U. S. Congress.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 79th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

Appendix

VOLUME 92 — PART 9

JANUARY 14, 1946, TO MARCH 8, 1946

(PAGES A3 TO A1246)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1946

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
12-23-46

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 79th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Appendix

The Air Force in Transition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1946

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an address delivered by Gen. Carl A. Spaatz, of the Army Air Forces, at Belleville, Ill., on January 8, 1946. General Spaatz was the honored guest at a "Salute to Scott Field" testimonial dinner sponsored by the Belleville Chamber of Commerce.

His address follows:

Coming back to Scott Field revives memories of the days when the air was young, when the old balloon hangar here was a welcome sight to Army airmen. As parent school in World War II for the training of technical personnel it made a large contribution to our victory in the air. It continues to have a role of essential significance for America's air power, turning out first-rate radio mechanics and operators, without which there can be no effective air power. I am happy to join you in the civic salute to Scott Field, which spanned the two World Wars with an unbroken record of service to the Air Force.

Col. Neal Creighton, your commanding officer, was post commandant of Camp Griffith, Bushey Park, headquarters of the Eighth Air Force of USSTAF, and in 1944 of General Eisenhower in the United Kingdom. He kept the post in model condition, opened facilities to keep all ranks happy, and is remembered for his constant effort to promote good will with the British, assisted by Colonel Bailey, also present. During the V-1 period, when flying bombs interrupted work during the day and our sleep at night, Colonel Creighton built sand-bag shelters for us all, and set up a loud speaker warning system, and even signals by bells for my residence some miles distant, so that we were able to get away from flying glass. He was our eyes and ears in that troublesome summer of 1944. This is to tell him that we all appreciated his care.

Present here is Col. Dick Hughes, chief of A-5, USSTAF, whose unerring instinct in the selection of targets was an important key to our success in hitting the enemy in the vital spots where it hurt him most. Colonel Hughes had two main topics of talk in those days—targets and Guernsey cattle near St. Louis.

And we see Col. Ken Bitting who kept our personnel problems down to a minimum. If he were on the same job in the Air Forces now he might lose some of the geniality which he maintained in the hard days of war.

Finally, the Army Air Forces would like to offer in this district a very special tribute of appreciation to your Congressman, Mr. PRICE. His long association with Congressman Ed Schaefer, another highly esteemed friend of the Air Forces, and his tour of duty as an enlisted man in this last war, give him an invaluable background of training and experience for his post in the Military Affairs Committee. In saluting Scott Field, we of the Air Forces also salute Congressman PRICE and his colleagues from Illinois.

I. TIMING IN THE AIR POWER AGE

My subject tonight, which I can only suggest in outline, is the Air Force in transition—transition to its peacetime role as first-line defense.

America has been accustomed to take time for granted.

We developed the comfortable luxury of reliance on a time lag long ago, in the age of steam, when we were beyond the reach of sudden attack by any aggressive power. The habit remains with us.

In the nineteenth century we had time to focus energies on our internal frontier, because the British Navy made us relatively safe. We could afford to keep our Military Establishment small.

We had time in World War I to meet danger because the Allies held the breach until we were psychologically ready. Even so we entered combat in 1918 with many of our weapons supplied us by Britain and France.

And we had time once more after Pearl Harbor because other nations were absorbing the attacks of the Axis. We had 2½ years to build our arsenal and train our manpower for the all-out assault in 1944.

The point is that the American luxury of the time lag, a byproduct of geography and historical circumstance in the age of steam, is gone forever—shattered by the new speed, new range, and new strategy of surprise through air power. The time lag was obliterated by the long-range bomber, by the atomic bomb. America is no longer the young Republic, remote from aggressors. Our hideway is gone; the world closes in.

America emerged from the war with technical, naval, and air superiority of the world. The key position in the world responsibility to keep the peace is thrust upon America, whether we like it or not.

That responsibility can be met only by the dominant medium of the new age—an air force in being, alert to surprise, equipped by the latest in science, and manned by the finest in technical personnel.

That, in turn, is a matter of timing—of changing American thinking from reliance on a time lag, now historically lost, over to reliance on preparation for the split-second exigencies of the age of air power and nuclear energy. That is the mental road to national security. There is no other road.

II. LESSONS IN TIMING

Our past reliance on the traditional time lag gave us some very close calls. We were aided not only by our eventual allies holding the breach until we got ready, but also by the wrong timing of our enemies.

One instance was the Kaiser's declaration of unrestricted submarine warfare on our shipping in World War I. That brought us into the war in April. If that had been delayed until the Germans had enough submarines, in the summer of 1917, America might well have been too late.

Another instance was the premature German air blitz on Britain in 1940, without heavy bombers necessary for such a task. The Spitfire and secret radar saved Britain, and saved the island base for America to join the all-out assault.

Then, our own bad timing. In 1939–40, when the Nazis were demonstrating the effectiveness of air superiority on the Continent, our Air Force had only 1,300 flying officers on active duty, and two flying schools (Randolph and Kelly).

After the blinding shock of Pearl Harbor we galvanized to action and began the race with time in our build-up for battle. Thanks to Britain and Russia, we had time, but not too much. We required two and a half years to get our arsenal and manpower ready for the all-out assault. Our people proved their technical genius in the arsenal, and our commanders proved their strategic genius, as our soldiers, sailors, and fliers proved their valor and élan in battle.

When the smoke blew away German war industries were masses of twisted, useless iron. German cities were blown apart. That was the work of the new weapon—the four-engined bomber, the B-17, the B-24, and the British Lancaster.

Never before in history had a great industrial country been destroyed from within, far from the battle lines on land or sea.

Air power had arrived on the pages of history with a strategy and tactic of its own.

In the Pacific our air power, operating from bases won by the Navy and Army forces, made the invasion of Japan unnecessary. Japan also collapsed from within, in which story the atomic bomb was only the last and most dramatic chapter.

We won the race with time, which began at Pearl Harbor.

But let us not forget that we were again aided by the wrong timing of our enemies. The Germans discovered too late their wrong use of air power, which they had harnessed to the specific needs of their ground troops. They became aware too late of the fatal lack of heavy, four-engined bombers. They diverted plant capacity from their air force to the making of V-1's and V-2's, which were also too late. Had they used the V-1 against shipping in British ports prior to D-day they

would probably have forced postponement of the invasion for another year.

We know, after inspection of their underground installations, that their manufacture of jet fighters, and even jet bombers, could have reached decisive proportions given another 6 months. With the superspeed of the jet fighters, in sufficient numbers, the Germans could have regained air supremacy. In that contingency anything might have happened. Certainly, the end of the war would have been postponed, and the loss of American and British lives would have continued.

We won the race with time. But our air force in being built up by our people in the arsenal, directed by our air commanders, and flown in battle by our gallant youth, fulfilling its war mission to the glory of the American people—that air force in being has become an air force in memory. America reverts once more to the perilous reliance on a time lag which is gone.

That brings me to what I really want to say tonight.

III. TRANSITION FROM WARTIME AIR FORCE TO VOLUNTEER AIR FORCE

We are in a critical interim period between the wartime air force and a volunteer air force not yet settled into form.

1. Disintegration

The Air Force shares with the Army and Navy the deplorable results of hysterical demobilization. At this very moment our overseas air commanders have insufficient usable personnel to carry out the responsibilities assigned, and considered essential, by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

One factor is that the Air Force, being the first to come into large-scale contact with the enemy, had an early build-up to full strength. Consequently, a greater portion of its personnel became eligible for separation on the point-score basis.

Another factor is that the Air Force needs a higher percentage of trained technicians than do other branches of the Army. The training is longer, and more intensive as to skills. The trained ground and air crews are the backbone of an air force. When they are broken up at a too rapid rate the air force ceases to be an air force in being. It takes 2 years to put an air crew together for combat; it can be blown apart with a stroke of the pen.

We will have only 80,000 selectees left in the Air Force in December 1946. We trained 130,000 selectees as mechanics; there will be only 6,000 of them left in September 1946. We trained 102,000 selectees as armorers; there will be less than 1,500 of them. Of 101,000 radio operators from the selectees we will have only 961. And we cannot give long-period training to the remaining selectees because they would be eligible for separation before completing their course.

2. Reenlistment

We must, therefore, rely on reenlistment of trained technicians in the Regular Army to make up the deficiencies. Our authorized strength in the volunteer Air Force is 400,000, of which 336,000 is enlisted.

Last month the Air Forces had 125,000 enlistees in the Regular Army, 40 percent of the total for the Army. By next December we must have 240,000, in addition to the 90,000 remaining selectees, to bring the Air Force up to its authorized troop basis. Of these, 105,000 must be trained technicians to meet the requirements of 70 groups.

Considering all factors, we must have a rate of enlistment set at 27,000 per month through June 1946 and at 12,000 per month thereafter.

Our special concern must be to make up the required 105,000 trained technical personnel, which can be done only by offering attractive technical careers in the Air Force. Under the pall of political uncertainties we cannot, at the moment, promise much.

IV. REQUIREMENTS FOR AN AIR FORCE IN BEING

Needless to point out, our timing is again wrong, as it was before Pearl Harbor. America is the most prodigal country in the world in the business of wasting talent, and throwing away hard-gained experience.

If we are to regain the Air Force in being, on a voluntary basis, we must prove equal to the task of maintaining such a force in peace as we did in war.

There are two immediate requirements:

1. Recruitment campaign

We must make all-out effort to reenlist trained technical personnel, both ground and air crews to make up the present deficiencies. We must recruit new blood to make up our authorized troops basis.

The Air Force must be recognized as the training school of technicians to meet the civilian demand in America's expanding air power. There should be no uncertainty about technical careers in both the Air Force and in the civil air lines.

2. Unification of the services

The Air Force supports President Truman's plan to unify the three armed services as being the essential requirement of the new era to insure our national security. I need not remind you of the arguments which have filled the press. However, note the factor of timing. Should unification be postponed now and then prove to be inevitable later, as would be certain in our view, then we might find ourselves in the midst of a necessary reorganization at the critical moment when some aggressor power is ready to stage another Pearl Harbor, maybe Pittsburgh, or Chicago, or even St. Louis. The factor of timing will be with us always.

Whether there is to be one Department of National Defense, or three separate Departments, the Air Force must be coequal with the land and sea forces, with an identity of its own to carry out the new strategy dictated by the air-power age.

V. CONCLUSIONS: TIMING IN THE NEW ERA

By way of conclusion, there are 10 points we should keep in mind:

1. Necessity to adjust our thinking to split seconds in timing

America's time lag, the luxury which colored our thinking in the past is gone forever. America, as the richest nation, will be No. 1 on an enemy's target list. The element of surprise must have top priority in national security plans. If war breaks out tomorrow, the Air Force must be ready yesterday.

2. Superiority of offense over defense will continue

At the end of this war the offense had gained an enormous superiority over defense. The Maginot line psychosis has been exploded. The new weapons—jet-propelled aircraft, guided missiles, atomic bombs, airborne armies, etc., give great advantages to mobile elements over static. There is no known answer to the rocket or the atomic bomb once they are launched at the target. Not yet.

3. Air power has come of age, with a strategy and tactics of its own

This was the overwhelming lesson of our mass use of air power in this last war, the Americans operating by day and the British by night.

4. Supersonic speed and vastly extended range change our defense strategy

In the past attacks on us would have been sea-borne part of the way, e. g., Pearl Harbor. Now attacks can come across the Arctic regions and strike deep into the heart of the country. America is wide open at the top. Our frontier is the entire air over the Western Hemisphere clear up to the North Pole.

5. War emergency fades into peace emergency

Future potentials of surprise through the air dictate abandonment of the traditional distinction between war and peace establishments. The only difference will be one of size. There can be no difference in the necessity for constant readiness.

6. New world situation

World responsibility is thrust upon America as a result of this last war. This time there will be no escape, no hideaway. America, for our own security, must have a role analogous to that of the British Navy in the nineteenth century. In the air-power age that responsibility can be met only by an alert air force in being.

7. Timing the build-up; stop disintegration

There must never again be a question of race against time. There will be no time. There is no way to stock pile an air force. There is no way to maintain an air force except with adequate trained technical personnel. The Air Force must be kept built up and ready. The first step is to stop this disastrous disintegration.

8. Necessity for readiness to make a show of force

The Air Force is responsible not only to keep abreast of science and to defend the country but also to be available for a show of force if called upon by the Security Council of the United Nations Organization. To that the United States Government has already agreed.

Before Pearl Harbor we implemented a tragic contradiction. We maintained a diplomatic frontier on the Yangtze River. But our armed frontier, to back up the diplomatic maneuvers, was thousands of miles to the rear, in mid-ocean. Hence, the Japanese flouted international decency, seized Manchuria, and overran China on their own timetable. That impunity set the fashion for the Fascists and Nazis.

Such a contradition weakens the position of our diplomats, and lowers the prestige of the United States. In the air-power age, quick show of force, by international decision, is the prime requisite to enforce peace.

9. Unification; separate air force

There are trends in history which even great nations can defy only at their peril. Such a trend is going on now as we move into the age of advanced air power. The dictate of the new strategy is centralized direction to insure unity of command, to insure mass use of all forces in emergencies, to guard against surprise. The trend dictates a streamlined offensive defense. That can be achieved best through unification of the three armed services, with the Air Force enjoying co-equal status with the land and sea forces. The alternative of a separate Air Force is, in any case, an absolute necessity so that the Air Force can operate to its capacity in its peculiar medium, the air, which has three dimensions.

10. Peace through air power

Air power is the latest instrument devised by man for the spread of civilization. It succeeds the sailing ship, the steamship, the covered wagon, and the railroad in penetrating and opening remote, unsettled areas of the earth. It supplements the automobile and tractor in economic activities, in large-scale agriculture, in forestry, fisheries, etc. It steps up the tempo of transport and communications, to unite nations, and to facilitate the exchange of peoples and ideas, which is the absolutely necessary preliminary step to international understanding for peace.

Air power, properly directed, can prevent that Third World War from ever coming into existence, as the instrument of strategy in peace as well as in war.

The badge of a country's air power is its air force.

America is the most air-minded nation in the world.

The question is: Is our timing again wrong?

We are sure that Scott Field will not lag in contributing technical personnel to these national tasks of America.

And we are sure that the town of Belleville will continue as a model of air-mindedness in the new era.

President's Disapproval of Appropriations Rescission Bill, H. R. 4407

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1946

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted today, I include the following memorandum of the President's disapproval of H. R. 4407, dated December 22, 1945:

MEMORANDUM OF DISAPPROVAL

I am withholding my approval of H. R. 4407, "Reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes."

It is with sincere regret that I am unable to approve this legislation. In response to my communication of September 5, 1945, and in conformity with their own careful plans, the Appropriations Committees of the House and of the Senate held extended hearings and gave mature consideration to the readjustment of Executive programs and finances to the problems of the reconversion period. The Congress has acted expeditiously and considerably to develop the basis for the continuing peacetime operations of the Government. It has demonstrated a fine spirit of economy in reducing appropriations without complicating the delicate adjustment from wartime to peacetime functions, and without sacrificing the basic progress which has been made during the war years in the long-term development of Government activity.

So far as the basic purpose of this bill rescinding appropriations is concerned, I am in thorough agreement with the action of the Congress. Far from wishing to sacrifice the care and effort which have gone into its development, I shall by Executive action preserve the full values of these rescission provisions in the exact terms which the Congress itself has approved. If these provisions stood alone I should gladly approve the bill. I have asked the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to place these rescission amounts in a reserve, nonexpendable status, and so to advise the departments and agencies concerned.

In addition to its effect on appropriations, however, the bill contains provisions which require our system of public employment offices—now unified in a single national system—to be broken up within 100 days, and transferred to operation as 51 separate State and Territorial systems.

While I believe such a transfer should be made at the proper time, I am convinced that this bill requires that it be made at the wrong time, and in the wrong way. Such a dispersion and transfer at this time would immeasurably retard our reemployment program. And as the basis for Federal-State cooperation, in a fundamental program of national importance, the provisions of the bill dealing with the public employment offices are unsound and unwise from any point of view.

So far as the timing of the transfer is concerned, the period designated by this bill—the next 100 days—is the most disadvantageous that could have been chosen. It will result in a disrupted and inefficient employment service at the very time when efficient operation is most vitally needed by veterans, workers, and employers.

Our local public employment offices are now and will be during the next several months, in the midst of the peak work load in their history. This is because the offices are now engaged in counseling and placing millions of applicants who require individualized service. These applicants include able-bodied veterans seeking assistance in their readjustment to civilian life, handicapped veterans requiring even more time and guidance in finding the jobs most suitable for them, and unemployed war workers who are confronted by difficult readjustments because of substantial reductions in job opportunities at their wartime skills and wage rates.

At such a time, any change in management and direction is necessarily disruptive to the service. A change which would replace our present single and unified management by 51 separate managements would be very harmful. Even with every effort by the States to promote a smooth transition, the transfer of some 23,000 employees to new conditions of employment, and the adjustment of operations to the requirements of 51 different State agencies, will inevitably cause confusion and delay.

In my reconversion message of September 6 to the Congress, I pointed out our national responsibilities and problems in connection with reemployment during the reconversion period. During this period, displaced war workers, and the veterans who are returning to civilian life at the rate of more than a million per month, will need and have a right to expect from their National Government an effective job-counseling and placement service. These problems and responsibilities cannot, in a period when millions of veterans and other workers are moving across State lines, be met adequately through 51 separate and independent public employment service systems, linked only by the necessarily remote and indirect influence of a Federal agency financing the State systems through grants-in-aid.

For these reasons, I now repeat my recommendation that the transfer of our public employment offices to State operation be postponed until June 1947. The administration is committed to returning the service to State operation, and that commitment will be carried through. But this is not the time.

Apart from the timing of the transfer, the provisions of H. R. 4407 which govern the basis for Federal-State cooperation in the maintenance of public employment offices do not assure that an adequate service will be available in all States.

The bill provides for the operation of public employment offices by the States under rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Labor to carry out the provisions of the Wagner-Peyser Act. Operating costs would be met entirely by the Federal Government. These provisions of the bill would remain in effect for only a few months—the balance of the current fiscal year.

The bill precludes the granting of funds to any State which is unable, or unwilling, to comply with the provisions of the bill or any requirement of the Secretary of Labor pursuant to the provisions of the bill.

A Federal-State cooperative program for a national system of public employment offices financed entirely by Federal funds must at least provide assurance as to two basic objectives. The Federal Government must be sure that the essential services are being provided through the States' employment offices, and it must know that the offices are being operated with reasonable efficiency. Under such a program, the Federal Government is not interested in prescribing minute or insignificant details concerning the State operation, but it does have a stake in the preservation of reasonable standards.

H. R. 4407 provides no effective protection for this national interest. If any State, for any reason, cannot or does not meet the minimum requirements, Federal grants cannot be made. But at the same time the Federal Government itself is precluded from continuing the operation of public employment office facilities in the State.

This means, in effect, that when there is a substantial failure to provide essential services or to meet minimum standards of efficiency, the Federal Government must choose between two alternatives which are both unsatisfactory. It must either acquiesce in the substandard operation—or, by withholding funds, it must deprive all of the State's employers, workers, and veterans of a service they need and to which they are entitled.

At a time of such acute emergency—when employment offices are needed to provide veterans with the services with which the Congress has required they be provided, and needed also to assist other unemployed workers in securing peacetime jobs—I cannot approve legislation which, under some conditions, may offer only a choice between a substantially substandard service or no service at all.

It seems clear to me that a matter of such grave importance as our public employment system deserves not only permanent legislation, but legislation carefully and separately considered. Issues of such a difficult and vital nature should not be dealt with as riders to appropriation bills.

The fact is that our present legislation governing the operation of our cooperative Federal-State employment service system, enacted in 1933, needs thorough revision in the light of changed conditions. Several bills now pending before both Houses of the Congress—H. R. 4437, S. 1456, and S. 1510—are designed to accomplish this. Enactment of such permanent legislation is essential before a transfer back to State operation can be achieved in an efficient and orderly manner.

Adequate and uniform standards of service must be maintained and proper security for the personnel of the organization itself must be provided in a permanent way, if it is to keep and attract the caliber of personnel able and eager to perform its important tasks.

Only in this way can we provide a sound and permanent basis for Federal-State cooperation in the maintenance of a postwar system of public employment offices which will meet the needs of veterans, employers, workers, and the Nation as a whole.

While I object to the specific measure which this bill proposes to carry out with respect to our employment service, I object even more strongly to the legislative method employed for its enactment. To attach a legislative rider to an appropriation bill restricts the President's exercise of his functions and is contrary to good government.

In view of my past legislative experience, I realize the obligations of the President to the Congress as a coordinate branch of the Government. At the same time, I must be equally aware of the constitutional responsibility of the President to the people, and of the obligation of the Congress to help him discharge that responsibility.

The Constitution has placed upon the President the duty of considering bills for approval or disapproval. It has always been possible for the Congress to hamper the President's exercise of this duty by combining so many subjects into a single bill that he cannot disapprove an objectionable item without holding up necessary legislation.

Partly in order to prevent this practice, it has long been considered a fundamental principle that legislation on a major issue

of policy ought not be combined with an appropriation measure. The present bill directly violates that principle. I am obliged to withhold my approval to some very excellent legisation because of the objectionable practice which has been followed by attaching this rider which I cannot possibly approve.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 22, 1945.*

Enforcement of the Wagner Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1946

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, in all the clamor and hysteria over troubled industrial relations, largely caused by big industry's sit-down strike against the American people, there have been half-baked demands for a whole battery of laws against labor—against the men and women who work for wages in this country and who are the principal market for the goods that our economy can produce in such abundance.

A few sober voices have pointed out that perhaps we do not need a new law so much as we have need of enforcement of laws already on the books, notably the Wagner Act.

I am glad to be able to state today that the Wagner Act is now being enforced with respect to the costly, tragic, and unnecessary GM sit-down strike against the legally selected representatives of 325,000 General Motors employees.

Mr. Speaker, the NLRB yesterday issued a complaint against the GM Corporation, returnable within 10 days. This complaint is based largely upon the UAW-CIO charge filed November 8 and a supplemental charge dated November 27, alleging that the $2,000,000,000 GM Corporation, after first claiming inability to pay, in its rejection of the union's demands in its October 3 summary rejection of the union's wage demands, subsequently refused to support that claim of inability to pay and in fact changed its whole line of opposition to collective bargaining by setting up the contention that it was not claiming inability to pay and that ability to pay is not relevant to collective bargaining and negotiating a wage agreement with American wage earners.

Personally, it has seemed to me that the Wagner Act might have been enforced with somewhat more dispatch. The GM workers, who have been out on strike since November 21, have been living under jungle law, without the protection of the Wagner Act, until this date. They have suffered substantial loss in wages. They have been willing to make an investment of more than $50,000,000 in what they deem a home-front battle to win a peace of full production, full consumption, and full employment.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, BEFORE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD, SEVENTH REGION—IN THE MATTER OF GENERAL MOTORS CORP. AND INTERNATIONAL UNION, UNITED AUTOMOBILE, AIRCRAFT, AND AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKERS OF AMERICA (UAW-CIO)—CHARGE

Pursuant to section 10 (b) of the National Labor Relations Act, the undersigned hereby charges that General Motors Corp., at 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit 2, Mich., employing 350,000 workers in the manufacture of automobiles, trucks, locomotives, electric refrigerators, engines, and other products and equipment, has engaged in and is engaging in unfair labor practices within the meaning of section 8, subsections (1) and (5), of said act, in that it, by its officers, agents, and employees, pleaded financial inability to pay any wage increase whatsoever, while at the same time refusing to discuss with the union the corporation's ability to pay a wage increase; refusing to disclose any information, essential to collective bargaining over the issue and peculiarly within the employer's knowledge, in the form of data concerning its costs and financial position;

Entered negotiations with an expressly stated predetermination not to permit ability to pay to become a subject of discussion in collective bargaining over wages;

Deported itself in such a manner throughout negotiations as to discourage collective bargaining, by indicating repeatedly that its position would remain unchanged regardless of any facts, reasoning, or argument which might be advanced by the union during the course of negotiations, by absenting from bargaining conferences its authorized representatives competent to commit the corporation to wage agreements, leaving the union representatives to present their case to minor corporation representatives, and in general by indicating its contempt for the entire negotiations;

Addressed letters to its employees (those represented by the union and also those not represented by the union) at the outset of negotiations, emphasizing the futility of negotiations and warning them of the inevitability of a strike; by doing so, interfering with, restraining and coercing employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed them by section 7 of the act;

In bad faith unduly delayed the inception of negotiations, and after finally commencing negotiations repeatedly refused to discuss the union's case during the course of its presentation;

Made an illusory offer in bad faith imposing conditions it knew the union could not legally fulfill;

Has demonstrated both by direct expression and by action an intent not to reach an agreement.

By the above and other acts, the corporation by its officers and agents has refused and continues to refuse to bargain collectively with the union in violation of section 8, subsection 5, of the act.

By the above and other acts the corporation by its officers and agents has discouraged and sought to discourage membership in, and activity on behalf of, the union of its employees, thus interfering with, restraining, and coercing its employees in violation of section 8, subsection 1, of the act.

The undersigned further charges that said unfair labor practices are unfair labor practices affecting commerce within the meaning of said act.

Name and address of person or labor organization making the charge. (If made by a labor organization, give also the full name, local number, and affiliation of organization, and name and official position of the person acting for the organization.)

INTERNATIONAL UNION, UAW-CIO,
WALTER P. REUTHER,
Detroit, Mich.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 8th day of November 1945, at Detroit, Mich.

VIOLA F. SMITH,
Notary Public, Wayne County, Mich.

My commission expires September 5, 1947.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, BEFORE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD, SEVENTH REGION—IN THE MATTER OF GENERAL MOTORS CORP. AND INTERNATIONAL UNION, UNITED AUTOMOBILE, AIRCRAFT AND AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKERS OF AMERICA (UAW-CIO)—SUPPLEMENTARY CHARGE

Pursuant to section 10 (b) of the National Labor Relations Act, the undersigned hereby supplements its original charge of November 8 against the General Motors Corp. at 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit 2, Mich., as follows:

The refusal by the General Motors Corp. to accept the procedure of collective bargaining, constituting an unfair labor practice within the meaning of section 8, subsection (1) and (5) of said act, of which the undersigned complained in its original charge of November 8, 1945, led to and directly caused the strike which began November 21 and which is presently continuing in the General Motors Corp. This refusal is in direct contravention of the declared policy of the United States, set forth in section 1 of the act:

"The refusal by employers to accept the procedure of collective bargaining lead to strikes and other forms of industrial strife or unrest, which have the intent or the necessary effect of burdening or obstructing commerce.

"It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to eliminate the causes of certain substantial obstructions to the free flow of commerce and to mitigate and eliminate these obstructions when they have occurred by encouraging the practice and procedure of collective bargaining."

The refusal to engage in collective bargaining contained in the General Motors' letter of November 26, issued in reply to the undersigned's wire of November 25 (requesting "further negotiating conferences" between the union and corporation, togther with full participation by United States conciliators, "In the interest of promoting the earliest possible fair settlement of the current wage dispute"), is a direct incitement to a prolongation of this strike, in flagrant violation of the spirit and the letter of the National Labor Relations Act.

The November 26 letter of the corporation states:

"You broke off collective-bargaining negotiations by calling a strike on November 20. With a strike in progress you now request further negotiations with General Motors."

The strike of November 21 was precipitated after the corporation refused to negotiate, refused to engage in collective bargaining—as outlined in the original charge filed with the National Labor Relations Board—refused to permit active participation by United States conciliators, and refused to accept arbitration, either in principle or in the form proposed by the union. No counter proposal for conciliation, mediation, or arbitration was made by the corporation either before or after the strike was called.

It is well-established National Labor Relations Board doctrine that, regardless of the cause of a strike, the fact of its existence in no way removes the legal obligation of an employer to engage in collective bargaining with the representatives of his employees. An act which has as its declared purpose

the removal of a cause of strikes, in the form of refusal to bargain collectively, embodies an even greater obligation to engage in bargaining as a means of terminating strikes which occur as a result of such refusal.

The statement in the corporation letter of November 26 that:

"Unless you are now prepared to modify your unreasonable wage demand, abandon your attempt to negotiate wages on the basis of our past profits, assumed future profits, and our selling prices, and are now prepared to discuss wage demands on their merits, we do not think that anything can be gained by further discussion of the wage issue with your union at this time."

is a statement that the corporation will not discuss the wage issue further unless and until the union stands ready to abandon its right to bargain under the act.

The corporation's obligation to bargain is not discharged by an offer to meet conditional upon union acceptance of limitations created arbitrarily and unilaterally by the corporation. Since the union has repeatedly stated its willingness to scale down its wage demand if the facts show inability to pay, and since the corporation has repeatedly refused to offer even a 1-percent wage increase without a price increase, the corporation statement is an announcement that it does not recognize any obligation to engage in collective bargaining under the National Labor Relations Act.

By the above and other acts, the corporation by its officers and agents has refused and continues to refuse to bargain collectively with the union in violation of section 8, subsection 5, of the act.

By the above and other acts the corporation by its officers and agents has discouraged and sought to discourage membership in, and activity on behalf of, the union of its employees, thus interfering with, restraining and coercing its employees in violation of section 8, subsection 1, of the act.

The undersigned further charges that said unfair labor practices are unfair labor practices affecting commerce within the meaning of said act.

INTERNATIONAL UNION—UAW-CIO,
WALTER P. REUTHER,
Detroit, Mich.

Small Business the Key to Prosperity in the Seventh Congressional District of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 14, 1946

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following table shows the county location of and the total number of manufacturing establishments, wholesaling and retailing establishments, and the total business establishments in the Seventh Congressional District of Wisconsin. There are a total of 635 manufacturing establishments, 4,742 wholesaling and retailing establishments, 5,377 total business establishments, a total of 4,944 owners and a total of 21,755 employees finding employment in the businesses in the Seventh Congressional District of Wisconsin.

Small business the key to prosperity in the Seventh Congressional District

County	Number of places over 2,500	Number of places 1,000 to 2,500	Under 1,000	Manufacturing, number of—			Wholesaling and retailing, number of—			Total business in Seventh District, number of—		
				Establishments	Owners	Employees	Establishments	Owners	Employees	Establishments	Owners	Employees
Langlade	1		1	39	39	1,128	403	367	809	442	406	1,937
Marathon	1	2	12	190	190	4,738	1,022	878	2,403	1,212	1,068	7,141
Shawano	1		10	110	110	752	604	578	757	714	688	1,509
Wood	2	1	3	85	85	3,613	624	551	1,463	709	636	5,076
Waupaca	3	2	7	84	84	949	680	629	1,130	764	725	2,079
Portage	1		7	57	57	1,260	553	477	1,152	610	535	2,412
Adams	0		1	8	8	19	111	108	99	119	116	118
Waushara	0	1	6	16	16	96	246	241	317	262	257	413
Marquette	0	1	3	14	14	58	182	176	164	196	190	222
Green Lake	1	1	3	32	32	390	317	291	458	349	323	848
Total	10	8	53	635	635	13,003	4,742	4,296	8,752	5,377	4,944	21,755

This Seventh Wisconsin Congressional District is typical of most congressional districts represented in Washington.

Only a few counties contain bigger cities. Most contain small cities and villages. Small business is the backbone of the business system in these counties.

Most of the families in these smaller places depend upon these smaller businesses for employment and economic security.

These small businesses need help and protection; they are not organized, nor do they have many ways to get their story to their Representatives in Congress.

As is evident in the table, the Seventh Congressional District of Wisconsin is very much the home of small businesses. A large percentage of these small businesses are closely tied in with the farming business. The near 30,000 farms are family sized units averaging approximately 120 acres each with about half the acreage under cultivation.

While dairy farming is the main type, we have the world's largest fox farms, other types of farming include potato, poultry, beef, and specialty farming units.

The prices of agricultural products are of interest not only to the farmers but also to the small business groups whether they be doctor, dentist, barber, lawyer, banker, hotel operator, filling station operator, grocer, dry goods merchant, canning factory operator, feed-mill operator, or feed-mill dealer. The agricultural prices have a direct bearing on the profits and take-home pay of the businessmen in nearly all of the business establishments in the Seventh District.

You will note that of the 5,377 business establishments 4,944 of them are owner operated.

The amount of wages paid the employees in nearly all these businesses is dependent upon the price of farm products. This not only includes the wages paid in the canning factories and dairy plants that process the farm products but also is reflected in the wages and salaries of the employees in the many small businesses of the district. In fact agricultural prices most assuredly influence and often determine the take-home pay of a large percentage of the 21,755 employees in the small businesses of the district, and when prices are low it is reflected in the whole economy of the district.

Without question, small businesses are to expand. First, they will increase in number to offset their share of the 500,000 in the United States that were closed during the war period. There will be the normal increase due to increased population and there will be other increases due to the fact that many people will want to be their own boss.

We all realize that many business ventures fail under normal times, but there are so many straws in the wind and so many factors that will be conducive to new small business expansion that this expansion is most assuredly in the picture of tomorrow.

These small businesses, like all other groups, must continue to be vigilant and see to it that they have fair consideration in legislation comparable to all the other groups of our society.

I am indebted to Mr. H. L. Post for the table. Mr. Post has always been in close contact with the development of small business of the district and has been very active in the civic development of the district.

Army Versus Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 14, 1946

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks and include an editorial, I wish to submit herein a copy of an editorial from the Washington Post, of date December 21, 1945, entitled "Army Versus Navy," as follows:

ARMY VERSUS NAVY

When the President disclaimed any intention of muzzling the armed services on the subject of his unification message to Congress, he showed a Christmas charity, but the fact remains that the unseemly battle between Army and Navy over the issue of his message has been conducted in violation of the law. That battle has not been waged

without funds. Brochures have been printed, speeches delivered throughout the country, and other expenditures entailed. The cost must have been pretty sizable. According to the Criminal Code, this is a misuse of public funds. Section 201 says:

"No part of the money appropriated by any act shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress, to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation."

This section of our Criminal Code, which was passed on July 11, 1919, appears to us to implicate a good many of the higher-ups, both military and civilian, in the War and Navy Departments. A single department is the object of several bills before Congress. Since their introduction both of the armed services have laid down a barrage of propaganda for or against, yet, without the express authorization of Congress. It has been a spectacle which should give the American people pause. But for the immense powers vested in the military in wartime, it could not have been possible. The fighting is over, but the military appears not to realize that the civilian again is king. What we have witnessed of late underlines the grave reminder in the Presidential message that civilian supremacy is next to equality before the law among the pillars of our American institutions. The propagandizing with which the people have been assailed constitutes a misdemeanor punishable by fine or imprisonment and removal from office.

Compulsory Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. ROBINSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1946

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a letter on the subject of compulsory military training, which was sent to me by the First Presidency of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints. This letter, in my opinion, gives a very complete analysis of this subject:

CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST
OF LATTER-DAY SAINTS,
OFFICE OF THE FIRST PRESIDENCY,
Salt Lake City, Utah, December 14, 1945.

The Honorable J. W. ROBINSON,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ROBINSON: Press reports have for some months indicated that a determined effort is in making to establish in this country a compulsory universal military training designed to draw into military training and service the entire youth of the Nation. We had hoped that mature reflection might lead the proponents of such a policy to abandon it. We have felt and still feel that such a policy would carry with it the gravest dangers to our Republic.

It now appears that the proponents of the policy have persuaded the administration to adopt it in what on its face is a modified form. We deeply regret this, because we dislike to find ourselves under the necessity of opposing any policy so sponsored. However, we are so persuaded of the rightfulness of our position, and we regard the policy so threatening to the true purposes for which this Government was set up, as set forth in the great preamble to the Constitution, that we are constrained respectfully to invite your attention to the following considerations:

1. By taking our sons at the most impressionable age of their adolescence and putting them into Army camps under rigorous military discipline we shall seriously endanger their initiative, thereby impairing one of the essential elements of American citizenship. While on its face the suggested plan might not seem to visualize the army-camp training, yet there seems little doubt that our military leaders contemplate such a period, with similar recurring periods after the boys are placed in the Reserves.

2. By taking our boys from their homes we shall deprive them of parental guidance and control at this important period of their youth, and there is no substitute for the care and love of a mother for a young son.

3. We shall take them out of school and suffer their minds to be directed in other channels, so that very many of them, after leaving the Army, will never return to finish their schooling, thus over a few years materially reducing the literacy of the whole Nation.

4. We shall give opportunity to teach our sons, not only the way to kill but also, in too many cases, the desire to kill, thereby increasing lawlessness and disorder, to the consequent upsetting of the stability of our national society. God said at Sinai, "Thou shalt not kill."

5. We shall take them from the refining, enobling character-building atmosphere of the home and place them under a drastic discipline in an environment that is hostile to most of the finer and nobler things of home and of life.

6. We shall make our sons the victims of systematized allurements to gamble, to drink, to smoke, to swear, to associate with lewd women, to be selfish, idle, irresponsible save under restraint of force, to be common, coarse, and vulgar—all contrary to and destructive of the American home.

7. We shall deprive our sons of any adequate religious training and activity during their training years, for the religious element of Army life is both inadequate and ineffective.

8. We shall put them where they may be indoctrinated with a wholly un-American view of the aims and purposes of their individual lives, and of the life of the whole people and Nation, which are founded on the ways of peace, whereas they will be taught to believe in the ways of war.

9. We shall take them away from all participation in the means and measures of production to the economic loss of the whole Nation.

10. We shall lay them open to wholly erroneous ideas of their duties to themselves, to their family, and to society in the matter of independence, self-sufficiency, individual initiative, and what we have come to call American manhood.

11. We shall subject them to encouragement in a belief that they can always live off the labors of others through the Government or otherwise.

12. We shall make possible their building into a military caste which from all human experience bodes ill for that equality and unity which must always characterize the citizenry of a republic.

13. By creating an immense standing army, we shall create to our liberties and free institutions a threat foreseen and condemned by the founders of the Republic, and by the people of this country from that time till now. Great standing armies have always been the tools of ambitious dictators to the destruction of freedom.

14. By the creation of a great war machine, we shall invite and tempt the waging of war against foreign countries, upon little or no provocation; for the possession of great military power always breeds thirst for domination, for empire, and for a rule by might, not right.

15. By building a huge armed establishment, we shall belie our protestations of peace and peaceful intent and force other nations to a like course of militarism, so placing upon the peoples of the earth crushing burdens of taxation that with their present tax load will hardly be bearable, and that will gravely threaten our social, economic, and governmental systems.

16. We shall make of the whole earth one great military camp whose separate armies, headed by war-minded officers, will never rest till they are at one another's throats in what will be the most terrible contest the world has ever seen.

17. All the advantages for the protection of the country offered by a standing army may be obtained by the National Guard system, which has proved so effective in the past and which is unattended by the evils of entire mobilization.

Responsive to the ancient wisdom, "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it," obedient to the divine message that heralded the birth of Jesus the Christ, the Saviour and Redeemer of the world, "Peace on earth, good will toward men," and knowing that our Constitution and the Government set up under it were inspired of God and should be preserved to the blessing not only of our own citizenry but as an example to the blessing of all the world, we have the honor respectfully to urge that you do your utmost to defeat any plan designed to bring about the compulsory military service of our citizenry. Should it be urged that our complete armament is necessary for our safety, it may be confidently replied that a proper foreign policy, implemented by an effective diplomacy, can avert the dangers that are feared. What this country needs and what the world needs is a will for peace, not war. God will help our efforts to bring this about.

Respectfully submitted.

GEO. ALBERT SMITH,
J. REUBEN CLARK, JR.,
DAVID O. MCKAY,
The First Presidency.

Ceiling Prices on Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1946

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose herewith a concurrent resolution adopted by the Senate of South Carolina under date of January 8, 1946:

Concurrent resolution requesting the President and the Congress of the United States of America to prohibit ceiling prices being placed upon cotton

Be it resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the President and the Congress of the United States of America are hereby earnestly requested that they do all in their power to prohibit a ceiling price being placed upon the sale and purchase of cotton.

Surplus Property Disposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROGER C. SLAUGHTER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 14, 1946

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

SURPLUS PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., December 26, 1945.
Hon. ROGER C. SLAUGHTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SLAUGHTER: In an extension of your remarks which appears on page A5500 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 91, part 13, there is included a letter of November 27, 1945, from Mayor John B. Gage, of Kansas City, Mo., concerning the administration of the Surplus Property Act of 1944.

Mayor Gage addressed an identical letter of the same date to Senator FRANK P. BRIGGS which was forwarded to this Administration for consideration and comment. A copy of our reply to Senator BRIGGS is enclosed. We thought you might wish to know of our correspondence on this subject and to have an expression of our views on the points mentioned by Mayor Gage.

We would welcome an opportunity to furnish additional information in the event our reply to Senator BRIGGS leaves any questions unanswered.

Sincerely yours,
W. STUART SYMINGTON,
Administrator.

SURPLUS PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., December 19, 1945.
Hon. FRANK P. BRIGGS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BRIGGS: This is in reply to your letter of November 30, 1945, enclosing a letter from Mayor John B. Gage, of Kansas City, Mo., which is returned herewith. We apologize for the delay in making reply.

SPA Regulation No. 2, issued November 16, 1945 (copies enclosed), is designed to give Government agencies and State and local governments full opportunity to purchase personal property under the priorities granted in the Surplus Property Act. This regulation was prepared with the cooperation, suggestions, and assistance of the Council of State Governments, the United States Conference of Mayors, the National Association of County Officials, and the National Institute of Governmental Purchasing.

The sales to Federal, State, and local governments have greatly increased in the last 4 months. For example, in the case of consumer goods, the sales to these priority claimants in November 1945 were 25 percent of the total sales of consumers goods as compared to less than 10 percent in July 1945.

Apparently, there is some misunderstanding concerning the application of 40 percent discount granted under SPA Regulation No. 14 (copies enclosed). This discount is not applied against the original cost of the property to the owning agency. Paragraph (b) of section 8314.9 of the regulation provides that the disposal agencies shall allow from the fair value of the property a discount of 40 percent. Such fair value shall not be greater than the lowest price which is offered to any trade level at the time the surplus property is purchased by the priority claimant. This formula—fair value minus 40 percent—enables the local governments, as well as the other eligible claimants, to acquire surplus property at a low cost.

Mayor Gage apparently does not agree with respect to the policy of selling surplus property on an "as is—where is" basis. We hold that this method of sale is consistent with the objectives of the Surplus Property Act. The primary purpose of making offerings on an "as is" basis is to achieve a prompt utilization of surplus property. This could not be accomplished if all goods were not made available for purchase until after the disposal agency had determined the exact condition of each item. Such determination would require unpacking, examination, sorting, testing, classification, and other processing. There are many hundreds of thousands of different items, and if this were done in every case the interval between declaration by an owning agency and acquisition by the purchaser would be much longer than is the case at the present time. Of course, this processing would also result in higher costs to the buyers. It is our opinion, therefore, that the advantages of selling surplus property on an "as is" basis—prompt disposals at minimum costs—are shared equally by the buyer and the seller.

The policy of requiring the purchaser to pay for handling and transportation charges conforms to established commercial practices.

The complaint of Mayor Gage has been brought to the attention of the Kansas City office of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and if, in the future, he feels that priority claimants are not receiving treatment in accordance with the Surplus Property Act we would welcome specific information so that we can investigate and take remedial action.

Sincerely yours,
W. STUART SYMINGTON,
Administrator.

Are the People Out of Step With the President in Regard to USES? The Apparent Answer Is "Yes"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 14, 1946

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have had many letters in support of legislation to return the employment services to the State. These letters have come from both the employees and the employers. There must be merit to their position or there could not be such unanimity of agreement.

The following letter of January 10, 1946, voices the opinion of the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor in regard to the USES:

WISCONSIN STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Milwaukee, Wis., January 10, 1946.
Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
United States Congressman,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: At the semiannual meeting of the General Executive Board of the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor action was taken instructing the officers of this federation to prevail upon the Members of Congress to use their influence to return the employment services to State control.

The board, in making its decision, felt that employment service under War Manpower control during the war, the period for which it was loaned by the State to the Federal Government, has now outlived its usefulness and that it is now a question of local concern which can best be administered by State agencies.

We therefore urge you to use your good offices to the end that the service of the USES be immediately returned to State control.

Very truly yours,
GEORGE A. HASERMAN,
President.
WM. NAGORSNE,
Secretary-Treasurer.

What United States Has Given in Wealth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 14, 1946

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Louis Bromfield:

WHAT UNITED STATES HAS GIVEN IN WEALTH
(By Louis Bromfield)

I have just been reading a file of clippings from British papers commenting upon the American loan. None of it is very nice reading and little of it is reasonable reading. What impressed me most were three things: First, the complete misunderstanding by people trained in the Lord Keynes school of economy of the vast differences in the bases of the two national economies; second, the lack of understanding or the deliberate refusal to admit the true causes of England's position; third, the shortness of memory with regard to the causes of the Second and, indeed, the First World War.

In most of the editorials we, as a nation, as simply abused for not making gifts of valuable dollars without interest and without limit to Great Britain. In nearly every case there was no mention whatever of the cancellation of the gigantic debt owed us in the First World War, nor the fact that we canceled twenty-seven billions of lend-lease in this war. The cancellation of the First World War was of much less importance than that of lend-lease, although in the end they come to the same thing.

In both cases what we furnished them was infinitely more important than money. You can replenish money. You can even print it on presses when you get a little short of it. But what we gave England in both wars was real wealth cut out of the very heart of the Nation. We gave them iron, oil, food, timber, clothing, copper, nickel—indeed, all the precious commodities which are the true foundation of our wealth and our prosperity.

CANNOT BE REPLACED

Most of these things we can never replace save by buying them from other nations when our own stocks are exhausted, and some of them are far nearer exhaustion than most citizens understand. To Lord Keynes and to the British bankers and industrialists these precious commodities do not have the same vital importance, because England's economy is not founded upon such things but upon lending money, processing raw materials

from colonies and other nations, then selling them again to other nations and colonies.

In both wars we lent and eventually gave them much more than money. What we gave them they could not have gotten anywhere else in the world.

In none of the clippings is there any recognition of the fact that in a changed world any loan to Great Britain is a bad loan and that no matter what happens it will turn out, both loan and interest, to be a gift.

As I have written before, in this changing, complex world the day of the banking, processing nations without real wealth, attempting to control vast, scattered markets and sources of raw materials is on the way out. No matter what happens, no matter how much money we should pour into England, there will never be any return to the power and prosperity of the days before 1914.

LOAN IS APPRAISED

It is a good thing to make certain that the British people have more to eat and more to wear, that they have better housing, that we help them to renovate and make efficient the industries which should have been renovated and made efficient even before the First World War. But it is hypocrisy on both sides to pretend that even a loan of nearly $5,000,000,000 is, in any form, a real business deal between two equally powerful nations with equally bright futures or that the United States is making a loan backed by the securities that would be demanded even by a country bank. It is simply not so and to pretend it is pure, unadulterated Anglo-Saxon hypocrisy and self-deceit on both sides of the Atlantic.

As to shortness of memory, the British have forgotten, perhaps conveniently, where lie many of the roots of this war—in Lord John Simon's deceit which condoned the Japanese invasion of Manchuria, in Lord Halifax's nonintervention policy in Spain, in Samuel Hoare's connivance with Laval and Mussolini, in Great Britain's refusal to back up the French when Hitler marched into the Rhine. Hitler himself admitted such action would have ruined him. In Chamberlain's pathetic attempts at appeasement and peace in our time, and most of all the tory British desire and the desire of most of her bankers and industrialists to sabotage the German Republic as a Socialist state and to build up the Nazis as a barrier against bolshevism.

MATTER OF RECORD

These facts are all matters of record together with countless others. Great Britain got the war which all these actions asked for. In all that, we were guiltless or nearly guiltless. The balance of power was no affair of ours. Today Great Britain has the socialism that its bankers and industrialists and tory statesmen hated and feared. In view of all these things, it seems a little fantastic that we are once again called Uncle Shylock.

The British deserve all the praise in the world for their heroism and we had to help them in order in the long run to save ourselves. The question is—How long does such a pattern continue? Zukhov has already complained of the great number of German troops still not demobilized in the British zone of occupied Germany. He has asked why?

Is it the old pattern beginning over again with Germany on England's side, this time against Russia? That is a pattern which is already a couple of centuries old and has given birth to war after war. The Atlantic Charter is already thrown out of the window in Java, in Malaya, in Hong Kong, in Greece.

I am not and never have been an isolationist. I am just growing a little tired of a pattern that is a little old and worn out. Sentiment is all right, but it seems to me that even to sentiment there is a limit when it involves ourselves and our children and grandchildren.

History will probably look upon lend-lease as the costliest gift ever made by one nation to another in history for it wasn't a gift of money which is so important to Lord Keynes. It was real wealth, torn out of our vitals and belonging in reality to generations of Americans as yet unborn.

Spartanburg, S. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1946

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, from the Birmingham Age-Herald, published at Birmingham, Ala., on Saturday morning, January 12, 1946, I have clipped the attached complimentary and truthful article regarding the city and county of Spartanburg, S. C., as described by John Temple Graves. I include the same as a part of my remarks in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS MORNING

(By John Temple Graves)

TIME MARCHES ON

SPARTANBURG, S. C.—Time is marching at quickstep here. Yet it carries baggage. The baggage is precious and is needed at each arrival. This community has come to be the most important textile one in the world and at the same time one of the most important agricultural ones. Spartanburg produces more than $166,000,000 worth of textiles each year, giving the county first rank in America in cotton-textile manufacture. At the same time its rolling red hills produce annually nearly 50,000 bales of cotton and 4,500 carloads of peaches. The peaches are something new, but already they rank in value with cotton. A swiftly growing livestock industry will rank with both one day.

And oh, how they know here that the South's greatest new market is the South. And oh, how they appreciate the importance of being science-minded, civic-minded, character-minded, hope-minded. The newspapers breathe it in print. The Kiwanis Club was electric with it as Duncan Sullivan Burnside turned the presidential gavel over to Lowell Talmadge Lister the other evening. A great factor determining the future of this county, vows the chamber of commerce in a teeming bulletin, "is the local demand for industrial products—demand from industry itself as well as demand from individual citizens."

"Piedmont" means foothills. This city of the Piedmont believes in foothills, especially Appalachian ones. The hills for ambition, the feet for marching and for modest appreciation of distance to go. Young William A. Townes, editor and publisher of the Spartanburg Herald, who belongs to one of the oldest families in this State and who has been learning in such distances as Oklahoma and Ohio to appreciate what a future his State has with its past, is preparing here with modern methods and ancient loves to push the Piedmont in all the directions of great living. There is something called the Piedmont Club. Outside it is Queen Victoria's—was once the stately nineteenth century home of the Montgomery family. But when you go inside you have skipped 50 years. All is smooth, beautiful, postmodernity, even to the extent of a manager trained in the elite vicinities of Bar Harbor, Maine.

Out at the old home of Judge and Mrs. T. S. Sease (she was Eunice Calhoun, grandniece of John C.) you stand at a hearthside where the great Calhoun himself once sipped toddy (my own father, too, later)—and hear talk of Petrillo, Truman, Stalin, atomic power, and the future of cotton. Yes; they carry baggage here. In Morgan Square, heart of the city, only the monument to Gen. Daniel Morgan, hero of the Revolutionary Battle of Cowpens, orients you to a picture of that same square in 1884. Every building has been torn down and replaced with a new one in that interval. But Morgan goes on being there, looking it all over, sometimes exercising a wise veto.

And do you know what their great baggage is as they travel, dear friends and fellow citizens of the atomic age? It is a sense of human excellence, through education and the Lord. They will tell you that they are a city brought into being by educational institutions founded in love of God, depending quite literally upon these for growth and present substance. The first impetus to the little village this once was came from Wofford College, founded in 1854 by a Methodist minister and owned today by the church. Then came the now famous Converse College, founded in 1889 by Presbyterians. And Spartanburg Junior College, established in 1911 as a textile school, owned today by the Methodist Church of America, is one of the first institutions in America to inaugurate a work study plan enabling young people to earn their way as they get their education. If this school had a less localized name, it would rank with Berea in national attention.

And what do they do with their money, these people of Spartanburg? One thing they do is invest it in Spartanburg, in South Carolina, in the South. Another is to put it into a newly created civic humanitarian fund whose directors appropriate the income of nearly half a million dollars to what will most serve the health, educational, or spiritual needs of the people, individually or as a whole. Only in Winston-Salem is here another such institution.

A city of balanced and balancing economy. A city where economy itself is balanced with those best things money can buy or has bought and with even better ones that can't be bought. That is Spartanburg, S. C. I am glad to be living in the same South with it.

Taking Stock of President Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1946

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the Chicago Daily News of January 4, 1946:

TAKING STOCK OF PRESIDENT TRUMAN

President Truman last night called on the Nation to take stock of itself. His speech affords the opportunity for taking stock of President Truman.

There was the familiar earnestness, sincerity, and humility. There was no pretense that all is well in this troubled land. There was a final appreciation of the fact

that our domestic confusion is beginning to threaten our position in world affairs.

He attempted to rally the people of the country to support of a program that Congress has in large part neglected. But the program is not clear and the call did not ring.

One need go no further than his own words for proof that the administration does not know which of two opposite evils threatens the country first, which it is fighting.

It fears both inflation and deflation, not merely as one might follow the other, but simultaneously, and it is fighting both at once. It has tramped down with both feet on the accelerator and the brake. When you and I do that, we kill the engine, and that is not very different from what is happening to industry.

Notwithstanding the enormous inflationary forces put into play by war expenditure and Government borrowing, President Truman was sold by the labor elements in his administration and counsels that the main threat was deflation.

President Roosevelt tried much more consistently throughout the war to hold wages and prices in line together, but since the end of hostilities President Truman has thrown the full force of the administration behind the inflation of wages and labor costs, while declaring (as he did again last night in his most emphatic tones) that we must hold the line on prices.

Secretary Schwellenbach told the oil industry that wages must rise more than 15 percent by the hour. President Truman proposed a 22-percent increase for Government employees. Even before this inflationary ground swell has taken effect, while much of industry is strike bound or strike threatened over the limits of the increase, prices are rising on uncontrolled items and production is jammed in many of the controlled lines.

It is foolish to suppose or dishonest to pretend that wage rates throughout the Nation can rise as far as even the administration proposes (by example and precept) without a substantial rise in prices, too.

The assumption is probably pretense. Washington is full of people who really believe that a measure of inflation, including prices, is not only desirable but necessary to reduce the burden of the national debt. While it might accomplish this, it would have the evil consequences that President Truman outlined.

Considering the forces making for it, inflation is the real threat, but the major part of President Truman's program ever since VJ-day has assumed the contrary. He decries inflation and says we must hold the line on prices, but he helps to build up the pressures that threaten to break the line.

So we have his insistence on higher wages throughout Government and industry, higher unemployment insurance, higher minimum wages, and kindred measures each of which will twist the spiral higher if it becomes effective.

We have no sympathy with the tactics by which any committee prevents or delays action on any measure pending in Congress. We hope President Truman's appeal does blast loose every item of his program that is log-jammed, so that there can be a decision on all, and affirmative action on many.

But as a remedy for what ails us, some of the program is a fraud. He says it is important that Congress pass a full employment bill such as he favors. For the present emergency, it is utterly unimportant whether it passes either the Senate bill, the House bill, or no bill at all.

Public works are the principal means by which this kind of legislation means to guarantee full employment. But today's unemployment is the result of bottlenecks of materials and manpower—including the bottleneck of voluntary, purposeful unemployment threatening to engulf much of major industry.

What sense would there be in a big program of public works at a time when a man cannot buy a few sticks of lumber to build a bookcase—or a garage to shelter an auto (if he could buy an auto)—to say nothing of the materials for a house?

With President Truman we deplore the withdrawal of General Motors from the fact-finding procedure intended to settle the automobile strike. With him we believe a legal basis must be found to facilitate the settlement of such disputes. But he did not answer the questions that General Motors raised in withdrawing.

It was no disagreement about facts that produced the General Motors deadlock, it is now apparent; it is a disagreement, or confusion, about theories.

The union, and the President's commission, have proclaimed a new theory of wage fixing, without precedent in American labor negotiations. This is the theory that a future estimate of a single corporation's ability should determine the wages it shall pay; but it is not clear whether it should also determine the wages of other units in the industry, regardless of their ability to pay.

Perhaps the Board, which may report today, will say what scope should be given to the theory, and what limitations. If so, perhaps President Truman will adopt the Board's theory as his own. But it is the theory, and not the facts, that has been the sticking point.

Congress may have to legislate concerning the theory as well as the facts. If Congress is confused, the President has not shown that he sees the issue clearly.

Navy Announces Details of New GI Uniform—Movement Started by Leib

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 14, 1946

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, on January 1, 1946, the Navy Department officially announced that it had finally given in to the zipper age and that the bellbottom trousers, jumpers, and so forth, representing a moth-eaten tradition honoring dead heroes of another nation, were to be discarded.

This statement culminated a long and extended fight to scrap the present uniform. Some years ago Joseph Leib, now legislative director of the American Veterans of World War II—Amvets—launched a private campaign to have the outmoded uniform replaced by one of a more modern design. It all started in this way: One day a Navy man, embittered because he had to wear the so-called Little Lord Fauntleroy suit, called upon Leib, pointing out to him the many disadvantages of the tight-drawn trousers around the hips and the big flaring bottoms at the ankles, also the lack of pockets.

Leib undertook an investigation and found that the black neckerchief, which sailors drape about their necks, represented a continuous mourning for Lord Nelson, hero of the British Navy. The 13 trouser buttons commemorates the Thirteen Original Colonies, while the three white collar stripes were for the three sea victories of Lord Nelson. In addition the big flowing square collar was designed in the early days of the British Navy to catch the tar that sailors used on their heavily greased pigtails and the white hat was designed to use as a bucket to bail out a boat.

Leib thought that it was about time for a change and went out to do something about it. He prepared articles for newspapers. When the going was hard he called upon the assistance of Members of Congress. He wrote Senate bill 1082 to provide for changing the design of the uniform of enlisted personnel of the Navy and the Coast Guard and have it conform in basic design to the uniform worn by commissioned and warrant officers of the Navy and Coast Guard. Then he prepared the speech that Senator LANGER delivered on the Senate floor on June 15, 1945—pages 6194–6201—which threw the Chamber in stitches. In the midst of this address Senator BARKLEY, majority leader of the Senate, walked over to Senator LANGER and assured him that if he would "call off the dogs" that he—BARKLEY—would make it his own personal business to see to it that the uniform would be changed.

Senator BARKLEY kept his word and now the outmoded uniform is about to be discarded. Here is the announcement as made by the Navy:

[From the Washington Evening Star, of January 1, 1946]

NAVY TESTS CONVENTIONAL STYLES FOR SAILORS' NEW UNIFORMS

The Navy has revealed details of its proposed new design for enlisted men's uniforms, replacing the jumper and bellbottom trousers which have been the trade-mark of seafaring men for six centuries.

It cautiously explained yesterday, however, that the new design is still the subject of tests and, if adopted, must await depletion of present stocks of old-style uniforms.

Some 2,500 sample uniforms have been distributed to the Atlantic and Pacific Fleets and to shore stations for wearing and stowage tests under all conditions, on the basis of which commanding officers will make criticisms and recommendations. The tests are expected to require about 3 months.

In the new design, conventional trousers replace the laced bellbottoms, and the black neckerchief, which tradition says was designed by the British as a sign of mourning for Lord Nelson, will be replaced by a black four-in-hand tie.

The body-tight jumper will give way to a jumper-type shirt similar to a sport shirt, which can be worn open at the neck for undress or buttoned for dress.

A tailored, waist-length battle jacket is provided for dress or winter wear.

There are three separate uniforms in the new outfit—blue, gray, and white—with shirts to match. The blue and white are dress uniforms and the gray the working uniform. White trousers may be worn with the blue battle jacket in warm weather.

The white uniform may be worn in both dress and undress fashion—with a black tie for dress and open at the neck for undress. The gray uniform is composed of gray shirt and trousers similar to those now worn by chief petty officers.

Headgear includes a blue garrison cap for the blue uniforms and the present white hat and a gray baseball-type cap to be worn with the white and gray uniforms, respectively.

Currently authorized badges, hash marks, and other insignia will be worn with the new uniforms. The present overcoat, known to Navy men as a pea coat, has been retained.

The Truman Loan to Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 14, 1946

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement made about the Truman loan to Britain:

The Truman loan to Britain does not merit support. The United States, through its Congress, has provided or is providing $2,700,000,000 for UNRRA. Additional millions and billions of dollars have been appropriated to carry out the principles of the Atlantic Charter. The UNRRA appropriation was made in the name of humanity. These funds were provided to feed, clothe, and shelter human beings. We should not nullify these Christian objectives by now providing Britain or any other country the funds with which to carry on an imperialistic war to destroy human beings. While UNRRA will save human lives, the British loan will destroy more human lives.

The time has come to tell Britain and all countries that the American people are not going to give further from their depleted resources any money to any country that does not subscribe and support the principles of the Atlantic Charter. There is small difference, indeed, between carrying on an imperialistic war ourselves and the providing of funds for other countries to carry one on.

No one need be deceived. Everyone knows that these funds will be used for bombs and bullets to take the lives of innocent people in Java, Indochina, and other countries. No thoughtful person would provide a loan for some individual to buy a gun and the ammunition to take even one human life. Why, then, I ask, should these enormous funds be provided a country to destroy thousands upon thousands of human lives?

The world should be advised once and for all that Christian America is not so materialistic that it can be influenced by those who would place more coins in the pockets of a few "money changers in the temple" regardless of the country the temple happens to be located in. I hesitate to believe that the American people are so materialistic and so mercenary that this loan can be sold to them on the basis of the "good times" it will bring in our country.

There is a moral issue involved in this proposed loan, and no whitewash is white enough to hide the sins incident to it. The Truman administration and the previous administration professed great interests in humanitarianism. Even on the floor of this House it is frequently evident that the majority wishes to convey the impression that minority membership is lacking in appreciation of human rights and human values. This has been a most false approach. The Truman administration has evidently now repudiated all humanitarianism—yes; it has openly flouted all humanitarianism by even proposing this loan.

Enough sugar cannot be used to coat this legislative pill so that it should be swallowed by any person who does not want human blood on his hands and a permanent blight on his conscience.

The American people applauded the President's action when he told the Chinese to quit killing each other and to unite for the benefit of their country. I believe the American people would applaud the President if he would tell Britain and the other loan-seeking countries to sweep off their own doorsteps, follow the Atlantic Charter, and cease activities that violate the rights of men—yes, men, whoever they may be, wherever they may be, and whatever the color of their skin may be.

Attlee's description to the Congress of the conditions in Limey and the reasons why he is for the general welfare of all the people of England was only a sham, if he now advocates or condones what his own country is doing in Java and in Indochina at this very moment.

The right and the desire for life and freedom is just as valuable and sweet to the lowly as it is to the snobs of any country.

Ability to Pay Wages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 14, 1946

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Daily Tribune of Royal Oak, Mich., of January 8, 1946. This editorial presents a reasoned and sound analysis on the question of ability to pay. If ability to pay is to become the yardstick on which wages are based and the tested principle of fairness known as value received is to be abandoned, then indeed a new philosophy has appeared in the United States. It would be as detrimental to labor as it would to management and the laboring man would suffer most.

The editorial follows:

PERSONALLY SPEAKING
(By Floyd J. Miller)

ABILITY TO PAY WAGES

Somehow, in all I have read or heard about the General Motors-UAW wage dispute, I have never encountered the statement:

"If wages are to be based on the ability of the employer to pay, they should also be based on his ability not to pay.

"That is, if good profits for the company mean a raise in pay, regardless of what the employee is now getting, a decrease in profits, or operation at a loss, should mean a decrease in pay."

I don't see how you can fairly have one without the other.

And if we are to adopt such a plan, we must realize that we are approving a very drastic change in our present system of wages and salaries.

Perhaps that is what we want. Or maybe we don't. But we should at least understand what we are headed for when we talk about wages being based on "the ability to pay." That is one of those fancy phrases that sounds wonderful—until we follow it through.

If we do this, we may come out with some answers that we never dreamed of.

The system on which we have always operated in this country has been based on agreements entered into at the time a man—or woman—takes a job. Under this plan, an employer promises to pay a certain wage for certain work. More often than not it has also been understood that a raise would be given after a certain time. Often this scale of increases was definitely set.

But under no circumstances was the worker to receive less than the agreed amount.

The employer does not say, "Of course you realize that this business may not be a success. In that case I shall expect you to share the loss; to take less pay, or even to get none."

No; the employer is held for the agreed-on amount. He may lose all he has invested in the business, plus his own pay, plus everything he can scrape up to try to save the enterprise. But he still has to pay the workers the amount due them.

That is the way it should be. The laws are right which provide that if a business goes broke, the workers' claims for wages due shall come ahead of almost any other claim in dividing up what assets are left.

How else could most of us plan our lives? How could a man marry, have children, buy a house, or take on other obligations if he were expected to share the risks of the business in which his employer is engaged?

PAY IS GUARANTEED

Guaranteed pay is such an accepted part of our system that it never occurs to us that the custom had to be built up by centuries of performance. It has become our never-worried-about rule because employers have made good on it. Once a wage is promised a man for certain work, it is paid, regardless of any other demands on the employer's cash.

Now, if we are to change the plan; to make wages depend on whether the employer makes a big or little profit, or none at all, that will be quite a shift in our way of doing things.

Just now the automobile union is asking that its members be given a 30-percent increase in hourly pay rate on the basis of alleged high company earnings over a very short period of years. With a great show of righteous indignation, Walter Reuther shouts, "Don't tell us you can't afford to pay that amount. Don't duck the issue. Just show us your books, and prove it."

It seems to me that the General Motors is not trying to duck the issue. Instead, it is trying to bring it out into the open.

It isn't doing too good a job in this because its head men are not as good argufiers as Walter Reuther. What we call "public relations" is only part of the job they have to know in order to run automobile companies in a highly competitive market. They are not nearly as quick on the trigger as the capable young labor leader.

DEPEND ON PROFITS?

They would make the situation much more understandable to the average person if they inquired whether the employees wanted their pay to depend on the employer's profit or loss. For if employees do want this, they must be prepared to go without any pay at all, sometimes.

The employees of automobile companies that do not make any profit would be forced to work for one rate, while those working for more successful concerns would get a lot more. Do you think the first group would stand this? Of course not. They wouldn't work. Nobody could make them.

In other words, if looking at the books showed that the company was making a profit, temporarily at least, raises would be granted. But the plan wouldn't work the other way around. For no union could force its men to take a pay cut because the company was in the red.

What rot, then, to talk about the ability to pay more, and demand to see the books to prove it, without also considering the ability to pay less, and expecting the men to take that, also.

General Motors Versus the Rest of Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. HOOK
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 14, 1946

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Walter P. Reuther from the New Republic of January 14, 1946:

GM VERSUS THE REST OF US

(By Walter P. Reuther)

More than 325,000 General Motors workers and members of their families are on strike and walking picket lines in a hundred American towns and cities. They are determined to win the first major home-front battle for a peace of full production, full consumption, and full employment, year in and year out.

The strike is solid. It has the full support of the entire CIO. Members and officials of other labor organizations support it. Church leaders, businessmen, and others who have studied the record of our attempts at negotiation, at conciliation, and voluntary arbitration have endorsed our basic contention, that purchasing power must match production and that the first step in making sure that it does is to maintain take-home pay.

We are convinced, as the result of our arithmetic based on published facts about the auto industry, about General Motors' past performance, about costs, prices, profits, and the certainty of a market for capacity production for the next 3 years, that General Motors should and can pay 30-percent higher wage rates without increasing prices and at the same time make profits higher than the prewar level. We are convinced that the real reason why the GM management will not discuss the arithmetic, will not discuss its ability or inability to pay, will not even try to prove it can't pay, is simply that the facts and figures locked up in GM vaults would bear out the union's case and prove beyond any question that GM can pay.

Actually, the corporation in its letter of October 2, 1945, and in page ads appearing about that time throughout the Nation, originally pleaded inability to pay. The letter rejected our August 18 wage demand as "unreasonable." The ads tried to frighten the public—and GM workers—into believing that higher wages would mean higher costs and, hence, higher prices. And that, said GM, would bring on inflation. The inference was that GM would have to pass any wage increase along to the consumer in higher prices. The fact that a postwar volume at least 50 percent above prewar would cut unit costs and permit higher wages, higher profits, and lower prices to the consumer was omitted.

When we challenged GM representatives to produce the facts and figures to support their plea of poverty, GM shifted gears. Overnight GM became the defender of "the prerogatives of management." We were told, day after day, that discussion of costs, prices, profits, production schedules, and volume of production was wholly out of place in a discussion of wages. Wages, we were told, must be discussed "on their merits." We were given no hint of what this meant until on December 28 GM trotted out the caveman of American labor relations, Walter Gordon Merritt, and presented him to the President's fact-finding board as the corporation's mouthpiece.

Costs, prices, and profits were "none of the union's damn business." GM books were closed, even to GM stockholders.

Our proposal of arbitration was turned down as an "abdication of management."

GM representatives told us and the public that past experience meant nothing in relation to present and future operations, that prices were set on hopes of what the traffic would bear, and that management was entitled to whatever profits resulted from the whole hit-or-miss operation.

As against this crystal-ball approach, let me quote from the findings of the national citizen's committee:

"Considerable data from the General Motors Corp. and United States Government reports were submitted by the union in support of its contention that the corporation can afford a substantial wage increase without raising prices. Outside of a flat denial based upon sources not open to the union, to this committee, or to the public, no convincing evidence has been submitted by the corporation to show that the union's wage proposal cannot be met.

"While future profits cannot be computed with absolute certainty, it is common practice to base the prospects of them upon experience and estimated volume and costs. The union is asking that wages be projected in such a forecast as other cost factors and profits are projected. It is the consensus of the committee that the union is making a legitimate claim in asking that wages be negotiated in terms of future expectations."

In the light of these words, consider GM's defiance of the President's fact-finding board and the President's own wage-price policy, set forth in his statements of August 18, October 30, and December 20. President Truman has declared that purchasing power must be maintained during reconversion by increasing wage rates while holding down prices. But when union negotiators take the same stand GM cries "revolution," "socialization," "regimentation," and the death of "free enterprise."

Twisting and turning in attempts to avoid negotiations based on the arithmetic, GM has made several offers to the union. As long ago as October 19, we were offered a deal whereby, if we would join the corporation in pressuring Congress to lengthen the normal workweek from 40 to 45 hours, by amendment of the Wages and Hours Act, wage rates would be boosted enough to maintain take-home pay on a 45–48-hour week. GM President C. E. Wilson said this was necessary because other nations (whose plants have been wrecked and manpower decimated by war) were going to work long hours at "subsistence wages."

This offer has been advanced again and again.

Then we were offered a 13½-cent-an-hour increase, the corporation reserving the right to use it to get higher prices from the OPA and the car-hungry public. This offer was used as the basis for a newspaper advertising campaign which sought to leave the impression that GM workers had been offered, and had rejected, weekly take-home pay 10 percent higher than in wartime. According to our best calculation, the $63.44 weekly wage (for a 45.6-hour workweek) used in the ad is $2.75 too high, based on GM's own wage figures. But the most important fact about this ad, and about GM's whole attitude in this dispute, is the stubborn determination to turn the clock back, to put into effect a workweek of 45–48 hours, to defy and defeat the national policy of maintaining purchasing power by increasing wages while holding down prices.

The union is charged by the corporation with making a broad attack on American industry and free enterprise. We feel that our demands, and our support of them by this strike, constitute an attempt to save American industry and free enterprise from committing suicide by liquidating some of its customers and underpaying the rest. There is nothing novel or revolutionary in our proposal that, in bargaining collectively with the corporation, we consider costs, prices, profits, volume, market, and other factors in the production picture. As the recently published Twentieth Century Fund study of collective-bargaining practices has pointed out, this has been done for years by employers.

The grim fact is that if free enterprise in America is to survive, it has got to work; it must demonstrate more than an ability to create earnings for investors; it must master the techniques for providing full employment at a high standard of living, rising year by year to keep pace with the annual increase in technological efficiency. Incidentally, this increment, estimated at more than 2.5 percent a year normally, may amount to more than 30 percent in the first three postwar years, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Free enterprise has got to demonstrate a willingness to adjust itself to national policies such as the present wage-price policy, now being appealed by GM from President Truman to Congress. Good will must be substituted for the obstructionism, arrogance, and refusal to cooperate—the latter Mr. Truman's phrase—that have marked GM's conduct in this dispute.

GM's sudden concern lest ability to pay be used to push small employers to the wall must cause the one-time small competitors of the General Motors Corp. to turn over in their economic graves. The union, in using ability to pay as one—not the only—factor in wage negotiations, can be relied on to be more considerate of small employers than the two-billion-dollar General Motors Corp. has ever been.

The UAW-CIO in this case has repeatedly said: "We are not going to operate as an economic pressure group. We refuse to act according to the principle of 'let's get ours and the public be damned.' That is why we have not conspired with GM to bring about a longer work week—with millions of unemployed in prospect. That is why we have refused to pocket a wage increase and look the other way while the corporation used it to extort a higher price.

"We are part of the community. We intend to make progress with the community and not at the expense of the community.

The fight of the General Motors workers is a fight to save truly-free enterprise from death at the hands of its self-appointed champions. In the face of a threatened loss of $35,000,000,000 from the annual wage bill, it is a struggle to maintain purchasing power. It is a holding action, designed to forestall a disastrous deflation and to prepare the ground for an advance toward a $200,000,000,000 postwar economy. As such, this strike, now nearing the end of its second month, is the fight of every American worker, farmer, small businessman and professional worker. It is also the fight of every veteran coming home in search of a job and a tangible stake in the future of the country he saved from international fascism.

Labor is not fighting for a larger slice of the national pie. Labor is fighting for a larger pie. That is a national, not a sectarian, goal. Its achievement must be the task of every American who appreciates the wisdom of the statement made by Secretary of the Treasury Vinson last July: "The American people are in the pleasant predicament of having to learn to live 50 percent better than they have ever lived before."

This fight is being fought for keeps. Vinson, Truman, Snyder—all our political leaders—have uttered the words of faith and good intentions. They have declared, along with progressive industrialists and economists, that purchasing power is the key to prosperity. General Motors workers are on winter picket lines to make those words stick. They will go back to making automobiles when General Motors policy-makers stop sulking in their tents—when Mr. Wilson and Mr. Sloan realize that General Motors is not a sovereign power but an integral part of the total economy.

In Search of a Solution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 14, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial which appeared in the Stamford Advocate of Monday, January 7, 1946, on the strike at Yale & Towne reflects my views in the matter of that controversy, which has now become notorious throughout the Nation:

IN SEARCH OF A SOLUTION

Today the strike at Yale & Towne is just 2 months old. This is a long time for men and women to be out of work, and an equitable settlement at the earliest possible moment is the fervent wish of the whole community. The management has invited the representatives of the union to meet with them in closed session for the purpose of resuming collective bargaining. This invitation must be accepted without delay. Every possibility of finding a solution should be promptly and thoroughly explored.

So much time has passed since this controversy started that it seems desirable to sketch its course briefly. The contract between labor and management was due to expire on March 21, 1945. In order to initiate discussions looking toward its renewal, the unions presented their demands to management on February 20 of last year. Thereafter there ensued interminable negotiations which by the month of September had led to an agreement in respect to many of the points at issue, with the notable exception of the basic question of union security.

In regard to this, no progress whatsoever had been made, nor was any progress subsequently made in regard to wage rates, which became an active issue with the ending of the war. On September 23, 1945, a walk-out took place which was not only unauthorized, but was actually opposed by the top union leadership. Although this walk-out lasted less than 2 days, it afforded the company legal justification for terminating the existing contract, and this the company did. When the men went back to work they were thus no longer covered by the old contract, and negotations were started with a view to agreeing upon a new one.

The unions took the stand that these negotiations should proceed on the basis that all conditions previously agreed upon be considered as accepted by both parties, and that the discussions should be limited to the major unresolved questions of union security and wages. The position of the company, however, was that every element in the contract had to be negotiated anew. When the unions found that they were making little progress, and none at all in respect to fundamental matters, a strike was called on November 7.

Thereafter discussions between management and labor, which had been difficult enough before the strike, became, as is so often the case, infinitely more complicated. Mass picketing diverted attention from the matters originally in dispute to the necessity of preserving law and order; and only after the intervention of Governor Baldwin was it possible to return to a consideration of the real points of difference. Thereafter two attempts to proceed with collective bargaining were made in open meetings at the Town Hall, of which the second took place last Thursday. Neither of these developed any basis for compromise.

This summary must be considered in the light of a certain number of related facts. Historically labor relations at Yale & Towne have not been satisfactory. They were, of course, greatly improved during the period of the war boom. With some increase in wages and a considerable amount of overtime, the take-home pay of the worker was larger than it had ever been before. The maintenance-of-membership clause, inserted in the labor-management contract under a directive of the War Labor Board, established a degree of union security. In spite of minor grievances, which normally arise, conditions on the whole were tranquil.

But with the end of the war, it became apparent that Yale & Towne was reluctant to make any material increase in wage rates to compensate in measure for the loss the workers were bound to suffer through a reduction in the amount of overtime, and that they were unwilling to grant any form of union security. This aroused the fear that a return to conditions prevailing before the war was threatened. The rigid and unyielding position of management during recent months has done nothing to alay this fear.

The workers felt that all the gains they had made through the years were placed in danger. Whether rightly or wrongly, they formed the belief that the president of Yale & Towne, W. Gibson Carey, Jr., was out to break the union; and that, in fact, Yale & Towne was being made the spearhead of a Nation-wide attack by reactionary business leaders on the trade-union movement.

The past history of the company furnished some ground for apprehension. The workers have long memories; and, whether management likes it or not, Mr. Carey's record is not apt to be entirely absent from the thoughts of labor when engaged in collective bargaining.

Until now management has been adamant in insistence upon an open shop. Labor has asked for a closed shop, but there is ground for the belief that they would be satisfied with the maintenance-of-membership clause. After negotiations broke down last Thursday, a United States Department of Labor conciliator proposed to management, as an alternative, a voluntary irrevocable check-off. This was rejected by management out of hand. It is entitled to more serious consideration.

The maintenance-of-membership clause requires an affirmative act by the worker if he does not wish to remain in the union on the basis of a contract that has been agreed upon. He has 15 days after the signing of the contract within which he can withdraw from the union. The voluntary irrevocable check-off, on the other hand, requires an affirmative act by the worker if he wishes to remain in the union under the terms of a negotiated contract. Clearly this removes a certain degree of union pressure from the worker, and it should be satisfactory to management—and to labor as well if the unions really deserve the loyal support of their members.

There is one other important point of difference. Under the maintenance-of-membership clause, the company is obliged to dismiss any worker who is not in good standing with the union. The worker can forfeit his good standing for many other reasons than merely failure to pay union dues. This provision may easily be abused by union leaders and become a disturbing factor in the operations of the plant.

Mr. Carey has argued for the open shop on what he likes to describe as grounds of high principle. It is hard to see how this argument can be fairly made against the voluntary irrevocable check-off.

The question of wages is in no sense a matter of principle, but purely one of bargaining, in which various factors must be given weight. In the present discussions, not the least important consideration would seem to be that it has become almost a matter of recognized national policy that the whole burden of transition from war to peace is not to be borne by the workers alone. Postwar wage rates have been increased to varying degrees by a large number of companies on the theory that it is neither just, nor economically sound, to expect the workers to accept the reduction in take-home pay that would otherwise be involved. In the State of Connecticut, and even in the lock industry itself, such increases have already been made. The demands of the workers at Yale & Towne have not been so exaggerated that there should be difficulty in reaching a satisfactory agreement on this point.

This, it appears, is the way matters stand as negotiations are about to be resumed. If Mr. Carey wants to win this strike, regardless of the cost to his company, his employees, or the community of Stamford, he may be able to do so. Two months of idleness have already made a material dent in the war savings of the worker. Men have families to feed, rent to meet, and doctors' bills to pay. They cannot in the nature of things hold out idefinitely.

But in the eyes of the citizens of our town, this is a human problem far more than a problem in corporate arithmetic. We do not consider that it would be good for the country, for the community, or in the long run for Mr. Carey, himself, or his company, if the strike were to be settled solely on the basis of economic strength. We like to think that in our great Nation we have passed beyond this point. We recognize that some labor leaders have taken, and continue to take, positions no less extreme than those taken by the most reactionary spokesmen of management. We do not find that in the existing controversy this charge can fairly be leveled at the leadership of the International Association of Machinists.

We want to see the workers of Yale & Towne return to their jobs with morale high, eager to play their appropriate part in attaining that high level of full production so essential to the Nation's prosperity. This they can only be expected to do if an agreement is reached on fair terms. It would be a tragic outcome if they were forced by economic pressure to go back to work as a body of dispirited men. We cannot urge upon Mr. Carey too strongly the wisdom of this view. There is still time for him to modify his position. He has much to gain by instructing his representatives to bring to the coming negotiations a sincere willingness to meet the unions half way.

Things the Public Should Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 14, 1946

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Mankato Free Press, Mankato, Minn., entitled "Things the Public Should Know":

THINGS THE PUBLIC SHOULD KNOW

The Big Three parley in session in Moscow is following the same pattern as other similar gatherings during and since the end of the war—all sessions are cloaked in complete secrecy; newsmen and radio commentators are denied access to any of the participants or their aides.

It is argued that such secrecy is necessary. There was some justification for that contention during the war; there seems little now. The London Conference last spring failed completely—to this day no one knows just why, just where the major powers were unable to agree, just what issues could not be compromised and adjusted.

Still it is public sentiment, within other nations as well as within our own, that must be satisfied and served in all of these agreements. How do we know that public sentiment in Russia or in Britain would not support the American position, in these unsuccessful negotiations, if that position were known?

If our cause is right and just, why should we permit it to be cloaked in the secrecy of Russian totalitarianism or British imperialism?

For an administration that professes to be following the ideals of Woodrow Wilson in international affairs the Truman administration has assuredly forgotten his cardinal pronouncement for "open covenants, openly arrived at."

Just where is that first of the "four freedoms"—freedom of speech and of press—in secret negotiations of this kind?

The Office of the Inspector General of the Army Should Be Controlled by Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, recent developments point very clearly to the conclusion that the Office of the Inspector General of the Army should be under the jurisdiction of Congress. Right now the need for congressional control of such an office stands out prominently, and Congress ought to give immediate attention to that question. I say this because we are faced with a tremendous amount of protests by men in our armed forces against the delays and the slow procedure in connection with our demobilization program. Members of Congress have had complaints from fathers, mothers, wives, and other people interested in our boys who are now scattered in some branch of service in the Army and Navy all over the world. We have also had letters of protest from the men themselves. Without exception, so far as I know, Members of Congress have sought advice and information from the War and Navy Departments. There has been one excuse after another in connection with the methods employed in getting our soldiers and sailors back to civilian life. A few days ago out of a clear sky the solemn announcement was made that the demobilization program would be slowed up 3 months or more because replacements for men discharged from service were not available, and for some unnamed reason we had to keep a large Army and Navy force. I do not here repeat the story of the different incidents that have taken place. You know what they are. Congress is still in the dark, so far as any intelligent picture of the Army and Navy program and plans are concerned. A timely suggestion was made by a United States Senator to the effect that Congress could, and should, cut off appropriations until we found out just what was going on, and why.

CONGRESS SHOULD CONTROL THE OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the sound answer to the whole problem is the enactment of legislation which will put Congress in control of the office of the Inspector General of the Army, and create a like office in other branches of our armed forces. The purpose of an Inspector General is to check up on the different departments of the Army, find out what commanding officers are running matters efficiently and just what officers are inefficient and unfit. The Inspector General is supposed to find out the mistakes and then see that these mistakes are rectified in connection with all matters of Army policy. Of course, we are to assume that this is done, but under existing law the Inspector General reports to his superiors, and perhaps it is not unkind to say that they like to protect each other from any public knowledge of their mistakes and shortcomings. It is doubtful if the office of the Inspector General can function as it should under present conditions. If it were responsible to Congress rather than to superior authority in its own group, results would be different.

HISTORY OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE ARMY

Historically, this office at one time was under the jurisdiction of Congress. In a report that has been furnished me I note that Baron Frederick William Augustus von Steuben was appointed Inspector General in 1778. His office was independent of every authority, except that of Congress itself. Later this was changed and as time went on the office came within the jurisdiction of the Secretary of War. Running through the history of this department, however, is the thought that the officers in the Inspector General's office were to be independent of the different department commanders, and one of the important functions was to detect and make possible prompt correction of irregularities and deficiencies and to eliminate unfit officers, and to see that merit governed the promotion of other officers.

MY CONFERENCE WITH AN OFFICER OF WORLD WAR II

During 1945 and probably prior thereto, on more than one occasion, I had visits from an Army officer who talked very frankly about the Army and its problems, its fine elements of strength, and also its shortcomings. On every occasion he would point out some matters that had come to his personal knowledge. He mentioned one commander in a certain theater of war who was thought to be unfit and inefficient by every Army officer, who was permitted to exercise his independent opinion when he could visit with friends and talk out of turn. It was pointed out that as a result of inexperience and inefficiency, large numbers of soldiers were ill-clad and poorly shod and that many of them would probably lose their feet because of such a situation. I was also told that if Congress had control of the Inspector General's office, this sad situation could be investigated and that Congress could be properly informed; that incompetent Army officials would then have to be discharged or relieved of their command and competent men placed in charge. Suggestion was made that nothing would be done under existing conditions because the mistakes would be covered up, and since no one talked out of turn, no one in the Army would ever do anything drastic toward the men who were responsible for its shortcomings. Instead, the remark was made that the Army officer would probably get a promotion and might, by accident, even be decorated by the Commander in Chief.

These discussions made quite an impression on me and convinced me that it would be a good thing for the Army and a good thing for the the American people if Congress had its own inspectors to investigate conditions in the Army and make true reports to Congress. There would not be the constant fear that some superior officer would resent having a fellow officer check up on his mistakes, and would then do everything he could to prevent the fellow officer from giving him poor marks.

I do not continue this line of thought further because I believe it is evident to everyone that a mistake was made when Congress lost control of the office of the Inspector General of the Army. I am introducing legislation that will correct this defect and enable Congress to again take control of this important office and administer it in the interests of the American people, and not in the interest of any clique or group of any branch of our Government. If we had such contacts today between Congress and the Army, the demand for an investigation into the program of demobilization would not be necessary, and Congress—and through Congress—the American people would be fully informed of the plans and procedure of the men in charge of our armed forces.

The bill reads as follows:

A bill to place the Inspector General of the Army under the jurisdiction of Congress

Be it enacted, etc., That the Inspector General of the Army shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and shall be responsible solely to Congress. The Inspector General shall hold office for 4 years. An Inspector General appointed under this act may be removed only by concurrent resolution of Congress after notice and hearing, when, in the judgment of Congress, he has become permanently incapacitated or has been inefficient, or guilty of neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office, or of any felony or conduct involving moral turpitude, and for no other cause and in no other manner.

SEC. 2. The Inspector General shall make to Congress at the beginning of each regular session a report in writing of the work of the Inspector General's Department, and shall make such additional reports as may be requested from time to time by Congress or by either House thereof.

SEC. 3. The President is requested to submit to Congress not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this act the name of the person nominated by him to serve as the first Inspector General under this act.

The Demobilization Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1946

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the recent demonstrations by GI's all over the world should cause the American people and the American Congress to consider the seriousness of the lack of a definite clear-cut demobilization policy. The January 5 announcement by the War Department that there would be a slowdown in demobilization and that men with two or more years service would not be released by late winter is a breach of faith with those who served us so well. The men and women in service have a right to know what our actual demobilization program is and will be, what our foreign policy is as far as they are concerned, and what our military needs in foreign countries will be in the foreseeable future.

We realize, of course, that we have definite commitments to occupy Japan and Germany and this must be done for as long as necessary. I can see no reason for the continued maintenance of large forces in the Philippines, India, Italy, the Caribbean and elsewhere. These are not enemy areas and therefore we should not continue large-scale occupation policies there.

The answer to the present disagreeable incidents lies, I believe, in the creation of a large volunteer army. We have been told that the Army is planning on maintaining 797,000 American troops overseas after July 1, 1946. In Europe there will be 335,000; in the Pacific, 375,000; elsewhere, 87,000. We have already had in excess of 400,000 volunteers enlisted for our postwar Army and undoubtedly that number will increase. This Army, however, must be a democratic body and the inducements must be sufficient to make a career worth while. The matter of salaries and promotions must be investigated and considered if we are to have the "esprit de corps" so necessary for a good functioning organization. The differential which exists between officers and enlisted men must be done away with or, where necessary, reduced to the lowest minimum essential for discipline. The following suggestions would, in my opinion, be helpful:

First. Make all appointments to the Military and Naval Academies from the enlisted ranks of the services.

Second. Install a promotion system based on merit and performance only.

Third. Introduce real orientation policies for all services so that our men will understand the peoples and countries in which they will serve and the reasons for their being there.

Fourth. Continue allotments to families of servicemen so they can have some degree of security.

Fifth. Allow furlough time for enlisted men to accumulate on the same basis as for officers' terminal leave.

Sixth. Set up a sound legal system for the offenses committed in service and do away with the present system of haphazard military justice.

Seventh. Do away with such rank discrimination as "off limits to EM."

These suggestions, if considered and followed out, would make a service career more attractive, would give us the volunteer army we need, and would offer security and advancement to all personnel. Our Army today is a citizen and democratic-minded army composed of men who are serving because of the emergency and who, on the whole, do not wish to make the service a career. The demonstrations in which they participated in are significant and the symptoms displayed calls for action now. They must not be repeated, and the solution is for the Congress and the services to keep promises made and to correct inequalities which now exist.

Mr. Speaker, I have received scores of letters and cablegrams this past week. Under unanimous consent, I am inserting at this point in the RECORD some of the cablegrams I have had sent to me from the Philippines, Japan, and Germany, and also copies of letters I have addressed to the War Department and the House Military Affairs Committee:

JANUARY 7, 1946.

Hon. ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War, War Department.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I wish to protest the Army's new policy announced by Lt. Gen. J. Lawton Collins on January 5, 1946, whereby the rate of demobilization of Army personnel is to be slowed down "because of lack of replacements for troops on overseas duty." I feel, in view of the fact that we still have in excess of 4,000,000 men in the Army, this statement will not bear scrutiny. Therefore, I am requesting a detailed explanation of the reasons for this new policy.

General MacArthur has estimated that 200,000 men will be necessary for the occupation of Japan, and General Eisenhower has estimated around 400,000 will be needed for occupied Germany. It would appear to me that, on the basis of these expressed needs by the commanding officers in those two occupied countries at the time these statements were made, the Army is still far too large, and that the greatest good could be accomplished by keeping up the rapid rate of discharges now in operation and, wherever possible, accelerate that rate.

The statement has been made that there is now no lack of shipping facilities, and, in view of that, I see no reason why the men overseas cannot be sent home and discharged as rapidly as possible. I should like to know also why so many of our armed forces are scattered throughout all the continents of the world. I see no justification for the continued need of our armed forces, in large numbers, in the Caribbean, Australia, New Zealand, India, China, Yugoslavia, north Africa, South Africa, Canada, Ireland, and elsewhere. These men in the service have done their job and now that the actual hostilities are over, I feel they should be brought home.

Also, I feel quite strongly that the statement on the Army's policy just issued, whereby it was stated that men with 2 years' or more service, would not be discharged by late winter as General Marshall informed the Congress they would on last September, is a mistake.

I feel any man with 2 years' service should be sent home and discharged not later than late winter in accordance with the promise made to Congress when General Marshall addressed us last September in the auditorium of the Library of Congress.

I feel furthermore that the fathers in the service should be discharged at the earliest possible opportunity. It will be recalled, because they were fathers, that they were inducted later than others but this in nowise has lessened their responsibilities, and certainly the allotments their families are receiving, are only a stop-gap between them and privation. The bread-earners, the fathers, are needed at home and while, at the present time, fathers with three children are declared eligible for discharge, there is no reason it should stop there, because the support of one child or two children, while a little bit easier, is just as much a responsibility. It is my feeling that the fathers should be declared eligible for discharge immediately so they can return home and take over their responsibilities as private citizens.

Will you please do what you can to see that the discharge system is kept rolling as rapidly and efficiently as possible, and that the "lack of replacements for troops on overseas duty" be investigated thoroughly in view of the previous statements made by General MacArthur and General Eisenhower concerning the needs in occupied territories.

Must close now, but with best personal wishes, I am,

Most sincerely,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

JANUARY 7, 1946.

Hon. ANDREW J. MAY,
Chairman, Military Affairs Committee,
House of Representatives.

DEAR ANDY: I am enclosing a copy of letter I am today sending to the Secretary of War concerning my views on the new Army demobilization policy.

May I urgently request that your committee undertake an investigation of this so that the Army's demobilization program can be continued at the present rate and wherever possible accelerated. I feel this is a vital question at this time and I should appreciate you and your committee giving it your most earnest consideration.

Must close now, but with best personal wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

MANILA, *January 10, 1946.*

Congressman MIKE MANSFIELD,
Washington, D. C.:

Give 'em hell Mike, we're behind you.

WYOMING VETS.

MANILA, *January 10, 1946.*

Representative MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Orchids to you for your actions on demobilization. We shall remember and we shall return. Every American soldier in the Pacific has a warm spot in his heart for your help in hastening our return to our loved ones.

TWO HUNDRED AND NINETY-FIVE MEMBERS OF THE SEVEN HUNDRED AND FORTY-NINTH RAILWAY OPERATING BATTALION.

MUNICH, *January 12, 1946.*

Representative MIKE MANSFIELD,
Washington, D. C.:

Demobilization slow-down policy undermining morale of troops. Danger to occupation duties imminent. Confusion in redeployment demonstrates incompetence of officials in charge. Program of constant broken promises and excuses clarifies fact combat soldier has been forgotten. Imperative that action be taken to correct dis-

graceful situation. Return us home immediately.

SIXTY GI's, C COMPANY, TWO HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-EIGHTH ENGINEER BATTALION

MANILA, *January 9, 1946.*

Representative MICHAEL MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Deeply appreciate your efforts our behalf. Request Congress probe demobilization facts.

Sgt. HAROLD SCHIFFRIN,
Spokesman, Twenty-five
Thousand Pacific Veterans.

MANILA, *January 10, 1946.*

Representative MANSFIELD,
Washington, D. C.:

One million two hundred thousand troops now in Pacific. War Department reveals less than 400,000 needed. Ask immediate investigation of these facts. Why are replacements needed before we can return home?

WYOMING VETS.

MUNICH, *January 11, 1946.*

Representative MIKE MANSFIELD,
Washington, D. C.:

Redeployment been as total flop. Get combat men home now. It's over.

JOHN WALSH.

MUNICH, *January 11, 1946.*

Representative MIKE MANSFIELD,
Washington, D. C.:

Fifteen months overseas, in three major campaigns. Feel new redeployment policy will keep me here holding the bag, when I am entitled to be home. Please keep punching to get me home.

J. P. GORMAN.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *January 11, 1946.*

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Representative,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

We of the Coast Guard Reserve are scattered widely. Opportunity not available for mass protest against the injustice of present Coast Guard demobilization program. Some of us will be sent out to sea again unless points are lowered to level of Navy points. Trust convening Congress will see justice done.

Respectfully yours,
HAROLD D. WALLERT,
Spokesman.

NAGOYA.

Representative MANSFIELD,
Montana Representative,
Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned husbands, fathers, and sons of those dear to us in the States, voice our protest against the broken promises of the War Department. We overseas GI's feel that the slow-down in the demobilization program is subterfuge used by the War Department to force passage of a bill to extend the draft. We ask that the discharge program be speeded up and all troop ships be utilized now. We have won the victory, and instead of being sent home we are being penalized by being forced to stay here unnecessarily. We want to go home now.

Sergeant Rich, Private First Class Georg, Jr., Sergeant McCleery, Corporal Gerowitz, Corporal Kopcha, Private First Class Czimbal, Corporal Kuiko, Sergeant Zoller, Corporal Moreno, Private Huntington, Sergeant Sittner, Corporal Wentz, Jr., Corporal Gehring, Sergeant Lamb, Private First Class Iansen, Sergeant Rush, Private First Class Baumann, Private First Class Sovetnick, Corporal Rosenblum, Corporal Merkl, Jr., Corporal Sankovich, Sergeant Tipton, Sergeant Morgan, Private First Class McConnell, Corporal Chojnowski, Sergeant Rice, Sergeant Bronstad, Jr., Corporal Riggins, Technician Third Grade Lange.

Information About President of National Maritime Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 14, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, last fall I commented on the activities of one Joseph Curran who was accused of promoting a strike in New York City among the seamen, or rather dock workers, and thereby delaying return of men in our armed forces from Europe. This charge was made by Joseph P. Ryan, president of the A. F. of L. International Longshoremen's Association. See Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 91, part 13, page A4331.

Just recently one of my constituents wrote me and indicated that I had been misinformed about Joe Curran, and his communistic activities. Proof, however, that I was correct is contained in the following news item in the newspaper published by district 50 of the United Mine Workers of America for the January 1, 1946, issue which statement reads as follows:

COMMIES ROUTED BY DISTRICT 50—PHILLY WORKERS SLAP CURRAN'S PHONY PROGRAM

PHILADELPHIA, PA.—Organized labor won one of its greatest victories in years when district 50, U. M. W. A, soundly trounced Joe Curran, the draft-dodging president of the National Maritime Union in an election conducted here for the unlicensed personnel of the port of Philadelphia

Angelo Cefalo, regional director for district 50 in the Quaker City, reported that Commy Curran and his maritime union never came close in the poll as district 50 won by a majority of more than 15 to 1.

The election held on December 18 covers employees of the following firms: Curtis Bay Towing Co., Sheridan Transportation Co., Independent Towing Co., Banks Towing Co., P. F. Martin Towing Co., Taylor & Anderson Towing Co., and Bernard Tucker Sons Towing Co.

Four years ago the employees of the seven companies were members of the maritime union, but left that organization when it decided to adhere to the Commy line. The employees voted themselves into an independent union, the United Harbor Workers of America, but in June of this year they asked to become affiliated with district 50.

Shortly after they voluntarily affiliated with district 50 the United Mine Workers of America won more than $300,000 in back pay for the workers. District 50 later asked to be certified as the bargaining agency for the workers, and Curran, who was busy visiting his comrades in Russia, injected himself into the case without one signed card. Comrade Curran used the excuse before an examiner for the NLRB that the maritime union filed its cards with the New York office of the NLRB.

There is additional comment in this news item, but it relates to the results of the particular election and indicates that district 50 won easily. The write-up concludes, however, with this interesting statement:

When Curran was called to enter the service of his country by selective-service officials, he appealed, and it was only through CIO pressure at the White House during the Roosevelt administration that he managed to acquire the title as the draft-dodging president of the NMU.

I have no concern, Mr. Speaker, in these disputes among various organizations, but, like other American citizens who are interested in getting our men in the armed forces back from Europe and the Far East and other places, the reasons for the delay and the men who have to do with these delays furnish legitimate need for checking up and calling attention to the real facts. Evidently my remarks of October 15, 1945, on this matter are still 100-percent correct.

Hatch-Ball-Burton Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 14, 1946

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to previous unanimous consent from the House, I wish to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington News of last Saturday, January 12, 1946, giving some very cogent reasons why legislation such as that contained in the Hatch-Ball-Burton bill should be given prompt and serious consideration:

AN INTOLERABLE STRIKE

A telephone strike is, in the word's exact sense, intolerable. The Nation and its communities have become too dependent on telephone service to let it be cut off by any controversy between workers and employers.

The strike beginning yesterday in most parts of the country affected chiefly long-distance service and local service over manual switchboards. But dial service also depends on maintenance by union members. Without this maintenance, the machines that make connections on dialed calls would cease to function in a week or so at most.

A continued strike, then, would soon stop all or practically all telephone service. The effect on business activity would be severe. The effect on public health and safety would be calamitous. Government simply cannot permit the telephone strike to go on. If the strikers ignore appeals to return to work and let the controversy be settled by other methods, President Truman will—indeed, he must—order the strike ended.

He still has wartime powers to enforce such an order.

But if ours is to remain a Government by laws and not by men, the President's war powers cannot be continued long in peacetime. And after those powers have been withdrawn a telephone strike, or any strike subjecting the public to severe hardship or depriving it of services essential to life and safety, would still be intolerable.

So, we think, an obvious lesson of the telephone strike is that the country must provide itself with a method of preventing such

strikes by law. One proposal to that end is before Congress in the Hatch-Ball-Burton bill.

This bill, in our opinion, would create better machinery than now exists for voluntary settlement of labor-management disputes. As a last resort, in a limited class of disputes, of which the telephone case is typical, it would forbid strikes and require submission of the issues to compulsory arbitration. Arbitration awards would be subject to Federal court reviews and enforceable by Federal court orders.

The thought of compulsory arbitration is repugnant to us, as to millions of other Americans. But the evidence now so plain that strikes of a certain type are intolerable, and that Government must by some means prevent them, convinces us that some such legal means, as the Hatch-Ball-Burton bill proposes, should be provided.

Politics, Propaganda, OPA, and the 1946 Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, on more than one occasion the statement has been made to me that one of the major political issues in the 1946 election would be the question of inflation, price control, and the achievements of the Office of Price Administration and the men in charge of its policies, program, and work. In other words, the man who has been against the mistakes and other atrocities committed by the ignorant and inexperienced Government bureau known as OPA is going to be purged. To put it in another way, if you have supported OPA then you will be entitled to administration support. On the other hand, if you have opposed OPA you are going to be held forth as a bad man who ought to be defeated for office.

I welcome this sort of an issue, namely, OPA, in the coming campaign. I have consistently said that we needed price controls where commodities were scarce or where there were other factors which would permit speculation and exorbitant charges against the consuming public. I have been equally emphatic in saying that the Office of Price Administration had made so many mistakes that it was evidently doing more harm than good and ought to be abolished and another price control agency set up. This suggestion has not met with approval of administration leaders because they do not want to repudiate their own agency. That evidently would be poor policy, politically speaking. We might just as well have a lot of discussion about all of these matters at this time. Even before Congress adjourned on December 21, 1945, people were talking about OPA and its relation to the 1946 election. One of the most interesting newspaper items that I ran across at that time was written by Walter H. Waggoner in the New York Times for December 23, 1945, and is as follows:

BATTLES LINES ARE DRAWN ON EXTENDING PRICE CURBS—ACT HAS 6 MONTHS TO GO, BUT CRITICS AND DEFENDERS MAP CAMPAIGN

(By Walter H. Waggoner)

WASHINGTON, December 22.—The possible end of price control was more than 6 months away, but lively skirmishes between the forces for and against continued restrictions had already begun this week and the lines of battle could be clearly seen.

The Emergency Price Control Act, which empowers the Office of Price Administration to impose, adjust or remove price ceilings almost at will, comes to an end on June 30, 1946. Its extension for another year, as a precaution against a sudden postwar wave of inflation, is being sought by a strong line-up of the members of the administration. As solidly against it are the spokesmen for commerce and industry who have chafed and complained under price limitations since they were first applied.

Chester Bowles, Price Administrator and vigorous leader of the Government's anti-inflation effort, showed signs of digging in for a hard fight a fortnight ago when he warned that even his time table for suspension or removal of maximum prices had proved too optimistic.

"We are far behind in our decontrol program," he told a press conference.

STRONG INFLATION TREND

He went on to say that the inflationary pressures he had hoped would have begun to subside with the advances made in industrial reconversion were still blowing strong, and it appeared that many more ceilings would have to be retained than had once been expected.

The pressure feared by Mr. Bowles was readily seen in a recent action relating to citrus fruits. The OPA, anticipating a depressing force on prices as a result of a big crop, eliminated ceilings last month. Prices abruptly went up, more than doubling in some sections of the country. Prices remained high for a short time but eventually dropped back to levels close to those they had left. But wholesale and retail prices declined less than growers' prices and the consumer still has to pay more for his grapefruit than the OPA believes he should.

The already complex issue of price control was further complicated, and yet somehow illuminated, by the opposition Congressman who charged the OPA with perpetrating a hoax. The agency removed price ceilings on citrus fruit, he argued, because it knew what the result would be and because it hoped to use the rising prices as a demonstration of further need for control.

The OPA has not bothered, so far, to answer the charge. Yet a good many other charges will have to be answered and considerable dialectics parried if Chester Bowles and his several cohorts sustain a case for extension of the Price Control Act.

A LITTLE INFLATION

Still in the Government—chiefly in its legislative branch—are a few spokesmen for the school of thought contending that a little inflation would be good for us. Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, a shrewd student of conservative economics, is of that opinion, as undoubtedly are several of his colleagues who prefer, however, a greater degree of anonymity.

A similar view, with variations, was put before the Senate Small Business Committee this week. A dress manufacturer expressed the view that Mr. Bowles and his coworkers have fallen for a lot of humbug. With disarming frankness, he said he was willing to gamble that within 4 months after price controls were lifted prices would be no higher than the previous ceilings. Fearing postwar inflation gave credence to an economic bogy, no more and no less, he suggested.

It was before this committee on the same day, however, that a businessman broke with the majority view and pleaded for the extension of the Price Control Act for at least a year beyond its present expiration date. The witness, a Jersey City tobacco dealer, also assured a startled committee member that the OPA had not solicited his testimony.

TAFT VERSUS BOWLES

Senator TAFT's strategy appears to be based on the hope of eliminating price ceilings by undermining the public's confidence in them. But Mr. Bowles, with his charts and his history, does a far more effective job of showing what he thinks is likely to happen when ceilings are removed. Assuming the validity of his historical parallels, it is a frightening prospect.

The more familiar arguments of his opponents, consequently, do not attempt to question the essential value of price ceilings. They begin by asserting that the pull of industrial production, which means assembly lines pouring out millions of automobiles, refrigerators and radios, prevents inflation naturally by supplying the volume of goods which keeps prices down.

From here, this logic tries to show that price ceilings, by discouraging production, are doing more to contribute to inflation than to combat it.

CABINET SUPPORT FOR OPA

With few exceptions, the OPA has been able to show that, price ceilings notwithstanding, most industries fighting price control are amassing profits at an unprecedented rate. Where they cannot, the agency tries to make the necessary adjustments.

Support of Mr. Bowles' position in the crucial months ahead will come from several Cabinet members and the heads of most executive agencies concerned with the domestic economy. Secretaries Anderson, Vinson, and Schwellenbach are already on record for continuation of price control measures. So are Mr. Collet, John W. Snyder, Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, and John D. Small, Civilian Production Administrator.

President Truman also is held likely to appeal for the life of the Price Control Act. Such support cannot help but be influential among the legislators who will act upon it.

It is very evident, Mr. Speaker, that the foregoing news item points clearly to one of the major political issues during the coming months. The politicians are going to be clever and they are going to manipulate things so that we will have no chance to vote on establishing some new and independent agency to control prices. Action on any legislative proposal will be delayed until the last minute and then, as in the past, we will be faced with the choice of taking OPA again, castor oil, epsom salts, and all of the rest of the stuff, or else—the "or else" conclusion that the politicians will suggest is that if you do not take OPA, you will get increased prices and inflation and a lot of other evil developments which nobody wants. My answer to that suggestion is that now is the time to give consideration to legislation which will protect the people against increased prices in the cost of commodities, in rentals, and in other matters. If we do that, we do not have to condone the mistakes of inexperienced Government employees. We do not have to adopt the OPA program that it is a crime to permit any-

one—farmer, laboring man, or a businessman—to make a profit. As I have outlined before, it means the destruction of our system of free enterprise if we are to take the position that in order to avoid an increase in prices we must see to it that no one makes a profit. That sort of a development just leads to a communistic condition where the Government has to take over all kinds of business. We do not want it.

PROPAGANDA AGENCIES BUSY

I am prompted to make these observations, Mr. Speaker, because the propaganda agencies are already busy. I am getting letters from different localities and from different individuals. Most of the letters read alike. It is evident that the people who wrote many of them have done so because they have been told certain things and they are, therefore, endorsing OPA. I am glad to get correspondence and to have the people write me and give me their views on public questions. That is not propaganda, that is not politics, but when you get a mass of circular letters signed in a great many instances by someone at somebody else's request, then you do have propaganda and you do have politics. Of course, this technique is ancient and has been used by politicians since time immemorial. Already Government officials are talking before groups of people throughout the country, pointing out the danger of inflation and then assuring these groups that OPA is the David which can slay the giant Goliath. What a twisting of the truth. What a perversion of facts. Yet, Mr. Speaker, it is clever propaganda that is being carried on by people in the employ of the Government of the United States at the expense of the taxpayers and it is being engineered and planned by officials in the office of OPA.

The truth does not need any such method to justify it. A Government agency that is worth while does not have to go about over the country and misrepresent the facts. As long as we are having congressional investigations, I think it would not be a bad idea to check up a little and see how much money the politicians are spending to cover up the mistakes of OPA and to try and convince the American people that this Government agency is a beautiful dream which will solve all troubles, real and imaginary, with which the American people might be afflicted. I still have, Mr. Speaker, some very clear-cut recollections of days when OPA adopted policies which caused food and meat shortages. I remember the protests that came to me from the housewives when they could not get meat for their husbands who were doing hard manual labor. That stuff took place under OPA. It was all unnecessary. The quicker we get rid of OPA and its desire to control the cost of production, the price of products, the habits of the American people, and the economic system of the country, just that much quicker will we get back on a basis where people can agair live their own lives in their own way. Then we will again have a free America.

Flight From Free Bargaining

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 14, 1946

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the organized minority monopoly now operating in the United States has acquired such proportions that most of the thinking people of this country are greatly concerned about our immediate future. I refer to the violent seizure of buildings, machinery, machine tools, communication lines, steel plants, packing houses, and other facilities now in operation and being proposed by certain organized labor leaders.

It would appear that this organized violence is under present Federal laws receiving a protection to a far greater degree than any other monopoly ever before enjoyed in the more than 165 years of the history of this Government.

When, under the direction of a labor leader, the buildings, machinery, and machine tools of a great industry are seized, and through this operation the production flow sheet ceases to operate and the flow of social income no longer runs, it all constitutes a violent attack against American ideals, institutions, and guaranteed freedom and liberty. For instance, when Reuther seizes the property of General Motors and holds it as a hostage until his demands are met, he in fact serves notice on the people in the vicinity where General Motors plants are located, that first, they cannot produce the goods, and secondly, that the people residing in other parts of the country cannot purchase and receive those goods that might otherwise be produced. Reuther in this manner violates all the rules of economic decency which have been generally accepted by our people as their protection under the provisions of the Federal and State Constitutions and the precedence of the courts of this land. If Reuther and those who operate concurrently with him can say to the man in North Dakota, "Thou shalt not produce and ship beef critters to Chicago for butchering and to be sold to the people of the country until you first meet the demands of my organized minority," then that constitutes a new philosophy which is of great interest to the people of this country If Reuther and his assocates seize the telephone lines and equipment of this country and precipitate a walk-out which deprives the people of the United States of the use of their telephones for which they pay in advance a monthly service charge, and if during the strike the cost of this service which is not being rendered must continue to be paid, that also is a great concern of the people of this country. If Reuther and his associates can deny the people of the United States the use of these utilities whether there be an incident of happiness or joy or death or birth or flood or tornado, or of some other character, that certainly is a situation of which the people of the United States must take cognizance.

The only protection there is for the people as a whole is in the free play of competitive forces. Goods of higher quality at a lower price can be obtained under competition, and in no other way. One of the great difficulties about this whole proposition rests in the fact that labor leaders and agitators have succeeded in so engineering our thought channels that little consideration is now given to the problems of all the people as consumers. In most every instance where any thought is given to the subject at all, that thought is directed toward the welfare of an organized minority of producers, instead of being directed toward the interests of all consumers, including those representing organized producers as well as unorganized consumers. The thought is given in behalf of a small group of occupational operators engaged in a certain factory or certain industry and as related to the particular practices of that particular unit of industry or the whole industry. The prayer is prayed in the name of a small organized minority as against an industrial unit or a whole industry. The prayer is not prayed in the name of all consumers as a class. In this way, legislation is proposed and enacted in the interest of some specific organized minority and against the interests of the general welfare of all consumers of the United States. This has all developed to a point where the organized minority-monopoly now goes along under the protection of Federal laws, and to a great extent enjoys the minority-monopoly benefit of violence of the first order.

December 17, 1945, Allen W. Rucker, president of the Eddy-Rucker-Nickels Co., business management counselors, of Cambridge, Mass., discussed certain phases of this subject over the radio, and for the benefit of those who care to know Mr. Rucker's sentiments, I submit his statement for the RECORD. In my opinion, Mr. Rucker has made a contribution at this particular moment which is so constructive that the people of this country cannot afford to ignore what he said. His statement, entitled "Today's Forgotten Man in Labor Disputes," follows:

The labor-management conference, from which so many had been led to expect so much by a fanfare of publicity, has failed. Its operation was very much like the Tennessee mountaineer's sawmill. Said a neighbor, "Bill's got a 50-horsepower whistle hooked up with a 5-horsepower saw. When the whistle is blowing, the saw is not cutting."

The conference was equipped with a 50-horsepower publicity whistle and a 5-horsepower saw. It cut no wood and the reasons are plainly these.

A handful of men from business and labor unions were asked to substitute their judgment on wages and hours for the democratic process of bargaining. Consider what that meant. In America there are over 2,000,000 nonfarm businesses with 40,000,000 employees. Those businesses are worth upward of $175,000,000,000. They are owned by some 50,000,000 thrifty people, many of them labor union members. How can a handful of men, any men, be expected to substitute their arbitrary judgment for the essential bargaining between these millions of people who own business and its tools, and the other millions who use those tools to

make a living? It is no wonder that the conference failed.

Exactly the same thing applies to the President's proposed "fact-finding" commission and to Governor Stassen's proposed economic conference. Both of these schemes are birds of the same identical feather—they are attempts to compromise the wage-rate issue by replacing free bargaining with the arbitrary decisions of a handful of men responsible to no one. If either succeeds, free bargaining among Americans is gone forever.

What, in plain words, are these labor conferences and commissions supposed to do?

They are supposed to appease the leaders of minority pressure groups by finding some sugar-coated way to compromise with the primary right of 50,000,000 thrifty Americans to own and manage their business property and to enjoy the legitimate competitive earnings therefrom. And the truth is there is no way to take arbitrarily from these thrifty people and give to others without substituting confiscation for cooperation and abandoning democracy for totalitarianism.

The life's savings of these 50,000,000 thrifty Americans, directly through ownership of corporate securities and unincorporated firms and indirectly through ownership of life insurance, savings accounts, trust funds, and annuities, are invested in the means of production—the land, buildings, and machinery used by business. These things are the tools of production. And the real owners of those tools are these 50,000,000 Americans who, through labor and self-denial, have accumulated the savings that have made the tools possible.

Now, every workman knows that the tools he uses are the source of his livelihood. Without a taxicab, the taxi driver would be no more than a ricksha boy; without the boring machine, the hydraulic press or the turret lathe, the machinist would be no more than a day laborer at a day laborer's scale of wages. Without tools of production, the users of tools could produce barely enough to exist.

Moreover, every workingman knows that tools are always wearing out, or becoming obsolete. In either case, the tools must be replaced with new ones. Throughout industry are thousands of tools that need to be replaced. These tools range all the way from battered old typewriters and adding machines to ancient trucks with broken connecting rods and sticky valves, and patched-up planing mills, boring heads and presses. If they are not replaced now, no power under the sun can maintain production enough to prevent a drop in the real earnings of working people, regardless of wage rates.

From where is the money coming to replace these tools?

There is just one source—the savings of some 50,000,000 thrifty Americans. These thrifty people, these tool owners, accumulate savings from what are erroneously called business profits. The right name for profits is "payments for the use and renewal of tools."

Unless these people are safeguarded in their right to receive legitimate, competitive earnings from their tools, they are just not going to put their life savings into replacing old tools and installing new ones. The situation is so serious now as to jeopardize the job security and pay, and the hope of future advancement of millions of working Americans. Note these figures:

Our own United States Department of Labor reports that in 23 out of 25 peacetime industries unit labor costs have risen all the way from 17 to 70 percent. Their tools are too old. That is not all. A recent study of the metal-working industries shows that 57 percent of machine tools owned by private business in New England and 54 percent of private business tools in the entire United States are over 10 years old.

By 1950, unless billions of dollars of savings are accumulated and invested by tool owners in new tools, as much as 75 percent of our tools will be over 10 years old. It needs no prophet to see what the end must be. If that happens, it will be impossible to maintain the annual production and the annual real earnings of American workingmen regardless of wage rates.

And to obtain those new tools so urgently needed, 50,000,000 thrifty Americans must be safeguarded in their right to receive payments for the use of their tools.

The incentive to save and invest in private enterprise rests solely upon that right. To deny or to seriously infringe that right is to destroy the incentive to thrift, and with it the source of funds necessary to renew and increase the tools of production.

Here lies the fundamental reason why business management, the responsible agent of 50,000,000 tool owners of America, resists every effort of any handful of men to dictate merchandise prices and payments for the use of tools. Business management is held morally, legally, and financially responsible by both its employees, who are the tool users, and by its own bosses, the 50,000,000 tool owners, to see that payments for the use and renewal of tools are continuously adequate. If management fails in that responsibility, there will be neither production nor pay nor job security and hope of advancement for millions of tool users and tool owners alike.

The President of these United States is therefore entitled to the earnest, vigilant, and vigorous support of every tool-user and tool-owner in a new policy that will safeguard the essential right of free bargaining. Any contrary policy which substitutes the judgment of a handful of men, any men, any time, for the bargaining of free Americans would deny this primary right to 50,000,000 tool-owners. Let me emphasize this:

The right of bargaining belongs quite as much to tool-owners who provide the mechanical energy of production as it belongs to the labor unions whose members provide the muscular energy of production.

Nonetheless, it has for many years been the persistent practice of the Federal Government to violate this right and to discriminate against our 50,000,000 unorganized tool-owners. And what has been the result?

According to official United States Treasury Department reports, it has been over 15 years since as many as one-half of corporations earned a taxable profit. With the exception of two or three war years, there hasn't been a year in the past 15 when more than one-half of corporations earned enough to make any payments to tool-owners for the use of their tools. Is it any wonder that thrifty people don't want to put their savings into new tools for production? Is it any wonder that in the absence of new tools, unit costs in 23 out of 25 industries have risen up to 70 percent above 1939; that 54 percent of the machine tools in private business are over 10 years old? It is no wonder at all.

When the Federal Government adopts any policy that undermines the fundamental human right to receive payments for the use and renewal of tools, it discourages investment to replace old tools with new tools, it hinders additions to the stock of tools and thereby obstructs the growth of production upon which the well-being and prosperity of everyone depends.

Unless, therefore, we encourage and vigorously support a square deal governmental policy that will safeguard thrifty citizens in their right to bargain for legitimate, competitive earnings from their tools, our future is dreary indeed. But, given such a policy the natural genius of Americans for thrift and risk taking will respond; new tools will replace old tools, and the American way of brains, sweat, and teamwork will carry us to the very heights of prosperity.

In our country's urgent need of such a square deal, it would be no surprise if 50,000,000 American tool owners should organize themselves into a union of their own for the purpose of regaining equality before the law; a union formed to reassert their fundamental human right to enjoy the fruits of their labor and self-denial; a union formed to reestablish their position as the primary source of the tools upon which depend the workingman's productivity, pay, and prosperity.

Certainly some such movement will develop to assure the continuous supply of tools. For without tools, without new tools, and more tools, there is no lasting job security, no strong prospect of a rise in annual real earnings, and no bright hope for the future advancement of our workers.

This basic national need cannot be compromised. It must be fulfilled. Its fulfillment now depends upon urging the President and the Congress a policy of encouraging thrift and risk taking by safeguarding the human right of 50,000,000 tool owners to be secure in their property and in the legitimate competitive earnings therefrom.

That kind of Government policy is in the primary interest not only of tool owners, but of our people in general and of our workers in particular; yes, in the very preservation of free bargaining itself. Our national genius for thrift and risk taking has provided the tools that have made this Nation the strongest and freest in all history; the blood and sacrifice of our sons and daughters have cemented that strength and freedom in democracy; it is our duty to keep it that way.

We must also press on and forward in the American way, with freedom of bargaining for all of us, and with brains, sweat, and teamwork by all of us.

An Example of Reason and Sound Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1946

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, to the misguided world reformers who imagine that it is our duty to reach out and reform all of the peoples of the world so that they will conform to our concept of living, I commend an article by Lowell Mellett, the columnist, as a shining example of reason and sound sense. Salient extracts from Mr. Mellett's article follow:

Our homesick soldiers in Manila and Yokohama and Paris who are holding demonstrations against being kept longer in the Army seem disposed to make Robert Patterson, Secretary of War, the object of their wrath. But he is not to blame; nor is President Truman, from whom he takes his orders and who supports the War Department's demobilization plans; nor is anybody in particular, except the American people.

The American people are incurable reformers—of other people. Not satisfied with helping to give the Germans and the Japs the worst licking they ever got, we are now bent on reforming them—determined to make them over into fine, free, upstanding democrats like ourselves. At least we've embarked on a program with that end in view, and nothing seems likely to stop us unless our sympathy for the boys that want to come home gets the best of us.

This isn't a Truman program nor an administration program. It comes nearer being a truly national program that anything the Government has engaged in save the war itself. About the only dissenter I've happened to observe is myself, although Walter Lippmann has recently shown signs of losing any missionary zeal he may have had. Speaking of the difficulty experienced in carrying out our occupation policy in Germany, he remarked one day this week, "There was an alternative. That was to let the Germans reeducate themselves and to fix our attention upon making it impossible for them to rearm. It was a relatively simple thing to do."

A relatively simple thing to do and one not requiring so many hundrds of thousands of American soldiers to carry out. One that would permit a much more rapid demobilization of our wartime Army.

But that, up to the moment, hasn't been the American way. Our way has been to debate and argue over what we should teach the Germans and the Japanese and the ways and means of doing same.

* * * * *

What a field day the Republican-southern Democrat coalition in Congress would have if President Truman should ask for "must" legislation comparable to that which we are trying to make "must" in Japan. And yet if any member of the political alliance that has been blocking the President's domestic program has raised his voice against our much more radical program for Germany and Japan, nobody seems to have heard him.

It is just possible that the steadily increasing chorus of discontent coming from the troops overseas may serve to make the administration and Congress take a new look at this part of our foreign policy. We've been accustomed to say that our best ambassadors abroad are the troops themselves. It is from them, we have thought, that other peoples would learn the advantages of our way of life. It's a sound idea, but what are these peoples going to learn from troops that have only one firm conviction—namely, that they haven't any business being where they are, that they ought to be allowed to come home?

This is not to say that the troops have thought the matter through to any better purpose han the rest of us; most of them doubtless would consider the program perfectly satisfactory, if given to some other troops to execute. But the howl they are raising may accomplish something. It may cause the administration, the Congress, and leaders of American thought generally to reexamine a policy toward Germany and Japan that contains no possibility whatever of being successful in the long run.

Labor-Management Relationships and Responsibilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 14, 1946

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, for the last several months, and especially since the cessation of hostilities with Japan, it has been my desire to discuss in this Chamber certain aspects of labor-management relationships and responsibilities which I felt to be pressing and in need of thorough consideration by the Congress. However, my comment has been withheld for the reason that it seemed best and more advisable if the readjustments which seem to be necessary were to be accomplished through cooperative efforts by the leaders of industry and of labor and, if not by them, then through the influence and authority of the President and Government officials.

Ample opportunity has been afforded both of these forces to establish industrial harmony, but both of them have failed—failed miserably and completely. Several weeks ago the labor-management conference, called by the President, adjourned without the accomplishment of a single effective or constructive step in the effort to bring an end to labor strife. It was inevitable that the conference would not succeed for two quite definite reasons: First, that our Government has had no positive, clear, and impartial policy toward labor-management relationships; and, second, that the attitudes of the leaders of both groups were so completely hostile, irreconcilable, and unyielding as to make unlikely any agreement which would be fair to both groups. Until the leaders of industry and of labor come to a full realization and understanding of the responsibilities and obligations of each other and the community of interest which both groups have in the peaceful settlement of their controversies without the interruption of production and employment, there can never be reached a satisfactory solution through voluntary efforts and agreements.

After the labor-management conference failed, the President then took a hand and endeavored to effect a settlement by an appeal to the employer group that they yield to the demands of labor with the rather vague promise that if it were found that the concessions were too great some subsequent steps would be taken by the Government which would give to them a measure of relief—the effect of such a program upon the public was not discussed, if considered. As was to have been expected, the employer groups did not acquiesce to the President's plea. The promise of governmental aid in the event it should develop that they had yielded too much was so vague and indefinite as to make it unwise for them, in the light of their responsibility to their stockholders and investors, to take a chance.

Then, when it appeared that his appeal was ineffectual, the President, shortly before the advent of Christmas, urged to Congress that it take immediate action on his recommended legislation giving him authority to settle industrial disputes by means of fact-finding boards appointed by him which would have authority to inquire into the issues involved and the capacities of the employers to meet the demands of the workers. His recommendation was met by a storm of protest by both groups; it satisfied neither of them. So, the President has likewise failed.

It has now become completely apparent that no solution can be found either by the warring groups themselves or by the authority or influence of the President. The public, which inevitably is a silent third party to labor-management disputes and whose interests are paramount though most often ignored and forgotten, now demands action and the only way by which this action can be taken by the public is through its elected representatives in the various State legislatures and the Congress.

Hundred of thousands of workers in basic industries and services are killing time at home or in picket lines; more thousands threaten to walk away from their jobs every day. Work stoppages have prevented the production of goods which have been denied the public during the war years and for which there is an urgent and crying need. Only by a full, increasing, expanding, and uninterrupted production of goods can the physical and material needs of the American public be met and the acute danger of inflation and unbridled prices be averted. Some alternative to the strike must be found so that kind of production can be given full sway.

How much longer are we going to temporize with this situation? When will we have the courage to grapple with the roots of this problem? Others, who have the primary responsibility of finding the right solution have tried and failed. Now the responsibility rests squarely upon us and we must not delay in our efforts to find a satisfactory solution.

This problem is not one which has come upon us overnight; it is not one which has developed in recent months. Only recently have we felt, bitterly and acutely, the full consequences of our failure to grapple with the problem. At no time in the past, certainly not in recent years, have we faced squarely the issues of a sound labor policy, and then acted in the public interest. Until that is done, we shall continue to have labor strife of such character and volume as to bring permanent and costly injury to the economy of this country in the future.

Examine the statutes now on the books affecting labor relations with management and you will find a hodgepodge of laws, none of which is descriptive of a consistent and impartial national policy. Study the administration and judicial interpretation of some of these laws and you will find incontestible proof of the need for reform.

The present widespread industrial strife is the direct result of an attitude of preferment which the national administration has shown, during the past decade, toward organized labor. Ostensibly interested in the economic and social advancement of working men and women, they have granted them privileges and immunities not afforded other classes of citizens and deliberately exploited the political strength of labor for their own partisan purposes. Labor unions, growing with unprecedented speed, nurtured and protected by the Government, have gained unfettered financial and economic strength beyond that of any organized groups in this country. It is now within the power of one man to tell us how much coal shall be mined, how many automobiles shall be produced, how much steel shall be fabricated and what kind of music our ears shall hear and when.

It should be noted that in sponsoring such a development, the national administration caused the Government to abandon its historic role of arbiter or

umpire in disputes between groups and classes of citizens. Handling of the oil strike by the Secretary of Labor is clearly a case in point. Here, as in other disputes, the unions demanded a 30-percent increase in wages. The oil companies offered 15-percent increase. The Secretary recommended that the parties arbitrate—not the whole issue, but the difference between what the companies had offered and what the unions had demanded.

A generation ago the employer class, because of an abject attitude by the Government, was allowed to run roughshod over the rights and interests of the working class. Public indignation was eventually aroused to the point where national legislation was enacted to prevent such abuses and exploitation. Today, because of an active and positive attitude by the Government, the pendulum has swung to the other extreme and labor groups are in unbridled control of our economy. Once again the public demands action which will bring more nearly into balance these two dominant forces in our economic system.

An objective study of the disputes now in progress shows the complexity of the problem before us. Some unions are struggling to enforce rights which have already been satisfactorily established by others. There is a pronounced reaction among employers to continuation of practices, imposed during the war by governmental direction, such as the check-off and maintenance of union membership. Labor is trying to force into its ranks supervisory employees, and groups of agricultural workers which heretofore have not been organized as labor units. The basis of certain other disputes is solely a test of economic strength irrespective of the rights of the parties or the public interest which should be paramount. Obviously, in most instances, labor is demanding wage increases to offset losses in take-home pay due to shortened hours of work and down-grading.

Here we begin to see the national administration's two-faced policy on wages and prices. Unions were determined to maintain wartime wages regardless of the course of reconversion. The administration gave them full encouragement, first, by discontinuing all attempts at wage stabilization and, second, by giving public sanction to wage increases of 15 or 24 percent—take your choice—and the unions took 30 percent. These decisions meant facing one way with a vengeance—toward increased production costs, greater amounts of money in circulation, greater consumer buying power—in short, toward inflation.

But the administration had to have a price policy. Accordingly, it continued ceiling prices on nearly all commodities. The OPA immediately engaged in a deadly struggle with industries that demanded reconversion prices which would permit payment of wage increases for shorter hours of work and less production. These decisions meant facing the other way with a vengeance—toward lessened production, fewer capital investments, and smaller profits.

If I understand it at all, Mr. Speaker, this is the way I understand the administration's two-faced policy on wages and prices. It will not work, and it is only a question of time before we shall see which is the irresistible force and which is the immovable object.

Judging events of the future by the record of the past, I greatly fear that the forces of inflation and of labor bias will prove the stronger. The cost of labor is 90 percent or more of the cost of the things we buy and use. Add substantially to that cost by arbitrary means and we shall add inevitably to the price of goods and services. It would make Government regulation far more efficient than that imposed or displayed by the OPA to change that eventuality.

The one sure way out of this dilemma requires prompt resumption of production, particularly of the goods which are in great demand. In satisfying market needs, competition will be restored, prices will be kept in proper relation to purchasing power, and still permit the absorption of labor costs. But such a course cannot be followed with sufficient speed when strikes shut down our major industries and the mere threat of strikes halts most attempts to carry out the postwar plans which employers everywhere developed during the war years. Thus, we must admit a duty which most of us would probably prefer to ignore; we must develop a sound labor policy enforceable at law which will restore industrial peace.

Mr. Speaker, I confess my incapacity, and doubt the capacity of any one person, to introduce in this House today a bill which would fully carry out such an objective to the satisfaction of a majority of the Congress. Our collective judgment is essential. The broad principles of such legislation are sufficiently clear to permit discussion of them at this time.

I am convinced that one of the evils which lies at the root of this problem is the trend which has taken place in the last decade, through statutory expression and judicial interpretation, toward concentrating all authority and all responsibility in labor-management relationships in the Federal Government. There was a time when the States shared this duty with the Federal Government, each in its respective sphere depending upon the relationship of the particular industry with interstate commerce. Because of this dual responsibility, an opportunity was afforded for the testing of various methods of dealing with complex problems and through the process of trial and error, the best and most satisfactory solution eventually was adopted by the several States and the Federal Government and became uniform throughout the country. The gradual encroachment of the Federal Government upon the constitutional responsibilities of the States in this field has resulted in denying to the Nation this source of what might be termed "proving grounds" for acceptable labor legislation. This condition has reached the extreme when, through judicial interpretation, it is held that the manufacturer of electric power which is supplied to a lighthouse whose rays shone across State boundaries, is engaged in interstate commerce. There must be a reassessment of the respective responsibilities of the States and the National Government in the field of labor relations and a corresponding revival of State activity within those limitations.

A primary principle requires a definition, a new definition, of the rights of labor and management. They must carry commensurate responsibilities that will give complete protection to the public interest. If such a principle necessitates the chartering or incorporation of labor unions, I am prepared to vote for it. Only responsible parties should have the right to make a contract and they should have an appropriate character in the eyes of the law.

The principle of free collective bargaining should be upheld. By the same token, the fruits of collective bargaining must be preserved. This may require a new definition of contracts covering the collective services of a union. Such contracts to have value for either party must be as good an instrument as a contract covering the services of an individual.

It follows that there must be adequate provision for remedies for a breach of contract, available to either party, and to any other person who can show injury as a result of a broken contract.

The making of a new contract is a fruitful source of labor controversy. The Congress cannot legislate good faith which is an indispensable element in any negotiation but it can lay down simple rules of conduct which the parties must observe in order to preserve an orderly procedure and cause a minimum of public inconvenience.

When disputes arise under existing contracts, there are numerous methods which may be pursued in order to bring about a speedy settlement. Labor's only weapon today is not the strike; management's only weapon is not the lockout. I bespeak a more clear and prompt recognition of the mutual interests of both sides, and a more definite understanding of the effects of their claims and counterclaims upon the public. Such an attitude is simply good business and good human relations. When it prevails, voluntary methods of settling disputes can be successfully employed, and there is ample experience to show which methods are preferable.

It is only in these wild and senseless struggles for domination entered upon by irreconcilable elements in management and labor that the needs for stronger methods exist. I seriously question several which have been proposed.

In the Railway Labor Act provision is made, for example, for the formation of fact-finding commissions. Such a commission performs the function of an impartial investigator whose findings are expected to provide a basis for settlement. Enforcement is made a matter of public opinion. Fact-finding commissions have worked in railway labor disputes remarkably well. It is true, however, that railway labor is on the whole well disciplined and well led; moreover, wage demands which are always the most difficult can usually be passed on to the public in the form of publicly regulated increases in rail tariffs.

It does not follow that fact-finding commissions would work in labor controversies affecting diverse industries, even if such industries were restricted to those

deemed essential to interstate commerce. Similar conditions do not always apply and other factors must be taken into account.

Public opinion is a powerful force in any cause; but the same means that a fact-finding commission might use to arouse opinion in support of its position can be employed, perhaps more skillfully and effectively, by a dissatisfied party to upset the finding.

For many years, voluntary arbitration has been used successfully. Arbitration is essentially a peaceful means of settling differences; the notion that it should be made compulsory, although thoroughly repugnant even in extreme cases, might become necessary if no other acceptable method is found.

An argument against the compulsory system is the common practice of selecting arbitrators. Both sides usually choose their man and let them select a third. Thus, two advocates and one umpire are named, instead of three impartial and disinterested arbitrators. Arbitration, either voluntary or compulsory, would be better favored if labor and management could draw upon a national reserve of qualified experts on labor relations. A trustworthy authority, for example, the Supreme Court, could name a panel of experts and arbitrators for each dispute, could be selected by mutual agreement of the parties, or each select a given number of arbitrators from the panel. This method could be provided for by law, together with suitable safeguards against procedural delays. Awards of arbitrators would, of course, be made enforceable as a judgment of a court.

Compulsory arbitration has been denounced by spokesmen for labor and management alike. However, conspicuous cases have been settled by that method recently under pressure of State or Federal officials; where the public interest is vitally affected, any method which will bring industrial peace is apt to be employed.

But a sound labor policy cannot be developed, nor will it receive public support, if the methods used do violence to the objectives to be accomplished. A better means must be found then for settling fairly and promptly the major disputes which now appear inevitable.

I urge upon your consideration a system of labor courts in which such disputes could be handled or an extension of the jurisdiction of our Federal courts to permit a review of the findings by the Labor Board. Experience abroad justifies a belief in the efficacy of labor courts. Under a carefully drawn statute, these courts might be made to work in this country. At least, such an idea is well worth careful consideration and study.

The exercise of force and violence and intimidation is so thoroughly repugnant to the American sense of honesty and fair dealing as to make it illegal in the settlement or enforcement of labor controversies. A bill for this purpose, though passed by the House on two occasions, has been held in a committee of the other body of the Congress, assertedly upon the plea of the President.

Not only should labor organizations be held responsible for the contracts and commitments which they make, but the labor leaders and union officials should be likewise responsible to their union members for their acts. To accomplish this, it might be advisable to require union elections to be held at definite intervals, an independent audit of the union books provided periodically to each member, and such other regulatory requirements as might be necessary to protect the union member from the dishonest or unscrupulous labor official.

The principle of the closed shop by which an individual must belong to a certain union in order to take employment is not consistent with our way of life, especially when the union is permitted to charge exorbitant membership fees or allowed to arbitrarily reject an application for membership. No person should be required to pay tribute to any organization for the opportunity to work.

Many years ago the public recognized the evils and corruption which followed the practice of corporations making financial contributionss to the election of public officials and the Congress enacted a statute making this practice illegal, with severe fines for punishment. Fairness and impartiality requires that no greater latitude be permitted to labor organizations or associations in this regard.

There are many problems of a detailed nature which would have to be considered along with any comprehensive labor legislation. Most of them have been represented in separate bills to this House but, with few exceptions, they should not in my opinion be acted upon separately.

I reject the idea of a piece-meal approach to this, our most serious domestic problem. I seek to have written into Federal law a new, national labor policy. It must embrace the problem, fairly and temperately. It must be predicated upon a realistic understanding of present-day labor and industrial conditions, and a sound appraisal of the public's interest.

Such a law cannot be enacted in haste, neither shall noisy minorities delay or dissuade us from our manifest duty. Now, at once, we must settle to this task with all the wisdom all of us can muster for we shall need it if this job is to be done well.

Navy Department and United States Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1946

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on December 11, the gentleman from California [Mr. PATTERSON] addressed the House in connection with the policy of our Government toward the Netherland East Indies. Mr. PATTERSON made certain charges against the Navy Department and requested a prompt investigation by the House Naval Affairs Committee. As a member of this committee, I considered it my duty to ascertain, insofar as possible, the facts which my colleague desires. Accordingly I addressed a communication to the Secretary of the Navy requesting a full statement in reply to the charges made by Mr. PATTERSON. For the information of the House, I wish to include herewith, without comment, the reply which I have just received:

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, D. C., January 4, 1946.
The Honorable JACK Z. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: This is in response to your letter of December 18, 1945, receipt of which I have previously acknowledged, in which you refer to the speech of the Honorable ELLIS E. PATTERSON in the House of Representatives on December 11, 1945 (Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A5426), and suggest the desirability of correcting the RECORD if the facts are not as recited by Mr. PATTERSON. I have looked into the entire question of the Navy Department's relationship to the Royal Netherlands Marine Corps. I believe the following paragraphs fairly summarize the Navy Department's actions with respect to the Netherlands Marines and am satisfied that examination of such actions will show that, although they originated from purely military considerations, they have at all times been thoroughly consistent with the foreign and military policies of the United States Government.

During 1943 the Netherlands Government approached the Combined Chiefs of Staff (British and United States) with a proposal for Netherlands participation in the war against Japan after the liberation of Holland. As a result, the combined Chiefs of Staff, having particularly in mind operations which might have to be undertaken against the Dutch East Indies to free them from the Japanese, determined in 1943 that plans should be made for such participation, and agreed that the United States should be responsible for the training and equipping of a brigade of Royal Netherlands Marines (about 5,000 men), while the British would assume responsibility for a substantially larger army contingent and for Dutch naval and air forces. Quite logically, the responsibility for the training and equipping of the Netherlands Marines was delegated by the United States Chiefs of Staff to the Navy Department so that their training and equipment might be closely similar to that of our own Marine Corps.

The Netherlands Marine Corps program was actually begun in 1943, and was accelerated shortly after VE-day when Dutch manpower became available but, even so, proceeded slowly since all available shipping was being utilized for transportation and redeployment of United States troops and because operations against the Netherlands Indies had not been assigned a high priority by the Combined Chiefs of Staff. However, by August 1945, about 5,000 men of the Royal Netherlands Marine Corps were undergoing training in the United States under the auspices of our own Marine Corps, the bulk of such training taking place at Camp Davis, N. C. Due to the shortage of shipping and the short time from VE-day to VJ-day, none of the United States trained Netherlands Marines had been shipped to the Far East by the time of Japanese capitulation on August 14, 1945.

In connection with the surrender of Japan, the responsibility for accepting the surrender of the Japanese in the Netherlands East Indies and contiguous areas was assigned to the South East Asia command, headed by Admiral Lord Mountbatten. This responsibility

included the tasks of disarming and removing the Japanese forces, of securing the surrender of Japanese equipment, of repatriating and liberating Allied prisoners of war, and of assuring the safety of civilians interned by the Japanese. It was entirely logical for the Kingdom of the Netherlands to desire to participate in accepting the surrender in this area of which it is the territorial sovereign. Furthermore, it was militarily desirable that it do so in order to lighten the load on United States and British manpower which would otherwise have been required to undertake the entire mission and, also, in order to make it unnecessary for United States forces to become involved in the liberation of these territories from the Japanese. Accordingly, the United States Chiefs of Staff supported the completion of the training of the Netherlands marines already in this country, but refused to accept in the United States the additional troops which the Dutch desired to be trained as replacements for the brigade of 5,000 men. The cost of this training was properly charged to lend-lease as a war measure and continued to be so charged until completion, as was permitted under the President's directive terminating lend-lease except for certain special categories. There is a possibility that the entire cost thereof may be recovered in the final settlement of lend-lease.

The equipment for the Netherlands marine forces presented a different problem from their training. Plans for procuring this equipment and delivering it to the Dutch under lend-lease had been perfected before VJ-day but it had not been delivered when lend-lease terminated. It is my understanding that the Netherlands Government sought to acquire the necessary equipment by negotiating a so-called 3-C agreement under the Lend-Lease Act, but that the Foreign Economic Administration refused to sanction their obtaining the necessary credit through such an arrangement. The Netherlands Government then arranged to pay cash for their equipment and supplies, many items of which otherwise would have become surplus and could have been disposed of at only a small fraction of their cost. The Netherlands Government was charged cost plus 10 percent for all equipment and supplies purchased; the additional 10 percent was to cover the cost of transportation within the United States to dockside. The estimated charges for equipment and supplies totaled $13,670,831.34 and the Netherlands Government has deposited checks for that amount in full. The equipment and supplies for the Netherlands marines have, therefore, been paid for in cash.

It is of further interest that the personnel of the Netherlands marines with their equipment and supplies, have left the United States in ships of Dutch registry.

That the Navy Department's part in the training and equipping of the Royal Netherlands marine forces has been entirely in keeping with the foreign and military policies of the Government is apparent from an analysis of the recent statement of the State Department on the Netherlands East Indies which was published in the morning papers on Thursday, December 20, 1945. The responsibilities of the troops under the Southeast Asia Command in connection with the Japanese surrender are there clearly set forth and it was to assist in these responsibilities that the training and equipping of the Netherlands marines, planned more than 2 years before VJ-day, was completed. To do otherwise than to assist in the completion of their readiness which had been undertaken by our Chiefs of Staff, would have been contrary to the military interests of the United States, and might well have been considered as an affront by our ally, the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

I believe the foregoing résumé of the Navy Department's part in the training and equipping of the Netherlands marines places the picture in the proper light and do not feel that anything would be gained by discussing the details of Mr. Patterson's speech. You may feel free to use this letter in such manner as you deem appropriate in order to clear the record. I am sending a copy of it to the chairman of the House Naval Affairs Committee for his information.

Sincerely yours,

H. STRUVE HENSEL,
Acting Secretary of the Navy.

Radio Address of Hon. Fred Bradley, of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED BRADLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1946

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my radio broadcast which was put on the air over Station WSOO, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., on January 8, 1946; Station WMAM, Marinette, Wis., January 6, 1946; and Station WDBC, Escanaba, Mich., January 9, 1946:

Probably because of its importance, one of the most urgent problems the Congress is going to have to face when the second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress goes into action on January 14 is the so-called British loan. Technically, just how this matter will be handled is still in doubt on Capitol Hill. Of course, it is common knowledge that the State Department has gone right ahead, presumably with the approval of the White House, and negotiated a so-called loan with Britain which has been overwhelming accepted by the British Parliament but without, however, the support of Mr. Winston Churchill and many of his cohorts. In other words, what has been done down here in Washington by our State Department is a "rule of thumb" method adopted by Mr. Roosevelt and his New Dealers many years ago of committing the United States Government and the people who make up that Government to a definite foreign commitment and then expect Congress to rubber stamp it. I repeat, just how this rubber stamp is to be applied is another matter but, personally, I feel at the moment I shall not be a party to that rubber stamp and I will tell you why in a few minutes.

This proposed loan to Britain is not a treaty—therefore, is not subject to ratification by two-thirds of the Senate alone. More probably there will be a bill introduced in the House—which under the Constitution has the sole authority to spend your money and reach into your pocketbook and take the money away from you in the form of taxes to meet those payments. When such a bill is introduced in the House it may be referred to any one of several different committees for study and debate; namely, naturally the internationally minded Foreign Affairs Committee, or the Banking and Currency Committee—which handled the Bretton-Woods proposition—or the Ways and Means Committee—which takes the money out of your pockets in the form of taxes—or the Appropriations Committee which spends your money for you. Once it passes the House—which is likely in view of the overwhelming New Deal—internationalist membership—it would then have to be concurred in by the Senate.

Presumably, the old argument will be used that the White House, acting through the State Department, has already committed this country and there is nothing we can do about it but vote for the bill. I said a few minutes ago that I intended to speak and vote against it—and now I am going to tell you why.

Let us look at the deal which the British have more or less quietly agreed to accept with some misgivings for their own future. This deal—as I choose to call it—or as you have heard of it as a loan to Britain—has been agreed to by our State Department. It's a huge international poker game in which we put up the chips and Britain deals the cards. It was promoted and put through by Lord John Maynard Keynes, whom you will recall came over to this country in the early days of the New Deal filled with grandiose monetary ideas which brought forth a warm welcome from the White House. It was Lord Keynes who advised the early Roosevelt administration that the best way to get out of the depression was to spend our way into prosperity. He was the first advocate of the "priming the pump" policy. He was the man who told us that no matter how high our internal debt ran it was not actually a debt because we were simply owing it to ourselves; that we never need pay it, and that the interest on it was not a burden because we merely took it out of the right-hand pockets of the people in the form of taxes and put it in their left-hand pockets in the form of interest. And that reminds me that I have always admired, and do admire, British statesmen. They are always honest with themselves and their people and with all those with whom they deal. Above all, they are the foremost realistic nationalists in the world—they are for Britain first, last, and always. As Mr. Winston Churchill so admirably stated one time, "I was not made Prime Minister to preside at the liquidation of the British Empire"—therefore, I say that in the present instance I do not blame Lord Keynes, Winston Churchill, Mr. Attlee, Lord Halifax, or anyone else, or the British Empire itself, for pulling the wool over our eyes. I do say, however, the wool is being pulled over our eyes and you people back home better know it because the wool is being pulled over our eyes by the State Department of the United States Government and you might as well know it—or if you have known it before you had better come to a better realization of it. Now, let us look at this so-called British loan for a minute and see what it exactly provides.

It provides, first of all, that we shall liquidate approximately $25,000,000,000 worth of lend-lease material and equipment that we sent over to Britain to prosecute the late war for roughly $650,000,000. That is a pretty sharp trade. When the lend-lease program was on the floor of Congress we were told it was lend-lease. In other words, when I lend my neighbor my lawn mower to cut the grass I expect him to either return it in as good shape as I lent it to him, or I expect him to give me something in exchange for it in a comparable value, or I expect him to pay for it. To me that is what lend-lease means, and we have carried on lend-lease all over the world. As you will recall, the provisions of the initial program provided that the President would send our sum and substance anywhere in the world where they would help to defeat our mutual enemy—but I still insist that we were repeatedly told that this was solely on a lending basis and that we would be repaid in money, or in kind, or in services. I want to get that clear in your minds because I will return to it in the line of present evidence.

Now, here is Britain who has gotten $25,000,000,000 of lend-lease—which is over 50 percent of everything we lend-leased to the entire world and our statesmen in the State Department propose a settlement of 2½ cents on the dollar which is a pretty fair settlement for Britain but even the settlement itself contains plenty of jokers. For instance, we

are told that we can—at any time—demand payment from Britain of $50,000,000 a year on this total amount of $650,000,000—but does that come back to the United States in cash—oh, no—not one penny of it. It specifically provides that the "Government of the United States will use this money exclusively to acquire land or to acquire or construct buildings in the United Kingdom and the colonial dependencies (that is the entire British Empire) for the use of the Government of the United States and for carrying out educational programs in accordance with agreements to be concluded between the two Governments." Now, just what does that quotation from the agreement mean. It means two things. We will either use that money to build grandiose new American embassies or other installations in the British Empire for the use of our own Government, or we will use it for a tremendously expanded Rhodes scholarship program. What do I mean by the latter? Well, simply the cleverest scheme ever invented by the thoughtful mind of one man to insure the perpetuation of the British Empire. When Sir Cecil Rhodes died many years ago he left a large endowment fund providing for the annual education of 96 American students in the famous Oxford University of England. Naturally, these British-educated young men return to the United States thrilled with the greatness of the British Empire—with its tremendous international scope—because you will recall that the sun never sets on the British Empire—and most of them have devoted their time ever since preaching the doctrine that America must forever be the guardian of, rather than the step-child, of her parent country of Britain from whom we thought we gained our independence back in 1776. They are in the driver's seat in the State Department today and I will give you just one illustration. When I was at the Food Conference in Hot Springs, Va.—at which time UNRRA was born back in May of 1943—our principal State Department spokesman, and who is now the Under Secretary of State, was Dean Acheson, who was a Rhodes scholar. He ate every meal with the British at that conference—not with the Americans. He played tennis with the British, he lived, dressed, and talked like the British, and that reminds me of another thing. Personally, I am getting sick and tired listening to the "cheerio's," "right-ho's", etc., down here in Washington—and the British accents and mannerisms which we are constantly met with. It's a new, but costly, fad

And so there is where your $650,000,000 are going, folks, to promote that stuff—to be sure, not that America shall continue to live but that the British Empire shall survive. Oh, yes, many of you fathers and mothers right now are sending letters to me wanting to know why your boys do not get home sooner from those far-flung places all over the world. Many of the boys themselves—and the girls—want to know why they cannot be demobilized sooner. Let me answer that in this fashion. There is no demobilization going on at the British Purchasing Commission right today. It is running bigger than it ever ran—every window in that tremendous building at Eighteenth and K Streets in Washington still has its lend-lease purchased air-conditioning unit sticking out to gawk at American citizens who pay the bill for it, and now we are going to liquidate all of that and pay for it at 2½ cents on the dollar. So that is the first phase of the situation that makes me boil. The sun shall never set on the British Empire—your boys are tending to that today.

The second phase of this so-called British loan is the fact that our State Department has committed us to give them $3,750,000,000 of your money in the form of credit to be used to put them back on their feet financially, and presumably to increase prosperity in America through the improvement of world trade. Well, let us look at that for a minute. I hope there is a butcher, or baker, or candlestick maker listening in to this program. Supposing I came into your store and I said, "Look, Buddy, you and I were out last week fighting a forest fire that threatened our entire town, and I lost some of my money in that fire, and I know you did—but you have a store here with a lot of groceries in it, and I am hungry—so I want to buy $5 worth of groceries and I want you to loan me the money. I am never going to pay it back, you understand"—and let us not kid ourselves on that point either because that is history—and so I have the storekeeper give me $5 worth of credit and I receive $5 worth of groceries. The point I want to make is this—how is he ever going to put those groceries back on the shelf—he must pay someone for them, and you Americans will have to pay with your cold dollars for that $3,750,000,000 worth of credits that we are pledged to give Britain presumably to purchase commodities in this country.

Now, how do they justify that? Let me quote from Mr. Sydney Campbell, financial editor of Reuter's, a British news agency. Last July he stated: "Britain would almost certainly refuse any such loan, however big it might be or however low the interest * * * they are rather mystified as to why Americans trouble to discuss the matter. A grant-in-aid would, of course, be accepted." Now, mind you, I am quoting Mr. Sydney Campbell, of London, who went on to say, "Britishers would regard that in terms of the United States and possibly others of the United Nations taking over their fair share of the common war debt, which is at present piled on Britain's back alone." And that is a very fair attitude for the British in their view, but let me remind you of two things, Britain's debt today is about double what it was before this war started. Our debt in the 7 years I have been in Washington has increased from less than $40,000,000,000 to its present $280,000,000,000, and of course the major portion of that went into this war, so I think we have paid our part, not only in dollars, but in blood.

The statement has been frequently made that we owe a debt of gratitude to Britain and the rest of our allies for holding the line until we got ready. My friends what do you think we would have been doing if our own Nation was invaded as was Russia—or threatened with imminent invasion as was Britain. Fight, of course; we would have fought and we would not have cared who was getting ready. The fact of the matter is when it came time to lick the Germans on the soil of France we furnished 75 percent of the manpower and we did 100 percent of the job in the Pacific. And yet today your boys that you want home are standing guard in the Pacific and are standing guard in Germany to protect the interests of the British, of the Dutch, of the French—of everybody else in this world—that is why they are not coming home any sooner.

And remember this: This $3,750,000,000 of British credit is to be loaned them at 1.62 percent, without any guaranty whatsoever to insure its eventual repayment, and that 1.62 percent of interest that they presumably will pay us comes out of your pockets, friends, in the form of taxes which cost you about 17 percent on every dollar you earn. And how are you going to float it? There is only one way and that is to take it out of your own pocket in the form of a new loan—"dollars for Britain" and that is not all—soon it will be dollars for Russia, France, China—and dollars for every other nation on the earth if this loan goes through and Congress rubber stamps it.

Ladies and gentlemen, when you sent me to Congress I took an oath to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States and to protect it against all enemies, domestic or foreign, internal or external. There was nothing in my oath that commits me to preserve and protect the British Empire.

Is This Their Reward?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1946

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the situation that confronts the presently returning war veteran is nothing short of desperate. When he seeks employment, after being tossed from pillar to post, the best the average dischargee can find is a job which will return him little more than the amount of his weekly unemployment insurance. When he attempts to find any sort of home for his wife and child or children the best he can get is talk of the State taking over some empty barracks. And when he tries to start a small business and looks to purchase surplus Government property which this Congress decreed he is entitled to buy, all he gets is, to use the vernacular, the run-around.

It is now practically 5 months since cessation of hostilities, and the situation is not getting any better. I trust that we shall all bear this in mind by immediately passing legislation designed to remedy these vital matters.

I suggest that we read and heed a newspaper article entitled "Is This Their Reward?" by Sidney Fields, which appeared in yesterday's New York Sunday Mirror. The article follows:

ONLY HUMAN

(By Sidney Fields)

Remember us? We went out to sweat and suffer, to fear and die, and the air was full of fine promises.

Remember us? We sweated and suffered. We feared and died. Then we got the big "Welcome home" signs.

Remember us? We're the young, the cream of the Nation. Nine years of depression. Four years of war. We left you all the lush opportunities of the boom war years.

Remember us? We're Americans. No damned charity. We want a job, a chance to earn our way. Our wives and kids want to breathe, too. And we want a place to live in just a little bigger than our old fox hole.

Remember us?

MONOLOG IN MISERY

Every door is slammed in my face. I'm Lewis C. Lingle, 26, a vet with 4 years in the Navy. Radio communications man. Convoy duty, air raids, sub attacks, three invasions—north Africa, Italy, Normandy. A wife, one 9-months-old kid, another one coming. And I can't get a job.

My wife doesn't say much. That's her way of cheering me up. She used to work in a war plant. Lived with her folks. Now we live in a one-room apartment and kitchenette. Just an alleyway. Couldn't have gotten that if her father wasn't superintendent of the building.

Our little bank account just isn't anymore. We're living on the $20 unemployment insurance and the mustering out checks. After we get the second one this month—God knows. It isn't pleasant thinking of moving in with the folks. I've just got to keep pounding at those locked doors.

No sense answering newspaper ads. Sixty cents an hour. We could all starve comfortably on that. I have to take the $20 and look for a better job. I've hit every

civil-service application I could fit into. Now I wait. Every job-hunting vet goes to the United States Employment Service. I've been going there since my discharge, last November. You're supposed to come back once a month. I get back more often.

It's a run-around. They place 1 out of every 4 vets, and 60,000 of us in the city are getting unemployment compensation. You sit around all day waiting to talk to someone. When you do, nothing happens. Meanwhile, you're supposed to live on $20 a week.

Why do we rate this? Where are the promises? I'm sore. Sore at the casual way they treat us at the Employment Service. Sore at the Government and the guy who offers us a job we can starve at. They sure sent us away fast enough. But they're in no hurry to take us back.

DON'T FENCE ME IN

You'd tear your hair, too, if you had to crowd your wife and baby and yourself into the same three-room apartment with your father-in-law, mother-in-law, and sister-in-law.

We all have colds. The baby is constantly sick. My father-in-law is a night worker and has to get up at 1 a. m. Cozy.

My name is David Saunders. War record? Private to second lieutenant. Three and a half years' service; 1 year overseas. Two bronze stars. I should have taken my CPA exam when I graduated NYU in 1941. But the Army had other ideas. I'm an internal revenue agent now.

Since my discharge last May we've been hunting for a place to live. Four visits to the housing commission. One offer—a cold-water flat. Swell, with an infant. They told my wife not to be so particular. We wrote Mayor LaGuardia and got a form-letter answer referring us to the housing commission. My Congressman says it's a local problem. Want ads. Real-estate agents. Fantastic rents we can't afford, even if we could pay the inevitable bribe to the superintendent.

Why wasn't all this foreseen by the big brains who run the show and made all the vote-catching promises? The OPA blames the builders. The builders blame the OPA. And the Housing Commission is always holding big conferences.

Listen. Vets and their families will need 3,000,000 homes by the end of 1946. Since last October 1,200,000 vets live doubled up. Lots of them have in-law trouble. There's going to be a lot of broken homes.

We built roads and bridges and buildings and anything they wanted overnight in the war. What's happened? Say, I'd even live in one of those converted barracks—if I could get one. But I don't see anyone who stayed behind rushing to rent one.

A SCARCITY OF SURPLUS

For 1 year I've tried three times to get some surplus property and start my own business. Don't know who gets all the surplus stuff. But the veterans aren't getting it.

I'm George Abo. No glamorous war record. In the Army 13 months. Discharged a year ago with a leg injury I got in service. Don't draw a pension. Never traded on my injury. Nor did I ever trade on the fact I'm president of the New York chapter of the American Veterans Committee. We're a young, vigorous group, and do it all the honest way.

My business is men's wear. Had 8 years of it before the war. With my bad leg and a business that keeps you outside I needed a car. Applied for one over 6 months ago. No word from them since. All vets who needed them have had the same experience. Who's getting them?

Last October the War Production Board said over 4,000,000 yards of parachute nylon were surplus. I wanted some desperately. Fifty letters and papers and applications and waiting endless hours to see some big shot. No luck.

I heard of one vet who took off his discharge button, applied through ordinary channels and got 67,000 yards of it. Must be a curse to be a vet.

Two months ago I filed for 5,000 yards of woolens, pleaded, badgered, traced my application to Washington, phoned there. Nothing. It's all crazy. They dump jeeps into the Pacific, and burn clothes while half-naked Filipinos beg for the stuff. Here we get lots of promises and no performance. They remembered us when they needed us, and forgot us when they didn't.

GI bill of rights? My foot. So far it's a GI bill of wrongs.

Criticism of H. R. 3462 by Commerce and Industry Association of New York Offers Strong Arguments in Favor of Passage of the Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include first of all a report of the Commerce and Industry Association of New York, Inc., concerning my bill, H. R. 3462:

The Commerce and Industry Association of New York submits the following report regarding the Voorhis bill, H. R. 3462, to amend the Clayton Act, now pending in Congress before the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

The Voorhis bill would amend the Clayton Act, entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, by adding thereto sections 27, 28, 29, and 30.

Section 27 authorizes the United States to intervene as a party in any action in which the validity, scope, or infringement of any United States patent is involved, provided that, in the court's discretion, such intervention will promote the public interest.

Section 28 requires that various enumerated patent transactions, past, present, and future, be reduced to writing and be filed with the Attorney General within certain prescribed time limits. It also provides for a heavy penalty for failure to file.

Section 29 is the heart of the Voorhis bill. This section declares illegal any use of a patent or patent application or of any interest therein which extends the monopoly granted by a patent beyond the invention covered by such a grant. The section specifies as illegal any use which limits or restricts the licensor or any licensee, or the assigner or any assignee, with respect to the following:

1. The amount of any article he may produce;

2. The price at which he may sell any article;

3. The terms and conditions on which he may sell any article;

4. The purpose for which or the manner in which he may use the invention or any article produced thereunder; or

5. The geographical area in which he may use the invention or produce or sell any article.

The penalties provided by this section are quite drastic, viz:

1 Such illegal use shall render such patent or patent application null and void, and shall be so adjudged by any court having jurisdiction under the antitrust laws, civil or criminal; and

2. Every person who violates this section or who engages in any combination or conspiracy to violate this section shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $5,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding 1 year, or by both.

Section 30 creates the right for a party in any proceeding involving a violation of the antitrust laws or involving a patent or any interest therein, to show the invalidity or the limited scope of any patent or patent rights involved.

From the above résumé it is clear that the Voorhis bill is very broad in scope, carrying severe and significant implications for all businessmen who are in any way concerned with patents. Presumably the bill is leveled at certain practices current in patent-license practices, which the administration, primarily through its Department of Justice, believes to be antisocial and illegal as an unlawful restraint and monopoly. To some extent the bill is a codification of existing law as developed by recent court decisions.

The Voorhis bill is designed to be a "cure-all" of all the evils alleged by the administration to be existent in patent-license agreements and practices, both domestic as well as international. For an exposition of the administration's indictment, see the monograph written by Mr. Corwin D. Edwards, Chairman of the Policy Board, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, entitled "Economic and Political Aspects of International Cartels." This study was made for the Subcommittee on War Mobilization of the Committee on Military Affairs, United States Senate, pursuant to Senate Resolution 107, a resolution authorizing a study of the possibilities of better mobilizing the national resources of the United States.

An immediate effect of the bill, were it to be enacted into law, would be to condemn all present patent-license agreements which allocate, justly or unjustly, markets, industrial fields, or production, or regulate prices and sales terms or restrict either party in any way. This would, of necessity, cause the revision and rewriting of most existing patent-license agreements.

The policy of our laws has been and still is to encourage and to stimulate new inventions. History has shown that this policy has proved beneficial to the industrial progress of our Nation. The monopoly granted to an inventor by our patent laws is, in nature, a reward and an incentive. This monopoly is a valuable property right which is intangible and exists for a limited period (17 years). Of course the right of ownership of a patent is subject to the requirement that the property be so used as not to infringe the rights of others. The patent owner has the right to license others to produce under his patent. However, a patent-license merely providing for the payment of royalty but containing no other protection to the patent owner, would limit the patent owner's reward solely to his royalty and would, in the nature of things, reduce the amount of the royalty. To forbid a patent owner to allocate geographical areas in which his licensee may produce or sell any article would stifle most patent-license agreements since a patent owner would, by his own act, be thereby setting up his own competition. Moreover, to a certain extent the rewards of the inventor would thereby be limited and diminished. The reasonable effect of all this would be to discourage new inventions and thus retard our industrial progress. The patent owner should not be restricted solely to his royalty; he should not be stripped of various rights which he may employ to increase and enhance his royalty.

Corporations spend countless hours of time as well as fortunes of money in research, i. e., the development of new inventions, methods, and processes. A mere royalty, as restricted by the bill, is insufficient to recompense, let alone reward, such enterprises. The foreseeable effect of the Voorhis bill would be to cause many corporations now carrying on expensive and vast research activities to cease such endeavors. This, again, would hamper our country's industrial progress and position in world affairs.

The very broadness of the language of the bill renders the meaning of the provisions of the bill unclear and uncertain. Were the bill to be enacted into law it would be the subject of much litigation. As an example, what is the precise meaning of "any use which extends the monopoly granted by a patent beyond the invention covered by such a grant"?

The Commerce and Industry Association of New York opposes the Voorhis bill, H. R. 3462, to amend the Clayton Act, now pending in Congress before the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

I have quoted in full the report of the Commerce and Industry Association. Now let us consider a few facts about the patent system and the bill.

The patent system of the United States was established by article I, section 8, of the Constitution. It provides: "The Congress shall have power to promote the progress of science and useful arts by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries." Despite this unequivocal statement of purposes, patents frequently have been used to retard the progress of science and useful arts; to prevent the development of technology and the introduction of new processes and new products.

It is the purpose of H. R. 3462 to provide a method for correcting certain patent abuses and by so doing to strengthen the operation of the patent system as a whole. The bill provides that patents which have been intentionally abused shall be rendered unenforceable. The bill does not seek any radical changes in the patent system, such as compulsory licensing. Evidence which has been accumulated over the years, in hearings before the Congress and in scores of cases brought by the Department of Justice, offers abundant testimony of patent abuses in many industries. Since a patent is a privilege granted by the United States Government, if this privilege is shown to have been used contrary to the constitutional purpose for which it was granted, then the Government which bestowed the privilege has the duty to withdraw it for the good of all the people.

In coping with the problems of the postwar period, this country must lead the world by demonstrating that a democratic economy can provide full employment, full production, and freedom of opportunity. American business will find its role rendered difficult if it is confronted with markets and fields of technology closed to new enterprise by arbitrary restrictions. It is imperative, now that victory has been won, to lift all possible restraints upon initiative if we are to achieve the peacetime levels of production and employment which are necessary to the successful operation of our economy. Where patents expedite the attainment of these ends, as they were originally intended to do, they will definitely aid in the expansion of new industries. Where patent practices are employed to destroy or impede opportunity, these practices must be eliminated. It is essential, if the public interest is to be safeguarded, that protection be provided against improper uses of patents. Where improper uses occur, the privileges bestowed by the patent grant become subject to cancellation, and that is what H. R. 3462 proposes to do.

It is inconceivable that anyone should contend that in addition to the monopoly for 17 years, the patentee is entitled to the further privileges of price fixing and production-quota arrangements which by law are denied to manufacturers and sellers of unpatented products.

In all other important respects, as the Commerce and Industry Association of New York points out in its report, the bill is merely "a codification of existing law as developed by recent court decisions."

The association criticizes the bill on the ground that the language, "any use which extends the monopoly granted by a patent beyond the invention covered by such a grant," is too broad and might be subject to various interpretations. This criticism certainly is difficult to understand since the very words quoted above are the same ones used repeatedly by the Supreme Court in rendering opinions in cases involving patents.

For example, in *Morton Salt Co.* v. *The G. S. Suppiger Co.* (314 U. S. 488 (1942)) the Supreme Court stated:

> A patent affords no immunity for a monopoly not within the grant. * * * The public policy which includes inventions within the granted monopoly excludes from it all that is not embraced in the invention.

In *Mercoid Corp.* v. *Mid-Continent Investment Co.* (320 U. S. 661 (1944)) the Supreme Court held that—

> It is the protection of the public in a system of free enterprise which * * * denies to the patentee * * * the power to use it in such a way as to acquire a monopoly which is not plainly within the terms of the grant. The necessities or convenience of the patentee do not justify any use of the monopoly of the patent to create another monopoly. The fact that the patentee has the power to refuse a license does not enable him to enlarge the monopoly of the patent by the expedient of attaching conditions to its use.

In other words the language of the bill is nothing more nor less than what the Supreme Court has already declared repeatedly to be the present law. This brings us to the very heart of the controversy which has been raging with regard to this bill.

The whole purpose of the bill is to provide certain protection for the American public against practices already repeatedly declared to be illegal by the highest Court in the land. Arguments against the bill, therefore, constitute primarily a contention that while these practices are illegal, nonetheless no penalty should be imposed against them. This is, indeed a strange doctrine and one entirely foreign to American principles of good government. An illustration of this point of view, however, is found in another portion of the report of the Commerce and Industry Association, for they state that—

> An immediate effect of the bill, were it to be enacted into law, would be to condemn all present patent-license agreements which allocate, justly or unjustly, markets, industrial fields, or production, or regulate prices and sales terms or restrict either party in any way. This would, of necessity, cause the revision and rewriting of most existing patent-license agreements.

I should like to underline the words "justly" or "unjustly." In other words, the association appears to contend that the bill is wrong because it would condemn patent-license agreements which unjustly restrict production, regulate prices and sales terms, or allocate markets. This is equivalent to saying that if a corporation owns a patent the law should not interfere, no matter what kind of monopolistic practices they engage in. Such a doctrine is obviously untenable in a civilized society, particularly one which professes to believe in economic freedom.

From a broader point of view, however, it is important to observe once again that the right to engage in monopolistic price fixing or production restrictions is denied to American business generally under the antitrust laws of the Nation. It is true that the granting of a patent gives to the holder of that patent a 17-year monopoly on the process or article involved, but it is not true, as contended in the report of the Commerce and Industry Association, that the granting of a patent entitles the holder thereof to use his patent monopoly as a means of stifling the trade and commerce of America by taking to himself powers far beyond the scope of the patent grant as such.

The passage of H. R. 3462 would strengthen, not weaken, the patent system of America, for it would deprive monopoly power in this country of the means most frequently used today for stifling competition and shutting the door of opportunity in the face of small business.

Radio Address of Hon. Fred Bradley of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1946

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include my latest radio broadcast, put on the air over Station WSOO, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.; Station WMAM, Marinette, Wis.; and Station WDBC, Escanaba, Mich.:

This last week I spent two very interesting days in Cleveland where I attended the second annual conference of licensed officers who operate our Great Lakes steamers. The principal speaker at the banquet was the famous Vice Adm. Marc A. Mitscher who made such a wonderful reputation in the Pacific. His first Pacific assignment was in command of the aircraft carrier *Hornet* which on that particular mission was charged with the responsibility of sending Gen. Jimmy Doolittle and his intrepid

fliers on their way to bomb Tokyo. Later, of course, he commanded the famous Task Force No. 58—one principally composed of our largest and fastest aircraft carriers whose pilots literally blasted the Japs out of the skies of the Pacific. He said that when the first atom bomb was dropped, Japan had been thoroughly whipped in the air, on the sea, and on land and the dropping of that first bomb merely gave the Japanese military commanders the perfect excuse to sue for peace and yet—as they thought—save face with their own people. Admiral Mitscher is an extremely personable man and having met him and chatted with him intimately it is very easy to see why all of those who served under him claim that he is not only a great fighter but one of the finest and most tolerant, and most fearless leaders of men that our Navy has ever known. Marc Mitscher is going down in history; he is going down in history alongside of the names of men like Dewey, Decatur, and all of those great Navy heroes of the past. He is a great man and a fine man to have met with and have talked with intimately and personally. I will give you an example of him—one of his young pilots happened to be present during the banquet, and also one of the boys who served under him. After the banquet Admiral Mitscher insisted that both of these boys come up, sit down and have a chat with him. Marc Mitscher is really a seaman's man and an airman's man as well.

The principal object of these annual meetings of the licensed officers is to get together to exchange mutual ideas on how to improve their unparalleled record for moving gigantic tonnages of raw materials and also to exchange mutual ideas with the Coast Guard to improve the regulations governing their operations and, above all, to promote safety at sea.

With the latter thought in mind, therefore, it was but natural that much of the conference should center around one of the greatest of wartime secret inventions and its future application to Great Lakes steamers to promote that safety at sea by visual means. Therefore, radar—and I will spell that for you r-a-d-a-r—was the all important subject matter of this conference. The famous radar—some secrets of which are being made public for the first time—is simply a radio device that sends out radio waves from the ship and when those radio waves strike an object a small proportion of them rebound and are then picked up by a sensitive radio receiver on the same ship—in the same equipment and over the same antenna—and are transmitted, in turn, to a visual indicator known as the scope. This scope is about 8 to 12 inches in diameter and on it the navigator of the ship sees a constantly changing silhouette of everything around him. Now, there is a time element that enters into this picture also. The time element permits the radar to accurately put right on that scope the exact distance the object is from the ship which originally sends out the radio waves which, in turn, receives it—and so the navigator has before him this accurate silhouette. In effect it is just exactly the same as one would see if he were out on a moonlight night in a rowboat on a small lake and if he were familiar with the outline of the shore line could then very easily distinguish where he was and, naturally, he would know how to proceed to his destination. An experienced operator can tell from these silhouettes on the scope not only the location of the shore line but also the location of buoys and other aids to navigation, and also can distinguish from the size of these silhouette markings the size of other objects like ships that may be in the vicinity. He does not get a picture of the ship but he knows from the silhouette on the scope exactly what type craft it may be or whatever obstacle may lie in his path or around him. Seven different radar manufacturers had exhibits at this meeting which were very interesting indeed. Radar experts from the Coast Guard and from the Lake Carriers' Association discussed the various types of radar instruments in considerable detail and explained the possibilities of its use to improve the safety of navigation on the Great Lakes and also stressed the present limitations in the use of radar. It has some limitations, too. In its present state of perfection it is not an absolute panacea to insure safety of operation at all times. It will pierce darkness, it will pierce fog, it will pierce storms—but it requires expert judgment in its use, just exactly the same as it requires experience and good judgment to operate any kind of craft on sea, land, or air at all times and especially by silhouette at night.

On Thursday morning a most interesting conference was held between representatives of the vessel operators and some of their captains and radio technicians and their engineers—the Coast Guard experts were there, too, and about 30 representatives of the 7 different companies who were represented. The purpose of that conference was to set before the electrical technicians—those wizards of electronics for these manufacturers—just what navigation problems are before a Great Lakes captain; just what he would like to have the radar perform for him; and, lastly, and perhaps more important than anything else—just how the radar could be installed on the various types of Great Lakes vessels. The sending and receiving antenna, for instance, of the average radar weighs at least 200 pounds. In order to increase its effective range it should be located as high as possible above the water because the radar can "see"—and I quote that word "see" because, in effect, that is what it does—only to the horizon. Therefore, the higher one puts it the greater the horizontal range. On huge ocean ships radar might be able to see 100 miles or more, but we do not need any such extreme range on the Great Lakes. We would like to see perhaps 30 miles at a maximum, but of much greater importance to a Great Lakes captain is to be able to see very accurately—such as during stormy weather—just where he is in some of our channels which are so extremely narrow that if a 600-foot vessel were to veer off of its course even as much as 10 degrees, it could very easily find its bow and stern aground at the same time thereby effectively plugging that channel to the passage of all other steamers, and if one were following too closely behind, it could very easily cause a most serious collision. Then there is another very important situation that the skipper runs up against and that is when he is going into some relatively narrow breakwater opening. If he could see clearly ahead, just what those openings are and exactly where they are, he could enter the harbor with extreme safety.

The Great Lakes vessel owners expect to install a number of various types of experimental radar in the near future and, naturally, will watch its performance with a tremendous amount of interest. From these experimental installations the manufacturers, themselves, will undoubtedly learn how to improve them, how to perfect their accuracy and to build them more closely to the operating requirements of our Great Lakes vessels. The interesting part of this conference over at Cleveland was the fact that for the first time those who used the equipment were telling the manufacturers what they needed to satisfy them rather than the manufacturers handing them a "cold deal," saying, "Here it is—you use it to best advantage." In this instance the manufacturers wanted to know what the problems were and they will set out now to solve those problems.

The Coast Guard, in turn, will undoubtedly set up certain shore installations designed to send out radio beams over the Lakes. They have coined a name for this proposed installation which they call Ray Mark. Now, here is exactly what the Ray Mark will do. It will simply be a radio lighthouse. When you are out sailing there are certain lighthouses that have what is called a fixed light. Some have a fluctuating light—or one that goes off and on occasionally. This can be done with radio just as well as with a fixed light. In the lighthouse this light may be white, red, or green but it is visible all around the horizon at all times and when a skipper is coming up on course night or day it is his practice to take a 45 degree bearing on that light; in other words, taking a line on it 45 degrees off his bow and then carefully calculating his time while holding the same speed and compass direction. When he gets abreast of the light he knows from his previously calculated speed he can then accurately determine exactly how far off the light he is. With the Ray Mark installation and a radar aboard his ship, therefore, in the stormiest of weather or in the blackest of night—or the heaviest of fog—he will be able to determine his position in exactly the same manner.

The Coast Guard cutter *Mackinaw* has been conducting practical experiments in the application of radar on the Great Lakes ever since she went into service a little over a year ago. Being a military ship she could put on the latest type of equipment and secretly experiment with it. The skipper of the *Mackinaw*, Commander Edwin Roland, told me that he finds no difficulty whatsoever in navigating our very narrowest channels in the Detroit River, in the St. Marys River, and elsewhere in any kind of weather without aids to navigation through the proper application of radar. I predict a great future for the use of radar on the Great Lakes and I assure you that this conference in Cleveland was most informative to everyone who participated in it, and I think we have made a great stride toward the ultimate goal of attaining perfection of safety of life and property at sea.

With the thought in mind that this very important, as well as very interesting, subject should be more widely understood by the public at large, I propose to ask for an immediate congressional investigation by our own Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the possibilities of using radar for the purpose of protecting life and property at sea.

Sometime ago President Truman made a radio broadcast to the people of this Nation. Among other things he protested the activities of some pressure groups who seek to influence legislation in the Congress and then in the next breath he did recognize the existence of these pressure groups who had been in support of him and said that some of them had let him down in his program which explains the present mess that we are in. Then, he turned right around and outlined his proposed legislative program and condemned the Congress as a whole—more particularly, certain committees of the Congress, for their failure to act more promptly on his legislation and he requested the people of this country to talk to their Congressmen when they were home during the recent recess—and if they did not locate us there—to write us letters demanding prompt action on his program. In other words, he personally sought to create the greatest pressure lobby that Congress has ever known. Well, what is the answer? As for myself, I have received exactly six letters so far and by and large they are entirely opposed to the program. I have talked with many of my colleagues and I think they would tell you the same thing—most people are opposed to it.

The Increase of Real Wealth Is Not Automatically Accomplished by Corresponding Increase in Money or Credits So as To Enable the New Wealth To Be Consumed by the Community Which Has Received It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker. I am very pleased to include with my remarks herewith a editorial published in the Pomona (Calif.) Progress Bulletin for December 29. 1945, entitled "Peace, the Burning Issue," and written by Mr. Dewitt Mackenzie, an Associated Press world correspondent.

I should like in this connection to point out that the argument which Mr. Mackenzie advances to the effect that the central problem of modern industrial society is the failure of nations to provide for an automatic increase in purchasing power in the form of money whenever the production of wealth is increased, is precisely the same point that I have been stressing since I first came to Congress in 1937. It is gratifying indeed to be able to include this editorial for this reason:

PEACE, THE BURNING ISSUE

(By Dewitt Mackenzie)

LONDON, December 29.—Preservation of world peace is a burning issue in this England which so recently was at bloody grips with the Nazi monster, and the debate has been given fresh impetus by the auspicious Big Three parley in Moscow and the impending meeting of the United Nations Organization assembly here.

One of the most unusual approaches to this subject I've encountered comes from Sir Richard Paget, distinguished British scientist, with whom I discussed the matter. He holds that peace depends primarily on the solution of two problems, one economic and the other judicial, and on the economic side his ideas are a sizzling challenge to economists.

"The economic problem," he told me, "is that of discovering the best machinery for enabling every nation to use and distribute the wealth-producing powers; that is, their power to produce goods and render services to the utmost and to exchange their surplus wealth with other communities which need them, without artificial restrictions of any kind.

"This will need many changes in the present economic system and can, I believe, only be arrived at by an intensive scientific research to be carried on by teams of the most intelligent economists, statisticians, psychologists, historians, legal experts, etc., working with the same freedom, team spirit, and intensity as that which produced the atomic bomb.

"At present it is not an exaggeration to say that nobody in the world knows how the problem of the production and distribution of real wealth could be handled. Man's powers of production have completely outstripped his orthodox methods of handling the problems of exchange and distribution of real wealth by means of monetary tokens, etc. A better and more scientific method is urgently required.

"Thus it is obviously crazy that the world's best metal for fine craftsmanship—gold—should be laboriously extracted from the earth at great expense of manpower and then be reburied in the vaults of the national banks. Gold should, of course, be used for the development of a real golden age by the world's finest craftsmen.

"It is equally crazy that the great manufacturing nations should be constantly striving to export more goods and services than they import, and that any sudden accretion of real wealth should be looked upon as a national danger, to be guarded against by tariffs.

"In this particular case the reason is clear. The increase of real wealth is not automatically accompanied by a corresponding increase in the tokens of real wealth, that is, money or credits, so as to enable the new wealth to be consumed by the community which has received it. Hence such tragic anomalies as the burning of surplus wheat, the ploughing in of cotton, the throwing of miraculous draughts of fishes back into the sea.

"So long as tariffs, currencies, and monetary questions are dealt with as matters of international politics and rivalries, there is little hope that a rational and scientific solution will be found, and the risk of future wars will continue to increase.

"Intensive scientific research might find the proper solution in 2 or 3 years—instead of 20 or 30, if ever."

Sir Richard believes that the judicial problem is that of discovering a method, "that of selecting from among all the nations a panel of men and/or women of the greatest wisdom, courage, clarity, and impartiality, to form a world supreme court to which all nations would be willing to submit their gravest differences and accept without question the decision of the court."

This world panel, he said, should be made strictly on the merits and without any question of national representation.

"With the discovery of rational economic system and a truly impartial world supreme court," he declared, "the prospects of world peace would be very good."

There Is a Call for Clarification of the 1939 Reclamation Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1946

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, on November 29 last year when the first deficiency bill was being read for amendments under the 5-minute rule in the House, our colleague, Congressman ROBINSON of Utah, made a point of order against the language in that bill commencing on page 30, line 15 and continuing on page 31 down to the end of line 6, on the ground that it was legislation on an appropriation bill. The point of order was sustained and the language was stricken out. As chairman of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation I agreed with Congressman ROBINSON that the language in the appropriation bill was subject to a point of order, and I was pleased to have it taken out of the bill that day.

However, in the subsequent debate, the reasons for the presence of that language which had been written in by the Appropriations Committee, were explained by various members of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior Department bill. The chief reason mentioned was that a solicitor in the Department of Interior had recently made a ruling, thought to be erroneous, on the provisions in the Reclamation Act of 1939 covering hydroelectric power rates for reclamation projects to make repayments. Members of the Appropriations Committee who voiced their sentiments that day felt that the solicitor's ruling on the act of 1939 violated the intent and purpose of that act. While admitting that the language stricken from the appropriation bill was properly subject to a point of order, they had taken this means of calling attention to a lack of clarity in the 1939 law as it pertains to power rates and the repayment of power costs on such suitable parts of reclamation projects given over to power production.

When questioned about my attitude in this matter I was free to admit that commercial power costs on reclamation projects should be repayed to the Government with interest and expressed my belief that such was the intent of Congress—at least of the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation—when the act of 1939 was being considered by our committee. Naturally I also expressed my view that policy should be determined by Congress rather than by solicitors in a department, and that if the act of 1939 was not clear, Congress should take steps to make it clear. I felt then, and feel now, that any needed modification of the act of 1939 in this or any other respect should be carefully considered by the legislative committee having jurisdiction over such matters, that is, the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. To that end I have called a meeting of that committee for January 24 at 10 o'clock, and scheduled hearings on Congressman ROBINSON's bill introduced today amending the Reclamation Act of 1939.

Because this is a controversial matter, and so vitally affecting the whole cause of reclamation, I am anxious that we shall hear at length from the Bureau of Reclamation, from any department of Government interested in power, and also from those Members of Congress or other persons interested in reclamation or in power connected therewith who feel the need of clarifying the law.

Without expressing an opinion whether the Solicitor's ruling properly interprets the law of 1939, or modifies it contrary to the intent of the lawmakers, I must say that this is an interesting matter to me personally and one vital to the cause of reclamation. While I have reread the law of 1939 and I have studied the Solicitor's ruling on the law, I am trying to determine whether the Solicitor's ruling on the language in section 9 (c) of the law is correct. It seems to me that the Reclamation Committee, made up of some eminent lawyers, of which I am not one, ought first to decide whether the Solicitor has correctly

read and interpreted the act of 1939 on repayment of power costs. What does the law of 1939 in section 9 (c) really provide with regard to the fixing of commercial power rates on reclamation projects?

What is my personal attitude in this matter? I am tremendously interested in promoting reclamation throughout the 17 Western States. I am more interested in the use of water to vivify or revivify the land and thus produce life, both animal and vegetable, throughout the semiarid West, than I am in any other use of that precious water. Second to that, I know full well that we cannot have full utilization of our scarce supply of water without a multiple use of it, and that means we must produce hydroelectric power in great quantities and at the cheapest possible cost at which it is economically feasible to be produced. Throughout the 43 years during which reclamation has been transforming the West, hydroelectric power production has gone hand in hand with the other phases of irrigation. As we develop bigger irrigation projects it is becoming increasingly necessary that irrigation and power production go along together. If we cannot have power production as a part of irrigation, certain otherwise feasible projects become unfeasible and we simply could not have them. Any move made to hamper production or distribution of hydroelectric power in connection with irrigation would be a terrific blow, and possibly a fatal blow, at some projects of reclamation. This close relationship must grow closer in the future as the projects become greater, and incidentally more expensive.

The contention has been made that if the law of 1939 is to be as the Solicitor ruled it, such will be sanctioning a deception so that reclamation will be subsidized through power rates that are too low and that such subsidy comes out of the pockets of the American taxpayers. Now, I want to say right off that I am not in favor of any conniving or scheming to subsidize irrigation through power at the expense of the taxpayer. I do not want to deceive anyone, or attempt to do so. I do know that reclamation must be carried on by the Government, or it will not be carried on. I dislike to call the Government expenditures for reclamation a subsidy, for such expenditures are really investments in wealth-producing developments and every cent which the Government expends on irrigation is reimbursable and comes back to the Federal Treasury.

My effort shall be to try to prevail upon the Congress to invest wisely and generously in these western developments of reclamation which build up communities and create such rich taxpaying units and wealth-producing areas, representing a hundred-fold the Government's initial investment. How to do this with equal fairness so as to aid reclamation and power production while duly safeguarding the established interests in power and the long-run interests of the American taxpayer is the purpose of the committee hearings on this bill, H. R. 5124, introduced today by Congressman ROBINSON of Utah.

Resolution on Profit Sharing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, the way to make a man conservative is to give him something to conserve. Profit-sharing plans tend to do precisely this.

The way to save the capitalistic system is to increase to a clear majority the number of Americans who can honestly call themselves capitalists. Profit-sharing plans tend to do precisely this.

The way to induce a sense of personal responsibility in the workingman toward the tools of production which he handles, and his own role in the productive system of the industry in which he is employed, is to give him some ownership in the tools, and a monetary stake over and above his fair and adequate daily wage, in that industry. Profit-sharing plans tend to do precisely this.

Today there is a disastrous economic and moral error common both to capitalistic states, like the United States of America and Great Britain, and collectivist states, like Soviet Russia, that labor, that is, the sweat, skills, efforts, intelligence of the working man are a commodity to be bought and sold, depending, in capitalistic states, on the so-called laws of supply and demand of the labor market, and in totalitarian states on the utterly arbitrary will of the state bureaucracy. The way to destroy or rectify this error is to establish clearly and finally the principle that the workingman is at all times and in all circumstances entitled to participate at two levels in the wealth of the community which his labor creates through production: First, at a wage level and a wage rate which must be adequate to his human needs, and not posited on the inhuman fluctuations of labor supply and demand; and, second, at a profit level and a profit rate which should be a fixed percentage of the profits of the industry or business for which he works.

Profit-sharing plans tend to destroy or rectify this most evil of modern economic errors, which has it that by and large no man who works with his hands or for daily wages is entitled, over and above his daily wages, to share in the wealth which his hands, or skills, or brains have helped to create.

Mr. Speaker, because of the failure of leaders of industry, government, and labor to rectify this basic error in our so-called free-enterprise system, they have condemned millions of our working people to the status of economic wage slaves, and today all of industrial America has become a vast arena, in which two hostile armies are engaged in bitter conflict, concerning the price of the commodity called labor. Both armies fight with the lowest of weapons, force, violence, espionage, smear, and propaganda.

Today, labor, having through many, many long years been on the defensive, is now in the deserved ascendancy, and capital properly, after so many abuses, is on the defensive. But labor's effort to key up the price of labor to a shortage of supply is merely repeating the basic error that labor is a commodity which was made by capital in the days when capital tried to key the price down because there was a surplus.

However successful organized labor may seem to be in the next few years in achieving its so-called wage demands, the repetition of this error will in the end lead to the same disaster as threatened us when capital was in the ascendancy; the break-down of the American free-enterprise system into collectivism. And with the state as employer, the workingman will have stepped from the frying pan of unregenerate capitalism into the fire of degenerate capitalism—which is communism or fascism. For the workingman is not free when:

First. The state can arbitrarily command his bodily services at wages which the state fixes, or force him to a dole, starvation, a firing squad, or a concentration camp.

Second. Private employers can arbitrarily command his bodily services at a wage which they fix—or leave him to starve or seek government aid.

Third. Labor leaders can arbitrarily command his bodily services at wages or on terms which they fix; or exclude him from the possibility of finding work of a character for which he is fitted.

He is free only when his relation and his labor leader's relation to their employer or employers is that of true partners—that is to say, profit sharers.

For the above reasons, I have introduced the following resolution today on profit sharing:

Resolution introduced by CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, of Connecticut, on January 14, 1946, to authorize and conduct a survey of experiences in profit sharing

Whereas the prevalence, persistence, and intensity of strikes and labor disputes are symptoms indicating that the establishment of a new principle of relationship between labor and capital which will win public support is urgent if industrial peace is to be restored and maintained; and

Whereas a fair and equitable distribution of the fruits of industry is a basic condition of a just and healthy capitalism; and

Whereas the profit-sharing principle provides a rational method for dividing the fruits of industry at the source where wealth is created; and

Whereas Senate Resolution 215, introduced in the Seventy-fifth Congress to conduct a survey of experiences in profit-sharing, resulted in extensive hearings on this subject; and the committee findings are of continuous importance in view of the present strike-ridden industrial scene, as witness the following paragraph from the Senate Committee report;

"The committee finds that profit sharing, in one form or another, has been and can be eminently successful, when properly established, in creating employer-employee relations that make for peace, equity, efficiency and contentment. We believe it to be essential to the ultimate maintenance of the capitalistic system. We have found veritable industrial islands of 'peace, equity, efficiency, and contentment,' and likewise prosperity, dotting an otherwise and relatively turbulent industrial map, all the way across the continent. This fact is too significant of profit sharing's possibilities to be ignored or depreciated in our national quest for greater stability and greater democracy in industry.

"The profit-sharing ideal, as an ideal, is invincible. The subjoined hearings and analysis present indisputable evidence to sustain this contention."

And whereas the outbreak of World War II, with the freezing of our economy for war production, halted the work of this committee and made its completion in wartime inexpedient; and

Whereas the report clearly indicated that it was the work of future Congresses to determine proper legislative means by which there could be created a wider diffusion of ownership through contracts of partnership in industry between employer and employee, in times of peace: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House Ways and Means Committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to complete the studies made under Senate Resolution 215, introduced in the Seventy-fifth Congress, and report to the House upon all existing profit-sharing systems, between employers and employees now operative in the United States with a special view (a) to the completion of an authentic record of experience which may be consulted by employers in the postwar period who are interested in voluntarily establishing profit-sharing plans; (b) to the consideration of what advisable contribution, if any, may be made to the encouragement of profit-sharing by the Federal Government, including the grant of compensatory tax exemptions and tax rewards when profit-sharing is voluntarily established; (c) to the consideration of any other recommendations which may prove desirable in pursuit of these objectives, including the enactment by the Congress of profit-sharing legislation; and be it further.

Resolved, That for the purpose of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold hearings; to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the House during the Seventy-ninth and succeeding Congresses; to employ such experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; and to take such testimony and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. The expense of the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, or the chairman of any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

Educational Benefits Provided for Veterans of World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 14, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I have this day introduced before this House of Representatives a bill to extend the educational benefits provided for veterans of World War II by part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to widows of such veterans.

The principle of the bill is simply this—that by this legislation I propose that the widow of any person who served in the active military or naval forces of the United States on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the date of the termination of the present war, as proclaimed by the President or specified in a concurrent resolution of the Congress, and, second, either died in service or was discharged or released from active service under conditions other than dishonorable after having served 90 days or more, exclusive of any period he was assigned for a course of education or training under the Army specialized training program or the Navy college training program, which course was a continuation of his civilian course and was pursued to completion, or as a cadet or midshipman at one of the service academies, or was discharged or released from active service by reason of an actual service-connected injury or disability—his wife shall be eligible for and entitled to receive education or training under the provisions of part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) as amended.

The bill further provides other conditions. The purpose is, however, to give to the widows of diseased veterans an opportunity for an education or the completion of an education under the revised GI bill in order that they may carry on in the support of themselves as well as in the support of their children.

Demobilization of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 14, 1946

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the House that I have introduced a resolution, today, asking and requesting that the War Shipping Administration give to the Congress the full and complete information regarding the demobilization of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and the vessels now employed in transport duty carrying our troops from foreign shores to our own country. This question of demobilization is a most important question, and there are vast numbers of our boys, in all branches of the service, with ample points for their discharge, but it appears that many ships have been taken out of transport duty, some of our ships have been turned over to foreign countries for transport duty for those countries, and many of our ships are standing idle in the many and various ports throughout the world while our boys await the opportunity to secure transportation back home so they may secure their discharges. This situation has created great dissatisfaction among our boys who are still in the service, and it is highly essential that this situation be immediately rectified.

Mr. Speaker, the boys who are still in the service write to their Congressman or to their Senator, urging that something be done to correct this bottleneck in bringing our boys back home who are entitled to discharge. These boys are homesick, they are despondent, and they are angry because of this unusual delay in returning them home to their families, and so they may again resume their work either in school or in civil life. The fact is, these boys with some 3 or 4 years' service in the late war, with citations and decorations denoting the major part they played in this war, want something done about this delay and they want to know who is responsible for it; they want to come home. There have been a number of demonstrations staged at various places by soldiers, sailors, and marines—and it is hoped that these will not in any manner jeopardize our country's position in enemy territory. Congress wants to do something about this situation, but there is certain information which has not been ascertained, and that is the specific information I seek to secure by the resolution I have offered. This information is essential before the Congress can tell, with certainty, just what should be done in this highly important mattter.

Mr. Speaker, three newspaper articles have appeared in the Washington Daily News upon this same subject. Under unanimous consent, I insert each one of these three articles as a part of my remarks, which are as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of January 1, 1946]

"FORGOTTEN" UNITED STATES VESSELS GATHER BARNACLES IN FAR PACIFIC PORTS

American harbors on the far side of the Pacific are jammed with scores if not hundreds of "forgotten" merchant ships loaded with enough unneeded war cargo to supply a revolution in every Central American country, it was learned today. At Saipan alone, one day earlier this month, 41 loaded vessels were awaiting reassignment.

Of these 41, a letter by a mercnant seaman to a Washington newsman reveals, some had been there since June. Others had arrived in August. Later, arrivals had straggled in from closed-down island bases, adding to the dismay of servicemen waiting for empty ships to take them home.

The Navy currently knows of 1,239 cargo ships in the Pacific, but has no break-down on those traveling homewards, those still carrying necessary occupation cargo, and those acting as floating warehouses for war goods now as useless as down featherbeds in Tahiti. By Navy figures, a cargo ship's upkeep is $2,000 to $2,500 per day, counting wages, supplies, and all. That would be nearly $3,000,000 per day for 1,239 ships.

TWO HUNDRED PROTESTS A DAY

Congressmen, newsmen, and the Maritime Union are sharing the protest mail from the Pacific. The Mead Committee has dug part way into the situation, and a House Naval Affairs Subcommittee will dig deeper after the recess. The mail's proportions may be judged from a union's report that its Saturday mail bag brought 200 complaints from seamen.

A War Shipping Administration official admitted today that "we've been after them (Army and Navy) for some time" to release ships for commercial use. He was aware, too, that merchant seamen were sick of sitting in the Pacific harbors and "I don't blame them." He understood, however, that the Army-Navy shipping program was "being coordinated," and that pretty prompt action in sending the ships back could be expected.

The letter to the Washington newsman was signed by a seaman, who wrote:

"My vessel has been a member of this forgotten fleet for almost 4 months. We were

at Ulithi for 2½ months, and have been anchored at Saipan for 42 days.

"No one can tell us when we can expect orders to take our cargo to a forward area or return to the States. There have been a few ships returned to the States, but the number is negligible. All of us are at a loss to understand this gross mishandling of these ships."

LOT OF VICTORY BONDS

In 4 months of limping around the Pacific or rusting in harbor, the seaman-writer's vessel has added at least $240,000 to the cost of World War II. That is a big chunk of Victory bonds.

Compared to his ship, the writer said the *Guatemala Victory* was lucky. It had been waiting around Ulithi and Saipan only 43 days; a deck officer said it was loaded and left the United States after the war was over, because "no one thought of canceling our shipment."

The same deck officer said he knew of at least 15 other ships that left at the same time or later. He blamed "brass hats and gold braid conflicting orders, red tape and Navy business as usual."

"THEY ALSO SERVE—"

War Shipping Administration's customary designation for ships in the *Guatemala's* status is "awaiting orders." The *Adolph Sutro, Chelsea Victory, Henry Durant,* and *Andreas Honcharenko*—all mentioned by the letter writer—were thus explained. The *Alma Victory,* after 116 days of waiting, recently was reported by the WSA as assigned to United States coastal shipping. However, WSA has no record it has left Saipan.

Some forgotten ships are more correctly forgotten and lost. WSA answers "not known," for instance, when asked whereabouts of the *Beatrice Victory,* the *Chief Charlot* or *Edward R. Ripley,* last reported at Guam or Saipan in November. The Pacific is a big place, and a ship is so small.

[From the Washington Daily News of January 8, 1946]

"FORGOTTEN FLEET" UNDER THREE-WAY FIRE

Developments were threefold today in the "forgotten fleet" situation which has kept hundreds of war cargo-laden merchant ships riding anchor for weeks and months at a time in Far East ports and even close at home ports awaiting rerouting orders.

1. The Maritime Commission said it was conducting a campaign to recruit seamen to replace those rendered hors de combat by the fact that several thousand crew members are tied up in harbors with their ships. The members, incidentally, are all on full wages in one of the country's best paid occupations.

2. It was disclosed that Admiral Emory S. Land, in one of his last gestures upon turning in his resignation as Commission Chairman and War Shipping Administrator, had written the War and Navy Secretaries demanding immediate action to unload the ships and free their crews for other pressing assignments.

TO ASK PROBE

3. Representative RAYMOND S. SPRINGER, Republican, Indiana, promised he would offer a resolution to investigate and get these ships on active duty immediately the House reconvenes.

With merchant seamen in the far Pacific area literally on the verge of nervous breakdowns because of enforced idleness, the Army-Navy Petroleum Board announced that the "current dearth of personnel available to man War Shipping Administration tankers" was causing "critical fuel and gasoline supply shortages affecting United States forces overseas." Admiral F. J. Horne, Board chairman, said that less than 1 month's supply is on hand for occupation forces in Germany and this will shrink to 15 days' supply unless sailings are expedited immediately.

Warming up to a reporter's offer to tell its side of the case, the Maritime Commission cited chapter and verse on typical tied-up ships which aroused Admiral Land's concern.

The steamship *Christopher Gadsen* left Italy October 30, anchored off Cape Henlopen at Lewes, Del., November 19, was still waiting to unload late in December. Nine other Liberty ships in a similar predicament were anchored beside her.

Among others aboard the *Gadsen* was an Army lieutenant who had been overseas for 2½ years and had 90 points discharge credit.

MAN WITHOUT COUNTRY

For 3 weeks, the Maritime Union's Washington headquarters was informed, he's been sitting aboard this ship staring at the shores of Delaware wondering if he will ever make it. We also have a United States Navy gunner aboard who is eligible for discharge but is in the same position.

The ship had not even been allowed to pass quarantine and no shore leave could be granted.

On board another ship in the group, the steamship *Oliver Hazard Perry,* an armed-guard unit of 11 enlisted Navy men—six eligible for discharge—and an Army sergeant with 60 points were "prisoners" just 5 miles from shore. With fuel and fresh water low and no clean linen since September, the situation, Chief Radio Officer Clyde M. Singleton reported, "is possibly dangerous." Most of the ships carried unwanted ammunition, and have about a "Z" unloading priority.

In addition to complaints about enforced idleness, which came to light in a seaman's letter to Joseph Leib, Washington veterans' leader, a House Naval Affairs subcommittee shortly get eyewitnesses accounts of destruction "throughout the Pacific" of valuable equipment. A crew member of the steamship *Edwin Markham* reports: "We sent a valve ashore to be rebuilt for our motorboat and when the captain went to get it he was told by the officer in charge that it had been thrown in a large hole and covered up with a bulldozer.

"He said his orders were to take what things he needed with him to Guam but to get rid of the excess. That is how they do it. Trucks are taken off ships, put on LCT's and taken out and shoved into the ocean. We have been sitting here for 4 months, waiting to unload. We have been told they don't need things we have aboard. No one wants to take the responsibility to divert us to some other base even though they say they are building a stock pile in Manila The food, trucks, and housing we have aboard can be used in China. The whisky and beer I leave to your judgment where they can be used."

The *Markham* is in the Far East.

[From the Washington Daily News]

GI RALLIES WIN SUPPORT, PROBE DEMAND IN CONGRESS

Angry congressional demands for a full investigation of the Army's demobilization program mounted today in the wake of mass GI demonstrations which extended from Manila to the very door of Congress.

The Manila demonstrations were the most spectacular. But gripes also were registered at Paris. And a large group of enlisted men at Andrews Field, just outside Washington, protested to their officers of "inequalities" in the discharge system.

Some Congressmen, members of both parties, charged bluntly the Army had broken faith with its men and demanded an investigation.

"PRESTIGE" INVOLVED

Bound up in the demobilization controversy was the problem of United States prestige in conquered countries and the home-front question of universal peacetime military training.

Also having a bearing on the outcome of investigation demands was congressional concern over the possible effect of GI discontent in the impending 1946 elections.

The Army, which touched off the demonstrations with an announcement that demobilization would slow down from now on, said it could not "rob" occupation forces because it did not have adequate replacements.

It said the situation stemmed from the lack of any comprehensive program for replacing veterans in Europe and Asia. It also blamed changed "world conditions."

WHAT CHANGES?

Representative BROWN, Republican, Ohio, demanded to know what the changed world conditions were. BROWN, a member of the GOP Policy Committee, said it was time for Congress to look into the entire picture.

"If world conditions haven't changed and there is no emergency," he said, "can it be that the War Department is simply pressuring Congress to enact compulsory military training or to extend the draft?

"It is the duty and responsibility of Congress to investigate as soon as Congress reconvenes."

Representative MANSFIELD, Democrat, Montana, joined the demand for an investigation, saying he saw "no need" for large United States occupation forces in a score of countries, including Greece, India, Burma, Java, and China.

MANSFIELD sent a letter to Chairman MAY, Democrat, Kentucky, of the House Military Affairs Committee. He urged the committee to see to it "that the Army's demobilization program can be continued at the present rate and, wherever possible, accelerated."

BREACH OF FAITH

Democatic Senators JOHNSON, Colorado, and MCCLELLAN, Arkansas, agreed an investigation was in order. MCCLELLAN charged the demobilization slowdown was "a breach of faith with the veterans."

White House Press Secretary Charles G. Ross said President Truman had no plans to intervene.

Senator MURRAY, Democrat, Montana, cautioned GI's to be careful "and not do anything that would jeopardize this country's position." He said the demonstrations were "unfortunate."

The War Department reiterated that the demobilization slowdown was not unexpected, and that Army planners ever since VJ-day have predicted that a point would be reached early this year where occupation requirements rather than available shipping would determine how fast men could be returned.

They pointed out Army demobilization plans, presented to the House Military Affairs Committee last August, called for an Army of 2,500,000 on July 1, including 900,000 men in the Pacific and 400,000 in Europe.

Since then, those figures have been scaled down to a total of 1,550,000 men, including 335,000 in Europe, 375,000 in the Pacific, and 87,000 in other overseas areas.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident the foregoing newspaper articles give a very vivid recital of the sad plight in which many of these boys, still in the service, find themselves. Many of these boys are stranded upon islands, and upon the mainland, of countries where there is no work of an occupational character to be done, and these boys are doing very little at this time. They are merely kept and held at great expense to the taxpayers of this Nation—without any service to render. The war is over, insofar as these boys are concerned. There are married men, with families, who are stranded there—they have enough points for discharge, but they cannot get a ship to bring them home; there are boys who

have not yet completed their high-school work, although they have been in combat service for 2 or 3 years, and they want to resume their education, but they cannot get a ship to bring them home. There are doctors, lawyers, farmers, businessmen, and those with skilled trades in the shop—they have been through the war, and now they want to return home—they want to try to rehabilitate themselves in some useful occupation—they have their future before them. All of these should have great consideration at the hands of the War and Navy Departments, and of the War Shipping Administration. It is a shame to hold the boys who are not now essential to our security in occupational work—and there are hundreds of thousands of these boys who are not stationed upon any island, or upon any mainland, which is enemy territory. Therefore, all those boys who are still in the service, and whose services can be dispensed with without impairing our security, should be released and returned to their homes so that they may start to again rehabilitate themselves in civil life.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the resolution I have introduced, today, may have immediate consideration at the hand of the committee to which it has been referred, and it is my further hope that the War Shipping Administration will promptly, and immediately, make available to every Member of Congress all of the facts relative to this situation as requested in my resolution. These facts are essential in order that Congress may know how to approach this very urgent and serious situation, and I feel confident that Congress will promptly approach this situation when the facts are made available to the Members.

Lastly, the boys have done their job—they did it well. Let us not fail in doing our job—to aid them in every possible manner to get aboard a ship to come home.

Proposed Loan to Britain Is Inflationary and Threatens the Future of the GI Bill

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1946

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting the text of a speech delivered by me over radio station WOW, Omaha, Nebr., January 4:

Fellow Nebraskans, the Christmas recess of Congress has permitted me to get home, and to be back with my friends and neighbors.

But in a few days I cannot make the rounds of five counties to visit the hundreds of folks from whom I should like to again get counsel and advice. Accordingly, I am doing the next best thing. Through the public service facilities of WOW, I am able to make a general report to you.

My conviction is that the American people are entitled to the full truth about the affairs of their Government. That belief has not been changed but instead strengthened by my experiences in Washington. Accordingly, as long as you entrust me with public responsibility, I propose to continue with what my eastern acquaintances call "my midwestern habit of forthrightness and plain speaking."

On VJ-day the task in Washington became that of restoring to America its traditional blessings of opportunity, righteousness, and justice.

BRING THE BOYS HOME

When Congress reconvened the military authorities were apparently planning a slow and leisurely demobilization. In early September, their plan was to have only 26 discharge centers—a method which would have dragged out demobilization over a period of years. However, the people of America rose up in their wrath and protests poured into Washington.

Faced by this rising tide of public indignation, the military became alarmed and increased the number of discharge centers from 26 to a total of 200 separation centers. As a result, hundreds of thousands of veterans are now home that would not have been home today except for the decisive effect of an aroused public opinion.

While the military leaders still dominate the Washington scene, there is a vital lesson in this episode. It is this: When the American people become aroused, they can still exert a vital influence on the actions of the Government.

With the humble people elsewhere almost hopelessly in socialism and slavery, this demobilization speed-up demonstrates that the people here can retain the direction of their Government, if they will.

However, the present situation is by no means satisfactory. Congress should have promptly passed legislation that would give every boy who wants to return home a prompt opportunity to do so. Various bills were introduced for that purpose. They have been referred to the powerful Military Affairs Committee. Thus far the chairman of that committee, obviously carrying out administration orders, has refused to hold a single hearing on these measures—and this procedure is the normal way to get bills before the House.

The only other method for Congress to consider legislation to bring the boys home is the petition route. If a Member can get 218 Congressmen to sign a petition for his bill it will be brought up promptly. When the first such petition was introduced, I was the second signer. That petition now has 160 of the required 218 signatures.

BARE CUPBOARD FOR VETERAN

As the boys get home, they are experiencing various problems, of which housing is the most serious. This significant fact is often overlooked. The veteran is at the end of the line on housing. Those who stayed at home have secured permanent quarters, so that when the veteran seeks a place to live, he is at the end of the line—with the cupboard bare of housing. This deficiency, however, can and must be remedied promptly.

There is another situation, however, where, if the veteran finds himself at the end of the line, the results will be even more critical than the housing shortage. I refer, of course, to the gigantic outpouring from the Treasury of the United States of the assets of this Nation into foreign lands.

On top of the reckless war spending of hundreds of billions, the administration is now engaged in pipelining abroad much of our remaining wealth. Before these officials run hog wild in their egotistical attempt to be a "good-time Charlie" to the whole world with your money, let us at least take a quick look at our problems and obligations at home.

HONEST DOLLARS A "MUST"

On September 30, 900,000 World War II veterans or their families were drawing pension or compensation payments from the Treasury. Moreover, additional claims are coming into the Veterans' Administration at the rate of 200,000 per month. Now, I ask you, does the Government have any business starting a series of gigantic foreign loans, of which the proposed $4,400,000,000 loan to Britain is only the beginning, unless it has made sure provision to pay our veterans' claims in honest dollars?

What do I mean by honest dollars? Simply this, what kind of dollars are these claims and your life insurance and war bonds going to be paid in—honest dollars, of their present purchasing power, or will they be paid in a diluted money that has declined in value like most European currencies?

The future value of the dollar depends on whether or not the Truman administration has the integrity and ability to fulfill its duty to balance the budget—a budget that has gone in the red over eighteen billions during the last 6 months. For a national balanced budget is the only genuine defense against inflation, just as in your home a balanced budget is your only sure defense against family bankruptcy.

OPA DOES NOT STOP INFLATION

Despite this truth, tremendous propaganda efforts are being made to sell you the counterfeit idea that OPA can stop inflation. Why this ballyhoo for OPA now? Here's the reason. If foreign reckless spending is to continue, the inflation it creates must be concealed. Remember this fact. Despite what OPA does or can do, every hand-out abroad today is a concealed cut in your pay check. Every foreign loan must slyly be deducted from your take-home pay. In confused anger against these tactics by government, workers become easy victims of the Communists in our midst who are stirring up much of our labor troubles. Likewise, chiseling, black-market thievery, and dishonesty of all kinds are spreading like an epidemic all over America—and the cause is the 40 or more Government bureaus still recklessly spending your money abroad. If you are a laborer or white-collar worker who has been fighting the uphill battle against the rising cost of living, you are entitled to the truth.

FOREIGN LOANS INFLATIONARY

Let's take a look behind the scenes, at how speculative interests profit by this spending. A financial expert advised his clients on December 24, as follows:

"New and inflationary calls on the Federal Budget follow one another in rapid succession. Congress last week voted final approval of a $750,000,000 appropriation for the UNRRA, as the first installment of the second year contribution. This comes shortly after a similar $550,000,000 appropriation. The Bretton Woods monetary funds and bank agreements will go into effect on December 27. Most authorities regard the new international financial entities, in particular the pending British loan, as powerful and inflationary trade stimulants."

Your Government has not told you that the billions now going abroad are pure inflation, and are the true cause of your family problems today, of rising prices, shoddy merchandise, and shrinking dollars. But the stock-market speculators, the profiteers in real estate, and the cunning people who are getting rich while inflation gnaws away at your pay check know this. You, too, should know that inflation goes on in America as long as your Government sends billions of our goods, even including housing materials, to foreign lands—taking the cost out of your pay check in one way or another.

BRITISH LOAN FANTASTIC

The proposed British loan, coming on top of billions for lend-lease, Import-Export Bank, Bretton Woods, and other hand-outs abroad, seems fantastic. While British agents were in Washington using their usual seductive social snobbery to set up this deal, another Britisher went to New York. He was that new leader, Harold Laski, telling east coast radicals that the American system of free enterprise must go on the scrap heap. Even though this technique is a British habit, this particular act of arrogance and insult seems like too much for the American people to swallow.

However, one fact about the British loan should be understood. I do not blame the British for seeking this huge fund from the United States. The British people bore many privations in the war, and the reckless spending of our Government naturally leads them to believe our resources are unlimited. Nevertheless, a loan either to prop up temporarily the brutal colonial imperialism of England or funds to finance an English venture into socialism, will do them no good in the long run—and it will pour gasoline on the fires of inflation in America.

If the administration is determined on a loan to England, let them meet these two conditions: first, that Mr. Truman should present a genuine plan to balance the Budget. That would indicate the effort to maintain an honest dollar. Secondly, this loan should be offered to the public as long-term bonds to individual investors for this specific purpose. Only then would this deal be noninflationary and only those who wanted to send their savings to England would do so. Most all of my mail on this subject has been vigorously against further loans. And if you favor this loan, I hope you will write me and give your reasons. I want to hear all sides. Likewise, I hope that the various veterans' organizations are aware of the long-term dangers of this scheme to the GI bill and other veterans' benefits. We should have learned when the Atlantic Charter was betrayed that even solemn government promises are often repudiated.

There is a limit to the failures the American people can absorb. The first was the great depression. The second was supplying Japan and Germany the materials for a gigantic war. Now our officials will fail us again if they saddle us and our children with the colossal and impossible burdens of the world.

To the claim the proposed loan to Britain will promote peace and trade, this answer should be made—America will not advance good will among nations, if we further endanger the American system that produced the goods that brought victory to every Allied Nation.

AMERICA'S DUTY IS TO VETERANS

On Christmas Day with my wife and youngsters, I visited the neighbors across the street in Washington. A happy crowd of folks were there, enjoying the fellowship of the holiday. But over in one corner, off by himself, sat the shadow of a man, too sick and too weak to ever participate in the conversation. He was a veteran who, while serving his country in the jungles of the South Pacific, contracted a strange oriental disease. From a position before the war of good income and a happy home, his service to his country has left him sick and broken.

For my part, our duty to this veteran, and thousands like him, must come first in America today. To care for the widow and the orphan, and to bind up this Nation's wounds are our first responsibility.

The time has come for us to put into practice the advice of St. Paul, who addressed Timothy in these words:

"But if any provide not for his own, and specially not for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel."

Fellow Nebraskans, nowhere in history is there a record of Christian charity to other lands that will compare with the generosity of the American people. For that aid we have asked no thanks, and generally speaking, we have received none.

In conclusion let me leave this thought: When a balanced budget indicates that we will carry out our responsibilities to those of our own house, then and only then can we, by the intelligent use of the simple virtues of example and persuasion, truly promote good will and prosperity everywhere.

Conditions in the Yokosuka Area in Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1946

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following anonymous letter regarding conditions of prostitution and sex laxity among naval personnel in the Yokosuka area in Japan and the Navy's action in respect thereto:

TOKYO BAY, *December 10, 1945.*

Representative JOSEPH O'HARA,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In the Monday, December 10, edition of Stars and Stripes there appears an article entitled "Congress Gets Low-Down About Jap Cathouses." I quote in part: "Forrestal explained many sections of Yokosuka had originally been placed out of bounds, but, unfortunately, some houses were in the in-bounds area."

"In order to protect the health of the men," he continued, "prophylaxis stations were established where they would be most effective and in one instance this was at entrance to a house of prostitution."

This is not the truth. Either Mr. Forrestal is not telling the truth or else the true facts have been misrepresented to him (which is more than just probable). The houses that were attacked by all of the chaplains combined and some of the doctors used to be in the out-of-bounds area until this present command took over—then it was decided to throw them wide open. And why? To prevent the spread of venereal disease. Since they were opened, the venereal-disease rate has taken a spectacular rise.

Now, the "one instance" that Mr. Forrestal refers to—this prophylaxis station was not at the entrance but right in the house of prostitution which was furnished with Navy corpsmen who were ordered there.

It is true that these houses are closed now—but only by command. But where is the investigation? Are military investigations dependent upon who is guilty? It might interest you to know that this situation was a gross and deliberate violation of the Navy Department's stated policy as given in the Restricted Bulletin NAV 147 RNC P3–1X85X regarding the repression of prostitution.

If you people really want the real hot dope on what went on out here and want also to know how boldly and nobly the chaplains and doctors spoke out against it, then you'd better call in some of those same doctors and chaplains who were stationed out here while this degrading situation prospered under the protection of the USN's.

By virtue of necessity I must sign this letter "anonymous" or else hang for it. And so, asking you to accept this as the whole truth I sign myself:

ANONYMOUS.

Let's Bring the Boys Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1946

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who believe that with the war successfully over our boys in the armed forces should be allowed to return as speedily as possible to their homes and families and I was shocked today when I learned that a vast amount of shipping that could be utilized in transporting troops back to the United States is standing idle. When information came to me that the troop-carrying service, instead of being augmented to meet the requirements of faster demobilization, is being depleted by the decommissioning of a large number of ships, I sent the following letter to the Secretary of the Navy:

Hon. JAMES V. FORRESTAL,
Secretary of the Navy,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am informed that notice has been given to the War Shipping Administration that 65 ships that have been manned by the Navy and used as troop-carrying ships are being taken out of the troop-carrying service and returned to the War Shipping Administration. I am also advised that the War Shipping Administration now has on hand, standing idle and inactive, 200 ships that are being held as surplus. With the addition of the 65 which the Navy is sending back to it, the War Shipping Administration will have on its hands, doing absolutely nothing, 265 ships which, if put to use in carrying troops back from foreign theaters of war, would be the means of soon reuniting many thousands of American servicemen with their homes and families. I would appreciate being advised why the Navy is sending 65 ships back to the War Shipping Administration to be decommissioned at a time when there is such a widespread interest in a speedy demobilization of the armed forces and I would like to have whatever information you can give me explaining why the 200 surplus ships of the War Shipping Administration are not being brought into use in carrying troops back to their homes. It seems evident that the explanation we so often hear that our boys cannot be brought home for lack of transportation is not well founded when all of this shipping is standing idle. I have the highest respect and esteem for you as an official, and this letter is not written in a spirit of criticism, but I would like to know, and I think the country would like to know, why this large amount of shipping space remains unused when it could be carrying our boys back to their homes and families. I would greatly appreciate a reply.

Very sincerely yours,

LOUIS LUDLOW.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the troop-carrying capacity of 265 ships is, but I would suppose that that many ships, without too much overcrowding, could

carry some hundreds of thousands of soldiers.

Five months after VJ-day there are more than 6,000,000 men in our armed forces. To get the hopes of the boys, particularly those in foreign service, built up with the prospect of returning them home and then dash them with cold water, as was done the other day, is to my mind very unfortunate. Let's get the boys back home and discharged at the earliest possible moment. They have done their part; now let us do ours. It is apparent that there is very little actual useful work for a great percentage of these boys, who are merely waiting for the discharge system to catch up with them.

I know boys who have fine prospects in life—many of them—who are suffering the agony of such menial duties as running errands or peeling potatoes or acting as chauffeurs for officers, while they yearn to return home to resume their education where it was cut off by the war. They deserve consideration, now that the war is over. They should not be kept in the service 1 day longer than is necessary. In a few years they will be running the country, and they are entitled to the training and education necessary to enable them to meet their responsibilities. I know fathers in the service with children they have never seen, and they deserve consideration, and perhaps most appealing of all are the cases of sick and overly burdened wives who are struggling—bitterly struggling—to keep their homes together pending the return of the husband and breadwinner. They, too, are entitled to our kindest sympathy and help.

No one doubts, of course, that armies of occupation will be necessary. My own belief is that if the President would call volunteers to the colors for that purpose there would be a larger offering of manpower than would be needed to meet the requirements. General MacArthur said that 200,000 men will suffice for the army of occupation in the Pacific theater. A liberal estimate has been made that twice that number will be sufficient in the European theater when the situation there gets shaken down, making 600,000 in all. And yet, with VJ-day 5 months in the past we are still holding more than 10 times that number in the service. The folly of this is evidenced by the statement that it is necessary to retain 70,000 of our men in the Philippines. With Japan beaten to her knees and beyond all possibility of making a military recovery, just why is it necessary to keep 70,000 of our American boys in the Philippines? We should bring our men back as soon as possible to resume their family and social ties and their business and educational connections and to reorient themselves, so that they may rebuild a happy and prosperous America on the foundation of the home.

When so much existing shipping space is not being utilized to transport our troops to America, we naturally wonder whether too much stress is not being placed on world regulation. There is a vast difference between cooperation and regulation. We should be a good neighbor and cooperate with all right-thinking nations; but it is not up to us to reach out and try to regulate everything around the earth. President Benjamin Harrison, a fine Christian statesman, once said to me: "We have no commission from God to police the world." We will make a mistake if we assume that it is our mission to reform the peoples of other countries so that they will conform to our concept of living. What we should be interested in is the maintenance of peace and order and friendly intercourse throughout the world and in justice in international relations and not in bending other nations to our particular ideology, superior though we believe it to be. We seem to be getting too much world interference virus in our national system. What we need is a rebirth of sturdy Americanism. If we will stick to the principles that made America great we will not go far astray.

United States Marines in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 14, 1946

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in order to clarify, if possible, the reason for maintaining a force of United States marines in China, I wish to include with my remarks the following exchange of correspondence:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 3, 1946.

Gen. ALEXANDER VANDEGRIFT,
United States Marine Corps,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL VANDEGRIFT: This will supplement our previous correspondence with respect to the presence of our marines in China.

In a previous letter you advised me that these troops were there for the sole purpose of disarming the Japanese and that they would be withdrawn when they had served their purpose. I have also received this same information from the War Department and from the State Department.

Recent published statements, however, to the effect that more of our troops are needed in China, and newspaper articles such as the enclosed, would seem to indicate that some of our marines are being used for other purposes.

I think you will agree with me that if the American people are to be expected to support the Government's foreign policy in China, a clear and definite statement of the use to which our troops are being put is absolutely essential. Any further light you can throw on the subject will be appreciated.

With every good wish, I am,
Sincerely yours,
JACK Z. ANDERSON,
Member of Congress.

HEADQUARTERS, UNITED STATES
MARINE CORPS,
Washington, January 9, 1946.

The Honorable JACK Z. ANDERSON,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ANDERSON: Your letter dated January 3, 1946, regarding the presence of United States marines in China, is hereby acknowledged.

In accordance with the United States policy toward China, as stated by President Truman on December 15, 1945, United States marines are stationed in North China for the purpose of assisting the National Government of the Republic of China in effecting the disarming and evacuation of Japanese troops in the liberated areas. Undoubtedly, the existence of a difficult internal situation in China has had a retarding effect on the accomplishment of the mission outlined above and has resulted in some situations which, when not considered in the light of all available information, appear on the surface not to be consistent with the assigned mission.

The basic directives concerning the occupation of China were issued by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The assignment of specific marine units employed was effected by the commander in chief, United States Pacific Fleet. Marines now on duty in China are under the immediate tactical command of the commanding general, China theater (U. S. Army). Although some of the recent newspaper publicity may indicate otherwise, from the official reports that I have seen, it appears that unit commanders are working conscientiously toward the accomplishment of their assigned missions and are handling a delicate situation in a commendable manner.

Sincerely yours,
A. H. TURNAGE,
Major General, USMC, Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps.

Statement of Free Competitive Enterprise, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 14, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, from time to time there have been sent to me statements by various organizations seeking to protect economic liberty in the United States and freedom of competitive enterprise, but I have never found so forceful, thoughtful or well-balanced a statement in this field as that recently issued by an organization known as the Association for Free Competitive Enterprise, of Columbus, Ohio.

Under unanimous consent, I therefore ask to include this statement with my remarks herewith:

WHAT WE MIGHT DO TO CHECK THE ABUSES THAT THREATEN OUR AMERICAN SYSTEM OF FREE COMPETITIVE ENTERPRISE

Freedom of competition is our objective. Freedom, not more controls. For we take it as axiomatic that freedom, not control, is the motivating force in a democratic system such as ours. Controls—whether by government or by private organizations—can only hamper and limit the free competition of private capitalism—and destroy it in the end. Our objective therefore must always be the encouragement of competitive enterprise, rather than its control.

The following are suggestions—not an adopted program, but merely suggestions that point out the possible areas which we may search for courses of action—when our organization is ready to function through properly constituted committees.

THESE ARE POSSIBLE AREAS FOR ACTION

Making research and new technologies available to all business—little as well as big

The control of research and new technology by a few big corporations is incompatible with a democratic free-enterprise system. But it has become an established fact today because only the big enterprises have had such profits as to enable them to finance research, or to buy up the results of independent individual research.

In the field of agriculture, Government has long sponsored research, and has spent great sums on this work. Farmers have benefited hugely from this research (which is made freely available to all) and the public generally has benefited a hundred-fold for each dollar spent in such research.

A similar program of research could be established by Government for the benefit of industry—with the results free to all comers. There is sound precedent for such a step, as well as great need.

As to the effectiveness of Government research, consider the atomic-bomb development. A practical way to release atomic energy was found in less than 4 years. Private research had not found the solution in the 20 years men had worked on it. Obviously Government can provide better resources for research, and quite as obviously Government research can get results.

It is conceivable, of course, that some huge private corporation like General Motors or duPont could have finally harnessed atomic energy. But it probably would have taken much longer. And in the course of the development there would (judging from past experiences with similar corporations) have been cross-licensing agreements with the Germans, and probably with the Japs.

In any case, how long would free enterprise last with atomic power the private property of one or two great corporations?

Revision of the patent laws to prevent abuse of the patent privilege

Our Government grants patent holders certain privileges and advantages in the use of a patent with the object of encouraging technical development. When a patent holder withholds from the public the benefit of his patent—to protect his investment in other patents, for instance—he clearly is abusing the privilege of patent protection granted by the Government. Deliberate withholding of patented developments from the market, or any other abuse of patent protection should void the right to protection. A revision of our patent laws in this respect is long overdue.

More active enforcement of the antitrust laws

The Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice should have more funds to work with. This would not cost us money in reality; it would make money. For example: In 1939 the Antitrust Division was given only $1,300,000. In the first 6 months of that year their enforcement proceedings resulted in over $2,400,000 in fines paid into the Federal Treasury. Of course, the Antitrust Division is not run to collect fines; this point is brought up only to illustrate that the Federal Government would not be out of pocket if liberal allowance were made for antitrust enforcement.

The really great benefits of enforcement accrue to the public. In one single case the milk consumers of Chicago were saved about $10,000,000 a year. And there is, of course, no way of measuring in dollars and cents the value to our democratic system, of maintaining freedom of competition.

Vigilant resistance to the ever-recurring attempts to obtain immunity of the antitrust laws

Every industry has members who think that the antitrust laws should not be applied to them. Frequently conditions within an industry become such that an association purporting to speak for the entire industry demands exemption from the operation of the antitrust laws. In recent years tremendous pressure has been brought upon Congress to secure such exemption by one industry after another. It is not in the public interest to whittle away the effectiveness of the antitrust laws simply because an interested group fears prosecution under them. The general public should be made aware of these attempts to secure special concessions and the legislation which would confer them should be opposed with determination. We refer specifically to present efforts to obtain immunity on the part of railroads and certain large insurance companies.

Government, financial and legal assistance to inventors or businessmen who are financially unable to defend their patents

Many a business has been throttled, and many an inventor has been kept from enjoying the benefits of his patent because of a suit for infringement brought against him by a powerful corporation. In such cases, it is almost inevitable that the small patent holder must yield to the rich corporation—because patent litigation is long and costly. It is suggested that Government be required by law to subsidize patent litigation—thus giving both parties to the suit an even break. Here again we have good precedent for such a law—even a common criminal is furnished legal counsel for his defense if he is unable to secure such counsel with his own means.

Government aid to those whose livelihood is taken away by technological improvements

The refusal of labor to use labor-saving equipment is a restraint of trade—and must be so considered. But along with this firmer attitude toward such restraints, we should adopt measures to compensate (pending reemployment) labor displaced by labor-saving equipment. It is largely the fear of unemployment and insecurity that prompts painters to refuse to use fast spray-painting equipment, or cement finishers to work on concrete mixed in transit. We cannot in fairness take a firmer attitude against all such forms of "feather-bedding" by labor unless we first remove labor's dread of displacement by adopting measures for compensation, retraining, and reemployment.

Cooperative equipment pools for small farmers, and the encouragement of cooperative marketing of farm products

Much of the difficulty of a large class of farmers arises from the operation of farms too small to be efficiently mechanized. Cooperative pools from which the farmer can secure the use of the more expensive machines would immensely benefit the smaller farmers.

Another aid to all classes of farmers would be the establishment of more marketing cooperatives. It is a curious fact that there are so many cooperatives trying to sell something to the farmer, and so few trying to sell his produce to better advantage. Surely the farmer's disadvantage lies as much in the disorganized market for farm products, as in the too profitable pricing of the things he must buy.

A notable example of the effectiveness of marketing co-ops is the egg auctions at Wooster and Versailles, Ohio. These auctions not only increased greatly the participating farmer's income from his eggs, but also raised the quality of the eggs marketed.

The establishment of similar marketing co-ops for all possible classes of farm produce should be encouraged by more active Government effort.

Provision for making new capital available to the small business

When General Motors needs new capital for expansion, investment bankers find no trouble in supplying the funds quickly. In fact, large corporations like General Motors have sufficient reserves to finance new construction. For example, large corporations are financing reconversion without the aid of bankers. But a small factory in need of money has the greatest difficulty in finding it. There is no Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the little fellow. Something must be done for the small business in this respect. And the Reconstruction Finance Corporation furnishes ample precedent. Why not permit banks to buy the stock of small companies and resell it to investors in the form of participating shares, thus averaging the investor's risk so that, with a percentage of any loss guaranteed by government, the investor's risk would be indeed small. Good precedent for this device also has been established—in the Federal guaranty of bank deposits. Some such arrangement as this would not only enable many small businesses to expand, but would also furnish profitable new business to the thousands of smaller commercial banks.

Taxation program

As a further means of encouraging free competitive enterprise, tax methods must be developed to encourage the development of free competitive enterprise and penalize the accumulation of monopoly profits.

The technical details for such a tax program require further study but are possible of achievement.

1945 a Record for Merchant Marine Fleet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1946

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank J. Taylor, president of the American Merchant Marine Institute:

1945 A RECORD FOR MERCHANT FLEET—BROOKLYN NERVE CENTER FOR GREATEST OCEANIC MOVEMENT IN HISTORY

(By Frank J. Taylor, president, American Merchant Marine Institute)

The year 1945 will go down in history as the peak year for the American merchant marine, surpassing all others in number of vessels operated, volume of cargo carried and number of troops transported on United States ships. Some 130 private steamship companies, serving as general agents for the War Shipping Administration, made these records possible with efficient management and operation of the world's largest merchant fleet.

It is only natural that Brooklyn should have had a prominent part in these efforts of the shipping industry as its warterfront, which stretches from Greenpoint to Bay Ridge, has been extremely active not only during 1945 but also in the entire war period.

BRILLIANT WAR RECORD

As headquarters for the New York Port of Embarkation, the borough served as the nerve center of the greatest oceanic movement of humanity in all history. The return of American troops from the war zones has been the merchant marine's No. 1 task since VE- and VJ-days. With the homeward flow of men increasing with each month, a record was set in November when more than half a million GI's landed at New York, Boston, and Hampton Roads. During that 30-day period 12 soldiers each minute went down the gangplank to American soil. Despite the use of some foreign-flag liners in this service, 90

percent of the troops came home on American-flag vessels.

While American shipping can look back on a brilliant war record which has earned it the acclaim of all military leaders, the industry realizes that its war job is far from completed In 1946 it will continue to bring home our soldiers from overseas and maintain supply lines to those making up our armies of occupation. Other highly essential services of world-wide nature will employ a great amount of shipping.

ACTIVITIES CONTINUE

The ending of the war has witnessed but little respite for the merchant marine. For instance, more ships sailed from New York and other east coast ports in November 1945 than during the peak wartime month. American ships not employed in transport service are providing desperately needed raw materials, food, and rehabilitation supplies to war-torn Europe. Services of this nature will require a large share of our merchant marine for many months to come.

Merchant shipping, which was the first industry in America to become totally mobilized for war, will, therefore, undoubtedly be the last to be returned to a peacetime basis. No American dry cargo or passenger vessels have been returned to private ownership. The dissolution of the Allied shipping pools under the control of the United Maritime Authority is expected to take place on March 2, 1946. The speed with which shipping is returned to private ownership and operation by our Government after that date will have considerable effect on the American competitive position with foreign nations.

MANY PROBLEMS AHEAD

The American merchant marine now, for the first time since the clipper-ship era, equipped with sufficient new, fast, and economical tonnage, can be of immeasurable service to an expanded foreign commerce. Our merchant fleet will transport the products of our factories abroad and return loaded with raw materials for further production and processing. New fleets of passenger liners to provide the best in oceanic comfort, luxury, and safety are being built or are on the drawing boards. Their construction was impossible during wartime.

The gradual transition from war cargoes to commercial cargoes has been responsible during the latter part of 1945 for the easing of rationing. However, this is not private operation, as all freight revenues earned are for the account of the United States Government.

Many difficult and complex problems lie ahead for American shipping during its return to private ownership and operation. However, the best minds and experience within the industry which coped successfully with the problems of war will also surmount the problems of peace.

Lateral Canal Project on Red River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1946

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a statement made by Mr. Homer H. Harris, of Alexandria, La., at the hearing conducted by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors. His statement is as follows:

The case for the Red River lateral canal, prepared for presentation to the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, by the State of Louisiana Department of Public Works in August 1945, is a very conservative document, wherein the engineers who prepared that brief were careful to include only data and statistics dealing with the subject that were substantiated and backed up by the facts and reports from only a partial list of shippers and receivers of freight in the trade areas that will be served by this canal. In fact, these gentlemen "leaned over backward" in order that there could be no reasonable contradictions made by anyone as to the figures and data submitted to support its case for the economic necessity to construct this canal.

My residence address is Alexandria, which is located in the very heart of Louisiana. In addition to having been a member of the State board of public works for the past 5 years, I have been engaged in business in Rapides Parish where Alexandria is located, for the past 34 years, operating during that time a large plantation and at present am owner and general manager of the largest wholesale and retail lumber and building-material business in central Louisiana. These operations, together with serving as a member of the Rapides Parish School Board and the Rapides Parish police jury, which is the governing body of the parish, as well as numerous other civic enterprises, has enabled me to be thoroughly familiar with the business and political economy of the area which this canal is proposed to serve.

Along he route of the lateral canal, which includes Red River Valley in Louisiana, is one of the highest developed areas of the State of Louisiana, but Red River Valley will never attain its full economic potentiality until it has water transportation.

Alexandria's trade territory extends 50 miles in every direction and can be easily visualized as a circle 100 miles in diameter, which is served by Alexandria's many wholesale and distributing houses, handling such heavy goods as lumber, building materials and supplies, hardware, mill supplies, farm implements, and machinery, food supplies, fertilizers, and other commodities too numerous to mention.

Alexandria and suburbs with a population of 60,000 is one of the important wholesale distribution and agricultural centers of Louisiana. It has a very large tonnage of freight both in-bound and out-bound, at the present time, and with water transportation serving this area, its possibilities for growth and development are stupendous.

Despite the fact that Alexandria is at present served by five railroads and many paved highways, it has suffered for many years and is still suffering from inadequate transportation facilities to handle its freight tonnage in a prompt and economically satisfactory manner.

The lack of water transportation is holding the area back from an otherwise rapid development of its natural resources, and unlike many other sections of the country, this area already has a large freight tonnage movement, and its shippers and receivers of freight are ready and anxious to make use of water transportation as soon as it becomes available.

It is a recognized fact by the highest military authorities here in Washington that central Louisiana provided the Army the finest military maneuver area in the whole United States during the past war.

This was attested by the numerous Army camp and air base installations within this area adjacent to Alexandria, and the large portion of our Army that received training in central Louisiana. It was in this ideal maneuver area that most of our outstanding and highest ranking Army generals for the first time experienced the opportunity to command very large units of men, under similar conditions that they were later to encounter in Africa, Europe, and in the Pacific. The benefits for over-all command training afforded our Army commanders by this ideal maneuver area contributed in a large manner to the ultimate victory for our troops.

Had the Red River lateral canal been in operation during the war and Army training period, its ccs would have been to a great extent saved by the Government in transportation costs of the enormous tonnage shipped in and out of this Alexandria area, where hundreds of trainloads of heavy Army ordnance, tanks, trucks, ammunition, supplies, and equipment were of necessity transported by costly rail shipments.

Gentlemen, there is no question as to the economic justification for the Red River lateral canal project. Its necessity is so very apparent to even a casual observer, and the more the matter is investigated and the facts and figures checked and verified, the stronger the case for the canal is found to be.

The canal is justified by tonnage already available, and there is a very great potential tonnage that will only be available when water transportation becomes a reality. Much of this additional tonnage and the development to the area that it will bring will never be obtained with our present inadequate transportation facilities.

To sum up, I wish to assure your board that the facts and figures already presented in the case for the Red River lateral canal are sound, true, and very conservative. There is no need to discount any part of it; on the other hand, there is much more tonnage that could be found and added if time were taken to gather up the data.

My long residence in this valley, close experience and observation, and broad information as to the economy of the State of Louisiana warrants the statement that there is no place in the United States where water transportation is more necessary than through Red River Valley in Louisiana.

I thank you kindly for your attention, and will appreciate your favorable consideration of this important project.

Free Enterprise or Socialism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I offer the following editorial from the New York Journal-American in its issue of January 4. Much misinformation has been given the public relative to the full employment bill which passed the Senate recently. The editorial which follows points out clearly the obnoxious features of the Senate bill. The Manasco bill which the House committee has substituted for the Senate bill is the type of legislation which anyone interested in preserving our free enterprise system, under which we have become the richest, most prosperous country the world has ever known, can enthusiastically support. The editorial is a valuable contribution to a better understanding of what the so-called full employment bill would do to this country:

FREE ENTERPRISE OR SOCIALISM?

On January 16 a Conference Committee of the two Houses of Congress will meet in one

of the most important sessions in the history of the Republic.

Its sole assignment will be to consider two bills which have been passed by the respective Houses.

Ordinarily a congressional conference has the relatively simple task of reconciling minor differences in the House and Senate versions of proposed legislation and the task is performed without much acrimony or delay.

In this instance, however, the differences are of such a nature that compromise is impossible.

One bill or the other must be accepted in toto; and the choice made, if accepted by the Congress, will have a profound effect upon the welfare and future progress of the Nation.

The Senate bill is the so-called full-employment bill which the upper House passed in a slightly diluted form.

Together with the general welfare bill, this measure would inflict the British Beveridge plan of state socialism upon this country.

It would establish deficit financing and huge public expenditures as the permanent Federal policy and would subject agriculture, industry, commerce, and employment to rigid Federal control.

All this was so evident that the House of Representatives refused to pass the full-employment bill in any guise.

Instead, the House substituted an entirely new measure, called the employment-production bill, which was drafted in its Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments under the chairmanship of Representative CARTER MANASCO, of Alabama.

The fundamental difference between the two bills is this:

The employment-production bill would protect the American system of competitive free enterprise, which the full-employment bill would destroy.

Under the terms of the Manasco bill, "the continuing policy of the United States" will for the first time be declared by law to be—

"(1) Preserving and encouraging the American economic system of free competitive enterprise and fostering the investment of private capital in trade, agriculture, commerce, and in the development of the natural resources of the United States;

"(2) Aiding in the development and maintenance of conditions favorable to stimulating new business, and especially small business; and to promoting continuous growth in the quality and quantity of facilities of production;

"(3) Encouraging individual initiative;

"(4) Avoiding competition of government with private business enterprise; and

"(5) Adopting sound fiscal policies and maintaining the credit of the United States."

The Manasco bill would therefore not only reject the collectivist theories of the full employment bill itself, but would also put Congress on record against other proposals which the full employment bill contemplates, including the various bills that would supersede the States by dividing the Nation up into eight regions under the totalitarian control of Federal authorities.

To meet actual problems, the Manasco bill further provides for a permanent Council of Economic Advisers, to be composed of three qualified members who would receive salaries of $15,000 a year each and who would make continuous studies of economic and employment problems to guide the Congress and the President.

But it authorizes no appropriations of indefinite amounts for undefined purposes, and it delegates no bureaucratic administrative powers.

Congress itself must act upon any recommendation made.

The House bill thus not only fortifies the free-enterprise system in America—it also reaffirms in effect, the legislative functions of Congress under the Constitution.

Obviously, if Congress is going to pass an employment bill at all, it should be the employment production bill to encourage the American system of free competitive enterprise.

Overseas Men Seek Action in Providing Replacements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 15, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to insert in the RECORD the following letters from various groups of servicemen now stationed overseas. These letters, published in the New York Times today, are profitable reading for any legislator or citizen interested in the present crisis of morale in our armed forces.

It is significant that these men show no sign of disloyalty, as has been charged by some observers. On the contrary, they call our attention to the fact that it is the Congress which has ignored the advice and the pleading of the generals under whom these men fought and won.

What they ask is that the Congress act to safeguard their victories by arranging properly trained replacements over the period of time which it will require to put in force the machinery of peace. Conquering forces have seldom asked for less at the hands of their civilian representatives.

The letters follow:

OVERSEAS MEN SEEK ACTION—CONGRESS IS BLAMED FOR DILATORINESS IN PROVIDING REPLACEMENTS

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

From December 1941 to the close of the war Congress established a record of patriotism and statesmanship seldom equaled in the history of any democracy. The majority acted swiftly in every emergency and generally supported to the fullest extent the desires of the President and of the people. Such things are not forgotten swiftly.

Since the close of the war, however, a marked change has come over Congress. Now one hears the voices of isolationists, of arch-conservatives too old to change or see the new light of freedom which the war brought. Worst of all one now hears the voices of professional politicians who cannot believe in democratic principles because they have none themselves.

Congress was asked by the Chief Executive and by the wisest generals to pass appropriate legislation in order that a steady flow of replacements to Europe and the Pacific would be insured. Of course, Congress of the war years would have acted at once. Now the politicians, the so-called nationalists, recoil in horror at such a positive act. They cannot believe it is necessary, though it is true they declaim loudly that fascism must never rise again. They raise the old hackneyed bogy of militarism, they scream about injustices in the court-martial system, they beg the question, they ignore the question, they bury the question in the cluttered trivia of their minds.

In short they cannot support a controversial problem because they fear they would lose votes. They have not yet learned that if they lead the people boldly and resolutely then the people will inevitably follow.

The soldier overseas does not ask that he be pulled out overnight and leave chaos behind. He does not ask that the Army be disbanded, the officers shot, the equipment junked, the obligations ignored. All he asks, all he demands is that as an American citizen and as a soldier he be treated as such and not as an embarassing relative who having earned his right to live is now forgotten.

The discerning soldier does not blame the War Department for the virtual cessation of redeployment. He could not, because Congress alone is to blame. He sees with nausea the sorry spectacle of these elderly politicians mouthing their worn platitudes and hearing only the cry of frantic constituents whom the Congressmen incite by their irresolution.

The soldier realizes that as a legislative body the American Congress has far less courage than the English Parliament. It can be seen that the soldier asks very little really. He desires no one to give more than he has sacrificed. He simply wants a universal draft law passed in order that rotation of men will be a fact and not a fantasy. No intelligent man could call this unreasonable.

S/Sgt. JAMES R. JACKSON
(And 605 men, One Thousand Two Hundred and Fifty-eighth Combat Battalion).
NÜRNEERG, GERMANY, *January 11, 1946.*

ACTION, NOT STATEMENTS, WANTED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Latest statements from high officials on the redeployment chaos are ambiguous and do not clarify this unjustifiable and deplorable situation. We are homesick, demoralized former Eighth Air Force personnel who are being penalized by the Army's indiscriminate redeployment policy. We are non-VD or court-martial cases, definitely nonessential. We average 26 months overseas and 3 years in the Army and are eligible for discharge. Low-pointers are being discharged home while we remain because of lack of replacements, as stated by "brass." We ask for definite action and not more statements.

EIGHT HUNDRED MEN, TWO HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FOURTH QUARTERMASTER TRUCK COMPANY.
HONINGTON, ENGLAND, *January 12, 1946.*

IDLENESS PALLS

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Give your readers all the facts. If we are psychiatric cases, there are 300,000 of us. Why maintain an idle occupation army, sane or otherwise, in the peaceful Philippines?

ENLISTED MEN, ONE THOUSAND AND SECOND ENGINEER FORESTRY BATTALION.
MANILA, *January 11, 1946.*

DELAYS PROTESTED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

We, the undersigned, as a duly elected committee of three, represent the enlisted men of Headquarters Company, Vienna Area Command.

The great majority of this group were members of infantry and armored divisions and include men who wear the Purple Heart, Silver Star, and Bronze Star earned in combat. We intend to refute the opinions and statements expressed by leading military and civilian officials in their attempts to justify the slowdown in demobilization. We are furious with the statement of Lieutenant General Collins that "the number of men still overseas who heard a shot fired in this war is not very great." To abolish now a system by which men could almost count the days until they would be home is prima facie unfair and we do not feel that we should accept it without expressing our position. We know from what we see about us daily, not from month-old reports, that the staff of 14,000 American soldiers in Vienna with minor reorganization could be reduced to 7,000 im-

mediately without impairing the efficiency of the military task here. We are told that a similar condition exists throughout the entire American occupation zone.

The highly mobile police force that could handle the job is out of gas. Why? Draft boards cannot furnish men to replace soldiers who served when soldiering was dangerous. Why? The statements of our high military officials indicate that they have no facts or are afraid to use them. A smoke screen of words is being used to cover ulterior motives. We are angered with being misrepresented and lied about. We cannot accept more weak excuses. Won't the people of the United States help us in our struggle for release from these brass chains?

Sgt. ALEXANDER N. RUBIN.
Sgt. HARRY P. MCKEAN.
Corp. EZRA LAPIDES.

VIENNA, *January 10, 1946.*

TROUBLE FEARED IN AUSTRIA

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Your stand on redeployment demonstrations is in keeping with the best American ideal, but objectively speaking there will be no end to them until favorable action is taken by Congress. Because of the breach of faith and the subsequent demonstrations we have lost all prestige in Austria and are now a laughingstock. Within 7 days, I predict, 80 percent of the American strength here will be out of Austria or in mutiny.

STUART M. THOMPSON.

SALZBURG, *January 11, 1946.*

FAIR DEAL SOUGHT

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

We want a fair democratic deal for all soldiers. We want (1) a set time limit for overseas service not subject to change, (2) a set time limit for all Army service not subject to change, (3) more similarity between the requirements for the present draft and the requirements for release from the Army. The ex-GI's are the men who know of our plight. Help us to get a fair deal.

EIGHTY MEMBERS OF SECOND MEDICAL GENERAL DISPENSARY.

FRANKFURT, GERMANY, *January 11, 1946.*

A Timely Suggestion to Mr. Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED BRADLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 15, 1946

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the President is scheduled to either give us by his personal appearance or send to us on Thursday a message on the State of the Union. I am sure when he prepares such an important message—if he does his own writing—the President receives some very sound advice. In the event, however, that he may resort to "ghost" writers I submit herewith for the RECORD what I believe to be a very worth-while, carefully prepared speech on the State of the Union. I suggest Mr. Truman read it carefully before appearing on your rostrum in this House on Thursday:

AN OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT TRUMAN

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As stockholders in the great corporation of which you are President, we desire to help in whatever way we can to promote the successful operation of that great enterprise known as the United States of America. We understand that you will soon advise our board of directors, the Congress, on the condition of our enterprise.

For what it may be worth to you, we have drawn up a suggested draft of your forthcoming message to Congress on the State of the Union, which represents, we believe, the views of many of your stockholders.

"To the Congress of the United States:

"1. We have successfully concluded two great wars, which have been enormously costly in lives and treasure. I urge you to pass immediately a resolution declaring that the state of war has ended, and that we are now at peace with the world. In the conduct of war it is necessary to concentrate enormous powers in the Chief Executive. I now desire to be relieved of these great powers. I desire that the division of powers between the Congress and the President, as set forth in the United States Constitution, shall be restored without unnecessary delay.

"2. The production of goods and services is being restrained by strikes and industrial turmoil. It is my belief that the National Industrial Relations Act passed by Congress in 1935 is largely responsible for the present turmoil. Experience has shown that the objective of this act—the relief of commerce from the burdens due to strikes and industrial strife—has not been achieved. Instead, the Wagner Act has been used to bring about a great concentration of economic power, so that single individuals can determine whether we can have coal, steel, and automobiles. It has given certain individuals the power to shut off essential services, such as telephone and telegraph service, radio music, truck and bus transportation, the loading and unloading of ships. I ask for the immediate repeal of the National Labor Relations Act, because it is a proven failure, because it gives the protection of the Federal Government to economic dictators, and because the United States Constitution does not authorize Congress to legislate on matters pertaining to employer-employee relations. The labor laws passed by Congress are a usurpation of powers which our Constitution reserves to the States. Our States differ greatly in soil, industries, climate, racial stock, and urbanization. Let each State enact whatever labor laws are required to meet local conditions and the desires of the citizens.

"3. I ask for the repeal of the Fair Labor Standards Act, because the Constitution gives Congress no authority to determine the hours a citizen shall labor or the wages he shall receive. The number of hours that a citizen works is a personal matter which depends on his age, health, ambition, and circumstances. This law which tends to restrict the hours of labor necessarily restricts production and lowers the standard of living of our citizens. I suggest the repeal of the wages and hours law.

"4. I ask that you repeal all Federal laws for the control of prices, production, and the allocation of materials. These controls are unnecessary and are opposed to the principle of free competitive enterprise. A large proportion of the war expenditures were financed by the printing of Government bonds and other promises of the Government to pay dollars at some future time. This enormous supply of paper-promises to pay dollars, which now exceeds the nominal value of all the physical wealth of the people, has greatly depreciated the value of our paper dollars. The operations of the OPA are designed to maintain a fictitious value for our paper dollars and to deceive the people in regard to the true worth of our paper money. If the elimination of price controls results in a great rise in prices, then we will know the true value of our money and we can then base our actions on the facts. Little or nothing can be gained by substituting deception for truth. To continue price controls is to make the Federal Government a party to the dubious procedure of perpetuating a colossal deception. A rise in prices is the inevitable consequence whenever any government pays its bills by printing money rather than by levying taxes. It is impossible, by devious monetary manipulations, to escape the necessity of paying for governmental extravagance and the enormous costs of the war.

"5. It is only a corrupt and dishonest government that destroys the value of the peoples' money. It is the duty of Congress to maintain the integrity of the American dollar. To restore the value of the dollar and to prevent further inflation, Congress should increase taxes and drastically reduce Federal expenditures so that there may be no further increase in the Federal debt, and so that in the near future the debt may be progressively reduced. Such action is needed to convince our people that Congress is determined to preserve and not to destroy our monetary system.

"6. I do not look with favor on laws which tend to nationalize agriculture. I ask for the repeal of all laws designed to influence the prices or the production of farm products. Our farmers are not incompetent. They shoud be free to operate their farms without help or hindrance from the Federal Government. Serfdom is outmoded, and we should not replace the lords of the manor, who enslaved those who toiled on the land in feudal times, with modern lords of the manor operating from the Nation's Capital.

"7. As a result of war, there is much misery, hunger, and suffering in other lands. The American people are generous and relatively prosperous. I suggest that nations which need capital to restore their productive machinery be encouraged to sell bonds to those Americans who desire to help them in the tasks of rehabilitation. I hope that private organizations like the Red Cross will disclose to us the needs of those who suffer and will collect funds for the relief of the suffering which is the aftermath of war. I have been unable to find in our Constitution any article which authorizes Congress to levy taxes on American citizens in order to make loans or gifts to other nations or to aliens residing in other lands.

"8. I ask for the repeal of the Social Security Act as of June 30, 1947. Legislation should be enacted to distribute to the States on that date any funds which have been accumulated as the result of this act, on an equitable basis. The relief of poverty and destitution should be handled by State and local governmental agencies as was our practice for 150 years. I fail to find in the United States Constitution any article which authorizes Congress to care for destitute citizens, or to establish compulsory and discriminatory systems of insurance, or to pay money to citizens because they are not working.

"9. I suggest that no appropriations be passed for Federal housing. It is not the function of the Federal Government to build houses for the people to live in any more than it is the function of the Government to make shoes for them to wear or to bake bread for them to eat. It is pure hypocrisy for Congress to give lip service to free competitive enterprise and at the same time engage in all kinds of business undertakings.

"10. There may be certain cases in which Federal aid to the States is necessary and desirable. But in most cases Federal aid to the States should not be granted. There should not be divided responsibility and authority. The plea that the States are too poor to engage in certain activities and that they must receive help from the Federal Government is specious. The total wealth and resources of the citizens of the States are exactly the same as their wealth and resources as citizens of the United States.

"11. This great Nation is at the crossroads of destiny. All over the world nations are floundering in the quicksands of socialism and communism. We ourselves have gotten off the main highway of economic

of the most important sessions in the history of the Republic.

Its sole assignment will be to consider two bills which have been passed by the respective Houses.

Ordinarily a congressional conference has the relatively simple task of reconciling minor differences in the House and Senate versions of proposed legislation and the task is performed without much acrimony or delay.

In this instance, however, the differences are of such a nature that compromise is impossible.

One bill or the other must be accepted in toto; and the choice made, if accepted by the Congress, will have a profound effect upon the welfare and future progress of the Nation.

The Senate bill is the so-called full-employment bill which the upper House passed in a slightly diluted form.

Together with the general welfare bill, this measure would inflict the British Beveridge plan of state socialism upon this country.

It would establish deficit financing and huge public expenditures as the permanent Federal policy and would subject agriculture, industry, commerce, and employment to rigid Federal control.

All this was so evident that the House of Representatives refused to pass the full-employment bill in any guise.

Instead, the House substituted an entirely new measure, called the employment-production bill, which was drafted in its Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments under the chairmanship of Representative CARTER MANASCO, of Alabama.

The fundamental difference between the two bills is this:

The employment-production bill would protect the American system of competitive free enterprise, which the full-employment bill would destroy.

Under the terms of the Manasco bill, "the continuing policy of the United States" will for the first time be declared by law to be—

"(1) Preserving and encouraging the American economic system of free competitive enterprise and fostering the investment of private capital in trade, agriculture, commerce, and in the development of the natural resources of the United States;

"(2) Aiding in the development and maintenance of conditions favorable to stimulating new business, and especially small business; and to promoting continuous growth in the quality and quantity of facilities of production;

"(3) Encouraging individual initiative;

"(4) Avoiding competition of government with private business enterprise; and

"(5) Adopting sound fiscal policies and maintaining the credit of the United States."

The Manasco bill would therefore not only reject the collectivist theories of the full employment bill itself, but would also put Congress on record against other proposals which the full employment bill contemplates, including the various bills that would supersede the States by dividing the Nation up into eight regions under the totalitarian control of Federal authorities.

To meet actual problems, the Manasco bill further provides for a permanent Council of Economic Advisers, to be composed of three qualified members who would receive salaries of $15,000 a year each and who would make continuous studies of economic and employment problems to guide the Congress and the President.

But it authorizes no appropriations of indefinite amounts for undefined purposes, and it delegates no bureaucratic administrative powers.

Congress itself must act upon any recommendation made.

The House bill thus not only fortifies the free-enterprise system in America—it also reaffirms in effect, the legislative functions of Congress under the Constitution.

Obviously, if Congress is going to pass an employment bill at all, it should be the employment production bill to encourage the American system of free competitive enterprise.

Overseas Men Seek Action in Providing Replacements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to insert in the RECORD the following letters from various groups of servicemen now stationed overseas. These letters, published in the New York Times today, are profitable reading for any legislator or citizen interested in the present crisis of morale in our armed forces.

It is significant that these men show no sign of disloyalty, as has been charged by some observers. On the contrary, they call our attention to the fact that it is the Congress which has ignored the advice and the pleading of the generals under whom these men fought and won.

What they ask is that the Congress act to safeguard their victories by arranging properly trained replacements over the period of time which it will require to put in force the machinery of peace. Conquering forces have seldom asked for less at the hands of their civilian representatives.

The letters follow:

OVERSEAS MEN SEEK ACTION—CONGRESS IS BLAMED FOR DILATORINESS IN PROVIDING REPLACEMENTS

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

From December 1941 to the close of the war Congress established a record of patriotism and statesmanship seldom equaled in the history of any democracy. The majority acted swiftly in every emergency and generally supported to the fullest extent the desires of the President and of the people. Such things are not forgotten swiftly.

Since the close of the war, however, a marked change has come over Congress. Now one hears the voices of isolationists, of arch-conservatives too old to change or see the new light of freedom which the war brought. Worst of all one now hears the voices of professional politicians who cannot believe in democratic principles because they have none themselves.

Congress was asked by the Chief Executive and by the wisest generals to pass appropriate legislation in order that a steady flow of replacements to Europe and the Pacific would be insured. Of course, Congress of the war years would have acted at once. Now the politicians, the so-called nationalists, recoil in horror at such a positive act. They cannot believe it is necessary, though it is true they declaim loudly that fascism must never rise again. They raise the old hackneyed bogy of militarism, they scream about injustices in the court-martial system, they beg the question, they ignore the question, they bury the question in the cluttered trivia of their minds.

In short they cannot support a controversial problem because they fear they would lose votes. They have not yet learned that if they lead the people boldly and resolutely then the people will inevitably follow.

The soldier overseas does not ask that he be pulled out overnight and leave chaos behind. He does not ask that the Army be disbanded, the officers shot, the equipment junked, the obligations ignored. All he asks, all he demands is that as an American citizen and as a soldier he be treated as such and not as an embarassing relative who having earned his right to live is now forgotten.

The discerning soldier does not blame the War Department for the virtual cessation of redeployment. He could not, because Congress alone is to blame. He sees with nausea the sorry spectacle of these elderly politicians mouthing their worn platitudes and hearing only the cry of frantic constituents whom the Congressmen incite by their irresolution.

The soldier realizes that as a legislative body the American Congress has far less courage than the English Parliament. It can be seen that the soldier asks very little really. He desires no one to give more than he has sacrificed. He simply wants a universal draft law passed in order that rotation of men will be a fact and not a fantasy. No intelligent man could call this unreasonable.

S/Sgt. JAMES R. JACKSON
(And 605 men, One Thousand Two Hundred and Fifty-eighth Combat Battalion).

NÜRNBERG, GERMANY, *January 11, 1946.*

ACTION, NOT STATEMENTS, WANTED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Latest statements from high officials on the redeployment chaos are ambiguous and do not clarify this unjustifiable and deplorable situation. We are homesick, demoralized former Eighth Air Force personnel who are being penalized by the Army's indiscriminate redeployment policy. We are non-VD or court-martial cases, definitely nonessential. We average 26 months overseas and 3 years in the Army and are eligible for discharge. Low-pointers are being discharged home while we remain because of lack of replacements, as stated by "brass." We ask for definite action and not more statements.

EIGHT HUNDRED MEN, TWO HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FOURTH QUARTERMASTER TRUCK COMPANY.

HONINGTON, ENGLAND, *January 12, 1946.*

IDLENESS PALLS

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Give your readers all the facts. If we are psychiatric cases, there are 300,000 of us. Why maintain an idle occupation army, sane or otherwise, in the peaceful Philippines?

ENLISTED MEN, ONE THOUSAND AND SECOND ENGINEER FORESTRY BATTALION.

MANILA, *January 11, 1946.*

DELAYS PROTESTED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

We, the undersigned, as a duly elected committee of three, represent the enlisted men of Headquarters Company, Vienna Area Command.

The great majority of this group were members of infantry and armored divisions and include men who wear the Purple Heart, Silver Star, and Bronze Star earned in combat. We intend to refute the opinions and statements expressed by leading military and civilian officials in their attempts to justify the slowdown in demobilization. We are furious with the statement of Lieutenant General Collins that "the number of men still overseas who heard a shot fired in this war is not very great." To abolish now a system by which men could almost count the days until they would be home is prima facie unfair and we do not feel that we should accept it without expressing our position. We know from what we see about us daily, not from month-old reports, that the staff of 14,000 American soldiers in Vienna with minor reorganization could be reduced to 7,000 im-

mediately without impairing the efficiency of the military task here. We are told that a similar condition exists throughout the entire American occupation zone.

The highly mobile police force that could handle the job is out of gas. Why? Draft boards cannot furnish men to replace soldiers who served when soldiering was dangerous. Why? The statements of our high military officials indicate that they have no facts or are afraid to use them. A smoke screen of words is being used to cover ulterior motives. We are angered with being misrepresented and lied about. We cannot accept more weak excuses. Won't the people of the United States help us in our struggle for release from these brass chains?

Sgt. ALEXANDER N. RUBIN.
Sgt. HARRY P. MCKEAN.
Corp. EZRA LAPIDES.

VIENNA, *January 10, 1946.*

TROUBLE FEARED IN AUSTRIA

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Your stand on redeployment demonstrations is in keeping with the best American ideal, but objectively speaking there will be no end to them until favorable action is taken by Congress. Because of the breach of faith and the subsequent demonstrations we have lost all prestige in Austria and are now a laughingstock. Within 7 days, I predict, 80 percent of the American strength here will be out of Austria or in mutiny.

STUART M. THOMPSON.

SALZBURG, *January 11, 1946.*

FAIR DEAL SOUGHT

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

We want a fair democratic deal for all soldiers. We want (1) a set time limit for overseas service not subject to change, (2) a set time limit for all Army service not subject to change, (3) more similarity between the requirements for the present draft and the requirements for release from the Army. The ex-GI's are the men who know of our plight. Help us to get a fair deal.

EIGHTY MEMBERS OF SECOND MEDICAL GENERAL DISPENSARY.

FRANKFURT, GERMANY, *January 11, 1946.*

A Timely Suggestion to Mr. Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED BRADLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1946

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the President is scheduled to either give us by his personal appearance or send to us on Thursday a message on the State of the Union. I am sure when he prepares such an important message—if he does his own writing—the President receives some very sound advice. In the event, however, that he may resort to "ghost" writers I submit herewith for the RECORD what I believe to be a very worth-while, carefully prepared speech on the State of the Union. I suggest Mr. Truman read it carefully before appearing on your rostrum in this House on Thursday:

AN OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT TRUMAN

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As stockholders in the great corporation of which you are President, we desire to help in whatever way we can to promote the successful operation of that great enterprise known as the United States of America. We understand that you will soon advise our board of directors, the Congress, on the condition of our enterprise.

For what it may be worth to you, we have drawn up a suggested draft of your forthcoming message to Congress on the State of the Union, which represents, we believe, the views of many of your stockholders.

"To the Congress of the United States:

"1. We have successfully concluded two great wars, which have been enormously costly in lives and treasure. I urge you to pass immediately a resolution declaring that the state of war has ended, and that we are now at peace with the world. In the conduct of war it is necessary to concentrate enormous powers in the Chief Executive. I now desire to be relieved of these great powers. I desire that the division of powers between the Congress and the President, as set forth in the United States Constitution, shall be restored without unnecessary delay.

"2. The production of goods and services is being restrained by strikes and industrial turmoil. It is my belief that the National Industrial Relations Act passed by Congress in 1935 is largely responsible for the present turmoil. Experience has shown that the objective of this act—the relief of commerce from the burdens due to strikes and industrial strife—has not been achieved. Instead, the Wagner Act has been used to bring about a great concentration of economic power, so that single individuals can determine whether we can have coal, steel, and automobiles. It has given certain individuals the power to shut off essential services, such as telephone and telegraph service, radio music, truck and bus transportation, the loading and unloading of ships. I ask for the immediate repeal of the National Labor Relations Act, because it is a proven failure, because it gives the protection of the Federal Government to economic dictators, and because the United States Constitution does not authorize Congress to legislate on matters pertaining to employer-employee relations. The labor laws passed by Congress are a usurpation of powers which our Constitution reserves to the States. Our States differ greatly in soil, industries, climate, racial stock, and urbanization. Let each State enact whatever labor laws are required to meet local conditions and the desires of the citizens.

"3. I ask for the repeal of the Fair Labor Standards Act, because the Constitution gives Congress no authority to determine the hours a citizen shall labor or the wages he shall receive. The number of hours that a citizen works is a personal matter which depends on his age, health, ambition, and circumstances. This law which tends to restrict the hours of labor necessarily restricts production and lowers the standard of living of our citizens. I suggest the repeal of the wages and hours law.

"4. I ask that you repeal all Federal laws for the control of prices, production, and the allocation of materials. These controls are unnecessary and are opposed to the principle of free competitive enterprise. A large proportion of the war expenditures were financed by the printing of Government bonds and other promises of the Government to pay dollars at some future time. This enormous supply of paper-promises to pay dollars, which now exceeds the nominal value of all the physical wealth of the people, has greatly depreciated the value of our paper dollars. The operations of the OPA are designed to maintain a fictitious value for our paper dollars and to deceive the people in regard to the true worth of our paper money. If the elimination of price controls results in a great rise in prices, then we will know the true value of our money and we can then base our actions on the facts. Little or nothing can be gained by substituting deception for truth. To continue price controls is to make the Federal Government a party to the dubious procedure of perpetuating a colossal deception. A rise in prices is the inevitable consequence whenever any government pays its bills by printing money rather than by levying taxes. It is impossible, by devious monetary manipulations, to escape the necessity of paying for governmental extravagance and the enormous costs of the war.

"5. It is only a corrupt and dishonest government that destroys the value of the peoples' money. It is the duty of Congress to maintain the integrity of the American dollar. To restore the value of the dollar and to prevent further inflation, Congress should increase taxes and drastically reduce Federal expenditures so that there may be no further increase in the Federal debt, and so that in the near future the debt may be progressively reduced. Such action is needed to convince our people that Congress is determined to preserve and not to destroy our monetary system.

"6. I do not look with favor on laws which tend to nationalize agriculture. I ask for the repeal of all laws designed to influence the prices or the production of farm products. Our farmers are not incompetent. They shoud be free to operate their farms without help or hindrance from the Federal Government. Serfdom is outmoded, and we should not replace the lords of the manor, who enslaved those who toiled on the land in feudal times, with modern lords of the manor operating from the Nation's Capital.

"7. As a result of war, there is much misery, hunger, and suffering in other lands. The American people are generous and relatively prosperous. I suggest that nations which need capital to restore their productive machinery be encouraged to sell bonds to those Americans who desire to help them in the tasks of rehabilitation. I hope that private organizations like the Red Cross will disclose to us the needs of those who suffer and will collect funds for the relief of the suffering which is the aftermath of war. I have been unable to find in our Constitution any article which authorizes Congress to levy taxes on American citizens in order to make loans or gifts to other nations or to aliens residing in other lands.

"8. I ask for the repeal of the Social Security Act as of June 30, 1947. Legislation should be enacted to distribute to the States on that date any funds which have been accumulated as the result of this act, on an equitable basis. The relief of poverty and destitution should be handled by State and local governmental agencies as was our practice for 150 years. I fail to find in the United States Constitution any article which authorizes Congress to care for destitute citizens, or to establish compulsory and discriminatory systems of insurance, or to pay money to citizens because they are not working.

"9. I suggest that no appropriations be passed for Federal housing. It is not the function of the Federal Government to build houses for the people to live in any more than it is the function of the Government to make shoes for them to wear or to bake bread for them to eat. It is pure hypocrisy for Congress to give lip service to free competitive enterprise and at the same time engage in all kinds of business undertakings.

"10. There may be certain cases in which Federal aid to the States is necessary and desirable. But in most cases Federal aid to the States should not be granted. There should not be divided responsibility and authority. The plea that the States are too poor to engage in certain activities and that they must receive help from the Federal Government is specious. The total wealth and resources of the citizens of the States are exactly the same as their wealth and resources as citizens of the United States.

"11. This great Nation is at the crossroads of destiny. All over the world nations are floundering in the quicksands of socialism and communism. We ourselves have gotten off the main highway of economic

freedom and constitutional government. I ask that Congress repeal all existing laws which do not have unequivocal constitutional authority, thus undoing some of the mischief done in the past. Respect for law cannot be inculcated in our citizens unless the lawmakers themselves obey the law. For you that law is the Constitution of the United States, which you have taken an oath to preserve, protect, and defend. I also took that oath. I ask you to restore the United States Constitution, under which we became prosperous, great, and strong, so that our children's children may have the great privilege of living in a free America. Whatever others may do, let us preserve this Nation as an island of freedom, so that liberty may not everywhere perish from this earth."

SOCIETY OF SENTINELS.

DETROIT.

Canal Project, Red River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1946

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the RECORD the following statement made by Mr. Fred C. Barksdale, of Alexandria, La., in which he supports the construction of a lateral canal on Red River:

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF RED RIVER LATERAL CANAL, LOUISIANA, PRESENTED TO THE BOARD OF ENGINEERS FOR RIVERS AND HARBORS, AT WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 14, 1946, BY FRED C. BARKSDALE, VICE PRESIDENT OF BROWN-ROBERTS HARDWARE & SUPPLY CO., LTD., ALEXANDRIA, LA.

Technical data in support of the Red River lateral canal project has already been given this board. Advantages anticipated in different sections of inland Louisiana are outlined today. Other localities being represented, I shall deal largely with benefits to be gained by my home community, Alexandria and central Louisiana.

But first let me pay tribute to the railroads for their magnificent contribution to our hard-earned victory in World Wars I and II. I recognize also their indispensable part in any future fight against enemies of our national welfare. If I thought the proposed canal would drive one railroad out of business or work to the lasting detriment of that industry, certainly I would oppose its construction. But as the automobile, long fought by railroads, has brought vastly increased revenues to them, so am I convinced that additional business from the economic and industrial expansion following completion of this project even justifies support from the railroads themselves. This canal means natural progress. Natural progress may be retarded or even diverted, but never permanently blocked.

Recognized as a natural distribution point, the site of Alexandria was chosen by French and Spanish settlers long before the Louisiana Purchase. Located almost in the exact geographical center of the State, a circle with a radius reaching a hundred miles distant would pass through or at the very door of Shreveport, Monroe, Baton Rouge, Lafayette, and Lake Charles. Surely, Alexandria is the hub city of Louisiana.

In spite of many disappointments through years of tireless fight against freight-rate discrimination Alexandria has, so far, successfully defended its commercial birthright. But it has been deprived of the full development which nature intended, and today it pleads for the privilege of climbing to the pinnacle of its economic possibilities.

Convinced that cheap and adequate transportation is one of the basic factors in economic progress, Alexandria has long sought the benefits of inland waterways. The proposed canal, leaving Red River about 30 miles north of its mouth and extending to the city of Shreveport, would fulfill that dream. It would connect central and northwest Louisiana with the Nation's navigable waterways. It would greatly aid a large and prolific agricultural area now held in check by transportation costs which clog the wheels of progress. It would reclaim vast additional acres, by proper drainage, for greater production of cotton, sugar, rice, and other farm products to help satisfy the wants of a growing nation. Such development would enable our farmers to retain and enjoy a greater share of the fruits of their own labors. Finally, it would bring higher living standards to our people.

It is notable, too, that unnatural barriers deprive our section of natural industrial development. With low freight rates only on outbound raw materials, we see our great natural resources being shipped to distant points for processing.

The devastating atomic bomb warns America that industrial congestion in comparatively few cities is a hazard to our national safety. Decentralization of industry must, of course, follow if we may hope to survive another war.

It has been said that nature was in an extravagant mood when she endowed Louisiana. Even natural waterways, no longer adaptable to modern every-day needs, once served our people. But today, with great stores of precious raw materials, including oil, gas, salt, sulfur, limestone timber, sand and gravel, with abundant fuel, with spacious sites for industrial expansion, with ample native labor, and with year-'round mild climate, inland Louisiana's only basic need is for low-cost water transportation.

We do not make this appeal as individuals seeking to advance our own selfish interests. We echo the call of our people and seek for them the stable and lasting prosperity which beckons. We have organized the Alexandria Port Development Association, of which I have the honor to be president, whose membership covers practically every phase of our economic life—manufacturers, processors, wholesalers, retailers, bankers, professional men. Our purpose is the full development of our community. Among our plans, when Red River Lateral Canal becomes a reality, is the promotion of adequate docks and other facilities to serve our city and adjacent territory.

Then will come the economic development and expansion which is our heritage. Then will come full fruition of our efforts and our dreams. Then will our people share and enjoy the benefits of the magnificent treasures which nature bestowed upon us. Then will our national safety be more secure. Then, too, will the whole Nation profit through a better balanced economy.

They Want Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I present for printing in the Appendix the following editorial taken from the Detroit (Mich.) News. This editorial is timely and calls attention to the developing situation. In view of the rapidly growing strikes throughout the country the reader will find the editorial very interesting indeed:

THEY WANT DISASTER

The Communist faction of the UAW-CIO is urging a general strike of automobile workers as an improvement on Vice President Walter Reuther's one-at-a-time strategy.

A general strike certainly would contribute more to the general economic paralysis of the country, if that is regarded as an improvement.

The Communist move evidently is in part, if not wholly, a maneuver in the never-ending game of union politics. That faction is laying the ground work for exploiting probable membership dissatisfaction with the wage settlement, whatever it may be, achieved in the General Motors strike. The Commies will say they could have done better.

They also may be counting on a steel wage settlement more favorable to union claims than will be won in the auto industry. At any rate, their spokesmen lay heavy emphasis on the strategy of Philip Murray, president of the steel workers as well as of the CIO, who has called an industry-wide strike for next Monday.

If the steel industry goes down, however, the Commies can stop worrying about a general auto strike. A steel strike automatically would shut down the auto industry, as well as a lot of others.

Demobilization

REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1946

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, this morning the Members of Congress had an opportunity to listen to Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower and Admiral Chester W. Nimitz. These men offered explanations and explained the big job of demobilizing the Army and Navy. In my humble opinion, they failed to answer many of the questions which are now bothering the American people.

What are the facts as to the size of the armed forces as of January 1, 1946? The Army has a total of 4,300,000 men in service; the Navy has 2,117,000; the Marine Corps 292,000. The Navy has an added total enlistment of about 372,000 since VJ-day. It can be readily seen that the armed forces now compose nearly 7,000,000 men. It should also be remembered that there are nearly 1,000,000 civilian employees, most of them outside of the United States, under the control of some branch of the armed forces.

The Army is complaining that they are unable to handle all the present details of policing, watching surplus property, prisoners of war, and other duties imposed upon them. If they are unable to do this with 4,300,000 men they now have, how, may I ask, would they expect to look after all of these details when they reduce their forces to a million and a half as of July 1, 1946?

The facts are, Mr. Speaker, that there has been very poor management and the

use of the men by the armed forces. In my humble opinion, the country did not expect to have an Army of nearly 7,000,000 men 8 months after VE-day and more than 4 months after VJ-day.

I am also of the opinion, Mr. Speaker, that this Congress should declare hostilities at an end. We drafted men to fight this war. We lowered the age limit to get more men. Our Government made a solemn agreement with these drafted men that they would be in service for the duration, plus 6 months. Is it the intent of this Congress now, by a legal trick, to continue them in the Army by failing to declare hostilities at an end? In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, this one thing is helping to break down the morale of our Army more than any other one condition. This Congress should not only declare hostilities at an end but should definitely set the size of the Army and the Navy and take from the brass hats some of the authority that they had during wartime and which they would like to continue during peacetime.

"And Peace on Earth"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 15, 1946

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial written by me and appearing in the December issue of the Villa Marian, and published by the students of the Villa Maria High School, Villa Maria, Pa.:

"AND PEACE ON EARTH"

(By MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Member of Congress)

At Christmas, the feast of the Prince of Peace, our thoughts turn naturally to that peace on earth which He came to bring. After the bloodiest war in human history all the world is hungering for peace. The great war is over; we have won the victory; we have not yet won the peace. When the Bishops of the United States met in Washington this November and surveyed the world situation, they issued a statement appropriately called Between War and Peace.

That, indeed, is our predicament today. We are in what Walter Lippmann calls "the period of pacification," when the passions aroused during the war have not yet been abated and when periodical flare-ups like the flash fires following a major conflagration still occur. There is major trouble in China, trouble in Iran, trouble in Palestine, trouble in Java, trouble in Indochina, trouble it seems everywhere. We might exclaim, as Pope Pius XI, with the Prophets Jeremias and Isaias, exclaimed after the last war in his encyclical, Ubi Arcano: "We looked for peace and no good came: for a time of healing, and behold fear, for the time of healing, and behold trouble. We looked for light, and behold darkness * * * we have looked for judgment, and there is none: for salvation, and it is far from us."

The world is hungering for peace and the world must have peace. The development of atomic energy and its use as a weapon of hideous destruction puts upon all the peoples of the world the solemn responsibility to assure a lasting peace. Gradually we are coming to understand the warnings of the atomic scientists that this planet cannot stand another war. Because that war would be an atomic war in which the belligerents would destroy not only themselves but the rest of the world as well

And so we are witnessing this Christmas time a frenzied effort to work out the means of making any future war impossible. In a few weeks the most ambitious attempt ever made on an international scale to assure lasting peace will begin at the London UNO Conference. Our best prayers must be offered for its success. All the while we realize that even the most perfectly conceived machinery for peace will avail little unless it is powered by the will to peace.

The angels who heralded the coming of the Prince of Peace expressed in their angel song the most profound political truth the nations could ponder today. "And peace on earth," they sang "to men of good will." The selfishness, suspicion, and distrust which wrecked the London Foreign Ministers Council will wreck the new organization for peace unless men and nations learn the lesson of the angels' song. There will be no peace while the wills of the great nations are motivated by greed and pride and the determination to dominate the affairs of the whole world. There will be no peace until the men who control the international organization for peace are good men with good wills.

It is at this point that catholicism can make an invaluable contribution to the cause of peace. Catholics still teach the principles of objective goodness. They still believe in the existence of free will and still attempt to develop a strong determined will. If peace is a matter of giving the world more and more men and women of good will then the Catholic educational system of which your school is such an important part can do its important share in bringing peace into the world. Catholics are working mightily to influence the peace settlements as well as the organization to maintain the peace, but they need the backing of millions of men and women of good will who know and love goodness and have wills trained to virtue and the full acceptance of the law of Christ. If all of us work to bring into the world just a little more of the good will which is the condition upon which God gives His peace, then we can be satisfied that we have done our share to establish what the world most desperately needs, "peace on earth."

Starving German Women and Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 15, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, many, many people in the United States who are not of German ancestry and who were and are ardently anti-Fascist and anti-Nazi, are nevertheless horrified by our policy in Germany, which seems designed to condemn millions of women and children to the horrible death of slow starvation.

In this connection, I wish to insert a letter from the Reverend Robbins W. Barstow, D. D., director of the Commission for World Council Service of the American Committee for the World Council of Churches:

MY DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN LUCE: I have sent the enclosed telegram to President Truman.

Cannot you and other leaders exert sufficient pressure to force quick action by the War Department or the Treasury Department or whatever other office is blocking this ministry of mercy?

I will be most grateful for your help.

Most sincerely yours,

ROBBINS W. BARSTOW.

A copy of his communication to the President, follows:

Referring to our letter and petition to you and heads of State, War, Treasury, dated December 17 only response is irrelevant and evasive answer from General Hildring dated January 4. He states that "special relief in Germany and other occupied areas must of necessity be limited to welfare agencies of the nationals concerned." This is precisely what we are requesting. Namely, the shipment of clothing and other necessities to be distributed by Deutsche Evangelische Hileswerke as cooperating arm of World Council of Churches. Despite agreements of American church leaders with military authorities in Germany that such assistance is politically and morally desirable we receive scant cooperation from Washington offices. British authorities are allowing shipments of relief goods from American church agencies into their zone, but we are still barred from extending aid in American zone. Unable even to secure clearance $100,000 church funds for purchase in Switzerland of medicines, fats, and oils specifically requested. Our representatives advise us "assurance of transportation for these materials into Germany." Would be distributed by indigenous church organization. Millions of American Christians deplore present-harsh policies and needless delays making a mockery of professed democratic and humanitarian aims. We endorse position stated by Dr. Swanstrom, of National Catholic Welfare Conference in New York Times today. We urge immediate executive action to expedite aid. Otherwise this Nation will stand condemned before conscience of world for missing decisive opportunity to build good will for future world peace.

I also wish to include at this point in the RECORD a copy of a letter from Howard A. Smith, of Bridgeport, Conn., written to President Truman on January 10 on the same subject:

JANUARY 10, 1946.

President HARRY S. TRUMAN,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR PRESIDENT TRUMAN: At the conclusion of the First World War, we promised, as a condition of the armistice, that we would feed the German people. It was 8 months after that promise before a food ship entered Germany. Three million Germans died of starvation—not the Kaiser or Hindenburg or other top-ranking Germans, but 3,000,000 women and children.

Again we have promised to the German people as a condition of the peace that we would feed them and again millions of Germans are dying of starvation. You know the horrible conditions reported in the Christian Century and you probably know of even more horrible conditions not reported and again it is the women and children who are dying. True, we are going to shoot this time the top-ranking Nazis after we put them through the more or less farcical trial for their crimes against humanity, but at least in the interim we are feeding them. It would be far more humane and kind to hoot these millions of women and children that we have, by the Morgenthau plan, literally sentenced to a slow and horrible death.

We have made the promise—we are primarily responsible and you as the leader of the American people must shoulder that responsibility. Relief organizations are permitted to send food to every other single

country in Europe but you do not permit any organization to send food to Germany. How can you distinguish between a German child and any other child unless you have been converted to the principles of the Morgenthau Mosaic law plan of an eye for an eye and 100 babies for every Buchenwald victim.

I heard a very prominent minister, Dr. William Ward Ayer of the Calvary Baptist Church of New York City say over the air a few Sunday's ago that every crime that we have attributed to our enemies we have committed ourselves. I think I am quoting him correctly, but I believe there is a bigger crime that our enemies have not committed, at least on the scale we have, and that is the crime of hypocrisy. We are trying a few old men for their crimes against humanity but God help us if America is ever put on trial for its crime against humanity today.

Do not tell me you cannot do anything about it because of lack of ships. There are 121 ships tied up, the papers tell us, for lack of crews but we got crews during the war. We got crews by paying them a bonus for crossing the ocean, more bonuses for calling at certain ports and more bonuses for going through mine areas. Well, there are no mine areas today and there are no submarines and there are no bombers to contend with, but there are reliable reports made by your representatives and officials that 10,000,000 women and children will die in Germany this winter. Already it is reported that few children are alive in Germany today who were born in 1945. The infant mortality rate is close to 100 percent.

If we can pay bonuses to ship munitions to kill people, we can pay bonuses to ship food to save starving children. I am not a Nazi. I fought the Germans in 1917 and 1918 and my two boys fought them this time, but babies and women are not our enemies. For Jesus Christ's sake give them at least an equal chance with the other women and children in Europe. Please—before it is too late.

Respectfully,

HOWARD A. SMITH.

Admiral Land Did His Bit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1946

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the New York Times of January 9. Admiral Land recently retired as Chairman of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration after a long and brilliant career devoted to the service of his country. Our great fleet of merchant ships is a fitting tribute to his knowledge and skill.

The editorial follows:

ADMIRAL LAND DID HIS BIT

After serving his country for almost 46 years, 39 of them in the Navy and 9 as Chairman of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration, Vice Admiral Emory S. Land has received President Truman's permission to retire. He has served the Nation well. His monument will be the greatest fleet of merchant ships that ever sailed the oceans of the world.

Admiral Land gives as his chief reason for retirement the belief that he has "done his bit." It was quite a bit. The only word to describe it is the one used by the President himself—"colossal." Under Admiral Land's direction this country built and sent to sea 50,000,000 deadweight tons of shipping, a feat unmatched in maritime history. This represents five times the tonnage we possessed before the war, and most of that was more than 20 years old. Today we have a splendid fleet of new fast vessels led by the Victory ships.

But long before we were attacked the Maritime Commission recognized that our future frontiers lay on the oceans and planned for it. The first Liberty ship, appropriately named the Patrick Henry, sped down the ways on September 27, 1941, more than 2 months before Pearl Harbor. In the worst months of submarine warfare our merchant vessels were being sent to the bottom at the terrifying rate of 50 a month. But activity in our shipyards to replace them was prodigious. Within 2 years we were turning them out at the rate of 180 a month, or more than 5 a day. No such mass construction had ever before been dreamed of. But the job was not alone to build the ships. It was to keep them moving, to keep their cargoes pouring not only into our far-flung bases all over the world but into the ports of friendly Allied Powers. That job, too, Admiral Land handled with equal skill, devotion, and fortitude.

He wants a rest now. He says he is "war-weary." But it is not likely that he will remain long at ease. Men with his knowledge and executive talents are seldom allowed to retire.

Supports Lateral Canal on Red River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1946

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by Mr. Sylvan W. Nelken, of Natchitoches, La., at a hearing conducted by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, concerning the Red River lateral canal:

General Crawford and members of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, the Red River Valley, stretching through a considerable part of Louisiana, as well as other States, contains thousands of acres of the Nation's most productive farm and grazing lands. The basic industry of this territory is agriculture—chiefly cotton, livestock, and hay crops. Continued production of cotton, because of inevitable lower prices, due to foreign competition, manufacture of synthetics, large carry-over, and loss of export market—must be based upon speedy mechanization of its production. This mechanization must and will cover all phases of production, planting, cultivating, and picking. Such change will most certainly create a problem in labor utilization. (One mechanical cotton picker is now doing the work of 100 cotton pickers.) A great reservoir of semiskilled and unskilled labor will result. Give us water transportation and industry will gladly make use of this labor and solve the great problem of what will happen to the Negro in the valley when cotton is harvested by machine. Such industry that would move to the valley to utilize the relatively cheap available labor would create tonnage. To mechanize cotton will require the movement of much heavy machinery—thus a great tonnage on the proposed canal.

It is a fact that the Red River Valley lands produce more grass per acre than any other land in the Nation. A small amount of this grass is being dried and ground and shipped to feed manufacturers. With water transportation this business will multiply many times, creating tonnage and jobs.

The late President Roosevelt called the South the Nation's No. 1 economic problem, and many of us from the South feel that he was correct. A great part of the South, lacking water transportation, has not been able to attract industry to any great extent, thus making a continuance of too many small farmers unable to earn a satisfactory standard of living. If industry could be combined with small farm operation, much of the South's economic problem would vanish. Buying power of the individual would be greatly increased, thus bringing about a great movement of goods along the proposed waterway

In conclusion, may I point out again:

1. Cotton will be mechanized, thus creating a vast amount of surplus labor.

2. That industry will most certainly use this labor.

3. That a tremendous amount of farm machinery must move to the Valley.

4. New industries will develop because of cheap transportation.

5. The canal will improve the income of our citizens and thus increase the movement of goods.

Housing Is Essential for Such a Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1946

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. John W. Bricker over the Columbia network on Saturday, January 12, 1946:

This morning as I came to the office I noticed five new houses under construction. Some were frame, some stone. A hundred more might well be built in that same community. This same situation prevails in the thousands of communities of our land.

Millions of veterans are returning, hundreds of thousands of them married. A great majority of the newly available housing facilities will be needed by returning veterans. Some will be needed for the shifting families resulting from readjustment of our industrial production to peacetime needs.

We cannot completely segregate political problems from each other. Housing is inseparably linked up with reconversion and industrial development. A strike in steel affects housing.

Public policy is determined by the attitude in which we approach the integrated whole of the problems confronting the governmental bodies of our country. Certainly housing demands political attention today. This is well attested by the number of bills before the Congress, the attention that has been given and will necessarily be given to the problem by the Congress. State legislatures have been working with it and many may be called back especially to consider the problem of providing homes for people. Councils of our cities are constantly dealing with the various aspects of building and housing. Building codes and standards need attention and revision in many instances.

Possibly the most acute aspect of housing is in connection with the returning veterans

who want to go back into the universities and colleges of the country. The educational programs of hundreds of thousands of young men and women who were in the armed service were interrupted. As a matter of right, they are entitled to the opportunity to make up that which they have lost. The welfare of our country is in no small degree dependent upon the proper training of those who are to assume leadership in the days hence. Our universities, their administrations, and boards of trustees can never be forgiven and should not, unless they do everything within their power to provide the facilities to make possible the best educational program for the returning veterans. Housing is essential to such a program.

We should also be mindful of the fact that when an individual builds his own home, either directly or through private contractor, he builds something more than a place to live. Something of his personality, his individuality, his aims, and ambitions in life enter into the structure. It ties him more closely to his home, to the community, and to the nation of which he is a part. That factor must not be forgotten in determining public policy.

American life has been built around the individual, his family, his home. His individual rights are paramount. The individual citizen of America is not one of a mass of Americans. For him, his rights, his opportunities, his enjoyment, the American Government was organized and must continue to be his servant, subject to his guiding will. The lure of a good family life and of a home—and yet a better home—is one of the noblest motives of our American community life. That ambition to own one's home America dare not injure, for government cannot regenerate it. It is something inherent in the American heart and soul and conscience and upon it we must build public policy.

The local problems of housing require different approaches. There are some fundamental principles that must guide the public housing program at this time if it is to ultimately effectuate the good that we desire.

I am excluding in this consideration today the problem of housing for the needy and those who are dependent upon their Government for the necessaries of life. Let us consider a few of the fundamentals that must be regarded in the immediate housing program for the American family.

1. THE BUILDING PROGRAM IN EVERY POSSIBLE WAY SHOULD BE CARRIED OUT BY PRIVATE BUSINESS

There are over 37,000,000 homes in America. Approximately 30,000,000 of these meet high standards of living conditions. Electricity, gas, refrigeration, adequate water facilities are the rule rather than the exception in the American home. Practically all of these homes have been built by private enterprise. Government standards locally fixed have protected the public interest. Approximately 19,000,000 of these units are occupied by the owners. It is most encouraging that the percentage of homes occupied by the owners has increased in a marked way during the war years.

A million housing units have been erected during war years. A great part of this construction has been under private ownership and private construction. We have an example here in Columbus that private ownership has proven speedier, more efficient, and able to produce in greater quantities than any Government agency. In 1940, in a city of 300,000 people, private builders built 1,700 building units; in 1941, 1,400; and since 1940, 4,254 home units have been built and sold for a figure of $6,000 each or under. In the spring of 1943, Defense Housing Incorporated, a Government agency, undertook to build 200 units in the $7,500 class. These were completed nearly 2 years later. I think that those figures generally mark the relative efficiency of political operation as contrasted with private operation. This contrast is more marked when there is a scarcity of materials as there is today.

2. THERE MUST BE LESS GOVERNMENT REGULATION AND MORE GOVERNMENT ENCOURAGEMENT IF THE HOUSING PROBLEM IS TO BE SOLVED

There are already too many czars, directors, regulators in Washington for the good of the housing program. There is adequate legislative authority for Government encouragement to building houses. Each house that is built means a home for someone, and in most cases a veteran. There is not enough ability in all the bureaucratic organizations of the Federal Government to mesh the various detailed needs of the communities of America into a uniform policy that will be in the public interest. Control and regulation should be brought to the local communities. The banks and building and loans are bulging with money—ready to be used. Owners and builders are ready to proceed, and will proceed as soon as released from the red tape of Washington. OPA recently, in a bulletin, boasted of increased production in certain fields of building materials because of price increases permitted.

A housing czar has now been appointed. The very name is repulsive to the American public and yet it is typical of the bureaucratic attitude toward the people of America—that they must be pushed around, directed, restricted, and regulated. We have just fought a horrible war and gloriously won it to do away with that kind of thing and permit our people to live their lives rather than grope about from day to day trying to find out what their government will permit them to do or furnish them.

Through the power-mad bungling of OPA, we now have a shortage of butter and a surplus of milk and butterfat. This is just the most recent mistake of this political institution of government, which has so greatly handicapped America's effort to move forward and is now interfering with the housing program.

It has been so inept in its work, so politically vicious in its administration, that the American people have completely lost confidence in not only the law, but in the political manipulation and administration of the law.

I note in the Washington Daily News of Friday, December 14, that enough lumber has been shipped to foreign countries during 1945 to build some seventy-five thousand to one hundred thousand homes in America. The article further says that higher prices could be secured in the foreign market than OPA would permit here at home. With the crying need for more and more material in America, no one can justify a program that permits a situation like that to come about. I am advised that the export of lumber is increasing the first quarter of this year over that which went out of the country last year. A public building administrator, such as has been appointed, can have but one function to perform, and that is to break the bottleneck in supplies. It will take the fearless courage, the ability and driving energy of a man like William Jeffers in the rubber program, because that which is needed today to solve the housing problem in America is first—material, and second—labor.

A step has been made in releasing the Army and Navy supplies for the building program. Temporary housing facilities have been made available for immediate needs. This is commendable, but it is only a temporary expedient. The material for building homes must flow from the mills and factories of America and until the wheels of industry start to turn that supply will not be available.

The greatest handicap that production has today are the restrictions and Government regulation which prevents the free flow of materials and rapid reconversion and promotion in production. Those are the bottlenecks first to be opened. There is, of course, a shortage of labor which will be taken care of, in my judgment, with the release of materials and with the returning of the veterans. Here is a field in which the virtues of the Republic ought to reassert themselves. Housing calls for private initiative and private enterprise. Opportunity with Government encouragement must be established. There is sufficient Government power today to direct the flow of the available materials into the proper channels. There are enough homebuilders in America to do the job. There is sufficient local authority to protect the public interest. There is a desire here among all those needing homes to establish their families, to own their homes. Home owning has continued and will continue to be the very hearthstone of the Republic. We must drive from government all those in every bureau and commission at once who look upon the American people as a mass—who would regiment them, shift them about, use them according to political whims or personal desires.

We must again encourage pride of production and release the full force of competition. In no other way can we secure full employment, retain individual freedom, and foster the home owning and home loving instincts, the undergirders of the Republic.

Why Our Soldiers Protest at Manila

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1946

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to say that while the War Department and the Navy make detailed explanations with reference to bringing our boys home, the fact remains that they are still in foreign lands.

More than 2 months ago I introduced bills into this House with reference to the number of ships with foreign countries and the use of our own ships to return the boys back to this country. The bills were referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and up to this time the administration has been successful in smothering hearings on this legislation. There have been no hearings or investigations with reference to the matter of our ships with foreign lands and the use of our own ships.

Forestalling every means of keeping the facts from the public as to failure to use our ships, it is no wonder that the men overseas are becoming dissatisfied.

The fake story of "no ships" put forth by the administration concerning the use of our ships to bring our boys home, was a fraud on our men overseas as well as upon the parents in this country.

It is no surprise that they are now openly asserting themselves and demanding that they be brought home, when they find the administration has lied to them and smothers hearings on bills covering the use of our ships.

And I want to include the printed matter that I have just received from Manila which evidences the temper and feeling of those who have been mistreated by our Government:

MR. TRUMAN, BRIEF US NOW

The late Al Smith campaigned, "Let's look at the record."

Let's look at the demobilization record as portrayed in the news dispatches from Washington to the Daily Pacifician:

September 22. Point scores announced: October, 70; November, 60; and after that all 2-year men.

September 25. No 36-point enlisted men or 48-point officers will be sent overseas.

October 20. Army must reduce point score to keep pace with demobilization.

October 21. War Department reaffirms release target dates.

October 24. Homeward sailings lag behind goal.

November 20. Pacific-based returnees promised relief as transport surplus looms for January.

December 5, 9, 12, 15. Bright prospects on shipping as backlog breaks.

December 21. Fifty points good December 31.

December 28. All troops not needed to go home by March 1, says Patterson.

January 3. Sixty-three thousand more berths assigned to AFWESPAC.

January 5. Empty berths sail to United States for lack of eligible men.

January 5. Army announces demobilization will be slowed down and the return of some troops delayed.

The facts read like a war-of-nerves drive. Yet throughout all the confusion one fact stood out: Policy makers were promising that men above occupation needs would be sent home immediately.

But what about the two new situations?

(1) The Secretary of War didn't know the way the point system is being operated. Does this show lack of liaison and understanding of our Washington leaders on the problem? This, with all the public clamor.

(2) Rate of demobilization is slowed down because of the difficulty of getting overseas replacements. What has happened to the thousands of red applers and selective-service inductees? Have no replacements been trained since VJ-day?

We ask our Commander in Chief, Harry S. Truman, to give us the facts. We were briefed on our mission during days of combat. Let us be briefed now.

POTENTIAL VETERAN

Do you want to go home?

We were told that—

1. There will be no empty berths returning to United States (War Department).

2. We need only 200,000 men for occupation (MacArthur).

3. No men will be held after they become eligible (War Department).

4. Men not needed for occupation or surplus-property disposal will be home by March 1, 1946 (Secretary Patterson).

5. By March 1946 all men with 2 years' service will be eligible for discharge (War Department).

6. When shipping is available men will go home (Secretary Patterson).

7. Sixty-eight thousand berths will be assigned to AFWESPAC for January (War Department).

The truth is—

1. Navy takes 130 ships off Pacific run (authorized source).

2. Ships leave Manila partly empty (A. S.).

3. I didn't know men overseas had stopped accumulating points (Secretary Patterson).

4. Secretary Patterson said on Guam that he didn't know 2-year men were to become eligible in March 1946.

5. Discharges cut in half; a man may be kept in the Pacific 3 months after becoming eligible (Lieutenant General Collins).

This is the story: The Army is up to its old tricks. Believing that public opinion is sufficiently placated by discharges to date, the Army hopes to fall back to such double talk as "But men are not yet eligible." Discharges have been intentionally slowed down first by the cry, "There are no ships," and now that they can no longer contend this, the cry is that there are no men eligible. In this last one nothing is said about refusing to lower the points except that it will disrupt the divisional organization of the Army, but again it is skillfully left out that the Army is trying to hold wartime installations with what is to be a peactime Army.

It seems we are to be used as a pressure group to force Congress to pass compulsory military training.

It seems also that if we wish to get home that we will have to do something about it. Write your family and Congressman, and above all, insist that the GI be given an open hearing with the Senate investigating committee that is to be in Manila Monday, January 7.

Every soldier in Manila is requested to be at city hall, Manila, today, Monday, January 7, at 6 p. m. to form a welcoming committee for the Senate investigating committee.

Manchester's Housing Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1946

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a letter which I have received from Ernest G. Swanburg, chairman of the special housing committee of the Manchester (N. H.) Chamber of Commerce:

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Manchester, N. H., January 8, 1946.

The Honorable CHESTER E. MERROW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MERROW: Manchester's housing problem, like that of many other communities throughout the country, is so critical that we have been forced to try and find a solution to it outside of the new-building field. Our reason for doing this was because of the fact that materials are not adequate for any new-building program and it looks as though they will not be available in quantity for quite some time. As a result of considerable study, we have arrived at a plan which we think has great merit. We can see its possible benefits here in our own community and it could undoubtedly be put into effect throughout the entire country.

Our plan is to overlook the new-building field for the time being and devote all of our efforts to the rehabilitating of substandard houses and to the remodeling of existing one- and two-family houses so as to accommodate more families. We find that in some cases the biggest part of the work can be done with the materials already in the building. In other cases it is necessary to use only a small amount of lumber and to install plumbing and fixtures. In no case would we use anywhere near the amount of lumber that would be required in the building of the average new small home. In other words, our available supply of materials can be stretched to cover some 5 to 10 times as much ground if we restrict our operations to remodeling and rehabilitating work.

In order to do such work efficiently, cooperation on the part of all Federal agencies is needed. This means the lifting of restrictions on the usage of lumber now available so that we might proceed with such a program and possibly the adding of new restrictions which would prohibit the use of lumber for any purposes except remodeling and rehabilitating until such time as the materials are coming through in volume sufficient to warrant the beginning of a new building program. In Manchester, we have started out on such a program. We have had splendid cooperation from the local newspapers explaining our plan and we have received numerous requests from property owners to discuss the matter further with them. It appears that they never thought a great deal about converting single- and two-family homes into multiple units until it was called to their attention.

In several instances, we have found that a good deal of lumber is being used for strictly nonessential projects—skating rinks, dance halls, etc., make up this category.

We believe that this is one opportunity you have to serve not only the people of your own State but the country as a whole in pointing out to them the advantages of following the suggested program of rehabilitating and remodeling possible for the next 6 or 8 months. We trust that you will see your way clear to have lifted any restrictions which interfere with this program and to place in effect such new restrictions as are needed to proceed efficiently with such a program.

Yours very truly,
ERNEST G. SWANBURG,
Chairman, Special Housing Committee,
Manchester Chamber of Commerce.

P. S.—A further suggestion might be offered to the effect that this program might well be sponsored by chambers of commerce in all parts of the country and thus eliminate the need for additional Federal agencies.

The Laboring People of Our Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1946

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, an intense and well-financed campaign is now being conducted by many of the huge corporations of this country to drive the laboring people of our Nation into the throes of reaction. They refuse to bargain collectively. They will not recognize the fact that the laboring class has suffered drastic reductions in take-home pay while the cost of living has steadily increased. Under permission granted by this House I include in my remarks a telegram received yesterday from the president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Washington, D. C.:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 14, 1946.*

Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY.,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

The laboring people of the United States today are the target of a most vicious campaign of propaganda, which is also misleading some Members of Congress. Instead of rewarding labor for its decisive contribution to victory in the recent war, there are those in Congress who would pillory the men and women who won the battle of production. These spokesmen for reaction are bent not only on destroying organized labor, but are

deliberately preventing the adoption of legislation on full employment, housing, health, social security, including amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act. It is time that thinking Members of Congress got on their feet and read into the RECORD the facts about the sacrifices the American worker has made and the fine job he has done for the war effort. Since VJ-day labor has suffered serious reductions in take-home pay while the cost of living has continued to mount. As president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen I call upon you to take an active part in offsetting the antidemocratic drive now being conducted against the working men and women of our Nation.

A. F. WHITNEY.

Red River Lateral Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1946

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement made by Mr. George F. Chicola, of Alexandria, La., in support of the project to construct a lateral canal on Red River in Louisiana:

It has been my good fortune to have lived in the city of Alexandria, La., for the past 30 years. During the last 15 years I have been actively engaged in the wholesale-jobbing business in the city of Alexandria, La., and with pardonable pride, I believe that I can say that I am thoroughly familiar with the economic conditions of the whole of central Louisiana. While my business connections consume a great deal of time I have been active in civic work and am at present president of the Alexandria Rotary Club. I mention this fact in order to show my range of observation of conditions and business.

Alexandria, La., is located on Red River in the geographical center of the State and is the parish (or county) seat of the parish of Rapides. It is the heart of the hard-surface highway system, leading into every direction of the United States.

Alexandria is surrounded by the richest and most fertile lands in the world and agriculture is a principal industry or occupation. Cattle-grazing lands are equal to any in the United States and the cattle industry is growing by leaps and bounds. The lumber industry is again finding itself, assisted by planned reforestation. Oil fields are in every direction of Alexandria and the development is only in its beginning.

Because of Alexandria's strategic location and the natural advantages, aforementioned, Alexandria is on its way to become a great industrial and jobbing center.

The development of water transportation will naturally afford cheaper and more transportation and so hasten and materially assist Alexandria in becoming an outstanding industrial and jobbing center. The range for service to jobbers into trade areas will be extended and the business of Alexandria jobbers, because of this increased territory opportunities, should triple in volume.

The development of water transportation will enable the railway systems to render a greater and better service, moving perishables and fast moving freight more expeditiously. By moving heavy and slow moving freight via water transportation, a bottleneck in existing car shortages will be eliminated.

In conclusion, insofar as Alexandria is concerned, water transportation will assist other means of transportation and will work in conjunction with other means of transportation in the development of a greater Alexandria. The opportunity of water transportation will bring new factories and business to Alexandria and this will mean additional tonnage for all types of transportation. In the future greatness of Alexandria, water transportation can well and truly move on with other means of transportation.

The Program of the American Legion Auxiliary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1946

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Dr. Ruth Miller Steese, State president of the American Legion Auxiliary, of Pennsylvania, over Station WHJB, Greensburg, Pa., on January 8, 1946:

A Happy New Year to every one and may that happiness be crowned with the realization of those national and international plans which shall culminate in an enduring peace.

To consider the program of the American Legion Auxiliary at the beginning of this New Year of 1946, the first year which has witnessed the dawn of peace for a long period of time, it is necessary to think just what constitutes membership in this greatest patriotic organization of women. We, as an organization, are most unique for we were organized by the American Legion in 1919, just 8 months after their own organization in Paris, France. They planned our program for us and they defined what should constitute our membership.

Because of the action of the American Legion, our parent organization, the American Legion Auxiliary, opens its ranks to the wives, mothers, sisters, and daughters of Legionnaires and of those men and women who paid the supreme sacrifice in World Wars I and II. We are also proud to claim within our membership those women who served our country in these two wars and who carry an honorable discharge from the armed services. With such a type of membership, we in the State of Pennsylvania are proud to announce our membership for this new year of 1946—a paid-up membership to date of over 56,000 women. But to these 56,000 we would add another 56,000 because in our organization we offer an opportunity for unusual service to humanity.

May I outline for you just a few of our interests—interests which command the attention of women of every religion bound together with that one common tie—service to humanity, service to others, service whose only recompense is to be found in unselfish devotion to those objectives which alone make life worth the living.

During the recent holiday season, when so many were interested in a new fur coat, a diamond ring, or a trip to the sunny Southland, the women of the American Legion Auxiliary visited every Government, State, and county hospital and institution in this great Commonwealth, distributing gifts to every serviceman and veteran, making contacts for them with their families back home and arranging that those families back home were also having a pleasant Christmas. In our mental hospitals, where so much thought must be given as to the correct type of gift, boxes were given containing those articles which could not injure the patients, but gifts which would remind them that there are still those in the outside world who know and care. In our medical hospitals and institutions we gave lovely boxes with a great variety of articles to please every taste, we distributed dollar bills and we gave parties to help and encourage, to help many to forget where they were, even if only for a few short hours.

The children of those hospitalized and disabled were not forgotten in any community. The slogan—"A square deal for every child"—is a reminder every month of the year, as well as in December, of our obligation to the youth of America. At Scotland—Pennsylvania's only school for the orphans of her sailors and soldiers—Christmas week was, indeed, a merry one with the continuous arrival of those packages which were the answer to the letters written to a faithful Santa Claus—that Santa Claus being the American Legion Auxiliary.

But our program in the American Legion Auxiliary is not just the distribution of gifts at Christmas. Throughout the year nine Government hospitals and veterans' facilities in Pennsylvania, one in Maryland, and three in New York are cared for by our Pennsylvania women, who distribute cigarettes, help with ward parties and dances, and add those personal touches which make permanent residence in a hospital a little more earphones.

These personal needs are supplemented by larger gifts to the hospitals themselves—permanent installations which are of value over a long period of years. These gifts include printing presses, mimeograph machines, band, orchestra, and athletic equipment—even the installation of bowling alleys and of metal collapsible stadiums and of master radio-control sets with hundreds of earphones.

Our first great project for 1946 is the erection of a greenhouse at Valley Forge General Hospital. As a living memorial to those men who by the sacrifice of their arms and legs on the Normandy beachhead, by the loss of their sight in the seething waters of the South Seas, and by the contribution of their very lives, made this year of peace possible, we would erect this greenhouse—erect it on the soil of Valley Forge—soil made sacred by Washington and his men in 1776, soil whose sacredness was preserved by the men and women of 1941–45.

This greenhouse at Valley Forge will be the answer to many needs. The blind, whose sense of touch is now the keener, can derive many hours of pleasure and comfort from the simple task of working in the ground. The war-weary can fill many lonely moments while the pleasure of blooming flowers gradually takes their thoughts from the crash of guns and the zoom of planes to the beauties and the quietness of enduring peace. The permanently bedridden can find happiness in the enjoyment which comes from colorful flowers scattered in the wards of the hospital—flowers which come from the hospital greenhouse.

This greenhouse project will be financed by the collection of coupons from various articles of merchandise and by large and small financial contributions from individuals and organizations whose great interest is the loving care of our hospitalized veteran. Already we have received checks for $1 and for $100 from those who felt most keenly the meaning of war, from those who gave their all in that war, and from those who prefer to give to the living.

In addition to our vast program on rehabilitation and child welfare, the American Legion Auxiliary offers a national defense program which would maintain the peace which nations fought for. This program demands for America an army and navy which would be of sufficient size to keep America

secure—an army and navy second to none. This program also seeks the enactment of the American Legion plan of universal training for national security. If you wish permanent national security, study this plan of the American Legion and then join with us in working for its passage into permanent legislation in our congressional halls in Washington.

National defense and Americanism are inseparable. Our Americanism program is a practical one, teaching in our schools what citizenship means through the medium of essay contests, emphasizing the good traits of citizenship by the awarding of medals to outstanding students, stressing the value of good sportsmanship by our support of the American Legion's junior baseball program, and sponsoring girl and boy scout troops to aid in the development of future leadership.

The poppy program of the American Legion and its auxiliary commands public interest. We are the only organizations—may I repeat—we are the only organizations which go into our Government and veterans' hospitals in Pennsylvania and present a poppy-making program. The hospitalized men make the poppies, are paid for the making of them by our organizations, and then we, the members, sell those same poppies that the proceeds may further promote the welfare of the disabled and hospitalized veterans and their families. If we would all realize that the purchase of an American Legion poppy means employment to the hospitalized and compensation for him and his family we would buy more and more poppies and make a reality our slogan for 1946—2,000,000 poppies worn over 2,000,000 hearts—another living tribute to those who gave and gave and gave.

These are but a few of the many phases of our American Legion Auxiliary program—a program which has a personal appeal to every woman interested in the enduring things of life. Will you by your membership add to the great womanpower of the auxiliary, so that, working together we, as women, may add our strength to preserve the peace for which Washington and his men fought at Valley Forge, for which Lincoln dedicated the National Cemetery at Gettysburg, for which the men of '17 and '18 went over there, and for which the men and women of '41 and '45 encircled the globe.

To be an auxiliary member means an opportunity to be a finer citizen, a more devoted comrade, a finer member of the United Nations. We would welcome you and you and you to membership, a membership which embraces every race, class, and creed which fought for the security of these United States—a membership which serves but two masters—God and country.

And so as we stand at the beginning of the New Year of 1946, as you, a member, and you, a prospective member, consider our program, may I ask for each of you the realization of this wish—

"May the Giver of Gifts give unto you
That which is good and that which is true;
The will to help and the courage to do;
A heart that can sing the whole day through:
Whether the sky be gray or blue,
May the Giver of Gifts give these to you.
That which is good and that which is true:
The will to help and the courage to do."

Silly "Sentinels"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 15, 1946

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Washington News of January 14, 1946:

SILLY "SENTINELS"

The Detroit group which has organized itself as the Society of Sentinels deserves some sort of award for the worst idea of 1946.

The year is young. But it is not likely to produce any more asinine proposals than the ones advertised by these "sentinels" in Detroit, New York, and Washington newspapers.

Generally, they want to abolish the New Deal. Specifically, they urge President Truman to advocate repeal of the Wagner Labor Relations Act, the wage-hour law, the social-security law, and practically every other Federal law adopted since 1933 in efforts to improve the condition of workers and farmers.

Chairman of this society is Les Allman, advertising director for the Freuhauf Trailers Corp. One of the vice chairmen is Stephen Du Brul, a General Motors economist. Its secretary is Wayne Stettbacher of the Detroit Employers Association. Its treasurer is Noble Travis, a banker.

Shades of the Liberty League!

The Sentinels appear to believe—at least, they say—that they are defending free enterprise against regimentation. In our opinion, they do not represent the viewpoint of any large number of industrialists or businessmen. If they did, then free enterprise would indeed be in deadly peril of destruction by blind, black reaction.

The American people, we think, hope to see many New Deal laws made fairer, more workable and more effective instruments for the purposes they are intended to serve. But they do not want, and they do not propose to let, these laws be wiped from the books.

It's a free country. The Sentinels have a right to be stupid, and to advertise their stupidity. But American business and industry as a whole—and especially the companies with which officers of this society are identified—should lose no time in repudiating the group and its absurd program.

New York Amvets Hold First State Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 15, 1946

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include three brief newspaper clippings that appeared in Buffalo, N. Y., newspapers concerning the recently held State convention of the American Veterans of World War II—Amvets—as follows:

[From the Buffalo Courier-Express of December 16, 1945]

STORM DELAYS AMVETS' FIRST STATE SESSION—IMPORTANT BUSINESS SCHEDULED FOR TODAY

American Veterans of World War II will attain the size and importance of the American Legion within a few years, Joseph H. Leib, of Washington, national legislative director of Amvets, predicted yesterday at the opening of the first annual State convention of the organization in Hotel Lafayette.

Amvets now has a membership of 25,000, which is greater than the American Legion strength after its first year of organization, Leib asserted. He said Buffalo, which has 17 posts, is a leader in Amvets growth.

STORM DELAYS DELEGATES

Because of the storm, many delegates arrived late, and most business was postponed until today. At the morning and afternoon sessions today, officers will be elected, a State charter adopted, and the resolution committees will report on revision of the GI bill of rights, the full employment bill, the Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill, waiving of premiums on retirement pensions for veterans returning to civil-service jobs, and the extension of price and rent control beyond 1946.

Amvets national headquarters is planning to buy the Government's McLean Gardens in Washington from the Defense Homes Corporation and operate it as a cooperative project, Leib announced. The cooperative will be financed by 700 veterans who will pool their $2,000 loans under the GI bill. If it is successful, similar projects will be organized throughout the country.

SEEK SURPLUS BENEFITS

The legislative director reported progress in Amvets efforts to have the Surplus Property Board "changed from a policy-making group to an organization staffed by veterans who will sell property direct to veterans and civilians."

"We don't find any fault with the American Legion and other veterans' organizations," Leib said. "But we feel the veterans of World War II can solve best our problems by having an organization of our own in which we have a community of interest, age, and experiences."

Raymond O'Brien, of Buffalo, acting State commander, presided.

[From the Buffalo Courier-Express of December 17, 1945]

AMVETS CLOSE FIRST ANNUAL SESSION HERE—BETTER-TRAINED STATE COUNSELORS DEMANDED

A resolution recommending that counselors group to an organization staffed by veterans Affairs be given more extensive training was passed at the closing session last night of the first annual State convention of Amvets, American veterans of World War II, at Hotel Lafayette.

Forty-three delegates, representing 32 Amvet posts throughout the State, charged that many counselors are insufficiently trained, especially in handling questions about on-the-job training.

Increased effort on the part of local and State authorities to arrange immediate housing facilities for veterans and their families was urged in a second resolution. A third resolution requested that the Government guarantee loans for homes, farms, and businesses up to 75 percent instead of the present 50 percent authorized in the GI bill of rights.

WANT CONTROLS KEPT

The Amvets further went on record as urging the State legislature to memorialize Congress to continue price and rent cantrol beyond 1946 and to waive back payment of premiums to the New York State retirement fund for returning civil-service employees. Many veterans returning to police and fire jobs must pay up to $400 in back premiums, the resolution pointed out.

A Buffalo attorney, William H. Hepp, 176 Lafayette Avenue, was chosen commander. Other Buffalonians elected to State department offices are Vincent M. Gaughan, 28 Downing Street, second vice commander; James T. Francis, 51 Lemon Street, provost marshal; State Senator-elect Edmund P. Radwan, 3 Norway Park, national executive committeeman; and William E. Blake, 73 Grey Street, alternate national executive committeeman.

Other officers elected are Michael A. di Fate, of Yonkers, first vice commander; Marcy Carlucci, of New York, third vice commander; Walter Brause, of New York, judge advocate; Joseph R. Barone, of Dunkirk, finance officer; and Joseph Grandwetter, of New York, adjutant.

[From the Buffalo Evening News of December 17, 1945]

BUFFALO ATTORNEY IS CHOSEN AMVETS' STATE COMMANDER

William H. Hepp attorney, of 176 Lafayette Avenue, was chosen commander of the Department of New York, American Veterans of World War II, by delegates at the first State convention Sunday afternoon in Hotel Lafayette.

Other State officers are: First vice commander, Michael A. Di Fate, Yonkers; second vice commander, Vincent M. Gaughan, 28 Downing Street, Buffalo; third vice commander, Marcy J. Carlucci, New York City; adjutant, Joseph Grandwetter, New York City; judge advocate, Walter I. Brause, New York City.

National executive committeeman, State Senator-elect Edmund P. Radwan, 3 Norway Park; alternate, William E. Blake, 73 Grey Street; provost marshal, James T. Francis, 51 Lemon Street; finance officer, Joseph R. Barone, Dunkirk; chaplain, the Reverend Stanley Wisniewski, assistant pastor, St. Adalbert's Church.

Raymond D. O'Brien, of 93 Meriden Street, who, with Mr. Blake, helped organize Amvets here, was designated as the department's first past commander.

A resolution was passed urging Congress to revise the GI bill of rights, especially to provide more liberal educational provisions and more liberal real property and loan features.

Other resolutions passed favored: Passage of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill; continuation of rent and price controls by OPA beyond 1946; passage of the bill to give enlisted veterans pay for accrued furlough time similar to terminal leave for officers; appointment by Governor Dewey of more qualified veterans to the veterans State commission and to give them more extensive training to make them more qualified; memorializing the legislature to waive payment of back premiums to the State retirement fund for returning civil-service employees.

Palmyra Legion Demands Fair Demobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1946

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker,. under permission to extend my remarks, I include some resolutions adopted by the Harrison B. Quigley Post, No. 72, of the American Legion, of Palmyra, Pa., on December 17, 1945. I thoroughly agree with the sentiments expressed and the purposes sought by these resolutions. They are further evidence of the desire by the American people for complete justice and equality in the demobilization program. They also show the careful thought and attention this important program. They also show the careful Americans:

Whereas the method of separation of men from the armed forces is being made on a point basis, giving credit for length of service, service overseas, dependents, citations, campaigns, and the like; and

Whereas men are being separated from the service because of age and years of service; and

Whereas the separation of certain individuals has been fostered regardless of agreement with existing regulations; and

Whereas favoritism has been exhibited to people of certain professional classes or to the sons of influential military and civil leaders, Be it

Resolved, That some action be taken by the legislative bodies representing the people of these United States to air these inconsistencies and restore equality of opportunity for separation to all those who meet the qualifications; and

Resolved, That favoritism be eliminated immediately from separation procedures because of the desire of certain peoples whose selfish interests are placed above established regulations; and

Resolved, That our representatives, through proper committees, exert the full measure of their high office to eradicate these existing evils.

Program of the Democratic Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1946

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Robert E. Hannegan delivered before the Boston Democratic State Committee on January 12, 1946:

A few days ago, from the President of the United States, you heard a candid and courageous discussion of the state of our Nation.

Harry Truman was talking to all Americans, to that all-important individual whom we in America describe as the Man in the Street. He was speaking not only of the tremendous opportunity that lies ahead for this country in the postwar era but also of the difficulties.

He was aware that we in America stand on the threshold of better times. He has several times mentioned this—new products, greater markets, and a higher standard of living—now all within our reach.

But he was aware, too, of present obstacles. And he was resolved that these difficulties should not be allowed to block our way. It was his purpose to let us know that for our future well-being and prosperity we must face these problems squarely now.

It is easy enough, you know, to talk about the prosperity that is just around the corner. Even a Republican can do that. But it takes courage and a deeper integrity to talk about the corner that we still have to get around.

The Republican Party was quick to criticize President Truman for talking over our Nation's problems openly and candidly with the man in the street.

To the Republican leaders, that idea has always been abhorrent. The members of the Old Guard clique have one rule which they hold inviolable, one principle to which they adhere through thick and thin with the greatest fidelity.

That principle is never to take the people into their confidence. And they stick to it even in their own party.

Naturally, then, when Harry Truman undertook to inform his fellow citizens of the true state of their Nation, these Republicans declared that he had made a political error. They disapproved of the program he was fighting for, but they went beyond that. They said it was poor political strategy, in an election year, to place any issue before the electorate—something they themselves would never do. And they were elated because they believed the President had made a mistake.

Now, political strategy is a deep, deep subject. I have been a student of it for years and I would think anyone ill-advised to try to learn it all in just one lifetime.

But I find that after a man has put in the deepest kind of study on this subject, and worked his way through its most difficult, complex problems, the net result is a certain humility. I find that after all is said and done, after all the clever techniques in the book are learned and digested, the best political strategy still lies in the answer to one simple question:

"What do the American people want?"

Now, the Republican strategists—those who have criticized the President's speech on political grounds—have not yet reached that point that understanding, in their studies. Apparently they cannot get beyond the chapter on Republican techniques.

Harry Truman would not make a very apt pupil in these particular techniques. His whole background and training point away from the Republican philosophy—and straight toward the man in the street. So these Republican Party experts probably would give him a grade of no better than C minus.

Harry Truman has pointed out that this year—1946—is a year of decision. And by that he meant decision vital to the American people. By what we decide now, we can make the most—or the least—of a great opportunity for economic security and better living. That is why he seeks enactment of his 21-point program for postwar America, a program of specific action to meet real problems.

The Republican political experts have given Harry Truman a low mark for this. They point out that 1946 is an election year. And it is "poor politics," as they see it, to be specific on anything in an election year.

One of these Republican specialists has already attacked the President publicly. That one—Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio—was selected by the Republican Party leadership In a radio broadcast following the President's address to the Nation, TAFT authentically voiced the answer of the Republican Party.

In providing that answer, the Senator has performed a service. He has further clarified the issue between the two parties. He has sharpened the battle lines for both 1946 and 1948 He has made it finally and unmistakably clear to all Americans that the Republican Party has taken its stand against a progressive postwar program for America. The Republican stamp of approval is once more on a policy of outright reaction.

Answering for my party, I wish to announce that in this drawing of the battle lines for 1946 and 1948, we Democrats wholly concur. We accept this challenge, and we go along with Senator TAFT 100 percent in his clarification of the issue.

We are ready to lay the case before the voters of America. We shall do everything in our power to make Senator TAFT's meaning perfectly clear to them—to all Americans, Republican voters included.

The rank-and-file membership of the Republican Party should now realize that their last hope of a forward-looking, constructive policy is gone.

Even the "me too" days are over. Senator TAFT and his associates have dropped the pose of liberalism. They control the party, and so long as they continue to do so, there can be no more claims to liberalism under that party's banner. There can be no such thing as an accredited Republican liberal. Henceforth, by the party's own decree, Republican candidates for office cannot stand on liberal principles.

What, then, does the Republican Party now offer?

For a fair appraisal, we must go back to September of last year and start from there.

At that time—September 6, 1945—when President Truman addressed his message to Congress embracing the 21-point program, immediately the Republicans in Congress set up a chorus of opposition. This was communism, they said It was communism for the Government to interest itself in what might happen to unemployed war veterans. It was communism to ask that war workers be granted unemployment insurance during reconversion. It was communism to put a minimum limit on wages.

But the scarce did not "take." Not many Americans began looking under the bed at night to see if Harry Truman, the Communist, was hiding there. In fact, there was a general approval of the Truman program in the press and in public opinion.

But wait, the Republicans then said. We have something much better. We have—and these were the exact words that Republican Congressman CHARLES HALLECK, of Indiana, used in a statement to the press—we have "old-fashioned conservatism."

Now, Congressman HALLECK is chairman of the Republican congressional campaign committee. His work was not without weight. President Truman's message, he said, was the kick-off. "This begins the campaign of 1946. And in waging the Republican congressional campaign, we will go back to old-fashioned conservatism."

But many people—and many Republican voters among them—were still puzzled. Truman had a program. It meant maintenance of public purchasing power. It meant consumers could continue to buy and, therefore, producers could continue to put better products on the market. And that meant that we could enjoy the higher standards of living which our new scientific and technical knowledge held out to us in the postwar world.

But what about this old-fashioned conservatism? Could you pay for the new products of American industry with it? Could you put a couple of ounces of it in the pay envelopes of American workers in place of wages? And would the makers of refrigerators and automobiles and new houses and radio sets accept this old-fashioned conservatism in lieu of cash?

The rank-and-file voters in the Republican Party began to wonder about this. They began to ask embarrassing questions. Suppose public purchasing power should fail to remain high of its own accord. Suppose our factories and our mines and our farmers should one day find their markets shrinking.

Was old-fashioned conservatism a good kind of insurance policy against this? Was it any better now than it was in 1930 and '31 and '32? Had something new been added? After all, Harry Truman had a program.

All right, the Republican leaders replied. We'll have a program too. And 4 days after President Truman's message was delivered to Congress, Republican Representative JOE MARTIN, House minority leader, had an announcement to make to the world.

Now, many of you know JOE MARTIN. He is from your State. And those who know him cannot help admiring his boundless confidence in predicting things that never come to pass. Nobody ever put his money on the wrong horse with greater consistency, greater frequency, and greater faith, than JOE MARTIN, of Massachusetts.

The Republicans in Congress, JOE MARTIN bravely announced to the world, had appointed a seven-man committee to draw up a Republican Party program.

"We plan," he said, "to set before the country a definite and concise statement of the aims and objectives of the Republican Party as represented by Republican Members in Congress. We plan to do this in such manner as will leave no room for questioning as to where the Republican Members stand on the issues before the country."

Now, when I saw this promise in the newspaper I was impressed with the statesmanlike attitude that JOE MARTIN had taken—so deeply impressed that I marked the day on my calendar with a red pencil.

Then I waited. Again and again the seven-man committee of Republicans in Congress met to draw up the program that would leave no question as to where their party stood. But the days went by, and the program was not forthcoming. I began marking those days off on my calendar

I ran up a total of 87 crosses on that calendar. Then came another announcement. At the December 6 meeting of Republican leaders in Chicago the "definite and concise statement" that JOE MARTIN had promised was finally to be given out to the world.

That statement, or "interim platform," as it was called, bore out a prediction which I had made repeatedly in my talks with fellow Democrats. It said nothing. It turned out to be a collection of mottoes—very few of them suitable for framing—with not one specific action proposed to solve the problems that America faces today.

Nearly all the Republicans gathered in Chicago were disappointed with the statement. Those who had hoped to emerge as a "liberal wing" of the party were shocked and outraged. And even the reactionary leadership did not want this brain child of the seven Congressmen and refused to give it a name. On all sides the complaint was that the statement said nothing.

The group at Chicago therefore did what many another group does when the members realize they have run into a stone wall.

They appointed a committee.

The committee is to go on where the Congressmen left off. To minimize their embarrassment, the Chicago meeting approved the Congressmen's platform. But the new committee was assigned the task—all over again—of writing a platform. In other words, the Republican Party, in offering a program for America, spent months getting nowhere, and is now ready to continue nowhere from that point.

Meanwhile, I am obliged to continue marking off the days on my calendar while I wait for that Republican program. I now have 120 days crossed off. I have had to start on a new calendar.

Between now and the election there are 297 days still to be crossed off, unless the Republican Party can produce its program meanwhile. In other words, since Congressman JOE MARTIN made his promise of a definite program, a third of the time remaining before the election has already elapsed.

Prior to that December meeting of the Republican leaders in Chicago, I had made another prediction. I had stated that this so-called interim platform of the Republicans would be one of two things: It would be another "me too," operation—in which case those who had criticized President Truman's program would have to eat their words—or it would be no program at all.

I am now ready to offer a further prediction. And this time I am adding no "either-or" condition. I now predict that the Republican Party will produce no program at all.

It requires no gift of prophecy, of course, to make that prediction. I am not taking any chances of miscalling the turn. Senator TAFT and his colleagues have given us all the information we need. They have made it clear that the old guard controls the party. And the Republican old guard never has had a program to offer this country and never will have one.

To the returning soldier, to the factory worker, to the farmer, to the businessman, and to the housewife of America, the issue between the Democratic and Republican Parties in the next election boils down, then, to this:

Democratic Party initiative and leadership in realizing the possibility of a prosperous postwar America, or no leadership, no initiative at all.

A Democratic Party program for full employment or no program at all.

Democratic Party action to maintain public purchasing power through the period of postwar adjustment, or no action at all.

Democratic Party protection of American workers against subdecency wages, or no protection at all.

Democratic Party measures to prevent inflation, or no measures at all.

Democratic Party assurance of adequate peacetime military reserves for the defense of America, or no assurance at all.

Democratic Party initiative in bringing medical care within the reach of all Americans who need it, or no initiative at all.

These are the choices that Americans must make when they go to the polls next November. If these objectives are the will of the people, then the voters can give their mandate only by supporting our party.

It is true that the main body of legislation required by the Administration's program has not yet been enacted. But let us not be deceived by this, and particularly let us not jump of our own accord into the fallacy which our opposition has reached by the route of their own wishful thinking. It is significant that those who have been predicting failure of the Truman program are those who do not wish its success.

The fact that the program has not been enacted to date does not mean, as our opponents would have us believe, that it will not be enacted in due course.

The program embraces a large body of new legislation. This takes time. Ordinarily, a legislative program of this magnitude would require more time than has elapsed to date.

President Truman has asked the people to press Congress for action now, not because he doubts the eventual acceptance of these proposals, but because he realizes the importance of enacting them as quickly as possible. He knows that in order to insure the continued public purchasing power which means good business and steady jobs, these things have to be done soon.

Harry Truman has every reason to believe that the people of America—the great majority—approve of his objectives. They are part of a bigger program which the people have four times approved by direct expression at the ballot box. The postwar objectives Truman has outlined in his 21-point message are the fulfillment of the promise which our party made to the people in its platform of 1944.

I believe the people of America want to see Harry Truman make good on that promise. I believe they will back him up in his efforts to do so.

Senator TAFT, who does not approve of the Democratic program, has stated his opinion that—I quote—"a large majority of the American people disagree fundamentally with Mr. Truman's program and his political philosophy."

I would recommend to the Senator a rereading of the Democratic Party's platform of 1944 and of the election returns of November 7 of the same year.

On the other hand, a member of Senator TAFT's own party, Republican Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, differs vigorously with the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Senator MORSE recently made a radio speech in which he endorsed the Truman program. Immediately, he said, his office was deluged with letters from all parts of the country. And the Senator added that his mail was running 9 to 1 in support of the position he took, favoring the policies of Harry Truman.

I would recommend to the distinguished Senator from Ohio that he get together and compare notes with the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Senator Taft goes on to criticize Truman's proposal of fact-finding boards and cooling-

off periods as a means of settling labor disputes.

But it appears that the American people are siding with Harry Truman. For an indication of this, I would commend to the distinguished Senator from Ohio a reading of the January 6 report of a Gallup Poll taken on this question. The poll shows that four out of every five Americans questioned are in favor of Harry Truman's method.

Ever since the victory of the Democratic Party in the last national election, wherever I have had an opportunity to address my fellow Democrats I have reminded them of the pledge our party made in its 1944 platform.

I have cautioned them against complacency. I have pointed out that with the count of ballots, the real fight was not yet won. The real fight is for America's safety and well being, at home and in the world at large. The real fight is to go on building the peace, to keep our promise of a job for every returning soldier, to maintain the purchasing power and the living standards of the American people, to defeat the reaction that would bar us from reaching these goals.

The real fight, in short, is to carry on and finish the job that Franklin D. Roosevelt began.

Not long ago I read in a newspaper column that I was guilty of a political error. Now, to me, that is a serious charge. So I read on down the column with keen interest.

I discovered that the political error I had committed was to urge that the Truman administration carry on the policies of Roosevelt.

I am very proud of that column. I consider it one of the greatest compliments that was ever paid me. And I shall continue to commit that political error. I hope we Democrats will all go on committing it, until the great hope that was held out to our Nation by the greatest leader of his time is realized throughout the land.

Resolutions Presented at Annual Farm Bureau Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1946

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, Jasper County, Iowa, is renowned, not only as the washing-machine center of the world but is a leader in agriculture as well, and the very progressive farmers in this county are responsible for the high yields of grain and the superior quality of the livestock produced. At a recent meeting of the Jasper County Farm Bureau forward-looking resolutions were adopted that deserve the attention of every Member of the House of Representatives. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein this set of resolutions:

We, of the Jasper County Farm Bureau, make the following resolutions:

NATIONAL UNITY

Our three major economic groups—labor, industry, and agriculture—are most interdependent on each other. No one of these groups can long prosper while the others are depressed. We therefore believe, that if we are to assure all labor a good annual income and thereby achieve a more unified and prosperous America, these three groups must reaffirm their pledge to forget individual selfish gains and work together towards that common end.

PERFECTING AND MAINTAINING WORLD ORDER

Realizing that farmers, individually and through their organizations, can and should play an active role in support of efforts to achieve world security, we recommend their fullest cooperation in the following measures to restore world worder:

1. We favor continued support to be given to international monetary policies originally proposed at Bretton Woods.

2. We favor the general plan for maintaining world order and promoting social and economic progress proposed and adopted by the delegates from 50 nations at the San Francisco Conference.

3. We favor continued support of the reciprocal trade agreement to promote fair economic and commodity exchange.

FARM PROGRAMS, THEIR IMPROVEMENT, COORDINATION, AND ADMINISTRATION

We believe that economic stability in agriculture should be maintained through the administration of governmental agencies.

1. We urge the unification and simplification of existing agencies in order to avoid overlapping of functions.

2. We recommend the continuation of production guidance as a means of insuring parity at the market place for agricultural products.

3. We favor the continuation of the Soil Conservation Service with the expansion of the soil conservation districts program in order to further promote the doctrine of land use according to its capabilities. We recognize this as a problem common to and of interest to both rural and urban populace.

4. We endorse the continued expansion of the activities of the Rural Electrification Administration as a means towards our ultimate goal: Electricity for every farm home.

We further believe that REA lines, since they are not operated for profit, should not bear the same tax rates as utility lines which are operated for profit. We also believe that cooperatives should be encouraged and that savings made by cooperatives belong to the patrons and should not be subject to cooperation income taxes.

5. We favor continued cooperation with the Extension Service in promoting an educational program for general agricultural improvement.

INFLATION CONTROL

We urge the continuation of price-control measures on basic commodities as a means of avoiding the disaster of inflation. We favor this control until such time as production of the commodity, in relation to the demand for it, will warrant its release from price control.

LEGISLATIVE ISSUES IN IOWA

Realizing that Jasper County farmers are vitally concerned in current legislative issues, we pledge continued support of these measures.

1. We favor 100-percent collection of the State income tax according to original rates.

2. We urge the further equalization of educational opportunities in Iowa by increasing the amount of State aid possible through complete income-tax collection.

3. We recommend the continuance of the county schools committee in order that they may cooperate with the county school board in making it possible for every child to have an equal opportunity to secure a good education.

4. We strongly urge additional legislation and appropriation of funds for use on all-weather farm-to-market roads. We believe that the Farm Bureau Federation should adopt an aggressive program in securing such funds and in the correct allocation of them.

5. We favor the establishing of a county library.

RURAL HEALTH

We recommend the continuation of the Jasper County Health Improvement Association as a means of providing a hospitalization program for rural people.

We advocate the continuance of the county health-nursing program as adopted by the county board of supervisors and approved by the County Medical Association.

Recognizing the sincerity and willing service that officers, directors, and leaders have given in planning and directing the program of the Jasper County Farm Bureau and realizing that no organization can remain static and continue to grow, without such leadership, we extend appreciation and urge the membership to give their fullest cooperation at all times.

RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE,
LESLIE DOAK, *Chairman.*
MRS. HENRY JENSEN.
MRS. W. B. SHAW.
W. B. SHAW.
JACK WORMLEY.

Give the President a Hand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1946

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, in these difficult days which confront all of us it is the duty of the American people and the Congress to give our President every possible bit of support we can. He has the toughest job in the world today and we should do our very best to encourage him in his endeavors in our behalf.

We know, from actual experience, that he has given every consideration to Congress and the people in letting us know what his program is and how he would recommend the course we should follow. He has disclaimed any pride of authorship in his suggestions and has shown a real willingness to consider any other point of view.

The times call for unity among ourselves, a combining of all our abilities and a high regard for the leadership shown by President Truman. He has been frank with us, we know where he stands, and he is entitled to our help on the rough roads ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I was so impressed by a column of Malvina Lindsay that I am inserting it at this point in my remarks. The article was carried in the Washington Post of January 8, 1946, and is entitled "Give the President a Hand":

THE GENTLER SEX

(By Malvina Lindsay)

"GIVE THE FRESIDENT A HAND"

(A housewife views the democratic system)

"They keep saying President Truman's voice sounded tired in his speech the other night. It has set me to thinking. Why shouldn't the President be tired, with 50,000,000 people or so constantly nagging at him about what he does or doesn't do?

"I don't see how any man stands up to being President. I don't mean only the strain of the work and worrying about making his salary meet his bills. What I do mean is that he has to take so much criticism and he gets so little praise. So many people's pet sport seems to be heckling him and his family.

"What brings it home to me is my own family. Could Junior or Sister ever do anything at school or be popular with their playmates if I kept telling them how stupid and awkward they were? Every mother I know works hard at giving her children faith in themselves. In the child-psychology courses they tell us how necessary encouragment and self-confidence are to creative achievement in anyone, young or old. Well, we certainly need that badly enough for our President, don't we?

"Then take my husband. Don't I have to build him all the time and keep him from getting discouraged? Doesn't every wife have to do that? What if men in private life were continually being badgered and picked to pieces over every little thing they did in running their businesses? Why, they'd go completely to pieces. Well, a President can't depend on his wife alone to build up when there are so many millions tearing him down.

"I'm not saying we shouldn't criticize the President or at times protest his actions. That's our democratic privilege. But most of us are entirely negative in our practice of democracy. We blame, denounce, assail, but never praise, encourage, and strengthen our public men, especially when they are in tough spots.

"It's this little, querulous, carping and backbiting that I'm objecting to. Like a wife nagging her husband. Some of it comes from people who have already made up their minds they are against the President and all his works and lie in wait to jump on him for everything he does. A lot of it comes from childish people who, whenever anything goes wrong, look around for someone to blame.

"But I think maybe the largest part of it comes from the boarding-house gang. You know the ones who can't resist the human urge to beef * * * the professional gripers in boarding houses, college dormitories, offices, homes. Oh, I admit we all do it to a degree. It's the path of least resistance. It's an easy way of letting off steam, and it appeases our consciences for what we are failing to do. It gives us a chance to be clever and sound smart without too much effort.

"Then I suppose there's still a lot of the jungle in all of us. Did you ever watch the expressions on people's faces when they begin to complain or snarl about a public figure? Or, on the other hand, did you ever notice how their whole bodies expand, their voices warm, and their faces light when they begin to praise someone?

"All Presidents go through this thing, of course. I used to wonder how President Hoover ever stood what he had to take when they tried to make him the national villain of the depression. And everyone remembers how the Roosevelt haters were on the job day and night. President Truman is in an extra hard spot because we all expect him to present us a bright, new, happy peacetime world overnight.

"All our public leaders now are behind the eight ball, it seems to me. And, instead of trying to share their burdens and back them up, we stand to one side and boo whenever they make a poor shot. And its precious little cheering we give them when they make a good one.

"It used to be when I was on a bus or streetcar and somebody started calling 'that man in the White House' names, I'd think, 'Well, after all, it's wonderful to live in a ccuntry where anybody can sound off.' But I'm beginning to wonder if free speech is really democratic speech. It seems to me, speech to be truly democratic should be responsible.

"This is the way I look at it: We're cutting off our own noses when we pull down our leaders with name calling, nagging, and with criticism that has no basis of fact. It's to our interest that they do the best they can. That's especially true of our President now, who must lead us through the most critical time in our history. When we think he does wrong, we should criticize him, of course—that is, if we can suggest a way to do better. And when we think he does right, I say, 'Give the President a hand.'"

Our Forgotten Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1946

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by Miss Grace Clyde, assistant district attorney, Kings County, N. Y.:

OUR FORGOTTEN CHILDREN

What condition does bill H. R. 4953 seek to remedy?

Many thousands of parents leave home each year and although their children who are left behind are neglected and unprovided for there is no law that can compel support to be sent for the children.

1. States have recognized the need for courts of domestic relations.

In New York State, article 1, section 91, of the Domestic Relations Court Act, provide

"The family court shall have—

"1. Jurisdiction within the city to hear and determine all proceedings to compel support of a wife, child, or poor relative.

"2. Jurisdiction within the city in all cases or proceedings against persons charged with failure to obey an order of the court made pursuant to authority conferred by law."

A visit to one of the family courts is sufficient to convince an observer of the necessity for such a tribunal in the many cases where parents fail to provide necessities for children.

The family court, after hearing testimony of both complainant and respondent, is empowered to determine and fix by order the amount that a parent must contribute for the needs of his family, and a respondent who fails to comply with such order is subject to arrest.

2. Unfortunately for such children, parents do not always remain under State jurisdiction. What is the result when a husband and father leaves the family and, securing a job in another State, settles there and neglects or refuses to send support for his children? Although there is the same need for support in the family, and regardless of the fact that the family court may have determined the amount to be paid, the parent has placed himself outside the jurisdiction of the family court, and its orders cannot be enforced, resulting in the family becoming destitute.

3. Is there any tribunal that can compel support for the children under such circumstances? Although the man may be employed at a substantial salary, there is no court either in the State of residence of the father or in the State of residence of the children where support can be enforced, the reason being lack of jurisdiction. Incredible as this condition may seem, it does exist throughout the United States and affects many thousands of children each year.

4. There are no official figures to show the number of children involved either in New York State or in the United States. However, in Brooklyn, N. Y., for the year 1944 the fathers of 640 children under 16 years of age abandoned them, left the State, and failed or refused to send support. These cases came to the attention of the authorities.

There are 3,050 counties in the United States. The lack of a remedy for support applies to all counties. Kings County, which recorded 640 children under 16 years of age so abandoned, is one of the largest counties. However, if computation is made upon the basis of 50 children to a county, the total would reach 152,500 children each year left unnecessarily in want.

5. This problem is known and appreciated by law-enforcement agencies of other States.

In answer to inquiry the following replies were received:

From the State's attorney of South Dakota:

"There is nothing we can do to help you" to obtain support officially. "It is certainly a real problem and it seems rather hard to believe that in a country enjoying the high civilization attributed to the United States and endowed with resources as it is, there should be such a large number of men of such low morale or morality, that apparently without any qualms of conscience, they bring children into the world and walk or run off and forget about them entirely."

From the county attorney of Iowa:

"We have had a great deal of this recently although I am sorry to say it is a common practice at other times."

From the county attorney of Minnesota:

"We have much the same problem in this office and I fully agree with you that the situation respecting abandonments is very unsatisfactory. It has always seemed to me that there should be Federal legislation on the subject to protect the families of such men."

From the district court of Nevada:

"We have the same difficulty in this State regarding fathers who abandon their children and move to other States."

The above illustrated conditions apply whether the States be Florida or Oregon, California, or Maine, or any other State.

6. It is stated above that 640 children under 16 years of age who were abandoned came to the attention of the authorities in Kings County in 1944. By authorities is meant the district attorney's office.

The complainants, usually the mothers of the children, worried to distraction by the lack of resources to provide food, clothing and medical supplies for the children, and not knowing where the money is coming from to pay the rent and other household bills, faced with eviction and hunger, apply to the family court or police department in an effort to secure support from the husband. Since neither the family court nor the police department has jurisdiction when the man is outside the State, the mother is referred to the office of the district attorney as a last resort. However, the function of the district attorney is to prosecute crime.

7. The crime of abandonment: Section 480 of the penal law, which was enacted in 1905, makes it a felony for a person having the care or custody of a child under 16 years of age to abandon that child in destitution and wilfully omit to provide for him.

Like all crimes the plaintiff is "The People of the State of New York." Crime is punished as an offense against society. Assuming that a man is indicted, extradicted and convicted for the crime of abandonment, and that he serves the maximum penalty of 2 years in Sing Sing prison, how does that help the family? Have the children been fed, clothed or housed thereby? Have the rent, gas, electric or doctor bills been met while the father is in prison? Has the morale of the children been benefited?

8. There is rarely an exception to the request for support in abandonment cases brought to the district attorney's office. Support is not only requested but absolutely necessary, and yet there is no law at the present time that can compel support. Is prosecution and sentence to jail an adequate or logical substitute? Experience has shown that endeavoring to obtain support through prosecution is impractical. The first result

of an arrest is loss of the employment upon which the man depends and which is the source of the desired support.

9. This problem calls for study and action on the part of governments and legislators. It is not difficult to solve. Does the remedy lie with the States or with the Federal Government? The latter would be more effective in that the necessary jurisdiction of the man could be obtained.

10. In June 1944 a bill was introduced in Congress, which bill was reintroduced on January 8, 1945, and amended on December 11, 1945, designated as bill H. R. 4953. This bill is pending in the Committee on the Judiciary.

Bill H. R. 4953 confers on the district courts of the United States power to issue support orders requiring parents who are possessed of sufficient means, or who are able to earn such means, to pay a fair and reasonable sum for support of their children under 17 years of age, or a contribution toward such support, according to the means of such parents. Such support orders would require the providing of necessary shelter, food, clothing, care, medical attention, and the payment of educational expenses, funeral expenses, and other proper and reasonable expenses.

Said courts would have power to commit to jail for a term not to exceed 1 year any person who fails to comply with the court orders.

The bill further provides that the proceeding may be brought in the district in which a child resides or is present, and process may be served on a parent at any place in the continental United States, in any Territory or possession of the United States, or in the Canal Zone.

It is hoped that our legislators will give this problem the study it deserves with the view toward effecting the much-needed remedy.

One of the Reasons Why Soldiers Do Not Have Homes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, everybody in this country realizes that an acute housing shortage exists throughout the land. Those who suffer most from this condition are the heroes of this war who have returned to find inadequate home facilities to take care of them and their loved ones. As part of my remarks, I am inserting herewith an editorial by Mr. Bob Bliss, editor of the Janesville Gazette, which goes to the heart of this problem. It is timely, interesting, and informative:

LUMBER GOES TO FOREIGN BUYERS

It is generally understood that the strike of 60,000 woodsmen and mill workers in the lumber industry have caused a serious shortage in lumber, but what is not so well known is that our lumber is being shipped to foreign buyers.

The C. W. Chapman Lumber Co., Waterloo, Iowa, ran this ad in five Iowa cities in which it operates lumber yards:

"To Our Customers:

"This is our third letter to you about what the bungling bureaucrats are doing to the building business, and why we ask you to demand action by your Representatives in Congress.

"Where is the plentiful supply of lumber that the WPB said you should have within 30 days after August 23, 1945?

"1. Last week the sawmills on the west coast sold 66,000,000 feet of American lumber to foreign countries. This is just 1 weeks' sales. This lumber would build 6,600 average-size homes here in the United States. There is no ceiling price enforced by the OPA on sales of American lumber to foreign buyers. The sawmills need higher prices to pay higher costs, so they are selling the lumber we needed so desperately here at home to foreigners. Where do these foreign countries get all this money with which to pay these over-ceiling prices? The answer—you taxpayers, through your Congress, either gave them this money or lent it to them. Now we and almost every other American citizen want to help every needy human being in the world—but our own returned veterans will be just as cold as any foreigner if they have to sleep in the gutter. We believe that these Santa Claus bureaucrats should give their own country a fair show first.

"2. The Federal bureaucrats have had, since the end of the war, tied up in red tape at one base (Port Hueneme) on the west coast, 80,000,000 feet of lumber which they will not release. This lumber would build 8,000 homes for you people that need a roof over your heads."

This, of course, is not the whole story, but it is an interesting sidelight on what happens when Government tries too much control.

Grown-up Labor Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1946

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Cleveland (Ohio) Press December 18, 1945, which is well worthy of consideration:

GROWN-UP LABOR RELATIONS

If the Joseph & Feiss Co. hadn't had a party Saturday night, it's likely there wouldn't have been much public attention called to a sterling example of labor peace right in the midst of the greatest labor-management turmoil in recent times. A group of companies comprising an entire industry, and a union have amicably resolved a wage and working conditions issue without strike or public incident.

The agreement has been quietly completed between the Cleveland Joint Board of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America and 22 industries employing about 5,000 in the manufacture of men's clothing. The process is "industry" bargaining, as contrasted with company-by-company bargaining. It insures at least that no companies are squeezed, in relation to their competitors.

This industry bargaining has gone on here in Cleveland for more than a decade. The ACW has maintained high-grade executive talent in union management. The present manager, Beryl Peppercorn, commands the respect of both the companies and the union membership. The companies know that he will deal fairly and responsibly, the union members that he will not let them down.

This is what the experts call mature collective bargaining. It offers a healthier lesson for our economy than the superheated battle for headlines in the motor industry. To make it possible, good company managements have shared with good union management the responsibility for keeping the peace under agreements that are responsibly made and honorably kept. This situation provides a constructive example, to which we are happy to call attention.

On the President's Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I include a column by Edwin R. Wright, former president of the Illinois State Federation of Labor, which appeared in the Galesburg Labor News, Thursday, January 3, 1946:

We're starting the new year in a cheerful frame of mind. Of course, we know that in the months to come there will be serious questions of jobs and even more serious questions of rates of pay for those same jobs. But, first, there must be jobs.

With the old-line craft unions we see little difficulty on either count—there will be plenty of work and union wages will be pretty good. But that isn't all. Organized labor must never permit itself to light its pipe and put up its collective feet and call it a day while other workers are jobless and without earning opportunity. That has been tried in the past and every time resulted in a drastic "hot foot"—or worse.

Labor confidently looks forward to more and better jobs. There's a reason.

We know—we're not guessing, we know that the question of jobs has been solved, at least in part, by the local branches of the United States Employment Service. Not every applicant to the branches has gone away fully satisfied with the work or the pay offered—that would be too much to claim or to hope for. But work has been distributed fairly and evenly and honestly.

For the first time in our recollection, and that covers a 55-year membership in a trades union, we feel not only impelled but justified in saying "Well done!" to a governmental agency of this nature—whether it be national, State, or local.

To our mind, and, probably, to all workers, trade unionists or otherwise, the private employment agency was a stinking affair. It has been charged, and we believe truthfully, that jobs were sold by the private agencies as a huckster peddles potatoes from the tail of his cart. Men and women were hired and then fired to make room for a new crop of fee-paying applicants. And it may well have been true also that a venal plant employment man helped engineer this turnover that he might build up the fees of his friend, the employment racket officer and for himself. We're writing about private employment agents.

State employment agencies may have been ably and efficiently managed. We're willing to give some of them the benefit of the doubt, but we never knew of one better than what was locally described as "pretty good." And, where men depend upon an agency to find them work and wages "pretty good" leaves a lot to be desired.

Now, here's a new angle and one worth thinking about.

President Truman's action, his most important veto to date, was made in rejecting the $52,000,000,000 war appropriation cutback bill. It contained a rider sending the USES back to the States where the political machines of 51 State and Territorial governments would operate an agency upon which

the Nation has depended for orderly and fair reemployment policies.

The veto message was sharply worded, which occasioned more surprise at the Capitol than the action itself. The President said the USES rider "would immeasurably retard our reemployment program" and he called the rider an "objectionable practice" that is contrary to good government.

By tacking the rider to the economy-directed cutback measure, Congress hoped Truman would let it go through rather than lose the savings it contained. In reply, Truman said that he would move "by Executive action" to preserve the savings carried in the bill "in the exact terms which the Congress itself has approved."

We suppose that it is now in order for the Congress to pass, if it can, the measure over the President's veto. And, from what has come out of the present Congress, that may be possible.

Many or most, as you wish, of the coming job hunters will be servicemen and to turn them over to a bunch of sharpshooters for exploitation is neither good business nor even good politics.

Answer this question: "Can the Government disband its employment service and keep the private employment racketeers out of business?"

A Congressman that would cast his vote for a return to the old system of private employment agencies—and that would follow the repeal of the present governmental setup—in my humble opinion, should be (at least theoretically and politically) gutted with a dull fish knife.

Here in Galesburg we have what we consider a very good facility with a competent and hard-working staff.

We think it should be held intact. It has done a good job. We hope our Congressman reads this.

We thank you.

E. R. W.

Trees for Tomorrow, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 15, 1946

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the Antigo (Wis.) Daily Journal appeared the following editorial:

Trees for Tomorrow, Inc., a nonprofit organization of the Wisconsin valley papermaking industry seeking to promote Wisconsin forestry by planting two trees for each one cut, brought about the planting of 4,000,000 young forest trees last year, which is no slight achievement. In 10 days last spring the organization supplied 700,000 3- and 4-year-old Norway pine, jack pine, and white spruce to loggers, farmers, and timbertract owners. Also school forests were started in six northern communities. It is hoped that in a few years 100,000,000 seedlings will be available annually for planting. We hope some of our local forestry minded organizations will find it possible to achieve a working partnership with Trees for Tomorrow, Inc.

Large areas in Wisconsin are adaptable to the growing of trees.

This crop has received the attention and support of the State and the State agricultural college. There is every indication that there will be a constantly increasing interest in this great project.

Letter to the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 15, 1946

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD a copy of a letter directed to President Truman from Mr. Donovan D. McCarty, attorney at law, Olney, Ill.

Mr. McCarty has been very successful in the legal business and his judgment, as a lawyer and a businessman, is respected in my district.

OLNEY, ILL., *January 5, 1946.*

Hon. HARRY TRUMAN,
The President of the United States,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Recently you took your case to the people on the radio, and I take it that you invite their reaction. Here's mine:

Of all the things you propose, probably the 30-day cooling off period is the only one that really makes sense. The rest are eyewash.

The theory of unemployment compensation is fine, but you ought or should know that it is abused all the time. Try and hire a worker who is drawing it. Extending it as you propose, will only create additional unemployment.

I want no part of the United States Government in the field of medicine. What you propose will only create another hugh bureaucracy with an additional horde of pay rollers taking their daily sustenance at the public teats, and reaching out for more and more power, until in the end the Government would name my doctor and hospital. There are plenty of voluntary hospital associations such as the Blue Cross, that any worker may join, and the over-all cost is cheaper than what you propose.

You can't stop strikes, neither can the Congress. Joe Stalin has been referred to as the only man who can do that, and Uncle Joe doesn't tolerate unions. For one, I believe in labor unions properly operated. The workingman would be in a sorry plight if he hadn't them in the past. He needs them now and in the future, but unfortunately many of them are in the hands of men drunk with power, and some of whom entertain communistic ideas. They want to perpetuate themselves in office by making bigger and better demands daily. They are leading their unions down the road the corporations traveled many years ago, before a distinguished predecessor of yours took them in hand.

Recently you held a conference of labor leaders and industrialists in Washington. The consumer who pays the freight when wages are increased was conspicuous by his absence. In this time of national crisis the people are looking to you for guidance. But you appear to be looking at the 1948 Presidential nomination and listening to the voice of the CIO. We don't all belong to that organization Mr. President. In fact, you might be surprised to learn that a vast majority of us do not Pay attention to the business at hand and forget about 1948. If you do a good job, you won't have to worry about the nomination and election.

Legislation should be enacted that would guarantee the local unions a free election each year, with the right of a secret ballot, wherein each worker may vote for his local and national officers without fear or favor. Unions should be held responsible for the violation of their contracts the same as any other person. Featherbedding and other equally unfair labor practices should be forbidden.

Set up a labor court with exclusive jurisdiction of all labor matters, with power to enforce its orders, but with a right of appeal to the United States District Court, and don't place either labor leaders, industrialists, economists, or college professors on the court as members. The books of a labor union should be open to examination by the Government.

And speaking of opening books, I would suggest that you read the annual reports of corporations which are now being published and sent the stockholders. They tell the story of their profits, losses, amounts paid for taxes, operating expenses, and all other matters. I expect any member of the Internal Revenue Department is as familiar with the earnings of General Motors as is the president. I own no stock in that corporation, but I see no reason to examine their books and learn what is known from the annual reports to see whether they can stand a raise.

It is entirely possible that the hired hand who opens your mail and decides what you should or should not read, will file this letter in the wastebasket, however, just to be sure that someone besides him reads it, I am sending a copy to my Congressman.

Lastly, Mr. President, instead of trying to be Bob Hannegan Phil Murray Truman, try being plain Harry Truman for a while, and I believe your administration will meet with more success and public approval.

Very truly,

DONOVAN D. MCCARTY.

Copies to Hon. CHARLES VURSELL, Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.; Senator C. WAYLAND BROOKS, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

A GI's Questionnaire to the Army and Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 15, 1946

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, a GI in the Pacific, who signs his name, has propounded a questionnaire for the high-ranking officers of the Army and Navy. His name is withheld but can be obtained by application at my office.

JANUARY 8, 1946.

Hon. WILLIAM A. ROWAN,
Second Illinois Congressional District,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Listed below is an account of statements from various sources, compiled in the interest of presenting the facts of the War Department's highly confusing discharge system:

"Shipping limits discharges."—Patterson.

"Three months would suffice were all available shipping used to return 1,553,000 men. However, it will take 6 months."—Lieutenant General Collins.

"There is a surplus of shipping in the Pacific, and as a result, the Navy is retiring certain ships which had been used as transport vessels."—Navy officials.

"I know nothing of the Navy."—Patterson.

"No man will be held longer than absolutely necessary."—President Truman.

"Two-year men will be released by late winter."—General Marshall.

"I am unaware that this was the case."—Patterson.

"Voluntary enlistments and the draft have failed to supply enough replacements."—Lieutenant General Collins.

"Patterson was completely surprised to hear that discharge points have not been accumulated since VJ-day."—Stars and Stripes.

"It is not difficult to figure out the next point drop."—Patterson.

"Patterson said he could not divulge the amount of the next point drop because 'I don't want to steal the show from the men in Washington.'"—Stars and Stripes.

The above statements clearly point to one fact—that the War Department's discharge policy is to appease the civilian public while at the same time confounding and confusing the servicemen.

The confusion, bitterness, and disillusionment of the Janus-mouthed War Department cannot be tolerated any further. The time has arrived for an exposure of the Regular Army hierarchy who are engendering the greatest kidnap hoax ever foisted on the American public. They hold the remaining servicemen as pawns for their perpetuation: "Give us what we want and you will get your men."

The time has also arrived for action. It is now up to Congress to clear up this oligarchy. It is time for the American people and their elected representatives to bring the control of the Army back into their own hands instead of allowing a small clique of Regular Army men to control them. We have all seen and felt what such an Army clique can do and has done in European and South American countries and in Japan.

Your aid in this matter is wholeheartedly requested. It is time Congress decided military policy.

Yours sincerely.

Jose Rizal, Filipino Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1946

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a miracle in this age of materialism that neither time, nor change, nor war can destroy the national unity of peoples whose individual destinies are inseparably joined by the sacrificial courage of martyred patriots. France struggled from slavery to freedom during the late war as much under the spiritual leadership of Joan of Arc as under the leadership of General de Gaulle. The United States has again successfully defended its tradition of liberty for which Abraham Lincoln lived and died. The people of the Philippines look forward to freedom today, not only because of the superb ability of General MacArthur to command in combat, but because—wherever the dauntless Filipino guerrillas struck a blow for liberty—the undying soul of Jose Rizal led each column of ragged liberators.

Jose Rizal—like Joan of Arc and Lincoln—was a child of the people. He shared their simple joys. Their suffering was his suffering. His fearless pen told their story to men and women of all nations. He died before the firing squad on the Luneta, as Lincoln fell before the assassin's bullet in Washington—and as Joan of Arc slumped against the stake in the market place of Rouen—serene in the knowledge that he had led his people to the threshold of liberty.

By their own trials, by their own monumental sores, the Filipino people have been drawn closer to Jose Rizal. They can understand his eternal message to them today—after the black years of enemy occupation—better than they could have understood his great gift to them before the war. This inheritance from Jose Rizal, this jewel beyond all price which belongs to every Filipino, is: "Live not for yourself but live for your people."

All Filipinos are as one in their love for Jose Rizal. It is at once their responsibility and their honor to see to it that he has not lived and died in vain. On the anniversary of his martyrdom, it is the sacred duty of the Filipino people to do all within their power to read the life of reality into the words of the man they love—"Together: For freedom."

Mr. Speaker, before meeting his untimely and tragic death, Rizal wrote his famous "My Last Farewell." By permission of the House of Representatives, I include it as part of my remarks:

MY LAST FAREWELL

Farewell, dear Fatherland, clime of the sun caressed.
Pearl of the Orient seas, our Eden lost
Gladly now I go to give thee this faded life's best,
And were it brighter, fresher, or more blest,
Still would I give it thee, nor count the cost.

On the field of battle, 'mid the frenzy of fight,
Others have given their lives, without doubt or heed;
The place matter not—cypress or laurel or lily white,
Scaffold or open plain, combat or martyrdom's plight,
'Tis ever the same, to serve our home and country's need.

I die just when I see the dawn break,
Through the gloom of night, to herald the day;
And if color is lacking my blood thou shalt take,
Pour'd out at need for thy dear sake,
To dye with its crimson the waking ray.

My dreams, when life first opened to me,
My dreams, when the hopes of youth beat high,
Were to see thy lov'd face, O gem of the Orient sea,
From gloom and grief, from care and sorrow free;
No blush on thy brow, no fear in thine eye.

Dream of my life, my living and burning desire,
All hail! cries the soul that is now to take flight;
All hail! And sweet it is for thee to expire;
To die for thy sake, that thou mayst aspire;
And sleep in thy bosom eternity's long night.

If over my grave some day thou seest grow,
In the grassy sod, a humble flower,
Draw it to thy lips and kiss my soul so,
While I may feel on my brow in the cold tomb below
The touch of thy tenderness, thy breath's warm power.

Let the moon beam over me soft and serene,
Let the dawn shed over me its radiant flashes,
Let the wind with the sad lament over me keen;
And if on my cross a bird should be seen,
Let it trill there its hymn of peace to my ashes.

Let the sun draw the vapors up to the sky,
And heavenward in purity bear my tardy protest;
Let some kind soul o'er my untimely fate sigh,
And in the still evening a prayer be lifted on high
From thee, O my country, that in God I may rest.

Pray for all those that hapless have died,
For all who have suffered the unmeasur'd pain;
For our mothers that bitterly their woes have cried,
For widows and orphans, for captives by torture tried;
And then for thyself that redemption thou mayst gain.

And when the dark night wraps the graveyard around,
With only the dead in their vigil to see;
Break not thy repose or the mystery profound,
And perchance thou mayst hear a sad hymn resound;
'Tis I, O my country, raising a song unto thee.

When even my grave is remembered no more,
Unmark'd by never a cross nor a stone;
Let the plow sweep through it, the spade turn it o'er,
That my ashes may carpet thy earthly floor,
Before into nothingness at last they are blown.

Then will oblivion bring to me no care,
As over thy vales and plains I sweep;
Throbbing and cleansed in thy space and air,
With color and light, with song and lament I fare,
Ever repeating the faith that I keep.

My Fatherland ador'd, that sadness to my sorrow lends,
Beloved Filipinas, hear now my last good-by!
I give thee all: parents and kindred and friends;
For I go where no slave before the oppressor bends,
Where faith can never kill, and God reigns e'er on high!

Farewell to you all, from my soul torn away,
Friends of my childhood in the home dispossessed!
Give thanks that I rest from the wearisome day!
Farewell to thee, too, sweet friend that lightened my way;
Beloved creatures all, farewell! In death there is rest!

Five Million Trees Planted by Farmers and Youths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1946

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Wisconsin has always evidenced an interest in forestry. The wood products are looked upon as a crop. County and State appropriations have been made to promote the growing of trees. The paper mills have had tree-growing projects in operation for many years. Five of the six leading tree growing counties of the State are in the district I have the honor to represent.

The following news release from the Manawa Advocate shows the magnitude of this project in Wisconsin:

FIVE MILLION TREES PLANTED BY FARMERS AND YOUTHS

More than 5,000,000 trees were planted in Wisconsin the past year by farmers and rural youths. All of the trees were obtained from the State conservation commission.

Fred Trenk, State extension forester, reports that of 3,910,517 trees purchased by farmers, 2,870,252 were for general reforestation, with about 1,040,165 for shelter belts in central Wisconsin.

Youths planted 1,031,720 trees. Of these, 741,795 were by 4-H Club members and Future Farmers and 289,925 were for school forest plantings. Trees planted in community forests totaled 198,125.

In each of six counties farmers purchased and planted more than a quarter of a million trees. Of those counties, Marathon led with 381,165 trees, followed in order by Waushara, Portage, Wood, Sauk, and Waupaca Counties. Every county in the State was represented in this adult planting project.

Marathon County also led the list in number planted in school forests with 93,000 trees. It also led in the number planted on farms by rural school pupils, 4-H Club members, and Future Farmers. The plantings by these groups in the county totaled 64,000 trees.

Oneida was the second county in school forest planting with 50,000 trees; Wood County was third with 39,500 trees.

There are many pulp and paper mills located in the Seventh Congressional District, upon which a large portion of the economic life in certain communities is dependent. Many of the pay rolls are based upon the trees grown there.

St. Lawrence Frontier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1946

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from a recent issue of the Chicago Sun:

ST. LAWRENCE FRONTIER

Once more, early in the new year, Congress will have before it the proposal to build the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. The project would make an ocean port of Chicago. It would generate cheap power for New England and New York, thus increasing the productivity and purchasing power of markets for Chicago goods. Yet, strangely enough, the city's businessmen and political leaders have not distinguished themselves as sponsors of this great plan to develop unused natural resources.

The St. Lawrence is a bargain for the country. It is a special bargain for Chicago. It represents a major test of national attitudes toward economic development in general. Those who cling to the status quo, who fear that we have only a limited amount of prosperity to divide, who value established commercial patterns over fluidity and adventure, will oppose the project. But it will be strongly supported by all who understand the crime of letting natural resources go to waste; by all who see that more goods, more commerce, more productivity, will benefit all sections and all groups alike.

Chicago once had the pioneering spirit. It backed and bred the pathfinders who conquered half a continent. We need to recapture some of that spirit now for the conquest of new frontiers. The intensive development of resources, natural and human, presents as great a challenge as did the subjugation of the geographical frontier 100 years ago. The St. Lawrence seaway, like the Missouri Valley Authority, should have high priority on Chicago's list of civic goals.

Mistakes We Mustn't Repeat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1946

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, granted by the House of Representatives, I include an article written by my able colleague from Michigan, the Honorable ALBERT J. ENGEL. It was printed in the American Legion magazine of January 1946.

Congressman ENGEL is an honest, hard working, and conscientious Member of the House of Representatives. He is diligent, thorough, and efficient. The Nation is indebted to him for his individual effort to prevent waste, and the saving of a quarter billion dollars of taxpayers' money.

His article entitled "Mistakes We Mustn't Repeat" is a forceful and direct statement worth reading by every thoughtful American.

FOREWORD

ONE-MAN INVESTIGATION

Representative ALBERT J. ENGEL is probably the best-qualified Member of Congress to speak up on the subject of mistakes we mustn't repeat. Legionnaire ENGEL (Merrit Lamb Post, Muskegon, Mich.) decided early in 1941 that our Government was spending entirely too much money in its camp-construction program—a feeling shared by many another American at the time. Unlike the rest of us, however, Congressman ENGEL was in a position to do something about it. He did. Long before Pearl Harbor he climbed into his aging automobile and began a one-man inspection tour of cantonment construction projects. His findings resulted in a complete revision of the War Department's contract and construction program. The entire investigation cost exactly $238.17; it saved the Government an estimated $250,000,000.

We're glad to have you with us, Congressman ENGEL.

MISTAKES WE MUSTN'T REPEAT

(By Representative ALBERT J. ENGEL, Ninth Michigan District)

The United States must never again permit a false sense of world idealism or an unwarranted trust in our fancied geographical isolation to lure us into the state of military unpreparedness which Gen. George C. Marshall described and deplored in all his post mortems of the recent global struggle. His findings warn that we must keep in mind the obvious and also the little known factors which allowed Germany and Japan to deliver an almost fatal blow at the democracies in the early years of the 1939-45 conflict. That tragedy demonstrates that everybody—the administration in power at Washington, the Congress, and the people—must unite to prevent another lowering of our guard like that which occurred between World War I and World War II.

It may seem idle to try to assess the blame for the slow, steady deterioration of our national defenses during that period. In a sense, it was everybody's fault and nobody's fault. But as a legislator whose specific duties charge him with keeping in constant touch with the men who frame and finance our national defense policy, I do question the suggestion that the American public alone was responsible for the deplorable condition of our military establishment at the time of Pearl Harbor. The basic reasons for our unawareness and unpreparedness lie deeper, although, fortunately for us, they can easily be remedied in the future by a few simple reforms.

I am confident that if the American people and the Congress had been kept informed by their leaders of 1919-39 concerning international developments which jeopardized our very existence, they would have responded so heroically that Hitler and Tojo would never have dared to molest us. Our people would have supported proposals for an army, navy, and air force so powerful that Uncle Sam would have been an invulnerable and dangerous customer. I am certain that the American people will not make the same mistake again, provided they are given the raw facts by responsible officials.

Let me make clear at the outset that I blame no particular administration for our defense delinquencies in the years before Pearl Harbor. Every regime of recent years must assume some responsibility for the gradual break-down in our willingness and ability to fight on behalf of our national honor and safety.

It is true, and also to our credit, that our weakness on the land, on the water, in the air, in the factories which manufacture weapons, and in the scientific laboratories which produce atomic bombs and jet planes, derived from the fact that we are a peace-loving nation. In 1922, in 1930, and again in 1933, Presidents Harding, Hoover, and Roosevelt paced the world in seeking a reduction of armaments. In retrospect, however, we placed too great a faith in promises and pacts which their makers never intended to keep. As late as September of 1937 the late President Roosevelt dedicated Bonneville Dam with these words:

"As I look at Bonneville Dam today I cannot help the thought that, instead of spending, as some nations do, half their national income in piling up armaments for purposes of war, we in America are wiser in using our wealth in projects like this which will give us more wealth, better living, and greater happiness for our children."

The American people approved this lofty sentiment as they endorsed all other attempts to lift the unbearable burden of armament costs from the backs of humanity. In looking back, however, especially in view of the concurrent rise of dictatorships to the east and west, it might have been good insurance to invest a few billions in battleships, planes, tanks, artillery, and a trained personnel. In those old-fashioned, preatomic days we permitted our idealism and our reliance on oceanic protection to lull us into an Alice-in-Wonderland spirit of security. We must not do it again.

Only a few simple steps are necessary to keep the United States so strong that no nation, even allowing for the atomic revolution of all concepts of warfare, will dare to engage us in battle, and if this country preserves and uses its might effectively and wisely it can be a force that will prevent, or, if not prevent, then localize, all future disputes. Indeed, it is not too much to suggest that Washington, depending upon the military and diplomatic program it adopts, holds the world's fate in its hands.

As a first step, the officials at Washington must take the public into their confidence with respect to changing or deteriorating international relationships, the prospects of conflict, and the state of our Military Establishment at all times. Utter frankness must replace hush-hush diplomacy and the secret assumption of responsibilities likely to involve us in war. No considerations of domestic or foreign politics must be invoked to withhold from the people any pertinent information affecting such grave questions as war and peace.

In short, we must know what areas and policies we propose to defend and uphold, and also what force we have on hand or need for these purposes. This is not a fantastic recommendation for the simple reason that members of our committee, who are charged with appropriating funds for the Army and the Army Air Force, have frequently been kept in the dark concerning these vital matters.

Secondly, the men actually charged with heading our Army, Navy, and Air Forces must be allowed to tell their real defense needs to congressional committees more frankly than they have been in the past.

Let me illustrate what I mean from personal experience on Capitol Hill:

All through the years of turmoil between World War I and World War II, when we succumbed to unwarranted waves of economy, idealism, and depression, successive Chiefs of Staff constantly deplored the unsatisfactory state of our fighting forces in their reports to the Secretary of War. In 1933 Gen. Douglas MacArthur said: "The Army strength in personnel and material and its readiness for war is below the danger line." Six years later, after Hitler's attack on Poland, General Marshall confessed: "The Army is probably less than 25 percent ready for immediate conflict."

Strange as it may seem, Generals MacArthur and Marshall were not permitted to voice these same fears before congressional committees as a basis for larger appropriations, and the same holds true for spokesmen of the Navy and the Air Forces. Once the Budget Bureau, an executive agency, has passed upon—and pared—their requests for funds, the military authorities cannot ask for more appropriations than the budgeteers have granted.

On February 21, 1939, General Marshall, while appearing before the Senate Military Affairs Committee, described the operation and effect of this sort of muzzling. When former Senator Logan, of West Virginia, pointed out that "Army officers had never made a fight before the committee for larger appropriations to do those things which should have been done," the Chief of Staff replied:

"May I answer that by saying that these representations have been made in the printed reports of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Staff. But when it comes to appearing before the committee, we are confined to the total amount authorized by the Bureau of the Budget. We have to make our fight there before we come here."

Because of this policy of censorship and secrecy, we legislated in darkness and ignorance in the very years when the dictators were arming for an attack on the democracies.

From 1934 to 1940, inclusive, the War Department submitted budget requests totaling $3,383,752,985 with the expectation that they would be forwarded to our committee. But the Budget Bureau reduced the military experts' total to $3,084,316,144, or a cut of approximately $300,000,000. If the figures for the 1941 fiscal year are included in this summary, the amount which the Budget Bureau took from the War Department's estimate of its need reached the amazing total of $833,927,456. Over this same period our committee and Congress restored the sum of $352,588,695. It is pertinent to mention that these reductions were made during the years when Hitler, Mussolini, and Japan began to run amuck.

It was not until June of 1944 that I was able to obtain data showing how the War Department's original requests for money had been reduced by the Budget Bureau. Then, of course, the question had only historical interest.

These reductions constituted a definite handicap to the expansion and modernization of our armed forces. The primary charges against the Army's budget consists of money for pay, food, clothing, supplies, transportation, etc., and those items ate up almost every dollar appropriated during those years. Thus, the extra amounts that were disallowed would have financed experimental construction of Garands, artillery, tanks, armored vehicles, planes, and other weapons. Instead, the Army had to live on a hand-to-mouth basis, as successive Chiefs of Staff reported.

Our committee and Congress, even though we did exceed the Budget Bureau's allocations, would have been far more generous save for the fact, as I have explained, that we were never allowed to know the amounts which the War Department had asked in the first instance. For the same reason the American people had no conception of the need for larger appropriations for defense, even though these might have necessitated higher taxes.

In view of the role which air superiority played in the defeat of the Axis, another example of the effect of withholding the facts from Congress and the people is pertinent. It involves the failure to recognize and act upon trustworthy reports of Nazi Germany's growing strength in the skies. The report came from Maj. (now Col.) Truman Smith, who was our military attaché at Berlin. On the basis of his surveys of Hermann Goering's accomplishments, he submitted a sensational memorandum to the War Department on November 1, 1937.

It consisted of 6 pages of written comment and 28 pages of maps and tabulations on German air strength and production capacity. He gave the names and sites of 23 factories, and estimated their potential annual output at 6,000 planes. He placed their November 1937 strength at 1,500 first-class planes, 600 in reserve and an unknown number in depots. Emphasizing that these were conservative estimates, he added:

"Germany is once more a world power in the air. Her air force and air industry have emerged from the kindergarten stage. Full manhood will be reached within 3 years. * * * In November 1937, it appears that the development of German air power is a European phenomenon of the first diplomatic importance."

Major Smith predicted that Germany would gain "air technical parity with the United States in 1941 or 1942," thus indicating the date when Hitler might be ready to make war. He added that if this country slowed down on development (industrial, not governmental), "German air superiority will be realized still sooner."

That truly alarming report was pigeonholed; it was not submitted to any congressional committee. It was not until the fall of 1942 that I was able to obtain a copy after persistent efforts. However, in the spring of 1939, Gen. Henry H. Arnold, Chief of the Army Air Forces, introduced Col. Charles A. Lindbergh to our committee. He testified for 2 hours on his inspection of Germany's air establishment and industry, confirming Major Smith's report in every detail. But only two pages of the Lindbergh testimony were allowed to be printed for public consumption.

Meanwhile, for lack of this data, Congress continued to base appropriations for the Army Air Force on the old Baker report, which provided for a total of 2,500 planes. Since the life of a plane was then estimated at 5 years, our annual quota of new machines was only 500. As a result, we had less than 1,000 first-line planes when France surrendered. It was not until after this catastrophe and the Dunkerque evacuation—3 years after the warning from our military attaché in Berlin—that the required expansion and modernization of our Air Force was authorized.

The third essential military reform which recent history should have impressed upon us, supplementing the need for a substitution of frankness instead of secrecy on these life-and-death subjects, is the permanent maintenance of a balanced and impregnable Army, Navy, and Air Force, together with constant research and experimentation on new weapons in our factories and laboratories. Whether we need universal military training or a comparable system is a question which the White House, the Congress and the military experts should decide on the basis of developing conditions throughout the world. However, if we take heed from the lessons we learned between World Wars I and II, there need never be another Pearl Harbor.

The Return to the Poultry Producers Is Not Causing Any High Consumer Cost of Fowl

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1946

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following advertisement is similar to the many which have been appearing in the newspapers of central Wisconsin. It plainly shows what the producer obtains for his chickens:

LIVE POULTRY WANTED

	Cents
Light fowl	17
Heavy fowl	20
Leghorn springers	18
Heavy springers	23

We don't buy No. 2 chickens.

Questions which are brought to mind by this advertisement are:

First. Do you realize that these prices are getting pretty close to, if they are not below, the floor price of 90 percent of parity guaranteed by the Steagall amendment?

Second. Do you believe the producer of this splendid food is obtaining too much per hour in producing the fowl at the above prices?

Third. Do you wish to take the position that the producer is responsible if you pay more than you wish for chicken at the market place?

Fourth. Can you think of any legitimate or legal reason why the Quartermaster General of the Army should be paying 38-plus cents per pound for plucked chickens at points South when they can be purchased in the Midwest as

cheaply as the above advertisement indicates?

Fifth. Do you know of any rational person who believes the sale of fowl by a producer to any one purchaser should be limited to five birds? The OPA say this should be done.

Sixth. Is there any reason to keep a price ceiling on these birds, when they are selling at below cost and practically at or below the 90-percent parity support floor?

Seventh. Do you know why these poultrymen have been and are subjected to such agency treatment when other farm products, even though there is a surplus of the commodity, are purchased at 130 percent of parity? Why?

That is where agricultural politics enters into the picture.

The ways of the New Deal are confusing and the longer they operate the more confused and frustrated they become.

Presentation of a Silver Plaque to the Battleship "Missouri"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1946

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an excerpt from the Lead Belt News, Flat River, Mo., for Friday, January 11, 1946, together with the text of the address of Gov. Phil M. Donnelly, of Missouri, and text of the address of Capt. R. H. Hillenkoetter, commanding officer of the battleship *Missouri*, given on the occasion of the presentation of a silver plaque to the battleship *Missouri* by the officers and men of the St. Joseph Lead Co., Sunday afternoon, January 6, 1946:

[From the Lead Belt News, Flat River, Mo., of January 11, 1946]

ABOUT 5,000 PEOPLE WITNESS PLAQUE PRESENTATION ON SUNDAY AFTERNOON

An estimated 5,000 people crowded onto the area of the old Young Men's Christian Association Building in Flat River, Sunday afternoon, as the $2,000 silver replica of the great seal of the State of Missouri was accepted by Captain Hillenkoetter, commanding officer of the U. S. S. *Missouri*, from Gov. Phil M. Donnelly.

The ceremony, widely publicized in metropolitan newspapers, was attended by several State officials and naval officers and their families, officers and enlisted men of the battleship, and officials of the St. Joseph Lead Co., whose employees conceived the idea and were donors of the 22-inch plaque made of native Missouri silver.

President Clinton H. Crane, of the lead company, presided and introduced Senator FORREST C. DONNELL, Representative A. S. J. CARNAHAN, of this district, Paul Manship, the designer of the plaque, and the officers and men of the *Missouri*.

Before a crowd that was anticipating the biggest day the Lead Belt has seen for some time and started lining Main Street before noon—2 hours before the presentation—President Crane introduced Governor Donnelly, who spoke in behalf of the State, this section, and the St. Joseph Lead Co. and its employees. The audience was representative of this entire area—people coming from Flat River, Esther, Elvins, Rivermines, Desloge, Leadwood, Frankclay, Farmington, Bonne Terre, Bismarck, Fredericktown, and several from St. Louis, in addition to many from rural areas here, to see the notables and witness the presentation.

Governor Donnelly, citing the record of the U. S. S. *Missouri* as paralleling that of America in its invincibility, said that even though the battleship upon which the Japanese surrendered in Tokyo Bay on September 2 was named after our State, the battleship and its record should not be accepted as a matter of fact, but treated as an honor bestowed upon the State by "the greatest Navy in the world."

Capt. R. H. Hillenkoetter, commanding officer of the battleship since November, accepted the plaque as the crowd cheered and five scout planes from the battleship itself roared overhead.

In response to the plaudits of the crowd as he and the governor posed with the plaque for pictures by St. Louis and local photographers and a Paramount Newsreel cameraman, Captain Hillenkoetter spoke briefly on the accomplishments of the *Missouri*.

He said that "although the youngest of our battleships, the war log of the *Missouri* shows participation in the operations against Iwo Jima and Okinawa and numerous bombardments of the main islands of Japan as well as accompanying carrier strikes against various portions of the Japanese empire."

The 45,000-ton dreadnought, which became the pride of the famous Third Fleet, is anchored at New York from where the personnel who attended the ceremony came Saturday, arriving in Bonne Terre in time for a dinner given by the company.

As President Crane introduced the beribboned officers and men who were members of the ship's crew since it was commissioned, the crowd roared its approval as Eugene C. Rudy, Flat River shipfitter on the vessel, stood on his chair so that he could be seen throughout the crowd, and saluted his fellow townsmen.

Also invited were President Harry S. Truman and Senator FRANK P. BRIGGS, who were unable to attend. Messages from the President and Navy Secretary James V. Forrestal were read by Crane.

The plaque was set beside the speaker's stand as the Flat River High School band and the crowd assembled. Accompanied by several members of the State Highway Patrol, Governor Donnelly and two other cars of his party drove up at 2 o'clock and was seated with State officials and their families on the left side of the speaker's stand. To its right the Navy men sat. Behind them the heads of the divisions and other representatives of the company stood.

The speeches, amplified by a public address system and recorded by a sound system for rebroadcast, were interrupted several times as the Navy planes "buzzed" the crowd and went over in formation, drowning out the speakers.

The plaque was displayed after the ceremony and for a half hour it was almost impossible to get near enough to see the beautiful casting mounted on teakwood. On Monday and Tuesday it was displayed at the city hall in St. Louis and then taken to the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York.

It will adorn the ship's wardroom as a permanent emblem after a period of display.

[From the Lead Belt News, Flat River, Mo., of January 11, 1946]

TEXT OF GOVERNOR DONNELLY'S SPEECH

Mr. Crane, Captain Hillenkoetter, officers of the Missouri, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, we meet here today on an historic occasion to take part in a ceremony of great interest to all the people of our State. We honor the Navy today and a great battleship of that Navy, and in doing this we pay tribute to those who wore the uniform of their country in the greatest of all wars; to those who fought heroically that we might live as a free people.

To the United States Navy the people of Missouri join with me in expressing the most profound admiration. In the Atlantic and in the Pacific, on all the seven seas, the Navy conquered. Without the Navy there would have been no victory in Europe or in Asia and no surrender ceremony in Tokyo Bay. In all the annals of sea warfare there is no more inspiring chapter than the story of the United States Navy in World War II. In all the pages of history there is no more fascinating account of the exploits of those who go down to the sea in ships.

In this great war, which came to an end in Tokyo Bay a few short months ago, thousands of the gallant youth of Missouri donned the Navy blue. From our homes there came forth a host of young men and women ready and eager to wear that proud uniform of their country. Throughout the world, wherever the Stars and Stripes were carried, the youth of Missouri were in the vanguard, battling shoulder to shoulder with their comrades. We honor them, in a very special way, in this ceremony. And to those who gave their all, to those who paid the supreme sacrifice, we express our eternal gratitude. To the loved ones of those who nobly lost their lives in the service of their country we extend our loving sympathy. We join our prayers wtih theirs. Missouri will never forget its war dead.

In that mightiest of navies, the greatest the world has ever seen, there was one great ship that stood out from all the rest. One of a group of giant craft, the largest of their kind, the greatest of an armada of great ships, that one was the latest and the best. That mighty craft was the magnificent *Missouri*, queen of all the navies of the world. The story of this superb, ultramodern streamlined battleship is the story of America, invincible in its power. And in the career of this great ship—this giant of the sea—can be found convincing evidence of the hand of destiny; a destiny which reached its climax in the drama that brought to a close the greatest of wars. The very construction of that vessel is representative of the stupendous power of this Union of States, this Nation of ours. The fact that this Nation could build such craft is indicative of the strength and virility of America. Completed in time for action in the Pacific, the *Missouri* played its full part in carrying the bold fight to the enemy. In every engagement, and in every encounter in which this craft was called upon for action, the result was successful and a harbinger of that greater victory that was to come. At Iwo Jima, off the Kyushus, at Okinawa, off the island of Hokkaido, and finally in the waters of the Japanese homeland itself, in the great industrial area of Hitachi, only 60 miles from Tokyo, the great guns of the *Missouri* helped to blast the road to victory. And finally, as a magnificent climax to the career of a magnificent fleet, the mighty *Missouri*, fighting flagship of Admiral Halsey, commander of the Third Fleet, rested at anchor in Tokyo Bay. And on her decks the once proud Japanese, now humble and beaten, signed the terms of surrender. Upon the deck of the battleship named for our own beloved State, on that second day of September 1945 was written a glorious ending to the greatest struggle for freedom mankind has ever waged. History reveals no more significant event in all the years of the past.

And so we are met here today in order that a fitting tribute may be paid by Missouri and Missourians to the Navy and to

the battleship *Missouri*. As you have been informed, a silver plaque, made in replica of the great seal of the State of Missouri, will be presented to the U. S. S. *Missouri*. Fittingly, indeed, this silver shield, which bears the seal of our proud State, was made from Missouri silver produced from ores that were taken from the mines of southeast Missouri. In this presentation, and in the casting of this shield, citizens of our State, the workers in the mines, in the mills, and in the smelters, and those who work with and guide the destinies of the great mining company which is sponsoring this event, pay a worthy tribute and one in which we can all join. In doing this, these citizens of ours, in a larger sense represent all the workers of Missouri, all those thousands on the production front who paved the way for the victory of our armed forces. The production front, as you are well aware, laid the foundation for the triumph of America in this war. In that superb production effort Missourians did their full part. Their untiring, patriotic efforts, carried on with unswerving devotion and zeal, helped to produce the materials and the weapons of war in prodigious quantities. Missouri is proud of them, as it is proud of our men and women who were on the fighting fronts all over the world and on the seven seas. It is most appropriate that they should now make this gesture, and speaking through you should make this permanent contribution, in the form of this historic silver shield, to the wartime records of our country.

It is also most appropriate that this token of our appreciation should be made of a Missouri mineral, one of an immense variety of Missouri products. The very fact that silver is mined in Missouri indicates most eloquently the richness and the diversified nature of this State of ours. Since 1879 more than $3,000,000 worth of silver has been mined in this State. It should be more widely known that for centuries men have sought for silver in this area and that more than 200 years ago lead was mined in this section, which was to become a part of the State of Missouri. In the years that have followed Missouri has become one of the great mineral-producing States of the Union. While the total amount of silver production has been relatively small, this district has long been the greatest producer of lead. During the recent war period this section of our State supplied more than 30 percent of all the lead mined in the Nation. The total value of lead produced by the mines of southeast Missouri exceeds the huge sum of $850,000,000. In addition to the new wealth created by these mines, some 3,800 persons have been employed by the mines, mills, and smelters of the St. Joseph Lead Co. and its subsidiary companies in southeast Missouri. And the mining industry centering in this area is the principal means of support for more than 25,000 people. The lead-meaning industry of Missouri has had a long and honorable record, and there should be many more years of useful production. You who are engaged in mining will be interested to know that at the present time steps are being taken to locate new ore reserves in order that the lead-mining industry of our State may continue in its role of a leading producer among the States of this Nation. A complete review of the records in the offices of the geological survey of the State of Missouri is now being made, in an attempt to obtain a description of every reported and known occurrence of lead in Missouri. It is hoped that this survey may reveal properties and prospects which will justify further drilling in Missouri.

And so, in this ceremony, the workers of a great industry in a great diversified State join with me in the presentation of this plaque. We appreciate the significance of today's events, and we feel an humble pride that we can take part in this ceremony. A distinguished writer, a former Missourian, in describing the storm of welcome that was accorded the *Missouri*, upon its arrival in New York Harbor after the war, said that it would have been the same had that mightiest of craft been named for any other State. We in Missouri realize this. We know that the *Missouri* is a symbol of the might of our entire beloved country, and yet we will never forget that it bears the name of our State. May we always be worthy of that great honor. Our people for generations to come will take note of it and will be proud, as we are today, that of all the States of the Union, Missouri should give its name to this great symbol of America.

But we should be derelict, indeed, to all our deeper feelings and emotions if we did not recognize an even greater significance in these events. With the final surrender of the Japanese, the greatest of all wars was brought to a victorious close. The free nations of the world have conquered. Those who feared for the liberties of mankind can put aside that dread, and can turn their thoughts to the ways and the problems of peace. Let us be equal to those days and those problems. Let us anticipate the future, and our hearts and minds resolve to act with the same high courage and the same noble ideals with which our fighting men and women gave their services to their country. Let us give of ourselves to that nobler future for which the world is waiting.

In that spirit, may this plaque, made from Missouri silver, reflect in its sterling character, its intrinsic quality, its purity and its beauty, the finer attributes of this great land of ours. Upon the great seal of the State of Missouri, appearing on this shield, are engraved the words "United We Stand, Divided We Fall." There is also engraved upon it the State motto, in Latin, which translated reads: "The Welfare of the People Shall Be the Supreme Law." We commend these thoughts to the people of our Nation, to the officers and men of the battleship *Missouri*, and to posterity. They represent our deepest feelings toward our country, toward the people of our own State, and toward the people of the United States of America. This plaque is a worthy symbol of the best that we have to offer to our country.

On behalf of the officials and employees of this great mining company, St. Joseph Lead Co., on behalf of the people of this productive mining district, on behalf of all the people of the State of Missouri, I have the honor and the privilege, Captain Hillenkoetter, of presenting this plaque to you as the commanding officer of the U. S. S. *Missouri*.

TEXT OF CAPT. R. H. HILLENKOETTER'S ADDRESS

In accepting this silver replica of the great seal of the State of Missouri, I do so not only for myself and these representatives of the U. S. S. *Missouri* here with me, nor for the remainder of the ship's personnel not here, but for all these, and in addition, in behalf of all those who have served aboard and for all those whose efforts and skills went into making the *Missouri* what she is. The men who provided the material for her, among them undoubtedly many of you, and those who built her are, though impossible to identify individually, just as much a part of the ship as those who man her.

When the *Missouri* started for the Pacific after her commissioning she carried literally the hearts and hopes of her builders. The yard workmen who built her contributed 10,000 pints of their blood to inaugurate a blood bank for the ship. Their keen and unflagging interest accompanied the ship throughout all of its service in the Pacific.

Although the youngest of our battleships, the war log of the *Missouri* shows participation in the operations against Iwo Jima and Okinawa, and numerous bombardments of the main islands of Japan as well as accompanying carrier strikes against various portions of the Japanese Empire. These actions culminated in the signing of the formal surrender document on September 2 in Tokyo Bay. Our access to the Japanese homeland gave opportunities for securing reliable information as to conditions there, both by our observation and by conversation with Japanese officials who no longer had the incentive to deceive either their enemies or their own people. It was at once apparent that while the damage to their cities and production centers by strategic bombing was fully as great as photographic reconnaissance had indicated, the strangulation from our less-obvious but relentlessly effective surface and submarine blockade and from our carrier-based air attacks had been a decisive factor in the enemy's collapse. Their food situation was critical and their remaining resources in fuel and in all strategic materials were not less so.

Never before in the history of war has there been a more convincing example of the effectiveness of seapower than when a well-armed, highly efficient, and undefeated army of over a million men surrendered their homeland unconditionally to the invader without even token resistance.

True, the devastation already wrought by past bombings, as well as the terrible demonstration of power of the atomic bombs, augured nothing less for the Japanese than total extinction; yet without sea power there would have been no Saipan, Iwo Jima, and Okinawa from which to launch these bombings. True, the Japanese homeland might have been taken by assault in one final amphibious operation of tremendous magnitude, yet without sea power such an assault could not have been attempted.

Sea power is not a limited term. It includes many weapons and techniques. Sea power means more than the combatant ships and aircraft, the amphibious forces, and the merchant marine. It includes also the port facilities of New York and California; the bases in Guam and Honolulu; the factories which are the capital plant of war; and the farms and the mines of Missouri and Illinois and all the other States which are the producers of supplies. All these are elements of sea power.

Dependent upon imported food and raw materials, and relying on sea transport to supply her armies at home and abroad, Japan lost the war because she lost command of the sea.

Now that the peace has been attained, we hope that the wish so eloquently expressed by President Truman at the launching of the *Missouri* will be fulfilled. Mr. Truman said, "May the battleship Missouri and the other ships of the Navy do their full share on behalf of the people of the United States to maintain the peace which will follow our total victory." We shall do our best to carry out this hope with the reservation that battleships do not make for either war or peace. War and peace come from the minds and hearts of men.

Governor Donnelly, it is with great pride that I receive from you this plaque, a replica of the great seal of the State of Missouri, and on behalf of the officers and men of the U. S. S. *Missouri* I express our sincere appreciation and gratitude to all those connected with the St. Joseph Lead Co., to all those who conceived the idea, to all those who mined and refined the silver, to all those who contributed to its cost, and last, but certainly not least, to Mr. Paul Manship who brought the idea to such perfect fruition.

The Governor of Ohio Speaks to the Governor of Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 16, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, it has been a long time since the Governor of North Carolina said to the Governor of South Carolina certain pertinent things. You know what they were. From the standpoint of historical importance the letter which the Governor of Ohio, the Honorable Frank J. Lausche, wrote to His Honor the Honorable Jimmie H. Davis, the Governor of Louisiana, is of tremendous importance. While this letter was written November 28, 1945, the holiday pressure must have denied it the publicity to which it was justly entitled. Whenever we get a man in public life who dares to take a stand against the selfish interests that are blocking the development of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, I feel that he is entitled to recognition and thanks on the part of the advocates of the seaway.

Back in December 1945 I discussed this project and suggested the names of some prominent Presidential possibilities who either had declared themselves for it or were being urged to do so. I was led to do that because of reports that President Truman had a new Presidential yacht and other prominent people were interested in it. This was back on December 17, 1945, and my extension of remarks will be found in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A5602. I want to assure the Governor of Ohio that my omission of him as deserving honorable mention in the Presidential Yacht Club was entirely unintentional and very unfortunate. His letter to the Governor of Louisiana had not been called to my attention when I prepared my speech for December 17, 1945. I hope there will be no hard feelings on his part by reason of this omission. It is never too late to correct an error, and for that reason I am submitting herewith copy of his letter to the Governor of Louisiana, which needs no eulogistic remarks on my part. This letter speaks for itself. It reads as follows:

GOVERNOR LAUSCHE OF OHIO WRITES GOVERNOR DAVIS OF LOUISIANA ABOUT THE SEAWAY

NOVEMBER 28, 1945.

Hon. JIMMIE H. DAVIS,
Governor of Louisiana,
Office of the Governor,
Baton Rouge, La.

DEAR GOVERNOR DAVIS: I received your letter written in respect to the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes seaway. I note your view that this project ought not to be built.

My own view is that in the end any course that will develop a greater productive power of the Nation at a reduced cost will inure to the benefit of all people living within the Nation.

There are many projects being contemplated for irrigation, power, navigation, and water-supply purposes. In the Northwest, where great progress has been made through the construction of the Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams, additional water impoundments are contemplated. Other areas in the Nation are studying and contemplating similar projects. These projects on the surface would seem to prejudicially affect those communities that are not immediately benefited by them. But it is my belief that in the course of time, wealth-producing projects will be built wherever they are feasible and the people as a whole will profit because of their construction.

If the cost of producing goods that are manufactured on the Great Lakes can be reduced, our ability to sell to the world will be improved. The more we, or other areas of our Nation, sell, the greater will be the gains that are made by the Nation as a whole in improving the economy and living conditions of all its people.

I am firmly of the belief that the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes seaway ought to be built. Economically the country is wasting a rich resource by delaying the project.

From the foregoing it is obvious that my views make it impossible for me to join with you in the course that you feel is the advisable one to follow.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK J. LAUSCHE,
Governor.

The foregoing letter, Mr. Speaker, is short but to the point. As I have indicated before, it is a clear indication of the fact that the great State of Ohio, which is rich in tradition, patriotism, and citizenship, is still in the forefront and ready to fight for constructive and worthwhile things for the people of the Republic of the United States.

Representative Manasco Assists Amvets in McLean Housing Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LUTHER PATRICK
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 16, 1946

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker. I obtained this time for the purpose of placing in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by the national legislative director of the Amvets regarding House Joint Resolution 297 introduced by the Honorable CARTER MANASCO.

The statement is this:

REPRESENTATIVE MANASCO ASSISTS AMVETS IN M'LEAN HOUSING PROJECT

(By J. H. Leib, national legislative director, Amvets)

Representative MANASCO, of Alabama, on January 14, 1946, introduced House Joint Resolution 297, which asks for a clarification of the Surplus Property Act in regard to the sale of defense housing for veterans.

Everyone familiar with the administration of the Surplus Property Act knows that it has never functioned to the benefit of the veteran. Particularly, the act as it is now being interpreted by Government officials is working to the veteran's disadvantage. Amvets have founded a mutual housing corporation, and are endeavoring to purchase McLean Gardens, in Washington, D. C., and are running into all kinds of difficulty because the terms of the purchase are such that the highest dollar bids are only being considered.

Obviously, such an interpretation of the act definitely works to the disadvantage of the veterans, for once having occupied the housing project, they must go through with their bid, whereas the speculative purchaser may leave the Government holding the bag, after making an initial profit on the venture.

The Defense Homes Corporation recently stated that the Surplus Property Board has required the acceptance of the highest figure bid which ignores the greater security to the Government by ownership of the project by several hundred veterans as well as the veterans presumed preferential right to purchase surplus housing. Any contention that the Surplus Property Act requires acceptance of such figures utterly disregards the rights of the veteran.

That is why the Manasco resolution has been introduced.

Attached herewith are a number of newspaper clippings that appeared in Washington newspapers and a copy of the mentioned resolution:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of January 15, 1945]

MANASCO BILL WOULD PROTECT VET PRIORITY IN HOUSING SALES

The American veterans of World War II got an ally on Capitol Hill yesterday in their fight to purchase McLean Gardens when Representative MANASCO (Democrat), of Alabama, introduced legislation which would delay sale of the property.

The measure, written as a joint resolution, would prevent the conveyance of permanent surplus housing to any private individual pending congressional consideration of the "priorities which should be accorded veterans" and associations of veterans.

MANASCO, chairman of the Executive Expenditures Committee, which wrote the surplus Property Act, said the legislation would be considered by the group "as soon as we can get around to it." Meanwhile, he added, he doubted if the Federal Housing Agency would take any further disposal action.

The Amvets, cheered by news of the new legislation which they hoped would give them time for formulation of complete financing plans, will meet tonight at 8 in the Interior Department Auditorium to continue discussions.

[From the Washington Post of January 15, 1945]

VETERANS PLAN M'LEAN OFFER

The Amvet-sponsored Veterans Cooperative Housing Association will meet to draw up detailed terms of its bid for McLean Gardens at 8 p. m. today in the new Interior Department Auditorium.

A Defense Housing Corporation spokesman said the Amvet offer was too "general" for the board to consider. DHC action was withheld on the bids until Amvets could complete the information.

"I don't know how much more definite we can be in our offer," Ray Sawyer, Amvet commander, declared last night.

"We have offered to pay a price fixed by a Government and an Amvet appraiser, or by a mutual appraiser if the two do not agree, with 10 percent of the purchase price as a down payment."

Ninety-nine bids were received by DHC, of which 58 were rejected as being too low. Forty-nine are under consideration.

A joint resolution which would give individual veterans and cooperative associations of veterans priorities in purchasing surplus permanent housing was introduced in the House yesterday by Representative CARTER MANASCO (Democrat), of Alabama. Senate introduction is expected today.

House Joint Resolution 297

Joint resolution clarifying the Surplus Property Act in regard to sale of defense housing for veterans

Whereas the regulations of the Surplus Property Administrator governing the sale of defense housing are being construed to permit the sale of such property and its use

by others than returning veterans of this war; and

Whereas no loss of housing or of the funds of the United States of America will be incurred if such surplus defense housing is withheld from private sale pending clarification of the Surplus Property Act: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That no surplus housing of a permanent character shall be sold or conveyed to private interests pending consideration by Congress of the priorities which should be accorded individual returning veterans and cooperative associations of veterans for the purchase and use of such housing.

Text of Complaint Issued by National Labor Relations Board Against General Motors Corp.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1946

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD the text of the complaint issued by the National Labor Relations Board against the General Motors Corp., alleging that the corporation has at all times since August 18, 1945, "failed and refused and now fails and refuses to bargain in good faith with the union"—the UAW-CIO.

The complaint charges that the corporation, "though meeting with the union on numerous occasions since August 18, 1945, in pretended or purported bargaining has engaged at all times since said date in a course of conduct calculated to and having the effect of frustrating and avoiding bona fide bargaining on the union's proposals."

This complaint, issued January 13, 1946, was made in response to, and after investigation of, the UAW-CIO's complaints of November 8 and November 27, the texts of which I inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD January 14, at page A6. The first hearing on the NLRB complaint has been set for Monday, January 28, in the city of Detroit.

The complete text of the complaint follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, BEFORE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD, SEVENTH REGION—IN THE MATTER OF GENERAL MOTORS CORP. AND INTERNATIONAL UNION, UNITED AUTOMOBILE, AIRCRAFT, AND AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKERS OF AMERICA, UAW-CIO, CASE NO. 7-C-1496

COMPLAINT

It having been charged by International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, (UAW-CIO), hereinafter called the Union, that General Motors Corp., hereinafter called respondent, has engaged in and is engaging in certain unfair labor practices affecting commerce as set forth and defined in the National Labor Relations Act, 49 Stat. 449, herein called the act; the National Labor Relations Board, herein called the Board, by its regional director for the seventh region, as agent of the Board, designated by National Labor Relations Board rules and regulations, series 3, as amended, hereby issues its complaint and alleges as follows:

1. Respondent is a Delaware corporation, having its principal offices in the city of New York and in Detroit, Mich. Respondent is the largest manufacturer of automobiles and trucks in the United States. In 1941 respondent manufactured more than 1,800,000 passenger-type automobiles. During the war respondent's manufacturing facilities were principally devoted to the manufacture of many and varied items of ordnance, munitions, and military vehicles for the armed forces of the United States. Respondent is now, and at all times mentioned herein was, engaged in the manufacture and assembly of automobiles, parts and accessories thereof, Diesel engines and aircraft motors, and in converting many of its plants from the manufacture of ordnance and military vehicles to the manufacture of the said automotive products. Respondent maintains and operates manufacturing and assembly plants in many States of the United States, including California, Connecticut, Georgia, Indiana, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Tennessee, and Wisconsin.

2. A substantial proportion of the raw materials, exceeding 25 percent in value at practically every manufacturing and assembly plant of respondent, is obtained from sources outside the State in which the respective plant is located. Most of the products of each plant are shipped to points outside the State in which such plant is located or are delivered to another plant of respondent within the same State for incorporation in an assembly or subassembly or in a completed automobil , truck, or engine, which completed products are directly shipped in substantial proportion to points outside the State or are sold and delivered to General Motors Sales Corp., a wholly owned subsidiary of respondent, at the place of completion and then shipped by the said sales corporation outside the State. Respondent's normal operations cause a vast and almost continuous movement of commodities in interstate and foreign commerce.

3. International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW-CIO), is a labor organization as defined in subsection (5) of section 2 of the National Labor Relations Act.

4. Prior to August 18, 1945, the Board, in numerous separate proceedings, had under section 9 (c) of the act, certified to respondent in writing that the union had been designated and selected as their representative by a majority of certain employees of respondent in a unit (or in each of two or more units) appropriate for the purposes of collective bargaining (the said unit or units being each defined in each such certification) and that the union was, pursuant to section 9 (a) of the act, the exclusive representative of all the employees in each such unit for the purposes of collective bargaining in respect to rates of pay, wages, hours of employment, and other conditions of employment. Each of said certifications (issued prior to August 18, 1945) and the record of the proceedings before the Board in which it issued, are incorporated herein by reference as though fully set forth.

5. The employees in each such unit heretofore defined by the Board in its aforesaid certifications did, on August 18, 1945, and at all times thereafter and down to the date hereof, constitute a unit appropriate for the purposes of collective bargaining within the meaning of subsections (a) and (b) of section 9 of the act.

6. The union was on August 18, 1945, and at all times since has been, the exclusive representative of all the employees of respondent in each bargaining unit described in the said previous certification of the Board.

7. Respondent has at all times since each such certification recognized the union as the exclusive representative for purposes of collective bargaining of the employees in each such unit. Since the first such certification of the union by the Board on or about May 29, 1940, respondent and the union have consolidated all negotiations and bargaining on subjects common to or affecting similarly all employees in all the said units.

8. On or about August 18, 1945, while respondent was engaged at its various plants as described in paragraphs 1 and 2 above, the union requested respondent to bargain collectively in respect to certain proposals made by the union in behalf of all of respondent's employees represented by the union concerning rates of pay, wages, and other terms and conditions of employment of the said employees, including a proposed general wage increase for all said employees. Respondent has at all times since said date failed and refused and now fails and refuses to bargain collectively in good faith with the union. Though meeting with the union on numerous occasions since August 18, 1945, in pretended or purported bargaining, respondent has engaged at all times since said date in a course of conduct calculated to and having the effect of frustrating and avoiding bona fide bargaining on the union's proposals. Without limitation thereto the said course of conduct has included the following:

(a) Respondent unreasonably delayed the commencement of any negotiations by refusing until on or about September 18 to meet with the union or to appoint a future date for a meeting for collective bargaining on the union's proposals.

(b) Respondent unreasonably delayed a reply to the union's proposals by failing and refusing to make any specific response to the said proposals or to any of them until on or about October 3, 1945, on which date respondent rejected the union's proposals in toto and without making any counter proposal.

(c) On or about October 19, 1945, and before any reasonable opportunity had been afforded the union for explanation or argument in support of its proposals, respondent caused identical letters, together with copies of certain enclosures referred to in said letters, to be sent to all employees represented by the union, each said letter bearing a signature (or facsimile representation thereof) of the manager of the plant wherein such employee was employed. A copy of the said letter (lacking signature) is attached hereto, marked "Exhibit A" and made a part hereof by reference. The said letter and enclosures were calculated and designed to discredit the union in the eyes of the employees represented by it, to undermine the confidence of the said employees in the union as their selected representative and to coerce and intimidate the employees into abandonment and repudiation of the union as their representative for collective bargaining.

(d) On various occasions since on or about October 4, 1945, respondent has disseminated on a Nation-wide scale inaccurate, misleading, and untrue statements concerning the proposals of the union. Such statements have been distributed through the media of newspaper advertisements and radio broadcasting announcements. The said statements were calculated and designed to undermine confidence in the union by the employees represented by it and to inculcate doubts among the said employees as to the veracity and integrity of the union officials, their designated representatives, and were calculated and designed to create a public opinion hostile to the union and as a result of such loss of confidence by employees and of such hostile public opinion, to compel the union to abandon its proposals.

(e) At various times on and after October 3, 1945, and up to and including the date of this complaint, respondent has, in the course of its pretended bargaining with the union, changed and shifted its position as to whether it did or did not rely on financial inability to accede to the union's wage proposals as

a reason for rejecting them, thereby perplexing and confusing all discussion with reference thereto and precluding any continuous rational bargaining.

(f) Respondent has at all times refused and now refuses to bargain collectively with the union in respect to its financial ability to pay the wage increases proposed by the union and has at all times, though repeatedly requested by the union so to do, refused to produce or disclose to the union any of its books or records containing information relevant to the question of its financial ability to pay the proposed wage increases and has at all times refused to furnish any such information to the union by production and disclosure of books and records or otherwise in any manner or form susceptible of verification. Respondent maintained its refusal to bargain in respect to its financial ability to pay the proposed wage increase and its refusal to produce or disclose such books, records, or information without regard to whether it was or was not currently asserting inability to pay the proposed increases as the reason for rejecting the union's proposals.

(g) On or about November 23, 1945, the union, having previously thereto (on or about November 19, 1945) proposed specific terms for submission of its wage proposals to arbitration, respondent rejected the said proposal without counter-proposal of other terms for arbitration. Respondent's rejection of the union's proposals was a rejection of arbitration on any terms.

(h) On or about November 23, 1945, respondent withdrew an offer of a wage increase of approximately 10 percent which it had previously made during the course of its pretended bargaining. Respondent withdrew said offer for the reason that the employees represented by the union had, as hereinafter set forth, exercised the right guaranteed by the act to engage in a strike.

(i) From November 26, 1945, until on or about December 6, 1945, respondent refused, unless the union would modify its proposals in accordance with terms imposed by respondent, to meet, confer, or negotiate with the union because the employees represented by the union had exercised the right guaranteed by the act to engage in a strike as hereinafter set forth.

9. By the acts and conduct set forth in paragraph 8 above respondent did engage and is engaging in unfair labor practices within the meaning of subsection (5) of section 8 of the act.

10. The unfair labor practices of respondent as set forth in paragraphs 8 (a) through 8 (f) above caused a strike on November 21, 1945, by the employees represented by the union. The continuing acts and conduct of respondent, as set forth in paragraphs 8 (a) through 8 (i) above have caused the said strike to be prolonged and have prevented settlement or adjustment thereof, the said strike being current at the time of issuance of this complaint. The said employees and each of them have been entitled at all times since the commencement of said strike to be reinstated to their former positions in respondent's employ upon application therefor.

11. By the acts set forth in paragraph 8 above and by each of them respondent has interfered with, restrained, and coerced, and is interfering with, restraining, and coercing its employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed to them in section 7 of the act and has thereby engaged in and is thereby engaging in unfair labor practices within the meaning of subsection (1) of section 8 of the act.

12. The acts of respondent as set forth in paragraph 8 above, occurring in connection with the operation of respondent's business as set forth in paragraphs 1 and 2 above, have a close, intimate, and substantial relation to trade, traffic, and commerce among the several States and have led to and tend to lead to labor disputes burdening and obstructing commerce and the free flow of commerce.

13. The acts of respondent hereinbefore set forth constitute unfair labor practices affecting commerce within the meaning of section 8, subsections (1) and (5), and section 2, subsections (6) and (7) of the act.

Wherefore the National Labor Relations Board, on the 14th day of January 1946, issues this, its complaint against General Motors Corp., a corporation, respondent herein.

HAROLD A. CRANEFIELD,
Acting Regional Director, National Labor Relations Board, Seventh Region.

EXHIBIT A

LETTER SENT TO HOURLY RATED EMPLOYEES IN BARGAINING UNITS UNDER UAW-CIO NATIONAL AGREEMENT

The employees of General Motors have been singled out by the international officers of the UAW-CIO to spearhead their attack on the country's wage and price control policy. Accordingly, a strike vote is to be taken Wednesday by the National Labor Relations Board among all General Motors factory employees under the UAW-CIO agreement.

All of us would like an increase of 30 percent in our wages or salaries if all we had to do to get it was to vote for it. However, in this case you will not be voting yourselves a 30-percent raise—you will be voting for or against a strike. In such strike votes the vote is usually overwhelmingly in favor of the strike. Probably most employees who vote for a strike really don't want one and hope the threat of a strike will be enough. But a majority strike vote invariably results in a strike.

General Motors has endeavored to make clear its position and the necessity for refusing the UAW-CIO's demand made August 18, 1945, for a 30-percent increase in the present wage rates of all General Motors employees covered by the UAW-CIO national agreement. Mr. C. E. Wilson, president of General Motors, replied to the union on October 3, 1945, and advised the union of General Motors' position on this demand. Because the welfare of the country is also involved, General Motors ran ads in newspapers throughout the country setting forth its position on this matter.

I believe Mr. Wilson's letter and the ad will be of interest to you so I am sending them along with this leter. Also included is a reproduction of a newspaper story which ran in the Detroit Times on Friday, September 14, 1945.

The same information was sent to all United States Senators, Congressmen, and State governors.

I earnestly suggest that you take the time to read these because, as I said before, this strike vote may result in a long strike.

If and when the strike goes into effect I sincerely hope that you conduct yourselves as law-abiding citizens, respecting the legal rights of others, and under no circumstances should you cause or permit damage to the plants and equipment with which you must earn your living when the strike finally ends.

Our Domestic Problems and the British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOREST A. HARNESS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 16, 1946

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me on January 7, 1946:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, this is Congressman FOREST HARNESS in another weekly report, brought to you from my home in Kokomo.

This past week has been filled with conferences and visits with people from all parts of my district. These discussions have been all the more interesting because of our steadily growing domestic problems, and the necessity of finding an immediate solution to these critical issues. The home front labor picture continues to grow darker by the hour. Most disturbing news of the past few days was the decision of the employees of the meat packing industry, and the workers of Western Electric to join the caravan of strikers. If all these employees join with the steel workers in a general strike, the Nation will be paralyzed. Is there any wonder that people in every walk of life are disturbed and uneasy about the days and weeks just ahead? There are many people who feel that legislation is necessary to meet this most critical issue, and there are others who contend that the Administration has all the power and authority needed to protect the national interest in such a crisis.

You may take whichever side of this question you want, but it is my guess that nothing will be done by the present administration until public indignation, approaching anger, is manifested by the American people. Farmers are worried about their livestock in the event of the closing of the packing houses by strikes. They realize that if there is a rush to market hogs and cattle to beat the strike, the market will be glutted and prices will topple. They also realize that if they hold their livestock and the strike continues for any great length of time, that their losses will be equally as great through the increased cost of feed and labor. Veterans just returned from the war are wondering if they are going to be forced into idleness and deprived of the opportunity of earning a living for themselves and their families. Thousands of families now on short rations because of idleness in the auto industry too must view the future with a gloomy attitude. Small businessmen and retail merchants who very largely depend upon the big industries to supply them realize that they must also take an unwanted holiday if these strikes occur. Do you think that all this suffering, turmoil and strife will be enough to arouse public anger and force a more courageous national labor policy? If it doesn't, then the American people will tolerate more imposition than I ever dreamed they would. It is readily understandable that our people would hold their patience and submit to impositions and restrictions of their liberties in time of war, but now that peace has been won they may be excused if they revolt against a weak and vacillating administration that tolerates such a reign of tyranny. This ominous outlook was not brightened in the least by the President's report to the Nation last Thursday night. He offered little hope and certainly no leadership for the American people in this dark hour.

As if these domestic worries were not enough, we are informed in dispatches from administration leaders in Washington that the first order of business when the Congress meets next week will be the matter of authorizing a four and a half billion loan to England. Apparently our leaders are more concerned with the welfare of our European neighbors than they are with our own. It occurs to me that our own domestic problems are far more pressing and in need of congressional attention. The irony of this so-called loan to Britain is that Mr. Leski, Chairman of the British Labor Party, now in charge of what our socialists continue to call "our mother country," declared in a speech in New York that the American free enterprise system has been a total failure, while at the

very same moment one of his countrymen was telling our President that unless we cancelled $25,000,000,000 of British lend-lease and loaned England four and a half billion dollars more, his country would collapse. Does this make sense? It was free enterprise, Mr. Laski, yes, the only free enterprise nation in the world, that won two wars and saved your socialistic neck. And moreover, the twenty-five billions that we gave your socialistic government would have built 5,000,000 houses for our returning veterans at $5,000 each. This same Mr. Laski, while still our guest in New York, and while his colleagues were in Washington wheedling billions of dollars from our Government, said that free enterprise and a market economy mean war; socialism and a planned economy mean peace. Well, after all, hasn't it been the so-called "planned economy boys," such as Hitler, Mussolini and Tojo, who started wars? Indeed it was not the free enterprise nations which planned international conquests.

The nerve of these Englishmen is unbounded. They criticize our system of government and at the same time demand our bounty. They first demanded an outright grant of $4,500,000,000 and later reluctantly agreed to take the money as a loan, provided we gave them free access to our markets. It was argued the loan or grant is necessary because the war has so impoverished the Empire that she will be forced into a policy of economic isolationism unless America generously supports her in the reconstruction period. State Department officials who support this grant to Britain contend that it is necessary for our own industrial export trade, but the fact is, American markets will absorb our entire production for at least 10 years. I should also like to remind those who urge this huge grant of American property and resources, that Britain has always preached free trade for the other countries, but is the worst offender in actually blocking free trade with other nations. Did she not, in the years just before the war, when we were knocking down our own trade barriers through reciprocal trade agreements, maintain a trade killing empire preference system which was the essence of economic isolationism? Was she not second only to Germany in the support and maintenance of national cartels and trade monopolies? This loan, or gift, is not intended to help our industrial export trade. We are the only nation in the world capable and strong enough to take over world trade. I pointed out once before on this program that to grant this huge sum of money to Britain, following our lend-lease gifts, would establish the precedent and obligate us to make similar grants to Russia, France, China, and a half dozen other nations. I do not believe we have the wealth and the resources to carry out such a program. We have recently joined and underwritten the Bretton Woods plan, which means that we will finance a huge world stabilization fund and international bank. Here we obviously pay a major part of the freight, and the British Empire will reap a major part of the advantage. You will remember when this plan was before Congress, we were assured that it would afford sufficient assistance for Europe to reconvert her peacetime economy.

If this tremendous American prop is not sufficient to keep Britain afloat, certainly it will not do the trick for a dozen other nations which are relying upon it. There is no doubt that we are in the same international boat with Britain now. Events of the past 6 or 7 years, engineered by No. 10 Downing Street, and our own White House, simply leave us no alternative, whether we like it or not. But it should at least be our privilege in this situation to demand that our British companions at least pull their own full weight in the boat.

The critical shortage of housing continues as one of the major headaches in the country. Every time a married veteran comes home, the need becomes more acute. Real-estate men, home builders, and construction contractors tell me that building in our State is almost at a standstill because of the lack of lumber, brick, electrical equipment, in fact about everything that goes into a new home. They tell me that our wartime system of bureaucratic restraints have stifled production practically from the tree standing in the forest, right down to the smallest little gadget in the new home. They say they are prepared to produce the largest volume of good housing in the history of the country, provided they are given the building materials and released from governmental regulations and competition. They are fed up with controls and with crackpot theories, criticisms by professors, housing experts, and social planners, both in and out of Government. Well, maybe the President's new housing czar will use some of the authority now granted to the Executive to crack the whip over OPA and other agencies that have created this housing bottleneck and get materials flowing. Obviously no new legislation is needed because the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion has the authority to force OPA to grant price increases to insure production. Free initiative and free enterprise can do the job if given half a chance.

As much as I agree with Chester Bowles, that rent controls must remain in critical areas until this bottleneck is broken, I think that the short-sighted policy of his agency has totally stifled all possible investment in rental home building. The man who ordinarily puts money in rental property would simply be a "tee-total" fool to do so under the restrictions which OPA has imposed. And these same restrictions which discourage the private investor, are denying hundreds and millions of homes to individuals who desperately need them today. We really need about 20 times as much new housing as we shall be able to produce this year. Do you think we shall get it under the present restraints which make it impossible for the average real-estate investor to break even on the money he has tied up in real estate? Well, that answer ought to be obvious. When an investor starts losing money, he is going to start pulling out.

And while on the subject of OPA, I want you to know of other complaints that are continually coming to me from small businessmen, who complain that established manufacturers are given ceiling prices often less than cost of materials, while new manufacturers of inferior competing goods are given higher ceilings. Well, OPA says these are isolated cases, but recently in Washington, the National Retail Dry Goods Association began hauling in the evidence—suitcases, fabrics, toy blocks and scooters, electric irons and heaters, dresses, blouses, aprons, robes, enough to fill up a committee room the size of a small barn. All were labeled and bore the sign in stand-out red lettering, "The consumer pays." Hundreds of people visited this display, and to just mention a few, there were two blouses displayed, one good, the other obviously poor quality. A sign read: "Blouse made by established manufacturer A, at a ceiling price of $2.50. Blouse is well finished, taped seams, one-piece sash, shaped front. OPA permits him to make only restricted numbers, not nearly enough to meet the demand." The other sign: "Blouse made by newcomer (that is, new manufacturer) gets the highest ceiling of all, $12. Finish poor, seams pinked, sash is pieced, edging is chain stitched." Another table of toys had two children's scooters. One was a big scooter with foot pads, stand, 10-inch wheels, a bell brightly painted, stands a good foot higher than its rival. The other was drab, no stand, wheels 4 inches high. The big scooter was tagged "OPA ceiling $1.92." The inferior product held the line at $3.75. It was apparent throughout the exhibit that no line is being held, general disorder in business is promoted, many old firms being crushed, new ones given a sort of royal grant to take their places. Is there any wonder that small manufacturers and purchasers complain to me about such OPA practices? In spite of all these complaints and injustices of wartime controls and restrictions, the President recently urged that all price control must be continued beyond June 30 next year. I wonder if much of our labor-management trouble, and the dissatisfaction of so many people, does not spring from these wartime controls that the President would continue in the peacetime era?

These are some of the problems that will give us plenty of headaches in the weeks to come.

That's all, folks, until next week at this same time.

Criminal Code

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1946

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report made on my behalf as chairman of the committee on the criminal code by Charles J. Zinn, a member of the committee, before the section on criminal law at the annual convention of the American Bar Association held at Cincinnati, Ohio, on December 17, 1945:

REPORT TO THE SECTION ON CRIMINAL LAW ON H. R. 2200 (79TH CONG.), TO REVISE, CODIFY, AND ENACT INTO LAW TITLE 18 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE ENTITLED "CRIMES AND CRIMINAL PROCEDURE"

The bill H. R. 2200, to revise, codify, and enact into law title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," having been unanimously reported to the House of Representatives by the Committee on Revision of the Laws, is now pending in that body. Inasmuch as this is the first effort since 1909 to revise the Federal criminal laws, it is appropriate that serious consideration be given to it by the section on criminal law of the American Bar Association. In his message to this section last year the Attorney General of the United States said:

"During the past year another undertaking of great interest to the bar has been inaugurated by the Committee on Revision of the Laws of the House of Representatives. I refer to the revision of the Federal Criminal Laws which will eventually replace the Criminal Code of 1909. A preliminary draft of part I of the revision, relating to crimes, has been printed and will be followed shortly by drafts of parts II, III, and IV, relating respectively to criminal procedure, prisons and prisoners, and juvenile delinquency. Despite the enactment of many new laws and the amendment and repeal of those previously in existence, there has been no codification of the Federal criminal laws for 35 years. In adopting a new Federal criminal code, the Federal Government will be following the excellent example of the States, most of which are now equipped with modern criminal codes and penal laws governing their citizens. A detailed study of the preliminary draft is presently being made by the Criminal Division, and its comments will be forwarded to the reviser and House committee. Again I suggest that the section on

crim.nal law may find it desirable to scrutinize the preliminary draft of the proposed revision and t_ submit to the House committee and to the reviser its suggestions and comments relative to this matter."

The Criminal Division of the Department of Justice prepared a memorandum to the Committee on Revision of the Laws in which it stated:

"There is vital need of a revision and recodification of Federal criminal laws. The action of the House Committee on Revision of the Laws in undertaking the project is exceedingly well-advised and should receive support and recommendation. The committee and the revisers, to whom the actual task has been entrusted, have performed their function in a highly competent manner. It is suggested that the proposed revision should be approved and its enactment into absolute law recommended.

"It is important that the revision, when it assumes final shape, should be enacted into absolute law rather than be placed in the same status as that of present title 18, United States Code, which is only prima facie law. The enactment of the revision into absolute law would obviate the burdensome task of referring to the original Statutes at Large and tracing the exact text of every criminal statute through numerous volumes whenever occasion arises."

The existing Federal criminal laws are now set forth largely in title 18 of the United States Code, although there are additional penal provisions which are integral parts of over-all legislation relating to taxation and national banks, for example, which are classified to the respective titles of the United States Code concerned with those subjects. Wherever feasible, H. R. 2200 has transferred those penal provisions from the other titles, so that the new law will contain all penal provisions as far as possible.

Before discussing the provisions of H. R. 2200 it seems desirable to present briefly the background of the existing criminal code and the urgent need for a revision. Title 18 of the United States Code is based principally upon the Criminal Code of 1909, and you will have noticed that the 1909 code section numbers are set out in parentheses after the number of the section in title 18. Congress did not preserve the code structure set up in 1909 and almost immediately thereafter enacted penal provisions which were amendatory of, or inconsistent with, the provisions of the 1909 code but did not specifically amend or repeal those provisions. One of the results of that method of legislating was that in preparing title 18 of the United States Code in 1925 it became necessary to abandon the numerical arrangement of the 1909 code and to insert the later provisions wherever they logically fit in. Another effect of such legislation is that the Statutes at Large now contain provisions which either duplicate or are inconsistent with provisions of the 1909 law which were not specifically repealed and are therefore still on the books—often requiring a judicial determination as to whether they are still in force.

H. R. 2200 is a comprehensive bill of almost 500 pages, in which section 1 sets forth the new code and the remaining sections amend provisions outside the proposed code and specifically repeal existing law which is incorporated in or inconsistent with the new code.

The lawyer will immediately recognize that the proposed code contains an altogether different arrangement from present title 18, which employs the arrangement originated in the Crimes Act of 1790 and carried over into the Revised Statutes and the 1909 code. Because of the limited criminal jurisdiction of the Federal Government, the original classification of crimes was according to offenses against the existence of government, etc. Such a classification, while logical in a broad sense, is not conducive to easy access to the particular provision sought. In the code proposed by H. R. 2200, there is a different principle of classification adopted, similar to that used in many of the State penal codes, namely, the alphabetical arrangement of crimes. A helpful feature of the arrangement of the 60 chapters is that only odd numbers are used at present, leaving room for internal expansion by the insertion of a whole even number without interfering with the alphabetical order in the event of later legislation defining a new crime. In order to permit the adoption of an alphabetical arrangement, new general provisions have been added defining the Federal jurisdictional limits.

Discrepancies in punishment provisions as to misdemeanors and felonies in existing law have been corrected in the proposed code. For example, there are more than a score of sections now in the law defining a crime as a misdemeanor but providing a felony penalty, i. e., imprisonment for more than a year in a penitentiary. Section 1 of the proposed code defines felonies, misdemeanors, and petty offenses according to the penalty provided.

Because the existing law has grown in a rather haphazard fashion there are, in almost 100 instances, inconsistencies in the amount of punishment provided for in crimes of comparable gravity. These inconsistencies have been resolved by increasing punishment in 16 sections and decreasing it in about 70 sections.

Simplicity of language has been achieved throughout the proposed code without harm to the substance. For example, a proposed penalty provision reads as follows:

"Whoever violates this section shall be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both."

Compare that provision with the existing law contained in section 394 of title 18, reading:

"For each evasion or violation of, or failure to comply with any provision of sections 391–393 of this title, any person, firm, corporation, or association, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 3 months, or both."

It should be noted here in a revision and codification of existing law, under the principles of statutory construction mere changes in phraseology are not deemed to change the law as it stood prior to the revision, so that fears of changes as a result of simplifying and clarifying language may be allayed. Of course, changes in the amount of punishment provided or other changes in substance are legislative in character and do change the existing law.

In many instances several sections of existing law have been consolidated into a single section, thus eliminating repetitions, redundancies, and overlapping.

In the present law the general conspiracy statute provides a punishment of up to 2 years' imprisonment or a fine of up to $10,000, or both, regardless of the punishment provided for commission of the offense itself. The result is that a person convicted of conspiracy to commit a misdemeanor is subject to a felony penalty, while conviction of a conspiracy to commit a most heinous felony carries with it the same penalty as conspiracy to commit a misdemeanor, except in those cases where there is a special conspiracy statute. In the new code there is a general conspiracy provision which takes into consideration the gravity of the substantive crime which is the subject of the conspiracy.

Part II of the proposed code deals with criminal procedure. It should be of interest to the bench and bar to know how this subject is handled in view of the Supreme Court's proposed Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure which have been reported to Congress by the Attorney General. There are a number of substantive matters relating to criminal procedure which are not properly the subject of court rules and these have not been incorporated in the proposed rules by the Supreme Court. The code proposed by H. R. 2200 contains all these statutory provisions as sections of part II. As to the matters covered by the proposed rules part II of the code furnishes them with section numbers and catchlines in their logical order, but instead of setting out the text of the rules there are merely cross-references to the rules themselves. The reason for this is that, although it is desirable to have the statutes and the rules in one place, inasmuch as Congress has restored to the Court its rule-making power, there should be no suggestion by the incorporation of the text of the rules that Congress intends to enact the rules into law. When the code is enacted into law the text of the rules will undoubtedly be carried as notes to the respective sections of title 18 of the United States Code referring to them and the convenience of the bench and bar will be thus best served.

Part III of the proposed code is entitled "Prisons and Prisoners" and in this part the program of simplifying the present law is carried out.

Part IV deals with youthful offenders and although no substantive change is made in existing law the arrangement of the chapters makes it easily adaptable to future amendments.

A distinctive feature of H. R. 2200, and one which has too often been lacking in other proposed revisions, is the specific repeal of existing laws which are inconsistent with, or incorporated into, the new code. This feature is also carried over into the field covered by the proposed rules of criminal procedure. The advantage of the specific repeal is readily appreciated by the bench and bar and needs no elaboration here. The chaos and bewilderment created by a revision which does not specifically repeal existing laws will be totally eliminated in this case.

Brief reference should be made in this report to the procedure adopted by the Committee on Revision of the Laws in the preparation of this bill. The committee engaged the services of the West Publishing Co., of St. Paul, Minn., and the Edward Thompson Co., of Brooklyn, N. Y., law publishing companies which have served in the preparation of each edition and supplement of the United States Code. The editorial staffs of the companies were augmented by William W. Barron, former Chief of Criminal Appeals in the Department of Justice, as reviser. They also procured the services of an advisory committee consisting of Floyd E. Thompson, former chief justice of the Illinois Supreme Court; Justin Miller, associate justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia; and John T. Cahill, former United States attorney for the Southern District of New York. They also had as special consultants Alexander Holtzoff, now United States district judge for the District of Columbia, and George F. Longsdorff, of California, both of whom are members of the Supreme Court Advisory Committee on Rules of Criminal Procedure. All worked closely with the chairman of the House Committee on Revision of the Laws, Congressman Eugene J. Keogh, and the committee's counsel, Charles J. Zinn and John F. X. Finn.

Conferences of the advisory committee and special consultants were held at which the drafts of the bill were thoroughly studied. No change in substantive law were made without their concurrence.

A public hearing was held during the Seventy-eighth Congress on H. R. 5450, the predecessor of H. R. 2200. At that hearing Justice Justin Miller stated:

"It has never been my privilege to work with a research and editorial group more conscientiously devoted to the task under way. * * * As a judge I was concerned

with simplification and clarification of language, the removal of ambiguities, uncertainties, duplication, redundancy, and conflict. To the achievement of this objective the editorial board was conscientiously and effectively alert. * * *

"With respect to chapter titling and arrangement and the arrangement of sections, I feel that a very substantial improvement has been worked out. * * *

"As a consequence of all this I am ready to say that the result is the best product that could be expected. * * * Considered as a whole it must be noted also, that absolute perfection should not be asked for or expected in a work of this kind."

Your committee on the proposed criminal code respectfully urges that the section on criminal law approve the bill H. R. 2200 to revise, codify, and enact into law title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," and advocate its prompt enactment by Congress.

Respectfully submitted.

COMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL CODE.
EUGENE J. KEOGH, *Chairman.*
CHARLES J. ZINN.
WILLIAM W. BARRON.

Food for 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1946

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit a copy of an address delivered by me over the Columbia Broadcasting System, Tuesday, January 1, 1946:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience: A happy New Year to you all.

The subject assigned me for discussion is Food in 1946.

My first statement will, I hope, meet with your unanimous approval. It is this, the food situation will not be as bad in 1946 as it was in 1944 and 1945. What the food situation will be in 1946 depends largely on whether the producers, the processors, and the distributors of food will again be hampered by governmental regulations and restrictions, or whether they will be permitted to operate with the freedom that is necessary to produce adequately and to distribute efficiently.

The doctrine of enforced scarcities advocated by those who killed the pigs and plowed the crops under has been thoroughly discredited. But some of those who advocated these unnatural theories are still in high positions in Washington. Full, free, adequate production of food commodities is the only sane and sensible doctrine. Nobody ever got fat on scarcities, and nobody ever went hungry on abundance.

The Government should not engage in the food business except to prevent scarcities and to assist in distribution of surpluses.

The food business is the greatest business in the world. More money is invested in food than in any other commodities—and more people are engaged in this business than in any other.

There are four great groups vitally interested and actively engaged in the food business:

First, the producer group. This includes the producers of grains, vegetables, meats, fruits, and dairy and poultry products.

Second, the processors. This group includes the canners, the meat packers, the creameries, and ice cream makers.

Third, the distributors. This group includes the transportation agencies and the wholesalers and the retailers.

And fourth, the largest group of all, the group that includes all of us—the consumers. The best interest of the consumers is the most important factor in this great business. The consumers' interest has been sadly neglected.

There is a natural sequence of relationship between these four great groups. The person in whom the producer should be, and is most vitally interested, is the ultimate consumer. And the ultimate consumer is vitally interested to know that the producer of his food is not unduly hampered.

Food is like a river. If it is not interrupted it will flow naturally from its source—the producer, to its destination—the consumer.

Therefore, the function of Government is to encourage the natural flow of food by removing unnecessary regulations and obstacles, and to guarantee adequate production that there may be no inadequate consumption. It must not be forgotten that the most helpless, as well as the most numerous, of these four groups is the consumer.

There has been great advancement in the production and processing of food. In the early days of our country, 90 percent of the people were engaged primarily in the production of food. Now about 20 percent of our people can produce sufficient food for us—and about 10 percent can do the processing and distributing.

Production has been increased by improved machinery and by the use of fertilizers and adoption of more scientific methods. Food processors have made great advances in packaging and preserving, and in refrigeration.

The Food Study Committee, of which I am chairman, has been giving consideration to plans to make available to the consumer new and better methods of preparing and using food. Much food value is wasted. Consumers should understand the relative vitamin and caloric value of the various foods. This is a field in which science can render a great service to the people—for it is a sad fact that there are still many people in the world who are undernourished. Many of these can be found in our own country.

The Department of Agriculture has made some progress along this line—but not enough. All food is produced to be consumed. The fact that millions of dollars' worth of food spoils every year in our country, while some of our own people are undernourished, proves that there is a great field for improvement in methods of food consumption.

Every year for the past 7 years we have had very favorable weather conditions. Providence was good to us. Weather is normally a 25 percent factor in food production. Because of record-breaking good weather conditions—and because of improved machinery making it possible for the producer to plant his crops faster and harvest them faster—we have been blessed with bumper crops every year for the past 7 years. If we should encounter a bad-weather year in 1946 we might have some trouble. Our production is so wide and varied, however—and our capacity to substitute one food for another is so much greater now than formerly—that with the unhampered cooperation of all food agencies, we should be able to reduce greatly the danger of food shortages because of bad weather.

During the war we had many serious food situations. Much of our trouble was due to fallacious policies and unwise and inefficient administration.

A great mistake was made in fixing price control at the consumer level. We tried to regulate the river by damming up the mouth. This put the greatest burden on the small man—the butcher and the grocer. To try to equalize prices we paid many billions of dollars in subsidies. But the butcher and the grocer did not get any of these subsidies.

From this condition, created by the Government, rose the greatest system of black markets the world ever saw. Law-abiding businessmen lost their profits and went out of business. The black-market man had a big business. He violated the law—people paid him exhorbitant prices—and his profits were tremendous.

There are two factors that formerly contributed mightily to a successful food business. One was efficient distribution. The other was quality of merchandise. Many thousands of successful grocers and butchers, who had made themselves successful by courtesy and cleanliness and efficient methods, were forced out of business by ruthless regulations. Those who wrote the regulations gave no consideration to courtesy or quality. Quality was subordinated to price.

When the Government gets the authority to fix the prices of every commodity, our cherished system of free enterprise will be gone and socialism will scourge us.

Let us see how this price fixing is affecting some of our foods today.

Why is it that in spite of a high production of milk this year we can get little or no butter? Why couldn't you get butter for Christmas? Here is the reason. The price of butterfat in milk is higher than the price of butter. The farmer can get more for the butterfat if he sells it in the milk than he can if he takes the trouble to separate the cream or to make the butter. The Government in 1945 paid the milk producers a subsidy of about $700,000,000 in order to hold the price of milk down. It took money out of one man's pocket to pay for another man's milk. It took money out of the butter man's business and put it into the milkman's business. Our butter supply in 1945 has depended on the price fixers in Washington. What will happen in 1946 will depend largely on whether Congress permits price fixing of foods to continue or whether it abolishes OPA control over food products.

What about sugar for 1946? In 1943 and 1944 it was pointed out to the Government price fixers that a dire shortage of sugar was imminent. The excuse was that there were no ships to bring sugar from Cuba. This was not true. Millions of pounds of sugar molasses were poured into ditches in Cuba. Millions of pounds of sugar went to waste, and millions of housewives went without sugar. All this was due to unwise attempts to fix prices. We will have a shortage of sugar in 1946, but it should not be as bad as 1943, 1944, and 1945.

Let's talk a little about chickens and eggs. In 1944 the Government purchased great quantities of eggs; 150,000,000 dozens of eggs in one purchase proper were allowed to spoil. These spoiled eggs were sold for $30 a carload. The Government guessed wrong. Today the Government price fixers are guessing again.

Here is the story: Because beef and pork were kept off the market for such a long time in 1944 and 1945, it was only natural that the production of chickens would increase. Now the number of hens has increased so that there is a threatened overproduction of eggs in the next few months. To avoid this, the Government is trying to reduce the number of hens. They hesitate to order the killing of hens, as they did the pigs, so they are trying to reduce the number of hens by cutting off feed supplies to poultry growers. Feed manufacturers have been asked to cut down their production of chicken feed. If they refuse to do so voluntarily, they will probably be ordered to do so.

Forcing chicken growers to reduce their flocks by cutting off their feed supplies is an example of bureaucracy in action. There

is plenty of feed in this country. Why not face the situation as statesmen and businessmen—and not follow the lead of inexperienced theorists.

There are many coffee drinkers in our country. No coffee is produced in the United States. It is likely that in 1946 you will continue to pay 33 cents a pound for coffee that ought to be selling for 23 cents. OPA price regulations prevent the better grades of coffee from coming to this country. Coffee importers have to operate under a quota. We are paying $24,000,000 in subsidies to secure even inferior coffee. That's why you pay 33 cents for 23-cent coffee.

The food industry and the Department of Agriculture and Congress are much concerned about the disposition of our future food supply. The matter of surpluses is bound to present itself. This is not only a problem of business methods, it is a matter of statesmanship—both national and international. From the days of the McNary-Haugen bill, 25 years ago, down to the present, no satisfactory solution has been found for the disposition of surpluses. A surplus, though small, can disrupt the market for that commodity. The great necessity for food supplies in the war-torn countries of the world offers an outlet for these threatened surpluses for this coming year.

It may be necessary for the Government to set up some kind of an agency that will be empowered to take over our agricultural surpluses and trade them for the surpluses that other countries have of commodities that we need and can import.

The Food Study Committee to which I have referred is giving this matter serious consideration.

Although the problem of surpluses may become an important one, still the problem that is presently before us is to rehabilitate our food business in our own country so that it can again operate as a great free industry—the better to produce and distribute adequate supplies of food of the highest quality, in a free over-the-counter market. Black markets thrive only when legitimate business is hampered by unwise restrictions.

Nineteen forty-six will be a great year if industry and labor compose their differences—and if the Government takes government out of business.

Has Ownership Any Rights?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DUDLEY G. ROE
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 16, 1946

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial from the Democrat and News, of Cambridge, Md.

The editorial follows:

HAS OWNERSHIP ANY RIGHTS?

Only Congress can remodel our one-sided and ineffectual labor laws so that they will represent fairness and equality. Under present labor legislation, all manner of biased rulings have been secured by labor leaders against industry. Abuses have become so odoriferous that they have finally reached the public's nostrils.

One of the latest moves of labor leaders to alienate public as well as congressional good will is their attempt to compel executive or supervisory employees of companies to join labor unions. This is nothing more nor less than an attempt to gain control of management without any financial obligation or responsibility.

If managerial and supervisory employees can be forced into unions, management might as well turn the industries over to the unions to operate, for there would be no one left on the side of management to represent the owners. If Congress fails to correct this situation, there will be no more freedom of enterprise in the United States.

A Letter From a Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 16, 1946

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter received from a soldier at Belem, Para, Brazil.

Mr. Speaker, the Army charts show that on January 1 there were 18,000 soldiers, mostly from the air wing, in Africa and the Middle East. The letter I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD is from a soldier in the air wing and he wonders why he is being kept in Brazil. He even suggests that the ports are being kept open so the "brass" in Washington can fly down with their C–54's and M–17's, and use that port as a stop-over to Rio, for a vacation at Government expense. Apparently that is being frequently practiced by the Army. This letter gives another reason why a great many soldiers are disgusted with the present demobilization plans of the Army.

The letter follows:

BELEM PARA, BRAZIL, *December 26, 1945.*
Hon. A. L. MILLER,
Kimball, Nebr.

DEAR MR. MILLER: My father sent me your answer to his letter. It brought several things to my mind. So I thought I would write to you.

First, I am not writing this on my own behalf. But for all the rest of the boys in this wing that are wasting precious time here in Brazil doing nothing. We have lost enough of our best years already. Maybe I shouldn't say lost, for we have brought peace for a time. We pray it is an everlasting peace.

Your statement, "I don't understand what he is doing in Brazil anyway." The fact is we are doing nothing. These are ATC bases which have served their purpose. There are no more aircraft passing through here to the States from ETO or CBI. The green project ended last September. There are no soldiers being hauled through here to their homes. Yes, I sternly believe that the South Atlantic Wing, ATC, has served its purpose.

It is true the number of men in this wing has been greatly reduced since the close of the green project. But there are a lot of men left here doing absolutely nothing.

It is costing a lot of money to keep this base open. Looks to me there are more useful places to spend Government money.

Most of us feel we are playing defense on a political football team. Just holding fast until some commercial airlines can get usage rights on these bases. We feel we are right in this belief because there seems to be no other conceivable reason.

There are very few people in the United States that know we are in Brazil.

I might add this. These bases made it nice for the brass in Washington. They can hop in a C–54 or B–17 or any plane in fact but they like the big ones, and fly to Rio for a 2-week vacation at Government expense.

I am 27, will be 28 in March, been married 4 years, lost our first child at birth. I have the best wife in the world to go home to.

If you can tell us a logical reason why this wing is being kept open we will be grateful to you.

Sincerely yours,
A SOLDIER IN BELEM PARA, BRAZIL.

James E. Moss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 16, 1946

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein a letter which I received from Admiral R. R. Waesche relative to the outstanding record of service of a civilian, James E. Moss, during the war period:

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD,
Washington, D. C., December 18, 1945.
Hon. SCHUYLER O. BLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C

MY DEAR MR. BLAND: As Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, which is responsible for the regulation of the merchant marine, I wish to bring to your attention the outstanding record of service of a civilian during the war period.

So far as I know, there does not exist at present any appropriate way in which such service to the Nation performed by a civilian in wartime can be properly recognized. Under these circumstances it seems most appropriate to bring this record of service to the attention of the four committees of the Congress which are interested in commerce and the merchant marine.

Prior to our entry into the war it was foreseen by the Coast Guard that merchant shipping and especially tankers would be vital to our service of supply. Arrangements were therefore made under which Mr. James E. Moss, manager of one of the large United States tanker fleets, would be available from time to time for consultation.

The importance of this service to the war effort was so apparent a few months after we had entered the war that I requested his full-time service as my consultant. Accordingly Mr. William R. Boyd, Jr., president of the American Petroleum Institute, arranged for the raising of a fund by the petroleum industry for the defraying of the wages and all expenses of Mr. Moss.

Since that time Mr. Moss has been constantly available to the Coast Guard for consultation, and during this period his contribution to the successful prosecution of the war with special reference to the safety of life and the security of ships has been outstanding.

Examples of his contribution to the war effort are as follows:

(a) He created and developed the system which was established for the reporting and analysis of war casualties to merchant ships. On this system of casualty analysis the Coast Guard based its program of greater wartime safety which resulted in the saving of many lives of seamen. Based on the same casualty

analyses, Mr. Moss prepared many safety procedures and methods which were printed and distributed to our merchant ships in large numbers.

(b) He made the original draft of the national code of regulations for the security of vessels in port which was signed by the President in 1942. This code provided the basis for the protection of all of our shipping in all of our ports during the war period. From the day it became effective until it was revoked at the conclusion of hostilities it was never found to need correction.

(c) He rendered outstanding assistance in establishing the policy for the investigation of the failure of welded ships and he carried a large part of the great responsibility which was unavoidable in developing methods for preventing such failures.

(d) He developed the ballasting handling procedure for naval and merchant vessels, preparing the general orders and methods for avoiding the pollution of our harbors and rivers by oil.

He brings to a conclusion this valuable record of service to the country on this December 31.

Very sincerely,

R. R. WAESCHE,
Admiral, U. S. C. G., Commandant.

Postage for Newspapers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DUDLEY G. ROE
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 16, 1946

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter I received from Mr. G. Arthur McDaniel, of the Federalsburg Times, Federalsburg, Md.

Inasmuch as the Post Office Committee has before it the question of postal rates for newspapers, this letter is very instructive. It shows that the Federalsburg Times, a weekly newspaper in my district, with a circulation of about 2,000, during the war gave the Government 24,271 inches of free space. This represents more than 162 pages and, at the regular advertising rates, would amount to over $8,000. The information is broken down into different items and, I think, makes very instructive reading.

The letter follows:

THE FEDERALSBURG TIMES,
Federalsburg, Md., December 31, 1945.

The Honorable DUDLEY G. ROE,
Sudlersville, Md.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: As a member of the important Post Office Committee in Congress, which we understand had under consideration a bill to greatly increase costs of postage for newspapers, we thought perhaps you might be interested in the following data compiled in our office.

The Federalsburg Times, during the period of the war, contributed no less than 24,271 inches of space to the war activities without 1 cent of compensation from the Federal Government.

Broken down into classifications this space included 2,434 inches on rationing publicity; 1,436 inches on civilian defense; 322 inches on salvage; 807 inches on bond-drive publicity; 776 inches on recruiting and war charities; 3,686 inches on morale building and servicemen activities; and 14,800 inches in direct war-bond advertising.

This represents more than 162 pages, which had they been billed at the regular advertising rate would have amounted to over $8,000.

In addition to the above we have always published without cost the Federal Government announcements on post-office and civil-service examinations and also information from the War Department on matters of rivers and harbors.

We feel that in consideration of the abovementioned extensive educational and publicity program which newspapers are glad to perform as a public service that our Government should be willing to continue its present nominal rates for postal service on second-class permits.

Will you be kind enough to write me a line or two expressing your views on this matter.

With all good wishes for a most prosperous and successful New Year, we are,

Sincerely yours,

G. ARTHUR MCDANIEL.

A Social Creed for All Americans—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 16, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, on December 1, 1945, at Buck Hill Falls Inn, Cresco, Pa., the department of Christian social relations and local church activities reported to the woman's division of Christian service of the board of missions and church extension of the Methodist Church on the many problems facing us today.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the report made by these women displays such height and depth of feeling and comprehension and has such wide social scope and appeal that it could well be a challenging program for any major political party.

To those of my colleagues on either side of the aisle who wish to know where the conscientious American stands on many a controversial issue today, I recommend a close scrutiny of the social creed of these Methodist women. Here is the conscience of America at work. Neither communism, with its regimentation, and its godlessness, nor reaction, with its laissez faire, and mere lip service to Christianity can take any comfort from this document. This is as comprehensive and as Christian a program as any Member of this House is likely to come upon in this session of Congress. These are the things in which American women of good will are interested and wish to see accomplished in order that peace should come to America and to the world.

The report follows:

REPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF CHRISTIAN SOCIAL RELATIONS AND LOCAL CHURCH ACTIVITIES TO THE WOMAN'S DIVISION OF CHRISTIAN SERVICE, CRESCO, PA., DECEMBER 1, 1945

The year 1945 has brought one world-shaking event after another, making an unprecedented impact on the life of this Nation, and on the whole world. The death of President Roosevelt, the San Francisco Conference, the expulsion of the atomic bomb, the cessation of hostilities, and finally the steps toward the formulation of peace treaties, and plans for the initial meeting of the agencies of the United Nations Organization—all have brought new questions, fresh opportunities, and enlarged responsibilities on both the domestic and the international front.

The problem of reconversion after the war is upon is. The nerves of the Nation are taut with fear of unemployment. Labor and management find themselves on opposite sides of a gulf of misunderstanding at many points. Both are powerful pressure groups. The forces of labor have demonstrated a new dynamic in wartime. The demand for full employment, full production, and full pay will be relentless in the days ahead. The church is called upon to live its social creed which proclaims "the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively."

The demobilization program for both service personnel and war workers will bring increased race tensions all over the country. Seeds of race riots are evident across the land. Jim Crow patterns of many years standing have been disturbed in the war period. The new day calls for a new way of life where the Negro, the Mexican, the Jew, or the Japanese-American can secure and keep a job commensurate with his skill without fear or hurt. The Christian Church is in a position to lead the way in creating a conscience that means justice for all.

In these times the institution of the family is gravely threatened. Widespread social and economic adjustments have resulted in increased frustration and insecurity. Social drinking, gambling, and cheap amusements daily furnish personal escapes and create national degeneration.

During the past 4 years the peoples of the Allied Nations banded themselves together to win a military struggle against fascism in the world. That job has been accomplished, leaving the aftermath of the most destructive war in history, and powerful nations, the victors, filled with fear of one another. Collective action for peace is not as easy as collective action for war, either on the home front or in the international scene. The appalling hunger, starvation, and utter misery now existing in Europe and Asia involving millions of human beings calls for immediate relief.

The Christian Church must generate a new spiritual power and continue to work to create a public conscience that will act for the best welfare of all people in our Nation and the world. Therefore, the Department of Christian Social Relations and Local Church Activities recommends continuing action in the following areas:

1. The full cooperation and active participation of each member of the local society in all phases of the crusade with special emphasis on stewardship in 1946.

2. That the woman's society of the local church cooperate in undergirding the church program for youth, student, and adult groups in developing Christian fellowship through a program of social, recreational, hobby, and cultural activities.

3. That we continue to serve uprooted people, returning service personnel, conscientious objectors, and new church members, by study of the special needs of these groups and cooperation with other community agencies that can help meet these needs.

4. That we promote a two-way relationship between the church and community agencies by becoming familiar with these organizations and their programs, cooperating with them on matters of common interest, urging church women to serve on community committees and to participate in the work of the agencies, and interesting women related to such organizations in the program of the Woman's Society and church.

5. Continued work for the removal of unfair voting restrictions.

6. Continued work for equalization of educational opportunities for all peoples in the United States regardless of race, creed, or place of residence.

7. Support of legislation to prevent lynching, and development of means of insuring equality of protection before the law.

8. Opposition to compulsory universal military training.

9. International control of atomic power.

10. Building of public understanding that international economic cooperation is necessary to the survival and prosperity of the American economy as opposed to the present trend toward economic isolationism.

11. Support of conscientious objectors and their dependents, now and after demobilization.

Some organizations, including the Commission on World Peace of the Methodist Church are urging President Truman to grant amnesty on Christmas Day to the 3,500 men in prison for "conscience sake." Personal letters to the President will evidence a desire to implement religious freedom.

12. Complete participation of the United States in the UNRRA program in the light of the priority of the whole relief problem.

To allow criticism of specific failures of UNRRA administration to prevent full support is inexcusable.

13. Cooperation with public and private agencies seeking to meet postwar problems of the community, and with the provisions of the GI bill of rights and Public Law 16 for veterans' education, home and business ownership.

14. Study wage scales and conditions of workers, child-labor practices in the community working toward more adequate laws and better enforcement of existing laws.

15. Acquaintance with the practices of State Departments of Labor in the Administration of unemployment compensation, lest pressure groups bring about discrimination in the administration.

Example: The women in one conference found in 1 week 276 skilled and semiskilled Negroes not allowed unemployment compensation by State Department of Labor, when they refused to accept the offered jobs of domestic service at $5 to $9 per week.

16. Attention to our own employment of domestic service and to the employment standards of maintenance of clerical and professional workers in the local church.

17. Study of the concrete possibilities of socially significant uses of war plants and other war properties in the communities.

Illustration: In one State, church and civic groups procured a war plant to be used as a tuberculosis sanatorium, and in another State the use of a war plant for specialized Negro education has been suggested.

18. That we continue to work for the principles and proposals in the original form of the following bills promoting full employment, full production, full pay, full security, prevention of inflation: Extension Social Security Act and national medical program (S. 1050, H. R. 3293), minimum wage bill (S. 1282, H. R. 3837), emergency unemployment compensation bill (S. 1274, H. R. 3891), maternal and child welfare bill (S. 1318), equal pay for equal work bill (S. 1178), Permanent Fair Employment Practice Committee (S. 101, H. R. 2232), full employment bill (S. 380, H. R. 2202), national housing bill (S. 1342); for adequate appropriation for FSA and OPA, and the extension of the Price Control Act beyond its expiration date, June 30, 1946.

19. Continued action of the jurisdiction standing committee of Christian social relations and local church activities in the study of and work for improvement in State laws regarding law enforcement and alcohol control and public welfare, and that local societies continue to plan family conferences in their communities, acquaint themselves with factors in the community working for and against spiritual security, and provide family participation experiences within the church which will strengthen family life.

GENERAL

We recommend:

1. An approved study in the field of alcohol education.

2. That each jurisdiction sponsor a 3-day seminar on a regional basis on the alcohol problem.

* * * * *

3. That a national seminar on Christian social relations and local church activities be held at DePauw University, Greencastle, Ind., July 3 to 17, 1946, with a program emphasis on "Rural Community Living and Changing Social Frontiers."

That invitations for representation at and participation in the seminar be sent to home and foreign departments and the home and foreign divisions.

That the seminar be jointly planned and sponsored by the department of Christian social relations and local church activities and the bureau of town and country work of the home department.

4. That the department provide an informal study in the area of International Relations and World Peace, centering around relationship between the United States and Russia with a view to creating sympathetic understanding and good will between the two countries.

5. That we use the study material on the Social Creed, by Dr. Karl Quimby, appearing in the June and July (1945) issues of Adult Student, as an informal study.

6. That the department publish an Information and Action Bulletin to be issued bimonthly and mailed from the Cincinnati office to the conference secretaries of Christian social relations and local church activities for channeling to the local societies.

That the woman's division suggest to conferences, in view of the necessity for the bulletin, that they see that the districts and/or conferences provide sufficient funds to carry forward promptly the mailing of these bulletins.

7. That local societies make a study of the civil-rights laws and their enforcement in the respective States of our Nation.

8. That the department prepare a free question-answer leaflet for study by the local society on postwar employment of women, and a pamphlet questionnaire to be called An Inquiry to determine gains made during the war in the area of race relations.

9. That jurisdiction, conference, and district organizations seek to provide a cultivation fund adequate for the promotion of the program of Christian social relations and local church activities by the jurisdiction, conference, and district secretaries. * * *

THE CHURCH'S MINISTRY TO THE FAMILY

The department recommends:

1. That local societies initiate or cooperate in plans for services in Christian counseling in the local church and community by studying ways and means of counseling, and by working with the pastor to make community services in family counseling available where needed.

2. That the local societies in cooperation with the Crusade for Christ and other agencies in the church, provide the kind of educational experiences which will enable parents to enrich and stabilize family living by the use of the family altar and, by giving religious significance to the varying aspects of family life, and utilizing them for worship experience.

3. That the local society work with its town or county board of education to have courses in the public schools on courtship, marriage and parenthood, and that similar courses be added in schools of the woman's division.

4. Support of the principles and proposals in the Patman housing bill (to prevent speculation in sale of old housing, to reestablish allocation of scarce building materials for houses costing $6,000 to $8,000, and to insure the availability of real estate at fair prices for home building).

5. That we work for a continuation of rent control, and work to insure that increased cost of manufacturing be absorbed, wherever possible, along the line without increasing cost to the consumer.

6. Work for legislation that would lift the income of the small farm and farm laborer and would conserve our resources of land, water, and forests.

7. Work for legislation that would provide for the Federal control of the United States Employment Service.

8. That in accordance with Methodist long-standing support of collective bargaining as expressed in the social creed, we oppose all current efforts to weaken rights of labor and management to arrive at mutually satisfactory agreements through collective bargaining.

9. That we recognize the urgent necessity to be alert to the gravity of the situation accompanying the demobilization of Negro service personnel, as evidenced in increased racial tension, lynchings, mob violence, and deplorable discrimination in employment, education, and housing. That we work with other community groups to eliminate the causes of tension and correct these injustices.

That we be alert to and cooperate with other agencies to combat the rise of repressive organizations once again often cloaked in religious phraseology, such as the Ku Klux Klan, the I Am, Free Enterprise, the Christian Front, the Commoner Party, etc.

10. That we favor legislation that would place Indian affairs in the same regular Government bureaus, departments, and courts which deal with the affairs of the white man, and we suggest

That women in the local church in communities where Indians are found in the population work for participation of the Indian in local, State, and National elections.

WORLD ORDER

1. As the United Nations Organization stands now at the threshold of actual existence, we recommend:

a. Immediate action by the division, and by local women supporting the full participation of the United States in the organization by the grant of the necessary authority to our representative and by making available specified military forces.

b. Also long-range study of the progress of the United Nations Organization and encouragement and support of the humanitarian and Christian principles inherent in the Charter, and full economic cooperation.

2. Whereas the whole relief problem is a priority on the humanitarian conscience of the world, we recommend that Methodist women write the President and the State Department requesting adequate allocations of food and supplies to Germany and Japan through the American Army of Occupation, and urge our Government to make it possible for private and church agencies to enter enemy countries for relief services immediately.

3. We recommend that Methodist women supplement UNRRA by immediate and generous response to every call of United Protestant agencies for food and clothing. (At present these should be sent to United Church Service Center for Europe, New Windsor, Md.; for Asia, Modesto, Calif.)

4. We recommend that we ask the Government to define objectives with reference to the kind of economy the United Nations are enforcing on the conquered nations.

5. We endorse the principle embodied in the bill introduced by Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT which proposes that credits established through the sale of surplus war properties abroad may be used for the promotion of international good will through the ex-

change of students in the fields of education, culture, and science.

6. That women throughout the church take advantage of every opportunity, through such agencies as the World Federation of Methodist Women, to develop better relations among women of all countries by encouraging an exchange of visitors—these to come from Europe as well as Asia, and to include former enemy countries; and that through the federation information be given to the women in local societies of the presence in their locality of these visitors, and of students from other nations, so that invitations to their homes, opportunities for participation in community life, and other courtesies be extended to them.

THE FOLLOWING SPECIFIC SUGGESTIONS INDICATE POSSIBLE WAYS OF WORKING IN SOME OF THE AREAS LISTED ABOVE

1. Participation of local societies in the program of local units of such organizations as the Conference of Christians and Jews, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the Urban League, and other interracial or interfaith groups.

2. Basic to international cooperation and the extension of Christian fellowship is the cultivation of new people in the community regardless of race, culture, or economic status through home-calling, cooperating with church departments and community organizations.

3. That local secretaries seek a conference with pastors on the work of the Christian social relations and local church activities committee as suggested through activities for 1946 and the information and action bulletin.

4. That conference, district, and local secretaries of Christian social relations and local church activities acquaint themselves with and make use of material available for their work from the board of education and the United Council of Church Women.

5. In order to channel into the church the valuable experience and training of women who have been volunteers in wartime services we suggest that local women give careful consideration to an adequate interpretation of the importance of the church's program and the ways their particular skills and interests could be of the greatest use to the church and the greatest satisfaction to the individual.

6. In order to improve their approach to volunteer leadership training in the church, local women might study, observe, or cooperate in volunteer leadership training courses of community agencies.

That members of local societies be helped to bring to bear the Christian approach to questions discussed in the secular organizations to which they belong.

7. We remind Methodist women of their opportunity to influence public opinion and practices in their community through expressing their attitudes in their private conversation and in any incidents of racial tension such as those which occur on busses, trains, public places, and in their neighborhoods.

8. Study the pamphlet on how a bill is introduced and its successive steps and how a woman in the local society can follow through.

Write to the Washington office of the Federal Council of Churches, directed by Benson Y. Landis, Room 316, Woodward Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington 5, D. C., for analyses of pending legislation.

Send letters indicating approval or disapproval to Congressmen.

Use the bimonthly bulletin of the Department on Information and Action.

9. Cooperate with local, State, national, and international organizations having program of study and action similar to ours.

10. Stress need for total registration and participation in voting.

11. Initiate State-wide conferences of organizations with similar programs of welfare. (Illustration: In one State, Methodist women cooperated with 21 organizations in a rural health conference.)

12. Request that the social creed be read to the congregation at least once a year as provided by article 20 of the creed. Refer to social creed in passing judgment on current issues.

13. Take the lead in discovering facts on both sides in labor and management disputes as it concerns the welfare of the people as a whole, judging each case on its own merits and in terms of spiritual and human values.

14. Study wages, conditions, opportunities for employment for all people in the community. (Helps: The industrial committee of the Y. W. C. A., labor unions, manufacturers, employers, farm organizations, urban league.) Pick out of the survey the most pressing need and work toward the solution with the above-named groups, through appeal to employer, through the press, and through legislation.

15. Study State labor laws and their enforcement in your community and State.

16. Add labor, Negro, Jewish, Latin American, and liberal press to our reading of the press and magazines.

17. Find and publicize facts concerning community issues through forums, bringing together members of groups concerned.

18. Visit all residential sections of town. See if you discover any correlation between housing and human welfare. Make similar experiment in the nearby countryside.

19. Study housing, health needs of community (facts gained from city or county departments of health, education, and courts).

20. Consider taking such action as taken by a workshop group—North Georgia Conference: "We call upon the people who call themselves Methodists to look well at the property they own and rent lest their income be from that which makes for the economic insecurity of the poor and the spiritual insecurity of the owner."

The Fight Against Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1946

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me, I am including as part of my remarks an address by Hon. Chester Bowles, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, over a Nation-wide hook-up. The address follows:

I wonder if you happened to notice the headlines the other night, about the stock market hitting its highest peak in 15 years? Or if you heard about those department stores, up in New York, which reported sales of a million dollars a day, just before Christmas time?

These are just two of the things that have happened recently to highlight the fact that individual savings in this country increased by over a hundred and forty billion dollars during the war.

Now, all that's wonderful news, of course. But I think it points one lesson very clearly.

It shows you why this broadcast—this tribute to 4 years of faithful service by the war price and rationing boards—can't just be a get-together celebration for a job that's all wrapped up and done.

On the price- and rent-control front far too much remains to be accomplished for that.

What the war price and rationing boards did in helping to keep prices in line during the war deserves the highest praise. Their work on the rationing programs is right there on the record, too. They made it easier for this country to have the best-fed, best-clothed, best-equipped Army and Navy in the world. Yet everybody here at home got his fair share of everything scarce. Along with a hundred and forty million other Americans, I can't say enough for that magnificent achievement.

But when we look at the problems that lie ahead, in the light of the tremendous inflationary pressures for higher prices today, the best anyone can say is that their people have done a grand job—but it's only half done.

Today the battle lines against inflation are sharply drawn. Your pocketbook, your savings, and what the money in it will buy are at stake. Your very jobs may be in danger. If the inflationary pressures aren't held in check now, this country may be headed for an inflationary price rise and a collapse that would dwarf by comparison anything we have ever known. That sounds like scare talk, but it's the cold, sober truth.

The battle to keep prices and rents within bounds isn't going to be won here in Washington. It will be won in community after community all over the United States—in cities and towns where hundreds of thousands of price-controlled items—from shirts and shorts to sewing machines, from apples and apricots to automobiles—are daily changing hands.

I want you to hear the story now from just a few of the thousands of loyal, hard-working, unpaid local board workers who are sticking to their price-control jobs. At a microphone in Cleveland, Ohio, the first of these speakers is waiting. He's Dr. Sanford A. Helsel, who has worked on a local OPA board in Cleveland ever since right after Pearl Harbor. Go ahead, Dr. Helsel in Cleveland.

Mr. HELSEL. Thank you, Mr. Bowles. Perhaps I ought to say that the "doctor" part of my name means I'm a practicing dentist. In the last 4 years, however, my dentistry has sometimes seemed like a part-time vocation. The board of which I'm chairman—Price Control Board No. 13—is in Cleveland's densely populated, highly industrialized Collinwood neighborhood and there's certainly always plenty to do there. Just in the areas served by our board there are something like 3,600 retail stores. About a quarter million people live in the neighborhood and trade in those stores.

Our board members and staff employees feel that they have an obligation to every one of the 250,000 residents in our area. If you people could attend one of our price board conferences and listen to the angry complaints of people who have been overcharged buying a used car, a secondhand radio, or a new tire, you'd get a clearer idea of how prices can get out of hand. No matter how honest the vast majority of dealers and individuals are, you'll always find a few chiselers with their eye on all the money that's flying around. That money's inflationary dynamite. Our job is to see that illegal price increases don't set it off.

Now that the one remaining rationing job—sugar rationing—is to be handled by the district OPA offices, we're free, like all the other price boards, to concentrate all our efforts to holding ceiling prices in line. But the best efforts of the local price boards won't be worth too much without cooperation of every citizen here in Cleveland and everywhere else. The public must support OPA's price-control program until it is no longer needed, if the boom and bust which followed World War I is going to be prevented.

The thing to do—if you think you've been overcharged—is to report that overcharge to your local board.

Now, out in California, another board chairman, is waiting to speak to you. I've

never met him, so I'll just say "glad to meet you, Mr. Paulsen," and let him take over.

Mr. PAULSEN. This is Oscar Paulsen, chairman of the San Francisco Price Control Board, speaking from San Francisco, Calif.

We've seen a lot of changes out here on the west coast during the past 4 years. We have had, and still have, the biggest population and the biggest pay rolls in our history.

We know that a lot of the people who came out here during the war are going to stay with us. We hope that our pay rolls will stay in the upper brackets, too. But we know that big pay rolls will not mean very much unless we can keep prices at or near present levels.

That was our problem all through the war, and it is our most important problem today. I have been an active member of the OPA in San Francisco ever since price control was started back in 1942. I have given my time and services to this program because I realized the tremendous importance of a balanced economy.

Now that the war is over I know that its more important than ever that we hold the line on prices and rents until we are out of danger. I have been in the banking business for many years. As a banker and businessman I think I may lay claim to some experience in practical economics. In the simplest terms, we cannot have prosperity unless we can maintain our ability to buy. Our ability to buy depends on the size of our pay envelopes, and on the prices we have to pay. That's all there is to it.

During the past 4 years many new industries have been started here on the west coast. I am convinced that fair and equitable price control is necessary to the well-being of these new industries during the difficult months just ahead. I am also convinced that price control is the best protection for the working man and woman during this reconversion period.

Actually, we are in better shape today than any of us expected to be 5 months ago when the war ended. We have less unemployment and our general business picture is brighter than we hoped it would be.

We can't afford to lose the ground we have gained and held. We can't afford to let a few selfish individuals break down the safeguards we have built up during the past 4 years.

There is one more point I would like to make. A personal point. My two sons served their country during the war, one in the merchant marine, one in the Navy. Now they are starting all over again as civilians. I want to see them get a good start and a fair chance for success. If we can hold the line, if we can make price and rent control continue to work, I know that they will have a real chance.

Now, in Boston, Mass., another OPA volunteer worker is waiting to give you her side of the story. She's Mrs. Vernon C. Stoneman, a New England housewife. Come in, Mrs. Stoneman in Boston.

Mrs. STONEMAN. I am a New England housewife; yes. But more than that, I am an American housewife.

Like millions of other American homemakers, I do most of the buying for my family and home. Because of that, I am particularly aware of the prices of the groceries and other things I buy, and of the rent we pay.

I suppose that's the chief reason that, right from the start, I have had a personal interest in this business of keeping prices down.

There are two more reasons. When war struck our country—and the call went out for volunteers—I naturally wanted to do my part. The men of our Nation went to the battle front. But we soon found out that there was a home-front battle to win, too—the battle against rising prices and inflation.

I remember when I volunteered as an OPA worker hearing people say: "You can't stop inflation. It comes with every war. History proves it."

Now we New Englanders believe in history * * * we have a rather long one of our own. But we believe even more in our democracy—and what it can accomplish.

So when our country called for volunteers to fight inflation, I was among the tens of thousands from every corner of the United States who joined up. And I'd like to say right here and now that I'm staying joined up until the job is finished.

Now I don't know too much about the economics of inflation, but I do know this: If prices were to go higher and higher, I wouldn't be able to buy food and all the other everyday things, or pay our rent, let alone get a new radio and some of the other things we've needed around the house for a long time. And if prices were to get completely beyond our reach, we might even have to sell our bonds just to keep food in our mouths.

As I said, I'm no economist, but I do know we're in for a lot of trouble here in Boston—and your town, too—if we don't watch out. That's why I'm not only willing—but glad and proud—to do my part in helping fight inflation. I can't do a lot myself, of course, but millions of others are also doing their part every day, and that gives me a lot of confidence that things are going to come out all right.

Now, goodbye from all of us in Boston and let me introduce to you Thomas Ratigan, a member of a price board in Gary, Ind., speaking from Chicago.

Mr. RATIGAN. Hello from Chicago. You see a lot of gold discharge buttons along Michigan Avenue these days. But next to my service pin I also have the privilege of wearing an OPA volunteer emblem. You see, I was an OPA volunteer before I joined the Army, and when I got back in civvies again the least I felt I could do was to get back in the fighting lines against inflation, too. I suppose my experience as a serviceman has made me appreciate more than I ever did before the value of the dollar.

Some of my buddies had to raise large families on an allotment, and any inflationary rise in prices would have taken all the stretch out of that allotment. I saw how vital was their need for price control.

I thought of those men more than once when I returned to civilian life and saw the unyielding pressures on prices. I thought of them when I saw what happened to the prices of items removed from price control—like citrus fruits, for example. Service families wouldn't have a chance if all prices of everyday necessities were to skyrocket.

When I went back into business again as a member of a furniture firm in Gary, Ind., I saw that business, too, wouldn't have a chance in the viselike grip of inflation.

As a businessman, I realize that the success of my business—all business—depends on large-scale orders. These stem from volume production—from sales at popular prices, not inflated prices. Sky-rocketing prices bring only buyers strikes—a falling off of orders, inventory losses—failures. Inflation leaves many casualties in its wake—just like the physical enemy. On the price panel on which I serve in Gary, we, as volunteer citizens, are doing what we can to make our community a good place to live in so that it may realize its full possibilities in the prosperous postwar years that we see ahead. Inflation has no place in this picture, and we are devoting our whole-hearted energies to combat it. As a representative of these volunteers, it is a great pleasure for me to take part on this anniversary broadcast.

Mr. BOWLES. This is Chester Bowles in Washington. Thanks, Mr. Thomas Ratigan, Mrs. Vernon Stoneman, Mr. Oscar Paulsen, and Dr. Sanford Helsel—for taking part on this program.

More people like yourselves, and the many thousands who served so faithfully on War Price and Rationing Boards during the war, are needed urgently now. The fight against inflation, the fight against higher rents and prices, needs 90,000 volunteers. I'd like to say to everyone listening to this program, if you have any time at all, even an hour or two a week, that you can spare, please go to your nearest local Board and say, "I want to help." Some day, when you look about you at a country enjoying sound prosperity, with reasonable prices and good jobs for everyone, you'll be glad you did just that.

Welles Says United States Foreign Policy Lacks Essential Dependability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1946

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an article by Sumner Welles, former Under Secretary of State, from the New York Herald Tribune of Wednesday, January 16, 1946:

WELLES SAYS UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY LACKS ESSENTIAL DEPENDABILITY—POINTS TO BYRNES' REVERSAL ON BALKAN REGIMES; DECLARES AMERICA'S MORAL LEADERSHIP IN WORLD HINGES ON CONFIDENCE OF OTHERS IN OUR WORDS

(By Sumner Welles, former Under Secretary of State)

If the United States is to exercise any potent influence in promoting world peace and in establishing a better international order, other nations must be confident that this Government will abide by its professions. American foreign policy must possess the all-important quality of dependability.

For example, other nations should be able to have faith that if the United States in the month of September 1945 takes a definite position upon certain basic principles, this Government will maintain that position 2 months later.

Unfortunately, precisely the reverse has proved to be the case.

Naturally, this Government, if it is ever to find grounds for agreement with other governments, must frequently compromise upon matters of procedure, or yield some of its material demands. But that is very different from abandoning its announced position upon international questions of high principle.

At Yalta, as a result of the insistence of President Roosevelt, it was agreed by the Big Three that the governments to be installed in the occupied countries of eastern Europe and of the Balkans should be freely elected and truly representative of the will of the peoples involved.

In accordance with that commitment, the United States later announced that it would not recognize any governments in those countries until they were constituted in accordance with the principles agreed upon at Yalta. It delivered official warnings in that sense to the de facto authorities there installed. Last September, at the London meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers, the United States took the position that peace treaties could not be negotiated with the Balkan States until representative governments had been freely elected in those countries. At the same conference this government further made it plain that it intended to insist upon the right of France to participate in the negotiation of the Balkan peace treaties.

BYRNES SHIFTS VIEWS

Mr. Byrnes, after much eloquent lip service to the cause of international democracy, later assured us that it was because of the insistence of the United States upon these principles that the London meeting broke up in failure.

What has happened since?

At the Moscow meeting Mr. Byrnes agreed that the United States would recognize the Bulgarian and Rumanian Governments and negotiate final peace treaties with them provided the present governments of those countries each added to their Cabinets two members of "democratic parties" not presently represented in them, and gave certain pious assurances as to the way in which future elections would be conducted. Under existing conditions no one can be so gullible as to believe that such an agreement will result in the creation of governments which will be either truly representative or disposed to hold free elections.

At Moscow, the United States agreed that France should have no part in the negotiation of the Balkan peace treaties although France possesses vital interests in the eastern Mediterranean and in the Balkans.

At Moscow, th United States agreed that the final European peace treaties would be dictated solely by the Big Three. There is no smaller member of the United Nations which will be deluded as to the real character of the so-called peace conference to be held before May 1 next, at which the lesser powers will be permitted to make recommendations, but will be given no assurance that their recommendations will be adopted.

The course now followed by the United States constitutes a complete reversal of what this Government had previously maintained.

Can it be surprising that the French Government has bluntly asked whether the so-called peace conference is summoned merely to ratify decisions already taken by the Big Three? Or that it serves notice that France is "interested in all important questions concerning Europe or any region whatever of Europe"?

"MERE WORDS" CHALGED

Have we any reason to wonder that Francois Mauriac, in a bitter allocution to the French people, quotes these words of La Bruyere:

"It costs the powerful so little to bestow mere words upon us, and their power makes it so unnecessary for them to carry out the fine promises which they have made, that it is really true modesty on their part not to make even more sweeping promises."

The promises previously given by the United States that it was determined that free and representative governments were to b installed in the occupied countries of Europe, and that it was solemnly committed to the great principle of "the sovereign equality of all nations, great or small," have thus proven to be mere words. The smaller powers of Europe and the lesser powers of the Western Hemisphere which, in the days of President Roosevelt, had looked with such hope to the leadership of the United States in the creation of a free and democratic world order, can today have but little faith in our future protestations. Our recent acts have clearly belied our fine words.

The United States continues to possess the influence in world affairs which is derived from its military might and from its material resources. But the moral influence which it possessed during the war years because of the belief that this Government was determined to support those principles which are indispensable if a peaceful world is to be established is rapidly vanishing.

It would be far better to refrain from giving assurances, however noble they may be, than to fail to carry them out. For the United States cannot exercise any effective leadership until all nations know that it means what it says.

Gen. Carl A. Spaatz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 16, 1946

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an address which I delivered in presenting Gen. Carl A. Spaatz, of the Army Air Forces, as the honored guest at a "Salute to Scott Field" testimonial dinner sponsored by the Belleville (Ill.) Chamber of Commerce.

The address follows:

I am greatly honored to have the assignment which has been bestowed upon me tonight. Just a little over a year ago I was a private in the ranks of the Army. And now I have the privilege of introducing to a home audience one of the Army's highest ranking officers.

In America such incidents are not uncommon. In fact, they are so commonplace we hardly think anything of them. Yet, there is some importance that should be attached to them.

They show the greatness of America. They show that here democracy really works. That in time of war, and in time of peace, all men work and serve together to preserve that democracy. We differ in opinions on many subjects and on many occasions, but when the majority casts its decision we get together to work in the interest of the Nation.

But America's greatness came through hard struggle. It has been preserved in the same way. We must realize good things are not easily obtained and they are not easily held after we have obtained them.

We have peace now, but to hold that peace we must work. And it is not enough to work among ourselves, we must work with all the people of the world to hold that peace. Without world cooperation there isn't anything we can look forward to but world destruction. We must appeal to the hearts and reasons of all men for a mutual understanding that will preserve the peace we have won at such a great cost.

If you speak ill of your neighbor long enough he will begin to speak ill about you. The climax of word arguments is usually physical clash. Let us speak kindly of our neighbors throughout the world today, so they may regard us kindly and be interested in joining with us in securing the peace.

America has the power to lead the way and to encourage all other nations to hold securely the peace of the world. Let us hope that power will be used wisely in the formation of postwar policies among nations.

In peacetime our armed forces are small in number and in equipment. Too little attention is paid to them. It is nothing short of a miracle that they develop into victorious forces in time of war. Someone is responsible for such miracles. We honor here tonight one of the handful of men who through the years of peace give their thought to any emergency which might arise to endanger our national security. We are fortunate that the men who direct our armed forces are not militarists, but are peace-loving Americans who much prefer that the occasion would never come when they had to be leaders in war. But we are thankful that when the crisis was here they rose to the heights and gave to our arms the kind of leadership that has been our American heritage since our first Commander in Chief, George Washington.

Scott Field, Belleville, and adjoining communities are honored by the presence of our distinguished visitor. A West Pointer, our guest began his active duty in the Army in 1916. His career has been an outstanding one since. He served in France in command of the Thirty-first Aero Squadron and on other assignments in World War I.

He is a pioneer in the Army Air Forces, having continued his active duty in the air services since World War I. His commands included Kelly Field and Ellington Field, Tex., and his achievements in the development of aircraft for military use are too numerous to mention. He has been one of the key men in his arm of the service since its creation.

In January 1942 he was assigned Chief of Air Forces Combat Command in Washington. In March 1942 he was assigned to headquarters, Army Air Forces at Bolling Field, Washington, and in May of the same year he became commanding general of the Eighth Air Force.

In July 1942 he was sent to the European theater of operations. In November 1942 he became commanding general of the northwestern African air force and in March 1943 he assumed command of all United States Army Air Forces in the north African campaign.

It is hardly necessary to recall the record he set in command of the United States strategic Air Force in the European theater through the h..rd struggle from January 1944 to the close of the war in Europe. His leadership in that battle of the air which brought ultimate victory to our arms has been recognized throughout the world and many special honors have come to him. His long years of experience in military aviation paid dividends to the Nation which placed so much confidence in his judgment.

In June 1945 he was returned to service in the headquarters of the Army Air Forces but within a month was assigned to transfer his strategic bombing operations to the Pacific. He is now back in Washington and we are hopeful that his vast store of aviation knowledge will be of service to our country for a long time.

He is rated a command pilot and a combat observer—he has the Distinguished Service Medal with an Oak Leaf Cluster, the Distinguished Flying Cross and the Legion of Merit.

But more than all these he has the thanks of the people of America for a job well done.

It is my great privilege and I am honored to present to you Gen. Carl A. Spaatz.

The Montana Method

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 16, 1946

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken many times on the outstanding bond record made by Montana during the course of the various drives. We are proud of the contribution our State has made and we think that the team which conducted all the loan campaigns is outstanding because of the hard work, cooperation, and patriotism they have shown. The men who directed the activities in Montana were A. T. Hibbard, of Helena; Bill Bartley, of Great Falls; and Fred Martin, of Great Falls.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD an

article on The Montana Method, taken from the magazine Minute Man of December 15, 1945:

THE MONTANA METHOD—STATE RECORD MADE ON STRAIGHT COMPETITION

Only a champion can make news by taking a defeat. Although barely nosed out by North Dakota, as the first State to achieve the E bond quota in the Victory Loan, Montana maintains its record of five straight, having led in the Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, and Seventh War Loans. On the opening day of the present drive six Montana counties achieved their E bond quotas. No other State has ever achieved this excellent record.

These results have been obtained practically without special events, glamour, or cheese cake.

At the beginning of each drive Chairman A. T. Hibbard, a banker in Helena, has conducted a series of ten 1-day meetings to lay out the campaign After the district meetings the campaigns have been a matter of straight competition between counties. A map was published every little while, with those counties printed in red which had already reached their quotas. The counties vied for position in the roster of successful campaigners.

So well were the citizens stimulated that they usually came to the committee headquarters to buy their bonds, with a steady stream of customers standing before the tables waiting to buy.

All loan campaigns in Montana have been conducted by the same team, Chairman Hibbard; collector of customs at Great Falls; William H. Bartley, now the vice chairman; and Fred J. Martin, who, after a turn with the marines, is now the executive director.

Montana is sometimes called the Treasure State, on account of its mineral and agricultural wealth, but its prime asset is its people, who give more than they demand.

Do You Want Errand Boys or Lawmakers?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. ROE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1946

Mr. ROE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD an article which appeared in the American magazine entitled "Do You Want Errand Boys or Lawmakers?" by a former Member of this House, Matthew J. Merritt:

DO YOU WANT ERRAND BOYS OR LAWMAKERS?

(By Matthew J. Merritt, former United States Representative from New York)

This is open season on Congress. Every man-Jack or Jill who could get a publisher, a 3-cent stamp, or a sawed-off shotgun has taken a crack at the Nation's lawmakers. Never before in our history have the elected representatives of the people been so vilified, ridiculed, and distrusted by the people who elected them. Thousands of words have been written on penny post cards, in newspapers, magazines, and $3 editions—telling Congress off.

To refer to the Senate of the United States or the House of Representatives as "the Illustrious Dunderheads" or "the Monkey House" seems to assure a writer's popularity. Some of these critics make helpful suggestions. Some are simply abusive. But all of them imply that the men who come to Congress are incompetents, loafers, or worse.

Granting that Congress is not so efficient as it might be, I think it's high time someone put the blame where it belongs: On the people.

If criticism of the character of our National Legislature is justified, then surely the people who choose its Members should come in for their share of it. If you were to buy a house the way you select your Representatives in Congress, you'd acknowledge that you deserved to get stung. Before the real-estate agent got your name on a contract, you would satisfy yourself that the plumbing and furnace were in working order and that the roof didn't leak. But the average American doesn't bother to know the man or woman he sends to Washington to make laws which will affect the lives of himself and his family, the conduct of his business, his bank balance, and the security of his later years.

Chances are 100 to 1 that he makes no attempt to inform himself of his Congressman's views on domestic issues or on the position the United States should take in world affairs. He votes the straight party ticket, checking names of candidates who are as much strangers to him as the natives of Guam. This at a time when in both Houses of Congress the vote on major issues is divided by the way men think, not by their party affiliations. The wonder is that this pig-in-a-poke system produces so many able and intelligent legislators.

When the voter discovers that the candidate he sends to Washington with blind and unquestioning approval does not represent his own views, he feels no self-reproach. What, he asks, can you expect of a blankety-blank politician? Actually, he expects a lot. Among other things, he expects his Congressman to be a social-service worker, banker, employment agency, father-confessor, and errand boy. He expects his Congressman to get his son out of the Army, to get the price of milk or steel boosted, to get him a date with Jeanette MacDonald, and to get his widowed Aunt Susan a job.

If Aunt Susan and Uncle Ned arrive in Washington on their uppers, it is not unusual for the Congressman to provide them with a pair of shoes, a winter overcoat, or a hotel room for their job-hunting expedition. And if they fail to land a job, more often than not it is the Congressman who pays their train fare home. One of my colleagues kept an account of one year's expenditures for charity to his constituents. It amounted to $2,800.

It is popularly believed that anyone who goes into politics is too lazy to support himself in private industry. In a recent poll the parents of high-school-age boys were asked whether they wanted their sons to go into politics. None of them did. One woman went so far as to say, "No; I want my son to go to work." This attitude is consistently reflected in the demands constituents make upon their Congressman's time.

When the average citizen visits his Congressman in Washington he feels privileged to require that the greater part of the day shall be devoted to him. After a leisurely discussion of his difficulties with some Government bureau, he frequently suggests that the Congressman should visit the bureau with him to personally appeal his case. After that he suggests lunch, and is hurt if his host declines. Luncheon over, he announces that he has nothing to do the rest of the day, and if the Congressman cannot devise some entertainment which appeals to his visitor, he is stuck with him for another hour or two, usually given to a recital of the constituent's personal problems, interlarded with home-town gossip. It is obvious that the caller thinks that, like himself, his representative in Washington has nothing else to do.

Believe me, your Congressman works hard at his job. The incidence of heart disease in the Senate and House of Representatives is grim evidence that the Members of both Houses are overworked. The average Congressman belongs to one major committee which meets four or five times a week from 10 in the morning until noon or 1 o'clock, when the Legislature convenes. He belongs to three or more minor committees which meet less frequently. From the middle of the day until 5 or 6 he attends debates on the floor of the House or Senate and discusses legislation with his colleagues in cloak-room sessions.

When the Congressman can manage a quiet evening at home he takes along a brief case bulging with committee reports and new legislation. More often he must attend banquets given by civic, labor, and industrial organizations, or late meetings with his colleagues to discuss legislative strategy. Week ends he tries hopelessly to bring his correspondence up to date.

Most Congressmen receive from 75 to 100 letters a day from their constituents. A veteran wants to know why he hasn't yet received his pension. There are a dozen or more letters from constituents who have been enlisted by pressure groups and who demand to know how their Congressman will vote on various bills. Another dozen or so letters ask for copies of Department of Agriculture bulletins and other Government publications. A hopeful author sends the manuscript of her novel with the request that it be copyrighted. A home-town moralist wants to know if it's true that her Congressman has a bar in his Washington apartment.

The Congressman's mail bag is weighted with letters of this kind, many of which require the exchange of half a dozen phone calls and letters with Government agencies, and the more persuasive letter writers imply broadly that if they do not get the right answer they will have their revenge at the polls.

Obviously, there is little time left for the Congressman to inform himself about the thousands of bills which are introduced at each session of the Senate and House. When I first went to Washington, I remember asking one of my senior colleagues what he thought of an important piece of legislation on which we were voting. He said, "I haven't had time to read it." Nevertheless, he voted for the bill. When you realize that between 8,000 and 13,000 bills are introduced each session, it is apparent that lawmaking is a full-time job. Nearly 10,000 bills were introduced in the last session of Congress, and 1,500 were reported out of committee.

It has been proposed that congressional machinery should be modernized, the number of committees reduced, and that Congressmen should be given adequate staffs, so that they may have more time for the job they were sent to Washington to do. Such reforms would help, but so long as Members of Congress are required by their constituents to spend 90 percent of their time at trivial chores, under compulsion of political disfavor, no amount of streamlining will make it possible for the legislative branch to serve the purpose for which it was created.

There can be little understanding of the real responsibilities of Congress by ladies of the garden club who call their Congressman from Washington to make awards at the annual petunia exhibition, by the constituent who sends his Congressman a model of his latest invention and asks to have it patented, by the job-seeker from my own district who got at least 50 of his friends to write urging me to help him get employment, or by the voter who asked me to send him a copy of the World Almanac.

Newcomers to Capitol Hill charged with ambition and enthusiasm are quickly discouraged by these unending selfish demands. The cynicism with which people regard their Representatives in Washington is matched by the cynicism with which their Representatives come to regard them. This is illustrated by a popular cloak room story:

A candidate for reelection was distressed to find that one of his oldest friends was not

supporting him in the campaign. When they met, the Congressman asked for an explanation. "Jim," he said, "I can't believe you're not going to vote for me. What does this mean? You must have forgotten all I've done for you. Remember your Uncle Jake? Well, I got him appointed postmaster, didn't I?"

The voter admitted this.

"And I got your wife's brother the rural mail route, didn't I?"

"Yup," agreed the voter.

"And your son, Billy," the Congressman persisted, "I got him an appointment to West Point."

"That's so," said his friend grudgingly. "But you ain't done nothing for me lately."

One of my colleagues, who had never distinguished himself as a lawmaker, was returned to Congress for more than 20 years by his constituency. He never failed to answer their letters. He wrote them friendly notes on their birthdays, sent them post cards when he traveled out of the country, and unfailingly expressed his sympathy for the farmer whose silo burned down or the grocer whose till was emptied by thieves. He is a throwback to the early days of our history, when we were an isolated nation of small communities with small interests. He cannot mature in public service until his homefolks grow up to take their place as world citizens.

The final and decisive power in our system of government is granted by the Constitution to elected officials, particularly legislators. These lawmakers have the responsibility of maintaining the balance of power. If they fail we must resign ourselves to some form of executive control.

Representative government will survive only if Congress continues as the chief policy-making branch of government. It will not survive if Congressmen vote with blocs and yield to pressure groups because their calendars are too crowded with the affairs of individual constituents to allow them time to study legislation. It will not survive if, when we the people speak, we ask favors for ourselves without regard to the national interest, if we compel Congress to think in terms of the jobs its constituents want done instead of in terms of national welfare.

The people are willing to give Congress the responsibility for curing unemployment, for adapting our domestic economy and national policies to new world conditions. They are willing to trust it with their money and their lives. But they are not willing to take it seriously.

Congressmen are regarded as comic-strip characters given to windy harangues on local power projects, with which they lull their colleagues to sleep. They are regarded as servants, not of the public, but of the individual voter. They are underpaid and overworked. Because their salaries are paid by the Government it is assumed that they aren't worth their salt. They are burdened with tasks to which an efficient business manager would assign an office boy—and threatened with political defeat if they demur.

Yet these are the men to whom the world looks for peace. Whether your children will go to war will depend on the kind of peace confirmed by the men and women you have sent to Congress. Without their cooperation and consent, as we discovered in 1919, there can be no respite from the dying, impoverishment, and weariness of war.

In his speech to Congress after Yalta, the late President Roosevelt said, "The question of whether my long journey is to be entirely fruitful or not lies to a great extent in your hands. For unless you here in the Halls of the American Congress—with the support of the American people—concur in the general conclusions reached at Yalta and give them your active support, the meeting will not have produced lasting results."

This is a challenge to our greatest wisdom. But our greatest wisdom cannot be enlisted to meet the challenge so long as honor and security are denied to men in public service. The strongest urge of nearly every human being is to have the approval of his fellowmen. If this approval goes to the businessman, then our bright young men will go into business. If it goes to the politician, they will go into politics.

Upon his return from Moscow, Eric Johnston, President of the United States Chamber of Commerce, said admiringly of Mikoyan, the People's Commissar for Foreign Trade, "He is highly intelligent. He'd be prominent in any country. In America he'd be a big businessman or industrialist." The implications of that statement are clear.

So long as "politician" is a word of derision and contempt, business will continue to attract our "highly intelligent" young men. Unless political life is made equally attractive to them, our domestic future and the hope of world peace are threatened.

The aversion Americans have to government is outdated. In the days of the frontier, men were a law unto themselves. Before the First World War, people were so intent upon developing our natural resources that they ignored government. They could afford to. The need was for men who would risk their lives in unbroken wilderness, for speculators and businessmen who would risk their money to open uncharted veins of our national wealth. There was little need for good government, or for honest and capable politicians.

Today we need the talent that has contributed to making this a great industrial nation to make this a stable and peaceful world. We need men with wisdom and courage to make us pre-eminent in world affairs as we are industrially. The scarcity of such men in public life is one of the greatest weaknesses in our Nation.

We must induce into the service of our Government the most capable young men in America. They must be rewarded in prestige and pay comparable to that enjoyed by brokers, engineers, doctors, and manufacturers. Unless young men of vision and understanding attack the problems of domestic readjustment and world reorganization, we shall have failed to meet the challenge of history.

It is not enough for America to give Diesel engines and alms to the world. The world needs our boldness, our imagination, our genius—in political leadership.

Finally, I believe that Congressmen should be elected for a single term of 6 years, the same as Senators. As it is now, a Congressman spends his first year in office showing proper gratitude to his constituents for having elected him and the second year trying to win enough votes to get reelected. At the end of 2 years the average Congressman has learned the ropes. If he is not returned for another term, the time he has spent in Washington is wasted. Voters would think twice about the qualifications of their Representatives if they realized that they were selecting men and women who would become their spokesmen in Washington for 6 years.

Limiting congressional service to a single term would clear the legislative branch of dead wood and give more young men and women an opportunity to help make representative government work. Their understanding of government would spread to their communities and colleagues when they went home, and Washington would no longer seem remote and mysterious to most Americans, as it does now.

If Congress is to be revivified, seniority rules must be abolished, and only those Congressmen who have demonstrated qualities of leadership and a grasp of legislative problems should be rewarded with positions of influence.

Having selected good men, and freed them from political pressure by the single-term rule, we should pay them at least $25,000 a year. Each Congressman should have an assistant whose entire time would be devoted to the personal affairs of constituents, so that the Congressman himself need not be diverted from the job of lawmaking.

Only a vigorous and informed Congress can save this country from the paralyzing growth of bureaucracy and protect it in its world relations. Only the intelligent self-interest of the voting public can recreate a Federal Congress of men and women who are carefully selected, decently paid, and liberated for the vital tasks which face them.

Montana's Outstanding Reclamationist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1946

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am happy to put into the RECORD an article from the Miles City Star, Miles City, Mont., containing a tribute to Mr. O. S. Warden, of Great Falls, Mont.

As newspaper publisher and citizen, Mr. Warden has contributed untiringly of his time and energy to Montana's and the Nation's advancement. We of Montana owe him much and we are proud that we can produce one such as him. Words cannot express adequately the love and admiration of Montana's citizens for this outstanding man. It is our hope that he will be with us for many years, to guide and advise us so that we may grow soundly, steadily, and progressively.

MONTANA'S OUTSTANDING RECLAMATIONIST

We have recently been in attendance at the fourteenth annual convention of the National Reclamation Association, an organization born in the still vivid days of the worst depression this country has experienced in its relatively short life. The National Reclamation Association came into existence in those dark days, as a sort of self-defense group for the 17 arid Western States of the Union. While the national reclamation act had been in effect as a law of the land since 1902, the pressing conditions of the depression were bringing about a drastic and gradual throttling of the activities of the Bureau of Reclamation. Eastern Congressmen, under the pressure of their industrial constituents who wanted more bread and butter in the eastern sections which did not produce that bread and butter, were constantly raiding congressional appropriations made for reclamation and irrigation development in the West. True, this was a short-sighted policy; a policy of literally killing the goose that was laying the golden eggs of food for the distraught eastern cities. But Congressmen are not always free from short-sightedness. Quite often they do kill the goose.

It was under these unhappy circumstances that the National Reclamation Association came into existence. Mr. O. S. Warden, publisher of the Great Falls Tribune, attended that forlorn and almost hopeless meeting, which was held in Salt Lake City. An organization was perfected; a little money was scraped—and that is really the word—together to maintain a 1-man office in Washington, which would look after the interests of the reclamation areas of the 17 Western States. And from that humble beginning the

fight was carried on with varying degrees of success.

Each of the 17 States was entitled to 1 representative on the board of directors of the association, which in turn elected the officers. Mr. Warden represented Montana on that board for 10 years and became the second president of the organization. Not only that, he served as president for 9 years, during which time his name came to be known throughout the length and breadth of the western States as a constant and willing fighter for more and more and greater and greater appropriations for irrigation and reclamation. He spent his own money traveling back and forth to Washington in the interests of this arid region. As time went on the Reclamation Association set up a meager budget to cover its activities and accepted voluntary donations to meet it. Among the items of the budget were $2,000 for traveling expenses of the president. But Mr. Warden never took a penny of that appropriation and at the end of each year it was turned back toward a small surplus which the association was accumulating. Not only that, but many times he dug into his own pocket to meet the $1,000 assessment made upon Montana as its share in sustaining the national organization. Sometimes he was reimbursed by late contributions within the State; sometimes he was not. And all that went on for the greater part of the 14 years of the life of the National Reclamation Association. Such was the faith of O. S. Warden in reclamation and such was his foresight into the possibilities of what reclamation could and would do for a State like Montana, with its vast agriculture resources. That faith and that vision is today bearing fruit in every State of the West. All over Montana, reclamation and irrigation projects are under way, bringing water to more and more thirsty acres which will and are producing new wealth and abundant crops in this hitherto drought-ridden area. Other States of North and South Dakota, Kansas, and Nebraska will have cause to extoll the name of O. S. Warden when that name shall have become a memory.

While interested in reclamation since knee-high to a hop toad, we had not had occasion to attend the meetings of the National Reclamation Association in its early years of discouragement and despair. But for some time past now we have had the pleasure and privilege of so attending and meeting many of the men who have lived through those years since 1931 with Mr. Warden. On those occasions we have heard them speak eloquently of the "giants of reclamation"; the men who first conceived of the reclamation plan and who fought to bring the Government around to the viewpoint that it was for the good of the Nation to develop these western agricultural lands.

At the recent annual meeting of the association in Denver, O. S. Warden stepped out of his long and active roll as a director and president of the organization. For 10 years he had been the Montana director thereof; for 9 years its hard-working president. And in this connection and at this time we salute O. S. Warden as one of those "giants of reclamation"; those men of the West who took a new viewpoint to Washington; those men who battled Congressmen from the industrialized East for appropriations to carry on this highly important reclamation work, without which development the United States would have indeed been in a sorry plight in the recently closed World War II.

Montana, too, owes much to O. S. Warden for his constant and untiring work, both in Washington and at the State capital in Helena, which has brought about an entirely new conception of the duty of government to its citizens; a thought that the welfare of the greatest number is served by the combining of the financial and engineering resources of the State and Nation in the production of more and better food and fiber for the 130,000,000 people of this greatest nation of all nations.

Yes, O. S. Warden, of Great Falls, is one of the "giants of reclamation" in the West and well entitled to take his place alongside of those who have labored in the same work for the past 43 years.

Montana is proud of his work in the National Reclamation Association and the United States is better fed and better clothed because of his efforts. We hope that the reclamation interests may long have the benefit of his wise and effective counsel in all matters looking to the development of these many Western States.

Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1946

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the New York Times of January 16, 1946, entitled "Labor Legislation":

LABOR LEGISLATION

The present labor crisis did not spring out of a vacuum. The foundations for it were being laid for months and even years by a combination of inaction and bad policies. Long ago either the President or Congress, or both, should have appointed a commission of experts to recommend a rounded program of labor legislation and labor policy. But many men in Congress, after waiting until the Nation's industrial life is disrupted by grave strikes and threatened by still graver ones, now talk of quick and angry action.

It is right, it is imperative, that action dealing with the present labor crisis be taken without undue delay. But the real question is what the proper action should be. Any attempt to forbid strikes or to impose compulsory arbitration would only make the ultimate situation incomparably worse than the present one. Nor does hope of a real solution lie in the enactment of a bill for setting up so-called fact-finding boards, as recommended by the President. The weaknesses and the hazards of that remedy have already become clear from the prompt consequences of the decisions of the fact-finding boards appointed by the President without benefit of legislation in the General Motors and oil-industry cases. The moment the General Motors board recommended a wage increase of 17½ percent practically every other union decided that this was the minimum increase to which it was entitled, and that the Federal Government would support it in imposing such an increase upon employers.

When one considers that the automobile workers were already among the highest paid in the country (actually standing in the upper third of the Nation's income receivers) this conclusion on the part of other union leaders does not seem unnatural. As Prof. Sumner H. Slichter wrote in the Yale Review before these fact-finding decisions were announced: "Collective bargaining will not develop * * * if the Government abandons the role of a neutral and virtually compels employers to grant better terms than the unions could win by bargaining. * * * Government wage setting and collective bargaining do not mix. * * * Where the Government wishes collective bargaining to flourish, it must not seek to impose settlements."

The real task before Congress today is not to attempt to throw the Government's weight onto either side of the scales, but to establish the conditions under which a peaceful, amicable and two-sided collective bargaining is encouraged. One way to do this would be to balance the Wagner Act so that an employer or a nonunionized worker, as well as a union, could complain to the National Labor Relations Board against unfair labor practices, including intimidation and coercion. But it would accomplish almost as much good if, short of that, any union that sought the protection of the Wagner Act would itself be required to come before the board with clean hands. Today a union that has shown itself to be irresponsible, and that may even be led by known racketeers, can bring accusations against an employer while the board is not even authorized under the law to take cognizance of the union's own transgressions.

This situation suggests its own remedy. The Wagner Act should be amended to authorize the National Labor Relations Board to refuse to extend the protection of this law to any union which has been guilty of enforcing its will through intimidation or violence, which has struck in violation of a labor contract, which excludes members on arbitrary grounds, which charges unreasonable initiation fees or dues, or which engages in similar antisocial activities.

Such amendments would go little further than those passed by the House of Representatives, by more than a two-thirds majority in June, 1940, but later buried in a Senate committee so that the full Senate never had an opportunity to vote upon them. These amendments separated the judiciary and the prosecution functions of the Labor Board. They prevented the Board from ordering reinstatement of striking workers who had willfully engaged in violence or unlawful destruction or seizure of property. They insured liberty of expression of opinion for employers on labor matters when not accompanied by acts of coercion, intimidation, discrimination, or threats thereof. They permitted employers to petition the Board for elections to choose collective bargaining representatives. They made the Board's decisions and findings of fact subject to review by the United States courts of appeal.

A measure of this sort would not deprive even the most reckless and irresponsible union of any rights which it had prior to 1935. Its sole penalty would be the refusal of the privileges and protections of the Wagner Act to unions that had done nothing to deserve them. It is true, on the other hand, that such a measure would not completely end strikes. Nor would any measure that did not threaten a free enterprise system and American liberties. But such a statutory recognition of irresponsibility and unlawfulness where they existed, and a refusal to encourage or reward them, would reduce existing sources of conflict and constitute an essential step toward industrial peace.

Veterans' Housing—"Curbstone Lament"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1946

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an item from the Army Times entitled "The Curbstone Lament," which graphically

pictures the problem of the returning serviceman who is seeking a home for himself and his family and points attention to one of the most critical problems facing our Nation today:

Ah, chill were the Normandy foxholes
And bitter and dank was Attu
But far more disturbing
Is life on this curbing
Where the cold is fast turning us blue.
The Housing Committees are buzzing,
But though their proposals sound fine
There's no satisfaction
In words without action—
It's shelter we need, me and mine!

My wife has turned suddenly frigid,
The winter winds wrinkle her face.
Her once-fetching dimples
Are lost in goose-pimples,
Can't somebody find us a place?
The building authorities holler,
"Priorities keep our hands tied!"
And we've been unable
To locate a stable
Or Chic Sale that is not occupied.

All vets, states the FHA's Blandford,
Should "double-up" now without fuss.
But letters from mother
And my younger brother
Say they plan to move in with us!
The landladies laugh at our misery,
The future's appallingly black.
We're plumb out of plumbing
And Christmas is coming—
Oh, Santa, please bring us a shack!

Four walls and a roof are sufficient
Just cardboard—we don't hope for brick.
I've begged and petitioned,
For my wife's heir-conditioned
And we've got to be off the streets quick.
Dear Congress, I'm not a brass monkey,
And I long to defrost my poor spouse.
Be assured my selections
For next year's elections
Will be men who can find me a house!

—*Ye Olde Vette.*

Root Cause of Labor Troubles Seen Revealed in Wire Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 16, 1946

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an article by Mark Sullivan from the New York Herald Tribune of Wednesday, January 16, 1946:

ROOT CAUSE OF LABOR TROUBLES SEEN REVEALED IN WIRE STRIKE—MARK SULLIVAN SAYS FAILURE OF TRUMAN TO ENFORCE WAR LABOR BOARD DECISION IN THAT DISPUTE NULLIFIES ALL OTHER REMEDIAL ACTION

(By Mark Sullivan)

WASHINGTON, January 15.—A country harassed by labor troubles seeks cure, and in order to find cure needs first to find the root cause.

The root cause can be identified in one of the strikes. The Western Union Telegraph Co. and a Congress of Industrial Organizations union of its employees had a dispute about wages. The dispute was laid before a Government body, the National War Labor Board. The Board made a decision. The union refused to accept it, and struck.

The strike has lasted 8 days. For 8 days the public has been forced to endure interruption of an essential public service, telegraph communication. President Truman has not acted to enforce the decision of a Board which was part of his administration and part of the Government.

Here is failure of the administration to act upon an authority it already has. As long as this condition exists, it is idle for Mr. Truman to ask Congress to enact his request. For the authority he already has, and has not used, is greater than the new authority he now asks Congress to give him. In the Western Union case, he already had an official fact-finding body, the War Labor Board. He has a decisio made by the Board. And this decision is official and enforceable—decisions by the Board have been enforced countless times. On the other hand, Mr. Truman, in asking Congress for authority to set up fact-finding boards, stipulated that decisions of these boards should not be binding upon the parties, that they should not be enforced by Government, that they should depend for their effect entirely upon public opinion.

RADIO TALK CALLED USELESS

As long as this condition exists—simple failure of the administration to act upon authority it possesses—nothing else amounts to anything. Mr. Truman's request for legislation amounts to nothing. The thousands of words in his radio address to the people amount to nothing. The other thousands of words in his messages to Congress amount to nothing. The thousands of still more words by his personally appointed boards without statutory authority amount to nothing. The coming and going of labor leaders and corporation heads to the White House do not meet the issue. The swirling about all the strikes—steel, telephone, meat packers, motors, the electric industry—all go around the real issue.

As long as the administration does not enforce a decision by one of its own agencies against a labor union, all else that it does creates impressions of ineffectiveness or worse. Upon the public, the impression must be one of the administration running around in circles, or of an attitude toward labor unions and leaders which must be either fear or favor. And in either case weakness.

Upon Congress the impression must be that it would be futile to pass the strike legislation Mr. Truman has requested, and that the administration is not prepared to do anything really effective about strikes or labor relations.

IMPRESSION ON LABOR

Upon labor leaders the impression is, as the New York Times put it the other day, "that under no conditions will the Federal Government stand up to a strike, that under no conditions will it seriously penalize unions for striking."

That impression is borne out by the facts. The attitude, as it grew up under Mr. Truman's predecessor, is that labor unions and leaders are a group apart and above, to be given immunities and privileges denied to others. It has the effect, if not the intention, of conferring upon labor leaders and unions a power which denies the superiority of Government itself, which denies that the interest of the people as a whole is superior to the interest of any group, as is just now abundantly shown.

This attitude is the root cause of trouble. As long as the attitude continues, the trouble will continue and grow worse. Mr. Truman, inheriting the attitude, has seemed not quite willing to embrace it, not quite willing to depart from it. Forces within the administration tend to hold him to it, for the attitude is deeply embedded in bureaus and agencies. For the President to go counter to an attitude thus embedded takes resolution. Besides, politicians in the administration or close to it press continuation of the attitude for political purposes.

New York Foreign Freight Forwarders Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 16, 1946

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speeches of Fred Bennett, the outgoing president, and Harold D. St. John, the new president, of the Foreign Freight Forwarders Association, at the annual dinner held at the Hotel Roosevelt in New York City on Tuesday, January 8, 1946:

SPEECH OF FRED BENNETT

Gentlemen, the bylaws of our association require that at this, our annual meeting of the year, we elect the officers of the association for the ensuing year.

We have, through a nominating committee, designated a member for each of the offices of the association. No other nominations have been presented. Accordingly I shall ask the secretary to cast one ballot in favor of each of the nominees proposed by the nominating committee.

I now have the pleasure to present to you the new officers of the association for the year 1946.

First, I will present Mr. Walter van Hoesen, who will undertake the duties of vice president. Mr. Van Hoesen has been an active member of this group for a number of years, is well established in the forwarding business, is capable and conscientious in the performance of his work and in the interest of the industry as a whole. The association is fortunate, indeed, to have Mr. Van Hoesen in this important office of vice president.

The treasurer of our association for so many years it is difficult to know when he entered that office, is Mr. Joseph E. Lewis. No one could have performed the duties of that office with the faithful regard for the interests of the association as Joe Lewis has done over this long period of years. It is impossible to find anyone who would be his equal in this office. The association has urged Mr. Lewis to continue in his faithful and efficient work for the association and I am glad to say he has agreed to do so. I am very happy to introduce him as our treasurer for the year 1946.

Both the office of vice president and treasurer carry with them very heavy responsibilities, but the burden of carrying on the work of the association falls most heavily upon the president. This burden will probably be greater in the coming years, with postwar trade, than in any time for perhaps 20 years or more. The association has seen fit to seek the services of a young and vigorous member who has a thorough knowledge of, and experience in, the field of forwarding, and whose ability as an executive is highly regarded. I know of no one who could undertake to carry on the work of this group better than the next president of the association, and with my best wishes and confidence in a successful administration, I have the sincere pleasure of introducing Mr. Harold D. St. John, and to whom I now present, for his use, the gavel of the association.

SPEECH OF HAROLD D. ST. JOHN

Mr. Bennett, honored guests, and friends: tonight marks another milestone in the history of overseas transportation, victory has been won—you gentlemen here tonight may well feel proud of your accomplishments in the war effort—yes, a job well done, aptly expresses it.

Such an outstanding performance could only have been possible through the fine spirit of teamwork and cooperation which prevailed among the shipping and allied industries represented here this evening—be it trucking, railroad, air line, steamship, underwriter or foreign freight forwarder—all played their part in the crushing defeat of our enemies. No one agency alone could have functioned without the other in the complex handling of the voluminous tonnage of war material and goods which cleared through this great port of ours during the past 5 years.

With peace at hand, we must now lend our efforts in this same spirit of cooperation toward hastening and effecting the reconstruction of the war torn countries through the prompt and efficient exchange of goods and services, so that peoples all over the world may enjoy, once again, the comforts of their homes and families to which they are justly entitled and have a right to expect.

The foreign freight forwarding industry will continue to play its important role in the promotion of our foreign trade. Now, more than ever before, the knowledge and experience of the freight forwarder in the handling of overseas shipments will be sought after by buyer and seller both here and abroad—already this is in evidence.

Visitors from all over the world are coming to our offices to discuss their shipping problems with us. We are being flooded with inquiries, cables, telephone calls—all having to do with shipping. Foreign trade is on the march. We must be ready and prepared to render the service required to promote good will and understanding to the overseas buyer. The foreign freight forwarding industry has made great strides since World War I and is rapidly becoming recognized as an essential intermediary in the expeditious and efficient handling of overseas shipments.

Great and important steps remain to be taken by every facility, every organization, serving foreign trade, and we forwarders who deal with all of you and act as buffers between you and the United States and foreign businessmen, can probably see them as clearly as anyone.

The American merchant marine must be restored to private ownership and operation, with regular sailings of suitable ships, well trained and loyal personnel, whose care of cargo and service to the traveling public will be second to none.

The Port of New York must be modernized to preserve its enviable position as the largest and most active port in the world. New business must be created for it. Particularly through economies in handling cargo and greater speed of turn around. Port efficiency directly concerns you steamship lines, the stevedore companies, the railroad and lighterage companies, and the workers they employ.

It is of interest to note that our new mayor, Mr. William O'Dwyer, takes cognizance of this situation. At his first press conference held last week he remarked that New York faces a challenge in shipping and would have to rehabilitate its water-front facilities lest its commerce be diverted to other ports.

I urge you exporters to allocate a percentage of your goods for export, instruct your employees in sound export practice, and in foreign languages. In this sellers' market, cultivate the overseas buyer, whose present need assures you that friendships begun now will last for lifetimes. Answer your mail and make your invoices and packing lists accurate.

We forwarders, like the rest of you, have lost three generations of junior clerks, junior salesmen, junior operating men, junior everything, because of the war. As these young men return, we who live by foreign trade must train them well, both in principles and practice, to make good use of their ability, to restore them to wealth-creating activity and to useful membership in a peacetime economy.

I urge you to participate in every educational activity relating to foreign trade, in any phase—for knowledge is power.

Uncle Sam, are you listening? You consuls, too. Let us have reduced red tape. As little regulation as possible, and a wise, constructive administration of the regulations we must have. If we are to get "one world," barriers must be broken down, beginning with the artificial ones.

The United Nations Organization deserves the last and most important part of these remarks. It must be made to work. Top level people can help it along. But bottom level people, like you and me, who are constantly adding to their international friendships, are laying the real foundation for its success. If this has never occurred to you before, the atomic age will soon convince you.

It will be my earnest desire as president of this association to bring about a closer relationship between us whereby we may arrive at a common understanding of our mutual problems. That is the American way and the only way for us to strive for. With your cooperation and patience we will attain that goal.

Thank you.

Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1946

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, by leave granted me, I include in my remarks a poem on Nebraska written by Mrs. Harold Gilman, one of my constituents. This poem indicates how deeply Nebraskan people appreciate our great State.

NEBRASKA

Nebraska has been woven on a loom
By marching feet. The red man closely laid
The warp, as north and south, he sought his food.
The restless feet of white man wove from east
To west and back, this homespun fabric strong.
No winter's wind however keen, or sun
In summer's sky, can change this sturdy web.

Green tones of cornfields, seas of grass; and gold
Of ripened grain, pure blue of open skies,
The red of apples, wine of grapes, and black
Of fertile soil, does rival artist's blend.
But prints of patient men who lived and died
To bind the girders of our Nation's soul
Have beautified this texture more than gold.

This is the homespun cloth from which America
Has cut her freedom loving heart!

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. BANKHEAD, 2d

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 17, 1946

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by me on the proposed universal military training legislation, broadcast on WSGN, a radio station at Birmingham, Ala., on January 6, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

What is the purpose of the proposed universal military training program?

The President stated to Congress, "Some should be trained for combat, others should be trained for whatever war service they are physically and mentally qualified to perform."

It is provided in section 2 of the administration bills pending in the Senate and House that "every male citizen and every alien residing in the United States shall upon attaining the age of 18 years, or within 4 years thereafter, be subject to military or naval training, and shall be inducted into the Army or Navy of the United States for this purpose alone!"

It is clear that the training contemplated is entirely for war purposes. Are we ready so quickly to weaken our position in total support of the San Francisco Charter? Such action is unthinkable.

Until the machinery of the United Nations Organization is in good working order and until full acquiescence in its decisions has removed the friction caused by the after-war adjustments, we need not be alarmed by the absence of newly trained reserves in the United States. If we adopt the tactics of the recent totalitarian countries and train millions of men for war, will not our leadership cause other countries to follow our example. The result will be a race for quick preparation and the building of large armies. There seems to be no surer way to militarize the world—a situation which would inevitably result in countless wars.

The universal military training plan proposes to go in time of peace into every home and school where there is a young man under 22 years of age who has not had 1 year's military training, and subject them all to military law in charge of Army and Navy officers not selected by the people and not responsible to them. It proposes to put these young men under the control of commissioned and noncommissioned officers, whose training is associated with control by force, and who too often entertain the viewpoint that nothing but force can maintain peace between nations. Every young man is to be exposed to a life in encampments which is not as wholesome as is the influence of their homes. There is a fundamental difference between military training in the schools of this country and training in military cantonments. School attendance does not remove the boy from his home and from his parents and from his community and local church. Whatever school he attends is in charge of teachers responsible to the public or the child's parents. Building the finest possible good character in youth should be the most important consideration in the training of boys and young men. If military

training of our boys is necessary, they should receive the requisite training while in school, in the national guard, and in ROTC, or some similar organizations during vacations. In addition to other advantages, that plan would not cause the loss of at least 1 year's time by boys and young men in acquiring academic, vocational, or professional training for life's pursuits.

What benefits would accrue to the Nation by such a plan? We have engaged in war in cycles of approximately 20 years. If the United Nations Organization fails to preserve peace and we have another war in about 20 years, what good will training boys next year, and each following year for years to come do in the matter of supplying soldiers at the time of the next war? How long will it take boys trained for 1 year to get soft and unsuitable for stringent military service? Probably 2 or 3 years. If a war comes 20 years from now the training for the next 17 or 18 years will be in large measure wasted, insofar as quick action in combat is involved. If a war comes before we can set up an effective peace organization, then we have available millions of men who have been thoroughly trained for a much longer time than the universal military training plan provides. What good will trained reserves do in a war waged with atomic bombs and other scientific discoveries? Japan had millions of well-trained soldiers and a large navy with which she planned to conduct offensive and defensive warfare. Did her martial forces, regular armies, and reserves successfully serve her nefarious purposes? Because of the destruction of her navy, as recounted to Congress recently by Admiral Nimitz, the destruction of munition plants by our bombers, and the appearance of our atomic bombs, with their almost unbelievable power of destruction, she suddenly surrendered before an American soldier had landed on her homeland.

Germany was armed to the hilt and equipped with fighting equipment superior to that of any nation of the world. She had every available male in her country in her armed forces. She did not win the war.

The point I am presenting is that trained soldiers and reserves, however numerous they may be, will not hereafter be rated as sufficient to win a war against an army equipped with modern weapons and fortified with atomic energy or similar power. The truth is, and we should frankly face it, that if we fight another war it will be fought with atomic energy and other explosive powers so horrible and destructive that man's imagination has not yet visualized the possibilities involved. It is the opinion of most leading scientists that the results of another war could be total destruction of the world's entire population and of the earth itself.

The atomic bomb, and all other forces of destruction heretofore or hereafter developed by any nation, should be made exclusively available to some agency of the United Nations Organization, or some new agency, which should be vested with authority and power to take such action as it finds necessary to prevent other wars. The situation demands that the executive, congressional, and military leaders devote their talents and powers to developing such a program. All agencies, instrumentalities, and secrets and use of atomic energy and all other powers of destruction should be placed under the exclusive control of the agency established to preserve peace. If the veto power stands in the way, it should be suitably modified or repealed.

All resources should be exhausted to induce every nation to cooperate in an all-out effort to secure enduring peace. The attention of the American people should be centered on this human-preserving project rather than on whether we shall now begin the universal military training of our boys in the art of fighting wars. If later it develops that some strong nation will not cooperate with us in a program that will assure peace, we can then begin preparation for the next war.

If all nations do not want to end wars, then it is likely that the next war will be fought with explosive forces similar to the atomic energy and not between armies composed of young men on each side. Wars will then no longer be won or lost by trained reserves. It should be recognized that we have crossed the threshold of a new era in the evolution of civilization.

At this time, instead of following the old way of seeking army supremacy, we should devote our efforts and resources toward research and securing developments in the field of science that will tend to end all wars.

Germany, Italy, and Japan entertained the philosophy that it was well to be ready for all eventualities by retaining large standing armies and reserve forces. It did not secure for them victories. It did not assure them peace. Excessive preparation led them into aggressive wars. History may repeat itself with other nations, including our own.

The War Department has advised the House Military Affairs Committee that the cost of providing military training per boy per annum would be $2,500. The Bureau of the Census estimates the American male youths reaching the age of 18 years in 1946 will be 1,170,000. The President's message to Congress said no exemptions would be allowed except for total physical disqualification. If 1,000,000 boys enter training the cost will be $2,500,000,000 next year, and will increase each year. The military training plan will add a staggering load of additional costs each year to the many billions now required to meet the annual stupendous reparations for past wars and the billions necessary to meet yearly requirements for administering the Government.

Why should we turn suddenly from our long-sought objectives of peaceful security of the world, when realization of our dreams is at hand?

The discovery of the way to harness the indescribable and limitless power contained in the atoms and the use of that energy under rigid safeguards and limitations by the United Nations to preserve and enforce world peace presents a new instrumentality for answering the centuries-old longings of people everywhere for security and peace. We should be patient during the current rapidly unfolding events and continue with determination our support of the world's hope for the enduring success of the United Nations Organization.

The Housing Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 17, 1946

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered on the subject of housing before the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce on January 7, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, I have been working for several years to formulate a national housing program. In 1945 I was appointed chairman of a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning to consider the housing program.

A COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

During the early part of 1944, we held long hearings at which all interests testified fully, and we explored every solution proposed. After we wrote our report, a bill was worked out by Senators WAGNER, ELLENDER, and myself, all members of the subcommittee, which deals more comprehensively than any former bill with the entire subject of housing. Heretofore bills have been introduced and pushed through Congress by groups interested in only one phase of the problem. This is the first attempt to deal with the whole subject from a broad standpoint—and I may say that 90 percent of it is devoted to encouraging the construction of homes by private builders.

Some of the provisions of the bill are, frankly, experimental. I believe those dealing with rural housing should be eliminated for the present. Some of the other provisions extending the FHA will require careful revision. The Senate Committee on Banking and Currency is now holding hearings, and I certainly welcome any criticisms or suggestions for amendments in detail.

While various provisions of the bill have been criticized, the real objection comes because we have extended the program of public low-rental housing for a period of 4 years at the rate of 125,000 homes per year, about 10 percent of construction necessary during that period.

NOT INTENDED TO DEAL WITH TEMPORARY EMERGENCY

Let me make clear that this bill is not intended to deal with the immediate emergency situation which now exists. It is intended to deal over the next 5 years with the great shortage of housing which has developed since 1932. It could not be passed by both Houses in any event until June, and it is unlikely that the projects under it, public or private, could proceed until 1947. The present temporary emergency is brought about by the present shortage of materials and labor. An expeditor has been appointed to attempt to break bottlenecks in lumber and many other building materials. He will have the full support of Congress. In my opinion, Government pricing regulations must be relaxed to stimulate production and get rid of a lot of the red tape which hampers builders today. We have appropriated money to make available to veterans all the Government's temporary war housing, but all are opposed to any further use of materials or labor for temporary housing to be built by the Government or otherwise. All of the materials available in 1946 should be channeled through the private construction industry, as much as possible for residence construction. In view of our productive ability, under any reasonable Government policy of prices, priorities, and expediting, materials should be fully available for building in 1947.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HAS A RESPONSIBILITY IN THE HOUSING PROBLEM

The present bill is designed to deal with the permanent situation. I suppose the first question is whether the Federal Government should concern itself with the housing problem at all. It is somewhat late, however, to discuss that question, because it has long done so. Under President Hoover we set up the Federal Home Loan Bank System to assist building and loan associations more adequately to finance housing. Under President Roosevelt we established the Federal Housing Administration, which by mortgage insurance has revolutionized the financing of homes and thus substantially reduced the cost of occupying homes when they are built. The

public housing program has been in force for more than 8 years. The Federal Government cannot avoid the responsibility of considering the whole problem.

The question we debate here is whether the Federal Government shall continue to assist States and local authorities to provide public housing at rents below the rents possible in privately constructed dwellings. I believe that it should, if that assistance is confined to the lowest income groups. Such assistance is in line with Government activities in many other fields. Public housing is not socialism by any stretch of the imagination.

The free enterprise system rightly claims the credit for the tremendous improvement in standards of living in this country. Undoubtedly, those standards, on the average, are the highest of any country in the world. Probably without Government action we could go on improving that average standard and keep the average well ahead of the rest of the world.

But the free enterprise system has certain definite faults. We have not learned to eliminate ups-and-downs, booms, and depressions—and so there is unemployment at times, and poverty and hardship if the Government does not assist. Our system is necessarily based on incentive, and a reward for ability and hard work. That means a wide range of wealth and poverty. Those who have not the capacity must fall behind. The system cannot pay more for the product of labor than that product is worth in comparison to those other products, where, for example, mass production methods or more use of machinery can be applied. Also there are many who for one reason or another cannot do a full day's work. So, apart from unemployment, the work done by many of the employed does not bring them sufficient to maintain a decent standard of living for their families. In short, while the average is high, the necessary inequality of the system leaves many poor, some deservedly, and some unfortunate.

The philosophy of socialism is to raise all to the average, which necessarily will bring all others down to the same dead level, and take all life and progress out of the system. There may be more equality, but I am certain there would be lower standards of living for the great majority.

The extreme philosophy the other way is to "let the devil take the hindmost," and let those who are unable to keep up suffer poverty and hardship, on the theory that in the end general progress will be faster. I read a book recently based on this philosophy, claiming that slums are necessary to drain off the ills of the body politic just as sewers are necessary to a city.

Without arguing the economics of this theory it is enough to say that it offends every humane sense, and that Americans are humane people. If the free-enterprise system does not do its best to prevent hardship and poverty, even for those who can't be shown to deserve it, it will find itself superseded by a less progressive system which does.

Our policy is to maintain a minimum standard floor under subsistence, education, medical care, and housing. I believe that our people have decided that our productive ability is so great that we will undertake to put a floor under essential things, to give to all a minimum standard of decent living, and to all children a fair opportunity to get a start in life.

This is really no new principle in America, nor has it ever been considered contrary to freedom. We long ago adopted the principle of universal, State-supplied education for every child, and we have gone further along that line than the most socialistic state in the world. We have adopted the principle that medical care shall always be available, whether it can be paid for or not. Witness the Cincinnati General Hospital. Certainly it was not socialism to build that hospital and provide free medical care for those unable to pay for it. We have always undertaken to provide poor relief and minimum subsistence, although it ha not always been well organized. In the depression of 1932 the Federal Government had to come to the relief of States to furnish this subsistence. It may be necessary again, although I hope through Federal aid to States and not through a federally administered WPA.

It is quite true that in providing this floor under essential needs, we should see that it is not too high to destroy incentive; that it is not so costly as to bear heavily on the other four-fifths who have to pay the bill; that it is administered locally by independent local agencies with Federal aid, if necessary, but not dominated by Washington bureaucracy.

I believe that the Government must also interest itself in seeing that every family has a minimum standard of decent shelter. Housing is a more difficulty problem than education, health, or medical care. Yet, in many ways, it is the most important. Every family must have shelter of some kind. Even though he is furnished free education, every child who is to have anything like an equal opportunity in life to make the most of his abilities must have a decent home in decent surroundings.

HOUSING A UNIQUE AND COMPLEX PROBLEM

Special problems arise in housing, because housing is permanent. Once built, it is likely to remain indefinitely and it is therefore more complex than the problem of furnishing a current supply of food, clothing, and medical care.

If all families are to have decent housing and decent surroundings, the whole housing plant must be constantly in reasonably good shape. Thirty-five million homes costing perhaps $200,000,000,000 cannot be built, repaired, or replaced overnight. Only slow progress and gradual improvement can be hoped for.

Is the plant in good shape today? Our best information comes from the census of 1940. Leaving out the farm homes, which present a special problem, there are some 29,000,000 urban and rural nonfarm residential units. Of these, nearly 4,000,000 are listed as needing major repairs and are, therefore, in bad physical condition. Of those in good repair, over 3,000,000 have no running water of any kind. Two million four hundred thousand have no private toilets or baths. Perhaps half of those without toilet facilities are in locations where water is not available or is limited, but many of them are in cities where the failure to have running water certainly indicates a very low standard of sanitary living conditions.

Our committee came to the conclusion that at least 6,000,000 of the 29,000,000 nonfarm residential units were in a condition which does not meet a low minimum standard of decency. Most of these are in city slums, where the quality of the residences is accentuated by the bad surroundings.

The problem the Nation faces is how we can get rid of these 6,000,000 homes, or if the surroundings are proper, renovate them. Of course, no one is saying that private builders or any one else are to blame for the present situation, but undoubtedly it has been brought about by the necessary faults of the private enterprise system as a whole, which as I have said, produces the highest average but does not necessarily do so well for the lowest income groups.

Taking prewar figures on income, rent, and costs, about 30 percent of our nonfarm families, or 8,500,000 had a family income of $1,000 and less. These families and others with a slightly higher income were able to find some 11,000,000 homes which rented for less than $20 a month. Nearly half of them were in rural districts and largely acceptable. Many of these low-income families were apparently able to find reasonably decent homes in proper surroundings at $20 a month and less, but the 6,000,000 substandard homes are rented by 6,000,000 of these low-income families at rents certainly averaging less than $15 a month. They rent for that sum because they are bad housing.

It is quite true that some kind of shelter is provided by our present system at rents which can be paid, but the lowest-income groups have necessarily gravitated to the substandard housing—for the most part in city slums.

As our committee analyzed the situation, the principal difficulty, assuming a proportion of low incomes, is the cost of new housing, and a disinclination to scrap old housing, no matter how dilapidated, as long as there are persons who must rent it even at a very low rent. It does not pay anyone to renovate or improve the homes. In other words, the so-called hand-me-down theory works, but it works to provide indecent housing for those who get it on the last handdown. As a matter of fact, the hand-me-down theory as a method of taking care of the lowest-income group at low rents is inconsistent with that group getting good housing. If a house has not deteriorated either in its condition or location, it ought to bring nearly the same rent as when new, providing that it is properly maintained. I live in a house in Washington which is 75 years old, and worth a good deal more than when it was built. Our committee could see no reason why, if the Government did not intervene, there would be any improvement in the over-all situation.

It is somewhat tricky to deal with the cost of housing, but as far as we could determine a four-room family house could not be built for much less than $4,000 in 1939, probably more in Cincinnati. A man who earned $30 per week at that time, or $1,500 a year, could afford to pay perhaps $30 per month for rent, or $360 a year, which would just about justify the purchase of a $4,000 home, old or new. Over 13,000,000 or nearly half of all the nonfarm families were earning less than $1,500 per year in 1939. Of course, income has increased, but costs have also increased, so that relatively the situation today is probably about the same as in 1939. In other words, today, because of costs and income, the market for new homes is confined to less than half the population and many millions of these are not in the market because they are permanently situated in the houses where they expect to live the rest of their lives. We ought to build 1,250,000 homes a year for the next 10 years. With the present cost of housing and the limited market, I am afraid that so many new homes cannot be sold by private builders. New homes, therefore, have never been built fast enough to eliminate the slums at the lower end of the hand-me-down process. The process is so slow that when slums are eliminated deterioration and blight have created other slums. If the market for new homes could extend to 75 percent of all families, the hand-me-down process might reasonably be expected to work.

The ultimate and permanent solution for the housing problem would be a reduction in the cost of housing. That cost is out of line with other costs. The Government has succeeded in reducing the cost of financing, but industry and labor have not succeeded in reducing the cost of housing. A much higher percentage of families is unable to pay for decent shelter than the proportion able to pay for decent food and clothing.

When present wartime conditions have been removed, I hope that the building industry can be reorganized and do the job of reducing prices. The more it can do so the more it can eliminate Government from the field of housing.

AID TO PRIVATE INDUSTRY

The present bill does what can be done to help the construction and sale of homes by private builders. It strengthens the Federal home loan bank system by giving many additional powers to the building and loan associations. It extends the operations of the Federal Housing Administration as far as that can be done on sound business principles. In fact, we are accused of going a little too far in reducing the rate of interest and the term of the mortgage, and we may have to make some modification. In particular, we are trying to encourage especially favorable terms, including an 85-percent firm commitment to builders for the cheapest possible type of housing which meets proper standards. We are thus trying to encourage private industry to find the best methods of reducing the cost of building.

We are broadening the provisions for the insurance of rental projects on a major scale, including sound mutual plans. We are establishing a form of yield insurance to encourage insurance companies and other large aggregations of capital to invest their money as owner in rental housing projects. As you know, several of the insurance companies have already undertaken such projects, well planned and protected from deterioration. In my opinion, rental housing, well operated, should be as good an investment as loans or corporate bonds. I greatly favor home owning, but we have to recognize the situation that many families prefer to rent. Even in Cincinnati only 33 percent own their own homes. We must recognize a condition and see that adequate rental housing is encouraged.

We have proposed an urban redevelopment plan which will assist cities to buy up slum areas, tear down the obsolete buildings, and redevelop the area by constructing public works, like parks and playgrounds, by selling or leasing sections for commercial use, or for private residential development, or for low-rent housing, or a combination of all four. Such projects may be undertaken without any public housing if the city so determines.

LOW-RENT PUBLIC HOUSING NEEDED

But, in my opinion, all of these proposals do not as yet eliminate the need for public low-rent housing. The committee estimates that there will be required in this country during the next 10 years 6,000,000 new homes to take care of new families, and about 6,000,000 to replace obsolete dwellings to which I have referred. That means a needed construction of 1,250,000 new homes per year. The bill authorizes 125,000 units a year of subsidized low-rent housing for the next 4 years. That is 10 percent of the total need as we see it. It is no more socialism than any other Government plan to take care of the lowest income group of the population in health, education, and subsistence. Private builders do the building.

The bill provides that this housing shall be available only to persons whose income is 20 percent less than that required to pay the rents for private housing, not necessarily new, available in the community. Constant checks of income are to be made, and those whose income rises above the point at which they can rent old housing are to be rigidly excluded. Private builders have criticized the existing public housing projects because many higher-income tenants have remained in such projects. This has been due to the Government policy of providing war workers with housing. In the emergency they could not be excluded from the only housing available in the neighborhood of the place where they worked. This bill insists on this situation being corrected.

We fully agree that public housing must not compete with private builders, but there is no competition in providing housing for those who are unable even to rent private housing in decent condition. The doctors are stenuously opposed to socialized medicine, reaching 95 percent of the people, but they will all tell you that they are not harmed in the least by the Government taking the lowest 25 percent of the people off their hands. What the doctors do for them is in any event charity.

The bill makes it clear that public housing can only be assisted if the project is initiated by the local governing authority, and, of course, authorized by State law; and if the State or locality is willing to contribute some part of the cost of the subsidy, by tax exemption or direct cash contribution. If Ohio or Cincinnati does not want low-rent housing they can save their money, and try some other method of eliminating slums by encouragement to private builders only.

One problem which has always concerned me is the fact that a 10-percent Government building program does not meet the whole need as I have described it, and may lead to an expanded program covering the entire 30 percent of the urban population which had incomes in 1939 of $1,000 or less. There are two answers to this. In the first place, if the private building industry succeeds in reducing costs in selling houses, the number requiring aid will be greatly reduced. In the second place, nearly half of these eight and a half million families have already found reasonably satisfactory homes at rentals of $20 and under, for the most part in the outskirts of cities or in rural areas where surroundings are satisfactory and the lack of modern facilities makes much less difference. Many other families succeed in finding reasonably good second-hand homes in the cities and keeping them in good condition. Efficient city administration can force repairs and improvements in some other inadequate homes without forcing their destruction.

I would certainly adopt as a principle that public low-rent housing should never go beyond 10 percent of the total supply. I hope that the percentage may gradually decrease.

Our committee considered all kinds of alternatives, but found none that were satisfactory. We considered the subsidizing of private projects for low-rent housing. That is done to some extent in New York City, but it would be necessary to regulate the rates charged, the condition of the premises, the tenants to be subsidized, and so many other features of the project that I am quite certain private owner would be loath to proceed. It would be difficult to enforce the regulations. It would cost the Government much more direct cash subsidy, because it could not give tax exemption or exempt the borrowing from taxation. I certainly would not object to any reasonable plan along the lines of subsidizing low-rent housing, under $20 a month, by private companies, but we could not work out any practical plan. We have attempted to give every possible assistance through sound FHA insurance for middle incomes, but without subsidies you cannot reach the low-income groups through FHA.

We considered the giving of rent certificates to all those who cannot afford to pay the going rents for decent private units. The giving of rent certificates, however, does not necessarily improve the condition of housing in which they live. It may merely raise the rent acquired by the owner of slum housing. No one is going to build new homes for people who may or may not have rent certificates 10 years from now. It is a very indirect and uncertain method of improving the housing plant. Furthermore, if we attempt to give rent certificates it will have to be a universal plan, and any man with $1,000 a year income or less would have a claim for some assistance. There are some eight and one-half million such urban families. We believed it would certainly not be cheaper than public housing, and it would not accomplish the purpose of improving housing conditions.

What we face today is a condition and not a theory. It is to improve or get rid of 6,000,000 substandard dwellings and at the same time provide decent shelter for the 6,000,000 families who have occupied them. The problem must be attacked from every angle. I don't believe we can pour in all the assistance from the top, and that is all private industry can do, or be expected to do. I think we must also attack it from the bottom. No doubt there are faults in our public-housing system. They should be eliminated. Our committee would favorably consider proposals for any proper requirements or restrictions which would improve the administration of public housing.

But those who are opposed to the entire bill because it adopts public housing as one of the tools to solve this problem are doing their own industry a disservice, and are assisting the critics of free enterprise in the United States for years to come.

No one has been more concerned to limit Federal regulation than I. But this is no more regulation as to housing than we have long adopted as to education, subsistence, and medical care. No one has been more concerned to save Federal money than I. But $100,000,000 or $200,000,000 a year of Federal subsidy to assist in solving our most serious social problem, out of a total Federal budget of more than twenty billion a year, does not seem to me an extravagance.

There can be no greater responsibility than to assist States and local governments to provide for all the children who are born in the United States decent home surroundings, so that they may actually enjoy the freedom and equality of opportunity for which our forefathers came to America.

International Problems Abroad and Economic Issues at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 17, 1946

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at the annual chamber of commerce dinner at Gastonia, N. C., on January 11, 1946, on the subject of serious international problems abroad and critical economic issues at home.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

America is facing serious international problems abroad and critical economic issues at home. Both require the best thought of the Congress and the leaders of the Nation. They cannot be settled by taking arbitrary positions and insisting upon our own particular viewpoint. We must be willing to recognize the reasonable contentions of other nations and pursue a policy of mutual understanding among our people at home.

Many laws have been enacted to implement our participation in world affairs and to assure other peoples of our world-wide interest and willingness to help stabilize the disrupted economy of our allies and other nations devastated by the war. We have also contributed lavish sums to help relieve the suffering and distress in the stricken areas of the whole earth. We have led the way for the establishment and maintenance of world peace.

It now becomes our duty to devote our best efforts to aid in the solution of the domestic problems which involve the highly important questions of inflation, full production, the prevention of strikes, and the removal of all bureaucratic controls at the earliest possible moment.

We have fought for freedom and liberty for the world. We must not fail to preserve this liberty and freedom for the people of America. We are standing at the crossroads. There are strong forces in the country seeking to infiltrate our democratic processes of life with so many socialistic or communistic philosophies that our whole economic system and our boasted free enterprise is seriously endangered. These groups want the Government to take charge of all business and provide a planned economy and they are carrying these policies just as far as they dare go now.

A planned economy means a regimented people and this results in a totalitarian government. Our laboring people would have the most to lose by the destruction of democratic processes, and yet by the policy of continued strikes they are playing into the hands of the very forces which would destroy their freedom and liberty. They ought to investigate the condition of labor in all totalitarian countries and see the practical serfdom which prevails among the workers. National socialism or state communism buries the workers in the mass of controlled and regimented subjects denied the right to live their own lives or enjoy the fruits of their own labor.

We must not have drastic inflation. There are many plans for dealing with this vexed question. The one sure remedy is to attain full production. Governmental controls will have to be maintained on products which are so scarce that prices would spiral if the controls were removed. Wild inflation would endanger permanent prosperity and result in destroying established values and delaying the recovery of our whole business structure. The effort should be centered on increasing production and OPA should adopt the wise policy of granting reasonable increases which would encourage industry and farmers to meet the needs of the Nation by producing an abundance. As soon as an adequate supply of any product is available, all controls should be removed. The law of supply and demand will take care of the situation.

The hindrances to full production today are twofold. One, the refusal of OPA to grant reasonable and just increases in the price of much-needed materials like lumber, brick, and other building materials, and many manufactured products in the field of textiles, and especially as relates to the cheaper goods. As a result of this policy we have not achieved full production and much of the lumber and other scarce materials have gone into the black market and the public and legitimate dealers suffer. The other chief hindrance is the continuous strikes all over the country.

In my opinion the Congress should take definite action in the field of labor relations. Without delay the National Labor Relations Act should be amended and its one-sided and unfair provisions repealed. There should be equality before the law for labor unions and management. Now there is unjustified discrimination in favor of labor unions. Both labor and management should be held equally responsible for their contracts and made to respond in damages for violating agreements. Both should be held accountable for their acts.

The right to strike is guaranteed under the law. This carries with it the right to peacefully picket. But there is no authority of law for using violence or force to prevent the owners of a plant or workers from crossing picket lines and entering to work, even though a strike is in force. However, this is seldom observed and in Connecticut, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and other States, plants have been closed and strikers refused even to let the owners of the plants enter, and beat up any workers who dared to offer to work. This could not happen in North Carolina. We maintain law and order in this State, and I wish to congratulate both workers and management upon the fine relationship which prevails and the splendid cooperation which has existed. There have been comparatively few strikes and practically no violence.

The unions must realize that the right to work is just as sacred as the right to strike, and the law must guard zealously the right of any person to work, regardless of strikes. So many of these strikes which paralyze business and cause widespread suffering, like the recent coal strike and the present General Motors strike, are unauthorized and brought about by ambitious labor leaders and a minority of the workers in the union, but all of them suffer as a result and lose public sympathy. The public is thoroughly fed up on strikes and properly demands legislation to curb these wildcat strikes and provide protection to workers who do not wish to strike and to a long-suffering public.

I believe in reasonable wages and good working conditions for all workers and the whole country sympathizes with all legitimate demands of labor for just compensation to meet the increased cost of living, but I am not in favor of determining this question by the amount of profit a business may be making, or its ability to pay. Should that method be employed, then when profits decreased and business was bad, the workers would be the sufferers. The Government has no right to take charge of the business of any company for the purpose of regulating its management or controlling its profits. If free enterprise is to continue and jobs be provided for the workers of America, we must have business freed from governmental controls and regulations—so long as the law is obeyed—and give full encouragement to industry to grow and expand. We cannot afford to penalize efficiency and good management by making them pay higher wages than their less successful competitors, merely because they have the ability to pay. The interest of the public must be considered in the decreased cost of the product manufactured.

The time has come when this whole question should be dealt with from the standpoint of the public interest. Pressure groups and minority factions have too long been favored in legislation and by the courts. The people should demand equality before the law for all, and cease this special favoritism for organized groups. The public interest should be paramount.

With the adjustment of our domestic disturbances and the gearing of industry and agriculture to full production, America should enter upon a period of unprecedented prosperity and of abundance for all. The common man should attain a higher standard of living and greater opportunity for his children in the tomorrows to follow.

Address by Senator Morse on the Twenty-fifth Radio Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 17, 1946

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech which I delivered on November 10, 1945, at a citizens' committee banquet honoring the twenty-fifth radio anniversary.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Politics are not what they used to be in America, thanks to radio. Students of political science in and out of Congress recognize that radio has become the most effective instrumentality for political education and campaigning available to the candidate for office. Radio has produced such a high degree of political enlightenment and such a thorough grasp of the pros and cons of national issues on the part of our people that it deserves much credit for our national unity in meeting the great crisis of recent years. It has done much to elevate political campaigns from exhibitions of demagoguery and medicine-show techniques to the educational plane of reasoned discourse on campaign issues.

The calm atmosphere of the voter's home living room, the sense of independence which accompanies our American doctrine that our home is our castle render ludicrous the politician who, over the radio, seeks to win votes by appeals to prejudice and non sequitur arguments. Blind partisans may still follow a candidate who, over the radio, substitutes sound and fury for reasoned discourse, but the intelligent independent voters who fortunately for our democracy, outnumber myopic partisans, as nimble of finger in turning off the radio as they are in marking their ballots when a candidate insults their intelligence.

Radio must continue to be maintained as the great open forum of American politics. Freedom of political discussion becomes a frustrated ideal unless the media for discussion are freely accessible to our people and to our candidates for office. I do not mean financially free, although even there financial barriers can be so high as to make politics a rich man's service. But the type of free radio I'm talking about involves a freedom from any industry or Government policies expressed or concealed, direct or indirect, which may hamper freedom of lawful discussion of problems of state. Such freedom is as essential as our cherished freedoms of speech, press, and assemblage if we are to remain a free and democratic nation. I have every confidence that those now directing the course of American radio policy both in the industry and in the Government can be trusted to preserve this freedom of which I speak. I am so impressed with the educational force of radio for developing a strong and vital political conscience among our people that I would welcome broadcasting at least many of the historic sessions of the Congress. Maybe broadcasting a few which are not so historic would be educationally valuable to the American people, too. Such radio waves emanating from the halls of Congress might produce atomic political effects quite constructive in nature.

Needless to say, it has been an honor for me today to pay honor in behalf of the Congress to the great radio industry of America. It is very appropriate that representatives of free men and women should acknowledge at such a grand occasion as this the Nation's debt to the industry which provides our people with their most informative and enlightening political forum. Let us keep it the Nation's greatest disseminator of the truth so that we may remain free.

The American Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. TAFT
OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 17, 1946

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The American Future," delivered by Wheeler McMillen, editor in chief of the Farm Journal, before New Jersey Chapter of Pro-America, at East Orange, N. J., on November 8, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The future of this country of ours will depend upon the American ability to continue to produce goods and services. Our productivity depends upon the continuance of freedom.

Under freedom we have done a job so remarkable that all the world looks with admiration upon American achievements. Here we have only 7 percent of the world's people. Yet we do about one-half of all the world's business, own 60 percent of the world's life insurance, use 60 percent of the world's rubber, own a third of the world's railway mileage and a third of the world's improved highways, use half of the world's telephones, and have four-fifths of the world's automobiles.

Our resources are not remarkably different from those of other continents. The only fundamental difference is that Americans have been free. Freemen in America, a small percentage of the total number of men in the world, have accomplished a tremendously high proportion of all the advancements in invention and science that the human race has experienced. Here as nowhere else men have become productive. Free to think, free to serve their understanding, they have become masters of the revolutionary principle that man does not conquer nature but he obeys her. The more he learns about the laws of nature, the more willingly she yields up the riches inherent in her materials.

Americans thus unfolded the application of steam, discovered the uses of petroleum, and applied the power of electricity.

The world was poor for thousands of years because all the work of the world had to be done by muscles of men and animals, aided occasionally by wind and water. We have created engine muscles. When we need to produce more goods we have only to build more engines. Engine muscles will work from dawn to dark and on until the sunrise again without exhaustion or weariness. When there is work to do that demands bigger muscles, we build bigger engines.

In the free pursuit of knowledge it was American scientists and industrialists who created the atomic bomb. It is always scientists and industrialists and workers who create things. Kings and generals and statesmen are not creators and are not producers.

Now the atomic bomb sizzles in the hands of statesmen who do not know what to do. Neither do I, but I cannot help but wonder. I wonder why, if an atomic bomb for the destruction of life can be devised, comparable efforts should not instantly be organized to develop atomic power for constructive uses. We now know how to destroy civilization with atoms. We would do better now to try to build civilization with atoms.

The most fundamental threat to peace among men always is poverty. Work which produces food and goods and services is the remedy for poverty. With engines to do work, Americans have left much of their poverty behind them. Can't we build an atomic engine able to do enough kinds of work cheaply as to add so hugely to world production that poverty instead of civilization may be atomized by this power?

I am not sure that the statesmen are going to know how to manage the power of the atom. It fits all too well into the old patterns of statesmanship seeking agents of destruction. Forty years ago a couple of our Iowa farm boys conceived the idea of putting an internal combustion engine on wagon wheels and making a tractor. They believed they had made a contribution to civilization by creating a new engine to do man's biggest annual lifting job, the job of turning over billions of tons of earth with the plow. When the statesmen and generals saw the tractor they conceived the idea of putting armor on its sides and cannon on its insides and making a tank, a new weapon with which to kill people.

When the Wright brothers invented the airplane they thought they might be giving civilization a new means of transportation and communication. The statesmen and generals seized upon it as a new engine of destruction.

I don't know what was in Fritz Haber's mind when he worked out the process by which nitrogen can be crystallized from the air and made an abundant fertilizing element to increase the production of the soil. In any event, his achievement eliminated the need that men shall starve for want of nitrogen to make their fields more productive. But Kaiser Wilhelm looked upon that achievement and decided that Germany finally had an abundant source of nitrogen for explosives and was ready to start a new era of bloodshed and war.

The affairs of the world might better be trusted to the scientists and engineers, and the workers and farmers, the businessmen and managers, rather than to the statesmen. The effects of what we call statesmanship appear to be all too destructive.

We agree that America's rich past has been built on freedom. The experience of the past reinforces the importance of preserving freedom as the fundamental ingredient of our future.

If we really believe in freedom, our thoughts and efforts will be directed toward constant restraint of the expansion of the power of government. We will externally exalt the individual. We will devote ourselves to make certain that government goes no further than is necessary to preserve the individual's freedom, to make certain that my liberties end where yours begin.

Our basic principle must be that government shall always be the servant of the people and never the master of the people; that government shall have no powers except those derived from the people, just as it has no money except that which it takes from the people.

All of us will admit that the United States is not a completely perfect country. In a century and a half we have not quite had time to accomplish everything. Yet, we have not done badly.

It has been repeated time and again that one-third of Americans are ill-housed, ill-clad and ill-fed. What other country on earth can boast that two-thirds of its people are well-housed, well-fed, and well-clad?

Under freedom, our advance for 140 years was almost uninterrupted. Every 10-year period saw more new wealth created, more new jobs brought into being than had existed in the decade previous.

The only decade in our history which did not produce more wealth and more jobs than its predecessors was the decade of the 1930's.

Could that have been because in the 1930's for the first time Government was permitted to exert powers which never before in our national history has been allowed?

During the Constitutional Convention of 1787, important decisions as to articles and clauses of the Constitution were made from day to day. They were decisions which have affected our lives enormously. One day after one important decision, one member turned to another delegate and asked, "What do you suppose the people of the United States will think about this decision of ours today 150 years from now?"

The other delegate leaned back in his chair and laughed heartily. He was amused at the very idea of anything that convention decided being even remembered for a century and a half.

I think that delegate was entitled to his laugh. He knew history. He knew that during all the thousands of years of human existence, the greatest struggle in society had been the constant conflict between power on one hand and freedom on the other. He knew that up until that day freedom had always lost and authority had always won. He knew that this convention was, for the first time, trying to create forms for a government which could be restrained from getting in the way of men who wanted to work and produce and live their individual lives. With his knowledge of the history of the past, he could hardly be blamed for doubting whether the effort would succeed. He could not have been expected to know that it would be followed by the greatest spurt of civilization in human experience.

It is not easy for us in the midst of our comforts and luxuries today to realize how tremendous were the consequences of that Constitution a document which Samuel Pettengill has called the greatest postwar plan ever written.

It may help to visualize the extraordinary speed of progress since the Constitution if I tell you about Joseph B. Case, a friend of mine who died just 2 years ago at his home over here in Lambertville, N. J.

Joe Case was in his 103d year. He was born in 1841. This Constitution of ours was only 52 years old in 1841. There are a few here today who with me can testify that 52 years are not very many.

When Joe Case was born the reaper was only 10 years old and only a dozen or so had been made. The first steel plow was only 3 years old. Joe Case himself was 3 years old before the word of man could be communicated beyond the reach of his voice faster than the speed of a horse. It was in 1844 that the telegraph was established. He was 7 years old before the sewing machine was invented. He was 18 years old before kerosene lamps came into general use. He was 35 years old before the telephone was invented. He was 37 years old before there was an electric light in the world. He was past 40 before there was an internal combustion engine or an electric dynamo. And he was past 50 before there was an automobile.

All these and the many marvels which have come since are the products of freedom. Our automobiles, our radios, our comfortable homes are the tangible results of free government. They were conceived and created within the life span of a New Jersey neighbor who walked the earth until 2 years ago.

Under freedom we have proved that the philosophy of production is infinitely more desirable than the ancient predatory philosophy which taught men to believe that they could get ahead only by taking things away from others. It was the philosophy of conquest and theft, the philosophy that might makes right. It was on the predatory philosophy that Rome built an empire and that other empires since have been erected. It was a predatory philosophy that inspired Mussolini and Hitler and the Japanese military people.

That philosophy is not extinct. Not long ago a famous prelate was heard to say, "It is true to say that the more one has, the less there is for others; so that each man's success represents corresponding failure on the part of his neighbors." I quote this only to illustrate how far into our so-called civilized society the predatory concept extends and how completely the philosophy of production fails to be comprehended.

The American philosophy is the philosophy of production. It is based on our discovery that freemen, finding an understanding of the laws of nature, are able to convert the materials of nature into abundant wealth. Freemen have enriched their country by producing things while the totalitarian spreads poverty by his effort to take things.

Growing and making things pays better than taking things.

Under the philosophy of production there is little excuse for individuals and groups in the United States to devote their full energies to contention over division of what there is. Far more profitable is the exertion of energy to increase the national output. Then there will be more to divide among all.

The production philosophy under freedom has worked in the United States. I wonder if we are not too modest in making clear to the rest of the world how well it might work elsewhere. Our production machinery and our managerial know-how will produce goods in any language and under any sun. Perhaps part of the destiny of Americans, when recognized, will be discovered to be to help others to help themselves.

If we believe in freedom, why do we not teach freedom? Other philosophies of government seek to impose their ideas upon their neighbors. Why should not we raise our voices and be heard speaking the voice of freedom and shouting the praises of freedom around the earth?

There was a time when Americans had that faith too strongly to keep it to themselves. When the Spanish colonies in South America revolted against the tyranny of Spain, the voice of Americans was raised in their behalf. When the Greeks sought to win freedom for their nation, the aid and sympathy of Americans crossed the seas to help them. When Baron Kossuth came to the United States to plead the cause of a free Hungary, freedom for Hungary became important to Americans.

Those events took place a century or more ago. Have we lost so much of our faith and freedom as to be disinterested when pleas in its behalf now arise in Europe or Asia?

Is it not possible that the best way to make freedom safe in America, the only area where still it stands, is to exercise our influence toward making freedom safe elsewhere in the world? Wouldn't we do well to exert more effort toward making it abundant instead of rare? When freedom does prevail everywhere, we shall have less need to be vigilant for its preservation in the United States.

I am happy to have this occasion to speak to you who stand foursquare with "Pro-America" inscribed on your banner. No one needs to apologize for being pro-America.

Scientific Research Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 17, 1946

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, at the request of some of my scientific friends, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Newark Evening News, of Newark, N. J., under date of November 29, 1945, entitled "Solely for Science." This editorial comments on a letter sent to President Truman under date of November 24, 1945, by a group of scientists commenting on the Bush report and on the so-called Kilgore and Magnuson bills for the setting up of a scientific research foundation with Federal support.

In asking that this editorial be inserted in the RECORD, I desire to add the comment that this subject is one of first importance and one that should have very careful study before any hasty legislation is enacted.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOLELY FOR SCIENCE

Well before the projected National Research Foundation has chance of taking tangible shape many of the country's leading scientists are fearful that it will be overlaid with politics. Nobody knows better than they the dangerous shortage in scientific training and personnel caused by the war. They heartily approve the report on the subject last July to President Truman by Dr. Vannevar Bush, Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, who had been ordered to make the study by the late President Roosevelt, and it is their earnest desire that most of its recommendations be embodied in law. But they see a double danger of its being swayed by political influence and its dilution by the inclusion of social studies.

The consequence is that a large committee of scientific experts, including such men as Presidents Bowman, of Johns Hopkins; Conant, of Harvard; Doherty, of Carnegie Institute of Technology; Marvel, of the American Chemical Society; and Stearns, of the University of Colorado, have written to President Truman, urging him to back the Bush plan as incorporated in a bill by Senator MAGNUSON (Democrat), of Washington, and not the bill by Senator KILGORE (Democrat), of West Virginia. Creation of a National Research Foundation, to provide annual scholarships for 24,000 undergraduates and some 900 graduate fellowships and endowments for continued long-time research, is indispensable to our national security. And it should not be padded by nonessentials to its special purpose, like sociology, political science, economics, and law. Its one aim is scientific research.

The committee is outspoken in its objections to any single director of the proposed research board, as proposed in the Kilgore bill. No better reason for such opposition could exist than this of the committee: "No single person, however eminent or competent, could, except in a great emergency, command the confidence and support of all branches of science and the many organizations and agencies, private and public, whose cooperation would be required." That is plain speaking; the most outstanding scientist, the most distinguished university administrator on the committee rightly disclaims ability to fill any such post. If these men admit they are incapable, where is Mr. Truman, sitting in the White House and pulled and tugged at by those with axes to grind, going to find the man who is?

We agree with the committee that "this is a great adventure in government for which there is no peacetime precedent," full of risks beyond the capacity of any individual. It wants no "subordinated board" with ex officio members. It certainly is no place for political officeholders of either party, however well intentioned. What the committee wants is a board capable of instituting or supervising all the work and itself responsible for the appointment of its chief administrative officer whose function it would be to look after its internal affairs. The board, consisting of scientists and nonpolitical laymen, would keep in close touch with all scientific agencies in and outside of the Government; it would know about and influence by its help the plans of Army and Navy, but not control them, as the committee members view the plan. What it wants is enlarged scientific personnel and wide scientific research with politics kept out. Is that too much to ask?

The White House Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 17, 1946

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. Walter Lippmann:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

THE WHITE HOUSE DEPARTMENT

Mr. Truman dwelt on the fact that while in foreign affairs Congress has been willing to legislate, his own proposals for domestic legislation are for the most part stalled in committees of the House of Representatives.

Where shall we look for the explanation? First of all, it seems to me, in the White House itself. For if, as Mr. Truman himself said, "the great mass of our citizens who have no special interest * * * find it difficult to make themselves heard," it must be because the President himself has failed to make it quite clear to them what they are to make themselves heard about.

They certainly cannot make themselves heard distinctly and strongly and with one voice about 30 or 40 assorted proposals.

The great mass of the citizens cannot support a complicated program consisting of many detailed measures; what they can support is a policy which the program is designed to put into effect. Thus, the people are supporting the policy of international cooperation, and that is the reason why, without their understanding fully the detailed measures as such, they have been behind intricate proposals like the Charter of UNO and Bretton Woods.

But Mr. Truman's recommendations are a program of which no one, not he himself, can say what the policy is. In his radio speech Mr. Truman in effect admitted it

when, speaking of the dangers of the reconversion period, he said he was trying "to avert the dangers of inflation and deflation." Is it astonishing that the people do not understand a program which appears to be moving in two opposite directions at once? How, without a much fuller and clearer explanation of what he is trying to do, can Mr. Truman expect great popular support for a program which, on the one hand, would increase purchasing power and the inflationary demands for goods, and, on the other hand, would control prices and the use of raw materials in order to refute the excessive demand for goods?

Presumably what the President has in mind is that in the present reconversion period there is inflation in certain sections of our economy and deflation in others. He is aware, then, that until civilian production is considerably greater than it is, there will be a predominating inflationary pressure on prices which may, if it is not controlled, be extremely inconvenient and troublesome. Beyond that he realizes that at some time in the future, the postwar boom will exhaust itself, that consumption and investment will fall off and be quite insufficient to sustain a high level of employment, and that a dangerous depression is indicated unless measures are prepared well in advance to correct the deficiencies.

This is probably what he is meaning to say since it is what the ablest economists in the Government service are predicting. It is, obviously, a rather complicated prediction, and it cannot easily be made clear and convincing to a large audience. But if that is to be done, the President will have to get his speeches on the subject written by men who really understand it.

What he is doing instead is to have men, who do not themselves understand very well what it is all about, explain what little they know in words of one syllable. But a really difficult subject cannot be explained simply except by someone who has mastered it thoroughly. Yet it is very evident that the men who helped him compose this speech, or at least those whom he listened to finally, had only a recently acquired smattering knowledge of what they were talking about.

Mr. Truman's troubles can be traced directly to the fact that he is just beginning to learn what the office of the President really is. He certainly did not realize at the beginning that the White House has now become itself a department of government. The Presidency is not just a man with some secretaries and some clerks. It is the central department of the Government where all other departments meet, and have to be guided, corrected, superintended, and made a team. This requires a White House staff of men who are so able and so versatile that they can settle many issues in the President's name, can select the issues the President himself must decide, and can prepare the issues so that he can know enough to decide them.

Now while Mr. Truman saw the need to reorganize the Cabinet and to use it, he did not see that he needed also to make the White House itself an efficient department. The Truman Cabinet is by any reasonable standard a good Cabinet. But the White House is deplorably weak, and since Mr. Truman is a modest and unpretentious man who must feel his way without benefit of much inspiration through a maze of problems, he has little hope of being a successful President if his own immediate official family remains what it now is. The blunt truth is that the men nearest him do not have enough brains, and have practically none of the wisdom which comes from experience and education, to help him to be the President of the United States.

The other day the Emperor of Japan told his people to abjure the myths and legends that he is divine. There is an American myth and legend, which it would be well for us to abjure, that "the plain people" who "made this country great and keep it free" like mediocre men in their Government, and do not respond to excellence and distinction. This is a politicians' fable. For the plain people are in fact not so plain, or as Franklin P. Adams once put it, the average man is above the average. If the polls are to be trusted at all, they prove that statistically. Furthermore, it is not true that the so-called common people like to have common men to lead them and govern them. They much prefer men of uncommon ability and character whom they have reason to trust. Any list of American leaders whom the people have liked is a list of men who, no matter what their background and origin, were distinguished men in any company: Washington, Jefferson, Cleveland, Lincoln, Wilson, the two Roosevelts among the Presidents; men like Root, Hughes, Stimson, Al Smith, Willkie, who played a great part in American life.

The cult of mediocrity, which is a form of inverted snobbery, is not democracy. It is one of the diseases of democracy. For what democracy demands is equal rights for all men because they are men and, at the same time, equal opportunity, so that what is best and exceptional in each man may come forth and flourish. Faith in democracy is justified by this promise that it will release talents and gifts that would be suppressed in a society of caste, and, therefore, that it brings into the service of the Nation and of mankind men who have rich and varied and excellent abilities.

Our Homeless People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, hundreds of thousands of ordinary American men and women today are unable to find shelter for their children and themselves because of the lack of an adequate Government program to provide houses.

How homelessness affects people is ably expressed in an editorial of December 9, 1945, in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, often quoted as one of the strongest newspapers in the Nation. Under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I should like to include this description of what is happening to our people, for the edification of the Members:

THE FACES OF THE HOMELESS

Homelessness does something to people. It is doing something to at least 5,000, perhaps as many as 10,000, in St. Louis right now. Some of the distraught faces of these thousands of our people are portrayed in the pictures section of the Post-Dispatch today. There are more in any real estate office, on any bus, at any corner.

What does it do to them to be torn up, drifting, obsessed with the one problem that becomes more and more depressing every day?

They are bewildered. What they have always been able to obtain as a matter of course, a place to live in, they can obtain no longer. They are set apart from other people who have a place to live in. Others have or can rent living quarters or can afford the exorbitant prices at which houses are sold; they cannot.

They are embarrassed. The feeling of insecurity weighs heavily on their spirits. Are they pariahs, are they suckers, are they the forgotten men and women and children? Why should they lack a family's first necessity, a home?

They are on nervous edge. Some of them are living beyond their means in hotels and tourist courts, harassed by the knowledge that they can't afford it indefinitely, but not knowing whether it will be 3 months or 6 or 12 before they can find anything. Some are doubling up with relatives or friends, continually subjected to the continuous small irritations of overcrowding, always cramped and unsure of comfort, never able to relax from the strain of work and house-hunting and work again without any of the blessed privacy of home in between.

They are just plain mad. Not grammatically angry, but mad. They have a decided impression that they have been let down. They don't see it getting any better, and they do see it getting a lot worse. They are certain of one thing: That if the only people who can do anything about it know how urgent the need is, they ought to be moving a lot faster and to a lot more effect than they are. They think they are getting a raw deal, and they expect to remember it.

These are the homeless, the people who have come home to a reception as cruel and disillusioning as if the warmth and trust of homecoming had been rewarded by a fist smashed into their faces.

What Can the People Do?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1946

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, having been granted unanimous consent by the House, I extend in the RECORD the following editorial from the Springfield (Mo.) News and Leader of Sunday, January 6, 1945:

WHAT CAN THE PEOPLE DO?

President Truman's speech Thursday night spotlighted one of the most complicated, difficult, and perplexing problems of a modern democracy—how to make effective, in the complexity of modern life, "government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

To be sure, the President presented many specific problems—foremost the labor crisis that is hindering reconversion and a return to peace and normality, and increasing the danger of inflation. The only normal way to deflate without disaster is to go ahead with such a lavish production program that competition and plenty will gradually and normally force prices downward toward a safe base. On the other hand, no production, scarcity, high prices, and a pressure expending the inflation balloon to the bursting point. If it is allowed to pop, everybody will suffer, labor not least.

The present labor situation is the very logical—almost inevitable—result of Government policies during the past 14 years under Democratic and New Deal administrations. Now it has passed the point where the administration can handle it—and, indeed for years past it often has looked as if labor were handling the administration, rather than the administration handling labor. At any rate, an impasse has been reached—and at this late day, the President rather helplessly, passes the buck to the people, just as he passed them the buck of responsibility for Pearl Harbor a few

months ago, apparently not knowing what else to do with it.

One phase of this labor crisis he did not mention—perhaps could not mention: That much of the striking now under way is not, in fact, either industrial or economic in origin, as is normal, but that it is politically inspired. Many men are striking today, not for the normal things—better working conditions, higher wages—but, under the leadership of Communists, for a new order of things and a communistic or socialized setup in this country.

And of course this—and the whole cocked-trigger labor situation—are quite as sensitive a spot with Congress as with the President himself.

There are a good many things which could be said about the President's speech—and most of them have been, many of them quite pointedly.

But these things we skip for the present, along with comment on the other specific matters he mentioned, each of which would require a full editorial for adequate discussion, because we want to contemplate further that appeal to the people which was the real core of his talk.

But the President was wrong about "the great mass of citizens who have no special interests" being "the most powerful pressure group in the world." They are not a pressure group—they are not a group at all, in any organized sense. That was the President's very point, we take it—that all these great majorities of disinterested citizens ought to be exerting some pressure, and are not. Their influence is too diffuse to be felt—while the special interest lobbies, with infinitely less potential power, have their small influence so concentrated and focused that it is keenly felt, and becomes potent. You're hardly aware of the ordinary humidity in a room—but you're pretty keenly aware of the steam out of a teakettle spout if it's turned on you.

Anyhow, if the people actually ever did put the pressure on Congress that the President seems to suggest they would no longer be the people, but just another and bigger pressure group or lobby.

So what can be done about it? How can the voice of the people be heard? How can they make their influence effective, as the President asked?

In the old days, when government was chiefly local, everybody involved could meet in a town meeting and thresh the thing out in free and open discussion—a truly democratic procedure.

As populations increased and societies became far more complicated and unwieldly, representation was evolved. The men who used to go to town meetings, since they no longer could handle the government directly and personally, delegated selected representatives to do it for them—an extension of simple democratic procedure. In theory, Congress is the voice of the people. Perhaps it is the President who should listen.

And what is the real job of a real Representative?

There are, of course, two kinds of employees—the ones who do what they are told and wait to be told what to do, and the ones who assume they are employed to do their job and go ahead and do it.

There are both kinds in Congress. The first are so jittery for their jobs that they are afraid to take any stand—the ones who always keep an ear to the ground and finger to the wind, in the hope of sensing public sentiment and acting accordingly. They are not representing public sentiment—they only try to reflect it, and they flicker and fumble accordingly.

The others feel it is their responsibility to represent the people's interests—and they realize their obligation to know what those interests are and to understand and protect them. They realize that today it has become physically and literally impossible for every citizen to follow all the intricacies of legislation personally, and that they have been employed for the specific purpose of doing the job for them.

What Mr. Truman proposes, we take it, is that the folks back home should get busy and tell their Congressmen what to do. If they could, that would make it easier for everybody. But the simple truth is that they cannot, and should not be expected to. They don't know. That's what they hired their Congressman for—to study and understand such things for them, and to act in their best interest accordingly.

Government is important, and each citizen and voter certainly should feel his responsibility to see that it is competently handled—but he shouldn't be expected to handle it himself.

So as we see it, the voter's biggest job is to see that his representatives are the best men he can find to represent him—carefully selected men of superior caliber; sound men; men of character, knowledge and good judgment; men who understand principles, economics, and the law; men who will keep informed, who know what the interests of the people are and will serve them honestly and disinterestedly, and who will accept the responsibility for representing them with all their skill and energy.

From this point of view, our voters have reason to be proud of themselves— for our Congressman is honest, intelligent, very conscientious and industrious, and a man we can be glad to have represent us. He may make mistakes—so might any of us, or all of us. But he is a man whom we can trust to represent us, one in whom we can have confidence.

Mr. BENNETT said yesterday that he "welcomes" expressions of opinion from his constituents.

We believe that they, in turn, should be careful to express opinions only when they really know what they are talking about. Opinions to be helpful must be informed, considered, and intelligent; those which are ignorant and prejudiced are dangerous, not helpful.

Senator Morse Takes Over

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY CORDON

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 17, 1946

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, in the Portland Oregonian of January 8 there appears an editorial in the nature of an appraisal of the distinguished services performed by my colleague the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] during his first year of service in this body. The editorial is perhaps more than an appraisal. It may even partake of prophecy. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR MORSE TAKES OVER

Whether or not Senator WAYNE L. MORSE's challenge of Senator TAFT and the congressional old guard has any effect in shaking loose President Truman's legislative program, it will have a great effect upon the off-year elections coming this fall and no doubt upon the Presidential elections of 1948.

This could be the turning of the tide toward a new—or a revived—Republican liberalism. The scene has been set for it. And Oregon will watch with increased interest and considerable awe because her junior Senator, in office only 2 years, has violated all the rules of silence imposed upon first-termers and escaped unscathed. Rather, he has achieved a definite leadership of the reform movement in Congress—perhaps the leadership—by sheer brilliance and forthrightness. His is the outstanding case of its kind within our memory. And there is no telling how far Mr. MORSE will go, particularly if his demand for the choice of liberal Republicans in the 1946 elections should have sweeping results.

Not that we have any great faith in President Truman's delayed legislation. We have said that it seemed inadequate to its job. Nor do we know that Mr. MORSE has any great faith in it.

Nevertheless, the Oregonian shares Mr. MORSE's disgust with the fact that Mr. TAFT should have taken advantage of the situation by attempting to fasten upon the Republican Party an antilabor, antiliberal program. If Mr. TAFT's statement linking the Truman legislation with the CIO's Political Action Committee had gone uncriticized by his own party, it would have done irreparable harm by tending to set the tone of the coming campaigns. Unchallenged, it would have amounted to announcement that the diehards on the Republican side of the aisle in Congress were still the spokesmen, so far as the spokesmanship resided in Congress, for the party.

The prompt retort by the Oregon Senator has obviated that danger. He has in effect served notice of a revolt against the old leadership which will be carried to the voters this fall, to the Republican National Committee as the opportunity offers, and to the national convention and the elections 2 years hence.

This background of conflict within the party is not, of course, unknown to any intelligent voter. Dynamic and liberal republicanism has extended from Abraham Lincoln through Theodore Roosevelt to Wendell Willkie. It is a liberalism which sees no paradox in preserving and extending free enterprise and at the same time giving greater security to the masses of people who are increasingly thwarted by the closing of the frontier and the crystalization of industry. It is the opposite of that reactionary attitude which becomes established during lean years on the Republican side in Congress, among those who survive by virtue of personal popularity at home and look upon themselves as the proper directors of party policy. It is the attitude of those who must win office, not those who merely hold office. It is the attitude, in general, of the young Republican governors who have sprung up all over the country and who have fought the congressional group in the national committee and the party councils.

Under these circumstances the rise of Senator MORSE is dramatic, though it could not be described as unforeseeable by those best acquainted with him and his record.

He did not go to Washington as a novice so far as the pitfalls and problems of that city are concerned. He had had the hard training of the War Labor Board. And there was plenty of significance in the fact that he had taken the leadership in that Board, and that so far as general policy is concerned little has been added or subtracted from his written opinions to this day. It was Mr. MORSE who established the policies of the Board; and during the war period, for which they were designed, they worked.

He entered the Senate with that unorthodox daring unabated, and he arrived at a time when the long-gathering revolt against the career Republicans was still without adequate leadership. He has undertaken that leadership without blinking an eye, where so many before him had either avoided the test or, after rebuffs, have thrown up their hands. And thus far the intelligence which made him the John Marshall of the War Labor Board has forced Congress to a respect which

has not been shown to a beginning Member in generations.

It is quite possible that Oregon and the Nation have far more in Senator MORSE than anyone bargained for. We hope so.

Unification of the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 17, 1946

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Portland Oregonian of December 21, 1945, entitled "Why Take It to Congress?" The editorial discusses the question of the unification of the armed services and the power of the President to act in the premises.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY TAKE IT TO CONGRESS?

The national Constitution designates the President of the United States as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. The scope of his power in that regard has been passed upon a number of times by the United States Supreme Court. The ruling decisions hold that by virtue of his position he has undoubted power to establish rules and regulations for the government of the Army and Navy, or may modify or repeal or create them anew, and that such rules and regulations cannot be questioned on the ground that they are unwise.

This page is not opposed to coordination of the armed forces. We are for it. But it seems to us that in determining upon the manner in which coordination shall be attempted, the power of the President of the United States to establish rules and regulations and change them at will has in its flexibility a profound advantage over acts of Congress, which if found of poor or questionable workmanship can be corrected or modified only by convincing a majority of two Houses of Congress just what ought to be done about it.

Mr. Truman, in his message urging Congress to enact laws unifying the armed services, acknowledges by strong implication his own power to coordinate the Army, Navy, and Air Force. He argues that with other problems before him, the President cannot be expected personally to balance either the organization, the training, or the practices of the several branches of national defense, but should be able to rely for that coordination upon civilian hands at the Cabinet level.

Granted. But we believe that the President has the authority, without sanction of Congress, to summon chiefs of staff and designated high commands into round-table discussions presided over by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of Navy, whichever he may choose, and with that Cabinet officer empowered in the President's name to umpire points of controversy, direct removal of duplications, establish change in practices, and weigh claims for dominance in men and equipment of this or that branch of the service as the science of defense shall dictate.

The President can obtain reliance for coordination upon civilian hands at the Cabinet level without, in this period of fluidity of ideas on relative importance to offense and defense of the three armed services, basing it upon the rigidity of an act of Congress.

The Nation is at peace. There is no foreseeable prospect that it will soon be drawn into another war. It is a time that lends itself to exploration into the field of unification of the armed services. But if by unforeseen circumstances we should be drawn into war before an inflexible act of Congress has been given the test of trial and error, we may find a less effective coordination than we had in the war that has ended.

The unification plan that has the presumptive indorsement of the President comes from the War Department. It is supported by the Army from top to bottom. It is opposed by the Navy from top to bottom. Each service has its friends and sympathizers in Congress. In so complete a split of opinion, one who is of open mind is prone to suspect that the scheme in its scope is founded in jealousy on the part of the Army and that opposition is founded in the pride and traditions of the Navy.

Since the founding of the Republic the Navy has been, in the sense of permanency, the Nation's first line of defense. We have never had a real Army except in time of war. We have built up the Navy, and at times have sent it round the world to awe other nations. When it came home or made periodical visits, we in ports received it with banners and bands and the blowing of whistles. It has embodied glamor and romance and popular notice. But in peacetimes a skeleton Army has been immured in mainland, Alaska, or island posts where nobody pays any attention to it except civilian neighbors. We have in consequence a Navy puffed up with its importance and an Army that in peacetime suffers an inferiority complex.

As we have said, we are for coordination; but we question whether, in this background, Congress will be able to act fairly and intelligently, and with a foresight that will provide unification equal to a coordination by the direction of an executive who can instantly correct flaws in the system if any shall develop.

Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1946

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of January 16, 1946:

LABOR LEGISLATION

The present labor crisis did no spring out of a vacuum. The foundations for it were being laid for month and even years by a combination of inaction and bad policies. Long ago either the President or Congress, or both, should have appointed a commission of experts to recommend a rounded program of labor legislation and labor policy. But many men in Congress after waiting until the Nation's industrial life is disrupted by grave strikes and threatened by still graver ones now talk of quick and angry "action."

It is right, it is imperative, that action dealing with the present labor crisis be taken without undue delay. But the real question is what the proper action should be. Any attempt to "forbid strikes" or to impose compulsory arbitration would only make the ultimate situation incomparably worse than the present one. Nor does hope of a real solution lie in the enactment of a bill for setting up so-called "fact-finding" boards as recommended by the President. The weaknesses and the hazards of that remedy have already become clear from the prompt consequences of the decisions of the fact-finding boards appointed by the President without benefit of legislation in the General Motors and oil industry cases. The moment the General Motors board recommended a wage increase of 17½ percent, practically every other union decided that this was the minimum increase to which it was entitled, and that the Federal Government would support it in imposing such an increase upon employers.

When one considers that the automobile workers were already among the highest paid in the country (actually standing in the upper third of the Nation's income receivers) this conclusion on the part of other union leaders does not seem unnatural. As Prof. Sumner H. Slichter wrote in the Yale Review before these "fact-finding" decisions were announced: "Collective bargaining will not develop * * * if the Government abandons the role of a neutral and virtually compels employers to grant better terms than the unions could win by bargaining. * * * Government wage setting and collective bargaining do not mix. * * * Where the Government wishes collective bargaining to flourish, it must not seek to impose settlements."

The real task before Congress today is not to attempt to throw the Government's weight onto either side of the scales, but to establish the conditions under which a peaceful, amicable and two-sided collective bargaining is encouraged. One way to do this would be to balance the Wagner Act so that an employer or a nonunionized worker, as well as a union, could complain to the National Labor Relations Board against unfair labor practices, including intimidation and coercion. But it would accomplish almost as much good if, short of that, any union that sought the protection of the Wagner Act would itself be required to come before the Board with clean hands. Today a union that has shown itself to be irresponsible, and that may even be led by known racketeers, can bring accusations against an employer while the Board is not even authorized under the law to take cognizance of the union's own transgressions.

This situation suggests its own remedy. The Wagner Act should be amended to authorize the National Labor Relations Board to refuse to extend the protection of this law to any union which has been guilty of enforcing its will through intimidation or violence, which has struck in violation of a labor contract, which excludes members on arbitrary grounds, which charges unreasonable initiation fees or dues, or which engages in similar antisocial activities.

Such amendments would go little further than those passed by the House of Representatives, by more than a two-thirds majority in June 1940, but later buried in a Senate committee so that the full Senate never had an opportunity to vote upon them. These amendments separated the judiciary and the prosecution functions of the Labor Board. They prevented the Board from ordering reinstatement of striking workers who had "willfully engaged in violence or unlawful destruction or seizure of property." They insured liberty of expression of opinion for employers on labor matters when "not accompanied by acts of coercion, intimidation, discrimination, or threats thereof." They permitted employers to petition the Board for elections to choose collective bargaining representatives. They made the Board's decisions and findings of fact subject to review by the United States courts of appeal.

A measure of this sort would not deprive even the most reckless and irresponsible union of any rights which it had prior to 1935. Its sole "penalty" would be the refusal of the privileges and protections of the Wagner Act to unions that had done nothing to

deserve them. It is true, on the other hand, that such a measure would not completely end strikes. Nor would any measure that did not threaten a free-enterprise system and American liberties. But such a statutory recognition of irresponsibility and unlawfulness where they existed, and a refusal to encourage or reward them, would reduce existing sources of conflict and constitute an essential step toward industrial peace.

More Dictation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 17, 1946

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Carroll County Independent of January 4, 1946, entitled "More Dictation":

MORE DICTATION

Mr. Petrillo, head of the musicians union, appears to be one of the most powerful and dictatorial men in the whole country.

As head of the union, he has done a fine job for his men. Wages and hours have been much improved over a period of years until the lot of the musician has changed far from the ancient status of the wandering minstrel playing for his supper.

But Petrillo seems to have gone too far. His latest edict is that broadcasting companies cannot rebroadcast European music, that is, music that originates in Europe, as played by European musicians. He takes the position since European musicians do not belong to his union, and are not American musicians, this is unfair competition. He is going to see it stopped.

As far as we know, very little European music has been rebroadcast for listening pleasure in the United States. It is not so much a question if we shall hear European music from time to time, but as to whether or no one man has the right to dictate what we shall or shall not hear.

Mr. Petrillo has recently ruled that broadcasting companies cannot pipe or transmit music from their regular stations to be rebroadcast by frequency modulated stations without having and paying an extra orchestra.

Mr. Petrillo's theory is sound from his viewpoint. The broadcasting company is using one orchestra for both a conventional station and also for a frequency modulation station. That is, it is getting two for one.

As far as the public is concerned, most FM stations today are of limited range, have a limited number of listeners, and simply cannot afford to pay for an idle stand-by orchestra.

For several years we have listened to FM station WMTW, on top of Mount Washington. No matter what the weather conditions, this station always comes in clear and strong. Listening pleasure is great, because FM is never bothered by the northern lights, thunderstorms, or local interference. The effect is almost as if the speaker or musicians were in the next room.

Thanks to Mr. Petrillo, New Hampshire folks who have enjoyed WMTW cannot get the same wide scope of program as formerly enjoyed. Records, speeches, and news will be the program.

From the viewpoint of the musicians in his union, the man is working for their interests every day in the year.

From the viewpoint of the public, Mr. Petrillo has come into every home, dictating what can or cannot be heard and in what form music may be enjoyed.

It is fair to ask if this is not more power than should be enjoyed by any one man in a democracy?

North Dakota's Prohibition of Corporation Farming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 17, 1946

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "An Old, Old Fight," published in the Bismarck (N. Dak.) Leader of January 3, 1946. It is one of the most inspiring editorials that I have read, and should be of interest to every man, woman, and child in the United States.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OLD, OLD FIGHT

The people of North Dakota won a very important battle when the Supreme Court of the Nation upheld the right of the State to prohibit corporation farming.

The American system of democracy is based on home ownership. The corporations do not aid in our democratic way of life. They have no individuality. The small farm, the family sized one, the size depending on the portion of the State where the land is located, is the ideal size for the development and continuous growth of democracy. (And small, individual business is in the same category, of course.)

Most of our readers will agree with the statements in the two foregoing paragraphs.

It was fighting that got the law on the books which prohibits corporation farming and holding of large tracts of land by corporations in our State. And that battle was won. But it was only one of many that have been fought, and likely will have to be fought over again in the future.

Just how old do you think this fighting for land ownership for the man who actually works the land really is? A couple of thousand years does not cover the period, and that is a long time.

As all students know there was a Roman republic in existence many years before our era. It was a very enlightened group of men who formed and ran that republic. But in those days the coining of money had already been in use for some time, and money could buy land. The rich people liked to own land and used their money to buy it up, just as they have geen doing for generations in modern times. The Roman farmers could not hold onto their land. It cost so much to run the ever more extravagant Roman Republic, so they were taxed out of business. They were forclosed on and the rich owned the land, working it with slave labor. The farmers had to go to town and live on relief.

That sounds very familiar to some of you, doesn't it?

One Roman, a man elected to the "lower house" of the Roman Legislature, a Tribune, as they were called, saw what was developing and that the condition was becoming worse. He had a law made. But he had to campaign for reelection, and had to stay in office to have the law enforced. He did make a campaign, and his campaign talk is memorable—so memorable it has come down to us in history. We'll identify the man for you. His name was Tiberius Gracchus, and the campaign mentioned was about 135 years before Christ.

Here is a portion of his campaign speech:

"The beasts that prowl about Italy have holes and lurking places where they make their beds. You who fight and die for Italy enjoy only the blessings of air and light. These alone are your heritage. Homeless, unsettled, you wander to and fro with your wives and children. You fight and die to give wealth and luxury to others. You are called the masters of the world; yet there is no clod of earth that you can call your own."

A campaign talk made more than 2,000 years ago, but with a few amendments it applied to North Dakota in the 1930's, and applies today in many parts of the southern sections of the Nation.

It is an old, old fight, this fight for land and ownership of it. Our farmers lost much of their land between the two world wars, and many of them may lose it again, many of those who have been fighting this late war, too.

We won the fight in the courts to keep the big corporations from farming our land with the help of a few hired men. But such fights are never won for good.

The first historical fight of this kind was perhaps the fight of Tiberius Gracchus in Italy for the small farmers of his day. You old Leaguers who might be tiring of the fight we have been having for the past 30 years under our own banner might bear in mind how ageless such a fight is, and impress it on your children. They also will be called on to fight to hold what you have won for them. You may be sure that the past few years of agricultural prosperity are not a sign of a permanent prosperity for you on the land. Your children will have to learn this, and learn to help win such fights when they come.

Since we mentioned Gracchus, since he is in fact the hero of this piece, perhaps we should tell you about the outcome of the fight he led for reelection. He won. But he was killed by the members of the senate, who were the rich landowners and did not like his reform. Ten years later a younger brother who had taken up the fight and tried to enlarge on the program by including votes for some groups of Roman citizens, was also murdered, even the landless for whom he was fighting turning against him. Another man, a century and a half later, said the same words the Gracchus brothers had used in their campaigns, framing them slightly differently. He also was murdered, and the people were turned against him too, as they had been against the younger Gracchus. We call Him Jesus Christ and celebrate His birthday, which we call Christmas, each year.

The fight was perhaps not started 2,000 years ago. It may be older. But you may be sure it is not ended, so do not let yourself become discouraged. And, bearing in mind the fate of the reformers of 2,000 years ago, weigh well all propaganda used against your own leaders.

Bonus for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD W. LANDIS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 17, 1946

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bonus bill which provides an adjusted compensation to the veterans

of this war in sum equal to $1.50 per day for each day of military service rendered outside the continental United States and $1 per day for each day of military service rendered within the continental United States.

I have received petitions from midwestern war mothers of World War II containing 30,000 signatures which I today presented to Congress in support of the bill.

I believe that it is high time that we pass a bonus bill for our veterans before the New Deal administration gives all of our money to foreign countries.

Our Latter-Day Deification of Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1946

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am happy to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the New Orleans Item, of New Orleans, La., on January 7, 1946.

I have taken particular interest in this editorial, not only because it is well written, well reasoned and timely, but also because the man responsible for it is a native Hoosier, having been born in Green Forks, Ind. He is Ralph Nicholson, who is president and publisher of the Item. His course has taken him through the public schools of Indiana, a stretch in World War I, Earlham College, the Harvard Graduate School, and then on through various assignments in the newspaper and radio field to eminent success with the New Orleans Item. He is typical of forward looking yet sound American leadership which is so needed today. This editorial is leadership in that direction.

OUR LATTER-DAY DEIFICATION OF CHANGE

An old school of shallow philosophy is coming of late into fuller flower in the discussion of our economic, political, and governmental affairs. It is placing its curse on "resistance to change." Anybody who resists any change that these philosophers desire, no matter how foolish or fantastic, is immediately classed as backward, stupid, and selfish—sometimes, indeed, as disloyal to the Nation and a traitor to the human race.

Ways that are old are damned on that account. Some of these philosophers, in fact, seem to believe that the ancient but once-popular idea that two and two make four should be rooted out because it conflicts with their economical mathematics. Everything that is old must be discarded for any new thing that they propose. We deny all such tosh for the nonsense that it is—whether it springs from the itch of self-interest or the vaporing of ignorance.

Every intelligent person knows, and should be happy to admit, that all human progress is the result of change—changes in our ways of thinking and doing, growing out of new knowledge in the realms of physics, economics, and politics. But everybody who has observed or read a little also knows that mankind has suffered untold woes by breaking too enthusiastically, without due consideration, from old ways to new notions that have failed.

We have a brilliant example of this in our own country these past 12 years. Mr. Roosevelt did a number of new things, especially in his first term, that needed doing. We have these yet. But he also did many new things and adopted new methods that have failed egregiously. Our national graveyard is cluttered with their costly tombstones bearing countless alphabetic names which were so numerous that none of us can remember for what they stood. These have imposed frightful costs on the country without any offsets in benefits. Their results have accumulated in the horrible mess in which we now find ourselves. Yet self-seeking politicoes and unbalanced idealists still clamor for irrational, unquestioning public acceptance of still more crackpotty notions of their own.

Out of their ranks rise the philosophers who make a god of change—their change—and condemn all their intelligent fellow-citizens who ask for proof of their wisdom, and decline to swallow it until this is produced. Yet all of us know that it is intelligent, rational skepticism that keeps society from flying apart under the cross-pulls and whirls that would result if every new notion, however fantastic, were swallowed without question.

Some of these philosophers of the sanctity of change have been drawing an illusory parallel between the late British elections and our American conditions. The British turn toward socialism, they say, make a similar turn necessary and inevitable over here. "It has energized the forces of conflict here; it has encouraged labor and alarmed our conservatives," they add, etc., etc.

But, through ignorance or dishonesty, they don't add that the British majority was impelled by a desire for the superior advantages enjoyed by the American working people and middle classes. The knowledge of this was brought home to them by 4 years of close personal association with millions of Americans in England and on the battle fronts. Their own observation of the vast superiority of the food, clothing, housing, equipment, and pay, of these millions of American boys raised their gorge.

They discovered for the first time, cheek by jowl, from the talk of their American companions-in-arms, these better wages and working conditions, the greater comforts, conveniences, and even luxuries, enjoyed by the plain people of our country, by comparison with wretched conditions in their own. These boons that the British majority sought were brought long ago to our people by our system of democratic free enterprise—which our philosophers of sacred change are trying to destroy.

Perhaps the British were right in turning toward socialism. We don't know. Their set-up has been different from ours. Socialism carried to its limit means complete dominance of a very few over all the rest. It leads to unchecked domination of government by politicians. This our people will never accept, knowing what they do. The philosophers of change must hide the meaning of their design.

But that idea is probably not so obnoxious to the English as to us because the politician's entrusted with the management of British affairs have traditionally been more competent, by and large, than our own politicoes. You have an example of this in the huddle of these now in Washington. There they present a sorry show of unwillingness or incapacity to do anything worthy of the name to save this country from deeper descent into a chasm from which only intelligent and courageous action can save it.

Roosevelt, with smug artistry, showed his political trailers how to smear public men who would not swallow his medicine without gagging. Among their other imitations of the master, they are now reviving the famous "fireside chats." We had one last week. But the master is gone and the fireside had already lost its fascination before he went.

So don't be dismayed by the foolish fantasies and fictions of the philosophers of change. It is Britain's desire for the greater blessings which our people enjoy that has turned the majority of them to a trial of socialism. But our absurd philosophers of change still say:

"Let us turn to socialism too. Let us abandon the system of free enterprise which has brought and is still bringing us the good things which the English covet. Let us abandon the way that has made us the wealthiest and most powerful Nation on earth—and kept us free all the while—in order to accept a system that has never been tested long anywhere, and has never brought any people any of those blessings so far as it has gone."

All such counsel is goofy. Regardless of the epithets of selfish or self-deluded philosophers of change, let us stand with those who still trust such aged commonplaces as the Ten Commandments, the Golden Rule, and the idea that 2 and 2 make 4.

Judaism and Race Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK P. BRIGGS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 17, 1946

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. President, Rabbi Ferdinand M. Isserman, of St. Louis, recently made a very enlightening and a most informative statement on Judaism and race relations. I ask unanimous consent to have the statement printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUDAISM AND RACE RELATIONS

I. THE TEACHINGS OF JUDAISM AND RACE RELATIONS

One of the most disturbing maladies of our age is the oppression and exploitation carried on in the name of race. Millions of human beings have been stripped of their dignity and relegated to a status of inferiority by the forces of prejudice and greed which wear the pseudoscientific mask of racism. In this crisis, Judaism has a message for mankind. It speaks out of its age-old tradition of concern for justice to demand in the modern world respect for the sanctity of every individual child of God. It finds in the moral principles implicit in the doctrines of Israel's prophets and sages a source of faith and a guide for action toward full human brotherhood. Judaism teaches the belief in one God and the oneness of mankind. This faith is the foundation stone of Biblical and Rabbinical doctrine which stresses the equality of all races and nations in the sight of God. In the words of Isaiah (Isaiah xiv: 25), "Blessed be Egypt my peoples, and Assyria the work of my hands, and Israel mine inheritance." Attacking the myth of group superiority, Amos exclaimed: "Are ye not as the children of the Ethiopians unto Me, O Children of Israel, saith the Lord' (Amos ix: 7). As the fundamental verse of the Torah, Ben Azzai selected Genesis v: 1: "This is the book of the generations of Adam." He chose this verse because it epitomized the unity of mankind. For the same reason, Akiba preferred the verse: "But thou shalt love they neighbor as thyself" (Leviticus xix: 18). In response to the question, "Who is meant by my neighbor?" Akiba

explains: "Every human being is beloved by God, since he is a creature of God, made in His image."

So that no man or nation might be able to claim superior birth or descent, Rabbinic legend teaches that Adam was created from dust gathered from the four corners of the earth. In the same spirit we are told that the Torah was given in the uninhabited wilderness and in the "70 languages of mankind" in order that it might be heard and accepted by all the people of the world. The attitude which the majority should adopt toward the minority has been formulated in the Biblical injunction: "The stranger that sojourneth with you shall be unto you as the homeborn among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself, for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt" (Leviticus xix: 34).

Specific issues of race relations have long confronted us in the conditions of American life In the world at large a crisis in race relations now challenges us. Conferences of rabbis have applied the above declared traditions of Judaism to the solution of racial problems. The Jewish religion teaches us that all men are made in the image of God. Judaism recognized only one race, the human race, from which there follows directly the basic equality of all peoples.

In the light of these religious convictions, we work and pray for the realization of these ideals:

1. We assert that no race has the right to dominate another.

2. We deny that God has selected some races for special favors and others for debasing servitude.

3. We urge the education and full emancipation of all peoples without exceptions. And we look with especial concern upon the exploitation of many millions in Asia and Africa and urge their admission as equals into the councils of nations.

4. We do not regard conflict between races as inevitable.

5. All racial discrimination and segregation must be banned by the laws of states and nations.

II. SCIENCE AND RACE

Theories of racial superiority and inferiority have no foundation in modern science. The differences which exist among the peoples of the earth are far less important than the similarities. There have been countless numbers of classifications of men based on traits or combinations of traits arbitrarily selected, such as stature, head form, and pigmentation.

These classifications have too often been accepted as stereotypes and have been accorded false values. Science recognized that within each type there exist wide individual differences, that present races are the products of intermixture, and that the traits classified are not merely the results of genetic inheritance but reflect as well the influence of environmental and cultural conditioning. One example of the racial falsehoods current in the modern world is the use of the terms "Aryan" and "Semitic" to designate biological types. These terms have no justification, for they denote linguistic families and no genetic differences.

Science provides no basis for discrimination against any people. There are no grounds for describing any of the existing human types as more primitive on an evolutionary scale. The present cultural status of any people is not an index of its psychological potentialities, but reflects the opportunities or lack of opportunities which history has provided for their fulfillment. Our present culture is a composite product of the contributions of all races.

False theories of race have been used as political instruments of antidemocratic forces the world over. The Nazis have used them in Germany and Fascists everywhere have made them serve as divisive forces and instruments of dominance. They have played upon the insecurity and frustrations of peoples, and have manipulated the basest aspects of personality, snobbery, malice, and hate.

The race theories which they have used have no validity in science; they are rationalizations designed for political purposes to justify exploitation, discrimination, terror, and violence. They have served as tools of disruption by dominant groups interested in maintaining and extending their political and economic control.

The antidemocratic practices which discriminate against racial groups and prevent their full and complete participation in American society impede the progress of our culture. All of us are deprived of the creative gifts which remain unfulfilled because of the impediments which frustrate the aspirations of oppressed peoples. There is overwhelming and convincing evidence that when complete economic, educational, and social equality are given to them, they are able to make major creative, intellectual, and artistic contributions to the progress of mankind. No truly democratic society can be lenient toward the doctrine of a racial elite.

III. THE NEGRO IN THE UNITED STATES

The war against fascism has been marked by some gains for our Negro citizens. Among these may be enumerated the recognition of the fine heroism and patriotism displayed by Negro troops in combat and other essential military services; the establishment of the Fair Employment Practice Commission (FEPC) which should be made permanent; the provisions embodied in the Federal aid bills guaranteeing greater educational opportunity to Negroes; the United States Supreme Court rulings requiring equal treatment for Negroes in cases involving the franchise, education, and union memberships, the campaign now being waged by many labor groups to root out the "color line" in unions, and the interracial activities of many religious bodies.

But we cannot be lulled to sleep by such gains which are far short of the demands of both justice and democracy. As long as Jim Crow laws exist, as long as thousands of Negroes live in virtual peonage as sharecroppers and tenant farmers, as long as houses unfit for human habitation are the lot of many Negroes; as long as health services are inferior and woefully inadequate; as long as brutal lynchings disgrace the land and mock our institutions; as long as segregation is practiced by the armed forces; as long as equal opportunity is denied to Negroes and thousands must face unjust union discrimination and are denied the right to live in desirable areas, hotels, and apartments; as long as opportunity and advancement are denied them in the professions, in industry, and in educational institutions; as long as they are denied equal rights to share amusements and other facilities; as long as hospitals, even those conducted under denominational auspices, continue to deny medical treatment and training opportunities to Negroes, we cannot abate our efforts to end discrimination. Hence, it is incumbent upon all Americans—especially those whose silence or inaction made such discrimination possible—to wage incessant war upon all manifestations of injustice to the Negroes. Hatred and prejudice against them must be rooted out.

These considerations are valid for all Americans. Because they are so deeply consonant with Jewish teaching and reinforced by Jewish experience, we shall lend our strongest efforts to secure justice for the Negro.

IV. COLORED RACES IN THE PACIFIC

The United States, but recently hailed throughout Asia and the Pacific as the champion of oppressed peoples, today seems to be lending its influence to the resubjugation of hundreds of millions of colonials, by force of arms where necessary. The dependent areas of the region still are administered primarily in the interests of alien merchants and investors. The aspirations of Burmese and Anamites, of Indonesians and Malayans no less than those of Filipinos and Koreans, all for the encouragement of freedom-loving people everywhere.

Manchurians and Koreans have been released from the Japanese yoke. In Outer Mongolia, Chinese prudence has permitted an ancient people of herdsmen to gain political independence without bloodshed. China itself, despite the unresolved political conflict, gives evidences of a new respect for the rights of her racial and religious minorities. India's 400,000,000 are struggling for political independence which we trust she will achieve. This is an essential first step toward that unity without which the inequalities in the nation's social system cannot be finally abolished. Further south in the Malay Peninsula and in the East Indies another 100,000,000 likewise assert their undeniable right to independence through revolutionary movements which, outwardly, political, derive in part from social discontent long held in check. The great capacities of the varied peoples inhabiting Oceania have been demonstrated not only by native arts which flourished before the impact of European influence, but also by the advances made by those like the Hawaiians and the Maori of New Zealand who have been given the opportunity for self-development.

The heart of Israel goes out to all who aspire to freedom. We are convinced that the age of imperialism—political, economic, and cultural—is ended. The Indians, Burmese, Koreans, Filipinos among other peoples, should be aided in the solution of problems incident to their immediate entry into the community of self-governing nations. In remaining dependent areas as a first step toward self-government, international trusteeship under the United Nations Organization should supersede colonial control. The relation of east and west must be one of equal partnership in the administration and enjoyment of the common resources and common cultural heritage of the world.

V. THE LAW AND RACE RELATIONS

The fundamental equality of all men is affirmed without limitation or distinction in the basic documents which are the foundation of our democratic legal system, from the American Declaration of Independence with the conviction that "all men are created equal, and endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights" to the United Nations Charter which stands for "human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion." These documents express the insight drawn from the Judaeo-Christian tradition that human brotherhood must be unqualified and all-inclusive. We believe that this insight must be translated into legislation adapted to the exigencies of modern society.

The potentialities of the law in helping to break down racial bigotry and its chief objective manifestation—racial discrimination—have, however, not been realized. The failure to distinguish between prejudice and discrimination, the ignorance of the role the law plays in creating and reenforcing racial attitudes and the active opposition of antidemocratic forces are responsible for the lack of adequate legislation.

The entire apparatus of Jim Crow is employed to confine the Negro to roles which symbolize inferior status and thus by daily example lend support to the claim of white supremacy.

Even in the North, the law is far from neutral in the field of race relations. Covenants in real-estate contracts which bar certain minority groups could not be enforced without the aid of our equity courts. The tax exemption granted to quasi-public educational institutions despite their discriminatory admission policies is another gift of the

law to racial prejudice. But the law can be converted from a supporter of bigotry to its implacable foe. It can best be utilized by forbidding discrimination because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry in any vital relationship. Segregation, the legally camouflaged form of discrimination, needs likewise to be outlawed.

In employment, the discriminatory denial of equal job opportunities means not only humiliation, but a threat to life itself. No employer should have the right to reject an otherwise qualified applicant because of irrelevant factors of race, or religion, or place of birth. The employer's right to choose his employees freely must be subordinated to society's greater stake in promoting equality of opportunity.

Because of the strategic role labor unions play in the labor market, their eligibility rules often mean the difference between a job and a bread line. The right of a union to act as exclusive bargaining representative carries with it the correlative duty not to deny membership because of racial or religious grounds.

We therefore favor the enactment of legislation by Federal and State governments for the establishment of Fair Employment Practice Commissions (FEPC) empowered to combat discrimination by issuing cease and desist orders enforceable in the courts.

Toward educational and other quasi-public institutions, our task is equally clear. The Constitution which forbids racial or religious discrimination by agencies of the state should likewise be applied to such institutions. We favor the denial of tax exemption and other governmental support to any such institution which discriminates.

In housing, not only must the restrictive covenant be outlawed, but landlords should be prohibited from selecting their tenants on the basis of race, religion, or color. Housing is as much affected with a public interest, as transportation, recreation, or public dining, already protected in some States by civil-rights laws.

In our suffrage, unquestionably, the law should be color blind. We favor Federal legislation outlawing the poll tax and the white primary.

In our immigration and naturalization laws, we must eliminate every vestige of outmoded racial doctrines. The decision to admit or exclude an alien should depend upon his own worth and not upon the color of his skin or the accident of his place of birth.

In every place which solicits public patronage—trains, hotels, restaurants, theaters, retail stores—we oppose not only discrimination but segregation as well.

Another aspect of the fight against discrimination is the effort to curb the instigators of racial prejudice. Such prejudice is often strengthened if not created by the circulation of false and malicious defamations of a race or religion or members or adherents thereof. Such hate literature or utterances incite the susceptible to violence and discrimination. Existing legislation against such literature must be vigorously and imaginatively utilized. Racial incitement in public is usually a breach of the peace and should be punished as such. Racial incitement on the floor of Congress can be curbed simply by the enforcement of existing congressional rules. We believe further that groups which have been libeled should have the right by private civil action to sue for an injunction, compulsory retraction, or a minimum penalty. This type of legislation avoids the danger of censorship or arbitrary governmental action, provides no obstacle to unhampered discussion of public issues, and furnishes a legal measure of speedy self-defense to groups directly affected. We urge also the further exploration of this issue with a view of drafting, within the framework of our constitutional guaranties, other remedial legislation to cope with the evil.

Finally we urge vigorous Federal protection of all civil rights, including enactment of a Federal antilynching law.

Our stress upon the utilization of legal sanctions does not minimize the importance of the complementary process of education without which no solution is possible. In this process of education, legislation and its vigorous enforcement play a significant and salutary role in molding public opinion.

But combatting race prejudice is not a mere matter of striking at its more obvious manifestations. In a country which is ill-fed, ill-housed, and ill-clothed, where men scramble desperately for jobs, and where insecurity is rife, racial suspicion will fester into racial hatred. This hatred in the long run is best prevented by eliminating the conditions under which it thrives. We favor legislation assuring full employment, social security, decent housing, education for all, which promise more than any direct attack. Victory in this struggle will mean an America in which all races, all faiths, all nationalities, can live in peace and security.

An International Creed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 17, 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a Statement of International Creed issued by me on January 5 prior to the first meeting in London on January 10 of the United Nations Organization.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A STATEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL CREED

1. I believe the United Nations Organization will be a success and will be adequate to its responsibilities.

The world's crying need for a peace of justice and continuity is such that UNO cannot fail.

The carnage of World War II stares us all in the face.

The threat of the atomic bomb and rocket warfare hangs over mankind.

Our very fear that we may be inadequate should spur the nations to make them adequate in UNO.

2. I believe that all of the Allies, including ourselves, must eliminate the "little foxes" of hate, distrust, and suspicion between ourselves.

These "little foxes" have been gnawing dangerously at the infant vines of Allied unity.

We must all replace the "little foxes" with the will, intent, purpose, and desire for a just and lasting peace.

3. I believe that America must be a good samaritan to the world, helping it to help itself.

This means adequate relief for all peoples in distress. That includes the prevention of inhuman suffering in Germany and Austria.

I believe that common justice, Christian charity, and common sense demand that Germany and Austria be rehabilitated along with the rest of Europe so as to contribute to the peace and prosperity of the globe.

4. I believe that the Moscow Conference of the Big Three, with its give and take, its compromises, is an excellent omen for the future.

Its results are neither grounds for extreme optimism nor extreme pessimism.

It indicates that the first steps have been taken to eliminate discord between the Allies.

If it is followed up in the Far East by complete respect for the statesmanship of General MacArthur, our progress will continue there.

5. I believe that the unsettled problems of bleeding Poland can be solved satisfactorily with Russia.

So, too, the well-being of the Baltic, Balkan, and other European peoples, now in doubt, can be provided for through agreement with Russia.

The near eastern and Asiatic problems are no more unsolvable than any other problems, if we will allow right, reason, and justice to prevail.

Fair Employment Practice Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 17, 1946

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written by Alfred Baker Lewis to the Washington Post commenting upon the activities of the Republican Party in several Northern States respecting the Fair Employment Practice Committee, and particularly calling to the attention of the Post readers the fact that the Republicans in the State legislatures have practically been unanimous against the proposal.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEPC

President Truman's endorsement of the proposal for a permanent Fair Employment Practices Commission is welcome proof that he intends to follow the Roosevelt policies in the important work of trying to eliminate racial discrimination in job opportunities. It is also a significant comment on the unreality of party platform pledges, for the Democrats did not in their 1944 platform promise a permanent FEPC bill, out of deference to the strength of the reactionary southern Democrats, while the Republicans made a specific pledge to support such legislation. Yet in most Northern States, except New York, the Republicans in the State legislatures voted almost solidly against FEPC bills and the Democrats voted solidly for them. In Connecticut, for example, every Democrat in the State legislature voted for such a bill and all the Republicans, except four, either voted against it or, with the same effect, voted to bury it in committee. In Massachusetts, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Michigan there was the same pattern of overwhelming Democratic support and equally overwhelming Republican opposition.

Citizens who believe that racial discrimination is un-American and should be stopped in employment policies by law ought to support President Truman wholeheartedly by writing their Congressmen accordingly. Especially the Republican leaders need to be reminded of their party's pledge.

ALFRED BAKER LEWIS.

NEW YORK CITY, *January 11.*

Prevention of Dental Decay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 17, 1946

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "The Prevention of Dental Decay," prepared by the dental profession of New Hampshire, supported by the State board of public health, making recommendations on the care of the teeth, which, if carried into effect, would manifestly be in the interest of the public health and welfare.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PREVENTION OF DENTAL DECAY

(The following statement is authorized by, and has the approval of the New Hampshire Dental Society, the New Hampshire Council on Dental Health, and Division of Dental Services of the State Department of Health.)

The New Hampshire State Board of Education is deeply interested in cooperating in the reduction of dental disease in the New Hampshire schools.

THE STORY OF DENTAL DECAY

Dental disease is more frequently found in this country than any other disease.

About 98 percent of all the people in the United States are affected by dental decay and it is reasonable to say that at least 50 percent of dental decay could be prevented by the application of the knowledge now available to the dental profession.

Dental disease is not confined to any one group of people. It can occur at all ages in any race, or locality.

It occurs in families with all levels of income, in either sex.

Dental diseases, if untreated, lead to toothache, tooth loss, crooked teeth, inflammation of the gums, and later loss of the teeth.

In addition, diseases of the teeth, if neglected, may be the cause of many ailments, including abcesses, infections in other parts of the body, resulting in arthritis, neuritis, neuralgia, valvular heart disease, and diseases of the kidneys and gastro-intestinal tract.

When the first 2,000,000 draftees of our Army were examined, dental defects caused more rejections than any other ailment.

The standards for admission to the Army were lowered to the minimum requirement of 12 teeth out of the usual requirement of 32, providing that they were in the right place.

Our Army could not be raised with dental standards so high, therefore they were lowered again so that some men were taken into the United States Army without any teeth.

It is appalling to find any such physical condition in our young manhood in this Nation which leads the world in opportunity, education, scientific achievement, and individual development. This country has the highest standards of living in the world and the highest per capita income.

Dental decay destroys most of the teeth that are lost by young persons. More than 9 of every 10 children, at the age of 6, have one or more decayed teeth. In New Hampshire there are approximately eight decayed teeth at 6 years of age.

At the age of 18—9 teeth on the average have decayed and several teeth have been lost. The loss of these teeth results in many dental complications. In New Hampshire approximately 11 teeth are decayed at 18 years of age.

There are not enough dentists in the country to correct the dental disease that now exists in the American public.

In this country there are about 70,000 dentists, including those serving in the armed forces.

The ratio of dentists to the population in 1940 was smaller than in 1930. There is approximately 1 dentist to 2,000 people in New Hampshire. Fifty-five percent of these dentists are located in 6 cities.

Appropriations from the treasuries of our Federal, State, and local governments for the purpose of providing more widespread dental service will probably be forthcoming, but these must increase the already heavy tax burden.

HELP PREVENT DENTAL DECAY

It is just simple, plain common sense to apply to the problem all available information possessed at this time regarding the prevention of dental decay.

Through research, knowledge on this subject will be increased some as the years go on but it is conservative to say that if we could apply the knowledge now possessed, we could cut the problem in half.

Research has confirmed the findings of dental authorities that the greater part of dental decay is caused, generally, by the consumption of too much sugars and starches, that dental decay results from acids from sugars and starches which are retained in the mouth; that a few individuals may consume more sugar and starches than they need but may not, because of certain individual conditions of the mouth, retain appreciable quantities resulting in tooth decay; that, on the other hand, there are more individuals who do not consume too much sugar or starches but who retain in the mouth much of that which is eaten, and hence develop dental decay; that individual characteristics of immunity or susceptibility are variables in the process of dental decay.

The consumption of free sugar has increased from 17 pounds per person a year in 1824 to approximately 115 pounds just before the war.

In 1823 the estimated per capita consumption of sugar in the United States was less than 10 pounds, whereas in many of the last 20 years it has exceeded 100 pounds. Not until 1845 did the per capita consumption reach approximately 20 pounds.

The total consumption of sugar in the United States has increased since 1923 from a few thousand tons to more than 500,000 tons. In 1927 the total consumption of candy was 1,733,000,000 pounds, or a per capita of 14.7 pounds. In 1943 the total consumption was 2,561,000,000 pounds, or a per capita of 19.0 pounds, which was sold for a total of $336,000,000.

Sugar causes a much larger percentage of decay than starches.

It is, therefore, recommended that:

1. Less sugar be consumed. Candy assumes a very prominent part among the forms of sugar causing decay. It is concentrated, lingers a long time in the mouth, and it is many times eaten alone, so that the sugar may remain in the mouth in contact with the teeth for a long period of time. Nearly all dental authorities, through research and observation, have reached this conclusion.

2. The practice of mouth hygiene by rinsing with water after eating concentrated sugars and other foods, is done by forcing the water between the teeth by tongue and cheek action; through brushing of the teeth with a good toothbrush so that all food particles are removed.

3. Systematic attention by your dentist to receive instruction in mouth hygiene and repair of dental damage.

4. The application of these principles to young children, avoiding the cultivation of artificial appetites for candy. No baby was ever born crying for candy.

The major portion of dental decay is connected with our excessive consumption of sugars and starches.

There are many subordinate factors which have an influence on the condition of dental decay, some of which are:

The general physical condition and the emotional status of the individual; mouth hygiene, and the presence or lack of certain minerals in the soil and the presence or lack of certain elements in the diet. Irregular arrangement of the teeth and abnormal conditions of the gums and other tissues of the mouth are unfavorable factors influencing mouth hygiene; hereditary influences; future research will undoubtedly reveal other factors bearing on the cause of teeth decay.

A simple diet which contains water, fruit, vegetables, milk, and its products, whole grain cereal with a moderate amount of eggs and meat and fish will produce the essential elements for a balanced nutrition. Candy, excessive sweets and starches tend to destroy the appetite of a child for an adequate quantity of more essential elements, resulting in a variable degree of malnutrition.

Present-day research is exploring the effect of the mineral fluorine, and other substances upon dental decay. The use of fluorine may prove helpful in the prevention of dental decay, but it must be borne in mind that the fundamental causes of dental decay are the excessive consumption of sugars and starches, in most individuals.

The dental profession of New Hampshire feels that it is obligated to convey to the citizens of this State this brief statement of available knowledge at the present time on the subject of dental decay and its prevention.

Prophecy of Republican Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 17, 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued by me on January 14, 1946.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY PREDICTS VICTORY OF CONSERVATIVE REPUBLICANS AND REPUDIATION OF NEW DEAL BLUNDERS

Since the Senate last met the best interests of the American people have been jeopardized.

(a) The Nation has been bumbled and fumbled into the worst strike chaos in a quarter of a century.

(b) The Nation has been brought closer to the greatest menace facing America in years—the menace of inflation which will make our bonds, our insurance policies, and our money valueless.

(c) There has been a reversion to the technique of the former administration, that of sabotaging the public's respect for the National Legislature.

The administration, and by that I mean the leaders of the second edition of the New Deal (leaders like Hannegan), has done this and further prepared the way for its own suicide—for its own elimination from the national scene.

By its inept and irresponsible acts it has helped insure the election in 1946 of a conservative Republican House of Representatives, the election in 1948 of a conservative

Republican Senate and House and President of the United States.

This is no mere wishful thinking. This is indicated by all the signs of the times, by the mail which floods my desk from common folks everywhere protesting the Administration's spiritual bankruptcy in our hour of national crisis, its surrender to leftist influences, its failure to get stability and harmony in America.

What do I mean by conservative Republicans? I mean those men who seek to conserve the best of the present and the past, the best traditions of constitutional Government, the best national habits of work, of industry, of thrift, of tolerance. I mean those men who recognize that change is the order of the day and who, therefore dynamically adapt to changing conditions, who offer constructive future programs, who utilize the best in the heritage of the present and the past, who do not fall to every crackpot scheme because it has a sincere name or a deceptive title.

New Dealers within and outside the Democratic Party have unsuccessfully sought to besmirch these conservative Republicans, by calling them "reactionaries" which they are not.

A reactionary is obviously one who blindly seeks to retreat to the outmoded conditions of the past, forsaking all progress.

Americans do not like to bandy terms about. But Americans know that the rightful use of the above terms demands that the term "reactionary" be reserved for the New Dealers.

It is they who would have us blindly retreat to the outmoded conditions of the past, the conditions in which a small group of arrogant men could dictate to and sabotage the welfare of the great American people.

That is the condition in which the reactionary Eureopean dictatorships of the right and left find themselves.

That was the condition of America, too, in bygone days. Then a small group of arrogant men, men of great wealth, violated the public welfare—thought they were the United States.

Today, it is the racketeering labor bosses—arrogant, grasping, reckless—who would duplicate this condition. It is they who, stimulated by the New Dealers, would halt American progress by a ruinous strike epidemic.

This, then, is first of the points I make now against the administration—that it has miserably failed to cope with the strike evil. Only a law with teeth in it can solve the strike problem now and protect the public interest. That's the way we handled the racketeers of capitalism.

Such a law would set up compulsory arbitration machinery to be used as a last resort to forestall strikes in vital industries. Such a law would revise the Wagner Act and make it an instrument for the people, for management as well as labor. It would make unions responsible for illegal acts.

The strikes and threats of strikes in the telephone, steel, telegram, auto, electric, and other industries, are intolerable in their harmful effects on the public welfare.

The President says this is the year of decision. Where are the decisions? We are only playing blind man's buff with this strike situation. Let's, Mr. President, make a decision. Your party at present controls the Government. Speak up. Let's meet the situation head-on, now, before it gets worse. The people are looking for that very action.

The following is a letter I received from a union official:

"JANUARY 8, 1946.

"Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

"DEAR MR. WILEY: This is to acknowledge receipt of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing your speech of October 4, 1945. I want to state that I am in full accord with its contents and congratulate you for your stand in the matter.

"It is high time that something be done to eliminate the un-American methods used in strikes today. You have broken the ice. Keep up the good fight.

"I have one suggestion to make. Why not establish an industrial labor court in each State? Pay the members of the court an adequate salary so as to eliminate any forthcoming bribes. Have said court weigh the facts of all labor disputes and make the decision of said court become final. Also set time limits on decisions not to exceed 30 days. This is merely a suggestion. Maybe you have a better one. At any rate keep up the good work. It may cost some of us our jobs, but I believe it is time for some of us Americans to talk American.

"Sincerely."

He approved my remarks of October 4, 1945, made on the floor of the Senate. In that speech I laid out a 10 point program, including the reevaluation of the entire Wagner Act, the enactment of legislation for compulsory arbitration to protect the public interest, enactment of legislation making unions responsible for violation of contract, requiring a full and accurate reporting of union finances, the same as corporations, amend the Sherman antitrust law to make labor organizations engaged in interstate commerce subject to the act and prohibit them from engaging in unreasonable restraints of trade. This is what was approved by the letter I just read. It confirms a further statement made in my speech that "it is our job to see to it that the racketeer does not damage the general welfare."

Also intolerable is the increasing menace of inflation—a menace which threatens our 85,000,000 war-bond holders, our 70,000,000 owners of insurance policies, our 45,000,000 bank depositors.

The administration, which has been posing as the heroic little boy covering the holes in the dike against inflation has actually been attempting to smash great big holes in that dike.

The administration has, by its one-sided labor policy, by its attack on corporations and on their financial integrity, actually encouraged strikes. By thus reducing production, it has given impetus to inflation.

It has also stupidly applied price controls, penalizing manufacturers for production, making them operate at losses or for negligible returns. In this way, too, it has reduced production.

The administration set out bait for Congress and sought to trap it into smashing the line against inflation instead of holding that line. The President recommended to Congress that it increase the salary of legislators. But Congress refused the bait.

Only recently, the Senate refused to enact its own wage increase. In so doing, it acted with statesmanship and leadership.

I believe that everyone of my colleagues believes as I do that the Congress is entitled to a wage increase. Yet, we know that the justice for such an increase is but one element of the whole picture we have to consider.

Had we enacted the increase, we would have set a dangerous precedent, we would have started an endless cycle of wage increases (which the administration has since started by other means) that might bring on inflation.

I am not arguing that the present wage level is equitable. The unions are claiming that they must have a 30-percent wage increase in order to meet the increased cost of living. Perhaps this is correct. But unless we get production, unless we can prevent inflation, what good will the wage increase be?

All of my colleagues are now preparing their tax returns. Let me take a moment or two to cite the bare facts about my own income as an illustration of the point I am making.

My own net taxable income for 1945 was approximately $13,000. Deduct from that:

Four thousand six hundred dollars for income taxes—State and National. In 1939, when I came to the Senate, my taxes—State and National—on same would have been about $1,000. That represents an increase of $3,600.

One thousand five hundred dollars for expenses at business luncheons with my constituents. Nearly every day I have one to five constituents as my guests in the Senate dining room. This is not entertainment; it is not politics. Luncheon often provides the only time I have to talk over with my constituents their problems, their questions, their suggestions. Thus, this represents an increase of $1,500 over my expenses in 1939.

Were I in private business, my company would pay these expenses and deduct this item from its own returns.

One thousand eight hundred dollars—the rental cost alone of maintaining a separate residence in Washington, in addition to the home which I must maintain in Wisconsin.

Were I in the employ of another, the residence expense would be borne entirely by him while I was on company business—just as I am now on the Nation's business.

When you add up these expenses—$3,600, $1,500, $1,800—you get a total of $6,900 over my expenses in 1939. This increased cost of living represents over half of my 1945 income. When you add to it the increased cost of living in food and all other items which affect all citizens, you see that Senators have been hit harder by price increases than has American labor. Our wages have not gone up one cent, although American labor's wages have gone up considerably.

I trust that these facts in my personal case will point up the situation in which my brother Senators find themselves.

We did not and we will not, however, vote ourselves a wage increase until we are certain that its effects will in no way be harmful to the best interests of the American people. We have thought this problem through.

That means we will not increase the danger of inflation, no matter how much the administration would entice us to do so.

If money becomes valueless, wage increases become meaningless. Is that not the lesson of the inflation-stricken lands of continental Europe?

The strikers are not alone at fault. Their leaders are. Labor has simply been shown the increase in the cost of living and sold the idea that they should have an equivalent increase on that basis only. No consideration has been given to the other factors. The truth has not been told these men. The public interest has been shunted aside. The old poison of capital imperialism, hate of capital, and of men who build and construct has been thrown in their eyes. It is the old technique used through the ages: "Whom the gods would destroy, they would first make mad."

What factors were ignored?

(1) The rights of the rest of the 139,000,000 Americans (there is estimated a million out on strike; there are 50,000,000 others working) and our need for production.

(2) The Government of the United States, which needs the taxes and a healthy economic current in its vitals, not a diseased current.

(3) The returning veterans who need the homes, the cars, the washing machines, and the jobs.

(4) The world, which just now, when our representatives in London are trying to get underway with the UNO, needs the example of a United States harmonious.

(5) In discussing what factors were ignored, apparently the function of the OPA, which is to hold the line, the threat to inflation, the problems of management in this reconversion period, all appear to have been ignored by the strikers.

The Senate didn't ignore these factors. That is why it refused to increase the salary of Senators.

The third and last point I wish to make now is that the administration has continued its efforts to undermine the American people's faith in the legislature which they themselves elected.

The President in his recent radio address sought to move the blame of the muddled national picture from downtown Washington, where the blame belongs at the doorstep of his own agencies, to Capitol Hill, where the blame does not belong.

For some reason or other, soldiers abroad are given the impression that Congress is to blame for their failure to be demobilized. Who's pulling that fast one? Speaking in the Senate on this very subjec on December 7, 1945, I said: "Who is propagandizing the servicemen or who is failing to tell them the truth?" If any blame belongs to Capitol Hill it is the administration's failure for 13 years to enact a constructive labor policy into law in the interests of labor, management, and the people. As a result we are today reaping the whirlwind.

It is true that the Congress has rejected some of the President's recommendations for legislation. In so doing Congress has put a definite brake on the continuance of these New Deal policies. If the people want New Deal legislation to continue, if they want New Deal philosophy to continue to shape the future of this country, then they should follow Hannegan's recent advice at Boston and elect New Dealers next November. But I am positive, as I have stated heretofore, that such is not the desire of a large majority of the American people. Congress knows that the only way to get production is by work, not by following the fetish of legislation. Had all the President's proposals been enacted, we would not have had a smaller debt but a larger debt; not more production but less production; not more domestic harmony but less harmony.

I conclude with this thought. The tide of new dealism is at last at its ebb. The end of deficit-spending and deficit-thinking is at hand. The hour draws close for the demobilization of bureaucracy and the end of Federal regimentation.

The floodtide of creative, constructive, conservative republicanism will soon be with us to sweep away the unlamented vestiges of new dealism.

The New World Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 17, 1946

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The New World Court," published in the New York Times for January 15, 1946. I think the editorial is one of the finest I have read on the subject of the world court and in support of the compulsory jurisdiction of that court, in keeping with the resolution which I have pending before the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW WORLD COURT

The first step toward the formation of the new International Court of Justice provided by the Charter of the United Nations has been completed with the nomination of 78 eminent international jurists to its bench. The Court itself will consist of 15 members to be elected by UNO's Security Council and Assembly at their present session. But the large number of nominations is in itself evidence of the high prestige and wide acceptance enjoyed by the Court by virtue of the work of its predecessors. It is a special tribute to this country's role in the development of international tribunals, as well as to its juridical system, that although the United States proposed only one official American candidate, two other Americans were likewise placed in nomination by other nations.

The official American candidate is Judge Green H. Hackworth, legal adviser to the State Department, who has participated in the drafting of many treaties and the codification of international law, and who was the successor to Elihu Root on the Permanent Court of Arbitration. But, in addition, Venezuela has nominated Prof. Charles G. Fenwick, distinguished political scientist and specialist in inter-American affairs; and, what is most noteworthy, six other nations have combined to nominate Manley O. Hudson, who was for many years a distinguished member of the old World Court even though the United States had rejected it, together with the League of Nations.

Under the statute of the Court, only one of these three candidates may be elected, but the election of one is assured. So, presumably, is the election of one member from each of the other Big Five. This means that the new Court will rest on a far broader foundation than the old. For it will have not only an American as one of its judges, but also a Russian, and both the United States and Russia, which were absent from the old Court, will now be official members, thus bringing in effect two new worlds under its jurisdiction.

Under the United Nations Charter, all signatories are obligated to seek a peaceful settlement of all disputes likely to endanger international peace and security. Judicial measures are specifically enumerated as one method for such settlement. Indeed, the Security Council is enjoined, if it deems necessary, to call upon the disputants to use such methods, and the Charter specifically provides that all "legal disputes" shall be referred to the Court as a general rule. In addition, the statute of the Court itself provides that it may act in all cases which the parties refer to it, and in all matters specially provided for in the Charter or in treaties or conventions. This wide jurisdiction is usually limited in practice by the very nature of the Court, which brings before it, not intrinsically political disputes which can be settled only by political means, but rather justiciable issues subject to judicial decision. This makes it more important than ever that as part of mankind's new effort to escape destruction the jurisdiction of the Court should be anchored even more securely than it is at present.

Under the present statute, the jurisdiction of the Court depends ordinarily on agreement between two states to refer a dispute to it. But there is also an "optional clause," providing that in a limited number of cases, dealing primarily with interpretation of treaties and questions of law, the member states accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court, which would bring before it automatically all disputes of this kind in which such states may become involved. Both the United States and Russia have hitherto opposed compulsory jurisdiction for much the same reasons that induced them to insist on a veto power in the Security Council. But developments since the statute was drafted, in particular the arrival of the atomic bomb, make it essential that the very idea of a settlement of international disputes before an international tribunal should be strengthened. The United States has now an opportunity to make up for its neglect of the old Court by taking the lead in strengthening the new. A resolution to that effect is already pending before the Senate. We are confident that the great majority of the American people would be in favor of such action if the issue were presented to them.

The Pearl Harbor Inquiry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 17, 1946

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I think it is generally recognized that the New York Times is one of the leading newspapers in the United States. It reports the news as it finds it, and its editorial policy is fair and factual. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Pearl Harbor Inquiry," published in the New York Times of January 5, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PEARL HARBOR INQUIRY

The Congressional Pearl Harbor Investigating Committee has completed perhaps two-thirds of the task it assumed as it goes into recess to allow its new chief counsel to familiarize himself with the context of the approximately 1,000,000 words of testimony thus far recorded and with the outline of testimony still to be heard. On the basis of what already has been adduced, especially with the testimony in the record of the top State Department, Army and Navy command in Washington at the time of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, it is possible to draw some general conclusions that hardly can be changed by any further testimony.

One conclusion is that neither President Roosevelt, Secretary Hull, Secretary Stimson, Secretary Knox, nor any Army or Navy commander actually expected the December 7 attack on Pearl Harbor, had any prior knowledge of Japanese plans, or, most importantly, had deployed our forces for the purpose of inviting a Japanese assault to "get the United States into war," as the prewar—and postwar—isolationists have so recklessly charged and have so desperately been attempting to prove.

If the Pearl Harbor investigation has done nothing else, it has laid the ghost of that charge. The wild stories that have been circulated since December 1941 of preknowledge, of White House commitments to other nations, and of White House maneuvering to bring about what actually happened have been proved either false or a biased distortion of what actually occurred behind the scenes. Admiral Stark, Chief of Naval Operations at the time of the attack, tersely summed up the informed opinion of the insiders when, in answer to a question from Senator LUCAS as to whether he believed that any man or group of men in the Government "trapped the Japanese in order to get them to attack Pearl Harbor so as to make it easier to get a declaration of war from Congress," he said: "I do not. The Japanese were the real cause of the attack on Pearl Harbor."

Another general conclusion that emerges from the hundreds of thousands of words of testimony—one that may not be so evident to the casual reader but is, nevertheless, ex-

plicit in much of the testimony of Army and Navy witnesses—is that the prewar lack of cooperation between the Army and Navy from top to bottom, was an important contributing factor—if not the principal one—to the tragic consequences of the Pearl Harbor attack. What cooperation existed was of the casual social sort, dependent largely on personal relations. There was a continual overlapping of functions. When the vital question of strengthening outlying bases in the Pacific arose, General Short—according to the committee record—demanded Army control of the islands if Army fliers and ground troops were used there, and Admiral Kimmel replied: "Over my dead body." Maj. Gen. Sherman Miles, the chief of Army Intelligence in Washington in 1941, previously had testified that Army-Navy jealousies blocked for months before December 7, 1941, the establishment of a joint intelligence office. "This sounds a litle ridiculous now," the general said, "but that is what was going on in those days."

In the first report on the disaster to President Roosevelt by the late Secretary Knox, a report which was just released last night, it was revealed that this lack of interservice unity frustrated the Navy's attempt to find and pursue the Japanese force. The Army, through use of its radar, tracked the attacking planes back to their carriers to the northward of the island. The Navy, searching in the wrong direction to the southeastward, did not receive this intelligence for 2 days.

There still are important witnesses to be heard, including General Short and Admiral Kimmel, our respective Army and Navy commanders in the Hawaiian Islands on the day of the Japanese attack. But the main outlines of the picture have been drawn. The record of the hearings, if properly digested and condensed, should be an important document for the future. For between its covers the ghost of Presidential duplicity is laid and the skeleton of Army-Navy jealousy is rattled.

Importation of Swiss Watches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY CORDON

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 17, 1946

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter appearing in the Sunday Portland Oregonian of December 23, 1945, written by Mr. Tom Burns, dealing with the importation of Swiss watches.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMAND—"MADE IN U. S. A."

To the EDITOR:

The undersigned and thousands of other storekeepers recently received a 151-word, $2.88, night letter telegram from Mr. S. Ralph Lazrus, 200 Hudson Street, New York City. This gentleman signs himself, "President American Watch Assemblers' Association." As this outfit assembles Swiss watches, only the use of the word American should be a criminal offense. Mr. Lazrus requested me "to petition Oregon's congressional delegation, and the State Secretary Byrnes, to prevent the United States Government reducing the number of Swiss watches now being imported."

In thoroughbred Chaucerian lingo I refused. Reasons for refusal follow: T. Albert Potter, president, Elgin National Watch Co., Elgin, Ill., wrote me: "For 3½ years the American watch industry has been the only source of supply for the highly critical timepieces, and timing mechanisms without which we and our allies could not have won the war." And Walter W. Cenerazzo, president, American Watch Workers' Union, wrote me: "Don't forget that the German-Swiss watch cartel made military timing devices for such brute beast war criminals as Hitler, Himmler, Hess, Goering, Ribbentrop, Raeder, Schact, Keitel, Doenitz, Mussolini, Laval, Quisling, Hirohito, and Yamashita."

The Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A5357, contains an insert by Hon. ROBERT F. RICH, of Pennsylvania, which is headed, "Who's to Make the Watches?" from which I quote: "The number of importers of Swiss watches has increased from 50 in 1940 to more than 500 at present.

"A total of more than 28,000,000 Swiss watches have been brought into the United States since the start of the war, representing a total of 14 years of work for 8,000 American watchmakers. Imports in October alone amounted to 2,100,000 watches."

Walter W. Cenerazzo writes me: "We have only three factories left, making American jeweled watches—Elgin, Hamilton, Waltham," and that labor, at long last has begun to awake to the harsh fact that importing competitive foreign goods is simply a way of exporting American jobs. Which is 100-percent correct. Therefore, the undersigned, for 60 years a student and practitioner of horology, with American and European factory experience, pleads with you, Mr. Genuine American, to buy, "Made in U. S. A."

TOM BURNS.

Statement of General Eisenhower on Demobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1946

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower, Chief of Staff, United States Army, supplementing his remarks on demobilization made to Members of Congress in the Auditorium, Library of Congress, Tuesday, January 15, 1946:

INTRODUCTION

I have come here this morning because a very human desire to get soldiers home in a hurry has clashed with the Army's manpower needs to do the job which has been assigned to us by the Government. It is a big job. Even with the fighting over it takes a great many men to carry out our mission. Overseas requirements in manpower for the long-term occupation job and for the temporary, but still unfinished, business of winding up the affairs of our great war establishment in both Europe and the Pacific are matters of cold, hard fact. They cannot be obscured by emotion and near hysteria. Evidently the relation of demobilization to these tasks which remain to be done is understood only partially by some and not understood at all by others. I believe the thing needed now is the fullest clarification.

There is no mystery in demobilization. There are no hidden ball plays. Long before our victory in Europe, General Marshall approved a master plan which has served and still serves as the basis of establishing priority of men for discharge. In any job as big as this one there are bound to be modifications made in the light of experience. But I assure you that I have made and intend to make no changes in the basic plan. The plan was simply this: to discharge men as quickly as possible and to the limit of available shipping with priority on those with the longest and hardest service—that is, with the most points. These criteria were to govern until we reached the point where minimum personnel requirements to do the jobs in hand were threatened by the rate of discharge. We have been in the business of discharging veterans from the Army under the point system for 8 months, with the system at full blast for the past 4 months since VJ-day. Men have been discharged so fast that the five millionth passed through one of the separation centers last week.

We used shipping to the utmost and secured the complete cooperation of the Navy in our zeal to get every man and woman back from overseas who could be spared. There is no longer any shortage of transports, and the shipping people assure me they will have vessels where and when we need them to bring troops home. The fact is that we worked so fast that about 10 days ago we had to slow the pace so that the work of our forces in Europe and the Pacific would not suffer too much from lack of manpower. The announcement of that slowdown was what touched off the fireworks.

If there has been any confusion in the minds of the soldiers overseas or their families at home, I propose to clear it up now.

CAUSES OF CONFUSION

Primarily, two underlying causes are responsible for the present confusion, which for a time has quite evidently exceeded the power of any information program to control. The first is that the Nation's release from the urgency of war started an emotional wave to get men out of the Army. This is wholly understandable. It was to be expected. But I am frank to say that I had never anticipated this emotional wave would reach proportions of near-hysteria. I am confident that members of the Congress are as anxious as I that straight thinking be substituted for emotion in this matter which strikes close to the firesides of several million families. The second cause of our present discontent rises, I believe, from the almost incredible speed with which the War Department moved in bringing men home from VJ-day to the close of the year. Including discharged men and women who were already in this country, more than 5,000,000 members of our VE-day army, 80 percent of them veterans of foreign service, have now returned to civilian life. While the vast majority of the combat men are home, there still remain some who have not been returned. These men are our greatest concern, and every effort will be made to return them as soon as possible.

All sorts of emergency measures were devised by the War Department to step up the speed of its demobilization processes. Performance has far exceeded the most optimistic schedules announced by our planners at the time Japan surrendered.

WAR DEPARTMENT ESTIMATES AND PERFORMANCE

Between the close of hostilities in Germany and the collapse of Japan, we had discharged just under 600,000. When General Marshall addressed a joint meeting of the Congress last September he told you that estimates then called for the release in September of 450,000; in October of 550,000, and during each month thereafter of between 700,000 and 800,000. (See charts: "Cumulative Returns to Civilian Life" and "Progress of Demobilization.")

But compare performance with prediction. In September, instead of 450,000, the number actually released was 597,000; in October, we more than doubled our estimate, releasing 1,270,000 instead of the 550,000 predicted.

In November, instead of between 700,000 and 800,000 we discharged 1,186,000; in December, the number was 1,112,000. So that, with the estimates for those months fixed at about 2,500,000, we actually exceeded our prediction by 1,665,000. This means that 1,665,000 men and women who had no expectation in September, of coming home so soon, were already reunited with their families by the close of the year. That is the extent to which the War Department has exceeded any so-called commitment to the men.

The very stepping up of these returning shipments undoubtedly helped to create confusion by stimulating optimism among servicemen and their families. But, in addition, during this same period a great many misleading statements were made by individuals some of whom were in the Army itself, that served to cloud the issue. All this time, which was long before I came to Washington, the War Department was doing a job which I believe must be considered as one of its greatest achievements. Certainly, there has never been such a planned movement of men over great distances in the history of any nation. Yet, in the face of this unprecedented performance, criticisms based largely on individual cases were deliberately confusing matters further. The presence of a high-point man still in service at some one station, because of some special need at that station, came to be interpreted, loudly, as a failure of the entire demobilization program. We must admit that there have been irregularities caused by the immensity of the problem, by the fact that the Army has been spread all over the world, and that we could not have a perfectly uniform application of the point-score system. Discovery of the fact that a man had been released as surplus, with fewer than the critical number of points, raised cries of injustice.

While these criticisms were being aired, ships poured the combat veterans of long service into home ports in schedule-breaking numbers. The War Department and overseas commanders made every effort to get as many men home for Christmas with their families as was humanly possible.

THE INCOMPATIBLES

But in this spectacular success of demobilization between VJ-day and the first of the year, the Army was rapidly approaching the foreseen juncture of two incompatibles: The speed of demobilization and our duties at home and overseas—the occupation mission delegated to us by higher authority and the protection and disposal of millions of tons of Government property throughout the world, representing billions of dollars of American taxpayers' money.

When General Marshall spoke to you last September, the War Department planners estimated that the point of definite interference between these objectives would be reached some time in the coming spring. The simple fact is that the speed-up in demobilization during the fall and early winter advanced that situation to the present.

That is the crux of the whole matter.

If we were to continue shipping men home at the rate we reached during the past few months, about April we would have nothing left but a woefully inadequate number of volunteers—we would literally have "run out of Army." That is the reason for the slowdown. There is no change in policy; there is no change in plan. We have merely reached a point in the pursuance of our plans and policies which we knew we must face when the time came. That time is now. We took all possible steps to meet inescapable needs without slowing the pace of demobilization. We pressed the recruiting campaign to the utmost in order to bring volunteers into the Army who could take the place of those overseas. We urged that positive steps be taken to provide us our full quotas of 50,000 men monthly through the Selective Service System. We required all theater commanders overseas to institute the most searching drive to cut down their estimates in manpower needed for occupation duties, for supply, and for the extensive personnel required to close up overseas depots, ports, warehouses, bases. We had also to cooperate with the designated disposal agencies in disposing of Government property as expeditiously as possible while still taking all necessary precautions to protect it. Similar instructions were issued to all commanders at home.

Pursuant to the instructions both General MacArthur in the Pacific and General McNarney in Europe have made extensive economies. The training of recruits in this country was recently cut from 17 to 13 weeks so that these men would be available sooner for overseas. We have taken every measure we could think of, and by no system of mathematics or sliderule magic is it possible to make the flow of available replacements equal all the men we should like to bring home now but who must be replaced if we are to do our job.

Now, understand this—the men who do not need replacement when their jobs are finished will come home immediately. So far as possible this will be in the order of their point scores and length of service. These will be the surplus men, the men available for discharge. But if we are not to disintegrate our occupation forces certain men must be kept until trained replacements are available or their job finished.

Now, whenever there are individual exceptions to a general rule, bitterness is sure to arise—especially in the hearts of homesick boys. I realize that fully, and it is absolutely essential that the immediate commanding officer of every man so affected realizes it, also. He must personally explain to him how he fits into the big picture and what his duty is.

Surely, where remaining on foreign duty for 1, 2, or 3 months longer—that is the most involved here—makes the difference between our Army's doing its job or failing to do its job—I believe I know the American soldier well enough to be certain what he will do—if he understands the need. He will stick there and do a good job—and gripe.

LAG IN REPLACEMENT SYSTEM

One thing right here on this matter of replacements which I believe is generally misunderstood is why, if we recruit 5,000 men today, we cannot release 5,000 men from the Army tomorrow, or next week, or next month. The answer is quite simple when you analyze the problem. So far as essential jobs in the theater are concerned, the recruits become available not when they enlist but only when they arrive overseas, trained to take over their assignments. If an 18-year-old enlists or is inducted through selective service in this country, he goes off to a camp for 3 months to learn the rudiments of being a soldier.

If a trained man already in the Army chooses to volunteer for regular enlistment, he is entitled to a furlough in the United States which will make him useless as a replacement until he returns. Any way you work it, there is bound to be a lag of 3 to 6 months in this replacement business. It cannot be avoided. The men who enlist or are drafted between now and next July will not be available in time to solve the immediate problem before us, even if there were enough of them. They are the effective replacements for men to be discharged 3 to 6 months from now. The lack of replacements facing the Army now is due to the shortage of selective-service men and the volunteers of the last 6 months in 1945. Because they did not come in fast enough, we must slow down our discharge rate now.

OUR JOB OVERSEAS

The people at home must understand this, too. Acceptance of the need for keeping large numbers of men overseas at the present time lies, I believe, in an understanding of all the necessary tasks they must perform. I was a theater commander myself, you will remember, until I was brought back here. I am thoroughly familiar with the problems which General McNarney, the present theater commander, faces in Germany. From my personal knowledge of conditions in Europe, it is easy to project in my mind the comparable, and in a geographical sense, far more difficult problems which General MacArthur faces in the Pacific.

EUROPE

Perhaps we sometimes speak in too general terms of what our troops are doing in Europe, obscuring the manifold tasks to which men are assigned. We speak of commitments and obligations. Let me translate such words into a picture of their meaning, as an army of occupation goes about the daily task of policing an enemy country and disposing of the prodigious stores assembled to fight the war.

Start with our primary and continuing mission of occupation duties. Troops assigned to this work supervise the German and Austrian Governments. It is a complex job. We are going through the throes of reconversion on this country. No one is more familiar than you gentlemen with the problems and the difficulties encountered even in this peaceful land. Germany and Austria are going through reconversion, too. In our zones in those two unhappy countries the Army is responsible for supervising all the headaches of a change-over from war to peace, with the added directive that we must make certain these people are so disarmed, both economically and in a military sense, that they cannot make war again. Reconversion measures in those two countries are enormously complicated by devastation. Normal facilities of living have been destroyed in all the cities and there is scarcity of even the barest essentials in consumer goods which Americans expect to find in any corner store. It requires a great many men to supervise the local governments in our zone in Germany and Austria with a civilian population of over 15,000,000. However much you may delegate local work to Germans, you still have the responsibility for policing these people, their industry, trade and commerce, food and agriculture, education, finance, telephone and telegraph and transportation. For details of the men used see chart attached, Overseas Employment of the Army. The figures represent the total air and ground troops required.

On January 1 there were 622,000 American soldiers assigned to the European Theater. General McNarney estimates that this number will be cut to 400,000 by April 1 and to 307,000 by the 1st of July. In the Mediterranean Theater on January 1 we had 51,000 American troops, a number which will be gradually reduced to 28,000 by July. The sum of the July figures for both European and Mediterranean theaters—335,000—is the total number of American troops who will remain stationed in those areas at the end of the first half of 1946.

Let me tell you in some detail what our men are doing in Germany and Austria. Demilitarization of Germany, for example, means demolition of her fortifications and other installations, including industrial plants selected for destruction under our economic program. Approximately 3,000 enemy military installations will be destroyed under the supervision of American soldiers in Germany.

The total area of our zone is about 60,000 square miles and contains 55 major centers of population and much rural territory. We have turned over the job of maintaining law and order to local police forces, but they have to be supervised and reinforced by a mechanized constabulary force of American soldiers. Two thousand miles of international or interzonal boundaries must be patrolled. If this is not done effectively, thousands of

refugees from other sections of Europe infiltrate into our zone adding to our burden of feeding, housing, and extending medical care to these victims of war. Military stores, telephone exchanges, electrical plants, road and railroad bridges, and other points which might be targets of enemy sabotage must be guarded.

Then there is the extensive intelligence and counterintelligence work required to carry out the work of denazification and pacification. This includes a constant watch for subversive activities, evaluation and processing of Nazi documents, supervision of civilian censorship, and the conduct of counterintelligence which alone is expected to result in the arrest of an over-all total of 500,000 persons. Unquestionably, many prominent Nazis are still at large because of a shortage of trained counterintelligence personnel.

I must remind you that we are operating in an enemy country where the most constant surveillance must be maintained over the civilian population to make certain that no elements are allowed to develop organized opposition. In addition to this, serious crime, minor thievery, and pilferage are a constant concern of our military police. Post exchanges, railroad trains, and supply depots are frequent targets, and vehicles are stolen. In most cases the thieves are quickly taken, but happenings of this sort are so frequent that we can never relax our alertness.

Discipline in this respect has a wider significance than the simple protection of the lives of American soldiers and of Government stores. Our example in maintaining law and order throughout the conquered countries will have the most far-reaching effect in hastening the pacification of the German people. If, through curtailment of manpower, lawlessness and contempt for the American brand of justice should be permitted to develop, it would not only hurt our progress in Germany but would weaken our prestige throughout Europe. Quickly, our commanders and forces would be in an impossible position.

In addition to these operations, recruits from this country, who have already been given their basic training as soldiers, must be further trained in occupation duties after arrival. This means that experienced men from the occupation force must be detailed to instruct them—another drain on the over-all manpower assigned to this work.

These duties have taken no account of the men who must be assigned to the procurement, storage, and distribution of supplies. Besides the normal function of supplying the military forces, General McNarney's theater has the responsibility of providing for such agencies as United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and the Foreign Liquidation Commission. The problem is complicated by the limited amount of rail transportation. Although civilians are employed as much as possible, there are limits to the effectiveness of their use. In order to reduce stealing in a land where goods are very scarce, civilians are usually worked in depot areas where they can be closely supervised. To give you an idea of the economies in military manpower obtained by the use of civilian labor, the theater engineer employs 59 percent German prisoners of war, 20 percent German civilians, and only 21 percent American soldiers.

The task of providing communications throughout the United States zone was greatly hampered by the damaged and chaotic condition in which the established lines of communication were found when we took over. These facilities must provide not only for the occupational forces but for the minimum needs of the civilian population. Considerable construction of bridges and, to a lesser extent, of highways and waterways is necessary. Civilian labor under military supervision is utilized in construction, but because of the technical nature of the work our own Signal Corps troops are required to perform maintenance on signal communication facilities. German civilians are operating such ground transport as exists, under our Army's supervision. The system of air transport must be operated entirely by our troops.

DISPOSAL OF GOVERNMENT PROPERTY

Of considerable importance is the disposal of United States property remaining in the theater, as well as the storage and orderly destruction of captured enemy material. The size of this latter part of the task is indicated by the fact that 100 depots and dumps are in operation for storage of material captured from the enemy. One such depot alone contains over 400,000 tons of ammunition.

At the present time United States property valued at more than $7,000,000,000 is being stored, guarded, and maintained by troops in the European theater. A great deal of effort has gone into the roll-up and concentration of this property, but there still remains a vast amount to be done.

Regardless of whether this property is stored for the use of our occupation forces, returned to the United States for current and future needs of the Army, in process of being declared surplus, or already declared surplus but not disposed of by the disposal agencies, the Army has the complete responsibility for care, maintenance, protection, delivery, and fiscal accounting for such property. These responsibilities also apply to captured enemy property. All of these vast stores require a large force of men not only to inventory, pack, and supervise their disposal but to guard them. This is property belonging to the United States Government, its care entrusted to the Army. Some of it is machinery or instruments requiring special mainteance for protection from deterioration.

That is a very brief and a very rough summary of the present duties of troops engaged on the strictly military duties incident to occupation. This work now requires the assignment of some 298,000 American troops. General McNarney's estimate is that by next July 1, their number may be cut to 171,000, of which 98,000 will be performing the duties of supervising the German Government and population and 73,000 will be performing the direct supply requirements of this force. The figure includes the considerable number who carry on constant occupational negotiations with British, Russian, and French members of allied control councils.

SUPERVISION OF ENEMY PERSONNEL

Another of our duties is the guarding, screening, supervision, administration, and eventual release of enemy personnel held by United States forces. In addition to persons in this category already in the theater, a large number of enemy prisoners of war are being returned from the United States to Germany. General McNarney estimates that 735,000 will be under detention in the United States zone in May 1946. We are now operating about 150 camps, inclosures, and hospitals for various classes of enemy personnel.

The care of displaced persons has been an enormous problem from the time of our entry into Germany. The repatriation of millions of these individuals has already been carried out with sympathy and high regard for the humanitarian nature of the problem involved. Estimates are that some 462,622 displaced persons still remain in our zone in Germany on the 1st of January, and that this number might be cut to 200,000 by June. We are now operating 365 installations for these tragic victims of Nazi brutality. But despite our sympathy for them they do add tremendously to our responsibility for police security, housing, and medical care. In the United States zone in Austria there were on January 1 an additional 150,000 displaced persons housed in 86 camps. Their number is expected to decrease to 109,000 by June 1, with UNRRA and the Austrian Central Government administering many camps.

Numbers of our troops are also engaged in the emergency program of providing supplies in Germany and Austria to minimize starvation, disease, and disorder among the civilian population. In Austria we are also helping to sustain vital economic projects on a minimum scale. Before the winter is over the distribution of emergency food supplies will undoubtedly become necessary.

At the present time some 50,000 of our men are directly concerned in control and direction of prisoners of war and displaced persons. By July 1, 1946, their number will have been reduced by half—to 25,000.

Some 111,000 service troops are now assigned to the European theater, to take care of the needs of the occupation force and troops engaged in winding up our surplus property installations. They include Medical Department personnel—doctors, nurses, technicians—Signal Corps, Ordnance, and Engineer troops. These men staff the camps, run the railroads and truck routes, man the hospitals and lines of communications, see that roads are kept repaired, run the post exchanges, the Army Postal Service, and furnish all the customary services which must be provided to men in the field. Our troops are scattered over a wide area. Lack of the usual civilian facilities has placed unusual burdens on the service units. These service units must also carry on a limited amount of construction and considerable maintenance work. This includes airfields, laundries, American Red Cross installations for the recreation of the troops, winterized billets, and hospitals. Maintenance is constantly necessary in all the ports. Prisoners of war and local civilian labor are largely used in this work under our military supervision, but the problems are so extensive that thousands of Americans are required for these jobs.

Last in this category I mention the graves registration service, which involves the location, identification, concentration, care, and disposition of the remains of our heroic dead. There are still many unlocated graves and bodies to be moved to established military cemeteries. We have 37 United States cemeteries requiring administration of records, supervision of construction, reburials, and the general upkeep of graves. According to present plans, the graves registration project will be completed by May 1946.

At present, as I have said, some 111,000 troops are assigned to these various service missions. By July 1, 1946, General McNarney expects to have cut this total to 61,000.

There is a final manpower category for the theater consisting of men temporarily unavailable for duty which the Army calls ineffectives, for want of a better word. This lumps together individuals who may be charged against the theater roster but are actually not, for one reason or another, performing any part of its duties. In this category are troops who are being moved in order to be discharged or to replace those troops; men on sick leave, pass, and recreation; men in schools, in confinement, or in transit to station; men absent from the theater on rest, recuperation, and rehabilitation; men on furlough in the United States after reenlisting in the theater. The total number of these individuals on January 1 was about 163,000. This number will be cut to 50,000 by July 1.

I have gone into this description in some detail because I wanted to show you how ramified are the duties on which our troops must engage to carry out their mission overseas. And I wanted to put some flesh on the bones of those two words "commitments" and "obligations." They are something more than high-sounding generalities. I can assure you that they are very real to the men in Europe and to their commander who is responsible for discharging them.

Within the broad categories I have indicated I believe you may imagine the thousands of daily tasks which must be performed by thousands of men. I know, and you know, that many of them are homesick men. But there is a job to be finished. Although our allies are carrying a heavy load, Americans have assumed the definite commitment and the responsibility of carrying out their own share. To the Army has been delegated the principal job in performing this work. The work cannot be done without men. Remember, this is your army—not the War Department's army and not the generals' army. It belongs to the country—to the Congress and the people. It carries out their wishes and their orders.

PACIFIC

Let's turn now to the Pacific where similar heavy responsibilities are being carried out by troops under command of General MacArthur. In addition to occupation duties, closing up supply bases, ports, dumps, etc., and the disposal of great stores of property assembled for the invasion of Japan, this theater has an additional duty in occupying bases which our troops seized in the island campaigns during the advance toward the home islands. The build-up of supply, concentrated in Hawaii and in the Philippines, was well along when the Japs gave up. As a matter of fact, our tonnage of supplies in the Philippines actually increased after the close of hostilities in the Pacific, due to the great number of ships nearing port and our uncertainty at that time of what our needs would be when we landed in Japan. While the majority of these ships were coming from the United States, many others of them carried supplies redeployed from Europe and other inactive theaters to support the invasion of Japan scheduled for November 1945.

General MacArthur has reported 7,000,000 tons of supplies as being on hand January 1 in the Pacific theater. The duties our troops are performing out there are almost exactly similar to those I have described for the European theater. Our occupation functions involve most of the islands captured from the Japanese as well as Japan proper. We have a force in Korea. We are still accepting the surrender of Japanese troops in the Philippines, Ryukyus and other localities, long after their nation had surrendered.

In Japan our forces are engaged in the destruction of enemy fortifications as well as in the numerous other tasks growing out of enforcement of the surrender terms. Law and order must be maintained. There is considerable work to the disposal of great quantities of enemy property seized in the home islands, some of which is destroyed, some salvaged, some shipped to the United States and our allies. The remainder is disposed of according to the most practical use that can be made of it. All this requires the services of a considerable force. The supply system, operating over thousands of miles, is a formidable problem in the Pacific. The Army is exerting every effort to maintain a never-ending flow of fresh foods to all bases and areas where our forces are located, but transport by air, water, and land is made difficult by great distances.

I should like to speak in some detail of the care of Government property in the Pacific, because the direct connection between its efficient handling and the availability of competent manpower is so obvious. It takes expert officers, experienced in the handling of supplies—men qualified to direct the dismantling of a hospital, a power plant, or a laundry, for example. Of course, a great many of such officers are being taken off the job constantly by the operation of the point system.

A great part of the work our men are now doing on many of those small Pacific islands whose conquest made savage headlines for a brief spell 2 and 3 years ago, is concerned with the disposition of property. Once these islands were battlegrounds, hard-won steps in the progress of our troops through the southwest Pacific. Then they were forward bases, with perhaps an airstrip from which the dogged Japs on other islands just ahead were bombed. Their development for military use required engineers with bulldozers and other heavy equipment to widen and lengthen the airstrip and clear the jungle for buildings and supply dumps. When islands were big enough, docks were constructed so that ships could come in to unload their cargoes instead of having them brought to the beaches by landing craft and ducks. Such islands became the springboards for further progress—overwater hops to other islands, which left many as rear supply areas in the backwash of war.

Then the war itself ended, and all need for these bases ceased. The business of "closing out" these bits of temporary American soil began. Our troops commenced to "roll them up," in the phrase the soldiers use.

This process of rolling up our bases occupies the time of a great many soldiers in the Pacific. These islands have been piled high with American goods, brought in to push our soldiers along the seaway to Tokyo. This is Government property, and now these things which the Army no longer needs must be disposed of through the proper disposal agency. They must be inventoried, inspected, packed, and guarded until the Army's responsibility is discharged. But out in the Pacific there is an enemy of property far more dangerous than thieves. It is the tropical elements which mildew and rot and destroy unless the utmost precaution is used. Trained and disciplined soldiers are needed for this work, men who know their jobs and who feel a sense of responsibility for the preservation of this property while it remains in the hands of the Army.

All too often these men are veterans of long service through these islands. Many of them went home with the first loads of high-point troops who returned from the Pacific. More are leaving every day. For each one who departs without a trained replacement, the danger is increased that the roll-up will not be accomplished efficiently and speedily. There is no question but that the normal operation of the point system is slowing us up in this process. It was bound to. With the veterans gone and garrisons reduced, the task of preparing for the disposal of the infinitely varied items which our troops used in the Pacific is made more difficult. The danger of deterioration is likewise enormously increased. The machinery rusts, the planking of docks and buildings rots, the dampness destroys delicate instruments. It is this aspect of the task and the tremendous distances involved which govern demobilization in the Pacific.

The property-disposal problem is a definite part of this Nation's mission in the Pacific. It is my responsibility, it is the soldier's responsibility out there—in the end it is your responsibility, as Members of the Congress, to the American people. Except where necessary for health, safety, or security, we do not have the authority to abandon this property; it must be taken off our hands by properly constituted civil authority. It is one of the incompatibles defying unrestricted rate of demobilization. It will continue to be a charge against our military manpower until it is liquidated.

ROLLING UP BASES

Don't let me give the impression that, in spite of difficulties, we haven't been making progress in rolling up bases and rear areas which were once battlefields or great forward points of supply. As an example, there were 44,000 troops and 314,000 tons of supplies on New Guinea September 1, 1945, when the Japs signed the terms of surrender. These figures were reduced to 7,000 troops and 42,000 tons of supplies by January 1, 1946. All troops and supplies are expected to be completely evacuated from these bases by April 1, 1946.

In Australia our first great far-Pacific base, about 104,000 long-tons of supplies remain on hand. The theater expects them to be finally disposed of and all Army activities there completely closed up by April 15, 1946.

On Okinawa a garrison of approximately 33,000 air and service force troops will be permanently stationed. In this strategic location our heavier occupational air strength remains secure against potential civil uprising, but yet in position to strike a deadly retaliatory blow against any section of the Japanese homeland.

PHILIPPINES

I will not go into the service functions of our Pacific troops in detail, since in most particulars they parallel those I described for the European theater, complicated by long supply lines, the tropical enemy, and difficulties of transport within many areas. But I should like to say a special word about the mission of our troops in the Philippines. You are familiar with the tragic destruction perpetrated by the Japanese during the final days of fighting. Their unwarranted and bestial acts of savagery destroyed not only lives and property but much of the functioning of orderly government and its agencies. There is no effective Philippine agency now in existence to maintain law and order. As a result of the war the Philippines were left without an effective police force and the splendid Philippine Scout organizations were practically destroyed. Now armed bands of guerrillas roam the hills, bent on pilferage which only our active presence controls. We are now engaged in recruiting a force of 50,000 Filipinos to replace a comparable number of our men in the Philippines and elsewhere in the Pacific, but it will be many months before this force becomes effective enough to accept the responsibility of policing the islands. It is our clear obligation to assist until that time arrives. In addition to this activity, American troops have here also the familiar task of liquidating the bases and immense stores of Government property which were assembled at a time when these islands were our principal forward base for the planned assault on Japan's home islands. With the exception of air and supply bases on Luzon and Leyte, our Philippine bases and supply points will be progressively reduced and closed out by July 1, 1946. On January 1 we had approximately 279,000 troops in the Philippines. These will be reduced as rapidly as possible to a garrison of approximately 79,000 which will be needed on July 1 to carry out our continuing responsibilities there.

There are now 865,000 American troops engaged in carrying out our over-all mission in the Pacific. General MacArthur has made a careful restudy of his requirements and assures me that he can operate with a total of 375,000 as of July 1, 1946. This number will later be gradually reduced.

OTHER THEATERS

In India-Burma our strength has been rapidly withdrawn since the end of August. From a figure of 166,800 on VJ-day it reduced to 55,000 on January 1. It is being further cut by large slices until on July 1, 1946, only 4,000 soldiers are expected to remain in the theater. Their mission is entirely concerned in guarding surplus property or in providing services and supply for those who are doing so.

Last August 1 we had some 63,000 troops in the China theater under command of General Wedemeyer. Following the Japanese surrender, the great majority was withdrawn. By January 1 the army had but 9,000, a figure which will be reduced to 6,000 on July 1. While there may be some reduction in this number later on, General Wedemeyer has informed the War Department that he will require this small force of Army Air Force and ground troops. As part of our Potsdam commitment, this Government as-

sumed responsibility of assisting and advising the Chinese in repatriation of Japanese nationals to the home island.

We have no considerable amounts of supplies in China. Most of what we have is designed for the use of our smaller number of troops. While our airmen flew thousands of combat missions against the Japs in China, our ground support of the Chinese Army was confined to training and liaison work. We had no army combat ground units in the China theater.

What I have said of the Pacific and of Europe applies to all the other areas overseas where we have American troops and property. The same problems exist in varying degrees in all theaters, and in the last analysis, we must rely on the professional judgment and ability of our theater commanders to find the solutions. I have the utmost confidence in them.

I have spoken to you thus fully of the situation and the mission of our forces overseas because only in the light of all these jobs, which complete the commitments and obligations placed on the Army by higher authority, is it possible to understand the continuing necessity of adjusting the demobilization program to the job in hand.

THE JOB AT HOME

These foreign commitments and obligations cannot be met, our demobilization cannot continue in an orderly fashion, we cannot carry on the business of our far-flung forces unless we keep a proportionate force on duty in the United States during this interim period. In this respect we are like a snake swallowing his tail. We are trying to gobble ourselves up as fast as we can but we must take care to keep the head big enough to absorb the body passing through it. The head of the snake is the force in this country. This force varies as the gobbling-up process goes on.

As of January 1 there were 2,100,000 on our rolls in the United States, including over 100,000 officers already on terminal leave. Of the 2,000,000 men of the ground, air, and service forces in this country nearly 1,000,000 are operating personnel administering our posts, camps, stations, ports—generally engaged in housekeeping and supply activities, and caring for the sick and wounded. For example, 100,000 of these alone are engaged in what we call processing duties, that is, they are operating the separation centers through which 7,750,000 individuals will have passed between VE-day and next July. They also operate induction centers and handle the selectees and volunteers as fast as they are brought into the Army. Another 100,000 of the 1,000,000 are engaged in the care of the 150,000 sick and wounded in our hospitals on the first of the year. Approximately 350,000 are engaged in the administration and training of individuals for air crews and the maintenance of our planes, transports, and ferrying activities. A total of 150,000 trainers are required for ground and service troops, including some housekeepers at schools and depots.

Another 50,000 are guarding prisoners, both our own and enemy prisoners of war. Finally, some 50,000 others are at ports and staging areas taking care of the flow of personnel in and out of the country. The rest (200,000) are engaged at posts, camps, and stations, and in manufacture and storage of supplies, in special activities, such as the USMA, care of returnees, housekeeping details, proving and demonstration activities, and other home-front jobs.

Aside from the 1,000,000 of the operating personnel there are the 150,000 that I mentioned in hospitals, at least 350,000 actually in process of separation, 200,000 or more on furlough and in transit, 200,000 students in training and a balance of 100,000 in units and miscellaneous activities.

This is a rough break-down only, the detail of which will be brought out no doubt in the subcommittee hearings which will be held these coming days. What I have endeavored to show here in a general way is merely what the head of the snake is doing and why it must be kept as large as it is. By July 1, 1946, it is estimated that our forces in this country will be cut to 654,000. This figure is broken down between 360,000 operating personnel and the balance to cover men in training or en route overseas, and to provide a small reserve of combat air and ground troops.

The question may well be asked—and it has been—If you have 2,000,000 men in this country now and are cutting these to 654,000 by next July, why not send some of the difference overseas to replace veterans who might then come home? That is exactly what we are doing. All of the replacements going overseas are carried as strength in this country until they arrive at a foreign port. But there is no economy in sending a man overseas if he is so close to eligibility for discharge that we should have to turn him right around and send him back. Nor is there any sound reason for keeping him in the Army if we no longer have a job for him here. So we discharge him. I realize that it is a source of irritation to veterans overseas to have a man discharged in this country with fewer points than the veteran over there. From his angle, it is rank injustice. But from the point of view of the country, the only realistic and practical decision is to let him out. We can't make an omelette the size of this demobilization job without breaking a few eggs.

THE SCOPE OF THE PROBLEM

I have described for you the composition and duties of our January 1 Army of 4,200,000 and of our Army of 1,500,000 as it will be next July 1. Our present problem lies wholly between these two figures.

Between now and the 1st of July, based on the best estimates of the performance of Selective Service and the Army Recruiting Service, we expect that 400,000 men will enter the Army from civil life. Three million more soldiers will return to civilian life. A million of these individuals are in the separation process already. They should be civilians again no later than early February. This leaves 2,000,000 men to be discharged in late February, March, April, May, and June. (See chart—"Progress of Demobilization.")

Many of these would not have been discharged in any case until May or June. They will still be discharged by that time. Many others will be discharged in February, March, and April just as they expected. The soldiers who are actually affected by this necessary readjustment over the next few months are approximately 700,000 (the red area on chart) 2-year men who hoped for discharge in March and April and who, because no replacements are available for them will not now get out until May or June. Of these 700,000, an estimated 300,000 are now overseas.

TWO-YEAR MEN

These 2-year men looked for discharge in March because of the statement which General Marshall made in his talk efore you last September. I should like to refresh your memories on the text of his statement. General Marshall said: "We hope by late winter we will have reached a stage in carrying out the point system—which is now governing policy and which we must not emasculate unless we want a morale situation almost chaotic to develop—when, in effect the point system may be relaxed and 2 years of service will govern. That will mean that men of 2-years service will be eligible for demobilization."

Later on, a War Department spokesman set the date for the expected discharge of 2-year men as March 20.

Now, this estimate was based on all the facts available at that time. As was stated at the same time, the initial discharge rate was not geared to any definite Army strength which might be required to complete our duties in the war, but to shipping facilities. In discussing this point, General Marshall said: "There has been no relationship whatsoever between the rate of demobilization and any future plans of the Army. I mean by that that all the facilities available in transportation and in personnel trained to handle demobilization have been devoted to release from the service as rapidly as possible the largest number of men. It will be next spring, presumably—and if the estimates in occupation forces now forecast are accurate, it will be even later than early spring—before we will reach a point where the rate of demobilization will be influenced in any way by consideration of the strength of occupation forces."

General Marshall based his statement on the best forecast that could be made at the time. Factors governing the entire demobilization picture have changed frequently in the five intervening months, all but once resulting in an acceleration of the rate of return from overseas and discharge. It gave me a great deal of satisfaction to consider the happiness of the 1,665,000 men and women who returned to their homes long before they expected because of the speed-up in demobilization. I am equally sorry that the failure of the replacement rate to meet our continuing obligations overseas has now forced a much smaller number of individuals to wait 1, 2, or 3 months longer for discharge.

Unfortunately, the War Department has no choice in this matter. I repeat that every feasible measure was taken before our announcement was made on January 4. We had no alternative. To declare every soldier with 2 years' service eligible for discharge on March 20 would mean that, in addition to the 1,000,000 now in process of discharge, another 2,000,000 would have gone out by that date. The results would have been catastrophic. Our operating forces in this country would be far short of the numbers required. Among other casualties it would mean the complete collapse of the Army Airways Communication system. Without technicians there would have been a consequent grounding of our air forces all over the world. It would mean the practical abandonment of billions of dollars in American equipment. It would mean such a complete rescramble of our occupational forces as to jeopardize the results of months of work in bringing order out of chaos. It would mean such a collapse of military organization in this country as to impair gravely our ability to care for our hospitalized veterans or to supply the soldiers remaining overseas. In a final burst of irony it would delay these very veterans for days and possibly weeks in the ports and the separation centers because the technicians who ran the centers would themselves have left the Army.

If there were any possible way to discharge all 2-year men on March 20 without disrupting the Army it would be done. We simply cannot do it.

I have the utmost respect and a most profound affection for the American soldier, and I believe that he knows me well enough to have confidence that I will always deal justly with him. I believe I am doing that now when I say—to him and to you—that we cannot discharge all 2-year men on March 20 and that this is dictated solely by the necessity of adjusting our discharge rate to our replacement rate and to the continuing job which the Army must do, both in this country and overseas.

I state categorically that he is not being held in the Army to get a Universal Military Training bill or any other legislation through the Congress. It should be unnecessary to say that, but the point has been raised, so I call attention to the fact that the President's program of Universal Military Training stipulates training only and does not provide for

any service. No trainee would replace a single soldier.

In this same connection I have seen the point made several times that the Army is deliberately being kept at greater strength than is needed so that the generals could keep their stars. I believe a single statement will answer that. The Army is proceeding with dispatch to retire or reduce or relieve from active duty its temporary general officers in the Army. To date, 789—more than half the 1,550 general officers of the VE-day Army will have been either reduced, separated, or are now under orders for such action and by June 30, 261 more will have been processed.

THE PRESENT PLAN

To each man who expected to be discharged in March or April and who will not be out until May or June, I say as I say to you—that the War Department is taking every possible measure to insure that he is not held in the service one day longer than is absolutely necessary. In order to insure this and to make clear to every man in the Army exactly where he stands, the War Department has issued an order to all major commanders. It is appended in full to the statement. The salient points affecting enlisted men are:

(1) By April 30, 1946, all enlisted men (except volunteers) with 45 points as of September 2, 1945, or with 30 months' service as of April 30, 1946, will be separated from the Army or aboard ship returning home.

(2) By June 30, 1946, all enlisted men (except volunteers) with 40 points as of September 2, 1945, or with 24 months' service as of June 30, 1946, will be separated from the Army or aboard ship returning home.

Whether or not these criteria can continue to be observed after July 1 depends directly upon the rate of inflow. Failing the necessary monthly intake either these criteria will have to be abandoned or competent authority—I presume the Congress itself—will have to relieve the Army of its vitally important missions. None of us can escape the realization that this will be a most fateful decision, therefore let me repeat at once that the commitment I now make is limited to July 1, 1946.

ANALYSIS OF REPLACEMENTS

Now let me talk of the replacement rate itself. Present estimates are based on past performance of Selective Service and our recruiting service. Only if future rates keep pace can the Army's rock-bottom requirements of 1,500,000 men in the service on July 1 be met. Let me examine these data for you. First, as to Selective Service: In July, the Army received 88,000 men through induction. In August, with the capitulation of Japan at hand and with the consequent easing of pressure by local boards, this figure fell to 55,000. Beginning with September, the Army arbitrarily reduced its monthly call to a total of 50,000. In September we actually received through Selective Service 41,000; in October, 37,000; in November, 35,000; and in December only 21,000.

As to enlistments, the Personnel Procurement Service, consisting of over 10,000 officers and men, is exclusively concerned with obtaining the maximum number of enlistments from every source—men in the service, those who have had previous service and now discharged, and from the vast number of men in civilian life who are eligible to serve. The most stringent orders are in effect to stress to the utmost all the inducements for enlistment which the Congress so recently authorized. Through the press and radio, a most comprehensive program of advertising has been launched. In November, when this program actually got into full swing, all previous records were broken when the Army enlisted 185,000. In December this number dropped off to 131,000. By January 1, our enlistments totaled slightly less than 400,000, but of this number approximately 44 percent are men who have enlisted for the minimum periods of 1 year or 18 months service. A great many in this latter group are men who have been discharged from the Army shortly after their induction to enlist for the purpose of determining their own date of release, or are men who enlisted for the minimum period rather than await induction. Of those who have enlisted for 3 years, a large number are old Regular Army soldiers whose previous enlistments had run out, and who have reenlisted to protect their seniority and retirement privileges. Our enlistment record has been good, but, taken together with selective service, it has not been high enough to provide required replacements. We shall continue to push this enlistment program, but only if selective service is able to provide the 50,000 men per month we are asking for will the 1,500,000-man Army be guaranteed under our present discharge policy.

THE POSTWAR ARMY

Let me make clear that the basic figure of 1,500,000 has no connection with the permanent peacetime Military Establishment. In this regard, I should like to dispel once and for all the confusion which apparently exists in the minds of many in the meaning of the term, "Postwar Army." The Army that won the war needs no definition, apology, or justification by me or anyone else. Its record speaks for it. It was the finest military organization the world has ever seen. It was perfectly adapted in quantity and quality to the tasks assigned it. In the accomplishment of these tasks it covered itself with everlasting glory.

But that Army no longer exists! Most of the long-service combat veterans are already back in civilian life. They are largely among the 5,000,000 who have already been discharged. As I said before, we are particularly concerned about the combat man still in service.

What we have today is the remnant of that combat Army in a state of reorganization and reduction to an interim Army assigned an entirely different mission or task. It is still a World War II task, but is not yet a task for a permanent peacetime Regular Army. It is the task of reconversion and of "securing the peace." When we have secured the peace, and liquidated our emergency tasks, we shall then have a third task—to preserve the peace. This is the long-term continuing peacetime mission of the Army. It will be the job of our permanent peacetime Military Establishment. The size and composition of that establishment are, of course, up to you.

But that is not the issue here. We are not talking about our permanent peacetime Military Establishment but the establishment to do the job now on hand. I know of no responsible officer who would not infinitely prefer to have both our present interim Army as well as our future Regular Army on a 100-percent voluntary basis at the earliest possible moment. The War Department will recommend the immediate termination of Selective Service as soon as it is assured of a stady flow of replacements adequate to maintain the size of force required to perform the tasks assigned to us. But we cannot escape the simple fact that Selective Service and voluntary recruiting together have been unable to furnish an adequate flow of replacements to compensate for the rate of discharge under our demobilization policy until the rate was necessarily changed on January 4.

EFFECT OF PRESENT DEMOBILIZATION PLANS

Now just where does this leave us? On VE-day we had 8,300,000 troops. We have already discharged 5,000,000 and by July 1 we shall have discharged another 2¾ million men who were in the Army the day Germany collapsed. This leaves but half a million or so of the VE-day men. Except for veteran volunteers, this is all that will be left of our own VE-day Army on July 1, 1946, less than 14 months after the last shot was fired in Europe. All the rest will be recruits. It is with this relatively untrained Army in the throes of reconversion that we must undertake the grave tasks still ahead.

This has been the most rapid and broad-scale demobilization in history. I consider our July 1 figure to be almost without a safety factor. It is a risk which, under any other circumstances than the vastly appealing one of reuniting men with their families, I should be unwilling to take.

The order on 2½-year men means the release of 2,200,000 by the end of April. It takes an estimated 500,000 men now in the Pacific, 400,000 in Europe, 400,000 from other areas overseas or already en route home, 900,000 now on duty in this country. This order has not been issued without the gravest consideration. As an example of how close this pares manpower by the end of April, General McNarney has just informed me that to continue performance of duty in his theater it will be necessary to eliminate the present rest and recuperation programs and drastically curtail leaves and furloughs, to suspend all military training except on-the-job training, to abandon or transfer to liberated countries certain types of Government property surplus to his needs, and to scrutinize more closely all requests for emergency returns to this country. From these measures you will appreciate how close the margin is between the efficient performance of duties and virtual abandonment of them.

THE RISKS

It certainly will indicate to you that should we fail to obtain the 1,500,000 men we require on July 1, something would have to break in the tight little net which we have now woven to perform our job in this country and discharge the Nation's overseas commitments. If we are not relieved of the still huge supplies of Government property entrusted to our custody overseas, we shall have no choice but to abandon them where they lie. But even if you gentlemen should approve such action on the choice between two evils, I know you would not tolerate the reduction of occupational forces below the levels required by General MacArthur and General McNarney to carry out their duties. There is no possible doubling up of work load which could enable us to accomplish that part of our present mission with fewer men. If that situation should develop, you gentlemen will have to decide what we must do. Other functions would have to be abandoned, too, with tragic results. Pared down to the bone, the Army air, ground, and service troops are still just able to discharge the duties I have outlined to you. We can function with no less. For my part, I can assure you that the Army will continue to carry out faithfully its planned reduction through the coming months, in accordance with the directive I have read to you. In the light of its terms, there will no longer be any useful purpose in such demonstrations as our troops have conducted during the past week in various areas around the world. Unfortunately, such meetings are always subject to misinterpretation. No disorders accompanied them. They were occasioned by homesickness. I sympathize with the depth of that longing for home and loved ones. For 3½ years in Great Britain, in North Africa, in Italy, and on the continent of Europe I shared the feeling of every soldier in wanting to come home.

CONCLUSION

During the war in Europe I had the heavy responsibility of sending into action the gallant sons of America, knowing full well that many would not come back alive. That is a commander's responsibility in a time of impelling need to defeat a menacing enemy. I did everything in my power to insure a

sound plan of action and to implement this plan with the necessary troops and matériel to keep our losses at a minimum. Throughout this campaign the welfare and best interests of our men were always close to the hearts of their commanders of every grade. I regard the responsibility placed upon me in the current situation as a continuation of what I bore during the war. Along with that responsibility I carry the same vital interest in the welfare of our men and the same determination to see that their interests are fully weighed and protected. In no question involving the GI will I ever appear except as his friend and his advocate, although I may be of the "brass." I feel confident that when the reasons for the change in pace in the demobilization program are recognized by our soldiers and they have full knowledge of their outlook for the next 6 months, they will accept, with that mature judgment Americans always show, their own responsibility for finishing the job. The time has now arrived to replace hysteria with calm judgment and sound discipline.

The War Department is prepared to answer any further questions which you gentlemen may have to propose. The Acting Secretary of War is appearing before the special subcommittee designated by the chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee for this purpose. I have placed myself at the disposal of this same committee.

One last thought I should like to leave with you. The War Department has no intention of abandoning the mission assigned to it by the Government, the Congress, and the people of the Unted States, so long as we have the troops to accomplish it. For myself, I feel it as a personal trust. I should be unworthy of those who gave their lives to gain the victory if I failed now to do everything in my power to protect it. We want to bring home quickly any man that has borne the brunt of battle and replace him, when necessary, by a man who has not.

My sole purpose, which I am certain you share, is that the Army which did so much to win the victory will be left fit to preserve it.

FIRST ATTACHMENT—DEMOBILIZATION DIRECTIVE OF JANUARY 15, 1946

WASHINGTON, D. C.

To: CG, USFET, Main, Frankfurt, Germany; CINCAFPAC, advance, Tokyo, Japan; CG, IBT, New Delhi, India; CG, USF, China theater, Shanghai, China (pass to Secretary of War); CG, USF, Middle East, Cairo, Egypt; CG, MTO, Caserta, Italy:

1. Effective immediately, the following will govern the demobilization of the Army until June 30, 1946:

(a) By April 30, 1946, the following will be separated from the Army or aboard ship returning home:

(1) All enlisted men (except volunteers) with 45 points as of September 2, 1945, or with 30 months' service as of April 30, 1946.

(2) All enlisted WAC (except volunteers) with 24 months' service as of April 30, 1946.

(3) All male officers (except Regular Army, volunteers, and Medical Department officers) with 67 points as of September 2, 1945, or 45 months' service as of April 30, 1946.

(4) All WAC officers (except volunteers) with 36 months' length of service as of April 30, 1946.

(b) By June 30, 1946, the following will be separated from the Army or aboard ship returning home:

(1) All enlisted men (except volunteers) with 40 points as of September 2, 1945, or with 24 months' service as of June 30, 1946.

(2) All male officers (except Regular Army, volunteers, and Medical Department officers) with 65 points as of September 2, 1945, or with 42 months' service as of June 30, 1946.

(3) Separate instructions covering the discharge of WAC personnel, officer and enlisted, for the period after April 30 will be issued by the War Department.

(c) Medical Corps officers will be demobilized by separate criteria established by the War Department.

(d) As soon as the tabulation of the desires of officers according to category as prescribed in War Department Circular 266, 1945, has been made, further instructions on their separation will follow.

(e) It is emphasized—repeat emphasized—that release of all personnel will follow the principle of priority of release for those with highest points and longest length of service, particularly combat.

2. Computation of length of service will include total active commissions and enlisted honorable service, continuous or interrupted, since September 16, 1940.

Time lost under AW 107 will not be included.

3. Eligibility for separation of personnel made eligible by previously published criteria is not affected by this message. Such personnel will be given priority for separation over personnel demobilized in accordance with paragraph 1 above.

4. The term "volunteers" as used herein includes enlisted personnel who have volunteered under provisions of change 2 of RR 1-1 or who have enlisted in the Regular Army. Officer volunteers are those who sign certificates under War Department Circular 366, 1945, as category I, II, or III, or category IV until date specified in the certificate.

5. Scarce category personnel whose MOS appear in Circular 321, WD, 1945, and in Circular 332, WD, 1945, may be retained in the service until replaced provided they are utilized in their specialty, but in no case longer than 6 months beyond date upon which he would be discharged under these instructions.

6. The above constitutes the War Department program of demobilization for the period until June 30, 1946. Z/I and theater commanders are responsible for the immediate release of every individual for whom there is no military need, and for releasing officers and men in sufficient time to carry out these instructions. However, no individual will be discharged under this directive with less service or smaller scores than set forth herein. The bulk of the men made eligible for discharge by this order should be discharged in the early part of the periods January to April and May to June, respectively. Theater commanders will notify War Department without delay of revised shipping requirements by month through June.

OPA Controls Should Be Continued

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 17, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a very fine editorial which appeared in the Marshall News Messenger, Monday, January 7, 1946, on OPA Controls Should Be Continued. It is as follows:

OPA CONTROLS SHOULD BE CONTINUED

Restoration of ceiling prices on citrus fruits illustrates again to all of America the absolute necessity of continuing price and other controls for some time to come.

It's no time to trust to the ordinary economic laws of supply and demand. The sharp increase in citrus fruits, which followed end of ceiling prices last November 19, emphasizes this point strongly.

Our tremendous, dormant purchasing power—accentuated by a 100-percent increase in local bank deposits in 2 years—must be held in check artificially until supply can more nearly swing in line.

Oranges and grapefruit gave us a simple and fortunately inexpensive example. Despite relative good production this fall, we saw the price swing up sharply just because people had lots of money to spend.

Coconut taught us another lesson. Unessential as it is to existence or even comfortable living, its price jumped 600 percent when controls were removed. Why? Those tremendous bank deposits—and the bonds cached in safety-deposit boxes—are burning holes in the collective pockets of America. So we bought coconut and paid the price.

Priorities were removed a short time ago from building materials. What happened? In the mad scramble for any kind of lumber at any price, the industry reached an almost chaotic condition. Controls were reimposed hurriedly to give the returning veteran half a chance to build a place to live.

And so it goes—the man who carefully thinks things through reaches the conclusion that only the OPA can hold the line against disaster for the wage-earning American public.

Yet the clamor to crucify Chester Bowles and kill the OPA is terrific. Each selfish interest—the citrus growers, the building materialman, the real-estate agent—shouts his complaint.

Only the little man—the one who stands to lose everything by inflation—remains relatively voiceless.

At best, OPA faces a grim fight for life when the question of extending its powers beyond June comes up shortly in Congress. Because of the clamor from selfish interests, many Congressmen will vote against the one agency which can protect the bulk of his constituency until America gets back on a real peacetime foundation.

It is time for the man who depends on wages for his existence to enter the fight. It is time for him to inform his Congressman that he must be protected against inflation, which would wipe out what little security he has gained.

Every businessman, every investor, every man who has purchased bonds, likewise has a stake in OPA's fight. Uncontrolled inflation, which make a mockery of merchandising, which wipes out bonded indebtedness with every turn of the printing press, is their enemy, too.

Americans must let their representatives in Congress know that they approve of Chester Bowles' fight for America.

There is so little time to act.

Lumber Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 17, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, today I received a most interesting letter from Mr. T. P. Dixon, president of the Lewis Manufacturing Co., at Bay City, Mich. Mr. Dixon was for 26 years the general manager of the company and since 1930 has been its president and treasurer. For many years this company has been one of the leading producers of read-i-cut houses. Houses produced by this company have been of the modest type. They have been beautifully planned, splendidly finished,

and composed of high grade materials. They have been and are thoroughly modernized. They are most attractive and desirable. The prices of these houses have been reasonable.

As a matter of fact, they are exactly the type of house our GI's are looking for. If permitted to operate, this company can provide the type of a house any GI desires and within a most attractive price range.

Today's housing problem is recognized as the most important one immediately confronting us. It has been difficult indeed for Members of the Congress to understand why we find ourselves in this situation. There can be no possible excuse for the failure of the administration to provide the builders of this country with the necessary materials to in part meet the demand for houses which has been growing since the very beginning of the war.

The labor disturbances in the lumber areas of the country, where men have remained on strike months at a time, has not contributed to the solution of this problem. If any attempt was made by the administration to quickly settle these strikes the result was an abject failure.

Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly all organizations manufacturing supplies for housing find themselves in the same position the Lewis Manufacturing Co. finds itself in, provided they are obeying the law and avoiding the black market. I think you will agree with me that something must be done and in the immediate future if we are going to, even in part, meet the desperate situation which our discharged soldiers and sailors as well as many, many others, find themselves in locating a decent piace in which to live. I believe the proper committee of this House should take immediate action so far as they can to bring order out of the chaos that exists throughout the country in our construction industry.

Mr. Speaker, I enclose herewith the letter referred to:

LEWIS MANUFACTURING CO.,
Bay City, Mich., January 15, 1946.

Hon. ROY O. WOODRUFF,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ROY: Realizing how busy you are under the chaotic conditions that prevail today, I have hestitated up until this time in writing you on a subject which I have felt should be brought to the attention of yourself and all other Congressmen. I now feel, however, that I can hesitate no longer, unless I am willing to sit by and watch this company, now entering into its fiftieth year of continuous operation, slowly strangled into enforced bankruptcy or liquidation.

As you know, I have been with this company during practically my entire business lifetime, coming with them in 1914. For the past 26 years I have been general manager, and have been president and treasurer since 1930.

During these many years we have had to operate under many varied conditions, but up to now, no matter what the problems were, our system of free enterprise at least gave us the opportunity of exercising whatever initiative and ingenuity we possessed to meet and surmount these problems. As a result we were able, in good years and bad, to keep on operating and providing low-cost housing for thousands of home-owners throughout the eastern section of the United States.

Today this is all changed. In the face of the greatest demand for moderate priced homes this country has ever known our factory stands practically idle. Up until 1942, at which time civilian home-building was practically stopped to conserve materials for war purposes, we manufactured and shipped from 600 to 750 complete homes annually. Our factory employment ran around 200 men and our office personnel was around 50. Today our factory employment is 35, most of whom are doing nonproductive work, and whom we are only retaining because they have worked for us continuously for from 15 to 40 years. The same situation exists in our office.

In the face of the above situation, we are being literally deluged with orders for small homes, a substantial portion of which are from returned veterans who are desperately trying to provide shelter for their families, but we are compelled to turn them all away, as under present conditions we are unable to obtain the lumber, millwork, and so forth, necessary to produce houses. This condition has existed for the past several months, but has been progressively getting worse.

We fully realize that there are many reasons that could be given for the unprecedented shortage of materials that exists. Strikes and manpower shortages have had their effect. Inability of the mills to get trucks, machinery, and equipment has curtailed production, and so on. None of these reasons, however, either individually or collectively, can explain why no lumber suitable for home-building purposes can be obtained through normal legitimate channels.

Present efforts of the administration to channel 50 percent of the lumber produced into the low-cost home-building field, through new restrictions and regulations, will not, in our opinion, provide the answer. Until the mills are encouraged or forced to produce lumber products needed for house construction, there is nothing to be gained by trying to channel a larger percentage of their product, which at present is not suitable for this purpose, into the house-building field. This will probably immediately raise the question: "Why don't they produce the lumber products needed for house construction?"

In answer to the above question we submit the following facts:

During the war, in order to obtain the vast quantities of lumber items needed for military purposes, the OPA set ceiling prices so as to discourage the manufacture of items usually produced for house construction, such as flooring, siding, ceiling, small dimension, and so forth, and, conversely, set ceiling prices so as to encourage the manufacture of items needed for war purposes. As the demand for lumber for war purposes intensified, ceiling prices were periodically revised, widening these differentials, so that during the last stages of the war practically no civilian items were being produced and almost 100 percent of lumber production was for war purposes.

In addition to the above, under the urge of military demand, the custom of drying and grading lumber was largely abandoned, lumber being almost entirely shipped green from the saws, with no pretense of grading or sorting. In other words, the mills could ship almost anything as long as it met the required dimensions, and invoice it at whatever grades they decided in the office they could get away with. It is true, of course, that many of the larger, responsible mills did not juggle grades as above, but nevertheless their product was largely shipped green with all known grades included.

This policy of OPA was successful. It provided the lumber required for war purposes and effectively stopped the manufacture of civilian items, as it was not profitable for the mills to manufacture same.

The war, however, has now been over for months. The greatest need today is to meet the unprecedented shortage of housing facilities that exists in every section of the country, and it would seem logical to us that the OPA would now be doing everything in their power to get housing construction under way. What are the facts, however?

The same price set-up that was created during the war for the specific purpose of stopping or discouraging production of lumber items for house construction remains in effect. As a consequence the mills continue to produce premium price items suitable for ship decking, heavy construction, airplane stock, etc., and refuse to produce such items of small dimension, flooring, ceiling, siding, trim, etc., as the ceiling prices on same are too low to allow their production on a profitable basis. Let me give you some typical examples:

The ceiling price on 1 by 4 B and better flat grain fir flooring is $45 per thousand, f. o. b. mill. This is about $5 more than it was in 1941. No mill can afford to make an item today at approximately 10 percent higher than 1941 prices. Consequently the mill refuses to make flooring. Instead they saw the same part of the log into 4 by 4's, and under OPA ceiling prices they can sell them for $57 per thousand f. o. b. mill, giving them $12 more without the cost of kiln drying, resawing, working to pattern, etc. Suppose the dealer, in his desperation to get flooring, buys these 4 by 4's and has them shipped to a remanufacturing plant for working to flooring. Under OPA ceilings he will be charged $10 for kiln drying, $3 for resawing, $7 for working to flooring, $1 for bundling, $1 for grading, $4 for unloading and reloading. His flooring then costs him $83 per thousand, mill basis, or $38 per thousand over the OPA ceiling price on the same item if it was manufactured, as normally, by the mill. By the time he adds his freight his cost per thousand is $98. His OPA retail ceiling price to his customer is $91, which is based on the $45 per thousand mill price.

The ceiling price on 2 by 4 No. 1 fir dimension is $34.50 per thousand f. o. b. mill. However, you cannot buy it. What you can buy is 2 b, 4¼ dressed to 1⅝ inches by 3⅝ inches, which is the same thickness as a standard dressed 2 by 4 and one-quarter inch wider. The cost? 2 by 4¼ inches under OPA regulations is measured as 2 by 6, plus $1 per thousand additional for odd or fractional widths, so your 2 by 4 costs $52.75 per thousand f. o. b. mill instead of $34.50, and it's all legitimate according to OPA, but your retail selling price again must be based on a $34.50 cost.

Dozens of similar examples could be given, but the above two are enough to show why standard lumber items are not being produced. These remanufacturing plants have sprung up all through the lumber-producing sections. If they added to the output of lumber, their existence might be justified, but they don't add one foot to the amount of lumber available, and while they are all operating to capacity, converting rough, green odd-sized lumber to commercial items, which must either go to black-market operators, or be sold by dealers in violation of OPA retail ceilings, many of the completely equipped sawmills have shut down their dry kilns and planing mills and produce nothing but rough, green planks and timbers for these remanufacturing plants.

After 50 years of legitimate operation, we do not propose to become a party to this racket. The alternative apparently, however, is to go out of business, either voluntarily or involuntarily. I have been purchasing lumber for about 30 years, running into hundreds of carloads per year before Pearl Harbor. During the past several months I have I been in constant contact with the dozens of mills from whom we have purchased lumber in past years. In November I purchased two carloads, and one in December. None of these were standard items.

It seems inconceivable to us that OPA would allow this situation to exist. We fully subscribe to their objective of trying to prevent run-away inflation. We do not believe that ceiling prices should be removed from scarce items until production overtakes demand, but we submit that their unrealistic attitude toward lumber prices is not only inflating the cost of lumber items to the consumer, but is forcing him to patronize black market and illegitimate dealers. A proof of this is the fact that millions of feet of house construction lumber items are being produced in the above manner and eventually find their way into the consumers' hands at prices away beyond OPA retail ceilings. Some types of dealers are doing a land-office business. Other dealers have empty sheds and warehouses. Draw your own conclusions.

In conclusion, let me say that before Pearl Harbor our annual volume ran around $1,250,000. Today, with the biggest demand for our products in our history, our volume is running about $10,000 per month, which is just about what our monthly overhead amounts to. A continuance of this situation for even a few more months will compel us to make one of three decisions:

1. Follow the lead of many other concerns who are in the same situation of disregarding these unrealistic and crippling rules and regulations, get materials where we can at whatever price we have to pay, passing same on to our customers in violation of OPA price ceilings.

2. Lay off the majority of our remaining employees, shut down our factory, and reduce our overhead to a minimum, in the hope we can sweat it out until either OPA sees the light, or passes from the scene.

3. Call it a day and liquidate before our capital is seriously dissipated.

I realize I have written a lengthy letter, but even so, I have just touched the high spots. I have confidence that if our duly elected representatives, who actually represent the American public, can be fully informed of this situation, it will be corrected, as it is inconceivable that at a time when housing is so desperately needed our Government officials should, apparently, create obstacles that are doing more to retard building than everything else put together.

After all, this is the United States of America—or is it?

Sincerely yours

LEWIS MANUFACTURING CO.
T. P. DIXON, *President*.

Cable From Our GI's Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VITO MARCANTONIO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1946

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein a cablegram signed by 233 GI's in Vienna. It is deserving of the attention of every Member of Congress.

VIENNA, *January 14, 1946*.

Hon. VITO MARCANTONIO,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned, as a committee of three represent the enlisted men of the Five Hundred and Fifth Military Police Battalion, Vienna. The great majority of this group were members of infantry and armored divisions and include men who wear the Purple Heart, Silver Star, and Bronze Star earned in combat. We intend to refute the opinions and statements expressed by leading military and civilian officials in their attempts to justify the slow-down in demobilization. We are furious with the apparent misinformation or willful falsification by Lieutenant General Collins as evidenced in his statement that the number of men still overseas who heard a shot fired in this war is not very great. To now abolish a system by which men could almost count the days until they would be home is prima facie unfair, and we do not feel that we should accept it without expressing our position. We know from what we see about us daily, not from month-old reports, that the staff of 14,000 American soldiers in Vienna with minor reorganization could be reduced to 7,000 immediately without impairing the efficiency of the military task here. We are told that a similar condition exists throughout the entire American occupation zone. The highly mobile force that could handle the job is out of gas. Why? Draft boards cannot furnish men to replace soldiers who served when soldiering was dangerous. Why? The statements of our high military officials indicate that they have no facts or are afraid to use them. A smoke screen of words are being used to cover ulterior motives. We are angered with being misrepresented and lied about. We cannot accept more weak excuses Won't the people of the United States help us in our struggle for release from these brass chains?

Signed with 233 signatures, Five Hundred and Fifth Military Police Battalion, APO 58, Vienna.

Health and Plunder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1946

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bristol Courier of Tuesday, January 15, 1946:

HEALTH AND PLUNDER

President Truman again is demanding that his national health program be passed.

Congress had tried to pigeonhole the proposal for two reasons. The first is that it would lead to the socialization of medicine.

The other is the extravagant cost. How much the plan would involve no one can say. Under the list of activities, the suggested czar of medicine, the Surgeon General, might find excuse for laying out ten to twenty billions of dollars a year, with a pay roll running into millions of new employees.

Quite aside from these reasons for opposition to the strongly communistic scheme of President Truman, there is another which should interest all citizens who are concerned about good government.

The Wagner-Murray health bill which the President finds so urgent would open the door to the biggest political racket ever invented.

The plan goes much further than the mere nationalization or socialization of medicine. It makes the professions of medicine, surgery and dentistry, as well as the allied enterprises of research, dispensaries, schools and hospitals, subject to the one-man control of an individual who would be beyond the power of Congress, States, courts, the medical and dental professions, and anyone else involved.

That man would be the Surgeon General, an at-will appointee of the President, answerable to no one. He would in effect collect his own taxes, make his own rules, spend the public's money according to his own whim, punish States and individuals and institutions as he saw fit—and, as a crowning touch of irony—sit as judge to review his own acts.

The bill is a 78-page document which is worth careful study. Many passages on first glance appear to make the plan a joint State-Federal project, to provide fair yardsticks for the allocation of funds, to arrange for appeals and reviews, to give the professions a voice in their management, and to permit doctors and dentists to remain independent of the Federal set-up.

But the final effect of the various qualifications and jokers in the bill is to strip away the effectiveness of every restraint apparently placed upon the Surgeon General.

Dealing with funds which do not come to him from regular congressional appropriations, he is independent of Congress. It is provided that appeals from his decisions are to be heard by himself, not the judiciary. As for the States, he sets the allocations for each, and pays or withholds them, without having to answer to anyone for mistakes or for prejudice.

The methods of financing appear to set at defiance the whole plan of the Constitution that Congress levy the taxes and distribute the public funds. A direct pay-roll tax would be charged against the earnings of substantially all employees, and this money would be placed in a new subdivision of the National Treasury—what the bill calls a separate account to be known as the personal health service account.

The account could be augmented by Congress, if it wished; but once in the Treasury the money would be under the sole authority of the Surgeon General. The bill provides that he would draw out what he thought he needed every 3 months, balance the books at the end of the fiscal year, and at that time report to Congress. This is a spend-as-you-go procedure, with no budget, and with Congress being advised only after the money was gone.

The White House has not yet explained how this plan can be reconciled with the Constitution, which says: "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law."

The Surgeon General is empowered to set up the standards by which those who share in these funds expend them. The standards do not have to be uniform, nor do they have to conform, in the last analysis, to any other yardstick than the official's personal opinion.

He can give hand outs to hospitals and medical schools that he thinks deserve it, can finance various kinds of research, can make agreements with hospitals—and of course can withdraw his generosity any time he fails to get cooperation.

Repeated many times in the bill are provisions for the Surgeon General to take over the training of candidates for the jobs which would be needed to carry out the health program. This authority makes somewhat silly the statement sometimes heard that the Federal plan would not dictate the pay roll in States, hospitals, and the like.

The Surgeon General's power over those engaged in the practice of medicine and dentistry is immense, although indirect.

In the first place, every patient, according to the bill, is to be handed a list of "approved" doctors and dentists, and, if he is going to need hospitalization, of hospitals and similar institutions. He could, but probably wouldn't, disregard this list.

But not if he seeks the services of specialists and consultants. Such experts can only be used if they are on the approved list of professional men who have sworn in with the socialization program.

Further, the Surgeon General fixes the fees that can be charged, without having to make them uniform; and can limit the number of patients whom doctors are allowed to treat.

Quite aside from the socialization of medicine, this is too much authority for a free people to put in one pair of hands—no matter how eager President Truman may be to see it placed there.

It could hardly be said that the provisions of the bill would compel the Surgeon General to become a political racketeer. But study of the details of the plan makes it painfully obvious that nothing in the bill prevents such a result.

The Surplus Property Problem in Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1946

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the people of Montana should be given every possible consideration in the disposal of surplus property. To date we have received little attention in this respect so, in behalf of Montana's citizens, I have sent the following letter to W. Stuart Symington, Chairman of the Surplus Property Administration:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 17, 1946.

Mr. W. STUART SYMINGTON,
Chairman, Surplus Property Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR Mr. SYMINGTON: For some months now I have been endeavoring to get the Surplus Property Board to establish a depot for the disposal of surplus property in Montana for residents of that State. As you can well understand, it is an extremely difficult proposition for Montana people to have to travel, as they have to, to places like Seattle, Denver, and Nebraska in order to look over materials in which they are interested. On occasions that our people have done this, they found that the surplus property in which they were interested was nothing but junk; consequently, their time and money both have been wasted.

In my opinion, insult has been added to injury in the lack of consideration given Montana in the disposal of surplus property because, you will recall, Montana received no industries during the war and suffered a large decline of population because of this. However, Montana's contribution to the war effort led the entire Nation, insofar as manpower on a percentage basis was concerned, and was in excess of 65,000 Montana men and women (out of a population of 450,000) serving in the various branches of the armed forces. In the matter of bond drives, Montana led the entire Nation in five out of the seven drives and finished second in the other two. In the matter of food and mineral production our farmers and miners contributed greatly to the waging and winning of the war and on these bases alone, though there are others, I feel that we merit the attention of the Surplus Property Board to this particular matter. For the past 4 weeks I have been doing my utmost to get the Surplus Property Board to send a representative to Montana to look into the situation so that you could be made fully aware of the problem which confronts us out there. I should like to urge that you send a representative of the Surplus Property Board to Montana so that our people could be given every possible consideration and our needs could be attended to on the basis of parity with the rest of the Nation. This is a very serious situation because there are needs for such things as jeeps, fire trucks, surplus clothing equipment, sheets, etc., in which our people, especially our veterans, are interested and I feel, therefore, that it would be to the best interest of both the Surplus Property Board and the people of the State of Montana to send an investigator out to the State for the purpose of meeting with Montana citizens so that this matter could be settled in a way which would give my State a fair deal. I should appreciate your doing what you could about this at your very earliest convenience.

Must close now, but with best personal wishes, I am

Sincerely yours.

Walter Lippmann on Fact Finding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the clearest arguments which I have yet read in favor of the proposal that Congress authorize by law the setting up of fact-finding bodies in connection with important labor disputes is contained in the column of Walter Lippmann appearing in the papers on January 15.

I include it with my remarks herewith:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

STRIKES: ONE CLEAR THING TO DO

The board in the General Motors strike has, it seems to me, made one thing quite clear. It is that fact finding can be done effectively without the trimmings which unions and management have objected to in the President's proposal of December 3. Mr. Lloyd K. Garrison and his associates found the facts that needed to be found without examining the company's books and without imposing a cooling-off period on labor.

These trimmings raise issues which have nothing to do with fact finding as such—for labor the right to strike, for management the right of privacy in a system of private competitive enterprise. They could and they should be separated out and considered separately. For the purpose of fact finding is to induce labor and management to agree—the purpose of the trimmings is to coerce them into agreement.

There is no certain reason for thinking that indirect coercion of the kind the President proposed would be successful even if it is desirable. But there is no doubt whatever that fact finding, as Mr. Garrison and his associates have practiced it, is desirable and necessary. The trimmings call for a thorough debate, whereas Congress could without hesitation and delay give legislative approval to fact finding as such—since that would mean only that it was giving its moral support to something which the President has the power to do anyway.

Those who point out that Mr. C. E. Wilson has rejected the board's recommendations and that the strike continues should ask themselves what reason they have for knowing that Mr. Wilson would have given in if his books had been opened or that Mr. Reuther could have kept the men cool if there had been a compulsory cooling-off period. There is, in other words, no certainty that the trimmings would accomplish by indirection what no one would, in an industry like the automobile, think of doing directly—namely, to forbid strikes and to substitute compulsory arbitration and the fixing of wages by law.

Industries where interruption of service is intolerable to the community may require this—for example, utilities and communications. They should not be lumped together, as the President did, with "steel, automobiles, aviation, and mining," where stoppages, though inconvenient and costly, do not affect immediately the health and security of the community. What would be sound public policy for the vital industries should not be confused with what would be sound for industries that are merely big and important. The Railway Labor Act has worked—on the railways, which are Government-regulated monopolies; it does not follow at all that it would work for automobiles and steel, which are privately managed and in considerable degree competitive.

It is for these unregimented industries that fact-finding as such is the first necessary measure to promote industrial peace. What does fact-finding do, as Messrs. Garrison, Milton Eisenhower, and Stacy have practiced it? It does not unearth new and hidden facts. It does not find facts. It takes the facts as they are alleged to be by management and by the unions. It then compares these partisan allegations, analyzes them, screens them, refines them, deflates them, and, if I may say so, delouses them. Then it measures them by established standards of public policy and makes a public report which says what these men, chosen because they are disinterested and rational, think would be the reasonable settlement if all the exaggeration and the propaganda were squeezed out of the argument.

I do not see how anyone who wishes to be rational, who means to be fair, who prefers information to dope and proof to demogoguery, cannot want fact-finding of this kind.

It is indeed a necessity where collective bargaining involves great numbers of workingmen, stockholders, and customers. Mr. Wilson and Mr. Reuther might as well admit it. They are supposed to be bargaining. But let no one think that bargaining as they do it is like bargaining in a horse trade or over the sale of a piece of real estate. In ordinary commercial bargaining the seller and the buyer make bids and offers one to the other. They do not buy newspaper advertising space, run high-power propaganda machines, to convince Tom, Dick, and Harry that the horse is a thoroughbred and not a spavined nag, or that the seller is a hold-up man and the buyer a greedy monster.

But in large-scale collective bargaining this is just what happens. Mr. Wilson and Mr. Reuther do not bargain only with each other; they spend large sums of money, and no end of ingenuity, talking to Tom, Dick, and Harry about the proposed deal. Why? Because they know perfectly well that their bargaining power depends upon Tom, Dick, and Harry. Neither believes what so many ideologists and doctrinaires pretend to believe: that without public support the owners can in fact, though theoretically they have the right, shut up shop, or that the employees can strike indefinitely. Both Mr. Wilson and Mr. Reuther have large constituencies, and their power to refuse to agree is, as they know perfectly well, dependent on how long and how enthusiastically they can keep their constituents in line. That is why they do not merely bargain across the table but use the printing press and the microphone to address the public.

That being the case, it would be foolish for the public, including editors, broadcasters, and commentators, to submit meekly to being deluged by unverified information and prejudiced argument. They must have some protection against the fine art of bamboozlement, and some way—since they have other things to do besides reading about General Motors—of not wasting their time trying to

decide which public relations expert is pulling their leg.

That is what fact finding of the Garrison type can do. It is considerable. No doubt it is not everything that needs to be done before there is industrial peace and all men are brothers. But it is one thing that can be done at once which will at least introduce the element of reason into industrial disputes, and enable men to act, if not as loving brothers, at least as rational human beings.

There is no telling what greater wisdom we might not hope to achieve once we decided that to begin acting rationally was the way to go about it.

A Social Creed for All Americans—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 17, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks on the very significant and moving program reported by the Methodist Church Department of Christian Social Relations to the General Conference of the Methodist Church, a special importance attaches to the following recommendations for elimination of Jim Crow practices within the church itself and in the community activities of church members.

More, perhaps, than any other one objective in the ultimate aim of building a peaceful world, the rooting-out of racial discrimination and prejudice is essential to true understanding. Here again is a program to which all American women of good will can give thoughtful consideration.

SPECIAL RECOMMENDATION

(For reference to the General Conference Commission to Study Race Relations in the Methodist Church, December 1, 1945)

The statement adopted by this department in 1943 and published in Activities for 1944 is recalled because of its present relevance. "Racial tensions and anti-Semitism have increased during the past year. The treatment of minorities in America has been a constant embarrassment to the United States in the present world conflict. If this country is to take its place of leadership in planning for peace and in the postwar world there must be a closer relation between the theory and practice of democracy. Likewise the church by the nature of its faith is constrained to become more adequately Christian in its own practice. It is deadening to the effort to achieve brotherhood to assume that we have it when it has not yet been achieved. The jurisdictional organization of our church tacitly accepts the principle of segregation. Methodist women have an obligation to stimulate within the church an increasing awareness of the contradiction between our Christian ideals and our plan of organization."

This statement clearly emphasizes objectives that are immediately imperative and practicable and objectives that will involve long-range planning and gradual realization. Certain actions of the general conference of 1944 similarly emphasize immediate and long-range objectives.

The general conference of 1944 urged "the active participation of our churches * * * in the preparation of communities to welcome and assimilate Japanese Americans from the relocation centers" (The Discipline, par. 2015, p. 571). The church can best implement this wish of the general conference by welcoming and assimilating Japanese Americans into its membership and fellowship in already established local congregations.

The fluidity of the situation now existing encourages the inclusion of people of varying race and cultural heritage in the active fellowship of our churches. To do so will enrich the churches and convincingly demonstrate their basically spiritual character. It is for Caucasian and Japanese Methodists together to make this venture of faith in building a genuinely Christian fellowship in the local church.

There are noteworthy instances in which Japanese and Caucasian ministers are effectively associated in the pastorates of Methodist churches. We urge the exploration and pioneering of ways for a larger and more varied use of Japanese Methodists in positions of leadership in the church.

The general conference also expressed its desire for "the ultimate elimination of racial discrimination within the Methodist Church." It accordingly asked "the Council of Bishops to create * * * a commission to consider afresh the relations of all races included in the membership of The Methodist Church and to report to the General Conference of 1948." It specified that "the members of this commission" would desirably include "the most complete representations of all racial groups possible" (The Discipline, par. 2015, p. 570).

Since the Negro is the largest minority group in the Nation and in our church, their assimilation has supreme importance. The shift in population makes practicable and imperative new patterns of church life and administration.

We urge that every such occasion be utilized for the assimilation of Latin Americans, American Indians, Orientals, and Negroes into nonracial congregations and conferences.

We believe that the future pattern of the Methodist Church should be based on Jesus' teachings of brotherhood, and we plead for the ultimate integration of racial groups into the membership and fellowship of our total church.

With this goal in view we urge that wherever possible work should be carried on across racial lines. Such action is illustrated in the demobilization workshops of the department of Christian social relations and local church activities, which were successfully conducted in New Orleans, Atlanta, Detroit, Louisville, and on a district basis in Georgia.

Methodist history furnishes heartening examples of the incorporation of foreign-language groups into the fellowship of local churches and annual conferences. Our faith encourages us to look toward a similar incorporation of all groups into a Christian fellowship, where race does not determine the pattern of participation. Only so can the Methodist Church of the future bear its most effective witness for Christ among the racially diverse populations of our Nation and of the world.

Draft Rejection Fallacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 17, 1946

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor, upon the subject Draft Rejection Fallacy:

DRAFT REJECTION FALLACY

President Truman's citation of draft rejections as a compelling reason for the introduction of compulsory sickness insurance in the United States loses its plausibility on comparison with draft rejections in Britain where this insurance prevails.

In his message recommending Government medical care insurance, the President said, "The number of those rejected for military service was about 30 percent of all those examined."

But in Great Britain, which has had compulsory sickness insurance since 1911, the draft rejections were far higher. How they ran is indicated in the published annual reports on the British Army. Rejections for the 10 years ending with 1936 are available in the annual report for that year.

During all the 10 years, 677,515 were served with notice papers and 400,775 were rejected, or 59 percent.

Even allowing generously for the effects of a lower standard of living, if Britain, after 25 years of sickness insurance, had a rejection rate practically twice that of America, there seems to be little argument in the draft rejections for socialized medicine.

Open Letter to Mr. Byrnes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 17, 1946

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to bring to the attention of the Congress an editorial which appeared in the Oneonta Star, Oneonta, N. Y., entitled "Open Letter to Mr. Byrnes" written by Mr. Wilmer E. Bresee as guest editorial writer. The editorial follows:

OPEN LETTER TO MR. BYRNES

(As guest editorial writer, the Star this morning presents Wilmer E. Bresee, second vice president of the Oneonta Department Store, who has written an open letter to Secretary of State James Byrnes. Each writer is given the widest latitude, and his views do not necessarily represent those of the Star.)

(By Wilmer E. Bresee)

I have just read Mr. George E. Sokolsky's article on the recent Moscow Conference, and I feel that the time has come for Americans to make their viewpoint known to the State Department.

As a veteran of World War II, I have watched with a growing feeling of concern the many indications that we, as a Nation, are prepared to give up our insistence on many of the policies first expressed by Mr. Roosevelt in the Atlantic Charter; and I think that I am justified as a citizen and a veteran in registering my personal objection to any background steps away from the principles and policies of bringing freedom and equality to all peoples of the world under the United Nations Organization.

My particular interest in the problems of the peoples of Asia and the East Indies stems from the fact that for 2 years I was an enlisted instructor and interpretor in the Chinese training program of the United States Army Air Force. My work brought me into close personal contact with the Chinese Air

Force, enlisted men, cadets, and officers who were in the United States, receiving training in this program. While working with these men, who, I believe, represent the finest elements in China today, I was frequently queried as to the policy of the United States in regard to the freedom of the peoples of India, Java, Sumatra, and other colonial areas, from the old European colonial system.

I learned that our Chinese allies feel a deep cultural and racial bond with these people. They bitterly resent the colonial system with its policy of exploitation and oppression of native groups. They look to the United States for enlightened leadership to end this situation and to guarantee the right of self-government to all colored races.

I know that, on VJ-day, our prestige among these people stood at an all-time high. It is unfortunate, indeed, that we now seem to be tacitly and actively giving our approval to a reestablishment of the prewar status quo in the colonial areas I have mentioned. This, I believe, is a betrayal of the ideals for which Americans fought in World War II, and for which Americans have fought and died for centuries.

It is not yet too late for the United States to take a position in regard to these matters, that will justify and enhance the respect and friendship which the people of Asia have shown us.

However, if we persist in our present policy of defending England, Holland, and France in their colonial claims, and bartering the rights of other nations for doubtful Russian support, we will forfeit the friendship of all the native peoples of Asia and create a block of enemies that will some day rise to destroy us.

It is your high privilege, Mr. Byrnes, to be entrusted by the American people, through their President, with the decisions that will mean freedom and democracy or serfdom and oppression for millions of colonial peoples.

In making these decisions, millions of veterans of World War II are hoping that you will remember the ideals for which they fought.

Amvets Promote Veterans' Hospital Educational Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 17, 1946

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to take the opportunity to congratulate the American Veterans of World War II on the effective work they are doing in behalf of disabled veterans. This new group of war veterans are rapidly making their presence felt in all sections of the country and recently have formed several active chapters in the Twenty-second Congressional District of Illinois.

At Granite City, Ill., a new chapter of Amvets has been taking the lead in assisting returning veterans to cope with the housing shortage. They have gone about the matter in a logical way by conducting a city-wide survey among veterans to actually determine the seriousness of the situation and by stimulating local interest in the problem through cooperation of the Granite City Press-Record.

I include herewith a statement from the national legislative director of the Amvets which bears on one of the recent accomplishments of the organization in the interest of the disabled veteran:

AMVETS WIN APPROVAL ON HOSPITAL EDUCATIONAL PLAN FOR DISABLED VETERANS

(By J. H. Leib, national legislative director, Amvets)

Last September a veteran who had contracted TB while in the service of his country came to this writer with a very pitiful case. Prior to his enlistment in the United States Army this veteran was studying law at one of the eastern universities. The war abruptly ended his formal education like it has done to so many others.

Upon discharge from the armed forces—however—this veteran was ordered to a TB veterans' hospital for further treatment. The boy was heartsick because he could not return to college and complete his education now that his war service was over.

It was while discussing his dilemma that an idea popped up—why not ask the Veterans' Administration to adopt a program to give disabled veterans correspondence courses while hospitalized for lengthy periods.

So a letter was sent to the Veterans' Administration recommending such a plan, etc., and attached herewith is the reply received. It is also further suggested that the VA take under consideration setting up classrooms in its hospitals whereby direct teaching can be undertaken.

The letter in which the Veterans' Administration announces that it will adopt such a program follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., January 12, 1946.
AMERICAN VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you very much indeed for your kind letter of October 4, 1945, raising a question about correspondence courses to be taken while hospitalized in a Veterans' Administration hospital. Reply to your letter has been delayed pending program developments.

We certainly agree with you that where a veteran is to spend a considerable period of time in the hospital he should be enabled to pursue his education. Accordingly, arrangements are being made whereby correspondence courses may be offered to hospitalized veterans in Veterans' Administration hospitals as occupational therapy, without charge against entitlement under Public Law No. 346 or Public Law No. 16. It is hoped that these arrangements will soon be completed and that the hospitals located throughout the United States will be able to offer veterans the correspondence instruction of their choice.

In the meantime, if you are a patient in a Veterans' Administration hospital and will advise this office as to where you are—in what hospital of the Veterans' Administration—we shall be glad to see if we can give you special attention in the way of making available to you the correspondence course which you desire. We shall request the regional office to send a vocational advisor to assist you in deciding what course to undertake so as best to tie up your study while in the hospital with that which you may pursue when you get out of the hospital.

We are glad to have had your letter, and trust that we shall hear from you further and that we will be able to be of assistance to you.

Very truly yours,

H. V. STIRLING,
Assistant Administrator for Vocational Rehabilitation and Education.

Improvement in Medical Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 17, 1946

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Baltimore Sun, written by Francis F. Beirne, on the subject of improvement in medical care:

IMPROVEMENT IN MEDICAL CARE

Those who are agitating for an elaborate federally controlled national health program, such as that proposed by President Truman in his message to Congress, lay great stress on the shortcomings of the existing system. They thereby create the impression that individual States and communities have failed to solve the Nation's health problem, and that therefore it is time for the Federal Government to take over the job.

In making that assumption they ignore an impressive movement looking toward improved health care that is now showing intense activity throughout the country. It is a movement not inspired from above but initiated by the communities. It is not revolutionary, but a continuation of a health program that has been going on for years. It is what used to be called typically American, in that it is an effort on the part of the people to help themselves instead of waiting for somebody else to help them.

Recently there was presented in these columns a summary of the health care now available to the people of Maryland. Though it contained an impressive list of medical services that have been established, it also showed clearly that our local medical authorities are aware of its many gaps and are taking steps to fill them. But, it might be argued, Maryland, with its two medical schools in Baltimore, and its wealth of expert advice, is exceptional in seeking to fill the gaps in medical care. Inquiry, however, reveals that what is happening here is merely part of a broader movement.

No complete and accurate survey of this Nation-wide movement has been made. In fact, such a survey would be well-nigh impossible, since statistics are out of date before they can be assembled. While some important programs may be overlooked, enough information can be presented to give an indication of the nature and variety of the movement.

For example, Maryland has made a survey of medical care in the counties and is completing one for Baltimore. But Maryland is not alone. Alabama, Georgia, and North Carolina also have made or are making similar surveys, and the North Carolina Legislature recently appropriated $100,000 for a continuation of the program. Virginia has appointed a medical commission to study the State's needs. In New York State the Mailler committee, appointed by the legislature, has been at work for several years making surveys of medical care in the counties upon which to base a State-wide program. Several other commissions, appointed by the Governor, are studying other phases of medical care. In New Jersey a general advisory committee is working out plans for the integration of all health services.

More widely distributed are the hospital surveys, sponsored some years ago by the American Hospitals Association and recently stimulated by the bill now before Congress

providing an appropriation for hospital construction. These surveys are not concerned alone with construction. In modern medical practice the hospital is an indispensable factor in all health work. In the very nature of the case, such surveys must include existing facilities and a program of future needs. In fact, they virtually constitute a State-wide health survey. At the latest report 22 States were actually making such surveys and most of the others were planning to do so.

Another part of the picture involves the activity of private foundations. They are, for example, the Kellogg Foundation, which has labored to raise the health standards of seven rural counties in Michigan; the Bingham Associates Fund, which has linked medical care in Maine and certain other rural communities with the New England Health Center in Boston, and the Commonwealth Fund, which is making a similar experiment in the Rochester (N. Y.) area. From the Middle West come reports of the Great Plains Health Council, with subsidiary councils in North and South Dakota, Montana, Nebraska, Wyoming, and Kansas, cooperating to solve the health problems of that vast area.

Here, then, are some of the evidences of the local strivings to provide improved medical care. But when the provision for improved care has been made, the next question of vital importance, to the hospitals and medical profession, as well as to the patients, is how it is to be paid for. President Truman recommended compulsory medical-care insurance. It is interesting to see how far the American people have gone on their own initiative in providing voluntary insurance.

Consider, first, hospital care alone. In this field the Blue Cross plan of insurance is outstanding because of its sudden and phenomenal growth. Eight years ago it had a membership of 500,000. Today membership in the many State and local Blue Cross plans is approaching 21,000,000, with new members being added at the rate of 70,000 a week. The Blue Cross is now operating in 45 States.

Local Blue Cross plans do not, as a rule, include that important item, the doctor's bill. But in some localities they are experimenting with the possibilities; and right here in Maryland the Blue Cross was authorized to do so by the last legislature. And there are other plans that do. There are today industrial plans, medical-society plans, private-group clinics, consumer-sponsored plans (fraternal, union, cooperative, etc.) and governmental plans. Contracts show wide variations. Doctors', surgeons', dental and hospital fees appear, some or all of which are paid in whole or in part. The number of individuals included in these prepayment organizations is estimated at from 4,000,000 to 5,000,000. The number of individuals in the United States who carry some form of health insurance has been estimated as high as 29,000,000.

Especially significant are the State and county medical society plans, since the medical societies have been for the most part opposed to the Federal program, and since the average individual is eligible for them. Willingness of the doctors to cooperate provides an alternative. In 1943 medical-society plans covered 942,000 persons. By last October 1 the membership had jumped to over 2,000,000. Conspicuous has been the growth in Michigan, with a membership of 868,322 and 3,543 participating physicians, or 69 percent of the membership of the medical society. Massachusetts also is outstanding with 183,000 members, more than double the number in the previous year.

In these varied programs is found striking evidence of the widespread consciousness of the need for better medical care looking to the ultimate goal of adequate care for all. Some of the programs may fail, for this is a typical American approach to a problem by the trial-and-error method. But where one succeeds other communities will be prompt to adopt it to their needs. Whatever may come out of it, we may be sure that health care will be far better than any we have known before.

Should this movement be ignored and discarded before we learn what it can do? Should we abandon this richly varied experimental approach for a set of alluring blueprints? That is what the advocates of a comprehensive scheme of tax-supported medical care, centrally administered by the Federal Government, are asking us to do. They are asking the country to throw away a system of medical care which despite many defects is fundamentally sound, and which is subject to constant improvement as experience points the way, for an entire new and untried plan.

Petrillo Ban on Foreign Music May Be Last Straw

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE F. ROGERS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 17, 1946

Mr. ROGERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Rochester Times-Union, Rochester, N. Y., under date of December 29, 1945:

PETRILLO BAN ON FOREIGN MUSIC MAY BE LAST STRAW

How long, oh Petrillo, will you abuse our patience!

The latest ukase of the head of the American Federation of Musicians is that American radio stations shall stop broadcasting musical programs originating in any foreign country except Canada—where the AFM has organized the musicians.

This order, addressed to radio stations and networks by James C. Petrillo as AFM president, does not have the financial importance to stations that some other demands have carried. Most broadcasts of foreign music are on a sustaining basis, that is, unsponsored.

Yet the prohibition of broadcasts of music originating in other countries is particularly offensive at this time, when it is so earnestly desired to establish closer relations with the nations of the world.

Mr. Petrillo speaks as one having authority. If his demands are disobeyed, he can and will order AFM members to refuse to play or make records for broadcasting.

Right now he is tightening the check rein. He demands that stations which use musical recordings employ a certain number of AFM members as stand-bys. They do not play, but draw pay. This denies to the stations the advantages of modern invention.

A union survey having shown that a considerable number of affiliates of the four networks do not employ musicians, Mr. Petrillo has advised the networks that something will have to be done about this.

The public is becoming increasingly determined that something will have to be done about the Petrillo regime.

Now before Congress are two bills. The Vandenberg bill, passed by the Senate, is confined to prohibiting interference with the broadcast of educational and cultural programs. The bill sponsored by Chairman CLARENCE LEA of the House Interstate Commerce Committee goes much further.

This bill would prohibit payment of "tribute" to the American Federation of Musicians for the broadcast of musical recordings, prevent requiring radio stations to hire more musicians than necessary, and make it unlawful to interfere with the broadcast of educational and cultural programs. The bill carries stiff penalties.

The comparison Mr. Petrillo makes with our tariffs and immigration restrictions is wholly false. Those restrictions are based on laws passed by Congress, and not on the orders of a labor leader.

This latest order should spur adoption of the Lea bill, or some other measure to curb Petrillo's arbitrary power.

To make your voice effective in this direction, write your Congressman, or fill in and send him the following coupon, which it would also be well to send to Senators JAMES M. MEAD and ROBERT F. WAGNER, House or Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

No Federal Aid for Schools, Says Virginia Governor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 17, 1946

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, the House having granted permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a news item of the inaugural address delivered by Governor Tuck, of Virginia, on yesterday.

He has voiced the opinion of many forward-looking citizens that Federal aid to schools means interference with and control of our public-school system:

FEDERAL AID TO STATES ASSAILED BY TUCK IN INAUGURAL ADDRESS

RICHMOND, VA., January 16.—Gov. William M. Tuck vigorously attacked Federal aid to States in his inaugural address today in telling Virginians they should be, and he believed they were, willing to finance higher standards in education, public health, agriculture, and other fields through State and local taxation.

Detailing the tremendous Federal debt and interest charges, and expenses, plus billions in veterans' benefits to come, the Governor said any money granted to the States must come out of the pockets of taxpayers who reside in those States.

CITES UNITED STATES HANDLING EXPENSES

Money paid by the taxpayer to the Federal Government and returned to the States, he added, is burdened with collection and handling charges by the Federal Government, with the operating costs of bureaus in Washington, and finally with the salaries and expenses of Federal agents sent into the States to regulate State agencies in their expenditure of what is left of the money received from the taxpayer.

"The amount left is probably about half," he said. "Since the money must be spent according to a national pattern prescribed by the Washington bureau, it cannot be utilized for such purposes as will best satisfy Virginia's needs. These needs necessarily vary in the several States according to varying conditions prevailing in them."

A grant, he said, may be made for a purpose Virginians do not want at all, but if it is rejected her taxpayers must pay their part of the cost just the same.

Governor Tuck said in his address that in appropriating war-inflated revenues to raise school standards through expenditures of a recurring nature, Virginia would eventually have to increase State and perhaps local taxes to continue the higher standards. The same would be true in other activities, he said, although he predicted that higher taxes would not be necessary for 2 years.

PREFER STATE FINANCING

"I am confident that such commitment meets with the people's hearty approval, and that they will gladly finance their own schools," he said. "I am also confident that they prefer these schools to be financed through State and local revenues rather than through the medium of Federal taxation with its accompanying interference."

Governor Tuck devoted the major part of his 6,000-word address to criticism of Federal grants to States which he asserted were destructive to State independence and local self-government, were costly to taxpayers and served as a means by which pressure groups in pivotal States in national elections seek to impose their will in States where they have little influence.

"I am convinced that the making of grants to the States by Congress should be vigorously opposed by all the States so long as the operations of the Federal Government necessitate incurring an annual deficit," he said.

A Plain Citizen of the U. S. A. Writes to His Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 17, 1946

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following communication written by one of my valued constituents in California:

DEAR CONGRESS OF THE U. S. A.: The other evening I heard our President tell the people what the Congress has not done. As a good citizen of the U. S. A. I have been reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD quite regularly. I had been suspecting many of the things the President said, but I didn't know but that the "REC" might be giving me the wrong impression. For one thing I noticed that from time to time there was not a quorum present in one or the other House to do business. I was puzzled about that. I know if I were not at my job regularly I would be fired, and rightly so.

Then too, I have been trying to figure out what the Congress has been doing on Capitol Hill. So many laws are introduced but few of them are ever passed by Congress. Now our President has told us what the real trouble is. It is our committee system. I wish you Congressmen would publish a "committee record" similar to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that we people could find out what Congressmen are on the committees and just who is sabotaging legislation in the committees.

Since you don't seem to be able to break up the deadlock, or the sabotage in the committees, could I make a suggestion to you? Congress has many rules. There are rules of debate, rules of order of business, etc. Well, why can't you adopt one more rule? Why not have a rule that if a committee fails to report a bill back to the floor of either House within a certain time, any Member of Congress can call that law up for discussion and have it debated in Congress or referred to a special committee. Since Congressmen don't want more committees created than are now in existence—they are too numerous already—this rule would have the effect of getting action on a bill.

I am only a plain citizen, Congress of the U. S. A., and I am busy making a living and striving to make good citizens of the youth of our community, and I haven't the time to check up on the work—or lack of work—you are doing. I just have to trust to your individual integrity and honesty—at least until election time—to do your job well.

I often see such headings in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as "Congress Faces the Problem of Inflation," "Congress Faces Problem of Housing." Now we common people face these problems, too. What we want you to do is not only face these problems, but to lick them for us.

I know that there will be much talk from now on about cooperation between you and the President. You will criticize the President for spanking you. But that gets you no place. We want you to stop bickering and do something about the problems confronting our country. If the President was wrong, then show us that he was wrong by producing some good laws to solve the problems of the U.S.A. In other words, "Put up or shut up."

I am not interested in whether it was the Democrats or the Republicans who laid down on the job. You are all Americans, like we common people are Americans. If each of you just remembered that you are Americans first and Democrats or Republicans second, then you would do your job as representatives of the people better.

I see by the December 28 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that you have accomplished much. In fact almost three pages are filled with enrolled bills and resolutions signed. But upon closer scrutiny I find that these are all private bills, such as an act to relieve Joe Doakes, or an act to authorize investigation of means to increase the capacity of the Panama Canal. These are all fine. But why don't you pass a law to relieve the strike situation and the housing situation?

I hesitate to write you about these things because I know that you Congressmen are swamped with hundreds of petty requests from your constituents. The people expect too much of you. They want you to find out everything from the price of peaches in Paris in 1914 to the name of a good hotel in Washington. And how they fuss when you don't give them a "prompt and courteous" reply. I think that one of the reasons the daily meetings of Congress are poorly attended is because you people are overworked with petty details. It seems to me that Congress is in session too long. I suggest that the sessions of Congress be limited to 190 days, Saturdays and Sundays excluded. If you were forced to do more in a shorter time, there wouldn't be too much delay in legislation. If your Senators were thus limited, the people back home would have a chance to see their Representatives more and to express to them their wishes better. You fellows are so busy in Washington that we plain people haven't a chance to talk to you and to give you our opinions on legislative matters. We want to meet our Congressmen, and we want to talk to them and make our wishes known. That is democracy.

As a common American I don't believe in threatening to defeat you at the next election for your failures of the past. I know you can do good work, as demonstrated by the great accomplishments in matters of foreign affairs. I know that in this session of Congress you will forget politics, forget antagonisms, and cooperate to make our democratic country the best example in the world of a "Government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

Greatest Diplomatic Capitulation Since Munich

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 17, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address by Lothrop Stoddard, of the Washington Star:

The outcome of the Moscow Conference of foreign ministers confirms the fears I have expressed in previous broadcasts. It is, to my mind, an almost unmitigated disaster—the greatest diplomatic capitulation since Munich, and one which, I gravely fear, will ultimately produce similar consequences. The chief difference between the two is that the Moscow surrender did not have as cogent an excuse; at Munich, Chamberlain and Daladier were faced with superior force. Hitler had got the jump on them in armaments and was ready to use them. The current revelations at the Nuremberg war criminals trial show that Hitler was not bluffing, and that if his demands had been refused he would at once have precipitated a war for which Britain and France were alike woefully unprepared. It is thus arguable that Anglo-French diplomacy bowed to stern necessity in order to gain time.

Last week at Moscow the western powers were under no such imperious compulsion; because notwithstanding their extensive demobilization since the close of hostilities, they still have an over-all predominance of armed might, topped off by the atom bomb. In a show-down over vital issues, therefore, the western powers would have been able to make their views prevail; because the Soviet Union is not yet in a position to challenge that preponderance of power with any reasonable hope of success. An unflinching Anglo-American stand for what both deemed the necessary pattern of world reconstruction would thus have succeeded without recourse to arms, because there is nothing in this pattern which menaces the legitimate interests of a Russia seeking merely peace and security, and it is hard to imagine even the power-conscious rulers of the Soviet Union deliberately plunging their people into a war, needless from a defensive viewpoint, which would probably entail a worse fate than that of contemporary Germany and Japan.

At Moscow, therefore, Mr. Molotov's diplomatic right arm did not pack the punch that Hitler's did at Munich. This means that, in the basic sense, Mr. Molotov was bluffing. Yet the bluff did not entail grave risks, because the Foreign Commissar and his colleagues of the Politbureau had long ago sized up their diplomatic opponents and had rightfully deduced that the political leaders of America, especially, had neither the vision nor the will to stand fast, regardless of immediate consequences, for the principles wherein they purported to believe. From the very start of its wartime association with the Soviet Union, America's record has been

one of appeasement in the invidious sense of that word. Wartime exigencies might justify, or at least palliate, such a policy. But decisive victory over the Axis coupled with our sole possession of the atom bomb rendered our continued surrender on fundamental issues as needless as it was potentially disastrous.

Three months ago, at the London Conference of Foreign Ministers, it looked as though appeasement was over. Foreign Commissar Molotov there adopted an attitude which was deemed absolutely inacceptable by the western powers. The result was a break-down of negotiations, lucidly explained and eloquently defended by none other than the American representative, Secretary of State Byrnes, in his radio address to the American people on the evening of October 5. Regular listeners to these broadcasts will recall the deep thankfulness and gratitude that I voiced in my talk 2 days later. If words meant anything, it seemed certain that American diplomacy would thenceforth be guided by the slogan then coined by Mr. Byrnes himself: "Compromise does not mean surrender." Amplifying his stand, the Secretary described at length Mr. Molotov's reneging on the Potsdam and Yalta Agreements and insistence on the original Soviet thesis that the postwar world should be run by a three-way deal which would inevitably discredit the inchoate United Nations Organization and would, in its stead, establish a tripartite balance of power on a world-wide scale. This reactionary proposal excited Mr. Byrnes to righteous indignation. "The American delegation," he said emphatically, "took the position that, in an independent, democratic world, peace cannot be the exclusive concern of a few presently powerful states; that, unless we were to revert to a world of isolationism, none of the states which we wanted invited to the peace conference could be said to be not directly concerned with the peace. We urged that those states, both large and small, which had fought and suffered in the war must make the peace. This has been a people's war and it must be a people's peace."

When Commissar Molotov turned an emphatic thumbs down on any such proposal, Mr. Byrnes went on to comment: "It therefore became obvious that there could be no agreement unless the other delegations were prepared to yield their views and convictions to those of the Soviet delegation. This, none of the other delegations were prepared to do. The United States is willing to dictate terms of peace to an enemy, but is not willing to dictate terms of peace to its allies." And from the unqualified rupture of the conference that ensued, Mr. Byrnes drew the following trenchant conclusions: "The matter that caused the suspension of our work is no trivial or technical question. It presented an issue which had to be met. This is whether the peace shall be made by three or even five nations to the exclusion of other nations vitally concerned in the maintenance and enforcement of the peace which is being prepared. The issue goes even deeper. The Council of Foreign Ministers acts under the unanimity rule just as the Security Council of the United Nations must act in many important matters. * * * The veto power is a great power and should not be lightly exercised. We are willing to make many concessions, but the United States does not believe in agreement at any price. The power of veto in procedural matters should not be used by the United States or any other nation to coerce the judgment and conscience of fellow nations. Peace must be based upon mutual understanding and mutual respect. It cannot be secured by procedural maneuverings which obscure from the people the real and vital issues upon which the peace depends."

Thus spake Secretary Byrnes on October 5. Meanwhile, Mr. Molotov went back to Moscow, Marshal Stalin went vacationing on the Black Sea, and the Soviet Government staged a diplomatic sit-down strike, refusing to cooperate in any way with its western associates while making itself actively disagreeable by all sorts of disturbing unilateral actions. The war of nerves went on through October and well-nigh through November. Came Thanksgiving Day. That night Mr. Byrnes had what his press relations subordinate described as an inspiration. He would go to Moscow to talk things over with Foreign Commissar Molotov, in company with British Foreign Minister Bevin if the latter could be persuaded, but standing ready to go himself anyway.

According to the most reliable information, Mr. Bevin distinctly did not like the notion. That hard-headed British Laborite saw what such a diplomatic "journey to Canossa" would probably entail. But of course he had no real choice save to go along. So the tripartite Conference of Foreign Ministers took place in the Soviet capital, and Mr. Byrnes resoundingly reversed himself on the attitude and spirit he had adopted less than 3 months before.

Consider, if you please, a few of these reversals. The veto power has been so extended that it becomes virtually the basic factor in all international procedure. As for the contemplated peace conference, there just "ain't goin' ter be none"—merely separate arrangements by varying groups wherein Soviet Russia will be the one constant participant. As a gesture to our feelings, presumably, these peace deals will be submitted to the Assembly of the United Nations, but merely for discussion and recommendations which can be ignored by the framers, who will have the last word. This degradation of the Assembly to the status of rubber stamp will have a profoundly depressing effect upon its prestige and authority, which is just what Moscow intends, because it never liked the Assembly idea anyway. Incidentally, those treaties concern chiefly nations in eastern Europe, about which we took so high a moral attitude on the basis of the Yalta agreement. At Moscow we practically abandon our position there, but simultaneously permit Russia to do the very thing in Japan which it so violently objected to our trying to do in the Balkans—namely, to have a say in what goes on. Furthermore, the elaborate double-talk indulged in in the Japanese clause results in such obscurity of meaning that Moscow will have a glorious opportunity to raise interpretations which may deadlock things there as they are now stalemated in Germany. Last but not least, the atom bomb. Apparently we have not promised to give away the secret—not yet, at any rate. But that is not the really important point. The agonizingly vital issue confronting the world is the placing of atomic weapons at the very earliest moment under a truly effective system of control and inspection against evasion of that control. Alas for the fond hopes of the peace-loving majority of mankind. At Moscow it was decided that a proposed Atomic Commission of the UNO should either consist directly of the Security Council or be responsible to it, rather than to the Assembly. This means that the unanimity rule and veto power prevail, whereunder a single dissent could nullify or postpone indefinitely any action on atomic control. This, of course, means in practice that Soviet Russia can stall off anything it doesn't fancy until its own scientists or Communist fifth columnists abroad have given it the secret and it can stock up on bombs of its own.

What a happy prospect all this portends for a bright new world! Mr. Byrnes certainly started something with his Thanksgiving night "inspiration." Our Secretary of State has assumed a terrible responsibility. And yet we should not be too hard upon him, even if things go very wrong, because he typifies the political leadership this country has had for generations. Press dispatches from Moscow describe him as "jubilant" when he emerged from the last conference meeting and took his plane for home, and his chief reason for this happy mood is extremely revealing. He told waiting newsmen at the airport that "the important thing about the conference is that closer relations have been established." There speaks your typical American politician. Let's get together, boys, and talk things out. I'm sure we can arrange something. That's the idea every politician keeps in the back of his mind; and, in our domestic politics, where everyone is agreed on fundamentals, compromise is usually not only possible, but desirable. But in a world sundered by ideologies as deeply antithetical as democracy and totalitarianism yet shadowed by the common menace of the atom bomb, "compromise," as we Americans use the term in our political terminology, may be a frightful delusion presaging ultimate annihilation of the more idealistic or the more squeamish by those who think only in terms of ruthless force. If a man steeped in domestic politics, but with scant experience in world affairs, is first made Secretary of State and then sent to negotiate perhaps the most vital agreement of the postwar period, that is our fault and the fault of political practices that are a hang-over from our happy and diplomatically irresponsible past. Only—let us remember in time the classic warning: "Where there is no vision the people perish."

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1946

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution unanimously adopted by the Franklin County Board of Supervisors, my home county, in support of the great St. Lawrence seaway and power project:

Resolution 72

Whereas the welfare of the people of the State of New York is directly concerned in the successful completion of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project; and

Whereas the development of the St. Lawrence River will remove the last major obstacles to deep draft navigation throughout the Great Lakes system to the Atlantic Ocean and the port of the world; and

Whereas the same development will simultaneously make available 1,100,000 horsepower of low-cost hydroelectricity, under the self-liquidating State power project; and

Whereas the Legislature of the State of New York on March 15-16, 1944, by unanimous vote, adopted a resolution declaring that this State urgently requires the prompt development of the St. Lawrence to furnish low-cost power to millions of industrial, rural commercial, and domestic consumers: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we appeal for the immediate enactment of such legislation as may be necessary authorizing the St. Lawrence seaway and power development as a postwar project; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to our United States Senators and our Representatives in Congress.

Letter From J. B. Hutson, Acting Secretary of Agriculture, to Hon. Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRENT SPENCE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 18, 1946

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith insert a letter from Hon. J. B. Hutson, Acting Secretary of Agriculture, to the gentleman from Texas, Hon. SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House:

JANUARY 16, 1946.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: At the present time Commodity Credit Corporation is carrying out subsidy operations pursuant to section 3 of the act of April 12, 1945 (59 Stat. 50), with respect to sugar of the 1945 and prior crop years, in order to maintain existing price ceilings on sugar and to make adequate supplies of sugar available in the American market for the essential civilian, military, and foreign commitments of the United States. The existing limitations on subsidy operations by Commodity Credit Corporation preclude any such operations with respect to 1946 crops, including, of course, sugar. The 1946 crop of sugarcane is now being harvested in Hawaii and Puerto Rico.

Because of the extremely acute situation with respect to world supplies of sugar, the Department of Agriculture on August 1, 1945, announced a price support program for growers of sugarcane and sugar beets of 1946 crop under which subsidies would be paid, contingent upon authorization by the Congress of subsidy operations by Commodity Credit Corporation with respect to 1946 crops. This announcement was deemed necessary to encourage the production of the required quantities of sugarcane and sugar beets. It is essential to carry out these programs in order to assure the maximum production of sugar in Hawaii and Puerto Rico.

The fulfillment of the commitments made by the Secretary of Agriculture subject to Congressional approval, with respect to subsidy payments on 1946 crops of sugarcane in Hawaii requires approximately $12,100,000 in subsidy payments. The fulfillment of such commitments with respect to the Puerto Rican crop will require approximately $13,300,000. The amounts presently authorized to be expended for subsidies in section 3 of the act of April 12, 1945, supra, are sufficient to permit the proposed payments with respect to the 1946 crop of sugarcane in Hawaii and Puerto Rico, and it will not be necessary to authorize the expenditure of additional amounts to meet the requirements of these programs if the authorization contained in section 3 is amended to include 1946 crops.

This Department cannot overestimate the gravity of the situation with respect to sugar supplies and the necessity for encouraging the maximum production, harvesting, and processing of sugarcane. A decision has been reached to permit an increase of one-half cent per pound in market prices of refined sugar at this time. This price increase substantially reduces the amount of funds required for subsidy payments on sugar beets and sugarcane. If legislation authorizing the payment of subsidies with respect to 1946 crop sugar is not adopted, the alternative would be a drastic revision of domestic ceiling prices which would seriously impair the existing stabilization program.

There is enclosed a draft of proposed language which would effect the recommended change in section 3 of the act of April 12, 1945 (59 Stat. 50). Also enclosed is a memorandum containing section 3 of the act of April 12, 1945, as it would read if the proposed language were enacted.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it has no objection to this submission.

Sincerely yours,

J. B. HUTSON,
Acting Secretary.

South Dakota's Junior Chambers of Commerce Establish Record in Community Service Projects

REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 18, 1946

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, this week, Members of Congress have from time to time during the openings days of the second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress taken the floor to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD factual reports of the great achievements accomplished by the junior chambers of commerce of their respective States. At this time, I would like to list a brief summary of what the South Dakota Jaycees accomplished during 1945 since they have established a great record of community service:

SOUTH DAKOTA JAYCEES CARRIED ON THE FOLLOWING PROJECTS IN THEIR STATE THE PAST YEAR

YOUTH PROGRAMS

Maintaining and operating of youth canteens, services to orphan children, and parties and assistance to crippled children.

AGRICULTURE

Close working relations with 4–H groups, sponsoring of calf scrambles, assisting in county fairs, improving city and country relationship, putting on programs for rural schools, assisting in rodent and weed control, holding farmers' night programs and promoting horse shows for the benefit of the public.

SALVAGE PROGRAMS

During the war all junior chambers organizations throughout the State participated in tin can collections or waste paper drives. This was an important factor in gaining victory over our enemies.

AVIATION

Jaycees all over the State are participating in CAP projects and helping to promote community airports for the future of their communities.

SERVICE TO VETERANS

Servicemen from South Dakota were sent monthly news bulletins, cigarettes, playing cards, Christmas packages, phonograph records, by the various organizations during the war. Returning veterans are given every assistance possible upon returning to their community to get them adjusted once again to civilian life.

HARVEST LABOR

In a great many communities, the Jaycees took the initiative in providing the extra labor required to harvest the bumper crops South Dakota produced during the war years. Jaycees not only worked in the harvest fields after business hours but they organized all community volunteer workers in order that the harvesting could be done systematically and thoroughly.

Mr. Speaker, the officers of the South Dakota organization who provided the leadership in carrying forward the above projects were as follows: National Director, John D. Beatty, Redfield; president, Bert Veenker, Sioux Falls; vice presidents, Clarence A. Nichols, Madison; Winfield McCain, Rapid City; Harold Gray, Watertown; secretary, Paul Holman, Sioux Falls; treasurer, Charles Bennett, Sioux Falls; past president, Clarence Griffin, Watertown. These able and alert young men deserve rich credit for their part in promoting the activities of the South Dakota Junior Chamber of Commerce and of the local junior chambers in their respective communities.

One of the commendable features about the work of the Jaycees of South Dakota is the fine manner in which they cooperate with the senior chambers of commerce and other organizations of their communities. There is a healthy rivalry among them all—but no jealousy, no bitterness, and all work together for the advancement of South Dakota and its many potentialities. On many occasions the activity and insistence of the Jaycees have served to spur larger and older organizations into action. On the occasion of the twenty-fifth birthday of this vigorous young organization, South Dakotans join with Americans everywhere in doffing their hats to an up and coming organization which already has a great record of achievement behind it.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I conclude my remarks by inserting an editorial from the largest daily newspaper in South Dakota—the Daily Argus Leader of Sioux Falls—which pays a well merited and widely shared tribute to the Junior Chamber of Commerce of South Dakota with special emphasis, of course, on the work of its local Jaycees. The achievements of the Sioux Falls Jaycees are duplicated, however, in many other South Dakota communities.

JAYCEES PROVE WORTHY COMMUNITY BUILDERS

The United States Junior Chamber of Commerce has reached its twenty-fifth birthday, and on this occasion the Argus-Leader takes great pleasure in saluting Sioux Falls Jaycees for their influence and accomplishments in community betterment.

Junior chamber anniversary week, being observed this year from January 14 to 21, is an appropriate time to take stock of what our local organization has done within the past year to improve and develop the city and to improve and develop its individual members by training them for civic leadership.

Foremost among the activities of 1945, another glorious and fruitful year in Sioux Falls Jaycees history, were participation in the Red Cross drive, promotion of Americanism Week in the public schools, maintenance of blood banks at Sioux Valley and McKennan hospitals, rat eradication, fire prevention, support of supervised recreation, monthly birthday parties for crippled children at Sioux Valley hospital, an orphans' picnic, encouragement of good citizenship on Halloween by providing free movies with the cooperation of theater managers, donating of toys for orphans, sponsorship of the Little Sioux Baseball League which kept baseball alive in Sioux Falls during the war, collecting

coat hangers for the service club at the Sioux Army Air Field, regular mailing of the Mess Kit, monthly news bulletin, to approximately 3,000 Sioux Falls men in the armed forces in this country and abroad, and staging a calf scramble and providing an information booth for the Sioux Empire Fair.

Our Sioux Falls group carried out a phenomenally active and productive program through the arduous war years, when many members were never sure how much longer they would remain in Jaycees ranks. Now that Jaycees are returning from military service in large numbers, the local membership roster is being rapidly replenished, and even bigger things can be expected in the future.

The fact that the junior chamber has voted to increase its board of directors from 9 to 11 members indicates not only numerical growth but an obvious and promising intention to expand the organization's scope of endeavor.

The Fact-Finding Board and Settlement of Strikes

REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 17, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the method that is being used by the present administration to obtain a settlement of the steel strike is similar to that which was used in Michigan in 1937 when the then Governor of the State, acting with the knowledge of the President of the United States, called the people who had the right to bargain collectively for labor and for employees into a conference and kept them there on one occasion for as long as 48 hours.

Now, a settlement obtained under circumstances like that—in effect, it amounts to coercion—does not give very much promise of being permanent. It is a forced, not a voluntary, settlement.

Another thing is the fact that when General Motors did not accept the recommendations of this fact-finding board, so-called—and there are no members on that board who ever made automobiles—then the National Labor Relations Board moved into action with a charge of unfair labor practices.

Another thing: This morning before the Committee on Labor there appeared in support of legislation advocated by the administration one John Gibson, who is an adviser to the Secretary of Labor. Now, John Gibson is a former president of the Michigan CIO, having held that office for some time and until recent months.

What sort of settlement do you expect to get out of a fact-finding board and out of an administration conciliation agency when it lifts right out of the CIO one of the parties to the dispute, one of its officials, and puts him in position of authority here in Washington, exerting the power of the administration to settle the dispute to which his union is a party?

Amending Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 18, 1946

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I have submitted a bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, by repealing section 800 (b). The retention of this section is beginning to work a great hardship upon many ex-servicemen who have obtained employment, thereby relinquishing their readjustment allowance for unemployment.

Many thousands of these men are in the employment of large corporations where there has been work stoppage. Under the provisions of this section they are disqualified to receive compensation for their unemployment because this section so specifies.

The particular injustice is created because in some States, such as Pennsylvania, the civilian employee can receive unemployment compensation from the State.

The Veterans' Administration has interpreted this section to mean that regardless of whether these men are interested in the labor dispute which causes stoppage, they are still disqualified, and for this reason I have introduced this bill to amend the act by repealing section 800 (b) in order to clarify the situation.

On December 19, 1945, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman GREEN, introduced similar legislation, but no action has been taken. I am much interested in this, along with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman GREEN, and hope that some remedy may soon be forthcoming.

What Should Be Our Policy in China?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 18, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a radio speech given on the Town Meeting of the Air, December 27, 1945. I was glad to note that the Moscow Conference communiqué published the following day revealed that Russia and the United States had agreed to follow in China the same policy I urged in this talk and have been advocating for many years.

The speech follows:

The first reason why we must continue our long-standing policy of supporting the established Government of China is our national honor. We must make good on our promises. I am shocked that any American should actually propose that we withdraw from China before we have faithfully carried out commitments we assumed there, such as expelling the Japanese and restoring to China the territories, including Manchuria, which Japan seized from her. These commitments, as President Truman reminded us only 12 days ago, were made to the National Government of China, the government headed by Chiang Kai-shek.

As a responsible Member of the United States Government, I cannot even consider as a serious possibility any suggestion that this Nation betray its honor. If we go back on our solemn promises to an ally which fought so faithfully by our side, then are there any promises on which we won't go back if a large enough pressure group demands it? Is there any nation that could or ought to trust us again—not only in Asia but in Europe and Latin America as well? Is there any possible hope for peace if the world cannot depend on a nation's pledged word?

But even if our honor were not involved, our national interests require that we continue to support the Chinese Government. Having fought four long years to keep Japan from getting control of China, can we now afford to throw away that hard-brought victory by abandoning China to Communist control?

Most of the leaders around Chiang Kai-shek, from the Prime Minister, T. V. Soong, on down, were educated in our country. They want to make China as nearly like our country as possible. Not a one of the Communist leaders in China is a returned student from America. Most of them got their training under Russian Communists. Can anyone conceivably imagine that China under the Communists would be oriented primarily in our direction, either politically or economically?

Some Americans have supposed that the surrender of Japan meant the end of our responsibilities in Asia. As a matter of fact, whether we win the war there so it will stay won will be determined by what pattern ultimately dominates in the development of China.

Is it to be the racial pattern as Japan advocated—all the colored peoples against the whites?

Are the Chinese to be driven in disillusionment into the Communist pattern?

Or will they have a chance to develop a genuine democracy more nearly after the pattern we helped establish in the Philippines, which is what the overwhelming majority of the Chinese unquestionably wants? There is no more important question in the world—and the answer is still in our hands.

Why do you think our marines and our supplies are in China? For China's sake? Or for Chiang Kai-shek's sake? Most emphatically no. They are there for America's sake. They are there because of urgent necessity from the standpoint of our own future security. They are there not because we don't want our boys home, but because we do want them home—and able to stay home.

A serious civil war in China is against our interests, because that would create chaos

and a political vacuum in which some outside power would certainly intervene. The surest way to avoid such a disastrous civil war is for the United States to continue to support firmly our ally, the National Government of China—the same Government our other allies have promised to support. Russia, for example, has pledged both moral and material assistance to that government, so she certainly cannot and will not object to our assisting it too.

Without outside support the Communists cannot wage serious civil war. Their argument that we must withdraw support from Chiang in order to avoid civil war is wholly propaganda. Actually, for us to withdraw support from him would make civil war almost certain because it would give the Communists some hope of success.

Why do you suppose our American Communists are agitating all over the country and picketing the White House demanding that we withdraw from China if they did not know that would be of tremendous help to the Chinese Communists?

If some should claim that to support the Chinese Government is intervening in China's internal affairs, surely they know that it is not possible for any nation with such power as ours to escape having enormous influence on one side or the other in any major issue in the world, whatever we do or don't do. If our influence is not on one side, then automatically it is on the other. If we refuse to assist our Chinese ally, we thereby assist the rebellion which is trying to overthrow that ally.

I am a doctor. If I decide to operate in a case of appendicitis and the patient dies, it was my decision to operate which led to his death If I decide not to operate and the appendix ruptures and the patient dies, it was my decision not to operate which led to his death. Both are decisions.

If to continue support of Chiang is to intervene on his side, then to withdraw our support is to intervene on the Communist side.

Thus the only choice we have is, on which side are we to be? Are we to be by decision on the side of our own American interests? Or are we to be by default on the side that is avowedly determined to set up a social, political, and economic order which is the very antithesis of that in which we believe?

The recent restatement by President Truman of our China policy should enable General Marshall and all of us to cut through the fog of claims and counterclaims and get the facts as to who in China really wants unity and who does not.

If the Communists agree to become a political party without an autonomous army, and Chiang refuses to establish a democratic government with legal and equal status for all parties, then he is exposed, and ought to be

If, on the other hand, he is willing to establish such a government, and the Communists are unwilling to give up their separate army and administration and become a loyal opposition instead of an armed rebellion, then their pretenses are exposed, and ought to be.

I am confident of the outcome of this fair test, because I believe completely in the sincerity of Chiang's desire to achieve a unified democratic China without further warfare.

Unless or until there is clear evidence that the Chinese Government is not acting in good faith, every consideration of honor and of intelligent, legitimate self-interest requires that we continue unswerving support of that Government in finishing the war, while assisting every effort to achieve unity and democratic reform in a strong, independent, friendly China.

If there are risks in supporting Chiang Kai-shek, there are far greater risks in not supporting him.

Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1946

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, as the world watches anxiously, representatives of nations from every continent seek to establish the United Nations Organization on a firm foundation. If it is to merit ultimate approval and success, the rights of the smaller nations must be safeguarded as carefully as those of the great powers. Many difficult problems must ultimately be solved. Some of them concern the peoples and the lands of our heroic allies. None is of greater interest to Americans than the destiny of Poland concerning which I made the following remarks in a radio address over Station WSPR on Sunday, January 13, 1946, under the auspices of the Western Massachusetts branch of the Polish American Congress, Inc.:

Ladies and gentlemen, every resident of the Second Congressional District of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has learned to respect highly their American neighbors who were born in Poland or who are of Polish descent. As children and young men and women they have been eager, industrious, and capable students. For me, personally, the best evidence is the fact that I have appointed two of them to our great Naval Academy at Annapolis during the past 9 years. Each young man won his appointment by securing the highest ratings in stiff scholastic competitive examinations open to all students in the district on equal terms. During this war one of these young men went down with his warship. All lives on board were lost.

On our athletic fields, our school, college, and professional football, baseball, and basketball teams not infrequently carry a roster of names that reads like a meeting of the United Nations Organization. The star player often bears a Polish name. Americans of today do not have to recall the names of Pulaski or Kosciusko to realize the important part played by men of Polish blood in winning wars for the United States. We rub elbows with such heroes daily as we pass along American streets throughout our land. We know how hard the men and women who remained at home worked on the farms and in the industrial plants in the Connecticut Valley, how energetically and how enthusiastically they strove to make every War bond drive a success. We were filled with admiration in 1939 at the determination of the Polish people to fight for their country against the Nazi invaders, at the heroic defense of Warsaw. We entered the war. Polish names dotted American honor rolls throughout the land. Gold stars were placed solemnly and sadly opposite many of them.

The hostilities in Europe came to an end. France had been liberated along with Belgium, Norway, and Denmark. Their peoples have been free to set up the kind of government each wished to have. They have not been coerced. In France we have watched the various political parties strive for leadership in a free election.

What of Poland? To most Americans it is a dark enigma. Most of us have been supporters of the principles announced in the Atlantic Charter. We wish them to be applied fairly and justly in the settlement of the problems of the smaller as well as the great nations among our allies. Many Americans find it difficult to understand why that one of our allies who first resisted the Nazis fully and bravely should not be restored to its former full independence within its prewar boundaries. We are told that its boundaries must be changed to secure a proper solution of long existing European problems of that section of Europe. We have been told that its people will be given the right to hold free elections, unhampered by influences from nations outside its borders. But when? It would be easier for Americans to understand Polish politics if there were only two major political parties in Poland as in the United States instead of several parties, no one of which, if uncontrolled by outside pressure, may gain a clear majority of a popular vote. We are told that through pressure, elements from outside Poland have been granted powerful positions in each party. How can an election under such conditions be free? Great estates have been divided among many Polish landowners of small farms. That appears to be a step favorable to these farmers. Yet we learn that if they raise certain crops, such as hemp and flax, all of their produce must be delivered over to Government agents at a fixed low price. It is not the American way of life, and requires considerable explanation in the future. Churches and schools have reopened. This is well, even though much remains to be done.

The foreign ministers, even the heads of the great nations, have met from time to time to discuss and to plan for the solution of world and national problems. Of late little has been heard about any consideration of the problems of Poland.

Poland has suffered much. I spent most of the month of June 1945 in Europe. I saw great devastated areas in France, Germany, and Italy. I was told that Poland had suffered far worse than any of these countries. This winter the people of Poland must rely largely on the medical, food, and other supplies furnished by UNRRA to prevent mass starving and freezing. Our Congress voted huge American appropriations for this worthy cause, not only to help the Polish people but the peoples of Greece, Italy, and all other stricken countries. I was in Belgium under former President Hoover on relief work during the winter of 1914–15. I saw at first hand what great service well-organized relief work can accomplish. I am sure the Polish people will make certain that the supplies are used to the best advantage.

Next summer representatives of the United States will join those of other great powers at conferences which will start writing the terms of treaties of peace. Some day in the not-too-distant future the problems of Poland must be solved. Unless they are solved in such a treaty in 1946, Poland's position will be critical. Americans of Polish descent who know most about these problems, about the past and the present of the Polish people, their aims, their needs, and their aspirations will do well to inform the American people in every way possible concerning them. For if our representatives, backed up by the public opinion of a well-informed American people, aroused to the importance to the United States and to the future peace of Europe and the world of a just solution of the Polish problems, take a firm stand at one of these conferences that Poland's future must be included in the particular document before them, they will secure results. If the decision is delayed beyond 1946, Poland may be a long, long time in securing true freedom.

This is a great challenge to the leaders of American diplomacy. All Americans who can aid them have a great opportunity to render

invaluable service to an outstanding cause. A just decision will satisfy the Polish people and remove a possible cause of another European war.

Why There Is Dissatisfaction Among GI's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 18, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a letter from a resident of the Twin Cities who is an outstanding and highly responsible citizen. He encloses an extract of a letter he has just received from his own son stationed at Le Havre describing conditions there and making one or two very constructive suggestions for improving them.

In common with every other Member of Congress I have had a good many letters similar to this and I have repeatedly taken them up privately with the War and Navy Departments, not desiring to drag them out in public, or to besmirch the good name of our military units abroad, or to cause additional anxiety to relatives at home. However, there comes a time when one cannot subordinate the national welfare to any other consideration. I feel under obligation to speak of this publicly because the condition described cannot be longer tolerated.

No one appreciates more than I the enormous difficulties which our high command faced with the end of the war and the necessity of suddenly reversing practically all of our military movements. However, the peak of demobilization has now passed. There can be no further excuse for failing to give more thought and attention to all situations like that described below. They are dangerous to every man and woman involved, to our national honor and standing, and to our effectiveness in gaining the sort of decent world for which the men have fought so valiantly.

The letters follow:

JANUARY 14, 1946.

The Honorable WALTER H. JUDD,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. JUDD: Enclosed is an extract from a letter just received from my son who is at Le Havre. The letter was dated December 20. He and I both know that it is necessary for us to keep troops in Europe, and as it seems his duty to stay for a while we accept it as necessary. I am, however, gravely concerned about the conditions that he describes in this letter. The moral effects upon the boys themselves are certainly serious, but to me the far more serious thing is the effect that such preposterous stupidity in administration can have upon the attitude of other nations of the world toward the United States. After all, the United States troops are the ones that the common people of the world see, and not the silk-hat State Department. They are going to form their opinion of us and our abilities and efficiency from the way our men act. How in the world an Army that was smart enough to handle the stupendous problem of supply during the war could be so short-sighted as to permit the development of a situation such as is described here is beyond belief.

You are one of the few Representatives we have who have been forthright in coming out for what you believed was needed for world peace and stability. If the Army hasn't enough brains to properly handle a situation like this, let's put in some business executives, but in some way correct this situation before all the peoples of the world take us as a laughingstock, as apparently this same condition exists in many places where our troops are located.

For obvious reasons, I do not want my or my boy's name used in connection with this letter because of the effect it might have on him.

Respectfully yours.

Well, as long as this lasts it's good enough. Eight hours of work a day keeps one from too many depressing reflections on the redeployment situation in general. The whole plan here has, through the lack of interest or reflection on the part of any of the responsible officers, become hopelessly confused and muddled. Units wander all over France with no record anywhere of their whereabouts. The major commands issue contradictory orders which no one bothers to carry out or clarify; and when further snags arise, instead of working the whole thing out (as in the case of the black market in clothing here, where the trouble lies in the quartermaster depot, itself, and blame has been placed on units drawing from the depot only occasionally) they just invent more useless red tape, slowing down the processing of troops returning home, and curing nothing at all that anyone can see. The situation as a whole is so futile that one could be amused at its Gilbert-and-Sullivan extremes, if men were not being held up, morale sinking steadily among troops, resentment increasing among the French, and the whole working structure of the military installations disrupted. I know that these conditions exist not only here, but also, and in greater extremes, in Germany; and it's not hard to imagine the disastrous effect on American prestige, if you want, or at least effectiveness in the face of such asinine administration. The trouble, of course, lies not with the system but in the way the higher-ups have decided to make it work. Instead of placing low-point men in the port areas (here, Antwerp, Bremen, Marseilles) early in the spring, and making them run the place in an experienced manner, they have kept replacing port personnel each month with others just about to ship home. Men about to board ship can take no serious interest in learning new Army jobs or expediting the return of those behind them. Records are ruined, procedure boggled, and the results are showing on the December shipping totals, which are behind last month's, and not I understand for a lack of ships. Low-point men are given poor jobs for the most part, and since their noncoms and officers are waiting only for their boat, neither group gets a damn thing done. Our captain, for example, came in one day out of a week and a half, for half an hour; the rest of the time he is running nurses around town in his jeep and consuming an inordinate amount of Scotch. It's that way all over, and with irresponsibility on the part of the officer cadre (who have stuck to their posts about as well as I've always predicted) and the noncoms under them, black marketing of clothing and PX rations is zooming. The venereal rate is fantastic—it was 576 men per 1,000 per year in the xxxth when it pulled out—and the number of crimes of all sorts goes up all the time. There are women in all the officers' and most of our tents every night; God knows I enjoy liquor and all the rest as much as anyone else, but you can imagine the effect it has on daytime working efficiency.

Well, this turned out to be quite an editorial. I have no personal complaint at the moment, as for the first time since I've been in the Army I feel that in my own way I'm getting something constructive done; in the captain's absence I can act with his authority, and the three of us that came here from the xxxth have straightened out what was an incredible mess in pretty good shape. But the prospect of getting home in the future grows dimmer with all this mess, and until someone above the brigadier general who is letting it all increase shows some interest, there is no prospect of improvement.

United States Employment Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. HOOK
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 18, 1946

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address:

Friends and neighbors in the Twelfth District, on Monday, the Members of Congress will reconvene to take up the business of the Seventy-ninth Congress. We will have our job cut out for us—with some of the most vital reconversion problems still unsolved and the confusion in the reconversion program growing every day.

Before it recessed for the holidays, Congress was guilty—not only through negligence which must be laid at the door of some, but certainly not all, Members, but guilty by a positive act of contributing to the confusion on the economic front.

I am referring to the decision to return the United States Employment Service to the States for operation. The bill to shift control of USES from the Federal to the State governments was attached as a rider to set aside $52,000,000,000 in unused war appropriations.

Because of this rider, President Truman has killed the entire legislation through a pocket veto. In announcing his decision, the President justified the veto on the grounds that the return of the USES to the States "would result in a disrupted and inefficient employment service at the very time when efficient operation is most vitally needed."

I heartily concur in this sentiment. Before the recess, I bitterly opposed the disruption of the USES. I believed that the operation of this important national program on a national level was essential to the postwar reconstruction economy. Events since the time of the House debate on the issue have strengthened this belief.

I would go much further than the administration which asks only that the employment service be retained until June of 1947. I can see no valid argument why the USES should not be made a permanent adjunct of our Federal Government.

Employment and unemployment have long since ceased to be local problems—with local solutions. Employment, following the pattern established by industry cuts across State lines, transcends community or regional spheres. The trade unions, so important a

factor in the national economy, have recognized the interstate character of employment problems. They, and other progressive forces, have realized the fallacy, the wasteful ineptness, of treating workers today as though they were still handymen in the village smithy.

It is very significant to me that the Federal Government has had to be called in every time employment became critical. It was called in during the First World War. Again, it had to step in when depression hit the country. And without Federal operation of the USES during World War II, it is extremely doubtful that the victory production records ever would have been made.

This dependence on the Federal Government in times of employment crises is to me, not only an argument that a Federal USES is required today, but that permanent Federal control is needed.

No one could validly argue that we are not now in an employment crisis. Statistics abound to demonstrate the critical state of our national labor market.

The number of calls made on the more than 1,500 local USES offices in the 48 States have increased 100 percent since VJ-day. Requests for service on job placements, job information, job counseling, and other USES services have increased from 4,900,000 in July of last year to 9,600,000 in November. Each month in that period, and thereafter, has been a steady increase of several hundred thousand in the number of persons requiring some kind of employment assistance.

Against the background of the war mobilization—the military as well as industrial mobilization—these figures are easy to understand.

More than 12,000,000 men and women entered the armed services during the war. They will be home soon—millions of them are already home—and looking for civilian jobs. Eight million war workers are in the process of changing jobs.

This is an employment crisis greater than any the Nation has ever faced. It requires a program of national action.

The Federal Government, and the Congress as the national lawmaking body, have a responsibility, at the very least, to take care of all job seekers whose employment problem arose from the national war emergency. To retreat from that responsibility by returning the USES to the States for piecemeal operation is nothing but capitulation to political opportunism.

For several weeks before Congress recessed in December Washington was the gathering place, the mecca of State officials clamoring for return of the USES to the States. Who can believe that this cavalcade was not driven more by jealous concern than by fervid interest in States' rights or by honest belief that the States could do a better job?

There is considerable misconception as to just what the responsibilities of the USES local offices are. Some advocates of their return to State control base their belief on the idea that State control is essential for the administration of State unemployment-compensation laws. Some local business interests would prefer to remove all Federal controls on present job-referral practices. The effect of this would be to deny unemployment benefits to a worker who refuses to take a job offered through the USES that is unsuitable when compared with his experience and income requirements. What the denial of benefits in cases like this amounts to is using the USES to force down the worker's standard of living by driving labor into cheap jobs.

There is at least a minimum guaranty against exploiting the temporarily unemployed in this way when the USES is federally operated. The local USES offices are then subject to nationally accepted placement standards. Local offices of the USES under the present Federal controls are not permitted to send a worker to jobs where the working conditions are legally substandard or where wages are less than the prevailing rate.

The wisdom of this kind of minimum check against forcing wage standards down is obvious in a period when the whole national economy is dependent on sustained purchasing power.

However, the functions of the USES are not confined to processing claimants for unemployment compensation. It has the responsibility to assist employers in recruiting qualified workers or improving personnel practices.

It has the responsibility to give guidance to young people leaving school, and to give special attention and help to handicapped workers.

USES has the further job of handling the special problems of minority workers who will be at a disadvantage now that wartime labor shortages are disappearing.

A well-integrated, effectiv program filling all these needs cannot be met by State operation. In order to do a complete employment service job for the whole community, the USES must function as a national organization with responsibility to the whole community. One of the most important reasons for retaining Federal control of the USES involves the welfare of millions of veterans. In the GI bill, the Congress promised returning service men and women efficient placement service and employment counseling, regardless of the veteran's place of residence. The Congress gave the USES this special responsibility, and in accordance with this congressional mandate, the USES has set up special programs to take care of the jobless veterans. Within the limits of a far-too-limited staff, it has done an excellent job.

It is clearly unrealistic to suppose that anything but a national set-up can take care of the needs of millions of war veterans. We have the responsibility to employ the most efficient means possible to assist ex-servicemen to get back into normal civilian pursuits.

More than 50 percent of the estimated 6,000,000 servicemen who have re-entered the labor market have turned to the USES for help of some kind or another. In Michigan alone, upwards of 150,000 veterans have registered. These registrations are constantly increasing—in greater percentage than the increased registrations of nonveterans.

The number of job placements for World War II veterans have grown from 87,000 in July to 128,000 in November of last year.

The task of fitting a veteran to a suitable job is a painstaking and delicate one. Many of the veterans are disillusioned about employment opportunities as soon as they put on their civvies. As a consequence, they do a lot of shopping around before they accept employment. Their shuffling around is not confined to their home locality. This understandable fussiness about jobs on the part of veterans is further complicated by the fact that very many of the veterans have little or no skills.

Obviously, a Federal system is necessary to adequately provide for the veterans' needs. The USES, as now operated under Federal control, is prepared to handle their needs. It has information about employment conditions in the important job centers, for instance, so that veterans could get advance advice about jobs while still at military hospitals or separation centers. Hundreds of thousands of veterans have used this information—information that it would be difficult, if not impossible for purely State agencies to gather.

One last point I would like to make about the folly of returning the USES to the States for operation. We have had a national system of financing State employment services for more than 10 years. From the very beginning of that system, the trend has been toward greater and greater financial support from the Federal Government. By 1941, 95 percent of State employment office costs were borne by the Federal Government. During the war, of course, the total cost of the USES was paid for out of War Manpower Commission appropriations.

In view of this, it is entirely misleading to speak of giving the employment service back to the States. The real question is not whether we should return the USES to the States for operation, but whether the federally financed employment service is to be operated as a national agency devoted to the welfare of the American people as a whole.

Saga of the People's Al

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, October 4, 1945, marked the occasion on which His Excellency the Most Reverend Francis J. Spellman, archbishop of New York, inaugurated, at a dinner, the building of the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Hospital.

Since that day many functions have been held for this splendid enterprise. Which reminds us Republicans that there are Democrats whose memory challenges the admiration, love, and affection of both parties and all Americans.

In the December 1932 issue of Vanity Fair I wrote a short and sentimental biography of that remarkable and beloved Democrat, Alfred Emanuel Smith. Rereading it after more than 13 years I see nowhere I would change or qualify the estimate it makes of the man himself. Today his spirit looms larger than ever, for in the end it was Al Smith who best loved and understood the common man.

SAGA OF THE PEOPLE'S AL—A STORY IN A SIMPLE MANNER OF AN EAST SIDE DEMOCRAT WHO WAS ONCE KNOWN TO MILLIONS AS THE HAPPY WARRIOR

(By Clare Boothe)

His mother was the daughter of an Irish immigrant, and his father was a truckman on the New York water front.

(O, sing us a song of democracy, a song of the city streets.)

"East side, west side, all around the town!
"The band plays ring-a-rosy, London Bridge is falling down!"

His grandparents came out of Ireland in a clipper ship, a clipper ship with 27 billowing sails, and it docked at Beekman Street. His mother was born on the corner of Dover and Water Streets, over the Dammermans' grocery store.

Apples in barrels, potatoes in barrels, and fresh vegetables in their bins. Flour in sacks, meal in sacks, and sawdust on the floor. The odors of spice, sweet cinnamon, and sugar, and the warm smell of ripe bananas and purple grapes.

Catherine Mulvehill was born over the Dammermans' grocery store.

His father was a boss trucker, and he stood 6 feet and over in his stocking feet. His father was as strong as his team together, and every day he drove to the docks, trucking from the ships that came in. He un-

loaded chests of tea from China; spices, cocoa, fruits from the West Indies; and coffee from Brazil. These were the things that the boss trucker loaded on his wagon, bending his great, sweaty back all day, all night, trucking by candlelight and in the dawn that crept into the slips on the water front: into Market Slip, James Slip, Peck Slip, Rutgers Slip, and Coenties Slip. He stored his truck at night in front of the darkened warehouses by the slips, and walked beside the horses, back to the stables. On Sundays he rested, and he was very tired.

Now he had a long memory and an Irish tongue for stories. He told his stories over a glass of good beer to the Sandy Hook pilots and the dock hands. They gathered to hear them in the corner saloon, and they laughed and paid for his beers.

Alfred Smith was a boss trucker, and at home his wife, Catherine, made hoop-skirts and umbrellas to sell, and they were very poor, but they loved each other and feared God, and they were happy.

Alfred and Catherine had a son, and this was Alfred Emanuel. He was born in 1873, the year that Ulysses S. Grant was President, and that was the year after Calvin Coolidge was born, and Herbert Hoover was born the next year.

When Alfred Emanuel was 10 years old he became an altar boy.

On cold winter mornings, even in the year of that great blizzard, he got up at 5 o'clock in the morning, and his mother gave him a cup of coffee and a roll, and at 6 o'clock he was at mass, swinging the censers of God before the altar of St. James' church.

Dominus vobiscum, et cum spiritu tuo.

He was a newsboy along the water front when he was 12 years old. His route was Beekman Street, Fulton Street and the foot of Peck Slip.

Daily Noose, Sun, Woild, Post, Globe, Telagra-am, Mai-ul and Expra-us!

All his childhood was spent in the shadow of the Brooklyn Bridge, for he lived on Dover Street by the anchorage tower of the great span. His mother often told him that many men were killed sinking that pier, and when he was 13 years old, his father died in its shadow.

"The Brooklyn Bridge on Sunday is known as Lover's Lane.
I stroll there with my sweetheart, oh, time and time again;
Oh, how I love to ramble, oh, yes, it is my pride.
Dressed in my best, each day of rest, with Danny by my side."

When the summers were hot he swam naked with the other boys in the East River. They dove in their white skins, dodging the crates and driftwood in the swift tide of the East River that brought the clipper ships like white birds, and the scows and barges like beetles, and the angry tugs, and lazy ferries into the harbor waters. He swung from the masts and bowsprits of the boats at the wharves, and the rigging of ocean wanderers was his gymnasium and his playground. But his fancy did not go outward with the ships for his heart was anchored to the water front and he found adventure enough on the sidewalks of New York.

Sometimes friendly sailors gave him their alien pets; once he owned an African parrot that swore lustily, and a sad-faced monkey, and an Indian goat. Or, he picked up stray dogs in the slums, and brought them home, and he loved these mongrels best.

Alfred Emanuel was a newsboy, and an altar boy from Dover Street, and he lived always in that part of town which was the cradle of the growing city.

Gala days were bicycling days, when the bells tinkled and the lights twinkled on the bicycles going to Coney Island. There was roller skating in the City Hall Park, and base ball in the back lots behind the blind warehouses, and there was sleighing and sliding in the winter, for in those times the snow was left on the streets until it melted away. Central Park was a long way off. Central Park was not for him.

And there were parades. On St. Patrick's Day the Mulligan Guards paraded, swinging up the Bowery.

"We shouldered gun, and marched and marched away,
From Baxter Street we marched to Avenue A."

And there were torchlight processions during the campaigns. He watched them from the top of a lamppost, or the fire escape of a tenement house, and he beat time to their step as they sang:

"Blaine! Blaine! James G. Blaine!
A con-tin-ent-al li-ar from the State of Maine!"

And he laughed when he heard them shout "Rum, Romanism, and rebellion!"

When school closed in the afternoons, he loitered around the station house of engine company No. 32.

Hook and ladder, hose and hatchet, smoke and cinders, brass and bells. Ladder and ax, and shining helmet, and the mad gallop of the white horses, manes flying, hoofs thundering to the alarm.

Peter Mulvehill was a fireman, and that was his uncle. Alfred Emanuel wanted to be a fireman when he grew up.

Alfred Emanuel became a fish-market clerk.

Bluefish, whitefish, mackerel, and cod, brought to the Fulton Market by the well-laden smacks that turned out of Buttermilk Channel.

He was the boy of all work in the Fulton Fish Market, and this work was hard. He got $12 a week, and his sister and mother got all the fish, and more, that they could eat at home.

The neighborhood knew him and loved him well. In the neighborhood there were dark-eyed Italians, and the Jews who brought Zion with them, and stolid Germans, but mostly there were poor Irish. The clerk of the district court was a grand fellow, and the alderman was a man of weight, and the neighborhood knew them and respected them, and Alfred Emanuel knew them all. Sitting on the stoops in the cool of the summer evening, watching the horse cars go by, and the children playing in the empty trucks, and in the gutters, and the lamplighter coming on his rounds; they it was:

Good evening to you, Mrs. Malone.
And how are you, Mr. Hennessy?
And hello, Al.
"Hello, Al!
"East side, west side, all around the town."

The Tammany clubs were jolly clubs; they gave food and sacks of coal to Mrs. Malone; they gave jobs and clothing to Mr. Hennessy; and gifts to all the children at Christmas time. In the summer they took the whole neighborhood, all that would go, on outings and picnics and chowders up the river. And Al always went along, because he loved them and they loved him. They ate clam fritters and drank ale and beer on the outings, and nobody got very drunk. And when they were back in the neighborhood they did not forget at the polls the men who had given them the coal and the jobs and the picnics.

Alfred Emanuel grew up with the Tiger; he was the Tiger's cub, and he never felt her claws.

There was drama in him and an urge to act. There was St. James Parish, and the parish had amateur theatricals, and when he was too old to be an altar boy he acted in them. He had a long memory and an Irish tongue for stories. He had a lusty voice, a merry eye, an easy way, and great good humor. And there was nobody in the neighborhood who could dance a better jig.

One time he played in Dion Boucicault's play, the Shaughraun, and he was Corry Kinchilla, the villain, and the hero was played by a young fellow called James J. Walker, and that play was well-cast and a great success. He wanted to be a real actor when he became a man.

When he was 22 years old he became a process server. He served summons for jury duty on all kinds of people—storekeepers, and bankers, and businessmen, and they abused him when he served them, but they remembered him long after, and recalled his Irish wit, and that they had really felt friendly to him at the time.

His sweetheart was the cousin of a policeman, and that was Katie Dunn. She lived in the Bronx. Many nights, going to where she lived from where he lived in the Fourth Ward, and back again, he went without sleep, so that he could pay her court. He wore a derby hat, and wide striped trousers, and always had a long cigar in his breast pocket when he went to call. And he saved his money to bring her flowers and boxes of candy.

At the turn of the century, in 1900, on the 6th of May, he married Katie Dunn, and they went to live on the water front.

Katie Dunn washed and cooked and ironed for him and she bore him five children, and loved him all the days of her life.

Now Tom Foley was the boss of the Fourth Ward. He was a young man when he came to New York, and at that time he was a blacksmith. He started a saloon on the corner of Oliver and Water Streets, and this was the year before Alfred Emanuel was born, and old Tom Foley lived in the Fourth Ward until he died. One day Tom sent for a man called Campbell who owned property and a grocery store on Vesey Street, and when the man came into the back room of his saloon, Tom said to him: "You better dig up Al, and ready him up. It looks as if this convention wants to nominate him."

That was in 1903, the year that Alfred Emanuel went to Albany as an assemblyman.

Tom Foley was a blacksmith and a saloonkeeper and a ward boss. But he knew Al, and he saw that Al had a heart in his breast and brains in his head.

Newsboy, altar boy, fish-market clerk, amateur actor, process server, assemblyman.

When Al went to the assembly, old Tom Foley said to him, "If you make a promise, keep it; and if you tell anything, tell the truth"; and that was something Al always tried to remember.

He took his first oath of office in the parlor of the assembly on a cold January morning. In the crowded years that followed Al took 17 oaths of office in that same room, and 4 of them were as Governor of the greatest State in the Union.

The first years in the assembly were hard years, and Al did not like it there, until he learned the facts, and understood the rules and procedure, and got into the swing of things. Soon there was nobody in the assembly who knew more than Al did about the business of legislation, and how the Empire State spent the people's money.

When he had been there 10 years, they made him speaker. He had mild blue eyes, and a gentle smile, but his voice roared like the bull of Bashan's, and the wit of his tongue cracked like a teamster's whip, and somehow, Al seemed to be a man who got things done.

William Allen White, the editor from Emporia, said of him in those days, "He kept his old friends with his heart, and made new friends with his head."

He was 12 years in the assembly, and in those 12 years, he helped to pass many good laws which are written in the books of the State where you can read them if you are curious. Now, many of them affected the workman and the widow and the orphan, and those who live in slums, for Al was himself born in the slums, and he knew that proverty has its own noblesse oblige.

Many people said that Al was a "regular" who always went along with Tammany, and

this was true in the beginning. But by and by Al made Tammany go along with him, so that he could still be "regular," and still get where he wanted to go.

Tammany, in the way it has, rewarded him for being "regular," and for his strength with the people. Tammany made him sheriff in 1916, and this job paid him well. Al could do a lot more for his family now, and he built a wing on his old house on Oliver Street, and he bought an automobile.

Then he left Albany for a little while, and this was when he became president of the board of aldermen in New York.

Now Al had begun to grow a little round stomach, and when he talked his face turned red as the apples in the Dammermans' grocery store, and the sweat dripped from his brow as it had once dripped from the boss truckman's back; but he had learned to wear tails and a white tie, and rich men as well as poor men liked to be seen talking to him. So, after a while, politicians up-State, and even outside of Tammany Hall began to talk of "Smith for Governor."

The first day that Al went to Albany, way back in 1904, he sent his mother a post-card of the Executive Mansion, and on the back he had written, "Someday I will live here."

When Al heard that he had been elected, he went to his mother, and he kneeled beside her, and she blessed him, and then later she showed him the post-card, and after that she showed it to all the neighbors.

Four times Alfred Emanuel Smith was Governor of New York State, and there were very few people who did not say that he was the best governor that the State had ever had.

Once, when Al was campaigning for his third term, Franklin Delano Roosevelt wrote him a letter, and it said: "Dear Al: * * * You have given to the State an honest, clean, and economical government. You represent the hope of what may be called 'the average citizen.'" Years went by and that average citizen was given a fine new name, he was called "the forgotten man."

Nineteen hundred and twenty-four was a big year in Al's life. That was the year the Democrats held their convention in the old Madison Square Garden. That was the year when Al first began to believe that he might one day be President, when the Democrats balloted 103 times in July heat and party confusion, amid limp bunting and still flags, in anger, in bitterness, and in mortal weariness, trying to break the deadlock between McAdoo and Smith.

"Alabama casts its 24 votes for Osc-c-arr W. Under-r-wood."

That was the first time that all the bands played East Side, West Side, All Around the Town, and Al, My Pal * * *.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt, on a new pair of crutches, came from the bed of a paralytic and stood on the platform to put this son of a boss-trucker and an Irish seamstress in nomination for the Presidency of the United States, and it was he, no other, who in that speech dubbed Al the Happy Warrior.

The years that followed were full years, and in them Al never forgot the White House, but he was never known to neglect his duty dreaming of it.

In 1928 the sons of Jefferson and Jackson nominated him for President. It was then that many things became clear to Al, and to the people. All the things that Al had been and still was he put before the people, and they considered them. It seems that they had forgotten many of these things—that Al was a good Catholic and that he had been an altar boy.

"Pax vobiscum * * * cum spiritu tuo."

All during this campaign the voters remembered that Al had drunk beer on the ward "chowders" up the river, and that he did not believe in prohibition, and that he had always thrown the weight of his influence in legislation against it. They remembered that he was a regular Tammany man, and that he was born down by the east-side docks, and had been a newsboy.

"Daily Noose, Sun, Woild, Tela-gra-am, and Expra-us!"

They remembered his brown derby, and the black cigar which he had always carried, even when he went to call on the former Katie Dunn in the Bronx, and that he had never read books, or learned to speak like a college man.

They remembered, and Al did not and would not let anyone forget these things. Al was not a man to forget what he was, or whence he had sprung. He was proud of it.

Now everywhere, in hotels and restaurants, on the sidewalks of a hundred cities, in farm houses, and factories, came over the "raddio," Al's strident voice, and great good humor, and the facts which he poured from the reaches of his long memory, and always when he came and went there was the echo of the song of democracy in the city streets.

"East Side, West Side, all around the town."

Then the people whispered among themselves, and they voted. Al lost the election.

And when he had lost the election, many people said that his defeat had embittered him and disillusioned him and that he was a changed man, no longer a man who believed in democracy, and that he had left the people in his heart.

They said this, again, when he left Oliver Street, down by the East River, where he had voted for 35 years and where his mother had been born, and went to live in a penthouse on Fifth Avenue. From there he could see the pleasant green patches that are Central Park. Central Park had not been for him when he was a boy.

Then Al helped to build the tallest building in the world, and from the top of its 102 floors, he could see spread out at his feet all of Manhattan, and dimly he could see Long Island, where the homes of the rich are, and he could see New Jersey, but he could not see as far as Washington.

So 4 years passed, and when the Democratic Convention came around again Al went to Chicago, and once more he dreamed that he might be President. "I am in this," he said, "for myself," and "The man who would not have an ambition for that office would have a dead heart," he said. But Franklin Delano Roosevelt had gotten there ahead of him, for Franklin D. Roosevelt was a good politician, too, and he put himself over on the fifth ballot. And although the galleries cheered, and Massachusetts stood firm, and the liberals wept, and the band played East Side, West Side, this time the campaign song was not for Alfred Emanuel Smith.

Al came back to New York after that. And for a long while he stayed in his tent. People began to say, "Smith is no longer 'regular,'" and "The Happy Warrior is finished now. He is bitter, and all the fight and fire are gone out of him."

Then Al became an editor. The man who had never read began to write and read. But this was not Al. Al could not long be like this. So one day he took off his coat and his vest and went to work for the ticket. And when he saw Franklin Delano Roosevelt—who had once, standing on new crutches, nominated him for President, who had taken the governor's chair which Al had gladly given to him, who had taken the nomination which Al had not wanted to give him at all—then Al took his black cigar from the side of his wide mouth, and reached out his red hand, and said in a loud and hearty voice, "Hello, Old Potato."

"Hello, Old Potato."

And the campaign was on.

When Al made his first speech there was an old bile and an ancient bitterness in him which again flowed out, and though that speech cleansed his heart and his spirit, it poisoned many who had not been his enemies before. But the people who loved him, and whom he had not forgotten, did not care, and they all voted for his friend Frank, because Al, who had himself almost been President, asked them to. * * *

Altar boy, newsboy, fish-market clerk, amateur actor, process server, assemblyman, sheriff, governor, Presidential candidate, Empire State builder, leader of his party.

This is the saga of a Tammany man, of the Happy Warrior, the wearer of the brown derby, of the people's Al.

But this is not the end: Alfred Emanuel Smith is a good politician and a strong man, and he has a heart in his breast and brains in his head, and there are still many things for a man who gets things done to do—East Side, West Side, and all around the town.

Last to Reconvert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the Chicago Daily Tribune on January 3, 1946:

LAST TO RECONVERT

Government officials have taken the turn of the year as the occasion for congratulating themselves on the speed with which the country has reconverted to a peacetime basis. What do they mean, reconversion? The biggest economic distortion the war brought was not in what we had to eat nor in the way we lived. There were shortages of many things and we had to get along with inferior substitutes for others, but the really profound dislocation was in the expansion of Government expenditures and the inflation of the currency to finance the deficit. Accordingly, the success of the reconversion from war back to peace can be measured best by the progress made in cutting the payments by the treasury and the discontinuance of the inflation.

Actually the shrinking of the Government outgo has been nil. New ways are being found to spend money. New international obligations are being proposed to substitute for those which ended with peace. New doctrines are being stated for justifying a continuance of a vastly swollen Budget.

Willard Edwards, of our Washington staff, in an article in Sunday's Tribune, quoted figures supplied by Representative JONES, of Ohio, which should cause grave concern to every thoughtful American. He said that the Truman administration plans to spend at the rate of $66,000,000,000 in the coming fiscal year and gave the detailed figures derived from Treasury data and information supplied to the Appropriations Committee which add up to this amount. The Congressman said that the Army and Navy expect to get twelve and one-half billions besides two and one-half billions for compulsory military training. The regular Government department will cost eighteen and eight-tenths billions, Mr. JONES indicated. With continuing deficits, the cost of carrying the debt will be ten billions a year, he said. Among other items which run the total to sixty-six billions are a half billion each for increased Federal salaries, Federal highways, and new river-valley authorities. The Truman health program accounts for six hundred millions.

Peacetime reconversion would mean getting the budget back to the fifteen- or eighteen-billion-dollar level. To reach the goal spending must be slashed all along the line and new proposals for appropriations firmly rejected, even if that means the loss of some votes.

The reconversion can well start with the admirals and generals. Fourteen billions for the national defense is ridiculous. The cost of the national defense stayed below a billion dollars until 1938 and did not go over the billion and a half mark until 1940. These amounts we now know were inadequate. However, in the early postwar years we shall have a huge reserve of trained men, besides vast supplies of ships, munitions, tanks, aircraft, and installations which can quickly be brought into use. Research needs to be continued, and even stepped up. With care and intelligence $4,000,000,000 should pay for both the Army and Navy.

On the rest of the budget a major operation needs to be performed. The wartime agencies—OPA, the propaganda agencies, and all the rest—ought to be cut off without any delay. The expenditures undertaken to boost prices, like the Commodity Credit Corporation, are not only superfluous but a positive menace when the problem is to keep prices down. The programs for grants to the States, which were put into effect when the treasuries of the States were busted, ought to be ended at once now that the State treasuries are bulging with money and State credit is better than national credit.

When these steps have been taken we can be said to have made some progress toward reconversion. When the economies are put into effect the currency will be safe, for the inflation which now goes on every day will be ended.

The national budget need not be more than 15 or 18 billion dollars, but it cannot be reduced to that extent except by men of high purpose and great skill who are willing to ride roughshod over vested interests. Reconversion of the Government to peacetime proportions is the country's biggest problem in 1946.

Ceiling Price on Raw Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1946

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter to the Honorable Chester Bowles, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, and his reply thereto:

JANUARY 14, 1946.

Hon. CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator, Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BOWLES: I am calling your attention to a wire sent to you by Mr. M. G. Mann, general manager, North Carolina Cotton Growers Association. Mr. Mann has also sent a wire to the President regarding the ceiling price on raw cotton.

Nothing has occurred in the Southern States since I have been in Congress that has so stirred the cotton growers as the announcement that a ceiling price will be placed on their product. Representing a cotton growing district and being familiar with the situation, I am certain it would be an act of injustice to the cotton growers and cause the greatest resentment of anything that has occurred in the Southern States since the outbreak of the war.

Everything considered, I do not think that the price of cotton is at all high. The fact is that everything that goes into the production and sale of cotton has sky-rocketed, including labor, and some of the cotton is yet in the fields because the growers have been unable to secure pickers.

I hope you will withhold action in this matter until the facts can all be brought to your attention and those who will be so adversely affected by the order can be given a hearing.

With great respect, I am,
Very sincerely yours,

R. L. DOUGHTON.

JANUARY 16, 1946.

The Honorable R. L. DOUGHTON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DOUGHTON: Thank you for your letter about the question of ceiling prices on cotton.

As you know, the Emergency Price Control Act as amended provides that before growers' maximum prices are established for an agricultural commodity which is the product of annual or seasonal planting, notice of the proposed maximum prices must be given at least 15 days prior to the normal planting season.

I think you will agree that, as Price Administrator, I would be remiss in my duties if I foreclosed myself from any right to take whatever action seemed necessary with respect to such an agricultural commodity. It was for this reason, and this reason only, that I approved the issuance of the recent notice covering raw cotton during the crop year 1946. Without such a notice, it would have been legally impossible, regardless of circumstances, for us to establish any such maximum prices later in the year. This, and I want to emphasize the point, is only a technical procedure. It has no bearing on the actual question of whether there should or should not be ceiling prices on raw cotton. I sincerely hope that such a program will be unnecessary. However, I could not shut myself off from the opportunity to judge this situation on its merits in the future.

I want you to know that the announcement that we have made does not necessarily indicate a final decision by this office to fix ceiling prices as indicated in the notice, or at any other figures. If it becomes evident that the price of cotton is becoming stabilized because of improvement in supply or other reasons, of course, it may not be necessary for the proposed ceiling prices to be put into effect. I am very conscious also of the difficulties which might be encountered in the administration of cotton ceilings. I want to assure you that we are constantly watching the situation and that every relevant factor and circumstance will receive thorough consideration.

Recognizing your knowledge of cotton problems, I appreciate very much your expression of your views on this matter.

Sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator.

Veterans' Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1946

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, we all know that housing is one of the chief problems of the day in this country. The recent order placing a limit of $10,000 on new houses with a minimum rental value of $80 a month is not the solution to our needs. What veteran or working person can afford these prices? We are all aware of the fact that returning GI's and their families are running into difficulties in finding any kind of a place in which to live.

Under the $10,000 ceiling a person would have to earn from $375 to $500 a month in order to afford to build a house. Neither the GI nor the average family can afford this. Where are the three-fourths of the American families whose income after taxes is less than $3,000 a year going to live and where and when are they going to get new homes?

What the returning veterans and the average American family needs is a house that sells for $5,000 and rents at $40 or less. We do not want to keep alive a system whereby most of the new houses are built for the wealthy while the average family has to take just what is left. To continue such a system breeds discontent, poverty, slums, disease, and crime.

It is time, therefore, for public and private builders to get together and outline a plan for the public good whereby materials will be allocated for $5,000 homes, scarcities overcome, bottlenecks broken, and price ceilings established which will give the little people a break in their quest for security and a decent place in which to live.

Army and Navy Merger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1946

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, the question of Army and Navy merger—or unification of the services—is becoming more heated as the days go on. In the rush to do something, I have been fearful that there are some very great errors being made.

On January 11, 1946, I addressed a letter to the President of the United States on this subject. Copy of that letter follows:

JANUARY 11, 1946.

PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As a member of the House Appropriations Committee concerned with the taxpayers' money insofar as the national defense is concerned, I am constrained to write to you about my misgivings over the present controversy and your recommendations in the matter of the proposed merging of the armed services under a single, new department head.

It is my purpose herein to submit to you my views and the reasons for my misgivings.

At the outset—although I have looked into the testimony both before the Woodrum committee and those currently before the Senate Military Affairs Committee—I come to the inescapable conclusion the present proponents of merger will not really achieve unification whereas the opponents of present merger proposals might have within their

grasp exactly what you are reaching for. This is not to say I favor the Navy plan.

To put it bluntly and tear away the masquerade, the issues rest in suspicions and fears within both services that one will be submerged to the elevation of the other. It is obvious that these fears are occasioned by the fact that the country is being offered a hodge-podge plan rather than a program for true streamlining and true implementation of national security.

While this truth has crept occasionally into the record, the burden of the record has had to do with a good deal of loose, unsupported talk about vast economies to be accomplished, the avoidance of duplication of manpower and facilities in procurement, hospitalization, and combat strength.

I am wholeheartedly in favor of the greatest streamlining possible, compatible with the special business of maintaining the national security. I am also in league with you who deem a closer integration of diplomatic intelligence with the military is essential to guaranteeing this security. So I have no quarrel with you or others who are earnestly seeking unification, not as a subterfuge but as a potent reality. I am for unification.

My questioning turn of mind, however, arises around your position that in order to achieve it we must tear down such approaches already realized in that direction for untried methods which go so far as to rearrange our basic concept of government.

A plan—the War Department plan—which talks unification in one breath and then in the other advocates a separate air force must be subject to careful examination before it is taken at face value. In short, that is, so to speak, unification through separation. A plan—the Navy Department plan—which sets up a council of national security and a joint chiefs of staff sounds, on the surface, like a defense to offset the threat which it believes is aimed at its existence. Yet this seems to come closer in arriving at the desired end than the Army plan, for it leaves the destiny of the separate air force up to the Army and to Congress, and yet I am not for the Navy plan.

My fixed opinion is that the Navy Department did not go far enough, obviously through fear of not being taken seriously. So it is my proposal that (if we are after a real unification) we start with an examination of what we have achieved in that direction. That start is in the Navy Department and its sister services, the Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and merchant marine.

Right now the needs in command are for those who are versed in joint land, sea, and air operations. Such command will be found within the Navy Department where there is no separate air force and none desired; where the "infantry" is the Marine Corps; where the Seabees are the construction unit; the surface ships the bombardment or artillery unit; where the merchant marine is the supply line; the submarine force a closely integrated unit of reconnaissance, communication, and attack; and the carriers a single striking unit for attack and defense, both by sea and air.

Furthermore, unless we wish during peacetime to transport a large army around the world and are permitted to occupy large areas of friendly countries, the principal contact for maintaining international military intelligence must, perforce, be the forces of sea-air power, in collaboration with the Department of State and the War Department.

The Navy and marines represent an integrated organization using common supply officers, doctors, chaplains, service of supply. Economically, it represents a saving to the taxpayers to have the marines as the policing and striking power. They are in the forward areas, they are combat troops, they will be the first to engage the enemy.

Here is no paper organization possibly doomed to failure in actual existence due to personal bias and innumerable human factors which cannot be achieved by legislative fiat. In urging a plan whereby the sea-air-marine forces become a central unit of any unified command, I desire to point out that the only element which the United States Army possesses that is not now operational in the United States Navy is that of high-altitude, long-range bombers. Obviously, this is why the officers of this command want a separate Army Air Force unfettered by a ground juggernaut which thinks in terms solely of land operations. The bill recently introduced in the House by the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, Mr. MAY, and the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, Mr. VINSON, creating a separate Army Air Force gives Army air its rightful position in the national security set-up.

The spearheads of victory in the past Global War were air, sea-air, and sea with air. This will be so in any future conflict, although it again, in all probability, will remain for the land forces to consolidate the spearhead operations. This would seem to be the position of the advocates of universal military training, namely, a trained land force in readiness rather than in continuous being.

To be sure, it required a vast army to bring ultimate victory in Europe but before this army could come to grips with the enemy it required a vast naval and air arm both to prepare its path and to transport it. The Pacific theater of operations, of course, provided the perfect example of the impact of sea power, sea-air power, and high-altitude bombing.

It provided also the classic example of the effectiveness of the Navy's integrated system which brought General Douglas MacArthur and his army step-by-step all the way from Australia to Tokyo Bay. In this connection it must be borne in mind that it was Navy air which supported every major landing and then it was the marines in amphibious craft or a marine operation by army who established the beachheads.

Had the Marine Corps been larger it might have been possible for the Navy and Marine Corps, and their Coast Guard and Seabee units, to have wrested the victory in the Pacific without the necessity of transporting millions of men all the way from Europe to the Pacific. This brings up for consideration what should be the size of the Marine Corps under the system which I propose. My estimate would be 1,000,000 men and officers trained in all phases of amphibious warfare.

From the first occupational landing in the Dominican Republic in 1801 up to the termination of World War II, the United States marines had made approximately 300 landings of all characters including assault, diversionary support, and occupational. In other words, here is not only the combat spearhead of our armed forces but also a unit of great and trained versatility.

To reiterate, in making a start toward unification of command, let us start where there is already the highest degree of integration between land, sea, and air. This lies in the Naval Establishment. Here is unity in fact, not in theory. Moreover, under the plan I propose the present balance of military power would be retained by preservation of the two Cabinet posts involved and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Finally, it should be axiomatic that whatever plan will accomplish the desired ends with the least upheaval of the existing organization is the one to be adopted. I can see nothing but upheaval, confusion, and waste accruing from the Army monopoly program put forward by the Army under the guise of unification.

Respectfully yours,

WALTER C. PLOESER.

Can This Be True?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 18, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from a reputable correspondent comes the following newspaper article:

VETS OUTRANKED BY NEWCOMERS

(By Lowell M. Limpus)

NEW YORK.—Too many newly arrived "brass hats" having a good time for themselves and neglecting their men—that's apparently one of the principal reasons for what is getting dangerously close to open mutiny among our forces in the Philippines.

And the situation has been growing steadily worse ever since General of the Army Douglas MacArthur went to Japan.

Swarms of high-ranking staff officers rushed to the Far East—as soon as the shooting ended. They've snatched all the good hotel rooms. They have private baths and excellent club rooms.

They take over every decent building as soon as it is repaired.

There's one nice waiting room in the Guam air terminal "for generals only."

A corner of the Dai-Iti Hotel dining room in Tokyo was roped off for "lieutenant colonels and above," and angry combat captains lugged their baggage out the main entrance to make room for more Washington colonels.

These things were typical—most of all in the Philippines. And they soon showed their effect on morale.

The men became angry and disgusted—and they wanted to get home and get away from it all. But mighty few people took the trouble to explain the details of the transportation shortage until they began to boil over.

Then discipline went bad—especially around Manila.

Some of the officers—mostly regulars—fought a valiant, if losing, battle to preserve discipline and morale, and these officers included a number of colonels and generals.

These officers undoubtedly are horrified at the idea of enlisted men being permitted to hold mass meetings and boo their commanders, but they may feel scant sympathy for the officers who permitted such a condition to grow until it found such expression.

Very few of these comfort-seeking gentry wear battle stars, or combat ribbons. But they pull their rank right and left on the boys who did the actual fighting.

They snatched souvenirs greedily—and therein lies one cause of a lot of friction that hasn't been discussed publicly. Many a staff delegation swooped down on the combat units and confiscated heaps of Samurai swords and daggers from the men who captured them.

Then they took them back and distributed them according to rank among the be-starred and be-eagled tourists from Washington.

The staff officers in the well-pressed uniforms even ranked liberated prisoners out of available comforts.

I saw whole truckloads of those gaunt, hollow-eyed prisoners—colonels and lieutenant colonels themselves—driven away from the Admiral Apartments in Manila, to which they were first taken, and dumped in crowded tents in a muddy replacement center, 20 miles out in the suburbs amid signs reading: "Be careful. This is malaria country."

Enlisted men burned up as they saw these things, and so did a lot of officers.

Regular officers burned because, as they frequently said, too many of their superiors were betraying one of the oldest traditions of the service—that an officer should look after the comfort of his men before attending to his own.

The practice increased steadily throughout the area after the war ended.

There was coffee and doughnuts "for officers only" at a stand outside the big post exchange, just above Manila's city hall—and a sign forbidding those officers to give any to enlisted men.

Japan's spiffiest summer resort suddenly went "off limits" for everybody below colonel.

The Response to the President's Plea for Congressional Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. VORYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 18, 1946

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago last night the President in a radio speech urged the American people to contact their Congressmen in support of his program. Since then I have received 29 letters in favor of his program and 31 against part or all of it. I represent over 400,000 people and 200,000 voters. Thus in 2 weeks the written response of the public to the President's plea for action in my district was three-twentieths of 1 percent. I had two phone calls at home about the President's program, one for and one against. I saw a great many people at various gatherings, large and small, at home after the speech. None of these gatherings were partisan or political in character; no one at any of these gatherings spoke to me in favor of the President's program; many people spoke to me against it in varying degrees. The President's plea aroused hardly any action at all in my district, and hardly any interest. I think the reasons are obvious; his speech was a rehash of his message to Congress after VJ-day, and that message was a rehash of New Deal proposals that were old before Mr. Truman became President. The public knew the general views of their Congressmen on all of this. The public also knew that the passage, or the defeat, of any or all of these measures would not solve the biggest problems that face the country now. I listened to the radio speech when it was given, and gave an interview on it immediately afterward. It struck me at the time as the plea of an official trying to duck responsibility while at the same time seeking more power. I have reread the speech after going over all of the letters and comments I have received, and my reaction is still the same.

In scolding Congress for inaction, the President was not talking to me but to the party of which he is the leader, which has complete control of the organization of Congress and all of its committees and which has the power and responsibility of determining the legislative program. I belong to the minority party. I can vote when bills come to the floor, but there is no way I can bring a bill to the floor. I agree with the President that his party has been dilatory in planning the business of Congress since VJ-day. Congress has wasted weeks at a time because we have had no legislative program on the floor. It is significant of the complete breakdown of his party and its leadership that after his stirring plea for action we have had no action at all in Congress during this first week of the new session, and the President himself has postponed his constitutional message to Congress on the state of the Union.

In his radio talk the President said that Congress "has done its full share toward carrying out its responsibility in foreign affairs." As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I am gratified at this praise for the work of our committee. In our foreign affairs, politics should end at the water's edge, and we should have, not a New Deal policy, nor a Republican policy, but an American foreign policy. I regret that we do not yet have an American foreign policy; I regret that we have so much secretive Executive improvising; but the President's remarks show that Congress has been doing its part when it was given a chance, in developing a nonpartisan American foreign policy.

The President in his radio talk recommended 12 specific subjects for legislation. People have written me about these, for and against. I am ready to vote on these proposals now. My vote would of course depend upon the wording of the particular bill and the amendments that are incorporated in it. Many times a catchy title is used on a bad bill, any many times important and far-reaching legislation is included in a bill with a label which does not describe it at all. In my final vote on these 12 proposals I shall be guided by the following principles:

First. Labor-management laws: Fact-finding procedures alone will not settle anything; a compulsory 30-day cooling-off period without rules maintaining the status quo is merely a 30-day warming-up period in a labor dispute; the ground rules for labor-management disputes should give equal rights and require equal responsibilities from the parties; labor unions are now big business and their actions should be regulated by law in the public interest; no law should force a man to work, whether he is a laborer or a businessman running a plant.

Second. OPA: Price control and rationing must be continued while essential materials are short, but price ceilings should include cost of production and a reasonable profit for each item produced. The President agrees that production is the greatest weapon against inflation, but he does not run OPA so as to secure production. No free man will willingly produce goods at a loss for very long.

Third. "Full employment": These words have been bandied about until they have lost any real significance. Everyone wants full employment in this country; no one has devised a bill that will guarantee it. The Government cannot guarantee full employment for everyone without forcing workers to take the jobs assigned. No one wants this. The only place I ever saw where a government was guaranteeing full employment was a Nazi concentration camp. Neither the Senate nor the House versions will guarantee employment for everyone.

Fourth. Federal unemployment insurance: The proposals made to date will go far toward insuring more unemployment in this country, when what we need is plans to insure more employment.

Fifth. Discrimination in employment: We need a proper law to prevent this in many parts of the country. Congress has the duty to regulate fair employment practices in interstate commerce.

Sixth. Minimum wages: The Federal laws on this should carry the minimums required for a decent postwar standard of living, not the present minimums based upon New Deal depression standards.

Seventh. Comprehensive scientific research, not under political or military control, should be fostered by the Federal Government.

Eighth. Peacetime conscription should not be adopted until we have at least asked other countries to agree with us to abandon it.

Ninth. Socialized medical treatment under Federal regulations should not be adopted in this country.

Tenth. No new salary scale for Federal employees should be considered until the present swollen bureaucracy has been reduced; I have not noticed any alarming exodus of Federal employees to private employment.

Eleventh. The Presidential succession should be provided by a new law, in order to avoid any of the alarming possibilities we have faced in the past year.

Twelfth. River valley development: Such projects as the St. Lawrence River Valley improvement should be financed by the sections which will benefit, not by those in other sections who will be directly injured by such developments.

The same people who wrote me on the President's message discussed a number of vital problems he did not mention, such as the Federal budget, the atomic bomb, the return of the USES to the States, the British loan, and demobilization. I hope the President will give us his views on these subjects in his message to Congress.

Many of my correspondents have written me about congressional salaries. I believe that the next Congress should be a $15,000 Congress and we should provide for this by law; I do not believe that this is a $15,000 Congress, and we are not justified in paying this Congress on that basis. We should up-grade the next Congress and then let the people pick the Congressmen they wish to employ at the new rate.

It is, of course, impossible in a single radio talk, or a speech before Congress, for a President or a Congressman to cover all of the perplexing problems which face our country. A single speech, however, may reveal a trend of thinking. The President's radio talk showed that he was seeking more executive power but was evading responsibility on many important questions and was ignoring others. In this Congress my position will be

in general to limit executive powers; to give individuals as much freedom as possible by limiting the powers of government over them; to protect the American way of solvent government and free enterprise against the attacks made on it at home and abroad.

A DAR Scholarship Rejected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 18, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, on January 12, 1946, the following story appeared under an AP date line in the Hartford Courant:

WATERBURY SENIOR CLASS DECLINES AWARD OF DAR

WATERBURY, January 11.—Seniors of Crosby High School today voted, 150 to 80, to reject the annual Good Citizenship Pilgrimage Award of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

Sixteen-year-old Carol Wall, who offered the motion, explained tonight that "we just didn't think it was feasible to name a candidate for a good citizenship award sponsored by an organization which refused Negro musicians, Marion Anderson and Hazel Scott, permission to use Constitution Hall for concerts."

A few days later the following editorial appeared in the New York Times:

A SCHOLARSHIP REJECTED

Seniors of the Crosby High School at Waterbury, Conn., have voted to reject the Annual Good Citizenship Pilgrimage Award of the Daughters of the American Revolution. The award is an interesting and useful one, consisting of a travel scholarship offered to a high-school representative from each State for a trip to historic American shrines. The reason given by a spokesman of the Waterbury students for their rejection of the scholarship is that they "just didn't think it was feasible to name a candidate for a good citizenship award sponsored by an organization that refused Negro musicians permission to use Constitution Hall for concerts."

The point is honorably taken. Any tour of American shrines must lead the traveler to the homes or the working places of a number of historic figures, men and women, who labored with deep conviction and unflagging effort to eliminate precisely that kind of discrimination which has been practiced in Constitution Hall. The ladies of the DAR are responsible for many good works. In this case, catering to an unworthy and unpatriotic prejudice, they have made a mistake which will haunt them until it has been corrected.

In the meanwhile, I had written 16-year-old Carol Wall and her senior class the following letter, which I am sure reflects the opinions of many mothers and fathers in our State and of many DAR members in our Connecticut chapters:

JANUARY 17, 1946.

Miss CAROL WALL,
Crosby High School, Waterbury, Conn.

MY DEAR CAROL: I read in the Hartford Courant of January 11 that you offered a motion in behalf of the Crosby High School seniors to reject the annual Good Citizenship Pilgrimage Award of the Daughters of the American Revolution because they had refused Negro musicians permission to use Constitution Hall for concerts and that your motion carried by a vote of 150 to 80.

I am writing to you and to the seniors who voted with you to tell you all how proud I was, when I read that, to be a Representative from your State.

These are hours, all over the world, when the power of darkness is great—the darkness of hate. And this flower of evil blooms nowhere so luxuriantly as in the soil of racial tension. Verbally we all condemn racial hatred. Actually too few of us do anything about it. An act of positive affirmation of love and brotherhood in racial matters is sufficiently rare that it shines like a bright light in a naughty world. It is all the more beautiful—and astonishing—when such an act is done by mere boys and girls in high school, for we adults are often—too often—told these days that the younger generation takes no interest in the profound questions which lie at the root of the world's unhappiness, that they care for nothing but "good times," movies, and "jive." By your brave action you have certainly disproved that proposition. If there be but 20 high schools in America where the pupils feel as you do, I shall never again despair for the future of our country.

It seems to me that by condemning the action of the Washington board of the DAR in discriminating against artists on a strictly color line, you have twice earned a good-citizenship award. But this second time you have earned it from 15,000,000 colored people, and many more millions of white people. And, believe me, you have earned it, too, from many a truly patriotic Daughter of the American Revolution who feels just as you do, but cannot make herself vocal, or prevail upon the reactionary leadership of the Washington board. As you know, we in Connecticut have many liberal DAR chapters—the Fairfield, Bridgeport, and Stamford chapters have all protested, just as you have.

Fundamentally why do they protest: For the same reason that you do. First, because it is ungodly to abuse, look down, condemn, or discriminate against any human being only because of the color of his skin. "Love thy neighbor as thyself" is the second commandment handed to Moses. Indeed, the Golden Rule is the first rule of 10 of the 11 great religions of the world. And for those of us who are true Christians, it is painful indeed to imagine what our dear Lord would say to many of our most respectable citizens in the U. S. A. who dare call themselves Christians today, if He were to come again. He would be very angry, I think, at the way they treat the Negroes, the most dispossessed, ill-treated, and abused of our population. He might say in condemning them, "Forasmuch as you have done it unto the least of these, my brethren, you have done it unto Me."

Yes, many older people—far too many—in America today forget that what made America the greatest and strongest and happiest of nations, what Abraham Lincoln called the last best hope of mankind, was that our whole political "ideology" was based on this particularly Christian precept of all men being created equal in the eyes of God and, therefore, entitled on earth to equality of opportunity to develop to the best of their capacities.

But you have remembered, Carol. You have not forgotten. You have behaved and thought as I would have been proud to have my own daughter do. So to you and the 150 who have stood by the best and truest in our Nation, greetings. And greetings, too, to the parents and teachers, and the community of Waterbury which built such character in you. Tomorrow, America belongs to you.

Cordially yours,

CLARE BOOTHE LUCE.

Sees Menace in Our State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. HESS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 18, 1946

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article:

SEES MENACE IN OUR STATE DEPARTMENT—CAN A GROUP OF OBSCURE PROFESSIONAL DIPLOMATS CONTROL THE NATION?

(By Upton Close)

Our Republic is faced with a new and terrible menace, creeping silently upon our people and our atomic-bomb fodder and our wealth, and no one is putting a stop to it thus far. It is a menace of a sort which has never before threatened us of this Republic of the United States of America, and because our Congressmen and people have never known such a thing before and are so unused to it, they scarcely comprehend that it exists, or, comprehending, know what to do about it.

It is the menace of control of this Nation—throwing of its wealth and manpower in any direction at all, controlling the value of its money, determining its foreign obligations and involvements and future wars—by a small, undistinguished, obscure, almost hidden group of professional diplomats in our State Department.

Under the guise of putting civil authority and state policy above military rule, this little, hidden group took control of United States men and wealth and interests and policies away from Eisenhower and the United States Army in Europe. Now, under the slogan that "Generals are made to obey orders" this brazen, hidden group moves to take control of United States soldiers and sailors of occupation and of United States policies and wealth and destiny in Asia away from MacArthur and the United States Army in Asia.

The citizens of the United States agree that civil rule and authority must stand over military rule. The Constitution says so. But it does not say that a privately intercommunicating, small, hidden, obscure, diplomatic clique of clerks and diplomats in our State Department, running away with things because a baffled and amiable man is in the White House, and an inexperienced and lost man is in the chair of Secretary of State, shall take charge and order about our greatest and wisest generals.

BYRNES MELTS A PROBLEM

The extent to which the Secretary of State is lost within his own Department and the complete lack of discipline and direction there has been admitted in two recent deplorable incidents. First, when General Hurley returned and resigned in anger at the needling he was getting from a State Department clique, supported by a few radicals in Congress, Secretary of State Byrnes admitted publicly that he did not know what it was all about. He had to either fire his State Department culprits or back them up. So in a half-hearted way he backed them up without, however, actually clearing them of the charges made against them or reprimanding Under Secretaries and clerks for acting in so impudent and totally untraditional a manner toward an Ambassador and special representative of the President himself.

The second case appears to be even more flagrant, but only because it is more plain and simple for the public to understand. Actually, similar things happened over and over again in the case of Hurley. But this second and flagrant case illustrates so clearly

the Marxist tactics now used by little fellows in the State Department to put tacks under big men whom they want out of their way!

"GET MACARTHUR"

The all-consuming ambition of these little fellows backed by all the Marxists in America and in the world today is: "Get MacArthur!" So a little guy named Blake hired from the taxpayer's money for State Department Public Relations—a hangover of the discredited OWI—gives out that General MacArthur had been conferred with about the limitation of his authority in Japan. The intent was to put the general in the wrong whether he let the lie pass or whether he challenged it, the hope being that if he did challenge it the general would get mad and blow up, as Hurley had done.

But when General MacArthur kept his dignity and temper, and likewise his job, and the little publicist in the State Department was revealed for the fact-twister that he was (and that the inner group bossing him wanted him to be), Secretary of State James Byrnes again ducked from under the responsibilities of a man over men and said in effect that the general had spoken the truth, that he had not been consulted—then Byrnes backed up the clique which had lied quoting their very language: "Why should he be consulted, anyway?"

Now, as an ordinary American citizen who never had anything to do with diplomacy, you can understand the unlimited capacity for wickedness, loss of prestige, and damage that can come out of a foreign office being run like this.

What we have now is a weakling at the top with the most unbelievable clique-bureaucracy running him, or running around him. This department, originally the mildest in our Federal Government, now becomes the strongest and most arrogant, actually swinging the Nation (a tail swinging the dog), operating its own propaganda services independent of any editing, forming its own national and international spy services, pledging us to unlimited expenses abroad, arranging our future alliances and wars, and daring now to go the final limit of reaching out to control our so-be-unified military services under the formula: "Generals exist to take orders."

This is a more impudent and arrogant development of bureaucracy than ever took place in Czarist Russia.

I wonder if Congressmen realize that Congress must take a hand? Ask your Congressman.

If not, one of our great political parties must take a hand. General MacArthur, in spite of being a general—for which the American people gladly forgive him—may be much more on the beam of American statesmanship as we, the people of America want it, than the hidden, brazen, obscure clique of Acheson and Lattimore in the ugly building off the end of the White House offices in Washington.

Protest of Exportation of Lumber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 18, 1946

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I am protesting the exportation of lumber from the United States to foreign countries and have demanded that the State Department investigate and curtail this exportation in view of the shortage of lumber in this country for the building of civilian homes for returning servicemen and their families.

This is a ridiculous situation which the State Department should immediately investigate and curtail. The inadequate housing facilities in the Los Angeles area and, in fact, in general on the Pacific coast, is alarming and serious largely due to the shortage of lumber. A thorough investigation and a curtailment of the exportation of lumber from this country in the face of the serious lack of housing is essential at this time.

Solution of the housing shortage is one of the problems of first importance among those facing the Nation during this critical reconversion period, and every effort must be exerted to provide adequate housing for the returning veterans and their families. New houses must be built, and all materials essential to construction of homes should be made available for use in the United States now.

Surplus Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 18, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, when the committee was considering amendments to the surplus-property bill, the Surplus Property Administrator admitted that one group advocated the destruction of surplus property on the theory that it should not be permitted to come in competition with goods to be manufactured here at home. Another group thought it should be sold and disposed of before new goods could come on the market. I agreed with the latter theory, but apparently valuable material is still being destroyed.

I quote from a letter from overseas:

If you folks could only see what is being dumped into the ocean here. Brand new Ford engines and Packard motors not even uncrated as yet. Motors that haven't been even so much as touched yet. They are dumping all kinds of things such as boxes of rifles, bayonets (I picked up one), ammunition, radio equipment of all kinds, and a lot of other technical equipment.

I'm O. K. and enjoying this trip so don't worry about me, just keep on writing. I don't know when all of it will catch up with me but it will. I'm down to a $1.06 so I will have to borrow a couple of bucks from the chief. I need a dollar for a haircut and I have to get some more air-mail stamps. We haven't received any checks from Frisco, so that is the reason that all of us are nearly broke. We haven't been paid in nearly 2 months. It's one way to save some money, though. Have you been receiving my monthly bond or not? I believe that is all the news for now.

Permit me also to quote from a letter received from the mother of an overseas serviceman:

Another thing I want to mention is the inquiry about Army waste that is going on. Those Senators are wasting their time and the public's money by going to investigate now. The reason I say so is that I have a son in Hawaii and he kept writing of dumping truckloads of stuff over the cliff. Once he said they were condemning so many trucks that he wasn't sure whether it was best to unload his load, or just drive the whole thing over. After censorship was removed, I asked him if it was the debris from Pearl Harbor that they were working on, and he said they were destroying Army trucks that $50 worth of repair would make worth $500 anywhere, and the day he wrote they were cutting up Army jeeps, amphibious, that had never even been uncrated. Later he wrote that there had been a reporter there who had written up their activities and that it caused enough of a stink—I am quoting his words—so that they had stopped destroying them and were selling to civilians instead. So you see the investigators will not be able to find anything wrong now, and naturally will think that there never was any waste.

The Heat Will Backfire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 18, 1946

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Hon. Carl Hanton, editor of the Fort Myers News-Press, Fort Myers, Fla., of Saturday, January 5, 1946:

THE HEAT WILL BACKFIRE

In calling upon the American people to put the heat on Congress, President Truman is asking for something that won't do his program any good. The great mass of unorganized and inarticulate citizens, to whom he appeals, are by no means in favor of the bills he wants passed. In fact they are against several of them and in applying the heat he is in danger of inciting an explosive backfire.

Prominent in this class is the rocking-chair money measure (pay for not working) which the President calls unemployment compensation. After he had asked for immediate passage of that bill Mr. Truman accused Congress of damaging delay in failing to act. There has been no damage. No one is suffering because of failure to draw $25 a week for not working, as he recommends. Jobs paying more than that are going begging all over the country.

Another bill which the President is wrong in thinking an overwhelming mass of our citizens favor is the so-called Fair Employment Practice Commission (FEPC) proposal. Under this measure Federal authority would force employers to hire Negroes, Jews, or other racial and religious groups in the proportion which they bear to the population of a given community. Thus in Fort Myers, if the population were one-fourth colored, one out of four employees in every store and office would have to be a Negro if the FEPC Government agency decided there were that many qualified applicants. And up in New York's Harlem a Negro dance hall would have to engage a proportionate number of white girls as hostesses in order to be legal.

The President also thinks that the public is in favor of his full employment bill to the extent of providing Government work for everybody who can't get jobs at the 30 percent pay increase the CIO is seeking. The American people want full production with steady work at good pay, but as far as the Government taking over strikers at the wages they demand, the answer is "no."

The President is right in saying the people want something done to end strikes but he admits that the fact-finding bill which he is sponsoring won't do that. He assures labor that it won't stop strikes and he agrees that employers can't be compelled to produce at wages they think will ruin them. It won't

do any harm to know the facts but Mr. Truman admits that the Government already has them—through the CPA, the War Production Board, the Income Tax Bureau, Department of Commerce reports, and from a multitude of other forms which business firms have been required to furnish.

When the heat goes on, what will the people of this district tell Congressman ROGERS and what will the people of Florida tell Senators PEPPER and ANDREWS? They will say they want strikes ended by providing for the open shop which is what they voted for overwhelmingly when the question was put up to them in an election referendum. As to the FEPC, which the President complains has been blocked in committee by "a small handful of Congressmen," they will say that's the place to keep it and that if it ever gets out they will expect Senators PEPPER and ANDREWS to join Senator BILBO and other southern Members in filibustering it to death.

The rocking chair money bill, says Mr. Truman, is "locked up in the Ways and Means Committee and will remain locked up unless the people of United States insist that it be reported out." If Florida Senators and Congressmen ask their constituents what to do about that the answer will be that $25 a week is too much at any time for doing nothing, and that anything a week in unemployment compensation is too much with jobs as plentiful as they are now.

Congressmen elsewhere in the country have been hearing about the same thing from the "unorganized and inarticulate mass of the people." The country undoubtedly agrees with President Truman's objectives of full production, full employment at good wages, and no strikes. But they don't by any means agree with the methods he advocates to achieve these results. Congress has the popular side of that and if the heat goes on it will be to steam up opposition to the President's program.

Jurisdictional Difficulties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 18, 1946

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, another jurisdictional labor dispute seriously threatens the food producing and processing industries in California. Perishable crops will not wait while labor organizations settle their differences. I have appealed to the Secretary of Labor and to the National Labor Relations Board to bring about a prompt settlement of the dispute referred to in the following communication. I commend this letter to the attention of my colleagues as it emphasizes the need for taking prompt action to prevent jurisdictional strikes, sympathy strikes, and secondary boycotts.

OAKLAND, CALIF., *January 5, 1946.*

To All Agricultural Interests of Central and Northern California:

A situation of gravest importance to your future economic welfare has arisen in California, which, if not promptly solved, will surely tend to result in the loss of the bulk of your 1946 fruit and vegetable crops.

Your help is urgently needed in aiding to solve it.

The trouble stems from a jurisdictional labor dispute between CIO Food, Tobacco, Agricultural, and Allied Workers Union of America and the A. F. of L. Cannery Workers' Union, which is affiliated with the International Teamsters, who control trucking and hauling.

In the past 60 days this jurisdictional warfare has resulted in "quickie" strikes and picket lines at six food-processing plants. Similar work stoppages are expected to occur in the near future throughout the canning areas of the whole State, and all indications point to universal job action when spring canning gets under way.

There is no issue of wages, hours, or working conditions involved. The issue is simply which of the above unions shall have jurisdiction over the men and women working in canneries.

The time is fast approaching when growers will seek contracts for their crops from the canners. But so serious is the situation at the moment that every canner is at a loss to know just what quantity of these crops he will be able to process in 1946.

Recognizing this situation, C. P. & G. already has addressed an urgent appeal to the California delegation in Congress seeking its support in demanding of the appropriate governmental agencies in Washington, D. C., that they take action now to settle the controversy rather than wait until the height of the canning season, when job action on a State-wide basis would halt canning and result in the loss of tremendous quantities of fruits and vegetables.

The history of the jurisdictional dispute is briefly:

1. Most canneries are operating under an agreement with the A. F. of L. Cannery Workers' Union, affiliated with the AFL Teamsters' Union. The expiration date of this working contract being March 1, 1946.

2. Last October the NLRB ordered an election among cannery employees to determine which union (CIO or AFL) they wished to represent them on and after March 1, 1946.

3. The CIO polled the largest number of votes but has not yet been certified as having secured a majority of the votes cast.

4. The CIO, believing it has a clear mandate to organize cannery workers without waiting until March, is trying to do so and is encouraging workers to resign from the A. F. of L. Union.

5. The A. F. of L., holding the contract until March 1946, is insisting that these workers operating under it, pay A. F. of L. dues and generally abide by the terms of it. The A. F. of L. is also challenging the legality of the entire election, including any certification of the CIO under it.

6. The canners, ordered by the NLRB to abide by the terms of the aforesaid contract until its expiration date, are caught between the conflicting factions. If they accede to the demands of the AFL and fire any worker on demand of the A. F. of L., they are immediately charged with unfair labor practices by the CIO and continuing pay is demanded for each discharged worker. If they refuse to fire the employee, work stoppages result or, as in two cases, plants are picketed by the Teamsters' Union and hauling in and out ceases.

Because it is clear to us that the instances mentioned above are merely the skirmishes which precede open warfare, we have asked the California delegation, whose names, districts, and addresses appear on the opposite side of this page, to intercede with Paul M. Herzog, Chairman of the NLRB, and Edgar L. Warren, Director of the United States Conciliation Service and urge them to act now in bringing the warring factions together with a view to ending this inter-union warfare.

In support of this action we are urging you, who are so vitally concerned in having peace and harmony restored in the canning industry, to write or wire both Senators and the Congressmen in your district, or any Congressman you may know in the delegation, and impress upon them the seriousness of the situation from your point of view and urge their immediate intercession.

Yours sincerely,

CALIFORNIA PROCESSORS AND GROWERS, INC.
By J. W. BRISTOW, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

A Congressman's Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARION T. BENNETT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 18, 1946

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, my office daily receives on the average a large amount of correspondence from the district of 11 counties and 288,840 people I represent. Just yesterday my office sent out 116 personal replies and 83 form replies to communications from my district. Since the President in his recent fireside chat asked people to write their Congressmen expressing their views on his legislative proposals, the additional mail received as a result of that appeal has been negligible. In point I extend as a part of my remarks the following editorial from the Springfield (Mo.) Leader and Press of January 15, 1946:

A CONGRESSMAN'S MAIL

During the full week after which President Truman made a radio appeal to the people to put pressure on their Congressmen, our own Congressman MARION BENNETT received only 29 letters prompted by the President's request.

Which, in his regular report to his constituents, he opines, "isn't much of a response" coming from "125,800 citizens who voted in the race for Congress in the Sixth District in 1944."

There could be several reasons why a man wouldn't write to his Congressman when the President asked him to. He might not agree with the President, or might just not like him. It might be sheer indifference. He might simply feel that it wouldn't do a bit of good.

And then he might feel that his Congressman was doing all right without any advice from him, and trust him to keep up with things and act accordingly on his own best judgment.

It is our guess that this last reason accounts for a good many Ozarkians not bothering to write their Congressman, both in our own and our neighboring districts. They have confidence in them to do the right thing anyway.

Mr. BENNETT interestingly reports that even of the 29 who did write him at the President's request, a majority—17—were against the President's program and the others were for it only with qualifications.

And he makes this further report on that week's mail:

Bulk of comment centered on the fact-finding proposal for labor disputes. It was favored by 12 writers; 17 objected to it and suggested stronger alternatives. Some writers in both categories expressed fear that fact finding by political appointees could be used as a blackjack on management and suggested labor's books should be opened, too. Others asked how it could stop strikes and if there was not socialistic danger in Government trying to fix wages in peacetime. A few pointed out the President still has all his war powers to stop strikes by Government taking over plants or unions

and suggested that if he was not going to use such broad powers Congress should take them away from him; 24 letters expressed hope the labor crisis would quickly be resolved in such a way as to stimulate home construction, clothing, auto, and household appliance manufacture.

Listed in order of frequency commented upon unfavorably were the following presidential proposals, some of them not mentioned in his fireside chat: Loans to Great Britain and Russia, $25 unemployment compensation weekly for 26 weeks annually, peacetime military conscription, continuation of wartime controls, a permanent Fair Employment Practices Committee with power to fine or send to jail any employer who refuses to hire a job applicant on basis of race, creed, or color, full employment bill promising Government jobs to all unable to work elsewhere—new WPA, Missouri Valley Authority, and increased immigration of refugees.

Most letters were thoughtful and helpful. Only one was of the "Dear Sir, you cur, yours in haste and anger," variety. It simply said, "You and Congress stink."

Mr. BENNETT adds, "Letters from those with informed opinions are still welcome."

This Strike Period Is a Good Time for Congress To Keep Cool

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1946

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the Baltimore Sun, Baltimore, Md., on Monday, January 14, 1946:

THIS STRIKE PERIOD IS A GOOD TIME FOR CONGRESS TO KEEP COOL

A good many Americans will be on strike when the Congress reconvenes. The strike of a good many more Americans will be imminent. This situation is likely to try the tempers and the judgments of the returning legislators. It will be well for the country if the legislators keep their heads and avoid repressive and inflammatory legislation.

The first step toward keeping one's head in or out of Congress is a broad understanding of the issues. In the broad the issues posed by the strike situation are not complex. Thus in the Wagner Act we have taken a whole range of employee conduct out from under managerial control. Unquestionably this was a good thing, though the law has been abused. But further, and without direct legislative interference with management we have widened the workman's powers as against management and the community in general. This we have done by exempting workmen from a whole series of laws to which the rest of us are subject.

The result has been that union bargaining power has equalled or surpassed that of management. That the collision of equal powers results in deadlock is an elementary proposition in social physics. Nobody prospers when industry is deadlocked. The Congress must study ways and means for making deadlocks less likely.

There are two ways of doing this. Having given the unions special privilege, the country can now maintain the special privilege but pyramid on top of it new special and discriminatory laws limiting the special privilege. Or it can simply undo the special privilege itself and return workmen to the simple equality before the law, which is all any of the rest of us desire.

If Congress tries to deal with union privilege by retaining it but then trying to limit it by new special laws, it will run into one formidable obstacle. For it will find that you can't discipline a union as such because a union is not a firm and stable entity. To demand by law, for instance, that a union hold its workers to the terms of a contract it fatuous. For as the Ford unit of the CIO-UAW has just confessed, the union cannot control its workers that well.

If new special laws penalizing unions as such won't work because the unions don't afford a firm and stable target on which such laws can be brought to bear, then the alternative method of control must be examined. In this method of control Congress would not look to the unions to control their people; it would look to those people themselves as individuals, in the historic spirit of the Anglo-American law that all individuals have equal rights but no more than equal rights before the law.

If Congress takes this view of the matter it will bring organized workmen back under the antitrust laws. It will bring them back under the antiracketeering laws. It will do what it can—which, under our constitutional system, isn't much—in exhorting local police everywhere to bring organized workmen back under the local laws against blockade of the public ways, against terrorism and its threat, against mayhem, mob rule in general and in all its infinite manifestations.

The beauty of such a program is that it would have no novelties. It would rest on the simple and self-evident truth that a mob is a mob, even though the members wear union buttons; that assault is assault, even if the weapon used is a baseball bat on which a union placard has been tacked; that a restraint of trade is a restraint of trade, even if a union leader has commanded it.

For if you look through the wave of strikes to their realities—if, so to speak, you pierce the veil of unionism which masks and obscures the factual situation, you will see that over and above the legitimate right of free men to strike what the country faces is a kind of blockading insurrection by a very small but strategically placed minority of its people. The ways of dealing with that kind of situation are as old as our form of government. And even thoughtful union people would probably agree that it was better to apply old and tried remedies for ancient abuses than to pile new and special discriminations against unions on top of unwise discriminations in their favor.

The Road Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at Columbia University on January 14, 1946:

Over in London, battered and scarred from what must be the last war if mankind is to survive, representatives of the peoples of the world are sitting in conference, dedicated to the principle that in the future arguments between nations are to be solved, not by throwing atomic bombs at each other, but around a council table.

At this conference, for the first time in history, the conferees represent the people of the participating countries—not just governments.

They are acting under a charter which opens with the words:

"We, the people of the United Nations. * * *"

These words were modeled upon the opening words of the Constitution of the United States.

At that conference in London the United States faces a challenge. For upon the principle of our Constitution is based what must be the first practical, working international organization for permanent peace and order in the world. The challenge the United States must accept is to furnish positive, generous, courageous leadership.

Our responsibility to furnish that kind of leadership is infinitely increased because here in our country was first developed the devilish weapon with which man is empowered to destroy himself utterly.

The scientists give us 5 short years in which to save ourselves and the world—5 short years at the end of which, no matter how carefully we guard the secret, no matter how noble our motives, other nations will have developed their own atomic bombs, if by going on making them behind a wall of secrecy ourselves we encourage them to, and the race of death will be on.

We built the first atomic bomb in the scientific race of all time, which was to decide whether the peoples of the world should be free. Now the necessity is to end wars—forever.

Five short years—we have left ourselves very, very little time. Each day, each hour eats away that precious time—so little time allotted for doing the job, of furnishing the leadership that must make of the United Nations Organization a living, working reality.

Five years in which we must build out of the present infant United Nations Organization, a world government capable of outlawing wars and the causes of wars. Five years in a world in which, from the dawn of Christianity from which our own democracy stemmed, it took nearly 2,000 years for our democracy to develop. Five years in which to project ourselves 1,000 years in maturity, in understanding, in social development.

We have special responsibility to meet the challenge for leadership in this hour, for the dream of world cooperation to stop wars was born with Woodrow Wilson and matured in the heart and mind of Franklin Roosevelt.

To meet that challenge we must be generous. It will take generosity. It will take greatness—greatness from all of us.

What is greatness? What is it made of? I can only say what I think it is, the simple rule that we were taught in childhood—the Golden Rule. Now has come the time in the history of mankind when we must obey that rule or perish.

I am not talking about philosophy. I am not talking about some abstract theory that "x" equals "m". I am talking about practicing justice. I am talking about acting fairly, each one of us, in our daily lives. Not when it suits us, not when it just happens to be convenient, not when it costs us nothing, but every day—every day in the year—whether it is easy or hard.

Living the Golden Rule means that everything we do, everything we say, everything we think, everything we desire affects other persons' lives because in the kind of world we live in they usually have a share in it somewhere. It means sitting in daily judgment upon ourselves, upon our own acts. It means following a course because it is right.

It is as simple as that. But it will take everything we have—as individuals, as a nation—to live it. Man hasn't been able to, so far, down through the ages. But he's got to do it now. It's the only way.

It demands self-discipline in the interest of others, self-discipline that prevents you from running beserk, the prey of your own desires. Down through history a few individuals have lived it. It is the quality we cherished in them, the quality we remember.

Now we must practice it, not only rarely as individuals, but we must all practice it collectively as a nation.

It's not just a question of morals now. It's a question of survival.

We must live not only in our own communities, but in a world community with seeing eyes and living hearts, sensitive to the yearnings and the dreams that help men to grow, sensitive to the needs that must be fulfilled if men are to be kept healthy.

This is the stuff of which greatness is made—in a man or in a people.

It is this quality that is talked about long after men are gone. It is this quality that men write poems and sing about. It is this quality that people respond to. It is this quality that builds faith and hope, that inspires trust, that makes men feel that their future is sometimes safer in another's hands than in their own.

And this is true, not only of men, but of nations.

Twelve months ago we had in this country—the whole world had—a leader who had that greatness. It was he who showed us the way. It was he who laid the foundations for the friendships we must now husband. It was he who designed the machinery which we now have to build upon.

Yes; we now have the machinery set up through which the peoples of the world can work together. We now have world-wide endorsement of the principle of working together. But that won't hold us together. Only a deep and true understanding of the rights of all, regardless of color or religion or nationality, will do that.

We are greatly fortunate in this hour that it was given to Franklin Roosevelt to understand that the continuing, long time preservation of our rights depends upon the preservation of the rights of others.

You can't go out into the community and preach one kind of living and practice something else at home. Sooner or later you will be found out. In world affairs it is no different. You can't preach peace and fair dealing to other nations while everybody tries to cut everybody else's throat at home.

That was the wisdom, the greatness of Franklin Roosevelt. And because of it, he left us a priceless heritage—the trust and confidence of the peoples of the earth. Let us pray that we do not fritter that heritage away, that we use it wisely.

Franklin Roosevelt led us to practice at home what he preached abroad. Not only did he talk about raising the living standards of two-thirds of the people of the world who are undernourished, but he fought continuously to focus attention upon and to raise the living standards of the one-third of our people, poorly fed, poorly clothed, poorly housed.

He not only talked about an international agricultural food committee that would help to bring scientific advances in agricultural production to backward peoples of the world, but he built and developed farm security and rural electrification programs to bring those scientific advantages to our own farmers.

People believed this man when he talked of bringing order into international finance and banking, because he had already done it at home by outlawing the reckless manipulation of little people's money on the stock exchange, by regulating the banks and insuring the savings of small depositors.

He was listened to when he talked about an international organization to aid education the world over, for he had fought for Federal aid to education here at home.

Equality of opportunity for all peoples meant something when Franklin Roosevelt talked about it, for he established, when he first became President, the principle of equality of opportunity for all, regardless of color or race or religion, and carried it out in the WPA, NYA, Farm Security Administration, selective-service laws, and the establishment of the FEPC. And with the Navy that he loved so much, he battled the issue out, insisting that Negroes be given the right to serve as fighting men as well as servants.

The little peoples of the world were willing to accept his invitation to find a road they could travel together. They trusted him to design the plan for their future security, for had he not fought the wage-hour fight, the battle that was waged and won so that those who were defenseless and powerless unorganized workers could have some protection?

He didn't have to tell the little people of the outside world, whether it was in China or South America, Europe or Africa, that he was their true friend, for the TVA was built on the basic conception that water in the great rivers belongs to all the people, and that all the people should share in the power that can be generated by it.

Freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want, freedom from fear—these were ringing words to the world, because they were spoken by a man who understood their meaning—and everybody knew it. For had he not waged a lifelong battle against want and economic fear?

It was he who conceived the social-security plan in all its magnificence. It was he who sought to lift the burden of fear from the unemployed, the widowed, the sick, the aged. It was he who understood and made us see that in the complicated, mechanized age in which we live, we cannot go blithely on our way, unmindful, when men and women are out of jobs; that the widowed and the orphaned should be given something more than society's charity; that when a person is sick or injured he should not and cannot be abandoned; that when a man gets too old to work he cannot be thrown aside like an old coat for which you have no more use.

With the social-security program, Franklin Roosevelt took us out of the jungle. It was he who believed that housing must become a Federal concern when millions of our people were found to be wretchedly housed or not housed at all, because he knew what intolerable living conditions mean, not only in family terms, but ultimately in terms of the community and the world.

Such a man could talk about the health of the world community because he had gotten down to the grass roots of the health of his own country.

We no longer have Franklin Roosevelt with us, but as we take our place at that conference table, the most powerful nation in the world, with all the responsibility that that places upon us, we have the record which we will need to draw upon, that record we made under his leadership.

Let us examine ourselves as we embark on this new adventure.

In a very short time—25 years—we have become a world power. To carry the responsibility that goes with that power we shall have to mature. We shall have to grow up.

In the 5 years that are given us to work out our salvation we have three alternatives. We might, of course, go out and kill off everybody else, suddenly, without warning. But we won't do that. We're not that kind of people.

Or we might just go along indifferent to the worries and problems of the rest of the world, hopeful that no one will take it into their head to wipe us out suddenly in the night. We cannot afford to do this. We are too vulnerable and would be the first target of any aggressor nation if we have been so foolish as to allow an aggressor nation to develop.

Our third alternative is to assume the responsibilities of leadership that our position of power and wealth has placed upon us and supply leadership in the building of a world community.

First of all, we no longer can afford the luxury of going on thoughtless, groundless, periodical emotional sprees against any member of the United Nations Organization. We must remember that we have to live with these nations around the council table in close daily contact. We have to work and build together. Finally, we really don't know one another very well, and until we do, until there is the kind of confidence between the nations of the world as there is between our United States of America, we must be especially watchful that our criticisms are at all times based on fact. That our criticism is constructive, not destructive—friendly, not hateful.

It is our privilege to disapprove of things our friends do, of course, but in this atomic age in which we live it is our duty to search for the causes of these actions, not just to criticize, and always to examine our own position to see if we are in any way responsible for these causes. And if we are, to correct our own position. If we are not at fault, to go to the root of the trouble and present a dynamic, positive, equitable solution.

Part of growing up is to be realistic. Great Britain, Russia, and the United States must stay closely and harmoniously united if the world organization is to work—if we are to benefit from these 5 years of grace.

Growing up, then, certainly means that we explore every possible avenue to better relations between ourselves and these two sister nations as fundamental to the working out of all other relations in the world.

To begin with, I think it is far from mature to think that the British and the Russians, after what they have been through, are any less desirous of peace than we are. And I think it is also far from mature to think that we are more in love with the idea of survival than anybody else in the world.

I also think it is far from mature to think that we are the only people in the world who like three meals a day and a decent house to live in. So we start with common objectives—the three pivotal nations and all the other nations in the world—survival and a good life.

Let's take the British first. The war has left Britain deep in debt with her world trade ruined, her physical plant badly battered, her manpower depleted, her people exhausted. Why in the name of common sense shouldn't Great Britain be worried about trade and commerce—eyeing even a little enviously our undamaged industrial plants, our pool of skilled labor, our expanded facilities for world trade? We should remember these things when Great Britain hangs onto her imperialistic pattern which seems to us outmoded and a block to the United Nations plan. It is a block, but the way to get rid of it is to help her find a new pattern. That's part of our responsibility—part of the job we have got to shoulder if permanent peace is to be realized in the world. Let's face it.

We ought to remember these things and that the British are still strictly rationed on food and clothing when they appear, in our eyes, to be a little edgy and querulous about accepting a loan from us which they say will tie them economically to our apron strings for generations to come.

I hope the British loan goes through Congress without the usual insults being hurled at Great Britain. I don't think they are in any condition to take them. When you are cold and rationed and tired after years of bombing with all the accompanying terror and nervous tension, when there is only one direction to which you can turn for help and yet if you have to accept that help with a feeling of humiliation, it doesn't make for good relations.

I am sorry that the terms demand an interest rate. I think it would have been healthier for everyone concerned if it had been worked out on some kind of lend-lease basis.

If we keep our goals in mind, we will keep on our course. Our aim is to make of ourselves a world citizen and as far as we are

able, to help transform the other nations of the world into world citizens.

The future is interdependent.

Until we decide what our long-range tariff policy will be, the English will be unable to know how much they can sell us. Until we decide how big our merchant marine will be, the British will be unable to judge how large hers will be. Until it is determined whether or not London will continue to be the insurance center of the world, until the United States makes up its mind upon the policy of postwar international trade, the British can make no plans. They are in the dark.

So long as we continue to keep them in the dark, we can be sure Britain will not make any revision in her imperial and colonial policies.

Slowness of decision on our part hampers not only the British in the formulation of policy, but it hampers all other nations as well.

Speaking of trade, we might examine the tied-loan policy of our Export-Import Bank. I quote:

"As a general rule, the bank extends credit only to finance purchase of materials and equipment produced or manufactured in the United States and the technical services of American firms and individuals as distinguished from outlays for materials and labor in the borrowing country or purchases in third countries."

Wouldn't that statement tend to make the British worry about their export trade, without which they cannot exist?

Remember, they can't buy unless they can sell. Since we are the only people who have money and since we are therefore the only people who can make loans, such a "tied loan" policy limits markets for the English.

If we make a loan, say, to Denmark, she is compelled to spend that money in this country, whether it be for materials, equipment, or technical services.

Suppose it is cheaper and better for her to buy part of the material from England. What would happen if she were able to do so? The Danes would convert part of the money into pounds sterling, and buy what they needed in England. The English, then in possession of badly needed dollars, would turn around and buy from the United States the material she needed. Our dollars would come back to us via England.

This is the kind of healthy trade we worked for all through the thirties. To set up such a "tied loan" policy now is short-sighted and a complete reversal of our whole foreign policy. It ought to be changed.

It's penny-wise and pound-foolish, to say the least. This action on our part, seemingly to protect ourselves and our dollars, simply hasn't been thought through in all its ramifications.

There is a shortage of dollars in the world. We don't need to worry about anybody hoarding them. If they pass them on to another nation, that other nation will eventually use them buying goods from us. Remember, we are the only big industrial nation in all the world with undamaged factories and plants. It shouldn't take very much common sense to realize that if people are going to buy, they've got to sell. Especially is this true of the devastated nations. In order to sell, devastated countries have to make tremendous sacrifices.

England is going without essentials now so that she will have something to sell in order to buy food and the necessary raw materials to set her economy again in order.

If we are going to set up unilateral trade policies that exclude England or any other country, they must in self-defense set up unilateral trade policies themselves—and we are headed straight for one of the troubles that helped to start this last World War. We shall be doing practically the same thing we did back in the twenties when we started the tariff race that contributed to World War II.

In our foreign policy what we want is reconstruction of foreign trade on a multilateral basis. No country should be compelled to buy from another goods which she can obtain better and cheaper elsewhere. No country, big or small, should be discriminated against by the commercial policies of another country. In this way international trade will become the source of increasing prosperity and rising standards of living.

Getting along around the council table must depend in part upon becoming economically integrated and interdependent. Economic unity of the globe will strengthen our chance of durable peace. Our foreign economic policy isn't something which concerns the exporter and the importer alone. It concerns the man in the street in every nation on the globe.

What are some of the other sore spots in the British situation? Well, let's take the Middle East. For one thing, I think England is dead wrong in her attitude about Palestine.

Dr. Walter Loudermilk and Robert Nathan, both eminently qualified, made careful and considered studies of this part of the world. We ought to offer a positive program based upon their findings.

Dr. Loudermilk's proposal of a trans-Jordan Valley authority on the TVA model could be sponsored by the United Nations and might contribute to a solution of the Palestine problem which plagues the world.

England is turning over to the United Nations the mandated areas she received after the last war with the exception of Palestine.

Why shouldn't Palestine, along with the Mediterranean bases, also be a trusteeship to the United Nations? The troublesome oil of the Middle East could also be handled through the United Nations for the benefit of all.

Above all, we should remember the thing that keeps England from being the great world citizen she is capable of being is economics. That is the problem which we must help England solve, not only for the sake of the English but in order that we may build a durable peace.

The Russian concern, on the other hand, is not primarily economics but survival. The Russians are trying to do exactly what we did more than a hundred years ago with the Monroe Doctrine which we brought up to date with our policy of hemispheric unity. Incidentally, at the time the Monroe Doctrine was first enunciated we pointedly told Russia, as well as the western European nations, to keep out of this hemisphere.

Russia wants her sphere of influence, too. She wants to make certain that her neighbors are friendly. She wants to assure herself that she won't be attacked a third time through Poland or the Balkans. She isn't quite sure that again an anti-Soviet bloc won't be built up against her; therefore, she is going to try to take care of herself as best she can.

In this atomic age, this kind of security sounds old fashioned, but we haven't abandoned it ourselves. We are even today talking about holding on to Pacific and Atlantic bases.

The only way to cure this kind of thinking is to make sure that there aren't going to be sudden attacks against any nation—that there isn't going to be another war.

This assurance must be given Russia before she will become the great world citizen she is capable of being. That's one of the vital problems to be worked out around the council table.

A beginning was made at the recent meeting in Moscow. We accepted Russia and Great Britain as partners in controlling Japan. That showed good faith—a recognition of mutual interests. Russia agreed to certain requests we were making the Balkans as a result.

Whereupon a great hue and cry went up over here that we were appeasing Russia. When will we learn that negotiation is not appeasement? There is no sense sitting around a council table unless you find some common meeting ground. To find that common meeting ground, everybody has to give a little bit.

But why, as a matter of fact, should the Russians feel any sense of security at all right now in her relations with us? While continuing day in and day out to insult her every chance we get in the press, in speeches, even on the floor of the Congress, we go right on building atomic bombs as fast as we can, announcing at the same time that we aren't letting her in on the secret. Of course, it's idiocy to talk about the secret. There isn't any secret. Russia knows that. She has scientists, too.

But it's our attitude that must be deeply disturbing to Russia. How could anyone be surprised if the Russians, in the face of this attitude, went off in a huff, locked themselves up inside their own borders, and started making an atomic bomb of their own and said to heck with the rest of the world?

We did something of the sort after World War I—and with far less provocation.

We have got to stop making atomic bombs at once if our plans for international control of atomic energy are to have any real meaning.

Russia has indicated over and over again that she would be relieved if she could stop worrying about danger of attack from without and get on with the building up of her country for the good life. Since the admission of the Russians into the League of Nations, right straight through, Russia has been willing and eager to cooperate in the building of world security.

Should Russia ask us for a loan, which is probable, we undoubtedly will make the loan after a lot of talk about it. The trouble with us is that we do these things so grudgingly that we lose much of the good will that is so indispensable to the building of a united world.

And that is what we are after—a united world. Because all our wealth, all our factories, all our power, all our dreams are nothing unless we help tie the people of the world together—tie them together with strong bonds of real friendship and understanding.

That is the job that has been given mankind to do. It must be done in a few short years. Each people must make its contribution—the contribution it is capable of to the utmost of its ability with all of its strength and its imagination—with its heart.

We the peoples of the United States have been given much. We have been blessed. We have been spared twice when the world was set on fire. We have already created a united pattern—one United States—which must serve now as a world pattern. As free people we have lived united—voluntarily. We have now the great privilege of leading the greatest undertaking that has ever been given mankind.

"There is a mysterious cycle in human events. To some generations much is given. Of other generations much is expected. This generation of Americans has a rendezvous with destiny."

Franklin Roosevelt spoke those words nearly 10 years ago. They are as true now as they were when he uttered them. There is more that is asked of us. We have not yet fulfilled our destiny. That must be the building of an abiding peace. We must arm ourselves with his last words, his farewell to us:

"The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with strong and active faith."

Steel Strike

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. KELLY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1946

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today this Nation faces the greatest shutdown in the history of the steel industry. Hundreds of thousands of workers will be off of their jobs. These people, added to those already on strike, make a sad commentary upon the history of our country.

Rejection by the United States Steel Corp. of the wage settlement proposed by the President, and accepted by the steel workers, places the responsibility squarely upon the shoulders of those in the steel industry who propose to fight against any wage increase at all.

Mr. Fairless, president of the United States Steel Corp., according to reports I have read in the newspapers, personally was striving faithfully to effect a settlement, but, from all appearances, he has been overridden by those in the industry he represents.

I remember very well when a similar instance occurred after the First World War in 1919. The steelworkers of this Nation struck for better working conditions. When it seemed evident that no agreement could be reached between labor and the industrial heads of the steel corporations, Woodrow Wilson, then President of the United States, called upon both groups to come to Washington—to sit in conference, in order that some kind of agreement be ascertained and to settle the differences that then arose between the heads of the steel corporations and the steelworkers.

I remember very well the reply that the late Elbert H. Gary, president of the United States Steel Corp., made to the President—that he would not sit at the same table with the steelworkers' representatives.

Wilson's reply to him was: "You will, if I have to send the armed forces out to get you and make you sit with those of us who are seeking to avert the coming strike."

The result was that Mr. Gary sat in this conference and President Wilson appointed Bernard Baruch as an arbitrator to try and peacefully settle the differences that prevailed then. While it did not immediately settle that dispute, nevertheless, the strike lasted but a short time and an agreement was reached.

The President of the United States can do the same thing today, not only with the steel corporations, but all other corporations and workers of industry that are now on strike.

And by bringing these representative groups together, he can effect a compromise of the differences between them—and settle these strikes.

Today, after the ending, a few short months ago, of the most terrible war civilization has ever encountered, it seems as though some people in the United States place themselves above the Government.

The President of the United States has asked for cooperation of all the people in the hard task ahead, and in his proposal has asked the steel workers to compromise from their demand of a 30-cents-per-hour increase to the acceptance of 18½ cents per hour, which was agreeable to the steel workers.

The steel corporations have agreed to a 15-cents-per-hour increase. The difference of only 3½ cents per hour stands between prosperity and chaos in this Nation.

We are all familiar with the tremendous profits made by industry during the war. We are all familiar, too, with the added increase of living conditions, which have risen in spite of price control, and which make it mighty hard for a man earning his living by the sweat of his brow to make all ends meet in bringing up his family in the American way of life.

I am familiar, also, with the fact that, in many small corporations, their overhead expenses have increased.

That is why I believe that the President should call these people together, or designate someone to represent him—someone who has a broad knowledge of the situation which now exists.

If one industrial leader in this Nation can agree upon a compromise with labor—and I refer to Henry J. Kaiser—they all can.

I realize that the steel corporations, or any party, has a right to a dispute and to reject a settlement, even though it be by the intervention of the President, and this right must be respected, or we would be subject to government by decree.

The President, in his proposal to the United States Steel Corp. to effect a settlement, did not overstate when he said that "a strike in the steel industry will be felt in practically every major industry in the United States."

It will paralyze this country and the effect will be felt throughout the entire world. It will rekindle the Nazi spirit again in those who sought to rule by destruction.

It will set the people of America back to the depression days of 1929–34 when this Nation shrank to a $33,000,000,000 nation in wages, and will add to the old familiar bread lines that prevailed during those sad days.

The United States Steel Corp. can avert this condition by agreeing to the proposal of the President of the United States and by so doing will prosper, by the demand that is now waiting by the users of steel, not only in this country but the entire world.

Mr. Richberg Talks Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of January 16, 1946:

MR. RICHBERG TALKS BACK

Donald R. Richberg is, ordinarily, a mild-mannered man. As a lawyer for the unions, as a coauthor of the Railway Labor Act, and as a Government official in early New Deal years, he has abundantly proved his liberalism and his friendship for those who toil.

The Railway Labor Act—a labor-supported measure—has helped to prevent serious strikes on the Nation's railroads for almost 20 years. Because of its success Mr. Richberg suggested, some time ago, that its principles be applied to all important industries. His suggestion took form in the Hatch-Ball-Burton bill, now before Congress.

The bill's introduction brought from officers of national labor organizations an amazing outburst of protest and abuse. Yesterday, speaking in New York, Mr. Richberg cast mild manners aside and talked back to the labor leaders. He said many things that are true and that, coming from him, carry great weight.

He did not spare criticism of management's faults. But, he pointed out, the balance of power has swung until now—

"Labor leaders are generally suffering from the delusions of rapidly swollen authority gained by political influence, by a special immunity from legal restraints, and by the command of organized force and violence which a sympathetic public permitted them to acquire and exercise in the days when unorganized, helpless wage earners were the common victims of injustice."

These labor leaders' greatest weakness, he went on, "is their hostility to impartial government. They feel that they are still entitled to an unfair deal * * *.

"With short-sighted selfishness, they are trying to create an economic system in which all wage earners would be compelled to join unions and to accept the fixation of wages and jobs under the monopoly control of labor politicians. Their success would end a free, competitive economy and produce some form of state socialism as the inevitable outgrowth of the labor dictatorship which they are seeking to establish."

If labor-management warfare continues to spread, he warned, everyone eventually will be compelled to take sides under class-conscious leaders of either labor or management who are strong enough to swing national power. And this would mean government by one class or the other which, in either case, "would be destructive of political and economic freedom."

Today's urgent need, Mr. Richberg asserted, is to maintain the balances of economic power that are essential "to preserve democracy and free enterprise. Any power that grows into an ability to dictate to the rest of the people must be cut down * * * before it grows too great to be destroyed without a civil war * * *.

"What is needed to stop this legalized flood of rising force and violence * * * is not a law to forbid strikes, but a law to make strikes unnecessary * * * a law establishing processes of justice for the settlement of economic conflicts; a law that sternly requires all those engaged in labor disputes to exhaust all peaceful ways and means of settling them before undertaking to make war on each other."

Mr. Richberg is correct, we think, in saying that labor leaders who automatically denounce all suggestions of such a law do not represent the opinion of most union members. We agree with him that "the American people in overwhelming numbers—including a large majority of labor unionists, as shown by every secret poll taken among them—want the Congress to pass a law that will end, or at least minimize, industrial warfare."

Three Men Who Vote "No"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER A. RAMEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 21, 1946

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bryan (Ohio) Press of January 17, 1946:

THREE MEN WHO VOTE "NO"

An old farmer, we believe in Putnam County, has suggested that a granite shaft be erected where the congressional districts of Congressmen ROBERT F. JONES, of Lima, FREDERICK C. SMITH, of Marion, and CLIFF CLEVENGER join on the Putnam, Allen, and Hancock County line and that on the tri-cornered stone be inscribed suitable words honoring "three men who have voted against spending more money than any three Congressmen the United States has ever had."

The grand total of spending against which these three have consistently voted runs far into billions. It is to their everlasting credit that they had the courage to stand up and vote against these appropriations, many of which were pure pork barrel. Like Fabius, they believe that to be turned from their course by men's opinion by blame and by misrepresentation shows a man unfit to hold an office.

Probably no three men have ever voted for more lost causes either, because it should not be forgotten that the Executive administration, the House, and the Senate are completely controlled by the Democratic Party, and have been for the past 12 years. Because the majority of Congressmen from Ohio happen to be Republicans, people are likely to be misled by castigations of Congress into thinking the Republicans are to blame for the mess the Nation is in and into which it is sinking deeper by the day. Not so. The Democrats would like to get rid of the blame, but it belongs strictly to them, as anyone can see by looking at the majority of Democrats in the House, the Senate, and the White House.

Government Keep Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 21, 1946

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Grand Rapids Herald of January 19, 1946:

GOVERNMENT KEEP OUT

Let management and labor settle their own disputes without the interference of Government. Let Government keep entirely out of labor disputes.

These are the recommendations of William H. Davis, former Chairman of the War Labor Board and former Director of the Office of Economic Stabilization.

Mr. Davis was speaking to the Senate Labor and Education Committee. Because of his experience, his word should carry some weight.

Mr. Davis told the committee that if management and labor settle their disputes between themselves and without Government or other interference, their bargains will last much longer and be more strictly adhered to.

Moreover, he declared that the intervention of Government in labor disputes destroys the essence of collective bargaining and that if Government is to assume responsibility for fixing wages and working conditions, we eventually shall lose our freedom.

In the course of his remarks Mr. DAVIS urged the Congress to have nothing to do with the President's fact-finding bill, with the Ball-Hatch bill, or any other similar proposed legislation which would shift to Government the responsibility for settling labor disputes.

He urged that in all such matters we get back to first principles and permit the factors which compose industry to settle between themselves their own difficulties and disagreements.

It seems to us that Mr. DAVIS is on sound ground in his position. Through the operations of the Wagner Act we placed all the advantage in the hands of labor, leaving management and the investing public on the outside looking in.

By legislation we have fixed minimum wages and hours of labor. Under the Smith-Connally Act, now repealed, we undertook to finance elections in plants and thereby encouraged strikes because the interested parties were able to shift the cost of strike elections to the Government.

If management and labor were let alone to settle their difficulties, each would have a higher respect for the other and because they had reached agreement between themselves, each would have greater respect for these agreements.

One of our greatest difficulties at the present time, not only in matters concerning labor but in many others, has been that Government has taken over the responsibilities which should remain with the people and the people are both management and labor and everything else in this country.

Redeployment and Replacements in Military Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 21, 1946

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bavarian, published in Augsburg, Germany:

REDEPLOYMENT AND REPLACEMENTS IN MILITARY GOVERNMENT

After a slow start, the Third Military Government Regiment, which blankets Bavaria, is practically caught up with the Army redeployment in the ETO. This past week all "available" enlisted men down to 60 points and all "available" officers down to 75 joined the Eightieth Division for shipment to the States in the very near future.

In a last-minute decision the number of officers available for shipment with 75 points or better was sharply cut by a ruling that those newly promoted and those assigned to detachments according to the new revised T/O of November 15 and December 15 are, at least for a short time, essential. This ruling directly affected a good number of officers who have served from 3 to 5 years in the Army already. Most of them would agree that the redeployment program has pretty well undermined the original supply of military government personnel.

But what they are all asking is "Where are the trained replacements?" The Government, working with the Army, spent a huge amount of time and money training a body of men to do military government work in Germany. The Second and Third Military Government Regiments were specifically groomed for that job. Now the fact is this: when enlisted men with 60 points and officers with 75 points go home, omitting volunteers, scarcely 10 percent of the military government personnel trained to govern in the western and eastern military districts remains.

We are not inviting an "essential" declaration on ourselves. Somebody, way up the line, forgot about replacements. The war is no excuse; the war in Europe has been over practically 7 months. When an Army regiment, which has been trained for from 1 to 2 years in military government work receives, in October, over 800 men from an Infantry combat division whose most important qualification for military government work was the fact that they had "low points," and about December 1 an additional 500 men new from the States who have only had basic training, then someone forgot or neglected the original plan for military government in Germany. The men we have received are good men; many of them, having been through combat, are quick to catch on and adapt themselves to their new jobs. But the regrettable part of the whole plan is that, as far as qualifications for military government work go specifically, the men from Infantry combat might have very conceivably gone to any of the other occupation units. And one of the first questions the 500 new men from the States were asking was, "What is military government?"

When 500 men, a great majority just out of high school, arrive as replacements in an organization which is in the midst of carrying out the most important phase of the Allied occupation of Germany, and then have to ask upon arriving, "What is military government?" then we think someone forgot. And when Infantry occupation units and military government units go together to the same replacement depots and pick up their assigned quantities of men from the same pool with the same training we think someone forgot * * * forgot that if you want a man to be an MP you train him as an MP; if you want him to be Infantry you train him as Infantry; and if you want him to work with the Army in governmental affairs and controls at least you tell him what they mean in regard to the Army and Germany so that he does not arrive asking, "What is military government?"

Trained replacements, we are told, are on the way. The State Department, we are told, is preparing to assume active control early this coming year. Meanwhile, a large number of detachments have almost a complete turn-over in personnel, and few of the original officers and men who laid down the law to the burgomeister and stadt and kreis officials are around to see that they toe the line. From the standpoint of a fair redeployment system, discharging men who have served in the armed forces upon points and length of service, the turn-over is commendable. But what the military government men who remain expect is that a country and State Department that is committed to the United Nations Organization and a long-range occupation and reeducation of Germany, and an Army that is committed to implement that policy with qualified trained personnel in the field of military government would have, at least, met the turnover with more foresight. At least, the men who have to step into military government work on a control level should not have to do so asking, "What is military government?"

We have now, in the Third MGR, a fine new group of young fellows. It is partially to the saving grace of American ingenuity and flexibility that practically all MG detachments will apparently operate as usual. In America, however, we do not take men just out of high school and put many of

them in important governmental positions on a control level. We have in Germany. Nor do we put a man into work of a State Department and foreign ambassador nature because he was a model farmer, a good electrician, or an expert rifleman. But that has been comparable to the selection of 1,300 MG replacements in Bavaria alone during the last 2 months. We think someone forgot.

And now the plea rises on all sides, "Hold military government personnel"; "Keep the controls from breaking down"; "Military government personnel must be declared essential." Why? Because someone forgot, some people way up whose business was not to forget. We can see the logic of the pleas, but they ought to be completed like this: "Hold military government personnel until the people someone forgot to train or select are ready to take over."

Meanwhile military government, working in the sphere of governmental policy and controls, yet being Army, is caught in the incongruous situation of redeploying enlisted men over 35 years of age and replacing them with hundreds just out of high school. In the States we have minimum age limits for our Presidents, Representatives, Senators, and governors because it is our common opinion that government is the proper realm of experienced men. In Germany we were caught in the ridiculous position of sending men home from military government for the sole reason that they were 35 years of age or more.

That is over the dam now. Meanwhile, there errors are named now that they may not be repeated. Those of us who have, in numerous cases, served longer in the armed services and often in equal or greater danger and difficulty than thousands of new civilians now in the States do not want them repeated. Meanwhile, we trust that both the State Department and the Army will rush the job of comprehensive training for suitable replacements. We have been on the job here long enough to know that the occupation is serious business and necessarily long-range. Some people, who should have remembered, evidently forgot. We do not intend to let them forget again.

Strikes: Causes, Effects, Remedies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 21, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a book might be written on each of the above topics. The following is just a hint, given with the hope it will be followed by serious thought.

STRIKES—CAUSES

First. The laudable desire inherent in all of us to better our condition so that each, and our loved ones, may have more of all the desirable things of life. Some believe a strike is one method of attaining that objective.

Second. The failure on the part of those who it is thought are able to make concessions to realize the need of concessions; the lack of accurate information on the part of those making demands as to whether they can or cannot, in whole or in part, be granted by those from whom they are sought.

Third. A feeling of class consciousness, deliberately instigated and encouraged by the last administration and by intemperate words and acts on both sides, which has led to a desire to win a pending argument, rather than a willingness to accept the facts, be reasonable and charitable, determine a long-range, overall, beneficial policy for all.

Fourth. As causing the present situation, the administration's statement that future profits justified a 20-percent increase in wages without a price increase.

Fifth. The drive on the part of a few vociferous, unscrupulous labor leaders and the Communists to insist upon a part in management, for the purpose of diverting profits from improvements, replacements, extensions, research, and dividends to stockholders, and a division of those profits among the employees. You can do your own reasoning, form your own conclusions, as to where that policy would lead us.

STRIKES—EFFECTS

The loss of millions of dollars to employees who will not during strikes receive pay checks. The loss of millions in reduced sales by local merchants and inability to purchase hundreds of items for which eager buyers are waiting, but the production of which has been slowed down or has ceased.

A scarcity of hundreds of items which ready purchasers wish to buy and which will cause a black market, higher prices, increased inflation.

STRIKES—REMEDIES

Many and varied have been suggested. A few simple ones, would, in my judgment, do the job.

First. A willingness on the part of management to sit down with the rank and file—as distinguished from some labor leaders and officials whose jobs depend upon the continuation of labor disputes—and discuss with the workers the facts with reference to the business.

Many employers know nothing of the needs—the home life of the workers. Many a worker has no conception of the problems confronting management—of the necessity for using a part of the earnings for dividends to stockholders, research, maintenance, expansion.

Second. Amendments to the National Labor Relations Act—which even its supporters concede was never designed to deal out equality of opportunity or responsibility as between employees and employers—which will give to all an equal opportunity to obtain justice under law.

Third. Legislation, and the enforcement of it, which will ban the use of brute force, violence, and rioting as weapons to be used in obtaining settlement of a labor dispute.

Fourth. A recognition of the fact that the rights of the public are paramount and must be preserved, regardless of the effect upon employee or employer. That is just a restatement of the principle that, when the exercise of a right or the liberty of the individual becomes detrimental to the public as a whole, the indivdual must yield. This last has particular reference to the situation where the furnishing of light, heat, water, power, food, communications, and transportation to the public rests in the hands of a public-service corporation and its employees.

The foregoing is sketchy but indicates some things to which we may all give serious thought; then act, each according to his ability and opportunity.

Strike Cycle Again Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 21, 1946

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following editorial from the Carroll County Independent, Center Ossipee, N. H., of January 18, 1946, entitled "Strike Cycle Again Here":

STRIKE CYCLE AGAIN HERE

Now it would seem that the strike cycle of 1919 will be repeated in 1946. It will be recalled that 1919, the first postwar year of World War I, saw the greatest number of strikes the country had known up to that time. At that time the workers had adequate savings to enable them to stay on strike. Confronted with rising prices, they went out for higher wages. The year 1919 saw rising prices, minor inflation, industrial unrest, strikes, and discontent.

Now it would seem that cycle is being repeated for the postwar year of 1946. Labor is confident of its organizations, has money in pocket, political power, and know how. It is confident that it can make management bow to its demands.

Management, knowing that there is plenty of business ahead for the next 3 or 4 years, feels that it can afford to sit things out for a few months. For it knows that it will get the business anyway. The public has waited for 4 years for durable goods. It can wait a few months longer.

While both labor and management undergo loss, inconvenience, privation during a strike, in the final analysis it is the public that really suffers and it is the public that foots the bill.

Coal, steel, and automobile workers all get raises in pay. The price of tractors is raised $50. That comes out of the pocket of a farmer in North Carolina or New Hampshire or North Dakota.

Automobile workers go on strike and a school bus stops running because a broken part cannot be replaced.

Telephone and telegraph workers strike and interstate business slows down and stagnates.

Electric workers strike in New Jersey and a mill in Chicago shuts down because replacement parts cannot be secured for machinery.

Today our life in the United States is so complicated and each group of persons, or each industry, is so dependent upon other groups or industries for orderly operation and existence, that the effect of any work stoppage can seriously tie up orderly life and cause real hardship and suffering.

Many people are beginning to wonder if firm Federal control must not be laid over both labor and management to prevent work stoppages. Obviously this is giving of more power to Washington. This is surrender of personal rights. This is increased centralization of authority.

But it is now certainly debatable if any group of workers, or any management group, have a right to bring hardship to the Nation simply to secure added profit to themselves.

The Gravediggers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1946

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, in pursuance of permission duly granted, I extend my remarks in the RECORD for the purpose of inserting an article by Max Lerner entitled "The Gravediggers of America," which appears in today's issue of PM. It is as follows:

THE GRAVEDIGGERS OF AMERICA

With industrial conflict in America growing tenser day by day, the whole duty of the American who cares for his Nation and his people is to ask some plain questions and give some plain answers.

Who is responsible for the stoppage of work that began at midnight last night in the steel industry, which is the heart of America's whole economy? For those who read as they run the natural answer might seem to be that it is, of course, the steel workers; for isn't this a walk-out of three-quarters of a million men who are striking for their higher wage demands? But even a casual effort to dig beneath the surface will show how superficial and wrong such a quick answer it.

For the open-minded the facts about the present steel-stoppage are plain. The steel workers started with a demand for a 25-cents-an-hour increase. The steel corporations countered with a 10-cent-an-hour offer. In the negotiations at the White House between Philip Murray for the union and Benjamin Fairless for the industry, Murray went down to 20, Fairless went up to 15. President Truman offered a compromise plan for an 18½-cent increase. Murray accepted. Fairless stuck fast at 15, and has refused to budge since.

Seen in wage terms, therefore, the walk-out of the steel workers has, in reality, been forced upon them by the refusal of the industry to accept the moderate compromise of the President. What separates the corporations from this moderate compromise is only 3½ cents an hour. For 3½ cents, it would seem, the steel industrialists have seen fit to throw an entire economy into paralysis. I say "an entire economy" because steel is the key industry of the country, on which every other industry depends. The framework of our whole industrial structure is a steel framework.

FORCING A SHOWDOWN

But it would be naive to think that this strike has been forced on the steel workers by considerations of 3½ cents. The steel industry involves many billions of dollars, and there are even more billions in the other industries that are interlocked with it. This isn't a niggardly 3½-cent proposition. Nor is it simply a matter of the stubbornness of Benjamin Fairless and the United States Steel Corp.

It is as clear as a bell that behind Fairless are other men even more powerful and determined then he is. It is transparent that their decision was based not on 3½ cents, but on considerations of power. They are forcing a show-down. Their show-down is not only with labor in the steel industry. It is with labor throughout the American economy. And in the end it is a show-down with the American Government and the American people.

Let us take a hard look at this. First of all, what are they aiming at in the steel industry? They want to return to the good old days, the days before the New Deal, the days before the steel workers' union was organized.

I have been digging back a bit into the history of the labor struggles in the steel industry—into the congressional investigation of the industry in 1911, into the report of the Interchurch World Movement on the great steel strike of 1919, into the misery and repression in the industry for more than a decade after that strike was broken, into the bitterness of the Little Steel strike of 1937. The story of steel labor is the story of the investment of sweat and blood in an effort to win a collective-bargaining position. After the 1919 strike was broken, steel wages for a 10-hour day for unskilled labor fell in 3 years from $5 a day to $3 a day. Those were the good old days. Before the CIO came into the steel picture in 1936, there never was a successful and unified movement of skilled and unskilled steel workers alike. Those were the good old days.

The steel workers are today the key CIO union. Under Myron Taylor's leadership the United States Steel Corp., the biggest in the industry, finally made a crucial decision: To place labor peace ahead of labor conflict and industrial order ahead of industrial anarchy. As a result, steel has been for almost a decade the model example of orderly collective bargaining. But now the pattern has been broken.

What happened to break it? Not, I have said, the 3½ cents. Until the last White House meeting, Fairless, who had for years been following the Myron Taylor tradition, looked as if he would go through with a compromise. Yet when he came back to the last meeting he stuck fast. What happened in the interval? To glimpse the answer one must remember that Fairless is now not the deciding voice in the industry. He is the spokesman, the front man. As Ralph Ingersoll pointed out in these columns the other day, ownership in the United States Steel Corp. is so dispersed that no owner can speak for it. It has management control. The real general staff of the industry as a whole is the Iron and Steel Institute, a trade association that has behind it the seamy history of Carnegie and Frick, of Gary, Grace, and Girdler. The dominant personality in the institute is today Eugene Grace, head of Bethlehem Steel. Grace is the symbol of the men who want the good old days back in steel. It isn't that he and his kind are niggardly about 3½ cents. It is rather that they want to weaken the unions and break the position they have achieved.

CORPORATIONS REJECT COMPROMISE

And not only in the steel industry. Here we come to the nub of the whole industrial conflict today. Here is where the steel situation ties up with the General Motors situation and with the electrical industry and meat-packing and the rest of the labor-industry picture. In every one of these cases labor has taken the initiative in order to consolidate its gains and prevent the wage-slashing and union-smashing that were the rule at the end of the First World War. In every one of these cases it has repeatedly shown its willingness to settle at a reasonable compromise. In every one—notably in General Motors and now in steel—the corporations have rejected the compromise, spurned the fact-finding, and are hell-bent for a show-down power fight.

I don't see how, in the light of the facts, we can escape the conclusion that the steel show-down is round two in a fight of which the General Motors show-down has been round one. One thinks of the attitude of Grace and of Fairless, of the duPont family that has the big controls in General Motors, and of C. E. Wilson, who is their GM spokesman. A small group of powerful men in our Nation have decided that if the steel companies were to accept the Truman compromise it would leave the General Motors bitter-enders in the unendurable position of holding out in one sector of industry against a solution which another sector had accepted. This is the united front of industrial action. It is a class-consciousness at the top of the owning and managing class so bitter that it is willing to sabotage the key industries of the Nation. It is the Marxian theory of class revolution turned topsy-turvy, the pyramid standing on its head.

That there are some cracks in the united corporate front is shown by the case of Henry Kaiser, who has shown his industrial statesmanship in steel as in autos by signing his contracts with the two unions. But thus far one cannot argue too much from Kaiser. He is a maverick who has had to fight the bitter-end mentality of reaction among his fellows as he has had to fight the bankers.

Yet these are the men who have the brazenness to talk piously of the need for work and production; these men who for the ends of their own power are interrupting the work processes throughout the economy; who, to smash the unions, are paralyzing the production of the Nation; who, to recapture the inequality of economic power that existed before the New Deal, are willing to bring the key industries of the country to a standstill; who, to undo the history of the past 13 years, are willing to risk the existence of the economy and the democratic Nation.

What better name can we find for them than the gravediggers of America?

MAX LERNER.

Alleged Destruction of Food and Supplies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1946

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, when I read in the papers an article which alleged that food and other supplies were being destroyed in the New Guinea-Australia area I immediately took the matter up with the Army Service Forces and also with Hon. W. Stuart Symington, the Administrator of Surplus Property. I told them that this charge should not go unanswered, and if it was true the people of the country were entitled to an explanation.

This morning there came to my desk a letter from Mr. Symington, and under the permission granted me I include it as part of my remarks. It follows:

SURPLUS PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., January 19, 1946.

Hon. JOHN J. COCHRAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COCHRAN: We regret the delay in replying to your communication of November 30, 1945, enclosing a United Press news item of November 26, 1945, bearing a New York by-line, concerning alleged destruction of food and supplies in the Finschaffen area of New Guinea by United States Army personnel

Inquiry was made of the Interim Foreign Economic and Liquidation Service for information concerning this matter. They advised that upon reading of the report of destruction in the paper December 6, 1945, they immediately requested their representative in Australia to investigate and report thereon. His reply reads, in part, as follows:

"United States Army officially denied wanton destruction. We believe allegations untrue and harsh criticism of Army not justified. Johnson and Sustare (assistants to

our representative) have seen situation at Finschaffen and similar points and effort made to meet situation. They report that supplies run gamut of everything armed forces might need and include used and unused as well as packed and unpacked property. Much used equipment beyond repair and much unpacked property beyond recovery. Despite tropic proofing and other measures all property is subject to deterioration including packed goods and capital equipment. Troop withdrawals heavy and native population very small. Local use will hardly dent present stocks.

"Material offered to Dutch and Australian Governments. Dutch purchases were substantial but in case of capital goods were confined to items which could be used on air fields and other installations in New Guinea. Australian purchases to date have not been large.

"Australia advised they could have reverse lend-lease food and other property returned or could negotiate for its sale to the Dutch. Various Australian and United States representatives both military and civilian have determined there can be little, if any, financial gain from further attempts to recoup. Any plan would involve hiring of personnel to repair, repack, guard, and reship.

"Consideration given to plans whereby food and certain other property which is in good condition could be carried to parts of the world where it could be used advantageously. Draw-back is lack of shipping space and manpower and continuous deterioratio. ."

"Our attention was also called to the fact that the Australian Purchasing Committee in New Guinea denied that large stocks of American supplies, including food, were being destroyed. This committee cabled the War Department that they regretted "that through an irresponsible and unjustifiable piece of journalistic reporting statements of destruction of United States stores and equipment at Finshaven had been published in New Guinea and Australia." Their cable stated that it was the unanimous opinion of all members of the Government party that the allegations of destruction were unfounded and were made without justification or any attempt at verification. They concluded by stating that they agreed that the interests of the United States were being effectively safeguarded in the face of considerable difficulties."

We appreciate your courtesy in calling this matter to our attention.

Sincerely yours,

W. STUART SYMINGTON,
Administrator.

Lee—A Pattern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 21, 1946

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the News and Observer, Raleigh, N. C., of January 20, 1946:

LEE—A PATTERN

Yesterday was the birthday of Gen. Robert E. Lee. It is a State holiday, but in the stress and strain of national and international problems few paused to observe it. There is too much hate in the world today. The study of Lee's life and attitude would help eradicate it. In defeat of his armies, when hate in the North brought injury to the South he loved, and hate in the South cankered many minds, Robert E. Lee rose superior to that hurtful passion.

Lee loved his State so passionately he preferred to suffer with its people than to hold the highest position in the Army of the Union which his forebears had done so much to establish. When the fortunes of war went against the South he sheathed his sword "with malice toward none" and gave allegiance to the reunited country. More than that—he lived the Golden Rule and taught the youth of the South to eradicate hate and rebuild upon the foundations of the virtues he incarnated.

In an address on Lee's birthday in 1912 Governor Aycock truly said:

"Within a week I have read a book professing to be an appreciation of General Lee which says that he failed. I cannot believe that any man has failed, or the principles for which he contended have ever failed, when he has left to the world a life so rich and full, clean and serene, as to make every man who studies it desirous of doing something and being better himself."

In a world long rent by hate and oppression and war the example of Lee shines for guidance. He is the ideal pattern for all men not only in his beloved South but in all the world seeking brotherhood and peace.

Today all men should adopt this creed expressed by Lee:

"Duty, then, is the sublimest word in our language. Do your duty in all things. You cannot do more. You should never wish to do less."

Letter of E. M. Biggers of Houston, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 21, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed to all Senators and Congressmen:

HOUSTON, TEX., *January 10, 1946.*

To Every Senator and Congressman:

Justification for this appeal is that I have three little grandchildren coming up. It would be easier to say, as many others do: "Oh! what's the use."

This was held back until you returned to Washington and pressure the President asked be heaped upon you had fully fermented.

The President complained of pressure groups but said nothing of the worst sort which he has allowed to so completely surround him. A little cooperation with Congress, for a change, might work.

Many of us have prayed for the day Congress would take back the duties it surrendered to the Executive 12 years ago. Our present disturbed condition is chargeable to that surrender.

Being alarmed, I am presenting my views:

1. The greatest service Congress can render to the Nation, to its workers, and to industry is to correct the Wagner Act.

The Roosevelt New Deal Party passed the laws compelling industry to make so many deductions from the worker's pay check: Union dues, social security tax, withholding tax, unemployment tax—even bond deductions—all of which shrink his take-home pay.

Every worker bitterly resents having anything taken out of his pay check. Foreseeing the dynamite in this program the sponsors cunningly shifted the collecting job onto industry. These deductions are today largely responsible for the ill feeling toward the boss. The worker is not complaining about his salary. His No. 1 gripe is "take-home pay."

As a boy on a west Texas ranch, one of my jobs was to pull cattle out of bog holes. After yanking an old cow to solid ground I would place a tub of water and a pile of feed at her head, for which she seemed grateful. Next day I returned and if the water and feed were gone I knew she had gained sufficient strength so that an artful twist of her tail would make her get up. A bit wobbly she would shake her head and cast her eyes my way. Being the first thing she saw I was blamed for all her troubles. I was no longer a benefactor but an enemy. It was either beat it to my horse or get hooked.

The worker does not see the hidden hand that compels his employer to make the deductions. He does not see that industry has struggled to keep our Nation and our workers on the highest level in all the world. He sees the total of his pay check—then his take-home pay—and the boss is blamed for the shortage.

Repeal that unfair law. Give the worker his full pay check. Give him the privilege of paying his own obligations. He will feel like an American again. It may even cause some of them to think.

When a worker pays his deductions directly to the Government he will have the grim realization that he has been subsidizing his own serfdom. In no other way can it be brought home to him that he owes and must pay his share of the great public debt—a debt which hasn't yet bothered him one bit.

He might even become doubtful of the wisdom, the motives, and the sincerity of those who have used him for their own political purposes.

After listening to the President's broadcast it seems even more deductions are planned. If his pressure groups have their way we shall have hospital fees, medical fees, higher social security taxes, higher unemployment benefit taxes—then just a step to food, clothing, and shelter stamps—Soviet style.

2. I would like for you to say to England: "Quit sending your Laskis over here to criticize and find fault with our America (Madison Square Garden, September 24, 1945); the same Laski who advised England to join up with Russia against America" (Associated Press, January 13, 1946).

England and Russia both owe their survival to America. Criticism of us by their high officials is both ill-timed and a bad omen. Determine the loan-lose on its merits. Bought good will usually proves fickle.

3. I would like to see the United States Employment Service closed. It is a vicious bureau. Job seekers should not be dependent upon a political agency for bread and butter—is any employment agency really needed?

At a time when we so badly need full production millions are refusing to work—a little protection for those wanting to work would be better.

In closing may I express the fervent hope that if Mr. Wallace's predicted revolution arrives our Congress will stand firm in preserving the Constitution and thus save America from the tragic misery, want, and starvation that has engulfed all the ism-nations of Europe.

Yours truly,

E. M. BIGGERS.

The Strike Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 21, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I have today received a letter from one of my constituents living in my home city. I believe he speaks the mind of a large majority of those who today are out of work because of the strikes taking place throughout this country. I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, include therein the letter referred to. For obvious reasons I am deleting the name of the writer.

It follows:

BAY CITY, MICH., *January 17, 1946.*
Congressman ROY WOODRUFF.

DEAR SIR: As my Representative in Congress for my district, I am writing you this letter to let you know my opinion of the strike situation, in which I am forced not to be able to work in a General Motors plant, which I have worked in for the last 19 years under satisfactory working conditions to me.

My outlook on the whole situation is that there always will have to be a workingman, and we all cannot share alike and divide the profits as there wouldn't be anyone that would want to work. Another experience that I have seen a lot of during the war, when we all had lots of work and large pays coming in, was a certain number of employees that would only work part time when they were receiving some of these large pay checks. In other words, the more income for some of them the more absenteeism for them.

I now haven't any automobile, as my old one is worn out and had to get rid of it. I went down to put my order in for a new one and there were 154 orders ahead of me and no promise date on account of strikes. M washing machine is beyond repairs and my wife is using her sister's machine at present. I went down and put my order in for a new one and got a receipt to the effect that I get the three hundred and seventh one, with no promise date on account of strikes, as they told me in the store. Now, I believe in fair play, and since the war has been over I can't see anything fair to the citizens of this country, the way things have been going. I want to work and be happy as I have in the past, and be able to buy the necessities of life as I have in the past.

Respectfully yours.

Immigration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 21, 1946

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the consideration of my colleagues an interesting and timely editorial from the Huntington Advertiser of December 28, 1945, published in Huntington, W. Va., and edited by Mr. Clyde A. Wellman. It is an indication that the thinking people of this country are greatly concerned about immigration.

IMMIGRATION

A State Department official just back from a mission abroad that carried him into several southern European countries is quoted as saying that "practically everyone in Europe would like to come to the United States."

We don't question the accuracy of the gentleman's observation. Why wouldn't people in Europe be happy to leave all the squalor, destitution, and suffering that have followed in the wake of a destructive war and establish new homes in America?

We have our problems, too. We are not getting along with our reconversion as well as we had hoped and should. We have a lot of unemployment. We have too many strikes, and industrial strife, instead of abating, promises to grow worse. But despite all these difficulties, nobody is hungry and nobody is cold; and everybody is privileged to enjoy all the good standards of living that obtained before the war. Indeed, America is a veritable paradise compared to the environment in which millions of wretched Europeans, with their cities and industries in ruin, live today. No wonder they would like to come to America.

The State Department official's report on their yearning is a forewarning of a serious problem which we must face in the years ahead. What are we to do about immigration? During the war immigration gave us no worry. The people who probably wanted to come to America were over there and had to stay as long as the fighting continued. When normal conditions return, however, the urge will be great throughout most of the war-ravaged countries of the Old World to start life anew in the American promised land.

When that time comes we should not be swayed by our sympathies. We don't want and don't need any new population through immigration. Besides, foreigners coming to us for the next few years will be destitute and, obviously, would complicate our economic and social problems. They would add to our unemployment numbers when, in the economic cycles, we shift from good times to bad times.

We shouldn't close the door to all immigration, but we need to maintain at all times a firm and realistic control on the inflow. We should lower our quotas rather than raise them, and do a thorough job of culling for high quality immigrants.

Adventure in Failure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 21, 1946

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of January 19, 1946:

ADVENTURE IN FAILURE

One of the most revealing documents on the diplomatic negotiations which led to war with Japan, ushered in by the attack on Pearl Harbor, has been written by E. Stanley Jones, a widely known missionary of long experience in Asia. Dr. Jones tells the story of his activities as an unofficial mediator between the Japanese representatives in Washington and the White House in the fall of 1941.

Dr. Jones' account, published in the December issue of the magazine Asia and the Americas, contradicts the Roosevelt administration thesis, advanced during the Pearl Harbor investigation by former Secretary of State Cordell Hull and others, that there was never any hope of keeping the peace. Mr. Hull asserted that Japan was "hell-bent" on war, that "nothing would stop them unless we lay down like cowards," and that the Japanese emissaries, Admiral Nomura and Saburo Kurusu, acted in complete bad faith in all their dealings with him.

Dr. Jones says in reply, "The idea that all the Japanese officials and people were united in their approval of aggression against China and their plans for further conquests in the Orient, even to the point of war with the United States, is commonly held. It has been carefully nurtured by propaganda. The American citizen is supposed to believe that a united Japan undertook world conquest, with no inhibitions and no internal opposition. But the idea is disastrously false.

"Bear in mind that the most intense struggle was taking place between the militarists and the peace party in Japan. Had we been wiser we would have outplanned the militarists. If we had lent aid and encouragement to the peace party in their efforts to prevent war we could have made Japan an ally instead of an enemy."

Dr. Jones credits Nomura, Kurusu, and Prince Konoye, the premier, who recently committed suicide, with sincerity in trying to preserve the peace. He indicates that they worked more wholeheartedly to frustrate the war party in their own country than did our own leaders. He blames the war party for the final break, but he reminds us, "There was another Japan that did not want this war any more than many of us. People burst into tears on the streets of Tokyo, we are told, when news of the war came through."

As to the American attitude, Dr. Jones says, "I was not sure whether the highest officials in the executive branch of our Government really wanted peace. From the time of the Atlantic conference between President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill in August 1941, the official attitude toward Japan had stiffened, bordering on belligerency. Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida, often a spokesman for the President, declared in a speech at Boston that if the Japanese crossed a certain line in the Pacific we would start shooting. Soon afterward severest economic sanctions were applied."

Dr. Jones found that Dr. Hu Shih, the Chinese Ambassador, wanted us to get into war with Japan. Great Britain, says Dr. Jones, was obviously trying to get us into the European war, as Mr. Churchill later openly said, and was not adverse to getting us in by the back door of a Pacific war.

"When I urged Lord Halifax to mediate between us and Japan and help avert a war in the Pacific," Dr. Jones recounts, "he replied, 'You will find my views in the enclosed speech I have made.' The whole tenor of the speech was—America must fight."

The real issue of the war, Dr. Jones contends, was empire. "It was driven home to me with keen emphasis how great aggressors the men of the white race have been," he states. "In the free-booting days, when grabbing was good, white men took all the available territory in the Pacific area before Japan woke up. * * * The Japanese suspected the United States of being willing to fight in order to preserve the white empires of the Pacific. That was correct, as time so amply proved. We did not go to the defense of China when she was attacked by Japan. In fact, we continued to send Japan our scrap

iron and oil. But the moment Japan threatened Indochina—a French possession—we were aroused. That touched a sensitive nerve—the prerogatives of the white nations' colonial possessions in the East."

Instead of negotiating to provide Japanese supporters of peace with a face-saving method of abandoning the program of conquest, Hull handed Nomura and Kurusu a memorandum, which, says Dr. Jones "could have no other interpretation than that of an ultimatum." Even in the face of the demands that Japan abandon the Axis, get out of China and Indochina, and acquiesce in equality of trade in the Far East, Dr. Jones says that the Japanese ambassadors did not abandon hope that we would still grant them a graceful means of surrendering all that the war party had gained.

Two days after the Hull ultimatum Counselor Terasaki, of the Embassy, in a note transmitted to Mr. Roosevelt by Dr. Jones, pleaded: "Don't compel us to do things, but make it possible for us to do them. If you treat us in this way we will reciprocate doubly. If you stretch out one hand we will stretch out two. And we cannot only be friends, we can be allies." There was no response, nor any relaxation of the pressure. As Dr. Jones says, "Our ultimatum * * * put Japan in a box. She had to knuckle under or else fight us."

In one of their last conversations Nomura told Dr. Jones that "it would be absurd for us to go to war over two air bases in North China." From a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Dr. Jones got confirmation of the fact that Japan had reduced its request to this face-saving minimum—the retention of two air bases—as the price for acquiescing to the demands presented by Hull. He would not give even this much to avoid war.

In listing the causes of the war Dr. Jones says a principal cause was "the pressure of a war party that surrounded the President. A Supreme Court justice said to us during the negotiations, 'We have a war party as well as Japan. They are surrounding the President and making it more and more impossible to see him.'"

The Pearl Harbor Committee should call Dr. Jones as a witness. The country is entitled to know who the men were who sabotaged peace.

Robert E. Lee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1946

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following address delivered by me at a special ceremony in Statuary Hall, the Capitol, in honor of Robert E. Lee on January 19, 1946, which was sponsored by the Washington chapter of the United Daughters of the Confederacy and presided over by Mrs. J. W. Johnson, president:

ROBERT E. LEE

EVEN IF WE PERISHED IN THE ENDEAVOR

As sons and daughters of the Confederacy, we are proud to proclaim our love and esteem for the man in whose honored memory we have gathered here today. Why? Who was Robert E. Lee, and what was it concerning the character and attainments of this modest soldier and statesman that secured an enduring regard among all men for his greatness and nobility?

REASONS FOR LEE'S GREATNESS

In an effort to fully emphasize what were, as well as what were not, the causes and conditions of Lee's high place among the great men of history, John W. Daniel, the renowned Virginia orator of a generation ago, concluded one his eulogies as follows:

"Did he wield patronage and power? No. He could not have appointed a friend to the smallest office. He could bestow no emoluments upon any of his followers. But an intimation of his wish amongst his own people carried an influence which the command of the autocrat can never possess, and his approval of conduct or character was deemed an honor, and was an honor, which outlived the stars and crosses and titles conferred by kings.

"Did he save his country from conquest? No. He saw his every foreboding of evil verified. His cause was lost, and the land for which he fought lives not amongst the nations.

"Did he gain wealth? No. He neither sought nor despised it. But he refuted the shallow worldling's maxim that 'every man has his price' and proved that true manhood has none, however great.

"Did he possess rank? Not so. Far from it. He was not even a citizen. The country which gave the right of suffrage to the alien ere he could read or understand its laws, denied to him the privilege of a ballot. He died a paroled prisoner of war, in the calm of peace, 5 years after war had ended."

So here is Lee: A man who possessed neither patronage nor power, who was unable to save his country from conquest, who failed to gain wealth, who died without rank or even citizenship—and still a man who stands foremost in the Nation's Hall of Fame. That Lee ranks foremost among history's honored great is reassuring proof of the fact that in the final analysis the human race possesses a proper sense of values and adjudges character more important than fortune. Robert E. Lee stands on high in the realm of national veneration because he gained more in the love and affection of his countrymen by being their humble servant than he lost by refusing to be their lordly master. His unswerving devotion to the duty that called him and unselfishness and sacrifice in its performance undoubtedly cost him the worldly fruits that his genius would have brought him if applied for personal gain.

THE COURSE CHOSEN BY LEE

But Lee chose a course that few men endowed with genius have been known to choose, and it was his choice of such a course which justifies differentiation in comparing his greatness to that of other men. It was that difference between Lee and others of this select company that inspired the biographer, Benjamin H. Hill, to declare:

"He was Caesar without his ambition, Frederick without his tyranny, Napoleon without his selfishness, and Washington without his reward."

By distinguishing himself in one particular set of circumstances a man may easily become well known and frequently what we call famous but it is only when a man distinguishes himself in every set of circumstances, as did Lee, does he win acclaim for the nobility of his character. As one writer has said, "The world is suspicious of vaunted heroes. They are so easily manufactured. So many feet are cut and trimmed to fit Cinderella's slippers that we hesitate long before we hail the princess."

We hail Robert E. Lee on this occasion because he measures up to our fullest conception of a noble person. We hail him not only as the hero of the Southern Confederacy, but also as the standard bearer of the highest principles and ideals of our Republic. It is especially fitting that we so hail him at this time because our continued progress and existence as a free and independent nation owned and operated by the free and independent citizenry of the United States is about to be tested in the crucible of postwar readjustment.

Writing to his son in January 1861, Lee said: "As an American citizen, I take great pride in my country, her prosperity, and institutions." Later, in the years following the war, he counseled patience and forbearance among his people of the fallen Confederacy and called upon them to work for the future good of the Nation.

SET AN EXAMPLE FOR THE REPUBLIC

In showing the proper respect for duly constituted authority and in conducting himself as an honest and sincere patriot of the land in which he lived, Lee set a high example that the people of the Southland have sought faithfully to follow. The record is very clear on this point. In three major wars which our country has fought since 1865 to preserve its national integrity and independence—the Spanish-American War, World War I, and World War II—the largest number of volunteers per capita serving in each of the three fighting forces required has come from the South.

And who can deny that right now—in the midst of the most serious industrial strife and economic upheaval this Nation has ever seen—the South, more than any other section of the country, stands as a mighty bulwark and anchor to our tossing ship of state. In this crisis I believe the South will lead the way toward a satisfactory solution of the basic problems which confront us.

This much I say without any fear of contradiction: The people of the South know and understand the need for keeping our country militarily strong. They will fight for the maintenance of an armed force equal in size and quality to the position we occupy among the nations of the world.

If pursuing such a policy, in order to insure our continued existence as a free and independent Nation, requires some sacrifice and inconvenience, I am sure that the grandsons, great-grandsons, and great-great-grandsons or granddaughters, great-granddaughters, and great-great-granddaughters of our Southern Confederacy will not complain or whimper because to them, like their forebears, liberty is always worth the price of personal sacrifice and inconvenience.

THE FULFILLMENT OF LEE'S HIGH HOPES

The courageous and sacrificial devotion to duty shown by our young men and women in the war just won establishes in my mind the solid and unshakable conviction that were Robert E. Lee alive today to behold their brave deeds he would be manifestly proud. Yes; we have just achieved victory in a war which was fought to preserve the independence of our Republic and, further, if the reasons may be given in Lee's own matchless words, because "we had sacred principles to maintain and rights to defend, for which we were duty bound to do our best, even if we perished in the endeavor."

Thus, we are able to meet beneath the statue of Lee today firm in the belief that this memorial to him stands now in the Capitol of a Nation which has fulfilled his high hopes and expectations. Let it be our prayer that as our lives run their courses and, knowingly or unknowingly, we come here for the last time to pay our respects, individually or collectively, to this immortal character that we may appear before him secure in the knowledge that the country which honors him has remained true to the high ideals and purposes he set for it. And finally, let it be our further prayer that this Nation, perhaps the most powerful and influential nation in the world today, our Republic, the United States of America, will ever remain true to the high ideals and purposes Robert E. Lee set for it.

Lack of Democracy in the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 21, 1946

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, one of the sore spots in our country today is the resentment of the enlisted man against the special privileges granted officers. This feeling has been intensified since the cessation of hostilities. I think most of the complaints are justified.

One definite action which the House could take promptly would be the passage of H. R. 4051, which would give terminal leave pay to enlisted men on the same basis that it is now received by officers.

To bring this entire question of discrimination clearly before the House, I am inserting an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal and an article from the Stars and Stripes, middle Pacific edition, which comment fully on the present undemocratic practices of our armed forces and offer certain suggestions to clear up present practices:

[From the Milwaukee Journal of January 19, 1946]

THE ARISTOCRATS IN UNIFORM

No one has to listen very hard or long these days to get an earful about the lack of democracy in the American armed forces. And the most vehement, persistent, and universal complaint heard from the veterans, and seen in the columns of the service newspapers, is against the officer caste system. The Stars and Stripes article on this page is typical of this opinion.

It is not alone the sharp distinction in matters of pay, authority, uniform, and privileges between enlisted men and commissioned officers that leads to this bitter criticism; more especially it is the flagrant abuse of prerogatives and position by some self-important officers, to which the system lends itself. No civilian without military service can fully comprehend the extremes to which the discrimination between officers and men can be carried, or how offensive it can become to men steeped in democratic traditions.

There can be no reasonable contention, of course, that an effective military organization can be wholly democratic in the ordinary civilian sense. Military effectiveness must be based on instant and unquestioning obedience to orders. There must be respect for authority, even where there may be no real respect for the individual exercising that authority.

But none of these necessities can justify the officer caste system which has its roots in the sharp class distinction of the Old World. Brave American officers by the tens of thousands who slept in the same foxholes, ate the same food, shared the same dangers and deprivations, and flew the same missions with noncoms and privates, earned the undying respect of the men they served with and yet sacrificed not one iota of their authority or prestige.

It would seem difficult, then, to uphold the military necessity for dividing our armed forces into two castes who shall wear different fabrics, sit in different sections of a theater, eat and drink apart, and generally keep aloof from each other except in line of duty. There seems every reason why the officer caste system ought to be drastically modified, if not abolished.

The moderate suggestion that the Army and Navy move in this direction by eradicating, as rapidly as at all feasible, the offensive distinctions between officers, as a class, and enlisted men, is most timely. For some time at least, the armed services will need standing forces far in excess of anything that America has known in peacetime. There is every indication that manpower in these standing forces will soon have to be maintained by voluntary enlistments, quite apart from any compulsory training devoted entirely to maintaining a civilian reserve for unseen emergencies. To induce a sufficient number of young Americans to enlist, military service must be made as attractive and democratic as can be.

[From the Stars and Stripes, middle Pacific edition]

OUR UNDEMOCRATIC FIGHTING FORCES—ENLISTED MEN IN LETTERS TO ARMY NEWSPAPER "GRIPE" AGAINST CASTE SYSTEM WHICH ALLOWS SPECIAL PRIVILEGES TO OFFICERS

The consensus of GI, swabbie, and gyrene is that the armed forces of democratic America are undemocratic; that the Army and Navy treat enlisted men as second-class citizens; that EM are subjected to humiliation and frustration from the very sources from which they have a right to expect support, encouragement and inspiration.

As a result, EM are returning from World War II hating and detesting military life. Very few who have served in the Army or Navy or who know what is in the minds and hearts of enlisted servicemen can doubt this.

For the future of our national security as well as the morale and efficiency of the Army and Navy, it is important to know why this feeling is so widely prevalent. It is even more important to do something about it.

Most EM complaints are concerned exclusively with officer privileges and behavior during off-duty hours and not in line of duty. A review of the letters to the editor column of the Stars and Stripes shows the following to be the officer privileges that gripe the men most:

1. A more plentiful and cheaper supply of liquor, especially in forward areas.

2. More adequate and attractive recreational facilities, such as clubs, beaches, and best seats in theaters.

3. Regulations which prohibit EM but permit officers to date nurses and Red Cross girls.

4. Permanent all-hour passes granted all officers but to few EM.

5. Near monopoly by officers of Government vehicles available for recreational purposes.

Far more significant than any single gripe, or all of them put together, is the resulting widespread bitterness, resentment, frustration, inferiority, and hopelessness so many EM feel. The whole thing adds up to a deplorably unhealthy state of mind. It is dramatically typified by that most rankling of all signs, "Officers' country," found on Navy ships and installations, and its Army counterpart, "Off limits to EM."

The solution to the "off-duty privileges" problem shouldn't be difficult to work out. All that is necessary is to treat officers and EM alike after working hours. This would be democratic and in accord with civilian practices.

But the mass bitterness of World War II's 10,000,000 enlisted men lies deeper. To root out all that is bad in the caste system demands a reexamination of the whole setup.

The Stars and Stripes has listened to thousands of its readers and thought about the problem at great length, and has come to the conclusion the fault lies in the division within the services connoted by the words "enlisted" and "commissioned."

Why should this division exist? Why shouldn't there be a steady progression from private to corporal to the various levels of sergeant to lieutenant to captain to field grade officers, and so on, to a five-star general? And similarly from a seaman to an admiral of the fleet?

Pay, responsibility, authority, and prestige would be graded upward just as they are now. But the other aspects of Army and Navy life—the ones which cause the gripes and bitterness, which make it virtually impossible for a master sergeant or a chief petty officer to deal with a second lieutenant or ensign on a basis of mutual respect and friendliness—should be leveled out and applied to all personnel alike.

This, of course, means much more than equalizing off-duty recreational privileges. Specifically, it means equal treatment for all personnel in regard to such matters as:

1. Clothing issue, except for insignia.

2. Rations and messing facilities. These two points mean that all personnel would receive free clothing issue and rations, equal in both quality and quantity.

3. Leaves, furloughs, discharge benefits, dependency allotments, and such things.

4. Military justice. At present, only officers sit in judgment instead of qualified men drawn from all ranks. This results in a double standard, with more severe punishment for EM facing the same charges.

5. Awards. During past years, officers have received a disproportionately large number of awards as compared to EM.

6. Promotions and demotions. EM have been "busted" frequently; officers rarely.

All this, we realize, entails a sharp break with tradition. But a caste system inherited from Frederick the Great of Prussia and the eighteenth century British Navy is hardly appropriate to the United States.

The aristocracy-peasantry relationship characteristic of our armed forces has a counterpart nowhere else in American life. It is notably at odds with American ideals of equality and democracy.

The Unknown Soldier of World War II Has His Say

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 21, 1946

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a copy of a brief sermon entitled "The Unknown Soldier of World War II Has His Say," delivered Armistice Day, November 11, 1945, in the Covenant-First Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., by its then minister, Albert Joseph McCartney, D. D., now director of the Chicago Sunday Evening Club:

Late one afternoon I made my annual pilgrimage to Arlington to keep my usual rendezvous with my friend of now many years standing—the Unknown Soldier of World War I. Musing there with the vagrant autumn winds sighing through the naked branches of the surrounding trees and watching the sentry pacing his rounds, silhouetted against the beautiful Potomac creeping slowly along in the distance, like the river of a man's life, and beyond it the Capital City gray and partly obscured by the heavy autumn overcast, the Unknown Soldier, true to his tryst, emerged from his

marble home and, stepping across the intervening pavement, took his seat beside me against one of the pillars of the amphitheater. As we conversed together I was telling him about World War II and discussing the problems confronting the Allied Nations in their effort at a constructive peace. Suddenly we were interrupted by the voice of a soldier whose presence had been obscured by our position, seated as we were against one of the pillars.

"Pardon me, sirs," he interrupted, "but I couldn't help overhearing your conversation. I happen to be an unknown soldier of the recent war, and I'm keenly interested in knowing how things are going and if the prospects for a world order are any better than they were after the last one."

"Sit down," I said, "and join us, won't you, please? And tell us something about yourself. This is our mutual comrade of World War I. What part of the country did you enlist from? And where did you see action?"

"Well," he drawled in unmistakable Virginia accent, "I haven't much to tell about myself. I was just a tail gunner in a bomber. I had 100 hours to my credit as a pilot in training, but got washed out at the last. We had a wonderful crew, for fortunately we had been kept together from our last training station. We learned to realize how each man's safety in that crew depended absolutely upon his concern for the safety of every other one in the crew. Our missions were around the Mediterranean, and off southern France. We went down on D-day and the whole crew was lost. Some of us were washed ashore; and that's how I come to be here."

He seemed exceptionally keen and mature, and betrayed amazing understanding of what the war was all about, for he explained to me that after graduating he had spent 2 years in postgraduate work in Europe. I then told him about the progress of the war from D-Day on, the final capitulation of Germany, and the later surrender of Japan, without an invasion. He was more interested, however, in what I had to tell him about the various peace conferences, and the plan for the new world order. He wanted to know a great deal about the men who were sitting in on those conferences.

"My big regret," said he, "is that we who have not returned will have no say in the making of the peace; and I do wish that some way could be found by which our feelings and judgments and point of view might somehow get across to the people who are in the peace making." He spoke with great emotion and earnestness. "Personally I have some very strong feelings about what ought to be done. I think many of our comrades whose lives have been fortunately spared ought to have more of a say than from what you tell me they seem to be having. Not many of those fellows who were so eagerly provided a seat in a fox hole, or the cockpit of a plane, have been allowed to sit in the gilded chairs at the peace conference. Surely, if we can be trusted and directed to brain a Nazi private with the butt of a Garand, or do some pin-point bombing around a great cathedral, we ought to be capable of knocking a few heads together with the putt of our logic—our moral logic. Some of us went over to fight for something we considered worth while, and because of our wide education we knew what we were fighting for. But we began to get a bit screwy when we found ourselves doing nothing but destroying. And now that the sands of war were running out, with little prospect of having anything to say about the constructive side of things, we feel shut out. We not only have fought, but we have thought, and we have felt, and now that our usefulness as destroyers is over, and our job of knocking things to pieces is done—we feel frustrated as we watch older men with portfolios grabbing all the seats at the table—men who have not actually sensed what war really means. It is we who have crouched with crawing stomachs in fox holes or cringed before plexiglass, as we watched the flack coming up at us, who can fully know what peace is. We feel an overwhelming sense of frustration, of being cut off, of never having a hand in what is to be done and decided."

At that I interrupted him to say that I appreciated his point of view, and that to a certain extent he was right; but in the last analysis he and his comrades must trust the older men who will do the peacemaking, and who will have the future in their hands, with their fountain pens.

"I do not mean, of course," he said, "that the peace table should be crowded by boys in their early twenties; but there should be some provision for younger men, thinking young men, who have felt the danger side of war, and the great good society such as we have felt in the comradeship of a squadron." At this point he began to speak as though he himself were one of the demobilized returning soldiers. "Certainly our voice ought to be heard in the peace recommendations and strategies. It's our generation of young men who have been decimated, and many of us went into this business voluntarily, with the vague idea that we would have a voice in what happened afterwards. I know that none of my comrades will have a chance to pound the table at some Versailles or San Francisco Conference; but I certainly would like to have the satisfaction of knowing that our purposes and ideals, and if I may say it humbly, our sacrifices, will not altogether be lost sight of in the snarling and quarreling confusion of the older peacemakers. We could tell them so much, for we who have come through this hell have learned so much more about what peace means, and many times have listed in our minds the elemental things that make for peace, as we have made a bomb run through the flack. But now we are voiceless * * *."

"Well," he continued, after a silence, "we've done our bit, and we're through. It is up to you who survive us to remember us and what we wanted to accomplish. For God's sake, don't let us down at the peace conference; but pause with pen in hand, and take my comrades the world over into account before you put your names to any peace document. Remember us. That is all we can ask of you now.

"We belong to a great comradeship on the other side, and we would like to rest in the confidence that it is not broken on this side, and that we have kept the faith."

There was a long silence, and the three of us instinctively arose and without a word saluted, and the two Unknown Soldiers, arm in arm, vanished down the steps in the gathering dusk, and disappeared into the marble home from whence they had so recently emerged, leaving me to gaze thoughtfully upon the inscription, "Here rests in honored glory an American soldier known but to God."

(NOTE.—The substance and wording of the "Unknown Soldier" conversation is taken almost verbatim from a letter written by Lt. Benjamin McCartney 6 days before he took off on his last mission and addressed to his copilot, who was then in this country. The letter was found a year after his death somewhere in Germany as the squadron had left the base in Corsica and moved to Germany and was forwarded to his home.)

The Red Dean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Detroit Times of January 13, 1946:

THE RED DEAN

The Very Reverend Hewlett Johnson, Britain's Dean of Canterbury—often and appropriately called the "Red dean" of Britain because of his communistic views—has given the American people something new to consider in connection with the impending British loan.

Speaking at a Communist rally in London, he said that in everything except religion the United States is 100 years behind the rest of the world—and that in religion it is 150 years behind.

This seems to come with poor grace and in bad taste from one of the most highly placed spiritual advisers of a nation so recently saved—not merely once, but twice—from disintegration and destruction in war by timely and decisive American intervention.

However, let us take the "Red dean" at his word.

If America is so far behind the rest of the world in culture and education and all the mental and spiritual refinements and especially in religion, surely America should do something about it.

We should devote all of our energies and resources to the alleviation of this sad condition.

Of course, if we do this, we will no longer be able to divert our resources into loans or gifts for the benefit of other nations as we have so often done in the past and as we are now contemplating doing for the benefit of Britain.

In fact, the very first segment of our resources we should devote to our own rehabilitation should be the $4,400,000,000 we have been considering loaning to Britain.

If we are 100 years behind Britain in all things but religion and 150 years behind her in that—as Britain's Red dean frankly thinks and bluntly says—surely our need of the money is greater than the need of Britain.

By all means, therefore, let us keep it—since we are advised by so eminent an authority that we have so great a need for it.

And if we must spend the money, let us spend it for the enlightment of our people and to lift from them the veil of darkness which denies to them the higher and finer conditions of life to which those so far ahead of us have attained.

Let us no longer disperse and dissipate our resources—of which we are so unaccountably in such abundant possession—in profligacy abroad, at least until we have bettered our condition in sufficient degree that Britain can accept our largess as from an equal.

The Road to Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1946

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address of Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., Republican leader of the House of Representatives, over the affiliated stations of the National Broadcasting Co. on Friday evening, January 18, 1946:

Nobody needs to tell you that the administration of our national affairs is lost in confusion. We all know America has been divided into factions

That is one condition the White House cannot blame on the American people.

It is the fault of administration leadership.

It is a failure of the men in responsible positions. It is the failure of a party—of an administration—an administration built up on the idea you can get people to work together under policies which set them against each other.

You are worrying about your responsibilities—and your future, in face of all this terrible uncertainty and confusion. Everyone is worried—employers, factory workers, religious teachers, farmers, housewives, veterans. Even little children are worried. Amid talk of violence, and war, and dissension, even they have been brought under the influence of a monstrous fear that has gripped this whole Nation.

Fear and concern cover the country.

That's a strange national reaction for the descendants of pioneers whose courage was the foundation of this country, for a people who, at the end of this war, were at the pinnacle of world-wide influence and whose prospects for the future were a shining example to all humanity. That's a very strange reaction for a people who in three short years out-produced and out-fought the Germans who had prepared for 12 years, the Italians who had prepared for 20 years, and the Japanese who had prepared for 40 years.

How can such a preposterous situation come about?

It comes from the failure of administration leadership—of leaders who cannot get us going, because they do not agree on where to go.

You and I know that unless those in political control of this Nation can get together on some common ground, then the whole fabric of society will tear apart.

That is exactly why the Republican membership of the House and the Senate went to work last fall to develop a set of principles on which we could all agree, without trying to write in specific details, which naturally follow the determination of principles.

Now principles are mighty important things. You can't have leadership without them. You cannot have constructive action without them. If your principles are wrong your actions will be wrong. If you have no principles at all—the result can be only the kind of confusion we now see all about us.

We Republicans in the House and Senate, said, "Let us try to apply common sense to these problems. Let us recognize there are farmers in America and they have a right to get along. There are working men and women in America and they have a right to get along. There are white-collar workers in America and they have a right to get along. Let us recognize there is such a thing as management—and a highly skilled calling it is—and managers have a right to live. Let us admit there's such a thing as the general public and the general public has a right to be served. Let us admit the United States is a part of the world and has to get along in it somehow. And finally, let us come right out and recognize that there are some things that are right, some things that are wrong, and there is such a force as moral principle."

We Republicans agreed on a set of principles which apply to all the important questions facing this generation of Americans. We know where we stand.

Now we have a basis on which to build constructive action for the future. That is the road to hope. Election of a Republican majority in the House of Representatives and in the Senate in 1946 will mean that after some 14 years you can expect a Congress capable of reaching common-sense agreements on the solution of national problems—a Congress capable of legislating in behalf of all the people in the United States—the guaranty that each individual American citizen, whether he is a farmer, a factory worker, a stockholder, a manager, or a white-collar worker, will get a fair break under the law. After 14 years you will no longer see the spectacle of a Democratic President lambasting a Democratic Senate and a Democratic House for failing to jump through legislative hoops at his command.

Now, here are some of the things we believe in:

We support the United Nations Organization for international peace. We look with particular hope to the General Assembly as the town meeting of the world wherein the organized conscience of mankind shall find effective expression in behalf of peace with justice.

We support the indispensable inter-American system as a regional part of the international organization.

We will engage in essential international relief as a humanitarian obligation and to prevent chaos through misery. We demand sound management and protection against exploitation in this connection. We will assist other nations to rehabilitate themselves under arrangements consistent with intelligent American self-interest and over-all limitations that shall not jeopardize our own economic recovery and stability.

We believe in fulfilling to the greatest possible degree our war pledges to small nations that they shall have the right to choose the form of government under which they will live and that sovereign rights and self-government shall be restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them. We condemn any desertion of these principles.

We advocate ultimate international agreements to stabilize military establishments. We demand open diplomacy, at home and abroad, and free communication throughout the world.

We consider that the maintenance of a strong, solvent, free America is the basis of our greatest contribution to world order.

Those are our principles in dealing with foreign affairs. Now you will realize why Republicans in the House and in the Senate feel very concerned about the actions of the State Department and Secretary Byrnes. We are opposed to any betrayal of the small nations of the world in the making of the peace. We believe, and I repeat, in fulfilling our war pledges to the small nations that they shall have the right to choose the form of government under which they will live. There is language that is clear to the Poles. Clear to the Yugoslavs. Clear to all the other peoples of the world who now suffer oppression.

We reject great-power domination of the world. We hold that world peace does not require us to endorse alien doctrines or to abandon efforts to seek justice for the weaker peoples of the world. When we saw that the Secretary of State had disregarded the guaranties we gave small peoples in the Atlantic Charter, we were gravely concerned. We gave our word, our men, our money, because those peoples were promised freedom. Our action built up for America a huge reservoir of good will all over the world, greater than any nation has ever enjoyed in history. It was the kind of good will on which you could establish real understanding and cooperation between nations. It was the kind of good will that would mean success of our efforts to outlaw war. We feel that if we are going to avoid war, the nations of the world must subscribe to a higher rule of law above and beyond the selfish desire of any ruthless nation to plunder the wealth and to enslave the people of another.

But how are you going to establish such a higher principle unless you observe the first fundamental rule of good faith. Who likes a man or a nation which will disregard the spirit and the letter of a contract—in this case a blood contract. We must restore confidence between all peoples of the world. Global peace will never be achieved by compulsion. It must be gained through confidence and fair dealing.

We still must maintain our defense. We stand for a well-trained and fully equipped Army, Navy, and Air Force adequate to meet any emergency under future conditions of warfare. It must be supported by the most scientific research, a strong industrial system, and adequate reserves of trained men with the best weapons and equipment.

We want a strong scientific army. We want the best kind of national defense. This requires a strong industrial system and a unified people. Before we can have either a strong national defense or a sound foreign policy we must begin to clear up our problems at home.

The common-sense approach is to recognize facts for what they are, and face problems together in a spirit of cooperation. When we cooperate we can work out solutions beneficial to all. We must stop playing one group off against another to the detriment of all.

We all know government alone cannot feed the people, nor employ them, nor make the profits from which new enterprises and new jobs are born. Governments are set up by the people. The people are not the pawns of government. In other words, the Government cannot create any wealth, and it, therefore, cannot feed you. It has to take something away from you first and then give some of it back to you in another form. But government can help its people to prosperity by lightening the burdens of debt and taxes, laying down the rules of fair play, and protecting those whose own strength and resources are not sufficient to protect themselves.

We believe equality of opportunity should be available to all, regardless of race, creed, or beginnings. Every individual should be afforded an opportunity to prosper according to his talents, his abilities, and his diligence, subject only to a like right for his neighbor.

We condemn the political tactics which have resulted in class consciousness and strife. We oppose those who would destroy us through the continuation of such strife and struggle.

We reaffirm our belief in the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively with employers as one of the cornerstones of competitive enterprise.

For that purpose we believe that governmental decision must not be substituted for free agreement, but governmental machinery to promote peaceful settlement of disputes should be improved.

Free collective bargaining and contracts resulting therefrom must not be nullified or destroyed by resort on either side to willful violence or unlawful destruction of property.

Boiled down, the essence of our whole scheme of life in America is a three-way partnership between money, management, and labor. You need money to start and to operate a business. You need management to make it function and to sell its products. You need labor to produce the goods.

There is another system. You don't use money to start a business under that system. You use Government power. The Government says, "Set up these machines here and go to work producing. You will be paid what we think you ought to have. You stick at your job, whether you like it or not. You stay right there. There will be no labor union, either, because the Government wants to hear no complaints."

Money is not needed to start a business that way. All you need is forced labor.

Well, we do not believe in that. No American does.

We believe in the competitive system. Under the competitive system people can look to profit, improvement, and advancement. That is why they can put their hearts into their jobs. That is why they are attracted to work. Money, too, has to be attracted to work. Management has to be attracted to work. In addition they all have to work together. That is why, Republicans are opposed to Government extravagance and high taxes and interference by Government for political reasons with the plans

and the conditions under which the cooperation of money, management, and labor is possible. Responsibility and integrity, sanctity of word and contract, mutual tolerance and honest effort by each side to understand the rights and needs of the other, and by both to consider the rights of the whole people—these are the essentials of industrial peace, production and prosperity. That is why we're against the baiting of labor, the undermining of management, or the demoralization of money.

By the same token we are against any abuse of power by money, management, or labor.

We want more people to have more money. We want that money to buy more of the good things of life. We want to give you an expanding economy, an expanding hope, a strong nation, a united nation.

The restoration of this Nation of ours to health and vigor in an era of good will must be based on recognition of the common welfare. The interests of all men and all women and all children are bound up in and cannot be separated from the restoration of truth, honesty, courage, and principle, not only in the conduct of our Government but in the conduct of all our national, international, and even personal relationships. We must discard that kind of thinking which can tear a whole nation apart in class or racial rivalries and hatreds; the kind of thinking which makes deceit and evasion a policy of government; we must avoid the immoral and irreligious standard of expediency, which betrays the best instincts of America. This Nation has grown great because its people have been great. Our national character has been great because our personal philosophy of government was great. Our Nation has achieved because our people achieve.

The conscience of the people must be reinstated as the conscience of the Government. We must raise again as our ideals those principles which supported the Declaration of Independence, and out of which our Constitution had its birth.

You and I know that the only way a nation can make a shining mark in history is to be true to its own greatness. The leadership of the United States must be as great as the people of the United States, and you, my friends, are the only ones who can make it so. Good night.

First in War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1946

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Sunday Tribune of January 20, 1946:

FIRST IN WAR

Within the last week there have been two impressive tributes to the patriotism of Chicago, of Illinois, and of the Middle West. The war finance committee has announced that Illinois was first among large quota States in the sale of E bonds during the Victory Loan drive. Sales totaling $163,687,000 were 112 percent of quota. Another Middle Western State, Michigan, was third in the national ranking.

Col. John Slezak, on the eve of his retirement as chief of the Chicago ordnance district, comprising eight States of the Middle West, called attention to an even more gratifying performance by this area. In the direct supply of war material the Chicago ordnance district produced during the war more than $5,300,000,000 of ordnance—more than 20 percent of all that was produced in the Nation. Of this, northern Illinois and Indiana alone produced $3,400,000,000 worth.

Among the ordance items which flowed to American armies at the front from the Chicago district were 19,178 tanks and gun motor carriages, 237,529 trucks, 227,151,000 shells up to 90 mm., 23,408,000 shells of 105 mm. and larger, 23,216,000 bombs, 64,865 gun tubes, 26,268 gun carriages and mounts, 638,000 .30 caliber carbines, and 2,166,236,000 machine gun bullet cores. Output of these dimensions would provide munitions for great armies. Chicago district production was a heavy factor in bringing the victory.

Colonel Slezak called this accomplishment a production miracle and credited it directly to the patriotic spirit of the Middle West. "The record," he said, "is the more amazing when we consider that before the war started the Middle West knew little about making war equipment." That is true. There had never been interest in this sector in the profits to be had from munitions. Munitions and wars are inseparable and the Middle West knew that war meant death, debt, and incalculable disruption in the Nation and the world. Transitory profits exacted at such a terrific offset did not appeal to our industrialists and workers—especially when the gains were to be derived from wars that were not America's concern.

Because of this dedication of middle westerners to America's welfare, and to America's alone, the Central States were a favorite butt in the prewar and early war days. A propaganda campaign, organized and inspired by eastern interventionists and the New Deal administration, sneered at what was called isolationism, but which, then as now, was dedication to country without reference to the imperialist interests of Britain and Russia.

But when the country landed in the jam which the war party had so persistently and cunningly sought, it was the Middle West which responded wholeheartedly. This section supplied fighting men without peers. It produced war materials in vast quantities. Again and again Illinois met its war-bond quotas and led the States in purchases.

The chaos of the world today; the bankruptcy of American foreign policy; domestic strife; the discontent of the soldiers held against their will on overseas duty; the renaissance of Communist disruption; the mortgage on the future in the form of an enormous debt; and the aimless drifting of the country—these are the poor reward of middle western patriotism, which contributed so greatly to victory in a war that middle westerners didn't want.

Matthew Fontaine Maury, Pioneer in the Science of Navigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1946

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me on January 20, 1946, before the Arlington (Va.) Chapter of the United Daughters of the Confederacy at a special ceremony in honor of heroes of the Southern Confederacy, presided over by Mrs. Elizabeth C. Fred:

MATTHEW FONTAINE MAURY, PIONEER IN THE SCIENCE OF NAVIGATION

In the War Between the States the fighting forces of the South were in almost every engagement greatly outnumbered by the armies of the Northern States. In the matter of resources, the same lack of parity existed; the South was greatly outweighed by the North in industrial capacity to wage war.

That our Southern Confederacy accomplished so much with so little may be attributed to two things:

First, the incomparable courage and sacrificial devotion to duty of the men fighting for the cause of the Confederacy.

Second, the wealth of talent provided by Southern-born leaders in almost every field of endeavor who returned to take up the defense of their native soil.

Matthew Fontaine Maury was one of those leaders.

AUTHORITY ON NAVIGATION

At the early age of 30, Maury established himself as an authority of international fame on the subject of navigation by publishing a great scientific and technical manual which appeared under the title of "A New Theoretical and Practical Treatise on Navigation." His later published works included: "Wind and Current Charts of the North Atlanti- " "The Physical Geography of the Seas," and "Explanation and Sailing Directions to Accompany the Wind and Current Charts," in addition to many others too numerous to mention here.

We may perceive from the titles of his books that in his writings he undertook to advance the art and science of navigation by providing a more logical basis for its operations. In his research into such subjects as wind currents, Maury helped point the future of navigation away from dependence on guesswork. The influence which Maury exerted in this connection is reflected in the present-day high state of perfection existing in the art of navigation, not only on the seas but in the newer stage of navigation, the air, where pilots rely on the indications of carefully prepared data of the type originated by Maury and not the smallest degree of guesswork.

A great number of Maury's books were adopted as standard texts by naval institutions throughout the world, including our own United States Naval Academy at Annapolis. And incidentally, if you were to visit the Naval Academy today, you would note that one of the most impressive structures there bears the name, "Maury Hall." Also you would most certainly learn that midshipmen of the Academy know a great deal about Matthew Fontaine Maury. One of the Academy's most sought after honors is the Maury prize, awarded annually.

The man we have been talking about was born only a short way down the road from here, at Fredericksburg. In spite of all his distinguished attainments, I do not believe that Maury would object to our thinking of him as home folks, and I propose to do so in my concluding remarks.

RECOMMENDED STEADINESS OF PURPOSE

From Maury's writings I have found a message which he left for his home folks, a message which, upon this occasion to honor his memory, I recommend to you as strongly as his scientific writings are recommended to navigators everywhere. In this home-folks message to a cousin Maury said:

"I don't think that so much depends upon intellect as is generally supposed, but industry and steadiness of purpose—they are the things."

In a day when opponents of the tried and true American way of life seem to be organizing in an all-out effort to substitute for the principles of free enterprise, which rewards a man for effort, initiative, and merit, the promises of a deadly concept which holds

that the Government should give a man his sustenance whether he works for and earns it or not—in this day of challenge to the principles which made our country preeminently the most prosperous in the world, it is well to remember, as Maury said, "industry and steadiness of purpose, they are the things."

Slaughter Speaks Plainly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. JASPER BELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 21, 1946

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Independence Examiner, Independence, Mo., Friday, January 18, 1946:

SLAUGHTER SPEAKS PLAINLY

Representative ROGER C. SLAUGHTER does not use common political language in dealing with problems that he believes are vital. He chops right at the heart of the tree and lets the chips fall where they may.

In his address to Congress yesterday he displayed a keen understanding of the public at this time. He knows what the people of his home community and of the Nation are thinking about in connection with the strike situation. He knows that they are concerned regarding their own rights and are greatly worried about the future under existing unilateral labor laws and policies.

His remarks should not be considered as an attack upon the administration. He rather conferred a favor on national leaders by helping to bring out in the open the two major problems now facing the country and by showing how they are so intertwined that care and judgment must be used in solving each of them lest the solution of one may prevent the solution of the other. Now when we are in the throes of strikes, tired and disgusted, we may hasten to bring about relief from the troubles between labor and management without giving due consideration to inflationary possibilities. If to further increase wages an increase in prices be granted, the dam against inflation will be further weakened and it will soon become so weak that it will entirely crumble away. When that happens the wage earners will be much worse off than if their earnings remained at the present standard.

SLAUGHTER has made many laborites boiling mad, and his tactics have been questioned by some of the administration leaders, but he has helped to make the issues clear, and his courage is generally admired.

Governor Dewey Making Provisions in New York State To Protect People of That State When Certain Federal Controls Are Removed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 21, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House to a very significant letter which Republican standard bearer, Thomas E. Dewey, wrote on December 22 to the Honorable Benjamin F. Feinberg, president pro tempore of the New York State Senate, and to the Honorable Oswald D. Heck, speaker of the New York State Assembly. The letter is as follows:

More than 1,000,000 veterans are coming back from military service to resume normal peacetime living in our State. Hundreds of thousands of war workers are likewise returning to their home towns after 4 years of service in war plants throughout the State and Nation.

As you know, the State administration, through its various departments, is doing everything in its power to provide emergency shelter for returning veterans and their families. The State administration is also cutting the red tape of government to insure the rapid conversion of existing buildings to adequate living quarters on former military installations for nearly 10,000 persons. We will continue to devote much of our effort in an attempt to meet this critical housing shortage.

But the citizens of our State may soon be faced with another problem—one which could easily affect every individual throughout the State who lives in or desires to live in a rented house or apartment.

During the war the Federal Government, carrying out its emergency wartime powers and acting through the OPA, put into effect a Nation-wide policy of rent control on dwelling units. This policy protects the tenant from excessive rent and greatly curtailed the threat of eviction.

These Federal controls, however, are only of a temporary nature and might be removed some time next year. It is imperative, therefore, that the State of New York take action in the coming session of the legislature to protect the tenants of our State against inflationary increases in rent. The problem is not limited solely to the State—it is Nation-wide—but I believe that New York must take action now to protect its citizens.

We dare not risk widespread dispossessions in our State. We must not remain blind to the possibility that if we do not act we could be faced with serious economic dislocations which could amount to nothing short of disaster.

I am writing you to ask that you join with Senator Feinberg in appointing at the earliest possible moment an informal committee from the legislature to study this entire problem of controlling our dwelling rentals so that action can be taken on it in the coming legislative session. Commissioner Stichman, of the division of housing, and my counsel, Mr. Birtell, will be available to the committee for a consultation, and I shall be happy to discuss the proposed program with them as soon as they are ready.

The entire problem of limiting rentals and the manner in which they should be limited is one which will require the greatest wisdom. In addition, it must be determined whether in the event the OPA is terminated this function should be taken over by a State administrative agency or whether it should be performed by the courts under careful rules, as has been done with commercial property. The whole field of new building remains one for careful consideration, and the question whether it should be included in rent control is one as to which the committee, I am sure, will wish to take expert testimony. I know that you will agree that it is our duty during this critical housing shortage to assure the right of any tenant paying a reasonable rental to occupy his premises without fear of eviction or threat of payment of extortionate rental.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS E. DEWEY.

I want to read again two paragraphs from this letter:

During the war the Federal Government, carrying out its emergency wartime powers and acting through the OPA, put into effect a Nation-wide policy of rent control on dwelling units. This policy protects the tenant from excessive rent and greatly curtailed the threat of eviction.

These Federal controls, however, are only of a temporary nature and might be removed sometime next year. It is imperative, therefore, that the State of New York take action in the coming session of the legislature to protect the tenants of our State against inflationary increases in rent. The problem is not limited solely to the State—it is Nation-wide—but I believe that New York must take action now to protect its citizens.

I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that this may be an attempt by New York real-estate people to supplant effective OPA controls with weak State controls, but I submit there never was a clearer recognition of the continuing need for rent controls than that contained in this letter. Obviously, any Republican Member of the House who opposes continuation of rent control will go against a clear recognition of the need for it on the part of their party's standard bearer.

Congress is going to have to vote on the issue soon. I trust the Republican Members will follow Mr. Dewey in supporting continued rent control so long as the housing shortage remains acute.

Reports From European Labor—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 21, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in further documentation of the desperate conditions now prevailing in the liberated areas of our allies in Europe, I want to call attention to the following excerpts from reports of the secretary-general, and of the Netherlands governmental delegate to the International Labor Conference, twenty-seventh session, held at Paris, France, October 15–November 5, 1945.

These factual and statistical statements are of value to Americans in and out of government for arriving at a true conception of Europe today:

EXCERPTS FROM PROVISIONAL RECORD, TWENTY-SEVENTH SESSION, INTERNATIONAL LABOR CONFERENCE, PARIS, OCTOBER 15–NOVEMBER 5, 1945

THE DIRECTOR'S REPORT: DISCUSSION

The SECRETARY GENERAL. It would not be proper for me to make any suggestion to the delegates as to what they should say in discussing the report which I have laid before you. I think, however, I might be permitted, as secretary-general of this Conference, to make a suggestion of a general character which, if it is followed, I believe would enable this Conference to render a service to the world at this time. In San Francisco some short weeks ago the United Nations laid the foundation of a world system designed to to secure to the world enduring peace and the possibility of building a civilization in

which there shall be economic security and a rising standard of living for all.

Since that time we have entered upon what the journalists call the atomic age, and Mr. Attlee, speaking in London only a few days ago, said that the choice before man is to have one world or none. The oneness of that world will not be created by any texts or any agreements. It can only grow out of sympathy and understanding between the peace-loving nations of the world. But that sympathy and understanding will be ineffective if it is not based upon knowledge.

We who have come across the sea have suffered some minor discomforts in Paris. We have been shocked to discover how grave have been the ravages of war on this continent. We have, I think, been filled with admiration at the cheerfulness, the courage, and the endurance of the people of Paris. But our experience must necessarily be very limited.

My suggestion, therefore, is this: We have in this Conference the representatives, governmental, employer and worker, from those countries in Europe which were successively invaded, occupied, and enslaved. These representatives, speaking from this tribune, are in a position to give to you and to the world an authoritative picture of the conditions on the continent of Europe which has not yet been given and which could not be given in any other way. They will give it to whom? They will give it, if they follow my suggestion, to an audience which has a special character. They will give it to the representatives of governments, to the representatives of great organizations of workers, and of the powerful organizations of employers who are the best intermediaries through whom that picture can be authoritatively carried to the rest of the world.

When I make this suggestion I am not unmindful of the fact—nor indeed will the conference be unmindful—that there are other regions of the world in which grave problems have to be faced. But the world is one world, and if we can take this small step of utilizing this meeting of the International Labor Conference in the center of Europe to secure this picture of the economic and social problems which have to be faced in Europe, we shall have made a contribution to the solution of the world's problem as a whole.

It is one world. We cannot hope to secure the objects of economic security and a rising standard of living in a mutilated world—and by a mutilated world I mean a world in which an exhausted Europe cannot play her full part and make her full contribution. We cannot hope to see a prosperous world if a battered and dismasted Europe is allowed to drift onto the rocks of economic disaster. We should, I think, bear in our minds the truth which we acclaimed at Philadelphia, that poverty anywhere is a menace to prosperity everywhere (No. 9, p. 35).

Mr. VAN DEN TEMPEL (Government delegate, Netherlands). On two occasions already I have had the honor of representing the occupied Netherlands, the first time at the International Labor Conference at New York, in 1941, and the second time in 1944 at Philadelphia. I now represent a free Holland. We are grateful for the liberation, and we are very thankful to the valient men and women from the Allied nations who took such an enormous part in this liberation. But it is a great heartbreak for us to realize the indescribable misery of our country, caused by the merciless foe; and the same remarks apply to Indonesia.

It would carry us too far to attempt to give an extensive picture of all the suffering which our country has had to endure, of the economic, social and financial disruption, of the great general shortage of the primary necessities of life, and of the great misery, both physical and moral, which, moreover, still exists. This picture, however, must in many respects resemble that of other European peoples—both great and small—which have been victims of German brutality.

In many respects the Netherlands is one of the most tried and tormented of the border countries of Germany. This is partly due to the fact that the glorious attack of the Allies in the autumn of 1944 could not be brought to a successful issue. The Allies performed outstanding deeds of heroism during the battle of Arnhem. But this temporary failure had awful consequences for our country. There followed the terrible winter of 1944–45. A part of our country had already fallen a prey to the sea. After the battle at Arnhem the Germans systematically extended the inundation, and a considerable part of the country was flooded.

In consequence of the heroic strike of the railway personnel who came out on strike at the request of the Allied Command, practically all civilian transport had come to a standstill. Very soon famine was raging in the towns of an already exhausted country. During that winter our families lived on a few potatoes, with now and then a piece of bread, but chiefly on sugar beets. Fuel was so scarce that people demolished the houses in order to get firewood. Hunger oedema spread rapidly.

If this situation had lasted even for a short time longer the consequences would have been catastrophic. These months of famine have imprinted deep marks on our people.

The 5th of May 1945 saw the liberation of the Netherlands. As from this date reconstruction has been firmly taken in hand, and one can already notice a considerable progress compared with the deepest point of misery and dislocation. The Supreme Allied Headquarters greatly and efficiently assisted us with food supplies, which have been deeply appreciated, and help was rendered to us by various countries in different ways. As a result of this aid and of our own efforts we progress step by step. The Dutch people eagerly desire to rise to their former state of prosperity and social progress after this catastrophe, which overtook us through no fault of our own.

But it would be dangerous to give free rein to illusions. Reconstruction and rebuilding are still in their very early stages, and if relief and help for rehabilitation and reconstruction were stopped or reduced, or if some misfortune were to befall us, the consequences for our people would be very grave indeed. It is an unfortunate coincidence that at the same time Indonesia, as a result of Japanese aggression, is in very difficult circumstances, and that the reconstruction and reinforcement of the basis for future cooperation, on the principle of equality, must be accomplished at a time when we need simultaneously so much of our energy for the reconstruction of the European part of the Kingdom.

Restricting my remarks to the Netherlands, I have to point out with much emphasis that, though we are making good progress, a satisfactory restoration will require great efforts over a long period. This reconstruction will only succeed on condition that international help during the transition period is really effective. There is no doubt about the fact that the prolongation of economic and social dislocation in Western Europe involves great dangers, not only to the countries directly concerned but also to the international situation as a whole.

We are gathered here in order to further the great purposes of the International Labor Organization, but we must fully realize that the problem concerning full employment and social progress in the countries we have in mind will not arise in the near future in the ordinary and traditional way. These countries must first of all, if I may say so, embark on a struggle to maintain themselves by very elementary methods, and they will have to seek sympathy and help from the Allies.

The Acting Director states in his excellent report, on page 161, that "the immediate problems of Europe were vastly graver in nature and extent than had been assumed." We are longing for the realization of the social aims of the International Labor Organization both in our own country and throughout the world, but, as the Acting Director very rightly states, on page 161, "long-term policy has no significance unless the short-term policy has been successful."

Confining myself to the Netherlands, the dislocation everywhere is still tremendous, the food supply is still scanty, there is an appalling shortage of clothes, shoes, and all types of requirements. This shortage of the necessities of daily life literally gnaws the energy of the population. Public-health conditions are still bad; the mortality rate is high, while infant mortality, for example, is at present still nearly four times the normal figure. There is an acute housing shortage. In districts where bombing or land warfare caused widespread destruction people now live in cellars and barns.

The picture of the economic life is by no means much more favorable. None of us will ever forget the sight after the German withdrawal of the desolate and grey water sides covering the once prosperous and fertile territories. Economic life has been totally undermined by the occupation. In particular three principal factors, complicated by many others, dominate the situation—transport difficulties, the shortage of electrical energy, and the shortage of raw materials.

The merchant navy has dropped to half its former tonnage, and for the time being this remainder is almost exclusively in Allied service. The inland fleet, which is of enormous importance in our country with its network of inland waterways, has suffered great losses. The railways, in addition, have also suffered enormously. The coal output must be considered as very precarious. Industry, in which half the population of the Netherlands makes its living, has been seriously affected by the looting and destruction of its machinery and equipment. Nevertheless every effort has been made to restart industry. Work is carried out with the limited facilities at our disposal, but for the near future everything depends on the possibility of fresh supplies.

The monetary system and public finances have been dislocated in an almost incredible manner. Strong measures have been taken to purify our monetary system. Radical financial reforms are in preparation. The national debt has mounted fantastically. Energetic steps are being taken to keep price and wage levels under control. But, under present circumstances, it is extremely difficult to reach definite and lasting results—all this without even mentioning the moral consequences of the war and of occupation, and the evil influence on youth, teaching, and education.

As to the labor market, a general well-founded survey is difficult to effect in these times of changing circumstances. Some characteristics, however, can be given. Intellectual and skilled labor is actually very much in demand. This is to be explained partly by the temporary extension of controlling bodies in every walk of social life and partly by the time lag in training caused by the war.

Of course, there is also the demand for ordinary labor for the work of clearing away debris and for repairs. The Government has just issued an order whereby the superfluous laborers of the towns are forced to accept work in the devastated areas under penalty of the loss of their right to unemployment benefit.

In spite of the demand for repairs, the danger of unemployment lurks in the distance. The only possible solution is to be found in the restoration of normal production, and resumption of normal production, as I have already mentioned, is none too near.

It is obvious that the problem of restitution of labor, and in connection therewith the problem of training and retraining, will play an important part in this respect. Equally obvious is the importance of the education of youth, and the care to be devoted to physical and mental health. But this, too, cannot be realized in the absence of a normal economy; and again normal production cannot be obtained in the absence of international cooperation.

In this connection we venture, in this international gathering, to make the following observations. The position of a small nation in the struggle for recovery is, under the present international political and economic circumstances, far from favorable. The small nation is in many respects dependent on the other powers. Take, for instance, the material stolen by the enemy, a large part of which is still in Germany. It would not be unreasonable to expect that a member of the united and victorious nations could retrieve, within a reasonable time, its stolen property from the country of the beaten enemy, so that its own wounds could be healed and its rehabilitation furthered. But a small nation is dependent on the Great Powers; and while these powers are full of understanding and ready to help, this process of restitution takes a very long time indeed under the present circumstances—longer than can be borne by an exhausted people.

The problem, however, must be visualized on broader lines. The present distress is so great that the question of sufficient help to the liberated countries is one of life and death. Yet it is only during a period of transition that a nation can live on help from abroad.

The Netherlands have always acted on the principle that they will pay, up to the limit of their capacity, for the goods they receive, and they long for the time when they will be able to pay regularly for their imports with their own exports and services, as they have always done in the past. But to do this necessitates, apart from the reconstruction of machinery and of production, and the disposal of raw materials, the possibility of reviving exports as soon as the first elementary needs have been satisfied. One of the obstacles to the more or less complete recovery of the liberated countries in the near future is the fact that their export markets will for the time being be unattainable, if not entirely lost. This applies to countries both large and small.

We are obliged to speak frankly about this matter. In this respect also the position of the small countries, which played an important part in the international market before the war, is more difficult because of the fact that the predominating position of the great powers prevents them from influencing to any great extent the development of the international and monetary policy. Their possibility of self-help in these matters is limited, and, in my opinion, it is there that a great danger lies for the future development and enforcement of the international spirit, for the feeling of solidarity, for international relationships, and for democracy.

The return to a more or less normal state of affairs in the liberated and devastated countries will be a question of many years, even if international solidarity fully develops. The all-important question is: "Will this solidarity manifest itself in the right way, on a sound basis, while at the same time remaining effective and comprehensive?" It seems to me impossible to overemphasize the interest of the whole world in the achievement of an early and sound recovery by a common effort.

Peace, democracy, and social progress are here at stake. We need not have any illusions about the widespread influence of antidemocratic or totalitarian fascist thought in all forms and disguises in many parts of the world. The economic and social misery in the period between the two wars was one of the main causes of this phenomenon. German nazism inspired hope in many hearts at the time of its rise to power. Do not let us underestimate the significance and the force of these influences, do not let us underestimate the influence of the years of economic and social misery on the minds of a tormented generation. It might well prove disastrous if, after the total defeat of fascism, there should follow years and years of economic and social destruction, of misery and disillusionment, while democracy should fail to find a solution for the inevitable difficulties.

Allow me to stress another point of view in this respect. The world wants at this moment commodities of every kind. But during the war the free countries have developed an enormous power of production, and this power will be maintained after the conversion from war economy to peace economy. It may well be that the time is not so far away when it will be difficult to find a market for this growing production, while many parts of the earth will be destitute. The marketing difficulties of well-equipped industries producing at full speed will be increased by the purchasing power in many parts of Europe and other continents, which is still inadequate. Depressions, though not, of course, really comparable to the depression of the thirties, will become manifest and will have the same effect. The result will be a fatal state of affairs, especially in those countries still in the acute stage of recovery and rehabilitation. The political and social repercussions would then be catastrophic.

We realize with a feeling of gratitude that the free peoples have already proceeded to set up the machinery necessary to insure the smooth progress of the future political, economic, and social development of the world. We applaud the application of the functional principle in the new world organization. It remains to the glory of the deeply regretted President Roosevelt, and it is an invaluable result of the great Anglo-American cooperation during the war, that this development has already been prepared and the foundations laid for the future organizations.

But it is now most urgent that this international machinery, animated by the spirit of the Atlantic Charter, should be set to work without delay to relieve the acute distress, and, above all, to shorten the period of recovery, rehabilitation, and reconstruction. This would enable impoverished Europe, bled white by a cruel war, to reach a phase in which a new and happier structure could be built on a solid economic and social basis (No. 12, pp. 64–66).

Who Is Striking?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, while Congress has been in recess the UAW-CIO-GM strike has continued, with a great loss to the Nation, to the corporation, and to the strikers in wages which they would have received had the strike not occurred.

In addition to the direct loss suffered by the parties to the dispute, reconversion has been slowed up.

In this and other industrial disputes the public is often too prone to accept the easy explanation of blaming labor, without inquiring too closely into the circumstances which led the workers to the final desperate step of going out on strike, cutting off their wages, their means of daily livelihood, and imperiling their security for the future.

Fortunately, in the GM dispute, the union has, from the beginning of its negotiations gone to unusual pains to lay its case before the public. I refer to pages 9939–9946 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 24, 1945, containing the text of a wire addressed to Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, by Walter P. Reuther, vice president and director of the GM Department, UAW-CIO, and the text of part I, part II, section 1, and part II, section 2, of the union's October economic brief; and pages 10411–10414 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 6, 1945, containing part II, section 3 of the October economic brief submitted by the union, inserted by the senior Senator from Idaho.

At this point under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the text of the UAW-CIO General Motors' council letter to President Truman dated January 13, and also an article appearing in the January 12, 1946, issue of the Nation, setting forth briefly the union's position in the wage dispute which is now 59 days old:

[From the New York Times of January 14, 1946]

TEXT OF GM STRIKE COUNCIL'S LETTER TO PRESIDENT TRUMAN

DETROIT, January 13.—The text of the letter which the General Motors council of the CIO United Auto Workers sent to President Truman today follows:

"Delegates to the National UAW-CIO General Motors Conference, representing 300,000 workers on strike, have carefully considered the report of your fact-finding board in a special meeting in Detroit today.

"We have voted to recommend to the General Motors workers that they accept the board's recommendations of a 19½-cent-an-hour wage increase and reinstatement of the 1945 contract on the following conditions:

"That you are successful in persuading the corporation to reconsider and accept the board's recommendations by January 21, 1946. We are willing to postpone achievement of our full equity in the situation in the public interest. For that reason, and that alone, we make the above offer.

"Unless the corporation changes its present position and accepts the recommendations, it must assume full responsibility for prolonging the strike and for forcing upon the General Motors strikers and the Nation further hardship.

"In the event the corporation does not accept the board's recommendations by January 21, we shall have no choice but to withdraw our offer to accept the board's recommendation of a 19½-cent-an-hour increase and insist upon our equitable demands.

"If you are able to secure the corporation's acceptance of the 19½ cents increase and the reinstatement of the 1945 contract, and the corporation negotiates a satisfactory settlement of local issues, on that basis we are prepared to terminate the strike."

BOARD'S STATEMENT HAILED

"We welcome the clear statement in the fact-finding board's report that the wage increase will not require any price increase. We believe that this represents a smashing victory for the General Motors workers, for the policies of your administration, Mr. President, and for the American consumers as a whole.

"We believe that the courage and sacrifice of the men and women who have manned the

General Motors picket lines for nearly 60 days deserves the honor and respect of every American for the successful fight they have made to hold the price line. They have been and still are a bulwark against higher prices and inflation.

"Our offer to you, to accept the board's recommendation for a 19½-cents-an-hour increase, is made as our contribution to the national interest and with a view to achieving full production and full employment at the earliest date.

"We are constrained to say that the 19½-cents-an-hour figure does not grant the GM workers the increase which the arithmetic of our case proved and justified.

The 19½ cents wage increase which the fact-finding board recommends represents a finding of fact for the volume of production achieved in 1941.

"The fact-finding board, in assuming that 1946 production levels would not exceed 1941 levels, departed seriously not only from the facts of the General Motors case but from the objectives of new high levels of production and employment without which the economic basis of peace cannot be achieved.

"General Motors workers have more faith than your fact-finding board in America's ability to achieve record levels of production in 1946. The war demonstrated the productive ability of our tools of abundance.

"We want to use these tools of abundance in peace and we want to use them in full in 1946. Record volume of production in auto and other industries can be achieved in 1946. Maximum production is our most potent weapon against inflation. 1946 levels of auto production will far exceed the 1941 levels.

"The board's report lays the basis on which the General Motors workers can in the future rightly claim additional compensation as we achieve these higher levels of production."

"CAPRICIOUS" ACTS CHARGED

"We believe you should call to the attention of the American people the record of capricious irresponsibility displayed by General Motors in this dispute. The General Motors Corp. refused to bargain in good faith, refused Government conciliation, rejected arbitration, scorned cooperation with your fact-finding board, and now, within 24 hours after its report was issued, and without giving it serious consideration, General Motors has rejected the board's recommendation.

"It is regrettable that in our democracy the managerial clique that rules this $2,000,000,000 corporation can be self-deluded into thinking of itself as a sovereign state, not subject to the same moral laws that regulate our other institutions and not responsible to the interests of the Nation and its people.

"Since the corporation has rejected the board's recommendations, we are forced to intensify further our strike action.

"We are, therefore, informing you that we are requesting the UAW-CIO strike strategy committee to take steps to see that UAW members in tool and die jobbing shops immediately cease work on all General Motors work.

"If necessary, we shall ask that the same action be taken in plants working on General Motors parts and accessories, in order to bring the full weight of the union's economic pressure to bear upon the corporation. This is an economic weapon whose use we had withheld thus far in the hope that a fair settlement could be reached without resorting to that action. But apparently economic force is the only language this insolent corporation understands."

[From the Nation of January 12, 1946]

THIS IS YOUR FIGHT!

(By Walter P. Reuther, vice president of the UAW-CIO and director of its General Motors department)

DETROIT, January 3.—In the confusion of peace, much of it carefully planned, we are in danger of losing the clear view of postwar needs which we had during the war. Administrative agencies, congressional postwar planning committees, and business groups, such as the Committee for Economic Development, were generally agreed during the war that after the war we must produce and consume at least 50 percent more than we did in prewar days to avoid a return to chronic mass unemployment. They were agreed that a return to prewar levels of production—and consumption—would mean 19,000,000 unemployed.

This conviction was expressed in the Department of Commerce study, "Markets After the War," which became the bible of the CED. It was reiterated by Senators JAMES E. MURRAY and Harry S. Truman in the 1944 year-end report of their War Contracts Committee, in which they proposed a bill to insure full employment. Last July, Fred Vinson, then Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, put it this way: "We are in the pleasant predicament of having to learn to live 50 percent better than we have ever lived before." In August, before VJ-day, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System published Post-War Economic Study No. 1, "Jobs, Production and Living Standard," in which these statements were made:

"We shall have an opportunity of living better than we ever have in the past, but only if we so manage our economy as to provide markets for a much larger total product than we have ever had in peacetime.

"Purchases of all classes of goods and services could and should expand greatly. A rise of 40 or 50 percent above prewar levels in consumption goods will be possible and necessary. This would mean that people would buy many more cars than they did during the 1930's, many more ice boxes, and several times the amount of some other goods and services. * * * Resources will be available for this rise in national well-being, but it will require a well-planned and vigorous national public and private business policy to realize this unequaled opportunity.

"We must not accept the miserable alternative of having our products piling up as surpluses for lack of markets and have their output shrink in consequence. We must not suffer our wealth to be the cause of our poverty, or permit the abundance of our resources to be the basis of our want. * * *

"If there is to be a market for the goods and services that will be produced, if employment is to be maintained, the Nation's income must not be permitted to decline materially."

Four days after VJ-day President Truman announced the national reconversion wage-price policy: free collective bargaining between workers and employers was to be restored and wage increases were to be approved up to the point where price increases would result.

On the same day, August 18, the United Automobile Workers of the CIO filed with the General Motors Corporation a demand for a 30-percent increase in hourly wage rates without price increases, asserting that this increase was needed to make up for the loss in take-home pay resulting from abolition of overtime and downgrading in jobs. We said that such an increase in wage rates was directly in the national interest as stated over and over again during the war, that it was in line with the national wage-price policy, that it was necessary to maintain purchasing power during reconversion. We pointed out that to make progress toward a standard of living 50 percent better than we had ever known it was first necessary to hold our ground, to stay where we were, economically, when the war ended.

It seemed to us that the way to begin was to begin. It was only fair to call upon the General Motors Corp., the most profitable corporation in the most profitable industry, to lead the way. We were convinced that past earnings, the certain market for capacity production for at least 3 years, and the lower unit costs of a volume 50 percent above prewar days made it possible for the automotive industry generally—and General Motors most conspicuously—to pay 30 percent higher wage rates without increasing prices and at the same time to pay dividends higher than the high prewar rates.

However, our demand was never "30 percent, or else!" as some editors, politicians, and propagandists have charged. From August 18 up to now we have offered to scale down our demand by whatever amount was proved necessary to prevent an increase in prices. But we said that until and unless G. M. proved it could not pay 30 percent, we would not reduce our demand by one red cent.

On October 2 GM turned down our demand as "unreasonable." No counter-proposal was made.

In dismissing our demand as "unreasonable" and in arguing in page advertisements that higher wages meant higher costs and higher prices—suppressing the basic production fact that 50 percent greater volume will mean lower unit costs—General Motors was, to our view, pleading inability to pay higher wage rates.

On October 19 we began presentation of an economic brief in support of our demand. We addressed ourselves to the question of GM's ability to pay. We invited, urged, and begged the GM representatives to discuss our facts, figures, and arguments as presented. They refused. They said, "Go ahead, and when you're all through, we'll make our answer." We read our case to the soles of their shoes perched on the edge of the negotiating table, and to the back of Liberty, which they said was "more interesting than the crap you [the union] are giving us."

When our case was all in, on October 26, Harry Anderson, vice-president of GM, said they would answer us in 10 days. That was at 5 o'clock in the afternoon. Three hours later, on a Nation-wide radio network, he gave GM's answer—a flat rejection.

In the course of the so-called negotiations GM shifted its ground from inability to pay to a refusal to discuss the corporation's ability to pay. In our view the change was made because GM knows that the arithmetic of our case is taken from its own reports and published Government sources, is confirmed by facts hidden in the corporation's books, and is uncontrovertible. This was made plain when GM made its formal answer to our brief on November 7. GM offered the union a wage increase of 10 cents an hour—subsequently increased to 13½ cents—hitched to the right later to use the increase in applying to the OPA for higher prices. (When we asked if GM would offer even a 1-percent wage increase without a price increase, the answer was "no.") In addition GM renewed its proposal that the union join the corporation in petitioning Congress to amend the Wage and Hour Act to raise the normal workweek from 40 to 45 hours.

The UAW-CIO could have settled this wage dispute long ago, without resort to a strike, if the General Motors workers had been willing to join the General Motors management in a double conspiracy against American consumers clamoring for 18,000,000 cars, and against millions of returning veterans and laid-off war workers, including more than 100,000 former GM workers with seniority rights. We could have agreed to take a wage increase and have kept quiet about price increases which, spreading out from automobiles in spiraling inflation, would have taken 15 cents or more out of one pocket for every dime put in the other in high wages. We could have joined the corporation in ganging up on Congress to legalize a longer normal work week at a time when unemployment of between six and nine million is predicted. We could have drawn down on the head of labor the whole blame for the rising pressures of inflation and its dis-

astrous results. We could have focused on labor the justified resentment of millions of unemployed veterans and laid-off war workers. We could have drunk the cup of pure economic poison which the GM management poured out and enticingly set before us on the negotiating table day after day.

Instead, faced with the deliberate, contemptuous, and provocative refusal of GM to bargain collectively in good faith by discussing the ability to pay, and having vainly offered to submit the dispute to arbitration, the GM workers on November 21 went on strike to obtain the demands presented on August 18. The strike, with an appeal to the opinion and judgment of the American people, was their only remaining economic weapon.

Today, with the strike in its second month, and with the GM attitude being copied by other employers across the whole country, General Motors workers and their families are the front-line troops in a home-front war to win the very peace that only 5 months ago it was generally agreed we must have if the war aims of the "four freedoms" were to be more than a sour phrase on the lips of apple-selling veterans of World War II. On GM picket lines and in UAW-CIO union halls and soup kitchens in a hundred American towns and cities the eyes of GM strikers see the postwar needs of this Nation as clearly now as when they were stated before VJ-day by our business and political leaders.

They are exercising the right of free collective bargaining. One of these days the GM management will agree to move the bargaining back from the picket lines to the conference room and to write a contract with the UAW-CIO, which will maintain the purchasing power of GM and other workers, including the farmers and businessmen from whom those workers in years to come will buy more or less, depending on the wages they receive.

Until that day, the strike of the GM workers is the fight of all Americans who want a lasting peace of full production, full consumption, and full employment, year in and year out, spreading beyond the United States, by example, not by conquest, to the rest of this fevered and unhappy world.

Amendments to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1946

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD, under unanimous consent, the most important changes made in the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944—the GI bill—as amended by Congress and signed by the President on December 21, 1945. These changes will bring up to date those discharged service men and women who have already received the handbook for service men and women.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Extension of time: The time during which a course may be initiated is extended from 2 to 4 years after discharge or end of the war, whichever is later, and the time limit for completing the course is raised from 7 to 9 years after end of the war.

Age limit removed: Any eligible veteran now may receive 1 year of education or training, plus additional education (up to a maximum of 4 years), for total length of active service. He need not have been under 25 years when he entered service, nor need he show that his education was interrupted by war service.

Short intensive courses: Courses are no longer limited to a cost of $500 for an ordinary school year. Short intensive courses may be undertaken and the additional cost prorated against the period of eligibility to which the veteran is entitled at the rate of $500 per school year. No such short course may cost more than $500.

Correspondence courses: A veteran may apply to take a correspondence course under the new provisions, but he is entitled to no subsistence allowance. One-fourth of the elapsed time used in pursuing such a course is charged against the veteran's period of eligibility. Total amount payable for correspondence courses for any veteran is limited to $500.

Subsistence allowance increased: Monthly subsistence allowances are increased from $50 to $65 for veterans without dependents, and from $75 to $90 for veterans with dependents.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION OF DISABLED VETERANS

Extension of time: Vocational training under Public Law 16, involving more than 4 years of training, may be begun by a disabled veteran, subject to Veterans' Administration approval, and the time for completing such training is extended from 6 to 9 years after the end of the war.

Subsistence allowance increased: Disabled veterans now will receive a minimum of $105 per month without dependents, $115 with a dependent, plus $10 for the first child, $7 for each additional child and $15 for any dependent parent. This represents an increase over previous allowances. If the veteran is receiving a lesser pension he will receive the above amounts while he is in training status. In no event will his pension be reduced by entering training.

GUARANTY OF HOME, FARM, AND BUSINESS LOANS

Guaranty is automatic: These loans may now be made by any lending agency which is subject to examination and supervision by a Government agency, and restrictions of certain Federal laws are removed. A loan becomes automatically guaranteed if the lending agency and the veteran close the deal, the terms being in accord with the provisions of the act. The only other requirement is that the cost does not exceed the appraisal made by a Veterans' Administration designated appraiser. Loans made by individual lenders (not falling in the class of approved institutions indicated above) must obtain prior approval by Veterans' Administration in order for the loan to be guaranteed.

Amount of real-estate loan guaranty increased: Any loan on real estate may be guaranteed up to a maximum guaranty of $4,000 of the loan, as compared with a $2,000 limit under previous law. The Government guaranty remains 50 percent of the total loan up to the maximum amount. The business loan guaranty limit remains at $2,000, or 50 percent.

Amortization limit extended: Real-estate loans may be amortized over a period up to 25 years, and farm-realty loans up to 40 years. Maturity on nonreal estate loans may not exceed 10 years.

Purchase of lots: Proceeds of a loan may be used to purchase a lot in connection with home construction.

"Normal" value out: Phraseology of the previous law is changed from "reasonable normal value" to "reasonable value" in connection with appraisals of property upon which a guaranteed loan is sought.

Loan purposes broadened: Provisions of the act are liberalized so that loans may be made for all ordinary farming purposes, for any normal business enterprise, and so that existing indebtedness in default may be refinanced in connection with all types of eligible loans.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

No deduction from future bonus: That portion of the law (sec. 1505), which provided that any financial benefits received under the act would be deducted from any future bonus authorized, is repealed.

United States veterans in Allied service now eligible: Anyone who served in the active military or naval service of an Allied Government and was a United States citizen, when entering such service is eligible for the benefits of the act and Public Law 16 (78th Cong.). He must, however, be a United States resident at the time claim is filed, and must not be receiving similar benefits from another nation.

Persons on terminal leave: Educational and loan guaranty provision of the act, and vocational rehibilitation under Public Law 16, are extended to persons on terminal leave or who are being hospitalized pending final discharge. No subsistence allowance may be claimed, however, by persons taking education or training under the act or under Public Law 16. This section is made retroactive to June 22, 1944, when the original Servicemen's Readjustment Act became law.

Artificial limbs: Provision is made to insure ample authority for VA to procure prosthetic appliances for veterans and instruct them in the use of such appliances, including payment of any expenses involved in the veteran's traveling to and from the center where the appliance is fitted and training given in its use.

Office space for service organizations: Veterans' Administration is authorized to provide office space, if available, to paid, full-time representatives of recognized veterans' organizations.

Veterans' Administration procurement of space: The act makes permanent Veterans' Administration authority to procure necessary space for administrative, clinical, medical, and out-patient treatment purposes by lease, purchase, construction condemnation, or declaration of taking. This authority previously was limited to 6 months after end of the war.

PROVISIONS NOT CHANGED

Major provisions of the law which remain unchanged are:

Eligibility requirements: A veteran must have served in the active military or naval service on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war. He must have been discharged or released under conditions other than dishonorable after active service of 90 days or more or because of an injury or disability incurred in line of duty.

Hospitalization program: Veterans' Administration is "authorized and directed" to expedite additional hospital construction and to establish all necessary administrative offices to make veterans' benefits more readily available.

Review of discharge: Ample provision is made for review by the War and Navy Departments of unsatisfactory discharge from service. A new amendment, of minor importance, is designed to clarify the intent of the law.

Job assistance: All previous regulations relating to Government assistance in helping veterans obtain employment are continued. The United States Employment Service and the Veterans' Placement Service Board are directed to cooperate in seeing that all veterans, able and willing to work, obtain employment.

Readjustment allowance: Unemployed veterans who register with an office of the United States Employment Service are entitled to a readjustment allowance of $20 per week while unemployed. An eligible veteran may receive such payments up to a maximum of 1 year, depending on length of service. Self-employed veterans with net earnings of

less than $100 per month may receive an allowance amounting to the difference between net earnings and $100 in any month, up to a maximum of 1 year, also depending on length of service.

WHERE TO APPLY FOR BENEFITS

Prosthetic appliances: Any Veterans' Administration hospital or regional office.

Education and training: Any Veterans' Administration regional office or at the school you wish to attend.

Vocational rehabilitation: Any Veterans' Administration regional office.

Loan guaranty: Any eligible lending institution as outlined above. If negotiating with a private lender, any Veterans' Administration regional office.

Review of discharge: The War Department or the Navy Department, whichever was your branch of service.

Job assistance: Nearest office of United States Employment Service.

Readjustment allowance: Register at nearest office of United States Employment Service.

Some Reflections on the Progress of Science and the Magnuson-Kilgore Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES L. GIFFORD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1946

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which was published in the 1945 Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors:

SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE PROGRESS OF SCIENCE AND THE MAGNUSON-KILGORE BILL

(By Theodore Koppanyi, Georgetown University)

A disruption of serious proportions in American science is threatened by a bill pending in the Congress which provides for the regulation of scientific research. This bill, popularly known as the Magnuson-Kilgore compromise bill, would establish a National Research Foundation to direct and subsidize science. The effect of the passage of this bill would, in my opinion, be as destructive in the field of science as the atomic bombs were destructive of the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Reference to the atomic bomb in this connection is more than figurative. The movement to bring about governmental control of science is given its chief impetus by the fear and bewilderment which the coming of the atom age has had on legislators, scientists, and the public alike. Confronted by the haunting spectre of destroyed Hiroshima, intelligent men throughout the country are crying for emphasis on science such as we have never seen before.

This widespread recognition of the importance of science is wise. But the pending bill to promote science is not.

In an analysis of the bill a basic wrong immediately leaps to the eye. This is the assumption that scientific research can be "initiated" or "prescribed for."

If this assumption could be grounded, the natural sequel to a National Research Foundation would be Federal foundations to initiate and prescribe for the composition of music, the painting of pictures, the writing of poems, and the establishment of social controls and education, for science is probably the most personal and individualistic of all human endeavors. No agency, however authorized and directed, can develop a national policy for scientific research.

THE NATURE OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

It is generally understood that scientific research attracts and requires a peculiar type of mind, a mind dedicated to the search for truth and devoted exclusively to that end. The scientist knows that he is seldom rewarded with financial success or even with widespread public recognition. He may enjoy the sense of masterly performance, but his primary motivation is intellectual curiosity. The life pattern of the scientist cannot be bought with money nor can it be the product of regimentation. In fact, there are not many milieus that are favorable for the development of a scientific mind. The development of that kind of mind needs an unhampered, unrestricted, unregimented freedom to explore. Scientists must not only know that which is known, but also must possess an awareness of the significance of the unknown and an active curiosity to explore the unknown. For projected jaunts into the realm of the unknown, the true scientist is unwilling and unable to formulate blueprints. In the every nature of the case, he must at all times work experimentally, and his best work is done when he works alone or in the company of sympathetic colleagues who are similarly motivated.

In practice, of course, scientists are not left entirely to themselves. Usually they are members of university faculties or of research institutions and, as such, they have certain duties to perform. It is to the credit of most of the administrations of these institutions, however, that they do not interfere with the freedom of the investigations of scientists and ask few or no questions as to the progress of their research, with the result that few persons outside the institution have any knowledge of what is going on in the institution's laboratories until the results are published in technical periodicals. To be frank, one of the principal reasons why university scientists have enjoyed this freedom is the fact that scientific inquiry has been regarded as an innocent pastime or a hobby and the appropriations for scientific research regarded as a reward for faithful work done by these scientists as teachers or administrators. Be that as it may, the freedom that has been accorded university scientists constitutes the principal reason why university research has brought forth such significant results.

The university scientist does not have to make elaborate petitions for grants and contracts with detailed blueprints; he merely has to get a modest sum of money for the purchase of some necessary instruments, chemicals, glassware, or laboratory animals and then start on his research, responsible only to his own conscience.

It is possible to distinguish between two types of scientific research. One, which marks a fundamental advance over that which is known on the basis of a hunch or intuition and which, since its actual goal is still beyond the horizon, cannot be organized, regimented or, in any real sense, directed. It may yield nothing or it may result in great discoveries. The second type of pure research, along with all applied research, is of the spadework or routine type. The fundamental discovery has already been made, the goal is already in sight and all that is needed is to corroborate, to extend, and to apply the basic observations made. Such research may be organized and directed both in the laboratory of pure science and of industry. In fact, this has been the common practice.

An example may illustrate better the meaning of all this. Insulin was discovered as the result of the great achievement of Joseph von Mering and O. Minkowski, of Breslau, Germany, who had removed the pancreas of dogs and then accidentally stumbled upon the discovery that these depancreatized animals developed diabetes (1889). It is obvious that this kind of discovery could not have been planned or contracted for. Many years later (1922), Frederick G. Banting and C. H. Best, of Toronto, Canada, already knowing that the pancreas elaborates a substance regulating carbohydrate metabolism, actually extracted this substance from the pancreas which others had previously tried to do but did not completely succeed because their extracts were either too toxic or, because of the presence of a protein-digesting enzyme in the pancreas, were inactivated rapidly. Banting and Best had the new idea to extract only the islets of the pancreas allowing the other, the enzyme-containing part of the gland, to degenerate by previous ligation of its duct. Even this discovery would have been hard to organize or to contract for, but now, since the role of the pancreas in diabetes and insulin was known, it became only a matter of time to extend this knowledge, to improve the method of extraction of insulin from the pancreas, to study the action of insulin in animals and in diabetic patients, to purify it and finally—and here is where industry came in—to improve the yield of insulin from animal material and to work out methods for its mass production. This latter type of research, both basic and applied, can and should be organized, directed, and, if you will, contracted for because it is a costly undertaking. In fact, we can depend upon our alert industries to take the lead in initiating and supporting such research.

Basic discoveries in science may be the result of accidents, are often made by the scientist working on a fallacious hypothesis or on the basis of correct theory but the discovery made on the correct basis was not anticipated and turned out to be far more important than the original goal. In this connection, think of Columbus. His working hypothesis was correct, the Indies can indeed be reached by sailing westward, but instead of arriving in Cathay or India he discovered a new continent.

And again, think of the other possibility. Chloral hydrate and chloroform were both discovered by the German chemist, Justus Liebig, by 1832, but the anesthetic action of chloroform was not demonstrated until November 1847, by Sir James Y. Simpson. Liebig himself observed that when chloral hydrate is acted upon by an alkali, chloroform is developed along with a formate of the alkali employed. The discovery of the first hypnotic (sleep-producing drug), chloral hydrate, by Otto Liebreich, of Berlin, is a typical example of how a wrongly conceived working hypothesis can lead to correct results and great discoveries. Liebreich knew of the work of Liebig and Simpson and assumed that the ingestion of chloral hydrate would lead to a slow liberation of chloroform in the body producing a soporific effect. In 1869 he announced the discovery of chloral hydrate as an effective sleep-producing agent. It became so widely used that by 1878 the consumption of chloral hydrate was estimated at 1 ton daily in England and America alone. And yet, as we know now, none of the chloral hydrate is converted in the body into chloroform, chloral hydrate producing its soporific effect by virtue of its own molecular composition.

THE PROMOTION OF BASIC SCIENCE BY A NATIONAL RESEARCH FOUNDATION

Every scientist knows that some of the most important discoveries in the history of science have been made by accident or on the basis of false assumptions. Walter B. Cannon calls it "serendipity," which is defined as "that happy faculty, or luck, of finding unforeseen evidence of one's ideas or, with surprise, coming upon new objects which were not being sought." This is the way

penicillin was discovered, through "serendipity."

Is "serendipity" by act of Congress feasible? Suppose, then, the National Research Foundation should farm out a contract to a scientific investigator for the purpose of discovering a diagnotic test for cancer. Suppose the researcher, during his studies, stumbles upon a drug whose possibilities might be as interesting as those of penicillin. His assignment is to find a test for cancer. So he plugs on at the task for which he has contracted, and what might well have been the most important outcome of his research falls by the wayside until another appropriation is forthcoming for the development of the new drug.

One of the major arguments put forth for passage of the Magnuson-Kilgore measure is that, while this Nation is far ahead of the rest of the world in the field of applied research, we trail behind in basic research. Is this really true?

Almost a century ago, the science of the fossil world was revitalized in this country. With the beginning of this century, after a few feeble European attempts, the experimental method was introduced into morphology, embryology, and allied biological sciences. The Columbia School of Scientists made the study of heridity an exact science. Remember the early American Nobel prize winners: Albert Abraham Michelson in physics, Theodore William Richards in chemistry. Since when have we been behind in basic discoveries? We may be behind in basic science now because some of our most promising youngsters have been absorbed by the armed forces. We may have, for a 5-year period, a lost generation of basic scientists, but since other nations, even those who had a more intelligent approach toward the problem of draft deferments for science students, fared as badly as we did, the situation is not too disturbing. It would hardly interfere with our leadership or, perhaps more modestly, our relative position in the field of basic sciences.

However, whether we are ahead or behind the world in making basic discoveries of scientific phenomena that contribute to man's well-being, the Magnuson-Kilgore bill would do little to help us forge ahead. No amount of Federal money can nourish the genius of the individual scientist devoted to the advancement of knowledge. Actually, Federal money would do more to impede basic research than to further it.

For one thing, research achievement cannot be measured in terms of money. One could point to many relatively poor laboratories in this country where greater discoveries have been made than in some of the best endowed institutions. In fact, if it weren't too indelicate one could enumerate examples showing that the same individuals when working under extremely modest conditions and stress produced great work and both the quantity but particularly the quality of their work diminished when they were placed under very favorable, in fact opulent, circumstances. Also, generally speaking, one cannot maintain that the richest and best equipped research laboratories produce the best and most significant work. I never heard that the discovery of insulin was made possible by huge grants or contracts, nor have I understood that the much-publicized penicillin was discovered by Alexander Fleming in a magnificiently equipped and endowed laboratory.

But, as Al Smith once was reported to have said, "You don't shoot Santa Claus." Why should I as a scientist worry if some poorly supported laboratories are granted Federal funds? The answer is that the plan to establish such grants will impoverish many scientific laboratories. If the bill is passed, even the present modest sources of support may be withdrawn from the scientist who does not get the National Research Foundation's stamp of approval.

Let us take the case of an investigator who has been doing fairly well with the modest support provided by his university's funds. The Magnuson-Kilgore bill is passed. The researcher asks his dean for the continuance of support. The dean may reply: "Apply to the foundation. They have plenty of money to support your research. If it is worth while, they are bound to approve it." And so he applies. The foundation does not think his idea is sound. So he goes back to his dean and asks again for university funds. But the dean says "No," arguing that if he has been turned down by the foundation the university cannot afford to take the chance of supporting his research.

Industry, according to estimates of Dr. Vannevar Bush, Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, footed fully 70 percent of the total scientific bill in the United States just before the war. It is also stated that of this amount only about 5 percent was devoted to pure basic research and the rest of it went for the support of applied science needed by the production program of the particular industry. The bulk of money for pure research came from philanthropy and the budgets of educational institutions. It is much to be feared that if the foundation undertakes to appropriate, let us say, $5,000,000 per annum for medical research, this sum of money will be considered amply sufficient by many educational institutions, only lukewarm in their support of research, to take care of the needs of all their staff members on the medical faculty. They might consider themselves relieved of the responsibility of supporting the research programs of their own employees. To make the long story short, much of the fundamental research in this country was supported by driblet contributions, and these driblets may evaporate suddenly if the providers of these driblets get the idea that the Federal Government will take care of all worth-while research.

Dr. Bush, one of the chief supporters of the Federal aid program to research, himself states that "discoveries in medicine have often come from the most remote and unexpected fields of science in the past; and it is probable that this will be equally true in the future. Discovery cannot be achieved by directive." I trust that Dr. Bush realizes that a directive does not have to be a positive dictation from above. There is another equally dangerous kind of directive, direction by elimination and discrimination. All you have to do is to reject all applications for one type of research, approve all applications of another kind of scientific blueprint, and you are directing research all right, and nobody but the victims need to know anything about it. And this kind of direction or coordination is the one to be dreaded, the silent treatment which may be accorded to individuals or institutions unpopular, unorthodox, or for some reason open to suspicion in the eyes of the authorities of the moment. It may hit me today and hit you tomorrow. It could easily lead to a selective elimination not only of certain institutions and individuals but also of certain ideas and theories alike.

The theories and ways of thinking of scientists are as diverse as the world itself. How can we set up a court with the power to pass on what is good and what is not good for science? It might have the same effect as having a court of art, directing artists to follow only the pet artistic theories of members of the board. Although few people are aware of what every scientist knows, science is as much an expression of the individual human being as any of the arts.

One feature of the Magnuson-Kilgore bill, however, would very likely aid in promoting basic research. This is the granting of scholarships for scientific education. A scholarship will not stifle basic discoveries; it will promote them, if the graduate scholar is permitted to do research on his own and not under the aegis of a Federal agency. But even here safeguards are necessary. It is essential that Government scholarships and fellowships be distributed on a regional basis, not only with reference to scholars but also with reference to colleges. Chances are that if the Government were to give scholarships with no reservation as to where they might be spent, the great majority of budding scholars would gravitate toward the highly endowed universities of the East. The small southern, western, and midwestern colleges, where many a discovery has been made despite scarcity of funds, would suffer and perhaps become sterile.

However, it is a fallacy to think that the selection of promising young scientists whose lives are to be devoted to the advancement of scientific frontiers can be based on competitive examinations or school records. The biographies of eminent scientists reveal that no fool-proof method of selection can yet be proposed. The point is that we should not fall into the error of believing that the foundation will be able to select and salvage all the available human scientific material. We should beware of a situation where all the future generations of scientists are handpicked by Government agencies, becoming, as it were, after graduation active or reserve officers of a Federal scientific army.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE NATIONAL RESEARCH FOUNDATION

The question whether the foundation be presided over by a director or by a committee representing some of the outstanding scientific brains of the country is less important than the fundamental problem of administration of this supreme court and treasury department of science. Since there cannot be any national policy of science as there is a national policy of labor or finance, it is pointless to argue that a director appointed by the President of the United States would apply Democratic or Republican Party politics in managing the affairs of the foundation. He would obviously have to be advised on every detail in carrying out the directions embodied in the act of Congress by one or, more likely, many committees of experts. The question again is whether any committee, however ably selected, can or should organize or give directives for scientific explorations into the unknown.

The history of scientific progress clearly shows that hypotheses of youngsters were often "pooh-poohed" by the authorities of the age and not seldom the youngsters proved right and in their turn became the authorities who again "pooh-poohed" the ideas of the younger generation and were again succeeded by still other youngsters. The flow of progress springs from the undeveloped sources of intellect inherent in newcomers on the scene and the authorities, regrettable as it may seem, have to pass on. To empower authorities of any age or even any decade to act as supreme arbiters of science stifles the rise of foolish youngsters or unpopular colleagues and stops science.

The proponents of the bill assume that the selection of the best scientists of the moment as heads of the foundation will insure that under their direction the progress of science, that is, the exploration of the unknown will be maintained or even accelerated. These leaders in science have for the most part explored some segments of the unknown, but should be the first to admit their lack of omniscience and their inability to forecast the directions which such explorations of the unknown should take. If they could make such forecasts, the hypotheses on which future research is to be based would already be known and the actual investigation already under way in their own laboratories. What we are dealing with, therefore, is an attempt to organize what in essence is unknown. This is obviously not regarded as feasible or practical by scientists acquainted with the actual methods, trials, and tribulations of research and can be classed only as

a mirage envisioned by well-intentioned individuals who have never been initiated into research or, if they have, never have analyzed the course of their own and their colleagues' progress. What is required, more than good intentions and optimistic visions of a scientific millenium, is a face-to-face acquaintance with the hard, real facts of science and how it progresses.

Problems in basic science should not be submitted for approval or disapproval to any director or to any group of directors of any foundation. We may take it for granted that clairvoyance is not a common characteristic of human beings, not even of great scientists. And it would take nothing short of clairvoyance to pass upon, to coordinate, or to farm out fundamental research problems. The spadework type of research, however, whether pure or applied, may be rendered more efficient by governmental or industrial cooperation. The fact of the matter is that such cooperative research programs have been under way for many years. They are responsible for the many improvements in the standardization of food products and drugs and, last but not least, for forging the weapons of our victory.

The Food and Drug Administration probably knows best how to organize and direct an extensive research program to safeguard the health of the Nation, and the Army and Navy authorities should be the final judges as to the needs of a scientific national defense research program. A national research foundation, if one is needed, should confine its activities (a) to supporting Government research particularly in the interest of public health and national defense, (b) to coordinating such Government research activities in the sense that it should try to eliminate duplications, and (c) to securing the cooperation and expert advice of private laboratories and individuals in the interest of such research programs. It should be distinctly understood, however, that the freedom of science and scientists should not be impaired by this program, even if the individual investigators happen to be Government employees. The foundation should not attempt to monopolize the direction of basic research and should refrain from putting the stamp of approval or disapproval on individual scientists, laboratories, or institutions.

Incidentally, the bill proposes that the members of the advisory committees of the foundation be compensated on a per diem basis. The task these men are asked to perform, however, is a most important and responsible undertaking. They could not be expected to do it properly in their spare time, in a more or less amateurish fashion. They are faced with a tremendous responsibility, and their public responsibility should be emphasized by adequate remuneration, preferably by generous per annum salaries.

CLARIFYING THE ISSUES

My objections to this bill are not based on the old fear of Federal control as such. Many controls that have been established by the Federal Government were and are necessary in the interest of the general welfare and have been and are being wisely administered. In this connection I have in mind the Pure Food and Drug Act, the Securities and Exchange Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, and the act creating the Interstate Commerce Commission for the regulation of railroads. All of these regulatory acts were opposed by the private interests concerned on the ground that they were attempts by the Federal Government to regiment private business. This, however, was not the purpose of any one of them, nor has it been a result of their enactment. An abundance of evidence shows that these controls were necessary in the interest of the general welfare and that they served this useful purpose. In support of the proposals for governmental regulation of science, however, it cannot be said that such regulation is necessary in the interest of general welfare, nor can it be said that scientists who oppose such regulations are motivated by selfish interest. That fact, plus the fact that governmental regulation of scientific inquiry, whether by the Federal Government or the government of several States, would impede scientific development to the detriment of the general welfare, constitutes the basis for my opposition to the Magnuson-Kilgore bill.

In this connection it should be clearly understood that the above arguments are not directed against Government sponsorship of research for national defense. Without imitating the Nazi's Wehrwissenschaften, i. e., subordinating all scientific activity to the Nation's ability to make war, we must still have science for defense. Let the Government develop bombs, gases, airships, and other war materials. But let us not confuse the science of war with the science of peace and pure science. Let the Government and its scientific aids study all problems that may be of possible use in the next war. Let this scientific program be as inclusive as possible. But let us not permit the Government, or rather a group of scientists advising the Government, to regulate the science of peaceful discoveries and inventions.

Such regulation by directive or by negative elimination would have a completely deadening effect on scientific advancement in the United States. Did I say United States? If I read the English of the bill correctly, more is involved than that. One version of the bill says that at least 20 percent of the money appropriated for the National Research Foundation must be spent for the programs of the Division of National Defense; 20 percent must be spent on the Division of Medical Research. That leave 60 percent of the funds unguarded. There is nothing to prevent, in the bill as it is presently written, expenditure of 60 percent of the appropriated funds on inquiries into the daily habits of sheep in Yugoslavia.

There is a provision in the bill for dissemination of scientific information and exchange of scientific intelligence between this country and abroad. There is hardly any need for a new Government agency or for more funds for this purpose. We have able popular science writers and an adequate number of popular scientific magazines; we have Science Service supplying newspapers, magazines, and interested laymen with up-to-date news on the progress of science. We have plenty of national and regional meetings of diverse scientific societies in this country; we have international congresses in various branches of science, and abstract journals published in this country and abroad cover in forms of brief résumés scientific papers published anywhere in the world. It is to be feared that support of such activity by Federal money would only lead to sinecures and the creation of a new type of scholar, the traveling scientist, who could do much more for science by sticking to his home-town laboratory.

The Kilgore bill, although not the Magnuson bill, has a proposal that the results of research which are contrary to national interest should not be made public. This proposal that discoveries or inventions should be kept secret, even though it may not be urged in the final bill which reaches the Senate, is still dangerous when you realize that so distinguished, and usually intelligent, a Senator as HARLEY KILGORE promotes it. What then would come of such inventions as nitroglycerin or atomic power? If a board felt that such an invention would be dangerous to the public, as it was to Hiroshima and Nagasaki, it could suppress it. And mankind, stopped at the barriers of a new age, would be deprived not only of a chemical that can blast rocks to make new tunnels but also of a drug that lowers blood pressure and stops the agonizing pain in angina pectoris. If such a board, with such authority, had existed in prehistoric times, we might still be in the stone age.

If the bill passes, this country may be facing a situation which, according to a resolution recently passed by the southwestern section of the Society for Experimental Biology and Medicine, may easily lead to "the development of a scientific orthodoxy, which would be detrimental to the ideals of science and democracy and to the further development of our civilization."

Can we devise safeguards insuring that the National Research Foundation's influence be exerted for the good and not to the detriment of science and country? Probably not, but certain measures, certain safeguards may act as safety valves for the present and the future.

The most important safeguard is publicity. The director and the committees of the foundation will be spending public money. Therefore the terms of each grant and contract (with the possible exception of contracts in the Division of National Defense) should be made public. What is perhaps even more important, every request for a grant or contract should be printed in a special bulletin published by the foundation and the reasons for a grant or its rejection clearly and specifically stated. The name of the applicant, the name of his institution, and the names of the members of the committee recommending the approval or rejection of the grant, should be listed in the bulletin.

The next safeguard should be impersonality. Money should be appropriated not so much to individuals as to institutions which in the past have demonstrated their willingness and ability to produce research as evidenced by publications in reputable national scientific periodicals. One argument for the bill is that during the war years the universities have been dipping deeply into their endowments and privately endowed research laboratories are hard put. The argument is that interest on the endowments is insufficient to promote research and capital must be spent. There is a danger of exhaustion of the funds, it is said. Therefore, unless the Government steps in, no one will be able to promote research, neither the universities nor privately endowed laboratories. General Government subsidy to these privately endowed research laboratories would solve the problem of dwindling endowments and eliminate the always unpleasant controversies of the merits and demerits of individual research projects. Also it would put the responsibility of dealing with Government agencies where it belongs, namely, on administrators and executives, and active scientists would not be obliged to spend most of their time in answering questionnaires or filing reports. The Government grants to universities and research institutions could be distributed by the beneficiary institutions, en famille as it were. The men at each university or laboratory know each other best and it should be presumed that they are the best judges of what each man in his milieu could do with his test tube or Bunsen burner.

Another safeguard may be sharing the burden. I recognize that scientific research is in need of funds. That has always been true, even in the best endowed universities. But better than for the Federal Government to make outright grants to universities would be a system under which the universities would shoulder part of the cost. The university could pay anywhere from 20 to 50 percent of the cost of research. If the university is given a share in paying for the support of research, the university will have a much greater voice in what is done in that research. And let no university think that it can relax and let George, or rather Sam, do it. A university may also indicate its willingness to share in the expenses of government fellowship or scholarship funds and thus prove its interest in the future of science and remove the exclusive responsi-

bility of the Federal Government in the promotion of American science.

The tenure and method of selection of the members of the various committees of the National Research Foundation is another item worthy of consideration. Scientists, old and young, from all parts of the country, and from different types of universities and research laboratories should be represented on the boards. National scientific societies probably would also like to elect representatives to the various committees. No scientist should be made to serve for more than 1 year on any of the committees, since it is presumed that no scientist with active research affiliation would consent to become a bureaucrat willingly or for over long periods of time.

And the last and most important safeguard should be a general enlightenment as to the real nature of science and scientists. In the past scientists had one thing in common: nobody ever told them what to do. They had contracts with nobody, although some of them have been accused of having contracts with the devil. To initiate research by grants or contracts must not only fail, but such a program would be wasteful in the extreme. A clear understanding that basic research cannot be regimented, but routine, spadework, applied research may be programmed or even coordinated whenever the need arises, should help the Government or industry to spend its money wisely.

You can spend a lot of money and get no return. But if you trust in human ingenuity, motivated by desire of public service, the love of science, recognition, and maybe selfish aims alike, you will have done more for basic science than you could ever do with billions of dollars of Federal money. The atmosphere in which science flourishes and discoveries are made is that of unhampered freedom, not an atmosphere filled with contracts and questionnaires.

Ceiling Price on Raw Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1946

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, the proposal of the OPA to put a ceiling price on raw cotton is one of the most vicious blows ever struck at the American farmer. It is unfair and unwarranted and is another attempt to hold down the living standard and wage earnings of the cotton farmer.

When Chester Bowles announced his intention to put a maximum ceiling of 24.09 cents per pound on the highest grades of cotton and then scale the price of other grades down by the use of a synthetic scale adjustment he was merely attempting to gain more power and control over the already overregulated farmer. It would mean a slave wage of 21 to 22 cents per hour for the southern cotton farmer—barely half of the present minimum wage standard of 40 cents per hour, and they are now talking of a 60-cent or even a 75-cent minimum wage standard. Why discriminate against the southern cotton farmer? Has he not just as much right to live and eat and wear clothes and send his children to school as the industrial worker? His work is just as hard if not harder, his product is just as essential. Anyone who knows anything at all about cotton knows that it takes a minimum of 1 hour's work to produce 1 pound of cotton—and they want to put a ceiling of 24.09 cents a pound on this work. What for? To hold down the price of living? "Baloney." The only living it would hold down would be the farmer's living. There is not one iota of sense to the whole proposal.

Oh, I know people are going to say that there is a ceiling on the finished product, the shirts, the sheets, the handkerchiefs, and so forth, and so there should be a ceiling on the raw product. Any informed person knows better than that. The ceiling on the finished product automatically puts a ceiling on the raw product because there is just so much the manufacturers can pay for raw materials, labor, and other costs. We all know that. But listen to this—a shirt sells for from $3 up if you can find one, and the raw cotton in that shirt weighs approximately half a pound, grosses the farmer approximately 11 to 12 cents and nets him only 2 or 3 cents. Where does the rest of that $3 go? Not to the farmer. Why if the farmer got twice as much for his cotton it should not affect the sale price of the shirt. There is too much spread and too much processing and distribution cost. It is unfair. It is poor economics.

Let us put it another way. At present prices the average bale of cotton grosses the farmer about $120, when processed and manufactured into ordinary cotton handkerchiefs, the kind you buy at the 5-and-10-cent store, that same bale of handkerchiefs selling at retail brings from $3,000 to $5,000. Who gets the difference? Not the farmer.

These are just two glaring examples, Mr. Speaker. I could go on and on for there are thousands of cotton commodities, but these two examples will suffice to illustrate my point.

If Chester Bowles is sincere about keeping the cost of living down why does he not do something about the wide spread between the producing farmer and the consuming public? Is he trying to protect the manufacturer, the middleman, and distributor at the expense of the farmer? It looks like it. If he holds the ceiling on the finished product, I assure you, Mr. Speaker, there is no probability of the price of cotton running away, but there is quite a possibility that the farmer will, as he should, get more for his cotton than he is now getting. He is entitled to a slice of the enormous spread, and I am going to do my utmost to see that he gets it.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is another factor that is working against the sudden increase in the price of cotton that Mr. Bowles seems to fear so much. Does not Mr. Bowles know that in spite of the enormous wartime consumption of cotton we still have a carry-over of more than 5,000,000 bales of cotton in the warehouses? Most of this cotton belongs to the Government and Mr. Bowles, being such an important part of the Government, surely should know about it.

I am unalterably opposed and will fight against a ceiling on raw cotton. It will only further retard the back breaking production of this most important commodity and make the lot and living standards of the farmer that much harder. Let us kill this vicious proposal.

Mystery of Foreign Policy by Administration Muddles Demobilization Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1946

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I feel it is imperative to call to the attention of my colleagues two of the recent letters, among the many I have received, which I believe are representative of the feelings of our veterans concerning demobilization, in spite of the recent explanation of policies by our brilliant leader, Chief of Staff of the Army, Gen. Dwight Eisenhower.

In testifying, General Eisenhower made a statement which I believe hits at the crux of the matter. After referring to the spectacular success of demobilization, he said that the "Army was rapidly approaching the foreseen juncture of two incompatibles: the speed of demobilization and our duties at home and overseas—the occupation mission delegated to us by higher authority."

In my opinion, there lies the force which has resulted in confusion, vacillation, and misrepresentation by our Government to our veterans and to the public. The administration controls our occupation policies. But what are they? What is our policy in China? What is our policy in Germany? How long are we going to stick our fingers into far-off countries without the public's knowing what is going on? Why does not the administration forthrightly tell us why we continue to occupy some of the jungles of the Pacific? Our veterans are entitled to know what commitments our administration has made and on what grounds, if they are to be kept indefinitely occupying these remote spots. The public also should be advised on how the administration and the military expect to maintain support from the public and the servicemen when it fails to make clear its objectives.

In the public interest, I believe that the administration and the State Department should immediately set forth its reasons for using the hidden-ball tactics. How can we be expected to reach the goal of peace with our world-wide allies, when our leaders who are formulating our international policies lack the spirit and honesty to explain to the people what is going on. I think it is time for our foreign policy, if any, to be fully clarified for our veterans so they will know why they are being kept overseas,

instead of being handed a mess of double talk. It is up to the administration to speak out. The public wants to know. The servicemen who have the job to do should be taken into the confidence of their leaders. We in Congress should be given a first-hand insight into these policies. Then we could be able to go intelligently about the business of securing the peace. But we cannot do it when the administration continues to meddle in foreign affairs without the knowledge and benefit of public opinion. It will only lead to further demoralization and mass defiance of authority.

Let us hear a clear explanation by the administration of the mystery as to what the "occupation mission delegated by higher authority" is.

The letters follow:

I am writing this letter in the capacity of a taxpayer, property owner, and voter in the district which you represent, and also as a member of the Army of the United States.

I was drafted into the Army in November 1942 and have been overseas since October 1944. Since those of us who are overseas have more or less lost our ability to have an active voice in the present policies of Government, I am taking this opportunity to voice my feelings to you.

I would like to have information to clarify the following questions:

1. What are you doing to help us return to civilian life, and release us from Army service, which we did not desire, but when called upon executed to the best of our ability?

2. For some length of time people who are over 26 years of age or with children have not been drafted. Yet those of us who were over 30 years of age when drafted, and have children, are still serving in the Army overseas. Why can't something be done to release those of us who want to return to civilian life and our families?

3. The Navy publishes its program for discharge as high as 2 months in advance. Yet the Army will not divulge information on the current month. What is the necessity for all this secrecy? We feel the least that could be done would be a simple and clear statement of what policy the War Department intends to follow.

4. Secretary of War Patterson, on his recent visit to Guam and the Pacific, seemed very poorly informed on current discharge policies, and made what we considered a very poor impression for a man in the important position which he occupies. Is it not the duty of our Representatives to see that these men are informed, and to protect the interests of their constituents?

5. Secretary of War Patterson seemed ignorant of the fact that points are not accumulating with time spent overseas. Why aren't they? The Navy follows this practice, and at least their members know that every month spent overseas means more points for them toward discharge.

6. Does the meager information possessed by our Secretary of War indicate the standard of knowledge that is possessed by other members of our Government?

7. The Army declared recently that a shortage of shipping was retarding demobilization. Yet the Navy has said repeatedly that there are plenty of ships for all. On January 2 the Navy declared that there was an excess of shipping, and that 100 ships of the "magic-carpet" fleet were being retired. What are we to think in the face of such statements?

8. Many men who have spent their entire Army career in the United States are being discharged. Yet those of us who have been overseas for over a year are given no idea of when we can expect to be discharged. Is this fair? We feel that as long as there are enlisted men and officers in the States who have not served overseas, they are not surplus until those who are now overseas are returned. Perhaps it would cost more money that way, but we are the present and future taxpayers of America, and we think we should have a voice in the manner in which our money will be spent.

First and foremost, I am voicing my own feelings in this matter, but I am also echoing the sentiments of thousands of other servicemen overseas. Many of us have won no Purple Hearts, Congressional Medals of Honor, or even battle stars, but we feel that we have done our duty in an assignment in which we had no choice, that our duty has been done, and has been well done, and we are more than ready to go home. I would appreciate hearing from you as to what is being done, or what can be done to alleviate the present situation.

TO WHOM IT DOES CONCERN:

Until January 5, 1946, most of us were at least partially satisfied with the progress of the demobilization program and the movement of troops to the United States, even though it was slower than had been promised us by the War Department. And, having accepted their alibis for failure to provide adequate transportation, despite the fact that we are the possessors of the largest navies and merchant fleets in the history of the world, we were patient, having faith in the promises from the leaders of our country and Army; that we would be returned home with the fullest possible expediency, that we could return to our families and jobs and to the normal pursuit of happiness of the life we left behind, when we answered our country's call.

Suddenly, and for no tangible or logical reason, at least of which we have been informed, the War Department issued an order calling for the retardation of demobilization, using as their alibi to an incredulous soldiery, who knows the truth, the worn-out and shallow theme that the degree of essentiality shall determine discharges, and now, without regard for these soldiers, who gave their unstinted measure of sacrifice to duty and devotion, they forced upon us a condition which definitely illustrated to you people at home, and to us in the Army, that the War Department will stop at nothing to gain their militaristic ends.

The War Department continually and consistently refused to answer any and all arguments and criticisms brought by its soldiers against the unjust policies of their demobilization program. Yet at all times, they accuse the soldiers of an unreasoning and emotional attitude while they themselves, as a traditional, last refuge of those who are unable to answer arguments or charges directed against their disreputable policies, employ the classic propaganda trick used by the dictators and have resorted to name-calling and scapegoatism. As a consequence, millions of GI's fighting for a return to the democratic way of life are branded as "Communists" and "hotheads." These are the same men, your sons, brothers, husbands, and neighbors, who yesterday defeated the greatest combination of military power in the history of the world, making possible the victory over fascism, and the liberation of enslaved nations. Today we are addressed as homesick, lace-pants babies, isolationists, Communists, and radicals who must be suppressed. We have also been accused of sabotaging the peace, the securing of which is the primary job of our leaders and statesmen. We have in numerous places mentioned the War Department, and we wish to make it clear that we recognize that there are in that Department and in other headquarters subordinate to it, individuals, who are not only intelligent but fair-minded men in sympathy with the plight of the GI's. Our attack is not against these individuals. We offer as an example of these characteristics a man who has demonstrated on more than one occasion that he is honest, able, and a friend of the GI's—Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower.

These are the facts—the plain mathematical truths—and we defy the War Department to dispute or discredit them. The War Department contends that in order to maintain the Nation's peace it is our responsibility to support an Army of 1,600,000 men. We do not dispute this fact. Our indoctrination as soldiers directs us not to question the statements and policies of the War Department. However, in view of the scare headlines and published innuendoes, we deem it essential to the security of our American democracy to unmask these falsehoods and half truths so that you, the people of the United States, may know the true facts confronting us on this issue. From a peak Army strength of 8,300,000 men, the Army has discharged 4,200,000. If we are to put any credence in the War Department statement of the hardships in deploying these men to their homes, the results are commendable, indeed, by simple subtraction, and by using these same War Department figures, we find there are still some 4,100,000 men remaining. Add to these men an admitted draft of 300,000 since VJ-day and, further, add also the voluntary enlistments of 400,000 men, we reach a grand total of 4,800,000 men. We, as soldiers, are not protesting against the required size of the peacetime Army; what we want everyone to know is that with an admitted surplus, above and beyond the War Department needs, the War Department has exercised the unfair prerogative of retarding demobilization. As yet the War Department refuses to explain the reason for holding these men in excess of its admitted needs. Still another grave problem confronts the American people. It is a confirmed fact shown by the War Department policies that by creating confusion and doubt in the minds of the American people it has made its intent clear to blackmail our Congress into accepting military conscription as the only solution for rapid demobilization.

We soldiers know, as does the world at large, through bitter experience, the attending evils of militarism. These evils have their birth when a people can be deluded into accepting military conscription as a component part of our natural way of life. Our Congress, to whom the War Department is responsible, is also your duly elected representatives. They are sent to Washington to give articulate voice to your mutual desires and opinions. We appeal to you to join your voice with ours against this infringement of all that America holds dear. We demand that you exercise and shoulder this responsibility which you owe, not only to us who are affected today but to the yet unborn generations of Americans to whom freedom has become a heritage.

Encroachment of Federal Power in the Utility Field

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1946

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Purcell L. Smith, president of the National Association of Electric Companies,

Washington, D. C., at a forum on public utilities, sponsored by Investors League, Inc., at Chicago, Ill., November 29, 1945:

The wording of my subject represents a happy choice of terms by the League for there is no better word than "encroachment" to describe the public ownership movement in the United States. Webster tells us that "to encroach" means "to invade insidiously and appropriate the province of another * * * to trench on another's limits by gradual usurpation or intrusion * * * to transgress the just bounds."

I believe there is general agreement that Federal power has and is continuing to encroach in the electric light and power field, but I think that the methods of this encroachment and the extent of the invasion are not matters of common knowledge. Furthermore, I am sure that the citizens of this country are unaware of the implications of this movement as they affect, not only our economy, but also the character of our political institutions.

According to the data of the Edison Electric Institute, approximately 12 percent of the installed electric generating capacity in this country at the end of 1944 was owned by the Federal Government, Federal authorities, or agencies financed through United States Government funds and about 7 percent was owned by municipalities or similar public bodies. Some of these publicly owned or publicly financed electric operations were based upon reasonable and fair economics and are entitled to respect and credit for fine accomplishment. But the economics became quite changed when the revenue needs of governments, particularly, the United States Government, became so great during the depression, followed by the tremendous financial requirements of preparing for defense and after Pearl Harbor waging two wars.

I wish to call to your attention that this approximate 19 percent of the electric supply operates without paying any taxes or equivalent thereof to the United States Government and in some instances does not pay either directly or indirectly any State, county, or municipal taxes. This is a serious matter from the viewpoint of all taxpayers of the United States, which, of course, includes all investors, except those who own securities free from taxes. It was estimated by the Edison Electric Institute that the Federal taxes paid by the privately owned electric companies of the United States in 1942 was $397,000,000; in 1943, $448,000,000; in 1944, $468,000,000; and I believe it is reasonable to estimate that the 1945 taxes will be around $450,000,000. The public power group's Federal taxes will be nothing. In addition, the security holders of the private power companies pay income taxes on the interest and dividends which they receive, meaning additional millions of dollars paid into the Federal Treasury, whereas, many of the publicly owned projects are financed by revenue bonds or municipal bonds on which interest is tax exempt and the owners thereof pay no income tax on such interest. It was estimated recently by a witness before the Securities Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee that if public power had paid comparable taxes, they and their security holders would have paid into the United States Treasury at least $135,000,000 for the year 1943 and an estimated aggregate for the 6 years 1940 to 1945, inclusive, probably in excess of $650,000,000.

It was only a little more than 50 years ago that Thomas Edison built his first electric generating station, which was the beginning of the electric light and power industry. Isolated plants sprang up around the country and these were later integrated into power systems. The pioneers of the electric-power industry had no easy road as they sought to promote the use of electric energy while at the same time they wrestled with problems of finance and engineering. In those early days, when the "going was tough," there was no encroachment of Federal power.

For many years the Socialist Party had been trying to get a foothold on the American political stage, but with little success. Their bold program to overthrow the Constitution of the United States was not relished by the American people and during World War I some of their leaders were jailed for subversive activities. After World War I, however, they recognized the impossibility of bringing about an outright revolution and they changed their tactics and developed a new program known as "boring from within." From that time on their strategy has been to operate within the framework of our political system to achieve the objectives of socialism.

Having been unable to make any headway through the normal political channels, the socialists evolved a new strategy based on economic control. And, in casting about for what they hope will be a quick and sure means of establishing economic control, their choice was the new, fast growing, and widespread industry—the electric power industry. Today their strategy was stated very clearly and simply by Carl D. Thompson, national campaign manager and one-time nominee for President on the ticket of the Socialist Party.

Mr. Thompson said, "Successful public ownership of power production means an adequate control of transportation and of industrial forces dependent upon electrical power of their successful operation."

I think that neither Mr. Thompson nor anyone else can make a clearer statement of the basic reason for Federal encroachment in the utility field. But Mr. Thompson went even further and gave a frank outline of how the Socialists would gain their objectives. He announced that "the Socialists will push their campaigns. They will capture cities. Later they will control State legislatures and, finally, the United States Congress and the Supreme Court * * * and finally the Nation will take over one after the other of the public utilities, mines, railroads, interurban electric lines, power plants, telephone and telegraph systems, waterways, forests."

And the methods by which the Socialists were to gain these objectives were outlined by another Socialist leader, H. S. Raushenbush, who said, "Between cataclysmic socialism (by which is meant armed revolution) and encroachment control, the latter will be the only one acceptable to this Nation for a long while. The workers are more apt to support a power authority."

Inasmuch as this was written some 6 years before the passage of the act creating the Tennessee Valley Authority I think we can take Mr. Raushenbush's statement as something more than prophecy. In fact, if we accept the theory of cause and effect we have good reason to assume that Mr. Raushenbush and his fellow Socialists had a hand in securing the effect which was so dear to their hearts.

Now the Socialists, having realized the impossibility of socializing America in one fell swoop, acknowledge that the country would have to pass through what they called a transitional state before complete socialization could be achieved. Mr. Raushenbush, having described several transitional methods, came to the conclusion, as he stated, "A fourth attempt, which I look upon as much more hopeful, is the one which seeks to set up, through Government ownership at Muscle Shoals, at Boulder Dam, and on the St. Lawrence, yardsticks by which the efficiency of private ownership under regulation may be measured."

Now that statement, on its face, appears innocuous enough. Who could quarrel with the purely objective desire to measure the efficiency of private ownership? Thus described, it sounds like a project of the Bureau of Standards. But we will discover that the yardstick which was to be used in this pseudoscientific measurement was to be a yardstick the like of which the Bureau of Standards never saw and never hoped to see.

In the early days of the electric-service industry the technology of the industry had not progressed to the point where integrated systems were possible. Each community had its own plant. Most of them were privately owned and operated but, of course, many municipalities had their own plants.

For a time, therefore, the public-power proponents worked assiduously for municipal ownership, seeking to have towns take over the private plants serving them.

Later on, bolder steps were taken by private companies to develop transmission techniques that would permit transmission of electric service over widespread areas with consequent substantial economies, efficiencies, and advantages. Inasmuch as the service areas of the municipal plants were usually confined to a relatively small number of square miles, it became apparent that many of the municipal-ownership projects could not give the same quality of service as the private systems nor as economically or efficiently. As a result, many of the municipal plants were absorbed into the private systems. Out of a total of 3,900 municipal systems which were established at one time or another in the United States, only 1,870 remained at the end of 1935.

The public-power proponents, of course, did not overlook any opportunities of the financial debacle of 1929 and the early thirties and the resulting severe economic depression to extend encroachment on much broader lines than the municipal-ownership plants. Vast sums were being appropriated by the United States Congress to stimulate industrial activity throughout the country. The public-power proponents saw in this activity an opportunity to enlarge their empire through the medium of the use of a generous Congress attempting to lift the national economy out of depression depths.

Some time back the Public Ownership League, in a gloating article in its magazine, proclaimed that, "Step by step this superpower plan is being realized. The Tennessee Valley has become an outstanding reality. The Boulder Dam has been finished. The Bonneville power system is nearing completion. * * * Grand Coulee is well on the way. In the map one can see the extent to which our dream of 1922–25 has already taken form and also the next steps that are being proposed."

Federal encroachment in the utility field cannot be denied. Can we then ignore the implications of this success . . . namely the complete socialization of the utility industry, followed by the socialization of other industries?

As a contrast, I quote to you from the New York Times of the 15th of this month reporting on an address made by the Honorable Harold L. Ickes at the annual meeting of the American Petroleum Institute in Chicago on November 14:

"'Both domestically and abroad, the oil should be done, just as far as possible, by private industry,' the speaker also said, 'I would consider it unwise and unfortunate for Government to interpose itself in any phase of the oil business which can be handled by the industry efficiently and economically and with the satisfaction that a fair profit brings.'"

This is the same gentlemen who is Secretary of the Interior where Mr. H. S. Raushenbush is, I believe, project analyst for the Power Division of the Department.

I have referred earlier to the very substantial discrimination again privately owned electric companies by reason of the tax exemption subsidy enjoyed by public power.

Public-power promoters have taken advantage of this exemption and have profited and capitalized upon it, for if an electric-utility property, which is privately owned paying substantial income taxes, were to go into Federal ownership, there would be no income taxes to pay and hence public ownership could afford to pay a higher price for the property, generally speaking, than another private owner could. Furthermore, in most cases by which public-ownership promoters acquire or bring about the acquisition of properties formerly owned by tax-paying private owners, such transactions and operations have not been subject to regulatory control and approval by Federal or State agencies.

As serious as the existing picture is for the reasons heretofore stated, the public-power advocates are planning still more Federal projects, either as primary hydroelectric developments or so-called multiple-purpose projects in connection with flood control, rivers and harbors, irrigation, navigation, and reclamation. The total dreams are staggering in billions of dollars required to complete the ultimate plans. A few of such projects have economic and public merit as to power features. Most of them do not, but a lot of poor economies can be buried when the operations are exempt from all Federal taxes and can also be buried in the maze of finances of the United States Government.

The National Association of Electric Companies has already engaged in having presidents of its member companies present some of the facts concerning many of these projects before appropriate committees of the Congress, and will continue to do so from time to time. We believe that Congress is interested in having the facts. The Committee on Appropriations in the House of Representatives on Monday of this week made a report to the whole House on the first deficiency appropriation bill 1946, and I quote you certain excerpts from that report:

"It is incumbent upon the Congress to get governmental costs down as early as may be practicable to levels consistent with a sound postwar economy. That is the aim of the committee and it is solicitous of all of the help and support it can get. It means turning a deaf ear many times to importunities which ignore the general good. It means a close watch upon executive agencies to check extravagances, and, as regards personnel, to see that the best utilization is made of forces already employed. There is ever an urge to expand. The committee is convinced that in many cases the principal need is better and firmer coordination and direction by top administrators.

* * * * *

"The committee regrets to say that it is rare to meet with witnesses who evidence a conception of the need to contract Governmental spending. A spending psychology has grown up in Government which must be dissipated. As Secretary of the Navy Forrestal recently tersely expressed it, we must recapture economy.

* * * * *

"* * * The committee believes that a number of the undertakings should have further investigation, particularly those which contemplate commencing construction of so-called multipurpose dams entailing ultimate separate costs of as much as $130,000,000. They may be thoroughly justified, but the committee is reluctant to recommend them without further inquiry into the merits of features not essential to proection against floods. Rather than purpose a partial program, approval is withheld of the entire submission for reconsideration by the War Department subcommittee early in January in connection with the War Department civil functions appropriation bill.

* * * * *

"In connection with the denial of funds for power-market and transmission-line studies and surveys the committee has taken the position that the Government should not go into the business of constructing transmission lines to market power developed at Government dams and that the activity, desirous of securing such power should construct such lines to the point where Government power is being generated."

Let me make it very clear that the association that I represent, and its member companies, have gone on record in favor of flood control where needed, good improvements on rivers and harbors that are of true public interest and needed irrigation and reclamation, provided the money will be well and sensibly spent and has honest economics as the primary motive for its expenditure.

The Challenge of the Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, the following information given in a broadcast over the NBC network December 28, 1945, may be of interest to those Members of the House, and private citizens who are concerned with the present threat to world health caused by lack of food, clothing, and medical care for the growing generation in Europe and Asia:

Most of us have had a gay and merry Christmas—our first since the war began—surrounded by families and children. In Europe and Asia today there are pitifully few who can say, "We have had a merry Christmas. We look forward to a happy new year."

For millions of children are in imminent danger of starvation and freezing as winter comes to Europe.

That is the tragic conclusion reached by five international relief organizations. They report today that a terrifyingly large number of the world's children—if they survive at all—will never become healthy grown-ups. They will suffer the terrible after effects of starvation for years to come—rickets, tuberculosis, bone diseases, and many other afflictions, including stunted bodies and, worst of all, stunted minds.

You don't have to be an expert to forsee what this means to the entire world—including America. Disease knows no boundaries—epidemics can sweep through the weakened children of Europe and Asia, reach across the oceans, and strike our own babies. Weakened children grow up to be weak adults. Children who are mentally crippled grow up to be mentally crippled adults, easily victimized by unscrupulous, cruel, aggressive dictators.

Unless food, clothes, and medical care arrive to strengthen and protect the sickly children of Europe and Asia today, they will surely grow up to contaminate, to menace, yes and to fight your children tomorrow.

The scope of the problem is so great as to demand prompt and continuing action by such international agencies as the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Association. It is good to note that UNRRA on the job is doing ever better work—and in 1946 will, we hope, do still more. But no governmental or intergovernmental agency can do the whole job—and the little children of Europe cannot wait for cumbersome state machinery to swing into aid.

What is the actual situation of the children of Europe? The agricultural experts of UNRRA report that domestic food production in Europe this winter will be sufficient to provide the 90,000,000 people who do not live on farms with about 1,200 calories per person each day. One thousand two hundred calories is less than half the amount of food you and I eat every day. One thousand two hundred calories is just about enough for children 3 to 5 years old. Children 5 to 7 years old need 1,440 calories; children 7 to 9 years old need 1,680; children from 9 to 15 years of age need amounts ranging from 1,920 to 2,400 calories per day. So, you see, the average European city child more than 5 years old will be starving little by little this winter.

That is the way it is in Europe as a whole. In some countries it is even worse. In France, infant mortality has increased 50 percent. Tuberculosis there among adolescents has increased 40 percent. In Belgium, 23 percent of the children in rural areas and 34 percent of the children in cities are critically undernourished. UNRRA reports that there are one and one-half million undernourished kids in Yugoslavia.

Foreign Minister Masaryk of Czechoslovakia reports that nearly 800,000 children in his country are ripened by hunger for epidemics. Seven million children in Poland have been orphaned, at the same time that 75 percent of the health and child welfare centers which should be caring for them were destroyed. In Italy, 1,000,000 children under 2 years, and 7,000,000 more between 2 and 14, urgently need food and clothing just to stay alive. More than 1,000,000 Greek children are being consumed, flesh and bone, by hunger, and malaria and tuberculosis rage. In Holland, Norway, Denmark, and Finland—in Luxembourg, Albania, the Balkan countries, the Near East, Asia—it's the same story. Listen, the children of every country ravished by the Nazis and by the Japanese war lords, and hammered by the terrible air and artillery bombardments we had to lay down in order to conquer them, face the most terrible winter poor little children have ever known in history.

The size of the relief problem is shown by a recent report of the Department of Agriculture. In order to raise the food allowance of the peoples of continental Europe to only 2,000 calories per day will require the importation of 18,000,000 tons of foods in 1946.

And it isn't only food; it's clothing, medical care, and education. Schools and hospitals were destroyed wholesale by the Nazis. And even if the schools had been left standing, in four countries alone—France, Belgium, Holland, and Norway—no less than 10,000,000 children will be unable to attend them if they lack clothing and shoes. How would you like to send your kids to school in the kind of weather we're having, without a coat or sweater, and barefoot, too?

But, thank God, people with even a little knowledge of the terrible need are not just wringing their hands. Concrete steps are being taken today to ameliorate the situation to the full limit of means made available by American generosity. The American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service, Inc., on which virtually every child-relief organization in the United States is represented, is serving as a clearing house for the information you want about these children. From the council and from member organizations I have learned something of the relief work which has been made possible by gifts of money and food and clothing from the American people.

Through the efforts of American Relief for Holland, for example, the children of the Netherlands have received since their liberation more than 3,000,000 pounds of food, including cereal products, strained fruits, vegetables, milk products, soups, and so on.

The Near East Foundation is taking partial or entire care of 17,830 Greek children in

winter and summer colonies, providing food and also medical treatment for children disabled by war.

American Relief for Italy has provided 100,000 Italian children with vitamins and with one daily pint of milk since last July. It has sent to Italy almost 19,000,000 pounds of milk, clothing, and medicine.

The Youth Aliyah of Hadassah has collected at camps, has fed and housed and then transported to Palestine, 8,000 children since the start of the war and has provided their maintenance, education, and health care upon arrival.

Statistically, these are just a few high spots of the relief picture. Tremendously useful work in the field of child rescue and rehabilitation is being done by the various agencies constituting the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service, Inc., which has offices at 122 East Twenty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

The membership of this council includes:

AMERICAN COUNCIL OF VOLUNTARY AGENCIES FOR FOREIGN SERVICE, INC.

MEMBERSHIP

American Association of University Women.[1]
American Bureau for Medical Aid to China.
American Christian Committee for Refugees, Inc.
American Committee in Aid of Chinese Industrial Cooperatives.
American Committee of OSE.[1]
American Field Service.
American Friends of Czechoslovakia.[1]
American Friends Service Committee.
American Hungarian Relief, Inc.
American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, Inc.
American ORT Federation.
American Relief for Czechoslovakia, Inc.
American Relief for France, Inc.
American Relief for India.[1]
American Relief for Holland, Inc.
American Relief for Italy, Inc.
American Relief for Norway, Inc.
American Women's Hospitals.
Armenian General Benevolent Union.[1]
Belgian War Relief Society, Inc.
Brethren Service Committee.
China Aid Council.
Church Committee for Relief in Asia.
Church Committee on Overseas Relief and Reconstruction.
Committee on Christian Science Wartime Activities of the Mother Church.[1]
Congregational Christian Service Committee.
Cooperative League of the United States of America.[1]
Girl Scouts.
Greek War Relief Association, Inc., U. S. A.
Hadassah.
Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society.
HIAS-ICA Emigration Association, Inc. (HICEM).[1]
International Migration Service.
International Rescue and Relief Committee, Inc.
Labor League for Human Rights, A. F. of L.
Mennonite Central Committee.
National CIO War Relief Committee.
National Council of Jewish Women, Inc.
Near East Foundation.
Paderewski Testimonial Fund, Inc.
Philippine War Relief of the United States, Inc.
Polish War Relief.
Refugee Relief Trustees, Inc.[1]
Russian Children's Welfare Society, Inc.
Salvation Army.
Save the Children Federation.[1]
Selfhelp of Emigres from Central Europe, Inc.[1]
Tolstoy Foundation, Inc.
Ukrainian American Relief Committee.[1]
Unitarian Service Committee.
United China Relief, Inc.
United Lithuanian Relief Fund of America, Inc.
United Palestine Appeal.
United States Committee for the Care of European Children, Inc.[1]
United Yugoslav Relief Fund of America.
War Relief Services-National Catholic Welfare Conference.
World Student Service Fund.
Young Men's Christian Associations (International Committee of).
Young Women's Christian Association, National Board.

AREA AND FUNCTIONAL COMMITTEES

Committee on the Balkans (subcommittees on Greece and Yugoslavia).
Committee on the Orient (subcommittees on China, India, and Netherlands East Indies).
Committee on Czechoslovakia.
Committee on France.
Committee on Italy.
Committee on Northwest Europe (subcommittees on the Netherlands and Norway).
Committee on the Philippines.
Committee on Poland.
Committee on Child Welfare.
Committee on Cooperatives.
Committee on Displaced Persons (subcommittees on camps and displaced Russians).
Committee on Material Aid (subcommittee on shippers and purchasers and allocations of supplies).
Committee on Insurance.
Committee on War Fund Agencies.

The officers of the council are: Dr. Joseph P. Chamberlain, chairman; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Patrick A O'Boyle, vice chairman; Dr. Joseph C. Hyman, vice chairman; Dr. A. L. Warnshuis, secretary; and Miss Charlotte E. Owen, executive secretary.

But what they and all the other splendid organizations are doing, calls for no expert analysis. It's just what you and I would do in their place—applying common-sense methods to accomplish as much as possible with their limited funds. They collect money to buy food and clothes in this country, and on the scene. They are supplying medicines. They provide homeless children with homes, reestablish schools, and they try to reunite the lost children with their parents if, oh, if their poor parents are alive.

I got in touch with all the organizations in the field. From them I received an impressive list of things they'd like to do for these heart-breaking children. Time, which works against these children even as I speak, again makes it impossible for me to do more than touch upon their plans.

American Relief for Italy wants to enlarge its program of emergency feeding for the 100,000 most sorely stricken Italian children. It wants to provide shoes, shoes, shoes, for many, many more bare-frostbitten little Italian feet.

The Greek War Relief and the Near East Foundation recommend immediate action to provide winter clothing and blankets—or blanket cloth—for 1,500,000 children—and layettes for 50,000 cradles. The Foundation says that after December, the only basic foods remaining for Greek children will be some cereals and a pitiful supply of milk.

The Polish War Relief wants contributions in cash or in kind of great quantities of condensed milk, cocoa, rice, and cod-liver oil.

American Relief for France wants, above all, shipments of food, medicine, and clothing. They say that 7,200,000 out of 13,700,000 French children urgently require health supervision and increased feeding; 2,400,000 need special medical attention as well as increased feeding.

But in every country devastated by the Nazis the needs are essentially the same—food, medicine, clothing. Do you want to know the details of the needs of 60 of these worthy organizations? Then please, I urge you, get in touch at once with the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service at 122 East Twenty-second Street, New York. Phone your radio station if you can't remember that name.

It is to the eternal credit of the American people that we have already contributed generously to the aid of less fortunate peoples through the National War Fund and through our churches and other organizations. But what we've done already is not enough, not nearly enough. With every bright tick of the clock in your warm home a child dies in the cold and dark in Europe. A child you could save.

Abraham Lincoln said that this Nation cannot endure half slave and half free. This Nation, with its Allies, has just fought and won a war on the principle that this world cannot continue half slave and half free. The world has been freed of the threat of Germany and Japan. But it will not remain free if half of its people grow up wrecked and crippled in mind, body, and soul.

For if we really want to win the peace we must suffer the little children to come to us—and give them aid.

And let us all make our own new year happier by trying to save the innocent children of Europe.

[1] Associate member.

[1] Associate member.

Public Defender Legislation Vitally Needed at This Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1946

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years leading jurists, lawyers, and Members of Congress have been interested in installing a public defender system for impecunious defendants charged with crime in the Federal courts. This movement has been approved by various bar associations.

During the last few years Hon. EMANUEL CELLER, Member of Congress from New York, and I have had bills pending before the Committee on the Judiciary of the House to effectuate this greatly needed judicial reform. Congressman CELLER's current bill is H. R. 186. I have pending H. R. 444, which provides for a public defender system for the District of Columbia, and H. R. 442, which sets up a system of public defenders in all of the Federal districts. These bills have recently been considered by the Judicial Conference. The Conference has approved the general plan but recommends a different bill.

In order that Members of both bodies and particularly the Committees on the Judiciary may have the benefit of the recommendation of the Judicial Conference, I am today introducing a bill which contains the recommendation of the Conference.

Recent developments, such as the sedition trial in the District of Columbia, impressively show the increasing need of a public defender plan in our Federal courts. I hope that the legislation may

receive early and favorable consideration.

I include herein a letter to Judge HATTON SUMNERS, chairman of the Judiciary Commitee, from Henry P. Chandler, Administrator of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, which sets forth the recommendations of the Judicial Conference. The letter, dated December 17, 1945, is as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE
UNITED STATES COURTS,
Washington, D. C., December 17, 1945.

Hon. HATTON W. SUMNERS,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE SUMNERS: With further reference to your letter of November 13, 1945, inquiring about certain bills pending before the Committee on the Judiciary to provide for public defenders in the district courts of the United States and of the District of Columbia (H. R. 186, 442, and 444), I transmit a bill for the same general purpose recommended by the Judicial Conference of Senior Circuit Judges and embodying most of the features of one of the bills referred to (H. R. 442) but also adding a feature.

The Judicial Conference of Senior Circuit Judges has been considering over a period of 8 years the best method of providing for the defense of poor persons accused of crime in the Federal courts. Plans proposed have been of one or the other of two types: One, the appointment by the courts of public defenders to be compensated by a salary; and the other, the payment of compensation to counsel appointed by the courts in particular cases. Two of the bills referred to in your letter (H. R. 442 and 444) provide for the former method. The Judicial Conference of Senior Circuit Judges has been inclined to favor that method, and at its annual meeting in September 1942 recommended the enactment of a bill pending in the House of Representatives of the Seventy-seventh Congress (H. R. 6628) corresponding with the pending bill (H. R. 442).

The district judges of the same districts, however, usually the districts of smaller population, preferred for their districts provision for the payment of compensation and reimbursement of expenses of counsel appointed by the court to represent defendants in particular cases. Confronted with this conflict of views as to methods, the judicial conference of senior circuit judges at its annual meeting in 1943 appointed a committee on the subject, consisting of Circuit Judge Augustus N. Hand of New York, chairman, Circuit Judge Otto Kerner of Chicago, and District Judges Guy K. Bard of Philadelphia and Eugene Rice of Muskogee, Okla. This committee, after conferring with the different classes of persons concerned with the defense of indigent defendants in criminal cases, judges, prosecutors, representatives of legal-aid organizations, and the committee of the American Bar Association on legal aid work, and considering how the diverse points of view above-mentioned might be reconciled, presented a report with a recommended bill to the Judicial Conference of Senior Circuit Judges at the annual meeting of that body in September 1944.

The judicial conference, in accordance with the practice in such matters, caused the report and bill to be circulated among the judges of the country with a request for an expression of their views. Such replies as were received were considered by the committee which was continued for that purpose, and the committee presented a supplemental report at the meeting of the judicial conference held in September last. By the report the committee recommended with slight amendments the bill previously proposed. The report and the bill in the amended form enclosed were thereupon approved by the judicial conference. Copies of the original and the supplemental reports of the committee are also enclosed.

The gist of the committee's recommendation and the new bill is that each district court is empowered in its discretion to appoint a public defender upon a salary very much as provided in the pending bill (H. R. 442), but the court of each district, except one having a city of more than 500,000 population, is also given the alternative of providing if it prefers for the compensation of counsel appointed by the court to represent indigent defendants in particular cases. The rate of compensation in that event shall not be in excess of $25 a day for the time spent in trial and preparation. Provision is made, also, for the reimbursement of expenses reasonably incurred in the representation when approved by the court. A limit of $3,000 is placed upon the aggregate amount which may be expended for the compensation and reimbursement of counsel in any year under such a plan.

It was the view of the committee and the Judicial Conference that the representation of poor defendants charged with crime could no longer be effectively provided for upon a voluntary basis, and that some plan for reimbursement of expenses and compensation of counsel in proper cases was essential. The committee and the conference were further of the view that in the districts having cities of large population (the size of which was set at 500,000 or over) the plan of appointing counsel in separate cases did not work satisfactorily or provide adequate representation in the long run and that the appointment of a public defender whose regular duty it should be to defend defendants too poor to employ counsel, was the only adequate way of meeting the need. They considered that the experience of large cities in which provision is made for public defenders in the State criminal systems demonstrates this. But recognizing that there is a disposition in various districts to prefer the system of payment to counsel appointed in particular cases, the committee and the Judicial Conference recommended the alternative of that nature which has been mentioned, for all districts except those containing highly populous cities. The limitation of $3,000 was prescribed because it was considered that if it was necessary to provide for the representation of poor defendants often enough to call for a greater expenditure than that per year, the purpose could better be accomplished by the appointment of a public defender to serve in all such cases at an annual salary which need not be any greater than proportionate to the volume of the work.

I do not discuss in this letter the detailed provisions of the three bills which you mention because the Judicial Conference submits the bill inclosed, and I hope that your committee may be willing to consider it as an alternative. The provisions of the pending bill inclosed correspond generally with the provisions of the pending bill (H. R. 442) as far as that goes. The principal differences are that (1) the pending bill places a maximum limit upon the salary which may be paid to a public defender as fixed by the Judicial Conference at $7,500 per annum; (2) it provides that if in any case in a district in which there is a public defender there is such a conflict in interest among the defendants that they cannot all be properly represented by the public defender, the court shall be authorized to assign separate counsel to one or more of them and to allow compensation to the separate counsel as in districts in which there is no public defender; (3) it omits the provision of section 2 of the pending bill that it shall be the duty of the United States marshals to serve without charge all subpenas issued in behalf of any defendant who is represented by a public defender upon the request of the defendant, for the reason that this matter is believed to be adequately covered by the proposed Rule of Criminal Procedure No. 17 (b) prescribing a procedure for the same purpose. In addition the bill recommended as inclosed, contains the optional provision above stated for the payment of compensation to counsel for poor defendants appointed in particular cases, subject to the prescribed limitations.

The payment of public defenders by salary as provided in the enclosed bill and the pending bill, H. R. 442, is considered preferable to the provision for payment by fees as provided in the pending bill, H. R. 186. Also, it is believed that if a public defender is appointed for the District of Columbia it would be better that he should be appointed by the District Court for the District and his salary fixed by the Judicial Conference of Senior Circuit Judges as provided in the enclosed bill, than that he should be appointed by the President and his compensation fixed by the Attorney General as provided in the pending bill, H. R. 444.

There is a crying need, as is recognized by those who are familiar with the administration of criminal justice in the Federal courts, for authority to pay reasonable compensation to counsel appointed by the courts for indigent defendants. Too long action has been impeded by the conflict between those who would accomplish this exclusively by public defenders and those who would do it solely by compensating counsel appointed in individual cases. The bill enclosed is offered as a way of reconciling these two points of view. It leaves in each district, except in the districts containing cities with large populations in which the superiority of the public defender seems clear, the choice to the district court concerned. As such I trust that the bill may receive the approval of the Congress and be enacted. I am authorized to say that the bill has the approval of the committee on legal-aid work of the American Bar Association, which as you know has long been interested in bringing about adequate representation of poor persons accused of crime.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

HENRY P. CHANDLER.

A Reply to the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED BRADLEY
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1946

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, when the President last addressed the Nation on January 3, he asked the people to write their Congressmen to tell us their "views concerning the grave problems facing our country." Insofar as individual letters are concerned, I have received very few, and most of those in opposition to the President's program.

However, I did receive a very constructive suggestion in the form of a petition signed by 191 voters in the village of Elk Rapids, Mich., in my district, which has a population of 818 people according to the latest figures I have. I suggest the President give careful heed to sound suggestions such as these coming from the "grass root" citizens.

The petition follows:

A REPLY TO THE PRESIDENT

ELK RAPIDS, MICH., *January 7, 1946.*

To Michigan Members of Both Houses of Congress:

The President, in his radio address to the Nation on January 3, urges the people to tell

you our "views concerning the grave problems facing our country." In patriotic response, we, voters of Antrim County, submit the following nonpartisan views to which we affix our names:

1. Now that the war is over, so-called "one-man government" should cease; legislative prerogatives should be restored to Congress; and the President should resume his normal function of carrying out the will of Congress rather than demanding that Congress carry out his will.

2. Second in importance is the balancing of the Federal Budget and paying off the national debt. This should be accomplished by drastic curtailment of, or elimination of, war-built bureaus; the reduction of expenses of every Department to approach a prewar status at the earliest practical moment; the abrupt stoppage of all new appropriations not actually essential and by deferment of all new social and other proposed Federal activities which call for more Government employees and more spending.

3. If, under existing legislation, the Government is to supervise labor strike votes, such legislation should be modified to make mandatory, with proper penalties, that all employees vote, by strictly secret ballot, and that only a very high percentage of such employees, at least 85 percent, shall have the power to deprive the dissenting minority of their wages and normal livelihood.

D. I. Aemisegger, Charles L. Anderson, David A. Anderson, Harold C. Amos, Tracy Anderson, W. H. Archbald, Oswald Arntson, Charles Atkinson, John D. Avis, John Bachi, Wm. N. Bain, Dexter C. Bargy, Lloyd Bargy, R. E. Barnard, Frank Becker, Mrs. Pearl Beebe, Seaman M. Beebe, John Bennett, Carl R. Berlin, Joe Billadau, Redic Billadau, Raymond Brochaus, Mort Broughton, Bertha Broughton, Ralph J Bruso, Allen Burch, William W. Bruce, Charles J. Burner, John H. Campbell, Ralph Carleton, Bertha Carson, James Carpenter, Mrs. Charles B. Carver, William Chase, Emma A. Chase, Ruth Clark, Mildred Collins, Lorimer Couturier, H. M. Clement, Lawrence Copeland, Mrs. Lawrence Copeland, W. M. Corse, Harry W. Corse, Robert S. Corse, Arthur Cox, Harold T. Carbtree, Robert J. Crampton, Lloyd Crisp, Mrs. Lloyd Crisp, Myrtle A. Dockery, Louis Du Cheny, Fred Du Cheny, William Derman, Ernest Dufresne, Lena Dufresne, Mrs. Edward Durkee, Charles E. Duverney, Earl E. Edson, Carl Erickson, A. O. Fitzpatrick, Michael Flanelly, Mrs. M. J. Flanelly, Charles W. Fox, Briggs Carroll.

Merritt Fox, Fred Gilbertson, Elmer A. Gnadt, Barbara Gnadt, S. E. Gersheimer, Albert F. Gribe, Percy Goodman, William A. Granger, Ray Hanel, E. J. Hollenbeck, Ernest F. Harret, Reuben Hause, Nettie Hause, Karl T. Heller, Grace A. Heller, Henry Herrman, Izoria F. Holmes, Harry Holmes, Frank J. Holnbar, Frank E. Hoopfer, Lewis E. Hicken, R. R. Huston, Theo Huston, Harold Johnson, Leon E Kaiser, Reav Kaiser, Stephen C. Kaiser, Margaret Kaiser, E. J. Kennedy, Bennie M. Kline, Verner H. Kitson, Marion E. Kitson, A. D. LaBonte, J. R. LaBonte, Harley F. Lane, Mrs. Myrtle Lane, Orrin R. Lathrop, Marvin Little, G. A. MacDonald, Elizabeth G. MacDonald, Helen Marker, Fred H. Marriott, A. E. Martin, D. R. Martin, Doris Martin, Ed. Martinson, Maurice Martinson, S. H. Martinson, M. H. Martinson, Gladys I. Maxwell, Wm. J McLachlan, Walter Meister, Marceline Meister, Donald R. Merillat, Mrs. Liloh A. Meyer, Goodman Moe, Ellen Moe, Joe Moore, Elmer K. Moran, Fred Moran, Charles Morrison, Glenn D. Morrison, Robert Morrison.

Neil Munro, W. T. Myers, Wallace Nada, Ira H. Olney, Sylvia A. Olney, R. Olson, Adolph Olson, F. Orschel, Mrs. Franklin Orschel, Don V. Paradise, Ernest M. Pelton, Dorothy Pelton, Emil L. Pfeiffer, Ralph Phillips, C. E. Pickard, E. A. Pillman, Edward B. Pollister, Julia S. Pollister, Bernie Powell, Ervin Powell, Phillip Pugh, Rosemary Pugh, B. Quercia-grossa, Amy Roberts, Mal Rosenburg, Harry Russell, William Russel, Miss Emma Schmaltz, Carl I. Schuler, Marie Schuler, Jacob Schuler, Mrs. Jacob Schuler, Mert Schuler, E. C. Schuler, Frank Sobbry, Lena Sobbry, Cyrilla Sobbry, Alice Spinner, Rev. W. H. Slack, Harry R. Sheffer, Andrew Sturmoski, H. E. Todd, T. Tompkins, F. E. Tompkins, Fred Trautman, John Voegle, Ernest E. Warner, Edith F. Warner, Claire Wellman, Frank J. Wesley, Theresa Wesley, Forrest D. Wicks, Hugo Will, Charles Wilhelm, Margaret D. Wilhelm, Fred Williams, Bruce Williams, A. P. Wilson, Vern White, James Winegarden, A. F. Wolzendorf, C. I. Wood, Joshpeh Yuchasz, Mrs. Joshpeh Yuchasz.

I, Ruth A. Mattison, a notary public, do hereby certify that there has been presented to me, and that I hold in my possession, the list of signatures to the foregoing as they appear in this printed form.

RUTH A. MATTISON,
Notary Public.

My commission expires on February 8, 1949.

Galveston Labor Council Recommends Sea Wall Extension for Protection of Port and Harbor Facilities and Public and Private Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1946

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on January 8 of the present year a hearing was held in Galveston by Col. D. W. Griffiths, United States district engineer, on a resolution for the extension of the Galveston sea wall to afford protection to the navigation channels and other port facilities at Galveston; and for the protection of property, both private- and Government-owned, including a United States airfield on which the Government has expended approximately $7,000,000, and a Government housing project representing an expenditure of $1,300,000 of Government funds which furnishes homes for 500 families; all of which at present is unprotected from disastrous hurricanes on the coast.

The proposed sea-wall extension would afford employment for several thousand returning soldiers for an indefinite period of time. The Galveston Labor Council, of which Mr. B. A. Gritta is president, has taken part in recommending the improvement and submitted at the hearing their resolution favoring it, which is as follows:

To Col. D. W. Griffiths,
District Engineers, United States Army:

Joint resolution adopted by the Galveston Labor Council and the Galveston Building and Construction Trades Council comprised of all A. F. of L. labor unions in Galveston County, representing 20,000 members, urging extension of the sea wall westward

Whereas Galveston is an island approximately 2 miles wide and 30 miles long, 17 feet above sea level at its highest point; and

Whereas because of its location on the Gulf coast it is susceptible to high tides whenever tropical disturbances appear in the Gulf; and

Whereas whenever these high tides appear, because the island is so low, particularly in portions unprotected by the sea wall which in most instances are about 4 or 5 feet above sea level, it causes material property damage to home owners, in many cases causing them to lose their homes, clothes, bedding, and livestock; and

Whereas the Government now owns considerable facilities in areas now unprotected by the sea wall, and are subject to great financial losses whenever high tides appear; and

Whereas considerable moneys could be saved by the Government and the worldly possessions of the residents in this area be protected by a 3-mile extension westward of the sea wall; and

Whereas the Government has seen the necessity for sea-wall protection for Galveston since the year of 1900 and helped to provide this sea wall so life and property could be protected; and

Whereas we have just completed one of the most horrible and costly wars ever fought on any battlefields and the soldiers now returning from the fields of battle are looking for gainful employment; and

Whereas the building of the sea-wall extension will provide employment for a large number of returning veterans, assuring them of an opportunity of gainful employment to some degree: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Galveston Labor Council and the Galveston Building Trades Council urge the United States engineers to recommend that sufficient appropriations be granted for extending the sea wall 3 miles westward; and be it further

Resolved, That the United States engineers be requested to urge that this appropriation be granted immediately so work may be started as soon as possible, thereby providing employment for the returning veteran who may otherwise be unemployed; and be it further

Resolved, That the United States engineers be requested to urge granting of appropriations for the sea wall to protect the lives and property of the residents of that area and to protect the properties owned by the United States Government; and be it further

Resolved, That the Galveston Labor Council and the Galveston Building Trades Council in its meeting assembled adopt this resolution and the members of the Galveston Labor Council and the Galveston Building Trades Council urge the United States engineers to use their influence in obtaining sufficient appropriations so work on this project may be started immediately.

Respectfully submitted.

B. A. GRITTA,
President, Galveston Labor Council.

Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SHERMAN ADAMS
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1946

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, with permission heretofore granted me, it is my privilege to insert the remarks made by the gentleman from Arkansas, the Honorable BROOKS HAYS, at the Washington Cathedral on January 13, 1946, on the subject of unity. There surely could be no topic more timely or of greater universal significance than that selected by

the gentleman from Arkansas. The suggestions made in these remarks are worthy of sober thought:

I want to talk to you about unity, in our own Nation and in the world. Religion rather than government must provide the stimulus for achieving unity—at least unity upon terms which are tolerable. Government cannot supply the motive for unity—it can supply only the mechanical arrangements by which it may be expressed. We in the Congress are aware of the threat of disunity because all of the conflicts of life—social, economic, and political—seem to converge in the Capitol of the United States. Those of us who have political responsibilities are concerned with it because unity is associated with stability and order, and disunity is destructive of the finest and most wholesome things in political life.

At the same time the question arises, "Unity under what conditions and on what terms?" If unity is indispensable for a stable and orderly system it must be admitted that order is sometimes imposed under intolerable terms. France was relatively stable and orderly in the period of German occupation; there was unity of a sort. But I was in France a few days after our soldiers had liberated the country and in spite of the confusion which went with a sudden collapse of the economic and political procedures to which they were accustomed, there was unfeigned happiness because the people were free again. We seek national and world unity without the loss of vital principles in a Christian order.

The relationship which religion bears to the great enterprise of government is a close one. Religion is often defined in terms of beauty, truth, and goodness, and the commitments of democratic government also embrace these elements. We have in the Capitol and the buildings which surround it the inspiration of physical beauty. May our performance of official duties be in harmony with it. The institution of representative government is itself a beautiful conception and we are in a peculiar sense the guardians of it. We might well apply the injunction of Christopher Morley, "There is nothing so tragic as to have a thing of beauty committed to the care of one who does not appreciate its value and its beauty."

The pursuit of truth is also inherent in political life, for as we know it in America government is an expanding and growing institution, and must remain progressive and free by devotion to truth.

It is apparent, too, that political activity should involve the third element, that of faith in the triumph of goodness. I was reminded of this fact the other day in reading the address delivered by Dr. Howard M. Jones, president of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, at a school for German prisoners of war about to return to their own country to share in the framing of new patterns of life. "It is not enough," he said, "for you to resist evil—you must have the strength to believe in the good." So government and politics must turn more and more to the sources of religious faith and guidance in a confused and difficult period.

We should probably define unity first in terms of individual experience. I had an interesting conversation recently with a friend whose company I enjoy and while all of our talks are overshadowed by practical politics, we sometimes explore the recesses of faith which are adjacent to political pursuits. One of us raised the question about a man's conversion—when does he become a Christian?—and I cited an example of how it may sometimes come through independent and personal efforts quite aside from formal or systematic religious instruction.

As an example I cited the experience of a college roommate in 1917, one of the wisest and best men I ever knew. He was a science student, and like true men of science was undogmatic. He questioned the tenets of Christianity. In those days students supplied their own furniture, so we shopped around for the minimum needs and got, among other bargains, an iron bed for $3. It was never referred to as "the bed"—it was always "the $3 bed." He spent considerably less time on the $3 bed than I—he was too busy with his chemistry. I explored his devotion to "the scientific method," his avoidance of dogmatism, his aloofness to religion. "You're so scientific you won't be sure of anything, not even that the $3 bed can't walk," I said. "Well, I wouldn't say it that way," he said. "If I stuck strictly to the scientific approach, I'd have to say it like this: 'There are no known physical laws by which the $3 bed can in the absence of applied external force change its location.'" He added: "If the $3 bed appeared to walk, science would be wholly unprepared for that phenomenon, but instead of denying that it occurred would begin a search for the principles and laws that had suddenly operated like that." Profound, I thought, for a sophomore. And I remember it to this day as an incident in our philosophical exchanges.

When a man of such fidelity to experimentation and research comes through with a strong conviction it should carry weight and his judgments on religion, therefore, impressed me. Years later after he became head of the science department of a great college and a leading layman of his church he told me of his faith. "I have thought it through," he said, "the universe cannot be explained in strictly physical terms. There are great spiritual processes to be reckoned with." Using a mathematical expression he added, "Now I am an integer, I am not a fraction any longer.' Then he spoke of God's concern for the individual in a way that carries greater emphasis for me than any sermon could have.

My friend then cited an experience of his involving one of our political contemporaries who grew up in the Midwest under conditions which tended to stifle every impulse for greatness. He described the hardships that the man encountered in his youth and in his early professional life and explained how provincialism and narrowness threatened to rob him of the possibilities of leadership in spite of his great natural endowments. But something happened to this man. He crashed through the barriers and became a statesman. When I asked for the explanation the answer was that he found how to identify himself with the sufferings of other people, even those in distant parts of the world and this, my friend agreed, is another form of conversion. If I had to deal with a single method for achieving unity I would stick to this type of Christian experience and would emphasize the indispensability of a force which lifts us above our immediate and personal concerns into the life of the world's distressed people.

The love of one's fellow man simply must find adequate expression, it must have a world scope. Fortunately the world's attention is focused on international conferences that are designed to produce the structure of a world government, one based upon Christian ideals. We should have recognized this as a great challenge to our religious faith many years ago, and the delay in recognizing it as such was tragic and costly. The Nazis sensed the fact that the old order was collapsing, and marching out of their own borders they determined to organize the world along the lines of cruelty and power. That we were aroused to resist that effort signifies that there is great vitality in our devotion to freedom and in our resolution to retain human kindness and brotherhood as the basis for a world organization.

Faith in ourselves and in our capacity for self-government is the basis for unity. Man cannot renounce the power to govern. This idea was doubtless in the mind of the psalmist when he said, "What is man, that Thou art mindful of him and the son of man that Thou visitest him. Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels and hast crowned him with glory and honor. Thou hast made him to have dominion over the works of Thy hands, Thou has put all things under his feet." As Col. Francis Miller of Virginia put it: "The world will be organized, the issue is, Shall it be by force or by those who believe in Christian methods."

Unity should not be confused with uniformity. Men do not need to act and think alike to live in unity and peace. Their social and religious life embraces historic preferences, and consequently the cultural and national ties that tend to separate or at least to distinguish people are to be respected in a Christian brotherhood. One of the great decisions of history was that of the Church in Jerusalem in the early days of the Christian era when the conclusion was reached that in order to become a Christian one need not cease being a Greek or a Roman. This right to retain and cherish a group attachment is associated with the basic rights of man. It is respected because individual men and women consider it a phase of enrichment and perfection of their own lives. America has made a unique contribution in this respect. The individual rather than the State has always been our chief concern, and this tradition is rooted in the Christian concept of man's dignity and worth. It is a great privilege to live in a country whose Government recognizes human rights but they are ours inherently because we are of the human family and not because of the Government's graciousness.

If we cannot agree on legislative formulas that are pressed rather vigorously by some members of our important minorities we can at least exert ourselves to guard and protect minority rights and avoid frictions between groups. We must, if we give the world a demonstration of national unity as a preface to leadership for world unity, find a way to destroy hate and suspicion. We must work toward harmonious relations based upon mutual respect. There must be demonstration rather than argumentation about the Christian ideal of unity. It is more important that we create an atmosphere in which solutions to problems may be sought in friendliness than to come up with the right answers to specific questions. Christianity is primarily a process and we cannot influence the world to join us in the pursuit of Christian objectives unless we proceed in this spirit.

Some goals cannot be achieved by force. Our example therefore becomes important, for circumstances have made America's leadership the most significant force for world reconstruction. We cannot decide some questions for the German and Japanese people but we can prove our devotion to the principles of liberty and justice. If they should remain blind to the evils that overtook them there would be tragic consequences, but since we cannot decide for them we can only hope to influence their thinking in the right direction and failing in that resolve to deal firmly with any revival of the terrible evil which produced the war.

Our policy would not be Christian if it were not both charitable and righteous. Our resolutions of kindness and compassion must not lead to indifference to the threat of evil. We must approach our problem "with malice toward none but with firmness in the right * * *." The world must understand that there are some values in which we believe devotedly and "for which we will expend our resources and our lives."

One of the immediate requirements, in fact, of a successful occupation policy both in Europe and in the Orient, is to make it very clear that America does stand for something in the world and that we will not consider merely our comfort and convenience or our narrow national interests. Adherence to our Christian ideal of a peaceful and united world requires an alertness to the evils of aggres-

sion based upon suspicion and distrust. We must build upon new foundations and with faith that by conscious effort the terrible evil that swept over the Old World can be distilled from their common life. To entertain that faith relieves us of none of the solemn commitments involved in our participation in the war.

In a world that will be subject to potential violence until the processes of reeducation and spiritual awakening are advanced the Christian community must exhibit an enlightened and uncredulous faith emphasizing its constructive aspects. We should emerge from the crucial transition period having demonstrated that justice can be achieved without vengeance and peace maintained by the application of Christian principles.

Humanity is one—Paul was right, "God has made of one blood all the nations of this earth." Science is constantly confirming this assertion of unity and the necessity for establishing our institutions accordingly.

It was eloquently formulated by Cicero, who spoke of it in terms of law: " 'True law' is right reason, consonant with nature, everlasting and unchanging. We cannot alter or repeal that law, and no man can be relieved by any legislature of the obligations which it imposes. It does not differ for Rome or Athens, for the present or the future, but one unchanging law shall be for all times and peoples. To violate it is to deny our own nature."

The Christian religion, building upon the same concept, extends the idea of good will and human brotherhood, giving us the positive hope of achieving that unity upon which the strength for an enduring world depends.

Let Us Have Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 21, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a speech I made over radio station WIND, Chicago, Ill., on December 29, 1945, almost a month ago, together with a brief additional statement of my own at this time:

Long before the defeat of the Nazis, big business waged a campaign through press and radio, and by full pages of paid advertising, to impress the people with the necessity of early reconversion; that is, the converting of plants from war to civilian production. The deliberate purpose of this propaganda was to create in the minds of Congress and the people of the country the impression that reconversion must be aided by the Government; that immediate assistance and reduction of taxes was required. Due to this tremendous propaganda, Congress passed a law to reduce the income tax for 1946, and eliminate the excess-profits tax, with a total saving to business of about $3,000,000,000. This was in addition to tax gifts of $6,000,000,000 or more under the so-called Ruml plan. But the great surpluses and reserves held by these corporations, amounting to at least $26,000,000,000 and perhaps to as much as $30,000,000,000, were not made known; nor was it made known to the public that these industries have been reconverting, reconstructing, rebuilding, and enlarging their plants while they still were engaged on war contracts, and that many added the costs of reconversion to their Government contracts. No sooner had the bill been passed reducing income taxes for 1946 and eliminating excess-profits taxes, and notwithstanding the great profits and surpluses, than big business began continuously to demand higher ceilings, or removal of price ceilings entirely, on all their products to still further increase their profits. The ever-increasing cost of their products, including the cost of food, constantly pushed up the cost of living.

But immediately after VE-day hours of labor were reduced from 48 hours a week to 40, which reduced take-home pay, in many instances, as much as 40 percent. Naturally, the wage earners urged and pleaded for an adjustment of their wages to enable them to exist. There were a few industrialists who saw the need of adjusting the wages, but most of the larger corporations refused to give any consideration to the just demands of their employees, and in many instances have even refused to comply with findings of Government agencies. In desperate efforts to secure an adjustment or increase in their shrunken pay envelopes, some unions were obliged to call strikes. It is conceded now that this was playing into the hands of the industries, because most of them, having made enough, yes, tremendous, profits, in the first 9 months of 1945 had come to the conclusion that to continue to increase their profits for the balance of the year would tend to increase their income and excess-profits taxes for 1945. Many of them, therefore, were more than willing to shut down or curtail their operations. At the same time, however, organized labor was charged with the restrictions on production of much-needed civilian goods, which the manufacturers themselves actually brought about. The facts are that there are tremendous quantities of civilian goods on hand now and held for sale at higher prices and profit in 1946. These goods are being deliberately withheld from the market, awaiting the reduction of taxes in 1946, and in the hope of obtaining higher prices in 1946, through repealing or amending the Price Control Act, which, as administered by the Office of Price Administration, has done so much to hold down the already high prices of all commodities.

The headlines and the full pages of advertising which told us how necessary it was to aid industry in reconversion have now been turned to the attack on organized labor. The strikes are magnified, and every effort is being made through press and radio to hold labor responsible for strikes instead of placing the blame where it belongs—on the industries. These strikes, though they amounted to only three-fourths of 1 percent, were exaggerated and publicized, and used to urge and demand legislation against organized labor. Hence the Smith-May-Arends bill, amending the original Smith-Connally Act, prohibiting organized labor from collecting a niggardly dollar per member for political education. True, the bill would preclude contributions from corporations but it does not restrict officers or stockholders from contributing tremendous sums, as the Du Pont and Pew families and many others have contributed thousands upon thousands of dollars to Republican Presidential, congressional, and other political campaigns. Still, the contribution of a lowly dollar by a laboring man would be made a crime. Of course, there were other bills which were pressed hard for passage, such as the Hobbs bill, all for the purpose of weakening, and, if possible, destroying, organized labor. All this, notwithstanding the fact that organized labor has kept its pledge to the country not to strike in wartime. This pledge has been kept faithfully, with but minor exceptions. The President, fearing the enactment of such unjust, unfair, and unreasonable laws that would in no way reduce strikes but would create greater strife, has recommended and urged legislation to bring about harmony and adjustment of conditions. He has also recommended the creation of fact-finding boards. I myself felt that if all the facts were brought to light, it was bound to inure to the interests of labor as well as to industry and the country, and to be advantageous to the peaceful adjustment of the differences now existing.

Unfortunately, the recommendations of the President for full employment legislation, for the increase of wages to a minimum of 65 cents an hour, to provide compensation to the unemployed for at least 6 months, and other beneficial recommendations made by him, have not received the favorable consideration to which they are entitled. But I am satisfied that after the return of Congress, and after Members hear from the people at home, they will realize that the people stand by the President, and will cast their votes for the fair legislation urged by the President.

Personally, I have the utmost confidence in our President, and though some labor leaders criticize his recommendations for fact-finding boards, I repeat that his interests are with labor, and he is deeply interested in bringing peace and harmony to labor, industry, and the consumer, with regard for the rights of all. In fact, his main interest is in creating a lasting harmony throughout the Nation, among all classes.

To conclude, I am grateful for this opportunity of wishing all of you a very happy new year.

Mr. Speaker, since I made this broadcast the action of the General Motors Corp., the United States Steel Corp., the Westinghouse Electric Corp., and the Western Electric Co., Inc., and the packing industry, all controlled by Wall Street, have substantiated my statements that they and not the labor unions have forced and worked to the end to bring about a general strike in the hope that they will be able to keep wages down and destroy the unions and organized labor. Besides, they have refused to comply with the rulings of the United States Conciliation Service and have also refused to heed the President's plea to a 3 cents per hour wage increase, not withstanding that the CIO has signified its intention to accept the recommendations. Further, these organizations are refusing to produce their books and records which, no doubt, will show that the great profits which they have derived from Government contracts would make possible an increase in wages after payment of taxes and the usual dividends to their stockholders, and still leave them a great surplus.

Subsidies in the Meat-Packing Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 21, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, we witnessed this morning before the House Banking and Currency Committee an event of such transcending importance that every citizen of the United States

should be informed about it. Representatives of the Agriculture Department and Reconstruction Finance Corporation appeared before this committee with a request that subsidies for the meat-packing industry be increased by the amount of $125,000,000. Two hundred and fifty million dollars are still available from former authorizations for subsidies to the meat-packing industry. Previous subsidies paid to the meat-packing industry contributed to the wages received by its workers. The $250,000,000 still available for this purpose will in the future be a factor entering into the wage structure, as would also the $125,000,000 requested if approved.

Employees of the meat-packing industry are now on a strike for higher wages. Insofar as these subsidies enter into and become a part of the wages of the meat-packing employees, the transaction represents nothing less than the subsidization of their wages by taxpayers' money.

Does President Truman really believe that our people are so naive that they are unable to see through this procedure? It certainly does not take much intelligence to perceive that the $125,000,000 requested for subsidies to the meat-packing industries would place him in a better position to support a wage increase for the workers of that industry. If this is not an attempt to buy votes with taxpayers' money, then what is it?

If wages of employees in the meat-packing industry are to be subsidized by taxpayers' money, why not the same for wages in all other industries? The principle is, of course, purely communistic. Further, it is inflationary because under the present system of financing Government costs, the money the Government pays out in the form of subsidies can, in reality, not be derived from direct taxes but will be provided in part or in whole by Government printing-press money.

And be it remembered that Government printing-press money is the one and only cause of serious or uncontrollable inflation. Shortage of goods can and does cause price rises but never true inflation.

UNO Pulling Together for Peace—London Meeting Now in Session Augurs Well-Being Through World Comity—World Collaboration Marches On, Despite Cynics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, at London all last week, and again today there sits in the same conference room, the duly chosen representatives of almost all the nations of the world. The United Nations Organization is functioning with clarity and dispatch. Who said it would never get even this far? Who said Russia would never send a representative nor participate in this history-making, voluntary world-wide collaboration? Well, Russia sits there, too. And, they are following democratic processes in their deliberations. The small nations, too, have just recognition and responsibilities by reason of elective leadership.

And here on our very shores a UNO committee seeks for a permanent home site for the world organization. Think of it. Think of the responsibility as well as honor it places upon us in the United States.

Several months ago a Member of this House told me that UNO would never even get to first base. Well, I am so happy now, that I then told him he was of too little faith and he also needed to add a basketful of good works to a new supply of faith. He had been reading my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 27, 1945, at page A1507 entitled "Footsteps on the Pathway to Enduring World Peace," and he frankly said he felt my hopes there expressed would never find a birthplace. Well, they have and the child is now a husky UNO—with many "daddies" and "mothers" too.

In those remarks on March 27 last, I said that there had never existed in modern history, a like opportunity to initiate a world cooperative for world peace, world understanding, world brotherhood. And, Mr. Speaker, I think it was on March 12, 1945, in my remarks at page A1146 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I said that, "Cynicism, criticism, the lack of faith, the lack of hope—these weaknesses have no place in the thinking and prayers of any American who sincerely desires that there be peace on earth and good will toward all men." Then the San Francisco United Nations Peace Conference came on April 25, 1945.

So today, Mr. Speaker, as we tussle with our domestic national problems it should behoove us to recall and realize, and with a deep sense of gratitude and gravity too, that our five distinguished American citizens are in London, in a world legislative body, making a pattern for world peace, because of world-wide understanding and world-wide collaboration—by all nations, large or small.

Ours is cause for great rejoicing that so much progress has already been made in London. The ultimate will now be reached—the ultimate is perfection itself. But, sir, why should we expect of a meeting of many nations, speaking many tongues, what we of our race and our tongue have not accomplished on our continent?

Let us breathe only good will, cooperation, understanding, and brotherhood toward the epochal United Nations Organization as it gets under way. Its life line extends right back to this very Congress. Each day of this atomic age makes us daily more dependent upon the UNO, for our daily safety and freedom from fears, which would be certain to permeate from an uncontrolled world—controlled for peace—instead of for pillage.

Long Beach Editorial Says "Action Is Up to Congress"—American People "Want Action on Bills by Congress"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call attention of Members of this Congress to the editorial in the Long Beach Press Telegram of January 4, 1946. This newspaper is published daily in my home city of Long Beach, Calif., a city of at least 300,000 people. It speaks so clearly and powerfully—it happens to be generally rated as "Republican" in political alinements—that it is especially indicative of how many folks in my district feel about the radio message of President Truman.

Apropo of the editorial's comment "Let them be reported out of committee and debated and voted upon by the full membership of the Congress"; I wish to call attention to my own speech along this line, in this House on June 8, 1945, and which appears at page 5828 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In part, I then spoke as follows:

I ask that this great legislative body be given an opportunity to discuss and debate and decide this bill on its merits and every other bill too, which is reported out of any of the duly constituted committees of this great legislative body. Let the House itself decide the merits of the bill; the House is qualified and entitled to this opportunity. To refuse it is dangerous and destructive to legislative process. * * * No, I am condemning the system which weakens democratic processes for which I will always speak out and defend.

The editorial follows:

ACTION IS UP TO CONGRESS

President Truman's program for reconversion of industry and reemployment of labor is economically unsound in some particulars, but he is everlastingly right in his rebuke to Congress for delay and obstruction when the time for action to avoid national disaster is rapidly passing.

The President's radio address last night was for the frankly stated purpose of putting Members of Congress "on the spot" for their failure in the nearly 5 months since Japan sued for peace to meet the issues of reconversion.

Precious time has been lost, and the cost to the American people, in retarded reconversion, hampered production, and the blocking of reemployment, is high. There is not much left of the time within which the transition of the Nation's industry from conditions of war to those of peace can be accomplished without an economic crash. It is as if the driver of a heavily loaded truck had to shift gears while on a steep grade; it must be done quickly, or the driver will lose control and the vehicle roll down hill, with rapidly increasing momentum, to disaster.

Unless the deadlock that prevents American industry from going into high production of civilian goods can be broken, these consequences must be expected: Scarcities of housing and other necessities of life, already worse than during the war, will be dangerously aggravated; the pinch of unemployment already being felt in some sections of

the country will clamp down its viselike grip on the Nation as it did in the 1930's; the unemployed will have to live on their savings, use up their unemployment insurance, cash their war bonds and spend the money, thus exhausting their resources; and the restriction of production, causing scarcities, plus the enormous volume of currency and credit produced by the Government's deficit financing, will run up the cost of living to inflationary heights.

"Every day that production is delayed and civilian goods are kept from our markets by strikes or lock-outs brings injury to our reconversion program," the President said warningly and truly. "Already millions of dollars in wages have been lost to workers. Laboring men and women are using up their savings."

And the United States is using up the time given it to establish successfully a peacetime economy.

"What the American people want is action," said the President. They want action, and they will get it if they let their Members of Congress know that they must act in this emergency or be retired from public life.

Congress has the choice of accepting President Truman's program for ending of strikes and lock-outs and speeding industrial reconversion, or of formulating and passing its own program. There is no possible justification of the practice by certain congressional committees of bottling up key measures of economic recovery. They are recommended by the President of the United States. Action in these matters is essential to the prosperity and welfare of the American people. Possibly the measures in committee could be improved by amendment; perhaps they should be rejected and substitutes adopted. Let them be reported out of committee and debated and voted upon by the full membership of Congress. Doing nothing, which has been the policy of Congress, is indefensible, for it is trifling with the vital interests of the Nation.

By appealing to the people over the head of Congress, President Truman has recognized the truth that the public interest is fundamental and paramount. The American people is the all-powerful pressure group once it is aroused, and rightfully so, for the people's welfare is the purpose of government.

The American Nation speaks in the voice of the President when he demands action to end the strikes and lock-outs which are threatening the United States with disaster. Any Congressman who ignores this voice will do so with peril to his political life. The record made by Congress in its 1946 session in dealing with industrial strife and the curse of strikes will be decisive in the elections this year.

Radio Address of Hon. Fred Bradley, of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

January 20, 22, and 23, 1946

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my radio broadcast put on the air over radio station WSOO, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., January 22; Station WMAM, Marinette, Wis., January 20; and Station WDBC, Escanaba, Mich., January 23:

On VE-day, May 12, 1945, we had approximately 8,000,000 men in our Army—today we have less than 3,000,000—scattered all over the world. We began demobilizing immediately. Naturally, every one of those 8,000,000 wanted to get home just as soon as he could. The American people looked more to the Congress than they did to the Army to return these men to their homes as fast as possible. Consequently, when we returned to Washington last September General Marshall addressed an informal joint meeting of both Houses of Congress and explained the Army's plan for demobilizing and the speed with which it hoped to proceed. At that time I reported to you the essence of General Marshall's talk. Having now retired he has been replaced by General Eisenhower, who did such a splendid job defeating the enemy in the European theater. General Eisenhower immediately found himself thrown into a cauldron of criticism—not only from the boys overseas but from the fathers and mothers—sons and daughters—and sweethearts here at home but also from Members of Congress who, in the interest of their constituents have been asking why the War Department announced early this year that they would have to slowdown their demobilization program. I have received many letters on the subject while I remained in Washington through the 3-week interval between the first and second session of this Congress and, I presume, that had I gone back home into the district I would have had many, many more complaints about this slow-down. Other Members who returned home told me that the pressure was so great that they had no vacation whatsoever; that they were hounded night and day—and a number of them in despair were literally driven back to Washington in order to get a few days much needed rest before they began to tackle the arduous legislative duties with which we are faced in this second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Because of this near hysteria which has developed we had another informal joint meeting of the Members of both Houses in the auditorium of the Congressional Library last Tuesday morning at which time we were addressed by General Eisenhower, Admiral Nimitz, and his personnel officer, Admiral Denfeld. To me that meeting was very informative and the Army and Navy representatives both set forth the facts. However, it took both of them about an hour to give us the entire picture of the reasons for the proclaimed slow-down. It must be obvious to you who are listening to me now that it is utterly impossible for us to digest in an ordinary letter to any one of you an hour's explanation by these top military men. Indeed, I cannot do it in a 15-minute broadcast. I can only touch some of the highlights today of General Eisenhower's explanation. I might tell you, however, that immediately following that joint meeting I made a speech on the floor of the House in which I recommended that both General Eisenhower and Admiral Nimitz, themselves, go on a Nation-wide—indeed a worldwide—broadcast program and tell all of you in as brief a message as possible what they told us. As I prepare this broadcast I notice that General Eisenhower will be on the air tonight, Friday, and I understand that Admiral Nimitz will be on the air very shortly. I hope that their explanations will satisfy you to such an extent that it will not be necessary for you to write us further because, based on their explanations, I am personally convinced that they are doing the best they can, taking everything into consideration, and that there is nothing Congress can do about it unless the Congress of the United States tells the Army and Navy, "Now that the war is over we do not want you to police Japan and Germany, we want you to leave every gun, tank, automobile, every piece of amphibious equipment, for which the American people paid billions and billions of dollars, over there; let it go plumb to Hades." If you want us to take that action then, of course, we can bring back the boys who are on police duty in Japan and Germany; we can bring back the boys loading valuable equipment and shipping it back to the United States as fast as possible.

There is $7,000,000,000 worth of it in Europe—7,000,000 tons in the Pacific. Here is another angle that General Eisenhower pointed out to us. We have at this moment under our responsibility in the European theater over 100 depots in which we have deposited captured enemy war matériel and in just one alone there is 400,000 tons of live enemy ammunition. We can bring back the boys who are guarding all of our own and the enemies' equipment if that is what you want us to do—but tell us to do that with our eyes open and with your eyes open so that you will know what kind of responsibility you are passing on to Congress. Why, any nation in Europe right today which could get its hands on the vast stores of American equipment and the captured equipment could start a war right over again tomorrow, and your boys would have to get back into uniform and put an end to it once more. If that is what you want—tell us in so many words instead of constantly demanding that we bring the boys back at once.

We can bring back the doctors and nurses who are administering to the ills of the boys still over there; we can bring back high-point cooks who are still there to feed the boys who are being inducted and those who are enlisting to replace those men over there and let them go hungry; we can bring them all back if you tell the Congress of the United States that that is what you want done and leave all that equipment there for Germany and Japan to rearm themselves and start another war—that is the only answer I can give you as to how we can go ahead at the present rate—on which we have been proceeding—in this demobilization program.

Now, let us look at the matter factually. Just what has the Army been doing in this demobilization program. As of January 11, 1946, 5,123,000 have been discharged. Last September General Marshall told us that he expected by this time—over a 4-month period—two and one-half million men and women would be discharged from the Army. As an actual fact, however, that number has been exceeded by 1,655,000 men and women—which means that 1,655,000 men and women who had no expectation of getting home for Christmas as of last September are now back in civilian clothes—if they can find the clothes. That remarkable record was over a million a month. Now, had we continued that way—if the Congress ordered General Eisenhower to continue bringing men home at that same speed, every man and woman in the Army of the United States would have been in civilian clothes by April 1 of this year—and that is unthinkable, of course, unless we are to give up the Army entirely. That is the entire reason for the slow-down unless, by your demand as I have stated earlier, you want the Congress to forget that we fought and won a war and drop everything where it is now. When the day is done farmers, as a rule, drive their teams back into the barn or drive their tractors out of the field. The workman lays his tools away for the night so that they will be ready for the next day's job. He does not leave them scattered around on the bench for somebody to pick up and walk off with or have somebody steal his means of making a living. A policeman—the protector of our life and liberty—when he goes home at night he does not leave his gun and billy hanging on the nearest lamp post—he takes it home and protects it because he doesn't know when he may have to use it to protect your

life and mine—and so it is with the Army. We must bring back our tools of war and somebody must be there to bring them back and protect them while they are still over there and until such time as we can get this equipment properly loaded aboard ship to return it and store it away in this country—not leave it out on Flanders Field to rot and rust, or leave it in the Malay jungles or on those islands in the Pacific we are giving up or turning back to our erstwhile Allies—we must protect it.

Now, I am just as anxious as any of you are—and I believe the Army is, too—to get those boys back as fast as possible, but we must be practical, not emotional nor hysterical about it. I believe, also, you are just as disturbed about these overseas mass protests that have almost bordered on mutiny and which are an unfortunate national disgrace, in my opinion, so let us examine some of the reasons for that.

Capt. Lowell M. Limpus, a New York News staff correspondent, who recently returned from the Philippines, where he covered the Yamashita trial and served as a war correspondent during the closing scenes of the war, gave a pretty good analysis of the cause of this unrest over there in an article on January 7. I have sought to verify his statements, and so far as I can find, he seems to have analyzed the situation excellently. It is outrageous that our Army should not put an immediate stop to this disgraceful behavior on the part of some of these new brass hats in the Pacific. Let me quote from the article:

"Too many newly arrived brass hats having a good time for themselves and neglecting their men while they let discipline and morale go to hell; that's apparently one of the principal reasons for what is getting dangerously close to open mutiny among our forces in the Philippines. It is a situation which has been worrying conscientious officers of the Regular Army for months, but they've been hoping it would work itself out in time. Evidently it hasn't and the accumulated neglect of many weeks is beginning to boil over. Now a lot of 'good-time Charlies' from Washington are beginning to pay for that neglect of the men. They've been looking after their own comfort and letting their subordinates stew in the sweltering Tropics. Swarms of high-ranking staff officers who rushed to the Far East, as soon as the shooting ended, have been concentrating on finding luxurious quarters for themselves in that war-shattered area and enjoying life therein once they were installed, and they don't seem to have paid too much attention to the men while they were doing it. * * * Very few of these comfort-seeking gentry wear battle stars or combat ribbons. They arrived on the scene after Japan surrendered and pulled their rank right and left on the boys who did the actual fighting. They snatched souvenirs greedily—and therein lies one cause of a lot of friction that hasn't been discussed publicly.

"Many a staff delegation swooped down on the combat units and confiscated heaps of samurai swords and daggers from the men who captured them. Then they took them back and distributed them according to rank among the be-starred and be-eagled tourists from Washington, while the boys who had won medals in action fretted and fumed—and came home without any souvenirs at all. The staff officers in the well-pressed uniforms even ranked liberated prisoners out of available comforts. I saw whole truckloads of those gaunt, hollow-eyed prisoners—colonels and lieutenant colonels themselves—driven away from the Admiral apartments in Manila, to which they were first taken, and dumped in a muddy replacement center, 20 miles out in the suburbs amid signs reading, 'Be careful. This is malaria country.' Out there the liberated colonels lived in crowded tents, using open latrines, until they were sent back to the States, while newly arrived staff colonels from Washington took over the nice rooms with the private bath in the Admiral. (The replacement depot staff did everything possible for the prisoners but we wondered why the desk officers didn't use the tents, for awhile, anyway.) Enlisted men burned up as they saw these things, and so did a lot of officers. I remember one swearing lieutenant protesting because one of his men sat up all night in a jeep while a staff colonel was inside a private home calling on friends one December night in Manila. Regular officers burned because, as they frequently said, too many of their superiors were betraying one of the oldest traditions of the service, that an officer should look after the comfort of his men before attending to his own. The practice increased steadily throughout the area after the war ended. More and more nice places were off limits except for colonels and generals. There was coffee and doughnuts for officers only at a stand outside the big post exchange, just above Manila City Hall, and a sign forbidding those officers to give any to enlisted men. * * * These things were typical—most of all in the Philippines. And they soon showed their effect on morale. The men became angry and disgusted and they wanted to get home and get away from it all. But mighty few people took the trouble to explain the details of the transportation shortage until they began to boil over.

"Then discipline went bad—especially around Manila. Drunken soldiers roamed the streets, brandishing bottles on Saturday night, and lack of respect for officers became manifest. Some of the officers—mostly regulars—fought a valiant, if losing, battle to preserve discipline and morale, and these officers included a number of colonels and generals. Conditions were excellent around the big base headquarters in Manila and around MacArthur's own headquarters in Tokyo. But these conscientious officers couldn't make much progress amid the general carelessness by which they were surrounded. And their smartly uniformed, well disciplined outfits stood out in bold relief. Contributing to the problem is the fact that many of the men themselves are newly arrived youthful replacements, who haven't been in the Army long enough or had sufficient training to really understand what they are doing. They may be easily led by malcontents, who have legitimate grievances. They really constitute the majority of the men in the theater now. It isn't the army which licked the Japs that is raising a ruckus today. Most of the combat-tried veterans already have been replaced. This is a bunch of kids, led by a few hot-headed men, who have been really abused and neglected."

And I want to add this comment that it has been proven beyond all shadow of doubt that much of the trouble stems from Communist agitators who have somehow or other gotten themselves into Uncle Sam's uniform.

And just one more observation—if you will look back, my friends, you will find that all of this agitation among the troops in China, in the Philippines, in Hawaii, in Europe—all of this stuff came to a head at a carefully predetermined time—the opening of the UNO meeting in London.

Rev. Hewlett Johnson

REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1946

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Hewlett Johnson, Dean of Canterbury, recently visited here in America, accepting of our hospitality, lionized by that element in our social life who bend the knee to British aristocracy and who think more of an invitation to tea and crumpets with the British than they do in looking after Uncle Sam's interests. The noted reverend has returned to Britain, where he should have remained in the first place, to tell the world that the United States is 100 years behind the rest of the world and that in religion it is 150 years behind.

Now the reverend's remarks are not at all surprising, as the British have been beefing ever since we declared our independence July 4, 1776; however, I think his remarks are untimely, in view of the fact that Britain is now asking the United States for $4,400,000,000 to subsidize the nationalistic and socialistic program of Britain at the expense of the American taxpayer.

It is questionable how any Member of this House can support such a loan on the terms that have been agreed upon.

The reverend's remarks evidence a lack of appreciation for the courtesies extended him on his recent visit here and a lack of appreciation of our loss of American boys on the western front which former Prime Minister Churchill stated were 60 to 1—certainly we were not behind the rest of the world in this respect.

Think of the audacity of the distinguished British clergyman to criticize a nation which came to the aid of Britain when its back was up against the wall, a nation that supplied the planes, tanks, jeeps, guns, foodstuffs, and manpower that saved the British Isles from becoming a hole in the ground with Hitler sitting on the edge, crowing.

The British have been grubbing on this and every other country of the world since they became a world empire. Others have fought its wars. We have contributed in two wars, and in World war II we had 1,300,000 casualties, also poured in billions of dollars in money. The loans from the United States have kept the British going financially even though they have repudiated their debts to us. We washed off twenty-five billions of lend-lease in this war as a friendly gesture—all for what?

To maintain the British Empire and to have the very reverend gentleman tell us we have been off the beam for the past 100 years.

I cannot understand why our State Department would engineer a deal without first giving the duly elected representatives of the people an opportunity to pass judgment on the loan.

It certainly would be gratifying if the State Department would stiffen a bit and cut out the appeasement, become realistic and look out for Uncle Sam's interests before dishing out every dime we have.

If the Members of this Congress were asked to contribute their own money to buy bonds to finance this loan I believe there would be but few bonds purchased—if any. And to vote $4,400,000,000 of the American taxpayers' money—at this time—when we have already saddled a debt on the American people of $300,000,000 will call for a lot of explana-

tion to the good people back home who will have to pay the bill.

We, I might say, are gluttons for punishment.

Should OPA Be Continued?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1946

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Omaha Morning World-Herald of January 17, entitled "The Crumbling Dike."

Mr. Speaker, the subject of renewing the authority of the OPA should soon come before this Congress. There is a mountain of evidence everywhere that the OPA has not controlled inflation. The objectives of the OPA have been acceptable to the American people, but the methods they have used have been deplorable. The OPA, through their snoopers, have been going about Nebraska and other States, spying on the merchant and going under the assumption that every merchant is a crook. It is my opinion that no merchants have been able to follow all of the maze and intricate regulations as put out by the OPA and not be in technical violation of some of these regulations.

It is time for this Congress to realize that the war is over, and that the OPA was set up as a war agency, and any controls which may be necessary upon rents and prices of essential articles, ought now to be transferred to some old established agency of Government. The OPA should be discontinued permanently, and the regulations which are needed should be transferred without delay. If this is not done now, the Congress will be blamed for continuing an agency which is no longer needed. It may be our last chance to relieve the American people of a lot of foolish regulations which have been forced upon them by the OPA.

It is my opinion that competition will now take care of items of food. Many items will be much cheaper if the OPA would simply remove the ceiling prices. It is only natural that the merchant, when given a ceiling price, will sell that article at the ceiling price. There is an ample supply of food in all lines, with the possible exception of butter and sugar. Take off the foolish regulations and the ceiling prices which hamstring the merchants and the American people and the cost of living will decline.

The Congress should take some action now and not wait until just a few days before this act is to expire and then have the administration rush in with a fire call that something must be done at once. It is unfair to the public and the merchants of the country who have carried on in such a patriotic fashion during the last 4 years.

The editorial follows:

THE CRUMBLING DIKE

An 18-cent boost in the price of butter?

That hits home. What in the world has happened to our inflation controls, we ask one another? Perhaps this man Bowles has been right in insisting on rigid price limits as the only protection for the consumer.

But let's look at what has happened, not only to butter but to other commodities upon which the pressures for price raises are so great that they can no longer be ignored.

Butter prices have been low in comparison with prices of other cream products, so low that cream and butterfat have been diverted to the manufacture of more profitable items.

The cause was an inadequate price-control system for all cream products. Butter was out of line. To get it back in line the Government tells us there will have to be a whopping big price increase. Otherwise, no butter production.

The same situation applies to meat. The prospects are for price increases if packing-house workers and livestock raisers are going to keep busy producing for the consumer.

The same goes for steel, where the price situation is such that the steel companies say they can't induce the men to work at wages the companies can pay under their price ceilings. For the same reason automobile production is paralyzed, electrical-appliance production is retarded, the whole process of reconversion slowed up.

But, say the bitter-enders who stick with Chester Bowles, isn't it true that OPA price control, despite its mistakes, does protect the consumer?

And the answer unfortunately is no, not very well. Not in the case of products in great demand, such as automobiles and building materials, hosiery, scarce foods, and many, many more items.

The Wall Street Journal recently made a country-wide survey of ceiling price enforcement and found it "shot full of holes." Black markets, it found, are rampant in all the items that Americans want badly.

The situation breeds racketeering. It freezes out respectable manufacturers and encourages fly-by-nights with their sleezy goods and questionable business methods. Ready to cooperate with them are an army of new get-rich-quick middlemen who will peddle whatever is offered at whatever price is asked.

At the bottom of this unholy black-market pyramid are millions of Americans who see quite clearly that the chiseler is once again favored. They have verified their suspicions with a quick glance at the strange brand name, the high price, the poorer quality.

While OPA enforcement officers flit about the countryside fining grocers for what is little more than a technical disregard of the sugar rationing regulations, vast floods of legal but shoddy merchandise are taking the consumer's dollar.

That is the price and inflation picture as it is today. The spectacle of Chester Bowles, holding his finger in the dike while its walls crumble about him, is far from reassuring. His sincerity is not questioned, but his judgment may well be.

Rescind Carry-Back

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. SAVAGE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1946

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I fear that Congress has been too liberal to big business in this country, and I feel that General Motors and the steel companies have been taking advantage of our generosity in giving them carry-backs on their taxes. I do not think any President has ever tried harder than President Truman to settle the strikes. The workers have accepted the President's proposal, and they are to be congratulated for putting the Nation's interest above their own, but General Motors and the steel industry have turned it down. The workers have no carry-backs on taxes, and perhaps if the steel companies and General Motors had no carry-backs they would have been more willing to accept the President's proposal.

Under the carry-back provision it would be possible for General Motors to receive $165,000,000 without ever turning a wheel. The same applies to the steel industry. If it does not produce a thing for the rest of the year, the United States Treasury will pay the dividends for the corporations. I think, perhaps, we made a mistake, and we should correct it by repealing the carry-backs. Congress passed the carry-back provision with the idea that it would aid reconversion, but it is actually retarding reconversion because these industrialists are taking advantage of the provision in making an all-out effort to break unions and get the workingman back on a starvation wage. They are out to destroy labor. They have tried it before. We know the tactics that Girdler has used, and I believe the whole industry is trying to carry on the same thing now. The difference between the industry's offer and the President's recommendation was so small that the recommendation should have been accepted by industry the same as it was by labor. Industry's failure to do so indicates there is something bigger in the cards. That is the destruction of labor unions and the resultant wage cuts. That is what they are using the carry-back for.

The following newspaper article, written by Thomas L. Stokes, brilliant columnist, describes the situation in more adequate terms than I am capable of:

CONSPIRACY SIGNS

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

It seems more than a coincidence that only a few days apart General Motors rejects a wage finding by a Presidential fact-finding board and United States Steel refuses a compromise wage figure offered by the President of the United States intervening on behalf of the public.

In each case the unions accepted the findings, which were much below their demands.

Big motors and big steel.

Sometime back, even before VJ-day, there were charges by labor leaders that big industry was going to start a union-busting campaign after the war. A combination of big motors and big steel was cited specifically as the offensive weapon. These charges at the time made the usual impression that such charges do from union leaders who themselves intend to take the offensive for wage increases. In short, they were somewhat discounted, even though there were significant signs about.

Now, with the latest action of General Motors and United States Steel, it all seems to add up to just about what the union leaders were charging. That is, a conspiracy by the

big interests to move in and take over, now that the people have lost the champion in the White House who was so quick to detect and expose the machinations of the big fellows, and to rally the people against them. They are capitalizing, too, upon the confusion that naturally follows a war, with the public weary and punch-drunk.

The big boys first thought they could take Harry Truman, Mr. Roosevelt's successor, into camp. They thought he was their man. They have found out different. Now they seem determined to break him, if possible. He does not, it is true, have the maneuvering abilities of his predecessor.

Breaking the power of the unions and breaking the power of the administration are all part and parcel of the same plot as it begins to unfold, in the view of those here who have watched and analyzed the various moves.

The tip-off came when big motors and big steel thumbed their noses at the President, the representative of the people, in what looks like a carefully premeditated gesture.

There are a few simple facts to remember in this situation. In each case, the awards proposed respectively by a fact-finding board and by the President were about half-way between those asked by the union and offered by the company. Without going into all the figures each proposed award seemed reasonable.

The point is made that President Truman stepped into the steel case before the fact-finding board had investigated fully and reported. But he stepped in, as any President is expected to do, in the public interest. It was an emergency case.

There is another thing to remember. Both General Motors and United States Steel netted handsome profits in the war, both have a nice backlog, and both were treated most considerably by Congress, along with all industry, in repeal of the excess-profits tax and making available various tax refunds. Congress, in fact, hastened to do that while it held up action on such measures for the benefit of workers as increased unemployment compensation and the full-employment bill, neither yet enacted.

Big industry, it would seem, can ill afford to fail the country at this time.

There seems little doubt that public sympathy will be out with the folks on the picket line.

An Overseas Soldier Denounces Racial Bigotry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1946

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, one of our overseas soldiers has written me a letter in which he expresses himself strongly concerning the fighting qualities of American Negro troops and in which he denounces those who disparage the Negro and would continue to divide American citizens into first- and second-class categories. His words in support of me and my crusade against all forms of racial and religious intolerance are inspiring.

It is time that the American people are awakened to the dangers in the offing. They should be alerted to recognize the dark clouds hovering on the horizon. Of what value a victory over nazism, anti-Semitism, and racial superiority's falacious doctrines elsewhere while tolerating if not encouraging similar reprehensible practices here. But let the soldier's letter speak for itself:

NOVEMBER 22, 1945.

DEAR SIR: In our Army newspaper "Round-up" here in the Indian theater I have read of your speaking out against the barring of Negro Pianist Hazel Scott from Constitution Hall by the Daughters of the American Revolution. May I highly commend your splendid show of Americanism. We soldiers have very litttle prejudice among us. We have seen the work of the Negro troops on the Burma Road and read of their aid in the fight for victory in other theaters all over the world. To read that any organization composed of people who had their tea and crumpets every day during the war had the nerve to take such an un-American stand makes us fellows boil.

When the American people start to bar certain individuals from their lawful rights then we are on the road to disaster. We fought that false philosophy in bloody battles in both Europe and the Far East What a hollow victory if some of the Negro troops return to their native land after losing an arm or a leg or blind for the rest of their lives and there find the same injustices that they fought so valiantly to defeat.

Therefore may I once again express my gratitude and pleasure in being able to read of your splendid action in condemning this show of racialism.

Very truly yours,

——— ———.

Address by Mayor of Lynn, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an editorial which appeared in the Daily Evening Item, Lynn, Mass., recently:

MAYOR COLE'S ADDRESS

Courageously facing the facts of postwar municipal life, Mayor Cole painted a straightforward and realistic picture of Lynn's major problems in the coming 2 years in his inaugural address to the city council today.

Pointing out that the utopian age for municipal government vanished with the coming of peace and that cities must now reassume the normal financial burdens from which they were temporarily freed during the conflict, the mayor was not content to chart a program designed merely to restore conventional services. Rather, with the initiative and confidence typical of the returning serviceman, he proposed new and bold departures to keep Lynn abreast of progressive municipalities throughout the country.

Most ambitious of these proposals is his recommendation that steps be taken at once to provide the city with an appropriate war memorial in the form of a new city hall. For years it has been generally recognized that Lynn's city hall is inadequate for the proper functioning of a municipality of our size. And ever since the end of World War I there have been vague discussions but no definite action concerning an enduring tribute to our fighting men. Mayor Cole, in one bold stroke, has suggested the solution of both problems in one undertaking. Refreshing, indeed, is this indication that we may expect action rather than aimless talk in the new administration.

The mayor, keenly conscious from his own military experience of the sacrifices of our young men and women in the recent war, urges that immediate recognition be given Lynn residents who served in World War II by the placing of a suitable plaque in the foyer of the present city hall, bearing the names of those who made the supreme sacrifice.

Even more tangible, from the veteran's viewpoint, is the mayor's recommendation that sufficient funds be placed at the disposal of the director of the department of rehabilitation to assist men and women upon their discharge from the armed forces and that immediate steps be taken to provide more adequate quarters for this vital work. The council should lose no time in following these recommendations which will have the hearty approval of citizens generally.

Heartening, too, is Mayor Cole's program for an immediate resumption of construction work in the street and sewer departments, which has been practically nil during the war years. His specific proposal that Union Street, one of the city's busiest downtown arteries, be resurfaced from Central Square to Chestnut Street, will bring a fervent "Amen" from the thousands of motorists who use that street regularly. Property owners and the general public will also respond enthusiastically to his proposal that sidewalk construction, neglected during the war, be resumed.

The mayor will go a long way toward solving the city's growing juvenile delinquency problem by his determination to provide sufficient funds in the 1946 budget to put the city's playgrounds in better and safer condition and to provide them with adequate equipment.

Mayor Cole's tendency toward direct action ratner than dilatory discussion is further reflected in his recommendation that the Campbell Building on Stewart Street, the Little property on Ocean Street, and other parcels now owned by the city be offered for sale at once through public advertising so that such properties may be restored to the city's revenue producing column. There has been altogether too much shilly-shallying on these matters.

The mayor's other recommendations, including the bringing of the police and fire departments' personnel to the figures called for by ordinance, closer supervision of liquor establishments to wipe out present abhorent conditions in some of them, and strict adherence to the city charter provision calling for the public advertising for bids on all materials and supplies costing $500 or more, will, if followed, help to eliminate annoying evils and inadequacies.

The mayor warns his colleagues that a return to progressive, "do-something" administration will involve financial problems and that expenditures in some necessary directions must be offset by economies in others. Mayor Cole asks for cooperation, not subservience, by the city council and an end to petty bickering and name-calling. His program, which will be amplified as he finds time to study municipal affairs in more detail after his long absence in the service, provides a sound and progressive pattern for the running of the city. We bespeak for him the sincere assistance of the city council and a continuance of that support by the citizenry as a whole which gave him such an overwhelming mandate in the November election.

Assistant Secretary Hensel, of the Navy Department, and Representative Randolph Disagree Again in Reference to Unification by the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1946

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under date of December 20, 1945, I placed in the Appendix—pages A5724–A5725—of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD correspondence between the Honorable H. Struve Hensel, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and myself, in reference to the subject matter of a single Department of Defense. I herewith include a further exchange of letters with Mr. Hensel on this important subject:

THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, December 22, 1945.

Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. RANDOLPH: I have your letter of December 1945, in reply to my letter of December 14. I am quite surprised at your references to the heat in my letter. I have reread my letter and yours several times and I think any impartial mind would find the heat much more on your side. In any event, no heat was intended by me, although the statements I characterized as unsupported are, in my opinion, still unsupported, in spite of your letter. The major statements made by you in reply to my challenge of John Cowles' statements were so phrased as to be impossible of check or confirmation. They would not be accepted anywhere as proof of anything except that you were so informed.

In the first place, although you mock my unfamiliarity with strategic matters, your letter starts with an admission of the correctness of my statement that there was a split of command in the War Department between the Army under General MacArthur and the Army Strategic Air Forces. In that respect I was clearly correct and that was the only factual statement I made with respect to strategy.

Then I asked the question, Why did not the single Secretary of War prevent that split within his own Department? Your explanation that such split of command under a single Secretary was necessary because there was a split of command between the Army under General MacArthur and the Navy under Admiral Nimitz is a novel one. Why the Army had to split its command because the Navy consolidated its own air, sea, submarine, and marine forces is hard for me to follow.

But I do not think we will make much progress by debating that point further. Judgment as to the soundness of your explanation can be left to those who read these letters. I am, however, constrained to wonder why people discussing the need for a single Secretary in order to assure unity of command in the field always omit any reference to that split under the single Secretary of War. I wonder further why, after some public revelation of that split in the War Department command, it has been found possible to put the Twentieth Air Force under General MacArthur, although there has been no change in the Navy command in the Pacific. Don't you concede yet that unity of command in the field is possible without a single Secretary?

Furthermore, I wish you would check with your informant as to whether the Twentieth Army Air Force was really under the command of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I have always been told that the Twentieth Army Air Force was under the command of Gen. H. H. Arnold, Commanding General of the Army Air Forces—and answerable only to the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the same manner that the Navy was so answerable. If my information is correct, your explanation of the reason for the split of command in the War Department needs considerable modification.

Your allegation that the savings claimed by John Cowles, Esq., were really possible is hardly proved by the listing of four very general categories of possible savings without detail or substantiating evidence. You know that such general statements would never be accepted anywhere as evidence of anything. You must have been aware that I could not possibly check the correctness of your statements when all identifying details were omitted. The blind statement that $372,067,000 could be saved in 17 items of research and development alone is still an unsupported statement. It is frankly challenged. The same is true with respect to the other items which you group generally under the headings of "Purchasing," "Facilities," and "Supply and materials handling."

I appeal to your sense of fairness to give me a break-down of these statements so that they can be checked. No witness facing the possibility of cross-examination has ever made any such statements. I would also appreciate the name of your informant and a detailed statement of the manner in which the savings were calculated—with a list of the items involved. Please give me the information in such form that a check can be made.

The items which you listed to demonstrate five instances of competitive bidding between the services turn out to be only one item of competitive bidding and four alleged program conflicts. And the only item of competitive bidding you could find was in respect of some water tanks in Miami, Fla. That case certainly seems de minimis when we are discussing billions but I will have it checked. I will also check your allegations of program conflicts which are far from competitive bidding. Your comment as to my "preoccupation with lumber (the forests and the trees)" seems to need no answer or check.

I am, of course, very pleased that we now have some promise of discussing the details of these extravagant claims. I trust you will promptly insert this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that my side of the case is presented forthwith and the readers of the RECORD are not left thinking you have really answered my questions or challenge.

Sincerely yours,

H. STRUVE HENSEL.

JANUARY 21, 1946.

Hon. H. STRUVE HENSEL,
The Assistant Secretary,
Navy Department,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HENSEL: Your letter of December 22, 1945, acknowledged in my absence by my secretary, has been read and re-read most carefully.

I confess that the points intended to be made by your four paragraphs relating to command are far from clear and their significance to the issue before us is, if I understand them, obscure. If any discussion of them is to further our mutual understanding and the enlightenment of "those who read these letters," it appears that I must correct certain concepts which appear fundamental to your thinking.

You apparently do not realize that, so far as United States forces were concerned, supreme direction, under the President, was vested in the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This direction over the various theaters of operations and commands functioned through that member of the Joint Chiefs, as executive agent, deemed best qualified in relation to the nature of anticipated operations. General Marshall acted as executive agent of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for the North African, Mediterranean, European, and Southwest Pacific theaters; Admiral King for the Central Pacific and South Pacific theaters, and, subsequently, the Pacific Ocean areas, and General Arnold for the strategic air forces in Europe, which operated in and over several theaters, and for the Twentieth Air Force and subsequently the strategic air forces in the Pacific where similar conditions obtained.

The operations of the Twentieth Air Force, and subsequently the strategic air forces in the Pacific, in and through several established theaters, were described to you in my previous letter. The strategic considerations which dictated the establishment of these organizations, by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, distinct from any of the affected theater commands, were, I think, adequately set forth therein. You, no doubt, are aware that this followed the pattern previously established by the Joint Chiefs of Staff for the strategic air forces in Europe operating both from the Mediterranean and European theaters.

It will, I think, be clear to you from the foregoing that the organization of the strategic air force in both wars was dictated by the versatility of the air arm and the far-flung nature of its operations, encompassing the area included in more than one theater. It did not represent a split in command within the War Department, as you describe it, but a division of command responsibility determined by the Joint Chiefs of Staff to meet strategic considerations. As I wrote you, had a single, unified command been established for the Pacific Basin or had it appeared practicable to the Combined and Joint Chiefs of Staff to consolidate the European and Mediterranean theaters, the distinct air command would presumably have been unnecessary. Your reference to split of command with the War Department would be equally applicable—though of no applicability whatever—to Admiral Nimitz's command in the Central Pacific and Admiral Halsey's command in the South Pacific.

As for the figures I gave in four general categories, I included them only as an assurance to you that I had assured myself that the savings claimed in John Cowles' article could be substantiated. I do not feel that an item-by-item debate in correspondence between us is the medium for proof or disproof of savings to be realized under unification of our armed forces. Forthcoming hearings on legislation to effect this unification before the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, of which I am a member, will presumably provide both the Congress and the public with detailed statements as to savings possible under a single department, as well as the proof, subject to the careful scrutiny and examination of the committee. In that forum experts on both sides will be heard and their evidence carefully weighed.

I also have before me your letter of January 7, 1946. This communication will be studied very carefully, as per my conversation with you a few days ago when I had the genuine pleasure of meeting you personally for the first time.

Sincerely yours,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

A Communication From an Air Corps Officer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a communication I have received from one of my constituents:

THREE HUNDRED AND FIFTH BOMB GROUP (CASUAL POOL),
St. Trond, Belgium, December 7, 1945.

For your information, part of an article from the Stars and Stripes of December 7, 1945, is quoted:

"OFFICER LACK DELAYS THEIR REDEPLOYMENT

"Because of a critical officer shortage, * * * the Army will ration the redeployment of officers who became eligible for release December 1, it was disclosed at USFET (rear) Headquarters yesterday.

"The plans are to let the officers go 'economically' over a period of 60 days as provided for in a recent War Department cable to the theater. It means officers who became eligible for separation December 1 may be held until January 31, 1946."

In October at St. Trond, Belgium, for example, a pool of Air Force personnel was formed to accommodate officers declared surplus and nonessential to occupational and close-out organizations.

Since they have been in this casual pool the salaries for these 367 officers have exceeded one-quarter million dollars, which is only an incidental part of the total cost to the taxpayers. Ir return, these officers have performed no duties.

Their point scores vary from 39 to 74, with an average of 65. In the United States flying officers are being discharged with as few as 19 points. This is an indication that there is a surplus of flying officers in the States as well as in this theater.

The plan presented by the War Department is in direct conflict with the situation in which these officers find themselves. The two reasons responsible are as follows:

1. A point system which has become inadequate.

2. A plan to keep officers here because of an "officer lack," which obviously does not exist in the Air Force.

These officers feel that some positive action should be taken to remedy this situation immediately

For the casual officers:

P. F. RINALDO,
First Lieutenant, Air Corps.

Good News About the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1946

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, no one has been more critical of the State Department over the years than have I, when I felt that it was deserving of censure. On the other hand, I have been always eager to extend a handclasp of warm friendship and support when our State Department did something deserving of commendation. Recently, our State Department has evidenced a stiffening attitude toward fascism. This has heartened true lovers of democracy throughout the country. Perhaps it has provoked attacks from certain fair-weather friends who were mistakenly given positions of power and influence in our diplomatic corps. It is to be hoped that these will be rapidly purged. A recent editorial in a great Tennessee newspaper lauds our State Department for calling home Ambassador Norman Armour from Franco Fascist Spain and for recalling Spruille Braden from the Argentine and thereafter elevating him.

The editorial is as follows:

[From the Nashville Tennesseean of November 21, 1945]

COLD SHOULDER

The unofficial report that Ambassador Norman Armour is to be called home from Madrid as a sign of disapproval of Francisco Franco's Fascist government promotes the hope that the State Department is making an effort to catch up with public opinion.

The report takes on added significance in that it was released in conjunction with the return of James C. Dunn from Europe. Mr. Dunn has been the main inspirer of the Department's silk-glove policy toward the Spanish Fascists for nearly a decade. Whether he saw new light on his trip and therefore has given assent to the move or has been overruled is open to conjecture. At least, the recall of Mr. Armour would be a complete reversal of the Dunn-Carlton-Hayes policy.

Unlike Mr. Hayes, whose sympathies for the military-clerical-feudal regime of Franco grossly overbalanced his judgment and watered down the policy which should have been pursued, Mr. Armour has dealt with the Fascist crowd in Madrid as a firm and unyielding representative of a democracy should. His recall, which would be as far as our Government could go at this time without a formal breaking off of relations, would be a cold shoulder not only to the present government in Spain but also to plans to make it respectable with certain skin-deep changes, such as the abolition of the Falange, and the personal retirement of bloody Franco.

The recall and elevation of Spruille Braden to an important post in the State Department leaves Juan Peron's government in Argentina without formal recognition. Consistency requires that we also recall our representative from Spain. In the present world there is no place for the discredited umbrella policy.

Letter From General Motors Employee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, today I received a letter from an employee of General Motors in Detroit. The writer is a long-time employee of that company. He is a veteran of the Spanish War, and evidently a man of good judgment. I am offering this letter for the RECORD, and for obvious reasons am withholding his signature:

DETROIT, MICH., *January 19, 1946.*
Congressman ROY WOODRUFF,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR COMRADE: As my Congressman is sewed up, body, soul, and breeches with the CIO I do not have strong hopes of getting a reply from him to a letter that I recently wrote him, so I am writing to you because I know you as a comrade of the Spanish-American War, and a friend of the underdog.

Comrade, isn't there some way of ending these needless strikes? Why should I and thousands of others be kept in idleness when we want to work? I am sure thousands in the other plants feel the same way. This strike has taken the bread out of their mouths. Unlike them I have my pension so it is not so hard on me, but at that it is plenty hard enough.

Comrade WOODRUFF, I have carried a union card since shortly after the Spanish-American War and no one knows better than I do all that unions have done for us, shorter hours, better pay, and better working conditions for us working men. Old Sam Gompers was the greatest labor leader this country has yet produced. He knew how to settle labor disputes between labor and employer without losing weeks of time. Old Sam wasn't much on publicity but he certainly knew how to look after his membership. How different now! Our unions are being led by a lot of self-seeking ballyhooers who seem to care little for us. Their pay goes on, strike or no strike, but we have to pay the fiddler. When we strike our pay stops.

Friend WOODRUFF, can't Congress do something to stop all this foolishness, and that is just what it is? I can give you the names of many, many General Motors' workers who are well satisfied with the settlement offer the company has made us. We want to go back to work, but a small and well organized group in our unions won't let us.

I ask you, Comrade WOODRUFF, is America still a free country, and if it is why can't those of us who are satisfied with General Motors' offer go back to work? You would be surprised at the number of us who don't like the way our leaders are leading. I guess we showed that in the mayor fight. I have been voting New Deal since the Hoover days, but I am through and so is a lot of others that I can name. I don't know how much you could do, but for God's sake do what you can. This thing cannot continue much longer. If it does we will have a blow-up here in Detroit that will put some of our leaders out of business. I hope you will answer this letter because I am getting kind of tired with writing Congressmen and not getting any answer.

Were you in Cuba, or the Philippines, during the Spanish War? I served in Cuba.

My best wishes to you, Comrade.

Yours very truly,

_____.

P. S.—Has a bill been put in to increase our pensions? I would like to retire and make room for a younger man, now that my family is grown and scattered.

The Housing Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BENJAMIN J. RABIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1946

Mr. RABIN. Mr. Speaker, the American Veterans' Committee and Mr. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., its chairman on

housing, are doing a splendid job to awaken the American people to the seriousness of the housing shortage and to urge the necessity for some expeditious and effective means of solving that problem.

Under leave given to me to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a radio address made by Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., on January 17, 1946, over a coast-to-coast broadcast of the Mutual network, on the subject of the housing shortage:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, the critical shortage of housing in the United States is something that must concern every American because by the end of 1946 there will be 3,000,000 families searching in vain for homes of their own, and if the present rate of home building continues for the next 10 years, there will then be 8,000,000 American families homeless. These are appalling figures, but they are the conservative estimates of the National Housing Agency in Washington.

During the war, no bombs fell on our great country and no homes were destroyed from enemy action, but still millions of American soldiers and sailors are returning home to find that there is no decent shelter for themselves and their families and that in many of our major cities the picture looks black for years to come.

This crisis is not something which has developed overnight. It has been building up for the last 15 years. During the depression, the majority of home building was done for the higher-income groups, and very little low-cost housing was undertaken. During the war, all construction materials went into building our great war factories and the temporary housing erected at these factories to give adequate shelter to our war workers. Even before the end of the war, all of our cities were overcrowded and now our returning veterans find that they are aggravating an already serious condition.

It is true that many people looked upon housing as a boring subject, until the veteran's crying need for a decent place to house his family dramatized the issue. I have heard many people say that the veteran needs this and the veteran wants that, but let's put first things first. Before a man can get a job, he must have a decent place to live in. I have seen some of my fellow veterans, with their wives and children, sleeping in the lobbies of our great railroad stations and hotels, here, in the proud city of New York. Another veteran, with his wife and baby, slept in his automobile for 3 nights, before he could find a one-room apartment. These are but two of the many tragic, similar stories.

However, let me emphasize right here and now that the veteran does not consider this to be his problem alone. We, of the American Veterans' Committee, feel very strongly that the veteran must not consider himself as a member of a group apart, working for its own special interest, at the expense of the rest of the community. Rather, we feel that we can only continue serving the best interests of our country and our fellow Americans by becoming a constructive and integrated force within our community, working with all other groups to achieve a better life for all Americans.

The housing problem resolves itself into two parts.

First, we must achieve an immediate temporary solution, to tide us over the winter months until a long-range permanent housing program for the Nation can get under way.

In various communities, this temporary solution may take many different forms. In Minneapolis, for example, part of Mayor Humphrey's plan is to convert some vacant school buildings. Here in New York, the American Veterans' Committee organized a rally last October, to discuss the local housing shortage. Out of this forum came several workable suggestions.

We urged that the city administration buy from the Federal Government a minimum of 10,000 temporary housing units, which the Federal Government had erected during the war, to house war workers. An example of such housing was the city of Oak Ridge, Tenn., which was built in 6 weeks and housed 75,000 men and women, who produced the atomic bomb. Such housing could be transported to New York and installed in a matter of a few weeks. We also urged the enactment of State legislation to ease the shortage and strongly backed such Federal legislation as the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill.

In the ensuing months, partly due to our repeated protests, New York City became housing conscious. Mayor William O'Dwyer assumed office on January 1, and in the first 10 days of his administration, placed an order with the Federal Government for 7,000 temporary housing units and 1,345 Quonset huts. The veterans of New York City congratulate Mayor O'Dwyer on his swift cutting of red tape in his efforts to solve his city's most pressing problem.

The New York State administration, under Governor Dewey, has acquired some Army and Navy barracks in the New York area which are being converted into approximately 3,500 temporary housing units. Together, this means almost 12,000 temporary housing units for the veterans and their families which will be available within the next few weeks.

This is not a complete solution, but it certainly is a step in the right direction.

Many people, both in New York and in other large cities, have urged, as a temporary solution, that the old law tenements, the cold-water, unheated slums, which have existed too long, be slightly modified and turned over to the veterans. I am sure that all of you agree with me in my opposition to such a solution. We do not wish our present problem to be used as the excuse for continuing in existence the slums, which should have been removed many years ago. If they are somewhat rehabilitated now, it will prolong their existence for years to come. Too many veterans know too much about foxhole existence to ever agree to subject themselves, their young wives and children to the slop-holes which are the slums—the blight on the faces of our great cities.

The second part of this housing problem is the long-range one—what are we doing today to insure that 8,000,000 American families will not be homeless 10 years from now. Here again, time is of the essence. We must start now to solve the problem of tomorrow. If the housing industry could rapidly adapt itself to the present situation and could go to work building homes, more than 4,000,000 Americans would be employed in this industry. But, unfortunately, there are many and complex obstacles holding back the beginning of immediate construction. Without placing the blame on any single group, let me enumerate the three main obstacles. They are, fluctuating labor costs, shortage of materials, and uncertainty as to OPA ceilings. In brief, due to these obstacles, construction is going ahead at an appallingly slow rate. Only 400,000 homes will be completed in 1946, and still 3,000,000 families will be homeless. As President Truman stated in his January 3d address to the Nation, this is an emergency situation, which requires an emergency solution. Congress has passed the Mead bill, which provides $195,000,000 to facilitate the moving of temporary and semipermanent war workers' housing to cities which now need it most, but this again is only a step in the right direction and cannot be considered as a permanent solution to the long-range problem.

Also pending before Congress is the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, which, briefly, will initiate a long-range, low-cost national housing program. This legislation recognizes that the greatest need exists in the lower-income groups of the Nation, and the American Veterans Committee has not only appeared before the congressional committee in favor of this bill but we have initiated a Nation-wide campaign of letters and telegrams to Congressmen, urging its immediate passage. But, unfortunately, I do not feel that this legislation alone goes far enough. For example, it will provide, over a period of years, approximately 50,000 low-cost housing units for the city of New York. This is only a drop in the bucket. More than 3,000 veterans are returning to New York City each week, and it is easy to see that they alone could gobble up these new housing units in about 4 months.

For this reason I do not feel that the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill can be considered the emergency solution to which President Truman referred on January 3.

However, about a month ago Representative BENJAMIN J. RABIN, of New York, introduced a bill in the Congress which we, of the American Veterans' Committee, along with many labor and business groups, feel is the only emergency solution for this crisis. This proposed legislation has now come to be called the Rabin plan, and, briefly, it is this:

Using the emergency powers of the President, the executive branch of the Federal Government is given authority to build, through private contractors, permanent housing of whatever nature and in whatever localities it is considered necessary to meet the present shortage. The contracts will be subject to renegotiation when the buildings are complete.

All necessary materials may be allocated by the President's representative in charge of this program, thus insuring an adequate supply of materials for low-cost housing. After completion, and after the OPA has determined the rent ceilings, the buildings will be sold to private management groups at a price which will give them a fair return on their investment.

In this connection, I would like to point out that the OPA, unless extended by the Congress, will cease to exist on June 30 of this year. I consider that the termination of OPA price and rent controls would be nothing short of a national calamity and the veteran, along with other low-income groups, would suffer most. But, if by any chance the few selfish groups who are seeking to end the OPA this June might be successful, I feel that the sale contracts on all housing units built and sold under the Rabin plan should be subject to renegotiation, if and when the private management groups increase the rents in any of these buildings. I feel this because the private management groups would then be getting a much greater return on their money, and the Federal Government, which had assumed the initial risk in going ahead with the construction, is entitled to recover any loss it might have incurred.

In short, this is the kind of simple plan which has made many people exclaim: "Why didn't somebody think of this sooner?"

This is the same method that the Government used in war to build our great war plants and I am convinced that it is the only adequate solution for this emergency. There are plenty of homeless veterans and civilians who will tell you, in all sincerity, that the war is not over for them until they have found a decent place in which to live.

The new veteran wishes to solve the problems of his Nation in cooperation with all of his fellow Americans. Only by working together can each community and the Nation as a whole solve our present housing shortage.

It is my deep conviction that not only the veteran, but every American, is entitled to a decent home—a decent home in which to raise his family—the Americans of tomorrow.

Pearl Harbor Fiasco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1946

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from a widely read and highly regarded neighborhood newspaper serving a part of the Eleventh Congressional District of Missouri, the South Side Journal, of Wednesday, December 19, 1945:

PEARL HARBOR FIASCO

The so-called Pearl Harbor probe has degenerated into a farce comedy which is altogether unworthy of a great power like the United States which stands now in the role of unquestioned victor on land, on the sea, in the air throughout the Far East, throughout Europe, and wherever our military, naval, and air forces have met the enemy.

As a matter of fact, the Pearl Harbor episode which precipitated the ultimate clash with Japan, has best been explained by the GI who said the other day that the Nips just pulled a fast one. It was sneak attack against which human precautions, however great, would undoubtedly have been futile.

Efforts of investigators to narrow down "responsibility" for the Pearl Harbor tragedy, thus far have been singularly unsuccessful. To us they represent so much wasted time which might better be directed towards the solutions of many genuinely pressing problems at home and one or two foreign problems which cry for immediate, careful attention.

Efforts to pin on the late Franklin D. Roosevelt the blame for our precipitation into the recent conflict, which seems not yet to be ended, are highly reprehensible. To some who are political minded, it might seem expedient to do this. But the consensus of American equity and justice finds such efforts abhorrent. Mr. Roosevelt never was among those who believed we should be in the position of being helpless when the inevitable crisis came, and most of our readers will recall that he warned us far in advance of actual hostilities of the peril in which we stood. His Chicago speech, directed specifically against the German Nazi regime, met with howls of anguish from those who now seek to charge him and his aides with criminal neglect leading to the conflict.

The American businessmen who sold Japan scrap iron and airplanes, well-knowing the uses to which these items could and probably would be put, should be in the dock. Upon them rests a large share of the blame for the recent conflict which has been so costly to us in men, material, and money. The same businessmen whose shipments of scrap iron were piled up on west coast docks on December 7, 1941, ready for shipment to Japan, knew they weren't shipping this metal to be used for the manufacture of skillets and teakettles for resale in America. They knew, or had every reason to know, that Japan had imperialistic designs, that hatred of the United States had been fostered among the Japanese over more than a generation, and that the Japs who were smart, but not quite smart enough, might be ready to strike in view of Hitler's supposed successes and strength.

The Pearl Harbor probe has disgusted even the men sent out from Washington to direct it. We feel the same way. There is no defense against treachery except eternal vigilance; such vigilance as is confined not to a few officials in Washington or in isolated spots; but vigilance which includes all the people, and vigilance in which patriotism far transcends greed.

Pearl Harbor is the price we paid for unpreparedness. We are unable to see that individual responsibility of military and naval leaders, individual responsibility of our leaders in Washington, has anything to do with the matter at this stage of the game. We have paid the price. We have won the victory.

There are manifold problems in the United States much closer to the people than ascertaining who, if anyone besides the Japanese themselves, may have been responsible for Pearl Harbor. There is the housing problem which at this moment is most acute. There is the problem of industrial relations which must have immediate and intelligent consideration. There is the problem of economic readjustment. All these cry out for exclusive attention. Let us demand that official Washington tackle those problems. After they have been solved, there will still be time to determine who among Americans was responsible for the Pearl Harbor tragedy, if we then think that is important.

Let us, in heaven's name, quit playing kid games and get down to adult business.

Mr. Farley's Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1946

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Binghamton (N. Y.) Sun of December 14, 1945:

MR. FARLEY'S VISIT

There is always a welcome in Binghamton for Big Jim Farley, a man who has the courage of his convictions.

Mr. Farley's mission is not political this time, at least on the surface. He is touring the State in the interests of the Alfred E. Smith memorial, a project which should have the wholehearted support of all admirers of the former East Side boy who became one of the most colorful figures in national life. No more fitting tribute to the memory of the former Governor could have been devised than a modern hospital building, fully equipped and dedicated to the care of the common people of New York, always so close to Al Smith's heart.

As one of New York State's greatest Democratic Governors, Mr. Smith was ever friendly and tolerant toward the people of the strongly Republican southern tier and a frequent visitor to Triple Cities, where he delighted in renewing many warm friendships. The people of this section, regardless of politics, shared with the whole Nation a feeling of genuine admiration and affection for the lovable Al. And this should make Mr. Farley's mission both pleasant and profitable.

It is to be hoped, however, that the courageous Jim hasn't lost interest in politics. A Republican newspaper may be open to the suspicion that an expression of this kind is not entirely unselfish, since the former Postmaster General did contribute something to Republican success in the last State election. We are unselfish, however, in a sincere desire to keep in public life men of Jim Farley's stamina. There is a definite need for his type of leadership, his outspoken convictions and determination to stick to any course he deems to be right.

Unquestionably Mr. Farley will be an important factor in the 1946 campaign in this State and it would be shortsighted, as well as selfish, for any Republican to father the hope that differences of the past in the Democratic organization may be kept alive. Republicans expect to win the next State election on the merits of candidates and principles and, in these days of stress, a decision based upon anything else would be unfortunate.

It was Jim Farley who said as recently as last February that if issues are not discussed on their merits, but on personality; if any political group tries to stir up hatred, and of course thereby provokes hatred on the other side, or if resort is had to the tactics of abuse, it becomes extremely difficult for these groups ever to agree again.

"Men tend to repay hatred with hatred," he told a Lincoln Day gathering at that time, "or insult with insult, and if that process is allowed to go, it becomes impossible for them finally to cooperate in carrying out any course of action. And yet, in a democracy like our own, our entire national life is a vast cooperation scheme. To the technical politician, extremism is not only a crime, it is a blunder."

A reasonable statement from a reasonable individual. There should be little difficulty in reaching an understanding with anyone who holds this point of view. However, there are indications that Democratic leadership within the State still has some distance to go in arriving at such an understanding. Be that as it may, the Tier is glad to welcome Mr. Farley and to wish him every success in the worthy undertaking which is the prime reason for his visit at this time.

Status Quo Demanded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. STIGLER
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1946

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, the United States Employment Service is an important cog in the machinery designed to assist in the readjustment of our returning veterans. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Thursday, January 17, 1946, issue of the Stars and Stripes. This editorial is included—not because it is the last word on this subject, nor because I subscribe to its contents in their entirety—but because it appeared in a service publication read by thousands of service men and women as well as veterans throughout the world:

STATUS QUO DEMANDED

As this comment is written, it seems evident that the Congress will soon have before it for action another bill seeking to transfer back to State control the functions of the United States Employment Service. The President's veto of the so-called rescission bill which was intended to save the taxpayers a big slice of money previously appropriated for war expenditures, but which had attached to it a rider to wipe out the USES in 100 days, leaves the whole question still up in the air. At present, proposed legislation would place the transfer date at June 30, 1947. However, the certainty that a compromise time will be arrived at gives rise to grave concern among organized veterans who have devoted much study to the question of job placement.

It goes without argument that under normal conditions the States should exercise at least some control over employment. Everybody but the confirmed bureaucrat will agree

to that, and even the highest USES officials whose jobs depend upon Federal supervision are in accord with this ideal. The matter of States' rights is concerned. Politics and patronage are involved. A multitude of other considerations enter the picture. The veterans' organizations not only will not quarrel with the proposition but will be for it wholeheartedly. The debate hinges only on timing. What will be best for the applicant? And so far as veterans are concerned, the problem is, what will be best for the veteran? If he was good enough to fight for his country, he is good enough now to have a job found for him. Unless those able to work are given gainful employment, this country of ours is in for a period of confusion and discontent that will pale other troublous moments in our history into insignificance.

In a sense, the USES is another of those babies that were nurtured by the major veterans' organizations. They did not conceive it, but they have given it their constant support. Through the years of its existence, it has performed a tremendous service. It has been a rock of refuge to the jobless and has put millions to work. The Veterans' Employment Service, one of its major branches has been officered by veterans who understand the men with whom they served and who know their shortcomings as well as their virtues. Having had to take much time and effort to sell veterans' rights to the people at large, the foremost consideration must therefore be the reaction on discharged servicemen of a transfer back to local jurisdiction of a benefit that could well mean bread and butter to men and women who have preserved their Government against its enemies, or a lack of the means of actual survival.

The USES is a well-coordinated Nationwide institution. Even though, for political reasons, it has been batted around from pillar to post every now and again, it has turned in a most creditable performance. In December alone it responded to 1,800,000 calls for information about available work. Requests have jumped by 5,000,000 since last July, a rate of a million a month. Over 600,000 of these appeals were from war veterans alone, as against 142,000 in July. A total of a million and three-quarters of veterans have registered in USES offices for jobs. The office has not called upon the Government for much in added appropriations either; its personnel has increased only by 4 percent in spite of the emergency occasioned by hasty demobilization. Those are figures worth examining, and it might be well to ask ourselves what, in addition to turmoil, might happen should the Employment Service be sent back to the State level at times like these.

Despite the fact that veterans differ very little in most respects from other classes of citizens, it is certain that their problems are quite dissimilar. Their treatment rates prior attention. They have given much more to their country than any others. The war just concluded has been a specialized one. It dealt in specialization. Service and attempts to reorient following service produce what we are wont to call "itchy feet." Having been in uniform for month upon month, subject to the will of others, they became, in a real sense, automatons. Nearly 900,000 World War II veterans are receiving compensation for service-incurred disabilities; they must submit themselves to radical readjustment. Hundreds of thousands of the 8,000,000 who have received discharges are back at school or are planning to continue their educations or take vocational training. Some are not yet ready for work. Others, unfortunately, cannot hope ever to compete openly at labor. Army pay was good, and allowances were generous, so a large number married, took on added responsibilities and, having heard much about war wages, expect to be placed in positions beyond their capabilities. While shopping around for jobs, 450,000 dischargees have applied for and received unemployment compensation of $20 weekly under the GI bill of rights, an increase since last July of more than 410,000 at a cost exceeding $10,000,000 each days.

These facts and figures are straws in the wind. Demobilization is only half completed. Two million of those already out have not yet entered the labor market. They will very soon, and their numbers will be augmented by millions more as they come out of uniform. Having earned and having learned, they will want new jobs in keeping with their added earning power and in accord with their self-conceived ability to earn. When reconversion really gets under way, when the present epidemic of work stoppages is relieved and when America gets settled down to its vast and destined duty of rebuilding a war-torn world and feeding and clothing its destitute people, skillful and qualified counsel must be available.

Treating with workers who want work, and especially with veterans who need jobs and who will demand the best they can get, requires patience and understanding. Experienced men and women under a single supervision at levels from the national on down are ready to perform the exacting task expected of them. However desirable might be the ultimate decentralization to State control of the USES, the time of such accomplishment is certainly not practical until the peak of the load of applicants has been passed, and that point has not yet been reached by a long shot.

Organized veterans have demonstrated their belief in decentralization of all Government activities. They believe now that State control of employment is a desirable and logical objective, but that for purposes of standardization and effectiveness and for purposes of standardization and effectiveness and for maintenance of high standards, there should be some Federal supervision. But veterans are also convinced that no transfer can be successfully accomplished now when the labor situation, particularly as it relates to our servicemen and women, is so acute. Nor can it be done without grave danger of tearing down much that has been so well built by time and toil.

The conclusion is inescapable. In keeping with our convictions that our veterans, as well as the whole people, be well served, the Employment Service should continue nationally until further events warrant a change. The interests of those who won the war demand the status quo.

Hollywood Writers Mobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NED R. HEALY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1946

Mr. HEALY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call the attention of the Members of the House to the outstanding contribution of the Hollywood Writers Mobilization to the war which has now been successfully concluded.

The Hollywood Writers Mobilization is a group of 3,500 motion-picture, radio, and newspaper writers, educators, and screen and radio directors and producers. It represents the world's largest pool of talent connected with the mass agencies of communication. During the war and the reconversion period it has placed its resources of talent and experience in the service of the Government, the war agencies, and the armed forces.

Since December 14, 1941, the Hollywood Writers Mobilization has handled a wide variety of assignments at the request of almost every type of war agency and of many Government departments. It has also cooperated in many community activities relating directly or indirectly to the war emergency, and initiated a large number of educational projects designed to aid workers in the mass communications industries meet the issues of war and peace.

This mobilization of writing power has achieved the following record in contributions to war activities:

Documentary and short-subject films	210
Radio scripts	1,069
Army and Navy camp sketches	910
War-bond and blood-bank speeches	920
War agency brochures	29
Feature articles on war activities	125
Songs	60
Posters and slogans	350

This material has been turned out on a voluntary basis by screen, radio, newspaper and magazine writers, cartoonists, publicists and novelists working in close collaboration with university educators, scholars, and scientists. The close tie existing between the Hollywood Writers Mobilization and the University of California has brought together for the first time working writers, artists, directors, and producers and trained university scholars in a joint effort to understand more intelligently the techniques and responsibilities of mass communication.

Many of the film and radio contributions to the war services have been directed and produced under the supervision of the Mobilization with the help of research facilities and specialized knowledge brought to the projects by university scholars.

Assignments for such material have come from the following war and Government agencies: War Department, Navy Department, Treasury Department, Agriculture Department, State Department, Office of War Information, War Production Board, War Activities Committee, Office of Price Administration, United Service Organizations, Women's Auxiliary Ambulance Corps, all branches of armed services, United Nations Relief, American Red Cross, Hollywood Victory Committee.

Through its close cooperation with the scholars and scientists of the University of California, the Hollywood Writers Mobilization has been able to serve more effectively the cause of the United States both in war and peace. Through research work, seminars, and conferences it has been able to provide essential background for writers performing many kinds of services requested by the United States Government and its agencies.

Recently, in cooperation with the University of California, the Mobilization has sponsored an important new publication, the Hollywood Quarterly, published by the University of California Press. The purpose of this journal is to give mature and timely consideration to the problems of motion pictures, radio, and television. The magazine is a tangible recognition of the importance of these agencies of communication both in the field of entertainment and education. It gives intelligent consideration to the

inherent possibilities of these agencies as instruments of international understanding and world peace.

The following editorial statement published in the first issue of this new periodical is worthy of the consideration of every American:

The war, with its complex demands for indoctrination, propaganda, and specialized training, emphasized the social function of film and radio. One of the first casualties of the conflict was the "pure entertainment" myth, which had served to camouflage the social irresponsibility and creative impotence of much of the material presented on the screen and over the air.

The motion picture and the radio reflected the anxieties and hopes of the long crisis and reported the tumult and prayer that marked the day of victory. What part will the motion picture and the radio play in the consolidation of the victory, in the creation of new patterns of world culture and understanding?

The editors of the Hollywood Quarterly are not so incautious as to attempt an answer to this question. Rather, the purpose of the magazine will be to seek an answer in presenting the record of research and exploration in motion pictures and radio in order to provide a basis for evaluation of economic, social, aesthetic, educational, and technological trends. The first issue of the Hollywood Quarterly is necessarily experimental; the scope of subject matter, and the stimulating but somewhat unsystematic diversity of style and viewpoint that characterizes the various articles suggest the difficulty of selection and arrangement, and the lack of precedent even in limiting and defining the field of investigation. If a clearer understanding, not only of current techniques of the film and radio but also of the social, educational, and aesthetic functions, is arrived at, the editors will feel that the Quarterly has justified itself indeed.

The Speech President Truman Did Not Make

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am offering for the RECORD an editorial prepared by Mr. Mason H. Dobson, editor of the Beloit (Wis.) Daily News, issue of January 8, 1946, in which he presumes a speech that President Truman did not make. It is pointed out that had this speech been made as suggested by Editor Dobson, I am sure that the Congressmen would have had a real response from the people. The response to the speech made by President Truman to Members of this body I am sure was extremely light. At least, it has been in my office. Mr. Dobson gives a much better speech than President Truman. Under permission granted to revise and extend my remarks, I am including the editorial or speech in question:

BY THE WAY

(By Mason H. Dobson)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the fireside chat which President Truman did not make.)

Fellow citizens, the President of the United States is going to talk to you a few minutes and what he's going to say isn't going to be politic, as you will see. He believes this is the time to be plain, not politic.

This is not the time, your President believes, to be worrying about a second term, or a third, or a fourth. It is time to think about a second term when we have surmounted the grave and dangerous problems of the first. These problems—at this moment the greatest in the economic history of your Nation—have not yet been surmounted.

I am convinced they never will be surmounted until we mend our ways.

Since I have been President, and for many years before, Americans have been running down here to Washington to dump their problems upon the President and upon Congress. Once you folks used to settle your own problems, but lately you've quit trying. You seem to think it's the President's job, and Congress', to make life easy and safe and secure for everybody. For instance:

I have been asked to see that there is a house for everybody who wants one. But neither the President nor Congress can chop a single tree, or saw a single log, or drive a single nail. Neither the President nor Congress has the power to make a single American chop a tree, or saw a log, or drive a nail. Men must do these things; and before they do them they must want to do them. You're silly to think the President or Congress can solve the housing shortage—but you can solve it, if you want to, my fellow citizens. It won't be solved any other way; and it will take work.

A lot of you have asked me to appoint a housing expediter. But a housing expediter can't chop the trees and saw the logs and drive nails. So I'm not going to appoint a housing expediter down here in Washington. That would do no good whatever. Instead I'm going to appoint some expediters who can do some good. I'm appointing every logger, every sawmill manager and employee, every contractor, every carpenter, plumber, bricklayer, stonemason, and every man and woman in America who has anything to do with producing materials and fixtures and furnishings for homes expediters to get the job done.

There isn't anybody but you can do it, anyway, and I'm asking you to do it now. I'm putting the problem strictly to you because it's your problem and you are the only ones who can lick it, if you want to. It will take work, not more laws, to get it done.

A lot of my fellow citizens have been hurrying down here to demand that Government money—which is your money—be utilized to build houses. Yet right now your banks are filled with idle money which can be borrowed at exceptionally favorable rates of interest to build houses, if there was anything with which to build houses. While all this credit—the greatest savings assets in history—is unused, is it your idea we should spend your taxes to do the job? If this is your idea, is it a good idea? Will you let me know what you think?

You have saved a lot of money, my fellow citizens, during the war. You have it in cash and war bonds and life insurance and many other things. So I suggest you ought to be doing some worrying about inflation. I'm sure you know that scarcity of consumer goods is the greatest incentive to inflation. What are you doing to produce? You'd better begin thinking about that if you want your bonds to maintain their present values. You can make them worth 100 cents on the dollar, or a dime—take your choice. Neither Congress nor your President can take the responsibility for that decision from you, even if they wanted to.

If there is going to be a run-away race between wages and prices, we're going to have a hell of a time. Are you doing any thinking about that, my countrymen? How about price controls? Remember what happened when we took them off citrus fruits? Want that to happen with everything? It wasn't the President or Congress that boosted citrus prices? Remember?

Looking at it from the White House it seems that a lot of you folks want everybody's prices controlled but your own. You acted that way when you patronized the black markets in gasoline and tires and cheese and butter and a lot of other stuff. You wanted all the breaks, didn't you? And to hell with everybody else. Well, you've got to get over that—or take the consequences, which won't be nice.

Fact of the matter is—this is straight from the East Room—too many of you folks are thinking too much about your personal interests and not enough about your country's interests. So we can easily be headed for a general break-down in production—which means inflation. We can be headed for chaotic crippling of communications and transport. You can have it that way if you want it; you can do as you please; you will anyway. But I'm warning you.

As your President I have to warn you that chaos creates Hitlers and Mussolinis and all the other tyrants who have ended the chaos, but destroyed liberty at the same time. I am asking you to choose between the ordered self-discipline of a free people who do the things necessary to preserve their liberties, and the regimented tyranny of a dictator. Have it your own way. No one but you can decide.

There is more I could say, but I guess you know what I mean. So I'll close, but in closing let me say:

Don't any of you go worrying about my second term. I'm not. Because if we all keep headed the way we're headed now you couldn't give me a second term if you made it unanimous. If every man Jack of us, big and little and all together, don't mend our ways anybody can be your next President and welcome to it. I'll feel sorry for him.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The reasnn Mr. Truman didn't make this fireside chat is because a lot of people, including Mr. Hannegan and the Democratic National Committee, wouldn't like it.)

Disposition of Surplus Government Materials to War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1946

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following letter and resolution:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
HEADQUARTERS DEPARTMENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA,
Brookville, Pa., January 14, 1946.

Hon. L. H. GAVIN,
Member of Congress, Nineteenth District of Pennsylvania, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GAVIN: As adjutant of the twenty-seventh district, American Legion, Department of Pennsylvania, comprising the counties of Clarion, Jefferson, Armstrong, and Indiana, I am instructed to forward to you the enclosed copy of a resolution passed by the John Jacob Fisher Post, No 62, of the American Legion, Punxsutawney, Pa., relative to disposition of surplus Government material to war veterans, which resolution was unanimously adopted by the Jefferson County Council of the American Legion on Janu-

ary 10, 1946, and was on January 6, 1946, unanimously adopted and approved at a regular meeting of the twenty-seventh district of the American Legion held in Indiana, Pa.

The action of the twenty-seventh district in adopting this resolution and directing that a copy thereof be placed in the hands of our representatives in the House and Senate, represents the desires on the matters contained in the resolution of approximately 5,000 actively enrolled members of the American Legion in the four counties comprising said district.

Your prompt efforts in obtaining the necessary action demanded by the resolution will be appreciated.

Respectfully yours,

WILLIAM A. SYKES,
Adjutant, Twenty-seventh District,
Brookville, Pa.

Whereas the Congress of the United States by law has made available certain surplus materials now owned and controlled by various Government agencies; and

Whereas the law provides that veterans shall be given preference in purchasing surplus materials; and

Whereas the various Government agencies, due to inefficient help, lack of clarification of certain regulations, or by direct refusal to comply with the provisions of the law, have repeatedly withheld these materials from veterans desiring to purchase them; and

Whereas specific cases have been cited of direct refusals on the part of those in authority to dispose of certain surplus materials to veterans, at the same time disposing of these same materials to larger financial groups; and

Whereas returning veterans have been handicapped in establishing business due to lack of ability to secure these materials: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the John Jacob Fisher Post No. 62, the American Legion, That the proper authorities be asked to investigate through proper channels the reason for refusal on the part of the various Government agencies to turn over these materials to returning veterans; and be it further

Resolved, That an effort be made to secure legislation giving priority and preference to veterans in the purchase of these materials regardless of the amount involved.

The above resolution was unanimously adopted by the John Jacob Fisher Post, No. 62, the American Legion, at its regular meeting on January 4, 1946.

Attest:

J. R. DODSON,
Commander.
HORACE A. BROWN,
Adjutant.

The attached resolution was unanimously adopted at a regular meeting of the Jefferson County Council, the American Legion, on January 10, 1946, at Reynoldsville, Pa., when a majority of the members of the Jefferson County Council were present.

Attest:

JOSEPH PALAGGO,
Commander.
JAMES A. YUENGERT,
Adjutant.

The attached resolution was unanimously adopted at a regular meeting of the twenty-seventh district, the American Legion, on January 6, 1946, in Indiana, Pa., when a majority of the posts of the twenty-seventh district were represented.

Attest:

JACKSON R. DODSON,
Commander.
WILLIAM A. SYKES,
Adjutant.

Judge Elbert Gary and Benjamin Fairless

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1946

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, in addressing the House yesterday afternoon, among other things, I called the Members' attention to the fact that Judge Elbert Gary, former chairman of the board for United States Steel, was 100 percent wrong 25 years ago when he said, "Steel could not be profitably produced unless labor work 12 hours per day and 7 days per week."

I also said that Benjamin Fairless, today's president of United States Steel, was 100 percent wrong when he said United States Steel would endure great financial harm if it complied with President Truman's 18½-cents-per-hour compromise, which is a 3½-cent increase over the corporation's offer.

The editorial in the Washington Times-Herald this morning confirms my statement. The editorial is captioned "Fairless made a mistake." One paragraph in this editorial sets out the following opinion of the Times-Herald:

In our opinion, Mr. Fairless did not exhibit a high type of industrial statesmanship in turning down the President's suggestions and letting the steel strike start. Why he did it, we don't know—whether on his own initiative on orders from big United States Steel stockholders. But he needn't have done it.

The last paragraph of this editorial contains the following:

What effect Fairless' mistake will have on Fairless himself we can't predict. We think, though, that in the end he will have to back down somehow from the uncompromising position he has taken, and that he may have to resign as president of Big Steel. We do not think majority public opinion will back him up in this case. Majority public opinion is sometimes decisive in big strikes; and you can't buck the President of the United States, a powerful Nation-wide union, and majority public opinion all put together.

Reports From European Labor—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, the reports of present postwar conditions in the various European countries given to the International Labor Conference by representatives of the countries themselves are of special value to American legislators and interested citizens in disclosing the tragic problems which our allies and friends must solve in order to feed, clothe, house, and provide employment for their populations.

These statements by the Netherlands' workers' delegate, the Belgian Government delegate, the Polish Government delegate, the Greek Government delegate, and a summation by the Secretary-General of the Conference show to what an extent the loss of manpower and of equipment hinders reconstruction and how, without speedy aid from less-distressed areas, this situation may lead to widespread despair:

Mr. KUPERS (workers' delegate, Netherlands). Before dealing with the Director's report, I should like to take the opportunity of expressing my profound gratitude to the Allied armies which liberated our country and our people from the yoke of the German oppressor under which they have suffered for five long years. The people of Holland are also deeply indebted to all those countries—almost too numerous to mention—which have done so much to help to alleviate their material needs. It is due to this help that thousands of men, women and children who were threatened with death from starvation and privation have been saved.

As requested by the Acting Director in the plenary sitting of the Conference of October 22, I shall try to give a summary of the most important events since the beginning of the occupation of my country.

Of the 2,000,000 dwellings in Holland, about 85,000 have been completely destroyed, more than 35,000 have been heavily damaged, and 273,000 have suffered minor damage; some 8,000 farms have been razed to the ground. Of the large shipbuilding yards in our country, only a single one has remained intact; all the others have been either destroyed or very considerably damaged. The same applies to the port installations in Rotterdam and Amsterdam. In hundreds of factories, plant and machinery have either been destroyed or transported to Germany. The livestock of our country has decreased by 40 to 50 percent and the stocks of poultry by 90 percent. One hundred and ninety-five thousand hectares of the most fertile soil have been inundated by the Germans, a large part with salt water, which means that it will take many years before this soil can again yield its normal production. The damage done to our railway system is so great that it puts us back to the position we were in 75 years ago. The potato crop is more than 1,500,000 tons smaller than before the war, due to lack of fertilizers, and the wheat crop is 300,000 tons less. Further, some millions of bicycles and hundreds of thousands of radio sets have been confiscated by the German oppressors.

These are only a few figures, but they by no means give a complete picture. Far worse has been the fate of hundreds of thousands of our countrymen, thousands of whom have suffered in the prisons and concentration camps, or have been shot. More than 370,000 workers were deported to Germany, and forced to work for the enemy.

Most of all our countrymen of Jewish origin have suffered, and out of 120,000 of these, 95,000 were murdered in Germany and in Poland. The number of people suffering from hunger oedema in Amsterdam was, at the end of May of this year, 25,000 or 30,000, and many of these died.

Holland has been plundered and looted, but we are determined to rebuild it. For this purpose, however, we urgently need the assistance of those members of the United Nations which are in a position to help us. Thanks to the assistance rendered by a number of friendly nations, the food situation has somewhat improved. We are, however, still suffering from an appalling lack of raw materials such as iron, cotton, wood—to mention only a few—which will enable us to set our industries in working order again and to combat the increasing unemployment.

No figures as regards the present extent of unemployment can be given, because the

registers of the employment exchanges in many cities have been destroyed by the Dutch resistance movement, and because a large proportion of the staff of these institutions has had to be dismissed, owing to their collaboration with the enemy. It is no exaggeration, however, to say that there are at least half a million unemployed. Even the clearing up of devastated areas and the opening up of public works to alleviate this great unemployment is being hampered on account of the lack of the necessary tools, such as picks, shovels, wheelbarrows, trucks, etc. An additional difficulty is the lack of sufficient housing in those parts of the country which have been the hardest hit by the war.

The statements made on page 41 of the Director's report I can fully substantiate. Full employment continues to be a primary objective of the peoples of the United Nations, but the most essential thing is that those countries which have been hardest hit should obtain the necessary raw materials to enable them to set production in motion once again. Give us the tools and we will finish the job.

The trade-union movement has also suffered severely under the terror of the invader. During the first months after the surrender of Holland the behavior of the Germans was fairly correct, but this attitude changed very quickly after the military government was replaced by a civil government under the leadership of the Austrian Seiss-Inquart. Every effort was made to imbue the Dutch people, little by little, with national socialist principles. In July 1940 the executive of the Dutch Federation of Trade Unions was dismissed and replaced by Dutch Nazis. The Roman Catholic trade-union movement and the Protestant Federation were placed under the supervision of German commissars. In July 1941 the executive of these federations decided to liquidate their organizations.

Nine months later practically all the executive members of unions affiliated to the Dutch Federation of Trade Unions resigned, because they too refused to obey the Germans, and hundreds of thousands of members left their unions. The Nationalist Socialist Labor Front, which was founded on May 1, 1942, never ventured to publish its membership figures. (No. 22, pp. 134, 135.)

Mr. TROCLET (Government delegate, Belgium). In view of the sufferings of the occupied and oppressed countries, the Acting Director suggested that we should give an account of the situation in those countries. We agree that these facts should be known, so that they may contribute to the extermination of any idea of fascism and dictatorship. The facts which I shall give are far from representing all the damage we have suffered, but they correspond to what can be estimated.

The real assets destroyed in Belgium, in belgian francs of 1938, are as follows: Public services, 1,538,000,000; houses, 464,527 destroyed, value 15,150,000,000; farms, 30,800 destroyed, material loss 4,551,000,000; industrial and commercial buildings, 16,786 destroyed, value 22,650,000,000; ships and ports, 2,989,000,000; railways and transport, 12,257,000,000; roads (one-third of the bridges destroyed), 1,182,000,000. To this list can be added: Movable property, 3,874,000,000; scientific property, 914,000,000; cultural property, 10,329,000,000; values and shares, 549,000,000. The movable and immovable property damaged comes, therefore, to a total of 65,700,000,000, or about 2,300,000,000 in dollars.

But, alas, the damage sustained by Belgium is not limited to that. Two hundred and thirty thousand Belgian workers were deported to Germany for forced labor; 18,000 of these died after being deported. In addition, 30,000 Belgians were deported to France, so that the figure of deportees has risen to 260,000, or one-sixth of the working population.

It is to the honor of Belgium that the number of political prisoners was 70,000, including 20,000 Jews, or 1 in 120 of the total population, 1 in 170 if the Jews are not included. Of these, 32,000 will never come back. The number of military victims of the war is 9,000. During the first year of occupation there were 200,000 Belgian prisoners of war, and 65,000 remained prisoners for the rest of the war.

The state of health of the Belgian people has suffered during the war, especially from bad feeding. An inquiry made among the working classes of Brussels by the ministry of public health indicates that one-fifth only could show all their members in good health. There is no relation between the income of families and health. About a third have had one or more of their members affected by tuberculosis. Of young people in 1941, an inquiry shows that 53 percent suffered from underfeeding. Rationing allowed only 1,100 to 1,300 calories, whereas a growing child needed 1,800 to 2,000. In 1942, of about 14,000 children examined, 20 percent were weakly; 8.2 percent suffered from rickets, tuberculosis and other pulmonary diseases, 3.8 percent from other illnesses.

This makes a percentage of weakly and sick of 32 percent. Among young people in employment, nearly 50 percent were under weight. In 1938 there were 8,327 children under 14 suffering from tuberculosis. In 1943 the figure had almost trebled. This really disastrous situation makes us anxious for the future, for these young people are now between 20 and 23 years of age.

The spoliation of Belgium by an insidious financial policy has had serious effects for, apart from damage, destruction, and removal of goods, and the death or weakness of many people, there has been a complex system of spoliation, resulting in the removal of Belgian property and causing inflation of currency and unbacked credit. As the cost of occupation, the Germans levied 100,000,000 francs a month during the first 14 months, and then one and a half million francs, whereas the largest sums estimated by experts in accordance with the law of the nations would have been 60,000,000 francs a month.

Besides this, we had to pay six and one-quarter millions in various other ways. The Germans also deprived us of 4,223 milliards in the form of German currency left in Belgium at the time of liberation. Then the Germans took from Belgium, by means of a clearing system, for which we paid, 62,665,000,000 francs worth of services and property of various sorts. It is calculated that the various payments required by the occupying authorities amount in all to 67,500,000,000 Belgian francs at 1938 values, or $2,274,000,000. Added to the material damage, this represents more than $4,850,000,000, an enormous figure for a little country. This does not include the allowances which we have thought it necessary to pay to the widows, the orphans, and the victims of all sorts. My Department has over 19,000 claims of various kinds, mostly for occupational accidents during work in Germany.

As regards young workers, Belgium was in a particularly difficult situation when it was liberated. The enemy took our young persons and attempted to force them into the service of its war economy. The great majority of young men and girls refused to obey the enemy decrees concerning forced labor, and fled to the woods or entered the resistance movement. This caused a worsening of the moral and health situation of young persons, already affected by underfeeding and all sorts of other troubles. Since liberation we have been trying to incorporate them in the collective effort of the nation for a rapid return to normal life.

We have also attempted to protect the health of young workers more efficiently, and to undertake the vocational retraining of disabled persons. The Ministry of Labor has endeavored to secure the direct participation of young workers in its work by consulting them on the measures to be taken. An advisory committee for young persons in employment has been established, including representatives of the four great democratic organizations of young persons. (No. 24, pp. 145, 146.)

Mr. STANCZYK (Government delegate, Poland). In studying the Director's report we confirm once more the greatness and value of the work done by the United Nations members of the International Labor Organization in order to secure to the working classes of the world better conditions of life. In thanking the Director and his staff for the performance of this responsible work, most of which has been carried out under war conditions, I would like to emphasize that if the International Labor Organization has survived the war tempest without interruption, it has been due to the vitality of the ideals which are the basis of its existence and of our common aspirations, and also because of the efforts made by the Director and his collaborators connected with the realization of the tasks of our Organization.

Divided by violence into three parts by the reactionary powers of Czarist Russia, Prussia, and Austria, and after 100 years of servitude and exploitation, the Polish Nation recovered its independence after World War I. Alas, that war, conducted on Polish soil, ruined our country economically and impoverished the population. After regaining its independence, the Polish Nation began at once to reestablish itself. Twenty years only passed and Poland again became the battlefield of a second war, infinitely more terrible in its consequences for the Polish people. After the First Great War we not only had to rebuild our ruined economic life, to make productive again our arable soil made barren by the war, to reconstruct our burnt-down towns and villages, but we also wished to secure for our working masses as good conditions of existence as were possible in these unfavorable circumstances. Therefore, in the first years of our independence we did all that we could to guarantee to the Polish working people social legislation which could protect them from exploitation and make them safe.

In these first years we instituted maximum working hours for all employed in industry, trade, and transport. Under the law, workers and employees were paid overtime; for the first 2 hours exceeding 8 hours a day, time and a half, and for any further overtime and for work on Sundays and holidays, double time. Legislation was passed so that workers and employees should have holidays with pay; 8 days after 1 year of employment and 15 days after 3 years. We introduced the law concerning the protection of children and young people and of women's work. This law prohibits the employment of women and young people in work especially harmful to health, in night work and in mines. Decrees were issued concerning industrial health and safety, industrial hygiene, inspection of labor, labor courts of justice, employment exchanges, collective agreements, labor disputes, arbitration, and conciliation on the protection of agricultural workers, home workers, housekeepers, and domestic servants.

All these decrees created a charter of rights protecting the Polish workers against arbitrariness and exploitation by employers. And the laws which secured to all persons gainfully employed free medical care, cash allowances in case of disease and in case of continuous inability to work due to old age, industrial accident or invalidity, retirement

and invalidity pensions, preserved the workers from misery during times of unemployment or during inability to work. (No. 24, pp. 149, 150.)

Mr. ARGYROPOULOS (interpretation) (Government delegate, Greece). Figures show that the three occupations which Greece suffered—the Italian, the German, and the Bulgarian—have created enormous havoc. Here are some figures. Out of 6,500 towns and villages in Greece, 1,339 have been destroyed; 870 of these wholly wiped out, and 1,200,000 people are homeless. From 1941 to 1942 there were seven times more deaths than in normal times. Among 7,500,000 inhabitants there are 400,000 cases of tuberculosis, and one-third of our population are suffering from malaria. As regards transport, we have lost 70 to 90 or 100 percent of our railways, shipping, and aircraft. Our power stations have been destroyed. The production of the only two products which can bring us foreign currency, currants and tobacco, has been reduced by 50 to 85 percent. (No. 29, p. 180.)

Mr. TOTH (interpretation) (Government delegate, Hungary). I do not want to give you an unduly highly colored picture of the disastrous situation of my country, but I must give you a few details to indicate the extent of our economic distress. In the first place, the industry, which was one of the main sources of our national income, has lost half of its producing power. A large number of factories were either destroyed or had their equipment carried away by the Germans. Some 40,000 trucks loaded with machinery, industrial products, and raw materials were taken away from our country and are now in Germany, Austria, or Czechoslovakia. As to our means of transport, we have left only 10 percent of the locomotives and 25 percent of the other rolling stock which we had before the war.

In Budapest 5,500 houses were completely destroyed and over 30,000 were seriously damaged. In agriculture the situation is even worse. This year's harvest produced only 8,000,000 quintals of wheat, whereas the amount necessary for us is 20,000,000 quitals. Seventy-five percent of our livestock has disappeared. In view of these facts it is not surprising that the country is suffering from a tremendous shortage of food and essential products. This has caused a great rise in prices, which is likely to give rise to social disturbances.

As a result our currency is losing all its value and its purchasing power is falling steadily. A fortnight ago a kilogram of flour cost 1,000 pengoes and a box of matches 100. Before the war the American dollar was worth 5.25 pengoes. The official rate of exchange today is 8,250 pengoes to the dollar, and on the black market its value has reached a figure which I should be ashamed to admit. Thus we are in the middle of a period of inflation. Forty-two thousand million pengoes in the form of notes had been issued at the end of September, and it is said that a further milliar is issued every day.

The prospects for the winter are gloomy, particularly as regards heating and food. Our economic recovery is entirely dependent upon assistance from abroad, but in addition to systematic measures for reconstruction we need emergency assistance. In this connection I should like to appeal to the representatives of UNRRA, who are here today, to consider the possibility of some immediate action to reduce the suffering of a large section of the population of Hungary. (No. 29, page 182.)

The SECRETARY-GENERAL. I should like to thank all those speakers from European countries who responded to my invitation to give the Conference an account of the conditions in their countries and the problems by which they are faced. It is of interest to note that while they were speaking here a debate on the same subject was taking place in the House of Commons in England, and the eloquent speech of Mr. Ernest Bevin, the British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, on that occasion indicates how fully the British Government is alive to the gravity of the situation.

I believe the speeches delivered here will help to bring the problem into a still sharper focus. Seen as it has been put before us, country by country, rather than in a series of generalizations, it makes an infinitely deeper human appeal to which I am sure the general conscience of the world will respond. It is my intention to bring together these speeches in some suitable way so that they may be available for detailed study. Certainly, the picture they reveal is somber. But hard though it may be, nowhere do we find it tinged with the blackness of despair.

As Mr. Godart so movingly said, "The spirit of resistance against oppression has kept its full ardor and its readiness to accept all necessary sacrifices, and so against the hard picture I have painted must be set our energetic confidence in our destiny, our will to recovery, our faith in international cooperation."

It goes without saying that in concentrating attention on Europe's problems, the problems of other regions in the world must not be forgotten. They, too, call for understanding and action. There can also be no question of priority, of leaving them aside until Europe's problems have been solved. In a world which is one, the solution of the problems of one region is dependent on the solution of the problems in the others.

The oneness of the world makes all of equal importance and urgency.

Good Advice From Jim Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1946

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Watertown (N. Y.) Times of December 13, 1945:

GOOD ADVICE FROM JIM FARLEY

Just before leaving New York City for an up-State tour, James A. Farley gave some good advice to Tammany Hall. He said that the Democratic city ticket had been elected by an overwhelming majority but that it would be turned over 4 years hence by just as overwhelming a vote if it failed in its duty to provide good, efficient, and honest government.

In other words, Mr. Farley said, "It is up to Tammany Hall." The people have given it the responsibility and on the manner in which it carries out this responsibility will depend its chances in the next election. If it fails, Farley said, "It will be cast out into exterior darkness, as it has been in the past, and fittingly so."

No one can say that Jim Farley is not a practical politician but because he is practical he knows what others less skilled in the art of politics do not know. That is that good government is the best politics. LaGuardia was elected three times as mayor of New York over Tammany opposition because he gave the people good government. He proved that the Tammany majority is not a firm one. After 12 years, the Democrats return to control the city hall. As Farley expresses it, they are on trial.

For one credited which seeking the Democratic nomination for governor next year, Mr. Farley's speech was a courageous one and yet it is entirely in keeping with his character. Tammany will do well to heed the advice of one who speaks from the experience of years in national, State, and municipal politics.

Amendment of Labor Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, there is constantly coming to my office resolutions and expressions of the people of my State, urging that some action be taken by this Congress to level off the difficulties that prevail in the country between those who employ and those who work.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution which came to me from the Chamber of Commerce of Devils Lake, N. Dak.:

Whereas after 4 years of the most horrible conflict in history we have emerged victorious only to be threatened by the paralysis of business and industry throughout the Nation, caused by the uncontrolled ambitions and demands of certain unions; and

Whereas almost from its inception business has been subject to Government regulation and held accountable for its acts on every score; and

Whereas unless Congress places appropriate controls on unions, the very foundation of the structure of American business will be destroyed by the proposal of the unions to seize the books of business through the innocent-sounding Government fact-finding panels, virtually permitting them to dictate the specifications for production, sales, and administration of business, and thus rupture the American pattern of free enterprise that has developed the highest standard of living and wages on earth today: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Devils Lake Chamber of Commerce in meeting on January 15, 1946, does urgently recommend to the delegation from North Dakota in the Congress of the United States that the members of such delegation exert all possible effort to the enactment of legislation to:

1. Adjust basic labor laws to recognize industry as well as labor.

2. Prohibit union contracts in restraint of trade.

3. Establish effective penalties and preventive measures to avoid breaking of contracts by labor.

4. Require the same degree of legal responsibility of labor unions as from industry.

5. Make closed-shop contracts illegal.

6 Make legislative corrections of Supreme Court ruling permitting interference with traffic on highways.

7. Prohibit union contributions to political campaigns on the same basis as corporations.

DEVILS LAKE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
LYLE HARRINGTON, *President*,
DONALD J. DONAHUE, *Secretary*.

Address by Hon. Thomas J. Lane, of Massachusetts, Concerning Victory Clothing Collection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an address which I delivered over radio station WLAW, Lawrence, Mass., recently, on the victory clothing collection for overseas relief:

This is a white Christmas and a peaceful Christmas, the first one we have enjoyed since 1940. The scourge of war is over and a heavy burden has been lifted from our hearts. The night of wintry black-out are past and the windows of stores and homes are filled with friendly light and not with the darkness of fear. For tens of millions of our people, the waiting and the dreading is gone and now we look forward with hope and confidence to living. Half of our boys in service are back in civilian life to enjoy the first Yuletide at home in several years. The ports of Boston, New York, San Francisco, and Los Angeles are filled with transports, daily bringing back thousands of our gallant men and women fron the far corners of the earth. The railroads are taxed to capacity and more, shuttling back and forth all over the country, bringing our loved ones from the ports of disembarkation to the warmth and affection and magic of home. This Christmas, peace is more than a word. It is joyous relief, welling up from the hearts of all.

The people, freed from anxiety and sacrifice, have gone out on a shopping spree that has broken all records. It is because we want to share this Christmas in happiness, knowing that our men have left the fighting and the dying behind them. We celebrate a peace-crowning victory.

We are thankful for these blessings which are ours. We should oe doubly thankful for that which we have been spared. The war did not ravage our women and our children, it did not lay waste our homes and our factories. The war did not touch us with hunger, disease, and exposure to the elements.

Let us remember that it has left this curse upon hundreds of millions of our fellow human beings. The war is over, but for many of them, the humble people all over the earth, the suffering has just begun. Grim winter has come to them through the broken windows and shell-torn walls and bomb-gutted roofs of places they once called home. There is not enough fuel, not enough clothing, not enough food for them to survive. Sick, starving, shivering people cannot work, they cannot start the long road back to reconstruction. Without help, they can only suffer and die.

This is the Christmas facing most of Europe and Asia. It is not a pretty picture, but it must be faced. The tragic misery of it we can understand only in a small measure because we are not in that situation. Yet, we must try to understand it and do something about it, for it is our responsibility. In this one world, these are our brothers. They were our allies, France, Poland, Italy, Greece, China and the Philippines; these will suffer most.

While we in America are happy and prosperous in the peace so recently won, let us never forget that this peace is uncertain while hundreds of millions of others suffer. To insure the peace, we've got to help them. There is no other way.

Six years and more of war—China had been fighting the invader since 1931—have left a terrible toll. What was built up through generations of labor, has been destroyed and the people have been reduced to a primitive level of existence. Last week, in the city of Shanghai, 70 bodies were picked up from the streets, victims of hunger and exposure.

In Europe, which felt the full fury of war, the destruction has been appalling. The people beg for food and clothes. Tens of thousands of babies will certainly die this winter when they might have—when they could be saved.

Take Normandy, which is a food-producing area. There are no pots or stoves. Trucks and cars have no fuel or tires. There are no shoes or blankets. Hundreds of thousands of people have no change of underclothing. In one city, out of 18,000 houses, 11,000 by actual count, have been destroyed. In the Calvados Department, corresponding to one of our States, 450 out of 765 villages were ruined. In one village there is not a single house left. Paris is hungrier than at any time since the siege of 1870. France may soon have nearly half of her industrial labor force on the dole. Shipping space is not available to bring in the raw materials without which men cannot work to manufacture the garments they urgently need.

Yet France is faring better than Belgium. The great textile factories of this country are locked up. They can't produce without cotton and wool. They have no money to buy from us. And Europe needs clothing even more than she needs food.

In Poland the Nazis methodically stole everything, determined to wipe out the people through hunger and exposure. In Yugoslavia, there are no matches, salt, needles, or leather. Five hundred thousand destitute children who have survived their parents, are roaming the country half naked. The clothing of the whole population is hardly better; it has been estimated that 80 p cent of all Yugoslavs are in rags. In Greece the economic breakdown became so final that the whole nation had to be put on relief. Only yesterday, it was announced from Washington that the demands for aid from the stricken millions of Europe and Asia, is far beyond the resources of UNRRA.

Two million tons of civilian supplies have been pumped into Italy. The country, however, was so ravaged by bitter fighting, that this relief is merely a drop in the bucket. Many an Italian lives on what the United States soldiers leave on their plates. Much of Italy is mountainous, which means cold at this time of the year, yet hundreds of thousands of the people have no shoes. In the great city of Rome, before the splendid monuments, you will find women and children begging for food and clothing. Tuberculosis is mounting rapidly in that unfortunate country.

A short time ago, I was approached by the representatives of a local Italian-American Society. Stirred by the tales of suffering that came to them in letters from the old country, these men resolved to do something about it. They conducted a campaign among their members to raise a relief fund, and they collected a sizeable sum. How to employ the money was now the question. It would be foolish to send the money for it would be swallowed up in the black market overseas, where the few shoes bring $50 and more a pair. The only solution was to send goods direct for the relief of the town in Italy where many of these men were born. What goods? Any kind of goods which the people could use to make clothing for themselves. Send the goods—the Italians will do the rest. But it is not so easy to buy a large quantity of goods, even in America. Knowing this, the members of the committee told me that they would be grateful if they could find a way to buy the linings of surplus United States Army overcoats, the linings which the poor people in the old country could make up into suits and dresses. Think of it. Grateful for the linings of overcoats. I quote this to bring home to you the desperate predicament of Europe and what some of our citizens are trying to do in order to relieve this suffering. It is a responsibility which all of us must share.

The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Adminjstration, to which all the United Nations contribute, is working hard to cope with this grim and staggering problem. But it cannot do the job alone.

Accordingly, in April of this year, a clothing collection drive for overseas relief, duplicated in other United Nations, was held in our country. To this you responded generously. Twenty-five million children, men and women, in the war-torn countries will have received clothing donated by you, but many times 25 million are still destitute, and winter is upon them.

Another desperate call for help is going out to you. In a letter written to the Hon. Henry J. Kaiser, who is national chairman for the forthcoming drive, President Harry S. Truman wrote: "Without adequate clothing and other necessities of life to sustain victims of war on the long road to rehabilitation there can be no peace. I therefore, ask you and the more than 7,000 local chairman of the United National Clothing Collection to lead the Nation in another clothing collection drive for the relief of victims of war."

Get ready now. When will this clothing be collected? From January 7 to January 31, 1946. This time, the Nation-wide goal has been raised to 100,000,000 garments for infants, children, men, and women, to be distributed free and without discrimination of any kind in every war-swept country.

What type of garments will be collected? Coats, suits, trousers, skirts, dresses, shirts, sweaters, underwear, shoes, overshoes, rubbers, knitwear, pajamas, night gowns, blankets, bedding, piece goods, remnants, and draperies. The following items are not desired: Straw hats, toys, feather beds, pillows, mattresses, novelties, and household furnishings. What is needed most is used clothing for both winter and summer wear. Although clothing need not be in perfect repair, it must be useful to the people who will receive it. All types of washable garments should be washed before they are given to the collection, but need not be ironed. Other garments should be clean and sanitary, but need not be drycleaned before being contributed.

John J. Kane of 80 Lynn Street, Lawrence, is chairman of the local committee. He is being assisted by a large and hard-working committee which has the active support of our churches, our schools, our theaters, our local government and all of our social, fraternal, and charitable organizations.

But let all of us start today. Look in your closets, look in the attic, for the clothing and the shoes you put away but which you know you will never wear again. Don't let this clutter go to waste. To tens of millions of homeless people in Europe and Asia the old clothes we keep to feed the moths will spell the difference between life and death. So let us put these discarded clothes to work for suffering humanity.

This is our chance to contribute to the making of the peace, in which all of us have a stake. This peace will not happen; it must be earned by understanding and mutual helpfulness. We are not being asked to give money, but only the outmoded clothes which we wouldn't care to put on. They are of no use to us, but they can and will protect the

tragic victims of war who have been stripped of all they possess.

Peace on earth, good will toward men. In 2 days we honor the birth of Him who came to save mankind. In the spirit and the practice of His teaching, let us do our part to help those less fortunate than ourselves. For He came to show the way. With the grace of Christian love, He went forth to heal the sick, to feed the hungry, and to clothe the naked.

On Christmas Day we are happy. We celebrate the birth of our Savior and our hearts go out in Christian fellowship to all. And as we move on to the beginning of the new year and a new way of life, let all of us make this resolution: "That we shall be ready to give, as generously as we can, to the victory clothing collection for overseas relief."

In the name of the child Jesus, let us help the children of men in all ravaged lands, who will freeze if we deny them.

For there, but for the grace of God, go we.

Is Uncle Sam Becoming Sappy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1946

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with my unanimous-consent request, which was granted, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement on the proposed British loan, by our former colleague, the able and fearless Hon. Hamilton Fish, who served with high honor and great distinction in the House of Representatives for many years.

The statement is concise, and does not mince words, and in my opinion reflects the overwhelming patriotic sentiment of the American people:

IS UNCLE SAM BECOMING SAPPY?

(By Hamilton Fish, Member of Congress, 1920–44)

When will the American people wake up and put a snuffer on the administration spenders who are trying to give away our money to every foreign power that comes begging and pleading poverty? If we open up our Treasury doors to the British, we will have set the pattern for the rest of the European nations to come to Washington, hat in hand, and request additional billions of American dollars. Applications for foreign loans, once the precedent is established, may total $25,000,000,000.

We spent three hundred billions to win the war—more than the combined expenditures of all our allies. We have canceled most of the lend-lease aid and asked for nothing in return, which is exactly what we got—nothing at all.

It is now proposed by the administration to lend Britain $3,750,000,000 with no interest payment for 5 years. The proposal, in my opinion, is the height of deception and is virtually a fraud on the American people.

It is quite obvious, under such a provision, that the loan will not be repaid. The British Labor Party now in power obtains the use of billions of dollars to socialize private industries in England and the Conservative Party refuses to vote approval of the loan so that if it returns to power in 5 years it can easily repudiate the entire loan.

Most economists anticipate a world-wide financial panic in 5 years after production has caught up and surpassed the buying demands. In that case the proposed British loan will be worthless and we will again become Uncle Sap holding the money bag, both in peace and in war. If, of course, we should suggest even payment of the interest at a later date, we would again become Uncle Shylock. The British Government offered a loan of $40,000,000 to Greece a few days ago. What kind of a merry-go-round is this? Why must we always pay for European wars we did not start, and continue to be the international Santa Claus?

The only way to end this duplicity and giving away of our taxpayers money is for the American people, regardless of party, to write or wire their Senators and Congressmen to vote against any loans or gifts to any foreign nations.

The Congress has an obligation to put our own financial house in order, stop deficit spending, balance the Budget, and provide jobs and loans for our returning veterans. Why should Congress approve a loan to Britain to help socialize England without interest for 5 years and make our own World War veterans pay 4 percent on governmental loans? It does not make sense.

A few selfish business interests who may profit temporarily by loans to Great Britain are spreading propaganda for the proposal. What about free American wage earners whose jobs and wage scale will be lowered to meet the competition from British and other foreign nations subsidized by our money?

I am bitterly and unreservedly opposed to loans to socialize Britain or to Soviet Russia to communize Europe. Let us give a billion dollars or more to feed and clothe the starving and destitute war-stricken people of Europe, but not one dollar to socialize or communize Europe.

The vote in the Congress will be close. The American people must snap out of their apathy before it is too late and serve notice on their Members of Congress that they were sent to Washington to safeguard the United States Treasury and not to join in raids on it for the benefit of the British, Russians, or any other foreign nation. If Congress insists on spending money which we will have to collect from the American people, as it is not in the Treasury, why not give preference to our old folks and aged who helped to build up America and will spend it in this country and not throw it away all over the world. If we loan billions to foreign nations we will have no funds to extend social security or unemployment benefits for our own people. Certainly Stalin would take $6,000,000,000 without a thought of paying it back. Why not? It would be in strange accord with the diabolical advice of both Lenin and Stalin to cause practical bankruptcy to make would-be victim nations fully ripe for Communist seizure. Let us stop our steady move to national bankruptcy.

If Congress insists on making the British loan under the whip and spur of the administration spenders, then a provision should be included giving us permanent possession of all the British islands off our eastern coast which are of no economic or financial use to her, but are necessary for our own future security. There should also be a proviso that not one dollar will be paid until all British and Indian troops are withdrawn from the aggressive and imperialistic war in Java.

In all fairness, the Congress, if it decides to approve the loan, should authorize a special bond issue payable solely out of interest and capital payments by the British. This would enable the extreme pro-British and adherents of the loan to buy to their hearts' content subject to the risk. The same type of bond issue should be authorized for Russia and other foreign nations.

There will always be an America, if our own international spenders do not give it away.

For whom were our war veterans fighting—America or Great Britain and Soviet Russia? The American people must decide without reservations whether they intend to put the interests of America first or that of foreign nations.

The time has come to try to save America and our own free institutions and stop subsidizing socialism, communism, and totalitarianism abroad by siphoning our wealth into Britain, Russia, and other foreign nations knowing full well that it will not be repaid. We were not repaid for loans made after the last war except from Finland, and there is less chance of getting anything back this time but ill will and ingratitude from the proposed loans.

GI Protests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1946

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Clinton (Mass.) Daily Item:

WHO'S RUNNING THE COUNTRY? ASKS GRIFFIN WHO SAYS GI'S PROTESTS ARE AIMED AT POLITICAL RUSE TO ENFORCE PEACE DRAFT

John Griffin, of the Washington (D. C.) Bureau of the Boston Post, said, in Sunday's edition:

One of the causes of unrest among soldiers who are at present in foreign lands is the belief that the Army is using them in its campaign to put over peacetime compulsory military training. All observers in the areas where the unrest has been marked, are agreed on that.

There are other reasons, of course. One is that under the system adopted, favored soldiers can be sent home, just as was the son of a general brought home from the Pacific for discharge in order to resume his studies at medical school.

Another is the antics of officers who have no regard for the welfare of their men and the wide gap between the way enlisted men live and the way officers get along.

ONE BIG REASON

But the most compelling reason for the massing of men in protest is the feeling that they are being used, that the Army leaders are using them to put over the peacetime training system and that the State Department is using them as a political weapon.

Eventually there will have to be a showdown, and it could be that the uprising protest in the Philippines and other areas will force it soon. It could be that the average GI and the average man at home is beginning to see through the whole Army scheme to put over compulsory training in peacetime, and further, is beginning to realize what it would be like under that system.

These protests are not something that can readily be dismissed as unimportant. Their importance can hardly be estimated, for they reflect a state of mind which thus far in our national existence has been markedly American. That is, the reluctance to have anything to do with foreign countries beyond what is necessary in the ordinary life of nations.

In other words, Americans never have wanted to be monkeying around in other

countries under control of military men, and they don't want to now. They will do what they feel is necessary to win a war and to hold up our end, but they won't allow themselves to be used as diplomatic weapons or economic weapons.

Whether you like it or not, they are not internationalists. They think the United States is a pretty sweet country, and they don't want any part of other lands. When their work is done in winning a war, they want to get home.

Home means something to them, and all the passionate utterances of those who would put over the one world idea won't convince them that home is all countries or any country.

KNOW THE SCORE

They know the score pretty well, too. When they are told, as they and other Americans were last week, that although enlistments are breaking all records the numbers still fell far short of meeting Army requirements, they undoubtedly check the figures against earlier statistics and statements.

When Army leaders first went before congressional committees to sell them the need for peacetime compulsory military service, some of the Members of Congress suggested that inducements be made for enlistments.

The Army leaders agreed that they would try out a plan, although they were not keen for it. But public pressure prevented them from putting over the compulsory system, and they undertook the enlistment project.

So, right after VJ-day, President Truman announced, in urging continuation of the draft, that 50,000 men a month were needed to cover the needs of replacements in the armed forces without interfering with the return of the men who had served.

RECORD ENLISTMENTS

Well, what are the figures? According to the Army, enlistments in the 5 months since the fighting stopped will be 400,000, although that does not represent the complete totals.

And how does that average up? It averages 80,000 per month, which is 30,000 per month more than President Truman said the Army would need.

The War Department is going to review the entire demobilization situation. When that is undertaken some of the officials ought to try to keep in mind that the troops they are dealing with are not slaves, nor are they regimented peasants who think all there is in life is deference to upper classes.

They are young Americans whose heritage is freedom and equality; young men who are willing to fight against any odds to preserve their country; patriotic youths who can't see the necessity for their occupying friendly lands thousands of miles away from home when the war has been over 5 months.

They are the men described by General Styer, Philippine commander, and General MacArthur in a joint statement as "good men who have performed magnificently under campaign conditions and inherently are not challenging discipline or authority."

It is only a few days ago that General McNarney, American commander in Germany, said that not more than 300,000 men would be needed by July 1 for occupational purposes, and General MacArthur had previously stated that no more than 200,000 will be needed in Japan.

NO NEED OF DRAFT

Why, then, is it necessary to keep hundreds of thousands of men in the Philippines and in places where there are more than enough already? Why, then, does General Eisenhower have to decide suddenly that more men ought to be sent home, and why does the War Department have to review its whole program of demobilization?

Why, for that matter, is there any necessity of continuing the draft? No necessity has been shown. Of course, some of the important people in the War Department didn't like it, and the State Department also was upset when General MacArthur cut the essential occupying force to 200,000.

They apparently would prefer people to believe that many more are needed in occupied areas than are actually necessary, in view of commanders who are in the best position to know. The facts haven't yet revealed the necessity for more men than are being obtained from voluntary enlistments.

Yet practically every one of the generals insists that the draft be continued and that further means of delaying discharges should be used. They all insist, too, that peacetime compulsory military training is needed.

But they are doing their own cause a lot of harm in that respect. The draft system ends on May 15, according to law, and, of course, the Army wants to do everything possible to have it extended. They would prefer that it be continued until a permanent conscription system has been put into effect.

WHO'S RUNNING THE COUNTRY?

You'd think the Army was running the country if you noted all their demands. They want to decide how long the draft shall continue, whether troops now in service shall be discharged, and when and whether the United States should compel the youth of this country to undergo military training all through the peacetime years.

That isn't their function at all. Those things belong to the people represented by Congress. The Army should be told by the Congress how big it should be.

The question of compulsory training is one for Congress, despite the suspicious unanimity of opinion in high Army circles.

Who Made the Money in This War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1946

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, there are many citizens who are disturbed and perturbed by the spectacle of the vast fortunes made during this war by profiteers and racketeers. Many will recall that all veterans organizations adopted resolutions at annual conventions each year, following the end of World War I, in which they proclaimed their relentless hostility to the making of profits out of wars. The American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars suggested that we draft property as well as manpower in the next war. This was in the period of 1919 to 1940. But when 1940 came, somehow or other the Congress allowed the manufacturers to make the usual commercial killing out of war. With great reluctance and under terrific pressure the Congress finally was compelled to impose an excess-profits tax running up, in some cases, to 90 percent. Great Britain had, from the inception of the war, levied a 100-percent excess-profits tax in addition to granting to a national commission the power arbitrarily to disallow certain corporate expenses claimed against tax charges. Meanwhile we permitted numerous loopholes. Salaries were raised enormously at the beginning, although frozen later. We proceeded to extend the draft, we raised from $30 to $50 a month the compensation paid the inductee. The question arises, Who made the money in this war? In an article in the January 1946 issue of This Month magazine I have discussed this subject. The article is as follows:

WHO MADE THE MONEY IN THIS WAR?

(By Representative JOHN M. COFFEE)

When the full bill for participation in the war is presented to the American people, it is expected to total $336,000,000,000. That is almost 11 times the cost of World War I. It is the equivalent of taking $2,551 from the pocket of every man, woman, and child in this country.

That, in dollars and cents, is the price we have paid for victory. It does not take into account the cost in human lives; 259,637 killed, 35,328 missing, 651,934 wounded. It does not include the suffering, the sacrifice, and ultimate waste of war.

There is another side to the ledger, the credit side. For there are those in the United States, as in other countries, who have made an enormous profit from the war.

In the years that preceded World War II a series of congressional investigations uncovered startling evidence of World War I profiteering. Public opinion was shocked and outraged, even though only a meager trickle of the sordid details ever reached it. Evidence was produced, for example, that:

British, French, German, and American industrialists made a profit from every soldier killed on either side.

Four years of war profits created 22,000 new millionaires in this country.

During the 4 war years—1915–18—United States industry made a profit, after taxes, of $28,500,000,000. Net earnings of United States corporations in those 4 years were as high as in the preceding 10 years.

By 1926, according to a Federal Trade Commission report, 59 percent of the Nation's material was in the hands of 1 percent of the population; 31 percent was owned by 12 percent of the people; the vast majority (87 percent) owned less than 10 percent of the Nation's wealth.

About 30 percent of the national wealth was owned by corporations. Some 70 percent of all corporate stock was owned by only 1 percent of the stockholders.

Thus, as the Nation increased in wealth, its people as a whole became poorer. More economic power passed into the hands of fewer men. War had accelerated this process.

Just after Pearl Harbor the late President Roosevelt pledged that there would be no profiteering from this war. It was precisely to prevent the excesses of World War I that Congress imposed heavy war taxes (in some cases four times the prewar level) and applied a surplus-profits tax to all corporate earnings.

The extent to which this noble purpose was fulfilled has just been revealed in separate studies made by Government and private agencies. Here are some of their conclusions:

Net profits (about $56,000,000,000) made by United States corporations during World War II far exceeded those recorded in any similar period in history.

During this war the number of billion-dollar companies in the United States increased by 11, making a total of 43.

Despite high war and excess-profits taxes, net profits after taxes of industry (1940–45) averaged 250 percent above prewar levels.

Since Pearl Harbor (1942–45) profits after taxes averaged 300 percent above prewar levels.

But even this picture is not complete, because it is an over-all picture. It includes all corporations, big and small alike,

and many of the small ones went out of business during the war years or only just broke even. This means that if we consider only those corporations and industries which recorded a profit, the size of their earnings will stagger us even more.

Take a look at these percentage increases in 1944 earnings, compiled by the OPA. Compare with average prewar (1936–39) earnings in the same industries.

	Percent
Motor-vehicle parts	596
Iron, steel, and byproducts	252
Lumber and timber byproducts	1,064
Electrical machinery	434
Communications equipment	521
Industrial electrical equipment	399
Other electrical products	772
Nonelectrical machinery	360
Engines and turbines	2,431
Transportation equipment	658
Aircraft and parts	1,686
Railroad equipment	318
Food and kindred products	150
Meat products	271
Apparel	280
Textile-mill products	522
Petroleum and coal products	159
Rubber products	698
Bituminous and other soft coal	1,148

And here is how the special Senate committee investigating the national defense program summed up the situation:

"The Planning Division of the War Production Board has estimated that net profits, after renegotiation and taxes, of the war industries (metals, chemicals, petroleum, and rubber) for the four war years will be about $16,000,000,000. Since the proportion of civilian business in these industries had been very small, almost all these profits may be regarded as coming from Government business. Such profits are about twice the prewar average of such industries."

The Senate committee also investigated the relative earnings of the 100 United States corporations which had the largest volume of war business. They discovered that, after all deductions for wartime taxes in 1942, 3 companies made more than 10 times their average prewar net profit; 19 earned more than three times prewar profits; 24 others between one and three times normal profits. Of the remainder, 12 companies which had shown average deficits during the prewar base period, earned in 1942 a net profit of between one and eighteen million dollars.

Many of us have criticized organized labor for striking in wartime and believe even now that labor demands for increased wages are unreasonable. Unions have been accused of being unpatriotic. But let's look at their side of the picture.

The cost of living, as every housewife knows, has gone up tremendously during the war years. A large part of the increased wages has gone simply to pay for that inflation. The unions, according to their own research bureaus and the evidence of Government agencies, know that the corporations have been making these fantastic profits.

A study, called Five Years of War Profits, published by the Research Bureau of the United Steelworkers of America (CIO), reveals further facts on the earnings of big corporations. It may be assumed that the unions base their decisions to strike or not to strike on these revelations. The study claims that 200 great steel corporations earned more than $2,000,000,000 in open and concealed profits during the war. From 1940 to 1945 the industry averaged a profit, after taxes, of $245,000,000 per year. Total reported profits in the steel industry, after taxes, for comparative periods are:

1936–39	$576,000,000
1940–44	$1,225,000,000
Increase (percent)	113

The United Auto Workers Union has released a study of 26 aircraft companies and their earnings during comparative years. The percentage increase in this industry is even more staggering.

1936–39	$20,554,274
1941–44	$173,598,422
Increase (percent)	745

If you have ever wondered how to make ends meet after you've paid your taxes, and how an extra few dollars a week would help that household budget, you'll be interested in these statistics on some of the aircraft industries. All these are profits after taxes and include postwar and contingency reserves.

	1936–39 average	1941–44 average	Percent increase
Bell Aircraft	$32,493	$3,845,404	11,743
Bellanca Aircraft	6,153	323,336	5,155
Bendix Aviation	2,480,661	17,883,226	621
Boeing Airplane	−840,038	7,294,040	
Consolidated Vultee	823,702	16,957,763	1,959
Curtiss-Wright	2,954,566	[1]25,351,791	758
Glenn L. Martin	2,083,787	13,569,776	551
Wright Aeronautical	2,544,172	[1]11,517,484	353

[1] Average of 3 years.

While making these profits, however, most companies were not generous with their stockholders. Dividend payments have by no means kept pace with the sharp advance in net profits. If they had, distribution of wealth would have been a little wider. The fact is that corporations paid out a much smaller proportion of their profits in dividends during the war than ever before. Prior to 1940, dividend payments were often two-thirds of net profits; since then they have averaged less than half. While the net income of incorporated business increased 134 percent between 1939 and 1944, dividends in the same period increased only 18 percent.

Reason? The conservative financial magazine Business Week of August 11, 1945, attributes it to the belief that high dividends at a time when war business alone was furnishing most corporate profits would invite public criticism.

Be that as it may, the fact remains that management had at its disposal a working capital 88 percent greater than in 1936. The figure in dollars had jumped from twenty-five billion in 1939 to forty-seven billion in 1945. One result was that corporations had to raise very little new capital for wartime expansion. At the same time, losses in enemy countries were written off or provided for through reserves. Investment in new plants was kept below depreciation charges, written off against taxes, charged to current operating expenses, or financed directly by the Federal Government.

And thus corporations have piled up $31,000,000,000 in undistributed profits and reserves during the war. They have also paid off a billion dollars in long-term debts.

A break-down of assets in the 200 great steel companies, as published by the United Steelworkers of America, further clarifies the situation.

	January 1940	January 1945	Increase
			Percent
Total assets	$4,860,000,000	$6,000,000,000	22
Dividend payments	419,000,000	765,000,000	82
Working capital	1,200,000,000	2,000,000,000	68
General reserves	103,000,000	395,000,000	288
Undistributed profits	585,000,000	1,000,000,000	81
Total financial resources	689,000,000	1,600,000,000	131
Funded debt	903,000,000	652,000,000	−28
Excess working capital over funded debt	308,000,000	1,393,000,000	363

The above figures give you a picture of the steel industry only. Others, of course, have fared as well. The 11 corporations that graduated into the billionaire class during the war make a total of 43 companies with assets of more than a billion dollars. Forty-third on this list is the Ford Motor Co., with total assets of a mere $1,021,325,159. But Ford is exclusively a family holding, while the others are owned by numerous stockholders.

According to a United Press survey, some of the giants and their assets are:

Metropolitan Life, almost $7,000,000,000.

Bell Telephone, more than $6,000,000,000.

Prudential, more than $5,000,000,000.

Chase National Bank, more than $5,000,000,000.

Pennsylvania Railroad, almost $3,000,000,000

Standard Oil of New Jersey, $2,400,000,000.

General Motors, $2,100,000,000.

American industry enters the postwar world with a greatly expanded plant and with tools and equipment far surpassing anything it had in the past. According to a report issued by the War Production Board, more than $25,000,000,000 worth of new plants and equipment were added to the industrial capacity in this country between 1940 and 1944. The Government contributed directly more than two-thirds of the total investment involved.

At the end of 1939 there were 934,000 machine tools in place in this country; by 1944 the number had risen to 1,400,000, an increase of nearly 50 percent. General Motors had 75,000 machine tools in 1940; in October 1943 it reported 143,774 machine tools in place.

Even after industry has financed its own transition to a peacetime production, equal at least to the prewar level of 1941, it will have on hand a fund, estimated by United States Department of Commerce economists in 1944, as between ten and twenty billion dollars left over for plant and other expansion.

It will also get from the Government a flat 10-percent rebate on wartime payments of excess-profits tax as a sort of severance pay to compensate it for the cessation of war contracts. This sum alone amounts to about $2,840,000,000, and is equal to more than half the total net corporate earnings in the banner year of 1937.

In addition, under the carry-back and carry-forward provisions of the excess-profits tax, United States corporations have accumulated with the Government a sort of unemployment insurance. Should the profits of any company in the next 10 years drop below its so-called normal profit level, it is entitled to a cash refund from the United States Treasury to make good these losses. That refund cannot be greater than the total income and excess-profits tax paid during the war. Theoretically, industry has thus a reserve fund of $62,000,000,000 to offset reconversion losses.

The steel companies, for example, face reconversion with savings (net working capital) of $2,000,000,000. Their flat 10-percent rebate from the Treasury will amount to about $200,000,000 more. If they fail to show a cent of profit in 1946, the Treasury must give them a rebate of $149,000,000. This last rebate guarantees them 29 percent more profits than they averaged during the years of peace.

Nowhere in the world, in any period of history, have comparable material gains been registered by industry. The war presumably has wiped out German and Japanese industry. Principal industries in Allied countries have suffered so heavily that it will take them a decade or more to regain even prewar production.

American business today is in the position of completely dominating world trade. It has become so strongly entrenched through its war profits that for many years it need fear no real competition anywhere on the globe.

Congress has not yet passed a comprehensive full employment bill for the American people. But the tax-reduction bill has been rushed through in record time. Principal provision of this bill eliminates the excess-profits tax as of January 1, 1946. The total cut in taxes is almost $6,000,000,000, apportioned as follows between individuals and corporations:

Individuals	$2,784,000,000
Corporations	3,136,000,000

The reduction in individual income taxes is overwhelmingly in favor of the larger income groups. The little man gets $1 a year more to spend; the millionaire gets $44,218 more.

The 900 largest corporations in this country will get a tax reduction averaging $2,000,000 each in 1946. This amounts to a benefit twice that of the rest of the 18,000 corporations which have admitted excess profits. There is no gain whatever for the 261,000 smaller corporations that were never able to report excess profits.

At the same time it was revealed that the deficit in the national budget for 1946 is estimated at $30,000,000,000.

All this, then, must go into the balance in which we weigh our victory. On one side we have the total cost of war: $336,000,000,000 in cash, plus the dead, the wounded, the missing; on the other, the outright profits made by large corporations—some $56,000,000,000 in cash, plus the power to dominate the lives of our people and the peoples of the world.

The GI's Side to the Demobilization Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 21, 1946

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on frequent occasions I have taken this floor to urge a speedy and equitable demobilization of the members of our armed forces. These men entered the service to win the war and they have done a splendid job. They are entitled to come home.

Several days ago, Gen. Dwight Eisenhower, the Chief of Staff, and Admiral Chester Nimitz, Chief of Naval Operations, appeared before a joint session of the Congress and stated their views and the views of their respective departments on demobilization. It was right and proper that the Congress should hear these officials, but by the same token the Congress should hear what GI Joe has to say about the slow-down in demobilization.

Mr. Speaker, I have received a great deal of mail, as have other Members of this House, but for the information of the House I wish to quote from a few of the letters I have received.

A young man from the district that I represent, now a corporal in the Army located on Guam, writes me as follows:

I didn't mind being over here sweating it out as long as it looked like someone was trying to get us home but when they start slowing up demobilization it makes one wonder what we were fighting for. The war is over now, so let us go back home to our families and enjoy what we have been fighting for.

A corporal stationed on Saipan writes me under date of January 5 as follows:

Tonight after our evening chow, my buddies and I were listening to the regular 7 o'clock news broadcast from the States, hoping and praying that some encouraging news would be brought forth concerning our return to our families. Instead we hear that the Army has decided that too many men are being released, making the occupation forces of our Army unstable. Well, sir, I think that announcement just about took the last of our hopes and confidence that we will be home soon. Frankly speaking, it welded more strongly in our minds the feeling that we are being held in the service, not to serve our country but to serve a group of military men who are entirely rank-conscious, or have their minds set on the high salaries paid to men of their position. The statement I just made may seem out of reason to you, sir, but in all seriousness I can say the majority of the men in my outfit feel the same way.

A young man at Fairbanks, Alaska, who is a technical sergeant, writes me under date of January 8, as follows:

All men regardless of whether or not they are performing essential duty are being held until they become eligible for discharge under official War Department discharge policies. As you know, this is not true in the United States proper. Once a man becomes excess in the United States he is discharged. I can cite a number of cases where men in the United States with less points and less service than most of us here who were discharged months ago. The military authorities in this theater have made no effort to send excess men to the States. Instead, they request more men. And now the War Department threatens to hold us until replacements are available. Hundreds of men here have been held for months doing nothing except details that will make the living conditions of officers more elaborate than they already are, if such a thing is possible. On the basis of the above, I believe it is time Congress took cognizance of the conditions in Alaska and took some action to remedy the situation. The best way to find out the true situation is not to talk to high-ranking Army officers because they will give all kinds of excuses, but talk to the masses of men in the Army—the enlisted men. They can tell you the true conditions. They can tell you exactly what they have been doing the past few months and how utterly useless their work really is.

Another sergeant, stationed at Yokohama, Japan, on January 7 writes as follows:

The first excuse for the delay in demobilization was the lack of shipping. Now that the shipping problem has been solved, we are informed that we must remain overseas an additional 3 months after our eligibility for discharge because of insufficient replacements. It sounds like a deliberate fraud upon us as American soldiers, voters, and citizens. I cannot believe that our Congress will permit the War Department to abuse us and our families in this way.

A young man writes me on January 7 from Manila, as follows:

We in Manila are quite incensed. Troop ships are going home with empty berths. The Secretary of War has no idea what the score is. General Collins says we aren't going home because the Army needs replacements for us; whereas, three out of four of us know we haven't done a day's work since coming to the islands. I've done virtually nothing, and there are few who have done much more. Most of us spend 4 hours a day in our offices writing letters and reading.

A young man stationed in Manila, who has been in the service for 44 months, writes:

I have refrained from writing you up until this time about the discharge situation, thinking that one should be a little patient and give the War Department a chance to adjust themselves to the situation. But the air is so full of propaganda, half-truths, distortions, and outright lies, and conscious sabotage of the demobilization program, that almost all of the thousands of men over here half way around the world are fully convinced that they are going to now have to fight for a freedom which the American people and "our way of life" said they would be returned to once they had fought for and secured the freedom of our country and the world.

Mr. Speaker, if the war ended on VJ-day, the "duration and 6 months" is about over and these men who have made victory possible are entitled to be home. If the war did not end on VJ-day, Government offices should not be closed on Saturday and all of us on the home front should be working hard to bring the war to a close. The Chief Executive should use his wartime powers to stop strikes and to get a full production going so that, among other things, the returned veteran can have a house to live in and can buy some civilian clothes upon his return. I sincerely hope that further speed can be attained in our demobilization program.

The young man who feels that his youth is being wasted away at some foreign outpost after the fighting stops, and the little children who pray for their daddy's return, are not interested in charts and explanations about demobilization. They want the men brought home.

Letter From a Soldier in India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1946

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I insert a letter which was written by a constituent of mine in India on November 1, 1945.

Like every other Member of Congress I have received thousands of letters in recent months, since VE-day and particularly since VJ-day, protesting one thing or another. I do not think we should clutter the RECORD with much of this material, which is pretty generally known by the public, as well as Members of Congress. However, many of the GI gripes are justified, and not only the Congress but the Army and Navy should do everything in their power to rectify any wrongs and to correct any mistakes made.

Having traveled through India myself, knowing the country, the people, and the climate as I do, I realize in a small way some of the hardships which our men have and are still suffering in that sad land.

Though there has been no censorship since VJ-day of any soldier's mail, and, while contrary to popular opinion, any man or woman in the armed services is free to write to anyone on any subject he chooses without fear of reprisal, I am, nevertheless, withholding the name of the soldier who wrote the following letter.

I am sure this message will contain information which will be of interest to the public generally and raises some questions which should be brought specifically to the attention of our military authorities. I had the pleasure this morning of calling the last two paragraphs of the letter to the attention of General Eisenhower, who appeared before our Committee on Military Affairs.

The letter follows:

To paraphrase that well known statement by General Stilliwell, American soldiers in India are still taking a "hell of a beating," but this time it seems to be coming from their own Government.

When VJ-day was declared, there were less than 250,000 American troops in India, Burma, and China, approximately one-third the number evacuated from the ETO in a period of about 3 months. Yet 3 months after VJ-day, there are still well over 100,000 troops left in India and Burma. In spite of this, the quota of shipping space allotted to the Indian-Burma theater has been reduced from 15 troop transports during the month of November to a predicted 12 for December. A simultaneous announcement from Washington predicted a surplus of some 34,000 berths during December on transports allotted to the European theater—while staging areas in India are already housing 35,000 troops awaiting transportation to the States. And now comes the telling blow: According to official announcement, 30,000 troops will remain here until the major portion of American property is disposed of—a period estimated to be at least 6 months.

At the time this last announcement was made, rioting was going on in Calcutta. Eight American soldiers were sufficiently injured to require hospitalization and 18 others were treated at dispensaries. The charred body of an American soldier has been found, so badly burned that identification had to be made by a dental bridge. This soldier was on an errand of mercy, the driver of a United States Army ambulance; at least 8 United States Army vehicles were destroyed and over 50 damaged. Demonstrations are now going on in other cities in India, and it is likely that the above situation may be repeated.

American soldiers here are constantly exposed to amebic dysentery and the over-all incidence of this desease among American troops is between 15 and 20 percent. Some indication of the prevalence of this disease is demonstrated by the fact that three widely separated hospitals (units in which sanitation is as good as can be found anywhere in the theater) have had incidences varying from 18 to 45 percent. The incidence of malaria in this theater at one time exceeded 50 percent in certain units and is still endemic.

It is quite necessary to put up with these hazards in time of war, but what excuse do we have for prolonging our stay in India now? No public statement of the over-all value of American property in India has been made, but it is quite likely to be sold for considerably less than its true value. Some of it is being sent back to the United States, but even there it is not likely to be sold on the open market because of the effect this would have on prices. It is well known that here many new items were indiscriminately destroyed, so that they would not be sent back to flood the markets. All in all, it seems quite likely that the property will eventually yield considerably less than its so-called true value.

But one must deduct from this the cost of maintaining 30,000 troops for a period of at least 6 months. It can be estimated that in pay alone this will cost the Government an average of at least $100 per month per man, or, over a period of 6 months, at least $18,000,000. This must be added to the cost of food, clothing, and shelter. Rent on installations to the British will continue, and from now on it is no longer reverse lend-lease. These items will considerably exceed the cost in pay alone.

The over-all picture seems quite clear to us. The difference between the cost of maintaining troops and the income to be expected from the sale of property does not seem to warrant keeping 30,000 men here in India for a period of even 6 months when one places in the balance the health and lives of these men, not to mention the fact that these same men could be performing useful tasks elsewhere, or continuing their education which was interrupted during the war. We certainly agree with the shouts of some of the more exuberant Indians during the recent riots, "Let the Americans quit India, too."

The Cause of Most of Our Domestic Unrest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1946

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much controversy as to the facts relative to the rise in the cost of living, whether it is 15 percent or 50 percent, or more, I concluded it would be worth while to compare prices of food staples and clothing taken from ads in the local paper in my home city of La Crosse, Wis.

I am setting forth the results of this comparison as taken from the ads of the La Crosse Tribune on September 1, 1939, and October 4, 1945. These figures and prices speak for themselves. The increase in the cost of living as reflected in these ads is astounding:

SEPTEMBER 1, 1939	OCTOBER 4, 1945
Hamburger, 1 pound, 14 cents.	Hamburger, 1 pound, 25 cents.
Beef:	
Pot roast, 11 cents a pound.	Not advertised.
Sirloin steak, 17 cents a pound.	Sirloin and round steak, 40 cents a pound.
Chuck roast, 15 cents a pound.	Chuck roast, 26 cents a pound.
Veal roast, 13 cents a pound.	Not advertised.
Veal chops, 17 cents a pound.	Veal chops, 33 cents a pound.
Leg of lamb, 19 cents a pound.	Leg of lamb, 35 cents a pound.
Pork chops, 18 cents a pound.	Pork chops, 33 cents a pound.
Bologna, 14 cents a pound.	Bologna, 27 cents a pound.
Ham, 17 and 19 cents a pound.	Wieners, 39 cents a pound.
Slab bacon, 9 cents a pound.	Bacon, 39 cents a pound.
Spring chickens, 16 cents a pound.	Unavailable.
Early Ohio potatoes, 19 cents a peck.	Potatoes, 49 and 52 cents a peck.
Flour, 49 - pound sack, $1.49.	Flour, 49-pound sack, $2.39.
Peanut butter, 2 pounds, 22 cents.	Peanut butter, 2 pounds, 39 cents.
Bananas, 5 cents a pound.	Unavailable.
Sweetpotatoes (yams) 4 pounds, 25.	Sweetpotatoes, 4 pounds, 42 cents.
Carrots, 4 cents a bunch.	Carrots, 10 cents a bunch.
Watermelons, 35-pound melons, 33 cents.	Unavailable.
Bartlett pears, $1.49 a bushel.	Pears, $4.99.
Colorado peaches, 93 cents a crate.	Not advertised.
Prunes, 69 cents a box.	Prunes, $3.29.
Oranges (small), 15 cents a dozen.	Oranges (same size), 30 cents a dozen.
Tomatoes, 39 cents a bushel, 2 cents a pound.	Tomatoes, not advertised.
Ladies silk dresses, $3.99 and $6.95.	Unavailable.
Cotton frocks, $1 and $3.98.	None advertised.
Silk hosiery, 49, 69, and 79 cents a pair.	None available.
Leather hand bags, $1 and $1.98.	None advertised.
Ladies' sport coats, $9.50 to $19.50.	Sport coats, $45 and $55.
Fur-trimmed coats, $16.50 and $37.50.	Fur-trimmed coats, $69 to $135.
Snow suits, $3.95.	Snow suits, $14.95.
Men's suits, 2 pairs trousers and a vest, $17.50 and $22.50.	$45 and up (one pair trousers, no vest).

I have read ads in the Washington newspapers for men's sport shirts starting at $6.50 and $25. I am wondering how many of my constituents are able to pay $6.50 and $25 for a shirt.

And so I repeat, Mr. Speaker, these revealing figures speak for themselves, and indicate the inflationary trend, which is one of the causes for so much of our domestic unrest.

Mr. Farley's Mission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1946

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial, which appeared in the Utica (N. Y.) Press of November 27, 1945:

MR. FARLEY'S MISSION

James A. Farley, who will never be anything but Jim to his Oneida County admirers, will be in Utica this evening on an important mission. He will meet representatives of this and Otsego, Chenango, and Lewis Counties who are interested in the campaign to raise $3,000,000 for the Alfred E. Smith Memorial. This will be a building at St. Vincent's Hospital, New York City. Michael

J. Larkin, Rome, is chairman of the local committee.

Mr. Farley is a worthy spokesman for a good cause. No man of his generation is more deserving of a memorial than Al Smith. He was among the first of our great national leaders to sense the people's rights in Government and to work for their realization.

Although he was a New Yorker, born and bred, the former Governor had the common touch which, in his hands, was not common at all but was a kind of political genius. He was just as persuasive and effective in addressing a Utica audience as one that might have been assembled from his East Side sidewalks.

He made New York's government a reality to its citizens and led many who had previously ignored politics to take an interest in what to him was a vital element of American life. It is appropriate, therefore, that his memorial should take the form of hospital facilities that will be useful to the men and women whom he served so well. And no one is better fitted to speak in behalf of such a project than Smith's old friend, Jim Farley. He is welcome here at any time and doubly so in this cause.

The Strike Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1946

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following open letter to the Congress of the United States which appeared in Flint newspapers Thursday, January 17, 1946, and Friday, January 18, 1946:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

Strikes, slow-downs, and threats of strikes have brought about a domestic crisis in America.

To meet it, the members of the undersigned organizations, representing all classifications of business, agricultural, professional, and service groups in this community, believe that there is imperative need for decisive legislative action.

Such action is needed in the public interest. It is needed now to effect early solution of the present problems and to provide a sound basis for permanent industrial peace.

We believe that existing labor legislation is essentially class legislation, passed to promote the growth of labor unions. The present size and monopolistic power of such labor unions now require that the legislation be rewritten to protect the public interest.

In our judgment, labor laws primarily intended to foster the organization of workers have largely served that purpose and now are being used in an attempt to establish union control of workers, management, and government.

There is no justification for the present exemption of powerful labor organizations from Federal antitrust laws nor can the exemption of unions and their representatives from responsibility under contract be justified.

Such legislative action as must now be taken should be designed to make labor organizations equally responsible under the law with other elements of the community.

In the present crisis, we protest against the misuse of monopolistic power which has blocked the recovery of our national economy, seriously delayed the expansion of industry and business designed to produce full employment and maximum national income, and handcuffed production in a period of pressing consumer demand.

We protest against the misuse of collective bargaining rights for collective bludgeoning purposes and the substitution of revolutionary economic and political objectives for the legitimate objectives of collective bargaining.

We protest against the abuse of the fact-finding procedure in its distortion for the purpose of substituting either a bureaucratic or union dominated economy for our free competitive economy. We warn against the enactment of fact-finding legislation unless based on a sound revision of the one-sided labor laws now on the statute books.

We further protest against those prevalent abuses of the right to strike, including jurisdictional strikes, strikes in violation of agreements, strikes against the Government or in protest of Government decisions, which should be forbidden by law and made subject to appropriate penalties.

The people of the United States, who have chosen you as their representatives, have just brought to a victorious conclusion the most destructive and widest-ranging war in history.

The cost of victory has been without precedent, however measured. In terms of human suffering, human time and effort expended, the costs are incalculable. In terms of property destruction, and exhaustion of resources, they are staggering.

If the desire to retain freedom, which sustained the American people as they struggled through adversity to victory, does not bear fruit, every item of that tremendous cost must be regarded, not as justifiable expenditure, but as flagrant waste.

Upon you, the duly elected representatives of the American people, rests the grave responsibility of making decisions which will determine whether the cost of the conflict was justified, or was a stupendous waste.

By your legislative actions you will determine whether the American people, including our veterans, are to be rewarded or cheated. On January 3, 1946, the President of the United States asked the American people to tell Congress what they want. We want Congress to keep the foregoing in mind during all the deliberations which will shape future legislative programs.

We believe that such legislation shall fall woefully short of the desires of the American people if it is designed to serve the interests of special groups rather than the broad public interests.

We believe that the mass destruction of the war makes mass production in peace an obvious world-wide need. That need constitutes a challenge which the American people have demonstrated themselves uniquely competent to meet. Their freedom to meet it depends primarily upon the formulation of national policy to overcome labor strife.

We seek labor-management peace—cooperation between employees and employer—productive jobs and the abundance for all which flows from high wages and lower prices—opportunity, progress, and growth for every citizen. We believe that these are ends to be achieved by free labor and free management under just laws impartially administered.

Flint Furniture Dealers Association, Genesee County Coal Exchange, Kiwanis Club of Flint, Retail Merchants Association, Flint Association of Home Builders, Genesee County Taxpayers Association, Flint Junior Chamber of Commerce, Flint Milk Dealers Association, Genesee County Farm Bureau, Inc., Flint Wholesale Bakers Association, Rotary Club of Flint, Flint Gasoline Wholesalers, Flint Chamber of Commerce, Flint Automobile Dealers Association, Genesee County Real Estate Board, Allied Construction Industries, Flint Farmers Club, Flint Ice Cream Manufacturers Association.

UNO Representation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1946

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, it is my firm belief that the composition of delegates to the United Nations, now meeting in London, is too topheavy with men. It is a sad commentary of our times that we keep alive the idea that the cures for the world's ills should be determined by men, either alone or in the preponderant majority. These kinds of groups have failed us innumerable times in the past and I feel the present world situation calls for a change in personnel in our own delegation at the opportune time.

I should like to see veterans of this war given representation because then at least one of their number could express the views of his comrades who certainly have earned that right. Let us try and make sure, this time, that this will be the last war, and let us give our veterans a voice in the peace. They have sacrificed the most and they and their families will be expected to pay for the recent war. It is their right to have a voice in the making of the peace so that they and their children will have an assurance that a peaceful and secure world will be theirs.

We should make certain that the women of America are given continued representation on our delegation to the United Nations Organization. I feel that the principles of the Atlantic Charter should be followed out because that declaration pledged, at least six times, that women should be eligible with men to participate in the activities of the UNO. Evidently these pledges have meant nothing, because out of 180 UNO delegates, representing 51 nations, only 5 are women. In addition to this, only one country—Norway—has a woman alternate, and the number of feminine advisers adds up to only six. This is a disappointing and unfair representation to the mothers, wives, and sisters of the men who have fought and died the world over for equal rights and democracy.

We should also have at least one scientist—preferably one well versed in atomic energy—representing us. The atomic age with its implications for good and evil merits an appointment of this sort. We must realize that atomic energy is here to stay and that the future use of this new development has a direct

bearing on the welfare of every person in the world.

Our veterans, women, and scientists may not be politicians, but they will be well able to take care of the people whom they will represent. The lack of recognition accorded to them must be corrected at the first feasible opportunity.

Our elder statesmen have failed us in the past. They have not been able to lay the foundation for a peaceful world based on justice and security for all peoples. In one generation we have gone to war twice and suffered the loss of our best manhood. This must not, if we can help it, happen again. Let us, therefore, see to it that our old-style representation is abolished and our veterans, women, and scientists accorded the right and the privilege to represent us.

Fairless Failure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1946

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, the steel mill area of south Chicago, immediately contiguous to the plant of the Republic Steel Corp., scene of the Memorial Day riots during the last great steel strike in Chicago, views the current strike with great trepidation. Not only the steel workers and their families, but all of the people of that great industrial zone, are hoping that President Benjamin F. Fairless, of the United States Steel Corp., will hear the rumblings of the people of the Nation and reconsider his ultimatum delivered to the President of the United States.

Today two Washington newspapers which do not see eye to eye on many problems, expressed a similar hope, namely, that there would be a speedy termination to this strike which, if it continues, will involve not only the steel industry but most of the manufacturing of the Nation. The Times-Herald, for instance, had as a caption to its editorial "Fairless made a big mistake," and the Washington Post in a front-page editorial analyzed the situation in a somewhat similar manner. Both indicated that Mr. Fairless had failed dismally in the negotiations at the White House.

Evidently he is not like another great executive of the United States Steel Corp. who made his own decision on the eve of a gigantic steel strike. That man was Myron Taylor, chairman of the board of the United States Steel Corp. The United States Steel Corp. at that time was preparing for a strike and it seemed inevitable that there would be a walk-out of all steel workers in the world's greatest industry. Newspaper reports at that time, nearly 10 years ago, stated that Mr. Taylor and his wife were in a Washington hotel at that crucial moment and Mr. Taylor sought an introduction to Mr. John L. Lewis, then the foremost figure in the strike that was impending. Newspapers related that Mr. Taylor and Mr. Lewis signed an agreement. The great United States Steel Corp. made a contract with the CIO of that day and the strike was averted, insofar as "Big Steel" was concerned. "Little Steel" refused and the strike was on, and there was great suffering and hardship as well as 10 deaths in the Memorial Day riot at the gates of the Republic Steel Corp. in south Chicago. If Mr. Fairless had the fearlessness of Mr. Taylor we do not think that steel, "big" or "little," would be in a strike today.

My colleague from Indiana, the Honorable RAY MADDEN in a speech yesterday on the floor appealed for a return of Edward R. Stettinius to his old position in steel stating that if Mr. Stettinius were there the strike would have been averted. Representative BAILEY, of West Virginia in his remarks yesterday, announced that he had introduced legislation that would strike from the Revenue Act of 1945 the carry-back provision affecting revenue from excess-profits taxes paid into the Treasury for the taxable year of 1944–45, which revenue can be claimed by corporations should their 1946 returns show they operated at a loss. Doubtless many Members of Congress voted for that provision because they expected fair play from Fairless et al.

The longer the strike continues the greater will be the indignation not only of organized labor but of all wage earners against United States Steel. It is not too late for Fairless to reconsider and save the day. If he does not the powerful industrialists will learn ere long the enormous pressure that can be exerted by the greatest pressure group in all the world, an aroused American citizenship.

Subjoined are the two editorials from the Washington newspapers of today:

[From the Washington Post of January 22, 1946]

THE PRESIDENT AND THE CRISIS

Twenty-four hours have gone by since the steel plants of this country closed down. Steel is the heart of our industrial system. The heart has now stopped beating, and the entire economy is fast running down. The people seem condemned to watch a knock-down and drag-out fight between labor and management. They must stand by and see the Nation lapse into a state of paralysis.

For weeks they have heard the spokesmen of both sides say their say interminably. It is now time for the public to take the platform. The Post thinks it would be shirking its public responsibilities if it failed to proffer its own ideas about the grave crisis confronting our country.

The effect on reconversion is immediate. Reconversion is stalled. After 8 months of hard work and skillful deployment by labor and management, the goal was actually in sight. We were 90 percent reconverted. Then silence fell on the automotive, meat, and electrical industries. Steel joins them to make the standstill of our industry complete.

It is a criminal set-back, and seems like a conspiracy. But no good will come out of name calling. Men on both sides are acting according to their convictions. There may be exceptions, but we prefer to think of the combatants as good Americans, all animated in the final analysis by a desire to serve the public. The fact remains that, because of inability to agree, they have thrown their hands in. When labor and management in our major industries quit, a crisis is created. We are in a crisis, not a conspiracy.

From this crisis we shall all suffer. The veteran coming back into our civilian life will be hurt. The prostrate world, looking to the United States for a lead in the work as well as the ways of peace, will lose heart.

The drift back of spreading inactivity must be arrested. This the people demand in self-preservation But they have no preventive power. Only the President of the United States can act in their united name.

The Post assumes that President Truman is not quitting.

The President has been damned for stepping into the picture at all. It is said that he ought to let the combatants slug it out. This was sound advice when industrial struggles were minor ripples on our community and our international life. But no such advice is tenable when this fight could conceivably hold up the activity of the entire industrial world.

Those who criticize the President for his intervention would have been the first to criticize him for nonintervention. For he had to intervene. The maintenance of the war powers of his office testifies to the fact that we are still in an emergency. This peace emergency calls just as much for Presidential responsibility as did the war emergency.

We do not suggest that the President should be panicked into hasty steps. But the Nation cannot stew in the present mess much longer without inviting an irremediable disaster. He must bring before him the men who in fact guide our industrial destinies. It is now seen to have been foolish to allow negotiations to go on between representative labor and management which was not equally representative. Labor as a whole was talking to men who had no mandate from the whole industry.

In the steel fight the President seems to have thought Mr. Benjamin Fairless was the decisive voice in the steel industry. It turns out he was mistaken. Let him ask the actual leaders of the steel industry to come to the White House.

Let him go further and ask the real leaders in the other major industries to talk things over.

A national crisis requires a national solution. The heart of our current troubles lies in the absence of a wage-price policy for reconversion. Steel could set the pattern. It has set the pattern before in every great change in our economic history. But in this instance the others may want to have their say along with steel. What makes steel and the others backward is the effort to keep wages and prices in separate compartments. It has never been done before. It does not make sense. Both have got to be squared.

What has happened is simply a breakdown in common sense. Common sense requires that we speed up reconversion. Reconversion means civilian goods. It follows that reconversion is the only way to beat inflation—to stop prices from spiralling, to prevent value from being drained out of our dollars. When this country is reconverted, other countries will have a chance to follow.

The setback can be retrieved by some such action as we have suggested. But every day's delay makes a meeting of minds more difficult. It thrusts the country and the world deeper into economic and social tribulation. In the President's hands is the last peaceful remedy, and no American, anxious for his own and the country's welfare, will deny him the right to invoke it. Mr. Truman would be in default to his own Presidential obligations in this national and international emergency if he balked at it.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of January 22, 1946]

FAIRLESS MADE A BIG MISTAKE

For some weeks past, President Benjamin F. Fairless, of United States Steel, and President Philip Murray of the CIO Steelworkers Union have been conferring off and on with President Truman of the United States.

Object of these conferences was to avert a steel strike if possible. By going to the White House in this matter, and by various public statements while the discussions were in progress, both Fairless and Murray tacitly accepted Mr. Truman as umpire in the steel-wage dispute.

The dispute was over a demand by the union for a pay increase of 25 cents an hour and an offer by United States Steel of a pay increase of 15 cents an hour.

President Truman went into the whole argument as carefully and as thoroughly as he could. Nobody could have given more conscientious, fair-minded attention to the problem.

In the course of the discussions, Murray's steel union cut its demand to 19½ cents an hour. Truman finally came up with a recommendation for an increase of 18½ cents, and the union signified its willingness to accept that.

Mr. Fairless for United States Steel thereupon refused to go for the 18½ cents increase; and the steel strike now has begun.

ECONOMIC EARTHQUAKE

About 750,000 steelworkers belong to Murray's union. About 1,300 plants in 30 States are affected by the strike. It is estimated that the steel industry will lose $10,000,000 in gross revenues for each day the strike lasts, and that the strikers will lose about $6,500,000 per day in wages.

Those are only the first direct effects to be expected. The indirect ones will be coming along within 2 weeks, if the strike lasts 2 weeks, and they will be as bad as the direct effects if not worse. An estimated 40 to 50 percent of United States manufacturing industries need steel. Few of these concerns have any big backlogs of steel on hand.

A strike of any considerable duration will dry up these companies' steel supplies, and they will just have to shut down until they can get steel again. This steel strike can snowball into an economic disaster to the United States.

STATESMANSHIP IN AN INFLATIONARY PERIOD

In our opinion, Mr. Fairless did not exhibit a high type of industrial statesmanship in turning down the President's suggestions and letting the steel strike start.

Why he did it, we don't know—whether on his own initiative or on orders from big United States Steel stockholders. But he needn't have done it.

We are in an inflationary period. That means that workers all along the line are getting pay increases—more dollars in their pay envelopes—and that employers in one way or another are pretty sure to get more dollars with which to meet the pay increases. To be sure, the dollar's buying power is going down all the while, so that nobody really wins; but that is what inflation is.

Fairless could have agreed to the 18½ cents wage increase per hour as recommended by the President in his capacity as unofficial umpire accepted by both Fairless and Murray. Then, after a while, Fairless could have gone before the President or some fact-finding board with data to show that United States Steel could not make a fair profit at current steel prices.

If this evidence had held water, Fairless could have got some sort of increase in the price of steel out of OPA. Not even OPA can do more than slow down the inflationary trend. It can't reverse it, no matter how many crusading speeches Mr. Chester Bowles rolls off his manly chest into the microphones.

Instead of practicing this type of industrial statesmanship in an inflationary period, Fairless chose to buck the present trend of things. The steel strike is on. Nobody knows how long it will last. It can do great damage to the entire country. One thing it can do is to speed up inflation, by sharply cutting down production of real wealth. Production of real wealth is the most reliable of all ways of combating inflation.

What effect Fairless' mistake will have on Fairless himself, we can't predict. We think, though, that in the end he will have to back down somehow from the uncompromising position he has taken, and that he may have to resign as president of Big Steel. We do not think majority public opinion will back him up in this case. Majority public opinion is sometimes decisive in big strikes; and you can't buck the President of the United States, a powerful Nation-wide union, and majority public opinion all put together.

OPA Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1946

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article by Mr. Forrest, president of the National Retail Lumber Dealers' Association:

NRLDA PRESIDENT FORREST URGES PROMPT CHANGE IN OPA POLICIES

S. L. Forrest, president of the National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, this week issued the following statement concerning the present housing crisis and Government moves to help alleviate the situation:

"No group connected with supplying the homes of the Nation is more fully aware of the shortage of homes than the 25,000 retail lumber dealers located in every town and hamlet of the Nation, for they are normally responsible for 60 percent to 70 percent of the housing built.

"Lumber dealers are now building up to the limit of materials and labor, but these at present are inadequate.

"It is our belief that the labor shortage will correct itself as more men are released from the services, but the material shortage still depends largely on the actions of Government."

OPA RETARDS PRODUCTION

"OPA, while set up to serve a worthy cause, is, by its lack of practical and realistic application of sound policies, materially holding back production.

"OPA's pricing policy is still largely the same as before VJ-day. In all the major species, except one, it has exactly the same price schedule in effect now that it used in getting production for war supplies. The industry has pleaded with OPA to revise this policy and put the emphasis on the items needed for home building, rather than things needed for shipbuilding, boxing, crating, etc., but to no avail. OPA refuses to take suggestions on this point from the groups who actually produce the homes, preferring rather to follow its own unrealistic policy which is the greatest single factor today blocking the solution of the lumber shortage problem."

DEALERS MUST TELL PUBLIC

"The lumber dealers have not fought OPA and price ceilings up to now, but we feel that our first duty is to those who need homes. We have now come to a critical position where we must tell the public the real truth. OPA must be made to change its policy, or it must be done away with. Nothing will head off inflation like production of housing and this is what we must have. Nothing must be allowed to stand in the way.

"The most potent lobby in Washington today is the OPA lobby and those supporting socialized housing. These groups are determined to keep controls in their hands rather than give private industry such assistance as Government can. This is a time when all forces in the Nation must work together to get housing, and Congress will have to step in and reform OPA or kill it. It is our belief that its reformation at the present time would be preferable, but its obstructionistic policies must be stopped if we are t produce houses in volume. It is unfortunate when a Government agency gets so far away from the constructive course for which it was set up by Congress. However, since Congress set it up, Congress can force a change of policy, or it can do away with the office. The way it now operates, the remedy is worse than the disease."

STOP LUMBER EXPORTS

"It remains to be seen what the proposed priority for veterans will accomplish. The crying need, however, is production and all other moves, at best, are only sedatives and stop-gap measures. With OPA rests the greatest responsibility for production. The retail lumber dealers hope the OPA can be made to realize this, and forced to act before the wrath of the American people and Congress forces its abolition.

"Export of lumber should be stopped until the critical housing shortage is relieved.

"No industry should be given a price advantage over housing—and this is now being done. Railroads are an example of this.

"The NRLDA membership has been and still is behind any practical program that will lead to production of the maximum number of homes. Homes must be built for our returning veterans. It must be remembered, however, that we can only build up to the supply of materials available.

"Government must recognize that homes are built by taking appropriate action and not by giving lip service to an industry. Ideologies must not be allowed to interfere with constructive action."

The Phony Liberals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1946

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I submit for the consideration of the Members of the House an editorial from the Parkersburg News of January 21, 1946, published in Parkersburg, W. Va., and edited by Mr. Herman E. Gieske.

The editor, in his usual vigorous style, certainly presents an interesting point of view regarding the position of the two political parties and the use of the word "liberal." I commend it to you as a piece of sound reasoning.

THE PHONY LIBERALS

Epithet hurling, of course, continues to be a great American political pastime. When reasonable argument fails, political agitators "smear" their opponents with a few choice epithets. Fortunately the public is wise to this merry game, which in former times, was

called mud-slinging. When a candidate has only abuse and villification for his opponent it is usually only a smoke screen to cover his own weakness. There is a trend in modern day, however, which is of a more subtle character. That is for a contender to degrade and abuse the hallowed symbols and shibboleths of his opponents. The use of the word "liberal" is in point. Formerly it connoted one of the highest and best forms of political activity. But now even the Communists style themselves "liberals," when, as everyone knows, a Communist dictatorship is just about as liberal as a thumbscrew. It tramples minorities into the dust, which would be anathema to any true liberal, and abolishes freedom of speech and freedom of the press. And while we are on this theme, let it be remembered that any government which makes the state all powerful, regiments the people and robs them of their liberties, is not radical, but reactionary. The historic constitutional government of the United States is still the most radical government in the world, and the Republican Party as the chief champion of that Government is still the most radical party in the world. Totalitarian rule, or Stalinism, as espoused by the New Deal, is a return to tyrannies that were old when Caesar was in his heyday. In championing the freedom of the individual man the Republicans are the true liberals of modern times. One hesitates to claim it, only because the word "liberal" has been so debased and degraded by phonies who use it only as a mask to conceal their sinister designs upon our Republic.

More Bugs in Bargaining

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1946

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Leo Wolman, which appeared in the Washington Post of December 20, 1945:

FACT-FINDING BOARD, LIKE ALL FEDERAL UNITS, GIVES LABOR BEST DEAL

(By Leo Wolman)

Whether or not General Motors should have accepted the wage recommendations of the fact-finding board is debatable. Much can be said for accepting the board's figure in the interest of peace and resumption of production, while rejecting the board's arguments and theories and disclaiming responsibility for the consequences of its recommendations.

But there can be little question that the board's report is unsatisfactory and amateurish. If this is what we may expect from fact-finding boards, the less we have of them the better. The figure of 19.5 cents an hour, arrived at by the board, is an arbitrary figure based on belief that everybody, and General Motors more than all, will make lots of money in 1946 and the years to follow, and hence should pay 19.5 instead of 13.5 cents.

The way the board handles specific facts and arguments is an index to validity of the entire report. Only a close reading will disclose the uncertain foundation on which the board's conclusions rest.

IMPORTANT FACTORS IGNORED IN TAKE-HOME PAY

Quite obviously maintenance of take-home pay was a prime consideration in the board's calculations. But in dealing with estimates, it omits reference to relevant but embarrassing items and, for all practical purposes, makes decisions on highly important questions of policy that would seem to go beyond the board's authority. Thus, in its computations of future take-home pay, it makes no allowance for gains from lowered taxes or retention of earnings deducted during the war to pay for war bonds. Yet, both of these items were regularly subtracted by Government agencies in the estimates they made of actual take-home pay during the war.

But the major decision of the board is to reject General Motor's view that the work-week will average 45 hours and to accept the union's contention that it will average close to 40. This decision, of course, determined the final result. General Motors pointed out that take-home pay on a 45-hour week would exceed war earnings by a substantial amount, even if no allowance were made for savings from taxes and discontinuance of pay-roll deductions. The board elects to reject the 45-hour week and, thus, prejudices all future negotiations concerning this matter not only between GM and UAW, but between any company and union.

Apparently the board anticipates no savings from increased productivity since it seems to think productivity will be no greater in 1946 than in 1941. The union estimates a 5-percent increase, though claiming it might exceed 10. The company aims to restore the productivity of 1939. But on this important issue, the board seems far from clear.

SEEMS QUEER WAY TO PROMOTE NEGOTIATING

Likewise on the matter of down-grading, the board finds it hard to make facts fit the theory. The average figures seem to show no loss from down-grading, but the board concludes "there is an element of loss of earnings through down-grading and demotion which, through it cannot be measured, should be given some weight."

The report ends with a general disclaimer to the effect that the GM case was decided on its "own particular merits" and, hence, what the board said in that case was no guide to general wage policy. That may be the intention. But the figure set will come close to being the figure below which unions will refuse to settle.

What this all amounts to is that labor negotiators can do better with the Government than with employers. Therefore, they can afford to lift their demands, refuse to settle on what employers offer and wait until they get a better offer from the Government. This seems a queer way to promote collective bargaining and avoid strikes.

Bring the Soldiers Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1946

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Clinton (Mass.) Daily Item of January 15, 1946:

BRING THE SOLDIERS HOME

It is apparent to all who read that the brazen attempt to keep men in the Army regardless of necessity or points has now reached a stage where every parent, relative, and friend of Clinton and vicinity World War II veterans who are still in uniform should take their pens in hand and in scorching, burning English demand of Congress that it move at once and take affirmative steps that will result in the immediate return to the United States of the hundreds of thousands of soldiers in the European and Pacific theaters of operation who are merely marking time in idleness under the inexcusable conduct of the higher-ups who have adopted a plan which they believe will continue them in their jobs and aid in saddling on the Nation the sinister and menacing program of shackling the youth of America to a war machine during the years when they should be afforded educational facilities that will equip them for constructive work in this Nation instead of training them to kill, maim, and destroy in unholy, unrighteous, unjustified and unnecessary wars.

The latest and most threatening gesture of the domineering brass hats is the order that issues of Stars and Stripes shall no longer carry a word of criticism by GI's because they are being kept in a condition bordering on slavery when they are entitled by every argument and fact to be returned to the United States and honorably discharged.

Shades of Russia! Have we, in the United States, reached the point where despoilers of civilization strutting in officers' uniforms can clamp down on the freedom of the press in this unprecedented and ruthless manner?

Were not these GI's told when they were torn from their homes and put into uniform that they were fighting for the four freedoms?

And now they are figuratively and literally informed that they cannot voice their views in any issue of Stars and Stripes, which to date has been the medium through which they could express themselves.

So, after all, the noble statement that they were to fight for freedom was only a 100-percent lie fashioned by a gang of diabolical egoists bent on destruction at any cost and at the expense of the lives of countless thousands of the Nation's young men who deserved a better fate.

The outbreaks in Germany, the Philippines, Hawaii, Calcutta, and elsewhere were hailed with glee by members of the families and friends of GI's in the United States as fully justified and as harbingers of early action looking to the immediate return to this country of the men now resenting their continued retention in the Army.

There is not the slightest question in the minds of veterans who have recently been discharged and returned to their homes that redeployment has been deliberately slowed down in order to bolster up and force un-American compulsory military training on the country.

Many of the men who have been discharged say the point system is a joke, and has been used as a two-edged sword to keep men in uniform instead of getting them out.

An unconscionable gang of generals and colonels is seeking to continue playing war in order that they may retain commands, and thus prevent their being deposed to their permanent grades of majors and lieutenants.

Many other soldiers believe that one of the primary objects in balking redeployment is to support the United States State Department in its imperialistic program.

Soldiers who have been courageous enough to express themselves in mass meetings and parades and in hot cablegrams to the higher-ups are on solid ground as flat promises made by the palsied War Department have been wilfully and flagrantly flouted time and again.

The soldiers were told that when shipping was available they could come home. Ample shipping is now available and has been for some time in both the European and Pacific theaters of war.

They were told that all men would be sent home as soon as they were eligible for discharge, but it is a matter of record that thousands who have all the qualifications are still being held in uniform overseas with little or no expectation of their being brought to the States.

They were told that March 20 had been set as the date of discharge of all men with two or more years of service, but thousands who possess this qualification are now told they must remain overseas indefinitely.

The nasty mess results from the failure to provide for the transition period between war and peace, according to so astute a commentator as David Lawrence. The War Department fiddled and devoted itself to extraneous controversies such as the proposed merger of the Army and Navy Departments and the compulsory military training fetish and never have a thought to the necessities of the hour.

It failed to decide how long troops would be needed in the European and Pacific areas and what missions must be arranged.

The stupidity of the Department is best illustrated by the red-faced admission of Secretary of War Patterson that he did not know that points were not given for Army service since last September, all of which bears out the opinion of many Massachusetts Congressmen that as an executive he has been a failure and ought to be filling a judgeship because his equipment is more judicial than administrative.

Drew Pearson is another commentator who pans the War Department for its inertia in dealing with demobilization and in ignoring what has appeared in servicemen's newspapers, in thousands of letters that poured in on him and other commentators as well as Senators and Congressmen, all indicating that resentment at their treatment had reached the boiling point after having been brewing for months and months.

He says the resentment springs from a sense of injustice and frustration and agrees with other commentators that the War Department deliberately slowed up demobilization in order to put the heat on conscription.

Nor are the GI's happy about McNarney's statement that low-point men might now come home earlier than high-point soldiers whose services are considered more essential, which, they know full well, means paving the way for the return of Senators' sons, football players, and anybody who can exercise political pull, provided they make themselves sufficiently nonessential.

Of course, the effect of this McNarney order was to add to the resentment of the GI's and to stimulate the determination to make themselves just as nonessential as possible and thus place a premium on inefficiency. The man who is doing a good job has to stay on and the one who does a poor job and is nonessential can come home.

The soldiers well know that the claim of the "brass hats" that fast discharge of men makes for inefficiency is the "bunk" and doesn't bear the light of day, as for instance, the Brooks Hospital Center, at San Antonio, Tex., which handled 10,000 patients at its peak but now is down to less than 2,500, yet its staff continues at 75 percent of what it was at the peak period. Scores of similar cases are known and cited by the soldiers to contradict the claims of the Army officials.

It is high time for concerted action and not mere bombastic promises and words.

The complaints aired by the GI's at one of the mass meetings in Germany that their friends in the United States have gone back on them are justified in many quarters.

The opportunity now presents itself to overcome this complaint by appealing to Congress to cut the filthy mess of red tape and delay that now binds overseas soldiers.

Opium: World Menace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor of January 19, 1946:

OPIUM: WORLD MENACE—UNITED STATES URGED TO TAKE UP CUDGELS ONCE MORE AGAINST THIS ENEMY OF ALL NATIONS

(By Disturbed Observer)

The war and its close have dramatically brought the opium problem once more to the attention of the world. General MacArthur's prompt handling of the situation in Japan came at an opportune and critical moment. By the use of this insidious drug as a weapon of war, the Japanese sought to paralyze the resistance of the Chinese. Today the flood of opium is riding at high tide throughout Asia—a constant menace to the thousands of American troops stationed in the East. The war may be over, but it will be months, if not years, before our soldiers and sailors leave the continent of Asia.

While MacArthur has put the spotlight on Japan, it is to be noted that it is largely opium from Iran that Japan imported to manufacture into its sinister derivatives, heroin and morphine. Iran produces, roughly, 600 tons of opium a year. In Iran the United States had some 30,000 American troops to guard lend-lease goods going to Russia. A fleet of ships brought the goods to ports in the Persian Gulf, and on these ships were many thousands of American seamen. With little or no control exercised in this ancient land, opium peddlers roamed the streets and bazaars. For a minimum price it was possible to procure this drug, which if resold in the United States or black market would bring 20 times the original cost.

The women of America, learning of this menace to their sons and husbands in the East, protested to the Government, begging that immediate steps be taken to protect them. The outcry of the women brought Representative WALTER H. JUDD, of Minnesota, to the rescue, who introduced a resolution in Congress asking the President to urge the opium-producing countries to restrict the cultivation of the poppy plant to legitimate needs. The resolution was passed unanimously by both Houses of Congress and signed by the President. This was over 2 years ago.

So far but one country has taken seriously the appeal of the United States. Last summer Afghanistan replied that she had determined to cease completely the production of opium. We are still waiting for action on the part of Iran and India. In Asia today there remain three countries in which opium is produced on a large scale—China, Iran, and India. In Korea, to a smaller degree, the Japanese forced the planting of the poppy.

We know that China bitterly opposed the use of opium for a century and more. By 1916 the country had all but eliminated the scourge and had stringent laws to prevent its use or production. Then came the ruthless attempts of the Japanese to reinstate opium. With the defeat of Japan, however, the Chinese government is making every effort once more to eradicate the evil.

While the British and Netherlands possessions in the East were in the hands of the Japanese, it was unequivocally declared by both governments that when their territories were freed they intended to abolish the opium monopolies and forbid the use of opium. Equally gratifying at this time was Great Britain's public acceptance of America's long-expressed opinion that only by controlling the production of opium could the problem ever be solved.

After the Far East colonies had been restored, it was hoped that Great Britain would immediately enforce the terms of her war declarations, both as to the abolishment of her opium monopolies and the use of opium in the countries once more under her control. Instead there comes drifting out of the East the old and familiar assertion that, after all the use of the opium by the oriental is not really injurious.

Despite the appeal of the United States 2 years ago, opium is still being produced in both Iran and India with the knowledge and consent of their governments, and from these countries large quantities of opium are entering the United States and the illicit traffic of the world.

With war restrictions removed and the shipping routes once more open to commerce, unless immediate steps are taken to check the enormous overproduction of opium in the East, the United States and the world will soon be flooded with this devastating drug.

Why has this pernicious evil been revived? Nearly 40 years ago President Theodore Roosevelt dragged it from its hiding place in the Far East and put it on the international stage for solution. He at once abolished the opium monopoly we had inherited from Spain in the Philippines and closed the opium dens, declaring the United States would never take revenue based on the corruption of an eastern people whom we had undertaken to protect.

Under the leadership of the United States, definite progress was being made in solving the problem up to the outbreak of the First World War. At its conclusion and under the terms of the Versailles Treaty, the opium problem was taken from the leadership of the United States and the jurisdiction of The Hague and placed in the hands of a committee of the League of Nations in Geneva for solution—a committee composed primarily of the governments whose colonies in Asia were largely dependent upon their opium revenue. After 20 years in the hands of this committee, the opium problem still remained unsolved.

Is it not time for the United States to resume the initiative and put an end to this recognized curse and evil? We have wasted time enough in exchanging futile notes with foreign offices and attending opium conferences. Months are spent in the preparation and transmission of letters and months again before the receipt of an evasive and unsatisfactory reply—concluding invariably with the proposal for calling another conference to take place at some indefinite date. It should be of interest to note that the opium problem was discussed by an international commission at Shanghai as long ago as 1909, at three international opium conferences at the Hague, and more recently at three similar conferences at Geneva under the auspices of the League of Nations. Seven conferences in all.

It is generally understood that the authority over the opium problem previously vested in the League of Nations will be transferred to the United Nations Organization. But there are more direct methods of solving this problem than leaving it to the discretion of such a committee—where for two decades secondary and ineffective measures have been interminably discussed.

It is time evasions and delays should end and that east and west alike be delivered from a common menace.

Why does the United States hold back from taking up the cudgels once more against this evil? The world knows we have no ulterior motive, no political or financial gain in view. This country has steadily refused to permit the production of this dangerous drug within its borders and has stringent laws to prevent it.

To an extraordinary extent America seems to have won the confidence of the nations of the world, both large and small, who look here for leadership in this dark hour. It is up to us to show we deserve this trust.

Veterans' Priority in Purchase of Surplus War Goods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. CLASON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1946

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, since my short speech on the floor of the House last Thursday calling attention to the miserable treatment accorded to veterans by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in the purchase of surplus Army motor vehicles, I am advised by Mr. Ross Williams, sales manager of the Consumer Goods Division of the RFC here in Washington, that he is calling for a report of the entire situation. He has told me that he will check on the situation and report what the facts are.

Obviously there is something wrong when the RFC has had in its possession hundreds of motor vehicles and failed to dispose of them promptly and fairly. In the city of Springfield alone 500 veterans have received certificates from another Government agency indicating that they are entitled to purchase them. Unfortunately, these veterans, thereafter, have been tossed around with loss of time and money to each of them.

For more than 3 months these certificates have not been honored by the RFC, although the veterans go to Fort Devens and select the particular vehicles which they wish to purchase.

In support of the complaints made by these World War II veterans, I include with my remarks the following letter from Mr. Arthur A. Guilbault, adjutant for Post No. 277 of the American Legion in Indian Orchard, Mass.

Such letters deserve prompt attention and should bring results.

POST NO. 277, INC., AMERICAN LEGION,
Indian Orchard, Mass., January 16, 1946.
The Honorable CHARLES R. CLASON,
Congressman, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: At the meeting of this post held on January 10, 1946, it was voted to bring to your attention for definite action the complaints of several of our members relative to the muddled situation in the handling of surplus war goods and equipment.

For instance, the Smaller War Plants at 1200 Main Street, Springfield, on December 27, 1945, notified our members that a lot No. 18, trucks and cars, would be sold at Whittemore Arsenal, Ayers, Mass. They went down there, and as per instructions from a Mr. Pope, they picked out several numbers in that lot, and then were told to go to No. 600 Washington Street, Boston, to see Mr. Brown. There, they were told that Springfield had no right to release that lot of trucks. The Springfield Smaller War Plants office claims to have a letter from Washington releasing that lot No. 18. We are told that Mr. Lee Manley, regional director of the Springfield office, showed our veterans the utmost courtesy and consideration as far as his end of the business was concerned.

It is quite obvious, Mr. Congressman, that the above confusion between the various bureaus having to do with the same work is a source of much annoyance to the veterans, not to mention the unnecessary expense they have to incur going to these various places for nothing. Other similar complaints hav come to us before of the same nature.

We submit that it is about time that headquarters in Washington get together with its field representatives and issue uniform orders and communications relative to carrying on its work, and that this "veterans' priority" be lived up to in spirit and letter of the law.

You have Post No. 277's permission to use this letter any way you wish to help you clear up this muddled situation so that our veterans will get the proper treatment.

With our best wishes for your continued health and success, and our thanks for your kind consideration.

Very truly yours,
ARTHUR A. GUILBAULT,
Adjutant.

Care of the Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1946

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to establish a Federal Commission for the Physically Handicapped.

The objective of this measure is to bring into one natural orbit certain Federal activities which deal with problems of the handicapped, but which are not now integrated and coordinated as they very obviously should be; and to provide the thus established Federal Commission for the Physically Handicapped with adequate authority to deal with the varied problems of the 25,000,000 physically handicapped citizens of the United States.

I believe this bill to be a very thorough approach to these problems. It was developed, after long study and practical experience, by the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, the national organization which has projected a number of very worth-while measures enacted by the Congress on behalf of the disabled, and follows the very elaborate studies made by a special committee of this House headed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY].

Mr. Paul A. Strachan, president of APPH, states:

The bill represents an effort to establish an agency wherein handicapped may, upon proper application and certification, enter—be medically, surgically, or therapeutically treated; be provided such education and training as may enable the individual to pursue a profession or trade; be placed at suitable, gainful employment; and to have such supervision as may be necessary to properly fit him, or her, into a suitable environment of social and economic life.

It is plain, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress should take immediate steps to develop an over-all program, the purpose of which would be to restore to physical usefulness millions of our citizens who, otherwise, must continue to be a drain upon their families, communities, States, and the Nation itself.

Enactment of this bill will concentrate, within proper limits, needful services for physically handicapped citizens, so that the Congress, the Chief Executive, and the people of the United States will, at all times, know what is required in this field; how many disabled apply; how many are being treated, trained, and placed; the over-all costs, and the final results—all of which, because of the confusion of activities under existing conditions is well-nigh impossible to even estimate.

For the years ahead, when America will be under the greatest strain any nation in the world has ever experienced, we will be in better position to meet these tremendous demands upon our strength and resources, if our people are provided with the means to needed rehabilitation and physical regeneration, so that they may take their part in conserving and building up our national resources, and thereby experience the pride that comes from shouldering a part of the load, and, above all, earning their own way. In short, being producers of wealth, instead of mere tax-eaters.

I hope we may act upon this measure promptly, so that we may thus discharge our obligation to these poor unfortunates, many of whom are unfairly condemned to a life of idleness and despair because of injury or disease which they do not have the means to remedy. We should not—we must not—deal with this situation in any niggardly way, but, boldly seize this opportunity to do what I firmly believe this bill will do—put many of our handicapped citizens in position to earn a decent living.

A bill to establish a Federal Commission for the Physically Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby created and established an agency of the United States to be known as the Federal Commission for the Physically Handicapped, which shall administer the provisions of this act, and all activities outlined in the following titles:

TITLE I. FEDERAL COMMISSION FOR THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

SECTION 101. There is hereby created a Federal Commission for the Physically Handicapped, which shall be an agency of the United States Department of Labor, with the personnel, powers, and duties hereinafter set forth.

SEC. 102. The Federal Commission for the Physically Handicapped (hereinafter referred to as the Commission) shall consist of seven members, as follows:

A president and a secretary, each of whom shall be appointed by the President of the United States, with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The director of the present Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, and the principal employment specialist for physically handicapped in present charge of special units for handicapped, now in United States Employment Service offices.

A representative of the Children's Bureau, to be designated by the Secretary of Labor, who shall be experienced in dealing with the problems of crippled and handicapped children.

A representative of the Public Health Service, to be designated by the Surgeon General, who shall be a qualified medical officer and shall serve as the medical officer of the Commission.

A representative of the Civil Service Commission, to be designated by the Commission, who shall be experienced in dealing with the problems of physically handicapped citizens.

The President of the Commission shall receive a salary of $12,000 a year; the Secretary, $10,000 a year; the Executive Assistant, to be designated from among the members of the Commission by the President, $9,500. and all other members, $9,000 a year: *Provided*, That this shall not be construed to effect a decrease in the compensation of any member designated from persons already in the employ of the Government.

Members designated by the President shall serve for a term of 7 years, and shall be eligible for reappointment. Those designated by the Surgeon General, the Civil Service Commission, and the Secretary of Labor, shall serve for a term of 5 years, or at the will of the appointing authority.

SEC. 103. The Office of Vocational Rehabilitation is transferred from the Federal Security Agency to the Commission, with all personnel, records, and balances of appropriations. All special units for handicapped now operating in the United States Employment Service, are transferred to the Commission, together with all personnel, records, and appropriations, but shall continue to function operationally in the field or local offices of the United States Employment Service and/or State units.

SEC. 104. The Commission is authorized to employ personnel necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act, and to fix their rates of pay in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. Whenever practicable, persons so appointed shall be drawn from otherwise qualified but physically handicapped applicants.

TITLE II. FUNCTIONS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 201. It is hereby declared that the general welfare of the United States requires the extension of employment opportunities to persons handicapped by physical disability, and the imposition upon employers in industry, having contracts with the Federal Government or any agency or corporation thereof, of a requirement, in filling vacancies, that they place and retain in employment fixed proportions of persons qualified to work, but handicapped by disablement from obtaining employment; that facilities be provided for occupational rehabilitation, including medical and therapeutic treatment and physical and vocational training; and that such employers in industry, having contracts with the Federal Government or any agency or corporation thereof, shall be advised and aided in the introduction of work methods and the adjustment of tools, appliances and machinery necessary to accomodate certain types of disablement.

SEC. 202. (a) It shall be the function of the Commission, in the effectuation of the policy determined in section 201:

To provide for medical, surgical, and therapeutic treatments, the application of prosthetic or orthopedic appliances, hearing aids, eyeglasses, and such other devices as may, by their use, enable physically handicapped individuals to become proficient physically so as to be able to earn their own living, wholly or in part;

To provide for education and training of physically handicapped citizens; and

To provide, whenever possible, for their suitable employment through proper placement.

(b) The Commission shall continue all functions of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, and of the Special Units for Handicapped in the United States Employment Service, at the time of their transfer under this act. It shall establish separate divisions, under qualified experts, for special work with the blind, the deaf, the hard of hearing, cardiacs, tuberculous, poliomyelitics, epileptics, amputees, and any other large or distinct groups of physically handicapped.

(c) It shall be the duty of the Commission to—

(1) Collect, tabulate, and make public statistics pertaining to the physically handicapped;

(2) Ascertain what fields of employment are available to the physically handicapped and make such information public;

(3) Acquaint employers in private industry with the special capabilities of the physically handicapped, and encourage their employment, where feasible and practicable, on an equal footing with the nonhandicapped;

(4) Cooperate with public and private agencies, organizations, and individuals in the medical and vocational rehabilitation and placement in suitable employment of physically handicapped citizens.

SEC. 203. The Commission shall appoint an Advisory Council on Employment of the Handicapped, to consist of six members, two of whom shall be selected from lists submitted by bona fide labor organizations; two from the public and two from employers. The President of the Commission, ex officio, shall be Chairman of the Advisory Council. The Council shall act in an advisory capacity to the Commission, and shall meet not less than twice yearly, or upon call of the Chairman. Appointed members shall be entitled to traveling and other necessary expenses and to a per diem of $25 per day for each day of actual service.

TITLE III. REGISTER OF QUALIFIED DISABLED PERSONS

SEC. 301. The Commission shall establish and maintain a register of qualified disabled persons, hereinafter referred to as the register. The register shall be kept in such form, and entries and alterations or removals of entries shall be made in such manner, as the Commission may by regulation prescribe. A person whose name is, for the time being, on the register, is hereafter referred to as a registrant.

SEC. 302. Qualifications for entry of the name of any person on the register shall be established by regulations of the Commission. Such regulations shall afford reasonable assurance—

(a) That the disabled person is 18 years of age or over;

(b) That he is a resident of the State in which he applies for registration; or, if his disability was sustained while in the merchant marine service of the United States, that he was such a resident of the date of entry into such service.

(c) That he is capable of entering into and keeping employment under the conditions in accordance with which, under this act, employment may be offered him.

SEC. 303. Applicants for entry on the register shall make application to the Commission, through its Special Service to Handicapped Units, at any local office of the United States Employment Service. The Commission may, by regulation, prescribe the method of examining applications and procedures for passing upon applications. If, upon examination as prescribed, the Commission is satisfied that an applicant is a qualified disabled person, and that his handicap is likely to continue for 6 months or more from date of application, and he meets all qualifications prescribed by the Commission under section 302, his name shall be entered upon the register. If at any time the Commission is satisfied that any person whose name is on the register no longer meets the prescribed qualifications, it shall remove his name from the register.

A person who ceases to be so registered, at a time when he is in employment with any employer, and who thereafter continues, with only such separation as is mentioned in section 401 (3) in employment with that employer, or with a person taking over in succession to, or jointly with that employer, a business or establishment in which the registrant was employed, shall be treated as a registrant for the purpose of the application of this act to that employer or his successor, as aforesaid.

SEC. 304. The term "qualified disabled person" as used in this act means a person who, on account of congenital deformity, or of injury or disease, is substantially handicapped in obtaining or keeping employment, or in undertaking work on his own account of a kind which, apart from such deformity, injury, or disease, would be suited to his age, experience, and qualifications.

TITLE IV. EMPLOYMENT OF REGISTRANTS

SEC. 401 (a). (1) As used in this act, "employer" means any individual, or the legal representative of a deceased individual, and any organization (including partnership, association, trust, estate, joint-stock company, insurance company, or corporation, whether domestic or foreign) or the receiver, trustee in bankruptcy, trustee or successor thereof, which has in its employment 10 or more individuals.

(2) "Employment" means service performed for remuneration, including, but not limited to, service under a master and servant relationship existing in fact or under a contract of hire, whether written or oral, express or implied, and including service performed for a State or a political subdivision of a State, or an instrumentality of either.

(3) "Taking into employment" shall not be construed to include (a) the reemployment by an employer of a person previously in his employment, after a separation attributable to the employee's illness, or being on vacation, or to other temporary causes; (b) the taking into employment, by a person taking over a business or establishment in succession to, or jointly with, another person who was carrying it on immediately before that time, of any person employed by that business or establishment at the date of such taking over.

(b) With respect to part-time employment, or to employment part-time with one employer and part-time with another, or with the same employer part-time in one class of employment and part-time in another, the Commission may by regulation prescribe the extent to which such employment shall be regarded as employment within the purview of this act.

SEC. 402. (a) It shall be the duty of every employer, in filling vacancies, to take into employment registrants to the number ascertained to be his quota under the provisions of subsection (c) of this section. Except as otherwise provided in this act, no employer shall, at any time, take into employment any person other than a registrant if, immediately after the taking in of that registrant, the number of registrants in his employ would be less than his quota. This requirement shall not apply (1) to an employer's taking or offering to take into his employment any person whom it would have been his duty, apart from this section, to take into his employment by virtue either of any Federal statute, or of any agreement to reinstate, entered into before the effective date of this act; (2) to an employer's taking into his employment any person under permit issued by the Commission, if at the time there are no registrants, or an insufficient number of registrants capable of performing the work.

(b) No employer shall discontinue his employment of a registrant if such discontinuance would result in reducing the number of registrants in his employ below his quota, except (1) for reasonable cause, or (2) in conformity with the terms and conditions of employment with respect to separations, transfers, or reemployment then in effect in the plant or place of employment by virtue of an agreement between such employer and the workers, or (3) by virtue of laws affecting the tenure in employment.

(c) The quota of an employer at any time shall be a number ascertained in accordance

with this subsection. (1) Standard percentage shall be fixed by the Commission and shall be: For plants, industries, or offices or other businesses employing less than 100 persons, not less than 1 percent of the total number of persons employed; for any such business employing over 100 but less than 1,000 persons, not les than 1½ percent of the total number employed; and for any business employing over 1,000 persons, not less than 2 percent of the total number employed. (2) A special percentage shall be determined by the Commission to govern employment in any particular trade or industry, or branch thereof, coming within the scope of this act, or employment with any class of employer, whenever in the opinion of the Commission a percentage either greater or smaller than the standard percentage ought to be assigned, on the ground of distinctive characteristics in the particular employment proposed, with respect to its suitability for disabled persons.

(d) Any employer violating or failing to comply with the provisions of this act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and subject to a fine of not less than $100, nor more than $1,000. The fact that the making, termination, or modification of a contract may involve a violation of this act, however, shall not affect the operation in law of the contract, or its termination or modification, as the case may be.

TITLE V. PERSONAL CATASTROPHE LOANS

SEC. 501. The Commission shall establish a revolving loan fund, which shall be funded with an initial sum of $5,000,000, which is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. From this fund the Commission shall make personal catastrophe loans as hereafter determined.

SEC. 502. "Personal catastrophe," as used in this title, is defined as any injury, disease or physical defect such that the use of a prosthetic or orthopedic appliance, a hearing aid, eyeglasses, or other devices, would enable the individual affected to return to useful and gainful employment.

SEC. 503. Any person may apply to the Commission for a loan under this title, in such form as the Commission may, by regulation, prescribe. Before making any loan, the Commission shall make such investigations as may be necessary, and shall certify that the applicant is worthy and of good character, and that he appears likely, with the help of a loan, to be restored to useful and gainful employment, and that he has not the instant means of independent action. The Commission may advise applicants, on request, as to types of appliances, but each applicant shall have free choice of the appliance or device best suited to his individual needs.

SEC. 504. Loans under this title shall in no instance exceed $500, and shall in every case be secured by personal note of the applicant, conditioned to make repayment monthly, when employed, or otherwise possessed of funds, with interest at a rate not higher than 2 percent per annum.

TITLE VI. NONFEASIBLE CASES

SEC. 601. Physically handicapped citizens of the United States who, upon application to the Commission, are certified by it as nonfeasible for rehabilitation, and who are totally and permanently disabled and are without means of livelihood or support, shall be paid, by the Bureau of Public Assistance of the Social Security Board the sum of $30 a month, beginning with the month following that in which the Commission's certification is filed with the Social Security Board.

TITLE VII. COOPERATIVE ENTERPRISES FOR HANDICAPPED

SEC. 701. (a) The sum of $10,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year 1947, and $5,000,000 annually for each of the 5 years thereafter, for establishing and maintaining special industries for physically handicapped citizens.

SEC. 702. Out of the foregoing sums the Commission is authorized and empowered to make loans to persons, corporations, States, Territories, or subdivisions or agencies thereof, municipalities, people's utility districts, and cooperative, nonprofit or limited dividend associate organizations organized under the laws of any State or Territory, for the purpose of financing work projects for physically handicapped persons, primarily drawn from the group termed "nonfeasible" for rehabilitation, and requiring special conditions of employment and training, such as is now afforded by various so-called handicapped persons' industries, sheltered work shops, etc. No single loan shall exceed $20,000; and not less than 25 percent in amount of all loans shall be granted in rural areas.

SEC. 703. Such loans shall be made on such terms and conditions as the Commission shall determine: *Provided*, That all loans shall be self-liquidating in not to exceed 25 years, and shall bear interest at a rate equal to the average rate payable by the United States on its obligations, having maturity of 10 years or more, after the dates thereof, issued during the last preceding fiscal year in which any such obligations were issued: *Provided further*, That no loan for the purchase, construction, enlargement, or operation of any plant shall be made without the consent of the State authority having jurisdiction in the premises being first obtained.

TITLE VIII. GRANTS FOR NONFEASIBLE CASES

SEC. 801. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated the sum of $2,000,000 for the fiscal year 1947, and $1,000,000 annually thereafter. From the amounts hereunder appropriated the Commission is authorized and empowered to make outright grants to local nonprofit groups organized with the objective of providing a means of teaching and training physically handicapped persons whose disabilities confine them to their homes or beds—commonly known as shut-ins. Grants shall be made pro rata on the basis of population: *Provided*, That not less than 25 percent of all grants in any fiscal year shall be made to groups located in rural areas.

TITLE IX. SAFETY ENGINEERS

SEC. 901. The Commission is authorized to cooperate with other Federal agencies in devising and arranging for proper safeguards to life and limb in public buildings, and in eliminating and preventing conditions therein tending to promote disease. It may employ safety engineers and sanitary engineers as required, who may, with the consent of the agency having jurisdiction, inspect and report on any and all buildings used by the Federal Government. The Commission may also cooperate with the American Institute of Architects and other interested groups and individuals, with a view to having public and other buildings constructed or remodeled, with ramps instead of stairs, and with railings to facilitate the free and safe movement of the lame and crippled.

TITLE X. TRAINING SCHOOLS

SEC. 1001. The President of the United States shall, within 30 days after the effective date of this act, appoint a Commission of three competent persons to survey the war plants owned by the Government or any instrumentality thereof, and to select 10 plants which upon conclusion of their manufacture of war materials shall be excepted from the surplus property sales program and set aside as training schools for physically handicapped citizens, and for teacher training. Selections shall be made on the basis of their suitability for the proposed use, the cost of conversion for training school purposes, and their regional distribution. The plants so selected shall upon direction of the President be turned over to the Commission for operation as training centers for physically handicapped, as well as for teachers of physically handicapped. Expenses of the Selection Commission, and of the reconversion of plants for use as training centers, shall be met by an appropriation out of the Treasury, which is hereby authorized.

TITLE XI. TREATMENT OF DEAFNESS

SEC. 1101. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Public Health Service, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,000,000, which shall be available for research, applied medicine and treatment, and necessary expenses to develop, if possible, a cure for deafness. The Public Health Service shall report annually to the President and to Congress the results of its research, and such report shall be printed as a congressional document.

TITLE XII. UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

SEC. 1201. There shall be established in the United States Civil Service Commission a Division for the Physically Handicapped, with a chief, an assistant chief, and such staff as may be required. It shall be the duty of the Division to deal with problems attendant upon the recruitment, examination, and appointment of physically handicapped applicants for employment in the Federal civil service. It is declared to be the policy of Congress that no citizen, otherwise qualified, shall be denied the right to examination and appointment, by reason of physical disability.

SEC. 1202. The expense of the Division for the Physically Handicapped shall hereafter be included in the regular appropriations for the Civil Service Commission. Such sums as may be necessary for the establishment of the Division are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

TITLE XIII. MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 1301. The Public Health Service shall, through its field employees, report to the local offices of the Commission, as soon as possible after the effective date of this act, the name, address, and other pertinent information of citizens who, by reason of physical disablement, are in need of the services to be afforded by the United States under the terms of this act.

SEC. 1302. The Commission shall have an official seal, which shall be judicially noticed.

SEC. 1302a. For the purpose of administering this act and for the purpose of making the studies, investigations, publications, and reports therein provided for, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any sums not otherwise appropriated from the Treasury, such amounts as may be necessary.

SEC. 1303. If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the remainder of the act and the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 1304. This act shall be known as the Federal Aid to the Physically Handicapped Act.

SEC. 1305. All laws or parts of laws in conflict with this act are hereby repealed.

SEC. 1306. This act shall be effective 90 days after date of passage.

STATEMENT TO ACCOMPANY PROPOSED BILL TO ESTABLISH A FEDERAL COMMISSION FOR THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED, TO DEFINE ITS DUTIES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

FOREWORD

The consensus of this bill represents 28 years of study and practice in the field of the physically handicapped.

It represents an effort to establish an agency wherein handicapped may, upon proper application and certification, enter, be

medically, surgically, or therapeutically treated; be given such education and training as may enable the individual to pursue a profession, or trade; to be placed at suitable, gainful employment, and to have such supervision as may be necessary to properly fit him, or her, into a suitable environment of social and economic life.

It endeavors to amalgamate certain Federal services which deal with problems of the handicapped, so that these will come into one natural orbit, and thus enable the Congress, the Chief Executive, and the people of the United States to concentrate, within proper limits, needful services for physically handicapped citizens.

It also provides for corollary services which, in the past, have not been provided, and because of their lack, make present operations of the program incomplete, awkward, and, in many instances, wholly inadequate to the needs of the handicapped, and the Nation.

Title I. Federal Commission for the Physically Handicapped

This provides for the composition of the Commission. As shown, it brings into alinement representatives of the chief services now dealing with the handicapped and, by thus combining the experience and knowledge of those most concerned, provides for a vastly smoother means of operation.

It transfers to the Commission the OVR and also special units for handicapped in USES, which are, by way of illustration, like two halves of a whole, but which heretofore have operated as separate units and have, in many instances, duplicated services which should have one direct channel.

Title II. Functions of the Commission

This defines the functions of the Commission, and in addition shows the purpose and method of a real program for handicapped.

It may be pointed out that, under this title, much of the present duplication and very likely waste of effort and money would be eliminated, because the prime objective here is to coordinate many present activities. Also present agencies lack certain requisite powers to educate the public, and particularly employers, on the value of the handicapped as workers, and this title, among other things, supplies that deficiency.

It also establishes an Advisory Council on Employment of the Handicapped, the need for which, as a working and policy-making unit, is apparent.

Title III. Register of qualified persons

This provides for proper registration of handicapped who may apply to the Commission and defines their qualifications, as well as establishes a legal definition of a "qualified disabled person."

Title IV. Employment of registrants

This recognizes and endeavors to partially discharge the obligation of Government to provide opportunities for employment of physically handicapped citizens through mediums under its control. Admittedly this enters a new field—that of endeavoring to have industries or businesses which handle Federal contracts to set aside from 1 to 2 percent of their jobs, to be filled by handicapped people.

However, there is no doubt but that the Federal Government has a grave responsibility with regard to the handicapped, both military and civilian, and there can be no question but that the Government has a right to prescribe wages, working conditions, etc., under present laws, for those who deal in contracts with its various agencies. Such being the case, the Government has a right to impose upon those who seek such contracts the obligation to provide employment for a relatively small number of handicapped people.

If the numbers cited were unreasonable, or disproportionate, there might be some validity in objections, but the time has come when Congress, as an act of simple justice to a large number of our citizens, should enact laws that will assure opportunity for employment of the handicapped.

Title V. Personal catastrophe loans

There are hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions, of citizens, who, because they abhor charity in any form, refuse present benefits under so-called means test, although they may greatly need certain equipment.

But if those same citizens were permitted to borrow money for the express purpose of purchasing needed prosthetic or orthopedic appliances; hearing aids; eyeglasses; wheel chairs, or other appliancess or devices which would enable them to become more proficient, physically, and thus better able to compete on more equal footing with nonhandicapped, there is no doubt but that many of them would do it, and their bodily improvement, and increased productive capacity, figured collectively, would be a great benefit to the whole Nation.

Title VI. Nonfeasible cases

One of the grave defects in present Federal-State rehabilitation laws is that reports of agencies operating thereunder do not cite the number of cases which apply to them for aid, but which are turned down as being nonfeasible for rehabilitation.

It is perfectly natural that such agencies, desiring to put the best foot forward in their public reports, would not, thus, particularly desire to reveal the extent of the cases which they refuse to handle. It has even been charged that they have devoted themselves, in many instances, to easy cases, in order to make a good showing on available funds.

In the light of continued improvement in medicine and surgery, it is reasonable to believe that many such cases, rated nonfeasible, yesterday, or even today, may, within a week, a month, or a year, because of some new discovery, be entirely feasible of rehabilitation.

On the other hand, when only superficial medical examinations are given, as has, no doubt, in many instances been the case, when the applicant is termed "nonfeasible," there is room for a considerable margin of doubt, if not positive error, in such diagnosis, and no medical examination should be accepted that is not thorough, in every respect, as a means of final determination of any case.

It is estimated that there are from 1,000,000 to 3,000,000 nonfeasible cases in the United States of America. These, for the most part, are termed "unemployable handicapped," and are usually bedfast, or confined to wheel chairs, etc. We have evidence that a considerable number are destitute and wholly dependent upon an uncertain charity to sustain even the barest essentials of life.

The only practicable, fair way to deal with this problem is; to see to it that such persons are afforded thorough diagnosis, by qualified experts, and, if the findings show such person to be totally nonfeasible for rehabilitation, then, if such person is destitute, or wholly dependent upon others for livelihood, who, themselves, are unable to bear the expense of providing a living for such nonfeasible, then, that person should be certified by the Commission as wholly unemployable, and certified for a Federal pension—the moderate sum of $30 per month.

This title would act as a double check, most effectively. It would reveal, over the long run, a more accurate picture of the so-called shut-ins, and provide for their needs, however meagerly, by a small pension—if they are disqualified for rehabilitation. On the other hand, the rehabilitation agencies at interest would have to show their hand and attest their incapacity to deal with the problem, by certifying the individual as hopelessly handicapped and unable to provide the means of livelihood, or, make strenuous efforts to find a way to successfully treat, train, and place in employment such person.

We particularly urge upon Congress the need and advisability of approving this title.

Title VII. Cooperative enterprises for handicapped

For many years, students of the handicapped problem have delved into the cooperative field in an effort to devise a means whereby, on however low a subsistence level, certain handicapped, mostly those termed "nonfeasible for rehabilitation," could be brought to some pitch of physical usefulness and earning power.

Charity groups have conducted many such enterprises, but, the fact is outstanding that there is no clear-cut plan, operating nationally, and there is no one plan, apparently, which can be adapted from present set-ups, for use in all instances. This is due to two reasons: One, in certain cities, one or more church groups may attempt operation of such an activity—some of these being known as Good Will Industries. In other cities, fraternal, civic, or other bodies, may attempt a variation of the same idea.

The time has come when there are sufficient handicapped to justify applying the cold light of reason and business management to this problem, even though it must be admitted that, since the objective is betterment of the status of the individual, this cannot be measured precisely in terms of expenditure of dollars and cents, nor yet, receipts from their production activities.

In the main, this must be regarded as would be any other cooperative enterprise, with, perhaps, a little more leeway in dispensation of funds, and considerably more pressure upon the exploitation angles, so that any such cooperative enterprises will not make the mistake of believing that Santa Claus will make up any of their deficiencies, and they need not consider the proposition, as they should, as a strictly business affair, but rather, as a muddled-up, "do-gooder's" effort, sans common-sense planning, proper financing, and businesslike administration.

Setting up such enterprises, across country, would, in the main, provide a channel through which many handicapped might be enabled to earn a living otherwise denied to them. This would be particularly true during periods of national depression, when the surplus labor market would make it wellnigh impossible for handicapped to procure jobs in regular lines of business or industry, in order to keep them out of the bread lines, enterprises of this sort are absolutely necessary.

Title VIII. Grants for nonfeasible cases

Under this title, we are endeavoring to reach the root of the trouble experienced by many handicapped, who are denied any educational facilities at all. This applies, particularly, to those in rural areas, or those districts sparsely settled, and having such distances from home, to schools, that it is impracticable for handicapped to attend such schools.

In the case of the shut-ins this would provide a godsend, as for development of this idea we would see, in the next few years, practical plans and extension of home teaching, etc., bringing all the latest developments in science right to the bedside, by means of radio, motion pictures, television, etc.

This is a very modest beginning on development of a great program—that of teaching the home-bound handicapped.

Title IX. Safety engineers

There is no need to dwell upon this title, which reveals a need so manifest that the Federal Government should immediately take steps to prevent accidents, or illness, in the erection of buildings, and the equipping thereof, and provide such safeguards as may be necessary upon recommendation of qualified sanitary engineers.

Title X. Training schools

Here, indeed, is an important matter. Now that war plants are being declared surplus property, and thrown upon the open market while, at the same time, admittedly, educational facilities, particularly buildings and equipment, are vitally needed at numerous points throughout the United States of America—assuredly, the Government should set aside a few such plants and, if necessary, remodel them for educational purposes.

We desire to emphasize a depressing but important fact: On behalf of the millions of physically handicapped, particularly handicapped children, we protest the grave lack of teachers for handicapped.

It is a matter of deep concern to note that only one major educational institution in the United States of America has a department of education for the physically handicapped, and it is literally impossible for that one institution, Columbia University, to train enough teachers to supply the entire national needs.

There is no point, whatsoever, in reiterating the need for education of the handicapped when there are no facilities with which to provide it, and, no especially trained teachers, to carry out the program.

So, the suggested training centers, to be developed from plants declared surplus property, and now owned by the Federal Government, would supply a great need, both as to training centers for handicapped, themselves, and, likewise, as training centers for teachers of handicapped.

We especially urge upon Congress the immediate need for favorable action on this title.

Title XI. Treatment and prevention of deafness

The United States Public Health Service has had numerous grants, from time to time, for various purposes relevant to the public health, but, the need for study of the causes, and, if possible, development of a means of prevention and cure of deafness, which is growing steadily in our population, is so apparent that there should be no question as to the need for desirability of approval of this title.

Title XII. United States Civil Service Commission

The growing requirements of civil service, dealing with physically handicapped people, necessitate establishing a regular division, within the Commission, for that express purpose. The expense would be nominal; the effects far-reaching, and beneficial.

Title XIII. Miscellaneous

SEC. 1301. Since the United States Public Health Service already has physicians and surgeons covering all parts of the United States of America, there is no good reason why such agents of the USPHS should not, as a regular part of their function, inform the Commission as to those within their respective areas, who would be eligible for services to be performed by the Commission.

This is an effort to short-circuit much of the waste motion which prevents speedy handling of cases, particularly in locating; having proper application made; processing, and completing essential work on behalf of rehabilitation of the individual.

FEDERAL AGENCIES DEALING WITH PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED AND PUBLIC HEALTH

Library of Congress: Books for the adult blind, service for the blind.

Office of Scientific Research and Development: Committee on Medical Research.

War Manpower Commission: Bureau Manpower Utilization, Bureau of Placement, Bureau of Training, Bureau Selective Service, Women's Advisory Committee.

War Relocation Authority.

War Shipping Administration: Recruitment and Manning Division.

President's War Relief Control Board.

Treasury: Procurement Division (Administration of Wagner-O'Day Act).

War Department: Office Surgeon General.

Navy Department: Bureau Medicine and Surgery.

Department of Agriculture: Farm Security Administration, Bureau Human Nutrition and Home Economics, Extension Service, Bureau Agricultural Economics.

Department of Labor: Children's Bureau, Women's Bureau, Division Labor Standards, Bureau Labor Statistics.

War Production Board: Manpower requirements.

Federal Security Agency: United States Office of Education, Columbia Institution for the Deaf, Public Health Service, St. Elizabeths Hospital, Freedmen's Hospital, Social Security Board, Committee on Economic Security, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Federal Board of Hospitalization.

United States Civil Service Commission.

United States Employees Compensation Commission.

Veterans' Administration.

National Academy of Sciences.

American National Red Cross.

Department of Commerce: Census Bureau.

Department of Interior: Indian Affairs, Health Division, Bureau of Mines, Health and Safety Branch.

Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion: Division of Retraining and Reemployment.

Federal Advisory Board for Vocational Rehabilitation.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS IN WHICH THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PARTICIPATES

Pan American Sanitation Board.

American International Institute for the Protection of Childhood.

Gorgas Memorial Laboratory.

International Office of Public Health.

Prepared by American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., national headquarters, 1376 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

Letter to the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1946

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed to the President of the United States:

THE SWEET SHEET,
Opelousas, La., January 5, 1946.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
Pennsylvania Avenue,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HARRY: As you and I are the top men of this old United States of America in our various spheres, I thought I'd write the first letter of the new year to you.

I thought, too, I'd wish you a Happy New Year before Congress met again 'cause from your point of view, those boys are getting pretty unruly—but the real truth of the matter is, Harry, they are just about following out as near as possible what the folks back home want. Lots of folks back here on the side roads don't agree with some of your ideas, Harry. Instead of trying to do what will get the most votes—let's do what will be best for the most voters.

I chat with quite a few of those Congressmen and take it from me, they know that the voters are about fed up on almost 16 years of "isms" and theories, and millions of us had hoped that you would take hold and put the old country back on a more realistic basis and cut out the beautiful "dreams."

I don't blame you for being confused, Harry, for I spend a few dazed days up there every now and then myself, so I can appreciate how it is for the fellow who has to stay there—you deserve a trip back home to old Missouri or a ride on the Potomac.

You have assembled "fact finding" commissions up there to get the facts on one side only—tell 'em to look at all the books of both sides and publish the truth of what they find out and it is possible that the demand for some company's books would end right there. Lots o' folks want the lights turned on the other fellow—but they yell bloody murder when you turn the lights their way.

And yesterday's facts are no good tomorrow, Harry—they are just like news: no good the next day. We know what we are talking about, Harry, because on August 28 we loaded a car of sweets and the facts showed $65 profit; 30 days later the same facts revealed a loss of $900. Now how can you use such facts as that at the bank?

We are sending a fact-finding commission of our own to Europe. We want to know why they are not eating sweetpotatoes over there. I hope we find out.

The fact is, we are trying to tell the world how to run their affairs, and we are not doing so good ourselves. Let's quit "telling 'em" and "show 'em" how to make a country happy and prosperous. The fellow who doesn't want to work should be permitted to go home and starve, but the fellow who wants to work should be protected with our Army, Navy, marines, and Air Force.

A happy New Year, Harry—with my fingers crossed.

Sincerely,

DEZAUCHE—HIMSELF.

P. S.—Sweetpotato business is swell. Thank you.

The sheet was written before you talked to me and the other stockholders last night, Harry, so I am adding this to keep the record straight. You asked that we express ourselves to our Representatives. Hon. HENRY D. LARCADE, who represents this district, knows how I stand and the others he represents; and when he votes against your "isms," it is because his people feel that way.

We had hoped, Harry, that you would not carry on or try to perpetuate the many "notions" that we had to put up with during the war days and that we could get this United States of America stock company back into the hands of the stockholders.

It is my opinion that you expressed nothing that will benefit us last night. Your principal gripe was against Congress for not doing your bidding and General Motors for desiring to run their own business.

Don't forget that it is safer to place the management of this Nation in the hands of Congress and the Senate than in the hands of one man—some 600 men could come nearer being right than just you. One man means dictator—Congress and the Senate are the only ones that can prevent that, and our prayers are that they will remain on the job and prevent it.

I agree with you that labor has the right to strike—I have the right to quit work if I so desire—but I don't agree that labor has the right nor do I have the right to stand in line with a stick and intimidate the man who doesn't agree with me and wants to work. Free labor means that you have the right to work when you want to or not to if you want to. If we are to protect the man who don't want to work—we should also protect the man who does want to work. That's the kind of law we need. I'll help you get that one.

And I'll help you get one to protect the property of these who don't agree with a group, whether it is industry or a group of men who want to work.

If I was a labor leader, I'd say to the men who depended on me to steer them, "Let's go to work and while we work and earn and serve our country and our families, we shall carry on negotiations with our employers to the end that conditions shall be bettered for all of us." I may be "wet," but it makes good sense to me; of course, I'm pretty dumb because I still have to work and worry 24 hours per day.

No, Harry, you are disappointing the old U. S. A. We had high hopes with you at the wheel. This is a grown-up Nation—we know how to walk—we have gone places and still going places. Your job is plenty tough, I know that, but look at that guy in the mirror; he may be wrong, too, sometimes.

Sincerely,

DEZAUCHE—HIMSELF.

The Labor Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 17, 1946

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I present for careful study two timely articles from the Christian Science Monitor, which enjoys just renown for the moderation and soundness of its views. They are entitled "Mr. Truman Steps In" and "As the Moderates Think."

With these I present a later article from the Washington Post, likewise distinguished for its editorial viewpoints. It is entitled "The President and the Crisis."

[From the Christian Science Monitor of December 4, 1945]

MR. TRUMAN STEPS IN

The form of Government action President Truman has now invoked to prevent large-scale, reconversion-delaying work stoppages should have a fair trial. Eight years ago this newspaper proposed that the methods which have proved so successful under the Railway Labor Act be applied to other industrial disputes where the public had a vital interest. We have repeatedly urged it since, and believe now that the fact-finding plan can greatly reduce industrial warfare.

Mr. Truman is aiming at both short-term and long-term remedies. For one—the situation created by the General Motors strike and the threatened walk-out of steel workers—he is using his Executive powers to set up a board for voluntary arbitration. For the long-range problem, he is recommending that Congress authorize the procedure by legislation.

It has succeeded in the railway field partly because of a recognized public interest and partly because the railway brotherhoods are responsible, disciplined unions. In some fields where it may now be applied the public interest is not so clearly defined, and neither unions nor management have always displayed a high degree of statesmanship. But this approach promises much more than any hasty hodgepodge of vindictive legislation, such as the Smith-Connally Act.

The immediate effect of the President's intervention in the automobile strike may appear to be against the workers, who are asked to go back to work. But the UAW does not seem to be in a particularly strong position, and if the fact-finding gets into a study of General Motors books, the union may welcome Government action more than the company. Even so, the company may accept a decision by a board of recognized caliber and fairness where it would continue to refuse to show its books to the union.

Mr. Truman is stepping into a seeming vacuum, left by the failure of the Labor-Management Conference to propose specific machinery and by the approaching demise of the War Labor Board. Yet intervention of Government involves several dangers, including political favoritism toward one side or the other. And industry may object that the fact-finding process involves an interference with its rights to judge what part of profits should be sown back into production, the setting aside of reserves, etc.

The question to be settled is: When is the public interest vitally affected by industrial strife? As the President says, Government intervention to force arbitration—even though the decision is enforceable only by public opinion—should be held to clear cases. But with companies and unions growing larger, and with the national economy more closely knit, such cases can no longer be limited to the railways or vital public utilities.

Public opinion is bound to be a decisive factor in large-scale industrial warfare. It is far better to have its decision made on the basis of a fact-finding board's report than on the basis of prejudice and partial information played upon by "war" headlines and public-relations strategists. The method promises better to achieve the aim Mr. Truman sets—good labor relations "based on justice and not on tests of strength."

[From the Christian Science Monitor of January 16, 1946]

AS THE MODERATES THINK

Congressmen have come back to Washington, all of them pressed, and many of them eager, to do something toward halting the wave of major strikes.

What can Congress do to be effective, and what should it do to be wise? This is a time of heightened emotions on the subject when partisanship runs strong. It is within such times that Congress finds it can move with decision but for that very reason needs to call upon thinking done in the cooler air of detachment from the immediate crisis.

The judgments of moderates who speak from long and intimate experience with labor-management relations can be assembled into a rough frame of reference within which Congress' proposals can be viewed. The outlines look something like this:

Americans are living in an era of huge, Nation-wide industrial corporations, and hence of huge, Nation-wide labor organizations. They are, for better or for worse, part of the system. The job is to work toward insuring that relations between the two follow some reasonable relation to the general welfare. That means at least a minimum degree of public regulation, and, in extremities, control.

Everyone, including labor, agrees that unions must assume greater responsibility. Responsibility to its own members might be helped by public audit of accounts, by making the freedom and honesty of union elections a matter of public concern, and by outlawing racketeering practices, such as exorbitant initiation fees. Responsibility to management seems attainable less practically by legal penalties for contract violations than by mutual guaranties written into contracts—such as that pending in the Ford negotiations and the one embodied in the Kaiser-Frazer pact.

Strikes can't be abolished by outlawing them for the simple but potent reason that strikes are often as much mass protests by citizens as they are manipulations by labor leaders. On this point authoritative opinion is strong: The hope for avoiding strikes lies in machinery, procedures, practices—anything—that disposes of the small issues and grievances before they snowball to strike proportions.

Here the public interest has long been represented by State and Federal mediation and arbitration services, available on call. Any improvement in these services is progress. Fact-finding boards help to break deadlocks by bringing a reasonably enlightened public opinion to bear. They can function as remedies of early, and in most cases, of last resort.

But increasingly acute is the problem of what to do when disputes in public utilities and in such industries as coal, oil, milk, and meat, have exhausted the resources of conciliation and voluntary arbitration. Government seizure may restore the services but it does not dispose of the controversy. Congress then may find itself obliged to consider means to compel arbitration of such disputes which directly imperil public health and safety. Compulsory arbitration is distasteful to both management and labor. But it is a possible remedy which the very complexity of modern economic life may, of itself, force into a place beside the civil courts as an agency of peace and order.

[From the Washington Post of January 22, 1946]

THE PRESIDENT AND THE CRISIS

Twenty-four hours have gone by since the steel plants of this country closed down. Steel is the heart of our industrial system. The heart has now stopped beating, and the entire economy is fast running down. The people seem condemned to watch a knock-down and drag-out fight between labor and management. They must stand by and see the Nation lapse into a state of paralysis.

For weeks they have heard the spokesmen of both sides say their say interminably. It is now time for the public to take the platform. The Post thinks it would be shirking its public responsibilities if it failed to proffer its own ideas about the grave crisis confronting our country.

The effect on reconversion is immediate. Reconversion is stalled. After 8 months of hard work and skillful deployment by labor and management, the goal was actually in sight. We were 90 percent reconverted. Then silence fell on the automotive, meat, and electrical industries. Steel joins them to make the standstill of our industry complete.

It is a criminal set-back, and seems like a conspiracy. But no good will come out of name calling. Men on both sides are acting according to their convictions. There may be exceptions, but we prefer to think of the combatants as good Americans, all animated in the final analysis by a desire to serve the public. The fact remains that, because of inability to agree, they have thrown their hands in. When labor and management in our major industries quit, a crisis is created. We are in a crisis, not a conspiracy.

From this crisis we shall all suffer. The veteran coming back into our civilian life will be hurt. The prostrate world, looking to the United States for a lead in the work as well as the ways of peace, will lose heart.

The drift back of spreading inactivity must be arrested. This the people demand in self-preservation. But they have no preventive power. Only the President of the United States can act in their united name.

The Post assumes that President Truman is not quitting.

The President has been damned for stepping into the picture at all. It is said that he ought to let the combatants slug it out. This was sound advice when industrial struggles were minor ripples on our community and our international life. But no such advice is tenable when this fight could conceivably hold up the activity of the entire industrial world.

Those who criticize the President for his intervention would have been the first to criticize him for nonintervention. For he had to intervene. The maintenance of the war powers of his office testifies to the fact that we are still in an emergency. This peace emergency calls just as much for Presidential responsibility as did the war emergency.

We do not suggest that the President should be panicked into hasty steps. But the Nation cannot stew in the present mess much longer without inviting an irremediable disaster. He must bring before him the men who in fact guide our industrial destinies. It is now seen to have been foolish to allow negotiations to go on between representative labor and management which was not equally representative. Labor as a whole was talking to men who had no mandate from the whole industry.

In the steel fight the President seems to have thought Mr. Benjamin Fairless was the decisive voice in the steel industry. It turns out he was mistaken. Let him ask the actual leaders of the steel industry to come to the White House.

Let him go further and ask the real leaders in the other major industries to talk things over.

A national crisis requires a national solution. The heart of our current troubles lies in the absence of a wage-price policy for reconversion. Steel could set the pattern. It has set the pattern before in every great change in our economic history. But in this instance the others may want to have their say along with steel. What makes steel and others backward is the effort to keep wages and prices in separate compartments. It has never been done before. It does not make sense. Both have got to be squared.

What has happened is simply a break-down in common sense. Common sense requires that we speed up reconversion. Reconversion means civilian goods. It follows that reconversion is the only way to beat inflation—to stop prices from spiraling—to prevent value from being drained out of our dollars. When this country is reconverted other countries will have a chance to follow.

The set-back can be retrieved by some such action as we have suggested. But every day's delay makes a meeting of minds more difficult. It thrusts the country and the world deeper into economic and social tribulation. In the President's hands is the last peaceful remedy, and no American, anxious for his own and the country's welfare, will deny him the right to invoke it. Mr. Truman would be in default to his own Presidential obligations in this national and international emergency if he balked at it.

Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Minneapolis Star-Journal of January 10, 1946:

WIDE OF THE MARK

In his speech to the people the other night President Truman said that "unemployment has not reached anything like the level which was feared." That is a decided understatement.

Immediately after VJ-day last August 14 the Federal War Manpower Commission estimated that within 3 months—that is, by mid-November 1945—unemployment "might exceed" 5,000,000. That was the most official estimate by ranking Government economists, but there were other Government estimates, not out of line with this one, that 3,100,000 persons would be unemployed in the third quarter of 1945 and 6,300,000 in the fourth quarter. Sidney Hillman estimated that unemployment by last fall would be 10,000,000.

Today, with demobilization well under way but far from complete, and with reconversion far behind what it might have been because of labor controversies and uncertainties about Government policy, actual employment is somewhere between 51,000,000 and 52,500,000—and is growing steadily.

Unemployment is increasing while employment grows because servicemen are being discharged faster than reconversion is proceeding. But unemployment has at no time exceeded 2,000,000 and the peak official figure has been 1,520,000 in the week of October 7–13, 1945.

Elsewhere in last week's address President Truman asked again for full-employment legislation "not only to tide us over the reconversion period but also to carry us on to our goal of full production and a higher standard of living."

Disregarding the fact that full employment legislation never was proposed as a reconversion measure, and that its machinery would not have begun to function for another 6 months even if it had been passed the day after VJ-day, consider this central fact about it in the light of the official Government predictions about unemployment compared with actualities:

The very core of the full-employment bill was its provision that the President predict the pace of business and the volume of employment a year and a half ahead and recommend to Congress measures, including Federal public works, to bring employment into balance.

If Government economists were 200 percent off—as they were—in their estimate of what unemployment would be 3 months ahead, how can the President and Congress expect to work 18 months ahead with any precision?

It happens that the Government experts guessed far too high. But whether they reckon too high or too low is incidental. The point is that economic forecasting is not yet an exact science, and the kind of Government planning which the full employment bill is based upon, and which so many people naively assume would solve our difficulties, is not planning at all in the precise sense, but political mumbo-jumbo.

Obviously it is part of the business of the President and Congress to stimulate employment. Only a relatively small congressional minority would oppose the idea. The reason the full employment measure backed by President Truman and so much of organized labor has gotten nowhere in Congress is simply that it won't do what its champions are pretending or believing. The experience of the last 5 months has proved it again.

Reduction of National Debt Limit

REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 23, 1946

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, let us lock the barn door on our national debt before it is too late.

President Truman, in his message to Congress, stated that the public debt which now amounts to $278,000,000,000 will decrease several billion dollars during the next 18 months. This may be an overoptimistic statement on the part of the President, but it is most encouraging.

Congress should make provision to reduce the statutory national debt limit as we are able to reduce our debt. If Congress does not vote to reduce our national debt limit, it will remain at $300,000,000,000. This margin between the debt limit and the actual debt would be a temptation for careless, extravagant spending of Federal funds. Now is the time to protect our Treasury with an amendment that provides for automatic reduction of our debt limit as we reduce our national debt. It was with that thought in mind that I presented an amendment providing for an automatic reduction in our national debt limit as we reduce our bonded indebtedness after the war. I offered this amendment in committee in April 1945 during the consideration of H. R. 2404, which was reported by the Ways and Means Committee and provided for an increase of the authorized debt of the United States from $260,000,000,000 to $300,000,000,000. The amendment I offered reads as follows:

Provided further, That whenever the President, by proclamation, or the Congress, by concurrent resolution, declares the cessation of hostilities or the termination of the present war, whichever is the earlier, that reductions of bonded indebtedness by the Federal Government be accompanied automatically by a reduction in the national debt limit of like amount.

This amendment was considered by the legal counsel of our committee and by representatives of the Treasury. After considerable study and discussion, it was agreed by the committee that this matter be left for future study and discussion.

Now is the time to revive this amendment, but without limitation to the official declaration of peace. I submit that it would be the only way for the executive and legislative branches to implement the good faith of the budget of 1946–47.

Otherwise, the budget becomes only a document which allows for a margin of error of $30,000,000,000; as a catch-all for all manner of new spending and extravagance.

This body alone, is the steward of Government finances. But for that good reason, should it spend its time reviewing items of a $35,000,000,000 budget and leave a blank check for $30,000,000,000 more? I note with approval that Senator BYRD adheres to this policy.

I am sure that 85,000,000 bondholders and 40,000,000 taxpayers would applaud, too.

I have no illusions about a rapid reduction in our national debt, but I am concerned with what rate our debt limit is reduced whereby to take care of our indebtedness. The reduction and the management of our national debt is going to be a problem for generations to come. If we should decide to retire the debt in annual installments over a period of 100 years, it will involve a charge of approximately $3,000,000,000 per year. This, together with an interest charge of $5,000,000,000 would total approximately $8,000,000,000 annually. Every effort should be made to reduce our national

debt from the sale of surplus war material, funds which have been impounded from the various war activities and the sinking fund which has been set aside for debt retirement during the past few years.

By no stretch of imagination can these funds salvaged from the war effort be regarded as anything but money borrowed from the American people. It would be most dishonest to use them otherwise than for repayment.

Demobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 23, 1946

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include two statements issued from the Pacific by soldiers who are questioning the demobilization program.

The first is entitled "Potential Veteran—Do You Want To Go Home?" The statement outlines some of the promises made to our soldiers by the armed forces. It then sets forth the facts to show how they have been deceived. It is not a pleasant statement, but I believe reflects the thinking of the average GI who feels that his country has broken faith with him.

The second statement entitled "Untruth and Consequences," again states the dissatisfaction with the Army and our Government. These soldiers, who were promised that they might return home, are appealing directly to the people of the United States for fair play.

The statements follow:

POTENTIAL VETERAN, DO YOU WANT TO GO HOME?

We were told:

1. There will be no empty berths returning to United States. (War Department.)
2. We need only 200,000 men for occupation. (MacArthur.)
3. No men will be held after they become eligible. (War Department.)
4. Men not needed for occupation or surplus property disposal will be home by March 1, 1946. (Secretary Patterson.)
5. By March 1946 all men with 2 years service will be eligible. (War Department.)
6. When shipping is available men will go home. (Secretary Patterson when on Guam.)
7. Sixty-eight thousand more berths assigned to AFWESPAC. (War Department.)

Facts:

1. Navy takes 103 ships off Pacific run. (Daily Pacifican, January 4.)
2. Ships leave Manila partly empty. (Daily Pacifican, January 5.)
3. "I didn't know men overseas had stopped accumulating points." (Secretary Patterson.)
4. Secretary Patterson on Guam said he didn't know 2-year men were to become eligible in March 1946.
5. Discharges cut in half; a man may be kept in the Pacific 3 months after becoming eligible. (Lieutenant General Collins.)

This is the story! The Army is up to its old tricks! Believing public opinion sufficiently placated by discharges to date, the Army hopes that it can fall back on such lousy talk as—"but men are not yet eligible". The Army has intentionally slowed down discharges. First it said that there were no ships for men eligible. Now that there is shipping the Army refuses to lower points. Lieutenant General Collins says that due to too many discharges the points will be dropped less than five a month.

Do you want to be used as pressure to get through compulsory military training legislation?

If you want to get home, then do something. Write or cable your family and Congressman. Insist that the Senate investigating committee in Manila Monday hold open hearings for the GI's.

Or do you prefer "Golden Gate in forty-eight"?

UNTRUTH AND CONSEQUENCES

Is Patterson stupid and ignorant of the facts or does he think that we're that gullible. His statements to the press were a direct insult to the American soldiers' intelligence. It has been said of this administration that this is the golden age of incompetency or no brains at the top; however we are underestimating their menace to our welfare. First, it is no ships, now no replacements; are we going to sit by and let them blackmail our families and hold us as hostages to push through their compulsory military training program? We have the right to know definitely when each and every one of us is going home. We are not gathering here to create a disturbance or have a good time, this is serious business. Our Army heads have failed us, our Government is failing us. Now we are appealing directly to the people of the United States only in the interest of fair play. The war is over and we see no need of occupying Allied Nations.

We want to go home.

The Meat Packing Strike

REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. SMITH
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 23, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on day before yesterday, I received a telegram from a reliable citizen informing me that the War Department had issued an order prohibiting all units of the Army from proceeding across any picket line that might be established by strikers around meat-packing plants. I was unable to believe that such a thing was possible and therefore wired the commanding general of the Third Corps Area for the facts. I received in reply the following telegram:

The following wire was dispatched January 19 to all installation commanders under this command: "Until further orders Army trucks under your command will not be permitted to cross picket lines established by striking meat packing unions without agreement with local labor representative concerned."

EDDY,
C. G., Third S. V. C.

I have never expected to live to see the day when the dictatorship of any labor union or other private organization over the Government of the United States would reach the disgraceful stage when the commanding officers of the United States Army would have to ask the gracious permission of labor union officials to allow Army trucks to go about their lawful business in procuring the necessary food and supplies for the armed forces.

It seems to me that this situation needs some clarification. Are we to understand that the general must ask the permission of any striking labor union before he can obtain the necessary meat to feed our Army? That is certainly the plain implication of the order.

The next question is: If the dictators of the labor union decline permission to obtain meat for the soldiers, what, when, where, and how do the soldiers eat? If they cannot eat beef, do they eat pork and beans? And if the pork-and-beans unions strike, must we then ask permission from that set of dictators, or must the soldiers eat something else?

Another question presents itself. If the unions have taken over the United States Army, it would appear that there is a division of command. Both A. F. of L. and CIO meat-packers' unions are striking. Whose permission must the general obtain in order to feed his Army? Must he have the permission of Gen. William Green of the A. F. of L. or Gen. Philip Murray of the CIO? Or must he have permission of both generals?

But, on the other hand, suppose Gen. William Green graciously accords the soldiers permission to eat, but Gen. Philip Murray refuses. What then is the result on the soldiers' bill of fare?

It seems to me that all of these questions lead to demonstrate the dire necessity for having a unification of command. Perhaps someone can suggest a plan by which we can unify the A. F. of L. and the CIO so that the War Department, in order to feed our soldiers, may only have to require the permission of one labor dictator instead of a number.

I hope that the Military Affairs Committee, which has jurisdiction to investigate the conduct of the War Department, will proceed at once to investigate this subject and relieve the anxiety of the American people on this very vital question of who commands the United States Army.

Chester Bowles, Price Administrator, Clarifies Notice of January 15 Respecting Ceilings for 1946 Cotton Crop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 23, 1946

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, there is general agreement among cotton growers that ceilings on raw cotton are unworkable and unenforceable. The crop of 1945 was not only one of the shortest, but probably the most expensive ever produced. Cotton growers were shocked when on January 15, 1946, the Office of Price Administration issued an advance release of a notice of ceilings

on the 1946 cotton crop. I quote from the advance release:

OPA explained that the purpose of the announcement is to put growers on notice of the maximum price they can expect to get for their crop under OPA ceilings.

I further quote from the administrative notice:

The proposed maximum price in each case is the base price of 24.09 cents per pound.

The Representatives in Congress from the cotton-producing States promptly met and after full discussion appointed a committee from each of the cotton-producing States to convey to Chester Bowles, Price Administrator, and to Clinton Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture, the unanimous protest of the Representatives from the cotton-producing States to the proposed ceilings on raw cotton and the unanimous request that said ceilings be revoked.

Following conferences between Mr. Bowles, Price Administrator, and Mr. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture, and the committee, Mr. Bowles gave out a clarifying press release on Tuesday, January 22, 1946. After the release was made the committee reported to the Representatives from the Cotton Belt on the conferences with the Price Administrator and the Secretary of Agriculture. The Representatives again emphasized their opposition to the proposed ceilings and the committee was continued for further protests upon the assurances of the Price Administrator and the Secretary of Agriculture that no further steps would be taken with respect to ceilings on raw cotton without notice to the committee, and without an opportunity to the committee to present further views and protests of the Representatives opposing ceilings before any decision for ceilings was reached or announced.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the said clarifying press release of Chester Bowles, Price Administrator, of January 22, 1946, as follows:

On January 15, 1946, I issued an advance notice of proposed ceiling prices on the 1946 crop of cotton. Some misapprehensions among cotton growers have resulted from an apparent misunderstanding of that statement. I wish, therefore, to clarify several points.

The notice applies only to the 1946 crop. The proposed ceiling prices contained in the advance notice represent the legal minimum levels at which ceilings would be established if it should become necessary to take such action later in the season. Under no circumstances will ceilings be fixed on the 1946 crop at less than the announced prices. If ceiling prices are established at a later date they can, of course, be higher than the prices proposed in the notice. In other words, the prices in the notice are the lowest ceiling prices that can be established, not the highest.

An advance notice of this character is required under the act to be given at least 15 days before the normal planting season. Cotton is normally planted in southern Texas beginning about February 1. As Price Administrator, I would have been remiss in my duties if I had failed to issue the recent notice covering raw cotton produced in the crop year 1946. The market for raw cotton has been advancing steadily since last August and is now above parity. Without such a notice, it would have been legally impossible to established any ceiling prices later in the year, regardless of what happened to cotton prices. It is a technical procedure.

Should we consider that an inflationary situation is developing in the future in the price of cotton so that ceilings would seem to be necessary, I would call in a representative group of cotton growers to consult with and advise me on every aspect of this problem. I shall give consideration to their recommendations. This is the orderly procedure set up under the Price Control Act.

It is sincerely hoped that a program of ceiling prices for cotton marketed after the beginning of the 1946 marketing year will be unnecessary. If it becomes evident that the price of cotton is becoming stabilized because of improvement in supply or other reasons, no ceiling will be imposed. I am very conscious of the difficulties which might be encountered in the administration of cotton ceilings.

The situation is being constantly watched and every relevant factor and circumstance will receive thorough consideration. The final decisions on whether there should or should not be ceiling prices on raw cotton and at what level are still to be made.

It has been our policy to place ceilings on basic agricultural commodities when prices reach or exceed parity, as is the case with wheat and corn.

Price action affecting agricultural products must be a joint decision of the Secretary of Agriculture and OPA. The announcement made on January 15 was approved by both agencies. Any ceiling imposed at a later date would similarly require the approval of both agencies.

Rigid OPA Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 15, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious obstacles to reconversion—one which must be removed before the goals of reconversion can be attained—is the rigid pattern set by the Office of Price Administration in attempting to control prices.

OPA, itself, could contribute toward the establishment of a stable peacetime economy and without producing additional inflation, by adopting a broad policy toward price alterations, simply stated. Simplification is a necessity. Court decisions affecting OPA, OPA orders, amendments to those orders, and Executive orders relating to the OPA, filled 18 large volumes by the spring of 1945. Much of this material is so involved as to be incapable of interpretation by businessmen and their legal advisers. Even OPA lawyers privately admit their inability to understand this accumulation.

It is high time that this wartime stock pile of price procedure, which involves the actual making of law by a nonlaw-making branch of the Government should be surveyed and the needless and detrimental parts junked. The stockholders who invest in industry; management, with the responsibility of operating industry; labor, whose wages come from industry; and the consumer, whose purchasing power supports industry—all have a vital stake in getting OPA to establish a broad price policy, simply stated.

OPA could certainly give a powerful impetus to reconversion if it would supersede its price-fogging methods with a policy announcement to the effect; for instance, that—

OPA will no longer try to handle price details of industry. Industry itself may handle its own price details within this limitation: Take the 1940 selling price, plus the actual increase since 1940 in basic wages, excluding overtime, and the actual increase in the cost of purchase of goods and services as the basis of the product's selling price.

Such an action would constructively stimulate every sector of American economy. It would not be of a temporary or of an artificial nature, for it would reach everyone, irrespective of the type of employment in which he was engaged. By using 1940—our last full peacetime production year—as normal, the elemental injustice contained in President Truman's address on wages and prices on October 30 can be corrected. The President said, in part:

There are several reasons why I believe that industry as a whole can afford substantial wage increases without price increases. * * * Improvements in machinery and manufacturing know-how developed in the war can certainly result in more goods per hour and additional room for wage increases.

The Truman premise ignores the fact that industry has been engaged in war production since 1941 and much of the peacetime know-how must now be regained. Labor expert Leo Wolman, in the Washington Post of November 4, stated:

The most prolific and the most popular source of economies is, of course, greater efficiency. It is from the increased output per man and per man-hour that most people hope to receive substantial increases in pay. But * * * the hopes are illusory. Out of an estimated labor force in 1940 of 54,000,000, less than 30,000,000 were employed in industry and some 25,000,000 in rendering service to the public. No one * * * anticipates a spectacular advance in service efficiency important enough to absorb the considerable wage advance since 1939.

In other words, OPA is now applying its rigid price-control methods to industries which, through their very nature, or because they are now confronted with the expense of reconversion, find it most difficult to regain the peacetime know-how, laid aside to produce for war.

To reach all industries in a "broad price policy, simply stated," the OPA should apply this policy first to the major industries which most affect the national income. Construction, automobile manufacture, steel, electrical equipment, and transportation would, naturally, come under this classification. With increased freedom to work out their own destiny by the handling of within-industry price details, the people of the United States could well look forward to augmented productivity and prosperity. It might well be that there would be no further need to stimulate smaller industries, directly dependent on the basic industries, since prosperity in the parent field would be reflected in any offshoots of that field.

Nevertheless, it would be important to follow up the initial application of self-determination within the larger Nation-wide industries with an extension of the same policy to independent and unrelated industries. This second step could well be made within 2 months after the first, since such a period would give sufficient time to establish the practical working out of the new OPA policy and to get together data on possible improvements.

This, in essence, would then be—not a sudden relaxation of OPA wartime price controls—but a reapplication, realistically made, of such controls to altered peacetime circumstances. Meanwhile, this process in action should be kept continually before an informed public. Stockholders, management, labor, and consumers are parts of that public. It is a major fallacy to consider any group as isolated from the welfare of the whole.

With OPA's new policy in actual operation—and with the American people knowing the reason for creating that policy and the goals established in order to return to peacetime industry, what is next on the uphill road to reconversion?

Here is where the Director of Reconversion would come into the picture. In this situation, the Director could well call in the top executives of individual companies in industries where the new OPA policy was in action for special consultation. It would be the Director's task to seek an unofficial and private pledge to price for volume during the next 9 months. Of course, such a pledge would be effective only if the broad OPA policy had been publicly announced and if the OPA had every intention of standing back of such announced policy.

There should be no question as to the sincerity of these private pledges entered into by heads of Government agencies and business executives. The smooth functioning of the late War Production Board's industrial scheduling was based on such agreements. Under Chairman Nelson and later under Chairman Krug, much of the success of the United States in doing as Gen. Nathan Bedford Forrest said—in getting there "fu'stest with the mostest men"—as directly due to the absolute integrity and to the carrying out to the letter of promises made by management to the WPB heads.

And there is no reason to believe that leaders of industry would not cooperate equally as well with the Reconversion Director and OPA Director Bowles—if the industrial leaders are given a clear idea of what is expected of them, specific assurances that the agencies involved will work with them rather than against them, and a simple, just price policy for them to apply within their own industries.

A broad price policy, simply stated, would tend to benefit OPA by enlisting industry on its side. As it now operates, OPA, in a legislative sense, formulates price regulation. Then, in a judicial sense, it interprets those same rules. Finally, in an administrative sense, OPA sees to it that the rules are enforced. Thus, a single Government agency, in actual practice, exercises the three distinct functions of our Government as set down in the Constitution as the basis for our system of checks and balances—the legislative, the judicial, and the executive. It is this unwarranted concentration of powers which underlies the instinctive American distrust of OPA. As a nation, we grumble over small inconveniences, but we deeply resent usurpation of authority.

What would a broad price policy, simply stated, do to remove this difficulty? Industry, by assuming the responsibility of handling within-industry price details, would take away the offensive and unconstitutional legislative function of OPA. At the conferences between top executives of individual companies and the Director of Reconversion, a single interpretation of the industry-created price regulations could be reached—thus, eliminating OPA's offensive and unconstitutional judicial function. What would remain? OPA's recognized and constitutional function as an administrative agency. It could then act as an efficient policing agent to bring to justice possible violations of the rules which industry itself had made and whose interpretation had been agreed upon between representatives of industry and the Director of Reconversion.

A return to basic American principles could be accomplished while, at the same time, making progress in establishing American economy on a firm and sound basis.

The possibility of attaining such goals is a challenge to industry, to labor and to government. A broad OPA price policy, simply stated, is not only worth trying for; it is worth utilizing our combined effort and our combined experience to achieve. In our present economic crisis we cannot afford to evade our responsibility. We must act and act now. Procrastination is inexcusable for we have long known and we know today, that OPA's rigid price-control methods have been and are now stumbling blocks to reconversion. We also know how those stumbling blocks can be removed.

Let us get the old OPA quagmire price policy out of the way. Let us get on with the new, broad, simple OPA policy. Let us grasp our postwar future by refusing to remain bogged down in our wartime past.

I wish it distinctly understood that I am not opposing an OPA policy that recognizes the fact that no business can nor will long continue to operate at a loss; that no sane individual will take his money out of the bank and invest in a new enterprise; that no small manufacturer who has temporarily engaged in war work can safely return to peacetime production unless his increased costs are reflected in his selling price.

The sooner this fact is recognized and the policy of OPA is amended accordingly, the sooner reconversion will be completed and our people, all of them who can and will work, can have the jobs they need. All of us will then be able to quickly get the many things we want and need.

Surplus Government Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 23, 1946

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a resolution from the American Legion Post, No. 7, of Alliance, Nebr.

This resolution points out the great dissatisfaction with the present method of disposing of surplus property. It indicates plainly the very things that have been emphasized upon this floor many times. It must be apparent by now that the Surplus Property Act, as passed by Congress, is not being administered as intended by this Congress. Unless something is done to straighten out this problem, it may well prove to be one of the major scandals following this war.

The resolution follows:

Whereas veterans are finding it more and more difficult to purchase surplus Government property, to which preferential right has been provided by law; and

Whereas the supply of such property is adequate, but due to conditions beyond the veterans' control, little if any of this property is getting into their hands; and

Whereas the veteran is in need of such property, and as rules and regulations now laid down by the certification agency requires that he spend considerable time and expense to appear personally at the headquarters of such certification agency to establish his eligibility; and, after receiving such certification he may find it necessary to travel many miles and in the opposite direction to make the purchase of property desired; and

Whereas the certification and disposal agencies have been changed numerous times by Executive order and regulations which further curtails and delays veteran's possibilities of obtaining such property for which he is otherwise eligible: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Alliance Post No. 7, American Legion, hereby directs appropriate action be taken to make it possible that the presentation of a veteran's honorable discharge certificate to the disposal agency be sufficient evidence to establish priority and eligibility to purchase any surplus Government property within the limits of fair share distribution. It is further directed that a more uniform method of notification of time, location, and type of surplus properties offered for sale be made available to veterans; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be spread on the minutes of this meeting and copies mailed to all American Legion posts in Nebraska, the department and national headquarters of the American Legion, the national legislative committee of the American Legion, all Nebraska Members of Congress, and chairman of Veterans' Affairs Committee of the Congress.

Adopted by Alliance Post, No. 7, American Legion, Alliance, Nebr., this 16th day of January 1946.

R. V. COPSEY,
Post Commander.
P. A. MOLLER,
Post Adjutant.

Report of Board of Visitors to United States Merchant Marine Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARDIN PETERSON
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 23, 1946

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report of the Congressional Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy, Kings Point, N. Y., June 8, 1945:

REPORT OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY, 1945

KINGS POINT, N. Y., *June 8, 1945.*

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.
THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

GENTLEMEN: Pursuant to Public Law 301, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, approved May 11, 1944, the following Senators and Members of the House of Representatives were designated to constitute the 1945 Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy:

SENATORS

By the Vice President:
HARLEY M. KILGORE, of West Virginia.
By the Committee on Commerce:
JOSIAH W. BAILEY, of North Carolina (ex officio).
THEODORE G. BILBO, of Mississippi.
ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin.

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

By the Speaker of the House:
EUGENE J. KEOGH, Ninth Congressional District of New York.
ELLSWORTH B. BUCK, Eleventh Congressional District of New York.
By the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee:
SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND, First Congressional District of Virginia (ex officio).
RICHARD J. WELCH, Fifth Congressional District of California.
J. HARDIN PETERSON, First Congressional District of Florida.
FRANK W BOYKIN, First Congressional District of Alabama

Representatives HENRY M. JACKSON, Second Congressional District of Washington, and JAMES DOMENGEAUX, Third Congressional District of Louisiana, were later appointed in the places of Mr SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND, of Virginia, and Mr. FRANK W. BOYKIN, of Alabama, respectively, who were unable to attend.

Representative ALVIN F. WEICHEL, Thirteenth Congressional District of Ohio, a member of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, accompanied the Board.

The members of the Board were accompanied from Washington to Kings Point by the following officers from headquarters of the training organization of the War Shipping Administration: Commodore Telfair Knight, USMS, Assistant Deputy Administrator for Training and Commandant of the United States Maritime Service; Lt. Comdr. John T. Everett, USNR, operations officer of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps; Comdr. Sam H. McConnell, USMS, chief public relations officer of the training organization; Lt. Comdr. Hale Boggs, USMS, chief legal officer of the training organization; and Lt. Comdr. Clifford W. Sandberg, USNR, of the Academy staff and secretary to the Board.

The Board assembled at Wiley Hall, Kings Point, at 10 a. m., Thursday, June 7, 1945, where the members were received by the Superintendent, Commodore Giles C. Stedman, USNR, and his staff.

The following members of the Board were present at the first meeting: Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Representatives J. HARDIN PETERSON, JAMES DOMENGEAUX, RICHARD J. WELCH, ALVIN F. WEICHEL, and ELLSWORTH B. BUCK.

FIRST MEETING OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY served as temporary chairman for the purpose of organization.

Representative J. HARDIN PETERSON was elected permanent chairman of the Board. Lt. Comdr. Clifford W. Sandberg, USNR, and Lt. Comdr. William L. Bull, USMS, were designated as secretary and assistant secretary of the Board, respectively.

At the request of the chairman, the Superintendent and his staff joined the Board in conference. The Superintendent was invited to make such reports on the state of the Academy as he deemed pertinent and proper. Accordingly, Commodore Giles C. Stedman, USNR, submitted a report, a copy of which is forwarded herewith.

The meeting was then opened for general questions.

Upon the termination of the question period, the Superintendent invited the Chairman to designate a member of the Board to address the regiment of cadet-midshipmen immediately prior to the regimental review at 4 p. m. on Kendrick Field. Senator WILEY was unanimously selected by the Board to make this address.

At this time the regimental commander, Cadet-Midshipman A. B. De Laski, United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps, was presented to the Chairman and members of the Board when he extended them an invitation to join the regiment of cadet-midshipmen at luncheon at Delano Hall.

Recess was taken at 11:45 a. m.

After interviewing a group of cadet-midshipmen from his home State, Representative RICHARD J. WELCH left Kings Point at 12:30 p. m., being unable to remain for the balance of the visit.

MEETING WITH THE REGIMENT OF CADET-MIDSHIPMEN

At 12:35 p. m. the members of the Board were escorted to Delano Hall by the cadet-midshipmen regimental commander and his staff for luncheon with the regiment.

After luncheon each member of the Board conducted a 30-minute private conference with cadet-midshipmen from his home State.

Accompanied by assigned officer escorts, the Board proceeded at 2 p. m. on a general inspe tion of the Academy, visiting Barry Hall, cadet-midshipmen barracks, the receiving barracks in Furuseth Hall, and the departments of seamanship and navigation, engineering, and naval science; Bowditch, Fulton, ar ' C'Hara Halls, respectively, as well as the improvised chapel in Wiley Hall.

At 4 p. m. the Board witnessed the review of the regiment of cadet-midshipmen on Kendrick Field, following brief addresses by Senator WILEY, Representative PETERSON, and the Superintendent.

SUPERINTENDENT'S RECEPTION AND DINNER

The Superintendent's reception and dinner in honor of the Board, which had been augmented by the arrival of Representative HENRY M JACKSON, was held in Markin House at 7:30 p. m. It was attended also by Commodore Knight, Captain McNulty, and the members of the Superintendent's staff.

Upon conclusion of the dinner, a documentary film, Future Leaders of Our Merchant Marine, depicting the activities of the Academy and Cadet Corps, was shown.

Because of previous commitments, Representative JAMES DOMENGEAUX left Kings Point at the conclusion of the dinner.

FRIDAY, JUNE 8, 1945

Because of a pressing legislative calendar in the Senate, Senator WILEY found it necessary to leave Kings Point for Washington, D. C., at 8:30 a. m. Commencing at 9 a. m., the Board was escorted on a tour of Samuels Hall, where they inspected the sail loft, marlinspike seamanship room, the signaling classrooms, bridge, and other training and life-saving equipment.

At 9:30 a. m., the Board left Mallory Pier on the *T. V. William Webb* for a short cruise on Long Island Sound to view the waterfront facilities of the Academy. Upon return from this cruise the Board proceeded to Wiley Hall, convening at 10 a. m. for their second formal conference, having been joined by Representative EUGENE J. KEOGH.

Present at the second formal conference were Representatives J. HARDIN PETERSON, EUGENE J. KEOGH, HENRY M. JACKSON, ALVIN F. WEICHEL, ELLSWORTH B. BUCK.

In accordance with their previously expressed isl., the Board received a delegation of 25 cadet-midshipmen selected at random from each class at Kings Point. At this point, the secretary and assistant secretary withdrew from the conference room and members of the Board conferred with the cadet-midshipmen in closed session.

Upon the recall of the secretary and assistant secretary to the conference room, the Board requested Commodore Knight, Captain McNulty and the Superintendent to appear before them.

Commodore Knight, who has served in an executive capacity with the entire training program since its inception in 1938, presented the respects of Vice Adm. Emory S. Land, Administrator, and Capt. Edward Macauley, deputy administrator in charge of the training program, and addressed the Board briefly recounting the history of the cadet training program and explaining that Congress, in passing the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, gave the Maritime Commission a joint mandate to build and man modern American ships. The training program, including the United States Maritime Service, the supervision of State maritime academies, as well as the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps, was a direct outgrowth of this mandate.

The United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps and its Academy as well as the entire training program, Commodore Knight pointed out, are permanently established by statute and will function after the war in the Maritime Commission. Tentative postwar plans have already been outlined to Congress and are published in the report of the Worley committee. These plans contemplate an Academy enrollment of approximately 1,200 during the postwar years.

At the conclusion of Commodore Knight's statement, the chairman instructed the secretary to invite the Academy staff officers to rejoin the conference. At this time the chairman and other members of the Board expressed their appreciation for the information furnished them and for the courtesies extended.

Upon the departure of the Superintendent and Academy staff, the Board continued its deliberations in executive session. Its comments and recommendations are set forth below. There being no further business, the Board adjourned at 11:45 a. m. The members then attended a buffet luncheon at the senior officers' mess, following which they took their departure from Kings Point at their pleasure.

After due deliberation, and as a result of the two formal conferences held with the Superintendent and members of the Academy staff, cadet-midshipmen of the regiment, and the several inspections conducted, the Board

of Visitors respectfully submits the following general comments and specific recommendations:

GENERAL COMMENTS

1. To dispel any misunderstanding, the Board desires to strongly emphasize the fact that the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps was created prior to the war pursuant to the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, and that its site at Kings Point, N. Y., was acquired for the purpose of constructing a permanent Merchant Marine Academy as shown by the reports which accompanied House Joint Resolution No. 260 (Public Law 472, 77th Cong.; 56 Stat. 124), approved March 4, 1942.

2. The Board desires to record its appreciation and admiration of the foresight, tenacity, and devotion to duty displayed by the supervisor of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps, Capt. R. R. McNulty, USNR, for his efforts in bringing about the creation of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps and its Academy at Kings Point, and for his administration of the functions of the corps since its inception in 1938.

3. The Board also desires to commend Vice Adm. Emory Scott Land, USN (retired), Administrator of the War Shipping Administration; Deputy Administrator Edward Macauley, and Commodore Telfair Knight, USMS, under whom Capt. R. R. McNulty, USNR, and Commodore Giles C. Stedman, USNR, serve, for their wisdom and guidance in the development of the training program for officers and seamen of our merchant marine of which the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps and its Academy at Kings Point are a part.

4. The Board recognizes that while the present plant and facilities of the Academy may have been adequate for the needs of the wartime training program, it is impressed with the necessity for an expansion of facilities if the ultimate aims and objectives for which the Academy was created are to be realized. The most obvious immediate needs of the Academy are for an adequate library and a suitable chapel.

5. It is the considered opinion of the Board that the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps and its Academy at Kings Point are a most vital adjunct to the maintenance of a strong merchant marine and Naval Reserve. Upon the character and education of our officer personnel will largely depend the security of our position in the field of international commerce and our status as a sea power.

6. The Board is gratified to learn of the resumption of competitive examinations for entrance to the Cadet Corps on the basis of State quota allotments, along the lines of those conducted in 1939 and 1940, which were suspended after Pearl Harbor. This action was the result of recommendation made by the Board of Visitors in 1944. It is believed that the competitive method of selection will result in securing the highest type and most apt young men for officers training in the merchant marine. It is the Board's thought that in addition to the Nation-wide competitive examination system, steps be taken to develop fully the possibility of working out a process of screening prospective entrants for leadership and officerlike qualities before admission to the Academy.

7. In the discussion of the curriculum, it was developed that the present course of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps would be extended from 2 to 3 years effective September 1, 1945. Further, that the 3 years consist of 6 months at either of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps basic schools at Pass Christian, Miss., or San Mateo, Calif., followed by 6 months on merchant ships and 24 months at Kings Point. The Board encourages those responsible for this progressive step and hopes that measures will be taken to extend the course to 4 years at an early date. In this connection, the Board believes that consideration should be given to adopt post-graduate or refresher courses for wartime graduates so that they may be placed on a comparable level with the men in the extended course. It is understood that such refresher courses will be given at the United State Maritime Service Officers' Schools at Fort Trumbull and Alameda. Further, the Board feels that appropriate measures should be taken to have the Academy placed upon an accredited basis for the awarding of degrees.

8. To qualify the United States Merchant Marine Academy to issue degrees, the Board feels that a properly equipped library building should be provided.

9. It is clearly evident to the Board that the present facilities for divine worship at the United States Merchant Marine Academy are wholly inadequate. The improvised chapel in Wiley Hall seating 100, which is less than 7 percent of the cadet-midshipmen complement, is entirely too small for holding adequate religious services.

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Board specifically recommends that funds be made available as soon as possible for a suitable chapel and an adequate library.

2. The Board specifically recommends that funds be provided for the development of adequate athletic and recreational facilities.

3. The Board specifically recommends that the Superintendent's discretionary fund be authorized in the sum of $3,500 per annum, an increase of $1,000 over the present fund.

CONCLUSION

The members of the Board have been particularly impressed with the splendid establishment at Kings Point, the highly efficient educational program and the fine type of young men participating therein, and wish to congratulate the Superintendent, Commodore Giles C. Stedman, USNR, his officers, cadet-midshipmen, and personnel of the United States Merchant Marine Academy for their outstanding accomplishments.

The Board is unanimous in its commendation of the morale and spirit at the Academy, and expresses its appreciation of the many courtesies extended during their visit.

To Lieutenant Commander Sandberg, secretary to the Board of Visitors, and to Lieutenant Commander Bull, assistant secretary, the Board expresses its sincere appreciation of their invaluable assistance and untiring efforts on its behalf.

Respectfully submitted.

J. HARDIN PETERSON, Chairman; ALEXANDER WILEY; HARLEY M. KILGORE; THEO. G. BILBO; JAMES DOMENGEAUX; EUGENE J. KEOGH; RICHARD J. WELCH; ELLSWORTH R. BUCK.

Sugar-Coated Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 23, 1946

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the St. Louis Globe Democrat entitled "Sugar-Coated Socialized Medicine."

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that when the people affected by this political socialized medicine realize that they must make the major contribution to this fund and then have someone in Washington tell them who they might call when they are ill, they will be less enthusiastic about socialized medicine.

The editorial follows:

SUGAR-COATED SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

President Truman in his health message to Congress last month declared he is not proposing socialized medicine. Almost simultaneously a National Health Act, embodying his requests, was introduced in Congress by Senators WAGNER and MURRAY and Representative DINGELL (S. 1606—H. R. 4730). They, too, insist that the proposed legislation does not aim at socialized medicine. The reiteration suggests that both the President and the legislators fear the American people will believe socialized medicine is inherent in the bills and don't want it. We believe this is the sentiment of an overwhelming majority.

The President has recommended that Federal funds be used to construct hospitals and related facilities, to expand the Public Health and Maternal and Child Health Services; to assist medical research and education; to aid in the prepayment of medical costs, and to protect against loss of wages from sickness and disability.

With the first three provisions there can be little quarrel. Medical authorities themselves have long advocated such extensions, with Federal aid to States, where need is shown, being administered by States. These were largely embodied in the Hill-Burton bill introduced in the Senate last February.

The Wagner-Murray-Dingell bills would appropriate $950,000,000 over the next 9 years for these purposes—probably not an excessive amount. But the catch lies in the last two sections providing for health and disability unemployment insurance—sections which clearly belie contentions that socialized medicine is not contemplated.

In brief these would insure full personal health services to all social security beneficiaries and their dependents—probably 110,000,000 persons. Cost is estimated at $4,000,000,000. This fund would be at the sole disposal of the Social Security Administrator and the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service. Under direction of the Administrator the latter is authorized to hire doctors, dentists, nurses, laboratory technicians, and establish rates of pay; fix fee schedules for physicians' and dentists' services; decree qualifications for specialists; determine the number of individuals for whom any doctor or dentist may provide services, and determine which hospitals may provide service for patients and under what conditions.

Significantly, the measures set out no mode of revenue raising, but the administration has suggested a 4-percent pay-roll deduction from both employee and employer might be necessary. The omission lends plausibility to the wide charge that Senator MURRAY left it out to further the no-socialization deception and to permit it to be referred to the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, chairmanned by himself, rather than to the more frugal Committee on Finance.

Since the State administrative committees it provides would be purely advisory, it is clear the Surgeon General would be cast in the role of a medical dictator holding a $4,000,000,000 political club with which to punish or remold the private practice of medicine to fit any sociological theory he might hold. Meanwhile workers would be forced to pay into the system, however much they might dislike it or however much undeserving derelicts might cash in on it. President Truman says the system must be "highly decentralized in administration." Let him who has not seen national bureaucracy in operation believe that one. Whoever holds the purse runs the show, and from the place where the money is held.

This is the standpoint also from which the sickness and disability, compensation is undesirable. All workers would be dependent on the Government for jobless payments.

The change-over logically would involve transfer of State unemployment reserves to the Social Security Board, and give the agency full control over all labor and working conditions throughout the Nation, with authority to shift workers from State to State.

Admittedly there are many shortcomings to our present medical-care system. But surely there are means to overcome them without submitting to a multibillion-dollar political dictatorship which amounts to socialized medicine, the President notwithstanding.

Veterans' Compensation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 23, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, today I received a letter from the mother of a youngster recently separated from the service, after having served 5 years and 10 months in the United States Air Corps, 3 years of which he served in China, in Burma, and in India. He enlisted in the service before he had completed his education and consequently had no job to which he could return following his discharge. He persistently sought employment, and in November last he finally was called to the Chevrolet plant in Bay City, Mich., for work. He has been on the job only 2 days, 2 hours and 45 minutes when the CIO ordered the strike which still exists.

This was this youngster's first attempt at industrial work. He was not a member of the union, and he had no vote either for or against the strike. He was broke and anxious to work. He found himself without a job and he now is denied veteran's unemployment compensation because of something for which he was not in the slightest degree responsible.

I believe the situation in which this boy finds himself is similar to that of many thousands of other discharged soldiers and sailors. Certainly the Congress should take action to speedily remedy this deplorable situation.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the letter from this mother. I have known this family for many years. The father was a veteran of the First World War and likewise is a veteran of the Second World War. These people spring from a breed that believes when one accepts the privileges of citizenship they likewise gladly accept the responsibilities thereof. They are among the very finest citizens we have.

The letter follows:

STANDISH, MICH., *January 22, 1946.*
Hon. ROY O. WOODRUFF,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I just finished writing to the Veterans' Bureau and will write several more letters on the same subject today.

It seems our Government needs to be reminded that our returned veterans have problems that might well be considered along with the loan for Great Britain. I am thoroughly sick and disgusted with the whole English mess, and I dare say the American women all feel the same way.

My son returned to civilian life September 29, 1945, after having served 5 years and 10 months in the United States Air Corps. Three years he served in China, Burma, and India. (It did not add to his or my love for England.)

Prior to his enlistment he was a schoolboy, so he had no job to come back to. His mustering-out pay went for clothing, doctor bills, and board and room in the city while seeking employment. In November he finally was called to the Chevrolet plant in Bay City. Just 2 days, 2 hours, and 45 minutes later the CIO ordered the strike.

This was my son's first attempt at industrial work. He is not a member of the union and had no vote, either for or against the strike. He was broke and wanted to work. But he is now denied veterans' compensation because he worked 18 hours and 45 minutes for Chevrolet.

Will you kindly tell me if this is an example of what we may expect in treatment for returned veterans of foreign service from a supposedly democratic United States? And who in the meantime (while the unions keep him out of work, with no compensation) is supposed to support this lad and other thousands in similar positions?

Personally, I believe the Government is giving these kids a rotten deal in return for hardship, heartache, medals, and ribbons.

You have made Michigan a wonderful Congressman, and I am sure you will do all and everything possible for her boys.

Sincerely,

MRS. ANNA M. SANFORD.

Communists Close Schools—CIO Hikes the Rent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 23, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from Flint, Mich., comes a letter enclosing three newspaper articles which throw some light on the forces back of some of the strikes and a hint as to how the CIO, when it becomes an employer, forgets its propaganda in behalf of the renter—of tenants.

The writer states that he is "not a politician because I am not educated enough to explain in words what I have in my heart. Thought you might do something to put across just what kind of men are at the heads of our [Flint] unions."

The writer of this letter may not, in one sense of the word, be educated, but he is a worker and he evidently knows something of what it is all about, for, after referring to the fact that the war which the young men had fought made it possible for union men to get higher wages, wrote:

Now, those boys can't put on demonstrations just to come home but these unionists defy all WLB orders and have been given everything they asked for just for their vote. But if the soldiers put on more demonstrations, they are told they are liable to court martial.

We all thought possibly Mr. Truman would try to build up some of the things that had been torn down previously, but guess we are all disappointed.

The clipping from the Flint Journal of Thursday, January 17, 1946, reads as follows:

ALL SCHOOLS CLOSED EXCEPT HAZELTON—HERE'S THE MAN LEADING PUBLIC SCHOOLS SHUT-DOWN

Leader of the education strike which has paralyzed Flint schools is a Communist Party member who, during the war, was a member of a committee named by the Communists to promote understanding of the Communist theories in Flint and Pontiac schools, data gathered by the FBI and other organizations has disclosed.

Casper P. Kenny, identified in Communist data uncovered by Government agencies as "the best worker here," was under constant surveillance during the war by the FBI, Army Intelligence and other organizations whose job it was to carefully watch the activities of sinister characters known to expound ideas and theories detrimental to the structure of the United States.

Kenny is also a convicted bootlegger and served time in the Shiawassee County jail after a conviction in Federal court. He was also arrested by Flint police in 1929 and booked at the city jail here under an assumed name.

Records disclose that Kenny was arrested November 25, 1931, by Mike Burns, now Sheriff Wolcott's deputy, and then Mount Morris chief of police, on a Federal liquor act charge. He was turned over to Federal authorities and sentenced by Federal Judge Arthur J. Tuttle, to 60 days. He was arrested and held for investigation by Flint police in 1929 under the name of Casper Douglas. He was later released.

Government authorities have disclosed that Kenny frequently attended Communist meetings, and before Russia entered the war was active in a campaign promoting the Communist theory that American workers should not aid Britain and her allies. After Russia entered the war, pamphlets urging workers to retain their right to strike during the war were destroyed and replaced by others advocating a no strike pledge—a complete about face to which Kenny subscribed, documents show.

Investigators report that Kenny, also state representative from Flint, maintained his membership in the Communist Party during this campaign and it was only through Kenny that certain people could be admitted to Communist meetings and educational programs.

In a letter confiscated by authorities and written to Pat Toohy, secretary of the Communist Party of Michigan by Hugo Beisinger, Flint secretary of the party, describing a recent quarrel in which Kenny and a woman had become engaged at a Communist Party rally, Kenny was identified thus:

"Both Cap (Casper Kenny) and Lou Baraty, best guys here, are incensed over the affair." Investigators said it was proven the Cap mentioned in the letter was Casper P. Kenny, frequently identified by comrades as "Cap."

The investigators also conferred with men who claimed that Kenny frequently boasted of his Communist affiliations and showed them his card. It was also found that Kenny was in charge of selling subscriptions to the Daily Worker in this area. One of the secret agents purchased a subscription from a man who declared he was working for Kenny. All of the information is now on file with the FBI, Army Intelligence, and other police officials.

Kenny has been seen at various Communist meetings here and other cities. His name and the name of his wife are included on letters and secret documents sent out by Communists to other workers.

The Kenny investigation disclosed a Communist pamphlet sent to all members before

Russia entered the war in which the policies to be followed here were outlined as follows:

"Our position is to remain loyal to the CIO program, defend the right to strike against any forms of compulsory arbitration and mediation for organization of the unorganized.

"Must build and strengthen organized peace movements, the American Peace Movement (Kenny was a member of this movement), so that we link up the struggle for immediate economic objectives with the struggle against the war. We must involve dozens and hundreds of the most militant progressive trade unionists in the peace movement."

Indicating the part public schools were to play in the communistic program here, a pamphlet obtained during the 1941 investigation of Kenny and other persons believed to be subversive, recommended the following program:

"1. Medical aid for Russia.
"2. Free Earl Browder.
"3. Flint V-Clubs campaigns.
"4. IWO mass meetings.

PARTY TASKS

"1. Daily Worker campaign (circulation).
"2. Schools."

The information, released by authorities who felt the public should know the philosophies of a man leading a strike against Flint's education system, contains reams of material linking Kenny to the Communists by Government authorities.

Information disclosing the amount of money Kenny and his wife turned in to the Communist Party headquarters on ticket sales to various Communist functions is included in the secret information gathered by many operatives for the United States Government here.

Kenny was shadowed throughout the war and classified as a character to be watched. He is still under investigation.

WHAT'S BACK OF IT?

The term "Communist" too often is used loosely. Aroused conservatives find it easy to attach the label to liberals as well as to radicals. We have a Communist Party in American politics, and citizens have a right to affiliate with it.

What is wrong and what should be intolerable to those who are Americans first is the subversive work in which some Communists engage. It is the anti-American activity of such individuals to which exception is taken, not their membership in the Communist Party.

This is the issue which now appears in the shut-down of Flint's public schools by a strike of a few employees of the board of education. The closing was largely the work of one person. The course was questioned by many of the maintenance workers themselves, and also by CIO affiliates. The support of the CIO council was in doubt, and rescinding the endorsement has been proposed by UAW-CIO officials.

That this individual has been identified as a Communist is not important. Of grave concern, however, is whether something more than the open demands is involved in this deplorable situation. That is a question which every parent and all other righteous citizens should wish answered.

What does Flint propose to do about it?

A second clipping reads as follows:

SAYS REDS BEHIND SCHOOL STRIKE—SHERIFF CHARGES COMMUNIST INSPIRATION

Sheriff Wolcott today charged tha the CIO public-school strike was Communist-inspired and contributed to juvenile delinquency.

His accusation was made as he expressed growing apprehension over a rise in juvenile delinquency because of the strike.

"It looks to me," he said, "that when there is a strike against the schools, which are part of our Government, it is Communist-inspired. If that isn't promoting juvenile delinquency, what is?"

Explaining that he didn't always agree with the school board, the sheriff declared that if the people were not satisfied with the job it has done, it should be supplanted by legal means.

Picketing of the schools is teaching children to defy the Government, he emphasized. He pointed out that if the city's youth sees the Government flouted, they will lose respect for it.

CIO HIKES THE RENT

The CIO has put out plenty of propaganda berating property owners and landlords because, the CIO charged, rent was being hiked. But the CIO, when it becomes a landlord, sings a different song to another tune. Read the following dispatch dated January 13, 1946, from Flint, Mich.:

CIO SKYROCKETS RENTS IN FLINT OFFICE BUILDING

FLINT, MICH., January 13.—The CIO, which demands a hold-the-line price policy in Michigan, has notified 50 tenants of the CIO building, a 12-story edifice which the union owns in downtown Flint, that their rent will go up 50 to 80 percent February 1.

The tenants include the United States Employment Service, the Community Chest, the War Chest, the Tuberculosis Association, the Catholic Charities, the Boy Scouts of America, the Girl Scouts, the Children's Aid Society, and the Urban League.

One social-service agency, which requested that its name be held confidential, said it was paying rent of $42 a month before the CIO Flint Labor Temple association bought the building in 1943 for a reported price of $100,000. Now the agency's rent is $92 a month, and it will be $136 starting February 1.

Reports From European Labor—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 23, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, our foreign affairs, as well as our foreign commerce, depend upon obtaining as full and factual information as possible on the situation which obtains in those countries abroad with which we maintain friendly relations, and expect to carry on mutually helpful trade.

The following excerpts from reports made last November by representatives of Belgium, Norway, France, Italy, and Finland are helpful to this purpose:

Mr. HEYMAN (interpretation) (Government delegate, Belgium). I wish to give a short statement on certain practical points. I am speaking on behalf of the whole Belgian delegation when I pay tribute, like others before me, to the xcellent report submitted by Mr. Phelan. We think that this report, like all previous ones of our acting director, is conspicuous by its universality, its clarity, and its sincerity. It has universality because all social, economic, and political problems which arise after the 5 years of the war which has ravaged the world are dealt with, but when I refer to its clarity I mean that the problems are discussed so logically that their real scope and extent can be readily appreciated.

Finally, I mention its sincerity, and by that I mean that the report does not shirk any difficulties but suggests solutions for the growing problems which face us in a clear and objective manner.

The acting director, in his introductory speech, requested the representatives of the various countries to explain to this Conference and the world the situation of their countries. In response to that invitation, I should like very briefly to explain to the Conference what is the situation of Belgium. Twice in the course of a quarter of a century Belgium has been invaded by Germany without any valid motive and in violation of all the solemn undertakings to which Germany had subscribed. The result of 4 years of occupation has been, from the economic point of view, that our industrial equipment was largely destroyed, and our transport system largely rendered useless by the removal of rolling stock.

From the point of view of social conditions there has been undernourishment and the health of thousands of our citizens has suffered severely.

Tuberculosis is a particularly serious problem. From the military point of view, 25,000 political prisoners were taken away, and many died in concentration camps and other prisons. Thousands of our soldiers and officers died on the field of battle, while others died as prisoners of war. From the housing point of view, 142,000 houses have disappeared altogether and another 100,000 are uninhabitable. There are 300,000 which can be put into suitable condition for living in again, but unfortunately there is a shortage of building materials.

Such, in brief, is the position in my country. I would like to add, however, that the Belgian people have never lost courage. They are not in the habit of giving way to their disasters. There is one quality which we may claim to possess; that is, we are always ready for hard work. Consequently, Belgium is already rebuilding itself by a common effort in which its industrialists, its traders and its hard-working workers are cooperating.

I should like to take this opportunity of paying a solemn tribute of gratitude from Belgium to her great allies, and in particular to the United Kingdom and the United States of America, for the assistance they gave us in providing us with our most elementary needs from the point of view of food and raw materials to enable us to begin our economic and social reconstruction.

From the social and economic point of view, which is what concerns us here, our parliament, elected in 1938, met in September 1944 and gave the government power to adopt immediately decisions on social security. Benefits had to be adjusted to the price level and monetary situation of the country. We had to adjust wages and pensions of all kinds, family allowances, workmen's compensation, etc., to the changes in the purchasing power of the currency. Labor legislation for workers in general, salaried employees and miners was promulgated. Compulsory sickness and invalidity insurance has been introduced under a national scheme by which contributions are paid by the employers.

We have a system whereby priority for the purchase of furniture and clothing is given to the workers who are specially affected by the war. A special fund for that purpose has been contributed voluntarily by the employers of our country up to a sum of about 6,000,000,000 francs. We are trying to improve the standard of quality of the work performed by our workers who suffered during the war years. The introduction of our social-security system will require about 25 percent of our wages bill to introduce it, and of that sum 16 percent will be paid by the employers. That concludes my first point—a summary of our economic and social development since the war. (No. 13, pp. 72, 73.)

Mr. BERG (Government delegate, Norway). The Secretary-General has asked the delegates from the occupied countries to give the Conference a picture of conditions in their countries. I shall try to give you an impression of the conditions in my country. For more than 5 years Norway has been occupied and terrorized by the German invaders. They enslaved us, pillaged and robbed us in every way. They overthrew our system of law and justice, one of the oldest in western Europe. They trampled under foot individual human rights and the fundamental political rights guaranteed by our more than 125-year-old free constitution. The right of freely expressing our opinion was denied to us.

We were not allowed to assemble in order to discuss our vital interests, and they threatened anyone trying to leave the country with the penalty of death. I am not sure that you fully realize what it means to my colleagues of the Norwegian delegation and to me to have been able to come as freemen to this International Labor Conference. Nor do I think you quite understand my feelings when I speak as a freeman from this international rostrum to a conference of free men and women from every part of the world, without the fear of being seized by the agents of the Gestapo.

We Norwegians know that many other nations have undergone much greater sufferings and have experienced the horrors of war to a much larger extent than we have ourselves. But even for us the war was a tremendous trial. We have experienced horrors and seen human suffering on a scale unprecedented in all our thousand years' life as a nation Huge material values have been destroyed And even worse is the destruction of spiritual and moral values.

Like all occupied countries, Norway is faced with the task of reconstruction, a task which demands of us Norwegians the full employment of all the resources at our disposal. We must build up once again our traditional system of legal rights. We must reestablish that respect for law and justice and for moral values which were the foundations of our national life, and which the invaders have done everything in their power to undermine. We have to reconstruct our national economy, a task which can be accomplished only through the cooperation of all men of good will.

The tasks with which we are faced are tremendous. First of all, we must reconstruct our devastated areas. The provinces which suffered most are those of the far north. When the Germans had to give up the Province of Finnmark, after the capitulation of Finland, they laid waste large districts, practicing liberally the tactics of scorched earth. They cleared the population southward, killed off their cattle, and systematically set fire to all buildings, whether for men or animals. The rest of the country has suffered less severely. The ravages mainly date from the first months after the invasion, during the spring of 1940, and were the result of military operations.

During the whole period of the German occupation, building activities have been at a standstill. All over the country, therefore, there is an acute shortage of housing accommodation. Without any doubt, housing is our main social problem. We must start a large-scale housing program, and everyone is agreed that such a program can be realized only on condition that central and local authorities take the lead in planning it on a national scale.

Another problem of primary importance to us is how we are to renew our merchant marine. Before the war Norway stood fourth among the shipping nations of the world. Great Britain, the United States of America, and Japan only were ahead of us. During the war we lost half our tonnage. If before the war we were able to keep up a relatively high standard of life, it was largely due to our shipping. It is, therefore, a vital condition for regaining and improving that standard that we succeed in bringing our merchant marine up to its prewar strength.

But we must not only rebuild our marine. Practically all our peacetime industries have been far below normal activity during the period of occupation, and must now be given new life. In order to mobilize and exploit to the full all public and private initiative and enterprise, in confident cooperation between the state and private interests, the Government, in accordance with the common program of all the political parties, has set up a Council of Economic Coordination, comprising representatives of the Central Government, of industry and commerce, and of the organizations of employers and employed. This council is to be an advisory body for the Government on questions of economic, financial, and industrial policy. (No. 14, pp. 86-88.)

Mr. GODART (interpretation) (Government delegate, France). The Director suggested that in the course of this discussion the various nations which had suffered during the fighting and the enemy occupation should mention some of the main material and moral consequences of the war for their countries.

I should like therefore briefly to outline what has happened in our country. Whole towns and cities have been completely destroyed, including many ancient historical monuments. The other day, when visiting Versailles, you saw something of what has happened. Over 400,000 buildings have been destroyed and 1,436,000 houses are at present unfit for habitation. Some 50,000 are industrial and commercial buildings which have been completely destroyed, while 175,000 can be repaired. Of private houses, 1,360,000 have been struck by bombs or set on fire; 360,000 have entirely disappeared, and the other million have been partially destroyed. The work of rebuilding will be very slow because of the shortage of building material and equipment. Of our agricultural buildings, 330,000 have no roofs left, and 96,000 farms have been completely destroyed. The peasants nevertheless have returned to their homes and are struggling to continue their work, but, unfortunately, they cannot proceed normally until we have cleared the millions of mines which cover 370,000 hectares of France. Only 6,000,000 mines have as yet been removed.

Over 3,700 kilometers of railways, 5,200 kilometers of canals, and large areas of docks have been blown up and destroyed. Similarly, 6,000 bridges were blown up. We have now only 2,800 locomotives out of 16,000 which existed before the war; 142,000 railway trucks out of 478,000; 6,247 passenger carriages out of 375,000; 6,425 barges out of 12,640; 600,000 motorcars out of 1,800,000, and 180,000 lorries out of 480,000. But the figures which show our losses in those respects by no means represent all that France has suffered.

We must think also of the large numbers of prisoners of war and deported workers. We think of those who died in concentration camps, and we are moved to pity by the suffering of so many French people. We think with shame of those guilty of crimes against liberty and humanity, and of treason against their country. Our children have suffered in health and been retarded in development by lack of proper food. Nevertheless, our people have shown themselves ready to make every sacrifice in resistance against the oppressor, and there is therefore on the other side of the picture a very strong confidence in recovery and restoration in France and an ardent wish to take part in international work. (No. 22, pp. 131, 132.)

Mr. CINGOLANI (interpretation) (Government delegate, Italy)—* * * There are 8,500,000 of our people who still have no roof to cover them during the coming winter. The generous help of UNRRA and other organizations, with the assistance of the Holy See and the Italian Government, has enabled a certain amount of clothing to be distributed to our population. The Italian democratic organizations and the workers' organizations are doing all they can to make our situation known and to deal with our problems.

In the case of Italy we are very short of raw materials and, in addition, the destruction of agricultural land and the drought of recent years have created a great shortage of wheat. The transport system has been disorganized and our mercantile marine has been reduced from over 3,350,000 tons to about 350,000 tons, of which only 50,000 tons can be used for supplying food for the country. Without a mercantile marine we cannot obtain coal, petroleum, cellulose, or the other articles which we require to restore our industry, and particularly the artificial silk industry, for which we have received large orders from the United States.

As to land transport, we have only a tenth of what we had before the war. Only a small percentage of our railways are in running order. This applies both to the rolling stock and to the permanent ways. Moreover, it is necessary to reconstruct some 13,000 kilometers of roads and bridges and to rebuild a number of buildings and installations, and also to repair our electrical system. By intensive work we shall, by the end of 1946, be able to restore to use 70 percent of our rolling stock. The work of reconstructing our railways will cost 120 milliard lire and provide employment for 118,000 workers.

But for our reconstruction work we need 175,000 tons of coal and 171,000 of steel. If we had more coal, we could in 1945-46 produce a million tons of steel ourselves. We also need about half a million litres of petrol. If we could intensify our reconstruction work, for which the Allies have given or promised us their generous assistance, that would go far toward relieving unemployment in our country. (No. 15, pp. 102, 103.)

Mr. MANNIO (interpretation) (Government delegate, Finland). During the war Finland has been placed in a splendid position. This is not the place to try to describe that situation, but I should like to give you a general survey of the development of social conditions in my country during the last 6 years, and indicate briefly the measures taken for social reconstruction. I consider this a duty to those interested in my country, particularly because the publications of the International Labor Office have not been able to give much information on what happened here, in this little corner of Europe.

The destruction due to the war has been heavy in Finland. During the war, with a population of less than 4,000,000 and with a total annual increase in the masculine sex of approximately 40,000, we have lost 100,000 young men. Our territorial losses and the devastation caused by the Germans in the north of the country means a reduction of 15 percent of all our economic resources. Yet at this time we have not only to repair the consequences of the war, but also to create new possibilities of assistance for half a million evacuees, and in addition 200,000 people who have lost everything in the north of the country. (No. 24, p. 142.)

Model Aeronautics and the War Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 23, 1946

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, years before World War II brought its bitter, savage destruction on all mankind,

America's youth was preparing itself. So effective was this preparation that the brevity with which we ruled the air left our foes gasping. This preparation was not an organized, regimented program; it was accomplished, rather, in the democratic, American way.

Boys mowed lawns, carried newspaper routes, shoveled snow from sidewalks, and did those thousand and one different jobs with which boys earn themselves a few pennies, in order to buy the supplies necessary for the construction of frail contrivances of wood and paper with which they conquered the air. Older people smiled condescendingly at their "playing," but the records of these boys in the cockpits of our fighters and bombers, in the maintenance depots, on the assembly lines and on the drafting boards speak for themselves. While they were playing they were learning, and we now know that what they learned, they learned well.

The United States Civil Service Commission made recorded flights of an applicant's model airplane a necessary prerequisite for appointment to certain positions at the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics laboratory at Langley Field, Va. It has also been recognized by personnel managers at the plants of aircraft manufacturers, who unanimously answered in a survey conducted upon the subject that model builders completed training courses more quickly, and by and large proved to be more efficient workers. It is also a known fact that the names of model builders are more apt to appear among the highest ranking students in flight training courses for the military services, and those familiar with the science of model aeronautics will recognize many a well-known name among those of our air heroes.

Even those too young to step from the ranks of the model builders into those of the armed forces, or into those of the vast industrial army which proved its efficiency during the war years, saw their opportunity to help. They utilized their self-trained skill in the production of thousands and thousands of identification models so necessary in many training courses.

I desire to mention some specific examples of American model builders who contributed in such large measure to the war effort. Dr. Walter Good and his brother, William Good, of Kalamazoo, Mich., among the early experimenters in radio controlled model aircraft, who won the national championship in this category in 1938, 1939, and 1940, were among those responsible for the development of the radio controlled target planes used to train our antiaircraft gunners. This development was to a large extent under the guidance of Reginald Denny, familiar to motion-picture patrons, but more familiar to those in the model world as investor, miniature engine producer, and early radio control experimenter.

Others on the staff of QST doing this valuable work were Chester Lanzo, of Cleveland, Ohio, Ross Hull, and Clinton de Soto. Dr. Walter Good also did contributory work in the development of the proximity, or VT, fuze for radar controlled missiles. William Good has been engaged in research in the field of airborne radar, and Chester Lanzo is now an electronics engineer for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. Important contributions in the field of aerodynamics have been made by W. Hewitt Phillips, of Boston, Massachusetts, who in recognition of his fine work at the Langley Field laboratory of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics was given the Lawrence Sperry Award by the Institute of the Aeronautical Sciences for the most significant contribution to aeronautics by a young man during 1944. The efforts of Roy Marquardt, in aerodynamics on the west coast, are also noteworthy.

Numerous reports have been made of entire groups, banded together prior to the war as model airplane clubs, in which all have distinguished themselves in the air. Among the more prominent are the Skyscrapers, of Brooklyn, N. Y., and the Balsa Butchers, of Cleveland, Ohio.

These are but a few of the individuals and groups who helped; the sum total of all individual contributions is staggering, and its high value is due solely to the knowledge assimilated while the contributors were engaged in the design, construction, and flying of model aircraft.

International competition, deferred during the war, is to be resumed on a larger scale, and there is no doubt but that it will prove to be of great value in the development of amicable relations with the people of other nations. The Academy of Model Aeronautics, a division of the National Aeronautic Association, is the governing body for organized competition. It is composed of the model builders themselves. Under its fostering hand children in ever-increasing numbers will develop by means of this sport-science into the designers and fliers of the aircraft of the future, and into substantial citizens who will do all in their power to keep America first in the air.

Neglected Statues of Public Men in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 23, 1946

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to say that I join with the Secretary of the Interior in deploring the neglected and spattered condition of the Statue of General McPherson here in Washington. He was one of the distinguished generals of the Civil War and a native of my district. He was born near Fremont, Ohio, and he now lies buried in the cemetery which bears his name at Clyde, Ohio, alongside of which runs the great McPherson Highway. And there is included herewith the story of the neglected condition of the statues of famous men throughout the city of Washington:

[From the Washington Post of January 17, 1946]

PIGEONS GIVING ICKES THE BIRD ON STATUES

Harold Ickes has been out-curmudgeoned.

The indefatigable Interior Secretary, it was learned on good authority yesterday, has bowed to the strength of Washington's pigeon population. And he can't scare that off with a sour look.

It all came out in a letter from Ickes to a reporter for the Buffalo Evening News, who had written in behalf of the somewhat neglected and spattered statue of General McPherson. The writer, among other things, wanted to know whether it was Ickes' job or that of Commissioner John Russell Young to look out for the general, who stands on Fifteenth Street between I and K.

The Interior Secretary admitted the task was his, and what's more, he pointed out he is charged by law with performing a similar service for all of the brass of our past wars which adorns the National Capital Parks—not to mention William Jennings Bryan.

Worst of it all, Ickes said, is that he has been unable to devise any effective defense against the attacks of the winged vandals. Our mopping up operations, he said, have been marked by temporary—but only very temporary—successes.

He held out hope, however, that the post-war period may find this department able to extend ablutionary services to the statues semiannually, as was the practice prior to Pearl Harbor.

Anyway, he said, he is anything but sentimental about pigeons—except as a table delicacy.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that those who are in charge of our national parks will now give care and attention to the statues commemorating the great men who have rendered distinguished service to our country.

Shall America Be a Closed Country?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 23, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Max Lerner from the New York newspaper PM of December 26, 1945:

SHALL AMERICA BE A CLOSED COUNTRY?

I have been turning over in my mind the meaning of President Truman's statement on speeding the admisison of refugees into the U. S. A.

The real wealth of nations is human life. We recognize that fact when we lament our war casualties, or when we speak of our young people as the base of America's future.

We recognize that our human resources count far more than our natural resources. Put it this way: the natural resources are for human beings, and they can be transmuted into wealth only by human beings. But if this is true about those who are already here as Americans, why is it not just as true about those who want desperately to come here and grow into Americans? Is their human quality—or their human need—any less than ours? Is the human contribution

they are ready to make to us any less than the human contribution our own fathers and grandfathers and great-grandfathers were ready to make when they sought entrance into this country?

President Truman has asked three of his department heads and three other agencies "to expedite the quota immigration of displaced persons and refugees from Europe to the United States." He does this "to reduce human suffering," "to set an example to the rest of the world," and in the name of "common decency and the fundamental comradeship of all human beings."

Fine. Within the limits he has set for himself, the President has given us one of the better state papers of his administration. It is, to be sure, very gingerly in its language. It hedges itself about with all sorts of apologies, denials, reassurances—no doubt to keep from rousing the wolves in Congress and the press. But taken as a whole it is a courageous and affirmative act—the first effort (along with F. D. R.'s Oswego directive) to thaw the frost that has settled on the American heart ever since 1924 in the matter of immigration exclusion. It is a good augury for what seems to be the President's reawakened liberalism.

HUNGER FOR DEMOCRACY

The President acted within his own administrative powers, and needs no authorization from Congress. The limit of 3,900 refugees a month (many of them will be children) falls within the existing quotas for Central and Balkan Europe, which are the states to which the refugees now in the American zone in Germany belong. What the President is doing is to cut the heartbreaking red tape and untangle the difficulties about visas, health examinations, and transport.

Senator CHARLES O. ANDREWS (Democrat, Florida), of the Senate Immigration Committee, seems worried in his sensitive senatorial mind as to whether these people will be "consecrated to our Constitution and our form of government." How ironic that he should express his fear about exactly this group. Someone ought to tell the Senator that these families are the victims of Hitler's racist ideas, that their homes and lives were broken by fascism, and that their hunger for a democratic way of life is accordingly even greater than his own.

Some may say about these people: Why don't they go home? The answer is that they have no homes which will receive them. I have seen a detailed report of the Jewish refugees who are in the American occupation zone in Germany. Very few of them are German—for Hitler quite literally wiped the Jews out of Germany, made Germany Judenfrei. Nor are they in the strict sense DP's—"displaced persons." They are not nationals of other countries whom the Nazis imprisoned in Germany under forced labor, waiting to go back to their native hearths.

They are Jews from Poland, Rumania, Hungary, who have tried to go home and have found no homes there, or know it is hopeless to try. Many of them want to go to Palestine, which will give them a home; but the British admit only the merest trickle, while an Anglo-American commission of inquiry which has been months in forming will now spend four more months inquiring. Many of them have looked longingly to these shores, but until now there has been no response from us. Like another Jewish Child whose birth almost 2,000 years ago made world history, their children have "no crib for their bed."

TRADITION OF ASYLUM

There is a great American tradition of granting asylum to the victims of political and racial persecution abroad. After the First World War our antiradical hysteria broke this tradition. We have a chance now to revive it. I do not mean only for those who have been exposed to Hitler's terror in the past decade, and more. For that terror is not yet over; let us not forget that.

Take Poland as an instance. When it was liberated, tens of thousands of Polish Jews found their way back to their former homes, only to be greeted by an anti-Semitic terrorism on the part of the Poles who coveted their farms and stores and houses and jobs, and who had been all-too-willing pupils of the Nazis. This terrorism is even more devastating to the spirit than was the Nazi terrorism, for it comes so cruelly just when its victims thought that at least they were freed from the Nazi grip and could stand up as human beings. Let it be said to the credit of the present Polish Government that it is trying to fight this terror, though unavailingly. But the need of asylum is a crying one.

I hope, however, that President Truman will not stop with his present statement and will go on in more militant and affirmative terms in future recommendations about immigration. He evidently fears—and has good reason to fear—that the congressional primitives will introduce bills to cut the present quotas in half. He asks them earnestly not to But what he—and we also, the people—must ask them instead is to liberalize the quotas and to end the basically racist philosophy behind the quota system.

For the real philosophy that must underlie our immigration policy is not racism, as the congressional primitives want it; nor even tolerance and pity and humanitarianism, as the President and the congressional liberals want it. The real philosophy is the premise with which I started this piece: That the wealth of America lies in its people. That the value of human beings as an enrichment to their adopted country has nothing to do with their color or their religion or their country of origin. That the greatness of America is the greatness of many streams of heredity and culture flowing into a great central ocean of tendency. That we have been from the beginning—to use the grand phrase from Walt Whitman which Louis Adamic has adopted as the title of his current book—A Nation of Nations.

This should be so obvious to everyone who has studied American history that it should scarcely need restating. Yet what we need most right now is, in the famous phrase of Justice Holmes, "education in the obvious." For a generation the alliance of reactionary labor pressures and a growing racist philosophy has shut the gates of America almost completely against further accessions from abroad to American life and culture. For the few we have admitted we have set a quota system heavily weighted in favor of the Nordic and against the non-Nordic immigrants—whatever those nonsense-terms may mean.

It is time to make hash of this Nordic nonsense. And it is time to assert again that America cannot be at the same time a closed country and a great country.

MAX LERNER.

Tidewater Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 23, 1946

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shreveport (La.) Times of January 20, 1946:

TIDEWATER OIL

The Attorney General of the United States, acting on the urging of various branches of Washington bureaucracy, has filed a Federal suit against the State of California in an effort to have the tidewater-oil lands of the Pacific coast, that is, the mineral rights beneath the offshore waters, declared to be Federal property. The suit might just as well have been filed against the State of Louisiana. Louisiana has more than 6,000 miles of ocean or gulf coastland, including inlets, and the oil rights beneath the waters on those coast lines are of inestimable value.

The issue is whether California owns the oil rights under its offshore waters—and whether Louisiana owns the oil rights under its offshore waters and whether every State in the United States owns such rights for such waters—or whether those mineral rights belong to the Federal Government in Washington. In other words, the issue is whether bureaucratic agencies in Washington shall take over, in socialistic and communistic manner, the rights and properties and revenues of the States, or whether those rights and properties and revenues shall remain within the individual States in accordance with the spirit of the Constitution and the States' rights, as sovereigns, for which Americans have shed their blood in more than one war. The international principles of the rights of States in the sense of States as nations, for which World Wars I and II were fought, are the same basic principles for which the Civil War was fought. In other words, the tidewater oil issue is an issue of sacred principles of States, with the Federal bureaucracy seeking to destroy those principles.

The right of California and Louisiana and any other State to the minerals beneath the offshore waters of their areas has been fully recognized by the House of Representatives. It has passed a resolution whereby the Federal Government would surrender whatever claim it may have, in theory, to mineral rights in lands beneath waters off the coasts of the United States. There was no outstanding opposition to the resolution in the House when it was under discussion. It was accepted as built in equity and fairness.

But, after it was passed—and let it be clear that this action came after the House passed its resolution—the United States Attorney General filed his suit against the State of California's rights to minerals beneath the coastal waters, knowing, of course, that this suit would tie up drilling developments in American coastal areas totaling thousands of miles of shore line.

Now it is stated that when the House resolution reaches discussion in the Senate Judiciary Committee, before which it now lies, there will be tremendous opposition from the Government, which means from the present political administration of and under Mr. Truman. Mr. Truman never has uttered a word about the tidewater-oil problem, but it is time that he should do so for the whole case is simply one of the bureaucrats trying to take over the rights and prerogatives of States.

The oil off the shores of a State belong to that State just as the shrimp or oysters off the shores of a State come under the State's jurisdiction. The position of Louisiana in this whole situation is ominous. Shell, sulfur, gas, and oil severance taxes all are involved. If the Federal Government should win in the highest courts this attempt to intrude into the natural resources of States, the payments involved might deal not only with the present and the future, but they might be retroactive as well.

But, aside from the tremendous sums of money involved, there is the great issue of State's rights. Those rights were fundamental in all the Constitution of the United States. They are fundamental in all freedom and liberty under a republican form of government which seeks the ideals of democracy.

The effort of the Federal Government now is not simply to gain financial benefit for

the Washington Treasury, but to place the rights of centralized Federal bureaucrats over the individual rights of States. For that reason this suit by the Government must be fought to a finish by the States. Louisiana is fighting it. So is California. So should every other State with a coast line.

Secrecy and the Atomic Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1946

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, the Capital Press of Salem, Oreg., is a progressive weekly newspaper. In its columns there appeared recently an editorial discussing attempts to impose secrecy on atomic bomb developments. The scientists of America are almost unanimous in their insistence that we do not attempt to sit on discoveries and explorations in the field of atomic energy. Many militarists, however, take the view that somehow we can prevent other nations from learning anything about the atomic bomb. In this editorial, the writer tells of the danger of attempting to maintain secrecy. The editorial is as follows:

[From the Salem (Oreg.) Capital Press, of November 30, 1945]

SECRECY

Albert Einstein, the world's greatest mathematician, is strongly in favor of a world government being organized by the three great powers—England, Russia, and the United States—made especially important now to safeguard the use of the atomic bomb. In this connection he says:

"I do not believe that the secret of the atomic bomb should be given to the United Nations Organization. I do not believe that it should be given to the Soviet Union. * * * The secret of the bomb should be committed to a world government, and the United States should immediately announce its readiness to give it to a world government. This government should be founded by the United States, the Soviet Union, and Great Britain—the only three powers with great military strength. All three of them should commit to this world government all of their military strength.***

"Since the United States and Great Britain have the secret of the atomic bomb and the Soviet Union does not, they should invite the Soviet Union to prepare and present the first draft of a constitution for the proposed world government. That action should help to dispel the distrust which the Russians already feel because the bomb is being kept a secret—chiefly to prevent their having it. * * *

"While persons who take only a step at a time may think they are approaching peace, they actually are contributing, by their slow pace, to the coming of war. We have no time to spend in this way. If war is to be averted, it must be done quickly."

In this matter, as in mathematics, Einstein seems to be about two generations ahead of the great minds of the rest of the world. He really wants peace to stay with us, while the others indicate that they merely hope that when the world is blown apart they will be the blowers rather than the blowees. They prate of peace, but do everything to incite war by holding a monstrous threat over the heads of those whom they pretend to respect and cherish, but whom they secretly hate.

Frankly, this paper does not believe that England and the United States are concealing anything from Russia. They merely think they are. Russian scientists are second to none. They probably started where the Germans left off when the invasion of Normandy interrupted their final completion of the atomic bomb. It is an even bet that the Russians right now know as much about it as we do, and could right now meet us more than half-way in the production and use of atomic bombs. They have all of the materials and the manpower to do it—and it would not cost them $2,000,000,000. This is likewise the opinion of our own scientists, who have virtually said as much and have earnestly warned against our silly and grandiose declarations about concealing it. Russia is foxy and suspicious, and has a right to be. Without their realizing it, she has placed England and the United States on the spot, and the spectacle is not comforting Their present attitude cannot fail to confirm Russia's suspicions that, given the chance to make it stick, they would be as open in their sinister antagonism to Russia as they were during the years after the First World War—until Russia stopped the Germans. So England and the United States stand in humilitating position before the eyes of a peace-hungry world looking for fairness and sincerity between nations. Bland declarations of friendship are not very convincing when made with a club in hand.

Professor Einstein has offered a constructive suggestion, and one which gives the United States and England a chance to "save face" in the ridiculous position in which they have placed themselves. The recent conference between the United States, England, and Canada, with Russia still left out, made it worse. The world cannot be deceived by soft music from the orchestra while murder is being enacted on the stage. England and the United States have a chance to square themselves, and had better take it. They may not have another.

Who Supports FEPC Legislation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. WOOD
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 23, 1946

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following appeal issued by the Communist Party of Jacksonville, Fla.:

AN APPEAL TO THE NEGRO PEOPLE: REGISTER DEMOCRAT

Register Democrat because the Democratic Party is the party in power in Florida. Register Democratic in order to improve conditions for workers, Negro and white. Former registered Republicans can change to Democratic now.

Register Democrat because big landowners and big businesses are trying to keep your standard of living down. Register Democratic so they can't lower it even further.

Register Democratic because your registration is a protest against the lynch murder of two Negroes in Florida. Mr. Jesse James Payne, of Madison County, and Mr. Sam MacFadden, of Suwannee County, will not have died in vain if you register Democratic.

Register Democrat because you can then vote for candidates who will support the 65-cent minimum wage bill. The South desperately needs 65-cent bottom wages for protection of both white and Negro families.

Register Democrat because you can then give real support to the bill for a Fair Employment Practice Committee, now being sabotaged by Congress. (EMORY PRICE, Congressman "representing" the Jacksonville area, is opposed to the FEPC, as well as to most other progressive legislation).

Register Democrat because today there is developing in America a movement for a third party made up of veterans, sharecroppers, trade unionists, and the Negro people. And because this alliance can only come about if the southern Negro becomes an organized group of voters, you should:

Register Democratic and vote in the 1946 Democratic primaries.

The Communist Party is proud of Benjamin J. Davis, who is a son of the good old South and a great Negro Communist leader. He was recently reelected by Negro and white workers to the City Council of New York City. We are the party that led the struggle to save the Scottsboro boys from death. We always have and always will fight segregation and discrimination. So follow us to the county courthouse and register for the Democratic primaries.

Don't wait. Register now.

For more information on the Communist Party, mail us a letter with your name and address inside.

COMMUNIST PARTY OF JACKSONVILLE.
WEST BAY STATION.

Selective-Service Awards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 23, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an address which I delivered at the presentation of the Bronze Selective Service Medals and certificates of merit to the members of the draft boards, the appeal boards, and the appeal agents of the city of Lawrence, Mass., which took place in the city hall, on Monday evening, January 21, 1946, at which time Mayor James P. Meehan presented personally the awards:

Tonight, our community honors the men on the home front who performed one of the most urgent and difficult tasks of World War 2. Theirs was hardly a popular job and never an easy one. Confronted with thousands of individual cases, each requiring the most careful scrutiny and absolute honesty, they had to make decisions which few men would care to make. Our Nation was in greater peril than at any time in its history We had no trained men to defend our way of life against the sudden assault of ruthless aggression. In this hour of emergency, our Nation had to raise an Army, a Navy, an Air Corps from its free citizens. And so the Selective-Service System was established and thousands of mature, dependable men in every city and village in the country, were called upon to administer this great responsibility. There was no glamor to these jobs and no financial inducement. In the strict and most difficult sense of the word, it was a call to public service. No man cares to send another man off to fight and suffer and die for others. But even more than this, no American will bend the knee to any force which threatens the peace, security, and

progress which is our faith. If put to the test, we will not buy life at the price of dishonor.

And so we had to send forth the young and the strong to destroy the evil that endangered everything we had come to believe in. Our freedom must vindicate itself by measuring up to our responsibilities. The American family was faced with a deadly challenge. "Fascism and democracy cannot live side by side," our enemies shouted. "One or the other must go. Reason must die and with it that weak and confused and superficial myth which you call democracy. We have the tanks and the dive bombers and propaganda and murder factories. And what have you got to stand up to our power? A few soldiers drilling with broomsticks and behind them, a mob of 130,000,000 civilians, each one blinded by greed and deaf to all else. Democracy, you belong to the past. We shall see that you are interred there and your death will come through forced labor, helping us even as you die."

That's what our enemies believed and planned at the height of their material power. At that moment, what else could we put in the way of their mechanized armies except human beings who are easily crushed by steel? And there, David before Goliath, it might have ended except that we believed that a human being was not simply a beast of burden, to be worked to an early death. We knew that a human being has a mind and a soul and that the life of these give life to his body and continue even beyond. And as danger awakens a man from his complacency, our senses became sharper and clearer. The physical being of America was immediately threatened, but more than this, the mind and soul which gave it being, were being threatened. Kill these, and America can be taken as easily as an over-ripe plum. Our enemies knew this to be the issue. They tried to confuse and divide us so that our faith would be shaken and we would be defeated in mind and soul even before their armies paraded through our land and passed out the license numbers of our slavery.

In this psychological warfare they were successful but not quite successful enough. As a free people with a free press, accustomed to seeing all sides of a question before we make up our minds, we considered this wave of the future. We tested it in the light of fact and performance and while we did so, our enemies believed that it was a sign of our indecision. They did not know that we were separating the chaff from the wheat, picking out the truth and rejecting the propaganda, and in this searching we were coming home like prodigal sons to the root-meaning of America. What we had neglected or forgotten was coming to life again.

The hour was dark and the issue was grave. Knowing that man does not live unto himself alone, we looked to those about us. The Jones family, across the street, suddenly took on a new meaning. They had lived there for several years, but except for an occasional "Hello," they had no meaning in our lives. And so it was with the Papparado family down the block, and the Sullivans, and the Cohens, and the others we knew by face or name alone. Thousands more were members of the community and we and they were related. And the question now was not just a matter of getting ahead as individuals but of surviving together. Suddenly we realized that our lives were tied in with theirs and under the stress of this need, cooperation was born.

To defend our way of life, we needed millions of men who were fit for the exacting demands of military service. And it had to be done in the American way without prejudice and without favoritism. The requirements of the armed services had to be met on a proportional basis, without weakening the schedules of our war industries. Within these physical and occupational limitations and that of dependency, all men must be treated as equals.

For the difficult task of deciding, under these rules, as to who should go and who should be deferred, you were chosen. From ancient times we remember how King Solomon and Pontius Pilate were faced with hard decisions. Either way, they stood to put themselves in wrong, so, being politicians, they straddled the issue. You could not. In accepting your responsibilities, you put yourselves out on a limb. Some men had to go to war, others had to stay home, and you had to point the finger. This required an unrecognized brand of heroism. Tonight, your Government seeks to remedy the oversight. Being a member of a draft board was nothing short of fighting a war of nerves and bearing up under much suspicion if not outright accusations. It was well that you understood the emotional tensions of the people whose loved ones were being called to war.

You took it in stride. You kept your judgment fair and honest. For the time came when you had to send your own flesh and blood, with the same impartiality with which you sent strangers. You were governed by one and only one consideration—all personal interests must be sacrificed for the public need. You gave your time, your effort, and devotion to the job at hand and allowed nothing to come between which might affect your judgment and your sense of duty. How well and faithfully you did that job is reflected in the respect accorded you by your fellow citizens. As the war went on and the casualty lists came in, there were no personal cries against you for you had built a reputation for fairness and integrity that was above criticism. You who had to send men and those who had to give their men were closer together than ever before. It was a community sacrifice which all of us shared in varying degrees. It will remain with us as a reminder of our citizen obligations in the years to come.

Second only to the men you chose and who vindicated your judgment, in a manner beyond my power to express, I like to think next of the Selective Service System and the way in which it proved itself to the Nation and to the world.

You, under the most trying conditions, put the theory of democracy to work. You demonstrated that there is nothing which a free people cannot accomplish in a fair and effective way. The knowledge of the valuable service you have given will be a satisfaction to you for all of your days. It does not belong to the past. It stands as an inspiration to the community, an example of the cooperation which can and will solve any challenge which the future may bring. It is living proof that democracy grows.

The Nation, through this community action, is proud to present these bronze selective-service medals and these certificates of merit. In the name of President Harry S. Truman and the American family, it is our privilege to honor the boards of Lawrence.

Well done, good and faithful servants of the people.

How Long Shall We Continue To Recognize the Franco Fascist Government of Spain?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1946

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, recently, in the St. Louis Star-Times of November 20, 1945, there appeared an interesting letter from a reader discussing Franco and world peace. It is expressive of views entertained by numerous American citizens. The letter is as follows:

FRANCO AND WORLD PEACE

EDITOR STAR-TIMES: The greatest problem confronting the peace of the world today is the making and use of the atomic bomb. Doubtless scientists of all advanced nations have been and are still working on its development, and in time will succeed.

If all advanced nations are to have the bomb, which one do we fear most? Definitely Germany. Germany lies defeated and her leading war criminals will be punished. Hitler is, no doubt, dead, but his soul goes marching on, a menace for ages to come. His followers cannot operate in Germany, but must find other fields.

Franco was a close collaborator of Hitler and is today the world's most dangerous despot. He no doubt would welcome an opportunity to become another Hitler, keeping in view the possibilities of the atomic bomb. There is nothing today to prevent German scientists from working in Spain under the protection of Franco. There lies the danger. What can be done? There is no danger from the common people of Spain. Franco and his despotism must be forever destroyed. True, nations have not the right to interfere with the internal affairs of others, but this involves the peace and safety of the whole civilized world and should be dealt with as such.

A resolution (H. Res. 312) has been introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman JOHN M. COFFEE which calls for a complete diplomatic and commercial break with the Franco regime. This would show the way for other nations and go a long way toward breaking down the power of the Nazi-Falange government of Spain. The resolution should have the support of every liberty-loving citizen of this country.

A. P. MERIWETHER.

ST. JACOB, ILL.

Unilateral Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 23, 1946

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include therein an article by Sumner Welles in the Washington Post of January 23, 1946, entitled "Unilateral Action."

UNILATERAL ACTION

(By Sumner Welles)

A LATIN-AMERICAN POINT OF VIEW

The Inter-American Conference at Rio de Janeiro, called off last October by the unilateral action of the United States, is now scheduled to be held soon after March 15.

In accordance with the Act of Chapultepec, signed by all of the American republics a year ago, the conference wil consider the conclusion of a treaty for the maintenance of regional peace and security.

The Department of State has submitted to all of the other American governments, except Argentina, its proposal for a military defense treaty.

The United States project differs fundamentally from the commitments embodied in the Act of Chapultepec.

The Act of Chapultepec provided that all the governments of the American republics shall consider the conclusion of such a treaty. Its provisions specifically envisaged the inclusion of Argentina.

The Act of Chapultepec further charges that the proposed treaty shall embody these principles:

"First. That all sovereign states are juridically equal amongst themselves.

"Second. That every State has the right to the respect of its individuality and independence on the part of the other members of the international community."

These stipulations are conspicuously lacking in the draft proposed by the Department of State.

Mexico, Brazil, and Ecuador have now also submitted their own treaty projects. They have sent their proposals to Argentina as well as to the other American republics. These 3 are among the 10 American republics which have already opposed the Uruguayan recommendation for intervention in the internal affairs of the sovereign American nations which was so promptly sponsored by the Department of State.

I have just received a letter from a prominent official of a great Latin-American republic, which is not Argentina. This official is one of the ablest of the younger generation of Latin-American statesmen. He has long been a firm friend of the United States as well as an enthusiastic supporter of the good-neighbor policy.

He writes:

"You will surely remember that during the San Francisco Conference, through a formal agreement entered into with the Latin-American delegates by former Secretary of State Stettinius, the Government of the United States promised to support a multilateral treaty covering the entire inter-American system as set forth in the Act of Chapultepec.

"That was the origin of the initiative for convoking a conference at Rio de Janeiro.

"The Department of State has now made a wholly different proposal. The Government of the United States has announced that it favors the conclusion of a treaty which does not embody the inter-American system but which will be limited solely to a military alliance for the defense of the continent.

"I must confess to you that this change of front is interpreted as a failure to comply with a promise made. It is regarded as a demonstration that the policy of the good neighbor is being unequivocally scrapped, and that at the same time the inter-American system itself is being abandoned.

"But even more than that, the Government of the United States has sent its draft for the military alliance which it desires to secure in Rio de Janeiro to all of the Latin-American governments with the exception of the Argentine Government.

"The impression which this has created in Latin-American diplomatic circles is concrete. It can be set forth in the following way:

"'1. The United States has proposed a treaty which is different and very much more limited than that which it had agreed upon;

"'2. By such action the United States is plainly abandoning the inter-American system;

"'3. Even in the negotiation of the treaty and prior to the Rio de Janeiro Conference, the United States is commencing by excluding—solely of its own sweet will, without any prior consultation of any kind, and without the consent of the other countries—one of the most important nations of the hemisphere.'

"By a curious coincidence the Government of Panama has now taken the initiative in inviting the other governments of America to break diplomatic relations with Nicaragua, Honduras, and Santo Domingo. This initiative, in my judgment, is intended to create a precedent for the case of Argentina. But this involves the same dangerous procedure, the procedure of seeking the exclusion from the inter-American system of nations and governments without unanimous consent, and by the sole action of a group of countries which, whether justifiably or unjustifiably, are regarded by the public as particularly susceptible to the influence of the Department of State."

These views are those of an objective and friendly Latin-American official. They deserve the very careful thought of all of us who regard inter-American solidarity as essential to the security of the Western Hemisphere.

The Department of State continues to insist that unilateral action is abhorrent to it. Yet simultaneously it resorts to unilateral action by excluding Argentina from the consideration of its inter-American treaty project.

It proclaims that the doctrine of nonintervention is "fundamental and will continue." And at the same time, the Department of State publicly asserts over the radio that intervention is all right, provided "a substantial number" of the American Republics go along.

The signs of the rapid disintegration of the inter-American system are apparent to all who are willing to see them. If there were some non-American power or influence which desired to undermine the present world influence of the United States by destroying the solidarity of the Western Hemisphere, it could not have done a better job than that accomplished by the Department of State.

Rt. Rev. Edmund D. Daly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 23, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article which appeared in the Pilot, Boston, Mass., on January 12, 1946:

MEET YOUR PASTOR

(By Bill McMorrow)

On March 17, 1945, feast day of the patron saint of the parish, St. Patrick's in South Lawrence celebrated its diamond jubilee, rounding out 75 glorious years of Catholic history in this great industrial community. The tradition associated with St. Patrick's through the years is, of course, no secret with Catholics of our diocese, for each in a long line of illustrious pastors has done much to spread the fame of this grand old parish. Today's subject, Rt. Rev. Edmund D. Daly, the beloved pastor, is no exception, for in his own quiet way he has endeared himself to all who have known him during the 15 years of his pastorate.

Born and raised in Newton Upper Falls, Monsignor Daly was educated in the Newton schools, Boston College, class of '99, and St. John's Seminary, Brighton. Ordained to the priesthood at the Cathedral in Boston by Bishop Brady on December 18, 1903, he was immediately assigned as curate to the Blessed Sacrament Parish, Jamaica Plain, with Monsignor Connolly. This proved to be of a permanent nature, for here he spent the next quarter century completely wrapped up in his priestly duties, winning friends at every turn. In 1927 he was appointed pastor of St. Paul's, Wellesley, and remained there until May of 1931 at which time he was transferred to Lawrence to take over the reins of this large and well-known parish—St. Patrick's.

GOTHIC EDIFICE

The church here is a most beautiful edifice, but a moment's walk from the Lawrence depot of the Boston & Maine Railroad. The towering spire may be seen for miles, which, by the way, proved most beneficial to your correspondent, who, to this time, had never visited the city of Lawrence. The original church of St. Patrick's was built by Rev. William Orr, and on March 17, 1870 it was blessed. The present building, large and imposing and in Gothic style, was dedicated by Monsignor McManus on June 17, 1894, and stands today on par with any church in the diocese an impressive house of God.

Both altars are gems of construction, beautifully decorated. The stained glass windows, the different stations of the cross, the side altars of the Sacred Heart and Our Lady of Perpetual Help, the statues of the saints, and the rare altar rail in the basement, with the figures of the Angels carved thereon, standing as two sentinels, all blend to create a truly Catholic atmosphere where the parishioners may worship Almighty God, and discover comfort and satisfaction in His presence.

ACTIVE SODALITY

Catholic Action is apparently the watchword at St. Patrick's, and led by the Holy Name Society, parish activities are on an all-time high plane. Rev. William E. Mulhane is the spiritual director of the Holy Name Society, which on December 9, enrolled 1,000 men into its ranks. Think of it—1,000 Catholic men receiving Holy Communion in a body, and later being received into the society. What a tremendous response to Archbishop Cushing's request that every Catholic man be a Holy Name man, and what a tribute to Monsignor Daly and St. Patrick's Parish.

The Holy Family Sodality, directed by Rev. Edward T. Dunne, is another outstanding group, and the records of the parish reveal their great support of charities and higher education for the children of the parish. Each year, I was told, this sodality offers a scholarship to Central Catholic High School to a deserving student of the boys' class, and a similar award to Emmanuel College for one of the high school girls. This program has attracted widespread interest among the pupils, and is certainly worthy of duplication in every parish in the diocese. Father Dunne is also county director of the Scouts, and at St. Patrick's, three active troops of Boy Scouts, and two of Girl Scouts play an important role in the parish.

LEGION OF MARY

Rev. Michael J. Barry directs the Legion of Mary, the Sunday school for public-school pupils, 350 strong, and the Young Ladies' Sodality, rounding out a complete program of parish functions for every member of the family.

Rev. George P. Gallivan, a former curate here, who has been in the Army as chaplain with the late General Patton's Third Army, is expected home in the very near future. The welcome mat is out for this popular curate and Monsignor Daly and his parishioners look forward to Father Gallivan's return with keen anticipation for he has always been a popular figure here.

"The parish is distinguished by two outstanding charitable organizations," Monsignor Daly informed me, "and St. Patrick's Charitable Aid Society which is 50 years old, and the St. Vincent de Paul Conference, adequately care for the parish needs in this direction."

St. Patrick's school system, with grammar grades for both boys and girls, and the girls' high school, directed by the Sisters of Charity, Halifax, is, indeed, the pastor's pride, and rightfully so. Here again the value of paro-

chial education for the little ones is forcefully brought out, and the records of the graduates must be a source of great satisfaction not only to the pastor, but to the Sisters who labor so willingly, as well. While at St. Patrick's, it was my privilege to visit the convent and to meet Sister Mary Albert, my former teacher at St. Margaret's, whose patience and kindness will ever be a happy memory of mine. It was Sister who pointed out the annual high light, the May procession, in honor of Our Blessed Mother, a regular fixture at St. Patrick's, one the children look forward to with pleasure and joy, because in their own childish way they may pay homage to Our Heavenly Mother in this public demonstration.

SCHOOL SYSTEM

"Many vocations to the priesthood and religious life are discovered in the parish," Monsignor Daly said, "and at the moment the Maryknoll Order seems to be a prime favorite with the boys and girls who anticipate entering the priesthood or the convent." This appears to be just one more indication that our parochial schools are cradles of Catholicity for future priests and nuns.

Named domestic prelate by Pope Pius XII on December 17, 1944, Monsignor Daly is a quiet and soft spoken man, cordial and sincere. Enthusiastic about his parish societies and sodalities, particularly those of a charitable nature, he delights in St. Patrick's part in the recent Bon Secours Hospital drive in which Archbishop Cushing himself was so active, and to the archbishop's frequent visits, the complete support of Lawrence's leading paper, the Eagle-Tribune, and to the fact that every Catholic in Lawrence was conscious of the tremendous effort put forth, he attributes the success of this venture.

May the years ahead add prestige and glory to St. Patrick's history, and to the beloved pastor, Rt. Rev. Edmund D. Daly, a true exponent of the three Catholic virtues—faith, hope, and charity.

Paying the Fiddler Even When He Doesn't Make Music

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 23, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, read the following editorial from today's Saturday Evening Post:

DON'T BLAME PETRILLO; HE'S BEEN SANCTIFIED

Columns and columns of diatribes have been directed at the portly figure of James Caesar Petrillo, whose latest ukase, as head of the American Federation of Musicians, forbade American radio listeners to hear musical programs from foreign countries. Petrillo, conceding that during the war it was a good idea to let in some foreign music in the interest of "good will and good relationships with other countries," insisted that we "should get back to normal as rapidly as possible"—normal to him meaning the rationing of music to the American public in the interest of a powerful and firmly entrenched labor union.

As remarked above, a lot of energy has been expended on abuse of Petrillo. This is wasted effort because Petrillo's only offense is to profit by the cowardice, poltroonery, and flabby brain work of politicians and judges, from executive labor boards, through Congress to the United States Supreme Court. He has made a profitable career out of making the American people look like 130,000,000 fatheads. He operates on the principle that the proprietor of a radio station or a restaurant who plays phonograph records for public hearing is under obligation to pay off certain "live musicians" who might be flogging fiddles for hire if mechanical devices had not displaced them. On this principle the trains ought to carry stand-in mule drivers in memory of the Erie Canal.

But is there any important dissent from this absurd and stultifying doctrine? Far from it. The principle has been recognized in thousands of arrangements with labor unions and has been embalmed into the law of the land by the Supreme Court of the United States in at least two leading cases. The basic idea is that almost any sort of racket becomes legal if it is adopted in a labor dispute. Thus restraints of trade by labor unions escape the antitrust laws if they can be shown to be part of a labor dispute. That's all you have to do.

It is easy to understand that a country threatened with a complete stoppage of its milk supply, or transportation, or electric-power transmission, might submit to such dictation. But the paradox is that one of the most relentless squeezes against the American public is operated by the purveyors of boogie woogie. Maybe a country which can't lay off the jive long enough to establish the right to buy its music canned, crated, or any way it likes, gets what it deserves when a Petrillo waves foreign music off the air. Anyway, it is inappropriate to blame Little Caesar for cashing in on our spinelessness.

Now that you have read it, what do you think of yourself and your Congressman and Senators?

On July 27, 1942, a bill was introduced by me to end Petrillo's graft, but my colleagues, in their wisdom and caution, have failed to give me effective support.

The great Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House is still considering—yes, considering—whether the Congress can and should make Petrillo behave.

The Truck Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 23, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, seven States in the Middle West, namely, Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, Iowa, Minnesota, North and South Dakota, have now been in the grip of a truck strike for a period of 10 weeks.

The truck operators in these States have refused to sign the horizontal contract offered by Daniel J. Tobin and ask for permission to state facts to justify their position, and the facts are, in part: That the general character of that country is one of such dense population and has few great industrial enterprises in the territory; consequently, a contract which is workable in the States of Ohio, Illinois, or Pennsylvania cannot be carried out in these seven Midwestern States. They have asked—and rightfully—for a differential. They have offered conclusive proof of the utter impossibility of the horizontal contract working in those areas.

During the war period 103 truckers in the Northwest States refused to sign Mr. Tobin's contract and gave as the reason the character of their country and asked for a differential. It was never granted. As a result, the drivers went on strike. The properties were taken over by the Office of Defense Transportation. At that time it was announced by the Government that in war the ability to pay on the part of an operator could not be a consideration. The Office of Defense Transportation took over the management of these companies, made the salary advances, and the vast number of them ran in the red under Government management to the extent that ODT had in many cases to advance funds to the owners of the truck lines.

On November 11, 1945, when the lines were returned to the owners, the owners were obliged to sign notes covering a 20-year period to pay back advances made by the ODT. According to the best authorities I can obtain, the striking drivers in these seven States desire to return to their jobs.

Under unanimous consent, I include here a letter just received from the Midwest Operators Association, who represent the seven States already mentioned:

SIOUX FALLS, S. DAK., *January 14, 1946.*
Representative CHARLES R. ROBERTSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROBERTSON: While you were home you no doubt found that the 9-week-old truck strike was still in progress. Five thousand three hundred and seventeen over-the-road truck drivers are involved. An additional 40,000 clerks, office help, dock help, warehousemen, pick-up and delivery drivers, etc., have been thrown out of work. We operators have done everything possible in an attempt to settle this strike with the powerful Teamsters' Union. We have failed. We are as far from a solution today as we were the first week of the strike. Daniel J. Tobin stated that they were asking only $1.02 per hour. We offered 8-hour guarantee at $1.20 per hour for the over-the-road terminal drivers. They refused. M. Hoffa, their chairman, admitted that the contract would average nearly a 40-percent increase when all of the hidden conditions were enforced for work not performed.

One paragraph in the contract—Article IX reads as follows:

"The Employer shall not request nor instruct any employee to go through the picket line of a union nor to handle unfair goods."

It would appear from this paragraph that it is the intention of the Union to use the trucking industry to force employees of all business firms into the union.

Another paragraph reads as follows:

"This contract is approved as to form only by the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America, and in doing so the international union assumes no liability whatsoever under this contract for the performance thereof or otherwise, and by such approval does not become a party to the agreement."

These are only two of the many impossible provisions in this contract.

Daniel J. Tobin has protested to the Secretary of Labor against the President appointing a fact-finding committee. We believe that every effort should be put forward to getting the President to appoint this committee and call the men back to work.

The Wilson employees in South Dakota have gone back to work because we have a labor law here in South Dakota that leaves it up to the employee as to whether or not he shall belong to a union. We feel confident

that if the drivers of other trucking companies in the seven-State area had the same opportunity that they would return to work immediately.

This is not a strike for wages particularly. It is a strike for control, one national contract, complete control of management, etc. A large percentage of the terminal-to-terminal drivers average $72 per week and the peddle runs average from $55 to $60 per week. Less than 5 percent of the truck drivers in the seven States belong to the teamsters' union and the wages being paid to these 5 percent will run from 20 to 40 percent above the other 95 percent of truck drivers.

Mr. Harry Janke, of Minot, N. Dak., who is one of our member operators, will do doubt call on you within a few days and my present plan is to be in Washington the middle of next week. I hope to have the opportunity to discuss the matter with you further if the President does not act in the meantime.

Hundreds of towns in this midwest area have been isolated and have no truck service because of this strike. Many towns do not have any rail lines. Embargoes have been placed on l. c. l. shipments at the Twin Cities, Chicago, St. Louis, Kansas City, Omaha, Sioux City, Des Moines, and Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; and many of these embargoes are still in force. Your people are being deprived of transportation. In my opinion, no public utilities should ever be allowed to discontinue service because of strikes.

I hope that you will be able to solve this strike problem and get these men back to work without delay.

Most sincerely,

MIDWEST OPERATORS ASSOCIATION,
WM. WILSON, *President.*

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 23, 1946

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution adopted by the Northern Federation of Chambers of Commerce, in support of the great St. Lawrence seaway and power project:

Whereas the United States and Canada on March 19, 1941, signed an agreement to complete the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project; and

Whereas most of the construction work needed to complete this great development, the Nation's No. 1 postwar project, is to be undertaken in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River in boundary waters of the State of New York and the Province of Ontario; and

Whereas the completion of the seaway will modernize an existing channel for commerce already improved for use by ocean cargo vessels over 90 percent of the distance from the head of the Great Lakes to the open sea; and

Whereas the dual purpose navigation and power project to be built in the International Rapids section will develop 2,200,000 horsepower of the cheapest electric power in the world, to be divided equally between the State of New York and the Province of Ontario; and

Whereas the State of New York in 1931, through the adoption of the Power Authority Act, by unanimous vote of the legislature, declared it to be the public policy of this State to develop the International Rapids section for both power and navigation, and authorized the power authority, as the accredited public agency of the State, to take over the ownership and operation of the St. Lawrence power project to be constructed in this State, upon assuming the construction costs thereof; and

Whereas the Legislature of the State of New York in March 1944 again declared by unanimous vote that New York State's power project should be completed to serve the postwar needs and interests of the people of this State; and

Whereas, President Truman and Governor Dewey in September 1945, by an exchange of telegrams reaffirmed their nonpartisan support of the development authorized by the United States-Canadian agreement of 1941 and specifically recommended the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway and the New York State power project under the terms of the Federal-State accord of February 7, 1933: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we favor the approval of the United States-Canadian Agreement of 1941 and the prompt enactment of legislation to authorize completion of the St. Lawrence seaway and the New York State power project, in full conformance with the recommendations contained in the statements of President Truman and Governor Dewey, made public at the White House, September 27, 1945; and be it further

Resolved, That we who live in the St. Lawrence Valley and for years have seen the waste of its mighty resources declare the proposed project to be the greatest public improvement now available for postwar completion in any part of the world, and strongly favor its construction in order to provide tens of thousands of postwar jobs for returning veterans and displaced war workers, to promote the foreign trade and domestic commerce of all parts of the United States, and to furnish 4,000,000 industrial, commercial, and rural consumers in New York State with power and electricity at low rates which will permit increased use of electrical energy and electrical appliances; and be it further

Resolved, That we commend the nonpartisan support given to the St. Lawrence seaway and New York State power project by such outstanding leaders as Governors Roosevelt, Lehman, and Dewey, Senator WAGNER, President Truman, and all Presidents of the United States, regardless of party, since World War I; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Honorable Harry S. Truman; to the Governor of the State of New York, Hon. Thomas E. Dewey; to the senior Senator from the State of New York, Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER; to the junior Senator from the State of New York, Hon. JAMES M. MEAD; and to Members of the New York delegation in the United States House of Representatives, together with a list of the civic organizations of northern New York represented at this conference.

ROLLIN NEWTON,
President, Northern Federation of Chambers of Commerce.
JOHN C. TULLOCH,
Secretary.

Terminal Leave Pay to Enlisted Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 23, 1946

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to again urge prompt action on H. R. 4051, to grant terminal leave pay to enlisted men. Nothing rankles enlisted men more, and justly so, than our present policy of giving officers terminal leave pay and denying the same to enlisted men of all branches of the armed forces. This is rank discrimination, and I believe the Military Affairs Committee ought to report the bill to the floor at once so we can remedy this deplorable situation.

I wish to insert a recent editorial from the Milwaukee Journal dated January 6, 1946, commenting on the situation, as follows:

ENLISTED MEN GOT CHEATED

In the matter of terminal leaves for veterans quitting the service, there has been the most flagrant discrimination between commissioned officers and enlisted men.

Officers ready for demobilization are permitted to take terminal leaves, up to 120 days, figured on the basis of accumulated service leaves which they have not previously used. This is fair enough. It is like a civilian employee getting credit for vacations which he was unable to take because of the press of urgent duties. While the officer is still technically in the service and getting service pay, he is permitted to return to his home, don civilian clothes and take a job. At the end of his terminal leave, he gets his final discharge.

But enlisted men have not been given terminal leaves, nor pay in lieu of unused leaves. If they did not or could not take their leaves before they reached the separation center, they simply lost out. So there is no wonder that this has been a sore point with the returning enlisted veterans.

The complaints have reached Congress, and there are five bills now in the two Houses that would rectify the situation and eradicate such indefensible discrimination. They would provide for terminal leave, or pay in lieu of terminal leave, for enlisted men. But not one of the bills has yet reached the floor for action, and committees have shown no great enthusiasm for quick action.

The expense, of course, would be large. A Senate committee heard an estimate that the total would run to $2.000,0000,000 or more. That approximates the total yield of the Federal income tax in 1940, or about $60 for every family in the United States.

But if the sum total of expense seems huge and cannot be treated casually even in times of colossal Federal expenditures, it can be argued that a single additional week of war would have cost more. Or, if demobilization had been more orderly and less precipitate, which many observers feel might have been wiser, the additional pay to the servicemen might well have run beyond the two-billion mark.

Costly or not, the terminal leave bill only meets an obligation which must not be evaded, and from which there is no decent escape. It is in no sense a gratuity, but simple justice and equity to millions who served this country in its hour of need. The duty of Congress in the matter is plain.

Americanism Versus Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 23, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the granting of my unanimous request, I am inserting an article entitled

"Americanism Versus Communism" by former Representative Hamilton Fish, who probably knows as much or more about Communist activities and propaganda in America than almost any other American.

Mr. Fish has, for 15 years, fearlessly and ably denounced and exposed Communist tactics and objectives. For a while, he was a lone voice crying in the wilderness. Today, he should be acclaimed as a prophet who warned of the onward march of world communism and of its menace to democracy, freedom, and religion throughout the world, including America.

Mr. Fish's article is as follows:

AMERICANISM VERSUS COMMUNISM

(By Hamilton Fish, Member of Congress, 1920–44)

The ignorance of the American people regarding communism is appalling and frightening. Americans are confused between the bravery of the Russian soldiers in the war and the idealogy of the Soviet Government.

All Americans give unstinted praise to the Russian war efforts, but that does not mean that we should approve or accept any form of communism or totalitarianism in America. It is none of our business what form of government exists in Soviet Russia. But it is very much our business to preserve democracy and freedom in the United States and as far as we are able to permit the people in the liberated nations to establish governments of their own choice. The ideals of the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms" for which we fought are gradually being whittled away through appeasement toward aggressive Communist strategy. Our lolipop appeasement and recognition policies have succeeded in strengthening and extending communism in Poland, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and throughout Europe. The surrender of Secretary of State Byrnes at Moscow to the demands for Soviet control over General MacArthur opens the road for communism in Japan. Step by step, and in conference after conference, America, the greatest exponent of democracy in the world, has been out-maneuvered and forced into humiliating concessions to Soviet Russia and the recognition of governments in Communist dominated nations.

The Red hordes of communism, aided and abetted by American appeasement, are on the march in Europe and Asia. We have helped to create a Red totalitarian Frankenstein in the place of nazism which is far more dangerous to democracy and world freedom. The marriage of convenience between the British Empire and world communism has run its course. The British Empire is shaking in its boots and like a weather vain twists and turns at every breath out of Moscow.

In the recent past when you spoke of the dangers of communism, the American people were either bored or indifferent. Now, that it is engulfing Europe and reaching its tentacles out into Japan the people are waking up to the Red menace.

It is slowly dawning on the American people that the onward march of communism in Europe and Asia is affecting the liberties and destiny of America and the world.

They are no longer indifferent to the plight of so-called liberated European nations which are falling like ripe plums into Communist hands. The tragic fact is that millions of democratic and Christian people in Europe are becoming the serfs and slaves to a totalitarian Communist state. The flame of liberty is burning low in Europe. Freedom and Christianity will be unable for long to withstand the ruthless Communist aggressions backed by the Red secret police.

Once Europe is communized as a result of World War II, waged for democracy, it will be a devastating blow to private enterprise, free institutions, and constitutional government in America. Those now on strike are mostly loyal Americans but already subversive and Red leadership is showing its power in the expanding strike situation which Mr. Foster, head of the Communist Party in America, acclaims the Communists are using every effort to develop bitter class hatred and a revolutionary spirit among the strikers. For the Communists the existing strikes, some engineered and controlled by Reds, are merely dress rehearsals for a future C-day.

There can be no compromise between democracy and freedom on one side and communism and totalitarianism on the other.

World communism will put Europe back hundreds of years, liquidate the upper and middle classes, and destroy indiviual liberty for which we were told the war was fought.

Anyone who refuses to face the realities and menace of world communism is merely playing into the hands of the Communists and assuring the awful day of reckoning for civilization, Christianity, freedom, and democracy.

We have far too many defeatists among our social and wealthy classes who shrug their shoulders and are blind to the dangers of communism at home and abroad. The continuation of our State Department policy of appeasement toward the Red-front forces in Europe can only mean communism, bankruptcy, and slavery there. There can be no compromise between Americanism and communism. We do not propose to let the Communists, or Sidney Hillman's PAC, sovietize us. Let us rise above party affiliations and unite in saving America from its enemies without and from within. Above all, let us not be afraid of exposing communism and its evil purposes and defending democracy and Christianity for fear of being smeared by Communists and their fellow travelers.

Appeasement, which our international press has denounced these many years, is still appeasement even if it is demanded by the Reds instead of by the Nazis. What will we have accomplished by our tremendous sacrifices in blood and treasure if after having destroyed one form of totalitarianism we help to set up an even more dangerous one to the peace of the world and to free institutions?

What profit it a nation if it wins victories over the whole world only to lose its own soul?

I have written a book entitled "The Challenge of World Communism," in order to present the facts to the American people regarding the principles and objectives of the Red dictatorship, the worst type of despotism and tyranny that has existed in the world since the dark ages. This book will be released by the publishers this spring. Proceeds from my share of the sale of the book will go into a nonpartisan and nonprofit fund to combat the spread of communism on the American Continent and to establish a Nation-wide American anticommunism organization.

The OPA Manipulated the Citrus Fruit Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 23, 1946

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, on December 19, 1945, in a statement which may be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, I charged in effect, that the Office of Price Administration had deliberately manipulated the ceiling price controls of citrus fruits in order to provide OPA with a publicity theme for one of the greatest propaganda campaigns of all time—the campaign to perpetuate price controls in the United States.

On January 5 Mr. Bowles issued a reply in which he did not attempt to deny the charges of propaganda but gave only a garbled and misleading account of the citrus fruit price situation and admitted the primary thesis of my charge—that OPA knew when it removed ceiling prices on November 19 that the price of better-grade citrus fruits would immediately go up.

Since then, OPA has completed its maneuver by reimposing ceiling prices as soon as the holiday demand was over so that it could claim credit for the low prices which naturally occur at this season of the year.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial printed on January 16 by the Redlands Daily Facts, of Redlands, Calif., a newspaper published in the very heart of one of the greatest citrus growing areas in the United States:

CITRUS, THE HORRIBLE EXAMPLE

J. A. Steward, manager of MOD, documents the congressionally voiced opinion that OPA manipulated citrus price controls to provide a shining example of the horrors of removing price controls in a statement published in the Facts today.

That price controls were not suspended to help the industry market the 1945 crop of small fruit valencias is a matter of record. That the ceilings were removed when the supply of fruit was minimum and the demand maximum is also a matter of fact. Only the most naive could believe that OPA's motives were honest and open.

Having chosen the optimum moment to make a scapegoat out of citrus, OPA was ready for the next move, a Nation-wide propaganda barrage. The firing was done by OPA district directors from New York to San Francisco. In unison they cried about the price of large-size oranges, a small percentage of the offerings. They were silent about average prices and about the continued low price level on small fruit.

By mid-December the propaganda barrage achieved its purpose. OPA gained support from those who swallowed its hokum in the form of letters, telegrams, editorials, and public statements. That support put OPA in a position to petition for reinsatement of price ceilings before the natural price decline would develop in January, as it almost invariably does.

Theoretically the case was taken before a wise and impartial umpire, Judge Collett, the Director of Economic Stabilization. Actually, he was incompetent to do anything more than conduct a judicial hearing. He did not know the A B C's of citrus price ceilings, being ignorant of the fact that controls had existed at three levels—shipper, wholesaler, and retailer.

At the request of the Secretary of Agriculture, he refrained from revoking the suspension order. To explain his stand he issued an asinine opinion. He said that he would leave it to the industry to voluntarily reduce prices. If the reduction did not come, he would grant OPA's request.

How in the name of common sense did he expect industry to voluntarily reduce prices? Citrus, in common with other businesses in America, is organized on a competitive basis.

Each organization finds its prices regulated by supply and demand. They have no control over each other, and the citrus industry has no czar of its own. At the slightest whiff of collusion the Antitrust Division of the Government gets after the industry, a phenomenon that Judge Collett seems unaware of.

We can only conclude that the findings of the Economic Stabilization Director were written by the OPA propagandists and not by a genuinely judicial officer.

OPA kept up the propaganda, and a short time later was able to get the price controls reinstated. It succeeded just in the nick of time to catch the market before the annual January decline.

That OPA engages in propaganda and deception in the hope of perpetuating itself is lamentable. Until the supply of money and of goods in America approaches equilibrium, some price controls will be required to prevent inflation. The facts are well known and are justification enough for the functions of OPA. By its tactics so clearly shown in the case of citrus the bureau is undermining itself and exposing the country to danger.

Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 23, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an editorial which appeared in the Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., on December 22, 1945:

LEADERSHIP

"To you who answered the call of your country and served in its armed forces to bring about the total defeat of the enemy I extend the heartfelt thanks of a grateful Nation. As one of the Nation's finest, you undertook the most severe task one can be called upon to perform. Because you demonstrated the fortitude, resourcefulness, and calm judgment necessary to carry out that task, we now look to you for leadership and example in further exalting our country in peace.

"HARRY S. TRUMAN.

"THE WHITE HOUSE."

The above is a copy of the testimonial letter signed by President Harry S. Truman which is to be presented to all honorably discharged men and women in the armed services who have served for any period between September 16, 1940, and the date to be established as 6 months after the duration of the present emergency.

In extending the heartfelt thanks of a grateful nation to those who served so nobly in the war just ended he voices what is firmly instilled in the hearts of all true Americans. It is fitting for all to subscribe to that expression of the President and give it practical application in all dealings with veterans of the war. The valiant service of millions of stalwart sons and daughters of this great Republic must never be forgotten. They must be made always to know and in more ways than a mere phrasing of words that their willingness to serve, make great sacrifices, and even die if necessary for their country is truly appreciated by their fellowmen who were not called upon to bear arms.

"We now look to you for leadership and example in further exalting our country in peace," has unusual significance and strikes a keynote of the utmost importance in relation to the future prosperity and happiness of this great Nation. The greatest need of this Nation in the perilous times ahead is that of sound and balanced leadership. The religious, governmental, and economic future will be no better nor worse than the standard of leadership exercised by free men and women. It is highly essential that this Nation encourage in every way possible the development of leaders in all walks of life. The challenge to the veterans of the late war can best be answered if such encouragement, support, and opportunity are afforded them. The whole system of government and economics becomes unbalanced under weak or biased leadership. Individualism among leaders must give way to a broad program that best serves all. American democracy has been put to the greatest test and has survived. Leadership must preserve the great gains that have been made, but it must be good and balanced leadership.

The men and women to whom the President directs his gratitude and his challenge have a great responsibility in this time of peace that has followed the war. They will play a great and important part in shaping the destinies of this Nation for which they fought. They will accept the responsibilities of peace with the same courageous patriotism as they did the responsibilities of war. And America will be greater because of their service in both peace and war.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 23, 1946

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include resolutions unanimously adopted by the National Grange in support of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project:

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL GRANGE AT ITS SEVENTY-NINTH ANNUAL SESSION AT KANSAS CITY, MO., NOVEMBER 23, 1945

Whereas the National Grange has for many years gone on record as favoring the development of the St. Lawrence River for navigation and power: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Grange reaffirms its support of the St. Lawrence waterway and power project and urges that Congress appropriate funds to complete this project at the earliest possible date.

ACTION TAKEN AT SEVENTY-SEVENTH AND SEVENTY-EIGHTH ANNUAL SESSIONS OF THE NATIONAL GRANGE

At its seventy-eighth annual session, at Winston-Salem, N. C., November 23, 1944, the National Grange reaffirmed resolutions adopted at its seventy-seventh annual session at Grand Rapids, Mich., November 18, 1943, as follows:

"Whereas the National Grange has for years advocated the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway, nearly 90 percent of which is already completed, and opening this wonderful artery of commerce to carry the products of the interior of our country to the markets of the world at reduced costs; and

"Whereas the completion of this project would permit the development of vast electrical energy, now going to waste in the onrushing waters of this mighty river, resulting in cheaper electric power to all our people; and

"Whereas there is legislation now pending in Congress to bring this project to completion as soon as material and labor are available: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the National Grange reaffirms its position favoring completion of this project for navigation and power purposes."

Action taken by the National Grange at its recent seventy-ninth annual session at Kansas City, Mo., November 23, in support of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, is consistent with the program favored by the Grange over a period of many years.

The Grange supported the St. Lawrence seaway treaty of 1932 and the Federal-State accord of 1933 on the power development submitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Senate, 1932–34. When the United States and Canada signed the pending agreement of March 19, 1941 to complete the development, the Grange recommended legislation to authorize the project (H. R. 4927, 77th Cong.) at public hearings before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors in 1941. Legislation to implement the 1941 agreement and the 1933 accord was reintroduced in the Seventy-eighth Congress (H. R. 2280—S. 1385) and in the Seventy-ninth Congress (H. R. 671—S. J. Res. 104 and companion bills).

Mr. Albert S. Goss, master of the National Grange, has been an outstanding supporter of the development of water resources throughout the Nation for navigation, power, and other beneficial public purposes. On many occasions Mr. Goss has advocated the St. Lawrence project and on November 29, 1944 declared that "had it been developed prior to the present war, its value to the Nation would have paid the total cost several times over."

At the last congressional hearings on the St. Lawrence project, Mr. Louis J. Taber, master of the National Grange, 1923–41, testified before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, July 17, 1941:

"The pending bill authorizes the modernization of an existing waterway, not the undertaking of an entirely new development. * * * By spending less than $200,000,000 in Federal funds, we shall thus greatly enhance the value of the investments already made by the United States and Canada on the upper lake channels, the Welland Canal, and the other great improvements now in use. In addition, we shall make available 2,200,000 horsepower of the cheapest hydroelectricity in the world, to be divided equally and distributed by public agencies of the State of New York and the Province of Ontario. * * * The use of all of our transportation facilities, including the St. Lawrence, to reduce the cost of shipping our products to market, will obviously help our entire country, not hinder it, in meeting competition in the post-war period."

In a statement presented at the congressional hearings, August 6, 1941, Mr. Fred J. Freestone, master of the New York State Grange, 1928–36, and chairman of the Executive Committee of the National Grange, 1933–41, said:

"The St. Lawrence development authorized by the pending bill will be of advantage to producers and consumers in every section of our country. Any project that helps to create low-cost transportation and low-cost power will bring benefits that are general in character and not confined to any one section."

An American Plea For the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARLOS P. ROMULO
RESIDENT COMMISSIONER OF THE PHILIPPINES TO THE UNITED STATES
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 23, 1946

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I take pleasure in inserting in the RECORD, a coast-to-coast broadcast made by Frazier Hunt over Station WOR, New York, Tuesday, January 15, and a radio interview that he had on January 18 with F. Theo Rogers, one of the best-liked Americans in the Philippines, who was tortured by the Japanese in Fort Santiago during the hateful enemy occupation of the Philippines.

I am proud to call the attention of this distinguished body to the statements made by these two Americans. They stand as a beacon light to guide us in these days when this Congress is confronted with so many difficult problems that must be solved.

Frazier Hunt is a noted American author whose writings have won for him the admiration of the American reading public. F. Theo Rogers is a fearless newspaperman who has made a name for himself in the Far East for his integrity and uncompromising advocacy of American ideals of freedom and democracy.

Frazier Hunt's broadcast and his interview with F. Theo Rogers follow:

BROADCAST BY FRAZIER HUNT

I'd like to talk a little while, right now, about the Philippine Islands—and how important they are to us, and to all the billion, seething, dreaming, awakening people of the great East.

I want to warn you at the start, that I've got a very soft spot in my heart for these lovely islands, and for the 18,000,000 gentle, sweet, and kindly people who live there. I first went to the islands in the summer of 1920. Freedom and independence was in the air. Two men, Manuel Quezon and Sergio Osmeña, were the leaders of this dream of Philippine Independence—and they were to become my close friends. They were both fairly young men then; and they poured out without stint their energies, their great talents and their determination for the ultimate winning of this goal of liberty.

It had come to them with their mother's milk; it has been nurtured and refreshened by a number of truly great Americans—soldiers and civilians alike—who gave of their own years and knowledge to make good the American pledge, that full independence would be given the islanders as soon as they were sufficiently trained to carry on their government and guarantee its safety. That handfull of men were wonderful Americans, true believers in democracy—and in the sanctity of the pledged word. Gen. Arthur MacArthur was one of them; the then Secretary of War, William Howard Taft, was another; Theodore Roosevelt was a third. They were all men of their word; and the Filipino leaders, and the plain people, as well, believed them.

And so together they started down the long trail toward the golden goal of independence. It was not a popular move in the eyes of the great European empires. It was dangerous and improper, they said, to upset the balance of their far eastern colonies. It was unfair, they claimed, for America to build here in the Philippines the idea that these native peoples would someday be free and truly independent—with their own flag and government.

Nine and a half years ago the Congress of the United States formally set up the Philippine Commonwealth, and pledged complete independence on July 4, 1946. Four years and some 5 or 6 weeks ago, the Philippines were suddenly and viciously attacked by the Japs—at dawn on the day Pearl Harbor was assaulted. Under the leadership of Douglas MacArthur, son of one of the very first and truest friends of the Filipinos, native sons proudly gave their lives, alongside tall lads from eight, ten thousand miles away. And when the President of the United States ordered General MacArthur to repair to Australia and there command an army of eventual liberation, MacArthur made his immortal pledge, "I shall return."

Once again an American kept his word—and the islands were once again free. Tens of thousands of brave Filipinos helped immeasurably in their guerrilla fighting. It took 3½ years to do the job—but it was nobly done. In the doing, Manila and all the lovely cities were destroyed. Much of it was done, through necessity, by American liberating guns and bombers. The richest parts of the islands, the fairest cities, were laid in ruins. They must be rebuilt—and America must help. Today the islands are helpless—powerless to get the machines of their life rolling again. We must vote them money—give them money—the same as we will soon be giving billions to Europe.

And we must guarantee the islands free trade with America for the next 20 years. It will take that long for the islands to find their feet, to regain their lost strength, to stand alone and walk alone. We have only to ask what our Army and Navy and Air wants in the islands—and it shall be given.

The key to the solution of the billion broken, dreaming, struggling, awakening peoples of Greater Asia and the neighboring islands lies in our cooperation, our mutual understanding, our fairness to the Filipinos. It is the pattern for empires to follow in dealing with their restless colonials. It is one of the most treasured possessions America has—the love of these 17,000,000 loyal, gentle people. We must never mar it—we must never cheapen it.

THEO ROGERS INTERVIEW ON FRAZIER HUNT PROGRAM

Mr. HUNT. I am very proud to get into this part of my program. With me, in the studio here in New York, is a very old and a very dear friend of mine. I might add, also, that he is a very wise friend—and a very brave friend, as well—a man of great inner courage and that valor of spirit, that only a few men are blessed with.

Theo Rogers landed in Manila off a transport in the late summer of 1898. He was a 16-year-old boy soldier from Boston, the youngest private in the grand old Twelfth Regulars. Save for trips home, and around the world, he has been in the islands ever since—47 years, to be exact. He is truly an old Philippine hand.

And he is much more than that; during all these years, he has served his country as loyally and courageously as he served it as a boy soldier. And the great weekly paper, the Philippine Free Press, which he and McCulloch Dick published, has for almost four decades stood on the side of decency and advancement of American-Filipino friendship and cooperation.

When the Jap hordes swept down on the islands, and entered the open city of Manila, on January 1, 1942, Theo Rogers was one of the first Americans scooped up—and the first American to be sent to the infamous dungeons of Fort Santiago Prison, in the old walled city.

He was kept there 3 months, then when the Japs found they could neither bribe him, nor break his spirit, he was sent to the Santo Tomas interment camp; finally, with health gone, but with his brave heart still beating, he was transferred to the Philippine General Hospital, where in the midst of the furious battle, he was rescued by his old friend, Maj. Don M. Higbee, of General MacArtur's staff. At that moment of rescue, and in the face of death, 8,000 Filipino men and women prisoners, sang "God Bless America."

And now this fine and brave American patriot, is here with me. Theo, I'm proud to have you on this program.

THEO ROGERS. For nearly half a century—a long time—Fate, or Destiny, cast my lot with a people whom I have learned to admire, respect, and love. The Filipino people are the most progressive and advanced people of the entire Orient, in which area more than one-half of the human race live and toil. They are the only beacon light of Christianity and Occidental culture in that vast area. (Their country is made up of a group of the most fertile, rich, and beautiful island gems of all the world.)

Their women have been hailed repeatedly as among the sweetest and most charming of the feminine world. Their men have proven their worth in all fields of endeavor.

No wonder that I should want to plead for them to our great and generous American people. During the past 4 years of agony, suffering and horror, it was my painful, and shameful, fate to be an eyewitness of what our neglect in not providing the greatest soldier of all time, Douglas MacArthur, adequate supplies, weapons, and means, to defend these wards of ours in the first great battle against our country. Today, these beautiful islands, that we were in honor bound to defend—and whom we promised to defend—now lie in utter ruins. And what are we going to do about it? We are about to give—and I repeat give—billions of dollars to other people around the world—and yet we have made no provision to help our Filipino people. We should vote at once a sum of not less than $500,000,000 for the rehabilitation of these, our most loyal comrades and allies. More than a million Filipinos were killed, or died as a result of this war—out of a population of 16,000,000. We owe them something, too. And how little $500,000,000 would be toward our obligations to them.

Douglas MacArthur pledged "I shall return." And he did return. The United States has officially pledged to stand by and rehabilitate the islands, and its people. We must do that now, immediately, or stand convicted in the eyes of the entire world, and for all future time, as deserters to our duty, and a Nation without honor. This is my plea fellow Americans, I know you will respond.

Mr. HUNT. That is very beautiful and deeply sincere, Theo Rogers. And something worth thinking about.

State Legislature of California Asks Federal Government to Declare Surplus Building Materials, etc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 23, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, indicative of the tragic need of immediate release of the stresses and strain upon folks in

my native State of California, resulting from no housing is the following resolution by the Assembly of the State of California:

I agree with the objective of the resolution and ask support of the Members of this House to the same effect, primarily because it specifies there shall be given preference for veterans in the purchase thereof.

Let us put some teeth into the mouth of the surplus property pit and immediately get into the hands of these veterans these necessities of life, to which they are entitled, a preferential chance to acquire. They fought with guns for us. Now let us work in utmost good faith and with utmost diligence for them and their dependents. Nothing less is decent.

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE,
FIFTY-SIXTH SESSION,
Sacramento, Calif., January 18, 1946.

Hon. CLYDE G. DOYLE.
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DOYLE: May I invite your attention to the enclosed copy of Assembly Joint Resolution 2, which was adopted by the California Legislature on January 17, 1946.

An acknowledgment of the receipt of this resolution would be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
ARTHUR A. OHNIMUS.

Assembly Joint Resolution 2

Joint resolution relative to requesting the Federal Government to declare as surplus property all building materials held but not needed by the armed forces in California, and to effect the immediate release of such materials for housing construction, providing for preference to veterans in the purchase thereof

Whereas the critical housing shortage in California is a matter of grave concern to the people thereof; and

Whereas construction work has been greatly impeded by the nonavailability of essential building materials; and

Whereas large stocks of needed supplies are now lying idle in Army and Navy ordnance depots throughout California, the release of which would facilitate housing construction; and

Whereas the present procedure for declaring such materials to be surplus property is extremely slow and cumbersome, ultimate acquisition being subject to considerable and needless delay: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That Congress and the Federal agencies charged with the disposal of surplus property are respectfully requested to declare as surplus property all building materials held but not needed by the armed forces in California, and to take such steps as may be necessary to effect the immediate release of such materials for housing construction, providing preference to veterans in the purchase thereof; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Surplus Property Board.

Philippine Independence and Rehabilitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARLOS P. ROMULO

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER OF THE PHILIPPINES TO THE UNITED STATES

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 23, 1946

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, with the unanimous consent of the House, I am inserting in the RECORD several articles that have recently appeared in the New York Times and the Washington Post. They deal with Philippine independence and Philippine rehabilitation.

Philippine independence is a settled question insofar as this Congress is concerned. The law provides that independence comes on July 4, 1946. However, the question of Philippine rehabilitation is still pending congressional action. May I commend these articles to the attention of the House, as I believe they represent American public opinion on an issue that affects the future of 18,000,000 Filipinos.

The first is an editorial appearing in the New York Times of December 29, 1945, which reads in part as follows:

Nine months after Manila was freed and 4 months after the war with Japan was ended, canceling the necessity to concentrate our energies on invasion of Japan instead of reconstruction and rehabilitation of the Philippines, little actually has been done to restore the economy of the Philippines or to give the Filipinos any real hope for the future. Congress has given little indication of any interest in revising the Philippines Independence Act of 1934 to provide for a more equitable trade relationship than is provided for in that act after establishment of independence next July 4. Several million dollars has been provided for immediate loans against future war reparations. But it is not money the Filipinos need—they have millions of Japanese pesos. It is reconstruction of their flattened sugar mills and other buildings that is vital now, a resumption of shipping and internal communications, definite assurance through legislative action that they will not be faced with a tariff wall between them and United States markets when they gain their full independence next July.

The haste of United States demobilization, brought about by public and congressional pressure, undoubtedly is partly responsible for our failure to do more for the Filipinos. Army newspapers in the Philippines would do a better service in calling attention to the necessity for immediate and extensive aid to the Filipinos than they do in protesting shipping delays in bringing soldiers home. The several hundred soldiers who staged a protest demonstration there the other day would have been doing a far better service for their country and their waiting families if they had been working to help the Filipinos rebuild their shattered homes and buildings.

The Philippines are our peculiar responsibility in the Pacific. It was United States bombs and shells that did most of the damage there. True, the damage was done in liberating the Filipinos from the Japanese, but that realization will not rebuild a shattered mill or warehouse. It must be incomprehensible to the hungry and war-shocked Filipinos that the country that could muster in their backyard such a great military force cannot move more rapidly now to rebuild the world they lost in making cause with us against a common enemy. Quick and complete action by Congress to redress this growing wrong should be among the top items on the calendar on Capitol Hill when the holiday recess is over.

The second is an article by Mr. Louis H. Pink, formerly superintendent of insurance of the State of New York, published in the New York Times on January 3, 1946:

The report from Manila by Robert Trumbull in the Times of December 30 is a fair-minded and intelligent account of conditions in the Philippines. Unfortunately it may be regarded as additional ammunition by those who seek to force the Filipinos to ask for the postponement of independence because the guerrillas have not been disarmed, the agrarian problem solved, collaborationists punished, or what not. There is always the threat that if the Filipinos do not do as each writer or public official thinks they should, financial aid may be reduced, or independence delayed.

Undoubtedly there are many disturbing conditions in the Philippines. But where are there not? There is more hope for social and economic progress and reconstruction in the Philippines than in most other war-torn areas. Progress in reconstruction, admittedly slower than it should be, is not being held back by the Army, as has been unjustly charged. The Army has done a great deal to alleviate distress and physically recreate the Philippines. No doubt it could have done even more. But the delay in adopting a policy and in providing funds lies squarely in Washington.

I doubt if Mr. Trumbull is correct in his opinion that "most Filipinos do not want unqualified independence on July 4, 1946." Business interests, whether United States, British, Chinese, or Filipino, do not want unqualified independence on July 4, 1946, or at any other time. It is not generally known in this country that most of the capital is not American or Spanish, as Mr. Trumbull intimates, but Filipino.

GOOD FAITH EXPECTED

Mr. Trumbull is undoubtedly correct in stating that all politicians think they have to be for unqualified independence in order to be elected, no matter what their own opinion may be. There is no way of knowing how the people as a whole feel. Many are poor and have little voice, but they undoubtedly expect that what they have been promised so often and so long, both by the United States and their own leaders, will be carried out in good faith. They have the same desire to decide their own destiny that prevails, with less preparation, in Korea, Java, Thailand, Indochina, and India.

The Filipinos have been preparing for independence not for 10 years, with the three war years out, but for almost half a century. While the self-governing Commonwealth began to function in 1935, we promised eventual independence when we first took over the islands and have been preparing them for self-government ever since.

OUR HELP NEEDED

There is no sound reason for delay if we carry out our promise to aid materially in the reconstruction and rebuilding of the Philippines. We can give the same financial, trade, and managerial aid to the republic as to a continuing Commonwealth. No one can deny that, while potentially rich, the islands will need our help for many years to come. It will require at least 10 years to repair the physical destruction and build a sound financial economy. We have a moral as well as a pledged obligation to supply this aid. It will always be possibe to find some

good reason why independence should be delayed, now, in 3 years, or in 10.

The Philippines might be just as well off with a Commonwealth. But the United States would not. Our prestige in the Orient and all over the world would suffer. The granting of independence, as promised, will be one of the finest things in our history.

The election of a President and Congress in the Philippines should not be delayed. There is no danger of revolt and possibility of any serious disorder is greatly magnified.

The good intentions of the United States in world affairs is sufficiently misunderstood. We cannot afford to let anything stand in the way of independence for the Philippines on July 4, 1946.

The third is an editorial published in the New York Times January 11, 1946, entitled "Philippines Problem":

July 4, 1946, will be a sad day of remembrance for the Filipinos instead of the joyous day of independence that it might have been unless Congress takes action soon to revise the Tydings-McDuffie Act of 1934. Under that act—which Congress considered equitable enough when it was passed 11 years ago and revised 4 years later—on the swiftly approaching day that the Philippine Commonwealth becomes a free and sovereign state it loses most of its preferential trade position with respect to the United States, its best customer. That is the prospect that now faces a country which was more ravaged by war than any other in the Far East and whose citizens fought more loyally and effectively on our side. We promised them much during the war. So far we have done little.

With the date for independence less than 6 months away, it is high time Congress got down to work on this problem and brought forth a reasonable solution. We owe a great deal to the Filipinos. No one can accurately assay how many American lives were saved by the intelligence of enemy dispositions sent out by the guerrillas and their operations behind the Japanese lines during the battles for Leyte, Luzon, and Mindanao. We believe the American people want Congress to be generous in its approach. It is hardly understandable why a comprehensive revision of the Tydings-McDuffie Act has not already been made. Further delay only aggravates the fears of the Filipinos and delays by that much the rebirth of hope that is as necessary in those islands as the reconstruction of their homes and economy.

The fourth is an editorial appearing in the Washington Post on January 11, 1946:

PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE

A recent dispatch predicts that Philippine independence which will become effective on July 4, will be followed by disorders, if not revolution. Former guerrillas are still in possession of their arms, and the proclamations of President Osmeña and of the provincial governors asking surrender of these arms have been ignored. In some sections of the islands armed bands are said to be terrorizing the peaceful inhabitants.

Reconstruction problems are also acute, being aggravated of course, by the delay of Congress in passing the bill for settlement of war-damage claims and in outlining a new trade policy between the islands and the United States. Inflation is giving officials grave concern. War has left the islands such a heritage of trouble that many Filipinos are said to be skeptical and regretful over the forthcoming dawn of independence. Some writers from Manila go so far as to say that a majority of the Filipino people no longer want unqualified independence.

We do not believe, however, that the situation justifies the suggestions repeatedly made in some quarters that the date of Philippine independence be postponed or that some other status for the islands be agreed upon. The prediction of disaster in the war-ravaged islands after July 4 seems to be predicated on the assumption that the United States-Philippine partnership will come to an abrupt end. That, of course, is an illusion. The nature of that partnership will change, but the partnership itself must continue in effect for the protection of the Philippines and for the greater security of the United States against external aggression. As we have previously pointed out, the American naval and air bases to be established in the islands will necessarily link the defense systems of two countries inextricably together.

To this extent Philippine independence will be limited. We feel that the Filipino people understand this joint-defense arrangement and overwhelmingly approve of it. Consequently, it will be only reasonable for them to ask and expect continued aid from the United States in reconstructing and stabilizing their country until the new governmental system is operating smoothly. And of course the United States could not decline such requests without undercutting the pledge that it has given to the Filipino people in addition to our own security in the Far East. The basic fact to remember is that independence for the Philippines will not take them out of the orbit of our close and immediate interests any more than the independence of Cuba broke the intimate ties between that country and our own. We think that any satisfactory approach to the islands' formidable economic and governmental problems must be made from this point of view.

Address by Hon. Robert M. La Follette, Jr., at Testimonial Dinner to Hon. Leo T. Crowley

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 24 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. WAGNER] I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] at a testimonial dinner for Hon. Leo T. Crowley, at Madison, Wis., on January 10, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am honored to have a part on this occasion when the services of Leo Crowley to his country, his church, and to humanity are so fittingly recognized.

It has been my privilege to know him for many years. Since he came to Washington I have observed his work in many and varied fields of public service. It is truly remarkable when one considers the broad range of important administrative assignments which Mr. Crowley has carried during his years in Washington. These are the best evidence of his great energy, fine administrative ability, and his genius for working with people of divergent points of view and from every walk of life.

Leo Crowley was one of President Roosevelt's advisers. He was present at the inauguration in 1933 and participated with others in discussing with the President the contemplated banking holiday closing all of the banks in this country. From that time until the President's untimely death he was intimately associated with the President, advising him on political matters, on matters of domestic concern, on governmental problems, and on international relationships.

Mr. Crowley became Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation at the beginning of 1934. At that time deposit insurance was regarded by many as a temporary expedient to give the public a sense of financial security. The large banks of the country were passive in their attitude toward deposit insurance, feeling then that it would be of short duration, and arguing that it could not possibly become permanent since it would place a premium on unsound banking.

Many State bank supervisors were more active in their opposition, since they felt that if deposit insurance were to become permanent it would jeopardize their jurisdiction. Other Federal agencies were curiously waiting to see how the experiment worked, not wanting to be charged with its failure, but ready to move in and attempt to take it over if it succeeded.

HELPED SAVE BANKS—FDIC ONE OF MOST EFFICIENTLY OPERATED ORGANIZATIONS

As you well know, Mr. Crowley quickly developed the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation into one of the most efficiently operated organizations in the Government. Likewise, he made it one of the most popular governmental organizations in the country. He gained the full support and backing of the State bank supervisors. He assured the banks, the public, and the Congress that deposit insurance, in place of putting a premium on unsound banking, would insist on the maintenance of sound banking practices.

He proceeded to eliminate dangerous weaknesses in the banking system that in many cases had been hanging over it since the First World War. The result is that today we have the strongest banking system we have ever had, with insistence on the highest standards of banking practices, with a greater degree of uniformity in bank supervisory practices than we have ever had, and with complete confidence in the strength and integrity of our banking system.

A recent remark of the president of a very large bank clearly indicates just how much progress has been made. This banker, on being asked by an official of a large business with many branches having large deposits in many banks about the safety of one of the banks with which he was doing business, told the official that although he, the bank president, did not know personally about this particular bank, since the bank was insured and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation was not raising any question about its condition, no concern need be felt.

A quotation from Mr. Crowley's letter of resignation to the President on September 29, 1945, indicates vividly the success of the Corporation. Mr. Crowley said:

"Today there are 60,000,000 insured accounts and as of June 30, 1946, the Corporation will have built up capital and surplus amounting to about $1,000,000,000. We are proud of this record; particularly of the fact that after 11½ years of deposit insurance protection the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation could liquidate today, reimburse the Government the money it invested plus a dividend of 2 percent, and return every penny of the assessments the banks paid to the Corporation."

There is no doubt that deposit insurance will continue as a permanent part of the financial structure of this country and will at all times, regardless of what general economic conditions may be, serve as a bulwark maintaining a basic public confidence so essential to financial stability. It will not be forgotten that Federal deposit insurance

stands as a monument to the man who made it such an outstanding success.

ALIEN PROPERTY—"TRACKED DOWN" ENEMY GOODS, SUPERVISED CUSTODY

Soon after the war started in 1941 the President was faced with making provision for taking over and controlling the property located in this country and owned or controlled by enemy aliens. The experience in dealing with enemy owned property in World War I resulted in many scandals involving extensive lawsuits in the years following the war. The President was determined to guard against the possibility of even a breath of scandal in the handling of alien property during this war.

Since there was then an estimated $7,000,000,000 involved, he had at the same time to be certain that he was selecting a man competent to deal with a most difficult administrative situation. The President immediately selected Leo Crowley as a man who met all of the exacting requirements for this particular job and was finally able to persuade him to accept the appointment.

Early in 1942 the Office of Alien Property Custodian was established and there then began a quiet tracking down of all of the enemy-owned property located in this country. During the next 2 years most of this property was vested and placed under the control or supervision of the Custodian. After the completion of a substantial part of the job of vesting and establishing the policies of the Office, Mr. Crowley persuaded the President to accept his resignation as Custodian since his additional duties as Administrator of the Foreign Economic Administration were so burdensome and time consuming.

In the summer of 1943 when the entire energy and resources of the country were being concentrated on the war effort we appeared to face a complete break-down of the foreign procurement of strategic materials not available in this country and urgently needed for the war effort.

To guard against an impending disaster the President on July 15, 1943, issued an Executive order creating the Office of Economic Warfare and designating Mr. Crowley as Director.

In this Office were included the functions of procuring strategic materials from abroad; licensing exports from this country in order to conserve our resources for the war effort and keep supplies out of the hands of the enemy; Economic Warfare, which was concerned with determining enemy centers of production as objectives for strategic bombing, and calculating the enemy's productive capacity; and preclusive buying from neutrals in order to keep strategic materials out of the hands of the enemy.

Soon afterward, on September 25, the President issued another Executive order creating the Foreign Economics Administration and designating Mr. Crowley as Administrator. The activities previously transferred to the Office of Economic Warfare were transferred to this Administration, and in addition there were included the functions of the Lend-Lease Administration, and those of the Office of Foreign Economic Coordination in the State Department, together with the foreign agricultural production and procurement activities of the Department of Agriculture. There were then consolidated in a single agency activities from 14 different agencies, which resulted in centralizing in this single agency all foreign economic operations of this Government.

Although every activity involved in the merger was being carried on under a pressure consistent with an all-out war effort, and although realizing the benefits of centralized control and economy of operation made possible through the establishment of a single agency necessitated a complete reorganization of all of the activities, there was not the slightest interruption in the performance of any of the functions.

GREATER EFFICIENCY—CUT COST OF COMBINED AGENCIES IN LESS THAN HALF

After the reorganization was completed the functions were carried out with a greater efficiency, and even though at the end of the war they were all at as high a peak of operation as they had been at any time and several new functions had been added, the administrative appropriation for the one agency was less than half of the aggregate of the administrative appropriations for the various agencies concerned at the time of the merger. These agencies were responsible for the handling of a total of $35,000,000,000 of Federal funds.

The range of problems with which Mr. Crowley had to deal in the Foreign Economic Administration differed widely from those to which he had been accustomed in his own private business and in his previous governmental experience, yet he handled them with great skill and dispatch. The soundness of the President's decision to place him in one of the most difficult administrative positions in Washington, involving the most extensive governmental reorganization that has ever been made and coming in the midst of the war, was amply justified by what was accomplished.

As the war drew to an end Mr. Crowley contributed very materially to solving the problems involved in our wartime international economic relations. He pointed out the dangers that would inevitably result from commitments and actions that seemed at the moment to be the expedient thing but that later on would jeopardize this country's world position.

He established basic plans in working out settlements with some of the countries with which we had become so heavily involved during the war that should serve as models in completing many additional international agreements. He was instrumental in securing the passage of the legislation expanding the lending powers of the Export-Import Bank to $3,500,000,000. In his testimony he laid down principles for the operation of the bank that should serve as policy guideposts throughout its existence.

The high esteem in which Mr. Crowley was held by men of all political parties was demonstrated in the Senate on October 15, 1945, the day on which Mr. Crowley's resignation became effective. In my own remarks I said:

"His administration as chairman of the board of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has been an outstanding success.

"He took charge of that very important responsibility against a background of the bank failures which swept over the country in the depths of the great depression. He has administered the Corporation without regard to political considerations and in the public interest. He has also had other heavy responsibilities. In each of them he has attempted to protect the best interests of the United States. During his service Mr. Crowley has won the confidence of Members of the House and Senate. His untimely departure from the public service will be regretted by the Congress and the people."

PRAISED IN SENATE—RECALLS EULOGIES BY BARKLEY, VANDENBERG, WAGNER

Senator BARKLEY said:

"Mr. Crowley has been unselfish in his service to the people of the United States and in his cooperation with the executive and legislative branches of the Government. It is really a source of genuine regret to me that he is now departing from all connection with the Federal Government as an officer."

Senator VANDENBERG, who has always been a staunch and outstanding supporter of Federal deposit insurance, had this to say:

"I think Mr. Crowley has rendered one of the great, outstanding services of our time to the American people. * * * It is a source of very great regret to me that he is leaving. I hope that the spirit in which he has administered the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation will live after him. If it does, it will continue to be a benediction to the American people. * * *

"Mr. Crowley has done many other things in his service for the Government. He has occupied many difficult and responsible fiscal positions, and in every instance, Mr. President—and this is, I am afraid, a somewhat unique record—in every instance he has been absolutely faithful to the intelligent self-interest of the United States."

Senator MCKELLAR, before whose committee Mr. Crowley appeared many times in connection with appropriations, said:

"As an official of the Federal Government he has no superior. As my colleagues have said, he has met every task in a fair, frank, open, sensible way, and I do not believe any man in our country could have filled better or more successfully the various positions he has held here during the last few years."

Senator WAGNER said:

"It is no exaggeration to say that Mr. Crowley was at the head, at one and the same time, of more important agencies of Government than any other administrator, and the whole country recognized his invaluable service, not only to the country, but to the whole world."

Senator WHITE summarized his statement about Mr. Crowley with the following:

"In the long years in which I have served in the Congress I have known no man who so completely merited the confidence of his fellow Americans and the Members of both branches of the Congress as did Mr. Crowley. He has worked with amazing industry. He has had sure and sound judgment upon public questions. He has always had courage in reaching and giving utterance to his beliefs upon public affairs, and at all times he has had the highest standards of public duty and the highest conceptions of public service."

An editorial in the Washington Evening Star on the day of the announcement of the acceptance of Mr. Crowley's resignation concisely summarizes some of the qualities that have made him so successful. This editorial states in part:

"Mr. Crowley has been so quietly efficient and so well organized that his multiple operations have had the appearance of being easy because they have been so smooth. Exceptionally gifted as an executive, he has been blessed, in addition, with a natural ability to get along with people, a fact which has made him outstanding as a noncontroversial figure in an era of controversy. He has rendered long and distinguished service, and as he returns to private life the accolade accorded him by President Truman might fittingly be echoed by the Nation at large, Well done."

Palestine Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1946

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from the Baltimore Sun of December 24, 1945, containing a statement by Hon. Sumner Welles, former Under Secretary of State:

WELLES URGES PALESTINE AS TASK FOR UNO—FORMER DIPLOMAT ACCEPTS MARYLAND COMMITTEE CHAIRMANSHIP

Sumner Welles, former Under Secretary of State, urged yesterday that Palestine prob-

lems be taken out of the hands of the British-American Commission and given to the Council of the United Nation Organization, and that a Jewish commonwealth be established in Palestine.

The former diplomat's statement was made on the occasion of his acceptance of the chairmanship for Maryland of the American Christian Palestine Committee, an organization born as the result of the merger last year of the American Palestine Committee and the Christian Council on Palestine.

ROOSEVELT VIEW ASSERTED

Urging unrestricted immigration into Palestine, Mr. Welles declared that President Roosevelt never believed that the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine was in any sense hostile to the Arab peoples; that, on the contrary, the late President thought such a solution would prove beneficial to both Arabs and Jews.

"I cannot feel," he stated, "in view of the dire need of finding an urgent solution of the question, that the British-American Commission which has now been appointed can have any truly beneficial result * * *. A lasting and just result can only be obtained through the determination of all the United Nations."

VICE PRESIDENTS OF GROUP

A number of prominent Marylanders have accepted office as vice presidents of the new group. They include:

William J. Casey, vice president of the Maryland Trust Co. and chairman of the Commission on Governmental Efficiency and Economy.

Joseph P. Healy, manager for Swift & Co., in Maryland.

Francis A. Davis, president of F. A. Davis & Co.

Dr. Lena C. Vanbibber, retired professor of history at the Maryland State Teachers College.

Dr. Gertrude C. Bussey, professor of philosophy at Goucher.

The Reverend Don Frank Fenn, pastor of St. Michaels and All Angels' Church.

Prof. William Foxwell Albright, professor of Semitics at the Johns Hopkins University.

Mr. Welles said in his statement:

"I have been greatly honored by my selection as chairman for Maryland of the American Christian Palestine Committee. I gladly accept the designation."

ONE OF THE GRAVEST PROBLEMS

"I have accepted the chairmanship of the Maryland committee because of my belief that the question of the future of Palestine constitutes one of the gravest problems with which the free peoples of the earth are today confronted. I do not believe that any peaceful or orderly world can be envisaged unless a humane and just solution of this problem is found.

"To many millions of people throughout the world an independent Jewish commonwealth of Palestine represents a symbol of hope and of passionate conviction.

"The Government of the United States is officially committed to the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine. Any failure on the part of this Government to assume its full share of responsibility for the realization of this ideal can only dangerously increase existing international tensions and destroy the one hope which is left to many thousands of homeless and destitute Jews in Europe who cannot return to their former homes."

PITIFUL SURVIVORS

"The rescue and resettlement of the pitiful survivors who escaped extermination at the hands of the Nazis is a moral obligation which rests upon the conscience of all free peoples. There is no method which would prove more truly conducive to the practical discharge of this obligation than the equitable solution of the problem of Palestine.

"The commonwealth of Palestine can only come into being if the United Nations Organization decides, as it should, that the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine is essential to world peace and to world stability. The International Trusteeship Council soon to be set up by the United Nations Organization should be charged with the obligation of carrying out this decision promptly. Only the United Nations Organization can possess the necessary authority to achieve a final and just solution of the Palestine problem."

UNO ARMED FORCES

"From the moment the Council assumes jurisdiction, the United Nations Organization should make available whatever armed force may be required to give assurance of security to all of the inhabitants of Palestine.

"Once this step has been taken, the International Trusteeship Council should set up a broadly representative provisional government of Palestine and entrust it with all necessary authority until such time as free elections can be held and an independent and democratic government can commence to function.

"The Council should permit unrestricted immigration into Palestine and, in particular, that of those European refugees who still so tragically await deliverance from the camps where they are now located. Therefore, immigration should only be interrupted if the International Trusteeship Council or the future government of Palestine decides that such restriction is required for economic reasons."

WHAT ROOSEVELT BELIEVED

"President Roosevelt never believed that the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine was in any sense hostile to the Arab peoples. He believed, on the contrary, that such a solution would prove beneficial to both Jews and Arabs. He further believed that the fair way of finding a lasting solution of the problem of Palestine would be through negotiations in which every opportunity would be given representatives of both Jews and Arabs to be fully heard.

"I cannot feel, in view of the dire need of finding an urgent solution of the question, that the British-American Commission which has now been appointed can have any truly beneficial result.

"The problem is not one which can be solved by the findings of a commission consisting of the representatives of any two nations. A lasting and just result can only be obtained through the determination of all the United Nations that such a solution must be found and found promptly."

HOPE IN UNITED NATIONS

"It is for that reason that I earnestly hope that the United Nations Organization will assume the responsibility for finding such a solution as soon as the organization is constituted.

"I wholeheartedly endorse these words contained in the declaration issued by the World Zionist Conference at London last summer:

" 'Any delay in the solution of the problem, any attempt at half measures, any decision which, however favorable, remains on paper and is not faithfully and speedily implemented, will not meet the tragedy of the hour and will only increase suffering among Jews and tension in Palestine.'

"The question is one which truly concerns all Americans of whatever faith they may be. If the Government of the United States exercises the moral influence of this Nation, a just solution of the problem can be swiftly found."

New Jersey Farm Production

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. EATON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1946

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, the State of New Jersey, although third smallest in area, is one of the great industrial sections of this country both in volume and value of its products. While our industry is being bedevilled by the present revolution, I call attention, with pride and satisfaction, to the fact that our farmers have been patriotically carrying on against great difficulties and have performed a miracle of production measured by our farm area and population. Last year we produced on the farms of New Jersey over $228,000,000 worth of food. I include the following record of this remarkable achievement for the delectation, information, and encouragement of the downtrodden and oppressed Members of this House:

ALL-TIME MARK SET IN 1945 BY FARM PRODUCTS IN JERSEY

TRENTON.—The total farm value of New Jersey farm products last year established an all-time record of approximately $223,970,000, compared to $221,000,000 for 1944, indicating an increase of nearly 4 percent. According to D. T. Pitt, supervisor of statistics, State department of agriculture, the increase prevailed for most items with the exception of eggs, tree fruits and berries, which averaged slightly less than in the preceding year.

VEGETABLES LEAD

Leading all other New Jersey agricultural commodities in respect to farm value in 1945, vegetables are hailed as the foremost product of the Garden State last year.

The survey made by the State department's statistical chief reveals that vegetables brought New Jersey farmers an income of $48,800,000 in 1945, representing a gain for growers of more than a million dollars over 1944.

Closely following vegetables in order of value to growers are milk, estimated at $42,800,000 (Government subsidy payments excluded); eggs, $33,500,000, representing a slight decrease; and poultry, $21,450,000 figured as a 21-percent increase since 1944.

POULTRY GAINS

The greatest gain in farm value was made by poultry, according to the statistical study. Authorities attribute the demand for poultry during the red-meat shortage last year as the main reason for the substantial increase in poultry income. Eggs dropped slightly lower in value because of the reduction in laying flocks and consequently smaller volume of that product.

According to estimates of the 1945 crop year, other New Jersey agricultural products ranked in farm value as follows: Nursery and greenhouse, $17,250,000; white potatoes, $17,000,000; grains, $14,800,000; hay, $10,900,000; meat animals, $10,000,000; tree fruits, $6,600,000; berries, $4,875,000; and miscellaneous, $1,000,000.

The preliminary survey of ranking farm products has been made available to Statewide farm organizations meeting in Trenton during Farmers' Week, January 21 through January 24.

Labor and Management

REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM W. LINK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1946

Mr. LINK. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress, just a few weeks ago I completed my first year in Congress, and I am proud to say that I have not missed any important session or vote on any important bills or amendments.

I listened intently to the arguments, pro and con, especially those involving management and labor.

We have just successfully concluded the most gigantic and terrible war in all history, and we thank God from the bottom of our hearts for that.

It was won at a terrific cost. Our fighting forces from a nonmilitary nation proved to be the best fighting machine in history.

Our soldiers were the best fed soldiers.

Our equipment was the best of any army—yes—even better than the German equipment.

Our fliers were the best fliers in the world, and they were equipped with the best planes.

Our Navy is the most powerful in the world's history.

Now, this was not the result of just haphazard planning.

This was the result of very careful planning on the part of our Government in cooperation with management and labor. It was a union of these three which made this possible, and behind it all, was the foresight of that great man, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Our fighting forces must be given top credit for this victory, but in all fairness, they must share this credit with our production forces, for they supplied them with equipment far superior to that of any other nation. Yes, we can truthfully say that labor has performed a miracle of production.

Now, was this miracle of production accomplished by the old free-enterprise system—where the foreman would walk out and choose his help from the lowest bidder? No, it was not. Production miracles were never performed by that method.

This miracle of production was performed by labor organized for the job; organized and watched over by men elected from its own ranks, skilled in the job it had to do and always willing and able to do a good day's work for a good day's pay, and thus kept work stoppages at the lowest level ever attained. It was this kind of organized labor that produced this unlimited and superior equipment for our fighting forces.

It was this combination of our fighting forces and our production forces that won this war and won it so decisively.

The Nazis were completely licked.

The Japs were being slowly but surely eliminated throughout the islands in the South Pacific, but it looked as though we still had a long road to Tokyo.

Then the Russians struck Manchuria.

Atomic bombs were dropped on the Japanese mainland and the very scared Japs, even though millions of their well-equipped men were in the field, got cold feet and quit, and the war ended sooner than was anticipated.

Millions of dollars worth of equipment was on hand and no use for it.

So the War Production Board stopped production and people were thrown out of work.

Now the war is over, and we face the same old bugaboo—no jobs.

Management no doubt has done a fine job, but it was a whole lot simpler for management to do it than for labor. Management had unlimited credit from the Government and guaranteed profits, yet labor had to fight every inch of the way to get a fair day's pay.

Now management sits smugly back in its seat, counting its profits.

Just a short time ago, Congress passed a bill removing all taxes on excess profits, and with that tremendous cushion of money in the bank, management can safely sit back without any loss to itself, for a year or more; but labor whose wages are just about enough to keep going from day to day, cannot outlast that excess-profits cushion. So naturally management thinks this is a good time to weaken the unions, but surely there is no need for this.

The United States is the only country that can swing into production in a very short time.

It will take years for European countries to be in a position to do the same.

Germany, our chief competitor in heavy industry, is out and must be kept out for a long time to come.

We are in the golden seat.

We have made our tariff laws flexible enough so that we need have no fear of ruinous competition.

All the world needs our products and we will be in a position very shortly to supply them. But these countries are in a deplorable situation.

They have been ruined by the war; they need everything—food, clothing, farm equipment, machinery, and so forth—but they have very little money.

In my opinion, the best investment we can make for the welfare of the world is to give worthy nations credit.

When and if we do give these nations credit, they will be our customers, and, in order to have full employment in the United States, we must have many customers.

These nations were our allies and helped win the war.

To turn them down now would be a big mistake.

We did not hesitate to send them millions of dollars' worth of equipment and food and clothing and many other things during the war.

So I feel it would be a very good investment, now that the war is over, to give them credit, and in this way to keep them as our customers.

The machinery for this is already set up.

The Bretton Woods proposals are a part of this machinery.

After this delay in reconversion, caused by the sudden stoppage of the war, the United States should, and I believe will, have an era of prosperity such as it has not had in many years.

The Government and Congress should work hard to make this reconversion period as short as possible, and the bills pending in Congress are all working toward that end.

The $25 weekly compensation for 26 weeks for those who are willing and able to work, but who cannot under any circumstances find suitable work, is one of the things that will hurry reconversion, for there is no profit for Government, for management, or for labor, if money is given just for existence and gets no returns in goods or the like.

Then there is the 65-cent minimum hourly rate bill.

This bill, in my opinion, is one of the most important, and will do as much or more good for the United States as a whole, than any other legislation.

The standard of living in our United States is quite spotty. Where the workingman is organized and where there is a demand for his labor, he receives fairly good compensation. But where he is left on his own, he gets barely enough to exist on.

There is no reason why some sections of our country should try to use cheap labor to compete with other parts of our country.

The workingman down South and in some other States, can and will produce about the same average as he does in the North.

Why that man should be given lower pay than in other sections is just not right.

If that man's wage is brought up to a certain minimum, that man will have a greater purchasing power and that State will benefit by this greater purchasing power.

Now, the full employment bill is before the House, and after the accomplishments of our soldiers and our workingmen, it is only fair and natural that there should be work for both our service forces and our working forces.

The full employment bill is not a force bill, because it does not force management, labor, or Government to do anything. It is a guide for Government to keep up the high standard of living in our United States by a high standard of full employment. And all the opposition and ridicule on this bill is unwarranted.

In order to keep labor employed, and in this way to keep a high standard of living in the United States, we must have a floor to wages.

If we do not embody all these safeguards around labor into law in a very short time, we will have a depression which will dwarf the depression of the thirties. The pinch is here right now and Congress must act now. Party lines should not be considered. Both political parties should work together now as they did during the war, for this is just as critical a period in our country as during the war.

I thank you.

Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 24, 1946

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following editorial from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of January 17, 1946:

SEEKING STATEHOOD FACTS

No one could attend the public hearings on statehood held here for the past week without being profoundly impressed with the attitude of the congressional committee.

It is an earnest, conscientious, industrious, competent group of congressmen.

Within the necessary limitations of time (and time was always an element, with many witnesses to be heard), it has gone deep into the statehood question, dug hard for facts as well as for opinions.

It has listened with patience—yes, tolerance—to witnesses who wandered far from the issue and could not be held to it.

Its members have not hesitated to ask probing, even sharp questions on any matter germane to the subject and of any witness.

It announced at the opening its policy as one of desire to let everyone speak who wants to speak, and everyone file a statement who wants to file a statement.

By its friendly attitude toward the people of Hawaii as well as its conscientious attitude toward its duties as an investigating committee, it has convinced those who attended the hearings that it takes very seriously the urgent appeal of Hawaii for statehood.

Moreover, it has repeatedly emphasized that to present this appeal properly and effectively before the full House committee, and before Congress it must have all the information possible, all the pros and cons, all the arguments for and all the arguments against admission of Hawaii as a State.

With the last of the Honolulu hearings today, it cannot be said that anyone has been denied the opportunity to speak.

It has been a public forum, and a good one. The standard set by Chairman HENRY D. LARCADE, Jr., of Louisiana, and his colleagues in the conduct of a public hearing has earned and will hold the respect of Hawaii, as the Congressmen individually have won the esteem and aloha of the islands.

Union Discrimination Against Returned Veterans

REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 24, 1946

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I received a communication from a returned veteran yesterday that makes my blood boil. The man who writes me has been denied the right to make a living by a picket line which has been placed around the stockyard where he is employed. He has addressed a letter to the American Federation of Labor in San Francisco, and I wish to quote from that letter:

I am employed in the stockyard, tending livestock, to which your members are allowed to enter and work, but to which I am refused admittance. I was not asked to cooperate, but I was told that I could not enter.

I am a veteran of 3½ years service, fighting for a government of free people and to live one's life as a free individual. Ten months of my service time was spent in a prison camp, and it was there that I made plans for my future should I return to the United States. And now your union denies me this privilege.

Mr. Speaker, I call on William Green and the American Federation of Labor to cease this policy of discriminating against our returned servicemen who are entitled to the right to earn their living as free American citizens.

The letter follows:

BURLINGAME, CALIF., *January 21, 1946.*
AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR, LOCAL 508,
San Francisco, Calif.

GENTLEMEN: Under date of January 16, 1946, I was refused admittance to Armour & Co., Virden plant, South San Francisco, Calif., by your picket line.

I am employed in the stockyard, tending livestock, to which your members are allowed to enter and work, but to which I am refused admittance. I was not asked to cooperate, but I was told that I could not enter.

I am a veteran of 3½ years' service, fighting for a government of free people and to live one's life as a free individual. Ten months of my service time was spent in a prison camp, and it was there that I made plans for my future should I return to the United States. And now your union denies me this privilege.

In March I am entering college, after which I plan a career of livestock buying. Up until March 1 I would be obtaining knowledge of handling stock, and the wages earned would help toward this goal. Armour & Co. have given me this advantage. The time lost in learning you cannot repay, but the wages can be repaid, and I expect your union to reimburse me for my earnings lost during your strike.

Your immediate response will be appreciated.

Very truly yours,
RICHARD J. DUNN.

Copy to Congressman ANDERSON.

A Demobilization Problem

REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 24, 1946

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire briefly to bring to the attention of the House an unusual and outstanding example of inefficiency in the demobilization program.

A high-point veteran from my district who had served for a long time in the CBI theater, received his going-home orders in the middle of last June and was on his way to a port of embarkation when a radio order came out of headquarters to freeze all personnel of his group so that an investigation of some apparently trivial irregularities concerning GI purchases in Burma might be conducted. The investigation was completed in the middle of September and all the while these boys were being detained as witnesses in a court martial that developed from the investigation. The offenses set forth were allegedly minor and insignificant and were based on the fact that some of the GI's had purchased more trinkets and gems from the natives than permitted under Army and Navy regulations.

Now, this is the gist of the situation. After more than 8 months, 30 or more boys eligible for discharge have been held to await this court martial. My independent investigation of the case indicates that the principal, the one who is to be tried, is here in the United States on a 30-day emergency furlough while the witnesses against him are still cooling their heels deep in the Orient. I have requested the Army to correct this situation at once.

Pertinent parts of the letter I received from my constituent follow:

I received my going-home orders in the middle of June and was on my way to a port of embarkation when a radio order came out of headquarters to freeze all personnel of this group pending the outcome of an investigation that was being started by a unit called the CID (Criminal Investigation Division). It seems that the CID received a report from headquarters that our organization had cashed in a large number of Burmese currency at our unit finance department. The investigation was instigated to determine the source of this Burmese currency.

The investigating agents were of the opinion that this currency might have been derived from the sale or disposal of Government equipment or some commodity intended for use by military personnel. Thank goodness, there was none of that. They did find, however, that some of the boys had taken a few civilian commodities to Burma with them for trading for gems, souvenirs, etc., this being in violation of some theater directive of December 1943. The investigation was completed by the CID in the middle of September and the facts were turned over to the Judge Advocate General in Calcutta for whatever disciplinary action they deemed necessary.

As I told you above, it was shown that most of the boys were merely interested in picking up a few stones and souvenirs, and, so, most of us were just reprimanded, including myself. I received my reprimand about a month ago and thought I'd be clear to go home, but was told that I was being held as a witness in one other case that they intended to try. Just a few days ago the principal in this case was sent home on emergency leave for at least 30 days, which leaves a few of us witnesses more or less high and dry.

This whole thing has been very poorly and inefficiently handled, as is shown by the ridiculous length of time it has taken to bring the whole thing to a head. The headquarters people know the facts and the people involved and were highly in favor of disposing of all personnel with a reprimand and sending them home immediately, but the theater headquarters people at Delhi insisted that some of the personnel involved be tried. So far they have not even produced the necessary witnesses from Burma, and we don't know when they'll be available.

There are 19 officers and 11 enlisted men, all former members of the group, being held for this case, which has dragged for 6 months now.

The Civil Air Patrol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HATTON W. SUMNERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 24, 1946

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I tender to be printed a statement with reference to the Civil Air Patrol, which statement has been prepared by a person thoroughly familiar with the services rendered by this fine organization of patriotic civilian volunteers:

Almost alone out of the war-born agencies which were formed to mobilize civilian support for our war effort, the Civil Air Patrol is carrying on intact and even is expanding, in order that the air supremacy which we have won will not be lost in peacetime as after the last war.

This patriotic flying and ground-training corps is composed entirely of civilian volunteers who buy their uniforms, furnish most of their own equipment, and arrange their local meeting places as a personal contribution to the cause of aviation and of national security.

Early in the war they flew out with bombs beneath their little planes to drive away the U-boats which had all but cut the vital supply lines to our hard-pressed troops and allies overseas. They patrolled our borders, carried urgent cargo between Army posts, and otherwise served in any way they could to relieve military planes and airmen for urgent duty overseas.

These warlike missions were discontinued bit by bit as the Army and Navy were supplied with airplanes. But CAP carried on in the recruiting of tens of thousands of alert young Americans for the manning of our air forces.

Today the Civil Air Patrol, in all of the 48 States, is continuing its preflight training of 100,000 CAP cadets. At the same time, it stands ready as an aerial home guard to go into action in disaster areas, to fly in search of lost planes, and to perform many other duties which will be just as important in peacetime as in war.

The result has been to maintain the headway of civil aviation through the war years by keeping airports open and by building public interest in local development, so that a great surge of activity is ready to go forward now, when it is vitally needed.

If we were starting from scratch to build for the air age, there could be no better plan than to begin at once to set up just such an organization as Civil Air Patrol. Since that organization is now in being, we should give it every recognition and support.

FUTURE AIR RESERVE

As an air reserve, the CAP is teaching military and aviation subjects to the young people upon whose abilities and patriotism the future security of our Nation will depend. We may now have a great surplus of veteran fliers but modern combat is a task for the young. Our great air forces would soon be over age without a source of young recruits.

After the atomic bomb and the hints of other weapons yet to come, we cannot at once foresee the exact number and kind of reserves America will need. But there are two things we do know. We are aware, and we must never cease to be aware, that air power can strike quickly at any point. No spot on the globe is safe against attack. Our defenses, therefore, must be made strong and kept strong at every strategic center.

We know also that future weapons will require a greater technical knowledge than ever before among those who use and produce them. Atomic energy, jet propulsion, and supersonic speeds may call for some radical changes in the training of the more highly skilled specialists. But fundamentals regarding wind and weather and aerodynamics and discipline will remain.

The two vital requirements—for wide dispersal of our reserves and for technical training—are served by the civil air patrol. It is not enough to rely on the reserves which we may in future decide to support by Federal funds. In a total war everyone will be a combatant. To prevent such a war we must keep alive the volunteer spirit, which is our strength.

All the other large nations—England, Russia, Germany, Italy, and Japan—started years before we did in the development of mass movements to train young people in aviation for the manning of their air forces. The civil air patrol, on its own initiative, created such an organization in the American way. Other nations, except for those which we have occupied, are continuing to foster and encourage aviation interest among their youth. If we have learned anything from the lessons of the war, we will be second to none in thus sowing the seeds for our future progress and security.

RECONVERSION

Regardless of what the future needs may be, this program is of great significance in the months just ahead. Our air forces and our air industries are now going through a difficult period of shrinkage and readjustment. The cancellation of contracts at the end of the war means a cut in aircraft production of something in the magnitude of 80 percent. Hundreds of thousands of aircraft workers and veterans of the air war are being released.

Both for the maintenance of air supremacy and in justice to the veterans who won it, we as a nation must bridge the reconversion as rapidly as possible so that the curve of air progress will again turn upward. We may count on commercial air transport only to a limited extent. The air lines went through the war with a fleet of only about 200 planes. Although several times that number will be in service within the next 2 or 3 years, the opportunities for employment will be small as compared to our wartime air forces with their tens of thousands of planes.

But private flying can move much faster. As the development of the family car, rather than of the trucks and busses, boomed the automobile industry after the last war, the light plane offers the quickest and broadest opportunities for employment-creating activity in aviation. Just as the building of a network of rural highways made possible the mass demand and thus the mass production of automobiles, the construction of thousands of home-town airports can pave the way to the air age.

AIRPORTS

In this, the spirit of volunteer action in communities large and small across the country is just as important for the fast development of air facilities as it is for the manning of our reserves.

Large Federal airport appropriations are contemplated. But such a program offers immediate employment merely to construction workers. It will not create any great volume of aviation employment, either directly at the fields or indirectly in the aircraft plants, until the airports are finished and that will be a matter of years.

To be of any real help to the veterans and the aircraft workers who want jobs today, our plans for Federal aid must be supplemented by immediate local initiative. Necessary as a national airport program may be, just as the Federal-aid highway program proved a wise national investment, we must ask the question whether the promise of Federal funds may not discourage more construction than it creates, by influencing State and local governments and private groups to conserve their own money in hope that Uncle Sam will foot the bill.

The self-reliant spirit of the Civil Air Patrol has shown how to overcome the attitude of "wait and see." Even under the difficult conditions of wartime, many CAP groups have spurred local demand or through their own unaided efforts have acquired the land and have leveled grass fields so that flying is an accomplished fact at scores and perhaps hundreds of communities that would still be grounded were it not for Civil Air Patrol.

FLIGHT TRAINING

Another great need is for civilian pilot training. Unlike the automobile driver who can take the wheel after a few hours of practice, the airplane pilot must undertake many complicated studies and many hours of supervised flight instruction before he can fly safely across country.

Some interests, as in the case of airports, would place the initiative and responsibility upon the Federal Government through grants to finance training of private pilots. Here, as in the case of airports, Civil Air Patrol has not waited but has pioneered its own local programs to develop flyers without asking for a cent of public money.

CAP does not give flight training. That is a job for private enterprise. But CAP's volunteer instructors give preflight training free and thus prepare tens of thousands of men and women, young and old, to become safe and practical flyers. In many areas CAP units have secured donations for flight scholarships so that the cadet and adult members who are most outstanding, and have thus proved their ability, are assisted in buying the necessary flying time from commercial airport operators.

In these and other phases of our planning for the air age, CAP has shown the way. This earnest and loyal group of good Americans, who are giving unstintingly of their time, money, and effort, deserve every possible encouragement from the Federal Government, from the States, from the aviation industry, from the civic groups, and from all citizens. Our future security is in air power founded on a vigorous and self-supporting program of civil aviation in every area of the United States.

The Way to Industrial Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 24, 1946

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, may I again call the attention of the Congress to the imperative necessity for immediate amendment of the Federal Revenue Act of 1945 by striking from this law the carry-back provision on excess-profits taxes, as provided in H. R. 5180 now in the Ways and Means Committee.

I want, in this connection, to call attention to an editorial in the daily PM for Wednesday, January 23. The editorial follows:

At a time when workers are stamping up and down in the cold on picket lines in Pittsburgh and Detroit, it may seem strange for PM to dive into the jungle of technicalities that constitutes our tax laws.

But PM believes one obscure provision of these laws holds the key to current strike difficulties. We refer to the carry-back section of the excess-profits tax. We invite

Congress to consider its curious consequences. We propose its revision as a means of removing the greatest single obstacle to peaceful settlement of labor disputes in the reconversion period—as the way to bringing an end to all the big strikes which have been forced on the workers of this country.

Thanks to the carry-back, Mr. Benjamin F. Fairless, of United States Steel, can walk into the White House and defy the President. And then go next door to the United States Treasury and draw a reward for his recalcitrance. The carry-back subsidizes stubbornness. It guarantees big industry as much in tax refunds as could be made in profits.

Imagine the outcry if the United States Treasury proceeded to pay full salaries to workers on strike! When steel workers go on the picket line they do not draw even unemployment compensation; payment of jobless insurance to workers on strike has been forbidden in most States, severely restricted in all but one or two of the rest.

But United States Steel can precipitate a strike by rejecting the decision of a Presidential fact-finding board, it can shut down its mills and make as much on the carry-back provision of the tax law as it could by operating its business. The carry-back provides a $20,000,000,000 kitty for big business, a princely strike fund on which it can draw while it sits down to starve out the labor movement, and disrupt America's hopes of a swift and successful reconversion.

CAN COLLECT FROM THE TREASURY

What is the carry-back? It was written into the 1942 excess-profits tax law to protect business men against the uncertainties of the war-production program. (Never, to paraphrase Churchill, were so many safeguards established for so few uncertainties.)

The law provided in substance that if in any one war year a corporation's profits fell below its average prewar profits, the corporation could collect the difference from the Treasury in the shape of a refund from the excess-profits taxes the corporation had paid in the previous 2 years.

Last year Congress repealed the excess-profits tax law. But it did not repeal the "carry-back." This means that in 1946 businessmen no longer pay excess-profits taxes. But they can draw on excess-profits taxes paid by them in 1944 and 1945. These total $20,000,000,000. The size of this profit backlog will be better appreciated if it is recalled that total net corporate earnings in 1929 were only $9,000,000,000.

This is the $20,000,000,000 kitty on which United States Steel and General Motors and other industrial recalcitrants can draw if they fail to make "normal" profits this year because of strikes. Under the circumstances, why should they be in any hurry to settle? They have a chance to break the labor movement at the Treasury's expense.

It should be understood that the Government was under no obligation to keep the "carry-back" provision in the law, whether the excess-profits tax was repealed or not. No constitutional restrictions are involved; the ex post facto clause applies only to criminal law, not to tax measures. The excuse for retaining the "carry-back" after repealing the excess-profits tax was that it would help American industry to meet legitimate costs of reconversion.

A strike precipitated by the refusal of United States Steel to accept the decision of a Presidential fact-finding board should hardly constitute a legitimate cost of reconversion. United States Steel does not have to accept that decision, we do not have compulsory arbitration. But there is no reason why its defiance of the White House should be subsidized by the Treasury at the expense of other taxpayers—for the rest of us will have to make up for the refunds United States Steel draws.

"CARRY-BACK" SHOULD BE REPEALED

Congressman Bailey, of West Virginia, has introduced a bill in Congress to repeal the "carry-back" provision of the law. He told the House on Monday the "carry-back" makes the Treasury "a silent partner in what appears to have all the earmarks of a conspiracy on the part of a few to destroy our economy in their frantic efforts to crush organized labor." Bailey is no novice at tax questions. He was State director of the budget for four years in West Virginia.

PM believes it would be better to repeal the "carry-back" altogether than to permit its present abuse. PM believes it would be even better if the "carry-back" privilege were left available for companies genuinely hard-pressed by loyal efforts to abide by the decisions of Presidential fact-finding boards in labor disputes or in collective bargaining.

PM believes that adjustment in the higher wage levels so necessary to America's prosperity in the postwar period is a legitimate cost of reconversion. PM proposes that the "carry-back" provisions be amended. PM suggests that the "carry-back" be allowed only to companies which can show that wage increases justify their use of this tax privilege.

If Congress changed the tax law in this way, it would encourage industrial peace instead of industrial war. It would stimulate cooperation with the President's program instead of subsidizing economic sabotage.

I. F. STONE
(For the Editors of PM).

National Agricultural Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 24 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which it was my privilege to make in Trenton, N. J., on Monday, January 21, at the twenty-seventh annual convention of the New Jersey Farm Bureau. This was the opening address the first day of the convention.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The most important attribute of anyone in public life is to retain a sense of proportion and also a sense of humor. For me to speak to a group of farm experts, which include the distinguished presiding officer of today, my good friend, Herb Voorhees, seems almost like bringing coals to Newcastle.

And yet, although I was trained as a lawyer and have more of a business background than an agricultural background, there is a certain fitness that I should be speaking to you, because my ancestors for a number of generations were producing farmers in the State of New Jersey. My father was a physician, but back of him my grandfather, great-grandfather, and great-great-grandfather, as far as I can check up from the records, were North Jersey farmers and lived in or near Newton in Sussex County. Furthermore, I lived in the West myself prior to World War I, and although I was engaged in the practice of law in the West, I was also profoundly interested in irrigation, and even was a partner for a time, until disaster overtook us, on a ranch that raised hogs.

My subject today is National Agricultural Legislation, but before considering the farmers' problems specifically, I want to emphasize my deep conviction that what we need more than any other single thing in the United States today is a determination that we all pull together in this difficult and challenging postwar period. Fundamentally, the interests of all our people are the same and the well-being and prosperity of any of us should mean the well-being and prosperity of all of us. Those forces that tend to divide us at a time like this must be very definitely opposed, and the self-interest pressure groups must subordinate their particular desires to the welfare of all of our people. Discriminations because of prejudices must be eliminated, and we must think in terms of equality of opportunity for all, irrespective of race, creed, or color.

Our experience of the war and of the depression in the thirties has taught us that probably the most important factor affecting farm prosperity is the general income level of the people in our cities and towns. This means employment at good wages. For this reason it seems to be important to the farmers for the Government to support policies that will make for the highest possible level of employment with high wages in keeping with fair returns to capital and to management. In years past our farmers have suffered when we were in the midst of Nation-wide depressions because at such times it is not possible for the masses of our people, who are on the borderline economically to buy adequate foodstuffs for normal nutrition. When times improved and when the national income rose, statistics show that the consumption of foodstuffs increased way out of proportion even to the increase in prosperity, and our farmers under such conditions enjoyed good times with the rest of our people. In the early thirties at the very height of the terrible depression, when there were some 14,000,000 people unemployed, the income of our farmers was only $2,000,000,000 out of the total national income. On the other hand, in 1944 during the war, when practically all our people were employed, the income of our farmers was in the neighborhood of $12,000,000,000.

The problem facing the administration and the Congress is how we can maintain or increase the present farm income and keep the proper relationship between the share that the farmer gets of the national income and the share that other employed persons get.

Let me suggest certain matters that we in Washington are keeping our eyes on as guideposts to a national farming policy:

1. Farmers have kept faith with the Government during the war by doing everything in their power to produce what the Government requested them to produce to help win the war. The Government must now keep faith with the farmer by making good on its price-support commitments for the promised 2-year period after the war. But beyond this, the Government must plan now for the kind of agricultural policy that will give the farmers the prosperity they deserve when the 2-year price-support period is ended.

2. As I stated above, our experiences of the war and of the depression in the thirties have taught us that probably the most important factor affecting farm prosperity is the general income level of our people in the cities and towns. This means employment at good wages. This might mean, of course, that farmers might have to pay high wages for their help, but in the long run they are undoubtedly better off with prosperous conditions and high wages than when labor is plentiful and cheap and when the income of the worker is low.

3. The administration is still committed to some form of price policies which it feels should be elastic enough to recognize changing conditions so that a proper relationship

can be maintained between farm prices and the price of goods and services the farmers have to buy. This is the so-called parity price problem. While I am personally in accord with maintaining price policies for a time until we can get back to normal living, generally speaking I am afraid of Government price controls, either on the incentive side or on the ceiling side. It has not yet been demonstrated to my satisfaction that man-made planners can operate in the field of prices more effectively than the laws of supply and demand, and it is my own conviction that we will come more quickly to solving the farmers' problem by the road of everybody working, with high production and high national income, than we will by either subsidies or price restrictions, so far as the farmers' production is concerned. Certainly, it hardly seems to make sense that the OPA at the moment should be putting controls on cotton when the Government holds a 14-million-bale surplus which could very readily be put on the market in the event of any threatened run-away cotton prices. And with the crying need for foodstuffs in practically every corner of the world, I can see no immediate purpose in limiting the production of our farms.

4. From the standpoint of food consumption on the home front it should be the policy of the Department of Agriculture to encourage the production of plenty of food for a truly adequate diet for our entire population. If we have full employment in business and industry and adequate wages, this situation will practically take care of itself. But in order to insure proper distribution of food, and especially take care of our growing children, who particularly need high standards of nutrition, supplementary Government measures, such as the school-lunch program, might well be included in our national policy.

5. There is no doubt that in this country we have the capacity to produce certain farm commodities such as wheat and cotton far in excess of our domestic needs, and this justifies the development of foreign-trade policies where we can find increasing world markets. Wheat and cotton are the two outstanding crops that have been embarrassing to us in years past. In the case of wheat, the principle of the ever-normal granary can be defended, provided the carry-over for a period of years is not too great. Doubtless over the years we would be able to take care of the normal surplus.

In the case of cotton, I am inclined to feel from my limited study of the subject that it may be necessary to encourage the raising of other crops in the cotton area so that that area will not continue to depend upon one crop in the future as it has in the past. The war has doubtless stimulated the growing of cotton throughout the world and the southern United States will probably no longer be the principal cotton-producing area from a world-wide standpoint. I certainly question the wisdom of continuing indefinitely the present administration's policy of subsidizing the growing of cotton.

6. Production for war has put a great drain on the soil resources of the country and we could not properly continue such a drain for an indefinite period. I am in accord with the present policy of the Department of Agriculture to expand and intensify our soil conservation policy as a means of producing more efficiently at lower costs and of preserving our soil resources for future generations.

The administration presents certain broad observations which we can all doubtless approve in order to bring about a well-balanced and prosperous economy. These observations may be summarized, as follows:

1. Production of plenty of food at fair prices to establish a high level of nutrition;

2. Increased efficiency in production, processing, and marketing of farm products;

3. Accomplishments of complete job of conservation of our natural agricultural resources—soil, water supply, and forests;

4. An expanding, free-moving trade with other nations to broaden the base of our economy.

The administration is constantly talking about 60,000,000 jobs and a national income of $150,000,000,000 upward. Should such a national income be the result of actual production of needed foods and other articles for a high standard of living, it would of course mean the goal that we would all like to see attained, and there would be very little need for us to be concerned about the problems of our farmers.

I feel that it is within the bounds of possibility to attain a goal of this kind, but not at once. It will come, in my judgment, in progressive stages, and will depend in large degree, as I stated in my opening remarks, on the extent to which the different groups in our society can recognize the needs of other groups and all of the activities of our people can be united. This, in my judgment, does not mean Government planning or Government control. At its best, such a result could be brought about by the decentralization of our activities so far as the freedom of the individual is concerned, but with the over-all knowledge and advisory direction by a government competent to watch the trends of the times and to give sound advice through its local representatives. In the field of agriculture this means the so-called extension service and the county agents whose functions must be to advise and not to command. This may be a slower process than the totalitarian method of bureaucratic direction, but the very slowness of the process may be the price of human freedom which the farmers of our country have been the particular champions of.

While we must look to our farmers to feed the rest of us and help feed the world, I always like to think of farming as a way of life, rather than as a mere production industry. The family farm of America appeals to me as the sound unit of our living, and if we look through our history we will see that from the farms have come in large measure those boys and girls who in later life have moved into positions of leadership in our State and Nation. This can be fostered by sound farmers' organizations, such as your own New Jersey Farm Bureau, and I cannot speak too highly of programs of cooperation among farmers, such as you are fostering, whereby the benefits of mechanization and intelligent marketing can be enjoyed by the smallest farm.

I have faith in America and in the individuals who compose it. If each of our groups who are striving to find their place in our postwar civilization, can see the position of the other fellow and the need of national unity, the skies will begin to clear, and those differences that divide us will begin to melt away in the over-all objective for a sound American economy.

Mount Alto Veterans' Facility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. GEELAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1946

Mr. GEELAN. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to the deplorable conditions existing at the veterans' facility known as Mount Alto.

A movement has been in progress for some time by the American Veterans of World War II to correct the admittedly inadequate facilities in existence at that hospital by the erection of a new, modern hospital at or near the location of the present hospital of sufficient size and with up-to-date equipment to care for the thousands of veterans who as a result of their service-connected disabilities will need such hospitalization and care. As a result of this campaign on the part of the Veterans of World War II the Veterans' Administration has announced that it intends to have constructed a new hospital to cost $7,000,000 to replace the present facility at Mount Alto.

While this certainly is good news there is some cause for concern inasmuch as the article states that the present facility will be torn down, and that the new facility will not be completed before October 1, 1947.

It is certainly to be hoped that despite the lack of a sufficient number of beds and proper equipment at the old facility, it should not be torn down until the new hospital is completed, and not then if at that time the need for its use for a further period of time appears necessary. At this point I would like to insert in the RECORD a statement by Mr. J. H. Leib, national legislative director of the American Veterans of World War II, concerning this matter; also a letter which he had written to President Truman on the subject, and a newspaper article from the Washington Times-Herald of January 23, 1946, and for the purpose of reference the dates on which articles pertaining to this and kindred subject matters were inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the names of the Members who inserted them:

AMVETS GET QUICK RESPONSE FROM THE WHITE HOUSE AND VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION IN DEMAND OF A NEW NATIONAL MEDICAL CENTER

(By J. H. Leib, national legislative director, Amvets)

On January 10, 1946, this writer addressed a special-delivery letter to the White House calling the President's attention to the unfortunate condition that exists in the National Capital in regard to inadequate veterans' hospitalization and medical care. In this letter attention was directed to the many promises that have been made by Government officials, both publicly and otherwise, on numerous occasions relative to the establishment of a national medical center for needy and disabled veterans and it was respectfully urged that the Chief Executive use his good offices to see to it that some definite action was taken to correct this deplorable situation.

Oddly enough, a reply came—13 days later—not from Mr. Truman or General Bradley, but from the newspapers after the Veterans' Administration rushed to announce that construction of a $7,000,000 hospital to replace the existing facility would be completed by October 1, 1947, mind you, more than 21 months away.

It is even more amusing to note that the Veterans' Administration rushed into print to proclaim that it was speeding up the construction of the hospital, giving for the first time a definite date as to when the institution would be erected, but explained that no exact site had been agreed upon.

Getting a new veterans' hospital in the Capital to replace the shamefully overcrowded, inadequate, and gloomy veterans' facility known as Mount Alto has been a heartbreaking affair. Everyone admitted the great need for such an institution—a model hospital for the whole Nation to behold and be proud of—yet nothing was done about it. In fact, every

attempt to start the ball rolling was met with a firm rebuff.

Now it is good to know that after several years of justifiable criticism, the veterans of this war have finally gotten a definite date as to when the hospital is scheduled to be completed. The following letter and newspaper clipping speaks for itself:

JANUARY 10, 1946.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: More than a year ago I had inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a number of articles relative to the urgent need of a new medical center for veterans here in the National Capital.

General Hines, then Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, assured me of the great need of such a hospital. On May 29 he publicly urged the construction of this center. Three months later General Bradley assured newspapermen that he would end overcrowding at Mount Alto.

In today's Washington Star there appeared a story that Mount Alto "is classed as one of the most overcrowded veterans' hospitals in the country. De Griffith said the hospital was still operating over its authorized capacity of 327 beds."

Mr. President, the District of Columbia should have the finest and most modern hospital in the whole country as a model and example of medical care for veterans. Instead it is probably the worst of all such Government institutions.

Is it not about time that something is done about this unfortunate situation?

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH LEIB,
National Legislative Director, Amvets.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of January 23, 1946]

VET HOSPITAL PLANS SPEEDED

Construction of the new $7,000,000 veterans' hospital to replace Mount Alto will be completed by October 1, 1947, General Bradley announced yesterday.

Although the site of the new 750-bed general medical institution has not yet been selected, Veterans' Administration officials indicated it might be built on the Wisconsin Avenue location now occupied by Mount Alto.

Here are a few of the articles that appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD regarding Mount Alto:

"Urgent need for veterans' hospital and bed," by Representative SPRINGER, November 16, 1944.

"Hospitalization and medical care of veterans," by Representative DOYLE, January 31, 1945.

"General Hines admits need for District of Columbia veteran medical center," by Representative GILLIE, February 27, 1945.

"The truth about Mount Alto and the Veterans' Administration," by Representative GILLIE, June 19, 1945.

"The facts behind the veterans' hospital scandal finally comes to light," by Representative SPRINGER, July 3, 1945.

Relief Program for Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VITO MARCANTONIO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 24, 1946

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article:

ITALY AND UNRRA SIGN $450,000,000 RELIEF AGREEMENT IN ROME

A $450,000,000 program of relief for hard-pressed Italy was agreed on in Rome yesterday by Premier Alcide de Gasperi and Spurgeon M. Keeny, head of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration delegation there. Most of the money will be spent for food and for revival of Italian industry.

In announcing here last night that the agreement had been signed, UNRRA headquarters, on the basis of a cabled report from Rome, quoted Premier de Gasperi as saying:

"Gratitude is a rare article in this world, but you will find it in Italy and will be able to use it for the peace of the world."

SUPPLEMENTS EARLIER ACCORD

The new UNRRA program, designed to bring relief to all Italians in a land suffering from the worst crop failure of 25 years, supplements an earlier limited one, approved at the UNRRA conference in Montreal in September, 1944, under which aid was limited to children and nursing and expectant mothers.

UNRRA authorities estimated last night that, compared with the two vessels monthly which have been arriving in Italy with relief supplies, 100 Liberty ships a month will be employed in carrying out the enlarged program. Realization of the new effort was made possible by Congress' recent authorization of a second $1,350,000,000 for the UNRRA program.

In addition to food, UNRRA plans to send to Italy coal for railroads, public works, and essential industries. These shipments are expected to average between 400,000 and 500,000 tons monthly.

ALL PROCEEDS FOR RELIEF

Also, Italy is to receive 75,000 tons monthly of liquid fuels—gasoline, oil, and kerosene; raw cotton and wool to alleviate the acute textile shortage; and fertilizers, seed, and agricultural machinery to increase food production.

The Italian Government in signing the agreement with UNRRA, undertook to spend all money received from the sale of supplies on relief and rehabilitation projects.

Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 24, 1946

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report:

REPORT OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON TERRITORIES, THE UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, ON STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

The Honorable HUGH PETERSON,
Chairman of Committee on Territories, Washington, D. C.:

The first congressional committee to hold hearings on the question of admitting Hawaii to statehood visited the Territory in October 1935. After extensive hearings the committee "found the Territory of Hawaii to be a modern unit of the American Commonwealth, with a political, social, and economic structure of the highest type. Its educational program is an advanced one, with a large proportion of the tax dollar being spent for the training of its youth. Even during the period of the depression this program was neither relaxed nor reduced, and its school facilities compare favorably with those of the most advanced States. Hawaii's economic standards are high, with an industrial and agricultural development forming a sound basis for the continued growth of the Territory." Nevertheless, the committee concluded that considerable further study was necessary before a favorable report might be made on a proposal to admit Hawaii as a State.

In October 1937, pursuant to a concurrent resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives, a joint congressional committee visited the Territory of Hawaii. The committee reported that while great progress had been made by the people of Hawaii, the question of statehood, because of disturbed international conditions, should again be deferred by the Congress until further study and consideration could be given. It was the committee's view also "that unmistakable evidence that a substantial majority desire statehood should precede affirmative action by Congress." A plebiscite to determine the wishes of the people was authorized by the Territorial legislature in 1939. Of those voting on the question at the general election of November 5, 1940, 67 percent favored statehood and 33 percent opposed it. A Gallup poll held on the mainland in 1941 revealed that opinion in the continental United States for and against statehood for Hawaii was in almost the same proportions as the Territorial view expressed in the plebiscite.

During the war years, Congress was not able to give renewed consideration to Hawaii's statehood ambition. But with the end of the war in sight, the duly elected representatives of the people of Hawaii in the Territorial house and senate adopted, by overwhelming vote in each house, resolutions that the Congress of the United States take immediate action on admitting Hawaii to statehood. Pursuant to this request and to House Resolution 236 of the House of Representatives, dated April 30, 1945, the chairman of the Committee on Territories appointed a subcommittee to visit Hawaii, to hold hearings, and to make recommendations on H. R. 3643, introduced by Delegate FARRINGTON "to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States."

The subcommittee appointed by the chairman consists of HENRY D. LARCADE, Democrat, Louisiana, chairman; JAMES J. DELANEY, Democrat, New York; GEORGE P. MILLER, Democrat, California; HOMER D. ANGELL, Republican, Oregon; DEAN P. TAYLOR, Republican, New York; and JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, Republican, Territory of Hawaii. Irwin W. Silverman, chief counsel of the Division of Territories and Island Possessions, Department of the Interior, was assigned by the Secretary of the Interior at the committee's request to serve as counsel of the committee.

On December 20, 1945, just prior to the committee's departure, the Secretary of the Interior, whose Department has jurisdiction over the Territories, issued a statement endorsing statehood for Hawaii.

The counsel of the committee, Mr. Silverman, arrived in Hawaii several days before the committee to make preparations for the hearings and to arrange for the scheduling of the large number of witnesses who had indicated their desire to appear before the committee. The committee arrived in Honolulu on Sunday, January 6, 1946. Hearings were held in the Throne Room, Iolani Palace, on Monday, January 7, and continued through Thursday, January 10. In order that residents of all the islands comprising the Territory might be given an opportunity to be heard, hearings were held on Maui on Friday, January 11; on Molokai on Saturday, January 12; at Kona on Sunday, January 13; and at Hilo on the Island of Hawaii on Monday, January 14. The committee returned to Honolulu on Monday, January 14, and held hearings in Honolulu from Tuesday, January 15, including a night session, through

Thursday, January 17. It held hearings at Kauai on Friday, January 18, and left for the mainland on the 19th.

Prior to and at the beginning of the hearings the committee stated that full opportunity would be given to every person who desired to appear before the committee to present his views on the question of statehood and upon any other matter relating to the welfare of the Territory. About 100 witnesses were heard and examined by the members of the committee. In addition, a large volume of memoranda, statements and statistical materials on the social, political, and economic problems of the islands was prepared and submitted by the heads of Federal and Territorial agencies, as well as by experts representing industrial, trade, labor, and civic organizations. The committee gave special attention to population trends, land ownership, concentration of wealth and labor conditions.

FINDINGS

On the basis of the detailed and voluminous record made before it, the committee finds:

1. That the population of the Territory of Hawaii in 1945 was 502,122, of which 10,988 or 2.2 percent of the total population were Americans of Hawaiian ancestry; 61,422 or 12.2 percent were part-Hawaiians; 9,090 or 1.8 percent were Puerto Ricans; 172,583 or 34.4 percent were Caucasians; 30,005 or 6 percent were Chinese; 163,300 or 32.5 percent were Japanese; 7,042 or 1.4 percent were Koreans; 46,464 or 9.3 percent were Filipinos; all others, 1,228 or 0.2 percent.

2. That the number of pure Hawaiians has declined from an estimated 300,000 persons in 1778 to 10,988 in 1945.

3. That the Caucasian population has increased steadily since 1878, when the precentage of the total population was only 5.09 percent.

4. That persons of Japanese ancestry in 1890 numbered 12,360 or 13.7 percent of the total population. By 1920 the percentage increased to 42.7 percent, but had declined to 37.9 percent in 1930 and continues declining, to date being only 32.5 percent, or 163,300 persons at present.

5. That since 1912 the proportion of interracial marriages has increased from 14.1 to 38.5 percent, the trend being accentuated by the recent war, during which over one-third of the children born had two or more racial strains.

6. That well over 85 percent of the present population was born in Hawaii or on the mainland.

7. That the war record of Hawaii is in every respect commendable. Hawaii had a full-scale organization for civilian defense and volunteer defense units sponsored by the Army, and participated in Red Cross, USO, blood bank, and similar activities, making liberal contributions to the war chest and oversubscribing its quota for war bonds. The Territory established a number of emergency agencies, such as a Bureau of Registration and Identification, Office of Food Control and Food Production, and a commercial rent control program.

8. That Hawaii did its part in contributing men to the armed forces. Selective Service did not apply to Hawaii during the first 2 years of the war, because of the Territory's crucial position and shortage of manpower. Since the application of the draft, Hawaii has met its full quota. Hawaii had two National Guard regiments which were called into the Federal service on October 15, 1940. In all, 33,000 of the citizens of Hawaii served in the armed forces. Americans of Japanese ancestry were rejected from March 1942 until February 1943 but made up for this as soon as they were accepted. Although Americans of Japanese ancestry constituted only 36 percent of the registrants under selective service, 52 percent of the total inductions from December 1940 to September 1945 came from this racial group, because of the large number of volunteers. Because of the Army policy of organizing and segregating units composed entirely of citizens of Japanese ancestry, it is possible to follow their activities and to see how they proved unwarranted the mistrust initially shown by the military commanders. Hawaii residents of Japanese ancestry constituted the entire original One Hundredth Infantry Battalion and by far the major part of the original Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Team. The record of those units, made in major offensives in the European theater, includes 5 Presidential unit citations, 1 Meritorious Service plaque, 65 Distinguished Service Crosses, 290 Silver Stars, 782 Bronze Stars, 10 Croix de Guerre (French), 3 soldiers medals (Italian), 50 Army commendations, and 82 division commendations.

9. That, according to Robert L. Shivers, Federal Bureau of Investigation agent in charge at Honolulu, there was not one single act of sabotage or fifth-column activity committed in Hawaii before, during, or after the attack on Pearl Harbor. Hawaii's people of various racial ancestries can and do work together, and what goes on in the countries of their ancestors is of minor concern to them, compared to their interest in the United States. People of all racial ancestries cooperated in preparing for and prosecuting the war, and Hawaii, despite its polyracial composition, is essentially American in thought, purpose, and action.

10. That the people of the Territory of Hawaii are a law-abiding people. Its different racial groups live together with a minimum of friction and no recial clashes; life and property are as safe in Hawaii as in any section of the mainland.

11. Such evidence of bloc voting as exists indicates that the practice has not assumed, and is not likely to assume, serious proportions. Members of the Territorial legislature whose ancestry is Japanese constitute normally less than 20 percent of the total membership, although 32.5 percent of the total population of the islands is of Japanese descent.

12. That in 1944, 71,704 of 84,326 registrants, or 85.03 percent, voted in the general election. The percentage of registered voters of Hawaiian ancestry declined from 33.8 percent in 1932 to 24.7 percent in 1940; Caucasian voters declined from 38.2 percent in 1932 to 30.1 percent in 1940. The Japanese showed an increase from 17.6 to 31.1 percent. With few exceptions, the percentage of registrants voting in each general election ranged between 85 to 90 percent.

13 That of the Territory's 4,118,400 acres, 1,762,050 acres, or 42.78 percent, are in public ownership and 2,356,350 acres or 57.22 percent are privately owned. The largest single owner holds 8.87 percent of the total of privately owned lands and the 10 largest owners (including the largest owner) together hold 30.11 percent; the 50 largest owners (including the 10 largest owners) hold 39.55 percent, and all other owners hold 17.67 percent of all privately owned lands.

14. That the largest owner is the B. P. Bishop estate, holding approximately 370,000 acres. This is a charitable trust, founded by a Hawaiian princess for the support of the Kamehameha Schools, which are devoted to the education of Hawaiians and part-Hawaiians, and the expenses of administering the trust are paid from trust funds.

15. That of the Territory's total 4,118,400 acres, 2,947,330 acres are devoted as follows: 1,045,085 acres are devoted to forest reserves; 164,205 acres to national parks; 84,040 acres to Army, Navy, or other public use (including territorial and county purposes but not including highways); 1,350,000 acres to pasturage; 220,000 acres to the growing of sugar cane; 63,000 acres to the growing of pineapples, and approximately 21,000 acres to the growing of other crops, including: 6,760 acres, truck farming; 4,000 acres, coffee; 2,090 acres, fruits; 2,067 acres, taro and field crops; 770 acres, macadamia nuts; and 5,438 acres for miscellaneous crops.

16. That in 1940 there were 2,094 farms of less than 5 acres, and 4,724 farms of less than 100 acres (including those less than 5 acres).

17. That in 1944 Hawaii produced 874,946 tons of sugarcane, the crop being valued at $65,498,532.

18. That in 1940—the latest year for which complete figures are available—Hawaii produced 22,341,429 cases of pineapple valued at $45,851,706.

19. That the coffee production of the islands in 1944 totaled 7,656,000 pounds, valued at $1,091,000.

20. That the Territory has consistently paid into the United States Treasury a considerably larger amount than the Federal Government, exclusive of military expenditures, has spent upon the Territory; its 1945 contribution amounting to $173,999,227.22.

21. That in 1944 and 1945 Hawaii exceeded several States in the total of its internal revenue collections.

22. That the finances of the Territory have been very well managed. At the end of the last biennium, on June 30, 1945, total budgetary resources of the Territory amounted to $68,339,384, with total obligations and reserves in the amount of $57,873,691, leaving an unappropriated surplus of $10,465,693. The bonded debt of the Territory as of December 31, 1945, was $16,520,000, with $7,151,344 in the sinking fund, leaving a net amount of $9,368,656.

23. That during the calendar year 1945 the following tax revenues were produced from the following sources:

Real property	$6,568,605.43
Personal property	3,697,620.65
Income, personal and corporation	23,529,447.21
Public utility	1,897,497.05
Liquid fuel	1,932,749.57
Compensation and dividend	8,819,507.92
Bank excise	50,000.00
Liquor	1,906,979.50
Tobacco	422,664.86
Gross income and consumption	10,460,310.25
Unemployment compensation	1,888,749.18
Business excise, poll, public welfare prior years)	96,468.83
Administered by tax commissioner	41,272,600.45
Inheritance and estate	661,274.16
Insurance	451,472.58
Miscellaneous licenses	10,252.63
Administered by Territorial treasurer	1,122,999.37
Total	42,395,499.02

24. That there are 35 sugar companies operating in the Territory with a total capitalization of approximately $175,000,000 and with stock held by approximately 16,000 persons. There are five corporations, known as the Big Five which act in the capacity of factors or agents for practically all of these plantations, and to some extent have substantial stockholdings in the plantation companies. The companies, with the number of plantations represented and the approximate percentage of sugar production for each group of plantations, are as follows:

	Number of plantations represented	Approximate percentage of total sugar production
American Factors, Ltd	9	30.8
C. Brewer & Co., Ltd	14	23.5
Alexander & Baldwin	4	20.8
Castle & Cooke, Ltd	3	14.5
Theo. H. Davies, Ltd	4	6.9
Total	34	96.5

The agency system is not used to such a predominant extent in the pineapple industry, although some of the "big five" are connected with that industry through stock ownership or other affiliation. The "big five" have other interests as well.

25. That the commerce of Hawaii with the continental United States exceeds that between the mainland and all but a few foreign countries. From 1935 to 1940, only five foreign countries—the United Kingdom, Canada, Japan, France, and Germany—bought more from the mainland than did Hawaii. In 1940 the value of the Territory's imports from the mainland totaled $127,539,539, while the value of exports to the mainland was $102,145,130.

26. That bank deposits have increased from $4,662,131 in 1901 to $499,295,940 in 1945, much of the increase being due to the presence of Army and Navy personnel.

27. That Hawaii's gross assessed value of real property is over $500,000,000—higher than that of any State at the time of admission with the exception of Oklahoma.

28. That as of December 1945, 36,875 corporations, firms, or individuals were engaged in 54,412 different enterprises as employers or self-employers.

A. There were 12,916 persons or companies engaged in retailing, representing the following subdivisions:

Appliances, 66; auto dealers, 42; auto supplies, 69; bakeries, 61; barrooms and saloons, 380; books and stationery, 34; building materials, 10; chemicals, 17; cold drinks, 206; confectionery, 205; curios and novelties, 298; department stores, 12; drugs, 151; dry goods, 222; electric supplies, 21; equipment, 43; fish dealers and fish markets, 532; food products, 481; fountain and lunchrooms, 444; fruit and vegetable, 713; furniture, 91; general merchandise, 1,135; groceries, 641; hardware, 61; household products, 15; jewelers, 185; liquor stores, 173; lumber, 10; meat dealers and meat markets, 333; mill supplies, 11; music stores and composers, 23; newspapers, 25; nurseries, 88; office equipment and supplies, 27; optical, 17; poultry, 636; radio and radio supplies, 67; restaurants, 952; service stations, 387; shoe stores, 68; toilet articles and cosmetics, 55; wearing apparel, 172.

B. There were 2,999 companies or persons engaged in wholesaling, including the following types of wholesaling:

Appliances, 14; auto dealers, 14; auto parts, 36; bakeries, 55; beverages, 11; block printing, 19; boatbuilding, 10; bottle dealers, 21; building materials, 7; coconuts, 9; confectioneries, 23; curios and novelties, 137; drugs, 39; dry goods, 42; electrical appliances, 19; equipment, 16; feed, 9; fish dealers, 273; florists, 41; food products, 109; fruit and vegetable dealers, 280; furniture, 26; general merchandise, 264; groceries, 44; hardware, 12; household products, 5; jewelers, 70; junk dealers, 8; lauhala weaving, 166; leis, 19; lumber, 5; magazines, 7; meats, 56; music, 9; tobacco, 6; toilet articles and cosmetics, 11; toys, 10; wearing apparel, 32.

C. Eight thousand three hundred and fifty-eight companies or persons were engaged in producing raw products, including:

Dairies, 66; farming, 1,051; fishing, 350; flower growers, 214; hog raisers, 589; poultry producers, 811; sugar growers, 2,135; vegetables and fruits, 1,542.

D. One thousand four hundred and twenty-six persons or companies were engaged in manufacturing, including:

Alcoholic beverages, 12; bakery products, 86 block printing, 17; chemical and fertilizer, 30; clothing, 27; concrete, lime, and stone products, 11; confectionery, 20; curios and novelties, 88; foods, 137; footwear, 21; furniture, 35; jewelry, 16; mattresses and springs, 12; nonalcoholic beverages, 38; soap, 7; wood products, 37.

29. That out of a total of 170,000 employees (not including part-time work by school children under the schools' temporary program established to meet the manpower shortage) the sugar industry employs about 24,500 workers. Pineapple agricultural labor (not including the canneries) totals about 4,750; 11,300 are employed in manufacturing (excluding sugar); 10,700 in transportation, communication and other utility services; 23,000 in wholesale and retail trades; 13,500 in various service industries; 7,400 in diversified agriculture; 6,600 in construction and quarrying, and 3,000 in financial, insurance, and real-estate establishments; 59,500 are in Government service and 4,075 in domestic service.

30. That since 1937 the Territorial legislature passed a number of labor laws, creating the Department of Labor and Industrial Relations, and dealing with such matters as apprenticeship, child labor, vocational training, vocational rehabilitation, unemployment compensation, regulation of employment agencies, minimum wages and maximum hours, payment and collection of wages, workmen's compensation, and safety regulations.

31. That the Territory's Department of Labor is considered by the local representative of the Federal Labor Department as doing an able job, and the Territory's labor legislation as comparing very favorably with that of many progressive States and in some respects is in advance thereof. Hawaii's unemployment compensation law provides more liberal benefits than that of any State with the possible exception of New York.

32. That the average cash wage paid to sugar employees in 1945 is in excess of $5 per day for unskilled labor not including the value of perquisites, which include housing, fuel, water, lights, and medical and hospital services. The cash wage paid in the pineapple industry is comparable. Wages paid industrial workers have advanced in Hawaii more than on the mainland during the period 1940–45 and Hawaii now is on a par with the mainland.

33. That a standard 8-hour day is in effect throughout the Territory.

34. That Hawaii is the only Territory or State with the exception of Wisconsin to pass a little Wagner Act, extending collective bargaining to agricultural labor.

35. That unionization of labor has made strides during the past 10 years both in industry and agriculture; nearly all major industries, including the sugar and pineapple industries, are now organized or organization is pending therein.

36. That there are 46 organizations in the Territory affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, 68 with the CIO, 2 independent unions, and 5 Government employees' organizations.

37. That in 1940 there were 7 strikes involving 502 workers with 33,217 man-days lost; in 1941 there were 16 strikes involving 2,530 workers resulting in 34,241 man-days lost; in 1942 there were 2 strikes involving 49 men resulting in 67 man-days lost; in 1943 there were 4 strikes involving 202 workers resulting in 716 man-days lost; in 1944 there was 1 labor dispute involving 6 men with 60 man-days lost; and in 1945, up to November, there had been 9 strikes involving 1,047 men with 8,876 man-days lost.

38. That at the last Territorial election a majority of those elected to both houses were endorsed by organized labor.

39. That illiteracy in the islands among native-born citizens is almost nonexistent. Hawaii has well-equipped schools throughout the Territory, most villages and hamlets being provided with proper educational facilities.

40. The standards of instruction, according to United States Chamber of Commerce, are the same as on the mainland and higher than those in many States. The average number of pupils enrolled per teacher is 27.9 in Hawaii as compared with 31.4 in the United States urban schools and 26.1 in rural areas. The average pay per teacher in Hawaii is $2,014 annually as compared to $2,013 in urban centers and $1,018 in rural areas of the mainland.

41. That there is a public library on each of the principal islands. There are 82,435 registered card holders. Each island library owns a bookmobile serving rural schools and homes, and approximately $620,000 is spent annually on library facilities.

42. That the University of Hawaii compares favorably with many State universities. For the year 1944–45 there were enrolled 1,463 regular students and 1,145 graduate students. The university had financial support in the amount of $3,126,028 for the biennium 1943–45, of which territorial appropriations from general revenues provided 50.8 percent, university income 27.46 percent, and Federal grants 21.74 percent.

43. That the level of the Territory's spiritual life is in the best American tradition.

44. That in 1945 the board of health spent $1,623,385 or a per capita cost of $3.23 as compared with $1.66 in 1937.

45. In 1943, Hawaii's death rates from 18 causes were below the national median. The rate was higher for syphilis, tuberculosis, and accidents, including automobile accidents. The mortality rate of infants under 1 year had declined from 87 per thousand in 1930 to 30 per thousand in 1945; the number of maternal deaths for 1,000 living births had declined from 7 in 1932 to 1.6 in 1945.

46. That the venereal disease infection rate per 1,000 in Hawaii declined from 175 in 1911 to 7.5 in 1945. On the mainland the rate has declined from 163 in 1911 to approximately 43 in 1945. In Hawaii the locally acquired rate was 1.4 in 1945.

47. That according to the Social Security Board, Hawaii's public assistance program is based on "liberal, progressive legislation." Hawaii has no maximum limitation of public assistance; and the Territory has thus placed itself in a position to make payments to needy individuals commensurate with need, and to give recognition to changes in living costs. Hawaii also has a medical and dental care program, and provides other forms of public assistance for which no Federal grants are given.

48. That in 1945 Hawaii ranked thirty-ninth in the average grant for old-age assistance, fifteenth in the average grant for aid to dependent children, thirty-fifth in average grant for aid to the blind, and fifteenth in the average grant for general assistance.

49. That the territorial legislature has enacted legislation comparable to that of many States. Hawaii has adopted 20 of the mainland uniform laws. In addition to laws mentioned above, Hawaii has a civil-service law, a modern retirement system for all employees. In the field of public health the Territory has enacted a crippled-children's act, created a bureau of mental hygiene, passed a uniform narcotic-drugs act, and established compulsory vaccination for smallpox, typhoid, and other diseases. In addition to the existing public medical-care program the legislature in 1945 provided for a study of health-insurance and hospital facilities. In 1935 the legislature created the Hawaii Housing Authority, passed the Federal Housing Act authorizing the acquisition by any Federal agency of property suitable for housing projects, and an act entitled "Government Aid for Housing Projects" authorizing the Territory and its political subdivisions to aid in the planning, construction, and operation of housing projects.

CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the record and in view of the foregoing, the subcommittee concludes:

1. That Hawaii with its population of over 500,000 has a larger population than any other State at the time of admission to the Union with the exception of Oklahoma.

2. That the heterogeneous peoples of the Territory live and work together amicably, democratically, and harmoniously.

3. That the mixed racial complexion of Hawaii existed at the time of annexation, was not regarded as an obstacle to annexation, and should not now be considered an obstacle to Statehood.

4. That the percentage of persons of Japanese ancestry reached its peak in 1940 and has steadily declined since then due to prohibition of immigration, lower birth rate, and the increasing immigration of other peoples.

5. That the people of Hawaii have demonstrated beyond question their loyalty and patriotism to the Government of the United States.

6. That on the record of their behavior and their participation in the war, American citizens of Japanese ancestry can be little criticized.

7. Such evidence of bloc voting as exists among Americans of Japanese ancestry is not likely to assume serious proportions in our opinion because they, like all other peoples, are divided amongst themselves by differences, political, social, and economic.

8. That Hawaii has been a Territory for 46 years, during which the people of Hawaii have shown themselves fully capable of self-government.

9. That there is a concentration of land holdings in the hands of a few persons, companies, or estates, but efforts have been made to improve this situation. The 1943 legislature created a Land Laws Revision Commission, which recommended the creation of a public corporation for the acquisition, subdivision, and sale of lands for home sites. A bill of this character, known as the Hawaii Home Development Authority Act, was introduced in the last session. Although it failed of passage then, and no further steps have been taken, it may in the near future be enacted into law. It provided:

"The authority is directed to acquire by purchase or eminent domain, undeveloped lands suitable for residential purposes on the island of Oahu, where the acute shortage of home sites exists. Lands thus acquired are to be subdivided into residential lots and offered for sale to those of the public most in need of houses. The development projects contemplated by the act are self-sustaining in nature. The act calls for an initial loan to the authority to be repaid to the Territory as the authority secures funds from its bonds, the issuance of which is provided for by the act."

10. That the Big Five dominates a great portion of Hawaii's economy; but this economic dominance has not prevented the establishment of many varied businesses, and there are good prospects for small business in Hawaii. Further, the influence of the Big Five has not prevented the enactment of progressive legislation in the field of labor, education, health.

11. That in every community of similar size, business policies are formulated by a relatively small number of individuals who hold positions of responsibility. There is no occasion to believe that these positions are maintained through stock control either directly or by means of proxies in Hawaii to any greater extent than is the case on the mainland. The committee's investigations were in the main confined to statehood, but in all the evidence presented to it, nothing indicated the existence in business life of collusion or fraud or any agreement or combination in restraint of trade.

12. That labor has made great strides since 1937 and has contributed greatly to the Territory's progress in the field of social and economic legislation.

13. That there is a growing mutual respect and confidence between management and labor in industrial relations.

14. That the school system of Hawaii has been successful in instilling into people of many races and backgrounds the objectives and ideals of democracy, and has produced a literate population capable of discharging the duties of citizenship.

15. That modern inventions have annihilated distance. Honolulu today is closer to the American mainland in time than the cities of Boston and New York were to the Capital in the early days of the Nation. Hawaii is closer to the seat of the Government today than all but the immediately adjacent States were when Washington first became the Capital of the United States. With efficient and rapid communication by cable, radio, or telephone, and 12- to 18-hour service for mail or passenger planes to the mainland, Hawaii can no longer be characterized as isolated.

16. That a majority of the people of the Territory are in favor of immediate statehood. No organized group has appeared in opposition. If a plebiscite were again held on the statehood question in our opinion the people would vote for statehood in the same proportion as they did in 1940.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Therefore, since—

1. The people of the Territory of Hawaii have demonstrated beyond question not only their loyalty and patriotism but also their desire to assume the responsibility of statehood; and since

2. The policy of the United States Government is one of self-determination: that peoples be allowed to choose freely their form of political status; and since

3. Hawaii's strategic location in the Pacific plays so large a part in our country's international position in this area; and since

4. The Congress of the United States has through a series of acts and committee reports indicated to the people of the Territory that Hawaii would be admitted into the Union when qualified; and since

5. The Territory of Hawaii now meets the necessary requirements for statehood:

It is the recommendation of this subcommittee that the Committee on Territories give immediate consideration to legislation to admit Hawaii to statehood.

HENRY D. LARCADE, Jr.,
Democrat, Louisiana, Chairman,
JAMES J. DELANEY,
Democrat, New York.
GEORGE P. MILLER,
Democrat, California.
HOMER D. ANGELL,
Republican, Oregon.
DEAN P. TAYLOR,
Republican, New York.
JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON,
Republican, Territory of Hawaii.

Post Office Building Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BUTLER B. HARE
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1946

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, under leave of unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including therein the statement made before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, October 31, 1945, I submit the following:

STATEMENT OF HON. BUTLER B. HARE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear and to present my views on the proposed building program. I have prepared a short statement, and I think, Mr. Chairman, I can expedite your time by probably referring to my statement, or notes, with the understanding that you may feel at liberty to interrupt or make inquiry at any time.

I shall not attempt to go into any great detail as to the various proposals but will confine myself to title I of the bill, which provides for the construction of buildings at certain post offices, particularly second-class offices. The policy of the Government to provide suitable buildings to accommodate offices after the receipts exceed $10,000 per annum was established many years ago. I think I could be more accurate and say that in 1926 Congress provided that thereafter post offices with $10,000 annual receipts would be eligible for a building. The assumption is that Congress felt that if the office had receipts amounting to $10,000 annually, there was a need for a building and that that was sufficient justification for the program. The Congress at irregular intervals has provided funds for the construction of such buildings as offices became eligible up until 1938 or 1939, when the last legislation for this purpose was enacted. Of course, the program has been delayed on account of the recent World War, but I understand that your committee is now planning to renew the program.

The justification for such a program has been heretofore well established, and I assume the purpose of your committee at present is to determine whether you shall authorize and make provision for the construction of buildings at all offices recently declared by the Post Office Department to be eligible under existing law, or whether it will be more advisable to make provision for the construction of these buildings over a period of years. Mr. Chairman, for a number of years I have insisted, and my purpose here today is to further insist, that Congress should now provide authorization for the construction of a building to accommodate all second-class offices now eligible and as they may hereafter become eligible. Then it would only be necessary for the Department, in its regular request for annual appropriations hereafter, to submit justifications for the construction of such buildings as may become eligible in the future. In this way provision would be made for furnishing postal facilities to every community where business is sufficiently large to justify such a building. Practically every agency in the Government is now and has been working for the past 2 or 3 years on some kind of postwar program that would provide employment for the unemployed. There are some, of course, who would like to go back to the original WPA program, but I think a great majority of people now feel this program was too expensive for the benefits derived. Briefly, therefore, I am suggesting that the authorization be made and funds requested to provide for the immediate construction of a suitable building to accommodate all post offices approved by the Post Office Department as being eligible for such buildings under existing law.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Congressman HARE, don't you believe that if they were to base eligibility on the receipts of a post office in the last 2, 3, or 4 years, or during the emergency, a large percentage of them would become eligible, whereas when we got back to normal times they probably would not be eligible. What would you suggest we should use as a basis for the determination of their eligibility?

Mr. HARE. The year preceding the passage of this act.

Mr. MCGREGOR. If we pass it in 1945, then it would be 1944, or if we pass the bill in 1946 then take the postal receipts of 1945 as a basis of determining eligibility. Do you not think that the receipts of various post offices would be larger in 1944 than possibly in 1942 or 1943?

Mr. HARE. My suggestion is that you provide for the offices that have become eligible heretofore and that you hereafter keep current in the building program.

Mr. McGREGOR. You would not go back into an emergency period to determine a fair or average eligibility, would you, which would be the case if you used a year before this act was passed?

Mr. HARE. I would certainly not go back to a depression period, but I think probably I will get to that a little later.

The total annual rental costs of these offices at present approximate $7,300,000, which is approximately 2½ percent interest on $285,000,000; and from the standpoint of business economy, the saving in rentals alone at the present rate would liquidate the investment I am suggesting within a little less than 40 years. Therefore, as a business proposition your committee and the Congress can well justify the suggested appropriation at this time.

In the second place, I want to emphasize it would be a good business investment for the Government; it would furnish employment, legitimate employment, honorable employment, employment that would in no way place the Government in competition with private enterprise, to many thousands of people. This would mean full employment for thousands of people per annum in the actual construction of the buildings; and, in addition, the program would furnish employment to many more thousands who would be engaged in the production of building materials such as lumber, nails, lime, cement, paint, bricks, etc.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, I can see no good reason, in the light of the established policy of our Government and the situation as it now exists throughout the country, why we should not report a bill that would provide for the immediate erection of a suitable building to accommodate each post office declared eligible.

Mr. McGREGOR. Congressman, do you have any idea as to the number of post-office buildings that would be needed to meet that requirement?

Mr. HARE. Yes, but I will get to that in just a moment.

I suggest further that the building, in addition to providing accommodations for post offices proper, when erected at county seats should be large enough to accommodate other permanent agencies of the Government that may be located there. This would not only be a saving to the Government in the long run but would be a great advantage to the public. That is exactly in harmony with Judge Hobbs' suggestion. Such offices as county agent, home demonstration agent, public health service, and other governmental activities that appear to be permanent, would all be in one building, and people interested would know where to find them.

I find from my own observation that this would be a great saving not only in rentals, but it would be a great service to the public. I go into a little town, where there may be 4,000, 5,000, or 6,000 people or less, and you have all of these agencies scattered out among the four corners of the village or town. The people have difficulty locating them, and if you want to visit two or three of these offices in one day, it takes all day to find them. But if they are permanent agencies of the Government, and we find that it is to the best interests of Government to house Government employees at county seats, the building should be large enough to accommodate all of them.

Now, Mr. Chairman, a hurried summary of the smaller post-office buildings shows the number to be about 2,100—and I gather this from the report submitted by the Department and filed with your committee may be constructed at an estimated cost of $85,000 each, or a total cost of approximately $178,500,000. Then there are about 900 listed with an estimated cost of $95,000 each, or a total cost of $85,500,000, making approximately 3,000 buildings at an approximate cost of $264,000,000.

I call attention to this list of eligible buildings for the reason that the need and justification for them have already been passed on by Congress and for the further reason that they are to be found in practically every nook and corner of the United States and will, therefore, distribute a service from the Government to practically every locality in the United States, many of which have never had an opportunity to see and realize the magnitude of our great Government and their relationship to its functions and responsibilities. There will be some people in these localities who will learn as never before to appreciate the significance of the American flag and what the Stars and Stripes really stand for. As they go about their daily work and see the Stars and Stripes waving to and fore in the breeze above these little buildings, the sensation will certainly arouse their devotion and loyalty to our great system of government as never before. Such a building and flag will contribute to the civic pride, and many a returned soldier within a few years will be able to create a feeling of pride, loyalty, and devotion in his children toward their Government when he points to that flag and relates to them how he followed it as his pillar of fire by night and pillar of cloud by day as he advanced through France, Italy, or Belgium on his way to Berlin, or as he sailed the uncharted seas of the Pacific and followed his leaders at Bougainville, Leyte, Luzon, Saipan, Iwo Jima, or Okinawa on his way to Tokyo.

Mr. WILSON. The thought that struck me, Mr. HARE, while you were speaking, is that a tiny flag flying from the homes of 12,000,000 ex-service men and women, and the pride of ownership, which I contend is the basis of Americanism and democracy, would mean a lot more toward the preservation of our form of government and of our way of living than a flag flying over a Federal building in these respective communities, and I would say that your statement fades into insignificance when we make that comparison.

Mr. HARE. I am not prepared to argue that question, but you may be correct in your observation.

Mr. McGREGOR. Getting back to the dollars and cents and the practical end of this program, it is my understanding that you feel that 3,000 post offices will take care of the needs of those which might become eligible under the limitation of $10,000 annual receipts.

Mr. HARE. Yes; approximately that.

Mr. McGREGOR. You calculated it at 2,100 buildings at $85,000 and 900 buildings at $95,000?

Mr. HARE. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. McGREGOR. From my own memory, we certainly have a lot of small towns which can qualify under this $10,000 annual receipts requirement, and certainly we can build a post office in these small towns for much less than $85,000 or $95,000. I think possibly your figures are very high.

Mr. HARE. I am glad to have that expression, because I was not attempting to place a minimum cost on construction, but my observations were based on the number of offices said to be eligible and the estimated cost as fixed by the Federal Works Agency at $85,000 and $95,000 respectively.

Mr. McGREGOR. I think that that was figured—and if I am wrong Mr. Reynolds will correct me—simply as a maximum figure, and I imagine that it is intended by the Department that some would be built at much less than that.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is quite correct, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you drafted an amendment?

Mr. HARE. Yes. I will come to that in just a minute.

I have referred so far only to a certain class or type of building, namely, those to be used primarily to accommodate postal facilities ranging in cost from approximately $85,000 to $95,000 each. Of course, this is only part of the building program suggested in the report submitted by the Postmaster General and the Public Works Agency. In round numbers there will be about 3,000 of these smaller buildings, and then by count or estimate there will be in addition about 1,000 miscellaneous buildings, at an estimated cost of about $521,000,000; that is, the construction cost of about one-fourth of the 4,000 buildings will be about twice as much as the remaining three-fourths. I am assuming that the latter buildings referred to are essential, but I have not had an opportunity to review the justifications or the grounds upon which they are recommended; but I want to emphasize the point that the 3,000 buildings to which I have specifically referred are found to be eligible upon a standard fixed by this Congress on June 25, 1926, and the committee, therefore, should have no difficulty in reaching a conclusion about authorizing their construction.

Mr. ARNOLD. With reference to the $85,000 and $95,000 building that you just mentioned, is that a building that is supposed to take care of, in addition to the post office, the production and credit association, the extension agent, and the Farm Security Administration office that we have in a lot of these towns?

Mr. HARE. My thought is that the additional cost attached to a building at a county seat can be offset by the reduction of the cost of housing the people in the other buildings; that is, some of these buildings may be constructed at a cost of $40,000 or $50,000 instead of $85,000 or $95,000, and this difference would provide the additional space required by those at county seats.

Mr. ARNOLD. Is it your idea that all of these different Government agencies such as have been mentioned here are to be gathered into the post-office building and housed there?

Mr. HARE. That is correct. And my thought is it would mean a saving in rent, fuel, heat, light, and a dozen other things.

Mr. ARNOLD. Let me ask you this: Do you expect to make provision for a Congressman to have an office where he can go, to take care of his business?

Mr. HARE. Not for the next few years, because I think he will be here in Washington. [Laughter.]

Mr. McMILLEN. Do I understand that you would confine the use of these buildings entirely to Federal use or to some local use having to do with health or other governmental matters?

Mr. HARE. Purely Federal.

Mr. GWINN. Are you not assuming that we are going to have the Federal offices permanently when you make such a proposition as that?

Mr. HARE. Yes; that is the assumption. My assumption is that the county agents will continue.

Mr. GWINN. Why have the county agent continue as a Federal agent from Washington, rather than a county or State agent of his own community?

Mr. HARE. He has always been a Federal agent.

Mr. GWINN. Why should he operate as a Federal servant, and why should we construct a building for him when he is a county agent in Indiana, or Wisconsin, or some other place, or from Washington?

Mr. HARE. My suggestion was based upon the action of Congress when it provided many years ago—about 1915, if I recall correctly—for the creation of the Extension Service, for the services now performed by persons referred to as county agents because their operations are generally confined to a county. The same is true of the home demonstration agent. The Government has provided for the establishment of public-health services in practically every community or county in the United States, and I assume that before we could take any contrary action it would be

necessary for the Federal Government to rescind its action.

Mr. GWINN. I understand. You are talking about a long-time investment of the Federal Government.

Mr. HARE. Yes; certainly.

Mr. GWINN. As though we are certain that these agencies that you mentioned are a fixed part, as a permanent concept of what the Federal Government should do. Now, your building will not be a very good investment if you build on that assumption and we change our minds. I think that this business ought to be scattered and that the counties and States ought to manage their own county agents. Take Federal funds, if you want, and appropriate them, but why should we manage from Washington a county agent growing grass in the dairy areas of New York State, rather than have that county agent in the county office building and subject to the department of agriculture of New York State, spending the funds at home instead of spending them through Washington.

Therefore, I would question the soundness of making an investment on the theory that we are always going to do business, in the next 30, 40, or 50 years, the way that we are doing it now.

Mr. HARE. I am sure that I could not argue with you on that, Mr. GWINN, because if you are assuming that all of these offices are going to be turned back—that is, that the Congress is going, by affirmative action, to turn all of the agencies or activities or offices over to the counties and States—then I do not think we should provide housing accommodations for them. But some of them have been in existence for 20 years, and I do not know of any outstanding movement to discontinue them, and you are correct in saying that my suggestion is based upon the assumtion that they will be retained and managed and financed by the Federal Government because the Federal Government now pays rent for their offices.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, in connection with the good investment that the Congressman speaks of, many of our business enterprises—chain stores, for example—find that it is much better business to rent quarters because their business changes, increases or decreases, and they are able to adjust themselves to less cost according to the changing volume of business. Isn't that true of post offices?

Mr. HARE. No; but I have found cases where that is correct. I have found many farmers who felt it was cheaper for them to rent land than to own it. I have found many merchants who have found it cheaper to rent space than to own it. But, on the whole, I have found that it is better for the country and better for those engaged in agriculture if they can own their homes, and I have found that merchants and other business activities have been more efficient and successful by following the same policy, and I feel that our Government is going to be a continuing agency for many years to come, and I feel further that if this Government is going to render services to the people provision should be made to enable it to render those services in the most efficient way and at the least possible cost. I believe that if a good businessman were placed at the head of our postal facility he would find he could own his buildings and furnish the service more efficiently and cheaper than he could by renting them and assuming the responsibility of robberies, fire hazards, etc. I think that it would be cheaper and better business in the long run, and if it is cheaper for one agency I think we could save money by bringing these four or five or six agencies, whatever they may be, into one building than to rent separate and distinct places for them.

Now, on page 2, line 11, I have this amendment to offer; strike out all of the words following the word "made" and the period thereafter, and then strike out lines 12 to 15, inclusive, to the word "provided," and insert the following:

"New projects for the foregoing purposes shall include all post offices listed and contained in the revised report made by the Federal Works Agency and the Postmaster General dated September 25, 1945, including any supplements thereto which may have been made by the agencies named in the meantime."

The CHAIRMAN. Do you suggest any amendment with reference to the conditional authorization of the amount of money?

Mr. HARE. Should the suggested amendment be accepted, other changes should be made to harmonize with the amendment. I have to admit I am not sufficiently familiar with estimating costs, and so forth, but if the committee in its judgment, good judgment, should decide to accept this amendment, then other parts of the bill should be amended to coincide with the amendment.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Might I inquire of Commissioner Reynolds if he has any idea of the approximate cost of Congressman HARE'S amendment?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I do not, Mr. MCGREGOR, because some of the projects that would be included in this list are already in the document and would be provided for under the present limit of cost that was suggested. I would have to make some study of it, and report back.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Would it require a lot of work to do so, or could you do it conveniently?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Oh, yes; I could do it without difficulty.

Mr. HARE. Permit me to state there that I believe that this list referred to was compiled probably since July 1, and there would not be many additional buildings required under this amendment, beyond those set out in the report.

Mr. MCGREGOR. It is my understanding this bill covers a construction program of approximately 3 years.

Mr. REYNOLDS. We have never called it a program for any number of years; we have called it an initial program following the war, and it is our opinion that it will take at least 3 years to carry it out.

Mr. MCGREGOR. What period of time does your full report cover?

Mr. REYNOLDS. The report covers all buildings eligible as of the date of the filing of the report, and we are suggesting certain changes in that report, and we will have them for you in executive session.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, about the only argument I have heard against this proposal of authorization for immediate construction, and I mean by "immediate" as soon as circumstances and conditions will permit, is that we would not have a sufficient amount of building materials to complete this program under 6, 8, or possibly 10 years. My thought is that that estimate is too long, and I inquired of the Bureau of the Budget as to the expenditures for building purposes by the Government for the past 5 years and I am advised that within that time we have expended upward of $1,800,000,000 for the construction of Government or public buildings. Of course, we know that most of those were for the promotion of the war.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Does that include buildings constructed in the District of Columbia?

Mr. HARE. Yes.

Mr. MCGREGOR. The Pentagon Building is included?

Mr. HARE. Yes. It includes all buildings constructed or erected by the Federal Government in the past 5 years, or a little less than 5 years. My thought is that in the 5 years through which we have just gone, we have had the tightest labor market in the history of the country; we have had a greater scarcity of building materials than at any time in the history of our country; and yet the Government, through its different agencies, has been able to construct buildings costing more than twice as much as is contemplated in this whole program, including buildings in the District of Columbia, all of which were constructed within less than 5 years. They found the labor; they found the material; they were able to purchase the sites; they were able to make the surveys; they were able to prepare the blueprints; and they were able to complete all of these buildings.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Do you not believe that private industry and private property owners have suffered because of that?

Mr. HARE. I do.

Mr. MCGREGOR. You do not recommend the carrying on of that program?

Mr. HARE. No; I do not think it will be necessary. I do not know that this program can be completed in less than 2 years, or in 1½ years, but I think that the program for the next few years, as contrasted with the program for the past 4 years, should be reversed; that is, instead of the Government obtaining priorities for the promotion of this program, the priorities should be given to the people and to private industry.

That would be my answer, Mr. Chairman, to the question that you propounded to Mr. HOBBS, who preceded me.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, a statement to that effect has been placed in the record by Mr. Reynolds, that that was his purpose.

Mr. HARE. That completes my statement.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you very much. We are glad to have your suggestions.

Mr. Speaker, it will be observed that my remarks before the committee were not in behalf of a building at any specific point or at any specific office, but in behalf of a program that will include all eligible offices, not simply for my district, but for the entire country. I admit that if the committee recommends the inauguration of the program suggested it will include a building for every office in my district eligible under the law of 1926. According to the records of the Post Office Department the following offices in my district are now eligible: Belton, Edgefield, Honea Path, Johnston, Liberty, McCormick, Ninety Six, Pelzer, Pickens, Piedmont, Saluda, Seneca, Walhalla, Westminster, Whitmire, and any other office that may have become eligible on January 1 or by the time the funds herein requested should be made available. I sincerely trust the committee will change the program of 1928 when it authorized only one building for each congressional district per annum. To bring in a similar bill now would be perfectly absurd, for if we undertake to follow that program it will require 15 years or longer before the present eligible offices in my district would all receive a building and by that time there would probably be a dozen more offices eligible.

Referring further to the suggestion that the building at county seats should be large enough to accommodate other Federal agencies, I might suggest that in many places this would not be necessary for the reason they already have accommodations for such agencies. I am pleading primarily for a suitable building at every second-class post office that is eligible under the policy adopted in 1926, regardless of any other agency, because I do not know of a single one of these offices but what would, with a Federal building, be able to render more efficient service to the public and in the long run be much cheaper for the Government.

Radio Discussion Over WLW, Cincinnati, Ohio, on the World Front Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1946

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio discussion over WLW, Cincinnati, Ohio, January 20, 1946, in which Mr. Frank Scriven, national executive secretary of Amvets, participated:

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (the moderator). Five million American war veterans have returned home since the defeat of Germany and Japan. About that many more are still to come. The veterans' readjustment to civilian life, and the Nation's readjustment to them, is and will continue to be for some time one of our more important problems.

For an insight into this matter, today's broadcast of the World Front seeks the advice and counsel of a spokesman for Amvets, the American Veterans of World War II He is Frank Scriven, national executive secretary of Amvets, and himself a veteran of the war. Amvets is the largest veterans' organization composed exclusively of men who took part in World War II. Welcome to the World Front, Mr. Scriven.

Mr. SCRIVEN. It is my pleasure, representing Amvets, to have had the honor of appearing here with you.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Many Congressmen who returned to Washington the past week report that the voters are demanding some sort of congressional action about strikes. Do you believe that the majority of the people are actually greatly concerned about the industrial-labor situation?

Mr. SCRIVEN. The strike situation has had an unhappy effect on the returning veteran. It has not been helpful in his readjustment to civilian life. He is deeply concerned and hopeful that a solution may soon be found.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. A question now for our World Front guest observer. It's about the GI bill of rights. Mr. Scriven, what is Amvets' opinion of this measure? Does it go far enough in protecting the returned veteran?

Mr. SCRIVEN. Few of us have forgotten the bonus march to Washington. We know what caused that mass agitation. It must not happen again.

Thousands of veterans have been led to expect high-salaried jobs, money with which to buy homes, ample loans to finance new businesses. They were told that an education was open to them with all expenses paid.

That was the so-called GI bill of rights—a grossly exaggerated piece of legislation.

In spite of high promises, job-hunting veterans are getting little help. Those who seek medical care often get pushed around. The same delay and confusion is experienced by men anxious to buy farms or open businesses of their own.

It was reported to Amvets, in illustration, that only 30 students of a group of 500 had been receiving their benefits under the bill at a university in Washington, D. C.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. How about the housing provisions of the GI bill?

Mr. SCRIVEN. Red tape attached to the loan provisions for home ownership puts the veteran in the position of receiving a final O. K. to purchase his home 6 to 18 months after his original application. He is extremely lucky, then, if it is still available. On the home-ownership provision alone, Amvets' stand has been to endorse the pending Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill. This liberalizes the old FHA provisions, with priorities for veterans. And it is to be remembered under the old FHA, homes were built and not with too much red tape involved. If and when this bill is passed, Amvets believes that as far as home ownership is concerned, the present GI bill will be largely ignored by the veteran.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. What is Amvets' position on the bonus question, Mr. Scriven? Do you advocate the payment of cash payments to all veterans regardless of injury. In other words, is mere service in the Army or Navy enough to warrant payments of such cash benefits?

Mr. SCRIVEN. Amvets has not thought of a bonus. When we convened in Chicago last October, nobody mentioned the idea. Amvets were preoccupied with such questions as housing, jobs, and world security. The veteran feels his position should not be prejudiced by his service for country. A convention resolution adopted stated—a veteran applying for a civil-service job (city, county, State, or Federal) should be entitled to land the spot he would have attained if he had not been inducted.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Today's guest observer on the World Front is Frank Scriven, national executive secretary of the American Veterans of World War II, Amvets.

Also joining our discussion is General Edmonds, Milt Chase, and William H. Hessler.

Sitting in at today's session of the World Front is Joseph Leib, national legislative director of Amvets, who accompanied Mr. Scriven on his trip to Cincinnati for this broadcast.

Mr. Leib is also a veteran of the war, and was a well-known Washington free-lance writer before joining the Amvets' organization.

Right here, I would like to ask Mr. Leib a question about Amvets' policy on the industry-labor matter. Has the organization taken a stand on this question?

Mr. LEIB. Amvets' position on this question was set forth last October at the national convention in Chicago. Our statement of principles includes the following passage: Amvets demands that both industry and labor clean house and establish responsible leadership and labor-management policies and procedures based on merited mutual confidence and integrity. We believe that both industry and labor have a paramount duty to the American people to reestablish their faith by denouncing and removing from their ranks and leadership professional racketeers, labor haters, labor agitators, regardless of what names they go by or what positions they occupy.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Let's return to our guest observer for more information about the American Veterans of World War II. What is Amvets' program for the veteran? What are your long-range goals?

Mr. SCRIVEN. Amvets wishes to assist in building a bigger and better United States, in reestablishing the veteran when he returns to civilian life, in getting jobs, looking after the welfare of the veteran's family, sponsoring education Amvets is working for the greatest over-all benefits of the veteran of World War II, so long as such benefits are not prejudicial to the welfare of the country as a whole.

If Amvets does nothing more than bring back to this Nation a feeling of confidence in its democratic Government and in one's fellow man, it will have served a great purpose. Amvets staunchly opposes a dog-eat-dog civilization in America. Amvets has polled its membership about peacetime military training. The verdict so far is in favor, but the returns are incomplete and not conclusive.

Mr. CHASE. Can you list some of Amvets' achievements to date on behalf of war veterans?

Mr. SCRIVEN. For the benefit of disabled soldiers, we have sponsored the procurement of the finest obtainable artificial appliances. Amvets' investigations resulted in the Justice Department's indictment of many of the Nation's artificial-limb manufacturers.

Amvets secured the elimination of the age limit under the educational provisions of the GI bill of rights.

As for adequate housing facilities, at reasonable cost levels, Amvets is sponsoring a complete housing program, part of which is already enacted. Amvets has initiated a program of securing present Government housing projects under a nonprofit, mutual corporation plan and that proposal is under consideration. Amvets has sponsored legislation to freeze the sales of such projects until Congress clarifies the veteran's preferential status.

Concerning the preferential treatment of the veteran in surplus-property disposal, Amvet-sponsored legislation is pending to investigate the disposition of the surplus to date, and to establish a system where the veteran's priority right has a meaning.

As for the Veterans' Administration—their lack of facilities and personnel—Amvets influenced the passage of the needed appropriations over the heads of the committee which had deleted Veterans' Administration funds.

Correspondence courses for hospitalized veterans.

Mr. Scriven, how deep is the cleavage between servicemen with combat experience and those who remained in this country or in other noncombat areas during the war?

Mr. SCRIVEN. The only type of rivalry Amvets has noticed between overseas veterans and the stay-at-homes is the friendly type. There seems to be a full realization that a man in uniform served where he was told to serve—that orders were orders. Likewise, a good many veterans who didn't get overseas repeatedly asked for field duty abroad—but were kept at home.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. How about the Army-Navy caste system, the strict separation of officers and enlisted men? Does it go too far, in your opinion?

Mr. SCRIVEN. "Enlisted men should have the privilege of being represented on courts martial, as defense counsel, trial judge advocate, or members of the court itself" was the wording of a resolution passed at the Amvet National Convention. This resolution was the only expression of feeling on this matter. Amvets' membership is made up of ex-officers, ex-enlisted men and women. Whether they have been generals, admirals, or buck privates—they become just plain Amvets.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. What is Amvets' position on the recent demonstrations by homesick GI's all over the world?

Mr. SCRIVEN. Is our own home front so happy? Might not GI demonstrations abroad be only an expression of desire to get home and help correct existing conditions? Has proper explanation been given by the diplomatic part of our Government? Has the whole story been told? These questions come to Amvets' minds.

Amvets feels that every possible effort should be made to expedite the return to this country of the veterans whose points are sufficient to warrant their return. And this does not mean preferential treatment of a choice few. Amvets hopes that Regular Army personnel will take over the occupation job—men who want to make a career of soldiering. If return of those with sufficient points can only be accomplished by increased induction—then increase it.

Amvets does not feel that the needs for occupation forces should in any way be jeopardized by the removal of necessary troops. But let the men know of these needs, if they are real. We only plead that induction and training programs be so expanded as to permit the eligible man's return at the time of his eligibility.

National Freedom Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 24, 1946

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House of Representatives to the unanimous acceptance by many nationally known men of the proposed National Freedom Day as an annual holiday. As you know, I introduced House Joint Resolution 77, paralleling Senate bill 40, requesting the President of the United States to designate February 1 as National Freedom Day, as an annual commemoration of the signing of the Emancipation Proclamation by President Lincoln. The same spirit underlies this bill as that which brought together the United Nations at the San Francisco Conference in June 1945. The late President Roosevelt's secretary in January 1945 wrote to the Citizens Committee for National Freedom Day that:

> Your celebration of National Freedom Day this year transcends its usual significance. It is more than a tribute to a great people and a great nation; it is a beacon to oppressed peoples everywhere. The progress of Negroes in America since February 1, 1865, only emphasizes to the world the possible achievements of free people in free countries everywhere. I know you will continue to make this example even more outstanding in the years and generations ahead.

The idea of a National Freedom Day germinated in the brain of Maj. R. R. Wright, Sr., of Philadelphia, born a slave 90 years ago, whose rise in the educational and financial fields has been phenomenal. It is characteristic of a determined man to overcome all obstacles of race hatred, intolerance, and poverty; and justly places him in a niche alongside of Booker Washington and George Washington Carver. He has worked tirelessly in the interest of this National Freedom Day and at last his efforts are on the threshold of fruition.

The major attended the recent San Francisco Conference as the official representative of the National Freedom Day Association and was graciously received by many of the dignitaries of the various nations.

He was admitted to all the conferences except the closed committee meetings, and a luncheon in his honor was given by a number of bankers in San Francisco.

Gov. Ellis Arnall, of Georgia, and Governor Meadows, of West Virginia, have endorsed the proposed holiday. Governor Meadows appointed the president of West Virginia State College as a delegate to the 1945 Freedom Day celebration in Philadelphia in 1945. Letters were received by Major Wright from two-thirds of the Governors of the United States, endorsing National Freedom Day, by sending delegates to the Philadelphia conference. Both houses of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania have unanimously adopted the House Joint Resolution 77, and Governor Martin of Pennsylvania has issued his Proclamation setting aside February 1 as National Freedom Day.

Eighteen Members of Congress wrote commendatory letters to Major Wright. The following letters are typical of the letters received from many of the Members of both Houses:

UNITED STATES SENATE, COMMITTEE
ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY,
April 28, 1945.

Mr. R. R. WRIGHT, Sr.,
President, Citizens Committee,
Citizens and Southern Bank and
Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR MR. WRIGHT: I have your letter of April 25 expressing the interest of your organization in the bill before the present Congress which is the same as Senate Joint Resolution 153 introduced in the Seventy-eighth Congress by my good friend, the former Senator, James Davis.

I enclose a copy of Senate Joint Resolution 40 which I am advised is the measure to which you refer. I always held Senator Davis in high esteem and had great confidence in his judgment. Furthermore, I think this resolution embodies a constructive move and it will have my support and my vote if it reaches the floor of the Senate for such action.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR CAPPER.

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Atlanta, January 9, 1946.

Maj. R. R. WRIGHT, Sr.,
President, Citizens Committee, Citizens and Southern Bank and Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR MAJOR WRIGHT: February 1 marks the anniversary of the adoption of the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution. It is an occasion upon which all Americans might profitably think upon two things.

First, that it is good that our country is a country of freemen, dedicated to the ideal that everywhere in the world all men must be free. Second, that harmony and mutual understanding between all races in this country is necessary and can be achieved by economic fair play and by mutual forbearance.

I am sure that those attending this celebration are mindful of these two things and are prepared to help maintain them.

Very sincerely yours,

ELLIS ARNALL,
Governor.

STATE OF MARYLAND.

Mr. R. R. WRIGHT, Sr.,
President, Citizens Committee, Citizens and Southern Bank and Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR MR. WRIGHT: I have your letter this morning advertising that National Freedom Day will be celebrated on Thursday, January 31, 1946, and February 1, 1946. You may be sure that I am pleased to cooperate as I have in the past because I feel that the movement which you are sponsoring is of such incalculable good that it gives great impetus to the most desirable race relations.

We have been so fortunate as to have two able representatives, Messrs. Willard W. Allen and Josiah F. Henry, Jr., and I would like very much to designate them again this year. Both of them, incidentally, hold important positions in our State administration and, for that reason, I feel would very capably represent the citizenry on the occasion of your meeting.

With compliments of the season, I am

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT R. O'CONOR,
Governor.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 17, 1946.

Maj. R. R. WRIGHT, Sr.,
President, Citizens Committee, Citizens and Southern Bank and Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR MAJOR WRIGHT: It has given me much pleasure to learn that the Honorable WILLIAM A. BARRETT, Member of Congress from the First Pennsylvania District, has introduced in the House of Representatives, House Joint Resolution 77, requesting the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day.

I recall your visit at my office some months ago and the interest which you expressed in this proposal at that time, and I want you to know that Mr. BARRETT's resolution will have my active support and that I will gladly cooperate with him in any way I can in efforts to bring about its enactment.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT J. MCGLINCHEY,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 15, 1946.

Maj. R. R. WRIGHT, Sr.,
President, Citizens Committee, Citizens and Southern Bank and Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR MAJOR WRIGHT: I have been interested to note that the Honorable WILLIAM A. BARRETT, who represents the First Congressional District of Pennsylvania, has introduced in the House of Representatives House Joint Resolution 77, requesting the President of the United States to designate February 1 as National Freedom Day, to commemorate annually the signing of the Emancipation Proclamation by President Lincoln.

Being aware of your interest and of your activities in the National Freedom Day movement, I take this occasion to assure you that the proposal has my hearty support, and it will afford me pleasure to cooperate in every way possible in bringing about the adoption of this resolution.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 23, 1946.

Maj. R. R. WRIGHT, Sr.,
President, Citizens Committee, Citizens and Southern Bank and Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

MY DEAR MAJOR WRIGHT: With reference to your interest in the establishment of a National Freedom Day, to be celebrated on February 1, I wish to advise that I fully concur in the provisions provided in the resolution introduced in the House of Representatives by the Honorable WILLIAM A. BARRETT, to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day.

You have my personal assurances that I shall render every assistance in the enactment of House Joint Resolution 77.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN EDWARD SHERIDAN.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C. January 22, 1946.

Maj. R. R. WRIGHT, Sr.,
President, Citizens Committee, Citizens and Southern Bank and Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

MY DEAR MAJOR WRIGHT: As I know of your great interest in the establishment of a National Freedom Day, to be celebrated on February 1, it is with pleasure that I advise you of my intention to wholeheartedly support the resolution introduced in the House

of Representatives by the Honorable WILLIAM A. BARRETT requesting the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day.

I shall be happy to cooperate in any way possible with Mr. BARRETT, and other Members of the House who are interested in this proposal, and I trust it will be possible to bring about the enactment of House Joint Resolution 77.

With kind regards,

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. GREEN, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

LIST OF GOVERNORS WHO HAVE APPROVED ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL FREEDOM DAY

Gov. Chauncey Sparks, Alabama; Gov. Earl Warren, California; Gov. John C. Vivian, Connecticut; Gov. Walter W. Bacon, Delaware; Gov. Dwight H. Green, Illinois; Gov. Ralph F. Gates, Indiana; Gov. Robert D. Blue, Iowa; Gov. Jimmie H. Davis, Louisiana; Gov. Horace Hildreth, Maine, Gov. Herbert R. O'Conor, Maryland; Gov. M. Q. Sharpe, South Dakota; Gov. Jim McCord, Tennessee; Gov. Mortimer R. Proctor, Vermont; Gov Edward Martin, Pennsylvania; Gov. Raymond E. Baldwin, Connecticut; Gov. William M. Tuck, Virginia; Gov. Clarence W. Meadows, West Virginia; Gov. Lester C. Hunt, Wyoming; Gov. Maurice J. Tobin, Massachusetts; Gov. Harry F. Kelly, Michigan; Gov. Phil M. Donnelly, Missouri; Gov. Sam C. Ford, Montana; Gov. Dwight Griswold, Nebraska; Gov. Charles M. Dale, New Hampshire; Gov. Walter S. Edge, New Jersey; Gov. John J. Dempsey, New Mexico; Gov. Frank J. Lausche, Ohio: Gov. Earl Snell, Oregon; Gov. John O. Pastore, Rhode Island; Gov. Ellis Arnall, Georgia.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Maj. R. R. WRIGHT, Sr.,
President, Citizens Committee,
Citizens and Southern Bank and Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR MAJOR WRIGHT: Reference is made to your letter relative to the joint resolution introduced in Congress by Representative WILLIAM A. BARRETT to make February 1 the anniversary of the passage and signing of the thirteenth amendment by President Lincoln National Freedom Day.

It is quite natural and appropriate at a time like this, when our boys are giving of themselves so unselfishly in order that all men and women may walk the earth as free people, for us to dedicate by definite act our belief in the high and lofty principles of freedom. I think I understand in some small degree what this occasion means to you and your race, its significance, and what it commemorates. Americans everywhere are more conscious than ever of what liberty implies to the average man.

National Freedom Day could serve a real purpose by focusing the attention of all the people on the advantages of freedom and the imperative need of vigilance if our liberties are to be protected from attack, either directly or by subtle means.

Your interest in bringing this matter to my attention is appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

SAMUEL K. MCCONNELL, Jr.

Mr. Speaker, the Post Office Department has issued the thirteenth amendment stamp in recognition of this day, the design for which was selected by that great humanitarian, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

The outstanding proponent of this National Freedom Day is Maj. R. R. Wright, Sr., president of the Citizens Committee for a National Freedom Day. Major Wright, a most striking personality, has been a leader and a great credit to the Negro people. The Morning News, of Savannah, on March 27, 1945, had a synopsis of the April 1945 Reader's Digest condensation of an article from the Progressive. The biographical sketch of this enterprising 90-year-old man which appeared in the Reader's Digest reads as follows:

"MASSA, TELL 'EM WE'RE RISING"

(Condensed from the Progressive)

(By Webb Waldron)

THE EXTRAORDINARY CAREER OF RICHARD R. WRIGHT, BORN A SLAVE, AND NOW LEADING NEGRO BANKER OF THE UNITED STATES

When Richard Robert Wright had taught school for 50 years he decided to quit. Born a slave, he had risen to be president of a Negro college in the South, a distinguished member of his race. Now he thought he'd better give younger teachers a chance. But Wright was only retiring from teaching, not from life.

"For years I had been telling my graduates to get into business," he says. "But they would come back and tell me there were too many handicaps for a Negro. I realized that the worst handicap was a firm belief among both whites and Negroes that the Negro hadn't any head for business. I thought it was up to me to disprove it."

So at 66 Wright became a banker. That was in 1921. Today at 90, a trim, vigorous man with fine-cut features, white hair, and sharp dark eyes, Wright is the leading Negro banker of the United States, president of the Citizens & Southern Bank & Trust Co., of Philadelphia. He thinks that his best years are still ahead.

Every working day from 8:30 to 6 o'clock Wright sits in his small, crowded office, busy with telephone, correspondence, Negro and white callers discussing loans and payments, the affairs of his race.

To get the full drama of this man's accomplishments, glance back to the day more than 80 years ago when news of Negro freedom came to a south Georgia plantation. Harriet, Dick Wright's mother, went to her mistress. "Are we really free?" she said fearfully. Reassured, she gathered up her children and wandered, afoot, 200 miles northward. After many months, near Atlanta, she found a school that had been opened to teach Negro children to read and write. Dick, then aged 11, entered at once.

One day the head of the Freedmen's Bureau, Gen. O. O. Howard, visited the school. "What message shall I take from you children to the people in the North who are helping you?" he asked. A boy rose in the back row. "Massa, tell 'em we're rising!"

That striking answer of little Dick Wright reached the ears of John Greenleaf Whittier, fighter for human liberty, and Whittier immortalized the phrase in his poem, Howard at Atlanta. Thousands of times the words of Dick Wright have been repeated in lectures, sermons, and songs. They became the slogan of a rising race.

Dick Wright pushed on through school, finally graduated from Atlanta University. Then he started a school of his own for Negro children, tuition 50 cents a month. One day a mother came with 25 cents—one "ition," she said, half the money for her little girl's first month's schooling. Soon she brought in the other 25, making it "tuition."

When Dick Wright was appointed first president of Georgia State College for Negroes, Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes sent him a message: "Man, you're not rising, you're risen!" Wright was president of that college for 30 years, fighting for the right of Negro boys and girls to an education not only in handicrafts and farming, but in science, languages, and the arts.

Then came the decision to start a bank. In his teaching days Wright had organized a national Negro teachers' association. Now he wrote several hundred Negro teachers all over the United States, asking whether they'd like to buy shares in a new bank to be owned and run by Negroes. Entirely on his name he raised $156,250. Then he visited various cities to determine where to locate the bank. Finally he fixed on Philadelphia. To a man, the leading bankers of Philadelphia advised him against it. There were enough banks in Philadelphia, they assured him, and besides he didn't know anything about banking. "That just made me determined to go ahead," says Wright.

He had three grown sons, all college graduates, and he persuaded the youngest, Emanuel, to join him in the banking adventure. Father and son enrolled in a course in banking at the University of Pennsylvania. Meanwhile, Wright bought and remodeled an old building in a section of Philadelphia that was predominantly Negro.

The Citizens and Southern opened with $125,000 capital and 300 Negro stockholders. From the start Wright used his bank as a means of creating better relations between white and colored people. For instance, the streets in that area were unpaved. Wright got up a petition to the city fathers which was signed by hundreds of people, black and white. Ultimately the district got everything it asked for, pavements, street lights, traffic lights. "That bank is the best thing that ever came into this part of town," said a white shopkeeper.

Wright promotes thrift among the people of his district, colored and white. "The Negro is often said to be thriftless and unreliable," he says, "but as a banker I have never been able to see any difference between white and Negro. There are thrifty and thriftless people among them both in about the same proportions."

He encourages individual initiative by lending money to ambitious youngsters. One time four young white men came to ask his advice about starting a hat factory. "I looked them over. They had saved about $400," he says. "I told them when they had their plans ready to come back and tell me what they needed. Ultimately I lent those boys $10,000. They made good, and paid back every cent of it."

Another man who wanted to start a sweater factory looked all over the city for credit before he came to Wright. "I thought he had character," Wright told me. "Character is more important than collateral. So I lent him $300 to get started. Last year that man banked $219,000 with us."

Dozens of small Negro enterprises in Philadelphia, such as laundries, dry cleaning establishments, groceries, bakeries, and schools, have got started or survived crises by the help of Wright's bank.

"Of course, there are handicaps for the Negro in business," Wright said, "but I always say to a young man starting out, 'Don't have a chip on your shoulder, don't be aggressive. Go ahead straightforwardly as if you expected to be treated like anybody else, and you usually will be. Your ability and honesty will do more to put you ahead than your color will hold you back.

"In the South it's different," he told me. "But the South today is going ahead more rapidly than the North in tolerance and fair play for the Negro. I predicted 25 years ago that this would be true, and it is."

The president of a large downtown Philadelphia bank, after telling me that he'd be proud to walk up Broad Street with Wright because he admired him so much as a man, added hesitantly, "But I don't think he's hardboiled enough to be a good banker. Why the other day the Major"—everybody

calls Wright "Major" because he was a paymaster with that rank in the Spanish-American War—"the Major came in here asking my advice about making a certain loan. 'Major,' I said, 'you'd be crazy to make such a loan. That man hasn't got anything!' "

I repeated this remark to Wright. "Well," he said, "maybe I'll make that loan anyway. I think the man has character."

A member of Wright's board of directors told me that sometimes when the board has turned down a loan Wright goes ahead anyway.

"Of course," the Major commented, "every bank in the world gets fooled on borrowers and loses money, but it's a curious thing that on those loans we've never lost a cent."

One time a group of Negro professional men formed a corporation, borrowed money from Wright's bank, hired a manager, and started a laundry. It looked like a sure thing. But the management was bad, and the business failed. Since it was a corporation, no individual was liable for the debt. Yet the incorporators raked up all available assets and repaid the bank in full. "I failed to make sure the company had good management," Wright says. "But my estimate of the character of those men was right."

Loans to churches are often considered by banks in the nature of charity. Wright's bank has loaned money to over 100 Negro churches in and around Philadelphia, and every obligation has been met.

Recently he called in 20 white businessmen who had banked with him for years and asked if they had any kicks or suggestions. "Yes, I have a kick," one of them said. "Why did you ask only white men here today? The next time get some Negro businessmen, too. We're all dealing with you together." Wright's ceaseless efforts to break down barriers between the races in a business way has had its effect.

In the 1933 banking crises, the Citizens & Southern was one of the first Philadelphia banks to reopen. "Some of those big downtown banks whose presidents had advised me to stay out of banking," said the Major with a humorous squint, "didn't reopen at all."

Today the bank's $125 shares are worth $143 in open market. The bank has some 10,000 Negro depositors, 1,000 white depositors. Total deposits are $2,312,000. A small bank for a big town, perhaps, but a big bank in its implications for the Negro people. Today the United States has 11 Negro banks. The other 10 are in the South.

On the wall of Wright's office is a photograph of the first meeting of the National Negro Bankers Association, which Wright organized. Here is a picture of the airplane that Wright bought in 1939 and sent, with a Negro crew, on a good-will flight to Haiti and then on a trip around the Negro colleges in the South. That trip did much to promote the enlistment of Negro youth in our air forces.

And here is a picture of this year's celebration of National Freedom Day, the day on which President Lincoln signed the joint resolution of Congress proposing the thirteenth amendment, and thus insured the legal end of slavery. The major originated the idea of celebrating this day—February 1—and already it is observed in many States. As he and his associates conceive it, National Freedom Day is not only a celebration of Negro freedom but a day to challenge bondage everywhere, to assert the right to freedom of all men.

So, "Tell them we are rising" has a constantly widening meaning as the major repeats it.

Mr. Speaker, the Morning News of Savannah also stated that as president of Georgia State College, Professor Wright was esteemed by all the white people who knew him, which is also true in Philadelphia.

Our late President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, was the first sponsor of this bill, and at that time Mr. Truman joined heartily in the request that the President proclaim February 1 as a National Freedom Day.

It is interesting to note that President Truman on December 28, 1945, signed Public Law 290, calling for public observance of January 5, 1946, in honor of George Washington Carver, the noted Negro scientist. The President's proclamation also calls for the display of flags on all Government buildings in commemoration of the scientist's achievements.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be the author and sponsor of this bill and to be included in the list of Members of Congress who have already given written and verbal support to this proposed annual National Freedom Day.

A Book That Should Be Published

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, there is a manuscript of a book which sets forth the full story of the machinations of the I. G. Farben Industry of Germany as an integral part of the Hitler war machine which up to date has not been published.

This book was written by Howard W. Ambruster, of Westfield, N. J., a man who has spent a great part of his life collecting the facts about the operations of this and other great cartels. Publisher after publisher has praised this book in the highest of terms, tentatively agreed to publish it, and then for reasons never clearly set forth, decided to reject it. This has happened so many times as to make no conclusion possible excepting that it is due to extreme pressure from the powerful interests associated with this huge cartel and to the likelihood that these interests would press suits against the publisher, using some of the great resources at their command for this purpose.

Over and over it has been stated by people competent to judge that the material contained in this book is not subject to suit for libel, but there is apparently fear that although the suits would ultimately be won by the publishing houses, the pressure against publication has so far been sufficiently strong to prevent any publisher from giving this information to the American people.

I am placing these remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD primarily because of my faith in the publishers of America and my belief that the time cannot be far distant when one of them at least will be courageous enough to publish this book. My interest in the matter is naturally not one of concern over what happens to Mr. Ambruster's manuscript, but rather with the importance of an adequate exposition of the operation of cartels, particularly the grandfather of all cartels, namely the one presided over by I. G. Farben and still a powerful factor in world industry and politics.

To indicate some of the opinions expressed by publishing house editors about the book, I quote directly here from a number of their reports. Each of the following reports is from a different publishing house and all of them are substantial companies well known throughout America.

Is full of dynamite. The author names names—and some of the names are in very high places indeed. The material appears to be well documented and I found it absorbing reading.

It is an absorbing and important story that deserves an early and widespread publication. * * * A tremendous contribution to peace for America and security for the ordinary man in the world.

Astounding revelations of the activities of I. G. Farben * * * a book that should be read and pondered by every intelligent American today who has made up his mind that the mistakes of the past quarter of a century should not be repeated.

Ambruster has done a magnificent job of uncovering the very important facts which have made the book possible.

The book contains a bombshell the detonation of which may help to prevent World War III.

All agreed that the material is significant and that Mr. Ambruster's contribution is an extremely valuable one.

One publishing house went even further and wrote to Mr. Ambruster the following letter concerning publication of the book:

This will say "thank you" for your thoughtful and courteous letter of November 8. We, too, are delighted that everything is working out so well in connection with the forthcoming publication of Hitler's Tar Baby. There are a few things to be decided and then we will be in a position to determine the month of publication. We fully appreciate your reasons for wanting the book published as early as possible. Bearing that in mind, but more important, thinking of the best interests of the book, we will arrange a time of publication which will enable the book to have every help in getting properly started.

However, the considerations which no doubt influence the publishers against putting out the book are summed up in part of a letter written by attorneys for one of the publishers.

The reason you have had so many rejections on this book and the reason why we ourselves do not want to publish it has nothing to do with our feeling about the veracity of the facts involved. My own hunch is that everything that Ambruster has written is probably true, but it is equally apparent that there would be not one but a number of expensive lawsuits involved and that the cost of publishing the book would be far beyond any profits which might accrue from that publication. I don't mean by that that I think the suits would be lost; I merely mean that our lawyers' fees in defending those suits would run to staggering sums. Some day I hope our court system will be changed so that an unsuccessful plaintiff has to pay the defendant's legal fees; that would make the publication of a book like Ambruster's a practical undertaking.

At this point I should like to insert the full text of two letters written to Mr. Ambruster by Amos S. Basel and Nathan Frankel, both of them competent attorneys who had examined the book with care in order to determine whether or not any of the material therein was libelous. A considerable number of other letters of similar import are available and could be submitted as well.

DEAR MR. AMBRUSTER: I have read your book, Treason's Peace, for libel. I have examined the documentation upon which the facts therein stated are based. In my opinion, the book is entirely free from any libelous statements and could be published immediately without any fear whatsoever on the part of anyone connected with its publication that an action for libel could be sustained.

I might add that I represent a stockholders' committee of the Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), which committee was formed for the express purpose of fighting the management's cartel policy. In connection with said work, I have had I. G. Farben upon American industry and I can authoritatively state that your book is a truthful and accurate picture of the operations of Farben and its American affiliates.

In the event any publisher who is interested in your manuscript wishes any further information from me regarding my opinion in this matter, please don't have him hesitate to call upon me at any time.

Sincerely,

AMOS S. BASEL.

DEAR MR. AMBRUSTER: The question you have asked me, whether the publication in book form of your manuscript concerning I. G. Farben and other cartels would or would not be followed by a suit for libel by persons unfavorably mentioned, may be answered simply.

The episodes recited in your study are obviously based on facts brought to light during hearings of legislative committees or in reports of official bodies made matters of public record and available generally. The copy which I had the privilege and pleasure of reading was annotated with marginal notations in pencil, indicating next to each statement alleged as a fact the particular source. I understand that at your home you have on hand, available for anyone's inspection, all the documents constituting the source from which you have pieced together the whole story. I assume that in no case has it been necessary for you to go beyond the documented facts. Some of the facts I recall having myself read in the public press and elsewhere.

Under the circumstances, the publication of such material, if it constitutes a fair transcript of the report of a legislative, executive, or judicial body, is deemed privileged in this jurisdiction, and immune from attack as a libel in a civil suit for damages, regardless of the truth or falsity of particular allegations made during the course of the hearing or report.

Any prospective publisher of your manuscript could assure himself against the successful outcome of a possible action in libel by having his attorney simply check the references you have supplied. In border-line statements, where he might be in doubt as to whether they constitute a fair comment or transcript of the public proceeding, the doubt might be resolved by a change in terminology.

My best wishes for the early publication of your valuable work.

Sincerely,

NATHAN FRANKEL.

I wish also to quote from the body of a letter written by Mr. T. H. Tetens, author of the book called Know Your Enemy. Tetens is a distinguished anti-Nazi German scholar who escaped from Germany after a number of arrests by the Nazis, and is now director of the library on Germanic and related problems at Columbia University:

As I told you repeatedly, I am of the opinion that Mr. Ambruster's book about the I. G. Farben octopus in the United States should under any circumstances be published and widely distributed in the United States. The Allied efforts to destroy the industrial apparatus of the I. G. Farben in Germany do not solve the problem with which Mr. Ambruster deals in his book. What Professor Foerster said years ago about pan-Germanism holds good for this book—we have to defeat them militarily on the battlefields of Europe and politically in the United States.

Provided that the most important plants of the I. G. Farben octopus in Germany are destroyed or transferred to Russia or other European countries as reparations, nevertheless the powerful world-wide octopus of the I. G. Farben is still in existence. This is exactly what Mr. Ambruster says in his book, by proving how the I. G. Farben resumed their dangerous economic and political activities after the First World War. We know today that the I. G. Farben agents, the "synthetic American citizens," as Ambruster calls them, are more firmly entrenched in the United States than ever before. In addition to that, long before the military collapse the I. G. Farben center in Germany transferred its best experts, its formulas, assets, and all its political and economic secret plans to Spain and Argentina. This development is the more dangerous because there are only a very few persons who are able to look behind this smoke screen.

There is no doubt that the I. G. Farben stooges in the United States are the chief backers of the anti-Russian, anti-British, and pro-German propaganda in this country. Mr. Ambruster should stress this point more emphatically than he does in his manuscript.

I here repeat the suggestions which I made during our conference:

1. The introducing chapter should be extended and should show the black records of the world-wide I. G. Farben conspiracy. The thesis is that this I. G. Farben plot in favor of pan-Germanism could not have been so complete without the tremendous economic and political support of the I. G. Farben influence in the United States.

2. The following chapters should show the record of the I. G. Farben machinations in the United States. These chapters of the manuscript need hardly any changes. They deal with the I. G. Farben record during the First World War and with their maneuver under the leadership of Herman Metz to get their assets back during the twenties.

3. The third part of the book should show the extensive political and economic corruption of the I. G. Farben in the United States. These chapters are a main part of Mr. Ambruster's present manuscript. On some places I think it should be somewhat shortened, and lengthy documents should be taken out and form part of the appendix.

4. The concluding chapter should wind up with an accusation of the I. G. Farben promoters in the United States and with an effective warning to the American public not to overlook the inevitable third plot of the I. G. Farben octopus and pan-Germanism.

The book should be published as soon as possible. I am convinced that it could serve as an important weapon in our fight as long as the vital economic and political problems have not yet been settled. I have no doubt that this book will exercise decisive influence on American public opinion. Makers of public opinion, such as journalists and commentators, will be strengthened and uplifted by the facts presented in Mr. Ambruster's book. They will understand why certain American monopolists and their agents are so eager today to revive Germany's industry.

The publication of this book would be an effective political action, and you would have done a grand job.

Sincerely yours,

T. H. TETENS.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated earlier, it is my confident belief that the day will come when the material contained in this manuscript will be made available to the American people. It will be a monument to the courage of some publishing house when this happens. It is evident from the material which I have included, even in this brief extension of remarks, that the book is not libelous, that it is of great value as a source of information, and that only threats and attempted intimidation have so far caused it not to be published. For such a situation to continue indefinitely would be a sad commentary on freedom of speech and the press in the United States.

Good-Neighbor Policy in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1946

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the consideration of the Members of the House a copy of a letter received from a United States soldier in Korea.

It tells a sordid story, and is another link in the long chain of evidence that the good-neighbor policy of the administration has failed in its objectives. However, for some reason unknown to most of us, we continue wasting good American dollars and materials.

The letter follows:

KOREA, *January 2.*

DEAR SIR: The article you enclosed with your recent letter concerning the meeting at Moscow, and the reactions of the Koreans to such, exposes some of the mistakes and farces of our leaders very mildly. One could spend a lifetime itemizing similar cases and much worse ones after being in the service and overseas for a time.

This very day the Government is spending millions of dollars building roads, airfields, petroleum storage, pipe lines, buildings, streets and sidewalks, and all sorts of nonmentionables right here in Korea which will all be outright gifts to a people who don't even care for them and the modern living of our Western World. That is not to speak of the lives and years of many of the servicemen's wasted years. At the very same time we find crowds, mobs, and numerous political factions carrying on demonstrations in the street with banners reading Independence or Death.

Meanwhile, a goodly number of GI's have been knifed, beaten to death, and the rest are all confined to their billets by a curfew, by 8 o'clock in the evening after working all day on the afore-mentioned comforts, under constant danger of being knifed or stoned by independence-seeking Koreans.

That is the story after we were greeted with "Welcome" signs and "Americans—Angels of Peace." Next they unloaded old stocks of junk for souvenir-seeking Yanks at ridiculously high prices. By this time they may have run out of stock and have plenty of yen baled from profits realized from black

marketing of our Government merchandise sent over here for "our dear boys."

Some day we liberators of the world will get everyone liberated, but only to return to our own great land to find it and our wealth well spent away, dissipated and scattered all over the face of the globe.

Right now I have but one ambition and that is to get out of here. I hope to leave here and any time now either on points or my 4 years' service. Of course many men with as little as a year's service have gone home. They are the ones who were "unfortunate" and couldn't get in the service, they were married, they had children, or worked long hours in war plants at time and a half and double time thus assuming great responsibilities. We, who are single, apparently have no responsibility and have plenty of time for our future. That is just a vague picture of what we have fought for not to speak of what we are going back to.

We have had snow on the ground for quite some time and it is flying quite thick now. The winds are much stronger and much colder and damper than we have in West Virginia. They seem to originate in Manchuria and have a terrific cutting power.

I hope to return and see you soon.

Sincerely.

Columbia Valley Authority—Rebuttal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 23, 1946

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles by Robert W. Sawyer and Richard L. Neuberger from the Sunday Oregonian of December 23, 1945:

CVA—REBUTTAL

AGAINST

(By Robert W. Sawyer, publisher, Bend Bulletin)

The differences between Captain Neuberger and me in the matter of the Valley Authority issue are best explained, I think, by saying that in his affirmative statement he discussed an idea, while I, for the negative, considered the manner in which it was proposed to put that idea into execution. He, that is, wrote in large and general terms about the TVA and the applicability of the TVA idea to the Columbia Valley. I considered the question of TVA's success and, in particular, examined Senator MITCHELL'S CVA bill (S. 460), which has been widely endorsed by Valley Authority advocates.

The Neuberger approach is, perhaps, the proper one to use if you are too hurried to get down to brass tacks. In this debate, however, when we have before us, as Secretary Ickes has said, "a major step in the basic reorganization of the Government of the United States as we have known it for the last 150 years," it seems to me that we must discuss the fundamentals as they are presented in the bill by which it is proposed to effect that basic reorganization. Hence my concern over what is to be found in S. 460.

Captain Neuberger, I have noted, does not mention the Mitchell bill. He does refer, however, to "the Mitchell-Jackson bill" and there he has me. Jackson is a fresh name in the Valley Authority argument. Does its introduction mean that something new is to be added of which my worthy adversary has advance knowledge?

Mitchell bill escapes mention, publisher avers

Captain Neuberger, I repeat, does not mention the Mitchell bill, S. 460. As a matter of fact, I doubt that he has even read it. The general evidence to that effect appears in his constant reference to the Columbia Valley, the resources of the Columbia River, and so on, and his complete failure either to mention the other Oregon and Washington rivers covered by the Mitchell bill or to offer justification for their inclusion.

Particular evidence is found in his statement that "the three directors of CVA could make a decision * * * without having to report to any Cabinet officer." "They would be responsible," he continues, "to the President and Congress. No Cabinet officer could stand between CVA and the elected representatives of the people." Certainly, Captain Neuberger would not have made that statement had he read S. 460 and noted section 6 (a) thereof, which provides: "All the powers of the (CVA) corporation shall be exercised by the board of directors subject to the powers of the National River Basin Development Board. * * *" In section 5 (a) appears the provision that "the Secretary of the Interior shall act as Chairman of the National River Basin Development Board." In the face of those provisions how would the CVA directors bypass the Secretary of the Interior? The Secretary of Agriculture, by the way, is also a member of that Board, and the Secretary of War is represented on it by the Chief of Engineers of the War Department.

Captain Neuberger's flair for the dramatic appears in the opening paragraphs of his article in which he tells us that in spite of a near 30-year crusade "for the Federal development of the vast resources of the Columbia River" nothing has happened until President Roosevelt entered the White House "pledged to the systematic and orderly improvement of America's great river valleys."

"During those decades," Captain Neuberger says, "leading citizens of the Northwest tried to work through such old-line Government agencies as the War Department and the Department of the Interior for the construction of dams at Bonneville and Grand Coulee. But not an ounce of concrete was poured, not a single rivet driven home. The old-line agencies, competent though they were, failed utterly to put over the projects."

Agencies get appropriations by act of Congress

In those sentences that I have just quoted, Captain Neuberger gives his readers the impression that it was the duty or the responsibility of "the old-line agencies to put over" construction projects and that they are to be blamed for failure to do so. I regret the need of taking space to set out the facts.

The facts are, of course, that the "old-line agencies" have no such responsibility. Their duties have always been and still are, obedient to the direction of Congress and through the bureaus and agencies they control, to investigate, and report. Then, when authorized by Congress and furnished by it with the necessary appropriations, they have the further duty to build.

The Portland Chamber of Commerce, for which Captain Neuberger has so slight regard, was the organization that sought the construction of the Bonneville Dam. The Spokane chamber led the effort to bring about Grand Coulee. In each there was involved, were the construction work to go forward, the expenditure of public funds. Those "old-line agencies" had none. Funds, in ordinary course, Congress would have provided. Congress required, however, in these as in other projects, the background of investigation and report.

It is true, as Captain Neuberger asserts, that "countless reports were written." It is fortunate that they were. It is fortunate that the chambers of commerce pressed for the studies and investigations that were back of the writing of those reports, for had they not done so, had not the reports been written, the construction ordered by President Roosevelt would have languished while the material of the reports was being assembled. But it is not true, as implied by the captain, that only the accession of Mr. Roosevelt to the Presidency brought about the dam construction.

It was the existence of a tremendous business depression, the surrender by Congress of its authority and control over expenditures and its handing its power to the Chief Executive that gave the President the opportunity to start the work. The Neuberger argument is for the continued abdication by Congress, even in normal times, and the grant to others of its hitherto accepted function of examination into and appropriation for specific projects. That would be a long step toward totalitarianism. Remember, please, that while Captain Neuberger is writing only about the Columbia Valley, Secretary Ickes has told a Senate committee that Congress will not do less for one river valley than another.

"Are we to leave the future development of our region to political caprice?" asks Captain Neuberger, suggesting that only through the establishment of "a permanent, continuing regional board with authority and responsibility to develop all the resources of the Columbia River Valley on a coordinated basis" will such a condition be avoided. Well, I venture to urge that there is no magic in a three-man board that will prevent decisions on the basis of political caprice. It was political caprice that, at times, guided President Roosevelt. The Nation will not avoid such caprice by creating valley authorities. There is bound to be what may be called politics and caprice in any Government agency. Most Americans, I believe, if they think the thing through, would rather deal with it in Congress than anywhere else.

Congress held essential in our country

Yes, Congress is slow. Yes, Congress is ponderous. Yes, Congress at times seems inefficient. Yes, Congress is unbusinesslike. Yes, Congress is subject to regional and special interest and to political pressure. Nevertheless, Congress is a representative body. It is responsible to the electorate. It is always on trial. Through its committee procedure and its annual study of appropriations it is constantly examining the affairs of the country and the needs of the people. It is and should remain the national authority.

To confute the charge that a valley authority would endanger the rights of the States, Captain Neuberger cites the statements of governors of Tennessee Valley States collected by a St. Louis newspaper. Let us agree that no rights of any of these States have been affected by the TVA. Our question is whether the legislation proposed for the Columbia Valley region would affect rights now enjoyed by and in the States of the Northwest. One has only to examine western water law in comparison with that of the Tennessee Valley to find his answer. If he would seek further let him ask the port commissions, the highway commission, the State engineer, the county courts whether the Mitchell bill proposes encroachments on State rights.

Instead of quoting these Tennessee Valley Governors, Captain Neuberger should observe what Senator O'Mahoney, of Wyoming; Representatives Case, of South Dakota; Lemke, of North Dakota; D'Ewart, of Montana; and Governors Vivian, of Colorado; Ford, of Montana; and Sharp, of South Dakota, said about States' rights and valley authorities in the hearings on the Missouri Valley Authority bill (S. 555), similar in many respects to the Mitchell bill.

Captain Neuberger quotes the late Ben T. Osborne in support of a Columbia Valley Authority modeled after the TVA. The statements quoted were made by the labor leader in the course of an appearance before the Pacific Northwest Regional Planning Commission. I am glad the captain introduced this matter. He thereby gives me the opportunity to point out that that planning commission, consisting of Marshall N. Dana and Ormond R. Bean, of Oregon; J. S. James, of Montana; B. H. Kizer, of Washington; and Will Simons, of Idaho, doubted "the wisdom of proposing a Columbia Valley Authority with duties duplicating the TVA." "Duplication of TVA not advisable in Pacific Northwest," is the subhead over a section of the commission's report. With all due regard to Ben Osborne, I suggest that the commission's views, as set forth in this report, are those to which deference should be paid.

I am glad, too, of this statement by Captain Neuberger, "A few years ago the old United States Biological Survey was consolidated into the Fish and Wildlife Service along with many other agencies." The assertion is made to show how easily Federal agencies can be combined, as they would be in a CVA, and continue to function efficiently. Now, there were only two, rather than "many," agencies involved in that consolidation—the Biological Survey and the Bureau of Fisheries—and the present head of the new agency has insisted that it be left out of any authority consolidation. Under the Mitchell bill it would be taken over by the Authority. That head of the Fish and Wildlife Service, by the way, is an Oregonian, Ira N. Gabrielson.

Captain Neuberger writes of the "whole galaxy of Government agencies" that operate in the Columbia Valley, and asserts there is no coordinating point. "Would you run a hotel," he asks, "with one kitchen for salads, another for soups, still another kitchen for meat orders, and so on?" The figure is an unfortunate one for a valley authority advocate to use, for while it is true that you would not run a hotel with numerous kitchens, it is the fact that hotels and restaurants have single kitchens that are staffed with cooks charged with various independent duties. Such is the case today in the Columbia Valley kitchen, and nobody has pointed to any lack of coordination.

Lilienthal quoted on remarks about TVA project

"We are told," says the captain, "that because of the difference in acreage (between the TVA and the CVA) we of the Northwest cannot have a regional authority." "This," he continues, "is nonsense." No one, I think, has said that we cannot have an authority in the Northwest. Chairman Lilienthal, of the TVA has said, however, that "regions should not be so large that they are not, in a management sense, of workable size." He has also said, in effect, that substantial additions to TVA's present 81,000 square miles would impair its effectiveness. The proposed CVA, you will remember, contains 279,000 square miles. This, on Mr. Lilienthal's testimony, would be too large, and thus it develops that on this point of the too-great size of the CVA, Captain Neuberger's argument is not with the chambers of commerce or the power companies, but with the head of the TVA.

I quote again from the Neuberger argument in support of the CVA: "During the immediate prewar years," he writes, "retail sales for the whole country climbed 54 percent, in the Tennessee Valley 67 percent. The income of the entire country went up 29 percent, in the Tennessee Valley 39 percent. Wages for the whole country increased 46 percent, in the Tennessee Valley 56 percent. Yet we of the Pacific Northwest now hear the propaganda that an agency like the TVA would be a bad thing for the Columbia River Valley." I cannot follow the argument. There is no meaning for the Pacific Northwest in the fact that retail sales, income and wages in the Tennessee Valley were higher than "in the whole country." The figures for the Pacific Northwest are the ones that concern us. What were they? Whatever they were the figures for the Tennessee Valley are easily explained. They were the result of the spending by the TVA of hundreds of millions of dollars. And the widespread approval of TVA, said to exist in that region is based, without doubt in large part, on the synthetic prosperity resulting from that spending.

Journal does not offer full approval

Captain Neuberger asks if we in the Northwest shall discard "the outstanding example of the TVA" or "coordinate the development of the * * * resources of the Columbia Valley in a single, integrated agency?" and he then says that "The Wall Street Journal, organ of business, can set us right on the subject." This assertion he follows with a quotation from the Journal and he would have the reader conclude, from the quotation, that that paper approves the TVA. "The proposal for TVA's in every important watershed in the country has a logical foundation," he quotes, and continues from the Journal, "If TVA has been a good thing for the Tennessee River region, it should be a good thing for every other river region."

By failing to follow that statement with the phrase "in which conditions are the same," the Journal departs from its usual logical accuracy. In using it as evidence of the Journal's acceptance of the TVA, Captain Neuberger fails to note that the paper uses the word "if." "If TVA has been a good thing," says the Journal and then follows with a sentence that the captain does not quote, "How good TVA has been for the region it occupies might be debated. * * *" In other words, the Wall Street Journal by no means has concluded that "TVA has been a good thing."

And since that organ of business has been mentioned, let me offer its opinion on the TVA electric rates as providing "a true yardstick" for measuring reasonable service rates. "The TVA yardstick," says the Journal, "isn't made even of a good synthetic rubber, but of a special nonhardening plastic."

Throughout Captain Neuberger's argument he speaks disparagingly, if not with scorn, of chambers of commerce and private power utilities. The fact that such organizations and business interests oppose a Columbia Valley authority is sufficient in his mind to damn them and to prove the authority idea to be sound.

There are honest men who believe in private power, in private enterprise, who support and work through chambers of commerce for pay rolls and for general community development and prosperity. There are men of integrity who see in the valley authority proposals an unwise, an unnecessary, even an unconstitutional extension of Federal control. They see in them an abrogation of the powers of Congress and a piecemeal destruction of representative government.

I invite Captain Neuberger to believe that not all who hold to ideas contrary to his are unworthy citizens and businessmen.

I invite him, so that this valley-authority question may receive the national attention that it deserves, to seek an authority in every valley region in the country, preferably under one general legislative act. Thus there will be developed a Nation-wide debate.

If the idea has been proved good it should be made effective at one time all over the United States.

CVA—REBUTTAL

FOR

(By Richard L. Neuberger, Portland author)

The argument over the proposed Columbia Valley Authority resolves itself down to a fundamental question: Do we want our region developed on a unified basis for the benefit of all the people or should we trust to a piecemeal, uncoordinated administration of the resources of the Columbia River watershed?

Whether he realizes it or not, Robert W. Sawyer's protests against a Columbia Valley Authority follow almost word for word the criticisms directed against Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams by eastern financial interests and their sympathizers in Congress.

Mr. Sawyer believes that the Tennessee Valley Authority has been a failure. Thus he is opposed to extension of the TVA idea to our own region. He claims the TVA does not pay taxes. He claims TVA is subsidized by the taxpayers. He claims TVA is guilty of false bookkeeping.

These are identically the same charges that have been voiced year after year on the floor of Congress in an effort to block further appropriations for Grand Coulee Dam and the Bonneville Power Administration.

Mr. Sawyer quotes approvingly the attacks made against the TVA by Representative ANDREW J. MAY of Kentucky. Does Mr. Sawyer know that this same Representative MAY is also opposed to the Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams? Does Mr. Sawyer approve of his stand in this respect, too?

Mr. Sawyer's criticism of the TVA follows nearly to the letter, word for word and comma for comma, the denunciations made of Bonneville and Grand Coulee by many Congressmen from the Eastern States. One can reasonably wonder whether the opponents of a Columbia Valley authority actually believe in developing our region at all.

Neuberger declares power should be cheap

Mr. Sawyer makes a point of the fact that the TVA residential rates are not as low as those charged by some private utilities in the Pacific Northwest. This is a wholly misleading claim. Power rates in the Northwest should be cheaper, for electricity can be generated at lower cost in this area of deep rivers and high mountains than in any other place in America. I doubt if Mr. Sawyer would care to offer a more logical comparison—a comparison between the private utilities and the publicly owned plants right here in the Northwest.

Such a comparison would reveal, of course, that the private power companies charge far more for electricity than such public systems as Tacoma, Eugene, Forest Grove, and similar communities.

Mr. Sawyer makes much of the fact that the TVA includes only 81,000 square miles, whereas the Columbia Valley Authority would take in 279,000 square miles. Because of this difference, he concludes, a TVA type of organization would not work in the Northwest. Does Mr. Sawyer realize that such an argument could have been used, for example, to keep the State of Oregon out of the Union?

The State of Connecticut has only 5,009 square miles. Would a State form of government work in Oregon, with 96,981 square miles? Of course, the answer is "Yes." Mr. Sawyer contends that a regional authority would not succeed in the Columbia Valley because it is so much larger than the Tennessee Valley. Why not? With equal logic, one might claim that a State type of government, suitable to tiny Connecticut, would not prove effective in so vast an area as Oregon.

Mr. Sawyer is disturbed because the three directors of the CVA would need only the qualifications of American citizenship and a belief in the act. He neglects to point out that under our democratic form of government, these are the only qualifications necessary for membership in the United States Senate or on the United States Supreme Court. Any citizen can be a Supreme Court Justice. Why should not any citizen be entitled to a directorship of the CVA? That is what democracy means.

Appointments sustained by writer as American custom

Mr. Sawyer is also disturbed because the Directors of the CVA would be appointed by the President of the United States for 9-year terms, subject to Senate approval. One wonders what can possibly be wrong with that. It is a method in the best American tradition. Cabinet members, Federal judges, the Chief of Staff of the United States Army—all receive their posts in this same fashion. If Mr. Sawyer is opposed to this system of selecting the CVA Directors, he is certainly against a time-honored American practice.

Mr. Sawyer claims that a Columbia Valley Authority would take away all present protection of the water rights of irrigationists. This, too, is a false contention. The CVA bill sponsored by Senator MITCHELL and Representative JACKSON conforms almost exactly to the original United States Reclamation Act of 1902. It safeguards amply both existing water rights and State laws for the appropriation of water.

Throughout Mr. Sawyer's argument against CVA runs the word "socialistic." How familiar this ancient charge sounds. When the late President Roosevelt first proposed social security laws we heard that old-age pensions were "socialistic." When Grand Coulee Dam was started the late Representative Culkin, of New York, said it was "socialistic." History books tell us that the first public schools in America were greeted with the charge of "socialistic." Woodrow Wilson's crusade for a graduated income tax was denounced as "socialistic."

Mr. Sawyer also uses the word "totalitarian" with respect to CVA. One is pressed hard, indeed, for logic when he begins to rely on such wild and reckless charges. Does Mr. Sawyer think CVA would be "totalitarian" because it might encourage public ownership of electric power? For years the people of Portland have owned their municipal water system. Does Mr. Sawyer think that is "totalitarian"? What is the fine distinction between water which enters your house via a wire and that which enters via a pipe?

With respect to decentralization of government, Mr. Sawyer both runs with the hare and holds with the hounds. He praises the splendid decentralized administration of the United States Forest Service. Then in the next breath he fulsomely lauds the highly centralized administrative methods of Secretary Ickes, who has been carrying on bureaucratic warfare against the Forest Service for nearly 15 years. The Forest Service and Secretary Ickes have diametrically opposite policies so far as decentralization is concerned, yet Mr. Sawyer blithely indorses both of them. This is a trick-riding feat worthy of Ben Hur or the late Buffalo Bill.

CVA listed as important to region's growth

Mr. Sawyer claims to be in favor of decentralization. He lists Oregon citizens who should control their own destinies. Then in the next paragraph he demands that the resources of the Columbia River be in the hands of the Chief of Engineers and the Director of the Bureau of Reclamation, two officials who are 3,000 miles away in Washington, D. C. How can this square with any faith in decentralization and local control?

If Mr. Sawyer wants local rule, let him come out in favor of a Columbia Valley Authority. CVA headquarters would not be a continent removed from our region. They would be right in the Northwest—in Portland or Spokane or some other Northwest city. That is why all seven governors in the TVA region insist that TVA has not infringed on State's rights; the headquarters of TVA are in the river valley itself. CVA would operate in similar fashion.

Mr. Sawyer attacks the statement made by William L. Chenery, the publisher of Collier's, that TVA pays State and local taxes. Mr. Sawyer wants the TVA to pay more taxes. How does Mr. Sawyer feel regarding other Government agencies in this respect? Does he want the Army engineers to pay Federal taxes on Bonneville Dam, the Bureau of Reclamation to pay Federal taxes on Grand Coulee Dam? Does he want the War Department to pay taxes on Fort Lewis, the Navy to pay taxes on Puget Sound Navy Yard?

Why does Mr. Sawyer single out TVA—and through TVA, the proposed Columbia Valley Authority—for the payment of Federal taxes?

Mr. Sawyer's case against CVA depends strongly on such charges as "socialistic" and "totalitarian." Listen to the words of a Wyoming bank president who went to the Tennessee Valley to investigate for himself the truth of such careless claims. "I do not regard the TVA as a trend toward socialism," the banker reported; "rather it appeals to me as a change in the administrative set-up of a large number of Government bureaus who needed to have their activities tied in together by a decentralized management more familiar with the problems of the region than Washington bureaucrats."

Mr. Sawyer favors the Washington bureaucrats in the War and Interior Departments. I favor a regional authority, the Columbia Valley Authority, with headquarters right on the banks of the Columbia River. And when we hear that a CVA would be "socialistic" and that TVA is subsidized by the taxpayers, I hope we remember that exactly these same claims have been voiced again and again in an effort to block our own Bonneville and Grand Coulee projects.

A Columbia Valley Authority means progress for the Pacific Northwest and prosperity and jobs for all the people.

Steelworkers Need a $2 a Day Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include facts on the present steel strike as presented by Philip Murray, president of the United Steel Workers of America, Steelworkers Need a $2 a Day Increase:

A TRUE HISTORY

Once upon a time there was an industrial giant. So powerful was it that it could hold lesser giants in the palm of its hand.

No tall building could be built; bridge could not span river; boat could not be made to sail the ocean; railroad track and telegraph wire could not bind the earth, unless the giant willed it.

The giant prospered. But while the giant prospered the source of its wealth did not. The truth is that this giant drew its great strength from a million men and women. They formed its girders and spun its cable and cast its metal, but they prospered not. Their tables were bare; their clothing old and worn.

Six of the fattest, most prosperous years the giant had ever known went by. Still the giant hoarded its wealth. And all the smaller giants followed the example of the big giant.

Wealth piled up in the counting-houses, only a trickle went to the people. Food stayed on store shelves, clothes and goods did not move out of the factories. The wheels of industry slowed while the giant and the lesser giants took a vacation.

The great depression came. Men stood on street corners selling apples.

Moral: Undistributed excess profits can glut our economy. When wealth piles up and purchasing power declines, the result is depression.

STEELWORKERS NEED A $2 A DAY INCREASE

The steelworkers have been seeking a wage increase ever since December 1943.

December 1943: The United Steelworkers of America asked the steel companies for a general wage increase.

January 1944: Negotiations broke down.

February 1944: The War Labor Board appointed a panel to find the facts.

August 1944: The panel issued its report to the National War Labor Board.

November 1944: The Board decided to send a report on the wage matter to the President.

February 1945: The Board issued a lengthy factual report to the President.

August 1945: The President changed the National Wage Stabilization policy and returned wage controls almost completely to collective bargaining.

September 1945: The War Labor Board declared that the wage clauses it had provided now permitted a reopening of the wage issue. The union asked the steel companies for a $2-a-day wage increase.

October 1945: Negotiations with the companies broke down after the union spent 2 days presenting its case and the United States Steel Corp. merely handed the union a letter which said "No."

November 1945: Two invitations by the Secretary of Labor to the United States Steel Corp. and the union to confer further with aid of a United States conciliator were accepted by the union and rejected by the corporation.

November 28, 1945: Steelworkers voted 5-1 to strike to back up the wage demand.

December 1945: Unable to get the steel industry to engage in collective bargaining, the union's policy committee voted to call a strike for January 14 at 12:01 a. m.

January 14, 1946: Strike scheduled, more than 2 years after the initial attempt by the union to obtain a wage increase. Volumes of material have been submitted by both parties, volumes of Government reports have been prepared on the issue, no general wage increase has been granted to steelworkers since the increase effective February 1942.

THE STORY

The United Steelworkers of America demand for a $2-a-day wage increase is justified because—

(a) Steelworkers need the increase to enable them to have a standard of living consistent with the minimum requirements of health and decency.

(b) The steel industry can pay the increase and still make greater profits after taxes than in the extremely prosperous war years.

(c) Unless the need of the steelworkers is met and the income of the industry distributed more equitably, America will be plunged into the worst economic collapse of our history.

I. Steelworkers need the increase

The end of the war deflated steelworkers' earnings. Deprived of a single general increase in basic wage rates for 4 years, the steelworkers keenly feel the removal of special wartime factors which had artificially inflated the pay envelope.

As a result, the average wage of steelworkers in 1946, assuming the absence of a wage increase, will command less purchasing power than did the average weekly wage of the steelworker in January 1941. In fact, the real wage (measured in terms of effective purchasing power) will be $4.15 a week less than in 1941, a drop of 12.4 percent. Increased living costs, increased taxes and the discriminatory wartime wage stabilization are responsible for this decline.

(The average weekly pay, based on a return to the scheduled 40-hour week from the wartime 48-hour week, will be $42.70, as compared with $56.32 in April 1945, and $33.60 in January 1941.)

The present 1946 prospect will result in an inadequate standard of living. This conclusion results from examination of wage levels as against standard budget requirements.

The Heller Committee for Research in Social Economics of the University of California develops the most authoritative budget for the average family. That budget shows that $58 a week is required for a minimum standard of health and decency.

The present wage rate of steelworkers will produce average earnings for 1946 which fall $15.76 a week below the $58 requirement. A majority of the workers in the industry receive hourly and weekly wages below the industry average; therefore, the majority will be more than $15.76 below the minimum requirements.

An increase of $2 a day would still leave the average wage of steelworkers $6 a week below the minimum requirement and would leave common labor in the northern steel plants $16.80 below the $50 level.

Thus, it can be seen that steelworkers urgently need the $2 a day increase to provide for their families.

II. The steel industry can pay

Despite abnormal wartime taxes and costs, the high-level wartime operations have demonstrated that the industry can pay the $2 a day wage increase and still prosper. In fact, the assured high level of 1946 operations would result in higher profits than those realized during the war years even after the wage increase.

Here is what happened during the war years:

The steel industry netted $2,000,000,000 in acknowledged and hidden profits, after payment of all taxes. Reported profits totaled $1,225,000,000, or $245,000,000 a year—113 percent more than the $115,000,000 annual average for 1935–39.

Acknowledged profits, before taxes, were 276 percent above the 1935–39 level—$700,000,000 a year on the average as compared with $187,000,000.

Steel profits in 1945, including carry-back gifts from the Government and postwar excess-profits-tax refunds, will have kept pace with or exceeded wartime earnings.

The total assets of the industry increased more than $1,000,000,000, or 22 percent, between 1939 and 1945, from $4,860,000,000 to $5,910,000,000.

Amortization beyond the legal peacetime rate of 5 percent per year totaled about $636,000,000 for the steel industry, thereby concealing an even greater profit-making capacity during a normal amortization period, such as 1946, and thereby resulting in a stronger earning position because of new wholly paid for facilities.

Dividend payments totaled $765,000,000, which exceeds the 1935–39 total of $419,000,000 by 82 percent.

The industry's funded debt decreased 28 percent, from $903,000,000 at the end of 1939 to $652,000,000 at the end of 1944.

Here is what 1946 looks like:

The industry will operate to the full extent of its profitable capacity. Orders will exceed production. A wide variety of sources all agree that during 1946 there will be about 85,000,000 ingot tons of steel production. This will be accomplished without the most obsolete high cost 10 percent of capacity (8,000,000 tons) and with those new facilities which are low-cost in operation (11,500,000 tons). Thus, the obsolete is replaced by the most efficient, new facilities. And much of the latter have been paid off in full by accelerated amortization permitted by congressional wartime tax legislation.

The product mix will be as profitable as in 1944 with ship and carbon plates de-emphasized in favor of the highly profitable flat-rolled and strip-mill products.

The reduction of abnormal wartime labor costs, reductions in Federal income-tax rates, and increased productivity will enable the industry to pay a wage increase of 43 cents an hour:

(a) An average of 10 cents an hour is saved through the return to the 40-hour workweek with the subsequent elimination of overtime payments.

(b) An average of 5 cents an hour will be saved through downgrading (more frugal administration of wage policies, an end to higher than scheduled rates, slowing down of promotions, etc.).

(c) An average of 17 cents an hour will be saved through the elimination of the excess-profits tax and the reduction in the normal corporate income-tax rate.

(d) Increased worker productivity and the replacement of the obsolete with modern low-cost facilities will permit an additional 11 cents an hour.

These savings, incident to change from war to peace, add up to an average of 43 cents an hour per worker.

In addition, if one considers 1944 as the last full year of war production and if 1946 projections are based on comparison with 1944, it is important to note that price increases on some products granted to the industry by OPA during 1945 add profits of $100,000,000 a year, thereby further improving the industry's outlook.

Should the industry, or a company in the industry, only break even in 1945 or 1946, carry-back tax refunds are available, and additional tax refunds are available should an operating loss be incurred during 1945 or succeeding years.

In the light of these circumstances, it is clear that the profit outlook for 1946 looms brightly for the steel industry. Computing all known factors against the commonly accepted production anticipation for 1946 leads to the conclusion that the industry can pay the $2-a-day wage increase and still make profits after taxes of $482,880,000 in 1946. This is $154,065,000 more than the profits for 1944.

III. The increase is essential to national welfare

The profit outlook for the steel industry is so favorable that failure to grant the union's wage demand will seriously endanger our whole economy.

The steel industry sets the pace for wage movement in American industry. If steel wages are frozen or if increases are insufficient, wages generally will fail to rise substantially.

However, profits will rise substantially. It is estimated that corporation profits after taxes for 1946 will be $10,200,000,000 to $11,000,000,000 which exceeds the all-time high of $9,900,000,000 in 1944.

Meanwhile, just as the weekly take-home pay of the steelworker has been drastically cut, so also has the pay check of millions of other workers throughout the Nation. Furthermore, the number of workers employed has been reduced since VJ-day. Others have been downgraded. Shifts from higher-wage to lower-wage industries have been extensive.

Consequently, the 1946 national pay envelope will be $20,000,000,000 less than the pre-VJ-day level. In addition, the Government pay roll is undergoing severe reductions due to curtailment of war agencies and demobilization of the armed forces. Thus 1946 pay rolls—public and private—will be approximately $35,000,000,000 less than the pre-VJ-day rate.

This shrinkage of the national pay envelope amid rising net profits is ominous. Industry cannot provide full employment unless this cut is restored. This need is underlined by the fact that the steel industry alone is now able to produce the same amount of steel as in the prewar years with 50,000 fewer workers. To make up for the purchasing power thus lost, a wage increase is essential to provide the remaining steelworkers with sufficient income to create employment for those displaced.

A sustained high level of production requires a purchasing power sufficient to buy the goods being produced. To provide such purchasing power, the proceeds of industry's production must be properly distributed. Labor's share must be fair and adequate.

During the war years, production increased, national income increased, but labor's share lagged considerably behind.

The increase in money wages during the 1941–45 period was only 16 percent. While some studies show a larger increase in average earnings for manufacturing industry, the component of what makes up industry and the distribution of workers as between one industry and another is extremely variable. Very sharp shifts took place during the war in the light of the emphasis on war industry and further sharp shifts take place now, in a reverse direction, since the war's end.

Therefore, the change in basic wage rates, increased primarily by general wage increases and specific adjustments of job rates, is the only sound measurement of increases in wages which can be projected ahead into 1946.

During this same period when basic wage rates rose 16 percent, the cost of living rose 45 percent. Even the conservative Government estimates show a rise in prices (a consideration considerably narrower than a measurement of total living costs) of 33 percent.

Therefore, not only have living costs risen more sharply than wage rates, but the increase in prices results in increased corporate income per unit produced, a fact important to determination of labor's share of income.

During the war years, productivity in manufacturing industry rose 23 percent. Thus, four workers can now produce what five workers had formerly produced. This fact, carefully adjusted so as to include only those increases in productivity which will continue from war production into peacetime production, further increases the income to be distributed in relation to the number employed.

To permit the worker to merely continue his 1941 share, it is necessary to increase basic wage rates 54 percent, or more than twice as much as the steelworkers request. (The increased price level times the increased productivity level divided by the increased wage rates results in the 54 percent figure.)

To the degree to which the required increase is withheld does labor's share of industrial production lag behind the 1941 levels. That lag spells danger to America.

Place these facts together:

(a) The national pay envelope declines.

(b) The ability of labor as a whole and of the average worker to purchase goods is curtailed.

(c) Labor's share is drastically reduced.

The result is a picture of dangerous proportions. If people do not have enough to provide necessary purchasing power, the economy of the Nation is headed toward disastrous internal break-down.

Look back at 1924–29, the boom years that led to the world depression in our history.

Steel profits for the 5 years following 1924 exceeded the 1924 level of $181,000,000 by a total of $492,000,000. Production rose 46 percent. Average earnings per employee, including incentive payments, rose 3 cents an hour, common labor's rates remained fixed at 44 cents an hour, and not one penny was added to basic wage rates.

The experience of the steel industry was typical. For 1924–29, manufacturing industry increased production 27 percent, labor

productivity rose 24 percent, net profits rose 72 percent, and average hourly earnings rose only 5 percent. There was no wage increase of national significance.

Income rose, production of goods increased, but labor did not receive its share. Consequently, the crash of '29 and the depression of the thirties.

The $2-a-day wage demand is a major weapon in the fight against drift toward another, more disastrous depression.

The high level of steel production for 1946 and the tremendous scheduled increase in income and profits of the steel companies must lead to the prompt grant of the union's demand if we are to avoid a lag of purchasing power behind production.

Steel sets the pace for wage movement in American industry. The grant of the union's demand will be a decisive step toward increasing purchasing power. Increased purchasing power will make more work available as a response to an active consumer's market and prevent the piling up of goods on store shelves.

The alternative is described in a speech by Mr. David F. Austin, vice president in charge of sales, the United States Steel Corp. In a speech to a group of salesmen (Steel, Nov. 26, 1945, page 71) he said:

"Full employment may actually be more important to you and to me than the success or failure of our own companies * * * If this time we fail to find a means of staving off wide unemployment, I'm afraid that the world will turn to some other method. And that will not be good for you, nor for me, nor for the people who will be persuaded to take the other road."

Whose Fault?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1946

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Dothan (Ala.) Eagle of January 21, 1946, edited by Mr. Horace Hall, of Dothan, Ala.:

WHOSE FAULT?

There couldn't be a more inopportune time than now for the United States Senate to get tangled up in a filibuster. But southern Senators have a king-sized talking marathon under way to block passage of a bill that would establish a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission with full status as an arm of the Federal Government.

All business in the Senate will stop while the Senators talk, talk, and talk. Vital legislation must wait. If Congress has the power and the brains to get the country out of its present turmoil, then that must be shunted aside while the filibuster goes on. And in the meantime more decisions, of national and international import, remain in the balance.

And whose fault is it? Is it the fault of those southern Senators who vow a fight to the death against the FEPC? Or is it the fault of those advocates of this unworkable proposal inspired by spite, intolerance, and viciousness, whose interest in the national welfare is so infinitesimal that they chose this time of uncertainty to put their pet bill through Congress?

Obviously it is the latter. They knew full well that when they brought this legislative monstrosity into Congress that it would stop all other business. But they hoped that the state of the Nation would be so acute that opponents of the FEPC would retire and let the bill become law rather than jeopardize passage of the many vital and essential proposals now pending.

Knowing of the bitter opposition to them, knowing the determination of the southern bloc to fight this measure, they projected their own pet fight into the turbulent national scene. They knew full well the consequences of their action. And now that they have stopped the wheels turning in Congress, the blame is theirs. They cannot lay the blame at the door of those men who are resisting the FEPC.

A filibuster was forced on foes of the FEPC. Had the issue not been brought up now they would not have invited one.

But backers of the FEPC wanted the filibuster, in the hopes that the wrath of the voters would break it for once and all and open the way for them to get this proposal into law. They asked for it and they are getting it. If they are willing for all else to wait, so are those who are opposed to the FEPC.

And President Truman, who professes to be so vexed with Congress for not enacting his program into law, is not without personal blame for the present mess. He has been encouraging a permanent FEPC, and listing it as one of the "musts" during this vital period of national recovery. He, as much as anyone else, is responsible for constructive business in the Senate being at a standstill during such a critical period in the country's history.

History of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1946

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, in 1915 a group of young men from St. Louis, Mo., were concerned over the apathy of citizens in conducting an improvement project around the civic center. Under the leadership of Henry Giessenbier these young men organized the Young Men's Progressive Civic Association and through personal effort, secured the passage of a needed bond issue that resulted in the desired community improvement. From this start a great number of civic projects were carried on in St. Louis. These received considerable publicity around the Nation and in 1920, by mutual consent, a group of 22 young men's organizations gathered together in St. Louis to organize the first junior chamber of commerce. It was so named in honor of the president of the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce who provided the encouragement and financial assistance that made the new organization possible.

Each year, beginning in 1920, a convention was held in some leading community of the Nation. A national president was elected and a program of expansion set forth. The leadership of the junior chamber for this 25-year period came from the following cities:

Henry Giessenbier, of St. Louis, Mo.; George O. Wilson, of Dallas, Tex.; Roy Wilber, of Boston, Mass.; Harry B. Mortimer, of Chicago, Ill.; Louis J. Arland, of Los Angeles, Calif.; E. Fred Johnson, of Tulsa, Okla.; Robert E. Condon, of New York, N. Y.; H. Grady Vien, of East St. Louis, Ill.; Ernest Baetz, of San Antonio, Tex.; Herbert F. McCulla, of Lincoln, Nebr.; Durward Howes, of Los Angeles, Calif.; George H. Olmsted, of Des Moines, Iowa.; Courtland Otis, of New York, N. Y.; Leslie B. Farrington, of St. Paul, Minn.; E. Richard West, of Los Angeles, Calif.; Allen Whitfield, of Des Moines, Iowa; Walter E. Holman, of Portland, Oreg.; Roswell P. Rosengren, of Buffalo, N. Y.; Philip C. Ebeling, of Dayton, Ohio; Perry P. Pipkin, of Memphis, Tenn.; Mark S. Matthews, of New York, N. Y.; Walter W. Finke, of Minneapolis, Minn.; William M. Shepherd, of Pine Bluff, Ark.; H. Bruce Palmer, of Flint, Mich.; Mearns T. Gates, of Pomeroy, Wash.; Henry Kearns, of Pasadena, Calif.

The growth of the junior chamber, while it has been rapid, has been retarded by two depressions and by the war. The organization is unique in that it is composed exclusively of young men. The age limit, 21 through 35, is rigidly adhered to and the basic principles of the organization in all the hundreds of communities where it is functioning are identical. The membership is open to young men regardless of their occupation, their station in life, their religious beliefs or their racial connections. Practical experience has demonstrated that those young men who have leadership qualities and who have a desire to progress, would automatically become local, State, and national officers. A constant refining process is carried on which automatically eliminates men who have no desire to serve their community.

The combined experiences of the several hundred junior chambers over the past 25 years provides an unlimited challenge to the future progress of young men. At the close of the first quarter century of service, the greatest desire of junior chamber leadership throughout the Nation is that of expanded activities and the increased opportunity to progress.

In commemoration of the twenty-fifth anniversary, the following letter was received from the President of the United States:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 10, 1946.

MR. HENRY KEARNS,
President, United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. KEARNS: I want to congratulate you and the members of your organization on the accomplishments of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce during its first 25 years. The junior chambers of commerce all over the country have served their communities well by virtue of their fresh ideas and their willingness to do something about putting their ideas into practice.

The years immediately ahead present a greater challenge than ever before to all the businessmen of America, and I expect the young men belonging to the junior chambers of commerce to provide progressive leadership in the thinking and doing of the business world.

I know that they will do everything possible to spur this country on to a full realization of its magnificent potentialities.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

The address by Henry Kearns, president of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, in observance of the twenty-fifth anniversary, delivered at Kaufman Memorial Hall, Minneapolis, Minn., follows:

YOUNG MEN AT WORK

The acme of good citizenship is found in the individual's participation in the affairs of a public nature. The United States Junior Chamber of Commerce is observing its twenty-fifth anniversary of service to the Nation. This organization is composed of young men, ages 21 to 35, and has as its principal foundation for growth three objectives: First, the training of leaders; second, individual community service; and, third, stimulation of active citizenship. In those three objectives we find the true exemplification of real Americanism. We would like to tell you how they affect the welfare of the Nation and are important to the future.

Every business, every community, and every State is constantly thirsting for leaders—people who are able and willing to assume a responsible position, who have the ability to make a decision, who have the ability to develop trust and confidence, and who have the ability to "get things done." Thousands of young men throughout the Nation in the past 25 years have found in the junior chamber of commerce the training ground wherein they can secure this leadership ability. Through personal participation in projects of a community nature, the young man has the opportunity of analyzing representative business transactions, of managing men, and of exercising every type of human cooperation. The community project requires the same planning, ingenuity, and ability needed in producing a successful business venture. This opportunity is given the young man through participation in junior chamber affairs. He gets the leadership habit; he learns to get along with his fellow men, and, above all, he gets things done.

In the field of community service every locality in the Nation has hundreds of jobs to be done—jobs that make that community a better place in which to live—jobs that add value to the community life—jobs that offer progress in learning, and in most cases these jobs must be done by volunteer workers. The junior chambers of commerce in thousands of communities throughout the land, are daily producing such projects that "get the job done."

In the field of juvenile delinquency, several hundred junior chambers attacked this problem with enthusiasm, energy, and intelligence. The organization of teen-age clubs, big brother activities for first offenders, the development of recreational and sports activities, production of money-making programs for young people, are among the activities carried on by junior chambers of commerce in the interest of the youth of our Nation. No less of an authority than J. Edgar Hoover acknowledges the true value of junior chamber activity in reducing juvenile delinquency and potential crime.

Public safety, fire prevention, public health, sports, and recreation, all find an active place in junior chamber affairs—each sharing a great number of specific projects participated in by hundreds of young men who voluntarily give of their time and of their energy to make their community a better place in which to live; this is true community spirit.

Active citizenship may be a trite term but we believe that it has a place in the life of every citizen. In it we refer to the young man who not only goes to the polls and votes but one who will take 1 to 2 hours each week to study and discuss matters of national interest; who will inform himself upon the broad affairs of government; the young man who will become acquainted with his representatives in State and National Government; the young man who will take the time and energy to interest his neighbors in public affairs. Yes, we're talking about the young man who will offer himself as a candidate for public office; who will make full use of the leadership training that he has received through participation in junior chamber activities. In junior chamber, active citizenship means an informed public; a public that will read, speak, and act upon affairs of a national interest; a public that knows that an individual has a job to do, if we are to maintain our American way of life.

From the humble beginning in St. Louis 25 years ago, the junior chamber of commerce has become an organization of widespread interest in every State and in every major community. It is composed of a true cross-section of American life. It is composed of young men, some who have reached the top rung in the economic scheme of things, and others who truly believe that they have the right to do so. They are willing to put forth the energy and the ability to lead. Among the ranks of junior chamber men are found labor leaders and major industrialists; are found cooks, doctors, lawyers, and storekeepers—young men of a common interest—young men who are looking forward toward the future with optimism and determination.

The junior chamber of commerce is about to embark upon its second quarter century of service. It is fitting that at this moment we observe an old junior chamber saying, "Take your hats off to the past and your coats off to the future."

A Marine Speaks Out on China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH DE LACY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1946

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege granted me, I wish to call the attention of the House to a letter from Pfc Frank Bromley, one of the marine heroes stationed in China, which was published in the newspaper, Greenwich Time, Greenwich, Conn., December 26, 1945.

In his letter Private First Class Bromley sharply raises the question of what our troops are doing in China. It is clear from his letter that they are not carrying out our stated policy of disarming the Japanese. It is clear, too, from his eyewitness account that at least on one occasion our military practices in north China were certainly not conducive to good relations between the United States and the peoples of China. I repeat from the article, to impress on Members present, the words of this marine:

We proceeded to blast this small village in the Chinwangtao area unmercifully. * * * How many innocent people were slaughtered in that small village is still unknown to us who did the slaughtering. If the Germans or Japs had done this who'd scream about the brutality of it first? This is merely one "incident" which was oiled up and sugar-coated in the newspapers for civilian consumption. The whole mission of the American forces in China has been oiled up and sugar-coated. I fought for my country on Okinawa, was ready to die for it, and nearly did often enough. * * * But whose country will we be dying for over here if, and it seems likely we will, become involved in actual warfare in China?

Mr. Speaker, these are the words of an American marine in China. Today there is a truce in the civil war in that Nation. But unless that truce is productive of real democracy and internal unity, and unless we are busy today disarming the remaining 300,000 Japanese instead of using them to guard railroads alongside our own forces, and unless we bring home our men from this theater, other marines, like Pfc Frank Bromley, will wonder why they die in an internal war in China, fighting on the side of reaction.

For that reason, I am including with these remarks the entire article from Greenwich Time, including the text of the letter from Private First Class Bromley. It follows:

PECK PROMISES COMPLETE REPORT ON TEMPORARY HOUSING SITUATION BEFORE TONIGHT'S TOWN MEETING—GREENWICH MARINE BITTER, ASKS WHY WE ARE KEEPING FORCES IN CHINA—PFC FRANK BROMLEY VOICES BITTERNESS OF CONFUSED GI'S—SCORES POLITICIANS, OTHERS WHO IGNORE SITUATION IN CHINA

Pfc Frank Bromley, of 44 Greenwich Avenue, a member of the Seventh Regiment, First Marine Division, now stationed in Linsi, China, wants to let his fellow townsmen know what some of the American soldiers still in China think about the role they are playing, or scheduled to play. In a letter to the editor of Greenwich Time he paints a rather dismal picture of conditions there and voices the bitterness that many soldiers there must feel.

Private First Class Bromley's letter, dated December 6, follows in full:

"DEAR SIR: However much I would like to see this letter published, I don't expect there is enough sense of justice left in the minds of the American people for you to endanger the circulation of your paper by printing what they evidently prefer to close their eyes to. But we realize the war is over now and we who met the Jap face to face can expect to be left holding the bag while the civilian celebrates. Still, here are the thoughts of just one GI in China.

"What are we, the United States Marines doing in China? Why are we here? What useful purpose are we serving? We were told our mission was to disarm the Japanese, but we are not disarming the Japs. We were told we would not become involved in China's internal affairs but now we find ourselves so involved that who can say when we can pull our meddling noses out of China and come home?

"So we are here to disarm the Japs, are we? The Chinese Army, the largest in the world in manpower, is not capable of this job? So we, one division strong, are sent to do it for them. I guess maybe I didn't realize what supermen we are. The Chinese could have very well accomplished this as anyone with an ounce of common sense must admit. So, the question remains, Why are we in China?

"I am a bazooka man with the Seventh Regiment, First Marine Division and have not personally participated in the disarming of any Japanese, have not seen the actual disarming of any Japanese, and know of no member of this regiment who has done either.

"The American people have been told that we would not actively assist the Nationalists in their struggle with what has become commonly referred to as the Communist Forces, but today, among the arms carried by the Chinese National forces can be found in large numbers American Garand rifles, mortars, flame throwers, tommy-guns, and even American pack howitzers, all of which are being turned against Communist forces in undeclared warfare.

"American ships transport Central troops, American planes patrol Communist territory, United States troops guard coal trains transporting coal for Government use, bridges which are strategic only to the Nationalist cause, power plants, property of the Central Government. Perhaps all this is not actually assisting the Chinese Nationalists in their internal struggle against the 'Commies,' but if it isn't perhaps you can tell me what would be 'assistance.'

"Who can blame the Chinese Communists (if one wants to refer to them as such) for their resentment against our two-faced policy, for our interference in an internal situation which has prevailed in China since 1927?

"And eventually when American lives are lost in China, who will do the screaming and screeching about an 'unprovoked attack by Communist forces against the poor marines who were only minding' somebody else's business? What blind man can't see that our policy in China is leading us straight to active participation in an impending civil war?

"I took part in the bombardment of a small Communist-held village in retaliation for the 'alleged' firing on of an American general by Communist forces—but here is the enlisted man's version of this incident, and, remember, we were on the spot.

"A train bearing an American general through Communist territory (where an American general had no business, in the first place) is halted by a break in the tracks, Communist instigated, and a repair crew of Chinese coolies are put to work repairing the break.

"A volley of shots were fired over the heads of the Chinese workers as a warning. No one was hit. It was quite evident that such was not the desire of the "Commie" shooters. But the American general, in a manner which only a general can assume, ordered his escorting guard to return the fire, and directed it to be sent at random into a cluster of small houses from which the initial fire was presumed to have come.

"In carrying out this order a heavy stream of automatic fire was poured at random into the small settlement. This brought one return volley, a few bullets of which struck the general's train. (I personally counted six bullet holes in one unoccupied car). Now, in a scream of outraged vanity this general ordered out the nearest Marine garrison under full combat equipment and prepared for a pitched battle.

"We moved up, a few shots came from the small village. Our heavy 81 mm. mortars were set up, the smaller 60's were set up, and we proceeded to blast this small village in the Chinwangtao area unmercifully. Two men, innocent or guilty, were cut down by machine-gun fire as they ran from a burning house. How many innocent people were slaughtered in that small village is still unknown to us who did the slaughtering. If the Germans or Japs had done this who'd scream about the brutality of it first?

"This is merely one incident which was oiled up and sugar-coated in the newspapers for civilian consumption. The whole mission of the American forces in China has been oiled up and sugar-coated. I fought for my country on Okinawa, was ready to die for it, and nearly did often enough. But I had a fairly good idea why I was fighting, and if need be, dying. But whose country will we be dying for over here if, and it seems likely we will, become involved in actual warfare in China?

"I'm ready to fight for my country again but I thought we won our war, at least I saw enough of my buddies die at Sugar Loaf Hill, Shuri Castle, and other places. But they died for their country. Whose country will we die for in a civil war in China? Surely America wouldn't be endangered by a Communist (a more fitting name would be 'Chinese peasant') and Nationalist struggle in China.

"What sort of propaganda would the money-grabbing politicians back home cook up for an explanation to the people when they found us in it? Or would an explanation be necessary to a people so unconcerned about it all now that their real danger has passed, as to let their government meddle in this mess until they find themselves back in war plants again. And when that time comes, I suppose we'll be 'heroes,' etc.—while now they let us sit out here and rot because, 'What the hell, the war is over now.'

"We did our fighting and now we'd like to come home. We risked our lives for you people and we don't want praise or thanks. We came over while you made your fortune in high wages. We came to the Japs so they couldn't get to us and you. Now we don't ask for praise or thanks, and we don't want anyone calling us heroes. All we want is to come home.

"So what are the people doing, letting us sit out here for 6 or 9 months more 'til we're all so disgusted with you that we won't ever want to come home. Well, let us sit here then, and look for the suckers to fight the next one some place else."

A Monthly Memorial and an Unusual Request

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1946

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to provide for the payment in a lump sum to the Montana State College of the national service life insurance granted the late Ralph Coldwater.

This young man, a graduate of the Montana State College, designated as beneficiaries his father, Lipman Coldwater, and his brother, Capt. Elliott Coldwater. They have asked me to present this bill to the Congress so that the remaining unpaid installments of the national service life insurance granted the late Ralph Coldwater to them be granted in a lump sum to the Montana State College for the purpose of establishing the Ralph Coldwater Memorial Scholarship in industrial engineering at that institution.

This unselfish act on the part of the Coldwater family is not only unusual but extremely meritorious. I want to congratulate the family for taking such a position and to express the hope that the scholarship will not only serve as a fitting memorial to Ralph Coldwater but to the hundreds of thousands of others who, like Ralph, gave their lives that this country and its people could live.

New Homes for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL STEWART
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1946

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, in order to combat extravagance and watered profits in the construction of new homes, a group of ex-servicemen in Oklahoma City have banded together to form a construction company to build homes for veterans. They are determined to build homes at a minimum cost even if they have to go to the forests, quarries and wherever raw materials are to be found and process them, themselves. Their organization is known as Veterans Associated, GI Home Builders, and their president, Mr. C. Harold Brand, represented them January 12 when our Oklahoma congressional delegation met with veterans in Oklahoma City to discuss their critical housing problem. Mr. Brand, recently released from duty as a captain with the United States Army Air Forces, has been actively engaged in rea. estate sale and development since 1931. He is a past president of Oklahoma State Real Estate Association, member of the National Board of Directors Real Estate Association representing State of Oklahoma, and the only veteran now a member of the Oklahoma City Real Estate Board. I was so impressed with the dogged determination of these ex-servicemen that I asked Mr. Brand to give me further details of the plans of his group and under date of January 12 I received a letter from him which I desire to insert in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERANS ASSOCIATED,
GI HOME BUILDERS,
Oklahoma City, Okla., January 12, 1946.

Congressman PAUL STEWART,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STEWART: Encouragement was felt in the hearts of every veteran who recently listened to the public hearing you and the Oklahoma congressional delegation gave to the veterans' service organization various financial lending agencies, materialmen, etc., with reference to the critical housing problem of returned veterans.

We are writing you to put on record and explain a little more fully the movement which got a spontanecus start when Congressman MONRONEY recently was confronted with highly technical, theoretical, and just plain excuses when he explained to the City Council of Oklahoma City the elements and issues involved in converting the Will Rogers Air Field barracks into temporary veterans' family housing units.

This country having fought this war on a basis of putting the important objectives first and the less important matters second, it is difficult for the returned veterans, as well as more sincere citizens, to understand the indifference and at times almost affirmative opposition which is being encountered throughout the Nation by all returned veterans in being unable to find such an elemental and necessary thing as a place to live.

We realize that there are many complicated problems such as production and regulatory bottlenecks and other deterrent influences which stymie the production of homes for veterans on today's market and which fails to give the GI a full 100 cents for his dollar.

This problem of the homeless veteran demands immediate action. To solve this problem in Oklahoma City a large group of veterans has organized a construction company known as Veterans Associated, Inc.—GI home builders, with trained leadership, inspired veteran labor, desirable land, and more adequate finances to construct our own homes.

Give us the priorities and the materials and this group of determined, mutually associated veterans will work day and night and if need be, 7 days a week to break this production bottleneck on veterans' houses. We invite and will work first with local, State-wide, and then Nation-wide material agencies to obtain the component parts of each house, but if there is an inadequate supply from these sources, we now propose to go to the source of raw materials with newly organized veteran-owned supply agencies, and cut the lumber from the trees and haul it in surplus GI trucks to the building site to be processed by assembly-line power-production methods to create these homes.

If a scarcity of brick, tile, or concrete blocks develops, GI veterans on nearby farms assure us they will quarry from the hillsides and from their GI-owned stone companies will haul this building stone for us day and night to furnish the four walls of these homes.

Naturally we cannot produce cast-iron pipe, plumbing, and electrical fixtures by our own hands locally, nor can we manufacture the hardware, nails, composition roofing, or other component parts necessary for the construction of these homes. We simply point out these facts to show our determination to pursue a down-to-earth simple and sensible remedy for our dilemma.

Our construction company is based upon sound, economic principles. Each workman will share mutually in a cash bonus based upon the completion and sale of the various houses. A hundred percent of the ownership of this company is vested in a group of veterans, veterans with financial, material, construction, and expediting experience; men who were construction experts in the various crafts before the beginning of the war and who were called to the service for their construction abilities in the far-flung battlefields of the world and who are now entering our company with their first connection and job since their return. These sincere leaders and construction craftsmen from the ditch digger to the president of the company will not allow any influence to stop them short of accomplishing their mission—building themselves homes and likewise for fellow GI's.

Statistics show that labor constitutes well over 60 percent of the cost of a home. With this inspired and determined GI labor and leadership we can attain the goal of giving that ex-serviceman his full dollar's worth. The war was won through an all-out offensive and an all-out campaign, particularly in production and manpower, and we veterans propose to win the peace on the same basis and utilizing the same methods.

In the old-fashioned days each farmer harvested his crop or built his farm home in the pioneer cooperative spirit, with each member of the community coming in and assisting him in building that sacred home. Mutual helpfulness in their activities began at dawn and ended after dark, with the moon in the skies. The farmers then exchanged labor to gather that food for winter and rainy days. We believe that threshing time has come—that the ripened grain is in the field.

We want to start our homes now. We have the leadership, the labor, and the capital raised among ourselves, and the determination to start with our hammers and saws. Regardless of regulations, restrictions, or bottlenecks or influence to the contrary, we shall succeed because we must. We are a cooperative group. We are ex-members of the Seabees who built toilet seats out of native mahogany. We have rebuilt plants on foreign soils under hostile gunfire and adverse climatic conditions. In China we boiled every drop of water to cool our parched lips.

Our veterans in wartime actually threw their bodies into gaping holes of sinking ships to keep them afloat. We GI's today are equally as determined to apply our own individual brawn now to conquer this similar housing emergency—housing.

On Monday, January 14, our first construction crew wil break ground to construct immediately our headquarters' building at Northwest Second and Walker, Oklahoma City, which will be a convenient location for our construction workers and veteran home seekers.

One of Oklahoma City's leading banks and an outstanding building and loan association have opened their money bags with the fullest assurance that they will back us from top to bottom in addition to the personal funds we have subscribed. We mean to serve every veteran from the $3,000 home buyer to the $10,000 maximum. Many of the more successful young veterans returning, upon their leaving home felt that a $6,500 home was a palace and would fulfill his needs for years to come. We are shocked, overwhelmed, horrified, and unreconciled to people throwing $10,000 homes at us which are poorly constructed and located in unattractive neighborhoods which make us feel we are almost tramps, because we have no such finances. Our pledged word means too much to assume such an obligation unless we intend to pay it. We sold our comfortable homes when we departed for the services for a mere four to six thousand dollars to find upon our return that these same homes are now bringing, on the competitive market, with no other supply available, ten to twelve thousand dollars.

Also we are faced with the fact that numerous civilians during the war have sold their homes at current inflated prices and have moved into rental units, thus depriving us of that source of supply.

Again it is our desire and intention to serve every veteran by building him a home, be he an owner of a building site in his own chosen desirable neighborhood or be he a three-, four-, or ten-thousand dollar home seeker with no site.

We will give our all to break a bottleneck or any other obstacle in the best Army, Navy, Marine, Coast Guard, and Seabee tradition.

If the veteran wishes to live near his friends whom he acquired before leaving for the service, we propose to build him a home there. (We are substituting the service motive for the profit motive we found existing when we returned.) Our aim is to house the veteran, giving him his choice as to material, as to price range, location and neighborhood, and nearness to his established family ties and other neighborhood connections before he departed for the services, which logical location he will cherish and treasure with continued home ownership for life.

* * * * *

VE- and VJ-day came through the cooperative offensive waged by everyone in the armed forces and home front. Unbelievable accomplishments in production were attained to win that goal. If we achieve the building of homes for veterans this month, next month, or the next—every piece of governmental red tape and every restriction must be brushed aside to give us materials, for that is all we need here now to build our homes. We feel the critical situation in our community is similar to the same problem existing in all other American communities today.

We firmly believe that you, Members of Congress, are actually supporting a critical existing human need and particularly since this housing project will be of the veterans, by the veterans, and for the veterans.

Hats off to the victorious past. Coats off and sleeves rolled up to the glorious future.

Respectfully submitted to the honorable Oklahoma congressional delegation from your Oklahoma constituents.

C. HAROLD BRAND.
GENE H. HENRY.
HAROLD W. MORGAN.
WILLIAM A. MORRIS.
WILLIAM HAROLD NETHERTON.

Nebraskans' Letter to Their Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 24, 1946

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, by leave granted me I include a letter sent to me by two of my constituents who represent the feelings of many of the people in my district:

DEAR KARL: Me and Marthy was listening the other night when our President, Mr. Truman, asked us to write to our Congressmen and tell them a few things. Now, we ain't hardly got the courage to write to our Senators, seeing as they is holding such high positions, but you, Karl, always seems a little more like one of us, and it would be like writing to one of our own folks, so we're taking pencil in hand to do the same. In the first place, Karl, before you get to worrying, we aim to tell you we ain't got no complaints to make as far as your representin' us is concerned and we even want to thank you for the good job you have done, but, Karl, there's a lot of queer things there in Washington a going on and we'd like to ask you some questions about the same and maybe you could get around to explaining them.

It looks like our country is pretty well broke financially, and a owing upward of $300,000,000,000, then where is the money coming from to loan to England the $4,000,000,000 she's a asking for and with Russia and China and what have you, a still figuring on their lists of what they're going to need? We thought we won the war, but it looks like we're paying the reparations bill anyway.

The economists is telling us we have to give England the money so's she can buy goods from us, but what is wrong with selling some of that goods to us home folks first, seeing as the shelves and storerooms of the country is empty of things we're really needing. We was to Winside yistiddy a looking for overalls and shirts and hoping to find a pair of stockings for Marthy. Well the only shirt in the store was a green silk velvet one, size 15½, price $6.50, which I suppose was OPA ceiling. Now, there wouldn't no farmer be caught dead out in public in no such shirt, and if a body was to wear such a rig out to do chores, I reckon the hogs would laugh their selves sick, and they been sick twice already this winter with flu, so we ain't taking any chances. The store hadn't had no overalls in 4 months' time, and the only stockings for Marthy was cotton fancy at $1.39 OPA ceiling, so Marthy didn't buy none. Millions of our boys went to war, and some of them, Karl, didn't come back, yet one man, Byrnes, can go to Moscow and, in settling the peace, give terms and mostly just give, to Russia and to England and to China a letting them have their way, when we think that ain't a one man's job. How did this Byrnes get to be a super-President? We don't recollect having voted for him and we kind of figger that kind of treaty making and deciding about the atom

bomb and such belongs to Congress, which was elected. We been wondering, Karl, if Congress was to take a damp sponge and wipe out all these bureaus and boards and commissions and such, and start with a clean slate, that maybe the country could settle down to producing, and to working, and letting Congress do the lawmaking for a change, just kind of let the country get back to normal. We could all quit worrying a little maybe and have a little time to spend on the real problems we got to home.

Sincerely,

PAUL AND MARTHY
(Mrs. W. S. Hupp, Carroll, Nebr.),
(Bloomfield Monitor).

Stream Pollution and Sewage-Disposal Systems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRENT SPENCE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 24, 1946

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith insert a letter I have received from Charles S. Rhyne, executive director of the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers, and a resolution adopted by that organization:

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
MUNICIPAL LAW OFFICERS,
Washington, D. C. December 28, 1945.

Hon. BRENT SPENCE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SPENCE: At the annual conference of the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers held in Washington on December 3, 4, and 5, 1945, a resolution was unanimously adopted which recorded the approval of the legal representatives of American boroughs, towns, and cities of your bill, H. R. 4070, on the matter of stream pollution and sewage-disposal systems. Copies of this resolution are enclosed and, as you can readily see, city attorneys from all over the country feel most strongly about this question and will be most gratified upon the passage of your bill.

It would be greatly appreciated if you will arrange for the publication of the enclosed resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order that other Congressmen may know how their cities feel about this matter.

Thanking you for past courtesies, I remain,

Sincerely,

CHARLES S. RHYNE,
Executive Director.

STREAM POLLUTION—SEWAGE DISPOSAL SYSTEMS

Whereas the official reports of the United States Public Health Service department disclose that water pollution is one, if not the greatest, of the health menaces which threaten the people of this Nation; and

Whereas it is estimated by health experts and competent engineers skilled in this class of work that the combined sewage and industrial wastes pollution of the United States as a whole approximates the raw sewage contributions of not lesss than 100,000,000 people; and

Whereas it is estimated by these same experts that the annual cost of present water pollution is $100,000,000 per year on the basis of its total economic damage; and

Whereas it is estimated that a reasonable program of pollution abatement throughout the Nation would cost about $2,000,000,000 and require 10 to 20 years for its completion; and

Whereas, because of the very large measure of public interest involved in water pollution abatement, Federal and State aid in financing such projects is justifiable to fully the same extent as is true of other forms of public-works improvements affecting large areas of the Nation; and

Whereas we are now in the postwar era where it is important to have worth-while jobs for our returning servicemen in the construction of public works which will result in the most good for all the people of this Nation, of which a sewage-disposal system is clearly one on account of its effect on public health; and

Whereas the cities and other governmental units are in need of Federal financial aid in order to prevent stream pollution by constructing sewage-disposal systems; and

Whereas there is now pending in Congress H. R. 4070, which by its provisions, if enacted by Congress, would furnish the necessary financial aid and relieve this health menace to the entire Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers hereby records its approval of H. R. 4070 and urges its passage without delay, be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the executive director to all Members of Congress.

NLRB Election Procedure in Canning Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 24, 1946

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, last week I called the attention of the House to a serious jurisdictional dispute which threatens the canning industry in the State of California. This controversy has been brought about as the result of an election ordered by the National Labor Relations Board in the California canneries last October. The election was held at a time when cannery employment was at a low ebb and only about one-fifth of the cannery workers in California cast ballots. Unless the dispute is properly settled in the near future, the farmers of California will suffer serious losses, the workers in the canneries will be without jobs, and the cannery operators will have to close down. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communication from the Secretary of the California State Federation of Labor. I trust that the cognizant congressional committees will conduct an immediate investigation of the charges brought by Mr. Haggerty:

CALIFORNIA STATE FEDERATION
OF LABOR,
San Francisco, Calif., January 21, 1946.

Hon. JACK Z. ANDERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANDERSON: Following my telegram regarding the discriminatory action taken by Joseph E. Watson re the NLRB election procedure followed in the fruit and vegetable canning industry, whereby the AFL was denied the elementary and lawful right of a hearing pertaining to irregularities involved, I am hereby submitting additional information.

Not only was this hearing denied by Mr. Watson, but he has been unmistakably antagonistic toward the AFL, and he has on many occasions expressed such hostility. He has lost all semblance of objectivity in the discharge of his duties as director of the NLRB in this region, and we believe that it is high time that Mr. Watson's actions be investigated by the proper agencies before a mass of indignation develops which will seriously disrupt the stabilized labor relations prevailing in California.

It is unfortunate that a man of Mr. Watson's responsibilities should administer his office in such a prejudicial manner. We do not believe that the American Federation of Labor and its affiliates should be victimized by his predilections, which apparently and indisputably are sympathetic toward the CIO. We believe that an investigation will reveal that Mr. Watson is incapable and should be replaced by someone who is impartial and will administer the duties of this important position as is prescribed by law.

Sincerely yours,

C. J. HAGGERTY,
Secretary.

Wisconsin: Nation's Leading Dairy State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 24, 1946

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include an article by Lewis C. French, which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal, January 20, 1946. This article tells a thrilling story. It is the story of agriculture in the State of Wisconsin. It is the story of agriculture in a free America. It is the story of the courage and the faith of the American farmer. It is proof to all the world of what is possible in America under a system of free enterprise. It should put to flight those so-called prophets who now and again arise among us to try to put fear in our hearts and make us believe that the American system and way of life have failed. To them and their fellow travelers I say, "Look at the record."

The article follows:

WISCONSIN OUTSTRIPS RIVALS IN DAIRY INDUSTRY ADVANCE—STATE HAS 2,577,000 DAIRY COWS; TURNED OUT 15,500,000,000 POUNDS IN 1945

(By Lewis C. French)

Increases developed during the war put Wisconsin so far out in front as the Nation's leading dairy State that its supremacy is no longer seriously challenged.

Few appreciate the might, volume, and wealth of the Wisconsin milk jug. And it is one of the many marvels of this war how the dairy farmers, crippled by shortages, were able to increase production to meet war needs.

The State starts the new year with more than 2,577,000 dairy cows.

In 1945, Wisconsin produced 15,500,000,000 pounds of milk worth around $418,000,000.

This one State now is producing about 12.5 percent of the total milk produced in the entire United States and selling every pound it can produce.

These monthly milk checks accounted for nearly half of the $770,000,000 gross farm income and, with the Government and subsidy payments, swelled the farm revenue totals to around $830,000,000 for last year.

Wisconsin's neighbor, Minnesota, is second in production with around nine billion (8,500,000,000 in 1944) and New York third with more than 8,000,000,000 pounds of milk.

Backtrack less than a century and you will appreciate the progress made and the swift changes—more cows, more milk, more dairy plants, the start of the big processing plants—all adding up to agricultural wealth and farm stability.

PICKETT SISTERS MADE CHEESE IN LAKE MILLS

In 1860, just 20 years after the Pickett sisters, Armine and Anna, started making marketable cheese by pooling the neighborhood milk from the Lake Mills settlement, there were only 250,000 dairy cows in the State. Most of these pioneer cattle were dual purpose and of nondescript breed, draft animals that were turned out to pasture, with the best cows milked. There were only a few more thousand dairy cows when Chester Hazen started the first cheese factory in Ladoga, in Fond du Lac County, in '64 to open the door to the more standard commercial processing and rapid expansion.

MORE CATTLE THAN PEOPLE

At the turn of the century, there were only around a million dairy cows in the State, and now there are 2,500,000—more cattle than people, counting the beef breeds as well as strictly dairy cattle.

K. G. Weckel of the department of dairy industry of the University of Wisconsin College of Agriculture has issued an interesting factual bulletin on just how big Wisconsin's dairyland has grown. During the last 5 years, Wisconsin has pulled away from other States, for at one time both Minnesota and New York were right on the heels of the Badger State for national leadership.

The intensity of the manufacture of dairy products is shown by the fact Wisconsin now produces:

Fifty percent of the Nation's cheese, 474,000,000 pounds.

Thirty percent of the canned milk, 1,053,000,000 pounds.

Thirty per cent of the powdered milk and cream, 287,000,000 pounds.

Ten percent of the national butter supply, 125,000,000 pounds, one of the few manufactured products to decline during the war.

And in addition to filling the milk and cream bottles in the State, 676,000,000 pounds of fluid milk is shipped out of the State, mainly to Chicago. During the war, more eastern and southern States have been reaching to Wisconsin for their sweet milk and cream supplies—Philadelphia, New York, Boston, and even Miami, Fla., getting some of their fresh milk shipped in big tank cars and trucks from northern Wisconsin. And in another year they'll be shipping supplies in the big cargo planes using high altitudes for refrigeration, carrying fresh milk and cream from Wisconsin to any place in the United States and parts of Mexico.

STATE DAIRY EXPANSION IN 10 YEARS CHARTED

The manner in which Wisconsin has expanded in markets for processed dairy products and milk in the last 10 years is shown in this table:

	Millions of pounds	
Product:	1935	1944
Butter	155	125
Condensed milk	55	196
Evaporated milk	725	1,053
Cheese	315	474
Powdered whole milk	4	12
Powdered skim:		
Human food	70	165
Animal food	43	38
Malted milk powder	10	33
Cream shipped out	5	35
Fluid milk shipped out	240	676

About the only products in which rival dairy States exceed Wisconsin are butter and ice cream and the byproduct, cottage cheese.

Minnesota ranks as the top butter State, producing 251,614,000 pounds in 1944, or nearly 17 percent of the output, followed by Iowa with 212,482,000, accounting for 14.2 percent, and then Wisconsin with 124,966,000, for around 10 percent of the production.

Led by Pennsylvania, which produces close to 50,000,000 gallons, Wisconsin ranks eleventh for ice cream, making 11,714,000 gallons. The three leaders for frozen dairy products are Pennsylvania, New York, and then California, which accounts for more than 28 percent of the national production. It is the shipment of cream to the eastern ice cream manufacturers that is partly responsible for the sharp drop in butter production.

METHODS HAVE CHANGED

The last 10 years have brought changes in dairy manufacturing, with motortrucks and stainless steel tank cars expanding milksheds and technical improvements bringing an era of big, flexible plants.

In 1920 there were 2,770 cheese factories and 780 creameries. The check made by Weckel shows the number of plants has dwindled to 1,500 cheese factories and 430 creamery plants, but those remaining are bigger and turn out far more volume than the crossroads community plant.

Before the war the production of dehydrated whole milk and skim milk was pretty much a side line—the drier being over in one corner of a plant and neglected until something had to be done with the periodic surpluses of milk.

No market developed swifter than that for dried milk powder during the war; 144 different plants have driers. It is noticeable that the amount of skim milk sold for human food went up from 70,000,000 pounds to more than 165,000,000 pounds, and that sold for animal feeds went down from 43,000,000 to 38,000,000 pounds between 1935 and 1944.

This trend, say dairymen, came from the greater appreciation of the nutritional values of milk without butterfat and the tremendous lend-lease shipments of powdered milk.

HIGH PRODUCTION MADE BY THE SMALLER FARMS

This Niagara of milk is from a lot of moderate-sized farms and not from the superherds so common in the Milwaukee milkshed. There are about 170,000 dairy farmers, and the average dairy herd is from 10 to 15 cows.

The survey shows that 35,000 dairy farms account for 20 percent of the milk with but 10 to 12 cows; 70,000 farmers account for 40 percent of the volume, with less than 10 cows; and 65,000 farmers have more than 10 cows.

There are a number of factors that enable Wisconsin to outmilk any other State in the Nation.

One important reason is that when a number of States were almost neck and neck with Wisconsin this State did not hesitate to adopt sanitary methods that were long opposed in the rival States. Wisconsin started the area test to eradicate bovine tuberculosis when Illinois farmers fought the test, and as a result Wisconsin moved right into the Chicago market when laws were passed requiring that city milk be from tested and approved cattle.

Another factor is that the dairy plants and cooperatives were quick to utilize refrigeration to conserve a highly perishable food, and kept the quality up.

QUICK TO IMPROVE

Then, too, the dairymen, through their livestock breed associations and marketing groups, were quicker to improve and meet advanced requirements. Add the leadership and aids of the college of agriculture and State departments and Wisconsin dairymen really made progress.

"There will be still further improvements in use of the newer principles and practices coming from research and new techniques," said Weckel.

For one thing, those in charge of dairy development are bearing down on quality. Milton H. Button, director of the State department of agriculture, and Harvey Weavers, chief of the dairy division, are in full accord with the quality program to make Wisconsin's milk and dairy products known.

UNITED STATES GOOD SALESMAN

"We want all our dairy products a little-better than the best competing States produce," said Weavers.

When the war ended, the dairy industry was fretting over the possibility of surpluses—what to do with the tremendously expanded wartime production. During the war, the Government took from 30 to 40 percent of the total production, but the minute the military orders eased off, civilian markets stepped right in to take over all available dairy supplies, and the rush to find butterfat continues.

"Uncle Sam was the greatest dairy salesman," said one dairy leader, citing the fact that millions of servicemen came home converts to milk and milk products. The startling fact to the dairyman is the surge in sales of fresh milk and cream, every important market showing sharp increases as soon as the limitations were lifted. This increased sale of fresh milk and cream took the play from the butter market—the prewar barometer of dairy prices.

Butter has been in reverse gear, reaching more than 161,000,000 pounds in 1942 and dropping to 124,000,000 in 1944, with the production last year drastically reduced almost half in some months.

But as the production of butter went down, the shipment of fresh cream and the civilian sale of cheese, canned milk, and ice cream sailed up. Because of price differentials, much of the butterfat that would have gone into churns was shipped as sweet cream.

"As long as the market stays strong and there are market voids to fill, the farmer is not showing any interest in culling or reducing his herd," say the dairy leaders. "They are keeping the last stanchion filled and squeezing out every pound of milk they can. The test will come when store shelves are filled, they start aging cheese and the flow of milk through the driers halts. Until then, there are no worries."

Immigration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 24, 1946

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I submit for the consideration of my colleagues a resolution adopted by the national legislative committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, meeting in Washington January 14 to 16, 1946, with which I am, in a general sense, in agreement. This is additional evidence that the people of this country are disturbed about the immigration situation:

SUSPENSION OF ALL IMMIGRATION

Whereas the critical shortage of housing in the United States is such as to require a period of 10 years for construction of new homes before the housing accommodations will meet the demands of the population of the United States; and

Whereas the United States has an obligation to first furnish employment to the men and women of the armed forces who have defended this country, and also furnish employment to the other employable citizens of the United States; and

Whereas unrestricted immigration to this country will intensify the critical housing shortage and prevent the furnishing of employment to returned veterans and employable citizens: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, through its national legislative committee, meeting in Washington, January 14, 15, and 16, 1946, That Congress be requested to immediately enact legislation prohibiting immigration from all countries for a period of 10 years; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to all Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States, with a request for an early pronouncement of their position on this issue.

Iowa Centennial Postage Stamp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY O. TALLE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 24, 1946

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD dated December 28, 1945, contains my remarks entitled "Iowa at Ninety-nine" in which I called attention to the fact that 1946 is the centennial year of Iowa's statehood.

Gov. Robert D. Blue has appointed a centennial committee to make plans for the observance of this noteworthy event in which all citizens of Iowa are genuinely and enthusiastically interested. The committee: Mrs. Robert Pike, Sioux City; Mrs. Myrtle Fellingham, Council Bluffs; Hugo Saggau, Denison; Homer Stephens, Clarinda; Mrs. R. R. Roberts, Britt; Lester Milligan, Mason City; Bert Stolpe, Des Moines; John W. Ganaway, Grinnell; Mrs. Mary Humeston, Albia; William Peterson, Iowa City; Ross Burman, Burlington; Mrs. Celia Gernand, Volga; E. W. Williams, Manchester; Ralph Evans, Davenport; J. N. Darling, Des Moines.

Mr. Speaker, on January 7, 1946, I sent the following letter to the Postmaster General:

Hon. ROBERT E. HANNEGAN,
The Postmaster General.

MY DEAR MR. POSTMASTER GENERAL: Nineteen hundred and forty-six is the centennial of Iowa's statehood.

The people of Iowa want to observe this important event in an appropriate manner, and it occurs to me it would be fitting that a 3-cent postage stamp be issued in commemoration of this significant anniversary.

I should like to suggest further that the centennial committee appointed by the Governor of Iowa be given an opportunity to propose a suitable design for this stamp.

Your attention is invited to these suggestions, and a statement setting forth your decision will be appreciated.

Thanking you, I am,
Sincerely,

HENRY O. TALLE,
Member of Congress.

To this letter the Postmaster General replied under date of January 23, 1946:

Hon. HENRY O. TALLE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I thank you for your letter of January 7, concerning the provision of a statehood stamp to mark the one hundredth anniversary of Iowa's entrance into the Union and suggesting that the centennial committee appointed by the Governor of Iowa be permitted to submit a suitable design.

In conformity with past policy the Department will doubtlessly recognize this occasion by means of a special issue and will be very glad to have the benefit of the committee's views as to effective subject matter.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT E. HANNEGAN,
Postmaster General.

Mr. Speaker, the State of Iowa was endowed by nature with resources that have been and will continue to be a source of rich blessings to the American people. In the next 12 months these blessings and their significance will be the subject matter of countless articles, essays, editorials, and speeches. It is most appropriate that a postage stamp be printed and distributed as a memorial to the labors of the citizens of Iowa during the past 100 years.

Assembly of the United Nations Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 25 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article on the subject of the first assembly of the United Nations Organization, published in New Yorker magazine of January 12, 1946.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Make an original and four copies, Miss Eberhard, one for each delegate. A delegate, on his way to assembly, carries two sets of instructions—one dictated by his own conscience (but not read) and one handed him by his constituents. Herewith we hand to each delegate to the first assembly of the United Nations Organization his instructions:

When you sit down sit down as an American if it makes you feel comfortable, but when you rise to speak, get up like a man anywhere.

Do not bring home any bacon; it will have turned rancid on the journey. Bring home instead a silken thread, by which you may find your way back.

Bear in mind always that foreign policy is domestic policy with its hat on. The purpose of the meeting, although not so stated anywhere, is to replace policy with law, and to make common cause.

Make common cause.

Think not to represent us by safeguarding our interests. Represent us by perceiving that our interests are other people's, and theirs ours.

When you think with longing of the place where you were born remember that the sun leaves it daily to go somewhere else. When you think with love of America think of the impurity of its blood lines and of how no American ever won a prize in a dog show.

Carry good men with you in your portfolio, along with the order of the day. Read the men with the short first names: Walt Whitman, John Donne, Manny Kant, Abe Lincoln, Tom Paine, Al Einstein. Read them and weep. Then read them again without tears.

If you would speak up for us, do not speak up for America, speak up for people, for the freeman. We are not dispatching you to build national greatness. Unless you understand this, and believe it, you might better be at the race track, where you can have a good time simply by guessing wrong.

Never forget that the nature of peace is commonly misstated. Peace is not to be had by preventing aggression, for it is always too late for that. Peace is to be had when people's antagonisms and antipathies are subject to the discipline of law and the decency of government.

Do not try to save the world by loving thy neighbor; it will only make him nervous. Save the world by respecting thy neighbor's rights under law and insisting that he respect yours (under the same law). In short, save the world.

Observe that chapter IV, article II, paragraph 3 of the Charter asks the General Assembly to "call the attention of the Security Council to situations which are likely to endanger international peace and security." We instruct you, accordingly, to call the Council's attention to the one situation which most consistently endangers peace: absolute national sovereignty. Remind the Council of the frailty, the insubstantiality, of your own Organization, in which members are not people but states.

Do not be confused by the noise of the atomic bomb. The bomb is the pea shooter come home to roost. But when you dream, dream of essential matters, of mass-energy relationships, of man-man relationships. The scientists have outdreamed you, little delegate, so dream well.

Be concerned with principles, not with results. We do not ask for results, merely for a soil-building program. You are not at a chess game, even though it has the appearance of one; you are at a carnival of hope.

For bedside reading we prescribe the opening remarks of Justice Jackson at the Nuernberg trial: "The idea that a state, any more than a corporation, commits crimes is a fiction. Crimes always are committed only by persons." (Yet the UNO has been chartered to stop states from committing crimes.) And further: "That fictional being, 'the state,' which cannot be produced for trial, cannot plead, cannot testify, and cannot be sentenced." We instruct you to compare these words with chapter II of the Charter, which says that the members of your Organization are states. If, as Justice Jackson points out, your membership is a fiction, then your first task should be to become more factual, less fictional. Your task will be to introduce people into the pie. Eventually you will have to supplant states with people, policy with law, diplomacy with legality, internationalism with federal union, and you probably haven't as much time as you like to think you have.

As talisman, do not carry a colored flag for the special occasion; carry a white handkerchief for the common cold. Blow your nose frequently and listen to the universal sound.

Finally, now that the Emperor has disclaimed divinity, we charge you to believe in yourself and to love truth. Build the great republic. The foundation is inescapable. The foundation is unity. It is what your initials suggest: UNO.

Capt. Dorothy C. Stratton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 25, 1946

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks on Capt. Dorothy C. Stratton, director of the SPARS, who was presented with a Legion of Merit, January 15, 1946, by Admiral Joseph F. Farley, Coast Guard Commandant, I include therein citation signed by the Secretary of the Navy, James V. Forrestal. The admiral explained that this honor was being conferred upon Miss Stratton "for exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding services to the Government of the United States as Director of the Women's Reserve of the United States Coast Guard Reserve."

Her accompanying citation, signed by James Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy, reads:

Responsible for initiating, reviewing, and recommending all policies and proposals for the procurement, training, and utilization of members of the Women's Reserve of the United States Coast Guard Reserve, Captain Stratton readily cooperated with the Chiefs of the various divisions of the Office of Personnel and, skillfully integrating women into the basic structure of the Coast Guard, carefully selected, trained and properly assigned SPARS as replacements for men in shore establishments. Under her inspiring leadership, the organization expanded to include approximately 1,000 officers and 10,000 enlisted women assigned to shore billets at the peak of the Coast Guard war program.

A brilliant organizer and administrator, Captain Stratton demonstrated a keen understanding of the abilities of women and of the tasks suited to their performance and, by her consummate tact in fitting women into a military organization, succeeded in directing the efforts of women of the Reserve into channels of the greatest usefulness to the Coast Guard and to the country, thereby contributing to the successful prosecution of the war.

Captain Stratton gave the Coast Guard Women's Reserve the name, SPAR, which she coined from the first letters of the Coast Guard motto, "Semper paratus," and its translation, "Always ready." She was the first "Spar," having been sworn into the Coast Guard with the rank of lieutenant a few hours after the bill creating a Women's Reserve had been signed by the President. Previously she had been a Wave, a member of the first class at the United States Naval Training Station, Smith College, Northampton, Mass. She left the Coast Guard on January 16, 1946, after over 3 years' service as director of the Spars.

In accepting the award, Captain Stratton said:

I am glad that this medal is called the Legion of Merit, for it is to the Legion that it is awarded, the Legion of 11,000 who volunteered to do a wartime job. As a representative of the Legion of Spars, I am happy to accept this award and to say how much we have appreciated the opportunity to serve in the Coast Guard.

The Coast Guard utilized the highest percentage of women of any of the services. This is adequate testimony to the adaptability of the Coast Guard and to the ability of the women who entered its service. We have liked serving in the Coast Guard, and we shall always be interested in its future.

Before she started her service career, Captain Stratton was dean of women and professor of psychology at Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind. She has five degrees—bachelor of arts from Ottawa University, Ottawa, Kans.; master of arts—psychology—from University of Chicago; doctor of philosophy—student personnel administration—from Columbia University; and the honorary degrees, doctor of laws from Ottawa University, and doctor of humane letters from Russell Sage College.

She was born in Brookfield, Mo., daughter of the late Reverend Richard L. Stratton and the former Anna Troxler.

Disgusted With Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 25, 1946

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Omaha Daily Journal-Stockman, entitled "Disgusted With Strikes."

Mr. Speaker, I believe this editorial reflects the thinking of the farmers in the Midwest, upon strikes. I have repeatedly urged that this Congress adopt legislation which would help to settle the labor-management disputes in this country. We do need legislation to make labor and industry responsible for their contracts. There is no question but that in the recent steel strike, labor broke its contract not to strike until October 1946. Labor treated their contract with steel, as just another scrap of paper. Mr. Murray shouts from the house tops that big business is trying to destroy the unions. He does this in the face of the facts that the increase offered to the steelworkers was the largest increase in pay they had ever received. The steelworkers have received, since 1940, approximately 40-percent increase in their pay. It can hardly be said that you are breaking unions when their pay is being raised.

It is a terrible situation, Mr Speaker, when our Government must first consult with labor to ascertain if they will return to work before attempting to seize industry. This was done in the packing industry. The AFL said they would return to work; the CIO hesitated. Of course, the CIO will return to work, because one of the best cards the Communists have is that of urging Government to seize all business. They want State and Government control of industry.

The time has arrived, Mr. Speaker, when this Congress must enact legislation to protect the citizens of this country. No labor union or industry should have the right to break their contracts, call a strike and throw the whole country into a distressing turmoil. No group should have special privileges and exemptions under the law.

The editorial follows:

DISGUSTED WITH STRIKES

To say that farmers are disgusted with the strike business is putting it mildly. They know that there is no wealth except in production, and they realize that the country needs wealth today as never before, to meet its accumulated obligations. They face a labor shortage worse than ever before because they can't meet the competition of industry, with their incomes restricted by food price control. They see a labor monopoly reaching out farther and farther for political and business control. They see the Government (politicians) knuckling under to organize labor's demands. And their patience is about exhausted.

One farmer suggests that all farmers just stop shipping for a time, till "labor and the politicians come to their senses." That would at least be the severe punishment, and might even be a cure. "I have a belly full of strikes and I think the general public has, too," writes another. Then there's the 90 percent—"the steady, hard-working, reliable men (men whom you and I could be proud to have as friends and neighbors), letting the 10 percent run their affairs for them. When the 90 percent get mad enough, the strike problem will be solved, and not before." And there is the element of fear, too, in this free land our ours. An Iowa farmer expresses it when he says, "I'd sure like to write a letter to Congress to let them know how we feel about strikes, but I am afraid to use the words I'd like to use for fear of getting in bad."

So the comments run. Farmers are reasonably inclined in the matter. They want to see labor well employed at good wages. That makes good markets for their products. But they can't see any sense in the current strike fever, where men lose more in lost wages than they can make up in a year or two, even if their demands are met in full. The Gencral Motors employees have been out of work since November 21, and have lost upward of $70,000,000 in wages. Some of the workers are keeping body and soul together on savings, some on credits extended by stores, and more and more are seeking relief. They got no union dole and they get no unemployment insurance while on strike.

A tragic thing about it is that the majority of the strikers want to work. But they are no longer freemen; they are slaves, with their destiny in the hands of a little coterie of self-perpetuating leaders concerned not so much for workers or the wages paid them as for more and more power, in politics and in business. They are determined to run the country and the business of the country, and the only power to stop them is in Congress. That is why it is important that Congress hear from the country. That is one place where a farmer's letter—and a farmer's vote—still carries weight.

All Our Postage Stamps Should Bear the Name "The United States of America"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 25, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, recently there has been called to my attention a circumstance that perhaps the average person does not

know exists. Apparently, a number of recent issues of postage stamps by the Post Office Department do not bear the full legal designation of the name of our country, "The United States of America."

The Oklahoma Philatelic Society has just brought this circumstance to my attention. They have written the Postmaster General on the same subject, and I am pleased to quote a resolution which the Oklahoma Philatelic Society has adopted and submitted to be, as follows:

Whereas the term "United States" on the postage stamps of our country is not completely descriptive, inasmuch as there are the United States of Mexico, United States of Brazil, United States of Colombia, and others;

Whereas the official name of our country, "The United States of America," is used on all official documents and on all money issued by our Government (article "the" is usually omitted on coins and on other items of restricted space);

Whereas a number of recent issues of postage stamps of our country bear the designation "United States of America," for example, National Defense (three values), 1940; Emancipation, 1940; Vermont Statehood, 1941; Railroad Golden Spike Ceremony, 1944; Motion Picture Issue, 1944;

Whereas grammatically the words "United States of" are a descriptive term modifying the proper name "America";

Whereas alphabetically the name of our country should be carried under the A's, much as a person's name is located in a directory by his surname;

Whereas historically our country has since its independence been considered and designated as "America" and its people have been referred to as Americans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the full name "United States of America" shall appear on all future potsage stamps issued by this country.

The Oklahoma Philatelic Society does hereby respectfully petition the Post Office Department to take such steps as are necessary to secure fulfillment of this desire in order that the full name of our country may be read on postage stamps wherever the mail of the United States of America shall be delivered.

No Belt Tightening

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 25, 1946

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Press of January 22, 1946:

NO BELT TIGHTENING

President Truman may have set a lasting precedent in combining his message on the state of the union with the budget message. This departure has received much comment, mostly favorable, though it seems more a change of form and procedure than anything else. However, in the sense that it draws attention to the economic crisis ahead for all the people of the United States, the combination of the two messages may have its values.

The first apparent objective of the message is to turn the public eye to the dangers of inflation. The president makes the point that—by using 1945 funds unspent for war due to the end of hostilities—he is reducing the national debt slightly and offsetting from these so-called savings the $4,347,000,000 he proposes that we spend above income in the year beginning July 1. If that represents the setting of a Government example of belt tightening, it is not a very strong one. Furthermore, it is common knowledge that we may very well have to loan Britain more than $4,000,000,000 if we are to take even a minimum step in getting the orderly expansion of foreign trade under way again; and this very important bit of international pump priming is given no consideration in Mr. Truman's estimates.

Setting aside the very great factors for producing money inflation which are under way, and which Melchior Palyi in his press article Monday contended were having a far greater effect than all the opposite attempts of OPA to hold down commodity prices, a natural question after reading the President's message is whether he is seriously aware of the price inflation forces which exist today.

The whole Nation, to halt the inflationary trend, would have to tighten its belt and produce the greatest amount at the lowest possible costs. Industry would have to speed reconversion and risk its money on necessary building and renovation in order to increase production. Labor would have to go to work with a single will to increase productivity of every man and hold down unit costs. Government would have to cut taxes on production in order to encourage industry to expand and risk. Incentives to increase supply at the same or lower costs would have to be matched by speed to prevent further piling up of unmet demand, with its desperate willingness to pay black-market prices.

The President's message, sincere in purpose as it may be, offers no leading in these directions. The Government does not propose to tighten its taxation belt at all. The President continues his demand for vastly expensive cradle-to-grave health service. He does not abandon his support of "ability-to-pay" as a basis for inflationary wages. He asks arbitrary increases in wage minimums. He proposes the further venture of the Federal Government into housing, the retention of its centralized control of employment, expansion of unemployment-insurance benefits with all their unfortunate effects of delaying return to work, a similar expansion for veterans, establishment of universal military service despite the atom-bomb lesson, and a number of other items which—far from representing a belt-tightening program—actually mean the loosening of the Nation's belt. They mean encouragement of inflationary influences continuance of strikes through tacit Federal support for the economic fallacies behind them, and the sure increase of Federal Government responsibilities for high-cost activities in social ventures.

Then the President proposes that we drop this highly inflationary program into the lap of the OPA for a continued price-contral rat race after June 30, and further implement it by continued food subsidies. We are afraid it will be a thankless job for the agencies which will be given a further lease of life.

Unification of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. BUTLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 25, 1946

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which I received from Mr. John F. Evans, commandant of the Niagara Frontier Detachment Marine Corps League at Buffalo, N. Y., on the subject of unification of the armed forces. I think this is one of the outstanding organizations in our country, and is one of long standing. This organization is composed of men who keep abreast of the times, and I believe their opinion is worthy of consideration. They have come to a decisive conclusion after long deliberation.

NIAGARA FRONTIER DETACHMENT,
MARINE CORPS LEAGUE,
Snyder, N. Y., January 12, 1946.

Hon. JOHN C. BUTLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This detachment in the Marine Corps League, organized in the year 1923, has functioned continuously as a marine veterans' organization, and now wishes to go on record, and in so doing, is in complete agreement with the Commandant of the United States Marine Corps, Gen. Alexander A. Vandegrift, as being unequivocally and unalterably opposed to the proposed unification of the armed forces of our country.

As commandant of the Buffalo detachment I am sure I bespeak the sentiments of all the seven or eight thousand men from western New York who, at one time or another, were privileged to served their country as members of the United States Marine Corps.

I assure you, Congressman, your voice in opposition to the proposed merger of the services will be greatly appreciated by all marines, and, of course, especially by those from western New York.

Thank you.

Respectfully,

JOHN F. EVANS,
Commandant.

A Lofty Ambition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 25, 1946

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Endicott (N. Y.) Bulletin:

A LOFTY AMBITION

President Truman, in his combined State of the Union and Budget message to Congress, outlined what he called a program for national economic prosperity based on higher wages and lower prices.

The President's program, coming as it does when over a million workers are striking against management, nonetheless sounds ideal. It is a lofty goal—one that should meet with the wholehearted approval of the average wage earner—but under existing legislation and procedure relating to labor and management, it is a goal that is practically out of reach.

Ever since the beginning of the current labor-management crisis, wages and prices have been the major factors. Labor has demanded higher wages and has been fairly successful in obtaining its demands. Management has been willing to grant wage increases up to a certain point. After that, to meet labor's full demands, management has insisted on the right to increase prices.

Now, President Truman has outline a utopian prosperity program based on all of what one group demands, but less than the other party demands. Such a prosperity, or

even a better relationship between labor and management, can never be attained unless there is a just basis for compromise.

We believe, however, that the President can effect more satisfactory relations between labor and management, reduce strikes, and possibly make a long stride toward attaining its ultimate goal, by supporting legislation which would "give strikes back to the strikers."

The present procedure is usually this: As a union's contract nears its expiration date, leaders of the union inform rank-and-file members that they intend to demand an increase of 30 percent in wages. If indications are that management will deny the demand, a strike vote is taken by the rank-and-file members, under National Labor Relations Board supervision. The vote is taken before actual bargaining negotiations begin, and from that point on the rank-and-file member is a forgotten man, as the union leaders carry the ball.

While the union and management bicker back and forth, after a strike begins, the rank-and-file member sits idly by, watching and waiting while walking a picket line. He has no voice in the proceedings, although he is the big loser.

Our suggestion is to pass legislation which would guarantee the rank-and-file union members the privilege of voting—by secret ballot and under NLRB supervision—on acceptance or rejection of any compromise offer management would make during the process of bargaining.

We are inclined to believe that the average union member would rather work than strike, providing he is treated fairly by management. We believe strikes such as the one against General Motors would not continue long if the rank and file were granted, by law, the right to vote on management's compromise offer.

If such a law were passed, giving strikes back to the strikers, we are sincere in our belief that strikes would be the exception rather than the rule in labor disputes.

And if such a law were passed, we believe President Truman's goal for national prosperity based on higher wages and lower prices would be within reach of being a reality.

Not Unduly Exacting About Treaties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 25, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, when the Secretary of State, Mr. James F. Byrnes, reported on the failure of the London Conference last October, he pointed out the mild attitude taken by the United States toward the many demands of the Soviet Government, and summed up our approach to the mutual engagements entered upon by the United States and Russia as being "not unduly exacting."

Since October, as every newspaper reader knows, there have been a series of further concessions by the United States as to positions taken vis-à-vis the Soviets, including some undisclosed but possibly far-reaching abridgements of our policy in the Pacific and East Asia. All these steps have been presented to us as necessary to soothe Soviet suspicion of our imperialistic intent and to obtain—eventually—Soviet cooperation for peace under treaties which shall establish a codified basis for international law.

Good faith is, of course, an essential element of any treaty, and in this regard the following record of the Soviet Government's respect for treaties should be of interest to all Members of the Congress and to the American public at large:

THE TREATIES STALIN BROKE—DOES THE RECORD JUSTIFY CONFIDENCE IN BOLSHEVIK ASSURANCES?

(By Julius Epstein)

(Julius Epstein, who came to the United States in 1939, was for many years foreign correspondent in Europe for Swiss Social Democratic newspapers Das Volksrecht, Zurich; and Freie Innerschweik, Lucerne. He is the author of The Nonsense of Autarchy, Sources of Anarchism, and The Yellow Claw; Japan on the Threshold of World Domination. In June 1942 he joined the staff of the OWI. He is now a free-lance journalist.)

Stalin has broken every international treaty or agreement his Government has signed at the first moment he had the power to do so, provided he considered violating a treaty advantageous to Soviet Russia. The only question Stalin asks himself is the question, "How far can I go without the risk of serious international repercussions?" That is exactly the same question Hitler asked himself before committing an aggression. Stalin, however, is more cautious and intelligent than Hitler.

No one expressed the Stalinists' attitude toward international treaties more clearly than the Soviet Commissar for Foreign Affairs, Maxim Litvinov, when he wrote in his book Vneshniaia Politika U. S. S. R., "As a rule, a treaty of neutrality is nothing but one of the elements in the preparation for war, one of the elements in making an aggression 'harmless.'"

After having concluded the pact with Hitler, Stalin did not hesitate to share the spoils. When the German Army had overrun Poland, Stalin crossed the eastern borders of the country and occupied more than half of Poland. Molotov, Soviet Commissar of Foreign Affairs, triumphantly declared before the Soviet Parliament on October 31, 1939: "One swift blow to Poland, first by the German Army and then by the Red Army, and nothing was left of this ugly offspring of the Versailles Treaty. * * * We were always of the opinion that a strong Germany is a necessary prerequisite for the preservation of a stable peace in Europe. An attempt at another Versailles in the present international situation may end in a complete crash."

By invading Poland and annexing half of it, Stalin obviously broke:

1. The Soviet-Polish treaty of peace of March 18, 1921, signed in Riga, the treaty which Lenin called "a voluntary and just agreement to stand for all time."

2. The "treaty for the renunciation of wars as an instrument of national policy," the so-called Briand-Kellogg Pact of August 27, 1926, to which the Soviet Union as well as Poland had subscribed on February 9, 1929. The Briand-Kellogg Pact is the most solemn condemnation of war ever signed. The first two articles of this pact read as follows:

"The high contracting parties solemnly declare in the names of their respective peoples that they condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies, and renounce it as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another.

"The high contracting parties agree that the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts of whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them, shall never be sought except by pacific means."

3. The treaty of nonaggression between the Soviet Union and Poland, concluded in Moscow on July 25, 1932, and prolonged till December 31, 1945, which read in part:

"The two contracting parties recording the fact that they have renounced war as an instrument of national policy in their mutual relations, reciprocally undertake to refrain from any aggressive action against or invading the territory of the other party separately or together with other powers.

"Should one of the contracting parties be attacked by a third state or by a group of other states, the other contracting party undertakes not to give aid or assistance, either directly or indirectly, to the aggressor state during the whole period of the conflict.

"Each of the contracting parties undertakes not to be a party to any agreement openly hostile to the other party from the point of view of aggression."

The Russian Government expressed very clearly its opinion on aggression when it signed the convention for the definition of aggression on July 3, 1933, in London. Ironically the definition used in this convention is based upon the Russian proposal. I quote:

"The central executive committee of the U. S. S. R. * * * the president of the Polish Republic. * * *

"Impelled by the desire to strengthen the peace existing between their countries,

"Believing that the Briand-Kellogg Pact (Pact of Paris) to which they are signatories forbids all aggression,

"Deeming it necessary in the interests of universal security to define as closely as possible the conception of aggression, in order to eliminate every pretext for its justification * * * have agreed upon the following provisions:

"Article 1. Each of the high contracting parties undertakes to recognize in its relations with each of the other parties, beginning with the day this convention enters into effect, the definition of aggressor outlined in the report of the security committee of May 1933 (the politics report) at the Disarmament Conference, based upon the proposal of the Soviet delegation.

"Article 2. In accordance with the above, the aggressor in an international conflict, with due consideration to the agreements existing between the parties involved in the conflict, will be considered the state which will be the first to commit any of the following acts:

"1. Declaration of war against another state;

"2. Invasion by armed forces, even without a declaration of war, of the territory of another state;

"3. Any attack by armed land, naval, or air forces, even without a declaration of war, upon the territory, naval vessels, or aircraft of another state; * * *

"Article 3. No considerations of a political, military, economic, or any other nature can serve as an excuse or justification of aggression as specified in article 2."

By attacking Poland, Stalin eventually broke—as No. 4—the Covenant of the Legue of Nations of which Soviet Russia had become a member on September 18, 1934. Article 12 of the Covenant reads as follows:

"The members of the League agree that, if there should arise between them any dispute likely to lead to a rupture, they will submit the matter either to arbitration or judicial settlement or to inquiry by the Council, and they agree in no case to resort to war until 3 months after the award by the arbitrators or the judicial decision or the report by the Council."

On November 30, 1939, Stalin attacked Finland. Again he broke the Briand-Kellogg Pact and the Covenant of the League of Nations. This time the League acted. Soviet Russia was expelled and declared an outlaw nation by the League on December 14, 1939.

The aggression against Finland was a violation of the Soviet-Finnish Treaty of Peace of October 14, 1920, and the Soviet-Finnish

nonaggression pact of January 21, 1932, valid till December 31, 1945. Article 1 of this nonaggression pact and "Pacific settlement of disputes between U. S. S. R. and Finland says:

"1—The high contracting parties mutually guarantee the inviolability of the existing frontiers between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Republic of Finland as fixed by the treaty of peace concluded at Dorpat on October 14, 1920, which shall remain the firm foundation of their relations, and reciprocally undertake to refrain from any act of aggression directed against each other."

Stalin was only too eager to use the pact with Hitler and the following events as a welcome opportunity to grab the three Baltic States—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. To conquer these independent states he had only to violate the following treaties which all guaranteed the integrity and inviolability of the three countries:

1. The Soviet-Estonian Peace Treaty of February 2, 1920, signed in Tartu.

2. The Soviet-Estonian nonaggression pact of May 4, 1932.

3. The Soviet-Estonian pact of mutual assistance of September 28, 1939.

4. The Soviet-Latvian Treaty of Peace of August 11, 1920, concluded in Riga.

5. The Soviet-Latvian nonaggression pact of February 5, 1932.

6. The Soviet-Latvian mutual assistance pact of October 5, 1939.

7. The Soviet-Lithuanian Treaty of Peace of July 12, 1920, signed in Moscow.

8. The Soviet-Lithuanian Treaty of Neutrality and Non-aggression which the Russian Government signed on September 28, 1926, in Moscow.

9. The Soviet-Lithuanian Mutual Assistance Pact of October 10, 1939.

Besides these main treaties Stalin had to break a special agreement with Hitler, concluded in 1939, and concerning the division of spheres in eastern Europe. This agreement bound Stalin not to sovietize the Baltic States. It goes without saying that he broke it at the very moment, in June 1940, he thought he could do so without risk.

After Hitler treacherously broke his pact with Stalin, Russia became an ally of the western democracies, and a member of the United Nations. As our ally Stalin subscribed to a great many common declarations and special agreements. There is hardly a single one which he did not violate when he felt he could do this to the advantage of the neoimperialistic policy of the Soviet Union.

Let us proceed chronologically:

On January 1, 1942, Maxim Litvinov, Stalin's Ambassador to the United States, signed the declaration by the United Nations. By this act Soviet Russia officially became an adherent to the Atlantic Charter, the first three articles of which read:

"1. Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial, or other.

"2. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned.

"3. They respect the right of all people to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

One has only to recall the Russian annexation of parts of East Prussia and the annexation of the Kurile Islands to realize how seriously Stalin kept article 1 of the Atlantic Charter.

To describe Stalin's hundredfold violations of the two other articles of the Atlantic Charter quoted above would mean to write the gruesome history of his unilateral dealings in the Baltic States, in Poland, Rumania, Yugoslavia Bulgaria, Hungary, Austria, and the Far East.

Immediately after Hitler's attack against Russia, on July 30, 1941, Stalin concluded a pact of friendship with his new ally, Poland. Paragraph 1 of that agreement reads as follows:

"1. The Soviet Government recognizes that the Soviet-German treaties of 1939 as to territorial changes in Poland have lost their validity."

How did Stalin implement this clear paragraph?

He changed the Molotov-Ribbentrop line into the Curzon line, so keeping almost exactly the same amount of the booty he had received by Hitler's grace and forced Poland to annex land which never has been Polish.

The next in the serial of common declarations to which Stalin subscribed because he was badly in need of the second front, and therefore ready to sign every declaration no matter how idealistic it might be, was the so-called Joint Four-Nation Declaration of the Three Powers Conference at Moscow (October 30, 1943), which emphasizes:

"That for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security pending the reestablishment of law and order and the inauguration of a system of general security, they will consult with one another and as occasion requires with other members of the United Nations with a view to joint action on behalf of the community of nations."

Stalin's dealings in eastern Europe and the Balkans are nothing but the history of violations of this paragraph and the violation of the other common declarations. All these common declarations have the same contents, the promise of honest concord in the postwar period, the promise of free and unfettered elections in the liberated countries, and the promise to maintain peace and security and to remove all threats to peace, and so on. Stalin kept none of them.

The remaining common declarations of the United Nations have also been violated:

The Three-Power Declaration of Tehran (December 1, 1943).

The Yalta Declaration on Liberated Europe and Poland (February 12, 1945).

The San Francisco Charter (June 26, 1945).

The Declaration of Potsdam (August 2, 1945).

The last declaration distinguishes itself from the others because it contains not only general phrases but also two exact stipulations. The first one reads: "During the period of occupation German shall be treated as a single economic unit." Stalin did exactly the opposite. He treated his part of Germany as he pleased without asking anybody. He removed all machinery and office fittings from various American- and British-owned factories. According to a New York Times report of August 21, 1945, the Russians stole immense amounts of property legally owned by the International Telegraph & Telephone Co., F. W. Woolworth, Metals Coating Co., of Philadelphia, Anaconda Copper, International Business Machines, the Ford Motor Co., Gillette Razor Co., and various others. That's the way the Russians treat Germany as "economic unit." Furthermore they removed railroad tracks and shipped them to the U. S. S. R.

Another paragraph of the Potsdam Declaration says that the "representatives of the allied press will enjoy full freedom to report to the world upon developments in Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Finland."

The next pact Stalin broke, and this time with the approval of Great Britain and the United States, is the Soviet-Japanese Neutrality Pact, signed in Moscow on April 13, 1941. This pact obliged both countries to "maintain peaceful and friendly relations * * * and mutually respect the territorial integrity and inviolability of the other contracting party." The pact should be valid for 5 years. Article 3 says: "In case neither of the contracting parties dencunces the pact 1 year before expiration of the term, it will be considered automatically prolonged for the next 5 years."

According to this stipulation and the fact Soviet Russia denounced the pact shortly before April 25, 1945, the Soviet Union could not declare war on Japan before April 25, 1946.

On April 14, 1941, Molotov signed a "frontier declaration" attached to the neutrality pact. In this declaration "the two countries solemnly declare that the USSR pledges to respect the territorial integrity and inviolability of Manchukuo, and Japan pledges to respect the territorial integrity and inviolability of the Mongolian People's Republic."

On the morning of August 8, 1945, the Russian motorized divisions roared over the borders of Manchukuo.

As Litvinov wrote:

"As a rule, a treaty of neutrality is nothing but one of the elements in the preparation for war, one of the elements in making an aggression 'harmless.'"

While this article is going to press, Stalin's last two violations of international law became evident. They concern China and Iran.

There can be no doubt that Stalin's interference in China's internal struggle violates article 5 of the Chinese-Russian treaty of alliance of August 14, 1945, signed in Moscow, which reads:

"Article 5. The high contracting parties, taking into consideration the interests of security and economic development of both parties, agree to work together in close and friendly cooperation after the conclusion of peace and to act according to the principle of mutual respect for their sovereignty and territorial entity and noninterference in the internal affairs of both contracting parties."

No less striking a violation of international law is Stalin's most recent interference in Iran. There he first instigated a "revolt" in the Province of Azerbaijan, with the clearly voiced aim that this province may become "independent" (read, a Soviet puppet), and then prevented the Iranian Government forces from entering the Province of Azerbaijan. By this, Stalin not only violated the Declaration of Tehran in which he recognized the Iranian Government as his "ally" but the solemnly concluded treaty of alliance between the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union and Iran, signed at Tehran, January 29, 1942.

In this treaty Stalin promised in article 1 to "undertake to respect the territorial integrity, sovereignty, and political independence of Iran," and in article 6, "not to adopt an attitude which is prejudicial to the territorial integrity, sovereignty, or political independence of Iran, nor to conclude treaties inconsistent with the provisions of the present treaty."

The American people should bear in mind the undeniable facts.

Only then will we be able to answer the fateful question—can we trust Stalin's word?

Name of the treaty, date of signing, and place

1. Soviet-Polish Treaty of Peace, March 18, 1921, Riga.

2. Treaty for Renunciation of Wars as an Instrument of National Policy (Briand-Kellogg Pact or Pact of Paris), February 9, 1929, Paris.

3. Treaty of Nonaggression between the Soviet Union and Poland, July 25, 1932, Moscow.

4. U. S. S. R. Convention for the Definition of Aggression, July 3, 1933, London.

5. Convention of the League of Nations, September 18, 1934, Geneva.

6. Soviet-Finnish Treaty of Peace, October 14, 1920, Dorpat.

7. Soviet-Finnish Nonaggression Pact, January 21, 1932, Helsinki.

8. Soviet-Esthonian Treaty of Peace, February 2, 1920, Tartu.

9. Soviet-Esthonian Nonaggression Pact, May 4, 1932, Moscow.

10. Soviet-Estonian Pact of Mutual Assistance, September 28, 1939, Moscow.
11. Soviet-Latvian Treaty of Peace, August 11, 1920, Riga.
12. Soviet-Latvian Nonaggression Pact, February 5, 1932, Riga.
13. Soviet-Latvian Mutual Assistance Pact, October 5, 1939, Moscow.
14. Soviet-Lithuanian Treaty of Peace, July 12, 1920, Moscow.
15. Soviet-Lithuanian Treaty of Neutrality and Nonaggression, September 28, 1926, Moscow.
16. Soviet-Lithuanian Mutual Assistance Pact, October 10, 1939, Moscow.
17. Atlantic Charter, January 1, 1942, Washington.
18. Soviet-Polish Friendship Pact, July 30, 1941, London.
19. Joint Four-Nation Declaration, October 30, 1943, Moscow.
20. Three-Power Declaration, December 1, 1943, Teheran.
21. Yalta Declaration, February 12, 1945, Yalta.
22. San Francisco Charter, June 26, 1945, San Francisco.
23. Potsdam Declaration, August 2, 1945, Potsdam.
24. Soviet-Japanese Neutrality Pact, April 13, 1941, Moscow.
25. Frontier Declaration between U. S. S. R. and Japan, April 14, 1941, Moscow.
26. Treaty of Alliance between the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union and Iran, January 29, 1942, Teheran.
27. Chinese-Russian Treaty of Alliance and Friendship, August 14, 1945, Moscow.

Veterans Favor 10-Year Suspension of Immigration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 25, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion recently among all classes of people, and particularly among the servicemen and the veterans of World War II, with reference to further immigration to this country.

I find that the people with whom I have talked are decidedly in favor of restricting immigration to the minimum, and many believe that immigration should be suspended for at least 10 years, until after our own veterans and citizens are able to construct and establish new homes and obtain employment and security for themselves and their families.

There is much to be said in favor of the sentiment that is being crystalized in this country. Suspension of immigration for 10 years will enable us to provide the living accommodations and necessities of our own people to a large extent, and then we may consider the advisability of admitting people from other countries.

In this connection, I am pleased to quote the following resolution adopted by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States through its national legislative committee in meeting assembled the 14th, 15th, and 16th of January 1946, at Washington, D. C.:

SUSPENSION OF ALL IMMIGRATION

Whereas the critical shortage of housing in the United States is such as to require a period of 10 years for construction of new homes before the housing accommodations will meet the demands of the population of the United States; and

Whereas the United States has an obligation to first furnish employment to the men and women of the armed forces who have defended this country, and also furnish employment to the other employable citizens of the United States; and

Whereas unrestricted immigration to this country will intensify the critical housing shortage and prevent the furnishing of employment to returned veterans and employable citizens: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, through its national legislative committee, meeting in Washington, January 14, 15, and 16, 1946, That Congress be requested to immediately enact legislation prohibiting immigration from all countries for a period of 10 years; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to all Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States, with a request for an early pronouncement of their position on this issue.

Billions in United States Supplies Scattered About Globe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 25, 1946

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Times-Herald, Washington, D. C., Sunday, January 20, 1946, by Merrill C. Meigs, including introduction:

BILLIONS IN UNITED STATES SUPPLIES SCATTERED ABOUT GLOBE—ROUND-THE-WORLD FLIGHT REVEALS MOST WILL HAVE TO STAY AS DEAD LOSS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The Times-Herald herewith presents a condensed version of a round-the-world diary by Merrill C. Meigs, a member of the Army-Navy Foreign Surplus Liquidation Commission, just returned from a global inspection of United States war surpluses. He represented the Secretary of War, Robert P. Patterson, and Thomas McCabe, Chief of the Surplus Board. Mr. Meigs is vice president of the Hearst Corp. Mr. Hearst contributed the services of Mr. Meigs to the War Production Board in its early days, where he served as Chief of the Aircraft Division under both General Knudsen and Donald Nelson.)

(By Merrill C. Meigs)

CHICAGO.—I have just returned from an inspection tour of our stupendous surplus depots overseas, covering 31,000 square miles.

I went as a representative of Secretary Patterson, not as a newspaperman.

The facts presented came not only from personal investigation but from officers and men whose counsel and information I sought—responsible Americans like General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, Commissioner Paul McNutt, Ambassador Jefferson Caffrey, Generals Wedemeyer, Richardson, Henley, Cannon, Brady, McMullen, Brandt, Parker, Bedell Smith, Clay, Echols, and Giles; Admirals Townes, Spruance, Taffiner, and Hanson, plus many articulate GI's and our hard-working surplus supply men.

Upon my return I made my report to Secretary Patterson and Commissioner McCabe, who agreed that a brief synopsis of my experiences would be of interest to the American public.

Billions of dollars' worth of United States equipment is properly assorted, cataloged, and housed where possible. However, the surplus is so vast that lack of storage and personnel for its preservation and guarding subject these materials to rapid deterioration.

I saw American officers and GI's struggling to solve the fantastic jigsaw of surplus, and I saw understaffed State Department men tactfully battling the unreasonable demands of some of our allies.

GRAPHIC PROOF OF CONSOLIDATION NEED

I saw graphic reasons for a united command of our armed forces at bases where the Army and Navy had built and maintained costly establishments in duplication of each other.

I detected a sharp need for a more realistic United States outlook on surpluses and of a more realistic foreign policy. I am no imperialist, but there are strong indications that we are bending over backward to be pleasant to certain countries which screamed for our aid—and got it—but which now are reluctant even to let our commercial planes land at fields we built.

Out of the often-bewildering panorama come several thoughts:

We must either pull completely out of a majority of our foreign bases—and write off the staggering cost—or we must keep a strong staff of seasoned experts in those areas to protect and maintain our huge investments.

Our representatives in the field feel the need for a strong, simple, and understandable foreign policy, which would protect first and last the interests of the United States of America. While there are billions in surplus, there is a glaring scarcity of decisions from Washington.

If we do not remedy this situation, we are going to confirm a growing feeling in certain countries that we are a Nation of suckers.

Our air facilities overseas have been reduced to such a state that one green, if willing, hand now works where several splendidly trained experts once labored. The fabulous records we set for safety during the conflict are being dissipated daily because we simply haven't sufficient trained men to run our far-flung network of Army and Navy planes.

PLANE MAKERS GEARED FOR HUGE PRODUCTION

It must be remembered that before Pearl Harbor the United States got along nicely with 370 commercial air liners. And we were the most air-minded nation in the world. The 370 planes more than handled the country's air traffic.

This traffic, naturally, will be expanded now. More and more people—including hundreds of thousands of airmen trained by Uncle Sam—will want to fly in the postwar world. But the progress attained will not in any way parallel the tremendous strides made by United States plane manufacturers when the call came to them to build war planes.

Willow Run itself was geared to build a four-engine Liberator bomber every hour of the day and night. One can readily understand how quickly the supply would overrun the demand, and the hard times which would come upon United States plane makers if surplus bombers and transports were dumped on the American market.

HOW CAN SURPLUS TANKS BE USED?

As for tanks, guns, and millions of other items and weapons of the great conflict, how can they ever be bent into plowshares?

We apparently must leave most, if not all, of this material overseas.

If we keep any considerable force overseas, we must by all means see to it that these men continue to get the best treatment, housing, food, equipment, entertainment, and religious and recreational facilities.

I am happy to report to United States parents that their sons remain the best-fed, best-equipped servicemen in the world. They have the finest supervision and guidance and at this time their lot is being made as pleasant as is humanly possible.

Parents and wives of men overseas, however, must face this inescapable fact, that their demands that the boys be sent home immediately is stripping the Army and Navy of its technical men and experienced hands.

As the father of three servicemen, I can understand that demand. Perhaps the hidden cost of bringing the boys home, which would involve sacrificing veritable mountains of expensive gear, can be marked off as part of the price of operating our great, free country.

But, having seen what that gigantic price is, and having heard the pleas over there for new experts to replace the old, I wish that more of our leaders and more parents could have made the trip I recently made. They would then at least grasp the cost of headlong demobilization, even if they were inclined to damn the cost.

DEMOBLIZATION HAS GONE TOO RAPIDLY

In the short months since VJ-day, experienced officers told me our demobilization has been so rapid that it would take us a year and a half again to be as strong as we were on the day final victory was won.

Our surplus problems are mighty. We must dispose of tremendous mounds of perishable and semiperishable food we stored throughout the world, and the same is true of medical supplies.

We must carefully weigh myriad other supplies against the threat that will glut United States markets, retard new business here and abroad, or become tools of another and mightier war.

We must sell what we can, rather than give it away. We must outwait such powers as the French, who are biding their time against the day when sufficient sentiment in the United States will take the Americans out of France and dump desired stores in France's lap.

And we must discourage the tendency of some powers to charge us rent for storing supplies which helped save those countries from starvation, disease, and slavery.

It is nobody's fault that we piled up such stores. We had to be prepared to invade Japan with millions of men. We had to be prepared to fight the final battle for Germany in Hitler's Bavarian redoubt.

Our supply lines from home to the fighting fronts were jam-packed—a miraculous and still unsung achievement of our services of supplies. The supply pipes were filled in the manner that the pipes leading from the reservoir to your kitchen spigots are filled.

But the job is not yet finished. And we at home will be doing both our men and our country a real service if we will understand that adequate staffs are still needed overseas to solve the supply problem and other complexities of demobilization and occupation.

Riding in the plastic nose of our special B–17 Flying Fortress, jotting down these notes, I found myself wondering how the cost of it all would ever be paid; how to ease the burden on coming generations of taxpayers.

GLOBAL LOG

November 4: Left Washington 11:30 a. m., after receiving instruction in use of parachute, "Mae West," rubber boat, signals, radio.

November 5: Left Bermuda 7:13 a. m. Four hours over Atlantic, rear entrance blew off. Could not repair. Returned after 8½ hours.

November 6, 7: Awaited repairs, or new plane.

November 8: New B–17 arrived. Departed, 4:20 p. m.

November 9: Landed Santa Maria, Azores, where United States invested $20,000,000 in fine airport. Portuguese natives earn $1 a day for 10 to 12 hours. Arrived Paris. Army-operated hotel. Steam heat. Good food. Tired.

November 10, 11: Armistice Day parade reviewed by General De Gaulle. Weather reporting here unreliable, due to departure of experienced men.

November 12: No market for scrap. Miles and miles surplus guns, tanks, trucks, etc.—250,000 items.

November 13: Flew over Le Havre, Omaha Beach. Barges remain sunk off beaches. Ground pulverized. Arrived Bovington Airport, London.

November 14: Inspected base near Liverpool. Everything fine order. Surpluses carefully stacked, housed.

November 15: Fog and rain prevented departure for Germany.

November 16: To Wiesbaden at 5,000 feet. Rode in glass nose of plane. Saw Dunkirk, Liege.

November 17: Frankfort and Mainz. What demolition!

November 18: Rhine. Hitler's gleaming white yacht—United States now operates it. No transportation. People walking, walking.

November 19: Berlin and indescribable destruction. Templehofen Field. Short, rough runways.

November 20: Hitler's bomb shelter. Chancellery. Women working with shovels, wheelbarrows.

November 21: Marseille, Swiss Alps, Corsica. Beautiful, rugged, tough country. Napoleon had to be tough to live in Corsica. Surplus representative says plenty of surpluses—but short on decisions from Washington.

November 22: Rome, Vatican. St. Peter's, most beautiful and awe-inspiring sight. Beggars pilfered car. Naples. Airplane surplus property man here well posted. Knows where every plane is and condition. Ruins of Pompeii. Fly over top Vesuvius, now inactive. San Carlos Opera House.

AGENTS IN ROME HAVE NO ORDERS

We flew in over Rome and Vatican City just at sunset, a stunning sight which soon will be within reach of countless air-minded Americans.

Surplus representatives in Rome told me that they have arranged to sell some of the supplies we cannot bring home, but that Washington has not told them what to accept for money.

A trip to the Vatican is a reassuring experience for any man, regardless of his faith. Here was peace in the midst of war, a tiny oasis in a desert of savagery, corruption and abandonment of human rights.

As in the past, I find no words apt enough to describe the magnificence of St. Peter's, nor the thoughts a visit there stimulates.

November 23. Off for Cairo. Sicily barren. Steep mountains. Bengazi. Remains of battlefields.

November 24. Cairo, Sphinx. Natives share mud huts with donkeys and water buffalo.

UNITED STATES IN MIDDLE OF CAIRO FIGHT

We invested about $3,250,000 in building Payne Field near Cairo, an airport complete with runways, hangars, shops, world-wide communications, passengers and freight facilities and housing for operating personnel. But we are having considerable difficulties getting permission from the Egyptian Government to continue to operate our airport. They propose to take over our airport, Payne Field, for the training and maintenance of their own army air force, compelling us to move all our operations to their inferior municipal airport.

Some Egyptians told me that it is the British—who control Egypt—who are promoting this exchange. But Englishmen told me to blame the Egyptians for the freeze that is being put on us.

Anyway, we are in the middle, and our representatives were praying that Washington would take strong action on this case.

November 25: To Jerusalem via Suez Canal in C–54. Port Said. Egyptians hunt ducks here. Seventy-five average bag. Palestine. Bethlehem. Dead Sea. River Jordan. Jericho. Pinch myself and stroke chin. No, am not living in Old Testament. Poker with Sheik. Lost. His English excellent. Only 35 percent literate in Cairo. The Nile.

November 26: Abadan famous for oil Karachi. Skinny natives sit on heels staring. Agra, India. Taj Mahal. Next to St. Peter's most impressive. Then what contrast! Mud huts. No windows or doors. Any American jail a palace in comparison. Fine intelligent American officers.

November 27: En route to Calcutta. Bicycles. Donkeys. Oxcarts. Open, unsanitary wells. Study graphs showing surpluses. Well-planned disposal set up. Natives bathe in water holes, wash clothes, and drink same water.

November 28: Cross Hooghly in launch. Bodies of dead native float by. Visited ghats where dead are burned. Wealthy buy all-consuming fire; the poor scorch body then throw in river. Inspected 700 planes not worth flying home. No market but for few. Fifty times as many people as in one block at home—crawling over each other like ants. Walking skeletons. My impression is get whites out of here and quick, regardless of surpluses.

November 29: Glad to leave for Kunming, China. Fly over Hump of Himalayas, 13,500 feet. Terrible winds. Drafts drop plane thousand feet then drive them back up again. Ice forms on wings. Vicious looking mountains. No wonder we lost hundreds of planes here during war. Quarter in General Chennault's rambling house. Airport bisects graveyard.

November 30: Flying over China. Such great rivers. No railroads. Freight transported by boat.

December 1: Shanghai. Smiling natives. Cathay-Manions Hotel. No heat. Japs took radiators for scrap. Everyone has a cold.

December 2. Visit head of China-American Air Force. Lacks trained mechanics to keep planes repaired. Not much declared surplus because no decision yet on size of Chinese and our Army. Excellent Chinese dinner. Use chopsticks, but mostly fingers. How to get 6,000,000 Japs out of Korea and Manchuria a problem. China impoverished. We hold the bag.

December 3: Tokyo, Yokohama. Burned out. Worse than Berlin. Nagasaki, Hiroshima—complete burnout. Rice paddies. Visited General MacArthur. Says he is telling Japs the story of freedom. Cannot leave for visit home until job is done. Dinner Imperial Hotel. GI rations.

December 4: Spent day in our International News Service office. Went to Jap Diet but Diet was not in session—gone to see American movie on how they were licked. Delicious dinner. General Kenney's home but general away. Complimented Jap cooks. Response, smiles, bows.

December 5: Okinawa. Hundreds of GI units. Steam shovels eating at hillsides. Town of 25,000 destroyed. Church steeple still stands. Army-Navy cooperating. Natives uneducated—small, runtylike Japs.

December 6: Fly over Bataan, Corregidor. Feeling of awe and reverence as we think of humiliation, starvation, and death of our men.

December 7: Manila. Visit Filipino farm. No machinery. Most of work done by hand. Farmers small but strong. Clark Field. Depressing to see over 1,700 planes parked wing to wing. Many new. Most to be declared surplus and scrap representing over a billion dollars. Wrecked Jap planes. Dustiest place seen. Planes must be attended or will corrode and mildew in hot, damp climate. Organized band of thieves. Split our life rafts to get two small packages of emergency rations, tools, etc.

December 8: Visit Corregidor. Concrete forts, mortars. Obsolete as horse and buggy. Leaving we see white hospital ship laboring way home to America.

December 9: Guam. Looks pretty small on map. Hope pilot hits it. Beacon flashes welcome. Still 200,000 soldiers, sailors, marines quartered here. Supplies vast, accumulated for Japan invasion. Insufficient help retards inventory.

December 10: Guam Harbor being dredged and docks built. See giant floating drydock. Bulldozers at work. Hats off to Seabees and engineers. Picturesque coral shore. Water clear. Varicolored ocean bottom. Saipan. Saw rock where native families committed suicide at approach of Americans. Villages all have churches.

December 11: Kwajalein Atoll. Commander says surpluses not worth saving. Worn out. Johnston Atoll a speck on ocean. Room for only 5,000-foot runway. Few buildings. Water system broken. Each person allowed gallon per day.

December 12: Flying at 9,000 feet. Taking oxygen regularly. Honolulu. Pearl Harbor. Land Hickam Field. Guest of Gen. Robert Richardson, commanding general mid-Pacific area. Visit demobilizing center. Comfortable barracks. Recreational facilities.

December 13: Radio and radar control rooms. Meet Admiral Spruance and members of staff. See vast Navy installations. Same orderly condition as Army. Fine cooperation Army-Navy here. See ships sunk by Japs. Visit Signal Corps receiving and sending rooms. What equipment.

December 14: Visit square miles of shops, docks, stock piles. Surpluses. Barracks. GI Club. All excellent condition. Richardson fine administrator. Insists on good housekeeping. Is taxpayer conscious.

December 15: Smooth comfortable flight. San Francisco in sight 11 hours flat. Party all well. Congenial.

December 16: Lake Tahoe. Salt Lake. Nebraska. Just crossed Mississippi. Home in 40 minutes. Piloted plane for hour. Looked down on Iowa where grandfather came from Vermont by covered wagon in 1852—inching his way at 2 miles per hour while we fly smoothly at 200.

BILLION DOLLARS IN PLANES AT ONE FIELD

In the Philippines the surplus troubles are typical of our troubles almost everywhere. We have sent home the men best able to care for our fortune in supplies. The replacements are entirely inadequate and, of course, inexperienced.

We have some breathtaking surpluses there. At Clark Field, which is rimmed by the remains of hundreds of Jap planes, I saw over $1,000,000,000 worth of American bombers, fighters, transport, and reconnaissance planes with spares. It is a veritable sea of planes. A vast, vast majority of them will have to be broken up into scrap. Modern as some of them are, they are still outmoded, and are ill-equipped to be flown or shipped home.

Indeed, there are as many transports at Clark Field alone as the entire United States commercial system possessed at the outbreak of the war. We plan to keep a minimum number of the best of these planes in operation ready to go to work on any task here. But it is difficult even to keep these in tip-top shape. Their seasoned custodians are gone. The men had enough points, and no suitably trained men have been sent in their stead.

The thievery of our supplies is at its worst in the Philippines, for it is organized. In some countries where populaces are preying on our surpluses, some efforts are made to punish the guilty.

But at Clark Field, to name one place, the local authorities give very light sentences—which usually are not served—or dismiss cases altogether.

In one week nine carloads of meat en route to Clark Field to feed our GIs disappeared entirely. Regulations prohibit our men from shooting at thieves. They must be tackled, as gently as possible, and turned over to local authorities. Often they are set free by officials patently in on the racket.

FIGHTING LOSING BATTLE TO PROTECT TAXPAYERS

Our boys are fighting a losing battle to protect the property of the American taxpayers. I was asked repeatedly to urge Washington to send enough men to the Philippines to protect our stores, and to give our men the right to use their weapons when necessary.

Nowhere did I see a more vivid example of what General Marshall was talking about when he told Congress, "You won't have demobilization, you will have demorialization."

We have good men left in the Philippines, but there aren't enough of them.

The long-promised independence of the islands will be a trying time not only for Filipinos but their American friends. Former experienced Philippine government officials have been liquidated by the Japs.

Tax and other public records were destroyed in the battle of Manila. The Philippine government has no clear-cut plan to collect taxes.

Officials in High Commissioner Paul McNutt's office told me that if Filipinos were permitted to vote today on an independence they would vote 8 to 1 in favor of staying under the political and economical wing of the United States.

With General McMullen we visited Corregidor and were stunned by the archaic arms of the island, where General Wainwright and a handful of men and nurses so gallantly held off the overwhelming attacks of the Japs in the early days of the war.

The old guns Wainwright had—I noticed a 1903 date on one—were pointed out to sea. They could not be turned to shell the Japs a few miles away on Bataan. What a tragedy that was.

Today a work crew of 1,200 Jap prisoners stolidly clean up "The Rock," digging the bodies of brave Americans and Filipino patriots out of the caves in which they died.

The wheels of our globe-circling B-17 touched hallowed land on the way home from the Pacific—land made forever sacred in our annals by the price paid for them in American blood.

After Okinawa and Guam we swept over Saipan, where you can see the sharp-toothed reefs that stopped our invasion boats and forced our boys to swim and wade ashore through murderous fire.

A hundred ships lie in Saipan's harbor, some of them jammed with unloaded supplies we no longer need.

There is no market for such supplies in that part of the world. If we shipped them all the way home, we could never realize enough from their sale in the United States to warrant the cost of transportation.

We touched at bloody Kwajalein, too. The tiny atoll we have transformed into a vital air-passenger base.

HAWAII COMMANDER DOING EXCELLENT JOB

Another long hop over the blue Pacific brought us to a speck named Johnston Island, which American enterprise has turned into another vital cog in our Pacific air travel.

Then, as if on smooth, invisible rails, Captain Larson took us to Hawaii, where the whole bloody and bankrupting business of our war began.

General Richardson, commanding general mid-Pacific area, himself soon displayed to our party the qualities which prompted General MacArthur to place him in charge of a huge portion of the Pacific.

Best of all, from a businessman's standpoint, Richardson has a highly developed regard for American property. A story typifies that regard:

One day Richardson saw a GI misusing an army truck. "You should treat that truck better, son," he counseled. "You and I and your buddies bought it."

The kid looked at him quizzically. "The Army bought it, sir," he said.

"True enough, but the money had to come out of the pockets of Americans like yourself."

The Pacific air traveler, and there will be countless thousands of them in the coming years, is comforted by an inspection of the precautions taken for his safety.

Before we took off for California, General Richardson showed us his control air operations room, where the most modern devices keep tab on the flights of all planes leaving or arriving at Honolulu. The room is dominated by a huge map, on which tiny planes, your own among them, move majestically across the blue expanse of water—constantly checked by radar and the lastest radio safety signals. Rescue planes stand by day and night. In case of trouble they are on their way to the spot within 3 minutes.

It is plainly beyond the power of most men, including this one, aptly to describe the emotion of homecoming. I felt I was home in this blessed land when I awoke after a nap in the B-17 and looked down on San Francisco's magnificent Golden Gate.

I knew then, as never before, how great this land is, for I had behind me the example of a world that is sick and battered and despairing.

CHANGES IN AMERICA SINCE PIONEER DAYS

As these final words are written we are crossing the strong flat midland of the United States. My grandfather crossed these lands in a covered wagon 100 years ago. I was born on a farm near which this big plane just flew. I saw the first telephone wires strung to that farm, the first automobile, the first flimsy plane.

Now, in smooth comfort, I fly over these lands at 200 miles per hour. In a few years we'll be doing it at 400 miles per hour in much more comfort, for pressurized cabins will reduce the tiring effect of insufficient oxygen. Food, service, and planes will be greatly improved. In my time I have seen the world shrink as never before in its history.

As for the trip itself, here is my summation:

We must face the fact that the rapid demobilization of our armed forces is causing great disorganization overseas and at home. Boys are released before they can be replaced.

Foreign markets, at best, are scarce because the world is generally busted. Priceless weapons and warplanes are now nothing more than spent bullets. Billions in United States war goods must be scrapped.

We should clear out of such lands as India and Iran as soon as possible. We should give up such Pacific islands as are no longer needed as bases and which cannot be turned into armed places by any unfriendly power.

Appalling is the staggering cost of our overseas military machine. How long can America stand this terrific burden? Some officers expressed the opinion that the development of atomic power may greatly reduce this tremendous expense. They are hopeful for the success of the United Nations Organization but are not too optimistic.

ARMY-NAVY HANGARS, FIELDS, SIDE BY SIDE

On some islands in the Pacific I saw splendid Army and equally efficient Navy air fields resting side by side. Each was fully equipped as to workshops, hangars, barracks, hospitals, and the like. Each used different types of planes, engineered and produced individually at fabulous cost. Members of both services admit that a united command would result in great savings and added efficiency. However, Navy men feel that this could be accomplished without a complete merging of the two services.

The country should draft its highly trained retired Army and Navy officers into the diplomatic corps. They have a grasp of world affairs, and an appreciation of United States interests, second to none.

They are immeasurably better suited to represent us overseas than, say, inexperienced politically appointed diplomats.

I found that many are strongly of the opinion that we should get Caledonia from the French in exchange for the mountains of surplus supplies we will soon be obliged to give the De Gaulle government. Caledonia, lying almost dormant in the Pacific, would strengthen our Pacific defense and serve as a fine stepping stone for our California-to-Australia trade.

Most of the American embassies are entirely unsuited to house our expanded diplomatic staffs. Many suggested that we swap surpluses for more adequate and representative quarters.

NOTHING BEING JUNKED THAT COULD BE SAVED

I saw no surpluses being destroyed overseas which should not have been junked. Our intelligent officers approach all scrapping problems with an "I pay taxes, too," attitude and caution.

Congressional junkets to distant lands have often been criticized as a waste of money. My trip convinced me that such trips are not only wise investments, but the duty of Congressmen. How can they enact legislation of an international character if they do not know the world we live in?

I am convinced that America and the allies will make a serious mistake if anything is done to curb the authority of Douglas MacArthur in Japan. He is ably handling the greatest job ever heaped on a military man.

I express the hope that these articles may contribute to a better understanding of the great problems facing the American people.

The Twisted Brass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 25, 1946

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I believe we all appreciate the necessity for the maintenance of a large Army and Navy for a considerable time to come. It is my hope and prayer that this Army and Navy will be made up entirely of volunteers. I firmly believe that this can be done. It can be done by making the service attractive to the young men of the country. The Congress can make the service more attractive, and a start in this direction was made when we passed the armed forces voluntary recruitment bill of 1945. But our Army and Navy leaders must do their part. If they fail to carry out their responsibility, then the whole program fails. One thing they must do above all else is to maintain the respect of the men in the service and the people generally. I issue a word of warning to them now—broken promises do not encourage respect. It would be well for them to take to heart the warning contained in an editorial which appeared in the January 21, 1946, issue of the Green Bay Press-Gazette, which follows:

THE TWISTED BRASS

A flood of mail to the Press-Gazette last week from privates, sergeants, and captains scattered around the world was convincing that these protesting soldier boys of ours are on the right track and know what they are doing in their many complaints against their superiors.

They are not complaining of serving their country. They do not gripe about lonesomeness. Filthy villages and sunken-eyed and miserable people have not turned their heads. The glorious but far-off comforts of home have not warped their judgments.

They simply insist that men in high positions who are faithless to their words, that leaders who have made promises only to break them, must be brought to an accounting.

In the numerous Army publications from the Short Snorter through the Tacalog Times to the Daily Pacifican, there runs but one theme, one startled question, one amazing interrogatory, What has become of the code of honor of the American Army?

The detail of broken promises is simply sickening. Nor is it merely a matter of changing orders. The soldiers aren't children. They realize that orders must be altered, that ships don't always make schedules, that emergencies arise, but they vehemently protest against generals who think they can answer a just complaint with a glib excuse, can secure an objective by making a definite promise, and after the soldiers have delivered the goods forget or ignore the promise.

In anticipation that we are going to have a bigger army than ever, something very drastic will have to be done at Washington so that a general's word is hereafter respected. If the brass does not realize that an honorless army is wholly useless, the men in the ranks do. They don't want that kind of an army. They won't stand for it. And in this attitude they are wise beyond their years.

The FEPC Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 25, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of January 24, 1946:

THE FEPC PROBLEM

The Chavez bill for a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission, now before the Senate, is recommended for favorable consideration by its avowed purpose and by the character and sincerity of its leading supporters. If the bill could actually accomplish what its proponents believe it will, we would have no hesitation in urging that it become law with the least possible delay. If its swift passage could be made a rebuke to Senator BILBO and others who propose to filibuster against a vote, there would be another argument in its favor. A filibuster at this time is an outrageous effort by a minority, at the expense of the public business, to defeat the will of a majority.

Under these circumstances it is not a pleasant duty to express doubt as to the wisdom and probable efficacy of the Chavez measure. Yet we are compelled to do so. The act would apply to every employer or labor union with more than a handful of employees or members in interstate or foreign commerce in any State, Territory, or possession of the United States. It would make it unfair for them to discriminate against any person "because of such person's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry." An FEPC order, if sustained, could in theory be enforced by the Federal courts, with contempt penalties, and any willful interference with the commission or its agents or agencies could be punished by imprisonment and fine.

We do not believe this act would be enforceable in any State or community where the dominant opinion ran strongly against it. Discrimination is always hard to prove, because it involves the subjective question of intent. There must be a majority will to comply if the unwilling minority are to be legally coerced. In many American communities this will to comply simply doesn't exist. It will have to be created by education, backed in time by State and local law. The Federal Government, with all its power, cannot change the climate of opinion overnight. And a new Force Act might do more harm than good to the very minorities the law aims to protect.

One clause in the Chavez bill can, certainly, stand. This clause requires the insertion of a nondiscrimination provision into Government contracts. The Federal Government may not be able to halt discrimination by direct action, but it can certainly refrain from patronizing the discriminators. For the rest, we will probably have to wait upon the civilizing influence of education in this field. People just can't be made fair and tolerant by the use of the policeman's billystick.

Walter Lippmann Writes on Basic Economic Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 25, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in including with my remarks a recent column by Walter Lippmann entitled "The State of the Union," in which, in my judgment, he goes to the very root of the economic problems of our country, both at the present time and in the future:

TODAY AND TOMORROW
(By Walter Lippmann)
THE STATE OF THE UNION

The President's decision to send one message, which includes the Budget, instead of two separate messages, as has been the custom, is in itself a highly significant event. It marks the acceptance of the fact that in these times the relation between Government finance and the private economy is intimate and reciprocal. The two cannot be considered apart and treated like two parallel lines that never meet. The day is gone, and will probably never return, when Government spending, taxing, and borrowing, can be isolated from individual and corporate spending, investing, and saving. For the

two combined, and interacting, determine the level of production, the order of prices, the quantity of employment, and the Government revenue at any given rate of taxes.

For some years before the war, in fact since 1936 when J. M. Keynes published his book The General Theory of Employment, Interest, and Money, the basic theory has been known. It has won wide acceptance among economists. But only gradually is it being understood and accepted by laymen, and only now at the beginning of the postwar period has it become possible and necessary to apply the new knowledge. The President's message, supplemented by the fifth report of the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, is based upon the findings of the new economic science of our generation.

The war has quickly turned what might have remained for long an academic argument into a practical problem of statesmanship. For at VJ-day the American people were producing goods and services at the rate of $200,000,000,000 a year. Nearly half of this product was bought by the Government; the other half was bought by the civilian market. No one could, therefore, dispute the enormous role of the Government in the whole economy.

Now that the fighting is over, the Government's purchases of goods and services will be reduced from the wartime peak of ninety-eight billions annually to almost thirty-five billions in the 12 months beginning July 1 of this year. Such a drastic and sudden reduction of demand by the Government would, in itself, produce unemployment and a severe decline in prices. But it is offset by the fact that during the war individuals and corporations earned much more than they were able to spend, were allowed to spend, or wished to spend. They have about $220,000,000,000 on hand. This private money not only offsets the reduction of Government spending. It hangs over the market which is not yet adequately supplied with civilian goods, and will not be and cannot be supplied until their is full civilian production. If the spending of this huge accumulation of private funds is not slowed down, it will, of course, push up prices to exorbitant levels.

These are the controlling facts with which national policy has to deal. In the near future the threat of inflation has to be countered. The threat arises from the fact that there is this huge accumulation of private funds, a long-deferred demand for goods and services, and a considerable delay in coming to full production, especially in the critical field of private housing. The problem is much money and not enough goods. The solution of the problem is more goods as soon as possible, less private spending until there are more goods, less money in circulation brought about by taxation and the control of credit and as stopgap and backstop for some time to come price control of scarce goods and Government allocation of essential materials.

The most urgent measures the President needs from Congress are, therefore, an extension of the Price Control Act and of the Second War Powers Act, both of which expire on June 30.

But while the immediate problem is that of inflation, no one who looks ahead and wishes to act with prudence and foresight can doubt that the time will come—no one can say exactly when but certainly within a few short years—when the deferred demand will have been satisfied, the private savings that will be spent and invested, used up, production will be at full capacity. Then the postwar depression will begin, and if measures have not been taken soon enough to prevent it, or at the least to moderate it, it is almost certain to be the most violent depression in our whole history. Nineteen hundred and twenty-nine was bad enough; the national income fell from ninety to forty billions. But now the national income is much larger, and if it fell to forty or even to seventy billions, the effect might well be catastrophic.

The measures to prevent this happening are among the most difficult our people have ever had to consider. The American economy will be at a level of productivity never before achieved anywhere at any time. To keep it at that level or anywhere near it, will require capital investment and consumer spending on a scale beyond anything hitherto known in time of peace. It is not easy to see, it is very hard to know, how capital investment of a wholly new order of magnitude can be brought about annually and consistently. But if it is not brought about, depression is certain, and depression of a kind which will shake the country and the world.

The success with which we master this American problem will have a profound effect on the peace of the world. An economic catastrophe in the United States, like 1929, would undermine the peace settlement. As a matter of fact the whole prospect of peace, the whole hope in UNO, all the plans of reconstruction and for liberty and democracy, rely at last upon the promise that the United States will itself achieve such prosperity that there will be increasing prosperity everywhere.

Address of Hon. Lindsay C. Warren

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1946

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller General of the United States, at annual dinner of the Chamber of Commerce of Asheville, N. C., January 17, 1946:

I am glad to come back to Asheville again, and I greatly appreciate your cordial invitation to be with you. I have never felt that I was a stranger here. Aside from many friends in this section over the years, I have felt special attachments for the city and its people.

My great great grandfather, John Gray Blount, owned a part of the land on which Asheville is built. I regretfully admit, however, that not 1 foot of it ever came down to me. My grandfather was the ever loyal and constant friend of the mighty Vance, and was a member of his council of state. My father was elected as the second president of the North Carolina Bar Association here in Asheville. I bear the name of an Asheville lady of yesteryears, and for 3 years I attended the famous Bingham school, which added its contribution in those days in making Asheville North Carolina's best-advertised city.

I am also glad to be here to pay a visit to a very important part of the General Accounting Office—the Postal Accounts Division with its 900 employees. When it became necessary to move this Division of our Office out of Washington temporarily on account of war congestion, I was happy that it could be located in Asheville. I may surprise some of you when I tell you that in this office here in the Arcade building, we are making an annual postal audit of $20,000,000,000 a year, and it is kept current. I wish to pay public tribute to the capable and efficient employees of the Government who are doing this important work.

So I think I qualify in saying that I feel perfectly at home here.

I am particularly happy to be able to talk to this annual meeting of your chamber of commerce, and to your distinguished guests. You in Asheville have a wonderful opportunity to go out and sell your city and section and to promote the location of industries here. The unbounded resources of our North Carolina mountains—kaolin, mica, feldspar, other minerals, timber and the rest—should be developed into manufactured good here in our own State, not sent elsewhere for processing.

Never in all their history have our chambers of commerce been faced with more numerous and perplexing problems than today, in readjusting the life of their communities to a peacetime economy, with its changing business and manufacturing activities. Never has there been a greater need for their services in building solid foundations for civic welfare, and in guarding our democratic institutions, in defense of which so many of our dear ones have just given their lives or their health.

I take it as self-evident that as citizens, businessmen, and taxpayers you are interested in the structure and efficiency of our National Government, and its relation with our own great State, and with the other States of the Union. No longer is this a remote and academic question. In one form or another it bears upon the daily lives of every one of us. Of late there has been much discussion of the expansion of the Federal Government, of its tremendous growth in bureaus, commissions, and boards. Our people are beginning to be concerned. They are beginning to wonder when and where this expansion will end, what it will cost them, and what will be its effect upon the States and their subdivisions. I have decided, therefore, to speak to you in a somewhat general way upon the subject of the Federal Government, its finances, and its relation to the States. This relationship is the jugular vein of our system of government.

If I am at all qualified to speak upon this subject, it is due to the fact that I have looked at the problem from both sides, having served a number of years in the North Carolina General Assembly and in the National Congress. In my present official position, I have, of course, had a wonderful opportunity to study the structure and the functioning of the Federal Government. It is part of my job to see that Federal agencies stay within the limits laid down by Congress in their use of public funds. In so doing, it is often my duty to rule upon problems that affect both Federal and State Governments. In an impartial and dispassionate manner, I thought it might be worth while here tonight to make a few suggestions as to our future goals in these fields.

When our Constitution was written in 1787, the prime problem was how to combine the Thirteen Original States into one union. Many of the States were fearful that they would lose their character and liberties if they came into the Union under the new Constitution. North Carolina did not enter the Union until after the new Government was well under way. After first rejecting the new Constitution it waited until November 21, 1789, to ratify it, too late to participate in the first election of Washington, because of the lack of a Bill of Rights and the fear that a strong National Government would in time overbear State authority.

This attitude was natural. When the Constitution was written, there were no great industries. There were no great systems of communication or transportation. Our people for the most part lived a rural life. The frontier spirit ruled the new Nation, and our people looked to themselves rather than to government for aid. A slogan of the times, made popular by Jefferson, was to the effect that those people are best governed that are the least governed.

It was inevitable that conflicts would arise as to where the powers of the States were to end and where the power of the Federal

Government was to begin, and vice versa. It is well known that there have always been a few overly ambitious men in Washington who love power and who are forever trying to extend their own influence, but, in my opinion, this enormous growth of Federal authority can only in a small degree be attributed to greed and thirst for power in the Nation's Capital. Much of it has surged up from the people and the States themselves, because of either the financial inability of the States or their failure to give their citizens the necessary State functions of government.

The industrial revolution, with all of its implications in the field of big business and of transportation and communication, has made necessary and logical some extensions of the arm of the Federal Government. Bigness in commerce and industry has made necessary some bigness in government. You cannot set up great corporate powers that reach out into 48 States, and even into foreign countries, without also setting up great power in government, to see that there is fair play in the land. Railways, highways, and skyways—the telephone, the radio, and now television—have themselves brought about "a more perfect union" in this country.

Also, in times of great national emergency the people (who after all are the final arbiters of all things in a democracy) demand prompt action of a kind and character that can be performed more quickly and more satisfactorily by the Federal Government. The great depression of the thirties was an emergency of this character. Economic chaos was threatening the country. Bankruptcy and poverty were staring our people in the face. In response to the cry of distress and the demand for relief throughout this Nation the Federal Government went into action through both old and new agencies. This meant a tremendous expansion of our Federal Government. It meant the extending of the Federal hand into almost every home and every business in the country. It meant that the Federal Government would become concerned with prices paid, with wages fixed, and with what crops were to be planted. The framers of the Constitution would have been shocked and amazed at such a demonstration of Federal activity. But no person who lived through that hectic period has any doubt as to why the Federal Government took such extraordinary steps. It was in response to the dire need and the cry for help that went up from the people of the United States to their Government at Washington.

But the greatest centralizer of power in Washington is war. Under the influence of World War I, the Federal Government grew mightily and we now see, as the result of World War II, that the Federal Government towers above the States with unprecedented prestige.

Naturally my own concern has been directed to the fantastic fiscal effect of that trend. Through 10 years of plodding escape from the slough of depression, through 4 years of underwriting, then actively waging history's greatest war, your Federal balance sheet has reached such a state as any honest man must call an alarming one. Do you know for example, that the yearly bill for interest alone is greater than the entire Government budget a few short years ago? In fact, our own State's annual share of the interest charges on the national debt would operate the whole State government for well over a year.

The free-spending philosophers who insist that an enormous, backbreaking national mortgage is a good thing, call anyone an alarmist who is brazen enough to recite the facts. What are the facts? To speak in billions of dollars and Nation-wide totals—now 280 billions—is only a way to escape the uncomfortable realities, to lull us into the feeling it will be somebody else's burden. Let us put the facts a little closer to home. Simply spreading the total figure among the number of employed persons in the country tells us that you and I (and every other person employed—the people who must pay the debt) owe in round figures $4,000 as our share, which we personally or our sons or our grandsons must somehow produce and pay. Furthermore, recently I ran across the even more startling comparison that the Government debt is three times as great as all private long-term debt in this country. What would thrifty old Benjamin Franklin, whose birthday this is, say to all of this?

There are five particular avenues which I want to suggest as leading out of this financial morass. The first task is an examination of the Government itself. The Government's sails must be trimmed. The tools for this reappraisal of the Federal Government's set-up were given to the President last month when the reorganization bill became a law. It is the best measure of its kind ever passed by Congress. There is a great opportunity for the President to do an outstanding job.

I was asked to testify before the congressional committees which formulated the bill, and I took advantage of the opportunity then to point out dozens of specific situations of apparent overlapping and duplications, situations that cried out for a restudy of the Federal organization, followed up by fearless and vigorous action. The act tells the President not only that he may revise the executive organization but that he may actually abolish any particular function of the Government.

You and I know that there can be no real economy unless there be weeded out and completely abolished those governmental functions which, perhaps well-advised at their inception, have long since outlived their usefulness. But any reform can become effective only after Congress has had an opportunity to examine the plan and veto it, if it so desires. There will be ample demands from the special groups and from what are called the pressure boys that Congress vote down any plan which abolishes somebody's project. Most of the Members of Congress want economy as much as you. What Congress should have, and is entitled to have, from the body of the citizens at large is some fair expression that the people do want economy, that they will back up the Members who have the fortitude to support the common benefit of all instead of the special benefit of the few. If "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," I say to you that even more so is it the price of economy.

However, the efficiencies and economies to be wrung out of reorganization, as necessary as they are, do not approach the larger problem. As emphasized by President Truman in signing the bill, substantial savings can come only by reducing governmental programs which were and are being created by Congress.

That brings me to my second point. Twenty-five years ago the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 became a part of the law of the land. One of the principles of that act was that the national expenditures and the national income should be estimated in advance and that the expenditures should be balanced against the income. That is still a good principle.

For years I have carried in my pocket this recipe:

"Annual income twenty pounds, annual expenditure nineteen nineteen six, result happiness. Annual income twenty pounds, annual expenditure twenty pounds ought and six, result misery."

That homely truism Mr. Micawber gave David Copperfield nearly 100 years ago is just as appropriate today as it was then. That recipe must be applied to the Nation unless we are to resign ourselves to continuous deficit spending. Any reasonable person must know that with a low national income and widespread unemployment large deficits were inevitable in efforts to combat the great depression. So were they more than necessary to wage an all-out, total, and victorious war. The aftermath of war also calls for more vast appropriations, for as a conquering but a Christian and humane people we have vast charitable and moral obligations. The highest obligation of all, however, is to see that our returning veterans are cared for in proportion to their needs and reestablished in their proper places in our communities. But with all of that, and with a national debt that staggers the imagination, should we not have an appraisal of the never-ending succession of new programs proposing large drains upon the Federal Treasury?

While some of these programs may be promoted from Washington, too often does Congress mistake as "the voice of the people" the urgings of special pleaders, blocs, privilege seekers, and Treasury raiders. It is fashionable to blame Congress for all the ills of the body politic. They are only human and are merely a good cross-section of the Nation. The fact is they have been propagandized and lobbied so much that a good part of their resistance has been broken down. What encouragement in a legislative way do they get from home? Everyone has an advocate in Washington except the people. It would be news indeed if a chamber of commerce commended a Congressman for his statesmanship or for a negative vote rather than praising him for some Federal money he had secured for his section. I know from experience how sweet it is to the ears of a Congressman to hear the plaudits of those who wanted Federal money, and who didn't stop to think it had to be paid back. We justified a lot of this in an era of big spending but the reckoning period is now coming on.

Business, agriculture, and labor have a tremendous and equal stake in a balanced budget, for after all they are the ones who must pay on the barrel head.

Next, the mounting complexity of our national life has led the Congress to delegate more and more of its responsibility to executive agencies. As a corollary to keeping within the national income, those who spend the people's money should be impressed that it is not their money and that extravagance and profligacy on the part of public officials will not be tolerated. There is no reason why the public dollar should not be of the same value and purchasing power as the private dollar. All this means that we must insist upon having capable and efficient administrators. In my official position it has been my pleasure to deal with many such men. However, we have not reached the millenium, and there are others who through carelessness or ambition do not hesitate to place personal interest ahead of the public weal. That is the area where there is much room for improvement in higher standards of administration and more conscientious attention to the Nation's business.

Fourth, Congress should revitalize its power over the purse, a fundamental legislative prerogative under our form of government. It should reexamine the large grants of unusual administrative authority over expenditures, much of which originated in the stress and strain of war. An example of the alertness of Congress in drawing back some of this financial power to itself is the Byrd-Butler-Whittington Act approved by the President last month. That act calls for an annual scrutiny and control by the Congress of the vast and far-flung financial operations of our Government corporations such as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Commodity Credit Corporation, and dozens of others.

Finally, we should return as quickly as possible to a proper peacetime balance between the Federal Government and the States. I spurn the doctrine advocated by many that each State should be considered

like a county in its relationship to the Federal Government. On the other hand, we should not be blind to the fact, already accomplished, that many of the things we regarded as sacred and as belonging exclusively to the States have gone out in the twinkling of an eye in a fast expanding Nation with a Constitution whose commerce and general welfare clauses seem to know no bounds. We cannot return to the simple idea of government as expounded by Jefferson, as beautiful as his conception was. We cannot turn back the clock even if we would.

In the face of today's conditions, the cry of States' rights can indeed become a hollow cry, utterly meaningless, going back to issues long fought over and decided. Therefore, I do not come to you tonight to make a fetish of States' rights.

What then is to be left to the States? Will they in time become merely convenient areas to divide Federal activity? If this should come to pass, this Nation will cease to have the kind of government described in the Constitution. Frankly, there are many who doubt that our Nation could long survive under those circumstances as a great democracy. The history of nations tends to show that when all power and authority have been concentrated in the central government, the nation becomes ripe for regimentation and dictatorship.

I, for one, still believe that there are important functions to be exercised by the States and their subdivisions. There are highly proper and necessary contributions that the Federal Government should make, but if the States, in order to obtain Federal funds, surrender too many of their rights and functions to the Federal Government, something very precious, something very valuable and democratic, and something uniquely American will have gone out of our public service. The danger is that our people, looking to Washington indiscriminately for aid, will sell their political birthright for a mess of Federal pottage. Moreover, the States are now, for the most part, in excellent financial condition. Their budgets, unlike that of the Federal Government, are in balance and most of them have comfortable reserves. If the States will assert their leadership in their proper sphere, there will be less incentive for further expansion of Federal power. If the States wish to retain power and prestige they must assume their full responsibilities and render to their people a high quality of public service that cannot be duplicated by the Federal Government.

Can the States do this? Of that I have no doubt. Take our own State of North Carolina. I do not believe that there exists anywhere in this Union a higher quality of public servant or a better brand of public service than we have here in our beloved State. As I go about my Federal duties, it is a source of pride to me to be continually told by people from other States that North Carolina is one of the best governed and one of the most progressive States in the Union.

Governor Cherry, like other governors before him, is known personally by thousands upon thousands of our citizens. In whatever town or community he goes, there are scores of our people who call him by his first name and feel that he is their neighbor. North Carolina is not too large to be considered a neighborhood. If a citizen has a grievance, he knows where to go and what to do about it. He can talk to a public official in his community or in Raleigh who understands the background of the whole affair and is in sympathy with our traditions and our way of life. Also, if mistakes are made, our people know where to place the blame and, when credit is due, they know whom to commend.

We people here in North Carolina are so accustomed to good government in our State that we take it for granted. We should prize it greatly and not give it up lightly. In my opinion, if all the States of the Union had taken the initiative as much as North Carolina, and if all had given uniformly as good a brand of public service, there would have been less tendency to look to Washington and there would be less encroachment on the States by the Federal Government. Moreover, as to those activities that are to be carried on in the future jointly and concurrently by the Federal and State Governments, I think there should be a genuine partnership existing between the two levels of authority.

We have still much more to do in North Carolina. It can be done if we continue in our course of planning and spending wisely and within our income. We shall never tolerate a static State. In all proper functions of the State, we must keep alert and progressive, we must streamline and keep modern our governmental processes and our laws. We must promote a healthy condition of industry, labor, and agriculture, upon which the prosperity of our people depends. We, in North Carolina, under great State administrations, have met those responsibilities and we must continue to do so. In that path lies the integrity of our institutions, the vitality of our Government, and the prosperity and freedom of our people.

And then, above all, I believe we should begin to teach our people to be more self-reliant, more independent, more anxious to do things for themselves, and not to always be looking for aid from Government. This Nation has become great because of its self-reliance and frontier spirit. There is a school of thought today that would have us believe that this Nation has grown old, that we have lost the spirit of adventure and daring, in which we have carved out a great Republic and a great destiny for our people. I repudiate such a philosophy. There may be no great West to develop, but we still have within us great undeveloped resources. There are today great frontiers of the mind and the spirit which challenge youth forever to go forward, and in my humble judgment, this Nation is still young. To those who think in such narrow and restricted terms, I commend the exploration of the undeveloped natural resources of western North Carolina. If I had any criticism to make of the past history of your wonderful section, it would be that you have put too much emphasis upon your marvelous climate and too little emphasis upon the boundless energies and adaptability of your people and your multinatured, God-given resources.

While the so-called good old days are gone and will never return as we knew them, we should never forget that this country was built for permanence, and our institutions reflect that spirit. We must ever remain a Nation of freedom, of liberty, of faith, and hope that the fathers gave us.

In closing, I hope it is not too outmoded to repeat what Jefferson said way back in 1802:

"Let us deserve well of our country by making her interests the end of all of our plans and not our own pomp, patronage, and irresponsibility."

[From the Washington Star of January 20, 1946]

A LOOK AT THE LEDGER

Comptroller General Lindsay Warren, who audits the Government's books, is gravely concerned over what he sees there. He believes it is high time that every taxpayer who has not only his own welfare but the welfare of the country at heart should share his concern over the state of Federal finances. In a recent address before the Chamber of Commerce of Asheville, N. C., Mr. Warren painted a picture which should have a sobering effect on all but those whom he described as the "free spending philosophers who insist that an enormous back-breaking national mortgage is a good thing" and who brand as an "alarmist" anyone "brazen enough to recite the facts."

By that standard of appraisal, Mr. Warren is an alarmist of first degree, for he had no hesitancy in citing the facts, as only one in his official post of vantage is qualified to cite them. He pointed out that the pouring out of billions of dollars by the Federal Government in its economic war against the depression, followed by the spending of additional billions in its military war against the Germans and the Japs, has piled up a deficit so large as to be beyond the comprehension of persons not accustomed to dealing in astronomical figures. The yearly interest on the staggering total (two hundred and eighty billions) is greater than the entire Federal Budget a few short years ago, he said. And with this huge increase in deficit spending there has been an inevitable top-heavy expansion of Government, with controls reaching further and further into private industry and private homes.

Mr. Warren, though justifiably depressed over the outlook, is not without hope. But he believes that only a widespread awakening by the American people to the dangers of national bankruptcy that may lie ahead can effect a change for the better. The remedies are clear, he says, but there is little chance of applying them unless the taxpayers insist that their Government apply them. First of all, the Comptroller General pleads for a drastic reorganization of governmental agencies to eliminate waste and inefficiency. Incidentally, the President was given authority to streamline the Government under the Reorganization Act passed last month. Mr. Warren places second on the list of remedial measures a strenuous effort to balance the National Budget through a sharp reduction of Federal expenditures. This will require wholehearted support by the people of congressional economy moves. Third, Mr. Warren calls for a more conscientious type of public service by those entrusted with the responsibility of spending other people's money. Fourth, he urges a reexamination by Congress of its "blank check" grants of spending authority to certain executive agencies. And, finally, he advocates that the States assume a proper share of their responsibilities toward the Union instead of looking to the Federal Government for more and more assistance.

These suggested remedies for the Government's fiscal ills are not new, of course, but now that the war is over they deserve to be revived and reemphasized at every opportunity. For, as Mr. Warren says, it will require an aroused taxpaying citizenry, voicing a popular mandate to their legislative and executive servants, to turn the Government back on the road to sound financial policies.

Tips for Secretary Anderson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 25, 1946

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, not so long ago the Secretary of Agriculture was traveling around the Middle West looking over the political situation for his boss and the New Deal. One thing he wanted to know was why the farmers in this area were not voting for the New Deal. I think the article by John Wyngaard, one of Wisconsin's leading columnists, which appeared in the December 23, 1945, issue of the Green

Bay Press-Gazette, will give the Secretary at least a substantial part of the answer to his inquiry and may make it possible for him to spend a little more of his time trying to look after the interests of the farmers of this country and less time looking for votes. The article follows:

MADISON

(By John Wyngaard)

MADISON, WIS.—When Clinton P. Anderson President Truman's new Secretary of Agriculture, visited in Milwaukee recently he asked what for him is a perfectly natural question about Wisconsin and middle-western politics.

Why, he wondered, should the farmers of Wisconsin and neighboring States in the Midwest who have received so many benefits from the Democratic national administration be so consistently and vigorously voting the Republican ticket? Anderson confessed that the question has bothered his chief as well as other figures in the national administration.

Perhaps the Secretary was thinking of the fact that the milk farmers of Wisconsin, most of whom have voted Republican in recent elections, will this year collect more than $50,000,000 in dairy subsidies from the National Treasury. Undoubtedly he remembered also the millions of dollars in other types of benefits that have flowed into this State in the last 12 years of New Deal agricultural programs.

And, indeed, it is something of a conundrum, if you haven't paid much attention to the discussions in Wisconsin agricultural circles and the utterances of Wisconsin farm politicians.

WHY?

This correspondent is not a farmer—and is therefore probably ineligible for the governorship or the Presidency—but the question was put to a man who is both a farmer and a shrewd and experienced observer of the political scene.

Paraphrasing what he said:

The farmer is an individualist, proud of his independent position as a producer. He is suspicious and afraid of collectivism. He is sick of restrictions and controls, and regimentation. The farmer doesn't like the idea of the millions paid in dairy subsidies, because he knows they are unnecessary. He knows that purchasing power and employment in this country reached all-time peaks, that the consumer could afford to pay for milk products the prices necessary to obtain maximum production. The farmer wanted encouraging prices in the market place, not pay from the Federal Treasury.

The farmer has a deep abhorrence of debt, personal and public. He feels that under the subsidy program he was charging to the taxpayers and the bondholders that the consumer could and should have been paying. Some of the producers figured they met particular raw deals, the cheese farmer, for instance, in the pricing of cheese, the butter farmer in the circumstances that created an artificial scarcity for which the city consumer is blaming him. Many milk producers fear what they suspect is favoritism for butter substitutes in the national administration.

There are some tips for Secretary Anderson. They may not tell the story in complete detail, but they are helpful to a degree in understanding why few farmers are Democrats.

ANECDOTAL

Our informant told a little story. "When I was a boy on a farm near Madison we saw the flames one day that destroyed the old State capitol building. The new building took 10 years to complete because the State could not bond itself for the cost, and it cost $7,500,000.

"This year the National Treasury is paying to the dairy farmers of this State seven times $7,500,000 in totally unnecessary milk subsidies."

My personal contact with the agricultural leaders in Wisconsin and my observations of the so-called spokesmen for agriculture in the Federal Government compel me to believe, Mr. Speaker, that the leaders in the Farm Bureau, the Grange, the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture, the extension workers, and, in fact, most farmers themselves have a better understanding of the needs of agriculture than any of these Federal bureaucrats.

The first thing that the present administration had better do in connection with its agricultural program is to follow the law and fulfill the commitments that they have made to the farmers of Wisconsin and the other States. The farmers of Wisconsin have been deceived altogether too many times for Mr. Anderson to expect them to relish and fall for his political agricultural medicine.

Founders of the American Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 25 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Founders of the American Navy," written by Capt. Dudley W. Knox, of the United States Navy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FOUNDERS OF THE AMERICAN NAVY

(By Capt. Dudley W. Knox, USN)

Although there is no precise definition of the term "founder of a navy," the many men who were conspicuously associated with the origins of our Navy might be regarded as its "founders."

The first naval forces under Continental pay and control were those established in the spring and summer of 1775 by Generals Arnold and Schuyler on Lake Champlain, and by General Washington near Boston. The lake force saw no important service for nearly a year when under General Arnold it was defeated by a greatly superior British squadron, although the Americans had gained a vital strategic victory by delaying an invading British army.

The so-called Washington's fleet, however, was effectively employed at an early date. When General Washington took command of the Army before Boston in July 1775, the extreme shortage of powder and arms persuaded him to commission several vessels in advance of congressional approval to prey on the sea communications of the British Army in Boston, in the hope of capturing munitions. The first of these vessels was the schooner *Hannah* which sailed on September 5, 1775, under Capt. Nicholson Broughton and brought in a prize within 2 days. Commodore John Manly commanded the little fleet of seven vessels that during several subsequent months were very active off Boston and made other valuable prizes of British ships carrying munitions.

Meantime, under the leadership of John Adams, Congress resolved on October 13, 1775, that two Continental ships be fitted out. This was the legislative birth of the permanent Continental Navy. A congressional naval committee was appointed, consisting of Silas Deane, John Langdon, Christopher Gadsden, Stephen Hopkins, Joseph Hewes, R. H. Lee, and John Adams. This committee laid the foundation of the Continental Navy. It directed the purchasing, outfitting, manning, and operations of the earlier ships, prepared the legislation organizing the new naval service, and drafted admirable rules and regulations to govern its conduct and internal administration. The latter was principally the work of John Adams.

Esek Hopkins was appointed commander-in-chief of the fleet and had general charge of its preparation at Philadelphia under the supervision of the congressional committee. The work of structural alterations needed to transform the purchased merchant ships into men-of-war was placed under the naval architect, Joshua Humphreys. The rerigging and outfitting of the ships were under Capt. John Barry. The matter of obtaining crews was given the special attention of the commander in chief, Hopkins, who was necessarily so much occupied with the affairs of the fleet as a whole that the preparation of his flagship, the *Alfred*, fell largely to the lot of Lt. John Paul Jones, the second in command on board the flagship.

The captain of each of the other ships attended to various wants of his own ship more particularly. These captains, in the order of rank, were Dudley Saltonstall, Nicholas Biddle, Abraham Whipple, John B. Hopkins, John Hazard, William Hallock, Willian Stone, and Hoysted Hacker.

The first continental fleet put to sea under these officers in February 1776. It proceeded to New Providence (Bahamas) and there landed and captured a large stock of munitions which was taken to New London, Conn., for the Army. Captain Barry was not in this fleet but remained in Philadelphia and soon was put in command of the *Lexington* which did splendid service in guarding the Delaware River and its sea approaches.

Following these initial operations which virtually launched the American Navy, other ships were put in active service on the home coast and overseas. There were frequent combats in which the fighting edge of the Americans was proven to be the highest. Among the more conspicuous who might be said to have fathered the fighting spirit of our Navy in this way were Capts. Lambert Wickes, Nicholas Biddle, John Paul Jones, John Berry, Gustavus Conyngham, James Nicholson, and Joshua Barney.

After the Revolutionary War the Navy went out of existence completely. It was not reestablished until 1794, when Congress provided for the construction of six new frigates, and appointed six captains to supervise the work and to command the vessels when completed. These men were John Barry (who was the senior in rank), Samuel Nicholson, Silas Talbot, Richard Dale, Thomas Truxtun, and James Sever, of whom four—Barry, Nicholson, Dale, and Sever, were former officers of the Continental Navy.

In 1798 we went to war against the French at sea, hastily buying more ships and appointing more officers. In the subsequent 3 years of quasi-war, Capt. Thomas Truxtun especially distinguished himself in two successful and severe actions in the *Constellation* against French frigates. Lts. John Shaw and Charles Stewart also fought brilliant engagements in smaller ships. Among the squadron commanders were Capts. John Barry, Alexander Murray, Silas Talbot, Thomas Truxton, Thomas Tingey, Stephen Decatur, Sr., and Richard Dale.

Closely following the quasi-war with France came our Barbary Wars in which the most

distinguished high-ranking officer was Capt. Edward Preble. He established an enviable fighting tradition in several hard-fought attacks on Tripoli by a squadron of 14 vessels under his command, with the frigate *Constitution* as flagship. Under Preble's leadership the loosely knit Navy of that day became a unified fighting force for the first time, and this unification has lasted until the present time.

All of the persons named in the foregoing, from Washington to Preble, may be said to have had an important part in the founding of the Navy. There were also others who might be included in a group designated as the founders of the American Navy. For example, Benjamin Franklin when acting as our diplomatic representative in France, was largely instrumental in creating a squadron of American ships for operations in Europe, and there was a period late in the Revolutionary War when the Continental Navy would have disintegrated but for the financial and political aid of Robert Morris.

Relief From Stringent Naturalization Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 25, 1946

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 23, 1946.

Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you with regard to H. R. 511, a bill which would give relief from stringent naturalization laws and which passed the House the early part of May 1945.

This legislation is needed more now than ever before. It would take care of the forgotten people who came to this great America in the 1890's—young, honest, industrious people who never really had the time or the opportunity to learn how to read and write. They married and had large families and have given the best years in honest labor. Many are property owners and taxpayers. Many had sons and daughters who served our great country in World War I and World War II. Many gave their lives in these great battles for the preservation of our free institutions. The sons and daughters of others are today in the vanguard of America's progress. Yet, these same clean-living people of America cannot become citizens unless they pass an examination that would probably flunk a high-school graduate or perhaps a college graduate. If the only requirements for citizenship were contributions to national wealth through honest labor and love for democracy, almost all of our noncitizens could easily become citizens.

There are thousands of people in the United States who have made application for their first and second papers, but who failed to pass the examination. In making application they renounced allegiance to their native countries, and yet they are not citizens of the United States. They love America, they are willing to fight to defend America and keep it democratic and free, so why deny them citizenship?

I might add that the House took favorable action on similar bills in the Seventy-sixth and Seventy-seventh Congresses and that this legislation is needed more now than ever before and urge your committee to act favorably on same.

The bill (H. R. 511) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, is as follows:

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1137), is hereby amended by adding, immediately following section 304 thereof, a new section to be numbered 304A and reading as follows:

"'SEC. 304A. An alien, if eligible to naturalization, 50 years of age or over, who has resided in the United States continuously since prior to July 1, 1924, and who, on or prior to the effective date of this section, has made a declaration of intention to become a citizen which is not more than 7 years old, or who, within 2 years from the effective date of this section, shall make a declaration of intention, may thereafter file petition for naturalization and be admitted to citizenship upon full compliance with all requirements of the naturalization laws, except that he shall not be required to speak the English language, sign his declaration or petition in his own handwriting, or meet other educational requirements: *Provided*, That this section shall apply only to petitions for naturalization filed within 4 years after the date of the enactment of this act.'

"SEC. 2. Section 326 of the Nationality Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1150; 8 U. S. C. 726) is hereby amended by adding a new subsection, to be known as subsection (e) and reading as follows:

"'(e) The provisions of this section shall not apply to any alien whose son or daughter is a citizen of the United States and has served or is serving honorably in the military or naval forces of the United States during the present war and who, if separated from such service, was separated under honorable conditions. For the purpose of this section, the present war shall be deemed to have commenced on December 7, 1941, and to continue until the termination of all hostilities in the present war."

"SEC. 3. The Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1137), is hereby amended by adding, immediately following section 331 thereof, a new section to be numbered 331A and reading as follows:

"'SEC. 331A. A declaration of intention to become a citizen shall not be required of any alien whose son or daughter is a citizen of the United States and has served or is serving honorably in the military or naval forces of the United States during the present war and who, if separated from such service, was separated under honorable conditions. For the purpose of this section, the present war shall be deemed to have commenced on December 7, 1941, and to continue until the termination of all hostilities in the present war'."

Your favorable consideration of this bill will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.,
Member of Congress,
Third District, Maryland.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION,
January 24, 1946.

Hon. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This will acknowledge your letter of January 23. I am glad to have the benefit of your comments and observations concerning H. R. 511, and shall call them to the attention of the committee.

Sincerely yours,
DICK RUSSELL.

Henry Ford II, President of Ford Motor Co., Calls Labor Relationships a Challenge of Human Engineering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM R. THOM
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 25, 1946

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, following is the complete text of an address by Henry Ford II, president, Ford Motor Co., on Wednesday evening, January 9, 1946, before the annual meeting of the Society of Automotive Engineers, at the Masonic Hall in Detroit, Mich.:

It is a great honor to be here as your guest this evening.

What I propose to do is to outline a problem. That may not be very considerate of me, but I take comfort from the fact that problems are the business of the Society of Automotive Engineers, and that you have never failed to rise to any difficult challenge. The problem, in my opinion, is one of the greatest which confronts American industry, for it concerns human relationships—relationships which can either aid or impede our efforts to achieve greater industrial efficiency. And if you can help to solve it—and I believe it needs the benefit of scientific thinking—you will have done much to increase the well-being and the living standards of America.

The ability of American industry to produce has never had the prestige it enjoys at this particular moment in history. The job of war production has been called a miracle. It confounded our enemies and drew praise from our allies. In a very short time we armed the largest fighting force ever mustered on this continent; we built, armed, and fueled combat ships and planes and tanks in quantities never before imagined; we put billions of dollars of weapons into the hands of our allies all over the world.

The mechanical principles which made possible this war-production record are not new to any of us—standardization of parts, line assembly, the use of large, high-cost machine tools. These are the principles all of us have used for many years in the manufacture of automobiles. They are the principles of mass production, and no group of men deserves a larger share of the credit for the rapid development of the mechanics of mass production than this group here tonight.

Mass production is not an end in itself, but a means to an end. It is a tool.

In war, mass production is a tool for making the weapons of war—as many as possible, as fast as possible. We used the tool better than other nations because we had more practice with it and because we were better equipped to use it efficiently.

In peacetime the use of the tool of mass production thrives best in a highly competitive democratic economy. For mass production is a tool which free people use in peacetime to make more and better products at less and less cost. It is a tool for raising the standard of living.

All of us would agree that a standard of living is not a question of money, but of things and opportunities. People are prosperous and enjoy a high standard of living, when great numbers of them can afford a great many things and services—refrigerators, automobiles, radios, homes, good food, education, recreation, and all the rest. Through the peacetime use of the tool of mass production, American industry has already made this country a land with an incomparably high standard of living.

And the use to which we can put mass production to bring millions of things and opportunities within the price range of millions of people has in no way reached its limit. It is obvious, for example, how much better off we would be in this country if it were possible to sell automobiles for half their prewar prices. Millions of people who never owned a car could have one. Families which have one could have two. Tens of thousands of private enterprises serving the automobile industry and the people who driv. automobiles would benefit, and would expand. Cut the cost of refrigerators in half, cut the cost of radios in half, cut the cost of homes, clothing, and other manufactured articles in half, and the people of America would find themselves vastly better off.

We continually talk about higher incomes, and higher wages, and more money. That is all right. A man should be ambitious. He should try to increase his income. But in our discussion of higher incomes, we must never lose sight of the universal advantages of lower costs—of more and better products brought within the budget of more and more people.

In the face of what peacetime mass production has already accomplished in raising our standard of living, in the face of current world praise of American industry's ability to produce great quantities of things in a short space of time, we may be tempted to think that the potentialities of mass production have been exhausted—that we have come to the end of this road to national well-being. Such a notion is absurd. The mechanics of mass production can still be greatly improved, and they can be more widely adapted.

But there is a whole vast area in which we are only beginning to make significant progress—what we might call the field of human engineering. Machines alone do not give us mass production. Mass production is achieved by both machines and men. And while we have gone a very long way toward perfecting our mechanical operations we have not successfully written into our equations whatever complex factor represents man, the human element.

I am suggesting, therefore, that we try to rewrite the equations to take into account the human factor. If we can solve the problem of human relations in industrial production, I believe we can make as much progress toward lower costs during the next 10 years as we made during the past quarter century through the development of the machinery of mass production.

In approaching the complex problems of human relations, I believe that management must take the initiative for developing the relationships between labor and management. Labor has a great opportunity to achieve stature through assuming greater responsibility. But I consider that management is in charge, that management must manage, and that the test of management is whether or not it succeeds.

Mass production did not invent the human equation—but it did alter it in a number of important respects which we may have been slow in taking into account. Under mass production large numbers of people flocked to the assembly line, each to perform a highly specialized routine duty. Mass production produced great concentrations of people—and a problem of communicating with them. And it produced the difficult problem of specialization, where the human being loses sight of the social usefulness of what he does.

How badly we have taken the human factor into account is indicated by many statistics. The Department of Labor shows that a total of 216,000,000 man-days were lost between 1927 and 1941 as a result of strikes alone.

I am not here concerned with the justice of these strikes or their injustice. I am saying that some 216,000,000 man-days of work were lost. This idleness was expensive—to the strikers, to the companies, and to the Nation. And that cost was part of the Nation's cost of production. Consider how many thousands of automobiles, radios, refrigerators, and other useful and needed products could have been manufactured with 216,000,000 man-days of labor. Or, to put it in another way, consider how much lower would have been the cost of the things that were manufacturerd if production had not had to absorb the expense of these work stoppages. Furthermore, when a production line stops, the jobs and purchasing power of hundreds of thousands of people in related businesses all over the country are affected.

We must remember, too, that strikes are by no means the only measure of lost time. That loss, indeed, is only a fraction of the time lost through industrial inefficiency and through mass unemployment. We are all aware of the fact that the man-days lost through unemployment during the same years—1927 to 1941—were of tremendous proportions.

Costs are also closely related to the productivity of the individual American worker. We take pride in this productivity, and as a matter of fact we in America cannot compete in world markets with our high wage rates if the American worker does not continue to be productive.

Recent statistics on productivity are confusing because of the factor of war. War necessarily brought into industry a great many less experienced men and women. The armed forces took away a great many skilled workers.

Other prewar mass-production industries have found, as have we at Ford Motor Co., that even after allowance for these unusual circumstances the recent record of productivity is not encouraging. We keep detailed records of the time it takes to perform various operations. Those I am about to cite are in every way comparable: that is, the operations have not been changed so that more time should be allocated to their performance. Let me give you the number of minutes required in December 1940 compared to July 1945 to perform certain operations.

One group of operations which took 96 minutes in 1940 took 128 minutes 5 years later. Another group which took 1,185 minutes in 1940 took, 5 years later, a total of 1,943 minutes to perform. A third group took 28 minutes in 1940 and 49 minutes 5 years later.

On the whole, productivity per worker in our plants declined more than 34 percent during the war period.

I have already pointed out that some of this was inevitable, a result of the war, and I should like to say that I am emphasizing these figures merely to demonstrate how great is the need for improvement in this field.

As we look at these problems in human relations, we feel that the solution must be found through a closer understanding between management and labor. If we cannot succeed by cooperation, it doesn't seem likely that we can succeed by any exercise of force. We cannot, for example, expect legislation to solve our problems. Laws which seek to force large groups of Americans to do what they believe is unfair and against their best interests are not likely to succeed. In fact, such legislation can lead to exaggeration of the very problem it is designed to solve. And when freemen give up the task of trying to get along with each other, and pass the buck to government, they surrender a substantial measure of their freedom.

That, then, is the problem I wanted to lay before you this evening. Let me summarize by stating it more briefly: In a free, competitive democracy, mass production is a tool for raising the standard of living by reducing costs and thereby bringing more and better products within the budgets of more and more people. We have not yet solved the problems of mass production, for our failure in human engineering is creating waste and inefficiency which handicaps the very purpose of mass production—lower costs.

I do not have the answers to this problem. But I am sure that workable solutions can be found if we will only bring to it the same insistent objectivity and willingness to experiment which you and others like you throughout industry have given to the mechanical difficulties in mass production.

In industrial human relations, then, we have a new and relatively unexplored frontier. And beyond this frontier lie opportunities greater perhaps than any of us can imagine.

There are many consideration which we must take into account as we work toward a solution of this problem. I can name some that have occurred to me, and you will think of others.

I assume, for example, that all of us agree that labor unions are here to stay. Certainly, we of the Ford Motor Co. have no desire to break the unions, to turn back the clock to days which sometimes look in retrospect much more attractive than they really were. The truth of the matter is that the unions we deal with rose out of the very problem we are discussing—the human problems inherent in mass-production. We do not want to destroy the unions. We want to strengthen their leadership by urging and helping them to assume the responsibilities they must assume if the public interest is to be served.

It is clear, then, that we must look to an improved and increasingly responsible union leadership for help in solving the human equation in mass-production. Union leaders today who have the authority to affect industrial production on a vast scale enjoy a social power of enormous proportions. If they are going to be real leaders they must accept the social obligations that go with leadership.

What is needed today is industrial statesmanship—from both labor and management. Instead, we have a tradition of industrial antagonism. Men who in their private lives would not think of entering into a brawl on the street have in the past found themselves blasting each other in the public press by colorful name-calling. This tradition has given rise in some circles to the theory that open conflict is inevitable. I have even heard it said that strikes are helpful in clearing the atmosphere.

With such unhappy theories I do not hold. Modern man, who has done so much to reduce the manpower loss caused by disease, can certainly hope to reduce the manpower loss from industrial conflict. The public interest requires that we find ways to eliminate industrial warfare without impairing or diminishing the rights which both management and labor must continue to enjoy.

We will always have some honest differences of opinion. But we can certainly deal with these controversies more wisely and efficiently. If we are to have industrial relations programs and labor relations staffs, and spend as much money on them as we do, we should do it expertly and efficiently, bringing to the task the same technical skill and determination that the engineer brings to mechanical problems. We must act on a more human and professional plane.

There is no reason, for example, why a grievance case should not be handled with the same dispatch as a claim for insurance benefits. There is no reason why a union contract could not be written and agreed upon with the same efficiency and good temper that marks the negotiation of a commercial contract between two companies.

In the meantime, there are day-to-day responsibilities of management toward employees which should fit into the whole pattern of the new relationships we seek. Consider, for example, possibilities for improve-

ment in personnel evaluation. Only recently have we begun to develop and use modern techniques which enable us to fit people to jobs, and fit jobs to people, with some degree of science. Too often we have assumed that if a man is a good sweeper he is a good sweeper only, if a man is a good assembler he is a good assembler only. But the results of industrial psychological tests show very clearly that sometimes a good sweeper may also be a good assembler, and an assembler may have qualities of personal leadership that will make him a good foreman. Every company follows a general policy of advancing men in accordance with their capacities. But we can do a more scientific job.

When we have learned to do a reasonably good job of evaluating an employee's capacities at the start of his career, we can do a better job of upgrading. I am not talking now about technical requirements having to do with such things as automatic pay raises and seniority. I mean the development of more opportunities for employees to improve themselves in accordance with their own initiative and desires.

We know that great masses of men work constantly at points below their top capacities, and it is one of our jobs to see that ways and means are provided to help them rise to these opportunities.

Communication between management and employees in large mass-production plants is another important field in which we can work.

In any large group of people working together it is a basic requirement that good lines of communication exist. There will always be plans and estimates, information about new styles and new engineering, and other data, which management must guard closely because they are the very elements on which tough competition is based. But information about company objectives and accomplishments should be made available to all. People want to know what the other people they work with are doing and thinking. They want to know the score.

It is fairly easy for everybody to know the score when there are only 50 employees in a plant. But when thousands of employees work at assembly lines in a single plant, they create a problem of communication which has not yet been solved.

In an age in which the world prides itself on speed and efficiency in human communication, it is absurd that we should not have been more successful in this field. We have the tools at our disposal—movies, radio, coordination conferences, newspapers, the graphic arts, posters, and all the rest. It is good business to see to it that the members of our industrial teams get information to make them conscious of the fact that they are on the team. This applies all along the line—shop employees, office workers, supervisory and executive personnel.

I think we can lick this job of better communication. Informed employees are more productive than uninformed employees.

I shall not attempt to point out other areas—and there must be many—in which we can work toward better human engineering in mass production. The important thing, it seems to me, is to recognize the problem for the vital one it is and to move forward in hope and confidence and intelligent experimentation toward workable solutions.

As a starting point for continuing efforts in that direction perhaps management and labor would today agree:

1. That the job of American industry—management and labor—is to make at lower and lower cost more and better products to sell for lower and lower prices.

2. That the only way that job can be done is through understanding and sensible cooperation between management and labor.

3. That the spirit of that cooperation must be a sense of joint responsibility. The public is the boss, not management or labor. Both labor and management must accept their share of responsibility to the public welfare and live up to their commitments.

4. That mass production has demonstrated its ability to bring high wages, and that higher wages can come only out of greater production and lower costs.

5. That, while no single human institution or industry can promise complete security because of the complexity of modern civilization, management and labor can work toward more certain, more stabilized employment.

6. That American industry should be a place of opportunity—a place in which men and women can grow and develop into better jobs.

If these are our articles of industrial faith, then we are squared away to attack the problem of making mass production more efficient by giving the same hard-headed attention to human factors that we have given so successfully in the past to mechanical factors. The only approach we can take is to live up to the best industrial statesmanship of which we are capable. If we give the best we have we can hope to get the best in return.

The Girls Come Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 25, 1946

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post carries a very fine editorial regarding the splendid service performed by our servicewomen. I remember Mr. Eugene Meyers' invaluable assistance in securing the passage of the WAC legislation and the helpful policy of the newspaper relative to all legislation for the women serving with our military forces. I hope everyone will remember the unselfish loyal service of servicewomen and show appreciation by helping them. The Army speaks in glowing terms of their servicewomen, as do the Navy and Marine Corps and Coast Guard. They know what their service has been. They speak with authority.

[From the Washington Post of Thursday, January 24, 1946]

THE GIRLS COME HOME

Women who have served in the armed forces are not being welcomed home as conquering heroines. "Many have been disillusioned and discouraged by a cold reception from various women's groups," says Mrs. Anna M. Rosenberg, head of the New York Veterans' Service Committee. Hence this organization, as well as some national women's groups, have formed special committees to help women veterans get jobs and to provide them with social activities.

Women, far more than men, veterans are likely to meet neglect as a result of civilian apathy and callousness. They are too new at the fighting business to be surrounded by any romantic martial tradition, so that there are no "When Mary Comes Marching Home" songs. The returned warrior in folk myth is always the gallant knight for whom the fair lady waits in the tower. Also, the heroic deeds of women in warfare are rarely spectacular. The slayings of the dragon (in modern equivalent) is man's task. Women in uniform, with the exception of battle-line nurses, work mostly at routine jobs behind the lines. Then, women veterans come home to swell the surplus of marriageable women, and other women see them as competitors. Finally, there is no vast eager body of men at home waiting with outstretched arms.

It is also possible that some civilian women feel a bit guilty at their own failure to help out in the armed services. The response of American women to the recruiting compaigns was not very flattering to the Nation. Young able-bodied women who clung to their well-paying civilian jobs, or who turned down recruiters' pleas with the excuses that their fiances or mothers didn't want them to enlist, may feel some twinges of conscience now that the girls who went to serve their country are coming home. They may regret, and even resent, that they have no service records to brandish through future years.

Nevertheless Americans generally must be proud of the quiet, faithful, and valuable service their women in uniform gave. They must appreciate the personal and professional sacrifices so many of these women made to do the drab routine deeds that always remain unsung. They will surely see that job opportunities and a warm social welcome overshadow any petty snobbishness that the women who doff the uniform may encounter.

State of the Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 24, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, at Pittsburgh, Pa., on October 19, 1932, Franklin Delano Roosevelt said:

> The credit of the family depends chiefly on whether that family is living within its income. And that is equally true of the Nation. If the Nation is living within its income, its credit is good. * * *
>
> But if, like a spendthrift, it throws discretion to the winds and is willing to make no sacrifice at all in spending; if it extends its taxing to the limit of the people's power to pay and continue to pile up deficits, then it is on the road to bankruptcy.
>
> * * * we find that the expenditure for the business of Government in 1927 was $2,187,000,000 and in 1931, $3,168,000,000.

On last Monday, President Truman sent a message to the Congress and to the people of America, in which he set the Budget for the fiscal year of 1947—the first peacetime year—at thirty-six billions of dollars and foretold a tax income of twenty-nine billions. He also told the American people that so far as he could see into the future, our governmental costs will be $25,000,000,000 a year, and that there cannot possibly be any reduction of taxes. His Budget message pointed the way down the road to bankruptcy as described by his predecessor in office, Mr. Roosevelt, when he said, and I quote:

> But if, like a spendthrift, it—
>
> The Government—
>
> throws discretion to the winds and is willing to make no sacrifice at all in spending; if it extends its taxing to the limit of the people's power to pay and continue to pile up deficits, then it is on the road to bankruptcy.

Mr. Truman's message and the Budget which he certainly cannot expect the

American people to understand, numbered 975 pages, and according to one newspaper account, weighed exactly 3 pounds, 11 ounces on the meat scales in the nearest grocery store. The message contained a section entitled "Explanation of the Budget Contents." A Washington Daily News' reporter made a very pertinent and applicable remark that the message badly needs a new section entitled "Explanation of the Explanation of the Budget Content."

When we contemplate this Budget of $36,000,000,000 that is to cover this fiscal year, what our Government is going to cost us for its first annual postwar peace operation, and then realize that it is four times the highest prewar Budget we have ever had, which was $9,000,000,000 in 1941, we can begin to get some idea whether this country has drifted. When we ponder Mr. Truman's statement that far into the future our governmental operations are going to cost the taxpayers $25,000,000,000 a year, almost three times the highest prewar peacetime budget, we begin to see the dangerous condition into which this Nation has drifted.

Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY, of Nebraska, Republican whip of the Senate, and Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, both analyze the Budget as being ten or eleven billions short of the actual figures. In other words Mr. Truman has left out, they point out, the cost of subsidies which have been promised; our contributions to the Currency Stabilization Fund and World Bank; our full commitments to UNRRA; our commitments through the Export-Import Bank; all of this to say nothing of the contemplated loan of nearly $4,500,000,000 to Great Britain. Other loans will, of course, be demanded by Russia, China, and every other nation on earth whose rulers believe they can get in line and dip into the United States Treasury. Senator WHERRY cites figures which indicate that the Budget of $36,000,000,000 should really be set at $46,000,000,000. This means a deficit of at least $10,000,000,000. Other estimates put the deficit as high as $14,000,000,000. Senator WHERRY points out that under a $46,000,000,000 Budget we would be spending $130,000,000 a day for governmental operations in this first peacetime year. If those figures are correct, and I have no reason at this time to doubt them, the Government will spend approximately a dollar a person per day for every man, woman, and child in the United States. That in turn would mean for you, Mr. Wage Earner with a wife and two children, and for you, Mr. Farmer with a wife and two children, that the Government would be taking, either directly or indirectly, $4 a day of your money to be spent for its operations. Now there is neither point nor logic in trying to twist and distort the figures and the conditions. The first condition is that if our Government is going to spend $25,000,000,000 a year, or $36,000,000,000 a year, or $46,000,000,000 a year the Government is going to get the money out of the pockets of the people of this country. The money is going to come out of the national income, and the greater part of the national income comes from the wage earners and the farmers, or we will have to continue the New Deal policy of deficit spending.

If the Government is going to continue down the road of deficit spending, there is no doubt, as Mr. Roosevelt pointed out, that it will lead eventually to national bankruptcy and disaster. There are those who will seek to fool the wage earners, and the farmers, and the white-collar workers, and the fixed-income citizens. But the plain fact is that they are the taxpayers who are going to pay this enormous bill for governmental operations, or we are going to continue to indulge in deficit spending and continued borrowing until the public debt grows so vast that it has to be repudiated either by inflation or outright refusal to pay. The fact is that the President's course, as determined in his Budget message, is straight down the road to ruinous inflation. The fact is that if we go on spending money and issuing Government paper, we will so inflate the currency that we will reduce the purchasing power of the wage dollar, the farm dollar, the salary dollar, the fixed-income dollar, and the Government-bond dollar, that those dollars will lose 10 or 20 or even 50 or 75 percent of their purchasing power. It is not the number of dollars the wage earner gets in his pay envelope, or what the white-collar worker gets in his check, or what the farmer gets in income that measures the real value of his income. It is the amount of goods and services, the necessities of life, the things he can consume and use that he gets in exchange for those wage dollars, those salary dollars, and those farm dollars which spell his real income. I have seen it stated that an ordinary dinner in China costs $25,000 in Chinese currency if you want to have a bottle of wine with it. The normal value of that currency is one-half that of our American dollar. That is what inflation can mean.

Inflation will ruin every man, woman, and child in this Nation if we keep piling up a Federal debt and expect finally to dispose of it with inflated dollars. That has been the way of the despotisms of Europe. On the other hand, as it was brought out by a distinguished Member of Congress in the House of Representatives, the Honorable DANIEL A. REED, of New York, our national debt is more than Mr. Truman alleges in his message by $300,000,000,000. The fact is that our national commitments today, as placed in the appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page A5504 by Mr. REED, are $636,898,220,145.98.

The President's Budget message, to every thinking man and woman, is as alarming as a cry of fire in a crowded tenement. We cannot go on taxing our people as we are taxing them now. We cannot possibly go on with the deficit spending year after year, because there is a limit to the credit of even a great and glorious Nation like the United States. The inflation which we are entering into is as dangerous to our people as the black plague. We can begin to see that Mr. Truman has adopted the New Deal theory, "We owe it to ourselves."

Mr. Truman tells us our reconversion is well stabilized. Now is it? Production is being paralyzed. The people are fearful. This Nation is riven by strikes and industrial disputes. Every dollar that is earned or spent in the production of goods and services constitutes legitimate purchasing power to buy the goods and services it creates. Prices at the retail counter are the sum total of all costs and profits. They were never anything else. They never will be anything else.

Either we are going to have an expanding economy in this country, which means the constant production of more and more goods and services, at constantly reduced prices, which means that people will have more for their money instead of less, or else we are going to continue to have strikes, slow-downs, shut-downs, cessation of the production and distribution of goods and services, continued borrowing, continued increases in wages and prices until inflation has carried us to a point where panic and ruin will face this Nation.

All Americans should demand of your Congress that if the executive department of the administration will not reduce its spending and strive to get our Budget back to a pre-war basis, then the Congress must do it.

If the taxpayers do not turn to this task of compelling their Government to stop this needless spending and this piling up of billions upon billions of dollars of deficits and debts. I can tell you that this overswollen political bureaucracy in Washington, which also infests every nook and corner of this Nation, is not going to do it for them. They and only they, apparently, can compel Congress to put the brakes on this reckless spending. You should look at the facts. Whatever your Government spends, must be taken from your pockets and the pockets of your children and your grandchildren far into the future. We do not need to face ruin in this Nation. We have a great Nation, the greatest in the world.

We made more progress in 150 years than other nations have in 5,000 years. We have the know-how in this country. We have the raw materials. We have the production technique. All we need to be prosperous is to see to it that the administration, which for nearly 14 years has never had a balanced Budget. Stop this reckless spending; cut out everything but the most absolute essentials in governmental activities; by all means put an end to giving and loaning billions to foreign nations, which never will be repaid; return government to home rule as soon as possible, and reduce these terrible taxes we now have to pay.

Only in that way, my fellow citizens, can we go forward. Only in that way can we have a safe, sound, free, prosperous America. If we do not do it, then we can look forward to despair and panic and ruin. I urge, I beg that the taxpayers everywhere act in this matter and demand of their Congress that we put the brakes on this careening journey down the road to bankruptcy.

Let us make America strong, happy, and prosperous. We still can accomplish this if we will.

What Is Your Answer to the Veteran?—He Asks No Special Favors Either

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 24, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I emphatically call attention of this House to an editorial from the pen of the Daily News, of Los Angeles, Calif., dated January 16, 1946. It is not only appropriate for me to ask your reading of it, because it speaks out so clearly and constructively in connection with the veterans, about whom every Member of this House is thinking a great deal; but it is appropriate because this editorial specifically refers to Congress. This newspaper is rated as one of the great dailies of America.

Here is the editorial:

AN ANSWER TO THE VETERAN

What are you going to say to all of these thousands of burned-up GI's and veterans blowing their tops at home and around the world?

Suppose you are—or are trying your best to be—a responsible trafficker in opinion, now and then laying an editorial egg but on the whole striving to help folks form reasonable judgments about what Walt Whitman called life's involved and varied pageants, what would you say to other citizens?

What would you say to the thousands of ex-GI's here in Los Angeles who can't even find a home? Who can't buy a suit of clothes? What would you say to the 200 riled flying veterans who marched the other day at Long Beach demanding a chance for jobs as aerial freight pilots?

Particularly what can be said to these guys when you know their feelings are right and their moral impulses are sound but that much they want and deserve just can't be made to jibe quickly with the imperfect patterns of peacetime living?

We've gone through this painful business of reabsorbing the veteran several times in our history and each time it's been tough—especially on the veteran.

But chances are this will be the most painful adjustment yet, because we went all out for the war this time—total war. And that sort of war is like a blind, staggering, blacking-out jag, inevitably followed by a lulu of a hang-over.

The settling down process is just going to hurt, that's all. But it can be made somewhat less hurtful if some among us can keep from acting like lunkheads—and by "some" the Daily News doesn't mean former service people alone.

The veteran, as Amvet head Charles G. Bolte has pointed out, has in many instances "matured without ripening."

The result is that he is inclined to make brusque demands for immediate results. Assessing these demands you're struck by the fact of their reasonableness, their almost naked simplicity, their embarrassing validity.

What are they? Well, the veteran wants a place to live at a price he can afford to pay. Either rental or purchase will do.

It needn't be a fancy dump, replete with all the wonders of the "miracle home" which yet exists only in the advertising copywriter's imagination. Just a clean, comfortable, pleasant, well-put-together abode where he can hang up his socks and begin to feel like he has a home, a home for himself, for his family, if he has one, or if he intends to have one, or a temporary home if he wants to go to school and take advantage of the GI bill of rights.

He'd like also two or three suits of clothes and some work togs. Not the $125 tailor-made creations, not the $5 rayon shorts with the two-way stretch, but some fairly good clothes like he used to buy around $40 or $50 for the suit and arcund 85 cents for the shorts.

He'd like a job—perhaps a new job—in congenial surroundings at a decent wage and with some sort of future. Every day the veteran sees things, jobs that need doing, and can't see why he shouldn't be working at those jobs.

The flyers who want to fly freight are a case in point. The freight is there—perishable freight, such as asparagus and citrus fruit and flowers—the planes are there, former service cargo ships standing around unused—and the pilots are there. It doesn't make sense, the veteran figures, that those three essentials can't be reconciled with one another.

And lastly, the veteran would like peace and freedom, the goals he was told he fought for and saw his buddies die for on the sweltering beachheads and jungles of the Pacific and the cold wet mud of north Africa, Italy, France, and the Rhineland.

Counseling GI Joe to be patient and to forbear doesn't come off, somehow, when he's tramping the streets looking for a place to live—when he's marching around idle planes he knows how to fly while needed merchandise waits overlong to be gotten from here to there.

For Joe's wants and the questions he is asking strike straight at the faltering heart of the existing, muddled order of things.

No, even though the veteran is impatient—justifiably so—even though the total mobilization of war perhaps has taught him to overvalue immediate results—the Daily News can't counsel him to forbear in the sense that he will be satisfied with today's imperfections and shortcomings. It can and does ask him to be tolerant and to remember he and his 15,000,000 buddies are going to share a major responsibility for shaping their country's future.

But mainly what the Daily News asks is that the whole country, for its own sake as well as Joe's, get on with reconversion, that Congress and the State legislature and the city council quit stalling, that management and labor settle their differences, that citizens everywhere recognize the simple fact that it is already later than we think.

The only veterans' problem is the problem of our resources and our machines and ourselves. But mostly ourselves, who haven't learned in sufficient numbers that winning a war doesn't mean you've won a peace.

R. E. G. H.

Oregon Tops All Nation in E Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 25, 1946

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note by a release recently given by Ted R. Gamble, national director in charge of war-bond sales, that the State of Oregon led all of the 48 States in the Union in the per capita purchase of series E bonds for the period May 1941 through December 1945.

As disclosed by this report there was purchased in the State of Oregon $446.02 in bonds per capita during this period. Connecticut took second place with $434.76 per capita; Washington was third with $433.86 per capita; and California fourth with $409.89 per capita.

Mr. Speaker, this is in line with the contribution made by the people of my State in war activities in the construction of ships, production of aluminum, furnishing of wood products and agricultural and fishery products. Our State held a commanding position. I am proud of my fellow Oregonians and believe I will be pardoned for calling this fine record to your attention.

On-the-Job Training for Veterans in the Schools of Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL STEWART
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 24, 1946

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, during the latest recess of Congress I discovered that the State of Oklahoma was on the alert upon the question of on-the-job training for veterans. This idea is known as the Poteau plan and the principal details were worked out by Hon. Elbert L. Costner, superintendent of the public schools of Poteau, Okla. He is also a member of the State Board of Education of Oklahoma, an ex-serviceman of World War I and one of our best educators. He was chosen as Oklahoma's representative in working out a national plan for training of veterans and plan hereinafter outlined was practically, if not completely, worked out beforehand by Mr. Costner in his own city. Since this plan is so simple and sound, it should certainly be made a public document by Congress for distribution throughout the Nation. The entire plan is as follows:

ON-THE-JOB TRAINING FOR VETERANS IN THE SCHOOLS OF OKLAHOMA

(Approved by all State and Federal educational and veterans officials—Courses in wholesale and retail, trades industrial, vocational agriculture—Robert S. Kerr, Governor of Oklahoma)

(Form for copying)

CERTIFICATES (B) AND (C)

On-the-job training

This is to certify that:

1. _____,
(Name of veteran)

C. No. _____, entered training on the job under the provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of June 22, 1944, Public, No. 346, with—

Name of establishment_____

Located at _____
(Address)

on _____ for
(Date)

training as_____
(Job objective)

and that this course ordinarily requires_____ months for completion.

2. The beginning monthly wage, exclusive of overtime will be $_____.

3. The establishment agrees to report at the end of each month the number of days

the veteran was absent during the month and the amount of money paid to the veteran for his services, exclusive of overtime.

4. The standard salary or journeymen's wage for this position is $---------- per month.

5. This veteran is in training---------- clock hours each week and the training will be continuous.

6. The estimated cost of supplies and equipment that are customarily required of a trainee for the successful completion of the course is:

Supplies $---------- Equipment----------
Name of school----------
Name of establishment----------
By----------
Title----------
Date----------

(Form for copying)

VETERAN'S TRAINING PROGRAM, OKLAHOMA SCHOOLS—MEMORANDUM OF TRAINING PLAN

1. The----------
(School)
and----------
(Establishment)
will permit----------
(Veteran)
to enter their establishment for the purpose of gaining knowledge and experience as (a) (an)----------
(Occupation)

(Department)

2. The course of training is designed to run for a ---------- year ---------- month ---------- day.

The training will be in accordance with an outline made and agreed upon by the employer, the coordinator, and the veteran.

3. The school will make provision for the veteran to receive related and technical instruction.

4. The status of the veteran while in training shall be that of a student-learner.

5. The veteran while in training shall progress from job to job in order to gain experience in various operations.

6. The schedule of compensation shall be agreed on by the training agency, the coordinator, and the veteran in accordance with existing local standards, labor laws, and policies.

7. All complaints shall be made to and adjusted by the coordinator.

8. The coordinator shall have authority to transfer or withdraw the veteran if he is found to be not feasible for the type of training begun, or if for any reason, the training station proves unsatisfactory, or for any other reason which the coordinator deems to be the best interest to those concerned. In any case, the veteran, the coordinator, and the practical teacher or trainer shall agree to any change that is made.

9. The veteran promises to abide by all implied and stated terms included in this agreement.

By----------
(Employer)

(Coordinator)

(Veteran)

(Superintendent or director of veteran's training program)

VETERANS' TRAINING PROGRAM

The public schools of Oklahoma will offer to veterans: Special courses of on-the-job training in wholesale and retail establishments, trades, industry, and agriculture. A large number of short courses will be given by technically skilled, practical teachers under the direction of the school's vocational coordinators, or other instructors. All such courses are available to out-of-school youth.

The above training is offered in an attempt to reach the veteran or youth that is not interested in returning to full-time high school or college work. Plans have been made that permit training on-the-job, and in short courses arranged at times that are convenient to the student. The Veterans' Administration has approved the plan and, subsistence allowance will be granted under the GI bill to eligible veterans.

Veterans wishing to enroll at the beginning of the month should contact the high-school office. New registrations or enrollments will be accepted any day of any month during the year.

State board of education: President, A. L. Crable; secretary, W. T. Doyel; director of vocational education, J. B. Perky. Members: Hugh A. Carroll, Fairview; Charles P. Howell, Ponca City; Elbert L. Costner, Poteau; R. L. McLean, Anadarko.

OAKLAHOMA PUBLIC SCHOOLS OUTLINE OF PLAN OF OPERATION FOR TRAINING RETURNING WAR VETERANS—WHOLESALE AND RETAIL OCCUPATIONS TO MEET PROVISIONS OF PUBLIC LAW 16 AND PUBLIC LAW 346

Purpose of plan

Numerous surveys have indicated that many men now in the armed services expect to own and operate their own retail stores. Others will enter the employ of already established wholesale and retail organizations. It is the purpose of this plan to help guide the veteran and to give him sufficient training so that he will be successful in his chosen occupation. The veterans trained under Public Law 16 will be assigned to the school by the Veterans' Administration after council and guidance given at Muskogee.

How the plan operates

The training plan operates as follows:

1. All training is conducted under public school supervision and control.

2. The training program will consist of three phases: First, a general basic training; second, specialized training; third, a cooperative on-the-job training.

3. Both the basic and specialized training should be offered as intensive training with a minimum of 40 hours basic, and 80 hours specialized training. These courses may be given concurrently and should be completed soon after the trainee begins training. Six hours per day or 30 hours a week should be spent in basic and specialized training, unless the trainee is receiving on-the-job training or is operating his own business while taking training.

4. The cooperative on-the-job training will be given in centers close to the place where the veteran is employed in a wholesale or retail, firm, near the center where he may be operating his own business. In the cooperative on-the-job training phase of this program the veteran will receive specific instruction from the coordinator instructor in the school and all specific on-the-job training from the coordinator and the operator of the business in which he is employed. Where the trainee is operating his own business cooperative on-the-job training may be given in the veteran's shop. It is anticipated that the trainee will devote a minimum of 4 hours a week to the group instruction and at least 32 hours a week to cooperative on-the-job training. If the veteran is operating his own business the 4 hours, group instruction may be given individually in the veteran's place of business at the option of the coordinator and the veteran.

5. The coordinator instructor will visit each trainee on the job at least once each month in addition to the meetings planned for systematic instruction.

6. The cooperative on-the-job instruction will be both remedial and supplementary.

Topical outline of basic training

I. Brief discussion of marketing process.

II. General facts that a prospective should consider.

III. Financial requirements.

IV. Personal qualifications of prospective merchant.

V. Opportunities in different fields of retailing.

VI. Why training is necessary for store owner or manager.

VII. Alternative to going into business for yourself.

In offering the work experience-related training program, a public school must provide the training related to the job needs.

Content of instruction

The content of the instructional program will be determined by the following factors:

1. A job analysis of the occupation.

2. Problems encountered by the trainee on the job.

3. Organized training materials made available by manufacturers, wholesalers, trade associations, trade journals, and others.

4. The veteran wishes should be given priority as far as possible under the law.

Approval of schools

Any high school in the State of Oklahoma that is accredited has been approved and may offer cooperative training for veterans.

Qualifications of coordinators or teachers

A coordinator or teacher having responsibility for a cooperative veteran's training program shall meet the qualifications required by the State Board of Vocational Education. This regulation shall not preclude the hiring of special instructors who may be necessary to the success of the program.

Administration and supervision

The local board of education and its administrative officers shall have administrative charge of the training program.

The Veterans' Administration, together with local school authorities, shall have supervision of the program under Public Law 16.

FARMER-TRAINING PROGRAM TO MEET PROVISIONS OF PUBLIC LAW 16 AND PUBLIC LAW 346

This program of farmer-training for veterans will be offered in high school under the supervision of the vocational agriculture teacher and the Veterans' Administration. The veterans trained under Public Law 16 will be assigned to the school by the Veterans' Administration after council and guidance given at Muskogee.

Educational basis for the program

This program is based on two integrated procedures which vocational education in agriculture holds to be fundamental to a sound farmer-trained program. They are:

1. Systematic class instructions, plus

2. Supervised farming (on-the-job training).

Systematic class instruction is necessary for the study and discussion of problems and practices significant to successful farming in the community. Through class instruction, the trainees can discover difficulties and problems confronting them on their individual farms, work out the best solutions to their problems, and acquire an understanding of the facts and principles and underlie the use of recommended or improved practices in farming. As a part of this class-work, the trainee plans rather definitely how he is going to carry on his own farming program. Each veteran's plan must be worked out and approved as an individual personal training unit.

Following the class-work on good farming practices and how they may be carried out, the trainee must have opportunity to use these practices in actual farming if he is to learn the use of the practices. The carrying out of improved practices in arming under the supervision of the teacher of agriculture is comparable to on-the-job training in industrial occupations.

Class instruction in agriculture and practice in farming are essential in the instructional program. Training the returning

veterans in the communities in which they are to farm not only makes this kind of instruction possible but promotes the establishment of farming.

Persons the program will serve

This program is designed to meet the farmer-training needs of disabled veterans under provisions of Public Law 16 and all other veterans under provisions of Public Law 346. In order to qualify for training in this program a person must have facilities and opportunity to carry on a satisfactory supervised farming program in one of the following situations:

1. Be a farm owner-operator or a farm manager.

2. Be a renter of, or a partner in, operating a farm.

3. Be working on a suitable farm with his parents or others.

Only veterans who have entered upon or who are preparing to enter upon a farming vocation and who have at their disposal farming facilities that will permit satisfactory practice in farming may receive training.

Plans of instruction

In offering this program, a school must provide a course or courses of instruction to meet the minimum requirements of one or more of the following plans:

Amount of Instruction: There is to be at least 150 hours of classroom instruction, plus at least two supervisory visits per month (24 per year), plus a supervised farming program of at least 1,536 hours for the year.

Course of Study: The contents of each course of instruction shall meet the approval of the vocational education director of Oklahoma. The courses shall provide as much as a 4 full years of training. The guiding aim of each course shall be to develop the individual's ability to successfully establish himself in farming and operate a farm.

The State Board of Vocational Education has developed course outlines with recommended content to be used in this program. These course outlines may be examined by the interested persons.

The course of study is to be designed to meet the needs of the veterans in the section of the State where they are to farm. Since different sections of Oklahoma have different types of farming, a course to meet the needs of the veterans in one part of the State will not meet the needs in another part.

A 4-year course of study, to meet the needs of trainees in a particular section of the State might be as follows, for example:

First year	*Hours*
Farming occupations (opportunities in farming and establishment in farming)	50
Home living (producing and conserving food and the like)	25
Farm shop	20
Livestock (general)	15
Corn and cotton, general row crops	15
Hogs and poultry	15
Total	150

Second year	
Home living	20
Farm shop	30
Soils (basic course)	40
Hay and pasture	30
Dairy	30
Total	150

Third year	
Home living	30
Farm shop	50
Feeding (producing and using feed)	50
Poultry	20
Total	150

Fourth year	
Home living	20
Farm shop	40
Farm management	40
Soil and water conservation and use 1	50
Total	150

The classroom instruction

Organized instruction may be more intensive during the fall, winter, and early spring and less intensive during the summer months. Transportation to all classes of systematic class instruction courses should be provided by the school at no cost to the veteran.

Class instructions shall be designed to develop in the trainees the ability and attitude necessary to:

1. Make a beginning and advance in farming.
2. Produce farm commodities efficiently.
3. Market farm products advantageously.
4. Manage a farm business.
5. Conserve soil and other resources.
6. Maintain a favorable environment.

Approved methods of instruction, including solving of farming problems, group discussion, demonstrations, and individual practice, visual aids, field trips, and planning and evaluating individual farming program and practices, shall be used.

The supervised farming

Each trainee shall have a farming program which is suited to his needs for training in farming. The amount of supervised farming may be greater in the spring, summer, and fall months, and less in the winter months.

The supervised farming program of trainees shall consist of the following

1. Making arangements for the program; buying a farm, renting a farm, or cropland, securing livestock or renting livestock, and the like.

2. Making plans for the program; deciding on the crops and animals to produce and deciding on production and marketing practices to use.

3. Providing facilities for carrying out the program; securing animals, feed, seed, fertilizer, finance, equipment, hired labor, storage, and so on.

4. Carrying out the program: caring for animals, cultivating the crops, using improved practices, managing the programs, marketing the products, etc.

5. Keeping, summarizing, and interpreting records of the program.

6. Planning future operations.

The teacher will give the trainee the supervision needed in his farming program, on the trainee's home farm. This supervision will consist of periodic and special visits to the trainee's farm to assist, encourage, and instruct him in such things as evaluating work already done, planning future work, using improved practices, and performing skilled jobs. The teacher will endeavor to see that improved practices are used.

School facilities to be provided

In order for a public high school to qualify to offer courses under this program, the following conditions must be met:

1. Classroom: The school will make available a classroom properly lighted and equipped. The school will also make available the vocational agriculture library and agricultural teaching equipment.

2. Farm shop: The school will make available an adequately equipped farm shop for instruction. The shop will be available to the trainees a minimum of one-fourth of the total time prescribed for class instruction.

3. Other training facilities. The school will make available to trainees such other farmer-training facilities that it has, such as school-community cannery, visual aids, and community farm equipment, for use in this program.

Qualifications of teachers

Teachers responsible for instructing veterans in this program must meet minimum qualifications for teachers of vocational agriculture in Oklahoma. However, the teacher of vocational agriculture may secure the assistance of special instructors to assist with certain phases of the instruction such as a teacher of home economics in teaching food preservation, a farm machinery repair specialist in teaching farm-machinery repair, or others who are recognized as competent in the field in which the course is being offered.

The use of special instructors shall be for the purpose of assisting the regular teacher in making the instruction more effective, and all work by special instructors shall be under the direct supervision of the regular teacher. All such special teachers as needed shall be provided by the local board of education.

The board of education and its administrative officers of the school district where a local program is operated shall have administrative charge of the program of training.

The State Board of Vocational Education in Oklahoma, together with local school authorities, and the Veterans' Administration at Muskogee, shall have supervision of the program under Public Law 16.

INDUSTRIAL OCCUPATIONS TO MEET PROVISIONS OF PUBLIC LAW 16 AND PUBLIC LAW 346

Purpose of the program

This program is planned to meet the needs of veterans who may find it impracticable to enroll in a regular vocational school for trade training.

Explanation of the program

A course under this program is given cooperatively by a public school and a local business or industrial establishment. The industrial establishment will employ the veteran or veterans and cooperate with the school in providing on-the-job work experience. The school, through a teacher coordinator, will offer the necessary technical and related instruction. In a typical course under this program the student will spend 35 hours a week on the job and 5 hours a week in school. The ratio of time in school and on the job may be varied or adjusted to meet specific individual needs. Provided, however, in case of Public Law No. 16, such adjustment meets the approval of the Veterans' Administration in Muskogee who will in all cases first interview, advise and at their discretion request the school to prepare for their approval a definite program of work in class and out that they and the veteran agree upon. The local school will accept the responsibility for seeing that the instructional pattern is carried out.

Plan of instruction

The public school will prepare, in cooperation with the industrial establishment, a specific plan for training the veteran. This plan will specify the work experience the veteran is to receive on the job, the technical information required in the trade which he is to receive at school, the length of the course, a work-study schedule, and other necessary details. Complete courses vary in length from 1 to 4 years.

A person with proper qualifications will be designated by the school to supervise the training in order that there may be proper correlation between the work experience and study activities of the veteran.

Satisfactory correlation will be accomplished by making a careful analysis of the trade to determine just what technical knowledge and job skills are required of a competent workman.

Facilities of the industrial establishment

Only industrial establishments will be selected for cooperative training that have facilities which will enable the veteran to acquire adequate experience with modern equipment and tools. A competent and sympathetic foreman will supervise the work of the veteran.

Facilities of the school

The school will provide a classroom properly equipped for giving the technical instruction required. This room will contain a selected list of books, charts, and other reference material for the trade.

The school will also furnish a trained instructor, who has had industrial experience, to teach technical and other subjects. This is the person who will be responsible for working with the veteran's employer in developing the analysis of the trade referred to in a previous section of this monograph. He will be responsible, also, for visiting the veterans on the job at regular intervals for the purpose of seeing that the planned correlation between work and study is being accomplished.

Approval of schools

All accredited schools offering cooperative training for veterans under this program are approved by the division of vocational education of the State board of education.

Qualifications of coordinators or teachers

A coordinator or teacher having responsibility for a cooperative veterans' training program shall have the qualifications required by the State board of vocational teachers in trades and industry classes. This regulation shall not preclude the hiring of special instructors who may be necessary to the success of the program.

Administration and supervision

The local board of education and its administrative officers shall have administrative charge of the training program.

The Veterans' Administration, together with local school authorities, shall have supervision of the program, and final jurisdiction will rest with the Veterans' Administration in all cases under Public Law 16.

SHORT COURSES

Short courses to be offered during the school year 1945–46 where fees are required of all who take the course:

Farm Training Program

Twenty hours, care and repair of farm machinery and equipment, No. 1, $8.
Twenty hours, care and repair of farm machinery and equipment, No. 2, $8.
Twenty hours, care and repair of farm machinery and equipment, No. 3, $8.
Twenty hours, care and repair of farm machinery and equipment, No. 4, $8.
Twenty hours, care and repair of farm machinery and equipment, No. 5, $8.
Twenty hours, farm auto mechanics, No. 1, $8.
Twenty hours, farm auto mechanics, No. 2, $8.
Twenty hours, farm auto mechanics, No. 3, $8.
Twenty hours, farm auto mechanics, No. 5, $8.
Thirty hours, conservation of soil and moisture, $12.
Twenty hours, pasture improvement and year-round pastures, No. 1, $8.
Twenty hours, dairy production, breeding, and milk markets, No. 1, $8.
Twenty hours, dairy production, breeding and milk markets, No. 2, $8.
Twenty hours, dairy production, breeding, and milk markets, No. 3, $8.
Twenty hours, poultry production for meat and eggs, No. 1, $8.
Twenty hours, poultry production for meat and eggs, No. 2, $8.
Twenty hours, food processing, No. 1, $8.
Twenty hours, food processing, No. 2, $8.
Twenty hours, food processing, No. 3, $8.
Twenty hours, establishment in farming, No. 1, $8.
Twenty hours, establishment in farming, No. 2, $8.
Twenty hours, farm management, No. 1, $8.
Twenty hours, farm management, No. 2, $8.
Twenty hours, farm management, No. 3, $8.
Twenty hours, farm management, No. 4, $8.
Twenty hours, farm management, No. 5, $8.

Wholesale and retail occupations

Twenty hours, salesmanship, No. 1, $8.
Twenty hours, salesmanship, No. 2, $8.
Twenty hours, salesmanship, No. 3, $8.
Twenty hours, salesmanship, No. 4, $8.
Twenty hours, window and interior display, No. 1, $8.
Twenty hours, retail store advertising, No. 1, $8.
Twenty hours, letter and show-card writing, No. 1, $8.
Twenty hours, records and reports, No. 1, $8.
Twenty hours, effective speech for salespersons, No. 1, $8.
Twenty hours, effective speech for salespersons, No. 2, $8.
Twenty hours, effective speech for salespersons, No. 3, $8.
Twenty hours, credits and collections, No. 1, $8.
Twenty hours, credits and collections, No. 2, $8.
Twenty hours, credits and collections, No. 3, $8.
Twenty hours, legal phases of retailing, No. 1, $8.
Twenty hours, legal phases of retailing, No. 2, $8.
Twenty hours, legal phases of retailing, No. 3, $8.
Twenty hours, house painting, No. 1, $8.
Twenty hours, store management, No. 1, $8.
Twenty hours, store management, No. 2, $8.
Twenty hours, store management, No. 3, $8.

Industrial occupations

Twenty hours, general carpentry, No. 1, $8.
Twenty hours, general carpentry, No. 2, $8.
Twenty hours, general carpentry, No. 3, $8.
Twenty hours, general carpentry, No. 4, $8.
Twenty hours, furniture repair, No. 1, $8.
Twenty hours, furniture repair, No. 2, $8.
Twenty hours, furniture refinishing, No. 1, $8.
Twenty hours, furniture refinishing, No. 2, $8.
Twenty hours, upholstery, No. 1, $8.
Twenty hours, upholstery, No. 2, $8.
Twenty hours, upholstery, No. 3, $8.
Thirty hours, care of hand tools, No. 1, $12.
Twenty hours, repair of electrical appliances, No. 1, $8.
Twenty hours, repair of electrical appliances, No. 2, $8.
Twenty hours, welding, No. 1, $8.
Twenty hours, welding, No. 2, $8.
Twenty hours, welding, No. 3, $8.
Twenty hours, electricity, No. 1, $8.
Twenty hours, auto mechanics, No. 1, $8.
Twenty hours, auto mechanics, No. 2, $8.
Twenty hours, auto mechanics, No. 3, $8.
Twenty hours, auto mechanics, No. 4, $8.
Twenty hours, radio, No. 1, $8.
Twenty hours, radio, No. 2, $8.
Twenty hours, radio, No. 3, $8.

Conspiracy Signs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 25, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, for days, yes, even for weeks, several of the gentlemen of the House, notably the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], and a few others, have criticized labor and have tried to place the blame for the present strikes on organized labor alone.

Yes it is true. In several instances labor has declared a strike; but not until they have made every effort to bring about adjustments in their reduced earnings.

I have heard it charged that industry is responsible. I do not wish to make this as my own charge. My opinion might be questioned because of my known friendship for labor and fair play. However, I do not make the charge alone. Many fair-minded men have said, in recent days that Wall Street leaders who control General Motors, United States Steel, General Electric and Westinghouse, and the Big Five packers have recklessly decided to risk the welfare of all for the sake of their own greed, and have ordered that the appeal of organized labor for adjustment of pay rates should be given no favorable consideration. Many writers have charged that big industry has entered into an agreement not to come to a peaceful and common-sense settlement of labor's grievances, that the workers have been deliberately forced to strike, in the ghoulish hope that out of the misery of the heralded eight to ten million unemployed, swollen by returning discharged veterans, industry could obtain all the nonunion help they need, and thereby destroy the great labor unions, or so weaken them they would be relatively powerless to protect their members and defenseless unorganized workers.

I have read many articles by outstanding, impartial, and fair-minded observers, and I have heard many on the radio, as all of us here have. I feel, as do most of my colleagues, that these writers have brought home to us and have expressed most clearly the charges I have previously referred to, and they seem to have substantiated what I have stated as to reports being circulated that big industry is in an open conspiracy to break the benevolent power of the unions and defy the national interest. To demonstrate the generality of opinion of these unbiased observers I desire, under leave given me to revise and extend my remarks, to insert several articles, chosen to be representative of th opinions. The first insertion is of a column written by Thomas L. Stokes, a star columnist for United Features, which appeared in the Washington Daily News and most Scripps-Howard newspapers, as well as many papers outside that chain, on Monday, January 21, 1946. Mr. Stokes is widely known as an objective, hard-hitting reporter who has severely criticized the present administration when he has deemed it to be wrong. I have taken his title for this column for my own in this extension. Mr. Stokes bears out my own suspicions that the generally recalcitrant attitude of big business, and the united front which has appeared, is no accident; that there actually exists a conspiracy or agreement on the part of the industries now involved in labor trouble to break up and defeat organized labor's

justifiable efforts to adjust income to mounting costs of living.

CONSPIRACY SIGNS

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

It seems more than a coincidence that only a few days apart General Motors rejects a wage-finding by a Presidential fact-finding board and United States Steel refuses a compromise wage figure offered by the President of the United States intervening on behalf of the public.

In each case the unions accepted the findings which were much below their demands.

Big motors and big steel.

Some time back, even before VJ-day, there were charges by labor leaders that big industry was going to start a union-busting campaign after the war. A combination of big motors and big steel was cited specifically as the offensive weapon. These charges at the time made the usual impression that such charges do from union leaders who themselves intend to take the offensive for wage increases. In short, they were somewhat discounted, even though there were significant signs about.

Now, with the latest action of General Motors and United States Steel, it all seems to add up to just about what the union leaders were charging. That is, a conspiracy by the big interests to move in and take over, now that the people have lost the champion in the White House who was so quick to detect and expose the machinations of the big fellows, and to rally the people against them. They are capitalizing, too, upon the confusion that naturally follows a war, with the public weary and punch drunk.

The big boys first thought they could take Harry Truman, Mr. Roosevelt's successor, into camp. They thought he was their man. They have found out different. Now they seem determined to break him, if possible. He does not, it is true, have the maneuvering abilities of his predecessor.

Breaking the power of the unions and breaking the power of the administration are all part and parcel of the some plot as it begins to unfold, in the view of those here who have watched and analyzed the various moves.

The top-off came when big motors and big steel thumbed their noses at the President, the representative of the people, in what looks like a carefully premeditated gesture.

There are a few simple facts to remember in this situation. In each case, the awards proposed respectively by a fact-finding board and by the President were about halfway between those asked by the union and offered by the company. Without going into all the figures, each proposed award seemed reasonable.

The point is made that President Truman stepped into the steel case before the fact-finding board had investigated fully and reported. But he stepped in, as any President is expected to do, in the public interest. It was an emergency case.

There is another thing to remember. Both General Motors and United States Steel netted handsome profits in the war, both have a nice backlog, and both were treated most considerately by Congress, along with all industry, in repeal of the excess-profits tax and making available various tax refunds. Congress, in fact, hastened to do that while it held up action on such measures for the benefit of workers as increased unemployment compensation and the full employment bill, neither yet enacted.

Big industry, it would seem, can ill afford to fail the country at this time.

There seems little doubt that a public sympathy will be out with the folks on the picket line.

I am also inserting in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post for the same day, January 21. No one, surely, will suggest in this Chamber that this newspaper is unfriendly to industry. In this crisis, however, the Post sees clearly that the country is entitled to the facts and is bringing them home. In the same connection may I include also a column by Kenesaw M. Landis II in the Chicago Sun pointing out that Theodore Roosevelt, a great Republican President, faced with a similar situation in 1902, used the Big Stick which some Members of this House are so fond of recalling to force the coal operators to come to terms with what he called the "entirely fair proposal" of the miners by threatening to seize the mines, dispossess the operators, and operate the mines as a receivership with the help of the United States Army. Note that the operators capitulated, and accepted a fact-finding board 40 years ago.

THE PRESIDENT AND THE CRISIS

Twenty-four hours have gone by since the steel plants of this country closed down. Steel is the heart of our industrial system. The heart has now stopped beating, and the entire economy is fast running down. The people seem condemned to watch a knock-down and drag-out fight between labor and management. They must stand by and see the Nation lapse into state of paralysis.

For weeks they have heard the spokesmen of both sides say their say interminably. It is now time for the public to take the platform. The Post thinks it would be shirking its public responsibilities if it failed to proffer its own ideas about the grave crisis confronting our country.

The effect on reconversion is immediate. Reconversion is stalled. After 8 months of hard work and skillful deployment by labor and management, the goal was actually in sight. We were 90 percent reconverted. Then silence fell on the automotive, meat, and electrical industries. Steel joins them to make the standstill of our industry complete.

It is a criminal setback and seems like a conspiracy. But no good will come out of name-calling. Men on both sides are acting according to their convictions. There may be exceptions, but we prefer to think of the combatants as good Americans, all animated in the final analysis by a desire to serve the public. The fact remains that, because of inability to agree, they have thrown their hands in. When labor and management in our major industries quit, a crisis is created. We are in a crisis, not a conspiracy.

From this crisis we shall all suffer. The veteran coming back into our civilian life will be hurt. The prostrate world, looking to the United States for a lead in the work as well as the ways of peace, will lose heart.

The drift back of spreading inactivity must be arrested. This the people demand in self-preservation. But they have no preventive power. Only the President of the United States can act in their united name.

The Post assumes that President Truman is not quitting.

The President has been damned for stepping into the picture at all. It is said that he ought to let the combatants slug it out. This was sound advice when industrial struggles were minor ripples on our community and our international life. But no such advice is tenable when this fight could conceivably hold up the activity of the entire industrial world.

Those who criticize the President for his intervention would have been the first to criticize him for nonintervention. For he had to intervene. The maintenance of the war powers of his office testifies to the fact that we are still in an emergency. This peace emergency calls just as much for Presidential responsibility as did the war emergency.

We do not suggest that the President should be panicked into hasty steps. But the Nation cannot stew in the present mess much longer without inviting an irremediable disaster. He must bring before him the men who in fact guide our industrial destinies. It is now seen to have been foolish to allow negotiations to go on between representative labor and management which was not equally representative. Labor as a whole was talking to men who had no mandate from the whole industry.

In the steel fight the President seems to have thought Mr. Benjamin Fairless was the decisive voice in the steel industry. It turns out he was mistaken. Let him ask the actual leaders of the steel industry to come to the White House.

Let him go further and ask the real leaders in the other major industries to talk things over.

A national crisis requires a national solution. The heart of our current troubles lies in the absence of a wage-price policy for reconversion. Steel could set the pattern. It has set the pattern before in every great change in our economic history. But in this instance the others may want to have their say along with steel. What makes steel and the others backward is the effort to keep wages and prices in separate compartments. It has never been done before. It does not make sense. Both have got to be squared.

What has happened is simply a breakdown in common sense.

Common sense requires that we speed up reconversion. Reconversion means civilian goods. It follows that reconversion is the only way to beat inflation—to stop prices from spiralling, to prevent value from being drained out of our dollars. When this country is reconverted, other countries will have a chance to follow.

The setback can be retrieved by some such action as we have suggested. But every day's delay makes a meeting of minds more difficult. It thrusts the country and the world deeper into economic and social tribulation. In the President's hands is the last peaceful remedy, and no American, anxious for his own and the country's welfare, will deny him the right to invoke it. Mr. Truman would be in default to his own Presidential obligations in this national and international emergency if he balked at it.

WHAT CAN TRUMAN DO ABOUT GENERAL MOTORS

(By Kenesaw M. Landis II)

General Motors has rejected the wage increase recommended by President Truman's fact-finding board as "unacceptable * * * in whole or in part."

This means that one of the most vital segments of American industry will remain closed down while the company tries to starve out its employees.

It is obvious that only hunger and want can force the workers to settle for less than the Government proposal, which itself meant a reduction in their wartime living standards.

Before that happens there is likely to be strife and bloodshed in Detroit, and our whole economy may be threatened.

If the worst comes to the worst, what should the President do? As a practical matter, what can he do?

I'll tell you what a Republican President by the name of Theodore Roosevelt did back in 1902, when the strike of 150,000 anthracite miners threatened the country with a coal famine.

First, he invited both sides to the White House in the hope of reaching a settlement.

For this he was denounced in the newspapers, which said such interference in the affairs of private corporations was so unconstitutional as to render him liable to impeachment.

Remember that this was over 40 years ago, and that there was no War Powers Act.

"I disclaim any right or duty to intervene in this way on legal grounds," said Roosevelt, "but my duty requires me to use whatever

influence I personally can to bring to an end a situation which has become literally intolerable."

The operators came to the conference in a belligerent mood, and left after an acrimonious session, giving the newspapers an account of how they had "turned down" both the miners and the President.

They refused point-blank to consider what Roosevelt said he regarded as the "entirely fair proposition" of John Mitchell, the head of the miners' union.

"Well, I have tried and failed," the President wrote to Mark Hanna. "What my next move will be I cannot yet say. I feel most strongly that the attitude of the operators is one which accentuates the need of the Government having some power of supervision and regulation over such corporations."

What was his next move? Quietly the President sent for General Schofield and made arrangements to seize the mines, dispossess the operators, and operate them as a receivership.

"If the operators should go to court and have a writ served on the general, would he do as was done under Lincoln, and send the writ on to the President?"

"Yes," promised General Schofield. "All right, I will send you," said Roosevelt.

Strangely enough, the coal operators suddently agreed for the President to appoint a fact-finding commission, and accepted without debate the decision in favor of a substantial wage increase.

"I was all ready to act," said Teddy, "and would have done so without the slightest hesitation or a moment's delay if the negotiations had fallen through."

I am inserting also an editorial from the Chicago Sun which demonstrates that employees in the meat-packing industries are receiving much smaller pay than is being paid by many other industries:

FACTS BEHIND THE PACKING-HOUSE STRIKE

In its efforts to avert a Nation-wide strike in the packing industry, the Government openly offered price concessions to the operators to induce wage increases. Certain facts are needed to complete the picture.

The packing industry pays low wages. A spokesman for Swift, largest of the Big Four, announced Tuesday that its hourly wage employees had averaged $48.95 a week in October, but this figure needs qualification. In September, when the weekly average was $48.22, the workweek was 49 hours—which meant that 9 hours were paid at overtime.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that the industry as a whole paid $45.68 in June 1945, on an average week of 48 hours. In August, when the week was reduced to 44.4 hours, the pay slipped to $41.57. Thus when the normal 40-hour week returns weekly earnings will be considerably below $40.

Packing-house workers have had no general wage increase since before Pearl Harbor. In a War Labor Board brief, the union stated that the basic wage was 82½ cents an hour. This contrasts with $1.12 to $1.20 an hour in the automobile and oil industries. Packing-house workers, therefore, have a claim to increases on grounds of equity as well as heavily increased living costs.

The Government's offer of price relief recognized that the packing industry operates on low-unit profit margins. Subsidies have been paid the companies during the war to let them function profitably without cutting the prices paid for livestock or raising meat prices to consumers. The packers argue, however, that the price increase suggested on Government purchases alone was insufficient to permit the 15-cent-an-hour wage rise considered the union minimum.

The Government then bargained a bit, offering a small general price increase as well as an increase on Government purchases for the armed forces and foreign relief. Again, the Big Four packers and the larger independents said "No."

A number of independents avoided the losses and discomforts of a strike by reaching voluntary agreements with the unions. The Hormel Co. gave a 17½-cent increase; others gave 15 cents, while still others agreed to match whatever rise the Big Four eventually grant.

These companies thus placed their action in line with the policy laid down by President Truman last October, when he pledged that any business which could show that wage increases made price increases necessary—within a 6-month period—could get relief. None of the Big Four has been willing to go along.

The striking CIO union is supported by A. F. of L. members and in Chicago is aided by the public opinion mobilized through the Back of the Yards Council. Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach, in his meeting today with company and union officials, may be able to suggest a solution to end the strike. Swift action is desirable because a long shutdown would mean substantial losses for the companies and genuine suffering among the payless workers, as well as almost immediate inconvenience to the public.

Long Beach Wins Sweepstakes in the Tournament of Roses, Pasadena, Calif., New Year's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 24, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, my home city of Long Beach, Calif., took her superlative float Shangri-La, blossoming with 750,000 fresh flowers—yellow roses, gardenias, chrysanthemums, white roses, candytufts, and blue delphiniums—to the world-famous Pasadena Rose Parade on January 1, 1946. Unanimously the judges awarded the most cherished award of the day to my own beloved city which means so much to me.

The float portrayed the great world-famous port of Long Beach. The deck of this significant creation was a series of floral waves which started with a floral ripple and then extended into a floral wave 14 feet high. All exclaimed that it was so realistic and so beautiful, too, that it made them homesick for those world-famous beaches and breaking waves at Long Beach. You see, we have about 7 miles of the finest beach in the world and Long Beach as a city owns most of it and has established a policy of acquiring it all, forever, to be kept open for the public recreation and happiness. Long Beach has learned that a city which recreates lives happier and healthier, and encourages its people to participate in recreation programs and activities.

But atop of these gorgeous floral waves and ripples rested at ease, the most gorgeous floral replica of the famous aircraft carrier *Shangri-La*. On this breath-catching depiction were also resting at ease floral replicas of airplanes of modern design, while three small white sails of beautiful flowers, at the rear, lifted their greetings to the million spectators along the line of the parade.

Long Beach has won much fame and merit in this world-famous Rose Tournament in years gone by, but never more justly so than in this good natured, artistic rivalry with the other cities of California on this day.

It is true that most people who have never been there think of Pasadena as the place where the annual football Rose Bowl game is played. I have seen many of these games. They come in the early afternoon and while the tickets are always a sell-out and 93,000 spectators witness the game, it is estimated that about a million people witnessed the rose parade or tournament in which my beloved city of Long Beach carried off top honors.

Not only is Long Beach a great commercial harbor and port; not only is Long Beach anchorage for the United States Navy; not only does Long Beach have the great Roosevelt drydocks and other extensive naval installations and the commodious naval hospital; not only does Long Beach have the Douglas aircraft factory and extensive shipbuilding yards and plants—but Long Beach again has proved her versatility and her resourcefulness and has demonstrated her strength as a city, too, of cultural mindedness and residential and recreational resources.

The more than 300,000 people of Long Beach are to be congratulated upon this creation out of God's own garden of flowers, Shangri-La.

The Word That Blocks Lasting Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 25 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most timely and challenging article entitled "The Word That Blocks Lasting Peace," written by the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and published in the New York Times of January 6, 1946.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WORD THAT BLOCKS LASTING PEACE

(By J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Senator from Arkansas)

WASHINGTON.—In this fearful and troubled world there are few subjects upon which men can agree. During the long years of war we did agree among ourselves, and with our allies, to devote our energies and our resources, without reserve, to the defeat of our enemies. We agreed that we did not like the return to barbarism and slavery proposed by the Nazi supermen. I think we realize that we escaped defeat, in the early days of the war, by the narrowest of margins.

With this experience so fresh in our minds, surely we can now agree that we do not like

war, that it is altogether wasteful, demoralizing and horrible. We can agree, I believe, that it is not to our own best interests to have another war and that therefore we should now devote our energies and our intelligence, without reserve, to the prevention of such a war. If this is our objective, can we agree now on how to proceed?

From the beginning of man's history, the only principle that has ever brought peace with freedom to men has been the supremacy of universal rules of conduct we call law. In the beginning these rules were centered around the family group, but gradually, as man struggled up from his primitive status, the application of the rules was extended to larger and larger groups; to the tribe, to the city-state, to the principality, and finally to the nation-state. In this evolutionary process those laws which were based upon justice tended to prevail, and those units with the best laws were torn less by inner strife and proved strongest in the fierce competition for survival.

Without rules of conduct accepted by the people, peace with freedom has never prevailed among any substantial group of men. If we can agree that rules of conduct, binding on all, and enforceable against all, by the full power of the community, are the indispensable requirement for peace among men, then we should be able to agree that we must have such rules if we are serious about wanting peace.

The use of force and arms to settle the differences among primitive men was the natural method prior to the development of law. An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth indicates the character of that method. Among the rules of conduct which first concerned our primitive forefathers were those dealing with the individual's use of force and arms. And so, today, our first concern should be to establish rules of conduct among the primitive and lawless nation-states, regulating, if not suppressing altogether, the production and ownership of those deadly armaments essential to the prosecution of modern warfare. These rules, to be effective, must be applicable to every state and to every individual within every state.

It is at this point in the discussion that someone always asks: "But what about our sovereignty? You surely don't propose to sacrifice our sovereignty?" From this point on, confusion and frustration are ordinarily the only result.

It is not surprising that discussions involving sovereignty are difficult and confusing. The term itself is an abstraction, a political concept, concerning human relations and is not easy to reduce to definite formulae such as may apply to concrete, physical things. It is so much easier to understand battleships, guns, armies, land, and oil. Sovereignty, like justice, equity, and goodness, is not definite, clear and absolute. Like nuclear fission, it is difficult to grasp. It savors of mysticism and the occult. Sovereignty is one of those esoteric, untouchable principles, we are led to believe, which common mortals do not question or discuss without a suspicion of sacrilege or treason. The question, however, is always asked and we must seek an answer.

In days gone by, when men were slaves, their masters imposed their will by the doctrine of the divine right of kings. "Your sovereign by appointment from the All Highest" was the dogma. It was a useful concept to those in power to legitimize their rule over the people. Reflecting this origin, Funk & Wagnall's dictionary says this about sovereign:

"Exercising or possessing supreme jurisdiction or powers; royal. One who possesses supreme authority, especially a person or a determinate body of persons in whom the supreme power of the state is vested; a monarch."

Roget's Thesaurus uses these words: "ruler, potentate, monarch, suzerain, king."

It seems strange, indeed, to find our superpatriotic nationalists going back to the Middle Ages and borrowing the dogma of the tyrants and despots of those days, as the basis for their objection to the creation of law among the war-torn people of this bewildered age. Can it be that the tyranny of total war is to be perpetuated by the same principle that supported the tyranny of medieval kings?

More than 700 years ago our forefathers at Runnymede challenged the sovereignty of the kings who oppressed the people, and sought to establish the rule of law above the king. If the rule of law was necessary to the barons of King John, I am certain it is equally necessary to all of us who must live under the menace of the atomic bomb.

If sovereignty means anything and resides anywhere, it means control over our own destiny and it resides in the people. According to our republican principles, sovereignty resides in the people or community, not in the governments which they create. Only a totalitarian or Fascist state is sovereign, but such a state is not democratic, it is founded upon fear and force and its subjects have no freedom. The people may delegate, according to our republican principles, any power they wish to their representatives, but they do not delegate their sovereignty to their government.

So far in this country, we, the people, have delegated certain powers to the county governments, other powers to the States, and still different powers to the Federal Government. But these delegations do not exhaust the power of the people. Our Constitution expressly recognizes in the tenth amendment that all powers not specifically delegated are reserved to the people.

We may recall that under the Articles of Confederation, in 1781, our forefathers delegated certain limited powers to the central Government. When these powers proved inadequate for the preservation of order and tranquillity, further powers were delegated under the Constitution in 1787. Does it make sense to say that in creating the Constitution, establishing order, and preserving tranquility these men sacrificed their sovereignty?

The question involved in creating a system of rules to control the making of armaments throughout the world is not one of sacrifice or surrender of anything. It is not a negative action, a giving up of something we already have. The objective is positive; it is the creating of something we do not have. It is the acquisition of a power for the lack of which we and the world narrowly missed defeat and domination by the most ruthless force the world has ever seen.

When our forefathers exercised their powers to control their own destiny, their sovereignty if like, by creating the Constitution, they were indeed very wise. They recognized that even their handiwork was not the final word by the provisions for amendment. Further, as I have mentioned above, they reserved to the people all powers not specifically delegated. For 130 years the system they created was effective to protect us from foreign wars. Now, within a quarter century, much against our will and in spite of all we could do, we have been involved in two wars. It seems to me clear that we cannot survive another world war, certainly not as a society of free men. The destructive power of science is simply too great.

The conclusion is inescapable that the Government created by our Constitution can no longer fulfill completely the purpose for which it was created. It can no longer, in this scientific, atomic world, protect us from the disastrous effects of war, even though we may be victorious in the war itself.

In a real sense this so-called sovereignty, the power to determine our destiny, is imperfect and defective. Therefore, it is appropriate, in fact it is essential, that we consider the delegation of power to some other and higher organization which is reasonably designed to perform the function which this Government cannot perform. The United Nations Organization is the logical instrumentality to which such powers should be given. At present it is a machinery, but it does not have the authority to formulate rules of conduct applicable to the people of all its members, and the veto power of the Big Five nullifies to a great extent the powers of enforcement.

It may well be that the people of this country have not suffered sufficiently from this war to convince them of the necessity for peace. Reason has seldom been a substitute for bitter experience. However that may be, there is absolutely no merit in the view that we should not delegate adequate power to the UNO because it would be a sacrifice of sovereignty.

The whole argument about the sacrifice or preservation of sovereignty is about on a level with the medieval treatises of the monks on how many angels can sit upon the point of a needle. If the people of these United States recognize that it is impossible, as I believe it is, to avoid being drawn into future wars and therefore the only practical defense is to prevent wars, the proper course is clear.

The only principle that has ever controlled the violent tendencies of mankind has been law. The only way to establish law is to delegate the power to create law to an institution which is also provided with the power of enforcement. The people of the United States have this power; it is merely a question whether or not they choose to exercise it.

The Critical Butter Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 25, 1946

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

THE CRITICAL BUTTER SITUATION

(Facts compiled by the Over-All Butter Industry Committee, representing Dairy Products Marketing Association, National Creameries Association, and American Butter Institute, whose membership produce more than 85 percent of butter in the United States.)

PRODUCTION AND SUPPLY DATA

Butter production and holdings have decreased to the lowest point on record. Unless immediate action is taken by the proper Government agencies to correct present inequalities depressing butter production, consumers face exceedingly low supplies for several months, and more creameries will be compelled to cease operation. This would eliminate a market for many hundred thousand dairy farmers, and discriminate against those who are directly connected with the butter industry and where other milk outlets are not available.

In 1941, 115,500,000,000 pounds of milk were produced, while in 1945 preliminary figures indicate the total production was 123,000,000,000 pounds. In spite of the increased milk production 471,500,000 pounds less butter was manufactured in 1945 as compared to 1941. This amounts to a reduction in the creamery production of butter at 25 percent from 1941 to 1945. After needs of the

armed forces were met, civilians had 43 percent less butter last year as compared to 1941.

The following statistics will indicate the diversion of butterfat from butter production, principally caused by terminating War Food Orders 8, 13, 79, and 92 on September 1:

MONTHLY BUTTER PRODUCTION

Comparison with same month, 1944

August 1945, 3,000,000 pounds more, 2 percent increase.

September 1945, 13,000,000 pounds less, 11 percent decrease.

October 1945, 12,000,000 pounds less, 12 percent decrease.

November 1945, 17,000,000 pounds less, 20 percent decrease.

December 1945, 25,000,000 pounds less, 23 percent decrease.

The production of butter during December 1945 was 50 percent less than the corresponding month of 1941. This critically low production is quite serious when consideration is given to the total trade storage holdings of only 30,000,000 pounds on January 1 as compared to 60,000,000 a year ago and 107,000,000 for the 5-year average, 1940–44.

EFFECT ON CREAM INDUSTRY

Although the ceiling price of butter has been frozen at the October 1942 level, the labor cost in butter manufacturing has gone up from 30 to 40 percent. Labor comprises about 37 percent of the cost of manufacturing butter. In addition to the increased labor cost it can be appreciated that when the volume going to a creamery is cut in half the fixed charges such as rent, taxes, depreciation, and other overhead items are doubled. A consistent drop in volume during and after the war has caused a serious financial burden to all butter-manufacturing plants.

During the war emergency, specific price formulas were issued by Government agencies that were intended to divert production from butter to cheese, whole milk powder, evaporated milk, etc. Restriction orders were placed on the sale of whipping cream, fluid milk, and coffee cream, ice cream, and the manufacture of certain cheeses other than Cheddar, to insure the production of sufficient butter and other dairy products for the armed forces, lend-lease, and civilians. These limitation orders were terminated September 1, 1945, and a tremendous demand has developed for fluid milk and sweet cream. With prices of sweet cream at 80 cents to $1 per pound of butterfat, the butter manufacturer cannot compete with those prices when his product is fixed by the 1942 ceiling of 46 cents per pound of butter wholesale, Chicago.

Approximately 850 creameries have ceased operation since 1941, according to the best information available. This represents almost one-fifth of the creameries operating in the prewar period, and denotes a serious casualty in an important segment of the Nation's small businesses. Why did those creameries close? Volume of butterfat handled by the various creameries—especially those in direct competition with companies receiving whole milk for the manufacture of cheese, evaporated milk and whole milk powder or the sale of bulk cream—dropped to such an extent that they were compelled to cease operation or face financial disaster. Overhead costs advanced in proportion to the decrease in volume of butter manufactured. Whenever the danger point of operating efficiency was reached, the creamery closed its doors and the balance of cream producers were compelled to seek a new market or quit dairy farming. The creamery industry is the only dairy products industry which was forced by Government controls to go through all the war with less than normal total volume.

The following table indicates the diversion from specific creameries, all located within one county in Minnesota:

	Pounds of butter made
Creamery No. 1:	
May 1945	202,000
June 1945	195,000
July 1945	211,000
August 1945	189,000
September 1945	43,000
Creamery No. 2:	
May 1945	125,000
June 1945	140,000
July 1945	131,000
October 1945	6,093
Creamery No. 3:	
January 1945	26,000
October 1945	7,000
Creamery No. 4:	
January 1945	20,000
October 1945	2,000
Creamery No. 5:	
January 1945	25,000
October 1945	9,691

In Minnesota during the year 1945, 257 of the 745 creameries have shifted from butter to the sale of butterfat in the form of bulk cream—some of them making only enough butter to supply their patrons. It is estimated that by December 31 approximately one-half of the creameries would be selling their volume in the form of bulk cream. In Wisconsin it is reported that from 85 to 90 percent of the available sweet cream is being sold as bulk cream instead of being processed into butter. It was estimated that all Wisconsin creameries have discontinued the manufacture of butter in favor of cream shipments as a major portion of their operation. In Iowa it is estimated that 25 butter plants in December discontinued churning butter in favor of the sale of sweet cream, and that 150 other creameries are selling a large portion of their receipts as sweet cream. In Michigan one modern creamery recently built at a cost of one-third million dollars, churned only 6,000 pounds of butter during a recent week. The same creamery in 1942 churned 50,765 pounds of butter during a corresponding week.

FARMERS' MARKET

Butter has supplied a market for 36 to 45 percent of the total milk production of this country. Butter has furnished a ready cash market for the producers, large and small, situated in remote areas, who do not have access to markets for whole milk, as well as producers located more favorably for other markets. In normal times about 85 percent of the creamery butter production comes from farm-skimmed cream. It is estimated that 65 percent of the butterfat for creamery butter production comes from farms having six cows or less. Before the war it was estimated that approximately one-half of all dairy farmers sold milk or cream for processing into butter, and will need such market for their products in the future.

On these comparatively small farms, more profitable uses have been made of their limited supply of labor, and the cows have been sold. Information from the National Stock Yards in East St. Louis reveals that during 1945 the percentage of milk cows being sold as beef ranged from 38 to 44 percent of the total number sold. This is the highest ratio of dairy cattle to beef as reported marketed through the East St. Louis yards. The farmer is discouraged in low prices of cream, and is thus turning to other endeavors.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Immediate restoration of War Food Orders 8 (ice cream), 13 (whipping cream), 79 (fluid milk and cream), and 92 (foreign cheeses other than Cheddar). This was deemed to be the most important step. The above table indicated the rapid decrease in the production of butter when the orders were terminated. Restoration for a brief period would correct that inequality.

2. New price ceiling on butter that will restore its prewar relationship to prices of other manufactured dairy products.

3. Suspension of ceiling prices and limitation orders on dairy products when we approach the period of surplus and normal relationships, which usually occurs about May 15. (During this flush period prices would seek their proper levels and would establish normal relationship as dictated by consumer demand.)

4. In addition, we request immediate consideration of price ceilings on cream historically comparable with the ceiling price of butter. (It is certain that price ceilings on cream without accepting the other three recommendations would make the situation worse, because certain users of cream are now out of the market because of the high price. Higher prices for butter or restrictions on the use of cream are necessary if a lower ceiling is established on bulk cream.)

Although this is the time of year when all dairy production is low, there is a potential increase in the supply of butter even now. It would materialize if the above recommendations are followed.

An Engineer Appraises the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 25, 1946

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by Vice Adm. Ben Moreell with introduction by President Harry L. Stone, of the Executives' Club of Chicago, made on January 11, 1946:

INTRODUCTION OF VICE ADM. BEN MOREELL BY PRESIDENT HARRY L. STONE AT MEETING OF EXECUTIVES' CLUB OF CHICAGO, JANUARY 11, 1946

President STONE. The world-wide exploits of the Seabees, the construction battalions of the United States Navy, are familiar to all Americans, but too little is known of Vice Adm. Ben Moreell, the organizer of the Seabees and Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks. He has been the directing genius of a force approximating 10,000 officers and a quarter of a million men, whose assignment has principally consisted of building airfields, naval bases, barracks, hospitals, and warehouses, and they performed this almost miraculous work for more than 4 years in Africa, Asia, Europe, and the Pacific Islands.

Speaking of the Pacific Islands, one time while the Seabees were building an airfield in the corner of New Guinea, a most interested spectator was a native chief. Day after day the old man, a spear in one hand and bottle of pop in the other, silently watched the bulldozers at work. Finally, to stir up conversation, a soldier asked him what he thought of the Americans as jungle fighters. The response was immediate. The chief said: "Jap him good jungle fighter. Australian him good too. But Yanks, they come and jungle go." [Laughter.]

In addition to their actual construction work, the Seabees have loaded ships, demolished and removed obstacles to landing operations, built pontoons, rigged up camouflage, and dispersed fogs, which represented only a part of their many duties in helping spearhead an attack.

At the risk of possibly encroaching upon one of Admiral Moreell's remarks, here is a

story emphasizing the brotherly love existing between the Seabees and the marines. As you probably know, the Seabees are a group of older men, and in making living conditions more comfortable for the marines it was natural that a close friendship would develop. As a result the marines had a slogan: "Never strike a Seabee, he may be your grandfather." [Laughter]

Admiral Moreell is not given to theatrics nor is his talk salty. His office in Washington is not shipshape in a nautical sense and except for a large Seabee seal and some maps and blueprints, it might well be the office of a business executive. Yet Admiral Moreell is no desk-chained sailor, for the world is his construction realm and his trips of inspection have repeatedly taken him over the seven seas. Navy men in general give him a large share of the credit for our recovery in the Pacific after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor.

His college career at Washington University, St. Louis, early gave evidence of the combination of a brilliant student and outstanding athlete. He possessed the rare ability of giving equal attention to both interests while also working his way through school to supplement the scholarship he had won. He was captain of the university track team and starred as fullback on the varsity football team.

Admiral Moreell has served as president of the Army and Navy Club of Washington for three terms, as president of the Society of American Military Engineers, and as president of the American Concrete Institute, in addition to making a valuable contribution to many other important organizations.

It is my privilege to present to you the organizer and director of the Seabees, Vice Adm. Ben Moreell, whose subject will be An Engineer Appraises the War. Admiral Moreell. [Applause]

AN ENGINEER APPRAISES THE WAR

Vice Admiral MOREELL:

"The tumult and the shouting dies;
The captains and the kings depart."

Our combat forces and their leaders have been justly acclaimed for their accomplishments in contact with the enemy. But in the calmer atmosphere which we are now privileged to enjoy, it seems appropriate to appraise the lessons of the war in order that we may establish proper relative values and guides for future operations. I do not mean to detract from the brilliance of our military leadership in the fields of strategy and tactics. But in our desire to pay well-deserved tribute to our fighting men we should not make the error of slighting the importance of the great material superiority which was brought to bear upon the enemy. We have learned that battles may be won by the genius of military leadership, but wars are won by the strength of the Nation, acting as one integrated unit.

A study of the changing methods of warfare leads to the conclusion that the most significant development in this science has been the tremendous increase in the power of the individual obtained by equipping him with the machinery of war. As the power of the individual in industry has been multiplied again and again by means of the machinery and tools of production so in warfare has the power of the individual been multiplied by means of the machinery and tools of destruction. It is my thesis that the contribution of American industry to this multiplication of the individual's destructive power has been the vital factor in our recent victory.

In the calendar year 1941, the war products of American industry, that is, planes, ships, guns, munitions, fuels, and other implements and materials of war, amounted to approximately $8,500,000,000. In 1942, the amount increased nearly fourfold to $31,250,000,000. In 1943, it again almost doubled from the previous year to reach a total of $56,250,000,000. In 1944, the amount was approximately $65,000,000,000; and in 1945, up to VJ-day, it is estimated that we produced war products in the amount of $45,000,000,000; a grand total of $206,000,000,000.

OUR PRODUCTION RECORD

What is the significance of this great production record? The answer is given in the reports from the battle areas and in the recapitulation of our progress from the early critical days to the successful conclusion of the wars in the European and Asiatic theaters. Not only were we able, first, to hold the enemy, then to push him back from the lines where he was firmly entrenched, but ultimately we smothered him in an avalanche of material power. More important, we were able to do this with a minimum expenditure of personnel.

Those are the significant values of our massive production. First, to insure victory, and, second, to insure that victory with a minimum expenditure of our most valuable asset, the lives and limbs of our fighting men.

Statistics are usually boring and frequently misleading, but it is pertinent to cite some instances of the overwhelming superiority of our material power. In the invasion of Kwajalein Atoll, in which I had the good fortune to participate, we assembled 354 vessels with a total military personnel of 175,000. The aggregate of the Japanese garrisons at both ends of the atoll was estimated at 12,000. The fire power represented by our ships and aircraft and by our landing forces was so overwhelming as to make the result of this operation a foregone conclusion. The fate of the Japanese garrison was sealed when contact was made. We must avoid depreciating the performance of our gallant men who stormed the beaches in the face of murderous Japanese fire. But without the irresistible pressure of our great material power, the issue would have been far from conclusive. The products of American factories brought our men to their goal, and then provided the support without which the utmost in personal bravery would have been of little avail.

And so it was throughout the campaign in the Pacific. In Admiral King's final report to the Secretary of the Navy, he stated that for the invasion of southern Japan the United States Navy planned to employ 3,033 vessels. He states, also, "Although the application of our sea power in its various forms proved sufficient to bring Japan to terms without the necessity of invading her home islands, the possibility of invasion on the scale contemplated indicates the amazing progress in matters of supply and support that has been made in less than 4 years of war."

EQUIPPING NAVAL BASES

Admiral King goes on to state, "In this evolution advance bases have played a vital role. The 1940 Navy had no properly equipped advance bases other than Pearl Harbor. More than 400 have since been established in the Atlantic and Pacific areas in order to maintain the fleet and air forces in the forward areas where there was fighting to be done. But for this chain of advance bases the fleet could not have operated in the western reaches of the Pacific without the necessity for many more ships and planes than it actually had. A base to supply or repair a fleet 5,000 miles closer to the enemy multiplies the power which can be maintained constantly against him and greatly lessens the problems of supply and repair."

To indicate the enormity of the supply problem, he states, "The stocks currently on hand at Guam would have filled a train 120 miles long. The magnitude of the fuel supply alone is indicated by the total of 25,000,000 barrels of bulk fuel which was shipped to the Pacific in June 1945 for military purposes. At Guam alone 1,000,000 gallons of aviation gas were used daily."

A single major amphibious operation required hundreds of naval vessels, battleships, cruisers, aircraft carriers, destroyers, and many types of auxiliary and landing craft. There had also to be provided hundreds of planes for air cover, and to fight these ships and planes there were thousands of highly trained men whose training required the provision of great camps and highly specialized structures and equipment.

The magnitude of the production problem involved in making these implements of warfare available at the scene of the battle can be roughly judged from the estimates of their costs. In the invasion of the island of Okinawa, for example, the cost of building the ships engaged in the initial assault is estimated at $7,800,000,000. To this should be added approximately $1,000,000,000 to cover the cost of aircraft, consumable supplies, and equipment for both the vessels and the marine landing forces. The total investment in naval equipment alone for the initial Okinawa operation was, therefore, in the neighborhood of $8,800,000,000.

Similarly, for the attack on Iwo Jima the estimated costs of the naval equipment utilized was $6,300,000,000, an amount more than double the total expenditures of the Navy in World War I.

I have quoted Admiral King's statement concerning the vital part played by naval bases in enabling us to project our offensive power into the far reaches of the Pacific where we engaged the enemy on his home grounds. Perhaps in no other field were we better able to demonstrate the superiority of American industry than in the field of construction. Every strike by our forces whether by sea, by land, or by air, was preceded by the construction of bases from which the attacks were launched. More important, the speed and rapidity with which we were able to lay blows on the enemy depended upon the speed, certainty, and economy (in manpower and matériel) with which we were able to accomplish such construction.

ADVANTAGE OF SUPERIOR CONSTRUCTION ABILITY

The great advantage which we were able to achieve over the enemy by the superiority of our construction abilities was well illustrated by an incident that was reported by the Associated Press from Iwo Jima. The report told how the marines captured a Japanese major who had been holed up in a cave for 2 weeks. He blinked his eyes in the unaccustomed daylight and then surveyed the scene before him, the transformed surface of his once familiar island. His arrogance disappeared and he mumbled weakly the one word, "Impossible."

It was just such impossible industrial achievements that have been the rule rather than the exception. Not only did the construction industry, through the medium of our civilian contractors, build a large part of the shore support for the fleets, the marines and our aircraft at home and abroad, but it provided us with the officers and men who were formed into construction battalions, regiments, and bridgades, to carry this work forward into the active combat areas. We in the Navy gave these men their military training, but you in private industry gave them their know-how by years of education in the hard school of competitive American enterprise. You are justified, therefore, in counting their achievements as your own.

The dramatization of the combat phases of the war by the press, the radio, and in the movies meets a popular demand. The construction of a pier at which bombs are loaded for transportation to the forward areas is poor drama compared to the explosion of one of those bombs on an enemy vessel. And still, both the construction of the pier and the dropping of the bomb are essential parts of the great jigsaw puzzle which must be fitted together to spell out victory.

CONSTRUCTION COSTS

To attempt to tell the complete story of construction in World War II is beyond the limitations of time. But some of the highlights of the Navy's program will serve to illustrate my thesis.

The national war production program is generally considered as having commenced on July 1, 1940. From that date to VJ-day, the Navy spent and obligated, in round figures, some $10,000,000,000 for construction. If, to this, we add the cost of the pay, subsistence, and transportation of the Seabees, which are carried by other appropriations, the program would total, in round figures, some $12,000,000,000. It is of interest to note that the entire expenditure for naval public works construction during the First World War was only $189,000,000. The increase in the tempo of construction is indicated by the fact that from 1916 to 1937, a period of 21 years including World War I, Bureau of Yards and Docks construction work totaled $360,000,000, as compared with the $12,000,000,000 expended during the past 5 years.

Those 21 years from 1916 to 1937 were years of expensive economy. Instead of having a naval shore establishment adequate for the support of our fighting forces, we had to start our war program almost from scratch. The construction industry was faced with a major test. The construction of plant, beginning with training facilities for the personnel and manufacturing facilities for the equipment, is an essential condition precedent to the expansion of a military force.

TRICKS OF THE TRADE

I need not remind you of the frenzied pace which the industry was called upon to set during those early days. Operating under the much-maligned cost-plus-fee contracts, our contractors were able to cut through red tape and a thousand and one bottlenecks of procurement and administration to meet our schedules. The accomplishment of the task called into play all of the tricks of the trade and all of the ingenuity and initiative which are characteristic of American industry.

A brief recital of some of the achievements on naval works is, I believe, appropriate. We built 70 new major naval air stations and more than 100 important auxiliary stations, including the world's largest aviation training center covering an area of 45 square miles near Corpus Christi, Tex., a total aviation program costing $1,661,000,000.

We built over a half billion dollars worth of structures for naval personnel, including the great training camp at Great Lakes, on which we spent $68,500,000, and the $55,000,000 installations at Farragut, Idaho, and Sampson, N. Y.

We built more than $1,000,000,000 worth of shipbuilding and ship-repair facilities.

During the same period our contractors completed the construction of more than $750,000,000 worth of ordnance facilities and approximately $500,000,000 worth of supply depots. In addition new hospitals and expansions of existing hospitals increased the total bed capacity from 6,000 to approximately 75,000, at a cost of $200,000,000.

OUR FLOATING DRYDOCKS ACHIEVEMENT

These achievements constitute only a part of the program which was carried out in this country, but I will not burden you with more statistics. I believe it appropriate, however, to mention one of our most interesting and important developments. I refer to the design and construction of floating drydocks.

At the beginning of the national emergency the Navy had in service just three floating drydocks, with a total capacity of 40,000 tons. For maximum support of the fleet it was essential that we project our service facilities as far into enemy territory as possible. It was quite evident that if the fleet fulfilled its mission many ships were going to suffer serious damage, and those which escaped battle damage would be subjected to the hardest kind of usage. Experience had taught us that the quickest and cheapest way to add a ship to the fleet was to repair an existing one rather than to build a new one; but we could not afford to have cripples limping half way around the world to our navy yards.

So we enlisted the support of private industry and went to work. By VJ-day, our three floating drydocks, with total capacity of 40,000 tons, had grown to 155 docks with a capacity of 1,200,000 tons. The most unique and the most important of these are the so-called advance base sectional docks. As the name implies, they are built in sections, each capable of lifting eight or ten thousand tons. The sections are designed to be towed to bases in the forward areas and there assembled and welded together into working units, one type having a capacity of 56,000 tons and the other 100,000 tons, the smaller being designed to accommodate the largest battleships then in existence and the larger being built to accommodate the superbattleships which were not completed during the war.

Reports from the forward areas indicate that our predictions as to the importance of these docks were correct. As an example, three battleships which played a vital part in the critical battle for Leyte Gulf would not have been available had it not been for the service provided by our sectional dock at Manus. The effects of the nonavailability of these three battleships can only be guessed, but it is certain that even under the best of conditions the battle would have been much more costly to our forces had they not been there.

In all, we spent approximately $400,000,000 for floating drydocks and, while this sum is large, I am sure that no money was ever more wisely invested. The Japanese Kamikaze attacks were directed at a fleet that had brought its own repair facilities with it. Stricken ships were either repaired sufficiently to reenter the battle or they were enabled to return to our major bases where more complete facilities were available. In any event, many of our ships which would otherwise have been permanently lost to the fleet, lived to fight another day.

I have not intended, by dwelling at such length upon the floating drydock program, to minimize the importance of our conventional large gravity drydocks, which are built into the shore line. During the war period we built 32 graving docks and 11 marine railways at a total cost of $250,000,000. Unquestionably, the most important of these was the great battleship drydock at Pearl Harbor, which was commenced in 1940 and completed by our contractor 10 months ahead of schedule and just 10 days before the fateful December 7, 1941, ready to receive ships and to restore the fleet to action. Competent authority cites the availability of this great dock as the major factor which permitted our speedy recovery from the disaster which overcame our fleet on that day.

These are some of the accomplishments of the construction industry, the unspectacular achievements that rarely make the headlines but are essential for winning wars.

THE SEABEES' PART IN THE WAR

Industry's contribution to victory has been demonstrated far more dramatically through the medium of the personnel which they trained for our naval construction battalions, popularly known as the Seabees. It is entirely appropriate that today our battalions are at work on their last assignment before demobilization. They are building shore facilities at the Yokosuka naval base at Nagasaki, and elsewhere in Japan. They are making good the prediction recounted in a jingle composed by the marines at Bougainville, which the friendly leathernecks painted on a signboard. It read as follows:

"So when we reach the isle of Japan
With our caps at a jaunty tilt,
We'll enter the city of Tokyo
On roads the Seabees built."

The arrival of the Seabees on the isle of Japan was the end of a long road which they, in cooperation with their friends and coworkers in the Army engineers, had constructed across the Pacific. Along this road they built the airfields, the supply depots, the fueling facilities, ship-repair bases, the hospitals, communication centers, ammunition dumps, rehabilitation camps, and many other installations necessary for the immediate support of our combat forces. They were called upon to work under all conditions of climate and difficulties of terrain and supply, and very often were called upon to combat the enemy as well as the handicaps of disease, loneliness, and isolation.

When Japan capitulated more than 60 percent of our 250,000 Seabees were at work on advance bases in the Pacific, and their work was directed by some 7,000 officers of the naval civil engineer corps. They and the Army engineers had achieved a fine start on the base at Okinawa, where 65,000 of them were at work on a program calling for 28 airfields and more than a thousand miles of heavy-duty roads, to be accompanied by such collateral facilities as fuel storage, supply depots, utilities, and harbor installations.

The Okinawa project was designed to be the greatest military construction operation in history, and was to constitute the major base from which the actual invasion of Japan was to start. To give you an idea of the size of the program, it has been estimated that if the facilities planned for Okinawa were constructed in the vicinity of Chicago, under current conditions, they would cost approximately $200,000,000, of which we had completed approximately $60,000,000 worth during the 5 months before VJ-day.

In all, we were called upon to complete 400 naval bases, varying in size from the huge bases at Guam, Manus, and Leyte, to small PT boat bases and radar stations. Typical of the major bases was the one constructed at Tinian, a brief description of which will serve to further emphasize the import of industry's contribution to victory in World War II.

When the marines stormed ashore on July 24, 1944, the Seabees were with them, unloading supplies over Navy pontoon causeways and establishing storage depots on the beach as fast as the supplies arrived. They worked around the clock. At 7 o'clock on the morning of the third day, they received an order to repair the Ushi Airfield, which the marines had just captured. It was so filled with bomb craters that not even a Piper Cub could land. The Seabees went to work with trucks, bulldozers, rollers, and miscellaneous hastily repaired Jap equipment. On the very next day, C-47 transport planes were able to land and remove approximately 300 casualties.

About 5 months later, on December 21, 1944, three B-29's landed on a newly completed 8,500-foot runway. Today there are two giant airports on Tinian, each one of which has more than 20 percent greater mileage in runways and taxiways than New York's prospective Idlewild Airport, which, I am told, is designed to be the greatest commercial airport in the world. I believe it is contemplated for Idlewild that planes will be able to take off at the rate of six per minute. A year after the Seabees landed on Tinian its airports could and did accommodate eight B-29's per minute for the bombing of Japan.

ENGINEERS' CONTRIBUTION TO VICTORY

Speed of construction was an effective instrument of propaganda. There were many evidences that we were able to convince the Japanese of our ultimate victory by the tremendous accomplishments of our men and machines and the furious pace which they set by round-the-clock work. To illustrate this pace, the story is told of two Negro Army men who inadvertently drove their dump truck onto the access road to the Seabees' coral pits on Tinian and were kept in the

stream of traffic, hauling coral, for one entire morning. It was only when "chow call" sounded that they were able to stop long enough to convince the powers that be that they were not really Seabees. [Laughter.]

Simultaneously, similar developments were under way on Guam and, on a somewhat smaller scale, at Saipan and Iwo Jima. From all of these bases the Army was sending out great fleets of B-29's to cover the Japanese homeland with destruction. The base at Iwo Jima had an additional function to provide refuge for battle damaged B-29's returning from Japan. When I was there last August, I was told by General Chaney, island commander, that of the 2,400 B-29's that had landed on Iwo, approximately 25 percent were in distress. The saving in lives, property, and war potential from this construction operation was almost incalculable.

SUPERIORITY OF AMERICAN ECONOMIC SYSTEM

What is the significance of these great works of American industry? Anyone who has had the opportunity to observe our operations in the field during the critical periods of this war will testify that there is something about our American economic system which makes it outstandingly superior. We have demonstrated conclusively that our system of American individual competitive enterprise has established a record of outstanding accomplishment not even distantly approached by any other nation.

This is the result of the coordinated efforts of American finance, management and labor working together as one team for the accomplishment of a great mission.

In the light of our great achievements, it is with some apprehension that I see evidences on the part of some of our economic theorists to destroy the advantages which we now enjoy.

After having accomplished these great production miracles, we have been told by a foreign economist who recently visited our shores that we are all wrong and that "free enterprise economies must be scrapped."

"There is no middle way," he said. "Free enterprise and the market economy mean war. Socialism and planned economy mean peace." I must differ with this gentleman. [Applause.] The proof of the pudding is in the eating thereof. We have accomplished what we have because of our way of living, which stems from our economic system. No one will dispute the fact that there is room for improvement. The current industrial strife is a case in point. A practical and durable solution to this problem must be found. The intermittent, I might say the almost continuous, "bloodletting" of the American economy which results from industrial strife and the resultant interruptions of production must be stopped if we are to maintain our world competitive position in trade and our national security.

It has been my duty in recent months to direct the operation of a certain portion of the oil industry, the products of which are essential for the support of our forces of occupation and for our demobilization activities. The economic waste and the interference with vital war activities would have been enormous had the cessation of petroleum production been permitted to continue and perhaps spread to other plants. However, although such economic waste is great and important, the most harmful effect of such strife is the bitterness engendered between the parties and the danger that the controversy will develop into one having the character of class warfare from which our country has heretofore been happily free.

TRUSTEES OF HUMAN WELFARE

It is my firm conviction that we can achieve understanding between management and labor in industry, and that once this understanding is achieved we will go on to greater heights in the development of our economic well being. But this achievement will require the realization by management and labor that they are not in competition—they are playing on the same team.

Above all, both parties should bear in mind their grave responsibility to the public interest. The thought is well expressed in the following quotation:

"Business enterprises which touch the everyday lives of millions of people are in large measure trustees of human welfare. The right of profit is measured, and the very existence of profit depends, on the way in which industry meets its responsibilities to the public as consumers and as workers.

"Competitive enterprise under democratic government must have the greatest degree of liberty of action commensurate with the general interest. When it has less or more its existence is threatened. Therefore, in asserting its privileges, industry must be equally ready to accept its obligations.

"Belief in democracy means belief in the right and power of the people to rule. It recognizes that the people will run this country in their own interest—not to please theorists, not to serve the selfish purposes of any bloc, including business."

These quotations are from an address recently delivered by the Honorable Edward F. Johnson, general counsel of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey. I subscribe to his thesis wholeheartedly. I would call particular attention to the fact that the obligation to recognize what he calls the "new legal dimension—the dominant public interest" weighs equally upon all elements in our body politic.

I believe that only by following along the lines of our traditional concept of individual competitive enterprise can we be assured that in future crises there will be available to us the men and the products of industry which were so vital to victory. In my trips to the battle fronts, I have been impressed by the loyalty and devotion of these men, many of whom were under no compulsion to enter military service and who might well have remained behind in security at high pay.

Let us not lightly discard the system that produces men of that caliber—men who, when the pinch comes, are in there pitching not because the law says they have to, but because they want to. We have achieved in this country the highest standard of spiritual and material well-being in the history of the world. Let us wait until others can show us that they have something better before we consider changing to their way of life. [Applause.]

Address by Chester Bowles to the New Council for American Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 28 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent because of illness, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. Chester Bowles before the New Council for American Business on December 5, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a great pleasure to take part in this opening banquet of the New Council of American Business. You are a young organization with a fresh point of view, and I notice that most of your members are young men—men with enthusiasm and ideals, men who are not ashamed to be called crusaders.

The country needs your crusading point of view. American business needs it. You have undertaken to reverse the pressure group slogan of a certain section of business—the slogan which says that whatever is good for business simply must be good for the country. As businessmen you believe that only what is obviously good for the country as a whole can bring lasting benefit to business.

The old hackneyed pressure group slogan, that what is good for business must be good for the country, flatters some businessmen into believing that he is the center around which the economic universe turns. You are out to urge the more sobering truth that business moves with the rest of the economy, and that there cannot be any abiding business prosperity except when the entire Nation is economically prosperous and sound.

Back in the late twenties this country ran its economy into the ditch when it accepted the false notion that the pulse of the stock market ticker is a measure of the country's economic health. In the ensuing crash, not only did the country take a terrific beating, but Wall Street took a beating and business, great and small, took a beating. The business leaders who had championed the false notion of "new era" prosperity took a moral beating from which it required 10 years to recover.

I was also a businessman before I took my wartime assignment in Washington. It is as a former businessman and as a friend of business that I feel an obligation to sound a note of warning. If we as a nation decide to follow the lead of the small minority of business pressure groups seeking purely selfish advantages, we shall sooner or later have a repetition of the 1929 disaster—and a repetition this time on a far larger and even more dangerous scale.

The possibility of such a crash, as I say, is not immediately around the corner and for that reason we still have time to stop, look, and listen and to take action to straighten things out. But if our action is to be really effective we have to think and talk frankly and we have to be ready to face some unpleasant facts.

During the war we had to deal with the danger of inflation as an impersonal economic phenomenon. The Government was taking half of our production for war, and the resulting scarcity of goods in relation to available purchasing power was creating a terrific pressure on prices.

There was a grave question in many minds whether the inflationary situation—created not by anybody's will but as a result of the war emergency—could be controlled. Never before in our history had we successfully prevented wartime inflation. But this time we pitched in together and did it. Notwithstanding that the war expenditures in this conflict were 10 times the scale of World War I, we demonstrated that as a nation we possessed the means and the know-how to keep under lock and key the greatest inflationary pressures that this country has ever seen.

What is the situation today? The inflationary forces have not subsided, and they are unlikely to subside for many months to come. We know we can continue to control those forces. The only question is, Have we the courage and, above all, the will to do so?

But here is our greatest danger—the will to control inflation seems to have disappeared from some business groups. During the war, when the physical survival of the Nation was at stake, all business groups, and in fact all economic groups in the Nation, loyally supported price control. Today, however, we find some business leaders who are demanding the crippling or elimination of price or

rent control. They seem to feel that since the active fighting has ceased there is no more need of restraint and self-discipline. Although most businessmen are sincerely convinced of the need for continued controls until danger to the whole economy is over, there is a powerful minority that seems determined to make a killing on uncontrolled rising prices and rents. And they have rationalized their position by telling everybody that what seems good for them simply must be good for the country.

I am confident that is not what most businessmen think. Hundreds of businessmen have urged us privately to stand firm. They have told us that they are with us, and that we must not be misled by the voice of the minority. But the American people can only believe what they hear. And they hear only from the vocal minority.

It is this vocal minority which has spread the propaganda that the way to solve the reconversion problem is to increase prices and increase profits. Profits, they tell us, are the mainspring of our economy; therefore, profits can never be too high for the economy's good—even in the face of inflationary pressures which threaten to overwhelm us.

Again and again they have told us, "Take the lid off prices, or we can't produce." In the housing field where prices are already dangerously high, they have called for the elimination of price controls on building materials and they oppose any proposal to hold the price of finished houses within the reach of the 2,000,000 married veterans who are coming back from the war with no place to lay their heads.

Others are letting it be whispered that they are holding their goods for a while—that price controls will go soon and that prices will be higher. A crop of identical rumors recently broke out in a few department stores that went like this, "Better buy now, lady," the clerk said, "prices are going up."

These people are betting on inflation. Their dangerous activities have given rise to a flood of contracts with escalator clauses and with prices and deliveries stipulated on a when-as-and-if basis. Their activities have also given rise to a crop of predictions in the tipsheets and even in the business press that inflation will be here soon. Their activities also unquestionably play a part in explaining the spurting stock market in Wall Street where some stocks have even reached 1929 highs.

Some of these people are counting on the prospect that OPA will yield under this kind of pressure. I can clear up that point right now. OPA has no intention of yielding.

Since the hold-the-line order was issued in April 1943, the level of prices has been held under control except in two major areas—finished houses and the stock market. Only in these two cases may it be said that inflation is underway. In every other field the American people, working with their Government, have done a job which the skeptics said couldn't be done.

I am confident that as a result of the courageous legislation recently introduced by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, ceilings may soon be established in the price of completed houses so that in this field also the American people can prevent the blind forces of inflation from turning the American dream home into a nightmare.

But the danger is far from past. It is hard to believe that responsible leaders of business would knowingly light a fuse to the explosive economic mixture around us. Most of those who oppose continued price control undoubtedly are sincerely persuaded that the danger of inflation is now definitely past and that the time has come to return to the conditions of a free market.

It is all too clear, however, that this is not true. Commodities all across the board, with rare exceptions, are pressing hard against OPA price ceilings. In a few cases, where we have counted on supply and demand factors being more or less in balance, we experimented with the suspension of ceilings. The response of prices in most instances was terrific.

The plain fact of the matter is that the inflationary danger today cannot be appraised solely by rational calculations of supply and demand—great though the purely economic pressure may be. What we are up against is a far more dangerous menace—the apparent will for inflation on the part of some minor but powerful groups.

Most of them do not, of course, appreciate fully the explosive forces with which they are toying. They feel, very likely in full sincerity, that the inflation that would result from their action would be relatively minor—even healthy. But that's the same old "didn't know it was loaded" theory with which disasters have been explained in the past.

Let's make no mistake about it. Unless we can win the fight against what might properly be called this "pressure group urge to inflation"—and we have to win it in the next few weeks, in the next few months—we shall condemn America—all America, consumers, agriculture, labor, and business—to a brief period of false boom followed by a shattering smash-up that will shake our economy to its foundations.

Statisticians may dispute as to the exact length of the boom—whether it will last into 1947 or end in 1946. People argued that way in the twenties as to the length of the bull market. But everybody knows that if we go through an inflationary boom, we shall suffer a deflationary crash whose consequence nobody can foretell.

We still have time to think and contemplate the possibilities. Price levels under OPA controls are still holding steady. Wholesale prices are still less than 2 percent above the levels of 2½ years ago. Only in the uncontrolled real-estate and stock-market areas is inflation actually under way.

Let us stop then and consider what a broad inflationary advance would mean for the various economic groups in the economy. What would it mean to the veteran? To labor? To the farmer? To the small and independent businessmen? And even to big business?

Nobody escaped the consequences of the crash of 1920 or the crash of 1929. That is why today, while reckless groups are optimistically talking up inflation, our farmers, our workers, and the great majority of our businessmen are swept by a sense of foreboding.

You don't see the veterans welcoming the Wall Street talk of inflation. You don't see labor or the consumers asking for the lifting of price and rent controls. You don't see the farmers cheering the bull market, and you don't see the great majority of businessmen doing any cheering either.

I think the people of this country are entitled to have their present fears set at rest. I think they are entitled to have the specter of willful inflation banished from our midst once and for all. The way to do it, it seems to me, is for the country to agree firmly, courageously, and beyond question or doubt upon its determination to see the job through. Then and only then will the speculative, inflationeers, and those sincere but misguided advocates of a free market under present inflationary conditions be kept from selling price control short.

We need, I believe, to do three things: First, as I testified to the House Banking and Currency Committee this morning, we need to establish controls over the prices of completed houses to put an end to the all-too-obvious inflation already under way in this field.

Second, we need to maintain firm price controls on all commodities, and ceilings on all rentals until the danger of inflation in each commodity field and each rental area is over. In determining the time at which controls should be removed, there are no magic dates. It depends entirely upon the speed with which supply comes into balance with demand.

Third, we should remove controls as promptly as possible, in one commodity field and rental area after another, as soon as it is safe to do so.

A firm decision to control prices and rents is an indispensable preliminary to any satisfactory transition from war to peace. Without it we can kiss good by the brave new postwar world of security and prosperity, full employment, and opportunity which we promised to build once the Nazi threat to our civilization was removed.

I would be the last to claim that price control in and by itself would be sufficient to call that brave new world into existence. That world must be built by the hard work and cooperative thinking and planning of all groups in the community—business, labor, agriculture, and government.

There has been a lot of talk of cooperation. Some of it has sounded hollow because it has come from people intent on advancing their own private interests, regardless of the general welfare. Cooperation under such conditions becomes an empty farce. The only time cooperation between groups becomes fruitful is when each group makes an honest effort to put the national interest ahead of its particular private interests.

That is why I like your businessman's platform. It not only urges all business to take the stand that what is good for the country is good for business, but it is an invitation to labor and to other groups to approach their problems from the same point of view.

To be sure, each group is not expected to neglect its own special State in the total national picture. We don't expect business to put forward a program which leaves out business enterprise and business profits, and we don't expect labor to put forward a program which leaves out the protection of good wages and steady jobs. But the particular planks which the various groups put forward for themselves, must fit into an honest program calculated to advance the welfare of all groups.

That is exactly the kind of program you have put forward. You are back of the full-employment bill. You are back of the bill to set a 65-cents-an-hour floor under wages. You are for liberalized unemployment compensation. You oppose the weakening of collective bargaining. You are for a permanent FEPC, so that no man whatever his race, color, or creed is denied the benefits of American opportunity.

You are for a program to protect the farmer—to protect his prices and protect his income. You support the broadening and deepening of the social-security program to cover everyone in the entire working population, and to raise benefits to a level of decency. You are for a medical-care and health-insurance program to bring the blessings of medical science into every home.

You are for the development of our natural resources, the application of the TVA idea to the Missouri River, to the Columbia River, and to the other river valleys. You are for all these good things and many others—last but not least of which is world cooperation and world trade.

This is a program in the national interest. This is a program for all the people. This is a program behind which men of good will everywhere may rally.

Your program shows us the way at home. But more than that it shows us the way to international peace as well.

In recent months the eyes of the world have been focused with a new anxiety on international problems, seeking to find an escape from war in the atomic age. Thinking men recognize that if mankind is to escape destruction, the nations of the world

must build a new international society, a society built not upon greed and selfishness and irresponsible power, but one in which there is freedom and abundance and security for all. But thinking men recognize that we cannot have these things abroad if we do not have them at home. We cannot have security, freedom, opportunity and abundance abroad while we have insecurity, fear, and economic disorder at home. We cannot have peace with other nations while we wage undisguised economic war at home.

The hopes of the world rest on us to provide leadership in the present crisis. Ours are unparalleled resources and productive power. Ours is the tradition of freedom—freedom not for the few but for all. If free men here in America should fail, where can free men anywhere succeed?

The world is looking to us to build a society in which there are jobs and opportunity for all who seek them, a society whose abundance is not denied to anyone whatever his race, color, creed or economic status. It is only a society dedicated internally to the principle of live and help live that can take the lead in establishing the same principle of live and help live in the international affairs.

Gentlemen, ours is a great and urgent responsibility. Time is running short. At home and abroad the forces of misunderstanding, of ignorant greed, of fear and conflict are mounting swiftly. These forces must be checked and reversed before it is too late.

The Nation needs men of unselfishness, and of vision. The Nation needs crusaders.

That is why I salute your organization. More power to all of you.

The Russo-Iranian Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 28 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article written by Joseph and Stuart Alsop under the title "We Are on the Brink," and published in their column in the Washington Post on January 25, 1946. The article relates to the Russo-Iranian crisis.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

WE ARE ON THE BRINK

At the risk of seeming alarmist, it is necessary to report that the inner gravity of the Russo-Iranian crisis cannot be exaggerated. It does not basically matter whether Iran's appeal to United Nations against Russia is withdrawn or maintained, since this will merely determine th locale of negotiations. What matters .s Russian policy. If it is Russan policy to carr, the Soviet adventure in Iran to its logical conclusion United Nations will be done to death at the moment of its birth.

This is no mere expression of opinion. It is a report o' the official American position, as it has been determined on the highest level. President Tru an and the American policy-makers are understood, on undoubted authority, to regard the Iranian question and allied Turkish questi.n as final tests of the workability of United Nations. The reasen is simple. United Nations cannot work without reasonably sincere Russo-Anglo-American cooperation. Such cooperation is impossible if the Soviet Union is committed to an imperialistic or ex,ansionist program. If that is the case, the American policy makers will conclude that the United Nations machinery cannot be made to work, and will seek other solutions to the problems of American security and world peace.

This does not mean, of course, that hope for United Nations has already been abandoned. On the contrary, the indications are that this Government and the British will join in a strenuous effort to demonstrate their good faith to the Kremlin and to secure a reasonable settlement. For example, it is probable that American and British influence will be used in favor of northern Iranian oil concessions for the Soviet Union—always provided that the Russians will be content with simple oil concessions, and will not insist on the equivalent o territorial cession, as they have done to date.

What if Soviet diplomacy in the Middle East should prove to have larger objectives than a little old-fashioned oil grabbing? The answer to this question is to be found in the issue concerning American overseas bases. The American policy on bases will be to offer compromises wherever possible, provided the Kremlin does not take action which is regarded as rendering United Nations unworkable. United Nations will, in fact, be relied on to assure our all-but-minimum American security. If United Nations is regarded as being unworkable, however, American policy will be to insist at all costs on the complete program for American overseas bases which the Joint Chiefs of Staffs have outlined as the optimum program for American defense. This program includes bases in Greenland, Iceland, the northern part of this hemisphere, and perhaps the Azores, as well as bases throughout the Pacific.

The implications of such insistence from the Russian standpoint can hardly be ignored. The complete program for American overseas bases would not merely provide the most effective defense of this country. With the production in quantity of the new B-36 aircraft, the program would also bring within range of effective attack all vital areas of the Soviet Union. All American policy makers, military as well as civil, are tragically aware of the meaning to this country and the world of an open return to the system of international relations founded not on trust but on suspicion. Yet it is hard to find a flaw in a statement of the logic of the American policy which was recently made by a responsible official.

"No man on earth," he said with some bitterness, "could accept the responsibility of insisting on less than the maximum defensive precautions in a world where there is no trust."

A further question may be asked: Why does the Iranian crisis raise such grave issues? The answer was presented at greater length some days ago in this space. Briefly, the evidence to date suggests that the Soviet objective, in both Iran and Turkey, is to overthrow the existing governments and establish new regimes dominated by the Kremlin. Accomplishment of that objective would give the Russians predominance in the Near and Middle East. Thus the Russians would be placed across the British, French, and Dutch lines of communication with the far eastern colonial areas. Those colonial areas are already in ferment. It is further feared that promotion of such ferment, and extension of the Soviet sphere of influence through all of Asia is the end purpose of the Kremlin policy.

In that event, it will no longer be possible to argue that the Kremlin has abandoned its original international program or has adopted a policy of simple development of Russia's own vast resources. The assurances given by Stalin to Harry Hopkins and Winston Churchill will have proved incorrect. The basis for our relations with Russia since the German attack on the Soviet Union will have been swept away. Before long, this enormous issue will be settled. The Russians can hardly complete arrangements for subversion of the Iranian Government by March 2, when they are committed to withdraw their troops from Iran. If they then withdraw, hope for UNO need not be abandoned.

The Strike Situation

REMARKS

OF

HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1946

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, President Truman is in the meat business, the transportation business, and will probably go into the steel business and others. In the meantime Government business is going to pot. That is usually what happens to a business whose operators attend to every business but their own.

Last Tuesday the Washington Post diagnosed the strike situation as being a crime and a seeming conspiracy, although it expressed itself as loath to name the crime or the probable conspirators. On Thursday in the well of the House I agreed with the Post and said the evidence showed the conspiracy in the administration, named some of the conspirators, and in my opinion, the crime.

I pointed to Davis in OES, Snyder of OWMR, and Wallace of Commerce, who long before the General Motors strike agitated and advocated wage increases of 50, 24, and 25 percent, respectively, wage increases they knew industry could not stand, their motive being to start a conflagration of strikes which would sabotage our reconversion program and bring about Government operation of industry. This was aid and comfort to the Moscow Internationale, whose operations in this country were denounced by Secretary of State Hull in 1935.

Three weeks before the General Motors strike, President Truman, in his wage and price policy speech, backed up the conspirators, perhaps reluctantly, with the statement: "There are several reasons why I believe that industry as a whole can afford substantial wage increases without increasing prices." I say "reluctantly" because immediately the President tried to straddle by saying, "We must not kill the goose that lays the golden egg."

It was reassuring, therefore, when last Saturday, 2 days after I made the above speech, the Post came out with another editorial and agreed that what 4 days before it had called a crime and a seeming conspiracy, must be laid in the lap of the administration with the following statement:

However, the next move, morally, is up to the President. He, and he alone, can untie this Gordian knot, which, as a result of a combination of Government price power and

Government sloppiness in dealing with reconversion labor disputes, is of the Government's own making. The President should climb down from his take-it-or-else attitude in the interest of working out a just settlement that will start the wheels of industry again. That is what will save us from inflation. We do not know what the "or else" of the President's implication means, but to us it means tragedy.

How true, Mr. Editor. But do you realize that this treacherous gang, which has President Truman in the middle of a swift stream, where the current is so swift that he can neither turn back nor get out, welcomes this tragedy? They are already well on their way in Government operation of industry, and if they can bring about destructive inflation, they welcome that. Anything, anything that will destroy our constitutional liberties, our free economy, and our American way of life fits into their plan.

The conspirators do not want any part of industry's profits to be used for expansion of plants, research, improved machinery, slack periods, and so forth, which offer security for future jobs for workingmen. Like the prodigal son, they want them to be disgorged immediately to the bureaucrats and the racketeer labor leaders. They still believe in the New Deal ideology that we have reached the limit of our frontiers, that it is no use to build more factories, that we must divide what we have because it belongs to all of us, and whatever debts we have we owe to ourselves. So I repeat, we cannot look to the administration for relief.

People are beginning to look to Congress. It is up to Congress, not only in labor matters, but taxes and financial problems, to get the Nation back to a Government by law in which laws are fairly and justly administered for all.

United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1946

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity of serving as one of the delegates of the United States to the United Nations Educational and Cultural Conference held in London, November 1 to 16. During this time the constitution for the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization was written. This proposed organization, which is to be a specialized agency under the United Nations Organization, is now popularly known by its short title UNESCO.

The constitution of UNESCO is now before the governments of the nations who participated in the recent educational conference. The constitution will be effective when it has been adopted by 20 states. I hope that the United States will become one of the first members of UNESCO.

Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a House joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. I go so far as to predict that UNESCO will become one of the great foundation stones in the United Nations structure. If the United Nations charter is to work effectively the peoples of the world must give it their wholehearted support. The most effective way of ensuring this support is to create the greatest possible understanding among the nations.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Congress will act at once in placing its approval on this constitution. Such action would guarantee to the world that we intend to participate actively in UNESCO. Such action would hasten the approval of this constitution by the requisite number of nations.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to list fairly specifically what this new Organization may well accomplish. I cite the following as examples of activities in which the new Organization will be engaged. They are for the purpose of illustration only and in no sense do they indicate the full scope of UNESCO:

First. Promote a free flow of ideas and information on the popular as well as the scholarly level—through the radio, motion picture, and printed page, and directly between scholars, teachers, librarians, and artists.

Second. Encourage the exchange of students and the reciprocal visits of scientists, and other scholars, teachers, and artists.

Third. Stimulate the circulation of scientific and technological information, now so vital to the well-being of all peoples.

Fourth. Forward the contribution to world understanding by creative writers, artists, and musicians through encouraging their association across national boundaries.

Fifth. Provide liaison arrangements to facilitate the giving of aid to peoples whom the war has stripped of educational and scientific resources, for the reestablishment and restaffing of schools, laboratories, and libraries.

Sixth. Provide for studies and reports concerning situations where educational and cultural opportunities are deficient.

Seventh. Cooperate with the Trusteeship Council in assisting non-self-governing peoples in the improvement of their educational opportunities.

Eighth. Assist in cooperative efforts to define the educational goals necessary to the development of free peoples.

Ninth. Foster approved programs of adult education in accordance with the needs and desires of the several nations.

Tenth. Publish factual studies of progress achieved in educational and cultural development.

Eleventh. In general, give all practical assistance to education, research, and scientific advance, as well as the free functioning of the press, radio, and motion picture, while scrupulously refraining from repression, surveillance, or dictation in the educational and cultural affairs of any country.

Twelfth. Encourage the development of education which gives support to world peace and international cooperation through the United Nations and its associated agencies.

Union Responsibility

REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 25, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] blames Mr. Fairless because he did not accept and go along with the President in his statement as to the amount of the wage which should be paid to those on strike. He forgot to add, however, that steel has to pay the wages. Neither the President nor the members of the fact-finding board pays the added sum that the President said should be paid as wages. That is a matter of importance. Can the corporation pay it, make needed improvements, replacements, carry on research, pay dividends? If not, there will be no jobs in that particular industry. The goose which lays the egg—a job—may just die for want of nourishment—profit.

Another thing the President also overlooks is the fact that in the steel strike the workers are striking in violation of the express terms of a contract they signed and for which they asked. What is the use of entering into a new contract if the union does not regard the terms of its present contract which they have put in writing? Is it fair for them to promise to do one thing today only to have them refuse tomorrow? Why not be fair about the situation? Of course, there are more workers—voters—than there are employers, and just a vote seeker should cultivate the field which promises the greater yield.

Summary of Social-Security Conference Held in Washington, D. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 28 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, on behalf of my collegue, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] who is necessarily absent because of illness, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a summary of the proceedings of the Social Security Conference held in Washington, D. C. by the International Workers Order on November 25 and 26, 1945. Represented at this conference were the general lodges of the International Workers Order and 15 nationality group societies,

comprising a total membership of 180,000.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF SOCIAL-SECURITY CONFERENCE HELD IN WASHINGTON, D. C., BY THE INTERNATIONAL WORKERS ORDER, NOVEMBER 25–26, 1945

PURPOSES

The IWO Social-Security Conference was held to organize and stimulate activities for the speedy passage by Congress of the two Wagner-Murray-Dingell bills, S. 1606 (H. R. 4730) the National Health Act, and S. 1050 (H. R. 3293), the social-security amendments, and related health and security measures necessary for establishing a rounded-out national health and social-security system in the United States.

A fundamental purpose of the conference was to emphasize the struggle for health and social-security legislation as an integral part of the efforts of the whole labor movement in America to attain postwar security for the working masses. It set about to link the IWO social-security campaign with the fight for full employment, wage increases, and the safeguarding of democracy by defeat of the reactionary forces which are promoting discrimination, anti-Semitism, and war policies.

The conference was to serve, also, as the "opening gun" of the International Workers Order national social-security campaign through the mobilization, in Washington, D. C., of its leadership from its general lodges and 15 nationality group societies assembling from New York, Chicago, Detroit, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, Cleveland, Boston, Newark, N. J., and the District of Columbia. The IWO societies included: American Russian Fraternal Society, Carpatho-Russian American Mutual Aid Society, Cervantes Society, Croatian Benefit Fraternity, Finnish American Mutual Aid Society, Garibaldi American Fraternal Society, Hellenic American Fraternal Society, Hungarian Brotherhood, Jewish Peoples Fraternal Order, Polonia Society, Rumanian American Fraternal Society, Serbian American Federation, Slovak Workers Society, and the Ukrainian American Fraternal Union. The total membership represented in these groups is 180,000. Among the hundred delegates were a dozen Negro leaders from the principal cities.

GREETINGS

The conference received greetings from the following officials of the Government and labor and other organizations: Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER, Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Representative JOHN D. DINGELL, Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Jr., A. J. Altmeyer, Chairman Social Security Board of the United States; Harry Bridges, president, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union; Reid Robinson, president, International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, CIO; Lewis Merrill, president, United Office and Professional Workers of America, CIO; Max Yergan, president, National Negro Congress and Council on African Affairs; Abner Green, executive secretary, American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born; George Marshall, chairman, National Federation for Constitutional Liberties.

In substance, the greetings from the coauthors of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bills emphasized the benefits of the new health measures and urged immediate actions in the congressional committees toward realization of the Truman health program. Representative DINGELL called sharply for defeat of the medical reactionaries impeding the bills. Congressman POWELL and the labor and civic leaders stressed the all-inclusive needs of the people for legislation promoting health, full employment, fair employment practices, equality, abolition of poll taxes and Jim Crow, and the extension and enlargement of social security benefits.

SPEAKERS

A representative group of speakers addressed the Sunday afternoon session which was chaired by John E. Middleton, IWO general vice president. These included: Max Bedacht, general secretary, IWO; Dr. Milton I. Roemer, of the United States Public Health Service, representing the Physicians Forum, Washington, D. C., chapter; Dr. Paul B. Cornely, head of the department of bacteriology and public health of the School of Medicine of Howard University; Rev. Francis W. McPeek, chairman of the legislative committee of council for social action, Congregational Christian Church; Lincoln Fairly, director of Washington division of the research department, United Automobile Workers of America, CIO; and Sam Milgrom, director of organization, IWO.

DIGEST OF ADDRESSES

Mr. Bedacht pointed out generally the health needs of the Nation and the timeliness of President Truman's five-point health program presented to Congress on November 19, 1945. He outlined the special responsibility of the IWO—as a labor fraternal organization devoted to social security for its members and the Nation—in the broad campaign of labor and all progressive groups for the adoption of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bills. Declaring that passage of this legislation would enrich the functions of fraternal societies, Mr. Bedacht emphasized that the winning of health and social security objectives would strengthen the fight against fascism. Dr. Roemer, representing the Physicians Forum of Washington, D. C., defined the health needs of the American people in relation to the proposed expansion of national health services. Dr. Cornely presented special aspects of the health problems of the Negro people which, he said, were a more acute aspect of America's health problems as a whole. He marshaled a convincing array of facts of health conditions and needs of Negro Americans in terms of benefits to be derived from S. 1606. Rev. McPeek discussed the churches' stake in the health program, declaring that Christian creed supported health advancement and that the church could be relied upon to aid to attain it. Lincoln Fairly, of the CIO, stressed the need of labor unity in overcoming resistance to health and social-security legislation, and warned against underestimating both the opposition and the people's strength. Mr. Milgrom reviewed the significant aspects of the struggle for social security legislation, emphasized the role of the communities in organization and mobilization for the two bills—especially the nationality group communities—and dealt with practical problems in developing an effective campaign nationally.

CONFERENCE ACTION

During the evening session, delegates reported plans and activities in their lodges and communities; discussed and adopted a main resolution outlining the policies and organization of the IWO national health and social security campaign; sent telegrams to President Truman, Senators WAGNER and MURRAY, and Representative DINGELL expressing support of their proposals for health legislation; and also sent a telegram to R. J. Thomas, president of the United Auto Workers of America, CIO, pledging full support of the striking UAW workers whose victory "will be a victory not only for the membership of your union, but also a big stride forward in winning economic security for all of the people."

Other decisions of the conference toward the projection of a mass campaign included the issuance of a petition for the collection of 2,000,000 names of American citizens supporting passage of the bills; the mass-scale distribution of a pamphlet on the health needs of the Nation; the issuance of other educational materials in English and various languages; the raising of a $25,000 social security campaign fund for literature, posters, use of radio, lecture tours, forums, films, and other educational and propaganda mediums; the organization of meetings, mass rallies, seminars, conferences on neighborhood, community, city, and State scale; the development, in cooperation with labor unions, fraternal groups, and other organizations, of a national center for the coordination of the growing mass campaign for social security and health legislation. The months of January and February 1946 were designated as a special period for the holding of educational meetings of the IWO membership and people in the communities. It was decided to place special emphasis upon action for the National Health Act, S. 1606, and to urge city councils in the principal cities to pass resolutions memorializing Congress to act favorably on the bill; and, finally, to circulate collection lists and use other effective means to establish the $25,000 fund.

Rapido River Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. LYLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1946

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, the Thirty-sixth Division, a Texas National Guard division, has a great record of service during World War II. Its men and officers conducted themselves in such a manner as to reflect credit upon the military services of this country. They have won the title "Brave Men," and America shall always be grateful for their service.

They have recently assembled in convention at Brownwood, Tex., and adopted a resolution, a copy of which I am inserting as part of this statement.

I shall not comment upon this matter at this time, Mr. Speaker, but I desire to include a copy of a letter I addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, and to say that in response to this the chairman has assured me that as quickly as the petition comes properly before him it will be referred to the whole committee for discussion.

Without regard to the merits of the matter, Mr. Speaker, I must say that I know the men and officers of the Thirty-sixth Division, and I am sure that only the deepest sense of responsibility prompted them to suggest this action, which is most unusual.

The resolution and letter follows:

This is the eve of the second anniversary of the crossing of the Rapido River, a military undertaking that will go down in history as one of the colossal blunders of the Second World War.

The One Hundred and Forty-first and One Hundred and Forty-third Infantry Regimental Combat Teams caught the brunt of this holocaust. Every man connected with this undertaking knew it was doomed to failure because it was an impossible situation. The Rapido River was the main line of resistance. The German elements opposing the division had every foot of ground covered with fire. The high ground was all held by Germans,

and observation was perfect for them in directing the artillery fire. Patrols had reported that those enemy positions were strongly held, that the area was heavily mined on both sides of the river, and the German positions were wired and strongly fortified, and that the crossing was not tenable.

Notwithstanding this information (which was in the possession of the Fifth Army commander), contrary to the repeated recommendations of the subordinate commanders, Gen. Mark W. Clark ordered the crossings of the Rapido at several points.

The results of this blunder are well known. The crossings were made under the most adverse conditions and required 2 nights to get elements of the two combat teams across. At daylight the Germans shot the bridges out behind the Thirty-Sixth Division troops and began a methodical destruction of our troops. The division suffered heavy casualties, amounting to 2,900 men.

It was such a colossal failure that one of the regimental commanders commented as follows: "The river was strongly defended by a German force superior in numbers to our attacking force. The first attack was made at night and was not successful. On the night before, the British attack of the south had failed. The last attack by my regiment was made in daylight and was more decisively unsuccessful than the first. Losses from attacks of this sort are tremendous in manpower and material, and have a devastating, demoralizing effect upon those few troops who survive them. Officers and men lost in the Rapido River crossing cannot be replaced and the combat efficiency of a regiment is destroyed": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the men of the Thirty-sixth Division Association in convention assembled at Brownwood, Tex., petition the Congress of the United States to investigate the Rapido River fiasco and take the necessary steps to correct a military system that will permit an inefficient and inexperienced officer, such as Gen. Mark W. Clark, in a high command to destroy the young manhood of this country and to prevent future soldiers being sacrificed wastefully and uselessly.

JANUARY 21, 1946.

Hon. ANDREW J. MAY,
Chairman, Military Affairs Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: You no doubt have observed in the press of yesterday that former members of the Thirty-sixth Division, a Texas National Guard unit, have, by resolution, requested a congressional investigation of the Rapido River operation during the Italian campaign of 1944.

Many American lives were lost in this operation and I know from personal contact with many men and officers of this organization that considerable bitterness was aroused over the resulting casualties.

I do not believe that the Congress is technically equipped to make an investigation of this nature. I do believe, however, that a board appointed by the War Department of trained officers, preferably retired, could well make an intelligent inquiry into the matter.

Great responsibility rests upon the shoulders of commanders as the lives of American youth are precious and should never be needlessly expended. If mistakes have been made, it is well for experts to study them and for the War Department to use every effort to see that they never occur again.

I believe it is the responsibility of your committee to request the War Department to appoint a board of impartial and qualified officers to make a full investigation of this matter.

Respectfully yours.

The Steel Industry and America's Economy

REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, use by the steel industry of its gigantic power to be the bottleneck of America's economy is a very dangerous threat both to our economic and to our political life.

The industry should understand that it is inviting widespread proposals not only for Government operation of Government-owned steel-making facilites, but for nationalization of the steel industry.

No industry so strategically placed can expect to use its enormous power carelessly or arbitrarily and not reap the consequences.

In the face of the concerted refusal of the steel industry to bargain in good faith, the President of the United States has in the Government-owned steel-making facilities one of the strongest instruments for securing from the steel industry agreement to his recommendations of an increase of 18½ cents an hour for the steelworkers. And he has in Henry J. Kaiser a man who can operate these facilities. Above all he has in Mr. Kaiser a man who has demonstrated his industrial statesmanship by his agreements to accept the President's recommendation in steel, and the findings of the President's fact-finding board for the General Motors Corp. and the auto workers. Last Tuesday, January 22, at the Department of Labor, Mr. A. W. Robertson, president of Westinghouse, admitted to reporters that United States Steel, General Motors, General Electric, and Westinghouse had met in New York the week before, as reported in the Washington Post January 23, as follows:

In a surprise move, the Labor Department took action yesterday in the strike of 200,000 workers who have walked out of the country's three biggest electrical manufacturing plants. The CIO United Electrical Workers and the General Electric and Westinghouse companies agreed to a proposal of Schwellenbach to sit in on mediation conferences.

The meeting began yesterday, with Arthur S. Meyer, New York State Mediation Board chairman, and William H. Davis, former Chairman of the National War Labor Board, as mediators. They adjourned with plans for reconvening tomorrow in Meyer's office in New York.

Neither the two mediators nor the disputants, including two top officers of the union, and C. E. Wilson, GE president, and A. W. Robertson, chairman of the Westinghouse directors' board, would comment on what transpired.

Robertson, however, held a press conference later in the day and was questioned by reporters whether there was an possibility of settling the electrical industry strike prior to a wage pattern being set in steel or in General Motors.

WOULD GET SERIOUS STUDY

Robertson said a settlement could be made provided a reasonable basis were found. He admitted, however, that if a wage pattern were set in the GM or steel cases "we would have to give it serious consideration and would be profoundly affected, and I believe we would be forced to be governed by it."

Pressed on how he could reconcile the two statements, Robertson laughingly conceded to a reporter that the "reasonable basis" would have to be a lower one than the 18½ cents proposed by President Truman for steel workers, or the 19½ cents recommended by the fact-finding board in the GM case.

Robertson was asked for information on an industrial conspiracy which Philip Murray, CIO head, has alleged to exist. He also was asked if there had been meetings last week among top executives of the steel, GM, GE, and Westinghouse companies.

NOT PRESENT AT MEETING

Robertson admitted there had been a meeting, but said he had not attended it, and insisted that there had been no joint discussion of the CIO wage drive. He said meetings of industrial concerns and their leaders were common affairs, but declared categorically that no meeting had discussed Westinghouse's wage rates. He also denied knowledge of any general strategy meeting by industry.

Mr. Robertson denied that wages had Ford, and Chrysler. And the four companies are still refusing to consider settlements at the level agreed to by Kaiser, Ford, and Chrysler. And the four companies named by Mr. Robertson, who have refused to bargain in good faith, are America's largest manufacturing corporations. The United States Steel Corp. holds the key to making effective this concerted refusal by these grea. companies or it can unlock the entire jam throughout American industry created by the present shut-down of the steel industry.

The refusal by the steel industry to accept the President's recommendations has started a creeping paralysis in our economy. The steel industry is the flywheel of our economy. If it can be kept rolling at its highest efficiency, every community throughout America reflects its prosperity.

Stop the steel mills and you soon stop the circulation of goods of almost every kind. Mr. J. P. Morgan understood this in 1900 when he put together the United States Steel Corp. And the American Iron and Steel Institute understands it today.

The settlements agreed upon last Saturday between Chrysler, Ford, and the automobile workers are very welcome news. They are especially welcome because Ford at least has said this settlement will not be based upon a demand for further price increases. They show that collective bargaining can work where there is genuine good faith on the part of management as well as the unions.

But these settlements will not enable Ford and Chrysler to continue operations. For that they need steel.

Letter in Opposition to Un-American Activities of the House Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter in opposition to un-American activities of the House Committee on Un-American Activities:

JANUARY 26, 1946.

We, the undersigned, feel called upon to protest the arbitrary, un-American, and illegal methods by which the House Committee on Un-American Activities is attempting to destroy the work of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee in bringing relief to Spanish Republican refugees. We speak as a group of citizens most of whom have no connection whatever with the committee under attack. The following events explain our alarm:

1. December 1: Ernie Adamson, counsel to the House Committee on Un-American Activities, asked the President's War Relief Control Board to revoke the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee's license.

2. December 8: The Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee received a letter from Mr. Adamson saying in part, "In the interest of saving time, I suggest that you permit one of our investigators to make a preliminary investigation of your organization to determine whether or not this committee is interested in your organization."

3. December 10: The Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee received a subpena to produce "all books and records."

As the Nation said in an editorial on this chronology on January 19: "Thus, after trying to execute a death sentence on an organization whose work for the relief of Franco's victims is a matter of public record, the Un-American Committee now wishes to launch a fishing expedition in the hope of finding something that looks like evidence to back the verdict it has already reached."

The House committee's contempt citation against Miss Bryan for failing to produce the thousands of documents requested was of a piece with the preceding pattern. Miss Bryan came before the committee prepared to answer all questions on the activities of her organization. She was given no opportunity to answer any questions. She was denied the right to consult with counsel during the hearing. She was given no chance to explain that to comply with the House Committee on Un-American Activities' request for "all books and records" would have been to stop the work of her organization.

The Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee is licensed by the President's War Relief Control Board. Its license specifically limits it to relief activities and prohibits propaganda activities. It renders regular trimonthly reports to the Board. Had the committee been engaged in propaganda activities, its license would have been revoked.

We urge you as a guardian of American democracy to vote against any resolution citing Miss Bryan for contempt of Congress.

Very truly yours,

QUENTIN REYNOLDS.
FREDA KIRCHWEY.
ROBERT W. KENNY.
Bishop EDWARD L. PARSONS.
CARL SANDBURG.
Rev. Dr. DAVID DE SOLA POOL.

A Plan for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1946

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I would like to include a most admirable article by the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY, Senator from Montana, in the January 21, 1946, issue of the New Republic:

A PLAN FOR AMERICA

(By Senator JAMES E. MURRAY)

Since January 1944, when the full employment bill was introduced into Congress, its sponsors have been asked repeatedly just what sort of program would be necessary to carry out the objectives of the measure and provide sustained full employment in a free America.

I have usually answered this question by pointing out that the bill commits the Federal Government to maintain full employment by every appropriate means and establishes executive and congressional machinery for developing the specific details of a full-employment program. I have always maintained that under the bill there could be many alternative types of full-employment programs, depending upon the economic situation at any given time and upon the varying judgment of Congress.

The full employment bill is now in the hands of the Senate-House conference committee. We shall soon know whether an adequate bill will be passed, or misconceived, ineffective and unworkable legislation which would serve only to confuse the issue. It would be most unfortunate for our country in the days ahead if this legislation were wrecked by the bias and ill will of men who are more interested in blocking sound, progressive government than they are in full employment. If, however, we can have enacted a carefully worked-out bill such as the Senate version, we shall lay the foundation for a program which will help cure the most serious defect in our economic system: Recurrent mass unemployment.

CHARACTERISTICS OF A FULL-EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

Accordingly, I should like at this time to state my personal observations on the requirements of such a program, in the hope that they will help stimulate constructive thought and discussion on this all-important subject. These observations are based upon many conferences and discussions with economists, businessmen, Members of Congress, and public-spirited citizens who are seeking to avoid another major depression. They are also based upon a careful review of present Federal policies and pending legislative proposals.

Before discussing specific fields of action, I should like to suggest five bench marks by which, in my opinion, any full employment program must be judged.

First. The program must face up to the question of how far we are to push toward a better distribution of national income, as contrasted with the use of Federal deficits to compensate for maldistribution of national income. Neither approach is easy. Improved distribution of income means a clash with dominant vested interests. Federal deficits mean a collision with those who regard a balanced Federal budget as more important than a balanced national economy.

The only realistic policy is to place major emphasis upon obtaining a better distribution of income. This means central emphasis on all Government policies and functions that affect wages. It means vigorous and forthright attack on monopolistic prices. It means driving toward a tax system designed to increase consumption and thereby speed up production. It means that public works and public services should be approached primarily on the basis of meeting public needs rather than as compensatory devices for coping with economic fluctuations.

To the extent that this effort to improve the distribution of income may be unsuccessful, we must deal with the deficits in purchasing power through proper Government-spending programs—if full employment is to be maintained. But in so doing we must make it unmistakably clear that the responsibility for Federal deficits rests with those who oppose a fundamental attack on our basic economic ills. It is those who support monopoly and special privilege and stand in the way of improved policies on wages, prices, taxes, and public expenditures who are responsible for making it necessary to use deficit expenditures as a means of maintaining employment.

Second. The objective of full employment must be integrated with these other basic objectives of national policy: a rising standard of living, the preservation and strengthening of civil liberties and personal freedom, and the maintenance of friendly economic and political relations with the rest of the world.

Third. It must be a long-range program. A short-range approach can lead only to a series of improvisations based upon one emergency after another.

Fourth. The program must be truly comprehensive. No handful of measures by themselves, no matter how important, is sufficient to give us full employment. It is essential that all the innumerable fields of action affecting employment and production be encompassed within the program.

Fifth. The program must consist of much more than a number of disconnected policies. Too often one arm of the Federal Government knows not what the other arm doeth—as is particularly true with respect to expenditure programs, on the one hand, and regulatory activities on the other. All of the Government's innumerable activities should fit together within a general framework and add up to a total level of economic activity that assures remunerative employment opportunities for all who are willing and able to work.

SPECIFIC FIELDS OF ACTION

In listing some of the important fields in which decisive action is essential, I shall try to cover the Government's present activities, pending proposals that deserve support, and the need for new proposals to help meet our country's problems.

Business and finance: The Government's present activities with respect to business and finance are little more than vestigal remains of programs designed to cope with the economic problems of bygone days—the days of trust-busting, of depression and relief, of mobilization for war. They bear little resemblance to the kind of program needed to meet the problems of today or tomorrow.

On the vital question of monopolistic control we must develop a two-sided approach. On the one hand, our antitrust activities must be strengthened. In this connection the final report of the Temporary National Economic Committee is particularly pertinent. The TNEC unanimous recommended more adequate funds for the Antitrust Division and the Federal Trade Commission, legislation against patent monopolies, registration of trade associations, control of corporate mergers, more stringent civil penalties for the violation of the antitrust laws, and authority for the Federal Trade Commission

to serve as master in chancery in antitrust proceedings. Although these recommendations were made almost 5 years ago, none of them has been carried into effect. On the other hand, in all cases where it is impossible to prevent monopolistic practices and restraints of trade, we must develop methods of public control that will adequately protect the public interest.

We must promote the peacetime uses of atomic energy and, in general, stimulate research and technological development.

We must eliminate discriminatory freight rates, promote the industrial development of the under-developed areas of our country, and help spread our population over the thinly settled areas.

We must liberalize the lending operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and establish a banking and credit structure that will really help small business and all truly competitive enterprises.

We must provide more direct incentives for the utilization of Government plants by small independent business enterprises, and under no circumstances allow such plants to be disposed of to an unregulated private monopoly

During the war, all attempts to establish a coordinated Government procurement system under civilian control were frustrated by Army and Navy claims that any change in the procurement set-up would impede the war effort. Since peacetime procurement will still have an important effect on our postwar economy, we much achieve the complete coordination, under civilian control, of the activities of all Government purchasing agencies.

Labor and working conditions: In the field of labor and working conditions, the essential task is to defend labor's right to bargain collectively and to strike. Compulsory arbitration or Government wage-fixing should be avoided, since they do not comport with our democratic system.

At the same time, the Government must clearly recognize the need for increases in purchasing power if our capacity to consume is to catch up with—and keep in line with—our capacity to produce. All facts relevant to wage disputes should be collected and analyzed on a current basis—not merely when a strike situation develops.

In addition, it is essential to press forward to obtain approval of pending legislation to improve the minimum-wage and Government-salary structure, prevent discrimination in employment or in wages, and improve our facilities for conciliation and voluntary arbitration. We should obtain action on the long-postponed study of annual wage systems, and the long-delayed reorganization and strengthening of the Department of Labor. Finally, another attempt should be made to obtain enactment of legislation to outlaw oppressive labor practices, as proposed by the La Follette Civil Liberties Committee, and as passed by the Senate in 1940.

Agriculture: The Government, as yet, has no postwar program to offer the American farmer. Its present activities in agriculture are based upon a wartime expansion program now in the process of liquidation and a prewar program aimed at restricting farm production and adjusting American agriculture to the exigencies of world depression.

To have full employment we must develop an agricultural program aimed at the maintenance of farm income; support for farm prices should be subordinated to this objective. This calls for regional and commodity programs for the improvement of the present use of agricultural resources—along the lines of the cotton conversion program currently proposed by the Department of Agriculture. It also calls for crop insurance, assistance both for farm purchase and tenant farming, greatly expanded public works and public services in all agricultural areas, and a United Nations program to use unabsorbed farm production in raising nutritional standards throughout the world.

Construction and capital investment: At present, much worth-while activity is in process with respect to roads, airports, and flood control, and action can soon be expected on a program of hospital construction. But these activities, excellent as they are, need amplification.

The pending proposals on the Missouri Valley Authority, the St. Lawrence Waterway, and the Columbia River Authority open up many new frontiers for enterprise and expansion. They should be supplemented with similar proposals for other areas.

In the field of housing, the pending general housing legislation proposed by Senators WAGNER, ELLENDER, and TAFT represents a historic and statesmanlike approach to one of the most important problems of our time. With an expansion of the public-housing features and a further liberalization of the FHA provisions, this legislation would serve to meet America's total need for housing of all types.

Above all, we need a coordinated approach to the problem of stabilizing construction and capital investment. This would call for the formulation of long-range and short-range estimates of the need for capital investment of all types, advance planning of all Federal construction and cooperation with States, local governments and private enterprise in planning non-Federal capital investment. My construction-industry bill, developed as a result of hearings before the Senate Small Business Committee and currently being revised on the basis of discussion with experts in the field, is aimed at this objective.

Social services and welfare: The existing social-security program is out of date. Coverage should be extended to include the many groups that are now excluded. The old-age and survivors' insurance should guarantee an adequate income for the aged. We need substantial liberalization and broadening of unemployment compensation and public assistance. We need a real health program, as proposed in the new Wagner-Murray-Dingel bill.

In the field of education current proposals for Federal aid are too narrow in concept. We need a long-range program of Federal aid to equalize and expand educational opportunities at all levels and to include programs for handicapped children, youth work, vocational education, physical fitness, school lunches, libraries, community centers, summer camps, nonmilitary education in the armed services, and the expansion of educational buildings and equipment.

Finally the Federal Security Agency should be converted into a Department of Welfare and Security under the direction of a Cabinet officer.

Foreign economic relations: The American economy is merely one unit—though perhaps the most important one—in the world economy. During the past year we have made considerable progress with respect to international currency stabilization, loans and relief and rehabilitation. But we have not yet formulated a clear-cut policy of assisting in the economic development of underdeveloped areas of the world, which represent the great potential markets for our products. Our program on the reduction of tariffs and the negotiation of trade agreements must be supplemented by a realistic approach to the problem of those domestic industries that will necessarily be curtailed by the liberalization of trade among nations.

Above all, we must transcend the narrow approach to foreign trade in terms of mere trade barriers. The key factor in the exchange of goods and services among nations is the consuming power of each country—and this depends upon the levels of employment and income. The currently projected world trade conference must include not only the problem of trade barriers, but that of full-employment policy. Each of the United Nations should agree to maintain full employment within its own borders in a manner consistent with its own traditions, and without resort to the exportation of unemployment.

Taxation and fiscal policy: The present trend of tax policy is toward the stimulation of an uncontrolled and short-lived boom in business investment. As part of a full employment program, we need tax legislation that: (a) is directed at increasing consumption; (b) sets forth basic long-range policies, rather than being limited to the next fiscal year; and (c) is phrased in terms that any intelligent layman can understand. In drafting such legislation, careful consideration must be given to taxation of undistributed corporate profits, the elimination of tax-exempt securities, an all-out campaign against the large tax evaders, special concessions for independent small business enterprise and the financing of our social security system through the regular tax structure rather than the regressive pay-roll and wage tax.

In recent years there has been increasing acceptance of the idea that fiscal policy should be used to help iron out the fluctuations in the business cycle and that a balanced budget cannot be hoped for except over a reasonable period of years. However, we still have a long way to go in educating the people to the fact that a balance between our capacity to produce and our capacity to consume is far more important than any balance between Federal expenditures and Federal revenues. In fact, a long-range balance in the Federal budget can be obtained only if: (a) We have sustained full employment based upon a greatly improved distribution of the national income; (b) we set a period of years that is long enough to embrace both the up-swing and down-swing in business investment; and (c) we have a long-range economic program to cover this entire period.

With service on the national debt such an important part of the economic picture, the interest rate at which the Government borrows its money should be reduced. It will not be enough to maintain low interest rates in general. Methods can be developed of borrowing through the Federal Reserve System at little or no net cost to the Government.

Finally, a special commission should be established to try to obtain coordination between the Government's fiscal policy and that of our States and local governments.

Government organization: It has often been said that Congress is a body without a head. It might be added, I presume, that the executive branch is a head without an adequate brain. Both branches need fundamental reorganization.

In the near future the La Follette Committee on the Organization of Congress will submit its report. This should be the signal for aggressive action to rejuvenate the organs of party leadership in the Senate and House of Representatives, establish a coordinated pattern of committee action, and provide additional staff assistance both to the committees and Members of Congress.

Without waiting for any formal reorganization, however, it is essential that each House be asked to debate and vote upon a joint resolution expressing acceptance, modification, or rejection of the general program submitted to Congress by the President at the beginning of every session. Only in this way can Members of Congress be impelled to come to grips with the problems of our economy as a whole.

In the executive branch there has recently been a healthy trend toward increasing departmental responsibilities. This should be accelerated by reexamining the status of the so-called independent commissions. The executive branch can have no consistent and

carefully planned economic program if such commissions remain a law unto themselves and constitute a fourth branch of the Federal Government.

We must be particularly wary of any attempts to put Federal funds or Federal power into the hands of special interests—as proposed in the May-Johnson bill on atomic energy, one of the pending research bills, and the hospital-construction bill recently passed by the Senate.

Above all, we must establish within the executive branch a realistic approach to economic planning. Planning bodies, set off in an ivory tower, apart from the main stream of decision and action, should be avoided. The development of a full-employment program must be the direct responsibility of the President; the staff work must be done in the Executive Office of the President and be closely associated with the planning of agency budgets. In order to decentralize the operation, planning offices should be established in all the departments and agencies. A formal structure of interdepartmental committees should be used to help develop programs that cut across agency lines.

THE TASK AHEAD

Since our task today is to make a new and fresh approach to America's problems, it is only natural that major emphasis be given to legislation. Only when our new legislation is adopted can the emphasis shift more toward the development of sound administrative policies.

While there are many legislative proposals now pending before Congress which can serve as essential elements in a full-employment program, there is still a broad area of legislative action for full employment in which no adequate bills have been presented to the Seventy-ninth Congress. Here are but a few of the fields in which new legislation is needed: Monopoly and competition, freight rates, loans to business, Government procurement, elimination of oppressive labor practices, basic agricultural policy, river-valley development, aid to education, veterans' benefits, a department of welfare and security, economic statistics, tax policy, and congressional reorganization.

Of course, there are some who point to the black record of the first session of this Congress and throw up their hands in despair. "Look at what has happened to the President's recommendations in his September message to Congress," they say. "If we can't get congressional approval for improved unemployment compensation, a permanent FEPC, and a Missouri Valley Authority, why worry about thinking up additional proposals to be buried in committee or defeated on the floor?"

The answer to this question is manyfold. We need a truly comprehensive program if the support of independent businessmen, professional people, farmers, labor, and all thoughtful citizens is to be enlisted in the campaign for full employment. We need a truly complete program if we are really to plan ahead to meet the needs of our vast and complex economy—instead of having to ring an intellectual fire alarm whenever a new crisis develops. We need a program as broad as a party platform if the issues involved in the fight for full employment are to be brought to the people at every election. If we are to oppose effectively those reactionary forces in America which are opposed to full employment, we must learn the strategy of total warfare and campaign on many fronts at the same time. Above all, our full-employment program must not be limited to what political strategists predict will be acceptable to the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Never before in the history of our country has there been an articulate drive to maintain employment opportunities for all who are willing and able to work—as distinguished from merely trying to provide relief in time of depression. There is still a vast need for public education on all the issues that are involved. There is a great war to be won—the war against depression and poverty. If we are to win it, we must not be afraid of losing some of the battles. The fight for full employment has just begun.

Letter to Secretary of War Emphasizing Danger of American Soldiers Being Embroiled in British India Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 28, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter to Secretary of War emphasizing danger of American soldiers being embroiled in British India politics:

JANUARY 28, 1946.

Hon. ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Maj. Gen. Edward P. Witsell has indicated that the number of American troops remaining in the India-Burma theater has been reduced to 55,000 as of January 1, 1946, and that this strength will be further reduced to 4,000 troops by July 1, 1946, and that all of these soldiers will be engaged in guarding surplus property or in providing services and supplies for those who are so doing.

All these soldiers have been given specific instructions not to become involved in internal controversies, but their very presence there during these parlous times is bound to involve them in great difficulties.

The independence movement in India is growing stronger and stronger. Each day the bitterness against the British Raj and its rulers is being emphasized and underscored by political disturbances, particularly where elections are being held or are about to be held. Elections for five provincial legislatures will take place during this month and the results will be known some time early in February, while the elections to the other six provinces will take place during the months of February and March and the results will be known in April.

It is the unanimous opinion of those in the position to know that if the British do not make a new settlement in India whereby their power is transferred to the chosen representatives of India, there will be widespread disorders all over India. If Britain continues her rule in India, on one pretext or another, the resentment against the British will result in intense civil strife and violence. When these widespread disorders break out, the American troops are bound to be involved as they were in Calcutta. The Calcutta demonstrations were against the British and not against the Americans, but mobs do not distinguish the British from the American soldiers.

Danger confronts our American boys. They may have to fight back in self-defense and use their arms against Indians who are fighting for their freedom. The repercussions will be tragic, more so, since they could have been prevented by the removal of these troops. Whether we wish it or not, the British will make effective use of our troops.

I have before me a letter which is a typical one from a GI stationed in India. He speaks of heavy concentration of troops in India where the British anticipate real trouble. He says our troops have been issued rifles and 50 rounds of live ammunition per man. They have drill and target practice every Sunday. Some of these soldiers say they will accept the rifles, but will refuse to shoot down innocent Indians. In all this we find the prevailing danger signals of real trouble for our troops if they are not removed from that theater.

These men likewise inform me that the British have not even started any full-stage redeployment. The British, they say, plan to crush any planned revolt and will not hesitate to use any American troops for this purpose, either directly or indirectly.

Our lads are worth more than any surplus property. In my humble estimation, the British should be held accountable for this surplus property and should be in duty bound to guard it.

Frankly, the excuse of the protection of surplus property is no longer valid for the keeping of a single American soldier in India. Those boys should be brought home forthwith, and special ships should be utilized for this purpose.

Very truly yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

Behind the Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 28, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, with millions of dollars being lost by striking employees; with industry unable to turn out the hundreds of items for which eager customers are waiting; with, in fact, the whole reconversion program which had started out so well and which had made such rapid progress stalled, many are searching for the real reason back of the present labor disputes and strikes.

Are these strikes due in part to the fact that during the war employees worked long hours, and, when the conflict was over, just wanted a vacation or a rest? Certainly, industry which can make neither improvements, extensions, carry on research nor make a profit during a strike, can gain no advantage through a closed plant.

Was the seed which was then being sown and the harvest which would follow accurately described and truthfully prophesied in Senate Document No. 14 of the Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, compiled under the direction of John L. Lewis, then president of the United Mine Workers of America?

In that document appear the following statements:

Imported revolution is knocking at the door of the United Mine Workers of America and of the American people. The seizure of this union is being attempted as the first step in the realization of a thoroughly organized program of the agencies and forces behind the Communist International at Moscow for the conquest of the American continent.

The overthrow and destruction of this Government, with the establishment of an absolute and arbitrary dictatorship, and the elimination of all forms of popular voice in governmental affairs, is being attempted on a more gigantic scale, with more resolute purpose, and with more crafty design than at any time in the history of this Nation.

The movement is aimed not only at the labor unions but at the entire industrial, social, and political structure of the country, and with the single aim of eventually establishing a Soviet dictatorship in the United States.

In 1930, a committee of the House of Representatives, Hamilton Fish, Congressman from New York, chairman, made an investigation into the activities of the Communists, and filed House Report No. 2290, which is well worth reading.

Congressman Fish, on many subsequent occasions, pointed to some of the activities of the Communists who were boring from within. Today, Congressman Fish issued a statement which calls attention to some of the facts which may aid in disclosing one of the reasons for the present widespread industrial disputes. His remarks are as follows:

A FIELD DAY FOR THE COMMUNISTS—A WARNING TO THE LOYAL 90 PERCENT CIO STRIKERS

(By Hamilton Fish, Member of Congress 1920–44)

The merits or demerits of the prevailing strikes will be presented fully by the management and by officials of the unions. That is their responsibility to the public, not mine. My remarks should not be construed as a criticism of the CIO strike situation. They are meant as a warning to loyal CIO members against the seditious and sinister purposes of the Communist agitators within their organization.

I propose to discuss merely one phase of the current strikes, the use that will be made of them by Communists within and without the CIO to incite class hatred, undermine private property and free enterprise, and create a revolutionary spirit among the workers. I predict that these strikes are forerunners of more violent ones to follow within the next 4 or 5 years. They are merely dress rehearsals for revolutionary strikes that will be set in motion as the Communists reach out and control more industrial unions, particularly transportation, communication, and heavy industries. In this article, I shall not name individuals with communistic records, but am prepared to do so if necessary.

Most of the strikers are loyal and patriotic Americans who have a natural and laudable desire to better their own economic conditions. As one who believes in collective bargaining and the inherent right of American wage earners to strike, I urge all employees who are now on strike or who may go on strike in the future to beware of Communist propaganda and Red labor leaders who will seize this opportunity to spread subversive and un-American doctrines among strike weary Americans.

It is well known that Communist agitators hold important positions in certain powerful unions now on strike. They are well organized, well led, articulate, and motivated by fanatical frenzy. They have been and still are infiltrating into all industrial unions that will have them.

The modern-day Communists are not to be envisioned as long-haired radicals or heavy-bearded revolutionists plotting behind bolted doors in some dark and secluded cellar. Nor are they to be regarded as radical and harmless crackpots without purpose or plan.

The Communist leaders in the CIO and PAC are largely the intellectual or the intelligencia type, serious, well educated, resourceful, and fanatical in their devotion to communism. They are often not even skilled laborers, but excel rather as paid union organizers and union secretaries, treasurers, and officials.

They are a force that has to be reckoned with in the CIO and particularly in the Sidney Hillman dominated PAC. Any American that shuts his eyes and ears to the communistic control of the PAC should have his brain examined.

It is well known in labor circles and by those families with Communist tactics that the Communist organizational network is strongly entrenched in the CIO and in its political affiliate, the PAC. These two organizations have increased communistic influence politically and financially beyond the fondest expectations of the Communist leaders in America. The CIO, which is directing the steel, General Motors, and electrical strikes, is honeycombed with paid Communist organizers and officials. Thousands of Communist Party members, taking orders direct from the party, are today in the CIO and its affiliate organizations. Some openly admit that they are Communists, others conceal their party membership, and still others parade around as non-Communists but all the time are serving the interests of the Communists Party in important labor quarters.

The dual hypocritical system of deceit and duplicity has been carefully built up to accomplish Communist objectives which the party could never accomplish by itself. This chameleonlike system is so stealthily operated that it deceives and hoodwinks many innocent people, both within and without the ranks of labor, who are inspired by idealistic sentiments. Ninety percent of the CIO members are not Communists. The 10 percent, however, form a solid, aggressive bloc, and have a powerful influence through skillful and determined leadership. The Communist element, on account of their unity in the CIO and PAC, wield a disproportionate influence in shaping their policies and promoting Communist ideology.

The growth of the communistic influence in the CIO is understandable because Communists have concentrated their energy and strength to achieve a large measure of control in both the CIO and PAC which accepts them as members and paid officials. The more important positions they hold, the easier to set up a patronage machine to take care of deserving Communists and provide them with paid jobs as organizers. Thus the Red network spreads.

There is no such person as an American Communist. All Communists in America are pledged to uphold and defend Soviet Russia. It is a misnomer to call them American Communists. They should be called Russian Communists, or International Communists. There is no possible compromise between Americanism and communism. The peace-loving, law-abiding, patriotic average American citizen knows almost nothing of this conspiracy in our midst. Yet night and day Communist conspirators are plotting in labor circles and urging the necessity of accomplishing the Communist revolution by militant and revolutionary methods.

The three largest CIO unions, steel, automobile, and electrical workers are on strike at the same time, totaling over 1,000,000 wage earners.

It is a tragedy for everyone except the Communists who are enjoying a field day. Mass strikes, mass demonstrations, mass suffering and mass paralysis in the critical reconversion period warm the hearts and delight the subversive minds of the Communists at home and in Russia. This is their opportunity to foment hatred and disorders and to denounce free enterprise and private ownership of property.

The steel strike is the most serious, as it will affect at least 10,000,000 workers in factories dependent on weekly steel shipments for production of numerous types of equipment. Most of these factories will have to shut down in 60 days if the strike is not settled by that time. It could paralyze one-third or more of American industry. If this situation should develop, the red hand of communism may come out into the open. There are numerous CIO Communist supporters who have been patiently waiting their day in the sunlight and whose main object is to destroy private enterprise, build a workers unity or a mass front and promote communism. The stark fact is that Communist strike tactics are not for immediate benefit of the strikers but to train leaders for the future revolutionary conflict. The Communist Party plan of campaign disavows democratic methods and seeks to sovietize America by direct action. It prepares its members to be ready for the revolutionary seizure of governmental power when a favorable opportunity occurs. Strikes controlled by Communists could become exceedingly dangerous and violent weapons and cause Nation-wide economic paralysis.

We must not forget that the Communists owe their first allegiance to the doctrines and ideas emanating from Moscow and will stop at nothing to carry them out. The Communists will seek to use the economic power of the CIO for communistic purposes and to turn strikes into revolutionary channels. The next radical step when the next economic depression sweeps America will be to urge the strikers to establish Soviets, take power in their own hands and if feasible to attempt to overthrow the Government.

I am not an alarmist but still believe in the old adage that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance. There is nothing I would not do to help preserve American freedom and our republican form of government and the civil rights guaranteed by the Constitution to all the American people. We are too complacent and too assured of our own security, on the basis it cannot happen here. I do not believe it will unless there is a complete economic break-down, which I do not anticipate for 5 years. All the Red termites are working furiously in their undercover assignments, fanning the flame of class warfare as a result of the strikes, yet I have faith in the strikers and the American people that they will not follow or be deceived by Communist treachery and treason. Former Attorney General Francis Biddle in his findings of fact in the Harry Bridges deportation on May 28, 1942, held that the Communist Party of the United States of America from the time of its inception in 1919 to the present time, is an organization that believes in, advises, advocates, and teaches the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States.

The Communists want to organize one big industrial union of workers which could paralyze the Nation. Then with Communist cadres stationed in local unions they would be in a position to terrorize large cities.

The following orders or directions, are interesting and instructive as regards Communist revolutionary tactics and plans, and are only a small pattern of them. The wording of these directives is certainly consistent with Communist aims and objectives. Every city police force, and all National Guard and Regular Army officers should be obliged to study these revolutionary orders and be prepared with a definite plan of campaign to counteract them in any emergency, day or night. It is obvious that control of communications, radio, telegraph, telephone and the transportation of newspapers are vital to such subversive plans as well as control of airfields, armories, waterworks, electricity and transportation, including trucks, streetcars, subways, and shipping.

The following are a few extracts from Communist underground operational directives in the New York City area (30-mile radius) as published in the original source system of the Federated Libraries, Inc., of Salt Lake City, Utah:

First action: Cripple all communication systems. Execute this action in the following order unless it is possible to work all simultaneously: Telephone, radio, telegraph, cable.

Section action: Cripple all air forces, public and private.

Third action: Block off and prevent the use of all bridges and ferries.

Fourth action: Shut off all electric power for use of all transit lines, subways, surface and elevated. Cut off all electric power for buildings, shops, streets, private and public buildings. Cut off all steam for public and private heat and power.

Fifth action: At this time all DL's (district leaders) must have special units ready to take over all armories, ammunition and military stores upon signal (United States forts excepted at time).

Sixth action: Only if it becomes necessary to create further terror to render the people more helpless, shut off all water in following order: shops, public buildings, private supply. Smoke bombs properly located in subways, buildings, large stores will prove of great service in stepping up the terror of the people. Large fires in old buildings will advance the panic. Sharpshooters and snipers will be detailed in taxicabs and vehicles to wipe out police and opposition.

The Need for New Labor Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1946

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following extract from the address of Donald R. Richberg entitled "The Need for New Labor Law," at the luncheon of Sales Executives Club, Hotel Roosevelt, New York City, January 15, 1946:

There is no effective program of industrial peace which will be supported today by the most conspicuous leaders of organized labor; and business managers are so divided and confused that they have no accepted program. But the American people in overwhelming numbers, including a large majority of labor unionists, want the Congress to pass a law that will end, or at least minimize, industrial warfare.

The active opposition comes mainly from leaders of labor and management who are hoping that they can win a few big battles and then dictate the terms of peace. Every proposal to lay down arms and give conciliatory methods a chance is met with abusive or plausible criticisms which spring from a basic desire to keep on fighting.

Business managers are confused and exasperated by a multitude of governmental regulations, partly required by wartime necessities, partly needed by the peacetime complexities of an industrial civilization, and partly imposed by the pressures of ardent reformers and special interest groups. They are resentful of the many abuses of organized labor power. They are distrustful of politicians who regard their favoritism for organized labor as proof of their liberalism—and as an insurance of votes in elections.

There is one saving grace among industrial leaders. In the mass, they do recognize their ultimate interest in the impartial writing and administration of law; and they do believe in a free, competitive economy, even though as individuals they frequently seek political favors and yield to the temptations of monopolistic power.

Labor leaders are generally suffering from the delusions of rapidly swollen authority gained by political influence, by a special immunity from legal restraints, and by the command of organized force and violence which a sympathetic public permitted them to acquire and exercise in the days when unorganized, helpless wage earners were the common victims of injustice.

The greatest weakness of these labor leaders is their hostility to impartial government. They feel that they are still entitled to an unfair deal; to be petted and favored as the representatives of a specially deserving and unfortunate class of people. With shortsighted selfishness they are trying to create an economic system in which all wage earners would be compelled to join unions and to accept the fixation of wages and distribution of jobs under the monopoly control of labor politicians. Their success would end a free, competitive economy and produce some form of state socialism as the inevitable outgrowth of the labor dictatorship which they are seeking to establish. Some of them know this. Most of the others don't know what they are doing, or don't care.

Our Government is still democratic in its representation of the unregimented masses of the people. But if the warfare between labor and management is permitted to spread, everyone will be compelled eventually to take sides under class conscious leaders of either labor or management who are strong enough to swing national power and wise enough to accept the responsibility for the general welfare that must go with the power to prosper or to ruin the Nation. But a government by any class would be destructive of political and economic freedom.

It is the balances of power between industry and agriculture, between manufacturer and merchant, between producer and consumer, between financier and borrower, between transporter and shipper—and everywhere between management and labor—that are necessary to preserve democracy and free enterprise. Any power that grows into an ability to dictate to the rest of the people must be cut down. It must be destroyed before it grows too great to be destroyed without a civil war.

As a free people we can no more permit organized labor to dictate terms to management and to regulate management, than we could permit management to dictate terms to labor and to regulate labor organizations. That is why the lawless and ever-growing power to strike must be cut down.

The spectacle of several hundred thousand men launching an industrial war today should warn us that tomorrow several million men may deliberately paralyze the Nation's energies. When an irresponsible labor boss today can stop the fuel, transportation, telephone, and telegraph service of great cities, we should realize that tomorrow the entire Nation may be denied the necessities of life. The sight of thousands of pickets marching today around a beleagured plant should warn us that tomorrow hundreds of thousands of such willful lawbreakers will also be trampling the Constitution and Bill of Rights under their feet.

The spectacle of a labor bloc in Congress today cringing under the whips of labor lobbyists should warn us that tomorrow a majority of the Congress may be whipped into line to pass laws to establish a labor domination—and that subservient administrators and courts may be forcing the free men of America again to revolt against such a tyrannical Government, and again to fight for their liberties. It would be wiser to fight labor sluggers in the streets today than to wait to have our offices and homes invaded by official thugs tomorrow.

What is the way to stop this rising flood of legalized force and violence that, if unchecked, will sweep away our liberties? The way is just as plain to see as the highway from the Department of Justice up Constitution Avenue to the Capitol. What is needed is not a law to forbid strikes, but a law to make strikes unnecessary, a law establishing processes of justice for the settlement of economic conflicts, and a law that sternly requires all those engaged in labor disputes to exhaust all peaceful ways and means to settle them before undertaking to make war on each other.

The overwhelming number of labor disputes can and should be settled by negotiation, or with the aid of mediation, or by voluntary arbitration. If these efforts fail and the public is not to be seriously injured, then the resort to a strike or lock-out may be justifiable or at least tolerable. Perhaps it is necessary, when the public injury may be slight, to permit irreconcilable opponents to resort to a test of strength in order to preserve that sense of democratic freedom which makes men tolerant of the difficulties and losses caused by democratic methods. But the freedom to strike should not be forged into as a license to break the laws. A lawless strike is an unlawful strike which should be broken by public authority. When the public police power yields to private force, the Government becomes unworthy of respect.

There are, however, two classes of labor disputes in which peaceful efforts should not end with the failure of negotiations. These are disputes where a stoppage of production will seriously affect the public interest.

In these cases the parties to an unsettled dispute should be required to refrain from any aggressive action until an impartial Government commission has had an opportunity to investigate the controversy, to hear the evidence and arguments of all parties, and to make public recommendations for a settlement. The experience of 20 years under the Railway Labor Act has proved that this procedure will bring about a peaceful end to most stubborn and difficult labor disputes.

This is not a compulsory arbitration, because the recommendations of such a commission would not ordinarily be made enforceable.

But there is a comparatively small class of disputes wherein it may be necessary to require the parties to accept the recommendations of a Presidential commission. These are disputes where a stoppage of work will inflict intolerable injury on an entire community or the Nation. Compulsory arbitrations and enforceable decisions have been made necessary in such cases because of two recent developments.

First, the expansion of labor organizations to the point where the number of employees who can strike in a body is so great that such labor organizations now have the power to paralyze vital public services and to bring grave suffering to a multitude of wholly innocent and helpless people.

Second, with the increased power of labor organizations and the absence of any legal responsibility for the misuse of such power, we have seen, with increasing frequency, reckless and devastating attacks upon the people and their Government through strikes which had to be stopped quickly by some public official to save the public from incalculable and unbearable distress and hardship.

We have seen repeatedly that a mayor or a governor, or the President was forced to use a doubtful executive power to compel the end of such a strike. It is an evil thing for the workers, for employers, and for the general public to have such economic conflicts settled by arbitrary executive action. Yet it would be worse for all concerned to have such strikes continue. Governor Dewey in New York had to stop a costly strike of building-service employees. Governor Kelly in Michigan had to stop a strike of public utility employees. President Truman had to stop dangerous strikes by seizing the properties of oil companies and of a local transportation company in the city of Washington.

In such an intolerable situation, some outside force must be employed to settle the terms under which labor and management,

which have undertaken to render a vital service, will continue to work together.

It is an underlying principle of our democratic, constitutional government that when private controversies must be settled by public authority they shall be submitted to a judicial tribunal which, after public hearings, will issue an enforceable decision. That is the principle which should be written into our Federal labor law.

It is not worth while to take your time today discussing the details of a Federal labor law that would preserve industrial peace. You might be convinced that my program is a good one. But tomorrow you might be persuaded that some other plan would be better and that mine had serious flaws. Eventually you will look to your representatives in Congress to solve the details of this problem for you.

But you can make up your minds today as to whether new labor law is needed and what kind of a law should be written. If you understand how destructive industrial warfare is to the interests of all the workers, all the businessmen, and all the consumers, and if you understand that it is the primary duty of government to preserve peace and good order, you know already that new labor law is urgently needed in the United States.

You should also know, or be able to learn very quickly, that the only way in which government can preserve domestic peace and good order is to establish peaceful methods for the just settlement of conflicts of interest between its citizens, and to require its citizens to use those methods instead of fighting one another. If you know these few things, then it should not take much time to explain what kind of new labor law should be written promptly into the statutes of the United States.

I am not trying today to persuade you that the HBB bill should be enacted by the Congress just as written, or that every provision in it should be supported. But I do think you should be easily persuaded that such a new labor law is sorely needed. Unrestrained labor warfare is bringing untold suffering and incalculable losses to the American people. It is destroying economic security, undermining Government authority, and sowing broadcast the seeds of civil war. It is a national disgrace. It shames us before the world in the very hour of a world-wide triumph of the strength and courage of the American people.

Yet, when public-spirited men, public officials, and private citizens strive to reestablish domestic peace with justice under the law, the leaders of this vicious labor warfare spit out their venom like angry snakes. They even have the arrogance to charge the President of the United States with "abject cowardice" because he has the courage to disregard their frowning displeasure.

Upon what meat have Murray, Green, and Lewis fed that they have grown so great? They are not even elected by the workers whom they claim to represent. They are chosen by delegates to conventions who are the product of boss-ridden political labor machines.

Public officers, however nominated, must be elected by the people. But these labor politicians have no such certificate of authority. They are only national bosses picked by the local bosses of half-free, half-enslaved organizations. These so-called leaders can't even maintain a volunteer army. They have to force employers to compel the workers to enlist and pay union dues—so they will be able to make war on the public with an imposing but largely conscript army.

That is why every secret poll taken of union workers shows that a large majority of them want strikes prevented. They don't want to fight and suffer in a conscript army to maintain the power and glory of the Murrays, the Greens, and the Lewises, who misrepresent them and lead them into wars in which everyone but the labor politicians and racketeers suffer irreparable losses.

For 60 years Presidents of the United States have been recommending Federal laws that would bring about the peaceful settlement of labor disputes by negotiation, mediation, voluntary arbitration, and through the recommendations of fact-finding commissions. From the days when President Cleveland proclaimed the leaders of riotous mobs of workers to be "public enemies" there has been a growing need and a growing demand to establish the supremacy of the public interest and the public law over the private interests and private laws of labor unions.

Without calling the roll and reading the long record, I will summarize it in the words of Franklin D. Roosevelt, who did more to strengthen labor organization than all the so-called labor leaders of today, and who said: "Every President of the United States in this generation has been faced by the fact that when labor relations are strained to a breaking point there remains but one high court of conciliation—the Government of the United States."

What kind of citizens are these who are unwilling to give to this high court, unwilling to give to their Government, the power to preserve domestic peace and security, the power to defend civil rights against organized mobs, the power to destroy conspiracies that deprive masses of people of the necessities of life, the power to break up the triple alliance of labor dictators, criminal gangsters, and alien revolutionaries?

It matters not whether those who are unwilling to give their Government the power to preserve industrial peace are labor leaders who regard themselves as defenders of the common people or industrial leaders who think they are the ordained defenders of free enterprise. It matters little whether these obstructionists are well-intentioned and ignorant or evil-minded and cunning. They cry out against Government compulsions but they are themselves advocates of a rule of private force instead of a rule of reason. All those who insist on using organized force to advance their selfish interests should be recognized as public enemies in an interdependent society which cannot prosper or even survive except through the ever-closer and more willing cooperation of all its members.

Nothing proves more clearly the need for new labor law than the opposition of these public enemies. They show themselves to be the enemies of labor and the enemies of business when they try to mislead workers and businessmen against a well-tried program of industrial peace which true friends of labor and of business management are advancing in order that labor and management together may seek and gain economic justice without suffering the losses and hardships of industrial warfare which a civilized society should have outlawed long ago.

Hope for Our Disabled Millions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1946

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the New York Times magazine yesterday a very interesting article by Dr. Howard A. Rusk, of St. Louis, former Chief of the Convalescent Services Division, Office of the Air Surgeon of the Army.

While in the service Dr. Rusk initiated and built up the most outstanding rehabilitation program of any Government agency. As a result of his experience, Dr. Rusk, who was one of the leaders of the medical profession prior to the war, did not return to his private practice but joined the Baruch Committee on Physical Medicine. Statistics show, according to the article, for every disabled soldier there are five disabled civilians—250,000 veterans, 1,250,000 civilians. Dr. Rusk maintains these civilians can be rehabilitated if we apply the same methods we use in restoring handicapped veterans. Knowing Dr. Rusk as I do, as well as his accomplishments, I am sure he is right.

Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me, I include the article as part of my remarks.

It follows:

It is paradoxical that out of the destruction and suffering of war may come opportunity and hope for millions. Today public attention is focused on the young men of America who are returning from the war disabled and handicapped. They number in the thousands. Yet few Americans realize that in this country prior to the onset of World War II there were in our Nation some 23,000,000 persons handicapped to some extent by disease, accident, maladjustment, or former wars. Few know that each year there are some 350,000 individuals permanently disabled by accident alone.

We had in 1940 some six and one-half million disabled males between the ages of 15 and 64 years, men who normally would be income-producing. These six and a half million plus the number of disabled or handicapped veterans being discharged from our military hospitals will give us, when demobilization is completed, approximately 8,000,000 working-age males who are disabled to the extent of requiring physical or vocational rehabilitation or special placement aids if they are to be successfully employed. This represents 1 person in 16 in our general population and 1 in 7 in our male working population.

Much has been written about the splendid work being done in our military and veterans' hospitals. We see and hear of the spectacular advances which have been made in the fields of physical, emotional, and vocational rehabilitation. Even a cursory study, however, will show that only a small segment of our civilian handicapped are receiving these advantages.

During the first 4 years of war there were approximately 17,000 amputations in the Army, but during this same period there were 120,000 major amputations from disease and accidents in our civilian population. Eleven thousand soldiers were wounded on the beaches of Normandy during the first 10 days after D-day, yet even with curtailed traffic, automobile accidents alone accounted for more than twice that many civilian casualties in the same 10 days.

The problem of the disabled and handicapped is not a new one. War has only focused our attention on it and quickened the necessity for its solution.

The alert citizen cannot fail to recognize the economic and social implications of the failure of our country to rehabilitate this substantial portion of our population to such a point that they can be self-sustaining, contributing members of their communities. The armed forces and some outstanding community and civilian agencies, such as New York's Institute for the Crippled and Disabled, have demonstrated that the physical and emotional rehabilitation of our handicapped and disabled is possible. The institute's staff with their 25 years of outstanding experience estimate that up to 97

percent of all our handicapped can be rehabilitated to such an extent that they can be gainfully employed.

The work of the National Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, operating under the Federal Security Agency, has shown how rehabilitation pays off economically. Of the 43,997 persons undergoing vocational rehabilitation under this agency in 1944, 22 percent, or more than 10,000, had never been gainfully employed and nearly 90 percent, or nearly 40,000, were not employed at the time they started their rehabilitation. The average annual wage of the entire group prior to rehabilitation was $148. After rehabilitation, the average annual wage of the group increased to $1,768. The total earnings of the entire group rose from $6,510,556 to $77,786,696.

Prior to rehabilitation the majority of these persons relied on general public assistance not only for the disabled individual but also for his family. The annual cost of this assistance to the taxpayer was from $300 to $500 per case, but the total cost of their rehabilitation averaged only $300 per case.

The short labor market during the war gave many disabled persons the first opportunity of their lives to take a place on the production line and prove that they could, with selective placement, produce on a par with the normal worker. An example is the Ford Motor Co. River Rouge plant, where more than 11,000 handicapped civilian workers were employed.

During the war 83 percent of our Nation's industries employed handicapped workers. Those industries report that among the handicapped there was a much smaller labor turn-over, less absenteeism, fewer accidents, and equal or higher production rates. Many employers, before this vast experience with handicapped employees, had a fear of increased accident rates. The industrial accident rate of 87 of the great industrial plants in America, each having from 50 to 12,000 handicapped employees, has disproved that fallacy. Their reports show that 56 percent found the accident rate of the handicapped lower than that of the able-bodied; 42 percent found the rate the same as for the able-bodied; and only 2 percent stated it was higher.

A statement of policy of the Association of Casualty and Surety Executives, composed of 65 major insurance and surety companies, states explicitly that no higher rate for workmen's compensation insurance is charged because of employment of disabled workers.

George Barr, Chicago pharmaceutical and cosmetic manufacturer, produced more than $6,000,000 worth of materials in 1944 and a scratched finger was the most serious casualty among 130 disabled of 150 employees. These handicapped workers produced from 17 to 22 percent more per man-hour than the nonhandicapped workers of his subcontractors.

There is no secret to George Barr's success in using handicapped workers. He knows you don't need a safety campaign to sell a handicapped worker on the wisdom of protecting those physical assets he has left. Men on crutches stop, look, and listen. An amputee himself, Barr knows and makes full use of the law of adjustments that takes place in the capabilities of handicapped workers. He knows the loss of one sense leads to the sharpening of the other senses; that men with no legs develop more capable hands; that men without vision develop sensitive, nimble fingers. This is a compensatory law of nature.

Most individuals use less than 10 percent of their potential efficiencies in normal pursuits. It is only in emergencies that we call upon our tremendous reserves of physical power and ability. In many cases a worker's physical defect acts as a tremendous stimulus to overcompensation resulting in extraordinary physical ability. Adler developed a complete system of psychology on the basis of inferiority. He believed that the successful, the efficient, and the aggressive individual was one who was compensating for some inferiority. The employer of handicapped workmen is putting that psychology into purposeful and gainful application.

Foremen report that handicapped workers are frequently a steadying influence in their departments. Their jobs mean more to them than to the normal workers. They have had more difficulty in getting employment and they value the right to work.

The answer to utilization of handicapped workers lies not so much in "fitting the job to the worker" as in "fitting the worker to the job." Through this procedure the worker in reality becomes nonhandicapped as far as his particular job is concerned. It is not a matter of coddling but one of proper placement. The worker is fitted to the task and knows that a full day's work is expected of him.

When attempts are made to adapt the job to the individual worker his flexibility as a worker is decreased. This is not necessary for if sudden engineering changes occur his value to the firm is decreased disproportionately.

A survey completed in a number of Westinghouse Electric Co. plants disclosed that approximately 19 percent of the occupations could be performed satisfactorily by persons having only one leg, 17 percent by operators who must use crutches, 83 percent by men with only one eye, and 82 percent by the deaf. Although much work still needs to be done in analyzing the physical requirements of jobs and physical capacities of the worker, the United States Employment Service has developed adequate tools and techniques to meet the needs of the bulk of our handicapped population.

No degree of economic gain, however, can measure the social and moral satisfactions obtained by the successfully rehabilitated and employed handicapped worker and his family. Nor can it measure the value to society in the transformation of these individuals from dependents to productive self-reliant persons. With adequate rehabilitation a disabled person retains his self-respect and becomes self-supporting; industry saves pensions, labor saves valuable workmen; government has more taxpayers; relief rolls are reduced, and our democracy retains its economic levels.

Although it is certainly not true of industry in general, there have been some isolated cases where handicapped workers after having served an industry faithfully and efficiently during the war are now the first to be discharged. This shameful practice becomes even more ironic when we learn that some of these firms used the employment of the disabled not only as a medium of production but also as a method of favorable public relations during the war.

Many of the handicapped were able during the war to become self-supporting without adequate rehabilitation because of the shortage of manpower. Many employees adopted the attitude that any employee was better than no employee. But now that the labor market is loosening, the handicapped are finding it increasingly difficult not only to find but to hold jobs. In order to meet the competition in the job market, the disabled must be brought to the maximum point of rehabilitation.

The work of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation and its participating State rehabilitation programs has been growing steadily since it was established under the National Civilian Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1920. Its services were greatly expanded by amendments to the original law by Congress in 1943. Today under Public Law 113 the disabled civilian can obtain practically the same rehabilitation services as offered to the disabled veteran by the Veterans' Administration under Public Law 16 with the exception of pensions and subsidization of living expenses.

But when we consider the magnitude of the task before the Nation, the total number of disabled they have been able to rehabilitate is woefully small. The 43,000 persons rehabilitated under the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation program is by their own figures but one-twentieth of the number who need such service. These figures alone show the crying necessity for increasing the services of this agency.

The Federal and State vocational rehabilitation programs alone, however, cannot meet our rehabilitation needs. Although they have both the funds and the authority, they are handicapped themselves by the lack of training facilities to which they can refer their cases. These State vocational programs do not do the actual rehabilitation and retraining themselves but use existing public and private facilities such as schools, vocational training courses, and on-the-job training on a fee basis.

Medical, surgical, and diagnostic services are obtained by contract with groups, clinics, and private physicians. Hospital care is purchased from existing hospitals. The same is true in physical restoration, which may include any type of medical or allied services which will aid in eliminating or substantially reducing an individual's disability as an employment handicap. These include medical, surgical, and psychiatric services, physical and occupational therapy, hospitalization, dentistry, care in a convalescent or nursing home, drugs and supplies, and such prosthetic appliances as artificial limbs, braces, hearing aids, eyeglasses, and dentures.

The funds and the authority are available, but the facilities equipped for doing the actual job of rehabilitation are inadequate. Several national organizations are making efforts to stimulate public interest in rehabilitation by demonstrating to both the medical profession and the public what actually can be done by an integrated program of physical, mental, social, and vocational adjustment.

One of such groups is the Baruch Committee on Physical Medicine, which is translating the experience of the armed forces in rehabilitation into its civilian applications in order that this experience may be made available to communities planning centers. The Baruch committee members have pointed out that rehabilitation cannot be done by segments. If a man has a hearing disability, has lost a leg, or has a cardiac condition, his disability affects all phases of his life. It has a bearing on his vocational opportunities, his family and social life, his recreation, and his mental and emotional outlook. Individual disabilities cannot be treated in rehabilitation; the whole man must be treated.

Today there are a few specialized services to the handicapped doing excellent work in their limited fields. The number is so few that they can reach only a small fraction of those who need aid. Too many existing agencies, however, can treat only one segment of a patient's problem. They lack the effectiveness of a planned, integrated community center. Rather than a dozen small agencies each giving individual psychological assistance, occupational therapy, vocational training, or social service, aid to the deaf, the blind, the orthopedically handicapped, the patient with a speech defect, arrested tuberculosis, or the cardiac, there should be one large community center where all the necessary services could be integrated, thereby improving the quality and scope of service to the patient.

In many ways the rehabilitation services we now have are in the same position as the high schools of our country over a century ago. There was no national planning but merely a number of small private schools with inadequate staffs, physical plants, laboratories, libraries, and workshops. Only a small percentage of the population could

receive a high-school education and only a very small percentage could receive a good high-school education. Today our high schools with their extensive curricula, specialized departments, complete laboratories and shops and highly trained faculties can give every child in this country the type of education he deserves. The same opportunity must be brought to our handicapped. The facilities we have must be integrated and the entire program expanded.

The Baruch committee is currently engaged in outlining a plan for community rehabilitation centers that will furnish a complete service. They are blueprinting a model civilization center, outlining its mission, organization, components, physical set-up, and its relationship to the medical and allied professions, industry, labor, social and governmental agencies, and to the community as a whole. To be published in the near future, it will give communities a pattern representing the ideas and experiences of both the armed services and leading civilian institutions and organizations. The plan will be available to any interested group whether it be community, civic organization, or medical school.

Preventive medicine and curative medicine and surgery have made great advances. The third phase of medical care—rehabilitation—has been neglected. Comprehensive rehabilitation programs have been established in the armed forces. The Veterans' Administration is organizing a similar service. The disabled civilian in a democracy deserves the same opportunities.

The medical profession, Government and social agencies, insurance companies, industry and individual citizens must be made cognizant of the opportunities available in a well-planned program of rehabilitation. They must learn that with such a program many handicapped individuals can be transformed from dependents into self-respecting, self-supporting, contributing citizens. The dividends of rehabilitation are great in dollars, in social gain, and in the saving of human beings. The investment is one for the whole Nation.

The Churchill Vacation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 28, 1946

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I believe that the following editorial from the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel is particularly timely.

I am sure that my colleagues have noted the announcement that President Truman is planning a vacation to Florida. By a strange coincidence, the former Prime Minister of England, the illustrious Winston Churchill, who was able to accomplish so much for Great Britain through his friendship with our late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, also is sojourning in Florida, coming to the United States for a vacation instead of visiting any of the various vacation spots in the British Empire on which "the sun never sets."

The newspaper editorial asks a very pertinent question. It could be put in this manner: Could there by any chance be any connection between the visit of Mr. Churchill to sunny Florida, the announced vacation of a week or 10 days for our President on the eve of congressional consideration of the proposed $4,500,000,000 loan that the British are trying to borrow from us?

The editorial follows:

THE CHURCHILL VACATION

British statesmen of the Churchill bracket don't come to the United States just to rest, and so we may check off the story that His Majesty's ex-Prime Minister had come to these shores for a vacation as the usual diplomatic folderol.

Every time Mr. Churchill has come to America in the last few years it has cost us plenty. The reason is twofold: Mr. Churchill is one of the world's most apt salesmen; and Mr. Roosevelt had such a little bit of sales resistance, where the British were concerned.

It is doubtful whether Mr. Truman will be of any tougher fiber, when crossing swords with the brilliant coiner of such phrases as "blood, sweat, and tears," so it almost goes without saying that, in one way or another, Mr. Churchill's trip will cost us something this time, too.

What he may have in mind this time it's hard to say. Since the matter of a $4,000,000,000 gift to England is about to be considered by Congress, it may just be that the Socialists thought this a good time to send England's most famous good-will ambassador over to the American colony, to turn on his personality and let it shine hither and yon in Washington.

Or it may be that he wants to find out whether Mr. Truman has yet fully realized what went on at the recent Moscow Conference, and just how long he expects to keep knuckling down to the Russian dictator. Or, fearing eventual trouble with Russia over their clashing interests of Europe, Mr. Churchill may want to feel out Mr. Truman now, and get a commitment, as he did in his conversations with Mr. Roosevelt back in 1940.

Churchill is nothing if not a realist, and he realizes the importance of having relations in a good state of repair. He also realizes that the Socialist worm may turn in England, and his people may again look to conservatism for salvation.

In any case, he is an Englishman first and a conservative second, and anything he can do to help England he will consider his duty.

Political parties come and go, but, as Mr. Churchill himself would say, "There'll always be an England."

Billions for Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 28, 1946

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, now it is billions for Britain. What can we expect next? Is this to become a habit? Must the American taxpayer continue to loan money to Britain and to other foreign countries and potentates? Must we continue to support them and their foreign policies?

Before the Congress of the United States votes to make these gifts to Great Britain and to other foreign nations—before we give four billions to Britain—let us vote a few millions to construct and to equip a few more research laboratories where scientists will be enabled to work on the cause of cancer and infantile paralysis and other degenerative diseases, and thus make it possible to aid all mankind throughout the world by finding the cure for all these dread diseases.

It already appears that the British do not like the idea of a loan. While they have gone on record in favor of taking the money, they are not at all happy about the prospects of having to pay it back some day. They have expressed themselves in Parliament as not liking to pay for the use of the money. They think 2 percent is too much interest. They think the terms of the loan are too harsh. Their leaders in the British Parliament call us "Uncle Shylock, the money lender."

They borrowed a great deal of money from us during the First World War and after, but they have not paid back the loan. In those days they also called us Uncle Shylock. According to what they called us then and what they are saying about us now, what will they be calling us if we lend them four billions and then ask them to pay it back in 50 years?

If a man borrows money from his neighbor, he can be compelled to repay through the courts in case he neglects or refuses to pay his loan when it comes due. But if foreign nations refuse to repay a loan there is no way to compel payment. And in that case if we as a nation insist on repayment of a loan made in good faith, it means strained international relations, and possibly another war.

We insist on charging interest to every GI and to every farmer and every home owner who borrows from the Government. We insist that every American make full payment of every loan, together with interest. But we make deliberate gifts to foreign nations under the guise of a so-called loan. That is not fair to the American citizen nor to the American taxpayer.

If Congress votes to make a loan of billions for Great Britain, we must make similar loans of billions for Russia, billions for China, billions for France, and billions for Wilhelmina. While we are thinking of making all these billion dollar loans it is well that we recall the admonition of one of the founders of our country, Benjamin Franklin, who said "To loan money to a friend is to lose both our friend and our money."

Regulation, Yes; Regimentation, No

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 28, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the true objective of government—the only justification for its existence—is the protection of the liberty of the citizen, the creation of conditions which will promote his welfare and happiness. Be-

cause individual desires are divergent and often in conflict, to promote the welfare of all, the activities and liberties of the individual must be curtailed by the Government.

The true function of government is to protect the weak from the strong. Hence, laws punishing violence; prohibiting monopolies, the unfair use of corporate and group power. It is the Government's duty to protect the honest, the credulous, against the dishonest, the cheaters. Hence, pure-food laws; laws punishing fraud, deception.

It is the Government's obligation to protect the thrifty, the industrious, against the wasters, the lazy. Hence, laws protecting property, requiring the performance of contracts freely entered into; preventing the appropriation of the earnings and savings of one individual to be used for the benefit of or spent by another.

It is the Government's duty to protect the less able, the individual with limited resources, he who depends upon his toil for his livelihood, against exploitation by able, smart, greedy, unscrupulous individuals, and combinations. Hence, antitrust laws, the Norris-LaGuardia Act, the National Labor Relations Act.

The foregoing are illustrations of needed, justifiable regulations, though some laws, inadvertently or otherwise, are one-sided and unfair, granting special privileges to some pressure groups without imposing adequate responsibility upon them, and so fail to aid in achieving the desired result.

REGIMENTATION

Regimentation is regulation run wild. Its advocates assume that the Government knows all, is infallible, can and will give to the individual, through complete control of his activities, the greatest happiness and prosperity. Advocates of regimentation proceed upon the theory that the individual, whether he believes it or not, will be happier—and, if not happier, he should be—if his wishes and desires are molded into their pattern. That, happy or not, he will be better off if he is told what to eat, wear, where to live, when and where he should work, what he should receive for his toil, how he should invest and use what he may accumulate by his thrift and industry.

Regimentation is the attempt to fit square pegs into round holes, to make inoperative man's desires, the laws of nature, of supply and demand. The impossibility of successful regimentation has been demonstrated by the failure of OPA to prevent inflation by its creation of scarcities.

That regulation, not regimentation, is the better practice has been demonstrated in this country through the more than 150 years of its existence. Whether advocates of another form of government believe it or not, prior to the war the desire of the people of other nations to live under our form of government was proof positive that here, in the shadow of our flag, under the principles of our Constitution, even though sometimes ineffectively administered, the individual was more prosperous, happier, than anywhere else. The war added proof that, in a world emergency, under our system, our production, the courage and fighting ability of our youth, were superior to that of any other nation.

THE TRAGEDY

But the tragedy of it all is that, having the best, a powerful minority group, seemingly with unlimited resources, through the press and over the air now tell us to discard our tried and efficient form of government, forsake regulation, adopt regimentation. If men could be molded and used as wood or steel is used, regimentation might succeed.

The President seems to think that two and two plus one still make four, and is demanding that wages be increased, but that prices shall not. Because individuals cannot be forced to produce at a loss, if that theory prevails, it will lessen production, increase inflation.

Today, the administration is telling steel, the motor industry, and some other producers that they must produce at a wage and price determined by the administration's fact-finding agencies. If that policy is carried out and if those ordered to produce on the named terms are unable to do so, the business of the Nation will be slowed down and, in the end, when the situation grows bad enough, when enough individuals are injuriously affected, regimentation will be thrown out the window; government will then confine itself to regulation. We will for a time have inflation and perhaps a depression, but ultimately, when we give recognition to nature's laws, to the economic laws of supply and demand, we will once more return to those conditions which gave us our prosperity in days gone by; which gave us the foundation which enabled us to be the deciding factor in the World War.

Citation and Investiture of Leo T. Crowley as Knight Commander With Star of the Order of Pius IX

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 28 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, on January 10, 1946, there occurred at St. Mary's Hospital in Madison, Wis., a very impressive ceremony in connection with the investiture of Hon. Leo T. Crowley as knight commander with star of the Order of Pius IX. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD the citation of Pope Pius XII to Hon. Leo T. Crowley, the address of Cardinal Stritch, and my address, delivered at the testimonial dinner which followed the ceremony, together with a list of the names of some of those who participated in the investiture.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITATION OF POPE PIUS XII TO HON. LEO T. CROWLEY

PIUS XII, POPE

To our beloved son, health and apostolic blessing:

Our venerable brother, the archbishop of Milwaukee, and our venerable brother, the titular archbishop of Laodicea in Phrygia, apostolic delegate in the United States of North America, in a most laudatory manner, recommend you to us for the strenuous and skillful service that you have rendered as Foreign Economic Administrator. They petition us to acknowledge publicly your outstanding deeds and honor you with the distinguished dignity of knighthood. We, desiring then, that you receive an appropriate and ample token of our esteem and benevolence toward you, have decided that you, already a knight of St. Gregory, are now deserving of greater recognition, and should be elevated to even a higher rank of honor: Wherefore, by these our letters, we choose, create, and appoint you knight commander of the Order of Pius IX, and by virtue of these letters, we pronounce you properly named and appointed among the illustrious assemblage and number of the same knights. Therefore, beloved son, we accord you the right to wear freely the special uniform and regalia, which knights of this order lawfully wear, especially to wear the pendant, distinctive of this higher rank, which, in keeping with the custom of other knights, is worn suspended from the neck on a blue silk ribbon with double red stripes on the outer extremities. Moreover, that our benign good will toward you may better be known, we likewise grant you the privilege of wearing the great silver medal, which should be affixed on the left side of the breast.

Given at Rome, at St. Peter's, under the fisherman's ring, on this 14th day of December, A. D. 1945, in the seventh year of our pontificate.

By special mandate of his holiness.

DOMINIC SPADA,
Secretary of apostolic briefs,
For the cardinal secretary of state.

To our beloved son, Leo T. Crowley, knight.

ADDRESS OF CARDINAL STRITCH, AT THE TESTIMONIAL DINNER FOR HON. LEO T. CROWLEY, AT MADISON, WIS., ON JANUARY 10, 1946

My dear friends, it is a centuries-old custom of the church to stress the individual, personal, social, and religious responsibility of the layman by bestowing special honors on some few men, who have satisfied their responsibility in an outstanding way. In giving these honors, the thought of the church is not so much to reward merit as to hold up before others the example of genuine, full Christian life. It is but natural these days that in an effort to help build a better world we should search for the causes of the dire tragedies which have befallen us. Who will deny that among these causes there is the failure of Christian men to live in all fields of action abundantly Christian lives? How often in the past have we seen men, who in their private lives were Christian, in public, social, and economic life tolerate, and by inaction approve the spread of principles and theories and practices which contradict the truths which Christianity implanted in our culture? There has been a tragic dualism in the western world in which Christian truth has been crowded into private living, and materialism given the control in public and social life. This sort of thing had to have a climax, and instead of an advance in Christian culture in the new conditions, we have witnessed so great an assault on it that for a time men feared that it would be driven back into catacombs and there would be a return to sorry conditions which the Gospel once removed from the western world. If ever there was a time when it is necessary to stress the responsibility of

the layman to live a full Christian life, that time is at hand. In a troubled world we are trying to reconstruct human society on the ruins of an awful war. Genuine democracy is the answer to the world's needs, and genuine democracy postulates the cooperation of Christian men. How can there be genuine democracy unless men recognize in public and social life the dignity of the human person and its rights in the unity of the human family?

We see two trends in contemporary society—one is the struggling of genuine democracy to expand its reaches and become more real, and the other the totalitarian system, in which there is a return to the overlord and the serf, whom we had thought forever banished from society. Authentic liberalism is identical with the struggle for the progress of democracy. At times in this struggle some men think that government is ineffective and even impotent. It is hard for many to face the changed conditions, and the tactics of those who promote new genuinely democratic advances are not always well-chosen. But the struggle is the democratic way, and we are safe if in the midst of it we refuse to borrow from the program of the totalitarians and damage democracy by overreaches of the political power of the state. In genuine democracy there is indeed the postulate for strong, respected civil authority with might to enforce its just decrees. There is also the recognition of the dignity and rights of the individual and his participation in government through intelligent virtuous civic action. It may be that at times democracy seems inefficient in meeting the complicated difficult problems of our times, but the inefficiency is only apparent. Its struggles are the condition for genuine progress, and its final achievements are its justification.

When our country adopted our charters of democracy, the benefits were not immediately achieved. Social life is ever-changing, and in millenniums of history there were not the epochal changes which have come in the years of our national history. At times we made great advances in our democratic manner of living, and at times there were retrogressions. Who would be foolish enough to say that always in our history we were happy in adopting our democratic principles to changed conditions? We must keep in mind that before the things fixed in our charters are full realities, there is much to be done in making real the freedoms which they guarantee and promise. In this progress there must be struggles, differences of opinion, variety of attitudes, under the guidance of strong, respected civil authority. Never may we hope for fuller freedoms except under law. In this development of our genuine democracy, there is the chance for authentic liberalism. It were a tragedy to yield to the thought that authentic liberalism is in any way identified with totalitarian systems, which in principle and fact are a throwback to conditions and miseries from which genuine democracy freed peoples.

As we must be true to ourselves, we must be true to peoples who look to us with hope and confidence. We are a great Nation, the greatest in the world today. What is the thing which we have to give to the world in its misery? There is only a single answer possible. We must be the champions and the protagonists of genuine democracy. Whatever differences of conditions and background there may be in other lands, the essence of democracy, with perhaps varied trimmings, is the answer to the needs of all peoples. We do not aspire to the role of the dictator of the world. We respect the rights of other nations. But our influence and our prestige must always be for democratic institutions, and we may add, not for institutions which are camouflages of democracy. The simple cardinal principle in our foreign relations must be helpfulness in giving to peoples free, democratic institutions, in which citizens with freedoms under law satisfy their responsibility in government.

Today we are paying tribute to a Christian gentleman who in all fields of endeavor has sought manfully to satisfy his Christian responsibility. A delightful friend, gifted with abundant talent, he has honored us in being honored by the Holy See. Few men have been called to serve in the important public posts which he has occupied with distinction. His vision has been wide, his liberalism authentic, his wisdom always apparent. More than all this, Mr. Crowley has been a Christian gentleman whose Christianity has been evident in his service to his country in these years of great crisis. We congratulate him today and beg God to give him years and strength to be always in the future what he has been in the past.

The address of Hon. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr., at the testimonial dinner was inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, by Hon. JAMES M. MEAD and appears on page A201.

The investiture of Leo T. Crowley, K. S. G., as knight commander with star of the Order of Pius IX, was made by His Excellency the Most Reverend Moses E. Kiley, D. C., archbishop of Milwaukee, at solemn pontifical high mass, Thursday, January 10, 1946, at St. Mary's Hospital Chapel, Madison, Wis.

Participants in the ceremonies were:

Master of ceremonies, the Right Reverend Monsignor Roman R. Atkielski, vicar general, Archdiocese of Milwaukee.

Assistant priest, the Very Reverend D. M. Burke, O. Praem., S. T. D., J. C. D.

Deacons of honor, Rev. Edmund Goebel, Ph. D.; Very Rev. Peter A. Brooks, S. J.

Deacon of the mass, Rev. John A. Koelzer.

Subdeacon of the mass, Rev. John B. Schneider, O. P.

Book bearer, Rev. Hubert Dougherty.

Crosier bearer, Rev. Charles Hayes, O. P.

Miter bearer, Rev. J. Haestrich.

Cross bearer, William Froelich, Jr.

Candle bearers, Leo N. Crowley, Robert E. Crowley.

His Eminence Samuel Cardinal Stritch, archbishop of Chicago.

Chaplains to Cardinal Stritch, Very Rev. Hugh O'Donnell, C. S. C., Ph. D.; Rev. Peter Leo Johnson, D. D.

His Excellency the Most Reverend Aloysius J. Muench, bishop of Fargo.

His Excellency the Most Reverend Francis J. Haas, bishop of Grand Rapids.

His Excellency the Most Reverend William P. O'Connor, bishop of Superior.

His Excellency the Most Reverend Stanislaus V. Bona, bishop of Green Bay.

His Excellency the Most Reverend John F. O'Hara, C. S. C., D. D., bishop of Buffalo, N. Y.

His Excellency the Most Reverend John P. Treacy, auxiliary bishop of LaCrosse.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Patrick A. O'Boyle, representing His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman, archbishop of New York.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Howard J. Carroll, representing the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. William Mahoney.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. William Eggers.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edward C. O'Reilly.

Very Rev E. K. Cantwell, C. Ss. R.

Knights of St. Gregory: Sir Frank J. Lewis, K. C. S. S.; Sir William G. Bruce; Sir Charles Kerwin; Sir J. Francis McDermott.

Fourth degree, Knights of Columbus: Albert Decker, Charles Brown, George Stein, Karl Brennan.

Page boys: John E. Crowley, John F. Doyle.

Insignia bearer: Mary Doyle.

Music of the mass: From the Octave of the Epiphany (Roman Gradual); Missa Rosa Mystica (Vito Carnevali).

The sisters choir of St. Mary's Hospital, assisted by the Norbertine novices.

Guest soloist: Miss Lucille Meusel, San Carlo Opera Co.

Director: Horton Roe, United States Navy.

The program of the banquet follows:

Presiding: Very Rev. Leo L. Rummell, O. Praem., Ph. D.

Invocation: Archbishop Kiley.

The National Anthem: Miss Lucille Meusel.

Program following dinner:

Polonaise in A-Flat, Chopin. (Miss Catherine Crowley at the piano.)

Greeting: The Honorable ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr., United States Senate, member of Foreign Relations Committee.

Vocal selections—Miss Lucille Meusel:

The Sleigh—Kountz.

Sunday—Carew.

Una Voce Poco Fa—Rossini (from the Barber of Seville).

The Universal Church: Cardinal Stritch.

A Business Program for Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1946

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an address I delivered before the twenty-seventh annual convention of the American Farm Bureau Federation at Chicago on December 18, 1945:

Farming is a business and should not be used as guinea pig to test out the social fantasies and hallucinations of some of the consumer-minded economists and utopian dreamers who, here of late, it would seem, are staying awake at night figuring out ways of putting the farmers upon a dole or subsidy program in order to give the consumers cheaper food.

The trouble with these well-intentioned fellows is that they look upon farmers as managers of eleemosynary institutions, run for the benefit of the consumers, whose deficits will be supplied from the public Treasury. While I am deeply concerned over the problem of getting the consumers more, better, and cheaper food, the solution of the problem lies, not in subsidizing the farmers, but in placing farming upon a business basis so they will be able to produce more and better food at cheaper production and marketing costs.

It is high time that we all realized that farming is an American business enterprise—the largest business enterprise in America—and in order to be successfully and economically conducted business principles and practices will have to be employed.

SUBSIDIES

Before I discuss some of the things that I think it is imperative we should do in order to place farming upon a business basis, I want to impress upon you the necessity of first clearing the way by getting rid of farm subsidies and roll-backs on farm products. This thing of the Government stepping in and subsidizing one class in order for another class to get enough to eat, thus subsidizing both classes, is a fallacious policy that will, if not checked, undermine both classes and eventually our whole economic system.

What the farmers want, and justice and fair dealings demand they have, is a fair price in the market place. The farmers, like everyone else engaged in business, want to look to the market place and not the Government for their pay.

And what the lower economic class in America wants is not a subsidized food bill but a pay envelope with enough money in it to purchase, at least, the necessities of life. This lower economic class wants to look to its pay envelope and not the Government for the money to live on.

Such a policy, as I have said, will lead to disaster.

The farmers, as well as the lower economic class, want to retain their freedom and independence. All they ask is to lead their own lives, free from every possible governmental restraint, and the opportunity to make their own living in the traditional American way. They do not want the Government putting a subsidy-curb bit in their mouths.

They want to retain their American complex of freedom and independence. If you want to change this independent-freedom-American complex into a paternalistic complex, the way, in my opinion, is to follow the subsidy highway. As for me, I want none of it. There is already in America a small class that seemingly thinks the Lord was joking when He said, "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread." This class, as I said, is now small, but if you want to see it increase, I do not know of a better way of recruiting their ranks than by adopting a subsidy policy.

When we resort to subsidies we are not only dodging the issue, we are undermining the basic principle of free government, namely, free enterprise. If we maintain our free enterprise system, the respective enterprises in America—and remember farming is the biggest enterprise in America—should be permitted to operate, not under the subsidy system, but under the profit system. American enterprises, including farming, should be self-sustaining from profits and not from subsidies.

If subsidies is the answer to our economic ills, then why should subsidies only apply to farmers? Because a certain class in America is unable to purchase sufficient clothing and other necessary goods and wares, we have not adopted the policy of forcing manufacturers and merchants to sell below the production cost and then go to the Government for the deficit. Yet, if the subsidy policy is sound, and we are logical in our thinking and consistent in our practice, this is just what we should do. Why make Government wards of the farmers by forcing them to sell below the cost of production and then look to the Government for the deficit, and have the merchant and manufacturer to operate under our free competitive profit system?

Yes, when we resort to subsidies we destroy initiative, we destroy incentive, we destroy competition, the things upon which free competitive American enterprise is built, in that those engaged in farming, in manufacturing, in producing, will, sooner or later, begin to ask themselves this question: "Well, what's the use of putting forth my best efforts, in burning up my mental and physical energy, striving to produce better and cheaper food, or better and cheaper goods, wares, and merchandise, when I have a Government subsidy to fall back on to take care of any deficit my lack of effort brings about?" Take heed of my warning: If we do those things that will bring about such thinking, we are creating conditions that will, sooner or later, supplant our democratic system.

I cannot think that any red-blooded American who has given thought to the matter thinks that subsidies is the solution to our problem. If there is a class in America that, due to their economic status, is unable to purchase the necessities of life, the solution to the problem is to improve their economic status so they will have sufficient purchasing power to go into the open market and purchase the necessities of life. Subsidies is not the answer to our problem. The answer lies in creating a greater purchasing power. This, in my opinion, can only be accomplished by bringing about, as far as possible, full employment plus a decent wage scale.

And, let me add, that the time to get rid of subsidies is now while our purchasing power is high, because subsidies are reflected back in farm prices, and when removed there will have to be a corresponding increase in farm prices or else the farmers will be ruined. There is, I believe, sufficient purchasing power at this time for the consumers to absorb the subsidies without undue hardship. If, however, we wait until our purchasing power is lower and consumers are unable to absorb the advance in food prices, then the whole subsidy load will fall back on the farmers and will bring about such an agricultural paralysis as this country has never experienced; and remember when you paralyze agriculture, you paralize the Nation. Think, for instance, what would happen to the producers of beef cattle if we removed the subsidy of $39 per thousand pounds, without a corresponding increase in beef prices, and thus threw the whole subsidy loss on the producers. Why, such a thing would wipe out the beef producers overnight. The same thing would happen to the milk producers and the producers of certain other farm products.

I do not want anything I have said with respect to subsidies to be construed as meaning that I am unmindful of the fact that there are those in America who through misfortune, or through circumstances over which they had no control, are in need of governmental assistance, local, State, and national. We do have such people and it is the function of government to see that their needs are supplied. In looking after this unfortunate group we should face the problem honestly, and not use this unfortunate class as an excuse to subsidize those who, under improved conditions, would be able to provide for themselves.

Having gotten rid of subsidies and thus recognized that farming is a business to be run upon the profit and not the subsidy system, let us now consider some of the things that are necessary in order to place farming upon a sound, efficient business basis.

1. SOIL IMPROVEMENT AND CARE

First on the list I would place soil improvement and soil care. Why? Because farmers can no more produce food abundantly and cheaply on impoverished and wornout land than can the manufacturers produce goods, wares, and merchandise abundantly and cheaply in run-down plants equipped with wornout and outmoded machinery.

Now, soil improvement and conservation are far more than farm problems; they are national problems. They are impressed with more than a public interest. They are impressed with a public duty. The very strength of this Nation depends upon the strength of our soil. As we improve the soil we strengthen our Nation, and conversely, as we deplete the soil we weaken our Nation. I make this bold statement, the strength of every Nation in the world today can be measured by the strength of the top soil of that Nation.

While, due to the vastness of our farm lands, we, as a Nation, have not reached the danger point as yet, we are beginning to run into signs along the agricultural highway we are traveling that point to danger ahead.

What do we read on some of the signs?

1. Soil erosion has affected in some degree more than 1,000,000,000 acres of land in America. This is more than one-half of the Nation's land.

2. Approximately 50,000,000 acres of once productive cropland have been already ruined for any further immediate cultivation; another 50,000,000 acres are in a condition almost as bad; and half to all the fertile top soil has been removed from another 100,000,000 acres.

3. Of the present American cropland of 415,000,000 acres, only about 342,000,000 acres can be classed as really good land. Of the 342,000,000 acres of good land, only about 62,000,000 acres are nonerodible, and the other 280,000,000 acres of good land is losing soil with every hard rain.

4. Three billion tons of top soil go down the streams and rivers every year.

5. Annual loss of soil minerals by erosion is twenty times the amount of soil minerals annually used by plant life.

6. We are annually mining out five times the soil minerals that we annually put back into the soil.

7. Erosion alone is costing the Nation approximately $3,844,000,000 annually.

8. In the short span of our existence we have whittled down our top farm-land soil from an average thickness of about 9 inches to a present average thickness of about 6 inches. This is a statement of deep significance when we realize that American civilization is resting upon such a thin foundation. Yes, when we begin to visualize that our Republic and all it stands for rests upon such a thin foundation, which, to say the least, is becoming wobbly through neglect, we begin to realize the importance of keeping the foundation in good repair.

Having realized that soil improvement and care are national problems affecting the welfare of every man, woman, and child in America, we would be remiss in our duty if we did not tackle the problem from the national point of view. We are justified in such an approach not only from the standpoint that in so doing we are insuring to the generations yet unborn an ample food supply, and thus insuring the perpetuity of our national existence, but upon the ground that we are insuring consumers, present and future, cheaper food. It is axiomatic that when we increase production we decrease production costs and make it possible to give the consumers cheaper food.

It was from such considerations that I introduced H. R. 2922 in the House and Senators BANKHEAD and HILL introduced S. 882 in the Senate. These bills are identical and provide for a 5-year national fertilizer program that would reach into every agricultural county in America.

The experimental pilot plants provided for in the bill would be run by the Government for a period of 5 years which, it is thought, would be ample time within which to develop the right kinds of fertilizer needed for our different soils, and demonstrate to the farmers of America the imperative necessity for soil improvement and care, after which period they would be turned over to farmer-cooperatives, or, in the event the farmers do not desire to organize and run the plants through cooperative effort, to private industry.

The fertilizer industry, judging from the past, does not have the urge, nor does it have the vision, to inaugurate such a program. So far it has been satisfied with furnishing the farmers fertilizers low in mineral content but high in filler content which, of course, means more profits to the industry and poorer yields to the farmers.

Soil chemistry, I believe, is in its infancy, and I am afraid if we leave the problem to the fertilizer industry that its infancy will

be extended to manhood and from manhood on into old age.

Land gets sick, just as cattle and sheep and hogs and horses get sick, yet we know a great deal more about administering to the diseases of livestock than we do about administering to the diseases of the land. In order for the good earth to produce, as God intended for it to produce, we have got to preserve the topsoil and keep it in a healthy, productive condition. We cannot continue, from year to year, to mine from the soil more mineral content than we put back, and expect our soil to remain in a healthy productive condition.

And remember, the Lord put more than nitrogen, potash, and phosphate in the soil, though there seems to be a common belief that if we put these things back into the soil, even in diluted quantities, we have completed the job of restoring the mineral content of the soil. Let me impress this thought upon you by relating the experience of one of my farmer friends.

This friend of mine, while not a soil chemist, has been giving a lot of thought to soil improvement. He owns a splendid bluegrass farm, and like all cattle farmers, is deeply interested in increasing the capacity of his grasslands. He came to the conclusion, as he expressed it, that if "he could put back into the soil the minerals the Lord originally put there," he would go a long ways toward the solution of his problem. This, to my way of thinking, was a sound conclusion. He selected a field of 40 acres that contained a fairly good blue-grass sod, the carrying capacity of which was 15 head of beef cattle. He first treated the field with TVA superphosphate, which, of course, increased the field's carrying capacity. Three years ago my friend treated a part of the field with a mixture containing, per acre, 600 pounds of 20-percent phosphate, 200 pounds of salt, 2 tons of burnt lime, 6 tons of ground lime, 20 pounds of sulfur, 20 pounds of epsom salts, 20 pounds of borax, 20 pounds of bluestone, and 1 gallon of iodine. This year the field carried, not 15 head of cattle, but 40 head of cattle, and it is thought that had the whole field been treated with the mixture it would have grazed 50 head. The grazing season on the field commenced about 2 weeks earlier than the grazing season in that section and lasted, at least, 2 weeks later, thus lengthening the grazing season for something over 1 month. The cattle put on approximately 400 pounds in weight.

Moreover, we now discover that the nutritive value of farm products depends largely upon the condition of the soil. Because, for instance, a certain truck patch produces well-developed, lucious-looking carrots is no reason to assume that the carrots have the nutritive value they are supposed to have. As a matter of fact, so far as their food value is concerned, they may be utterly worthless. Why? Simply because the soil from which they came was lacking in certain soil minerals. Remember, the soil cannot put into the products thereof that which it lacketh. Hence, it is possible for us to undermine our health, even starve to death, eating good-looking food products that came from soil depleted of the necessary soil minerals.

As I said, I am afraid we know very little about the proper treatment of our soil. And I am afraid that too many farmers of today, like the doctors of yesterday who thought that calomel, quinine, and opiates would cure all the ills to which man is heir, think that nitrogen, potash, and phosphate will cure all the diseases to which the soil is heir. I am afraid that we do not appreciate that the soil on one farm may be suffering from an entirely different disease from the disease of the soil of a neighboring farm, which, of course, means that we have got to diagnose soil diseases just as we do human diseases, and treat them accordingly.

All Americans, regardless of their trade or calling, should be deeply interested in soil improvement and care. And, if the American people will only pause and think this thing through, I know that they will not only become interested, but that they will become interested to such an extent that they will become imbued with the spirit of the crusader and will line up in solid phalanx and fight until S. 882 and H. R. 2922 are written into the statutory law of this land. Do not think that the task ahead of us is an easy one. The Fertilizer Trust is on the war path. The trust has money, and money employs talent, and from present prospects it looks like we are going to be met on the threshold of this fight with an unlimited lobby fund plus the best, shrewdest, and most influential lobbyists money can hire.

Upon the introduction of these companion bills several significant things happened:

1. The Fertilizer Trust commenced to operate under a name that has more farm appeal, namely, the American Plant-Food Council, Inc.

2. Having obtained a name with more agricultural "it" in it, the next move was to invade Congress and select one of its most outstanding Members, occupying a strategic position on the Appropriations Committee, which committee, of course, will have to pass on all appropriations for the fertilizer pilot plants, as the leader to spearhead the drive to kill the bills. This Member is now listed as the president of this great pseudo-farm organization, the American Plant-Food Council, Inc.

3. The Fertilizer Trust has started the printing presses turning out propaganda against the bills, the like of which I have not seen since the days of the holding-company legislation. Oh, this American Plant-Food Council, Inc., is a high-powered outfit that started, from the very beginning, in high gear.

Now, this is a free country, and I do not criticize my colleague for resigning from Congress in order to improve his financial position—in order to become president of this newly created, all-important farm organization, the American Plant-Food Council, Inc., which was set up for the worthy purpose of protecting the American farmer from the rash, un-American act of providing means for improving his soil—but I do question the propriety, yes, the right of a Member of Congress taking on new duties vitally affecting pending legislation before divesting himself of all responsibility incident to his high office.

Yet, to my astonishment, I find my colleague, who has served his people in the House for some twenty-odd years, during which time he has evidenced no visible interest in agriculture, overnight, as it were, rushing in to defend the American farmers from the socialization, the regimentation, and the other baneful influences and effects the passage of S. 882 and H. R. 2922 would visit upon them. Oh, I wonder where this agricultural Roderick was during the early thirties when the farmers of America were fighting for their very existence! Oh, where was this fertilizer-scented Roderick when the agricultural situation was so serious that shotguns were being used by farmers to stay sheriff sales of farm lands? Oh, where, oh where, was Roderick during the so dark days when, if we measure his capacity for leadership by the valuation the fertilizer trust has placed upon it, one clear blast on his bugle horn would have rallied the farmers around a leadership that would have led them out of the low grounds of sorrow into "a land flowing with milk and honey." I will not be so uncharitable as to even suggest that it took a long-term contract, plus a princely salary, to get this psuedo farmer Roderick to toot his horn in defense of the farmers of America.

I am, however, persuaded that the farmers of America know their friends, and that they will not rally to the seductive bugle call that today is being sounded by this recent "plant food" convert. If they do, may the good Lord have mercy upon their souls, because I am afraid their fate will be that which befell the flute-enchanted rats that followed the leadership of that charming, seductive flute player, the Pied Piper of Hamelin.

On December 6, 1945, in the city of Roanoke, before the Virginia State Horticultural Society, my colleague, as reported in the Roanoke Times of December 6, 1945, sounded this blast upon his bugle horn against S. 882 and H. R. 2922:

"Senate bill 882 and House bill 2922, companion bills pending before the respective committees of Congress, are another misguided effort to turn the American farmer over to the Federal Government and to put him under bondage by unnecessary subsidies and Federal regulation and control," he said.

"However, I do not believe the time has come or should ever come when the Government goes into the farming business, or when it should undertake to regulate or regiment every action and procedure of the farmer, even down to the point of doing his plowing, seeding, fertilizing, and harvesting for him.

"I cannot go along with the unsound philosophy that would put the American farmer sitting on the curb with a tin can in his hand asking alms of every passerby. Those who advocate such unsound principles are doing a disservice to agriculture. I think that what the farmers want is a fair, square chance in a free and competitive economy to live his life, conduct his business under circumstances from which he may reasonably expect to have a profit for his labors.

"I maintain we can have no economic solidarity in this country—no domestic tranquillity—no personal security unless we maintain and foster individual initiative and a system of free enterprise," Woodrum continued. "That means that the Government, States and Nation, should not, except under circumstances of extreme national emergency, undertake to order our lives or enter into competition with free enterprise."

I am not surprised at the line of attack. It is the same line that has been followed by the Fertilizer Trust since the bills were introduced.

"Socialization!" "Regimentation!" "Free enterprise!" When unable to answer by logic and reason, these are the bugaboos with which to frighten the American people. I have heard these arguments used since the days the cities first commenced to put in their own waterworks and electric plants. Yes, and I have heard one or the other of them used against every forward movement we have taken in this country; against TVA, against social security, against unemployment insurance, against the Securities and Exchange Act, against the Holding Company Act, against the act giving labor the right to organize and bargain collectively, against the Fair Labor Practices Act. And now they bring these same old arguments out of the closet to frighten Congress into killing bills designed to improve our soil.

Now, let me briefly answer these arguments:

As to socialization: The public has a vital interest in the soil, and it is the duty of our Government to see that our soil is conserved and improved. Why? Because it is the source from which comes the food and fiber to sustain our people. While I believe in the ownership of land in fee simple, I also believe that every grantee in a land deed be-

comes, to a certain extent, a trustee. The trust imposed by the conveyance is not to wantonly abuse the land. And this trust is so broad that it also extends to the Government. It is the duty of Government to not only see that our land is conserved, but to render every reasonable assistance in soil conservation and improvement. Why? Because the strength and perpetuity of this Government depends upon the strength and perpetuity of the Nation's topsoil.

As to free enterprise: I suppose this argument is directed at the provisions in the bill giving the farmers, at the end of the 5-year period, the right to form cooperatives to purchase the fertilizer plants from the Government. Well, if individuals can organize, for instance, a fertilizer corporation to operate a fertilizer plant that no one individual is financially strong enough to build and operate why cannot farmers, no one of which is strong enough financially, get together and organize a farm cooperative for the same purpose? If corporations are permissible under our free-enterprise system, upon what theory are cooperatives excluded?

As to regimentation: There is nothing in the bill, not a single line, that would regiment anyone. The bill is free from compulsion and regimentation.

II. EQUIPMENT

Having provided the farmers with good plants, that is, good farms, we should see that the farms are well equipped. I use the word equipped to cover not only sufficient and up-to-date farming machinery, but necessary livestock and farm buildings, including the farm home and modern conveniences. As I intimated, a farmer can no more abundantly and economically produce on good land without the necessary equipment, than can the manufacturer produce in a fine up-to-date plant that lacks modern and up-to-date machinery.

These objectives can be accomplished by—

1. Carrying forward our rural-electrification program.

2. Adopting a rural-building program comparable to the urban-housing program. Such a program, of course, would have to be worked out in a sane, sensible manner in order to see that the earning capacity of the farm justifies the improvements because if a farmer is loaned money to erect buildings that the earning capacity of the farm is not sufficient to carry, the ultimate result would be not only the loss of the improvements, but the loss of the farm.

3. Bringing our farm-credit structure down to date so it will take care of the financial needs of the farmers in purchasing livestock and farm machinery, as well as modern conveniences that will add so much to farm life.

The farm home should be made an attractive place to live. The farmer is entitled to some of the modern conveniences in order to take out of farm life, as far as possible, the drudgeries that are, at present, incident thereto.

III. PRICE

Having provided the farmers with productive, well-equipped farms, in order for them to produce abundantly and cheaply, good business demands that we inaugurate a price system that will, at least, insure them a reasonable profit over and above the cost of production and upkeep.

No matter how modern an industrial plant may be, no matter how efficiently it operates, how abundantly and cheaply it may be able to produce, unless it operates at a profit it will, sooner or later be thrown into bankruptcy. The same is true of a farm.

The inability of the farmers to regulate prices, as does industry, has been the greatest problem that has confronted the farmers of America over the years. This problem has to be solved before we will ever be able to stabilize agriculture and place it upon a sound business basis.

Of all the suggested or tried farm-price formulas the parity concept is, I am persuaded, the soundest It is sound because it is fair to all. It protects producers and consumers alike.

Now, just what is this thing that we call, for lack of a better name, parity price? How does it operate with respect to the farmers, who are the producers, and how does it operate with respect to the consumers of farm products, which latter class, of course, includes all of us? If it works to the interest of the farmers and at the same time imposes no undue hardships upon the consumers, then it works to the interest of every man, woman, and child in America, and should demand universal approval. Well it does just that thing and, in my opinion, has the approval of everyone that has thought the matter through and understands parity price. Of course, those who are suffering from the subsidy hallucination and want to see Uncle Sam operate a free-lunch counter in every home will not agree with me. They want parity income, or some other subsidized program, which they masquerade under the name of a farm plan, but which in truth and in fact simply means a dole for the farmers and cheap food for the consumers, with generous old Uncle Sam paying the bill.

Now parity is a relative term. It is a price relationship, and seeks to maintain the proper price relationship between those things the farmers sell and those things the farmers buy. Under it farm prices would constantly change in order to maintain the proper relationship between what the farmers sell and what the farmers buy. Under it, for instance, if wages go down and consequently what the farmers buy cost less, farm prices would go down correspondingly. In other words, it would give the farmer's dollar the same purchasing power as the consumer's dollar, and conversely, it would give the consumer's dollar the same purchasing power as the farmer's dollar. It would keep the industrial dollar, the labor dollar and the farm dollar on a parity—on an equality.

Now, as I have said, there can be no question about the soundness of the parity concept. The trouble comes when we attempt to put the concept into practice by establishing parity prices. When the parity concept was first adopted back in 1933 we adopted the 5-year period of 1909–14 as the period when the price relationship between the things the farmers sold and the things the farmers bought were, more or less, at a proper balance, and called this period the base period, and attempted to figure our parity prices in such a way as to maintain this balance that existed during the base period. While this period was the best period we could find, we found that it did not work out justly and equitably in all cases, and at the time, for instance, adopted another base period for tobacco in order to bring about, as far as possible, a better tobacco price relationship. However, in spite of our efforts, we found that parity prices as figured during this base period, while manifestly fair—in some cases more than fair—to certain farm products, were manifestly unfair to other products. The truth is we created some price valleys and peaks, which, in my opinion, should be leveled off. And when this is done we should include farm wages in the calculations of parity. I am afraid, however, that if we only amend the parity law by including farm wages in calculations of parity that we will augment rather than ameliorate our parity trouble. What we should do is this: We should reexamine parity and work out a formula that will, as far as humanly possible, level down the present valleys and peaks, and bring about the proper price relationship with respect to all farm products. And, may I add, that in my opinion it is humanly impossible to write with one stroke of the pen a parity law that will hold good on down through the years. We will, if we maintain even approximately correct parity prices, have to modernize the law from time to time.

Having established parity prices, the job, however, is only one-half completed. It is an idle gesture to establish parity prices unless we take the next step and make parity prices effective. This is going to be a most difficult undertaking, but unless it is worked out, setting up parity prices for the farmers means absolutely nothing. And when it is worked out it should be worked out in such a way as to give the farmers the full parity price, and not 75 percent or 90 percent of parity. We can no more put farming on a business basis, for instance, giving the farmers 90 percent of parity than we can place industry upon a sound business basis by cutting industrial prices to 90 percent of a fair selling price.

IV. MARKETING

Having given the American farmers good production plants by soil improvement, equipped the plants, and provided them with a price system that will insure, at least, the cost of production plus upkeep, the next step is to set up a marketing system that will bring about the marketing of farm products orderly, efficiently, and economically.

One of the biggest farm problems yet unsolved is the marketing problem. Over the years we have spent millions of dollars teaching the farmers how to produce. Our production efforts have, by and large, been successful. Through conservation practices, improved strains, improved methods of cultivation, and mechanized farming, we have been able to increase our production tremendously. The sad part of the picture is this, that while the average farmer knows a great deal about production he knows very little, if anything, about marketing what he produces.

As you know, a special committee on farm marketing has been set up. I am chairman of the committee. While we have done a great deal of spadework looking into this, that, and the other phase of the problem, and are now holding open hearings, we are not in position, at this time, to make concrete recommendations. We are still seeking information and guidance. We do know that the spread between the farm and table impoverishes the farmer and consumer alike, in that, while reducing farm prices, it increases consumer prices. Our present farm-marketing system may be accurately described as the system of subtraction and addition. Yes; in 99 cases out of 100 the syster employs both subtraction and addition, shooting the farmers with the subtraction barrel of the marketing shotgun and the consumers with the addition barrel. Our problem, of course, is to work out a marketing system that will bring the farmer and consumer closer together. The whole secret of a successful farm-marketing system hovers around reducing the spread between the farm and table. If this can be done, and we believe it can, it will literally save the farmers and consumers millions of dollars per year. Most industries have worked out such a system, and the time is long overdue for such a system to be worked out for the farmers and consumers. I say it advisedly, no American industry could stay in business if it had to operate under the same double-barrel marketing system the farmers have been forced to operate under over the years. In order to impress upon you the seriousness of the situation let me make this statement: Roughly speaking, for every dollar the farmer receives for a farm product the consumer pays from 2 to 3 dollars for the same product. The table that follows will show you the spread from the farmer to the consumer for the years 1913 to 1943:

Year	Cash farm income (1)	Retail value (2)	Marketing margin (3)	Government marketing taxes (−) and payments (+) (4)	Marketing bill adjusted for Government taxes and payments (5)	Farmer's share of retail value, derived from columns (1) and (2) (6)
	Billion dollars	*Billion dollars*	*Billion dollars*	*Billion dollars*	*Billion dollars*	*Percent*
1913	3.8	8.2	4.4		4.4	46
1914	3.8	8.6	4.8		4.8	44
1915	3.8	8.8	5.0		5.0	43
1916	4.6	10.4	5.8		5.8	44
1917	6.5	13.8	7.3		7.3	47
1918	7.3	14.5	7.2		7.2	50
1919	8.0	16.4	8.4		8.4	49
1920	7.7	17.7	10.0		10.0	44
1921	5.2	13.2	8.0		8.0	39
1922	5.4	13.6	8.2		8.2	40
1923	6.8	14.5	8.7		8.7	40
1924	6.1	14.9	8.8		8.8	41
1925	7.0	16.1	9.1		9.1	43
1926	7.2	17.0	9.8		9.8	42
1927	7.0	16.9	9.9		9.9	41
1928	7.3	17.0	9.7		9.7	43
1929	7.5	17.8	10.3		10.3	42
1930	6.5	16.6	10.1		10.1	39
1931	4.8	13.3	8.5		8.5	36
1932	3.5	10.9	7.4		7.4	32
1933	3.7	11.4	7.7	−0.1	7.6	32
1934	4.4	12.8	8.4	−.4	8.0	34
1935	5.3	13.4	8.1	−.3	7.8	40
1936	6.0	14.7	8.7		8.7	41
1937	6.3	14.6	8.3		8.3	43
1938	5.5	14.2	8.7		8.7	39
1939	5.5	14.3	8.8		8.8	38
1935–39 average	5.7	14.2	8.5	−.1	8.4	40
1940	5.9	14.5	8.6		8.6	41
1941	7.4	16.6	9.2		9.2	45
1942	9.5	19.6	10.1		10.1	48
1943	11.2	21.5	10.3	+.4	10.7	52

While I know that a part of this spread, probably the larger part, represents transportation and legitimate handling charges, I am persuaded that if the right kind of farm-marketing system is worked out a considerable percent of the spread can be saved, and most of the saving, provided we have a fair fram-price system, will inure to the benefit of the consumers.

While, as I stated, we are still seeking information and guidance, and are not, at this time, ready to make concrete suggestions, I am going to briefly mention two or three things in particular that I think are worthy of careful consideration.

First, we should improve our present State marketing services and coordinate the marketing services of the respective States. If the respective States would put on an educational campaign to educate the farmers in up-to-date marketing the money would be well spent. And if the State activities were coordinated so information would be quickly transmitted through the States many supposed surpluses would disappear.

The marketing-news service should be improved, so the farmers can keep up with prices, trends, and gluts in particular markets and areas. The present news service, in many instances, comes too late to be of any real value to the farmers.

Probably the greatest field in which to make real farm marketing progress is in the cooperative field. That the farmers, when they cooperate and work together, have the capacity to market their products efficiently and economically is no longer open to question. T ey have in many instances demonstrated their capacity.

Let me briefly mention some of the accomplishments of the farmers in Rockingham County, Va. I am mighty proud of the record of this Virginia county. And let me call your attention to the fact that it is the home county of G. F. Holsinger, the wide-awake and efficient president of the Virginia Farm Bureau, which has played an important part in bringing about the accomplishments which I shall mention.

The farmers of Rockingham cooperatively own and operate:

1. Mutual insurance companies that carry $60,000,000 of insurance on farm buildings and property, at a rate greatly under the old-line companies, and which, of course, saves the farmers thousands of dollars in insurance premiums.

2. Mutual telephone companies which give the farmers one of the best rural telephone services in America.

3. A farm-bureau store with assets of over $1,500,000 and no liabilities, and which did a business of $3,617,633 during the fiscal year 1943–44. This cooperative store saves the farmers thousands of dollars annually.

4. A milk-producers' association containing 1,500 members, which handles 37,000,000 pounds of milk annually, and for which it received last year $2,225,000. This association is paying from 10 to 20 percent more for milk than other buyers of milk in that section, and owns one of the most modern dairy manufacturing plants in the South.

5. Perhaps the finest poultry-dressing plant in America, which is being expanded, but which is now dressing some 12,000,000 pounds of poultry per year. Its annual business amounts to more than $5,000,000 per year.

6. A rural-electric cooperative which was established in 1938. The cooperative now has a membership of 3,735, has 1,250 miles of lines, and a generating plant with a capacity of 3,600 horsepower valued at $250,000. The entire project, lines and plant, has a valuation of $1,500,000.

7. A mutual cold-storage plant, with a capacity of 375,000 boxes. In 1944 this plant stored for growers $200,000 worth of peaches and $675,000 worth of apples, and in addition stored for the Government, 72 carloads of eggs, 202 carloads of meat, and 42 carloads of potatoes.

8. A fruit- and meat-canning cooperative for food processing and packing. This cooperative only recently installed juice-manufacturing equipment with a daily capacity of 8,000 bushels.

9. Recently the farmers organized a livestock processing plant, the cost of which will be around $250,000. It is aimed to process and supply quality meats and meat products, and plans to package and quick-freeze meats for frozen-food distributors serving the eastern United States.

Now, what does this all add up to? Hold your breath if you do not know what cooperative effort will do, because the results are truly astonishing. The cooperative efforts brought to the 3,900 farms of Rockingham an income of $31,573,950, or an average income of $8,095 per farm. This income came from the following sources:

	Amount sold	Amount brought
Broilers	12,000,000	$12,000,000
Layers	2,000,000	3,000,000
Turkeys	650,000	3,900,000
Eggs, dozens	4,740,000	1,422,000
Milk, pounds	09,192,000	3,750,000
Cattle	36,100	1,805,000
Sheep and hogs	11,450	114,500
Apples, bushels	1,000,000	1,500,000
Peaches, do	300,000	450,000
Corn, acres	27,470	1,428,440
Wheat, do	37,741	1,135,000
Hay, do	40,800	816,000
Soybeans, do	1,640	33,000
Tomatoes, do	200,000	160,000
Vegetables, do	1,200	60,000
Total		31,573,940

Believing as I do that farming is a business, honesty demands that I state in this connection, though my utterances may be regarded by most members of the cooperatives as heresy, if farmers get together and form a cooperative to further their business interests, that the cooperative so formed should be taxed just like any other business enterprise is taxed. There is no economic justification for any business enterprise, including cooperatives, that has to depend upon tax exemption or tax evasion for its existence. I am afraid if we continue to follow the policy of granting cooperatives tax exemptions that we will, sooner or later, bring the cooperative movement into public disrepute. This would, indeed, be not only a high but a ruinous price to pay, because no enterprise can long exist without public approval.

V. AGRICULTURAL CREDIT SYSTEM

Lastly I mention a credit system designed to take care of the financial needs of the farmers.

There is great need to bring about a consolidation of all Federal agricultural lending agencies. Until this is done, the farmers of America will never have a Federal agricultural credit system that is administered in an efficient and businesslike manner and enjoys the confidence and respect that it should. The American farmers are entitled to a Federal credit system that is just as efficient as the Federal Reserve System, and the system should enjoy and command the same confidence and respect in the field of agriculture that the Federal Reserve System commands and enjoys in the field of business and finance.

Some time ago I introduced H. R. 3422 for the purpose of laying the proper foundation upon which to build the right kind of an agricultural credit structure; and, unless the right kind of foundation is laid, the structure, no matter how perfect it may be, will always be in jeopardy. For this reason it is imperative that we lay the proper foundation.

After we lay the proper foundation, I hope no one will think that we have completed our undertaking. If the laying of the foundation is all that we have in mind, then, as deeply concerned as I am in seeing set up an efficient credit agency for the farmers, I would not be interested in this piece of legislation. This piece of legislation is only the first step. While it is an important step—just as important as a foundation is under any structure—it would be a foolish step for us to take unless we intend to go ahead and erect thereon a farm-credit system that will serve the needs of the farmers in an efficient and businesslike manner.

Having taken the first step, that is, laid the proper foundation by bringing all the farm-loan activities under one agency, to be known as the Agricultural Credit Agency, we should then go ahead and take up the different activities transferred to this agency, one by one,

weeding out all duplications, bringing about consolidations where practicable, and setting up economical and efficient working machinery all the way down from the agency to the farm level. I do not mean by this that we should take hasty action. Other than the Farm Security Administration, for which we need immediate basic legislation, I would like to see the policy board set up in this legislation given a chance to make a thorough study of all our lending agencies and make recommendations to Congress before we bring in further legislation.

Our present understanding, however, is to lay the proper foundation. H. R. 3422, introduced after long study and careful and painstaking consideration, has the backing and approval of some of the best brains, not only in agriculture, but in banking and finance. The American Farm Bureau, the National Grange, and the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives have been pioneers in this legislation. It is believed that it lays the proper foundation for a permanent, efficient, and serviceable agricultural credit structure that will command the respect and confidence of all.

The main provisions of the bill, which has been favorably reported by the House Committee on Agriculture, and is now known as H. R. 4873, are as follows:

AGRICULTURAL CREDIT AGENCY

It creates an independent establishment of the Federal Government, to be known as the Agricultural Credit Agency. To this Agency there would be transferred:

All functions, powers, and duties of (a) the Farm Credit Administration, and (b) the Farm Security Administration.

AGRICULTURAL CREDIT BOARD

It establishes within the Agency an Agricultural Credit Board of seven members, one of whom shall be the Secretary of Agriculture, the other six members to be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Board would be a bipartisan, full-time policy Board. The members of the Board would be appointed for 12-year terms and would draw a salary of $10,000 per year. The duties of the Board are fully set out in the bill, and it is expressly provided that "the Board shall not operate in an administrative capacity."

ADMINISTRATOR

The Board is directed to appoint an Agricultural Credit Administrator, who will be held responsible for the administration of the Agricultural Credit Agency.

DEPUTY ADMINISTRATORS

With the approval of the Board, the Administrator is directed to appoint a Deputy Administrator to be in charge of each of the principal divisions of the Agency. These divisions are six in number and are as follows:

1. A division for supervising loans to farmers' cooperative associations. Under this division there would be placed: (a) The Central Bank for Cooperatives, (b) the 12 banks for cooperatives, and (c) the revolving fund authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act.

2. A division to supervise short-term loans made by cooperative lending institutions. Under this division there would be placed: (a) the 12 production-credit corporations, and (b) the production-credit associations.

3. A division to supervise long-term farm mortgage loans. Under this division there would be placed (a) the 12 Federal land banks, (b) the national farm loan associations, (c) the Commissioner loans, and (d) the joint stock land banks (in liquidation).

4. A division for supervising and administering direct loans to farmers. Under this division there would be placed (a) the Farm Security Administration program (including rural rehabilitation loans, Bankhead-Jones tenant purchase loans, and other activities); (b) the Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Acts; and (c) the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C.

5. A division to supervise financing and discounting activities. Under this division there would be placed (a) the 12 Federal intermediate credit banks; (b) the security issuing and corporate financing phases of operations of Federal land banks, Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, and banks for cooperatives; and (c) any other financing and discounting matters.

6. A division to carry out functions of appraisal and examination and other services. This service would be open to the public. Under this division there would be placed (a) appraisal functions, (b) examination functions, and (c) other service functions.

This legislation attempts to bring about not only a consolidation of the agricultural lending agencies under one head, but to set up, down to the Federal level, efficient and businesslike operating machinery.

Now a few observations as to the objections that have been advanced:

1. Some think the Agency should be left in the Department of Agriculture. It is thought that no financial agency should be under a department head. I think the Congress expressed itself definitely on this point in the Wallace-Jones controversy. In this controversy the membership of the House and Senate seemed to be pretty well agreed that the original mistake was in transferring a lending agency to a Cabinet member. To place a lending agency under a Cabinet member is not good business. It simply will not work. Lending agencies should be, as far as humanly possible, removed from political considerations. President Truman realized this when, along with others, he introduced S. 3480 in the Seventy-sixth Congress. This bill, S. 3480, was introduced to provide for the establishment of the Farm Credit Administration as an independent agency of the Government.

2. Some question the wisdom of appointing a full-time policy board. In answer let me say that a part-time board, in my opinion, would be a fatal mistake. The board members will, of course, be outstanding men of affairs. If they only serve part time, they will continue to be engaged in business, and in all probability would be up to their necks in their own affairs when called to Washington. When called to Washington to a board meeting their chief concern, I am afraid, would be in getting through with the meeting so they could return home. This would result, past experience shows, in the members leaving the thinking and planning to subordinates in the Washington office. It is, in my opinion, imperative that we have a full-time board; and if the board functions as it should—if it keeps in close touch with all the lending agencies in order to see that they are properly functioning and in order to see what improvements, if any, can be brought about, it will be one of the busiest boards in Washington.

3. Some object to bringing Farm Security into the Farm Credit Agency on the ground that the Agency will be administered by hard-headed businessmen. To my mind, this is the most compelling reason for bringing in Farm Security. The chief trouble with Farm Security in the past has been the fact that business principles and practices were never employed in administering the program. In my opinion, had the Farm Security Administration been under the general supervision of a policy-making board, such as is proposed in this legislation, the board would have seen that the Administration carried out the policies laid down by the Congress and would not have permitted the setting up of a single one of the communistic crackpot projects that cost the taxpayers untold millions and that brought the Administration into such ill repute. And had such a board been in existence, and had it killed only one of these crackpot projects, it would have saved enough to pay the salaries of the board members for many years.

Now, personally, I am a great believer in the farm-security program, if rightly set up and administered in the American way and along business lines. It has a place, an important place, in our agricultural picture, and I want to see the House Committee on Agriculture, just as soon as we get this legislation through, go to work on a farm-security program that will fit into the pattern of American life and will be administered along business lines. And why should it not be administered along business lines? Simply because you are dealing with loans in which there is an element of risk, simply because in certain cases you are administering relief is no reason why business principles and practices should not be followed. Remember the Congress will determine the policies of Farm Security and the board will only see that these policies are carried out. If the board fails to see that the policies of Congress are carried out, we have our remedy. Also remember that under this legislation Farm Security will be treated just like we treat every other agricultural lending agency; that is, it will be treated as a separate division and placed under a deputy administrator. What more could be asked?

I want to say that my criticism of Farm Security does not apply to the administration of the agency under the Honorable Frank Hancock, who, as we all know, has rendered an outstanding service since being placed in charge. And the reason he has rendered an outstanding service is because he has employed business principles and practices and conducted the program in the American way.

In conclusion, let me say this: The farmers of America are entitled to a Federal lending agency that is run along business and not political lines, and serves the needs of agriculture in the same efficient and businesslike manner that the Federal Reserve System serves industry and banking. And I hope the day may come when this independent agency is housed in a separate building here in Washington, just as is the Federal Reserve System, and will also have separate district buildings. Yes; I would go a step further and erect in every agricultural county in the United States a separate building in which I would also house all county farm activities.

This five-step program will not only place farming upon a business basis but will enable the farmers to produce more abundantly and cheaply. For these reasons it is not only a farm program but a consumer program as well. Let me briefly point out how the program will enure to the benefit of the consumers.

1. Soil improvement will increase production. As production goes up production costs go down. The decrease in production costs means cheaper food to the consumer.

2. A well-equipped farm will further reduce production costs which, in turn, will further reduce consumer costs

3. Under a price formula based upon the parity concept things will be kept upon an even keel. Stability will be brought not only to the farmers but to the consumers, because as the purchasing power of the consumers go up or down, so will the price of food correspondingly go up or down.

4. The right kind of farm marketing system will bring the farmers and consumers closer together. As we reduce the spread between the farm and the table, in the same proportion we should reduce the costs of the things that go upon the table.

5. By giving the farmers the right kind of agricultural credit system we not only eliminate unreasonable interest charges, but we make it possible for farmers to obtain credit without making unreasonable sacrifices. And, too, we give the farmers a dependable

credit source. These things will, of course, further reduce production costs which, in turn, will further reduce consumer costs.

I bespeak your earnest consideration of these proposals.

Red-CIO Concoction Based on an Old Moscow Recipe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1946

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, it is more than a coincidence that internal strife in the United States comes at a time when the prestige of this Nation should be unquestioned. The timing of these events simultaneously with the convening of the United Nations Organization has been perfect.

The long Red arm of radicalism can be seen stretching across the Nation, casting its shadow upon the innocent participants who love their country while the incendiaries who would apply the torch to our form of government wallow in the prospects of fulfillment of their long-range plans.

The Reds are head over heels in the labor strife along with the radicals of the CIO.

The Reds are head over heels in the recent soldier demonstrations along with the CIO inciters.

The Reds are head over heels in attempts to steer our international relations along with the CIO manipulators.

Plans for the present trends were drawn on paper years ago. They were not secret but in our patriotism we said it just could not happen here. As the result we find loyal American citizens at home and heroic defenders of the Stars and Stripes overseas who are trapped in the Red network.

It has been admitted that the recent soldier demonstrations in the Pacific as well as in Europe brought about as critical a condition in military affairs as this Nation has experienced.

It is to the credit of the American soldier that common sense prevailed in this crisis.

That Reds took advantage of the homesickness of our troops and the bungled statements of the military chiefs is beyond question. There is positive proof of the leadership of American Communists in many of these overseas demonstrations. There is positive proof of an intermingling of Red and CIO.

CIO'S GOLDEN AND RED

A few days ago Members of Congress received from the CIO headquarters a copy of a cablegram addressed to Clinton S. Golden, of the National CIO Veterans' Committee, and signed by a group of soldiers headed by Sgt. Emil Mazey, as chairman. The cablegram came from Manila, scene of one of the wildest of the Communist-inspired demonstrations. Who are Clinton Golden and Emil Mazey?

Records show Golden's radical career goes back beyond his association with Brookwood Labor College at Katonah, N. Y., which has been identified in Government records as a communistic institution. He has been associated with William Z. Foster, head of the Communist Party in the United States; Sidney Hillman and others in the Garland fund which has been identified by a congressional committee as a "highly profitable source of revenue for Communist causes." Golden was active in the January 1944 CIO Political Action Committee conference in New York at which the predominance of Communists on the program has been referred to as providing a true index of the extent to which the Reds infiltrated and obtained places of leadership on Hillman's CIO committee.

MAZEY AND COMMUNISM

The name of Emil Mazey has already appeared in the records of Congress. In 1938 he was named by a witness before one of our committees as a Michigan member of the Communist Party and a member of the Proletarian Party, which was listed as an offshoot of the Communist Party. Mazey was a ringleader among the radicals in the United Auto Worker movement in Michigan in 1938, and his connection with Golden's Brookwood College dated back at least that far. Government records reveal that he attempted to secure a donation from the UAW union for Brookwood but was overruled by union members who declared dues should not be spent for such purposes. He was identified as an agitator and attempted to seize control of one of the auto workers' locals.

Mazey's cablegram, relayed to Congress by CIO's Golden, attacked what he called vested interests of the War Department and demanded that demobilization be taken away from the War Department.

The New York Mirror has identified T4g David Livingston, a leader in the demobilization demonstration in Honolulu, as the same Livingston who was a key figure in New York's Communist Party and chairman of the credentials committee of the convention of the Young Communist League in 1943. It will be recalled that for reasons of convenience the name of the Young Communist League was changed during the war to the American Youth for Democracy, whose ideals were assailed a few days ago by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

GI JOE LABELS AGITATORS

The rank and file of the GI's, whose common sense has prevailed in this tense situation, are in a better position than anyone else to know what has been back of these demonstrations which have been stirred up. Their letters indicate that the radicals have used the desire in the heart of every soldier to get back here to his family as a vehicle to stir up trouble and discredit the Army.

I have received letters from Pacific soldiers as have other Members of Congress. Here is one which outlines the situation. This disabled soldier, a GI who is stationed in Hawaii, says:

I know the set-up here. The trouble is being instigated by a lot of CIO hoodlums who are low-point men. The main speaker at the Fort Shafter meet was a former CIO local president. No matter what was accomplished, the United States Army has been disgraced and dragged through the mire of hell by a bunch of young radicals who don't know the difference between a mortar and a trench knife. Some of these youngsters know of no other way to accomplish their desires, and it's no secret that the committees planning these local affairs did all of their brain-trusting at the Honolulu labor canteen.

This GI who thus wrote me is not a part of the "brass" but an ordinary soldier.

We do have the statements of the Army officers too. Lt. Gen. Charles P. Hall, in Japan, has warned that subversives will take the cue from these uprisings and their next steps will be sabotage, and his chief of staff has declared that subversive forces are deliberately at work attempting to undermine the morale of our Army. Col. Charles A. Mahoney in Yokohama declared the protest demonstration against Secretary of War Patterson was stirred up by Communists and Bolsheviks among the soldiers.

Now the Red press and the Communist elements of CIO will use what I am saying and brand it a smear against GI Joe. They are fact-twisting contortionists of the highest degree and I would not expect them to accurately present what I have to say.

As far as the natural participation in these demonstrations is concerned, General MacArthur summed it up pretty well when he said of the GI's:

> These men are good men who have performed magnificently under campaign conditions and inherently are not challenging discipline or authority.

He was not talking about the radicals identified by the soldier I quoted. He was talking about the loyal redblooded boys who went out and fought for this country and who did so because they know we have the best form of Government on the face of the earth.

The same agitators who stirred up the demonstrations operate on the same party line as the gang that is out to kick General MacArthur out of the Pacific and who misrepresent his every move just as they will misrepresent my remarks here today.

REDS IN ARMY PLANNED

The Red instigation of these uprisings should not come as a surprise to the Government. Congress was warned that the War Department was commissioning Communists and even placing them in strategic places. Earl Browder, until recently the head of the Communist movement in this country, boasted there were actually some 13,000 Communists in the armed forces of the United States last year. We had also been informed by our own Committee on Military Affairs that the Communist Daily Worker in this country had declared that—

> The party and the Young Communist League must energetically conduct work of propaganda and agitation in the Army, Navy, Marines and all our armed forces, formulating a program of economic demands and complaints * * * linking up the struggle for these immediate demands with the struggle against imperialism, and the struggle against imperialist war.

Thus things are moving along according to the blue print with the Reds in the Army and Communist leaders here at home branding the moves of both the War Department and the State Department as "imperialistic," while the CIO has become a vehicle for the accomplishment of Stalin's statement in one of his books that the unions "constitute a school of communism."

Echoes of the Sixth Communist International in 1928 are in evidence in some of the resolutions shoved through by the leaders in the demonstrations in the European theater where the document called for opening of all officer messes, clubs, and so forth, to soldiers and for a general program for placing officers and soldiers on the same basis. The International called for the Red agitators to organize the soldiers and officers and abolition of compulsory saluting.

Here in the United States only a few weeks before these demonstrations a member of the executive board of the Council of United States Veterans, Inc., which is listed by a congressional committee as "the latest form of Communist controlled veterans' organization" whose executive board and advisory board have "numerous connections with Communist front organizations" carried in his publication for November 1945 the statement that—

> Our boys have been brought up to believe they are just as good as any other Americans; that we are born equal. By joining the Army they place themselves in a position of artificial inferiority. * * * Congress should consider whether it is necessary to have that sharp dividing line between officers and enlisted men.

CIO-RED PATTERN SIMILAR

The Pacific coast Communist Daily World for January 12 and the CIO News for January 14 spread the Golden-Mazey communications across several columns of type. The Red Daily World in a typical misrepresentation referred to the "virtual abandonment of demobilization." This cannot be substantiated by any War Department directive. The CIO News referred to the "discharge Snafu."

Other Communist groups in this country were quick to ride the tide of feeling among soldier and sailor loved ones here for their quick return. In Long Island City, Dave Rosenberg, acting Queens County organizer for the Communist Party, headed up a mass meeting designed to "fight to bring our GI's home to their families and to fight the imperialist policy of the Army." The Communist Daily Worker reported that Ray A. Birch, acting chairman of the Connecticut Communist Party, addressed a demonstration at Hartford, Conn., and in Chicago demonstrators identified by the Daily Worker as trade-unionists listened to an address by George Danfield, who is listed in one of the congressional hearings as a member of a Red front organization.

Using the Red's own yardstick this all pretty well measures up to the outline contained in their Program of the Communist International, which says:

> The Communist Parties in imperialist countries, while supporting the struggle proceeding in the colonies, must carry on a campaign in their own respective countries for withdrawal of imperialist troops, conduct propaganda in the army and navy in defense of the oppressed countries fighting for their liberation, mobilize the masses to refuse to transport troops and munitions, and, in connection with this, organize strikes and other forms of mass protests, etc.

In this connection it must be recalled that while Stalin and Hitler were stalking around Europe arm-in-arm the Reds were picketing the White House with manners declaring the "Yanks are not coming" and their allies in the CIO were manipulating sit-down strikes which seriously handicapped the administration's program to aid Britain in her fight against the Nazis.

Then Hitler booted Stalin out of his bed and the Red contortionists here in this country vanished from the White House and began yelling for lend-lease aid for Russia, a second front, and more production for Britain.

Now that the war is won they revert to their old philosophy that we should withdraw to our own Atlantic and Pacific seaboards. The Reds have had their way in Germany and are anxious that we move out of there. They have not been so successful in the Pacific in dealing with General MacArthur and that is why they are repeatedly garbling what he says and what he does in a scheme to have him recalled. The Daily Worker, Red mouthpiece, recently said:

> MacArthur must go if the United States intends to have this Allied Council accomplish anything.

One of the topics of the Communist mass meeting in Long Island was the "Political implications of the United States Government intervention in China." Further evidence that this is all a part of long-range planning is revealed in the program of the American Youth for Democracy, a Red outfit against which G-man Hoover recently warned American parents. Heads of this organization revealed that it had been engaged in a Nation-wide campaign to obtain signatures to petitions and post cards sent to the White House calling for withdrawal of our troops from friendly countries.

The AYD calls for an American occupation force in Germany and Japan to be scaled down to the bare number actually needed and contends that occupation forces in the Jap-infested Philippines and in China and in other friendly countries means interference in their internal affairs. As to the problems involved, I would refer these young radicals to the full text of General Eisenhower's statement before Members of Congress a few days ago.

Russia is jockeying for the No. 1 seat in world affairs. Is she withdrawing her troops from Germany and other friendly nations reclaimed at the price of American blood?

Mutiny in the Army and a collapsed economy through industrial strife in America is her dish. The fellow travelers are back on their line—all the way from telling Congress and the State Department to get back in the shell, except for the financial hand-outs, to keeping American school children out of their schoolhouses as the Communist-directed CIO strikers have done in Flint, Mich.

A. F. OF L. WARNS OF COMMUNISTS

Mr. George Meany, of the American Federation of Labor, did a good job recently in warning the American people against Communist front organizations in this country which use devious tricks to drum up support for Soviet policies and undermine America's foreign policy, and he concluded that warning by saying:

> It must be clear to all that there can be no compromise between real trade unionism and a political party which receives its orders from Moscow.

Availability of Rice for Domestic Consumption

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1946

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include herein a letter I have received from Mr. Ray A. Tate, secretary, Louisiana Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., Baton Rouge, La., as follows:

LOUISIANA WHOLESALE
GROCERS' ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Baton Rouge, La., January 16, 1946.

Hon. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LARCADE: On November 20, 1945, we called to your attention the critical situation that was rapidly developing regarding the availability of rice for domestic consumption and requested that you take the matter up with proper authorities in Washington. You presented this problem to the Department of Agriculture which we definitely appreciate. However, Mr. C. C. Farrington, Director of the Production and Marketing Administration Grain Branch of United States Department of Agriculture in his reply on December 12, would lead you to believe that we were in error concerning the availability of rice for domestic civilian consumption.

The rice situation to date is worse than November 20, 1945, and becoming more critical daily. We had hoped this condition could have been avoided, and that was our purpose in requesting that you bring the situation to the attention of the United States Department of Agriculture at that time.

Regardless of the thinking of Mr. Farrington or any other representative of the bureaus in Washington, the rice situation in Louisiana is most critical and less than 50 percent of the normal minimum essential needs are available. If some relief, adjustment, or modification to the existing orders is not immediately given, there will be no rice available for domestic consumption in the very, very near future.

A comprehensive survey of inventories in the hands of the wholesale distributors in Louisiana of this date show that the stocks range from the majority of instances to be none to approximately 30 days' supply, with the distributor making every effort to stretch the distribution to as long a period as possible. The situation indicates that the

over-all supply available would last approximately 20 days. Bear this in mind; the suppliers and millers do not have rice available for domestic consumption to replace the wholesalers' depleted stocks.

The condition is so critical that wholesale distributors of rice whose business establishments are in the very shadows of some of the largest rice millers in the world do not have a pound of rice and cannot get any; the reason being that what rice the millers now have belongs to the Government as a part of the set-aside and cannot be touched for civilian consumption.

The stocks in the retail stores are in the same condition as those in the wholesale establishments, for at no time has the wholesale distributors had sufficient rice on hand to enable retailers to buy sufficient quantities to build up stock of any consequence. These facts are irrefutable and we challenge the Department of Agriculture or any of its representatives to disprove them. Theoretically, they may tell you the rice is here but from a practical and concrete point of view it is not. Something has got to be done, and the people of Louisiana are depending upon you to do it.

If in your own mind there is the slightest doubt or apprehension we suggest that you pick up the telephone and call any wholesale grocery jobber or rice miller and ask him directly what the conditions are.

May we repeat that there is rice in the hands of millers but this rice belongs to the Government and is not available for domestic trade

Amendment 13 to War Food Order No. 10, issued December 29, 1945, and effective January 1, 1946, which reduced the Government set-aside in three Southern States from 40 to 35 percent makes the conditions worse rather than relieving it because the amendment further provides that sales to territories can no longer be applied to the Government set-aside. Consequently, instead of improving the situation, this amendment with all of its provisions has made it more critical.

We have been advised further that while certain agencies committed to UNRRA, 3,200,000 pockets of top-grade rice for relief, the Siamese Government made available to the British Government approximately 33,000,000 pockets which is almost twice the United States total production.

Why cannot these 33,000,000 pockets be made available to the combined Food Board instead of to one particular government and release the 3,200,000 pockets allocated to UNRRA for domestic use?

We recognize the fact that our Government and its agencies have commitments and responsibilities to other countries, but we are also remindful of the fact that they should have first responsibilities and first considerations for our own domestic economy and welfare.

Therefore, to bring some modicum of relief to the critical rice situation domestically we are urgently requesting that amendment 13 to War Food Order No. 10 be modified immediately whereby the reduction of the Government set-asides of rice remain at 35 percent, or even further reduced, and then permit sales to our Territories to be applied against the set-asides, and further, let the Government set-asides of rice include other grades than the top grades of rice. Those countries needing relief can well use and should be appreciative of other grades than those of the very best.

This same letter is going to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation and 135 wholesale grocers in Louisiana who service more than 13,000 retail and institutional outlets, who in turn, distribute food daily to Louisiana's approximately 3,000,000 consumers, respectfully ask that each of you individually and collectively give this matter your prompt attention and secure immediate relief to our critical rice situation.

With warm, personal regards, we remain,

Sincerely,

LOUISIANA WHOLESALE GROCERS' ASSOCIATION,
RAY A. TATE, *Secretary.*

Issues and Significance of the 1946 Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 28, 1946

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by Hon. JOHN J. SPARKMAN, Democratic whip of the House of Representatives, presented at the annual convention of the Young Democratic Clubs of Ohio, Columbus, Ohio, January, 26, 1946:

By this time it has been made abundantly clear to the American people that President Truman and the Democratic administration have a definite program for the Nation in this "year of crucial decision."

The President first gave clear and vigorous expression to his 21-point legislative program in his message to Congress on September 6.

In his radio address to the American people on January 4 he again outlined his plan for speedy and successful reconversion, and called for action to put it into operation.

Finally, only a few days ago, he again laid the whole plan before Congress, and gave an estimate of its cost.

The President's program is one designed to realize to the fullest extent the great potentialities that this country possesses.

It is a program that envisages a strong and prosperous America on the only terms that America can be strong and prosperous—full employment and increased production, higher wage levels and increased purchasing power, broader social-security safeguards, improved public services in the fields of health and education, and greater protection for the small businessman and farmer against the ruthless assault of monopoly.

It is a program that takes full cognizance of the many stumbling blocks that lie ahead, and that charts a safe course around them.

It is a forward-looking program—one that rejects the stultifying theory that what was good enough for our fathers and grandfathers will have to be good enough for us and for our sons.

So far the criticism voiced by the Republican opposition has been threefold.

First, they say that the program is nothing but a continuation of President Roosevelt's New Deal.

To this charge we Democrats gladly plead guilty. Our program is a continuation of the Roosevelt policies—the same humanitarian and farsighted policies that lifted this country out of the depths of the great depression—the same courageous policies that enabled us to triumph over our enemies in the terrible war that has just ended.

The second charge that they level against us is that our program is communistic. The idea of full employment, says Senator Taft, that doleful Jeremiah from your own State, is taken directly out of the Soviet constitution.

By this time that argument is so threadbare it does not deserve a serious answer. When Senator Taft uses it, it is only because he hasn't any legitimate grounds on which to argue. Instead, he indulges in the childish practice of name calling.

The same charge was made 10 years ago against the Social Security Act. It was employed without variation against one after another of the New Deal measures. It was dusted off and used as a weapon of desperation in the Presidential campaign of 1936—and again in 1940—and again in 1944.

But the elephant doesn't forget—nor does he learn. Obviously the Republicans are going to inflict the same old tommyrot on the electorate in 1946 and 1948, and the American people, with their inherent good sense, will fail to be impressed.

The third argument advanced by the Republican leadership is that the Democratic Party is split.

Now, I would be the last to claim that there is unanimous agreement among the members of our party on all of President Truman's proposals. And in all frankness, I think that is just a little too much of the Republicans to ask.

Of course, if we Democrats could see our way clear to draw up a program the way the Republicans do our inner-party life might easily be one continuous love feast.

If we carefully avoided coming to grips with the major issues—as the Republicans do—all might well be peace and harmony within the fold.

If, as the Republicans do, we came out boldy and and unequivocally for the flag, the Constitution, the way of our forefathers, mother love, and the law of gravity and nothing else, then we might all find ourselves in perfect agreement.

Then, if we cautiously approached the minor issues and phrased our pronouncements on them in such careful language that even a Philadelphia lawyer could find no fault—we might indeed have a program that would arouse no dissension.

But that is not the way we Democrats do things. We realize that there are important problems facing the country, and we know that weasel words will not solve them. Instead, we face the issues squarely and offer what we believe to be an honest and workable solution.

That is what President Truman has done in laying his program before the people. I do not believe it strange that a program of such scope and vigor should arouse some opposition—even within our own ranks.

The truth of the matter is that most Democrats are in agreement about the program as a whole. Some object to this or that specific part of it. Some believe that the particular method suggested is not the best way to bring about the desired result. Again I say, this is not strange in a country as vast as this, where there are so many differences of tradition, of opinion, and even of immediate interest.

But this I also say—only the Democratic Party could set forth such a vigorous and comprehensive program. And only the Democratic Party can bring about the fulfillment of such a program—for it is only within the Democratic Party that there is substantial agreement concerning the broad aims and purposes on which that program is based.

Moreover, when the Republicans assert that we are a house divided they lose sight of the fact that they themselves are split.

There is, however, one important difference between the situations within the two parties. We should not lose sight of this difference, nor should we ever fail to point it out to the people we meet and talk to. The difference is this—in the Democratic Party the progressive, forward-looking group is in the saddle. In the Republican Party the reactionary Old Guard has complete control.

In the Republican Party there is a small minority—a very small minority—who complain of the reactionary ways of their leadership. But these malcontents wield no influence. Their complaints and their suggestions go unheeded in the party councils. Each time one of them speaks up he is rebuffed. If he persists, everything possible is done to crucify him politically.

It is the height of futility to hope that this small group will be able to invigorate the arteriosclerotic old elephant. They are nothing more than the tail of the creature. And who ever heard of a tail wagging an elephant?

What has the Republican opposition been able to offer as an alternative to the Truman program?

The answer is—nothing. Nothing but the usual set of sonorous platitudes, and a reiteration of the Harding plea for a "return to normalcy."

This political and social bankruptcy of the Republican Party has been a source of worry to the Republican leaders. Or, to put it more correctly, they are worried by the public apathy toward their party induced by this chronic state of bankruptcy.

Every once in a while, therefore, the Republican leadership comes forth with a statement to the effect that they are going to develop a program.

The last time this threat was made was early in September, when Republican leader of the House, JOE MARTIN, announced that his party would soon declare what it stood for.

Mr. MARTIN gave the impression that this time it would be the real thing. No more beating around the bush. No more double-talk. With an air of complete confidence he stated, "People won't fall asleep when they read it—everyone will be able to understand it."

Well, I won't go into the details of what happened. After 3 months of cautious word polishing, during which the advice of the few liberal Republicans was unceremoniously tossed out the window, a statement was finally presented to the Republican National Committee which met in Chicago.

I am not going to tell you what I and other Democrats thought of that statement when we saw it. Instead, let us see how it was received by the press and by many of the Republicans themselves.

The New York Herald Tribune, a Republican newspaper, said: "It is vague where it ought to be specific. It avoids vital national issues."

The New York Sun, a Republican newspaper, called it, "A statement of limited usefulness," and said that its authors were "speaking in generalities and avoiding specific issues."

The Buffalo News, a rabidly Republican newspaper, could only characterize it as "a disappointing statement."

The Washington Star, a paper which consistently takes a Republican viewpoint, called it "a masterpiece of evasion."

The Washington News, a Scripps-Howard journal that cannot by any stretch of the imagination be called a supporter of the present Administration—characterized it as "a sorry apology for a program," and said that it was nothing but "a jumble of vague promises, shabby phrases, glittering generalities, and vacant viewings with alarm."

The columnists were no kinder than the newspapers. Tom Stokes, the veteran political reporter, said, "It is a mass of generalities lacking even glitter. * * * It has no emotional lift whatever, recalling in its barebones aspects some of the cooler of Calvin Coolidge's pronouncements."

This from Lowell Mellett: "It is a truly tasteless bit of spinach * * *. It is not surprising that a number of the national committeemen in Chicago threw down their spoons when it was placed before them. They had expected something they could get their teeth into."

And this from Pete Edison: "One of the emptiest and most meaningless documents of all time."

Among the Republican politicians themselves there was scarcely more enthusiasm than in the press. Senator WAYNE C. MORSE, voicing the sentiment of the small and ineffective group of Republican congressional liberals, called the statement "a program of blind reaction and double talk."

On the other hand, Clarence Budington Kelland, Republican national committeeman from Arizona, was peeved because the statement did not come right out and swat labor. "It is a meaningless conglomeration of ambiguous words," he said.

And National Committeeman Frank O. Horton, of Wyoming, must have caused Minority Leader JOE MARTIN a twinge or two when he said, "At last we should have a statement that people will read and understand."

After that barrage of verbal tomatoes, the Republican National Committee did what a committee usually does when it finds itself in a box. It appointed a subcommittee.

This new group bears the impressive-sounding title, "Subcommittee on Development of National Policy." Their duty presumably is to develop a program that people will read and understand.

Chairman Brownell appointed seven members to this subcommittee. Since they are the ones who will be responsible for the framing of party policy during the coming pre-election period, it behooves us, as well as all Americans, to inquire into their identity and backgrounds.

One of them is Werner W. Schroeder, a Chicago lawyer and a recognized spokesman for Col. Robert R. McCormick, publisher of the isolationist and reactionary Chicago Tribune.

In 1942 Mr. Schroeder put up a strong bid for election as chairman of the Republican National Committee. He was vigorously supported by the ultra-conservative Hoover-Taft wing of the party. He was finally defeated through the determined opposition of the Willkie group. As Willkie said at the time, he did not want "to see the masthead of the Chicago Tribune imprinted on the Republican Party."

Another member of the subcommittee is G. Mason Owlett, corporation lawyer and president of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association.

When Mr. Owlett was elected to the Pennsylvania State Senate in 1932 he was counsel for 29 large corporations, including many powerful railroads, utility companies, banks, and insurance companies.

His record in the Pennsylvania Senate shows the most tender solicitude for the welfare of the giant corporations and bitter opposition to every measure designed to improve the lot of the common man. He fought against liberalization of workman's compensation, old age pensions, minimum wages for women, regulation of holding companies, repeal of manufacturer's tax exemptions, child labor laws, and abolition of the company sheriff system. About the only thing he seems to have been for is the sales tax.

Perhaps the best characterization of Mr. Owlett comes from Mr. Morton Witkin, Republican president of the Philadelphia Board of County Commissioners, who said, "He is a Tory, an ultraconservative, a reactionary, an opponent of labor, and solely a representative of big interests."

A third member of the subcommittee is CLARENCE J. BROWN, Congressman from Ohio.

Now, Mr. BROWN is my friend, and I have a warm regard for him personally. But if he is going to be making Republican policy during the coming year, I know what kind of policy it will be. All we need to do is look at Mr. BROWN's voting record.

Before Pearl Harbor he was an isolationist. He voted against neutrality revision, lend-lease, selective service, and practically every other measure designed to aid our future allies and prepare this Nation for the coming struggle.

On domestic issues Mr. BROWN has been consistently reactionary. He opposed and voted against work relief, postwar planning of public works, farm parity payments, rural electrification, price and manpower controls, the Federal ballot for service men and women, and the full-employment bill.

Fourth member of the subcommittee is Barak T. Mattingly, who is boss of the Republican political machine in the State of Missouri. Just what his qualifications are as a developer of national policy is a complete mystery.

The remaining three members are women whose qualifications are equally obscure. It is evident that they were installed as window dressing to catch the women's vote. They, like Mr. Mattingly, will undoubtedly go along with whatever policy is decided upon by Schroeder and Owlett and Brown.

I don't believe anything more need be said. What sort of a policy can we expect to emerge from a group such as this? Obviously, the Republican Party is still headed for nowhere. It is still the party whose eyes—and hearts—are fixed on the dead past. It is still the party that refuses to face the future or adopt the policies that the future demands.

In the coming election the issues will be the same as in 1932, 1936, 1940, and 1944.

In November 1946 the American people will have another opportunity to choose between—

Frank and wholehearted collaboration with the other nations of the world in guaranteeing permanent peace, or a policy of undercover isolationism that can only lead to another war.

Jobs for all who want them, or a return to mass unemployment.

Full production at wages that will insure a high level of purchasing power, or a crippled economy in which industry and agriculture will not find an outlet for their products.

A broader Social Security System, or continued exclusion of millions of our citizens from adequate protection against joblessness, old age, ill health, and dependency.

In addition, the people in the next election will have to choose between continued vigilance against inflation and a return to Republican "normalcy" which will mean another ruinous era of boom and bust.

The American people have chosen wisely before. I am confident that they will do so again.

Care of Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1946

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Disabled American Veterans' Department of Ohio:

Whereas under the current policy of the Veterans' Administration many wartime disabled veterans are neglected and fail to receive the service and care that should reasonably be expected under the laws enacted by Congress; and

Whereas continued publicity through the press, magazines, and by radio of the wonderful care of this particular group of veterans is not substantiated by the facts; and

Whereas the Veterans' Administration hospitals in Ohio are inadequate and overcrowded conditions exist, with upwards of 1,500 wartime disabled veterans on the hospital waiting list and only strict medical emergency cases are accepted, and out-patient treatment for service-connected veterans is administered on a basis of considering the cost over and above sound medical judgment; and

Whereas at the offices of the Veterans' Administration in Ohio alone there are upward of 40,000 claims for benefits on war-incurred disabilities, not adjudicated and that thousands in this group are seeking medical treatment for combat wounds, tropical and other conditions incurred in many parts of the world, three-fourths of these claims not having even been acknowledged, and in the meantime these veterans are not eligible to out-patient care, monetary allowances or vocational training to overcome physical handicaps; and

Whereas the impression that all wartime disabled men and women file claims at time of separation from service is entirely erroneous, there being a backlog of thousands of authorizations for physical examinations pending for many months and the load is increasing every day and the adjudication of these claims must wait; and

Whereas a directive issued by the Washington office of the Veterans' Administration directs that applications of the able-bodied veterans seeking education and other benefits have precedence and priority over the claims for disability and medical benefits of those disabled as a direct result of war service; and

Whereas the disabled American veterans, Department of Ohio, believes such directive is unfair and unwarranted, and that first things be done first for America's service disabled, that they should at least have an equal standing with the able-bodied veteran in connection with the application for benefits. Therefore be it

Resolved by the Ohio Department of the DAV that we recommend the following corrective measures:

1. That the press, magazines, all other publications and radio stations give to the people the actual facts pertaining to the treatment and service extended to veterans who have been physically handicapped as a direct result of war service.

2. Extend or enlarge existing hospital facilities or immediately engage in the building of new institutions without further delay and without continued interference from political and pressure groups; that the Veterans' Administration arrange to accept the Army hospitals known as Fletcher General at Cambridge and Crile at Cleveland immediately upon their release by the Service Department.

3. That out-patient or home medical treatment be made available for wartime disabled veterans at established Veterans' Administration clinics and by fee-basis physicians on a more practical and humane basis.

4. That administrative action be instituted to handle out-patient physical examinations more promptly, which can be accomplished by requiring salaried and full-time physicians of the Veterans' Administration to put forth a full day's work, and to supplement this service by utilizing fee-basis physicians.

5. That the worn-out excuse of insufficient personnel and insufficient office space or the defeatist attitude with regard to the administration of the laws affecting benefits for the wars' disabled be abandoned. At this time actual unemployment is prevalent throughout the country and sufficient office employees are available. This condition can and should be relieved by the slashing of civil service red tape. Adequate office space can be procured by restoring to condemnation proceedings when necessary; authority for such action already being provided for in existing laws.

6. It is the opinion of the Ohio department of the DAV that the able-bodied veterans themselves do not desire this preferential or special treatment in the processing of their applications for benefits—over the claims of those veterans who have been disabled as a direct result of war service. It is also the opinion of this department that the able-bodied veterans desire that this directive of the Washington office of the Veterans' Administration be canceled at once to that all claims may be considered at least on an equal basis.

Adopted by the executive committee of the Disabled American Veterans, Department of Ohio, 111 Wyandotte Building, Columbus, Ohio, January 24, 1946.

D. M. BROWN.
Commander, Department of Ohio, DAV.

Patriotic Groups Demand Congress Outlaw Communist Party and Retain A-Bomb Secrets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 28, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Don Markel from the New York Journal-American of January 26, 1946:

ONE HUNDRED PATRIOTIC GROUPS DEMAND CONGRESS OUTLAW COMMUNIST PARTY AND RETAIN A-BOMB SECRETS

(By Dan Markel)

WASHINGTON, January 26.—The American coalition of 100 patriotic societies today called on Congress to deprive the Communist Party of all legal status in the United States and to rescind the civil rights of any citizen acting as agent of a foreign political party or power.

In other resolutions adopted at its annual convention here the patriotic coalition:

Endorsed Senator HARRY BYRD'S bill to hold labor unions responsible for performance of contracts, accountable for union funds, and liable for civil damages.

Opposed the extension of American gifts, loans, or credits to any foreign government, or the sharing of American's atom-bomb secrets with any alien power.

Demanded retention of strategic-island bases, maintenance of a strong Navy and large merchant marine, and acquisition of adequate stock piles of strategic metals.

BACKS LEGION PROGRAM

Pledged full backing to the American Legion program for universal military training.

Praised J. Edgar Hoover's achievements as Director of Federal Bureau of Investigation, urged full appropriations for the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and denounced administration efforts to centralize and control dissemination of information.

Warmly commended Gen. Douglas MacArthur "for the fair, careful, judicial, but firm manner in which he is performing his present difficult mission as a culmination of well-planned and executed military successes."

Called for repeal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, protection of America's economic system from foreign investment practices, and withdrawal from the International Bank and International Monetary Fund set up under the Bretton Woods Agreement.

Urged suspension of all immigration to the United States except that of wives and minor children of American citizens.

Denounced the expansion of parasitical and paternalistic bureaucracy, including attempts to establish socialized medicine and to intervene in State educational programs.

"COMMUNISM ENTHRONED"

"We have destroyed nazism and fascism and enthroned communism in Europe," John B. Trevor, of New York City, president of the American Coalition, declared in his report to the convention today.

"The Russian Soviet regime now exercises a stranglehold on eastern Europe, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Rumania, and Bulgaria, not to mention the absorption of vast areas of Poland. As for Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, their obliteration as independent states may be viewed as an accomplished fact.

"Looking at the situation objectively, it seems to me that since Admiral Standley was removed from office as our Ambassador to Moscow, our abasement before the Soviet Government has been complete."

ENGLAND GOES MARXIST

"In western Europe the highly organized Communist minority in France has brought about the downfall of General de Gaulle," he continued. "England, which we fought to save from domination by a totalitarian Nazi regime in Germany, has succumbed to totalitarian Marxism by the action of a majority of her own people."

Characterizing the United Nations Charter as a grotesque parody of the Holy Alliance and the United Nations Organization a farce, Trevor cited that Russia through her veto powers can block any attempt to check Soviet aggression.

"Our position in central Europe is thoroughly unsound," Trevor warned in urging that American troops be withdrawn from the chaotic continent.

"Our lines of communication through France, by reason of the character of its government, are not safe," he amplified.

"Our lines of communication to the port of Antwerp is dependent upon the grace of France, Belgium, and Great Britain. We are cordially disliked in France, barely tolerated in Belgium, and hated in Britain."

Housing Shortage—A Proposed Solution of the Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BENJAMIN J. RABIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 28, 1946

Mr. RABIN. Mr. Speaker, the housing shortage is most serious and is one of the postwar problems to which we should give our first attention. Under leave given me to extend my remarks, I include two radio addresses on that subject made over the Columbia network on January 19, 1946—one by Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., chairman on housing of the American Veterans Committee, and the second by myself:

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, this evening I would like briefly

to review the most serious problem now facing the veteran—in fact, a problem so serious that all Americans must take an active interest and a part in its immediate solution. This problem is the housing shortage which has developed in the last 15 years all over America.

The National Housing Agency recently reported that at the present rate of construction of new homes, there will be 3,000,000 homeless American families at the end of 1946. And in 10 years, at the present rate of building, 8,000,000 American families will be homeless.

The reasons for this colossal shortage are simple. During the depression years almost no low-cost homes were built and the small amount of construction that did go on was to meet the demand of the higher income groups only. And then came the war and all building material was allocated for the construction of our great war plants and emergency housing needed to shelter the workers in these new plants.

For the last several years, the experts in the housing field have recognized that this crisis was bound to come but, except for a few public-spirited citizens and the poor people who could not find a place in which to live, the average citizen considered adequate housing a boring subject. Even before the end of the war, almost every community was beginning to feel the shortage of housing. The return of the veteran of this war to civilian life has, therefore, only exaggerated an already existing crisis. But the veterans' crying need for a decent home has at last dramatized this great national problem and made Americans from top to bottom housing conscious.

The American Veterans Committee has led the fight for a quick and effective solution to this problem and, as the chairman of its housing committee, I have left no stone unturned in our efforts to force our public officials to act and act fast. First, we have urged our cities to purchase from the Federal Government all available temporary demountable housing to tide us over until a long-range permanent-housing program for the Nation could go into effect.

Here, in New York, Mayor William O'Dwyer has earned the thanks and the cheers of every veteran by his rapid and effective efforts temporarily to solve the problem. Mayor O'Dwyer took office on the 1st of January and in the first 2 weeks had ordered from the Federal Government 7,000 temporary housing units and more than 1,300 quonset huts. This is the kind of swift red-tape-cutting action all Americans applaud in their elected officials.

However, this is only a step in the right direction and a temporary one at that. We must start today to solve the problem of tomorrow so that 10 years from now 8,000,000 Americans will not be homeless.

The American Veterans Committee has favored and worked for the passage of any and all legislation which would get a long-range, low-cost national housing program under way. And we feel that, until Congressman RABIN came forward with his plan, all the other proposed legislation were only half-way measures, a drop in the bucket, a step in the right direction.

When I first read Mr. RABIN's bill a few days after he submitted it to the Congress, I said, 'Why hasn't somebody else thought of this sooner?" It is the first plan which just doesn't nibble at the edges but goes after the entire problem, eliminates all the present obstacles which are holding up construction by private enterprise, and handles a national problem on a national basis. We have had letters from labor groups, from business groups, and civic organizations—all not only endorsing the plan but also pointing out that it is the first simple solution which tackles the entire problem. During the war our Government built war plants to save our Nation. Congressman RABIN proposes that the same methods be used now to house our people and our veterans in peace.

President Truman, in his address to the Nation on January 3, called the housing crisis an emergency situation which requires an emergency solution. I believe that the Rabin plan, which is based on the President's emergency powers, is the solution.

I know many veterans and civilians who will not agree that the war is over until they have found a decent place in which to live—a decent place in which to raise their families—the Americans of tomorrow.

Congressman RABIN has been good enough to come up from Washington tonight in order specifically to tell you about his plan—about the legislation which he has proposed—the legislation which I know will quickly and efficiently solve the housing crisis facing our country, and solve it now.

Ladies and gentlemen, United States Representative BENJAMIN J. RABIN, of New York.

Mr. RABIN. Thank you, Mr. Roosevelt. At the outset let me take this opportunity to congratulate you and the American Veterans Committee for the splendid work which you are doing to awaken the American people to the seriousness of the present housing situation. You are rendering a service not only to the veterans whom you represent and whose welfare should be the cause of concern to all of us, but also to the thousands and tens of thousands of our citizens, including returning war workers, who are seeking a place in which to live.

I welcome this opportunity to discuss the bill which I presented to the Congress. I feel that it deals with the housing shortage in a most expeditious and effective manner.

It would serve no useful purpose for me to discuss here the causes for the delays in building. They may or may not be justified—that is beside the point. The fact is, there is no real construction in progress now. And we dare not delay any longer. It is amazing how helpless we seem to be in our approach to this problem.

When the emergency of war came upon us the Nation responded with a determination and with a virility that astounded the world. We met that emergency. We needed ships, planes, tanks, and guns. We needed factories in which to build them. We built those factories. We produced the necessary war materials, and without delay. Why cannot we meet this housing situation with the same determination, with the same spirit, and with the same energy with which we met the great emergency of war?

If we were at war today, and if a war could be won merely by building houses, how long do you think it would take us to build houses from coast to coast? We would not be talking about a housing shortage—we would be building our way out of it.

My approach to the problem is just as simple as that. This great emergency arises out of the war and my bill provides for the use of the great war powers of Government to meet that emergency. It gives the President full power to act without any if's, and's, but's, or restraining conditions attached.

Let me summarize briefly the main features of the bill.

It directs and authorizes the President of the United States, through such agencies as he may designate:

First, to commence the construction of housing facilities in any part of this country where necessary and essential for the public welfare;

Second, to requisition any material for the purpose of such construction;

Third, to condemn such sites and acquire such land as may be necessary for that program;

Fourth, to let out contracts to private industry on any basis the President may deem most expeditious; and

Lastly, upon the completion of any structure, to sell it to private ownership for the best price obtainable, reserving the right to manage until a sale is effectuated.

In short, this measure provides for immediate construction. It provides for all types of housing—low-cost housing, medium-cost housing, or even high-priced housing, depending upon the needs of any particular locality. It provides for either temporary or permanent housing. It bypasses all of the controversies indulged in by the conflicting schools of thought on housing. It cuts red tape. It makes time of the essence and it seeks to avoid the loss of this spring's building season which we certainly will lose unless we begin building at once.

I know there are many who object to Government intervention in a field that they deem reserved for private enterprise. The program I propose, however, will not interfere with private enterprise. The buildings will be built by private industry and the Government will sell those buildings to private management after they have been constructed. Rather than interfere with private enterprise, it will assist it. In effect, we are merely lending to private enterprise the great war powers of Government to enable it to thrust asid the obstacles that now stand in the way of immediate large-scale construction.

This is not a spending program. It is in the nature of an investment with every prospect that we will have our money repaid in full. Besides, we are investing in the security of our Nation. We are investing in the welfare of our returning veterans. We are investing in the safety, health, and comfort of the American people. We are investing to avert a catastrophe.

It is the solemn obligation of our Government to act vigorously to relieve this acute housing situation. I agree with you, Mr. Roosevelt; the war is not over until we meet that obligation.

The Jet Plane Arrives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1946

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the New York Times of January 28, 1946, entitled "The Jet Plane Arrives":

THE JET PLANE ARRIVES

An Army Lockheed P-80 jet-propelled plane has crossed the continent from California to New York in 4 hours and 13 minutes. If it had been flying in the opposite direction, it would have followed the sun to reach its destination within approximately an hour of its starting time.

We are moving with tremendous impetus into a world of almost incredible speeds. The average rate of this Army plane was 584 miles an hour and that of its two companion planes not much less. But at times it was racing through the atmosphere at 660 miles an hour. Even so, the plane was never extended to its full power. Not so long ago it was predicted that such speeds would prove impossible for human beings because of the crushing pressure of the air itself. Yet Col. W. H. Councill, the pilot, reports a comfortable flight too brief to tire him. "In a couple of years," he said, "flights like this will be an everyday affair."

Colonel Councill was not merely flying from coast to coast or from city to city. He was flying from the past into the future. The fuel that carried him was the same that the farmer uses in a kerosene lantern to light his barn. But in the jet plane it will light vistas scarcely dreamed of. These projectile-like fliers are aptly called shooting stars. They arch the heavens like meteors. But they are already obsolete on the drawing boards. There may be a limit to the speed of flight, but it has not yet been reached in the stratosphere, where the air is too thin to breathe and men must depend on oxygen. The jet plane may in time relegate the propeller plane to our museums. It may, in turn, be succeeded by the rocket for human travel, though in itself it is a kind of rocket. We don't know. But we suspect that it will profoundly influence life and thought on this planet.

Making Ourselves Poor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 28, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Journal-American of January 26, 1946:

MAKING OURSELVES POOR

As a part of the New Deal's internationalism, the little that remains of our protective tariff system is to be bartered away this year. The action will be taken under the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

It was under this act that former Secretary of State Hull, a free trader, adopted a policy of opening the home market to foreign competition several years ago.

The law at that time permitted the Government to reduce tariffs 50 percent by a treaty with a foreign country.

The law also provided that our tariff reductions agreed upon with one country should then be generalized—that is, be extended to all other countries under the most-favored-nations doctrine without an equivalent return from each.

The resultant treaties were thus not reciprocal agreements at all but tariff reductions made by the State Department without reference to Congress.

The second phase came about when former President Roosevelt reported to Congress that the tariff-reduction powers had all been traded away, and obtained an amendment to the Trade Agreements Act by which rates once reduced 50 percent could be cut another 50 percent, or 75 percent altogether.

This is the form of the law under which the New Deal is now proceeding.

The old law was beginning to have adverse effects upon our industries long before the Second World War.

Favored by depreciated currencies and low wage scales, foreign countries could more than undersell our protected industries in the home market in the early years of the New Deal.

Raw cotton, electric lamps, footwear, packed foods, metal products—these were only a few of the items in which imports increased 100 to 500 percent; and, of course, every import of competitive merchandise meant less work available for unemployed American workers.

The reciprocal trade agreements entered into under these conditions threatened to have the effect of piling bankruptcy upon poverty.

The outbreak of the Second World War, abolishing all international trade, postponed the consequences of our purblind policy.

Now the need for postwar settlements gives our Government the opportunity to reverse an evil and ruinous course—and the Government is throwing the opportunity away.

The State Department has invited 15 nations to a preliminary conference on international trade which is to be held in Europe, far from our shores.

All of these countries, except Soviet Russia, have accepted.

According to the New York Times:

"The preliminary conference * * * will * * * provide the occasion for negotiation of the initial reciprocal trade agreements under enlarged authority to reduce tariffs."

Quite evidently, we are to play another game of American give-away.

And it is going to be a wholesale affair.

The New York Times explains:

"Ordinarily the Trade Act hearings * * * would involve commodities in the trade with 1 country, but this time the goods in trade between all 14 countries and the United States will be considered simultaneously."

Furthermore what the administration obviously intends is to flood the home market with foreign goods.

Again quoting the New York Times:

"The new formula for speeding tariff reductions was seen as part of the administration's program to promote the highest level of foreign trade and to permit imports in quantities commensurate with the country's role as a great creditor country."

This country has nothing to gain and everything to lose by such a policy.

Supposedly we are "lending" billions of dollars abroad so that the borrowers may buy billions of dollars of our exports with our own money.

If the foreign loans are not repaid, we will be merely giving our goods away.

The New Dealers hold that the loans can be repaid, but only with foreign goods.

This idea runs contrary to our whole economic experience.

This country does not live by foreign trade.

Our imports depend not on our exports but on our domestic prosperity and purchasing power at home.

And we have never exported more than 6 percent of our production.

The other 94 percent is consumed in our own market and makes jobs for our 40,000,000 workers.

If, however, we are to import billions of dollars worth of foreign goods, what will our producers do for an adequate market?

Do we want to pursue a policy of exporting prosperity and importing unemployment?

Let's Settle General Motors Strike, But Not by Hunger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 28, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter by Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, appearing in the Washington Post, January 26.

I, too, subscribe to the slogan of the committee to aid the families of the General Motors strike: "Let us settle the General Motors strike, but not by hunger."

LETTER ON GM STRIKE

SHOULD HUNGER DICTATE OUTCOME?

In an industrial dispute as long lasting and as widespread as the current General Motors strike, unfortunately public attention becomes so focused upon the economic issues involved that frequently an even more important issue becomes overshadowed and its significance dwarfed.

I refer to the human side, to the plight of the families of 200,000 General Motors workers, a total of 1,000,000 men, women, and children, who have not received a GM pay check since November 21, 1945, when the strike began.

For the average American family 10 weeks without any income is a heavy strain. Food must still be purchased, rent must be paid, medical care is needed. These are daily necessities which cannot wait.

Those who believe, as I do, in the perpetuation of an economy based on private enterprise must not permit economic warfare in America to reach a state where the issues are finally determined by the hunger and deprivation of women and children. Such settlements are never lasting settlements and the use of such weapons will boomerang in the long run against our national security. The bitterness which a man feels, seeing his wife and children suffering, is hardly calculated to make him a good citizen in the years to come.

There are thousands of desperate cases among General Motors strikers' families which require immediate attention. In many areas, families are existing on diets of soup and little else. Influenza and pneumonia are increasing. Many homes are without fuel. Children are in need of milk, shoes, clothing.

How bad the situation is can be seen from the first three cases which were given assistance by the Michigan Citizens Committee to Aid Families of General Motors Strikers:

.. striker, his savings depleted by several lay-offs following VE-day and the illness of all his seven children, was granted funds to meet payment on his home from which he was facing eviction.

A widow's appeal for new shoes for her three children, who didn't have a wearable pair between them was granted.

Hospitalization and medical care were provided for a striking former serviceman's wife who was expecting a baby. The hospital had demanded that the bill be paid before admitting the patient.

Despite this, one hears many questions being raised. What about the heavy savings these workers must have piled up during the war? Why don't they apply for unemployment compensation? What about the unions involved—don't they have huge reserves to meet just such an emergency? And then, there is another question, usually asked in an indignant tone, how will our servicemen feel returning home to a land where reconversion is delayed while workers go out on strike?

In answer to these, the following facts may be enlightening.

At the time the GM strike began, it was estimated that the savings of the average striker amounted to a total of $200 in cash and war bonds. Families cannot spend average savings; many families had less than the average and some had almost none. These are the ones that need help. Out of

200,000 strikers, 40,000 families have already exhausted their cash funds and war bonds. Thousands more are exhausting their savings each week.

Unemployment compensation is denied to strikers in 43 of the 48 States. Of the 5 States which grant unemployment compensation to strikers, only 2 contain GM plants. In both these States, New York and Pennsylvania, strikers first qualify for compensation after 7 weeks of unemployment.

Public relief has proven starkly inadequate. In the entire country only 8,500 strikers have been certified for, and are receiving, public relief. In many cities—Baltimore is an example—relief rolls are closed to families of strikers. In others, residence requirements and like technicalities prevent families from receiving relief through local agencies.

On the question of the union's strike relief fund, the entire resources of the international and all the struck locals combined is hardly equal to the loss in wages which the strikers suffer every 2 days. Many locals, with little at the start, have nothing left today

As to how the GI returning home reacts, I do not pretend to speak for the serviceman. But I do know that approximately 28,000 of the GM strikers are World War II veterans. And I know, too, that many of these men, who, just a short time ago, were welcomed home as beribboned heroes for whom nobody could do too much, are now stoically accepting the laments and brickbats hurled their way as they march on GM picket lines.

How many more weeks the strike will last is unknown. Each day that it does thousands of families feel its effects. Even when the strike is settled it will be fully 3 weeks before the average worker receives his first pay check. This allows 1 week for preparing the plants for operation and 2 weeks before the first semimonthly pay check is issued.

I see no difference in helping the family of a striker and helping people who suffer privation as a result of flood, fire, or other catastrophe. I do not argue for one side or the other in this strike, but no one can challenge the sincerity of the strikers who accepted the recommendation of President Truman's fact-finding board and would be at work today if the company had done likewise. This fact-finding method of settling disputes can succeed only through public support of those who will accept the compromise solution which the fact finders propose.

I am sure that it is generally known that I believe that the General Motors strike and the other major strikes now spreading creeping paralysis over the economy of this country should be settled by voluntary arbitration. I understand the workers are ready to arbitrate. I am convinced that lasting justice in settling these disputes cannot be reached by use of the economic weapon of hunger and deprivation.

There is now in operation a national committee to aid the families of General Motors strikers with a Washington, D. C., branch in room 718, Evans Building, 1420 New York Avenue NW. This organization is dedicated to the sole purpose of raising funds through public solicitation to provide relief to needy General Motors families through recognized relief organizations. It numbers among its sponsors American citizens from every walk of life, individuals such as Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Archbishop Lucey, and Leon Henderson. I am proud to be among the sponsors of this committee, which has as its humanitarian slogan, "Let's settle the General Motors strike—but not by hunger."

WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from Oregon.

WASHINGTON, *January 24*

Bill Trinke, Outstanding Commander, the American Legion, Department of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 28, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Wisconsin, the American Legion, has as its commander William Trinke, of Lake Geneva. In the brief time that he has been commander the people in Wisconsin recognize his outstanding leadership. He is not sparing himself in his effort to tell the American Legion program to all of the people in that State and it is already evident that his year will top all records of the Legion to date in membership and program achievement.

Mr. Speaker, Bill Trinke is not only an outstanding Legion commander but he is the kind of man who has helped to make the small city in these United States the real backbone for our way of life. His gospel is always that of Americanism and that means a willingness to work for those principles in his contacts with people in his own community. His friends and neighbors respect him for what he is—an honest, hard-working business and professional man.

My attention, Mr. Speaker, has been attracted to a most valuable and interesting editorial that appeared in his home-town paper, the Lake Geneva Regional News, of Thursday, January 24, 1946, which tells a story about Bill Trinke better than I can relate it. Under permission granted, same is included as part of my remarks. I am glad that Bill Trinke is a constituent of mine.

BILL'S DOING A JOB—AND HOW!

The American Legion Department of Wisconsin's annual midwinter conference just closed testifies in double measure to the success of Bill Trinke's State commandership administration. Not only was it one of the most colorful presentations ever recorded, but likewise, the definite and clear cut position the Legion adopted demanding Congress to immediately enact legislation equitable to both labor and management and compel them to respond in the public interest strikes us as one of the most forceful steps the veterans' organization has ever taken. Both reflect upon the influence Bill has contributed to the State Department.

Ever since the local Legionnaire stepped up from the ranks to take over the reins of the commander post and began his strenuous journeys to the farthermost points of the State to make personal appearances and speak to individual post memberships, reports have come back to Lake Geneva. Dozens of requests, from veterans groups and civic clubs alike, have asked for return appearances. All of them have given absolute proof of an appreciation of the efforts he is making to accomplish the things that he has set himself to do. His speaking engagements are setting up some kind of a record for the office he holds.

When Bill visits a Wisconsin community, the folks there learn something of Lake Geneva. And from the reports mentioned above that we've received—coming from Lions, Legionnaires, and all the way to press association managers, we conclude that Trinke is doing more to acquaint the folks throughout Wisconsin with Lake Geneva than the local chamber of commerce has accomplished in a dozen years past.

Knowing Bill as a fellow townsman, we are convinced that the American Legion of Wisconsin will continue to fearlessly lead public opinion to demand of the national administration the fulfillment of its obligations of providing jobs, homes, and opportunities to those 12,000,000 veterans of World War II. Under such leadership, the group deserves the avalanche of World War II memberships it is attracting today. We trust that such leadership will continue to direct the Wisconsin department in the years to come.

Railroad Reorganizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHAUNCEY W. REED
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 28, 1946

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call to your attention a splendid review of pending legislation relating to railroad reorganizations.

This review was published in the Detroit Free Press and was prepared by Mr. Paul R. Leach, whose ability as a shrewd observer, careful analyst, and interesting writer is well known to every Member of this House.

You will find this review accurate and dependable, and it will, I am sure, assist you in replying to the numerous letters you are receiving from your constituents on this important subject.

[From the Detroit Free Press of January 15, 1946]

RAIL RECEIVERSHIP PROBE IMPENDING—SENSATIONAL DEVELOPMENTS EXPECTED IN INQUIRY INTO ALLEGED SCANDALS

(By Paul R. Leach)

WASHINGTON.—Scandalous holding of railroads in receivership, when many are said to be wholly solvent, promises to be a sensational congressional issue in the weeks to come.

Involved are 75 large and small railroads. Some have been in bankruptcy for 13 years or more.

Hundreds of millions of dollars in potential worth of common and preferred stocks being washed out in reorganizations come prominently into the controversy.

It is one of the most explosive financial situations in recent history.

With the resumption of work Monday following the holiday recess, the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee was preparing to recommend a resolution for a thorough investigation of all railroad receiverships and reorganizations.

Meanwhile pending in both Houses is legislation designed to protect some of the millions of dollars of stock equities endangered or already wiped out by permitting affected carriers to work out voluntary refinancing outside of bankruptcy courts.

If the Senate authorizes the inquiry, which it is expected to do, the Interstate Commerce Committee, after several weeks of preliminary accumulation of information, some of which is already at hand, will begin public

hearings. Observers expect among those called would be:

1. Trustees of roads in reorganization, who have been appointed by Federal courts, to explain their actions.

2. Attorneys and others who have been allowed large fees.

3. Representatives of bond and other security protective committees, including large insurance companies whose investments have been safeguarded, as well as of stockholders whose equities are dissolving or gone.

4. Members and experts of the Interstate Commerce Commission, which formulates reorganization plans and passes on fees.

5. Members of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, involved back in the early thirties through immense loans for the saving of tottering roads, some of whom have been said to exercise considerable Government influence in trusteeships since.

It is unlikely that any Federal judges will be called before the committee, despite charges of irregularities by some courts in appointing trustees, continuing receiverships beyond necessary time, and going ahead with ICC plans for washing out common and preferred stocks when both Houses of Congress were concerning themselves with these very stockholders equities.

Should any serious irregularities by judges develop, the House and Senate Judiciary Committees could scarcely escape taking them up. Those committees have jurisdiction in matters affecting the judiciary.

But because of the serious implication of possible impeachment in a public investigation of a Federal judge, all congressional committees will move very cautiously in this respect.

It is not so much illegalities that the Senate Interstate Commerce and House Judiciary Committees are concerned about. Its interest is in correcting by new laws what are termed injustices or bad practices in the light of present-day financial conditions of the roads, as compared to the depression years.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER, Montana Democrat, chairman of the Senate committee, and Senator CLYDE REED, Kansas Republican, jointly sponsored the investigation resolution.

Both of these Senators, who have informed themselves deeply on the whole problem, were responsible for use of the word "scandalous."

The investigation resolution grew out of committee's hearing before the holidays on a bill to provide voluntary modification of railroad-financial structure.

In the course of that hearing, with Commissioner Charles D. Mahaffie, of the ICC testifying, WHEELER brought out that many roads in receivership are actually sound today. The following remarks were made in the hearing:

Senator WHEELER. "Is there any reason for keeping such railroad companies in bankruptcy? I mean, when they are not bankrupt at all. What is the reason for such railroads remaining in bankruptcy when they are not bankrupt?"

Mr. MAHAFFIE. "I know of no reason in the world why a railroad should stay in any longer than the time it takes to get it out."

Senator WHEELER. "The only reason I can see is that some receivers and lawyers want them to stay in bankruptcy so they can continue to draw down fees. Frankly I think it is getting to be a scandal."

Senator REED. "Maybe some of the courts like to retain control."

Senator WHEELER. "I can't understand why these court trustees are holding millions of dollars in surplus cash and not paying off some of the indebtedness and getting them out of bankruptcy, and why they do not pay off the RFC or some of the other indebtedness.

"It seems to me that there is just no excuse at this particular time when many of them are not actually in bankruptcy."

Senator REED. "If there is not legislation enough to clear this up we ought to have additional legislation. I think it is a scandal."

Senator WHEELER. "I think it is a scandal, also."

[From the Detroit Free Press of January 16, 1945]

ROCK ISLAND ROAD PAYS, YET INVESTORS MAY LOSE

(By Paul R. Leach)

WASHINGTON.—Although the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railroad appears to be in good financial condition, its security holders have been asked to approve reorganization plans which would wipe out common and preferred stocks.

Ballots were sent by the Interstate Commerce Commission to owners of bonds as well as stock after Congress recessed for the holidays. The ICC draws up all reorganization plans under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act. They are put into effect when the courts so order.

Upon completion of the poll of security owners, Federal District Judge Michael L. Igoe of Chicago, in whose court the tangled affairs of the Rock Island have been long undergoing litigation, will be confronted with this problem:

Although apparently able to pay dividends on its stock, shall the Rock Island be so reorganized that this class of security will have no value?

According to information from the ICC, put into the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce record of hearings on legislation to prevent this sort of thing, the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific has had earnings justifying purchase of its bonds by investment trusts.

From 1940 to June, 1945, according to these records, the Rock Island earned its interest charges 16.63 times.

In that same period, when the company was in bankruptcy and not qualified to pay stock dividends, its earnings before interest and Federal taxes were on the basis of $121 on preferred and $67.50 on common stock. That computation is for the 5½ years as a whole, not for any one year.

This does not mean that, if not in bankruptcy, the Rock Island would have paid out that much in dividends over the 5½ years. Some funds would have gone into other accounting channels, as well as taxes. But that it could have paid its interest and some dividends appears evident to the protesting Congressmen.

Thus to Senate committee members, it seems that Rock Island bonds are safe as investments for insurance companies, savings banks and trusts, compelled by law to buy only sound bonds.

Furthermore, to congressional irritation, it appears that equity exists to make the common and preferred stock worth too much to be wiped out, even if those stocks should in close accounting be able to pay only a few cents now.

Bond securities are judged by large investors, who must under their State laws play safe, by the number of times they earn their interest charges. Insurance companies cannot buy as a rule unless the company has earned one and one-half times its interest per year for a certain number of years.

The Rock Island appears to have earned three times the minimum interest requirements in the last 5½ years.

Some time ago, when Judge Igoe's final decision on the ICC-approved reorganization plan for the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific was pending, Representative CHAUNCEY W. REED, Illinois Republican, wrote to Igoe asking that the final order be held up.

Representative REED is a member of the House Judiciary Committee. He, like others in Congress, has been seeking to prevent wiping out of stocks in reorganizations where stock value might be apparent. He has introduced a resolution which would take solvent roads now in receivership out of bankruptcy if they can make a satisfactory financial showing over the last 7 years.

Judge Igoe waited a few days, then issued his final order in the Milwaukee case, approving the ICC plan.

At about the same time Federal Judge George H. Moore, in St. Louis, approved an ICC plan for reorganization of the Frisco lines. Then, shortly after the Congressional holiday recess, he approved an ICC plan for the Missouri Pacific.

Although Judges Igoe and Moore acted on plans set up by the ICC, Members of Congress have been concerned over the fact that the court orders were issued while legislation was pending in committees to save stock equities.

Judge Moore called the Missouri Pacific reorganization plan as perfect as human mind could make it. Yet Chairman WHEELER has shown that the Missouri Pacific paid out $47,000,000 in excess-profits taxes in 1943 and $46,380,000 in 1944. These excess-profits-tax payments were exceeded by only one railroad, the Santa Fe, which is not in receivership.

[From the Detroit Free Press of January 17, 1946]

LITTLE PROTECTION GIVEN BY LAW TO RAIL STOCKS

(By Paul R. Leach)

WASHINGTON.—Congressional efforts to protect bond and stock equities in reorganized bankrupt railroads date back to the depression years.

In the early thirties, with earnings falling off to the point where maturing bond debts could not be met, big and little roads, representing three-fourth of the country's mileage, went into bankruptcy or on the verge of it.

Through huge loans from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation efforts were made to save the tottering carriers. Eventually 77 of them went into some form of receivership.

Seeing many investors likely to lose large sums, especially trusts and insurance companies with widows and orphans to think about, Congress in a series of investigations asked why.

Skullduggery? Bad management? Government at fault?

It was found that the Government, through its regulating agency, the Interstate Commerce Commission, had no supervision over railroad failures. Although operating across State lines the roads had to go through bankruptcy the same as any big or little private business.

That was all right for a closely owned small business. But there were thousands of railroad bond and stock holders to be considered.

As a result the Transportation Act was revised, giving the ICC more authority. Also section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act was passed, setting up proceedings for the handling of railroad receiverships through reorganizations.

Later, some roads showed they would be able to straighten out their own affairs if given time. The McLaughlin amendment to the Bankruptcy Act was passed. It barred the ICC from washing out any classes of security holders. But it applied only to a few roads.

Those which were allowed to operate under this act came through in good shape. Their investors lost little or nothing. The McLaughlin Act has been extended and is up for consideration now in Senate committee after House extension.

Under section 77, applying to all but these few roads, the ICC works out reorganization plans, generally washing out common and preferred stocks to save the bonds. The Hobbs

bill was passed in the House last year, designed to modify ICC authority so that Federal courts could use more independent judgment for stockholders.

More legislation to affect all reorganizations, somewhat similar to the McLaughlin Act, is now under consideration by the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee.

This new Senate bill would permit what is called voluntary debt adjustments. But they would have to be carried on with ICC approval, with further agreement by 75 percent of each class of security holders, bonds as well as stocks.

Bondholders heretofore have objected in reorganization set-ups to the kind of capital structure which would permit retaining common and preferred stock equities because of a contention that this would weaken the bonds.

It is probable that the pending Senate bill will be revised before going to the floor for action to provide stockholder protection of some sort not now assured.

Up to 1943 the courts in railroad reorganization cases assumed they had a right to consider equities of all classes of security holders and were not necessarily bound by ICC findings.

In the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Supreme Court test, ICC plans in general were upheld. Justice William O. Douglas' opinion added the warning that the railroads probably faced poor times, with taxes and costs going up.

Those bad times have not yet come. Many Congressmen believe the roads have years of profitable operations ahead. Yet, based somewhat upon this Supreme Court opinion, the lower courts generally feel that there is nothing they can do about a plan once submitted by the ICC, and they are going ahead weakening stocks.

Thus, say protesting Congressmen, the ICC has a vested right in continuing a position it took originally, although conditions have changed.

Three years ago the House Judiciary Committee talked of giving warrants safeguarding stockholders. The ICC protested, saying the stocks were valueless. Now the ICC is willing to accept the warrant idea, but neither the House nor Senate committees are willing to accept warrants on the contention that stock equity values are now worth more than a promise.

In the House Committee report on the Hobbs Act in 1945 it was contended that section 77 did not give the ICC authority to wipe out stockholders, but that the ICC had interpreted it that way and has been upheld by the courts.

Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1946

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Un-American Activities has been engaging these past few days in a series of activities which I believe are a proper cause for alarm to every Member of the Congress. It has attempted to carry out a wholly unwarranted inquisitorial investigation of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, a group well known for its splendid activities on behalf of cementing American-Soviet relations in line with the policies of the United States Government.

Furthermore, the committee has launched an attack upon the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, whose humanitarian efforts have saved the lives of countless men, women, and children, victims of Fascist terror. The Un-American Activities Committee has climaxed its actions by an attempt to cite for contempt the executive secretary of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee. She properly resisted the request for the records and books of her organization on the grounds that, as a relief rather than a propaganda organization, its fund-collecting activities were answerable to the President's War Control Board but not to an unconstitutional "fishing expedition" by the Un-American Activities Committee. Miss Bryan, the executive secretary, was given no opportunity to report on the activities of her organization or to state her objections to the Un-American Activities Committee's action. She was also denied counsel.

The committee has challenged the right of many other organizations to carry on their programs in various fields of American endeavor, as guaranteed by the first amendment to the Constitution. The committee openly announced on January 23, through its spokesman, Mr. Ernie Adamson, that it proposed to "investigate all organizations aiming to influence public opinion." This is precisely the field in which Congress has no power to legislate and in which the American people should be free to act without interference. By this action, the committee sets itself up as a censor of American thought and I have repeatedly said that it is thus riding herd on the thought of the American people.

The committee's action fully justifies the scathing indictment brought against it by the Washington Post in its editorial of January 23 entitled "Controlling Thought" which says in part "this Un-American Activities Committee, acting as it does under the authority and sponsorship of the House of Representatives, casts an ugly stain upon the integrity and the good name of Congress." Congress can render no greater service to the cause of Americanism than to wipe out this "ugly stain" by abolishing the Committee on Un-American Activities. I wish to conclude these remarks by quoting the whole editorial from the Washington Post:

CONTROLLING THOUGHT

The Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee is an organization of responsible American citizens licensed by the President's War Relief Control Board to collect funds in the United States for the relief of refugee victims of fascism abroad. Among its activities is the maintenance of a hospital at Toulouse for those most pitiful and abandoned of all refugees, the Spanish Republicans exiled from their own country because fascism is still triumphantly there. In helping these people, the committee is wholly consistent with the position of the United States Government, which has already agreed to discuss with France and Britain the severance of diplomatic relations with Franco Spain.

Obviously, then, according to the logic which has been consistently pursued by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, this organization for the relief of anti-Fascist refugees is un-American. It is as plain, is it not, as the un-Americanism of Shirley Temple's dimples? The organization has therefore been subpenaed to produce all its books and records before the Un-American Activities Committee this very morning at 10 o'clock. And prior to this investigation, the committee asked the War Control Board to cancel the organization's license to collect and distribute funds.

This is in no sense an isolated case. The other day another reputable organization, the National Committee to Combat Anti-Semitism, received a letter signed by one Ernie Adamson, the Un-American Activities Committee's chief counsel. "I have received a copy of a formal petition being distributed by you," the letter began, "together with solicitation of money for the purpose of controlling the thoughts of American citizens." It has become un-American, apparently, in the view of the Un-American Activities Committee, for men to enter into voluntary associations to advance their common purposes or even to petition Congress for redress of their grievances. If the Committee to Combat Anti-Semitism is attempting to control the thoughts of American citizens, then so is the Anti-Saloon League, the Republican Party, the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, and every other group which, in the free tradition of America, is seeking to secure acceptance of its views by a free people. There is a danger of controlling the thoughts of American citizens only from those like the Un-American Activities Committee who would suppress the free expression of ideas.

We say again that this Un-American Activities Committee, acting as it does under the authority and sponsorship of the House of Representatives, casts an ugly stain upon the integrity and the good name of Congress. It undermines faith in the legislative process. It violates fundamental concepts of Americanism. We urge the Members of Congress soberly to examine what this committee has done and resolutely to put an end to its travesty on the American idea.

Occupation Troops in the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1946

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include two letters; one from a sergeant stationed in Manila and one from a sergeant stationed in Saipan.

Mr. Speaker, the Filipinos are our friends. They are about to have an election. The soldiers in the Philippines, as well as other countries and islands in the Pacific, are wondering why they have such a large number of occupation troops in these countries. It does seem ridiculous that we should have so many troops watching our friends.

I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that having an armed force in our friend's house, watching every move they make, is not conducive to a lasting friendship. I am inclined to agree with the Secretary of State, Mr. Byrnes, when he suggests that troops in all countries and islands be brought home with the exception of those in Germany and Japan. I am also

convinced, Mr. Speaker, that the number of troops in these countries can be greatly reduced. Certainly the troops in these countries should not be those impressed and kept in the Army against their will. The following letters from a sergeant in the Philippines and a sergeant in Saipan, asks some questions which should be answered, either by the War or State Department:

MANILA, P. I.

DEAR SIR: There are one-quarter of a million American soldiers in the Philippines today. Why? We ask the War Department, we ask Congress, and we ask you.

The Philippines are a friendly, allied country that we helped liberate a few short months ago. In another few months the Philippines will be granted their independence. Yet the War Department keeps a quarter-million occupation troops here, under the cover of such vague phrases as "hostile countries" and "commitments."

We ask what is hostile about the Philippines, and we ask what are these commitments? Are they commitments to protect the vested interests which wish to continue their exploitation of the Filipino people?

We are not satisfied with the present twice-slowed rate of redeployment of troops from the Philippines. We think that the present stand of the War Department is a step toward the establishment of military fascism, both at home and abroad. We have accomplished little if we defeat fascism in enemy lands and cannot return home because our own military fascists decree that we must occupy a friendly country.

If there's an answer to the question of why we are being kept here, we have not heard it. If there is an explanation, it has not been given. It's up to Congress to do something, before we cease to have a government by people and wake up to find that we have a government by the military.

Congress must act, and act now.

Respectfully yours.

SAIPAN, M. I., *January 16, 1946.*

Hon. A. L. MILLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Let the "brass" in the War Department sit around and play checkers—although it does seem a terrific waste of taxpayers' money. I have more important things to do; a business which I hope to salvage at least a part; a family to raise, if I am not too old by the time the checker game is over.

I am not a professional soldier; would be ashamed to be a part of this organization except by force.

We men who actually had a hand in winning the war, who have been overseas from 1½ to 2½ years, are most certainly being discriminated against by the War Department's new slow-down policy. The man who has long overseas service has far less chance of getting back to his responsibilities than the USO soldiers who fought the war within the continental limits of the United States. Our country should show enough gratitude for what we have done for it to get us home after long overseas service. There are thousands of us who have seen no civilization of any kind for more than 18 months, and who have nothing to do on these lonely islands now that the war is over.

Transportation is available. Can it be that the people are against bringing us back?

Please see that we get a bit of justice; there is so little we can do for ourselves in this organization controlled by methods and traditions centuries old. Frankly, I, for one, am getting desperate. Thanks for the assistance I know you will be able to give us.

Sincerely yours.

Standing at Kadesh-barnea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL K. HOCH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1946

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following sermon by the Reverend R. Paul Schearrer, D. D., of the Takoma Park Presbyterian Church:

With the single exception of Sinai, no place has more significance in the wilderness wanderings of the Hebrew people than Kadesh-barnea. At Sinai, the laws had been given, the organization effected, the census taken, and the responsibilities apportioned. Moses was proving to be a wise and competent leader. At length, the people were on the march again and in 11 days had reached the southern frontier of the land of Canaan. Here is the record: "We came to Kadesh-barnea. And I [Moses] said unto you, Behold, the Lord thy God hath set the land before thee: go up and possess it, as the Lord God of thy fathers hath said unto thee; fear not, neither be discouraged" (Deuteronomy, 1:19–21). They were standing at the gate of the Promised Land. To enter or not to enter, that was the question.

The people were familiar with the ancient promise. They knew, too, how Moses, their leader, felt. Nevertheless, prudence dictated that a committee be named to investigate and report. Moses was amenable to the suggestion. A committee of 12 was appointed, 1 representative from each tribe. They were charged to do a thorough job—to learn all they could about the nature and number of the people, the size and strength of the cities, the topography of the land, and the fertility of the soil. In due time, the committee returned. A hazardous assignment was faithfully completed. The people were assembled to hear the findings of the committee. The interest of the people was universal and intense.

The striking feature of the reports submitted was their common agreement relative to the basic facts. The committee were of one mind regarding the fertility of the soil. It was poetically pictured as "a land flowing with milk and honey". Samples of grapes and pomegranates and figs were exhibited. These were enough to make any desert wanderer's mouth water. The committee were unanimous in their descriptions of the people of the land. They referred to them as "giants". In comparison with them, they added, "we, the spies, seemed as grasshoppers"—an excellent example of Oriental hyperbole. And lastly, all reported the cities were walled and well protected; and, in addition, that the mountainous topography of the land afforded natural defense. In short, here were the facts: the land was most desirable, though its occupation was beset with some difficulties. There was entire agreement so far as the facts were concerned. However, there was irreconcilable division of opinion in the matter of conclusions reached and recommendations offered.

* * * * *

The minority report made by Caleb, in which Joshua also joined, urged immediate action: "Let us go up and possess it." The recommendation was positive and progressive, definite, and decisive. It was in line with the ancient promise of God. It was in accord with the thought of Moses. Not ignoring any of the difficulties, it rested upon a vital faith that the God who had brought them thus far would keep His word; that the God who had delivered them at the sea could and would also open up the land for them. In short, Caleb's case can be stated thus: We are able, we have the men and the materials, we have experience that the Lord our God makes good His promises, we have dreamed of a land of our own—a land of freedom and security, of peace and plenty—we are standing at the very gate of such a land, therefore, "let us go up and possess it."

The majority report, supported by 10 against 2 (all forgotten men, I challenge any congregation to name just 1 of them), was summed up in 4 words, "We are not able." Their statement played upon the fears of the people—the natives are giants, we look like grasshoppers beside them. The cities are walled, the mountains are high, the climate is wretched, literally eating up the inhabitants. They exaggerated all the difficulties. They made no reference whatsoever to their resources. By emphasis and omission, they created a false impression and won the verdict of the people. Standing at Kadesh-barnea, the people lacked the courage and faith to go up and possess the Promised Land. The result of their refusal in history, 40 years of aimless desert wanderings. And most striking of all—everyone of that generation perished in the desert save 2, Caleb and Joshua. In God's sight, they were the only ones considered worthy of entering the Promised Land.

This bit of Hebrew history is a precious parable for us today. In fact, the Old Testament is an ancient light on many modern problems. Why are we so reluctant to be guided by its light? Hebrew history is a sample of the universal history of mankind from the religious point of view. As God dealt with them, so will He deal with all nations. Modern states reveal how little nations—like men—learn from the experience of others. There seems to be a strong natural penchant to learn life's lessons the hard way. O Lord, how long will Thy children stumble about in the darkness of fear rather than walk in the light of faith?

As I see the world today, and especially as I see America's role in the present world situation, we are standing at Kadesh-barnea. For centuries mankind has had the prophetic vision of nations "beating their swords into plowshares." For centuries mankind has been haunted with the mystic overture of the angels, first heard on the night when the Christ was born, "Peace on earth, good will to men." "Peace on earth"—that is our land of promise. Since the day when the Pilgrim Fathers dared to cross the sea and settle on the cold, inhospitable shores of New England, we, as a people, have been led of God in such a way that it is clear God is seeking to use us as a divine agency for the fulfillment of his age-long purpose for all mankind. And have we not come to think of ourselves as His chosen, His beloved? We acknowledge in gratitude His past providences. We declare our faith "In God we trust." By His grace, we are now standing at our Kadesh-barnea. At this very hour we are listening to reports dealing with the new world in a new day. God's eye is upon us. Will we have the courage and faith necessary to "go up and possess" the land?

As in the days of Moses, so now, men are agreed on the facts in the case. There is no disagreement as to the nature of war. It is all men say it is—brutal, beastly, inhuman. We wonder what Sherman would call it if he were living now! Language breaks down in attempting a description of its true nature. In the span of a single generation, we have seen the introduction of the submarine, the airplane, poison gas, robot planes, rocket bombs, and atomic bombs. We are now told that Danish, Swedish, and Russian scientists are working on a plutonic bomb that will be a thousand times more devastating than the atomic. Professional soldiers calmly state that our own defense in the future will be offense; which means we must

annihilate the enemy before the enemy annihilates us.

Also, there is universal agreement on the question of the total defeat of Germany and Japan. So far as Germany is concerned, the several armies of occupation are vying for honors in doing a thorough job. It has been months now since anyone has hinted that MacArthur's policy in Japan was soft. The enemies are crushed; and what is more, they are cold and hungry. For purely selfish reasons, we dare not let them freeze or starve to death.

Again, no exception is taken to the general proposition that there is no more natural time to be thinking in terms of rebuilding than when so much of the world is in ruins. On every hand, we are hearing of blueprints for a better world. The cynic may raise his eyebrows and say, "It sounds like 25 years ago." Which is true, but with a difference. Today, the devastation is more nearly total than it was then. Too soon, after Versailles, everyone was rebuilding along the old familiar lines. It's an unwelcome question to raise, but not without point: "Who helped 'to build up' Hitler?" The German "big shots" now on trial want to call in as defense witnesses the "Cliveden crowd" of Britain. We might well ask ourselves whether we shall again lend money and provide credits to enable other nations to rearm. Shall we aid in financing the armament program of other nations and then use their program as an argument for arming ourselves? What guaranty have we that the money we lend other nations will not be used for military preparations? The heart of America would allow billions for relief and rehabilitation; but not a dime for aiding in the rearmament of potential future enemies.

Lastly, no one would deny that a start has been made in world government with the launching of the United Nations Organization. True, it is only a start; but it is a step in the right direction, which, if followed by other steps in the same direction, will bring us at length to the desired goal.

There would seem to be, then, general agreement on the main facts in our present situation: on the nature of war, the defeat of Germany and Japan, the devastation wrought, and the setting up of new machinery for international cooperation. But, what shall we say of the conclusions drawn and the recommendations offered in the light of these admitted facts?

Here, again, as in the days of Moses, there is division of opinion. There are two schools of thought. One school counsels: We must watch our step. Prudence, they assert, dictates that when we are strong it is our duty to remain strong; aye, grow stronger; no, we must not stop even there, we must make and keep ourselves the strongest nation on earth. We must be stronger than any combination of nations which might unite against us. We must be so strong that when other nations look at us they will conclude, as the majority of the spies reported of the Canaanites, that we are "giants". To this end, the following recommendations are being made: (1) conscript every lad as he becomes 18 years of age and compel him to study the art and science of war; (2) maintain a navy stronger than all other navies combined; (3) keep all laboratory secrets, like the manufacture of the atomic bomb, as trump cards, to be used if and when needed. It is the counsel of suspicion and fear. In all of it, there is not a word of past providential deliverances. They are made of such flimsy stuff. What shall we say of Valley Forge or Trafalgar, of Gettysburg or Verdun?

The other school of thought recommends, as did Caleb and Joshua, "Let us go up and possess the land." They feel that because, with God's aid, we have gained the victory; because, before our eyes, we can behold the punishment which nations bring upon themselves by brandishing the sword; because there is no better time to make a fresh start according to new specifications than when the world is in ruins; because we have before us the age-old vision of the prophets of a promised land of peace; and because we have already taken the first step in the right direction; therefore, "let us go up and possess it." This view of the minority report of centuries ago has now become the considered judgment of our most advanced scientists. The modern Calebs and Joshuas are men like Einstein and Compton, who see clearly we are standing at the Kadesh-barnea of the promised land. Either we shall "go up and possess it" or we shall wander, yea, we shall perish, in the desert.

One angle to the land of promise was lost sight of in the days of Moses which is still being forgotten today. I refer to the original promise God made to Abraham: "I will give thee the land and will bless thee and through thee, all the world." The land of promise is no exclusive, selfish possession of any one nation. It shall be given to that people through whom God can work out His purpose for the whole world. Can we, as a nation, catch that vision? Science has reduced the world to a neighborhood; only religious faith can transform it into a brotherhood.

We are standing at Kadesh-barnea. Before us stretches a land of promise. May we hear God say to us, "Go up and possess it; fear not, neither be discouraged."

New Pacific Era Dawns as Hawaii Nears Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1946

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by William H. Doherty, from the Washington Sunday Star of January 27, 1946:

NEW PACIFIC ERA DAWNS AS HAWAII NEARS STATEHOOD

(By William H. Doherty)

While residents of the District of Columbia rejoice over President Truman's support of their campaign for enfranchisement, the peoples of four other American areas lacking statehood status—Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands—also are finding deep satisfaction in the Chief Executive's recommendation to Congress.

In the same brief but highly significant section of his State-of-the-Union message dealing with the District's voting aspirations, Mr. Truman made the following proposals which promise to be of historic import:

Hawaii: Prompt, favorable action on her statehood application.

Alaska: Statehood as soon as it is ascertained her people desire it.

Puerto Rico: Legislation by which her people might choose their form of government and ultimate status.

Virgin Islands: An increasing measure of self-government.

From a national and international standpoint, the Presidential endorsement of statehood for Hawaii and Alaska is filled with the greatest significance. No new State has been created since 1912, when New Mexico and Arizona were admitted, and never before in history has a noncontiguous area become a full and equal partner in the American Union.

HAWAII THE FORTY-NINTH STATE

Of these two Pacific Territories, Hawaii definitely seems to be in the lead for the honor of becoming the Forty-ninth State. Mr. Truman's recommendation regarding Hawaii was unqualified. He urged that "the Congress promptly accede to the wishes of the people of Hawaii that the Territory be admitted to statehood in our Union."

The President's statement was the second administration pronouncement in favor of Hawaiian statehood in the past few weeks. Just before the close of 1945, Secretary Ickes issued a public statement advocating statehood as part of the Interior Department's Territorial policy.

Largely as a result of his action, a six-man subcommittee of the House Territories Committee flew to Hawaii early this month to investigate the question. The group arrived back in San Francisco the day Mr. Truman delivered his message, and the chairman, Representative HENRY D. LARCADE, Jr., Democrat, Louisiana, stated he was "convinced the people of the Territory of Hawaii have demonstrated their capacity to assume the responsibility of statehood."

LARCADE'S view was indorsed in a report to the full committee Thursday by the other members who were: Hawaii's lone—and voteless—Representative in Congress, Delegate JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON; Representative HOMER D. ANGELL, Republican, Oregon; Representative JAMES J. DELANEY, Democrat, New York; Representative GEORGE P. MILLER, Democrat, California, and Representative DEAN P. TAYLOR, Republican, New York.

Press reports indicate the subcommittee's appearance set off the greatest statehood demonstration in the islands' long campaign for that object, which dates back to the day in 1898 when the Republic of Hawaii voluntarily became a Territory of the United States.

Representative of all segments of the insular population trooped to the throne room of Iolani Palace in Honolulu, where native kings and queens once held court, and to other meeting places on other semitropical islands of the Hawaiian group, to have their say. A few dissenting voices were heard, but the majority cry was for "statehood now."

No organized group appeared in opposition, whereas the proponents included the leaders of both political parties, which have invariably carried statehood planks in their platforms; organizations of both employers and employees, and representatives of many professions and trades. Governor Stainback, a Democrat, and Delegate FARRINGTON, a Republican, both gave strong support.

LABOR AND BUSINESS APPROVAL

The International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, affiliated with the CIO, strongly indorsed Hawaii's full participation in the Union. So did the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, composed of sugar producers having labor contracts for both mill and field employees with the ILWU.

The bipartisan Honolulu County Board of Supervisors approved it unanimously, as also did the board of directors of the local chamber of commerce. This latter action was voted following "whispers" that big business might be "half hearted" in its stand. To scotch such rumors the chamber took a secret ballot of its membership, which resulted in 506 affirmative and 170 negative votes. The Honolulu Advertiser commented editorially that if a ballot were taken including all small business in Hawaii, "the proportion for statehood would be even higher."

The Honolulu County Medical Society recorded its membership for statehood after

presenting figures showing that in public health work Hawaii ranked with any State in the Union. Dr. Charles L. Wilbar, president of the Territorial Board of Health, offered statistics showing that only the District of Columbia exceeds Hawaii's per capita expenditure of $3.23 for public health work. Jack Hall, regional director of the ILWU, was among those who made a frontal attack on charges that if statehood were granted, those citizens of Japanese extraction, numbering approximately one-third of the population, would control the electorate.

He termed it "a gross untruth and a slander upon the integrity and Americanism of our citizens of Japanese derivation. The military record of the One Hundredth Infantry and the Four Hundred and Forty-second (military units composed of AJA's) dispels any question of loyalty. The complete absence of any sabotage by citizens or aliens of Japanese ancestry during the war has been vouched for by military commanders in this area."

He said the AJA's always have had less than their share of representation in the local legislature and that "race has never been a serious factor" in elections.

Among others who supported this view were the president of the University of Hawaii, Dr. Gregg M. Sinclair; the previous Delegate from Hawaii, Samuel W. King; leaders of both the Democratic and Republican parties in the islands, and many others.

Secretary Ickes, in his statement advocating statehood, also commented upon the lack of any evidence of bloc voting.

Many observers regard the race question as one of the most important obstacles to overcome in Congress. One of the subcommittee's west coast Members, Representative ANGELL, made this plain to the Hawaiians. He said the mainlanders were quite unfamiliar with racial conditions in Hawaii and it would be the subcommittee's task to explain the situation on Capitol Hill.

According to the latest statistics, published by the Board of Health, Hawaii's total civilian population as of July 1, 1945, was slightly over 500,000, of which about 91 percent were American citizens.

The latest available break-down by racial groups is for 1941, no figures having been published during the war. These figures showed that of the Japanese, 124,351 were citizens and 85,183, aliens. Of those listed as Caucasians, 139,299 were citizens and 2,328 were aliens. However, those not listed as Caucasians were not necessarily of Oriental extraction. There were over 14,246 pure Hawaiians, 52,445 part Hawaiians and 8,460 Puerto Ricans (all of them citizens). The remainder of the population consisted mainly of Chinese, Koreans, and Filipinos.

There has been an upward trend in the non-Oriental population and a progressive downward trend in noncitizens year by year. A joint congressional committee which visited the islands in 1937 to investigate statehood pointed out that immigration, except from the continental United States, had halted, and added:

"It is obvious that the time is not distant when there will be practically no aliens in Hawaii, nor indeed any even of foreign birth."

NOW CLOSER TO WASHINGTON

Many of the arguments which previously figured importantly in any discussion of statehood for Hawaii have, through time and circumstances, been reduced to minor points or have disappeared, proponents say.

Among these are Hawaii's remoteness from the rest of the Nation. In this day of rapid transportation and communication, Hawaii is in some respects just as close as other parts of the Nation, and closer to Washington than were any of the States when they entered the Union, excepting the original 13.

THE NEW AMERICAN FLAG

The argument is also heard in jest, but perhaps with some sentimental force behind it, that a new State would knock the flag out of kilter. The Hawaiians have a ready answer for that one: They've already designed a new flag with seven rows of seven stars.

The Constitution sets up no requirements for Territories seeking to become States, but the territorial status is generally considered an apprenticeship looking to that end. Governor Stainback told the Larcade committee that Hawaii's property value assessment of over half a billion dollars exceeded that of any Territory at the time of admission except Oklahoma. The island population is also greater than that of any State when admitted, again excepting Oklahoma.

Hawaii's internal revenue tax payments to the United States Treasury totaled $174,000,000 in 1945, or more than 14 of the States.

CHEERED BY TRUMAN BACKING

The former island kingdom has another proud boast—she leads the Nation in war-bond sales. From May 1941 to November 1945, latest figures available, her per capita purchases of E bonds were $542.93, compared with a national average of $291. The District of Columbia, with $527.43 per capita, had to take second place.

If it is true that "humanity sympathizes with a strenuous aspiration," Hawaiians figure they have a big part of their battle won. President Truman's statehood endorsement—the first given by any President—has cheered them greatly.

OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1946

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit for the Members of the House an article on nylon hosiery under a date line from New York, January 24, which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald, on January 25, 1946, as follows:

BULK OF NYLONS GO OVERSEAS—SHIPPERS ESCAPING OPA PRICE LIMIT

NEW YORK, January 24.—Just in case you'd like to know, ladies, the nylons you couldn't buy the last few months are being put to good use. They're embellishing some of the prettiest legs in all Mexico—not to mention gams in Cuba, Venezuela and other Latin-American countries.

An investigation today established that the lure of higher prices in foreign places devoid of OPA ceilings plus a lamentable error by certain Washington officials—who haven't yet learned that women's stockings are scarce in the United States, has resulted in the siphoning out of the country of a heavily increasing percentage of nylon production.

Unofficial estimates from Government scurces point to the probability that nearly 3,000,000 pairs of nylons have been whisked out to foreign markets in the last 2 months.

But the hosiery trade, boiling mad over the continued domestic shortage, insists that as many as 4,500,000 pairs have been snatched abroad.

Don't think that just any senorita in Mexico City or Havana can walk into a store and plank down the equivalent of $1.40, our average OPA ceiling, for a pair of nylons.

They're a top luxury, bringing up to $6 in Havana. Wealthy women can buy a dozen pairs if they can pay that price.

Foreign demand is so strong that it's even robbing our black market, the trade says.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1946

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, January 24, 1946, the Secretary of the Treasury, Hon. Fred M. Vinson, addressed the twenty-first annual meeting of the North Carolina Newspaper Institute at Music Hall, Chapel Hill, N. C.

The following is the address of the Secretary:

Coming from Kentucky I feel that I am visiting my friends and neighbors when I come to North Carolina. All of us in the South are proud of what you are doing. We are proud of the great forward strides you are making in industrial and agricultural development. We are proud of the great forward strides you are making in education and public welfare. We see in North Carolina a vigorous and progressive democracy built on the finest traditions and highest ideals of the South.

Tonight we shall discuss a measure, on which the representatives of two democratic nations reached agreement, that will better our chances of establishing a sound world economy. That measure, which is subject to the consideration and approval of the Congress, is the proposed financial agreement between the United Kingdom and the United States.

The American people should understand fully the nature and effects of the proposed agreement in order that Congress can have the benefit of their views in applying its best judgment to the proposal.

One part of this agreement provides that the United States will offer a credit of $3,750,000,000 to Britain. There are certain misconceptions about this line of credit to Britain which should be dispelled at the outset. In some quarters this credit is still said to be, through inadvertence, misunderstanding, or purpose, a gift.

The proposed line of credit is not a gift; it is a loan. It is not merely a loan of so many dollars to be repaid, but it is an interest-bearing loan. The interest is not a nominal fee, but it is reasonably comparable to what it costs the United States Government to borrow money.

The repayment of the loan and the interest, moreover, is not all of the consideration or benefit that the United States receives under this financial agreement. Britain promises, in addition to repaying the loan with interest, to remove currency restrictions. Moreover, Britain promises to avoid trade controls which would discriminate against American products. On top of this, Britain has agreed with the United States on the principles that should be followed by a proposed international trade organization to improve world-trade practices.

In addition to these benefits which the United States receives, a general purpose of the loan, as stated in the agreement, "is to facilitate purchases by the United Kingdom of goods and services in the United States." This will be a real contribution to our domestic program of high production, employment, and national income.

A strong case could be made that in view of these benefits to the United States which I have mentioned last—the expansion of our markets abroad, the principles for an international trade organization; the elimination of trade discriminations; the abolition of monetary controls which restrict trade—that in view of these substantial gains, we could have made the $3,750,000,000 a gift instead

of a loan. While $3,750,000,000 is a lot of money, it is a small investment if it contributes to an expansion of world trade and to peace and to general prosperity.

Some may ask that if it could be claimed that these considerations fully supported a gift, why did we bargain for a loan, and an interest-bearing one at that? The answer is simple. The administration wanted to make the best agreement possible from our viewpoint and to offer a plan which would be acceptable to our people and the Congress.

Now, in regard to this financial agreement, we have an anomalous situation. If the benefits are as great as I have indicated—and they are—why is there as much opposition as there is? The only explanation, I believe, is that there are so many benefits extending in so many directions in so many direct and indirect ways that the total picture appears to be complex, whereupon particular economic isolationist or defeatist groups muddy the water and parade their pet prejudices in picturesque and sometimes demagogic language.

It is my hope, therefore, to explain some of these benefits in such plain language that those who wish to understand will not be lured away by colorful statements without substance. As we proceed to this more detailed examination, keep this over-all summary of the proposed financial agreement in mind: the money extended Britain is not a gift but an interest-bearing loan wherein we receive not only a return of the dollars and interest but benefits that in truth many believe would have supported a gift.

The prosperity of this country is closely linked with our export trade. Even during the 1930's, when world trade was severely reduced, our exports accounted for some 7 or 8 percent of our agricultural and industrial production. For many of the products of our factories and farms, foreign trade meant the difference between prosperity and depression. And of all our foreign trade, no part was more important than that with the British Empire.

It is hardly necessary for a southerner addressing southerners to state that British trade is important to the South. But just look at cotton and tobacco, the two principal crops of the South. In the 4 years before the war, from 1935 to 1938, for every 2 pounds of tobacco we consumed in this country, we sold 1 pound abroad. In that same period England alone bought more than two-thirds of all our tobacco exports. Of our flue-cured tobacco a much larger proportion went abroad, principally to England. And the same thing is true with cotton. In the 4 years from 1935 to 1938, for every bale of cotton consumed in this country we sold a bale abroad. England alone bought nearly one-fourth of all our cotton exports. It is plain that without the British market it would not have been possible to maintain our cotton and tobacco production and price levels.

During the war Britain adopted certain monetary and trade controls which if continued would hurt seriously peacetime trade. I say, frankly, American business cannot afford to see Britain's wartime trade and currency restrictions continued.

In connection with these wartime controls you have heard of the sterling area, blocked sterling, and the dollar pool. What does this mean?

Most of us spend our entire lives in the United States. We are accustomed to money in the form of dollars and cents. When we work we are paid in dollars. When we buy we spend in dollars. When we travel up North we find that they take our dollars, too.

In the world, however, there are other currencies. There are a few of intercountry application, but the world-wide currencies are primarily the dollar and the pound-sterling. If you have a dollar and want to buy something in another country you may have to change your money into its kind. If someone abroad wants to buy your cotton or tobacco he has to change his money into dollars.

In this convertibility of money from one kind to another restrictions and impediments can grow up or be imposed. As you can readily see this puts a brake on trade between nations.

Now what do we mean by the sterling area? These are the countries of the British Empire and some European countries who keep their monetary reserves in the form of sterling in London. Australia, for example, keeps its reserves on deposit in English banks. Before the war, the sterling-area countries could draw on these reserves to buy goods all over the world. If Australia wanted to buy American cotton, it sold sterling for dollars. But during the war, Britain had to stop the convertibility of sterling.

That brings us to blocked sterling. Britain had to say to these countries of the sterling area—to India, Egypt, Australia, and all the rest—the reserve you now have in sterling cannot be converted into dollars. You can use these sterling reserves for making payments to each other but not to outsiders.

One reason for restricting the convertibility of sterling was that England did not have enough gold and dollars. During the war not only did Britain sell $4,500,000,000 worth of her foreign investments to finance her expenditures, but also she incurred an enormous debt of $13,000,000,000, measured in our money, held by foreign countries in the form of sterling balances in London banks and sterling securities of the British Treasury. Britain had to restrict the convertibility of sterling. She couldn't convert such large amounts into dollars or other currencies. She had to block their use.

But it wasn't enough to block the wartime sterling balances and end the convertibility of sterling. England had to mobilize all of its dollar resources to pay for war needs. The British Treasury took over private holdings of American securities in England, paying for them in sterling, and sold many of these investments in the United States for dollars. And it took steps to see that all of the dollar receipts of the sterling area countries were mobilized for war.

This was done through the so-called dollar pool. For example, when an Egyptian exporter sold goods in the United States, he turned over the dollars he received to the National Bank of Egypt and received Egyptian pounds. These dollars were then sold by the National Bank of Egypt to the British Treasury for sterling. In this way all of the dollar receipts of the sterling area are pooled in London. Then when a country in the sterling area needs dollars, say Egypt, it applies to London which allocates these dollars on the basis of the most essential needs. To conserve dollars, London does not allocate funds to buy goods in America if they can be secured from sterling-area countries.

Of course, along with these financial controls, there are direct controls of imports in all sterling-area countries. And these controls, like import licenses, are used to keep out goods that must be paid for in foreign exchange. In practice, this meant keeping to a minimum imports from countries that had to be paid for in foreign exchange.

These wartime restrictions are still in effect in Britain. Clearly, they were essential for the war. They helped Britain to mobilize her foreign-exchange resources and devote them to war purposes. They restricted the use of her foreign-exchange resources for nonessential purposes. But these wartime restrictions are dangerous in peace. During war, ordinary trade must give way to war; but trade is the very lifeblood of peace. To restrict trade in time of peace is to force poverty on the world. That is why we and all countries have an interest in seeing the prompt removal of Britain's wartime restrictions.

Neither England nor the countries of the sterling area have any wish to continue these wartime restrictions. But until Britain finds some other means to pay for its imports it cannot remove these restrictions. Until the blocked sterling balances are settled, sterling cannot be made convertible. Until Britain's dollar recipts are increased, she cannot permit the sterling she pays for her imports to be used freely in any country, and particularly the United States. Until Britain can earn enough to pay for her imports from the dollar area, she must continue the dollar pool. Until Britain exports enough to pay for its essential imports it must continue to limit imports from outside the sterling area, and particularly from the United States.

The elimination of all these wartime restrictions and discriminations is the major international economic problem for the entire world. Whether they are eliminated depends on what we do. We are the largest exporting country in the world. It depends on what England does. England is the largest importing country in the world.

As you know, England's attitude will influence other countries, just as ours will. A number of countries in the British Empire and in Europe are so completely dependent on British currency and trade, that they are invariably guided by British policy. That is why Britain's decision to 'erminate her wartime restrictions and discriminations is an essental prerequisite to establishing fair trade and currency practices.

This country has a particular interest in the removal of England's currency and trade restrictions. England is our best customer. One-sixth of all our exports before the war went to England. Nearly 40 percent of all our exports were sold to the British Empire and the sterling area. Every section of this country, every American industry has a vital interest in the opening of British markets to our products on fair and nondiscriminatory terms. The people of this country, the people of the South, cannot afford to see England continue and extend her wartime restrictions on currency and trade.

Let's see, for example, what that means to the South. It means that England would concentrate its trade within the sterling area where countries would take payment in sterling for the cotton and tobacco and other things England would buy. It means that England would buy cotton primarily from India and Egypt; she would buy tobacco primarily from Rhodesia and the Near East. England would stimulate production in her trading area, and once such production was built up, the British market might be lost to us forever.

You know the consequences to the South if Britain should adopt such a policy. In plain language, we would have no other alternative than to cut the production of cotton and tobacco by 20 or 30 percent. More than that! With the decline in tobacco and cotton exports the downward pressure on prices would be heavily increased. We might once again see 8-cent tobacco and 5-cent cotton.

I speak of cotton and tobacco, only, because they are southern crops that we know so well. But the situation would be much the same in other industries. Wherever American farms and factories depend on exports, the closing of the markets of the British Empire and the sterling area would mean economic disaster.

A good deal of progress has been made toward establishing a world in which countries can trade together. We have agreed on the fair currency and trade principles that are necessary to make it possible for world trade to expand and grow. But it will do no good to agree on these principles unless all of the trading countries are ready to put them into practice. We can move ahead on this program only after Britain removes the restrictions on the use of sterling outside

the sterling area; only after the wartime dollar pool is abandoned; only after the blocked sterling problem is settled. When these wartime restrictions have been removed it will be possible for world trade to expand and to make its full contribution to world prosperity.

Frankly we have told England that we should like to see her wartime currency and trade restrictions brought to an end. We want importers in England and the entire sterling area to have an opportunity to buy American products if they prefer our products. The British Government, in turn, has told us frankly that they have no wish to continue these wartime restrictions. If they could find some other means to secure the flow of essential imports of food, raw materials, and equipment into Britain, they would be prepared to abandon at once these wartime restrictions and discriminations.

We all know that Britain, as an island nation, relies heavily upon trade. During the war what she shipped in and bought and what she shipped out and sold was thrown out of kilter. In 1944 she shipped out only 30 percent of what she did in 1938. Her export industries were converted to war production. She has lost a large part of her merchant fleet. Her income from foreign banking and insurance services declined. She sold many of her most marketable foreign investments and lost the income from these. Britain must somehow make good the fall in her foreign exchange income because she needs to import large amounts of food and raw materials to feed her people and industries.

This is the basic reason that Britain needs the money in this loan. The loan will help balance the difference between what she must buy abroad and what she sells until she reestablishes a full flow of export trade. And may I add that though in the transition period her imports will far exceed her exports that the resulting standard of living for Britain will be little different from the austere wartime levels.

In return for the loan, in addition to repaying principal and interest, here is what Britain undertakes to do by way of removing within a year, unless we agree to a temporary extension, the wartime trade and currency controls:

First. All countries of the sterling area will be allowed to use the proceeds of their exports to England to buy goods in any other country, including the United States. That's because sterling arising from current trade will be made convertible.

Second. All countries of the sterling area will be able to use the dollars they acquire from their trade with the United States to make purchases in the United States. That's because the sterling area dollar pool will be dissolved.

Third. England's import controls will be administered in a manner which will not discriminate against American products. Any exports from the United States to England will be paid for in dollars or in sterling that can be converted into dollars by American exporters.

Fourth. England will settle the blocked sterling obligations out of her own resources. The funds that are released in settling these balances, whether as an immediate payment or as future payments, can be freely used for purchases in any country, including the United States.

Fifth. England will support the American proposal for the establishment of an international trade organization, for the reduction of trade barriers and for the elimination of trade discriminations.

This agreement, then, will be a big step in preventing economic warfare. It will also be a big step in creating a world in which countries live and work together in peace and prosperity. For England it will mean a chance to feed her people and reconvert her industries in a world of expanding trade. For the United States it will mean the opening of the markets of our best customers, England and all the countries in the British Empire and the sterling area, to the products of our factories and farms. It will mean a larger American share in a larger world trade. For the South it will mean the stimulation of the great industrial development which now beckons. Just as there cannot be national prosperity in the United States without international prosperity, there cannot be that great economic development of the South without general prosperity in the United States and the world. For all countries it will mean a chance to reconstruct a war-shattered world with expanding trade, great employment, and higher standards of living.

The alternative is as unhappy as it is clear. If England cannot secure the financial assistance of this loan, she will have to take drastic steps to curtail her imports and force her sales on other countries. This means that England and the countries that depend on England's currency and trade—the sterling-area countries—would reduce their purchases in the United States and in the dollar area. Our exports would be excluded as far as possible from British markets. Britain would enter into bilateral agreements with countries in Europe and South America, offering to swap her manufactures for their food and raw materials. Such a policy would inevitably divide the world into conflicting economic blocs.

I have no doubt we could defend ourselves. We would have to fight fire with fire. We would be forced to retaliate. We would set up restrictions and discriminations of our own. In blunt language, the world would be at war—economic war. And if we won, at best we would win a sorry victory. World trade would be destroyed and all countries would suffer.

That is not the kind of a world our people want. Our basic goal is to establish a world in which countries can live and work together in peace and prosperity. Two world wars and a world-wide depression have taught this generation the bitter lesson that there is no other road to peace—there is no other road to prosperity except through international cooperation. The political and economic problems of the world cannot continue to be solved by force. That road leads to destruction.

This is nothing new to the people of the South. They have long known that expanded trade among nations will contribute to the prosperity of all. It was Woodrow Wilson, a Southerner brought up in Virginia, North Carolina, and Georgia, who warned an unheeding world that only through international cooperation will it be possible to maintain peace. Without regret for what might have been we must finish the job we have at last begun. That job is to build through international cooperation a peaceful and prosperous world.

The people of the United States and the United Nations have agreed on a program in which countries cooperate to maintain peace and prosperity. The United Nations Organization, with its Security Council, General Assembly, International Court of Justice, and Social and Economic Council, constitutes one side of this program. The Food and Agricultural Organization, the International Monetary Fund, and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and the proposed International Trade Organization constitute another side of the same program. The financial agreement with the United Kingdom is a sound, big step to the realization of this entire program for peace and prosperity. This is what I hope the people and Congress will bear in mind in considering the financial agreement.

Permanent Location of United Nations Capital Merits Careful Study and Complete Consideration of All Pertinent Aspects Prior to Final Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1946

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House, I am herewith calling the attention of the Congress and the country to a pertinent and important editorial from the typewriter of Fred C. Christopherson, editor of the Daily Argus Leader, published in Sioux Falls, S. Dak. It merits the thoughtful reading of every citizen seriously interested in the preservation of world peace and the success of the United Nations Organization.

It should clearly be kept in mind that not "just any location" is equally desirable for the United Nations Capital. At best the problems with which the United Nations Organization must deal are prodigious. These problems should not be aggravated and accentuated by a careless choice of the site upon which the world capital is to be permanently housed.

Every historical, political, social, economic, and geographical aspect of the final decision should be carefully weighed before the final selection is made. Partisan politics, personal favoritism, passing sentimentalism, and pressure of time must not be permitted to dictate a decision which would decrease respect for the United Nations Organization or hamper its opportunities for success in the years to come. As nearly as possible, the final selection should name a site which will not antagonize the sentimentalities or the sensibilities of any considerable section of our public here at home and which will not indicate any favoritism among the many countries belonging to the UNO.

In the geographies of the future, the name of this site should be identified with the cause of peace and the work of the United Nations Organization. It should stand out in the field of international relationships as the reference to Rome stands out in the field of religious activities.

The UNO capital should not be located within the environs of a large city where it would be submerged and obliterated by the historical or commercial significance of that metropolis. It should not be compressed into a tightly crowded area where future expansion is impossible. It should have room enough for steady growth and space enough for the quiet and uninterrupted study of its mighty problems. It should be in a location, midway between Europe and Asia, where neither area need feel that its problems are being neglected or under-emphasized for the consideration of a more adjacent cause.

Mr. Speaker, the great central area of the United States lying between the Rocky Mountains and the Appalachians seems, by every criterion, to be the optimum region in which to locate the

United Nations capital. In this mighty region—comprising as it does the heart of America—the United Nations site location committee has had called to its attention attractive invitations from Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Oklahoma, Missouri, and from the world famous Black Hills Mountain country of South Dakota. Perhaps other communities in this region have also extended invitations of which I am not aware. All of them merit careful and analytical consideration by the authorities finally making the decision for the permanent location of the United Nations capital.

BRITISH INFLUENCE STRAIT-JACKETED SITE COMMITTEE

Unfortunately, in a moment of hasty decision, the present UNO site capital committee now on tour in this country was restricted through the influence of Great Britain from even inspecting or considering any site outside of the limited east-coast area favored by the British Empire because of its relative proximity to the British Isles and its hoped-for adaptability to British influence. As a result, the UNO site inspecting committee has been prevented by this artificial and arbitrary device from even visiting many of the most attractive and meritorious locations which have invited the United Nations to inspect their offerings. Frankly, it is difficult to rationalize the strategy of the British Government which in one action seeks to float a gigantic loan in this country which all Americans would help to pay while in another action it endeavors to snub that great portion of America lying west of the Hudson River and south of Washington, D. C.

From reports emanating from the UNO site committee activities, it is apparent that in its highly circumscribed and circumvented inspection trip it has failed to find a site with which it is fully satisfied. But the dogmatic instructions under which it is traveling prevents it from looking "on the other side of the river" even though that area offers the United Nations Organization advantages and opportunities far beyond those which it has found in the limited region which it has been free to consider.

It would be extremely unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, if something is not done to free the UNO site committee from the strait-jacket in which it has been endeavoring to operate. I respectfully propose, therefore, that accredited spokesmen for the British Empire now publicly withdraw their objection to the consideration of any other American site for the UNO capital other than those in the eastern part of the United States for which they have expressed their support.

The gracious and the statesmanlike thing for British leaders to do would be for them to issue an open statement to the effect that they no longer insist that the UNO capital site committee restrict its inspections and considerations to the particular region of the United States favored by Great Britain.

The UNO must not be dominated by the attitudes and activities of a single nation or a single area. It is sincerely to be hoped that in its initial important decision—the choice of a permanent home—it will demonstrate the courage and capacity to approach the decision with an open mind and an uncontrolled opinion. The hour is late, but it is not too late to take the British strait-jacket off from the UNO site committee and to give it a free hand in reporting back to the parent organization on the benefits and disadvantages of all of the more desirable sites offered to it regardless of the section of the United States in which they are located.

[From the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Daily Argus Leader]

CAPITAL SITE TO BE A MAJOR WORLD CITY

Somewhat surprising to us is the seemingly casual indifference in the United States as to the site of the UNO world capital. Perhaps the people are so engrossed in their domestic difficulties that they are failing to appreciate the significance of the international organization's selection.

Yet the place which it selects as the site is likely to develop in the years to come as the world's most distinctive and most important city. It will be the place where the decisions affecting the world's welfare are made. It will be to the world what Washington is to the United States.

This statement, of course, is predicated on the assumption that UNO will become a workable institution. And certainly this is the current hope of every person who is genuinely interested in world welfare.

Other sections of the country may not appreciate as well as we in South Dakota do the potential development of the UNO world city. We have given closer study to it because of the Black Hills campaign to induce the organization to locate in that area and, in consequence, are familiar with the subject. Other sections seem to regard it as just another organization without comprehending its full import.

For our part, we are strongly of the opinion that it would be a mistake to place the capital in the already congested areas of the United States near a large city where difficulties in respect to racial backgrounds and so forth might develop. The UNO itself is worried about this and has sought to find a region where there is broad tolerance and understanding. Yet if the capital is placed adjacent to New York, Philadelphia, or Boston, future demonstrations of an unpleasant nature can be expected. Delegates with a swarthy complexion are likely to find some prejudices against them when they visit these cities and may be barred from some hotels and cafes.

There would be no such difficulties if the UNO capital were established in its own city well removed from other centers of population.

Our first choice, of course, is the Black Hills. But, if it is not to be there, we are still firmly of the opinion that it should be in some separate inland city of its own.

The great central part of America itself should be interested and concerned in this and we hope there can be developed a vigorous campaign to place the capital in the interior, well removed from both the eastern and the western seaboards.

Sermon of the Most Reverend Bryan J. McEntegart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a constructive, powerful, and courageous sermon delivered by the Most Reverend Bryan J. McEntegart, D. D., bishop of Ogdensburg, N. Y., at the Red Mass in the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception at the Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C., Sunday, January 27, 1946, which everyone should read. It is a sound contribution by a spiritual leader to the greatest question confronting mankind:

"Love thy neighbor and be joined to him with fidelity" (Ecclesiastes 27: 18).

In everyday life, my dear brethren, few traits of character are more esteemed than that of trustworthiness. We say of the trustworthy man that his word is as good as his bond. In business or social life, we feel secure when called upon to deal with him. For we know that his life is ruled by fidelity. He will be faithful to his obligations and promises without being watched. To live in a community where such men prevail is to know security and peace in community life. Fidelity is indeed the foundation of justice and the work of justice is peace.

On the other hand, which of us would choose to live in a community where each of our neighbors was a law unto himself? Where each was armed with deadly weapons? Where no one's word could be trusted, and the only recourse would be to police and courts dominated by the most powerful and the most ruthless. From such a community, all peace and security would be banished. Fear and suspicion would fill our day; and our nights would be troubled with worry and distrust.

What is true of a local community is likewise true in large measure of the world community.

I

Today distrust hangs like a cloud over the world community, darkening all prospects for international cooperation in the interests of peace. Its benumbing influence is to be felt everywhere in the public attitude toward the main problems in international relations.

Take for instance, the negotiations concerning atomic energy. President Hutchins of the University of Chicago speaks for many when he says that the world has only a slight chance of averting the horror of atomic war. That slight chance, he believes, lies in a rate of moral progress during the next 5 years far beyond anything that has ever been dreamed of. For that purpose, he would marshal the instruments of education throughout the world to develop in all men a common tradition, common ideals, and common ideas. "The task," he states "is overwhelming and the chance of success is slight. We must take the chance or die."

But even apart from the atomic bomb, public opinion is filled with distrust. We see it in the agitation for abolition of the veto power in the United Nations Organization; and just as clearly, we see it in the stubborn efforts to retain that power.

Distrust has stirred bitter controversies over the occupation policies in Germany and Japan, and it has influenced deeply the public reaction to the conflicts in Palestine, Iran, and Indonesia.

Nor does its work stop there. The failure to formulate any program for the gradual disarmament of all nations, and the clamor throughout our own land for universal military training, the little brother of national conscription, are but further evidence of this same pervading spirit of distrust.

II

Now, to the student of history, all these examples are but surface indications. They are only the outcroppings of a distrust which is rooted in more general causes. We must search deeper for those underlying causes.

In the first place, the roots of public distrust are grounded in the utter lack of public confidence in the promises of totalitarian states. The monstrous crimes of nazism and fascism are still vivid in the public

memory. Neither have people forgotten the other examples of totalitarian aggression to be found in recent history.

They know that in violation of solemn promises, the sovereignties of the Baltic nations were sunk without a trace, and even without public remonstrance from world leaders. They know that in violation of solemn promises Poland has been partitioner, its recognized government scrapped and a misrepresentative regime installed and maintained by force. And they know, too, that today the people of Balkan countries live in terror behind an iron wall of censorship.

With the logic of common sense, the public does not indulge in hopes that totalitarian governments will afford to other peoples the rights they refuse to their own subjects. And they are convinced that slave labor, concentration camps, and the mass banishment of innocent people are evil, regardless of what nation sanctions them.

Is it any wonder then, that the peoples of the world lack confidence in the promises of every totalitarian regime?

Furthermore, the roots of public distrust are also to be found in the disappointing history of other efforts at international cooperation. Still fresh in memory is the break-down of the League of Nations when it was faced with questions of vital import to the peace of the world. Men remember well the rapid succession of international treaties which were made between the two World wars and broken almost as soon as they were made. Nor does it serve any good purpose to ignore the shock experienced by our own people and those of other lands, when they heard the Atlantic Charter, that inspiring statement of moral objectives, minimized, disparaged and whittled down by its very authors.

Over and beyond these examples of history, the common people of the world sense that national spokesmen and political philosophers have done tremendous harm to the validity of international agreements. Stealthily, determined efforts have been carried on to divorce international relations from morality.

From many quarters comes the doctrine that the will of each state is supreme and subject to no higher law. International agreements, it is contended, are made to serve only the utility of a state; and such agreements are revocable whenever that state considers them no longer useful to it. Fine words and clever phrases may bolster the plausibility of such a doctrine. But the common sense of mankind brands it for what it is—international anarchy.

Another school views all law as only an expression of force. Men and nations, they tell us, are entitled only to the rights which they can hold by force or artifice. The common sense of mankind rightly names this doctrine, the "law of the jungle," and labels it unfit for human relations.

In fine, the people are distrustful because deep down in their souls they sense in recent efforts at international cooperation the lack of an essential element. They know that charters, covenants, and treaties are only so many worthless scrolls unless interwoven in the text and standing behind the signatures—there is legal recognition of an inviolable moral obligation. And common sense tells us that nothing is inviolable; if there be no God.

III

Three thousand years ago, Plato wrote: "If God presides not over the establishment of a state; if it has only a human foundation, it cannot escape calamity." Five hundred years later, King David, with divine inspiration, wrote: "The fool has said in his heart: There is no God."

And again: "Unless the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it." Today, 25 centuries after David, the truth and the wisdom of his words are evident in the tragic folly of men planning for the peace of all mankind without reference to God, the Maker of mankind.

The existence of God and His supreme dominion over the world is not a theory or hypothesis which men can accept or reject at will. It is a stark fact. To deal with human relations without taking that fact into consideration is folly. One might as well try to draw the map of the United States without reference to the Atlantic Ocean, or to write the history of the United States without reference to the Constitution.

If God is ignored, if we do not look for the true, the good, and the right in the nature of God, where shall we look for them? Politics will give us the answer: To the State. "The true," "the good," and "the right" will be what each State says they are. And when these little gods differ, the most powerful will make itself the almighty god of the human race. No. There is only one moral code of universal and everlasting application. The rule of right, the standard of truth, and the norm of good are determined by the nature of God. They cannot be found apart from the one true God.

How poignant, then, are the searching words of that valiant woman of China: "Religion, on which the doors of diplomacy seem to have been slammed, is the main pillar of civilization. Without it, there can be no international righteousness, no justice, no common decency, go guaranteeing of the honor of the pledged word."

Shortly after our entry into the war, our late lamented Commander in Chief made this prophecy: "We shall win the war, and in victory we shall seek not vengeance but the establishment of an international order in which the spirit of Christ shall rule the hearts of men and nations." One need not grope for the objectives of the spirit of Christ in human affairs. From a hillside in Galilee, the Son of God gave mankind the answer in words that come ringing down through the centuries: "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His justice, and all these things shall be added to you."

The first step toward world order is to acknowledge in reverence and obedience the kinship, the dominion of God over human affairs, national and international.

The second step is to see that the instruments for the ordering of men's actions are in accord with His justice, that is, with the law written in man's nature and later given to us mainly in the Ten Commandments.

The chief instrument set up to secure the peace of the world is the United Nations Organization. At present, it is little more than an alliance of victorious powers. But it is all that we have and we must build on it. With good will it should be possible to transform it into a real organization under law of the international community. It should be possible, too, through its agency to develop and proclaim the provisions of international law in accordance with the true norms of justice.

In our own country the status and powers and prestige of the Supreme Court came to be clearly recognized only after years of conflicts and resistance. In time, too, may we not hope that the World Court will develop into a court to which all justiciable disputes among nations must be referred—a court to which the provisions of disputed treaties shall be submitted for just interpretation, or, where necessary, for equitable revision.

Ultimately, however, the success of the United Nations Organization will be measured by its progress toward two great goals. They are: First, the sincere adoption by all nations of an international bill of rights for individuals and for minority groups; and, second, the adoption by all nations of a program to reduce armaments gradually and to abolish military conscription.

When these objectives are achieved, and only then, may men feel with any assurance that the instruments of world order are in line with His justice.

IV

God has placed it within the power of the men of our day to introduce a new era—an era in which nations will live together in justice and charity. The deepest hope of mankind is for a world at peace, a world of sovereign states cooperating to insure to all men the full enjoyment of their rights, a world of freemen and free nations with their freedom secured under God and the law.

Along the hard road to that goal the nations may be called on to make many sacrifices which today seem great, but which, in the light of God's justice, are necessary for the welfare of the human family. Unjust trade barriers, the unfair advantages that go with might and wealth, the idea of unlimited sovereignty—all of these must be either rejected or readjusted in accordance with God's principles of justice. As we move along that road to understanding and unity, let us share the reverence and faith of Tennyson's prayerful words, timeless and for all humanity:

"Our little systems have their day;
They have their day and cease to be.
They are but broken lights of Thee;
And Thou, O Lord, art more than they."

Today, as we stand at the threshold of a new era, it is a heartening sign for the future that men, such as those who make up this congregation, should gather around the altar of God to offer their tribute of worship to Him, and to draw from the sublime sacrifice of the mass divine guidance and divine grace. You seek divine guidance that you may see more clearly God's purpose in a tangled world. You seek divine grace that you may, with courage and with loyalty, pursue that purpose in the cause of justice among men and nations.

May the Holy Spirit consecrate your labors in the sacred task of laying those foundations of fidelity and trust upon which rest the future peace and security of mankind, and now, in benediction, I leave with you the divine promise:

"My son, forget not my law; and let thy heart keep My commandments. Let not mercy and truth leave thee; put them around thy neck and write them in the tables of thy heart, and thou shalt find grace and good understanding before God and men."

Rural Electrification Benefits From St. Lawrence Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 29 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Development of the St. Lawrence: Benefits to Rural Electrification." The article was prepared by me for the January 1946 issue of the magazine "Rural Electrification."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEVELOPMENT OF THE ST. LAWRENCE: BENEFITS TO RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

(Editor's Note.—The co-ops of region 1 voted to request the National to have an article written showing the benefits to be derived from the proposed development of

the St. Lawrence seaway. We went to Senator AIKEN, long-time friend of the co-ops and advocate of the St. Lawrence project, with the request of region I, and he kindly agreed to prepare this article for Rural Electrification.)

(By Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN, United States Senator, Vermont)

Each year that the development of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is delayed, this Nation is being deprived of the use of a natural resource which rivals in economic value the TVA and the Panama Canal combined. For the 2,200,000 horsepower hydroelectric capacity of the proposed power station at the International Rapids of the St. Lawrence River will equal the generating capacity of all the hydroelectric of the Tennessee Valley area, and the 16,000,000 tons of ocean shipping which the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway will provide greatly exceeds the original traffic in the Panama Canal.

The importance of opening the great and productive midwest to the deep-water trade routes of the world holds for this country even greater promise than the opening of the Dardanelles and the Suez Canal held for the nations of the old world. The completion of this long-planned project will add a fourth coastline to the United States, extending 2,350 miles into the heart of the North American Continent.

Only eight countries of the world produce as much electricity as will be generated at the single dam near Massena, N. Y. Also, the generating capacity at the proposed dam will be exceeded only by the production capacity of Grand Coulee.

The feasible transmission range of this electricity includes most of New England, New York, and a part of Pennsylvania. Interconnections will make this power available on an emergency basis as far as Chicago and Washington, D. C. The value of this cheaper power—which can be generated for about 1 mill per kilowatt-hour—to the rural and urban people of the area served, where electric rates are now among the highest in the country, will be tremendous. Its value to REA co-ops is particularly significant.

In this land of ours—known the world over for its high standards of living—little more than 40 percent of our farms are electrified. That means that more than 3,500,000 farms and about 2,800,000 other rural dwellings are still without central-station electric service. In the States of New York, Vermont, and New Hampshire alone, there are still almost 50,000 farms without central-station electricity, and more than 85,000 unelectrified nonfarm homes and establishments in rural areas of these States.

The question now is: How much longer will obstructionists and self-seeking interests be permitted to stand in the way of the development of the navigation and power phases of these waters which constitute one of the greatest natural resources in the world? The opposition has come mainly from power interests and eastern railroads, both groups being closely allied with New York financial powers. The eastern railroads fear competition in their rates, and the power companies fear cheap public power. This opposition has been both vocal and united since public development of this project was proposed a decade and a half ago. Prior to that time private-power interests had long been trying to obtain the right to tap, as a private development, the latent power in the rapids of the St. Lawrence.

CALAMITY HOWLERS BUSY

The calamity howlers have voiced all kinds of claims against the proposed public development of the project. They have fought the power phase of the project with the same kind of scare propaganda that was used against TVA, Boulder, Grand Coulee, Bonneville, and other similar projects, claiming that it isn't needed. Just as the need for the power of these other projects has been proved beyond all question, so has the need for power in the area to be served by the St. Lawrence project been proved. During the war, the shortage of electricity in the Northeast was one of the biggest power headaches the war mobilizers had. The peacetime need for cheaper power in that area is still acute.

The railroad opponents of the seaway—like the man who mounted his horse and rode in all directions—hold simultaneously that the seaway will be a waste of money because it will not be used, and that it will cause their economic ruin by taking business away from them. There is ample evidence to show that the long-time benefits to be gained from the seaway's cheaper transportation far outweigh any temporary, short-range disadvantages claimed by the opponents. There are always those who oppose any move in the direction of progress. Actually, the seaway will be an alternative means of meeting a part of our future transportation requirements under an expanding economy.

The legislation, introduced in both Houses of Congress on October 2 as a joint resolution, is the latest of several efforts on the part of congressional proponents of the project to gain legislative consent to it. Specifically, the proposed legislation provides for approval of the major portions of a 1941 agreement between the United States and Canada to develop the navigation and power phases of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway. The Senate bill was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and in the House, where several identical bills have been introduced, the matter has been referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. While it had been expected that hearings on the Senate bill would be held first, no public announcement concerning the holding of hearings has been made as this is written.

FIRST REAL OPPORTUNITY

The legislation now before Congress represents the first real opportunity afforded both Houses to pass on the real merits of the project. Previously, technical, procedural questions—unrelated to the merits of the project—have served to obscure the fundamental issues. In the course of pursuing these delaying tactics, those opposed to the undertaking have achieved their purpose on at least one occasion by talking it to death.

In both the Senate and the House of Representatives the current bipartisan support of the bill is stronger than for any similar legislation in recent history. President Truman's endorsement of the legislation, in a special message to Congress on October 3, is in keeping with a precedent followed by every Chief Executive since Woodrow Wilson—Republican and Democrat alike. Also, the project has had strong support from many and varied groups outside of Government.

PROPOSAL NOT NEW

The proposal to develop this seaway is not a new idea. It has been envisioned by the United States and Canada for over a century. During the last 50 years the desirability of harnessing the power latent in the rapids of the St. Lawrence has been more and more appreciated.

The truth of the matter is that the 2,350-mile seaway already exists, except for a comparatively short span. Aside from some spot dredging in the channels connecting the Great Lakes—mainly in the St. Clair and Detroit Rivers—the main work to be undertaken by the United States will involve the construction of a control dam and the big power dam, locks, canals, and a power station in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence. Canada's major remaining work includes the construction of canals and locks at the Lachine and Soulanges Rapids, and the installation of machinery and equipment in the power station, at the International Rapids.

The total cost of developing the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin and the benefits from the 27-foot seaway and the cheap power will be shared equally by the United States and Canada. Our neighbor to the north has already spent approximately half of its share of the over-all cost. The United States has yet to make its main contribution.

President Truman Requests Extension of Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 29 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Truman Asks Price Control for Next Year." The article not only relates to the statement made by President Truman but also to a statement made by Civilian Production Administrator John D. Small, who takes the same position as the one I have taken in the Senate during the past 2 years, namely, that the only way to whip inflation is by means of obtaining maximum production, and the only way to obtain maximum production is through a realistic pricing program. I think Mr. Small concurs in the view I have expressed in the Senate for the past 2 years.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUMAN ASKS PRICE CONTROL FOR NEXT YEAR—PRODUCTION CHIEF THINKS OPA POLICY BALKS CONVERSION

President Truman yesterday called on congressional leaders for an extension of price control legislation for another year after next June 30.

A short time later Civilian Production Administrator John D. Small expressed the view that OPA pricing policies must be changed before the Nation's industry can get back into high gear.

Chairman SPENCE (Democrat, Kentucky) immediately set House Banking Committee public hearings on the OPA extension bill to begin Tuesday of next week.

TRUMAN WANTS SPEED

House Democratic Leader MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, said "the President feels that early action on extension of price-control legislation as soon as possible is a matter of paramount importance to the country."

Representative WOLCOTT, of Michigan, senior Republican on the Banking Committee, said large numbers of Republicans would support a continuation of price control "where needed," but they want amendments for more precise definitions of OPA's powers.

SPENCE voiced the belief the bill would go through "without much trouble," and commented: "You know everybody is for self-preservation. And that is just about what OPA amounts to in our economy today."

OPPOSITION AHEAD

However, the extension measure is bound to meet some vigorous opposition.

Charging OPA with lack of realism and flexibility, Small told a news conference that CPA is able to get only dribbling price increases with which to break production bottlenecks. These, he said, are granted only after much argument and a real "go-to-town" campaign on CPA's part.

Small's attack on OPA methods brings into the open a long-developing interadministration battle over whether Price Administrator Chester Bowles is to be permitted to make pricing policy or whether Reconversion Director John W. Snyder will be able to impose his philosophy of "flexibility."

Small and Snyder held the same views on pricing—and that is that a few cents given here and there hurts nobody. When in doubt, raise the ceiling. At his news conference Small went a step farther than Snyder has gone publicly to declare a new plateau of price ceilings might be in order.

"A price increase is not what will hurt the country most," he declared. "Lack of production is." Questioned on how much of a general price increase he thought the Nation should have, Small said: "It would not take much. These men who come in here are asking only for very little."

Pressed to state whether he visualized a new price level of "say 5 to 10 percent to consumers," Small said: "Not any more than that would be needed—if that much."

INSISTS ON PROOF

The Price Administration believes the cost-of-living line should be held as much as possible, but has given hundreds of price increases since VJ-day. It believes that nearly any increase is going to be felt by the consumer sooner or later, and insists that proof be presented to show whether an increase really will increase production before consenting to raises for that purpose alone. Lumber—one of the items Small declared "we've just got to have more of"—has had five major price increases since 1941 and production has continued to decline.

Small presented numerous charts and comprehensive report to show that production is in reality bogged down. December output was far below expectations on most consumer durable goods items. Building materials are lagging. Nineteen hundred and forty-six goals look next to impossible when viewed beside reconversion output to date.

Strikes are only one factor which has delayed output, Small pointed out. Many vital industries have manpower shortages, he said, and there has been a letdown in intensity of effort by both management and labor.

Part of this letdown, he said, is due to "dissatisfaction with OPA price ceilings on individual products by those who are squeezed between rising costs and rigid ceilings." Another part is due to "reluctance to make forward commitments because of uncertainties as to wages, prices, and labor relation."

"We are in a sellers' market of unprecedented magnitude. * * * If we are to avoid inflation we must have all-out sustained production. * * * Instead we have rapidly growing black markets, a trickle of consumer goods to dealers' shelves, and increasing shortages of materials and components," he declared.

The "trickle" of consumer goods Small is worried about is illustrated by these samples of production in December, compared to 1941 levels:

Electric irons: 350,000, or 92 percent of the 1941 rate.

Electric ranges: 30,000, or two-thirds of the 1941 rate.

Electric refrigerators: 150,000, or about half the 1941 rate.

Radios: 100,000 sets, or only 8 percent of the prewar figure.

Sewing machines: 5,000, or only about 11 percent of the prewar rate.

Domestic washing machines: 65,000 units, or about 40 percent of the 1941 rate.

Considered beside accumulated wartime demands, these trickles are alarming to Government officials who believe that only greatly increased 1946 production can stop the inflationary tide. Some of these officials besides Small and Snyder believe price incentives must be offered.

Address by Hon. Harold E. Stassen at Conference of the National Council for a Permanent Fair Employment Practice Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 29 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by a great American statesman, Gov. Harold E. Stassen, of Minnesota, at the conference of the National Council for a permanent Fair Employment Practice Committee, at Washington, D. C., on January 23, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is my deep conviction that we meet at one of those critical periods in which the world takes on a sense of direction and establishes a course. A world-wide war of terrific destructive impact has ended. It ended with victory for us and for our United Nations allies. And it ended as science revealed that the tiny atom had been successfully split in a manner to unleash amazing destructive power.

We are now in the period in which the minds and hearts and materials and machines of mankind are reconverting to a world at peace. It is a time of change, of readjustment, of unrest, of questioning, of searching. It is a time that pleads for moral leadership from the United States of America.

A review of history makes it quite clear that the pattern and the trends were established within the first few years after the last World War, which in a quarter of a century led to world-wide depressions and unemployment and suffering and to the tragic outbreak of the second world-wide war.

That must not happen again. It will not happen again if the United States of America contributes in full measure to the moral leadership of the world. At the very base of the moral foundation of our own country has been the principle so bravely and beautifully enunciated in the Declaration of Independence, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

It was this recognition of the fundamental dignity of man which more than any other thing has made it possible for a small group of struggling colonies to become a powerful nation, peopled by sons and daughters of every nation in the world.

We are all keenly aware of the fact that this great principle has been violated in varying degrees in many portions of the world and has also been violated within the borders of the United States of America. This National Council for a Permanent Fair Employment Practice Committee has recognized clearly that unfair discrimination in employment because of race or color or creed has been one of the blots upon the record of our moral principles. You have recognized the imperative necessity, if we would continue to build America, if we would increase its units, its strength, and its stability to move forward in a practical, definite, gradual, and common-sense manner, to eliminate this unfair discrimination.

I commend you highly this evening for your clear recognition of the importance of this work. It is encouraging to find this unusual group of national organizations working actively together for this noble purpose. I would like to urge upon you tonight, the full recognition of the fact that not only are your efforts making a profound contribution to America within, but also that your efforts in the program for fair employment practices is an essential part of the moral leadership which America must contribute to the world.

If we would have peace for mankind, if we would have a slow, steady march of progress in the well-being of men and women and little children around the world, then it is imperative that America speak out against injustices around the globe. America must speak out against the violation of basic human rights wherever they may occur. America must speak out on behalf of the peoples of the world, their hopes, and their aspirations, and their yearnings. And, America's voice cannot be heard in the clear, convincing, sincere, tones that are needed, unless America also speaks out and acts upon economic injustices and violations of basic human rights at home.

I know you sense the bigness of this issue. I know you grasp its historic significance.

The current situation upon the measure in the Senate raises some additional grave questions. It seems quite clear that the overwhelming majority of the peoples of the United States are in favor of this legislation. It seems equally clear that a minority of the Democratic Senators in the United States Senate can effectively block this legislation by the filibuster method in which they are now engaged. The question then is not simply of the importance of legislation to safeguard the rights of minorities, but also of the importance of the establishment of a legislative procedure that will prevent minorities from willfully blocking the decisions of the majority.

Clearly the filibuster has a place in legislative procedure. It can well be used to insure an opportunity to the people of the country to thoroughly understand an issue before a decision. It can be used to give time for the marshalling of evidence, for the investigation of facts, and for sound democratic compromise. But it does not appear currently that it is being used for any of these purposes. The issue has been thoroughly debated for many months. A temporary wartime FEPC functioned ably and well throughout the war. The State of New York under Governor Dewey has placed a similar measure in operation with agreed success. The Republican platform of 2 years ago continued unequivocal support for the program. A definite notice was given by the senatorial sponsors of the legislation, to whom high praise should be given for their forthrightness, their fairness and their vision. The opinion of the people clearly supports the legislation. The filibuster then, if long continued, constitutes, purely and simply, obstruction by a minority which defeats the effective functioning of democratic government. It gives comfort to those of the extreme right and of the extreme left, who seek to undermine the effectiveness of and the confidence in our representative form of government. It contributes to the establishment of fertile ground for the flourishing of subversive activities It throws a spotlight upon a condition which is of even wider significance than the important issue of the FEPC. It is an issue which should be decided by the people of the country in the elections that are before us.

There are those who obstruct this legislation on the pleas that there are other injustices that need correction. This is a frequent tactic of entrenched reaction. It is not the method by which progress is made. Let measures be presented and debated be-

fore the country and considered by the people and the political party conventions to meet other injustices on their own merits. Used as a tactic of obstruction this device is simply a method which results in keeping the smudge on both the kettle and the pot.

As to the immediate measure of legislation itself, I know that the organizations represented on this Council are desirous that it be adopted and administered in a manner that will carry out its name; in other words, that it will promote fair employment practices. The amendments which are proposed by friends of the measure limiting its application to employers of over 25 and requiring substantial evidence of violation are sound amendments. Other reasonable and sincere amendments should be accepted. I know that is your attitude. I commend the reserved and balanced judgment of the predominant leadership of the minorities who are directly concerned. You have demonstrated that you know that progress must come gradually, that education and understanding must keep pace with legislation. You have demonstrated an awareness of the manner in which subversive elements might endeavor to take advantage, to the detriment of all the people of the country, of the situation created by unfair employment practices. You have emphasized properly that you seek only to have the men and women of this country judged in their important economic rights on the basis of their ability and their character and their industry. You have merely and ably insisted that the doors of economic opportunity should not be slammed shut because of race or color or creed. You have indicated that you have recognized that a program of nondiscrimination in economic matters must not be interpreted to mean the invasion of essential rights of privacy. You have indicated your recognition that the rights of men to associate together in groups of their own choosing so long as they do not close the doors of essential economic, political, and cultural rights should properly be preserved. I commend this broadness of your approach.

Let us not forget that everyone fits into a minority of one type or another in this great country. I urge upon all members of minority groups that they should so conduct themselves that they encourage respect from the majorities and stimulate a desire to extend fair treatment. The continuing success of America requires a continuing dual obligation of those who from day to day and issue to issue, find themselves in the majority to extend fair treatment to the minority, and of those who on the same basis find themselves in the minority to so conduct themselves that they do not obstruct the majority and that they make it a pleasure for the majority to extend fair treatment to them. It should be added, however, that the conduct of neither a majority nor a minority should ever be used as a reason for the failure to give the basic fair treatment and respect to fellow human beings which is at the very foundation of our form of government.

The issue is intense, it is emotional, it is deep. But let us recognize that the stakes are very high. It is a part of the very atmosphere which will determine the continuing peace and happiness of mankind. Then let the effort to attain success of your endeavor continue. Recognize that even while, as now, the issue is being debated this will in itself have a continuing wholesome effect upon the economic policies and practices within the country. Never become discouraged. Be ever resourceful, vigorous yet patient, determined yet understanding, with faith that the people of this country will so respond to the issue that it will win through.

Prices and the Cost of Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 29 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Housewives, Attention!" published in the January issue of the Journeymen Plumbers and Steam Fitters' Journal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSEWIVES, ATTENTION

It's just about time that the politicians of this country stop their orations long enough to listen to the housewives of America tell them a thing or two about prices and the cost of living. The housewives are authorities when it comes to making ends meet by stretching a dollar. Perhaps they cannot distinguish the truth from a falsehood when it is buried in the depths of a complicated display of statistical figures or explained by zig-zag lines of varying colors on a chart; but they certainly know what is happening to prices and qualities of goods. They do the buying for the Nation, and there is a great deal of truth in the homely saying that husbands may earn the money, but it's the wives who spend it.

Are the housewives of America being consulted as qualified experts by the Members of Congress? The answer to this question is so clear that it need not be made. Instead, too many of the Congressmen are busy appeasing every pressure group that has enough money to come to Washington. Indeed some Members of Congress are so busy listening to pressure groups that they rarely are present in the halls of Congress. The list of absentees in Congress resembles that of the "little red schoolhouse" when there is a circus in town.

Let's take a look at this question of prices.

Within a year after America got into World War II Congress decided—by a majority vote—that an attempt should be made to avoid inflation. Every time we went to war there was inflation. Every time the war came to an end, inflation did not. Every time inflation got started during the war, it did not end until we suffered through two postwar depressions. The American housewife doesn't need an economist to "prove" that inflation is not good for the Nation. As a matter of fact, even Congress was sufficently aware of the dangers of inflation to conduct an experiment designed to avoid inflation. For the first time in the history of America the Federal Government made a positive effort to fight inflation when Congress passed the antiinflation act of October 1942.

As a consequence of this act the OPA fixed prices and rationed the amount of certain goods that could be bought. To be sure this first experiment was not 100 percent successful. To be sure, housewives had to become magicians in order to match the appetite of the family with the "points" allowed her. To be sure, the chiselers refused to produce low-priced goods for the public markets while they did supply the black markets. To be sure, some landlords let their properties run down because they could not raise the rent.

FEPC Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 29 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from A. Philip Randolph to the editor of the New York Times urging passage of the FEPC bill.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PASSAGE OF FEPC BILL URGED—EDITORIAL OPPOSITION TO PROPOSED ACT SUBJECTED TO CRITICISM

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Concerning your editorial, The FEPC Problem, in your issue of January 24, you state: "If the bill could actually accomplish what its proponents believe it will, we would have no hesitation in urging that it become law with the least possible delay."

Obviously neither the FEPC bill nor any bill which is now, or will come before the Congress, will accomplish 100-percent performance. But the word "what" suggests such a performance. The fact that the Federal Constitution has been amended some 19 or more times shows that it did not accomplish 100-percent performance. But if the founding fathers had refused to support the Constitution on the grounds that it was not infallible and complete we would today be unable to predict what the course of the Nation would be. What bill or law is without its Achilles' heel?

"If its swift passage could be made a rebuke to Senator BILBO and others who propose to filibuster against a vote, there would be another argument in its favor," you observe. But how can its swift passage be effected? Certainly not by tenuous reservations, but with the support of powerful voices, such as the New York Times, which cannot successfully be accused of wild-eyed demagoguery.

Supporting your reason for refusing to back Senator CHAVEZ's measure, you state: "The act would apply to every employer or labor union with more than a handful of employees or members in interstate or foreign commerce in any State, Territory, or possession of the United States." I don't see anything wrong with this. The National Labor Relations Act and the Railway Labor Act apply to businesses with a so-called handful of employees, and these acts have the same scope of territory as FEPC. However, in order to remove the grounds for this criticism, representatives of the National Council for a Permanent FEPC met in conference with the Senators leading the fight for the bill and agreed upon increasing the number of employees involved from 6 to 25.

SIMILAR PROCEDURE SEEN

You add that "an FEPC order, if sustained, could in theory be enforced by the Federal courts, with contempt penalties, and any willful interference with the Commission or its agents or agencies could be punished by imprisonment and fines." But this is not different from the procedure of other administrative agencies such as the Interstate Commerce Commission, Federal Trade Commission, the Fair Labor Standards Act, Securities Act, and the National Labor Relations and Railway Labor Acts. These Federal administrative agencies have been reasonably successful.

"We do not believe this act would be enforceable in any State or community where the dominant opinion runs strongly against it," your editorial points out. Undoubtedly the law would encounter difficult problems of enforcement in certain areas where dominant opinion runs strongly against it, but that is no valid reason for not passing the bills. Dominant opinion ran strongly against the National Labor Relations Act in the South. It still does. But I am sure you would not advocate repealing the act for this reason.

Who does not remember the terrorism against labor unions in Harlan County, Ky., and other boss-ridden, open-shop sections of the country?

If this logic were to prevail, it would justify abolishing the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendment to the Federal Constitution, for the dominant sentiment runs strongly against them throughout the South

QUESTION OF INTENT

You go on to say, "Discrimination is always hard to prove, because it involves the subjective question of intent." I doubt that modern psychology will sustain this position. While it is true discrimination is hard to prove, it does not follow that it involves the question of subjective intent. You are confusing prejudice with discrimination. Prejudice, racial, religious, or national, is subjective and involves intent. It is an emotion or feeling, a tate or attitude of mind. It is an inner condition.

Not so discrimination. Discrimination, racial, religious, or what not, is an objective practice, which can be seen, heard, and felt. For instance, discrimination against workers through the blacklists, yellow-dog contracts and company unions was stopped by the Wagner Act. But this does not mean that the prejudice against, and hatred of, the workers by the employing class are any less. FEPC is not designed to abolish prejudice but to eliminate discrimination. The law cannot compel Protestants to love Jews, but it can stop hoodlums from smearing synagogues with swastikas. Federal legislation may not be able to make Senator BILBO embrace Representative ADAM C. POWELL but it can stop mobs from lynching Negroes. Laws can prevent residential segregation through restricted covenants and Jim Crow in transportation.

"It will have to be created by education," you insist. Certainly education is a basic factor in preparing the way for the enactment of legislation of any kind. But this does not indicate that in order to make public opinion favorable to FEPC classes and tracts on anthropology should be held and distributed. While there is no objection to this form of education it doubtless would involve astronomical time to register any visible change on FEPC or any other issue in the interest of minorities.

It appears that there is an unwarranted distinction between the processes of education and legislation. The fact is legislation is a form of popular education. It tends to dramatize an issue which educates the people. The fight for FEPC legislation brings into public focus a concrete socio-economic question, which is debated and discussed pro and con in schools, churces, trade unions, business clubs, barber shops, and on street corners. But this exchange of ideas on FEPC in the arena of public discussion would not obtain and have the vital interest and enthusiasm were there no bills before Congress. This form of education is a living, dynamic force. It conforms to the principle of the progressive school of education of learning by doing.

A. PHILIP RANDOLPH,
Cochairman, National Council for a Permanent FEPC.
NEW YORK, *January 25, 1946.*

Alternatives to Brass-Hat Muddling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 29 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arkansas will yield to me without prejudice to his right to the floor, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which I wrote for the Progressive, and which is to be found in the issue of Monday, January 28, 1946.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALTERNATIVES TO BRASS-HAT MUDDLING

(By Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr.)

Despite repeated assurances from the Army and Navy top commands, demobilization of the armed forces continues to be a red-hot issue for many millions of Americans.

The undercurrents of dissatisfaction are not merely homesickness nor the standard brand of griping which some troop commanders insist is a natural and desirable trait in an aggressive Army man. Nor is the dissatisfaction explained by other far-fetched theories that the American soldier is so superior intellectually that he has no respect for discipline, or that treatment of him has been too soft compared with the ironclad rule of other armies.

The smoldering resentment that pervaded the thoughts of many of the men overseas for many months was kindled into a roaring flame by two recent incidents: (1) The news story in Stars and Stripes of an interview in the Pacific area with the Secretary of War in which it was reported the Secretary expressed complete lack of knowledge that points did not continue to accumulate after VJ-day, and (2) the announcement by the Army that demobilization would be slowed down, despite previous promises and ample shipping space.

So great was the reaction in many parts of the world that, in the opinion of some observers, it approached the condition of mass hysteria and even mutiny. The Army Chief of Staff later admitted in a meeting before Members of Congress that the reaction of the men was unexpected by the Army and they were unprepared to meet it. Even now, the Army's primary method of meeting the situation seems to be in restricting the privileges of the men so that they cannot demonstrate their feelings openly.

When a GI digs in his pocket and spends his hard-earned cash to send expensive telegrams to his Senator or Congressman, or joins with his friends in buying expensive advertising in American newspapers, you can safely conclude that his are not ordinary rumblings without good cause.

The exceptionally heavy congressional mail on this subject comes not only from the servicemen, but also from the relatives and friends at home who share the impatience and dissatisfaction. There is nothing superficial about the letters and telegrams. They are not mass inspired. Each has an individualistic opinion or a pathetic personal story to relate. In each, one senses a deep feeling and a dead-earnest attitude. The irony of it all is that the individual Senator or Congressman is able to give direct assistance to but a small percentage of those who seek his aid.

Demobilization is such a tremendous job that it was inevitable that mistakes be made. Furthermore, regardless of the program adopted, certain borderline cases and certain inequities were bound to arise. In all fairness, credit must be given for some phases of demobilization that have proceeded entirely satisfactorily.

However, it is apparent from congressional correspondence that some of the past excuses about inadequate shipping space only served to raise to the boiling point the ire of those who saw partially loaded ships leave their harbors. It is also obvious that the very specific Army promise of only a few months ago that certain men would be released by March—and then reneging on the promise now, is a mortal blow at Army morale, no matter how justified the revision may be on any other grounds.

No one, not even the men directly affected, want to shirk any real responsibilities we have. When our men overseas had a job to do, they did it. Too often now they have no job and can see no reason for their enforced idleness, thousands of miles from home. You don't have to be a psychologist to know that enforced idleness breeds unhappiness and discontent. If we have a clean-up job to do, if we have Government property that must be cared for in remote parts of the world—that job must be done. But it can be done, in my opinion, with fewer men and in more orderly fashion.

Another excuse frequently given for demobilization delays is that replacements are not reaching the foreign theaters fast enough. This is also used as a convenient argument for the extension of conscription and compulsory military training. The simple mathematics of the situation is convincing proof that there is a fallacy in this argument. The plain fact is that the present numerical strength of our armed forces is still many millions above that called for by any permanent plans. Not until we demobilize the excess must we provide replacements man for man. Hence, it follows that if replacements are not sufficient in foreign areas, either the over-all planning is awry or replacements are being used to provide complements for establishments which are not intended to be permanent installations.

There may have been some justification from an administrative standpoint for each of the services to have its own plan of demobilization, but this has been offset by the confusion and unfortunate dissimilar action taken as between similar cases in different service branches. I am convinced Congress erred in permitting the services to work out their own demobilization plans rather than facing the problem squarely and legislating into law a clear-cut uniform procedure.

Of course, this experience is not unique in Government administration and legislation. We had some of the same confusion on a lesser scale when Selective Service was inducting men. We had some of the same uncertainties and frequent changes in our wartime tax laws. The factor of unnecessary uncertainty is a most disturbing influence, whether it concerns the taxpayer, prospective inductee, or serviceman seeking release to civilian life.

This type of uncertainty could be minimized with better administration. There are many other uncertainties that prey on the minds of the men overseas. Economic problems pertaining to themselves and their families loom very large. Future job opportunities—especially the better jobs—appear very uncertain unless early release is obtained; even the opportunity of attending school under the GI law appears to be jeopardized by inadequate housing and filled student quotas. And in the meantime his dependents may be struggling to survive on a niggardly allotment from the Government. Add to that occasional marital problems, sickness, and a score of other problems, plus, of course, an overwhelming desire to get back home with his friends, relatives, and neigh-

bors—and you have a composite of the uncertainties and desires in the mind of the serviceman.

In many cases there is still another important problem that must be faced before satisfactory morale can be had: all unwarranted discriminations between officers and enlisted men must be eliminated. In a peacetime military or naval establishment there is always a tendency to erect rigid social and administrative barriers which are a serious threat to the morale of the enlisted men.

The importance of an orderly solution to the demobilization problem should not be underestimated. Apart from the personal considerations of the service men and women (which is reason enough in itself) we are face to face with at least two repercussions from the problem that can entail widespread and disastrous consequences:

First, with respect to our part in international relations. With the display of internal difficulties in the armed forces, we may give an appearance which will weaken our hand in international dealings.

Second, with respect to a future volunteer army. Unless we quickly rectify the present situation and assuage the bitter feelings of those getting out of the Army we cannot hope successfully to encourage others voluntarily to accept a career in the armed forces.

The stakes are higher than many realize. The time has come to move boldly and decisively with constructive alternatives to the muddling of the demobilization problem.

A Humanity Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 29 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Alvin Johnson entitled "A Humanity Loan."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A HUMANITY LOAN
(By Alvin Johnson)

"Some hae meat who canna eat,
Some can eat wha want it;
But we hae meat, and we can eat,
And sae the Lord be thankit."

We Americans can eat and the red points have gone back to the Devil, leaving it to the good old honest dollar to regulate our consuming fires. All through the war we were the best fed people under the sun. Now we will have to look to our buttons. And shall we not be universally admired for our sleek plumpness, like Little Jack Horner?

Alas, a hungry world has no admiration to spare for the sleek and fat. On the contrary, we are by way of becoming the most detested nation. That is wholly unfair. It is not our fault that French and Italians, Greeks, Yugoslavs, Poles, Russians, Austrians, Germans, Chinese, Japanese go hungry. We didn't start this war. We finished it, and we deserve the gratitude of all mankind, even the former enemy populations for that. But mass starvation is an icy soil for gratitude to grow in. There are 30,000,000 children in Europe who would hardly recognize the sensation of a full stomach. There are 20,000,000 mothers starving themselves, brave souls, to put a little more food into their children's mouths, or to supply a few extra calories to support a hopeless husband in his treks for fagots to make a little fire. As good Christians or good Jews, they ought to find pleasure in the fact that we at least are fed and clad and housed humanly. But they don't.

Well, you say, what can we do about it? Could we find food, even by stinting ourselves savagely, for all those hungry people? Could we find transportation? Could we find the finances?

We could.

Our farms produced this year a billion bushels of wheat, and we have a carry-over of 450,000,000 bushels. We cannot possibly eat more than 650,000,000 bushels; we do not need more than 200,000,000 bushels for seed and for the rats. There are at least 350,000,000 bushels we could not only spare but which we could gladly have taken off our hands to keep them from weighting down next year's market. And 350,000,000 bushels of wheat, in addition to home supplies, would provide bread for every man, woman, and child in Europe, and leave enough over to supplement the Indonesian rice needed for Japan and China.

But Europe also needs proteins of animal origin, mainly meat and milk. We shall produce enough meat this year to give us each, counting also the toothless babes and the octogenarians, with 160 pounds of meat. Do we need 160 pounds per capita? The healthiest adults in America do not eat above 120 pounds per capita; or, if they consume their quart of milk a day, not above 80 pounds. The strong-limbed Scots have never in history eaten more than 60 pounds of meat and fish. We are going to eat—or waste—40 pounds of meat per capita in excess of our full needs. That means 5,600,000,000 pounds—enough to cope with the greater part of the physiological protein deficiencies of most of western Europe.

We produce a hundred billion pounds of milk a year. Reduced to solids, that means 4,000,000,000 pounds of butterfat and 4,000,000,000 pounds of casein. If we consume as much milk as we should per capita, we would consume one-tenth of the whole milk. The butterfat we use for our consumption, but the casein mostly goes to American hogs. In the form of dried skim milk we could supply Europe with 3,000,000,000 pounds, quite enough to make up for any meat shortage. And we could spare a bit of butterfat, enough to abate the discouraging European fat shortage, taken together with lard we don't need and vegetable oils we could get from the copra of the South Seas and the palm nuts of Africa, if we went after them.

But can we find the shipping? The idle ships lying around the wharves of the world, the ships crossing the ocean in ballast, are a scandal. Could we distribute the food in Europe, with transportation in its present state? We handled bigger and more difficult problems of distribution for the Army.

But the reader will say with relief, we are getting ready to do these things. Is not Congress preparing to add another $1,350,000,000 to the exhausted UNRRA budget? Grant that Congress does act. Is $1,350,000,000 enough?

Consider: Out of 1,350,000,000 it is possible to send 300,000,000 bushels of wheat. That will take more than half of it. It will be possible to send a billion pounds of meat—just about equal to the billion pounds we will supply to our 300,000,000 population of legitimate cats.

No; our conscience cannot get off so easily. We shall need a lot more money, and where will Congress find it? The American public is no longer avid for Victory loans.

You subscribe and I subscribe to stale Victory loans, but with wry faces. How about a humanity loan, every dollar to go to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, bind up the wounds of war where possible, set at least the small industries that involve no war risks operating? Would you subscribe for such a humanity loan? Would I? Of course we would, even if we had to borrow money to do it. Millions of Americans would, if we built up an adequate propaganda for it. The average American may be cynical in speech, but his heart is human.

But you ask, would we relieve the suffering of former enemy populations on the same terms as populations that remained friendly? We would. We savage civilians would take a leaf from the policy of our gallant Army. They fed and clothed and housed prisoners taken in murderous battle on the same terms as themselves.

Honor to our gallant Army: it shot no hostages, it inflicted no reprisals; it sullied its name with no Lidices. We civilians, when we let a beaten population perish by the ten thousand weekly for want of the relief we are quite able to give: what are we doing but taking reprisals in their most abhorrent form? For by and large, it is the children and their devoted mothers we are dooming to death.

Readers will you join with me in a movement to awaken our people to our imperative moral responsibility to raise the hope of the hopeless, to pave the ways of peace, to build a future of the world upon a sounder basis than the threat of atomic bombs?

FEPC Termed Farce by Local Employers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 29 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "FEPC Termed Farce by Local Employers," which appeared in the Anderson (S. C.) Daily Mail.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEPC TERMED FARCE BY LOCAL EMPLOYERS
(By Jack Stillman)

The Fair Employment Practices Commission legislation, if enacted into law, would be a farce, as far as small businessmen in Anderson, questioned by a Daily Mail reporter yesterday, are concerned. Included in the survey were Negro workers and white employers alike, who admitted that they did not know what the proponents of the FEPC were seeking.

They believe Anderson represents an average southern town, and those businessmen questioned yesterday represent average small businessmen throughout the South. They were of the opinion that the FEPC seemed to have a "hidden" meaning in "fair employment," and that it was a bad bill and could never be enforced if it were passed by Congress.

"I believe it would be a bad law, and could never be enforced," one employer said. His opinion was that such a law would only cause confusion and do nothing toward solving interracial relations in the South, "if that is a purpose of the bill," he said.

One Negro included in the survey was a veteran of 21 months in the South Pacific. He told the reporter that he had discussed racial relations with white soldiers in the Philippines many times. There was some argument about racial segregation, he said, but he pointed out that neither the Negro soldiers nor the white soldiers could determine just what was meant by discrimination, when applied to white and Negro races.

The Negro pointed out that neither he nor many of his race had been able to determine just what the proponents of FEPC were seeking. "If they want to improve racial relations between the white people and the colored people, then the FEPC will do nothing but cause confusion. The question of personal feeling is too big," he said.

Those Negroes questioned yesterday admitted that they had not heard of any clear definition of fair-employment practices, and told the reporter that they did not see how any such law would improve racial relations in the South. None would charge that they had been discriminated against, and again asked, "What does the Congress mean when they say 'discrimination'?"

Most of the employers pointed out that they had built their business up over a period of years, and held to the belief that they had the right to hire anyone whom they saw fit and would conduct their businesses accordingly. They said that any such legislation as the FEPC had too many loopholes to be successfully enforced upon the people.

Anderson has no large labor unions, and the closed shop is virtually unknown. Those included in the survey yesterday were convinced that the closed shop was discrimination, and they said that until such a measure was included in any law to enforce any form of compulsory employment, the fair employment enactment of Congress could not even hold any hope of enforcement.

The survey showed that the average southerner believes that proponents of FEPC are trying to reach too many intangible things that exist in the problem of racial relations in the South. They believe that those favoring fair-employment practices are attempting to use the power of numbers to pass the measure, instead of digging into the facts involved where the law would affect the majority of the people. They believe that the FEPC is aimed directly at the South, and that it would be no fair enforcement in any part of the Nation.

Negroes and white persons alike pointed to the racial troubles of northern cities, and refused to believe that legislation designed to curb these troubles would serve the same purpose in the South. They again pointed to the intangible problems facing the two races in the South, and said that the most prominent problem confronting the average southerner is a friction between personalities which no law on earth can prevent.

In answering questions put forth by the reporter, those included in the survey brought up the matter of States' rights, and held to a strong belief that the FEPC is trespassing these rights They could not understand how representatives of other parts of the Nation could successfully campaign for the welfare and well-being of the South.

It was conceded by all questioned that if any other State adopted a fair employment practices commission of its own, it possbily would solve some of the labor problems of that State, but never, they said, would such a law serve any purpose other than to confuse and bring about more problems than already exist for the people of South Carolina.

Miami Is a Substantial, Fairly Typical American City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 29 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the city of Miami, because of the charm and greatness of the city, is often regarded as not being a substantial city, that is, a city of business and industry as well as a city with recreational appeal. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Miami Is a Substantial, Fairly Typical American City," written by Mr. John S. Knight, owner of the Knight newspapers, which emphasizes the substantial as well as the more recreational character of this great American city.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MIAMI IS A SUBSTANTIAL, FAIRLY TYPICAL AMERICAN CITY

Several hundred Associated Press managing editors gathered here for their twelfth annual meeting and the first since 1943 are getting a perspective of Miami never related by the picture magazines and that acidulous debunker of the American scene, Westbrook Pegler.

When Miami Beach was very young, the late Carl Fisher employed Press Agent Steve Hannagan to glamorize that spit of pumped-up land and reclaimed mangrove swamps as the zenith of the American Riviera.

Very soon thereafter, Miami Beach bathing beauties and local lovelies in gay sports attire crowded many a newsworthy picture out of the roto sections and the newsreels.

So well did Steve do his job that in the era of gat and gal journalism, the Miami area was the beneficiary of so many millions of dollars of free publicity that newspaper business managers winced every time they say another piece of cheesecake art under a Miami date line.

Miami became known throughout the world as a gay winter resort flaunting its tinsel and spangles to lure the well to do who could afford winter vacations without unbalancing the family budget.

But there was and is another side to the Miami story. Brush aside the tinsel and fold back the spangles and you will find Miami to be a substantial and fairly typical American city.

Dade County, in which both the Miamis are located, has a permanent population of slightly over 300,000. It is a county of home owners who take their community responsibilities seriously and have unbounded faith in the future of this truly remarkable area.

While the resort business is Miami's primary industry, there is a great deal more to this little corner of the country than glitter, glamor, gambling, and gals. During the winter season, Miami fairly bulges at the seams in assimilating some 300,000 visitors but they all manage somehow to find living accommodations, food, and recreation. Sometimes we wonder how a community of this size can withstand the impact of such an avalanche of people. But Miami does the job and thrives on it.

The rest of the year, Miami is concerned with all of the community responsibilities that fall to the lot of any growing, progressive American city. During the war years, Dade County Red Cross and War Chest campaigns met with a tremendous response. Its citizens knew there was a war on because they could see with their own eyes the ships that were torpedoed just offshore by the Nazi submarines.

When this winter playground was converted virtually overnight into a gigantic parade ground, Miami and Miami Beach took it without faltering. As I said in a little talk to the A. P. Managing Editors, more American troops were trained here during the war than composed the entire American prewar Army. Hotels became barracks, and restaurants and night clubs were converted into mess halls.

The famous Hialeah race track was turned into an Army warehouse and Miami's commercial docks became the naval training center at which thousands of Allied as well as American sailors were instructed in the art of handling small boats.

Miami became the headquarters of the Gulf Sea Frontier and the Seventh Naval District. The Nazi submarine warfare was licked in the Gulf of Mexico and the South Atlantic by naval officers who directed the fight from Miami.

General of the Army H. H. Arnold is authority for the statement that the air forces training program was advanced 6 months by the availability of Miami's resources.

At one time the antisubmarine training base was giving instruction to more than 10,000 men. The naval air station at Opa Locka had a personnel varying between 10,000 and 15,000 throughout the war.

Miami was the nerve center for the Army Transport Command's service to north Africa and the CBI theater. Nearby Homestead provided one of the world's finest bomber fields and the Richmond Naval Air Station a few miles away housed the blimps that performed such yeoman service in Atlantic antisub patrol duty.

Additionally, at war's end, more than 500 Miami plants were producing gas masks, diving helmets, radios, airplane assemblies, oil tankers and hundreds of other military items.

Last year Look magazine pictured the seamy side of Miami as a hide-out for war-weary playboys and a few mental IV-F's from both Houses of Congress, but the real people of Miami need never apologize for what I consider their superb all-out war effort.

Although picture editors are notoriously susceptible to "leg art," it is to be hoped that Miami's press agents may some day learn how to glamorize a potato, tomato, or bean.

This area has a winter vegetable business that brings in better than $50,000,000 a year and is the only place we know where a farmer can stick a tomato plant or a potato cutting in the ground in October and ship his crop in December.

Another $50,000,000 industry is dairying, and the Miami Herald carried a story the other day about a farmer who averaged a thousand dollars a day net profit for 60 straight days growing and shipping "glads" by air to New York.

Miami's publicity experts should tell the world about our rapidly developing garment industry, specializing in sportswear, which is fast gaining recognition in the country's major markets.

Plastics are being made from pine trees and rough plumbing fixtures are fashioned from the palmetto scrub that covers many acres of undeveloped land. The area's fresh water provides an almost inexhaustible source of lime. Miami is also an important commercial fishing port and its small boatbuilding and repair is considered a major factor in the area's economy.

The first manufacturer who was successful in building, demonstrating, and selling radio communications to an American railroad is located in Coral Gables, a Miami suburb.

Miami leads the Nation in international air transportation. A recent report released by Pan American Airways revealed that more international passengers and air express traffic passed through Miami than New York, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Brownsville, and New Orleans combined.

Aerial routes extend outward from Miami to all of the principal ports of entry in Latin-American and Caribbean countries and possessions. As an illustration of how this traffic is growing, Pan American recently stepped up its flight schedules between Miami and Habana to 22 a day—almost one flight an hour around the clock.

Miami's commercial industry has a total pay roll of more than $25,000,000 a year. The permanent naval air installations and pri-

vate aviation increase that total by several millions annually.

The list of Miami's civic and business achievements is both lengthy and imposing. Better still, most of the adventuresome politicians with deep and cavernous pockets have been eliminated from public office.

Miami has a fine young mayor, a veteran of World War II, a capable city manager, and a city commission that is beginning to understand that the caliber of a city's government is the best index to the community's character.

Colonel McCormick of the Chicago Tribune once referred jestingly to my venture into the Miami newspaper field as "going slumming."

Today, I think a tour around this area would convince the colonel that the Miamis have come of age and attained a degree of community respectability and pride in excess of anything that might have been considered possible a decade ago.

Admittedly, Miami is not without its sins and shortcomings but what American city of comparable size can start throwing stones in all good conscience?

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

Give Industry Its Head Instead of Strait-Jacket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAX SCHWABE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George E. Sokolsky, from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of January 24, 1946:

GIVE INDUSTRY ITS HEAD INSTEAD OF STRAIT-JACKET

(By George E. Sokolsky)

The only items left out of the President's message to Congress on the state of the Union were a recipe for potlikker and a cure for dandruff. To make sure that nothing like it had ever been tried before, I went through Presidential messages from George Washington to Franklin D. Roosevelt to see whether any other President had put so much into one single document. No one had ever tried it. No one had ever thought of putting a decade or two of legislation into a single state paper.

Mr. Truman wants price control to continue for a year and a half more. But at this moment the principal industries of the Nation are on strike because of price control. Every strike could be settled in the flash of an eye by genuine collective bargaining, without Government intervention, if price controls were lifted.

CONTROLS TO BLAME

And he wants to continue his war powers, including priority and inventory controls, in spite of the fact that these very controls have stymied and delayed reconversion by making it so difficult, and at times impossible for business, particularly small business, to get the materials to start again to produce civilian commodities.

And he wants to extend the draft, when everyone wants to find a way of bringing all the boys home. And there is no one to tell the American people why so many Americans need to be kept abroad, except to guard surplus war supplies and to police the prostrate Germans and Japanese.

And so Mr. Truman says: "Good wages mean good markets." Selah. And he adds: "Good business means more jobs and better wages." Selah. But how do you pay good wages for the good markets when prices squeeze out profits and for the small man produce a loss?

PRICES HELD DOWN

He does not explain that one. So prices are to be held down and wages are to be shoved up, and inventory and priority control are to be retained, and a new doctrine in economy is enunciated:

"Private capital and private management," Mr. Truman says, "are entitled to adequate rewards for efficiency, but business must recognize that its reward results from the employment of the resources of the Nation."

What were those resources producing when the Indians had them? What did similar resources produce in Russia for a thousand years, or in China, or Brazil?

It is not resources in or on the ground that produce goods but their exploitation by daring, ingenious, and wise men. Oil lay in the earth for hundreds of thousands of years before the ingenuity and labor of man brought it forth. Electricity has been in the cosmos longer probably than the earth has been inhabited, but it was not until Franklin, Faraday, Volta, and others captured it that it became the servant of man.

INITIATIVE KILLED

Steam is as old as heat, but it was not until James Watt saw a teakettle and had an inspiration that it became of use to man. And so with Bessemer's steel, and Westinghouse's air brake, and Edison's electric light, and everything else.

Yet Mr. Truman brushes all that aside and talks about resources. It was not resources but man that made this country what it had been before the wreckers and despoilers got to work on it. Of course, capital and management and labor should receive adequate compensation, but how can they in the economic straitjacket which the Government has devised for them?

Give the industry of this country its head and it will outproduce the rest of the world. But it will not do it on the formula proposed in Mr. Truman's address to Congress. That address kills initiative, but, what is worse, it kills hope for a return to common sense. And they say he comes from Missouri.

Collective Bargaining and the Strike Limitation Issue, 1933–46

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS W. BENNET

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1946

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the contents of Bulletin No. 39 issued by the Library of Congress Legislative Reference Service, entitled "Collective Bargaining and the Strike Limitation Issue, 1933–46":

POLICY OF ENCOURAGING COLLECTIVE BARGAINING ADOPTED

While trade unions and collective bargaining have been more or less important factors in a number of industries in the United States from the 1890's to 1933, particularly in construction, mining, on the railroads, and in the printing and apparel trades, trade-union agreements and collective bargaining played a minor part in American industry until 1933, except for the short period during and immediately following World War I. Since 1933, when the policy of encouraging the growth of trade unionism in all industry was foreshadowed in the National Industrial Recovery Act and later written into the National Labor Relations Act (the Wagner Act), trade-union membership and strength has increased from approximately 2,500,000 members to a present claimed membership of affiliated, unaffiliated, and independent unions of some 15,000,000.[1] This has been accompanied by a very great increase in both the number and scope of labor agreements which outline the terms and conditions of employment and provide machinery (under some but not all agreements) for the handling of grievances and disputes in the establishments and plants of the country. These agreements are intended to preserve peace in industry on terms satisfactory to both sides during the period of their operation, which is commonly 1 or 2 years. Encouraged by the Government and enforced by the administrative agencies and the courts, collective bargaining and the making up of mutually satisfactory agreements have become accepted as the national industrial relations policy.

JUSTIFICATION OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

The basic purpose of the National Labor Relations Act of 1935 was to strengthen the organizations of workers by keeping them free from all possible interference by employers and by giving scope to their access to employers across the conference table. Administrative agencies were given wide powers to use public authority to prevent employers from engaging in specified unfair labor practices or interfering with efforts of workers to form their own organizations for mutual aid and protection, including effective bargaining with employers. If a question developed as to who or what organization was to represent the workers in such bargaining, this was to be determined in an election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board. It was a basic preconception of this policy that the bargaining of workers through their unions with employers or groups of employers would result in the establishment of mutually acceptable wages and other conditions of employment and the adoption of peaceful procedures for the handling of grievances and complaints. As economic conditions changed new terms in the agreement would be negotiated.

Collective bargaining has its justification in economic and social policy as a means of providing stabilization under the highest possible returns to labor while promoting self-government and responsibility in industry. Collective bargaining is intermediate between individual bargaining, which is regarded as unfair to workers under modern conditions, and the Government fixing of wages and other conditions by compulsory arbitration or direct regulation which, as a permanent policy, would be regarded by most Americans as alien to our system of free enterprise. The Government adopted the policy of encouraging collective bargaining and the writing of agreements convinced that collective bargaining was to be the instrument for promoting industrial justice and peace. The high hopes of the National Labor Relations Act with reference to the maintenance of industrial peace is seen in the opening words of the act, which describes its purpose: "To diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, to create a National Labor Relations Board, and for other purposes."

[1] See footnote at end of article.

STRIKES AN ACCOMPANIMENT OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

This new national industrial relations policy was a determined shift from the traditional Government policy of indifference, if not hostility to unionization and its works. Taking advantage of the new support of Government, unions put on great organizing drives and made demands on employers for recognition. Many employers resisted these demands because they did not want "outside" organizations to meddle in their affairs, or because they did not think that the protesting workers represented a majority of their employees, or because they did not approve of the new national policy embodied in law, or for other reasons. Workers then "went on strike" to enforce these now legal demands. Between 1933 and 1937 the number of strikes and lock-outs increased each year.[2] A large proportion of the strikes were caused by efforts at unionization rather than in pursuance of direct efforts to improve wage and working conditions.

Strikes for union recognition aroused a good deal of public sympathy because it was felt that the workers had the law on their side and that the law itself was in the public interest in its support of the weak against the strong, in its purpose to prevent the victimization of men engaged in union activity, and in its fundamental effort to increase the bargaining strength of workers. With this increased bargaining power unions expected their weight to be felt.

MACHINERY OF THE NLRB AND COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

The Wagner Act avowed that inequality of bargaining power between employers and employees depressed wages and prevented the stabilization of competitive wage rates in industry. It assumed that the protection of the employee's right to organize would equalize bargaining power and thus lift the pressure on wages and promote the stabilization of wages at a high level. The specific terms of the act, and therefore also the machinery which the NLRB developed in the course of its administration, dealt with the safeguarding of the rights of self-organization and collective bargaining. These were to be guaranteed by prohibiting the employer from engaging in five specified types of practice deemed to be unfair. The act also had specific provisions for the settling of questions as to who were to represent the workers in collective bargaining. These were implemented by the elections conducted by the Board, as a result of which representatives were legally selected.

Beyond the responsibility of the NLRB to enforce the safeguards of workers against interference from employers and the selection of appropriate bargaining agencies the Wagner Act provided no machinery. It was assumed that, if workers were free to organize and bargain collectively, and if employers bargained in good faith, agreements would be reached. There was no new machinery provided to facilitate the coming to agreement of the parties. And agreement, experience showed, was not always possible. While the act said in its preamble that the national policy of encouraging collective bargaining had as one of its main purposes to diminish the causes of labor disputes, it specifically provided that nothing in the act shall be construed so as to interfere with or impede or diminish in any way the right to strike. There was no implementation of an orderly and peaceful adjustment of disputes when collective bargaining ended in disagreement. This failure to provide adequate Government machinery for intervention and adjustment to facilitate coming to agreement made it appear that a strike or a lock-out must follow every disagreement.

[2] See footnote at end of article.

The right of workers to withhold their labor either individually or collectively has been recognized in law, in the courts, and in custom. The law has also sanctioned strikes and the threat of strikes in any stage of the collective-bargaining process. The "strike weapon" has become organized labor's treasured possession, by the use of which the bargaining strength of labor can be made as potent as that of the employer, who is made to realize that the demands of labor can be ignored only at great cost to the company. In this sense the increase in the number of strikes in the past 12 years is some measure of the growth of collective bargaining.

PREWAR SPREAD OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

In April 1937 the Wagner Act was held constitutional by the Supreme Court and this further facilitated the work of the NLRB and the organizing efforts of the unions. After the successful organizing drives of 1937 the total number of strikes in the country declined, but they remained at a relatively high level in the ensuing years. With the upswing of business in 1938, followed by the stimulus of European war orders and later by our own defense program, unemployment diminished, the labor market began to tighten and the bargaining power of labor continued to improve. Trade union strength, which had increased steadily during the period of relatively large unemployment ranging from about 15,000,000 down to about 9,000,000 between 1933 and 1937, continued to increase as unemployment began to vanish. A higher plateau in the number of strikes was an accomplishment of the entire period since the passage of the Wagner Act and strikes of greater or less duration become part of the normal industrial scene.

STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

The settling down in the number of strikes in 1938 did not augur a permanent downward trend. While there were slight decreases in the number of strikes in 1939 and 1940, the number of workers involved and the man-days lost in 1939 were among the highest for the period under review. In 1941, when our military preparations were increasing sharply and we were producing war goods on a large scale for nations fighting an enemy with whom we were also on the verge of war, strikes increased sharply to the high level of 1937 and involved more workers than at any time since records have been kept, except for the year 1919.

To the degree that editorials and public-opinion polls reflect public reaction, strikes in defense industries aroused the strongest public revulsion. There were demands to prohibit strikes and to control the activities of trade unions. This public reaction was reflected in part in the passage in a number of States of laws which endeavored to control or regulate union activity. On March 19, 1941, the National Defense Mediation Board was established by Executive order to deal with the strike situation. The Board settled more than 100 cases involving more than 1,000,000 workers; but it was finally brought to an end by the resignation of the CIO members over the refusal of the Board to recommend the union shop to the United Mine Workers in the captive mine dispute. In this background the House of Representatives passed the Smith antistrike bill by a vote of 252 to 136. This bill contained many provisions to control the activities of unions, including regulation of membership, limitations on the conduct of strikes, cooling-off periods and the withholding of bargaining rights from unions under certain conditions. The bill was passed by the House 4 days before the attack on Pearl Harbor, an attack which stirred the country and brought about a sense of unity heretofore lacking in industrial relations.

WAR EXPERIENCE WITH COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AND STRIKES

After we entered the war the leaders of organized labor pledged their unions to the policy of no strikes in wartime and agreed to iron out all differences by means of collective bargaining, supplemented by the enlarged conciliation and wage stabilization services of the Government. Greatly increased selective service withdrawals and expanded war-production programs further tightened the labor market. Industry had sharply rising war schedules and expanding and certain markets for their goods ahead of them. The only thing lacking was labor and consequently great efforts were made to augment the labor supply from sources not customarily in the labor market. Millions of new workers entered the recently unionized war and war-supporting industries.

Government labor policy during the war period, especially the adoption of the maintenance of membership device by the National War Labor Board in partial compensation for the no-strike pledge by organized labor, added to the force of the total economic situation in strengthening the continued growth of trade-union membership. At the same time it was felt necessary to keep wages from rising further under the impact of the tightening labor supply situation in order to keep costs and prices from getting entirely out of hand. The substantial increases in wage rates and earnings which had taken place in the 2 or 3 years before we had to mobilize for all-out war continued into the summer of 1942, when the policy embodied in the Little Steel Formula was developed in order to place a ceiling on wages. As prices and the cost of living continued to increase and wages remained stabilized, except for overtime rates, upgrading, bonuses, shift differentials, and other indirect means of increasing earnings, union spokesmen became more and more critical of the wage formula. They felt they were being deprived of increases to which they were entitled and which they would have received had the wage formula not stood in their path, because it seemed that after 1943 the Little Steel Formula brought results which did not give full weight to the continually improved bargaining position of labor, upon which, in the whole previous decade, labor and industry both had been taught that just wages were supposed to be determined. The War Labor Board was making the important decisions. The right to strike, as well as wages, hours, shift differentials, vacation allowances, and internal and external inequalities, were all being prescribed by directive order.

Most employers were either working for the Government more or less on a cost-guarantee basis or were producing for a civilian market where higher prices were by no means barriers to sales. For these reasons and also to obtain additional manpower which in many instances meant inducing workers to give up one job for a higher paying job, many employers were ready to meet the demands of the unions in their industry. In many such cases strikes became a means of obtaining War Labor Board attention. The War Labor Board was not able to keep up with the numerous requests for wage increases, and the protests and irritations of the unions were therefore directed increasingly against the Board rather than against employers. Although statistics are not compiled in this way, those experienced in these controversies know that many strikes occurred to force prior action by the War Labor Board, or to get favorable action, or to reverse a decision of the regional board, while some of the most spectacular strikes followed decisions of the National War Labor Board which were not satisfactory to the unions involved.

The reaction of the public to strikes in wartime became increasingly hostile because

the public had been convinced of the relatively high earnings of union workers as hours in war industries increased and also because the strikes appeared to be directed against the actions of Government agents who were presumed to be fair. In many minds comparisons were made with the lower earnings and greater risks of men in combat. Everywhere there was an increasing impatience with any interruption of war production, whatever the cause. Some strikes or threats of strikes in important industries had to be stopped by the Government seizure of plants in order to avoid great loss or to prevent the cutting off of supplies to the battlefronts. It was seen more clearly during the period of maximum mobilization for the conduct of the war that a strike in one plant interfered with production in many other plants, and that the conception of an industrial dispute as of primary interest only to the employers of the particular plant and their employees was not adequate to describe the economic reality of modern industrialism. Most companies are suppliers of other companies as well as a market for still other companies. Industries such as coal mining, public utilities, and railroads are the very lifeblood of the economy as a whole, and few if any industries can carry on for long if these materials or services are not forthcoming. The secondary effects on other business and on consumers are also passed on to labor, where many more than the number directly engaged in a strike may be disemployed because the company with which they were employed and with whom cordial relations existed has been incapacitated by a strike in another plant, located perhaps in another city or another State. The official strike statistics do not record the losses arising out of these secondary effects.

THE WAR LABOR DISPUTES ACT

In June 1943, at the height of public irritation with strikes in wartime, the War Labor Disputes Act was passed over President Roosevelt's veto. The act was based on the hypothesis that strikes were to some large degree stimulated or encouraged by the leadership of the unions and that they were called without adequate reflection or consideration. The 30-day strike notice provided in the act was intended to offer an opportunity for reflection and to lessen the ardor for strikes because of the possible consequences to the war effort. After the 30-day waiting period the men would have an opportunity to vote by secret ballot against the intention to strike in wartime. Great hopes were held out that the passage of this bill would avoid work stoppages. However, strikes continued at practically the same level after the passage of the War Labor Disputes Act, with a sharp increase in the number of new strikes in the middle 6 months of 1944. Obviously this act was not preventing strikes; instead it provided a validated procedure for strikes in wartime by making them legal after notices had been properly filed and secret ballots taken. After the surrender of Germany and particularly after the surrender of Japan petitions for strike ballots increased until this activity became the major function of the National Labor Relations Board. Demands for the repeal of the vote-taking provision of the act increased as its failure to attain its original objective became apparent to all in the light of the mounting severity of strikes toward the end of 1945.

TYPES OF UNION REGULATION ENACTED OR PROPOSED

The increasing power of unions and the fuller realization of their widespread effects on the economy as a whole, as well as on the individuals who come into direct contact with them as members or employers, has given rise to a variety of legislative proposals to deal with the problems created. Since 1937 a number of States have passed statutes regulating the activities of unions beyond any regulation provided by Federal law, while many other proposals dealing with union affairs have been made in the State legislatures and in the Congress of the United States.

Present State and Federal laws and additional proposals to regulate unions may be classified into one of three types:

1. Some of these laws or proposals deal in one way or another with unions as business or social organizations. They include such matters as the regulation of unions, the filing of financial statements, regulation of initiation fees and dues, and the contributions of unions to political organizations and activities.

2. Another series of laws or proposals attempt to deal with unions as controllers of work opportunities. They deal with such matters as the closed shop, limitations of union membership, the qualifications of union officers, and the democratic organization and administration of unions.

3. A third type of legislation, the type to which this bulletin is addressed, deals with unions as bargaining agencies and has as its avowed purpose the development of additional machinery to help in the peaceful conduct of collective bargaining and in the reduction of work stoppages.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S DISAPPOINTMENT WITH LABOR-MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE

The growin realization that widespread collective bargaining was not promoting industrial peace but was in fact accompanied by increasing strikes and work stoppages has intensified the search for remedies. Editorial discussion became more widespread and intense. More bills were introduced in Congress. The President took action on this problem soon after the surrender of Japan by calling for an impressive labor-management conference, focusing responsibility upon it and giving it plenty of time and assistance to work out a solution satisfactory to all sides. The conference met and earnestly debated a number of issues for a period of about 4 weeks. The conferees agreed that collective bargaining was the correct policy in industrial relations, but they came forth with no solution of the problem of work stoppages. On the third day after the adjournment of the conference the President issued a message in which he said:

"The American people have been patient. They have waited long in the hope that those leaders in labor and management whose business it was to handle this problem would be able to do so in agreement. The Federal Government declined time and again to make any suggestion to the conference as to proper machinery. All that the Government did was to point out the objective which the American people expected it to attain.

"Now that the conference has adjourned without any recommendation on the subject, it becomes the duty of the Government to act on its own initiative. Therefore, I now suggest to the Congress that well-reasoned and workable legislation be passed at the earliest possible moment to provide adequate means for settling industrial disputes and avoiding industrial strife."

QUESTION OF LIMITATIONS ON THE RIGHT TO STRIKE

Assuming the functioning of collective bargaining strikes or lock-outs occur, whether immediately or after unsuccessful mediation, when one side or the other decides that it can find no further purpose in continued negotiation and concludes that it has more to lose than to gain by continuing to work on existing terms. Some strikes have not been called until after prolonged negotiations and until all existing mediation and arbitration machinery has been employed to avoid the necessity of a strike. A large percentage of strikes occur only after the union heads are convinced that the company is unyielding or altogether unreasonable on the important issues. There have, however, been cases where strikes were called almost immediately upon making demands, and there have even been times when one or the other side said it did not know what the strike or lock-out was about. The President's proposal and other proposals which will be discussed hereinafter involve in one way or another some limitation on the unfettered right to strike under every and all conditions. Before considering the specific legislative proposals, the fundamental differences raised in the strike limitation issue as such will be considered.

THE POSITION OF THE UNIONS

Practically all union leaders who have spoken on this issue have argued that any limitation on the right to strike is an interference with freedom to work or not to work and is, therefore, an intolerable throw-back to feudal or slave conditions. This line of argument rests on the conviction that under modern conditions workers do not have real industrial freedom except in association. In turn the association of workers in trade or industrial unions derives its strength from the power to strike, which gives them a weapon to be used in negotiations with employers to force the best terms and conditions which the economic situation can afford. This weapon can be used most effectively when the employer is vulnerable to attack, since the whole point of the strike is to make him yield or accede to their demands. Any limitation on the time, place, or manner of attack limits the union that much in its strategic campaign to bring the employer to accept the terms and demands of the union by giving him time to prepare to counteract the pressure of the union or to nullify its effects.

Limitations on the right to strike are therefore regarded by union spokesmen (and others) as limitations on the worker's freedom and his bargaining power. They hold that a democratic society should hold inviolate the right of men to be free to sell or to withhold their labor on the basis of mutual self-interest and benefit. Unions represent the workers' self-interest in selling or withholding their labor. If unions cannot act freely and without restraint, they will soon have no important functions and will eventually wither or be destroyed. Many, if not all, are convinced that the destruction of unions is the principal purpose of all efforts to limit the freedom to strike.

The position of the unions is that they do not want to strike but that they must retain the strike weapon inviolate. Workers risk much in going out on strike. They are not paid for time lost and they run the risk of losing the strike as well. In most industries the loss of only 2 weeks' pay due to a strike would have to be made up by an increase in wages of at least $1.50 per week for a whole year before there would be any net gain to the worker at the end of the year. There may be no net gain at all; and strikes are also ordered to prevent reductions in pay or standards. They assert that in a profit-seeking, competitive, industrial economy the strike and the threat to strike are the time-tested means by which free men attempt to improve their economic position. They argue that it is little enough to expect that the worker be not disarmed in this uneven struggle. Where the strike is over other questions than wages, such as work assignment, hiring or laying-off procedures, the discharge of a particular worker, etc., over which issues no wage increases would generally result, they assert that the momentum to strike must come from some pretty deep-seated convictions regarding the men's rights and sensibilities believed to be infringed by the employer. Men who withhold their work and pay for it in lost wages are in fact paying in part for their own freedom and the freedom of all workers.

As to the public interest, spokesmen for labor say that the workers are largely the public and anyway what is to the workers' interest is always in the public interest. Limiting the freedom of unions to strike when they judge it is to their long-time interest to do so, would weaken all unions by dulling the edge of their most effective weapon; it would lower efficiency and morale, lessen the pressure on management, reduce general purchasing power and expose all workers to the whims of irresponsible bosses.

For all these reasons union spokesmen have opposed all legislative measures which have as their objective the limitation in any way on their freedom to resort to a strike in furtherance of their aims at any stage in their dealings with employers. Unions have, however, limited their own freedom of action in agreements which many have voluntarily made with employers not to strike during the life of such agreements.

POSITION OF PROPONENTS OF LEGISLATION TO LESSEN STRIKES

Those who support any of the legislative proposals intended to lessen strikes differ greatly among themselves in their attitude toward unions and the effective participation of unions in the economy of the Nation. While some are hostile to the extension of union conditions and control in industry, others are unquestionably friendly to the aspirations of the unions in playing their part in developing joint and mutually satisfactory relations in industry. They all agree that good industrial relations flow from mutual trust and cooperation and they do not approve of coercion. However, they look upon the volume of strikes in recent years as evidence of the periodic break-down of collective bargaining, of perhaps the lack of sufficient confidence and cooperation in industry and as proof that the national labor policy of encouraging the growth of unions and the extension of collective bargaining is not in fact yielding the beneficent results anticipated by its sponsors and friends. The remedies they propose differ in method and content from the imposition of only a moral obligation not to strike in important industries while the facts and recommendations are published by a disinterested panel to closer implementation of collective bargaining with effective machinery for mediation and arbitration and, the most extreme position, the prohibition of strikes, at least during certain periods, with severe penalties for illegal strikes.

All the proponents of additional legislation to lessen strikes emphasize far more than those who accept the unions' position and conclusions that strikes are practically always an inconvenience to the public (interpreted as those not directly involved in the strike or lock-out) and that strikes in key industries involve great losses to innocent parties and jeopardize the health, safety and welfare of many individuals. They are impressed, that when collective bargaining results in work stoppages, it is frequently of much greater consequence to others in our tightly knit society than to the struck company or to the workers directly employed by that company. They plead principally for the rights of these innocent parties and for the public to be able to carry on its legitimate business. They are satisfied that when both sides directly involved in an industrial dispute are completely free to strike or lock-out at any time, the public interest may not be considered at all or given next to no weight in comparison with the grievances felt by either side to the controversy. Some are convinced that an important proportion of strikes is carried on for trivial reasons or to serve private, anti-social or jurisdictional ends and that most strikes could be avoided if a legal obligation to come to agreement were imposed and proper alternative facilities provided. They are all convinced that it has become necessary to bring the weight of public opinion to bear upon the strike problem as a whole in order to protect all the interests involved.

The proponents of additional legislation do not question the absolute freedom of the individual worker to quit any job which he finds unsatisfactory, and this is provided for in every bill which is reviewed in this bulletin. They do not seek to limit the freedom of any worker to quit his job, but they seek in one way or another to postpone the use of the strike weapon or to make its use rarely necessary in order to obtain justice in industry. Another way of putting it is to say that they seek to place some limitation on the right to quit work collectively and by picketing and other devices preventing all others from working until the employer comes to terms. The bills under consideration seek delay and friendly mediation; they seek to reduce the necessity for work stoppages, not to prohibit the right to strike. Most of them would concede that in a democracy the right to strike cannot finally be taken away; but they are even more certain that the multiplication of strikes is not in the public interest. They feel it is the duty of public authority to develop effective machinery for peaceful and fair settlements of labor disputes. The strike may be the final resort in an industrial dispute; but it does not have to be the only resort—just as war is not the only resort of peaceful nations in handling their differences.

Proponents of legislation also say that it is by no means proved that any postponement of the use of the strike weapon weakens the power of unions in collective bargaining. If, as some union officials allege, many corporations simply say "no" to their demands and do not in fact engage in collective bargaining, the requirement of a public report on the issues would smoke out such situations and obligate the company to bargain with the union in the light of the facts placed before the public. In arbitration awards it is felt that unions have generally gotten a square deal. The evidence that the old railroad unions and the new air transport unions have grown and prospered under one form of such strike and lock-out control and the allegation that a similar strike limitation law has effectively reduced strikes in the State of Minnesota are held to prove that a system of industrial relations can be established by law which will protect the interests of the public as well as of the workers and employers.

CURRENT LABOR RELATIONS BILLS—ELLENDER AND NORTON BILLS (THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL)

The President proposed that Congress authorize the certification to ad hoc fact-finding panels of issues in important labor disputes which have not been settled by negotiation or mediation and which threaten to result in work stoppage. These boards would hold hearings and publish the facts and their recommendations on the issues within a period of 30 days, during which strikes or lock-outs would be unlawful. The board would have the power to subpoena such company records as it deemed necessary to arrive at the facts in the dispute and to make recommendations for settlement.

Hearings were held before the Christmas holidays on the Ellender bill in the Senate, and the Norton bill in the House, both of which embodied the President's specific proposal. Neither committee was satisfied that it could report its bill in the time requested by the President and they both decided to continue hearings on the reconvening of Congress on January 14, 1946.

The position of the representatives of organized labor at these hearings on the central issue of limiting the exercise of the right to strike was one of almost violent opposition. The reasoned argument was in line with the position of labor on the strike limitation issue outlined on pages 13-15 of this bulletin.

With reference to the specific limitation on strikes during a period of 30 days, spokesmen for labor have also said that it is impossible to frame any measure which would have the effect of limiting the right to strike to a period of no more than 30 days. They argue that the limitation is far more extensive. It will hover over the negotiations while the partier are engaged in collective bargaining, during all subsequent efforts of mediation or conciliation, during the period of discretionary uncertainty as to whether or not the President will certify the dispute, and the deliberations of the fact-finding board, which may have to be extended beyond 30 days. The 30 days start only from the time the dispute is certified. What may apepar in the law as a formal period of 30 days may thus be stretched out to a period of 5 to 6 months or more from the beginning of negotiations until it is legal to strike. For, to have struck at any time during this extensive period would have exposed the workers to the requirements of the law that they return to work. Preparation and organization for a strike cannot be developed and held static for weeks or months, built up to the point of action and let down again during discretionary delays. During this long period of negotiation, mediation, conciliation, certification and fact-finding, strikes would be impossible as a practical matter. The strike weapon would be blunted to complete uselessness.

The position of the top union spokesmen, therefore, remains that this proposal, if enacted into law, would condemn labor to involuntary servitude and that, to enforce the restrictions on labor, the courts will be restored to their pre-Norris-LaGuardia Act role of issuing injunctions in labor disputes.

The representatives of employers organizations at the pre-Christmas hearings also did not support the President's proposal. The spokesman for the National Association of Manufacturers endorsed the principle of fact finding but objected strongly to the subpena power of the panels. He spent the greater part of his time making entirely different proposals for legislation and, when asked finally whether he favored the bill before the committee, his answer was that he was not in favor of it in its present form. The spokesman for the United States Chamber of Commerce said that his organization had not been polled on the subject but that, speaking for himself, he opposed abridging the right to strike, was skeptical whether legislation of itself could create good labor relations, and felt that Congress should not pass the bill hastily.

The strongest support of the bill came from the Secretary of Labor. He found a need for the measure in the break-down of collective bargaining in some important industries and in the sharp increase in the number of strike notices filed with the NLRB under the War Labor Disputes Act. He had confidence that the informed findings of a panel of public-spirited men, backed by public opinion, would generally be accepted, and he based this confidence on the history of emergency boards under the Railway Labor Act. He did not think that labor had anything to fear from the 30-day period during which no stoppage would be lawful, which he said is also a provision included in the Railway Labor Act. Contrasting the waiting period in this bill with the 30-day waiting period provided in the War Labor Disputes Act, he pointed out that the latter was designed to be a cooling-off period and nothing more, while the 30-day period provided in the bill under consideration will be used to secure affirmative action in the nature of hearings, fact finding, and recommendations which will serve as a basis for the settlement of the dispute "rather than serving as a period of preparation for the beginning of a strike." He

pointed out that the fact-finding procedure would be used only where certification is made that Government conciliation and arbitration have failed, that the parties are unwilling to submit the controversy to arbitration, and that the stoppage of work would seriously affect the national public interest.

The simplicity and directness of the President's proposal was apparently a source of its strength in the public mind. Although there was much skepticism regarding the probable accomplishment of the fact-finding device on the part of those most experienced in labor relations, public support appeared to be overwhelmingly in favor of attempting this program at once. In a survey of the American Institute of Public Opinion issued on January 3, 1946, it was shown that about 78 percent of the sample canvassed approved, while only about 11 percent disapproved. Of union members voting on the question in the survey, 70 percent approved, 16 percent disapproved, and 14 percent were undecided. Union members appeared from this survey not at all eager to strike if other means of resolving current controversies could be found. Sixty-eight percent of union members thought that the President's proposal would reduce strikes and presumably they did not think they would be hurt by that contingency. In a similar survey conducted at the same time by the Des Moines Sunday Register, 72 percent of union members in Iowa voted approval of the President's plan. Sixty-seven percent of the union members voted favorably to make strikes and lockouts unlawful during the fact-finding period of 30 days, while only 11 percent of union members opposed this provision; 22 percent had no opinion.

BALL-HATCH AMENDMENT

The amendment to the Ellender bill proposed by Senators BALL and HATCH strikes out the whole bill after the enacting clause and substitutes a new bill. This is a somewhat reduced and toned-down version of the Ball-Burton-Hatch bill originally introduced in June 1945 and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, but upon which no formal hearings have been held. It appears that when the committee reconvenes hearings on this substitute may be permitted as part of the over-all effort to find a satisfactory method of handling industrial disputes. It is pertinent to note, however, that the Ball-Hatch amendment makes no effort to amend the National Labor Relations Act or to make illegal labor practices by labor organizations, which were the most criticized provisions of the original Ball-Burton-Hatch bill. In place of these there is a provision that "the Board (created under this amendment) shall take no action which will interfere in any way with the consideration or determination of complaints of unfair practices by the National Labor Relations Board in accordance with the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act."

The central task which the Ball-Hatch amendment sets itself is how to make collective bargaining function to settle the issues between management and labor fairly but without work stoppages. It seeks to restore to the parties and to Government a sense of the public necessity to settle collective bargaining issues amicably and to make collective bargaining work as the national labor relations policy. It does so directly by imposing upon all parties the duty to make and maintain agreements, while it provides detailed orderly Government settlement procedures for controversies which threaten to result in a substantial interruption of commerce.

Under this bill a Federal Industrial Relations Board of five members is given comprehensive power to mediate and settle disputes. The United States Conciliation Service will be transferred to this Board and it will also have the power to utilize the services of other agencies deemed helpful in its settlement efforts. If the Board is not successful in its efforts at mediation and conciliation, it is obligated to use its offices to induce the parties to agree to submit their controversy to arbitration. Pending the exhaustion of settlement efforts, existing conditions must be maintained by the parties to the dispute.

If, finally, a fact-finding commission is appointed as a last step in the Government's settlement efforts, no strike or change in conditions by employers shall be made until 30 days after the report is made. It is a violation of the act to strike or lock-out until every reasonable effort has been made to settle controversies by the formal procedures established for collective bargaining, conciliation, mediation, fact finding, and voluntary arbitration.

The "right to strike" is specifically impeded under this bill by the imposition of the duty imposed on both parties to make and maintain agreements, to settle controversies by the procedures provided and to maintain conditions pending exhaustion of settlement efforts, including a 30-day period following the report of a fact-finding commission if such is appointed. This bill, like the Ellender and Norton bills, also provides that nothing in it shall be construed to require an individual employee to render labor or service without his consent or of quitting or withdrawing his labor. There is a further restriction on unions and employers that controversies arising out of any grievance against any employer concerning the application of any such agreement—that is, so-called grievance controversies—must be arbitrated and the award is binding on the parties and enforceable in the courts. The substitution of "effective grievance procedure, including final and binding arbitration for strikes, or lock-outs in grievances which arise under existing contracts" was, however, one of the agreements arrived at in the national management-labor conference called by the President last November and listed as an accomplishment of the conference in its release to the press on December 1, 1945.

Collective bargaining is not conducted according to the principles of a one-price store. It will generally lead to deadlocks when either side holds firmly to its original position. The more publicity given to the issues, the larger the interests represented, and the more the public is taken in on the discussions the more difficult it becomes to recede from original positions. A compromise proposal becomes a "break in the dam"; a fair concession is restrained by fears that it will be used for trading upward.

That is where mediation can play an important role to supplement the collective-bargaining process. The mediator, after he has come to grips with the final decisions of the parties in confidential talks with each side, is in a better position to quote rock-bottom prices. This role of firming up the bid-and-asked prices can be performed by the mediator before a strike as well, if not better, than after a strike, after which the mediator's job is also made more difficult by the public positions taken by the parties.

The Ball-Hatch bill makes the supplementary mediation and arbitration processes integral parts of the collective-bargaining process, and it endeavors to make collective bargaining itself less of a burden upon commerce. It looks to these publicly supported mediation efforts to lessen the inevitability of strikes or lock-outs when formal collective bargaining breaks down. Both sides will have to trade realistically or expose themselves to the persistent pressure to accept public decisions. The bill does not prohibit strikes or lock-outs after these efforts have failed; but it does not expect that strikes and lock-outs will be as inevitable or as numerous if both sides accept the duty to maintain agreements, make use of the settlement machinery provided and, as reasonable men, voluntarily leave a larger number of issues to arbitration.

SMITH BILL

H. R. 4875, introduced by Congressman SMITH of Virginia on December 3, 1945, contains practically all the provisions which had passed the House—but not the Senate—on two different occasions, on December 3, 1941, and on June 4, 1943. While the measures proposed in this bill are violently opposed by organized labor, they nonetheless commended themselves to a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives as necessary to meet the strike situation when it becomes very critical. The first passage of a similar bill 4 days before the attack on Pearl Harbor followed the great increase in strikes in 1941 in defense industries; the second time a similar bill was passed by the House was in 1943 after another increase in strikes, frequently against Government directives or Government policies. (The latter bill was compromised with a Senate bill and emerged as the Smith-Connally War Labor Disputes Act.)

The present Smith bill was introduced 2 days after the adjournment of the Management-Labor Conference and referred to the Committee on Labor. This committee held pre-Christmas hearings on the Norton bill (the President's proposal). It was announced by the acting chairman of the House Committee on Labor that when hearings are resumed on the return of Congress they will be broadened to include other measures to deal with the current situation.

The Smith bill has a number of provisions which do not deal directly with the strike limitation issue and will therefore not be discussed in this bulletin—such as the provision depriving any labor organization of its status under the National Labor Relations Act if it knowingly or negligently permits members of Communist or Nazi organizations or felons to hold office, and the provision for the compulsory registration of labor organizations, including the furnishing of detailed information on initiation fees, dues, limitations on membership, elections, and financial statements.

On the point at issue the bill provides for the maintenance of the status quo in collective bargaining by making it unlawful to conduct strikes or lock-outs until after 30 days' written notice filed with the employer and the Secretary of Labor of both the intention of striking and the reasons therefor.

There are a number of specific provisions regarding violence and intimidation in industrial disputes. These make it unlawful for any person to use or threaten force or violence in an attempt to prevent another person from working in a struck plant, to picket the homes of workers, to picket a place of business unless before the strike or lockout the picket was himself in the employ of the company. On the other hand, employers are enjoined from employing any person for the purpose of obstructing or interfering by threats or force with peaceful picketing or with the exercise by employees of their rights of self-organization or collective bargaining.

The bill would make it unlawful for workers concertedly to engage in sympathy strikes, jurisdictional strikes or to refuse to work on articles produced by any person in an attempt to induce such person to recognize, comply with the demands of, or to employ members of any labor organization.

Federal district courts shall have jurisdiction to enjoin any of the above acts and persons committing them shall also be liable to civil suits for damages. Individuals committing any of these acts shall lose their rights under the National Labor Relations Act, employment or other benefits under any act making appropriations for relief purposes or any unemployment compensation benefits under the Social Security Act. If a trade union or an officer of a union is guilty of any of the foregoing violations, the union shall cease to have the status of a labor organization under the National Labor Relations Act

and shall lose the protection of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, which prohibits the issuance of injunctions against certain acts of labor organizations.

It is declared to be the policy of the United States that labor disputes affecting the public interest should be settled fairly and without interruption or delay in the production necessary in the public interest. To this end additional facilities are created for the voluntary settlement of such disputes as cannot be settled expeditiously by collective bargaining and by existing conciliation and mediation procedures.

The bill creates in the Executive Office of the President a National Mediation Board, composed of an equal number of representatives of employers, workers, and the public to have jurisdiction of labor disputes which are not expeditiously adjusted by collective bargaining or other conciliation and mediation procedures. The Board may set up panels of employer-employee-public representatives or exclusively of public representatives who will make every reasonable effort to settle the dispute. The Chairman of the Board (a public representative) or the mediation panel may at any time request the parties to a dispute to negotiate by collective bargaining or to meet with any representative of the Board.

If a dispute is not settled by collective bargaining or mediation, the Chairman of the National Mediation Board or the mediation panel shall endeavor to induce the parties voluntarily to submit their differences to arbitration. Arbitration awards shall be filed with the Board.

If a dispute is not settled by collective bargaining, mediation, or voluntary arbitration the Chairman may authorize a panel to investigate the issues involved and to make findings of fact and recommendations. The Board shall submit such report to the parties and to the public.

After the Board has taken jurisdiction of a dispute the Chairman may issue an order requiring any person to refrain from calling or assisting in a strike arising out of the dispute or an order requiring an employer to refrain from any practices which change the situation existing at the time the dispute arose. Such order shall terminate within 5 days after the findings and recommendations of the Board or within 60 days after the date on which the order was issued, whichever is first.

Orders of the Board shall be enforced in the appropriate District Court of the United States at the suit of the Attorney General of the United States and its judgment and decrees shall be subject to review by the appropriate circuit court of appeals and by the Supreme Court upon writ of certiorari. The jurisdiction of the courts when granting temporary relief or restraining order or making or entering a decree enforcing an order of the Chairman of the National Mediation Board shall not be limited by the terms of the Norris-La Guardia Antiinjunction Act.

The Board shall have subpena power to examine relevant books and records necessary for the settlement of labor disputes before it.

Those who support the stringent provisions of the Smith bill have felt that it is no longer true that unions have weaker bargaining power than employers because they are organized nationally to deal with individual companies; they frequently strike at will without giving the employer an opportunity to bargain with them; they sometimes break or ignore their own contracts; they employ threats or violence in labor disputes; they picket the homes of workers or of managers; they employ pickets who never worked for a struck company to mislead the public; they engage in sympathy strikes, jurisdictional strikes, and strikes against employers who use materials made by another union or by nonunion labor—practices which are directed against employers who maintain friendly union conditions in their own plants.

By making all the foregoing acts illegal, proponents of the Smith bill believe they are striking at the roots of the abuses of labor organizations which have contributed to the multiplication of strikes. Other provisions of the bill, dealing with the purging of unions of such of their leaders as are Communists, Nazi sympathizers or racketeers or criminals and the elaborate provisions regarding the registration of unions and the publication of the basic facts regarding their organization, jurisdiction, fees, dues, assessments, limitations on membership, paid-up membership, election of officers, constitution and bylaws and financial statements, have as their purpose the cleansing of unions of internal abuses, the elimination of subversive or other deleterious and extraneous purposes in the conduct of unions and of strikes, and the protection of both the membership and the public from irresponsible control by unwanted, selfish or even vicious leaders. The proponents of this bill believe that peace and order and fair dealing in industrial relations are not possible while the conditions exist which have called forth these proposed remedies.

Over and above the provisions of the Smith bill which aim to eliminate what are regarded as serious abuses of unions and which seek to inquire into the practices of unions as membership organizations, the bill remains the most severe of the four bills considered in its restrictions on strike activity. There is, first, the 30-day notice which must be given before strike action is possible. There is the specific provision with respect to the use of force or violence in connection with picketing, which union spokesmen say means the destruction of strike discipline and the exposure of normal picketing to unfriendly local police and courts. There are the provisions against sympathy strikes, so-called jurisdictional strikes and strikes against employers using nonunion materials, which union spokesmen say will not only greatly reduce their effectiveness but, especially in so-called jurisdictional strikes, will create a happy hunting ground for company unions and make it impossible for workers to select the representatives who they think can serve them best. Union leaders point to the severe judicial penalties, including the practical repeal of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, which they say means the return to the destructive and immoral doctrine of conspiracy under which men are not permitted to do in association what is perfectly legal for them to do as individuals. They point to the withdrawal of all unemployment compensation and relief benefits as measures which are sure to destroy unions as well as to intimidate the rank and file of union members. Their reactions to all these proposals are bitter in the extreme; they charge that those who support these proposals are either naive individuals who do not know much about the struggles of labor in the past to obtain its present position of near-equality with management or that they are avowedly antiunion spokesmen who use fair words to destroy trade unionism in the United States and to return to a condition where it is illegal for workers to organize for mutual aid and protection and for effective bargaining with large aggregations of capital.

Union spokesmen say that they have no objection to the creation of adequate conciliation and mediation machinery and that they have urged the necessity of better settlement machinery for years. They say that it is also the policy of the trade-union movement to settle labor disputes fairly and without interruption or delay, but they do not see how fair settlements can be made by so greatly restraining the weaker party. Their objections to any limitation on the freedom to strike were outlined on page 13–15 of this Bulletin and their criticism of compulsory waiting periods in connection with fact-finding panels were given on pages 19–20. They naturally find a 60-day compulsory waiting period for the report of a fact-finding panel more objectionable than a 30-day waiting period.

M'MAHON BILL

S. 1419, which was introduced on September 20, 1945, by Senator McMAHON for himself and for Senators HAYDEN, THOMAS of Utah, and TUNNELL, provides for the creation of special boards of inquiry to hold hearings on the issues of a labor dispute and to make "the factual argument of each party to the controversy available to the public." Nothing is said about recommendations to be made by boards of inquiry which would bring objective thinking to bear upon the contesting arguments and help to crystallize public opinion on the issues involved. The appointment of such board of inquiry "shall not otherwise interfere with any action undertaken or to be undertaken by either party." In other words, in this bill, unlike the Ellender and Norton bills (the President's proposal), the Ball-Hatch amendment and the Smith bill, no recommendations are made by the fact-finding boards, and strikes or lockouts may take place before the appointment of such boards, while the board is conducting hearings, or any day after the board makes available to the public "the factual argument of each side of the controversy."

The other provisions of the McMahon bill deal with the centralization of labor functions in the Labor Department, the creation in the Department of a Conciliation and Mediation Division which takes over the functions of the Conciliation Service and any other conciliation and mediation functions in the Department, and the establishment of an independent United States Board of Arbitration to handle arbitration voluntarily requested by both sides.

The Administrator of the Conciliation and Mediation Division has the duty of encouraging representatives of employers and employees to make and maintain agreements and to settle all differences arising therefrom with expedition and, wherever possible, in conference. The services of the Division shall be employed in mediation and conciliation efforts to bring the parties to agreement in any labor controversy involving or threatening an immediate and substantial interruption to the free flow of commerce.

The independent arbitration agency created—not within the Department of Labor—to be known as the United States Board of Arbitration, is composed of three members appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate for overlapping terms of 3 years. This Board will cooperate with the parties in forming a board of arbitration when requested to do so; but the failure or refusal of either party to agree to arbitration shall not be construed as a violation of any legal duty or other obligation imposed by this act. The Board will establish a roster of fair and competent arbitrators familiar with the industrial and employment problems in the region where the controversy exists. Arbitration awards shall be transmitted and filed with the District Court of the United States and with the United States Board of Arbitration. Boards of arbitration shall have the power to require the attendance of witnesses and the production of necessary books, records, etc., deemed material to a just determination of the matters submitted for arbitration; for this purpose the Board may request the District Court to issue the necessary subpenas.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor is authorized to maintain a file of copies of agreements reached as a result of mediation, conciliation, and arbitration pursuant to this act, of arbitration

agreements made and awards rendered pursuant to the act, of all statements and summaries of fact issued by the Board of Inquiry and of any other collective labor agreements submitted by the parties. Such file shall be open to inspection for the guidance and information of interested representatives of employers, employees, and the general public. The BLS shall be equipped (presumably more so than now) to furnish factual information which may aid in the settlement of any labor controversy.

To remove any possible doubt in the matter, it is provided finally that nothing in this bill shall be construed to interfere with or impede or diminish in any way the right to strike, or exert other lawful means or to amend or modify the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act.

What we have here, then, is some further centralization of the labor functions of the Government within the conciliation services in the Department of Labor, perhaps larger appropriations for the Bureau of Labor Statistics to gather, collate and publish relevant labor data, and the establishment of an independent board of arbitration and other arbitration facilities the use of which will depend upon the willingness to use such facilities on the part of both parties to a dispute. The parties need not agree to arbitration but, once they do, arbitration awards are enforceable in the courts. In connection with collective bargaining and conciliation and mediation, strikes and lockouts are permissible at any time from the beginning of a controversy. Arbitration boards have subpena power; but the decision to submit to arbitration is voluntary.

This bill, which was submitted after the original Ball-Burton-Hatch bill, and partly as a rival measure, contains substantially the same arbitration provisions and is animated by the same aim as the Ball-Hatch proposal to prolong the process of collective bargaining before such bargaining breaks down in a work stoppage; but it differs from the present Ball-Hatch amendment particularly in that it provides no such compelling duty on both parties to make and maintain agreements and to use the settlement facilities of government, no recommendations by the fact-finding board, no obligatory waiting period, and no sanction.

The general counsel of the American Federation of Labor was quoted in the press on January 5, 1946, to the effect that the McMahon bill does not contain the "objectionable features" of the President's proposal for a "fixed waiting period" and "for recommendations by the fact-finding board." He added that "we possibly should have indicated that fact finding in and of itself is not harmful to labor even though I am not convinced that it can do much good." Nevertheless, he added in a later interview, the general executive board of the A. F. of L. at its meeting in Miami later in January "would give serious consideration to the fact-finding bill proposed by Senator McMAHON."

---

[1] In 1944 about half the workers in private industry—some 14,300,000 men and women—were working under terms of union agreements. In manufacturing industries about 65 percent of the workers were covered by agreements, while in some industries, like coal mining, railroads, and longshore work, practically all the workers were covered by agreements. The national average for all industry was pulled down by the lower degree of unionization in the service trades, in clerical occupations, and in agriculture. (See Florence Peterson, American Labor Unions, pp. 188–191. Miss Peterson is the Director of the Industrial Relations Division of the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U. S. Department of Labor.)

Total union membership is somewhat larger than the number of workers covered by union agreements because there are scattered union members in plants where the union does not yet represent the majority of the workers.

[2] While Government statistics make no distinction between strikes and lock-outs, practically all work stoppages are popularly regarded as strikes. In a period of generally rising production, prices, and wages, the initiative in asking for changes in the labor contract is, of course, taken by labor. If a work stoppage results it is called a strike. A lock-out in the traditional sense is very difficult to effectuate under the National Labor Relations Act because the employer is obliged to bargain with his present employees and cannot call in new workers to take their place. At the same time, when there is a stoppage because the employer will not accept a demand of a union, the union many interpret such stoppage as a lock-out.

Strikes and lock-outs in the United States, 1916–45

Year	Strikes and lock-outs		Workers involved		Man-days idle			Indexes (1935–39=100)		
	Number	Average duration (calendar days)	Number [1]	Percent of total employed [2]	Number	Percent of available working time [3]	Per worker involved	Strikes and lock-outs	Workers involved	Man-days idle
1916 [4]	3,789		1,599,917	8.4				132	142	
1917	4,450		1,227,254	6.3				155	109	
1918	3,353		1,239,989	6.2				117	110	
1919	3,630		4,160,348	20.8				127	370	
1920	3,411		1,463,054	7.2				119	130	
1921	2,385		1,099,247	6.4				83	98	
1922	1,112		1,612,562	8.7				39	143	
1923	1,553		756,584	3.5				54	67	
1924	1,249		654,641	3.1				44	58	
1925	1,301		428,416	2.0				45	38	
1926	1,035		329,592	1.5				36	29	
1927	707	26.5	329,989	1.4	26,218,628	0.37	79.5	25	29	155
1928	604	27.6	314,210	1.3	12,631,863	.17	40.2	21	28	75
1929	921	22.6	288,572	1.2	5,351,240	.07	18.5	32	26	32
1930	637	22.3	182,075	.8	3,316,808	.05	18.1	22	16	20
1931	810	18.8	241,817	1.6	6,893,244	.11	20.2	28	20	41
1932	841	19.6	324,210	1.8	10,502,033	.23	32.4	29	29	62
1933	1,695	16.9	1,168,272	6.3	16,872,128	.36	14.4	59	104	101
1934	1,856	19.5	1,466,695	7.2	19,591,949	.38	13.4	65	130	116
1935	2,014	23.8	1,117,213	5.2	15,456,337	.29	13.8	70	99	91
1936	2,172	23.3	788,648	3.1	13,901,956	.21	17.6	76	70	82
1937	4,740	20.3	1,860,621	7.2	28,424,857	.43	15.3	166	165	168
1938	2,772	23.6	688,376	2.8	9,148,273	.15	13.3	97	61	54
1939	2,613	23.4	1,170,962	4.7	17,812,219	.28	15.2	91	104	105
1940	2,508	20.9	576,988	2.3	6,700,872	.10	11.6	88	51	40
1941	4,288	18.3	2,362,620	8.4	23,047,556	.32	9.8	150	210	136
1942	2,968	11.7	839,961	2.8	4,182,557	.05	5.0	104	75	25
1943	3,752	5.0	1,981,279	6.9	13,500,529	.15	6.8	131	176	80
1944	4,956	5.6	2,115,637	7.0	8,721,079	.09	4.1	173	188	51
1945 [4]	4,600		3,325,000	11.7	35,000,000	.42	10.5			

[1] The number of workers involved in some strikes which occurred from 1916 to 1926 is not known. However, the missing information is for the smaller disputes and it is believed that the totals here given are fairly accurate.

[2] "Total employed workers" as used here refers to all workers except those in occupations and professions in which there is little if any union organization or where strikes rarely if ever occur. In most industries it includes all wage and salary workers except those in executive, managerial, or high supervisory positions or those performing professional work the nature of which makes union organization or group action impracticable. It excludes all self-employed, domestic workers, agricultural wage workers on farms employing less than 6, all Federal and State government employees, and the officials, both elected and appointed, in local governments.

[3] Available working time was computed for purposes of this table by multiplying the average number of employed workers each year by the number of days worked by most employees during the year.

[4] Tentative.

Blank spaces mean information not available.

The figures are those of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Official strike statistics do not add up the total amount of idleness and lost man-days due to work stoppages. They do not include time lost in plants because of a strike in the plant of its regular supplier, time lost in other plants which buy its commodities, or time lost by large segments of industry resulting from any strike of local transport workers, coal miners, delivery men, public utility workers, and elevator operators. The Bureau of Labor Statistics, which compiles the official statistics, asserts that, because it is impossible to obtain consistent and accurate information concerning the indirect and secondary effects of stoppages, only the workers in a plant who are made idle because of a dispute in the plant are counted. Such statistics are, of course, comparable from month to month and year to year, but they are by no means the true measure of all the losses created by work stoppages. In a number of strikes of recent memory the known secondary effects involved losses many times the man-days lost in the specific strikes themselves.

In Honor of Mrs. Woodhouse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 29, 1946

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of January 25, 1946, containing a reference to the plan of the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. WOODHOUSE] for discussing public questions with her constituents, and a deserved tribute to the gentlewoman:

IN HONOR OF MRS. WOODHOUSE

To the special honor of CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE, Congresswoman from Connecticut, for the right answers at the right place to the right people:

At biweekly intervals, Mrs. WOODHOUSE reports in the Norwich town meeting to as many of her constituents as care to come. After that, she stands up to questions.

"Your letters," said she to the 350 present on January 7, "are not always helpful. I can't perpetually vote 'No' as most letters advise me to." As she conceives it, she must vote "Yes" on anything to promote peace and "grassroots" prosperity—and specifically for renewed price control, low-cost housing for veterans, and a strong full-employment act. Then the questions:

Why the British bitterness on the proposed loan?

"Don't take Beaverbrook's editorials for the British people."

Why the delay in bringing the troops home?

"My own son has been in the Pacific 44 months, yet I am willing that he stay as long as necessary rather than have his son sent there to fight 25 years from now."

Antilabor legislation?

"There may be a bill to curb Petrillo, but I call that procultural rather than antilabor."

A Legionnaire said his post is 100 percent for atomic secrecy.

"I wish you would remind your members that there is no secret of the atomic bomb."

To CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE, economics professor on leave and town-meeting Democrat, all good wishes, and would the Congress were graced with many more men and women like her.

The Filibuster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 29 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Filibuster," from the Oregonian of January 21, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FILIBUSTER

The southerners' filibuster to prevent Senate action on extension of the Fair Employment Practices Act was anticipated—in fact, openly promised. Yet the Senate majority made no move to tighten its rules to prevent the filibuster, which is the weapon recurrently used by southern Democrats to block legislation advancing the rights of Negroes.

The Senators have been reluctant to restrict harshly the immemorial freedom of debate which guarantees the rights of minorities to be heard and by fairness and logic, on occasion, to so influence their colleagues as to become the majority. The Senate did not find it necessary to adopt a rule to close debate ("closure" or "cloture") until 1917, when a filibuster by "the little group of willful men" stopped action on the armed ship bill.

To stop debate under a closure petition brought by 16 Senators, a two-thirds vote is required, and the southerners heretofore have held enough votes to defeat such motion. The British Parliament, which was confronted with filibusters by the Irish comparable to those in Congress from the southerners, long ago was forced to adopt restrictive measures more severe than the two-thirds closure vote.

It is incomprehensible to the man in the street that a majority of Senators is willing to sit idly through filibuster after filibuster in which the subject matter at issue is not even discussed. Creaking parliamentary machinery which prevents functioning of the will of the majority must be replaced.

Significant Pictures and Displays Portraying Irrigation Shown in House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 29, 1946

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, when the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation moved into new quarters at 328 House Office Building about a year ago, the walls of the committee room were bare and in need of appropriate decoration. The chairman felt that the decorations supplied should be appropriate to the work of the committee and instructive and therefore urged his staff to get such pictures, maps, charts, and displays as would convey to the eye of visitors, and to the minds of the committee members the nature of the great conservation and constructive work in which the committee is engaged. A glance around the walls of the committee room will indicate the completeness of that impression which the displays are intended to give. Naturally, there are maps showing the sections and regions where irrigation is carried on throughout the 17 Western States. Some of these maps are in colors outlining the major river basins of the West, which theoretically ought to be treated as a geographic unit for maximum development.

As is to be expected, the committee room has pictures of some of the larger dams, both of the earlier construction and of the very latest construction. The visual story would not be complete without some scenes from both above and below those great dams and reservoirs showing forested uplands above and desert stretches below converted into irrigated farms and now producing fruitfully. Therefore, in order that it may be shown that irrigation on any project is not at first concerned with the building of dams, there are pictures showing the watersheds and the character of the catchment basins that supply the water for storage. To get these pictures it was necessary to get views of national forests, which were furnished by the National Forest Service and of course pictures of dams furnished by the Bureau of Reclamation, and that we may not forget other agencies of Government interested in such development, a picture of one dam was obtained from the Indian Service to represent its part in the work of irrigation.

The committee is indebted to the Forest Service for two splendid pictures which are worthy of comment. One shows a view of the Tonto National Forest from the crest of the ridge on the Mogollon Rim which extends diagonally across Arizona from northwest to southeast. As a ranger stands at this point looking out over a vast area toward Pleasant Valley, the floor of which is carpeted with yellow pine forest, he gets some notion of nature's great contribution to the needs of civilized man. The view impresses the value of forests, but there are other values not apparent to the eye. This Tonto Forest is the principal part of the watershed for the great Roosevelt project in central Arizona, which surrounds the city of Phoenix. This is one of the oldest and best of our reclamation projects.

This picture in the committee room shows a ranger surveying the prospect. One wonders what he is thinking—possibly it is something like this—"Up here is the world as God made it; down yonder is the world as man made it, but for good or bad the valley has to depend upon these upland regions for nearly everything that is needed to carry on modern life. In the productive garden down in the Valley of the Sun their crops are dependent entirely upon the precipitation in rain and snow that fall on this forested area. These waters must be stored behind the curving walls of stone or concreate in our dams until conveniently turned loose for the growing crops, but as the waters are turned loose, they churn the wheels to spin the dynamos to produce the power which runs the industries and lights the city streets. The very building material of which those cities in the valley are built comes from these mountains. If it is timbered products, they are taken from these pine trees. If it is building stone, it is quarried from these mountains. If it is copper for the great bronze doors of the State Capitol, or for the electric-transmission lines, it is taken from the mineral wealth in these hills. A study of the history of the State shows that some of its leaders with the best brains and minds also came out of these mountains. Probably such thoughts are going through the ranger's mind.

Another beautiful colored picture, furnished by the Forest Service, hanging on the walls of the committee room, shows the beginning of Workman Creek in the

Tonto National Forest of Arizona. One can almost see the trout in the clear stream in the picture. This mountain stream is only one of innumerable twig-end beginnings of a river which nourishes a great reclamation project. Now, this particular small stream has its watershed which is but a small fraction of the total watershed of which it is a part. Possibly it constitutes only about 1 percent of the total, but it is centrally located in the heart of the watershed and thus presents the whole watershed in miniature. An experiment station has been located upon this small stream and careful measurements of its run-off are made, especially between November and February, and the knowledge of the miniature stream flow is used to predict the stream flow of the entire watershed for 3 months later or during the spring months of March, April, and May.

Now, stream flows on all western watersheds vary greatly from year to year. However, there is a very close correlation between the stream flow of this creek and of the entire river. Through a number of years the two stream flows have been correlated and the coefficient of correlation is found to be .99 plus. That is about as nearly perfect correlation as has ever been computed or discovered in nature. The difference in time is important for the high mark of run-off in the tiny tributary occurs before March the 1st, and the run-off which is to be predicted does not completely occur before June the 1st. Thus the farmer in the Valley can ask the ranger in the mountains any time prior to March the 1st, "How much water can we count on collecting in our reservoirs this season?" One does not want to detract from the beauty of this picture by injecting such mathematical and practical utilitarian ideas regarding the mountain stream other than to say that to some it is beautiful and to others it is equally beautiful and also significant.

In one corner of the committee room hangs a picture of the Coolidge Dam on the Gila River, which was furnished the Committee by the Office of Indian Affairs. This picture is unique for it is the only dam of its type in the world, as well as being the largest dam built by the Indian Reclamation Service in our country. It does not look like a dam but looks instead as if two giant eagle eggs had fallen off a wall like "Humpty-Dumpty." These are the two great domes which constitute the unique part of the structure. The view is from the upstream side of the dam and that is why these dome sections appear like egg shells viewed from the outside. If viewed from the lower side, they are seen to be concave sections of an oblong. They not only look like egg shells but are built on the principle of the egg shell. The great engineer who designed this dam convinced a committee of Congress that he could build as strong a dam as any other type of similar size with a saving of 50 percent of the material and thus he built the major part of it in a shell-like structure. This dam was dedicated by ex-President Calvin Colidge on March 4, 1930, and present on that occasion was the great humorist Will Rogers and other notables, all of whom made appropriate speeches. Probably the best speech which was delivered that day was by a full-blooded Pima Indian concerning the significance of this structure.

The committee does not have pictures of all the big dams but does have a group of four including Roosevelt Dam, the first big reclamation dam in the West. This is the "Father Abraham" of our modern dams, begun in 1906, finished in 1911, and dedicated by Thedore Roosevelt in that year. Roosevelt Dam in the first of 6 big storage dams on that one river. The group includes also a picture of Boulder Dam on the Colorado River between Arizona and Nevada, Shasta Dam in northern California on the Sacramento River, and the greatest dam in the world which is Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia River in eastern Washington. These enlarged pictures of these dams do not and cannot do them justice and nothing that could be said in a brief description regarding their significance would begin to do them justice.

The walls of the committee room contain other pictures of downstream agricultural benefits showing irrigated fields, alfalfa in the midst of a desert, flocks of sheep and herds of cattle, and vast citrus groves of oranges, lemons and grapefruit, together with nearby vineyards. Other pictures show date palms which give some indication of more than one hundred semitropical productions of a land that is fertile as the Valley of the Nile and is coaxed into productiveness by unfailing sunshine and the water that fell miles away up in the mountains. This is a synopsis of the story of reclamation as pictured by one project.

The Housing Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. LYLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1946

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, the American Veterans of World War II have submitted to me the following statements, together with certain press reports, which they request to be placed in the RECORD for the consideration of the Congress:

AMVETS DEMAND CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION OF THE HOUSING CRISIS

(By J. H. Leib, national legislative director)

American Veterans of World War II, respectfully demand a congressional investigation of the serious housing shortage for veterans, also an immediate clarification of the Surplus Property Act as it affects the sale of defense housing.

The veterans of this war are getting a pathetic run-around and it is about time that the Congress take constructive action to see to it that the returning soldiers are given the priorities to which they are entitled.

Amvets, tired and disgusted after being pushed around while attempting to find suitable homes for their fellow comrades, came forward with a plan to purchase a Government housing project which the Defense Homes Corporation has declared surplus.

This plan has attracted national attention and veterans throughout the land are eagerly waiting to see whether or not the men who fought in World War II will be given a stake in our democracy.

Because of the obstacles that have been thrown at the Amvets plan we requested Representative MANASCO, Senators FULBRIGHT and HILL to introduce House Joint Resolution 297 and Senate Joint Resolutions 131 and 132, respectively, which asks for a clarification of the Surplus Property Act in regard to the sale of defense housing for veterans.

These bills are now pending in Congress and we urge immediate consideration of this legislation so that the veterans of this war may know where they stand.

Following are three newspaper clippings which covers the subject somewhat in detail and I ask that every Member of Congress study these accounts for an idea of how the veterans look upon this housing crisis.

The press reports follow:

[From the Washington Post of January 27, 1946]

"VETERANS ASK HOUSING BID AID

"The board of directors of the Veterans Cooperative Housing Association yesterday agreed to ask Congress to take action that would help them purchase McLean and Naylor Gardens.

"The board directed William A. Roberts, counsel for the group, to send letters to the Senate Military Affairs Committee and the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments asking action on resolutions now in their hands.

"The Senate resolution was recently presented by Senator LISTER HILL, Democrat of Alabama, and the House resolution by Representative CARTER MANASCO, Democrat of Alabama. They both ask Congress to delay the sale of the housing properties to private investors until veterans' priority rights to the projects have been investigated.

"The Defense Homes Corporation Board is expected to meet some time this week to award six properties on sale to bidders.

"In announcing the action of the board of directors, Raymond Sawyer, commander of District Amvets, and a member of the Board said: 'It is discrimination against the veterans to require us to bid in an inflationary market when the Federal Public Housing Authority sold a housing project in Dayton, Ohio, to war workers at a price determined by appraisal and without soliciting public bids'."

[From the Army Times of January 19, 1946]

"VETS MAY STRAIGHTEN IT OUT

"Lip service. The old malarkey. That's what the veterans are apparently getting when they look for a place to live. In the past few months many Government agencies, presenting arguments for their continued existence, have issued pious declarations, pointing out that they can help the good old vets.

"So what happens if you deal with one of these agencies—if you go to one looking for assistance in obtaining said house? You get lip service. The old malarkey.

"For example, members of the Washington Amvet post, tiring of the run-around, decided to get homes of their own. They set up an organization with the intention of buying McLean Gardens, a Government project which had been declared surplus and put on the block.

"The organization submitted a bid. It didn't enclose a check for $9,000,000. Who ever heard of a veteran with that kind of money? Instead, a reasonable proposition was given the Defense Homes Corporation—a proposition which would inconvenience no one, and which would eventually reimburse the Government.

"But the DHC didn't like the bid. It asked for a new one and at the same time made it clear that some of the big-time real-estate operators were topping the Amvet bid—and that if by some fluke the Amvets got the project, they couldn't take it over for some time. New rules would be made to make sure that they didn't.

"It was the first time anyone had heard that the DHC was a profit-making firm. But it wasn't the first time that the surplus property priority of veterans has been ignored.

"If the DHC was the only agency that is giving the veterans the run-around a simple congressional investigation might clear up the matter—but, unfortunately, it apparently isn't.

"Many veterans have complained about the treatment accorded them in personnel offices of Government agencies. Those coming back to old jobs have all too often been discouraged by the personnel officers. Other veterans, seeking civil-service jobs for the first time, are given vague answers, as only experts in giving vague answers can give them.

"It's a sad situation—but it may be that 12,000,000 veteran voters can straighten it out a bit!"

[From the Washington Times-Herald of January 27, 1946]

"VETERANS' AFFAIRS

"(By Lt. Comdr. Tyrrell Krum, USNR, retired)

"It's high time that the Congress of the United States swung some of its unlimited investigational powers into a genuine and straightforward attempt to find out why, despite expenditure of billions of dollars of taxpayers' money, our Nation today faces the most acute housing shortage in history.

"Since away back in the early days of the New Deal, we have had a constant parade of so-called 'housing programs,' ranking from PWA's clumsy attempts at slum clearance down through our recent 'war housing' era, which actually was the construction of new slums for millions of war workers and service personnel.

"A few days ago another 'housing czar'—Wilson Wyatt, of Louisville, Ky., was appointed 'housing expediter' to succeed John B. Blandford, National Housing Administrator.

"And the first words Wyatt uttered upon assuming his new position were:

" 'The present housing shortage is one of our gravest national problems. A great emergency exists.'

"The reaction of most veterans was: 'Here we go again.'

"There is no doubt that a definite housing shortage exists and is nearing the point where it is about to become a national scandal. But why, veterans are asking, do we have such a shortage in view of all the billions that have been spent on all the programs that have been lobbied through Congress?

"And particularly when some 4,000,000 of our citizens are still out of the country.

"Veterans are fed up with bureaucratic double-talk and are slowly and cautiously mustering their strength to do something about taking the housing proposition into their own hands. And the first thing they intend to do is to kick out a lot of bureaucrats who used their jobs in war-housing agencies as a cause for deferment from the draft throughout the entire war.

"Veterans would like to know what was back of the effort on the part of the Federal Public Housing Authority to foist off on ex-service people a lot of second-hand knocked-down defense housing units which had been abandoned by war workers in various parts of the country as they returned to their homes.

"Despite one of the biggest publicity stunts in housing history, engineered by a nationally known advertising agency and designed to persuade municipalities throughout the Nation to take some of the warped, cracked, and practically worthless housing junk back home for the use of veterans and their families, the whole scheme blew up when ex-servicemen held their nose at the deal.

"And it is easy to see why, by the FPHA's own estimation of the type of housing they intended to hand returned fighting men as set out in the fancy pamphlet gotten out at Government expense:

" 'Sooner or later, temporary war housing units, after they have fulfilled their task of housing veterans, will be available for ultimate reuse as various types of utility buildings * * * barns, implement sheds, poultry houses, repair garages, resort cabins, tourist camps, etc.'

"In short, all the present housing authority has to offer the men who won World War II are abandoned war workers' dwellings potentially fit only for barns, sheds, and poultry houses.

"Also the returned veterans would like to know why the professional housing 'experts' who are running the show here in Washington take such terrific exception to any efforts which ex-service men and women are expending on trying to work out their own solutions to the housing shortage.

"One concrete example of this was the opposition thrown out by the Defense Homes Corporation to the proposal by the American Veterans of World II (Amvets) that they be permitted as a group, to purchase McLean Gardens, a huge Government housing project which has been declared surplus and put up for public sale.

"The Amvets, along with members of the older veterans' groups—American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Disabled American Veterans—were sick and tired of the constant run-around they got when they tried to find places to live.

"And so, under the leadership of Raymond Sawyer, commander of the local Amvet post, the group submitted a bid on the project which would provide several hundred homes for former fighting men. Of course, they didn't enclose a check for $9,000,000, because they didn't have that kind of money.

"But they did—individually, at least—have the right under the GI bill to obtain a loan through the Veterans' Administration with which to buy a home. The Defense Homes Corporation didn't like the proposition and told Amvets so.

"It is easy to see that war veterans are in for the same run-around in the field of public housing they are getting in most other endeavors and it's time they did something about it. But more important is that Congress dig out all the ugly facts about the housing program of the past and then try and set up some new scheme that will really work—and good."

Television

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1946

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it fell to my lot today to be the first woman Member of the Congress to broadcast over television station W3XWT. This is an experiment station conducted by the Allen B. Dumont Laboratories. Participating in the news broadcast with me were Jay Owen, a Washington radioman, and two men whom we of the Congress know well, Gordon Graham and Robert Coar, who are in the House Radio Room where we make our transcriptions.

It was a most interesting experience. The studio is in the Harrington Hotel building. The lights now being used give 1,000-foot candlepower. Two hundred and thirty 300-watt lights are focused on those participating. The heat is terrific, but in possibly 2 months cold light will be used.

Our audiences today were confined to a restricted area. Among the viewers were members of the Television Institute from New York, Baltimore, Washington, and Richmond, Va., attending a luncheon at the Statler. We had word from several of the viewers that the broadcast came through very clearly.

I was most interested to be told that it is anticipated that within a year or two the cameras will be so constructed that they will be brought right into offices and we will talk directly to our constituents from our own desks. In addition, the actual happenings on the floor will not be beyond the power of these amazing cameras.

I was particularly interested to know that both Cleveland and Cincinnati, in my home State, have applied for television stations.

Truly, this is a world of miracles in which we live.

What Our Nation Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1946

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News:

WHAT OUR NATION NEEDS

Over and above all things else the thing this Nation seriously needs is this:

A revival of the spirit of hard work, the will to do, the ambition to achieve, the laudable desire to get along in the world.

We need to realize that hard work carved out of the wilderness that was this continent 300 years ago, the greatest, the most prosperous, the freest nation on earth.

We need to learn again to be thrifty.

We need to learn again to be God-fearing.

We need to reassemble our scattered families and have again the daily family gatherings around the dining-room table.

We need to recapture the spirit of self-reliance which made all great Americans great—in statesmanship, in art, in education, in industry.

We need to work ever so much harder at keeping our families intact instead of running them as on a conveyor belt through the divorce courts.

We need to reestablish our old birth rate and raise millions of healthy and happy children who in this country can have such opportunities as no other land can offer.

We need to learn again the honest policy of doing an honest day's work for a day's pay; to learn again that to do less is to steal from another.

We need to learn again to have a wholesome respect for the rights of others, even though we dissent from their views.

We need to learn again—and practice—the Golden Rule.

We need to develop a wholesome respect for the law—all laws.

We need among the various political units of Government our one-time feeling of independence one of the other.

We need to resolve to vote regularly—and do it.

We need to resolve to study carefully the records of candidates for office and vote for the better man without regard to mere party labels.

We need to encourage the wise and courageous and incorruptible among us to seek public office, and to support them while they serve.

We need to scrap our 13-year-old flabby notion that we can lean on Washington for whatever we need, in States, counties, cities, towns, and villages.

We need to learn again the rugged practice of saving each for himself; we need to abandon the wastrel's practice of earn today—spend tomorrow—deluded by the extravagant idea, so long encouraged in Washington, that rich old Uncle Sam will be ready with a bag of cash whenever we are in want.

We need to learn again the sound and sensible program for the boys of our grandfather's days—that every boy should work and earn, and learn the value of a dollar.

We need to learn again that a dollar must work for a year at 5 percent to earn a nickel.

We need, in short, all of us, to be good Americans, and if each of us is a good and God-fearing American we shall have a good America.

Governor Tuck's Inaugural Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. BURCH
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 29, 1946

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by the Honorable William M. Tuck, Governor of Virginia, at his inauguration in Richmond, Va., on January 16, 1946:

Mr. Speaker, members of the general assembly, and fellow citizens of Virginia, today brings to a close a memorable administration in the history of Virginia governors. I shall always remember the occasion 4 years ago, when Governor Darden and I were inducted into our respective offices. It was a little over a month after the treacherous blow at Pearl Harbor. We had just become actively involved in the greatest war in human history. The Japanese were running roughshod over the Pacific areas. The Germans and the Russians were locked in deadly combat. The picture was indeed a gloomy one when Governor Darden entered upon his new duties. It is not necessary for me to remind the people of this State how well and how earnestly, and with what statesmanlike ability, he has discharged those duties. His brilliant leadership during those trying times will be accorded a prominent place in Virginia history. It will, for many years, provide to his successors an inspiration to emulate his worthy achievements. As he lays down the burden of his official duties today the picture is much brighter than it was when he assumed them, but it is still clouded with sadness. We can now look back with pride upon a hard-won military victory, and with a feeling of immense relief from the sickening fear of possible subjugation and enslavement at the barbarous hands of the Axis dictators. But we would not, if we could, forget the sacrifices made by those heroic members of our Army and Navy who fought so gallantly in foreign lands in order that we at home might still have freedom. The thoughts of them will ever glow in the hearts of the people of a greateful State and Nation.

PROUD OF VETERANS

Virginia is proud of her sons and daughters who have returned and are returning from the war zones and the fields of battle. She mourns for those who perished in the conflict and does honor to their sacred memory. It is now for us, with the help of Almighty God, to see to it that they shall not have suffered or died in vain—that nevermore will mankind be subjected to a repetition of such hardships, slaughter, and suffering, as those to which our beloved sons have been subjected. And now today, with the picture thus changed, I have come again to be inaugurated; this time as Governor of the Commonwealth. Words cannot express my gratitude. There is no higher honor. I pray that I may prove worthy of it.

During the gubernatorial campaigns, I stated the principles by which I would be guided and some of the objects I would try to accomplish if elected. These objects I was careful to hold within bounds which I thought could be attained. To that end I now dedicate myself as I enter upon the duties of this high office.

There are many difficult problems which call for solution, but I shall deal with only a few of them today. My legislative recommendations will be the subject of a message which I will communicate to the general assembly next Monday. What I say today I consider addressed primarily to the people of Virginia.

I will now speak of a matter which is of vital concern to us all, and that is the necessity of improving and preserving State and local self-government. As we all know, under our constitutional system we have three levels of government: First, the local governments, that is, those of the counties, cities and towns; second, the State, which should be careful not to trespass upon the local functions; third, the Federal, which was intended to operate solely in the field of national affairs, and was so limited, it was thought, by the Constitution.

RIGHTS OF STATES

Even before the late war, there had developed a decided movement by the Government at Washington to break over the constitutional bounds prescribed for it and take on activities which were supposedly reserved to the States. This was being done in most instances by making grants of money to the States to aid in some State function. The States were required to match the grant. This presented, at first blush, a picture of generosity and benevolence, and it was no doubt so intended by the Congress. But upon analysis it developed that the proposal was not that of a gift but for Federal regulatory control over certain State governmental agencies. A Federal bureau was given the power to say whether, and, if so, under what conditions, the grant would be made to a particular State. This bureau invariably imposed a condition that the money must be spent under its control and supervision, and a Federal agent would be sent down either to take charge, or from time to time to supervise. In this manner began the recent movement for the centralization of power in Washington. The movement has grown by leaps and bounds. There are a multitude of bills calling for huge additional grants to States now pending in Congress. If this policy of expansion of Federal activities into State fields continues, it will result in the virtual abolition of the States. The preservation of State sovereignty was the chief aim of the founding fathers when they established the Constitution of the United States. In that instrument it is clear that they regarded State independence as a necessary bulwark against the growth toward and the ultimate founding of a Federal dictatorship. They knew that dictatorship meant the destruction of our personal liberties. These liberties were greatly treasured by the fathers because they had lived under conditions where they were denied to them, and they had fought for them and had bought them at great cost. We of this day, having enjoyed for more than a century and a half these liberties which they achieved and handed down to us, have fallen into a way of taking them for granted. It is so comforting to assure ourselves that nothing can happen to them, unless through conquest by a foreign foe.

The fact that in England, South America, and in nations all over the world, freedom has been otherwise greatly curtailed or completely destroyed has not aroused us from our slumber or disturbed our complacent dreams of security. Under the emergencies of war we have seen the Federal bureaus and agencies take complete control of our everyday affairs, and the affairs of industry, commerce and trade. This was undoubtedly a necessary step in the successful prosecution of the war, and has been cheerfully accepted by the people. But we must be ever conscious of the fact that many of them may not be discontinued when the proper time arrives. Also there have been other regulations of domestic affairs adopted under the guise of war measures which had no real purpose of aiding the war effort. I will mention but one of them, but it is illustrative of many others. I have in mind the creation of the Fair Employment Practice Committee. It has the power to send a Federal agent into the States and tell us who we may hire and fire in our businesses and industries. Outstanding political leaders, both Democratic and Republican are now advocating that the Congress continue this committee on a permanent peacetime basis. One does not have to be a constitutional lawyer to perceive that this invasion of a private individual's right to select his own employees on the basis of efficiency, or for any other reason, is but the first step in the complete destruction of all his personal liberties. We may be sure that other measures equally as objectionable will follow if Congress yields to the pressure groups which are advocating this one. These pressure groups, who reside in some of the big cities, are very influential for the reason that they are supposed to virtually control the election results in a half dozen pivotal States which have the largest electoral votes. Both political parties, therefore, cater to these groups of voters chiefly because of their ability to influence the election of a President. Thus it is every day becoming more clear that the people of Virginia and many other States are being constantly threatened with the very real danger of having their domestic affairs regulated in accordance with the ideas and wishes of these pressure groups. Furthermore, it is in these groups of voters that many of the Federal grants have their origin, the underlying purpose being to regulate through Federal agencies various activities of the governments of those States in which such groups have little local influence. The proponents of these regulatory measures are always careful to clothe them with the garments of pious and worthy-sounding purposes.

EMBARRASSING SITUATION

When it is proposed to make such a grant to the States, the Members of Congress are placed in a very embarrassing situation. It is very tempting to them to be able to go back to their constitutents and tell how they secured large sums of money for them out of the Federal Treasury. On the other hand,

if they vote against the grant with such apparently worthy objectives, the Congressmen may have a hard time satisfying their constituents that they were justified in doing so.

Let us view the matter, however, from the standpoint of the interest of the Virginia taxpayer. What money does the Federal Government possess which it can legitimately and properly grant to the States? It has none. The United States, by the time the war activities have been brought to a close, will have incurred an indebtedness of about $300,000,000,000. We may have a little better idea of this stupendous and inconceivable sum if we express it as three hundred thousand million dollars. It has been estimated that this is more than twice the value of all the land and tangible property owned by all the persons and corporations in the United States. The annual interest on it alone, at 2 percent is six billion, or six thousand million dollars, and, in addition, large sums must be paid in reduction of the principal. On top of this there is the annual cost of operating the Federal Government, which, on its present basis, is several times more than it was a few years ago. But that is not all. The program of benefits for the war veterans, which they so richly deserve, will cost many billions of dollars more in the years to come. So where is the money to come from for these grants? Federal revenues are not now meeting current expenses. Obviously, there is a limit to the amount of bonds which can be sold. If the Federal financial structure is to avoid collapse, any money granted to the States must be derived from one source and one source only—that is from the taxpayers who reside in the States. Is it to the interest of the Virginia taxpayer that the money he is required to pay to provide governmental services by the State shall be paid by him directly in the form of State or local taxation, or is it better for him to pay it in the form of Federal taxes and have the Federal Government turn it back to the States? The answer to this question is clear.

Money paid by the taxpayer to the Federal Government and then returned by it to the States is burdened with the collection and handling charges incurred by that Government. It is also burdened with the operating costs of the headquarters of the Bureau in Washington which passes upon the grant and regulates its expenditures. Finally, it is burdened with the salaries and expenses of the Federal agents who are sent into the States to personally regulate the State agencies in their spending of what is left of the money received from the taxpayer. The amount left is probably about half. Since the money must be spent according to a national pattern prescribed by the Washington bureau, it cannot be utilized for such purposes as will best satisfy Virginia's needs. These needs necessarily vary in the several States according to varying conditions prevailing in them. There can be no correct uniform pattern. A grant may be made for a purpose Virginians do not want at all, but if it is rejected her taxpayers must pay their part of the cost just the same. It may be said with truth, therefore, that when Congress makes a grant to the States it has the effect of almost forcing it on them. The States must either accept it and submit to the Federal regulation of local affairs which such acceptance entails, or else reject it and place their citizens in the position of paying Federal taxes for grants to other States without receiving any corresponding benefit. The result is that nearly all of them are accepted. I am convinced that the making of grants to the States by Congress should be vigorously opposed by all the States, so long as the operations of the Federal Government necessitate incurring an annual deficit. However, if the time comes when, consistent with sound financial policies, the making of such grants can be justified, then no purposes, conditions, or restrictions should be attached, but such State should be free to spend its share for such purposes as its best interests require. The grants for highways, except such of them as are necessary in our national defense or in the exercise of other strictly Federal function, should be discontinued and the Federal tax on gasoline, which is a road-use tax, abolished and reimposed by the States. The same policy should be adopted with respect to the cost of operating the unemployment compensation commission and the entire pay-roll tax retained by the States.

GRANT NOT A GIFT

I have discussed this question at length because I believe it essential to the independence and autonomy of the State that the people clearly understand that a grant of money from Washington is not something for nothing, that it is not a gift, but that it must be paid for twofold by the Virginia taxpayers, and at the same time we are surrendering control of our State governmental agencies to a Federal bureau.

Yet, despite this obvious truth, there are many who advocate the policy of these Federal grants to States. They assert that the States and their local governments do not and cannot provide the governmental services required by a progressive citizenry; that the people in the States will submit to being taxed by the Federal Government because the levying authority is so far removed and inaccessible. On the other hand, the people will not stand for a tax to raise less money to accomplish the same purpose when same is imposed by their board of supervisors, or their city council, or their State legislature. And I must admit that in the past there has been truth in this statement. But I believe the people of Virginia and other States now realize that it is much better to run their own governmental activities and services than to have them controlled from Washington. I think our citizens are becoming wise to the fact that every so-called grant to Virginia necessarily involves the payment by the Virginia taxpayer of more money in Federal taxes than the amount of the grant; that it is more economical to finance their public services through local and State taxes than through Federal.

There has been considerable agitation in some circles for a Federal grant to the States to aid in the conduct of their public schools. It is claimed that the present schools are inadequate and the States are not in a financial position to make them so. The thought is seductive; it carries with it the something-for-nothing idea. But let us not deceive ourselves. The plan will not only cost the taxpayers of the States more money, but will eventually result in the control of their schools by a Washington bureau. Under the influence of the pressure groups I have referred to, the use of the money will, in the course of a few years, undoubtedly be restricted to schools conducted according to their ideas and teaching their ideologies. The principles of government preached by these groups are not in conformity with the faiths and traditions of Virginia. The teaching of them here would be highly objectionable to our people.

SET-BACK TO EDUCATION

From the earliest days of the Commonwealth, when Thomas Jefferson was the champion of education, the business of educating its children was recognized as perhaps the chief function of the State. Unfortunately, this task was grievously interrupted by the War Between the States and the days of the reconstruction which followed. When we recall the great difficulties encountered during that period, the impoverishment of our people, misgovernment at the hands of the carpetbaggers, the huge public debt which they had fastened upon our parents, the scarcity of teachers, and the great number of illiterate parents and children following the abolition of slavery—when we consider all these nearly insuperable obstacles to education which confronted our forebears, we must bow our heads in tribute to the great work they did, and the remarkable success which they achieved. But in spite of their heroic efforts the progress of education did receive a severe set-back.

In recent years, however, Virginia has been blessed with prosperity. The incomes of her people, as well as her public revenues, have steadily increased, and her citizens have come to realize that there is no longer any reason why she should not go forward in expanding her educational facilities. We have witnessed among the Virginia people a rebirth of enthusiasm for an efficient public-school system. We sense a demand that our teachers be adequately compensated and that their importance as members of their school community be recognized. And the teachers have become conscious of the fact that they are not merely instructors, but that they are educating the future citizens of Virginia, molding their character and habits, are, in fact, dedicated to the greatest of all work—the building of the citizenship of the State. This reawakened interest of the teachers and the people generally in the improvement of our schools is most gratifying. It has been greatly stimulated in recent months by Governor Darden's vigorous activity and by the public discussions conducted throughout the State under the auspices of the Denny School Commission. In my campaign addresses I expressed my hearty approval of many of the recommendations contained in the fine report of this commission, and I entertain the hope that future conditions in the State will enable their fulfillment.

I have spoken to you at length upon the question of public support for the improvement of our schools, because such support is vitally important. If the people want better schools they will get them, but unless they do, they will not. Unless the people desire to have the conduct of their schools controlled from Washington, which I do not believe, they must be willing, through State and local taxation, to provide the necessary money. The general assembly will not and should not impose taxes upon them for a purpose they do not endorse, and if imposed they would be speedily repealed. In a democracy the government springs from the people, and no function can be performed successfully by that government unless it conforms to the wishes of the people and has their support.

INCREASED FUNDS

Fortunately, the greatly enhanced revenues of the State during the unprecedented industrial activities of the war years have enabled large increases to be made in State appropriations for school purposes without the imposition of additional taxes. The comptroller estimates that condition will continue through this biennium. We must bear in mind, however, that this raising of school standards requires expenditures of a recurring nature, and at least as large in each of the years to come. The maintenance of these higher standards will eventually call for increases in State, and perhaps local, taxation, if and when the revenues derived from the present tax structure prove inadequate for that purpose. We cannot expect abnormally prosperous conditions to remain with us always. I feel sure that the members of the General Assembly, as well as the public at large, clearly recognize the fact that by increasing these recurring expenditures we are committing the State to higher standards for our public schools, and to increases in taxation should same become necessary. I am confident that such commitment meets with the people's hearty approval, and that they will gladly finance their own schools. I also am confident that they prefer these schools to be financed through State and local revenues rather than through the medium of Federal taxation with its accompanying outside interference.

PUBLIC HEALTH

Closely associated with an efficient school system is public health. There should be competent and adequately staffed health organizations available to every county in the State, and charged with the duty of frequent periodic examinations of every school child. Effective means must be provided to remedy, if possible, all physical defects and illnesses revaled or discovered. These organizations should also be required to safeguard the health of all other persons in the community through the use of modern methods for the prevention of disease. For instance, tuberculosis is a contagious affliction, but our present facilities for the care of such sufferers in tuberculosis sanataria is conceded to be inadequate. There is an urgent need for an expansion of this service in order to arrest the progress of the disease in the patient and to prevent its spread through contagion.

Virginia is an agricultural State. We must keep it so. The successful cultivation of crops possibly means more to Virginia than any other activity of our people. About one-third of our population live and earn all or part of their livelihood on the farm. It is an occupation which is conducive to the finest type of citizenship.

We have during the last few years enjoyed increased production of agricultural products despite the handicaps of war. Our young Virginians must be encouraged to remain on the farm, as well as to develop new ones. This can be done through the services afforded by the Virginia Department of Agriculture, the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, the extension services, and other agencies, which have pointed the way to soil conservation and improvement, better living conditions, and increased earning power. The practical and scientific services offered by these agencies must be extended; their use must be encouraged.

Our farmers, and their wives and children, have struggled long hours in the war to produce the necessities of life. Our workers in industry have forged the sinews of war. All deserve and will have the consideration of Virginia to which their efforts entitle them.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Let me say, in conclusion, that the message which I have sought to bring to the people of Virginia is one which I consider of paramount importance to their future welfare. I conceive it to be my duty, as Governor of this great Commonwealth, to do what I can to instill in her citizens a keen and enlightened interest in the affairs of their government. To this end the problems, dangers, and pitfalls which confront us should not be obscured but brought into the open for their wise and intelligent consideration. Virginia has a fine government, the peer of that of any of the States. This is generally conceded. But it is not perfect and we should not allow ourselves to become too well satisfied with it. All of us should strive unceasingly to improve it. I would encourage the desire for improvements in schools and those other functions of the government which serve our needs and improve our citizenship. But I would have this desire coupled with the realization that these improvements must be paid for through taxation, and with the willingness on the part of all of us to pay for them.

I am particularly anxious that there be an acute public consciousness of the danger to our State regulation of our home affairs by Federal agencies. I hope that what I have said on this subject will be helpful to that end.

It would have been much easier and more pleasant, both for you and for me, to have avoided any reference to the painful subject of taxation; to have dwelt upon the present prosperous condition of the State's finances, and to have suggested to you that, when conditions become less favorable, we have but to turn to Washington relief. But taking this easy and pleasant course would not have been consistent with the duties and responsibilities of a Virginia chief executive as I conceive them. The people are entitled to know the true facts involved in governmental policies. We are now at the crossroads. We must either do the job or the Federal Government will undertake to do so. If, in the light of this knowledge, you decide upon a policy different from that I have advocated, this is your undoubted right and privilege. I do not believe such of the facts as they exist, and not based entirely on wishful thinking. The final responsibility for the decision rests with you, the people, for this is your government. I very much want your confidence and support in the efforts of our government. Without it I can do nothing. God being willing, and with His divine help, we shall not fail one another.

Reemployment of Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1946

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by the American Veterans' Committee:

This statement is being addressed to Congress by the American Veterans' Committee, which speaks for thousands of veterans of World War II.

Next to housing, the principal problem facing veterans in their return to civilian life is that of obtaining suitable employment. Congress recognized this problem and directed, in title IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, that effective job placement and counseling services be provided by the United States Employment Service so as to give veterans the maximum of job opportunities in the field of gainful employment.

Several months ago, Congress took action to dismember and return the United States Employment Service to the States. This action was in the form of a rider to an appropriation rescission bill. President Truman vetoed this bill because "these problems and responsibilities (of providing an effective job counseling and placement service to veterans) cannot, in a period when millions of veterans and other workers are moving across State lines, be met adequately through 51 separate and independent public employment service systems linked only by the necessarily remote and indirect influence of a Federal agency financing the State systems through grants in aid."

A bill, H. R. 4437, has been introduced into the House of Representatives which embodies the substance of the President's proposal for delaying the return of the United States Employment Service to the States until June 30, 1947, and then returning it under standards and conditions which will guarantee that Congress' pledge to veterans can be effectively carried out. In hearings before the Labor Committee of the House of Representatives on this bill, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the Secretary of Labor, and the Director of the United States Employment Service have testified that the dismemberment and return of the United States Employment Service to the States at this time would disrupt the operations of that agency and prevent the carrying out of Congress' mandate to provide an effective job placement and counseling service to veterans. There are approximately a million servicemen per month now returning to civilian life who require such service.

The reasons the return of the United States Employment Service to the States at this time would endanger this essential service to veterans are obvious. The services would be placed under new management and there would be the inevitable adjustment period; there would be a major turn-over of personnel and an impairment of the services while new personnel was being recruited and trained; the effectiveness of the personnel that remained would be undermined by the uncertainties that would surround the question of their retaining their jobs; and finally, by attacking the national reemployment problem on the limited basis of State boundaries, the veterans would be denied those employment opportunities which lie beyond the boundaries of the State in which he resides.

If Congress should in effect override the veto of the President, and in the face of the testimony stated above, return the United States Employment Service to the States, it would be violating its pledge to the veterans whereby they were to be guaranteed effective assistance in obtaining suitable employment. Congress will be playing politics with the veterans' welfare.

We are familiar with the groups which are pressuring Congress for the immediate return of the United States Employment Service to the States, and with the interests which motivate them. We understand that there are State political machines which are desirous of obtaining the patronage which might be derived from employment-service jobs if the United States Employment Service were returned to the States. We can understand their interest in obtaining control of such jobs, particularly with the 1946 congressional elections in the offing. We do not believe, however, that this constitutes justification for impairing a vital service to returning veterans.

We also understand that the State Unemployment Compensation Commissioners have maintained a lobby in Washington to pressure Congress into returning the United States Employment Service to the States immediately—a lobby which is being financed indirectly by the Federal Treasury. The State Unemployment Compensation Commissioners are motivated by an understandable, but not commendable, bureaucratic interest in expanding the scope of their authority and enhancing the prestige of their jobs. We do not believe that the bureaucratic interests of these State officials constitute an adequate justification for disrupting an essential service to returning veterans.

The State unemployment compensation officials are working in conjunction with certain employer groups which desire the immediate return of the employment service to the States because they see in a successful, federally operated USES a persuasive argument for the federalization of the unemployment compensation system. It is not that these employer groups deny the economies to be derived from integrating the administration of the unemployment-compensation system with the old-age and survivors' insurance program—both of which now duplicate the other's collection and processing of wage records and taxes—but that they fear the Federal Government would scrap the experience-rating provisions of State laws by which they have thus far been able to obtain tax abatement totaling well in excess of a billion and a quarter dollars. The question of federalizing the unemployment-compensation program is in no way related to the continued Federal operation of the USES during the reemployment emergency, and we do not regard it as any justification for the destruction of the job placement and counseling service which Congress has promised the veteran and on which the returning serviceman depends.

If and when the USES is returned to the States after June 30, 1947, when the peak load of adjusting returning servicemen to civilian employment will presumably have passed, it should be done under the conditions and standards proposed by the President so that the veteran, whose employment problems will continue beyond that date and indefinitely into the future, will be assured of effective assistance. Under the provisions of the Wagner-Peyser Act, which would have governed the return of the USES to the States had not the President vetoed the action of Congress, standards of operation were set forth with which the States had to comply as a condition for receiving Federal funds for administration. Should the States fail to provide the quality of service required to meet these standards however, the Federal Government would be confronted with the undesirable alternatives of sanctioning such substandard services to veterans, or of cutting off administrative funds and denying all services to veterans and other job seekers. This impossible situation can be avoided by adoption of the President's proposal whereby the Secretary of Labor would be empowered by Congress to operate an employment service in any State which failed to provide an adequate service in accordance with the standards set forth in the legislation.

We understand that the President's proposal with respect to the above-mentioned standards, including authorization of Federal operation where necessary to enforce those standards, is embodied in H. R. 4437. On behalf of the veterans of World War II who are members of the American Veterans' Committee, we urge Congress not to default on the promises made to veterans in the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, but to enact this legislation as recommended by the President.

Memorial Plaque to Merchant Seamen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1946

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with my unanimous-consent request, which was granted, I am inserting the following remarks which I made on Saturday, January 26, 1946, when a memorial plaque was dedicated, in the new Philadelphia, Pa., headquarters of the National Maritime Union, to merchant seamen from the Philadelphia area who gave their lives during the last World War:

Today in the city of Philadelphia a memorial plaque was dedicated to the more than 600 heroic merchant seamen from this area who valiantly gave their lives in the struggle against world fascism.

It is fitting and proper that this plaque was dedicated in the new and modern Philadelphia headquarters of the National Maritime Union, the largest maritime union in America.

It is fitting also that hundreds of nonseafaring citizens from Philadelphia and the neighboring sovereign State of New Jersey should join with the seamen today in paying tribute to the memory of their fallen shipmates.

We can all subscribe with heartfelt determination to the legend inscribed on the plaque, which avows:

"We will continue your struggle.

"We will never rest until the cause for which you died has triumphed.

"We will go forward in your hallowed spirit—the spirit of freemen who never have and never will bend the knee to Fascist slavery."

I want to pay personal tribute to the veterans of the convoys represented by the National Maritime Union. I recall that our late departed Commander in Chief, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, often gave high praise to the men who braved the dangers of the seven seas to help crown our efforts with victory. The pledge not to strike, which the seamen gave to President Roosevelt and to the Nation, was not once violated throughout the war. Moreover, not a single ship under contract to the NMU was held up for even a minute ecause of any labor dispute. I recall also that the Kilgore subcommittee of the Senate Military Affairs Committee singled out this patriotic organization for signal commendation. In its report on war mobilization, that Senate committee stated, in part:

"American seamen are heroes. Thousands have died under bombardment and torpedo attack. They and their organizations, particularly the National Maritime Union, have acquitted themselves with honor. The appreciation of the American people is theirs."

From my association with the members of the National Maritime Union, I know that in war and in peace these heroes in dungarees carry their hatred of fascism like a badge of honor. That hatred of tyranny, oppression, and exploitation was the white-hot flame which 10 years ago welded seamen of all races, creeds, and colors into unbreakable unity in the National Maritime Union.

That hatred and that unity has paid dividends in advancing the cause of democracy here at home and abroad, in promoting racial harmony, and in improving the unspeakable living and working conditions which for too long had been shamefully imposed upon American seamen.

I see in this splendid new three-story building being dedicated here today a noble symbol of the growth and strength of the National Maritime Union and its democratic principles, and a living monument to the heroic dead we are gathered here to honor.

In the critical period we are now passing through, the gains which the seamen have achieved at bitter cost must not be cast by the wayside. Their contribution to our common welfare and their sacrifice in the struggle against our common enemy must be forever remembered by a grateful Nation. If necessary, the shipowners should be reminded by the people that the seamen deserve wages and working conditions that are comparable to what American workers ashore are receiving. That is the least that we can do for the men of the merchant marine. For myself, I shall continue to support all legislation in Congress that will extend to seamen the protection and benefits already assured other workers, such as unemployment insurance and minimum wage standards. These are the ways in which we can, together, pay proper homage to the men whose names are listed on this plaque and to the nearly 6,000 others who died while delivering the goods.

Occupation Troops in the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1946

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include a letter received from a boy in the Philippines, as follows:

There are one quarter of a million American soldiers in the Philippines today. Why? We ask the War Department, we ask Congress, we ask you.

The Philippines are a friendly, Allied country that we helped liberate a few short months ago. In another few months the Philippines will be granted their independence. Yet the War Department keeps a quarter million occupation troops here, under the cover of such vague phrases as "Hostile countries" and "Commitments."

We ask what is hostile about the Philippines, and we ask what are these commitments? Are they commitments to protect the vested interests which wish to continue their exploitation of the Filipino people?

We are not satisfied with the present twice-slowed rate of redeployment of troops from the Philippines. We think that the present stand of the War Department is a step toward the establishment of military fascism, both at home and abroad. We have accomplished little if we defeat fascism in enemy lands and cannot return home because our own military Fascists decree that we must occupy a friendly country.

If there's an answer to the question of why we are being kept here, we have not heard it. If there is an explanation, it has not been given. It's up to Congress to do something, before we cease to have a government by the people and wake up to find that we have a government by the military.

Pacific Coast Management Favors Higher Wage Minimums

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH DE LACY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1946

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege granted me, I desire to call the attention of the House to the results of a Nation-wide poll, taken by Modern Industry, one of the Nation's leading industrial and management publications, on the question of increasing minimum wages.

In the November 1945 issue of this magazine, I had the extreme privilege of participating in a "debate in print," urging upon industry the necessity of advancing minimum wages by legislation to 65 cents immediately, 70 cents after a year, and 75 cents after 2 years. Dean Neil Carothers, of the School of Business Administration of Lehigh University, took the opposite view.

Our conflicting opinions were circulated by the magazine to 50,000 management readers of the magazine. They were then polled to discover their views on this vital subject.

I am proud to say that the leaders of management and industry in my own great section of the country, the Pacific coast, overwhelmingly decided that this Congress should enact into law higher minimum wages such as I have described. The welfare of the Nation's business—the opening of vast new internal markets through increased purchasing power—appealed to these forward-looking industrialists from along the shores of the great Pacific.

The national results of the poll showed that 44.7 percent of all business executives who were polled favored the higher minimums. That is a sizable showing

when we recognize that these men speak for business. Historically, business has always approached the question of increased purchasing power, of full production, and of full employment with something less than caution. Every forward-looking step, even though it is taken in the eventual interest of business itself, has been opposed by a majority of big industrialists.

Whether my article in Modern Industry influenced their views I cannot say, but I am deeply gratified that the businessmen in my own section so clearly identify the Nation's welfare with their own. I have often thought that many businessmen throughout the country could learn much from the business leaders of my own section. I am only the more convinced of my view by the result of this poll.

It would hardly be fair, however, to say that I was less than gratified with the results generally throughout the Nation, in view of the high percentage of businessmen who recognize the justice of higher minimum wages.

I am particularly impressed by the fact that slightly more than a third of business executives in the South are for higher minimum wages. I can only conclude that an overwhelming majority all over the Nation wants Congress to raise the wage floor.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to include with these remarks the letter from Modern Industry, revealing the results of this important poll. The letter follows:

MODERN INDUSTRY,
New York, N. Y., January 9, 1946.

The Honorable HUGH DE LACY,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SOUTH, 33.3 PERCENT FOR; PACIFIC COAST-MOUNTAIN, 56.2 PERCENT FOR

DEAR SIR: The above two figures represent the maximum spread in industrial opinion on the question "Should Congress Boost Minimum Wages," as indicated by Modern Industry's poll of its readers on this issue. Midwest and mid-Atlantic industrial voters are almost evenly divided. Nation-wide results show 55.3 percent against, and 44.7 percent for the proposition.

In forwarding these results to you, Modern Industry takes no editorial position. We conduct our monthly polls of industrial opinion after we present both sides of controversial issues to our 50,000 management readers in the manufacturing industries responsible for 89 percent of all United States manufacturing production. Through our debates, we are constantly reminded that there is no such thing as a unanimous industrial point of view. Like the rest of American life, segments of industry both favor and oppose most issues before Congress today.

Certainly the results of the minimum-wage poll indicate no unanimity of industrial opinion. They represent a very close division, thereby further disproving the dangerous notion that "all industry thinks alike."

Congressman HUGH DE LACY argued "yes" and Neil Carothers, dean of the School of Business Administration, Lehigh University, asserted the negative on the minimum wage question in our November issue. Below are section by section results:

	Yes	*No*
New England	41.5	58.5
Mid-Atlantic	48.9	51.1
North Central	42.3	57.7
South	33.3	66.7
Midwest	48.9	51.1
Mountain-Pacific Coast	56.2	43.8
National	44.7	55.3

If you would like the complete text of the minimum wage debate, please let me know. I should be very pleased to have your comments on the current minimum wage subject.

Cordially yours,
ELDRIDGE HAYNES, *Publisher.*

Larcade Committee Wins Praise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 29, 1946

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Honolulu Advertiser of January 23, 1946:

THE PRESIDENT ENDORSES STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

At long last a Chief Executive of the Nation has examined the qualifications of the people of Hawaii and declared himself for statehood. On Monday President Truman, addressing the people of America, said that both the United States Senate and House should "promptly accede to the wishes of the people of Hawaii that the Territory be admitted to statehood in our union." This was a punch line to the findings of the five-man House subcommittee "for immediate statehood" after 2 weeks of painstaking probing into the evidence.

Now the last word remains for utterance from the Halls of Congress. One-fifth of the House Committee on Territories is committed unequivocally to immediate statehood for Hawaii. If they can convince their contemporaries on the committee, then the House and the Senate, then statehood will be a reality.

The Delegate from Hawaii is charged with keeping the iron hot. The first two blows forging the actual sword of statehood have been struck. By diligent and unceasing application, Hawaii's present sole Representative in Congress can, and will, see through the shaping of the forty-ninth State.

The contrast between the 1937 congressional committee investigating the merits of statehood for Hawaii and the work of the 1946 group, from the standpoint of hard-hitting, aggressive, and effective work, needs no comment.

That they meant business was shown on the first morning of their awakening under an Hawaiian sun. Their chairman, HENRY L. LARCADE, a Louisiana Democrat, went to great pains to make plain that the committee "wore no man's collar" and would not brook any attempts to have its probe into all phases of the question stifled in the slightest degree. At each hearing throughout the islands his introductory remarks were to the effect that the committee was here to listen, learn, and ask questions. To that end he issued the broadest of invitations to everyone to be heard so long as their remarks were relevant.

There can be no justification of remarks on any basis that the testimony presented to the committee by over 100 independent witnesses was "directed." The Hawaii Equal Rights Commission, charged by Territorial law with keeping alive Hawaii's fight against discriminatory national legislation, was the logical body to present a united front of proponent testimony. Under Judge A. G. M. Robertson the commission performed an excellent job, complete in variety of fundamental facts and competent in refuting certain loose and unfounded remarks of opponent testimony.

It was unfortunate that opposing testimony was not better documented and more forcefully delivered. The underground of opposition to statehood confined itself to whispering and failed to make its points. A study of the statements made and the briefs filed show a lack of understanding of the problems as it is revealed in the harsh daylight of the postwar year of 1946.

By personal declaration, committee members revealed that they were disappointed in the lack of opposition testimony. They would have much preferred an equal number of no exponents so that they might have gone deeper into the allegations of the loyal opposition. But the preponderance of "yes" testimony caused them to believe that the people of the Territory, in a vast majority, want statehood, and they so recommended.

To the committee, which exhibited a selfless and hard-working desire to clear the air once and for all, the people of Hawaii are most grateful. To the President, who further clarified the issue, goes the same aloha.

Compensation and Pension Payments to Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 29, 1946

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter recently received from Mr. Edward F. Rzonca, commander, Disabled American Veterans, Hugh Smith Thompson 3d Chapter 17, United States Veterans' Hospital, Castle Point, N. Y.:

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
HUGH SMITH THOMPSON 3D CHAPTER 17,
Castle Point, N. Y., January 28, 1946.

Hon. JAY LEFEVRE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We call your attention to a distinct inequality and gross discrimination in the payment of compensation and pension to a service-connected single disabled veteran of both World War I and II who are at the present time hospitalized for the treatment of their disabilities.

A service-connected single disabled veteran without dependents who enters a hospital for treatment of any kind and is rated permanent total receives an award of $115 per month. However, under the present law there is deducted the sum of $95 per month from his monthly check while he is hospitalized. In other words, he is forced to pay his own way for his sustenance in a Government hospital while he is permanently and totally disabled and undergoing treatment for his service-connected disability. Prior to the enactment of the Economy Act of 1933 these men received full benefits while hospitalized.

Many single disabled veterans, particularly those with tuberculosis, which requires an extremely long period of hospitalization, leave Government hospitals before maximum treatment is reached in order to secure full benefits due them, as they have obligations contracted prior to their hospitalization, such as insurance and family obligations, which the Veterans' Administration does not recognize as dependency. A veteran who leaves a hospital in this manner not only jeopardizes his own health but is a menace to the public in general.

Returning disabled veterans are very much disillusioned to find that their benefits are reduced to $20 a month during periods of

hospitalization for service-incurred disabilities, while in the service of their respective branches of the armed forces they had been receiving a minimum amount of $50 per month.

H. R. 536 is a bill which will correct the injustices outlined above, but for some reason the Veterans' Committee of the House of Representatives has not seen fit to act on this particular bill. We appeal and urge upon you to take some definite action in securing a favorable report and enactment of this bill, or a similar one, into law in order to eliminate existing discrimination and hardships. No longer are expressions of sympathy of any value to the disabled veteran—a greater effort must be put forth on the part of Congress.

Respectfully yours,

EDWARD F. RZONCA,
Commander.

Floor Price for Tobacco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK L. CHELF
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 29, 1946

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions memorializing Congress:

Senate resolution memorializing Congress to establish a floor price for tobacco

Whereas a ceiling price has been established, above which tobacco cannot be sold; and

Whereas tobacco is one of the chief sources of income for the farmers of Kentucky; and

Whereas the selling price of tobacco is dropping far below the ceiling price, thereby diminishing the farmers' ability to purchase the equipment needed for the operation of the farm, at the present high prices of equipment which wil be even higher when labor's demand for higher wages is granted; and

Whereas the farmers are powerless to demand adequate prices for their tobacco: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky:

1. It is respectfully urged that the Congress of the United States establish a floor price not more than 4 cents below the ceiling price.

2. It is further urged that the Congress strive through scientific research, to find more uses of tobacco such as fertilizer ingredient, insect control, etc., which may result in such demand for tobacco that the farmers can expect a good price for their product at any time.

Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Secretary of Agriculture, Clerk of the United States Senate, Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, and to all Kentucky Members of House and Senate, Washington, D. C.

Attest:

EMERSON BEAUCHAMP,
Chief Clerk of Senate.

Resolution memorializing Congress

Be it resolved by the Senate of Kentucky: It is respectfully requested and urged that the Congress of the United States pass an act ordering the War and Navy Departments to pay terminal leave to all enlisted personnel who are now or have been or shall be in this War, and who are now serving, have served, or will serve in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or United States Coast Guard; and to pay this in the same manner and on the same basis as terminal leave is now paid to an officer: Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Honorable ALLEN W. BARKLEY, United States Senator from Kentucky, the Honorable W. A. STANFILL, United States Senator from Kentucky; the Honorable FRANK LESLIE CHELF, the Honorable NOBLE J. GREGORY, the Honorable EARLE C. CLEMENTS, the Honorable EMMET O'NEAL, the Honorable BRENT SPENCE, the Honorable VIRGIL CHAPMAN, the Honorable A. J. MAY, the Honorable JOE B. BATES, and the Honorable JOHN M. ROBSION, Representatives from Kentucky.

Problems Before Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 29, 1946

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter recently received from my constituent, Mr. E. L. Johnson, of Poughkeepsie, N. Y.:

POUGHKEEPSIE, N. Y., *January 17, 1946.*
The Honorable JAY LEFEVRE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LEFEVRE: I want to compliment you for the forthright statement appearing in the January 14 issue of the Poughkeepsie New Yorker. It happens I was about to write you and our Senators in line with the President's recommendation in his recent radio address; so, I take advantage of this opportunity to express my views.

Frankly, it is easy enough to criticize proposed legislation taking a stand for or against, but it is rather difficult for the average layman to give reasons for his or her viewpoint, let alone to make counter suggestions. To my mind the present session of Congress will be one of the most important in the history of our country, and therefore, we need more level-headed men, like yourself, in Washington who will think things through and apply sound reasoning in reaching decisions. Many a man seems to lose his sense of perspective when he gets involved in politics, apparently forgetting his background of experience and the problems he faced either in business or professional life.

1. Obviously the most important problem is how to stop the current epidemic of disputes between labor and management. I am inclined to agree that we have had too much legislation or regulation on this question which has helped to increase rather than to eliminate controversy. In fact, present regulations foster labor unrest. The labor laws today are absolutely unilateral and contrary to our supposed established policy of equal rights for all. Would it not be a good idea for Congress to appoint a commission to study existing legislation with a view to eliminating that which is unnecessary and correcting inequalities? What we need is less regulation—more statesmanship; less strikes—more production; less interference by central government—more emphasis on State and local government. Judging from the strike hysteria prevalent today, it would seem that we have a fifth column at work using the labor organizations and leaders as pawns to stir up strike. It might be a good idea to thoroughly investigate some of this activity.

2. Full employment bill: My attitude on this is that you cannot legislate healthy employment and maintain a balanced Budget. Throw off many of the shackles on industry and watch employment take care of itself. This country was developed by free industry and has maintained for our citizens a consistently higher standard of living than anywhere else in the world. We don't want to emulate foreign "isms" and regulations that will not only lower our standards but stifle incentive, which would be a calamity, indeed. What has happened to old-fashioned patriotism, love of country, individual pride, etc.? I hope that our soldiers and sailors will have had enough of foreign lands, and when they return, will make known in no uncertain terms that our old-fashioned principles of democracy and freedom are all right and should not be changed.

3. Minimum wages: You may be able to establish a minimum scale for each type of industry, but it is doubtful that one flat minimum rate for all industry will be practical. This subject requires considerable study before enacting legislation.

4. Atomic energy: I recommend that we keep our secret developments until such time as all other countries have demonstrated beyond any reasonable doubt that they intend to abide by the Constitution and Bylaws of the United Nations Organization. In other words, use our knowledge for trading, which in the last analysis will be for the benefit of all mankind.

5. Social-security expansion: In my opinion, this is no time for expansion. Rather we should consider and correct what has been developed up to now. For example, unemployment insurance has become a huge vacation fund and measures must be taken to correct this evil. Unemployment insurance was intended to take care of those unfortunate individuals who could not secure work of any kind. Now we have the paradox of many jobs available and plenty of workers without jobs but no vacation.

6. Foreign loans: Our system of free industry has always been successful and produced enormous wealth. This same system produced more war materials than England, Russia, France, and China combined. It met and passed the production capacity of Germany, which had 10 years' accumulation. Now other countries whose systems of government and economics, we are told, are better than ours want to borrow from us. I think we should do a great deal of trading before we lend our hard-earned money, viz.

(a) Some provision must be made to reimburse us for old loans; without interest, if necessary.

(b) We should receive concessions including strategic military bases in different parts of the world.

(c) Assurance that no borrowing country will attempt to influence our people in any other economic philosophy, instead, we should prevail on them to establish democracies patterned after our own. Make them adopt the Bill of Rights and our own Constitution and you will come close to having a real United Nations.

(d) We should be given an equal opportunity with other nations for world trade.

7. Housing: This matter should definitely be taken out of the hands of Federal agencies. Give private firms the incentive and you will be surprised how quickly homes will be built throughout the land. American ingenuity, initiative, and enterprise have never failed yet when there is promise of fair profit without throttling regulations and Government bungling.

8. Fair-employment practices: No Federal legislation is needed on this question now. Simply watch New York State for a year or two and then act accordingly.

9. Budget: Obviously this should be balanced without delay. We cannot continue our present course of spendthrift policy without meeting the same fate as other nations now practically bankrupt.

In closing I should like to point out that continued Government paternalism will only lead to ruin. We cannot afford to favor selected groups but should keep in mind that America lived in its early days of struggle for national existence because it was united. We need this unity now. This can be brought about through faith in God, ourselves, and in American institutions for the perpetuation of democracy and freedom for which many of our young men have recently sacrificed their lives and countless others maimed for life.

Yours very truly,

E. L. JOHNSON.

Philippine Churches and Collaborationists—Unequal Distribution of War Damages—Possibility of Filipino-Japanese Collaborationists Receiving War Damage Compensation From the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN PHILLIPS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 29, 1946

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a timely and illuminating article on war-damage compensation to those in the Philippines who suffered during the war.

The article appeared in the Washington Post and is by Mr. Vincente Villamin, Filipino lawyer and economist, of California.

Senate bill 1610 was passed by the Senate nearly 2 months ago. It is now in the House Committee on Insular Affairs. The Filipinos have been urging action on the bill. They want to start the rehabilitation and reconstruction of their country. Their appeals should be heeded.

The article follows:

PHILIPPINE FUTURE

(By Vicente Villamin)

CHURCHES AND COLLABORATIONISTS

The United States Senate has passed a bill (S. 1610) appropriating a total equivalent of $480,000,000 to pay an estimated compensable war damages of about $650,000,000 in the Philippines. The difference will be met by what might be obtained from Japan as reparations. In this connection, it may be stated that the Philippines as a combatant country is entitled to reparations from the enemy, the bill notwithstanding.

The appropriation is an act of grace on the part of the American Government and is in recognition of the cooperation of the Filipinos in the war and also in aid to the maintenance of their national independence, which is scheduled for July 4, 1946.

The bill will help the Philippines immensely, but at the same time it will (a) work an injustice to the churches and other religious organizations and (b) it will enable those Filipinos who collaborated with the Japanese to receive war damage compensation.

The losses of all religious organizations (excluding schools, hospitals, and other charitable institutions) amounts to about $100,000,000. The bill limits their compensation to a total of $5,000,000, or 5 percent of the total loss, while other private properties will be paid 75 percent.

Approximately 85 percent of the religious property losses are Catholic and the rest are Protestant. There is one small synagogue. As an example, if that synagogue were valued at $50,000 it would be paid 5 percent of it, or $2,500; but if it had been a nonreligious property it would be paid 75 percent of it, or $37,500.

As a result of this inequality, the following comparisons may be cited, based on figures given by the War Damage Corporation, an RFC subsidiary. A mineral oil company, with damages of only $7,500,000, stands to receive more compensation than all churches and other religious organizations. The same thing would be true of a coconut oil company and a telephone company; two gold-mining firms would each receive twice as much, and an electric power company three times as much. These examples show that the spiritual rehabilitation of the Philippines does not receive equal encouragement under the bill as the material reconstruction.

This subject was never discussed at the Senate committee hearings nor on the Senate floor when the bill was passed. However, it is on record that in a letter dated June 25 last, the War Damage Corporation recommended to the committee that public property as well as "property owned by religious organizations * * * receive as favorable consideration as property in private ownership." The recommendation as to public property is carried out in the bill, but not so as to religious property.

It is, therefore, urged that religious properties be placed in the same category as other private properties and compensated equally. If an increase in the appropriation is required, it would only be just that this be done. The determination of what claims to allow or not is left with the War Damage Commission, which the bill creates.

As to the collaborationists, the bill provides that no payment shall be made to "any person who, by civil or military court having jurisdiction, has been found guilty of collaborating with the enemy or of any act involving disloyalty to the United States or the Philippines Commonwealth."

This provision is liable to be rendered ineffectual. If, for instance, the President of the Philippines, after independence, should proclaim a general amnesty, then most of the 1,400 Filipinos now awaiting trial as collaborationists would be released and rendered eligible for war damage compensation under the bill. During the last 6 months, less than a dozen of them have been tried and at that rate the overwhelming majority of them will remain untried during the next 6 months before independence.

A vital omission in the bill is an appropriation for two purposes: First, to help the Philippine budget for 2 or 3 years when the people are not able to pay taxes and, second, to start in earnest the diversification of Philippine farm production.

The separate appropriation in the War Department budget to pay the Philippine Army and the guerrillas during the war may be considered as a compensation for the fact that the Philippine government never received lend-lease assistance.

The American Government is being most generous to the Philippines and after the inequities in the bill, which doubtless are unintentional, are corrected, the Filipino people will be even better aided and be more appreciative.

Private Enterprise in the Home Financing Field

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 29, 1946

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

UNITED STATES SAVINGS & LOAN LEAGUE,
Chicago, January 26, 1946.

HON. RALPH E. CHURCH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR RALPH: It seems to us that the President of the United States is entitled to know the feelings of the savings and loan associations and cooperative banks in all parts of the country regarding the position of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and the Federal Housing Administration in the structure of the Federal Government. The present situation is that the agencies which our institutions support and upon which we must rely to protect and speak for the cause of home ownership and private enterprise in the home financing field are subordinated to a group principally interested in public housing. This is, in our judgment, unsound Government management and unfair to our local institutions and to the people whose savings they are safeguarding and who believe in home ownership.

Accordingly, our officers addressed a letter to the President of the United States on this matter, a copy of which is attached. A copy of this letter is also in the hands of all our 3,640 member institutions and 47 State organizations. We know that practically without exception they strongly support the view expressed.

You have always been most interested in the welfare of these local cooperative savings and home ownership institutions and have given appropriate consideration to our needs and suggestions. I thought, therefore, you would like to see this letter to President Truman and also to know that at an appropriate time we would like to urge action on Congressman MONRONEY'S H. R. 2681 if the President fails to remedy this situation by Executive order or by exercise of his powers under the new Reorganization Act.

Sincerely yours,

MORTON BODFISH,
Executive Vice President.

UNITED STATES SAVINGS & LOAN LEAGUE,
Chicago, Ill., January 10, 1946.

To the PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Executive Order 9070, issued February 24, 1942, abolished the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and transferred all of its functions, along with the Federal Housing Administration, to the National Housing Agency, which has carried on the war housing activities of the Government, both public and private, during the war. We made no objection at that time because of the war situation, but we now urgently request that these two agencies be returned to their independent status or be transferred either to the Federal Loan Agency or to the Treasury Department.

The reason for this request directly to you is that the housing situation in the country today is critical, and these agencies set up by Congress to encourage and promote home ownership through private home-financing

institutions cannot function effectively under the direction and supervision of the National Housing Agency, which is also responsible for the public housing program of the Government. This question has been fully discussed not only by the savings-and-loan people of this country, who finance about one-third of the new homes, but also by the home builders, mortgage bankers, and others deeply concerned with home building and home financing, and these groups are substantially unanimous in wishing to separate the private home-financing functions of the Government from the subsidized public housing program.

The Federal Home Loan Bank Board and the Federal Housing Administration deal exclusively with private parties and institutions. Savings-and-loan associations pay more than $5,000,000 a year for examination, supervision, and insurance of accounts; and approved mortgagees remit over $27,000,000 to the Federal Housing Administration as premiums and fees for mortgage insurance. These self-supporting financial agencies of the Government logically should be independent establishments or attached to an agency or department which is concerned with financial matters.

The public housing program of the Government is a welfare operation. The interests of private home-financing institutions and public housing activities definitely conflict. Experience in 1942, 1943, 1944, and 1945 has taught us a lesson. During these years there was an abundance of equity money, an ample supply of mortgage credit on the best possible terms, and many small builders anxious to build homes; yet, notwithstanding these facts, the National Housing Agency has caused about 40 percent of all war housing units to be built as public houses, owned and operated by the Government and local public housing authorities. The comparatively small amount of private building which has been permitted has been done mostly by large builders in the form of rental housing, and the small local builder who builds for sale has been largely eliminated from the program.

What we are requesting can be done either by Executive order or under the new Reorganization Act. It does not call for any new agency or even necessarily the return to independent status of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and Federal Housing Administration. Our request only involves the separation of the public housing functions of the Government, which, if they proceed at all, should proceed on their own merits from those functions of the Government dealing with privately financed home ownership.

We shall be glad to submit further information or to discuss this question with you or anyone you may designate.

Respectfully yours,

HENRY P. IRR,
President,
United States Savings & Loan League.
PAUL ENDICOTT,
Chairman,
Federal Legislative Committee.
MORTON BODFISH,
Executive Vice President.

Whose White House?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 29, 1946

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, the White House, designed by the distinguished architect, James Hoban, one of the most beautiful buildings in the world, has since its construction been one of the chief landmarks of the Nation's Capital and the pride of the American people. Up to this good hour, from the year 1800, when it was first occupied by President John Adams in November, it has been big enough to house all the great and good men who have served this Nation in the Presidency. But now, the present occupant of the White House proposes to mutilate and destroy its architectural symmetry and beauty by enlarging it so as to convert it into a movie theater, a radio station, a restaurant or cafeteria—as the case may be—a museum, and an office building.

Last week the House of Representatives emphatically vetoed this proposal by refusing to appropriate the more than $1,600,000 with which Mr. Truman proposes to make over this national shrine. He defied the will of the House of Representatives by contemptuously saying the opposition to his spoilation of the White House was nothing more than a "tempest in a teapot" and to further show his disregard of the interests of the overwhelming majority of the people of this country, he said that those who objected to opposition to his spoliation of the White House "could chain themselves to the bushes on the White House lawn."

There are other reasons why the President should hesitate in carrying out his ill-conceived and petulant plan to destroy the beauty of the White House—because of the lack of building materials, thousands of returning soldiers, sailors, and marines are unable to rent, buy, or build a home. These homeless veterans should come ahead of the use of materials or the expenditure of money to house unnecessary bureaucrats in Washington.

Then, there is the little matter, to some, of the unnecessary expenditure of more than $1,600,000 by a temporary resident of the White House. The desires of the people of this country for the preservation of the White House are permanent and will endure long after Mr. Truman has moved or been moved from this edifice. In this connection, I insert as a part of these remarks an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of Tuesday, January 29:

THE PRESIDENT'S HOUSE

It is a little shocking to read that although the House last Thursday cut the appropriation for the proposed addition to the White House out of the independent offices bill, workmen, nevertheless, were busy on Friday clearing the way for the excavations. President Truman's own sense of fitness is strong; surely, on reflection, it will suggest to him that the concern over his suddenly revealed plans to add a radio broadcasting auditorium and a cafeteria to the historic mansion which enshrines so much of the national tradition is a great deal more than a tempest in a teapot. Americans take a fierce interest in their great monuments; the President's house certainly belongs to the American people quite as much as to any one Presidential occupant, and to launch a fairly drastic alteration of the buildings and grounds before the public at large is even aware of what is contemplated is scarcely seemly and is certainly unnecessary.

Few will doubt that the Executive Office facilities are inadequate. The answer does not lie in a plan hastily (indeed, almost secretly) put together last fall, indorsed without publicity or discussion by the unfortunately rather weak Fine Arts Commission (to which Washington's architectural development is now entrusted) and then rammed through by imperious gestures from Mr. Truman. The work should be stopped at once, and before Congress appropriates the funds it should provide for a proper review of the whole subject by competent national authorities. It may be that present plans would themselves not greatly alter the existing appearance of the White House and its grounds; but it is plain that the process of meeting Executive Office requirements by pasting on a museum here, a theater there, a cafeteria somewhere else is likely to lead to lamentable results in the end, while offering no sound solution of the real problem in the meanwhile. The Washington chapter of the American Institute of Architects has asked for time to permit a thorough study of the question and the development of a really valid treatment of it as a whole. The White House is too precious and too jealously treasured a heritage of the American people not to be accorded at least that much care and respect.

OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 29, 1946

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter from a constituent in Nebraska, who has recently handed in his resignation as chairman of the OPA in his city.

Mr. Speaker, the views of this gentleman, who has for several years been close to the workings of the OPA, should be valuable to the Members of Congress.

This writer complains to me about the way the OPA has protected its own men from military service; the way they are now hoarding office equipment and typewriters which were formerly used in the offices of the OPA.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress should immediately give consideration to placing all pricing controls in some other agency. It seems to me that either the Department of Commerce or the Department of Agriculture could take over price control on the essential items of living. The last testimony of the OPA showed that they were trying to control prices on more than 8,000,000 separate items. These items range all the way from pictures of hula-hula girls, to teething rings, bird cages, and manhole covers. I am convinced that what price control is needed now on the essential items of living should be placed in some other agency and the vast horde of OPA agents, now roaming the country checking up on minor violations of our merchants, as well as their large office staff, should be liquidated. I trust the Members of Congress will read the letter which follows:

JANUARY 23, 1946.

Mr. J. C. ELLIOT,
OPA District Office,
Omaha, Nebr.

DEAR SIR: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of, and chairman of the OPA

price panel in this city. My reasons for doing so are many.

When I returned from 3 years of military service I was asked to become a member of the price panel. I accepted the appointment and devoted a great deal of time and personal effort to the work because I felt that it was part of my duty as a citizen to do so. I have seen inflation at its worst in Europe and I am anxious to prevent any such disaster in the United States. But I am convinced that the OPA as it is set up under the existing law and as it is administered by its present personnel is not the answer to the problem.

I have been impressed constantly with a tendency to emphasize the bureaucratic folly of following the book rather than using common sense in dealing with the problems that come before the agencies of the Office of Price Administration. It has been obvious to me that too much time and effort was being expended to harass the honest-intentioned little man and not enough to catch the bigger, dishonest-principled one.

The particular case which brought my feelings to a head was one in which a small merchant had made a 1 cent overcharge on one item. When this merchant was called before the price panel he explained that the overcharge was due to an oversight. This was because he was running the store by himself, had no assistant and just didn't have time to get through the multitudinous paper work necessary to keep abreast of the latest ceiling prices. It was the opinion of the panel that the man was not dishonest, that he had no intent to defraud his customers, and so the panel told him that he should be more careful in the future, and closed the case.

We then received an inane letter from the District Office in Omaha telling us that we should reopen the case and fine the man three times the overcharge, or $25, whichever was higher. In this case it would have been $25. In other words, we were expected to fine this man $25 when his income for a week probably wasn't much more than that, and at the same time I am told that used-car dealers are making deals which involve prices high above the ceilings, and that rents in business buildings are being steadily inflated, and nothing is being done about it.

I personally will have no part of a program which is apparently intent on persecuting small honest-intentioned businessmen. I consider the administration of the price control machinery a gross mockery of any conception of justice. I wash my hands of any part of it.

Tribute to Jack Nichols

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. STIGLER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1946

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, on November 12, 1945, the League of Young Democrats of the Second Congressional District of Oklahoma held a district convention in Muskogee.

During the convention time was set aside for memorial exercises for the late President Roosevelt and ex-Congressman Jack Nichols, of the Second Oklahoma Congressional District. The Honorable Kelly Brown, of Muskogee, Okla., Democratic county chairman of Muskogee County, and eminent lawyer, was designated to deliver the eulogy on the life of the late Jack Nichols.

Under the leave granted me to extend my remarks, I include the remarks of the Honorable Kelly Brown:

Ladies and gentlemen assembled in convention of the Second Congressional District of Oklahoma, here is the assembly of the home folks of Jack Nichols. Now is the time when it is difficult to speak. On occasions such as this for many, many years we had the drama of the living, virile character to enlighten our meeting; to gather in his absence and miss his charming personality is an anticlimax in the lives of all of us. Perhaps every one of you feel the same way that I feel, but since you have selected me to make a few remarks calculated to express the sentiments of all of us, I feel wholly inadequate to the occasion and perhaps you have selected the least appropriate personality for this occasion. He was my friend, a close personal friend, and logic and sentiment do not mix well together. Therefore, the thoughts that may come to you this morning will not be the logical, expressive, statements that should characterize this occasion. The subject was too close to this speaker for a good view and it is another occasion when we "cannot see the trees for the forest." No soldier on the battlefields of Europe or Asia has lost his last buddy and turned the sod over the remains of his last fighting companion with any deeper feeling of loss than I have when I speak the words this morning in memory of our friend, Jack Nichols.

In the year 1934, when our much beloved and highly respected Congressman, Hon. William Hastings, laid aside the congressional toga, we looked over the field with a feeling of distinct loss and abandon. We did not see and could not believe at that time that so worthy a statesman as Congressman Hastings could have his place taken over by a competent successor. But nature was still working and God was still good, and out of a field of a number of aspirants the good people of this district gave a handsome indorsement to Jack Nichols as a successor to Bill Hastings. He was comparatively a young man. For many years he had practiced his profession in all of our counties and as an advocate he had become known as an outstanding and brilliant lawyer. First of all he carried with him his library of information and his book of dramatics. His personality was invigorating. He touched the lives and hearts of our people in such a way as to fully revive the hopes for a worthy Representative. He espoused the cause of the farmer and the laboring man and in doing so also presented the best argument as to why he was likewise the friend of the businessman and any investments of money or capital. He thought the big investors and the moneyed interests were built upon the welfare of the common people and he preached the gospel in such a way that was convincing to all of our people so that he was accepted as a representative of no particular interest but the welfare of our entire district. His first session in Congress was such a convincing proof of this theory of government that his reelection was with only slight opposition. As time went on and one term of office succeeded the other, we became fully convinced that Jack Nichols was a Representative worthy of the approval of all of our people and by the time that he had served his 10 years in office he was as full a Representative of and spokesman for our district as any Congressman that ever graced the halls of our National Assembly.

The work that he did in Congress and the valuable representation that he gave to our people was of such a nature that it was only fitting that he should be called into one of the most important lines of duty of our national welfare. He was then selected to a very important position in one of our great national industries and the position that he took with the Transcontinental & Western Airlines was only another step in furthering his services in the welfare of the people of the Second Congressional District, for the welfare of the people of the entire Nation and for the promotion of the great and growing industry of air transport. He fitted into this work with a natural ease and aptitude to such a remarkable degree that at the time of the sacrifice of his life in this work he was an outstanding member of this great national industry. Never at any time did he abandon his idea of representation of our people. On frequent occasions he returned to make his report to this district in the same manner and with the same interest that he did while he was your elected representative and he has brought to us in this portion of the great central South and West a recognition with the transportation lines that has been highly valuable. At the time of the unfortunate accident that brought an end to his career he was engaged in contact work of the most valuable character. He was carrying out the idea of having the great company of which he was the representative in making a globe-circling route that would have brought in touch all of our people in the effort of truly making this one world.

The steps that he has taken and the path that he has laid out will not be forgotten. The map that he has made will be followed as the lines of travel for future generations. I recall very intimately his plans for taking your humble servant along with him and others of his friends on the first globe-circling trip and it would have been a thrill to any human mind to have followed him in this path that he had laid out. We will go over these lines. We will remember the genius of Jack Nichols in plotting the course. We will have the memory of our own man from the Second Congressional District who blazed this trail. We will greatly suffer from the loss of his dramatic personality as a companion. Why Moses was led on top of the mountain to look over the Valley of Promise and then not allowed to enter; why our great Franklin Roosevelt fought in such a valorous manner through the network of European and Asiatic wars to look upon the consummation of an Atlantic Charter; why our Congressman, Jack Nichols, was led to the peak and then not enter the fruitful valley? These things we do not know. These things we cannot comprehend except through faith.

"Flower in the crannied wall,
I pick you out of the crannies;
I hold you here, root and all,
In my hand, little flower;
But if I could understand what you are,
Root and all, and all in all,
I should know what God and man is."

To these things that have been done, to this dramatic character that has passed, to the personality of Jack Nichols that was so thrilling, we simply pay our tribute without knowing the fullness of our acts and thoughts, except this one lone thought: We do respectfully show our gratitude for what has been done and we do, through our thoughts and actions this morning, pledge our eternal loyalty to this friendship that we had and to this splendid, estimable character that was given to live with us. In utter humility we state these things and leave the verdict to be written in accordance with our constancy to these plans. We now leave with the individuals of this convention, in the homes of the men and women of the Second Congressional District, and in our own hearts, the thought that we have had a true friend, an able statesman, and a memory to revere.

"Green be the turf above thee,
My friend of better days;
None knew thee but to love thee,
Nor name thee but to praise."

A. F. of L. Wins Wage Gains for Millions Without Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 29, 1946

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, there have been two parallels in the current postwar labor-management discussions, one of which has been entirely overlooked.

On the one hand we have had mass walk-outs of the CIO with wild charges being made against management by CIO leaders. On the other hand we have had the American Federation of Labor quietly negotiating wage gains almost entirely without strikes. Out of 1,800,000 workers on strike and threatening strike on January 18, only 112,000, or a bare 6 percent, were A. F. of L. members.

At the same time the American Federation of Labor has gained for its members the same percentage of wage increases and sometimes greater increases without the hysterical, wild-eyed charges so commonly reverted to by the CIO leadership.

The A. F. of L. accomplishments in this respect are presented in the current issue of the Federation of Labor's Monthly Survey, which follows:

Since VJ-day, unions affiliated with the A. F. of L. have won wage increases averaging from 10 to 20 percent and more for at least 2,500,000 workers.[1] A large proportion of our increases have been for 15 percent or more, very many from 20 percent up to 100 percent. We are establishing the 75-cent minimum wage throughout the South.

The vast majority of these wage gains have been won without strike or threat of strike; and our unions have universally kept within the wise and sound formula laid down by President Truman: Wage increases should not force breaks in price ceilings.

When workers add to their wage demands that extra 5 cents which breaks a price ceiling, the extra nickel brings them no real gain but a serious loss. For a break in price ceilings for one or two unions brings a flood of demands for more price breaks from other unions and companies, and the tide of inflation is let loose. Then the cost of living rises and everyone loses. We know only too well what the rise in living costs meant to workers during the war. In 1944 it cost at least $500 more per year for a family to live than in 1941.[2] Although workers' average yearly income rose 50 percent from 1941 to 1944, living costs rose 32 percent.[3] These high living costs cut away the major part of the wage gain. The result is shown on the chart below. Even at the wartime peak about one-third of American families still had incomes below a health and efficiency standard, although their wage gains should have given them a far better living. Wage gains mean little if they have to be paid out in higher prices.

The administration's reversal of policy to permit price-ceiling breaks for certain unions is bringing the results to be expected. A 5 to 8 percent increase in living costs is already forecast this year. Not only will workers lose the extra nickel that breaks the price ceiling but they will force on themselves and others an even greater loss. For every family with savings or life insurance will cut away the value of those savings because each dollar will be reduced to 95 cents or 92 cents in buying power. Retired workers living on pensions or social-security benefits will lose likewise; for their pensions will not rise with increased living costs. The only way to make real gains is to keep wage demands within price ceilings. This policy has been followed by experienced unions.

AFL RAISES WAGES WITHOUT STRIKES

Labor Department figures show that AFL unions are winning their wage gains almost entirely without strikes. Out of 1,800,000 workers on strike or threatening to strike, only 112,000 were AFL union members (January 18).

Why is it that AFL unions can save their members the huge losses caused by strikes and yet win them large and lasting gains? The answer is that our experienced union leaders seek substantial progress through collective bargaining conducted privately with employers on a basis of fact and experience, with consideration of the interests of both parties. We regard collective bargaining in good faith as the normal procedure for establishing good relations with our employers and working out the terms of employment in a contract. Our unions have negotiated in good faith within the administration's declared wage-price policy.

FOUR COMMANDMENTS OF PROGRESSIVE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Workers can make the greatest progress by building up confidence and mutual understanding between themselves and their employer. These four commandments should be observed:

1. Good faith and square dealing on both sides of the conference table. Show your employer that you are seeking a fair and just settlement, satisfactory to both parties. Keep your contract. A broken contract is the mark of bad faith and irresponsibility.

2. Know your industry and know your company. Get such facts as costs of operation, outlook for sales and production, particular problems of your company and industry, past profits and prospective profits. Know what a wage increase will cost and what the company can pay. You cannot get these facts from the Government: But some AFL unions get this information from their companies for use at the conference table because they have proved that they are responsible organizations, interested in the success of the business and acting in good faith. Remember that your collective bargaining conference is the business of your union and your employer. The company does not want its information released to competitors. Don't injure your company's business. If you cannot secure the information you need, write to the AFL Research and Information Service.

3. Remember that three groups—workers, consumers, and management—should share the wealth created by American industry. This is the American way forward to higher living standards. Industry's profits should bring (1) wage increases; (2) price reductions; (3) reward for management as an incentive to improve production. Also, reserves must be laid aside to buy the new machinery which will increase productivity and make further wage gains possible; and investors must receive enough return on their investment to bring your company adequate financing. You cannot expect all the profit to go into wage increases.

4. Work to improve production per man-hour, so there will be more income to share. Have an understanding with the company that workers are to share the increased income they produce and get higher wages. Work out a plan for union-management cooperation. Let your employer know that your union is a strong and responsible organization, that you want to see the business succeed, that you expect to act as a partner in developing it and to share the returns as a partner should.

WHAT DOES A STRIKE COST?

Some strikes are unavoidable because management refuses to bargain in good faith. The AFL maintains, however, that a strike should be the last resort, used only after genuine efforts at collective bargaining, conciliation, and arbitration have failed. The reason for this is clear. Count the cost of a strike to the workers:

Suppose the workers are earning an average of $1 per hour. The company offers an increase of 12 cents to $1.12, but the union turns down the offer because they think a Government board may give them more. They go on strike and stay out for 8 weeks. Each worker loses an average of $358 (pay for 8 weeks of 40 hours at $1.12 an hour). At the end of that time the Government board awards 18 cents, 6 cents more than the company offered. The company accepts the award and grants 18 cents, but it will take the workers nearly 3 years' work before this extra 6 cents will amount to enough to repay their loss. If, as seems more likely, the company refuses to accept the award and gives only 3 cents more (15 cents in all), then it will take the workers nearly 6 years of work before their extra 3 cents per hour will add up to the amount they lost by the strike. If the 3 cents or 6 cents breaks a price ceiling, workers may take losses they can never regain.

If, on the other hand, the workers had avoided the strike and used every means to build up a sound relationship of good will between their union and the company, and both sides had turned their attention to getting out production, they could have gained much more than the extra 3 cents or 6 cents in further wage increases. They could have saved their strike loss and won public good will by turning out the products other people were waiting to buy. That is why responsible AFL leaders bargain in good faith and make every effort to avoid strikes.

[1] This is a conservative estimate based on information gathered from international unions, AFL organizers, and published reports.

[2] The actual dollar increase in living costs differs at different income levels. For purposes of the chart, this was the closest estimate possible with available information.

[3] Average yearly income of all workers (excluding Government) rose from $1,462 in 1941 to $2,189 in 1944; U. S. Commerce Department figures. Living-cost figures are from Labor Department Study on Consumer Expenditures.

Puerto Rico's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 29, 1946

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an article appearing in the January issue of the National Republic, published in Washington, D. C. The article, written by Ira E. Bennett, highly regarded American author and newspaperman, relates to conditions in Puerto Rico and should be of interest to all Members of Congress and the public. It shows that unrestricted communism under Gov. Rexford Tugwell is increasing the misery of the people of that island.

If the Communist experiment in Puerto Rico is a failure under the most favorable conditions, with the support of

the United States Government financially and politically, Mr. Speaker, one can easily imagine what can be expected of a communistic experiment in world government. The enlightening article by Mr. Bennett follows:

PUERTO RICO'S FUTURE?

(By Ira E. Bennett)

What is to be done about Puerto Rico? While the United States undertakes to insure democracy and promote prosperity among backward peoples all over the globe, it neglects its own half-starved stepchild at its Caribbean doorstep.

Conditions in Puerto Rico, deplorable for half a century, are now becoming worse. There is heavy overpopulation—554 persons to the square mile—and great scarcity of natural resources. Many of the people live in squalor and are ridden with disease, to such an extent that they are visibly undersized, lacking in vigor, and unable to do a good day's work. When in good health the laboring Puerto Rican is a faithful and industrious man, but in his native island he is under a heavy handicap.

Most Puerto Ricans seem to think that misgovernment is one of their chief misfortunes. They center most of their bitterness upon Gov. Rexford G. Tugwell—yes, that same shining Excelsior who led the New Deal hosts in days of yore. Tugwell is accused of having grasped the opportunity to make guinea-pig social experiments on Puerto Ricans, with resulting failure, misery, and public outcry. The insular house of representatives demands his removal. Everybody clamors for some kind of change. There is talk of statehood, independence, home-rule election of Governor and all other officials, and a dominion status, whatever that is.

Congress controls the political destiny of Puerto Rico, of course. It made Puerto Ricans United States citizens in 1901. It has given generously to the island for relief, rehabilitation, and general welfare. Since 1900, when the organic law was enacted, the United States has given to Puerto Rico in grants and loans about $325,000,000, besides relinquishing to the island in customs receipts, internal revenue, excise taxes, etc., about $275,000,000. In addition, large sums were spent by the Army and Navy during the war years, giving employment to the islanders. (Incidentally, an Army officer testified that he was compelled to bring in labor for the work, as the natives were inclined to knock off work as soon as they had accumulated a few days' pay.)

The island is 95 miles long and 35 miles wide, contains about 2,200,000 acres, of which 1,223,000 are tillable. On this patch live more than 2,000,000 people—that is, only 45 acres for every 100 people. The same density of population in the United States would give this country 1,632,000,000 inhabitants. But the Puerto Ricans, while individually underfed, are prolific to an amazing degree, with a birth rate of 40 per 1,000 annually. So the problem of survival grows more acute every year.

Sugar is the chief product of the island. Needlework by the women is a big item of income. Coffee, formerly a lucrative crop, was destroyed by hurricanes and has never recovered. Tobacco was going well a few years ago, but the employers claimed that local labor unions killed the goose. At any rate, Puerto Rican tobacco is a small item now. The island does not and apparently cannot produce enough for the population. Country people have been driven into the town slums and are living on the dole.

Islanders say that Governor Tugwell's scheme of breaking up the big landholdings and giving small farms to the farm laborers has proved a fiasco. The Government gives the laborer a lift of about $150 to furnish him forth as a farmer—and he fails. The total farm production is less now than it was under the larger landlords. Sugar making has been made a "public utility" under the peculiar political philosophy of the Tugwell regime, with the result that might have been expected—capital has been scared away. The universal complaint among businessmen in the island is that the Government is strangling private enterprise, including farming, transportation, manufacturing, banking, etc. The "Little New Deal" of Puerto Rico has installed these agencies to "supervise" the people: Puerto Rico Development Co.; Puerto Rico Development Bank; Transportation Authority; Communications Authority; Water Resources Authority; Housing Authority; Public Service Commission (having control of the sugar industry).

There is a "Planning Board," on approved New Deal lines, with authority (on paper) to approve or kill off all island activities within the planning orbit. The "plan" includes spending $411,000,000 in the 6 years ending 1950. The money is "expected" to come largely from the boom-time sales of rum, but recently the rum balloon has shown signs of sagging.

So infuriated have been the citizens of Puerto Rico against restraints upon their efforts to carry on business that the outcry has disturbed Washington. President Truman sent a message to Congress on October 16, asking that body to submit to Puerto Ricans several alternative proposals for a change of government. "The present form of government in the island," cautiously observes the President's message, "appears to be unsatisfactory to a large number of its inhabitants." Different groups advocate these changes: (1) Local election of Governor and wider self-government; (2) statehood; (3) complete independence; and (4) a dominion form of government. Nobody has clearly explained what is meant by a "dominion" form of government, but presumably it is desired that Puerto Rico shall bear to the United States the relation which Canada bears to Great Britain. The United States, in other words, is regarded as a commonwealth or empire.

President Truman takes care to suggest that Congress should not submit any proposals to the Puerto Ricans which the Congress is not prepared to enact finally into law. And there's the rub. What the Puerto Ricans may desire and what the United States may desire is not the same thing.

Puerto Rico is a fixed air base guarding the approaches to the United States and the Panama Canal. The island cannot therefore be given up. It is important to our national defense. Independence is a vain dream. Statehood is almost as vain a vision, because Congress cannot be expected to admit into the Union a region that is pauperized and doomed to live on the charity of outsiders. The only alternative left is the popular election of Governor and wider home rule—and this is questionable because of the inveterate habit of Puerto Ricans to take their politics too seriously. On the smallest questions, when the people have a right to decide it, furious passions rise, and riots and feuds develop.

So far as cure of government can cure Puerto Rico's ills, common sense would seem to require that good sound American procedure should take the place of the fancy communism that disguises itself as paternal solicitude in Puerto Rico. Encouragement of private enterprise, including investment from the mainland, might work wonders in developing agriculture and industry. The island cannot live by itself alone—it must always have help from Congress—but it could be made to help itself by a reform in the policies of the insular government. Since it is not to be expected that Governor Tugwell will admit that his policy has been wrong, a way toward betterment of conditions might be found by a change, not in the form of government, but in governors.

The Employment Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1946

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, no Member of this House is more strongly committed to State control and management of the Employment Service than I am, or more sincerely anxious to return the employment offices back to the permanent control of the States.

The only reason I am not voting to transfer the employment offices back to the States on June 30, 1946, as provided in the Dirksen amendment, instead of at a later date, is that Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Administrator of the GI law, tells me that the transfer of the Service on that date would have a very disturbing and disrupting influence on the veterans' program and would injuriously affect the prospects of many thousands of veterans to secure employment. General Bradley says the demobilization program will be proceeding at top speed at that time at the rate of 400,000 discharges a month and that to try to switch from Federal to State control would be very confusing and would throw a big monkey wrench into the machinery.

The time chosen in the Dirksen amendment for the transfer is especially unfortunate owing to the fact that under General Eisenhower's announced program all 2-year men and all men with 40 points are to be discharged at that time and the placement machinery will be clogged with many thousands of men looking for jobs and depending on General Bradley's organization to place them.

For these reasons I could not vote for the Dirksen amendment, as much as I approve the transfer of the Employment Service to the States, and its complete removal from Federal control.

After all, it is not important that the Employment Service shall be transferred at a certain date. The important thing is that it shall ultimately, within reasonable time, be transferred and brought exclusively under State management, and removed entirely from bureaucratic control at Washington, and that, I am sure, will be done.

Representative DIRKSEN'S amendment proposed to make the transfer of the employment offices on June 30, 1946. Representative EBERHARTER, of Pennsylvania, on behalf of a number of Members, including myself, offered an amendment to make the transfer on December 31, 1946. The Eberharter amendment would have given the Employment Service six more months to operate under its present management in the placement of veterans. By December 31, demobilization should be well over, and I supported the Eberharter amendment as the wisest possible solution of the problem. Eager as we may be to return the Employment Service to the States, surely we can wait 6 months to accomplish an orderly demobilization that will protect all the rights of the veterans.

I received today the following very illuminating letter from General Bradley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs:

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: This is in response to your request made by telephone for a statement of my views with reference to possible transfer of the public employment offices to State operation June 30, 1946.

It is estimated that demobilization is now about half accomplished. It is anticipated that demobilization will continue at a rapid rate for more than a year. At the present time members of our armed forces are being discharged at the rate of about 1,000,000 per month. Employment offices are needed to provide veterans with the services the Congress has assured will be given to them.

It would be most unfortunate, in my judgment, to disrupt the service of the public employment officer by attempting to accomplish the transfer as of June 30, 1946. Demobilization will be continuing at a high rate at that date. Also it is readily understood that the transfer cannot be accomplished without at least a temporary impairment in the efficiency of the Service. Many veterans have never been previously employed. These veterans and others will need repeated assistance and counseling from the Employment Service. To disrupt the Employment Service in the midst of demobilization and in the midst of the adjustment period of veterans would be highly detrimental.

I am deeply concerned that the reintegration of our service men and women into the peacetime economy be accomplished with the greatest speed and efficiency. One of the important mediums for accomplishing this transfer is the United States Employment Service, which must be in a position to render efficient and competent service. This it cannot do unless a definite date for the transfer to the States is set sufficiently remote to maintain the service through the period of demobilization and first job adjustment of our veterans.

Yours very truly,

OMAR N. BRADLEY,
General, United States Army,
Administrator.

Industrial Disputes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BENJAMIN J. RABIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1946

Mr. RABIN. Mr. Speaker, the matter of industrial disputes and the approach which the Government should take toward their settlement is one of utmost importance to all of us today. On January 22, 1946, a radio address was made by Hon. Jesse Freidin in connection with that problem. Mr. Freidin is well qualified to discuss the subject inasmuch as he was formerly General Counsel and subsequently public member of the National War Labor Board. His speech is most timely. Pursuant to permission given to me to extend my remarks, I am including in the RECORD the radio address made by Mr. Freidin.

Three months ago, in a radio address to the Nation, President Truman outlined what was to be the postwar wage policy. He described the role Government was to play, following the end of the war, in the settlement of labor disputes. These are his words:

"Many people have asked the Government to step in and decide who is to increase wages and by exactly how much. I have indeed been criticized because I have not stepped in to lay down the law to business and labor. My refusal to do so has been deliberate. I am convinced that we must get away as quickly as possible from Government controls and that we must get back to the free operation of our competitive system where wages are concerned. This means that we must get back to free and fair collective bargaining."

That was a sound policy when it was announced by the President 3½ months ago. I believe it is still a sound policy today. But the proposal we are discussing here tonight—statutory fact-finding boards with power to subpena parties, witnesses, and records, and to recommend the terms on which labor disputes should be settled, with all the moral force Government recommendations carry—is the very reverse of that policy. Instead of getting away as quickly as possible from controls, the proposal would continue and perpetuate them, even though in modified form. Instead of getting back to free and fair collective bargaining and encouraging labor and industry to develop their own solutions to problems with which only they have sufficient familiarity and judgment, it continues Government in the dominant role of decision maker. Instead of reducing Government participation to an irreducible minimum, it enlarges and broadens its powers of intervention.

Anyone who has had to do with the settlement of industrial disputes will, I am confident, agree that so long as there is assurance of Government intervention parties to a labor dispute will not always exhaust the possibility of agreement. In the minds of both will always linger the hope that they will secure from Government a decision which in the case of the union will give it more than it can get in collective bargaining, and in the case of the employer will call upon it to give less than might be necessary to avoid a strike. And so long as there is held out to each side the opportunity to gain more through Government intervention than it can through its own efforts, legislation will aggravate not ameliorate the problem. I think it must be self-evident that Government wage setting and collective bargaining do not mix. We cannot insist upon the first if we want to maintain the full vitality of the second.

Regardless of what is said to the contrary, and no matter how good original intentions may be, it seems to me also true that when the Government itself undertakes to decide what one or two or three of the greatest employers in the country shall pay as a fair wage a pattern or policy begins to take shape which soon fastens itself, with little if any variation, upon many employers and many unions who were not parties to the Government's decision, and who may be faced with totally different fact situations. Once the Government sponsors a precise wage increase for a particular union, the rank and file of other unions feel themselves, and understandably so, entitled to a comparable increase. The freedom of their representatives to make a substantially different bargain is surely limited, if not wholly destroyed, no matter how compelling the particular facts in the case might be.

We have had two major experiences in the United States with Government intervention in wage disputes. One was in the railway industry, the other in the work of the National War Labor Board. But in relying on those experiences and in seeking to apply the same procedures to industry generally and in time of peace it is most important to bear two things in mind. In both instances the procedure was agreed to in advance by the parties who were to be effected by it. The railway industry and the Railway Brotherhoods in 1934 joined in devising the scheme of the Railway Labor Act and tacitly agreed in advance to conform to its provisions. The establishment of the War Labor Board was similarly prefaced by agreement between major representatives of industry and organized labor to accept the procedures of the National War Labor Board as a means of settling disputes peacefully during the war. Today, by contrast, both industry and organized labor have expressed deep and unyielding opposition to the proposal for fact-finding boards. The second circumstance to bear in mind, and indeed it may be of far greater significance, is that the railway industry is entirely and closely regulated by the Government in all of its activities—its rates, its profits and its routes, and that wage regulation by the War Labor Board was in the same way accompanied by wartime regulation of every important industrial activity—prices, manpower, hours worked, supplies, etc. The point is that if we are relying on the experience under the Railway Labor Act or on the experience of the National War Labor Board, had we not better begin by asking ourselves whether Government participation in the setting of wages can succeed without leading inevitably to the regulation of other economic and personal activities which bear directly and indirectly on the question of wages?

I have no doubt that there are many people who in utmost good faith minimize these risks—the risk that the entire fabric of collective bargaining will be impaired, that settlements will be forced upon particular employers and unions without regard to their particulular needs and problems, that wage regulation has in the past been accompanied by over-all economic regulation—these dangers may have been overlooked or ignored in the emphasis placed upon the strike features of the proposal. It has been advanced as a method of eliminating strikes. But upon analysis there is little in the proposal, at least in its present form, that furnishes the slightest assurance that strikes will be eliminated or curtailed.

The only part of the program that bears directly on strikes is the so-called 30-day cooling-off period. The bill introduced by Mrs. NORTON, for example, provides that for a period of 30 days, during which the fact-finding board is to be set up, hold its hearings, and render its report and recommendations, the parties to the dispute are to continue at work. But how effective this section of the bill may be is highly doubtful, for the measure provides no sanctions of any kind for its enforcement. The union is left free to decide whether its probabilities of success will be enhanced or reduced by striking. It is offered, in fact, simultaneous access to two forums—the pressure of the strike and the picket line and the semiarbitral machinery established by the Government. The fact-finding mechanism, in other words, is being offered not as a substitute for, but as an addition to, the strike and the lock-out. We solved that problem at the War Labor Board through the administrative device of refusing to consider any labor dispute while a strike was in progress. We insisted that, if a union wanted to air its grievances before a Government forum, it had to stop airing them on the picket line. But even that device is not referred to in the bill.

We also had experience at the War Labor Board with a cooling-off period as a strike deterrent. The War Labor Disputes Act, you will recall, provided for the filing of a notice of intention to strike and the continuance of production during the ensuing 30-day period. But the fact is that following passage of the act we had more strikes than before and they were more difficult to settle because, having followed the statutory provisions, they had the appearance of congressional approval. The month interval operated more as a heating-up than a cooling-off period. Even where no strike was intended the machinery was utilized to demon-

strate that a strike was in preparation. And it was frequently resorted to as a ceremonial ritual for the effect it might have on the public, on employers and on government officials. Far from deterring strikes, it did no more than make available government facilities as a means of dramatizing and propagandizing an intention to strike.

As to strikes after the 30-day period, the proposal is wholly silent. Either side is at liberty to reject the recommendations of the fact finders and to resort to force. Now by no means do I mean to suggest that the bill would be improved did it attempt to penalize strikes or otherwise illegalize them. For to eliminate the threat of a strike or the right of an employer to close down his plant if he cannot come to terms with the union, would be to remove from the area of collective bargaining the single most potent force which drives the disputing parties to final agreement. A great American, Mr. William H. Davis, the former Chairman of the War Labor Board, expressed the same thought in these words:

"The creative adventure of the bargaining table loses all color of reality if the workers have been deprived of the right to reject management's offer and quit or if management has lost its right to refuse the workers' terms and close the plant. It is, in the last analysis, the pressure of this right to strike or to lock out that keeps the parties at the conference table; that tests their courage, resourcefulness and decision."

And let me say that there are few men to whom deep understanding and broad experience give a greater right to express an opinion on this matter than Mr. Davis.

A democratic country, if it is going to retain its traditional principles of freedom, must place its final faith in free collective bargaining. Freedom of the workers to strike and of the employers to shut down is no more than freedom to resort to the necessary tools by which a collective bargain is reached. We ought not permit curselves to lose faith in the resourcefulness and strength of this process. Government can aid it by broadening and strengthening its mediation and conciliation facilities. These functions help the parties reach agreement. Government most assuredly will not aid it either by coercing agreement or by itself assuming responsibility for making the final decision.

The postwar problems which face industry and labor today are unique in both their economic and emotional content. They are by no means characteristic of normal peacetime operations and ought not be accepted as the basis for peacetime legislation. They are charged with an amount of tension which sheds a good deal more heat than light, and heat seldom induces the thoughtful deliberation which is the necessary preliminary to wise lawmaking. In my humble judgment legislation will not aid the present strike picture—you cannot force American workers against their will to resume jobs at wages they deeply believe are inequitable, nor can you force American employers to pay wages which they believe with equal sincerity are uneconomic. I believe the parties must be left to make their own agreement assisted, not coerced, by the Government.

H. R. 4437

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 29, 1946

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, this bill (H. R. 4437) has come before the House under false pretenses. It is supposed to provide for the return of the Employment Service to our State governments but so worded that it will defeat State control of this agency and further entrench Federal control of it. I feel that the adherents of Federal control of the Employment Service, realizing that Congress fully intends to reenact legislation to return this agency to its rightful place under our State governments, have deliberately set about to circumvent the will of Congress and the people by loading H. R. 4437 with provisions which will keep Federal authorities in the saddle. This is about the most flagrant attempt at legislative sabotage I have ever seen.

There is a little FEPC in the woodpile of this bill. It is hiding under the provisions of section 212 which authorizes Federal authorities to prosecute, if not put out of business, employers accused of racial discrimination. I voted against FEPC in its full form and I am going to vote against it in this subdued form now by supporting an amendment to H. R. 4437 which will eliminate all the subterfuge elements of this bill and bring about a return of the Employment Service to the States as intended by Congress.

Views of John P. Lewis, Editor of PM, on Associated and United Press Associations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 23, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York newspaper PM of Sunday, January 20, 1946:

DOLLAR JOURNALISM

Carl W. Ackerman, dean of Columbia University's School of Journalism and front runner for the monopolists of American journalism, has injected himself into the fight between Assistant Secretary of State William Benton on one side, and the Associated Press and United Press on the other side.

Benton is in charge of the State Department's distribution of information abroad, which has just been reorganized from a wartime to a peacetime basis. This news service was designed to consist of three parts:

1. A cable-wireless news file prepared from AP, UP and International News Service news reports and sent to Germany, Austria and Japan for publication in papers there, largely to areas where private American news agencies have not yet begun to operate. It will be discontinued as soon as possible.

2. A radio bulletin sent daily to United States embassies and missions abroad, giving texts of Government documents, speeches, and so forth, plus a brief summary of miscellaneous press news. This file is for the personal information of Government officials and not for publication.

3. Short-wave voice broadcasts to peoples abroad designed to present a well-rounded picture of the American scene.

The row over this program was precipitated when the Associated Press announced that it would refuse to provide Benton's department with its service for broadcast overseas. The United Press followed up by announcing that it, too, intended to discontinue its service to the State Department.

Benton is fighting back and has accused the directors of the Associated Press of voting to "contribute to the misunderstanding of America abroad."

Into this set-up now comes Ackerman to ask President Truman to withdraw his support from the State Department's distribution of information abroad.

"The education of the peoples of foreign countries in respect to American policies, activities, and ideals should be primarily on the same basis as the education of our people at home," he says. "That is by means of daily news, collected, interpreted, and distributed by privately operated press associations, newspapers, periodicals, books, and radio. That is the American way at home. It should be the only American way abroad. * * *"

What Ackerman is saying is that news abroad, as at home, should have a dollar sign attached to it; that information to the other peoples of the world should be made available to them only if they can pay for it.

What he is saying is that the American way—the way of a free press—is the sole province of private business—business which has developed in our own country over the course of time into a monopoly business, with fewer and fewer businessmen—businessmen, not journalists—controlling more and more outlets of news and information.

What he is saying is that informing the world of the truth of what is going on in the United States of America is not the right of the United States Government, or its President, or the State Department. He is saying that is the exclusive business of that select group, which, by virtue of circumstance and the profits that derive from monopoly in close association with the business community, happens to control the press of America.

What he is saying is that the Associated Press and United Press and the only other big news service in existence—the International News Service—if it happens to join the other two, are bigger than the United States Government and can dictate to the people of the United States of America what they can and what they cannot tell their neighbors in this world.

Dean Ackerman says: "I am convinced that freedom of international news and subsidized governmental propaganda are incompatible."

What he is saying is that, when handled by private journalists, facts are news, but when they are handled by the Government, they are propaganda.

To all of which the best and clearest answer is, "Nuts."

If democracy and the American way of life are going to be preserved in this world, it is only going to be because the people of the world know and understand what we are doing over here. That is a job that the United States of America left exclusively in the hands of the private newspaper monopolies before this war. They didn't do the job.

Millions upon millions of the people of the world—far more than those living in our particular segment of it on the North American Continent—were cut off as completely from knowledge of America and what it was doing and what it was trying to do and what it was thinking as if they lived in the Dark Ages. The monopolists couldn't do the job then. They can't do it now in a world so torn by turmoil and confusion and poverty in the wake of the war that the profits are just not there to permit the sale of news for profit to the people who need news.

There is just no way for news of the United States of America to reach most of the people on this planet unless the United States Government broadcasts it. The other nations of the world can broadcast their news

to the people abroad, but our press associations decree that our Government cannot.

And so they cut off the service to the State Department and would give only silence to the poor devils in Europe or Asia who are hungry for word of what's doing in the magic land of America.

Well, things like this AP-UP attempt at supergovernment are what's doing.

JOHN P. LEWIS.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1946

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, the Indianapolis Association of Credit Men, one of the largest and most virile organizations of its kind in America, is telling the world in no uncertain tones that the proposed British loan is a bad credit risk.

A statement on this subject from the pen of Merritt Fields, the keen and forceful executive manager of the Indianapolis Association of Credit Men is attracting Nation-wide attention. Every month the association issues an economic letter by Mr. Fields, dealing with the paramount questions and issues of the day in his own original and inimitable style. The February Economic Letter of the Association is devoted almost entirely to the proposal to loan $4,400,000,000 of the American taxpayers' money to Great Britain. I believe that Mr. Fields' observations in respect to the proposed loan, coming from a practical credit executive, will be very interesting to the people of our country, and I have obtained the unanimous consent of the House to insert the statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is as follows:

YOUR PERSONAL STAKE IN ENGLAND'S CREDIT

All American citizens have a direct pocketbook interest in England's credit. Normally an Anglophile, this writer does not like England as a credit risk. If it were our own money or we were handling your money for you we would not give England one nickel on credit for England's credit record is bad. It is your personal money and the writer's money that is involved as we shall show.

Our politicians (Government officials) have recently agreed to give England on credit $4,400,000,000, and this huge credit is now before our Congress for approval. This association is in the credit business and you are too if you are in business at all, so let's have a look at the facts. England, remember, is just another customer. From a credit standpoint, you may be interested in knowing how long England has been in business, who owns her, how she is managed (the Socialists are running her now) .how much capital is invested, what her financial statement looks like, what "authorities consulted say" (we always wonder who these authorities are) but what you really want to know is only one thing, i. e., will England pay; and suppose you ask the Indianapolis Association of Credit Men's Service for a credit report on England, such a report as we render on any other customer of yours, large or small. We don't give you a "rating" on England—we tell you how England has paid in the past and is paying today. From that you decide whether she will likely pay in the future. We call that report a credit interchange report because the people who sell England (or anybody else) exchange or interchange their credit experience through this association as a central clearing point.

"ENGLAND IS UNCOLLECTIBLE—HAD TO CHARGE IT OFF"

Our credit interchange report without any question says England is a bad credit risk on the basis of her past paying record and her largest credit grantor makes this notation on the information he gives us which we put in our Credit Interchange Report: "Uncollectible—had to charge it off."

Who is England's largest credit grantor? Why it's good old Uncle Sam, probably humorously referred to in European circles as the C. C. C.—Champion Credit Chump. And who is Uncle Sam? You, the American taxpayer. Oh, yes, how much was charged off as uncollectible? A little matter of only $6,000,000,000! We gave England a credit including interest of $6,000,000,000 at the time of World War I, she never paid it, so her largest credit grantor, the Champion Credit Chump, lost $6,000,000,000. Here is where your personal stake in England's credit comes in. England got the money from the United States Treasury and when she didn't pay, the Treasury made you as an individual pay by simply adding England's failure to pay or perhaps it was a repudiation, on to your personal Federal tax.

WILL THE C. C. C. DO IT AGAIN?

Are we little c. c.'s (credit chumps—taxpayers who pay for the bad credits granted by the big C. C. C.) really in favor of our politicians giving England another $4,400,000,000 on credit? It is reported even before Congress votes on it that our negotiators don't really expect England to pay this new credit; that even if she doesn't pay, it will be a good investment in a customer; that we should loan her the money so she can buy from us, then we can afford to lose the money. That doesn't make credit sense. In addition to the report that our negotiators don't really expect this credit to be paid off, here is something which is not a report. Many of the British themselves frankly say in advance of congressional approval that the C. C. C. will never be paid back. We quote directly from the London News Weekly: "The chances are that long before America can collect there will be a new international conflict to throw the loan and many kindred superstitions into hogwash."

Do you as a Federal taxpayer who had to pay for that first British credit regard this new loan as a superstition? And the London economist, one of England's leading financial papers, without blushing reports the odds are "billions to one" that this new credit will not be paid and says further it is willing to bet "all Lombard Street to a China orange," etc. After World War I England was given 62 years to pay off the first credit, but she paid on it for only 9 years. What she did pay amounted to 6 cents on the dollar of the principal including interest. Then in 1933 she quit cold, and from 1933 on, the United States Treasury was not able to collect one more nickel.

In World War War II, just closed, we gave England another credit amounting to $25,000,000,000, only the ingenious Mr. Roosevelt, then President, did not call it a credit, he called it lend-lease, and in a message to Congress relating to lend-lease, Mr. Roosevelt said, "For what we send abroad we shall be repaid within a reasonable time following the close of hostilities in similar materials or at our option in other goods of many kinds, which they can produce and which we need." This $25,000,000,000 of lend-lease under the agreement now before our Congress, will be settled for 3 cents on the dollar, to be paid running into the century 2000. So, as has been pointed out by a number of good credit executives (not politicians) on the first credit granted England in World War I we collected 6 cents on the dollar and lost 94 cents on the dollar; on the twenty-five billions of lend-lease we will get 3 cents on the dollar (if England pays it, see quotes above) and now on the new credit of $4,400,000,000, we loan her the money but she pays us nothing for 5 years and then the agreement says she is to start paying off in installments ending in 2001.

For a long time we have been wondering if it is good credit judgment for we American taxpayers to try this same customer again on credit and, on the basis of England's past paying record, can we in view of our own heavy obligations afford to write off another credit of $4,400,000,000 as uncollectible? And we are also wondering, if England is a decadent nation, can we afford to keep propping her up with these credits of $6,000,000,000, 94 percent of which we wrote off as uncollectible, and $25,000,000,000 of lend-lease, 97 percent of which we have written off as uncollectible.

In passing, we are told by some American liberals that this credit to England is too complicated for the ordinary credit executive to understand; that it involves great international forces, something mysterious, etc. As to that, we have noticed in our business, which is the credit business, that whenever any credit transaction becomes too complicated to understand there is something wrong with it. There is nothing complicated about this last credit to England; on the basis of the paying record—all that really counts—England is a bad credit risk for you as a Federal taxpayer. Ask your Congressman and your two United States Senators to enlighten you further on this credit matter. Ask them to suppose that England once loaned us $6,000,000,000 and we didn't pay and she wrote it off as uncollectible. Also suppose that England gave us $25,000,000,000 worth of net lend-lease and we didn't pay that and then suppose we asked her for another credit of $4,400,000,000 so we could trade with her. Query: Would we get the money on the basis of our past credit record? Significantly, many American liberals want to loan money again to England. Over the years we have taken a good many of these liberals apart—find their mainsprings to be made of other people's money. They are always liberal with that and we think their credit judgment should be somewhat discounted. If you care to write to your Congressman and your two United States Senators, we will furnish you with three extra copies of this economic letter.

Young Men and Women Aline Themselves With Democratic Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT RAINS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1946

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, in the January 25 issue of the Washington Post the Gallup poll presents convincingly the unmistakable fact that the Democratic Party is regarded by the vast majority of the young men and women in this country as the party of progress and the hope for the future.

This study of political opinion presented by the Gallup poll points definitely to Democratic success in the coming elections. Since the vast majority of new voters will be from the ranks of the young people of this country, and since the overwhelming majority of these young voters will aline with the Democratic Party, Democratic success at

the fall congressional elections is apparently assured.

The poll follows:

GOP FACES SERIOUS PROBLEM ON GARNERING YOUNG VOTERS

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N. J., January 24.—One of the major problems facing the Republican Party strategy committee is how to win into the GOP fold a larger share of the two or more million young people who come of voting age every year in this country.

The Republican Party is unquestionably suffering from a shortage of new blood. At the present time, out of every three arriving at voting age, one is Republican, two are Democrats.

The problem looms even more serious than at first might be supposed by further evidence from surveys showing this proportion—two-to-one Democratic; as early as the 15- to 18-year-old bracket.

This picture emerges from a study of political opinion by age groups, including a poll of young people 15 to 18 years of age. The latter were asked:

"Which political party do you think is the best in the country?"

Voters of the country were polled on the question:

"If a Presidential election were being held today, which party would you vote for—the Democratic or Republican?"

	Democratic	Republican
Teen-agers:	*Percent*	*Percent*
15–18 years of age	65	35
Other age groups:		
21–29 years of age	62	38
30–49 years of age	55	45
50 and over	49	51

Between Presidential elections, between 8 and 10 million young people become eligible to vote. If only 50 percent of these young people turn out at the polls, their vote of almost two-to-one Democratic would be enough to offset a substantial defection among older persons.

Republican strategists can take some comfort from the fact that eventually they do win a larger proportion of these voters—after they have passed the 30-year mark, as can be seen from the table presented above. As people grow older, they tend to become more conservative. As they become more conservative, more of them become Republicans.

Republicans can also take comfort from the fact that older people turn out in greater proportion at the polls on election days than younger people.

This is not a new problem for the Republican Party. It has been present in all recent elections.

In the older age group—50 years and over—political sentiment in the last two Presidential elections was almost evenly divided. It continues about that way today.

Welcome Home Banquet for Veterans of World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a speech delivered by me at the welcome home banquet for veterans of World War II tendered by Companies K, M, and Battery C, Veterans Association, at the State armory, Lawrence, Mass., on Sunday, January 27, 1946:

In the life of every city there is a tradition handed down from father to son and grandson and carried over from family to family which binds the isolated members of a community together in the common fellowship of democracy.

That tradition is the responsibility of public service.

Too often in life we experience the feeling of being alone, of not fully sharing the great journey we are making together. Somehow, individual success is not completely satisfying. We have the urge to participate in a wider effort, teaming up with other men to work for a goal that is finer than our individual ambitions. The time comes when it is greater to give than to get.

In the life of every community, this spiritual quality is at work. Individually and by groups. Man feels the need to go out of himself to help those who are weaker. He lifts and encourages the underprivileged, the wayward, the disabled, and the aged. He lends his strength to these, so that all may live in human dignity.

Quietly, day in and day out this work goes on.

Then suddenly, a disaster stirkes. A fire, a flood, an epidemic, or a hurricane brings death and suffering. Instantly, all men of good will step forward to help. There is no thought of hours or pay or profit or publicity. The needs of the community come first and all men pitch in with no other thought in mind than to save the other members of the community. And when it is over and we have time to look around, we are amazed and thrilled by the unsuspected courage and unselfishness of our fellow citizens. The knowledge of this builds precious morale. It is well that we develop this morale, for one in a generation, the way of life of the whole community and its sister communities, is endangered and the Nation is engulfed by war.

This is the sternest test of all, requiring the greatest sacrifice in the name of group survival. The danger is immediate and it affects everyone. To meet it, we have a pathetically small Regular Army and the National Guard.

None of us will forget that cold Sunday of December 7, 1941, when the Nation was shocked from its complacency by the news that we had been attacked and defeated, losing 3,000 men before the deadliest of all weapons—surprise assault.

We did know that we had been forced into war and we were not ready for it. With all the advantage of preparation and surprise, the enemy took Wake, Guam, the Philippines, overran Java, New Guinea, and threatened Australia. Our Navy was crippled, our Army was but a token force, and our Air Corps was not yet born. We had suffered defeats at the hands of superior forces and the future was black indeed.

When General MacArthur was evacuated from Bataan against his will, he said: "I shall return." It was inspiring but, it seemed so impossible. The High Command was in some doubt as to whether it could hold Australia. And MacArthur, arriving in Australia, found that he had only two divisions available to defend a continent. Though his forces were far outnumbered, with a spirit that was typically American, he decided not to defend, but to attack. He crossed over to New Guinea to smash the preparations the Japs were making for the invasion of Australia. He established a small beachhead but he could not go far inland because the towering Owen-Stanley mountain range barred his way. The Japs held all the passes, their main base was protected by the mountains, and they looked forward to a mass slaughter of the small Allied Army if it dared to come up the mountains. At this point, MacArthur loaded a whole division into transport planes and dropped them on the other side of the range, behind the Jap lines. He kept them supplied by air and flew in an entire airdrome with fuel and ammunition. When the Americans seized the Buna base and went on, after bitter fighting to take Guadalcanal and Bougainville, it was the turning point of the land war in the Pacific.

Who were the handful of men who did this? Regulars, Marines, and the National Guard. Men from greater Lawrence were there, taking all that a powerful enemy could throw at them, then holding, and finally going over to the offensive. These men from the National Guard were all we had. They fought with unyielding courage the time we desperately needed to draft and train and send into combat the millions who were needed to win a Global War. If this thin line had failed and the Axis had the opportunity to perfect their new weapons, who knows what the result might have been?

We remember even before Pearl Harbor our National Guard units leaving to join the United States Army. It was 5 years ago this month that one of them, Battery C, went off in another direction, to fight across France and through the Siegfried Line.

We remember how a generation before their fathers had fought at the Marne, which was the turning point of the First World War. And going back still further, we remember how some served under "Black Jack" Pershing in the expeditionary force that was sent into Mexico. And before that, peacetime service and training beyond memory.

Tonight, seeing the faces of the young and the old who have, through the years, been privileged to serve with Companies K and M and Battery C, it all comes together in one piece, the pride of men in belonging to a good outfit. When the chips were really down, these men of our community had what it takes. That makes for good morale and good citizenship, in peace as well as in war. We are proud of the example which you have set because it has kept the faith. The tradition which your fathers have handed down to you, the new veterans, has gained in strength and vitality. It will go on to inspire the living of our democratic way by those who will follow us.

We do not meet here tonight to extol the glories of war. We know that it means slaughter, unspeakable suffering and destruction. The greatest single responsibility that must be met by every person who is alive today, is to work unceasingly for a way to eliminate the savagery that is war. We must do this before the techniques of mass murder crush our whole civilization and reduce the few survivors to an existence little better than that of animals wandering in a wilderness of ruins.

War is a tragedy and a paradox. It brings out the best as well as the worst in man. Courage, unselfishness, and the willingness to sacrifice all, if need be, for the sake of others—all these qualities come to the surface. The individual becomes part of a group, working for the group. He no longer feels separate and alone. He is sharing and helping in something that is bigger than himself. Out of this experience comes a new relationship, one that has given a new word to our language. Under the stress of war men become buddies, a spiritual comradeship born of understanding, loyalty, and self-sacrifice.

The word "buddy" has a deep meaning for all men who have gone through hell together, helping each other to see it through. The awful impact of war strips away false pride and mean motives. Men become honest with each other and in their mutual need they develop a courage and devotion that overcome all doubts and fears. Men are challenged to the very depths of their being and they face up to it in the name of their common humanity in a way that surprises themselves. They know that life comes to its best

and fullest expression when it is lived for others as well as for self. Veterans do not speak of this for words can never tell the fine and reverent meaning of this experience. But every veteran holds it high in his heart and treasures it there as something beyond all other understanding.

And when he comes back to the peaceful routine of the old home town, he is vaguely aware that something is missing from the picture. It is swell to see the wife or the girl friend, the folks, the old friends, the familiar places. He makes the rounds and for awhile there is all the joy of reunion. But as he begins to settle down and get back into the ways of civilian life he senses that something is missing from the picture. The veteran walks the streets and he is alone again. The people he sees have personal interests and nothing more. The comradeship he once knew and the morale-building unity of it is gone. Sometimes he wishes he were back with the old outfit again.

After all, isn't that part of the reason why we are here tonight? On the surface, we call it a "welcome-home" banquet. We want to express our admiration and our gratitude to the men who have just come back from the grim experience of war. The community wants to make them feel at home again, and to help them to find their place in civilian life. There are many urgent and difficult problems facing a returning veteran which the community as a whole must help to solve. Jobs and homes and education and rehabilitation, these and many other problems must be met and solved. I believe that the municipalities, the States, and the Nation are more thoroughly conscious of this responsibility than at any time in our history. On the international front, we are determined to work for a world system of law and order that will eliminate war. By the same token, on the domestic front, we must work to help the veterans whose sacrifices have humbly taught us this great and imperative need.

That is part of the reason why we have gathered here tonight. But there is a deeper meaning behind it. The old soldiers of greater Lawrence are extending the hand of human fellowship to our returning GI's. You have served us; now we must serve you, and in that interchange discover the basis for a continuing comradeship. We have adjustments to make as well as you. The war just ended was not merely a struggle between rival groups of nations. It marked a revolution in the affairs of men. An old order is passing, while the new has yet to be born. All of us stand at the crossroads of change. We must preserve the heritage of freedom which is our birthright, yet, consistent with that faith, we must make economic and social adaptations which will make our society function in the realities of the present. Fortunately, our democracy is not a fixed and rigid thing, resisting the needs of evolution and progress. It is a faith which grows and develops with life itself. It does not begin in Washington and spread down to us. Rather, it begins in the mind and heart and actions of each individual citizen. Its first test of performance is in the individual's relation to his community.

Ours is greater Lawrence. Here and not elsewhere is our new outfit. The racial and religious tolerance, the working together for the sake of the team, courage, intelligence, devotion, and sacrifice, all these were developed by military service. They are needed now, more than ever, in the citizenship of our community. Our duty is to carry over to the tasks of peace, the inspiring comradeship that we know in war. There are some civilians who have never awakened to this need. We must show them by our example. With this spirit we will fight and overcome any problem that may challenge us.

The enforced discipline of war must be replaced by the self-discipline of peace. Tonight we welcome you back to the free and responsible company of American community life. Through the fellowship of the veterans of all wars, who have learned the imperative need of cooperation in building a better and finer way of life, we ask you to join ranks with us. We need each other, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to clear away the road blocks of misunderstanding, to venture into the unknown future and conquer it in the name of peace and progress for all.

Tonight, with your help, we start out on the most important mission of all. With the experience and the firm faith you bring to this task we shall not fail. Welcome home, veterans of World War II, welcome home to the new America which we shall build by working together.

Who's Kiddin' Who?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 29, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of very graphic illustrations showing the distress of our servicemen in the various theaters of war. They are thoroughly disgusted and disheartened. Their morale is low because somebody at home apparently has not kept faith, and they are asking in the letters which I receive from them, "Who is kiddin' who?"

I wish I were able to insert in the RECORD for the reading of everyone the graphic illustrations that have been sent me. One in particular deals with five subjects, from which I quote:

1. CLOSE CALCULATIONS

January 3. "In the interest of accuracy and in order not to arouse hopes that cannot be fulfilled we are making our calculations as closely as we can." (Secretary of War Patterson.)

2. ENLISTMENTS

October: Army announces recruiting drive.

December: Army announces recruiting drive a success—original goal already two-thirds met—goal trebled.

January: Army announces return of overseas vets cut by almost two-thirds—enlistment drive a failure.

3. 2-YEAR MEN

September 20: "By mid-winter all men with 2-years' service become eligible for release." (Chief of Staff.

"Mid-winter" changed to "late winter."

"Late winter" defined as March 20.

January 3: "I am unaware" of any plan calling for the release of men with 2-years service by March 20, 1946. (Secretary of War.)

4. SHIPPING LIMITS DISCHARGES

January 3: Shipping is the "limiting factor" in demobilization. (Secretary of War.)

January 5: Return of men from overseas to be cut from rate of 800,000 to 300,000 monthly—in spite of excess shipping. (Army Chief of Information.)

5. DELAY FOR ELIGIBLES

September: No eligible enlisted personnel to be retained in service because of military necessity. (War Department.)

January: Overseas eligibles to be retained as much as 3 months. (Army Chief of Information.)

Who's kiddin' who? It wasn't made to fit.

Yours,

_____.

P. S.—Send it to our Congressmen—maybe they can make it fit.

Mr. Speaker, the least we can do as Members of Congress is to require the military authorities to keep faith with these boys. We who have had boys in the service understand fully the language of these men. It does not do for the Secretary of War to disclaim knowledge of the promises that were made the boys and their wives and parents. It will not suffice to hear the Secretary of War tell the boys in the Pacific that he was not familiar with the manner in which the point demobilization formula was worked and is being handled by those in charge at Washington. His alleged surprise will not satisfy any of us.

Accompanying some of the letters from the servicemen was the following clipping from the Daily Pacifican of January 6, 1946:

MR. TRUMAN, BRIEF US NOW

The late Al Smith campaigned, "Let's look at the record."

Let's look at the demobilization record as portrayed in the news dispatches from Washington to the Daily Pacifican:

September 22: Point scores announced: October, 70; November, 60, and after that all 2-year men.

September 25: No 36-point enlisted men, or 48-point officers, will be sent overseas.

October 20: Army must reduce point score to keep pace with demobilization.

October 21: War Department reaffirms release target dates.

October 24: Homeward sailings lag behind goal.

November 20: Pacific-based returnees promised relief as transport surplus looms for January.

December 5, 9, 12, 15: Bright prospects on shipping as backlog breaks.

December 21: 50 points good December 31.

December 28: All troops not needed to go home by March 1, says Secretary of War Patterson.

January 3: 68,000 more berths assigned to AFWESPAC.

January 5: Empty berths sail to United States for lack of eligible men.

January 5: War Secretary Patterson is reported "completely surprised" by certain facts on the demobilization set-up.

January 5: Army announces demobilization will be slowed down and the return rate of some troops delayed.

The facts read like a "war of nerves" drive. Yet, throughout all the confusion one fact stood out: policymakers were promising that men above occupation needs would be sent home quickly.

But what about the two new situations?

(1) The Secretary of War didn't know the way the point system is being operated. Does this show lack of liaison and understanding of our Washington leaders on the problem? This, with all the public clamor.

(2) Rate of remobilization is slowed down because of the difficulty of getting overseas replacements. What has happened to the thousands upon thousands of red appliers and selective-service inductees? Have not replacements been trained since VJ-day?

We ask our Commander in Chief, Harry S. Truman, to give us the facts. We were briefed on our mission during days of combat. Let us be briefed now.

SERVICEMEN PLACE BLAME WHERE IT BELONGS

Mr. Speaker, I have every reason to believe that the mail which is pouring into my office daily from the men being held in the service, and particularly from those being held overseas, know who is to blame for the failure in the demobilization scheme. The servicemen are placing the blame where it belongs. They are writing their Congressmen and

telling the story. It is in this way that we are getting the unvarnished truth.

For example, the following is a copy of a letter which I recently received from a young man who is a gradute of arts and science in one university and of law in another university. I quote:

THEY SAY THE ARMY CAN NO LONGER BE TRUSTED

JANUARY 8, 1946.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The Army has made us one promise after another which has been broken. Ships are leaving here with empty berths—1,800 of them on 2 ships during the past 2 days. Thousands of officers and men sit around idle. The biggest waste in the Army is the waste of time. There were 20,000 soldiers at the GI rally last night and they weren't all enlisted men. Many of them were officers. I am a pre-Pearl Harbor father with two children and, like everyone else out here, I want to know when I will go home and I want it to be soon.

We are thoroughly convinced that the Army can no longer be trusted. If men are to be demobilized at the fastest rate commensurate with available shipping and occupational needs, some action by Congress is necessary. My buddies and I hold you and other Members of the House of Representatives and Senate responsible for our predicament. You put us in the Army and you can get us out. Either demobilize us or, when given the next shot at the ballot box, we will demobilize you.

Yours truly,

_____.

Here is a letter from another well-educated officer, also a graduate from a very reputable law school. I quote:

MANILA, P. I., *January 11, 1946.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am writing you about the program called the Army demobilization program, specifically as it applies to the Pacific theater. The program here has been one continuous story of generalities, distortions, and broken promises. The last straw was when we found out that the Secretary of War did not even know that no points had been accumulating since September 2, 1945, and seemed entirely unaware of General Marshall's statement to Congress that by March 20 all men with 2 years' service would become eligible. Occupation quotas have been set, still the Army announces a slow-down of the demobilization with three or four times as many men here as they said they would need according to their own estimate. In the meantime thousands of officers and men sit around idle. The biggest waste in the Army is the waste of time! The situation applies to officers as well as enlisted men.

We have been patient and we have waited. Now 5 months after the war is over we want to know how much more of our lives the War Department wants? Is 47 months and 30 months overseas enough? Is the real reason for this the desire of a great group of high-ranking officers to keep their rank and command? Was the promise of the release of 2-year men meant merely to placate Congress while the real plans were formed underneath the scenes? Do occupation quotas mean anything? Why are ships leaving here empty? Does eligibility under the point and length of service system mean a priority for discharges or is it a system devised to keep me in the Army?

We are now convinced that our only chance for redress is with Congress! We are thoroughly convinced that the Army can no longer be trusted. My buddies and I hold you and other Members of the House of Representatives and Senate responsible for our predicament. You put us in the Army and you can get us out. Either demobilize us or, when given the next shot at the ballot box, we will demobilize you.

Yours truly,

_____,

It will be observed that these men say the Army can no longer be trusted. They are looking to Congress for relief. They blame Congress for putting them into the service, even if some of us were not here when war was declared, and they are holding Congress responsible for their discharge since they have lost faith and confidence in the Army and in our military organizations. The majority party in control of Congress and all of the committees of Congress, and especially the committees dealing with military and naval affairs, will do well to consider and weigh the statements of these intelligent young men.

MORE TROOPS IN MANILA THAN ARE NEEDED IN THE ENTIRE SOUTHWEST PACIFIC

The following is a letter which I received from a very well-educated man serving in the Army in the Pacific theater. I quote:

JANUARY 10, 1946.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: A mere glance at the Army's plan to slow down demobilization should be sufficient to convince one of the crimes against humanity being unfolded here in the Pacific. The Army has failed completely and utterly to reduce its personnel to a figure consistent with the needs for occupation forces. There are far more troops in Manila and the immediate surrounding area than are needed for the entire Southwest Pacific.

This same condition exists throughout the entire Pacific theater, with the exception of Japan. It is therefore quite apparent that definite and drastic steps need to be taken (and we mean just that) to force the Army to release excess personnel. A lot of "stars" will have to fall, too. The more the better.

We don't want the promise of a reduction of personnel next September or later. Instead we feel that a discharge rate of 700,000 per month is justifiable. This pace should be continued until the actual numbers needed for occupation are all that remain.

Any efforts you extend along this line will be greatly appreciated by each and every fellow in the Army. Too, you can be assured, all of us from northeastern Oklahoma, plus our families and friends shall remember it and return the favor when the opportunity arises.

Respectfully yours,

_____.

The same malcontent and disappointment is expressed by the boys in the European theater, as shown by the following letter which I have just received:

EUROPE, *January 1946.*

HONORABLE SIR: We, those thousands of American exiles under military bondage, raise our voices to be heard through all the din and the clamor of the many mercenaries at work on the home front.

We are those same men who were invited here that the blood of war might not be spilled on American soil.

We are those same men who, after serving two, three, or more years through this war, are now left stranded—to wonder if anyone particularly cares how much previous time we are to sacrifice or whether it is believed that we are gullible enough to accept the various phases of the War Department's demobilization policies as being anything but a carefully timed plan of excuses to delay the whole program.

Are the lawmakers of our country no longer concerned with what is, or what is not just—to those who must build the future? And if they are concerned, do they consider it more just to let us who have already given so much, continue giving because it is in the selfish interest of others, or more convenient to the strategy of military politics? Why, we ask, are veterans not rotated with those who have not yet served?

Sincerely,

_____.

Mr. Speaker, similar letters are pouring into my office from our servicemen stationed in all parts of the world—in Manila, Korea, Guam, Luzon, Yokohama, Germany, and many other points in both the Pacific and European theaters. The first, second, and fourth letters from which I have quoted above are from commissioned officers, and the third letter is from a high-ranking noncommissioned officer. These men are men of the highest integrity, whose veracity cannot be questioned. Their intelligence is sufficient to enable them to know whereof they speak, and they are not prejudiced by their mistreatment and apparent unnecessary delays in demobilization. But, they are Americans of high standing, the boys whose voices will be heard upon their return. During the war they served well and nobly. Now, they are telling their Congressmen where the fault lies and who is to blame. They are still Americans and are following the American instinct to preserve America and prevent the inauguration of a militaristic regime.

Franklin D. Roosevelt Lives On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an address which I delivered before the Junior Board of the YMHA, Lawrence, Mass., at the Hebrew Community Center, Sunday, January 27, 1946:

He was the first global leader in history, a symbol of hope for the common man at home and abroad, a foe of privilege, a champion of the people. The hardest job in the world was his but he thrived on responsibility, turning every increase in power toward the welfare of humanity. We remember his precedent-shattering leadership, his energy and vision, his achievements in bringing economic, political, and financial power under democratic controls, his gallant fight to save the spiritual values of our civilization, his determination to outlaw aggression and bring all men together in the family of nations. We remember the long cigarette holder tilted upward at a rakish angle, the laughing eyes, the gay chuckle, and the fireside chats when he visited us in our homes. We came to know him and love him and with cheerful affection we called him F. D. R.

In many ways he was more than one man. He became the spokesman of a world-in-change, giving voice to all of our hopes and aspirations. Through storm and stress he led his people and the world by the hand out of the ruins of yesterday, through the dark night of depression and war, to the first faint glimpse of the brighter, fairer world of tomorrow. By ability and temperament he was destined to meet and master crises. But the greatness of his heart, reaching out to all of suffering humanity and taking all of its troubles to its care, was stronger than the mortal frame of man could bear. In

his thirteenth year as President of these United States, in the midst of his labors, he was called to his reward, leaving the inspiration of his memory to guide us for the rest of our journey.

Franklin D. Roosevelt is a man for the ages. History says that we must wait for the perspective of time to establish a great man's worth. With lesser men that is true. But we, living through the greatest crisis in the thousands of years that mark man's time on earth, one that has brought us to the dawn of the Atomic Age, know that F. D. R. does not have to wait. Before our eyes we have seen the revolution of his accomplishments, that history can only add to his brilliant record of public service. As time goes by, the world will catch up with the genius of his insight. Generations as yet unborn will be nourished by his example.

Of distinguished Dutch ancestry, Franklin Roosevelt was born to a life of comfortable ease. Educated at Groton and Harvard, he studied for the law and practiced his profession before engaging upon a public career. He was in the national eye long before he entered the White House. He had been a New York State senator. There as a young man he attracted attention by his single-handed attack upon, and his defeat of, the powerful political organizations of that time. He served as Assistant Secretary of the Navy in World War I and he was the unsuccessful candidate for Vice President when James M. Cox was defeated for the Presidency. Then came the tragic day in 1921 when he was stricken with infantile paralysis while swimming at the family home at Campobello, New Brunswick. He had plunged into the cold surf with his usual zest. A few hours later he had to be carried away on a stretcher. For months his life hung in the balance. And when he recovered it was only to find that he would never walk again as other men walked. A bedridden life, or one doomed to a wheel chair, was a double blow to a man of Roosevelt's vitality. He was not the type to accept defeat and watch the life he loved go by his window. There, through the terrible ordeal he endured, were forged the qualities of mind and spirit that made him utterly fearless.

One day the veteran newspaperman and devoted friend, Louie Howe, who saw his lifelong faith justified when Franklin Roosevelt finally entered the White House, came into the invalid's room. Roosevelt lay in his bed that day with his face twisted in some concentration of thought or effort. Great beads of perspiration rolled from his wrinkled forehead.

"Boss, what is it?" Louie called, as he hurried to the bedside.

The man fighting on that bed of pain, took a deep breath and opened his eyes. He looked up at Louie and a beaming smile came through the sweat on his face, like sunshine through the rain. By the power of will he made reluctant nerve centers respond.

"Louie," he said, "you don't know how much fun it is just to try to move your big toe and to do it."

Small wonder that Louie Howe had such faith in the dauntless courage of this man. Others would come to know it. Gamely, Roosevelt fought the disease and after tiresome, discouraging months of treatment, was able to walk with steel braces, crutches and finally with the aid of canes. And yet, such was the personality of the man, he turned our attention away from his afflictions. He looked, he acted like a healthy, confident man. But the newspapermen who were close to him knew, and it became an unwritten law with them, never to refer to this. The agony which marked his efforts to move about, never showed in his face. It was necessary for him to sit on the floor of an automobile, place his hands on the edge of the floor behind him and while attendants lifted his legs, he would raise himself by the strength of his arms. Once in the seat, he would immediately smile and start kidding the reporters. Before this greatness of spirit, who could but admire the man.

In spite of this handicap, Franklin Roosevelt engaged in more grueling campaigns, and traveled more miles—300,000 of them—than any President in our history. He appeared at public functions supported by a military aide or leaning upon the arm of a son. Ramps were used to assist him onto planes and railroad trains and in parts of the Executive Mansion. He permitted his birthday to be used for celebration throughout the country to raise funds for sufferers from the disease. Because he found the waters at Warm Springs, Ga., helpful, Mr. Roosevelt established the Warm Springs Foundation so that others suffering from the same affliction, but without the money to go there, might enjoy the benefits.

Once he told a close friend he thought his crippled condition was an asset. He explained that while others might be tempted to get up now and then to look out of the window or stretch their legs, he was riveted to his desk and thus was able to concentrate on his work.

After two terms as Governor of New York, he came to the White House in the midst of a strangling depression, proclaiming that there must be a "new deal" for the "forgotten man." His predecessor presented him with 12,000,000 unemployed, prices depressed to new low levels, a shrunken foreign trade and thousands of bank failures. The whole Nation had the jitters and if any man was in a tough spot, it was Franklin Delano Roosevelt. With characteristic fearlessness he told the Nation: "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself." Then he tackled the mess. One of his first acts was to proclaim a national banking holiday that closed every financial depository in the country for 10 days while readjustments were made. He summoned Congress into special session to implement by law a national recovery program that broke all precedents. One hundred days later every one of his requests had been granted and he held powers never before entrusted to a President in peacetime. The Nation rallied to his confidence and drew badly needed strength from it.

The Constitution was amended to repeal national prohibition. Social-security benefits were provided by legislation. A wage-hour law was enacted for labor. A Securities and Exchange Commission was set up to curb gambling with the Nation's economic welfare. A good-neighbor policy was established for the Western Hemisphere. The Civilian Conservation Corps, the National Youth Administration, the Works Progress Administration, these and many other alphabetical agencies, became familiar household terms. Mr. Roosevelt swiftly became known as the country's foremost practical liberal and a leader of a social revolution.

It was to hold aloft the New Deal banner for a second term that the President was unanimously renominated by the Democrats in 1936 and overwhelmingly defeated his opponent in the election. At this time he said: "America will not forget these recent years. We feared fear. Today we have conquered fear. But I cannot, with candor, tell you that all is well with the world." He raised his voice against economic despotism which he likened to the tyranny of political autocracy that precipitated the American Revolution. "Out of this modern civilization," he continued, "economic royalists carved new dynasties. They created a new despotism and wrapped it in the robes of legal sanction. The collapse of 1929 showed up the despotism for what it really was. The election of 1932 was the people's mandate to end it. Under that mandate it is being ended."

In his first two terms, Mr. Roosevelt was concerned primarily with domestic problems. The Agricultural Adjustment Administration was designed to help farmers through crop-control measures and subsidies. The TVA—Tennessee Valley Authority project of flood control, navigation, and electric power distribution—was the striking example of the President's rate yardstick for public services. In 8 years alone, Mr. Roosevelt pushed through Congress expenditures of $850,000,000 for vast construction such as Bonneville and Grand Coulee power and irrigation plants on the Columbia River. By the end of his second term, these public enterprises were supplying more than one-twentieth of the country's electricity.

Though up to his neck in the work of national economic recovery, Mr. Roosevelt, with his world view, glimpsed war on the horizon. As early as 1937, in a Chicago speech, he demanded the quarantine of aggressor nations. He repeatedly advised America to prepare for any emergency. Europe went to war in September 1939, and Mr. Roosevelt watched the Axis run roughshod over country after country. The President took realistic steps.

He and his supporters in Congress remodeled the Neutrality Act to allow cash-and-carry purchases of arms by belligerents * * * a step favoring the Allies. After the Nazis swarmed through Holland and Belgium in 1940, Mr. Roosevelt set up a billion dollar emergency arms program and a National Defense Advisory Commission. He laid down the principle that the preservation of Britain and the British Navy were necessary to defend American safety, and in September 1940 traded 50 old destroyers to Britain for naval and air base sites in the western Atlantic. The next month, selective service became law. A new army was drafted. Naval and air programs were accelerated, industry put on a wartime basis, and America became the "arsenal of democracy."

Engrossed in questions of defense and foreign policy, Mr. Roosevelt refrained from stumping for a third term until the week before election, but he defeated his opponent by 4,000,000 ballots.

In March 1941 the dollar sign was wiped from munitions for the Allies in a multibillion lend-lease program. And on May 27, 1941, a few months after his third term began, the Chief Executive declared an unlimited national emergency.

There were months of great debate, both in and out of Congress. The well-organized isolationists, closing their eyes to international realities, fought the President every step of the way. Almost alone, the President undertook the task of educating the American people to the fact that the insularity of the past was gone. Oceans were no barrier to airplanes, and radio, and propaganda, and more terrible weapons defying distance, which were already in the experimental stage. We did not live in an ivory tower where we could choose to ignore the rest of the world. We were a part of that world and we would have to face the dangers and the responsibilities that went with it. Because of the great faith which Americans had in Franklin Roosevelt, they listened and learned and applied pressure to Congress to support his policies. Thank God that we had such a realistic leader. With someone else, we might have been doomed.

But suddenly Japan, borrowing a technique of surprise and treachery from her Axis partners in crime, struck Pearl Harbor at the very moment when her mouthpieces in Washington were deceitfully talking conciliation with the Secretary of State, Cordell Hull.

It was a day, Mr. Roosevelt declared, "which will live in infamy."

Our enemies thought they had Mr. Roosevelt where they wanted him but they did not know Mr. Roosevelt. Thirty days after Pearl Harbor, Congress gasped when the Chief Executive proposed a 2-year production of 185,000 planes, 120,000 tanks, 55,000 anti-aircraft guns, and 18,000,000 tons of shipping.

Fantastic, impossible, many declared, but Mr. Roosevelt knew no such words. It was typical of the man. He had vision, but the practical capacity to make it become fact. Stalin called him "the great organizer." Production goals, stupendous as they seemed, subsequently were expanded, again and again; America amazed herself and the world. The Allies achieved a crushing superiority of arms over their foes.

Taking time out from these great efforts, Mr. Roosevelt proclaimed to Congress his famed "four freedoms"—freedom of speech and religion, freedom from want and fear—as fundamental to a lasting peace. In part, they formed the basis of our peace aims and were incorporated into the Atlantic Charter, drafted by the President and Prime Minister Churchill in their first meeting aboard warships anchored off the Newfoundland coast.

In addition to his many talents, the President was an able strategist. Churchill gave him credit for being the "author of this mighty undertaking" in north Africa. The Allies swept the enemy from the African continent, out of Sicily, and finally, in Italy, carried warfare to Europe itself. The President's activity was prodigious. He flew to Casablanca for another consultation. For the first time during the war, an American Chief Executive had gone to foreign soil. Not since the days of Abraham Lincoln, who did not have to leave the District of Columbia, had a President been in a combat zone. But this was only one of his many travels, observing and coordinating the strategy of global warfare. He journeyed to Quebec, to Cairo, to Teheran, and Hawaii.

In 1944 he was again overwhelmingly elected on a platform of winning the war and establishing the peace. But the strain was beginning to tell. By this time we had 7,000,000 men overseas. We had landed in Normandy and driven the enemy back into his own country. In the Pacific the Japs were defeated in Burma, flushed from one island stronghold after another, his navy worn down by attrition and his homeland subjected to the mounting fury of B–29 bombers.

Then came the conference with Stalin and Churchill at Yalta. Those of us who saw pictures of this meeting in the newsreels became uneasy. The President was thin and drawn, his cheeks hollow, and he wore a shawl around his shoulders. When he came back to report to Congress the anxiety of those who saw him deepened. Then he left for Warm Springs. Already he was preparing for the great peace, whose foundations would be built at the forthcoming San Francisco Conference of the United Nations. His armies were at the gates of Berlin and Tokyo. Victory was in sight. And the next task was the job of organizing the peoples of the world into a family of nations—with security and opportunity for all. On the afternoon of April 12, 1945, he was working on his papers when he looked up and said: "I have a terrific headache." In a few minutes he had lost consciousness. At 3:35 p. m. he died, of a massive cerebral hemorrhage.

The world was stunned. Common people in every country wept openly when they heard that their friend was gone. The most striking thing about his death was that millions took it as a personal loss. One of his "Young Guard" Democrats, Representative LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, said: "There are plenty of us left here to try to block and run interference, as he had taught us, but the man who carried the ball is gone—gone. He was just like a daddy to me always; he always talked to me just that way. He was the one person I ever knew, anywhere, who was never afraid. God, how he could take it for us all."

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt said, when informed of the death of the President:

"I am more sorry for the people of the country and the world than I am for us."

The First Lady received Vice President Truman in her second floor sitting room which adjoins the President's bedroom in the White House.

She told Truman "the President has just passed away."

"What can I do?" Truman said.

"Tell us what we can do," Mrs. Roosevelt replied. "Is there any way we can help you?"

There was the valiant spirit working through those close to him, reaching out to help all people. The true mark of greatness is the unselfish devotion which it inspires in others.

We meet to honor the personality of Franklin D. Roosevelt. We shall perpetuate it, as he would want us to, not in backward-looking requiem but in the spirit that never dies. We shall carry into our private lives and our public duties the gallant and generous love of mankind which was his.

And as we journey up the staircase of time, that great heart shall never be far away. In times of doubt and stress we shall hear his friendly voice saying: "Carry on. There is nothing to fear but fear itself."

Franklin D. Roosevelt showed the way. With his spirit still with us—we shall follow through, as better men and better Americans to finish the job he so nobly began. F. D. R. lives on—in us.

In the name of the junior board of the YMHA this plaque is dedicated to the continuing inspiration which he gives to our American way of life.

A Tax Exemption for Doctors

REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, today we hear a great deal about the shortage of doctors and surgeons and dentists. Accusations have been made that the War and Navy Departments are hoarding these trained professionals to the detriment of civilian public health. Yet it is obvious that even in many service hospitals there are barely enough doctors and nurses to care adequately for those who have been physically or mentally wounded and who are certainly entitled to every bit of the finest curative talent available.

Proposals are also being made for various kinds of governmental control of the medical profession—socialized medicine as it is called—by which all doctors receive a stipend from government and would be empowered in some instances to prescribe for and operate upon citizens against the will of the patient.

None of these proposals is a logical development of the American system of recognizing, promoting, and rewarding individual choice and achievement. In our earlier history pioneer medicos were rewarded for their frequently ill-paid devotion by a very special place in the community, high respect from their fellow citizens and patients, and payment in lovingly prepared delicacies where cash was scarce. Those times have largely vanished. To become a doctor, a surgeon, a dentist now requires some 8 or 9 years of unremunerative and expensive schooling. Until he has completed all this, usually by the time he is 29 or 30, the doctor cannot even begin to earn his own bread and salt, much less begin to repay himself for the costs of learning his profession.

In addition, as every informed person knows, all reputable medical practitioners give a considerable portion of their time to treatment of patients who are unable to pay for the services in any way—except by gratitude. Surveys as to the amount of these unpaid services indicate that the percentages ranges from around 30 to 45 of all treatments given. This is a direct contribution on the part of the physician, surgeon, or dentist to the public welfare. In addition are the hours spent without pay in public research work, on hospital boards, and boards of charitable organizations. All this must be chalked up to professional devotion since it results in no return and often requires the practitioner to lengthen his working day to 15 or 16 hours or more in times of epidemic. There are no limits possible on a doctor's working day.

Under all these circumstances it seems obvious that one of the ways to restore the medical profession to its privileged place in the community and to attract the necessary number of young men and women into its ranks for future care of public health is to recognize the time spent in strictly public service by crediting such time as a deduction on the income which physicians, surgeons, and dentists actually receive from patients who can pay for service rendered. That is the reason for my introducing a measure to grant such income-tax exemptions to members of the medical and dental professions.

Democrats Continue to Hold Lead in Cities

REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1946

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, those who have lately been giving the Eightieth Congress to the Republicans may well pause to observe the results of the recent Gallup poll which sampled the sentiment of voters in the large metropolitan centers.

The survey showed that if an election were held today over two-thirds of the voters in the 13 largest cities in the country would support Democratic candidates. These cities accounted for more than one-fifth of all the major party votes cast in 1940. The preponderance of Democratic voters was even greater than that registered in the 1940 and 1944 elections.

Another sampling of voter opinion in cities of from 100,000 to 500,000 population showed almost the same results.

Here is decisive evidence that the people—and especially organized labor—recognize the gains that have been made

under the Democratic administrations since 1933. Here is proof that they are determined not to relinquish these gains by switching their allegiance to a party that longs for a return to the good old days of special privilege for the few at the expense of the public as a whole.

If these sagacious voters want to see something that will provide a vindication of their good sense—if they want to witness an example of what would happen under a Republican Congress—I recommend that they pay particularly close attention to the proceedings here in the House during the next few days.

Within a day or two we shall be considering the labor legislation that has been reported out by the Labor Committee. There have been indications that the Republicans will undertake a concerted drive to change this legislation by amending it so that it can be used as a weapon against labor.

An informed electorate is the best guarantee against the usurpation of power by those who would crush the back of labor and return this country to industrial chaos that prevailed under the last Republican regime. It is gratifying, therefore, to note that the labor districts are still solidly Democratic.

Let's Hear Cabinet Members in Our Own Forum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1946

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include two editorials from the Baltimore Sun. I only ask consideration of these by Members of Congress:

[From the Baltimore Sun of January 20, 1946]

MORE EVIDENCE OF THE NEED FOR MR. KEFAUVER'S QUESTION PERIOD

On Tuesday General Eisenhower appeared before a large audience in the Library of Congress and made a speech. It was a good speech and on a gravely urgent subject. In a word, the general, as Chief of Staff, was telling Americans that if they want to keep conquered nations down, as all Americans do, they will have to have an army to do it with.

What audience did the general choose to hear this speech? Oh, a Washington audience, mostly men in the middle or later years, bright men by their looks, fairly well off, intelligently interested in the subject matter. Any other thing to remark about the audience? Well, they did happen to be Members of the Congress of the United States.

But if this was the Congress of the United States listening to a discussion of high state policy by the Chief of Staff on a question of supreme national import, why did it all take place in the Library of Congress? Why was the meeting procedurally and technically informal? Why were there no questions from the floor? Why was this historic confrontation of the military and the civilian legislative authority so carefully disguised as just such a public lecture as might have taken place at the grange hall in any rural village of the Republic?

If you want a really comprehensive answer to that question, delivered with obvious though controlled passion, and with a wealth of historical background and constitutional perspective, talk to the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER, Representative in Congress for the Third Congressional District of Tennessee. For Mr. KEFAUVER is in this, as in several previous Congresses, sponsor of a resolution which would provide for a "report and question period." And the purpose of this question-period resolution is precisely to allow men like General Eisenhower to appear before the full House of Representatives and give reports on high policy in a wholly formal and official way.

As Mr. KEFAUVER sees this question-period idea, it would permit the House committees to invite any Cabinet member or agency chief to appear before the whole body of the House. Questions would be prepared in writing in advance for the visitor to answer. In this way the whole House membership could hear what the answer was. What is more, the visitor would have to appear but once where, under the present system, he may have to say the same thing before a half dozen different committees without even then reaching the full House membership.

It is true that the Kefauver plan would not cover both House and Senate, as did the Library of Congress meeting Tuesday. There may be kinks of various kinds that will have to be ironed out. But by and large the fact that General Eisenhower, like Messrs. Stimson and Patterson before him, has had to take this extraordinary and informal way of laying his case before the National Legislature argues a certain defect in our constitutional practice. No one has diagnosed this defect better or prescribed for it more ingeniously than Mr. KEFAUVER. It is time his colleagues listened to what he says.

[From the Baltimore Sun of January 21, 1946]

MR. HULL SHOWED THE WAY

President Truman's annual message to Congress this year comes at a time when relations between the White House and the Capitol are less satisfactory than at any time in recent memory.

Congress did little in the 4 months prior to the Christmas adjournment to carry out the recommendations which the President included in a lengthy message last September. Chagrined by the delays, the President went to the microphone in the first week of the new year to urge that citizens write letters to their Congressmen demanding action.

Now the President sends up a new message restating and amplifying his program. The efficiency of our system of government in a period of grave domestic strain depends on the sort of teamwork which marks the consideration of the latest set of recommendations. This matter of teamwork between the executive and legislative arms is as important in its way as the reorganization of Congress, which was discussed in this space last week.

Indeed, there is a close relation between the two subjects. The reorganization of Congress is necessary to promote legislative efficiency just as the reorganization of the executive departments is necessary to bring about administrative efficiency. But governmental efficiency in the larger sense depends upon the harmonious cooperation of the two arms.

Such cooperation has depended in the past more on chance and personalities than on formal procedures. Strong Presidents, like Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt, have by the sheer force of their leadership and the adroit use of patronage managed to create close ties between the White House and the Capitol. With weaker Presidents in the White House the ties have tended to disappear and Congress and the President have taken divergent courses, with the result that public policy has remained static for considerable periods of time.

Mr. Truman is not the strong President Mr. Roosevelt or Mr. Wilson was. Unless special efforts are made, his course and that of Congress may easily diverge. Such a divergence, with its paralyzing effect on Government, would at this time be a calamity. To prevent it should be a major object of concern on both sides.

Prevention requires compromise. That is to say, Mr. Truman cannot adopt a stiff-necked attitude and insist on his own way on every issue. Nor can Congress override the President at all times. If the energies of the two arms of the Government are to be joined in meeting the emergencies that lie ahead, there must be real give-and-take teamwork. With a run-of-mine President like Mr. Truman this calls for special procedures and organization.

How can teamwork be organized? The key to this question is to be found in the consultative procedure initiated by former Secretary Hull in preparation for the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, at which the preliminary draft of the United Nations Charter was agreed on. In anticipation of that conference Mr. Hull asked for the appointment of a bipartisan subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to assist in working out plans for an international organization. The committee was appointed, and its members were in close touch with the State Department throughout the whole period of the Dumbarton Oaks meeting and also in connection with the San Francisco Conference.

As a result of these consultations congressional advice was continuously available to the State Department and the President, and they were able to shape American policy accordingly. At the same time congressional leaders in the field of foreign affairs were constantly informed as to the developing interchanges with foreign governments, and their attitude toward policy was in no small degree influenced by the knowledge so acquired.

In other words, there was in the management of foreign affairs in this tremendously important enterprise a constant interweaving of executive and legislative influences. The success here at home of the program which has now brought American delegates to the UNO meeting in London is due in great measure to the arrangement which Mr. Hull suggested.

While the Hull procedure was designed to promote a nonpartisan consideration of foreign affairs as well as to secure congressional cooperation, there is no reason why it could not be adapted to the formulation of domestic policy. It would perhaps be too much to expect the cooperation of the minority party in shaping domestic measures, but arrangements could easily be made to set up Democratic congressional committees to consult with the President and his advisers on labor policy, on tax policy, on price controls, on agriculture, and perhaps other important subjects. If the consultations were conducted in the give-and-take spirit which marked the interchanges between Secretary Hull and the senatorial subcommittee on foreign affairs the effect would be beneficial.

By the use of such committees congressional influence would be brought into play in the formulation of administrative policy. A better knowledge of the grave difficulties which the administration is encountering would at the same time be brought home to congressional leaders. Given a desire in both branches of the Government to rise above petty bickering, such arrangements would lead to a greater degree of understanding and teamwork as between the two branches.

This procedure has the advantage of being extra-legal. That is to say, it could be set up without passage of any law. The only necessity would be a decision on the part of the President and the members of the

Cabinet to take this means of promoting better relations with Congress. Or, again, congressional leaders could take the initiative and approach the President with proposals of this kind.

This is not, of course, the only means of strengthening the ties between the executive and legislative arms of the Government. Other proposals of a more formal nature have frequently been suggested. The plan of Representative KEFAUVER of Tennessee to have members of the Cabinet and the heads of independent offices appear before the House and Senate at stated times to submit to questioning is especially noteworthy in this connection. The procedure used by Secretary Hull and the one proposed by Mr. KEFAUVER are not necessarily exclusive. Both might well be used.

The basic requirement is that practical procedures be set up to promote the cooperation which has been left to chance and personalities in the past. Any arrangement which provides Congress with continuous information as to what the executive departments are doing and thinking and which also provides the executive departments and the President with continuous congressional advice will contribute to this end.

MacArthur Winning Peace in Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 30, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Walter W. Van Kirk is secretary of the department of international justice and good will of the Federal Council of Churches, and recently he had the privilege, with others, to visit Japan. In the Christian Century of January 23, 1946, there appears a most interesting article by him on the situation in Japan. He pays a high compliment to General MacArthur. I am certain this article is of interest to all members. I include the article, as follows:

WINNING THE PEACE IN JAPAN

(By Walter W. Van Kirk)

The political, economic, and educational reforms initiated in Japan by General MacArthur indicate that the peace may be won in that country. This is the unanimous view of the Christian deputation that visited Japan.

Promptly upon our arrival in Tokyo we were invited by General MacArthur to a luncheon conference in the American Embassy. In the course of this 3-hour interview we were given a broad outline of the occupation policy which the Allied commander believed essential to the establishment of a free and democratic Japan. As far as MacArthur is concerned freedom for the Japanese people is more than a political shibboleth. "The war was fought," he said, "to make Japan free and I am determined to give these people their freedom." The issue, we were told, was not one of a soft peace or a hard peace, but a just peace.

"The Japanese people," MacArthur said to us, "were the only warlike people in Asia. If now these people can be given their freedom they will not again choose war. People who are free are not warlike. Wars are made by leaders. Wars do not come up out of the minds of free people. If Japan can now be led into the ways of freedom there should be peace in the Pacific for a thousand years."

MAC ARTHUR A STATESMAN

I am not one of those who believe that freedom and its concomitant blessings can be fully brought to a conquered people by an army of occupation. Freedom and democracy are the byproducts of an inner compulsion, not of externally applied pressure. But it is a matter of the greatest significance to the peace of the Pacific that in General MacArthur the Japanese people have found a friend who possesses rare gifts of statesmanship.

Accordingly, our deputation felt that we were witnessing, while in Japan, the beginning stages of one of the most remarkable reform movements in history. We saw an army of occupation everywhere hailed as an army of deliverance. This demonstration of confidence in General MacArthur and his associates is explained by the fact that the Japanese masses are entirely convinced that the present policy of the occupation authorities is designed to create a new and better Japan.

General MacArthur has scrapped the Japanese sword. With a rare understanding of oriental psychology he has pulled the props from under the military. The most unpopular people in Japan today are the war lords and their jingoistic compatriots. I am confident that if the prosecution of the Japanese militarists were left to the people whom they deceived the job would be well done. General MacArthur has dealt sternly with the notorious "thought" police. For the first time since the outbreak of the Manchurian affair the Japanese people are free to think and to express their convictions without fear of being manhandled and thrown into prison. They know that if their own military masters had won the war this freedom would have been denied them.

CHANGES IN CONSTITUTION

General MacArthur had no sooner been installed in Tokyo than he began pressing for changes in the imperial constitution. Certain of the desired changes have already been approved by the Diet. The primary purpose is the democratization of Japanese society, and the substitution of freedom for regimentation. The new constitution will guarantee freedom of speech, press, religion, and education. The sovereignty of the Emperor will be restricted and the sovereignty of the people will be expanded. The right of labor to bargain will be recognized. The existing peers law will be revised and the arbitrary legislative power once possessed by the House of Peers will be no more. There was such a favorable public response to these suggested changes in the constitution that a number of princes forthwith renounced all privileged status and declared that hereafter they would regard themselves as ordinary subjects. The most formidable obstacle to the revision of the constitution was removed when Emperor Hirohito in his New Year rescript told his people that emperors of Japan are not divine and that the Japanese are neither superior to other races nor destined to rule the world.

In the new political structure there will be litle if any opportunity for the Japanese jingoists to influence the shape of things. In one of his most recent directives, General MacArthur has ordered the Japanese Government to remove from public office and to ban from the coming general election all active exponents of military nationalism including officers of the army and navy, "influential" members of Japanese nationalist or secret patriotic societies, and all officers, directors, and local heads of the Imperial Rule Assistance Association and the Imperial Rule Political Society. These blatant protagonists of military aggression are slapped down in a most thoroughgoing manner. Slapped down, too, are the members of controling war boards, the governors and administrative council members of conquered territories, and "any person who has denounced or contributed to the seizure of opponents of the military regime."

FASCIST ORGANIZATIONS GONE

Gone with the wind are the notorious Black Dragon Society, the Greater East Asia Association, the Great Japan Renovation Society and the Great Japan Asia Alliance. The members of the new Japanese Diet may be political novices but they can at least be counted upon to give more than lip service to the building of a new and democratic Japan. Seldom, if ever, has there been such a thorough liquidation of a once proud and boastful military caste. How far underground these militaristic patrioteers have been or may yet be driven remains to be seen. But they have been driven underground. And while they are underground the Japanese people will be free to fashion a new Japan without fear of the coercive pressures once exercised by the saber rattlers.

On the economic front the feudalistic system of land tenure has fallen under the MacArthur ban. With the issuance of this directive the system of absentee ownership was dealt a body blow. The Japanese Government was given until March 15 to formulate a program of rural reform that would do two things: Facilitate transfer of land from absentee owners to land operators, and provide for the purchase of farm lands by the tenant from nonoperating owners in annual installments and at reasonable rates of interest. It was further specified that the Japanese Government must provide credit for the purchase of landlords' holdings, stabilize farm prices and protect yesterday's tenants against a possible return to a sharecropper status. Moreover, it was requested that plans be drafted for the diffusion of technical and other information of assistance to the farming class and that a program be fostered designed to accelerate the agricultural cooperative movement.

ECONOMIC AIMS

The over-all purpose of this directive was said to be "to destroy the economic bondage that has enslaved the Japanese farmer during centuries of feudal oppression," and to establish a system insuring "that those who till the soil of Japan shall have a more equal opportunity to enjoy the fruits of their labor." MacArthur knows full well that such a sweeping agrarian reform cannot be accomplished overnight. But he is determined to smash the economic power of the absentee landlords who habitually worked hand in glove with the militarists. For the first time the farmers of Japan have been given a vision of economic freedom.

Included also in the economic reforms initiated by General MacArthur is the directive ordering the Japanese Government to impose a 100-percent war-profits tax on all war industries, to levy a graduated tax up to 100 percent on all other corporations and individuals, to impose a graduated capital levy up to 70 percent, and to abolish the military pension system. The end sought by this directive is not so much the blueprinting of a permanent economic structure as the political and financial penalizing of the interests that coined swollen fortunes out of the blood of the Japanese masses. Neither Hirohito nor his imperial household is exempt from the specifications of this directive. It is expected that the recapturing of war profits, together with the capital levy, will yield in excess of 100,000,000,000 yen, thus providing a comparatively sounder financial basis for the protection of a peace economy.

Kindred in purpose is MacArthur's directive aimed at the breaking up of the zaibatsu, the monopolistic industrial combines. This reform was getting well under way while we were in Japan. I have in my files a copy of the Nippon Times with a front-page story on the dissolution of the Mitsui interests and the prospective dissolution of the Mitsubishi, Sumitoma, and Yasuda interests. The zaibatsu provided the Japanese military with

the economic sinews of war. Just as the militarists are deprived of their swords, so the zaibatsu are to be deprived of their banks, their holding companies, and their directorships. The four companies specifically dissolved controlled about 40 percent of the country's economy. Through interlocking stock ownership and intermarriage this small number of industrial czars had a stranglehold upon the Japanese people. That hand has been pried loose from the necks of Nippon's underprivileged.

A FREE PRESS

The one-time power of the zaibatsu over the press and other media of publicity has been smashed. The newspapers of Japan are freer today than for many decades. Clearly seeing the handwriting on the wall, the chairmen of many of the boards of directors of the various industrial and financial combines controlled by the zaibatsu began resigning while we were in Japan. In thus encouraging free enterprise, the occupation authorities are leading the Japanese into the ways of economic freedom.

Of crucial importance to the reform movement in Japan is the directive revamping the educational process. The official in charge of this program is Col. Ken R. Dyke, chief of the civil information and education section of general headquarters. Our deputation talked with Colonel Dyke on several occasions while in Tokyo. "This is one of the most vital directives of the occupation," the colonel told us. "Carrying it out will change the entire way of thinking of the Japanese people." We were advised that the over-all aim of this directive is to prevent the dissemination of "militaristic and ultranationalistic ideology." It prohibits all military education and drill. It provides for instruction on representative government, international peace and the dignity of the individual. A clause in the memorandum prohibits discrimination against any student, educator or official on grounds of race, creed, nationality, political opinion or social position. Textbooks and other instruction material are being examined and portions which promote the militaristic spirit are being deleted. There is to be free and unrestricted discussion of political, civil, and religious subjects. Consideration of the objectives and policies of the occupation is being encouraged.

DISMISSAL OF TEACHERS

Teachers and educational officials were being examined during our stay in Japan. Persons who had been active exponents of militarism and ultranationalism, and those antagonistic to the policies of the occupation, were being removed. Teachers who had been dismissed, suspended, or forced to resign for liberal or antimilitaristic opinions or activities were being reinstated.

Mission schools and other educational institutions sponsored by Christians of other countries are included in the investigations now under way. We talked with the president of one of these institutions who had just been informed that he was to be removed. The reason given was that he had had certain connections with the Navy in his earlier years. Officials of certain other mission schools who are believed to have violated the charter of these institutions for military or quasi-military purposes are also being relieved of their duties.

Subsequent to our leaving Japan, General MacArthur ordered the immediate suspension of all courses in geography, morals, and Japanese history. All textbooks and teachers' manuals in these and related subjects are to be collected and shipped to pulping centers where they will be destroyed and turned into new paper for use in printing new textbooks consistent with the directives on education. The Minister of Education has been instructed to prepare and submit to headquarters plans for the preparation of new texts in the suspended courses. It is hoped that these new texts will be ready to print by the spring of this year.

We held several conferences with Mr. Mayeda, the Education Minister, one a luncheon conference in his official residence. Mr. Mayeda is a Christian and he impressed us as being entirely in accord with the educational policies laid down by General MacArthur. In order to determine who is, or in the future will be, acceptable as instructors or school officials, the Japanese Government has been ordered to set up suitable administrative machinery for the investigation, screening, and certification of all present and prospective teachers and educational administrators.

Here again, as in the case of other directives, the purpose is broadly one of free inquiry as opposed to authoritarian indoctrination. The people of Japan lack understanding of the essential facts pertaining to the democratic process. Years, perhaps decades, will be required before these people can fully develop the intellectual outlook of a free as over against a regimented society. The Allied directives on education mark the beginning of a process that can be made effective only by the Japanese people themselves. That the people are being given the opportunity to do precisely this is one of the outstanding accomplishments of the MacArthur regime.

Altogether, what is happening in Japan today is a historic movement of political, economic, and social reform. We of the American church deputation observed at first hand the beginnings of this revolution by consent.

Streamline the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, for as long as I can remember, and probably a long time before, there has been talk of modernizing, streamlining, and reorganizing the Congress of the United States. Congress, however, has made haste slowly in making available to itself a modernly equipped staff and facilities. It has been most generous in supplying all these needs to the executive department and to the judiciary, but has been penurious in taking care of its own needs.

The La Follette-Monroney committee has just completed its hearings and is about to make public a full report on this subject matter. Our people back home are looking to us to give full study and consideration to the suggestions and recommendations made by this committee. Today, during the transition from war to peacetime activity, it is particularly important that we be equipped with a staff of experts who are able to assist in fully appraising all legislation coming before the Congress; in holding down Government expenditures; balancing the Budget; and take immediate steps toward the liquidation of our tremendous national debt. No substantial saving or reduction in Government expenditures can be realized by mere fractional cutting of appropriations. This process has been found unscientific. Such reductions are not sufficient or efficient and can often merely paralyze some worth-while activity.

It is important that the Congress be equipped with competent staffs of experts in order that it might be able to study fully the various proposals for legislation, examine and appraise the functions of the multitudinous agencies of the Government, and decide which shall be eliminated entirely, which shall be relegated back to the States, and which shall be reduced in their scope. Only in this way can we hope to make any substantial or worth-while savings to the Nation, balance the Budget, and wipe out the debt.

As part of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I wish to incorporate an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of January 27, 1946, which comments on the preliminary report of the La Follette-Monroney committee:

STREAMLINE THE CONGRESS

The Congress, in the reorganization program that will soon be before it, has an unequaled opportunity to strengthen one of the bases of American democracy.

It is an American prerogative to berate Congress. James Bryce noted decades ago that Americans "are fond of running down Congressmen." "There is nothing new about the current claims that Congress is stupid, long-winded, obstinate, and out of step."

Thoughtful Congressmen have admitted in recent years that there is truth to some of the charges. They acknowledge that Congress is operating with machinery of pre-Civil War days. They confess that the legislative process, formulated for the simple economy of the pioneer Nation, is not adequate to the needs of today's complex government. This has resulted, they point out, in more and more of the policy making of Government being usurped by the President, his administrators, and bureau heads.

The crisis posed by this situation is one that cannot be ignored. Representative government is the heart of the democratic faith. The legislature, which is Congress, is the heart of representative government. Under our system the Congress is supposed to be the voice of the people. If the Congress cannot operate effectively, and as a result the executive powers expand into near dictatorship, how long can democracy continue?

On another page of this section is an article dealing with the reorganization plan offered last week by a subcommittee of the La Follette-Monroney committee, set up to study this problem. When the entire committee has studied the new proposals, enabling bills will be entered in Congress.

The proposed plan is comprehensive. Most of its points are good. A few may not be.

The Journal does not believe that Congressmen should be placed under the Federal pension system. It does not believe that each Congressman needs an $8,000-a-year assistant to handle nonlegislative matters.

The Journal does believe that Congressmen deserve a pay raise. We opposed it during the war when there were wage ceilings on everyone else. Now that this objection is gone, some raise would seem to be in order, although, as we have seen in Wisconsin, a raise in pay does not necessarily mean better qualified legislators.

We endorse wholeheartedly the proposal to cut the 33 standing committee in the Senate to 16 and the 48 in the House to 18. This is probably the crux of the whole streamlining program. We believe that each committee should be provided with the proposed staff of experts.

Senator LA FOLLETTE, who has long been in the forefront in this reorganization effort, pointed out in a magazine article several years ago that there is no rhyme or reason to the present committee set-up. Committees established for specific problems of a particular period are still in existence. One leg-

islative subject can come within the jurisdiction of six committees.

Such a system cannot but result in wasted effort, indecision and confusion. Senator LA FOLLETTE himself is on five regular committees and one special committee. Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, holds a record with seven regular committees and three special ones. No one can be expected to do his best work when he must thus scatter his efforts.

We endorse the proposals that the House Rules Committee clear all bills within 20 days after receiving them and that each committee hold a public hearing once a month on legislation pending before it. These provisions are essential to keep bills moving and prevent the pigeonholing of measures that do not have approval of a committee majority. It was this delaying practice that brought President Truman's rebuke to congress in his recent radio talk.

We favor the delegation to some other agency of the authority to settle claims against the Government. These private claims take up much time of Congressmen. Most of them are trivial.

The subcommittee did not, apparently, dare to touch the "sacred" seniority rule for committee chairmanships. This is the time-worn provision that committee chairmen shall be appointed on the basis of (a) length of service on the committee and (b) affiliation with the majority party. Competence plays no part in the appointment. In proposals made last year in Strengthening the Congress, a pamphlet of the National Planning Association, Robert Heller suggested various substitutes for what he termed this "generally recognized evil." It is to be hoped that the entire La Follette-Monroney committee will deal with this problem, which is so vexing because it is so bound up with traditions, emotions, and personalities.

The present Congress faces many challenging issues. This issue of reorganization, of modernization, is certainly one of the most challenging. Citizens who are deeply concerned with our future will hope that congress establishes a procedure by which it can function properly and assume its ever growing responsibilities in preserving democracy.

Saving the White House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1946

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of January 30, 1946:

SAVING THE WHITE HOUSE

President Truman was amused as well as surprised at the protest against his plan to add 7,250 square feet to the White House Executive Office Building. His reasoning was simple and honest. He hasn't enough office room for his staff. Since 1934, when the annex was last remodeled, some clerical employees have had to work underground. A meeting place is needed and possibly a place to eat. With the approval of the Fine Arts Commission, the President decided last December that the required space could be secured by building a new structure on ground south of the present offices, along West Executive Avenue. This structure, he added, could be seen only from the avenue or from the air. What harm could it do?

The original harm may have been done when the Executive Office Building was put up, under the Presidency of Theodore Roosevelt. That building has ever since impaired the view of the White House from the west, as well as from the air—and an increasing number of people are bound to look at Washington from the air. The proposed new building will add to the clutter. There would be more popular enthusiasm for taking down the original office building and transferring the Presidential offices to the State Department Building across the street. A President could surely commute that far without undue hardship, and he would have the inestimable advantage of a home that is really a home and not in part a factory.

If President Truman is a wise man he will bow to the opposition that has shown itself in the House of Representatives and elsewhere. The American people have a few sensitive points, among which is a reverence for historic structures. The present uproar is not, as Mr. Truman called it, a "tempest in a teapot." The White House stands for something, and so does the lot on which it sits. If new utilitarian buildings are added now more will be needed a generation hence and still more a generation after that. In time the White House will be the center of a high-class Executive Office slum. Does anyone want that? Does Mr. Truman want it? Of course not.

Our International Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 30 (legislative day Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a copy of an able address delivered by the Honorable Alf M. Landon, of Kansas, on January 28, 1946, before the Kansas Women's Republican Club annual meeting at Topeka, Kans., on the subject of Our International Policies. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Both the momentous political and military policies involved in our foreign relations demand the most thorough and searching debate and discussion so that the American people may know exactly what they are doing and why.

Our democracy has survived and fostered a great nation because of the ability of the people to grasp issues and dominate their solution.

The double talk and conflicting actions which the administration has given the American people, has left them in doubt and confusion. This has had a disastrous effect both at home and in the world. "Bread of deceit is sweet to man, but afterward his mouth shall be filled with gravel."

In the British financial proposal, for the first time a fundamental question of international policy is placed squarely before the entire Congress for discussion and debate.

I urge the Congress not to decide the British deal on snap judgment—the way the administration has been making its decisions on matters of the gravest import to the American people.

This is not the occasion to embark on a detailed discussion of the terms of the proposed British financing agreement.

But I hope whatever the debate over those details—that the Congress and the American people will not lose sight of the fundamental question of national policy involved.

I believe the issue is primarily a political one.

If the Congress bogs down in discussing only what we are getting and what they are getting, it will be in danger of passing up one of the most important benefits to be derived from the debate—namely the broader aspects of American foreign policy.

The great thing is that what we do shall be based on a consistent policy which the American people will support because they understand and approve it.

The mismanagement of our international relations has brought us to the place where it is vitally essential to America to keep the British Empire a going concern—strong in a world concert of nations.

Not to keep Great Britain strong would be to abandon the continent of Europe to Russia. If that happens, the weight of Russia falls across Asia as well as Europe.

Now let me say right here that I am not as much afraid of Russia or of Russia's purposes as a good many are.

We are dealing there with a strong people who have long been repressed in many directions by the outside world, and who now, feeling themselves strong, are asserting themselves in unreasonable ways.

I think we should be patient and fair with Russia—but firm. Much more firm than we have been, in standing for those principles and those international ideologies which—as far as we are concerned—were definitely involved in both World Wars. It is obvious as negotiations go on, adjustments must be made. Adjustments on details, but not principles.

By patience and fairness I do not mean appeasement. The people of the United States should be fully aware of the dangers of appeasement. Yet, aside from Germany, our foreign policy has been one of conceding today what we refused yesterday.

Our foreign policy at Moscow was different from our foreign policy at Yalta, at the Council of Ministers in London or at San Francisco.

At Moscow we conceded to Russia's demands that the Big Three write the peace—that she be permitted to dictate the peace and redraw the map of eastern Europe and the Balkans.

On October 31 Secretary Byrnes said:

"We cannot recognize regional arrangements as a substitute for a world system. To do so would not promote the common and paramount interests of all nations, large and small, in world peace."

That statement is completely in accord with the UNO set-up. It is in line with what Byrnes tried to do last September at the Council of Ministers in London. But at Moscow he walked out on the UNO Charter and the obligations we made at San Francisco.

Just 10 days ago there came another shocking example of this administration retreat from the San Francisco Charter and Secretary Byrnes' October 31 position.

At the very moment Secretary Byrnes was participating in organization of the UNO, the Assistant Secretary of State, in New York, in thinly veiled language, urged punitive action against Argentina, regardless of article 33 of the UNO.

To quote the very informing and farsighted Washington news letter, Human Events:

"Without mentioning Argentina by name, but unmistakably defining that nation as his target, Mr. Braden said, 'there is nothing in the book of diplomatic etiquette that requires us to embrace the enemies of our way of life.' Pulling no punches, he then made pointed references to the typically Fascist government in this hemisphere; compared its alleged threat to peace with that of Nazi Germany; and argued that the good-neighbor policy must not be construed as

meaning tolerance for an American republic which is governed by such a dictatorship."

"Apparently Mr. Braden did not realize, in making this speech, that he was attacking a government which is a fellow member of the United Nations. His official denunciations, as made public by the Department of State, come perilously close to violating the first paragraph of article 33 of the San Francisco Charter, which reads:

"The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice.

"Now, regardless of our obligations under the Charter, we are officially threatening a fellow member of the United Nations with punitive action."

Why, if that is our fundamental policy toward Argentina, did we use all our strength and influence, to get her into the UNO at San Francisco?

We were either wrong then—or wrong now.

It is simply another illustration of the complete inconsistency and expediency that is lowering American prestige and influence throughout the world.

The consequences of our actions at Moscow, our policies in the Pacific, and Assistant Secretary of State Braden's New York speech, are to weaken world confidence in our wholehearted support of the principles of collective security as stated in the UNO Charter.

People are wondering whether this administration is completely ignorant in the concrete application of those principles and are confusing internationalism with imperialism—or whether the national administration actions are not inconsistent but a definite policy of building an alternative to the UNO.

In any event, at the critical moment of the birth of the UNO, our policies are bound to create doubts as to our confidence in its workability and as to our sincerity in abiding by its terms.

Again, we reversed ourselves when we accepted at Moscow a control council for Japan, and the idea of an Asiatic commission. The worst of it is the Moscow agreement was so loosely drawn that Secretary Byrnes barely reached home before the argument started over what was actually the intent of the Big Three. It is already being differently interpreted in different countries. Thus, it already is another source of mistrust and suspicion that is the curse of the world. President Truman also must have been conversant with and a party to this appeasement policy.

In any event, no one can deny that our Government on all these points has made a long retreat from its previously announced position. If we were right before, we are wrong now. No one can claim the Moscow agreement is a democratic approach to peace settlements.

To quote Phillip Simms, "To a vast majority of the United Nations the outstanding tragedy of the Big Three meeting at Moscow was the Anglo-American surrender to the Soviet thesis that world rule belongs to the great.

"Even France—not to mention Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, and others—was banished from the European peace table. Yet, from the point of view of the United States, Britain, and free peoples everywhere, it is highly important that France be restored to her rightful place.

"That world rule belongs only to the great was the foundation of nazism and fascism. It was against this conception that the United States entered the conflict against the Axis in 1940, more than a year before our shooting war began at Pearl Harbor. It was to abolish this ideology that the people of America went into debt for $250,000,000,000 and sent hundreds of thousands of their sons to die on battlefields all over the world. World rule by a few means carrying Nazi-Fascist-Communist totalitarianism from the national to the international level. Within the Kremlin, a few men decide who shall rule the Soviet Union and how. The 190,000,000 people of that vast country have no voice whatsoever in the proceedings. Once in a while they are allowed to put their cross on the one-party ticket which the dictatorship has arranged for them.

"According to the Molotov-Byrnes-Bevin formula, the new world order is to be conducted in much the same way. First, in effect, the Big Three will dictate the peace and allow the smaller powers to give it their O. K. Then, by means of their veto the Big Three will be able to control the UNO.

"World peace based on any such arrangement, declares Australia's Foreign Minister, Dr. Herbert V. Evatt, will not work. The attempt to make it work, he says in the January number of Foreign Affairs, is largely responsible for the present world-wide pessimism and disillusionment."

We see the same undemocratic procedure slowly gaining ground at home. The agreements made at Casablanca, at Teheran, at Yalta, at Potsdam, at Moscow, all have the effects of treaties. None of them were ever submitted to the United States Senate. Exemption was claimed by the President because of their temporary character and military necessity. Their character proved to be permanent instead of temporary. Military necessity no longer exists. My point is that these executive agreements, dealing as they do virtually with the division of the world, and made with more or less snap judgments, are perilous. The danger is that they deprive the Senate and the American people from considered decisions on foreign policies according to our Constitution.

We have not been very realistic in our foreign policies. We have allowed the "hallelujah" aspect, on the one hand, and the forces of hate and revenge, on the other, to dominate our foreign policies. We have built a roof without laying the foundation that is prerequisite of world peace—world organization or no world organization.

The world, mystified by America's inconsistent foreign policy and fearing we are drifting away from the UNO, and never being very confident of its success, is threatening to divide once again into spheres of influence and power blocs that have always meant trouble and grief for mankind.

Therefore, we must attempt to work out a stable world equilibrium. In order to do that, Britain's potency must be maintained one way or another.

We have got to face the facts whether we like them or not. It would be a calamity, at this state of world affairs, if the spheres of influence drop to two major powers. Therefore, we must try to keep the British Empire going. We must bring back into the world picture, as rapidly as we can, France, the Netherlands, the Scandinavian countries, Spain, Italy, Germany, China, and Japan.

But unless we immediately and forthwith reverse some of our policies—both foreign and domestic—I believe there is no chance of us accomplishing our purpose and on our own position will steadily deteriorate.

The cruel and infamous Morgenthau plan is responsible for keeping our armies of occupation in Europe in such large numbers—for the colossal suffering and avoidable loss of life in Europe this winter—for the failure to draft a just and decent peace that will preserve some of the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

The entire break-down of the economic and political structure of Germany—for which the unworkable Morgenthau plan is primarily responsible—is preventing the reconstruction of Europe and tranquilizing the world. It is costly to the American taxpayers and prevents the sending home of our soldiers.

As I have often said, we must reverse our policies in Germany and abandon the evil Morgenthan plan, whose principles are the enemy of God, of decency, of mercy, and of common sense, if we are to build a durable peace.

Stop the New Deal policy of borrowing and borrowing—spending and spending—giving and giving. Our National Government cannot possibly carry the financial burden of the world on its shoulders, and continue to give a living to those unwilling to do an honest day's work. All issues in the end relate to a balanced budget and to economy and efficiency in Government. If we are going to achieve a sound future for the United States, the American people must not be deluded by the siren song that Government is a "sugar daddy," able to shell out money endlessly.

As far as stabilizing the world is concerned, all the money we could pour into Great Britain won't do the job—as long as our foreign policies are based on expediency, not sound principles.

Secretary of State Byrnes daily adds to his reputation as the great compromiser.

The trouble is, we always get the worst end of the dickers, with the result that we are steadily losing our stand for democratic liberalism in the world.

Compromise and inaction at home and compromise and inaction abroad is the policy of the Truman administration. The War, Navy, and State Departments are unable to agree as to our policies relating to the final disposition of the Pacific islands. Even the President's recent statement on this question, vital to our national security, was so cloudy that his own party leaders, as well as department officials, are seeking clarification as to just what the President meant. But that highly important question should have been definitely settled before our UNO delegation left for London.

No one can be sure what our foreign policies are with any degree of certainty at any time. Stop blaming our soldiers in foreign lands for losing American prestige when the lack of a clear, definite, and honest foreign policy on the part of our national administration is the main cause.

Yet, as usual, the administration is attempting to blame the people and the Congress and the soldier. "American hysteria to get the boys back home," to quote an administrative spokesman, imperils America's prestige. But eminent nonpartisan news commentators unanimously agree that our prestige is dwindling also because we have compromised our principles. That weakens our moral strength.

Let us hope that the debate on the question of the British subsidy with the representatives of the American people speaking may be the opportunity for which we have been waiting to secure for ourselves and the world, a clarification of our national policy, so that we may hereafter direct all of our international arrangements—not only the British loan—consistently with the conviction.

Congress, as I said before, has its first opportunity to make certain that America does have a clearly defined national foreign policy and to participate in what that policy shall be in the future. And let me emphasize once again that our foreign policy involves the size and the duration of our armies of occupation.

Once our foreign policy is clearly defined by our representatives, and floundering and uncertainty has disappeared, it will receive the wholehearted support of the American people.

Facts About United States Steel Pay Rolls and Profits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 30, 1946

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, in view of the vigorous discussion on the floor of the House about United States Steel, and industry generally, Members may find some factual material both interesting and enlightening.

The earnings of United States Steel in the 1944 war-year were just under $66,000,000, including interest on borrowed money. Twenty years earlier, in 1925, the earnings were just under $118,000,000, similarly calculated.

In 1944, the wages of labor in the United States Steel Co. were over $957,000,000, including social security and pensions. In 1925, the payments to workers in United States Steel were just over $458,000,000.

Labor's take-home pay from United States Steel more than doubled between 1925 and 1944. But capital's earnings dropped to only a little more than one-half of what they were 20 years ago. However, the invested capital of United States Steel declined about 25 percent during these 20 years, which accounts for some shrinkage in earnings.

Stated another way, in 1925 the owners of United State Steel kept $1 in earnings for every $4 paid to labor. In 1944 the owners kept about $1 in earnings for every $15 paid out to workers. Labor's share of the United States Steel Co. income has increased in 20 years almost 400 percent.

Because capital had been thriftly saved and invested in United States Steel, American workmen in 1944 carried home over $900,000,000 in pay checks from that one firm.

Mr. Speaker, American business has produced the things that have given the humble people of America the most magnificent material blessings in the history of the world. That achievement was made possible because for the first time in history the individual man or groups of men were free to use their talents and energies to build businesses and humanity was the chief beneficiary.

Today, a great effort goes on in this country to destroy this system—the system that brought unbounded happiness and comfort to the humble people of this land.

Unfortunately, the management of American business seems unable to portray effectively its achievements, which give the average American more personal useful comforts than a king had only 100 years ago.

Certainly, the Members of Congress will be interested in the following statistics about United States Steel, in view of the present controversy:

United States Steel Corp. and subsidiaries

[In millions of dollars]

Year of operation	Employment costs	Amount earned on capital employed
1925	458.2	117.7
1926	469.3	143.5
1927	412.7	114.0
1928	402.9	139.8
1929	410.2	212.4
1930	371.7	110.0
1931	258.4	18.5
1932	138.5	[1] 65.9
1933	167.9	[1] 31.3
1934	214.8	[1] 16.6
1935	253.9	6.1
1936	339.0	55.4
1937	447.1	100.0
1938	294.4	.6
1939	386.6	50.4
1940	464.3	115.8
1941	628.3	122.2
1942	782.7	77.4
1943	912.9	68.9
1944	957.2	65.8
Total	[2] 8,771.0	[3] 1,404.7

[1] Deficit.
[2] Paid to workers.
[3] Available to investors.

During this 20-year period, the average percentage Steel earned on its investment was 3.52 percent. In 1944 the percentage earned on the capital employed was less than 4 percent. It was 3.79 percent. Do you wonder why risk capital is disappearing in the United States? This factual data about United States Steel should give you part of the answer.

Mr. Speaker, I have no especial regard for United States Steel. As a matter of record, I am strongly opposed to the concentration of economic power represented by United States Steel and similar industrial giants. I have long believed that such concentration of economic power automatically brings dangerous concentration of political power. Current events seem to demonstrate the accuracy of that belief.

However, I believe Congress should have the facts about what is happening in the American system of free enterprise. Our deliberations should reflect a factual appraisal of the actual situation. I have somewhat hastily prepared the foregoing tables, but the facts recorded are matters of official record.

Harry Hopkins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VITO MARCANTONIO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 30, 1946

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post:

"A GREAT AMERICAN IS GONE FROM US"—CHURCHILL PRAISES HOPKINS FOR SERVICE TO WORLD CAUSE

MIAMI BEACH, FLA., January 29.—Former British Prime Minister Winston Churchill tonight expressed profound grief at the death of Harry Hopkins, and declared "a great American is gone from us."

"A strong, bright, fierce flame has burned out a frail body," Churchill said in a statement issued here, adding:

"Few know better than I the services he rendered to the world cause. President Roosevelt had the gift of choosing generous and noble spirits to help him in peace and war.

"In Harry Hopkins he found a man not only of wide ranging vision but piercing eye. He always went to the root of the matter.

"I have been present at several great conferences where 20 or more of the most important executive personages were gathered together. When the discussion flagged and all seemed baffled, it was on these occasions he would rap out the deadly question: 'Surely, Mr. President, here is the point we have got to settle. Are we going to face it or not?'

"Faced it always was and being faced, was conquered.

"He was a true leader of men, and alike in ardor and in wisdom in time of crisis, he has rarely been excelled.

"His love for the causes of the weak and the poor was matched by his passion against tyranny, especially when tyranny was for the time triumphant.

"To dynamic, compulsive and persuasive force he added humor and charm in an exceptional degree.

"We do well to salute his memory. We shall not see his like again."

Sale of Surplus Men's Clothing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. HOOK
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 30, 1946

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article:

CIO PROPOSES SHIRT SEIZURE

(By Gordon H. Cole)

WASHINGTON, January 30.—The CIO today urged President Truman to seize and market as surplus property, the estimated 3,000,000 men's shirts and 400,000 men's suits now being withheld from the market by manufacturers in anticipation of higher ceiling prices.

This action followed disclosures that:

The Manhattan Shirt Co., and a few smaller firms, gambling on the collapse of OPA, or serious relaxation of its regulations, had concentrated their production exclusively on high-priced shirts. (Since last June OPA has required manufacturers to produce low and medium-priced shirts in the same proportion as they did during 1943.)

Other manufacturers were withholding shirts from the stores and limiting their production until OPA decides how much of the recent increases granted the cotton mills will be passed on to the shirt makers.

Suit manufacturers are withholding their product awaiting issuance of a new price regulation by OPA from which they expect higher profits.

Some manufacturers refused to believe OPA would hold to its low-price order of last June and went ahead and made high-price articles. These shirts are now in warehouses. Manhattan, because of its disregard for OPA's regulation, has an estimated 1,200,000 shirts on hand.

The basic fact in the shirt shortage, however, is a problem in production. According to experts, the industry is now producing at

meaning tolerance for an American republic which is governed by such a dictatorship."

"Apparently Mr. Braden did not realize, in making this speech, that he was attacking a government which is a fellow member of the United Nations. His official denunciations, as made public by the Department of State, come perilously close to violating the first paragraph of article 33 of the San Francisco Charter, which reads:

"The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice.

"Now, regardless of our obligations under the Charter, we are officially threatening a fellow member of the United Nations with punitive action."

Why, if that is our fundamental policy toward Argentina, did we use all our strength and influence, to get her into the UNO at San Francisco?

We were either wrong then—or wrong now.

It is simply another illustration of the complete inconsistency and expediency that is lowering American prestige and influence throughout the world.

The consequences of our actions at Moscow, our policies in the Pacific, and Assistant Secretary of State Braden's New York speech, are to weaken world confidence in our wholehearted support of the principles of collective security as stated in the UNO Charter.

People are wondering whether this administration is completely ignorant in the concrete application of those principles and are confusing internationalism with imperialism—or whether the national administration actions are not inconsistent but a definite policy of building an alternative to the UNO.

In any event, at the critical moment of the birth of the UNO, our policies are bound to create doubts as to our confidence in its workability and as to our sincerity in abiding by its terms.

Again, we reversed ourselves when we accepted at Moscow a control council for Japan, and the idea of an Asiatic commission. The worst of it is the Moscow agreement was so loosely drawn that Secretary Byrnes barely reached home before the argument started over what was actually the intent of the Big Three. It is already being differently interpreted in different countries. Thus, it already is another source of mistrust and suspicion that is the curse of the world. President Truman also must have been conversant with and a party to this appeasement policy.

In any event, no one can deny that our Government on all these points has made a long retreat from its previously announced position. If we were right before, we are wrong now. No one can claim the Moscow agreement is a democratic approach to peace settlements.

To quote Phillip Simms, "To a vast majority of the United Nations the outstanding tragedy of the Big Three meeting at Moscow was the Anglo-American surrender to the Soviet thesis that world rule belongs to the great.

"Even France—not to mention Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, and others—was banished from the European peace table. Yet, from the point of view of the United States, Britain, and free peoples everywhere, it is highly important that France be restored to her rightful place.

"That world rule belongs only to the great was the foundation of nazism and fascism. It was against this conception that the United States entered the conflict against the Axis in 1940, more than a year before our shooting war began at Pearl Harbor. It was to abolish this ideology that the people of America went into debt for $250,000,000,000 and sent hundreds of thousands of their sons to die on battlefields all over the world. World rule by a few means carrying Nazi-Fascist-Communist totalitarianism from the national to the international level. Within the Kremlin, a few men decide who shall rule the Soviet Union and how. The 190,000,000 people of that vast country have no voice whatsoever in the proceedings. Once in a while they are allowed to put their cross on the one-party ticket which the dictatorship has arranged for them.

"According to the Molotov-Byrnes-Bevin formula, the new world order is to be conducted in much the same way. First, in effect, the Big Three will dictate the peace and allow the smaller powers to give it their O. K. Then, by means of their veto the Big Three will be able to control the UNO.

"World peace based on any such arrangement, declares Australia's Foreign Minister, Dr. Herbert V. Evatt, will not work. The attempt to make it work, he says in the January number of Foreign Affairs, is largely responsible for the present world-wide pessimism and disillusionment."

We see the same undemocratic procedure slowly gaining ground at home. The agreements made at Casablanca, at Teheran, at Yalta, at Potsdam, at Moscow, all have the effects of treaties. None of them were ever submitted to the United States Senate. Exemption was claimed by the President because of their temporary character and military necessity. Their character proved to be permanent instead of temporary. Military necessity no longer exists. My point is that these executive agreements, dealing as they do virtually with the division of the world, and made with more or less snap judgments, are perilous. The danger is that they deprive the Senate and the American people from considered decisions on foreign policies according to our Constitution.

We have not been very realistic in our foreign policies. We have allowed the "hallelujah" aspect, on the one hand, and the forces of hate and revenge, on the other, to dominate our foreign policies. We have built a roof without laying the foundation that is prerequisite of world peace—world organization or no world organization.

The world, mystified by America's inconsistent foreign policy and fearing we are drifting away from the UNO, and never being very confident of its success, is threatening to divide once again into spheres of influence and power blocs that have always meant trouble and grief for mankind.

Therefore, we must attempt to work out a stable world equilibrium. In order to do that, Britain's potency must be maintained one way or another.

We have got to face the facts whether we like them or not. It would be a calamity, at this state of world affairs, if the spheres of influence drop to two major powers. Therefore, we must try to keep the British Empire going. We must bring back into the world picture, as rapidly as we can, France, the Netherlands, the Scandinavian countries, Spain, Italy, Germany, China, and Japan.

But unless we immediately and forthwith reverse some of our policies—both foreign and domestic—I believe there is no chance of us accomplishing our purpose and on our own position will steadily deteriorate.

The cruel and infamous Morgenthau plan is responsible for keeping our armies of occupation in Europe in such large numbers—for the colossal suffering and avoidable loss of life in Europe this winter—for the failure to draft a just and decent peace that will preserve some of the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

The entire break-down of the economic and political structure of Germany—for which the unworkable Morgenthau plan is primarily responsible—is preventing the reconstruction of Europe and tranquilizing the world. It is costly to the American taxpayers and prevents the sending home of our soldiers.

As I have often said, we must reverse our policies in Germany and abandon the evil Morgenthan plan, whose principles are the enemy of God, of decency, of mercy, and of common sense, if we are to build a durable peace.

Stop the New Deal policy of borrowing and borrowing—spending and spending—giving and giving. Our National Government cannot possibly carry the financial burden of the world on its shoulders, and continue to give a living to those unwilling to do an honest day's work. All issues in the end relate to a balanced budget and to economy and efficiency in Government. If we are going to achieve a sound future for the United States, the American people must not be deluded by the siren song that Government is a "sugar daddy," able to shell out money endlessly.

As far as stabilizing the world is concerned, all the money we could pour into Great Britain won't do the job—as long as our foreign policies are based on expediency, not sound principles.

Secretary of State Byrnes daily adds to his reputation as the great compromiser.

The trouble is, we always get the worst end of the dickers, with the result that we are steadily losing our stand for democratic liberalism in the world.

Compromise and inaction at home and compromise and inaction abroad is the policy of the Truman administration. The War, Navy, and State Departments are unable to agree as to our policies relating to the final disposition of the Pacific islands. Even the President's recent statement on this question, vital to our national security, was so cloudy that his own party leaders, as well as department officials, are seeking clarification as to just what the President meant. But that highly important question should have been definitely settled before our UNO delegation left for London.

No one can be sure what our foreign policies are with any degree of certainty at any time. Stop blaming our soldiers in foreign lands for losing American prestige when the lack of a clear, definite, and honest foreign policy on the part of our national administration is the main cause.

Yet, as usual, the administration is attempting to blame the people and the Congress and the soldier. "American hysteria to get the boys back home," to quote an administrative spokesman, imperils America's prestige. But eminent nonpartisan news commentators unanimously agree that our prestige is dwindling also because we have compromised our principles. That weakens our moral strength.

Let us hope that the debate on the question of the British subsidy with the representatives of the American people speaking may be the opportunity for which we have been waiting to secure for ourselves and the world, a clarification of our national policy, so that we may hereafter direct all of our international arrangements—not only the British loan—consistently with the conviction.

Congress, as I said before, has its first opportunity to make certain that America does have a clearly defined national foreign policy and to participate in what that policy shall be in the future. And let me emphasize once again that our foreign policy involves the size and the duration of our armies of occupation.

Once our foreign policy is clearly defined by our representatives, and floundering and uncertainty has disappeared, it will receive the wholehearted support of the American people.

Facts About United States Steel Pay Rolls and Profits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 30, 1946

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, in view of the vigorous discussion on the floor of the House about United States Steel, and industry generally, Members may find some factual material both interesting and enlightening.

The earnings of United States Steel in the 1944 war-year were just under $66,000,000, including interest on borrowed money. Twenty years earlier, in 1925, the earnings were just under $118,000,000, similarly calculated.

In 1944, the wages of labor in the United States Steel Co. were over $957,000,000, including social security and pensions. In 1925, the payments to workers in United States Steel were just over $458,000,000.

Labor's take-home pay from United States Steel more than doubled between 1925 and 1944. But capital's earnings dropped to only a little more than one-half of what they were 20 years ago. However, the invested capital of United States Steel declined about 25 percent during these 20 years, which accounts for some shrinkage in earnings.

Stated another way, in 1925 the owners of United State Steel kept $1 in earnings for every $4 paid to labor. In 1944 the owners kept about $1 in earnings for every $15 paid out to workers. Labor's share of the United States Steel Co. income has increased in 20 years almost 400 percent.

Because capital had been thriftly saved and invested in United States Steel, American workmen in 1944 carried home over $900,000,000 in pay checks from that one firm.

Mr. Speaker, American business has produced the things that have given the humble people of America the most magnificent material blessings in the history of the world. That achievement was made possible because for the first time in history the individual man or groups of men were free to use their talents and energies to build businesses and humanity was the chief beneficiary.

Today, a great effort goes on in this country to destroy this system—the system that brought unbounded happiness and comfort to the humble people of this land.

Unfortunately, the management of American business seems unable to portray effectively its achievements, which give the average American more personal useful comforts than a king had only 100 years ago.

Certainly, the Members of Congress will be interested in the following statistics about United States Steel, in view of the present controversy:

United States Steel Corp. and subsidiaries

[In millions of dollars]

Year of operation	Employment costs	Amount earned on capital employed
1925	458.2	117.7
1926	469.3	143.5
1927	412.7	114.0
1928	402.9	139.8
1929	410.2	212.4
1930	371.7	110.0
1931	258.4	18.5
1932	138.5	[1] 65.9
1933	167.9	[1] 31.3
1934	214.8	[1] 16.6
1935	253.9	6.1
1936	339.0	55.4
1937	447.1	100.0
1938	294.4	.6
1939	386.6	50.4
1940	464.3	115.8
1941	628.3	122.2
1942	782.7	77.4
1943	912.9	68.9
1944	957.2	65.8
Total	[2] 8,771.0	[3] 1,404.7

[1] Deficit.
[2] Paid to workers.
[3] Available to investors.

During this 20-year period, the average percentage Steel earned on its investment was 3.52 percent. In 1944 the percentage earned on the capital employed was less than 4 percent. It was 3.79 percent. Do you wonder why risk capital is disappearing in the United States? This factual data about United States Steel should give you part of the answer.

Mr. Speaker, I have no especial regard for United States Steel. As a matter of record, I am strongly opposed to the concentration of economic power represented by United States Steel and similar industrial giants. I have long believed that such concentration of economic power automatically brings dangerous concentration of political power. Current events seem to demonstrate the accuracy of that belief.

However, I believe Congress should have the facts about what is happening in the American system of free enterprise. Our deliberations should reflect a factual appraisal of the actual situation. I have somewhat hastily prepared the foregoing tables, but the facts recorded are matters of official record.

Harry Hopkins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VITO MARCANTONIO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 30, 1946

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post:

"A GREAT AMERICAN IS GONE FROM US"—CHURCHILL PRAISES HOPKINS FOR SERVICE TO WORLD CAUSE

MIAMI BEACH, FLA., January 29.—Former British Prime Minister Winston Churchill tonight expressed profound grief at the death of Harry Hopkins, and declared "a great American is gone from us."

"A strong, bright, fierce flame has burned out a frail body," Churchill said in a statement issued here, adding:

"Few know better than I the services he rendered to the world cause. President Roosevelt had the gift of choosing generous and noble spirits to help him in peace and war.

"In Harry Hopkins he found a man not only of wide ranging vision but piercing eye. He always went to the root of the matter.

"I have been present at several great conferences where 20 or more of the most important executive personages were gathered together. When the discussion flagged and all seemed baffled, it was on these occasions he would rap out the deadly question: 'Surely, Mr. President, here is the point we have got to settle. Are we going to face it or not?'

"Faced it always was and being faced, was conquered.

"He was a true leader of men, and alike in ardor and in wisdom in time of crisis, he has rarely been excelled.

"His love for the causes of the weak and the poor was matched by his passion against tyranny, especially when tyranny was for the time triumphant.

"To dynamic, compulsive and persuasive force he added humor and charm in an exceptional degree.

"We do well to salute his memory. We shall not see his like again."

Sale of Surplus Men's Clothing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. HOOK
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 30, 1946

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article:

CIO PROPOSES SHIRT SEIZURE

(By Gordon H. Cole)

WASHINGTON, January 30.—The CIO today urged President Truman to seize and market as surplus property, the estimated 3,000,000 men's shirts and 400,000 men's suits now being withheld from the market by manufacturers in anticipation of higher ceiling prices.

This action followed disclosures that:

The Manhattan Shirt Co., and a few smaller firms, gambling on the collapse of OPA, or serious relaxation of its regulations, had concentrated their production exclusively on high-priced shirts. (Since last June OPA has required manufacturers to produce low and medium-priced shirts in the same proportion as they did during 1943.)

Other manufacturers were withholding shirts from the stores and limiting their production until OPA decides how much of the recent increases granted the cotton mills will be passed on to the shirt makers.

Suit manufacturers are withholding their product awaiting issuance of a new price regulation by OPA from which they expect higher profits.

Some manufacturers refused to believe OPA would hold to its low-price order of last June and went ahead and made high-price articles. These shirts are now in warehouses. Manhattan, because of its disregard for OPA's regulation, has an estimated 1,200,000 shirts on hand.

The basic fact in the shirt shortage, however, is a problem in production. According to experts, the industry is now producing at

a rate of 60,000,000 shirts a year, 40 percent below the 1939 output.

JANUARY 30, 1946.

The following wire was sent to President Harry S. Truman at the White House yesterday:

"Press reports over 3,000,000 shirts and 400,000 men's suits now being held in warehouses in face of pressing shortages of these commodities.

"The CIO cost of living committee urges you to immediately use your war powers to seize these surplus goods made from materials, some of which were allocated under your Second War Powers Act, and make them available to the American people through the Surplus Property Administration. This action is imperative in order to assure supply of clothing to returning veterans."

CIO COST OF LIVING COMMITTEE,
DONALD MONTGOMERY, *Chairman.*
LEO GOODMAN, *Secretary.*

Position of Republic Steel Corp. in the Labor-Management Dispute

REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 30, 1946

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, without comment I desire to incorporate in my extension of remarks a letter from Mr. C. M. White, president of the Republic Steel Corp., which sets forth in a comprehensive manner the company's position in the existing labor-management dispute. I commend to my colleagues a reading of Mr. White's letter as it contains a great deal of information that has not heretofore been available to Congress:

REPUBLIC STEEL CORP.,
Cleveland, Ohio, January 24, 1946.

The Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KNUTSON: You have undoubtedly read the letter which B. F. Fairless wrote to President Truman on the subject of the steel strike. I would like to comment on the entire strike situation, particularly with respect to its effect on Republic Steel Corp.

Virtually all of the 56,000 Republic employees are now idle. The strike affects 11 steel plants, 18 manufacturing plants, and several ore mines in more than 25 communities from New York State to Alabama, from Hartford, Conn., to Moline, Ill.

The strike is a flagrant violation of a contract entered into April 11, 1945, between the company and the United Steelworkers of America, CIO. This contract contains a stipulation that there shall be no strikes or work stoppages during the term of the contract which will not expire until October 15, 1946. This strike is due to an attempt of the union to enforce its demands on Republic for an increase in wages which Philip Murray, president of the steelworkers' union, now sets at 18½ cents an hour or $1.48 for an 8-hour day.

Put on an annual basis, this amounts to $22,200,000 in a normal year for Republic. Never in its history has Republic had earnings of $22,200,000 in a year of normal peacetime production, even before taxes. For example, net income in the years 1936, 1937, and 1939 averaged approximately $10,000,000 after deducting $3,000,000 Federal income taxes in each year. In 1938, Republic had a loss of approximately $3,000,000.

Republic's earnings have been affected in a startling way by the transition from war to peace. Since August 1, 1945, with the cessation of hostilities and the resumption of our normal line of products, Republic has had total losses, before taxes, averaging $831,330 per month. For the period—August 1, 1945, to December 31, 1945—there has been a total loss of $4,156,658 before taxes. It is my understanding that this is typical of the entire steel industry.

In brief, the history of steel prices and of wages for the steel workers in recent years is as follows:

Prices in effect, except for a few minor changes, are the same as they were in 1937. Even OPA admits that the steel industry is losing so heavily at today's wage-and-price levels that the industry must be granted an immediate price increase to compensate for the past wage increases. As evidence of this, and as has been shown above, Republic is losing substantial amounts on 60 percent of its regular line of steel products.

Now as to wages, Mr. Murray, in his plea for his unjustifiable wage demand, would lead one to believe that the steel workers had received no additional compensation during the war period.

Let's look at the facts. Between January 1, 1941, and December 31, 1945, the steelworkers have received a total increase of approximately 24 cents per hour. This consists of a 10-cent-an-hour general wage increase granted April 1, 1941, a second 5½-cent-per-hour general wage increase, effective February 7, 1942, a shift differential of 4 cents and 6 cents per hour for the afternoon and night shifts, the adjustment of wage-rate inequities which cannot exceed 5 cents per hour and increased vacation allowances. These last three were all effective on December 25, 1943.

As a result, in November 1945, the weekly earnings of Republic steelworkers were 58 percent higher than they were in January 1941.

The average weekly take-home pay of Republic steelworkers during the war year of 1944 was $59.57 and the average workweek was 48 hours. With 15 cents an hour increase the average take-home pay of Republic steelworkers in November 1945, long after the end of the war, would have been $61.41 even though the average workweek was 3.6 hours less than it was in 1944. Although Republic operated at a rate of only 77.9 percent of capacity during November 1945, its employees worked an average of 44.4 hours per week. This shows that, contrary to statements made by Philip Murray and other union leaders, there will always be some overtime in the steel industry.

There will be very little downgrading in the steel industry. The same jobs which existed during the war in steel plants exist today and will continue to exist for peacetime purposes, and the same rates of pay exist today for such jobs as existed during the war. The argument of union leaders that there will be a substantial reduction in take-home pay due to downgrading is wholly inapplicable to Republic.

As a matter of fact, this take-home pay has been further increased by the changes in the Federal income-tax law effective in 1946 which have removed approximately 12,500,000 taxpayers, all in the low-tax brackets, from the tax rolls. For example, under these new schedules, a married steelworker earning $2,500 a year will, through this tax reduction, have an increase in his 1946 take-home pay of approximately $65. Steelworkers earning more pay will have correspondingly larger income-tax reductions.

Excluding all overtime and vacation allowances, the straight-time average rate, in January 1941, in Republic's steel plants was 83.9 cents per hour. In November 1945, this had risen to $1.11 per hour, or an increase of 32 percent.

On the other hand, since January 1941, living costs, according to Government authorities, show an increase of 33 percent. Wage increases to date have kept pace with the increase in the cost of living. If this is to be used as a basis, the steelworkers are entitled to an increase of exactly 1 percent.

It is readily apparent that the union leaders have no interest in maintaining a parity between the cost of living and the steelworkers' wages. On the contrary, the union is attempting to freeze upon a peacetime economy, based on the 40-hour workweek, the artificially high wages of wartime production when the workweek averaged 46 to 49 hours.

In an earnest effort to avoid the disastrous steel strike, the United States Steel Corp. recently offered its employees a wage increase of 15 cents per hour, or $1.20 per eight-hour day—and increase fifteen times greater than that to which they were entitled to compensate for increases in the cost of living.

But the stubborn and all-powerful Philip Murray refused to accept this offer. Instead he now insists on 18½ cents per hour and is perfectly willing to shut down the entire steel industry and so paralyze the economy of our country for 25 cents a day.

The 15 cents per hour wage increase offered by United States Steel is in my estimation amazingly generous. It is higher than any wage increase in the history of the steel industry. It represents 60 percent of the union's original demand of 25 cents an hour or $2 per day, 75 percent of the union's amended demand of 19½ cents per hour, and 81 percent of the President's compromise proposal of 18½ cents per hour.

If Republic, too, were to make such an offer, it would cost the company $18,000,000 annually, and would increase the average straight-time hourly rate of Republic steelworkers from $1.11 to $1.26. The man who sweeps Republic's plants would receive 93 cents per hour. In addition, this straight-time rate would be further increased by overtime and vacation allowances.

Let me point out to you that the offered increase of 15 cents per hour was made in the face of vanishing profits and a definitely uncertain future.

Now we hear people ask why United States Steel would not go up another few pennies an hour, meet the President's 18½ cents compromise proposal and so avert this disastrous strike.

I cannot speak for United States Steel but I can speak for Republic.

Three and one-half cents an hour does mean only a few pennies to the steelworker. On the basis of a 40-hour week, it means $1.40 a week. On an annual basis, it means $72.80. It is interesting to note that if the steelworkers were finally to receive this additional 3½ cents per hour, they would lose all benefits of that increase for a full year were they to be on strike as much as 7 days.

To Republic, on the other hand, 3½ cents an hour means $4,200,000 a year, and this, let me emphasize, is on top of the $18,000,000 represented by the offer of a 15 cents an hour increase or a total of $22,200,000. To Philip Murray that may be a few pennies, but it's a lot of money even to the Nation's third largest steel company.

Both union officials and high Government officials are fully cognizant of the facts set forth in this letter. Yet the union's answer to an offer of a 15 cents an hour increase is a paralyzing strike of the entire steel industry.

For years Philip Murray has forced industry to capitulate to his extravagant demands, well knowing that a friendly administration in Washington would exert on industry every pressure in its power to help him gain his ends. Maintenance of membership and the check-off, forced on industry against its will by this friendly Government in Washington, now stands Murray in good stead. Through this clever device he has exacted tribute from the hundreds of thousands of employees in

the steel industry by the check-off of union dues. During the year 1945 Republic checked off for the union, as initiation fees and dues, and turned over to the union treasury, approximately $473,000. Applied to the entire industry this means millions of dollars in the union treasury, all of which, mark you, is entirely exempt from Federal taxation. As a matter of fact, only recently the steelworkers' union increased its dues by 50 percent—from $1 to $1.50 per month.

Secure in the fact that the Federal administration will be on his side, comfortable in the knowledge that he has at his command millions of dollars of tax-exempt union funds, arrogant in his disregard of the interests of all groups in the Nation, except the selfish interests of his own union membership, Philip Murray, and he alone, is responsible for the strike which now exists.

In my personal opinion, the labor situation has now gotten into a position which can only be handled in a few ways:

1. Full and complete capitulation to the union's demands, which quite apparently is President Truman's wish, but which Republic could not meet for the reasons given above. Also, an abject surrender would only lead to more extravagant demands. This is the natural consequence of permitting one man supported by Government favor to wield the power which allows him to shut down America's basic industry in an effort to enforce his unreasonable demands. Even the most powerful business monopolies of years ago were weaklings when compared to the modern labor monopoly. This is the path to a form of government which is neither democratic nor American.

2. A forthright statement of policy by the administration that it wants just so much inflation and that OPA will grant price increases concurrently with wage increases not only sufficient to compensate for the wage increases but also to bring company earnings at least up to a rate of earnings comparable to that of previous years, as intended by Congress in the OPA enabling legislation.

3. President Truman may take over the steel industry, increase the price of steel by some $12 or $13 a ton in the hope of insuring operations in the black, and then, under Government control, order an 18½ cent per hour wage rate increase, thus in effect answering No. 2 above on how much inflation the administration wants. In such event, it is Republic's present intention to hold the Government strictly accountable and to take every proper legal step to recover from the Government all damages which may be sustained by Republic as a result of such Government seizure and operation.

4. The only alternative is to let management and labor fight out their differences on the picket line and in the markets until the economy of the country drops to a level where people will appreciate a job and go back to work, or management cannot stand the losses of a long strike and capitulates or compromises.

5. Legislation is needed to prevent this wave of strikes from recurring and I am attaching a proposal which has been prepared by our general counsel, T. F. Patton, and which represents the thinking of the management of our company.

The existence of the OPA, to which we are opposed, is an important contributing factor in the current strike. Price should be a matter of supply and demand, quality, attractiveness, comfort, appeal, etc., and not the warped imaginings of a small group of people seeking a substitute for democracy. If the steel companies were free from governmental interference to adjust prices as well as wages, it is likely that the problem would soon be solved.

Very truly yours,

C. W. WHITE.

Mr. White also submits the following statement, which I commend to the members of the House Committee on Labor:

REPUBLIC STEEL CORP.'S PLATFORM ON LABOR

Republic is in favor of—

1. Collective bargaining between labor and management through representatives freely and fairly chosen without coercion of any kind.

2. Amending the one-sided Wagner Act or replacing it with a new national labor law which will be fair to employers and employees alike, and which will be administered by a board that will be impartial. Such a law must:

(a) Impose responsibilities upon and penalties against labor unions and their members for wrongful conduct in the same manner as responsibilities are now imposed upon and penalties assessed against employers;

(b) Preserve inviolate freedom of speech in labor disputes for employers, labor unions, and employees without discrimination;

(c) Penalize labor unions and strikers for indulging in violence of any kind or mass picketing during a strike;

(d) Insure union responsibility by providing for the distribution of audited financial reports to members and regular elections of union officials at reasonable intervals by secret ballots of the membership at large; and

(e) Prohibit strikes which have not been approved by a majority vote through a secret ballot of the workers directly involved.

3. Amending the Federal antitrust laws to make labor unions and their members subject to ordinary criminal laws for extortion and other crimes, just as are all other citizens.

Republic is opposed to:

1. Compulsory unionization in any form, whether it be called the closed shop, the union shop, union maintenance, or any other name. Each employee should be free to join or not to join, and to resign from, a labor union as he sees fit. No employee should be forced to belong to a labor union as a condition of his continued employment with the company.

2. The check-off of union dues. The check-off is a vehicle for entrenching labor union leaders in power without rendering service to union members. A labor union should stand or fall on its own merits, and the services it renders its members should be such that the members will voluntarily pay their dues direct to the union in return for such services.

3. The unionization of supervisory employees. Such employees are part of management, and their undivided loyalty must be accorded management. They cannot be faithful to management and to a union at the same time.

4. Compulsory arbitration of labor disputes. This deprives management of its right and duty to exercise its own judgment and make its own decisions on important labor matters.

5. The guaranteed annual wage for the steel industry. The nature of the steel business is entirely too cyclical to permit of any guaranteed annual wage.

No Defense Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 30 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting and timely article entitled "No Defense Plan," written by Joseph and Stewart Alsop and published in the Washington Post of this morning.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO DEFENSE PLAN

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

The best commentary on the embittered Army-Navy controversy over defense unification is to be found in a single, simple fact. Six months have passed since the bomb fell on Hiroshima. Six months have passed since the strategic position of this country was completely revolutionized. Yet the responsible heads of the armed services have not yet agreed on an over-all defense plan for the United States, revised in the light of capabilities of the new weapons. No such plan exists.

It is not for want of asking that no plan has been prepared. On the contrary, President Truman asked the Joint Chiefs of Staff for a plan a good many months ago. The joint chiefs referred the problem to their strategic subcommittee. On the subcommittee the representatives of the air, naval, and ground forces soon found themselves in flat disagreement. Neither the joint chiefs themselves nor their subordinate bodies can act unless unanimous. The President did not get his plan. Sometime before the Budget went to Congress he renewed his request. Again the joint chiefs found agreement was impossible. And there, so far as is known, the matter rests.

This extraordinary state of affairs has far-reaching implications. Confiding the task of coordinating the air, ground, and sea arms to the Joint Chiefs of Staff is the essence of the compromise by which the Navy hopes to avoid unification. The idea is to secure perpetuation of the Navy's separate identity by establishing an independent Department of Air, thus buying off the air enthusiasts, while pronouncing coordination through the joint chiefs. Currently the naval strategists are predicting that this compromise will pass Congress.

As far as the War Department is concerned, these predictions are part of a naval squeeze play. Secretary of War Patterson and the Army General Staff are unalterably opposed to the three-department plan, which they consider worse than the existing set-up. Their understanding is that the President shares their view. Accordingly, they suspect the Navy of trying to block action to modernize the defense set-up by promoting a plan which will be vetoed by the President if passed by Congress.

Action may well be blocked, for there are powerful interests in Congress which will support the Navy. Meanwhile, it is difficult to find an answer to the Army's objection to the Navy plan—that the Joint Chiefs of Staff only worked well in wartime, and even then failed to settle any issue where the bureaucratic interests of the services were in conflict. There are innumerable examples of such failure.

A current and extremely disturbing case is the simultaneous experimentation on guided missiles which the ground forces, air forces, and Navy are now all carrying on. If the appropriation of all three services for this purpose were placed in a common pool we might soon master the problems of the guided missile, which is generally regarded as the major weapon of the future. As it is, none of the three is likely to have money enough to complete the job, which will, as it were, fall between three stools.

As for wartime examples, they may be multiplied endlessly. There was the case of the Army antisubmarine patrol at the beginning of the war. Only the Army had planes for the coastal antisubmarine patrol at that time. No joint communications system or

other method of effective Army-Navy cooperation in this urgent mission had been devised, and the joint chiefs, despite the emergency, failed to agree upon any. Lives and ships were therefore lost. Again, there was the case, in the Pacific, of the unification of the command before the invasion of Japan. In their fruitless search for a system which would not subordinate the admirals, the Navy proposed giving command to a sea officer until the landing was completed and our forces had marched 30 miles inland, at which magic omen MacArthur was to take over.

Again, there was the case in China, where the Navy insisted upon maintaining an independent Navy group throughout most of the war. The outstanding effort of this interesting organization was to finance and equip a series of private military forces for the notorious head of the Chinese Political Secret Service, General Tai-li. These included, incidentally, a naval camel corps in Sinkiang Province, in the wilds of central Asia.

There would be a kind of comic irony in this sort of thing if the fundamental issues were not so grave. Possibly the rules can be revised to make the work of the joint chiefs effective in cases where there is conflict of interest. But in peacetime, when men and money are short, there is conflict of interest between the services at almost all points. The best proof is the failure to agree on an over-all defense plan, which arose from the need to assign to each arm its strategic mission, and to tailor its requirements of men and money to fit this mission only. It is difficult to see how a committee system can operate, even supposing that the unanimity rule is abolished, if any individual member of the committee seldom agrees with any other member of the committee.

Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 30 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address I delivered in Lincoln, Nebr., on Monday of this week at the annual meeting of the Nebraska Reclamation Association.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I appreciate your invitation to come here today and to speak to you briefly about the reclamation picture, as I see it from my distant point of observation in Washington. I am particularly happy to be here because, as you know, I was active in reclamation work in the State for many years and at the time our association was founded, and I had the pleasure of talking to you at our first annual meeting. I am glad to see that our association is firmly founded and making good progress and the officers doing a good job.

Since our last meeting, that good friend of all of us, Harry Bashore, has retired and come back to his home in Mitchell, Nebr., to live. Harry has been a fearless leader of the reclamation movement all his life, and I believe he can look on the development that has already been made, and the projects and programs that are now under way, as a kind of permanent memorial to his life and his 39 years of service in reclamation work. Personally, I can think of no finer memorial that a man could have than that. Incidentally, it shows something of the part that Nebraska has played in the national reclamation movement that both Harry Bashore and John C. Page, his predecessor as Chief of Reclamation, were Nebraskans. So I think Nebraska can claim some of the credit for having provided the Nation with much of its leadership on this program in recent years. I am hopeful that this association, even though it was created so recently, will continue to supply Nebraskans as national leaders.

To our new Commissioner, Michael Strauss, we wish the best of luck and pledge him our cooperation toward every sound program for developing our water resources and bringing our western dry lands into production.

I had the pleasure of addressing you just 1 year ago, on the occasion of the first annual meeting of the association. At that time I pointed out that a coordinated policy for the development of the entire Missouri Valley was in process of formation, and that part of the program had already been enacted into law by Congress.

I am happy that I can now report that the fundamental programs for the complete development of the Missouri Valley program have now been enacted into law, that an administrative procedure has been set up for coordinating policy and construction, and that we can look forward to progressive completion of the program just as fast as the money is available.

This seems to me such a milestone in the development of reclamation in Nebraska and in the Missouri Valley that it seems worthwhile to review briefly the principal events of the story. You are all familiar with the passage of the Federal Reclamation Act on the recommendation of Theodore Roosevelt in 1902. Since that time the Bureau of Reclamation has been constructing storage reservoirs and irrigating our lands on an ever larger scale. During the past 44 years they have spent around $1,000,000,000, and have passed from local projects serving only a few acres to the complex, multiple-purpose storage systems of the present day. And this growth in the scope of their works has come to have an important effect on the volume and timing of the flow of water farther downstream, which is to say in the main stems, the Missouri and the Mississippi. This brings me, of course, to the work of the Army engineers, who have for an even longer period been working on flood-control and navigation facilities. The resulting argument between the irrigationists and the navigationists, both of whom wanted the same water, began to show signs of becoming the battle of the century.

At this point the suggestion was made that the only way to settle these differences was by creation of a Missouri Valley Authority.

There was another way to settle these differences, however. The Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers were asked to work out a coordinated plan for the development of the entire river. The views of the two agencies, along with those of all other interested activities, were reconciled in the Pick-Sloan plan. With passage of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1944, this has now been adopted in its entirety by Congress. Furthermore, Congress, after thorough study of the problem, adopted a positive decision of policy—that navigation uses must not conflict with beneficial consumptive use of waters for domestic, municipal, stock water, irrigation, mining, or industrial purposes. I think the adoption of the Pick-Sloan plan settled that argument.

In addition, machinery was set up to maintain this coordination and to develop the unified plan for the valley in all its details, through the Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee, which contained representatives of the principal Federal agencies interested, as well as the States in the area. This committee has been holding regular meetings, and so far they have found it possible to come to agreement on the issues before them.

So the way has now been opened to really large-scale development of our water resources. Two hundred million dollars was authorized for the Army engineers, in addition to previous authorizations, as the first step toward completion of their program. And $200,000,000 was likewise authorized for the Bureau of Reclamation, as fast as budgetary requirements would permit.

Appropriations are, of course, another story. Yet we have had no real reason to complain to date. The sums approved by the Budget Bureau for fiscal year 1947 are the highest in our history.

But perhaps this discussion will be a bit more interesting if I bring it closer to home by talking about Nebraska projects of direct interest to Nebraska. For the next fiscal year the Budget Bureau has approved $3,621,000 for progressive work on these projects. Since portions of this money will go to benefit adjoining States under projects that cross State lines, the sum that will be of direct benefit to Nebraska is $2,976,000.

"TRUMAN ASKS FOR EXTRA FLOOD FUNDS

"WASHINGTON.—President Truman has asked Congress for an extra $16,450,000 for flood-control operations of the Federal Government in the fiscal year beginning July 1.

"In a letter to Speaker SAM RAYBURN, Mr. Truman asked that the proposed budget for War Department flood-control projects be raised from $124,765,000 to $139,114,000—an increase of $14,350,000. He also requested $2,100,000 for the Agriculture Department's flood-control work.

"Mr. Truman said that $2,000,000 of the fund would be spent by Army engineers on the Harlan County Reservoir in Nebraska."

The Republican River is the stream on which plans for development are in the most advanced stage. I know how long you people out here have been working to make the Harlan County Reservoir a reality. I understand that the Army engineers will be starting actual construction work on the Harlan Dam this year, and that the Bureau of Reclamation will be making the dirt fly on the irrigation system which will bring water from the reservoir to lands of the Bostwick project. For the Bostwick project alone $317,000 is being spent this year and $1,000,000 is in the proposed Budget for fiscal 1947. About 90,000 acres will eventually be brought under irrigation, practically all of it land that has never before been irrigated. These irrigable lands lie on both sides of the Republican River, extending from Naponee, Nebr., east and south to Concordia, Kans. Of the total acreage about 27,000 acres are in Nebraska and 63,000 acres in Kansas.

The other large Republican River project which is scheduled for construction beginning this year is the Frenchman-Cambridge project. About 53,000 acres will be irrigated by this project, of which about 36,000 acres will be new land. Proposed works for the project will extend from Enders, Nebr., eastward along Frenchman Creek and the main Republican River to Orleans, just a few miles above the Harlan County Reservoir. Two storage reservoirs will be constructed, the Enders Dam on Frenchman Creek, on which work is to start immediately, and the Medicine Creek Reservoir, 8 miles northwest of Cambridge. Ultimately, it is hoped that additional storage capacity will be provided by Culbertson Reservoir on the Republican River, and by a reservoir on Red Willow Creek.

Five hundred and thirty-two thousand dollars is available for this project during the current fiscal year, and $1,500,000 is in the budget for it for next year. Incidentally, this is one place where I feel we have a justified complaint against the budget-makers. About $3,500,000 is really needed for

this project during the coming fiscal year, and I shall try to have the 1947 appropriation for the project increased when the appropriation bill reaches the Senate.

Preconstruction surveys are under way on the Wray unit of the North Republican project, which embraces an area lying along the north fork of the river from Wray, Colo., east to Parks, Nebr. This project will provide supplemental water for about 3,000 acres of land now irrigated, and will bring about 2,000 acres of new land under irrigation in the vicinity of Haigler, Nebr. There is $40,000 available for the project this year, and another $100,000 is being asked in the 1947 budget.

Pumping projects authorized along the Republican River Basin in Kansas and Nebraska contemplate the ultimate development of five main units. About 23,500 acres would be irrigated by pumping from wells. Work on this project is starting in a small way with a $20,000 appropriation this year and a budget request for $100,000 for next year.

Work on two of our earlier projects is practically completed. The Mirage Flats project on the Niobrara River in northwestern Nebraska near Hay Springs will irrigate 12,000 acres. Likewise, the work on the Box Butte Dam on the Niobrara is nearing completion.

The other major project provided for in next year's budget is a $600,000 transmission line from Gering to Sidney. If money for this budget item is appropriated by Congress, it is expected that construction of the lines can be completed during fiscal 1947, although some additional substations and other minor works may have to be constructed during succeeding years.

Additional funds have been budgeted to carry on engineering surveys and investigations of a number of other proposed projects.

I think you can see from what I have said so far that this program is moving forward smoothly, and that it will not be long before we begin to see the Harlan County Dam and the irrigation works for the Bostwick project completed within a few years. Some of the other projects which do not have plans for development in an advanced stage will take longer.

The effect of this program on development of our State will be tremendous. Probably a million acres of additional cropland will be brought under irrigation. But more important, irrigated land guarantees a larger and more secure yield than nonirrigated acreage, particularly in a State like Nebraska. Irrigation will provide acreage for from 10,000 to 20,000 additional farms, with a resulting increase in population for the State of 200,000 to 300,000 people. Some of the reservoirs will give us power, to tie in with our rural electrification program. The damaging floods on our streams will be brought permanently under control.

All of this is being done or will be done by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers, coordinated by the Interagency Committee, acting on a basic plan reconciling all divergent viewpoints, authorized by Congress, using annual appropriations, after consultation with all interested parties and adequate opportunity for all to be heard.

I know you have all followed with interest the arguments over the proposal for a Missouri Valley Authority. I believe you may be interested in a brief summary of the recent history of the proposal in Congress and an explanation of its present status.

I described to you something of the history of the development of the Missouri Valley and of the adoption by the Congress of the Pick-Sloan plan as a master plan for the entire basin. At about the time the Pick-Sloan plan was adopted Senator MURRAY, of Montana, introduced Senate bill 555, which proposed a Missouri Valley Authority, composed of three men appointed by the President, to control all water development of the basin with very broad powers. This bill was first referred to the Committee on Commerce, which reported against adoption of the measure in the following terms:

"In summarizing, the committee concludes that—

"(a) The plans recently authorized by unanimous action of both Houses of Congress provide a complete program of unified water resources development in the Missouri Basin.

"(b) Existing laws and procedures provide for full coordination between the established Federal agencies charged with the responsibility of prosecuting the several phases of water-resource development.

"(c) The procedures already established by the Congress for the development of water resources, protect States' rights and prescribe full cooperation between local, State, and Federal interests.

"(d) Development of the authorized plan under existing Federal agencies will assure proper emphasis on the primary needs of flood control and irrigation.

"(e) It is impracticable to have regular Federal agencies and a valley authority operating in the same territory.

"(f) Under S. 555, the Missouri Valley Authority would be able to control practically all aspects of economic and social life in the Missouri Valley without local interests having proper recourse to Congress: if the Congress desires to enter these questionable fields of activity such functions can best be accomplished by the established Federal agencies under the full control of Congress."

The proposal was then referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, which held very extensive hearings, and likewise reported against the bill. I have not time to quote the conclusions of this committee in full, but, in summarizing its position, the committee said:

"The creation of an MVA would amount to the welding of economic and political powers resulting in nothing short of autocracy. It would mean the substitution of arbitrary power for democratic processes. It would mean the creation of a superstate—neither Federal nor State, and not contemplated by our Constitution. It would subject the social, cultural, and economic welfare of the Missouri Basin to the dictates and whims of a three-man board, not responsible to the people and largely irresponsible to the Congress itself. It would constitute a virtual abdication by the Congress in favor of government by a Federal corporation wielding autocratic powers. It would challenge State sovereignty and destroy systems of laws, both State and Federal, under which western agriculture has grown and prospered. It would throttle in the West the reclamation program which has been prosecuted through the years by an experienced agency and which has met with the approval of the Congress and of the people directly affected. It would permit a three-man board to avail itself of trust funds created for reclamation. It would be an excursion into an uncharted field of vast expenditures of public funds and of experimentation under a board unencumbered by the restraints that a democracy should erect against agencies of government."

Those are pretty strong words. Then the committee quotes Shakespeare against the bill.

The Senate had decided that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry should likewise consider and report its view on the bill. When the time came for this committee to hold hearings, Senator MURRAY, the bill's author, requested that the committee defer the hearings and that no action be taken on the bill for the time being.

I interpret this chain of events to mean that sponsors of the Authority proposal are willing to permit development of the basin to proceed on the basis of the Pick-Sloan plan for the present. Our construction work is going ahead rapidly under this plan, and whatever the merits of the Authority plan might be if it were adopted, there is no need to let the argument delay us now.

I do not mean to contend that every phase of our program is perfect. The plan has not yet been completely engineered in all its details, and no doubt further study will show the advisability of some engineering changes. Furthermore, future developments may show the need for additional means of coordination among the interested agencies. It may be that the Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee will not work as effectively as we hope in ironing out the differences among the activities concerned. This committee was developed in the democratic way with the intention of giving all interested parties representation. But if it does not prove able to maintain development of the river on a balanced basis, there is no reason why we cannot expand and strengthen the machinery for coordination even to adoption of an MVA plan. On such matters as these, your suggestions and ideas are of the greatest assistance to me.

I hope this association will undertake a very active program for the next year. In this connection the activities of some of the other State reclamation associations may be of interest to you as a sort of a model for your own activities.

Most of the State organizations seem to function as a sort of clearinghouse for the divergent views of various groups interested in reclamation. I am fully aware of the fact that some problems have already arisen upon which your membership has taken different views. I have no doubt that you will have some difficult decisions to make. But that shouldn't disturb you too much. It reveals more forcibly than ever the need for an organization such as ours, to bring to a focus the beliefs of various individuals and groups.

Opposition to authorities proved one of the most universal activities in which State reclamation associations engaged last year. Idaho, Oregon, Washington, and Montana State reclamation associations vigorously opposed, and are continuing to fight, the Columbia Valley Authority. State groups in North and South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, Missouri, Nebraska, and Kansas opposed the Missouri Valley Authority, going so far as to send witnesses to appear before congressional committees to make their views known. Although not definitely affected by a proposed authority, a strong State association just formed in Texas a year ago campaigned against the authority principle.

New Mexico appears to be taking its cue from the Missouri Basin, and the State association there is seeking to develop a joint program of flood control and irrigation by the engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation covering the Rio Grande Basin. A State group is currently being organized in Arizona. You will probably want to watch them closely, for one of the announced intentions of that body is to strive to bring about some control over ground water.

I hope that brief survey will give you some ideas for your future activities. We already have most of the interested parties of the State in the association, and we have a fairly complete program of what we would like to have done toward developing our water resources. I believe it is now the principal task of this association to create a public sentiment throughout the State, and, so far as possible, throughout the Nation, to support a carefully planned program of reclamation and a general land and water development program.

The entire Nebraska congressional delegation feels as I do, that the development of 1,000,000 additional irrigable acres in this State, plus provision for flood-control, power, and other benefits, stands out as the major development open to the State in the next decade. Any of us will give top priority at any time to assist your State association or

local groups in furthering your projects when they reach the stage where they are ready for consideration in Washington.

But let me repeat one thing I have said to you before. Your congressional delegation will be helpless to assist you until you have first composed any differences at home and are able to present a united front in behalf of a specific program. We will never feel competent to act as umpires over conflicting engineering or social developments. Those are problems which must be settled by the men and women who reside in the areas where these projects lie.

And by the same token, the 17 Western States must not air widely conflicting views before Congress, or we will not have a chance. Through the aggressive influence of the National Reclamation Association, with which you are affiliated, the West must constantly work to resolve its differences. Then we can gain the support of Congress as a whole to any legitimate and sound development program for the West.

The Bureau of the Budget has recommended an appropriation of $168,000,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation alone for the 1947 fiscal year. This is an all-time record for a Budget estimate. Our job in Nebraska, and in other Western States, is to gear ourselves to this gigantic program, and to prepare the soil at home for this tremendous development.

Operation of Packing Plants by Gayle Armstrong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 30 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Roswell (N. Mex.) Daily Record of January 25, 1946, dealing with the appointment of Mr. Gayle Armstrong, of Roswell, N. Mex., to take charge of the packing-house plants under Government control.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HE'LL DO THE JOB

Roswell can well enough take considerable pride in the fact that one of its citizens has been chosen to operate the struck meat packing plants of the nation if Government is forced to take them over Saturday, as is now ordered.

Few, perhaps, had thought it possible that Gayle Armstrong would be chosen by Secretary Anderson to step into the tremendous job of operating the packing plants, but those who are most surprised admit that the choice is in all probability a good one.

It has been learned here that Secretary Anderson holds the ability of Armstrong in high esteem, since he has made him one of his chief advisers, and the confidence the agriculture chief has displayed in the Roswell man reflects credit to him as well as to his home community.

Armstrong and President Truman are a great deal alike, in many respects. They are unassuming, do not have too much to say about most things, but have an abundant quantity of human understanding.

Armstrong's story is something along the Alger line. He has made his own way in the business world, has operated on a wide scale from a comparatively small beginning, and has been successful beyond the usual expectations. Meantime, he has grown in esteem of his townspeople.

When he was made president of the chamber of commerce last year he had to be practically pushed into the position, since his retiring nature did not permit his taking over such a position. Once assuming the job, however, he has rhown remarkable leadership, so his associates say.

In spite of the fact that he has the confidence of his home folk, however, his nomination for the post had not been many hours old when the firing began. The head of the State Federation of Labor attacked him through telegrams to the White House and to Anderson, declaring that he had not been friendly to organized labor, and therefore was not suited to the post.

The protest appears to be not only unfair but ill-advised. As the situation is understood, Armstrong will direct operations of the plants and settlement of the wage dispute is in no way involved. Therefore, the protest should lose strength, as it perhaps will. Meantime, Roswell folks know that the operation will be carried out on a high level, and that there will not be any reason for apology when the job is finished.

The Agricultural Situation in Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 30 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an address I made at Columbus, Nebr., January 25 last, to the Nebraska State Convention of the NRECA.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I am very proud and happy that you have honored me by inviting me to your meeting and asked me to say a few words. Because I like to talk about farm electrification and I like to get back here and talk to people who are as much interested in farm electrification as I am. I take considerable pride in the fact that it was a fellow Nebraskan, the late George Norris, who first put rural electrification before the country and pushed it through the Congress. He is the real daddy of the REA, as you all know. When Senator Norris left the Senate, 3 years ago, neither Senator WHERRY nor myself was eligible to take his place on the Agriculture and Forestry Committee, because of lack of seniority. Last year, however, I got a chance to go on that committee, which passes on all REA legislation, and of course I jumped at the chance. So now I hope I will be in a still better position to serve the cause of farm electrification.

To be perfectly frank with you, I do not believe it will be too hard to get more or less the kind of REA program out of Congress that we want. This is because the REA program has been, without question, an outstanding successful program ever since it started. It has pushed ahead systematically and energetically on its job of bringing electricity to thousands and millions of farm families all over the Nation, and in Nebraska alone it has more than tripled the number of Nebraska farms having central station electric service. It has justified all the claims of its friends by keeping on an absolutely sound financial basis.

I am frank to give you gentlemen and your coworkers most of the credit for this success. It would not be very courteous of me, with the Administrator of the program our honored guest here today, to deny that the Federal Government has been very helpful, but I am sure that Mr. Wickard will agree with me that what really put this program over was the active enthusiasm and continued cooperation of users of the electricity combined with the sound management and in particular the careful financial control of those who have been responsible for the administration of your respective districts and cooperatives. In fact, it offers quite a contrast to some less successful programs that have suffered a little too much from what I call "Washington influence." In other words, this has been primarily a grass-roots proposition from the beginning. For after all there wasn't much that the REA did or could do except lend you the money and give you some advice, and after that you built your own systems, managed them yourselves, collected your revenues and paid your debts from your own earnings. I believe that just as long as farmer-users continue to manage their own systems and keep them on an even keel financially, the program will continue to be successful. We in Congress have tried to keep it that way. Let's keep politics and Washington bureaucracy out of it. That's why I have always supported the suggestion that the REA be an independent Federal agency.

I imagine that what you really want from me is not a lot of flowers and compliments, but something of my viewpoint and my knowledge of the trend of events in Washington, as it relates to the Rural Electrification Administration. Let me say this first: I believe you can confidently expect the day to come soon (and by soon I mean within the next 5 or 10 years) when cheap electric power will be available to practically every farm in Nebraska. By that I mean that Congress will see the thing through on appropriations and loan authorizations, and on as favorable and as liberal terms as any of us can rightfully expect. Just to give you an example of what I mean, in April of last year Mr. Wickard came before the Congress, to a subcommittee of which I was a member, and asked, among other things, for a loan authorization of $150,000,000 for fiscal year 1946. He wound up by getting $200,000,000 for this fiscal year. I believe he now thinks that is still not enough—and maybe it is not enough, but I tell the story just to illustrate that Congress is pretty cooperative toward the REA.

There may be a few arguments about exactly how much we appropriate and authorize, and about whether we authorize it for next year instead of the year after, and so on, but one way or another I am sure in my own mind that just so long as you show you can use it as well as you have in the past, Congress will make the necessary funds available. I believe you can count on that.

As to terms, you are all familiar with the Pace Act of 1944, which extended the authorized time limit on your loans to 35 years, and cut your interest rate to 2 percent.

REPAYMENTS GO TOWARD AMORTIZATION

On that basis—present program—probably better than two-thirds of what you repay to REA will go toward amortization of your balance rather than toward carrying a load of interest payments. So, I think you can see that Congress is with you. Incidentally, just at this time when Congress is getting a few harsh words for not cooperating with the President, I think the legislation on REA is pretty good proof that when we have a really good program, sound in every respect, Congress and the administration have no great trouble in getting together.

Now let me look for a moment at the program in Nebraska, and how much has been accomplished and how much remains to be done. At the end of the last fiscal year, last June 1945, more than 37,000 Nebraska farms had central station electric service as compared with less than 10,000 when the REA program was started in 1935. However, it is estimated that there were still more than 80,000 Nebraska farms (more than two-thirds) without electricity and in 35 of our counties, mostly in the northern and western parts of the State, there was not a single mile of REA line.

A good start toward bringing electricity to these nonelectrified areas has already been made through allotment of more than $5,000,000 in this fiscal year to build lines to serve more than 9,000 additional rural customers. In case you have not tried to keep track of our progress all over the State, let me briefly list a few new projects for you:

To the Custer Public Power District, Broken Bow, $480,000, to acquire and rehabilitate lines serving 826 rural customers and to build new lines to serve approximately 400 new rural consumers in Custer County.

To the Twin Valleys Membership Association, Cambridge, $565,000, to serve 1,317 rural consumers in Furnas, Harlan, and Phelps Counties.

Three hundred thousand dollars to the Panhandle Rural Electric Membership Association, Alliance, to serve 426 rural consumers, all of them now unserved, in Box Butte, Grant, and Sheridan Counties.

To the North Central Nebraska Rural Public Power District, in Creighton, $325,000 to serve 612 unserved rural consumers in Antelope, Holt, Knox, and Pierce Counties.

To serve 627 unserved rural consumers in Perkins County, $400,000 to the Midwest Electric Membership Corp. of Grant, Nebr.

To the South Central Membership Association, in Red Cloud, $420,000 to bring service to 971 new consumers in Clay and Webster Counties.

To the Central Nebraska Public Power and Irrigation District of Hastings, $369,000, which with $350,000 of the district's money will be used to construct 81 miles of transmission line from Elwood to McCook. This line will ultimately permit extension of low-cost power to over 4,000 farms in the southwestern corner of the State.

These are just a part of the major new projects. In addition, loans are being made to prewar borrowers for extension of new lines to consumers previously unserved. These lines, together with other projects already approved, will carry REA-financed rural power lines into 74 counties in the States, leaving only 19 counties not yet reached by REA. I am particularly encouraged by such projects as that of the Panhandle Association in Alliance, since they prove definitely that there is nothing impossible about extending this program up into parts of the State which are more sparsely settled than the areas that have been covered previously.

Estimates published by the Department of Agriculture indicate that with about $8,000,000 more, service can be extended to more than 15,000 additional consumers within the next 2 years under the programs now being considered by Congress in the Lucas and Poage bills. That would mean that just about half our farms would have electricity in 3 years or less. So you see we are beginning to cover the map. Now that doesn't mean that the job is almost done by any means. There will still be plenty of farms that are nowhere near an REA line, where new districts or cooperatives will have to be organized before electricity can be extended to them. And a lot of your existing organizations will want to extend into territories or pockets you are not serving now and some of you will need additional financing for that, although many cooperatives and districts are in strong enough financial shape so that they can undertake a little expansion out of their own resources.

But at least most of our farms in Nebraska have been brought within shouting distance of electrification. The pioneering phase is well over. Those of us who have had a dream of electric power in every farm home can begin to see daylight ahead.

WANT TO SEE NEBRASKA TAKE THE LEAD

Of course, I suppose the day will never come when electricity is in every single farm home. There will always be a few farms whose owners, for one reason or another, will not or cannot electrify although I do not think there will be many. Electricity is so pressing a convenience, and in fact so great a need for modern production farming, that there are not many farm families that will not jump at the chance of electrifying, once they are given the opportunity at reasonable rates. For my part, I don't think I will be satisfied until upwards of 90 percent of our farms here in Nebraska have electricity. I expect Nebraska to be approaching that goal very closely before the end of my next term in the Senate.

I have one final suggestion to offer before I close. We have sold this program to the American public on the promise that it is a financially sound, self-supporting proposition; that all the American farmer wanted was a loan, not a gift; and that all the money lent would be paid back, with interest. According to REA's last financial summary, that promise is being kept pretty well by Nebraska borrowers, since just about 99$^{9}/_{10}$ percent of all money due has been paid. That is a tremendous tribute to the good management of your organization. But it is also a tribute to the farm prosperity we have enjoyed pretty generally throughout the State for the last several years. It seems reasonable to expect that this coming year will likewise be prosperous, but for the years after that we have no way of knowing for sure. If drought or depression hits us again, it may not be so easy to sell electricity to your consumers, or to collect for it once it is sold. If we should meet with such adversity, that will be the real test of the financial stability of our program. So my advice to you is this: Now is the time to build up your surplus, pay off your obligations, build up your properties and your revenues, get your organizations in just as sound a condition financially as possible, so that if the storm should come, you can ride it through. We want to demonstrate to the whole country that this dream of rural electrification, which some people said was just a pipe dream, is really a vision of a prosperous agricultural America, and that no one can say the farmers did not pay their way.

Address by Secretary of Labor Before National Council for Permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 30 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by the Honorable Louis B. Schwellenbach, Secretary of Labor, before a dinner meeting of the National Council for a Permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission, held in Washington, D. C., on January 23, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I appreciate very much the invitation you have extended me to speak at this important meeting. This meeting is important because the issue presented goes to the very heart of the fundamentals of American democracy. It goes to the basic concept of human freedom. That is so because it involves the question of equality of opportunity in employment. Without such equality, we do not meet the true test of freedom. Human freedom is the keystone upon which our American democracy stands.

Today the highest honor for bravery that our Government can give to anyone—the Congressional Medal of Honor—was given to Rev. Joseph T. O'Callahan, chaplain of the aircraft carrier, the *Franklin*, the great old warrior ship which was struck and struck again, bombed and fired, but which refused to surrender or die. You have read the stories about Father O'Callahan; perhaps you have seen the motion pictures about the fateful hours upon the ship. Father O'Callahan was proclaimed by the commander of the ship to be the bravest man he had ever seen. The chaplain wrote about the bravery of the men who had conquered their fear and, particularly, about a Filipino steward and some Negro steward mates. I want to read two paragraphs written by Father O'Callahan:

"There was a group of steward mates on board, and their reaction was even more striking than that of the Filipino boy whose story I have told. These particular steward mates were Negroes, and every one of them who remained abcard (remember that many were blown overboard) did a really magnificent job. I know personally that each of them was as frightened as the Filipino youngster, and remembrances rushed through my mind that day of the many cartoons I have seen, jokes I have heard, about how easily Negroes scare; but this group overcame their natural fear like real heroes.

"It was primarily due to their help that our executive officer was able to get a towline from the *Franklin* to the cruiser *Pittsburgh*, which was standing by. That towline was a terrific weight. There the gang was, lined up shoulder to shoulder, officers and men, black and white, sweating and straining, and all afraid. The towline was not to be budged. I have read about things like this and have been rather blase and skeptical, but there on the deck of the *Franklin* that afternoon it really happened. All of a sudden, uncertainly and slowly at first but gathering volume until it pierced the roar of flames, those Negro men started an impromptu chanting, making up the words as they went along. It was almost a Negro spiritual, and, as the rhythm of their voices found certainty, the rhythm of the gang's muscles and sinews started to work together and that heavy towline we hadn't been able to budge started to move, how God alone knows, but it was certainly the Negro stewards who led the way to a really superhuman job."

What better argument against employment discrimination is needed? Nothing that I could say or write could present so eloquently the argument on the question of equality of opportunity. There they stood shoulder to shoulder—black and white, officers and men—pulling together for freedom. There was no thought of proscription of men because of race or color or creed when lives were hanging in the balance. This was their time of great emergency. There was freedom of speech, of course; that speech rose in the form of Negro spirituals. They pulled together shoulder to shoulder, and the ship was saved. It should be of some significance

that in that hour of their fateful crisis no man aboard that ship demanded the right to debate.

At this time there is for consideration before the Senate of the United States a bill which has for its purpose the setting up of machinery by which equality of opportunity in employment might be achieved for the people of the race to which these stewards belonged and for other minority groups. For the present, action upon the bill is being delayed through the use of the Senate rule which permits unlimited debate. For 6 years I was a Member of the Senate. I was, and am, proud of my membership in that body. I have a most profound respect for the institution and its traditions. During that time, I came to know and I dealt with on terms of mutual confidence most of the men who are now opposing this measure. I never had any quarrel with them about the Senate rule which permitted unlimited debate. But I always contended then, and I still believe now, that equally important and equally essential to the effective functioning of our Government was the full recognition of another Senate rule which provided for cloture when it had approval of two-thirds of the Senators voting.

In a democracy, it is a desirable thing to have a forum where members may speak their minds fully and freely. However, every time during my tenure in the Senate when I thought that all the avenues of debate upon a particular subject had been explored and searched, I signed petitions for and voted for cloture in order that the successful functioning of the body might be assured. Were I now a Member of the Senate, when the time came that I reached a similar conclusion, I would again petition for and vote for cloture.

The argument has been made that in these troublesome times it is inappropriate to raise this issue. If that argument is valid, it must of necessity rest for its validity upon the assumption that the issue is unimportant. With that assumption, I disagree. I disagree because I believe that this issue is a moral one. The time is never inappropriate to consider moral issues. There never is a time when we can afford the luxury of silence in matters such as these. We cannot propose to become virtuous as citizens next year or the year thereafter. We cannot propose to be a little virtuous now and wink and blink as our less fortunate neighbors are denied their rights and denied them by the society of which we are a part.

I want at this point to call upon two witnesses to answer the question as to whether or not this is a moral issue. The first, Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, speaking on behalf of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, which represents a large part of the protestant churches in this country. Let me quote from what the Bishop said.

"As Christians, each of us should give active support to the Fair Employment Practice Committee against discrimination in employment in industry. Discrimination in employment because of race, creed, or national origin, is one of the great moral issues before our Nation today. The right of a worker to be employed and paid solely on the basis of his character and ability is so clear, just and Christian that it should be protected by law.

"The religious forces, and I believe the democratic forces of the United States, face a fundamental problem here, and that is finding concrete means to translate our ethical ideals into the realities of economic justice and racial brotherhood."

Unfortunately, the other witness upon whose testimony I wish to rely died a few months ago, but his reputation as a great Catholic churchman still is remembered and his opinion about this bill is still available. I quote from a statement made by the Rt. Rev. John A. Ryan.

"In all these cases of discrimination the human dignity of the Negro is outraged and the virtues of justice or charity, or both, are violated. Such discrimination, whether practiced by employees or employers, is definitely immoral. The Christian precept of brotherly love is not satisfied by mere well-wishing, nor benevolent emotion, nor sentimental yearning. It requires action, action which assists the neighbor who is in need."

There can be no dispute about the fact that there is general and widespread discrimination against Negroes and Jews and, yes, Catholics in the matter of employment. Nor can it be denied that the basic law of our Government guarantees that there shall be no such discrimination. There can be no question about the legal right of our Government to protect its citizens against discrimination.

I contend that our Government is our trustee, holding for us in common our heritage of freedom. No faithful and worthy trustee who deserves the name of trustee can permit that which he holds in trust to be dissipated or destroyed. Certainly when the trust is one involving the most sacred of all trusts—the natural right to freedom—the trustee cannot ignore its dissipation or destruction. But more than that, the trustee who has in his trust this sacred right of freedom cannot sit silent when there is any doubt. If the trustee would retain his self-respect, he must be ready at all times to challenge anyone or any proposal that threatens to injure his trust.

Our Government cannot sit silent now. Our officials of Government cannot be silent. Nor can citizens who believe in their sacred rights as citizens be silent. The Government—trustee for all of our people—Negroes and Jews, Catholics and Protestants, black and white and yellow—must proclaim through positive act its determination to protect all of our citizens against discrimination. It cannot be merely acquiescent. It has the sacred obligation to fly the flag of freedom in order that peoples of the world everywhere will know that American freedom does mean freedom.

Freedom is not a metaphysical thing. It is difficult to define accurately because it cannot be bounded or delimited, but it is a very concrete thing, nevertheless. The right to work and an equal opportunity to obtain employment is a God-given right. We have just successfully concluded a great war during which time we carried the banner of freedom to the four corners of the earth. We proclaimed to the world and we demonstrated to the world that under American freedom a great military force could be assembled and equipped. So profound was our belief and so effective was our leadership that we conquered two of the greatest military forces the world has ever known. We drew no color line during that period. The draft boards did not say to members of minority groups that they should be the last to be called. The War Manpower Commission raised no color line when it recruited the labor force necessary to man our factories and our munition plants.

It seems to me that the least the Government of the United States can do is to tell these people that it intends to see that those principles for which they fought and labored will be protected insofar as they themselves are concerned. The Government can do this only through legislative enactment.

It is highly symbolic that the FEPC legislation should be the first among the President's program to come to the floor of the Congress. It is a test of our willingness to practice democracy as well as preach it. I quote from the President's recent message on the state of the Union:

"We have won a great war—we, the nations of plain people who hate war. In the test of that war we found a strength of unity that brought us through—a strength that crushed the power of those who sought by force to deny our faith in the dignity of man.

"During this trial the voices of disunity among us were silent or were subdued to an occasional whine that warned us they were still among us. Those voices are beginning to cry aloud again. We must learn constantly to turn deaf ears to them. They are voices which foster fear and suspicion and intolerance and hate. They seek to destroy our harmony, our understanding of each other, our American tradition of live and let live. They have become busy again, trying to set race against race, creed against creed, farmer against city dweller, worker against employer, people against their own governments. They seek only to do us mischief. They must not prevail."

The President's National Health Insurance Plan—Poll of Washington Residents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 30 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a poll published in the Washington Post of January 28, 1946, showing 70 percent of the residents of Washington, D. C., favoring President Truman's national health-insurance plan.

There being no objection, the poll was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POST SHOWS 70 PERCENT OF WASHINGTON'S RESIDENTS FAVOR TRUMAN'S NATIONAL HEALTH-INSURANCE PLAN

An overwhelming majority of District residents support President Truman's plan for national health insurance.

Seventy percent of all Washingtonians are in favor of the President's health-insurance plan under which citizens who "work for a living would contribute to a common fund, the latest Post poll reports.

Twenty-one percent of District residents object to the health plan chiefly on the grounds that there are already too many deductions from their weekly pay check. The remaining 9 percent of those questioned were undecided.

Almost 9 of every 10 residents earning less than $4,000 yearly favor the adoption of national health insurance legislation. Those in higher income groups support the plan by a slightly smaller majority.

The President's compulsory health-insurance scheme has been written into the Wagner-Murray bill, now in the Senate Education and Labor Committee.

In a special message to Congress last November the President pointed out that the program would cost about 4 percent of each person's earnings up to $3,600 a year. But of this sum, the bill would collect only 1½ percent from the employee, 1½ percent from the employer, and leave 1 percent to come from general governmental revenues. Under the plan individuals would be free to select their own doctors.

The Post survey also shows that the average family total for doctor and hospital bills in Washington last year was about $73.

Resident opinion on the compulsory health insurance proposal was learned when interviewers asked a representative cross section of the city's population:

"The President has suggested that a small amount be paid from a worker's wages into an insurance fund that would help pay doctor, dentist, and hospital bills for the worker and his family. Do you approve or disapprove of the plan?"

Replies divided as follows:

	Percent
Approve	70
Disapprove	21
Don't know	9

Objectors to the pending compulsory health insurance bill were then asked why they disapprove of the idea. Here is a breakdown of the reasons they gave:

Reason for disapproval

	Percent
Too much deducted from salaries now	30
Will lead to socialized medicine	17
Want to select own doctor	17
Too much coddling	15
Other miscellaneous reasons	8
No reason given	13

Half of the District residents, the poll reveals, now participate in some private health, hospitalization, or accident insurance program. Among those already protected by private insurance policies, 79 percent said they favored adoption of the compulsory Government plan, while 84 percent of those without insurance support the President's national health insurance program.

In a final inquiry into the public-health question, the Post asked residents "About how much did your family doctor and hospital bills amount to during 1945?"

They answered:

Cost of family medical care:	Percent
Less than $100	59
Between $101 and $500	35
More than $500	6

AS SHOWN BY POST POLL—TYPICAL WASHINGTON VIEWS ON HEALTH-INSURANCE PLAN

Here are some representative comments of Washington residents who were asked by Post interviewers what they think of President Truman's plan for compulsory national health insurance:

Harry Gerrity, Jr., 55, a lawyer, of 6109 Nevada Avenue NW., said: "Too many people don't get proper medical attention just because they feel they can't afford to see a doctor once in a while. There are many rural sections of the country where there are no hospitals or doctors for miles around. Working people would hardly notice the small deduction from their pay check if the President's plan went through. Although I carry health insurance for my family and am able to meet my doctor's bill reasonably well, I feel very strongly that we should back up President Truman's efforts to improve the Nation's health."

"I am certainly in favor of health insurance, but I cannot see this proposed compulsory Government insurance set-up," Mrs. Edith M. McNerney, housewife, of 4523 South Dakota Avenue NE., told a Post poller.

"The pay check already looks sick from all the deductions imposed by Uncle Sam. The President has a good, worthy idea but the average wage earner can stand only so much. We have a health and hospitalization policy and it has been a big help to us but I just can't see forcing people to take it out." Mrs. McNerney's husband works at the Federal Works Administration. They have two children and have lived here for more than 30 years.

Frank S. Jerry, 36, instrument maker at the Naval Ordnance Laboratory, 15 Ocean Green SW., commented: "Harry really has a good idea in putting a health program on a national scale. If Congress passes the compulsory health insurance bill it probably won't cost the individual more than 2 percent of his earnings. I don't see how any sensible thinker could say that assurance of good medical care isn't worth 2 percent of his pay. I would jump at the chance for such a low premium insurance."

William A. Gibbons, 48, mechanic at Andrews Field, of 4420 Bowen Road SE., said: "Frankly, I don't think a whole lot of the idea. It strikes me that people should be allowed to take care of their own affairs, such as health insurance. Any compulsory insurance is getting too close to socialism for me. I have nothing but straight life insurance. But I probably am a lucky person because I have a wife and child and haven't spent a nickel on doctor's bills in more than 3 years."

Mrs. Paul M. Guild, 35, United States Coast Guard employee, of 26 Channing Road NW., commented: "By all means I approve of national health insurance. I know of many families that have become absolutely crippled financially by unforeseen accidents and sickness. A Government fund to which everyone contributes a very small percentage of their income would be of inestimable benefit to the general public. Everyone would save money under a scheme such as President Truman has suggested and it would assure medical care to the poor folk." Mrs. Guild has lived here 20 years. Her husband is a painting contractor.

Parity Prices for Agricultural Commodities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 30 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement upon parity prices for agricultural commodities, prepared by C. C. Hanson, secretary of the Association of the Southern Commissioners of Agriculture.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun of December 8, 1945]

INTERESTING NEW OVERTONES IN FEDERAL THINKING ON FARM PRICES

It has already been noted that the political farmers in Washington are showing discontent with the current parity formula. Under it, farm prices on average are above parity. Since the political farmers for 20 years have professed to want only simple parity, it seemed, by their own arguments, that the present above-parity prices were excessive. Now the political farmers are offering a series of upward revisions in the parity formula. Most of these proposals would have the highly soothing effect of pushing present prices back to parity, or below it, without affecting their actual dollar amount.

The Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. C. P. Anderson, has himself joined in the present attack on the parity formula. This looks like an official declaration that the formula long defended as sacrosanct was really something of a fake. But there may be more even in Mr. Anderson's remarks than a mere denunciation of the old parity formula.

For instance, the Secretary says that even at 110 percent of parity present milk supplies are short. By implication, that is, he seems to be arguing that the Government must fix milk prices at a level sufficient to bring out some preordained volume of milk. But this price theory differs fundamentally from the parity-price theory. As the political farmers have always argued, parity prices are those which are just in relation to nonfarm prices. Nothing in the parity theory aims at any specific volume of production. A price aimed to bring out a specific volume of production is an incentive price, pure and simple, and makes the Government in effect the master farmer of the country.

But farmers, at heart, are still individualists. They don't want Government monkeying with the running of their farms. They want price support, but they purposely sought that support by way of a parity formula which at least looked objective and scientific and beyond the reach of bureaucratic manipulation in Washington. The parity rule, in the farm view, was merely a kind of refinement of the law of supply and demand.

But a government which makes itself responsible, not for mere "parity" justice to the farmer but for the production of farm commodities in appropriate variety and volume, is a government that has taken over a good deal of the managerial authority in the farm field. Prices no longer become something to be fixed by abstract rules of parity justice. They become more like a piece-work wage which an employer offers to a hired hand to get out the work. These new overtones in Federal farm policy are worthy of close attention from thoughtful farm leaders.

ASSOCIATION OF SOUTHERN COMMISSIONERS OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., December 11, 1945.

Memorandum for Mr. Harry D. Wilson, president, Baton Rouge, La., and our other 12 members and friends individually addressed:

Parity price means parity income, but parity income does not mean parity price.

You will recall copy of a letter sent you last week, in which the addressor discussed parity prices; will quote the concluding sentence of the sixth paragraph, page 1:

"Parity income, as distinguished from parity price, implies low agricultural prices plus grants or doles or subsidies to an extent to equal parity income."

Discussed, this morning, the reproduced editorial from the Sun with Carl H. Wilken, economic analyst and a member of the National Association of Commissioners, Secretaries and Directors of Agriculture's Educational and Economic Committee's Research Staff. Also:

Reviewed with Mr. Wilken news items and editorials of like trend, recently appearing in the Post and other Washington papers; the New York Times, Wall Street Journal, Journal of Commerce, and other publications in the Northeastern States. * * *

Certain phases of these news items and editorials seem to have aroused Mr. Wilken's "righteous indignation." * * * Attention is called to this writer's concluding paragraphs.

You will be interested in what Mr. Wilken had to say to this writer in said discussion; his remarks, in substance, follow:

"PARITY PRICES NEEDED FOR ALL GROUPS

"The Congress of the United States shou'd establish permanent parity prices for agriculture; agriculture is the largest industry in the United States and is entitled to economic equality with other groups.

"To provide for parity of price for agriculture means simply to provide a 100-cent dollar and regulate the value of it at 100 for all groups.

"To force the farmer to live in an economy which pays him only 80 cents on the dollar

means he will sell his commodities at a bankrupt price. * * *

"We have been confronted with this parity-price problem since 1800, and there have been only two 5-year periods since that time when the farmer under normal conditions received full value for his production—1910–14 and 1925–29.

"In all other periods, with the exception of war inflation, the farmer received an average of approximately 70 percent of parity price.

"The farmer has had, theoretically, equality under the Constitution of the United States, but in reality he has been exploited by being forced to sell his products at 'public auction' * * *.

"Seemingly but few of our economists and political leaders have ever recognized the importance of agriculture.

"Society has always wanted cheap food * * *.

"PARITY PRICES, THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO NATIONAL INCOME

"Agriculture is the governing factor in our economy * * *, all employment and income ratio from agriculture.

"The prices the farmer receives for his products determine whether the Nation's income shall be high or low.

"Agricultural raw materials and income determine the number of jobs and the wages which can be paid.

"We have in our economy approximately 9,000,000 business units of which 3,000,000 are nonagricultural and 6,000,000 are the individually owned and operated farms * * *.

"We have a capital economy and our farms have approximately two-thirds of the capital investment in productive enterprise.

"In 1940 our farms had 10 times the capital investment of our steel and automobile industries combined and employed 10 times as much labor.

"Agriculture produces 65 percent of the raw-material income of the Nation and the processing of agricultural products makes up almost two-thirds of our manufacturing industry.

"The agricultural industry processing raw material through livestock has the greatest manufacturing plant in the Nation * * *.

"In addition thereto, over two-thirds of all our agricultural production must be processed into other forms before it enters into our manufacturing plants.

"This factor results in agricultural income being the governing factor with a normal precedence of about 6 months.

"Only through production of our farms at a parity price level can we maintain full employment and national solvency.

"PARITY PRICES, THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO EMPLOYMENT

"In our economy each dollar of farm income creates $1 for payment of factory pay rolls and $7 of national income, the 1–1–7 formula.

"This 1–1–7 formula has never been refuted; it has held approximately constant since 1921; nor has it ever been recognized by Congress or experts in our various department of government.

"The 1–1–7 formula is probably the most important ever presented to the American people.

"Failure to use the formula in the period 1930–41 caused the Nation to lose $473,000,000,000 of national income.

"In the postwar era failure to recognize the importance of the formula can result in a loss of $75,000,000,000 annually to the United States.

"The Curtis Publishing Co., of Philadelphia, Pa., after carefully checking * * * published an article entitled 'The Key to Prosperity,' in the Country Gentleman in December 1944.

"In that article, the Curtis Publishing Co. not only pointed out these ratios * * * but they also pointed out * * * some new laws of exchange * * *.

"The Manufacturers' Record, of Baltimore, Md., in the month of October 1945, carried a page advertisement by the Tennessee Coal, Iron & R. R. Co., which is concurred in by the United States Steel Export Co., of New York, using some of the material carried in the Country Gentleman article * * * under the headline 'As southern farms go, so goes southern business.'

"They point out that each dollar of farm income results in $7 of national income; that agriculture produces 65 percent of all raw materials.

"As stated, each dollar of farm income creates the income to pay a dollar of factory pay rolls, you will note from this chart (handing one to Secretary Hanson) that factory pay rolls did not recover as rapidly from 1932–33 as did the farm income * * *.

"Factory pay rolls are tied to agricultural income and as farm prices receded in the latter part of 1937 and reduced farm income approximately a billion dollars in 1938, factory pay rolls came down in ratio.

"The only way that the Congress can increase factory pay rolls without incurring a huge addition to the national debt is to first increase the basic farm income.

"Remember, anything done that reduces the farmer's income $1, more or less, likewise affects other groups, and reduces the national income $7, more or less.

"That the reverse is also true, viz, anything done to increase the farmer's income $1, more or less, likewise affects other groups and increases the national income $7, more or less * * *.

"Can you, Colonel Hanson, not clearly see that the normal income for the farmer at parity prices for his products is the foundation for full employment and national prosperity?

"The worries in regard to synthetics replacing cotton are without foundation. * * * if we maintain our economy at a parity price level, we will create the income to consume both the cotton and the synthetics.

"PARITY PRICES—THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO PRODUCTION

"The average value of our manufactured goods is 80 percent of the national income. Do we want the value of manufactured goods to be 80 percent of $150,000,000,000 or let the farm income go back to 1940 levels, getting 80 percent of $75,000,000,000?

"For each 1 percent that farm income is below parity prices, we will have a loss of 1 percent in value of manufactures and 1 percent unemployment * * *.

"If we permit our farm income to drop back to 1940 levels we will wipe out $75,000,000,000 a year of national income * * *.

"Retail sales averaged approximately 60 percent of national income * * *. Do we want 60 percent of $150,000,000,000 of national income in retail sales volume or 60 percent of $75,000,000,000? The farm income will determine which it is to be.

"Higher farm prices don't mean higher living costs. * * * Higher farm prices do not result in higher living costs when calculated on the basis of the increased per capita income generated by higher farm income.

"The simple facts are that with higher farm prices we have a corresponding increase in income for all groups and the cost of living, on the basis of income, does not increase as farm prices increase, it remains practically constant.

"In 1932, with approximately 65 percent of farm parity, we had 65-percent employment. In 1940, with approximately 85 percent of farm parity, we had 85 percent of employment; the foundation for full employment is parity price for agriculture.

"For each 1 percent that farm prices are below parity we will lose approximately 1 percent of the physical production of our factories.

"Labor should support permanent 100 percent farm parity price, as that is the foundation for continued factory output.

"PARITY PRICES, THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO TRADE AND WORLD COMMERCE

"We have now and have had for years a surplus of underconsumption of cotton goods, due to the subnormal price farmers receive for their cotton production * * *.

"Had parity prices been maintained, America could have consumed the production of at least 10,000,000 bales of cotton annually.

"America now has no surpluses of agricultural products; there may be an accumulation of certain commodities that were held off the market * * * due to war and other conditions.

"These commodities so held off the market, now called by some surpluses, under normal or substantially normal conditions would have with parity prices and parity tariffs continuously moved from field and mine to consumer and user.

"Parity prices, parity tariffs, and new industries is the solution of our economic riddle.

"Had parity prices and parity tariffs prevailed for the period of the so-called surpluses, money for needed new industries would have been available on reasonable terms as and when it was wanted and there would have been no unemployed.

"In 1930–39 we were laboring under a surplus complex and our farm production did not expand above the 1925–29 level; we had low prices which in turn gave us a low national income and underconsumption; we did not have surplus production.

"Gross operating revenues of our railroads followed farm income down in ratio, and they followed farm income when it rose again.

"In the postwar, if we permit farm income to drop back to 1940 levels, the railroads will lose $4,500,000,000 per year, with like ratio of losses to other groups. Total transportation income is approximately one-half of gross farm income.

New construction averages approximately 12 percent of the national income. Approximately 2,800,000 jobs in the construction industry are available in the reconversion period if materials are released and other controls removed.

"In 1920 all items on this chart (handed Mr. Hanson and others) started downward together, bringing about the depression of 1921.

"The price of silver, a monetary medium in many nations, fluctuates on the world market like any other commodity.

"The price of silver dropped from $1.35 in 1920 to 80 cents per ounce in 1921.

"The drop was disastrous to those nations using silver as a monetary medium and reduced the buying power of approximately 60 percent of the world's population.

"All prices leveled off from 1922–29, and the United States went into a new period of parity prices at a level of approximately 155 percent of 1910–14. During this period the prosperity of the United States held up world prices as well as our own.

"The price of silver continued to drop; all raw material prices again started downward in 1925, the beginning of the depression which culminated in the stock-market crash in 1929, bringing on the most severe depression this Nation ever had, in 1932.

"Failure to restore farm and other raw material prices in the 1930–41 period * * * prevented our Nation from again having full employment and normal income and caused us to lose $473,000,000,000 of potential income in that 12-year period.

"At the present time, there is complete chaos in foreign exchange and, until world fiscal policies and commodity prices are stabilized, there will be no foundation upon which to build world peace.

"The record proves quite clearly that our first step as a nation is to have Congress pass legislation which will provide permanent parity prices for basic agricultural products which include the seven major crops, all of which are nonperishable, making up approximately 90 percent of all harvested crop acres.

"Permanent parity prices could be definitely stabilized with the present commodity loan program and, if such loans were made callable only at the parity level, there would not be any wide fluctuations in farm income and in turn no great fluctuation in the income of other groups.

"By stabilizing the price level in the United States, we automatically stabilize over 40 percent of the income of the world and, with full parity for farm products in the United States, we will lay the first foundation stone in bringing about world prosperity as a foundation for permanent peace.

"Our tariff should be flexible, automatically representing the difference between our parity price level and the landed cost of any imported product.

"With only 6 percent of the world's population we produced approximately 47 percent of the world's goods.

"With the natural resources to produce 98 percent of everything we need, our export trade will be trivial and insignificant * * * and we can't use but a small volume of imports except at the expense of displacing some of our own production and in turn our outlet for labor and our income from production * * *.

"Other nations will require tariffs to protect them against our efficiency, just as we must for other reasons be protected by import duties on both raw materials and finished goods up to our parity price farm levels.

"We should serve primarily as a referee in helping the world maintain a proper price level for prosperity.

"The English Empire has practically bankrupted itself with cheap raw materials in trying to make up for its inefficiency of production.

"The British Empire has a population of 700,000,000. With a price level which would permit its people to earn $400 per capita, or less than 40 percent of our per capita income, the Empire would have an annual income of $280,000,000,000, and would then have a market with her own people, much greater than her industrial capacity to produce.

"England would then be solvent instead of needing loans, whereas, if they continue to maintain a price level which permits of a 10-cents-per-day wage in India, they will have neither markets nor income.

"Permanent parity prices for farm products are necessary if we wish to maintain national solvency and, our next step is to have an accurate parity price formula.

"In the case of weights and measures the standard was selected and locked up in the Bureau of Standards for safety and future comparisons. We must establish such a formula for parity price and it must be one that is simple and one that cannot be changed at the first sign of political pressure.

"If we will maintain our present farm production and maintain our farm prices at parity we will not have any serious unemployment or depression.

"At the parity price level our farm production always creates the income to consume our production or in the case of any surplus, to consume the products of other nations for which we exchange our surplus * * *.

"Permanent parity price legislation can end the confusion which now exists as to our future economic policies and make it possible for industry to carry on a definite program of reconversion."

As stated, am telling you in substance what Mr. Wilken said; writing is based upon shorthand notes made when he was talking. Sent for Mr. Wilken, submitted to him a draft of the foregoing, which he read and said, "O. K."

In conclusion, beg leave to make this personal observation, viz: Was impressed with the sincerity and soundness of Mr. Wilken's statement of facts and his reasoning based upon them; what he said, according to this writer's records and recollections, is well in line with what he has, for months, been telling members of the national association, which includes the membership of the southern association.

Will observe further: Mr. Wilken has not said anything to this writer's knowledge that conflicts with the views of Dr. J. Lee Coulter, a Washington agricultural consultant, or Mr. Charles B. Ray, trade counselor, of Chicago, both of whom are his associates on the National Association Research Committee's research staff.

C. C. HANSON,
Secretary.

Resolutions of United States Conference of Mayors on Postwar Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1946

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include certain resolutions passed by the annual conference of the United States Conference of Mayors which was held recently. This is an organization which represents the chief executives of more than 1,000 cities in the country. Throughout the war period they have given a faithful accounting in their respective communities. I know of no group of men who have cooperated better in the national war effort. Cities have restricted their municipal programs and their citizens have supported all sorts of war drives from salvage of needed short materials to the raising of money and the purchase of Federal securities. Naturally they are concerned now with postwar planning, and I thought that it would be advantageous to us all to have this expression on public works, funds for public-works planning, airports, airport and air-traffic control, surplus property, taxation of war-surplus properties, and the release of war-surplus materials for housing purposes.

PUBLIC WORKS

Whereas it is recognized and accepted that public works constitutes an important factor in providing employment and stimulating production in times when industrial production lags; and

Whereas many cities throughout the Nation are ready with detailed plans and specifications for useful and needed public works in the event of a high level of unemployment; and

Whereas it is essential that cities know in advance the extent to which there will be Federal financial participation in a public-works program, if any: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States Conference of Mayors petition the Congress of the United States to the end that a definite and specific statement of policy may be laid down covering all phases of Federal responsibility for the financing of those public works designed to meet possible emergency conditions.

FUNDS FOR PUBLIC-WORKS PLANNING

Whereas the Congress of the United States in title V of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 authorized Federal appropriations to be advanced to cities for the preparation of plans for public works to be undertaken in the reconversion and transition period; and

Whereas the amount of funds so far actually made available is so inadequate that the purpose of title V of the act has been completely emasculated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States Conference of Mayors petition the Congress to appropriate sufficient planning funds to enable completion of a reserve of carefully planned projects which can be put into the construction stage, should such action be necessary by reason of economic conditions.

AIRPORTS

Whereas both the Senate and the House of Representatives have passed, in different form, the bill (S. 2) authorizing a program of Federal grants for the development of public airports, and that bill is now being considered by a conference committee representing the two Houses of Congress, and

Whereas certain of the differences between the Senate and House versions of said bill are of major importance and concern to the municipalities of the United States, the Senate version being preferable in some respects and the House version in others. Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the United States Conference of Mayors unanimously and strongly recommends that the Congress agree upon and enact a Federal-aid airport act containing (1) the provisions of the House version of S. 2 permitting any municipality or other public agency to apply directly to the Civil Aeronautics Administration for grants for airport projects, and to receive such grants; (2) the provisions of the House version relative to the size and duration of the proposed Federal-aid airport program; (3) the provisions of the House version authorizing the Government to condemn lands needed for an airport project when requested to do so by the project sponsor; (4) the provisions of the Senate version permitting the Government to share the costs of acquiring property interests necessary for airport projects; and (5) the provisions of the Senate version requiring that project sponsors make available airport building space to the Government for certain purposes only if a reasonable rental is paid therefor; and be it further

Resolved, That the standing committee on legislation of the United States Conference of Mayors is hereby authorized and directed to present these recommendations to the Congress and to the Senate and House conferees on the bill S. 2, and to urge their favorable consideration and adoption.

AIRPORTS AND AIR-TRAFFIC CONTROL

Whereas the United States Conference of Mayors has for many years maintained the position with regard to air-traffic control that safety considerations should be paramount and that responsibility for safety in the air, at municipal airports essential to the national defense, commercial air transport, and the postal service, should not be divided; and

Whereas during the war the above principle as advocated, namely, complete Federal responsibility for air-traffic safety was recognized throughout the Nation; and

Whereas there has now been presented the whole question of return of operation to certain cities of airport traffic control responsibilies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States Conference of Mayors insist that there be no division of responsibility for air safety by return to the archaic system of Federal responsibility for safety control on civil airways and city responsibility for safety at and in

the vicinity of municipal airports; and be it further

Resolved, That the United States Conference of Mayors petition the President and the Congress of the United States to approve legislation and authorize such appropriations as may be necessary to insure CAA administration and financing of all traffic control operations at all civil airports serving the needs of national defense, commercial air transport and the postal service.

SURPLUS PROPERTY

Be it resolved by the United States Conference of Mayors, That the president and executive committee continue their efforts to insure that section 13 of the Surplus Property Act, giving priorities to cities, be effectively carried out.

TAXATION OF WAR SURPLUS PROPERTIES

Whereas the United States Government has disposed of and is presently disposing of property, through sales on time payments with title retained in the Federal Government until full payment has been made, or by lease to private individuals or corporations, the effect of which arrangement allows the purchaser or lessee to escape State and local taxes on said property because the title remains in and is still vested in the Federal Government; and

Whereas sales or leases as aforesaid are a discrimination against the taxpayers of the States and municipalities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That in those cases where the property is sold on the installment payment plan, or leased for private use, the sales contract or lease shall contain a provision requiring the purchaser or lessee to pay in full all State and local taxes which would be levied on such property if the title had not been retained by the Government, or its agencies, and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States and to the presiding officers of the Senate and House of Representatives; and to all governmental agencies having control of the sale or lease of Federal properties.

RELEASE OF WAR SURPLUS MATERIALS FOR HOUSING PURPOSES

Whereas a critical shortage exists of materials for construction of housing; and

Whereas the situation is so serious that every possible item of construction materials and equipment not needed by the armed forces should be made immediately available for housing purposes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the President and other officers of the Conference confer at once with the President of the United States, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy for the specific purpose of urging them to declare surplus and to release all possible quantities of consumer and durable goods which can be utilized and are required for the construction of housing.

I Shall Not Wholly Die

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks I include a poem by Lt. Theodore C. Agins, USNR, entitled "I Shall Not Wholly Die":

I SHALL NOT WHOLLY DIE

"NON OMNIS MORIAR"

I saw him yesterday,
Watched him ride by,
Saw his broad-brimmed hat,
His lean lined gray face.
His cape,
His thinning hand he waved,
With familiar gusty grace.
Of course he smiled.
He always did,
Warm, human, good,
And leaned forward
To let you see his eyes.
They smiled too.
I knew they would.

Sure
I've talked to him;
And every time he answered,
It was
Christmas in my heart again,
Time for all familiar men
To listen,
Leaning over a thousand neighbor fences.
His cherished voice made
Courage flare,
Brought vibrant life
Through unseen
Air.
We were close,
My President and I,
He confided, inspired,
And later,
Comforted and consoled me.
I trusted him—
Implicitly.

And I saw him ride by
Pale and thin,
Somewhat weary, yet contented within;
And his head was high,
Halo in strength against
The sky,
Shoulders squared,
Valiant, gray,
I tell you now,
He can't be
Dead.
I saw him yesterday.

—*Lt. Theodore C. Agins, USNR.*

Seizing of Hebrews Who Seek Entry to Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 30 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an advertisement entitled "The War That Still Goes On," which appeared in the New York Times of January 25, and which was inserted by the American League for a Free Palestine, of which former Senator Guy M. Gillette, is president.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WAR THAT STILL GOES ON

(Extracted from American newspaper correspondents)

NINE HUNDRED HEBREWS SEIZED SEEKING ENTRY TO PALESTINE—2 EXILED IN ERITREA SLAIN, 12 WOUNDED

JERUSALEM, January 18.—More than 900 illegal Hebrew immigrants were captured off Haifa by a British naval craft yesterday. Their ship was confiscated and the captain and crew arrested.

The illegals came on a 500-ton motor vessel named for Enzo Sereni, a Palestine labor leader who was executed in northern Italy by the Germans after he parachuted behind the enemy lines.

Their ship was sighted during the afternoon by a routine air reconnaissance patrol that noted her uncertain course and her strange flag. Word was flashed back to the naval station and a British naval patrol was sent out. The ship was intercepted and boarded.

None on board had proper papers. The 900, along with captain and crew, were taken to the Athlit detention camp.

At the same time it was announced in a cryptic communiqué that as a result of a disturbance in a detention camp in Eritrea, where suspected terrorists are held, 2 Hebrews were killed and 12 wounded.

Full details are not available, but it is known that the Eritrea camp has been a hot spot since the first detainees were sent there in October 1944. About 250 persons are now being held indefintely in Eritrea.

The Hebrews are particularly concerned about them because they cannot understand by what right the British can ship persons out of the country and hold them indefinitely without trial. The British answer is "security." British officials contend that although no war is going on, there are wartime conditions in Palestine that call for wartime measures.

Mankind will always remember with gratitude how the good and brave people of England stood at Dunkerque alone and took the blitz, and thus contributed so much toward saving the world from Nazi enslavement. But we also remember how in those dark days in the history of Great Britain, when she stood disarmed, alone, defeated on the Continent and blitzed from the air, she sent a pleading voice across the Atlantic to the Government and people of America:

"Give us the tools and we will finish the job."

America's magnificent answer made a brilliant gleam in those gloomy pages of history.

Now it looks as if some of these tools are being used not to finish the job for democracy, for decency—the job that millions of our sons fought and died for—but to finish the job that Hitler started and didn't quite succeed in finishing.

Look now for what purpose some of these lend-lease tools are being used. See how Great Britain now concentrates part of its military and naval power on the shores and on the soil of a tiny country and against the survivors of Oswiecim and Bergen-Belsen, of the death factories and crematories—against these wretched survivors whom Hitler did not quite succeed in exterminating.

Now, due to Britain's action, those survivors remain in the concentration camps behind barbed wire, in ragged prison clothes, disease-ridden, with the prospect that this winter may perhaps be their last; compelled to go back to the miserable lands from which they barely escaped to be the prey of anti-Semitism, now more savage than before the war.

WEAPONS OF OPPRESSION

Ships of the Royal Navy and planes of the Royal Air Force patrol not only the shores of tiny Palestine, but the whole Mediterranean, against a handful of survivors fleeing hell to find a promised haven of life and dignity. And if a boatload of survivors is sighted, weapons forged for democracy are used to shoot at them. And if, in spite of all the warships and airplanes and shore patrols, some wretched hundreds still succeed in getting in, then they are tracked through the streets of Jerusalem and Tel-Aviv, even into the friendly houses where they expected to find shelter and hoped to spend a first night in bed after years of being hunted and

haunted. And they are caught and put into concentration camps.

This is being done to the people who were Hitler's first adversaries and greatest victims, and this is being done in a country that was entrusted to Great Britain by international agreement, not to dominate or to control, but to look after so that in it these very people might find their new life and dignity. More than that, this is being done only to that people, for there is no restriction on entry into Palestine for anyone but Hebrews.

And this is being done against the will or without the knowledge of the public opinion of Great Britain, which we believe would never tolerate such acts if they knew the facts. We therefore address ourselves not only to the people of the United States of America, but also of Great Britain, where the Hebrew freedom movement has stanch and courageous supporters.

WORLD PEACE AT STAKE

The plight of the Hebrew survivors in Europe is not the concern of one people alone. If the Hebrews are abandoned to their own gruesome fate—if the British persist in keeping the doors of Palestine barred to them—it will be an evil omen for the hope of world-wide peace.

The atomic age is here. Atomic power, plus cynicism and godlessness, equals global destruction. The fate of the Hebrew people in Europe is a test case for the United Nations.

Victor L. Anfuso

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1946

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by Victor L. Anfuso, former special assistant to the Commissioner of Naturalization, and intelligence officer for the OSS on the occasion of the presentation to him of the Distinguished Service Medal for his war services by the Regular Veterans Association, at the Hotel Ambassador, New York City, Friday, January 25, 1946:

At the outset, I want to say that I deserve not the slightest credit for the very little part I played in this last war.

One of the greatest things for which all of us should always be thankful to God is that we are Americans, and live in a country wherein our troubles, no matter how big they may seem at times, when compared to the hardships and deprivations suffered by the other peoples of the world, are really trivial. For this blessing I shall always remain grateful. I shall never stop offering my little contribution to any cause which is for the general welfare and security of our country. That is the only reason which prompted me to volunteer for overseas duty and to sponsor a national security program immediately after my return in July 1945, which program I should like briefly to discuss tonight.

Up to 1941 Germany's plan for world conquest was little known in the United States. Such limited intelligence as we did have prior to our entry into World War II, however, dictated to our leaders at the time, a policy of supplying the materials of war, first to the English and later to the Russians. Our help then in some degree made El Alamein and Stalingrad possible. Had it not been for such assistance the result and the picture today might have been entirely different. I think that no one will dispute the fact that had our intelligence then been more extensive in the Far East the Pearl Harbor disaster might have been avoided.

In the future the need for intelligence will be greater than ever. The potentials and their alignments may be different, but that very fact requires our greater alertness.

The political potentials alone are numerous, and without exhausting the possibilities we might list those of England, Russia, China, and the South American countries. What is being planned for the Balkans? For Italy? For France and Spain? What underground movements are now on foot to bring back Germany and Japan as great world powers?

Greater than these potentials are those of economics. What is this new economic fascism—this synarchism of which we are beginning to hear talk? How is this fascism related to cartels? What trade alinements are being arranged? We are giving aid to war stricken nations in cooperation with the United Nations. Are any of the participating countries in UNRRA using the agency to promote their own interests?

Recent developments of the atomic bomb have brought home forcibly to us the great importance of scientific research and development in warfare. By this new weapon, which can virtually be fired from any point on the globe to any other point, it is said that all of mankind is in danger of being destroyed should there be another war. And by means of a sneak attack, a nation the size of Albania, if it has access to this and other inventions, without a large army, navy, or air force, can destroy this, the most powerful of all nations on earth.

Despite all the pledges of the statesmen and scientists never to release such destructive inventions to carry on warfare in the future, we know from experience that such studies will continue in peacetime, both by the nations who desire to preserve the peace and those who will seek new empires through a third world war. It becomes of paramount importance, therefore, to know what other nations are accomplishing in the way of scientific developments. And in the words recently uttered by Arthur Hays Sulzberger, publisher of the New York Times, "We have reached a point in our growth and scientific development where our free order rests upon being informed."

At this moment, for instance, while the well-meaning people of the world are making plans for the United Nations Organization—which is to make war impossible in the future just as the League of Nations was supposed to have outlawed war after World War I—international criminals, who might well be called synarchists, are sponsoring and conducting secret researches with regard to the atomic bomb and other inventions, which might make our own defense preparations wholly inadequate, and which, were they known by the average man on the street, might send shivers down his spine. And you may rest assured that as soon as the new superstate is established within our boundaries that this country is going to become contaminated by the greatest number of foreign agents ever, who are going to use the UNO as an excuse and as a means to visit every vital point in the United States to study our strength and our weaknesses.

What is the answer to all this? We know that what I have said is not at all fantastic.

I believe that today the President of the United States and the people as a whole are alerted to the idea that we must never again be caught asleep and that we should have a coordinated system of intelligence. This country is also well aware of the fact that since World War II, other countries have not terminated their systems of obtaining foreign intelligence nor curtailed them in any way. If anything they have expanded them. So that it is perfectly proper and natural for us to guard our own security in a similar manner. The difficulty lies in how best to establish a permanent bureau of intelligence.

A short time ago you may have read in the newspapers that our State Department had set up a system of obtaining foreign intelligence in collaboration with the Army and Navy, and more recently that President Truman created an authority under the jurisdiction of the secretarial triumvirate of the State, Army, and Navy.

I am personally opposed to setting up an intelligence bureau under the State Department. The more successful methods employed in obtaining foreign intelligence rarely follows the defined patterns of diplomacy and formality by which the State Department is required to act in its dealings with foreign powers. The State Department is so bound by the traditions of its office and the rules of protocol that it should not be burdened with the tedious and sometimes dangerous function of gathering foreign intelligence, except as to intelligence it may normally come upon through its usual overt sources.

Besides we are too proud a nation to deal with other nations with daggers under our silk gloves. For example, we could never stoop to the kind of international double-dealing as did the two silk-hatted men from Japan, who called on Secretary Hull and President Roosevelt on a seemingly friendly mission, knowing full well that while they were making their curtsies, the Japanese Navy was speeding to make the infamous attack on Pearl Harbor.

But I do say that while Mr. Byrnes is talking to any foreign diplomats, setting up plans for the United Nations Organization, he should know if those countries talking peace are at the same time preparing for war.

I also believe that when a country applies to us for a loan, whether it be for $1,000,000 or $5,000,000,000, that before granting such loans assuming that we can afford it, that we know that the money is actually needed for the purpose described; that it will be so used, and if so used that the borrower does not release other funds which it has available for selfish propaganda in other countries or in preparation for war. And in this connection I am reliably informed that many diplomats in the State Department, especially Assistant Secretary of State Spruille Braden, are opposed to having a bureau of foreign intelligence in the State Department, and in the words of Drew Pearson, Washington columnist, "believe their job is to smooth foreign relations, not ruffle them with undercover agents."

To set it up under the triumvirate would still involve the State Department in the intrigues of undercover agents which would lower the dignity and ethical standard of the State Department. To leave it under the joint chiefs of staff of the Army and Navy is all right in wartime but certainly not in peacetime.

The most effective plan of intelligence, I believe, from the experience, working with the Army, Navy, and State Departments, is to have a central bureau of information within the Department of Justice, like the FBI, except that the CBI would be concerned only with foreign intelligence.

And here if you will permit, I'd like to pause for a moment to take up the cause of the thousands of scientists, men and women, who have given many great boons to humanity on starvation pay and uncertain futures, while manufacturers have made millions on their inventions. Take for instance the scientists who developed the wonder-working drug penicillin. These men had no funds at all to work with, and at one time the experiments would have stopped had not the Rockefeller Foundation made a vitally needed grant of only $1,280. And when the scientists did make the discovery,

they didn't receive a penny for their work, although commercial drug houses profited handsomely from it.

Is it any wonder then that many scientists, not quite so scrupulous and patriotic as the penicillin prize winners, fall to the tempting offers of private, sinister interests—both foreign and domestic?

The United States Government should take more of an interest in the future in its scientists than it has in past. The majority of these men, like the majority of professional men and women—be they doctor, lawyers, engineers or dentists—do not care for great wealth; they find their greatest happiness in their pursuit of scientific endeavors. But they should not be exploited.

There is room for all scientists under a central bureau of information, which I now would like to briefly discuss.

The purposes of this central bureau of information which would have liaison connection with the State Department, Army, Navy, and all other departments which are sources of information, would be to gather and coordinate all foreign intelligence in the political, economic, psychological, sociological, and military fields. The CBI should also have a research and development branch to gather intelligence of a scientific nature and to conduct scientific researches.

The proposed central bureau of information falls naturally within the Department of Justice because the Attorney General, a member of the President's official family, is also the legal adviser and investigator of the United States Government. As such it is his duty to keep the Chief Executive and our Government properly informed as to what is going on all over the world. Such a bureau within the Department of Justice would also make possible perfect team work between it and the FBI, the internal informant of our Government, whose services and research laboratories are recognized as the finest in the world.

When we speak of creating new departments or bureaus, Congressmen, and there are many here tonight, are naturally interested in its cost to the people.

Although I am convinced that such a central bureau of information will save millions of lives which would make any monetary cost appear insignificant, I am prepared to discuss the proposal from the monetary point of view.

I am reliably informed that war activities from World War I up to 1929 cost the United States Government $37,573,960,113, and that war activities from July 1, 1940, to November 1945, cost the United States Government $310,000,000,000.

We know, too, that if we had had such a centralized, unified system of intelligence in operation from the last war much of the duplication and waste could have been avoided, money allocated for war activities could have been more effectively spent for appropriate equipment and arms in line with the knowledge we would have had on hand, and that much which was spent need not have been spent.

I sincerely believes that the United States Government and the world at large would profit more by a system which would supply to us in peacetime all the information and intelligence we need to deal with international war criminals and synarchists responsible for the commencement of all wars, rather than waiting for them to strike and then developing the weapons to stop or destroy them.

It is my firm conviction that the establishment of a unified, coordinated system of foreign intelligence should receive top priority now. It will help us to know our friends and our enemies much better than we really do and would materially help in the kind of treaties and agreements we make with other nations in the future.

Within the United States lies the power and the means to prevent another war. But we must be practical. It cannot be done alone by idealistic and well-meaning international agreements and protocols. We must know that which is not on paper to make the writing more effective.

Finally, let this or any other plan of intelligence be a guaranty to the peaceful nations of the world that the knowledge we gather will not be used to promote wars but rather to enforce the United Nations Organization and to serve as a guardian of the peace of the world.

The Caste System in the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 30 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Barrack-Room View of 'the Brass,'" which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post of January 5, 1945. The editorial is one of the many protests against the Army caste system which I have read in recent weeks. I am informed that these charges apply equally to all branches of our armed forces. It would seem to be extremely unsafe to the future of our democracy to conscript our young men to live during peacetime in such an undemocratic atmosphere.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BARRACK-ROOM VIEW OF "THE BRASS"

(By Paul Jones)

They say that in Italy one German commander remarked enviously that the United States was fighting a millionaire's war. Never were any enlisted men in the history of the world better clothed, better fed, better equipped and better housed. You could add, with perfect truth, that they fought a better fight because they got good treatment.

By a curious coincidence, the rank and file were not only tops in performance and in the comforts of life—short of the front line, where life has no comforts at all. They also hold the all-time record for griping. This is a remarkable claim to make for any soldiers, but it appears well-founded. Their letters pour across every newspaper desk in the country, from Austria, Italy, Czechoslovakia, from the jungles of New Guinea, from Leyte and Okinawa and Upper Assam—wherever bitter souls by candlelight finally rouse themselves to angry composition.

What they get mad about is sometimes a standard military grouch. Food, for example. That happens in Germany, where transport is poor, Or in France, for the same reason. It is also a favorite gripe in the Pacific, where the fellows have to eat powdered eggs and dehydrated vegetables.

But this does not raise the most serious problem evident in their letters. Temporary hardship can be logically explained, and soon fades from the memory. What burns the men up more than anything else is their apparent status of peasants, while officers play the role of manorial barons. You find dark references to a caste system, and they come often enough to show that something is radically wrong.

They are not talking about ordinary discipline and subordination. They make few complaints about the basic principle that officers and men should live separate lives for the best military results. The point they raise is that, in so many places and in so many respects, the contrast is altogether too glaring.

The German general in Italy referred wistfully to the prodigal way in which our Army could use planes, gasoline, shells, transport and bombs. He didn't like it, which proves it must have been a sound idea. In that sense, our millionaire's war was the right way to proceed, and no one in his senses could quarrel with it, least of all the men it saved.

But when this notion carried over into the construction of back-area bases, the millionaire concept backfired heavily. There, too many commanders behaved as though they had just come into a large fortune in tax-free bonds. From the size and appearance of the officers' clubs the base engineers would run up, you might suppose yourself in a Florida resort hotel. Spacious and well-appointed, often handsomely landscaped, and a bar serving anything you cared to name at cost. They did themselves very well indeed.

Who would begrudge a little extra comfort, perhaps even luxury, to men serving their country far from home? Well, the enlisted men did, and apparently still do. Because what they got, while it was clean and comfortable, though crowded, was by comparison nothing. The post exchange, the day rooms, the beer garden, were all very well, excellently planned, neatly furnished, perhaps, but just down the road was that huge country club.

As one man said, he felt as if he were living in a low-cost public-housing development just across the street from the Waldorf-Astoria, assuming that he would not be permitted to enter the hotel.

He further said that he neither expected nor wanted the run of the officers' club. That wasn't the point. But he had always believed that rank had its duties as well as its privileges, and one of its duties was to observe a decent restraint.

The situation in areas now under occupation, to judge by soldier letters, is different in degree, but not in character. Some officers appear to allow themselves the utmost liberty, while imposing very severe and often unreasonable restrictions on the men under them. Once more, the point lies in the failure to maintain a responsible attitude.

Men's Clothing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1946

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include therein the following joint resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, requesting that an increased amount of men's clothing be sent to Rhode Island. The resolution follows:

House Joint Resolution 534

Joint resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to take up the matter of the clothing situation in Rhode Island with the Office of Price Administration in Washington, D. C., to see if there cannot be a greater increase in the amount of men's clothing sent to Rhode Island

Whereas the supply of men's clothing for Rhode Island seems to be insufficient for the

demand which at the present time, when so many veterans are being separated from the armed forces, and are trying to outfit themselves with civilian apparel creates a real hardship: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States be and they are earnestly urged to take up with the Office of Price Administration in Washington, D. C., the matter of the clothing shortage in Rhode Island to see if there cannot be a greater increase in the amount of men's clothing sent to Rhode Island; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be and he hereby is directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States and to the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration in Washington, D. C.

Address of Hon. John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1946

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address recently made by the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, majority leader of the House of Representatives:

The record of the Democratic Party since March 1933, when the Republicans were ousted for their inaction and lack of leadership, has been one of progressive and constructive service in the cause of the American people.

In the Congress, that record shows that the great majority of members of the Democratic Party have given sound and progressive consideration to the needs of our people.

In the Republican Party, that record of Congress shows, the great majority have looked backwards. For 13 years they have been looking back, and in their concentration on a scene that is happily passed for the majority of Americans, in their nostalgia for that heyday of the favored few, they have lost sight of this mighty, forward-marching Nation of ours. They have made a record of blind opposition.

Through the most trying period of our Nation's history—the Hoover depression—through the threatened danger to our country in the pre-Pearl Harbor years, through the war itself, the Democratic Party, first under the leadership of our late beloved President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and now under President Harry S. Truman, has given the American people a Government that brought victory over both depression at home and aggression abroad.

The Republicans in Congress neither acknowledged that leadership nor offered constructive criticism. They could—or would—only obstruct. From the time when President Roosevelt assumed office, up to the very day of Pearl Harbor, all we met was the blind and bitter opposition on every important issue of from 80 to 100 percent of the Republican membership in Congress.

Today, my friends, offering you that kind of government, thinking you are gullible and will forget, these Republicans are once more asking you to go back to the Hoover days of inaction and indifference.

What few progressives there are in the Republican Party in Congress are given no voice in its councils. They are suppressed, isolated, politically neutralized by the deadening combination of Old Guard reactionaries dominated by big business.

It was only the other day that a prominent Member of the Congress—not a Democrat, but a progressive Republican—condemned his own party for its inaction, its self-dedication to reaction, and its blind and irresponsible obstruction to an entire program of progressive legislation for the best interests of the American people.

But the voice of this prominent progressive Republican fell upon deaf ears on his own side of the congressional aisle.

A week ago, at this very hour and over this broadcasting system, the Republican leader of the House of Representatives made what was actually an apology for the complete failure of his party to assume its proper place in our political life and its proper tasks and responsibilities in the Halls of Congress.

The other prominent Republican had condemned the Republican Party not only for its lack of vision and courage, but for its evasions its resort to empty, high-sounding verbiage in the attempt to cover a condition of complete political bankruptcy. And this denunciation from the lips of a Republican Senator was echoed and re-echoed through the rank and file of his party.

Last week, in his attempt to explain, the Republican House leader offered the curious thesis that action—or the lack of it—did not matter. He placed the emphasis on general principles—by removing that emphasis away from a specific program such as President Harry Truman has offered the Nation.

Yes, according to this new Republican thesis, what we need in this country to meet the problems of reconversion, of full employment, of safeguards against inflation, is a good resounding set of platitudes, all beautifully embroidered on cloth—whole cloth—and ready for framing.

But the people of America are not ready for this or any other kind of framing. And those who were listening to last week's Republican apology noted that not once during his speech did the party's spokesman outline a specific legislative proposal that the Republican Party stood for.

Before 1933, when the Democrats were the minority party, I remember that its representation in Congress told the people just where my party stood. The people were not left guessing, or listening to lofty words of little meaning. They knew what we stood for, and when they voted in 1932 to put the Democratic Party in power they knew we had leadership.

Before the Republicans can follow that example they will have to effect a political revolution within their own party. And from what I have learned in my experience with politics, I do not think that can happen for some years yet. The Old Guard is unlikely to relinquish its iron grip on the party merely at the invitation to do so from a handful of liberal members.

We Democrats have been accused—not by our own party but by the leaders of the opposition—of making a grave political error. That error, say the Republicans, was to carry on toward the goals set for our Nation by the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

When President Truman presented his 21-point program for a prosperous, secure postwar America, the Republicans in Congress immediately brought this accusation—as they regarded it—against him.

Here was a program such as might have been drawn up by Franklin D. Roosevelt himself. Here was concrete, specific action—action in the interest of our returning soldiers, our working people, our farmers, our factory hands, miners, railroadmen.

Again, it was the protection of the many, the refusal to favor the few. Yes; this was Roosevelt all over again. And that, said the Republicans, was a political error. They do not believe America wants to march ahead. They do not believe Americans want to speak today in terms of action, of progressive, forward-looking action. No; what they say America needs is—and I quote one of their leaders—"old-fashioned conservatism."

Now, in the Republican lexicon, that phrase, "old fashioned conservatism," means one thing, and one thing only. The kind of Government we had in the 1920's from Harding to Hoover, the kind of Government that let inflation run wild and then let depression spread unchecked; that looked to the stock market to relieve those who had earnings and relied upon charity to take care of those who did not; the kind of Government that blinked ruinous business practices and blocked efforts to correct them—that is old fashioned conservatism, the prescription for postwar America which the Republican Old Guard now holds out to us.

I do not believe the American people want that prescription. I do not believe they see in it the assurance of their future well-being. On the contrary, as they survey the scene today, and behold industry locked in a standstill on the very threshold of a new and promising age, I believe they can already identify the forces that have brought the wheels of industry to a stop.

Why are certain great corporations in America refusing to accept reasonable compromises of their wage disputes—compromises of the kind that have always been regarded in the past as the way of reasonable men, the American way of splitting the difference and then going ahead and getting back to work?

Why do these recalcitrant corporations suddenly abandon the American way at this time? Why do they refuse to match labor's acceptance of the compromises reached by fact-finding boards? Why do they stand pat and ignore their responsibilities to the public?

If this is a last-ditch struggle to break the back of organized labor and end collective bargaining in America, if this is a war of attrition against the working people of America, which party in Government has given its political blessing to that war? Who has flashed the green light signal?

I have sat in the Halls of Congress and I have heard some men speak bitter words about organized labor. I have witnessed the political scene setting for this crisis through many months of haranguing by my Republican colleagues in the House of Representatives.

Yes, the Republican Party has long ago given the nod to big business, has long ago said, "Go ahead and break the unions as you broke them after World War I. Crush them, fell them, and let the consequences descend upon America where they may."

But as I once believed in the integrity of government under a Democratic administration with President Franklin D. Roosevelt at its head, so do I believe in the integrity of our Government under the leadership of President Harry S. Truman.

To you—the average American, the working people of this Nation—I say, your Government under the Democratic Party is keeping the faith. The social gains of yesterday are deep in the hearts of our people of today. With a Democratic national administration and a Democratic Congress in the years ahead, that fiber will be strengthened.

America is too great to turn back. Her people, conscious of their country's great destiny, are keeping on the road of progress. They are marching on. They will continue to march on under the leadership of President Truman and the Democratic Party.

The China Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 29, 1946

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Sun recently printed some editorial observations concerning the crisis in China. Because many American citizens are confused on this issue, I deem its reproduction into the columns of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD justified. The editorial discusses Generals Marshall and Hurley and pays its respect to General Hurley's recent blast. The article is as follows:

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch]

HURLEY'S BLAST AND THE CHINA CRISIS

(Big policy issues outweigh personalities involved in Ambassador's melodramatic resignation, newspaper says; has used his influence against Chinese democracy and unification; goal now should be removal of our forces, and aid in bringing factions into coalition)

(From the Chicago Sun)

Far transcending all personalities involved in Ambassador Hurley's melodramatic resignation are the great issues of American policy in China.

Our immense influence will continue to waste itself there, and undermine the peace of our country as of the world, unless we exert it for a democratic, unified China. General Hurley, unwittingly no doubt, and his backers have been wielding it against such a China.

The country salutes General Marshall for his unhesitating, patriotic acceptance of a temporary assignment from President Truman to go to China on special mission. General Marshall has neither the vanity nor gullibility which so contributed to General Hurley's failure.

WHY DID HE QUIT?

Further, Marshall was Mr. Roosevelt's close coworker and knows the late President's policy to promote unity in China. May he do as much as one man on special mission can to revive that policy.

To date, the reasons for General Hurley's resignation are much clouded. He cannot have resigned simply because he was incensed over statements by some Congressmen saying that he caused dissension between Chungking and the Chinese Communists.

Not even General Hurley could have imagined that such statements were proof of State Department "leaks" when independent students of Asia, throughout this country, were castigating America's unilateral buttressing of the Chungking dictatorship, implemented by Hurley, as support for civil war.

Did the resignation, then, result from a shift by the President and Secretary Byrnes from the disastrous Hurley line? Mr. Byrnes' press conference the other day did not establish this.

AIM SHOULD BE UNITY

In actuality, General Hurley should have been removed long since. Instead, he was entreated to go back to China and given large assurances by Mr. Byrnes. Yet he must have felt that he was at least being curbed. Thus, there is some hope for the future.

If the right policy is followed, we shall withdraw the marines from the civil war zone. We shall withdraw all support from the waging of that war. It has become most dreary to hear repatriation of Japanese cited as an excuse for transporting American-armed Kuomintang troops in American planes and ships, guarded by American armed forces, to wage war on the Chinese Communists.

Given such American support, of course Chiang Kai-shek and the reactionaries of Chungking will refuse any fair compromise with the Communists and minor democratic parties of China.

Our objective should be a coalition government, including Kuomintang, Communist, and other party representation, to prepare for a constitutional regime.

It is China's responsibility, not ours, to create such a regime. But our present policy—the Hurley policy—prevents it. And it threatens to embroil us with Russia. Were we to use our friendly influence aright, without force, and in cooperation with Russia, we could bring the warring sides together.

Such are the issues which transcend personalities. It is necessary, however, that the State Department, and any congressional investigation which ensues, shall protect loyal public servants from smear attacks. General Hurley's charges of action by career diplomats against American authority are utterly without substantiation thus far.

THE GENERAL'S RECKLESSNESS

If any subordinate flouted proper authority, let the fact be established and discipline follow. But let there be an end to hounding of the career men General Hurley sent home from Chungking because he could not brook advice from experts who were undeceived by Kuomintang blandishments

And when suppression of information is investigated, let charges of General Hurley's suppression of it receive the incisive attention that has long been needed.

Assuredly, the State Department needs reorganization. But the Office of Far Eastern Affairs, with which he is furious, is relatively perhaps the best office in the Department.

Aside from the issues, General Hurley is inexcusable for the method of his resignation and his reckless broadsides and innuendoes against our allies, including Britain and Russia. His distaste for imperialism is commendable, but he has been serving it starkly in China.

Celler Deplores AP and UP Denial of Service to State Department—Letter to Assistant Secretary Benton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 30, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

JANUARY 29, 1946.

Hon. WILLIAM BENTON,
Assistant Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BENTON: I applaud your efforts to induce the Associated Press to supply the State Department with material for its broadcasts and newscasts. It is difficult to understand how you can properly direct our Government's International Information Service without this service. The same reasons that actuated the Associated Press to give its news items to the Office of War Information during the war and to the War and Navy Departments should, at this juncture, compel it to render the same service to the State Department for overseas newscasts as well as for the formulation of bulletins to its embassies and legations. Such bulletins are not for publication. This latter service has always been rendered and will be continued.

The charge that the Government cannot engage in newscasts without creating the fear of propaganda is just so much eyewash.

The Supreme Court recently determined that the Associated Press could not withhold its services from the Marshall Field papers, like PM and the Chicago Sun, without violating the antitrust laws. Certainly, the United States Government should be in a better position than private newspapers.

Experience has shown us that news events of the United States concerning its people and its institutions are greatly distorted in places near and places far. News of strikes, of Hollywood scandals, are ballooned out of all proportion in, to name a few, China, in Siberia, in Australia, or in Paraguay. Americans in the eyes of Czechoslovakians, Italians, and South Africans are a bunch of lotus eaters, and our people on the eastern coast are gum-chewing illiterates, and the people of our West are all gun toters. The true perspective is never given in India, in Iran, or even Mexico. All this is so, because on the one hand there is no one medium to convey the true state of facts, and, on the other hand, the true status is distorted and slanted according to the religious, political, or economic ideology of the particular government, or sycophants of a stated government in control.

It is true that, for example, in a country like India there is the Reuters News Agency which has wide coverage there, but it is also generally known that Reuters, if not British-owned, jolly well adheres to the line of British foreign policy and British imperialism. The Associated Press and United Press serve India, too, but have not, as yet, the facilities to cover that wide area adequately. I have read Indian papers and letters from Indians and one can hardly imagine the high-falutin notions that people of that country have concerning us. They think that everyone who walks the streets of New York is a millionaire and that gangsterism is the only American way of life.

Why, therefore, should not the State Department remedy this situation and supply this news lack and remove the tremendous amount of news misinformation about America—misinformation that was deliberately planted by the machinations and propaganda of Nazi and Fascist countries? Why should not the State Department be permitted to short wave even to the nethermost parts of the world the truth about America? But the State Department has not had appropriated to it sufficient moneys to gather the news over the length and breadth of the United States. If the Associated Press lays down on the job and assumes the "dog in the manger" attitude, the efforts of the State Department to build an effective international information service will greatly suffer.

Neither the Associated Press nor the United Press (which has followed the lead of the Associated Press) bring their news service to all parts of the world. For example, there are tiny areas like the Balkans where it would be impossible for privat newspapers to be published without the loss of large sums of money. Why should not the State Department fill the lack in that regard, more particularly when the Balkans is a trouble spot.

One of the objections of the Associated Press and the United Press is that the Government would distribute their bulletins and dispatches free of charge and that this would constitute unfair competition. I recall, however, in particular the Associated Press' boast that it is a public service and was not primarily concerned with profits.

In order to get our viewpoints accepted by others in foreign climes, it is necessary for the foreign peoples to understand those

points of view, to appreciate our ideology, and our economic structure. To that end, it is essential for them to understand something of our history and our traditions. If we are to dispel these misunderstandings about us, our Government must have the right to spread the gospel of the United States throughout the world. The misunderstandings yield to dislikes and dislikes to suspicions and suspicions to unfair and discriminatory practices, all of which finally lead to war.

There are many places where there are no newspapers, and which can be reached only through the radio. While it is true those communities may have few individual radio sets, the few that do thave them will repeat and reiterate the message received.

In a way, our commerce and our national interests are involved and I am firm in the conviction that a denial of the service by the Asscciated Press and the United Press, even with the State Department willing to pay adequately, is shortsighted, unbusinesslike, and pettish.

I believe a splendid service is being rendered by your division in that it is transmitting, as I understand it, 66 programs a day in 21 languages via 36 short-wave transmitters and that newscasts are relayed through stations in Algiers, Germany, London, Saipan, Honolulu, and Manila. There is no danger to freedom of the press. As a matter of fact, I am sure your newscasts abet freedom of the press since they are reproduced in many foreign language papers all over the world.

The Associated Press and the United Press supply services to the British Broadcasting Company, which is government controlled. They supply services to Tass, a distinctly Russian Government department. How in thunder the AP and the UP can deny their service to their own Government is beyond comprehension. They give to the British and to the Communists, but not to democratic United States. Certainly, the Russian Government does not take on full faith and credit what the AP and UP give it. After Tass gets through with these reports, I am sure they would hardly be recognizable. Likewise, British imperialism colors and tints these reports.

But iron-clad assurances can be given by the State Department that it will not distort or misuse the reports, and that the State Department will only act as a sort of pipe line of intelligence to spread information. However, no such demand is made upon any other subscriber.

The AP fears that once our Government begins to function as a newscaster there will be the tendency, inevitably, to suppress or tone down news items that do not reflect creditably on the United States or parts of its people. It fears there will be an attempt to cut here and cut there, that the result, therefore, will not be "news." Well, the answer to that is, Put the State Department on trial, give it a chance for its "white alley." Let there be a probationary period, but if the State Department distorts and misinforms, then and only then let the AP refuse to continue its services.

Furthermore, subscribers are not under obligation to repeat the dispatches verbatim, unless they use the AP or UP dateline. In truth and in fact, the subscribers have axes to grind and reshape and remodel, underscore or tone down the AP reports, putting AP items in the front or back pages and headlining them as policy dictates.

Already reactionary and tory newspapers in Britain, like the Beaverbrook Daily Mail, are seeking to crack down on our State Department for setting up its newscasting organization. Lord Beaverbrook in his various newspapers has done everything in his power to distort for the British readers the American way of life. Naturally, he does not want the truth told. He would like that distortion to continue. He inveighs against so-called government-inspired propaganda. Indeed, of all the propagandists that ever lived he is the most forward and adept.

There are those in the House and in the Senate who think the same as the editors of the AP and the UP and I fear there may be difficulty in getting sufficient appropriations for your international information service. You will have to do much missionary work.

However, I pledge you every possible support so as to induce sufficient appropriations for your broadcasts and newscasts.

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

Improvement of the United States Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 30 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, Yank, the Army weekly, ceased publication at the close of 1945. Published by the War Department and written by and for the enlisted men of the Army, it became truly representative of the thoughts and feelings of our soldiers. It attained a high level of journalistic excellence and an enormous popularity among our troops. Its staff, composed entirely of enlisted men, was represented wherever American soldiers were. Its reporters were part of the show, rather than mere spectators. They knew what it was to carry a rifle, to police quarters, to clean latrines, to drill and to try to wheedle an overnight pass from their sergeants. Although they reported the war from every training post, every front line and every beachhead, none of them ever saw the inside of an officers' club. Their experience is thus a composite of the experience of the average soldier.

In an editorial published in Yank's issue of December 21, 1945, just before it ceased publication, the staff wrote a valedictory editorial which summarized the basic suggestions enlisted men would make for the improvement of the Army. It is a carefully reasoned, brilliantly written document.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have that editorial printed in the RECORD. Coming from so friendly and authoritative a source, I hope it will be given very serious consideration in the Pentagon, and also in Congress.

In sum, the editorial asks for a more democratic Army. It will shock many citizens who were not aware of the completely undemocratic pattern of army social life. I believe that all this is important for us to consider now, because we will soon debate legislation to entrust our young men to the tutelage and training of the Army high command. I am sure that none of us want to conscript our boys for military training if it means a steady dose of Prussianism. We want our youngsters to receive the sort of education that will qualify them to be citizens in a democracy—participants in history's greatest and most successful experiment in self-government. We want them to learn to respect themselves as the equals of others, and to respect others as their own equals. We want self-reliant, cooperative men, who know how to work as a team—who do not accept orders blindly, but are alert to make criticisms or suggest improvements. The Army and Navy do not encourage that sort of thing in their enlisted men or officers. They do not encourage ideas from the ranks—"theirs not to reason why" is still the motto of the services. Only last week we observed the Army's action in forbidding all public meetings of soldiers on the question of demobilization.

If the Army can clean its own house and bring forward a program of training that conforms to our American democratic institutions, if it can junk its caste systems and junk the drill manuals that go back to Frederick the Great, it had better do so soon. Unless it does, it will get a cool reception to its conscription plans from the people of this country and their representatives in Congress. We will be paying a high price for conscription indeed, if all our sons are discharged as civic invalids.

Mr. President, I repeat my request to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YANK RECOMMENDS—

AN ATTEMPT TO PUT TOGETHER SOME OF THE BASIC SUGGESTIONS EM HAVE FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY

There is sharpening of ears and a stirring of activity in the advertising business these days, and the reason is a strong rumor that the United States Army is getting ready to spend $3,000,000 a year on advertising and publicity. Naturally, the various advertising agencies are interested in securing the Army account. Fifteen percent, the usual advertising agency fee, of $3,000,000 comes to almost half a million bucks.

The purpose of the proposed advertising campaign, as we understand it, would be twofold—it would help boom recruiting for the peacetime Army we need by making service in that Army look attractive, and it would keep the general, taxpaying public informed as to the desirability of having an Army and as to what improvements were being made in training that Army.

Yank has been serving as the magazine of the enlisted man for some 3½ years now, and we feel that we know pretty much about the Army. We are even willing to give the Army—for free, without even a 15 percent commission—some advice on how to make itself more appealing to recruits, how to keep the voting public happy about it, and how to save a few millions of dollars in advertising. You see, this peacetime Army will, fortunately or unfortunately, have to be made up of a great many more enlisted men than officers. Our idea is to make it more attractive to these enlisted men—and, incidentally, a better Army all around.

The ideas we suggest are offered sincerely. They are a composite of what the enlisted man has been thinking about all along, a gathering of material which has been piling up in Yank's mail bag and of observations made by Yank enlisted-men correspondents in all theaters of the war and at home.

First, let us have more promotion from the ranks. By this we mean that every possible position requiring a commissioned officer should be filled by a man who has had some service as a GI. Let every West Pointer,

either just before entering or just after leaving the Academy, put in a year as a noncommissioned soldier. Knock out political appointments of officers and, in those cases where some officers have to be directly commissioned to do a certain job, make public their qualifications for the job and let them be passed upon by a board of officers who have had experience in the ranks before granting their commissions.

Such a system would give enlisted men an incentive to work toward eventual officership and would attract a smarter type of soldier to recruiting offices. It would also deal a blow to the "officer-caste" type of thinking which is already in danger of permeating our entire Army. Something like this "officer caste" came into power in Germany and the German General Staff, and a 130-year cycle of wars—two of them world wars—was the result.

Yank believes that a man should not be eligible for officership because of an accident of birth or education or political connection. An officer should be given the opportunity to prove himself first in the ranks. Perhaps there should be no dividing line between commissioned and noncommissioned—just a promotion ladder going straight on up from private to general.

For our second improvement, let us have all promotions—both noncommissioned and commissioned—on a basis of competitive examination without overdue attention to seniority. Between two equally qualified candidates, personal preference of the officer in charge will necessarily be the deciding factor. But let us have a few less sergeants made sergeants simply because they're good guys, and let us put an end to the ridiculous sight of capable young junior officers prancing around their CO like so many newly rich women around a reigning dowager, trying by this favor and that attention to buck their way a grade higher. As to seniority, there is no evidence that hardening of the arteries, even in colonels, is an infallible index of brain power.

And let's do something about making officers as liable under military law for their errors and faults as GI's already are. Every enlisted man knows that an officer can, and sometimes does, get away with a hell of a lot without any more serious bother than a reprimand and a change of station. If an officer is unfit, don't just ease him into a clerical job or hold up his next promotion a month or two. Bust him, as you'd bust a corporal in the same position. If the officer's good, he can climb up again. That seems to be Army reasoning in the case of GI malfeasances; why not apply it to officers?

Let's also do something about keeping distinctions of rank in their proper place. Rank, and the respect due to it, are necessary for the organization of the Army. There must be men to give orders and other men to obey them, but there is no need to differentiate between officers and men off post or off duty. This differentiation has been made in this war and it has had uniformly bad results. Let's get rid of it.

As a first step here, "let's abolish differences in uniform (except for insignia), in messing facilities, in equipment, in quarters. Perhaps in this last instance there might be fewer men assigned to a room as rank increased, but there should be no difference in type or quality of housing.

All ranks should have the same type of quarters for the same reason that they should have the same type of food. And for the additional reason that there has been no single cause of GI hatred for officers—and we use the word hatred advisedly—greater than the hatred stirred by looking out of a matchbox barracks or a dust-ridden tent to see your platoon commander breezing off to a soft bed in officers' quarters or a quick one before dinner at the chrome and plastic bar of a movie-type officers' club.

There should be no social difference because of rank, because there are no social differences in the human being involved—except as individuals. You'll find many a bore, and even a boor or three, with stars on his collar, and there are some charming and amusing people with only one stripe or less on their sleeves. There is no reason why the captain can't come to the movie early enough to get a good seat, and no reason why a GI can't cut in for a dance with the prettiest girl in town—she being willing, of course.

The most depressing spectacle of this war, and the most disgusting for some soldiers who had a slight pride in the fact that they were said to belong to a "democratic" Army, was the sign "Off limits to EM." The idea that the technical artificiality of rank, a label useful only to clarify the chain of command, could entitle one man to eat in a good hotel and banish another to a flyspecked zinc counter has no part in any Army that represents the United States.

We on Yank believe the Army can benefit by studying these suggestions. We believe that improvement within the Army is just three million times as important as publicity outside the Army. We believe that ours can be as fine an Army as its potentials promise only by hard work from within on the part of every GI and every officer, and by sharp observation from without by every civilian.

More on Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1946

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, I have repeatedly asserted, is one of the great newspapers of the United States. Its editorial columns are saturated with evidence of the gifted powers of its editorial writers. Its news columns are free from cant, hypocrisy, bias, and domination by advertisers' caprices and prejudices. It is a fearless, forthright, journalistic spokesman for all the people. It is a credit to St. Louis and to the State of Missouri and to the great newspaper family which controls it. This newspaper, through the years, has been conspicuously militant in its exposure of monopoly, graft, corruption, and miscarriages of justice in general. Would that there were more newspapers possessing these superlatively laudable qualities, in other cities of America.

Recently there appeared a characteristically incisive and pentrating expression on the subject of atomic energy. Because, in my own State of Washington, at Hanford on the Columbia River and in adjacent areas, there is located the most important of the three Federal operations maintained to develop atomic energy, we in our State are especially interested. Here is the editorial:

PEACETIME CHALLENGE OF ATOMIC ENERGY

The ways of science are quiet ways, and its monumental discoveries usually come unobtrusively to the eyes of men.

There was little sense of drama among the group who saw James Watt's first steam engine pumping black water from a mine pit on a bleak English hillside in 1765, nor among the few who heard the unsteady hum of Faraday's dynamo in his laboratory in 1831. The telegraph was introduced in 1844 with an eloquent sentence "What hath God wrought," but the first telephone message was Alexander Graham Bell's simple instruction to an assistant in another room: "Mr. Watson, come here; I want you."

It was quite otherwise with the discovery of atomic fission. That burst upon the world with the most cataclysmic demonstration of searing, pulverizing, annihilating force ever released by man. It is undoubtedly because of that prodigious impact, the bearer of wholesale death in horrifying form and the virtual finishing blow in a global war, that this discovery has been associated almost entirely with its destructive possibilities, very little with its prospects for beneficence to mankind.

VAST SOURCE OF ENERGY

Those prospects are less dramatic than the awesome pictures of catastrophe to civilization from the atomic bomb which the scientists have painted, and of which the world had a glimpse at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. They must nevertheless be considered, as man's intelligence is bent to planning toward control of this new and mighty force.

Here is an untapped and seemingly illimitable source of energy whose possible uses send the imagination reeling. It may be generations or centuries before some of the more fantastic possibilities of atomic disintegration can be attained, such as Sir James Jeans' estimate that a drop of water could supply 200 horsepower for a year, or the prospect, cited by Waldemar Kaempffert in the New York Times, that "a handful of clay will produce far more power than a million tons of coal." Those are scientific dreams for the future's realization, but there are possibilities not so far ahead with revolutionary impact in store for our own times.

Atomic heat is already being produced at the Hanford plant in Washington State. Dr. Arthur H. Compton sees the possibility that city power plants will find it feasible to use uranium's atomic heat instead of coal within 10 years. In a symposium a few days ago, nine atomic scientists made estimates ranging from 3 to 20 years as the time within which atomic power could compete with coal at $15 a ton.

One present handicap is the fact that protective shields equivalent in weight to 2 or 3 feet of solid steel are required to prevent escape of dangerous rdiations from atomic power plants. This means that they can be used only in stationary form or on large steamships, perhaps on locomotives.

SCIENCE IS STILL AT WORK

There are other handicaps to be overcome, but it would be rash to predict that science, after solving the riddle of the atom, cannot overcome them. Uranium is rare and costly, yet other elements will ultimately be found capable of fission, and the possibilities of hydrogen, cheapest substance on earth, are already being investigated. Since the atomic bomb, despite its terrific explosive properties, uses only one-tenth of 1 percent of the energy released from uranium, the prospects from development of greater efficiency are staggering.

The entering wedge was driven with perfection of the bomb, and science never rests. Hence the predictions of power and heat of now unimagined cheapness, making possible the heating and lighting of cities at low cost, vast irrigation projects to make the deserts bloom, large-scale indoor agriculture, swift new forms of transportation, a literal revolution in all the forms of industry.

There are hopes, too, for great advances in science, particularly in medicine. Ordinarily conservative research workers already are predicting unprecedented progress through atomic discoveries in tracking down the causes of cancer and perfecting means for its prevention and treatment. Other

branches of medicine, notably the field of metabolism, are likewise counting on a new stimulus to their research.

All these possibilities bring mankind up against a hugely magnified version of the problems posed by the machine age problems which had been most inadequately met even before the fracturing of the atom opened up new and unknown vistas.

PROBLEMS OF JOBS FOR ALL

Mass production brought a lowering of manufacturing costs that made possible the widespread acquisition of comforts and conveniences, but it also brought mass unemployment. So we had the paradox of want in the midst of plenty, the spectacle of unemployed pick-and-shovel men idly watching the giant mechanical excavator that had taken over their jobs. How can work for all be provided in the coming day of stepped-up labor-saving devices and vastly cheaper power?

The first fruits of the industrial revolution went to the owners of the machines while the workers lived miserable lives. Small children, it was found, could tend the new power looms satisfactorily, and they were hired for shifts of 12 to 15 hours a day, housed in unheated sheds, and paid up to 4 shillings a week. Workers' wages were so low that, James Watt himself recounted, they stole the grease from his engines to use for food. How can the greater industrial revolution now made possible be kept from becoming a windfall for monopolists, and channeled to providing benefits for all?

There is a tremendous vested interest in the machines and processes that may become obsolete if the potentialities of atomic power are realized. Shall these interests be permitted to obstruct its fullest adoption at the earliest possible moment? Two billion dollars in tax funds were spent to bring about the epochal discovery, and the public is entitled to a voice in the decisions on policy.

Will man's new leisure be spent in graceful living, in recreation and cultural pursuits, or will the access of time on his hands lead to dissipation and crime?

DILEMMA OF OUR CENTURY

Scientists and educators realize the social implications of the discovery, along with the tremendous new issues of security it involves. Dr. Paul F. Douglass, president of American University in Washington, summarizes their view of the alternatives ahead in the peacetime uses of atomic power:

"We either are going to live on an animalistic plane or we are going to have a flowering of civilization which is unparalleled and which will reflect itself in art, literature, music, and beauty. * * *

"It's a question as to whether we're going to have enough inner ethical resources to keep character in society when we no longer have scarcity and drudgery and no longer have to struggle."

These questionings and doubts reiterate the dilemma of the twentieth century—the failure of man's social thinking to keep up with his scientific genius. It is this lamentable fact, no less than the civilization-wrecking potentialities of atomic power, that makes the utilization of the new force a challenge to the best intelligence humanity can develop.

The destructive potentialities are in the spotlight now, and properly so, for failure to control them will make futile all discussion of how atomic energy can be best devoted to everyday living. Yet each success of the statesmen in bringing closer an agreement on the military aspect makes more urgent the solution of the peacetime phase of the problem.

There is still time to solve the riddle, but the time for decision is growing shorter.

A Fine Citizen and Outstanding Army Officer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. R. EWING THOMASON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 30, 1946

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Star regarding Maj. Gen. Alexander D. Surles; knowing him as well as his Army and official record as I do, I unhesitatingly say it is well deserved:

WELL DONE

Newspapermen in general nurse a professional if impersonal grudge toward any man or group of men placed in a position to influence or impede a free flow of news.

During the war the War Department's Bureau of Public Relations was held suspect many times, taking the blame for the absurdities committed by some of the officers assigned to public relations jobs and suffering, more than once, the accusation of covering up legitimate news. As the head of this bureau, Maj. Gen. Alexander D. Surles took his share of this particular sort of rap.

But to newspapermen who came to know him during his 4 years in one of the toughest spots to which a senior officer of the Army could be assigned, few of them, indeed, failed to appreciate his difficulties and to admire the way he did his job. Quiet, friendly, and approachable, with a real conception of news values and an understanding of the newspaperman's point of view, General Surles was more anxious to help than to hinder. He was as quick to acknowledge a mistaken policy as he was firm in protecting the legitimate interests of the War Department and the Army in relations with the public. Men trusted him because of his obvious sincerity and because they knew that he was giving his best in carrying out the assignment, though he would have given a right arm to be with his beloved First Armored Division.

The test of his ability to run his job to the satisfaction of his superiors and to get along with the various media of public information lay in the fact that he held his post throughout the war and now that he has been relieved by Lt. Gen. J. Lawton Collins, he leaves with more friends among newspapermen than he had in the beginning. Alex Surles will be remembered with real affection by his friendly enemy of war times, the press.

Demobilization of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 30, 1946

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, from the information coming to my desk from men being held in camps here in the United States and overseas as well, I feel certain that there are hundreds of thousands of men being held overseas and in the camps in continental United States who are badly needed at home, and whose time is absolutely being wasted in being maintained in the military service. There are fathers with one or two children in thousands of instances who are loafing about camps without anything to do who should be returned to their families.

The Government would save money, the morale of the men would be lifted by such action, and men would be returned to civilian life, where they have something constructive to do, in addition to helping take care of their families.

I have a letter today from a father in my district whose three sons were all taken into the Army. One of them has now served 42 months and is idling his time away in a camp out in the Northwest. His father operates a large and productive farm, and he writes me that he would like to get the boy out in time to get ready for spring plowing and planting. I have a letter from the boy stating that he is sitting around doing nothing, just idling his time away.

Such foolishness as this is going on all over the country regardless of what military leaders say. Anyone can well see that this boy who has been in the service 42 months would certainly do the country more good back on the farm than he can do if he is kept, at Government expense, wasting his time in a camp out West.

I have letters of this kind every day, as do doubtless the other Members, yet we are told that we must keep these men in the service and that we must continue to get all of the volunteers possible, and also that we must continue the draft if are to have enough men in the military service to do the job. It certainly is not a very promising outlook.

I have a letter which I received from a private overseas now serving in the Philippines. I think his case can best be stated by including his letter with my remarks, the signature of which I am deleting:

MANILA, P. I., *January 18, 1946.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN VURSELL: As a resident and voter of the good State of Illinois I would like to say a few words to the man who represents our fair State.

You have no doubt received many letters before this one in regard to demobilization as a whole, but as a father I am primarily interested in the discharge of fathers. Speaking as a father, I know that all fathers feel the same way as I do about staying in the Army now that the war is over. Fathers of one and two children are still in the Army and there is no mention made as to when we will become eligible. Fathers of three children, regardless if they were in the Army only a month were declared eligible for discharge. Our families need us every bit as much as the fathers of three. I think it seems undemocratic to stop drafting all fathers and doing nothing for those already drafted and away from their families. I wish you could realize all the hardships and suffering it causes the families involved.

I and others don't think that it is necessary to keep millions of men scattered throughout the earth in uniform idleness while their personal affairs go to the rock, their opportunities for education vanish, and their wives and children cry for them to come home.

There is a bill to discharge all fathers and it needs some more signatures before it can be put on the floor for a vote. I and a lot of other fathers from our State and fathers from every State will appreciate your wholehearted support of any bill to get the fathers of two and one child home.

It is the Congress who must run our country as our representatives instead of the country being run by the coalition of the War Department and State Department.

As a voter of Illinois I am looking forward to you as our representative and will appreciate your support of any bill which will bring home soon the fathers with one and two children. We will not forget the men who helped to bring us home.

Sincerely yours.

There are several bills on the desk to speed up demobilization. One of the bills is to discharge all soldiers who have seen 18 months' service; one is to discharge all soldiers with children; one is to declare the war over. I hope the Members will sign these petitions because it is apparent we shall not be able to act upon them on the floor of the House unless they are taken away from their respective committees by such action.

The Congress must act if it can because those who are directing demobilization, including the administration and the military leaders, are not getting the job done.

United Nations Permanent Headquarters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. H. HEDRICK
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 30, 1946

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the Charleston Gazette, Charleston, W. Va., under date of January 27, 1946, entitled "Why Not White Sulphur?":

WHY NOT WHITE SULPHUR?

We are informed that there is a possibility of the United Nations permanent headquarters being located at White Sulphur Springs. Aside from our pride in the State and the section, we can think of no other place more suitable.

It is encouraging to learn that Representative E. H. HEDRICK, of this district, has been active in bringing the matter before the United Nations committee now in this country inspecting sites, and in efforts to enlist the support of President Truman, Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., the United States representative to the United Nations Organization, and other high officials in this country.

Apparently considerable preliminary work has been done toward furthering the possibilities of locating the capital of the world at White Sulphur. There must be more. The West Virginia Chamber of Commerce certainly ought to help in every way possible.

We think if the committee can be persuaded to visit and inspect the White Sulphur location, it would be impressed. The magnificent hotel, the Greenbrier, is now occupied as an Army hospital, but we are informed that the Army wants to vacate it as soon as possible. The hotel was formerly owned and operated by the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway, but we have heard the company is lukewarm about reopening it as a pleasure resort.

Everything that would be immediately required is at White Sulphur. It has an excellent airport, and the railway station is within 100 yards of the hotel. It is on a first-class national highway. Available is a tract of approximately 6,000 acres. There are fine facilities for golf, swimming, hunting, fishing, and other recreation. And the setting is one of the most beautiful in all America.

It has been suggested that the capital of the world be located away from congested centers and the coastal areas, and it is not considered desirable to have it too close to Washington. But White Sulphur is not too far away, being 500 miles from New York City by highway and rail and 150 miles from Washington by air. The location is easily accessible but admirably secluded.

The town of White Sulphur adjoins the hotel and offers all the amusements and conveniences that would at first be required. We are informed that it is the intention of the planners to build a permanent city to accommodate 30,000 people and this would include several large and ornate business buildings and a great auditorium. It is to have the finest airport in the world and the most powerful radio station The new city would be laid out by highly skilled and experienced engineers and architects Top representatives of all the nations of the world would be coming and going all the time and there would be a permanent staff of several thousand.

We respectfully suggest that all of our Senators and Representatives put their influence and best thought behind Representative Hedrick in his efforts to get the capital of the World located in West Virginia and that all our leading business men do the same.

Democracy and the Balkans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 29, 1946

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, George Pirinsky, executive secretary of the American Slav Congress, has written an article expressing the views generally entertained by the American Slav Congress urging nonintervention by the United States in that area. A peculiar situation obtains in these sections of Europe. The article expresses views contrary to those expressed by many editorial writers and is well worth reading by my colleagues. Here is the article:

LET THE BALKAN PEOPLES WORK OUT THEIR OWN TYPE OF DEMOCRACY

(By George Pirinsky, executive secretary, American Slav Congress)

Now that the peoples of Yugoslavia and Bulgaria have spoken, our State Department should cease any further interference in the internal affairs of these two Balkan countries for the purpose of bolstering reactionary forces. In the elections on November 11 and 18, the electorates of Yugoslavia and Bulgaria repudiated the opposition which we had taken under our sponsorship. In Yugoslavia out of more than 8,000,000 voters only 700,000 voted for the opposition. In Bulgaria, despite the last minute intervention of our State Department and the frantic appeals of the opposition to the voters to boycott the elections, more than 85 percent of the voters cast ballots.

In both countries, women voted for the first time. All persons of 18 and over had the right to vote. Only Fascist traitors and open Nazi collaborationists at the time of the German occupation were deprived of the right to vote. The National Front list in Yugoslavia and the Fatherland Front candidates in Bulgaria included the representatives of all major political parties, which represent the overwhelming majority of the people.

American correspondents in Yugoslavia and Bulgaria reported that the elections were conducted most democratically and that the people went to the voting booths in a festive mood. There were no disorders, no clashes—to the great disappointment of some of our diplomats and newspaper editors. In fact, our poll-tax States in the South could learn much from the democratic way in which the elections in Yugoslavia and Bulgaria were conducted.

Before the elections our State Department was reported to have been much concerned about the extent of democracy which actually would prove possible during the elections in these two Balkan countries. Neal Stanford of the Christian Science Monitor wrote: "Official Washington, viewing the current ferment in the Balkans, is concerned about the extent of democracy which actually will prove possible in the forthcoming elections there."

This significant dispatch raises some important questions: What is the basis for official Washington's concern about the Balkans? What is our policy there and how does it affect the future peace and security not only of the Balkan peoples but of the American people as well?

NEW BALKAN REGIMES ANTI-FASCIST

To answer the first question, it is necessary to bear in mind that the great war of liberation which the United Nations waged against the Axis aggressors brought basic changes in the nature of the Balkan regime, Greece being the only exception.

Before this war, all Balkan countries went through a terrible period of Fascist rule. The Munich diplomacy of Chamberlain and Daladier had given Hitler and Mussolini a free hand there. The regimes of all the Balkan kings, Boris in Bulgaria, Alexander in Yugoslavia, Carol in Rumania, George and General Metaxas in Greece differed little from those of Hitler and Mussolini in Germany and Italy. Constitutions were suspended, workers' and peasants' parties outlawed, thousands of the best sons of the Balkan peoples killed, tens of thousands thrown in jails and concentration camps. In Bulgaria alone 30,000 were killed during and after the 1923 June and September uprisings of the peasants and workers.

At that time no real concern was displayed in official Washington over the tragic Balkan developments that paved the way for the Nazi invasion. The concern seems to come now when the anti-Fascists have taken over the destiny of their lands.

Concern over the events in Greece, where some of the worst reactionaries are in power (thanks to British tanks and bayonets), would be understandable. But official Washington is worried not over Greece but over Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and other countries where the people broke completely with their hateful past and are building their life on a new anti-Fascist basis.

In each of the two countries there exists at present a coalition government which includes all democratic elements who have participated in, or were sympathetic to, the national liberation struggle against the Axis. These unity governments, such as the Fatherland Front Government in Bulgaria, include the peasants party, Communists, Social Democrats and other liberal parties and individuals. Their representation in the governments depends on the strength of the respective parties and on the extent of their participation in the anti-Axis war.

Many of our newspapers complain that the opposition is not getting an adequate chance to present its program. The opposition in most instances consists of individuals who have in one way or another compromised themselves by open or secret collaboration with the Nazis and their puppets. Its main efforts are directed toward splitting the unity of the coalition governments and thus throwing the country into chaos. Naturally, in these countries where conditions are still very unsettled and where every ounce of national strength and unity is needed to overcome the supreme task of reconstruction and rehabilitation, such opposition is not welcomed by the people. They cannot afford it. They cannot permit petty disrupters and compromised elements to start undermining their national unity and program for reconstruction.

One other factor must be mentioned. In both countries the coalition governments are striving to raise the standard of living (which in most cases means simply avoiding mass starvation and famine) for the masses of people. They are taking over some industries formerly owned by those who worked in the service of Hitler and Mussolini. Naturally some people's toes are being stepped on, and they are joining this opposition in protest against the governments whose chief concern is the common man.

With this picture of people's governments, with a people's program, what then is the reason for official American concern? The answer must be sought not in the Balkan ferment, but in the American foreign policy.

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY DISTURBING TO BALKAN PEOPLES

Perhaps American attitude toward the Balkan anti-Fascist regimes and their future will become clear when we observe the following:

That America still recognizes, and deals with, Franco's Fascist government in Spain which was imposed by two foreign powers, Germany and Italy.

That America sponsored Fascist Argentina's seating at the United Nations Conference in San Francisco, which was contrary to the entire spirit of its commitments to destroy fascism wherever it arises.

That in Indonesia, where the people are fighting for freedom and democracy against imperialist Dutch and British rule, use of American lend-lease supplies is sanctioned by Secretary of State Byrnes providing the labels are removed before the tanks and guns shoot down Indonesian patriots.

That in China, United States Marines were landed ostensibly to assist in the disarming of Japanese troops but in reality they are intervening to bolster Chiang Kai-shek's dictatorship all over China.

That in Greece, the British-backed government is terrorizing its people without any "official" Washington action to restore democracy there.

That in the American zone in Germany big Nazi war moguls still occupy key posts in industry and business because they are "efficient", "intelligent" and have the "proper contacts" with some of our big businessmen.

That Congress in Washington is playing international politics with relief for the peoples of the liberated countries, turning UNRRA into a club over the heads of starving people.

That economic aid to the eastern European countries is being held up because those governments are not "democratic" enough.

And lastly that the atomic bomb is being used by our Government as a political weapon of coercion of allied nations.

From the above, the only conclusion that can be reached is that official American protestations about democracy must sound very hollow to the Balkan peoples, that our policy seems to be rather one of bolstering every reactionary group and reconstituting regimes which rode roughshod over the peoples before the war.

The Balkan peoples are not too impressed with the Churchill-Bevin type of democracy in Greece, or our Mr. Byrnes' type of democracy in South Carolina where the vast majority of citizens cannot vote because of the poll tax. No, they want something better. They do not want to give their Gerald L. K. Smiths, their Bilbos, and Hearsts the freedom to destroy their hard-won gains.

Unless our policy makers understand this new upsurge of freedom in the Balkans we will commit the same blunders as before the war. Our refusal to recognize the genuinely anti-Fascist people's governments there will make the job of rebuilding there much harder, but they will go on despite all difficulties because they know that once lost, freedom is hard to regain.

In a recent interview with a group of British M. P.'s, Marshal Tito declared: "We have created that kind of democracy which corresponds best both to the nature and way of thinking of our people and to the economic conditions of our country."

After a visit to Belgrade, Dennis Almond, writing for Reynolds News, stated: "London's academic discussions of real democracy ring strange here. It amounts to an absurdity while talking of reality."

In conclusion, we might ask whether the United States policy makers have learned anything out of this war. Have they abandoned the policy of United Nations cooperation for the eradication of fascism, or are they trying to save it? Mr. Walter Lippmann, noted columnist, gave the answer in the November 1 issue of the New York Herald Tribune. Said Mr. Lippmann:

"Let no one deceive himself; we are drifting. We are drifting toward a catastrophe. Woe be to those who, when they have the responsibility to steer the ship, do not make for a safe harbor but drift with the wind and the tide."

United States Employment Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 30 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, because of the importance of the controversy over the USES, I believe the very interesting and enlightening discussion that took place regarding it on the American Forum of the Air program Tuesday evening, January 8, should be read by all who are concerned with the problem. Very succinctly the main points are dealt with by four individuals eminently qualified to discuss them.

I ask unanimous consent to have this included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I have obtained an estimate of the cost of printing the manuscript in the RECORD. The cost will be $225.40.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNOUNCER. What should Congress do about the President's veto? Is unemployment a national or a State problem? Who can do the job best? Should the United States Employment Service be turned over to the States immediately?

Once again the vital issue of the week heard on your American Forum of the Air. [Applause.]

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. From the Shoreham Hotel in your Nation's Capital, Mutual proudly presents America's pioneer public-service radio program, the American Forum of the Air, founded 17 years ago by Theodore Granik, attorney and moderator. The forum presents, every Tuesday night at this time, the vital issue of the week, both sides of that issue, and the men who affect the decisions.

In Mr. Granik's absence we are honored to present as guest moderator the distinguished Chairman of the Social Security Board. He has appeared on these programs in the past as a participant. We now present the Honorable Arthur J. Altmeyer. Mr. Altmeyer.

Chairman ALTMEYER. Thank you. One of the first items of business facing a returning Congress is consideration of President Truman's pocket veto of a bill which would have returned the United States Employment Service to State operation within 100 days.

Immediately after Pearl Harbor with the consent of all the States, the Federal Government took over the various State employment agencies, welding them into a national employment service to facilitate the recruitment of workers for war plants, wherever needed throughout the country.

With the conclusion of the war, the States now demand the return of the offices. Labor and other organizations oppose the return to State jurisdiction.

The President has not opposed eventual return, but he is opposed to a return before July 1, 1947.

These are the current facts. The arguments pro and con are many and diverse.

State agencies now administer State unemployment compension laws. They argue that they cannot properly discharge their responsibility for deciding whether an individual should receive unemployment benefits unless they have control of the employment service, since it is only through the employment service that it is possible to determine whether or not a claimant is refusing to accept suitable work.

Those who argue for retention of Federal operation claim that the labor market is no longer confined to a locality or State, but is national in its scope. They point out that it will now be necessary to find jobs for millions of displaced war workers and millions of returning soldiers regardless of State lines.

This evening we will hear all views argued. We have a State official, a former State official, a past national director of United States Employment Service, and a representative of organized labor as our guests.

First, Stanley Rector, chairman, legislative committee, Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies. Mr. Rector.

Mr. RECTOR. Good evening. With the passing of stringent manpower controls, made necessary by war production, the efficiency of the employment service is again dependent upon its responsiveness to the needs and conditions of the many localities comprising this Nation. Administration by State government can more effectively meet the varying needs existing between localities. It is more representative and more accessible to the people and it is demonstrably more economical.

Administrators versed in employment security programs, however they may differ as to whether or not such a program should be on a State or a Federal basis, uniformly agree that unutterable confusion and inconsistencies arise through having the related functions of the unemployment compensation and employment service under two distinct and separate controls. They are no more separable than Siamese twins,

assuming they are to live and function properly.

The reconversion and demobilization process requires immediate reintegration of these related services and since there is little prospect of a Federal take-over of unemployment compensation, good management dictates that the employment service be immediately returned to the States.

Chairman ALTMEYER. Thank you, Mr. Rector.

Next, John J. Corson, former Director, United States Employment Service, and now director of research, Washington Post, Mr. Corson.

Mr. CORSON. Mr. Altmeyer, my answer to the question, "Should the United States Employment Service be turned over to the States immediately?" is "No."

If we are to keep the number of unemployed in this country even as low as 3,000,000 in the years ahead, we need an aggressive, efficient, well-knit system of local employment offices. This system of employment offices must be capable of bringing unemployed workers and jobs together, even though the workers are in Texas and the jobs in Wisconsin. It must be capable of finding workers with the skills required when employers need them promptly. It must be able to aid all workers find jobs, including those handicapped by their own inexperience, age, physical disabilities, or the color of their skin.

Almost 30 years' experience has demonstrated that a federally operated employment service is essential. In every employment crisis since World War I, this country set up Federal employment service. Between 1918 and 1946 the Federal Government has been in the business of running an employment service, with the exception of 4 or 5 years.

Hence, the question really is: Should the Federal Government abdicate its responsibilities for bringing workers and jobs together, in the light of three decades' experience and in the face of present reconversion needs? The obvious answer is "No!" If political exigencies force Congress to the opposite conclusion, then at least the United States Employment Service should not be turned over to the States until definite and precise standards as to how these States shall operate 48 separate systems are written into the legislation governing the future operation of the USES. This much is the essential minimum if we are to maintain an employment service to aid workers in finding jobs.

Chairman ALTMEYER. Thank you, Mr. Corson.

Next, Claude A. Williams, past president, Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies. Mr. Williams.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Thank you, Mr. Altmeyer. Good evening, ladies, and gentlemen.

I advocate the immediate return of the employment service to the States

The number of people employed or unemployed is probably due to national conditions, but the actual placement of unemployed persons in jobs is a local function and the means of doing that job must conform to local conditions. These vary, not only between States, but between localities within a State. It is impossible to cut the cloth on a national pattern to fit all situations.

Continued Federal operation of the employment service will continue the attempt to provide minimum wages far in excess of those now provided by Federal law, force upon employers so-called fair employment practice regulations which Congress has refused to enact and the use of unemployment compensation funds to finance strikes.

Only through the integration of unemployment compensation and the employment service in a State system can the confusion resulting from duplication and red tape be eliminated and displaced war workers, the veterans, and the public obtain the service to which they are entitled.

Chairman ALTMEYER. Thank you, Mr. Williams.

And now, Ted F. Silvey, chairman of the CIO Reconversion Committee. Mr. Silvey.

Mr. SILVEY. The CIO reply to the question is an emphatic "No"; neither immediately nor at any future time. The public employment service exists to give help in our complicated national labor market situation to employer, veteran, young people seeking their first jobs, handicapped person, minorities who suffer discrimination, and everybody who seeks a job which matches their skill, experience, ambition, and economic need.

It is as ridiculous to talk about operating the employment service on a State level as it would be to talk about breaking up the United States post office into 48 separate administrations, each independent of and unrelated to the other.

Should a qualified worker in Bridgeport, Ohio, be deprived of job referral a short streetcar ride away in Wheeling, W. Va., or Philadelphia people looking for work not be referred to a shipyard across the river in Camden, N. J., just because two neighboring States had entirely different political or administrative organizations?

What then is the reason for a break-up of a national, unified system? What is the motive here?

Those who are screaming for return of the federally operated, national public employment service to State operation have at least two basic motives and both of them are evil. One, they want to make the employment service an adjunct to the State unemployment compensation administrations so they may prostitute the original purposes of unemployment compensation benefit payment for workers into tax reductions for big business; and two, they want to get the 23,000 employees on State pay rolls so they may filch some of their personal earnings for State political campaign purposes and use the time of these persons, both public and personal, for beating the political bushes for votes for State governors and senators, especially Tory Republicans and reactionary southern Democrats.

Chairman ALTMEYER. Thank you, Mr. Silvey.

There we have the issues and the sides are clearly drawn.

Mr. Rector, to start our discussion, why do you think the United States Employment Service should be returned to the States at this time?

Mr. RECTOR. First, Mr. Moderator, in view of the last statement, I would like to rise to a point of personal privilege. I find that the sweeping indictment is made that the advocacy of the return of the employment service to the States is representative of the forces of evil. In that category you will find 48 governors of States, without exception; and if my memory serves me correctly, many of them were actively supported by the CIO-PAC organizations.

I can assume that these governors and State officials are representative of the attitude of the public interest and our and their feeling is this: That the interests of the displaced workers can best be served in the finding of suitable employment, and that our returned servicemen can be reintegrated into society best by the responsive, responsible back-home governments, which are certainly as interested in their welfare as removed bureaucracy in Washington.

Mr. CORSON. That draws the issue. It seems to me that Mr. Rector's argument as to a responsible back-home government is an illustration of the weakness of the State argument. Today workers are looking for jobs wherever those jobs may be, not necessarily at home.

I am told, for example, that the Selective Service records demonstrate that only 2 out of every 10 workers, or 2 out of every 10 veterans coming out of the Army, are interested in going back to the same community from which they were drafted, and not more than 6 are going back to the home State.

Today workers are looking for jobs from one end of the country to the other. They have been for a long time, and to place them in jobs a national employment service which can bring them to jobs wherever they may be is essential.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Silvey, I would like to know if you subscribe to this statement: "Even today, in wartime, when emphasis on centralized Federal control is so strong, I have found that a man or commission, sitting in Washington behind a table loaded with figures, cannot analyze the manpower problems in any State as well as the State agencies, which are so thoroughly steeped in the particular problems and particular conditions in each State."

Mr. RECTOR. If I may, I would like to return to what Mr. Corson has indicated.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would like to get my question answered. Apparently Mr. Silvey was not listening.

Mr. CORSON. It can easily be answered. The United States Employment Service, during the period of the war, has demonstrated full well that you can administer a national program, and administer it effectively, in each local community.

During the war a whole series of local employment service programs were developed. There was the Buffalo plan; there was an employment council in Dallas; there was the Louisville plan; there were a host of others. It demonstrated how effectively a national program can be integrated on a local basis.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr Corson, those local plans were established because they attempted to cut the cloth on a national pattern and it didn't work, so they had to go down to the local proposition to develop a thing that would work.

Mr. CORSON. And established because they were supported and stimulated by the national War Manpower Commission.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; because they were supported and stimulated by the local people who knew the problems.

Mr. SILVEY. I don't agree with your quotation. I think you probably found it in some obscure place and you are trying to trip me with it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It happens to be Senator Truman's statement before the Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies on October 21, 1942.

Mr. SILVEY. I had a notion you were going to tell me it was a CIO member in Utah.

Mr. WILLIAMS. May I carry it just a little further? Since you think it is such a funny statement, perhaps you and your organization are responsible for changing the President's mind and causing him to veto this bill.

Mr. SILVEY. All right, Mr. Williams. I don't know whether it is Scripture or not, but some place it says that a wise man changes his mind and a fool never does. I think Mr. Truman is showing considerable wisdom on a number of questions, especially on this one.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is why I think CIO should keep open-minded on the return to the States. There is still a chance for them to change their minds.

Mr. SILVEY. We haven't had the evidence like Mr. Truman has had it presented to him, you see.

I will contend that the maximum labor-management and community participation was in the Federal employment service during the war, in contrast to almost no such participation under State operation before the war. I think this rather indicates that State operation again would fall back into the isolated, incompetent condition that made it impossible for the country to risk

State operation during hostilities. We had to federalize in order to get on with the war.

Mr. RECTOR. Those are adjectives, Mr. Silvey, not proof.

Mr. SILVEY. We didn't have 48 separate armies to fight Germany.

Mr. RECTOR. This is Mr. Rector, Mr. Moderator; I have been very anxious to get to the item at issue which he so well set out. I am very familiar with the argument that unemployment is a national problem, therefore, QED, it can best be handled by the Federal Government. As if any phenomenon that occurs throughout the Nation, merely because we find it in the various States, therefore, QED, it can best be handled by the Federal Government. If that be true, then education, divorce, all laws governing society——

Mr. SILVEY (interposing). Including traffic?

Mr. RECTOR. All laws governing society should be under the Federal Government per se. Merely that it is a national phenomenon, it does not necessarily follow that the treatment of that problem can best be taken care of by the National Government. After all, the placement of individuals is essentially a local problem.

Mr. CORSON. Let us stick to the placement of unemployed workers and forget about divorce and public education for the moment. Probably you know more about them than I do. With respect to the placement of unemployed workers, in the first place, there are industries in this country, as you well know, such as transportation, construction, agriculture, which rely on a mobile labor force for their workers. Every year workers move from one place to another place to find jobs in those industries. In addition, we have in this country about 47 labor market areas that lap over one or more States. Mr. Silvey has pointed out already, Why is it a worker on one side of a river should be denied a job on the other side of the river, just because it happens to be in another State?

Mr. RECTOR. I wonder if you are at all familiar with the facts. I have gathered considerable data, which we are going to present before congressional committees, to the effect that there has been greater compartmentation under the present Federal set-up than under the State.

Mr. CORSON. Those are just adjectives; be specific.

Mr. RECTOR. All right. In your experience as an administrator, I am sure you know that there has been an interstate clearance system under the Wagner-Peyser Act under which the States operated, and you further know that essentially has not been changed under the present operations.

Mr. CORSON. The latter part I disagree with.

Mr. SILVEY. Mr. Altmeyer, after using that phrase "Tory Republicans," I wonder if it would be all right to make a quotation from Herber Hoover on March 7, 1931. May I do that?

Chairman ALTMEYER. There is no law against that.

Mr. SILVEY. Mr. Hoover, then President, had a bill presented to him by the Congress for signature which he vetoed, and it had to do with the establishment of employment services in the States, financed in part by the States and in part by the Federal Government. In his veto he said in part: "I have repeatedly urged a proper extension of public employment agencies, but this bill unfortunately abolishes the whole of the present well-developed Federal Employment Service and proposes, after certain requirements are complied with, to set up an entirely new plan by subsidies to the States from the Federal Treasury. * * * This bill proposes, as I have said, to destroy the Federal Employment Service in the Department of Labor, which has developed out of the many years of experience, and to substitute for it 48 practically independent agencies, each under State control." That is the end of Mr. Hoover's quotation.

I am amazed that a situation that was too reactionary for Herbert Hoover in March 1931 is being espoused here today, 14 or 15 years later.

Mr. WILLIAMS. One thing I agree with Mr. Hoover, that he shouldn't attempt to subsidize the State into surrendering any of its local prerogatives and authorities.

You talk about a federally financed employment service that is operated by the States. That employment service is not financed by the Federal Government; it is financed through a special tax upon employers, levied for the purpose of raising revenue.

Mr. SILVEY. Which employers charge to the consumer.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I don't care who they charge it to, but they don't levy the tax on everybody. The tax is levied on employers for the specific purpose of paying the expenses of the employment security program. As an employer, I think we ought to have something to say about this matter. We foot the bill. We are the ones who pay for it and certainly we ought to have something to say about the kind and character of employment service that we operate. A survey of all the employers in the United States showed that 95 percent of them favor the immediate return of the Employment Service. In fact, they think it should have been returned to the States more than 6 months ago.

Mr. SILVEY. May I come back to the question "why"? Here I come in with the charge I made in my opening statement, the people who want the return to the States want it to prevent the payment of unemployment compensation benefits to unemployed workers.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No. We want to prevent the payment of unemployed compensation benefits to workers that are not entitled to them.

Mr. SILVEY. Now, Mr. Williams, you stand up before Senate committees and make comments and they are written down. And on September 5, 1945—which isn't so very long ago—you recommended that there be a suspension of "unemployment compensation for the next 6 months and not pay any benefits to anybody."

Mr. WILLIAMS. I still advocate that.

Mr. SILVEY. O. K., then you are against unemployment compensation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, no. I said if you suspended the payment of unemployment compensation for the next 6 months that you would bring about more expeditiously than any other method the rehabilitation and reconversion and placement of discharged war workers.

Mr. SILVEY. You can explain, but here's another one from a Senate hearing on June 1, 1944. "It sounds terrible," you said, "to say that 24 percent of all checks for unemployment compensation were less than $10, and in seven States from 10 to 50 percent were for $5. * * * I think it unfair," you continued, "to make a flat statement and leave the impression that $7 a week is an inadequate sum of money to pay in unemployment compensation benefits, particularly so" (and here is the point I want to emphasize, seeing that you are from Texas) "when there are thousands of gainfully employed people throughout the South who do not earn more than $7.50 or $10 a week when they are working."

I don't think you can ring many cash registers in Texas with eight or ten dollars a week wages for working people.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Are we arguing about unemployment compensation or about Employment Service?

Mr. CORSON. I find myself in agreement with Mr. Williams. Mr. Williams has said, "Are we arguing about unemployment compensation or about the Employment Service?"

Mr. SILVEY. I am saying these people want the Employment Service back in State control so they can stop benefit payments under the State unemployment compensation laws.

Mr. CORSON. With that point of view I agree. That unfortunately is what handicaps the unemployment service in doing a job to help unemployed workers. That is the case of the tail wagging the dog, literally.

Mr. RECTOR. Do I have to talk louder?

Chairman ALTMEYER. Mr. Rector, you have the floor.

Mr. RECTOR. I have a rather single-track mind and I would like to keep on the point because it is essentially—and it is a hard-ridden horse that has been ridden to death—that this item is a national problem and there are vast numbers of workers circulating throughout this country and that we have to have a national system per se.

I would like to give you, John, some interesting data. The State of Maryland has paid on the average 35,000 checks per week since about 10 days following VJ-day to unemployed people in the State. There has not been a single month—the high month was November—in which the clearance system, worked out by the United States Employment Service, has moved 50 people across State lines, out of that 35,000, into jobs in other States, pursuant to the clearance procedures. It has gone down as far as 15; the next high figure being 40.

In the State of Wisconsin we have paid out an average of twenty to twenty-five thousand checks; twenty-five thousand being high. The high month in the State of Wisconsin for clearance to surrounding States has been forty.

With reference to the complete elimination of State lines, it is not State lines that cause the barriers. It is the departmental administration. What has actually happened, Mr. Corson, is this, and we can't put them out here on the air, but you will find them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in proper time. We have conclusive evidence that the area departmentalization—as you know, the States have been broken into areas, area directors—what has happened in some States is the breaking up of that State into five more States, if you so want to call it, as far as the Employment Service, by the inability to work out effective clearances between areas. You would be surprised had you actual front-line experience; you would be surprised at the confusion, the complete confusion of the directives coming out of Washington with reference to the handling of those "back home" problems.

If I may check my facts with you, with reference to your statement that always in time of stress the Federal Government has to come to the fore. The first employment service set up on a national scale was the old Reemployment Service, the United States Reemployment Service, following out of the World War. That was the first one in the country. We had no State system, only seven separate State systems.

Mr. CORSON. Haven't you really posed your two questions? Let me try to answer them.

Mr. RECTOR. All right.

Mr. CORSON. You said, in the first place, that there is a need for the interchange of workers between these areas, even though you won't admit there is a need for the interchange of workers and the availability of jobs for workers between States. I agree with you as far as you go, and I go you one step further. It doesn't seem to me to make sense that you would break a State up into areas, nor does it make sense that just because a worker lives in Kansas City, Mo., he is not entitled to a job in Kansas City, Kans.

Your second point is that Federal administration is less efficient than State administration. On the basis of my experience I cannot see how you come to that conclusion. I had the unfortunate experience of being the Director of United States Employment Service when we took over the 48 State employment services. There were some very efficient State employment services. Wisconsin was one. Even Claude's State of Texas was one. So was Connecticut and Indiana

and a number of others. But there were some of the most atrociously inefficient State administrations you can imagine.

Mr. RECTOR. Has the War Manpower Commission's administration in the past 3 or 4 years—did you find that efficient?

Mr. CORSON. The War Manpower Commission couldn't rival at least a dozen of the State administrations which we had to rework and rebuild as quickly as we could.

Mr. SILVEY. On the point of service to the veterans, I am interested in seeing what Tom Stokes said in his column yesterday about job problems. Commenting on President Truman's veto of the bill, he said that these problems "relate to the hectic situation now existing all over the country, as incoming ships unload war veterans on top of the big task of finding jobs for civilian war workers, which still is a problem, too. President Truman is much concerned," he adds, "that war veterans shall have the most efficient service in trying to get back into normal civilian pursuits. That can be done, as the other job can be done, only by handling on a national basis and without disrupting the USES organization with its expert, trained personnel that is supervising State agencies."

Mr. WILLIAMS. What more efficiency can he have than a system located at the grass roots, where the people know and understand the problems pertaining to local employment, job opportunities, the kind and character of working conditions, and hours, better than any swivel-chair bureaucrat in Washington could ever dream about?

Mr. SILVEY. Take one of the ghost towns where there was one war industry and 700 veterans coming back, and there aren't 7 jobs in the whole town. Do you think they can place them there? Of course, they can't.

Mr. CORSON. What is the congenital difference between a swivel-chair bureaucrat in Washington and a swivel-chair bureaucrat in Austin? Is there any basic difference?

Mr. WILLIAMS. One is that we are close enough to the people so we can put the finger on them and make them squirm.

Mr. SILVEY. You have the right answer to that question, Mr. Williams. You can put your finger on the employees and sure make them squirm, and make them come across with a percentage of their salaries for your political campaign funds.

Mr. WILLIAMS. You know that is not true.

Mr. SILVEY. I have watched it work.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The main reason you want it turned over to the Federal Government is so you can get an increase in your dues, because their pay is going to be increased on the Federal pay roll.

I want you to get this straight. I want you to know that both State and Federal employees in this program operate under both little and big "Hatch Acts" which prevent any political activity and solicitation of any contributions, and the only place that I know of that it was ever attempted, both the administrators of the Employment Service and the Unemployment Compensation were removed from office for it. That happened in the State of Georgia.

Mr. RECTOR. Mr. Moderator, this is Mr. Rector. I would like to ask Mr. Silvey this. I can see where he would be quite concerned with the immediate self-interest of the rank and file of his unions, but he now proposes to speak for the veterans. I am wondering if a better spokesman of the veterans' interest would not be the veterans' organizations.

Mr. SILVEY. Well, we have 1,500,000 of our own members who are veterans and, of course, in the other large labor movements there is another 1,500,000, so we aren't entirely unrelated to that problem.

Mr. RECTOR. No; I suppose you have some veterans. I am wondering if you know the position taken by the American Legion, certainly as powerful a group as there is in the field of veterans' organizations, at their Chicago convention last September, in which they broke openly with the USES as being discriminatory and unsympathetic to the problems of the veterans.

Mr. CORSON. Mr. Rector, hasn't the Veterans' Employment Service been a national employment service for something like 15 years and do you think for a moment that the American Legion, or any other veteran organization, would agree to the breaking up of this National Veterans' Employment Service?

Mr. WILLIAMS. They want to get it out of the USES and put it into the Veterans' Administration, so the USES wouldn't have anything to do about it.

Mr. CORSON. Irrespective of where they put it, they insist on a national employment system.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Operated through State systems.

Mr. SILVEY. I make no point of speaking for the American Legion because I am not authorized to do so, and I don't know that you are, either.

Mr. RECTOR. I can quote the resolution and I can demonstrate the resolution to you. I would like to answer you, Mr. Corson, if I may. You are saying that they would not stand for a minute having it disintegrated into State systems, but I suppose you are conversant with the facts that the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Legion, in their sponsorship of the GI bill of rights, in title IV, provided for just that; namely, an administrative policy be laid down by the Veterans' Administrator to be executed and carried out by State agencies through the States, by State officers and State employees. You are conversant with that fact?

Mr. CORSON. By State employment officers, by State veterans' service officers appointed through the National Veterans' Service.

Mr. RECTOR. That is not correct. Look up section 602 on that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is not this great job that you talk about the Employment Service doing the result of about half the placements being made by your business agents in all these unions all over the country, where they go out and make the placement and send the list to the Employment Service and the Employment Service comes out with a big yell, "Look what we did! We placed all these people," when, as a matter of fact, your business agents did that.

Mr. SILVEY. That is not done to my knowledge. I don't know that it is true. It is not true in my union and I don't know that it is true in any CIO union.

Mr. RECTOR. That is the accepted practice. That is done all throughout the country in the matter of placement.

Mr. WILLIAMS. As a matter of fact, that is one of the reasons you don't want to go back to the States, because you are afraid they won't let your hiring halls and your business agents do the work of the Employment Service and they get the credit for it.

Mr. CORSON. Claude, you paint something here in very false colors. Of course, the Employment Service aids in the placement of union workers, and why not? Here you run into a situation, as we did in Camp Pickett, as we did in the early part of the war, where the employers and the union had agreed as to certain arrangements which would obtain in the employment of workers on that job. One of the arrangements that the employer agreed to, not the Employment Service, was that all the workers on that job would be union workers. All right, the union business agents refer their members to the employment office. Why not?

Mr. WILLIAMS. He doesn't refer them to the employment office; he refers them to the employer and sends the Employment Service a list of those he referred and then the Employment Service spends a lot of time writing up a lot of statistics showing what a big job they did, when they didn't do a thing.

Mr. CORSON. Claude, I guess you have been removed from the activities of the Employment Service for awhile.

Mr. SILVEY. I guess if the business agents of the unions are doing the job of the Employment Service, maybe under the carry-forward and carry-back provisions of the tax laws the union business agents ought to get a refund because they save the Government so much money.

Mr. WILLIAMS. They didn't save the money. All the money was spent making up the statistics that we did the job that the business agents did.

Mr. SILVEY. Let me ask Mr. Williams or Mr. Rector this question. If an employment service is best adapted to local conditions, as you assert, why then have it on a State level; why not set it up on a township or municipal basis?

Mr. RECTOR. Mr. Silvey, my answer to that is there can be absurdities at either extreme. There can be absurdities by having a too small basis to be efficiently administered with reference to the market. After all, a market is beyond the immediate township. When I say local, I mean relatively contiguous regions.

Mr. CORSON. Actually the Employment Service did grow up on such a local basis.

Mr. RECTOR. Right.

Mr. CORSON. Municipal service. And interestingly enough, back as far as 1907 we had a Federal employment service. This State idea has been a definitely recent idea.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Corson, what you had in 1907 was established by the Immigration Service to try to expose immigrants coming into this country to job opportunities. The thing wasn't a success. It didn't work and it fizzled out, just like the Employment Service did after the last war. It got into such disrepute that Congress would appropriate but $400,000 for its operations.

Here the States come along and build another employment service and we build up a going concern and these guys up here who want to get everything in Washington that they can, they couldn't wait to take it over under the guise of an emergency. To you guys up here there will always be an emergency and there will never be a time when the Employment Service will be returned to the States, Mr. Truman's promise to the contrary notwithstanding.

Chairman ALTMEYER. Mr. Rector.

Mr. RECTOR. John, whether it is a fact or not, it is true that in a free competitive labor market, not under the controls and forced policing that went on during the war period, and presumably for good reasons, that under a free competitive labor market, the ability of the Employment Service to efficiently function is dependent upon the jobs that are listed with it. In other words, it is dependent upon employer good will. I hold no brief for the employer's sentiments. Whatever may prompt him, it is still a fact that 92 percent on a poll conducted through the States—and very good sampling—were in favor of State management. You know, too, that the large employer organizations are all in favor of State management. One-third of the poll tickets coming back stated that under no consideration would they ever do business with the United States Employment Service.

Mr. SILVEY. Mr. Altmeyer, may I come in with a new question, just before we finish up here? I would like to ask—and I don't care who answers it—what assurance would there be with the United States Employment Service under State administration that competent Negro personnel hired to work in the agency during the war would not be discharged merely because they are colored people?

Mr. RECTOR. May I answer that?

Chairman ALTMEYER. Go ahead, Mr. Rector.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We don't have any in our State.

Mr. SILVEY. Wouldn't you hire a competent Negro in Texas at all, even though they are citizens and taxpayers?

Mr. RECTOR. We happen to have in our agency—unemployment compensation agency, if I may refer to that—a number of Negroes working in the State of Wisconsin.

Mr. SILVEY. Not janitors?

Mr. RECTOR. No; they are clerks.

Chairman ALTMEYER. Gentlemen, we will have to stop now for a summation of the arguments advanced this evening. Mr. Corson, will you sum up for your side?

Mr. CORSON. The arguments that we have presented are first and foremost that unemployment is a national problem; unemployment is not bounded by the State political boundaries.

There are a number of industries that range from one end of the country to the other seeking workers. I have enumerated them, transportation, construction, agriculture and a host of others that rely on a national labor force. In addition there are a number of centers that lap across State boundaries.

There is no sense to a system of employment offices that denies workers jobs on one side of a State line and gives workers jobs because they live on the other side of a State line. That, you may say, is an unreasonable provision that wouldn't be done even under State administration. The truth of the matter is that it was done. It was done in Kansas City, Kans., and Kansas City, Mo. I did my best to overcome it then, unsuccessfully, because of the pressure of Governors, Senators, and Congressmen from both States. That illustrates the pressures.

That is one argument. That isn't the only argument. Unfortunately, we have developed a system of unemployment insurance in this country which gives employers an incentive to deprive unemployed workers of their benefits. It is to their advantage to see that unemployed workers do not receive benefits when they are unemployed. That is very unfortunate, but it happens to be the sort of a system we have built in this country.

If I understand the arguments of Mr. Rector and Mr. Williams, it is that essentially you should have a State employment service in order that the State unemployment compensation laws can be more effectively administered. That means essentially that workers who are in search of jobs will be provided jobs if they are entitled to unemployment-compensation benefits, not necessarily that we provide jobs in order to put the best skilled worker in the job for which he is best fitted.

Chairman ALTMEYER. I am sorry, Mr. Corson, but your time has expired.

Mr. Williams, will you sum up for your side?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is apparent that the negative side of this question has failed to show any necessity for a national system of unemployment compensation. They failed to show that there has been any improvement made in the interstate clearance of workers from one State to the other. The evidence here conclusively shows that they took the State interstate clearance procedures and used them throughout the war and did not improve them in any material respect.

There has been no proof offered that there has been any discrimination on the part of workers because they live across State lines. And secondly, the allegation that the employment service operated under the States would be used solely for the purpose of refusing benefits to unemployment compensation claimants has not been supported by any evidence here.

As a matter of fact, the only interest that the employers of this country have is in seeing that the unemployment compensation program and the employment service is operated to prevent the payment of benefits to those not entitled to them, and only in that respect are we interested in the operation of the employment service and the unemployment compensation systems.

The proposition has been alleged here that there is a lot of politics involved in this. The employers of this country have a right to have something to say about the kind and character of unemployment compensation program and employment service that is operated. The employers pay the bill; they are the ones that are taxed to support this pattern.

It is conclusively shown that 95 percent of the employers favor the operation of the employment service by the States because there they can see to it that State policies, State philosophies, are carried out in line with what is in accordance with the principles and practices of those respective communities.

Chairman ALTMEYER. I am sorry, Mr. Williams, our time is up.

Atomic Bombs in International Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 30 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article prepared by me on the subject of atomic bombs in international society, appearing in the October 1945 issue of the American Journal of International Law.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATOMIC BOMBS IN INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY[1]

(By ELBERT D. THOMAS, United States Senator from Utah, a vice president of the American Society of International Law)

That man could destroy his civilization has been known, theoretically, for many years; now there is actual proof that he can. Atomic bombs have been unleashed in international society, the results of which have no comparison in history.

However, the atomic bomb is proof of something more. It is proof that man's ideas can be mightier than man himself and mightier than the matter which surrounds him. The new atomic weapon is a product of the minds of brilliant scientists; it is not, in a real sense, a military development. It is an idea materialized, a frightful idea that only a few erudite physicists can grasp. It is the product of scientific laboratories and of remote electronic investigations. It is final proof that man's ideas have become superior to the very matter from which the thinking brain itself is constructed.

Much as the atomic bomb has been praised by persons of all classes since the destruction of Hiroshima the place of the atomic bomb in the history of culture does not seem to me—probably because I am so close to so many great and seemingly miraculous discoveries—to be as epic making as the invention of the wheel, the discovery of the storability of cereal foods, or the domestication of animals. From a military standpoint it is, to my mind, just another weapon. It is not as deadly as biological warfare would be if we stooped to that, nor as destructive as the use of rays or chemicals on a major scale. I say all of this despite the commonplace statement that the destructive strength of 70 bombs such as that dropped on Hiroshima would be equivalent to all other types of bombs dropped from the air over Germany and Japan. If total death, complete destruction, become the objectives of actual warfare there are many instruments more deadly and more destructive than the atomic bomb. Those who have zealously assumed that the invention of the bomb would guarantee peace because it makes war so illogical are merely echoing what was said by so many persons when international control of money was certain to make war impossible and when, through the invention of the airplane, global warfare became a fact. War has never been that logical.

In international society man's ideas are also paramount to physical matter. Law and custom will continue to be the controlling factors in that society, and they are but another product of man's thinking. The development of a new technique of destruction will not upset men's way of living together; only a change in law and custom can do that.

We can conceive of the world being a desolate place without life, for we have studied the moon. We have heard for 20 centuries the undeniable truth that "he who lives by the sword shall perish by the sword." If mankind could be transformed by fear of consequences, however, he would have been reformed centuries ago when God sent the flood down on Noah's land. Yet the Bible suggests that within a generation after the ark landed on Mount Ararat sinning was just as bad qualitatively as it was before the deluge descended.

The fact that the use of the atomic bomb may have done more good than harm is a matter of blind luck. The facts appear to be that a number of powerful nations have the formula, or something like it, and that others came so close that a correctible accident in one of the experiments changed the whole path of victory. It is not difficult to assume that the United States and Germany might well have discovered and perfected the bomb, gone into production, and come out with the weapon simultaneously. With such a hypothesis it is not difficult to appreciate the weapon, not as a fright used against a Japanese city, then a repeat performance to show we meant business, with no real thought that we should be compelled to continue its frightfulness, but as an actual day-by-day working tool of war. Add to this prospect the radar discoveries announced by the Chief of our Army Air Forces together with other new weapons which have a way of constantly coming along in greater intensity and abundance in any war, and we have the world's match boxes in two pairs of hands. We do not need to guess whether the war would have continued if we had razed Berlin and Germany had razed Washington; if we had traded Essen for Pittsburgh, the Redwood Forest for the Black, and ruined the Mississippi in exchange for the Rhine. So long as there was authority in either land there would be striking power, and there would be striking. Nations slug it out to the death in the manner of the old prize fighters who went through tens upon tens of rounds until they could no longer stand. This was true of the civil war in Spain. It was true of the War Between the States in America. It was true of cornered Japan, cornered Germany, cornered Italy. They did not quit as up-and-coming, going concerns. They dropped from their last legs.

Nor are combatants discouraged by the prospect of total decimation of a race, or a people, or a world. What sterner lesson in history than the reduction cited above, when only mates of man and of animals, two by two, were left in the Ark? What more awful thing to contemplate than that a whole Carthage may again be wiped out to the last Carthaginian, as Germany told the

[1] This article is an expansion of an unpublished interview given to a student, Glenn Everett, the day after the bomb was loosed over Hiroshima.

Germans would happen if the Allied Nations should win, as Japan told the Japanese would happen if the Allied Nations should win, or as we would have hoped for in merciful comparison with the actual prospects in the event that the Axis should win.

It is, then, a matter of blind luck that the atomic bomb did not run rampant as not merely a one-sided weapon, used with great restraint, but as a weapon in the hands of both sides, to the very death. That is, it is a matter of blind luck unless one wishes to say that it was the work of Providence.

Enduring peace cannot come through fear; it cannot be maintained by any technique of physical destruction, nor by fear of any single piece of war matériel. Peace can come only as a result of a respect for law and a desire to have such law justly enforced. Thus the structure of the world's law is more important than any bomb could ever be. The bombs can, and perhaps may, destroy much of world civilization. Only a structure of law can save it.

In the recent San Francisco Conference mankind's leaders came together for the second time in a generation to try to formulate a system of law by which the nations of the world would be governed, to amend their customary method of living together enough so that they might enjoy mutual security from the terrible weapons which modern states then had in their possession. Was the San Francisco Conference a culmination of the compact theory of the origin of the state for the purpose of saving mankind from its own destruction and brutish tendencies?

Since the adjournment of the Conference we have weapons which some thoughtful analysts predict will drive us back into the convention halls for more effective decisions, and while we do not have as many armed nations as we had a few weeks ago, and while we are working in military and political unity with those left who do have arms, nevertheless at least four great powers are left with great armies carrying many guns, and will continue to do so in greater numbers than are necessary to maintain a global police force. Competition hovers over us like a great shadow and creates today, in contemplation, a situation not different in any way, except that we are still trying to agree, from yesterday. We are more nearly trying to agree than agreeing, more nearly trying to organize than organizing; and it is only from the honesty of our effort that there is hope. Peace never will come from fear. It may come from hopeful and honest effort.

Yet if man insists upon keeping his concepts of strict nationalism, absolute independence, and complete state sovereignty, this common effort must fail and man's new inventions, such as atomic dissolution, will be used for destructive purposes in the ultimate collisions of states' wills which are bound to occur. Physics may again dominate politics and the theory of relativity may thus save the world.

Could man endure to live in such an anarchic world with the seeds of destruction sprouting all about him? History, unfortunately, suggests that he can—and may—until catastrophe eventually overtakes him. Famines and plagues have periodically carried off millions of people in India and China. Both Italy and Japan have been areas of terrible natural destruction from volcanoes and earthquakes. Yet persons have continued to live in the most dangerous areas of those lands. The Japanese devised earthquake-proof houses; the Italians did not even bother. Both India and China are apparently as far from a solution of the famine question as ever. Man can, and often has, lived uncomprehendingly upon the very brink of disaster. The uncertainty of life has often given it zest. Who wants anything but a brave young world?

The atomic bomb in many of its aspects is more terrible than any natural disaster. When an earthquake destroys man, it is nature's doing. When the atomic bomb destroys man, it is man planning his own destruction. Those who contend that the horrible prospect of future warfare will cure man of his bad habits reckon without the ability of man to live carelessly, blindly, and nonchalantly in the midst of a physical situation that may threaten to destroy him at any time. As Robert M. Hutchins declares, this indifference is "man's supreme sin."

In all of the world's history, civilization has never before presented so many excellent possibilities nor have the destroyers of civilization ever perpetrated so many ills. If as some of the philosophers held, good and evil exist eternally, never have they dwelt side by side in such close proximity as they dwell today. Man can transport himself quicker, can make for himself greater happiness, can live life more abundantly than it has ever been lived before. He can commit more evil, bring about more destruction, destroy more happiness than he has been able to do before.

In many ways, the world we have today is like the world implied in Cicero's great orations against Cataline. Cataline, a boy, a choice heir among the youths of Rome, had all of the opportunities that anyone had open to him, yet he deliberately chose evil. Perhaps the world is not so different after all. At any rate, the good and the evil are side by side. Man must awake from his lethargy. We and the world cannot be indifferent. We and the world must make a choice. In the Orient people who have long lived in fear of early death have developed a callousness to life and an indifference to human suffering which used to repel us. The Western world, however, is rapidly developing this same callousness and indifference to human values in its international society. Human butchery and starvation used to horrify us, but it has been common all over Europe for 5 years now. Evil forebodings can be drawn from this new callousness toward life

In 1904, in the Russo-Japanese War, General Nogi, of the Japanese Army, performed one of the most notable acts in all the history of warfare when in a battle to capture Port Arthur he sacrificed several brigades of men and his own sons in order to capture a certain strongly defended hill. He wanted the hill so that he could direct his artillery fire against the Russian naval base. He could have fired over the hill without taking it, but refused because blind fire would have endangered innocent noncombatants in the city below.

Less than 30 years later, in January 1932, the Japanese first practiced wanton, deliberate killing of massed civilians by their bombing of Chapei, a suburb of Shanghai. The entire world was horrified by the murderous act. Sometime between those dates Japan had changed. But it was not only Japan that had changed. The United States had changed, too, and so had the other western powers. Americans put up barricades to bar stampeding Chinese from the International Settlement. Hundreds died as they fought for safety. We were indifferent to their deaths. An American naval captain and his party callously climbed to the top of the tallest hotel to "watch the show." As this and other events of modern barbarism swept the world during the past 13 years, Americans have asked themselves in the words of Cain, "Am I my brother's keeper?"

We can look now in retrospect at the war's contribution to the horrors of history. There was Buchenwald and other places like it, where German atrocities almost defied comprehension. There was the death march from Bataan. The atrocities were so horrible from the other side that soldiers, American soldiers, have told me: these are not people; I have no more feeling in killing one of them than I would an animal; in fact, I would prefer to let the animal live. Such is retaliatory feeling. One of the first developments of the war was the instruction to our trainees not to be so lady-like about the whole thing. They were told to forget the sportsmanship they have applied on the football field. They were taught to kill suddenly in the dark and without warning. They were not told to kill a helpless enemy soldier who might be taken prisoner, but I leave it to you whether our boys always let them live. The competition was pretty fierce for dastardly conduct, and while we did not meet the competition completely, we compromised our best standards, and did lower them. Things began to be done which under 1939 standards very definitely would have amounted to American, and Russian, and English, and Chinese atrocities.

Today few citizens pause to realize that we, once the defenders of humanity and the foremost advocates of international law, have unleashed the most horrible weapon of all horrible war. The atomic bomb takes no account at all of women and children. It destroys indiscriminately and mercilessly everything in its path. Will the effect of the atomic bomb be to make Americans even more callous toward human life? Will it brutalize the men who wield it? Will it make us even more indifferent toward our international responsibilities?

The war has been bad enough, but the drift away from morality and human feelings on the part of all the world during the past decade has been even worse. Never was a reminder of sound principle in the conduct of world affairs more urgent. No one can foresee the tragic results of failure to reestablish international morality, which has so completely disintegrated before and during the present world struggle. Once again, what is happening to men's minds is more important than what has happened in the physical realm.

The world is not going to be changed overnight by any single invention. Man's mind moves slowly, over a period of years, and his laws and customs change slowly with his thinking. It is not war and not the atomic bomb which has changed the world; it is man's mind, making use of these terrible tools, that has changed it.

So long as man lives upon the earth and is the social animal that he is, man's relationship with man will continue to be the most important thing in civilization. Men have to work courageously together to improve their relationships in world society. It is a problem that urgently challenges both the church and the state.

The inability of the Christian church to cope with this wave of antihumanism and the disintegration of morality through the world is one of the most disquieting realities of modern history. The church's failure to keep abreast of the times, to provide a modern solution of political and social problems, must be held partly responsible for the present surge of aggression and moral irresponsibility which has horrified the civilized world, and which threatens the very existence of civilization. The Christian church needs to take a practical, vital, interest in men's social relationships. If man is only a savage brute modern civilization is doomed. The church declares forcefully that he is not, and if man can come to a full appreciation of his own majesty and his spiritual and moral responsibilities the teachings of Jesus may yet rise triumphant in the struggle with the philosophies of Nietzsche, the militarist, and Machiavelli, the opportunist.

I speak as a Christian and as a church member. I am sure I have many friends among my Jewish, my Confucianist, and my Buddhist associates who would speak the same of their great moral systems and for those systems' inability to cope with this

problem. With the possible exception of the Jewish, each of those systems have had their equivalents of Nietzsche and Machiavelli.

The state has the responsibility of erecting and codifying a system of international law which both nations and individual men will recognize and obey. The church can build character, and the state can transform that character into institutions which reflect it. Our own Nation has a grave responsibility for leading the world away from war and armaments, away from national selfishness and irresponsibility, and toward a united world society where the use of atomic bombs against his fellow men will be but a bad dream from man's incredibly barbaric past.

Is the task hopeless? Are the Nations so foolish that they will commit suicide rather than give up a little of what they claim for themselves in order to gain much for all?

The world must be regarded as a unit.[2] An unwholesome condition in any part affects the entire world. Despotism, treachery, and treaty breaking in any part of the world must have their evil influence on every other part. On the other hand, "A single good government is a blessing to the whole earth."[3] The interdependence of the nations, their differing abilities to produce various things of universal worth, makes it necessary to think of the world as a unit economically as well as politically. There can be and there must be a universal respect for law if not for government. By that I mean that governments can maintain separate jurisdictions within themselves and at the same time live in harmony with the will of all among themselves.

That freemen can live and work in unison has been proved by the great American experiment. The conflict in the world today is the eternal conflict. Shall we be free in a world of freemen, or shall we be passive followers of a single will? The weaknesses of Mussolini and Hitler were that they failed to see the possibilities of any unity among freemen. Their great mistake was merely that of assuming that unity can come only by the destruction of the individual in his service to a single will.

The world's great task is the same as it was when the Constitution of the United States was drafted and ratified. How to bring one out of many—e pluribus unum—is the task that faces us today as it faced our fathers. It must be done as they did it. It is because of my firm belief in the great American experiment that I always advocate that world unity can only come through American leadership and under the auspices of the American theory. It is in America that the Federal technique of government has been most fully worked out. It is in America that the theory of dual and plural citizenship has been made practical. It is in America that we can unite for some purposes and be divided for others. It is in America that liberty is maintained by voluntary cooperation instead of forced unity. It is in America that National and State sovereignty are permitted to exist side by side, not without conflict to be sure, but with those conflicts adjusted by peaceful means. It is in America that the individual has the right to have and to hold, to go and to come, to live life in a greater sense than it has ever been lived before, with each man "under his own vine and fig tree," as some prophet of old foretold man should live. After 150 years of experience, if the world would but catch America's spirit, no one need feel that the efforts being made by our leaders today are in vain. Slowly but surely man is being made conscious of the fact that, no matter what nation he belongs to, that nation in turn is but one of a community of nations. That fact realized, that fact maintained, surely then the standards for nations can be as readily set up as the standards for individuals are set up within the community or the nation. Man lives in law and is not free from the restraints of his neighbors. A nation, too, lives in law and should not be free from restraints of its neighbors. If we fail to bring about a better world through the organization of the nations we will fail because we did not realize the fact that the earth is a unit and the nations of the earth are but individual entities within that unit and must adhere to the prevailing will of the community of nations. If we but do this we shall have a sanction for international law as binding and as great as the fundamental sanction, which we have in our own Constitution.

When we say in our Constitution that "we, the people," in order to accomplish certain things do certain other things, there is no questioning our Constitution or our right to say "we, the people." What State among our 48 questions that right today? Can we not expand the idea as America has expanded from 13 small States to 48 mighty ones and say: "We, the people of the world, in order to form, in order to do, in order to act, establish the following: * * *"?[4]

Practically every pitfall that is pointed out by those without faith in the earth today was pointed out by those without faith in our American Constitution 150 years ago. If those theories which were dreamed of by the fathers, if that Constitution, which we so glibly call inspired, contain the elements of truth, why should anyone criticize me when I say that the American Revolution is still on, that it has not accomplished its ultimate objective, and that its full meaning in the earth will not be understood until world unity is made manifest, that same type of unity which we have made manifest in our 150 years of history? A unity which has destroyed war among us can by expansion destroy war in the earth.

It was a heroine in one of the early Greek dramas who wailed, "Oh, why! oh, why! do men unite so readily for war, but never unite for peace?" Is the task hopeless? Are nations so foolish that they will not give a little of that which they claim for themselves in order to gain much for all? There were those among our fathers who talked against our Constitution with that spirit, but they did not prevail. There are those in the world today who still have little faith. May I suggest this simple approach: had you lived in Washington's time would you have been happy to have been one of those without faith in Washington's cause; had you lived in Lincoln's time would you now be proud that you were one of those who were against what Lincoln was trying to do? We will have to make decisions.

The atomic bomb, itself, represents the strength of a united free people, acting through their Government. It was a whole people in action. The big fact about its successful development is that the American people threw all their resources behind it. Two billion dollars were spent. How pygmy the greatest of private or endowed experimental activities are when compared with this two billion. And, unleashing our imagination, how pygmy will be the benefits derived from atomic energy should the whole of the peoples of the earth unite and live in a peaceful community of nations for the benefit of mankind. The acquisition of any knowledge does not redound to mankind's benefit unless mankind willingly accepts the moral obligation which accompanies it.

[2] See my World Unity as Recorded in History, in International Conciliation, No. 297 (February 1934).

[3] See my Thomas Jefferson, World Citizen, New York, 1942, p. 198.

[4] The authors of the San Francisco Charter did not dare go further than "We the peoples."

America's Production Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 30 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last night I spoke over a coast-to-coast hook-up of the Columbia Broadcasting System on the subject of America's production problem. My address was carried over the CBS program, Congress Speaks, which has proved to be a very fine broadcasting institution for public service.

I ask unanimous consent that my address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow Americans. "Come, let us reason together."

You and I. Let us reason together tonight about the greatest domestic challenge facing America today.

That challenge is the challenge of full, uninterrupted production.

You don't need to be told that our country is still up to its neck in the worst strike crisis in a quarter century. The settlement of the Ford and Chrysler strike does not solve the strike issue.

I am going to talk turkey with you, my fellow citizens, about this strike crisis, about why we are not getting full, uninterrupted production, and about what we ought to do to get full, uninterrupted production.

Why is it necessary to have full production?

Well, suppose this current epidemic of strikes continues and a general strike occurs, then what?

Production ceases, the economic current of the Nation congeals.

Then, this will result:

1. We will be in for ruinous inflation.

What does that mean?

It means that prices will skyrocket. It will cost the housewife not $2 to prepare a meal but $200 or $2,000. It will cost the laborer not $35 for a suit but $3,500 or $35,000.

This is not fantastic. This is what happened in Europe. Money there means nothing. It cannot buy anything.

This inflation condition will happen here if strikes continue.

There will be no goods to buy, but there will be $170,000,000,000 in accumulated American savings which will blow the roof off prices in people's rush to buy anything.

The little man will be busted and so will a lot of big men.

Our money won't be worth the paper it is printed upon. We have 85,000,000 war bondholders. Their bonds won't be worth anything. We have 70,000,000 holders of life insurance. Their insurance policies won't be worth anything.

My friends, it is not too late to prevent such a catastrophe. There is no ground for hysteria, only, for constructive action. Our bonds are still good. Our insurance policies are still good. Our money is still sound. Let's keep them so. Remember the key word: "Production."

But let us continue and see what will happen if strikes continue. If they continue:

2. We will not be able to pay off our $300,000,000,000 national debt with sound money. It might be paid with worthless currency.

That means national financial collapse.

3. If strikes continue, we will not be able to fulfill our international obligations.

That means we won't have the goods to resume trade. It means we won't have goods for necessary foreign relief.

This is a grim picture. But it is a realistic picture. Let all who have eyes, see. Let all who have ears, hear, these truths.

Remember the key word: "Production."

Well, what are we going to do about the lack of production?

First, we ought to get it clear in our minds who is responsible.

Just who and what are responsible?

It is my belief that wrong thinking, wrong economic and political philosophies like communism and new dealism are responsible.

I do not speak with hate in my heart, with prejudice, with partisanship. I speak as an American for Americans, as an American to Americans. And I say that those in high places, who follow these philosophies, have brought about this condition which is threatening us with inflation, with financial collapse, with international default.

Yes; the second edition of the New Deal has brought us to the brink of disaster.

And by that I mean the CIO Political Action Committee branch of the Democratic Party and its friends in high and low places.

Well, just what have they done?

1. They have stimulated strikes. They have encouraged a handful of racketeering labor bosses to trample the rights of the public in this period when all America was calling and praying for reconversion that would give us adequate production.

These bosses have trampled the rights of the laboring man, too. They have dictated ruinous strikes apparently for wage increases. But wages are just a fake issue that doesn't mean anything because the strikes stop production, and the flow of goods, and cause the rise of prices.

We are not discussing what constitutes equitable wages. We are saying that in this postwar period, the challenge for production is so tremendous that every segment of our economy should see that challenge and not upset the applecart. The big thing in America is to get this production and then iron out any inequities in wages, prices, etc. When a cyclone strikes a community, people don't start arguing about their little creedal differences.

There are other more ominous issues behind the present strike wave.

But let us go on.

2. The PAC New Dealers have introduced a score of pieces of legislation that encourage loafing, chiseling, and dependence on Government hand-outs.

Crackpot legislation which encourages everything but full, uninterrupted production. Remember the key word: "Production."

3. The PAC New Dealers have blown up the Nation's debt balloon until it is almost about to burst.

They refuse to demobilize unnecessary Government bureaus. They refuse to cut unnecessary Federal expenditures. They play Uncle Sam's Treasury for a sucker.

4. The PAC New Dealers apply price controls in a manner that cuts production instead of increasing it.

The OPA has in innumerable instances applied price controls without reason and judgment.

The OPA has in innumerable instances forced business to operate at a loss or with negligible returns. As a result, production is cut.

The OPA has created a group of czars. They have set up a gestapo which browbeats and bullies business, and treats it as a thief and a chiseler. Until maximum production is achieved, OPA may be a necessary evil. But much of its destructive effects could be done away with by OPA's simplifying its regulations, using common sense in its enforcement and modifying its arbitrary orders.

You, my fellow Americans, sitting in your homes tonight know that present OPA tactics do not make for full uninterrupted production. Remember the key word: "Production."

All this New Deal philosophy and program sets brother against brother. It divides our house. And a house divided against itself cannot stand.

One hundred and forty million Americans demand that our house shall not divide, that it shall stand.

WHAT IS THE SOLUTION?

Here is a program which I propose. I submit it to you humbly for your thoughtful consideration.

1. Let the Congress meet the strike issue head-on—now.

Let it investigate the present strike wave. Let it find out what is behind these strikes, behind these demands for wage increases.

A handful of collectivist labor leaders can issue orders today that can paralyze our Nation, that can lay us open, helpless, to atomic and rocket invasion, that can smash our international trade and our domestic trade.

There is more to this strike situation than meets the public eye. Is labor responsible? Is capital responsible? We know that the public pays the bill and it wants to stop paying through the nose. Let Congress get the facts.

2. Let Congress enact legislation with "guts"; legislation which is for the public, for the great, honest rank and file of American labor, for our white-collar folks, our farmers, our management.

Such legislation would establish compulsory arbitration as a last resort to prevent strikes in utilities and Nation-wide industries.

Such legislation would require democratic union elections, publicized union finances, legal responsibility of unions before the law.

It would prohibit the election expenditure of slush funds by unions as well as by corporations.

I know that in submitting these proposals, I will be smeared as antilabor by the labor bosses.

But I speak for labor. I have been a laboring man myself as well as a farmer and businessman. I have worked in the sawmills of my own State for 15 cents an hour, 11 hours a day.

Particularly in this atomic age, I think the public interest and welfare are superior to that of any group. This Government doesn't belong to either labor or capital. It belongs to all the people.

3. Let us get some brains and judgment into the price-control organization.

Let us encourage production.

Let us treat the American people and the American businessmen as honest, patriotic folk.

4. Let us repudiate every piece of legislation which makes for slavery to government, which makes for financial collapse, which makes for anything but thrift, self-reliance, and energy in our people.

This is the four-point program.

Remember the key word: Production. It means sweat and toil in the American way. It means homes, autos, refrigerators, washing machines, and farm machinery, clothing for civilians and veterans. It means economic health. It means freedom from fear and want about which we have heard so much.

Come, my fellow Americans, let us return to the faith of our fathers—the faith of working, not shirking, the faith of cooperation, not division, the faith of toil and self-reliance and not dependence upon Government to do everything.

A house built on such principles will not fail. It will stand. God grant that we will prove steadfast and adequate.

The Issues of the Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 31 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an able address delivered by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] at Minneapolis on January 19 of this year.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As President Truman said in his recent radio speech addressed to the American people, "This is the year of decision."

It is the year when we Americans must decide—

Whether we shall join our neighbors in guaranteeing a lasting peace, or once again adopt the isolationist policy that can lead only to another war.

Whether we shall have jobs for all who want them, or a return to mass unemployment.

Whether we shall have wages that will maintain a high level of purchasing power, or an economy shriveled and paralyzed by substandard incomes.

Whether we shall broaden our present system of social-security benefits so that every worker will have adequate protection against loss of his job, insecurity in old age, and ill health, or leave millions of our people without protection against these insurable risks.

Whether we shall remove the blot of "second-class citizenship" from our national life, or continue to subject a large proportion of the population to a Hitler-like system of racial discrimination and blind prejudice.

Whether we shall withstand the increasing pressure for rise in prices, or open the floodgates to a wave of inflation that will submerge the country in another ruinous depression.

These are the main issues. During the next 6 or 8 months many things can and will happen to swing the balance one way or another. But I believe that the real decision—one from which there can be no turning back—will be made in November, when the people go to the polls to choose the next Congress.

Already the battle lines are closely drawn. Both sides have fired their opening guns. Both of them have selected their general staffs and mapped out the strategy they intend to follow.

On one side is the Truman administration. It has drawn up a realistic, aggressive, forward-looking program. This program is based on the same principles and on the same aspirations that enabled the country to emerge victorious from two other major struggles—the fight against the depression and the triumph over the tyranny of fascism.

It is a program that envisages the kind of America that Franklin D. Roosevelt worked to achieve. And it is written in letters to large and so clear that he who runs may read. It is impossible to mistake either its terms or its intentions.

On the other side is ranged a bankrupt bourbonocracy, a party that eyes only the dead past, but is unwilling and unable to learn from the mistakes of the past.

This party has no program except a negative one. It envisages, and longs for, an America frozen into the cracked mold of the 1920's. Its leaders, casting about for a slogan, have been able to produce nothing bet-

ter than the old and discredited siren song of the Harding regime, "back to normalcy."

Of course, they don't use those exact words. They know that would bring too many horse laughs. Instead, they take the same old song and give it a new lyric. "What this country needs," they now say, "is a return to the tried and true in government."

Well, I am quite willing to admit that the policies they advocate have been tried. They were tried in the 1920's with results that we all remember as disastrous.

When they characterize these policies as "true," however, they are really letting go of a whopper. The American people did not have to give these policies much of a trial before they discovered that the whole thing was a hoax.

In 1918 our people were tired of war and all its restrictions—just as they are today. The siren song of the Republicans—"back to normalcy"—therefore sounded particularly sweet to the public ear.

Read the Republican campaign speeches in that 1918 congressional election and see how closely they resemble the G. O. P. utterances today. Although World War I was still raging during that campaign, the Republicans came out loudly against wartime taxes, wartime food restrictions, and wartime price controls.

The public listened to the siren song, and in November the Republicans won a majority in both the Senate and House.

The world today has good reason to remember—and regret—that Republican victory. For the Republicans then, as now, had their eyes on the past rather than the future.

The first thing they did when they came to power was to scuttle American participation in the League of Nations. No; they wanted no entangling alliances or agreements with other nations that might in any way impair our sovereignty. The League, they asserted, was the creation of visionaries and "crackpots," and these hard-headed men of affairs wanted no part of it.

They even admitted that the majority of the people was for the League, but that made no difference. If the old "tried and true" system of international relations was good enough for Mr. Lodge, and Mr. Beveridge, and Mr. Watson, it ought to be good enough for the American people.

And so, for 14 crucial years America went the way of isolation.

Under the "tried and true" diplomacy of these hard-headed men of affairs, Germany was allowed to rearm and grow strong. "Why should we interfere?" they said. If we only minded our own business at home, and built up our Army and Navy, no power on earth would dare attack us. Besides, wouldn't a strong Germany be a safeguard against Russia, where a lot of new and alarming ideas were being given a try? These Bourbons, for all their isolationism, didn't like new ideas abroad any better than they did at home.

The events of the last 4 or 5 years have impressed the people of this country with the terrible folly of these mistaken Republican policies. Unfortunately, the lesson has been costly. Tens of thousands of our best American youth lie dead and tens of thousands more have been maimed—in a war that could have been prevented.

As a result of this second catastrophe in a generation, the American people have given notice in no uncertain terms that they want no more isolationism.

That does not mean, however, that they may not get it.

Let them repeat the mistake of 1918—the mistake of electing a Republican Congress—and I believe there is more than a chance that the hope of world cooperation and peace may go glimmering.

Of course, the Republicans do not come right out and say that they have reservations about the kind of world cooperation that is necessary to insure peace. That would be political suicide—especially in an election year.

Instead, because they are well aware of public feeling on the subject, they pay lip service to international cooperation in all of their public pronouncements. Many of them, again because they are aware of public feeling, even vote for international cooperation when the issue is raised on the floor of the Senate or House. And, I want to be fair and say that I am convinced that some of them sincerely believe in international cooperation, and are eager to do what is necessary to preserve the peace.

Where, then, is the hitch? It is simply this: The real leaders of the Republican Party—the ones who control the party machinery and lay down the party policy—do not believe in international cooperation, and will never commit the United States to genuine collaboration with other nations.

This was made plain on the 29th of last November, when 16 Republican Senators joined with Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, in an attempt to put through amendments which would have emasculated the United Nations Organization bill. These amendments would have made it impossible for the United States to play a really effective role in helping to maintain the peace.

It was made even plainer a few days later when Senator TAFT, his crippling amendments having gone down to defeat, could not bring himself to vote "yes" on the United Nations Organization bill itself. He voted "no," and thereby gave a hint of what the people might expect if a Republican Senate is elected in 1946.

Among the five other Republicans who joined Senator TAFT in voting "no" on the historic issue was Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY, of Nebraska. His vote, too, provided a hint of what the people might expect if a Republican Senate is elected in 1946.

Senator TAFT and Senator WHERRY are key figures. TAFT is chairman of the Republican Steering Committee, which controls Republican policy in the Senate. WHERRY is Republican whip.

Both of these men represent and speak for the interests that control the Republican Party. These interests are the most reactionary in America. They are isolationist to the last ditch, and their propaganda organ is the rabid McCormick-Patterson press. They are filled with venomous hatred of our allies, and they lose no opportunity to spread the seeds of discord between the nations upon whom all hope of future peace depends.

If a Republican Senate is elected in 1946 these interests will control the Senate through the leadership of men like TAFT and WHERRY.

I ask you, how could the Senate, which under our Constitution ratifies the treaties that we make with foreign countries, succeed in getting us into anything but trouble if it were under the control of such forces.

We have now, under Roosevelt and Truman, succeeded at least in laying the foundation for amicable relations with the other great powers. But we must remember that so far we have nothing but the foundation. Building the structure itself will call for as much or more good will and statesmanship as our progress to date. If we should now turn over the Senate to a wrecking crew the way we did in 1918, the fate of the United Nations Organization would be the same as that of the League of Nations. The foundation would be undermined even before the structure was raised.

Let us now consider what the 1918 Republican victory did to conditions here at home.

With characteristic inability to look ahead, the Republicans abolished the wartime price controls that had, until then, kept living costs within some kind of reason.

The results of this pell-mell return to the tried and true way of doing things was just what might have been expected. Prices hit out for the stratosphere, rents soared, and even wages went up somewhat.

By June 1920, a year and a half after the armistice, living costs were up 108 percent above the 1914 level.

The cost of food went up 126 percent above what it had been in 1914.

Clothing went up 200 percent above the 1914 level.

Rents went up 54 percent.

House furnishings went up 179 percent.

The wholesale price of sugar rose from 8.8 cents a pound at the time of the armistice to 28.5 cents.

Nearly everyone was happy on this typical Republican spree. We had returned to normalcy, the kind of normalcy in which everybody looks out for himself and the devil take the consequences.

The consequences were quick in coming. Within a little over a year the entire Nation was suffering from a first-class economic hang-over.

The price of sugar slid from 28.5 cents wholesale to 4.8 cents.

Wholesale milk prices dropped 32 percent.

Beef cattle, 58 percent.

Lamb, 61 percent.

Hogs, 69 percent.

Eggs, 73 percent.

Cotton, 75 percent.

Corn, 77 percent.

Potatoes, 85 percent.

Before the farmers knew what had hit them, net farm income in the country had dropped from $8,800,000,000 in 1919 to less than $3,000,000,000 in 1921.

Average farm income shrank from $1,360 in 1919 to $460.

Unable to meet the debts they had contracted during the short-lived boom, nearly half a million farmers lost their farms through mortgage foreclosures between the years 1922 and 1926, inclusive.

Businessmen, too, felt the pinch. The number of business failures in 1919 was just under 10,000. Two years later, in 1921, approximately 20,000 businesses went broke and quit operations. And the failures increased steadily until 1932 when, after 10 years of the tried and true policies of Coolidge and Hoover, no less than 31,822 businesses went to the wall. Most of them, of course, were small businesses.

Corporation profits, likewise, took a nose dive. In 1919, corporation earnings, after taxes, were about $6,500,000,000. By 1921 the ink on the company books was red instead of black, and there was a total net loss that year of $55,000,000.

The workingman, too, took it on the chin. Between 1920 and 1922, factory pay rolls decreased 44 percent. And between 1919 and 1921, 5,500,000 workers lost their jobs.

Do we want that sort of thing to happen again?

Certainly not. But there is a great danger that it may. Even with an administration in Washington that is determined to hold the line against rising prices, the inflationary pressures are great. They are greater, in fact, than they were after World War I. It would be the greatest imaginable folly to hamstring this administration by turning the control of Congress over to the very men who are now clamoring most loudly for the lifting of price controls.

Despite the many danger signals that are plainly visible, the country today is in good condition.

National income is twice as large as it was in the predepression year 1929. It is more than four times as large as it was when Mr. Hoover left the White House.

Farmers are in better condition than they ever were before. Net income of farmers reached an all-time high of about $13,000,000,000 in 1945, compared with a prewar yearly average of less than $5,000,000,000.

Net income per farm operator averaged more than $2,000 yearly during the war. This

compares favorably with the earnings of the average city worker.

Farm prices in 1945 were almost double the prewar average, and were about 15 percent above parity.

Food production in 1945 was 36 percent over the prewar annual average, and total agricultural production was 31 percent above the prewar level.

During World War II farmers paid off their debts, whereas during and after World War I they continued to go into debt. At the time of Pearl Harbor farm-mortgage indebtedness stood at $6,500,000,000. Today it is down to about $5,000,000,000, and is steadily decreasing. This is in striking contrast to the situation after the First World War. In 1917 farm-mortgage debt amounted to $5,800,000,000, but by 1923 it had risen to a peak of $10,800,000,000.

Total agricultural assets amounted to more than $95,000,000,000 on January 1, 1946, compared with $54,000,000,000 on January 1, 1940.

As the farmers of the country entered upon this new year, 1946, their financial assets, such as war bonds, cash, bank deposits, and warehouse receipts, were considerably more than twice the amount of their indebtedness. Before the war their debts amounted to much more than their assets.

Annual foreclosures of farm mortgages have been reduced to one-twentieth of the 1932 total.

What about business? Here, too, we are in a period of unprecedented prosperity. In 1944, corporation profits, after taxes, were $10,000,000,000—an all-time high; 1945 profits were probably in the neighborhood of $9,500,000,000, and 1946, with elimination of the excess-profits tax, is expected to provide earnings that have never been equalled.

Manufacturing profits before taxes in 1944 were 450 percent above the 1936–39 yearly average.

The rise in retail profits for the same periods ranged from 117 percent among independent grocers to 1,324 percent among department and specialty stores.

Business failures have fallen from a peak of 31,822 in 1932 to an all-time low of 1,222 in 1944.

I believe that these figures are all the evidence we need to show that neither the farmer nor the businessman has suffered unduly because of wartime price controls.

The industrial worker, likewise, has substantially bettered his condition. The average weekly dollar income for such workers in 1944 was approximately $46. This is almost three times as much as in 1932, and approximately twice as much as in 1939.

Despite this tremendously increased income, accompanied by an acute shortage of many types of goods, prices have, on the whole, been kept relatively stable.

Yes, we have had inflation in some instances. But the price rises have been as nothing compared to those that followed immediately upon the lifting of controls after the last war.

The over-all cost of living has been held to a rise of a little more than 30 percent. Inflation has been limited to luxuries, and to certain items on which controls have unwisely been lifted in response to the pressure of those who want to get back to normalcy.

For example, the prices of citrus fruits advanced from 50 to 100 percent within a few days after ceiling price regulations were removed.

Similarly, sums of $1,000 or more were suddenly added to the prices of houses when the priority system on building materials was lifted some months ago.

Now, fortunately, citrus ceilings and building priorities have been restored.

The brief but unhappy experience in these two instances should be a warning to us of what will happen if we let go of controls before the normal relationship between supply and demand is established.

It should be a warning to us of what will happen if we again heed the siren song of those rugged individualists who, as Sam Grafton said in his column the other day, hate regimentation but always think alike.

President Truman, in his 21-point program, has charted a course that will take us safely around the worst pitfalls in the rough road of reconversion.

It is the course that will lead to fulfillment of America's tremendous potentialities. It is the way of more jobs, higher wages, increased purchasing power, and greater security against the economic hazards that beset us all.

The Roosevelt-Truman policy of good will toward other nations, and wholehearted cooperation with them, is also the only road to future peace.

The leaders of the opposition—the Tafts and the Wherrys—will not and cannot travel either of these paths. Their eyes are too firmly fixed on the past. Their hearts are too fond of the old ways—the ways that once before led us all to disaster.

I am convinced that in this year of decision the American people will choose those leaders who look ahead, who see the dangers, and will do what is necessary to avoid them.

British Trade Disputes Act of 1927

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 31, 1946

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following English Trade Disputes and Trade Unions Act of 1927, taken from Chitty's Statutes of Practical Utility:

SOCIETIES (TRADE UNIONS)—TRADE DISPUTES AND TRADE UNIONS ACT, 1927

Seventeenth and eighteenth, George V, chapter 22: An act to declare and amend the law relating to trade disputes and trade unions, to regulate the position of civil servants and persons employed by public authorities in respect of membership of trade unions and similar organisations, to extend section five of the Conspiracy, and Protection of Property Act, 1875, and for other purposes connected with the purposes aforesaid.

Be it enacted, etc.—

1. (1) It is hereby declared—

(a) that any strike is illegal if it—

(i) has any object other than or in addition to the furtherance of a trade dispute within the trade or industry in which the strikers are engaged; and

(ii) is a strike designed or calculated to coerce the Government either directly or by inflicting hardship upon the community; and

(b) That any lock-out is illegal if it—

(i) has any object other than or in addition to the furtherance of a trade dispute within the trade or industry in which the employers locking-out are engaged; and

(ii) is a lock-out designed or calculated to coerce the Government either directly or by inflicting hardship upon the community;

And it is further declared that it is illegal to commence, or continue, or to apply any sums in furtherance or support of, any such illegal strike or lock-out.

For the purposes of the foregoing provisions—

(a) A trade dispute shall not be deemed to be within a trade or industry unless it is a dispute between employers and workmen, or between workmen and workmen, in that trade or industry, which is connected with the employment or non-employment or the terms of the employment, or with the conditions of labour, or persons in that trade or industry; and

(b) Without prejudice to the generality of the expression "trade or industry" workmen shall be deemed to be within the same trade or industry if their wages or conditions of employment are determined in accordance with the conclusions of the same joint industrial council, conciliation board, or other similar body, or in accordance with agreements made with the same employer or group of employers.

(2) If any person declares, instigates, incites others to take part in or otherwise acts in furtherance of a strike or lock-out, declared by this act to be illegal, he shall be liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding ten pounds or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding three months, or on conviction on indictment to imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years:

Provided that no person shall be deemed to have committed an offence under this section or at common law by reason only of his having ceased work or refused to continue to work or to accept employment.

(3) Where any person is charged before any court with an offence under this section, no further proceedings in respect thereof shall be taken against him without the consent of the Attorney-General, except such as the court may think necessary by remand (whether in custody or on bail) or otherwise to secure the safe custody of the person charged, but this subsection shall not apply to Scotland, or to any prosecution instituted by or on behalf of the Director of Public Prosecutions.

(4) The provisions of the Trade Disputes Act, 1906, shall not, nor shall the second proviso to subsection (1) of section two of the Emergency Powers Act, 1920, apply to any act done in contemplation or furtherance of a strike or lock-out which is by this Act declared to be illegal, and any such act shall not be deemed for the purposes of any enactment to be done in contemplation or furtherance of a trade dispute:

Provided that no person shall be deemed to have committed an offence under any regulations made under the Emergency Powers Act, 1920, by reason only of his having ceased work or having refused to continue to work or to accept employment.

2. (1) No person refusing to take part or to continue to take part in any strike or lock-out which is by this Act declared to be illegal, shall be, by reason of such refusal or by reason of any action taken by him under this section, subject to expulsion from any trade union or society, or to any fine or penalty, or to deprivation of any right or benefit to which he or his legal personal representatives would otherwise be entitled, or liable to be placed in any respect either directly or indirectly under any disability or at any disadvantage as compared with other members of the union or society, anything to the contrary in the rules of a trade-union or society notwithstanding.

(2) No provisions of the Trade Unions Acts, 1871 to 1917, limiting the proceedings which may be entertained by any court, and nothing in the rules of a trade-union or society requiring the settlement of disputes in any manner shall apply to any proceeding for enforcing any right or exemption secured by this section, and in any such proceeding the court may, in lieu of ordering a person who has been expelled from membership of a trade-union or society to be restored to membership, order that he be paid out of the funds of the trade-union or society such sum by way of compensation or damages as the court thinks just.

(3) As respects any strike or lock-out before the passing of this Act but since the first day of May, nineteen hundred and twenty-six, which, according to the law as declared by this Act, was illegal, this section shall have effect as if it had been in operation when the strike or lock-out took place.

3. (1) It is hereby declared that it is unlawful for one or more persons (whether acting on their own behalf or on behalf of a trade union or of an individual employer or firm, and notwithstanding that they may be acting in contemplation or furtherance of a trade dispute) to attend at or near a house or place where a person resides or works or carries on business or happens to be, for the purpose of obtaining or communicating information or of persuading or inducing any person to work or to abstain from working, if they so attend in such numbers or otherwise in such manner as to be calculated to intimidate any person in that house or place, or to obstruct the approach thereto or egress therefrom, or to lead to a breach of the peace; and attending at or near any house or place in such numbers or in such manner as is by this subsection declared to be unlawful shall be deemed to be a watching or besetting of that house or place within the meaning of section 7 of the Conspiracy and Protection of Property Act, 1875.

(2) In this section the expression "to intimidate" means to cause in the mind of a person a reasonable apprehension of injury to him or to any member of his family or to any of his dependents or of violence or damage to any person or property, and the expression "injury" includes injury to a person in respect of his business, occupation, employment, or other source of income, and includes any actionable wrong.

(3) In section 7 of the Conspiracy and Protection of Property Act, 1875, the expression "intimidate" shall be construed as having the same meaning as in this section.

(4) Notwithstanding anything in any act, it shall not be lawful for one or more persons, for the purpose of inducing any person to work or to abstain from working, to watch or beset a house or place where a person resides or the approach to such a house or place, and any person who acts in contravention of this subsection shall be liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding 20 pounds or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 3 months.

4. (1) It shall not be lawful to require any member of a trade union to make any contribution to the political fund of a trade union unless he has at some time after the commencement of this act and before he is first after the thirty-first day of December, nineteen hundred and twenty-seven, required to make such a contribution delivered at the head office or some branch office of the trade union, notice in writing in the form set out in the first schedule to this act of his willingness to contribute to that fund and has not withdrawn the notice in manner hereinafter provided; and every member of a trade union who has not delivered such a notice as aforesaid, or who, having delivered such a notice, has withdrawn it in manner hereinafter provided, shall be deemed for the purposes of the Trade Union Act, 1913, to be a member who is exempt from the obligation to contribute to the political fund of the union, and references in that act to a member who is so exempt shall be construed accordingly:

Provided that, if at any time a member of a trade union who has delivered such a notice as aforesaid gives notice of withdrawal thereof, delivered at the head office or at any branch office of the trade union, he shall be deemed for the purposes of this subsection to have withdrawn the notice as from the first day of January next after the delivery of the notice of withdrawal.

For the purposes of this subsection, a notice may be delivered personally or by any authorized agent and any notice shall be deemed to have been delivered at the head or a branch office of a trade union if it has been sent by post properly addressed to that office.

(2) All contributions to the political fund of a trade union from members of the trade union who are liable to contribute to that fund shall be levied and made separately from any contributions to the other funds of the trade union and no assets of the trade union, other than the amount raised by such a separate levy as aforesaid, shall be carried to that fund, and no assets of a trade union other than those forming part of the political fund shall be directly or indirectly applied or charged in furtherance of any political object to which section three of the Trade Union Act, 1913, applies; and any charge in contravention of this subsection shall be void.

(3) All rules of a trade union made and approved in accordance with the requirements of section 3 of the Trade Union Act, 1913 (*k*), shall be amended so as to conform to the requirements of this act, and as so amended shall be approved by the Registrar of Friendly Societies (in this act referred to as "the Registrar") within 6 months after the commencement of this act or within such further time as the Registrar may in special circumstances allow, and if the rules of any trade union are not so amended and approved as aforesaid they shall be deemed not to comply with the requirements of the said section.

(4) Notwithstanding anything in this act, until the 31st day of December, 1927, it shall be lawful to require any member of a trade union to contribute to the political fund of the trade union as if this act had not been passed.

(5) If the Registrar is satisfied, and certifies, that rules for the purpose of complying with the provisions of this section, or for the purposes of the Trade Union Act, 1913, as amended by this act, which require approval by the Registrar have been approved by a majority of the members of a trade-union voting for the purpose, by the executive or other governing body of such a trade-union, or by a majority of delegates of such a trade-union voting at a meeting called for the purpose, the Registrar may approve those rules and those rules shall thereupon have effect as rules of the union notwithstanding that the provisions of the rules of the union as to the alteration of rules or the making of new rules have not been complied with.

(6) Section sixteen of the Trade Union Act, 1871 (which provides for the transmission to the Registrar of annual returns by registered trade-unions), shall apply to every unregistered trade-union so far as respects the receipts, funds, effects, expenditures, assets and liabilities of the political fund thereof.

5. (1) Amongst the regulations as to the conditions of service in His Majesty's civil establishments there shall be included regulations prohibiting established civil servants from being members, delegates, or representatives of any organisation of which the primary object is to influence or affect the remuneration and conditions of employment of its members, unless the organisation is an organisation of which the membership is confined to persons employed by or under the Crown and is an organisation which complies with such provisions as may be contained in the regulations for securing that it is in all respects, independent of, and not affiliated to, any such organisation as aforesaid the membership of which is not confined to persons employed by or under the Crown or any federation comprising such organisations, that its objects do not include political objects, and that it is not associated directly or indirectly with any political party or organisation:

Provided that the regulations made in compliance with the provisions of this section shall not prevent—

(a) any person who is at the commencement of this Act an established civil servant from remaining a member of any trade union or organization not composed wholly or mainly of persons employed by or under the Crown of which he had, at the commencement of this act, been a member for more than six months, if under the rules thereof there had on the fourth day of April, nineteen hundred and twenty-seven, accrued or begun to accrue to him a right to any future payment during incapacity, or by way of superannuation, or on the death of himself or his wife, or as provision for his children; or

(b) any person employed at the commencement of this act by or under the Crown who thereafter becomes an established civil servant from remaining, so long as he is not appointed to a position of supervision or management, a member of any trade union or organisation, not composed wholly or mainly of persons employed by or under the Crown, of which he is a member at the date when he so becomes an established civil servant, if under the rules thereof there has at that date accrued, or begun to accrue, to him a right to any future payment during incapacity, or by way of superannuation, or on the death of himself or his wife, or as provision for his children; or

(c) a person who in addition to being an established civil servant is, apart from his service as such, also engaged in some other employment or occupation from being a member, delegate, or representative of any trade union or organization, of which the primary object is to influence or affect the remuneration or conditions of employment of persons engaged in that employment or occupation.

(2) Subject as hereinafter provided, any established civil servant who contravenes the regulations made under this section shall be disqualified for being a member of the Civil Service:

Provided that, in the case of a first offence, a civil servant shall forthwith be warned by the head of his department, and the said disqualification shall not take effect if within one month after such warning the civil servant ceases to contravene the said regulations.

(3) In this section—

(a) the expression "established civil servant" means a person serving in an established capacity in the permanent service of the Crown, and includes any person who, having been granted a certificate by the Civil Service Commission, is serving a probationary period preliminary to establishment; and

(b) the expression "conditions of employment" means in relation to persons other than persons employed by or under the Crown the conditions of employment of persons employed under a contract of service.

6. (1) It shall not be lawful for any local or other public authority to make it a condition of the employment or continuance in employment of any person that he shall or shall not be a member of a trade-union, or to impose any condition upon persons employed by the authority whereby employees who are or who are not members of a trade-union are liable to be placed in any respect either directly or indirectly under any disability or disadvantage as compared with other employees.

(2) It shall not be lawful for any local or other public authority to make it a condition of any contract made or proposed to be made with the authority, or of the consideration or acceptance of any tender in connection with such a contract, that any person to be employed by any party to the contract shall or shall not be a member of a trade-union.

(3) Any condition imposed in contravention of this section shall be void.

(4) There shall be added to section 5 of the Conspiracy and Protection of Property Act, 1875, the following provision, that is to say:

"If any person employed by a local or other public authority wilfully breaks a contract of service with that authority, knowing or having reasonable cause to believe that the probable consequence of his so doing, either alone or in combination with others, will be to cause injury or danger or grave inconvenience to the community, he shall be liable, on summary conviction, to a fine not exceeding £10 or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 3 months."

7. Without prejudice to the right of any person having a sufficient interest in the relief sought to sue or apply for an injunction to restrain any application of the funds of a trade-union in contravention of the provisions of this act, an injunction restraining any application of the funds of a trade-union in contravention of the provisions of section 1 of this act may be granted at the suit or upon the application of the Attorney General.

In the application of this section to Scotland, there shall be substituted therein for references to an injunction references to an interdict, and for the reference to the Attorney General a reference to the Lord Advocate.

8. (1) This act may be cited as the Trade Disputes and Trade Unions Act, 1927, and shall be construed as one with the Trade Union Acts, 1871 to 1917, and this act and the Trade Union Acts, 1871 to 1917, may be cited together as the Trade Union Acts, 1871 to 1927.

(2) For the purposes of this act—

(a) the expression "strike" means the cessation of work by a body of persons employed in any trade or industry acting in combination, or a concerted refusal, or a refusal under a common understanding of any number of persons who are, or have been so employed, to continue to work or to accept employment;

(b) the expression "lock-out" means the closing of a place of employment or the suspension of work, or the refusal by an employer to continue to employ any number of persons employed by him in consequence of a dispute, done with a view to compelling those persons, or to aid another employer in compelling persons employed by him, to accept terms or conditions of or affecting employment; and

(c) a strike or lock-out shall not be deemed to be calculated to coerce the Government unless such coercion ought reasonably to be expected as a consequence thereof.

(3) This act shall not extend to Northern Ireland, except that the provisions of this act relating to civil servants shall apply to civil servants employed in Northern Ireland in the administration of services with respect to which the Parliament of Northern Ireland has not power to make laws.

(4) The enactments mentioned in the second schedule to this act are hereby repealed to the extent specified in the third column of that schedule.

The Proposed Loan to Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 31 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Should Congress Approve the Proposed Loan to Britain?" delivered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] before the Illinois Manufacturers Association at Chicago, Ill., on January 15, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. MacKeever, thank you very much for your very generous and kind invitation and your kind introduction. I never cease to worry about any opportunity that has been given to me to speak to any distinguished group of citizens and tonight is no exception. In fact, it is amplified a bit by the fact that I am to discuss, in part, a subject that was discussed before here on December 11 by Mr. Philip Reed.

I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before the joint session of the Illinois Manufacturers' Association and the Illinois Manufacturers' Costs Association.

Before I go further, I have just heard about a matter that I should bring to your attention. We have just come out of the worst war in all recorded history. We, out here in the Middle West, have taken a leading part in the production of the instruments of war, and that doesn't just happen. It is a result of leadership; the result of patriotism, and I have just learned that Gen. Thomas Hammond, who, in the early days of this war, was the Chief of the Chicago Ordnance, has just been awarded the highest award that the War Department and the Government of the United States can give to a civilian in the war effort, the exceptional meritorious service award, which will soon be presented to him. At least, I want to pay my compliments, and I am sure you want to pay yours to Gen. Tom Hammond, tonight. General Hammond: (General Hammond arose and was applauded:)

I have seen the record of this great Chicago Ordnance Department. I would like to present it sometime, and I may do so on the floor of the Senate. I would like to show what we out here in the Middle West really have contributed, not only in leadership, but industrial production as well. I have also a very high regard for the man who followed General Hammond, Col. John Slezak, who has done an equally magnificent job. [Applause.]

The subject which has been assigned to me tonight could probably be divided into many sections: The world affairs, foreign policy, our participation, and our responsibilities. They are all vast and cannot be treated lightly or hurriedly. We are the leading power of the world and our responsibility is very, very great, and it should not be approached with any sense of narrowness or partisanship or bigotry. We have finally arrived at, and we are presently, the outstanding example of man's humanity to man. We have also proven that we can develop as a people into the fiercest fighting force that has ever been known in the history of mankind.

The loan which I have been asked to discuss, is not a simple loan. It is one of a series of agreements. Its complication is confused by the number of agreements. It was presented to the Congress accompanied by two statements from the joint executive departments of Great Britain and the United States; two financial agreements, one for a loan of $3,750,000,000, and the other, the final settlement of the lend-lease that deals with more than $20,000,000,000 worth of goods and services which we rendered to the United Kingdom alone. And, it was connected, as it was presented to Great Britain, with their acceptance of the Bretton Woods agreement, which is complicated in itself because it comprises two separate undertakings; namely, the monetary fund devised to develop and maintain some kind of stable currency throughout the world, and the Reconstruction Bank. In addition to this, there was sent to the Congress and will be presented to the Congress, a commercial policy declaration that has to be discussed some day, somehow, in the future. This commercial policy declaration is a result of two different agreements; namely, the statement that was issued originally in the Atlantic Charter and section 7 of the Mutual Aid Agreement, by which we furnished so much aid to Great Britain.

I am sure you are clear now as to just exactly where we are. I feel about like the lawyer who was explaining to the judge when he said, "Judge, this law is based upon a statute that was passed in 1654, amended by another statute in 1684. It was partially repealed by an enactment of the legislature in 1754, but was reestablished by the legislative act of 1851. Do you follow me, Judge?"

The judge said, "Yes, but if I knew my way back I would quit you now." [Laughter.]

The loan to Great Britain has been presented on several grounds, and if I can I want to clarify the terms. You hear the term "four billion four hundred million" and again the term "three billion seven hundred and fifty million." The four billion four hundred million comprises the loan of three billion seven hundred and fifty million plus six hundred and fifty million, which is the definitive final settlement of more than $20,000,000,000 worth of goods which we supplied to Great Britain during the war, plus all the goods she has received since VJ-day, plus all of the surplus property belonging to the United States within the United Kingdom, which is now in the possession of the American Government, plus all of the installations in which we have an interest within the United Kingdom.

One hundred and eighteen million of the six hundred and fifty million is for the goods that they received from us after VJ-day. Many of them are salable goods. The $532,000,000 balance is for settlement of all the other goods comprising almost $20,000,000,000, plus the surplus property, plus the food, plus the ammunition, plus the guns, plus our interest in the installations throughout the United Kingdom. So, if we may clarify our discussion, I would like to state that the loan of three billion seven hundred and fifty millions is only part of the total agreement, which I contend was forced upon the British people.

I wish to read to you the statement I have released to the press and then I wish to discuss it a little further.

I am opposed to the loan of $3,750,000,000 to Great Britain for many reasons. It was not presented to the British Parliament on its own merits and it will not be so presented to the American Congress. It was, and will be, presented in conjunction with the agreement finally settling all lend-lease accounts between the United States and Great Britain whereby we virtually forgive more than $20,000,000,000 of lend-lease for practically nothing, and it is presented in conjunction with a proposed future program of commercial policy declaration which is full of evasive promises.

In short, we forgive more than $20,000,000,000 lend-lease debt, and give up a fresh three billion seven hundred and fifty million American dollars and get contracts of future promises full of escape clauses and loopholes. It is not the kind of a loan that any businessman in America would make and recommend to the company he heads.

I am opposed because the British didn't want this loan, but we forced them to take it, along with their hasty agreeing to Bretton Woods, settling lend-lease accounts, and agreeing to some time consult about lowering tariffs and eliminating imperial preference in foreign trade.

When the discussions originated last summer, the British press and the British negotiators frankly and honestly stated they didn't want a loan. They couldn't pay a loan.

They wanted a grant-in-aid or another gift or at least an interest-free loan over a long period of time.

Sydney Campbell, financial editor of Reuter's, said in July:

"One thing should be made clear about the present discussions in the United States about a loan of three to five billion dollars to Britain. Britain would almost certainly refuse any such loan, however big it might be or however low the interest. They are rather mystified as to why Americans trouble to discuss the matter. A grant-in-aid would, of course, be accepted."

Lord Keynes, the principal British negotiator, also, frankly expressed their position. He arrived in September and he told us he was here to make some kind of an arrangement about lend-lease, and about some way of helping England struggle out of her economic difficulties. But, there was one thing he wanted to make plain to us. That was, Britain could not afford to make a commercial loan in this country. To quote him, he said:

"No doubt an easy course would be for you to offer and for us to put our name to a substantial loan, on more or less commercial terms, without either party to the transaction troubling to pay too much attention to the question of the likelihood of our being able to fulfill the obligations which we were undertaking.

"'However this may be,' he said, 'we shall not lend ourselves to any such soft and deceptive expedient.' He continued: 'We are not in the mood, and we believe and hope that you are not in the mood, to repeat the experiences of last time's war debt. We would far rather do what we can to get on as best we can on any other lines which are open to us.'"

The New York Times, commenting at the time, said:

"Not only did he fear that deception would probably have a very short life, but it would be extremely shortsighted if the absence of friction and bad feeling between the two countries is one of the principal aims."

Nevertheless, our negotiators insisted they accept a loan of $3,750,000,000 at 1.62 percent interest over a 55-year period, even though we will have to borrow this money from the American people, paying at least 2½ percent interest through the sale of additional bonds. The agreement provides that the interest from the British does not start until the end of 5 years, and then at any time the United Kingdom decides that the exchange conditions are not favorable they can request a waiver, and the United States must grant it. There is no provision, however, that the American people will not have to pay the 2½ percent interest every year and the principal, too, in the event of a British default.

The British couldn't pay a $4,000,000,000 debt after the last war. They themselves tell us they can't pay it now. And still our negotiators insisted on calling it a loan and demanded that the British accept it as such.

I am opposed to it because I am confident that it will prove to be a gift and the language and form of the agreement is subterfuge to deceive the American people and to make it easier for those whose interests are largely concerned with foreign trade to secure its approval by the American Congress.

The British believe that the $4,000,000,000 they spent for munitions of war before we established Lend-Lease should be paid back to them now in the form of this gift. They frankly stated so, and asked for this amount as a gift or a grant-in-aid. This supposed loan, coupled with diverse and sundry other agreements and joint statements with loopholes and escape clauses, is a complicated method for accomplishing this unwarranted request.

Lord Keynes, in explaining in the House of Lords the reasons why this supposed loan had to be accepted instead of an out-and-out grant or gift, said: "The American Congress and the American people have never accepted any literal principle of equal sacrifice, financial or otherwise, between all of the Allied participants."

You simply cannot sell that theory to the American soldiers who stormed and streamed across Normandy Beach, constituting over three-fourths of the total number of men fighting on the western front.

I am opposed to it because it is a part of several agreements, one of which wipes out our contribution of more than 20,000,000,000 American dollars without securing a single additional island base for our Navy or Air Corps for our own protection and the peace of the world in the future; because we give all surplus property and all construction and installations located in the United Kingdom without acquiring any permanent rights in airports built by American sacrifice, blood, and money throughout the British Empire to aid our future civilian commerce as we struggle to pay the debt caused by our enormous contribution to the winning of the war throughout the world.

I am opposed to any loan to any foreign government of billions of dollars at 1.62 percent interest as long as we charge all veterans of our own country, including our badly wounded men, 4 percent on the money we loan them to establish their homes or businesses when they return and give them no waiver of interest and no consultation clauses to adjust the payment of the principal.

I am opposed to this gift of $4,400,000,000 of the American people's money under the guise of a loan that has no collateral, knowing full well that it is only the forerunner of additional huge loans to Russia, China, France, the Netherlands, and all the rest to come.

We have already made a loan to Great Britain through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. We have committed ourselves to the extent of $2,700,000,000 for UNRRA. We have extended the credit capacity of the Export-Import Bank to $3,500,000,000. We have committed our country to contribute $5,925,000,000 to the Bretton Woods Fund and Bank. We have authorized vast changes in our export-import status through the reciprocal trade agreements.

I am opposed to any vast loans or gifts to any foreign countries until the administration tells the people honestly how many demands or requests it has received up to date and presents a balance sheet to show the American people just what our foreign commitments really are and what additional burden each gift or so-called loan will place on our already heavy and strained economy. [Applause.]

I am opposed to any series of world-wide gifts or loans that play a part of the Lord Keynes and the American New Deal plan for a world-wide WPA project that will lower our American standard of living at a time when we are beset with Nation-wide strikes demanding an even higher standard of living in America this very night.

In presenting the so-called loan to the House of Lords in Great Britain, Lord Keynes stated, and I quote him again:

"Fifthly—and perhaps this is the consideration which is least prominent in people's minds—the United States is rapidly becoming a high-living and a high-cost country. Their wages are two and a half times ours. These are the historic classical methods by which, in the long run, international equilibrium will be restored."

I am opposed, for I know that this loan does not meet the full financial needs of Great Britain, but is merely a stopgap arrangement which we have forced upon them in connection with the other agreements that are presented with it. It will lead only to bad feeling and ill-will between our two countries who should always be the closest friends in peace.

Mr. Winston Churchill, who so gallantly led the British Empire through the darkest hours of its history, also opposed this loan and allied agreements and led his colleagues in abstaining from voting for them, saying on December 12, 1945, in the House of Commons:

"It is a pity that we should have allowed a commercial loan agreement to be mixed up and linked up with our transactions." He said further: "Not only is there disappointment, there is deep misgiving as to what the consequences will be and also our ability, however hard we try, to discharge successfully the obligation imposed upon us."

I agree with Mr. Churchill.

If we are going to forgive $20,000,000,000 of lend-lease obligation, let's do it on its own merits and let's secure some permanent rights to bases and airports which were bought with the blood, sweat, tears, and money of the American people.

If we are going to make commercial loans, let us make them on sound commercial terms with collateral to secure them.

For the sake of future good and friendly relations between our two countries who were such stanch allies in the war and should be such close friends in peace, for the sake of protecting the standard of living of our people who must carry the heavy burden of our present enormous national debt, for the sake of being honest with the American people whose money we would be giving away, this British loan agreement should be defeated, and I shall oppose it in the Congress of the United States. [Applause.]

I said when I started that it was difficult to know where to start and where to stop. There are many questions connected with it. What is the alternative? They always say if you oppose something, you ought to present an alternative. I have said I would oppose this loan and I do, because I know that this does not meet even the financial needs of Great Britain. She owes, in addition to it, twenty billion or twenty-five billion—I don't know what the figure is.

When I say these things, I am not speaking disparagingly of Great Britain. Nobody can, in my presence, without challenge, belittle the sacrifice, the courage, the devotion, the fortitude, the patriotism of the British people. They are in trouble, but they are the master diplomats of the whole world, and suddenly we become the leading power of the world and we'd better stay the leader and not be drawn down or we will not fulfill our mission, as God has given us the right and the power to do. Living as we do, without titles, without distinction of religion or race or creed, we have become the most powerful people on earth and we must now assert our leadership, and when we meet a problem presented like Great Britain's, we'd better analyze it and do it honestly so the American people who will pay the bill will know what their obligations will be and then give them a chance to decide whether they want to undertake it.

Great Britain owes, in addition to the $20,000,000,000 lend-lease which we will forgive, $14,000,000,000 in the sterling area. Those sterling bloc countries through the necessity of war have blocked their sterling so that it is not available for trade outside of that area. I say, Great Britain owes in that area alone, $14,000,000,000. She has, according to Mr. Dalton, the Chancelor of the Exchequer, $1,800,000,000 in gold and dollar reserves today. They have, in addition, what is variously estimated to be between two billion five hundred million and three billion five hundred million liquid assets in foreign investments, many of them in our country. They have, according to another report, 4,000,000,000 pounds of wool. The world needs clothes. We

can't get them even for our returning soldiers. They might very well sell this wool. But, the plan as I see it under this loan is for us to loan them $3,750,000,000 and they then will sell some of their assets to satisfy their other creditors within their sterling area alone. But, all this is being done at the expense of the American people under the guise that Great Britain will some day give up their imperial preference.

I give you my word tonight that they have never given up their imperial preference, and under this loan they are not obliged to give up their imperial preference and they never will. In the darkest hours of Britain's history, when Churchill was leading them and they didn't have any idea whether they could win the war, and when our representatives were asking him to agree to the statement of the Atlantic Charter, even then he protected the imperial preference of Great Britain. And, later, when they drew up the Mutual Aid Agreement by which we were ultimately—and no one dreamed it would reach such fantastic figures—to give them $25,000,000,000 of American goods, he still protected the British imperial preference.

When we say we will wipe out the $20,000,000,000 to Great Britain, that is a generous statement and we are, indeed, a generous people.

It was said in Parliament that this will make a fine, clean finish to the lend-lease between our two countries. But it doesn't finish it for the American people. We haven't paid this bill. We still have to pay the interest on these $25,000,000,000 worth of bonds, and some day we've got to earn and pay taxes to pay the bonds themselves to the American people.

I simply don't understand how the gentlemen of the State Department and the Treasury can so blithely give away, with a broad gesture, twenty-five billions of obligations, knowing there isn't a man in this room or a man in America that will ever live long enough to finally see the obligation met by the American people who still must pay it.

May I quote Winston Churchill when he was leading the Conservatives and begging them to abstain from voting for this loan in the Parliament, saying they wanted no part of the responsibility for it? He said this:

"Finally, there is one point I must put on record about the Commercial Policy Declaration."

Now, keep those words in your mind because you are going to hear the Treasury and the businessman like Mr. Philip Reed—you are going to hear Mr. Vinson and Mr. Acheson talking about that wonderful golden era that will come when the Commercial Policy Declaration is put into effect. Under this agreement they make no agreement except they will consult in the future. But, while Mr. Churchill was discussing it, I repeat, quoting Mr. Churchill:

"Finally, there is one point I must put on record about the Commercial Policy Declaration. At my first meeting with President Roosevelt in Argentia in 1941, I was very careful that the terms of the Atlantic Charter in no way prejudiced our rights to maintain this system of imperial preference.

"Those were not easy days. The United States was neutral. It was hard to see how the war could be won, but even then I insisted upon that. Similarly, when it came to the mutual aid agreement, I received from President Roosevelt the explicit assurances which have since been published, we were no more committed by article 7 to abandoning of imperial preference than was the United States to abolish her tariffs."

I give you that as an illustration of the attitude of the British on the commercial declaration of the future.

I would like to take a long time to show that when they were here asking for a gift—not for a loan—when they were here asking for a grant-in-aid, they were told, not what Mr. Vinson said the other night on the radio, "The gift was not possible"; they were told it was not "practical politics" in America because they couldn't get the Congress to go through with it. But, as Mr. Dalton was explaining to the House of Commons, a new device has been inserted, the waiver of interest. And, never before, said he, in any agreement of this kind, has it ever been installed in an agreement. Lord Keynes in urging that they accept it said, if they (meaning us) wanted to preserve the essence of interest, must we, the British be fooled? The terms of this loan are more liberal with no interest for 6 years and a waiver of interest after 6 years, whenever our exports do not measure up to 50 times what they were before the war. He said, it is even a better deal, but the Congress wouldn't accept it any other way.

That is why I said to you that it is a device to deceive the American people and to get the American Congress to accept it as a loan. If we make this loan to Britain, Russia will soon be here. If they say, "We've got to make this loan to Britain for peace"—there will be no peace without Russia. If they say, "We've got to make this loan to control the atomic bomb"—we've got the bomb. We are the ones that have the bomb. Other countries may have it. Russia may have something like it. We don't know.

Our scientists—I have talked with many who followed the bomb from beginning to end. I have talked with those who were present at the demonstration in New Mexico. I talked with those who flew with the elements that made up the bomb on the tiny Pacific Island. I talked with one of the men who flew in the plane that dropped the bomb. They all have high regard for the Russian scientists, but they will all tell you we know nothing about what they have done, how far they are, and there will be no peace in this world until Russia raises that iron curtain of secrecy behind which she will not even let as trusted allies as we take a look. Right now, while they are meeting in the United Nations Organization, they are not discussing the terms of the Atlantic Charter. They are not discussing the high ideals of America. They are not discussing who is running hard across the little nations and why.

If we don't look out, we are going to wind up as coconspirators to subject little people and destroy the liberty of people who would like to be free even as our forefathers wanted to be free when they were ready to die for it in 1776. [Applause.]

I said I was opposed to this loan because it is a part of so many other agreements and our leaders don't give us a balance sheet and tell us what our commitments are.

Even during the war we had to get our information from the British, and I guess we will have to get it from them on this loan. So I sent to the Parliament and got the discussion and debates in the Parliament, and I have them here.

Lord Keynes said that when he was here the demands of foreign countries for like loans were reported reliably to be four to five times as much as their maximum demands. Well, if their maximum demand was $5,000,000,000, then the requests are already in for $20,000,000,000. Will that satisfy them? Will that buy peace? What will we do when we grant $20,000,000,000?

During the last fiscal year our taxes and our borrowing did not completely meet the expense of this Government, so we dipped back into the reserves that were already available from earlier borrowings from the American people. But, you can't go on forever deficit-spending and borrowing to pay for the deficits you create while you are dishing out money to the world under the guise it is good for the American workingman.

What is going to happen to us? That is what Lord Keynes was talking about when he said, "The American people are rapidly becoming a high-living and a high-cost country. Their wages are two and a half times ours. These are the historic, classical methods by which in the long run, international equilibrium will be restored." He means, we will be restored down to the level of the rest of the world. There is no other answer to that one.

You cannot tell me that you can meet the demands of the strikers of this country, asking for more money, which puts more costs on production, by adding to the debt of our country in continuous vast loans to foreign countries. We have set out as the people of a great nation to raise the standard of living, and we have already imposed all manner of taxes and restrictions and controls, all of which add to the cost of our production. We have unemployment insurance, old-age insurance, sickness insurance, factory inspection, regulation of investment houses, control of everything—and now we will add more wages, and then are you going to let the goods come in here from all the nations of the world where they pay from 15 cents to $1 a day for slave labor, with no restrictions and no restraints—it simply does not add up.

What is happening to us at this very minute, gentlemen, is that Lord Keynes, the New Deal, the Treasury Department, and the State Department of this Government have a major operation in mind for our entire protective tariff system that Lord Keynes said is the "historic, classical methods by which in the long run international equilibrium will be restored." The plain answer to that is we will be restored downward instead of bringing them up.

To those who insist that we must make this gift, under the guise of a loan, to preserve peace, let me say—first, you cannot buy peace; and second, every other nation can insist on a similar gift in the name of peace, and we simply cannot finance this whole world.

Great Britain needs help. Every other country of consequence needs help. We don't know ourselves how broke we are or what our present and anticipated commitments are.

Great Britain needs to set her house in order. She should adjust her debts with her sterling area countries before she asks us to add more than $4,000,000,000 more to our contribution to her welfare.

Then she should use any credit we give her to modernize her production facilities to raise the standard of living of her own people and the millions under her command and rule.

The whole world has been blown and torn by the roots in this devastating war of destruction. No country can meet its obligations and survive without rigid economy and hard work.

We cannot survive and preserve our standard of living or our representative form of government without economy and hard work. We cannot survive as a people living under a private enterprise system unless we get to work fast to produce real wealth in the form of goods so badly needed by all of our people.

Maybe we will have to have new leadership in Washington. Maybe we will have to have a better leadership at home as well as in our foreign affairs.

What we need most desperately in foreign affairs is men who will be absolutely honest with the American people and not try to foster these pet schemes by dragging us down to the standards of the rest of the world or by giving away the substance of America.

We need diplomats today who will truly stand up for America. [Rising applause.]

The Tragedy of Truman: He Has Failed the Nation in Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 31, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Journal and American of January 20, 1946:

THE TRAGEDY OF TRUMAN: HE HAS FAILED THE NATION IN CRISIS

(By Samuel Crowther)

I

On the night of Thursday, January 3, President Truman, speaking over the radio from the White House, asked the American people to join with Sidney Hillman's Political Action Committee in bringing pressure upon the Congress to enact a program of legislation which would socialize America and foreclose what remains of American freedom.

Principally Mr. Truman urged that the despotic powers granted on the pretense they were needed for war be strengthened and extended into peace.

He asked that the OPA's power to dictate the price at which a citizen may buy or sell his goods and services be confirmed into the far future.

In addition, he asked for the passage of laws extending the already vast Federal bureaucracy through new or bigger agencies to look after employment, medical care, anti-discrimination, and full employment.

And, finally, he asked for a bill to settle labor disputes by referring them to fact-finding boards which he would appoint.

The program advanced by President Truman is, with the exception of the "fact finding" boards, the program of the PAC-CIO.

It is even more drastic than that of the popular front which reduced a once powerful France to a mere shell that collapsed at a touch by the Germans. It is even more drastic than the British Labor program which has reduced that once great nation to a mendicant bitterly standing on the international street corner snarling for alms.

The American people have wanted to believe in Harry S. Truman. They have wanted to believe in him as a plain American who would never yield to the superman delusion and who would battle to rid the White House of the despotism which a series of rubber-stamp Congresses and the war had lodged there.

The people have hoped and prayed that President Truman would use the transition from war to peace to mark a transition from control of the people to control by the people.

In the beginning the Truman words were fair and heartening. Now it stands revealed that Harry S. Truman, no matter how good were his original intentions and no matter how good are his present intentions, is President of the United States in name only.

Today our Nation is in crisis. There is no point in being optimistic or pessimistic. Those words are worn out. The facts are plain.

We have passed, with the speed that night follows day and with scarcely a twilight, from being the world's dominant power with the might to make right to being the world's dominated power equally impotent to control either our external or our internal affairs.

No one could defeat us. No one has defeated us. We have defeated ourselves. We have permitted the forces of evil pretending to be the forces of good to rob us of our birthright of freedom and our proud chivalry that the Stars and Stripes never marches except to make men free.

We have been robbed of our birthright and stripped of our honor because President Truman and his picked associates forming the administration have had neither the wit nor the courage to face their duties as Americans but, on the contrary, have approached our great national and international problems with the capacity and the attitude of ward politicians and have permitted themselves to be the tools of the efficient and well-organized groups that grew up inside and outside the departments of Government under the Roosevelt administration and which for an indeterminate number of years before his death were really running Roosevelt.

This group is at the core communistic and takes its orders from Moscow. These are the guiding spirits, for they know the technique of modern revolution.

But the strongest men are the political adventurers, acting as the heads of CIO unions, who, having received the right from the Roosevelt administration to make faceless serfs of their members, have combined in a ruthless drive against private ownership in America under the pretense that they are only asking for higher wages for their serfs.

This drive is becoming an unofficial general strike.

The drive would not be possible in its present form, were it not for the Truman administration program of inflating the money supply with the one hand and attempting to control the effects of inflation with the other through the elaborate and sinister system of the OPA.

These policies are being used as pincers by the CIO buccaneers to squeeze out private ownership and thus despoil America of the savings of the millions of hard-working men and women who made America the land of opportunity.

The drive is being conducted with the complete ruthlessness and the complete contempt for truth and honor which mark every Communist movement.

It can be made to mark the beginning or the end of alien control of America. It cannot be compromised.

Nero fiddled while Rome burned. Truman plays the piano.

OPA—An Appreciation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 30, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in the barrage of criticism descending on the OPA it is encouraging to find a word of commendation in the editorial columns of an Idaho Republican paper, which is inserted herewith:

FAIRNESS TO ALL

The Office of Price Administration is this month having its fourth anniversary. Born of war emergency, the boards over the country have handled rationing and price control with fairness to all to the best of their ability. Members of OPA boards and employees in offices have been subject to severe criticism at times, because orders from higher-ups were bound to cause inconvenience to some. Those who served on boards are especially to be commended for their good work. They served without pay, giving of their valuable time, suffering from some who felt they were not being treated right, often to the extent of losing friends and customers in their own line of business.

With rationing ended, except for sugar, and price problems increasingly pressing under the dangers of inflation, the boards are now known as Price Control Boards, their major job holding the price line steady to keep down costs of living in communities. The threat of inflation is greater today than ever before.

Even though we have had our toes tramped on at times, let us now be broadminded over the past of rationing and the price control of the future. The work of rationing and price administration is truly of the democratic nature of "government of the people, by the people, for the people."

Loopholes in Election Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 31 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Loopholes in Election Laws," written by me and published in the February issue of the magazine Nation's Business.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOOPHOLES IN ELECTION LAWS

(By ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator from Wisconsin)

POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS, IN SPITE OF CONGRESSIONAL INTENTION, STILL INVOLVE PRACTICES WHICH, THOUGH WITHIN THE LAW, ARE UNFAIR TO THE VOTERS

"Sad as it may seem in this democracy of ours, Congressmen must be greased, that is, wined, dined, and bribed for their votes, and they can be—very effectively. This greasing process costs a tidy sum with every session of Congress. That is what your dollar goes for."

The dollar referred to in this quotation was the political assessment on each member of the United Automobile Workers Union in the 1944 election.

The quotation itself is from a letter signed by William Booher, financial secretary of UAW Local No. 2. It was sent on July 6, 1943, to union workers in Fleetwings, Inc., Bristol, Pa.

The letter is in the record of the Senate Campaign Expenditures Committee. It was written to inform CIO members why they were being assessed $1 per head for the Political Action Committee's campaign chest. Its writer's ambition was apparently not only to fill the congressional seats but to make them pleasant and profitable.

With the first guns already booming in the 1946 campaign, the threats of greased elections again demand the voters' attention.

Though Sidney Hillman, chairman of PAC, after a consultation with its counsel, John J. Abt, denounced the letter as stupid, unfair, and untrue when it was produced at the committee hearing, nevertheless it indicates a kind of thinking that has no place in a democracy.

Political assessments, the action which this thinking purports to justify, deserve the clear-headed, unbiased consideration of every American. The subject is larger than its union aspect. It also affects individuals, partnerships, and corporations. Its potent influence on elections strikes at the very roots of our concepts of republican government.

Slush money in elections

Everyone knows that American elections often have been cursed by the use of slush funds—money employed for personal bribery or corruptive propaganda. Far too often, tainted money has been used to grease the election of political stooges. The very use of gigantic sums of money by any one private source to steamroller an election is an action which sticks in the average American's craw.

Various Federal and State laws to limit the use of slush funds in elections are on the books. Loopholes and weasel words are so plentiful in them that a steamroller and caravan of political workers can drive through. The large-scale activities of PAC in the 1944 election and its girding for a repeat performance this year have limelighted the bare spots in these laws as never before.

Preventing election abuses is the supreme challenge to lawmakers. On one side is the need for an aroused electorate, an essential for democratic government where every citizen is free to express his opinions and to participate in choosing officials. For that reason, we who are eager to amend the present laws and plug their loopholes must be careful that we do not infringe on the freedom of speech which is the right of every worker, of every group, and of every organization. The obligation of Congress and legislatures is both to prevent such extravagant use of money or other pressure that individual citizens are denied an equal voice in elections and to require publicity so citizens will know what interests are providing the money and arguments. For half a century, Congress has been trying to meet the challenge.

A brief review of past legislation clearly shows that the present Federal election laws are more like scattered posts which can be avoided than a solid barrier against slush funds and pressure groups.

Congress became sufficiently aroused in 1909 to make certain election practices of that gaslight era amenable to the Criminal Code. That was in the happy heyday when corporations boasted of carrying State legislatures and Senators in their vest pockets. In 1910 Congress passed another law requiring publicity of campaign expenditures.

Prohibits some contributions

The present Corrupt Practices Act was not enacted until 1925. In addition to enforcing publicity of collections and expenditures for elections, it limits the expenditure by a candidate for Senate or House of Representatives to $25,000 and $5,000, respectively, unless his home State fixes a lower limit. It also prohibits contributions by any corporation or national bank to a candidate campaigning for a Federal office. The words in quotations chart the loopholes.

The only substantial effect of the Hatch Act of 1939 is to bar Federal civil-service employees from political activities. Its other restrictions are easily side-stepped. It limits contributions to a national candidate or committee to $5,000 by any individual, corporation, or organization. It generously fixes $3,000,000 as the limit for contributions to, or expenditures by, any one national political committee. State or local committees or organizations are specifically exempted from any limitations.

The Smith-Connally Labor Disputes Act which followed on June 25, 1943, added labor unions to the corporations and national banks which are banned from contributing to national elections.

The ban on political contributions by corporations, banks, and trade unions serves the worthy purpose of protecting an individual stockholder or member from the use of funds, in which he has an interest, for candidates or political parties which he does not support. That is a broad principle of safeguarding investments in which political activity is only one incident.

More pertinent are the loopholes in the election laws. In brief, they are:

1. These Federal laws apply only to Presidential and congressional elections. They are not concerned with State or local elections.

2. They do not prohibit expenditures labeled "educational" activities though their practical purpose may be to elect particular candidates. Any activity to promote wider discussion of national issues must be encouraged but it should not be given a fanciful label to avoid the election laws when its purpose is purely political.

3. Also, as the acts are largely concerned with cash expenditures, they are ambiguous in evaluating many possible services by individuals, corporations, unions, or other organizations which are in contravention of the spirit rather than the letter of the law and which may be more helpful than money in a campaign.

4. The Corrupt Practices Act applies only to elections and not to the party primaries where candidates are nominated, which is equivalent to election in many States, or to the selection of delegates to national conventions which draft party platforms and name candidates.

5. While the act prohibits certain contributions to a candidate, it does not prohibit expenditures by the same organizations in behalf of a candidate.

6. Though the Hatch Act limits the contribution of an individual, corporation, or organization to $5,000 in a primary or election campaign, an unlimited number of individuals in the same family or groups can each contribute up to that amount.

7. This can be varied by organizing campaign committees under different names, each of which will be eligible for a separate $5,000 contribution from the same individual or organization.

8. As the latter may encourage campaign chests which tried and true party wheelhorses will not control, the act thoughtfully includes a detour sign by exempting State and local committees. Though a $3,000,000 limit is set for a national committee jackpot, each regular State or local committee, as well as any committee organized for a particular campaign, can collect and spend to or even above the same limit.

9. The Smith-Connally Act, while bringing labor unions into the fold, did not close any loopholes in the previous acts.

These loopholes were not new, but it remained for the Congress of Industrial Organizations to go through them in a big way and with all the fanfare of an old-time torchlight parade on a national scale.

Two weeks after the Smith-Connally Act became effective, CIO's executive board organized the Political Action Committee and charged it with the task of conducting a program of political education. Within a short time PAC was to demonstrate the clearest object lesson of the flaws in our election statutes. Its spending in the 1944 campaign gave America a preview of still more distasteful slush-funding to come in the 1946 and 1948 elections. How true that preview was could be seen in the 1945 mayoralty election in Detroit when PAC put on an unsuccessful campaign to elect a UAW vice president, Richard Frankensteen, as mayor. The exact sums PAC spent in Detroit are unknown but it is known that, during the 1944 fourth-term campaign, $647,000 of funds from union treasuries were turned over to PAC, ostensibly for educational expenditures.

How much more was turned over to State and local PAC's no one outside PAC will ever know. It may have been many millions of dollars more and may have resulted in the reproduction of far more than the one hundred million pieces of literature printed and distributed by the national PAC.

Five checks for $100,000 each in that $647,000 were from CIO's national treasury, and the union treasuries of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, the United Automobile Workers of America, the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, and the United Steelworkers of America.

No universal coercion-free vote was taken among the rank and file of the CIO unions or CIO as a whole for the allocation of such huge sums from their treasuries. (For that matter, neither did John L. Lewis democratically consult all of his miners before he lent $500,000 to the Democratic National Committee in 1936, a loan which was later repaid. The law classifies such advances or loans as contributions.)

Funds allocated to PAC from unions may be derived from one of two sources or both:

(a) Special political assessments on members.

(b) The union treasuries accruing from dues, etc.

In either case, two sinister results may obtain:

1. The funds of all members may be used on behalf of the election of candidates to which some members are opposed. (This would be equally possible in the case of stockholders' funds.)

2. Refusal to allow their union treasuries to be so used or to pay assessments on the line may cause members to be expelled outright or things may be made so uncomfortable for them that they will "voluntarily" quit their jobs. In plants with maintenance-of-membership contracts, such loss of union status automatically deprives a worker of his job.

The Superior Court of Cook County, Ill., recently decided a case on this point in favor of a workingman. The decision affected 82 other employees in the same plant who resigned from a CIO union on the ground that it was Communist-dominated. The Court ruled:

"Morgan's expulsion from union membership, which in turn compels the employer, under the maintenance-of-membership contract, to discharge him regardless of his value as a worker, is * * * a violation of his legal rights and cannot be sustained."

Unfortunately, not many workers will fight such a case in the courts, and this decision has not been confirmed by higher courts.

PAC makes a self-conscious effort to comply with the letter of the law. From the time President Roosevelt was renominated for President in 1944 until he was reelected, PAC froze all its funds gained through trade-union contributions. It spent only those funds ($470,000) gained from individuals' contributions. Thus, Mr. Hillman could claim scrupulous compliance with the strictest possible interpretation of the Corrupt Practices Act as amended by the Smith-Connally Act because he had lived up to the law by abstaining from using trade-union contributions in the postprimary period.

Even had he used trade-union contributions during that period, he might have relied on the argument that PAC's contributions were expenditures and therefore allowable under the law.

To broaden the source of individual contributions, particularly from nonunion supporters, the National Citizens Political Action Committee was created in July 1944. It received $380,000, exclusively in individuals' contributions, and spent $378,000 in behalf of the fourth term and progressive congressional candidates. The activities of PAC and NCPAC were admittedly synchronized; personnel and offices were substantially the same and Mr. Hillman was the chairman of both groups.

In its report filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, NCPAC tabulated the financing, as follows:

	Received	*Spent*
Trade-unions account	$547,903.26	$478,498.82
Individual contributions	376,910.77	470,852.32
NCPAC	380,306.45	378,424.78
Total	1,405,120.48	1,327,775.92

The individual sources of NCPAC funds may be relatively impervious to further legal restraint, but assessments and trade-union sources of PAC funds are not.

I have introduced legislation to ban political expenditures as well as contributions by any union, national bank, or corporation and thus preserve their treasury funds inviolate. Other congressional colleagues have bills pending which would extend the expenditure and contribution ban to primaries and national conventions as well as elections and which would specifically prohibit political assessments by unions.

New laws are no panacea

Passage of such legislation would by no means be a panacea against the use of slush funds. Even if enacted, the laws would only prohibit contributions and expenditures to national committees. Moreover, the courts would still have to differentiate between political and educational expenditures in national elections.

A further differentiation would have to be made between, for example, what it costs an established newspaper corporation to support certain candidates or political issues during a campaign and the expenditures by temporary campaign newspapers set up by individuals, unions, national banks, or corporations. Affiliated or sponsored organizations, not only of unions but of all interested groups which engage in election work, also would continue to pose a problem.

The enactment of the expenditure ban would at least help to plug a national loophole through which a minimum of $750,000 of trade-union funds were poured in 1944.

The loopholes and jokers should be eliminated by a complete overhaul of our Federal election laws. Vigorous action will be necessary to extend the expenditure ban to State and local committees. State and local governments also must legislate until the country eventually has uniform election laws guaranteeing honest elections to every citizen.

No law can be valid which might hamper or discourage a qualified voter's participation in elections. Every effort is to stimulate greater participation. Election laws are needed to protect the voter from coercion; from forced assessments by unions, employers, or political parties and from funds which can make his vote worthless.

Active participation in elections is the first duty of a free citizen. He must decide the issues between candidates and parties. To form his opinion, he should know what goes on behind the scenes—the secret pressure groups, the interests backing the candidates and the sources of campaign funds.

Publicity, and publicity alone, can give him that information. Election campaigns should not be allowed to hide secrets from the public.

Publicity is a great cleanser and should be obligatory.

It already is obligatory for contributions of money to a candidate or political party, the sources and amounts, and where the money is spent.

However, the final reports may not be filed until weeks after the ballots are counted, too late to help the voter in picking candidates. If the deadline for contributions and final reports were a reasonable time before an election, he would know who and what is behind the candidates. The bill which I have introduced will include expenditures for a candidate as well as contributions to a candidate or party, further broadening the benefits of publicity.

Elections are too serious to be left in their present state, wide open to the wiles of the unscrupulous. Greater political squeezes are in the offing. For the benefit of labor, for the benefit of business and, more than all, for the benefit of the public, such squeezes must be prevented.

The Tragedy of Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 31, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Journal and American of January 21, 1946:

THE TRAGEDY OF TRUMAN
(By Samuel Crowther)
II

Our Nation, only a few months ago on the day when Japan surrendered, was mightier, both absolutely and comparatively, than any power the world had ever known.

Our Nation is now impotent to defend itself from aggression and powerless to make war.

And further, by a series of almost incredibly fantastic acts, it has given up not only the ideals for which the people thought they were fighting and sacrificing but also the power to control its external relations and to an unknown degree the power to control its internal relations.

As a world power, we collapsed before we got started.

The precipitate withdrawal of our troops from Europe was in response to everyone's natural desire to get the boys home, but it is not without significance that the Communist periodicals which once were screaming for a second front to help Russia, regardless of the cost in American blood, screamed even louder to get the boys home when the presence of a great American Army in Europe could have lent weight to our discussions with Russia on the state of freedom in the little countries that we were supposed to have helped liberate.

We have already eliminated ourselves as a military power in Europe and are on the way to doing so in Asia.

The covenants limiting our power to manage ourselves are contained in the International Fund and the International Bank, growing out of the Bretton Woods meeting; in the United Nations Organization, growing out of the San Francisco Conference; and in the as yet obscure food, air, and relief international organizations variously put together at various places. In the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, the Congress divested itself of its constitutional obligation to regulate tariffs.

During the Bretton Woods meeting, the Hearst newspapers pointed out that the agreements being fashioned had almost nothing to do with the stabilization of exchanges or any other worthy purpose and a great deal to do with draining off American resources and rigging the American dollar. The power to rig the dollar is the power to control the American economy.

During the San Francisco Conference, the Hearst newspapers pointed out that the elaborate Charter being evolved, although festooned with fine words and noble purposes, could be made a device by which the United States might obligate itself to defend tyranny and slavery.

The Congress approved the Bretton Woods Agreements and the San Francisco Charter and passed the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act under tremendous pressure from Hillman's Political Action Committee and no end of organizations mobilized for the purpose.

President Truman lent himself to these campaigns—although it is now evident that he did not know what any of the obligations were—on the ground that he needed these votes of confidence for the Big Three meeting at Potsdam.

It is clear that, if he had intended to do any bargaining, he would have held up the approval of these various articles and used them for trading purposes. But the President did no trading at Potsdam. He signed what was given to him.

He agreed—without any comprehension of what he was doing—to have America enforce the Morgenthau plan by which future generations of Germans are forcibly to be kept at a substandard of living.

By inference and again without knowing what he was doing, he endorsed communism by engaging to exterminate all other forms of collectivism.

Secretary Byrnes went to London, and his meeting with Messrs. Bevin and Molotoff broke up in a row because he and Mr. Bevin would not agree for Russia to make puppet States out of Rumania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia in the way that it had already made puppets out of Czechoslovakia, Poland, and the Baltic States.

Mr. Byrnes, having made a stand for the right, made an about-face, went to Moscow and in effect told Commissar Molotoff that the right was whatever the Soviet wanted it to be. In addition, he put the Soviet in a position to interfere with the rule of General MacArthur in Japan—which was the one creditable and honorable piece of fine Americanism left in the world.

Russia, having gained or being about to gain everything it desired in the way of domination of peoples, permitted the United Nations Organization with great pomp and circumstance to come into being in London.

The single purpose of that Organization, outside of providing a haven for lame ducks and a hall for orators, is to make the United States the guarantor of Russian imperialism. By the terms of the deed, the UNO can take no action against Russia without the unanimous consent of the Security Council. Russia is a member of that Council.

At San Francisco, the American delegation, brilliantly led by Mr. Stettinius and Senator VANDENBERG, admitted the Argentine to the Conference against the protest of Russia and pledged the American Republics that the Act of Chapultepec would be confirmed by a treaty guaranteeing hemisphere solidarity. That meant an offensive and defensive alliance of all the Americas and a barrier against communism.

The treaty was due to be drawn at Rio de Janeiro last November. It was blasted by Under Secretary of State Acheson and others in the State Department.

The solemn pledge made to these republics—on which a hemisphere unity could have been built—has been broken and Messrs. Stettinius and VANDENBERG seem to have traded their personal honor for the empty privilege of being delegates to the UNO.

Our country under Messrs. Truman and Byrnes, with the mute acquiescence of the Senate and House Foreign Relations Committees, has followed the Communist Party line and has eliminated itself as a world power.

And, as if to top off the half-comic tragedy, Great Britain has arranged for a gift-loan from us which may or may not be approved by the Congress—and Russia is standing by for another and bigger gift-loan.

Both hope to rehabilitate themselves at our expense and also to pay their quotas in the Bretton Woods scheme in order to take more of our money.

Never has a nation nose-dived so quickly.

The Schuylkill River Restoration Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 31 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Schuylkill River Restoration Program," delivered by me at a dinner meeting of the Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin, held at Philadelphia, Pa., on January 25, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The keystone around which I am going to build my talk with you concerning programs for the restoration of the Schuylkill River can be described by a simple and homey word. Successful progress in any and all fields of endeavor depends, in my judgment, upon the sensible application of that word more than any other factor. The word to which I allude is: Teamwork.

The advancement of programs for the restoration of the Schuylkill River which has taken place in the last 2 or 3 years is an example of teamwork in the field of public works and governmental administration which would be pretty hard to beat. I say this without fear of contradiction. I am sure our good friend, Grover Ladner, who unquestionably has worked longer and more earnestly for its accomplishment than any other person, will agree with me.

Unfortunately for the river, Incodel was only a fledgling when Grover and I were connected with State government in Pennsylvania. But it is fortunate today when Incodel has grown up that someone like Attorney General Duff occupies a position in public life to convince industry and government of the fallacy of their reasoning that rivers are just places to throw stuff into. Too often have both industry and government seemed to search for ways to shirk their responsibility.

With Incodel's help and the assistance of the Schuylkill River Restoration Association, things changed rapidly. The program has been moving forward at an encouraging pace ever since it announced in October 1943 that the practice of the pot calling the kettle black was leading nowhere; that the solution of the problem involved a three-way teamwork attack by industry, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the Federal Government.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania rightly was called upon to take the first step. Both parties in both branches of the legislature responded splendidly and, working as a team, passed a law during the 1945 session specifically outlawing the practice of using Pennsylvania streams as the dumping grounds for mine wastes. A companion act, No. 441, authorized the execution of a $15,000,000 project for dredging an estimated 20,000,000 tons of accumulated coal culm and silt from the section of the river above Norristown. Five million dollars was appropriated to cover the cost of work to be accomplished during the present biennium, which ends July 1, next year.

While concentrating its efforts on getting Pennsylvania to take the initiative, Incodel also gave attention to that part of the project which it deemed should be handled by the Federal Government, namely, the dredging of the river from Norristown to Philadelphia. By means of good teamwork with representatives of the Schuylkill River restoration and of other conservation agencies, it succeeded in securing the authorization of a review survey of the problem by the Army engineers. Based upon new factors, of which the most important was the adoption of the project by Pennsylvania to clean the upper river, all of the officers of the United States engineers, from the district engineer to the chief engineer, reversed their previous conclusions that the project was the sole responsibility of Pennsylvania, and concurred in a new recommendation calling upon the Federal Government to dredge the lower river of silt deposits, at an estimated cost of $13,000,000.

In the case of both the State project and the Federal project, the estimated time required for completion of the entire job is 6 years. The people are expecting that it will be accomplished within that schedule. It will take teamwork of the highest order to do this. I assure you that I shall be happy to carry out my part in this endeavor.

Progress in the immediate future, in my judgment, depends chiefly upon the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. One reason I say this is because the Army engineers have recommended that Federal participation in the program should not be started until the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has completed at least 50 percent of its job. That, it seems to me, is a reasonable condition. There certainly would be no object in having the Federal Government commence dredging the lower part of the river unless there is definite assurance that the State will meet its obligation upstream. The faster the State moves, the quicker the river will be redeemed. It is up to Pennsylvania to set the pace.

Personally I do not know how much progress has been made in this direction. I do know, however, that while the program was being discussed during the legislative session in which it was passed the press reported that engineers had estimated that preparatory plans could be well advanced in 6 months. Time flies. That period and an additional month already have elapsed. If work has proceeded in accordance with the calculated schedule, construction and dredging operations should soon get under way. And, indeed, they must if the schedule is to be met. Twenty million tons of silt is a lot of material. If it is to be dredged within the next 5½ to 6 years, it will have to be taken from the river at a rate of more than 3,500,000 tons a year. That is a sizable job.

According to recent reports in the press, I note that the State is giving consideration to requests that private interests be permitted to dredge silt from the river. Apparently such dredging is to be undertaken in conjunction with programs for the recovery of coal, as it was stated that the removal of the silt would involve no cost and possibly result in a profit to the State. I also noted that Ellwood Turner, ever alert, sounded a word of caution regarding such proposals. He is reported to have stated that industry should be encouraged to take all of the material from the river which it can use, provided it is required to dispose properly of the unused wastes. But he also warned the State not to get itself into a position where the over-all program would be hampered or drawn out unduly on the prospect of getting part of the job done for nothing.

That is sound advice. I would like to supplement it by pointing out that the State's interest and industry's interest in the desilting program of necessity are different, although not necessarily conflicting. The State's primary responsibility is to clear and properly dispose of deposits from the river within a period of 6 years at the least possible expense. Industry's main objective, to the contrary, is not centered upon the redemption of the river. Its interest is to secure from the river those deposits from which usable coal and other material can be recovered most economically.

As far as actual dredging is concerned, it will cost money no matter who does it. If, therefore, such operations can be done, in whole or in part, at no cost or a possible profit to the State it is because of the value of the materials which can be reclaimed. That this is a prospect is splendid news.

I understand that the act which authorizes the project gives power to the administrative agency to sell the deposits taken from the river. In view of this provision, it would seem to me that the State should retain as complete control as possible over dredging operations throughout the prosecution of the program. It certainly should not allow the program to be hamstrung on the uncertainty of an indefinite policy.

Like Ellwood, I am 100 percent in favor of having industry participate with the State in the Schuylkill program. But such participation must be on a teamwork basis. All participants must pull in the same direction and toward the goal of relieving the river of its choking mess before the next 6 years have elapsed.

The necessity of enforcing laws which require coal operators to keep solid coal wastes from getting into the river in the future is another important State responsibility. Everyone realizes, of course, that it is not economically feasible to keep out the last grain of coal dust. I am sure no one expects this result. But it is common knowledge that it is now practicable to keep from streams a very high percentage of the wastes being plopped into them. The Lehigh Coal & Navigation Co. is building plants to accomplish this result and I understand, that the reclaimed fuel will be marketed at a profit. If one company can do this there is no obvious reason why the industry as a whole cannot follow suit. Certainly, if the coal which now lies mixed with mud and dirt in the channel of the Schuylkill River can be reclaimed profitably, as seems probable, it follows as a commonsense deduction that the wastes at the point of operations must be even more valuable.

Now to get away from the State's part of the program and on to the Federal Government's responsibility for a while.

The Army engineers' recommendations regarding this phase of the program have not yet been filed with Congress. Following the new policy for Federal-State cooperation as established in the recent flood-control and river and harbor acts, the Chief of Engineers has first submitted his report to the Governors of the States affected by the project—Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware—for a statement of their views. In each case the Governor filed a report approving the engineers' recommendations.

It is hardly necessary to tell you that I shall be most happy to sponsor the necessary legislation for authorization of the Federal project and to do everything in my power to secure Congress' approval. Many of you know that during the congressional session of 1945 I attempted to secure an appropriation of $10,000,000 for this program in the then pending omnibus flood-control bill. As a definite project had not been formulated at that time, the effort proved to be premature. Now that a fixed program has been developed, which has received endorsement from all sides, it will be a privilege and an honor to head up efforts to secure its authorization. This is another part of the over-all program for the development of the Delaware River watershed which can be successfully consummated by effective teamwork.

I am sure that I can count on the assistance of all interested conservation agencies. Incodel's help will be particularly effective.

The project for the restoration of the Schuylkill River is a vital part of an over-all program for the unified development of the Delaware watershed and for the basin-wide abatement of stream pollution. Completion of the Schuylkill project, supplemented by the construction of adequate sewage collection and treatment facilities in Philadelphia and Camden, will do more, in my judgment, to advance this broad objective and the related problem of the development of the port of the Delaware River than almost anything else that could be done.

The abuse to which the rivers and streams in this country have been subjected in the past is a national disgrace. It is gratifying to know that agencies in the Philadelphia metropolitan region are finally taking steps to end such practices. The program, however, in my judgment is Nation-wide. It is for this reason that I have sponsored one of the stream-pollution measures now before Congress. While I am in favor of the principle of the States and their local subdivisions assuming the initiative, I believe that it is time for the Federal Government to step into the picture after the States have had a reasonable opportunity to meet their responsibility and have failed. That is the underlying purpose of the bill which I have sponsored for putting an end to the defilement of our rivers.

There are many extremely pressing and important issues confronting this country today. Aside from the part which we must play in taking the leadership in securing an enduring world-wide peace and in devising plans for the establishment of friendly relationships between capital and labor, none is more important, in my opinion, than working out practical procedures for the conservation of our natural resources.

Incodel, by demonstrating effective teamwork, is setting an outstanding example in this field.

The Decisive Issues of 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 31 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech entitled "The Decisive Issues of 1946," delivered by him on the CBS network program, Congress Speaks, on January 15, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Communities all over the country today are plagued by problems of postwar readjustment. In my home town of Beckley, W. Va.—and in the other towns and cities of West Virginia—we are faced with rising prices, lack of housing for returned veterans, a scarcity of civilian goods, cuts in take-home pay, and inexcusable delays in the release of husbands, sons, and brothers from the armed services. These are not problems which can be solved by Beckley nor by the State of West Virginia. They are problems not only of the cities and towns of West Virginia but of the whole Nation. Common hardships are bringing home to the American people that the welfare of their own communities is dependent upon national—and in some respects international—action.

These Nation-wide difficulties need not have occurred. Two years ago, along with several of my Senate colleagues, including President Truman, then a Member of the Senate, I urged the immediate enactment of a comprehensive reconversion program embodied in what became known as the Kilgore bill. The objectives of that program were full production and full employment through speedy reemployment of war workers and returning veterans, the maintenance of high purchasing power, and the orderly expansion of civilian production as war contracts were terminated. The Senate bill embodying that program asserted the clear Federal responsibility for adequate housing and in similar areas where national action is now proving absolutely necessary.

Let me emphasize this point. Every major reconversion problem of today was anticipated in this legislation of 2 years ago. Housing, full production, reemployment of veterans. This program was actively opposed by spokesmen for financial interests. They contended that reconversion would take care of itself if large financial reserves were made available to industry. Their counsels in large measure prevailed. The American people are now suffering the consequences. The bill which was finally passed omitted Federal responsibility for full employment, and such crucial matters as a housing program and maintaining of postwar purchasing power were deleted.

Handicapped as we are by this heritage of failure, the Congress of 1946 must take bold and decisive steps to put us back on the road to full production and full employment. Our first task in domestic affairs is to support an effective program for maintaining the Nation's purchasing power. This is essential in order to guarantee high living standards not only to industrial workers but to farmers and small businessmen whose prosperity is dependent upon the ability of workers to buy their products.

Since VJ-day, the take-home pay of industrial workers has been cut by an average of 25 percent through the termination of overtime and by down-grading. In some industries, notably in steel, in electrical goods, and in the automobile industry, the decrease has been even sharper. In the absence of an orderly program for maintaining purchasing power, labor has resorted to direct action of its own. This is the real reason for the strikes. The resistance of the management in some of these industries to take a realistic view of the reduced purchasing power of their workers is a blow not only at one group of our people but at the stability of our entire economy. A policy of low wages and high profits through high prices provides but a temporary gain to a small minority of people who possess concentrated economic power. It means ruin for the vast majority of the people who make up this Nation. Our large corporations have come out of the war with financial reserves greater by far than at any previous time in their history. These reserves have been safeguarded and expanded by special legislation. Congress must lead the American people in supporting the Nation's purchasing power. We must face this issue squarely. If this purchasing power is allowed to shrink, we will find ourself in another depression far more severe than that of the 1930's. It is the movement of the money through trade that sustains business, not the stagnant dollars hoarded away.

The only sure way that Congress can effectively solve labor-management strife is to enact the President's program for a 65-cent minimum wage, expanded social security, and other measures designed to develop the Nation's resources, maintain purchasing power, and assure a minimum of decent living for all Americans. In all legislation on economic matters, Congress must take account of the vast increase in productive capacity of this Nation. If we set our sights too low with respect to production goals and earnings and living standards of the great mass of the American people, Congress will again fail to meet the Nation's postwar economic problems.

One national emergency resulting from our do-nothing policy is in the field of housing. Systematic planning 2 years ago could have foreseen and met our present housing needs. In the present housing crisis, we must mobilize all available resources if we are even to come close to meeting the shortage of 5,000,000 homes. This cannot be accomplished by thinking in terms of the traditional goals of 300,000 or 500,000 housing units per year. We must raise our sights so that in 1946 we will produce at least 1,000,000 units and in 1947 2,000,000. This can be done, just as we produced 100,000 planes per year when men of little vision said we could not produce 50,000. But these goals cannot be met without active Federal planning and support. Congress should enact this month measures such as the Wagner-Ellender bill and the Mitchell-Kilgore bill. It must give the executive agencies the green light to aid and promote housing construction in every possible way. We must break the bottlenecks on short materials by using surplus supplies of the armed services, by enlisting the now idle facilities of war plants, and by introducing new construction materials and new types of housing. The Government must set the objective of a great number of low-priced housing units and not permit construction resources to be diverted to a comparatively small number of high-priced homes.

The shortage of housing, the cut-backs in take-home pay, and the constantly rising cost of living, are inflicting special hardships upon the returned veterans. These men are finding that the decent life for which they fought is being denied them by our failure to provide them with jobs at decent wages or to produce the goods they need. The war has uprooted these men from their homes, jobs, and families. Now the Nation has a serious obligation to these men. We owe it to our veterans to establish our economy on a sound, stable, and prosperous basis. Only in this way can we provide our veterans with decent opportunities to reenter civilian life. Congress must, in addition, provide solutions for the special problems of readjustment faced by veterans. For example, the Mitchell-Kilgore emergency housing bill is primarily concerned with supplying new homes for veterans.

The discharged veteran, even with his many problems, is still an object of envy to the millions of GI's who remain in the armed services. It has been said that our commitments in the field of foreign policy require a large army. This point of view has been urged particularly, though not exclusively, by those who advocate solutions of international problems by a display of American military might. Such a policy constitutes not only an injustice to the GI who is kept in the Army or Navy unnecessarily, but it prevents the development of mutual confidence among nations so essential to the building of a secure peace. There are only two areas in the world where the United States must maintain sizable armed forces. They are Japan and the one-fourth of Germany which we are administering. And in these areas large numbers of troops are required only to the extent that we fail to eradicate nazism and shintoism and fail to destroy the economic power of the Germans and the Japanese to make war. As many of you know, I have followed closely our policy in Germany. It is apparent that our military administrators there have so far failed effectively to carry out the Potsdam agreements

requiring the denazification and industrial disarmament of Germany. It has been suggested that to carry out these commitments would require a large occupying force for policing purposes. This is not true. If we eliminate speedily and effectively the German war-making power, we obviously have a much smaller policing burden. It is our administrators with cartel connections who are obstructing the elimination of their former German partners and who are in fact using the large occupying forces to hasten the reconstruction of German industry.

This reluctance to carry out the Potsdam agreement amounts to sabotage of world peace. It protects the German's industrial might, and German cartelists who have always spearheaded her aggressions. It tends to create suspicion and a lack of confidence among the Allies, particularly those who have been promised reparations in the form of dismantled German equipment to rehabilitate their devastated lands.

The 1946 Congress has a decisive role to play in securing the peace by implementing and strengthening the machinery of international cooperation. Congress must support the efforts for international regulation of atomic power. It has been urged particularly by short-sighted isolationists that we proceed independently with a view to maintaining an atomic armaments supremacy. I have talked with the scientists who developed the atomic bomb and they assure me that such a supremacy would be meaningless. For in a few years all major nations will know how to manufacture atomic bombs. And a small number of crude bombs could utterly destroy our great cities. In the meantime, our attitude would have generated an atomic armaments race of which we and the other peoples of the world would alike be victims. Secretary Byrnes has already initiated agreements providing for international cooperation in the field of atomic power. This agreement must be carried out in good faith. We must not give heed to the carping of isolationists who continue to advocate American unilateral action by their emphasis on secrecy, who seek to disrupt international negotiations by constantly questioning the honesty of our allies. It is up to us, who have the atomic bomb, to show our good faith by halting its manufacture and by furthering international efforts for the elimination of atomic weapons.

If we would build a lasting peace, we must cease giving aid and comfort to the reactionary forces throughout the world which are endeavoring to suppress patriotic movements of the common people of colonial and undeveloped countries. Many of these movements are comparable to our own Revolutionary War and have as their aim the winning of elementary economic and political rights upon which our own democracy is based. The people of the United States have nothing to fear from these movements. Their success will build free and prosperous nations with whom we can live in peace. It does violence to our American traditions to employ our military or economic resources to deny the hopes of peoples who should look to us as a model democracy.

Let us divest ourselves of the responsibility of supporting reactionary regimes which are odious to their own peoples. Saber-rattling canot secure the peace. Let us resolve that the cooperation and friendship among nations born in war and shall be strengthened in the peace which we must build together. In domestic affairs, let us provide decent living for all Americans by maintaining wages high enough to purchase the products of American industry and agriculture. Let us act to build peace abroad and create full employment at home. Let us release our surplus soldiers from the services and bring them back to homes and jobs.

Development of the REA Program in Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 31 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Development of the REA Program in Nebraska," delivered by Claude R. Wickard, Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, before the Nebraska Association of Rural Power Districts, at its meeting at Columbus, Nebr., on January 25, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am always glad to have the opportunity to attend a meeting of the officials of the REA borrowers. Such meetings make it possible for me to become better acquainted with the people who are closely associated with this great program. I get much inspiration from meeting with these people. I find that they are invariably enthusiastic about the program, and are untiring in their efforts to make it of maximum benefit to the rural people in their areas. Such meetings give me an excellent opportunity to learn about the REA progress in the field. It is easier for me to get a clear picture of the problems in the different areas when I have an opportunity to visit with the people who are chiefly responsible for it. Of lesser importance is the fact that at these meetings it is also possible for me to give people first-hand my ideas about the program and to make a report as to what is being done by the national office to help the borrowers.

In my talk today it is my purpose to review the REA objectives as they relate to Nebraska and to discuss some of the problems attendant to reaching those objectives. It is only appropriate that when I speak in this State of REA objectives and accomplishments I mention the fact that much of the accomplishment of REA is due to the vision and courage and the untiring efforts of one of the greatest statesmen this Nation ever produced—your own George Norris. It was his conviction that the Government, in sound and practical ways, should help people live happier and more prosperous lives. He wanted to see our natural resources and our ingenuity for developing those resources used for the benefit of the great masses of people in this country. His desire to see happier homes and more efficient methods must, at least to some extent, have come out of his boyhood experiences when he lived on a farm in northwestern Ohio.

I heard Senator Norris describe one of his experiences which indicates that he, like so many other great men, was greatly influenced by a saintly mother. You will remember that his widowed mother had several children and that he as a youth had the great responsibility of assisting his mother in keeping the family together by helping to make a living for them. Times were hard and good-paying jobs were scarce. One of the sources of income in those days came at harvest time when a great number of men were employed in cradling the wheat crop and binding it by hand. Senator Norris explained to me that this work gave him an opportunity to earn money needed to buy the children's shoes and other clothes for the winter. There was great consternation in the neighborhood when the news spread that a man had invented a harvester which did away with all of the cradling and binding of wheat, and that one of these machines was already in the neighborhood.

On this particular occasion the youthful Norris had been away all week working in the harvest field. He returned home late on Saturday evening, very tired, and went directly to bed. The next morning when he arose he was confronted by his mother who asked him if he knew anything about the destroying of the new harvesting machine on a neighboring farm. He was questioned very closely by his mother. She knew that he had shared her anxiety about the way in which this modern invention might eliminate the need for so many people to work in harvest fields. He knew nothing about it. His mother was very happy to know that her son had not played a part in the destruction of property of other people.

This incident was never forgotten by George Norris. It must have intensified his desire to see that modern facilities are used to take the drudgery out of the life of rural people and make them more efficient in their daily tasks. Every farm wife and mother in America who has the REA service in her home owes much to George Norris.

Today, unfortunately, a little less than half of the farm homes in America have electricity, despite the great progress that has been made in the last 10 years since the REA was created. At that time, only 10 percent of the Nation's farms were electrified. Here in Nebraska, although great gains have been made in the last decade, nearly 70 percent of the farms are still without this most essential convenience. In addition to the farm homes which do not have electricity there are a great number of homes in small towns and villages which are unelectrified. There are also rural schools, churches and other establishments such as stores, shops and small industries which greatly need electricity.

In my estimation the first objective of the REA program is to reduce the number of unelectrified rural homes and establishments as rapidly as we possibly can. We must strive toward this objective with every means at hand until central station electric service is available to every rural area in this State and in all other States of the Union.

Before the REA was created only very thickly populated rural areas had the benefit of central station electric service. The outlook for people living in the more sparsely settled areas was dark indeed. The power companies said that it was financially impossible for them to provide service for the great majority of rural people. The REA has proven that this theory is absolutely wrong. Through REA loans and other assistance some 900 borrowers throughout the United States have been able to take central station service to over 1,400,000 rural consumers. These borrowers are furnishing energy to their consumers at costs lower than was thought possible a few years ago. The consumers are using the energy in larger amounts than was anticipated, and the borrowers are paying back their loans and interest. Only about 1 percent of the loans are delinquent more than 30 days and about $20,000,000 of principal payments have been paid back in advance of the date due.

Here in Nebraska since the start of the program $13,225,000 have been advanced to 28 borrowers to take electricity to 26,000 rural consumers. The latest statistics indicate that these borrowers have paid $2,700,000 on principal and interest due. In addition, they have paid $153,000 in advance of the due date. Many of them have bought war bonds. Only $3,400, according to latest information, is due more than 30 days.

These facts should convince all of the skeptics that it is possible for rural people

to ably manage their own central station electric facilities. It should be remembered that these records have been made despite the fact that the development of the projects and utilization of electricity have been hampered because of wartime scarcities.

For the most part, REA construction is financed by borrowing money from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The amount which may be borrowed for this purpose is established each year by the Congress. For the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1945, and ending June 30, 1946, Congress has made available $200,000,000 for loans to REA projects. Due to an unprecedented demand for REA service, $142,000,000 of this amount has already been allocated to the borrowers. In many States the funds are exhausted or nearly exhausted. Nebraska is one of these States. Out of the $200,000,000, $6,000,000, in round numbers, was set aside for Nebraska. Over $5,000,000 of this amount have already been allocated, and we now have on hand, or in process, over $10,000,000 in applications which have not been covered by allotments. In other words, with the fiscal year only a little over half gone, we have only $1,000,000 to satisfy $10,000,000 of demands for funds.

I have given you these figures because I want you to know just what the situation is so far as funds for allotment are concerned.

Several weeks ago I was honored by being invited to a breakfast of the Nebraska congressional delegation. I informed them at that time that REA funds for allotments would be exhausted in many States long before the end of the fiscal year. Members of the Nebraska delegation are always interested in the REA program. They were perhaps surprised to know that the largest amount of loan funds ever available to REA was not going to be sufficient to meet the demand. Here in Nebraska, as is generally true throughout the country, more people than ever before are anxiously seeking REA service.

Let us look briefly at the construction side of the REA program. For the Nation, in recent months, about 20,000 new REA consumers are being added each month. In Nebraska you have been able to connect about 635 new consumers each month. You and I, as well as the unserved people, wish we were extending the service to far greater numbers. REA borrowers, like everyone else engaged in construction, have been hampered by shortages of labor and materials.

The most serious shortage in the REA field has been that of poles. We have been making a special effort in the national REA headquarters to get the facts and to see that our program is hampered as little as possible by pole shortages. It is evident to us that the supply of poles is going to be inadequate to meet the demand unless entirely new sources of poles are found.

During late September we started on a definite program to step up production and treating capacity. Progress has been made. In the Douglas fir country on the north coast and in the lodgepole pine section of the Rocky Mountains several new operators are now turning out poles. Others are in the process of installing treating plants and arranging for timber.

The new operators and those definitely coming into production will have a capacity of some 500,000 to 600,000 poles per year. Interest among other prospective producers is keen. The prospects are bright that before 1946 draws to a close we will see treating capacity under way sufficient to care for all the lodgepoles that can be taken from the forests on a sustained-yield basis.

In the Southern States the labor supply is improving. One new commercial treating plant in east Texas is going in to supply us with poles. So the southern production is on the upgrade also.

However, the South can't supply all our need in the Central Valley States. Nebraska and other States west of the Mississippi must look to the Douglas fir and lodgepole pine country for a large part of their supply. These species properly treated make a long-life pole, according to the reports of wood experts. So much for what has been done and the prospects.

Now comes a darkening cloud over the horizon. The steel strike will reduce the supply of creosote. That oil is derived from coal tar produced in the coke ovens of the steel plants. There is a small inventory of creosote in the country.

Pole cutting can go forward, however. Thus a stock of white poles can be built up in the West to keep the treating plants going on an around-the-clock basis when creosote again becomes plentiful.

We will solve the pole problem and other construction problems in time. I pledge that the REA organization will give you every assistance. I am sure the time will come when we will be building REA lines much faster than we ever have before. I know that you and every other person connected with the REA program are going to be much happier when that time arrives.

In my opinion the pattern for the future REA development in Nebraska is clear where the REA projects have been well established and lines have been energized. Nebraska compares very well with other sparsely settled states so far as the percentages of farms electrified is concerned. In fact, it is ahead of 13 other states in the Union. Yet, there are 35 counties in Nebraska that do not have a single mile of REA line. For the most part they are in the sparsely settled areas in the States. Now, the people in those areas want electricity and need electricity just as much as they do in any other part of the Nation. Can they get it through the REA program? My answer is "Yes," if we have sufficient vision and courage. We must have the vision to see how much brighter and happier the REA homes of the future will be. We must try to visualize all the new uses that farm people are going to make of electricity to save labor and to produce better products. It should be clear to us by now that central station electric service is an investment not just in happiness but in more efficient farming. We can see now that not only do the REA borrowers pay their own way but that electricity pays for itself so far as the individual consumer is concerned.

We must have the courage to make plans now to take electricity to everyone in the project areas. We must lay out territory and design systems so that everyone in the project areas will be served in due time. This means that the people in the hills and on the plains will get electricity just the same as the people in the fertile valleys. The people in the small towns and villages in the sparsely settled areas should get their electricity from the REA projects. The same is true for the small rural industries and other rural establishments. In other words, we can make it possible for all rural people to have electricity only if we include all rural people in the planning of our projects. It is most essential to keep this in mind as we proceed with the REA program in Nebraska. In the last year 12 new projects have been organized in Nebraska. We should give these new projects every assistance so they can get started and gain needed experience and confidence.

We should take full advantage of the easier terms which Congress has provided through lower interest rates and longer amortization periods in order that more people can become REA consumers. Also, we must plan to make full use of the cheaper electricity which is made possible by the various hydroelectric projects in Nebraska and surrounding areas. This cheaper electrity means that more people can use the REA service and that all consumers can use more of it. Cheaper electricity means that all REA borrowers will make even better financial records.

The future is bright for the full development of the REA program in Nebraska if we make it bright. We need the vision and the courage of the pioneers who came to Nebraska in the face of adversity. We need the vision and courage of George Norris. You and I, as leaders in the REA movement, must never fail to have the proper vision and courage because we dare not fail the people in the unserved areas of this great State.

The Need for Housing Facilities and Housing Supplies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 31 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a release issued by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States stressing the need for housing facilities and housing supplies in the United States.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, January 25.—More than 1,100 cities in every State in the Union reported to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States today that lack of materials and equipment is primarily responsible for the current serious housing shortage encountered by veterans.

Replying to President Eric A. Johnston's inquiry for a report on their local situations and possible solutions the chambers of commerce in those cities and towns said four principal steps should be taken:

1. Overcome reluctance of OPA to make price adjustments urgently needed.

2. Speed up the release of unused Army barracks, prisoner-of-war camps and like buildings either for conversion to residential use or to be torn down to permit the lumber and other materials in them to be used for new housing units.

3. Release lumber and plumbing, heating and other equipment now in the hands of the Army and Navy.

4. Stop the diversion of lumber for export. (The Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion last week said that exports were not a major consideration.)

These replies were to this telegram sent by Mr. Johnston to the 1,735 chambers of commerce which are members of the United States Chamber:

"Reports from all parts of the country indicate increasing anxiety over inability of veterans to find housing. Please wire immediately report on situation in your community including what steps are being taken to relieve situation and what measures, in your judgment, would be helpful in speeding up the provision of permanent housing and of temporary housing where necessary."

The replies available to date showed 596 reporting the housing situation acute; 401 reported it serious; and only 75 said they had no housing problem at all. Only a small percent reported the number of houses needed, but recent studies indicate the acute need is somewhere between 800,000 and 1,000,000. About 880 of the chambers laid the housing shortage directly to lack of material, and 165 reported a lack of skilled labor.

Typical of the replies was this one from John D. Adams, general secretary of Des Moines Chamber of Commerce:

"Veterans' housing growing more and more acute. We are trying everything. Have been turned down on trailers and demountable

units. Now trying to get surplus wooden buildings for salvage and home building. Greatest need is availability of materials. We have adequate finances and labor to build necessary houses but lack lumber."

In the field of temporary housing the survey developed the fact that businessmen in some communities are forming local nonprofit corporations by popular subscription to finance construction where builders can't take the risks currently involved. The sponsor is the local chamber of commerce.

For example, Girard C. Vanrum, president of the St. Louis County Chamber of Commerce, informed Mr. Johnston of such a plan for Clayton, Mo. The city accepted a plan of the builders' guild to build 16 units of temporary housing for veterans, with the city providing sites tax-free. The entire construction cost of the project would be subscribed by citizens, and the units would be built at no profit.

Also typical was the report from William E. Morrow, secretary of the Louisville Board of Trade:

"Housing situation here very critical. No vacancies in normal supply except where family moves to another city. Existing housing utilized fullest extent; 5,000 to 7,000 families doubled up; badly overcrowded conditions.

"War housing center has approximately 3,000 applications waiting to be filled. At present 300 vacancies available to veterans at Charlestown, Ind., war-housing project but rapidly being filled. City has applied for conversion surplus barracks at Bowman Field to provide approximately 300 units and for removal of 50 temporary housing units to Louisville for Negroes. Approximately 31,000 persons in services from this county yet to return. This means greatly increased overcrowding next 3 months. Not over 500 to 1,000 homes can be built here this year by private capital, number depending on availability of materials, but none ready for occupancy for 6 months.

"Private conversions of existing single-family structures into multiples practically exhausted during war. In our opinion, Government assistance to speed-up production prefabricated permanent style housing offers quickest and best answer to housing need with least economic damage to general housing values. That program would provide housing faster than temporary housing could be built. More temporary housing in our opinion very damaging to economic values."

The United States Chamber said that it was too early to appraise the working of the new Government program to give priorities on materials to builders of homes for veterans which do not cost more than $10,000, except that, obviously, if materials are not available, priorities become only slips of paper.

Many applications have been made under the congressional appropriation of $200,000,000 to permit the Federal Public Housing Authority to move temporary housing units to places badly in need of them. The survey showed that this procedure was adopted only as a last resort. In New England, the cities and towns showed no interest in this plan, primarily because of the colder weather.

How We Can Make Jobs for Millions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McCARRAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 31 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in the January issue of the American magazine there appears a very able and scholarly article by Mr. J. A. Krug, retiring Chairman of the War Production Board, entitled "How We Can Make Jobs for Millions," with the subheading, "If you want to have a good job tomorrow, or any job at all, this article is of vital importance to you. Here is the first clear, authoritative explanation of a little-understood subject—the need for redistributing industry throughout our underdeveloped States. Decentralization is the best insurance, says Mr. Krug, against the threat of mounting unemployment."

I ask that the article, together with the subheadings, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW WE CAN MAKE JOBS FOR MILLIONS

(By J. A. Krug, retiring Chairman, War Production Board)

IF YOU WANT TO HAVE A GOOD JOB TOMORROW, OR ANY JOB AT ALL, THIS ARTICLE IS OF VITAL IMPORTANCE TO YOU. HERE IS THE FIRST CLEAR, AUTHORITATIVE EXPLANATION OF A LITTLE-UNDERSTOOD SUBJECT—THE NEED FOR REDISTRIBUTING INDUSTRY THROUGHOUT OUR UNDERDEVELOPED STATES. DECENTRALIZATION IS THE BEST INSURANCE, SAYS MR. KRUG, AGAINST THE THREAT OF MOUNTING UNEMPLOYMENT

When I was a boy, some of our industrialists eager to expand, looked wistfully at China, with its millions of consumers, as a future market for our goods. The only difficulty was, as it is now, that the Chinese could not afford to buy our goods. Today, some of our industrialists, with facilities to serve the whole world, advocate the building up of a huge export trade with Europe as an outlet for the vast productive system we created during the war. Again they are faced with the same difficulty. Can bankrupt Europe afford to buy our goods?

But all is not lost. There is yet another country they may serve—a country as large as Europe, leaving out Russia, unimaginably wealthy in natural resources, highly civilized, and ambitious to get ahead in the world. That country is the western half of the United States; indeed, more than half, because it comprises 61 percent of our national area. It embraces the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Idaho, Utah, Arizona, Washington, Oregon, Nevada, and California.

These 17 States contain 21 percent of our population but account for only 11 percent of our manufacturing. But they produce half of the Nation's minerals and contain 70 percent of our timber. During the war they were equipped, through the development of water power, to provide about 75 percent of our electric energy.

TOO MUCH OF OUR INDUSTRY WAS CONCENTRATED IN DETROIT, BETHLEHEM, PITTSBURGH, AND SUCH GREAT CENTERS. IF THEY HAD BEEN DESTROYED BY BOMBERS WE WOULD HAVE BEEN PUT OUT OF THE WAR

But, strangely, despite its great wealth, this land, with its millions of ambitious people, may soon fall very short of the all-out consumption that will be necessary if we maintain all-out production. Already the shadow of mass unemployment falls across these 17 States.

Here is what has happened: Since the war began, it has been estimated, at least 3,000,000 people in this region have moved to its urban centers to find employment in war plants or in the many services which spring up around centers of population and prosperity. When the war plants are all closed, these 3,000,000 probably will be out of work. They can't all go back to the farms, now that farms are mechanized and can be operated by fewer workers.

Thousands by thousands, this region's 2,000,000 servicemen are returning home. Many of them who were on farms before the war are coming back with new skills they were taught in mechanized warfare. They now want jobs in industry. But how can they be accommodated in a region which accounts for only 11 percent of our manufacturing and which normally employs less than 1,000,000 persons in industry?

Thus, the potential unemployment in the West may mount into millions before we see the end of it unless we use the utmost initiative, daring, imagination, and resourcefulness to meet the situation. If we don't solve the problem, these millions and the millions dependent upon them cannot buy goods from the East. If the factories of the East aren't going full blast, unemployment will begin to snowball in other parts of the country.

I am not being pessimistic. There is a solution, in which every American may participate, which I shall discuss later in this article, but first I want to speak of still another country, which is also a great potential market for top production.

EVERYTHING NECESSARY FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF INDUSTRY IS AT HAND IN THE WEST AND THE SOUTH, AND YET THEY HAVE NO INDUSTRY—WHY?—ONE REASON IS THAT SOME INDUSTRIALISTS IN THE EAST WON'T LET THEM

This country is rich in fertile soil, timber, potential hydroelectric power, and strong, intelligent people. But many of these people are poor, although undeveloped wealth lies at their doors. This future market for the "exports" of the industrial East also is part of the United States, consisting of the contiguous States of Arkansas, Mississippi, Alabama, Tennessee, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Kentucky, West Virginia, and Virginia.

While this vast region contains 20 percent of our population and embraces 39 percent of our farm population, it receives only 11 percent of our national income and receives only 20 percent of the farm income. Figures are dry, indeed, compared to the lines of a good play, but in these figures lies the tragedy of the South—the drama of a fallen empire. And as long as it stays down we all stay down. If the income of this region were raised to the per capita level of the United States as a whole, it has been estimated that the national income would be increased by $10,000,000,000 annually. That is money with which to buy goods in the East and elsewhere.

While this region had the highest ratio of investments in war plants and facilities during the war, in terms of population, it had the smallest volume of war contracts—only 69 percent more than its 1939 production. And this great region, believe it or not, has only 10 percent of the Nation's manufacturing. Those war plants and facilities, for the most part, consisted of shipyards, airplane factories, and chemical plants, all requiring a high rate of investment. One by one these industries are ceasing to operate. Workers are drifting back to the farms. Most of the farms are poor. And labor will be poorer when electric cotton pickers begin to do the work of millions.

What is the chance of boosting the income of this region? It looks as if it may go down, rather than up. It will, unless we act, and act soon. And remember, if the workers of the South have no jobs they can't buy goods, and our eastern industries go to pot and eastern workers lose their jobs. The crisis, then, begins to snowball.

You don't have to be a Joel Kupperman to see by now that 75 percent of the geographical area of the United States accounts for only 20 percent of our manufacturing. And we are the greatest manufacturing Nation on earth. And this three-quarters of our Nation, with 40 percent of our popula-

tion, also contains most of our basic wealth, our natural resources. What a paradox! And now it in faced with something approaching economic disaster. Why?

The answer, by now, should be obvious: Because it has no heavy industry to speak of to support its increasing urban populations and, in the case of the 17 Western States, to draw new population. These Western States could support many new millions of population if there were industries to maintain them. Without heavy basic industries, such as steel, aluminum, and such, there can be no fabricating industries—not with the steel industry in the East. And without a multiplicity of industries, businesses and services do not increase. They are all tied up together.

At a glance, you may think I have contradicted my original thesis—that jobs and incomes in these underdeveloped regions of the Nation will mean greater manufacturing production in the East. But how, you may ask, if those regions have a greater share of manufacturing, and themselves are producing goods, will they not be competitors?

That is shortsighted hokum. I am speaking long-range of a nation which can support a far greater population than it now has, of a nation whose productive capacity, even though we served the world in the war, has never been realized. Full employment and a higher rate of per capita income, a larger population, and a level of living higher than we have ever dreamed of would enable us to cover the Nation with factories and deprive no region of productive opportunity.

As the years go by, given peace and the fulfillment of the objectives of the war, Europe and Asia will be able to buy again, and our surpluses can go to them. With the industrialization of the vast West, we shall be better able to serve Asiatic markets than ever before. The West, we may have forgotten, has a seacoast, although, before the war, it had little opportunity to use it except for fishing and bathing.

And now for the most incredible fact in this story:

While 75 percent of this Nation has only 20 percent of our manufacturing, less than 10 percent of it has 65 percent of the manufacturing industry. This tiny area is pretty well concentrated in the northeastern region of the United States. It consists of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, Delaware, and Maryland.

This region—it might better be called a district—produces only 4 percent of our lumber and 26 percent of our minerals. In natural resources, when compared with the vast underdeveloped regions of the Nation, it is comparatively poor. Yet it contains 43 percent of our total population and receives, as of 1940, 56 percent of our national income. More than one-half of the $17,500,000,000 spent on plants and facilities for war production throughout the Nation was spent right in this little area, which, in 1939, paid 75 percent of the Federal income taxes.

Incredible? Yes; and incredibly unjust. Of course, in the war emergency, the Government had to take advantage of facilities already in existence, and they existed for the most part in these 11 States. But why?

There was a time when our economy was very simple. The steel industry was in Pennsylvania because fuel, water transportation, markets, and a labor supply were near at hand. Around steel sprang up the fabricators—the makers of machinery, railroad rolling stock, washtubs, and so on. In New England, where water power, good ports, and a dense population were available, other great factories came into being. It was all sound and necessary. The rest of the country was left to the farmers—and the Indians.

But since that time we have discovered America. We have found that most of the wealth of the Nation lies elsewhere than in the little empire of the Northeastern States—that the West and the South are far richer in timber, ore, and agricultural products for fabrication than the 11 little States which have two-thirds of our industry.

We have found, too, that the now underprivileged and underdeveloped regions of the Nation can produce more power more cheaply than the rest of the Nation. Our Government has already developed some of it in such projects as the Boulder, Bonneville, and Grand Coulee Dams in the West and the TVA power project in the South, and has outlined for the future many other projects, including the St. Lawrence seaway and hydroelectric project, and new dams on the Columbia River and in the Missouri Valley.

The vast western region has, through hydroelectric installations, more than seven times the electric power of the little industrial empire of the East—and cheaper power. The Nation is crisscrossed with highways and railroads. The South and the West have seacoasts. Everything necessary for the development of industry is at hand in these regions, and yet they have no industry. Why?

One reason is that some of the industrialists of the East won't let them. For years they have lobbied and publicized their cause. They are still doing it. They cry their old economics, which won't stand up any more. They don't want to decentralize industry. No labor out there, they cry. To them I say that skilled labor has already been widely distributed in the United States because war plants were widely distributed. No transportation out there, they say. There is cheaper transportation now than ever before, because recently the Interstate Commerce Commission granted an equality of freight rates to the West and Middle West, which will make it possible for shippers there to compete with the Panama Canal. Why wasn't this equality granted before? The established and entrenched magnates were afraid of competition. If they persist in their ways, they will ruin not only themselves, but the national economy as well.

We built many war plants in the nonindustrial regions during the war, not necessarily as economic measures always, but for purposes of strategy. Too much of our industry was concentrated in Detroit, Bethlehem, Pittsburgh, and such great centers. If they had been destroyed by bombers, we would have been put out of the war. We had to spread until the danger of bombing had passed. But has the danger passed yet? Do not consider the possibility of our destruction a fantastic idea, lest we have another more disastrous Pearl Harbor.

A dozen long-range atomic rockets might simultaneously wipe out the principal industrial centers of the United States. Scientists of other nations will soon know our secrets; they may soon have greater secrets of their own. It would be wise to move quickly—just as a matter of security.

But our first consideration is living, not dying. The underprivileged regions of our Nation also want to live, and live well. If it is not immediately sound economically to decentralize and more widely distribute industry in this country, to provide jobs and incomes for all, it will be in the long run. Factories will attract population; population will create markets. If it is necessary, the Government should see to it that the war plants now being closed in nonindustrial regions are converted somehow to the purposes of peace and maintained until they can stand on their own feet. It may be necessary. This is not a matter for a near-sighted accountant, but for a long-range Government policy of credit and interest.

The great $200,000,000 Geneva war steel-producing plant near Provo, Utah, was built and operated, without fee, at the request of the Government, by United States Steel. Later its officials considered the idea of buying or leasing it. Then, presumably because of rising pressures against big business, they announced no action would be taken in the matter. Twenty-nine other of our 30 large steel concerns were asked to bid on the plant. They made no offers. Will Geneva be sold at auction for salvage? It would be a crime. Around Geneva will spring fabricators, businesses, services, prosperity. And what of the war-born airplane plants? Must they be doomed because we lack enough imagination to find peacetime uses for them?

During this war, mostly in the nonindustrial regions, the Government built 9 aluminum plants and 45 aluminum fabrication plants, at a cost of $760,000,000 of public money. The American Aluminum Corporation of America in the East could not produce enough of this metal to keep our planes flying. Can we keep these plants open, or is the industry going back to the East, to limited production, and higher prices? If we can't immediately use enough to keep the best of the western plants running, it seems to me that the surplus ingots might be stored in a Government stock pile against shortages or emergencies. In my simple economics, the wealth of a nation is measured by its stores of materials, its plants, its distribution network, and its people. We cannot afford to close down plants and lose the contribution they might make to our economic security.

Walter P. Reuther, vice president of the Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, suggested recently that the railroad rolling stock of America, broken down in war services, might be rebuilt with aluminum, so as to put fast, streamlined, lightweight, and inexpensive cars on the rails of the Nation. He suggested, too, that airplane plants would make ideal fabrication centers. It's an idea. That's what we need if we are to save the Nation economically—ideas for the continuation of what decentralization we have already accomplished, and ideas for new industries in the underdeveloped regions. Incidentally, if we had more plants in the rest of America, strikers in the East couldn't tie up the production of the Nation as they have been doing.

Already, I am glad to say, legislative action will soon be proposed to enlist the Secretaries of the Departments of Labor, Commerce, and Agriculture in a joint committee to recommend other legislation to stimulate industrial development in the underdeveloped three-fourths of the Nation. They may attempt to remove such handicaps as inadequate sources of loans for new enterprises, burdensome taxes, discriminatory transportation rates, and lack of research information for small manufacturers and businessmen. This last is most important. Having had little industry, the underdeveloped regions are not industrially minded. They should not only be aided in research problems, which they cannot solve without laboratories, but be helped to find industrial opportunities suitable to their districts. There are other bills in Congress which make provisions for such services.

So many of these neglected States have opportunity at their door. The plastic industry is in its infancy. Ramie, the new fibrous plant, grown with a minimum of cultivation, can be produced on any land that grows cotton. It is said to make better canvas than cotton or flax and better rope than hemp. Combined with other fibers, it makes excellent suiting and cloth. Can it be fabricated on the spot in the cotton country? Here, perhaps, is a new industry.

What of the plastic crops, such as soybeans? Glucose is now being made from potatoes; potable alcohol, which can be used for fuel, from wood. What of the great magnesium plant at Velasco, Tex.? Around it, no doubt, can spring up fabricating industries. Aluminum is available not far away. The alloys could be substituted in many cases for copper, of which there is a shortage, and copper could be stock-piled.

These are not necessarily practical hints; I pose them merely to excite the imagination of businessmen and investors in this vast underdeveloped empire within our own country.

One does not need to wait for legislation. I think every chamber of commerce in the country should be exploring, planning, suggesting, at this very moment. Every returning serviceman should be thinking, thinking, and planning for his opportunity in this vast country of opportunities. The individual worker, about to lose his job in the West or South, may give his manager a practical suggestion for a new industry that will save the jobs of thousands.

If you, or you, no matter where you live, are to have a good job tomorrow, or any job at all, believe me, this is your personal problem, to promote a thriving industry in the underdeveloped States.

It is the job of the people in the States which I have not mentioned—Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Indiana, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, Florida, and Louisiana. They have a relatively balanced development, but they may not continue to have it if the standard of living declines in this country.

It is the job of the industrialists of the East, too, if free enterprise is to continue and the country flourish.

But only recently I heard an industrialist cry out against the decentralization of industry in these unreasonable words: "Want to tear down the big cities, eh? Destroy the East? Give everybody a little shop and a truck garden?"

You couldn't tell him no. He wouldn't listen. He ignored my assurance that what is proposed is supplement, not destruction. He didn't believe that all of us could work together and prosper together. But we can. We did it magnificently in the war. We can do it again. The best example, and it has many ramifications, was our vast wartime power pools.

Governmental and private utilities can operate together peaceably, profitably, and for the good of all. In an electric-power emergency during the war, all the Nation's power systems—private, municipal, county, State, and Federal—were assembled in great operating pools. By this means, without new installations, we increased our output of electric energy fivefold.

For example, all the power systems in Tennessee, Alabama, Georgia, Florida, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Kentucky, were tied together and operated as a single network. This network, through a tie-up at Memphis, was linked, in turn, with the great power pool in the Southwest, embracing the utilities of Oklahoma, Kansas, Arkansas, Texas, and Louisiana. Similar pools were established in the Pacific Southwest, Pacific Northwest, the Middle West, New England, and in the Middle Atlantic States, all of them tied together.

When a Cleveland war plant demanded more power than its Midwest pool could fill, the emergency was met by the automatic opening of floodgates at a hydro dam of the Southwest pool in Arkansas. Here was cooperation

Now the private power companies have reported that they will continue expanding during this postwar period at the rate of $1,200,000,000 a year. Their programs will be combined with public programs of electrification such as TVA and will serve to hasten the spread of power into every habitable section of the Union. With power must come industry.

Before TVA, the Government had engaged in separate and unrelated projects of flood control, navigation, forestry, agriculture, and research. In TVA it combined, for the first time and in one comprehensive program, the purposes of control, conservation, and industrial development, while promoting the well-being of all the men and women of a region. It worked; industry knows it worked.

The interests of public and private systems thus welded together in the valley of the Tennessee add progressively to the Nation's wealth. Because of its combination of skills and experience in working together, the organization that brought them into being and operates them, itself constitutes an added national resource.

It is a pattern of power that has made possible the dawning atomic age, and it is destined to harness this power for an epochal advance in civilization. It is also a pattern for national teamwork, which alone will make all of us great and prosperous. It should silence the noncooperative opponent of decentralization, whose very selfishness will destroy him unless he sees the light.

An Equal Pay for Equal Work Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, Americans generally agree that the spirit of the Constitution is a guaranty of equal opportunity for every human being according to his talent. We all know that the fulfillment of this ideal of the founding fathers has yet to be achieved. Yet we also are aware that we have made very substantial progress toward the achievement of the ideal during the century and three quarters of our national independence. No where else on earth has an individual had so much opportunity to make the fullest use of talent as in the United States. That is still true today, although the difficulties of demonstrating talent in an industrial society are much greater than in an agricultural or frontier community.

It is the highest duty of government, according to many of our foremost authorities to maintain the balance between mass pressures and the right to development of the individual citizen. That is the contrary of attempting to liberate mankind by classes or by color, creed, and partisan allegiance. In the spirit of the Constitution it is the essence of a free society. Under present conditions of industrial employment the basic guaranty of such individual development is the assurance of equal pay for equally efficient work, without respect to the sex, color, religious, or political belief of the worker. Unless this guaranty is supported by law there is no sufficient safeguard under present conditions for those members of minority groups who may be forced by necessity to undertake employment at less than the wage a more fortunately placed individual may get for performing the same task. There is no reason why some sweatshop owner should be able to hire a woman bushelman at less cost per garment than a man, or why a Negro welder should receive less than a white welder, or why Christians are unwelcome in some industrial plants, and Jews in others, as we all know to be the fact and as innumerable volumes of statistics and reports attest.

Under our basic charter and our traditions the only fair gage of payment for work done is the quality of the work itself and not the peculiarities or prejudices of the worker or the employer. Violation of this principle will immeasurably complicate the present industrial unrest and will react unfavorably upon the veterans who are now beginning their readjustment to civilian life.

For these reasons I have today introduced the following bill providing for the elimination of unfair wage practices by establishing in law the principle of equal pay for equal work:

A bill providing for the elimination of unfair wage practices by establishing a principle of equal pay for equal work without respect of the sex or color of the worker

Be it enacted, etc., That the Congress hereby declares that the existence in industry of wage differentials based on the sex or color of workers who perform equal work with equal efficiency is prejudicial to the common welfare and is without basis in equity or in law or economics.

SEC. 2. That the Congress finds that such practices tend to increase labor disputes, to establish false standards of employment, to raise artificial and unjust barriers against improvement of living standards by discrimination against women and colored workers, and that this condition is without adequate relief in present statutory law.

SEC. 3. Therefore, it is hereby declared to be the purpose of this act to establish as a principle of all employment, subject to the exercise by Congress of its power to regulate commerce among the several States, that, equal pay in respect to actual wages, hours of work, and working conditions, shall be given to all those who perform equal tasks with equal efficiency, irrespective of whether such employees are men or women, white or colored.

SEC. 4. This act shall be known as the Equal Pay for Equal Work Act of 1946.

Birthday of the Late President Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 31 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, in view of the fact that yesterday was the anniversary of the birth of the late President Roosevelt, I think it is appropriate that I should ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a poem which makes an appealing reference to the late President. The poem was written by George W. Ward, who is a native of my State of South Carolina.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We honor the birthday of one now past.
A birthday destined through ages to last.
As we cannot say greetings with his clasped hand,
We'll carry on the work of our honored man.

'Tis many moons since he from us has gone,
But the March of Dimes lives on and on,
Preserving the work of Warm Springs Foundation,
That it may give its good for our Nation.

Denied now his natal cake to see,
One counting candles three score and three,
Yet spared in life a foundation to lay,
Where unfortunates have a comfortable stay.

Receiving the best of science and skill,
While the March of Dimes pays the bill,
With President Balls adding their share,
As F. D. R. is honored year by year.

Being struck with this malady himself,
And of his walking strength bereft,
And doomed to aids and braces to be led,
Yet ne'er complained or bewailed, 'tis said.

Still in celebration we miss his presence,
Who heedless of handicap was ere life's essence,
With his eternal stately smile,
Lifting man up and making life worthwhile.

—George W. Ward, a native of South Carolina.

Naval Torpedo Station, Newport, R. I.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 31, 1946

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include joint resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, reciting the hardships inflicted upon a large number of civilian employees as a result of the Navy Department's decision to terminate the manufacture of torpedoes at Newport—a station established 75 years ago—and transferring this activity to Forest Park, Ill., a plant built during the war to supplement the requirements of torpedoes needed during the war.

There is grave question in my mind as to the authority for such action by the Navy Department without a specific directive from the Congress. Utter disregard of the human element involved is most regrettable.

Newport is the birthplace of the torpedo. There it was invented and improved over the years by men whose craftsmanship is unexcelled. Many of the men who have been discharged from the station have spent their lifetime on this important work. They have married and raised families and they own their own homes. With the removal of the torpedo factory from Newport these men, many of them with 25 and 30 years of civil service to their credit, and because they are only around their fifties, are thrown out into the street without the benefit of civil-service retirement—something that had been held out to them as an incentive to retain their employment at the Torpedo Station, the only industry in the city of Newport.

While too young to be eligible for civil service-retirement benefits they are told they are too old when they seek positions in private employment. This is a most regrettable fact and I believe is a situation which Congress should take steps to correct.

In view of the small amount of torpedo manufacturing scheduled for the immediate future I strongly urge that what work in that line is available be concentrated at Newport. This would not only be more economical from a point of view of finance but it would also be a gesture of fairness and justice for the present and former employees of the Torpedo Station and would prove of great help to the economy of the city of Newport. Other work for which the station is equipped, should also be assigned there.

In addition, prompt action should be taken on my bill, H. R. 4718, now pending before the Civil Service Committee, to provide that civil-service employees with 25 years of service to their credit be given the full benefits of retirement as now computed under existing law for a longer period of service.

Throughout the war we were given to understand that the construction of facilities to aid the war effort were not to supplement our regular naval facilities and not to be substituted in the postwar period for the prewar Naval Establishment.

The action taken by the Navy Department in closing the manufacturing facilities at Newport is contrary to the understanding of all of us who did everything possible to expedite the closing of the war by furnishing additional war facilities. It is most unfair to have the Navy Department now take advantage of the situation to throw out of employment men of greater skill who unselfishly trained inexperienced help to man war facilities and who now find that those whom they trained are being brought into civil service to man in the postwar facilities that have been built during the war and that they, the experienced craftsmen, are being thrown out into the streets without even the consolation of receiving civil-service retirement benefits.

I trust that the Congress will consider the merit of our plea and see to it that justice is done to the people of Newport.

The resolution follows:

House Joint Resolution 587

Joint resolution protesting emphatically against the decision of the United States Navy Department to terminate the manufacture of torpedoes at the United States Naval Torpedo Station at Newport, R. I., and the transferring of such activity to Forest Park, Ill.

Whereas the United States Naval Torpedo Station at Newport, R. I., was established by act of Congress approximately 75 years ago and is one of the oldest naval institutions in the country, a New England institution as well as a Rhode Island one; and

Whereas there is serious question upon the part of the citizens of this State concerning the right of the United States Navy Department to substitute for the main plant at Newport, R. I., established by act of Congress, a temporary war activity for the future manufacture of torpedoes; and

Whereas the termination of the activity at the Naval Torpedo Station at Newport, R. I., has caused extreme hardship to hundreds of civil-service employees who have given the best years of their lives to the Federal Government service only to learn that involuntary separation in a very large number of cases will mean loss of retirement benefits; and

Whereas the said termination of activity presents a serious unemployment problem in a community which has depended over the years upon torpedo manufacture as practically the sole industry in the city of Newport; and

Whereas a large number of former employees at the Naval Torpedo Station have their families and homes to support and maintain and find it a severe sacrifice or impossible to move out of Newport to find new employment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the general assembly protest earnestly and vigorously the decision of the United States Navy Department to terminate the manufacturing of torpedoes at the United States Naval Torpedo Station at Newport, R. I., and the transfer of such activity to Forest Park, Ill., directing the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to use every effort at their command to halt this said proceeding and to have said decision reconsidered; directing the secretary of state to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America, to the Secretary of the Navy, and to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States.

What a Tangled Web We Weave When—

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 31, 1946

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of January 30, 1946:

MR. ROOSEVELT'S LAPSE

Secretary Byrnes has now confirmed the Russian contention that at the Yalta Conference in February 1945, a secret three-power agreement was made promising the Kurile Islands and southern Sakhalin to Russia after the defeat of Japan. The news comes as something of a shock. It shows that the late President Roosevelt was not entirely candid when, some time before his death, he said that, aside from the agreement to give representation to the Ukraine and White Russia at the United Nations Conference—that fact leaked out not very long after Yalta—no other secret agreements had been made at the Crimea Conference.

It is true that at the time Mr. Roosevelt made this statement Russia was still neutral in the Pacific war. It is also true that any revelation as to the future disposition of the Kuriles would have tipped off Japan regarding Russia's intentions. A valid argument could therefore be made for the secrecy of the agreement. But this does not explain Mr. Roosevelt's assurance. Nor does it explain why President Roosevelt kept the arrangement secret even from the State Department. Secretary Byrnes says that he did not hear about it until after Japan's defeat. It appears doubtful whether former Secretary Stettinius was informed. And there is no copy of the agreement in the State Department archives. No wonder that when asked about the Kuriles at a press conference on January 22, the then Acting Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, said that it was his understanding—now proved to have been mistaken—that Russia was only to occupy the Kuriles, not to keep them permanently.

The fact is that at Yalta President Roosevelt was a very sick man. This is a charitable explanation not only of his lack of candor but also of the arrangement itself. Had Mr. Roosevelt been in full vigor, he would no doubt have hesitated to accept such an arrangement. It was not within Mr. Roosevelt's authority to give the Kurile Islands to Russia or anyone else. That can

only be done by treaty, which means with the Senate's advice and consent. Accordingly, the Kurile arrangement must be regarded as tentative rather than final.

Evidently Russia was promised the Kuriles outright with no strings attached. No quid pro quo was asked or given. Nor was any question raised about putting those strategically important islands under international trusteeship. This we must now try to do. The American Government ought not to oppose the cession as such. For strategic reasons, they are just off Russia's coast, those islands are vital to Russia's security, and there can be no valid objection to Russian occupation of them. But we must press Russia to accept the same kind of trusteeship arrangement for these islands that is made in respect of other Pacific islands. The whole trusteeship arrangement is endangered by the new revelation.

An Open Letter and Reply Thereto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in response to the President's fireside request that constituents put the heat on Congressmen, the Hastings (Mich.) Banner, published and edited by Richard Cook, on January 10, 1946, printed an open letter addressed to me, which is as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO CONGRESSMAN CLARE E. HOFFMAN

DEAR CLARE: President Truman in his address to the Nation Thursday evening suggested that the people back home put heat under their Representatives in Congress to speed up action on perplexing domestic problems—preferably, we presume, the sort of heat which would force Congress to accept bills and measures of his own choosing.

So, here goes.

In the first place, Clare, I recognize that Congress is not an efficient institution. Much of the criticism directed against it is deserved. It is a highly political body—just as political, in fact, as the executive branch headed by our President. Many of its actions appear to be unduly influenced by concern over some forthcoming election—just as Presidential policies are.

But in spite of all its faults, Clare, I hope that none of us lose sight of the fact that Congress is the one and only barrier which stands between the people of the United States and the ever-expanding tentacles of the Federal octopus.

Frankly, Clare, I fear this ever-growing Federal power which concentrates too much authority in the executive branch of government and tends to give us government by Federal bureau and commission instead of the representative form of rule our Constitution was supposed to provide and protect.

Personally, Clare, I like Truman. I don't think he ever aspired to the Presidency. I don't think he was guilty of false modesty when he said that the job was too big for him. But fate decreed otherwise and so he is in there pitching. However, sympathy for the man and the job he is trying to do, is no reason why we should automatically support every measure he advocates—especially when those measures mean an extension of Federal power and bureaus.

A powerful Federal Government is not necessarily a benevolent one just because it is in the United States. The secret of democratic rule is a proper balance of power between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of government. During the depression years of the thirties and continuing on into the war years, an undue amount of power was concentrated in the executive branch. During the war years, this was an utter necessity. But now that the emergency is over, the executive branch appears very reluctant to loose its hold on these extraordinary powers.

Frankly, I hope that Congress never again forgets that it is the duly elected representative of the people, nor that it has been granted a position of great responsibility and dignity by the Constitution of the United States.

So, Clare, when a President appeals to the people to "put the heat" under Congress to force support of a legislative program he sponsors, I hope that all of us will realize what we are being asked to do.

It is our privilege, Clare, to write to you as our Representative in Congress—either in praise or criticism. If such communications represent independent, thoughtful opinion, I believe you will agree that they perform a valuable function (even if you fail to agree with the thoughts and conclusions expressed). But, if the public or any considerable portion of it is stampeded into bombarding Congress with critical broadsides merely in response to a Presidential request, that is a dangerous form of mob action aimed at undercutting the authority and prestige of one of the most important of the three props of our democracy—the legislative one.

Having vivid memories of what can happen when Congress abdicates its responsibilities and becomes a mere rubber stamp for executive authority, I have no wish to see the experiment repeated.

President Truman has frequently stated that he would like to see an end of Government paternalism and a more definite trend toward individual initiative and free enterprise. Yet, Clare, it seems to me that most of the measures advocated by the President call for a still further extension of Federal powers and controls. In this respect, you have to judge a man by what he does. Good intentions are nice—but nothing more.

As to the specific measures which the President advocates, I cannot agree with many of them. Congress, it seems to me, will be accomplishing something useful if it does no more than prevent some of these questionable measures from becoming law.

I am not in favor of the President's fact-finding plan (so-called) to settle labor-management disputes. It sounds reasonable on the surface but I fear that it is merely an entering wedge for Federal control of wages, profits, prices, etc., all of which is not consistent with free enterprise—and it was free enterprise not federally regulated enterprise, which changed the United States from a wilderness to the world's leading industrial power in less than 200 years.

Ability to pay is something which changes from quarter to quarter and year to year. It is something which depends on wage costs, material prices, and efficiency in production. Frankly, I doubt the competency of any Government bureau to arrive at a sound formula to determine "ability to pay."

As to extending the Price Control Act beyond June 30, it seems to me that if you use your own best personal judgment, not many will criticize you—no matter how you vote. It is a sharp question as to whether OPA is now doing more good than harm or vice versa. It seems to me that OPA's attempt to hold artificial retail price ceilings (while the Government, itself, is upping production costs by encouraging wage boosts and lifting ceilings on many of the materials which go into finished products) is slowing the reconversion effort and laying the groundwork for a long series of labor-management disputes. Right now, I can't go out and buy a white shirt at present ceiling prices because none are to be had, although I can go out and get plenty of sport shirts at fancy prices. Under OPA, the maker of ordinary shirts is denied the privilege of an ordinary profit because of OPA ceilings, but the fancy shirt maker can produce the limit at really fancy profits. Butter is short not because there is a scarcity of milk, but rather because existing price ceilings and production costs, make butter a comparatively unprofitable item to market. White shirts are cheaply priced if you can get 'em—but you can't get 'em and butter is not expensive but there isn't much of it. That is life a la OPA and illustrates what happens when Government officials (who don't always seem to know what they are doing) attempt to monkey with our complex economic mechanism. But if you think that there is good reason for extending price controls beyond June 30, by all means vote for it.

The full employment bill, it seems to me, is a mere political hoax. We all favor full employment. No one who lived through the last depression wants to see it return. But I don't believe that any Government law or any Government agency is ever going to insure full employment. The problem of full employment is a world-wide one—not just a national one. I am against this bill because it would pave the way for another Federal bureau, and we have too many of them already.

When it comes to Federal unemployment compensation, please proceed with caution. A Federal bill insuring adequate help to those genuinely unemployed would be fine. But I am definitely opposed to any bill which is so loosely written that aid would be given to those who would like to loaf at Federal expense rather than accept work which is available. A wide-open unemployment-compensation bill would be a great vote getter—but I do not see why people of the United States should help pay Steve Hannegan's political bills. When it comes to believing that a just unemployment-compensation bill will be written, I am definitely from Missouri—and I hope that the President will remember that he is, too. However, if a bill is written which you feel compensates the genuinely unemployed and at the same time excludes the would-be loafers, I hope you will give it your support.

A permanent fair employment practice committee is basically a sound idea. But here, too, some caution is needed. It is another Federal bureau, and therefore I am suspicious of it. On a commission of this sort there should be representatives of labor, management, and the public. If the law is not carefully drawn and the powers rigidly defined, a committee of this sort could do more harm than good—could become an impediment in industrial progress and labor-management relations instead of a help.

Higher minimum wages will probably hinge on the outcome of present wage disputes. However, no matter what happens in the wage field, this Nation is going to find that production and not money is the key to a better standard of living. I know you never liked Wendell L. Willkie (one of the many issues on which we have disagreed) but you will have to admit that his statement to the effect that "we are wealthy only as we produce" is eminently correct—also his contention that a better standard of living is something that we, ourselves, must produce. So many people have their minds fixed on money—and yet, China, should serve as a warning to us all that money without production is valueless. China has more money, less production and lower living standards than any other major nation in the world. But, if wage averages go up, the minimum should also be raised proportionately. I wish to go on record, however, as, stating that wage raises alone will never give this country a better standard of

living. Higher standards will be attained only if we match higher wages by better production which will supply an abundance of goods at reasonable prices.

Emergency housing legislation is undoubtedly a necessity. However, I believe, the President is not entirely correct when he states that private enterprise alone could solve the problem, if it would. The trouble is that too many restrictions and hindrances have been placed in the path of free enterprise. The building trades have consistently opposed the development of prefabricated housing—and yet it is difficult to see how conventional building methods can ever meet the demand in time even if materials were immediately available.

I am definitely opposed to a program of universal military training. A highly trained professional army of soldiers and technicians is the answer to our defense—not a cumbersome hoard of partially trained citizen soldiers. France is a good example of what happens when an army of trainees meets a smaller, more compact, and better-equipped professional army. Money spent on universal service would be so great that our proper professional defenses would, in all probability, be neglected. Universal military training is not the answer to our defense problems. Therefore I am against it.

The Government should, I believe, sponsor and vigorously support a comprehensive scientific research program such as the President outlined. If such a department could be taken out of politics, like the FBI or the Bureau of Standards—and kept out—that would be fine At present the United States leads the world in most branches of science. A Government program of research to supplement work being done by private enterprise would benefit us all and help safeguard the future. I am for it.

A Federal health and medical program is another political bill which sounds good but means nothing. Here again, Congressman, it seems to me that such a bill merely gives the excuse for the creation of another Federal agency. Frankly, Clare, I don't care to have the Government tell me what doctor I have to patronize, what hospital I must go to for care and what sort of medicine I must take for a cold. A better job of health work can and should be done in this Nation but I believe that this problem can be handled more effectively at State and local levels than by superimposing another big Federal bureau on a nation that is already overburdened with bureaus.

Higher pay for Federal employees will have to come. Wage scales have already risen considerably in this country since the last adjustment in pay was granted to Federal employees, and an increase (especially in view of probable further increases in the auto and steel industries) is definitely in line. I believe that this increase should also include the salaries of Senators and Representatives, since living costs in Washington have risen tremendously (despite the OPA—ha).

A Presidential succession bill is desirable. The necessity for using such a bill may never arise but the death of President Roosevelt and the elevation of Vice President Truman at a time when a comparative newcomer to Government held the office of Secretary of State, focused attention on a situation which might have developed. If Truman had died after assuming office, this Secretary of State would have become Chief Executive.

I am against extension of the Tennessee Valley Authority because I think that the Federal Government has already gone too far in competition with private enterprise. In the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Government has what it wants—a yardstick for measuring power utility costs. Unless the United States is to drift definitely toward Federal socialism, then let's resist Federal pressure to expand further as a direct competitor of private enterprise.

So, there it is—the heat which President Truman suggested. I know he is facing a tough job and is trying to do his best. There are times, however, when I feel that if he were more the man from Missouri and less a Democratic politician, he would inspire more universal confidence and support. Also, knowing you as I do, I feel confident that you will read this communication through to its conclusion (as well as other letters which may come from the district) and then go out and vote the way you feel you should vote—all of which is not a bad trait for a Congressman to have and is one of the main reasons why the district has consistently supported you even though it has frequently disagreed with you. But that is something Walter Winchell would never understand.

Best of luck,

R. M. COOK.

I replied:

JANUARY 11, 1946.

Mr. RICHARD COOK,
Editor, the Hastings Banner,
Hastings, Mich.

DEAR EDITOR: In response to President Truman's request, in his fireside chat of January 3, that the people of the district pressurize their Congressman into support of the proposals he mentioned, you have printed in the Hastings Banner of the 10th an open letter addressed to me, expressing your views.

To save space and repetition, your comments will be answered in the order they were made.

THE CONGRESS

Because all Members of the House and a third of the Senate Members are elected by the people every 2 years, the Congress is, as you state, the only barrier which prevents the destruction of representative government by ever-growing and continuing bureaucracy.

Permit me to join you in the hope that never again will the people's duly elected representatives forget their constitutional obligations, abjectly become a rubber-stamp of the executive department.

AN ALL-POWERFUL FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

In Government, as with individual, one grant of power almost inevitably causes those exercising it to seek ever-increasing authority; causes those who first grant the power to become the subjects of the exercise of autocratic, arbitrary, unworkable rules, directives and regulations.

The people's experience during the last 10 years—if their letters and complaints which come to me are any indication of their feelings—has convinced me that there is today in this country entirely too much authority centered in Washington.

President Roosevelt said, in substance, that in 34 months his administration had returned to Washington the powers which, improperly used, would shackle the liberties of the citizen. Millions of citizens can testify that their liberties have been shackled, and that without a corresponding benefit to the people as a whole.

I have no intention of voting for blank checks or grants of arbitrary power to either the President or any other executive, or to any agency or department of the Federal Government.

COMPLIANCE WITH THE PRESIDENT'S REQUEST

It is your privilege—permit me to go further—it is your duty to write to your representative in Congress, "either in praise or in criticism," advising him of any complaint you may have—of any policy you may wish supported or opposed. As the result of such praise or criticism, his ability to serve should be continually increased.

The only qualification is that when suggestions are made they should be the result of the citizen's independent judgment—his own wish—not something merely passed on as the result of manufactured propaganda.

THE SO-CALLED FACT-FINDING PLAN

The Committee on Labor, of which it is my privilege to be a member, has heard Green, Murray, and Lewis, representing the three largest unions; Schwellenbach, Secretary of Labor; Johnston, of the United States Chamber of Commerce; Mosher, of the National Association of Manufacturers. None favored the President's plan. Other hearings will be held.

The bill, as written, would authorize any member of the Board to call any individual from any Territory in the possession of the United States to any other place in the United States, there to give testimony, produce his books and records.

So great a power is not even granted to the United States Supreme Court. Never will I vote to grant that power to an executive agency.

Ability to pay should be given consideration in the fixing of a wage, but it is not the true measure of a wage. If it were, the employee of an employer which did not make a profit would be required to accept less than a subsistence wage—an unthinkable policy.

The value of the service rendered or the article purchased, not the ability to pay, should determine the wage or price to be paid. Certainly the union man earning the highest wage would blow his top if he was required to pay 30 percent more for his loaf of bread, pound of meat, or peck of potatoes than was asked of the worker earning a lesser wage.

If profits each year are to be disbursed as wages, there will be no money for replacements of worn-out facilities, improvements, expansion, or research. Logically followed, it would mean the end of the business; the end of present jobs when the machinery wore out; no jobs in new industries.

Unless stockholders have some hope of profit, they will not invest to create new jobs nor contribute to support present ones.

Had the policy of dividing profits as wages prevailed in the past, we might still be riding in a model T Ford; be without radios, refrigerators, and many other items now regarded as necessities by the members of the unions which are now on strike.

OPA

You have by illustration demonstrated the failure of OPA to hold the price line Further illustrations might be these.

The President, speaking in favor of continuing the price-fixing powers of OPA, said:

"Of the three major components which make up our standard of living—food, clothing, and housing—housing presents our most difficult problem. As for food, there is every prospect that 1946 will be a peak year of production."

Yet, in spite of OPA, all three are scarce and prices have been continually rising.

There is a scarcity of housing, and it is due not only to wartime restrictions, to the orders of executive agencies, but to the price-fixing policies of OPA.

There is a shortage of clothing. That likewise is due to the orders issued by OPA which prevent production of low-priced quality items. The same is true as to many articles of food.

The administration has spent millions of dollars in attempts to rig the market on various farm products. All too often, it has failed miserably.

First, eggs were scarce. Then Government hiked the price, and the first thing we knew there were 25,000,000,000 cases of eggs—30 dozen to a case—which could not be used and which the Government finally disposed of for either fertilizer or for the manufacture of fowl or animal food, at a price of 6 cents a case. Recently eggs in Washington were 70 cents a dozen.

OPA's regulations caused the accumulation and later the dumping of carloads of potatoes; millions of pounds of lard.

Today, butter is almost off the market, not because there is a scarcity of milk and cream, but because of price regulations made by OPA.

If OPA was ended tomorrow, there would probably be a rise in prices, but it would be a temporary one and production of the higher priced items would shortly bring down excessive prices.

It has been my privilege to listen to the testimony of manufacturers, middlemen, retailers, consumers, unions' representatives, protesting OPA's regulations, and to hear Chester Bowles and his aides in their efforts to justify their rules and regulations.

On one occasion, before our committee and in the presence of Mr. Bowles and his aides, manufacturers and retail merchants produced 64 exhibits, each having at least two items, some several, and all demonstrating that OPA regulations had resulted in an increase in price; a loss in quality of the articles shown.

Neither Mr. Bowles, faced with this exhibit, nor any of his topranking aides—and several were there—was able to explain or to justify the ruling which caused the increase in price, the lowering in quality.

After hearing thousands of words of testimony from those engaged in making and selling merchandise and farm products, it is my conviction that no group of men, however intelligent or sincere, can by over-all regulations effectively and beneficially control prices; repeal the law of supply and demand.

In 1940, I proposed legislation to fix, as of a certain date, the prices of all things and all services and to require the enforcement of the law by local authorities. No consideration was given to that plan, which, in my judgment, is the only feasible plan to, for a period, stabilize prices—this because prices of merchandise and wages are tied together, each dependent in some degree upon the other.

THE FULL EMPLOYMENT BILL

During 2 months, testimony on the original full-employment bill advocated by the President was taken by a committee of which I am a member, and the printed record contains more than 1,100 pages.

The President sent up Secretaries Wallace, Vinson, and Schwellenbach; Director of the Budget Smith; Reconversion Director Snyder, and many other prominent men appeared.

The bill originally supported by the President and his advisers would require the Federal Government to provide regular, full time, remunerative employment for those who were unemployed, either because there were no jobs available in private enterprise or because employees left their jobs for any reason.

The jobs, however, under present Federal laws and the administration practice, would be limited to members of the unions who were in good standing.

When I support legislation which takes the money of the nonunion taxpayer and uses it to create a Federal job which is available only to the member of a union in good standing, a job which is denied to the unemployed citizen whose tax money helped provide it, I'll be a lot older than I am now. Such a policy can have back of it no moral nor legal justification.

Everyone favors full employment. Everyone wants to see all who wish to work given the opportunity to work and, if the planners and the do-gooders will just relax and let us proceed as we have, while there may be booms and depressions, there will continue to be, as there has been in the past, a better opportunity here in America for the man who wants to work than in any other place in the world.

FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

The unfortunate, those willing to work but who cannot care for themselves, can and will be cared for.

The history of our country shows there has always been less suffering here than anywhere else.

The duty of caring for the unfortunate should, however, first fall upon the local communities, for they, better than a Federal agency, know the need and the extent of the relief which should be given.

Too many people look to the Federal Government for aid, evidently believing that it has an inexhaustible fund; that the cost of the things they advocate will fall on the other fellow.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE

Certainly, there should be no discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, or state of origin. But the problem is an educational one; cannot be solved by law.

We have an executive FEPC. Its own records disclose that, while it was created to prevent discrimination, in its own activities it has given 59 percent of its jobs, 55 percent of its money to Negroes, who, according to census reports, make up 9 percent of the population.

With that kind of an example and practice before me, can you wonder why I have little faith in a Federal agency's ability or, more properly, willingness to prevent discrimination?

HIGHER MINIMUM WAGES

The advocates of this measure maintain that the minimum wage should be raised from 40 to 65 cents per hour; later to 75 cents per hour; that no one should be given a job unless he or she receives 65 cents per hour.

Some people just cannot earn in productivity either 65 or 40 cents per hour. I am quite sure that, if the only available job open to me was in a foundry or on the farm, I could not turn out work which would be worth enough to pay me 65 cents an hour. But I could perhaps earn something.

Should I be denied the opportunity of employment because of a law which prevented an employer giving me a job at what I was worth? What is to become of all those who, because they cannot earn the minimum wage, will not be given jobs? Are they to be denied opportunity to help support themselves and the whole burden thrown upon the taxpayers?

EMERGENCY HOUSING LEGISLATION

If the President will call off the OPA and various other Federal agencies, competition will give us material and investors will give us houses.

America will never have enough of anything until we change our policy of caring first for all unfortunate people abroad.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

I want none of it, if it requires taking young men out of their home surroundings, turning them over for a year to the Army or the Navy.

Military training—yes; in schools, colleges, and universities. Throughout our history, American fighting men, wherever they came in contact with professional soldiers, have won in the end.

A COMPREHENSIVE SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH PROGRAM

By all means we should have it, and the results of such a program, combined with adequate pay to volunteers who desire to serve with the armed forces, will give us an adequate national defense.

FEDERAL HEALTH AND MEDICAL PROGRAM

The less the Federal Government interferes with the family, with local educational and health programs, the better.

I will never vote for any program which imposes upon the citizen the duty of calling as his medical adviser an individual designated by the Federal Government. In my judgment, anyone giving 5 minutes serious thought to the proposition should be against it.

The war has shown us how unjust, unreasonable, and arbitrary Federal agencies and their employees can be.

HIGHER PAY FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

If wages throughout the country, for all except white-collar workers and Congressmen, are to go up, Federal employees should receive their share of the increase.

It might be better, however, if we would all be content with our present pay and devote our efforts to a drive toward production, which will automatically bring down the cost of living. Wage increases followed by price increases get us nowhere.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION BILL

One should be enacted without delay.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

I can see no excuse for increasing the number or extending the authority of Government corporations engaged in what we have always believed to be private business.

The less the Government meddles in the system which has shown itself to be the best in the world, the better for all.

The foregoing are the views held by me at the moment. They are based upon my experience as a worker in a factory, on the farm, in a law office and, later, over some 30 years in the practice of the law in a city of 4,000 population, and upon my personal observation of the manner in which the Congress, executive department, and the courts have functioned here in Washington over a period of 10 years.

On some of the proposed legislation hearings have been held by committees of which I am a member; not a little testimony has been taken; more will be taken, and, if that testimony is persuasive and the views of the people of the District indicate that the views outlined are erroneous, they will of course be modified.

"THE HEAT"

So, Dick, thanks for "the heat" requested by the President and please excuse the length of this reply, which, however, in view of the issues involved, is very, very brief.

On the general subject of the President's message, let me add a few observations.

Unbiased citizens, with a knowledge of the facts, insist that some way to end labor disputes and strikes which are preventing reconversion, provide fertile soil for inflation by limiting production and bringing about unemployment, must be found.

But the panacea of a fact-finding board, with a 30-day cooling-off period during which, after it has been found to be impossible to amicably settle a labor dispute, neither lock-outs nor strikes will be permitted, is not the remedy.

Of his fact-finding recommendation the President said:

"It is nothing new to have the Government get accurate information from a corporation. It is now done by many Federal agencies—by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, by the Securities and Exchange Commission, by the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor, by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and by many others."

Inasmuch as the Government already has the facts, why ask for another fact-finding agency, in the interest of one party to a labor dispute, to determine the amount of profit which a corporation has made or may make, and to use such a conclusion, sound or unsound, as the basis for a wage agreement?

The President's inconsistency is shown, when, in one paragraph, he states:

"Experience has repeatedly shown that, once the public knows the facts, it can make its opinion felt in a practical way",

and then says,

"No detailed information obtained from the books of the company is to be revealed."

Just how does the President expect the public, upon whose opinion he relies for the settlement of labor disputes, to know the facts, if no detailed information obtained from the books of any company is to be revealed?

And why does he limit his fact finding to the books of the employer? He is following the fallacy which permeates the National Labor Relations Act, which confers benefits upon organized labor; imposes penalties upon employers but none upon either unions or employees; confers no benefits upon employers.

Today, with that law in force, we have more labor disputes, more strikes, than ever before.

Until the administration takes the heat off Congress and permits so-called labor legislation (and it is in no sense antilabor legislation) which has been proposed to be enacted, labor disputes and man-days lost through strikes may be increased.

Many sound, constructive proposals looking toward the lessening and the solution of labor disputes have been offered by me and by others, but, because of the political power claimed and the fear engendered by labor politicians backed by organized labor, exerted upon the administration and Members of Congress, they have not been enacted into law.

Let me cite just two offered by myself: An amendment to the Wagner law, providing that employees should be free to join or not to join a union. Another, first offered by Senator TYDINGS when the original bill was under consideration; later introduced by me in the House on several occasions, providing that employees should be free from coercion from any source.

If the President, instead of talking in the interests of the public but acting in favor of labor politicians, will approve of legislation, the enactment of which would aid in protecting the interests of all the people, he can get action without delay.

It is unfortunate that when the President said:

"I have indicated my opposition, and I repeat it now, to the antilabor bills pending in the Congress which seek to deprive labor of a right to bargain collectively, or which seek to deprive a union of its ultimate right to strike," he did not make it clear which bill, if any, now before the Congress would deprive unions of the right to bargain collectively.

I know of no such bill. Nor do I find any legislation which would deprive a union of its ultimate right to strike.

I do contend—and if the President disagrees, I would like to have him make it clear—that, where a public utility and its employees are engaged, under authority granted by a municipality, a State, or the Federal Government, in furnishing light, heat, power, communication, or transportation to a community, neither the corporation nor its employees should be permitted to endanger the health and well-being of the whole community by a strike until after reasonable warning had been given.

Every contract between an employer and a union, an employer and employees, engaged in furnishing the service just referred to, should contain a provision that the corporation could not shut off the service, put in force a lock-out; that the union and the employees should be required to give at least 30 or 60 days' notice of any proposed strike.

The day has gone by when the interests of the people as a whole, when the public welfare, should give way to the demands of any corporation, of any union, of any group of employees, however just or reasonable the demands of either.

The opportunity to hold a job with a public utility corporation should carry with it the obligation to serve without joining in a strike until adequate notice has been given of the intention so to do.

Moreover, if employers and employees cannot, after collective bargaining, after a strike has existed for a reasonable length of time, agree upon terms, employees should not be forced to work, nor should the continuance of the business be jeopardized by a refusal to work, backed by a massed picket line which denies to all other citizens the opportunity to work, prevents employers continuing a business.

There should be a time after which employees engaged in a strike cease to be employees under the National Labor Relations Act, and the employer be given opportunity to hire others seeking jobs.

The President has himself refused to actively support legislation which is not antilabor, which would protect the public from the racketeering activities of a labor union.

From a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States rendered on March 2, 1942, it appears that members of Dan J. Tobin's teamsters union have made it a practice to hold up trucks using the public streets and highways and to require the drivers or the owners of the trucks to pay a tribute of either $8.41 or $9.42, depending upon the size of the truck, for every load of produce or merchandise entering that territory in interstate commerce.

The House passed and, on April 12, 1943, sent over to the Senate a bill to end the practice above outlined and which the Supreme Court labeled as extortion.

For 2 years, or from April 12, 1943, to April 12, 1945, when he became President, Mr. Truman was a Member of the Senate. So far as I know, he never raised his voice in behalf of that legislation while he was Senator, and certainly he has never made an appeal to the Senate to pass it since he became President. By his silence, he has given his consent to that type of extortion as practiced by the Teamsters Union.

If President Truman will strike from the House and the Senate the shackles which have prevented them from acting on strike legislation, beneficial not only to the public but to employees—the men and women who do the work—he can, if he wishes, get appropriate legislation out of the House in 2 days and probably out of the Senate within a week.

Instead of berating members of his own party for opposing legislation which they honestly believe would harm, rather than help; instead of calling upon the people throughout the country to add to the burden of the already overworked congressional staffs by calling for a reply to the thousands of protests received—and the overwhelming majority of those I have are opposed to his policies—let him start a house-cleaning job in his Executive department.

Let him kick the left-wingers and the New Dealers out of his advisory council. Let him get back to the policies and the principles which have made us the most powerful and the foremost nation of the world.

He can get action out of Congress anytime, if he will ask for the right kind of action; but it will be a long and a cold day before he will get the majority of Congress to support any policy which tends to undermine the foundations of our Republic. He knows it and he was just talking in his fireside chat.

The President also said:

"I intend no blanket criticism of the Congress."

Again, he said:

"And let me make it very clear that, when I speak of bills not getting any action, it is not the Congress as a whole which is responsible. It is the committees which hold up action on bills. What I am asking is that these various committees at least give the representatives of the people a chance to vote 'yes' or 'no' on these vital issues—and that they give them that chance soon."

The President said that one of the measures he recommended "is now locked up in the Ways and Means Committee." Of another, he said, "A small handful of Congressmen in the Rules Committee of the House have prevented this legislation from reaching a vote by the Congress."

"Other bills," he stated, "are now resting in the Education and Labor Committee of the Senate and in the Labor Committee of the House. And so it goes with measure after measure now in the Congress."

It is regrettable that the President was not more accurate in his "fireside chat." As a former Member of the Congress, with 10 years' experience, he knows that, in the House at least, a majority of the House can at any time bring before the Congress any proposed legislation by the signing of a petition.

Both the House and the Senate have passed so-called full employment bills, but the President complains because the House bill does not meet his views.

He ignores the fact that it is not only the privilege, but the duty of the House to pass the kind of legislation of which it approves, and that it is his privilege and duty to veto it if he does not like the measure which finally comes out of the joint action of the House and Senate.

The President's whole plea is based upon the fact that the Congress exercised its independent judgment and that its judgment is not in accord with his views. He is complaining because the Congress is not a rubber-stamp body; that it is not "yessing" everything proposed by the administration.

He forgets that the Congress represents the people—not the President. He would deny to it the same right to independent action which he claims for himself and his subordinates.

Thanks again for your letter and for the other letters which have come to me because of the President's radio talk. The opportunity to reply is appreciated.

Sincerely,

CLARE.

A Case in Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VITO MARCANTONIO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 31, 1946

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Thomas L. Stokes from the Washington Daily News:

A CASE IN POINT

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

Something was written here a few days ago about accumulating evidence tending to show a concerted effort by big interests to move in at this time and try to break the power of labor unions and the Truman administration.

Various significant developments were cited. One was the refusal a few days apart of General Motors and United States Steel to accept compromise wage findings by a Presidentailly appointed wage board, in the motors case, and by the President himself, in the steel case.

There was reference also to the coalition of Republicans and Southern Democrats in Congress which fought progressive measures in the domestic field all during the war and have intensified their fight since.

Now another chapter begins to unfold here, openly and brazenly, under management of that coalition. A few simple facts will tell the story, although you'll have to hang on close, for this particular conspiracy involves tricky parliamentary procedure.

After some deliberation, the House Labor Committee reported a much modified version of President Truman's proposal for fact-finding boards. This measure then went to the

Rules Committee, which is supposed to be a procedural committee to arrange for consideration of bills by the House, but which long ago arrogated to itself powers far beyond this.

After a couple of days of public hearings about this bill, which went as usual beyond procedure into merits, Representative CASE, Republican, South Dakota, turned up before the Rules Committee Tuesday afternoon with a brand new bill he had just introduced. It had never been considered by any legislative committee. He didn't even have printed copies, only a few typewritten copies. He asked that the committee grant a rule to make this bill in order as a substitute for the Labor Committee bill on the floor.

Chairman SABATH, Democrat, Illinois, an administration supporter, heard about the bill for the first time only the night before. He wasn't in on the secret. But Republican and southern Democratic Members were thoroughly familiar with it, revealing the plot. Mr. CASE admitted he had help in writing the bill. It was obvious he was the front.

The next day, according to plan, the Republican-southern Democratic coalition on the committee voted a rule for the Labor Committee bill which authorized the Case bill to be offered as the only substitute. Even for the Rules Committee it is unprecedented to permit the offering as a substitute of a new bill never considered by a legislative committee.

The Case bill, creating a mediation board to settle labor disputes, has a beautiful preamble about being fair to both industry and labor. Yet it carries provisions to abrogate fundamental rights of labor. These include, for some purposes, repeal of the Norris-LaGuardia anti-injunction law. This law was put on the books 14 years ago, after a long battle, to protect labor from sweeping court injunctions such as that by which Attorney General Daugherty broke the railway maintenance workers' strike in the Harding administration.

* * * * *

The Case bill is recognized as an "anti-labor" bill by anybody familiar with labor-law history.

Recognized as its real sponsors are Representatives SMITH, Democrat, Virginia; COX, Democrat, Georgia; and HALLECK, Republican, Indiana; all veterans on the Rules Committee and active figures in the coalition. When you have watched Congress for many years and have found out the motives of Members, it is easy to smell out one like this, and what the real purpose is. Messrs. SMITH and COX are known for their antagonism to labor, and Mr. HALLECK is one of the Republican House leaders.

They have done a job here, make no mistake about that. The facts speak for themselves, both in the brazen way they used the Rules Committee and in the objectives of the bill itself.

This is the story behind this story.

Settlement of Industrial Disputes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 31, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the board of aldermen of the city of Chelsea, Mass.:

Resolved, That President Truman, Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach, Congressman Lane, Senators Walsh and Saltonstall, and Governor Tobin use their good offices in helping to establish industrial peace between management and labor, with a view of speeding up the process of reconversion from wartime to peacetime production. We believe that if the American standard of life is to be maintained and improved for the American people, and particularly for the men and women who served in the armed forces, that American industry maintain full production with jobs for all willing and able to work at decent pay which will permit workers and their families to meet the present cost of living adequately and decently. Furthermore, if the consumers, which include the masses of American workers and farmers, are to be in a position to purchase products of American industry they must have a sufficient income power to pay to help to maintain the American way of life. It is our fervent hope that American businessmen, as well as labor leaders, under the help of our Government will adjust their differences and help bring about peace and prosperity in our great county.

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to President Truman, Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach, Congressman Lane, Senators Walsh and Saltonstall, and Governor Tobin.

Address of Hon. John W. Hanes, Former Under Secretary of the Treasury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 31, 1946

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address made by the Honorable John W. Hanes, former Under Secretary of the Treasury, at a meeting of the Pittsburgh Advertising Club in Pittsburgh, Pa., on January 22, 1946:

Ladies and gentlemen of the Pittsburgh Advertising Club, I am always glad to come back to Pittsburgh. Pittsburgh is in many ways our most characteristic American city. Here one feels the mighty throb of American industry; here is the very heart of the great steel empire. That spirit of daring and enterprise which is part of America's great tradition is no less a part of Pittsburgh's birthright. I particularly welcome the opportunity of talking here today with a representative group of advertising men and women. It is the very nature of your profession that you must be concerned with the future. Your stethoscopes on the sales' prospects for various industries very often indicate what lies ahead for the country.

The subject of my discussion here today is Business and Politics. You will remember a few years back we had a popular slogan, "More business in Government, less government in business." The order of today seems to be just the opposite. Whether we like it or not, business is in politics, and we are there to stay. Labor has announced its intention of capturing the local and State governments, as well as the Congress of the United States and the Federal Government. The question is, therefore, "Will the United States be run for the benefit of a few privileged groups, or will we accept again the basic philosophy of Thomas Jefferson?" You well remember his famous slogan, "Equal rights for all, special privilege for none."

During the past 12 years the greatest injury to our industrial system has been brought about by a new use of the taxing power. Instead of taxing our people for revenue only, we have seen the revenue department used as an active instrument of social reform. We have been taught to believe that the burdens of taxation are to be borne only by the rich. It has become popular, in the politician's belief, to levy high taxes upon the corporations, and here is the greatest crime against every man, woman, and child in the United States. It is a fallacy to say that corporations pay taxes; they do not; they collect taxes from the people and transmit them to the Government. The ultimate consumer pays the corporation tax in the price of every manufactured article he buys. For instance, in the price of your new automobile—when, as, and if you can buy a new automobile—there will be included the cost of labor, materials, overhead, and, last but not least, taxes; and the same thing holds true for every other purchase made by 135,000,000 consumers in this country. The higher taxes go, the higher will go prices, and the lower our standard of living will go. Thus, to drain off into the hands of Government, through excessive taxation, any arbitrarily set portion of earnings, is to weaken industry and make it incapable of performing its true function of creating more and more jobs in an ever-expanding economy.

There are many convincing demonstrations of the power of advertising when it is applied as an economic or social force. The facts seem to be exactly the reverse when advertising is employed in the political sphere. When it comes to selling the American people on the benefits and virtues of our free-enterprise system, we must admit that the results have been somewhat disappointing. Many attempts have been made by the best advertising brains in the country during the past decade to write persuasive copy on this theme. By and large, these efforts have not measured up to expectations. The public has remained highly skeptical even when great business and trade associations have sought to win popular followings for slogans like "What's good for business is good for you."

Why was it that in this, the most vital of all assignments, business did not succeed? Was it that the problem had been only superficially studied or that causes of popular economic discontent had not been properly analyzed? There was, and there still is, a strong case to be made for the business point of view; to be made, if you please, for sane and experienced guidance of our national affairs as against irresponsible promises by demogogs seeking to capitalize on popular dissatisfactions. But against the smear campaigns waged by the radicals who falsely call themselves liberals and progressives, business leadership has been ineffective; too frequently it has either abdicated or sought to play a game of appeasement with its critics. Our business leaders, remembering what happened to their predecessors after the economic collapse of 1929, are often too timid or so lacking in faith in their own "case" that they fail to convince the American public either of their own sincerity or their own ability to lead.

Nowhere has this practice of appeasement been carried to a greater point than in the use of radio. Here again the advertising fraternity must carry a high degree of responsibility. Too often, in this very critical period through which the Nation is passing, principles have been suborned for an easy opportunism. One has only to listen to many of these so-called commentators over the air to perceive where they take their stand on these vital issues. Most of these artful molders of public opinion are frankly contemptuous and condescending toward the businessmen who provide their pay checks. For everyone of those who conscientiously believes in free enterprise, I will name you a dozen who are deliberately distorting the facts for their own personal gain and abusing the right of free speech. You

know their names as well as I do—all busily engaged in tearing down the business system which gives them their jobs. Too many businessmen, whenever we get together, are "viewing with alarm" while at the same time, our advertising agencies or our own advertising executives are aiding and abetting these detractors of American business. There are many who throw up their hands, despondent and discouraged, and say that business must go with, and not try to oppose, this rising tide. They do not think that any kind of advertising approach will solve the problem. They think that America is caught in a world-wide drift toward socialism—toward totalitarianism—which it is foolish to oppose.

More and more, lip service is being given to the common man who is now seen as coming into his own. This John Q. Public is to become the ward of a great, all-powerful welfare state which will undertake to guarantee him a job as well as his future economic security. Those rights of the individual which our ancestors fought for so bitterly during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, are today suspected and under attack by the very men who call themselves liberals. In every country the trend is toward the aggrandizement of government and giving the bureaucrat unlimited power. The issue is joined between two distinct political philosophies, this new worship of absolutism—call it communism, socialism, or what you will—and that simple, old-fashioned Jeffersonian type of democracy under which I grew up and in which millions of Americans still believe. One group would place the management of the national economy in the hands of bureaucrats rather than in the hands of skilled technicians. One would nationalize industry and finance and seek to divide rather than create new wealth. The choice is between men who talk and the men who act.

Do not misunderstand me. I believe that the politician has a very important role to play in American life. Our job is to keep him in his rightful place; not to permit him to become intoxicated with his new-found power and start messing around in economic affairs which he will never, never understand.

We ought to look carefully at the blueprints for this totalitarian state which is now being prepared for America. These plans date back to before the war; they were greatly accelerated by that conflict and right now they are being pushed ahead for early application in the postwar period. Don't be lulled into believing that Mr. Truman has fired all Mr. Roosevelt's radical advisers or that the country once more is turning conservative. Our radical friends are biding their time. They expect to triumph with the arrival of the first sizable postwar depression. I do not believe a postwar depression is necessary. This economic collapse, so these prophets say, will be so far reaching and so much more severe than the depression of the thirties that the American public will welcome the advent of a new socialist welfare state.

Some well-informed people even go so far as to assert that the present wave of CIO strikes has been deliberately designed to bring about a postwar depression. Plans for the rebuilding of America into new economic patterns will be found in much of the CIO literature that has been published. Many of these proposals are incorporated in bills that are now pending before Congress. The CIO has two objectives which are clearly defined. It seeks first, through industry-wide strikes, particularly in the fields of transportation and communication, to accustom CIO unions to the use of mass power; and, second, through employing pressure politics at the Capitol, to teach forcibly that Members of Congress are dependent upon the voting strength of labor, its political allies, and its friends.

Here is a list of seven bills, six of which the CIO-PAC groups are demanding that the Congress pass or face the consequences. Note, also, that practically every one of these bills is being actively supported by the administration. You may draw your own conclusions as to whether this is merely a coincidence or reflects some deeper alliance. In every one of these bills there is a worthy objective and it is stated in language with which no one can disagree. I quote from a CIO pamphlet which lists these bills, together with the CIO explanation for them.

1. Unemployment compensation of $25 (maximum) per week up to 26 weeks (Kilgore-Forand bill, S. 1274, H. R. 3891).

Note what the CIO says: "President Truman's program for Federal funds to supplement State unemployment compensation constitutes an emergency measure to bring benefits up to the level long recommended by the Social Security Board. Opposition to it has been based on a fear that it will make workers unwilling to accept jobs at less than $25 a week. This open intention to cut wages to substandard levels is a drastic attack on the American standard of living."

2. Full-employment bill (Murray-Patman bill, S. 380, H. R. 2202).

The CIO says, "The right to a good job was a key plank in the Roosevelt platform. To establish that right is a mandate of the people through the overwhelming victory Roosevelt won in 1944. The Murray-Patman bill makes this right a Government policy. There is no question of taking the initiative away from private industry There is simply a method of planning ahead to meet, by means of worthy public works, the gaps which the past three decades have shown private industry alone cannot prevent."

3. Sixty-five-cent minimum wage (Pepper-Thomas bill, S. 1349, H. R. 3914)

The CIO says, "This measure, raising minimum legal wages to 65 cents per hour immediately, and 70 cents and 75 cents after a year and 2 respectively, is the indispensable floor under purchasing power and living standards. It is necessary for the protection of millions of workers from misery and malnutrition, and also for the prosperity of business and agriculture whose products these workers should buy."

4. Permanent Fair Employment Practice Committee (S. 101, H. R. 2232).

The CIO says, "As manpower shortage is replaced by growing unemployment, many employers are reverting to racist personnel practices which are one of the earmarks of fascism. Organized labor cannot tolerate the reestablishment of a group of low-wage workers who can be used to pull down all labor standards. Nondiscrimination in employment must be made a permanent Government responsibility. Congressmen must sign discharge petition to have opportunity to vote on this legislation."

5. Abolition of poll tax for voting in Federal elections (H. R. 7) (has passed the House).

The CIO says, "Two Congresses have failed to guarantee American citizens their elementary democratic rights, without the full Senate ever having a chance to vote on the issue. Poll-tax politics and poll-tax Congressmen are a stumbling block to every bill in the people's interest. Senators this year must refuse to tolerate diversion, delay, and filibuster which frustrate the will of the majority of the Senate."

6. Generous treatment of returning veterans.

The CIO says "The niggardly benefits so far provided by Congress for veterans of this war do not reflect the sentiments of the Nation. The Rankin amendments (H. R. 3749) to the GI bill of rights, are only trivial improvements. The law must be amended to provide $25 per week unemployment compensation, with $5 additional for veterans with dependents, to liberalize loan provisions, and to liberalize several other provisions. We also support a generous 'bonus' or adjusted service compensation. We condemn all attempts to divert the veterans from their real rights by playing them off against the labor movement and using them to undermine collective bargaining, wages, and working standards."

7. Ball-Burton-Hatch bill (S. 1171).

The CIO says, "Passage of this bill would destroy the National Labor Relations Act and the democratic principles of free collective bargaining. It would enable reactionary employers to tie workers' organizations up in endless litigation and paralyze their efforts for better wages and working conditions."

Now these measures, all except the last one, President Truman is actively supporting. They fall within the power-politics program of the militant CIO-PAC organization headed up by Sidney Hillman. They constitute some of the basic issues of the 1946–48 campaign, for which the preliminary skirmishes are now under way. The Nation has thus been put on notice as to the economic objectives which are being pursued by these radical groups. That these objectives go far beyond the ordinary "demands" of labor in collective-bargaining procedures has likewise been admitted by one of the CIO's most influential leaders, Walter Reuther, who leads the strike against General Motors. Referring to that conflict and its significance, Reuther declared: "This issue is bigger than an ordinary wage argument, bigger than the corporation, bigger than the union. The current issue * * * transcends the narrow economic interest of labor and management and * * * gets to the very heart of the basic economic problem facing this Nation." That statement, I submit, confesses the revolutionary intent behind the Nation-wide strikes which now paralyze the country's industries, retard employment of returning veterans, and seriously threaten the entire 1946 reconversion program.

That free enterprise is now battling for its very life was also made definitely clear by another socialist leader speaking at about the same time that Mr. Reuther spoke. This new declaration came from the head of the British Labor Party, Harold Laski, on a recent visit to the United States when he spoke with Sidney Hillman and others in New York City. Said Mr. Laski: "There is no middle way. Free enterprise and the market economy mean war; socialism and planned economy mean peace * * *. It is significant that only in the new world of Russia has the businessman ceased to count. The day of the middle class is over. Their thought is bankrupt, their ethical values are obsolete, their dogmas an angry anachronism. A new social philosophy is necessary for a new world. Let us admit that it can be born only of a new social order."

Take the legislative program of the CIO and these various statements; what do they add up to? Is there any doubt of the direction in which they point? They express the same contempt for the business classes, for the capitalistic system, that has led to the nationalization of industry not only in England but in virtually every liberated country in Europe. Here is a direct challenge that can be evaded no longer. It must be met, not by appeasement, not by reliance upon legal defense mechanisms, but by courageous resistance to the further aggrandizement of the power of big government, to the power of pressure groups operating from within the very framework of government itself. Those who believe in America and American institutions must make a decisive choice; there can be no further retreat or surrender of principles that are fundamental to the preservation of our form of government and the rights and liberties of the individual citizen. That choice must be made now because I agree at least this much with these radical groups: it's later, much later, than you think.

The first problem that requires decisive action is to correct at once an increasingly serious defect in our political machinery. This means that like-minded men must join hands and make common cause against the subversive influences now at work in

America. Just as the effort is now being made, under the auspices of the CIO–PAC groups to organize all minority and dissident factions into one dominant self-interest bloc, so the time has come when imaginary differences between forthright, progressive Republicans and forthright, progressive Democrats should be resolved in a common cause. Only thus can we remedy the existing weakness within the two major political parties, a weakness which the pressure groups have so skillfully exploited. If a political action committee for the left is justified to strong-arm Congress into accepting a program like that of the CIO, then a political action committee for the right, which will actively oppose force with force, is no less justifiable.

Let's utilize the pattern adopted by Mr. Hillman's followers and organize every village, and every city to counter these threats to true representative and democratic government. In this way I earnestly believe that we can get our country back into the middle of the road, away from extremists of the left, or reactionaries of the right. Let's create a new political consciousness among the American people that will overcome their complacency and inertia and unite them into a militant citizenry against un-American, political "goon squads" now attempting to regiment our national life. The gulf between these two political philosophies, one that upholds American principles and American traditions, and one intent on building up a totalitarian police state, that gulf is increasingly wide and unbridgeable. We can maintain free government only as we, each and every individual, are prepared to rally to its defense.

Ford Tells United States It Can Remove Labor Trouble by Ending OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAX SCHWABE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 31, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the following headline in the Washington Post this morning bears out statements I have made to the press and in correspondence that United States can remove labor trouble by ending OPA. Mr. Henry Ford 2d, president of the Ford Motor Co., has been noted for his forward-looking policies in connection with labor, and his courageous statement, as follows, should cause all Americans to stop, look, and listen to his warning and weigh in their own minds the reasoning it presents. I quote:

FORD TELLS UNITED STATES IT CAN REMOVE LABOR TROUBLE BY ENDING OPA

DETROIT, January 30.—Henry Ford 2d, president of the Ford Motor Co., today told Federal officials he was "convinced that if Government control of prices is removed promptly, management and labor will settle their differences without running to the Government."

Ford warned that "unless steel can be made available to us and to our suppliers promptly we will have to shut down completely sometime this week."

Ford outlined his views in a telegram to Reconversion Director John W. Snyder at Washington.

The youthful executive asserted that at "current OPA ceiling prices we are currently losing about $300 on every car we make."

He repeated previous statements that his company's reconversion program has been hampered by parts shortages, which he said were due in part to the fact that some of the company's suppliers "have stopped making our parts because they lost money at their ceiling prices."

Ford said some suppliers were hampered by strikes or because they could not raise wages. He said others are unable to get steel.

Ford added:

"To my mind, you cannot have a freely competitive mass production industry with even 'just a little' Government price control. When you fix prices you control every production operation. * * * Nobody wants runaway inflation, but if we continue to stifle America's ability to produce, that is exactly, in my opinion, where we are heading for. * * * Inflation grows out of scarcity."

Beginning To See the Light

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 31, 1946

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include the following article on the subject of strikes printed in the Chicago Daily Times of January 29, 1946:

BEGINNING TO SEE THE LIGHT

A few beams of light and gusts of fresh air have been let into the dark atmosphere of the national industrial scene.

There is now a basis for hope that the country will escape general shutdown or a condition such as prevailed in 1919. In that first postwar year, one out of every five employed workers went out on strike.

The return of the packing-house workers to their jobs has averted a national meat famine. Wisely the union members decided that they would gain little by keeping food from the public after they had been assured that the Government would adjust their wage grievance on the basis of the President's fact-finding-board report.

The packing-house dispute, however, has merely been put on ice, and has not been settled. Moreover, until the steel impasse has been broken there can be no cause for general jubilation. It will avail us little to settle auto and electrical workers' strikes if there is no steel to work with.

It is a matter for satisfaction, however, that the settlement of the Chrysler, Ford, and Radio Corp. of America wage issues set a possible wage pattern and also showed what can be done if collective bargaining is carried on in good faith by both sides. In these industries management and labor seem to have put into practice the homespun philosophies of President Truman. They made collective bargaining work.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING CAN WORK

The question arises: Why haven't these same principles worked in the Steel and General Motors disputes? Who's at fault there? Negotiations between RCA and the CIO electrical workers were in progress for 3 months. But agreement on a 17½ cents an hour wage increase for 8,000 Camden, N. J., workers was reached without a strike and without Government intervention. The agreement may become a basis of settlement for the 2-week-old strike of 200,000 CIO electrical workers.

Ford negotiations lasted 9 weeks, during which, said the CIO representative, "we got to know more about the company's financial condition. * * * We are convinced 18 cents an hour is all they can afford right now."

In the Chrysler case, settled on the basis of an 18½ cents an hour increase, a joint Chrysler-union statement gave a clue as to why, perhaps, collective bargaining worked in this case and has failed in the case of General Motors. It said, "We negotiated in a friendly and constructive spirit * * * In the same spirit we agree there should be no vilification of the other by either the union or the company."

So far, in other cases, there has been too much vilification—of management, of labor and of the President. It is difficult to settle human problems in such an atmosphere.

It is a sad commentary on our lack of rules for handling serious economic matters when the President of the United States can be accused by a steel company president of playing politics because he proposed a wage compromise to avert a national catastrophe for all the people that would result if the steel industry shut down. The same deplorable condition is shown when a labor leader can accuse the President of strikebreaking when, in the interests of all the people, the President decided to take over the meat-packing industry under a law passed by Congress.

TOO MUCH SHOUTING GOING ON

And everyone knows the battle cries that have come forth from the camps of capital and the fox-holes of labor in the past few weeks. It had been charged that labor was attempting to bankrupt industry, that management was trying to smash unions.

There may be some industrialists who, as reported by Louis Stark, New York Times labor expert, are in agreement that unions must be curbed. And there may be some Communists in the labor movement who promote unrest for the sake of unrest. But neither of these represent the real American spirit because they deliberately would threaten the general welfare for selfish ends. Stockholders would be wise to remove those reactionary leaders who refuse to bargain collectively and labor must insist that its trusted spokesmen come down off the soap boxes.

The public has had an example in the Ford, Chrysler, Oil, and RCA sessions that collective bargaining does work when the parties keep their minds on their important tasks and live up to their responsibilities. It is going to be difficult to convince the public that General Motors and Steel can't work out their problems, too.

Steel's problem is tied up with prices, and the Government apparently is prepared to grant a steel price increase. That will have an effect on all other products fabricated from steel. A little more frankness from Washington on this vital subject might help to clarify the afore-mentioned dark industrial atmosphere.

Great Lakes Naval Training Station

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 31, 1946

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include the following resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee on January 21, 1946, on the Great Lakes Naval Training Station:

Whereas a movement is now on foot to discontinue recruit training at the Great Lakes Naval Training Station; and

Whereas the Great Lakes Naval Training Station is the oldest and largest establishment of its kind in the United States, having at the disposal of its trainees modern facilities and equipment and an excellent official staff; and

Whereas the Great Lakes Naval Training Station is centrally located which makes it convenient for trainees to visit and receive visits from members of their respective families: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by this Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, That the Navy Department of the United States be respectfully petitioned and urged to continue recruit training at the Great Lakes Naval Training Station, and that necessary funds be set up in the Budget for this purpose; be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Secretary of the Navy and to Members of Congress representing Milwaukee, including the United States Senators from Wisconsin.

Big Things Are Stirring in the Mighty Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 31, 1946

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, Richard L. Neuberger, distinguished American writer, has recently written an article on the proposed Columbia Valley Authority in the Pacific Northwest which appears in the January 26 issue of the Liberty magazine. Knowing as I do of the tremendous benefits accruing from the Tennessee Valley Authority in my own State of Tennessee, I recommend to the Members of the House this brilliant description of what the Columbia Valley Authority might accomplish for the Pacific Northwest region. This proposed legislation is sponsored by my distinguished colleagues, Senator HUGH B. MITCHELL and Congressman HENRY M. JACKSON, of Washington.

The article is as follows:

BIG THINGS ARE STIRRING IN THE MIGHTY NORTHWEST

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

American soldiers home from war have always followed the frontier. Meriwether Lewis and William Clark, the greatest frontiersmen of all, served together under the Revolutionary hero, Gen. "Mad Anthony" Wayne. Pioneers in tattered Confederate gray and faded Union blue first broke the sod in mountain valleys beyond the Continental Divide. Veterans of World War I took up homesteads in what was left of the vast public domain.

Today, the victorious fighting men of the Second World War are looking toward the last American frontier—the dry uplands of the Columbia Basin, in the heart of the State of Washington. This region is now a desert, but water from Grand Coulee Dam can turn 1,250,000 acres of it into what President Truman recently described as "thousands of new family-sized farms upon which returning veterans can secure a livelihood for themselves and their families and create new wealth for the Nation."

The first land under the proposed project would not be ready for cultivation until 1947, when it is hoped to have a small section of 6,000 acres irrigated near the junction of the Snake and Columbia Rivers. It would be 1950 before settlement could begin on a large scale, but by then 400,000 acres could be available for homesteading. This area would be subdivided into approximately 7,000 "family-sized farms." After 1950 the Government plans call for opening up 50,000 additional acres each year, until the entire 1,250,000 have been reclaimed.

Congress has already been asked by the President to appropriate funds for clearing the sagebrush and tumbleweed from this area as the first step in changing the high prairie from a wilderness into a Garden of Eden.

Will the development be undertaken by a regional authority patterned after TVA? The principal political and economic issue in the Northwest today is a proposal to establish a CVA—Columbia Valley Authority. It is sponsored by two of the youngest members of Congress: Senator HUGH B. MITCHELL and Representative HENRY M. (SCOOP) JACKSON, both of Washington State. MITCHELL is 38, and JACKSON, a former private first class in the Army, is 33.

As proposed by MITCHELL and JACKSON, CVA would develop the forest and mountain solitudes of the Pacific Northwest. It would take in all of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, as well as portions of Montana, Wyoming, Nevada, and Utah, a region that contains 14 percent of the Nation's area but only 3 percent of its people. It includes entire counties the size of New England States that are without a railroad or a paved highway. And countless vistas are exactly as Lewis and Clark and other early pioneers saw them.

An American census map tells the story. White space on this map means fewer than two persons a square mile. The only white space east of the Mississippi is a tiny patch indicating Florida's swampy Everglades. But white space practically predominates in the far-flung 282,000 square miles which MITCHELL and JACKSON hope to include in their Columbia Valley Authority. The task of the TVA was to restore an old, settled region where soil had been exhausted and forests destroyed. CVA is designed for a region that has scarcely been settled at all.

The forests in the area contain more than half of America's standing timber. Locked in the swift reaches of the Columbia River is 42 percent of the water power of the entire Nation. A pair of dams on this river, Bonneville and Grand Coulee, are capable of producing more electricity than the 260 power plants in the State of New York. Compare the 114,200,000,000 kilowatt-hours of energy of the Columbia and its tributaries with the 21,075,000,000 available in the basin of the St. Lawrence, for example. On the Columbia's main tributary, the Snake, the United States Army Engineers have designed a dam to be wedged into the bottom of Hell's Canyon, a chasm deeper than the Grand Canyon of the Colorado. White Monument, a peak on the rim of Hell's Canyon, towers 7,400 feet above the river; six Empire State Buildings, piled one on top of the other, would fail to reach the height of the summit.

A quarter of a century ago a young man rode along the Columbia on a train that clung to a narrow ledge above the water. On the back of a dining-car menu he scrawled this observation:

"When you cross the Mountain States and that portion of the coast States that lies well back from the ocean, you are impressed by those great stretches of physical territory, just land, territory now practically unused but destined some day to contain the homes of thousands and hundreds of thousands of citizens like us, a territory to be developed by the Nation and for the Nation. As we were coming down the river today, I could not help thinking, as everyone does, of all that water running down unchecked to the sea."

Franklin Delano Roosevelt wrote those words—when he was 38 years old.

Senator MITCHELL and Representative JACKSON recalled this prophecy when they introduced their bill for a Columbia Valley Authority. "CVA will help make Mr. Roosevelt's vision come true," said JACKSON. "In America a new chance has always meant going west. We seek to give modern application to Horace Greeley's famous motto. 'Go west, young man, go west,' is still pretty good advice."

The CVA bill would set up a regional board of three. The members would report to the President and Congress, as do the directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, but they would be responsible to no particular Government department o Cabinet member. Headquarters would be in the Northwest, probably at Portland, Oreg., or Wenatchee, Wash. They would be appointed by the President with the assent of the United States Senate and would direct the diverse resources of the Columbia River from the British Columbia border to the sea.

They would develop water power for industries, farms, and homes. They would protect the Chinook salmon runs, most valuable fish resource in the United States. They would improve navigation all the way from the Columbia's stormy mouth to Lewiston, Idaho, at the lower end of Hell's Canyon. They would have charge of irrigating the 1,250,000 acres of the Columbia Basin with a network of canals, an enterprise which the late President Roosevelt referred to as a "Promised Land." And beyond all the present projects, they would render the final verdicts on a vast variety of future undertakings—new dams and powerhouses, immense fish hatcheries, deep-navigation locks, 230,000-volt transmission lines, great networks of irrigation ditches and canals.

MITCHELL and JACKSON see a regional authority as the one practical way to insure full development of the country's last frontier. They believe that a host of Federal bureaus, all reporting to different heads in Washington, D. C., makes for competitive chaos rather than unified cooperation. They also favor regional autonomy, with important decisions reached in the Northwest rather than 3,000 miles away in the National Capital.

Many labor unions and the powerful Oregon, Idaho, and Washington State Granges favor the CVA proposal. So does a chubby Wenatchee editor named Rufus Woods, who in 1918 first suggested the construction of Grand Coulee, man's biggest construction job. Wood is a Republican, but not all members of his party agree with him. The Oregon State Legislature, with Republicans in control, has condemned the CVA proposal as calling for a "superbureaucracy." Judge Robert Sawyer, veteran Oregon conservationist and vice president of the National Reclamation Association, believes that CVA would impede development of the West. He thinks the Army engineers and the United States Bureau of Reclamation have demonstrated far greater competence to do the job.

Opponents of CVA contend that the sponsors plan a colossal political organization extending into seven States and jeopardizing State governments. Supporters of CVA reply that the opposition is dominated by private utility companies.

In the final analysis, President Truman's stand may decide the issue in Congress. He has indicated that he favors some kind of regional authority for Columbia's Valley, but he has yet to give specific backing to the Mitchell-Jackson bill. Until then foes of the CVA can say that the President has yet to make up his mind.

However, most inside political observers in the Pacific Northwest are willing to wager their fishing tackle that Mr. Truman will endorse the bill introduced by the two young Congressmen. This bet seemed safe when the measure was approved recently by Mon

C. Wallgren, Governor of the State of Washington and Harry Truman's close friend. The new President's first vacation trip was a visit with Wallgren in the Pacific Northwest.

"Mon Wallgren wouldn't be backing CVA," said a political insider in Olympia, Washington's capital, "unless Harry Truman intended to put his O. K. on the bill, too."

Many famous American rivers will be part of the CVA if it is established—the Snake, the Salmon, the Willamette, the Clark Fork, the Flathead. But one river will dominate the entire undertaking—the Columbia.

Second in size in the United States only to the Mississippi, the Columbia, 1,400 miles long from the Canadian Rockies to the Pacific, has been called the greatest power river in the world by no less an authority than Col. Hugh L. Cooper, the engineer who built the biggest dam ever constructed outside the United States—the huge Dnieprostroy project in Russia. And he lived to help plan a project six times bigger—Grand Coulee.

If Senator MITCHELL and Representative JACKSON succeed in passing their CVA bill, Grand Coulee will be the key unit of the new authority Four ocean liners the size of the Queen Mary could be placed on the parapet of this great dam. In bulk it exceeds the 10 next largest dams combined. Behind the dam extends a broad lake 151 miles long, stretching to the Canadian boundary. This lake is already one of the West's leading recreation spots, and last summer it was named in honor of Franklin D Roosevelt.

Colonel Cooper's prediction, that power could be generated more cheaply at Grand Coulee than any other place on the globe, has been proved correct. Columbia River power is now sold at wholesale to the new industrial plants along the stream for 2 mills a kilowatt-hour. This contrasts with 3.25 mills in the Tennessee Valley Authority, the next lowest rate in the Nation. Many utility companies charge a rate of 10 mills or more.

The existence of Grand Coulee's 2,646,000 horsepower brought about the erection of the huge Hanford plutonium plant on the sagebrush flats where the Columbia and Snake Rivers join. A few miles from where Capt. Meriwether Lewis first saw the Columbia, the United States Army engineers built this key unit of the atomic-bomb project. The plant was located at Hanford for two reasons—the 230,000-volt transmission line linking Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams, and the fact that the deep and icy Columbia offered the best facilities for cooling the tons of red-hot slag and residue incidental to the production of the ingredients in this stage of the atomic bomb.

The Hanford atomic works cover thousands of acres at the lower tip of the tract which is expected to provide family sized farms for returning soldiers. Congress, in fact, has begun consideration of a bill to give former servicemen prior rights to this land, and the measure has been reported favorably in the House. MITCHELL and JACKSON have included many of its provisions in their CVA bill. Secretary of the Interior Ickes has said that completion of this irrigation undertaking will "make 17,000 fertile farms available to returning veterans, and provide jobs for 25,000 men on construction in the immediate postwar period."

If the CVA proposal is approved by Congress and the President, the three directors will have charge of the most elaborate land-settlement project in history. The Coulee land will grow any crop from alfalfa to peaches. This already has been demonstrated on experimental farms in the nearby area. The Coulee farms would be limited in size. A single man could own only 40 acres; a family, 80 acres. This is to prevent corporate farming as a business venture.

Not only power, irrigation, and fertile land will claim the attention of the CVA directors, if the regional authority plan is enacted. Dams also mean hazards to the millions of fish that migrate up the Columbia each spring and autumn. Chinook salmon must reach the spot of their birthplace or they will not spawn. Grand Coulee Dam, for example, shuts off the salmon from the Columbia's last, lingering reaches. The largest Chinook salmon always spawn far upstream. In an experiment to save the most spectacular fish runs in the United States, the salmon have been artificially hatched and the resulting young released into streams which enter the main stem of the Columbia below Grand Coulee. Thus far the experiment has worked. Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, believes the Chinook runs are safe to date. He emphasized this qualification, for he fears that construction of additional dams on the river may wipe out the lordly Chinook, largest of all salmon.

Such a decision would have to be faced by the new CVA board. Kilowatts or fish? Nature's bounty or man's industrial techniques? Can both exist side by side in the same river?

The migrating salmon can surmount Bonneville Dam, 370 miles down the Columbia from Grand Coulee, by flipping up a series of curving fish ladders. Grand Coulee, as lofty as a 40-story skyscraper, is too high for such devices. The Bonneville ladders are wide concrete steps over which the water falls in gentle cascades. Their construction cost $7,022,000, but the Fish and Wildlife Service believes they have been worth it. Millions of salmon have journeyed through them.

Naturalists agree, that the Bonneville salmon ladders have been a success. Yet the upstream migration is not the only peril which threatens these nomadic fish. Do the baby Chinooks, the tiny fingerlings, travel safely downstream to the sea, where they grow to maturity? Tests conducted by the Oregon State Fish Commission cast doubt on this question. The fins of 100,000 fingerlings were clipped in two distinctive patterns. Fish marked in one way were released below Bonneville, those marked differently were put in the water above the dam. The proportion of these two groups caught in the lower river indicated that a fourth of the baby salmon die in the plunge over the spillway.

Indians who fish the Columbia and sports fishermen and biologists insist that the damage to the $10,000,000 annual salmon industry by additional dams would more than erase the benefits in irrigation and power development. Advocates of the Columbia Valley Authority answer that dams and fish can exist in the same river. They say that the projects actually will stabilize the Columbia and cover treacherous rapids where many fish once were buffeted to death against the rocks.

These are some of the problems which will be at issue when Congress votes on the question of a Columbia Valley Authority.

"There are parts of this Nation that are not as favored as the Northwest," Franklin D. Roosevelt said not long before he died. "I am thinking about those people as well as you people. You have got room for them here in the Northwest where they can make homes—where they can live happily and prosperously." Will a regional authority modeled on the TVA supervise and manage the development of this wilderness in the West? Would such an agency improve the value to the Nation of our only remaining region where men can sink their plows in new ground?

The TVA is now an integral part of the South, where it has bolstered the economy of the Tennessee Valley. The proposed Missouri Valley Authority, still a highly controversial plan, would deal with the problems of the Middle West and the Great Plains—the Nation's breakbasket. The CVA, most unique of all, would go to work on our last frontier, whose development is the issue at stake in the question of a Columbia Valley Authority.

Fair Employment Practice Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 31, 1946

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the city of Milwaukee on January 21, 1946, on H. R. 2232, providing for a permanent Fair Employment Practice Committee:

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, That it hereby goes on record in favor of the passage of bill H. R. 2232, providing for a permanent Fair Employment Practice Committee;

Resolved further, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to Senators LA FOLLETTE and WILEY and Congressmen WASIELEWSKI and BIEMILLER, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the reading clerk of the United States Senate.

OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 31, 1946

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article from the Washington Herald, of date January 30, 1946, as follows:

OPA AND CPA PLAN TO FORCE MEN'S SHIRTS, SUITS ON MARKET—MANUFACTURERS ADMIT HOARDING GOODS BECAUSE OF PRICE REGULATIONS

The Government yesterday promised action in a day or two to force hidden shirts and suits back on the retail market.

The Civilian Production Administration said it would notify manufacturers of its power to take away priorities from those guilty of hoarding. The OPA said it had field agents investigating alleged inequalities in its price program.

THREE MILLION ON SHELVES

The National Association of Shirt and Pajama Manufacturers had charged in New York that OPA regulations have kept more than 3,000,000 men's shirts made to sell at $3 or more on factory shelves.

The OPA promised that if inequalities in its maximum pricing program are found, adjustments will be made to bring hoarded goods back on the market. A CPA official said that agency has the power to take away priorities from manufacturers if hoarding regulations are violated.

NEW YORK, January 29.—More than 3,000,000 men's shirts made to sell at $3 and up are held on factory shelves because of OPA sales regulations, the National Association of Shirt and Pajama Manufacturers said today.

PRICES APPROVED BY OPA

Prices of the shirts have been approved by the OPA. The obstacle to their sale is the lack of low-cost shirts. An OPA order requires that manufacturers must keep the same balance of low-cost shirt production that they did in 1943. Because of a shortage

of low-cost fabrics, shirt makers say they have been unable to make low-cost shirts.

Negotiations have been held with the OPA to arrange for a reconsideration of the order, known as the maximum average price regulation, but according to the association's secretary, Max Lovell, so far "we've had nothing but promises that they'll think it over."

TWO METHODS OUT

"Only two things could free these shirts to a shirt-hungry public," Lovell said, "a change in the OPA ruling or a greater volume of low-cost fabric production. The latter could not possibly come in less than 6 months."

If shirt makers bucked the OPA to sell the shirts, Lovell said, they would face treble damage penalties for every dollar they made over 1943 profits.

United States Urged To Put Own House in Order Before Seeking World Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 31, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank R. Kent, from the Washington Evening Star:

UNITED STATES URGED TO PUT OWN HOUSE IN ORDER BEFORE SEEKING WORLD LEADERSHIP

(By Frank R. Kent)

No real American wants a dictatorship for this country. We entered the last war, fought and won it largely to avert the threat of another and to preserve our own democratic form of government. Yet the almost incredible incompetency with which our system operates makes it utterly ridiculous for us to urge its adoption upon other nations with other ideas.

We do not want to change, but certainly we should not boast about it. On the contrary, we should as a people feel profoundly mortified. For the spectacle of impotent confusion which we now present to the world is unparalleled in history, and the extraordinary demonstration of our complete inability to manage our own affairs is the most impressive thing about us.

Under such conditions our pretensions to world leadership become preposterous. We cannot run the world if we cannot run ourselves. The first qualification for world leadership is to put our own house in order.

That seems a strong indictment, but those who think it too strong might take a look at the house. Here we are the greatest of all the countries engaged in the war (and the one that suffered least) in a condition that must alarm every citizen.

NOT FAR FROM CHAOS

Our internal disorder is not far from chaos. Neither the judicial, the executive, nor the legislative branch of our Government is functioning satisfactorily and not one of the three is in harmony with another. The Supreme Court, split in two sharply separated factions, is further handicapped by the insistent political propaganda that centers around one of its members—Justice Douglas—and the prolonged absence of another—Justice Jackson—upon an assignment not remotely connected with the Court.

The Democratic President, unable to get even a small part of his large domestic program through a Democratic Congress, and, in the main surrounded by obviously inadequate men, in the great industrial-labor struggle now going on has thrown his weight on the side of the union faction in which the subversive elements which seek to undermine our institutions are most influential—to wit, the CIO. In this he follows the example of his predecessor who formed a political alliance with the CIO and its PAC which the Truman political managers apparently are anxious to continue.

And Congress, faced with a national crisis and a call for action, is unable to act. With important measures waiting consideration, a filibustering Senate minority has tied itself into a tight knot over the so-called Fair Employment Practices Act, originally sponsored by the Communists, now endorsed by both Republican and Democratic Parties, but really pressed by the CIO.

That isn't all by any means. Badgered by the political demagogues, the Army has been forced to demobilize at dangerous speed and is nearing the mark where its size will be inadequate to carry out our commitments abroad. At the same time Congress thus far has refused to tighten up or extend the draft and, so far, has sidetracked the universal military training bill recommended by the President and the Army as the least we can do if we are not to descend from the mightiest power in the world to one of the feeblest. Its passage, as has been pointed out again and again, is vital.

Nor is that all. With a long period of great prosperity in prospect, provided our production can measurably meet the tremendous demand for our products, we appear deliberately intent upon killing the prospect.

MORE THAN MILLION IDLE

More than a million men have been thrown into idleness by the great strikes in the steel and automobile fields. Others, such as the meat strike, have forced the Government to seize plants to protect the food supply. In New York City the radical union leader, Michael Quill, compelled the mayor of New York humiliatingly to surrender to his purely political demands to avoid what would have been a calamitous tie-up in the transit system. Other strikes are bursting out all over the place, and the administration has no labor policy worthy of the name and no restraining law on the books to protect the people's interests.

Add to all this the fact that Federal finances are still out of control. We preach economy but practice extravagance. We call for a reduction in the swollen Federal pay roll and for a decrease in waste. Yet, as Senator BYRD points out, instead of reducing the civilian personnel since peace came, it has been increased. The pay roll instead of going down has gone up. The only big reductions have been in the Army and Navy, and these were inevitable when the shooting stopped.

With the national debt close to three hundred billions we deliberately reduced taxes by more than seven billions and we lend abroad billions which we do not really have. More could be put in the picture, but this seems enough to make the point that our cherished system has bogged down pretty badly. There will be those to say that this is too black a picture, that things eventually will be straightened out and, as usual, we will pull through. And, of course, that is so this time. But the cost of the struggle will be terrific and the strain upon the system will leave it weakened.

A few more crises like the one on us now and it will be unrecognizable and we all will be worse off. The sad state we are now in represents the accumulation of years. How to achieve the governmental teamwork and competency essential to save us is the great problem. If that cannot somehow be done, we shall steadily slide downward to the grand bust-up.

Amendment of the Internal Revenue Code

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 31, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks regarding my bill to permit physicians, surgeons, and dentists to deduct from their taxable income the time spent in giving free professional service, I want to insert the provisions of the bill itself, as follows:

H. R. 5296

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That section 23-q of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by adding the following new paragraph, to read as follows:

"(4) That commencing with the taxable year 1946, physicians, surgeons, and dentists shall be allowed an additional credit as a deduction on their income tax equal in terms of percentages to that portion of their time each year which is devoted to charity, free clinic work, and/or public research work;

"(5) The Commissioner of Internal Revenue shall prescribe by regulation the method of computing such time and the proof which shall be required in substantiation thereof."

Pensions of Retired Railway Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 31, 1946

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter that I have received from the John Fritz Chapter, No. 6, of the International Association of Retired Railway Employees, of East St. Louis, Ill., with regard to their railroad pension:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: At a meeting of the John Fritz Chapter No. 6, held last Friday, the officers were asked to write you with reference to our railroad pension. As you know, the cost of living has increased considerably and we find it difficult to make both ends meet. There was a time when we could indulge in an occasional luxury but no more. In fact we are continuously obliged to curtail on necessities.

In this chapter there are 400 retired railway workers, all over 65—some 70, 75, 80, and a few 85. At least 50 percent of the homes represented have one or more dependents. Dependents are likewise suffering for the need of necessities. The pension increase we ask for is more reasonable. The act levies a tax of 3¼ percent on wages of railroad workers up to $300 a month—the railroads contributing the like amount of 3¼ percent. This increase we believe can be made without having to increase the tax levy (Railroad Retirement Board in its last report showed a large surplus). However, if an increase should be necessary the tax could be made 3½ percent or 4 percent and this would answer. Such an increase, we believe, neither the railroads or railroad employees would object to, it being so small.

The increase we have asked for is—for those who are getting $100 to $120 (maximum—5 percent; $75 to $100, 10 percent; $50 to $75, 15 percent; $25 to $50, 20 percent. Those who get $25 or less, 25 percent. Very few get the higher amounts—the average pension is $42.

Unlike some other kinds of pensions, the railroad pension does not cost the Government a penny. If a bill, separate from others, calling for such an increase is not now before Congress, we wish one might be introduced, and that Congress enact the pension change, as herein indicated, into a law without delay.

We really need the pension increase.

Please, please, please, please help us now.

Sincerely yours,

C. A. DUNCAN,
President.

V. C. POWERS,
Vice President and Treasurer.

E. C. JENKINS,
Secretary.

ERNEST COOMBS,
Chairman, Board of Directors.

FRANK C. SMITH,
Counsel.

Some of the Causes for the Shortage of Hosiery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 31, 1946

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, due to the fact that there has been quite a lot of misunderstanding as to the reason for the shortage of women's hosiery, I wish to include a statement from the Greensboro Daily News, Greensboro, N. C., January 30, 1946, issue, which I feel explains the facts as exist in the hosiery manufacturing industry:

MATERIAL SHORTAGE AND BIG-BUYING DEMAND CAUSING HOSIERY SHORTAGE—PROSPECTS FOR 1946 NONE TOO BRIGHT FOR LADIES UNLESS SUPPLIES INCREASE

(By DeWitt Carroll)

An acute Nation-wide shortage of women's hosiery is due to the cumulative effect of factors ranging from lack of raw materials to increased buying power of the public, a survey of manufacturers and retailers revealed here last night.

Greensboro merchants who are fortunate enough to get shipments of stockings report that what would have been several days' supply in normal times is now snapped up in an hour. Retailers' estimates on current hosiery shipments range from 10 to 20 percent of normal.

LITTLE BLACK MARKET

Although it is reported that nylons are being sold on the black market in Greensboro, both manufacturers and merchants were overwhelmingly of the opinion that the illegal traffic is very small. Black-market nylons are being offered at about $3 a pair, one source reported. Another pointed out that if the black market were active here, the effect would be seen in a lessening demand at the stores and the demand is as great as ever.

Taylor R. Durham, executive secretary of the Southern Hosiery Manufacturers Association, of Charlotte, attributed the shortage mainly to a lack of nylon and rayon yarn. Unless these supplies increase, he said, fewer women's stockings will be made this year.

In 1941, the last normal year, a total of 57,400,000 dozen pair of women's hose, all types, were made in the United States. Final figures for 1945 are not in yet, Durham said, but the total is expected to be about 43,000,000 dozen. Unless manufacturers are able to get more nylon and rayon yarn, he predicted the total for this year would be about 33,000,000 dozen, including nylon, rayon, and cotton.

APPEAL MADE

Durham said his group had appealed to the Civilian Production Administration to restore some rayon to hosiery mills, and he expressed hope of some relief from this quarter. However, there is pressure from the regular customers of rayon manufacturers, who are also in need of the material for woven products.

The association secretary said North Carolina leads the Nation in the manufacture of hosiery of all kinds, by volume. It makes nearly 40 percent of all seamless hose for men, women, and children, and about 22 percent of all full-fashioned hosiery.

Main cause of the hosiery shortage, one manufacturer said, is the lack of nylon and rayon yarns. When war broke out, silk and nylon were taken away from hosiery mills and replaced with rayon. Now the supply of nylon yarn being allotted to hosiery concerns is not sufficient to fill their demand. He would not say what percentage of his nylon yarn requirements is being met, but did say that his company is utilizing available nylon at full capacity.

RAYON SOUGHT

Since he is unable to get enough nylon, his firm is trying to buy rayon in the open market to obtain supplies to make this kind of hose. With the war over, the bulk of the rayon is going to weavers, half-hose manufacturers, and other regular prewar customers, and his firm is able to get only a comparatively small amount.

Du Pont is releasing enough nylon to make 30,000,000 pairs of stockings a month, but he believes this figure includes full-fashioned, seamless, half-hose, and other types. Export of 4,500,000 pairs of nylon hose over a 2-month period last year added to the shortage, he said.

A further factor in the current shortage, this source said, was the difficulty in converting production back to nylon. Manufacturers had more troubles than they had anticipated, he explained, and some of them are still having these difficulties.

OTHER FACTORS

Still another factor with some manufacturers is a shortage of sizing and preboarding equipment. A sizing machine puts a film on the yarn to protect it while it is being knitted, and preboarding machines subject nylon hose to pressure at a temperature of 240° to make them hold their shape. Before the war this equipment was not as much in demand as it is now, and, until it can be obtained, these manufacturers are working under a double handicap.

Another hosiery-manufacturing official voiced the same reasons for the shortage, and added several more. Manufacturers have had to build up working inventories of yarn before they could operate smoothly in all stages of hosiery fabrication, he said. His concern, he continued, is getting about 40 percent of the nylon yarn it could use. Another strong factor is that the hose made during the war years did not have the wearing qualities of the prewar variety.

A third hosiery official felt that additional purchasing power is having its effect on the way women are cleaning out the shelves of local stores in efforts to buy leg wear. Manufacturers and merchants agreed that no one along the line has any backlog of women's hosiery. And the women, wearing out precious hose as they hike from store to store, vehemently make it unanimous.

Strike Settlements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. HOOK
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 31, 1946

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, the rejection by General Motors Corp. of the recommendations of the President's fact-finding board and the refusal of the United States Steel Corp. to accept the President's compromise settlement have precipitated the greatest industrial crisis in the history of our economy. The actions of these corporations indicate that fact-finding boards will not solve this crisis.

The unions have accepted the compromise proposals and have charged that the refusal of these corporations is part of a concerted plan to destroy labor unions and endanger the welfare of the American people.

To solve this crisis we call upon General Motors and the United States Steel Corp. to accept the Government's proposal for settlement of the disputes.

Signed by Congressmen CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, of West Virginia; ANDREW J. BIEMILLER, of Wisconsin; EMANUEL CELLER, of New York; JOHN M. COFFEE, of Washington; WILLIAM L. DAWSON, of Illinois; HUGH DE LACY, of Washington; HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, of California; CLYDE DOYLE, of California; HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, of Pennsylvania; WILLIAM J. GALLAGHER, of Minnesota; JAMES P. GEELAN, of Connecticut; THOMAS S. GORDON, of Illinois; WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN, of Pennsylvania; FRANCK R. HAVENNER, of California; NED R. HEALY, of California; FRANK F. HOOK, of Michigan; AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, of Pennsylvania; CECIL R. KING, of California; LOUIS C. RABAUT, of Michigan; JOHN LESINSKI, of Michigan; CHARLES M. LAFOLLETTE, of Indiana; WILLIAM W. LINK, of Illinois; VITO MARCANTONIO, of New York; GEORGE P. MILLER, of California; THOMAS E. MORGAN, of Pennsylvania; THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, of Illinois; DONALD L. O'TOOLE, of New York; GEORGE E. OUTLAND, of California; ELLIS E. PATTERSON, of California; ADAM C. POWELL, Jr., of New York; MELVIN PRICE, of Illinois; BENJAMIN J. RABIN, of New York; LEO F. RAYFIEL, of New York; GEORGE F. ROGERS, of New York; JOHN J. ROONEY, of New York; ADOLPH J. SABATH, of Illinois; CHARLES R. SAVAGE, of Washington; JAMES H. TORRENS, of New York; RICHARD J. WELCH, of California; GEORGE G. SADOWSKI, of Michigan; and GEORGE D. O'BRIEN, of Michigan.

Sales of Surplus Army Vehicles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 31, 1946

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I enclose herewith an Associated Press news item from my home-town paper, the Monroe News-Star, which has to do with the shenanigans of surplus property sales at Camp Claiborne, La. Many veterans have complained to me that they have traveled many miles trying to get a line on surplus property, particularly automobiles, trucks, and housing, and when they finally did arrive at the place the property was supposed to be located they ran into all kinds of misinformation or lack of information or lack of authority or just plain incompetence and indifference. There is no reason why a veteran of the United States Army or Navy should not receive accurate information including both the description and price of the surplus property he is trying to buy. He is also entitled to know exactly where this property is located and who is in charge of it and at what time he can see it. The time and travel expenses of an American citizen and veteran are just as important to him as the time and martinet authority of some brass hat or bureaucrat.

Why cannot the Government put a price on surplus property and offer it for sale at a given date and place and stick to its decision just like any business firm would be expected to do? Is it because some bureaucrat is afraid an American citizen might get a good buy? It is ridiculous. They want to give the stuff to some foreigner but are actually reluctant to give an American veteran an equal opportunity to buy what he wants and needs.

Mr. Speaker, why does every fool who goes to work for the Government feel that he has to get up some long-winded, complicated, red-tape formula for everything he does? Why does he seem to think the American citizen is someone to be given as little consideration as possible? Why do we put up with it? Well, for one, I am not going to put up with it. From now on it is going to be my intention to try to get action from the surplus-property authorities. People need the stuff they have to offer, and if it was put on the market at once it could benefit both the citizen and the Government.

Look over the following. Is not it a disgrace?

VETERANS ASSERT SALES ARE UNFAIR

ALEXANDRIA, LA., January 25.—Fred Gray, a representative of the Veterans' Administration, today checked on compiaints made by veterans that prices on surplus Army vehicles had been raised and that other irregularities had been noted during the sale of surplus equipment at Camp Claiborne.

A Captain Overton and a Lieutenant Munves, both of Dallas, told Gray that a truck bearing RFC No. 434 (Army 394192) had been raised from a price of $1,023 in the sale announcement to $1,466.90, and another truck, bearing RFC No. 441 (Army 389676), had been upped from $1,072.33 to $1,531.90.

E. G. Haas, of Fort Worth, reported that RFC No. 442, listed at $669.76, had been raised to $956.81.

N. R. Clement, of Lubbock, Tex., said he had asked an RFC official why prices had been increased, and was tolc that some repairs had been made, and, therefore, the selling price had to be increased.

Clement reported that at Wednesday's sale, set aside for city, county, and State governments, he had noted several wrong transactions. He said a man who claimed he represented a county in Oklahoma had bought 11 vehicles and later offered them to individuals at mark-ups of about $100 each.

Gray said Captain Overton and Lieutenant Munves told him they thought the prices were changed after sales to Government agencies had ended.

H. W. Wright, an RFC official at Claiborne, admitted to Gray that "some prices are too high, but there is nothing we can do about it." Wright said the prices were fixed by an analyst in Washington.

Issues Underlying General Motors Wage Dispute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1946

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix the texts of two news articles by Mr. Peter Edson, the distinguished correspondent for NEA Service. On Friday, January 25, Mr. Edson attended the Senate Education and Labor Committee hearing at which Mr. C. E. Wilson, president of the General Motors Corp., testified and that evening wrote a report for his service. The following day, readers of the Washington Daily News were presented with a news picture showing Walter P. Reuther, vice president of the UAW-CIO, declining to shake hands with Mr. Wilson until and unless Mr. Wilson signed a satisfactory wage agreement with the union.

The news caption stated that:

Peter Edson, the news expert, termed Wilson's testimony before the Senate committee "one of the finest demonstrations of issue dodging ever heard."

Readers of the News, including myself, strained their eyes trying to find Mr. Edson's article in the News, but to no avail. I understand that the News was besieged with inquiries. In the final edition, two sentences from Mr. Edson's article were published.

Because I suppose that many Members of both Houses searched through the News as I did for Mr. Edson's report, I am sure that they will read the full text with interest. Also an article written the following day about the appearance before the same committee of Mr. Reuther. Read together, the two articles provide an interesting and important report on the issues underlying the General Motors wage dispute. The texts follow:

GM BOSS SAYS A MOUTHFUL

(By Peter Edson)

WASHINGTON, January 25.—Charles E. Wilson, big, tough, white-haired president of General Motors, came down to Washington as first witness before the Senate Labor Committee on fact finding. In morning and afternoon sessions of 2 hours each, he gave one of the finest demonstrations of dodging the issue ever seen or heard in this home of indirect answers to direct questions.

Wilson smoked countless cigarettes, one after the other, and kept on talking great mouthfuls of words with sincerity, conviction, and many gestures. But whenever one of the able panel of Senators—MURRAY, ELLENDER, TAFT, MORSE, SMITH, DONNELL, GUFFEY, and LA FOLLETTE—backed the General Motors head right up against a leading question, he skidded to one side and started to talk about other things. It was masterful.

It was all highly entertaining and perhaps even informative. But as for producing anything that would help settle the present industrial muddle, nothing came out, except maybe a little indirect evidence that, if this is the way labor negotiations are conducted, it's no wonder the General Motors strike isn't settled yet.

STILL IN THE DARK

All the committee wanted, said Senator MORSE, was to know what, if any, legislation Congress should pass to help solve industrial warfare.

Well, Mr. Wilson said that was a big question. He said he wasn't a lawyer or a politician but a production man.

Coming down on the train the night before, Mr. Wilson had made a few notes on what should be the guiding principles for Congress. There were 14 points. Did Congress believe in free competition, private ownership, profit and loss, industrial liberty, the right to work, to strike, to organize unions, to bargain collectively, the American standard of living, monopolies, sound currency, a balanced budget and inflation—when and how much?

Mr. Wilson had four measuring sticks for this program. He would give up trying to find political solutions for economic problems. But whatever laws were passed should be socially sound, legally sound, enforceable and practical.

In brief, he seemed to be afraid of fact-finding. The procedure would interfere with collective bargaining, and it might start finding principles. Principles were apparently bad.

STILL ASTRADDLE OF THE FENCE

Senator ELLENDER wanted to know if Wilson entertained the view that Congress should do nothing. Answer—Oh, no, but the primary trouble now came out of the war. The relation of government to industry and labor got away from the free competitive principle.

Senator TAFT wanted to know if Wilson was opposed to contracts preventing strikes. Well, it was hard to generalize. The trouble was that there were two policies.

Which policy did Wilson want Congress to declare, TAFT wanted to know. Wilson said he thought we could do it if we went back to work. That was the way to do it. We ought to work more. Then we ought to decide what we're going to do on the workweek, union security, inflation and the wage policy.

Later, Wilson said neither side would agree to arbitrate on hours, wages, union security or the right of management to manage.

Senator DONNELL then tried to pin Wilson down on the idea that, where bargaining failed, Congress should legislate for compulsory settlement.

If we have the free competitive system, Wilson replied, we must have strikes. If we believe in free enterprise, we should go down that road.

NOTE.—If this column is a bit incoherent, you've got the idea.

WALTER REUTHER'S IDEAS

WASHINGTON, January 26.—Red-headed Walter Reuther's 3 hours of nonstop testimony before the Senate Labor Committee cleared up a lot of misconceptions about the General Motors strike which this young United Auto Workers' official is directing.

It clears up the degree to which the corporation has refused to bargain collectively. It clears up the much chawed-over "wanting to look at the books." It clears up the basic ideas this husky giant of a union is shooting at.

As Senator FULBRIGHT observed, Reuther's indictment of the General Motors management "amounts to saying there was no collective bargaining."

In brief, General Motors, after 6 weeks' deliberation refused to consider the union's 30-percent wage-increase demand, even when told that if the company could not afford to pay without increasing prices, the demands would be scaled down. When asked if a 1-cent increase could be paid without an increase in prices, the union was told this was none of its business.

Wanting to look at the books grew out of that. The union didn't want to look at the books, says Reuther. All it wanted was the basic cost data on auto production as it related to wages, hours, and working conditions—data probably contained on three or four sheets of paper and known only to the company.

COUNTERPROPOSAL FIRST OFFERED NOTHING

GM counterproposals have been, first, nothing, then a 45- to 48-hour workweek, then 10 cents, and finally 13½ cents an hour increase, after the strike was called.

When it became apparent negotiations were at a stalemate, the union suggested conciliators from the Labor Department. For a week the management refused to admit them to negotiations. The second week they were admitted as observers, to sit in a corner and say nothing.

The final effort at settlement came in a union proposal for three-man arbitration, one selected by the union, one by the company, these two to pick a third. After 3 days, the answer came back that if the company arbitrated, it would be abdicating.

"Are you willing to arbitrate now?" asked Senator GUFFEY.

"Oh, no," said Reuther. "We gave them two chances."

So the strike was called. Since then the management has refused to meet with the union, it has declined to participate before Presidential fact finders, it has canceled the union's contract, which would not have expired until April 28.

That is a sorry record of labor relations. But the interesting thing in all this is what motives are driving young Reuther and his union.

When the company's offer of 45 to 48 hours a week was turned down, it was because, that would mean prosperity for a few, unemployment for others. That is not the answer.

HE SEES INCREASED PRODUCTION AS ANSWER

When wage increases without price increases were demanded, it was because "We don't want to get ours at the expense of the public."

Economically, Reuther believes the answer to everything is in increased production. Before the war the country had an $80,000,000,000 production machine. Now it's a $200,000,000,000 machine. He calls it a B-29 production, and he says it has to be put to work. He quotes Treasury Secretary Vinson's statement that the living standard has to be raised 50 percent to do it.

Legislatively, Reuther proposes restoration of the excess-profits tax, repeal of the carry-back tax, and extension of price control, "to make management go back to work."

He would strengthen the conciliation service.

He would require management to file data on wages, hours, and conditions of labor so that such data would be available for collective-bargaining negotiations.

He would be willing to have union financial data made equally available. His own union now publishes trimonthly statements.

But legislation is not the answer, he says, because no law can make men work and no one can legislate good will.

Elmer Twitchell Writes His Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1946

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article sent me by one of my constituents entitled "Elmer Twitchell Writes His Congressman," from the column of H. I. Phillips, as follows:

THE ONCE OVER

(By H. I. Phillips)

ELMER TWITCHELL WRITES HIS CONGRESSMAN

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Well, on account of President Truman asked me to, I am taking up with you direct the terrible mess the country is in. I am like a man going down a ski jump in a fog, only even more scared and I guess you are the same. (The difference is that you get paid for the trip.) For me to take up with you direct the troubles of America seems funny, as I had an idea you being a Congressman must know what they were, but who am I to turn down a request by the President?

First of all I will come right out and admit I am not too sure who is right and who is wrong in the assorted disturbances, but I think it would be helpful if you decided on the following program:

1. Cut the double talk, which is America's trouble No. 1.

2. Put your soul above the election returns.

3. Try to regard the words, "It's close with 22 districts missing," as less vital than "No matter what happens to me I have been a man."

4. Wipe off that goose-pimply look and do what is best for the people of America, let the votes fall where they may.

5. Realize that this is not one of those times when it is enough to be an artful dodger, a main-chancer and a pussy-footer.

6. Get it into your head, Mr. Congressman, that a man can be right and still not be in a newsreel often.

7. Try to understand that America never needed straight-shooting, straight-talking leaders so desperately.

8. Take the stand that you would not only rather be right than be President but rather be nearly right than be a Congressman.

9. Smarten up to the fact that the national appetite for baloney is slowly but surely on the decline.

10. Remember that on your words and actions today depend the future happiness, yes, and the very lives of millions of Americans and their kids.

11. In the words of "the State of the Union," stop thinking of the next election and start thinking of the next generation.

12. Be a United States public servant, not a waltzing mouse with a Washington address, or a Potomac River hanger for coat and pants.

Well, I could give you some more advice but a Congressman can absorb only a little at a time, so I will quit at this point. The fate of America is in your lap or would be, if you had a lap. Your kids and your constituents' kids may be the happy citizens of tomorrow or penniless bums, depending on whether you are a man or a halibut in these grave times. Whether America will continue to be the land of the free and the home of the brave or wind up as the Quonset hut of the hog-tied and the home of the baffled goat is up to you. For once in our life forget the votes. Yours in a cold sweat,

ELMER TWITCHELL.

P. S.—You are not only fiddling while Rome burns, but trying to combat the fire and the music into a regular radio program.

Answering Attack on the Veterans' Administration

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 1, 1946

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON], if he is really interested in the welfare of the disabled veterans, should make some investigation before he comes on this floor and repeats these charges against the present Veterans' Administration, headed by Gen. Omar N. Bradley, one of the greatest soldiers of this war and one of our finest living Americans.

I happen to know something about what is going on. General Bradley is doing the very best he can. He is doing everything possible to speed up the construction of veterans' hospitals, get every disabled veteran into a hospital as quickly as possible, and to process every claim that comes in.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. He has had trouble getting sufficient help in the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, I will yield.

Mr. FULTON. Of course, this is the first time you have heard me because I am a new Member of Congress.

Mr. RANKIN. I thought so.

Mr. FULTON. There are many of these veterans in my district. I want to ask this question. Is it not true that there are hundreds of thousands of letters?

Mr. RANKIN. Now, I will give the complete answer to that question in a letter from General Bradley which I am inserting as a part of my remarks, I would read it but I have only 1 minute.

This is the most unjust attack on General Bradley and the Veterans' Administration I have ever heard. It sounds like communism to me.

Mr. FULTON. I am asking for information.

Mr. RANKIN. In my opinion this man Stelle is doing the Veterans' Administration a grave injustice as well as doing great harm to the American Legion.

General Bradley's letter follows:

Hon. J. E. RANKIN,
Chairman, Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. RANKIN: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of this date enclosing

a letter addressed to you, dated January 31, 1946, from Commander John Stelle, national commander of the American Legion, on which you desire information, which is furnished as follows:

I assumed office as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on August 14, 1945. The following facts are presented as a review of the operations of the Veterans' Administration since that date and facts pertaining to the current load of work.

Separations from the armed services from October 1, 1940, to July 31, 1945, were 2,688,600. From August 1, 1945, to December 31 of that year there were 5,656,000 separations, making a total of 8,344,000 separations from service in World War II. The estimated separations from active service for January 1946 are 1,180,000, making a grand total of 9,524,000 veterans who have served in World War II. By an examination of these figures it will be noted that 28 percent of the total separations were accomplished in 5 years and 72 percent during the last 6 months. This will give you some idea of the accelerated load which the Veterans' Administration has had to assume during my administration.

DISABILITY PENSION CLAIMS

On August 1, 1945, there had been filed 985,182 disability pension claims by veterans of World War II; of this number, 120,920 were pending; 283,262 had been adjudicated; 616,467 had been allowed, and 266,795 had been disallowed. The percentage of allowed claims as of August 1, 1945, was 74.6.

On December 31, 1945, 1,820,093 disability claims had been filed; of this number 392,642 were pending; 1,427,451 had been adjudicated; 967,141 had been allowed, and 460,310 disallowed. The percentage of allowed claims as of December 31, 1945, was 67.8.

The vast majority of claims now pending were filed subsequent to the veterans' discharge, and, according to a recent survey made in the territory of one of the Veterans' Administration branch offices, 77 percent of the cases pending were awaiting AGO records from the Service Department. It is not possible to adjudicate these cases until the Service Department records are received. Based on available information, it is indicated that this percentage of 77 percent represents an over-all picture.

Insofar as the claims of veterans, who are discharged from service on certificate of disability, are concerned, they are handled without delay. In fact the Veterans' Administration adjudicates these claims within 3 to 5 days of the receipt of the claim in our area offices. These offices were established for the specific purpose of rendering expedited action in this class of cases and this procedure has proven to be most effective. The area offices have adjudicated over 600,000 disability claims.

It is desired to emphasize that the Veterans' Administration is handling the claims of those veterans who are discharged on a certificate of disability without any delay whatsoever.

The Veterans' Administration has used every expedient possible to adjudicate the claims filed by veterans without delay. As indicated above, the veterans who have been discharged because of disability, numbering in excess of 600,000, certainly the most meritorious group, have been adjudicated through the area office procedure set up for this purpose. There has never been any appreciable delay in the adjudication of cases of this character. As those taper off, the area offices are being utilized to adjudicate cases initially claims of naval veterans discharged through naval discharge centers. This is made possible by the practice of the Navy Department which enables them to furnish, in the great majority of cases, the veterans' complete records. Special procedures have been set up with the Army separation centers whereby essential records are immediately forwarded to the Veterans' Administration when the veteran files claim at the center. These are used wherever adequate to allow the claim. Other records automatically follow which permit the adjudication of many cases. Recently the Army because of many reasons—the rapidity of demobilization, the move of records to St. Louis, the great influx of records from overseas—has been unable to furnish the military records with the desired dispatch. However, this is a temporary condition, and in order to assist the veterans it is immediately establishing a liaison group of its own employees in St. Louis.

Insofar as the withdrawal of the records of the living veterans from the regional offices to the branch offices is concerned it has never been contemplated that the branch offices will adjudicate the claims of the living veterans. The regional offices will continue to adjudicate the claims of the living veterans and, at the present time, it is contemplated that there will be a further decentralization of the claims of living veterans to the regional offices.

INSURANCE

Pertaining to the specific items cited in Commander Stelle's letter, concerning waiver of premiums on national service life insurance, 20,411 may seem a large pending load without analysis. It should be understood that over half of these pending claims cannot be acted upon by the Veterans' Administration until further evidence, which it has requested, has been supplied. During the week ending January 19, 1946, 6,506 claims for waiver of premiums were adjudicated so that the real pending load of claims we now have represent only 10 days' work. It is believed pertinent to state that in excess of 360,000 waiver-of-premium claims have been filed; almost half of this number, or over 153,000, have been received since August 1, 1945, with approximately 160,000 adjudications having been made subsequent to that date. It would seem that a load slightly in excess of 20,000 pending claims of a total of 360,000 claims of this character would not support an allegation of failure to take action.

HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION

In our currently authorized construction program, 27 projects are now under construction, most of which consist of additions to existing hospitals. These projects include a total of 10,702 additional beds, the large majority of which are fast approaching completion. However, in our construction program, of the 41 new hospitals on which actual construction has not been started we have completed inspections at 35 locations and secured Presidential approval for the acquisition of 21 of these sites.

It must be understood that considerable time must of necessity be consumed in connection with the establishment of a new hospital and in making inspections and selection of available sites, in securing Presidential approval of the acquisition and in the actual acquisition of title to the property.

Estimated plans for hospitals of various capacities are being developed which, when approved, will greatly accelerate completion of this building program.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION AND EDUCATION (PUBLIC LAWS 16 AND 346)

It is alleged by your correspondent that 102,830 unprocessed applications for education and training under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act are pending. As of December 31, 1945, which is the latest figure we have on this item, there were 69,463 claims in a pending status.

On August 1, 1945, 96,828 had applied for education and training under Public Law 346. On December 31, 1945, 454,489 had applied for education and training under Public Law 346—22,813 applications were received during the month of August, 45,095 during the month of September, 62,114 month of October, 97,439 month of November, and 130,200 in the month of December. Prior to August 1, 1945, the monthly increase in claims approximated 7,000 applications a month.

In training, as of December 31, 1945, there were 91,176 veterans. Two hundred and fifty-eight thousand seven hundred and eighty-one veterans had received their certificates of eligibility and were awaiting entrance into training, i. e., they may not have elected courses of education or training or were waiting to begin their courses of education or training or acceptance by the educational or training institution.

While your correspondent did not mention the vocational rehabilitation program under Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, there were 14,771 veterans who had not initiated their advisement and guidance and 37,804 veterans were undergoing advisement and guidance on December 31, 1945. Twenty thousand one hundred and fifty-five veterans were awaiting induction into training. On August 1, 1945, 89,961 veterans had applied for courses of rehabilitation. On December 31, 1945, 202,884 had applied for vocational rehabilitation—14,641 applications were received in August, 24,031 in September, 27,990 in October, 24,586 in November, 21,675 in the month of December. There were in training, as of December 31, 1945, 40,222.

During the month of December, I issued instructions to speed up the payment of subsistence allowances to veterans receiving education or training under Public Law 346 which involved a major change in one of the established procedures of the Veterans' Administration. Because of the provisions of Public Law 268, approved on December 28, 1945, I was also able to issue instructions to speed up the payment of allowances to disabled veterans pursuing courses of vocational rehabilitation under Public Law 16. The instructions implementing the law which was passed on December 28, 1945, were issued to our field offices within 15 days after this law became effective.

I am convinced that with the perfection of our supervisory forces in the 13 branch offices, the extension of this work to subregional offices and constant study for the purpose of eliminating unnecessary operations, we should be able to handle the load under both Public Laws 16 and 346.

STATUS OF DEATH PENSION CLAIMS, WORLD WAR II AND NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE DEATH CLAIMS

The following is the status of these claims as of August 1, 1945, and February 1, 1946:

Death pension claims, World War II

	Aug. 1, 1945	Feb. 1, 1946
Total cases in file	154,952	213,000
Total cases pending	27,103	22,000
Total cases adjudicated	127,849	191,000
Total cases allowed	106,857	162,000
Total cases disallowed	20,992	29,000
Total pensioners on roll	103,882	157,000

National service life insurance death claims

	Total claims received	Allowed	Disallowed	Pending
Aug. 1, 1945	380,172	344,545	7,726	27,901
Feb. 1, 1946	486,668	459,400	10,820	16,448

Oct. 1, 1945, peak month in point of national service life insurance claims allowed, 29,963.

READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCES

In the first week of August 1945, 44,184 unemployed veterans received readjustment allowances, compared to 940,262 for the week

ending January 26, 1946. These payments during the 6 months' period totaled $167,851,366.

LOAN GUARANTIES

Forty-two thousand three hundred and fifty-six applications for loan guaranties were approved during the period August 1, 1945, to January 19, 1946, with 318,000 pending as of the latter date.

This office is fully aware of the tremendous job that lies before the Veterans' Administration as well as its pending load. With that in mind, and because of handicaps being experienced in respect to lack of sufficient administrative space and personnel, on January 19, 1946, I issued telegraphic instructions to all deputy administrators as follows:

"Following telegram sent all regional managers today: 'Although commendable reports have been made to reduce pending load, statistics available indicate work in arrears majority regional offices in mail and records, adjudication, rehabilitation, medical examinations for rating purposes. Authority has already been delegated for employment additional personnel to permit second or third shifts if necessary where delay is due to lack of space and where work cannot be kept current by overtime. Authority permits full utilization of physicians on fee basis. You are directed to exercise authority already delegated to employ second and third shifts if necessary to insure maintenance of currency in mail and records and other divisions of your office. Transfer unit must operate so as to clear transfer cases on 48-hour basis. All separation records must be alphabetized and cabinet filed immediately. You are directed to staff all divisions if necessary on three-shift basis with night differential to accommodate overload when mail and records clears.' Deputy Administrators will immediately assume supervisory authority to assure that instructions to managers are carried out. In event difficulty experienced in recruiting new employees advise Assistant Administrator for Personnel at once indicating specific needs by type of job."

Moreover, with a full appreciation of the tremendous load ahead in connection with carrying out the provisions of law pertaining to vocational rehabilitation and education, instructions are now in the process of completion to further decentralize certain activities of this work from regional offices to subregional offices, which would serve to accelerate the accomplishment of this program.

Sincerely yours,

OMAR N. BRADLEY,
General, United States Army,
Administrator.

Strikes Have Gone Far Enough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 1 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Strikes Have Gone Far Enough," published in the Arkansas Democrat, of Little Rock, Ark., of January 14, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRIKES HAVE GONE FAR ENOUGH

The first duty of government is to maintain order, to insure the basic rights of all the people, so they may go on in security with their daily affairs, working, producing, selling, and buying.

All else comes after that. When government fails in that duty, it fails to govern in the true sense of the word. When it allows any group to flout the public welfare, to set itself up as a superior force, shoving the majority around to gain its own ends, then we do not have government.

We have anarchy. We have a lawless rule of the many by a few.

The Nation is perilously near that situation now, if not actually in it. Strikers have been swinging their picket lines across the land, closing plants which are essential to the Nation's welfare, and promising to close more.

A small fraction of the Nation's workers are paralyzing its economic life. Other workers refuse to cross their picket lines. Many related plants depend for supplies on the ones closed by strikes, and cannot operate without them.

Strikes cannot be stopped entirely, of course. It would be wrong to do so, if it were possible. There have been cases, and there may be more, when the strike was labor's only weapon of defense for fundamental rights. There is employer greed as well as labor greed.

But it is the Government's solemn duty to see that labor is brought under the law, just as was done with business when it became big and powerful, and sometimes ruthless. For the public good, and for the preservation of our democracy, the Government is obligated to act.

Frequently, labor now has no respect for its contracts. A steel strike has been voted in violation of a contract which pledged no strikes during its life, and it runs till next fall. There has been a plague of wildcat strikes, of strikes over which union had jurisdiction of certain work in a plant, and of sympathy strikes where there was no grievance—just to back up some union demand maybe hundreds of miles away.

For all of this the public pays. It is in effect a conspiracy against the public peace and welfare. It is a restraint of trade as vicious as any trust ever attempted. It is undemocratic, unchristian, outrageous.

President Truman's fact-finding proposal is not the required remedy. In a preliminary test, General Motors has refused to accept the findings. A union could refuse as well. The findings would have no force, even if sanctioned by the law the President wants.

It is up to Congress to draft something stronger. The remedy is to make the unions liable for irresponsible conduct. This near-anarchy of allowing labor and management to slug out their differences over any matter at all, at the public expense, has gone far enough. Tell your Congressman and Senators that you want action.

Veterans' Administration

REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 1, 1946

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I am speaking today as a veteran of World War II about the other veterans that have not been taken care of. I, too, have received a letter from the American Legion, from John Stelle, national commander, of the Washington headquarters.

He states to me that there are now 500,000 applications for service-connected ratings for compensation purposes which have not been processed by the Veterans' Administration today. Also, that there is delay in new hospital construction required for the 500,000 applications for service-connected disabilities. He stated that these are not being taken care of because the available beds are not adequately being used and the hospitals are not being constructed immediately. I feel that unless something is done to open the thousands of unopened letters which he states are in the Veterans' Administration we will have a complete breakdown of the legislation passed for the protection of our World War II veterans. We in Congress want to see that these laws which we passed are enforced, and as a veteran myself I want to speak out, courageously I hope, against this threatened breakdown of the Veterans' Administration. I ask for an immediate answer from the Veterans' Administration, not to myself, but for public information.

(The letter referred to follows:)

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, D. C., January 31, 1946.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: A survey conducted throughout the Nation by the American Legion discloses that in the central offices in Washington and regional offices throughout the country there has been a tragic break-down in the administration of the law pertaining to the care and the treatment of the veterans who are the special charges of the Veterans' Administration. Amongst other delinquencies we have found there are over 500,000 applications for service-connected ratings for compensation purposes, which have not been processed by the Veterans' Administration; 7,840 pending applications for hospitalization awaiting process; 102,830 applications for education and training under title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act which have not been processed; and literally hundreds of thousands of unopened letters pertaining to various phases of veterans' benefits and insurance claims in Veterans' Administration offices throughout the Nation; 20,411 pending claims for waivers of premium on national service life insurance due to total and permanent disability; and 18,847 pending death claims undisposed of.

It is apparent from the above figures that the great promise of our Government to the returning veteran that he would be adequately cared for, together with his widow and orphans, is not being fulfilled by the present administration of the act.

It must be borne in mind that the figures given above are absolute minimum figures reflecting the extent of the neglect, since the American Legion is unable to have access to the fullest extent to the records of the Veterans' Administration. Our investigation discloses that there has been an apparent unwillingness on the part of the Veterans' Administration to utilize the staffed hospital beds available in Army and Navy hospitals throughout the country to service those in need of hospitalization in this emergency.

It further appears that although the Veterans' Administration has been given authority and ample appropriations for the construction of hospitals in various States to meet the present and impending heavy hospital load reflected in the 500,000 pending applications for service-connected disabilities, nevertheless, there is undue and persistent delay in new hospital construction. The American Legion has been advised that thousands of beds are now available in Army and Navy hospitals throughout the country, adequately staffed with doctors and nurses which could be used in the emergency.

There appears to be no disposition on the part of the Veterans' Administration to make adequate or complete use of these beds. Only 7,848 of these beds have been accepted by the Veterans' Administration.

The American Legion feels that the time has come when it must speak positively of the dereliction of the Veterans' Administration in order that our people will see to it, through their Representatives in Congress, that the Government keeps faith with those who sacrificed in its defense.

The American Legion, and we believe the American people, demand that Congress take immediate action to see that its mandates are not longer ignored by the Veterans' Administration; that measures for emergency hospitalization be adopted at once; that the authorized program for hospital construction be immediately launched, and that the unjustifiable and unwarranted delay in processing claims for benefits under the law be eliminated.

Yours very sincerely,

JOHN STELLE,
National Commander.

Proposed Independent State of Trans-Jordan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 1 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter sent to Hon. Dean Acheson, Acting Secretary of State, by the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation, regarding the separation of the territory of Trans-Jordan from Palestine, as advocated by the Foreign Secretary of Great Britain, Mr. Ernest Bevin, in his speech before the United Nations Organization.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 19, 1946.

The Hon. DEAN ACHESON,
Acting Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: On behalf of the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation, we are writing to request the consideration and assistance of the Government of the United States in the following matter.

The Government of Great Britain has announced its intention to proceed with the establishment of an "independent state of Trans-Jordan." While we welcome every instance of granting independence to peoples hitherto deprived of statehood, we wish to state our strongest objection to the announced intention of the Government of Great Britain in this particular case.

We submit that such action would be in strict violation of the clear international obligations undertaken by His Majesty's Government as specified in the Anglo-American Convention of 1924, as well as in utter disagreement with the mandate issued by the League of Nations for Palestine.

The territory referred to as Trans-Jordan is an integral part of Palestine, clearly included within the boundaries of Palestine as specified in the mandate of the League of Nations under which Palestine was entrusted to Great Britain for the purpose of reconstituting that country as the national home of the Hebrew people.

This territory, referred to as Trans-Jordan, comprises 34,740 square miles and is very sparsely populated. Even with the inclusion of the wandering Bedouin tribes, the population numbers around 400,000. In 1922 this province was separated from the rest of Palestine in its administration by enforcing an arbitrary interpretation of article 25 of the mandate, thus leaving some 10,000 square miles (western Palestine) with a total population of 1,700,000. But at all times the province of Trans-Jordan remained under the jurisdiction and the control of the High Commissioner of Palestine and its budget was provided by the Treasury of Palestine, raised through taxes from the people of Palestine. Thus, even the most far-reaching interpretation of article 25 and the practice and policy of the colonial office imply that Trans-Jordan was at all times considered part of Palestine.

Furthermore, such a separation is contrary to the basic interests and welfare of the population. The comparison between the status of the residents of the western and eastern parts of Palestine speaks for itself. The average resident in the western part of Palestine has an incomparably higher standard of living, of health and education than in the province of Trans-Jordan, where the population is largely illiterate, disease-ridden, and in a permanent state of semistarvation.

Any effort to grant independence to Trans-Jordan is an obvious endeavor of a coup d'état in order to deprive the Hebrew people of three-fourths of their national territory which is theirs from the time immemorial by the will of God and which has been recognized as such in modern times by the mandate of the League of Nations.

The British Government is in control of Palestine's 45,000 square miles as a trustee and guardian by virtue of authority given to her by the League of Nations. Now that the United Nations Organization is in existence, the British Government is duty-bound to return the authority over the territory of Palestine to the United Nations Organization, which will take the necessary steps to effectuate the fulfillment of the original League of Nations mandate. Pending such action by Great Britain, it could not possibly grant "independence" to any one part of Palestine over which it has no sovereignty.

As a small nation which is still denied a seat on the United Nations Organization, we appeal for the protection of the Government of the United States against this latest effort to deprive us of our own territory and our internationally recognized right to it.

This comes at a time when hundreds of thousands of Hebrews are being prevented by force of arms from entering their own country. We wish to condemn before the entire civilized world the cruel treatment thus offered a loyal and fighting ally in the common war that has just been won with so much sacrifice and blood.

Appealing for the assistance of the Government of the United States, the Hebrew committee wishes to stress that under the terms of the Anglo-American Convention of 1924 and preceding correspondence between the two governments, any change in the terms of the mandate requires previous consultation with and the consent of the Government of the United States. We wish to express, therefore, our most confident hope that Your Excellency will institute the necessary measures to provide for Great Britain's adherence to the terms of her treaty with your Government and to her other international obligations pertaining to Palestine.

With assurances of my highest esteem and appreciation, I beg to remain, Your Excellency,

Faithfully yours,

PETER H. BERGSON,
Chairman.

Increase in Wages and Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 1 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Strange Contradiction," dealing with proposed increases in wages and the danger of inflation, published in the Arkansas Democrat, of Little Rock, Ark., January 23, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRANGE CONTRADICTION

There is a strange contradiction in the President's message to Congress.

On the one hand, he warns of the danger of inflation—that is, a runaway of living costs. He suggests certain measures to halt this calamity, already started. Two of them look to holding down on the amount of money in circulation. They thus strike at the cause of inflation, which is people having more money to buy with than there are goods to buy.

One of these proposals is reduced Government spending. The Federal Budget would be balanced at a lower out-go figure, against estimated tax receipts, helped out by using a few billions of cash now in the Treasury.

Then, the President would keep taxes where they are—no further reduction.

So the Government would be pouring less money into circulation, and taxes would continue to soak up the present percentage of what people get.

In addition, the President wants his power to control prices extended.

So far, so good. But then the President swings right around and asks for a wide raising of wages. There you'd have increased buying power, more upward pressure on prices, to offset the cut in Government spending and the tax take.

It's true, the President says wages should be raised without putting prices any higher. If that could be done, the wage hikes wouldn't add to the total of money in circulation. For it would just mean that the workers would get more, and the plants would have less profit to use for plant expansion, new industries, stockholders' dividends, and the like.

But the Government has already admitted that this can't be done. Industrial profits aren't generally big enough. The Government has recommended higher steel prices, so the steelworkers can be paid an additional 18½ cents an hour. Other price increases are hinted.

And that isn't all. If union wages go up, and prices are lifted so industry can pay them, what about the millions of farmers, professional people and unorganized workers, who cannot expect increased incomes?

Their one good chance of a raise is to get the equivalent of it in lower prices and taxes. But the President's program would defeat that, and worse—they would pay higher prices.

It's a strange contradiction—a dangerous one for the majority of our people. They should speak out about it to their Congressmen.

Reasonable wage increases, where justified—yes. But, above all, get production to going. Enough goods to buy is the one sure way to prevent inflation.

Veterans' Affairs

REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 1, 1946

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the controversy between the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. Like every other Member of the House, I, too, received a letter this morning from the national commander of the American Legion. I receive complaints from veterans almost daily. I would like to know just where the trouble lies. About a month ago I referred a communication to General Bradley in connection with 20 boys in my district who have returned from the service and who are going to college and who are supposed to be paid, under the GI bill of rights, the benefits to which they are entitled. Why are those payments, some of which have been overdue since February and March of last year, not paid? Why is it I have to wait for a month or so to get some sort of a reply from General Bradley?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. In the first place, the law was not passed that long ago. In the second place, the amended GI bill was only passed a month or two ago. In the third place, General Bradley told me himself that he was having trouble getting enough help.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Is it lack of funds appropriated, or is it because he cannot get the personnel?

Mr. RANKIN. He just cannot get the personnel.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. The gentleman must agree there is something wrong somewhere, and if the Congress can correct it, we should take steps to do so.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman must understand that we had several times as many men in this war as in the First World War. Our casualty list was greater, and our disability list was a great deal larger. General Bradley has only been head of the Veterans' Administration for a short time. General Hawley has only been head of the Medical Service for a short time. They are doing the very best they can, and are working overtime trying to meet these conditions. A great deal of this stuff in Stelle's letter is exaggerated.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I am particularly disturbed over Mr. Stelle's reference to the need for additional hospital beds, and the delay in new hospital construction. Two service hospitals in my district, the Dibble General Hospital, Army, and the Santa Cruz Convalescent Hospital, Navy, are to be closed prior to the end of the present fiscal year. The Veterans' Administration has indicated that they have no desire to use the excellent facilities at either of these institutions. Something is wrong somewhere, Mr. Speaker, and it is up to Congress to find the answer.

Ben Toland

REMARKS
OF
HON. SHERMAN ADAMS
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 1, 1946

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, there have been few boys like Ben Toland. In giving his life in the service of his country as a marine on Iwo Jima, his life closed not much differently than thousands of other boys. In that he loved his God and his country, and in that he believed in sound government, education, and in industrial peace—he shared the creed common to all American boys. But the unusual thing about Ben Toland was the way in which he expressed it. Before he died he made a will. On this day, when Congress and the people are considering the problems of those who work and those who hire, it is significant to recall that Ben Toland gave 40 percent of all he had to promote the peaceful settlement of the differences which are of common concern to us all. Ben Toland gave 20 percent of all that he had to the Congress to promote efficient government; he gave 30 percent to his schools, and 10 percent to charity and to his church. Ben Toland gave his life to his country, and his material possessions to make it a better place in which to live.

It seems to me appropriate that in the work in which we are presently engaged we, in all humility, recall the deeds of this New Hampshire boy who gave everything he had in the interest of a better country.

I include as a part of my remarks the following article:

HE, TOO, WAS SEEKING "GOOD WILL AMONG MEN"

No one ordered the 24-year-old marine lieutenant to take over the wounded officer's platoon, which was to storm the ridge.

First Lt. Ben Toland, of Concord, N. H., simply took command, charged the ridge "where every 10 yards cost a life," and was laying out air markers to show the new position when the mortar burst hit. He died instantly, there on the barren, bloody slopes of Iwo Jima just a few weeks after last Christmas, on February 21, 1945.

Later they found his will.

It was just a handwritten note from a marine going into battle. Perhaps it does not speak for all the 5,000 marines who died on Iwo Jima, but certainly there is a message for Americans in the last thoughts of this scholarly youth. He was a junior, a Phi Beta Kappa, at Yale; his mother, Mrs. Esther Toland, is Republican national committeewoman from New Hampshire.

Ben Toland wanted peace between labor and management.

He gave nearly half of his modest estate—40 percent (about $1,500)—for the settlement of their problems. Ten percent each goes to the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L.; 20 percent goes to the National Association of Manufacturers.

Ben Toland wanted a sound national government.

His attorney, Frank J. Sulloway, of Concord, who is national committeeman from New Hampshire, says that although it cannot be accepted, Lieutenant Toland wished to bequeath 20 percent "to the Congress * * * to promote efficient government in the interests of all the people in the country instead of merely the organized pressure groups, and to promote a farsighted foreign policy."

Ben Toland believed in education.

To his schools, St. Paul's, of Concord, and Yale University, he left 20 percent and 10 percent, respectively.

Ben Toland believed in God.

The remaining tenth—perhaps intended as his final tithe—was bequeathed 5 percent to the New York Times Christmas charity known as the One Hundred Neediest Cases, and 5 percent to the Protestant Episcopal Church "to bring the kingdom of God nearer to earth and the earth nearer to the kingdom of God."

This was the will of a marine who volunteered his life and gave all his worldly goods for a better America.

The Case Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERKELEY L. BUNKER
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 1, 1946

Mr. BUNKER. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post is one of the Nation's great newspapers. Its expressions on governmental affairs are sound and conservative. That is particularly true of the editorial, Coup in the House, that appeared in the Post's editorial columns this morning. It lends weight to the contentions of many of us that the House Rules Committee has drifted far from the Democratic paths and the judicial role its originators intended. The time when public opinion will demand an end to the practices in which the Rules Committee indulges can only be hastened by such decisions as it made in the Case bill. Here is the editorial:

COUP IN THE HOUSE

We see no prospect that the House Rules Committee's coup will give the Nation the sound labor disputes policy for which it is yearning. The Case bill which the committee is sponsoring embodies a number of constructive ideas, but it would also invoke some dangerous methods that might do more harm than good. To this must be added the fact that it is to be placed before the House by illegitimate means. It has not been passed upon by the Committee on Labor or by any other legislative committee. Instead it will go before the House by fiat of the Rules Committee, for the rule under which the fact-finding bill is being debated makes it possible to substitute the Case bill for the administration's measure when the general debate is over. No other bill may thus be substituted. In effect, the Rules Committee has usurped the right of initiating legislation.

The bill itself has grave defects which the House can scarcely be expected to correct on the floor. It would set up a "labor-management mediation board" composed of representatives of employers and employees as well as the public. Since the purpose of the board would be to protect the public interest and to aid the disputants in reaching an agreement, we think its members should represent only the Government. As a matter of good organization, moreover, such an agency should be set up within the Labor Department and should absorb the existing

Conciliation Service. However, no mention of that agency is made in the bill.

The specific duty of bargaining collectively would be laid upon both management and labor. In case of continued disagreement, the board or its local or regional agents could step in to assist a settlement. The chairman could order the parties not to strike or to change working conditions for 30 days. So far so good. But the bill goes on to provide for enforcement of such orders by court injunctions. We doubt that such enforcement would be either effective or proper. The Railway Labor Act after which this machinery is patterned is wholly voluntary. The board would have other means of making its influence felt in the end. Under effective board action the noncooperating party would likely come out on the losing end of the dispute. Cooperation would thus tend to become a national habit, as it is in the railway industry.

We are wholly in sympathy with the idea of making labor contracts binding, as this bill undertakes to do. Obviously, too, Congress should protect employers as well as employees against the use of violence and intimidation. Nowadays unions turn strikes into sieges of industrial plants. Ways must be found to combat such violence. Likewise we think it is wholly reasonable to withdraw the protection of the National Labor Relations Act from employees who are found guilty of violence, intimidation or unlawful destruction of property in connection with a strike.

The trouble with the Case bill is that a number of sound objectives have been tangled up with extreme and unworkable provisions. It needs precisely the sort of pruning and revision that a good legislative committee could give it. Considering the deficiencies of both the revised fact-finding bill before the House and the Case bill, it looks as if the country will have to rely upon the Senate for the initiation of well-balanced labor disputes legislation.

Relief for Starving People of Europe

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 1, 1946

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced in the House a companion resolution to Senate Concurrent Resolution 51, the purpose of which is to set up a joint committee to be composed of six Members of the Senate—three from the majority party and three from the minority parties—appointed by the President of the Senate and six Members of the House of Representatives—three from the majority party and three from the minority parties—appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives which will be directed to make an official visit to Germany and such other places in Europe as may be necessary for the purpose of enabling the committee to make studies and obtain information with respect to existing conditions in Germany and action which may be taken by the President or the Congress to improve such conditions. The joint congressional group shall make a report to the Congress at the earliest practicable date but not later than 1 month after the adoption of this resolution with respect to such conditions and its recommendation for legislative or other action designed to improve such conditions.

Very briefly, Mr. Speaker, under the Potsdam agreement, the United States Government has unwittingly become a partner to mass starvation, particularly in Germany, contrary to the established and humanitarian concepts of international law, which have always placed upon the victor the responsibility of protecting to the best of its ability the innocent victims of the population conquered. Our present policies and practices are contrary to every concept of the Christian religion which has made this country great against the humanitarian principles which have always prevailed in the thought, the heart, and soul of the American people. We now find our Government to be in partnership in the occupation of Germany in enforcing policies that are starving millions of innocent women and children to death in that occupied territory. I know this will be almost unbelievable to the rank and file of the American people, yet it is a fact that cannot be denied; and unless it is corrected the seeds of hate will be so widely sown in that industrial section of Europe against the American Nation that we will have planted the seeds of World War III in the future, and our actions will drive the people in our territory of occupation as soon as we quit our job there into the ranks of communism, which will doubtless bring about an amalgamation of these people with Russia which will overflow France, which is now greatly affected by that ideology of government, and will completely communize the continent of Europe.

The administration and the personal advisors and investigators of the President concur in the judgment that a major tragedy is rapidly developing in Europe. But in answer to a rising chorus of pleas for intercession and action, the administration has refused to move. It will be news to the people of America in general to learn that the people of Germany are receiving only 1,500 calories a day, and many less than that amount, which the highest medical authority in Europe or elsewhere regards as a starvation diet.

It will further be news to the people to know that a great many of the Protestant church relief organizations and the Catholic church relief organizations are aware of this condition and have been imploring the President and the Congress to do something about it, and it will be news to the American people to learn that even though these church organizations of which I have spoken have pleaded with the administration to allow such organizations and the people of this country to send packages of food and money to relatives and the people generally in Germany and for the purpose of preserving the lives of the mothers and children of Germany, all of these requests so far have been denied.

These church relief organizations, including the great Quaker relief organization, believe that the humanitarian instincts of the American people are so strong that if the administration in Washington will lift the ban and allow those who want to help, shiploads of flour, food, medicine, and clothing can be sent to Europe in such quantities purely on a volunteer basis, that it will to a great extent furnish such relief as will save the lives of hundreds of thousands of women and children who, without it, will die before spring.

Back in October, a delegation representing 43 international organizations in the United States headed by Mrs. Dwight W. Morrow, chairman of the Food for Freedom Organizations, called upon the President to urge more generous overseas relief for Europe. Among the more than 40 organizations included were the CIO, the A. F. of L., the Federal Council of Churches, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the Farmers Union, and others.

Mrs. Morrow was the spokesman of the delegation. The report was that Mr. Truman's attitude was bristling, hostile. It is obvious that the slow awakening of the American people to the terrible tragedy and crime against humanity to which our Nation was committed at the Potsdam Conference is beginning to be understood by the American people.

A report on September 15 from one of the leading Quaker organizations on the ground in Europe made this statement:

> No child born in Germany this year will survive the coming winter. Only half the children aged less than 3 years will survive.

This was reported to the British press, which has been reporting such instances time and again while the American press seems to have been completely gagged.

On October 4 a British major is quoted in the London Daily Mirror as follows:

> The greatest horror in modern history is taking place in eastern Germany. Many millions of German people have been ejected onto the roads * * * are dying by the thousands on the roads from starvation, dysentery, and exhaustion. Even a cursory visit to the hospitals in Berlin is an experience which would make the sights in the concentration camps appear normal.

On October 12 a correspondent, writing for a publication known as the Friend, published in London, had the following to say:

> In the forest around Berlin countless dead are hanging from the trees. One becomes indifferent to death. Mothers see their children die and bury them by the wayside apparently with none of that pain which usually tears a mother's heart apart. If this misery cannot be checked it is no exaggeration to reckon on a figure of 20,000,000 dead this winter.

The London Observer stated that not only Germany but also Europe is threatened by a catastrophe which has no precedent since the Black death in 1348.

On November 14 the Christian Century carried the following plea which had been issued by a joint committee of the World Council of Churches, the International Red Cross, the World Jewish Congress, and the Save the Children International Union and Catholic Charities:

> Children by the millions are in imminent danger of starving and freezing as winter comes to Europe unless immediate help comes. Helpless children cannot survive much longer unless there is a united effort to save them.

The Christian Century continued:

It is time for the Christian conscience to cry, Stop, stop this torture of helpless war victims. The policy being followed in central Europe is ghastly. It is unnecessary. It is a repudiation of Christian charity and a defiance of Christian morality.

On November 28 the Christian Century made the further charge:

Silent concurrence by the churches in murder by starvation makes the church an accessory to the crime. As a result of the Potsdam decisions, millions of Germans are starving now.

In the November issue of the Lutheran Outlook the following protest was recorded:

Inhumanity and even brutality are being practiced in a manner that is shocking to the Christian conscience. Millions of human beings are on the verge of starvation, and yet, in America at least, there appears to be no official cognizance of the fact. The American people are being kept strangely in ignorance of the awful catastrophe that has befallen a large part of the world's population. We raise a voice in solemn protest against the inhumanity which today is being practiced by the victor nations against the German people and we do plead for pity and mercy for the millions of innocent children who are now become the chief victims of the judgment which has fall'

On December 11, a delegation of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America returned from an investigation of conditions in Germany. They warned that expulsion of millions of Germans from their homes had caused unspeakable hardship, and that the persons who were trying to get into the Reich were without food, shelter, clothing, or medical supplies. They voiced an urgent appeal for aid to the German people.

Mr. Speaker, the late President Roosevelt in a broadcast to the German people in asking them to overthrow Hitler and the Nazi regime assured them that our fight and effort was to destroy not the German people but the Nazi Fascist form of government and promised the German people protection.

None of us in Congress and few Americans believe in a soft peace for Germany. In our trial of war criminals we have begun at the top in rounding up the leaders of the Nazi Fascist Party in order to bring them to trial possibly by the thousands before we are through. Doubtless most of them will eventually be put to death as they should be. Our purpose, President Roosevelt proclaimed during the war, was to destroy the Nazi Fascist ideology of government with the hope that when the destruction had been brought about the people of Germany might be won over to a peaceful democratic type of government. We want to make it impossible for them to again develop the instruments for another war. But certainly, we have changed our course completely since the late President Roosevelt assured the German people in his broadcasts during the war that we would protect them and not attempt to destroy them.

We have not kept the word of the Nation. We are destroying the innocent women and children of that nation, we are sowing the seeds of hatred in the generations to come, we are planting the seeds of another war, we are going directly contrary to the Christian concepts and humanitarian ideals which have caused America to be honored and respected throughout the world.

I hope the Members of the House will pass this resolution to dispatch a committee of the Congress without delay to Europe to bring back the facts to the American people. General Eisenhower, at the close of the war, did the Nation a great service when he called for a committee to be sent to Europe to view the horrors of the concentration camps which committee brought back the true picture to the American people. Certainly, it is time for us to view the picture again and to determine without question or error what is the situation in Germany today. When the American people have the facts then they will be able to deal with the question. It is to be hoped that before this happens the President in some way will arrange to lift the ban on the sending of packages and of food and medicine to help preserve the lives at least of the infants and little children of Germany who are starving to death daily by the thousands according to every authentic report coming out of Germany at the present.

Truman Bidding United States To Accept Marxian Ideas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 1, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Samuel Crowther from the New York Journal-American:

TRUMAN BIDDING UNITED STATES TO ACCEPT MARXIAN IDEAS

(By Samuel Crowther)

President Truman's message to the Congress in which he combined a message on the State of the Union with a message on the Budget is a long and dreary document taken as a document. So is the Communist manifesto.

President Truman dealing with the State of the Union has brought together, using a few more words, what he said on domestic affairs in his radio address of January 3 and what he said on foreign affairs in his address on Navy Day. The part of the message dealing with the Budget is merely arithmetic of a sort.

REPLACES ORIGINAL PRINCIPLES

Nevertheless this message, in spite of its dreariness, in spite of its masses of words that convey no ideas and in spite of the good intentions that wander through the text like homeless orphans in a crowd, must be set as a historic one.

It marks the first time that a President of the United States has asked the Congress to abandon the principles on which our American state was founded and to adopt a new set of principles directly repugnant to them.

And all this is the more remarkable because the man who is asking for socialism does not believe in socialism and does not know he is asking for it.

These are the words in which President Truman definitely denounces the American ideal:

"There is no question in my mind that the Government acting on behalf of all the people must assume the ultimate responsibility for the economic health of the Nation.

"There is no other agency that can. No other organization has the scope or the authority nor is any other agency accountable to all the people."

APPLIES MARXIAN CREED TO UNITED STATES

This is a direct proposal that the Marxian creed—not in theory but as it has worked out in practice—shall be applied to the citizens of the United States.

This means that they must be submerged as individuals and become serfs in an all-powerful state, living or dying at the will of the politicians who are in control.

That was the kind of state Mussolini was driven into making after seizing power to rescue his country from chaos; that was the sort of state that Hitler was driven into making after seizing power to bring his country out of chaos.

There is no point short of the absolute at which a government can stop once it assumes responsibility for the economic health of its people.

That is well known to every modern revolutionist. That is well known to those inner circles in Washington who control the puppets holding our principal offices, and that is why these inner circles, as has just been pointed out in the series The Tragedy of Truman, are so well satisfied with the way events in this country are shaping up.

ADVOCATES CIO PROGRAM

The titular officers of the administration are being pressed to ask for more control, on the ground that more control now will mean less control later. Exactly the opposite is the case.

The notion that a price control can be held until the article comes into full supply is naive, but the promotion of the thought is sinister, for any article on which there is a price control can never come into large supply, because price control is production control.

The President, having been persuaded that there is a way by which a man who has mortgaged his property to the hilt and spent all his money can keep right on spending by some magic creation of purchasing power, has naturally accepted the program of Sidney Hillman's PAC-CIO crowd who hang this sort of feed bag in front of their followers.

Therefore, it is not surprising that in his message he demanded, as in his radio address, the adoption of the full PAC-CIO program. He added to that program universal training, fact finding, succession to the Presidency, unification of the armed services, and a couple of items having to do with ship sales and stock piles.

FACT FINDING DEFERS ARBITRATION

He had no answer whatsoever to the near-revolution in which this country now finds itself—a long-range, socialistic program and the reiteration of his strange belief that the facts are lacking in the present labor disputes.

The fact-finding bodies thus far appointed have not proved to be impartial committees and through their seeming dominance by labor unions are doing the country a real disservice by postponing the day when arbitration on a plane of high integrity can be brought into being.

The President, in his discussion of foreign policy, chooses to ignore that through the UNO we have all but shifted our State Department to Moscow and, although we may weep over our fate of small nations, we can do nothing about them.

In the Budget message, as in his treatment of the domestic issues, the President ignores the fundamentals and elaborates the trivial-

ities. He proposes to balance the budget, not by limiting the expenditures, but by drawing on funds already in hand.

HIGH TAXES CRUSH INCENTIVE

He says nothing about really funding the debt but points with pride to an interest rate so low that individuals will not buy Government bonds as investments. The bonds will thus remain in the banks supporting a stupendous money supply for inflation.

And he gives no hope that taxes may be reduced to a point where it will pay a man to venture and to earn.

It is a strange message, in that it takes nowhere into account the state of liberty in our Union.

The President speaks not at all of the plight of the ordinary citizen who, if he is a union member, has been deprived of most of his citizenship by his union leaders; or, if he is in business for himself, is being crushed by union wages, rules, taxes, and price controls; or, if he is a white-collar man, is being pushed about by everyone.

The message might well be entitled: "A manual of what not to do if the United States is to resume its status as a great and free nation." As such it is a challenge to the Congress.

Do Congressmen Drink?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1946

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion in the public print as to whether Congressmen are heavy drinkers. My friend, Jack Pollack, discusses the matter in the January 1946 issue of This Month magazine. There are arguments pro and con. Here are Jack Pollack's own observations:

DO CONGRESSMEN DRINK?

(By Jack H. Pollack)

An alcoholic bomb dropped on Capitol Hill recently when a physician—who happened to be a Federal employee—was quoted as saying that Congress was overbrimming with liquor-loving legislators. Some lawmakers, he audaciously if somewhat imprudently charged, were unmistakable alcoholics. Others, borderline cases. Result: demon rum made the people's representatives rude, vulgar, aggressive, forgetful, and a prey to lobbyists.

This view of Congress was put forward by a capable psychiatrist on the staff of St. Elizabeths Hospital, a Washington institution supported by congressional funds. The mild-mannered, 35-year-old Dr. Michael M. Miller, told the United Press that liquor is a "major factor in Congress, and exercises a most damaging effect on legislation." In the bard's intoxicating idiom, lawmakers 'put an enemy in their mouths to steal away their brains."

Behold these Scottish symptoms, Dr. Miller contends. Don't Congressman tend to repeat their words and ideas again and again? Aren't they crude and belligerent in their shameless filibusters and home-brewed debates?

Not one to discriminate against our legislative public servants, Dr. Miller simultaneously denounced the august State Department and United States Diplomatic Corps for being "stuffy with drunks."

As was to be expected, the State Department haughtily ignored the innuendo—even though it was rumored not long ago it had requested an additional three-quarters of a million dollars appropriation to stock its embassies' cellars abroad. At the same time, our more sensitive solons, rubbing their bleary eyes, spoke up—and booted their critic out of a job.

Denying that there were dipsomaniacs under the dome, our sober statesmen scoffed at the slur. Even the upper Chamber's leading dry, Senator Arthur Capper, rushed to his colleagues' defense. Conceding that some of his thirstier conferees raised the elbow unduly—and of that he roundly disapproved—the octogenarian Kansan concluded, "I doubt that it interferes with their services."

Notwithstanding, naysayers contend that some lawmakers get so drunk at some parties thrown by a famous Washington hostess or at their own poker games that they are absent at roll call votes the following day. Press gallery cynics tell of one tipsy statesman who must be periodically dragged out of the Chamber to the recuperative cloakroom couch. Drew Pearson recently made public the dipsomania of an ex-Senator—a fact long known to Capitol insiders.

Similarly, suspicious souls point out that the House of Representatives' breakfast menu—under "pick-ups"—recommends Bromo Seltzer, aspirin, and bicarbonate; and that Dr. George W. Calver, congressional physician, in his ten commandments of health issued to his legislative patients, urges them to "drink plentifully," but adds in his own handwriting as an afterthought "of water."

Obviously, there is more than one Member of the House and the Senate who drinks too much. Since the Republic was founded, that has been so. Alcoholic abuses led to the removal of the last saloon bar in the Capitol in 1903—just as it was the excesses of Tammany politicians that led to the closing of the New York City saloons on election day.

Nevertheless, many legislators are genuine teetotalers, while others will just take an occasional sip in company. Earl Wilson, the New York Post's irrepressible saloon editor, gleefully reports that several years ago a Washington electrician finished some wiring in a Senator's office late one afternoon. A man he mistook for a clerk asked, "How would you like to sample some of the Senator's private stock?" The electrician happily obliged and on the way out murmured to a secretary, "That was a helluva nice fella who gave me that drink. Good thing the Senator did not catch us."

"That was the Senator," was the reply, "Senator Truman."

Still, as a group, Congressmen are a pretty temperate bunch. Businessmen, militarists, and newspapermen are as great if not greater drunkards. Some tycoons and junior executives, especially in urban areas, would be lost without that 5 o'clock cocktail. Army and Navy officers, even in peacetime, are heavy drinkers. And journalists, chiefly those frustrated by difficult editors and publishers, assert themselves on the rosy cup.

Unquestionably, a handful of lawmakers—even as several million fellow Americans—drink more than is good for them. One Congressman with high blood pressure drinks because his doctor tells him to. Another elder statesman, when in Bacchus' arms, will make less sense than when sober. And I remember crying in my beer with one of our ablest lawmakers shortly after a bill that he had thrown his heart and soul into, was callously voted down. Pouring himself a drink, he bitterly toasted, "To my colleagues. May they some day learn the meaning of democracy."

However, Dr. Miller is mistaken if he believes alcohol changes votes. Whether for good or evil, the legislative is too slow-moving a process to be seriously affected by liquor. Rarely is there a surprise vote. Because most legislators vote according to party lines, economic pressures, or sectional prejudices, Capitolists can and do predict votes long before they are cast. Important votes are counted weeks before the regular floor vote.

Questioned about this, Dr. Miller explained that although the United Press story had misquoted him, he strongly believed that those who blocked constructive social legislation, especially the irresponsible filibusters, were the real drunks in the Congress.

Yet the prospect of a bingeless legislative body is unfortunately not hopeful, if history is any guide. Not only General Grant but even the founding fathers were not averse to a bit of carousing. After all, they lived in an era when corn liquor was plentiful, gin the washerwoman's drink, and an outraged citizenry rose up to harass President George Washington, protesting the liquor tax during the Whisky Rebellion.

Society's attitude toward inebriety has varied from age to age. Medieval moralists held that no mortal was really drunk as long as he could differentiate a man from a haystack. In our own day, far more is required. The responsibilities of our lawmakers are too great to take a chance on tippling. Dr. Miller's outburst may have come in the nick of time to make us aware of the extent of these responsibilities.

Meanwhile, wiser, jobless Dr. Miller continues his alcoholic crusade. He lost his job in Cleveland because his successful clinic fought the penal treatment of alcoholics in the house of correction there. Rather than send daily drinkers to prison or the insane asylum, Dr. Miller urges special clinics with a medical psychotherapy and social rehabilitation program.

At present he is trying to open a private clinic to aid alcoholics. Congressmen, State Department employees, and all others, welcome.

UNO: Welcome to Westchester

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1946

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent of the House, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Standard-Star published at New Rochelle, N. Y., on Wednesday, January 9, 1946, entitled "UNO: Welcome to Westchester":

UNO: WELCOME TO WESTCHESTER

To the members of the United Nations Organization Headquarters Site Selection Committee who flew over Westchester this morning and who return tomorrow for a more intimate inspection of potential sites, Westchester extends hearty and sincere greetings of welcome.

We are not sure that Westchester has available any site which will measure up fully to the yardstick of qualifications set up by the UNO Interim Committee on Headquarters of the Preparatory Commission, particularly if permanent installations, as mentioned, require from 40 to 50 square miles. That represents roughly about one-tenth of the entire county. But if the UNO can scale down the geographical dimensions of its permanent site, we believe the county meets effectively other standards.

Regardless of whether the choice of headquarters, either temporary or permanent, be in Westchester, we wish the visiting Commission members to know that our real interest lies in the success of United Nations. That comes first.

With regard to other essential criteria as established by the Interim Committee, we can assure the UNO that here in Westchester they will find the desired accessibility to the world at large through proximity to New York City's air and steamship lines, through our own fine system of parkways, and our own new airport. Too, they will find excellent climatic conditions, favorable cultural surroundings, high public service standards, and adequate educational, health, and recreational facilities. These are all desirable criteria as set down by the committee on site selection.

Also, in conformity with the committee's yardstick of qualifications, the UNO will find in Westchester local sentiment, through public opinion and an independent press, which is strongly in support of the goals of that organization. We have no isolationist group of any consequence, we are absolutely free from any social or economic or political movements which might seek to influence the UNO, and we permit no legal disabilities or general social discriminations on the ground of race or religion.

Should the two specific sites suggested, Ophir Hall in Harrison or Rockwood Hall in Mount Pleasant, be too small, as appears most certain under presently mentioned requirements as to size, we suggest the UNO committee might well consider an area including both Westchester and adjoining Fairfield County in Connecticut, including the southeastern portions of the towns of North Castle and Bouridge and the northern portion of Fairfield County, near the Round Hill section of Greenwich.

In that area there are many square miles thinly populated, with consequent less hardship through displacement of any large number of homes; there is immediate proximity to the county airport at Rye Lake, adjacent are the Merritt and Hutchinson River Parkways, and less than an hour away is New York City. There UNO would have all the advantages of remote privacy, beautiful countryside, and yet be within reach of the recreational, educational, and cultural offerings of Westchester, Connecticut, and the metropolis.

Should Westchester be unable to offer any site for permanent headquarters, we suggest to the committee the desirability of temporary quarters here while the permanent home is being constructed. There would be available for such temporary purposes the Westchester County Center at White Plains, the county airport a few minutes away, golf and country clubs for lodging or recreation, and rapid transportation to New York City.

In any event, regardless of where or why the permanent or temporary headquarters may be located, we wish to emphasize Westchester's solid support of the program which UNO offers a war-wearied world. We are proud that this area has remained within the narrowed-down zone selectivity through possession of many of the high standards the selection committee has established. And we pledge without stint or reservation our continued support here in Westchester of public opinion and press as UNO marches forward bravely toward the goals of permanent peace for which civilization yearns.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 1 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address made by Dr. Alexander Guerry, president of the University of the South, on the subject of Universal Military Training, a subject which is at this time of vital importance to the American people. This address was made before the Rotary Club at Chattanooga, Tenn., on December 27, 1945.

Dr. Guerry, who was at one time president of the University of Chattanooga, located in that city, has been at the head of the University of the South at Sewanee which is on top of Cumberland Mountain at Sewanee, Tenn., for several years and, under his guidance and leadership, this university has grown and has become more and more prominent among the outstanding schools of the country.

Dr. Guerry had two sons in the last World War, both of whom distinguished themselves on more than one occasion.

His words on the subject of Universal Military Training are worthy of most serious consideration and meditation. He is not only one of the outstanding educators of the Nation but is an alert and deep thinker. I hope that this address of his will be universally read.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The choice is not between universal peacetime military training and unpreparedness. The choice is between compulsory universal peacetime training and some other manner by which our Nation can be prepared adequately to defend herself and to preserve the peace. And for these purposes our country should be prepared.

The choice is not between peacetime conscription and unpreparedness because preparedness can be accomplished by other means than a compulsory universal training law. This other means is volunteer enlistments and, if necessary, a selective service act to keep the Army, Navy, and Air Force at the strength deemed essential. Selective Service can operate to produce the personnel of an army of 500,000 or 10,000,000; the same for the Navy. It is much better to have an adequate army, air force, and navy from volunteers plus Selective Service, when and if Selective Service is necessary, than to initiate now universal peacetime training. It is better because we have now a fine Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and Selective Service. To maintain our armed forces at whatever strength is considered advisable and as long as desirable is a natural and essential procedure.

It seems unnecessary and unwise for this country to break now with its traditions and its conviction over the years regarding peacetime conscription and to embark at once upon a program of universal military training with its inevitable, far-reaching consequences, before we see the pattern of peace, before we observe the effectiveness of the United Nations Organization in its efforts to keep the peace and to prevent aggression, before we play our part in attempting to make the UNO an effective agency for the purposes for which it was created, and before we know more about the use of atomic energy and the relation of atomic energy to a program of national preparedness and to war itself.

The Army can have enough soldiers for effective preparedness including occupation duty overseas, through the process of volunteer enlistments, in my judgment, if the Army as a career and as a temporary occupation is made more attractive. This could be brought about by better pay and more particularly by an improved program of general and vocational education, recreation, and athletic sports at every Army post, and by the providing of homes for the families of enlisted men at or near each Army base.

On the other hand, if such a program fails to secure the required number of soldiers, a selective-service law could produce the additional men. The additional number needed might be very small. Certainly it would be better to call these into the service through impartial selection than to put the whole Nation under a universal-training law.

The same procedure would be in effect for the Navy. It is my opinion, however, that the Navy feels it can secure sufficient personnel through the volunteer method, and that the Navy is not particularly interested in compulsory universal military training.

Surely the only justifiable reason for peacetime conscription is that it is a military necessity, and peacetime conscription is not a military necessity. If I believed it were, I would support it.

Furthermore, it is not an adequate means of national defense. As high military spokesmen have recently and repeatedly pointed out, the next enemy who might attack us would strike without warning and with his full might in an effort to win the war right at the start. As the proponents of universal military training have proclaimed time and again, in the event of another war America may not have the time to prepare herself for battle as she had for World War I and World War II. This is quite true.

And it all goes to show that what is necessary as long as there may be the danger of war is an army, a navy, and an air force of the minimum but sufficient strength, composed for the most part of men who are making a career of the military or making the military their occupation for a period of three or more years, an army, a navy, and an air force composed of men skilled and trained in the modern instruments and weapons of war and possessing the most modern instruments and weapons of war.

In the 1930's and in particular in his book, The Army of the Future, General De Gaulle emphasized the necessity of armed forces carefully trained, equipped with modern weapons and ready to fight at the drop of the hat and minimized the value of France's program of universal military training. It is my belief that, if we enact a military training law, we will have both peacetime conscription and an army, navy, and air force of approximately the same strength as with or without universal training.

Millions of 18-year-olds in training or millions of reserves, men trained in 1 year of a compulsory universal military program, probably will not play an important part, possibly not any part, in a war, if another war comes, that will be fought to a finish with a deadliness and a swiftness beyond imagination.

If, however, reserves are or may be important or necessary to the security of our Nation in war or peace, the present ROTC program should be continued and expanded and, in particular, the program of the summer civilian military training camps, under Army supervision, known as the CMTC, should be revived, improved and greatly expanded. These two voluntary programs would give the country hundreds of thousands of reserves with valuable military experience.

As civilian aide to the Secretary of War for Tennessee, I was actively associated with the CMTC for about 20 years, and I know the tremendous possibilities in summer military camps sponsored by the War Department. I believe that a very large number of boys and young men would attend camp for one, two or three summers during the high school and college days, especially if a small honorarium were paid to compete with summer jobs.

Just as necessary as an adequate army, navy, air force, and marine corps for national preparedness and infinitely more important than universal military training are these three factors: (1) Constant improvement of the weapons and instruments of war; (2) a plan for the instant mobilization of industry for war; and (3) the pursuit and encouragement of scientific research, not scientific research alone, as applied to war, but general scientific research.

My chief objection to peacetime conscription is that universal peacetime military training will change the character of the American people. To draft boys and men for war in time of war or under the threat of war is one thing. To compel all men in this country at a given age to spend a year in military training in peacetime is quite another thing. This will lead, beyond any doubt, to regimentation of our youth and will place Government in control of all the men of this country for 1 year in peacetime. This will be an enormous extension of the function and power of government. The ultimate result will not be good.

Four arguments often presented in behalf of universal military training should be critically appraised. The first is that universal military training will be a valuable and necessary experience in discipline. The second is that the physical fitness of our youth will be greatly improved by universal military training. The third is that universal military training would have restrained Germany and Japan from war. The fourth is that universal military training will strengthen America's foreign policy.

I hear on all sides that young men need discipline and the Army and Navy can give it to them. Certainly discipline is necessary. But discipline should come through the home, the school, the college, and the church, and not through the State. When we turn to the State for discipline for our youth, a free society has failed. If our youth need discipline, let the home, the school, and the church look to their responsibility. To ask the Government to accomplish what the home, the school, and the church have failed to accomplish is to undermine the foundations of a self-reliant, independent people, the foundations of a free society. The same about universal military training and responsibility.

As a matter of fact, the discipline that is needed in a democracy is self-discipline. Army discipline operates as a control of the soldier in the Army, not as a general rule after he leaves the Army. A year of universal military training will not be conducive in the long run to discipline or self-discipline in a democracy.

As for compulsory military training and physical fitness, it should be clear to every person that it is during all the years of a boy's life, from his earliest childhood, that he becomes physically fit. Proper medical care, proper dental attention, nourishing food, sunshine, exercise, sports, and proper living conditions, these make a young man physically fit. But it's a process over the years. The age of 18 is too late. Our young men should be physically fit. We can make them physically fit if we start at the beginning, and if the home, the school, and other agencies, the county, the municipality, and State departments of public health join hands for the promotion and development of a real program of physical fitness.

The statement has been made often by the advocates of universal military training that Japan would not have attacked America or that Germany would not have gone to war if America had been carrying on a program of universal military training. This may be true. But it also may be true that Japan might not have attacked America or Germany might not have gone to war if the United States had maintained a reasonably adequate Army, Navy, and Air Force, properly equipped and supplied with modern guns, modern instruments of war, modern ships, modern planes, or if the League of Nations had been effective when Germany broke the Treaty of Versailles, or if America had joined the family of nations for the purpose of preventing aggression and preserving the peace of the world.

This word with regard to universal military training and our foreign policy. Before we inaugurate universal military training to back up our foreign policy, it is urgent and necessary that the United States have a definite foreign policy which it consistently and intelligently supports. Lack of a clear-cut foreign policy to which this country firmly adhered was in part a cause of the last war. As for the relation of universal military training to the effectiveness of our foreign policy, we should realize that it has certainly been demonstrated that our armed might, even at its very peak, has had insufficient relation to the effectiveness of our foreign policy or to the respect and regard of other nations for our views and our position in international affairs.

A further objection to universal military training is that the interruption of a boy's education is bad. Education is a continuing experience. The normal process is for a boy to go direct from elementary school to high school, from high school to college, from college to graduate or professional school. Theoretically, it can be argued that a year out of school or college makes a boy or young man more mature, more eager and more appreciative of the opportunity to get an education. Actually it does not turn out that way. The very small number of boys in high school or college who have been out of school a year and returned to school is and has been proof for many, many years that interruption of one's education is anything but conducive to his return to school. And their records do not indicate that their absence has bettered their scholastic achievement.

If I am charged with prejudice in this matter because I am a college president, I can only say that I am certain in my own mind that the interruption of the education of boys and young men for a year will have three unfortunate consequences: (1) That many boys and young men will not continue their education; (2) that of those who do continue their education, fewer will go to college and the professional schools, more to vocational and trade schools, the country losing some of its best material for a general college education and for the professions, including scientists, engineers, technicians, architects, artists, musicians, as well as physicians, lawyers, and ministers; (3) that the level of academic attainment will be lower.

What a country needs for war and peace is a large number of citizens of fine intellectual training, who possess power and versatility of the mind. That is the reason that the lowering of the level of intellectual attainment would be a great misfortune, just as it would be a misfortune to have fewer or less capable men in the sciences and in the professions.

One of the dangers of universal military training is that it has become a panacea in the minds of the people. Pass a law, they seem to say, for universal military training, and we will have discipline, physical fitness, and better education for our youth, preparedness, a firm foreign policy, security, and lasting peace. These objectives will not be realized, in my judgment, through peacetime conscription, but by other wiser and more difficult measures.

If it is the decision, however, of our Congress to enact a compulsory universal military training law, there should be no substitution of ROTC or of National Guard for the year or a portion of the year of prescribed military training, no substitution of any other kind of training for military training, and no substitution of any other agency for the War and Navy Departments.

Thus far we have discussed a program of adequate defense, a better alternative to universal military training, and some reasons against peacetime conscription. Now, let us face the truth of some other vital things, the deeper issues.

First, universal military training and preparedness have never prevented war. At times they have postponed war. At times they have hastened war. Sometimes, but by no means always, they have determined the victor But they have never prevented war, and they never will.

Second, the next war, a war to be fought in the atomic age with atomic energy, will be incredibly and horribly terrible. It will be so awful that another war will probably destroy civilization. If it does not destroy man, it may drive him back again to the dark ages.

Third, there is and it seems that in all probability there can be no real protection against atomic energy. Atom bombs can be delivered and used in a hundred different ways.

Fourth, nations will go to war regardless of the terror or the consequences of war unless their sovereignty is made subject to international law and to an agency to enforce the law, a world organization above the nation.

The United Nations Organization, international law, the application of the principle of law between nations, a world court to interpret the law and to settle disputes between nations, a world force to enforce international law, to prevent conflict and aggression and to keep the peace, these are the keys to security for the future and the only agencies that can surely prevent war. While we remain prepared in an uncertain world we must strive toward these goals for our own salvation and the salvation of the world.

If we say that we cannot surrender any portion of our sovereignty to international law, a world court and a world organization, we must accept this inevitable result: the surrender of freedom as we have known it, the surrender of freedom to a greater degree than would come through a surrender of a portion of our sovereignty, the loss of personal liberty as we have cherished it, increasing regulation and control of our lives in civilian as well as in military matters in order to be prepared and ready as far as possible in every way for the war that will hang over our heads like the sword of Damocles and, in the end, is certain to come.

Missouri Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK P. BRIGGS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 17, 1946

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. President, the citizens of my State are very much interested in the development of the Missouri River Valley. Recently the Governor of the State appointed an official commission to investigate various plans offered for the improvement of the valley. One of the commissioners, Mr. F. V. Heinkel, who is president of one of our great farm organizations, has made an excellent and a comprehensive report on this matter. I ask unanimous consent to have the report of the commission and the appended report of Mr. Heinkel printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I may say, Mr. President, that the Government Printing Office advises me that to print in the RECORD the manuscript I have submitted will cost $225.40.

There being no objection, the report and its accompanying statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMISSION'S UNANIMOUS REPORT, NOVEMBER 16, 1945

We agree that the Tennessee Valley Authority is of vast benefit to the people and the area served by it, and enjoys high standing among the people of the Tennessee Valley.

We agree that the bills pending in the Congress of the United States for the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority are objectionable.

We recommend that construction of reservoir projects in Missouri proposed and included in the authorized Pick-Sloan plan be deferred until those features of the plan have been again reviewed.

We agree that there is a necessity for a basin-wide control, development, and utilization of the water resources of the Missouri Valley.

We agree that national action in development of water resources is justified only when there are interstate characteristics operating to prevent successful development by private industry under State laws or by the States or subdivisions thereof.

We recognize that basin-wide coordinated control and maximum practicable utilization of water resources, including conversion of potential water power into pooled electric energy available for public use at the cost of production, is sound public policy. We recognize that this cannot be successfully undertaken by individuals, local or State government, or by private industry. We believe that this utilization of any river basin is regional and not national in scope. However, we do believe that it could be properly assigned to be executed by a regional authority created for and restricted to the accomplishment of that specific purpose. Thus restricted, we agree that it would not constitute an invasion into the fields of endeavor heretofore reserved under our form of government for development of resources by individual private industry or by State or local government.

SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENT

(By F. V. Heinkel)

I

"We agree that the Tennessee Valley Authority is of vast benefit to the people and the area served by it, and enjoys high standing among the people of the Tennessee Valley."

My investigation in the Tennessee River Valley amply substantiate the Commission's conclusion that "The Tennessee Valley Authority has been of vast benefit to the people and the area served by it, and enjoys high standing among the people of the Tennessee Valley."

I made inquiries of scores of people in literally all walks of life, and during the whole tour I heard not one single complaint against TVA from anyone living within the area. Farmers, mayors, governors, businessmen, clerks, taxi drivers, laborers, bankers, editors, manufacturers, Republicans and Democrats—all agreed that TVA has been a wonderful influence for good in their region, and many of them admitted that they had fought the TVA from its inception until its deeds had proved their opposition to be wrong.

M. B. Spraggins, a banker-farmer of Huntsville, Ala., typically stated the case. He admitted he fought TVA from start to finish on the grounds that he objected to Government being in business of any kind. But now he approves. "If there is anything wrong with it I can't find it," he said, and added, "I don't believe the job could have been done without an Authority."

County Agent Mitchell, of Madison County, Ala., said, "We consider TVA one of the highlights of this county." Editor Ryndon, of the Chattanooga Times, whose paper opposed TVA in the beginning, said the Authority has been "so modest and self-effacing that the average person doesn't realize it is around." He said further that the Army engineers had tinkered with the river for a hundred years, but only since TVA came have there been satisfactory results in the way of flood control at Chattanooga.

T. J. Cottingham, of Decatur, Ala., who is president of a chain of 14 banks in north Alabama, and who also bitterly opposed TVA in the beginning, declared: "The outstanding result of TVA has been the improved social and economic condition of the people in the valley."

John A. Caddell, a lawyer, is president of the Chamber of Commerce at Decatur, Ala., and he was asked if the people of the region generally approve of TVA because of the results obtained, or because it is a "Santa Claus" propcsition with them. His indignant reply was that it is not a "Santa Claus" proposition—"We are going to pay it (the money) all back, plus develop the valley." (NOTE.—TVA expects to amortize the debt in about 30 years' time.)

A dairy farmer in Catoosa County, Ga., said, "The progress we have made with TVA over the past 10 years has been astounding to me," while another one said, "The TVA people are the nicest people we have ever dealt with."

Every one of the governors of the seven States in the Tennessee Valley has unqualifiedly endorsed TVA. "The rights and interests of the several States," they told the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, "have been strengthened by operations of the Authority." We, the Missouri commission, found that the Authority cooperates with and works through existing governmental agencies by means of contracts mutually agreed upon.

Perhaps the most remarkable thing of all about TVA, particularly when considering its scope and the magnitude of its task, is that it has won such universal approval. Nothing short of the production of great benefits to the people, plus fair dealings to all, could have brought about such a result.

Electric power: What are some of the accomplishments? Perhaps foremost have been the savings in electric bills and the expansion of the use of electricity. Consumers served by the 130 municipal and cooperative distributors of TVA power are saving an estimated $11,000,000 per year on their electric bills as compared with the cost of electricity under rates previously in effect. For example: In the TVA area prior to TVA service, the cost of residential service averaged about 5.7 cents per kilowatt-hour; in the 12 months ending April 30, 1945, the average cost was 1.87 cents per kilowatt-hour.

In the area now served by TVA power production of electricity has grown from about 1,000,000 kilowatt-hours in 1933 to more than 10,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually at present. While about three-quarters of the total has been used during the emergency for war purposes, residential users have increased their consumption of electricity from about 600 kilowatt-hours each, on the average, in 1933, to an average of 1,713 kilowatt-hours per customer in the 12 months ended April 30, 1945. On 29 of the systems average use exceeded 2,000 kilowatt-hours in the calendar year 1944, ranging as high as 3,300 kilowatt-hours per customer. The number of residential consumers has also increased from 225,000 in 1933 to 493,000 at present. As soon as war demands end, the people are looking forward to a much greater expanded use of electricity, such as heating their homes and the use of all kinds of electric appliances, together with a more widespread use in industry.

Navigation: Low water rates have been attracting new private industry into the region, we were told. The TVA system provides a 9-foot channel upstream 650 miles to Knoxville, and freight traffic increased on the Tennessee from 33,000,000 ton-miles in 1933 to about 206,000,000 ton-miles in 1943. Among the several new industries which have moved into the valley—a trend which has been interrupted by the war but is now expected to resume—is a flour mill whose general office is in Omaha. Its manager said his company was attracted to Decatur, Ala., because of low water rates and cheap electricity.

Whereas in the area served by the new flour mill cotton was once king, and agriculture was on a decline owing to a decline in soil fertility, wheat and other crops are now being produced. The flour mill was able to buy only $10,000 worth of soft wheat in the vicinity during its first year of operation. Three years later it bought $250,000 worth of soft wheat, and the acreage is increasing. A growing population caused by the location of new industries in the valley, plus the use of better farming practices stimulated by TVA, is developing a new dairy industry. King Cotton is being relegated to fewer acres of the best land. Rail traffic has been increased by the new business locating in the valley—most of the river traffic seems to be new business.

Soil conservation: The region is being vastly benefited by soil-conservation work promoted by TVA through the several State extension departments. Briefly, TVA furnishes the money to the State extension departments for the work TVA wants done in the watershed. The extension departments simply employ additional county agents to specialize on soil conservation. Extension departments, using TVA funds, publish any literature needed.

At Muscle Shoals, TVA has been producing high analysis fertilizers from low-grade phosphate rock under a new electric furnace process developed by TVA scientists, and these fertilizers have been furnished to farmers over the area to carry on educational demonstrations, showing how soil conservation can be accomplished on the one hand, while farm profits can be increased on the other. The silt is thus being kept out of the reservoirs, while at the same time farming is made more efficient and the entire area more prosperous.

Wildlife and recreation: Soil conservation and better farming practices, with a greater diversification of crops, are promoting wildlife and recreation. The people told me that quail and wildfowl are increasing, and the lakes are teeming with fish. I was told by businessmen that the lake near Decatur, Ala., had more than a half-million dollars worth of pleasure craft on it last summer, and that several war industries in the region expect to convert themselves into boat manufacturers as soon as war work is finished. Located not too far from densely populated areas of the Nation, the people are expecting the region to become a vast playground, which will bring millions to the people in the area.

Flood control: The TVA's integrated system of 26 dams—5 of which are owned by the Aluminum Co. of America—provides space to store 13,000,000 acre-feet of flood waters at the height of the flood season. At the close of the flood season, around April 1, there is still storage space for 10,000,000 acre-feet. This is the way the system works to control floods and at the same time to generate electric power:

By the time the rainy season begins, the TVA tributary reservoirs have been drawn down to provide storage for floodwaters. Space is also reserved in the mainstream reservoirs for the same purpose. During the rainy season, when the streams are run-

ning full, the power plants on the mainstream, the Tennessee, carry most of the power load, while the powerhouses on the tributaries (Norris on the Clinch, Douglas on the French Broad, etc.) are closed down. As the end of the flood season approaches, the reservoir levels are allowed to rise gradually, and with the end of the major flood danger, all possible stream flow is stored. Then, during the low-flow periods of summer and fall when there is less rainfall, the stored water is released to maintain the navigation channel and produce power at both the tributary dams and the nine dams on the mainstream. These releases, drawing down the reservoirs, provide storage capacity for the next flood season.

Flood control is a major function of TVA, and during flood periods on the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers TVA flood control is correlated with that of the Army engineers. The TVA system is calculated to be able to reduce flood stages at Cairo by as much as 3½ feet.

Inundation of land: TVA has permanently inundated about 462,700 acres of land. Of this, about 298,000 acres were crop and pasture land, of which practically all was previously subject to destructive and periodic flooding. Investigations as a member of the Missouri Commission satisfied me that this loss of productive acres has been more than overcome. In the first place, thousands of acres of land, including land on which towns and cities are located which had been subject to frequent floods, have been permanently protected against further inundations.

But in addition, TVA, working through the several State extension departments, has stimulated the use of fertilizers and better farming practices on the uplands. This has been done by TVA mostly in order to retard the soil erosion which fills up reservoirs. Most people do not realize the importance of fertilizers in erosion control. For example: The Missouri Experiment Station found that "during the rainy period in 1944 at Columbia, the runoff was 60 percent for a grass plot that had not been fertilized. From an adjoining and corresponding plot, where the soil had been fertilized and a dense sod prevailed, the run-off was only 12 percent of the rainfall."

The better farming practices include, besides the use of high-analysis fertilizers, contour farming, strip cropping, terraces, reforestation on marginal areas, the growth or more legumes, the use of better seeds, more livestock, etc. Cotton, formerly the chief crop, is being restricted to fewer acres of the best land and the use of fertilizers has maintained as high a production on the fewer acres as formerly on the larger acreage. Altogether, the increased production on the uplands has more than offset the loss of production on the land that is now permanently flooded.

The tax situation: The tax situation has been taken care of in the Tennessee Valley. TVA took the average taxes paid to State and local governments over the 2-year period prior to the time they acquired the land, on all occupied land and property, and is returning that amount in lieu of taxes—one-twelfth of it each month. In the fiscal year 1944, TVA paid $2,168,798 to States and counties in lieu of taxes, and in fact, in 1944 the payments by TVA exceeded the former taxes on purchased power properties and on all reservoir lands by more than $790,000. Besides this, all of the net income of TVA belongs to the Federal Government and is available for Federal purposes in the same manner as taxes.

Land purchases: I found that whereas other branches of the Federal Government have been slow about paying farmers and other landowners for land taken for developments (some farmers in the Weldon Spring, Mo., area haven't been paid yet) the TVA paid for the lands before any developments were begun. Farmers told me they continued to use the land a year or more before TVA began operations. When farmers were bought out by TVA they were not simply paid off and moved out into the highways to become a health menace, as well as a prey to real-estate sharks. TVA specialists helped them to find new homes at the proper prices, helped them start life anew in new locations on the uplands.

Public health: TVA has concerned itself with the health problem. Malaria, once the worst human plague in the area, is being controlled by the Authority. It keeps down the malaria-bearing mosquitoes by raising and lowering the lake levels at frequent intervals—the mosquito larvae are stranded on the vegetation when the lakes are lowered and are destroyed by the sun; when the lakes are raised the new crop of larvae is set afloat for the fish to consume. Low areas on the lake fringes are sprayed with insecticides.

Phosphate developments: At Muscle Shoals which I, the only member of the Missouri commission, visited, I learned that TVA has conducted extensive experiments with fertilizers. It has developed a new process which enables it to economically produce high-analysis fertilizers from low-analysis phosphate rock. Samples for demonstrations have been sent out over the region, as well as to several other States including Missouri, so that farmers in cooperation with State extension departments could demonstrate to all the results from its use. These demonstrations have greatly stimulated the more extensive use of fertilizers sold by private manufacturers. As a result of these demonstrations in the Tennessee Valley soil erosion has been retarded through the growth of legumes and other plants which hold the soil and at the same time restore the humus which absorbs and holds water on the land.

The phosphate plant at Muscle Shoals has furnished nitrogen and phosphorus and other products for the Government in winning the war, just as TVA electricity helped produce the atom bomb further upstream. Its laboratories have also tested phosphate deposits elsewhere in the Nation for the people, including private industry.

Some conclusions: I found that TVA is not doing one thing that is not already being done one way or another by the Government elsewhere in the Nation. The only difference is the method. For example, the Reclamation Department is producing electric power, and distributing it. The Army engineers have been working on floods for 100 years. TVA has built towns, schools, and other business enterprises for its workers on the projects (most of which it has now disposed of), but so have the Army engineers (see Fort Peck in Montana). Soil conservation and reforestation, wildlife and recreation, have been promoted for years by various branches of the Government. TVA is engaging in no kind of business except electric power, and this only in a wholesale manner. All other activities are on either an experimental or demonstrational basis, calculated to help private industry and the people generally. The only difference has been in the method—TVA does it on a regional, or watershed basis, with all the activities coordinated, and with the Authority located where the people can see it, talk things over with it, understand it. This fact, to my mind, is why the people in the region so universally approve of the Authority * * * they see it, talk to it, understand it, and cooperate with it.

II

"We agree that there is a necessity for a basin-wide control, development and utilization of the water resources of the Missouri Valley.

"We agree that national action in development of water resources is justified only when there are interstate characteristics operating to prevent successful development of private industry under State laws or by the States or subdivisions thereof.

"We recognize as sound public policy that basin-wide coordinated control and maximum practicable utilization of water resources, including conversion of potential water power into pooled electric energy, should be made available for public use at the cost of production. We recognize that this cannot be successfully undertaken by individuals, local or State government, or by private industry. We believe that this utilization of any river basin is regional and not national in scope. However, we do believe that it could be properly assigned to be executed by a regional authority created for and restricted to the accomplishment of that specific purpose. Thus restricted, we agree that it would not constitute an invasion into the fields of endeavor heretofore reserved under our form of government for development of resources by individual private industry or by State or local government."

The conclusions of the commission above noted and unanimously agreed to, constitute in my opinion a strong and unqualified endorsement of the principles of a Missouri Valley Authority, as well as a condemnation of the presently authorized Pick-Sloan plan.

The commission's statement that "National action in development of water resources is justified only when there are interstate characteristics operating to prevent successful development by private industry under State laws or by the States or subdivisions themselves" is merely a recognition of our system of democratic government and our American free way of life to the effect that the Federal Government should perform only those functions which cannot successfully be undertaken by the people themselves or the States or local subdivisions themselves. However, it is noted that the commission agreed that, as to the water resources of the Missouri Valley, there are interstate characteristics operating to prevent their development by private industry or by the States or subdivisions themselves, and on this point the commission concluded "that this (basin-wide coordinated control and maximum practical utilization of water resources) cannot be successfully undertaken by individuals, local or State governments, or by private industry." The commission was unanimous in its opinion of the "necessity for a basin-wide control, development, and utilization of the water resources of the Missouri Valley."

The water resources of the Missouri Valley for over a century have been subject to control, development, and utilization by private industry or by the States or local subdivisions themselves, but during this period of time the waters have been uncontrolled and have failed to be developed and utilized for the benefit and welfare of the people. The runoff of the water on the uplands, washing away and eroding the soil, has continued at such an accelerated pace that much of the fertile soil of the Missouri Valley now rests in the Gulf of Mexico. Devastating floods continue to occur and to occur more frequently, causing untold loss of and damage to property, loss of life, and great suffering. Power and electricity at the lowest possible cost have not been made available to the people, so that many of the farms of Missouri continue and would continue to do without the commonplace wonders of electricity and electric power. Industrial development in the Missouri Valley has been retarded by the failure to harness the waters of the Missouri and make it work for the people rather than against the people. Today only 24 percent of the farms of Missouri have electricity, and much of this power is excessive in cost. Private industry and the States or subdivisions themselves have thus miserably failed to control, develop, or utilize the water resources of the Missouri Valley. And because the Missouri Valley covers a great portion of more

than 10 States, there do exist interstate characteristics for its control, development, and utilization which prevent successful development and utilization by private industry or the States themselves of the water resources of this great valley.

Therefore, the commission very correctly and reasonably unanimously agreed, after extensive and detailed study, that the control, development and utilization of the water resources of the Missouri Valley must of necessity be basin-wide in scope because such could not be successfully undertaken by individuals, local or State government, or by private industry.

The commission further unanimously recognized "as sound public policy that basin-wide coordinated control and maximum practical utilization of water resources, including conservation of potential water power into pooled electric energy, should be made available for public use for the cost of production," and agreed that such "would not constitute an invasion into the fields of endeavor heretofore reserved under our form of government for development of resources by individual private industry or by State or local government." The conclusions of the commission are answer to those who have charged and may continue to charge that a regional authority or basin-wide control of the water resources of the Missouri Valley is an invasion into the fields of private endeavor and as such is socialistic in nature. The Federal regional authority for the Missouri Valley would be performing those functions which the people themselves, which private industry itself and which the local or State governments themselves have not and could not perform. The best proof of that fact is that they have not yet been performed although the Missouri Valley has been open for development by private industry for over a century. If the water of the great Missouri River is to be controlled and if industry and farming in the Missouri Valley are to be properly developed, then full utilization of the water resources must be made. First of importance is the control of floods which not only cause great human suffering but cause ruinous loss of property and the washing away of the fertile soil of the Missouri Valley. Control of floods means soil conservation on the uplands, the development and utilization of the great phosphate deposits of the upper valley for fertilization of the soil and the building of many small reservoirs and lakes. The water should be then utilized in the dry regions of the upper Missouri Basin for irrigation and to bring into productivity lands not now arable. Lastly, conversion of the water on its onward rush to the sea into electrical energy to bring light and power and the benefits resulting therefrom to the people of the Missouri Valley is of the utmost importance. That can be accomplished only when the control of the water resources of the Missouri Valley is in a basin-wide authority created for the accomplishment of those purposes.

The commission further subscribed to the belief that "this utilization of any river basin is regional and not national in scope." In that conclusion the commission condemned the principles of the Pick-Sloan plan for the control and development of the water resources of the Missouri Valley. The Pick-Sloan plan is a part and parcel of a national scheme. It is administered by national agencies operating on a Nation-wide basis. Those agencies are the War Department, the Department of the Interior, the Federal Power Commission, and the Department of Agriculture. The chief administrative officer of each of those departments, charged with the execution of the Pick-Sloan plan, holds his position and is responsible for many functions national in scope and not specifically related to the problems of the Missouri River Basin. Those Departments are administered, not from offices in the region of the Missouri Basin, but from national offices located in Washington, D. C. Therefore, this conclusion of the commission definitely calls for a regional authority for the Missouri River Basin and not control and development by Nation-wide agencies of the Federal Government which are not restricted nor confined to dealing with the problems of and the control, development, and utilization of the water resources of the Missouri Valley. The Pick-Sloan plan not only is a plan injurious and detrimental to the welfare and interests of the people of Missouri, but it is a plan which is unsound in principle for the successful development and utilization of the water resources of the Missouri Valley.

In my opinion the above unanimous conclusion of the members of the commission constitutes a definite recommendation for the creation of a region-wide authority for the control, development, and utilization of the water resources of the Missouri Valley, and further constitutes a definite condemnation of the principles of the now authorized Pick-Sloan plan.

III

"We recommend that construction of reservoir projects in Missouri proposed and included in the authorized Pick-Sloan plan be deferred until those features of the plan have been again reviewed."

The conclusions of the committee that the execution of the Pick-Sloan plan should be held in abeyance until reviewed is an important one and one which in my opinion is deserving of some elaboration on the reasons therefor. It is my opinion that upon review of the Pick-Sloan plan by the people, the plan will be found to be highly objectionable and one which should be discarded and replaced by a single basin-wide authority established in conformity with the conclusions No. 2 of the commission, above set forth. The Pick-Sloan plan, upon careful review by the people and the Congress, will be found objectionable for the reasons herein noted.

The Pick-Sloan plan does not create or establish a basin-wide authority for the control, development, and utilization of the water resources of the Missouri Valley. It is merely a plan, approved by Congress, under which existing Federal agencies are to do parts of the work of developing the Missouri River Basin. It is only a plan based upon the voluntary cooperation between four independent Federal agencies as to the part each will take in the execution of the contemplated program. Part of the Pick-Sloan plan is to be administered by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior; part by the Corps of Engineers of the War Department; part by the Federal Power Commission; and part by the Department of Agriculture. Thus, the Pick-Sloan plan does not furnish an actual basin-wide authority, created for and restricted to the control, development, and utilization of the water resources of the Missouri Valley, found to be absolutely necessary by the unanimous vote of the commission, but on the other hand, represents a continuation of the hodge-podge program of dealing with the problems of the Missouri Valley.

The laws adopting the Pick-Sloan plan vest almost absolute and arbitrary control in the development and execution of the plan in two individuals—the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Interior. It is noted that part of the plan was approved by Public Law 578, Seventy-fifth Congress, enacted June 28, 1938, and the language used therein vests power to modify the plan in the sole discretion of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers, as follows:

"The general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Missouri River Basin, as set forth in Flood Control Committee Document No. 1, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, with such modifications thereof as in the discretion of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers may be advisable, is approved * * *."

It is noted that this is the law which first approved the plans for the construction of the large reservoirs in Missouri, which will inundate thousands and thousands of acres of Missouri farmlands, with no corresponding benefits to the people. Furthermore, House Document No. 475, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, which constitutes the Pick part of the Pick-Sloan plan, approved by Public Law 534, Seventy-eighth Congress, in December 1944, provides as follows:

"That the general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Missouri River Basin, approved by the act of June 28, 1938, as modified by subsequent acts, be expanded to include the plans presented herein, and as expanded be approved for prosecution by the War Department under the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, with such modifications thereof and changes therein as in the discretion of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers may become advisable."

Furthermore, the act of December 1944, approving and authorizing the Pick-Sloan plan authorized an appropriation of $200,000,000 "for the partial accomplishment of the works to be undertaken under said expanded plans by the Corps of Engineers," and authorized the appropriation of $200,000,000 "for the partial accomplishment of the works to be undertaken under said plans by the Secretary of the Interior."

Therefore, not only does the Pick-Sloan plan vest far greater control in fewer individuals in the execution of the plan for developing and utilizing the water resources of the Missouri Valley than does any proposed regional authority, but it also vests such control in individuals who are not restricted to dealing with the problems of the Missouri Valley. The Pick-Sloan plan constitutes the handling of the problems of the Missouri Valley on a national basis rather than on a regional or basin-wide basis. Those directing the activities of the national agencies taking part in the development and execution of the Pick-Sloan plan are not required to reside in or maintain offices in the Missouri Valley. Those individuals will continue to reside in and maintain offices in Washington, D. C., rather than in the Missouri Basin. Therefore, the real heads of those agencies, charged with the responsibility for the control, development, and utilization of the water resources of the Missouri Valley under the Pick-Sloan plan, will be far removed from the people and the actual interests of the Missouri Valley.

It will be found that the paramount interests and rights of the people of the State of Missouri were ignored in the development of the Pick-Sloan plan. In order to give a semblance of taking into consideration the rights and interests of the States and the people of the Missouri Valley, there has been voluntarily created a so-called "Interagency Committee," which has no statutory standing and is merely advisory in capacity and does not exercise and cannot exercise any real control or jurisdiction over the Federal agencies involved in the development and execution of the plan. Statutory standing for this committee has been proposed, but even then it would remain advisory in capacity, for any attempt to make the four existing Nation-wide Federal agencies subject to the control of State governors would clearly be illegal and in violation of the Federal Constitution. The most that the so-called Interagency Committee could do would be to advise and try to keep the four Federal agencies working in harmony on the plan, but in the event of serious disagreement the committee would be powerless to act. Therefore, the Interagency Committee is merely an effort to give lip service to the real interests of the people and the States in the Missouri Valley.

Not only is the Pick-Sloan plan erroneous in principle, administered by too many Federal agencies, too far removed from the people and the interests of the people ignored, but it is noted that the plan itself is detrimental to the interests and the welfare of the people of Missouri. The plan calls for the construction in the State of Missouri of numerous reservoirs which will inundate thousands of acres of Missouri's most fertile land. These reservoirs which are now held as a part of the plan for the control, development, and utilization of the water resources of the Missouri Valley were first proposed, not for the development of the Missouri Basin, but for flood control in the lower Mississippi and for an aid to river navigation. In House Document No. 238, Seventy-third Congress, second session, dated September 30, 1933, the Chief of Engineers of the War Department, in recommending the construction of these gigantic reservoirs, said:

"For the primary purpose of alleviating flood conditions on the lower Mississippi River a system of seven reservoirs with an aggregate gross capacity of 9,405,000 acre-feet is suggested by the district engineer, as follows."

Then are listed the reservoirs at Richland, Arlington, Osceola, South Grand, Pomme de Terre, Chillicothe, and Garfield. In that same report it is stated that due to the method of operation proposed for these reservoirs, the development of anything but secondary power at widely separated intervals would be impractical.

Therefore, there is no assurance that the impounded water will be utilized to produce electric power so vitally needed for the advancement and the betterment of the people of Missouri, but, on the other hand, it is practically conceded that the dams will be so operated for flood control on the lower Mississippi and for aid to river navigation that it will be impractical to convert the water power into electrical power. Such a scheme constitutes a tremendous waste of the water resources of the Missouri Valley to the detriment of the people of Missouri. Furthermore, as the construction of the reservoirs is planned also as an aid to river navigation, that will constitute a Federal subsidy to a special-interest group, involving the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money with little return of benefits to the people.

The lands condemned for such reservoirs will be removed from local and State tax rolls and will seriously affect the operation of local schools and county governments in at least 17 Missouri counties. These unfortunate counties are Bates, Chariton, Cooper, Daviess, Grundy, Henry, Hickory, Livingston, Monroe, Macon, Pulaski, Ripley, Stone, Shannon, St. Clair, Taney, and Vernon.

Furthermore, the Pick-Sloan plan proposes the construction of huge levees along the Missouri River from Sioux City, Iowa, to the mouth. These levees will virtually destroy and remove from production thousands of acres of fertile bottom land which is some of the most productive in the State of Missouri. Such a scheme is not flood control, but an admission that the river cannot be controlled and a plan to destroy by levees the land which is now subject to flood, as well as to destroy by reservoirs thousands of acres of additional land.

Lastly, the Pick-Sloan plan fails to adequately deal with the great problem of soil erosion, which, over a period of years, costs the State and Nation four times as much as do floods. If floods are to be controlled, then soil erosion must be arrested, and this will mean slowing down the run-off of water in the up-lands and holding it there as long as possible and straining out the silt instead of permitting it to rush wastefully down to the creeks and rivers so as to bring about ruinous floods in the low-lands.

It is for these reasons that the Pick-Sloan plan should be reviewed by Congress and the people. The objections above noted cannot, in my opinion, be met by a revamping of the Pick-Sloan plan but can only be remedied by discarding entirely the future development of that plan and by creating a basin-wide regional authority to deal specifically with the problems of the control, development and utilization of the water resources in the Missouri Basin.

IV

"We agree that the bills pending in the Congress of the United States for the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority are objectionable."

It is noted that the commission unanimously concluded that the presently pending Murray bill for the creation and establishment of a Missouri Valley Authority is objectionable. Certainly, in view of the other conclusions arrived at by the members of the commission, no member of the commission could contend that the principles of a Missouri Valley Authority are unsound. In my opinion, the only objection to the presently pending bill is that the authority should consist of more than the three members proposed. It is my opinion that the authority should probably consist of at least 10 members, one appointed from each of the States in the Missouri River Basin by the President with the consent and approval of the Senate and that the appointee from each State be from a list of nominees submitted by the governor of each of the respective States in the Missouri Valley. This method of nomination and appointment of the directors of a Missouri Valley Authority would assure that the agency would remain responsible to the people of the Missouri River Basin and would assure the recognition and protection of the rights and interests of each State in the development and execution of an over-all plan for the development of the Missouri Basin. This objection could be met by amendments to the pending bills, but, even if not amended, the Missouri Valley Authority proposed in the pending bill is still superior to the Pick-Sloan plan and should, in my opinion, be adopted, rather than permitting the further waste of the taxpayers' money in developing the Pick-Sloan plan.

CONCLUSIONS

The Pick-Sloan Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, is a compromise plan which is to be administered in Washington by four Federal agencies. This hodge-podge plan is not only inadequate to meet the needs of the Missouri Valley, but in my estimation it is detrimental to the best interests of the people in the State of Missouri, because:

1. The seven huge reservoirs planned for the basin in Missouri will inundate 450,500 acres of Missouri's best land. Only 388,000 acres of land will be protected, and 301,000 acres will not be protected at all. They are intended, according to a report of the Army engineers to the War Department (Sept. 30, 1933), for the primary purpose of alleviating flood conditions on the lower Mississippi, and any flood and electric power benefits to the Missouri River Basin will be incidental. The Army engineers themselves, who are to administer the Pick-Sloan Act in this State, admit, therefore, that the State of Missouri is to be damaged out of all proportion to any benefits derived from the compromise plan.

2. Enormous levees, providing a trough for the Missouri River 3,000 feet wide from Sioux City to Kansas City, and 5,000 feet wide from Kansas City to the river's mouth, are provided for under the Pick-Sloan plan. Set back approximately ½ mile from the river's banks on either side, these big levees will ruin practically one acre for every acre of land they will protect. The very plans for these big levees are an admission by the Army engineers that the big reservoirs will not protect the Missouri Valley in this State from floods. They are an admission that the Army intends to deal with floods here in Missouri after the waters have swept down into the lowlands. Levees represent an age-old, fossilized thinking such as prevailed when huge levees were constructed along the Yellow River in China generations ago. Because of siltation, which the Pick-Sloan plan does not adequately deal with here, the Yellow River now flows between two walls—the bottom of the river is now higher than the land behind the levees. One does not have to be an engineer to foresee that the same conditions will one day be found in the Missouri River bottoms.

3. While there has been much ado about the generation of power at the dams scheduled for Missouri under the Pick-Sloan plan, and penstocks will reputedly be installed, the Army engineers themselves, when the seven dams in the basin in Missouri were first proposed, declared that only "secondary power at widely separated intervals" could be produced, and that several power sites would be ruined by the dams. Therefore, the Pick-Sloan plan, so far as the State of Missouri is concerned, offers little promise of alleviating some of the drudgery around the farmstead and in the homes; and as the sole farmer member of the commission I deplore this fact, because 71.6 percent of the Missouri farms are still without this blessing which is so commonplace to city dwellers, while at the same time under the Pick-Sloan plan the power to produce it will be wasted. I submit that this is a disgrace to the State of Missouri. By the same token private industry in our State is to be denied the benefits of low-cost electric power, and thus under the Pick-Sloan plan industrial development and greater employment which spells prosperity, not alone to city and town dwellers but to Missouri agriculture which needs better nearby markets, will not be encouraged. This is of the utmost importance, because, for example, had Missouri enjoyed the same low electric rates as are charged by TVA, Missourians would have saved $39,000,000 on their $80,000,000 electric bill last year.

4. Designed primarily for flood control on the lower Mississippi, the several reservoirs will be filled up during rainy seasons and drawn down during dry seasons, whereupon huge mud flats with an accompanying stench and mosquito habitat will be created. This will create a public nuisance and public health hazard. For an example, I refer those interested to residents of Greenville, Mo., in Wayne County, where the Wappapello Dam was built on the St. Francis River. The Pick-Sloan plan proposes to create a mess for our State, and offers to do nothing about it.

5. Lands condemned for reservoirs over the entire State of Missouri by the Pick-Sloan plan will cause serious loss in taxes to school districts and county and municipal governments in at least 17 counties. For, unlike TVA and as is proposed under the MVA plan, the Pick-Sloan plan makes no provision for in-lieu-of-tax payments (except in cases where marginal land is rented to farmers, which will be negligible). The 17 counties that will be most affected are: Chariton, Grundy, Bates, Cooper, Daviess, Henry, Hickory, Livingston, Monroe, Macon, Pulaski Ripley, Stone, Shannon, St. Clair, Taney, and Vernon. In addition the counties located adjacent to the Missouri River where the big levees are to be constructed will be affected more or less. There is no way to reliably estimate the damage to our State in this respect * * * for towns will be adversely affected that are located at some distance from the mechanical structures and the inundations. Other property owners elsewhere in the State will no doubt be required to make up the difference in tax revenue.

6. Only backhanded and incidental recognition is given to soil conservation by the Pick-Sloan plan, notwithstanding soil erosion is costing the State and Nation four times more than floods over a period of years, and notwithstanding the Army engineers themselves admit that the huge reservoirs will be silted up within 50 years' time. The

law says some soil conservation work shall be done by the United States Department of Agriculture, but this Department itself does not know what is to be required of it. Every person conversant with the subject knows that floods begin on the uplands where the rain falls, and as a farmer I contend that the place to begin dealing with floods is on the uplands, and not after the uncontrolled waters have swept down into the lowlands.

7. The Pick-Sloan plan gives only lip service to wildlife and recreation. I maintain that wildlife and recreation in our State will be greatly damaged—the wide fluctuation in the water levels of the huge reservoirs will be detrimental to fish life, while several of Missouri's scenic streams and springs that are admired by the Nation wil be ruined forever.

8. Friends of the Pick-Sloan plan and opponents of the MVA talk a lot about the Interagency Committee. They put it forth as a substitute for a Missouri Valley Authority. Composed of four governors in the Valley and certain Federal departments, they urge that it be given statutory standing, and suggest that it act as a referee to settle disputes under the Pick-Sloan plan. In the first place, it is an admission of the need of a Missouri Valley Authority. But in the second place it is an absurdity. For, does anyone seriously believe that the several Federal agencies, such as the Army engineers and the Reclamation Bureau, represented on the committee will allow themselves to be outvoted? And since when has it become wise for men to sit on their own board of directors? Governors are busy men. They would have to have substitutes of lesser ability to deal with the problems for them by proxy. Moreover, the Federal Government cannot, without changing its Constitution, permit State governors to decide policies of the Federal Government. It would be a strange thing, indeed, if a time came when four State governors could tell the Army, for example, what to do and what not to do. And how could the Interagency Committee act as a referee without any power? Webster's dictionary defines referee as "one to whom anything is referred for decision." It would certainly be a radical departure from custom if Congress delegated powers to an agency composed of State governors and miscellaneous bureaus to decide things for the Army.

9. No recognition whatever is given by the Pick-Sloan plan, unlike that of the MVA plan, to research and experimental work necessary for the development of phosphate deposits in the Northwest where lie, undeveloped, 80 percent of the Nation's known phosphate deposits. Missouri farmers now use phosphates from Florida and Tennessee, and these deposits will be exhausted in about 30 years. Missouri farmers must have phosphate fertilizers in ever-increasing amounts if soil fertility is to be maintained and the health of our people who subsist upon Missouri's agricultural products is to be safeguarded. Every Missourian ought to investigate the experiments made at the Missouri College of Agriculture which show that runoff on a plot of sod was reduced from 60 percent to 12 percent by the mere application of fertilizer, and the experiments which show how essential this plant food is to the nutrition of the livestock of our State and hence to the people who consume the livestock.

The Army engineers have already spent $319,000,000 on the Missouri River for navigation and flood control. Neither objective has been attained, as witness the grandiose schemes to promote navigation and flood control contemplated by the Pick-Sloan plan. On the contrary, the flood sitution has been aggravated. (As proof, figures recently released by the Department of Resources and Development of the State of Missouri, based upon information obtained from the annual reports of the Chief of Engineers and the United States Geological Survey, indicate that the carrying capacity of the channel has been reduced by from 13 to 41 percent at various points from St. Joseph to Hermann.) The river has been choked off by an extensive system of dikes placed in the river, and the most that can be claimed for this enormous expenditure is that the river's banks have been stabilized, but even now the pilings are rotting off and more trouble lies ahead.

Notwithstanding this failure, however, the Army engineers, under the Pick-Sloan plan which they helped to promote, now want an additional $700,000,000 for navigation and flood control. What assurances do the people have that they will succeed in view of their past record?

As a member of the Missouri commission, with the profound responsibility of making recommendations on which plan would best serve the Missouri River Basin and the people thereof in the development of its resources, I most earnestly call the attention of all Missourians to the fact that under the Pick-Sloan plan the State of Missouri will be greatly damaged—damaged out of all proportion to any benefits derived therefrom.

I think most of our citizens agree that the river's devastating floods must be controlled as nearly as possible, and I submit that under the tried and proven TVA plan this can be done without so much damage to our State. On the contrary, a careful study of the Tennessee River Valley makes it crystal clear to me that under an integrated, unified, balanced plan patterned after the TVA the resources of the valley can be conserved, developed, and utilized, thereby stimulating the growth of private enterprise in the valley, which will spell better markets for farm products, jobs for thousands of workers, opportunities for private business, both large and small.

I most vigorously maintain that the Missouri River should be harnessed and put to work for the people under a plan similar to that of TVA, and not merely be put into a strait-jacket at the taxpayers' expense as is proposed by the Pick-Sloan plan.

Pending Legislation and Problems of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave given me I insert in the RECORD a speech delivered by the Honorable William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, on December 4, 1945. The occasion was a caucus in the Old House Office Building attended by more than 100 Members of the House desirous of learning the facts about antilabor legislation then under consideration. The subject of Mr. Green's address was Pending Legislation and Problems of Labor, and his remarks were particularly directed to the then pending bill, H. R. 3937, the so-called May-Arends-Smith bill. It is my opinion that what he said then applies with even greater force to that monstrosity now pending, H. R. 5262, which carries many more, and more objectionable, vicious and restrictive antilabor provisions; which was never read, heard, or considered by the Committee on Labor; and which the Rules Committee has made in order for consideration as a substitute for the Randolph fact-finding bill in defiance of all orderly procedure of this great House. The text of Mr. Green's speech follows:

Chairman SABATH. The meeting will come to order. Many Members have said that leaders and spokesmen for labor were not granted an opportunity to be heard before the Committee on the Judiciary on H. R. 3937 and H. R. 3938, two bills which obviously threaten all that labor has gained in two decades. Therefore, some of us decided to call together Members who desire to hear the real facts in regard to these bills.

I am indeed gratified there are so many of you here. Do not fear that I shall talk a long time. I shall not. We have here today several gentlemen whom you want to hear and whom you came to hear. They have served equally their country and the cause of labor all their lives and are recognized as spokesmen for organized labor. There is one outstanding gentleman here who desires an opportunity to place before Members of the House his position, and the position of the great organization he represents, on these pending bills which have been granted such broad and liberal rules that any amendment, no matter how vicious, would be in order.

Now it is a pleasure and a privilege to call on Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, who will address you.

Mr. GREEN. Congressman SABATH, Members of Congress, and friends, first may I express to Congressman SABATH my deep appreciation of the steps he took to call this conference and to the Members of Congress and their friends who are present here. I interpret your presence and the action of the chairman of this meeting as evidence of your definite interest in this antilabor legislation, which is now pending in Congress, and of your desire to know the sincere and honest attitude of labor toward said legislation.

Our membership will deeply appreciate the report they receive from us of your attendance at this conference this afternoon.

First of all, I want to state with all the emphasis at my command and in a most vigorous way that the 7,000,000 members of the American Federation of Labor are united, thoroughly united in opposition to this antilabor legislation to which I will refer in just a few moments. It is policies of this kind that serve to cement labor, to unite it, to place it upon a common basis and there they stand; feeling as one, thinking as one, and acting as one.

I think I can also speak out of knowledge of the understanding about the state of mind of men and women of labor and other organizations. It is my opinion that all of them stand on the same basis. There is no division. They are aroused, and are united in their solid determination, immovably in opposition to this antilabor legislation.

It occurred to me that I should make those statements to you so there would be no misunderstanding by you of the attitude of labor toward this pending legislation.

First of all, may I refer to H. R. 3937, a measure offered to repeal the War Labor Disputes Act and to provide penalties for stoppages of work and breach of contract. This measure was proposed by those who were associated with the Military Committee as an amendment to the Smith-Connally Act, and by the way, may I point out that when the Smith-Connally Act was pending in Congress the American Federation of Labor appealed to the Members of Congress to defeat that measure because instead of a strike-prevention measure it would prove to be a strike-promotion measure. Do you recall those prophetic words, that prophetic appeal that was made when that act was pending? All that we prophesied has happened and more, too.

The Government of the United States and the taxpayers of the Nation have been called upon to spend thousands of dollars in holding elections designed for promotion of strikes. Even the authors of the measure now realize that it was a mistake. Now they are engaged in steps to make the same mistake—even a worse mistake—by proposing to enact these amendments to the Smith-Connally Act as provided for in H. R. 3937. In fact, what ought to happen is this: That the Members of the House of Representatives and of the Senate ought to rise up to new heights and repeal the Smith-Connally Act in its entirety.

Now, may I make an observation? In September 1945, Representative SMITH of Virginia introduced a bill to repeal the War Labor Disputes Act—the Smith-Connally Act—and thereby terminate strike ballots under the present act. You will recall that only a short time ago the appropriations committee of one of the Houses decided to strike a blow at the Smith-Connally Act and as a result they refused to appropriate any more money.

On October 13, 1945, the House Committee on Military Affairs reported the bill out with certain amendments, whereupon it was submitted to the whole House. It is now pending in the House of Representatives. This bill is H. R. 3937. It provides for two new proposals with serious penalties for work stoppages and breaches of contract in an agreement which contains a no-strike clause. It provides that activities and conditions of this nature be brought to an end and made unlawful.

We know that a measure sponsored in Congress by a Member of Congress who is known to possess broad liberal views will be a measure to promote the public interest, but when a measure is sponsored and supported by those whose constant record over years and years has been antilabor, we know that that bill is designed to strike at the heart of labor; and when a bill is sponsored by men whose record is such as has been made by Congressman SMITH of Virginia, Congressman Cox from down in the South, Congressman HOFFMAN, of Michigan, the kind of men who have been constantly antilabor, we know then that any bill sponsored by those men is antilabor And these men, I feel sure, who have always been regarded as enemies of labor are taking advantage of a disturbed public opinion, aroused for various causes, to secure the enactment of this antilabor legislation.

The provisions of H. R. 3938 with respect to strike penalties reads: "In the event of any strike or concerted failure to bargain on a contract which includes a no strike provision, the employer shall be relieved of any obligations under the contract and the labor organization shall lose its status as a bargaining agent for a period of a year. Any such organization which is a party to the contract may be sued and in its own name in any Federal court in which any of the officers reside and be found responsible in damages."

Labor understands that proposal, how it strikes at the heart of labor. If enacted into law it will serve to cripple, if not destroy labor organizations. I will go into that in a moment just a little more fully. It is apparent that many evils are in the foregoing provision. The use of the words "concerted collective bargaining" brings back to life the common law doctrine of conspiracy. That is, while it is lawful for one man to quit work, it is unlawful for two or more to do so.

Also, the section is written that a violation by a party to the agreement, no matter how insignificant the violation may be, relieves the employer of any obligation under the contract. It is shocking to think that the Members of Congress would entertain such a proposal for a single moment. Most significant is the unfair and unjust provision that a labor organization shall lose its status as a bargaining agent for a period of years when it is guilty of breach of contract, yet an employer does not lose its business or status when it violates the agreement.

It is depriving a union of its status of bargaining. It is no union if you destroy it. But no similar penalty or effect is visited upon an employer.

The last sentence of the above-quoted paragraph is significant. In providing that labor organizations may be sued for damage in breach of contracts, it proposes enactment of this bill into law. The malicious intent back of the proposed provision is to be found in the use of the word "any" in connection with the party injured as a result of the breach of an agreement.

Bakery workers in a small bakery found to be in breach of an agreement may not only subject the union to payment of damages to the employer of the bakery workers, but to an additional payment of damages to a hotel, a retail grocery, or other similar customer who suffers damages through the nondelivery of bread.

Prior to the passage of the Norris-LaGuardia Act in 1942, employers brought suits against unions, rendering them ineffective. Damages were also recoverable against individual, officers and members. You remember the Danbury Hatters case, when the wage earners' houses were taken and sold. The most classic example attempting to overcome that broad and unjust responsibility is the Norris-LaGuardia Act which includes the following provisions: "No officer or member of any association or organization, and no association or organization participating or interested in a labor dispute shall be held responsible or liable in any court of the United States for the unlawful acts of its officers or agents except on actual proof of, or actual authorization of such acts or of ratification of such acts after actual knowledge thereof." The proponents of this legislation want to take us back to those days, those bygone days, when labor was exploited and when the homes of honest, upright men were taken and sold over their heads.

I can't believe that the Members of Congress who believe in justice and fair play will subscribe to such legislation. The proposal in the House Military Affairs Committee implied it will repeal the Norris-LaGuardia Act and put a penalty upon any breach of agreement, whether authorized or unauthorized acts, or whether the acts were participated in or not participated in directly by the owner or whether they were ratified or not ratified by the union. I have reserved my discussion of the language in the proposed amendment, the no-strike amendment. A straight construction of that language would not make it effective in instances where an agreement did not contain a specific no-strike clause, but there are rules of law which permit courts to indulge in constructions of law and to read into provisions intents and implications. Judges can very well read into the proposed law a no-strike pledge. Courts can very well say, and many will say, the warning conditions constitute an implied agreement not to engage in stoppages of work, or to exercise other economic pressure during the life of the agreement. In other words, judges may hold that the agreement itself is a no-strike pledge. That is far-reaching—far-reaching. It's susceptible to that sort of interpretation.

Shall labor be reduced now to that status? Is that how they are to be rewarded for the faithful service they have given during the war emergency? The performance of labor from Pearl Harbor to VJ-day was a miracle. No other workers in the world ever measured up to such heights as did the workers of America. No workers in any country under the sun ever turned out ships and guns and airplanes and war material in such volume and in such perfect completion as did the workers of America, and now, immediately after it is over and they made their contribution to win this war, they are to be compensated by being reduced to a basis of servitude and slavery.

Not until the Supreme Court of the United States will have construed the law will we know whether the provision proposed by the House Military Affairs Committee is applicable to those provisions which contain the specific no-strike pledge.

From the foregoing it will be observed that the provision is dangerous to the labor movement, it may destroy the existence of trade unions.

The second proposal has to do with so-called political contributions of labor unions. The Smith-Connally Act itself broadened and enlarged on this point. Former Attorney General Biddle approved political contributions when he said it applied only to general elections. The provision amends the Federal Fair Employment Practice Act of 1925 as follows: "Section 313. It is unlawful for any national bank or any corporation organized by authority of any law of Congress to make a contribution in connection with any election to any office or any political office held to select candidates or any political organization. It is unlawful for any labor organization to make any contributions. expend any sum to aid in the solicitation of any funds, or levy any assessments on its stockholders, members, or subordinate affiliates in connection with any election, or in connection with any political convention held to select candidates for any such election, or for any candidate, political committee, or person to accept or receive any contribution prohibited by this section. The corporation or labor organization which makes any contribution in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $5,000, or the officers or directors of any organization or any officer of any organization, as the case may be, in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $1,000, or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both. For the purposes of this section labor organizations shall have the same meaning as under the National Labor Relations Act."

I imagine there are labor representatives here this afternoon who can scarcely believe that such a proposal has been made in the Congress of the United States, to rob men of this political and citizenship right, to prevent them from helping to elect men like many of you here this afternoon to the Congress of the United States. It is unthinkable. The foregoing language could be construed to prevent unions from spending money for radio time, for disseminating their views on candidates or political offices and on campaign issues. Although on the face of it the provision writes of freedom of speech, some parts may hold otherwise. Thus, it will not be known until the courts have passed on the proposed enactment, whether it is unconstitutional. And that will involve the expenditure of large sums of money by labor to test the validity and constitutionality of such an objectionable act in the courts of the land. It will bring them into the courts for a long period of time and in the meantime the rights of labor will be hanging in the balance of uncertainty, and we will be deprived of helping our friends to be elected to the Congress of the United States, and in defeating our enemies.

It is apparent that the purpose of the enactment is meant to make unlawfyul activities of certain organizations such as were engaged in the last national election. However, there is embraced within the provision many activities in which labor is obliged to engage in order to defeat an adverse legislative program. Now, my friends, I have gone over this bill known as the H. R. 3937 to repeal the War Labor Disputes Act and analyze some of the objectionable features.

These men who sponsor this measure are committeed to the preservation of our free-enterprise system. They extol the virtues of that system. They demand that it shall

be maintained at any cost. Labor supports a free-enterprise system because it fits in with our free-democratic procedure. But, my friends, how are we to maintain a free-enterprise system that denies labor the exercise of its inherent and fundamental rights? Where are they going to drive labor here in America? Can't they learn any lessons from what is taking place now in the different nations throughout the world? What is the political trend among the masses of the people in Great Britain even, and other nations throughout the world? Well, I want to warn you here right now that we are no different than those in Great Britain. When you drive them to distress, to desperation, they will turn to the left also, and if this kind of procedure is to be kept up the workers of America will be found veering to the left within a short period of time just the same as the workers in other countries throughout the world.

If you want to maintain your free-enterprise system in America then you must be just and fair. The rights of labor under a free-enterprise system must be recognized and protected, just the same as the rights of capital. It isn't one-sided. It isn't for the employers of labor alone. Under the free-enterprise system the owner of the labor is the one who uses it, and he has as much right to give labor or withhold it as an employer has to give his capital or to withhold it.

There are certain rights that go with a democracy and with a free-enterprise system, and if one group in our political and national life wants to maintain their rights under a free-enterprise system they must be big and broad enough to accord to other groups the recognition of a preservance of their rights.

They make much about local strikes that take place. Well, my friends, they don't have any strikes in Russia under the totalitarian form of government. Do we want this Nation to be like that? We don't defend illegal strikes and we don't defend strikes that should not occur, but please bear this in mind, that we, the representatives of labor organizations, are not clothed with the right to select the membership of the labor organization. We can't operate like a fraternal union—pick our men after we have examined them carefully. We must take them as we find them. We organize those whom the employers employ. They select them, and, perfect and imperfect as they are, we blend them into a union for the purpose of teaching them as best we can their responsibilities under a union agreement.

Well, have we reached a point here now where any man living in this day and age can expect perfection in an imperfect world? Please remember that we are still made up of imperfect men and women. We haven't yet reached the millenium and because of that fact I maintain that during the war period and subsequent thereto we have made a record that we ought to be commended for rather than to be condemned for. Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, when the millenium comes and the world is perfect then we can have a land where no strike takes place.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have presented in this brief way our opposition to these measures. I sent to all Members of Congress a letter, a personal letter, urging them to defeat this highly objectionable legislation. I certainly hope there will be a favorable response on the part of a majority of Congress to our appeal. I repeat again that we are endeavoring to correct evils. We are endeavoring to prevent strikes. We are endeavoring to promote management-labor cooperation. We believe it can be done better through cooperation, through meetings, through conferences on the part of management and labor than it can be done through the enactment of compulsory legislation and I know that such a proposal meets with the hearty response of a part of the Members of Congress who are here this afternoon.

Thank you so much for this opportunity of being with you and I know I shall go from here carrying with me a full consciousness of the fact that you are going to stand with us in this fight.

Chairman SABATH. Mr. Green, I am satisfied and convinced that the Members that are here will appreciate—and do appreciate—the splendid explanation of the objectionable features of these bills, and I feel that if the same opportunity had been given to you before these legislative committees, there would have been enough Members there to have defeated the attempts of those few gentlemen who take advantage of unsettled conditions and report such legislation as you have correctly criticized and objected to.

Statement by Harry W. Bashore Before Nebraska Reclamation Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 31 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, Mr. Harry W. Bashore, former Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, Washington, D. C., delivered a very interesting address before the Nebraska Reclamation Association at Lincoln, Nebr., a few days ago. Mr. Bashore, as well as his predecessor, Mr. John C. Page, are former citizens of Nebraska. Mr. Bashore is returning to make his home at Mitchell, Nebr. We welcome him back home. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Bashore's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I have received an estimate from the Public Printer that the address will cover two and two-thirds pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and that the cost will be $138.80.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It's good to get back to Nebraska. For a long time I have been looking forward to the day when I would have leisure time to meet old friends again and talk over some of our mutual interests.

It gives a man a great deal of satisfaction to look back over the years and realize that he has had a part in bringing some portion of prosperity to a great State. I think most of you know that I have my roots pretty well down in Nebraska soil. Thirty-nine years ago I came to work here on the North Platte project as an engineering aide for the Bureau of Reclamation. I am proud to say that the North Platte reclamation development is an outstanding example of what can be accomplished through irrigation.

Since the establishment of this project, Scotts Bluff County has grown in population at a rate three times as great as that of the State. Records of the drought decade (1930-40) show that this county increased 18.3 percent as compared with a net loss for the whole State of Nebraska of 4.7 percent.

Water was the loadstone which drew settlers to Scotts Bluff County. Water will continue to be the deciding factor in the increasing prosperity of this region. Fertile lands in the North Platte project, located in both Nebraska and Wyoming, produce great quantities of sugar beets, alfalfa, barley, potatoes, and beans. Farmers on this irrigated acreage contributed greatly to the more than 11,000,000 tons of food and forage raised on projects served by Bureau facilities last year. You will be interested to know that the total gross value from this 1944 crop was in excess of $411,000,000. That represents a lot of money as well as a great deal of food.

We have learned much since we built the North Platte project. No longer do we consider development of just one stream or river. We map the river basin as a whole, so that by careful planning and regulation of different streams, we can get the most use out of every drop of water in a river valley.

The Bureau of Reclamation is now launching the greatest construction program in its history—a $140,000,000 one for 1946, designed to meet the peacetime needs of the Nation. To finance this program Congress recently granted a supplemental appropriation of $81,462,300. This sum, plus regular appropriations and carry-over funds from the fiscal year, make up the $140,000,000 total available for expenditure this year. Approximately $14,000,000 of this will be used in starting construction on several authorized projects in the Missouri River Basin plan, and in completing engineering and investigations on other approved units. The Missouri River Basin plan is the first of 15 river-basin plans of the Bureau to be presented to the Congress. Nebraska—the whole State of Nebraska—is included in this comprehensive development.

As you know, the Bureau plan, correlated with that of the Corps of Engineers, was approved under the Flood Control Act of 1944, and 29 units were authorized for the initial stage of costruction.

The regular appropriation act for 1946 made $3,200,000 available to the Bureau of Reclamation and other interested agencies of the Interior Department for undertaking detailed surveys, preparation of plans and specifications and further investigation for the over-all Missouri River Basin plan. This money, however, was not sufficient to finance an orderly, well-balanced program of development. The funds would permit the work to be carried forward on only 11 of the 29 approved units.

Following the President's statement to the Congress on September 6, when he urged that funds be provided for the continuation of detailed planning for construction of most needed Federal works, we prepared, with other interested departmental agencies, a program designed to get things going on this and other war-deferred projects.

In the supplemental appropriation bill recently presented to Congress, the Budget estimate for the Missouri River Basin was $11,918,000. Congress appropriated $10,780,300. Included in this amount are funds with which the Bureau can continue its surveys and investigations on several projects in Nebraska.

It is estimated that of the $14,000,000 available for the Missouri River Basin $948,025 will be spent in Nebraska in 1946. Now let us break down this sum into units on which preconstruction work will be started and those on which general investigations will be continued.

Of the 29 authorized Missouri Basin units, there are 4 located in the State of Nebraska where it is anticipated that money will be spent during the fiscal year 1946. These four projects are in the Republican River Basin that includes parts of the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska. Here's a short summary of the anticipated program:

One hundred and forty-six thousand and twenty-five dollars is programed for preconstruction activities including designing and specifications on the Franklin and Red Cloud units of the Bostwick project. The

Nebraska portion of the Superior-Courtland unit will also use some of this money mainly on the diversion dam.

Five hundred and thirty-three thousand dollars is programed to be spent during fiscal year 1946 on preconstruction work and design for Enders Dam, Medicine Creek Dam, Cambridge unit, Oxford unit, Frenchman unit, and Meeker unit of the Frenchman-Cambridge project. The present schedule is to have all the designs and specifications ready for the above units by the 1st of July 1946.

Ten thousand dollars is programed to be spent on the North Republican (Wray) project during the fiscal year 1946. This will be used by preconstruction activities in relation to the two diversion dams and canals that will be constructed to irrigate 2,080 acres of dry farmland near Haigler, Nebr. The major work accomplished during this fiscal year will be at the storage dam at Wray, Colo., and this cost would not be included in the totals for the State of Nebraska.

Ten thousand dollars is programed on pumping projects in Nebraska for the fiscal year 1946. The work accomplished would include geological explorations, field surveys, and surface- and ground-water studies of the units in southwestern Nebraska. The complete unit is approximately one-half in Nebraska, and one-half in Kansas.

Thus a total of $698,025 is programed to be spent for preconstruction work in Nebraska during the fiscal year 1946. Both the Bostwick and Frenchman-Cambridge projects are well under way at this time, and it is anticipated that construction contracts will be awarded on both these projects early in fiscal year 1947. The North Republican (Wray) and Pumping projects are still in the preliminary stages.

In addition, approximately $250,000 of the Missouri River Basin appropriation will be used for general investigations in Nebraska this year. The money will probably be divided as follows: $200,000 in the lower Platte River Basin; $5,000, Republican River Basin; $10,000 for cooperation with the Corps of Engineers, and $35,000 for a general economic study of the Missouri River.

The following shows expenditures proposed for Nebraska in the regular budget for the fiscal year 1947 but not yet appropriated by Congress.

Investigations

	Total project	Nebraska only
Lower Platte (Grand Island, Kearney and Loup River)	$196,000	$196,000
Republican area (including part in Colorado and Kansas)	85,000	30,000
Niobrara	40,000	40,000
Total	321,000	266,000

Preconstruction and construction

North Republican (Wray Dam)	$100,000	$30,000
Bostwick below Harlan County Reservoir (diversion dams and canals)	1,000,000	700,000
Frenchman-Cambridge (Enders Dam, diversion dams, and canals)	1,500,000	1,500,000
Pumping (wells)	100,000	80,000
Transmission lines (Gering-Sidney)	600,000	600,000
Subtotal	3,300,000	2,710,000
Grand total	3,621,000	2,976,000

The Bureau now has under construction in northwestern Nebraska the Mirage Flats project on the Niobrara River. This project lies within the Missouri Basin area, but it is not covered in the supplemental appropriation. You see, we already had the money set aside for the project, which we were constructing as an essential war food development. Although manpower and material shortages have delayed work on Mirage Flats, the irrigation system should be ready to serve part of the lands by next spring. When it is complete, the project will irrigate about 12,000 acres.

Since about 1881, dry farming has been carried on in this area with good crops in occasional years and with poor crops or near failures in most years. After the dry years of 1893 and 1894, the farmers organized a mutual water company and constructed an irrigation system without storage regulation to serve a somewhat larger area than that included in the present Mirage Flats project. The system failed because of inadequate maintenance resulting from lack of use in wet years; the destruction of wood flumes by prairies fires, and because of water shortages in hot months.

Then came the drought decade, which I have already mentioned, and the realization that something must be done to help farmers in regions of uncertain rainfall. Investigations were undertaken and construction was begun on the Mirage Flats project, under the Water Conservation and Utilization Act of May 10, 1939, upon a finding of feasibility approved by the President April 26, 1940.

The Bureau is building Box Butte Reservoir of 30,000 acre-feet capacity about 20 miles above the lands to be served. Irrigation water will be diverted from the Niobrara River about one-half mile below Dunlap by a concrete ogee-type diversion dam. The main canal will be 25 miles long and there will be laterals of simple construction.

And as the Bureau completes work on the Miraga Flats project, it is scheduling construction in 1946 on the Bostwick, one of the Missouri River Basin units. Preliminary investigations have been completed by the Bureau and a final report is being prepared. Preconstruction surveys are now under way. The project includes lands located on both sides of the Republican River from Naponee, Nebr., east and south to Concordia, Kans. The Bureau proposes to irrigate 89,170 acres of new land and to provide a regulated water supply sufficient to supplement 230 acres of land now irrigated, all by gravity. Of the total acreage, about 27,000 acres are in Nebraska.

Drought and flood have been the twin handicaps in Harlan County—droughts causing such serious crop losses that in some years there is not enough feed for cattle and hogs, and floods which sometimes rise to devastating proportions. The plan is to regulate the flood flows and save these waters to stabilize both crop and livestock production in the region.

The Harlan County Reservoir, authorized for construction by the War Department, is scheduled for early building. The dam located just below the confluence of Prairie Dog Creek with the Republican River will provide 850,000 acre-feet of storage capacity allocated as follows: Silting, 200,000; irrigation, 150,000; and flood control, 500,000.

The silt-control feature of the plan is very important because it will improve the use of water below the dam for municipalities, industries, and domestic purposes. Cities now diverting water from the Kansas River, of which the Republican is a principal tributary, will be saved money in filtration costs and maintenance of city waterworks. Likewise, silt control will cut down on costs of operation and maintenance of canals and laterals, as well as aid in keeping the river confined to its channel.

The Bureau plans to develop the irrigable lands below Harlan County Dam in five separate units: Franklin, Red Cloud, Superior-Courtland, Republic, and Scandia. Five diversion dams and nine main canals with a combined length of 169 miles will be required. Lateral and drainage systems for the full acreage will be provided.

A 2,000-kilowatt power plant will be constructed at the Harlan County Dam, if necessary, to provide power for pumping irrigation water from wells along the Republican River above the dam. A 62-mile transmission line to Superior, Nebr., is also proposed for construction.

Exclusive of the Harlan County Reservoir, which is estimated to cost $21,935,000, the total cost of the Bostwick development is expected to be about $9,018,500, based on January 1940 unit prices.

I don't need to tell you what this project and others like it will mean to Nebraska. The Republican River is small, but when its waters are included in a large basin development plan, such as that of the Missouri, this little river assumes a new role in the reclamation of semiarid lands.

Another Republican River project scheduled by the Bureau for early construction is the Frenchman-Cambridge project in southern Nebraska. This is another one of the initial units of the great Missouri River Basin plan. The proposed works will extend from Enders, Nebr., eastward along Frenchman Creek and the main Republican River to Orleans, located only a few miles above the proposed Harlan County Reservoir. The project will include 53,140 acres of land under the following units: Frenchman, 14,200 acres; Meeker, 6,980; Red Willow, 13,870; Cambridge, 13,600; and Oxford, 4,400 acres. Of the total, 16,740 acres, mostly on the Frenchman and Meeker units, will be provided with supplemental irrigation water, and 36,400 acres will be new develoment.

Two storage reservoirs with earth-fill dams for flood control and irrigation use will be constructed. Enders Reservoir, to be built on Frenchman Creek at Enders, will have a gross storage capacity of 74,000 acre-feet to spillway level, of which 30,000 acre-feet will be used for flood control, 34,000 acre-feet for irrigation, and 10,000 acre-feet for silt and wildlife protection.

Medicine Creek Reservoir to be built on Medicine Creek 8 miles northwest of Cambridge will have a storage capacity at spillway level of 100,000 acre-feet, of which 65,000 acre-feet will be used for flood control, 25,000 acre-feet for irrigation, and 10,000 acre-feet for silt and wildlife protection.

One diversion dam will be constructed on Frenchman Creek near Beverly and three on the Republican River near Culbertson, Indianola, and Cambridge. Four main canals and extensions of two existing canals with an aggregate length of 103 miles will be constructed. Laterals and drains will be provided for the Red Willow, Cambridge, and Oxford units. The Meeker system will be improved where necessary to assure dependable service.

Using the 1940 price basis, the total cost of the project is estimated at $11,477,000 of which $6,326,000 represents the cost of the two storage reservoirs.

A Republican River project which will serve both Nebraska and Colorado is the North Republican project. The lands proposed for development lie along the North Fork of the river from Wray, Colo., east to Parks, Nebr. Within this area, 3,340 acres of land already irrigated under private canals will receive supplemental water, and canals will be built to irrigate 2,080 acres of land near Haigler, Nebr.

An earth dam for flood control and irrigation will be built on the North Fork about 4 miles above Wray. A small diversion dam will be constructed on the river near Sanborn to supply water to a 13-mile canal serving lands east and west of Haigler. A second small diversion weir 5 miles east of Haigler will supply a 5-mile canal to serve new lands further east, and laterals will be provided for all new lands. The total cost of the project is estimated at $935,000. These project plans, however, are to be reviewed prior to preconstruction activities.

Along the Republican River Basin in Nebraska and Kansas are many small areas of

good land which require irrigation by pumping from wells. Preliminary plans have been developed for this construction which is one of the initial projects of the Missouri River Basin development. On the basis of such plans, it is proposed ultimately to develop wells in five main units to provide water for the irrigation of 23,500 acres of land distributed as follows: (1) South Fork of Republican River from St. Francis, Kans., to Benkelman, Nebr., 2,500 acres, (2) Republican River from Benkelman to Trenton, Nebr., 7,500 acres, (3) Lower Frenchman Creek above Culbertson, Nebr., 2,500 acres, (4) from Culbertson to the proposed Harlan County Reservoir below Oxford, Nebr., 5,000 acres, and (5) below Harlan County Reservoir, 6,000 acres. Opertion of the pumping plants will require a total installed motor capacity of about 5,000 kilowatts. The total cost of the well units is estimated at $1,140,300.

The Cedar River is another small tributary which is of importance in river valley development for Nebraska. The Cedar Rapids project in east central Nebraska approved under the Flood Control Act of 1944, comprises about 20,000 acres of excellent irrigable land lying in a "shoe-string tract" about 25 miles long and one-half to 1 mile wide on each side of the Cedar River in Nance, Boone, and Greeley Counties.

These lands, as you know, produce fair to good crops in many years, but have serious crop losses in dry periods. The average precipitation is about 24 inches, but varies widely and is often too poorly distributed to permit satisfactory crop yields.

Principal project features would consist of a reservoir at the Ericson site on Cedar River below Ericson with a capacity of about 20,000 acre-feet and an irrigation, distribution, and drainage system.

A rough approximation indicates a construction cost of about $4,000,000. Increased gross crop value will average about $25 per acre, or $500,000 per year.

Loup River waters will be used to the greatest advantage by the construction of the Lower North Loup project and the Sargent project. Both projects are approved as initial units of the Missouri River plan.

The Lower North Loup project comprises about 15,000 acres of excellent irrigable land lying on both sides of the lower part of the North Loup Valley in Howard and Greely Counties in east central Nebraska.

A reservoir at the Davis Creek site would cover irrigation of 10,000 acres and a direct diversion from the North Loup River would serve the rest. A very rough approximation indicates the distribution system may cost about $1,500,000. The Davis Creek Reservoir is estimated to cost $12,500,000. The project would also serve other areas in the lower Platte and Loup Valleys. This development would furnish irrigation water to an area that experiences frequent crop failures, although it has an average annual precipitation of about 24 inches. Increased gross crop value, it is estimated, will amount to about $25 per acre, or $375,000 per year.

The Sargent project will be on the Middle Loup River, near the town of Sargent. There are about 25,000 acres of suitable land that can be irrigated in this area. Unused waters would be conserved and regulated at the Dismal Reservoir site on the Middle Loup River, about 50 miles west of Sargent. There are potential reservoir sites nearer the irrigable lands which might be used to regulate the run-off, not only for use on lands in the Loup Basin, but also for diversions into the Platte Basin near Kearney. Desirable storage capacity of the Dismal Reservoir has been placed at 30,000 acre-feet.

A small area is now irrigated just below the project area, but the generally sandy soils and somewhat rough topography on these lands make irrigation difficult. All lands in the Bureau's proposed Sargent project area have been classified and a reconnaissance survey has been made for canals and reservoirs.

The Loup River and the Platte River will be used to serve the Grand Island project. This development, approved in the over-all Missouri River Basin plan, contemplates the irrigation of several hundred thousand acres in Nebraska on the Platte River from Kearney to Fremont and along the main Loup River.

In this area the annual precipitation ranges from 21 inches at Kearney to 27 inches at Fremont, with fair to good crops as a rule. In almost every year, however, the crop yield could be materially increased by the timely application of water and with adequate and dependable moisture, more diversified and higher-priced crops would be grown.

There is no gravity irrigation on the Platte River below Kearney and it is limited in the Loup River drainage basin to areas along the Middle and North Loup Rivers. A goodly portion of the area in the Loup-Platte Valley is now irrigated by pumping, mostly from wells. Nearly all users of pump irrigation are enthusiastic as a result of the increased crop returns.

The cost of the project is roughly estimated at $40,000,000. Investigations are under way at the present time and several surveys and land classification parties are at work in the area. The possibility of producing power at the contemplated reservoirs and along the diversion canals will be investigated.

The Bureau is also considering for development in the Platte River Valley from North Platte to Kearney a project area containing approximately 200,000 acres of irrigable land of which about 65,000 acres are being irrigated by the Gothenberg, Cozad, Lexington (Dawson County), Elm Creek, and Kearney Canals north of the river, and the Thirty Mile, Six Mile, and Orchard and Alfalfa Canals south of the river.

The canals were originally constructed in the early nineties and, with possibly one exception, underwent a period of disuse early in the century. They were revived after 1910 when the North Platte project return flows and irrigation waste improved stream flows.

The Platte Valley public power and irrigation district in 1934 and 1935 constructed the Sutherland Reservoir at North Platte. Designed to hold 150,000 acre-feet of water, unforeseen circumstances prevented full use of that capacity. The district is under obligation to provide 100,000 acre-feet of storage annually to six of the canals at a charge of $1 per acre-foot. The district has contracted for temporary use of 150,000 acre-feet of capacity in Kingsley Reservoir to comply with irrigation storage contracts and to augment power output at its North Platte plant.

Full development of the project area would require the importation of Loup River waters to Platte Valley. It will be necessary to rehabilitate and extend present canals and construct a new high-line canal on the north side of the river to serve adequately the irrigable lands. Canal capacities are generally inadequate, none of the canals has permanent diversion dams, and some of the intakes are in a precarious condition. Widespread ground water pumping will be needed to provide supplemental water and to minimize a considerable mileage of deep, open drains. A widespread system of surface drains will be necessary to dispose of excessive rainfall in the heavier flat lands, and there should be improved channels and possibly some detention reservoirs for the control and disposition of floods debauched in the flat valley floor by streams draining the neighboring uplands.

Power development at high drops in the canals with power to be used for pumping and the surplus output to be sold is included in the Bureau's plans. The construction cost is estimated at $12,000,000. A conservancy district or similar organization is needed which can effectively operate the complicated system of canals, drains, pumping plants, power plants, and collect adequate funds for the operation and maintenance of the system.

I should also like to call to your attention that the people of this State will benefit from projects to be constructed under the Missouri River Basin plan in neighboring States. To name a few of these, there is the Angostura unit on the Cheyenne River just across the line in South Dakota, and the Glendo Reservoir on the North Platte River in Wyoming.

And included in the supplemental appropriation for the Colorado-Big Thompson project was an amount of $500,000 for building the Brush-Sterling-Holyoke transmission line. This extension will consist of 35 miles of 115-kilovolt transmission line from Brush to Sterling, Colo., and 50 miles of 66 kilovolt transmission line from Sterling to Holyoke, Colo. The proposed extension will serve immediately to alleviate the critical power shortage in the vicinity of Holyoke, Colo., and will ultimately serve cooperatives, municipalities, and private utilities in northeastern Colorado and western Nebraska.

The Bureau, in cooperation with the Corps of Engineers, is also planning further studies and surveys on the South Platte River in Colorado and Nebraska with especial reference to the Cherry Creek, Chatfield, and Narrows River sites, the Sappa Creek area in Kansas and Nebraska, and Elk Horn River in eastern Nebraska.

It was a great day for Nebraska when the Missouri River Basin plan was approved by the Congress. I have long looked forward to the time when it would be possible to offer a good development program to you people. The Missouri River Basin plan is the culmination of our hopes and dreams. By controlling this unruly river, it will be possible to bring under irrigation almost 1,000,000 new acres of land in Nebraska and to provide supplemental support for almost 20,000 acres now inadequately served.

New irrigated farms can be made ready for settlement of veterans and others in this State; supplemental water supplies can be provided to farmers now barely eking out an existence; and job opportunities can be opened on construction sites, and in cities, which will thrive near reclamation developments. Above all, we can minimize the dangers of drought and flood, and provide economic stability through the diversification of agriculture in this State. A more prosperous Nebraska will mean a more prosperous Nation, for we have found that when western farmers have money to buy what they need, other parts of the country feel the effect of their purchasing power.

The projects which I have discussed for this State are part of a great inventory of 415 developments which the Bureau has blueprinted for the 17 Western States. More than 100 of these, including the Missouri Basin units, have been authorized or are under construction or in operation.

If all these projects are built it is estimated that the purchasing power of the West will be increased by several billion dollars a year, that it will be possible to open up 200,000 new farms for settlement on 11,000,000 new acres of land, and to provide supplemental water for another 11,000,000 acres. Hydroelectric plants on reclamation projects, which contributed so greatly to war production, would be of increasing importance for pumping irrigation water, for serving rural electrification needs, and for the development of home-State industries, such as food-processing plants.

With greater use of electrical labor-saving devices, people will have more leisure time. Recreational opportunities, such as boating, fishing, and picnicking will be offered by the many reservoirs created by dams on the Missouri River and other great western streams.

My years of association with water users in this State have been happy, challenging ones. What the Bureau of Reclamation has accomplished here has been done through the cooperative, untiring efforts of great county, town, and State leaders. The Bureau of Reclamation needs your continued support. As a resident of Nebraska—for here is where I intend to settle now that I have retired from the job as Commissioner—I will be working with you and looking forward to sharing the good years ahead of us.

Secret Agreement at Yalta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 1, 1946

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein two editorials from the Washington Post of January 30, 1946, and February 1, 1946, entitled "Mr. Roosevelt's Lapse" and "Halter at Yalta":

[From the Washington Post, January 30, 1946]

MR. ROOSEVELT'S LAPSE

Secretary Byrnes has now confirmed the Russian contention that at the Yalta Conference in February 1945, a secret three-power agreement was made promising the Kurile Islands and southern Sakhalin to Russia after the defeat of Japan. The news comes as something of a shock. It shows that the late President Roosevelt was not entirely candid when, some time before his death, he said that, aside from the agreement to give representation to the Ukraine and White Russia at the United Nations Conference—that fact leaked out not very long after Yalta—no other secret agreements had been made at the Crimea Conference.

It is true that at the time Mr. Roosevelt made this statement Russia was still neutral in the Pacific war. It is also true that any revelation as to the future disposition of the Kuriles would have tipped off Japan regarding Russia's intentions. A valid argument could therefore be made for the secrecy of the agreement. But this does not explain Mr. Roosevelt's assurance. Nor does it explain why President Roosevelt kept the arrangement secret even from the State Department. Secretary Byrnes says that he did not hear about it until after Japan's defeat. It appears doubtful whether former Secretary Stettinius was informed. And there is no copy of the agreement in the State Department archives. No wonder that when asked about the Kuriles at a press conference on January 22 the then Acting Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, said that it was his understanding—now proved to have been mistaken—that Russia was only to occupy the Kuriles, not to keep them permanently.

The fact is that at Yalta President Roosevelt was a very sick man. This is a charitable explanation not only of his lack of candor but also of the arrangement itself. Had Mr. Roosevelt been in full vigor he would no doubt have hesitated to accept such an arrangement. It was not within Mr. Roosevelt's authority to "give" the Kurile Islands to Russia or anyone else. That can only be done by treaty, which means with the Senate's advice and consent. Accordingly, the Kurile arrangement must be regarded as tentative rather than final.

Evidently Russia was promised the Kuriles outright with no strings attached. No quid pro quo was asked or given. Nor was any question raised about putting those strategically important islands under international trusteeship. This we must now try to do. The American Government ought not to oppose the cession as such. For strategic reasons—they are just off Russia's coast—those islands are vital to Russia's security, and there can be no valid objection to Russian occupation of them. But we must press Russia to accept the same kind of trusteeship arrangement for these islands that is made in respect of other Pacific islands. The whole trusteeship arrangement is endangered by the new revelation.

[From the Washington Post of February 1, 1946]

HALTER AT YALTA

It is clear from the revelation of the secret Yalta agreement to give the whole of the Kuriles to the Russians that Mr. Roosevelt proceeded to the Crimea in January 1945 not only a sick man but also with an imperfect grasp of the situation in the Pacific. Perhaps the sickness and the lack of grasp went together. At any rate, Mr. Roosevelt seems to have labored under two misapprehensions. One was that the struggle with Japan would be protracted, and the other was that, either because of the prospect of a long conflict with Japan or because of uncertainty about Russia, it was necessary to buy Russia's entry. The misapprehensions combined to make the conference at Yalta a monumental blunder.

At Yalta the uncanny intuition and commanding faith which marked Mr. Roosevelt's conduct of the war went under a cloud. The contrast looks strange in retrospect. The President never minimized the Nazi menace, he appreciated the survival value of Britain and went to Britain's aid with lend-lease, he knew that the course of wisdom was to beat Hitler first, he gave moral sustenance to the British in their darkest hour. In these respects he has been brilliantly vindicated. May it not be that the intuition and the faith which made him the grand bulwark of the Allied cause against Hitler were built on information which he was able to size up correctly?

This seems to be the case in the light of what happened at Yalta. It looks as if the President was neither so well served in the Pacific nor so well equipped to evaluate or to understand the forces in operation. He had Joseph Grew as his chief adviser on Japan. Mr. Grew had a sense of values in dealing with Japan, but he seems to have overestimated Japan's staying power. It could be said for him that when the homefront morale was a vital element in warmaking the tactic of exaggerating the foe's prowess was forgivable. But it is another thing to base military and political strategy on a public-relations tactic. The blunder at Yalta shows that the President counted on the long and sanguinary struggle for which the American people were prepared.

But the chief weakness in the advice available to the President would appear to have lain in Moscow. Mr. Averell Harriman, who is now retiring from his post, was our Ambassador. He was one of the proteges of Harry L. Hopkins who got and stayed out of their depth when they were given high office. We felt this at the time, and the knowledge that Mr. Harriman was at Mr. Roosevelt's side when he made all the deals at Yalta which have turned out to be Dead Sea fruit confirms our feeling. Did Mr. Harriman try to restrain the President? Evidently not. The assumption must be made that Ambassador Harriman advised the President that on the theory of a bitter struggle with the Japanese, it was necessary to buy Russian participation.

Nothing could surely have been more obvious than that in her own interests Russia would have jumped into the war against Japan without a purchase price. The Russians would have had no title otherwise in the peace settlement in the Far East. As Badoglio once said, the price of a seat at the peace table is always a few thousand dead. Evidently, however, the conferees at Yalta sought to persuade the Russians to come in, the price being all the Kuriles and two extra seats for the Ukraine and White Russia respectively in the United Nations. In return the United States got a mess of pottage in the form of promises of a democratic eastern Europe and a frontier line in Poland which never materialized. The clumsiness and mistake of the Yalta proceedings yielded nothing but unnecessary headache over eastern Europe, a legacy of trouble at San Francisco, and the jeopardization of a sensible and cooperative trusteeship system in the Pacific. It was a tragedy for the United States that Mr. Roosevelt was sick at Yalta and his advisers asleep. Mr. Truman, we hope, will take the lesson to heart when the time comes to name a successor to Mr. Harriman. We need an Eisenhower in Moscow.

Bad Conditions in the Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 1, 1946

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, evidently there is something wrong with the treatment of our armed forces in the Pacific, for almost daily I have received complaints from the parents of these men who are now serving in the Pacific area. There seems not only to be low morale but utter disgust for the treatment they are receiving at the hands of the high officer personnel.

I am including a copy of a letter to the father of one of these men which will depict what is seemingly going on in the Pacific theater:

DECEMBER 12, 1945.

DEAR DAD: I don't want mom to see this letter if possible, because she would probably worry a lot and it isn't very nice to think about.

As you have probably been able to tell in my last few letters, our morale has been getting pretty low out here. First of all we have been over here 17 months; second, we have been stuck so far hauling Japs in the repatriation program. We don't mind the first part so much because most of the LST's doing this duty are old or older than us. We did think taking Japs to Japan was bad because we had to cramp 1,000 of them in the tank deck, which can hold them all, but with little room to spare. The Japs, however, have interpreters, doctors, and as a whole are pretty clean. Also few, if any, of the Japs are sick. Some of the Japs get seasick but on the whole they manage to throw up over the side. They are also easy to keep in line, having been strongly disciplined in the Jap Army. The main objection to them seems to be that their food and their bodies smell bad. But it can be worse, we found that out. Before I go into that though, our schedule is like this: We load in groups of three LST's at Taku, China, with 1,000 Japs apiece with six marines to guard them. Then we sail for Japan where we set for a couple of days and then return empty. On these LST's there is no doctor except Jap doctors for their men. Last trip we had two men come down with dysentery.

However, the worst is yet to come. The last time at Sasebo we loaded up with Chinese civilians to take to Taku. That was yesterday afternoon. These are our observations so far. Of the 1,000, anywhere

from 600 to 800 are definitely sick and probably all of them are diseased in some way. The diseases include dysentery, syphilis, gonorrhea, leprosy, and beri-beri. We had some rough weather last night and they didn't bother to go to the "heads" we had made for them. They just puked, ——, and urinated right where they were. The tank deck smells worse than any barn you ever thought of. The Japs at least were clean, the Chinese are filthy. I saw a few today from a distance who had big syphilis sores on their buttocks. Others have feet rotting off from beri-beri (lack of vitamins or nourishing food). The Chinese have no doctors or interpreters.

Our men refuse to go near the tank deck and I don't blame them. I won't go near them myself. So far no disease has broken out in the crew and I'm hoping and praying it won't. But this is the last straw. I think that this is something that needs looking into. It might be somewhat of a blow to MacArthur's unblemished (?) reputation if something like this were to come out at home.

Authorities out here rule with an iron hand and no sense can be drilled into their heads, but there ought to be someone in Washington who would be interested in this. So if you can think of anybody to write to that will help us out, please do so. We're not the only LST on this duty; there are about 50 more. Most of our crew are writing similar letters home. You know we can't write letters like this to a Congressman.

I can't exactly describe my emotions now. I guess the greatest is the fear of getting one of these diseases. Then there's contempt for the Army, Navy, and anything military. Discouragement, as far as getting to the States, that almost reached despair and anger at the whole lousy set-up.

Well, this has been a pretty strong letter, but it just gives you a faint idea about how things are being done out here. If something isn't done, one of these things will happen:

1. A major epidemic will break out in one of these convoys, with no doctor to help out.

2. Or one of these crews is going to mutiny.

Men are eligible for discharge and cannot be sent home because of no replacements. LST's are being held out here long after they are supposed to have gone to the States, even in wartime schedule.

The Japs offered to do this job with their own ships, but MacArthur said, "The United States Navy will take them back." About the only time that LST's have been considered a part of the Navy.

If I wasn't an officer, I'd write straight to a Congressman. Some of the men, I'm sure, have done that. They don't mind whatever they get because this stink will so overweigh whatever error they made that it won't make any difference. I'll bet a paper like the Chicago Tribune would go for a story like this.

Well, I must close now. Maybe a miracle will happen and they'll decide to stop all this stuff. I'll let you know how we come out.

P. S.—Please see what you can do. This is mighty important to us.

Foreign Policy Must Be Based on Principle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 1, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Sumner Welles, from the Washington Post of January 30, 1946:

FOREIGN POLICY MUST BE BASED ON PRINCIPLE

(By Sumner Welles)

In an article of January 19, Mr. Walter Lippmann vehemently assails my recent statement that the United States will impair its chance of leading humanity toward lasting peace unless all peoples can have faith that when this Government speaks officially it means what it says.

Mr. Lippmann's writing is usually distinguished by its clarity. His present argument seems to me a singular amalgam of contradictions and of confused reasoning.

Mr. Lippmann admits the fact that at Moscow this Government abandoned two basic principles to which it was solemnly pledged. He insists, however, that the picture which I draw of this fact is "absolutely and fundamentally false."

To justify this charge he pleads that the action of the United States in agreeing to relinquish its exclusive control over Japan justifies its abandonment of those essential principles to which it had committed itself at Yalta and at London. He claims that "our moral position is better after Moscow than it was after London."

He asserts that the partial rectification at Moscow of a grave lapse of which we had been guilty in our Far Eastern policy warrants the abandonment of our official pledge to secure the establishment of free and representative governments in the occupied countries of eastern Europe. In other words, atonement for one error justifies the commission of another. That would indeed be a new precept in international morality.

He is certain that my own position in this connection is not free of embarrassment. He reminds me that while I have urged that this country should not abandon the official commitment into which it entered at Yalta, to bring about the installation of democratic governments in the occupied countries, I have quite as strongly opposed intervention by the United States in the American Republics for the purpose of imposing some standardized form of political regime upon their people.

Mr. Lippmann is evidently ignorant of the fact that the United States is bound by inter-American agreements to refrain from any form of intervention, direct or indirect, in the Western Hemisphere.

I can see no cause for embarrassment in urging that this Government should always abide by its official commitments, whether those be to promote self-government in the countries formerly dominated by the Axis or to refrain from intervention in the internal concerns of its neighbors.

The difference between Mr. Lippmann and myself is, however, much more far-reaching.

Mr. Lippmann believes, and so maintains in much of his recent writings, that the peace of the world can best be preserved through the establishment of a few spheres of influence, each dominated by a major military nation. He has repeatedly urged that a new balance of power should be constructed upon such a basis.

I, on the other hand, believe that neither world peace nor human freedom can be advanced through a return to any kind of a military balance of power. I believe those ideals can only be attained through the development of a world under law, which has available the power to enforce its decisions.

I further believe that the United Nations Organization affords the American people the one chance they possess to promote those objectives.

I do not believe, however, that the United Nations Organization can succeed if it is utilized as a front behind which the rights of weaker peoples are to be flagrantly disregarded. Were that to take place the major powers would speedily surround themselves with subservient satellites and thus create the system of military spheres of influence which Mr. Lippmann upholds. The Charter was designed to bring about a world order in which the smaller neighbors of the major powers will become peaceful and friendly because they can have confidence that the United Nations Organization will be employed not as means for the extinction of their liberties, but rather as a means for the protection of every one of their legitimate rights as free peoples.

We will have no assurance of a better world order until the three major powers have had the opportunity to cooperate in the United Nations Organization, and by thus working together at length learn by experience that they can live and prosper in the same world without reason for fear or suspicion. Until such a foundation of mutual trust has been established, it would be difficult for the new international organization to make much progress.

But surely international confidence will not be built up unless the three major powers abide by their commitments.

The most extraordinary feature of Mr. Lippmann's reasoning seems to me to be his apparent failure to attribute any importance to the need for this Government to abide by its pledged word.

There is no country today which, because of its power, its demonstrated resources, its geographical position, and its lack of any imperialistic ambitions can assume the leadership which the United States can exercise.

If other peoples find that the basic principles of policy which the United States professes, and to which it is officially pledged, are disregarded in practice, the ability of the United States to exercise such leadership will necessarily be lost.

If the foreign policy of the United States is not generally recognized as being dependable, and if other countries have no assurance that the United States means what it says, this Government will lose its best chance to help in erecting a new world order.

Neither the United States nor any other major power can buy its safety by sanctioning the present spreading disregard of the rights of weaker peoples, by doing homage to force rather than to justice, or by abandoning for the sake of apparent expediency those proven principles in international relations which alone can make for a free and peaceful world.

Proper Consideration for a Great Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 1, 1946

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

STATEMENT TO THE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF ENGINEERS FOR RIVERS AND HARBORS BY JUSTIN R. QUERBES, PRESIDENT, QUERBES & BOURQUIN, SHREVEPORT, LA.

It is my pleasure to come before you today in a dual capacity. First, as president of the Shreveport Port Development Association, and, secondly, as a businessman in Shreveport whose interests extend into some of our major shipping industries.

In the capacity as president of our port development association, I should like to assure this honorable board that we in Shreveport will develop a public dock that can be used by shippers of every classification, irrespective of the quantity of merchandise they wish to ship. Several mem-

bers of our association are representatives of the leading firms within our community, and many are major shippers. The acceptance of a place on the directory of this association is indicative within itself that these men within their industries, and the industries with which they are affiliated, will supply substantial tonnage in support of this canal. There is no need of my elaborating upon this because we have, each of us, supplied our data to the department of public works, and it is therefore incorporated in their report.

I am here, in my second capacity, as a Shreveport businessman, to assure you that we in Shreveport will use this canal when you provide it. My affiliations in a business way give me a small insight into the over-all business picture of our community. One of the industries with which I am affiliated is a fabricator of steel products. Our best available estimates indicate that we would ship by this canal approximately 60,000 tons per annum. Now, we are only one of several industries in our community that does a similar business in the same general classification. It would be economically sound for us to use the canal, and I see no reason why it would not be just as sound for every other fabricator of steel or iron products in the community. I believe it would, and I believe they would use the canal.

Another of my business affiliations is a wholesale electrical appliance establishment. We have carefully analyzed our operations and believe that we would use the canal in this enterprise to the extent of some 3,000 tons per annum. We would do this because it is economically sound for us to do so. The use of the canal on any other basis would not long endure. There are several other establishments in our community of a similar or a related nature, and I can see no reason why it would not be equally as sound for them to use the canal.

I am submitting this information relative to my own business connections solely for the purpose of pointing out to you that we as businessmen in the firms with which I am associated have determined it to be sound business for us to use this service when it is made available. If it is sound for us, it will be equally as sound for many other institutions which have not as yet, perhaps, given it the same analytical study that we have given it. So I have no fears but what the canal will be used more than is necessary to establish its economic justification.

Sound United States Leadership in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 1, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Maj. Gen. David P. Barrows, from the New York Times of January 20, 1946:

SOUND UNITED STATES LEADERSHIP IN ASIA

(By Maj. Gen. David P. Barrows, military authority and former president of the University of California)

The cease-fire agreement between the national government at Chungking and the Communist organization in the north is hailed as the emergence of China as a strong, united nation.

This result has not yet been fully achieved, but to give it any prospects of success it was essential that the Communist endeavor to create a northern state embracing the provinces of Inner Mongolia and the very rich area of Manchuria should be defeated.

This Communist object has failed.

Those Americans who would have defeated the unification of China, and there are many such among our informers of opinion, will still attack and belittle the achievement of Marshal Chiang. There will be an element of truth in these hostile representations, for Chiang's regime is admittedly far from perfect, but there will continue to be, as there long has been, a great deal of misrepresentation.

The Chinese are a very great people, inclined to be orderly, but never well organized. Perhaps no people ever got on so tolerably under what may be called "philosophic anarchism." But the long calm of the Chinese Empire was disturbed in the last century by the aggressions of foreign nations.

The last attempt to break up the country came from an oriental neighbor, Japan. It resulted in moving the masses of the Chinese to a fury of resistance. It developed in the lowest classes a sense of their national existence and a hope for their national greatness.

It is essential to the peaceful order of the world that China become a unified state without sacrifice of the liberal and individualistic principles upon which its society has long rested. China is today not only a member of the UNO, but one of the five principal powers. Asia is by far the most populous continent. It has three important popular movements represented by India, the Russian Soviet Empire, and China. The most important of these, for the right settlement of Asian life, is China.

Fortunately, after seemingly long hesitation, Washington realizes this, and now gives its support to the Government of Marshal Chiang. This Government is not free from objections; it contains several groups struggling for personal power; it is as yet incapable of performing well many essential services, but it is undoubtedly the best and most honest Government that China has had in modern times.

Also, this National Government is under the only leader who has the necessary qualities, including military and civil skill, and unrivaled influence with the Chinese masses. Marshal Chiang has surmounted the crisis which arose immediately out of the defeat of Japan. Most of north China, the railways, and important cities were in the possession of the Japanese armies, which numbered more than a million men. Manchuria was in possession of the famous Kwangtung Army.

Manchuria, after the Japanese surrender, was overrun by Russian armies. We do not know yet just what happened to the Kwangtung Army, but in large part it surrendered to the Russians.

The Communist army saw its opportunity to secure the surrender of the Japanese in northern China. In this way they would gain important territories, cities, and railroads, and the greatest prize of all—the arms and particularly the artillery of the Japanese forces.

Here is where the power of the United States exerted its best influence since the end of the World War. General MacArthur is known to have advised the Japanese Government at Tokyo that Japanese forces in China must surrender only to the Nationalist armies of Marshal Chiang or to those of the United States. A United States Marine Corps, picked up on Okinawa and Guam, was sent into north China to effect this Japanese surrender and to assure the position of the Chinese Nationalist Government.

This is the explanation of what has been going on in China and of the continued presence there of our Army officers and Air Force and of the United States Marines.

The Nuernberg Trial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH CLARK BALDWIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 1, 1946

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from a constituent:

COUDERT BROTHERS,
New York, December 10, 1945.

FELIX MORLEY, Esq.,
Human Events, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MORLEY: I have read with interest, as every lawyer must, your article on travesty of justice, which appeared in Human Events.

While I have grave doubts as to the wisdom of attempting to try the German leaders for organizing warfare and have so stated, I cannot but feel that your article is not wholly fair to Mr. Justice Jackson and to the participation of our Government in the present trial at Nuernberg.

I know that you are desirous of being altogether just and impartial in the matter, and therefore I write you this letter as one who has given some thought to the difficult problems presented by the post-war criminal situation.

I have never had any serious doubt that many of the atrocities perpetrated during the war could be prosecuted under the Military Code. I also felt that superior orders should not be allowed to stand as a defense for those who had actually committed these outrages against the fundamental dictates of humanity and all civilized systems of law. My doubt was as to the question of waging aggressive war. Until recent times, international law certainly had not definitely condemned war as a means of national policy. In fact, it had been looked upon as a development of political action. However, since the First World War, the Kellogg-Briand Peace Pact primarily, and many other non-aggression pacts between nations, have repudiated this conception of war. The Kellogg-Briand Peace Pact was signed by Germany as well as by the other nations. With such pact in force, a definite, avowed, and admitted conspiracy to wage aggressive war was entered into by the national, military, and civil leaders, under Hitler's direction—not only in defiance of treaty—but also to wage wars of extermination against the Poles, Jews, and others who stood in the path of the German superman. This would seem to present a situation which even the most indulgent could hardly claim to be free from criminality. As matter of fact, it was probably the greatest and most deliberately planned and calculated conspiracy to commit maximum crime that has ever been known on this planet.

Under the circumstance, should we be astute to place about those perpetrators American constitutional guarantees, which have no reference to such a situation, and to use them in defense of men to whom you would have no objection "if they had been shot by a military firing squad when captured"? While I incline to think that this latter course has certain advantages, as I watch the growing record of the trial I am impressed with the wisdom of bringing to the light all of the facts involved in this colossal conspiracy. From the standpoint of history it will certainly have the highest value; moreover, it will give to the defendants an opportunity to explain at the bar of

history whatever case they may have in justification of these monstrosities of calculated cruelty.

You will say, of course, that the court is not a neutral and impartial court. Indeed, that is not an unfair criticism, but I think it may be said that the case presented to the court will be of so overwhelming a character that the opinion of decent, civilized men throughout the world will be that no court, worthy of the name, could reach any other conclusion than condemnation.

If this should turn out to be the result, could we fairly call all this a "travesty of justice"? With a full realization of the novel, legal problems involved, I cannot believe that this is so. Might it not be more accurate to say that, while the proceeding might be doubtful in law, there could be no doubt of its essential justice? Usually law lags behind the dictates of justice, but in exceptional cases new law is and must be made to fit new circumstances. This is quite as true of international law as of national law.

After all, if general international agreements, such as the Paris Peace Pact, specific and definite in its renunciation of war, are to go for naught and be ranked with mere pious antiwar expressions, would not such a situation be hopeless, indeed? Is it not just that a group of men who had worked through the years with the definite purpose of destroying other nations and peoples through the violation of all law should be punished? If, as you admit, it might be well to shoot them summarily, is it not better first to observe the forms of law, to wit: giving due notice of the charge against them, opportunity to appear personally through counsel and to present their defense? If they can make out any defense which any respectable section of our public opinion thinks should exonerate them, I should be very much surprised, and would then feel that perhaps it would have been unfortunate to have shot them without trial.

I have no explanation of the Krupp incident to which you refer other than to assume that the younger Krupp was deemed by the prosecution to be equally guilty of criminal conspiracy with his father. If not, I can see no explanation for the substitution.

I am trying to look at the matter as objectively as possible as I have been, for many years, interested in the substitution of law for force. I am hopeful that this trial may in the end, although I have differed with some of its features and proceedings, set a precedent for the future, in which any attempt to organize aggressive warfare, by whomever practiced, may be recognized as a criminal offense on behalf of its perpetrators. Nations are composed of men and if treaties and international law are to have any sanction the men who designedly conspire to violate them should be held criminally responsible.

Believe me,

Faithfully yours,

FREDERIC R. COUDERT.

A Soldier's Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 1, 1946

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

JANUARY 15, 1946.

DEAR MOM AND DAD: I'm sorry I haven't written to you for quite some time. I expected to come home, so I didn't think I need to write.

Well, we did leave for home on the 8th. We left Palawau in an LCT and went to Cavite receiving ship which is just across the bay from Manila. We got here the 10th. We were scheduled to leave here, for the States, on the aircraft carrier *Jacinto*. It left day before yesterday, but we weren't on it. We went to find out why, and they told us our orders were all fouled up. We asked them what was the matter with them, and they told us that the yeoman at Palawau didn't put our destination in the States in our orders. We asked them how long it would be before we could leave, and they said it would be about 2 or 3 weeks. Well, we knew that was a damned lie because it would only take about 2 hours to fix all our orders up, which are just 26.

Well, after we found that out of course we started looking around to see what we could do to hurry them up. Some of the boys went to the chaplain, others went to the personnel office. In the meantime the ship had left. The chaplain said if we had come to him sooner he could have gotten us on the ship. He said we would make the next one.

Well, today our names were called over the loud-speaker to report at such and such a place, so, naturally, we thought we were going home so we hurried up there. Then we got there and found out that we were on a permanent working party and P. A. L.'s, which means prisoners at large. We know we can't be prisoners at large without a charge, so we asked them the charge. They said that it was for missing our draft. Well, we didn't miss any draft, because we were never called for one, so we explained to them. They wouldn't listen, so we went to work. We tried to get to see an officer but they would not let us. After working about 2 hours we found out that we were not prisoners, but the working is punishment for raising such a stink because we didn't get to go home. They say we will go out on the next draft, but I don't know whether we will or not. We worked all day today, and we have to work tomorrow. I don't mind working, but to have to work for punishment for something we didn't do wrong makes me mad as hell.

I am just writing this to let you know just what kind of an Army I'm in. As far as I'm concerned, it's just a concentration camp.

Well, if I don't write in the next week, you will know that I have gotten out of this —— —— place.

I hope that I get home soon, and I hope you are all well.

Love,

A SOLDIER.

The Vital Stassen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 1, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mark Sullivan from the Washington Post of January 28, 1946:

THE VITAL STASSEN

(By Mark Sullivan)

This writer last Saturday listened to an address by retired Navy Capt. Harold E. Stassen. It was, he said, his first address to a political body in 3 years, since he resigned as Governor of Minnesota to enter the Navy. (The occasion was a luncheon of the Women's National Republican Club in New York.)

Doubtless those who listened over the radio got the same impression of Captain Stassen's personality as the audience who both heard and saw. It is the writer's impression that, for whatever reason, the radio conveys with special definiteness personality and shadings of it, as expressed in the quality of a speaker's voice. Particularly does the radio convey a quality that is salient in Captain Stassen, vitality. What the radio conveyed of that was not materially increased by anything perceptible only by the eye. His gestures were few and very restrained, an occasional up-and-down movement of the right forearm. This rarity and slightness of gesture illustrates a special quality of Captain Stassen's forcefulness. His vitality is just there, like his arms and his features. It flows out of him as easily and as without effort as unhurried breath. It is vitality combined with temperateness; temperateness is as obvious in him as strength.

All that he said was temperate, even when he dealt with matters that are the heart of our present political controversy. Far from taking advantage of the failure of what President Truman has tried to do about strikes, Captain Stassen counseled further use, with changes, of the principle which Mr. Truman, up to a certain point, has used, but in the steel strike ceased to use. "The President," Captain Stassen said, "can never properly break off contact with an industrial dispute of as grave and Nation-wide significance as the current steel strike."

Captain Stassen suggested an over-all conference "to bring together all the economic groups involved." To these he would add, in the spirit of political cooperation, "the leadership of both political parties." He would include "expert advice from leading economists." All to the end that the conference would "develop agreement on basic policy."

If Captain Stassen were President and sat in such a conference, his immense store of vitality would count greatly. It is not that he would knock heads together; he is not that kind. It is not merely that he would outlast the others, as he would. It is rather that he would prevail by sustained and unexcited pressure in behalf of the necessity of agreement.

Captain Stassen, as a possibility for the Republican Presidential nomination, will be helped if the public realizes that sheer vitality is a seriously desirable quality in a President. Vitality can stand up to the number and burden of the tasks. It could dominate, instead of being overwhelmed by, the immense and sprawling number, partly mesh and partly tangle, of departments, agencies, and bureaus which the executive branch of the Government has come to be. And vitality could resist the pressure groups who drive ruthlessly for special interests.

Captain Stassen's vitality goes with his comparative youth, he is 39. He is young without being juvenile. (The distinction is material, we have seen men who were juvenile without being young.) Toward Captain Stassen, young voters might have a feeling of fraternity. That might offset a detriment the Republican Party bears.

Common observation sees, and polls bear out, that the Republicans are strongest in the age groups above 40 or so, that younger voters tend the other way. This may be because a voter who is now 25 has spent more than half his life, and all the part that takes notice of public affairs, under the administration that began with the inauguration of President Roosevelt in 1933. It would not be strange if such a young voter looked upon the idea of a Republican in the White House as an adventure into the unaccustomed. On the other hand, but to the same effect, it may be in part that the younger generation may have become indoctrinated with a spirit of skepticism about tradition and accepted institutions, making

them unsympathetic to the conservation with which the Republican Party is associated. In both cases and altogether, the Republicans need young voters, and nominating Captain Stassen might help to get them.

The Housing Prospect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 30, 1946

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial which appeared in the December 19, 1946, issue of the Mamaroneck (N. Y.) Daily Times entitled "The Housing Prospect":

THE HOUSING PROSPECT

Experienced observers at Washington advise against optimism with regard to early construction of homes. Some will be built next spring and summer—but not many. In fact, the shortage is likely to remain acute for at least 2 years. In view of such predictions, Westchester, where building long has been our principal industry, should arm itself with facts before it begins to plan.

Here is the general situation as it appears:

Low-priced and medium-priced homes will get priorities on materials; that is, houses costing $10,000 and less, exclusive of the land. Efforts will be made to induce builders to concentrate on the lower-priced dwellings first, and there will be strong governmental opposition to early construction of such buildings as those designed for clubs, theaters, and even hotels, on the theory that these will tend to serve classes instead of the masses. Such high-class suburban developments as have featured Westchester in the past may be delayed until 1947.

Veterans will get priorities.

The Government is preparing to release surplus building materials, and local chambers of commerce can help by locating local stocks and going after them through Federal Housing Expediter Wilson Wyatt. This holds true, too, for war industry housing and barracks.

City, town, and village councils may well overhaul their building and zoning codes; some requirements which were justified when first drawn may have disappeared. And there must be specific planning of what type of homes will be permitted if we are to avoid jerry-built "quickie" developments.

Builders and unions must get together to eliminate unfair practices on either side. The black market should be squashed and unions should stamp out any "feather-bedding." It seems contrary to general policy that, when painters expect to receive as much as $20 a day, union regulations should be considered limiting the size of the brush which may be employed, in order to lengthen the work.

Prices, we fear, are going to be much higher than the average potential homeowner contemplates. OPA price controls on materials are likely to be eased, to encourage the industry, and there is every indication that construction-wage scale, if not thrown overboard altogether, may be evaded. All this will push up the ultimate cost of a new home far beyond the prewar figure. One indirect benefit therefrom, whether welcome or not, will be enhancement of the values of existing homes, both as to sale and as to tax assessments.

Rents, it is predicted, may be as much as 20 percent higher, under the OPA formula.

Altogether, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that whatever may be said in Washington about holding the line, inflation has hit the building market, and there is little that can be done about it. You may say what you please about the danger; there is little logic in denying the actual condition. And you will find this when you lay your architect's plans before your contractor.

Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 1, 1946

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the national commander of the American Legion:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS,
Washington, D. C., January 31, 1946.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: A survey conducted throughout the Nation by the American Legion discloses that in the central offices in Washington and regional offices throughout the country there has been a tragic breakdown in the administration of the law pertaining to the care and the treatment of the veterans who are the special charges of the Veterans' Administration. Among other delinquencies we have found there are over 500,000 applications for service-connected ratings for compensation purposes, which have not been processed by the Veterans' Administration; 7,840 pending applications for hospitalization awaiting process; 102,830 applications for education and training under title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act which have not been processed; and literally hundreds of thousands of unopened letters pertaining to various phases of veterans benefits and insurance claims in Veterans' Administration offices throughout the Nation; 20,411 pending claims for waivers of premium on national service life insurance due to total and permanent disability, and 8,847 pending death claims undisposed of.

It is apparent from the above figures that the great promise of our Government to the returning veteran that he would be adequately cared for, together with his widow and orphans, is not being fulfilled by the present administration of the act.

It must be borne in mind that the figures given above are absolute minimum figures reflecting the extent of the neglect, since the American Legion is unable to have access to the fullest extent to the records of the Veterans' Administration. Our investigation discloses that there has been an apparent unwillingness on the part of the Veterans' Administration to utilize the staffed hospital beds available in Army and Navy hospitals throughout the country to service those in need of hospitalization in this emergency.

It further appears that although the Veterans' Administration has been given authority and ample appropriations for the construction of hospitals in various States to meet the present and impending heavy hospital load reflected in the 500,000 pending applications for service-connected disabilities, nevertheless, there is undue and persistent delay in new hospital construction. The American Legion has been advised that thousands of beds are now available in Army and Navy hospitals throughout the country, adequately staffed with doctors and nurses which could be used in the emergency. There appears to be no disposition on the part of the Veterans' Administration to make adequate or complete use of these beds. Only 7,848 of these beds have been accepted by the Veterans' Administration.

The American Legion feels that the time has come when it must speak positively of the dereliction of the Veterans' Administration in order that our people will see to it, through their representatives in Congress, that the Government keeps faith with those who sacrificed in its defense.

The American Legion, and we believe the American people, demand that Congress take immediate action to see that its mandates are not longer ignored by the Veterans' Administration; that measures for emergency hospitalization be adopted at once; that the authorized program for hospital construction be immediately launched; and that the unjustifiable and unwarranted delay in processing claims for benefits under the law be eliminated.

Yours very sincerely,

JOHN STELLE,
National Commander.

The Common Good

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 1, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, today, Americans are all concerned with the improvement of their fellow citizens as a whole. It was true before the war; it was true during the war, and it is still true during the continuing conflict of reconversion, the battles of which we are fighting at this very minute.

What we do, what we say—even what we think—is based upon that immortal document, the Constitution of the United States. Our Constitution often mentions the terms "common defense" and "general welfare." When special groups are mentioned, they are only referred to in their relation to matters affecting the well-being of all the people. According to our Constitution and its record during the 157 years of existence, it is impossible to segregate any section, or class, or race from the citizenship of America, and say its welfare can be separate and apart from the welfare of the whole people. Americans want no Samurai, no Elite Guard, no dictatorship of Commissars. Americans will not tolerate the establishment of a "master" race in their midst.

The prospects were good for successful reconversion at the end of the late war. Then the United States stood at the pinnacle of world influence. Little by little that has been and is being whittled away. The State Department has frittered away some of this prestige in conferences at London and Moscow. There is an ever-present peril of losing still more of our influence which, once lost, can never be regained. That prestige may even be given away.

The situation resolved itself into this: We had to find a way to help ourselves reconvert because our former allies showed no disposition to help, and some have either secretly or openly opposed our reconversion attempts.

We became increasingly aware that the only possibility for successful reconversion and readjustment in the United States was for more goods and services to be produced at lower prices, without reducing wage, salary, farm, or fixed incomes. Above all, we have had it forcibly impressed on us that our key to sustained prosperity is mass production as the powerful means to attaining increased production at reduced prices without lowering wages. Furthermore, improvement of existing industrial techniques, or the discovery of new techniques, offers a way in which mass production may supply the American people—with even more goods and services at reduced prices without reducing wages.

The picture at the end of the war was one of promise. Yet, some 6 months later, more than 1,800,000 workers were out on strike. Whatever the real or publicized reason for these strikes, smokeless chimneys and silent factory wheels mean decreased production or no production at all. This situation affects more than just the strikers and their families, the management of the strike-bound industries and the individual and collective investors in those industries. Such a situation is a forerunner of hardship and real poverty for all our people; not for any race, section, or class. Decreased production means universal financial ruin. No production means that this financial ruin will come all the more swiftly and catch all of us all the more unprepared for its dire consequences. Wealth, national or individual, is not in dollars. Rather, it is in goods and service procurable and consumable—in exchange for dollars. When goods cannot be procured for dollars, or when services cannot be purchased by those dollars, savings lose value and meaning, and wealth ceases to exist.

This community of interest is no modern phenomenon although improved methods of communication and modern conveniences have emphasized it. Shakespeare recognized it in his Romeo and Juliet. The strife between the Montagues and the Capulets was reflected in strife throughout the dukedom. The duke's stern admonishment "a plague on both your houses" in the closing scene was directed at the damage they nad caused to all the people.

To this day, the underlying truth of the duke's admonition has not changed. Strikes, broken contracts, industrial dissension, labor disorders—and, even more dangerous—the entangling of the business of production in politics, have brought this Nation and our people to the very brink of disaster.

Let us examine the present situation objectively. It is not possible in a sound, free economy to raise wages or profits to a point where the cost of production exceeds the utility value of the products themselves. In this respect, there are always two values in whatever product is turned out:

First. The money value: The materials, plus the labor, plus the planning, plus the distribution and transportation costs plus the reasonable profit to the producer, wholesaler, and retailer.

Second. The utility value: The value of the product to the purchaser for the use required of it.

If costs and profits are permitted to crowd the price of any product to a point and beyond a point where the product is not worth the price asked for it, the most immediate result will be that the public will not buy. That is why any planned economy which contemplates planned production also carries the need for compelling planned consumption. Otherwise there can be no choice but for factory wheels to stop and for factory chimneys to be smokeless. With no purchasers, or insufficient and irregular purchasers of products, the machinery of production must rust. The next logical step is unemployment. Though the industry affected may be small, there is no assurance that the impact will be localized. Even a small industry may take the major part of the output of another small industry. The grocery stores, the filling stations—yes; and the banks—of many communities will suffer because an industry employing from a few score to a few hundred men has banked its fires and closed down.

How much greater is the implication of the closing down of large industries. The repercussions from such catastrophes spread over our entire Nation. Not one of us is immune from this industrial paralysis, because unemployment breeds unemployment. No job producing goods or services is safe. All Americans must win against this threat of no production or decreased production, or else every American will lose.

Labor and management are not alone committing slow economic suicide. The rest of the Nation must die with them unless production replaces disputes and strikes. Our nonproducing factories are of no value to capital, to labor, or to the public, irrespective of the reason for their nonproduction. We know that both labor and management are imperiled by engaging in industrial disorders. But it must always be kept in mind that in all industrial disorders it is the general public which suffers as much as managers, capital, and labor.

Unless President Truman can find better leadership for our industrial economy than he has thus far procured or produced, the Congress will be forced to move into the picture, because a long-term condition of Nation-wide industrial disputes simply should not be tolerated since everybody suffers, and in the end we will share ruin instead of prosperity.

There is no excuse for not summoning the best in industrial leadership now, for if the best leaders are not secured immediately there will eventually be nothing for them to lead. There can be no excuse for dilatory tactics. The self-evident truths involving the common welfare of all Americans were obvious—weeks, even months, ago. Platitudes and generalities were made to serve where understanding, know-how, and action were required. It is not too late now, but further procrastination can make it too late.

Abraham Lincoln knew the danger of class warfare and hatreds. He said:

> Property is the fruit of labor; property is desirable; is a positive good in the world. That some should be rich shows that others may become rich, and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise. Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him work diligently and build one for himself, thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built.

Then Lincoln summed up the whole philosophy of the American system, when he said:

> I like the system which lets a man quit when he wants to, and wish it might prevail everywhere. One of the reasons why I am opposed to slavery is just here. What is the true condition of the laborer? I take it that it is best for all to leave each man free to acquire property as far as he can. Some will get wealthy. I don't believe in law to prevent a man from getting rich. It would do more harm than good. So while we do not propose any war upon capital, we do wish to allow the humblest man an equal chance to get rich with everybody else.

By and large, we as a nation have followed these precepts of Lincoln. And in so doing we have become, down through the years, a light to lighten the way for freemen everywhere. Under that system we became so strong that when the world was threatened with destruction by the mounting tide of godless tyranny, all men with the love of liberty in their hearts turned to America as their great hope of salvation. The overpowering forces we brought to bear to turn that tide rightfully gave to us the respect of all the world.

But how long may we hope to hold that respect?

Only so long as we present to the world a united front, with confidence born of a united people, bonded together, working together, thinking together for the common good.

Today America stands in a new and peculiar relationship to the world. We not only have our own destiny hanging in the balance, for good or for ill, but to a very large extent the destiny of the entire world. Our influence is a tremendous power in world affairs. If the American system fails, in peace, to adjust itself, and to develop prosperity and harmony at home, this, the greatest example of free government ever known, will have failed all lovers of liberty everywhere in the world.

Employer Attitudes and Methods in Industrial Disputes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 1, 1946

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, as background for an understanding of the attitude toward labor of General Motors management, I ask consent to insert in the Appendix a brief summary of the

findings of the La Follette Civil Liberties Committee:

GENERAL MOTORS MANAGEMENT ATTITUDES AND METHODS IN INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES

(Excerpts from a study of Employer Attitudes and Methods in Industrial Disputes, by Jack Barbash, New York University, 1937, based on Senate civil liberties hearings.)

THE GENERAL MOTORS CORP.

General Motors is responsible for the largest output of automobiles in the industry. The keynote of its labor policy as enunciated in a statement made by Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., and approved by the executive committee, is the principle "that there is no real conflict of interest between employes and employer." [1] It is possible, however, that a "divergence of ideas may result from lack of understanding. * * * In such instances (it) may be cleared up through some process which brings about a mutual comprehension of each others' problems. * * *" A harmonious relationship may be brought about by sincere and patient effort on both sides and by sympathetic intercommunication.[2] Then there is a reaffirmation of the law, "that no one seeking employment shall be required as a condition of employment to join any employees' association or to refrain from joining, organizing, or assisting a labor organization of his own choosing." [3] Further, the "prohibition against discrimination places an additional responsibility upon the management to furnish clear evidence of the justification of the discharge of any employee in the event that discrimination is alleged." [4] Although this statement was promulgated during NRA, "it is still the policy." [5]

Labor policies of General Motors

What does this declaration of principles mean in terms of the actual labor policies followed, which in summary form, look something like this:

1. Between January 1, 1934, and July 31, 1936, inclusive, General Motors Corp. and its division spent $839,000 for detective-agency services in the field of espionage, varying directly with the intensity of the auto workers union organization drives.[6]

2. It employed, among others, the Pinkerton Agency, Corporations Auxiliary, Railway Audit & Inspection Co., National Industrial Service, William J. Burns Agency, and practically every prominent espionage organization.

3. The agencies which it hired employed all of the standard devices of the espionage organization: corruption of union members and officials to act as spies, constant shadowing of union officials, and inciting to violence.

4. There is an abundance of evidence to support the accusation of discrimination against and intimidation of union members by GM officials.

The Pinkerton Agency, which was the greatest beneficiary of General Motors' expenditures for detective agencies, was hired in March 1934, which coincides pretty much with the beginning of militant union activity in the automobile industry. It seems clear from the testimony of General Motors executives that the major impetus for the employment of espionage agencies was the threat of union organization.[7]

As Merle C. Hale, a director of industrial relations for General Motors, puts it:

"I wanted to know what the outside union was doing; what the employees' interest was; how large the meetings were; and I wanted to know particularly what they were contending was the trouble with the management; what their selling talk was, if you can put it that way; on what basis they were getting membership, whether wages, working conditions, foremanship, or what not, because if we knew what they were complaining about then that would be a clue for us to get into the picture and try and correct it." [8]

General Motors and the Pinkerton Agency

Precisely, what activities did the Pinkerton Agency engage in to justify payments of $419,000 over a period of 2 years and 7 months? First it engaged a special office in the Hoffman Building in Detroit, which also housed the auto unions, in order, to know who was—contacting the labor organization." [9]

Then, the Pinkerton Agency acted as a sort of register of opinion to ascertain the reaction of certain groups and individuals to General Motors' policies and apparently, to public affairs in general. This was done in two ways, through a clipping service, and through direct contact with individuals This latter work was not performed in the role of General Motors representatives or Pinkerton informants.

For example, when the GM executive staff wished to learn the reaction of the workers to the announced labor policy, parts of which we quoted above, the Pinkerton agency was asked to canvass the situation thoroughly.[10] Apparently the employee representation plans in the various plants were not adequate to record a faithful picture of the situation.

A bill rendered by the Pinkerton Agency enumerates under the heading of For Services and Expenses in Case of "Public Opinion," the following items:

"Review of labor news and editorial comment in plant and city newspapers.

"Survey of employee reaction to factory management.

"Review of safety conditions in GMC plants.

"Surveys of employee reaction to William Green's speeches in Detroit, Cleveland, Toledo, St. Louis, and Buffalo.

"Survey of General Motors' position at Warren, Ohio.

"Survey of employee reaction to plant medical department.

"Survey of effectiveness of plant protection department.

"Survey of industrial disputes in the United States." [11]

Shadowing of union officials in behalf of General Motors constituted another aspect of Pinkerton activity. Among those who were under surveillance, were William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, John Frey of the Machinists Union and the Metal Trades Department of the A. F. of L., Adolph Germer of the CIO, and Homer Martin and Walter Reuter of the CIO auto workers union.[12]

The basic function, however, of the detective employed was undercover work in the GM plants. As Lawrence Barker, an exoperative of the Lansing, Mich., plant of GM, related it, he was told to secure information about "supervision of the foremen, their treatment of the men, and favoritism. Personnel, including hospital, employment department, the treatment received from those places, and whether the service was good, slow, or just how they treated the men. Complaints and thefts, safety infractions, working conditions, plant conditions, plant police, outside labor activities, or to send in labor papers and other things pertaining to labor in the newspapers." [13]

Relating to union activities, he was told to "attend all meetings, open and otherwise. Find out how many were there, and get an approximate number, who spoke, and who acted as the chairman, and the number present. And any out-of-town speakers, and things on that line." [14]

Mr. Mason, the Pinkerton assistant superintendent, Barker's superior in the espionage work, "was well pleased" [15] when Barker joined the union. When Mason was informed that Barker had become an official in the local he said, "Well, I have got all of them in the union now. All the officers belong to me." [16] The local, however, had no members aside from the officers and Barker ventured the opinion that this might have been a consequence of the fact that the officers were in the pay of the Pinkerton agency and the General Motors Corp.[17]

The Pinkerton agency refused to list its operatives for the La Follette committee.[18] The General Motors executives suffered complete losses of memory in addition to the fact that they had stripped their files of material relating to espionage [19] so that it is impossible to arrive at any adequate number of Pinkerton operatives. Our knowledge on Corporations Auxiliary Co., however, is somewhat more exact. The records reveal that there were between 31 and 35 operatives in General Motors plants in the years 1934 to 1936, inclusive, under the direction of this agency.[20]

Effect of General Motors' espionage on unions

The effect of General Motors' espionage on the auto workers' union may be seen from a few case records. The Flint local of the automobile workers, with a membership of several thousand, fell to 200 members when Richard Adlen, an informant for the Corporations Auxiliary Co., retained by General Motors, started to operate.[21] Barker testified that the Lansing local of Fisher Body, starting with a hundred percent membership, dwindled to five as a result of espionage activities.[22]

General Motors' strike breaking

In its conduct of strikes, the General Motors Corp., consistently enough, utilized the methods and tactics which have become associated with the antiunion employer. The entire subject of strikebreaking is treated in some detail in a later section, which duly recognizes the contributions of

[1] A statement of General Motors Corp.'s basic policies governing its relations with factory employees, hearings, pp. 2509 ff, exhibit 657, pt. 7.

[2] Hearings, ibid., p. 2510, pt. 7.

[3] Hearings, ibid., p. 2513, pt. 7.

[4] Hearings, Ibid., p. 2513, pt. 7.

[5] Hearings, testimony of Roy N. Wismer, the manager of a Fisher body plant, p. 2241, pt. 7.

[6] Amounts paid by General Motors Corp. and subsidiaries to individual detective and service agencies, hearings, pt. 6, p. 2186, exhibit 626.

[7] Testimony of Merle C. Hale, hearings, pt. 6, p. 1905 f., p. 1909 f., p. 1914.

[8] Ibid., hearings, pt. 6, p. 1911.

[9] Ibid., hearings, pt. 6, p. 1912.

[10] Ibid, hearings, pt. 6, p. 1913.

[11] Hearings, pt. 5, p. 1865, exhibit 609.

[12] Conclusion of Senator LA FOLLETTE from the testimony, hearings, pt. 6, p. 1992.

[13] Testimony, hearings, pt. 6, p. 2097.

[14] Ibid., hearings, pt. 6, p. 2097.

[15] Ibid., hearings, pt. 6, p. 2098.

[16] Ibid., hearings, pt. 6, p. 2099.

[17] Ibid., hearings, pt. 6, p. 2099 (most of Barker's testimony is supported by his wife's affidavit, p. 2106, exhibit 676; but its veracity was challenged by Mason, pp. 2107 ff.).

[18] Testimony of Robert Pinkerton, hearings, pt. 6, p. 1766.

[19] Testimony of Alfred Marshall, director of personnel relations at Chevrolet, hearings, pt. 6, p. 2048.

[20] Clients of Corporations Auxiliary Co., 1934–36, hearings, pt. 4, p. 1363, exhibit 474.

[21] Statement of Senator La Follette, hearings, pt. 6, p. 2068.

[22] Testimony of Lawrence Barker, hearings, pt. 6, p. 2104.

General Motors. At this point a brief sketch will suffice. Pinkerton operatives were among the strikers in the 1937 sit-down strikes in Flint, Mich.[23] The Railway Audit & Inspection Co., an espionage agency with none too savory a record, was employed by General Motors in 1935 for the Toledo strike. Wherever strikes took place in General Motors plants, there arose company-sponsored "loyalty groups" and "back to work" movements.

General Motors' campaign to curb union organization in its plants has not been carried on only through professional agencies, but it also has been waged by its own supervisory staff, which directed the "loyalty groups."

The testimony and affidavits of automobile workers in General Motors plants before the La Follette committee present evidence of the inspired character of the intimidation practiced against them, and the forceful establishment of what might be called the closed antiunion shop. In Baltimore, on January 20, 1937, active union men suddenly found themselves surrounded by hostile-looking men who in several instances used physical violence. The manager, upon being informed, invariably replied that the "boys refuse to work with union members."[24] The following is a typical account of a union man in the Baltimore Fisher Body plant:

"I work as a welder in the Fisher Body plant in Baltimore, Md. * * * I was employed by General Motors Corp. the same as these men, and got along peacefully until the 18th of January, when, somehow or other, they discovered I was a member of the union and chairman of the organization committee. Immediately a guard was placed over me at my work. Two foremen of the plant guarded me constantly while I was in the plant, even to extent of following me to the rest room and lunchroom.

"On the morning of the 20th of January we completed our work about 9:15 a. m. At that time I gathered my tools and turned them in to the proper authorities and received my clearance slip. I was then called by a subforeman, and I approached this man and he kept me standing there about 10 minutes without having anything to say to me. About that time a group of men, about seven, gathered nearby, and he said that it was all right for me to leave. I approached the pay table with these men following me. I received my pay, and the superintendent of my department was standing there and said, 'Now, I hope the union feeds you.' There were four company guards standing by and these seven men descended on me and grabbed me—two on each arm and two had me by the belt—and they escorted me to the plant office, where I was met by the plant doctor and the superintendent of the plant, Mr. Wismer, who disclaimed any knowledge of what was going on. While they were telling me this, they threw another union man into the office * * *."[25]

Meeting places were denied to union speakers in GM plant cities, such as Flint and Saginaw. Organizers were assaulted by armed bands in which were recognized GM foremen and officials of the so-called loyalty leagues. This state of terrorism showed every evidence of police connivance.[26]

The records of Federal laboratories reveal that that division of General Motors purchased $8,479 worth of tear and sickening gas, the greater part of that amount bought by Chevrolet in January 1937, in addition to an almost equal amount shipped to the authorities in the plant cities of GM.[27]

[23] Statement of Senator La Follette, hearings, pt. 5, p. 1767.

[24] Testimony of William Pearlman, hearings, pt. 7, pp. 2269 ff.; Glenn Rowland, pp. 2233 ff.; affidavits of James Scheibe, p. 2517.

[25] Affidavit of Joseph Winge, hearings, pt. 7, p. 2519, exhibit 698.

[26] Affidavits of union organizers and witnesses to these occurrences, hearings, pt. 7, pp. 2520 ff.

[27] List of sales of tear and sickening gas and gas equipment sold by Federal Laboratories, January 1933 to January 1937, ibid., pt. 7, p. 2604, exhibit 810.

Department of Science and Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 1, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, among the more important lessons we have to learn from the Second World War is the extent to which we—the whole human race—are now subject to the discoveries and inventions perfected during the past 5 years. The atomic bomb is only the most dramatic of these new and powerfully dangerous forces which now control the destinies of nations and may determine the very existence of life on our planet and perhaps the continued existence of the planet itself.

All these new, violent developments of physical and chemical science may be put to use for the service of mankind instead of its destruction if, and only if, the policies which guide us from now on are founded upon facts and are carefully chosen in the brightest light of common sense unshadowed by partisan bias. The difficulties of accomplishing this purpose of self-preservation have no precedent. Never before has any comparable situation arisen. To say that the problem must command attention from the very best and wisest minds should be so obvious as to need no mention. Yet in our system of government the fact of the problem must be made clear to the public, and every possible provision for its solution must be incorporated into the Government itself.

As is well known, various initial steps have been taken toward this end. One measure to create a National Science Foundation is now pending before the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate of the United States. The Navy Department has initiated a broad program to encourage scientific research in American educational and industrial institutions as shown by the appended article which appeared in the New York Times on January 27, 1946.

Many of us are aware that during the war the United States, alone among the great warring powers, refused to exempt its scientific students from conscription. Nearly every educator and scientist in the Nation protested against this policy and warned that it would lead to a grave scarcity of scientifically trained minds within a decade following the war. This folly we must now compensate as best and as speedily as we can by concentrating our Nation's tremendous organizational abilities upon the building of a framework which shall offer to scientists of all degrees of proficiency the most ample opportunities for study and research and shall assure talent the best reward.

This I believe can best be accomplished, and the results best integrated into the national defense and into the promotion of national health and welfare, by the creation of a separate executive department of the Government. Only the prestige which attaches to a regular member of the Cabinet will render the findings of any scientific body of sufficient weight to command the constant attention of the highest officials of the Government in the consideration and formulation of policy.

These are the reasons for which I have today introduced the following measure:

A bill to create a Department of Science and Research

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby created an executive department in the Government to be called the Department of Science and Research with a Secretary of Science and Research who shall be the head thereof, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall receive a salary of $15,000 per annum, and whose tenure of office shall be like that of the heads of the other executive departments.

The purpose of the Department of Science and Research shall be to foster, promote, and develop the study and spread of scientific knowledge and its practical application to the enforcement of peace and the attainment of high living standards throughout the United States and the world.

The Congress hereby finds that the fullest development and use of the Nation's scientific and technical resources is essential for the safety and continued welfare of the Nation. The Congress further finds it necessary for such development and use to create an executive department in order to correlate on the highest governmental level the programs of national defense, national health, and proper conservation and use of the production and natural resources of the Nation, all of which will increasingly depend upon and be affected by scientific discoveries and inventions of the most far-reaching character.

SEC. 2. That there shall be in said department five Assistant Secretaries of Science and research, to be appointed by the President, each of whom shall receive a salary of $12,000 a year. The Assistant Secretaries shall be charged with the duties, respectively, of:

(1) A Bureau of Physics and Mathematical Science.

(2) A Bureau of Public Health and Social Science.

(3) A Bureau of Scientific Education and Information.

(4) A Bureau of Biological Sciences.

(5) A Bureau of Engineering and Technological Sciences.

The functions of each of these Bureaus shall be defined by their respective titles and as may be further prescribed by the Secretary of the Department. In order to insure the greatest benefit to the national defense such additional personnel as may be needed in any Bureau from time to time may be filled by properly qualified members of the armed forces of the United States selected in the discretion of the Secretary by agreement with the Secretaries of War and the Navy.

Appointments of personnel necessary to discharge the duties of the Department of

Science and Research and to carry out the purposes of this act shall be made and compensation fixed, except for assistant secretaryships, in accordance with the provisions of the civil-service laws and regulations: *Provided*, That, when deemed necessary by the Secretary for the efficient administration of the Department and the fulfillment of the purposes of this act, the secretary shall be empowered to employ such technical, scientific, and other experts without regard to any civil-service laws and may fix compensation for such experts without regard to the Classification Act of 1923 as amended.

SEC. 3. That the Congress specifically disclaims any intent under this act to empower the Department of Science and Research to direct or control the course of independent research into the various sciences. It is the intent in creating the Department to provide a governmental instrument with which to utilize and coordinate all such discoveries and inventions as may best promote the national defense and welfare.

For this purpose, the Secretary shall solicit the active and continuous voluntary cooperation of all qualified technical and scientific educational institutions, and of the professional and learned societies which shall be invited to nominate candidates yearly for an advisory council to the Department.

Such advisory council shall consist of not less than 100 members, with adequate representation of all branches of science, appointed by the Secretary for a 3-year term, one-third of the membership being renewable each year. Temporary appointments for 1 year and for 2 years, will be made during the first 6 months after this act becomes law.

The council shall elect its own executive committee, and special committees to advise with the Secretary and the Assistant Secretaries, respectively, on the general and the specific activities of the Department and the bureaus.

Within 1 year after the passage of this act the Secretary, each Assistant Secretary, the advisory council and each special committee of the council shall issue separate reports and recommendations to the President and to the Congress regarding the operation of this Department and setting forth such changes, amendments, or extensions as may appear necessary or desirable in the light of actual practice.

He Served Faithfully

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 30, 1946

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial entitled "He Served Faithfully," eulogizing the courageous and efficient public service performed as a member of the Westchester County (N. Y.) Board of Supervisors by the Honorable Benjamin I. Taylor, a former Member of the Congress, which appeared in the Standard-Star published in New Rochelle, N. Y.:

HE SERVED FAITHFULLY

The Westchester Board of Supervisors will not seem the same without Benjamin I. Taylor, of Harrison.

Since 1905, with two interruptions of service, he has represented his town courageously and efficiently. Where it was necessary to utilize practical politics, Mr. Taylor knew how to do it. Where reasonableness and logical persuasion would gain the desired end, Mr. Taylor was reasonable and persuasive.

But more than in his official course of duty, Mr. Taylor has given to the board of supervisors a sparkling personality, a keen wit, and a clear mind. And his retirement at the age of 68, upon doctor's orders, takes from the scene one of the two holding seniority.

We trust that Mr. Taylor, refreshed by relaxation and rest from official responsibilities, will be able to continue to serve his town and his county as an elder statesman. His experience, his advice, are too valuable to be wholly lost.

The Tragedy of Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 31, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Journal-American of January 23, 1946:

THE TRAGEDY OF TRUMAN

(By Samuel Crowther)

IV

France, under policies such as are now being advanced here by the PAC, has steadily devalued its monetary unit since World War I and the thrifty portion of the French people have been wiped out.

Inflation hits hardest those whose salaries are fixed by law, such as school teachers and public officers, because their money buys less and less.

But it hits with nearly equal force all wage and salary workers, for their incomes lag behind prices. Only the speculators and the crooks benefit from inflation, or, as the poet Pope said many years ago:

"Blest paper credit!
Last and best supply!
That lends corruption lighter wings to fly."

The easy, unthinking reply to inflation is price control of the sort that we now have under the OPA. Price control is really production control, for unless the State takes over all the elements of production, including labor, and rations supplies, costs are bound to rise faster than ceiling prices and the profit incentive to produce is killed.

The most elaborate price controls ever evolved were those by Diocletian in the year 301 A. D. He produced the perfect planned economy and it all but ruined Rome before it was abandoned.

The OPA is only trying to do what every spendthrift government in history at one time or another has tried to do.

We are following the same old road. We are controlling prices, but we are not getting goods at the controlled prices.

Practically every shortage in goods and foods today is traceable directly to OPA policies.

This organization is not softening the effects of inflation. It is making them worse by stifling production.

That is well known within the OPA for it is the clearinghouse for those who want to change the Government of this country.

The drive to make the change is now on. It is spearheaded by the strikes called by the three great radical CIO unions—the unions in steel, automotives, and electrical machinery and appliances.

The strikes are all of the same pattern. They take advantage of the natural desire of the workingman to keep up his war earnings and to meet rising prices.

But it is to be noted that when the wage demands were first made, the union leaders were loud in their insistence that the wage advances could be made without any changes in ceiling prices. Their stand has been reinforced by their colleagues or coconspirators within the Government who have promptly furnished figures—mostly faked—to show that the wage demands could be met without raising prices.

The real basis for the demands, all of which average out at about $2 per day per man, has nothing at all to do with the supposed needs of the workers. The leaders have only crocodile tears for their serfs.

The demands have been carefully calculated to wipe out or all but wipe out the returns to owners of the large corporations. The plan is to force the large corporations to resist and then have the Government take over the corporations to end the strikes.

If the corporations are forced into accepting the wage rates and the ceiling prices are retained or modified only a little, the process of destroying private ownership is slower than if the Government takes over. But it is even more certain.

That is why the Communists have gone all out for the present strikes. It is not of moment whether the PAC-CIO is or is not Communist.

The course being followed is directly in line with Soviet desires and it exactly follows the revolutionary technique always to take advantage of inflation.

The measures proposed by the PAC and endorsed by President Truman fall exactly in line with the revolutionary course.

The big unemployment allowances and the "full employment" bill, as well as the lesser measurers, all demand further inflating of the money supply and bigger and better controls—as well as a bought vote. They would finish the job that the strikes are attempting to start.

In this situation no labor settlement can be more than temporary, for, as long as the money supply is being inflated, prices will continue to rise. Thus wages will always run behind prices and unrest will continue and increase.

The President's only answer in the present emergency is fact-finding boards.

We have had a trial run by an official fact-finding board, appointed by the President in advance of any statute, in the General Motors-UAW case. The report of this board shows no concern with facts, but a great concern with social theory.

By hitching wages and profits, it sought to reenact the undistributed profits tax which Roosevelt and Morgenthau forced into one tax bill but which the Congress, after a trial, threw out.

The object of that tax provision was to kill the expansion of and eventually to kill private industry by preventing any funds from being set aside for progress or for a rainy day.

The present board, turning logic upside down, says that these funds, instead of being turned into the Treasury by the tax route, should be put at the disposal of the radical labor-union officers to manage at will through wage demands.

There is a plain duty before the Congress. It is at once:

To end the President's wartime powers.

To abolish the OPA and all other Government controls.

To kill any appropriation that is not covered by taxation and thus halt inflation before it gets away from us.

Red River Navigation and Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 1, 1946

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of January 14, 1946, before the Army Engineer Board by John D. Ewing, editor and publisher of the Shreveport (La.) Times, member of the board of directors of the Kansas City Southern-Louisiana & Arkansas Railway System, president of radio stations KWKH, Shreveport, and KTHS, Hot Springs, Ark., and the News Star-World, Monroe, La.:

Technical engineering details and statistical data concerning potential freight cargo for the proposed Red River lateral canal running between Shreveport and the Mississippi River at the mouth of the Red River, have been or will be placed before this Board by authorities in such matters—Brig. Gen. Max Taylor, Maj. Gen. R. W. Crawford, the Louisiana State Department of Public Works, the Red River Valley Improvement Association, the chambers of commerce and port development authorities of the various cities and towns on the proposed barge canal.

It is not my intention to try to add to the complete and convincing data which comes to you from such sources. I do wish, however, to deal very briefly with some of the broader aspects of this barge-canal proposal, particularly in its value, economically and otherwise, to far greater areas than the valley through which it would be built. In so doing, I am expressing my own opinions entirely, but they are expressed from a background of business and civic interests and activities over many years which have given me opportunity for what I believe to be an unusually encompassing viewpoint.

I am a director of one of the Nation's large rail systems, but I am in complete disagreement with any who may oppose water freight transportation in the belief that it would compete unduly or unfairly with other forms of transportation—rail, motor van, or air. Available records are to the contrary. I believe that even a cursory survey of American industry would reveal that virtually all big industrial cities of the Nation are located on water transportation facilities and that the biggest freight-hauling railroads of the Nation all get a substantial volume of their freight business from areas where both water and land freight transportation exist.

The records show, I believe, that advent of water-freight transportation into areas backward in industrial development has been followed by widespread industrial development, and that advent of water transportation into areas already prospering through industry has increased industrial activity and brought added prosperity to existing enterprise.

In other words, the trend found in the addition of water-freight transportation facilities to land-transportation facilities is toward increase in existing business and creation of opportunity for development of new business; and this in turn means more freight for all forms of transportation. I believe that this will be found to be true already up and down the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers, which have been subject to great Federal development as water carriers in recent years.

It is a matter of factual record that Shreveport was a thriving port town when many other larger cities of today were unknown except by name. And it was only when Red River transportation was closed through the river becoming filled with its own silt that Shreveport lagged in economic development and other cities were able to surpass it. As for what water transportation means to an inland city and its contiguous territory, and the benefits such transportation bring to all other forms of transportation, Houston, Tex., is the most recent example. Its development as a port and the far-reaching values that development has produced, are well known to this Board.

I believe that construction of the proposed Red River lateral canal not only would bring new economic development to its immediate area, but that it would directly enhance the value of the entire Mississippi Valley waterway system, of which it would be an integral part. I believe that it would provide opportunity for expansion and development to the entire economy of a vast area of untold natural resources and industrial possibilities as yet untouched.

To me, in areas of established opportunity for future progress, limiting one form of public service, such as transportation, on the theory that a new form might compete to too great extent with another and established similar form of service is like saying that a thriving community should not increase the number of its drugstores, its doctors, its lawyers, its schools, its grocery stores, or its wholesale distributing houses. The opportunity for economic development of the South and Southwest is unquestioned, particularly in development of industry. There are as yet untouched tremendous natural resources in petroleum and minerals. As further brief, high-spot examples, the undeveloped iron-ore resources of a small section of central east Texas have been held by mineral experts to exceed in volume the deposits of the Birmingham, Ala., area, and it has been stated, by those who have investigated and should know, that virtually every commercially usable metal is found to some extent in Arkansas alone. Louisiana has vast deposits of oil, gas, sulfur, salt, and other natural resources. The whole Red River Valley is an area of tremendous possibilities for new development of forest products and of modern agriculture and all of this development—agriculture, industry, and commerce—would be given new impetus through added water freight transportation facilities.

Such development would hurt the business of no one, but would, in my opinion, help the business of everyone whose business is affected directly or even indirectly by transportation, and it would be difficult to find any sizable business which is not affected in some way by transportation.

I believe, also, that construction of the proposed Red River lateral canal would be a sound business venture. The sincerity of my belief to that effect is attested by the fact that it is my intention, if this canal is constructed, to take part in formation of a common-carrier barge-line company to operate freight service on the canal, and to promote use of the canal's freight service through all proper and legitimate use of the publicity facilities provided by my own newspaper and radio interests. Our papers are large shippers, particularly in receiving considerable annual tonnage of newsprint. A considerable portion of our shipping could be handled advantageously via the Red River lateral canal.

There is another value which construction of the proposed lateral barge canal would offer and which, I believe, has not been given as much consideration as it deserves. That is the military value the canal would have, both in time of war and in time of peace. Several million men of the Army received at least some of their training in Louisiana during and just preceding World War II.

I do not have the exact figures—they would be available to this Board, of course—but high Army authorities have told me that far more than 1,000,000 men of the Army at some time or other passed through the one town of Leesville, La., alone—normally of but 5,000 population—where Camp Polk is located. Camp Livingston, near Alexandria, constructed by the Army as a model for permanent posts of large size; Barksdale Field, topographically the world's largest military air reservation; the headquarters for the Eighth Naval District, and various other military installations—all of those mentioned being permanent in nature—are centered in Louisiana and would be aided directly through the additional transportation facilities for freight which the proposed Red River lateral canal would provide. The huge permanent Army maneuver area and the big permanent artillery ranges of Louisiana are in the heart of the area this proposed canal would serve. I need not remind anyone in uniform of the tremendous and stupendous freight transportation difficulties faced during the war in this area. The quantity of war material which traveled the Mississippi River and its connecting water transportation links during the war is testimony to the military value the proposed lateral canal would have from the standpoint of national security.

For 20 years before his death in 1931 my father, Col. Robert Ewing, publisher and owner of the Shreveport Times and of the New Orleans States, editorially advocated—and consistently so—the reopening of the Red River to navigation as a waterway leading to the four corners of the globe. Since his death in 1931 I have seen nothing but what convinced me that his policy was correct and therefore the Shreveport Times still consistently is advocating the making possible a great asset to our whole local and national economic life—water transportation through the lower Red River Valley.

H. R. 5262, the Case Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 1, 1946

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD two telegrams relating to H. R. 5262. These wires from Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, and Mr. Daniel J. Tobin, president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, very eloquently express the inadvisable features of this measure:

Hon. MELVIN PRICE,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

The American Federation of Labor is deeply concerned over H R 5262 introduced in the House yesterday and scheduled for general debate today. The American Federation of Labor hereby protests most forcefully the consideration of this bill which has for its purpose the destruction of fundamental and constitutional rights of workers without the holding of public hearings thereon. This bill would impose unlimited liability for damages upon workers and their unions and would destroy their right to act as bargaining agencies for alleged violation of the law

while no similar penalties are imposed upon employers for similar violation. It is inconceivable that Congress would wipe from the statutes of the Nation the Norris-LaGuardia Act passed in 1932 and signed by President Hoover without even according labor the opportunity to present its reasons in opposition to such drastic action.

The repeal of the basic provisions of the Norris-LaGuardia Act is in effect the reestablishment of the false and repudiated doctrine of conspiracy in labor cases and it will bring back the evil of government by injunction condemned in both the Democratic and Republican platforms of 1912, and which resulted in the passage of the Clayton Act of 1914. The establishment of a mediation board with power and procedure for functioning as provided in the bill requires much thought and consideration in order to assure a fair and impartial tribunal. It is apparent it has not had such consideration. The American Federation of Labor requests that full hearings be held on this bill and that representatives of labor be accorded the opportunity to appear at such hearings to acquaint the committee with facts and information which will clearly establish that the passage of this bill will not bring peace and harmony in industrial relations but on the contrary will cause confusion, chaos, injustice, and will disrupt industrial relations as long as this bill remains law.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
WILLIAM GREEN, *President.*

Hon. MELVIN PRICE,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

The International Brotherhood of Teamsters desires to record its opposition to H. R. 5262 now being considered in the House. This bill has not had the benefit of public hearing and thus the position of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters has not been made known. The bill is of such magnitude and importance that it is inconceivable that Congress will act upon it without according labor an opportunity to express itself at committee hearings. If enacted this bill will impose drastic civil penalties on labor. It will virtually nullify the provisions of the Norris-LaGuardia Act and it will subject workers and their unions to court injunctions for alleged violations for which they can be punished by fine and imprisonment. The procedures for mediation set forth in the bill require discussion and consideration. The International Brotherhood of Teamsters therefore not only protests the passage of this bill without committee hearings but it expresses most vigorously opposition to the bill which will destroy fundamental constitutional rights of the workers of this Nation. The executive board of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters is now in session and has unanimously adopted the foregoing statement on behalf of its 700,000 members.

DANIEL J. TOBIN,
Genral President,
International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

Lateral Canal for Red River Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 1, 1946

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following additional information in support of Red River lateral canal, La., presented to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors at Washington, D. C., January 14, 1946, by Walter B. Jacobs, president, First National Bank, Shreveport, La.:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, there is real enthusiasm for the Red River lateral canal down in our section of the country, and it is quite logical that this should be true, because water transportation was such a predominant factor in the early development of Shreveport, La., and that trade area.

As you know, Shreveport, La., is located on Red River, and this was by no accident. The site was chosen because it was an excellent location for a port, and as the development progressed the settlement was often referred to as the Port of Capt. Henry Shreve, who brought the first steamboat up Red River in 1814. Logically enough when the city was incorporated in 1839 the name of Shreveport was chosen. For the next 50 years the business and social life of the city was built largely around steamboat traffic.

Historically, there is every reason for us to be intensely interested in water transportation, and based on all the technical information carefully prepared by the engineers and acknowledged experts in the various fields, there is every evidence that the Red River lateral canal is a sound project, the completion of which will have a most stimulating effect on the industrial development of the entire area.

During the past quarter of a century, the need for water transportation has become more evident, because we have seen so many cases where industries which would have logically located in our area have, for sound economic reasons, chosen locations where port facilities are available. Not only that, but what is perhaps even more depressing, we have seen concerns that employed many of our citizens cease operations in our locality because water transportation was essential for their survival, and this was the one thing we did not have to offer.

I have in my files a letter from the president of a large refinery, dated December 18, 1945, in which he lists 6 refineries, with a total annual output of 19,345,000 barrels, which have ceased operations in our area.

Without being free to disclose the authority for this assertion, I would like to tell you about a specific case where Shreveport lost a plant that cost almost $100,000,000, because all the other advantages that we had to offer could not offset the fact that we did not have water transportation. I refer to the Cities Service Refining Corp. plant which was recently erected at Lake Charles, La. Since the new plant has gone into production, this concern has ceased operating its refinery in our area, which had an annual output of 7,500,000 barrels. This discontinued refinery and its production was included in the six referred to as having ceased operations in our section. Being, as we are, in the center of one of the great oil-producing areas in the United States, and with so many factors favorable to industrial development, it would seem only natural that numerous refineries would locate in our area if it were not for the fact that we do not have water transportation.

From the standpoint of raw materials, we have an abundant supply in the Shreveport area. As previously stated, we are in the center of one of the great oil-producing areas in the United States; natural gas is plentiful; agricultural products in large quantities include cotton, peanuts, soybeans, alfalfa, sweetpotatoes, oats, and many others; livestock production is increasing rapidly and a real need has developed for larger markets and for processing industries using these products; we produce annually more than 5,000,000 cords of pulpwood and some 3,000,000 board feet of timber; in close proximity to Shreveport there are tremendous sulfur and salt deposits; we have fine ceramic clays, sand, gravel, limestone, and abundant deposits of lignite.

Our climate is most desirable, with a mean average yearly temperature of 66°, permitting year-round out-of-door work; Shreveport is excellently served by six major rail lines; paved highways go out of the city in all directions; we have excellent motor-freight lines and motor coaches and three major air lines. With adequate water transportation facilities, as would be provided by the proposed Red River lateral canal project, our section of the country would undoubtedly experience a tremendous industrial development.

Of greatest importance to the future growth of our area is the abundance of high-quality labor, with about 62 percent native-white, 3 percent foreign-born, and 35 percent Negro.

The bank with which I am associated has served the Shreveport area since 1877, which means that we were in business long before navigation on Red River became impossible. Our growth has been closely allied to the growth of our trade area, and we have been in an excellent position to feel the pulse of the people, so to speak. With a total of over 33,000 checking and savings accounts in a city of 115,000 population, we are afforded a real opportunity to learn how our fellow townsmen feel about important matters pertaining to our community. For the past several years, during the time when water transportation has been so widely discussed, my fellow officers and I have made it a point to find out what our customers think about the matter. I assure you that the Red River lateral canal project has the enthusiastic support of virtually every individual with whom we have discussed it, and it is quite obvious that this should be true.

I believe that the attitude of labor toward the Red River lateral canal project would be of interest, and I am pleased to read a letter received from Mr. E. H. Williams, president, Louisiana State Federation of Labor:

LOUISIANA STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Shreveport, La., December 29, 1945.

Mr. W. B. JACOBS,
President, First National Bank,
Shreveport, La.

DEAR MR. JACOBS: It is my understanding that you are to be one of the speakers to appear before the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in Washington in support of the Red River Canal project.

As you know, the Louisiana State Federation of Labor is composed of all of th American Federation of Labor unions in the State, and we have a total membership of approximately 300,000. The Red River lateral canal project has been enthusiastically endorsed by this federation, and if you feel that the endorsement of this large number of laboring people would be of interest to the group that will have the responsibility of approving or disapproving this important project, you may feel free to use this letter in your presentation.

We realize full well that the industrial development in our area has been substantially curtailed due to the fact that we have not had water transportation facilities since Red River became unnavigable many years ago. It is most apparent that our future progress is wholly dependent upon our providing, at the earliest possible moment, suitable water transportation such as would be provided by the Red River Canal project.

Naturally we are vitally interested in the future growth and development of our area and if we can be of assistance in any way please feel free to call on us.

Yours very truly,

E. H. WILLIAMS,
President.

Regardless of the fact that we have failed in all of our efforts to provide water transportation since Red River became virtually unnavigable at about the turn of the century, substantial progress has been made because there are so many other factors so outstandingly favorable to the growth of our area.

The following information regarding our progress, as indicated by the total resources of Shreveport banks and the population of our city, in even thousands, during the past 68 years, at 10-year intervals, is indicative of the aggressive spirit of our people:

	Bank resources	*Population*
1877	$403,000	4,000
1887	931,000	8,000
1897	2,162,000	11,000
1907	12,203,000	16,000
1917	36,853,000	28,000
1927	57,067,000	44,000
1937	64,382,000	76,000
1945	196,478,000	[1] 115,000

[1] Estimated.

The fact that our population has increased more than 24 times, and our bank resources more than 487 times, in the past 68 years is, in itself, abundant evidence as to resourcefulness, energy, and aggressiveness of our people. Shreveport is today a thriving, growing city that is forging ahead with enthusiasm and initiative.

I appreciate the privilege of appearing before you gentleman, and on behalf of the citizens of Shreveport, I want to say once more that we are vitally interested in the proposed Red River lateral canal, and you may be sure that if this project which has been dreamed of for so many years is made a reality, we will make good use of it.

Thank you.

Veterans and Surplus Motor Equipment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 1, 1946

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I have just read a release from the War Assets Corporation which is now handling the Consumers Goods under the Surplus Property Act wherein it states that receipt and certification of applications from World War II veterans for the purchase of passenger cars and station wagons was discontinued Monday, January 28, 1946.

Much as I would like to see all veterans secure a good automobile I have taken the position from the outset that it would be a grave mistake for them to buy the motor equipment the Government agencies declare surplus for the reason that it will spend most of its time in a repair shop. When automobiles have been run 50,000, 75,000, and 100,000 miles by men who do not own them one can realize their condition. The agencies have withheld the best motor equipment for their own use.

Under the permission granted me, I include as part of my remarks the release from the War Assets Corporation. It follows:

Receipt and certification of applications from World War II veterans for the purchase of passenger cars and station wagons will be discontinued Monday, January 28, 1946, the War Assets Corporation, a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, announced today. Certification of veterans' preference applications, formerly handled by the Smaller War Plants Corporation and transferred to War Assets Corporation by Executive order, becomes effective on the same date.

War Assets Corporation explained that the action is being taken because the number of veterans' preference certifications already outstanding for the purchase of passenger cars and station wagons is far in excess of the total number expected to be declared surplus.

Since veterans' preference certifications are handled in the order of date of filing, War Assets Corporation pointed out that discontinuance of further certification for passenger cars and station wagons would save veterans time, money, and effort, and eliminate false hopes of obtaining these items which are in such short supply.

War Assets Corporation also announced that when statistics and inventory records show that other items of surplus property are being considerably oversubscribed, receipt and certification of veterans preference applications for such items will be discontinued. As these situations develop public announcement will be made by War Assets Corporation. The procedure and policy is being adopted, War Assets Corporation explained, in order to provide the veterans with the facts on the availability of various kinds of surplus property.

Mr. Speaker, the following release from the Surplus Property Administration relates to the condition of motor equipment:

Sampling of the condition of motor vehicles available in surplus as of December 21, 1945, showed that more than 54 percent required repairs, 6.8 percent were not usable as vehicles, and only 6.1 percent of the trucks and jeeps were new, the Surplus Property Administration announced today. No new passenger cars were available.

The inventory as of December 31, 1945, listed 31,084 surplus motor vehicles, an increase of 3,406 cars over the November 30 inventory. The bulk of these vehicles were trucks and jeeps, totaling together 26,513 for November and 29,882 for December.

While acquisitions in December of trucks, jeeps, and passenger cars mounted above those of the preceding month, officials pointed out that the proportion of vehicles in poor condition will tend to increase in the inventory, since they move at a slower rate.

A total of 11,587 motor vehicles, largely trucks and jeeps, were acquired in December as compared with 10,187 the preceding month. Exactly 8,181 motor vehicles were sold in December for $6,965,027.62, representing $16,851,118.01 in original cost to the Government. November disposals were slightly higher, due to heavier sales of trucks and jeeps

The following table indicates the condition of 23,049 surplus motor vehicles inspected as of December 21, 1945:

	New	Used				Total
		Reconditioned	Usable without repairs	Repairs required	Not usable as vehicles	
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Trucks (except jeeps)	3.0	3.6	21.9	45.6	5.9	80.0
Jeeps	3.1	1.3	5.5	6.1	.3	16.3
Passenger cars	0	.1	.6	2.4	.6	3.7
Total	6.1	5.0	28.0	54.1	6.8	100.0

Idaho State Pharmaceutical Association Makes Plea for Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 30, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for the earnest consideration of my colleagues, a letter from the Idaho State Pharmaceutical Association, Inc., with offices in Boise, Idaho, in behalf of small business. I feel that this letter is particularly timely for there is a certain element within the United States who see in the destruction of small business and the growth of monopolies the opportunity to destroy our American system of government and substituting some form of regimented socialistic totalitarian state. If small business is destroyed, big business cannot long survive, for if all business is reduced to a few great monopolies, it will be an easy matter for the demagog to point to them as great octopuses exploiting the people, and induce the people to replace private monopoly with state monopoly. There is room for neither monopoly nor bureaucracy within the United States—both are but the trappings of the totalitarian state. The letter follows:

IDAHO STATE
PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Boise, Idaho, January 15, 1946.
COMPTON I. WHITE, Congressman,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WHITE: My knowledge of your friendliness to small business prompts me to write this letter. There are any number of men in Washington who are willing to give lip service to small business, who say that they are the backbone of our system of free enterprise—and then proceed to oppose everything the small businessman wants and needs to insure his survival as a part of the national economy. You are not one of these. In fact, Congress has usually been disposed to deal fairly with us. Our trouble comes chiefly from some of the people at the other end of "the Avenue" who are charged with the interpretation and application of the laws you men in Congress make—and who have uncanny skill in making those laws means something entirely different from what you Congressmen intended.

CIRCUMVENTING ANTITRUST LAWS

In that connection, I want to call your attention to the antitrust laws. When Congress passed the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, and the Federal Trade Commission Act, its purpose was to check monopoly and prevent big business from becoming so big that it could dominate the Nation's economy. With that purpose we small businessmen are in full agreement. We applaud the objec-

tive Congress had in mind. But what do we find? The very laws passed by Congress to prevent integration of business into huge, monopolistic units have been so interpreted and applied that men have been able to use them to promote monopoly. After all these years of antitrust laws we have aggregations of power that would make Senator Sherman turn over in his grave if he could know what has been done under his law.

GROWTH OF MONOPOLY

I say that misinterpretation of the antitrust laws has promoted monopoly. Let me give you an example.

You are aware of the growth of corporate chains. One of them—it happens to be in the food field—did more than 13 percent of the retail grocery and food business in the United States last year. One general merchandise chain has annual sales of more than $1,000,000,000, and two others do business aggregating more than half a billion dollars each. The drug chains are not nearly so big, but there are two of them which, between them, operate more than a thousand drug stores.

TIPPING THE SCALES AGAINST PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

Now, I have no quarrel with chains as such. The thing I object to is that they are attaining their inconceivably enormous size because the Government, which should be a fair umpire, is tipping the scales in their favor. The Government in Washington, and more particularly the law-interpreting and law-enforcing branch of it, has, in effect, decreed that "to him that hath shall be given, and from him that hath not shall be taken even that which he doth have." In less Biblical language, this is what the Department of Justice has ordered: Individual merchants shall be sent to jail if they presume to do what great corporate chains may do with immunity, even although the result of this policy be to fasten upon small merchants inequalities of bargaining power that will inevitably doom them to eventual extinction and put all distribution in the hands of billion-dollar corporations.

NOT MORE EFFICIENT

The reason for the growth of big business is not that it is more efficient, for there is a preponderance of evidence to prove that it is less efficient. The reason is the possession of overwhelming bargaining power.

A corporation which buys for a thousand stores owned by itself, can go to a manufacturer and say: "We shall require you to sell your product to us on a basis that will enable us to resell it to the consumer at a price no higher than what you charge our small, independent competitors at wholesale. We grant that the price we demand is less than your year-around cost, but the volume we give you will enable you to operate at full capacity, even in slack periods, and will cover the actual cost of labor and material, plus, perhaps, a small profit. Your overhead, you can get out of your other customers. You will be required to supply all of our stores on this basis. Here is our business, take it or leave it."

WAS THIS THE INTENT OF CONGRESS?

Such an ultimatum is entirely legal, under the laws as now interpreted by the Government at Washington. In the contemplation of law, a corporation is a person, so there is no question of conspiracy involved— a person cannot be said to conspire with himself, although that person is a fiction representing perhaps thousands of individuals. The actual duress involved is not duress in the contemplation of law—it is duress arising from the unequal bargaining position of the parties.

Now, suppose that individual owners of a thousand independent stores were to undertake to do the same thing. What would follow: Investigation by the Department of Justice, the forced surrender of all books and records of the "offenders" under subpoena, indictments, the compulsory attendance of all defendants at a trial far from their own communities, the necessity of engaging counsel at fees beyond the financial capacity of the defendants, conviction on criminal charges, fines of up to $10,000 for each defendant—virtual confiscation of their life savings—and possibly imprisonment for a year. And that could happen in a country which poses as the one remaining exemplar of free enterprise, governed by men who shout their friendship for small business.

FREE ENTERPRISE OR CARTELS

But I have not yet touched upon the more serious consequence of this perversion of the antitrust laws. That consequence is not to individuals—for it will not make much difference a generation hence what happens to them. The more serious consequence is to our economic structure—to what its lip-servants have been pleased to call free enterprise. If big distributors are permitted to become indefinitely bigger and more powerful, how long will it be before they will have squeezed the manufacturers out of existence and taken over the whole process of manufacture? Then we shall have the perfect cartel—a cartel which controls the product from the raw material stage to the finished goods sold to the consumer over the counter, which has power to squeeze the raw material producer at one end and the retail buyer at the other. Long before that stage had been reached, 1,500,000 individual distributors would be forced out of business—the proletarian servants of their former competitors, or sharecroppers, or relief clients. If you think my picture overdrawn, scan the record between the First World War and the Second, and project the trend into the future, through the next 10 years, with the aid of available information on the chains' plans for postwar expansion. I am not dealing in mere possibilities, not even in probabilities, but in certainties—unless you men in Congress can be aroused to action.

EQUALITY BEFORE THE LAW

What we propose is not radical, it is not unreasonable, it will not hurt anybody. We are not asking for repeal of the antitrust laws, but for action by Congress that will make those laws do what they were intended to accomplish. We ask that the chains and the independents be placed in a position of bargaining equality, that the owners of independent businesses be allowed to do what big business is permitted to do with impunity. We ask for the speedy consideration and enactment of House Joint Resolution 19, introduced by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas.

There are only two ways to deal with the inequality to which I have called your attention. This is the dilemma into which you are logically forced: You can either abandon the legal fiction that a corporation is a "person" and require each unit of a chain to bargain independently for the purchase of only enough merchandise to supply that store, and make cooperative buying by the members of a chain subject to laws against conspiracy; or you can write into the antitrust laws a provision that it shall not be deemed a violation for a group of independent merchants to bargain collectively with manufacturers or other suppliers to establish the prices to be paid or the discounts to be obtained in the purchase of goods bought for resale in their respective stores.

If it is thought that there is danger that the bargaining power built up by any group should become great enough to overbalance the bargaining power of manufacturers, we should have no objection to reasonable limitation on the size of the groups according to the amount of volume they handled, but we should insist that equal limitations be placed on corporate chains.

RIGHT TO BARGAIN COLLECTIVELY

We anticipate that the objection will be made that independent retailers now may form corporations to engage in the wholesale business and that, therefore, there is no need for this legislation. The answer is too obvious to require much elaboration. These mutual wholesale houses are themselves too small to exercise bargaining power equivalent to that of the great corporate chains. They serve a relatively limited number of stockholders in a small section of the country, and cannot effect enough savings to put their members on a footing of equality unless they themselves enjoy the immunity which House Joint Resolution 19 seeks to extend. Further, the class of retailers who most need the help which the bill seeks to extend have hardly enough capital to operate their retail businesses successfully. They have no surplus capital to invest in the wholesale business.

TWO KINDS OF ACCOUNTS

Further, many manufacturers have two kinds of accounts. The retailers buying in the smallest quantities must get their supplies from wholesale houses; those who purchase in larger amounts are what is known to the trade as "direct buyers." There is a wide range of direct buyers, from the individual operator who has one or two stores to the huge corporation which operates hundreds of stores, and there is a corresponding range in the prices they pay for goods. Direct buyers need the right to bargain collectively. Without it, they are frozen in a position of price disadvantage.

Yours very truly,

J. J. LYNCH,
Executive Secretary.

Secretary of State Byrnes on Need of International Information Service by Our Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 1, 1946

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, on December 17, 1945, favorably reported to the House H. R. 4982, to enable the Department of State more effectively to carry out its responsibilities in the foreign field by means of public dissemination abroad of information about the United States and promotion of interchange of persons, knowledge and skills between the United States and other countries.

The House has not yet considered this bill, but it is awaiting action by the Rules Committee.

Under leave granted, I submit herewith a letter dated December 31, 1945, from Hon. James F. Byrnes, Secretary of State, addressed to President Truman which tells of the transfer to the State Department of the overseas information functions of the Office of War Information, and containing reasons for the passage of the legislation set forth in H. R. 4982:

DECEMBER 31, 1945.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On August 31 you issued an Executive order transferring to the Department of State the overseas information functions of the Office of War Information and the Office of Inter-American Affairs.

You ordered them to be consolidated, until December 31, in an Interim International Information Service within the Department. At the same time you asked me to study our foreign informational needs and to formulate during the remainder of this calendar year the program to be conducted on a continuing basis.

The overseas information functions of the war agencies in this field have been transferred and consolidated as you directed. Their transferred personnel has been reduced by half, and many of their functions have been ended. The study which you requested from me has been made, and on January 1 a new Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs, within the Department, will begin to conduct those activities of the former war agencies which I feel should be carried on in peacetime in the national interest.

All of this consolidation, reduction, and planning has taken place without a break, anywhere in the world, in the effort to present what you described on August 31 as a "full and fair picture of American life and of the aims and policies of the United States Government."

There never was a time, even in the midst of war, when it was so necessary to replace prejudice with truth, distortion with balance, and suspicion with understanding.

The past 4 months have imposed critically important tasks upon our information officers in every country. Many of them have been serving in distant posts, cut off from their homes and families, uncertain about their pay and status, yet they have carried on in the finest traditions of American foreign service. I should like to commend them, and those who have continued servicing them at home, for living up to the trust which their country placed in them.

Detailed proposals for the future overseas information service, in terms of money and personnel required after July 1, 1946, have been submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for submission to you and to the Congress. These proposals call for the maintenance of American libraries of information abroad, the supplying of documentary and background material by wireless and by mail to our missions overseas, the scoring of documentary films into foreign languages, the continued publication of a Russian-language magazine for distribution in the Soviet Union, the continuing supply of visual materials about the United States, and the maintenance in 62 countries of small staffs to conduct our informational and cultural relations, under the direct supervision of the chiefs of our diplomatic missions.

To these activities will be added an extension to many other countries of the work now being done by the Department, principally in Latin America, in exchanging students, scholars, and technicians on behalf of 26 agencies of the Federal Government.

Finally, the proposals provided for the continuance of short-wave broadcasting on a reduced scale until recommendations can be made to you and to the Congress for the ultimate disposition of the transmitters and the frequencies now in the Government's hands. Many countries are interested in the development of this powerful new medium giving us direct access to the peoples of other lands who want to understand the American people and their policies.

The Department's proposals will constitute a modest program compared to wartime standards. We shall not seek to compete with private agencies of communication, nor shall we try to outdo the efforts of foreign governments in this field. Our program, however, calls for a significant expansion, in terms of personnel and budget, of the prewar expenditures of the Department of State. It will be a new departure for the United States, the last of the great nations of the earth to engage in informing other peoples about its policies and institutions.

We cannot expect to carry on our foreign relations effectively unless we recognize this activity as, in your own words, "an integral part of the conduct of our foreign affairs."

We would defeat our objectives in this program if we were to engage in special propagandist pleading. Our purpose is, and will be, solely to supply the facts on which foreign peoples can arrive at a rational and accurate judgment.

It is my firm belief that the proposed informational and cultural activities of the Department of State abroad will help to achieve the security and peace which our people so ardently desire.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. BYRNES.

The American Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. SAVAGE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 1, 1946

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, the social-security program has alleviated a great deal of human suffering in the last few years; and another important benefit to the Nation from the social-security program is that the purchasing power created by social security is now doing a great deal to supplement our wages and earning power here in this country. Thus it has amounted to a great shock absorber in this transition period.

I want to include with my remarks a very enlightening editorial on the subject entitled "The American Way," which appeared in the Boston Daily Globe of January 29, 1946:

THE AMERICAN WAY

Federal social security, regarded as a strange little creature with uncertain prospects when the measure creating it became law in 1935, is now presented to the American people as a sturdy specimen of human engineering by the Social Security Board report for the fiscal year 1945.

For its early period, many people felt annoyed when they realized that one cent for every dollar of wages, up to $3,000 a year, was being sequestered from their pay to be sent to the United States Treasury, along with another cent required from the employer's cash drawer, with a contribution from Uncle Sam.

A few, addicted to reading public documents, were able to point out that when the system got into full operation it would afford much protection in old age, considerable care for children after the death of the breadwinner and also work in unemployment insurance in the State in which one lived.

As the years have passed, appreciation of the helpfulness of social security has taken hold of the consciousness. The present report shows 39,000,000 fully insured. On the other side of the picture are 32,000,000 workers without protection under the act. Some of these have the benefits from other retirement systems. Railroad workers come under the Railroad Retirement Act set up by Federal law. Most of the national civil-service employees are looking forward to annuity rights at 62. About half of all the employees in State and local governments are members of retirement systems. There are also some in nonprofit organizations who are somewhat covered by special retirement plans. Examples would be in college, school, or church pension arrangements. But when all these groups are added together there are left something like 21,000,000 Americans who are not insured in any way, except as they themselves take out policies and meet the premium payments.

During the past decade countless individuals in these various occupations without involuntary or automatic coverage have looked, with curiosity at first and later with longing at neighbors sheltered under the protection offered by social security.

Many communities have examples of what it provides. There are old men retired after years of hard work who receive monthly checks There are fatherless children whose mothers could not have managed to keep her brood together had it not been for the help that comes to her regularly, not as charity but as a right, from the account her late husband paid into while he was employed.

The advantages of the system are now stirring the minds of many millions. Of these more than 8,000,00 are in agriculture, either as farm hands or as owners. More than half as many others belong to the class called self-employed. Some 6,000,000 are working for one of our governmental agencies. In addition are 2,000,000 in domestic service or drawing pay from one or another of lines of endeavor now excluded from social security.

It was not the purpose of the authors of the original measure to leave a multiude of their fellow citizens out in the economic cold. The reason was a desire to get the legislation through rather than indifference to human need. The fear of the proponents was of mass dissent which might prevent the proposal becoming law.

The success of social security during a decade, which began in economic darkness and went through a war in which production was speeded unbelievably, has been convincing.

The result is very naturally mass desire on the part of those not now participating for a share in the benefits of the system. The influences being felt at the National Capitol are not at all like those exerted by special pressure groups. As this is realized, various extensions in the law are probable.

Among others it is proposed that the qualifying age for women beneficiaries be reduced from 65 to 60, that benefits for low-paid workers be increased, that the sum subject to contribution be raised from $3,000 a year to $3,600 and also that the system be enlarged to include as many uncovered groups as possible.

As President Truman has declared, social security has become part of the American way of life.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

Red River Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 1, 1946

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement in support of the Red River lateral canal, State of Louisiana, presented to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, Washington, D. C., January 14, 1946, by S. S. Caldwell, mayor of Shreveport, La.:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the board, illness has prevented me from being present

today for your Board's review and consideration of the proposed Red River lateral canal in the State of Louisiana.

For many years the people of Shreveport and the surrounding area have joined with the Red River Valley Improvement Association and other agencies in working for the reestablishment of a navigable transportation system in the Red River Valley.

Shreveport, La., first became a settlement and was founded because of its strategic location to water transportation. The very foundation of the economic development of the entire State was opened to future growth by this same medium. We, the people of Shreveport and the surrounding trade territory, cannot overestimate the importance of this necessary transportation system that completes the economic foundation for any growing and prosperous city, State, or Territory in the Nation.

A scientifically controlled navigation waterway in the form of the Red River lateral canal has been recommended as economically sound and feasibly possible to your honorable Board by the president of the Mississippi River Commission.

The city of Shreveport stands ready to assume its full share of the obligations stipulated by law in the construction and development of this project, and we respectfully urge that your honorable Board approve this project, which will provide the missing link in the city of Shreveport's transportation system, and will permit us to take our rightful place in the over-all economic development of the Nation.

England General Hospital, Atlantic City, N. J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 1, 1946

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks on this subject, it will be recalled that an irresponsible accusation was recently made that there was pressure from Atlantic City to remove the England General Hospital. To put an end once and for all to this unfounded statement I herewith insert a letter from Maj. Gen. Norman T. Kirk, the Surgeon General, as follows:

JANUARY 31, 1946.

Hon. T. MILLET HAND,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HAND: This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of January 23, 1946, with reference to the Thomas M. England General Hospital, Atlantic City, N. J.

The questions raised in your letter were answered in my letter to you of January 23, but since our letters crossed in the mail I would like to assure you again that the selection of hospitals to be retained by the Army was based on the best professional judgment available and was made after a very exhaustive study several months ago. This office has never been requested by any individual or group, from Atlantic City or elsewhere, to release England General Hospital. On the contrary, the people of that city and nearby communities have been most cooperative at all times and have contributed greatly to the successful operation of the hospital.

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN T. KIRK,
Major General,
The Surgeon General.

The Church and Natural Resources Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEWART
OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 1 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able address delivered by Hon. James P. Pope, one time Member of this body from the State of Idaho and now a director of the Tennessee Valley Authority at Alpine, Tenn., before the Tennessee Rural Life Conference on January 25, 1946, on the subject, The Church and Natural Resource Energy.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is a living universe. The heavens and the earth abound with energy. The stars and planets swing in beautiful arcs and contain an inconceivable amount of energy. The earth as a source of energy is revealing itself in an amazing way. The recent demonstration of atomic energy bewilders the human mind. It opens a new field of almost unlimited possibilities. At once it is realized that this cosmic force may portend either the destruction or the upbuilding of civilization beyond our imagination.

There are two concepts that weigh heavily upon our minds—the immensity of the physical energy at hand and the enormous moral responsibility in its use. The results of the existence of the one without the other are unthinkable in their horror.

If without the atomic bomb the use of the lesser forms of mechanical energy has resulted in a distressing, war-torn world, what would be the result of the use of this new and infinitely greater energy? The use of atomic energy simply must be accompanied by the fulfillment of moral obligations. Since these moral obligations are the primary interest of the church, there looms before it the greatest task of all time.

ATOMIC ENERGY

Because of the newness of the use of atomic energy and its possibilities, it is literally the beginning and the end of every discussion these days. Our minds are full of questions. Will it take the place of our present sources of energy—hydro power, coal, oil, steam? Will these things be obsolete within a short time? Will men in their confusion wipe themselves off the face of the earth? There are no satisfactory answers to these questions. Nobody knows.

There are, however, two or three things that can be said about the matter. One is that we must go on performing the tasks at hand, utilizing the energy and facilities at our disposal, and hoping that humanity will be wise enough to cooperate in a moral way and save itself.

OTHER ENERGIES HAVE THEIR PLACE

One thing is historically true, so far as displacement of older forms of energy is concerned. As new sources of energy have been discovered in the past, those in use have not been discarded. Steam, for instance, has not been displaced by either electricity or gasoline, and today more steam energy is being used than ever before. And, of course, far more electricity and gasoline are being used than at any time in the past. There is a place for all of them, and an increasing demand for all of them. It seems entirely likely that our present sources of energy will continue to be used at least for a long time to come.

Still another thing seems very clear—that the technique of producing atomic energy cannot be kept secret by any nation or nations, and that the only way to control it is by the united effort of all the nations. This is the conclusion of the most eminent scientists in the world.

In modern industrial life, we are accustomed to thinking of energy mainly in terms of mechanical power. We think of what might be called mechanical energy, rather than the organic energy of plants and animals, as the main source of useful energy. Mechanical energy is certainly the more spectacular, and during the last century or two it has been developed into an almost endless variety of new uses and services. The steam engine, the gasoline motor, and the electric dynamo have never ceased to be of dramatic interest.

The great locomotive puffing black smoke, the electric crossarms silhouetted against the sky, the hum of the motor of the airplane 2 miles high, the radio carrying messages around the world with the speed of light, to say nothing of the atomic bomb, are marvelous mechanisms of energy. And in war the uses of these things have transformed war making from a more or less gentlemanly contest between professional armies into a mechanical process of wholesale destruction of peoples, their property, their homes, and their cities. They have increased the destructive power of men a thousandfold. Now comes the atomic bomb to increase it a millionfold.

MECHANICAL ENERGY SPECTACULAR

These modern developments, even before the appearance of atomic energy, greatly changed our ways of life, both in peace and in war. They have helped men to utilize natural forces and to change the face of the earth. It took a hundred thousand Egyptians 30 years to build the great Pyramid of Cheops. It has taken TVA, with from three to four thousand men, 6 years to build the Kentucky Dam, which is a third larger in cubic yardage than the great Pyramid. It took the Egyptians 1,750 years to build all the pyramids of Egypt and it has taken TVA less than a dozen years to build the TVA dams, which are something like 50 percent greater in mass than the pyramids. And the modern concept is that such dams are more useful in serving living people than are the pyramids in serving dead kings. As a visitor from India at TVA said the other day: "The mistake the Egyptians made was in building the pyramids on dry land instead of in the Nile River."

I know of no better example of the development of energy than in the Tennessee Valley during the last decade. Energy is manifested in different ways and serves different purposes. I have mentioned atomic energy, electricity, gasoline, steam, and the energy produced by food and feed. The amounts of these energies consumed in the Valley have largely increased, and the amounts of some of them produced have also been greatly increased.

The natural power of the Tennessee River and its tributaries has been converted into a large amount of electric energy. Last year, from the 22 dams and the several steam plants, more than 11,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity was generated by the TVA and used in the area. This is equal to the whole amount of electricity generated and used in the United States in the year 1912. Incidently, TVA is now the largest single producer of electricity in the United States.

TVA AND PUBLIC POWER

So spectacular has been this development of electric power that most people think of TVA as essentially a public power agency. And the fact that this phase of the work has

been the subject of much controversy in the courts and the country has added to that impression in the public mind. The fact is, however, that electric power is only one phase of TVA's development work in the Valley.

It is not my purpose to depreciate the importance of electric power in the Tennessee Valley development. It is a major factor in the development of the region when integrated with others. Its low rates (about one-third of those at the beginning of TVA) and its widespread and largely increased use in the Valley have been of very great benefit to its people. It means savings of something like $11,000,000 a year to them in their power bills, as compared to the rates 12 years ago. It has meant an increase of electrified farms from less than 3 percent to about 25 percent in the Valley.

Electric power has played a part in the much-needed development of industry in the valley. More than 400 new industries, mostly based on local resources, have been set up in the region within the last decade, with low-cost electricity a factor in many cases. Power is the paying partner in TVA's work. Receipts from its sale make it possible for TVA to reimburse the Federal Government for the money invested in the project. It is estimated that the full investment for power without interest will be returned within 30 years and the full investment in navigation, flood control, and power could be repaid within 60 years.

The supply of large quantities of electricity for war purposes has been an invaluable contribution to the winning of the war, including the development of the atomic bomb. About 75 percent of TVA's output has been used for these purposes. The service of this electric power to the people of the region and to the Nation in its war effort cannot be overemphasized in any discussion of the Tennessee Valley.

OTHER PHASES EQUALLY IMPORTANT

However, the other phases of TVA's work are equally if not more important. The savings on water transportation, it is estimated, will not be much less in the course of a few years than the savings on electric power and of like influence in the development of the region. The benefits of flood control will also approach the benefits of power. And the benefits of farm and forestry programs will undoubtedly be equal to if not greater than those of electric power.

The importance of soil improvement, of the production of better crops for food and feed, and of the creation of the vast amount of life-giving energy for men and animals cannot be measured in money, for in it are involved considerations of health, of nutrition, of living comforts, and of human well-being. It is about this matter that I would speak for the rest of my time tonight.

Perhaps one way of measuring its importance is to make some comparisons of the amounts of energy used. The different expressions of energy have different units of measurement. The familiar unit of electric energy is the kilowatt-hour, and the familiar unit of food energy is the calorie. These forms of energy are not interchangeable, of course; a man can't plug himself into an electric socket to obtain the energy for his daily tasks. But for the purposes of comparison they can be reduced to the same unit.

Thus the energy the average person obtains from food in a year is equal to 1,275 kilowatt-hours, and a family would consume three or four times that much. The average family that has electricity in the United States uses 1,117 kilowatt-hours of electric energy per year. It happens that the average use of electricity per family in the Tennessee Valley is much greater—1,707 kilowatt-hours. When the total consumption of food by men and animals is reduced to kilowatt-hours, it is found that in the Tennessee Valley the amount is about 44,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year, as compared to 11,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity used.

To put the matter another way: The average person consumes in food the equivalent of 3½ kilowatt-hours a day, and the family consumers in electricity 3 kilowatt-hours a day. Each person, then, eats more kilowatt-hours a day than the average family uses in electricity. And what about animals? Do they eat many kilowatt-hours a day? Listen to this: The old milch cow is a regular dynamo. She consumes the equivalent of 46½ kilowatt-hours every day of her life, when she can get it. That amount of energy would supply the average family with electricity for all the lights, washing machine, refrigerator, electric iron, cream separator, and all the other electric things on the place for over 2 weeks' time. She actually uses about as much energy as a 5-horsepower dynamo running 10 full hours a day. My hat is off to her—for a good many reasons.

There are some other interesting comparisons, too. The annual amount of energy generated by plants in food and feed crops in the State of Tennessee alone is equivalent to 34,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours, or about three times the production of electric energy by TVA. Even the energy from the wood used for fuel each year in the Tennessee Valley is equivalent to 25,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours, or more than twice the electric energy used. A calculation has been made of the amount of energy in kilowatt-hours created by the growth of the timber above 6 inches in diameter each year in the Tennessee Valley. That amounts to about 37,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours of energy.

And what about the energy contained in the coal that is mined in the Tennessee Valley every year? That is a surprising amount. It is estimated that about 15,407,000 tons are produced in the valley every year. The energy of this coal is equivalent to 122,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours, or more than 10 times the TVA production of electric energy in the region. Some of this coal actually is turned into two or three billion kilowatt-hours of electric energy in the valley. It should be emphasized here that coal comes from a definitely exhaustible source of energy, as does gasoline, while all these other sources are renewable. This is an extremely important consideration.

ENERGY OF FOOD AND FEED

I know of nothing that better illustrates the tremendous importance of food, feed, and fuel than these facts about their relative energy value. We can get along without atomic energy or electricity or gasoline or steam—humanity did up to 200 years ago—but we cannot get along without food and feed and fuel. These are the greatest producers of energy as they are the greatest factors in the life, the health, and the well-being of people.

TVA has from the beginning realized the supreme importance of this and of the necessity for the food and feed to have in it the essential proteins and minerals. It has recognized the necessity for preserving the bases of this vital energy. It has recognized the depletion of the soil and the forests which supply most of the things that men and animals live by. It has, in cooperation with other agencies, developed a program of soil-building and of forest conservation. It has developed a potential capacity of 130,000 tons a year of phosphatic plant nutrients—P_2O_5. Much of this capacity was used for munition purposes during the war, but some part of it was used on the 24,000 demonstration farms in the valley and the other thousands outside. TVA also has considerable capacity for producing nitrogenous plant food as a result of the munition requirements of the war.

TVA AND PHOSPHATE

This whole demonstration-farm program has been built around phosphate. At the beginning TVA decided to process and use phosphate rather than nitrogen, and here are some of the scientific reasons for the decision.

Each pound of phosphorus, with lime, can add to the soil 3 pounds or more of nitrogen through legumes. This 3 pounds of nitrogen can produce from 125 to 350 pounds of food material necessary to animal and human nutrition. This can in turn produce 160 pounds of milk, or 15 pounds of beef or 23 pounds of pork. All this production, then, stems from 1 pound of phosphorus. Up to July 1945, TVA supplied 54,500 tons of phosphorus for use on these farms, and it is estimated that this would produce some 818,000 tons of beef or 1,255,000 tons of pork or 8,720,000 tons of milk.

While you are coming up for air from this sea of figures, I will assert that here is energy for you. The old milk cow is getting in her work. She is producing energy faster than Norris Dam. In the eight-million-odd tons of milk there is energy of more than 5,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity. That is about half the present annual output of all TVA's dams and steam plants. And this milk energy represents not the total milk of the area by any means, but only the increase made possible by the TVA phosphate. If you have survived the statistics, I think this may indicate to you the enormous energy that is created by food, feed, and fuel, and on the business side it indicates a pretty fair return on the investment in phosphorus.

ENERGY AND NUTRITION

Talking about all this energy that comes from food and feed is simply another way of talking about nutrition—human and animal nutrition. And the story of the use of phosphorus on the land is simply a story of better nutrition. It is a story of more and better food and feed—more and better plants containing protein and minerals—more and better crops containing the elements that build up bone and muscle and sinew.

And the need for this has never been greater than now. The deficiency of nutrition at the beginning of the war was serious enough, as everybody knows. And certainly that deficiency has not decreased among the peoples of the world, for ever-increasing numbers have been without sufficient food of any kind. Millions have gone hungry and many have starved during the war, and millions more will suffer now that the war is over. Even in the United States, probably the best-fed country in the world, there is an alarming lack of nutrition.

LACK OF NUTRITION

In a recent statement, Dr. William A. Albrecht, head of the department of soils at the College of Agriculture in Missouri, used this language:

"Keen minds among doctors of medicine and dentistry * * * have seen degeneration in bodies, minds, and souls taking place at the highest rate among our people * * * Studies * * * make it possible to see human deformities associated with nutrition and this nutrition going back to the crop, the season, and the soil itself."

And he had this to say about our animals:

"Animal ailments are on the increase. Because of the declining soil fertility, animals have been pushed to the dangerous precipice until decreased reproduction, increased diseases, more body malformation, and other irregularities have compelled us to market these animals early. What the use of this meat has been doing to human health had not yet been given consideration."

And there has never before been such a drain upon all our natural base. In a report by a committee of the Department of Agriculture a year or two ago, the extent of the drain on crop and grazing lands and forests was pointed out. Soil erosion and loss of fertility have been very heavy. And the drain on forests has largely exceeded the growth of new timber.

All this presents a problem immense and vital. Its importance to human welfare is beyond measure. Improvement of the land, conservation of the forests, production of better food and feed, thus assuring the necessary amount of life-giving energy for men and animals, is certainly one of the "must" policies of the American people, and it is going to require the best efforts of individuals and of institutions to approach any solution of the problem.

FORWARD STEPS

There is considerable evidence, I am happy to say, of movement in this direction. Public consciousness of the problem is growing. Meetings of this kind are being held over the country. Educational forces are more active than at any time before. There is increasing discussion in magazines and newspapers. Significant experiments are being made in different parts of the country. Business concerns and banks have become interested in some places and are assisting in the task.

Recently my attention was called to a pamphlet entitled "Country Bank Action on the Soil Front," gotten out by the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland, Ohio. In it this bank talks about declining soil fertility, about soil-conservation districts, about changes in yield with phosphate and lime applications, and the like. One paragraph must be quoted:

"One of the great costs of the Second World War has been the accelerated deterioration of the Nation's soils. That soil productivity must be rebuilt is self-evident, for all human destiny is dependent upon it. It is not merely a problem for farmers, for, truly, the land is everybody's heritage."

A very important step forward is now being taken with respect to a national fertilizer policy. It is based on the concept of enabling farmers throughout the country to use the amount of phosphate and other fertilizers needed by the soil for its maintenance and for the economical production of nutritious food and feed crops. The Department of Agriculture has estimated that about twice as much phosphate is needed as is being used on the land now. The same is true also of some other kinds of plant food. Based upon its own experience for the last 10 years, TVA has issued a statement strongly recommending such a national policy.

A CHALLENGE

The life-giving energy that comes from the land can never be replaced by any form of mechanical energy, atomic or any other. It alone can sustain life. It alone can provide health and vigor and bloom. It alone can build strong bodies, clear heads.

Mechanical energy can give power and provide comfort. It can enable men to do prodigies on the land, on the sea, and in the air. It can carry messages with the speed of light. But it cannot tint the rose, green the grass, or ripen the corn. It cannot put the glow of health into boys' cheeks. Only the sunshine, the fresh air, and the energy of the fruits of the soil can do that.

To provide an abundance of this life-giving energy is a great task. It is of such importance as to challenge the best efforts of men. It is so vital to human well-being as to require nothing less than the keenest minds, the most skillful hands, and the most devoted souls that can be enlisted in it.

Understanding Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 1, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, in a world groping for concord, Russia is the most important and the most difficult nation for Americans to understand. The Minneapolis Star-Journal is publishing a series of five articles on Russia and her activities in Europe, written by Dr. Sverre Norborg, a distinguished American citizen born in Norway, who until lately was on the University of Minnesota faculty, and who, during the war, served in the Office of Strategic Services and was for a year in charge of UNRRA activities in northern Europe.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial from the Minneapolis Star-Journal of January 28, and the first two of Dr. Norborg's articles. The others will be included later:

[From the Minneapolis Star-Journal of January 28, 1946]

UNDERSTANDING RUSSIA

In contrast to some of our own seemingly aimless foreign-policy decisions, Russian international action may appear resolute and concerted. Yet a look behind the scenes at Moscow reveals schools of thought as widely divergent as those in America. Isolationism, chauvinism, and internationalism all have their champions in the Soviet capital.

A searching study of these men and their policies is provided in the series of articles by Sverre Norborg beginning in the Star-Journal today. As student, political philosopher, and UNRRA official, Dr. Norborg has watched the currents of public life on the Continent at first hand for many years.

The former University of Minnesota faculty member is convinced that we must know the Russians better to arrive at a basis for understanding with them. We must comprehend the not too complex motives which govern factions within the one party of the U. S. S. R.

The Russians have kept a smoke screen between themselves and the rest of the world, yet an objective study is possible. Russia's foreign maneuvers since VE-day, the behavior of her armies abroad, the few public utterances of her leaders all provide clues. Fortified by his acquaintance with European diplomats and professional scholars, Dr. Norborg has made that study.

His intelligent analysis should be read by every American interested in understanding the rulers in the other great powers of today's world.

[From the Minneapolis Star-Journal of January 28, 1946]

MICROSCOPE ON RUSSIA—EUROPE MOVES LEFT AFTER WAR BUT SHUNS COMMUNISM—SOVIET UNION "MISSES THE BOAT" AS CONTINENT TURNS INSTEAD TO SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC CREED

(By C. Sverre Norborg)

In Paris last August, I asked a European economist what he thought of the Russian situation. In his radical youth he had served as technical adviser in Moscow on Stalin's first 5-year plan, but his enthusiasm has since cooled off to a state of critical objectivity.

His answer was: "The paradox of 1945 is a double one. The world is afraid of Russia and does not want to be so. The Russians are afraid for themselves and do not want to admit it.

"Since VE-day I have done considerable monitoring of Radio Moscow to find out whither the Soviet wind is blowing. Shcherbakov, the Soviet propaganda chief, is still plugging away, but the 'melody' is lost. The whole thing is improvised.

"During recent months, Russian broadcasts have reflected the uncertainty which has gripped Moscow ever since Europe began to show its postwar political colors. Politically speaking, the premature calculations of A. Y. Vishinsky (Soviet brain truster) on postwar Europe have backfired in the most miserable manner.

"Now I am waiting for the great realist, Josef Stalin, to make a frank admission of the mistaken hopes which the Soviet Union failed to see fulfilled in Europe during this summer of liberation. We may soon witness some startling changes in Soviet foreign policy."

(Andrei Y. Vishinsky is a leading Russian lawyer and Molotov's vice commissar of foreign affairs. A revolutionist at 18, he installed Russia's now legal code after the 1917 revolution. After Hitler's defeat he attempted to install Communist-controlled governments in the Balkans. He is Russia's chief delegate to the UNO sessions in London.)

After the glorious victory at Stalingrad in 1943 the foreign-policy planners of Moscow decided to accelerate their neat work on a "blueprint" for a New Europe. With the broad outlines and basic directives given by Marshal Stalin, the Politburo, Russia's supercabinet, left most of this planning work to Vishinsky, Bulganin, and Zhdanov.

A. A. Zhdanov is the keen, fiftyish, middle-of-the-road Stalinist, who in many respects serves Generalissimo Stalin as Harry Hopkins served the late President Roosevelt.

The comparatively unknown N. Bulganin wields an active and considerable influence on Russian foreign policy through his chairmanship of the Soviet commission on foreign affairs.

The brilliant but slightly visionary Vishinsky heads the unofficial circle of political scientists who constantly watch over what Russian Marxists like to call "the dialectics of Soviet world policy."

Outside Russia the best-known member of this Russian "brain trust" was the late Ambassador Oumansky, who, strangly enough, was transferred from Washington to Mexico (where he met death in January 1945 in a plane crash).

Piecing together all of the information gathered by the Russian political intelligence, this circle of Moscow planners called in Russia's top experts on European underground movements. Former Comintern leaders like pale, obstinate Georgi Dimitrov, voluntary exiles like Maurice Thorez and A. Kuusinen, and leading European representatives of the Communist underground, reported to Vishinsky, Zhdanov and company that they were convinced that Red Europe would be right around the corner once World War II came to an end. It was inevitable, it was demanded by that logic which Marxists are prone to find in history.

In this spirit of victorious fervor, the foreign affairs experts of Moscow accordingly laid plans for a postwar European policy in which special emphasis was put on—

The unification of all Slav nations.

Russian dominance of the Baltic.

The final unbottling of the Dardanelles.

A deep security belt of friendly nations along Russia's European borders.

A selling campaign of Russian good will and power throughout the world.

Since VE-day European history has staged a surprise party.

Europe has not gone Red.

True, the western European nations have followed in the political steps of the British Labor victory. And in France the party with the greatest popular following is the Communist Party. In all countries the native Communists have elected more representatives to the parliaments than at any earlier time. This is notably the case in Denmark.

Yet it is surprising to find Norwegian, Danish and Dutch Communists insisting, both privately and publicly, on strict adherence to Western democratic ideals and procedure.

Last summer in Copenhagen, a cosmopolitan group was discussing Europe's future with one of the Communist members of the interim Danish cabinet. Our conversation had inevitably wheeled around to the Red Army, when he suddenly broke into a spontaneous declaration:

"We must not forget what we owe the English people. We Danes always will remember that had it not been for Churchill and England in 1940, there would be no democratic Europe today."

A fresh breeze of European good will went through the room, and a smile or relief lighted up the serious faces.

How did it happen that the Moscow foreign experts were caught so badly off base in their diagnosis of political postwar Europe?

Was Russian political intelligence inadequate or misled?

Did Moscow underrate the political maturity of the European underground movements?

Did American victories on the Continent have anything to do with the change of the political climate throughout Europe?

Did the atomic bomb change the political climate?

The answer to each of these questions is: Yes, decidedly.

[From the Minneapolis Star-Journal of January 29, 1946]

MICROSCOPE ON RUSSIA—REFORM OR REVOLT?—POSTWAR EUROPE CHOOSES REFORM—BRITISH LABOR VICTORY SAVED CONTINENT FROM RED BRAND OF DEMOCRACY

(By C. Sverre Norborg)

American military victories in Europe changed the political climate on that Continent. Atomic bombs dropped half a world away confirmed the change. But there are two deeper reasons why Russia's postwar program for Europe has failed, and Europe has chosen instead to follow the social democratic instead of the Communist political philosophy.

Those reasons are psychological.

Discussions with scores of European underground leaders in the summer of Europe's liberation revealed them. Both factors were overlooked by Russian intelligence and neglected by the makers of Russian foreign policy.

First, the resistance against Nazi tyranny in all the fighting underground movements was motivated by a definite and all-embracing national spirit, which did not know or count political party lines.

I have heard Norwegian clergymen of underground fame give unstinted praise to the self-sacrificing patriotism of Norwegian Communists.

Danish Communists seeking asylum from the Gestapo have spent many a night in a shipowner's or an industrialist's home. Self-effacing patriotism was the key to the European underground.

The second factor, democratic individualism, is, if possible, of even greater and more lasting political significance. The national underground forces in the different European countries were under strict, unified discipline. Orders were given. Assignments were carried out. No questions were asked. No explanations were expected.

And yet this was the iron discipline of a freedom movement in which each individual held in his hand the safety and security of all the others—banker, professor, bricklayer, clergyman, bus driver, or housewife—this was a classless community of freedom-loving spirits.

They met at work, they shared concentration camps, they walked to execution—together.

"Now I know what true democracy is," said a crippled Belgian student just back from Dachau. "I have lived in it for 3 years. It is humanity itself."

In retrospect, therefore, it can be said that Russia's informants were too Marxist and too superficial in their political analysis of the spiritual forces at work. Deep under the stupid brutality of Nazi heels, a new moral experience was unifying Europe's democratic masses in a national and social cohesion of unknown strength.

Not that there was much more prophetic insight among us westerners than among the Russians. The Labor victory in England came as a shock in Europe as well as in Washington.

But the democratic nations of liberated Europe almost instantly jumped at British Labor's program as a welcome political alternative to the managerial centralism of Moscow.

Prof. Harold Laski's good-will tour during the summer of 1945 to the Scandinavian countries came at a turning point in European political history. Before his visit, the Communists and the Socialists in country after country had worked with fear and fervor to amalgamate their respective parties into a united popular front.

Then suddenly the Socialists broke off the negotiations. The leading Communist newspaper in Copenhagen wrote an editorial entitled, "Laski Came and Unity Went." The stinging irony of the editorial testified to the bitterness of a Marxist mind which had seen its European dream burst.

Moscow has never loved Social Democrats, who prefer reform to revolution. The invectives used by Communists before the war, in every country, against "these chicken-hearted, pink traitors to the cause of the proletariat" are too well known to need repetition.

Furthermore, Moscow no longer speaks of the proletariat. It proclaims socialism. It emulates democracy, and in its own way it believes in what it proclaims.

It is a matter of definition. It may be much more.

Vishinsky's famous Bucharest speech is still the clearest statement of the Russian idea of democracy which the outside world has received. It was a brilliant sales talk along somewhat obscure lines, on the mythical will of the people.

After analyzing the Vishinsky text, a keen British political philosopher observed:

"Add a new definition to your vocabulary—Vishinsky's concept of democracy. According to him, democracy is 'the greatest amount of happiness for the greatest number of people, whether they want it or not.'"

It is at exactly this point that United States foreign policy has been at loggerheads with Moscow.

The Russians forced a solution of the Polish problem on the basis of this mythical "will of the people." They installed Austrian, Bulgarian, and Rumanian "governments" as expressions of this mythical "will of the people." On the very same ideological basis they are strongly behind what has been called Titotalitarianism in Yugoslavia.

However, authentic reports of recent developments in Poland tell of a definite westernizing even of the Polish political situation.

The revealing victory of the political opposition party to communism in Hungary is another straw in the European wind. The Czechs are busy with nationalization of most of their industries, yet they remain political democrats in the constitutional sense of that word. In Austria the Russians have given in, after considerable pressure.

The Moscow agreement points to a compromise by the Big Three on the governmental situation in Rumania and Bulgaria.

And that military statesman, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, has publicly stated that a free election in the Russian zone in Berlin would show up the German Communists as the pitiful minority group they really are.

What will the foreign policy makers of the Narkomindel (Russian foreign office) do about the political temper of the New Europe?

Will they accept it as a fact and cooperate in trade and cultural relations?

Will the Soviet Union insist on keeping a "security belt" along her European borders, while it otherwise withdraws from the rest of Europe?

Will it compensate for a loss of face in Europe by turning its attention even more than before to the Asiatic peoples?

Or, will Russia itself change, broadening democracy within her own borders and, with the United States, lead all nations toward one world?

The world has once again begun the Herculean task of making peace.

This time the main burden falls on the two former isolationist world powers—the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Confusion, mistakes and frustration cannot meet the challenge of the atomic age.

Russia is in midpassage. So is the world.

The Negro Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 1, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is about the Negro soldier I wish to speak today. I wish to pay him the respect and to express the gratitude of the American people for his contribution in the greatest battle of all time—the battle which decided whether or not we were to remain a free people.

We should be especially mindful of the Negro soldier, remembering that he fought and shed his blood for a freedom which he has not as yet been permitted fully to share.

The service record of the Negro in World War II began with the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941, and carried through to the day and the hour of the Japanese surrender.

Whether in the North African, European, or Pacific theater of war, the Negro serviceman responded to the call of duty to the fullest extent of his opportunity and to the very best of his ability.

The Negro soldier made his contribution in World War II as he has in every other war in which we, a free people, have fought. And he has again met the test of patriotism and heroism. The names of Negro heroes in this war are everlastingly recorded among the living and the dead. They won their citations

in every combat area, on land, on sea, in the air.

It should never be forgotten that Negro heroes in this war achieved their proud records under handicaps that did not have to be overcome by most of their white fellow citizens.

This was the most mechanical of all wars. Training had to be based on the education and experience of the average man. The average American boy going into the service of his country had some knowledge of, some experience with the mechanical gadgets that contribute to our much boasted high standard of living. And at least he could read and write.

Three-fourths of all Negroes in the armed forces came from areas in this land of the free where their people had been held down for generations, denied education, denied the use of tools any more complicated than a hoe, denied the right to participate in self-government, denied even the right to self-respect. For them, equal educational opportunities, equal pay for equal work, practically any opportunity to work at skilled trades, simply did not exist. They went into the armed forces ill equipped, through no fault of their own, for the tremendous job required of them.

But they did the job, all the same, handicap or no handicap. And they did it magnificently.

They were MEN—with the heart and the will and the courage—the stuff of which heroes are made. They may, as did one group, have had to memorize instructions because they could not read them. But while letters may have been foreign to them, devotion was not; nor was courage foreign to them. The qualities that cannot be indoctrinated—the qualities of greatness—were there.

Some of the most outstanding units in all theaters were made up of Negroes who had been classified in the lowest Army classification categories—those very boys who had never had a chance to run a machine or even to learn to read and write before going into the Army.

Despite the Selective Service and Training Act, which established a basic policy of nondiscrimination because of race or color in building up our Army, and in spite of improvement during the course of the war, it must not be forgotten that segregation, discrimination, and race prejudice, in all of its varied forms, placed an added burden on the Negro in the armed forces and dogged his steps from the induction center to the front line.

Navy Crosses—for "conduct in keeping with the highest traditions of the United States naval service"—were won by Negro mess attendants not permitted to enlist in their country's Navy as fighting men.

It was a mess attendant—not permitted, because he was a Negro, to train as a gunner—who manned a machine gun and fought back when the Japs strafed his ship at Pearl Harbor. For this and for dragging his mortally wounded captain to safety, Dorie Miller, mess attendant first class, won the Navy Cross.

It was Leonard Roy Harmon, mess attendant first class, who won the Navy Cross, posthumously, for heroic action. He lost his life aboard the U. S. S. *San Francisco* in battle off the Solomon Islands. Later his mother was brought from her home in Texas, by order of the Secretary of the Navy, to the shipyards in Hingham, Mass., to sponsor the destroyer escort U. S. S. *Harmon*, named after her hero son.

It was Pvt. Woodall I. Marsh, of Pittsburgh, of the Ninety-second Division, who won the Silver Star for taking 12 wounded paratroopers out of the front line to safety, fording a raging torrent in his truck, after an officer had said it could not be done. When he was told he could not get through because the water was too deep, Private Marsh replied, "Well, there's dirt underneath, ain't there?"

In December 1944 when the picture in Europe was dark, where our front-line losses were mounting with tragic swiftness, a call was sent out for volunteer replacements from troops assigned to noncombat duty behind the lines. More than 5,000 Negroes eagerly responded. Because only privates were accepted, many noncommissioned officers offered to sacrifice their stripes for a chance to get into the fighting. Twenty-five hundred Negro soldiers were accepted, but 3,000 more were turned back, because a quota for Negroes among the volunteers had been set. One of those who was accepted, Pfc Leroy W. Kemp, of Atlantic City, N. J., remarked, "We've been giving a lot of sweat. Now I think we'll mix some blood with it."

They did mix their blood—with the blood of their white brothers—and out of that mixing new understanding and respect were born.

One of the finest tributes paid these volunteers came from Brig. Gen. Charles T. Lanham, assistant commander of the One Hundred and Fourth Infantry Division, following the presentation of combat decorations:

"I have never seen any soldiers who have performed better in combat than you," General Lanham told the Negro doughboys.

Under the Selective Service Act, Negroes were trained for every branch of the service, but, although Negro fighter pilots were shooting down German planes over Italy, although the Ninety-second Division fought through the Italian campaign from start to finish and came out with 2 Distinguished Service Crosses, 1 Distinguished Service Medal, 16 Legion of Merit awards, 95 Silver Stars, 6 Soldier's Medals, 723 Bronze Stars, 1,095 Purple Hearts, and 7,996 Combat Infantry Badges, and although the Nine Hundred and Sixty-ninth Field Artillery Battalion was caught at Bastogne and fought it out side by side with the celebrated One Hundred and First Airborne Division and received, with the One Hundred and First, a Presidential Unit Citation, and although there were Negro combat troops in action on every front, the fact remains that the majority of the Negroes, sometimes regardless of qualifications, found themselves in service outfits.

And what did that mean? It meant building airports, bases, roads, and highways under fire, in freezing cold and blazing heat. It meant building an approach to a bridge across the Rhine, under artillery fire, unable to take cover, unable to shoot back. It meant landing ammunition on the Normandy beaches on D-day, always under fire. It meant setting up field kitchens on those beaches, even before the fighting troops which were to be fed and heartened had all come ashore. It meant Negro Seabees winning commendation for building an airport on a Pacific island under heavy Japanese fire. It meant stringing thousands and thousands of miles of communication wire—across rivers, through steaming jungles, over icy mountain passes, with artillery shells crashing around them, with snipers forever shooting at them. It meant trucking high explosives and octane gas over the Red Ball Highway—continuously under aerial bombardment. It meant building the Ledo Road, under impossible conditions, cutting and blasting their way through jungle and over mountain passes—riding their bulldozers down with tons of sliding rock when the narrow ledges gave way, to save the precious equipment. And again and again and again it meant dropping a shovel and picking up a gun from the stiffening hands of a fallen fighting comrade.

In 1940, when the Selective Service Act was passed, there were only 4,451 Negroes in our Army, including 5 commissioned officers and 11 warrant officers.

In February, a year ago, there were 690,282 Negroes in the Army. Of these, 52,884 were in the Infantry, 27,163 in the Coast and Field Artillery, 770 in the Cavalry, 140,154 in the Engineers, 63,079 in the Air Corps, and 406,232 in other branches of the armed services. Included in the total were 6,548 commissioned officers. Of that number, 120 were Dental Corps officers, 343 were nurses, 569 were Medical Corps officers, and 260 were chaplains. The Army had 820 Negro Wacs, the Navy had 68 Negro Waves, and the Coast Guard 5 Negro Spars.

Last August there were 695,264 Negroes in the United States Army. Of these, 495,950 were overseas. On the day of final victory in Europe there were 22 Negro combat units in action on the European front.

Here are some things that "Ike" Eisenhower, the man who broke the Axis, had to say about the Negro troops who served under him.

In July 1944, to the commanding officers and men of a Negro antiaircraft balloon battalion, the only outfit of its kind participating in the D-day landings:

The commanding officer, First United States Army, has brought to my attention the splendid manner in which you have carried out your mission during the period of June 6 to July 10, 1944.

Your battalion landed in France on June 6 under artillery, machine-gun, and rifle fire. Despite the losses sustained, the battalion

carried out its mission with courage and determination and proved an important element to the air-defense team. The cheerfulness and devotion to duty of officers and men have been commented on by the personnel of other units.

This report is most gratifying to me. I commend you and the officers and men of your battalion for your fine effort, which has merited the praise of all who have observed it.

On the same day to the commanding officer and officers and men of a Negro truck company:

I have received from the commanding general, First United States Army, a report of your exceptionally fine work during the landing in France and the period of a month subsequent thereto. The report confirms my own observation.

You landed under enemy machine-gun and artillery fire, which caused losses in men and equipment. Nevertheless, you salvaged most of your equipment at once and within 3 days 90 percent of your vehicles were operating on a 24-hour basis, a scale which was maintained for 5 weeks. During this time you continued the delivery of essential supplies. I want you to know that I appreciate your splendid work. Your accomplishments are a source of gratification to me and to your Army commander.

Reviewing the war at a press conference in Paris on June 15, 1945, General Eisenhower was asked to comment upon the contribution Negro soldiers made to the European Theater of Operations. He replied:

To start with, I would like to say this: That I do not differentiate among soldiers. I do not say white soldiers or Negro soldiers and I do not say American or British soldiers. To my mind, I have had a task in this war that makes me look upon soldiers as soldiers. Now, I have seen Negro soldiers in this war, and I have many reports on their work where they have rendered very valuable contributions and some of them with the greatest enthusiasm. In late November, when we were getting short of reinforcements, replacements, some 2,600 Negro soldiers volunteered for front-line service and they did good work. All my commanders reported that these volunteers did excellent work. But their major job has been in Service of Supply, engineer units, quartermaster units, ordnance units. There, so far as I know and certainly as far as any official reports, they have performed equally with every kind of ordnance battalion, quartermaster battalion, and engineer battalion. They have done their job and they have done the job given them.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that all of us, as we continue our task of building a firm and lasting peace, will emulate "Ike" Eisenhower. He did not differentiate between whites and Negroes—nor between Americans, British, French, nor Russians. They were all soldiers. It is my fervent hope that we will have the wisdom to look upon citizens as citizens—neither white nor black nor yellow—but simply as citizens—of a world community.

At this point I wish to introduce what at this time can only be a partial record of Negro devotion and heroism in the cause of freedom. My material has been gathered from the War and Navy Departments.

AFRICAN-ITALIAN CAMPAIGN

FORTY-FIRST ENGINEERS

On June 17, 1942, 18 months before United States troops were reported to have landed at Dakar—the first Negro troops landed in Africa. They were the Forty-first Engineer Regiment—the "singing engineers"—and their mission was to protect that vital area in the trans-African life line of the United Nations under an agreement between the Governments of the United States and Liberia. The pact, signed on March 31, 1942, gave the United States the right to construct, control, operate, and defend airports in the West African republic. In return for use of lands for American troops, the United States agred to protect Liberia's neutrality, provide $1,000,000 in lend-lease aid, undertake a road-building program and train a Liberian Army, using American equipment.

Pfc. Edward Taylor, of Baltimore, led ashore the first American expeditionary force ever to set foot in Africa. A handful of natives and civilian construction workers watched him step ashore. "Liberians," he said, "we are here to join hands and fight together until this world is free of tyrannical dictators."

The Forty-first Engineers worked at a grueling pace. A big job had to be done in record time, despite malaria, bad terrain, and the rainy season. But they built the airports, cantonments, and other installations that were needed. They unloaded ships and dispatched supplies through three big defense areas. They laid steel landing mats in the emergency airports and waged a constant battle against the verdant undergrowth. They built permanent structures to replace temporary shacks and sheds.

"For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding service" in Liberia, Master Sgt. Albert F. Williams, of Waycross, Ga., Headquarters and Service Company, Forty-first Engineers, was awarded the Legion of Merit.

His citation stated that "As a member of the advance detachment of an expeditionary force, from April to June 1942, he distinguished himself by his soldierly qualities, leadership, and dependability. Upon arrival on a strange continent, by his example of cheerfulness, confidence, energy, and industry he was a constant source of inspiration to his fellow soldiers and a tower of strength to his commanding officer. Sergeant Williams set the pace for all duties assigned. He supervised his men every moment of the day, protecting their health so that there was no illness in a disease-ridden country. He used his 600 native laborers with patience, understanding, and skill. He was largely responsible for building up an enviable reputation for our soldiers abroad and contributing materially toward the preliminary mission of the force."

President Roosevelt stopped in Liberia on his way home from the Casablanca conference on January 27, 1943, and reviewed the Forty-first Engineers.

FOUR HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANTIAIRCRAFT ARTILLERY AUTOMATIC WEAPONS BATTALION

This battalion had the distinction of being the first Negro combat unit to land in north Africa and the first Negro combat unit to go into action on European soil.

As a matter of fact, before it even landed on the Italian peninsula, it won the commendation of Lt. Gen. Mark W. Clark, commanding the Fifth Army, for "outstanding performance of duty" in its baptism of fire. It accounted for two German bombers before it landed in Italy.

While the Negro troops of the Four Hundred and Fiftieth Battalion were still aboard ship in Naples Harbor, German bombers came over. The attack occurred at night. Soldiers of the Four Hundred and Fiftieth Battalion aboard one ship manned its 40-mm guns. Seachlights picked up the bombers, and the Negro gun crew shot down one German bomber.

Aboard another ship, carrying personnel and equipment of the Four Hundred and Fiftieth Battalion, M/S Johnson Clark, of Detroit, Mich., jumped into a loaded truck parked on deck and opened fire with a 50-caliber machine gun mounted on the cab. Other fire opened up from that ship, and a second bomber crashed into the sea.

Commending troops of the Four Hundred and Fiftieth Battalion for this accomplishment, General Clark declared:

"I am proud of the outstanding performance of duty of these soldiers in this baptism of fire. Their conduct was excellent and reflects the training and discipline of their unit. The Fifth Army welcomes such soldiers."

NINETY-NINTH PURSUIT SQUADRON

This unit of fighter pilots trained at the Tuskegee Army Air Field. After further training by veterans of the Tunisian campaign, the unit was committed to combat on June 1, 1943. It flew its first mission, over an air base at Fardjouna, the following day. Other early missions were over the island of Pantelleria, Italian stronghold guarding the Sicilian straits. Six of its pilots had their first brush with enemy aircraft over Pantelleria, and pilots of the Ninety-ninth dive-bombed Pantelleria daily until it was surrendered on June 11, 1943.

Next came the Sicilian campaign. During the first 9 days of July 1943, the Negro pilots of the Ninety-ninth Squadron escorted bombers to Sicily. On every trip they were attacked by superior numbers of enemy fighter planes.

By the middle of July the Ninety-ninth was escorting bombers over Italy. In a dogfight over Sciacca, Italy, one day, First Lt. (now Captain) Charles B. Hall, of Brazil, Ind., shot down the first Axis plane officially credited to the Ninety-ninth Squadron. On that same day the Ninety-ninth, flying close escort for medium Mitchell bombers, probably destroyed two more German planes and damaged three.

General Eisenhower was at the air base with the squadron's commander, Lt. Col. (now Colonel) Benjamin O. Davis, of Washington, D. C., when Hall and the others landed after that fight and congratulated them on their first confirmed victory.

From June 1 to September 3, 1943, the Ninety-ninth Squadron participated in about 800 sorties over north Africa, Sicily, and Italy.

Squadron's Biggest Day

The Ninety-ninth Squadron, by this time based in Italy, had its biggest day on January 27, 1944. In one of the fiercest air battles of the Italian campaign, over the Anzio beachhead, south of Rome, Negro pilots of the Ninety-ninth Squadron scored eight confirmed victories over the Germans.

Bent on driving the Allied landing force out of its beachhead, a hundred or more Messerschmitt 109's and Focke-Wulf 190's came over in two attacks, morning and afternoon on that day. Twenty-eight were destroyed during the day and the Ninety-ninth got eight of them, the largest number credited to any single squadron that day.

Flyers from eight States figured in this outstanding collective victory of the Ninety-ninth that day. Capt. Lemuel Rodney Custis, of Hartford, Conn., squadron operations officer got one "Jerry." Six other pilots of the Ninety-ninth got one each: First Lts. Robert W. Deiz, of Portland, Oreg.; Willie Ashley, of Sumter, S. C.; Leon C. Roberts, of Pritchard, Ala.; and Edward L. Toppins, of San Francisco, Calif.; Second Lts. Charles P. Bailey, of Punta Gorda, Fla.; and Wilson Eagleson, of Bloomington, Ind. The Ninety-ninth Squadron's eighth victory was shared by Second Lts. Clarance Allen, of Mobile, Ala., and Howard L. Baugh, of Petersburg, Va.

The Ninety-ninth shot down four more enemy planes on January 28, 1944, Captain Hall scoring a double.

Lieutenant Deiz was credited with his second German plane in 2 days, and two pilots, Lieutenants Baugh and Allen, were credited jointly with the destruction of one plane. The fourth German plane was shot down by

Second Lt. Louis C. Smith, of Los Angeles, Calif.

Second Lt. Elwood T. Driver, of Trenton, N. J., got the thirteenth German plane credited to the Ninety-ninth Squadron. Planes of the squadron were just arriving over Anzio beachhead on February 5, 1944, to take their turn at air cover, when a formation of German planes came over. The Ninety-ninth swooped down, and Driver sent one Focke-Wulf 190 crashing.

On February 7, 1944, Allied fliers brought down 18 Focke-Wulfs and 3 Messerschmitts, against a loss of only 4 of our own. Three of the German planes were brought down by pilots of the Ninety-ninth in the first of the day's engagements.

Sixteen Nazis in 10 days

In 10 days over Anzio beachhead, the Ninety-ninth brought down 16 enemy planes.

Gen. Henry H. Arnold, commanding general of the Army Air Forces, in a message to Lt. Gen. Ira C. Eaker, Allied air commander in the Mediterranean theater, commended the Negro Ninety-ninth Fighter Squadron on its exploits over Anzio beachhead. He said:

"The results of the Ninety-ninth Fighter Squadron during the past 2 weeks, particularly since the Nettuno landing, are very commendable. My best wishes for their continued success."

Exactly 1 year after they had flown their first mission over an enemy air base at Fardjouna, north Africa, pilots of the Ninety-ninth Fighter Squadron, on detached service with the Three Hundred and Thirty-second Fighter Group, flew their five hundredth combat mission.

The Ninety-ninth flew 3,728 sorties during its first year of service. During the first year, the squadron lost 12 pilots—5 killed in action, 4 reported missing, and 3 known to be prisoners of war.

THREE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-SECOND FIGHTER GROUP

From Allied headquarters in Naples it was announced on March 17, 1944, that the Three Hundred and Thirty-second Fighter Group, in which Negro pilots of the Ninety-ninth were flying, was operating from Italian bases, as part of the Mediterranean coastal air force. This group flew P-39's on convoy protection and harbor-patrol missions along the west coast of Italy. It also flew in close support of advancing Allied armies in Italy, in daily dive-bombing operations against enemy supply lines, motor transport, rail yards, and gun emplacements. Penetrating ahead of the Fifteenth Army Air Force bombers bound for Munich on June 9, 1944, the group battled more than 100 enemy fighters near Udine, Italy, and sent 5 of them crashing to earth. The bomber formation they were protecting suffered only a few losses.

The Three Hundred and Thirty-second Fighter Group destroyed a total of 111 enemy planes in the air and 150 on the ground. In addition, it is credited with destruction of 57 locomotives and damaging another 69. Perhaps the greatest single feat of the group was the sinking of an enemy destroyer, with machine-gun fire, off the Istrian Peninsula but its pilots are best known for the protection they gave Fifteenth Air Force bombers during concentrated raids on oil refineries at Ploesti and Vienna. On the D-day invasion of southern France the group flew cover for Allied landing forces and strafed radar installations along the coast preparatory to the landings. On March 24, 1945, the group flew escort to B-17's of the Fifteenth Air Force to Berlin and destroyed three enemy aircraft, probably destroyed three others, and damaged three. For its outstanding performance of duty, the group was awarded the Distinguished Unit Citation, which reads as follows:

"On March 23, 1945, the group was assigned the mission of escorting heavy-bombardment type aircraft attacking the vital Daimler-Benz tank-assembly plant at Berlin, Germany. Realizing the strategic importance of the mission and fully cognizant of the amount of enemy resistance to be expected and the long range to be covered, the ground crews worked tirelessly and with enthusiasm to have their aircraft at the peak of mechanical condition to insure the success of the operation.

"On March 24, 1945, 59 P-51 type aircraft were air-borne and set course for the rendezvous with the bomber formation. Through superior navigation and maintenance of strict flight discipline the group formation reached the bomber formation at the designated time and place. Nearing the target approximately 25 enemy aircraft were encountered which included ME 262's which launched relentless attacks in a desperate effort to break up and destroy the bomber formations.

"Displaying outstanding courage, aggressiveness, and combat technique, the group immediately engaged the enemy formation in aerial combat. In the ensuing engagement that continued over the target area, the gallant pilots of the Three Hundred and Thirty-second Fighter Group battled against the enemy fighter to prevent the breaking up of the bomber formation and thus jeopardizing the successful completion of this vitally important mission. Through their superior skill and determination, the group destroyed three enemy aircraft, probably destroyed three, and damaged three. Among their claims were eight of the highly rated enemy jet-propelled aircraft with no losses sustained by the Three Hundred and Thirty-second Fighter Group.

"Leaving the target area and en route to base after completion of their primary task, aircraft of the group conducted strafing attacks against enemy ground installation and transportation with outstanding success. By the conspicuous gallantry, professional skill, and determination of the pilots, together with the outstanding technical skill and devotion to duty of the ground personnel, the Three Hundred and Thirty-second Fighter Group has reflected great credit on itself and the armed forces of the United States."

Col. Benjamin O. Davis, Jr.

The leader of the Ninety-ninth Pursuit Squadron and later of the Three Hundred and Thirty-second Fighter Group, of which it became a part, was Col. Benjamin O. Davis, Jr., a graduate of West Point and son of Brig. Gen. Benjamin O. Davis, the highest ranking Negro officer in the United States Army.

Colonel Davis and three other pilots of the Three Hundred and Thirty-second Fighter Group—Capt. Joseph D. Elsberry, of Langston, Okla., and First Lts. Jack D. Holsclaw, of Spokane, Wash., and Clarence D. Lester, of Chicago, Ill.—were presented with Distinguished Flying Crosses in Italy on September 10, 1944. Lt. Gen. Ira C. Eaker, in command of all Allied air forces in the Mediterranean theater, attended the ceremony. It was held before a formation of the entire fighter group and the Fifteenth Air Force band, which was drawn up in review.

Concerning the leadership of the group by Colonel Davis, in a fight on June 9, 1944, when a bomber formation which his pilots were protecting was attacked by more than 100 enemy fighters, the citation said:

"Faced with the problem of protecting the larger bomber formation with the comparatively few fighters under his control, Colonel Davis so skillfully disposed his squadrons that in spite of the large number of enemy fighters, the bomber formation suffered only a few losses. During the engagement, Colonel Davis led one flight against more than 15 enemy fighters which were making repeated attacks on one group of bombers. His courage and combat ability have reflected great credit upon himself and the armed forces of the United States of America."

Colonel Davis also has been awarded the Silver Star, the Legion of Merit and the Air Medal with four oak-leaf clusters.

Capt. Joseph D. Elsberry

The award to Captain Elsberry was for "extraordinary achievement in aerial flight against the enemy in the North African and Mediterranean theaters of operations." His citation said:

"Throughout the extensive air offensive against the enemy in direct support of our ground troops and against targets of vital strategic importance deep within hostile territory, he, through his aggressiveness and courage, has consistently aided in the success of combat operations. Against heavy opposition from both aggressive and persistent fighter aircraft and intense, heavy, and accurate enemy antiaircraft fire, with his plane frequently seriously damaged by enemy fire, he has battled his way to his targets, defeating the enemy in the air and destroying his vital installations on the ground. Through severe and adverse weather conditions over treacherous mountain terrain, he has continually surmounted overwhelming obstacles for successful completion of his assigned mission to attack and destroy the enemy. Through his outstanding leadership and personal example, completely disregarding his personal safety at times of great danger, he has contributed to the ultimate and final defeat of the armed forces of the enemy, has upheld the highest tradition of the military service, thereby reflecting great credit upon himself and the armed forces of the United States of America.

First Lt. Jack D. Holsclaw

On July 18, 1944, Lieutenant Holsclaw led his flight as escort to heavy bombers attacking enemy installations in Germany and despite severe and adverse weather conditions, he brought his flight through to engage an enemy force of approximately 300 Army fighters. Of Lieutenant Holsclaw the citation said:

"In the ensuing engagement, despite the superiority in numbers of enemy aircraft, with complete disregard for his personal safety, Lieutenant Holsclaw, with an outstanding display of aggressiveness and combat proficiency, destroyed two enemy fighters and forced the remainder to break off their organized attack."

Lt. Clarence D. Lester

Lieutenant Lester participated in the same mission as that of Lt. Jack D. Holsclaw. The citation of Lieutenant Lester said:

"With complete disregard of his personal safety, Lieutenant Lester destroyed three enemy fighters, thus materially aiding in preventing the enemy from making concentrated attacks on the bombers."

The citations said of each of them that by his outstanding courage, professional skill and devotion to duty, evidenced throughout his combat career, he had reflected great credit upon himself and the armed forces of the United States.

A few months later back in this country, General Eaker presented Colonel Davis to the officers and men of the Four Hundred and Seventy-seventh Composite Group in a ceremony at Godman Field, Ky., June 21, 1945, as the commander of the group and of Godman Field. General Eaker said:

"Along with other officers in the Army Air Forces, I have followed closely the record of Negro pilots. As the commanding officer of the Mediterranean Allied Air Forces, I had under my command the Ninety-ninth Fighter Squadron and later the Three Hundred and Thirty-second Fighter Group. I watched closely as the pilots progressed through the

P-39, P-40, P-47, and P-51 aircraft. I likewise watched their assignments develop from routine but necessary coastal patrol missions to important heavy bomber close-escort missions.

"The Ninety-ninth Fighter Squadron and other squadrons of the Three Hundred and Thirty-second Fighter Group have done well. They have carried out the missions assigned to them and they have destroyed enemy aircraft both in the air and on the ground. By their efforts and performance they have won a place on the great Air Forces team. They came up the hard way."

NINETY-SECOND DIVISION

A regimental combat team of the Ninety-second Infantry Division went into the line on the Fifth Army front in Italy in August 1944. Ten minutes later they went into action against some of the best trained and seasoned troops Hitler had in his whole army.

From then on, until the Italian campaign finally ended with the surrender of a million crack German troops in April 1945, the Ninety-second Division fought in Gen. Mark Clark's Fifth Army. Some of them were in the line as long as 68 days at a stretch, more than 2 months.

It is one of the marvels of the war that the Ninety-second Division with an enlisted personnel made up almost entirely of Negro boys from the South—boys who had been sent out to work in the fields before they were even adolescents, boys who in many cases never had a chance to learn to read or write, boys who had grown up in an area where they and their people were always treated as inferiors—should have made the record it did, staying in there week in and week out, through some of the bitterest fighting in the whole war, against Hitler's best, a superb army of self-assured German veterans fighting with all they had to protect their homeland from the attack rolling up from the South.

The Ninety-second Division consisted of approximately 12,000 officers and men, including some 200 white officers and 600 Negro officers, 3 of whom were lieutenant colonels and 6 were majors. Its enlisted personnel was all Negro—a majority of them rated as IV and V, the lowest grades in the Army classifications. This was largely due to the fact that three-fourths of them came from Southern States, where educational opportunities for the Negro are practically nonexistent. And the Ninety-second Division was activated before the Army educational program—designed to carry a man only through the fourth grade in school—got under way.

But these men—ill equipped as they were—did their job. They stayed in there, giving their best, day in and day out, seesawing back and forth through the rain and cold and mud, locked in a titanic death struggle with an experienced, magnificently trained enemy who knew all the tricks and who had never known defeat.

Through the whole bitter experience, the men of the Ninety-second Division were dogged by the racial prejudice and segregation that had followed them from the Southern camps where they trained at home. Other troops might yield temporarily, but there was no comment. But if the Ninety-second Division lost a yard one day—even though they might gain it back the next day—the reports went back across the Atlantic and soon their letters from home would tell them of loud-mouths screaming, even on the floor of Congress, that the Negro soldiers were cracking, that the Negro soldiers were no good.

A polyglot army

It was a polyglot army, the Fifth Army in which they fought, made up of British, American, Brazilian, French, Italian, Greek, Polish, Palestinian, New Zealand, and East Indian troops. It was in this Fifth Army that the Japanese Americans so greatly distinguished themselves—the Japanese American One Hundredth Infantry Battalion, one of the first outfits to receive a Presidential Unit Citation for fighting in Italy.

On April 30, 1945, General Clark announced that the long, weary, bitter campaign, begun on the beaches of Salerno in September 1943, had ended. His polyglot troops had so smashed the German armies in Italy that they had been virtually eliminated as a military force. Nearly 1,000,000 Germans in Northern Italy and Western Austria laid down their arms in unconditional surrender on May 2, 1945, at 2 p. m. The surrender had been signed in the royal palace of Caserta on April 29, by representatives of the German commander, Col. Gen. Heinrich von Vietinghoff-Scheel, and of the Allied Mediterranean commander, Field Marshal Sir Harold R. L. G. Alexander.

Around this last Thanksgiving time, the Ninety-second Division came home, landing in Boston, New York, and Norfolk. Only 4,000 were left of the once 12,000-strong Ninety-second Division whose ranks, like those of other divisions that fought overseas, had been thinned by transfers, discharges, and deaths.

While overseas the Ninety-second had received 12,096 decorations—including 2 Distinguished Service Crosses, 1 Distinguished Service Medal, 16 Legion of Merit awards, 7 Oak-Leaf Clusters to Silver Stars, 95 Silver Stars, 6 Soldier's Medals, 723 Bronze Stars, 1,891 Purple Hearts, and 7,996 combat infantry badges. It also received 205 commendations.

Almost 25 percent casualties

On the day the campaign in Italy ended, the Ninety-second Division had lost almost one-fourth of its men through casualties. Three hundred and thirty had been killed in action, 2,215 wounded, and 616 were missing in action.

A soldier of the Ninety-second Division, Pvt. Woodall I. Marsh, of Pittsburgh, Pa., was the first Negro to win the Silver Star in Italy. He got it for taking 12 wounded paratroopers from the front lines to safety in his truck, after officers said it could not be done.

When he was told that he could not make it because the water of a raging torrent he had to ford to get to the wounded paratroopers was too deep, Private Marsh replied: "Well, there's dirt underneath ain't there?" and he proceeded to ford it.

Under terrific enemy fire, he drove his truck through water up to the hubs of the wheels to get to the wounded men. On the return trip, he tried another route, but it turned out to be just as bad. He had to dig his truck out of the muck and mire again and again. For 30 minutes during the trip, the Germans were trying to get him and his truck with heavy mortar and artillery fire.

Another hero of the Ninety-second Division was Second Lt. Vernon J. Baker, of Cheyenne, Wyo., a rifle platoon leader. He won the Distinguished Service Cross for the bravery he exhibited in action on 2 days, April 5 and 6, 1945, near Viareggio, Italy. The citation reads:

"Second Lieutenant Baker demonstrated outstanding courage and leadership in destroying enemy installations, personnel, and equipment during his company's attack against a strongly entrenched enemy in mountainous terrain.

"When his company was stopped by the concentrated fire from several machine-gun emplacements, he crawled to one position and destroyed it, killing three Germans. Continuing forward, he attacked an enemy observation post and killed its two occupants.

"With the aid of one of his men, Second Lieutenant Baker attacked two more machine-gun nests, killing or wounding the four enemy soldiers occupying these positions. He then covered the evacuation of the wounded personnel of his company by occupying an exposed position and drawing the enemy's fire.

"On the following night Second Lieutenant Baker voluntarily led a battalion advance through enemy mine fields and heavy fire toward the division objective. Second Lieutenant Baker's fighting spirit and daring leadership were an inspiration to his men and exemplify the highest traditions of the armed forces."

One of the officers of the Ninety-second Division awarded posthumously the Silver Star for gallantry in action was Capt. Charles F. Gandy, Jr., of Washington, D. C. On October 12, 1944, Captain Gandy was ordered to deploy his company in reinforcement of another company in position on difficult mountainous terrain. His citation states:

"He personally led his company out in broad daylight and, through further reconnaissance and by personal example and leadership, succeeded in getting his entire company across a canal, with an abrupt 12-foot wall. This was accomplished in rain and under extremely heavy enemy fire.

"Halting the company at its intermediate objective, Captain Gandy went forward alone to reconnoiter the route of the next movement. While engaged in this activity, he was mortally wounded by enemy machine-gun fire. His outstanding gallantry and leadership in combat exemplifies the heroic traditions of the United States Army."

Lt. Theodore O. Smith, aged 24 years, was killed in action in Italy on February 11, 1945, 1 month after he had been awarded the Silver Star for his bravery in leading a small patrol on a mission that netted the Americans two Nazi prisoners and four enemy dead. According to the citation, Lieutenant Smith led his 14-man patrol 2 miles across a mined area through enemy lines to climb up a mountain where the enemy was holding out.

Risking his life to lead the mission, his action made it possible for the Americans to accomplish their objective and capture a strategically important point on the Fifth Army front. Lieutenant Smith was a native of the District of Columbia. He was graduated from Dunbar High School and received the degree of bachelor of arts from Howard University, where he was a captain in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

First Lt. John M. Madison was posthumously awarded the Silver Star for gallantry in action with the Ninety-second Division in Italy on February 8 and 10, 1945. The first action for which he was cited occurred after his company had taken its objective against light enemy resistance. Immediately afterwards the enemy subjected the position to terrific artillery and mortar fire which killed or wounded all officers except Lieutenant Madison.

"Extremely heavy casualties and the loss of leadership disorganized the company, and it sought to withdraw," the citation said. "First Lieutenant Madison quickly gathered the remaining 15 men, and regardless of continuing enemy fire put them into positions to hold the hill. By sheer personal courage and disregard for his own life, First Lieutenant Madison inspired his men to repel three separate enemy counterattacks aimed exclusively at their position. He withdrew only upon orders. Two days later he captured seven enemy soldiers while leading his company in an attack routed through an extensive unmarked mine field."

Killed in subsequent action

Lieutenant Madison was killed in subsequent action with the Ninety-second Division on April 5, 1945.

First Lt. William E. Porter, of Indianapolis, who was also awarded the Silver Star for gallantry in action, exposed himself to enemy arms while his company advanced on its objective under a hail of machine-gun fire. With his unit pinned to the ground, Lieutenant Porter succeeded in eliminating the

machine-gun nest, killing the German officer in command and forcing the gun crew to surrender.

During a patrol action Staff Sgt. Mansfield Mason, of Baltimore, Md., distinguished himself by heroic conduct. Acting on information that some Germans had been seen to enter a house near a village, his patrol surrounded the building and effectively covered all of its approaches. Sergeant Mason then crawled to within 30 feet of the house in the face of withering machine-gun fire. He hurled three hand grenades into the building and shifted his position slightly. Out walked five Germans, including an officer, to surrender.

Among the Negro units operating outside the Ninety-second Division in Italy was a Signal Construction Battalion, assigned to the Fifteenth Air Force. This battalion established a record. It installed and maintained 2,300 miles of open wire, 500 miles of field wire, and 100 miles of cable in its first 4 months in Italy

EUROPEAN THEATER

COMBAT TROOPS

Slightly under 9 percent of the 259,173 Negro troops reported in the European Theater of Operations on May 15, 1 week after VE-day, belonged to combat organizations.

Twenty-two Negro combat units participated in the operations of the American Expeditionary Forces against the Wehrmacht. These were: The Three Hundred and Thirty-third, Three Hundred and Forty-ninth, Three Hundred and Fiftieth, Three Hundred and Fifty-first, Five Hundred and Seventy-eighth, Six Hundred and Eighty-sixth, Seven Hundred and Seventy-seventh, Nine Hundred and Sixty-ninth, and Nine Hundred and Ninety-ninth Field Artillery Battalions; Four Hundred and Fifty-second Antiaircraft Artillery Battalion; Seven Hundred and Sixty-first and Seven Hundred and Eighty-fourth Tank Battalions; Six Hundred and Fourteenth and Eight Hundred and Twenty-seventh Tank Destroyer Battalions: One Hundred and Eighty-third, One Hundred and Eighty-fourth, Sixteen Hundred and Ninety-fifth, Sixteen Hundred and Ninety-sixth, Sixteen Hundred and Ninety-seventh, Sixteen Hundred and Ninety-eighth, Sixteen Hundred and Ninety-ninth, and Seventeen Hundredth Engineer Combat Battalions.

The Three Hundred and Twentieth Barrage Balloon Battalion was the only Negro combat unit to take part in the initial landings on the Normandy coast on June 6. Classified as an antiaircraft organization, it was the only American unit of its type in Europe but was transferred from the theater before the end of the war.

Men from the Three Hundred and Twentieth Barrage Balloon Battalion waded ashore in the early hours of D-day, struggling with their "flying beer bottles" which they had brought across the channel on LSI's and LST's on the first assault waves. They brought their balloons to the shoreline, dug in with infantrymen of the First and Twenty-ninth Divisions, and proceeded under fierce enemy fire to erect a protective curtain of silver barrage balloons that proved highly effective in combating strafing German aircraft.

Negro artillerymen of the Three Hundred and Thirty-third Field Artillery Battalion landed their 155-millimeter howitzers in Normandy on D plus 10 and went into action shortly afterward as a unit of the Eighth Corps. Their first mission was to fire in support of the Ninetieth Infantry Division and take part in the bloody battles at St. Jores, Lessay, Hill 95, and Hill 122 in the Foret de Monte Castret.

This unit swept through the Avranches corridor with the Third Army and did considerable firing in Brittanny at St. Malo and Brest. When the German counteroffensive in the Ardennes began, the Three Hundred and Thirty-third had batteries staggered in Belgium and across the German border near Schoenberg.

LOSSES SEVERE

Along with United States units like the One Hundred and Sixth and Twenty-eighth Infantry Divisions, the Three Hundred and Thirty-third Field Artillery received the full fury of the spearhead thrust of Von Rundstedt's attack at the point of impact. Losses in men and equipment were severe. The battalion commander was captured and most of two gun batteries were casualties.

Survivors of this action and recently liberated prisoners captured during the fight told of stubborn resistance and examples of high courage by the artillerymen that prolonged the battle after large groups of men had been surrounded.

"We took our toll of Germans before we went down, either because we ran out of ammunition or because some of us were hopelessly cut off," reported one Negro RAMP of the unit, shortly before sailing for the United States from Le Havre.

The Nine Hundred and Sixty-ninth Field Artillery Battalion, another medium howitzer outfit, was the only Negro artillery unit in Europe to receive a Presidential Distinguished Unit Citation. It had fought through the Normandy, and northern France, campaigns, providing artillery backing for infantrymen of a number of United States divisions. When the Ardennes breakthrough started, the Nine Hundred and Sixty-ninth received orders to displace its guns and withdraw in the direction of Bastogne, Belgium.

It reached that little city in time to be pressed into service by the acting commander of the One Hundred and First Airborne Division, then Brig. Gen. W. A. McAuliffe, and to earn for itself a place in American military history as one of the units making up the gallant garrison that fought against overwhelming odds to save the strategically vital rail and road junction.

DISTINGUISHED UNIT CITATION

The Nine Hundred and Sixty-ninth Field Artillery Battalion received its Distinguished Unit Citation along with the One Hundred and First Airborne Division and other attached units which formed the garrison that fought the epic Battle of Bastogne. The citation reads:

"These units distinguished themselves in combat against powerful and aggressive enemy forces composed of elements of eight German divisions during the period from December 18 to 27, 1944, by extraordinary heroism and gallantry in defense of the key communications center of Bastogne, Belgium.

"Essential to a large-scale exploitation of this break-through into Belgium and northern Luxemburg, the enemy attempted to seize Bastogne by attacking constantly and savagely with the best of his armor and infantry. Without benefit of prepared defenses, facing almost overwhelming odds, and with very limited and fast-dwindling supplies, these units maintained a high combat morale and an impenetrable defense, despite extremely heavy bombing, intense artillery fire, and constant attacks from infantry and armor on all sides of their completely cut-off and encircled position.

"This masterful and grimly determined defense denied the enemy even momentary success in an operation for which he paid dearly in men, matériel, and eventually morale. The outstanding courage and resourcefulness and undaunted determination of this gallant force is in keeping with the highest traditions of the service."

FIRST ROUND ACROSS RHINE

The Seven Hundred and Seventy-seventh Field Artillery Battalion was the only Negro 4.5-inch gun unit in the ETO and fought with the Ninth Army. One distinction claimed by the Seven Hundredth and Seventy-seventh is that it fired the first American artillery round across the Rhine River near Munchen-Gladbach.

Other veteran ETO Negro artillery units were the Nine Hundred and Ninety-ninth Field Artillery Battalion, which fired its 8-inch howitzers from lower Normandy to Central Germany, and the Five Hundred and Seventy-eighth, another 8-inch howitzer unit that helped to stem the Nazi tide in the Ardennes in December and January.

In early November the Seven Hundred and Sixty-first Tank Battalion, commanded by Lt. Col. Paul L. Bates, of Boonton, N. J., was committed as attached armor of the Twenty-sixth Infantry Division in the Third United States Army, becoming the first Negro tank unit to go into action.

The Seven Hundred and Sixty-first fought in six European countries—France, Holland, Belgium, Luxembourg, Germany, and Austria—and was at various times attached to the Third, Seventh, and Ninth United States Armies. During these campaigns the battalion furnished tank support for the Twenty-sixth, Seventy-first, Eighty-seventh, Seventy-ninth, One Hundred and Third Infantry Divisions, and the Seventeenth Airborne Division during the Battle of the Bulge.

Eight enlisted men of the unit won battlefield commissions. Decorations included 40 Bronze Stars, 8 Silver Stars, 3 of them posthumously awarded.

These Negro tankers spearheaded the famous "Task Force Rhine," which crashed through the rugged mountain defenses of the Siegfried line in the Nieder Schlettenbach-Reisdorf-Klingenmunster area. Task Force Rhine consisted of the Seven Hundred and Sixty-first Tank Battalion, the Second Battalion of the One Hundred and Third Infantry Division's Four Hundred and Ninth Regiment, a detachment of combat engineers, and a recon platoon from the Six Hundred and Fourteenth Tank Destroyer Battalion, a Negro outfit. In 3 days the task force opened up a big hole in the Siegfried defenses through which passed the Fourteenth Armored Division on March 24.

Another Negro tank unit, the Seven Hundred and Eighty-fourth, arrived in Europe in time to assist the Thirty-fifth Infantry Division in crossing both the Roer and Rhine Rivers and the subsequent fighting that followed these crossings

MOST BRILLIANT RECORD

Probably no other Negro combat unit in Europe achieved as brilliant a record, both in terms of consistently outstanding performance in battle and excellence of morale, as did the Six Hundred and Fourteenth Tank Destroyer Battalion. Commanded by Lt. Col. Frank S. Pritchard, a white officer from Lansing, Mich., the unit was mainly officered by Negroes.

The unit moved into position with the Ninety-fifth Infantry Division in front of Metz in November, but soon after was transferred to the One Hundred and Second Infantry Division of the Seventh Army, where it remained as attached tank-destroyer support until the end of the war.

For "outstanding performance of duty in action against the enemy" at Climbach, France, on December 14, 1944, the third platoon of company C of the Six Hundred and Fourteenth Tank Destroyer Battalion received a Distinguished Unit Citation. The citation itself tells graphically the grim, heroic nature of the action:

"The third platoon was an element of a task force whose mission was to storm and capture the strategically important town of

Climbach, France, on the approaches of the Siegfried line. Upon reaching the outskirts of the town, the task force was halted by a terrific hail of fire from an enemy force firmly entrenced in the surrounding woods and hills overlooking the route of approach. The only position available for direct fire upon the enemy was an open field.

"As the Third Platoon moved into position, its commander and several men were wounded. Undeterred by heavy enemy small arms, mortar and artillery fire, which was now being directed against their position, the men of the Third Platoon valiantly set up their 3-inch guns and delivered accurate and deadly fire into the enemy positions. Casualties were mounting; two of their four guns were knocked out; nevertheless, the remaining crew members heroically assisted in the loading and firing of the other guns. At the height of the battle, enemy infantry converged on the position from the surrounding woods, threatening to wipe out the platoon's position.

"While a few members of the gun crews remained firing the 3-inch guns, others manned machine guns and individual weapons, laying down a devastating curtain of fire which inflicted numerous casualties on the enemy and successfully repulsed the attack. During the fight an ammunition shortage developed, and gun crews were reduced to skeleton size, one man loading, aiming, and firing, while the other men repeatedly traveled a distance of 50 yards through a hail of mortar and small arms fire, to obtain shells from a half-track which had been set on fire by a direct hit from an enemy mortar shell.

"Heedless of possible injury, men continuously exposed themselves to enemy fire to render first aid to the wounded. In this engagement, although the platoon suffered over 50 percent casualties and lost considerable matériel, its valorous conduct, in the face of overwhelming odds enabled the task force to capture its objective.

"The grim determination, the indomitable fighting spirit and the esprit de corps displayed by all members of the Third Platoon reflect the highest traditions of the armed forces of the United States."

INFANTRY

In December 1944 several thousand Negro soldiers answered a general appeal for volunteers for training as infantry riflemen. Some 2,500 volunteers from Negro units of Communications Zone were trained at a ground forces reinforcement command depot at Noyons, France, and committed to action with infantry and armored divisions of the First and Seventh Armies as assigned platoons and companies.

The setting of a quota for these Negro infantrymen resulted in the rejection of nearly 3,000 other Negro GI's who wanted to fight at the front.

In a story carried in its Paris edition on March 19, the Stars and Stripes announced the presence in the line of Negro infantrymen and said: "Long contemplated, the plan of mixing white and colored doughboys in fighting units was launched not as an experiment in race relations but as an answer both to the needs of the military situation and repeated requests by Negro service troops for an opportunity to get into the war as combat men."

The men gave many reasons for having volunteered. Some were sick and tired of dull rear-echelon activity. Many went in for idealistic reasons, determined to disprove the myth that Negroes are poor combat soldiers and lacking in courage.

Said Pfc Leroy W. Kemp, from Atlantic City, N. J.: "We're all in this thing together now—white and Negro Americans in the same companies—and that's how it should be. That's why I volunteered. Most Negro troops are in service units. We've been giving a lot of sweat. Now, I think, we'll mix some blood with it."

The record shows clearly that these men gave an extraordinarily fine account of themselves in combat, captured and killed hundreds of Germans, earned many decorations for front-line heroism, and won praise and respect from their white fellow infantrymen.

Negro rifle platoons fought with the First, Second, Eighth, Ninth, Sixty-ninth, Seventy-eighth, Ninety-ninth, and One Hundred and Fourth Infantry Divisions of the First Army, and Negro companies joined armored infantry battalions of the Twelfth and Fourteenth Armored Divisions.

"If comments of white personnel of these divisions are any indication, the plan of mixing white and colored troops in fighting units, a departure from previous United States Army practice, is operating successfully," a Stars and Stripes staff writer reported in an article in the paper's April 6 issue.

FRIENDLY WELCOME EVERYWHERE

Negro reinforcements reported a sincere, friendly welcome everywhere. They also spoke of excellent relations with their white fellow-doughs, of the making of inter-racial friendships.

One company commander's comment was typical. "The integration of the Negro platoon into this unit was accomplished quickly and quietly. There was no problem."

In its first action the Negro platoon of K Company of the Three Hundred Ninety-fourth Infantry Regiment of the Ninety-ninth Division, led an attack on the town of Honningen across the Rhine River, cleared one-fourth of it and captured over 250 prisoners.

Another platoon with E Company of the Three Hundred Ninety-third Regiment of the same division got its baptism of fire on March 25 when it attacked German positions near Jahrfeld, Germany. Employing marching fire, they advanced, routing the Germans, knocking out a Mark IV tank and a flak wagon, killing 48 of the enemy and capturing 60. These men gained their objective. Hill 373.

The Negro platoon of Company G of the Two Hundred Seventy-third Infantry Regiment helped the Sixty-ninth Infantry Division to become the first American unit to make contact with the Russian forces. During the platoon's first combat action at Hann Munden, Staff Sergeant Ames Shipper, of Philadelphia, Pa., took 118 prisoners from a barn.

This platoon was later attached to the Ninth Armored Division's Combat Command A for the drive across the German plains to the Mulde River. This platoon helped in the capture of Falkenharst, Wersenfeld, and a number of other German towns during this drive.

On VE-day, May 8, a group from the Negro platoon led by Lt. H. C. Hind, Los Angeles, Calif., and Staff Sgt. Elmans Starks, Washington, D. C., crossed the Elbe River, met Russian troops and held a victory celebration. It was the first time that these Russians had seen American Negroes and they exchanged stories and souvenirs and had a victory feast.

Sgt. Edgar E. Zeno, a member of the Negro platoon of G Company of the Thirty-ninth Infantry Regiment of the Ninth Infantry Division, received the Silver Star for "gallantry in action against the enemy." Near Siedlinghausen, Germany, Zeno's company met heavy enemy machine-gun fire. Zeno worked his way across open terrain, armed with a BAR, firing all the while.

Twenty-five yards from the machine-gun position, he hurled a hand grenade and rushed the emplacement. His action led to the capture of the machine-gun position, during which he killed 7 Germans, wounded 3, and enabled his unit to take 60 more prisoners.

ANOTHER SILVER STAR

Another Silver Star recipient was Pfc June Jefferson, Jr., of Company A, Four Hundred and Fourteenth Infantry Regiment of the One Hundred and Fourth Infantry Division. The award citation stated:

"When an enemy tank crashed through a road block and entered a recently captured town, Private Jefferson voluntarily and at great risk of his life, crossed open, fire-swept terrain in the face of direct fire from the tank, made his way to the house where the tank was located, and dropped incendiary and fragmentation grenades into the open turret of the tank, causing it to catch fire.

"As the crew emerged, he killed them with his rifle. He then returned to his position and quickly organized an assault on the enemy riflemen who were supporting the tank, killing, wounding or capturing all of the enemy infantrymen."

One of the finest tributes paid these volunteer infantrymen came from Brig. Gen. Charles T. Lanham, assistant commander of the One Hundred and Fourth Infantry Division, following the presentation of combat decorations of 11 of the men.

"I have never seen any soldiers who have performed better in combat than you," General Lanham told the Negro doughboys.

SIGNAL CORPS

During the campaign against the German Army in Europe, 5,500 Negro Signal Corps troops belonging to 20 signal units participated in the vital battle of communications.

These Negro troops worked in two main types of Signal Corps units—light and heavy signal construction battalions and companies.

Negro units that participated in various campaigns were the Twenty-fifth, Twenty-ninth, Thirty-seventh, Fortieth, Forty-first, Forty-second, Forty-third, and Forty-fourth Signal Construction Battalions, and the Two Hundred and Fifty-eighth, Two Hundred and Fifty-ninth, Two Hundred and Sixty-first, Two Hundred and Sixty-seventh, Two Hundred and Sixty-eighth, Two Hundred and Sixty-ninth, Two Hundred and Seventieth, Two Hundred and Seventy-fifth, Five Hundred and Thirty-fourth, Five Hundred and Thirty-fifth, Five Hundred and Thirty-seventh, and Four Hundred and Ninety-sixth Signal Construction Companies.

Negroes comprised 7½ percent of the total Signal Corps personnel in the European theater.

Several of these units made communications history. Negro signal outfits laid wire from the hedgerowed fields of Normandy, across France, Luxemburg, and Belgium deep into Germany.

A recent estimate of communications wire put in by Negro troops released by Communications Zone Headquarters included these figures: Over 10,000 miles of open wire set up, over 500 miles of field wire, and over 500 miles of rubber and lead spiral 4 cable.

The Twenty-ninth Signal Construction Battalion arrived in France on D plus 9 and 10. Its first major mission—rehabilitation of the Chef du Pont-Valognes railroad pole line, was accomplished in the face of enemy snipers, mines, and artillery fire.

After this the Twenty-ninth moved into Carentan on June 22, shortly after the town had been liberated by United States forces, and repaired damaged telephone lines frequently under heavy German artillery fire.

Another Negro Signal Corps unit—the Forty-first Signal Construction Battalion—arrived on the Continent on D plus 20 and was assigned to the rehabilitation of damaged French lines. The first line started at Valognes, Normandy, and ran into Cherbourg, where the Forty-first signal men worked before the city was completely cleared of enemy resistance.

The unit set up about 200 miles of open-wire pole lines and 40 miles of underground lead-covered cable. This latter is reported to be the longest underground cable laid in Europe by any one signal unit. The Forty-first also installed the communications system for the Continental headquarters of Communications Zone during the Normandy campaign, and assisted with the installation of communications for the first SHAEF continental command post.

The Forty-first Signal Construction Battalion was officially commended for its work in Normandy by Maj. Gen. W. S. Rumbough, chief signal officer of the ETO, who said: "This is to commend the officers and enlisted men of the Forty-first Signal Construction Battalion upon the construction work in connection with the establishment of the headquarters Communications Zone signal system. The work was done at high speed, and the men worked far in excess of their normal working schedule to accomplish their job."

CHEMICAL WARFARE

Chemical Warfare Service headquarters in the European theater of operations has disclosed that of the 9,500 Chemical Warfare Service troops in the theater on VE-day, 2,442 of these were Negro enlisted men and officers. Other Negro Chemical Warfare Service units were the three chemical decontamination companies, the Twenty-fifth, Thirty-second, and Thirty-fourth.

All of the smoke-generator units were not used in their primary function of manufacturing artificial fog, several being diverted to trucking operations under Transportation Corps supervision.

The record shows that the smoke-generator companies which saw action performed excellently, often under heavy enemy fire, winning praise from infantry commanders and chemical officers.

The Eighty-fourth Chemical Smoke Generator Company arrived in France on D-plus-1, but did not engage in smoking operations during the early part of the Normandy campaign. Its first important combat test came when it was attached to the Fifth Infantry Division in the latter part of Sepember 1944.

The Fifth Division was in the Moselle River Valley region and meeting severe German resistance there. The Eighty-fourth provided smoke for the screening of bridge-building operations across the river and materially assisted in the winning of the first major United States bridgehead east of the Moselle in that part of the valley.

There were casualties among the smoke men and a number of them distinguished themselves by gallantry under observed enemy artillery fire.

After watching men of the Eighty-fourth perform under fire during this action, the commander of the Tenth Infantry Regiment told them: "If I could, I would award the combat infantryman badge to all of you."

Some idea of the difficulties encountered during the Moselle operations can be obtained from reading the company operations record. The report covering the period November 12 to November 18 has the following facts recorded concerning the smoking of the Moselle crossing at Ancerville.

"Artillery fire was continuous over the entire area on November 15. At approximately 1200 on November 16, artillery fire at positions 1, 2, and 3 and on the surrounding roads made it impossible to bring supplies to these generator positions. Two trucks and one generator were hit by shrapnel."

Another Negro unit, the Seventy-fourth Chemical Smoke Generator Company, made smoke to cover the Ninth Army's crossing of the Roer River in February. It was attached to the Eighty-fourth Infantry Division for the attack across the Roer.

The division G-3 reported that the company had completed its mission "in an excellent manner." The G-2 of the division also reported that 300 enemy artillery rounds landed in Linnich, Germany, in 5 minutes on February 22 while the Seventy-fourth was working there.

One of the greatest artificial fogs in military history was created in December 1944 by the all-Negro One Hundred Sixty-first Smoke Generator Company when it shrouded the upper Saar River Valley with a dense cloud of fog that completely obscured the movements of one entire division, the Ninetieth Infantry Division.

The Ninetieth Division was effectively concealed for nearly 2 weeks, it is reported, during which time the entire division crossed the Saar, established a bridgehead, wiped out 260 pillboxes, wrecked a portion of the Siegfried Line and killed hundreds of enemy soldiers.

During this operation the One Hundred Sixty-first fed 146,000 gallons of oil into their M2 smoke generators.

The One Hundred Sixty-third Chemical Smoke Generator Company was assigned to the job of screening the crossing of the Neckar River at Heilbronn, Germany, by the One Hundredth Infantry Division of the Seventh Army. The mission was successfully accomplished.

A report of the operation states simply: "Hostile artillery and rocket fire was intense."

This unit also assisted in screening the crossing of the Rhine River at Speyer, Germany, on March 25 and 26, in support of advance elements of the Seventy-first Infantry Division. Its mission was to support the division's river crossing and to divert the enemy's attention from the site of the major river-crossing operation which was to take in another location.

Negro chemical smoke generator companies that operated on the Continent between D-day and VE-day were: The Eighty-first, Eighty-second, Eighty-third, Eighty-fourth, Eighty-fifth, Eighty-sixth, Eighty-seventh, Seventy-fourth, One Hundred and Sixty-first, One Hundred and Sixty-second, One Hundred and Sixty-third, One Hundred and Sixty-fourth, One Hundred and Sixty-fifth, One Hundred and Sixty-seventh, and One Hundred and Seventy-first Chemical Smoke Generator Companies.

Other Negro units in the Chemical Warfare Service were the Twenty-fifth, Thirty-second, and Thirty-fourth Chemical Decontamination Companies.

ORDNANCE

Of the 6,000,000 tons of ammunition handled by ordnance ammunition companies on the Continent between D-day and VE-day, more than 4,500,000 tons passed through the hands of Negro ordnancemen, Maj. Gen. Henry B. Sayler, chief ordnance officer of the ETO, said recently.

In releasing the figures on the amount of ammunition made available for use by United States fighting men, General Sayler paid high tribute to the 14,323 Negro enlisted men who accounted for 11 percent of the total ordnance personnel on the Continent.

"Not only did these Negro troops 'pass the ammunition,'" said General Sayler, "but on numerous occasions many of them fought the Germans, participated in patrols, and took prisoners."

The forward ammunition supply points operated by these Negro ordnancemen were the retail source for all types of ammunition, bullets, shells, fuses, and propelling charges, served directly to infantry, artillery, and armored units. As such, these ammunition supply points were behind the front lines and on several occasions, in front of them, especially during periods of fluid fronts.

One ammunition company, the Six Hundred and Twenty-sixth, although it had moved into its new location, was unable to operate until the infantry had cleared the enemy artillery from a hill less than 2 miles away.

The peak of ammunition handling was reached shortly after the Germans were repulsed in their Ardennes break-through During the period that followed, the 101 ammunition companies received and issued 24,000 tons per day, or seven to eight thousand tons over the average of 15,000 tons per day established in the European campaign.

In carrying out their mission of supplying ammunition to the men behind the guns, the Negro ordnancemen displayed courage time and again, General Sayler declared.

An example cited by General Sayler was the bravery demonstrated by the members of the Six Hundred and Fifty-fifth Ordnance Ammunition Company which unloaded a trainload of white phosphorous mortar shells on December 26, near Soissons, France, while shells were exploding around them. Their acts of heroism saved the French city from complete destruction.

Another noncombat Negro ordnance ammunition company earned the title of the "Fighting Fifty-sixth" when its members engaged 51 German SS troops near the Belgian border early in September. When the shooting was over, 36 Nazis were killed, 3 wounded, and the rest taken prisoner

Of the 20 ordnance motor-vehicle distributing companies in the European Theater of Operations, two of them were manned by 430 Negro ordnancemen. These distributing companies furnished the combat troops with armored vehicles and service troops with the trucks necessary to keep the front-liners supplied.

The remainder of the Negro personnel, 165 in number, were active in the administrative divisions of battalion headquarters.

MEDICAL CORPS

Negro personnel formed 2.2 percent of the total European Theater of Operation medical service strength or 5,482, a statement released by the office of the chief surgeon of the European theater of operations disclosed.

Negro officers were distributed as follows: Medical officers, 51; Dental Corps, 28; Medical Administrative Corps, 17; and Nurse Corps, 67. Sixty-five of the Negro nurses were attached to the One Hundred and Sixty-eighth Station Hospital in England.

Working with divisions at the front the performance of Negro medics was particularly outstanding.

The Four Hundred and Twenty-eighth Medical Battalion operating with the First Army, carried more than 1,200,000 patients in their ambulances in evacuating wounded to rear areas.

Of the 230,000 patients hauled by the Five Hundred and Ninety-second Ambulance Company only 2 were lost, those being caused by enemy action when an ambulance was strafed by enemy aircraft at Malmedy during the German counteroffensive last winter.

Typical of the heroism displayed by the medics is the story of Corp. Waverly B. Woodson, Jr., of Philadelphia, a medic of the Three Hundred and Twentieth Barrage Balloon Battalion.

At about 9:30 a. m. on D-day Corporal Woodson was wounded by shrapnel when the LST in which he was riding was damaged by a floating mine near the shore. The ship was under continuous mortar and machine-gun fire and was finally beached.

Corporal Woodson, along with three other enlisted men and an officer, went over the side of the LST onto the beach where they planned to set up a first-aid station. The shrapnel wound, which he had not noticed, was dressed by a member of the party. All other participants said that Corporal Woodson began caring for the wounded as a member of the group at 10 a. m. and remained on duty treating wounds ranging from bullet abrasions to intestinal wounds until relieved at 4 p. m. the next day.

When they were relieved Corporal Woodson found himself without bedding and started

down the beach to acquire blankets. He was called by a group of soldiers who had been completing a landing operation by a rope attached to an LST out in the harbor and anchored to the beach. The rope had broken and three of the men attempting to land had been submerged. Corporal Woodson's Red Cross brassard attracted the soldiers on the beach and they called him to assist in giving artificial respiration, which he did. The three joined their companions after his treatment. Corporal Woodson was then sent to the hospital for further treatment of his wound.

Following an investigation by Lt. Col. Leon J. Reed, of the Three Hundred and Twentieth Barrage Balloon Battalion, a recommendation for an appropriate award has been made for Corporal Woodson.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Of the 259,173 Negro troops in the European theater of operations as of May 15, a little more than one in every five was an engineer soldier, according to information released by the office of the chief engineer of the European Theater of Operations.

On May 31 there were 54,600 Negro engineer enlisted men, 320 officers, and 54 warrant officers, of a total of 337,000 in the theater's engineer command. This total includes personnel of general service regiments, engineer dump-truck companies, engineer firefighting units, aviation engineer battalions, and separate battalions. There were 165 engineer units of all types.

A survey of Negro engineer units showed that Negro engineers participated in all of the main operations by United States forces on the continent which required engineering, from D-day landings and beachhead operations of June 1944, to the conquest of the Rhineland.

Dump Truckers

One unit, the Five Hundred and Eighty-second Engineer Dump Truck Company, landed on Omaha Beach shortly after H-hour on June 6 and worked continuously up until and after the crossing and bridging of the Rhine.

The Five Hundred and Eighty-second was one of 58 Negro engineer dump-truck units in the ETO on May 31. This outfit came ashore on D-day with the One Thousand One Hundred and Sixth Engineer Combat Group, performing its "primary mission"—hauling bridging equipment and explosives. Almost immediately these dump truckers were conscripted to taxi combat personnel of the Eighty-second and One Hundred and First Airborne Divisions and the Fourth Infantry Division to forward areas.

Silver and Bronze Stars were awarded to several men of the unit for bravery under fire. First Sgt. Norman Day of Danville, Ill., received the Silver Star for heroism on the beach where he directed United States traffic under heavy shelling. Day also received the Purple Heart for wounds and the British Distinguished Service Medal.

During the Rhine crossing operations the Five Hundred and Eighty-second was significantly well up forward working as a XVI Corps unit, hauling crushed rock for bridge-building operations.

These dump truck units worked all over Europe but rarely hit the head. The Four Hundred and Thirty-fourth, another Negro dump truck company assisted the One Thousand and Fifty-sixth Port Construction and Repair Group in rehabilitating the port of Cherbourg in July 1944. They worked day and night on a double shift basis, removing thousands of tons of debris that had accumulated from bombing and demolition work.

Not all of the work done by the engineer dump-truck units was in the rear areas, however. The following excerpt from the unit history of the Five Hundred and Seventy-second Engineer Dump Truck Company, a Negro unit, describes a front-line incident:

"July 3, 1944, Pvt. William Wright, Jr., wounded by enemy shell fire while on operations delivering engineer supplies to a bridge site which was under enemy fire."

On July 20 this unit was given the job of hauling road-building material and debris for filling craters and building bridge approaches ahead of the armored columns which broke through the day after the capture of Lessay in Normandy.

The following account of a strafing attack on a Negro dump-truck convoy near Fontainebleau, France, was written by one of the drivers, and illustrates the dangers and difficulties under which the men frequently operated:

"The German planes came in very low dropping flares, lighting the area as far as one could see. The AA guns answered back with steady streams of cross-fire. The convoy was brought to a halt. The men scrambled to their guns and opened fire in unison with the ack-ack barrage.

"The accurate fire sent up by the men made it impenetrable. The barrage continued for what seemed an eternity before all was quiet. The Germans had gone on leaving the main bridge destroyed, their only damage. The men descended from their guns reluctantly. After finding a new road the convoy continued and delivered our much-needed cargo."

General Service Regiments

According to paragraph 318 of FM 5-5, which is the Engineer Field Manual, the mission of an engineer general service regiment is defined: "The engineer general service regiment performs general engineer work—particularly that requiring most skilled labor—throughout the Army service area and communications zone of the theater of operations. A general service regiment * * * is capable of executing extensive and permanent work."

This general phrasing of a general service regiment's function provided sufficient latitude for Negro general-service units to perform a wide variety of tasks on the Continent, from erecting tent camps and welding to repairing damaged rail lines and all-purpose excavations.

By VE-day 60 percent of all engineer general service regiments assigned or attached to Communications Zone were Negro units, 30 out of 50 reported on May 31.

When the Three Hundred and Fifty-sixth Engineer General Service Regiment moved into Granville, France, four days after the German garrison had left, it was given a few unexisting chores to do. One battalion was assigned to clearing and rehabilitating buildings and quarters in the city, removing debris, wiring, plumbing, and glazing a number of three-story houses.

"In addition," the regimental record states, "two kitchens were constructed and additional latrines and washrooms erected, showers installed, and an area of some 36,000 square feet graded and cleared."

After doing this, the regiment went to work on maintenance and repair of the road net from Granville to Vire to Mortain and Avranches, and all minor roads, a total of 245 miles of road net. The work consisted of repairing bomb craters and holes, "resurfacing of shoulders and general maintenance."

By and large this is the kind of work general service regiments were given to do. But it was precisely this work of rehabilitation and maintenance that helped to keep Communications Zone functioning.

Another Negro general-service regiment, the Ninety-fifth, arrived in France July 8. It had worked on the Alcan Highway to Alaska and in Wales. Its first operational mission said: "Road construction and maintenance, debris clearing and street reconstruction in the Valognes and Cherbourg areas."

But during this job, mines and booby traps were encountered in hundreds. They had to be removed and defuzed. The regiment also built during this period a very important traffic circle in the heart of shattered Valognes. Through that circle passed a vast and vital flow of traffic between Cherbourg and the beaches, toward the front.

This regiment was officially commended by Lt. Gen. C. H. Lee, Communications Zone commander for its work in constructing Communications Zone headquarters at Valognes.

Another job assigned to the Ninety-fifth was the rehabilitation of a single rail track from Alencon to Mortagne, France. How the job was completed is told in the regimental history:

"Three days were spent on removal of explosives in the yards at Mesles-sur-Sarthe before any heavy equipment could be put to work. The railroad bridge at Bressy-Mangis was damaged as a result of enemy demolitions, but the span was not completely dropped from the abutment, and a trestle bent placed under the end after jacking provided suitable bearing. The attempted demolition of the trestles themselves were very ineffective, and they were repaired in place by welding and patching.

"On September 2 a test run was made over the line with a locomotive. On the 4th the project was finished."

Another Negro general-service regiment, the Three Hundred and Ninety-second, was awarded the Meritorious Service Unit Plaque for work performed between September 23 and December 31.

"Despite numerous difficulties," the citation order states, "including inclement weather and limited supplies, this unit efficiently accomplished several difficult and hazardous projects. The enterprise, ingenuity, and unremitting diligence displayed by the members of the Three Hundred and Ninety-second Engineer General Service Regiment were in keeping with the highest traditions of the armed forces of the United States."

The Meritorious Service Unit Plaque is awarded for "superior performance of duty in the performance of exceptionally difficult tasks."

TRANSPORTATION CORPS

Negro troops made an impressive contribution to the operations of the Transportation Corps from D-day to VE-day, a survey compiled from information obtained from ETO Transportation Corps headquarters showed.

The mission of the Army's Transportation Corps is to transport men and supplies. Statistics released by the office of Maj. Gen. Frank S. Rose, chief of transportation in the European theater, indicate the magnitude of its achievements as well as the extent of Negro participation in the operations of the corps.

Of a total of 157,327 troops in the Transportation Corps in the ETO, reported on May 3, 1944, 69,914 of these were in Negro units—or 44.4 percent.

Thirty-two of the forty-one port battalions reported were Negro, while out of 50 separate port companies in the theater 38 were Negro, making a personnel total of 31,763 in all Negro port units.

In the quartermaster truck field, 316 of the 453 quartermaster truck companies operating under Transportation Corps control were Negro companies. Ten of the nineteen quartermaster groups were Negro, and there were 31 Negro battalions among the 86 quartermaster battalions listed. There was one Negro quartermaster car company, the Five Hundred and Twenty-fourth, and four Negro chemical smoke generator companies under Transportation Corps command.

PORT BATTALIONS

When the first United States elements reached the French coast in June, Transportation Corps units were among them and the battle of the beaches merged with the vital and hard-fought battle of supply.

Negro troops of the Transportation Corps were in the initial waves on D-day, came ashore with the engineer brigades and helped start what eventually became the greatest supply operation in military history.

The Normandy supply battle was won by units like the Four Hundred and Ninetieth Port Battalion, which came in with the second tide on D-day and unloaded crucial supplies of ammunition, food, and equipment to be used by the assault troops.

"We were in holes dug in on the beach when artillery fire from the bluffs started giving us hell," Corp. Joseph McLeod, of Tampa, Fla., a checker who landed with the Four Hundred and Ninetieth recalled. "That was about 10 in the morning. After it slackened, we got up and went to our LCT and unloaded .05 millimeter shells."

Another Four Hundred and Ninetieth man, Staff Sgt. Fred B. Jones, of Hazelhurst, Miss., was in charge of a platoon on an LCT carrying a load of antitank mines, detonators, and fuzes He said:

"We stacked the stuff up on the beach and then moved it inland. We were lucky that stuff didn't get hit by shellfire. We made a human chain and passed the cargo inshore by hand."

Other Negro units that arrived on D-day, D plus 1, and the first week of the beachhead fight were the Four Hundred and Ninety-fourth and Five Hundred and Second Port Battalions.

These operations were constantly under fire. To keep the invasion moving, men and supplies had to be discharged with split-second timing, and men worked the ships until exhausted. Work shifts ran into one another and men continued to volunteer to unload ships under hazardous conditions that included direct artillery fire and strafing.

"As one of the few regularly constituted Services of Supply units selected to accompany the Combat Engineer Battalions in the establishment of the beachhead, the Five Hundred and Second Port Battalion suffered some casualties," the unit history laconically reports. Their casualties included the battalion's commanding officer Lt. Col James T. Pierce, of Erie, Pa.

This unit sailed for France on June 2 and started unloading on the morning of the 7th. In accomplishing its mission in "Plan Neptune," as the invasion was called, the Five Hundred and Second met problems that were complicated by the element of "calculated risk." The record indicates it solved them all.

The GI stevedores had to devise special slings for handling bundles of pierced steel planking, a type of cargo that proved a problem during the ship DUKW operation.

The job of unloading cargo at the beaches and the ports never stopped. Tonnage schedules were reached and exceeded. Unloading records were broken weel after week.

By May 8, VE-day, total United States Army cargo arriving by water and discharged by port units amounted to 20,432,368 tons. How much of this was unloaded by Negro port units is not precisely known, but a general estimate can be obtained from the fact that 77 percent of all port units operating during this period were Negro units.

The next phase of the battle of supply following seizure of the beachhead and expansion of the Allied toehold on Europe, consisted of development of Cherbourg and the minor ports on the north side of the Normandy Peninsula. Negro port units worked all of these ports

How the battle of supply during this period was won is tersely told in "The Transportation Corps" in the Battle of France, volume IV, which is the official history of the Transportation Corps operating in Europe. An excerpt reads:

"Front-line Transportation Corps units from the battle of the beaches—the port battalions and the DUKW companies—played their part in the unspectacular but equally important work of getting supplies into the port of Cherbourg. The port battalions marched to the embarkation point at 0730 where they were ferried by the Navy in LCM's to ships waiting at anchor. The same battalion was assigned every day to the same ship until it was finished, and if possible, each group was given the same hatch to work in order to increase its efficiency."

By August 15, 10,000 long tons had been discharged at this port in a single day by an unloading force that was overwhelmingly Negro

Cherbourg was a key Allied port. Its reconstruction and development became a chief task of the Transportation Corps. Its development was vital to the speeding-up of military operations on the Continent. The whole supply build-up hinged on the exploitation of Cherbourg. Much credit for the success of the complicated and arduous Cherbourg operation must go to the port battalions and DUKW companies that brought the cargo ashore and to the port-construction groups and special-service engineers who repaired the harbor.

On July 21, the 11th Port moved from Omaha Beach into the small ports of St. Vasst, Carentan, and Barneur, and continued work begun at Isigny and Grandcamp. Negro Transportation Corps units participated in all these operations, as well as in the development of the port of Granville.

The Negro contribution to the supply victory further can be gaged from the following facts. Progress of the campaign and the time factor would not permit development of the large Brittany ports as called for in the original plans. The military operations were supplied and supported by Cherbourg and the smaller Normandy ports. Through these small ports and Cherbourg, sufficient supplies were funneled to support the decisive break-through at St. Lo on July 25. Negro port and DUKW units handled the bulk of these supplies

There wer 53 ports in all, exclusive of Utah and Omaha Beaches, used by United States forces between D-day and VE-day. The largest were Le Havre, Antwerp, and Marseilles. As already stated the major share of tonnage handled came through the hands of Negro stevedores and crane operators.

AMPHIBIAN TRUCK COMPANIES

Six Negro DUKW companies, the Four Hundred and Sixty-seventh, Four Hundred and Sixty-eighth, Four Hundred and Sixty-ninth, Four Hundred and Seventieth, Eight Hundred and Nineteenth, and Eight Hundred and Twenty-first Amphibian Truck Companies, had been attached to the Eleventh Port for "Plan Neptune," the invasion operation The first of these, the Four Hundred and Sixty-eighth, arrived on D plus 10. Others followed shortly after and helped importantly in the solution of the critical supply problem.

The official Transportation Corps historian states: "Great difficulty was experienced in locating ships at night. DUKW's were sunk by striking submerged objects and one was lost through the explosion of a mine.

"Guts and nerve, and the willingness to work long hours to help the soldiers struggling to enlarge the beachhead won the day, however. By June 26, these men discharged 14 coasters and 11 motor-transport ships and supplies were being built up on a scale sufficient to enable the fighting men to turn the landing into an offensive of decisive proportions."

These DUKW's saved the day following the severe coastal storm of June 20-22 which wrecked all of the Loebnitz piers on the beaches and temporarily halted port battalion unloading. The DUKW's stepped into the picture and carried the cargo night and day, onto the beach and sometimes inland to the waiting combat troops.

During this period an Eleventh Port officer estimated that these DUKW units hauled ashore 94 percent of all cargo unloaded at Omaha Beach.

On May 30, there were 16 amphibian truck companies in the ETO, 10 of them Negro units with a total personnel of 1,730. One Negro unit, the Four Hundred and Sixty-ninth, ferried supplies and personnel across the Rhine River during the attack that placed American forces on the east bank of the river.

TRUCK COMPANIES

As of May 30, 1944, 69 percent of all truck drivers in Tranportation Corps' motor transport branch in the ETO were Negro. This average remained much the same following the beachhead phase of the battle of Europe.

Some of these units operated continuously after D-day. Negro cargo truck units landed vehicles and personnel on Omaha Beach on June 6. The Three Thousand Six Hundred and Eighty-third Quartermaster Truck Company had vehicles ashore on D-day. The Three Hundred and Seventieth Quartermaster Truck Company, a transportation unit, was scheduled to land 55 vehicles and 115 men on the beach on D-plus-1. Instead, it got 24 men and 12 trucks ashore as early as the morning of D-day.

The Four Thousand and Ninth Quartermaster Truck Company landed 115 men and 55 vehicles on the beach on D-plus-1. The Four Thousand and Forty-second Quartermaster Truck Company landed 6 men and 34 vehicles on D-day.

These men went through unforgettable experiences. What they did is starkly told in comments of some of the drivers of the Three Thousand Six Hundred and Eighty-third Quartermaster Truck Company, D-day veterans all:

Corp. Clavon Brown: "About 25 yards offshore 8 to 10 shells hit right near us. We hauled till 1800 on D-day. We dug in on the beach. Hauled ammunition on D-plus-2 while enemy planes strafed around us."

Pvt. George McLain: "After we got on the beach, an 88 burst my truck radiator. Hawkins, the mechanic, used the radiator from a deadlined truck to keep it running. On D-plus-4 I was nicked on the arm by a bomb fragment."

Pvt. Herman Copeland: "Eighty-eights were hitting all around us. We were just lucky. While hauling ammunition, bullets hit the corner of the gas tank and left door, just barely missing me."

Pvt. Walter Pearson, Jr.: "My truck drowned out and I had to swim into shore. A couple of grenades were thrown at my truck while I was hauling ammunition. On D-plus-3 a bomb dropped in front of the truck and tore up the radiator and both front tires. The fragments killed several foot soldiers. I also hauled some wounded from the lines."

After Cherbourg and the smaller ports in Normandy had been opened and operating, the main burden of transporting supplies fell on truck transportation. As the tactical situation improved and the military railway service started to operate its first trains, trucks were used to clear the ports, supplementing the rail lines whenever possible, and hauling troops and supplies to the combat areas.

The St. Lo break-through lengthened American supply lines enormously. But Transportation Corps's motor transport followed General Patton's Third Army, making possible exploitation of the break-through and maintenance of the speed of advance.

The first motor express line—the famous Red Ball Express—was started on August 25, 1944. It was built on the one-way traffic principle. Trucks were kept operating 22 hours out of 24 with only 2 hours reserved for maintenance. Drivers worked an average of 36 hours on the road without sleep

At its peak Red Ball contained 67 percent Negro personnel. Its initial target was to

haul 4,850 tons daily from the ports and beaches to Army or forward destinations. Peak reached by the system was 6,000 tons daily.

Between August 25 and November 13, Red Ball's 132 companies hauled 412,193 tons from the beaches and Normandy ports to the First and Third United States Armies. An average Red Ball Express route round trip was 546 miles.

As the supply situation dictated the closing down of Red Ball, other motor routes were opened from other ports.

There was White Ball, ABC, XYZ, Yellow Ball, Green Diamond, Red Lion, B–B (Bayeux to Brussels), Yellow Diamond. These were all important truck express routes which combined to form the world's greatest supply operation.

The motor express lines alone accounted for transport of 3,169,744 tons between D-day and VE-day.

Bombing and strafing were routine dangers for Transportation Corps drivers before Red Ball started operating.

Red Ball Cited

On behalf of General Eisenhower, Maj. Gen. E. S. Hughes, decorated Corp. Robert E. Bradley, of Lynchburg, Va., Negro truck driver of the Army's famed Red Ball Highway, with a Bronze Star Medal, and lauded the work of the thousands of Negro quartermaster truck drivers who were hauling vital front-line supplies over this 400-mile one-way loop, day and night, to the fighting fronts. It was awarded in symbol of all drivers.

Sixty percent of the drivers were Negroes. Stopping a huge convoy on the outskirts of Paris, Major General Hughes pinned the decoration on Corporal Bradley in a surprise ceremony which caught the entire trucking group unaware. He told them that he would have liked to present all of them with medals, but that "Bradley was chosen as a representative of the whole Red Ball Highway, including the men who repair the roads and bridges, put up the telephone wires and do all the service work in the rear.

"General Eisenhower realizes that you men seldom get the same recognition as soldiers in the front line and wants you to know that the part you're playing is vital. His message is for every man engaged on this vast project; the troops at the front couldn't do without you."

Maj. Gen. Frank Ross, Chief of Transportation, Communications Zone, disclosed that the route was four times the length of the Burma Road, and that in its first 26 days of operation it hauled and delivered more than 200,000 tons of supplies to advance depots, where front-line units picked it up with their hauling units.

Speedier supply became acutely necessary when Lt. Gen. George S. Patton's Third Army broke through at St. Lo, and began moving with lightning-like rapidity through France. And so the Red Ball Highway came into existence, with thousands of truck drivers pulling 24-hour a day shifts, as the long convoys rolled across specially designated one-way military highways through France.

The vast line became the biggest chain of supply maintained by United States forces.

During Von Rundstedt's break-through in the Ardennes in December, hazards encountered by Transportation Corps' truckers in supporting front-line troops made the Normandy and central France operations look mild by comparison.

During the historic Bastogne fight drivers carried ammunition and food into United States pockets as German forces closed in behind them. There were times, too, when these drivers having delivered their cargo had to take their individual weapons and dig in with the infantry.

But the most impressive testimony to the work of the drivers of the Transportation Corps, including the 35,839 members of Negro Transportation Corps truck units, is the tremendous total tonnage forwarded by Motor Transport Service in Europe between June 17, 1944, and May 31, 1945. It is 22,644,609 tons.

PACIFIC THEATER

All through the Pacific campaign runs the story of the heroism of Negro soldiers. They were in at the start in the Philippines and at the finish, too.

In fact, the first American soldier of the armored forces killed in the Pacific theater was a Negro boy, son of a Kentucky sharecropper. He was Pvt. Robert H. Brooks, who died on the battlefield near Fort Stotsenburg, in the Philippines, on December 8, 1941. The main parade ground of the armored forces at Fort Knox, Ky., has been named Brooks Field in memory of Private Brooks.

The Ninety-sixth Engineer Battalion later the Ninety-sixth Engineer Regiment landed in Port Moresby, New Guinea, on April 29, 1942, the first American troops in New Guinea and probably the first American troops to face the enemy after Bataan.

In Alaska, the South, Southwest, and Central Pacific areas, and in the China-Burma-India theater, Negro troops played an important role in engineering activity. This included the construction of roads, airfields, ports, camps, and storage facilities and their maintenance.

Three of the seven Army engineer regiments—the Ninety-third, the Ninety-fifth, and the Ninety-seventh—which helped to build the Alcan Highway were Negro The highway, 1,671 miles long, runs from Dawson Creek, northwest of Edmonton, Alberta, to Fairbanks, Alaska. Although most of the Negro soldiers in these regiments had never before been out of the South, only 140 men were incapacitated by the cold, and all except 4 recovered completely with no ill effects. The four suffered minor amputations.

After helping to blast through the brutal terrain of Alaska, building the Alcan Highway, the Ninety-seventh was transferred to the steaming jungles of New Guinea. There they struggled for a year or more in sweat, mud, and mire. While in Alaska this regiment adopted for its slogan: "No task too great." And it carried that slogan with it into the jungle.

A Negro aviation engineer battalion participated in the victory of the Battle of the Coral Sea, which was fought on May 7 and 8, 1942. It worked 24 hours a day to construct an airdrome in New Caledonia, which was effectively used by Army and Navy aircraft engaged in the battle. Their accomplishment was revealed in a commendatory report by Lt. Gen. Alexander M. Patch.

General Patch also told how members of the battalion unloaded gasoline from a supply ship which had anchored in an uncharted roadstead of the island. The Negro troops transferred the fuel ashore in rafts and moved it rapidly to the airdrome just in time to service aircraft which engaged the enemy in the Battle of the Coral Sea.

Negro soldiers were engaged in combat in the Pacific in September 1942. An Australian dispatch of that date describes their first engagement. It relates an interview with three wounded men, who told how the tricky Japanese used a hospital ship as a shield in a surprise attack on Milne Bay at the tip of New Guinea. Two of the three soldiers were Negroes—Charles Brown, of Milwaukee, Wis., and Reginald Simonds, of Durham, N. C. They were in charge of an antiaircraft gun emplacement watching the harbor.

They saw the hospital ship moving in and thought that it was an American Red Cross vessel. Suddenly the ship "lit up like a Christmas tree" from the searchlights focused upon it from out in the bay. They were about to relax when someone yelled:

"It's a Jap cruiser."

They made out the outlines of a cruiser lying beyond the hospital ship.

The Americans trained their guns toward the cruiser hoping to get a chance to rake her decks, but the cruiser had the same idea. Every gun aboard her opened fire. After about 10 minutes, a shell from the cruiser hit the American gun position.

Hanson and Brown woke up in an ambulance headed for a field hospital. All the way to the hospital the wounded men were one jump ahead of Jap shells, which were hitting the road right behind the ambulance.

Simonds set up a machine gun on the edge of the Milne Bay airfield. Others did likewise. They watched for the arrival of Japanese ground forces who had been reported advancing through the jungle. Simonds was quoted as saying:

"I guess we did a pretty good job slaughtering those Japs when they came running out of the jungle. None knew very much about firing guns, but we knew enough to aim and keep them shooting at the Japs. And I guess that's all we had to know."

Both Brown and Simonds were seriously wounded; Brown by shrapnel and explosive shells and Simonds by machine-gun bullets and shrapnel. They were credited with saving the vital airdrome at Milne Bay by their quick perception, and response to the situation.

"ROAD TO TOKYO"

One of the most amazing construction feats of the war was the Ledo Road, Negro soldiers christened it "The Road to Tokyo." This highway from India to China via Burma was begun on December 12, 1942. Though they were originally brought in to construct United States airfields in Assam, a battalion of Negro aviation engineers was pressed into service as road builders after they had finished their initial assignment of building runways and dispersal areas. The road had just been started by the British Army with Indian labor when the Americans took over.

Three companies of the battalion spearheaded the drive into Burma from the Assam jungles in northeastern India. A Company cleared the point, cutting a road wide enough for heavy Army vehicles. B Company did the drainage work, installing pipes up to 6 feet in diameter to carry off the monsoon rains into the huge ravines that line the winding mountain road. C Company widened, backfilled, and graded the road.

It was a round-the-clock job, 7 days a week. At night, drivers pushing their bulldozers into rock and dirt were always in danger of rolling too close to the edge of cliffs 500 feet high. In the weird light cast by smudge pots, gasoline-saturated bamboo or flaming 5-gallon fuel oil cans, they carved a road out of jungles and rock masses, 100 yards wide. They carried their highway up over mountain ranges, the Himalayas, that rise as much as 1,000 feet in 2 miles. One of the toughest spots was encountered just west of the India-Burma border line. A 100-yard formation of solid rock along an almost vertical cliff stopped the lead bulldozer cold. The 16-ton D–7 could not even get a bite into the cliff. So the air-line hose and jack-hammers were put into the job, cutting 8-foot holes in the rock for the charges of dynamite that blasted ledges for the bulldozer to follow.

Ultimately these men succeeded in making the impossible possible. With blood and sweat, they vanquished both the swampy, disease-infested jungles, and the skulking Japanese to create a desperately-needed supply route.

Three Negro enlisted men were awarded the Legion of Merit for exceptionally meritorious services rendered at Guadalcanal. They were Jesse Harris, private, Infantry, Tuskegee, Ala.; Henry Smith, Jr., private, Infantry, Good Pine, La.; and Verna C. Neal, private, Infantry, Ruleville, Miss. In announcing the awards, Secretary Stimson em-

phasized the fact that the recipients were all infantrymen, and that they were fighting in one of the most difficult theaters. These men abandoned the comparative safety of a slit trench, and advanced 250 yards over open terrain, exposed to bombing from an enemy air raid to assist in evacuating casualties. The undertaking was accomplished despite continued enemy action, causing impenetrable dust and confusion.

SOUTH PACIFIC

NINETY-THIRD DIVISION

On March 21, 1944 the commanding general, United States Army forces in the South Pacific area ordered the Ninety-third Infantry Division to move its Twenty-fifth Combat Team to Empress Augusta Bay Perimeter on Bougainville Island with the least practicable delay. The combat team was composed of the Twenty-fifth Infantry Regiment, Five Hundred and Ninety-third Field Artillery Battalion, Five Hundred and Ninety-sixth Field Artillery Battalion, Company A of the Three Hundred and Eighteenth Combat Engineer Battalion, Company A of the Three Hundred and Eighteenth Medical Battalion, one platoon of Company D, Three Hundred and Eighteenth Medical Battalion, Ninety-third Reconnaissance Troop, a detachment of the Ninety-third Signal Company, a detachment of the Seven Hundred and Ninety-third Ordnance Company, and a detachment of the Ninety-third MP Platoon.

By March 31, the Combat Team was in position and at 2:30 p. m., on April 2, Pfc Isaac Moore of Brooklyn, N. Y., pulled the lanyard on the No. 2 gun of Battery A of the Five Hundred and Ninety-third Field Artillery which sent the first round fired by the Ninety-third Division into enemy positions. The Ninety-third Division was in combat.

On April 4, the Second Battalion of the Ninety-third Division which had been detached from the American Division and passed to operational control of the Commanding General of the Thirty-seventh Infantry Division closed with the enemy and killed approximately 25 Japanese soldiers.

Four men were lost by the A and P Platoon while it was returning from a supply mission to the Americal Division on Hill 500. These soldiers, Pfcs Hugh Carrol, Oginal I. Ryan, William W. Ash and Joseph C. Mallory, were the first men of the Ninety-third to be killed in action in this war.

On April 5, the men of the Five Hundred and Ninety-third Field Artillery received a commendation from Brig. Gen. W. C. Dunckly for their firing on the Numa Numa Trail.

On April 7, Company K contacted the enemy before an ambush could be established and in the fire fight that resulted one officer and 17 men were killed and 7 wounded. Our forces withdrew about 100 yards and called for artillery fire. All bodies were recovered and the men were buried in the Bougainville cemetery.

On April 15, litterbearers were subjected to enemy fire during the night and fought with as much vigor as the infantrymen. On one such occasion T5g Mose Wheeler, of Company A, Three Hundred and Eighteenth Medical Battalion, became the first casualty of his unit.

Thirty-five Japanese were killed by Company G on April 16 in repelling an attack by an enemy force aimed at a Fiji battalion located on the right of Company G. In this encounter the Five Hundred and Ninety-third Field Artillery fired 1,216 rounds.

Battle casualties of the Twenty-fifth Combat Team as reported through May 30, 1944, totaled 26 killed, 13 seriously wounded in action, and 27 slightly wounded in action.

The records of the War Department contain the names of many men such as Thomas J. Caveness, private, first class, Corps of Engineers, a native of Los Angeles, who was cited for heroism in risking his life in going to the assistance of his comrades buried under debris from an ammunition dump which had been set on fire by Japanese bombers.

LEGION OF MERIT AWARDS

The following Negroes received the Legion of Merit for performance in the Pacific theater of war:

Dennis Holt, staff sergeant, Infantry, Birmingham, Ala., and Isaac McGrew, Jr., staff sergeant, Infantry, Yazoo City, La.

Sergeant Holt was chief of a battalion wire section from May 4, 1942, to April 20, 1943, at a base in the South Pacific area. His leadership, skill, cheerfulness, and devotion to duty in the installation, maintenance, and operation of a wire net, in many respects comparable to that of a division, assured continuous communication. Without transportation, he led his men in cutting wire trails through miles of difficult jungle, in carrying wire up to a mountain top observation post, in crossing several miles of water to nearby islands, in all kinds of weather.

Sergeant McGrew was primarily responsible for the successful installation and maintenance of 300 miles of wire in the South Pacific area from May 15, 1942, to February 20, 1943. This task was performed under the most rigorous of tropical, climatic, and terrain conditions. By long hours, ingenuity, and perseverance, he performed remarkable feats of accomplishment.

The Silver Star was awarded to Mack B. Anderson, private, Corps of Engineers, Brenham, Tex., for gallantry displayed in the Asiatic theater of operations. During an attack by Japanese Zero fighters on an airfield in India, Private Anderson, while under continuous fire from the attackers, manned a machine gun until it went out of action, then continued firing with his automatic pistol while several Japanese fighters definitely centered their attack on him.

SOLDIER'S MEDAL FOR HEROISM

Several Negro soldiers received the Soldier's Medal for heroism in the Pacific area. Edward Williams, private, Quartermaster Corps, Hurtsboro, Ala., helped to extinguish a conflagration at a United States truck assembly plant in Iran, Persia. He risked his life to the peril of intense heat to save quantities of Government property from damage and destruction.

James Scott, private, Corps of Engineers, Montgomery, Ala., risked his life on June 25, 1942, near an airdrome in New Guinea to save a pilot. When a fighter plane, taking off to intercept enemy planes then overhead, struck a log and crashed into the nearby river splashing gasoline on the plane and water, and igniting both gasoline and ammunition. Private Scott in the midst of flames and expicding ammunition waded into the river and assisted in rescuing the pilot.

Roscoe E. Thomas, master sergeant, Corps of Engineers, Atlanta, Ga., went to the assistance of three comrades buried under debris from an ammunition dump which had been set on fire by Japanese bombers.

James Williams, private, Infantry, Indianapolis, Ind., save two of his buddies from drowning when they slipped and fell into the ocean while embarking in the Solomon Islands. He immediately dived into the water to help them.

Columbus Howard, private first class, Corps of Engineers, Inkster, Mich., proceeded within 200 yards of an exploding inferno to remove hot metal fragments from inflammable materials, and fought tirelessly to prevent the fire from spreading to other vital supply dumps.

Jesse E. Evans, private, Quartermaster Corps, Morristown, N. J., aided in the rescue of three sailors from the waters adjoining a United States island base in the South Pacific.

Private Evans was one of a party of soldiers working on a ship in the harbor when he heard the cry for help and located a small home-made boat not far away which had capsized. One of the three sailor occupants was unconscious and being held up by another. Without regard for his own safety, Private Evans plunged 40 feet over the side of the ship, swam to the men and helped keep the unconscious man afloat until a ship's launch could come alongside.

Nathaniel Hocker, sergeant, Coast Artillery, Brooklyn, N. Y., helped to save the life of a pilot on the island of Oahu, T. H., on March 24, 1944. With complete disregard for the gasoline flames and the danger of the unexploded bombs, Sergeant Hocker assisted in removing the pilot from a burning plane that had crashed near his gun position.

William Downing, technician fourth grade, Quartermaster Corps, Nyack, N. Y., plunged into the icy waters of the Bering Sea to rescue a soldier in danger of being crushed between a barge and a freighter.

Douglas D. Hopper, private first class, Corps of Engineers, Shelby, N. C., braved the treacherous currents of a river in India to rescue an officer.

OPINIONS ABOUT NEGRO INFANTRY PLATOONS IN WHITE COMPANIES OF SEVEN DIVISIONS

What do the white company grade officers and the white platoon sergeants in the European theater of operations think of the combat performance of Negro rifle platoons which were attached to their companies in March and April and fought side by side with white platoons through VE-day?

This question is answered by a survey, made in late May and early June 1945, by personally interviewing 250 respondents, namely, all available white company grade officers and a representative sample of platoon sergeants in 24 companies containing Negro platoons in several infantry divisions, namely, the First, Second, Ninth, Sixty-ninth, Seventy-eighth, Ninety-ninth, and One Hundred and Fourth. Standardized questions were used in the survey, which was conducted by five trained interviewers of the research branch, I and E Divisions, European theater of operations.

In all except one of the companies visited, the standard organization of three rifle platoons and one heavy infantry platoon had been augmented by one rifle platoon of colored soldiers. The colored platoons were made up of men from rear echelon units who volunteered for service with the infantry and were trained for approximately 6 weeks in reinforcement depots, usually by a white officer or noncom who later led them into combat.

In generalizing the opinions here reported, the fact that the Negro infantrymen in these platoons were volunteers must be kept in mind, as must also the fact that not all of the platoons experienced heavy and arducus fighting.

OPINIONS OF WHITE OFFICERS AND ENLISTED MEN IN COMPANIES WITH NEGRO PLATOONS

Question. How did you feel at first about serving in a company that had white platoons and colored platoons?

	Percent white officers	*Percent white noncoms*
Relatively unfavorable: Skeptical, didn't like it, thought it'd cause trouble, etc	64	64
Relatively favorable: Willing to try it, made no difference, didn't mind, etc	33	35
No answer	3	1
Total	100	100

Question. Has your feeling changed since having served in the same unit with colored soldiers?

	Percent white officers	Percent white noncoms
No; my feeling is still the same	16	21
Yes; have become more favorable toward them,[1] feel more respect for them, like them better, etc	77	77
No answer	7	2
Total	100	100

[1] No cases were found in which an individual reported his attitude had become less favorable.

Question. How well did the colored soldiers in this company perform in combat?

	Percent white officers	Percent white noncoms
Not well at all	0	0
Not so well	0	1
Fairly well	16	17
Very well	84	81
Undecided	0	1
Total	100	100

NOTE: In commenting on this question, respondents frequently gave detailed accounts of combat performance. Positive qualities stressed were aggressiveness in attack, effective use of fire-power, adeptness at close-in fighting, team-work in battle. Negative qualities reported in a few instances were that at first the men sometimes went forward too rapidly—too far in an attack. Some officers stressed the fact that these colored soldiers, being volunteers, may have had exceptional combat qualities. Others mentioned that in their units there had not been an adequate test under the most severe type of fighting, such as sustained attacks under heavy mortar or artillery fire. It should be noted, however, that the performance of the colored troops was rated just as high, if not higher, by the white officers and noncoms in those companies in which the colored platoons have had severe fighting as by respondents from other units.

Question. With the same Army training and experience, how do you think colored troops compare with white troops as infantry soldiers?

	Percent white officers	Percent white noncoms
Not as good as white troops	5	4
Just the same as white troops	69	83
Better than white troops	17	9
No answer	9	4
Total	100	100

Question. How have the white and colored soldiers gotten along together?

	Percent white officers	Percent white noncoms
Not well	0	0
Not as well in garrison as in in combat	14	4
Fairly well	7	36
Very well	73	60
No answer	6	0
Total	100	100

NOTE.—Replies are somewhat more favorable from white officers and white noncoms with a northern background than from those with a southern background, but differences in opinion are not great. Actual friction between white and colored soldiers is said to have been confined to isolated cases involving white soldiers from outside units who did not know the combat record of the colored troops. Evidence indicates that white and colored soldiers have gotten along best together in those units in which they have shared the heaviest combat. While many of the officers in further questioning expressed some doubt as to how well the situation would work out if their unit remains in the army of occupation, or other semipermanent garrison status, 9 out of 10 said there had been no difficulties as yet.

Question. If colored soldiers are used as infantry, do you think they should be set up by platoons as they are here, or would some other way be better?

	Percent white officers	Percent white noncoms
In the same platoon with white soldiers	7	1
In a platoon within the same company	62	89
In separate companies	18	12
In separate battalions or larger organizations	10	2
No answer	3	0
Total	100	100

NOTE.—Most of those interviewed volunteered one or more reasons for their answer.

Among those who favor the platoon basis, the reasons given, in order of frequency, are:

1. Competition - emulation (encourages friendly competition; each tried to make a good showing; gives them something to come up to).

2. Avoidance of friction (saves any chance of trouble to have them in their own platoon; because of the old feeling of boys from the South).

3. Better discipline and control among the colored soldiers (whites have a steadying influence on them; colored boys feel more secure in combat this way).

4. Feeling of participation or nondiscrimination on part of the colored soldiers (gives them the feeling of being with the white boys; avoids that feeling of being set apart and discriminated against).

5. Improved interracial understanding (work close enough together so they can each get to know the other better and see what they do).

Among the minority who favored separate companies or larger units, the main reasons given were avoidance of friction (especially in garrison situations) and better discipline. A few men gave as their reason their personal feeling of not wishing to be in a company containing colored troops.

INDEPENDENT CHECK IN A CROSS-SECTION SURVEY

In the course of a survey of a representative cross section of 1,710 white enlisted men in ETO field forces, to ascertain men's information and orientation needs, two questions were asked about the use of Negro troops. This survey was independent of the interviews tabulated above.

The responses to the two questions asked in the cross-section survey were tabulated separately for four subgroups indicated below. The sample in some groups is small and therefore subject to a larger margin of error than is customary in research branch reports.

Question. Some Army divisions have companies which include Negro and white platoons. How would you feel about it if your outfit was set up something like that?

Percentage of white enlisted men answering, "Would dislike it very much":

Cross section of field force units which do not have colored platoons in white companies (1,450 cases)	62
Men in same division, but not in same regiment as colored troops (112 cases)	24
Men in same regiment, but not in same company as colored troops (68 cases)	20
Men in company with a Negro platoon (80 cases)	7

Question: "In general, do you think it is a good idea or a poor idea to have the same company in a combat outfit include Negro platoons and white platoons?"

Percentage of white enlisted men saying, "Very good idea" or "fairly good idea":

Cross section of field force units which do not have colored platoons in white companies	18
Men in same division but not in same regiment as colored troops	50
Men in same regiments but not in same company as colored troops	66
Men in company with a Negro platoon	64

NOTE.—These differences in attitude, varying with extent of experience with platoons of colored troops, can hardly be attributed to differences in geographical origin. For example, 31 percent of the white soldiers whose company has a Negro platoon are from the South, as are 34 percent of the soldiers in the cross section of field force units.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ABOUT COLORED TROOPS IN THOSE INFANTRY PLATOONS

The soldiers in the Negro platoons were somewhat superior to other colored troops in ETO in education and AGCT, but the differences actually are not striking.

Percentage who had graduated from high school:

Colored in infantry platoons	22
Colored in ETO (cross section)	18
White riflemen (cross section)	41

Percentage with AGCT scores above class IV:

Colored in infantry platoons	29
Colored in ETO (cross section)	17
White riflemen (cross section)	71

Percentage from the South (including border States):

Colored in infantry platoons	67
Colored in ETO (cross section)	76

As compared with white riflemen the Negro infantrymen were somewhat younger, 10 percent of the colored were 30 years old or over—as were 20 percent of the white riflemen.

Branches of service from which the transfer to infantry were made were as follows:

Percent of total Negro volunteers:

Corps of Engineers	30
Quartermaster Corps	29
Transportation Corps	26
Signal Corps	3
Ordnance Department	2
All other branches	2

Of all who were converted to riflemen, 63 percent came from the following six military occupation specialties, in order of frequency:

Truck driver, light (MOS 345).
Duty soldier III (590).
Longshoreman (271).
Basic (521).
Foreman construction (059).
Cargo checker (470).

NEGROES IN THE NAVY

When the United States entered this war Navy policy restricted Negroes to the steward's branch of the naval service. This was so despite the fact that Negroes had been an integral part of our Navy from the days of John Paul Jones.

Yet, despite this restriction, when the Japanese made their infamous sneak attack at Pearl Harbor, one of the heroes of that day was Dorie Miller, a Negro messman, who took a machine gun from the dead hands of its gunner and turned it on the Japs. For his quick thinking and courage Dorie Miller received the Navy Cross. He was cited for his "distinguished devotion to duty, extreme courage, and disregard for his own personal safety during the attack." Later, still a messman, Dorie Miller went down with the *Liscombe Bay*.

Dorie Miller's heroism symbolizes the eagerness of Negroes to get into the fight despite the restrictions which the dead weight of tradition and prejudice have imposed upon

them. This eagerness was recognized by the Navy in June 1942 when the Navy for the first time accepted Negro inductees from selective service.

At later dates, the Navy commissioned Negroes as naval officers, admitted Negroes into the WAVES, SPARS, and Nurse Corps, and began to assign Negroes for general duty aboard ships of all classifications.

On August 31, 1945, there were 165,506 Negro enlisted men in the Navy and 53 Negro officers. In the Marine Corps there were 16,964 Negro enlisted men; and 3,727 Negro enlisted men and 4 Negro officers in the Coast Guard.

On the same date Negro women in the naval service included 68 Waves and 2 officers and 38 officer candidates; while there were 4 Negro Navy nurses and 5 Negro enlisted Spars

As the number of Negroes in the Navy increased, and they showed their qualifications, the Navy began to relax its restrictions. On August 9, 1944, the Navy began to assign Negroes in special service to man, partially, 25 large auxiliary vessels. Most of these ships were then in combat areas as part of the fleet train in the Pacific. Approximately 500 Negroes were assigned to those ships, both as petty officers and nonrated men. The 25 vessels were of the following types: Store ships, ammunition ships, cargo ships, oilers, and miscellaneous auxiliaries.

ALL RATINGS INCLUDED

The petty officers assigned to these vessels included substantially all ratings required to operate the ships. Among them were coxswains, gunner's mates, quartermasters, storekeepers, carpenter's mates, shipfitters. Since then, the Navy has extended the assignment of Negro personnel to naval vessels so as to include all auxiliary and many fighting ships.

On July 13, 1945, Lester B. Granger, executive secretary of the National Urban League, held a press conference following completion of a tour of 12 naval stations, bases, and depots in the United States. "The Navy," Mr. Granger said, "has made remarkable strides in the last 2 years toward complete equality of expression in the service. It is a progress which reflects great credit upon the integrity and intelligence of the Navy's leaders and which should evoke a warm spirit of cooperation from the Negro and white public which is anxious to see our armed services more completely democratized."

Some of the gains which Mr. Granger cited were:

1. Admission of Negroes to general service.
2 Rating of Negroes in practically every category and training of Negroes as commissioned officers.
3. Assignment of Negro personnel to auxiliary craft up to 10 percent of a ship's complement.
4. Assignment of Negro commissioned and petty officers to these vessels to serve in their duties without regard to rank.
5. Important elimination of racial segregation in mess and in recreational facilities.
6. A beginning of assigning Negro personnel to combat duties on warships.

Dorie Miller was the first Negro decorated for heroism by the Navy in World War II. Some of the others were:

Elvin Bell

Elvin Bell, mess attendant, third class, United States Navy, 20 years old, of Jamaica, N. Y., on February 2, 1943, was awarded the Navy and Marine Corps Medal with the following citation:

"For distinguished heroism while serving aboard the U. S. S. *Lexington* during the battle of the Coral Sea on May 8, 1942. Voluntarily joining a repair party fighting a fire in an area frequented by violent explosions of gasoline vapor and ammunition, Bell, although emerging in an exhausted condition, unhesitatingly entered the most dangerous section of the stricken carrier and assisted in removing injured personnel who had been trapped below decks. His courageous initiative and utter disregard for his own safety were in keeping with the highest traditions of the United States naval service."

Charles Jackson French

Charles Jackson French, mess attendant, second class, United States Navy, 23, of Foreman, Ark., was commended by Admiral William F. Halsey, United States Navy, commander South Pacific Area and South Pacific Force, for heroism while serving on a destroyer in the Pacific area.

His commendation announced May 18, 1943, reads as follows:

"For meritorious conduct in action while serving on board a destroyer transport which was badly damaged during the engagement with Japanese forces in the British Solomon Islands on September 5, 1942. After the engagement, a group of about 15 men were adrift on a raft which was being deliberately shelled by Japanese naval forces. French tied a line to himself and swam for more than 2 hours without rest, thus attempting to tow the raft. His conduct was in keeping with the highest traditions of the naval service."

Leonard Roy Harmon (the U. S. S. "Harmon")

Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox, on June 8, 1943, designated Mrs. Naunita Harmon Carroll, whose address was post-office box 381, Cuero, Tex., to sponsor the destroyer escort U. S. S. *Harmon*, which she did when the vessel was launched July 10, 1943, at Hingham, Mass.

The *Harmon* received its name in honor of Mrs. Carroll's son, the late Leonard Roy Harmon, mess attendant first class, USN, who was awarded the Navy Cross posthumously for heroism while serving on the U. S. S. *San Francisco*. This is the first vessel to bear the name *Harmon*.

Harmon's citation issued with the award of the Navy Cross read as follows:

"For extraordinary heroism while serving aboard the U. S. S. *San Francisco* during action against enemy Japanese forces in the Solomon Islands area on November 12 and 13, 1942. With persistent disregard for his own personal safety, Harmon rendered invaluable assistance in caring for the wounded and evacuating them to a dressing station. In addition to displaying unusual loyalty in behalf of the injured executive officer, he deliberately exposed himself to hostile gunfire in order to protect a shipmate and, as a result of this courageous deed, was killed in action. His heroic spirit of self-sacrifice, maintained above and beyond the call of duty, was in keeping with the highest traditions of the United States naval service. He gallantly gave up his life in the defense of his country."

William Pinckney

The Secretary of the Navy, on behalf of the President of the United States, awarded the Navy Cross to William Pinckney, cook third class, USN, on June 10, 1943. Pinckney, 28 years old, was the son of Mr. and Mrs. Renty Pinckney, box 92, Beaufort, S. C. The Navy Cross was given with the following citation:

"For extraordinary heroism while serving aboard the U. S. S. *Enterprise* during the engagement with enemy Japanese naval forces near the Santa Cruz Islands on October 26, 1942. When a heavy bomb exploded in the near vicinity Pinckney, standing at his battle station in the ammunition handling room, was knocked unconscious. With several compartments completely wrecked and four of his five companions killed, Pinckney, regaining consciousness, groped his way through the burning and tangled wreckage to a point under an open hangar deck hatch. Just as he was about to escape he found a shipmate, the only other survivor of his party, struggling up through the hatch. When the man fell unconscious, either from his wounds or from smoke and fumes, Pinckney, unmindful of his own danger, lifted his comrade through the hatch to safety before he himself battled his way out of the burning and smoke-filled compartment. By his dauntless courage in saving his comrade's life at great risk to his own, Pinckney upheld the highest traditions of the United States naval service."

Joseph Cross

The Secretary of the Navy, in the name of the President of the United States, awarded the Navy and Marine Corps Medal to Joseph Cross, steward's mate, first class, USNR, of 2510 Thalia Street, New Orleans, La.

The citation says:

"For heroic conduct during four submarine war patrols in enemy-controlled waters. Performing his duties with excellent judgment and conscientious skill, Cross contributed materially to the destruction by his ship of an important amount of Japanese shipping. His resolute courage was in keeping with the highest traditions of the United States naval service."

Elbert H. Oliver

A Silver Star Medal was awarded Elbert H. Oliver, steward's mate, first class, United States Navy, by the Secretary of the Navy, in the name of the President of the United States. Oliver, who had been wounded in action, resided at 1112 Locust Street, North Little Rock, Ark

His citation reads:

"For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity while serving aboard a United States warship during a raid upon that vessel by approximately 25 Japanese torpedo planes in the vicinity of the Solomon Islands on June 30, 1943. When members of his 22 mm. gun crew were severely wounded by a bursting projectile, Oliver quickly took over the station of the injured gunner and, although he himself was bleeding profusely, maintained accurate fire against the attacking planes until eventually compelled to give way to a relief gunner. His aggressive fighting spirit and grim determination to carry on in the face of acute pain and waning strength were in keeping with the highest traditions of the United States naval service."

Every branch of the naval service has seen courageous acts performed by Negroes in combat. Examples from the principal branches of the services are summarized below. All of them are based on official Navy Department releases.

A story of Negro steward's mates who received awards for their conduct under fire is told in an official Navy release.

"Six Negro steward's mates who manned their antiaircraft guns until a Japanese suicide plane crashed in flames among them have been awarded the Bronze Star Medal for their heroism in action aboard the U. S. S. *Intrepid*, the Department of the Navy said today.

"Vice Adm. John S. McCain, United States Navy, commander of Task Force Thirty-eight, made awards for their participation in the action of October 26 1944.

"The medals were awarded to—

"Johnell Copeland, steward's mate second class, USNR, 19 office box 1363, Haines City, Fla.;

"Que Gent, steward's mate first class, USNR, 22, of 132 Center Street, Atlantic City, N. J.;

"Harold Junior Clark, steward's mate first class, USNR, 25, of 910½ Fourth Street, West Palm Beach, Fla.;

"James Eddie Dockery, steward's mate first class, USNR, 38, of 28 Barclay Street, Newark, N. J.;

"Alonzo Alexander Swann, Jr., steward's mate first class, USNR, 19, of 353 Christian Street, Steelton, Pa.;

"Eli Benjamin, steward's mate second class, USNR, 20, of 734 Jefferson Street, Norfolk, Va.;

"The six men, who volunteered to man antiaircraft guns in the event of attack by the enemy, were stationed at a 20 millimeter machine gun by the gunnery officer of the U.

S. S. *Intrepid*, *Essex*-class carrier that was damaged four times by attacking Japanese planes."

The citations read:

"For distinguishing himself by heroic and meritorious service in connection with operations against the enemy, while serving aboard an aircraft carrier on October 29, 1944. When a Japanese dive bomber attacked from the starboard side of the ship, he continued to operate his portside gun in its fire over the flight deck although it became apparent that the enemy plane was headed directly for his gun tub. His gun fired until the Japanese plane crashed into his tub. The courage and skill he displayed were at all times in keeping with the highest traditions of the naval service."

NEGRO MARINES

A Navy press release dated February 13, 1945, states:

"On the beach nearest the enemy on Iwo are Negro marines of the Eighth Ammunition Company—worthy successors of the Negro marine ammunition companies in the Marianas actions and at Peleliu.

"They carry ammunition by day, feeding the front lines and building up supply dumps, playing a vital role in what is undoubtably the toughest battle in the history of the Marine Corps. At night they lie in foxholes among their kegs of TNT and dumps of high explosives, enduring the most persistent mortar and shell fire any American troops have faced in the Pacific.

"I've been using a TNT box for a pillow," says Corp. Coleman Bagwell, of Chester, S. C. "There's nothing any softer around, and if a mortar hits anywhere near I figure the whole ammunition dump will blow up anyway, so that's not being reckless."

Four of the men of the Eighth made a run to the front lines, loaded with ammunition, then stayed there under fire to assemble rockets which were to be used against the Japs.

The four are Pfc Walter Moore, of 1217A Sam Rankins Street, Corpus Christi, Tex.; Simms Pattin, of Spartanburg, S. C.; Pfc William L. Stephenson, of 212 Northwest Eleventh Avenue, Fort Lauderdale, Fla.; and Pfc Samuel Miller, of 3780 Monroe Street, Detroit, Mich.

"It's a rough beach," said Corp. Edward White, of Nacogdoches, Tex., standing beside one of the first trucks the marines managed to bring ashore under fire.

Some of the Negro marines, despite wounds, returned to duty after receiving medical treatment.

The men of the Eighth agree that it has been a rough beach, and their fellow marines agree that they have proved they can take it.

NEGRO SEABEES

One of the important contributions of Negroes to the Navy in the war was that of the Seabees. An official Navy release tells of the work of one unit.

"Veterans of 20 months of jungle warfare in the South Pacific, and bearing a unit citation for many outstanding feats of construction completed under great difficulties, the first battalion of Negro Seabees to go overseas has returned to this country," the Navy Department announced this week.

"The unit, the Thirty-fourth Construction Battalion, indoctrinated at Camp Allen in Virginia, sailed outside the continental limits of the United States on January 7, 1943, and arrived in Noumea, New Caledonia, 19 days later. Since that date the unit has suffered casualties of 5 men killed in action and 35 wounded.

"The first big job tackled by the unit was the construction of the Halavo Seaplane Base at Halavo in the Florida Islands. Brigaded there with the Acorn (Red) Four, an air unit, the Thirty-fourth Battalion helped carve its camp out of a deep jungle. During February and March 1943, the two outfits experienced two direct enemy bombings and were under almost nightly enemy air raids in the area for a period of 5 months. Casualties from these raids resulted in 2 killed and 28 wounded.

"A detachment of approximately 350 men were transferred, on March 19, 1943, to Guadalcanal to assist other battalions in constructing fuel and gas storage facilities. This detachment remained on Guadalcanal until November 1943, constructing all types of air-field facilities and housing. They were under frequent enemy air raids for the first 6 months of their duty there and then less frequent raids, the last of which occurred in October 1943. No casualties resulted.

"On April 20, 1943, another detachment of approximately 200 men with 75 percent of the battalion's heavy equipment was transported by LCT's to Russell Island where they laid out and constructed, together with the Thirty-fifth Construction Battalion, the second fighter strip north of Renard Sound on Banika Island. This detachment was a part of what was essentially a regimental command consisting of the entire Forty-seventh Battalion and one-half of the Twentieth Battalion. It was assigned to the task of constructing a 6,000-foot bomber strip and a 4,500-foot fighter strip on the Russells in time for the New Georgia campaign. These Seabee units completed their assigned tasks on time and the first three units later enlarged the bomber facilities south of Renard, completing this assignment by August 1943. At Russells the detachment was subjected to constant enemy bombing until the completion of the New Georgia campaign in July. The Negro detachment experienced five casualties, consisting of three killed and two injured with minor burns in the operation of the fighter strip, caused during the crash of a Navy plane on the field.

"The entire battalion was reunited in November 1943, in the Tulagi area; with approximately one-half of the battalion quartered at Halavo, and the other half scattered over the adjacent islands of Tulagi, Savo, and Phillips Peninsula on Purvis Bay. The construction tasks at Halavo varied from marine railways, fueling docks, and coastal defense gun mounts, to harbor boat nests, dolphins, piers, and considerable jungle and mountain roads for the Army defense. A unit at Tulagi took over and performed naval-base maintenance, relieving the Twenty-seventh Seabees until the arrival of the two CBMU's to release the battalion for assignment to Guadalcanal in March 1944.

"The battalion was reequipped with new housing facilities and a small quantity of new equipment and supplies early in 1944. The movement of the entire battalion personnel and equipment from the Tulagi area to Guadalcanal was completed in approximately 6 days aboard three LST's.

"A new camp was set up on the beach at Kukum to accommodate 1,200 men and 40 officers. The battalion duties were assigned by the public works division of the commander, Naval Base, Guadalcanal. In 2 months the battalion has cleaned up the unfinished priority projects in addition to numerous newly authorized projects assigned during this period. The duty hours of this battalion ran from 8 to 10 hours a day, 7 days per week for the first year, and for the last 5 months the hours were 8 hours per day, 6½ days per week.

"Just before the men embarked for home, Capt. Mark L. Halsay, Jr., United States Navy, commander of the naval base, sent them the following unit commendation:

"On the occasion of the completion of your work in this area, covering a period of 20 months, I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate you and the officers and enlisted men of your command for the splendid record which you have made and the outstanding reputation which your battalion enjoys. During this period your battalion has accomplished many outstanding feats of construction, too many to mention in detail, which will stand as a monument to your ability and efficiency for many years after the United States forces leave this area.

"Many of these construction jobs were completed under great difficulties, including bombing attacks by the enemy, in which 5 of your men were killed and about 35 wounded. In spite of these difficulties and dangers, and the impracticability of giving your men rehabilitation leave, your battalion continued to work at top efficiency until the day it was ordered to secure.

"The best wishes of this command for future success and continued usefulness to the naval service go with you and the personnel of your battalion."

NEGRO COAST GUARD MEN

Tribute was paid to Negroes in an official release on the one hundred and fifty-fifth anniversary of the Coast Guard, July 20, 1945.

"Approximately 4,000 Negro enlisted men, officers, and SPARS participated in the celebration, which honored the Nation's oldest fighting sea service and one of the world's most diversified fleets.

"One of the outstanding Negro heroes in the Coast Guard was 26-year-old Charles V. David, Jr., a mess attendant who gave his life rescuing his executive officer and others from the icy waters of the Atlantic during rescue operations of a torpedoed transport.

"The Navy and Marine Corps Medal, one of the highest naval awards, was presented to the Coast Guard man's widow, Mrs. Kathleen W. David, of 343 West One Hundred and Twenty-second Street, New York City, on June 20, 1944, by Rear Adm. Stanley V. Parker, district Coast Guard officer, with the Davids' 3-year-old son, Neil Adrian, standing by.

"Lt. R. W. Anderson, of 291 East Eighth Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., the Coast Guard officer whose life was saved by David's heroic act, was also present. Lieutenant Anderson, who had previously been decorated for his bravery during the dramatic rescue, paid tribute to the deceased:

"'David's bravery under the most hazardous conditions and his unselfishness in sacrificing himself was an inspiration to every officer and man on board the cutter. We were all impressed by his alertness, for his quick thinking, and heroic daring in face of certain death were responsible for the saving of the lives of many men, including myself, who would be dead today.'

"David was a mess attendant first class aboard a Coast Guard cutter that rescued nearly a hundred men from a torpedoed transport in the North Atlantic. In a heavy sea, with freezing temperatures hampering operations, David dived countless times into the sea, in total darkness, to haul survivors to safety.

"When the rescue operations were nearly completed, David noticed that Lieutenant Anderson was near exhaustion from his work on a life raft off the side of the cutter. Passing the word along to the bridge, David, himself near collapse from his efforts, dived overboard and hauled Lieutenant Anderson back aboard. He died shortly after from pneumonia, exhaustion, and exposure as the result of his heroic actions."

The citation accompanying the medal, signed by Secretary of the Navy James Forrestal for the President, reads in part:

"Quickly realizing that the benumbed and suffering men were too exhausted to climb aboard the rescue vessel because of the heavy seas and intensely cold wind, David unhesitantly volunteered to go over the side to assist them. Despite the rough, near-freezing water, and gale he worked tirelessly with several comrades until 93 survivors had been rescued from certain death in the steadily

mounting seas. His great courage and unselfish perseverance contributed to the saving of many lives and were in keeping with the highest traditions of the United States naval service."

THE MERCHANT MARINE

The contribution to victory of the Negroes who chose the merchant marine as their form of service has been a great one. It is significant that the records of the Maritime Commission, the War Shipping Administration, and the Coast Guard, the licensing and certificating authority for seamen, deliberately fail to include race and color data. Because of this lack of discrimination, it is impossible to determine the number of Negroes who served in the merchant service, the number who survived torpedoings or the number who were killed or injured through enemy action while delivering the supplies and men essential to the conduct of the war.

Negroes are known to have served in every capacity aboard ship; from master to ordinary seaman, chief engineer to wiper, and chief steward to messman. The 31 War Shipping Administration training schools all admit Negroes. The first Negro graduate of the Maritime Academy, Joseph B. Williams, of Annapolis, Md., went on active duty with the Navy and was the first Negro officer in the Naval Civil Engineer Corps.

There were four Liberty ships named for Negro merchant seamen lost on active service in the merchant marine. Fourteen Liberty ships were named for noted Negroes, and four Victory ships named for Negro colleges.

No vessel under War Shipping Administration control has ever sailed with an entire Negro crew and the good relations which existed among mixed crews were a surprise to many. The United Seamen's Service which operated hotels and recreation centers abroad for our merchant seamen reports that the crews of mixed race who sailed together, mixed excellently while ashore in foreign ports. All Brave Sailors, by John Beecher, published by L. B. Fischer, tells the story of the steamship *Booker T. Washington*, manned by a black and white crew under the command of the Negro master, Capt. Hugh Mulzac.

It is competently estimated that approximately 25,000 Negroes served in the merchant marine out of a total seagoing labor force of 250,000 men.

The Merchant Marine Distinguished Service Medal, the highest decoration, was awarded to Fred Carlos Archibald, of San Francisco.

"CITATION

"For distinguished service in the line of duty.

"For 18 months the ship in which he was serving operated in the Southwest Pacific under especially hazardous conditions, as it was at all times in the danger zone, was unescorted, and only lightly armed. In an attack on Port Darwin, and on the nine succeeding days, when most of the crew had left the ship, he with his captain and four officers and men, manned the two machine guns, and so successfully defended the ship that it was the only 1 of 12 merchant vessels in the harbor not destroyed. After the first attack, this small group protestingly left the ship upon orders of the military authorities, but subsequently returned, got underway, and took their ship out into the harbor each morning and returned to the dock each night to discharge cargo, so as not to endanger the dock during daylight. Because of the indomitable determination and courage of these six men, they succeeded in delivering the gasoline so vitally necessary to Army operations

"His loyalty to his ship and his devotion to duty have added another inspirational chapter to the history of the United States merchant marine."

Eight Commandments for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 4 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, on October 24 I submitted a resolution calling upon the Senate to go on record as asking that our delegates to the United Nations Organization work toward the creation of a world republic and world disarmament. At that time I had printed at my own expense copies of the speech which I had made, as well as the resolution. I started including a copy in each letter I sent out. From that humble beginning I have received requests for 60,000 copies of the resolution. I do not mean 60,000 individual requests, but I have had requests for copies in quantities ranging up to 5,000, to be distributed by various organizations.

At this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "A Young Soldier Gives You Eight Commandments for Peace," written by Capt. Richard C. Davids, and published in Better Homes and Gardens for December 1945.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A YOUNG SOLDIER GIVES YOU EIGHT COMMANDMENTS FOR PEACE

(By Capt. Richard C. Davids)

If ever man needs to think straight, the time is now.

More than the world needs strong, unselfish leaders, it needs clear-thinking and unselfish people.

For the world right now is coming to a maturity which can be the flowering of a genuine civilization—if the people of the United States and of Russia and Great Britain will make it so.

Dead ends of thinking are quick to trap you—as a few less fanatic Germans are beginning to realize—when you lose all sight of goals. So now is the time for you to formulate commandments of thought and action that will keep your thinking straight.

For already a crop of spellbinders and well-intentioned zealots is confounding the real road to world maturity with a tangle of crooked thinking that would do justice to a Goebbels.

In the frenzy of debate, the most honest man finds it all but impossible to keep to the course which certain truths, stripped to nakedness, demonstrate to be the true course toward an enlightened world.

Let's look at those truths, and when you're certain that they constitute the code for a mature world to live by, tack them to your kitchen wall, place them under the glass of your office desk, commit them to memory, so that during the morass of debate you can judge intelligently between what is wise and foolish, benign and dangerous. Use them as a master gage against which you judge debate and current history.

Let's proceed carefully, free of emotion-loaded words which confound. Let's admit at the start only those clearly defined ideas which need no argument.

1. DO NOT AGAIN TRY ISOLATION; TWICE IT HAS NOT WORKED

During World War I, 8,538,315 men died and 21,219,452 were wounded. Every last man died or was crippled for nothing. Those are cruel words with which to bury our dead. But no decent attempt was approved to prevent another war.

We tried isolation, failed to the tune of one-quarter of a million dead here and 10,000,000 dead the world over. Can one doubt the correct road?

We can never return to hermit-crab isolationism. Our world-wide fraternization must be genuine and complete—social, economic, and political.

2. LET NO MAN TELL YOU THE WORLD CANNOT UNITE; THERE IS ALREADY PROOF

There is nothing impossible about international teamwork. Russia, the largest country in the world, whose shores are washed by the Pacific, the Arctic, the Black Sea, and the Gulf of Finland, and stretching across two continents to form one-sixth of the world's land surface and take in one-twelfth of its people, has been unified into a single country, and the wars and bloodshed of a thousand years have been ended. Let no man tell you that the remainder of the world cannot unite.

3. GIVE LOYALTY, NOT TO NATIONS BUT TO MANKIND

National histories breed suspicion, distrust, a phony patriotism. People of a nation that worships gangsters and killers like Napoleon and Hannibal and Caesar can't help but be suckers for a brand-new faker with the same old snake-bite medicine of racial and religious intolerance. Heroes don't need to ride horses and brandish swords. Perhaps our truest heroes are among those unsung men who calmed a mob outide a city jail, or caused laborers and boss to bury the hatchet. Let's reappraise our own history and our own heroes. Let's take a lesson from the Chinese, whose greatest hero, a peaceful old man of 2,400 years ago, expounded the novel idea that man ought to love his brothers.

The word "patriotism" is one of the biggest hoaxes ever sold to a confused people. Tied to an idea, talk about sacred rights, and patriotic duties to family and home and country can sell the blackest lie for the whitest truth.

Whenever you hear the word "patriotic" ask your speaker, "Patriotic to what? To a self-seeking group who desires to perpetuate themselves? Or patriotic to the cause of decency and justice, and freedom for all people, black, white, yellow, red, and brown?"

As children we thought we were patriotic when we warred against the neighboring children, when we defended the high honor of our village against slander by the neighboring village. And there are children with gray beards in the Tennessee hills who believe with a certainty that they are patriotic to their family's high name when they kill and feud, generations on end.

4. FREE ALL COUNTRIES OF BOUNDARIES RESTRICTING TRADE

As children we used to draw a bold line in the dirt and dare a single comer to cross. A mature world could do infinitely better with its national boundaries than mimic the antics of 5-year-olds.

Europe must not and cannot be treated except as one cooperating whole, free of the strangle of national boundaries. Germany has no oil, Italy no coal, Czechoslovakia no seacoast. If those countries cannot get within their own boundaries the things they need to live, they'll have to trade. And if narrow boundaries and laws prevent that trading, of course, they'll bargain for more land, and fight for it.

There must be unrestricted trade, and eventually it will come, just as it did to the fabulous Union of States which never could exist because it wasn't "fundamentally sound" and was "against nature." You, by straight thinking, can unhinge the demagogs and speed the day of free-flowing trade.

Some may suffer temporarily, need to switch over to other work. But is this too high a price to pay? Is any inconvenience short of curtailing our freedom as high a price as what the world has just paid? Ten million dead. Fifty million dead, wounded, or missing. Can you convert those prices into dollars?

Competition helped make our country great. Won't that same competition by business the world over be healthy, permit smart management to make more profit, and reduce costs of goods as it has done here?

5. KNOW YOUR NEIGHBORS, AND YOU WILL CEASE TO FEAR AND HATE

There must be freer exchange of citizens between nations. Not only should we make it easier for Russians to enter our country but they should allow us easier access to Russia to tend our businesses, to study at the finest schools, and to settle there, if the place is to our liking.

The idea that the rest of the world would give its right arm to migrate to this country is an absurd bit of conceit. Since 1932 our trifling quotas have been only one-sixth to one-half filled.

When men travel and trade and live in other countries, even the least observant can see that men in Arabia are like men in Alabama—plenty good and plenty bad. There are straight-thinking Arabians as there are straight-thinking Alabamans. Remember the new kid who came to school? Until you beat him up and learned to know him better, you treated him as an outcast. It's easy to hate someone you don't know, and to teach others to hate as crazy mad as you. It's too easy to hate in the abstract, but did you ever talk to a Russian who had your brother's voice, your brother's thoughts, and his same warm-hearted friendliness? Once I guarded a German prisoner and learned how hard it is to hate a man face-to-face, a man who is good and clear-thinking.

6. BEWARE OF MEN AND THEIR IDEAS, NOT NATIONS

Wars are incubated not by one color of skin or roll of tongue, but by false ideals which hatch into false leaders. That is tremendously important to remember. Beware of men and their ideals, not nations. Men bound together by geography won't be completely good or bad, but men bound together because they fear, distrust, and hate alike may very well be.

Look closely at that man or band of men who talk fear, distrust, or hate of any nation or race. Don't make the mistake of looking too far—your neighbor next door, someone at the office or your club may be a far better Nazi than many Germans. You will probably find that your race-hater brands a nation with the same evil qualities with which he is endowed. If he blames the British with greed, you'll find he has more than his own share of greed. Look closely at the men you know who preach that the Jews are hell-bent on wrecking the world. They are unsuccessful men, not the captains of industry or business or science they would like to be. Rather than pin their failure on their own lack of brains and energy, which isn't at all pleasant, they choose Hitler's own scapegoat, the Jew.

The traitors of mankind are never exclusively one race or nation. They are those men and bands of men who whisper mistrust, suggest fear, and before long are shouting hate of races and nations. From nations we have nothing to fear, but beware those men and bands with diseased ideals and warped thinking who kindle mistrust and intolerance. They are the traitors of mankind.

7. RESORT TO INTERNATIONAL POLICE AND COURTS, NOT TO ARMED MIGHT

If we learn to recognize the traitors of mankind and their gullible followers, what then? How stop them and bring them to justice?

The answer is by an international police force. And let us never be confused between police force and standing army. A police force will root out evil-doers by name, single individuals whose crimes are obvious, or small bands of evil-doers whose crimes in deed and doctrine can be appraised by the courts, where unprejudiced thinking is a profession.

A police force can cope with half-crazed zealots before they spread their epidemic of mistrust and suspicion. It can deal with crooked-thinking bands of men whom the courts have proved to be dangerous.

There's an amazing amount of badness in us. One out of every 500 Americans has to spend all his time as a policeman to bawl out the rest of us for speeding, keep us out of our neighbor's silverware, and dissuade us from murder, rape, and arson. Something like one international policemen per 1,000 of us would probably do the job in the world community. Compare that ratio with the way your draft board picked your community clean of able-bodied young men. One in a thousand would be pretty small potatoes.

8. SIT NOT ON YOUR HAUNCHES IN DESPAIR; THIS IS MAN'S LAST CHANCE

You agree to the foregoing truths, but you smile indulgently and say, "Nice ideas. Wish I could live long enough to see them come true." Such indifference is criminal.

Here is the most vital truth of all—that a mature world community can, must, and will become reality.

Our so-called practical man a thousand years ago would have laughed at the hare-brained idea that nations could be united, the sun's circuit around the globe, into a British Empire. The same "practical" man was amused at the idyllic concept of uniting 13 scrappy colonies into a giant, fairly peaceful United States where State boundaries are no more important than fleeting signposts along the highways. A nation and a world can do anything it believes it can do. All that limits man is his own imagination.

If the American people can dig out their beliefs and give them an airing, they can help the world's people to know what they believe. They can begin a campaign of truth in diplomacy that will help eradicate suspicion, which is a requisite of war.

And when Americans do dig out those beliefs and strip them of emotion and prejudice and selfishness and "patriotism," they'll probably be surprised. They'll find some "everlasting truths" as dead as mackerels, as antiquated as the Great Wall of China and its charm against invasion.

The most significant changes don't come by war, but through changes in custom and habits of thinking. Without loss of blood, the Industrial Revolution shook the world to its foundation and boosted humanity to a plane of living unknown in world history.

Hopes and effort are better than despair—and despair is absolutely all that remains if we adopt the sit-on-your-haunches policy of noncooperation which has already offered up 50,000,000 dead and wounded in ghastly proof of its error.

There's no other course than to work together. We end war or we end mankind. This is our last chance.

Tribute to Robert H. Hinckley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 4 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial paying tribute to Robert H. Hinckley, formerly Director of Contract Settlement, which was published in the Washington Post yesterday morning.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. HINCKLEY RETIRES

The sixth report of the Director of Contract Settlement has just been released coincident with the return to private life of the Director himself, Robert H. Hinckley, who was appointed to that post a year and a half ago. This official record of accomplishment amply warrants President Truman's praise of Mr. Hinckley's "superior performance of a difficult task." Perhaps the greatest tribute that could be paid to the skill and energy with which the Director has discharged the duties of office is afforded by the absence of unfavorable publicity. Because the complicated work of settling terminated war contracts has proceeded smoothly and rapidly, the public is apt to forget that this work might have been as badly bungled as it was after the First World War, when there was no sound contract legislation and no competent administration of the law.

It was widely believed in the early stages of the war that the primary impediment to speedy postwar reconversion would be lack of working capital for financing the change-over to civilian production—a lack aggravated by delays in discharging contractors' claims against the Government. As it turned out, strikes have become the most formidable obstacle to speedy reconversion, not any lack of funds with which to finance reconversion. During the last quarter of 1945, indeed, contract settlements were delayed and plant clearance work halted in some cases because the settlement personnel was not permitted to enter plants while strikes were in progress.

A great deal remains to be done, but the record to date warrants the forecast that less than 5 percent of the 168,000 unsettled contracts pending at VJ-day or since terminated will remain open at the end of next June. But with the work of settlement so far along, the planning and over-all direction of the program which has been the task of Mr. Hinckley is, he feels, nearing completion. Having laid down policies and tested them, completion of the actual work of settlement can be left to an increasing extent to the contracting agencies, with such assistance as may be required from Mr. Hinckley's successor in office, the former Deputy Director of Contract Settlement H. Chapman Rose. It is to be regretted that men of Mr. Hinckley's caliber are being lost to the Government service. We would rather see them being promoted to other posts than going back to private business. Government needs them as never before.

Statement of Facts Relative to Strike of United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 4, 1946

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

1. UNITED ELECTRICAL RADIO AND MACHINE WORKERS OF AMERICA

Two dollars a day wage increase for 200,000 workers in 69 communities and in over 100 plants.

2. WHY $2 A DAY

(a) The average UE worker has suffered in many instances as high as 50-percent cut in take-home pay. Here are typical examples of six weekly pay checks of Robert Morrison, machine operator at the General Electric plant, Erie, Pa.:

1943: $48.55, 58.32, $64.19.
1945: $23.73, $29.02, $36.17.

The first paragraph contains pay checks for three typical weeks in 1943 when war production was in full swing. The second paragraph contains pay checks for three typical weeks in 1945 following VJ-day, August 15. Mr. Morrison has four small children and his rent is $35 a month.

(b) United States Office of Economic Stabilization estimates cost of living increase of 33 percent above 1941; CIO, 45 percent.

(c) Shifts to new jobs with lower basic hourly wage rates; cuts in incentive earnings.

(d) Loss of second and third shift differential, reduction in overtime.

3. WHAT DO THE COMPAN[illegible] OFFER?

General Electric: December 21 offered 10 percent increase then raised it to 10 percent for those making over $1—10 cents for those under conditioned on speed-up and wage rate cuts. Canceled contracts in existence for number of years.

Westinghouse: Has made no offer at all—canceled contracts in existence for number of years.

General Motors: Offered 10-percent increase, raised it to 13½ cents.

4. CAN COMPANIES AFFORD WAGE INCREASE?

	Profits before taxes 1935-39 (millions)	Profits before taxes 1940-44 (millions)	Profits after taxes 1935-39 (millions)	Profits after taxes 1940-44 (millions)
General Electric	$255	$1,000	$203	$314
Westinghouse	[1] 18	[2] 111	----------	[3] 33
General Motors	[4] 225	[2] 441	[4] 184	196

[1] Average for period 1935-39.
[2] 1944.
[3] $33,000,000 higher than any year in the period 1929-44.
[4] 1936-39.

NOTE.—GE reserves for 1944 were $262,000,000; Westinghouse, $127,000,000; General Motors $746,000,000.

5. WHAT HAS GOVERNMENT DONE TO SETTLE WAGE DISPUTE?

Union bargained for 4 months at own initiative; 3 weeks ago Secretary of Labor invited GE, Westinghouse, GM, nd UE to Washington for conferences; the union accepted, but companies refused invitation for 1 week then appeared in Washington to refuse mediation. UE kept the Government advised of developments. Three days before strike was scheduled to start, UE offered to all companies to postpone the strike if the companies would meet the offer of steel (15 cents) and negotiate the difference between 15 cents and 25 cents. The companies refused this offer. After fruitless meetings, the first strike in 9 years was called on January 15, 1946.

Communism Threatens the Peace of the World as Well as the Safety of America

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 4, 1946

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, communism is now threatening the peace of mankind throughout the world, by spreading subversive doctrines, stirring up strife, and attempting to undermine the various governments—especially those of the English-speaking nations of the earth.

While that is going on abroad, the Communists and their fellow travelers are constantly busy in this country, fomenting trouble and stirring up strife throughout the land.

They and their fellow travelers continue to attack the Committee on Un-American Activities because of the stand the members of the committee take for the protection of American institutions.

The members of that committee are doing everything they possibly can to protect this Government against those subversive attacks by elements which want to destroy it and set up a soviet system in its place.

That is the object of the Communists and their fellow travelers, in and out of Congress, as I will now show.

Mr. Speaker, recently there was a change in the organizational set-up of the Communist Party in the United States.

Its present head, William Z. Foster, is one of the most dangerous proponents of revolution in this country that has ever been brazen enough to come before the American people and expound his subversive theories in plain and simple language. Foster recently replaced Earl Browder as head of the Communist Party because Browder was not revolutionary enough.

Before discussing Foster's revolutionary statements, it seems fitting that a statement of the Honorable Charles Evans Hughes be discussed; since it appears that some of our other law makers have never heard of Mr. Hughes' statement, I will repeat it. Here it is in his own words:

It will be seen that the question of whether Communist programs contemplate the use of force and violence has been passed upon by every class of tribunal which would pass upon it, namely, Federal and State courts, administrative tribunals and legislative committees of both Federal and State governments, and in every case the result has been in support of the position that force and violence are inseparable from Communist programs.

This statement was contained in Mr. Hughes' report to the United States Senate on January 21, 1924, in his capacity as Secretary of State. Mr. Hughes also said that the Communist Party in the United States is an organization created by and completely subservient to a foreign organization striving to overthrow the existing social and political order of this country.

It appears that Mr. Hughes' report has been forgotten as well as the public testimony of William Z. Foster, the present head of the Communist Party.

It is a matter of public record that on December 5, 1930, Mr. William Z. Foster testified under oath that he was a member of the Communist Party and at one time had been a member of the International Workers of the World, or as it is better known, the IWW. During his testimony, Foster said, in speaking of the American Revolution, or the war for independence, as we call it:

These early revolutionists found that government is not a matter of majority votes, but organized power which does not give way to the desires of the majority but only to a greater power.

In other words, Mr. Foster compares his proposed internal revolution in the United States with a fight fought by the forefathers of this country for freedom. Mr. Foster in his revolution merely wants to subject the descendants of the war for independence to the domination of a foreign ideology.

Mr. Foster is a standing candidate for nomination for the President of the United States under the banner of his party, the Communist Party which, according to his party's constitution, uses the hammer and sickle as its emblem. The constitution of this party, the Communist Party, is designed to replace the Constitution of the United States, for which men fought and died in the American Revolution, as well as every other war from that day to this.

This American Constitution adopted by the people of America after the American Revolution, uses the Stars and Stripes as its emblem, and not the hammer and sickle. The money issued by our Government functioning under the American Constitution says "In God we trust," but under another constitution it would probably say, provided there is any money, "In the loss of liberty, we glory."

With reference to Mr. Foster's views on a presidential election, it seems fitting that his views be expressed, and according to his own words. During the testimony referred to, Mr. Foster was asked the question, "You made an acceptance speech on May 25, 1928, when you accepted the nomination for President?" Mr. Foster's reply to this question was, "Yes." He was then asked whether or not in part he made this statement: "No Communist, no matter how many

votes he should secure in a national election, could, even if he would, become President of the present Government. When a Communist heads a Government of the United States—and that day will come just as surely as the sun rises—that government will not be a capitalistic government, but a soviet government and behind this government will stand the red army to enforce the dictatorship of the proletariat."

Mr. Foster's answer was: "I made that; I think I made that. It sounds like what I said. I do not know that is word for word, but that is in substance what I said." In other words, the ballot to Mr. Foster means nothing, the will of the majority means nothing, but the President appointed by the revolutionists will replace the duly elected president of the majority. These words of warning from Mr. Foster, should be heeded; he means that it is not necessary to have a majority in order to succeed in a revolution.

None of us knows how large the Communist Party is in the United States, but please note that when one of Mr. Foster's comrades named Carr spoke at the Moscow conference in 1922, he said:

> Many of the comrades were convinced that it was essential to organize a legal party. The underground party was to be continued and strengthened, but, in addition, a legal party was to be constructed, as an instrument of the Communist Party, that we might be able to work more effectively among the masses.

From this it is pretty definitely indicated that the Communist Party has concealed memberships and an underground group who subtly prescribe to its communistic doctrines.

With further reference to Mr. Foster's views on the American flag, the following extracts from his testimony regarding the flag of the Communist Party appear interesting. In answer to a question propounded to him by the chairman of the investigating committee, Mr. Foster said that the more advanced workers of this country look upon the Soviet Union as the r country. Then in answer to this question, "Do they, the workers, look upon the Soviet flag as their flag?" Mr. Foster replied:

> The workers of this country and the workers of every country have only one flag and that is the red flag. That is the flag of the proletarian revolution; it was also, incidentally, the flag of the American Revolution in its earlier stages. The red flag has been the flag of revolution for many years before the Russian revolution.

Mr. Foster then says:

> The workers, the revolutionary workers, in all the capitalist countries are an oppressed class who are held in subjection by their respective capitalist governments and their attitude toward these governments is the abolition of these governments and the establishment of Soviet governments.

Mr. Foster then says:

> I stated very clearly the red flag is the flag of the revolutionary class, and we are part of the revolutionary class. And all capitalist flags are flags of the capitalist class, and we owe no allegiance to them.

In other words, Mr. Foster and his party, the Communist Party, in addition to being revolutionists, openly say that the government of and the flag of the United States has no meaning to them.

The Communist Party, and Mr. Foster pretend to do everything in their power to preserve the American Bill of Rights which permits them, in their opinion, to carry of their gigantic and well-defined conspiracy to abolish the Bill of Rights after they have taken over the government of this country. For instance, this is what Mr. Foster has to say about the rights of individuals once he has established the Soviet form of government in the United States. The question asked him was, "if we are correctly informed—and possibly we are not—any man who would rise on the street corner in Russia, and inveigh against the Soviet government would be taken out and shot? What about that?" Mr. Foster's reply was:

> Yes. I will explain that. The situation of the Soviet Union is quite different than the situation in the United States. In the United States, the whole productive processes, the industries are owned by private capitalists and exploited for the benefit of a small ruling group of capitalists, and the government is the instrument for maintaining this exploitation, in which the millions of workers are exploited and forced into unemployment, and all the conditions that they comprehend. In the Soviet Union, the industries are owned by the workers, the government is their government, and it is carried on for the benefit of the masses. In America the worker who stands up and proposes the advocacy of the Soviet form of government and the struggle for the improvement of his conditions, is taking the stand on the side not only of the interests of the working class, but of the whole progress of human society The man who rises, the capitalist agent who rises in the Soviet Union and proposes to overthrow the Soviet Government and to reestablish capitalism there, proposes to turn the wheels of society backwards. The worker in America who fights for the program of the Communist Party is a fighter for the progress of society in general. The capitalist who proposes the otherthrow of the Soviet Government is an enemy of the human society.

In other words, if you believe in our form of government, you are a capitalist who is entitled to no rights, under the Bill of Rights, and who will be taken out and shot if he so much as says "I believe in private enterprise." A soviet government in America would establish the block-by-block, street-by-street system of espionage which is in vogue in the dictator nations of Europe. Who knows how many persons would be considered enemies of the state under the block-by-block espionage system?

Mr. Foster and his Communist cohorts believe that capitalistic nations are dead and giving way to the "newer and higher social order," which is socialism. Did not Hitler say that about certain governments, too? It appears that one capitalistic nation, the United States of America, had a large share in the winning of two wars just recently, and that Nation is not giving way to socialism, but has been giving away a lot of things to some other nations in order to keep them alive.

Remember that what the Communists mean by the capitalistic system is the right to own private property—the right to own your home, your farm, your store, or your factory. All this would be swept away under a Communist regime and every individual would become a slave of the state and told what to do by a few self-appointed commissars.

There is no more freedom, there is no more liberty, in a Communist country today than there is in the penitentiary of New York, Mississippi, Ohio, Illinois, or any other State, and not near as much religion.

The Communists' views on religion are also interesting. In his testimony Mr. Foster says:

> Our party considers religion to be the opium of the people, as Karl Marx has stated, and we carry on propaganda for the liquidation of these prejudices among the workers.

In other words he would make an atheist of every individual in America, if he could.

He goes on to say that—

> Many workers join the Communist Party who still have some religious scruples, or religious ideas; but a worker who will join the Communist Party must necessarily be in the process of liquidating his religious beliefs and, if he still has any lingerings when he joins the party, he will soon get rid of them.

He also says that—

> In my opinion, a member of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union who would be married in a church would not be of any value to the Communist Party.

Mr. Foster and his Communist cohorts therefore would eliminate religion; this would be in addition to the abolition of free speech and freedom of the press under the Communist conspiracy.

The Communists, according to their own statements, say that "We exist in every form of American life, we are in the theater, the motion-picture industry, the magazines and the newspapers, the radio, the unions, the schools, the church and in politics." They also say that "we publish more pamphlets than any organization in the world."

They hate the Committee on Un-American Activities for exposing their subversive activities in these fields.

All of these activities further their well-defined conspiracy to overthrow this Government and do away with the Bill of Rights and the Constitution of the United States, as well as the right to own private property.

In closing, it should be said that anyone who opposes these Communists is called a "Fascist" because he is an enemy of the communistic state which they hope to set up.

They brand the white people of the Southern States as "native Fascists" for resisting their treasonable activities.

They call everyone a "native Fascist" who opposes or exposes their subversive activities.

That is the reason for these attacks on the Committee on Un-American Activities.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Civil-Service Funds for Service to Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 4, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

UNITED STATES
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., January 25, 1946.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. McCORMACK: I have your letter of January 7, 1946, requesting information regarding the insufficiency of funds available to the Civil Service Commission for rendering adequate service to veterans, as indicated in a resolution recently adopted by the Disabled American Veterans, of Massachusetts.

In response, let me assure you that we are all very concerned regarding the situation which has developed, not only in our central office, but throughout our regional offices, such as are located in Boston and 12 other major centers of Federal Government activity throughout the country, as a result of a substantial reduction in the funds available to the Commission at the same time that demands upon the Commission for rendering service to returning veterans has been increasing rapidly.

As an indication of the exact status of our available resources, in comparison with what we have estimated our requirements to be, may I cite the following record of our requests for funds for the fiscal year 1946 and the grants which have been made available to us:

1946 estimates and appropriations

	Requested of Bureau of the Budget	Allowed by Bureau of the Budget and requested of Congress	Allowed by Congress
1. Regular annual Budget (filed Sept. 15, 1945)	$19,522,363	$17,048,000	$14,705,882
2. First Deficiency (Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1945) (filed with Bureau of the Budget June 7, 1945)	1,859,000	1,311,118	[1] 670,000
Total available			15,375,882
3. First supplemental surplus appropriation rescission bill, 1946 (request filed Aug. 20, 1945)	[2]	[2]	[4] −2,032,000
Total available			13,343,882
4. First deficiency appropriation bill, 1946:			
(a) Request of Sept. 26, 1945	[3] 3,573,153	None	[5]
(b) Request of Dec. 3, 1945	1,600,000	1,600,000	600,000
Total available			13,943,882

[1] Totally for fees for medical examinations for veterans.
[2] That full amount of present appropriation be retained.
[3] Same as requested.
[4] In the first supplemental surplus appropriation rescission bill the Congress rescinded $2,032,000. While this bill failed of enactment, a Budget reserve of $2,032,000 has been established at the direction of the President.
[5] This is the amount requested for regular functions. An item of $584,822 for the Panama Canal construction annuity fund was also included in the request. This was allowed by the Bureau of the Budget in full and by the Congress in the amount of $510,000.
[6] Not submitted to Congress by Bureau of the Budget.

As a result of this drastic decrease in our available funds, the Commission has found it necessary to reduce personnel from the peak of 7,500 on its rolls just prior to VE-day to less than 4,750 on December 31, 1945, and a still further reduction to 3,889 has been ordered effective February 1, 1946. In our field offices, where the bulk of our veteran contacts are handled, this reduction has been effected largely since VJ-day, with the result that in most of the offices, as in the case of the Boston office, the personnel has been cut more than 50 percent since September 1. It has also been necessary to abandon 262 field stations which were located at various large employment centers throughout the regions.

At the same time we have been faced with an influx of applications from veterans being released from the armed forces and Federal employees separated because of reduction in force in other Government agencies. Even though the Commission, upon the cessation of hostilities, closed all examinations to the general public and established the policy of accepting applications only from veterans entitled to reopen examinations and Government employees separated for reduction in force, as long as these sources provided sufficient eligibles to meet the needs of the service, we are receiving thousands of applications each month from veterans. Also the number of veterans calling at the regional offices for information, advice, and the granting of veteran preference, has increased manyfold. Our correspondence from Members of Congress and individuals has increased to such an extent that we are rapidly creating a backlog of truly serious proportions.

In our veterans counseling and information work we have tried to take care of the veteran with a minimum of delay. However, we realize that veterans have had to take their turn and have had to wait some time before getting the information or advice they sought. This has been unavoidable because the number of veterans visiting our offices has been very large and we would have to have a tremendous staff of counselors to take of the veterans without delay. I can assure you that we are anxious to furnish the veteran every possible assistance and are endeavoring to staff our veterans counseling and information sections with as many qualified counselors as our funds will permit. After repeated reductions in our personnel in the face of this growing work load, it is not possible for us to make available sufficient personnel to handle all those who come to us for assistance without frequent and regrettable delays.

We have streamlined many of our operations and have revised many official regulations in the interest of getting the utmost speed and efficiency into our procedures, particularly as they relate to expediting the placing of veterans in Federal employment. To date, however, these have not afforded relief sufficient to offset the crippling effects of the curtailment in our total funds and personnel.

I trust that this information will be helpful to you. If there is any additional information desired, we shall be glad to furnish it to you.

Very respectfully,
WILLIAM C. HULL,
Executive Assistant.

Price Increases and Inflation

REMARKS
OF
HON. ROGER C. SLAUGHTER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 4, 1946

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, those of us who are interested in holding the line against inflation cannot but be alarmed at the proposal which has come up in renewed form to try to buy some temporary industrial peace by permitting the price of steel to rise $4.75 per ton, which, of course, is going to invite inflation. I have a letter here this morning which I am including as part of my remarks from a constituent. I have deleted the name of the sender, but I will be glad to show it to any Member who may be interested in seeing it. It is from a white-collar worker, a woman who lives in my district. The letter shows very clearly that the white-collar people of this country are at last becoming aware of the danger that they are facing if inflation comes.

The letter is as follows:

JANUARY 30, 1946.

The Honorable ROGER C. SLAUGHTER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you because I am one of that body of unorganized labor dependent upon a middle-class business for my livelihood. You are familiar with the problems of organized labor and big business, but a realization of their effect upon we in-betweens can come to you only through such individual appeals as mine.

My personal story is representative of thousands of women who are faced with a choice between an unhappy change of jobs for financial security or a lowered standard of living.

I have worked my way through 5 years of college and have a bachelor of science degree in textiles and clothing from Iowa State College. As a result of my education and special talents, I have chosen millinery as my trade. In the course of 3 years I have been through an apprenticeship and have been a maker for over two of these years. My job meets all of my requirements except that of pay. For the last year my wage rate has been 55 cents per hour, which economists have said is the lowest rate under which living standards can be maintained, and yet my living standard is above average. I have maintained an apartment, a well-balanced diet, and a wardrobe commensurate with my fashion career. Beyond the bare necessities I have a box seat to the Town Hall series, subscriptions to several periodicals, insurance sufficient for my needs, and a small savings account. This can be done on an income of $1,445 per year.

But if the price of food continues to rise and my rent were raised even $5 per month,

my wages will not rise; so the alternative is a lowered standard of living. The OPA has been the only reassurance that my cost of living would not so greatly exceed my income that I would be forced to give up a trade for which I have prepared for 8 years. I say, continue the OPA until labor and capital have agreed through arbitration and fact finding designed to prevent inflation.

What labor needs is not a union to blindly incite them in a quest for a few more dollars, but an organization to educate them in the real value of their income, whatever it may be. Freedom from want and freedom from fear are really what we are all seeking. The health of a human being is first judged by whether or not his weight is constant, so the health of a nation is determined by the stability of the general level of prices.

Sincerely yours.

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a splendid speech, Justice for Poland, made over Station WSPR, Springfield, Mass., on December 9, 1945, by our former colleague, Hon. William J. Granfield, now chief justice of district court of Springfield, Mass., under the auspices of the Polish-American Congress, western Massachusetts branch:

JUSTICE FOR POLAND

(By Judge William J. Granfield)

Throughout the 1,000 years of her recorded history, Poland has been subjected to pressure on all its national borders. Her unfortunate geographical location in the very center of Europe, with virtually no defensible frontiers, has invited aggression from the west since the days of Otto I down to those of Hitler and from the east aggression since the days of Genghis Khan to those of Stalin. Added to this she suffered from periodic invasions from the north and from the south.

And yet, for 1,000 years Poland has served as the bastion of western civilization and the safeguard of Christendom in Europe, repelling one furious assault after another. Despite the exacting price in land, in life, and national wealth Poland has always had to pay for being the key to Europe, so dynamic a nation was she that the years of peaceful endeavors brought her achievements unparalleled in the history of the world.

Through centuries, Poles have contributed their share to the progress of mankind. Copernicus, Mme. Curie, Kosciuszko, Pulaski, Chopin, Paderewski, and Joseph Conrad are names to conjure with. Let us not forget that the Polish king, Jan Sobieski, saved Europe from the Turks in 1684. Let us remember the two Nobel prize winners for literature, Sienkiewicz and Reymont; the anthropologist, Bronislaw Malinowski; the discoverer of vitamins, Dr. Funk. And let us mention such giants of the musical world as Wieniawski, Szymanowski, Moszkowski, Rodzinski, Stokowski, Landowska, Hofmann, and Rubinstein.

THE CRIME OF 1772

Tolerant and freedom-loving Poland was in many ways so far ahead of the times in her love of culture and peace that her three powerful autocratic neighbors, Prussia, Austria, and Russia, took advantage of her weakness and in 1772 despoiled her for the first time, committing what President Wilson characterized "one of the greatest crimes in history."

For more than a century Poland was virtually wiped off the map of Europe. But the amazing thing about the Poles is that regardless of the odds against them, they never gave up, never took the easiest way out. Even during the long black-out of the partitions, the people of Poland demonstrated their will to be free by staging a bloody insurrection once every generation and by waging an unyielding underground fight for freedom and independence.

Poland, however, furnished the best proof of her vitality in the 20-year interval between World War I and World War II. It must be borne in mind that when Poland began to function as an independent state in November 1918, she had to start from a condition of utter feebleness.

THE RECONSTRUCTION DECADES

Poland received very little succor and aid from abroad in rebuilding her shattered economy. Yet in those 20 years Poland accomplished the impossible. She reduced illiteracy among her young people to a fraction of 1 percent. She brought under cultivation more than 11,000,000 acres of fallow land. She parceled out more than 11,000,000 acres of the large estates to the peasants. Her rolling stock was the envy of Europe. Her fleet increased from a few ships to 500 merchant vessels which plied the seven seas. Along her seacoast of a few miles she constructed her own modern port of Gdynia and turned it into the fifth seaport in Europe. Poland raised three times as many potatoes as the whole of the United States, more cattle than Great Britain, as much wheat and rye as France. She ranked fourth in coal export and fifth in zinc export. Her persistent industry, ladies and gentlemen, in the rehabilitation and reconstruction of her nation by her people was unexcelled by any nation in the history of this world.

Poland was especially proud of her progressive labor legislation in which she truly led the world. Labor unions were recognized by law as early as 1919. Health insurance, accident insurance, disability and old-age pensions were compulsory for the alleviation of all working people. Every factory employing 100 workers was required by law to maintain a nursery for the children of employed mothers. White-collar workers received a minimum of a month's paid vacation. Three months' severance pay was also provided for by statute.

The Poles were just beginning to reap the benefits of two decades of intensive effort when catastrophe struck again. Preferring to see their life work wrecked rather than compromise with their honor, the Poles dared to say "No" to Hitler, and again they paid a fearful price. Alone and pitifully unprepared, they resisted the vastly superior and ruthless forces of Germany in 1939 for more than a month. Fighting with their backs to the wall, they saw their mighty eastern neighbor, Russia, join the Nazis in partitioning their land along the Ribbentrop-Molotov line.

LOVERS OF FREEDOM

However, when the Polish campaign was over, the Poles showed their true mettle and their great love of freedom. Deported to slave labor in Germany or to the tundras of Siberia, killed inside concentration camps or ghetto walls, shot during manhunts or deliberately starved to death, the men, women, and children of Poland have suffered as never before in that country's tragic history.

In the 5½ years of German rule by terror the Nazis could not find a Quisling or a Laval in Poland. Marked for extermination, the Poles unrelentingly fought back. Inside Poland was organized an underground state which improvised methods of sabotage, published 120 secret newspapers, and recruited in the face of close German surveillance a regular home army to fight the Nazis. The world has paid little notice to their supreme act of sacrifice—the 63-day Warsaw uprising in 1944 in the course of which those parts of the Polish capital that escaped destruction in 1939 were leveled. A quarter of a million Poles laid down their lives in those terrible 63 days, hoping against hope that the aid promised them would materialize.

Fourth in size among the fighting forces of the United Nations, they shed their blood generously in the Battle of France, at Narvik, at Tobruk and El Gazala, at Monte Cassino, and in the great invasion. The Polish air force in the RAF destroyed more than a thousand German planes and the Polish Navy won more British decorations than any other Allied sea force in the recent war.

ATLANTIC CHARTER THEIR HOPE

In all these years of bitter fighting and suffering, the Poles drew courage from the noble principles of the Atlantic Charter and the pronouncements of Allied statesmen. They hoped that their sacrifices would bring them not only liberation but internal political liberty as well and the right to organize their life without outside interference, on a democratic basis.

A Soviet-dominated government, the presence of Soviet secret police and of Soviet troops, economic chaos, the absence of a free press, and the denial of political freedom—these are some of the reasons why the bulk of Poland's army and of the displaced persons prefer the uncertainty of self-imposed exile to a return to their Communist-ridden homeland.

The Atlantic Charter provides that all people shall have the right to self-determination. The Polish people were not consulted at Yalta when the three powers decided to turn the Moscow-created Lublin committee into a provisional government of national unity. Poland has been a loyal and brave ally. She deserves to be treated as such. She should not be punished for her adherence to the principles of a high idealism and for her belief in the triumph of right over might.

If we are to remain at peace with our conscience, if we are to feel that this war has not been fought in vain, we must demand justice for Poland.

In Defense of Our Boys Who Want To Come Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1946

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, so much has been written and said in the last few weeks about the so-called hysteria of our soldiers to get home, and of their families to get them home, always with the inference, direct or indirect, that these men and their families simply do not know what it is all about, that they have no conception of our responsibilities here, there, and all over the world. Yet, almost without exception, the one basic fact that is fundamental to the whole question is overlooked or deliberately ignored. These men, soldiers and officers alike, who have expressed their impatience with delays

in returning them home, were drafted out of civilian life, out of schools, colleges, private jobs, away from wives, parents, and children, to fight our war against the Axis; not to occupy Germany for 15 or 100 years, or Austria, Japan, Korea, Burma, China, the Philippines, or any other of the many places where our forces are still scattered.

One amazing thing about the present situation is that anyone should be surprised at what has happened. Anyone who had the slightest understanding of American psychology should have realized that the discontent and these demonstrations were inevitable. According to reliable Army figures there have been 800,000 enlistments in the Regular Army since VJ-day, and there are still more than 4,200,000 men in the Army who were drafted to fight the war, making a total of more than 5,000,000 still under arms in the Army.

General MacArthur was undoubtedly right when he said he would be able to hold Japan with 250,000 trained regulars. He knew that draftees and reserves were not the men to do it, though this expression of opinion by this fine, experienced officer immediately brought down the wrath of the little men in our State Department—jealous of their plan to regiment and keep regimented our young men. The problem of occupying our third of Germany is far less difficult than the problem of Japan with its 60,000,000 people, and it would be stupid to say we would require more troops for our one-third of Germany than for all of Japan. In other words, not more than 500,000 Regular troops should be required for both Germany and Japan, and we already have 800,000 enlisted for that purpose. Then what is the sense of keeping the other 4,000,000 men still under arms? How foolish for Army officers in Washington to talk about sending fresh draftees, boys 18 years old, as replacements for the men who should be sent home. No 18-year-old boy is qualified in any way to do this job, which requires maturity and judgment. It is a job for a professional soldier, and yet we wonder why occupation with young draftees is not a success.

We constantly hear loose talk about our foreign commitments. What are they? The American people do not know and have never been told what our policy is—if there is any. The officers of the Army General Staff and the little men in the State Department all disagree with each other. One says the marines are in China to disarm the Japs; the very next man quoted—a Congressman who happens to be touring the Far East for some investigating committee—says: "The marines must be kept in China for many years as a stabilizing influence." Is it any wonder that servicemen and their families are confused and resentful?

We are told our men must guard our war materials in friendly countries scattered to the far corners of the world. Is it fair to keep the homes, lives, educations, careers of these men who were drafted to fight interrupted indefinitely because the Army or the Foreign Liquidation Commission cannot make up their minds how they are going to dispose of these materials?

To say that these demonstrations are leftwing-inspired is just silly, though of course the leftists will try to take advantage of them. These men are simply tired of being put off and their return delayed for one excuse or another, most of them with nothing to do worth doing, or knowing that what they are told to do should not be their job to do. It is all very well for men and women in comfortable jobs at home, in government, or out, to criticize these soldier demonstrations as hysterical, when neither they nor their sons, nor their fathers are being affected by the ineptitude, inefficiency, and stupidity of the bureaucrats in Washington.

What this situation cries aloud for is for the American people to recognize the fact: Since the occupation of Japan requires only 250,000 regular troops and the occupation of our third of Germany requires not more than that number, therefore, every man who is not a volunteer in the regular army should be sent home immediately.

China Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of February 1, 1946:

CHINA PROGRESS

The People's Consultative Conference has taken a second step toward Chinese unity. All those interested in a stable far eastern peace—and Americans are especially concerned—will cheer this progress. We know, however, that the road ahead in China is still a long one, mined with factionalism, rutted with inefficiency and worse. All the patriotism and wisdom which Chiang Kai-shek and other leaders can summon will be required to make the new truce work.

Last night's agreement provides an interim coalition government and the method of choosing the National Assembly, which will meet in May to write a new constitution. This political agreement, in turn, was made possible by the earlier military truce brought about by our General Marshall.

In brief, Chiang's Kuomintang gives up its one-party totalitarian position and the Chinese Communists agree to the merger of their troops into a reorganized national army. In the temporary coalition cabinet the Kuomintang gives up seven or eight seats and creates several new ones, so that the total can be divided equally between itself and a combination of all other parties. In the national assembly the Kuomintang is to have a plurality, but not enough to steamroller the others. So-called democratic minority parties will hold the balance of power between the Kuomintang and Communists.

If Chiang is able to keep his promises China soon will have a representative government, individual rights and civil liberties. At best it is difficult to change overnight from a dictatorship to even a half-way democracy. Chiang faces added difficulties. The old guard in his own party has fattened too long on power and privilege to welcome change. And the Communists, who have been running their own dictatorship in the north even more tightly than Chiang, are not likely to be so enthusiastic about civil liberties for others when they are inside the government as when they were on the outside.

Probably Russia will be the determining factor. If Russia considers Chinese unity to be in her own long-run interest—as we believe it to be—Stalin may tell his boys to be good. Otherwise, they will have plenty of opportunities to wreck Chiang Kai-shek's plan for national unity.

Joseph V. Moreschi, General President, International Hod Carriers, Building and Common Laborers' Union of America, Vigorously Supports 65-Cent Minimum-Wage Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1946

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Joseph V. Moreschi, general president of International Hod Carriers, Building and Common Laborers' Union of America, which has been made a part of the hearings before the House Labor Committee on the proposed 65-cents-per-hour minimum-wage bill. This statement sets forth in detail in a very direct and forceful manner the feeling of the members of one of the largest unions in this country.

The following is Mr. Moreschi's statement:

This statement is being presented for and on behalf of the International Hod Carriers, Building and Common Laborers' Union of America, an organization composed of approximately 300,000 unskilled, semiskilled, and skilled workers. This organization is an affiliate of the American Federation of Labor and its membership extends to every State of the Union.

We unhesitatingly endorse and urge the enactment of the proposed 65-cent minimum-wage law (S. 1349) now being considered by your committee.

In presenting this statement, we desire to point out that our unskilled labor members are already enjoying an average $1-an-hour rate. This standard is due to harmonious labor relations between employer and employee and as a result of orderly collective bargaining carried on over a long period of years.

We are justly proud of our record of achievement. We have been free of strikes and our record of production before, during, and after the war speaks for itself.

More than 100,000 of our members served in the armed forces. Hundreds made the supreme sacrifice and hundreds of others were given special citations for bravery in combat.

On the home front, all of our local unions and individual members bought bonds, gave blood to the blood banks, and in divers ways

contributed to the ultimate victory of our armed forces.

As good, loyal Americans, we feel duty bound to plead in behalf of the unorganized millions who are now suffering from substandard wages.

While the majority of laborers who are receiving substandard wages of less than 65 cents an hour are situated in the South, it is only fair to state that in isolated cases, there is a minority of workers in other sections of the Nation who are just as unfortunately handicapped.

It should also be pointed out here that in the South our organization has been able to substantially advance the wages of laborers from starvation to a minimum subsistence level.

The exceptions that cause us alarm are some few localities in the Southern States and, quite frankly, we fear that employing interests will endeavor to cause the present deplorable minimum to become the Statewide maximum in this group of States.

To be specific, Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas still have communities where wage rates on projects financed wholly or in part by Federal funds are substantially lower than the proposed 65-cent rate.

That laborers who were strongly organized have been denied equity in wage adjustments may be demonstrated by citing adjustments under the shipbuilding stabilization program to which the Federal Government procurement agencies were parties.

Mechanics in the South were advanced from $1.07 an hour to $1.20 an hour, bringing about uniformity of rates on a national basis while laborers were advanced from 54 cents an hour to 63 cents an hour. This 63-cent hourly rate for laborers in the South stood throughout the war as compared with 88.7 cents per hour for laborers doing the same class of work on the Pacific coast. This gross inequity was due to pressure of Southern shipyard operators who looked eagerly forward to holding down wages after the war.

Incidentally, it occurs to us that stabilization could have been best approached on the basis of a cents-per-hour in lieu of percentage basis of increase due to the fact that the low-income wage earner needed a greater increase than the higher wage group, as he was already suffering from increased prices of the basic commodities.

In arriving at minimum rates, it must also be borne in mind that the low-income group is the first to suffer from unemployment as they have no accumulated savings. They are also the first to feel the pinch of less carry-home pay as a result of the loss of overtime.

In substantiation of the argument presented herewith, I cite to you the Wage Report of the War Labor Board, dated February 22 1945, page 24:

"3. Substandards: It must be recognized that the situation of the lower-income wage and salary workers, upon whom the increase in the cost of living has fallen with disproportionate severity, has remained unsatisfactory under the wartime economy. This situation deserves the most careful consideration as we pass from war to peace."

Quoting further from the same report, we note:

"Legislative possibilities: For the most part the economic status of the 'unorganized millions' referred to in the President's message above can be improved only by legislative action, chiefly on the part of local governments. There are other millions of low-paid industrial wage earners whose cases, while falling under the War Labor Board's jurisdiction, never reach the Board and whose prospects for economic advancement are not favorable. Their status could most rapidly and effectively be improved by increasing the minimum wage requirements of the Fair Labor Standards Act."

We concur in this report and particularly stress the last sentence quoted; i. e., "Their status could most rapidly and effectively be improved by increasing the minimum wage requirements of the Fair Labor Standards Act."

That the majority of all the people favor the establishment of a 65-cent hourly minimum rate was borne out by the Gallup poll published in August 1945 that indicated a substantial majority favored the proposal.

That no relief may be expected by State legislation is indicated by the fact that only two Southern States have minimum-wage legislation and these laws are wholly inadequate to cope with the situation.

That poor health, poor education, and poor housing go hand in hand with low wages is graphically portrayed as follows:

In the South where wages are miserably low, we find:

Fifty percent of draftees rejected for poor health as compared with 35 percent non-South.

Twenty-five percent of southerners over 25 years of age with less than 5 years of schooling as compared with 10 percent non-South.

Fifty percent poor housing in South as compared with 19 percent non-South.

That present minimum-wage rates are entirely too low is recognized strongly by leading industrialists who point out:

1. High incomes, immense pent-up wants assure a high, continuing level of demand.
2. High income means high employment.
3. High employment will encourage spending of income and expansion of credit buying.
4. Rising rates of pay will tend to cushion the decline from current dollar income.

The Committee for Economic Development, in its News for December 1945, has pointed out in a most convincing manner that by doubling income we double consumption. It points out that the $50-a-week family spends 74 percent more for food than the $25-a-week family, 105 percent more for clothing, 112 percent more for home furnishings, and 167 percent more for formal education.

The enactment of this legislation will mean good prices for the farmer, stable profits for businessmen, and a higher standard of living for those who need it most.

Even though this proposed legislation becomes law, the average low-wage worker representing a family of four would enjoy only a three-quarters minimum living. This reasoning is arrived at as follows:

If you and your family all enjoy good health, you may skimp and try to save $2 a week. Then come the deductions for social security, etc. With seasonal lay-offs, you cannot expect to work more than 50 weeks. After deductions, you find you must get along on $1,000 a year—you, your wife, and two children.

Out of this $1,000 you will have to pay 1945 prices. Your $1,000 a year, or $83 a month, will buy only $69 worth of necessities. This means your 65 cents an hour today is exactly what 46 cents an hour was in 1939.

Best estimates are that the average family of four would require a wage of 87 cents an hour. You therefore find that you must try and exist on three-fourths of a minimum living.

Then, we ask, is it unfair to ask Congress to support the proposed 65-cent minimum wage law?

Again, we stress the fact that we, as an organization, have far less to gain from proposed minimum wage of 65 cents than others who have not been as successful as we have in improving the social and economic status of our members.

But as an unselfish organization, being desirous of helping those least able to help themselves, we therefore plead with you to promptly enact into law the proposed 65-cent minimum rate for those employed in interstate commerce and on work financed in whole or in part by Federal funds.

JOSEPH V. MORESCHI,
General President, International Hod Carriers, Building and Common Laborers' Union of America.

Bundles for Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD W. LANDIS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1946

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address which I delivered over Station WLW, Cincinnati, Ohio, February 2, 1946:

My fellow citizens, America will support the United Nations Organization for international peace. We also will aid the starving nations with our surplus food. We have agreed to the Bretton Woods proposal to stabilize the currency and make it possible to borrow from the International Bank, but we will not bankrupt America in order to finance Great Britain and the rest of the world. America knows England cannot repay this loan and we cannot afford to make an outright gift of $4,400,000,000. It is time to call a halt on such foreign hand outs. Uncle Sam must not play the role of Santa Claus to foreign nations to make socialism work in England or communism work in Russia.

I am opposed to the British loan or similar loans to foreign countries unless such loans have proper safeguards to protect the American taxpayers. On the other hand, I would agree to a specific bond issue where the purchaser of the bonds would assume all the risks.

The New Deal has proposed to loan Great Britain a total of $4,400,000,000. The money will be repayable over a 50-year period at 2 percent interest, but repayments will not start until 1951. Under the proposed loan Britain would not pay interest for the first 5 years. Consequently, the actual rate of interest would be 1.62 percent. If our veterans and farmers wanted to borrow from the Government the interest rate would be at least 3 or 4 percent. Why the distinction?

Our own experience in foreign investment has not been a very happy one. Foreign countries now owe us $14,500,000,000 from World War I, of which Britain owes us $6,400,000,000. All but one of these nations will not even pay the interest on their war debts.

History shows that such loans will not make for peace. After the last World War we were severely criticized for trying to recover on debts owed us.

If we should make this loan to Britain other nations will also seek their share of our wealth. To refuse them would create dissension throughout the world. If we loan to all countries the initial cost will be $20,000,000,000 or $160 for every man, woman, and child in the United States. Where are we going to get the money? Of course, every American would be called upon to pay his share. The American people should not be required to continually keep their nose to the grindstone to aid foreign countries. The time has come to begin looking after our own people, more especially the veterans who will need help in reestablishing themselves in our economy.

It would be most unwise to invest and risk the taxpayers' money to finance these loans. There is no legal way in which such

debts can be collected from a foreign country. If payments were suspended, as they were back in the late twenties, we would be left holding the bag.

The proponents of the British loan contend that money will come back to America in wider markets, if the plan works. However, in the past, our entire exports to all countries only amounted to about 8 percent of our trade, and England's trade only amounted to about 2 percent. This is no time to retard domestic recovery and further inflate our currency by overliberal exporting. Our critical housing problem is due partly to the exportation of lumber and logs. The same is true of farm equipment and other things. If this money were distributed to our citizens in wages, farm prices, veterans' benefits, and old-age pensions, both the money and goods would remain in the United States.

Why should we make this loan to Britain? They now own 1,500,000 shares in United States industries. They have unmined gold reserves of $24,500,000,000, unmined diamond reserves of $8,800,000,000, and $14,000,000,000 in foreign investments. Let her use these assets before coming over here with cup in hand.

Do you believe American taxpayers are willing to finance huge salaries and allowances to support royal households in foreign lands? No, the New Deal is not going to fool the American people this time. If we take a look at our indebtedness Americans will understand why the British loan faces defeat. We now have a national public debt of $278,000,000,000. Additional billions will be needed to pay the interest on our debt for foreign relief, veterans' benefits, and reconversion plans.

Our first big job is to make the United States a solvent Nation. Everyone should know that we cannot continue to give away our money and resources without jeopardizing our own welfare. The American taxpayers cannot uphold the British Empire forever. There will always be a U. S. A. if we don't give it away. Beware of the leader who places the welfare of other countries before his own. He is not to be trusted.

Use of DDT in Promotion of Public Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the health commissioner of the city of Boston:

CITY OF BOSTON,
HEALTH DEPARTMENT,
Boston, Mass., January 29, 1946.

Congressman JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In view of your unusual interest and concern for public health through the use of DDT, I feel that I should express not only my own gratitude, but the gratitude of the entire citizenry of this city, because of the results achieved in the application of this wonderful insecticide through the use of spray and powder.

We had heard of a very ethical undertaking through the use of this chemical for the control of insects which might have a bearing on the spread of infantile paralysis in an Illinois city. It was reported that official United States Army planes were used in the spraying and the whole project was carried out under the careful supervision of a professor attached to Yale University Medical School.

We had been endeavoring to obtain a pound of this DDT through regular channels, but were unsuccessful, and at the time of your presentation of the cask of this chemical, the problem which concerned us most, was the prevalence of infantile paralysis.

Between July 17 and August 29, 1945, in an area in the vicinity of Mattapan and Hyde Park, which area represents 3 percent of the geographical area of the entire city of Boston, there had been reported 15 cases out of a total of 28 cases throughout the city. In other words, over 50 percent of the infantile paralysis reported in this city occurred in this small 3-percent geographical area. We felt, therefore, that this was the place to utilize your gift.

We have, at no time, been under the impression that DDT will control the spread of infantile paralysis, because we agreed, as is stated in the enclosed bulletin from the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, that the exact means of spread of this disease is not known, but concur with their statement that "flies have repeatedly been shown to be carriers of infantile paralysis virus."

Fortunately, we had carried on, the previous months, an educational program in the various city departments, relative to DDT. We had brought our films and equipment to the various offices in city hall, so that all employees might be informed. We also had the field workers of the public works department attend two similar educational programs held at the Archbishop Williams Auditorium in the South End. Thus, all employees became familiar with the purpose and equipment, etc., used in the program and its application in the field of preventive medicine.

While we had no official report from the experiment in Illinois and many official and nonofficial opinions against the use of this insecticide in the field were elaborated upon in this vicinity, yet we sent forth on August 30, six of our public-works department employees, equipped with knapsack sprayers. These men attacked, first, the insects in areas adjacent to homes in Mattapan and Hyde Park wherein were located cases of infantile paralysis.

They then attacked homes adjacent to these and finally endeavored to attack the remaining homes in this area of but 3 percent of the geographical area of Boston, but which represented 50 percent of the cases in the city.

We must remember that this was early in the season for infantile paralysis and, therefore, we had no right to expect anything but a gradual reduction in the number of our cases of infantile paralysis. To our amazement all cases of infantile paralysis in this community ceased immediately. Although we closed our record on December 31, 1945, with a total of 107 cases, no other case appared in this small area from the day we started spraying with DDT. Of course, we do not claim that DDT carried this wonderful result into completion, but can claim that it possibly was a factor in the control of the disease and at least through this experimentation we have been able to present this very satisfactory result, let us call it, and one which would justify us in spraying by hand any community wherein this disease has appeared, especially in such force.

Authorities may claim that normally one person in seven might be expected to contract this disease in a mild form, and we feel that even a single case is worthy of our efforts if it can be eliminated. That this result was accomplished in spite of a marked increase in this disease in the city may be realized from the following statistics for this disease for the years from 1940 to 1945:

Cases:	*Resident*	*Non-resident*
1940	4	5
1941	15	57
1942	4	11
1943	23	64
1944	30	76
1945	107	211

One of the most annoying problems to children in a large city is that of head lice, or pediculosis, and we have had that problem, as well as almost every community. At times, in the past, this department has taken entire families to our detention hospital, where treatment was carried out, requiring the operation of the hospital and the services of nurses. Usually, after much effort and several days' work, improvement was noted. Often, reinfection was noted and so this became a serious problem for the health department.

While I was in the Navy, I saw the results of the use of this insecticide in the control of head lice. Immediate results were obtained by the application of DDT in powder form.

Upon a visit to various orphanages, etc., in the city, I noted that among the underprivileged children housed there, a routine daily examination and treatment showed infection of from 10 to 25 percent of the enrollment. A preparation consisting of 10 percent DDT powder was presented to various organizations and agencies and I am happy to report to you that we are justified in arriving at the conclusion that such head lice are a thing of the past because these institutions have reported to us that in 100 percent of the cases all such vermin are destroyed and the enrollment formerly harboring vermin have been free for the past 3 months.

We have also sprayed—

Yards and passageways	4,100
Boston public schools	175
Hospitals, orphanages, institutions, etc	42
Public lodging houses	6
Public buildings	10
Cow barn and piggery, Deer Island	1
Dead body for larvae and maggots	1
Apartments infested with vermin, body lice, bedbugs	90
Dead horses for the prevention and spread of organic matter following a fire	24

All this work has been carried on without a single complaint or a single instance of any person being made ill. Some establishments, who at the beginning of our campaign indicated that DDT would kill their pets, are themselves now selling some form of DDT 10 percent powder over the counters.

In addition to all the wonderful accomplishments enumerated, we have instilled into the minds of the people of this city by an educational program the great value of this insect-control program in their homes and premises.

Yours sincerely,
FREDERICK J. BAILEY, M. D.,
Health Commissioner.

Guiding the Handicapped to Happiness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1946

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Irmis Johnson from

the American Weekly of February 3, 1946:

GUIDING THE HANDICAPPED TO HAPPINESS

(By Irmis Johnson)

Anyone who talks a few minutes with Betsey Barton promptly forgets that she has a physical handicap—legs made helpless 11 years ago when her back was broken in an automobile accident.

But she remembers the bitter, despairing years before she learned to live again and is grateful to the trained workers who re-educated her body and mind for a new life. For this reason Betsey Barton now is devoting much of her energy to plans for an unusual Foundation for Physical Rehabilitation, to be located at 117 East Fifty-fifth Street, New York City.

The main purpose of the Foundation—for which Miss Barton and some of her associates hope to raise $100,000—will be to train capable men in the complete art of reeducating the disabled. Its director will be J. M. Williamson, the man who through simple exercise helped Miss Barton learn to overcome her handicap and live with it.

The trainees will master all the exercises necessary to bring disabled bodies back to health and strength.

Reeducators must be extremely wise persons, Miss Barton explains, prepared to mend the broken personality, the broken mind, the broken body and even the broken heart.

For this reason the men to be trained will be selected carefully so that when they leave the foundation to carry on their work they will be fully capable of starting the handicapped on their way to a new life.

Today Betsey Barton gets around easily on crutches with the help of braces to support her legs. She leads a full and worth-while life and is eager to help others with physical disabilities do the same.

"The swift exchange of a once normal body for an impaired, abnormal one is very hard," she admits and likens the experience to exchanging one costume for another in the dressing rooms of Time.

At the age of 16 Miss Barton was completely helpless, but she has learned that to readjust to a handicap one must forget the old life and start an entirely new one—be a new character in a new role, so to speak.

Memories of feats that may never be accomplished again will mock and hurt at first, she warns. But under the right guidance those remembrances that may never be useful can be weeded out, others can be put to work helping muscles and nerves acquire the coordination they once had but have lost.

Today a great many families have members disabled by war, accident, or disease. Often there is little those near and dear to the invalided patient can do but wait and supply the love that is so necessary for any recovery.

It is the patient who must face the reality of his disability and admit to himself that from now on he will have an artificial leg, a mechanical arm, an artificial eye, or twisted and useless body muscles.

Facing the reality of being permanently endowed with new physical equipment that is less than normal is the first hurdle of the handicapped, Miss Barton believes.

The second step, perhaps the most difficult and time-consuming, is acceptance of this disability and the willingness to plan a new life with it.

Then comes the arduous task of learning to handle the disability at all times and in all ways.

When she took her first steps toward reconstruction under the special teacher whose help she values so highly, Betsey Barton tells disabled men and women there were ninety and nine things she couldn't do, and not many she could do.

She could breathe and use a few muscles.

By perfecting many simple exercises under his expert, understanding guidance, she made a start on which to build new strength and health, and acquired faith in her future.

When this had been accomplished she went to the Institute for the Crippled and Disabled, 400 First Avenue, New York City. Here she learned to walk down the long waxed corridors on crutches and mastered other abilities to handle herself so necessary in normal living.

Once the limitations of any physical misfortune have been mastered, Miss Barton explains, the final step is to learn to live creatively in spite of the disability.

The institute offers vocational training to help the patient meet his or her need for a normal usefulness, and employers are finding that a disabled person rightly placed in a job no longer is disabled at all.

Betsey herself, since her readjustment, has become an accomplished writer, as is shown by her recent book, And Now To Live Again.

Interested in all of the problems of the handicapped, who number 23,000,000 throughout the Nation, she recognizes the great value of large centers for rehabilitation now being planned for our leading cities, where skills of many specialists are pooled for the benefit of patients. Even so she still believes the ideal to be a one-man reeducator with a wide understanding of physical and mental ills.

Such a personal teacher can lay much of the groundwork when the mind and body are hurt and the danger of settling down to being a shut-in is great. Too many specialists, at first, may be discouraging.

That is why the foundation now being planned by Miss Barton is to be devoted to training such men.

The Tragedy of Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Samuel Crowther from the New York Journal and American:

THE TRAGEDY OF TRUMAN—POLITICAL AIM FOLLOWS PLAN SET BY REDS

(By Samuel Crowther)

III

President Truman in his radio address was chiefly concerned with what seems to be a labor chaos in this country but which, as will be brought out, is not a labor chaos but something quite different.

He advocated the continuance of his own wartime powers, although he did not say why he wanted to retain the trimmings of despotism.

He wanted the continuance of price control—sharing and encouraging the curious but popular delusion that price control is the same as inflation control. He wanted to keep the Federal employment agencies instead of letting them pass back to the States. He wanted his bill to add Federal funds to local unemployment relief. He wanted a bill by which eventually the Federal Government would finance a job for every man who asked employment.

Wants fact-finding power

And finally he wanted a bill giving him the power to set up what he calls fact-finding bodies with the authority to postpone strikes for 30 days while the facts were being found.

The program that he urged was, with the exception of the fact-finding boards, exactly the program of Sidney Hillman's PAC, which in turn is the preliminary program of the Communist Party in the United States.

The program as urged by the President could not aid the cause of progress or liberty. It could not aid in finding an answer to the wave of strikes which is sweeping the Nation.

It could add nothing to human happiness but, on the contrary, it could and would greatly speed our regression into decadence and bring us the more quickly into the kind of state where the common man would be so common as to be a mere chattel moved about by slave masters with high-falutin titles.

We could, under the program, achieve more quickly the impotence in our domestic affairs that we have already reached in our foreign affairs.

It is highly improbable—as was noted in a previous article—that President Truman or any of his close political associates have any grasp of the meaning of the policies that he is advocating.

But it is equally improbable that they did not realize that all of these measures involved the heavy spending of Federal funds and the creation of a bought vote of sufficient size to carry this year's congressional elections and to lay a firm foundation for reelection in 1948.

Ignores root of the evil

The address was principally noteworthy in that it failed to touch the primary cause of our domestic difficulties. Therefore it did not propose doing anything about the cause.

The primary cause of all our domestic difficulties is inflation of our money supply.

The men who have infiltrated into every department of our Government and who do not believe in the American system of government fully understand that inflating the money is the quickest of all ways of breaking down public morale and government. They are promoting inflation while pretending to cure it.

President Truman and his close associates simply do not understand what is going on and hence they do not understand what their supposed subordinates are doing to them and to the people.

Inflation, it has been made to appear by devious but all-embracing propaganda, comes about from people being allowed to spend their money too freely. That being so, if the people can be restrained from spending too much by price fixing and other measures, they can be saved from themselves and inflation can be avoided.

That has been standard nonsense from at least the time of Diocletian. But the nonsense is a hardy perennial and it is in full flower today.

Inflation is not caused by the people spending money. It is caused by the Government printing money. The people have no more to do with bringing on inflation than the man in the moon.

Inflation is not fully understood by Americans because, until the coming of the Roosevelt administration, every political party in power accepted the preservation of the dollar as a sacred trust.

During the war, when the great bond campaigns were on, any man who raised his voice to question the methods of finance or to note the progress of inflation was smeared as disloyal. Now it should be disloyal to be silent.

Everyone understands that when the Government prints money, it is inflating. But few seem to understand that there is more than one way of printing money.

How United States causes inflation

No amount of money borrowed from the people in exchange for bonds can be inflationary. The bonds simply exchange for money and the amount of money is not increased.

But when the Government sells a bond or a note to a commercial bank, the process is very different. No money passes. The bank just opens a deposit account to the credit of the Government.

The Government draws checks against that account and these checks become deposits in other banks or are drawn out as hand money in the form of Federal Reserve notes. The bonds become the eventual collateral for the Reserve notes.

So when the Government borrows from a commercial bank, it just manufactures bank deposits—which is the same as printing money. That is what has been going on.

We now have a total money supply—bank deposits and bank notes—of well over $160,000,000,000 as against $61,000,000,000 in 1939 and $55,000,000,000 in the boom year of 1929.

We have a tremendously inflated money supply due to the Government policy of borrowing from commercial banks.

If a nation has more money than goods, the money will be used to bid up the prices of goods. That is one evidence of inflation, but it is not inflation. The inflation is in the supply of money.

If we have a reasonably large production—say, the production of 1940 or 1941—prices and wages in an atmosphere of confidence will gradually rise and adjust themselves to the supply of money.

In order to use all the money supply we now have on any reasonable projection of production, we shall require an eventual price rise of about 50 percent.

If we continue to inflate our money by loans to foreign nations, by relief payments, or other payments which cannot be covered by taxes, the money supply will be further watered—or inflated—and the value of the money will steadily decline. That is another way of saying that prices will steadily rise.

If production does not reasonably catch up with the money supply, the Government must devalue. This is a polite name for repudiation.

Proposed Substitute for the Case Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1946

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, on Friday during general debate on the Case bill I spoke briefly on my intention to submit a substitute modeled after the Ball-Burton-Hatch plan for the settlement of industrial disputes. The proposed substitute contains only one modification in the revised bill submitted by the sponsors of this legislation (S. 1661), but eliminates all compulsory arbitration features in the original bill and also strikes out section 13 dealing with the reorganization of the National Labor Relations Board. My proposed substitute is as follows:

SEC. 1. (a) Declaration of policy: It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to facilitate the prompt, peaceful, and just settlement of all labor relations controversies between employers and employees that may interrupt commerce among the several States or with foreign nations; and to that end—

(1) to encourage the making and maintaining of agreements concerning wages, hours, and other conditions of employment;

(2) to assist in maintaining the right of the parties to be represented in collective bargaining and in the making and maintaining of such agreements by duly authorized representatives freely and voluntarily designated by the respective parties without any interference, influence, or coercion exercised by any party over the self-organization or designation of representatives by any other party;

(3) to provide Federal settlement procedures for labor relations controversies likely to result in such substantial interruption of commerce among the several States or with foreign nations as to require or make appropriate Federal action; and

(4) to leave to the several States the handling of all other labor relations controversies that may interrupt such commerce among the several States or with foreign nations.

(b) Declaration of purposes: It is the purpose of the policy above declared (1) to promote continuity and regularity of employment, and (2) to avoid interruptions to employment arising from the inability of employers and employees to maintain satisfactory labor relations or from resulting strikes, lock-outs, shut-downs, or similar interruptions or cessations of the production or distribution of goods and services necessary to the health, safety, and welfare of the people of the United States.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 2. (a) Administration by Federal industrial relations board: This title shall be administered by the Federal Industrial Relations Board which shall be composed of five members appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The terms of office of the members first appointed shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of nomination, one at the end of 1 year from the date of approval of this act, one at the end of 2 years, one at the end of 3 years, one at the end of 4 years, and one at the end of 5 years, from said date. The terms of office of all successors shall expire 5 years after the expiration of the terms for which their predecessors were appointed; but any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of his predecessor.

(b) Vacancies: Vacancies in the Board shall not impair the powers nor affect the duties of the Board nor of the remaining members of the Board. A majority of the members in office shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of the business of the Board.

(c) Salary: Each member of the Board shall receive a salary of $12,000 per annum, together with necessary traveling and subsistence expenses, or a per diem allowance in lieu thereof, subject to the provisions of law applicable thereto, while away from the principal office of the Board on business required by this act.

(d) Eligibility and removal: No person in the employ of, or whose conduct may be affected by any obligation to, or who has any pecuniary or other prejudicial interest in, any employer or employee organization shall be eligible to enter upon or continue to be a member of the Board. A member of the Board may be removed by the President for inefficiency, neglect of duty, malfeasance in office, or ineligibility, but for no other cause.

(e) Miscellaneous: The Board shall annually designate a member to act as chairman. The Board shall maintain its principal office in the District of Columbia, but it may meet at any other place whenever it deems it necessary. Each member of the Board shall have the power to administer oaths and affirmations. The Board shall have a seal which shall be judicially noticed. The Board shall make an annual report to Congress.

(f) Personnel: The Board may (1) appoint such experts and assistants to act in a confidential capacity and, subject to the provisions of the civil-service laws, such other officers and employees as are essential to the effective transaction of the work of the board; (2) in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, fix the salaries of such experts, assistants, officers, and employees; and (3) make such expenditures (including expenditures for rent and personal services at the seat of government and elsewhere, for lawbooks, periodicals, and books of reference, and for printing and binding, and including expenditures for salaries and compensation, necessary traveling expenses, and expenses actually incurred for subsistence) as may be necessary, and as may be provided for by the Congress from time to time. All such expenditures shall be allowed and paid on the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the chairman of the Board, or other officer designated by the Board.

(g) Delegation of authority: The Board is hereby authorized by its order to assign or refer any matter arising with respect to its functions under this act or other law, or referred to it by the Congress or either branch thereof, (1) to one or more members or employees of the Board, to be designated by it in such order, or (2) to a joint board composed (as determined by the order of the Federal Industrial Relations Board) of one or more of its members or employees, to be designated by the Board in its order, and of one or more members of the appropriate agency of any State or States affected by the matter, to be designated by such State agency. The Board may by its order at any time amend, modify, supplement, or rescind any such assignment or reference. All such orders shall take effect forthwith and remain in effect until otherwise ordered by the Board. If so provided in the Board's order and in conformity therewith, such member or employee of the Board or joint board shall have power and authority to act for the Board in such matter assigned or referred.

(h) Rules of practice and regulations: The Board may from time to time adopt, amend, and rescind such interpretive regulations not in conflict with nor in addition to the provisions of this act or other law, as may be necessary for the administration of its functions.

(i) Utilization of services of other agencies: The Board may utilize the services of any other agency or officer of the Government or of any State agency whenever in the Board's judgment such utilization is desirable for the administration of its functions, and the Board may authorize any such agency or officer to act as the agent of the Board.

(j) Transfer of United States Conciliation Service: All functions of the Secretary of Labor or the United States Conciliation Service under section 8 of the act entitled "An act to create a Department of Labor," approved March 4, 1913 (U. S. C., title 29, sec. 51), or under the War Labor Disputes Act (U. S. C., title 50, sec. 1507) or such functions under any other law are hereby transferred to the Board, together with the personnel, records, property, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds of the United States Conciliation Service. Such transfer shall not affect any proceedings pending before the United States Conciliation Service or any certification, order, rule, or regulation theretofore made by it or the Secretary of Labor.

DUTIES OF EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYEES

SEC. 3. (a) Employers and employees subject to act: Employers and employees shall be subject to this act if controversies between them involving labor relations are within the scope of this act as hereinafter provided.

(b) Duty to make and maintain agreements: It shall be the duty of employers and employees subject to this act and their agents

and representatives to exert every reasonable effort to make and maintain agreements concerning wages, hours, and conditions of employment to the end of avoiding the occurrence, and providing for the prompt, peaceful, and just settlement of controversies within the scope of this act. In case any such agreement is in existence and one of the parties thereto desires a change in the agreement, such reasonable efforts shall include the giving of notice in accordance with the provisions of such existing agreement, or if there is no such provision, then the giving of adequate written notice of the proposed change to the other parties to such existing agreement. Unless otherwise fixed by agreement the time and place for a conference between representatives designated and authorized so to confer by the respective parties shall be agreed on by the parties within 10 days after receipt of such notice and the time agreed on shall be within 30 days after receipt of such notice.

(c) Duty to settle controversies: If there arises a controversy within the scope of this act, it shall be the duty of the employers and employees involved therein—

(1) promptly to arrange conferences between representatives designated and authorized so to confer by the employers and employees, respectively, and to exert every reasonable effort to settle the controversy expeditiously in such conferences; and

(2) in case the controversy is not so settled in such conferences and the Board proceeds to deal with the controversy through the settlement procedures hereinafter provided, then fully and expeditiously to carry out their respective duties under such settlement procedures.

(d) Maintenance or existing conditions pending exhaustion of settlement efforts: Whenever there arises a controversy within the scope of this act it shall be the duty of the employers and employees involved therein and their agents and representatives, pending the exhaustion of all efforts at settlement under this act in accordance with the terms thereof, to make no use of any unilateral arbitrary or coercive methods or compulsory process to end the controversy or to obtain an advantage in its final determination, and except by agreement of the parties or with the approval of the Board, to make no change in the conditions out of which the controversy arose. In case a special fact-finding commission is appointed, as hereinafter provided, in connection with any such controvercy no such method or process shall be used and no such change in conditions shall be made pending the expiration of 30 days after making of its report, as provided in section 7.

Nothing in this act shall be construed to require an individual employee to render labor or service without his consent or to make illegal the quitting of his labor or service or the withdrawal from his place of employment; nor shall any court issue any process to compel an individual employee to render labor or service or to remain at his place of employment without his consent.

(e) Right to strike: Except as provided in subsection (d) of this section, nothing in this act shall be construed so as to interfere with or impede or diminish in any way the right to strike.

(f) Designation of representatives: Representatives for the purpose of this act shall be designated by the respective parties in such manner as may be provided in their corporate organization or unincorporated association, or by other means of collective action, without interference, influence, or coercion exercised by any party over the self-organization or designation of representatives by any other party. Such representatives may be individuals who are not in the employ of the employers concerned, or organizations whose membership may include persons not in the employ of the employers concerned, so long as such individuals or organizations have been duly designated by the employers or employees who are concerned, as their representatives for the purposes of this title.

CONTROVERSIES SUBJECT TO ACT

SEC. 4. (a) Classes of controversies within scope of the act: Any labor-relations controversy shall be within the scope of this act, subject to the exclusions and limitations hereinafter specified. For the purposes of this act such controversies shall be divided into the following classes:

Class 1: Controversies over the right of representation of employees.

Class 2: Controversies over the making or maintaining of an agreement concerning wages, hours, or conditions of employment.

Class 3: Controversies arising out of any grievance against any employer concerning the application of any such agreement.

Class 4: Controversies not included in any of the foregoing classes.

(b) Exclusions by reason of character of employment: No controversy shall be within the scope of this act if it concerns—

(1) employment by the Government of the United States or of any State, or of any Territory or possession, the District of Columbia, the Canal Zone, or any other area under the jurisdiction of the United States, or of any political subdivision thereof, or by a governmental agency of any of the foregoing;

(2) employment by an employer (or if more than one employer has a common interest in the controversy, by employers) whose aggregate number of employees is less than 20, unless in the opinion of the Board the controversy threatens to result in such a substantial interruption of commerce as to require or make appropriate Federal action;

(3) employment of agricultural labor by farmers or cooperative associations of farmers;

(4) employment in the domestic service of any family or person at his home;

(5) employment by any labor organization (other than when acting as an employer) or by anyone acting in the capacity of officer or agent of such labor organization;

(6) a dispute for the settlement of which provision is made by the Railway Labor Act, as amended;

(7) a dispute over which the National War Labor Board takes jurisdiction under the War Labor Disputes Act or other law, or Executive orders thereunder, but only so long as the War Labor Disputes Act remains in effect.

(c) Exclusions by reason of local character of controversy: No controversy shall be within the scope of this act (1) unless the employment involved directly affects the producing, processing, preparing, or handling of raw materials, supplies, or goods for distribution in substantial quantities in national or international commerce of the United States, or directly affects their distribution in substantial quantities in such commerce; or (2) unless the employment involved directly affects the supplying of power, light, transportation, communication, or any other public or private utility service in substantial quantities in such commerce. For the purposes of this act, the national commerce of the United States is commerce between the several States (including the Territories, possessions, the District of Columbia, the Canal Zone, and other areas under the jurisdiction of the United States); and the international commerce of the United States is commerce between such States or areas and foreign countries: *Provided*, That the national and international commerce of the United States does not include such local handling or distribution of consumer goods or end products after termination of their interstate shipment or their importation as does not directly affect such commerce.

(d) Regulations defining controversies: The terms (1) "directly affects," (2) "substantial quantities," and (3) "such local handling or distribution of consumer goods or end products after termination of their interstate shipment or their importation as does not directly affect such commerce," as used in this section, may be further defined by the regulations of the Board. In any such regulations, such terms shall be so defined as to exclude controversies that are predominantly of a local character or effect and that do not directly affect national or international commerce of the United States. Such regulations shall be adopted after due notice of proposed regulations and opportunity for public hearing thereon and shall, when adopted, have the force and effect of law.

(e) Controversies where employment is outside United States: No controversy shall be within the scope of this act where the place of the employment incident to the controversy is outside the several States, the Territories, possessions, the District of Columbia, the Canal Zone, and other areas under the jurisdiction of the United States, unless the employment is in connection with international transportation or communication facilities operated by a business organized under laws of the United States, or the several States, or such areas.

(f) Applicability of State laws: The laws of the several States, Territories, and possessions may apply to any labor relations controversy occurring therein, whether or not such controversy is one within the scope of this act: *Provided*, That in case of a controversy within the scope of this act, the laws of the State, Territory, or possession shall remain applicable only so long as the services of the Board have not been invoked or proffered as provided in section 5. The Board shall cooperate with State and local authorities in the preparation and application of State and local legislation to carry out the purposes of this subsection.

HANDLING OF CONTROVERSIES BY BOARD

SEC. 5. (a) Invocation or proffer of Board's services: Any party to a labor-relations controversy within the scope of this act shall have the right to invoke the services of the Board, but in case of a class 3 or class 4 controversy only if in the opinion of the Board the controversy threatens to result in such a substantial interruption of commerce as to require or make appropriate Federal action. The Board may on its own motion proffer its services in any class of controversy if it finds and publicly announces that the controversy threatens to result in such a substantial interruption of commerce as to require or make appropriate Federal action and that the services of the Board are necessary or desirable in the settlement of the controversy.

(b) Use of appropriate settlement procedures: In the event that the services of the Board are so invoked or proffered with respect to any controversy, the Board, having determined that the controversy is within the scope of this act shall proceed promptly to deal with the controversy with due expedition through the appropriate settlement procedures as hereinafter provided.

(c) Controversies handled by State authorities: If a labor-relations controversy within the scope of this act is being handled under State law by the appropriate State authority, then, notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, no party to the controversy may invoke the services of the Board unless he does so on or before the tenth day after jurisdiction over the controversy was assumed by the State authority. In the event that the Board's services are not so invoked within such 10-day period, then the jurisdiction of the State authority to handle such controversy under State law shall continue until such time as the controversy is settled or the State authority

ceases to act unless prior thereto the Board on its own motion proffers its services after a finding and public announcement as provided in subsection (a).

SETTLEMENT PROCEDURE FOR CLASS 1 CONTROVERSIES

SEC. 6. Determination of employee representation: In case of a class 1 controversy (that is, one relating to representation of employees) the Board shall refer the dispute to the National Labor Relations Board for determination in accordance with the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act.

SETTLEMENT PROCEDURE FOR CLASS 2 CONTROVERSIES

SEC. 7. (a) Mediation: In case of a class 2 controversy (that is, one relating to making and maintaining an agreement) the Board shall use its best efforts by mediation and conciliation to bring the parties into agreement. If such efforts to bring about an amicable adjustment through mediation and conciliation are unsuccessful, the Board shall then endeavor to induce the parties to agree to submit their controversy to arbitration under the provisions of section 10.

(b) Fact-finding commission: If any party declines to submit the controversy to such arbitration, the Board shall determine whether the controversy threatens to result in such a substantial interruption of commerce as to make it necessary or desirable in the public interest to create, or to request the President to create, a special fact-finding commission. If the Board determines that a special fact-finding commission is necessary or desirable, the Board may thereupon either create and appoint or request the President to create and appoint a special fact-finding commission to investigate and report respecting such controversy. Such commission shall be composed of such number of persons as may seem desirable to the Board (or to the President, if he shall act). No commissioner appointed shall be pecuniarly or otherwise privately or prejudicially interested in the employees or employers concerned. The compensation of such commissioners shall be fixed by the Board at an amount not exceeding $75 per day, or in case of commissioners appointed by the President, fixed by the President at an amount not exceeding $100 per day. Such special fact-finding commissions shall be created separately for each controversy or for each group of controversies presenting similar issues and pending at the same time. The commission shall investigate promptly the facts as to the controversy and make a report thereon to the Board (or to the President if the commission was appointed by him) with its recommendations as to the manner in which such controversy should be adjusted. The report shall be made within 30 days from the date the commission is created. The time for making such report shall not be extended except by action of the Board, which, in exceptional cases, may allow an additional 30 days on request of the commission.

SETTLEMENT PROCEDURE FOR CLASS 3 CONTROVERSIES

SEC. 8. (a) Adjustment board: In case of a class-3 controversy (that is, one relating to a grievance) the Federal Industrial Relations Board shall direct the parties to such controversy, to refer such controversy to an adjustment board which shall be authorized to make an award binding on the parties. It shall be the duty of the parties in making agreements to provide for an adjustment board to settle grievance controversies. In the event of the failure of the parties to establish such a board by agreement, the Board shall be authorized, when grievance controversies arise, to establish an adjustment board for their settlement and to designate an equal number of representatives of the parties as members of the board and to appoint, as hereinafter provided, an impartial chairman. An adjustment board shall consist of an equal number of representatives, not less than two, designated by, or on behalf of, each party. No member thereof shall be immediately involved in any controversy to be decided by the adjustment board.

(b) Impartial chairman: If the adjustment board is not able promptly to adjust such controversy, the Federal Industrial Relations Board shall appoint an impartial chairman who shall be an additional member of the adjustment board. An award certified by a majority of the adjustment board so constituted shall be binding on the parties and may be filed by any party thereto within 6 months of the date of the award in the clerk's office of the district court of the United States for the district wherein the controversy arose, and when so filed shall be subject to the provisions of section 10 (c).

(c) Expenses of adjustment boards: The parties shall agree on an appropriate division of the expenses of an adjustment board, including compensation of an impartial chairman. In case of dispute his compensation shall be fixed directly by, or made subject to the approval of, the Federal Industrial Relations Board.

(d) No interference will unfair practice complaints: The Board shall take no action under the provisions of this section which will interfere in any way with the consideration or determination of complaints of unfair practices by the National Labor Relations Board in accordance with the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act.

SETTLEMENT PROCEDURE FOR CLASS 4 CONTROVERSIES

SEC. 9. In case of a class 4 controversy (that is, other controversies not specially provided for), the Board shall proceed as in the case of class 2 controversies.

VOLUNTARY ARBITRATION

SEC. 10. (a) Boards of arbitration: (1) Whenever the parties to a labor relations controversy agree to submit the controversy to arbitration under this section, the controversy shall be arbitrated by a board of three (or if the parties to the controversy so stipulate, a board of six) persons: *Provided*, That the failure or refusal of any party to submit a controversy to arbitration shall not be construed as a violation of any legal obligation imposed upon such party by the terms of this act or otherwise.

(2) Such board of arbitration shall be selected in the following manner:

In the case of a board of arbitration of three, the representatives of the employer or employers and the representatives of the employees, parties respectively to the agreement to arbitrate, shall each select an arbitrator. The two arbitrators thus chosen shall select a third arbitrator. If the arbitrator chosen by the parties shall fail to select the third arbitrator within 5 days after their first meeting such third arbitrator shall be selected by the Federal Industrial Relations Board.

In the case of a board of arbitration of six, the representatives of the employer or employers and the representatives of the employees, parties respectively to the agreement to arbitrate, shall each select two arbitrators. The four arbitrators thus chosen shall by a majority vote select the remaining two arbitrators. If the arbitrators chosen by the parties shall fail to select the remaining two arbitrators within 10 days after their first meeting the said two arbitrators or as many of them as have not been selected shall be selected by the Federal Industrial Relations Board.

(3) When the arbitrators selected by the respective parties have agreed upon the remaining arbitrator or arbitrators they shall notify the Federal Industrial Relations Board, and in the event of their failure to agree upon any or upon all of the necessary arbitrators within the period fixed by this section they shall, at the expiration of such period, notify the Board of the arbitrators selected, if any, or of their failure to make or to complete such selection.

(4) The board of arbitration shall organize and select its own chairman and make all necessary rules for conducting its hearings: *Provided*, That the board of arbitration shall be bound to give the parties to the controversy a full and fair hearing which shall include an opportunity to present evidence in support of their claims and an opportunity to present their case in person, by counsel, or by other representatives as they may respectively elect.

(5) Upon notice from the Federal Industrial Relations Board that any party to an arbitration desires the reconvening of a board of arbitration (or a subcommittee of such board of arbitration appointed for such purpose pursuant to the agreement to arbitrate) to rule upon any controversy over the meaning or application of their award the board of arbitration or its subcommittee shall at once reconvene. No question other than or in addition to the questions relating to the meaning or application of the award submitted by the party or parties in writing shall be considered by the reconvened board of arbitration or its subcommittee. Such rulings shall be acknowledged by such board or subcommittee thereof in the same manner and filed in the same clerk's office as the original award and become a part thereof.

(6) No arbitrator except those chosen by the Federal Industrial Relations Board shall be incompetent to act as an arbitrator because of his interest in the controversy to be arbitrated or because of his connection with or partiality to any party to the arbitration.

(7) Each member of any board of arbitration selected by any party to the arbitration shall be compensated by the party selecting him. Each arbitrator selected by the arbitrators or by the Federal Industrial Relations Board shall receive from the Board such compensation as the Board may fix together with his necessary traveling expenses and expenses actually incurred for substistence while serving as an arbitrator.

(8) The board of arbitration shall furnish a certified copy of its award to the respective parties to the controvery and shall transmit the original together with the record of the proceedings and a transcript of the evidence taken at the hearing certified under the hands of at least a majority of the arbitrators to the clerk of the district court of the United States for the district wherein the controversy arose or the arbitration is entered into, to be filed in said clerk's office as hereinafter provided. The board of arbitration shall also furnish a certified copy of the award and of the record of the proceeding and transcript of evidence to the Federal Industrial Relations Board to be filed in its office.

(9) All testimony before the board of arbitration shall be given under oath or affirmation and any member of the board of arbitration shall have the power to administer oaths or affirmations. The board of arbitration or any member thereof shall have the power to require the attendance of witnesses and the production of such books, papers, contracts, agreements, and documents as may be deemed by the board of arbitration material to a just determination of the matters submitted to its arbitration and may for that purpose request the clerk of the district court of the United States for the district wherein said arbitration is being conducted to issue the necessary subpenas.

Upon such request the said clerk or his duly authorized deputy shall be, and he hereby is, authorized and it shall be his duty to issue such subpenas. In the event of the failure of any person to comply with such subpena or in the event of the contumacy of any witness appearing before the

board of arbitration, the board of arbitration may invoke the aid of the appropriate district court of the United States to compel witnesses to attend and testify and to produce such books, papers, contracts, agreements, and documents relevant and pertinent to the proceedings pending before the board of arbitration to the same extent and under the same conditions and penalties as provided for in the act to regulate commerce, approved February 4, 1887, and the amendments thereto. Any witness appearing before the arbitrators shall receive the same fees and mileage as witnesses in courts of the United States, to be paid by the party securing the subpena.

(b) Form of agreement to arbitrate: The agreement to arbitrate—

(1) shall be in writing;

(2) shall stipulate that the arbitration is had under the provisions of this act;

(3) shall state whether the board of arbitration is to consist of three or of six members;

(4) shall be signed by th duly accredited representatives of the employer or employers and the employees, parties respectively to the agreement to arbitrate, and shall be duly verified by said parties and filed in the office of the Federal Industrial Relations Board;

(5) shall state specifically the questions to be submitted to the said board of arbitration for decision and that in its award or awards the said board of arbitration shall confine itself strictly to decisions as to the questions so specifically submitted to it;

(6) shall provide that the questions or any one or more of them submitted by the parties to the board of arbitration may be withdrawn from arbitration on notice to that effect signed by the duly accredited representatives of all the parties and served on the board of arbitration;

(7) shall stipulate that the signatures of a majority of said board of arbitration affixed to their award shall be competent to constitute a valid and binding award;

(8) shall fix a period from the date of the selection of the arbitrator or arbitrators necessary to complete the board (as provided for in the agreement) within which the said board of arbitration shall commence its hearings;

(9) shall fix a period from the beginning of the hearings within which the said board of arbitration shall make and file its award: *Provided*, That the parties may agree at any time upon an extension of this period;

(10) shall provide for the date from which the award shall become effective and shall fix the period during which the award shall continue in force;

(11) shall provide that the award of the board of arbitration and the papers, proceedings, and transcript of the evidence when certified under the hands of at least a majority of arbitrators shall be filed in the clerk's office of the district court of the United States for the district wherein the controversy arose or the arbitration was entered into, which district shall be designated in the agreement and when so filed such award, papers, proceedings and transcript of evidence, shall constitute the full and complete record of the arbitration;

(12) shall provide that the award when so filed shall be final and conclusive upon the parties as to the facts determined by said award and as to the merits of the controversy decided;

(13) shall provide that any difference arising as to the meaning or the application of the provisions of an award made by a board of arbitration shall be referred for a ruling to the same board or by agreement to a subcommittee of such board and that such ruling when acknowledged in the same manner and filed in the same clerk's office as the original award, shall be a part of and shall have the same force and effect as such original award; and

(14) shall provide that the respective parties to the award will each faithfully execute the same.

The said agreement to arbitrate when properly certified, as herein provided, shall not be revoked by a party to such agreement: *Provided*, That such agreement to arbitrate may at any time be revoked and canceled by the written agreement of the parties signed by their duly accredited representatives and, if no board of arbitration has yet been constituted under the agreement, delivered to the Federal Industrial Relations Board or any member thereof; or if the board of arbitration has been constituted as provided by the agreement, delivered to such board of arbitration. The award of a board of arbitration having been certified as herein provided shall be filed in the clerk's office designated in the agreement to arbitrate.

(c) The arbitration award: (1) An award certified and filed as provided in this section or in section 8 (b) shall be conclusive on the parties as to the merits and facts of the controversy. Unless with 10 days after the filing of the award a petition to impeach the award on the grounds hereinafter set forth shall be filed in the clerk's office of the court in which the award has been filed, the court shall enter judgment on the award. Such judgment shall be final and conclusive on the parties.

(2) Any such petition for the impeachment of any award shall be entertained by the court only on one or more of the following grounds:

That the award plainly does not conform to the substantive requirements laid down by this act for such awards or that the proceedings were not substantially in conformity with this act;

That the award does not conform nor confine itself to the stipulations of the agreement; or

That a member of the Board rendering the award was guilty of fraud or corruption or that a party practiced fraud or corruption which fraud or corruption affected the result.

(3) No court shall entertain any such petition on the ground that the award is invalid for uncertainty. In such case the proper remedy shall be a submission of such award to a reconvened board or subcommittee thereof for a ruling. An award contested as herein provided shall be construed liberally by the court with a view to favoring its validity and no award shall be set aside for trivial irregularity or clerical error going only to form and not to substance.

(4) If the court shall determine that a part of the award is invalid on some ground or grounds designated in this section as a ground of invalidity but shall determine that a part of the award is valid, the court shall set aside the entire award: *Provided*, That if the parties shall agree thereto and if such valid and invalid parts are separable, the court shall set aside the invalid part and order judgment to stand as to the valid part.

(5) At the expiration of 10 days from the decision of the court upon the petition filed as aforesaid final judgment shall be entered in accordance with said decision unless during said 10 days either party shall appeal therefrom to the circuit court of appeals. In such case only such portion of the record shall be transmitted to the appellate court as is necessary to the proper understanding and consideration of the questions of law presented by said petition and to be decided.

(6) If the petitioner's contentions are finally sustained judgment shall be entered setting aside the award in whole, or, if the parties so agree, in part; but in such case the parties may agree upon a judgment to be entered disposing of the subject matter of the controversy which judgment when entered shall have the same force and effect as judgment entered upon the award.

ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 11. (a) Violations of act: It shall be a violation of this act for any person—

(1) to fail to perform the duties imposed on him by section 3;

(2) whether or not a party to a labor-relations controversy or proceeding for the enforcement of the requirements of this act, to interfere, or to incite or to support any interference, with the performance by any person of duties imposed on him by section 3, or in concert to attempt to prevent the effectuation of the purposes of this act or the making effective of regulations or orders issued under the authority of this act.

(b) Civil actions brought by Board: The Board is authorized by filing its complaint to institute a civil action to restrain or enjoin any violation or threatened violation of this act or to compel the performance of duties imposed by section 3. The district courts of the United States shall have exclusive original jurisdiction of any such civil action. In any such civil action instituted by the Board, the limitations upon the jurisdiction of the Federal courts imposed in the act entitled "An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of the courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes," approved March 23, 1932 (U. S. C., title 29, secs. 101 and the following), shall not be construed or applied so as to prevent or restrict the granting of injunctive relief to the Board in aid of enforcement of this act.

(c) Any employee who fails to perform the duties imposed on him by section 3 (d) of this act (which subsection relates to maintenance of existing conditions pending exhaustion of settlement efforts) shall not be entitled to reinstatement by, or any back pay from, such employer under section 10 of the National Labor Relations Act.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 12. As used in this act—

(1) The term "person" includes one or more individuals, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.

(2) The term "employer" includes any person acting in the interest of an employer, directly or indirectly.

(3) The term "employee" includes any employee, and shall not be limited to employees of a particular employer, and shall include any indivdual whose work has ceased as a consequence of, or in connection with, any current labor relations controversy or because of any unfair labor practice, and who has not obtained any other regular and substantially equivalent employment.

(4) The term "representative" includes any individual or labor organization.

(5) The term "labor organization" means any organization of any kind or any agency or employee representation committee or plan, in which employees participate and which exists for the purpose in whole or in part of dealing with employers with regard to the making or maintaining of agreements concerning wages, hours, or conditions of employment or with regard to grievances or other types of labor relations controversies.

(6) The term "Board" means the Federal Industrial Relations Board.

SEPARABILITY CLAUSE

SEC. 13. If any provision of this act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid, the remainder of this act, or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 14. This act may be cited as the "Federal Industrial Relations Act."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to protect interstate and foreign commerce by providing for the prompt, peaceful, and just

settlement of labor relations controversies between employers and employees, to establish the rights and obligations of the parties thereto, and for other purposes."

H. R. 5328—Substitute Labor-Management Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the complete text of H. R. 5328, a bill introduced by me, which I shall, at the proper time, offer as a substitute for the Case bill. The text as here given differs from the text of the printed bill only in that I have here added section 15. That section will be included when I offer the bill in the House.

H. R. 5328

A bill to provide additional facilities for the mediation and peaceful settlement of labor disputes, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the Congress hereby declares that the objectives of this act are to avoid and diminish strikes and other forms of industrial strife or unrest, which have the intent or the necessary effect of burdening or obstructing commerce, and to aid in attaining increased prosperity by achieving the highest degree of production at wages assuring a steadily advancing standard of living, by encouraging the acceptance of collective bargaining and voluntary conciliation, mediation, and arbitration agreements, thereby disposing of controversies between labor and management by peaceful means and discouraging avoidable strife through strikes and lock-outs.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. When used in this act—

(1) The term "commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication among the several States, or between the District of Columbia or any Territory of the United States and any State or other Territory, between any foreign country and any State, Territory or the District of Coulmbia, or within the District of Columbia or any Territory or between points in the same State but through any other State or any Territory or the District of Columbia or any foreign country.

(2) The term "industry affecting commerce" means any industry or activity in commerce or in which a labor controversy would burden or obstruct commerce or tend to burden or obstruct commerce or the free flow of commerce.

(3) The term "labor controversy" includes any disagreement, or any dispute, concerning terms, tenure, or conditions of employment or concerning the association or representation of persons in negotiating, fixing, maintaining, changing, or seeking to arrange terms or conditions of employment, regardless of whether the contestants or disputants stand in the proximate relation of employer and employee; but the term shall not include any matter subject to the provisions of the Railway Labor Act, as amended (44 Stat. 577, 48 Stat. 1185, 49 Stat. 1189).

(4) The term "employer" includes any person acting in the interest of an employer, directly or indirectly, but shall not include the United States, or any State or political subdivision thereof, or any person subject to the Railway Labor Act, as amended from time to time, or any labor organization (other than when acting as an employer), or anyone acting in the capacity of officer or agent of such labor organization.

(5) The term "employee" shall include any employee, and shall not be limited to the employees of a particular employer, and shall include any individual whose work has ceased as a consequence of, or in connection with, any current labor controversy or because of any unfair labor practice, and who has not obtained any other regular and substantially equivalent employment, but shall not include any individual employed as an agricultural laborer, or in the domestic service of any family or person at his home, or any individual employed by his parent or spouse.

(6) The term "representative" includes any individual or labor organization.

(7) The term "labor organization" means any organization of any kind, or any agency or employee representation committee or plan, in which employees participate and which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers, concerning grievances, labor controversies, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work.

MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION DIVISION

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby created in the Department of Labor a division to be known as the "Conciliation and Mediation Division" (hereinafter called the Division), at the head of which shall be a conciliation and mediation administrator (hereinafter called the Administrator). The Administrator shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate of $14,000 per annum, together with necessary traveling and subsistence expenses, or per diem allowance in lieu thereof, subject to the provisions of law applicable thereto, while away from the principal office of the Division. The Administrator shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment.

(b) The Administrator may appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees and make such expenditures for supplies, facilities, and services as may be necessary to carry out the Division's functions. Without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, the Administrator may appoint such experts, mediators, conciliators, and their assistants and fix their compensation as may be necessary to carry out the Division's functions. The Administrator may, subject to the civil-service laws, appoint such clerical and other personnel as may be necessary for the execution of the Division's functions, and shall fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

(c) The principal office of the Division shall be in the District of Columbia, but the Division shall establish regional offices convenient to localities in which labor controversies are likely to arise. The Administrator may by order, subject to revocation at any time, delegate any authority and discretion conferred upon him by this act to any Deputy Administrator, regional director, or other officer or employee of the Department of Labor and shall do so to the extent necessary to assure the decentralized exercise of the Division's functions. The Division may utilize the services of other agencies of the Government, part-time employees, and such voluntary and uncompensated services as may from time to time be needed.

(d) The Administrator may from time to time adopt, amend, and rescind such regulations and rules as may be necessary for the administration of the Division's functions.

(e) The Administrator shall make an annual report to Congress through the Secretary of Labor.

(f) Upon the appointment of the Administrator, those officers, commissioners of conciliation, employees of the Department of Labor, engaged in carrying out the conciliation and mediation functions now vested in the Secretary of Labor under the act of March 4, 1913 (37 Stat. 738), commonly known as the United States Conciliation Service, and those officers and employees of the National War Labor Board whose services in the judgment of the Administrator are necessary to the efficient operation of the Division, shall be transferred to and become employees of the Division. All records, papers, and property of the Department of Labor in carrying out these functions shall become records, papers, and property of the Administrator, and all unexpended funds and appropriations for such purposes shall become funds and appropriations available to be expended by the Administrator pursuant to this act. All conciliation and mediation proceedings pending before the Department and undisposed of at the time of such transfer shall be handled to conclusion by the Division.

(g) The Administrator may recommend for appointment by the President special mediators who shall act individually or in panels, when the Administrator shall deem such appointment necessary or desirable in furtherance of the objectives of this act. Each mediator appointed by the President shall receive from the Administrator such compensation as the President may fix at an amount not exceeding $100 per day together with his necessary traveling expenses and expenses actually incurred for subsistence while serving as mediator. Mediators appointed in accordance with this subsection shall not serve as arbitrators during their service under such appointments.

DUTIES OF EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYEES

SEC. 4. (a) It shall be the duty of employers and employees engaged in any industry affecting commerce and their agents and representatives to exert every reasonable effort to make and maintain agreements concerning wages, hours, and conditions of employment to the end of avoiding the occurrence, and providing for the prompt, peaceful, and just settlement of labor controversies. In case any such agreement is in existence and one of the parties thereto desires a change in the agreement, such reasonable efforts shall include the giving of notice in accordance with the provisions of such existing agreement, or if there is no such provision, then the giving of adequate written notice of the proposed change to the other parties to such existing agreement. Unless otherwise fixed by agreement the time and place for a conference between representatives designated and authorized so to confer by the respective parties shall be agreed on by the parties within 10 days after receipt of such notice and the time agreed on shall be within 30 days after receipt of such notice.

(b) If there arises a labor controversy within an industry affecting commerce, it shall be the duty of the employers and employees involved therein—

(1) promptly to arrange conferences between representatives designated and authorized so to confer by the employers and employees, respectively, and to exert every reasonable effort to settle the controversy expeditiously in such conferences; and

(2) in case the controversy is not so settled in such conferences and the Administrator proceeds to deal with the controversy through the procedures hereinafter provided, then fully and expeditiously to cooperate with the Administrator in respect to such procedures.

DUTIES OF ADMINISTRATOR

SEC. 5. (a) It shall be the duty of the Administrator, in order to prevent or minimize interruptions of the free flow of commerce growing out of labor controversies—

(1) to encourage employers and employees within industries affecting commerce to make and maintain agreements concerning wages, hours, and conditions of employment, and to encourage such employers and employees to settle their differences by peaceful means and by negotiations between the parties without resort to strikes, lock-outs, or any form of violence; and

(2) to assist parties to labor controversies within industries affecting commerce to settle such controversies through conciliation and mediation.

(b) The services of the Administrator may be invoked by the parties, or by either party, to any labor controversy in any industry affecting commerce, if such controversy is not referable to an adjustment panel hereinafter provided for in this act. The Administrator may proffer his services whenever there arises a labor controversy involving or threatening an immediate and substantial interruption to the free flow of commerce. In either event it shall be the duty of the Administrator promptly to put himself in communication with the parties and to use his best efforts, by mediation and conciliation, to bring them to agreement.

(c) If the Administrator is not able to bring the parties to agreement by mediation or conciliation, within a reasonable time, he shall seek to induce the parties voluntarily to submit the controversy to arbitration. If arbitration at the request of the Administrator is refused by one or both parties, the Administrator shall at once notify the Secretary of Labor and both parties to the controversy, in writing, that his efforts at mediation and conciliation have failed.

MAINTENANCE OF CONDITIONS DURING NEGOTIATIONS

SEC. 6. In the case of any labor controversy within an industry affecting commerce, it shall be the duty of the parties to the controversy to make no change, except by agreement, in the rates of pay, hours, or conditions of employment in effect prior to the time the controversy arose, until the expiration of 5 days after the Administrator has notified the parties that his efforts at mediation and conciliation have failed, unless a period of 10 days has elapsed after the termination of conferences between the parties without the services of the Administrator having been invoked or proffered in connection with the controversy.

UNITED STATES BOARD OF ARBITRATION

SEC. 7. (a) There is hereby created as an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government a Board to be known as the "United States Board of Arbitration" (hereinafter called the Board), composed of three members who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. One of the original members of the Board shall be appointed for a term of 1 year, one for a term of 2 years, and one for a term of 3 years. Their successors shall be appointed for terms of 3 years, except that any person chosen to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of any member's term shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of his predecessor. The Board shall annually designate a member to act as chairman. Any member of the Board may be removed by the President, upon notice and hearing, for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, but for no other cause.

(b) A vacancy in the Board shall not impair the authority of the remaining members to exercise all the functions of the Board, and two members shall at all times constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. The Board shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

(c) The Board may from time to time adopt, amend, and rescind such regulations and rules as may be necessary for the administration of its functions.

(d) The principal office of the Board shall be in the District of Columbia, but it may meet and exercise any or all of its functions at any other place.

(e) Each member of the Board shall receive a salary at the rate of $12,000 a year, together with necessary traveling and subsistence expenses, or per dim allowance in lieu thereof, subject to the provisions of law applicable thereto, while away from the principal office of the Board on official business. Members of the Board shall be eligible for reappointment, and shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment.

(f) The Board shall make an annual report in writing to Congress.

POWERS OF THE BOARD OF ARBITRATION

SEC. 8. (a) The Board may appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees and make such expenditures for supplies, facilities, and services as may be necessary to carry out its functions. Without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, the Board may appoint such experts, arbitrators, and their assistants and fix their compensation as may be necessary to carry out its function. The Board may, subject to the civil-service laws, appoint such clerical and other personnel as may be necessary for the execution of its functions, and shall fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. All expenditures of the Board shall be allowed and paid on presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the chairman or by any employee designated by the Board for that purpose.

(b) The Board may utilize the services of the Department of Labor and of other agencies of the Government in accordance with section 601 of the act of June 30, 1932, as amended: *Provided*, That by agreement of the Board with the Secretary of Labor the expenses of all or part of the services rendered by the Department of Labor may be paid out of the appropriation of that Department. The Board may utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services as may from time to time be needed. The Board may by order, subject to revocation at any time, assign or refer any part of its functions under this act to any member, agency, or employee of the Board. The Board may establish suitable procedures for cooperation with State and local mediation and arbitration agencies.

(c) The Secretary of Labor shall supply the Board with offices and hearing rooms in the District of Columbia and whenever possible when the Board's functions are exercised at any other place in accordance with section 601 of the act of June 30, 1932, as amended.

(d) Upon the appointment of the three original members of the Board and the designation of its chairman, all arbitration functions now performed by the Department of Labor shall be transferred to the Board. All records, papers, and property of the Department of Labor principally used in carrying out such arbitration functions shall become records, papers, and property of the Board. All arbitration proceedings pending before the Department and undisposed of at the time of such transfer shall be handled to conclusion by the Board.

PROCEDURE FOR VOLUNTARY ARBITRATION

SEC. 9. (a) (1) Whenever the Board is requested to do so by both parties to a labor controversy, it shall cooperate with the parties in forming a board of arbitration in accordance with an agreement to arbitrate conforming with the provisions of subsection (b) of this section signed by the parties: *Provided*, That the failure or refusal of either party to agree to arbitration shall not be construed as a violation of any legal duty or other obligation imposed by this act.

(2) It shall be the duty of the Board to establish a roster of arbitrators having a reputation for fairness and objectivity from which the Board or the parties to a controversy may select an arbitrator or arbitrators (as provided in section 10 (b) 3) familiar with the industrial and employment problems in the region or locality where the controversy arises.

(3) The board of arbitration formed in accordance with paragraph (1) of this subsection shall organize and select its own chairman and make all necessary rules for conducting its hearings: *Provided*, That such board of arbitration shall be bound to give the parties to the controversy a full and fair hearing which shall include an opportunity to present evidence in support of their claims and an opportunity to present their case in person, by counsel, or by their collective-bargaining representative.

(4) Upon notice from the United States Board that any party to an arbitration desires the reconvening of a board of arbitration (or a subcommittee of such board of arbitration appointed for such purpose pursuant to the agreement to arbitrate) to rule upon any controversy over the meaning or application of their award the board of arbitration or its subcommittee shall at once reconvene. No question other than or in addition to the questions relating to the meaning or application of the award submitted by the party or parties in writing shall be considered by the reconvened board of arbitration or its subcommittee. Such rulings shall be acknowledged by such board or subcommittee thereof in the same manner and filed in the same clerk's office as the original award and become a part thereof.

(5) No arbitrator except those chosen by the United States Board shall be incompetent to act as an arbitrator because of his interest in the controversy to be arbitrated or because of his connection with or partiality to any party to the arbitration.

(6) Each member of any board of arbitration selected by any party to the arbitration shall be compensated by the party selecting him. Each arbitrator selected by the arbitrators or by the United States Board pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection shall receive from the Board such compensation as the Board may fix at an amount not exceeding $100 per day together with his necessary traveling expenses and expenses actually incurred for subsistence while serving as an arbitrator.

(7) The board of arbitration formed in accordance with paragraph (1) of this subsection shall furnish a certified copy of its award to the respective parties to the controversy and shall transmit the original together with the record of the proceedings and a transcript of the evidence taken at the hearing certified under the hands of at least a majority of the arbitrators to the clerk of the district court of the United States for the district wherein the controversy arose or the arbitration is entered into, to be filed in said clerk's office as hereinafter provided. Such board of arbitration shall also furnish a certified copy of the award and of the record of the proceeding and transcript of evidence to the United States Board to be filed in its office.

(f) All testimony before a board of arbitration formed in accordance with paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be given under oath or affirmation and any member thereof shall have the power to administer oaths or affirmations. Such board of arbitration or any member thereof shall have the power to require the attendance of witnesses and the production of such books, papers, contracts, agreements, and documents may be deemed by such board of arbitration material to a just determination of the matters submitted to its arbitration and may for that purpose request the clerk of the district court of the United States for the district wherein said arbitration is being conducted to issue the necessary subpenas.

Upon such request the said clerk or his duly authorized deputy shall be, and be

hereby is, authorized and it shall be his duty to issue such subpenas. In the event of the failure of any person to comply with such subpena or in the event of the contumacy of any witness appearing before such board of arbitration, the board of arbitration may invoke the aid of the appropriate district court of the United States to compel witnesses to attend and testify and to produce such books, papers, contracts, agreements, and documents relevant and pertinent to the proceedings pending before the board of arbitration to the same extent and under the same conditions and penalties as provided for in the act to regulate commerce, approved February 4, 1887, and the amendments thereto. Any witness appearing before the arbitrators shall receive the same fees and mileage as witnesses in courts of the United States, to be paid by the party securing the subpena.

(b) Form of agreement to arbitrate: The agreement to arbitrate—

(1) shall be in writing;

(2) shall stipulate that the arbitration is had under the provisions of this act;

(3) shall specify means not inconsistent with the provisions of this act for selecting the board of arbitration;

(4) shall be signed by the duly accredited representatives of the employer or employers and the employees, parties respectively to the agreement to arbitrate, and shall be duly verified by said parties and filed in the office of the United States Board;

(5) shall state specifically the questions to be submitted to the said board of arbitration for decision and that in its award or awards the said board of arbitration shall confine itself strictly to decisions of the questions specifically submitted to it;

(6) shall provide that the questions or any one or more of them submitted by the parties to the board of arbitration may be withdrawn from arbitration by agreement of all the parties on notice to that effect signed by the duly accredited representatives of all the parties and served on the board of arbitration;

(7) shall stipulate that the signatures of a majority of said board of arbitration affixed to their award shall be competent to constitute a valid and binding award;

(8) shall fix a period from the date of the selection of the arbitrator or arbitrators necessary to complete the board (as provided for in the agreement) within which the said board of arbitration shall commence its hearings;

(9) shall fix a period from the beginning of the hearings within which the said board of arbitration shall make and file its award: *Provided*, That the parties may agree at any time upon an extension of this period: *Provided further*, That if the award of the said board of arbitration is not made and filed within the time agreed upon, and in the event the parties will not agree to any extension, the said board may extend the time for a period not to exceed an additional 15 days.

(10) shall provide for the date from which the award shall become effective and shall fix the period during which the award shall continue in force;

(11) shall provide that the award of the board of arbitration and the papers, proceedings, and transcript of the evidence when certified under the hands of at least a majority of arbitrators shall be filed in the clerk's office of the district court of the United States for the district wherein the controversy arose or the arbitration was entered into, which district shall be designated in the agreement and when so filed such award, papers, proceedings, and transcript of evidence shall constitute the full and complete record of the arbitration;

(12) shall provide that the award when so filed shall be final and conclusive upon the parties as to the facts determined by said award and as to the merits of the controversy decided;

(13) shall provide that any difference arising as to the meaning or the application of the provisions of an award made by a board of arbitration shall be referred for a ruling to the same board or by agreement to a subcommittee of such board and that such ruling when acknowledged in the same manner and filed in the same clerk's office as the original award, shall be a part of and shall have the same force and effect as such original award; and

(14) shall provide that the respective parties to the award shall each faithfully execute the same.

The said agreement to arbitrate when properly certified, as herein provided, shall not be revoked by a party to such agreement: *Provided*, That such agreement to arbitrate may at any time be revoked and canceled by the written agreement of the parties signed by their duly accredited representatives and, if no board of arbitration has yet been constituted under the agreement, delivered to the United States Board or any members thereof; or if the board of arbitration has been constituted as provided by the agreement, delivered to such board of arbitration. The award of a board of arbitration having been certified as herein provided shall be filed in the clerk's office designated in the agreement to arbitrate.

(c) The arbitration award: (1) An award certified and filed as provided in this section shall be conclusive on the parties as to the merits and facts of the controversy. Unless within 10 days after the filing of the award a petition to impeach the award on the grounds hereinafter set forth shall be filed in the clerk's office of the court in which the award has been filed, the court shall enter judgment on the award. Such judgment shall be final and conclusive on the parties.

(2) Any such petition for the impeachment of any award shall be entertained by the court only on one or more of the following grounds:

That the award plainly does not conform to the substantive requirements laid down by this act for such awards or that the proceedings were not substantially in conformity with this act;

That the award does not conform nor confine itself to the stipulations of the agreement; or

That a members of the board rendering the award was guilty of fraud or corruption or that a party practiced fraud or corruption which fraud or corruptions affected the result.

(3) No court shall entertain any such petition on the ground that the award is invalid for uncertainty. In such case the proper remedy shall be a submission of such award to a reconvened board or subcommittee thereof for a ruling. An award contested as herein provided shall be construed liberally by the court with a view to favoring its validity and no award shall be set aside for trivial irregularity or clerical error going only to form and not to substance.

(4) If the court shall determine that a part of the award is invalid on some ground or grounds designated in this section as a ground of invalidity, the remainder of the award shall not be affected thereby.

(5) At the expiration of 10 days from the decision of the court upon the petition filed as aforesaid final judgment shall be entered in accordance with said decision unless during said 10 days either party shall appeal therefrom to the circuit court of appeals. In such case only such portion of the record shall be transmitted to the appellate court as is necessary to the proper understanding and consideration of the questions of law presented by said petition and to be decided.

(6) If the petitioner's contentions are finally sustained, judgment shall be entered setting aside the award in whole, or, if the parties so agree, in part; but in such case the parties may agree upon a judgment to be entered disposing of the subject matter of the controversy which judgment when entered shall have the same force and effect as judgment entered upon the award.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

SEC. 10 (a) For the guidance and information of interested representatives of employers, employees, and the general public, the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor shall maintain a file of copies of (1) all agreements reached as a result of mediation, conciliation, and arbitration pursuant to this act; (2) all arbitration agreements made and awards rendered pursuant to this act; (3) all reports made by a fact-finding board pursuant to this act; and (4) any other collective labor agreements submitted for such purposes by any of the parties thereto. Such file shall be open to inspection under appropriate conditions prescribed by the Secretary of Labor.

(b) The Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Department of Labor shall be authorized and equipped to furnish upon request of the Board, the Administrator of Mediation and Conciliation, employers, employees, or their representatives, or any fact-finding board appointed under this act, all available data and factual information which may aid in the settlement of any labor controversy.

FACT-FINDING BOARDS

SEC. 11. (a) When the Administrator notfies the Secretary of Labor that his efforts at mediation and conciliation have failed in any controversy within an industry affecting commerce, if the Secretary of Labor finds that such controversy seriously affects the national public interest, he shall certify such finding to the President.

(b) At any time within 5 days after the date of such certification by the Secretary of Labor, the President, in his discretion, may appoint a board to investigate such labor controversy and to make a report containing its findings of fact and recommendations with respect to such controversy. Such board shall be composed of three or more persons, none of whom has any pecuniary or other private interest in the employers or employees who are parties to the controversy. The board shall proceed expeditiously to make a thorough investigation of all facts which it deems revelant to the controversy. The board shall give the parties to the controversy a full and fair hearing, which shall include an opportunity to present evidence in support of their claims and an opportunity to present their case in person, by counsel, or by their representatives. Within 20 days after the date of its appointment, the board shall submit to the President a report containing its findings of fact and such recommendations concerning the controversy as the board deems appropriate. The time for submitting the report of the board may be extended by agreement of the parties, or their representatives, with the approval of the President.

(c) Any board appointed under this section may prescribe or adopt such rules and regulations as it deems necessary to govern its procedures and the exercise of its functions. Each of the members of such board shall receive compensation at such rate, not exceeding $100 a day, as may be fixed by the President, and shall receive his necessary travel and other expenses incurred in connection with the work of the board. Such compensation and expenses shall be paid by the Secretary of Labor.

(d) The Secretary of Labor shall provide for the board such stenographic, clerical, and other assistants and such facilities, services, and supplies as may be necessary to enable the board to perform its functions. When a board appointed under this section has made its report, the board shall be dissolved and its records shall be transferred to the Secretary of Labor.

(e) After the President has appointed a board under this section and until the expiration of 5 days after such board has submitted its report, it shall be the duty of the parties to the controversy to make no change, except by agreement, in the rates of pay, hours, or conditions of employment in effect prior to the time the controversy arose.

ADJUSTMENT OF GRIEVANCES AND INTERPRETATION OF AGREEMENTS

SEC. 12. (a) The United States Board of Arbitration shall establish such adjustment panels as may be necessary for the adjustment of labor controversies growing out of grievances or out of alleged violations or the interpretation or application of collective agreements between employers and employees. Such adjustment panels may be established on a regional basis or an industry basis, or both, and each such panel shall have jurisdiction with respect to controversies to which this section is applicable in such region or in such industry or industries as may be prescribed by the Board. The members of each adjustment panel shall be selected by the Board. Each such panel shall consist of one or more representatives of employers, an equal number of representatives of employees, and one or more members, officers, or employees of the Board. The Board may authorize any member of the Board to serve on any adjustment panel at any time in place of any officer or employee of the Board who is a member of such panel. Members of such panels who are representative of employers and employees shall not receive any compensation from the United States, but no provision of law prohibiting officers or employees of the United States from receiving compensation from other sources shall be deemed applicable with respect to such members.

(b) The Board shall from time to time adopt, amend, and rescind such rules and regulations as may be necessary for governing adjustment panels in the exercise of their functions. The Board shall provide for adjustment panels such stenographic, clerical, and other assistants and such facilities, services, and supplies as may be necessary to enable such panels to perform their functions.

(c) Whenever a labor controversy between an employer and employees within an industry affecting commerce arises out of grievances or out of alleged violations or the interpretation or application of a collective agreement, if no method is provided in such agreement for the final settlement of such controversy, such controversy may be referred by petition of the parties or petition of either party to the appropriate adjustment panel with a full statement of the facts and all supporting data bearing upon the controversy. If such panel finds that the controversy so referred to it is within its jurisdiction it shall proceed to consider such controversy. Parties may be heard either in person, by counsel, or by other representatives, as they may respectively elect, and the adjustment panel shall give due notice of all hearings to the parties involved in the controversy. Any panel may empower three or more of its members to conduct hearings and make findings upon controversies, at any place designated by the panel, but final decisions as to any controversy must be made by a majority vote of the entire panel. Each adjustment panel shall deliver a written opinion in respect of each controversy referred to it, setting forth its decision as to the respective rights of the parties and requiring the parties to take such action as the panel deems just and equitable. The decision of the panel shall be transmitted to the Board; and if the Board finds that such decision was made in accordance with the provisions of this section, the Board shall issue an order requiring the parties to the controversy to comply with the requirements of such decision.

(d) If either party to a labor controversy does not comply with such an order of the Board, any party to such controversy or any other person for whose benefit such order was made may, at any time within 2 years from the date of the order of the Board, file in the appropriate district court of the United States a petition setting forth briefly the causes for which he claims relief, and the opinion of the adjustment panel and the order of the Board in the premises. Such suit in the district court shall proceed in all respects as other civil suits, except that on the filing of such suit the findings and opinion of the adjustment panel shall be prima facie evidence of the facts therein stated, and except that the petitioner shall not be liable for cost in the district court nor for cost at any subsequent stage of the proceedings, unless they accrue upon his appeal, and such cost shall be paid out of appropriation for the expenses of the courts of the United States. If the petitioner finally prevails in such suit he shall be allowed reasonable attorney's fees, to be taxed and collected as part of the costs of the suit. The district courts shall have jurisdiction to make such orders and to enter such judgment as may be appropriate to enforce or modify or set aside the order of the Board.

RIGHT TO QUIT EMPLOYMENT

SEC. 13. Nothing in this act shall be construed to require an individual employee to render labor or service without his consent, nor shall anything in this act be construed to make the quitting of his labor or service by an individual employee an illegal act; nor shall any court issue any process to compel the performance by an individual employee of such labor or service, without his consent.

SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

SEC. 14. If any provision of this act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of this act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 15. Nothing in this act shall apply to employers or employees covered by the Railway Labor Act.

Should the Selective Service Act Be Extended?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1946

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include notes used by me on the program Congress on the Air, which was broadcast over Station WINX in Washington Sunday, February 3. Since this material contains figures which I believe will be of interest to the membership on the subject of the extension of selective service, I call it to the attention of the House. The material follows:

SHOULD THE SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT BE EXTENDED?

I am glad to appear on this program with the distinguished Senator from Idaho, Mr. TAYLOR, and with my close and able friend, Congressman CLASON, and with Ernest Lindley, whose work is so well and so favorably known.

Congress, which is already laboring under heavy responsibilities, will, as Mr. Lindley has indicated, soon have the hot subject of draft extension added to its worries.

In effect, the War Department has stated that we must continue selective service beyond its present expiration date of May 15 or we shall have another lag in demobilization which I can assure you, Congress doesn't want to face, or we can abandon some of the commitments of the armed forces. If these are the actual alternatives, Congress will find itself in another hot spot. And if there are no other alternatives, Congress may find it necessary to continue the draft. This much is certain: we shall not abandon the things we have won honorably with American blood.

But I believe there are other alternatives, and Congress believes it. I'll go further and say that the heads of the armed forces can develop other alternatives. I have a great deal of confidence in their leadership. We have seen them lead our forces to victory; we have seen them put into operation a plan of demobilization which, despite weaknesses which may have been developed, has brought men home faster and in a more orderly manner than any other nation has ever done.

There is another very practical reason why the heads of the armed forces must develop suitable alternatives to the extension of the draft. Until the Congress has positive proof that there is no other way out, it won't be possible to muster a corporal's guard on Capitol Hill in support of continued selective service.

DRAFT VERSUS RECRUITMENT

I said a few moments ago that the War Department has stated in effect that we soon shall be right up against the choice of continuing the Selective Service Act or of causing a lag in demobilization, or an abandonment of commitments. If this should be the case, the choice will indeed be a most difficult one for Congress. Under such circumstances, Congress would continue the draft. But I don't believe those are the real circumstances.

Let me point out the basis for the War Department's reasoning that the draft must continue. The Army wants 1,500,000 men on July 1, 1946. I think we can confine this discussion to Army needs because both the Navy and the Marine Corps expect to get sufficient personnel from volunteers. The Army says recruitment will not provide enough men to fill its needs; that the others must come through selective service.

Let's examine the known facts to date. The prewar Regular Army was small. Recruiting was a more or less haphazard affair. By the standards then in effect, we could not hope to recruit many men. However, we may as well admit that no nation in history has maintained by volunteer recruitment a force as large as we now contemplate. And to complete that picture, we had, in September 1945 but 12,000 enlistments in the Regular Army.

But during September and October, Congress wrote a bill providing material inducements for service in the Regular Army and Navy. And in October the number of enlistments went up to 65,000; in November to 185,000; in December, the number was 131,000; and in January 71,000 for the first 3 weeks. By the end of January, the number had totaled more than 475,000. Enlistments are now running about 4,000 per day.

To me, here is a significant point. Representatives of the War Department testified in September before the Military Affairs Committee, of which I am a member, that it could not expect to secure more than 300,000 volunteers during the 10-month period from September 1945 to July 1946. The present high rate is unexpected, and the War Department does not believe the present rate of enlistments will continue. Many of the men who are enlisting are men already in the service who see advantages in the new act.

But War Department estimates for recruits for the 10-month period named already have been revised upward from 300,000 to 750,000.

On the other hand, the drive for volunteers from civilian life is just getting under way. Recruiting has never been pushed to the limit in this country. Military careers are now much more attractive than they have ever been before, and the public is not yet fully acquainted with this fact.

At any rate, the Army now thinks it can get 750,000 volunteers by July 1. I think it can get more, and if additional inducements for peacetime service are required, I am confident Congress will provide them. But, using the Army's figure of 750,000 as a basis, we arrive at a startling fact: This figure is nearly as large as that which the Army expected to secure from both enlistments and selective service. I want you to think on that. Representatives of the War Department stated that they needed 800,000 men in the period September to July, of which they expected to secure 500,000 by selective service and 300,000 by enlistments. By judging from past experiences, the Army greatly underestimated its ability to get volunteers.

NUMBER INDUCTED THROUGH SELECTIVE SERVICE

Now, let's take a look at selective service during the same period. Early in 1945 draft quotas were 120,000 per month. In September the Army reduced its monthly call to 50,000 men per month. But with the easing of pressure on the local boards the number secured began to drop. In September, 41,000 were received through selective service; in October, 37,000; in November, 35,000; and, in December, 21,000; in January the number was 21,000 for the first 3 weeks. This gave a total of something over 135,000 for the 5-month period.

I want to emphasize the fact that the Army anticipated 50,000 men per month for the 10-month period from September to July. It is falling far short of that mark. Local draft boards are quite naturally giving more and more consideration to family and hardship conditions. Even if selective service were continued, I do not think the Army could secure by this means the replacements which it needs to relieve men now in service.

ALTERNATIVES

I suggested that there are alternatives to selective service. I would like to discuss them.

The first, obviously, is added stress on voluntary enlistments. Service in the peacetime army should be made as attractive and distinctive as service in time of war, if that is possible. It may be necessary to provide some additional inducements for military careers through legislation, but I believe that policy changes by the departments are more important than additional legislation. I suggest:

1. Elimination of the caste system which relegates enlisted personnel to the lower social strata.

2. Homes for family men on or near military posts.

3. More promotions, including promotions from the ranks to commissioned status. I'm inclined to the view that all officers should first serve as enlisted men.

4. Continuation of family allotments.

5. Revision of pay scales periodically to make service compensation comparable to industrial wages.

6. Uniform and liberal retirement benefits for all services.

7. Improved educational opportunities.

I do not doubt that there are others which could be named.

As a second alternative, I suggest the reduction of requirements for men in the armed forces, by—

1. Greater use of PW's in processing of equipment for reshipment to this country and in rolling up overseas bases. It appears that we've got to feed them. We may as well work them.

2. Use of more civilian employees—at home and abroad. I have in mind Americans preferably, but I don't limit it to Americans at overseas stations.

3. More efficient use of men in the armed forces. I think this is a field for real improvement. I get letters every day from and about men in the services who have nothing to do. They want to get the job done and get home.

NOW, LET'S SUMMARIZE

With due respect to the men who direct the policies of the War and Navy Departments—and I do not think we have ever had an abler or more progressive group—I believe they have yet to learn a few things about the psychology of the American people. The people are not concerned about the fact that we are not now in a position to fight an engagement. They see no necessity to fight engagements now. I do not believe that the task of closing up shop and bringing our belongings home has been made sufficiently clear. To the people, this war, except for policing, is over. They want the boys home. When they get them home, they will be ready to start thinking about the next war, or of means for preventing it. Our people respect the armed forces and their leaders. They are in the mood for strong peacetime defenses. They don't want to abandon the things we fought for. But the job of demobilization and the job of building peacetime forces should be completely separated just as fast as possible.

I don't think the American people can be sold on continuation of the draft. But they will gladly endorse steps to make peacetime service in the armed forces by voluntary enlistments attractive and distinctive in peace as in war.

Needs for an Experimental Forest in Northern Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1946

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, the people of Wisconsin are vitally interested in their forest lands because the cutting and manufacture of wood products has been and still is a leading industry in the State. Concern over the future of the wood-using industries has been growing for a number of years as the more valuable species and sizes of raw supplies of standing timber became scarcer. A few figures will illustrate that there are real reasons for concern and that action must be taken to guide a revival of forest enterprises.

For several decades Wisconsin was a leading State in lumber production and vast quantities were exported to other areas. But annual production has declined steadily from over 3,000,000,000 board feet prior to 1900 to about 1,000,000,000 in 1925. Since 1935 annual production has been under half a billion board feet and Wisconsin has been forced to import lumber to meet its own requirements. This decline has resulted in loss of industries, employment opportunities, sources of taxable wealth, and entire communities.

The condition of the present forest resource is the key to possible future expansion and shows clearly some of the steps that must be taken. There are about 17,000,000 acres of forest land in the State, with 10,000,000 acres of it concentrated in the northern part.

This 10,000,000 acres covers 80 percent of all land in that northern territory and is primarily suited to tree growth rather than agriculture. It was once the major source of raw material for the lumber business but liquidation of saw timber stands was so rapid that today only 1,000,000 acres bear commercial stands of value to the lumber and veneer industries. These 1,000,000 acres are not supplying all of the remaining mills and some are continuing operation for a time by importing logs from other States. An additional 1,600,000 acres is forest of cordwood size. These areas produce pulpwood badly needed by our paper and pulp manufacturers but because of the small sizes of trees provide few raw materials for industries requiring larger timber. Diversification of industry is therefore limited in these cordwood areas. The saw timber and cordwood areas combined total 2,600,000 acres, or only 26 percent, of the entire forest area in northern Wisconsin. The remaining 7,400,000 acres is contributing very little raw material, because nearly 6,000,000 acres of it is covered with young growth too small for commercial use and the rest is deforested.

Maintenance of the forest-products industries now present in northern Wisconsin means that cutting in the small area of commercial forest must be prolonged until the young growth can grow to suitable size for cutting. Growth rate on the young forests must be increased so that trees will reach commercial size in time to meet the demands for raw supplies as older stands become exhausted. Deforested and brush areas should be converted to productive-forest growth by planting or other means. All this means more intensive management of forest land under improved methods.

Research is needed to develop these methods but no adequate program is available in Wisconsin. The Dukes experimental forest in northern Michigan is a practical demonstration of how research in forestry can benefit the people and industries in timbered sections of the country. Technical foresters have found out at Dukes how to prolong indefinitely the annual cut from a given forest area. This kind of information adapted to northern Wisconsin conditions is needed to help solve one of the most critical needs in that area. Improved methods to help with other important problems can also be worked out by tests and studies on an experimental forest. People needing the information can then see practical demonstrations on the ground by visiting these areas as they are already doing in great numbers in other parts of the United States.

Last year the Congress appropriated funds for setting up more experimental forests in the South but provision was not made for other regions where forestry is important. There is a great deal of public interest in expanding this program to include northern Wisconsin. Farmers are vitally concerned because as landowners they continually face problems of

forest management. Bankers and businessmen realizing the importance of forest industries to the State are in favor of an experimental forest to develop methods of intensive management that will help in putting the industries on a sounder permanent basis. Northern Wisconsin labor has the biggest stake in this program. Whether or not northern Wisconsin will have jobs in paper mills and pulp mills and other wood-product industries depends on the future of the wood, lumber, and timber supply. Other groups, including sportsmen and recreationists, see in better management an advancement of their interests.

Northern Wisconsin needs the services that an experimental forest program can provide, and $50,000 should be appropriated for the support of this work. This Congress cannot and must not let us down.

Pending Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 4, 1946

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

For the Members of the House of Representatives:

We, the undersigned, representing seven maritime unions, of 250,000 members, and meeting in the city of Washington on February 4, 1946, call upon Congress to reject pending legislation aimed at the destruction of American labor unions and to take immediate steps to break the conspiracy of dominant industrial and financial interests which today threatens the future of America.

This coalition is embarked on a program which spells crisis, unemployment, suffering, and stagnation. They seek monopoly control and monopoly profits. They would foster unemployment and low wages, restricted production, and high prices.

Organized labor stands as a barrier in the way of their putsch.

There has been no repetition of the ugly and open repressions of the past, of the Memorial Day massacre, of the Mohawk Valley formula, because the solidarity of working people foredoomed such attempts to failure. Veteran and nonveteran workers, male and female workers, Negro and white workers stand shoulder to shoulder.

Unable to breach labor's solid wall, these conspirators now attempt a flank attack. They seek to shackle labor with legislation railroaded through on the wave of a manufactured hysteria. They have calculated their plot to exclude public consideration of the issues. They seek to impose their absolute control over the American people by a process akin to the dictum of a dictator.

The subvention of the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act, the bans on peaceful picketing, the prohibitions of the right of workingmen to organization, the initial move to destroy labor's basic right, are steps to the denial of freedoms achieved only after long years of uphill struggle.

The opening of union treasuries to mulcting by the combined industrial and financial interest is a hideous mockery of equality under law. These giant corporations with their unlimited reserves will deplete the workers' fund as rapidly and callously as they have destroyed our natural resources in their drive for unlimited profits.

As if their own giant holdings were not sufficient, the present strike of industry, the war against the American people, the withholding of vitally needed goods to clothe and shelter our returning veterans and to ward off dangerous inflation are being financed by the United States Treasury through excess-profits credits.

In the interest of a strong, free and prosperous America we call upon Congress to:

1. Repudiate the Case bill and all other variations of strait-jacketing antilabor legislation.

2. Repeal the carry-back carry-forward provisions of the Revenue Act of 1945.

3. Investigate immediately the conspiracy of corporative interests utilizing the full resources of the Congress, the Justice Department, the OPA and other agencies.

Joseph Y. Rubin, Murray Winocur, Jack Winocur, E. L. Gillman, Harry Morgan, Walter A. O'Brien, American Communications Association; Fred Bruette, V. J. Malone, E. A. Ramsay, Walter Stack, Walter Harris, Marine Firemen, Oilers, Watertenders and Wipers Association; Hugh Bryson, Sid Kaufman, Irv Dvorin, Dennis Hooper, Marine Cooks and Stewards Association; Joseph E. Curran, Joseph Stack, John Rogan, Harry Conner, E. E. Williams, Jack Lawrenson, Howard McKenzie, National Maritime Union; Harry R. Bridges, Louis Goldblatt, J. R. Robertson, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union; Samuel J. Hogan, R. Merriweather, Warren C. Evans, National Marine Engineers Beneficial Association; Ralph Goldsmith, Inlandboatsmen's Union.

Settlement of Industrial Disputes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. GEELAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 4, 1946

Mr. GEELAN. Mr. Speaker, I cannot say that my experience in the Congress thus far has impressed me too much with the effectiveness of debates.

Usually Member after Member takes the floor and gives his opinion on the subject matter under discussion and very often without too much regard for the facts in the case.

It would seem, therefore, that a much better contribution could be made in debates if the Members were in possession of the facts, so probably the better course to pursue would be to postpone consideration of this legislation at this time until Congress had done a little fact finding of its own. In support of that contention I submit the following as proof of the wisdom and necessity for following such a course of action. Two days following the request of the President that legislation be adopted to provide adequate means for the settling of industrial disputes the distinguished chairlady of the Committee on Labor [Mrs. NORTON] introduced in the House of Representatives a bill now known as H. R. 4908, to implement the suggestion of the President, and public hearings were held by the Committee on Labor on this bill on December 10, 12, 13, and 14. Now, I submit that that was speedy and expeditious action on the part of the Committee on Labor, which I have heard accused numberless times on this floor as being dilatory in their tactics and irresponsive in their actions to the will of the people of the country. Following the hearings on December 14, it was decided that in view of the fact that the House was scheduled to adjourn on the 21st, that it would be impossible to conclude the hearings, have the report printed, and the bill reported to the House for action before that date.

The majority of the committee felt that in view of the testimony that it heard that the bill in its present form was certainly not the answer to the problem confronting the Nation. As a result of that conclusion a motion was adopted to continue hearings following the recess and to broaden the scope of the subject matter so that we might get at the basis for the real cause of these industrial disputes and as a result of that information would be able to submit corrective legislation to the House.

During the recess, as you know, the President appealed to the people of the country in an attempt to break the log jam which was holding up his legislative program.

This evidently caused the strategists in the Republican Party to go to work, and the first manifestation of their plan was exhibited on January 17, the first day on which a hearing was held by the Committee on Labor following the recess. The bills under consideration at the public hearing on that day pertained to the return to the States of the employment offices. When the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] moved, even though we were still conducting a public hearing on a definite subject matter, that we proceed to the consideration of H. R. 4908, the so-called fact-finding bill, and to report the bill with an amendment striking out the cooling-off period and the subpena power of the fact-finding boards to the House. Despite the irregularity of such proceedings, the motion was only defeated by a narrow margin.

The committee continued its hearings on the employment service bills, on the 18th and 19th. On the 21st a request was made to the Rules Committee for a rule on H. R. 5142 and on Tuesday, January 22, the committee went into executive session on H. R. 4908, the fact-finding bill. This bill was reported out of committee with the Landis amendment again attached late that afternoon. On Wednesday, the 23d, a request was made of the Rules Committee for a rule on H. R. 4908 with the result that we neither have the fact-finding bill as suggested by the President nor as a suggested substitute, a bill which any person professing to be fair could say that he would support. Much has been said about the method

used in bringing the Case bill to this floor for action so I will not dwell further on that point other than to say that no star-chamber proceedings ever conducted could match the operation of the Rules Committee on their handling of this matter. I think I have shown to all fair-minded people that the Labor Committee has acted expeditiously and intelligently. I think it is now very evident to all who will see that this subject requires much more investigation and study before anything resembling an honest or factual decision as to what the correct method of handling these disputes should be.

It has been contended here by a number of Members on the other side of the aisle that they were acting at the request of the President. If this is correct I dare say it would mark the first time since 1932 with the possible exception of the declaration of war that the members of the minority party in this House followed the advise, council, and suggestions of the President or of our late President. They also forget to tell you that largely by the efforts of the members of their party they have other legislation which the President recommended securely locked up in committee and is still so pigeonholed. No mention is made of that, no promise that the suggestions of the President's in those respects will be followed out.

As a result of questioning on the floor the other day it became quite evident what the plan in the back of the framers of the Case resolution was. As I stated before, on January 17 the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] moved that H. R. 4908 be favorably reported to the House with the subpena power of the fact-finding boards and the cooling-off period stricken from the bill. Obviously this was merely a move to get the bill out of committee, and it was felt that by amending the bill as suggested he would satisfy opposition that management had to the subpena power of the fact-finding boards and would satisfy labor by the removal of the cooling-off period. The obvious intent for such a move was to use the bill as a vehicle to which could be attached much more drastic and punitive measures as has been done. The reference he made as to why I think this is so is that on Thursday, as a result of a question by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN] addressed to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] as to whether the gentleman from Indiana knew, at the time he made his motion in the committee to report out the fact-finding bill, of the Case bill. His answer to that question and subsequent contributions on the part of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] left no doubt in the minds of all who heard the question and answers that the gentleman from Indiana did know that a measure along these lines was to be presented.

I am sure that with this explanation all fair-minded Members will agree that neither of these bills are the answer to the problem and that only by a further painstaking investigation will we be able to come up with the right answers, a solution that will be fair to the public, to industry, and to labor.

Shall We Have Peacetime Military Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1946

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address delivered by me over WWDC, Washington, D. C., December 5, 1945; over KDRO, Sedalia, Mo., and KGBX, Springfield, Mo., on Saturday, December 15; and over KWTO, Springfield, Mo., Sunday, December 16, 1945:

My fellow countrymen, today Congress is faced with more headaches than ever before in our history. Among the many complex, baffling problems that confront us, none is more important or momentous in its consequences than the highly controversial and hotly debated question of universal military training.

As a member of the Special Select Committee on Postwar Military Policy that listened for weeks to voluminous testimony, and as a member of the House Committee on Military Affairs that is now holding hearings on this widely disputed question, I propose briefly to discuss it. Like every other question, it has two sides, and is a matter on which honest, intelligent, and patriotic people differ. We should be charitable or at least reasonable with those who differ from us.

There is one fundamental point upon which all the members of our committee, and I believe the whole Congress and the American people agree—and that is—America must be strong during the postwar period of readjustment and in the midst of confusion and uncertainty in a troubled and unstable world. All of us want adequate preparedness for this country and differ only as to the means whereby we can achieve it. We all want a just and lasting peace.

As most of you know, I made the motion in our committee to postpone action on this legislation until next January. And though the motion failed by the narrow margin of 3 votes, I think I can assure you tonight that there will be no action on this legislation until next year, and also that H. R. 515, which grants blanket authority without any definite plan to the Federal Government to conscript young men at the age of 18, will not pass without modification.

We who opposed the consideration of this legislation now are not necessarily opposed to some kind of military training because we believe in adequate national defense. We want a superior Air Force, the largest Navy, not necessarily the largest but certainly the most highly trained and best equipped Army on this earth. We also want two more things: 1. Scientific research and technological development in the latest weapons and most up-to-date techniques of warfare. 2. A centralized intelligence service which will inform our Government and our people what is actually going on in every other nation.

It is generally agreed that the next war will be as different from the one just ended as this war was from the one fought a quarter of a century ago. The next war will largely be fought in laboratories and test tubes—perhaps by pushing buttons, touching off pilotless planes, and jet-propelled rockets carrying atomic energy which would render obsolete any large standing army within a few years or even months after its training. While trained men are still necessary, future wars will not be won by mass armies.

There is no occasion for hysterical haste and any attempt to use wartime emotions to pass this legislation is unwise. The fears of the people are being played upon. Like a Mother Hubbard this bill covers everything and touches nothing. We want more details in this specific measure, more information about the President's negotiations with foreign powers and the possibilities of universal agreements in the United Nations Organization which might make the military draft unnecessary. Questions have developed which make it advisable to review the whole structure of our national defense and our military establishments. We must not hurriedly adopt recommendations for makeshift solutions which in the long run may only weaken this Nation.

Can we not afford to wait for a little while until some definite decisions are reached upon the handling of the atomic bomb and until our foreign commitments are made known under the United Nations Organization?

It is generally admitted by everyone that Germany, Japan, and Italy have been all but annihilated and rendered impotent for years to come so that there is no great need for building up a huge military establishment in order to defend ourselves. General Eisenhower recently said there would never be war between the United States and Great Britain, and that Soviet Russia did not want war with us.

The truth of the matter is both Britain and Russia are exhausted by this war and are now coming to us with hat in hand, each asking for a $6,000,000,000 loan. Russia will be kept occupied for the next quarter of a century in rehabilitating herself, rebuilding her cities, and setting her own house in order. Britain has more irons in the fire than she can handle. Of whom, then, are we afraid? We still have superiority in the air and on the sea, with a reservoir of 12,000,000 men and women who fought in this war, and half of whom will be the best reserves on earth for the next 5 years. Why not wait just a little while until we find out what our contribution will be to the international organization that will establish a just and lasting peace? Why not center our attention on peace instead of war? Why challenge others to an armament race?

There is no danger of an immediate attack on the United States from any quarter in this world. We have the secret of the atomic bomb and intend to keep it until we can reach a mutual understanding and agreement that will not jeopardize our safety.

But the militarists and those who rely only upon physical force are working feverishly to cram down our throats this bill. Naturally, the admirals and generals have a vested interest because they want to maintain their rank and pay. They like to command large bodies of men and think little of other phases of our national defense, except the military.

Certainly, such legislation, which is a radical departure from our whole philosophy of life, should not be acted upon until the millions of men and women in our armed services—many of them still overseas—are returned to this country to give their own free and untrammeled opinions after their discharges. We have been told that those in our armed services are overwhelmingly in favor of this legislation. This, I do not believe any more than I do the Gallup poll. I can truthfully say that my heavy correspondence has been 10 to 1 against peacetime conscription or universal military training.

The proponents of this legislation have adroitly called it universal military training and they have belabored the point that

it is not peacetime conscription. A rose smells the same by any name you call it and the point is, every youth when he reaches the age of 18 is drafted for 1 year to take military training. He must do this whether he wants to or not. This is the essence of coercion and compulsion which is repugnant to free men. It is so contrary to our American tradition that it deserves the most careful scrutiny and mature consideration.

I dare say that most men and women in our armed services, as well as our civilian population, have not read this bill and thought it through to its inevitable conclusion. If men in our armed forces are so strong for it, why do the proponents of the measure want to rush it through before these men are brought back home? Why saddle this un-American scheme and foreign system upon them when they are abroad? The ones who have suffered most and made the greatest sacrifices are entitled to be heard on a matter of such major importance. Men in uniform are not free to give their honest opinions—not so long as they remain in the clutches of their officers. We should wait until the servicemen come home and are out of uniform. Then they will be free to talk and express their full and honest judgment.

My fellow Americans, those who are advocating the passage of this legislation have been very careful to say little or nothing about its tremendous cost. The money called for under this program would give every boy and girl in the United States a 4-year college or university education. It was admitted by the Secretary of War that the enactment of the pending bill will create a standing Army of 500,000 men to train every year 700,000 inductees, which with the upkeep and equipment will cost the taxpayers of this country $4,200,000,000. Yesterday we passed a naval bill in the House which will add its annual expenditure of $3,500,000,000. This means a total of $7,700,000,000 for the Army and Navy alone in peacetime. The Veterans' Administration will spend next year $3,600,000,000 and the interest on our staggering national debt of nearly $300,000,000,000 will amount to $6,000,000,000 a year. Think of it—an annual Budget of $17,300,000,000 for only our armed services, the Veterans' Administration, and interest on our national debt. This does not include social security or any appropriations for the regular departments and establishments of the Government. It is safe to predict that our annual Budget following this war will be about four times as large as it was before the war. Can the American people carry such an overwhelming burden? Any sane person knows we cannot continue forever to spend two and three dollars for every one we take in.

Yes; we believe in national defense, but the military arm is only one part of it. Economic soundness and financial strength are just as important. Military prowess is no good if we are bankrupt. No sane person will deny that it was America's industrial capacity, her business acumen, and her financial strength which supplied the sinews and weapons of war, as well as the fighting heart of our men and women on the battle fronts that won this war.

This calls for a word about industrial mobilization. If we will not have time to mobilize men in the next war, certainly we will not have time to convert from peace to war time economy. So if we are to have conscription, let's make it total. If we have draft of manpower, let's have industrial mobilization. Men are at least as important as money. If we want to stay out of war, let's take the profits out of war. Those who are so eager to conscript their neighbors are not so keen on having their own money and their own business drafted. There was a plan of industrial mobilization before this war, but we could not put it through Congress.

My fellow Americans, I want to keep this country free. I want it to be a land of freemen and of free enterprise. Because it always has been, we have repelled every attack made upon us. Only recently Congress passed a bill with liberal provisions to stimulate voluntary enlistments. We reduced the period of training from 3 years to 1. We made the Army more attractive by increasing servicemen's pay, by encouraging promotions within the ranks, by giving benefits to their families, by offering travel and educational opportunities, and in the first 2 months 60,000 men enlisted or reenlisted in our Army. They are coming in now at the rate of more than 6,000 per day, or four times the number volunteering in September. Why not give the volunteer method a fair trial? A volunteer army is the best army on earth. Freemen always have outworked, outproduced, and outfought slaves.

It is significant that Germany, Japan, and Italy—the three Axis Powers—as well as every other major nation in history which has had universal military training or peacetime conscription, inevitably has been led into war and eventually to defeat and utter ruin.

If we begin drafting men and then pass the equal rights amendment to the Constitution, we will also draft women and finally and inescapably we will draft all business. We have not fought to destroy militarism and dictatorship abroad to establish them here at home. We do not feel that it is morally safe, economically justifiable, or politically wise to take 18-year-old adolescents from the influences of their homes, churches, and schools and segregate them in Army camps where influences are none too good. In military life discipline is imposed from without. In civilian life discipline is created from within. Education and health of our youth can be developed much more efficiently and cheaply in our schools than in Army camps. Blind obedience to military commands is not conducive to the free scientific spirit of inquisitiveness. Servility to superiors makes a boy weak—not strong. One can differ and talk back in a college classroom, but not in an Army camp.

We do not feel that America, which is populated by many peoples—most of whom came to this New World to escape the tyranny of the Old—should now adopt the foreign philosophy and the alien idea from which they fled. Millions of our men have fought and many thousands have died to avoid such slavery.

Mr. Speaker, it is rather significant that our Committee on Military Affairs, after reconvening in January 1946, decided to postpone hearings on this controversial measure indefinitely. Perhaps it is because they heard from the people when they were back home during the recess, or maybe it is because General Eisenhower has justified fully the stand I took on this legislation before hearings began November 8, 1945.

Demobilization of Doctors and Dentists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following portions of a letter received from a dentist on duty in the Philippines. Apparently the same old hoarding of doctors and dentists still exists.

LUZON, PHILIPPINES, *January 20, 1946.*

DEAR DR. JUDD: I'm a dentist in the Army stationed on Luzon for the present. I feel very strongly that the War Department is not accomplishing this demobilization as fast as they can and the reasons they give for the slowing down are certainly not valid in a majority of the cases here. There are still a lot of question that I think Congress ought to investigate.

1. Why has the Army Dental Corps stopped giving commissions to ASTP graduates and yet will not discharge men 35 to 40 that will have to go out and start building a practice again? I am 25, 2½ years Army, overseas 14 months, and so have no complaint at present but I am afraid that I will be in a couple more years if a fire isn't set under the man in charge. There are men here that have been declared surplus a month ago by Base M but they are just left here although we have eight dentists doing work that could easily be handled by two dentists.

2. Why isn't the medical department relieving the doctors overseas and discharging more doctors? The doctors are as badly overstaffed as the dentists with 32 doctors for 900 patients but again the surplus is just left. A majority of the doctors (75 percent) have had 3 years' service and 1½ years overseas. One young doctor has been sent here and he says that the Army is holding the fresh graduates in the States for some reason or other. He volunteered to come overseas or would be in the States himself.

There are many more lesser points that should be cleared up but I do not wish to bother you with the minor items. A doctor whom I know is being held up for discharge because he is a specialist in internal medicine. He has not been practicing internal medicine for better than a year.

I am like the rest of the men over here, perfectly willing to do my duty and stay if necessary, but I haven't done a day's work since the war ended and I know that most of the soldiers in the islands have done the same. I think we deserve an honest statement as to why we are here or else a trip home.

I realize that you aren't on the committee investigating the demobilization but I thought that you could forward the facts. My aim was to let you and the other Representatives know about the situation over here from a person who has been over here quite a while and traveled around Luzon a good deal.

Sincerely yours,

_____,

Captain, Dental Corps.

Loan to England

REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1946

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, as the time approaches for us to consider the application for a loan to England, it is significant that British figures generally popular in this country begin to arrive on our shores. We have Mr. Churchill, Lady Astor, Labor Party Floor Leader Herbert Morrison, Food Minister Sir Ben Smith, and we are told a trip was planned for Princess Elizabeth, but for some reason her trip was canceled. Our friends across the sea have found by experience that this operation pays big dividends. The King came to see the President just

before our entry into the Second World War.

Our internationally minded folks in New York and Washington, sometimes referred to as parlor pinks, now can be expected to whoop it up for the Empire.

This past week Lady Astor reminded us of our obligation to England although we have canceled war debts and lend-lease obligations to the tune of $35,000,000,000.

At the time Bretton Woods was approved by the Congress we were told by the proponents that this bank would afford facilities for foreign loans along with the Export-Import Bank and make direct loans unnecessary. Now we are informed that practically all our allies are coming in for loans. First comes the British for $4,500,000,000, then the Russians for $6,000,000,000, and five or six billion for other allies. Why does not the administration give us the overall picture of the loan situation so we can approach the problem intelligently?

The opposition to the Truman loan by some of the British spokesmen has been the subject of much speculation in this country. We have some interesting information from an authoritative source which will throw some light on the subject. This source discloses Mr. Dalton, the Chancelor of the Exchequer, as saying the loan agreement gives England a substantial and undisputable advantage. It is further evident that England must have the Truman loan in order to fulfill one of its provisos, to wit, to have the financial strength to participate in the Bretton Woods agreement. Again we have a picture of the cunning deceit of our administration.

The American people were told that our allies would contribute to the Bretton Woods Bank. Now it appears that the Allies will contribute to the bank, whose sole purpose is to lend money to and stabilize the currency of foreign nations, provided we give them the money for their contribution. This certainly presents an interesting situation, and it is my intention to discuss this subject to a greater extent when the loan proposal comes to the House.

Polish Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1946

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very interesting and to the point editorial on the Polish problem that appeared in the Washington Evening Star of Saturday, February 2:

POLISH PROBLEM

The grave charges made by London and Washington against the law-enforcement branch of the present Polish Government brings back into the limelight of public interest the thorny problem which that unfortunate country presents. In virtually identical terms, Foreign Secretary Bevin and Secretary of State Byrnes accuse the Polish security police of murdering prominent members of political parties which are in the Polish Government's bad graces. These open charges follow repeated diplomatic representations by the British and American Ambassadors to Warsaw which have had no effect.

The indications are that the Polish Government is not minded to heed these protests. The reaction of the Polish official press and Government spokesmen to Mr. Bevin's statement was an angry denial of the charges, coupled with assertions that Poland was an independent nation whose Government would do as it saw fit. Now, in answer to Secretary Byrnes, the Polish Ambassador here denies the charges, puts the blame on agents of the London government in exile, and goes so far as to assert that those exiled elements, headed by Gen. Wladyslaw Anders, maintain contact with their "terrorist" agents in Poland "through a group of the national armed forces stationed in Coburg in the American zone of Germany."

Whatever may be the truth about the doings of those "reactionary" agents, the Polish Government is not free to do as it pleases, because it is bound by the terms of the Yalta and Potsdam agreements, to which it assented in order to get recognition from Britain and America. One of those terms is the establishment of a democratic, representative government, attained by free elections. And both Secretary Byrnes and Foreign Secretary Bevin have pointed out that their governments assumed responsibility for the carrying out of those pledges.

However, the weight of reliable evidence is to the effect that the present Polish Government is ruthlessly persecuting all those who do not bow to its policies; also that those elements constitute a majority of the Polish people. Under such circumstances the holding of free elections is impossible. Furthermore, a high Polish official has announced that the elections, when held, would be "democratic in the sense that the Poles understand democracy, and not in the western sense." This is, of course, the line taken by Soviet Russia and all its satellites. It reveals more clearly than ever how thoroughly the present Polish Government, originally Moscow's creation, is Moscow's tool. In view of all this, it seems that Washington and London have reason to regret what seems to have been premature recognition of a regime which makes a mockery of its international obligations.

Industrial Dynamite

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1946

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Times of Friday, February 1, 1946, on the strike situation:

STOP, LOOK, AND LISTEN, CONGRESS

Events of the past few days bring thoughtful citizens to the unhappy conclusion that the Lower House of Congress has been stampeded into consideration of a labor-control bill which has the earmarks of industrial dynamite.

The pressure on Congress to "do something" about the current strike situation apparently has built up a mood of mob psychology among some legislators. The House yesterday voted, 258 to 114, to consider a labor bill introduced only 3 days ago by Representative CASE, Republican, of South Dakota.

This bill has never been considered by a legislative committee. There have been no public hearings on it. It was not even in printed form when it was first submitted on Tuesday. It stands a fair chance of being passed by the House next Tuesday, whooped thoroughly by Republicans and southern Democrats.

Aside from the merits or demerits of the Case bill, Congress, by hasty action, has shown it is in no mood to pass important legislation which should have all the study and preparation as was given to such a bill as the Wagner Labor Relations Act in 1935. Passage of half-baked legislation could make matters worse, not better. Congress should recall the fiasco of the Smith-Connally bill, which was passed during a wave of anger against John L. Lewis and which caused more strikes than it prevented.

The Case bill may contain provisions which eventually must be adopted, in some form, by Congress. But it contains others which at the very least have nothing to do with the present controversies—such as prohibition of formation of foremen's unions. It includes one provision that could take away from certain workers their hard-won rights under the Wagner Act in the event of a fist fight on a picket line.

ACTION NOW, HEADACHES LATER

These are matters for long-range legislation to be considered when the country, through Congress, writes a definite labor policy. Hasty action now can bring headaches later. Calmer heads in Congress should ask their colleagues: Is there anything at all that we can do now about the present strike situation? William M. Leiserson, Chairman of the National Mediation Board and a towering figure in American labor history, says it's too late to aid the settlement of the current strike condition by legislation.

Mr. Leiserson says the Government cannot absolutely prevent strikes. That's a plain fact. The Case bill is advertised as a measure that will prevent strikes. All the Government can do is to secure the rights of both unions and employers, to protect the rights of the public, to use its good offices in bringing employers and employees together, and in the most stubborn cases to facilitate the settlement by mobilization of facts.

After the Government has done all of that, there still will be strikes unless collective bargaining is conducted in a spirit of good will on both sides. We have seen that genuine bargaining can be made to work, as witness the settlement of the Ford and Chrysler issues without strikes. The prevention of strikes must come voluntarily from the relationship which capital and labor create between themselves.

WAGNER ACT VERSUS HUMAN NATURE

The question has been raised whether the Wagner Labor Relations Act has failed. It was supposed to remove certain sources of industrial strife and unrest. The Wagner Act was not a cure-all. It eliminated one cause of industrial strife; the refusal of employers to recognize the inherent right of employees to organize into unions. It equalized the position of capital and labor at the bargaining table—but it couldn't force them to agree. The Wagner Act couldn't change human nature.

The Wagner Act was a long step on the road to harmony between those who own the tools of industry and those who work them. The Wagner Act eliminated most of the violence from the labor disputes. It has brought disagreements from the picket line to the conference table. Now, perhaps, we have reached the stage where the two powerful groups, capital and labor, must write their own rules to facilitate agreement or find themselves in a maze of musts that Congress will attempt to write.

The answer to that problem does not lie in passing laws such as the Case bill with which would have the effect in many instances of going back to the days when there were no labor laws at all. In some cases it would nullify the Wagner Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act.

The answer should lie, in the long run, in better defining the social obligations of both capital and labor, and, in some industries, such as utilities, setting up better machinery for bargaining patterned after the Railway Labor Act.

Congress should stop, look, and listen—especially to experts such as Leiserson—before it takes any action that it, or the country, may later regret.

Where Was the American Legion When the Veterans' Administration First Caught on Fire?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. HOOK
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 4, 1946

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by J. H. Leib, past vice commander, past service officer, chairman, servicemen's hospitality committee:

WHERE WAS THE AMERICAN LEGION WHEN THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FIRST CAUGHT ON FIRE?

(By J. H. Leib, past vice commander, past service officer, chairman, servicemen's hospitality committee)

The vicious and demagogic attack by the national commander of the American Legion upon General Bradley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, backfired so fiercely that the echo was heard throughout the Nation.

Why did the leadership of the American Legion wait to bombast the befuddled Veterans' Administration at such a late date?

It is amusing to recall that during the original assault upon General Hines and his deplorable administration of veterans' affairs, which was led by this writer, the leadership of the American Legion had the audacity to come before the House of Representatives Veterans' Committee in June 1945 to defend the very predicament and state of affairs that they are now attempting to criticize.

I submit that the leadership of the American Legion more than any other single force is responsible for existing conditions within the Veterans' Administration. This assertion is based upon the following facts:

When this writer as an officer in the Legion launched an attack upon the Veterans' Administration early in August 1944, predicting the very situation that now presents itself, the national headquarters of the Legion sent representatives to the king makers of my post to demand that I be ousted from office. I was coerced, threatened, and finally bitterly reprimanded by the District of Columbia department commander of the Legion at an open post meeting.

This feeble censure came at the specific request of the national headquarters of the American Legion.

In other words the leadership of the Legion did everything it possibly could to silence a single voice that was crying in the wilderness—pleading and urging that immediate action be taken to prevent the existing chaotic scandal, which now has been heaped upon the shoulders of General Bradley and who is trying his utmost to correct these conditions.

The leadership of the Legion not only refused to take part in such a farsighted campaign but went out of its way to vilify those who were extremely anxious to see that the machinery was set up to ease the burden of returning veterans who might have business before the VA.

When I, and later others, demanded an immediate shake-up and the necessity for the streamlining of procedures for claims and hospitalization in the Veterans' Administration—didn't the American Legion rush to the defense of General Hines, heaping praise and additional honors upon him?

It was during this very period that the break-down of the Veterans' Administration was well under way. The American Legion showed no concern then—why is it doing so now?

Didn't the national rehabilitation director of the Legion say during last spring's congressional investigation of the Veterans' Administration that the American Legion had no other choice but to defend their benefactor—General Hines, and his dispirited administration, simply because the VA was "our baby—and we must defend ourselves in face of the charges"?

Didn't the National Legionnaire—official publication of the Legion, carry a story in its June 1945 issue headlined as follows: "An appreciation of General Hines—by director of division that worked closest with veteran leader"—meaning the rehabilitation director.

I ask—appreciation for what? For the callous disregard of human feeling and public responsibility that the Hines' administration displayed in the rehabilitation of disabled veterans—for his lack of foresight and incompetency that was so obvious then, as it is now?

Didn't the leadership of the Legion on August 31, 1945, present a gold watch to General Hines, as a token of "love, respect, affection, and esteem of every member of the Legion"—for his outstanding service as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs?

This stupid occasion took place 2 months after General Hines was ousted from office and while the newspaper headlines were still burning with such articles like "Veterans treated like dogs in veterans' hospitals," "Northport Hospital manager confirms abuse of patients," "Care of tubercular at veterans' hospitals scored," "General Bradley on surprise visit finds bad state at Northport," and while disabled soldiers were flooding official Washington with shocking cases of mistreatment and confusion at the hands of the Veterans' Administration.

During the same period did not the American Legion protect General Hines when he refused to clean up the artificial limb scandal and it finally took a Justice Department indictment of the limb industry on antitrust violations to give amputated veterans better equipment.

Finally, when this writer urged the immediate construction of badly needed veterans' hospitals to care for veterans of this war, pointing out over and over in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that only 8,000-odd beds had been added to Veterans' Administration facilities throughout the Nation since Pearl Harbor, did the American Legion lift a finger to help bring about these needed beds? In fact, when this writer raised the issue of the pauper oath, which was intended to force the immediate construction of additional hospitals, the national headquarters of the American Legion wrote three letters to Washington demanding that I refrain from pressing the matter any further.

Now we find Johnny-come-lately Stelle, the national commander of the Legion, emerging from his hole a day before groundhog day, charging in a punch-drunk manner that "hundreds of thousands of veterans' claims for hospitalization, compensation, and so forth" are stalled in the Veterans' Administration under General Bradley—a man who took over a mess left behind by an incompetent public official.

Need anything else be added? Yes; thanks to the short-sighted leadership of the American Legion and to their protégé, General Hines—for their joint refusal to act when action was so vitally necessary.

Compulsory Military Training and the Future of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 4, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in considering the proposal to establish permanent compulsory military training in this country, we should follow the advice of an eminent educator, when he said:

We should postpone action on conscription until the subject has been much more fully investigated and the President appoint a national commission to survey all the aspects of the proposed training program.

A condensation of an illuminating article by Arthur E. Morgan entitled "Conscription and the West Point Mind," taken from the February issue of Mercury, is presented herewith:

The value of (case for) compulsory military training has been ably presented by high Army, Navy, and Government officials, in the press, on the radio, and before congressional committees. Let us now look at the other side.

Both sides agree upon the importance of the proposed step. Hanson Baldwin, the military critic of the New York Times, and an opponent of conscription, says: "Permanent peacetime conscription—universal military training—will profoundly influence our social, economic, physical, and educational life, as well as our military organization." General Marshall, former Chief of Staff and a vigorous exponent of conscription, states in his recent biennial report: "By this method we would establish, for the generations to come, a national military policy."

The Army works ceaselessly for more power and prestige. It has disclosed no limits to the craving for power.

The authoritarian and dictatorial temper of West Point rules the Army. It is not just a regime for training military men, but a cult, with a deep-rooted tradition and philosophy. Few religions or other cults anywhere put their novices through such intense training. Few Americans realize what medieval, coercive indoctrination of young minds goes on at the Academy.

Three factors have helped West Point to perpetuate that pattern: The habit of appointing its own graduates to its teaching staff; the admission of immature and impressionable youth, mostly just out of high school; and the system of extreme isolation. In such an environment the spirit of the young cadet is broken and his mind is deeply indoctrinated. Only a few exceptionally strong characters withstand that process.

General MacArthur, as Superintendent of the Academy, tried to modernize the institution, but was opposed and eliminated before his 4-year term was completed.

Extension of West Point influence would menace long-time military security. Its regimentation and arbitrary subordination to

authority has been deadly to alert, creative inquiry.

Everyone remembers the unsuccessful efforts of General Mitchell to get recognition in the Army of the significance of the airplane in war. I am told by an able and well-informed physicist that rudimentary radar equipment was designed, built, and furnished to some of our warships during the First World War. It was not perfect, and was left unused. The equipment lay on shipboard for about a decade, while no one in the Navy showed enough creative imagination to explore its enormous possibilities.

As for the atomic bomb, Alexander Sachs, who was directly effective in bringing the project to the attention of the President, states that both the Army and the Navy were initially uninterested and for a considerable period remained indifferent. This most powerful of all military forces, therefore, like so many other concepts requiring ranging imagination, would have been lost if the West Point and Annapolis judgments had not been overruled by an imaginative President, with the encouragement of the civilian head of the United States Bureau of Standards, Lyman J. Briggs.

There is reason to believe that military shortsightedness continued to impede the atomic bomb project, and there can be no doubt of its well-nigh disastrous influence on the development of science generally. Dr. Charles Allen Thomas, vice-president of the Monsanto Chemical Co., had charge of a critical phase of the project—the chemistry and purification of plutonium. He holds that the Army failed utterly to see the significance of science to the war effort, and insisted on drafting science students vitally needed to sustain our national strength. Dr. Thomas said:

"The present selective-service policies may have a profoundly adverse effect on the atomic bomb program, and might even cost the United States its head start in atomic bomb research over other nations. * * *

"Postwar scientific research in the United States has been set back by at least from 2 to 4 years by the drafting of young natural scientists. * * *

"Already it will take until 1955 for the universities of this country to catch up with the need for scientifically trained young men at the rate at which that need was growing before the war. * * *

"In contrast with United States policy, both Great Britain and Russia have been careful to conserve their young natural scientific and research talent."

He stated that 20 percent of his research staff now face induction. More are classed I-A than during the war! "It takes 6 or 7 years from high school to give a young man the necessary training for research work, and the moment he finishes this schooling in college and industry he is 'right in the middle of the draft.' The average age of the natural scientists working on the atomic bomb project at Santa Fe was around 30 years."

Senator LA FOLLETTE wrote (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, November 23, 1945): "It is a well-known fact that most of the startling technical progress of the past war came from outside the armed forces. And many a scientist and engineer will bitterly tell you that his developments and contributions were made in spite of, not with the help of, the services." Military strength, as Hanson Baldwin has pointed out, is not to be confused with peacetime conscription. In this age of science and rapid technological change, the spirit of active creative inquiry is indispensable to military strength; conscription is not. Rocket ship and atomic bombs make it necessary that we have as many resilient, imaginative minds as possible if we are to avoid chaos. West Point strait-jackets the minds of its own. Can we expect that the youth of the Nation will escape the deadening impact of its regimentation under a program of compulsory military training which it dominates?

In addition to paralyzing the inquiring spirit, this Prussianization of youth also threatens democracy itself. The lessons of discipline and obedience, which military establishments preach, tend to suppress liberal tendencies and to uphold the status quo. Universal compulsory military training spread those lessons effectively in Prussia.

Training Manual 2000-25, published by the United States Army in 1928 as an official textbook on citizenship for the citizens' military training camps, attacks labor legislation and efforts to outlaw war. Its definition of democracy is illustrative:

"Democracy. A government of the masses. Authority derived through mass meetings or any other form of direct expression. Attitude toward property is communistic—negating property rights. Attitude toward law is that the will of the majority shall regulate, whether it be based upon deliberation, or governed by passion, prejudice, and impulse, without restraint or regard to consequences. Results in demagogism, license, agitation, discontent, anarchy."

Following public objection, this and some other passages were deleted, but the militaristic, antidemocratic tradition which inspired them was not. It is in the blood and fiber of West Point. Significantly, an official Army textbook has also complained that among "the defects in our (national) policy" is "direction of military operations by a civilian Secretary of War."

One benefit claimed for military training is that it improves health and morals. Under the proposed program about a third of the men, those most needing help, would be rejected and not helped. A civilian program would aim to help those most needing help.

Records of the Army and Navy Surgeons General and of the United States Public Health Service indicate that in 1939 the incidence of syphilis in the general population was 5.1 per 1,000, in the Army 29.6, and in the Navy 85.9. As draftees were inducted the rate in the services fell, but as they took on Army and Navy ways it rose again, the rise being very rapid in 1945.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for November 20, 1945, is a detailed account of the Navy policy of operating a large house of prostitution in Japan, with others contemplated. The account describes men lined up four abreast for a block, supervised by military police while waiting admission, with a return line waiting to receive prophylaxis from Navy medical men assigned to that purpose. The military caste system was protected by reserving geisha houses for the officers. Hanson Baldwin writes, "No one knowing the Army can describe the standard of morals and habits formed there as uplifting. Quite the contrary." The same, of course, is at least equally true of the Navy.

As to the educational value of conscription, a letter on the subject signed by Presidents Conant, of Harvard; Dodds, of Princeton; Day of Cornell; Hutchins, of Chicago; Sproul, of California State, and seven others reads: "Military training offers no real solution to national problems of education, health, or responsible citizenship in a free society. Moreover, we do not favor the control of even a year's education of young men by the Federal Government." As another commentator remarked, forcing a high-school boy into military life "will not bring democracy into militarism; it will bring militarism into civilian life and undermine democracy."

Why not give voluntary enlistment a fair trial? The common soldier has been looked on throughout history as a sort of slave, to be paid little more than subsistence. Treat him as an American citizen and pay him as such, and probably enough young men will join the services.

What can be done? Four things specifically. First of all, we should postpone action on conscription until the subject has been much more fully investigated. The American Council on Education, which includes all the major organizations in the educational field, recommends that the President appoint a national commission of representative leaders from industry, agriculture, labor, the church, education, and the Congress to survey all aspects of the proposed training program—among them its relationship to other aspects of national defense, to the educational system, and to the program of international peace through world organization.

Second. When a national policy is formulated and adopted, then if it should include some elements of military training, a somewhat similar commission should have over-all control of that program, to insure that such training does not destroy the self-directive freedom which is the genius of America, and the source of its long-time strength. The state is only one aspect of society. A wise state will be modest and restrained in exercising power over its subjects. The American concept of life has included a high regard for personal autonomy. Any program, such as peacetime universal compulsory military training, which would require a boy of 17 or 18 to surrender his life philosophy if he has one, and make himself an uncritical and obedient instrument of imposed authority while being indoctrinated in the philosophy of force, would be a blow to freedom.

Third. At present West Point is an antidemocratic outpost in America, with plans to capture America for the spirit of blind obedience, arbitrary power, and rigid caste stratification. It should be reorganized, making it a graduate school, receiving men of greater maturity and educational background; and all except the explicitly military members of the faculty should be drawn from other educational institutions, where the American spirit survives and modern scholarship prevails. West Point should be Americanized before it Prussianizes America.

Fourth. America should study most carefully the conditions necessary for peace, and not only the conditions necessary for waging war.

Farm Surpluses—Portion of Hearings Before Senate Committee on Agriculture

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 4 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a portion of the hearings before the Senate Committee on Agriculture dealing with the uses of farm surpluses in the production of various industrial items such as alcohol and rubber. This proposed legislation is designed to make use of the many alcohol and other surplus war plants now situated in many areas of the United States.

Present at this meeting held Friday, February 1, 1946, were Senator THOMAS, chairman, and Senators AIKEN, BUTLER, HOEY, SHIPSTEAD, and YOUNG. The pages

which I wish to have inserted are 14 to 30 inclusive.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Senator YOUNG. Mr. Johnson, in the days of the great surpluses, every farmer in my part of the United States looked for a solution of the surplus problem, as you have outlined it, and this bill, it would seem, would take care of that. In my opinion, we will again be faced, before long, with large surpluses. This seems like a most intelligent approach to the problem of surpluses. Every farmer in my part of the United States is for it. The North Dakota legislature passed an appropriation 6 years ago to go into research along this line and planned to build a plant, but about that time the war came along and Federal Government plants were built; we let it go for the time being.

Senator BUTLER. And it is a fact that the largest plant of this kind constructed by the Government as a war instrument happened to be in Omaha, in my home town. I have the opportunity to see the possibilities of following such a program as this through as a permanent policy, as we were forced to fall into during the war.

The CHAIRMAN. What did the Omaha plant cost, if you know?

Senator BUTLER. Seven million, and it has been operated by a local company and they have paid the RFC a magnificent sum in the way of a lease. They are operating now, and have been, on a surplus of potatoes as well as grains.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it in operation now?

Senator BUTLER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. What are they making?

Senator BUTLER. Alcohol.

Mr. JOHNSON. I am getting ready to make sirup.

The CHAIRMAN. What do they make it from?

Mr. JOHNSON. Corn, and possibly wheat also.

Senator BUTLER. I might say, Senator THOMAS, that when sorghum grains got to a low peak, it was found abundant in Texas and Oklahoma; this plant was looking for these opportunities, and when they got in the market the price advanced tremendously. It was a direct benefit to the growers of your immediate area.

Mr. JOHNSON. Whenever you have a process that can consume 100,000 bushels of grain that would be a drug on the market every day, it does not take long before you can step into the spot markets and clear up a situation in a very short time. We did it in Texas and Oklahoma in less than 2 weeks' time.

Senator YOUNG. This happened in our potato area, just a few extra carloads of potatoes break the market.

Mr. ROBINSON. We experimented with potatoes to find out if we could take the starch out of potatoes. I think with research work in these plants, when they are able to operate a year or so, we will be doing a wonderful lot of things.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Johnson, I would like for you to complete your statement.

Mr. JOHNSON. You may be wondering why we think there is an emergency in a matter of this nature because they are now operating. We are operating by sufferance at the moment. RFC could cancel us out tomorrow if they thought it proper to sell the plants. They have been advertised. You will recall Senate Resolution No. 176 asking for a study of their uses; that is going on now.

The CHAIRMAN. Who is making that study?

Mr. JOHNSON. The Department of Agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. I remember the resolution, I just forgot who had the charge of it now.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is the reason it seems so imperative to get a bill introduced and to get people thinking on it, crystallizing public opinion in this direction, and pointing up some of the things we are talking about. I know that today the research organizations have enough things in their bag of tricks, and are developing those things every day, that require the assistance rendered, or would be rendered, by this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. What are the additional needs for this legislation, you suggested industrial alcohol, and we have suggested molasses, indicates some of the things that might be developed or made available as a result of the passage of this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I am not a chemist or a technician, but when you start with the grain production, there are so many things, and cotton, celanese—cotton is the purest celanese that grows, and instead of using the cotton materials the farmer grows—I mean by using some of the cotton materials the farmer grows instead of the carbons that are in our industrial research piles and converting those—of course that might develop into a competitive question—but celanese is one of the things that is produced from cotton—then, there is rayon, nylon, housing materials for fabricated houses, paints, plastics—the field is full.

There is a question whether or not in such cases it would not be good economy to use those crops that come along year by year or take it out of the stock pile that nature has built up during the centuries.

The CHAIRMAN. At the present time the country is short of paints, and this committee reported legislation, which became law, authorizing subsidies to be paid to the growers of flax, in order that that product might be increased, that linseed oil might be increased, that paint might be increased. Now, I have information that it is possible to make a fine paint with soybean oil.

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes; and sesame seeds, and other things, and that is what we are looking to from this bill, getting their uses, the uses of these agricultural commodities channeled into the production of these paints, and other industrial uses.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what I am getting in the record. You have suggested industrial alcohol, and molasses, and paint, that can come from agricultural products—are there others?

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, there are lacquers, and all kinds of solvents.

The CHAIRMAN. What are they used for?

Mr. JOHNSON. Solvents are used in toilet articles, in food, in medicines, and many things, and some are imported. We feel they ought to be made out of surpluses when surpluses are available.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you any further suggestions?

Mr. JOHNSON. I believe not.

The CHAIRMAN. If not, I will call the other gentleman.

STATEMENT OF FRANK L. ROBINSON

The CHAIRMAN. Will you please state your full name?

Mr. ROBINSON. Frank L. Robinson.

The CHAIRMAN. Where do you reside, please?

Mr. ROBINSON. Senator, I am from Nebraska——

The CHAIRMAN (interrupting). What is your occupation?

Mr. ROBINSON. I am a farmer at heart, and have been for close to 45 years, also a cattle raiser.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean, "at heart"?

Mr. ROBINSON. I have had to leave that because I got imued with an idea from Henry Ford in 1935 that if our agriculture was to prosper we must have the assistance of industry and chemistry to utilize our surpluses, and I have talked and worked on that program, more or less, all of these years, at the neglect of my farm operations.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Robinson, you made a statement awhile ago, and I will ask the reporter to lift out what you said and have it go in now, so we will have it all; now go ahead.

(The previous remarks of Mr. Robinson are as follows:

(Mr. ROBINSON. We experimented with potatoes to find out if we could take the starch out of potatoes. I think with research work in these plants that we will be able within a year or so to do some wonderful things.)

Mr. ROBINSON. I really appreciate the work that Cecil Johnson has been doing in preparing this bill, as I have been more or less associated with Cecil Johnson for the past 10 years, and during that time we have thought along the lines of the necessity of such a program as he has presented here today to this committee.

Incidentally, I would like to also state that back 5 or 6 years ago, even less, when the Triple A program was in operation, with the curtailed production in a big way, that the thoughts represented and presented by Mr. Johnson were thoughts in our minds years ago, but we did not get the cooperation for the idea across until that curtailed program came along, which has cost the Government $4,000,000,000 since it has commenced to break up, and with the mechanized equipment now usable on the farms, and the fact that three men can do the work of five on the farm and produce about 30 percent more farm production, we all realize that we had better get ready for the surpluses before they really break upon us.

The CHAIRMAN. Indicate, if you will, the time you can envision or foresee what might come about if this bill becomes law, referring to what Mr. Johnson says—tell us how you make molasses out of potatoes.

Mr. ROBINSON. It is a dextrose sweetening mostly—not real molasses. The Farm Crop Production Association at Omaha, who are operating this industrial alcohol plant, received an appropriation from the RFC of about $460,000 about a year ago for the installing of equipment to extract the corn oil from corn before the starch from the corn was used into alcohol process. Incidentally, a bushel of corn contains about one-third of a pound of corn oil.

The CHAIRMAN. Would that make about half a pint, would that be about half a pint of oil?

Mr. ROBINSON. Just about

The CHAIRMAN. About half a pint—all right, go ahead.

Mr. ROBINSON. That oil——

The CHAIRMAN (interrupting). What is the color of the oil?

Mr. ROBINSON. It is just about the color of Mazola—you have seen Mazola.

The CHAIRMAN. I am afraid I would not recognize it. What is it used for?

Mr. ROBINSON. For salad dressing, cooking in restaurants, cafes, and hotels; hotels prefer it because this oil does not smoke, and it is used in the sizing of paper and cloth, and is used in a great many industries which were manufacturing essential materials during the war.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the first product taken out of corn; what is the second?

Mr. ROBINSON. In the manufacture of dextrose sirup, which is comparable to many highly advertised sirups. We extract a starch from the corn which is about 33 pounds to a bushel of corn. We cook this starch, adding a malt and a mold bran, and we shake out a starch and press the oil from this starch, recovering 56 pounds of sirup from a bushel of corn, believe it or not.

The CHAIRMAN. What does that look like?

Mr. ROBINSON. That is just about as near the color of genuine maple sirup as you can imagine and about as sweet.

The CHAIRMAN. What is it used for?

Mr. ROBINSON. Table sirup and the manufacture of foods, and used in soft drinks like the Coca-Cola and Pepsi-Cola and all those drinks, and it is used in the manufacture of candy.

The CHAIRMAN. Does it have a trade name?

Mr. ROBINSON. We have not one for it—Cecil, do you know?

Mr. JOHNSON. It is the same thing as Karo——

The CHAIRMAN. Karo sirup?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Another question—does it have any other uses, is it used in the manufacture of certain medicines?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes.

Senator BUTLER. I would like specially for the record to show that you get 36 pounds of sweetening from a bushel of corn, as a substitute for sugar out of each bushel of corn, that the United States produces only about one-third or one-fourth of its requirements from sugar.

The CHAIRMAN. At this point, for the record, state how much sugar you can produce out of a bushel of corn.

Mr. ROBINSON. I am not familiar with that, there is a good deal of corn sirup made, but I don't know.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the sugar a refined product from the sirup?

Mr. ROBINSON. No, the sugar is made in a different way.

The CHAIRMAN. Go right ahead.

Mr. ROBINSON. I might add that the manufacture of this sirup might be of interest to the officials in the Department of Agriculture who are disturbed over our sugar shortage and sweetening shortage in general and that may exist for a couple of years yet, and we thought it was our duty to carry on this research work, and we thought we should do it in a big way, and we asked the RFC for a grant of $218,000 to install equipment to make sirup for this tremendous shortage that now exists, but they could not see their way clear to grant us that sum, so we are furnishing our own money to install this equipment, and pay the freight on it, and I might say, incidentally, that some of the large presses we are using in the manufacture of sirup are furnished from other plants that were erected by the DPC, and I think you will appreciate that is why these properties should be in sympathetic hands. If you have had the experience of running the gantlet here in Washington you will know that it is trying.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead.

Mr. ROBINSON. I will say, if we had not had the sympathy of the Department of Agriculture in getting these plants erected in the Middle West for the manufacture of industrial alcohols I doubt very much if you would have had the Normandy invasion yet today because 70 percent of the synthetic rubber that was used for our mechanized equipment during the war was made from grain alcohol.

The CHAIRMAN. Answer this question, if you can. What is the relative cost of rubber made from alcohol and that made from petroleum?

Mr. ROBINSON. I think if the facts were taken into consideration of the use of the material resources of the country to convert any of these into butadiene for rubber, and the fact that the depreciation on the synthetic and gas plants that produce the synthetic alcohol were also considered, and that if we were allowed to continue producing a certain amount of synthetic rubber from grain alcohol, thereby allowing us to continue the research so necessary in reducing the cost of alcohol, we could make synthetic rubber from grain alcohol, and from these agricultural products, as cheaply as any other process, and as cheaply as we could import natural rubber from foreign countries, giving those natives a reasonable sum in wages—or perhaps we could do it cheaper.

We must continue to operate these Government-owned plants not only to take care of the grain situation but the sweetpotatoes—always a critical situation in the South—and waste forest material in the West, and excess spoilage wheat, which you always have more or less, whether it is a short or a large crop.

For instance, Senator BUTLER spoke about grain sorghums.

A year ago this summer we had excessive rains in Dakota and Minnesota whereby the wheat could not be threshed from the shock. It sprouted and grew in the shock. We heard about that. We communicated with the officials connected with the Agricultural Department located in these States, and they sent us samples of this sprouted wheat, which was unfit for human consumption and we bought a good many thousand bushels of that kind of wheat, and, strange to say, it really produced more alcohol per bushel than the good wheat, believe it or not.

Senator YOUNG. And, I believe, you paid the market price.

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes, before they knew there was any market for it at all, and by the time we had bought several cars it went up 40 cents a bushel.

The CHAIRMAN. Maybe wheat sprouts makes better alcohol than the other.

Mr. ROBINSON. Maybe so, but we prefer that it is not sprouted. That just goes to show you how useful plants of this nature can be to agriculture, and how necessary it is that such plants as we have mentioned be in friendly hands.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you considered the possibility of making synthetic motor fuel?

Mr. ROBINSON. I am glad you mention that. That is my hobby. That is one of the things that I became imbued with many years ago when I attended this conference called by Henry Ford. At that time we were selling grain at 10 or 12 cents a bushel.

The CHAIRMAN. What kind?

Mr. ROBINSON. Corn, oats, wheat, and barley.

The CHAIRMAN. Wheat at 10 cents a bushel?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes, in my county.

The CHAIRMAN. What year was that?

Mr. ROBINSON. About 1932.

The CHAIRMAN. Wheat sold in Enid, Okla., for 19 cents a bushel, that was the lowest I heard of.

Mr. ROBINSON. I bought wheat, corn, oats, and barley for cattle and hog feed at 10 cents a bushel.

The CHAIRMAN. Was it good wheat?

Mr. ROBINSON. Not all of it always, but even the good wheat was not worth more than 25 cents.

The CHAIRMAN. I am glad to get that on the record.

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes. Now, about that time I was associated with some people in the East who had investigated the use of alcohol in motor fuels, in a great many of the foreign countries, and learned that the United States was practically the only country in the world that did not use alcohol in their internal combustion engines.

Senator BUTLER. Is that true today?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes, so far as I know, it is true today, yes sir.

Mr. JOHNSON. And many oil companies in this country are sponsoring its use in other countries.

Senator YOUNG. This policy was followed by Germany preceding the World War, and was probably responsible for their apparent prosperity; they used many of their farm products industrially.

Mr. ROBINSON. They perfected the manufacture of synthetic rubber, which was first introduced by the Russian Government and followed by the research of the Germans and the Poles, and strange as it may seem, that after the use of synthetic rubber in those countries for 12 years in a big way, and most of that synthetic rubber was made from grain and potatoes, that we should have had to go through all of the painful processes and hard work of the Gillette committee to build synthetic alcohol plants that could produce synthetic alcohol from grain to save our Nation in this last war.

I would like to go back to the alcohol and motor fuels.

I have had considerable experience in the blending of alcohol with gasoline over a period of years, selling it to users directly on the farms in their tractors, trucks, and automobiles.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you call the product?

Mr. ROBINSON. An alcohol blend—ethyl alcohol. I learned over a period of years, with the actual use and observation that alcohol blended with gasoline is a most remarkable fuel and the fact that we were using our natural resources, in the way of petroleum at a very rapid rate, which is becoming more or less recognized since the war, that we must, in the years to come, and now, commence to supplement our motor fuels with alcohol made from starches and grain, grown on the farm, which is nothing but air and water and sunshine and can be replaced annually from the soil.

Is that enough on that?

The CHAIRMAN. What was the best result you got in blending alcohol with gasoline?

Mr. ROBINSON. The nicest blend I have had experience with is about 7 percent of alcohol in 68 70 octane gasoline. It makes a most perfect fuel.

The CHAIRMAN. How much grain would be required for a 1-percent blend?

Mr. ROBINSON. On a 5-percent blend it will require—we are using in this country about 25,000,000,000 gallons of gasoline a year, and a 5-percent blend would require about 500,000,000 bushels of grain. I think I have those figures right; if not, they can be checked before we leave.

Senator BUTLER. That approximates all the surplus we normally would have in grain, does it not?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes. I think the grain tonnage in normal years is about 5,000,000,000 bushels, and if you remove 10 or 15 percent of that from the market you would stabilize the market. I think the history of the market over a period of years will show that.

The CHAIRMAN. Could you make 100-octane motor fuel out of alcohol?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes, sir. It has an octane rating of 140.

Senator YOUNG. You have not mentioned what effect it would have on unemployment; would it not provide a vast amount of additional jobs?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON. And especially, if you went into fields like sweetpotatoes, as Senator ELLENDER told us of the program in Louisiana, converting lands that were devoted to cotton to sweetpotatoes because they were so rich in starches, it would be a natural.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you any further suggestions?

Mr. ROBINSON. No; I think not. There is a great deal more that can be said, but I think we have covered the ground very well.

Mr. JOHNSON. There are lots of people with a great many ideas that would like to be heard if and when this bill comes up, some very important men like, for instance, Mr. William Dow, and a number of others that see in this a way of tying their industries into this other thing.

Mr. ROBINSON. This will keep the farm going, together with soil conservation, and will balance up agriculture. It is a problem we have all been thinking on for years and years, and it is very interesting and also wonderful to note that after many years of curtailed production that the best thinkers in our Government today, as well as in industry and agriculture, see the great possibilities of this kind of an operation for the balancing of agriculture.

Senator YOUNG. I fully agree. The problem lem is to get them all to see the possibilities.

Senator BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, this is all appreciated by me and the others interested, that we have had the opportunity to make this record today.

I am sorry that a good many members could not be here. I assure our guests that they are busily engaged elsewhere—not loafing, but I want to ask the chairman if he thinks he has the information now so we can get the benefit of his counsel and suggestions as to how to proceed with the introduction of the bill.

Veterans and the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting herewith an article which appeared in the Christian Century for January 30, 1946. It is most timely and indicates that there is much to be done if we are to win a permanent peace. At least, there must be a realistic approach to present world problems:

THE VETERAN AND THE PEACE

A familiar refrain is beginning to echo through the dispatches sent American newspapers by their correspondents in Europe. It is impossible, the American people are being told, to stabilize the European situation, or to assure any durable peace on that war-torn continent, so long as doubts persist as to what the United States is going to do. A little examination will show that the recurrent phrase, "what the United States is going to do," really refers to the probable length of American occupation in Germany and other parts of Europe, or to the readiness of this country to pledge itself to military intervention in case there are attempts to overthrow the peace terms now being worked out. Demonstrations by American soldiers for rapid demobilization are credited with having increased European doubts as to America's future role in continental affairs.

This tendency to imply that American remissness lies at the bottom of Europe's persistent instability will hardly stand up under close scrutiny. It is at least arguable that the current European jitters owe as much to Russian as to American failure to define a hard-and-fast future policy. And there are many other factors besides the puzzling uncertainties of Soviet policy which are keeping postwar Europe from settling into a definitive pattern. Nevertheless, international understanding might be served by meeting this reported European misgiving on its own terms. If Europe's future so largely depends on what the United States is going to do, what will American foreign policy be for the next 10 or 20 years?

No certain answer to that question can be given. The United States is enough of a democracy so that its foreign policy, at least in its major aspects, must conform to public opinion, and there can be no assurance as to what course American public opinion will support for the next two decades. We are sure, however, that there is one factor of tremendous importance which is not being sufficiently taken into account by most of those who are trying to predict or influence future American policy. That factor is the veteran. Twelve million former servicemen will make up the most influential element in this Nation's political life for the coming 40 years. Asking what the United States will do in Europe, or anywhere else, without taking the veterans into account is like asking what the future policy of the Roman Catholic Church is going to be without taking the composition of the college of cardinals into account.

This curious indifference to the part the veteran is certain to play may grow out of the fact that so far he has been slow about getting into political action. (Yet not so very slow; there is already a $25,000,000,000 bonus bill before Congress.) With the veterans' organizations bequeathed by former wars competing for his membership, and new organizations of those who wear the service button coming into being every month, the veteran's interest has been largely centered up to now on the choice of agencies through which he will wield his power. But this is only a preliminary stage. It will soon pass into a period in which the veteran's vote and the veteran's views will be the first consideration of every politician. If Congress and State legislatures have kowtowed in years past to the Legion, what is to be expected when there are 12,000,000 votes at stake?

While the war was in progress it became the fashion to deplore the lack of political indoctrination of the men in uniform. It was charged that they were not told what it was all about at the time they were fighting—or if efforts were made to tell them, through lectures and through films, these largely failed to register. Now it is being charged that the failure to convince them of the rightness of our present policy is responsible for the soldier riots. A great opportunity to send 12,000,000 citizens back into civilian life informed on the issues of international relations has been lost. The veteran is coming out of his term of service as politically naive and uninformed as he went in.

There is a large measure of truth in this. But it is not the whole truth. In his service overseas the veteran has received a political indoctrination of a sort, and it has sunk deep. It may not have been the sort of indoctrination that holds out hope for the future, but as to its actuality there can be no question. In some degree, this indoctrination has simply embedded more deeply prejudices which the veterans carried into the service. That does not lessen its influence; it increases it. What are the ideas which these 12,000,000 men are bringing home? Admitting the existence of exceptions, the overwhelming majority of the returning servicemen are thinking in much this fashion:

They have a scorn for other peoples and countries which they do not bother to conceal. They judge the regions into which their service has carried them by American standards of living, of working methods and of social customs. In most cases their conclusions are far from complimentary.

Those who have served in occupation posts in Europe regard the politics of that continent as a hopeless mess. They know little about the details, or about the nature of the contending forces. They know only what confronts their eyes, and they characterize that in the same words, whether they have been stationed in Italy, in Trieste, in Austria, in France, or in Germany—"it's a mess."

They believe that American intervention in Europe, apart from political purposes which they declare they have been unable to fathom, started out to save the bacon of our allies, and did so, and now serves to hold down a military lid on a boiling pot that would overflow the moment American forces were removed.

They believe that American intervention in the Far East, again apart from purposes which they have been unable to fathom, gave the Japanese a licking they had coming to them, and now serves to prop up a collapsing colonial imperialism and a tottering central Chinese government. They sometimes express their suspicions of the meaning of American deployments in the Orient vis-à-vis Russia.

All this adds up to a belief that millions of servicemen are being kept from home to do something that is none of America's legitimate business. Partitioning Germany, reducing the German diet to a near-starvation level and then policing against outbreaks, holding Trieste or the industrial areas of Italy for one political group or to prevent the rise of another, clearing the way for restoration of the colonial empires, umpiring the internal politics of China—all such things the serviceman lumps under the single phrase, "It's none of our business."

Along with this, it must be recognized, there goes no recognition that the United States may be contributing to the increase of international difficulties by, for example, such policies as the Potsdam program in Germany or the plans to build an island empire in the Pacific.

An Englishman or a Frenchman or a Chinese may look at such an account as this and call the American veteran self-righteous, snobbish, ignorant, callous, and a general threat to international understanding and cooperation. We will not argue the point. But that does not alter the fact that he must be taken as he is. And as he is, we find him thoroughly indoctrinated with the sort of ideas we have tried thus briefly to summarize. It is on the basis of the existence of those ideas that he must be dealt with.

What is the hope of changing the views of the American veteran? What is the hope of getting him to welcome American participation in world cooperative action to preserve the peace and to build toward a powerfully functioning world organization? We doubt whether that hope is very great. We are sure that it will remain dim unless the veteran can be made to believe, by the evidence of his own eyes and of the eyes of his comrades who continue in service overseas, that the United Nations Organization has begun to serve the ends of justice in Europe and the spread of liberty in the Far East. Of course, the Government of the United States is as responsible for seeing that the UNO does this as any other government. It is more responsible than any government except those of Great Britain and Russia. If the American Government hopes to persuade the American veteran that its international commitments through the UNO, or through other agreements, are really serving peace, justice, and freedom, it will have to act fast.

There is one phrase which any listener will hear often on the lips of these men who have served in the European and Asiatic theaters: "The whole thing makes no sense." When one faces the question as to America's part in future international relations, that is the phrase to remember. The veteran doesn't talk about "isolationism" or "imperialism" or "fascism" or any of the other slogan terms that fill the editorial columns. But he talks in the terms of the frustration of that recurring judgment: "The whole thing makes no sense." We were suckers. Our comrades whom we buried, when we could find their bodies, were suckers. The American people who sent us into this war were suckers. It meant nothing—nothing beyond giving two or three guys the beating they asked for. Worse than that, it will mean nothing. It's coming out in a worse mess than ever. ("Mess" is another keyword among the veterans.) So what is there to do but for us to go out to get ours and to forget the fancy words about world cooperation and all the rest? That is pap for the feeble-minded.

Thus speaks, and thinks, the veteran. There are, we repeat, 12,000,000 of him. Can anything be done to change him? Is anything being done? No amount of lecturing will have any effect. From now on he is resolved to believe in only what he sees.

What is he going to see? That's the question for those to answer who are worrying about America's future participation in international affairs.

Oscar Youngdahl

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 4, 1946

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, though it was not with surprise, it was with profound sorrow, that many of his friends in this Chamber learned today of the death of our former colleague, Oscar Youngdahl, which occurred yesterday morning in Minneapolis, Minn.

Mr. Youngdahl came from a fine and distinguished family of that great State in the Northwest. One of his brothers is an eminent clergyman; another is a renowned jurist, serving today as a justice of the Supreme Court of Minnesota; and still another brother is a famous professor at Washington University in St. Louis, my own State.

Oscar Youngdahl was born in Minneapolis, attended the grade and high schools of his native city and was educated at Hamline University in St. Paul, and received his bachelor of arts degree from Gustavus Adolphus. Later he received his bachelor of laws degree from the Minnesota College of Law, and after serving in the Navy during World War I, as his elder son did in World War II, he practiced law in Minneapolis and served as department commander of the American Legion.

In 1936 Mr. Youngdahl was the Republican candidate for attorney general of Minnesota but, like most Republicans in that year, was defeated. However, he made many friends and 2 years later was elected to the Seventy-sixth Congress, and was reelected to the Seventy-seventh Congress.

During the 4 years—1938 to 1942—that Mr. Youngdahl served in this body he made many warm personal friends. He was generous to a fault and loyal to the core. Those of us who knew him well and often visited his office will never forget the delicious smörgåsbord, and the genuine pleasure we derived in listening to Oscar's almost inexhaustible fund of Scandinavian stories. He understood and loved his people and could make even a stranger understand and appreciate them.

It was my privilege to speak for Mr. Youngdahl in Minneapolis during one of his campaigns and on other occasions I traveled with him through northern Minnesota. I have been a guest in his Christian home and I know the devotion which each member of his family has for the others. He leaves a charming wife, two fine, stalwart sons, and two sweet, lovely daughters, with many relatives and friends to mourn his passing.

How vividly I recall many evenings I have spent with him in his office when he expressed the regret in being separated from his family, and his keen desire to return to them in Minnesota when he was forced to spend so much time in Washington.

Oscar Youngdahl had strong convictions and stubbornly fought for them. He was afraid of no man. We all appreciate the fact that he served not only his own constituency in Minnesota, but all the people of his State and the Nation, faithfully and well. Most of all we remember the hours of enjoyable fellowship spent with him, and shall always cherish the memory of this true friend.

Microscope on Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 4, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the third and fourth installments of a penetrating analysis of the situation in Russia, particularly with relation to the rest of Europe. The author, Dr. C. Sverre Norborg, is a careful student and observer who has recently returned from a year of work with UNRRA in northern Europe:

[From the Minneapolis Star-Journal of January 30, 1946]

MICROSCOPE ON MOSCOW—5,000,000 TROOPS, MILLIONS OF DISPLACED PERSONS WORRY RUSS

(By C. Sverre Norborg)

Article 132 of the new Soviet Russian Constitution proclaims military service to be "an honorable obligation of citizens of the U. S. S. R." The Red Army was originally organized by Leon Trotsky as the arm and shield of the Communist revolution and the Communist Party. By now, it has become the vast citizens' army of a self-conscious Russian Empire.

By its massive and historic victories over the eastern part of the Nazi military machine, the Red Army serves as the cornerstone of Russian foreign policy in Europe and Asia.

At the same time this Red military machine is posing one of the most delicate and fateful problems ever tackled by the rulers of the Soviet Union.

Wherever one goes in postwar Europe, one finds our American soldiers have only one longing: to get home to the United States. Reports from all Russian-occupied areas indicate that nowhere is the Red soldier showing any such delighted eagerness about his pending repatriation and demobilization.

A Red Army captain in Warsaw sent his fifth vodka down a wet throat, exclaiming: "I love this army life. It is a man's paradise. It makes me forget the drabness of Omsk. This is the best form of collective living I've ever seen."

Hundreds of thousands of Red soldiers will not get home for months or maybe years. After demobilization their work will be needed in other parts of the Soviet Empire.

Thousands of Red soldiers have deserted since VE-day. Their violence and banditry are bringing stinging discredit to the Red Army from the Vistula to Sofia and Bucharest.

Admittedly discipline is not an easy thing in any army of occupation. But the Red Army battalion commanders are today struggling with morale problems created by the Russian propaganda system itself.

First, Russian commanders are attempting to neutralize the gigantic hero-worship by which Moscow, during the war, entreated each and every Red soldier to feel like a superman.

In a collectivist state it is obviously dangerous to instill any excessive individual pride into citizen soldiers, since heroes are not readily reconverted to the gray obedience of the orders of state supervisors of collective farms, factories, or labor gangs.

No one could envy the former security police chief, Laurenti Beria, his job of neutralizing and controlling the proud spirits of 5,000,000 to 6,000,000 Red Army heroes.

Beria relinquished his police post last week and was succeeded by Col. Gen. Sergei Nikolaevich Kruglev, who stands 6 feet 2 inches and weighs 245 pounds.

HE LOOKS LIKE A POLICEMAN AND IS ONE

Kruglev bossed the police detail that guarded Stalin at Yalta and Potsdam, and Molotov at San Francisco and London.

At Potsdam he so impressed President Truman that the President gave him an autographed photo and decorated him with the Legion of Merit.

No one except Stalin seemed to know what the change in police chiefs means. It was generally accepted, however, the move was to give Beria a freer hand in keeping returning Russian soldiers down on the farm.

Moscow reports previously have told of intense disagreements between Beria and A. A. Zhdanov, Stalin adviser on the enforcement of strict security policies against the Red Army personnel.

Zhdanov is advocating comparative leniency in the treatment of soldiers' individualism. In this fight he has the support of Marshal Zhukov, his friend and collaborator from the heroic days of the Leningrad siege.

On the outcome, the future balance between a strict control and a growing democracy in Russia may depend.

According to best available estimates, 2,200,000 Red soldiers remain outside the Soviet Union. Unforeseeable developments may speed up Red Army repatriation, but this will depend to a great extent upon whether the Politburo decides that the Red soldiers have seen enough of the outside world.

There is a growing feeling in Moscow circles that Russian eyes have seen too much already.

They have burned with flaming hate beside the ruins of what used to be the cities, factories, and farms of Hitler's new order. Looted and denuded, East Prussia, home of the Junkers, has now felt the total revenge of the Russians for Ukraine and White Russia. And 1,200,000 cattle were driven through Poland last summer on the way to Russia.

But Russian eyes have also beheld the dignity of progressive Prague, the charred beauty of Vienna, the ruins of lush Budapest. They have stared with unbelieving admiration at the magnificent workers' apartment buildings in Copenhagen. Eighty-two thousand pondering Russians have gone home from the valleys and cities of resistance Norway.

Thus Russian soldiers and refugees are returning home with a varied and disturbing treasure of impressions with which to compare things and ways at home.

Moscow is prepared to reeducate her returning children.

Comparatively the easiest group for the Russian secret police to handle and control will be the multinational world of deportees and prisoners. These have been streaming into Soviet Union for more than a year now: 200,000 Estonians, 250,000 Latvians, 280,000 Lithuanians, 100,000 Ruthenians, 100,000 politically suspect Poles.

In this group the German slave laborers also belong. Their total number has been estimated variously at 1,800,000 to 3,000,000.

There is nothing uncertain about the fate which awaits these 3,000,000 to 5,000,000 new

inhabitants of Arctic Russia, the Ukraine, and eastern Siberia.

In 1944 G. Malenkov, who as boss of Soviet heavy industries, is spearheading the vast expansion of industrialization, suggested that these millions of "imported labor" be screened for industrial skilled workers, technicians, and scientifically trained personnel.

His suggestion was supported by Y. N. Voznessensky, young genius of USSR state planning. But under pressure from the leaders of the Soviet labor reserve schools the screening plan was abandoned, reportedly to the great satisfaction of the NVKD commissariat, which runs great projects and factories of its own by slave labor in Kazakh, Tadjik, and Kirghis Republics.

With the imminent return of Red Army soldiers and Russian prisoners of war Shcherbakov, Soviet propaganda chief, and Beria argued there was no reason to multiply "obstructionist cells" and "unrest centers" throughout the country.

Political nonconformity, increased crime, and the war-created threat of a spreading "individualism" promise to keep Russia's 2,200,000 secret agents busy enough during the next decade.

Truly staggering problems confront Russia's centralized government today in the political control of the Red Army soldiers and Russia's millions of slave laborers.

On the other hand, an immeasurably greater task lies in the rebuilding and reconstruction of the Russian system of state socialism.

The economic life of Russia has been devastated by a ruthless enemy. Its huge manpower has for years been squeezed by the greatest burden of war which any great power ever faced.

We Americans cannot even begin to understand what desolation and suffering hide in the fact that cities, farms, and homes of 88,000,000 Russians were in the grip of Hitler's armies and his subhuman Gestapo torturers.

It is only too bad that Moscow never realized what disservice it did to its own cause by keeping Allied newspapermen from giving a full report on the heroism and the nightmares of the eastern front.

To heal the wounds of this war in the Soviet Union will, under the best circumstances, take many years.

Finally, a strange tragedy has occurred: international uncertainty has prevented Russia, so far, from making an effective decision on an early, integrated program of national rehabilitation and reconstruction.

[From the Minneapolis Star-Journal of January 31, 1946]

MICROSCOPE ON MOSCOW—RUSS RECONVERSION WAITS AS THREE GROUPS SEEK SOVIET POWER

(By C. Sverre Norborg)

Reconversion and reconstruction are not being handled with too much efficiency in Great Britain or America. But Russia's task is of such staggering dimensions that decisions on reconstruction cannot be delayed long if Russia wants political tranquillity and social progress.

Let us examine some of the causes for Russia's delay in rebuilding the cities, plants, and farms of a desolated, war-torn country.

Moscow likes to mystify the world. And other nations have been too willing to accommodate Soviet party leaders at this harmful and irrational game.

Russia is no mystery. At least, it is consistently becoming less a mystery than it was before Russia became our ally in World War II.

A high European diplomat, recently come from Moscow, explained the situation this way:

"The war has changed the Soviet Union every bit as much as it has changed any other nation. It has not, however, changed Russian psychology, which still remains more Asiatic than western. What we might call a feeling of inferiority is to the Russians the most realistic and rational procedure in the world. There is an almost cosmic loneliness in a Russian's soul when he meets strange people who speak strange languages and express strange ideas about government and international cooperation."

Working closely with Russians, meeting many more of them casually, I have become convinced that unless western minds show a lot of imagination we will never be able to meet Russia as the world's second greatest nation must be met.

Without true understanding, without ability to take an objective look at our own self-righteous western dogmatism, we may be led catastrophically close to an international policy which the late Lloyd George called "muddle, bungle, and blunder."

One of the deceptive ideas which has taken hold of western minds is the impression that there is always celestial agreement and absolute unity in Moscow. The known facts do not bear this out. Moscow is human, and where human beings are, there are disagreements, prejudices, jealousies, fights, dissensions, and compromises.

One of the fundamental psychological lessons which our alliance with Russia during the war should have brought home to us Americans is the discovery that Russian statesmen, diplomats, generals, soldiers, secret police, or the millions of Russians driven by evil Nazis into slave-labor camps in Europe are perfectly understandable samples of the human race.

Their emotions are deeper, their internal sense of belonging to one another is keener and more primitive than ours. Their suspicions are more easily aroused.

Russians do disagree, and disagreement is well known even in the Russian supercabinet, the Politburo.

In fact, it is exactly there, on the highest level of Soviet authority, that violent and fateful disagreements have appeared during the months since VE-day.

The full story of the clash in high Moscow circles probably never will be recorded in history. We do know, however, that since the San Francisco meeting three schools of thought have come into deep conflict in Moscow. The world may soon learn which of these groups is winning the argument about foreign policy within the Moscow Government.

We must not make the mistake of putting this disagreement down in our mental notebook as a rift in Moscow. The tidal wave of a new Russian nationalism has united the peoples of the Soviet Union, under Stalin the great, to a degree which the two earlier Russians, Peter the Great and Catherine the Great, never could have conceived.

A day in any camp for Russian prisoners of war in Europe convinced an observer that, fearful though some of these prisoners might be about their individual fate all of them were Russians—intensely proud Russians.

I will never forget my impressive first meeting with the new Russia in the excellent Danish camp for Russian prisoners of war at Taegerspria.

Here they were—Mongolians, Tartars, Ukrainians, White Russians, Georgians, an empire of many nationalities and races—and yet united into a living proud unity of national consciousness and language.

Their methods are not ours. Their political ideals we reject. But no one could escape the impressiveness of thi new people, nor fail to sense the power of the great mother Russia to which they were going back after the long, inhuman, bitter years of exile and slavery.

Whatever line the Soviet Union rulers, therefore, finally decide upon in question of international policy, one can be sure the decision will be guided again by Molotov's famous dictum of 1939: "It is our duty to think of the interests of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."

If this most fundamental fact of Russian national policy is clearly understood and accepted, we will have the necessary background for correct appreciation of the present struggle in Moscow circles between three dominating schools of national Russian thinking on the international future.

These schools are:

1. Socialist isolationism.
2. Communist imperialism.
3. Russian internationalism.

From 1918 to 1939 Russian foreign policy was characterized by a strange duality.

In the main, Soviet leaders kept fanatically aloof from the affairs of power politics. On the other hand, Russia spent hundreds of millions of dollars, through the Comintern in an attempt to instigate proletarian revolutions in other countries.

The official aloofness and the persistent conspiracy were both employed with the knowledge of the Moscow foreign office.

Habits die slowly—especially when they express a logical pattern of conscious purpose.

Russian aloofness is the mechanism by which Soviet leaders today express resentment of foreign criticism and rejection of foreign interference.

And fear, nourished by suspicion and violent consciousness of independence, has made Russian foreign policy uniquely difficult to grasp.

Paradoxically, the Russians do not like to be misunderstood, but at the same time they seem to hope that they will not be completely understood. This inner contradiction is the heart of Russian isolationism.

Long Beach City Councilman, City Attorney, Harbor Board Come To Attend Senate Hearings on Tideland Bill—Newspaper Editorial From Long Beach States City Interest at $50,000,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, this House passed the Sumner resolution relating to tidelands of all the States by a vote of 108 to 11. I voted for the resolution; I spoke for it and was an author of one of the bills before the Judiciary Committee at its hearings. The Senate Committee has announced hearings on the same subject to begin February 5.

The great and significant public interest in this subject as a matter affecting the entire public fiscal policy and program of Long Beach City—both past and future—is clearly stated by the editorial of the Long Beach Press-Telegram of Thursday, January 10, 1946, which I include in my remarks.

Long Beach, Calif., is my beloved home city and is the largest in the Eighteenth Congressional District which I have the honor to represent in this Congress. Every person, and every piece of property, is interested in this matter. If any oil company is also interested—the great public concern and interest is paramount and the interest which concerns me.

This editorial states clearly the emergency as it affects my home city:

THIS CITY'S OIL FIGHT

Long Beach city councilmen have voted themselves authority to go to Washington and support pending legislation to surrender any Federal claim to oil in submerged lands within the boundaries of this municipality. Harbor commission, city attorney, city manager, port manager, and city clerk will go, as they should, for this is an emergency.

Whoever has an interest in Long Beach, and is in a position to exercise any influence in support of this city's oil rights, is urged to use the influence while there still is time to accomplish something.

The House of Representatives has passed a bill to quiet title to oil-bearing tidelands and submerged lands, thus upholding State and municipal ownership of coastal lands and their mineral contents which was unchallenged for 100 years, until Secretary Ickes, former Attorney General Biddle and others at Washington having their slant on questions of government and law, advanced the theory that the oil belonged to the Nation.

The Attorney General of the United States, carrying out the policy of the national administration, has filed a suit in the Supreme Court to contest the submerged land rights of the States and their subdivisions.

Unless the Senate passes the quitclaim bill already approved by the House, California and all cities, including Long Beach, to which the State granted tidelands and submerged lands within their borders, will be pitted against all the legal powers of the United States Government in the pending litigation. Although precedents of a century uphold the coastal land rights of States and cities, it would be foolish to ignore the uncertainties of any legal battle with the National Government.

It would be equally foolish to overlook anything which can be done to strengthen the case of California and Long Beach at the hearing on quitclaim legislation before the Senate committee, beginning February 5.

The State legislature has before it a bill appropriating $150,000 to finance the battle against the Federal Government's claim to the coastal oil.

Long Beach, with its upward of $50,000,000 in oil deposits at stake, is the principal interested party. All of its plans for harbor development and related public improvements, upon which its future growth and prosperity largely depend, are involved. No effort, no reasonable outlay, should be spared to safeguard its interests.

Effect of Wages, Prices, and Inflation on Income-Tax Collections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1946

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE,
Raleigh, January 28, 1946.

Hon. O. MAX GARDNER,
Shelby, N. C.

DEAR GOVERNOR: Because of your familiarity with conditions in the textile industry, I am writing to request your help. As you know, we are always interested in getting the views of well-informed people as to what we may expect in the State in income-tax collections.

We now see in the papers much discussion of wages, prices, and inflation. I want to know, in your opinion, what effect these factors may have on our income-tax collections that will be based on the calendar year 1946 and which will, of course, be payable in 1947.

With kindest regards, I am,

Cordially yours,

EDWIN GILL,
Commissioner.

SHELBY, N. C., *January 30, 1946.*

Hon. EDWIN GILL,
Commissioner of Revenue,
Raleigh, N. C.

MY DEAR EDWIN: In reply to your letter of the 28th requesting my opinion on wages, prices and inflation and what effect, if any, these factors may have on State income tax collections for the calendar year 1946, I am pleased to give you my hurried opinion.

This wage price controversy is a struggle between conflicting economic philosophies that are as old as the human race. It seems that one view may be said to be represented by Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture, and the other view by Bowles, of OPA. My own view lies somewhat moderately between the two. This struggle has taken on the form of a crusade and you know a crusader makes a fetish out of a cause and is prone to forget that what is good for the country is likewise good for the consumer and that, after all, we are all consumers.

As Chairman of the Advisory Board on War Mobilization and Reconversion under Byrnes, Vinson and Snyder, I have favored price control, rationing and rent control. I believe that any evils created under these controls have been infinitely less than the evils that would have occurred if there had been no controls at all. The conditions prevailing for 18 months after the first World War when practically all controls went off within a few days after the Armistice created a nightmare of wild prices for scarce articles and this condition contributed to accelerate the depression of 1921. Of course, you know that after every war in American history there has occurred a temporary period of inflation and this condition always existed until production caught up with consumptive demand, but it always caught up!

It is my belief that reasonable and flexible controls should be preserved with proper safeguards until we can emerge from the abnormalities of war, and I am sure this is the view of Director Snyder and President Truman.

My record as Chairman of the Advisory Board is clear and consistent on this issue. I have repeatedly stated in full meeting of the Board at the White House that if price controls are to stand the pressure for wage and price increases, one of two things will happen—they will bend before the storm or they will break before the storm. I have always contended that in the long view we are shortsighted if we do not recognize that wage-price adjustments will have to be accepted as a government policy to meet changing conditions created by the destructive demands of war.

If we are to retain controls, there is no doubt in my mind that prices generally will have to be increased to offset and take care of increased costs. This condition will be relieved when the law of supply and demand goes to work and it always has gone to work and it always will.

But this raises the big issue—the real issue—upon which there is such a wide divergence of opinion: The issue of inflation. I have decided convictions on this vital subject, the soundness of which to my mind no politician, bureaucrat or economist has been able to shake.

Just remember one thing when thinking of inflation and that is the fact that inflation feeds on scarcity. If we could drive this fact home to the leadership of America, our fears of inflation would soon vanish. Mankind has never feared inflation in a land of plenty.

I do not have the history of inflation before me but if I remember correctly, neither France, Germany, nor Holland ever had runaway or uncontrolled inflation at any time unless there was an epidemic of sustained distrust in their governments or unless the nations affected were unable or incapable of supplying the basic and essential necessities of life. I believe, therefore, that the one way to avert the threat of uncontrolled inflation is to vaccinate our economy with the virus of confidence and full production. With our tremendous capacity to produce, I have too much faith to seriously fear the dreadful effects of uncontrolled inflation in this country, provided we give American labor, industry and agriculture full go-ahead, fair play and honest, cooperative incentive to produce. What we need in America today is to turn on the motors and let the goods flow. Inflation is a coward—production is faith and courage.

You must bear in mind that in spite of our controls in the war period, we have not been entirely free from inflation, black markets, and high prices. Controls have been effective and they have been helpful, but they have been far from perfect—they have minimized but have not eliminated inflation.

It is, therefore, disturbing to me to observe the sudden, desperate fears of the ghost of inflation when, as a matter of fact, inflation is in the very air we breathe. It will remain there until we purify the air with the oxygen of full production.

The only way in my judgment to keep effective, sensible, and accepted controls at this time is to move prices moderately upward in harmony with the necessity for increased costs. Wages, please bear in mind, are not the only cost that has increased.

I do not say that there is no risk in this proposal—there is risk, but in this period I had rather assume the risk incident to this flexible policy than to permit the country to drag its heels. We must remember that the American people are willing to give up everything in time of war, but they love freedom too much to follow a field marshal in time of peace. There comes a time when we must assume risk—Eisenhower assumed it when he hit the shores of Normandy; Lincoln assumed it when he freed the slaves; and Truman assumed it when the atomic bomb hit Nagasaki.

I know one thing. The American public is assuming a great risk when 2,000,000 essential workers quit work. This condition is merely deferring inflation and contributing to existing scarcity, in addition to doing great damage to future human relations and to the national welfare.

You asked me what effect these factors may have on State income-tax collections for the calendar year 1946. It is too early in the year for me to express a set opinion on this point. There are too many "ifs" involved. I would suggest that you get in touch with Charlie Cannon, W. J. Carter, A. G. Myers, Thurman Chatham, Spencer Love, Ben Gossett, and Herman Cone. These leaders will be able to give you a fair cross section of opinions concerning cotton, rayon, hosiery, and wool. I can speak with accurate knowledge about the Cleveland Cloth Mills and Stanley and I would like to cite you a few facts about the Cleveland Cloth Mills. Since 1938 we have had eight voluntary wage increases at Cleveland Cloth Mills totaling a 164-percent increase in our minimum wage. Within the last 11 months we have had two wage increases, one on March 21, 1945, of 9.52 percent, and one effective Monday, February 4, 1946, of 15 percent. The latter gives us a minimum wage of 66 cents per hour. These increases have occurred without any increase in ceiling prices. Our ceiling prices have not been increased since the ceilings went into effect. The last 15-percent increase will add $150,000 annually to our costs.

We have already reached and passed the limit where efficiency in machinery, labor, and management is able to absorb these costs. We have no excess-profit carry-back, although we paid excess-profit taxes during the war. Our last quarter of 1945 showed a decrease in gross earnings of over $100,000 from the earnings of the last quarters of 1943 and 1944. I will say in conclusion, therefore, that unless the Cleveland Cloth Mills gets an increase in its ceiling price commensurate with its increased costs you, as commissioner of revenue for the State of North Carolina, will receive considerably less income from it for the calendar year 1946 than you have received in the previous years.

I think I should say in all fairness that our gross income for the last quarter of 1945 is not typical of the industry as a whole and is in part explained by the fact that we were undergoing building improvements which, to some degree, interfered with our production; but our increased costs were beginning to bear down on us in that quarter and the recent increases are really hitting the nerve center. We are planning to lay our problems before the OPA and in justice and fair dealing request an increased price in the ceiling of our products. Please bear in mind that any gain we will receive by the repeal of the excess-profits tax has already been absorbed by our wages and other increased costs.

I did not intend to write you at such length when I commenced this letter, but you touched on a subject with which I am greatly concerned and I took the liberty of giving full expression to my views.

With every good wish and kindest regards, believe me

Sincerely yours,

O. MAX GARDNER.

Exclusion of Negro Artists From Constitution Hall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, on December 3, 1945, Mr. Ernest S. Griffith, Director of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, wrote to Mrs. Raymond C. Goodfellow, organizing secretary general of the Daughters of the American Revolution, in Washington, as follows:

The Legislative Reference Service has been asked by a Member of Congress to obtain the list of all existing DAR local chapters, together with the addresses of the towns where located. Not finding any such thing in our printed collection, we approached national headquarters with this request. We have been informed that your permission is necessary for us to obtain the right to photostat it or obtain a duplicate copy. This letter is to make a formal request for the same.

I might add that it is the feeling of the Member in question that the national corporation of the organization has the requirement in its incorporation that it must report annually to Congress, making it a not unreasonable request.

Inasmuch as the matter is one of some urgency, I would appreciate it if we might have a reply, in the first instance, by telephone, and if there is any hitch, a reply in writing.

Sincerly yours,

ERNEST S. GRIFFITH,
Director, Legislative Reference Service.

On December 5, Mr. Griffiths received the following reply from Mrs. Goodfellow:

MY DEAR MR. GRIFFITH: Your letter has been received, regarding the request for the mailing list of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

I am sorry that we cannot grant you the use of our list, as it is not available to the public.

Yours very truly,

EDNA B. GOODFELLOW
(Mrs. Raymond C. Goodfellow).

Mr. Speaker, the addresses of DAR chapters not being available to the Congress which gave the DAR its charter—a truly remarkable situation—it is, therefore, impossible for any Member of Congress to seek the opinion of all chapters concerning the "white artists only" clause in the Constitution Hall contracts. However, it is my opinion that more than a majority of chapters would protest if they knew the real facts of the case, and if their opinions could be sought.

It seems to me that the DAR, in refusing to supply a member of the DAR and of the Congress with a list of its chapters, reveals the extent to which it fears to put its social discrimination policies to a democratic test among its Nation-wide membership, which, if polled, would undoubtedly reject those policies.

I have asked unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks today to include therein some resolutions passed by chapters of the DAR in protest against the action of the Washington national board of the DAR in denying the use of Constitution Hall to Hazel Scott, Negro pianist, which were sent to me voluntarily.

The Eunice Dennie Burr Chapter of Fairfield, Conn., on November 26 adopted the following resolution:

Resolved, That we of the Eunice Dennie Burr Chapter, DAR, do recommend to the Board of Management of the National Society DAR that the policy of discrimination on racial basis in renting Constitution Hall be discontinued. We find further in making this study the fact the National Society DAR recognizes the right of any citizen to request the use of Constitution Hall and it also reserves its individual right to grant or deny a request for its use. This fact we believe to be fully justified and is approved by us.

The Wadsworth Chapter of Middletown, Conn., on October 18, 1945, protested the action of the national board in a resolution stating—

It deprecates and deplores the action of excluding artists from the use of Constitution Hall solely on the basis of color, as not in accord with the principles of our organization or representing the sentiment of our members, and it is our hope that future action will be more liberal and more traditionally democratic.

The Mary Silliman Chapter of Bridgeport, Conn., by a vote of 34 to 4 in January 1946, submitted certain suggestions to the national board including among others:

1. That the Board of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, delete the words "white artists only" from the amendment to the rules for the management of Constitution Hall, adopted on March 23, 1932—and that "artists of merit and ability" be substituted.

2. That a committee be established by the national board representing members of ability, artistry, and breadth of vision, to assist the management in determining the merit of the applicant; and that we further recommend

3. That the national society engage a salaried publicity director, to interpret to the public, the policies and activities of the national society, Daughters of the American Revolution.

The Saghtekoos Chapter, of Bay Shore, N. Y., in November 1945 went on record as follows:

The executive board of Saghtekoos Chapter recommends that our chapter protests the attitude of the national board and recommends that the words "white artists only" be stricken from the rules of management for Constitution Hall.

The Mendota Chapter, of St. Paul, Minn., at its regular monthly meeting for October 1945 adopted the following resolution:

Whereas it has come to our attention that the national board of management on October 11, 1945, reaffirmed the policy of the rule governing the use of Constitution Hall, as adopted March 23, 1932, we do protest, and recommend to have stricken from the records "white artists only," as in conformity with that which identifies itself with the best traditions of the United States and of the DAR: And it is hereby further

Resolved, That the regent, Lucia W. Armstrong and the executive board be, and they hereby are authorized and directed to forthwith direct a true copy of this resolution to the national society at Washington, D. C.

The Orford Parsh Chapter, of Manchester, on January 22, adopted a resolution calling for the elimination of the words "for white artists only" from the rules governing the use of Constitution Hall.

The Polly Wyckoff Chapter, of West Englewood, N. J., submitted the following statement to the board of governors of the New Jersey State society to the national society in Washington, and to the local press in October 1945:

Polly Wyckoff Chapter, DAR, has heard with regret of the refusal to allow a Negro artist to use Constitution Hall for a public concert.

This regret is based on the following reasons:

1. Constitution Hall is not a local Washington city possession and should not be controlled by any gentleman's agreement made to satisfy the prejudices of local Washingtonians. This hall was built by contributions from every State in the Nation and the customs of the donors have a right to consideration in the use of the building.

2. Polly Wyckoff does not believe that an enlightened public opinion is promoted by so limiting the use of this building, or that such an action fosters patriotic citizenship or aids in securing for mankind all the blessings of liberty, all of which are set forth in our ritual as the objects of our society, to which objects Polly Wyckoff has always given loyal adherence.

3. More especially do we regret the exhibition and perpetuation of racial prejudice at a time when the whole force of our Nation has been engaged in combating such prejudice and its fearful consequences the world around.

4. Our chapter has a long roster of men and women of our own families who have served, and some of whom have died, to achieve true liberty on earth. By their sides men and women of every race and color have served and suffered. To deny the use of our facilities solely on the basis of race and outworn

custom is a denial of every principle for which this war was fought.

5. Polly Wyckoff believes that the National Society of DAR should show the way in this time of crisis, in order to break down all barriers raised in our Nation which prevent true brotherhood and liberty.

Therefore Polly Wyckoff adopts this statement as its conviction that the true objects of our society are not served by perpetuating racial discrimination in the use of our buildings located in the National Capital.

A copy of this statement will be sent to the board of governors of the New Jersey State Society, to the national society in Washington, and to the local press.

The seniors of the Crosby High School of Waterbury, Conn., in January 1946, voted 150 to 80 to sustain the motion of Carol Wall to refuse to participate in the annual good citizenship pilgrimage award of the DAR because of that organization's refusal to open Constitution Hall to Negro artists.

The following editorial, which appeared in the Bridgeport Post on January 20, 1946, concerns this incident and another courageous group of high-school students in Massachusetts:

WASHINGTON DAR TAKE WARNING

Two groups of high-school students, one in Connecticut, the other in Massachusetts, have declined to participate in the annual good-citizenship contest sponsored by the Daughters of the American Revolution, on the ground that the national headquarters of this organization which controls Constitution Hall in Washington is not itself setting an example of good citizenship by the rule which bars Negro artists from the use of the hall.

The protests of these youngsters ought to awaken the DAR managers in Washington to the fact that they have taken an utterly indefensible and impossible position. It does not represent the true opinion of the rank and file of the members of the DAR. Of that we are certainly convinced.

The local chapters are beginning to express their disapproval of the use of the word "white" as a qualification for artists desiring to rent Constitution Hall in Washington. The excuse of the national board of governors that it is a local custom is a cheap and unconvincing evasion. The whole spirit of our Declaration of Independence is denied when we start to discriminate on racial grounds. And in this case the DAR has the very opposite duty. By its own principles it ought to lead in the fight against discrimination.

Here in Connecticut we have some DAR chapters taking the field in the right way. First, Eunice Dennie Burr Chapter in Fairfield, then Mary Silliman Chapter in Bridgeport, sent resolutions to their national organization asking that the stand be changed. Then the Stamford chapter, which at first had upheld the national action, reversed itself and petitioned for a change. Other chapters throughout the Nation will follow suit, we believe.

In the meantime the action of the high-school seniors has high lighted the issue so that the Washington board ought to see the point. It is impossible for the DAR to fight public opinion and to lead it at the same time. It cannot act unpatriotically itself while urging others to be patriotic.

Washington is our National Capital, belonging to all of us and if some of the local customs there are bad customs, stemming from vicious precedents and evil ways of thinking, it is time that the rest of us exerted ourselves to change them, not to kow-tow to them.

Representative CLARE LUCE, who brought the issue to the attention of the Nation by resigning her membership in Greenwich chapter (which supported the racial ban) and asking for a transfer to the Fairfield chapter which opposes racial discrimination, may have made herself unpopular with some of the Washington old ladies who chatter over their teacups but throughout the Nation there is ample evidence of growing appreciation of the courage, vigor, and patriotism of her stand.

It might also be appropriate to insert a letter which was written on December 4, 1945, by Mrs. Allen A. Johnson to each regent of Connecticut DAR chapters. Mrs. Johnson has been a member of the Eunice Dennie Burr Chapter of the DAR since 1923:

FAIRFIELD, CONN., *December 4, 1945.*

In 1942, at our National DAR Congress in Chicago, a slim slip of a girl from our Tamasshee School recited a most inspiring speech she had written and for which she was awarded the prize offered in a national contest by the American Legion. The subject of this young girl's speech was the United States Constitution. Never was I more thrilled and inspired than by that young girl and the fire of her oratory. Many times have I thought of her earnestness as she pleaded for America to wake up that "your Constitution live."

Again today her words ring in my ears and I hear her voice plead once more. This time it pleads in behalf of the Constitution that we of the DAR wake up and realize what we are allowing our national society to do by practicing racial discrimination in the renting of our Constitution Hall. Now that this question has been allowed to become what it has—a deplorable mess—our national board will undoubtedly feel the present policy cannot be changed without expressions of opinions from the local chapters. Local chapter members do make up the national society. Therefore, I am writing to ask if your chapter will not wake up and rise up and express itself in behalf of the elimination of racial discrimination as now practiced in the renting of our Constitution Hall.

Our ancestors had the courage to fight for freedom. We of the North fought to free the Negro slaves brought here by white men. Now, cannot we have the courage to urge that equal consideration be given to artists of all races? I am not asking that the standard of measurement used to decide upon the type of artistry to perform in the hall be lowered by one iota, but only that all races receive equal consideration. This is American. This is in accordance with the United States Constitution. This is in accordance with our national society, DAR objects. This is above all and beyond all—Christian.

Now is the time. Let us act courageously. No organization is stronger than its weakest policy. We have a weak policy in our society. Will not your chapter work to strengthen it? Wake up, Daughters of the American Revolution, that your Constitution live.

Very sincerely and earnestly yours,

MRS. ALLEN A. JOHNSON.

Farm Security Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a statement on the need for the Farm Security Administration proposed by Roger Davis, an outstanding public-spirited citizen of Texas and one of the ablest and best informed men, especially on this subject, I have ever known. He has a lifetime record of unselfish service for the low-income group of farmers. It is as follows:

LONGVIEW, TEX., *December 26, 1945.*

To: Mr. Ted Watson, Assistant Regional Director, Dallas, Tex.

From: Roger Davis, District FSA Supervisor, District I—Bowie, Camp, Cass, Franklin, Gregg, Marion, Morris, Red River, Titus, and Upshur Counties.

Subject: Reasons why a rural rehabilitation program is essential to our democracy.

I. WHY A RURAL REHABILITATION PROGRAM?

Unfettered, trained thought expressed through universal franchise is essential to the development and success of our democracy. These cannot be without economic independence. Neither can economic independence exist without them. The purse strings are the greatest factor in economic success, freedom of thought, and universal franchise. This is especially true with reference to a large percent of the farm families who are more isolated than other groups.

Shall the power of the "filthy lucre" be conducive to the social, economic, and political development of these families or shall it be used to suppress the essentials to our democracy? It depends wholly on whether the group holding the purse strings are interested in the development of the families or interest income on loans.

II. WHAT IS NEEDED AND HOW MANY FAMILIES NEED IT?

Census figures for 1935 in district I are 28,909 farms; 1940, 23,766; 1945, 22,546. There are now 78 percent as many farms as in 1935. Each farm family used only 50 percent of the land they used in 1935. A 50-percent reduction by 78 percent of the families is a 36-percent reduction of the whole. Twenty-two percent reduction of families effects 22-percent reduction of land used. Twenty-two percent plus 36 percent equals 58-percent reduction in acres of land used since 1935. These figures are fairly accurate and corroborate results of surveys by AAA and other estimates.

A. How many farmstead building units?

There are now no farmstead building units vacant. Five percent of the 22-percent decrease of farm families are now back and need farmstead building units. This is 1,000 farmstead building units. One thousand more couples have attained family status and need farmstead building units. This is a total of 2,000 in 10 counties or an average of 200 farmstead building units per county now needed. Fifty percent, or 11,000 of the existing farmstead building units, are in need of major repairs.

There will be 100 couples per county annually attaining family status and needing farmstead building units. There is no other private or Government agency set up to adequately and satisfactorily provide funds and leadership to meet this demand than FSA.

B. How many need loans to buy farms?

There are now 10 tenant families per county qualified for farm ownership who cannot buy farms other than through the Bankhead-Jones or GI bill of rights provisions. There will be 20 annually per county of veterans and nonveterans who will qualify and cannot be adequately financed other than as above or similar provisions.

C. How many other farm families need money and assistance in farm and home management?

1. Fifty percent, or 11,000, of the farm families of the district will fail to have adequate medical and hospitalization services if deprived of FSA financing and supervision.

2. At the present rate, 60 families per county, or 600 families, will have obtained initial loans and arrangements made for assistance in farm and home management for

1946. A conservative estimate is double this or 1,200 families who will need initial loans and supervision in 1947. This estimate of 600 and 1,200 is based on needs for tools, machinery, power, livestock, and supplies.

Only 5 percent of the farms of the district have adequate farmstead water systems. Twenty-five percent, or 5,000, of the farm families will install farmstead water systems under the FSA water facility plan as fast as they can be contacted and arrange for the loans.

All of the above families who need loans and supervision for the above purposes need assistance and will accept leadership in increasing incomes to support an acceptable standard of living, improved health program, improved food production, conservation and use, improved home furnishings and equipment, and home management.

There are now 1,300 active standard and 150 FO borrowers in the district. Additional loans and supervision are essential to the success of 90 percent of these.

D. Round number summary of needs. The urgent need is information and assistance in farm and home management. This is the first need, and then loans are needed to execute the new ideas and farm and home plans. Fifty percent, or 11,000, of the farm families are in dire need of the FSA services. There will be an additional 200 or 300 families annually per county. FSA is the only private or governmental set-up which can render this service.

III. FAMILY-TYPE FARMS AND DEMOCRACY OR LARGE COMMERCIAL-TYPE CORPORATION FARMS, PEONS AND PLUTOCRACY?

The dawn of the day is here when heavy farm machinery and power must supplant small tools and power. It will be done either by corporation farming or special loan provisions coupled with education and supervision so that groups may own and operate large machinery units to do the heavy work of brushing, breaking, and processing for family-type farms. The FSA group service loans with supervision give the only answer as related to the low-income family type farm group.

IV. MAJOR REHABILITATION BENEFITS TO BORROWERS

A. Loans and collections: There have been a total of 7,000 RR loans made in district I. The total advances were $5,050,000 and the total collections were $4,000,000 as of November 30, 1945.

B. Production increase and quality improvement:

1. Six thousand of the 7,000 borrowers have increased the volume and improved the quality of their products. Ten percent of them have used better sires, 50 percent better poultry, and 75 percent better seed for field crops and gardens.

2. One thousand borrowers made substantial progress in 1945 in feed production. Five hundred and seventy-one made satisfactory progress in grain production, 499 in hay production, and 79 in special protein production. Five thousand of the total 7,000 borrowers have improved their feed production.

3. Four thousand five hundred borrowers improved their soil management by using more and better fertilizers, planting winter cover crops, and summer legumes, terracing, and draining.

4. A uniform package of vegetable insecticides has been bought by contract. Forty percent of the borrowers have participated during the last 4 years.

C. Better farm and home equipment: Six thousand borrowers have used better farm and home equipment as a direct result of supervised FSA credit.

D. Year-round balanced supply of quality food:

Ninety percent of families have made commendable improvement in production and conservation of food. Greatest improvement has been made in increased production of milk, eggs, and meat and in canning vegetables. Emphasis is being placed on production of year-round vegetables to eat fresh and on balanced fruit production.

With increased production has come improved preparation of food, however, the preparation of food containing maximum food value remains a major phase of the program.

E. Health: Forty percent of FSA families have been benefited by prepaid medical care program including hospitalization. Twenty-five percent of families have been led to improve the sanitation of water supplies and an equal number to improve sanitation of toilets.

Statement of Hon. Claudius Dickson, President of the Red River Valley Improvement Association and Chairman of the Caddo Levee Board to the Rivers and Harbors Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1946

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, in 1925 the people of our valley organized the Red River Valley Improvement Association. The association is just what its name indicates—the grouping of many of our citizens for the purpose of improving conditions in the States of Oklahoma, Texas, Arkansas, and Louisiana bordering on Red River.

One of our major problems, affecting practically every part of our valley and much territory adjacent to this valley, is adequate cheap transportation. We are advocating and supporting the plan for canal navigation to Shreveport because we recognize this method of supplying navigation as the most practical, and realize that the problems entering into the navigation of Red River proper from Shreveport south can be avoided by using the proposed canal system.

Our association has made a careful study of every phase of our proposal, and as a representative of the association, I request that consideration be given to the evidence we propose to submit to your honorable Commission, and hope you will believe me when I say that we have made a sincere effort to present figures and facts without exaggeration.

In assembling facts we have been guided by skilled engineers, rather than by professional promoters, and we were told by General Tyler at the beginning of our hearings that he did not want a proposal built on sand or idle dreams, but on solid rock in the form of facts and figures developed by exhaustive engineering research by trained engineers such as Mr. Pyburn, Mr. Odom, and their associates, and by such traffic experts as Mr. Wilson and others associated with him.

Our entire valley, one of the most fertile in America, has a vital interest in navigation to Shreveport. We are prepared to take full advantage of this navigation, should we get it, and by "we" I do not refer to Shreveport, Louisiana, but the hundreds of miles of bordering territory that will be directly benefited by this major improvement.

Our people have asked little from the Government, and we feel that we have taken our part in every major movement, both in war and in peace. We do not believe we are asking for a donation, but merely for an opportunity to develop one of America's greatest valleys and one that has tremendous possibilities for agricultural and industrial growth.

We are confident that when the canal waterway to Shreveport is completed we will have many private and semi-private barge lines using this waterway. The evidence we propose to place before you at this time does not cover the activity we are practically sure of having and does not allow for any benefits other than those we know we can have and that we are prepared to develop.

While the development of the proposed canal system will be a wonderful help to Shreveport and the territory adjacent to northwest Louisiana, it will be a tremendous benefit to the vast area from Alexandria north, including Natchitoches, and other cities and towns on Red River. We know you recognize this project as interstate in character, though it is, of course, intrastate insofar as the present navigation proposal is concerned. We believe that the people of Texas will derive as much benefit as will the people of Louisiana and that the people of Arkansas and Oklahoma will be benefited proportionately, though necessarily to a smaller extent unless, and until, navigation is developed westward and northward from Shreveport.

Our group appearing before you today is small in number but representative, I believe, of our section. We know you gentlemen can, and will, pass on the merits of our proposal. We know you are extremely well qualified to judge and weigh the evidence we will present. I have purposely avoided any attempt to discuss professional facts and come before you today at the request of many thousands of our citizens in the four States represented in the hopes that you will know that we are enthusiastically behind navigation to Shreveport, that we stand ready to support the development of our area in every way possible, and that we are so thoroughly sold on the possibilities of our section that we guarantee the development of a major inland port when you gentlemen give us the opportunity by developing canal navigation to Shreveport.

Thank you very much for allowing me the privilege of appearing before you.

Veterans' Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1946

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein some very important and significant resolutions recently adopted by the Massachusetts Department of the American Veterans of World War II—Amvets.

The membership of this militant servicemen's organization in Massachusetts is composed largely of founders and charter members of Amvets and has exhibited vigorous, far-sighted interest in the problems of the veteran. It is noteworthy that they make no extravagant demands upon the Treasury, that they present their views in an able, temperate manner.

I hope that Members of the House will carefully read these timely and well-considered resolutions:

AMERICAN VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II ADOPT RESOLUTIONS AT FIRST CONVENTION—RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED BY THE RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II—AMVETS—DEPARTMENT OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO THE FIRST CONVENTION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF MASSACHUSETTS, HELD AT THE COPLEY SQUARE HOTEL, BOSTON, MASS., ON DECEMBER 1 AND 2, 1945, AND PASSED BY THE DELEGATES AT THAT CONVENTION ON DECEMBER 2, 1945

We, the American Voters of World War II, Amvets, of the Department of Massachusetts in convention assembled have declared in the preamble of our constitution that we, "fully realizing our responsibility to our community, State, and Nation, associate ourselves for the following purposes: To uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America; to safeguard the principles of freedom, liberty, and justice for all; to promote the cause of perpetual peace and good will among nations; to maintain inviolate the freedom of our country; to preserve the fundamentals of democracy and Americanism; to perpetuate the friendships and associations of the great war of liberation; and to dedicate ourselves to the cause of mutual assistance, this by the grace of God."

We must always bear in mind that in all we do, or say, or think, the public will feel that we speak not alone for ourselves but for those who died that we might live and for those who are still in service, whether here or abroad. Hence, we must give careful consideration to what we do, or say, or think, for upon us rests a heavy burden. But in discharging that burden we must not be afraid to express ourselves definitely and unequivocally upon the large issues which face us, provided, however, that we are sincere and honest and base our conclusions upon a full knowledge of all the facts. If we do that we shall merit the attention and respect of all America. Hence, let us speak fearlessly but with dignity and sincerity.

We owe it to the dead to see to it that the ideals for which they fought and died shall be perpetuated and fully realized. We cannot and must not betray them. We solemnly declare that we will speak for them for that purpose.

We owe it to the disabled veterans who fought and suffered and yet by the grace of God do live. We cannot and must not deny them our undying devotion. We will speak for them.

We owe it to those still in the armed forces who cannot yet speak their minds fully and freely. We cannot and must not let them down. We will speak for them.

But in speaking for them and ourselves we must never forget that we are American citizens first. We fought to preserve a whole Nation. Now we must work for all America. Our duties as American citizens are paramount. We must act and speak for the common welfare and for the good of all.

Yet it must be remembered that the common welfare of our society depends on the welfare of the individual, that injury to him is injury to all; that the denial of the rights of the individual eventually lead to a denial of the rights of all. Hence we declare that the welfare of 14,000,000 veterans is inextricably bound up with the welfare of all America.

What do we want? We make no extravagant demands. We do not want or ask for hero worship. We do not want or ask for charity, for alms, for gifts, or philanthropy in any form.

We are here to see that we as veterans receive what we are justly and honorably entitled to.

Are we entitled to a better world to live in?

Are we entitled to live as free American citizens in a free and democratic society?

Are we entitled to a place in our community without regard to race, color, creed, or station in life?

Are we entitled to a decent job with fair wages?

Are we entitled to equal opportunities of employment, of business and other endeavors?

Are we entitled to a decent education, proper living conditions, proper housing, proper food, proper medical care?

Are we entitled to live in a world of peace, of mutual understanding and appreciation and trust?

Are we entitled to live in a world without fear of want, suspicion, hatred, and discrimination?

Are disabled veterans entitled to the best medical care and the best rehabilitation?

Are the dead to be forgotten?

Have we asked for too much?

We have faith in America. They will not forget us. For if the dead and the living of us are betrayed by the society which we sought to save, then civilization, too, will have been betrayed. That must not and will not happen, so help me God.

With those principles and ideals before us we approach our task.

(1) MILITARY TRAINING AND UNIFIED COMMAND

Whereas we recognize the need of preparedness for the adequate defense of our country but believe that we do not have sufficient facts at this time upon which to form a fair opinion and that that problem is part of a greater over-all national program which also involves our participation in the United Nations Organization: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the whole question of universal military training and unified command be deferred until the rights, duties, and obligations of this country and the other great powers under the United Nations Organization are clearly defined, and that in the meantime—

(1) voluntary enlistments be stimulated by adequate pay, attractive living conditions, pensions and opportunities for vocational and other training; and

(2) the President appoint a national defense commission, adequately financed and directed to formulate a comprehensive plan giving

(a) the number of men required as a standing army;

(b) proposed commitments to the United Nations Organization and our rights and duties thereunder;

(c) whether the necessary armed forces can be obtained by voluntary enlistments;

(d) the cost of the various plans of universal military training;

(e) a proposed reorganization of the armed forces to make it more efficient, scientific, democratic, and humane;

(f) recommendations for the cooperation of industry and labor for defense purposes, stock piling of strategic materials, conservation of national resources, scientific research, and any other subjects which affect the national defense.

(3) Such a commission shall be composed of persons known for their integrity and ability, special knowledge, and experience with large affairs, and chosen from military, diplomatic, legislative, industrial, labor, veteran, scientific, educational, and religious organizations and other walks of life.

(2) COURTS MARTIAL

Whereas it is the opinion of veterans, both enlisted men and officers, and many other competent authorities that the system of courts martial as practiced in our armed services is archaic, harsh, arbitrary, discriminatory, and not keeping with democratic principles and that the sentences imposed in many cases are harsh and constitute cruel and usual punishment contrary to the Constitution of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the system of courts martial be recognized on the following principles:

1. That military courts be composed of men trained in the law.

2. That the judges be appointed by the President and be accountable only to him and the Congress.

3. That at least one judge of the court be a civilian and one an enlisted man.

4. That prosecuting and defense counsel be trained in the law.

5. That defense counsel be members of a separate department of the Government.

6. That the defense counsel be appointed to represent the accused immediately upon the accusation in the event the alleged crime is serious.

7. That a Federal court of appeals be established to review, approve or disapprove all felony convictions; and be it further

Resolved, That a soldier's history in civilian life be taken into consideration in imposing sentence; and be it further

Resolved, That sentences be made more humane, uniform, and more definitely defined as to maximum punishments; and be it further

Resolved, That cases in which sentences have already been imposed be reexamined by competent counsel.

(3) VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Whereas, as a matter of practice, veterans of World War II are not being given their fair share of positions in the Veterans' Administration and other governmental agencies, whether Federal, State, or city: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Veterans' Administration and the other governmental agencies be requested to place veterans of World War II on a par with all other veterans in the matter of appointments to positions in the Veterans' Administration and other governmental agencies.

(4) COST OF LIVING

Whereas the returning veteran has found the cost of living entirely too high for his means; and

Whereas there exists surpluses in many commodities: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Federal Government, the respective States of the United States, and the municipalities immediately establish plans to reduce the cost of living, to rigorously enforce the rules and regulations of the OPA to cut out black marketing, and to distribute the surplus commodities to the public at a fair and reasonable price.

(5) HOUSING

Whereas the returning veteran and the public have not been able to find proper or adequate housing; and

Whereas there exists a real shortage of housing on a large scale which, if permitted to continue, will endanger the morale and health of the veteran and the public and lower our standard of living: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Federal Government, the respective States of the Union, and municipalities immediately establish concrete plans to remedy that situation, and, in furtherance of these plans, to promote Government and community large-scale, low-cost housing projects, to encourage private building, and to reduce the cost of building private homes and maintaining them; and be it further

Resolved, That the President and the governors of the respective States call an emergency conference of Federal, State, and city housing officials, representatives of labor, the building industry,, landlords, veterans, and other persons interested to formulate those plans and to report the same within 1 month; and be it further

Resolved, That in the meantime all heavy construction, except for industrial purposes, be suspended until the housing problem is met or solved; and be it further

Resolved, That the various communities make an immediate inventory of all houses which are abandoned, unoccupied, vacant, or closed, and then to determine whether those houses can be repaired or remodeled

into decent apartments for returning veterans and the public.

(6) SURPLUS PROPERTIES

Whereas the returning veterans have not been accorded fair or proper treatment in the disposal of surplus properties of the Federal Government and in fact have been unable, in most instances, to obtain the said surplus properties at all or within a reasonable time; and

Whereas dealers have been able to obtain said surplus properties in preference to and to the exclusion of veterans contrary to the intent of Congress; Therefore, be it

Resolved, That each department of the Federal Government which disposes of surplus properties be required to accord preferential treatment to veterans in the disposition of said properties in accordance with the intent of Congress and to see to it that such properties are available for sale to veterans and are definitely produced within a reasonable time after a veteran applies for the same.

(7) MEDICAL HEALTH

Whereas President Truman has sent a message to Congress outlining a five-point health plan aimed at providing the American people with the right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health; and

Whereas the five points of the plan provide for:

1. Increased Federal aid for constructing needed hospital and other facilities.
2. Expansion of public health, maternal, and child-health services.
3. Increased education and research for the medical profession.
4. Compulsory health insurance; Therefore be it

Resolved, That we support President Truman's health plan and request the Congress to act upon it as quickly as possible.

A Great and Rich Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1946

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of W. Harry Johnson before the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors on the Red River lateral canal, Washington, D. C., January 14, 1946:

General Crawford and members of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, neglect of some of Louisiana's rivers and small streams—in particular the Red River—and the failure to recognize their economic value, has cost the citizens of that State many millions of dollars, and set industrial development back one-third of a century.

There was a time when the Red River, traversing the rich valley from north Caddo Parish to its confluence with the great Mississippi, was one of the most important and valuable transportation arteries in the Nation.

In the days when cotton was king, when the rich lands along the Red River yielded hundreds of thousands of bales of the fleecy staple every year, the river provided the only means for transporting this valuable cargo to market, as well as returning into the areas from which these shipments were made the products of manufacturers and processors from every part of the United States.

In an earnest endeavor to present my argument to this Board I find it expedient to indulge briefly in a few personalities.

Because of my life-long residence in the district under discussion and my great interest in the matter, I shall beg the kind indulgence of the board toward my injection of a few references of a more or less personal nature.

If it were not for the fact that at one time the Red River was navigable as far north as Shreveport and some distance beyond, this witness would not have appeared before your board today. Among the earliest pioneers of north Louisiana were my forebears on my father's as well as my mother's side, and their migration to the State of Louisiana was due to the well-developed river transportation in that section of the South during the first half of the nineteenth century.

James Blair Gilmer, my maternal great-grandfather, first landed in this year 1840 at a point on the upper Red River which was subsequently called Gilmers Landing. He used this landing as transportation headquarters in operating a line of steamboats to and from New Orleans. The town he settled was called Collinsburg and was located in the hills of Bossier Parish, a few miles from Gilmers Landing.

My paternal grandfather, Col. Benjamin May Johnson, settled at Shreveport in 1850, and he used steamboat transportation exclusively in handling his extensive commerce from New Orleans to Shreveport, La., and Jefferson, Tex., in both of which busy townships he operated large mercantile establishments.

In the early 1900's Shreveport was still benefiting from low river-freight rates, and as a result was recognized as a rate-breaking point and a distribution center of considerable importance. Due to this fact, this witness organized a transfer, warehousing, and distribution business in the growing city of Shreveport in the year 1907.

However, due to governmental neglect of the maintenance of this important waterway, the traffic on Red River gradually diminished year by year, the channel becoming too shallow, except at flood stage, to accommodate river steamboats, and in 1924 your witness was forced to transfer a part of his business from Shreveport to Monroe, La., where he established a similar business, with warehouses and other facilities on the banks of the Ouachita River.

Soon after the establishment of this enterprise at Monroe, Mr. Fred Stovall, and associates of that city began the operation of a regular barge-line service between Monroe and New Orleans, La.

This was made feasible by the building of locks on the Ouachita River by the Federal Government, which furnish Monroe and the Ouachita Valley with a 6½- to 9-foot channel depth, which was adequate for steamboat and barge transportation.

It was through my connection with Mr. Stovall's barge-line service that I became interested in river transportation, but we soon realized that the operation of wooden barges with prohibitive marine insurance rates, added to the excessive cost of operating steamboats to tow these barges, rendered this business unprofitable and for these reasons this company was dissolved.

However, during the entire time that Mr. Stovall and myself were operating the original barge line, we realized that the long-range picture was favorable in the matter of tonnage, for we were handling 100-percent barge capacity from Monroe to New Orleans, and 90-percent capacity upstream from New Orleans to Monroe, with a 20-percent differential in barge-line rates under rail rates.

Later Mr. Stovall, myself, and associates formed the Commercial Transportation Co., a barge service, using Diesel towboats and 800-ton steel barge equipment.

The saving on marine insurance, using steel instead of wooden barges, liquidated the original cost of the steel barges in 4½ years, and the use of Diesel-powered towboats, instead of the obsolete coal-burning steamboats, liquidated the original cost of the Diesel towboats in 4 years.

With this new Diesel and steel equipment, with its low operating cost, this company paid substantial dividends until it was sold at a good profit to a competing firm.

If the proposed lateral canal project, with a channel depth of 9 feet, becomes a reality, within a reasonable length of time I will, without hesitation, be willing to organize a corporation with adequate financial resources to assure the utilization of this canal facility to its fullest possibilities, thereby assuring this area low-cost water-borne transportation between the great port of New Orleans and Shreveport or wherever the terminus might be at the northern end.

I am, furthermore, positive that this service can be rendered and can be made to pay a reasonable profit at much lower rates than now prevail through existing transportation facilities.

Our people see in the Red River lateral canal project how such streams as Bayou Pierre, Bayou Rapides, and Bayou Boeuf, and other similar streams can be utilized to form a lateral canal which will be of benefit beyond estimation to the citizens of Louisiana and the Nation.

Such a project as is proposed in this program is a definite necessity to this section of the United States.

Industrialists have learned that Louisiana has much to offer to those seeking locations where climate makes possible all-year-round operations, and where labor, both skilled and unskilled, is plentiful.

There is an additional angle to this proposed canal project which I hope this board will also seriously consider.

Let us suppose that this canal was in existence at the time of Pearl Harbor.

The heavy concentration of war industries and the utilization of the vast oil and gas reserves in the Arkansas-Louisiana-Texas area would have been far more extensive and of even greater benefit to the Nation in the recent national emergency had this additional water transportation been available for the movement of the products of war industry, so vital to the Nation's defense. And it should not be forgotten that there are still, in this area, great industrial manufacturing facilities which can be quickly converted to ordnance production in any future national emergency.

Any weighing of the benefits expected from this canal project, must, in my opinion, take into consideration its possible and probable wartime advantages.

Observation of the large industrial producing areas of both this country and Europe will show beyond question that the full economic strength of any area or country can only be realized when transportation of every kind is available. The idea that the availability of only one means of transportation is adequate for full economic development is not only antiquated but can be dangerous.

And in conclusion, while it may appear that my entire argument has been to prove the necessity for river and canal transportation between the two largest cities in the State of Louisiana—New Orleans, which is one of the Nation's greatest ports—and Shreveport, which is the recognized center of the vast Arkansas-Louisiana-Texas area—I by no means desire to convey the impression that this is my only concern.

As a resident and large landowner in Caddo Parish, lack of flood control of Red River has quite recently been brought forcibly to my

attention, for the 1945 high water in this valley inundated 3,600 acres of my 4,000-acre plantation, which is located 8 miles north of Shreveport, causing heavy financial losses to me as well as to other planters in that section.

My argument and contention is that it is going to be absolutely necessary that the Federal Government work out a satisfactory drainage program and flood control, along the line of the development of this proposed lateral canal; and, if this is accomplished in the near future, instead of killing the proverbial two birds with one stone, you will be killing three birds with one stone, for, the completion of this great undertaking will bring about at once, flood control, adequate drainage, and economical water transportation through the development of the proposed lateral canal project.

Strike Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 4, 1946

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Sun, San Bernardino, Calif., for January 22, 1946:

STRIKE LEGISLATION

Legislation for some measure of control of the industrial situation by the United States Government is not likely to be what Mr. Truman has requested and thinks it ought to be. Current announcement by Representative LANDIS indicates the situation is such as to discourage Mr. Truman, whatever he is able to do about it.

What the President has asked the people of the United States to stimulate the Members of Congress to put into law was something similar to the Railway Labor Act. That legislation provides the railways and their employees before a strike is called and during which a fact-finding board will go into the situation to make a report to the President.

That impressed the occupant of the White House as a solution of the existing situation, but it was greeted by both industry and labor with no cheers at all. His appeal to the people, via radio, that they put the heat on their representatives while they were home for the Yuletide holidays seems to have been not what he hoped.

In any event, what the President apparently is going to get is not what he wanted, although it is not quite impossible that he may be able to get some change in the set-up.

What Congressman LANDIS says he has enough votes in the committee to get out on the floor of the House of Representatives is a measure President Truman has regarded as wholly without teeth. The legislation Mr. LANDIS says apparently suits Congress does not contain any provision for a cooling-off period nor does it compel either industry or labor to accept the results a fact-finding board the law will set up after they have been reached.

Mr. Truman is likely to regard that summary of the proposed legislation as merely an opportunity for the members of the fact-finding boards to get an expense account. It is not unlikely industry and labor will take the same attitude. When Congress gets around to getting the bill out of committee and on the floor and then votes upon it, we shall see what we shall see.

Whatever occurs, recalling a bit of United States history might give us all a better perspective of what is going on. The listener-in on casual conversations gets the notion that most of our people think nothing like this has ever happened before in this democracy. That is profoundly in error.

The wave of strikes now spreading over the Nation does not impress anybody who can recall that situation much more serious than the strike wave which followed the end of World War I. For one thing, while we may not feel we have been spared very much in the way of industrial turmoil, we have not had up to this time a coal strike or a rail strike. Those were both on the industrial program following the First World War. That was in 1919.

The mine workers that year demanded a 60-percent wage increase and a 6-hour day. When the demands were rejected, a bituminous coal strike of about 435,000 miners went into effect for 6 weeks. The Government got two injunctions against the strike, but the miners ignored them. Then a court order was issued directing the end of the strike and the order was obeyed. But the miners did not go back to work because it was the American tradition then, as it is now—that men cannot be forced to work against their will.

Finally, the miners accepted President Wilson's proposal of a small wage increase followed by a wage investigation. Several months later the investigating commission recommended wage increases averaging 27 percent over the prestrike levels. Both sides accepted the finding.

That same year, 1919, 250,000 railway shopmen went on a strike asking wage increases of 17 cents per hour to meet the rise of living costs. After much discussion and a lot of wildcat strikes, the full 17 cents per hour increase was allowed.

There was also a great steel strike in 1919 involving 365,000 workers. There were strikes among building trades, among textile workers, among silk workers, and clothing workers. In fact, the total number of men involved in strikes and lockouts in 1919 was estimated by the Department of Labor as 4,113,000.

The facts set forth above are worth remembering. The Government still stands and ours is still the greatest industrial Nation on earth. Whatever happens, we go forward, and that is a good point to remember.

Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 4, 1946

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein the following article from the New York Times of February 3, 1946, entitled "Explicit Word Awaited on Our Foreign Policy":

EXPLICIT WORD AWAITED ON OUR FOREIGN POLICY—PEOPLE OF THIS AND OTHER NATIONS HOPE WE WILL LAY DOWN A CLEAR, STRONG COURSE ON WORLD ISSUES—OCCUPATION ROW AN EXAMPLE

(By W. H. Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, February 2.—There was abundant evidence this week that the people of the United States and of many nations around the world needed and would welcome a new and explicit definition of long-range American foreign policy.

They wanted something which would go beyond a general declaration that we favored peace, prosperity, progress, and freedom for the world. They wanted to know our definite aims and interests in nearly every country around the globe, and they wanted to know, as well, the principles which we considered inviolable by ourselves, by our friends, and by our enemies.

The need for such a clearcut statement was probably greatest in relation to our aims in Germany and Japan and the reasons for retaining sizable occupation forces in those countries and surrounding areas for a considerable period of time. American objectives hadn't been made sufficiently clear to win the support either of the people in the United States or of the occupying troops abroad—for the ceaseless cry which went up from both sides of the Atlantic and the Pacific was "bring the boys home."

ECHO OF WORLD WAR I

And to those who did know and understand the postwar aims of American forces in Germany and Japan this continual and effective agitation was tragic, for it seemed to presage a repetition of what happened after World War I when we pulled out of Europe before we had accomplished our job.

Within the administration itself there seemed to be urgent need for such an explicit definition of foreign policy which would stand the test not alone of months but of years. There was confusion and bickering and considerable evidence of snap judgments on vital issues—decisions made, reversed and revised without any reference to an over-all plan of advancing the long-term interests of the United States abroad.

Consciously or unconsciously, President Truman, at his latest press conference, revived talk about his strained relations with Secretary of State James F. Byrnes. It was not so much what the President said but the manner in which he said it that led the Washington Post to headline its report, "Truman flares up to stress he is boss of foreign policy," with a black-face note: "South Carolina papers please copy." (Secretary Byrnes, of course, is from South Carolina.)

There was also the matter of the secret agreement made at Yalta nearly a year ago in which the late President Roosevelt and former Prime Minister Churchill agreed to hand over to Russia the Kurile Islands group then occupied by Japan, with which Russia was not at war at that time.

That agreement was so secret that Mr. Byrnes, who was present as a Presidential adviser but not yet as Secretary of State, said he did not learn of it until after the Japanese surrendered last August. Mr. Truman, who was Vice President at the time, but who did not go to Yalta, said he did not learn of it until just before the Potsdam Conference last July.

The Yalta agreement on the Kuriles also gave new strength to those in Washington who would have the United States annex former Japanese-owned or mandated islands in the Pacific conquered by American forces in this war and whose continued occupation and fortification is considered essential to the future security needs of this country.

POLICY ON ISLANDS

At least tentatively, the administration policy has been that such islands as are considered vital will be placed under exclusive United States trusteeship in accord with the strategic area clauses of the United Nations Charter, and the others will be turned over to the UNO trusteeship council for appointment of multi-nation trustees.

When that proposed course of action was outlined by President Truman, speaking extemporaneously, about 2 weeks ago, it immediately aroused considerable opposition on Capitol Hill.

Whatever may be the merits of annexation versus individual trusteeship of Pacific bases which we desire to hold, the debate on the issue has made it undiplomatically clear that we propose to decide the island issue on a unilateral basis, and that if one of the other permanent members on the UNO Security Council sought to use its veto power to block an American proposal relating to one of the islands, we would withdraw the proposition from UNO consideration and continue to occupy the island by right of possession.

Those who recognized the need for a new and explicit definition of United States foreign policy are concerned not so much with individual and immediate problems such as have been discussed above but more with the long-term objectives of our relations with other countries throughout the world.

NO RUSSIAN POLICY?

What, for example, is our Russian policy? Of course, it basically is that we want peace and friendship, and it is founded on the presumption that the peoples of the Soviet Union basically desire peace and friendship with us. But, assuming the continuance of peace and friendship, have we no other objectives?

Do we have economic interests in either expanding Soviet purchases in the United States, or American purchases in Russia? Do we have cultural interests? What other interests have we in Russia or the Russians in us?

It is argued that in drafting such a Russian policy it would be well to draft simultaneously a policy for the states immediately covered in the Russian security belt—such as Finland, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, etc.

It is contended that if we were thus to reduce to specific terms the guide posts for American policy and conduct, and that if, in response to such a declaration from us, the Russians were to make similar propositions, the two states and others with similar interests could try to iron out differences and prevent disagreements before they arise in acute form.

SHORT-WAVE BROADCASTS

Currently, the State Department is considering a recommendation from W. Averell Harriman, retiring United States Ambassador to Moscow, that this Government should undertake short-wave broadcasts in Russian to give the peoples of the Soviet Union a complete and accurate picture of the United States.

A decision on such a question obviously should be made only within the framework of our over-all Russian policy. Simple though it may seem, it is in fact very difficult to answer because the Russian Government's attitude is that the people of the Soviet Union should have only such information as their Government wishes them to have.

Because our concepts of free speech and a free press differ, it probably would not make any difference to the Russians if we were to cite as justification the fact that they make similar broadcasts about Russia beamed to the United States in English.

Clarkson College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1946

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address delivered by Mr. Charles E. Wilson, president of General Electric Co., at a dinner meeting of 275 of the alumni of Clarkson College of Technology, of Potsdam, N. Y., in the Hotel Roosevelt, New York City, on the night of Saturday, January 19.

Mr. Wilson is a member of the board of trustees of Clarkson College, an engineering institution which recently celebrated its fiftieth anniversary by conferring honorary degrees on Herbert Hoover, former President of the United States; former Ambassador Joseph E. Davies; and other distinguished citizens.

Clarkson is a splendid example of the American system of free education. During its 50-year span it has been supported entirely by the gifts of enlightened private citizens, by the tuition fees of its students, and from sound investments made by its administrators. It has been a free college, graduating 2,000 fine men into the stream of American technical and business life, because it has depended on itself and not on the bounties of the Government.

A former colleague, Hon. Bertrand H. Snell, remembered by so many of us, was for 25 years president of the board of trustees of Clarkson College and is still a very active member of the board.

It was very fitting that the president of one of our greatest engineering and scientific concerns should talk to the Clarkson alumni, which is composed of men who are forging new scientific frontiers. It is worthy of note that many Clarkson men were chosen to work on the development of the atomic bomb.

Mr. Wilson's constructive and temperate address follows:

Just about a year ago things were very different with us. So much has happened to the United States of America in 12 months, so much that will be written in bold letters down the years by historians, that it seems almost inconceivable. Three years of World War had shocked and hammered us into the greatest fighting and producing machine that the world has ever seen—or ever will see, for that matter, because by the very nature of things that kind of war will never again be waged. In spite of our armadas of thousands and thousands of planes, in spite of a fleet grown to such proportions that the mighty British Navy became little more than one of its associated task forces, in spite of radar, and jet propulsion, and rocket bombs, and bazookas, and a thousand other refinements and progressions in the art of destruction, this was a conventional war, conceived and directed along traditional lines, with the marshaling of defense and attack and the measuring of force by force, steel against steel, and man against man. It was a tremendous, deafening, catastrophic, tragic spectacle—but differing only in degree from those which preceded it in human history.

A year ago we were very tired of war, tired of our mounting dead, tired of the everlasting effort required to hold up our end, physically tired of the vast expenditures of courage and determination, tired of frustration and deprivation. And the end, if you will remember, did not seem so very near. In Europe our armies were battered and bruised from the Battle of the Bulge, and at home our confidence was shaken. In the Pacific we were heartbreakingly far from our goal. If we had one great holiday wish, as a Nation, it was to be rid forever of this conflict in which we were engulfed—rid of it victoriously, to be sure—but rid of it nonetheless.

Then, in a few short months, the miracle had happened and we had our wish. We have it now, this peace for which we fought so hard. We are standing on the threshold of the golden age, the rude blueprints for which we used to inspect and redraft furtively during the battle, in order to keep up our spirits and remind ourselves that things were going to be better, just over the hill. This is our peace—how do you like it?

There is only one thing that brings such a group as this together, or any group of alumni from an institute of higher learning, and it is not pure nostalgia or simple gregariousness. You are here because you are a product of the organized itch for knowledge, richly endowed by generations of tough-minded men who were not content with the status quo, either in the world at large or within themselves. You are here not simply because you went to school and want to recall some of the gifts and experiences which resulted—but because of the conviction that others must follow you, now and next year and next decade, and the traffic along this highroad must never cease to move forward. Particularly in your case, it seems to me, you are here because of the future which is unfolding, and not merely to commemorate the past with social pleasantries. And tonight—how do you like as much of that future as you can see?

All of us have earned our honorary degrees as doctors of hindsight, or almost all of us. There is still a frighteningly large group who have even "flunked" that course and who have not revised their political or economic or sociological thinking by so much as a footnote. They are useless and unpleasant citizens, but not dangerous. Let them lie.

As for the rest of us, we should not discount hindsight too much, especially if it is of the honest, amateur kind. We know now that many of the paths we followed in business, in practical politics, and in education, were wrong in many respects, but they had this virtue, that they did carry us forward. Technical and scientific men were perhaps the least offenders and the greatest ground gainers. They have gone farther and straighter than most because they were dealing with nature in the raw and not so much with nature in the so-called refined, or human, state. But even the men of science have had a nasty jolt. Their assiduous researches have led them straight to the secret of atomic energy, and their achievement has at least temporarily scared their fellow beings and many of their colleagues into a jelly of apprehension. If the world were to vote today to turn back the clock to before Hiroshima, I am not at all sure but what those in favor would be in the majority.

And yet that is a very foolish thing. Dr. Gallup can measure human forces but he cannot stay or undo them. We long ago drew the lines and put in motion the forces which led us surely and inevitably to the atom bomb. Now we must live with it and meet the new challenge which it offers before it destroys us. Just as long ago some of our nonscientists drew the lines and put in motion the forces which today have threatened to paralyze and demoralize our whole economic system. If a million men walk the picket lines in America, and their savings, and industry's resources, rust and rot and disappear, that too is another kind of atomic bomb which threatens the existence of all of us. And I am sure that if America could turn back the clock somehow to full employment and industrial peace by the process of taking a vote, it would do so overwhelmingly.

And in doing so it would no more rub out the inevitable than it would in voting away the atom bomb. Industrial strife is here. We must live with it, too, for these unpleasant and tragic hours, and learn to meet its challenge before it destroys us.

That is why this group is important, and all the others like it. Our only hope today, as always, lies with men who are not ashamed to learn, men who put methods ahead of

goals, men who will scrutinize and analyze the past as critically and honestly as a scientist or engineer, and then apply what they have learned to the problem confronting them. If there is one thing above all others that distinguishes a man of learning—and it makes no difference whether his school is formal or informal in character—it is tolerance. A man may have a mind as open and wide as the horizon itself, or he may have a horizon as narrow and confined as his mind. With intellectual tolerance comes good will. These are old-fashioned words for old-fashioned concepts, and what a mighty need we have for them today.

The other day a fairly reasonable man of my acquaintance was criticizing the press for the part which he, at least, believed it to be playing in aggravating our present management-labor troubles. This was not petulant or childish criticism. He, too, believed that the only solution to these troubles would come from the earnest efforts of men of good will and intellect on both sides of the question, and, therefore, he blamed the newspapers for reporting—and thereby magnifying by the very application of editorial technique—the hostile, angry, belligerent statements that were made. He credited the press as the catalyst which was producing the great amount of heat and modicum of light that seemed to aggravate labor-management relations.

I agree with his conclusions as to what is happening, but not as to the responsibility of the press. Newspapers for the most part do a fair job of reflecting factual situations. It is true that by their effective reporting and efficient dissemination of news they make certain that more and more people read the hasty words of angry men, but the initial responsibility is not theirs. They are simply a conduit for both the venom and the nectar which issues from mortal man—and venom makes better reading. My point simply is that good will is not in the ascendant, on the industrial front, and it must be if we are ever to learn the answers.

Anyone who throws the first stone at such a juncture runs a grave risk of being beaten to death in the next edition, but I am going to venture the observation, as gracefully as I can, that labor has won most of the honors to date for bad manners in public. The managers of industry may have been guilty of many faults; they have been well and frequently cataloged; but this tendency to hurl bad names and harsh accusations is not generally one of them. I do not mean to be heard as saying that all of the good will is on management's side, but they are usually too conservative to produce flashy repartee.

Union spokesmen, on the other hand, do not seem to be so hampered. I wish they were. I wish they were just as cautious and painstaking and colorless in their public utterances as corporation executives usually are. I wish that for their sake, and for all of our sakes, because angry men—especially earnest and honest angry men—make themselves too easy prey for the calculating and vicious manipulators of violence who have tried to wreck the United States since its birth, and who are with us today.

You are all aware, I am sure, that I come here tonight out of days and weeks and even months of wrestling with the immediate problems of the labor relations of the General Electric Co. They are largely those of the whole electrical industry, and even more. As every newsboy knows, they are also the problems of all industry. The ugly word "strike" with all that it comprehends in the way of violence and waste is very much with us now, and until events cast it out of the news we cannot go forward and do the things we have to do as a nation to put the war behind us. We have exchanged one tragic set of circumstances for another. In war we knew where we were going and what we had to do. We had our opponent well measured, and we were united in our fight to lay him low. Now we have lost that unity and that strength, and we seem to be futilely lashing out in all directions and only getting tangled deeper in the web as the days go by. There is no clear-cut enemy in this industrial conflict, and the real tragedy is that so much of the time we seem to be slashing away at those who are really on our side, hurting them and hurting us and wasting the precious days that should be spent in growth. We are going to harvest wounds and scars that will be worn for a long time, no matter what happens. Any party that wins a clear-cut victory in industrial strife does so at its own expense. Any new power that is built on selfishness must maintain itself by violence, and it faces a day of reckoning that is sure and complete in its consequences.

There has to be another solution, and it is the road to that solution that I am more interested in exploring. At the same time it is hard to keep your mind on long-range solutions which require the continued application of the intellect along scientific lines when you find yourself in the middle of a fight.

The citizen who suddenly finds himself in jail can be excused if he shows more interest in getting out than in criticizing theories of jurisprudence or searching new legal techniques.

I have no intention of arguing the case of my own company, or even of management generally, on this occasion. If you are interested you can find the statement of our position in the daily newspapers. I will only say now, because I do think it has a bearing on my real subject, that the position we have taken, the policies we have announced, the offers we have made, have been honest and deliberate, rather than tactical. A large corporation is a very complex mechanism, for all of its human and mechanical talent, and one on the outside has no conception of the difficulties involved in coming up with a simple answer, particularly a statistical answer. I confess that today it is almost impossible to know from day to day how many plants we have or where they are located, how many employees we have, what their average wage is, whether or not they belong to a union, how much equipment we are producing and what is happening to it, what are the costs of that production, what are the selling prices. The answers are in the machine, true enough, but it takes time to get them out—and often it takes so much time that they are no longer the right answers. I have watched this process particularly in recent months as the machinery of reconversion gathered speed, and as the clouds of labor trouble gathered, and I have some idea of just how much perspiration and how many hours of effort are poured into the process of finding a simple answer, applying the factors of change and judgment, and then staking perhaps millions of dollars of investors' and workers' money on the published result.

The next thing that happens is that you find your offer refused, or your answer thrown back in your teeth almost in a matter of minutes, by some unofficial spokesman or commentator who blithely announces that you are misrepresenting facts, misleading the public, and apparently can't do simple arithmetic. I wonder at this omniscient power of these lightning calculators. I wonder where they buy their crystal balls. And I wonder, somewhat bitterly I am afraid, why responsible people in high places in public life are so eager to adopt such answers and act upon them. Mere repetition and volume seem to weigh unduly in the scales of credibility. There is a terrible tragedy in the making for the American people, a tragedy of inflation, unemployment, and domestic chaos which can only have international repercussions, unless we can bring to bear on this problem some of the common sense and intellectual zeal of which we are capable, and do it soon. The greatest tragedy of all is that it could be prevented. It seems to me that the great irony of our present situation is that management and labor are fighting their fight on entirely different levels; they are not even talking about the same things. It is as if a great debate were going on with one side taking the affirmative of one question and the other taking the negative of an entirely different question, one that was decided long ago by history and is now academic. It doesn't make sense. The pressure machinery of organized labor, and it is an admirably organized machinery, is being directed against an opposition that no longer exists, which died in the days of the great depression. It is a technique of attack that takes no cognizance of the controlling factors of material costs, labor costs, manufacturing facilities, price controls, supply and demand, selling costs, and the one inevitable and inexorable fact that we first have to produce and sell our goods before we can collect our price from the customer.

Every hour that we stand still in industry we discourage the investment in our businesses of the risk capital that every business needs. Not only does business need it, but the investors themselves need it, who include the postman, the policeman, the stenographer, the housewife and every family that has a bank account or owns an insurance policy. The need is mutual and crying. For at least a half dozen years the best brains of our economy have been planning peacetime reconversion, since before the beginning of the war itself. Private enterprise, awake at last to its real responsibilities and obligations to the future, rolled up its sleeves and expended millions of dollars and millions of hours on a vast blueprint for tomorrow, designed to bring us greater prosperity than we had ever known, designed for full employment, designed for better living, designed for intelligent marketing, designed for fine working conditions and a true recognition of the social responsibilities of everyone—and that blueprint tonight is not only on the shelf but the clock is ticking away the possible hours during which it can be used. The great manufacturing plants of America look more and more like deserted villages. The most alert marketing machinery ever devised has nothing to market. And the workers of America, given the opportunity to share to the fullest extent in this dream which lies beneath their hands, are committed to idleness, to living on their wartime savings, to building up pockets of resentment and distrust.

This is what I mean by saying that management and labor are not talking about the same things. It is not in industry's power to grant most of the demands that are made on it today without turning around and adding this new cost to the price paid by the consumer, and we don't want to do that because it means adding to the inflationary spiral and is an endless process.

There is one other possibility, one that we foresaw before the close of the war and incorporated into our plans. We knew that if we could make our people more productive, through their own efforts and through the introduction of better methods and new facilities, it would be possible to pass on the fruits of greater production. We were aware of the tremendous potential markets ahead of us. We thought we had some fresh thinking on marketing and distribution which would eliminate waste and reduce selling costs. We knew, as every manufacturing man knows,

that multiplying our volume for any product once we had set up to make it and taken care of initial costs could mean a greater return than before even on smaller profit margins. But it seems perfectly plain to me that these are things that have to be demonstrated. Business cannot be expected to mortgage these unrealized sales and pay over labor's increased wages in advance of their being made. That practice brought the city of Chicago close to bankruptcy some years ago, when it paid the salaries of city employees with warrants that had not been collected in taxes and would not be for a long time to come—and when taxpayers found out about it they quit paying taxes. That is just what could happen to our market.

It is tantamount to giving up the enterprise system, because obviously bankrupt business can only continue to operate by some form of government subsidy, and subsidy means control, and control means introducing a whole host of factors that are foreign to the way we do business. The distinguished characteristic of private enterprise is that it pays its way, makes a profit, and stands on its own feet. Do we want to give that up as a way of life and go along with Professor Laski and a state-planned economy?

I don't think so. Moreover, I don't think that the rank and file of labor think so, either. I don't even think that most labor leaders think so, and that is what makes their position completely unrealistic. They are using the techniques of a generation ago to accomplish the objectives of a generation ago without realizing that those objectives have already been achieved. Labor has won its fight against managerial selfishness and doesn't know it.

It was not my purpose to recite much of the facts of our present controversy. It is impossible to settle that controversy here, and from here on we will have to deal with it on a day-to-day basis, hoping and praying that in the process of settlement none of us will be forced to do irreparable harm to our economic system. But this seemed to be a good opportunity to remind you, or tell you if you did not know, of the high-caliber socially conscious, intelligent job of planning the postwar years that was done by many men, companies, and agencies. To me it is proof that we must persistently employ the same intellectual techniques to find our way permanently out of industrial strife. Although we find ourselves in jail, and in need of an immediate bail bond, let us buckle down to this task of thinking our way out, and of making it impossible for us ever again to be in such a situation. At a time when our leadership is needed so desperately by the rest of the world it is a national tragedy to find our great economic machine threatened with complete demoralization because of the inertia or ignorance of many, and the helplessness of many more.

We spoke earlier of the senselessness of trying to vote away an atomic bomb or an industrial crisis. It is too late for that. But if we are convinced, as I am sure that all reasonable men must be, of the wisdom of the democratic process; of the time-tested value of negotiation, mediation, and judicial arbitration as established by law; of contract obligations that can be enforced on both parties to a dispute and not just one; of equal protection under the laws and obedience to civil authority as established by the Constitution—then let us seek these characteristic American remedies through intelligent legislation and quit drifting down the road to tragedy.

To such an objective we can apply our learning and our good will. To such a purpose we can recover and rededicate our great strength and national unity. And when we achieve it we can stop being ashamed and once more take pride in a job well done.

Coordination of the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1946

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by H. Struve Hensel, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, before the Town Hall Club at the Biltmore Hotel, Los Angeles, Calif., January 28, 1946:

The proper organization of our national security establishment—or even of the armed forces' part of that establishment—is an unfortunately complex subject. Complete understanding of all facets of national security is most difficult to acquire. Detailed knowledge of the armed services alone is equally elusive. Yet everyone is expected to have an opinion. The admission that one is not yet clear is regarded suspiciously or as an admission of utter stupidity. We are expected to be for or against something.

Consequently, unnecessary heat is engendered and the investigation has shifted from the plane of critical analysis to one of debate. Slogans and appealing phrases are invented. If you respect the accomplishments of the Army, you are expected to regard their representatives as omniscient. If the attainments of the Navy appeal to your imagination, you are expected to espouse their plan for comprehensive security. Yet few of the speakers have made any detailed study of the administrative problems involved in assuring national security. As a result, a subject which is difficult enough has become further confused.

In addition to arguments as to which service won this war and will win all future wars, we are involved in discussions of auxiliary, although equally complicated, subjects, such as consolidated purchasing, joint intelligence, combined communications and transport. Your attitude toward the many plans for solving these problems is expected to color your approach to the larger problem. Yet if consolidated purchasing or combined communications be deemed advisable, the establishment of a single secretary is not necessary for that accomplishment. Consolidated purchasing and combined communications could be made equally effective with two departments, three departments, or one department. The solution of those problems does not affect in any substantial way the over-all or top executive organization of the armed services.

Likewise, there are passed from mouth to mouth various word tags which decidedly cloud the issue. We talk of unification, unity of command, and merger. As abstract terms, those words offer little assistance in our struggle for understanding. Their meanings are never explained or tied into day to day operations—those activities which occupy an executive when he reaches his desk in the morning. The Army feels that its plan alone deserves the label of unification and merger. You are urged to believe that the more detailed and comprehensive Navy plan for integration of all elements of national security is the essence of disunity. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The fact is that no responsible person has seriously suggested a merger of the three armed services. If this is understood, our discussion is immeasurably simplified. A real merger would involve the fusing of all three services into one single tridextrous service, headed by a military commander completely familiar with the science of making war in every medium and with every weapon. The true meaning of unification is much the same. To achieve that end we would have to plan a homogeneous single service like the single river formed by the junction of three streams.

Such combination has not been suggested by anyone. The Army Air Forces would resist violently any attempt to merge their identity with another service. That is what they are now struggling to escape—amalgamation with the ground forces. Many Navy supporters fear that the Army proposal involves an absorption of the Navy by the Army command. If the supporters of the Army plan ever admitted that such was their intention, that plan would be as dead as the proverbial salt mackerel.

No; everyone from the President down starts with insistence on the autonomy and separateness of the three services. The President, in his message to Congress, spoke of three coordinated branches—land, sea, and air. The Navy plan suggests three coordinated departments of the same identity. The Army speaks continually of three autonomous services. The Army Air Forces describes its aims as autonomous coequality with the Navy and the ground forces. No matter how you approach the proposed charts of organization, the fundamental structure is three separate services coordinated in some fashion.

There is the field of dispute. How can these three services be best coordinated? Those who prefer the Army plan, that is, splitting the War Department into two parts—ground and air—and reducing all three services to the position of divisions headed by a single secretary usually assisted by a supreme military commander, claim they are proposing a merger and effecting unification. Anyone preferring a different method of coordination is labeled antimerger or antiunification. That is not accurate. Those who propose to elevate the Army Air Forces to the status of a Cabinet department and to coordinate the three departments through a series of permanent coordinating councils are just as entitled to the label of merger and unification.

The fundamental question is clearly—which plan of organization is most likely to produce coordination and unity? If our problem is approached from that angle, our study can be greatly simplified.

Furthermore, our search for the most suitable mechanics of coordination is not assisted by assertions of the need for efficiency, economy, and preparedness. Everyone desires the achievement of those goals. Effective coordination will obviously be the most likely way to attain such results. We are thus led back to the basic question—how can our three services be best coordinated?

Long wrangles as to which of the defects and inefficiencies revealed in this war were the most serious are somewhat more educating but again not too helpful. There is general agreement as to the identity of most deficiencies. They should all be cured.

The only dispute in this connection is with respect to the relative seriousness of the various defects. Some think that the gaps between the armed services caused the greatest loss and waste. Others, like myself, regard more seriously the gaps which appeared between our military services and our foreign affairs and between our military needs and our productive sources. In my opinion, much more money was wasted in our early struggle to establish a satisfactory system of matériel priorities and to harness the industrial machine to the war effort than was ever wasted in duplicating or competitive procurement between the services. I believe that the gap between both armed services

and the State Department, abetted by mistakes of individuals inside the services, was more responsible for Pearl Harbor than any lack of cooperation between the services. But that entire argument should fade in our realization that comprehensive coordination—perhaps more extensive than just the armed services—is the best remedy. Again, we are back to our search for the best method of coordinating the armed services.

Extravagant claims have been made for the Army plan of coordination. Just how the desired coordination will be accomplished by the simple device of appointing a single secretary and a single military commander to rule over the three services, each reduced to the position of branches in a single department and headed by assistant secretaries instead of Cabinet secretaries is hard for me to envision. I have never seen any detailed explanation as to how such a single secretary and single military commander will gather up the three service threads, keep them separate and yet knit them together. When that part of the discussion is reached, there is a leap across the chasm and coordination is just asserted. It is never demonstrated. Sometimes we are told that a single secretary is a principle, and the details will be easy once the principle is accepted.

Frankly, I am skeptical. I want to know the grubby details. How will this theory of single-man control work as a practical matter? If there is real substance in the idea, a detailed blueprint should not be too difficult.

My skepticism of single-man control starts with my experience in the Navy Department. That agency, although much smaller than the proposed new superdepartment, is already too big for detailed one-man control. The history of Secretary Forrestal's administration is a record of delegation of authority and a search for a satisfactory system of coordinating and reviewing committees. My own experience in the field of Navy procurement has been parallel. Even that limited field is too large for one man to manage or control in detail.

The experience of large industry seems to me to be the same. One-man control in our superindustries is breaking down under expanding delegations of responsibility and committee coordination. I realize that large organizations are usually headed by a single man with the title of "president." Yet the corporate president is responsible to a superior group, a board of directors. In practice as well as theory, the board of directors is the body responsible for coordination of the enterprise. The decision of certain important matters is by law reserved solely for that board and a wise president refers much more to the board than is required by law. The corporate president also uses committees for coordinating operations. We find corporations directed more and more by executive committees, finance committees, loan committees, operating committees, production committees, sales committees, and many others. The theory of single-man control has little place in our publicly owned corporations.

The same is true of large labor organizations.

What evidence is there that single-man control will be successful?

The administrative complexities of a superdepartment are too many to be directed in detail by one man. And the attainment of effective coordination will require an attention to detail. If the single secretary is not to deal with detail, he is not the subject of our search. We must look elsewhere for coordination. Huge complex departments with their tentacles in countless fields of endeavor cannot be loosely held together by one tack at the top. They must be riveted fast—or, better yet, knit together—from the bottom up. The ivory-tower approach limited to the pronouncement of broad policies may appeal on paper but it does not work in practice.

And when one man tries to deal with all details, there is always trouble. You probably recall General Marshall's defense of his failure to appreciate the significance of General Short's message that he had adopted protective measures against sabotage rather than against attack at Pearl Harbor. General Marshall stated that so many messages crossed his desk each day that he could not be expected to give detailed attention to each one. How could he have watched the Navy and the Marine Corps as well? Likewise, the unfortunate order to destroy the Japanese cyclotrons was missed by the War Department in a welter of detail. A single man can be stretched only so far.

Believing as I do that the present Departments are now of such size that they strain the capacities of our best men to the utmost, I cannot imagine the superhuman, able to run a department of three armed services and at the same time to advise the President on matters of general political policy. And the President has made it clear that such latter duty is just as important as the job of administering a department.

The usual answer given to these worries is not an explanation of how the single secretary would effect coordination. It is rather the assertion that the President performs an even bigger job. The President is a single man, it is said, running a whole country. The large staff in the Executive Office of the President, the Bureau of the Budget, the office of the assistant President, known as the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, the various departments and independent agencies, and the many special committees are never mentioned.

The President does not by himself even try to effectuate detailed coordination of our various governmental departments or to master the details of routine departmental operations. The President is expected to devote himself to broad matters of policy—not coordination. For his decisions he is forced to rely on huge staffs and many groups. Many matters have to be delegated. Even then the job of being President of this country is a back-breaker. There is no real analogy between the supremacy of our President over the entire executive branch of our Government and the suggested coordination of three separate armed services by a single man.

A single secretary trying to cover the three fields would be forced to delegate coordination to lower levels. No man could discharge his general Cabinet duties and personally coordinate three entirely different armed services. Even the assistant secretaries, each in charge of a single service, would have to delegate downward the coordination and direction of procurement, personnel, and operations. Such delegation would in each case be to men of lesser rank and in all probability of lesser ability. Under secretaries and assistant secretaries would be given duties at least as difficult as those now performed by Cabinet officials. The duties now performed by the Under Secretary and Assistant Secretaries of the Navy would be passed down to men without titles and without equivalent dignity. It is a certainty that less capable men would be attracted to those lesser jobs. The quality of the decisions would undoubtedly be correspondingly depressed. Can we possibly afford that risk?

We should be realists. It is difficult enough to attract able men to the Government service. The President has frequently spoken of the problem. Government compensation will never be made competitive with the compensation obtained in commercial and professional careers. Position and dignity are our greatest governmental magnets. We should grade our jobs up and not down. Top-flight men will seldom be attracted by second-grade positions. And effective coordination depends much more on the quality of the men performing the essential tasks than on the symmetry or neatness of any organization chart. I do not like to think of the result if the supersecretary is selected more for his political sagacity than for his administrative ability.

The single-man theory of coordination likewise tends to weaken civilian control. I shall not argue the importance of civilian control. It is a fundamental principle of our Government, revered by the military and the civilians alike. If, as the Navy suggested, three departments are created, 3 secretaries, 3 under secretaries, and at least 6 assistant secretaries, a total of 12 civilians, would occupy the top positions. Under the Army proposal we would have one secretary, one under secretary, and three assistant secretaries, a total of only 5. The controlling civilians are thus cut in half. The work to be done will not be lessened. It must gravitate into the hands of the military. There is no answer to that argument.

The evolution of the War Department's proposals over the last year demonstrates the inevitable movement of control to the military. It also contains a tacit admission from the stanchest supporters of one-man control that one man cannot deal with every question. When General McNarney in 1944 presented the first War Department plan, he envisioned a single department headed by a secretary and an under secretary with three assistant secretaries, each in charge of one of the armed services. The top military men were the three military commanders of each separate service. Civilians, although reduced in number, were to be at the top of the new department. A few months later there was added the concept of a single military commander superior to the three assistant secretaries.

When General Collins in October 1945 presented the final Army plan, all budgetary matters and the planning of the basic military program, including procurement and production as well as operational matters, were assigned not to the single secretary, but to a purely military committee—the Joint Chiefs of Staff—which would report directly to the President, with the secretary permitted only to comment and not to command. Matters of basic policy are to be controlled by the military, acting in the main through a group—the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Civilian control and single-man control fade together.

Furthermore, there is no guaranty that superior men will always be appointed as the supersecretary. Incapable men will at times succeed to the position. The dangers of mistake and, in fact, of sweeping comprehensive mistakes, are, therefore, increased. The chances of correction through the influence of other men at the Cabinet level or by congressional committees will be gone.

In a single department important differences of opinion will be resolved or compromised at lower levels and seldom disclosed to the Congress or the people. Today those differences of opinion—and in those differences lie vitality—are resolved at the Cabinet level and in the Congress, before the eyes and ears of the American people. In all deference, I submit that, while I agree with the President that there need be no fear for our liberties as long as the American people "continue fulfilling their duties of citizenship," the American people cannot fulfill those duties if they are not aware of the issues to be resolved. The extent to which even the President will be made aware of differences in thought is even problematical.

The advocates of the single-man theory offer one advantage to counterbalance those many deficiencies. It is repeatedly asserted that the one man will guarantee a decision. Coordination will be ordered from above. Differences will be firmly decided. Delays, as sometimes occur when differing points of

view are sought to be reconciled, will be impossible. The single top man will decide.

That is not only an insufficient counterweight, but also a theory which will not stand a practical test. It was Fabius, a single Roman general, who made delay so famous that his name was adopted into our language. Fabian is now a synonym for delay. He had many successors.

There is something more important than prompt decision. What we need above all is intelligent decision—and intelligent decision requires knowledge and familiarity. Otherwise, decision is little better than a guess. No one man will ever possess the requisite knowledge to make all decisions intelligently. He will be required to toss a coin or to delegate downward. The quality of decision is bound to suffer.

In this war, coordination was brought out, as a matter of natural evolution, through committees and councils. The domestic economy was linked to the military program by the War Production Board. The Chairman of that Board sat with the President's Cabinet. The job was graded up and extremely capable men were attracted. Foreign affairs were coordinated with military strength through the State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee, evolved late in the war. Our triphibious, global military operations were combined by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, assisted by many subordinate committees. In the continuation and perfection of that system lies, in my opinion, our sole hope for effective coordination. The fact that other essential committees such as a research committee, a joint intelligence group, a procurement assignment board, and other committees were not created is no reflection upon the system. It merely demonstrates that we had not reached our goal. If the requirement of unanimity for decision in the Joint Chiefs of Staff was a mistake, that can easily be changed. To the extent that the committee system was tried during this war, it was substantially successful. I would prefer to perfect the system we were evolving when the war ended rather than to espouse a radical change which has little promise of affecting coordination.

Furthermore, the committee system of coordination has been made workable in the only country which for a long time has faced global complexities. That is England—a country distinguished for governmental know-how. In the British Cabinet, there are 20 members and the three armed services are separately represented at the highest level. The theory of single-man control in the Prime Minister or in a few superior Cabinet officers was discarded long ago. Coordination of the entire British administration is effected by a comprehensive series of committees with permanent secretariats, which tie together the various governmental activities like those in no other nation. There is no reason why we cannot achieve the same success.

The committee control theory has another advantage. It can be used to coordinate the military effort with the domestic economy and foreign affairs. The single-man theory is limited to the military services. That defect is always admitted. It is explained that the single-man control of the armed services is intended only as a start. Later, it is said, we can seek to coordinate the various other segments of national security. Is it really wise to start building even a foundation until there is some sketch or outline of the entire structure? Would we not be far wiser to plan our entire national security establishment rather than to trust to luck in having its comprehensive form dictated by an organization of the three armed services determined without regard to the proper over-all pattern? I prefer seeking first at least a general idea of a comprehensive national security establishment. There is much more to war than combat.

This is probably my last discussion of this problem while I am an official in the Navy Department. I have no ambitions or desires other than as an American citizen to assure our country of a sound security establishment. I do not seek a military or a political career. I want to see our Navy preserved, not for the Navy's sake, but for our country's sake. I believe, as I think you do, that sea power is one of our major weapons. I likewise believe in the efficacy of the slugging ground forces and the versatility of the Army Air Forces. I am certain that the three services must be preserved in vigorous integrity and that the activities of all must be effectively coordinated. In all deference to the policies of my Commander in Chief and with his permission to express my contrary personal views, I have tried to set before you my reasons for believing that a single secretary heading a single department will not achieve such desired coordination. In my brief description of a system of controlling committees, I have outlined briefly a system which I believe will achieve real coordination of our entire security establishment. I submit that plan also as a pattern for the needed coordination of our entire governmental structure.

Our Latterday Deification of Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES DOMENGEAUX

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1946

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which recently appeared in the New Orleans Item and which I hope will be read by the Members of this Congress, for I think it so well values the unfortunate un-American trends that are growing in this country:

OUR LATTERDAY DEIFICATION OF CHANGE

An old school of shallow philosophy is coming of late into fuller flower in the discussion of our economic, political and governmental affairs. It is placing its curse on "resistance to change." Anybody who resists any change that these philosophers desire, no matter how foolish or fantastic, is immediately classed as backward, stupid, and selfish—sometimes indeed as disloyal to the Nation and a traitor to the human race.

Ways that are old are damned on that account. Some of these philosophers, in fact, seem to believe that the ancient but once-popular idea that 2 and 2 make 4 should be rooted out because it conflicts with their economical mathematics Everything that is old must be discarded for any new thing that they propose. We deny all such tosh for the nonsense that it is—whether it springs from the itch of self-interest or the vaporing of ignorance.

Every intelligent person knows, and should be happy to admit, that all human progress is the result of change—changes in our ways of thinking and doing, growing out of new knowledge in the realms of physics, economics, and politics. But everybody who has observed or read a little also knows that mankind has suffered untold woes by breaking too enthusiastically, without due consideration, from old ways, to new notions that have failed.

We have a brilliant example of this in our own country these past 12 years. Mr. Roosevelt did a number of new things, especially in his first term, that needed doing. We have these yet. But he also did many new things and adopted new methods, that have failed egregiously. Our national graveyard is cluttered with their costly tombstones bearing countless alphabetic names which were so numerous that none of us can remember for what they stood. These have imposed frightful costs on the country without any offsets in benefits. Their results have accumulated in the horrible mess in which we now find ourselves. Yet self-seeking politicoes and unbalanced idealists still clamor for irrational, unquestioning public acceptance of still more crackpotty notions of their own.

Out of their ranks rise the philosophers who make a god of change—their change—and condemn all their intelligent fellow-citizens who ask for proof of their wisdom, and decline to swallow it until this is produced. Yet all of us know that it is intelligent, rational skepticism that keeps society from flying apart under the cross-pulls and whirls that would result if every new notion, however fantastic, were swallowed without question.

Some of the philosophers of the sancity of change have been drawing an illusory parallel between the late British elections and our American conditions. The British turn toward socialism, they say, makes a similar turn necessary and inevitable over here. "It has energized the forces of conflict here; it has encouraged labor and alarmed our conservatives," they add, and so forth.

But, through ignorance or dishonesty, they don't add that the British majority was impelled by a desire for the superior advantages enjoyed by the American working people and middle classes. The knowledge of this was brought home to them by 4 years of close personal association with millions of Americans in England and on the battle fronts. Their own observation of the vast superiority of the food, clothing, housing, equipment, and pay, of these millions of American boys raised their gorge.

They discovered for the first time, cheek by jowl, from the talk of their American companions-in-arms, these better wages and working conditions, the greater comforts, conveniences, and even luxuries, enjoyed by the plain people of our country, by comparison with wretched conditions in their own. These boons that the British majority sought were brought long ago to our people by our system of democratic free enterprise—which our philosophers of sacred change are trying to destroy.

Perhaps the British were right in turning toward socialism. We don't know. Their setup has been different from ours. Socialism carried to its limit means complete dominance of a very few over all the rest. It leads to unchecked domination of government by politicians. This our people will never accept, knowing what they do. The philosophers of change must hide the meaning of their design.

But that idea is probably not so obnoxious to the English as to us because the politicians entrusted with the management of British affairs have traditionally been more competent, by and large, than our own politicoes. You have an example of this in the huddle of these now in Washington. There they present a sorry show of unwillingness or incapacity to do anything worthy of the name to save this country from deeper descent into a chasm from which only intelligent and courageous action can save it.

Roosevelt, with smug artistry, showed his political trailers how to smear public men who would not swallow his medicine without gagging. Among their other imitations of the master, they are now reviving the famous "fireside chats." We had one last week. But the master is gone and the fireside had already lost its fascination before he went.

So don't be dismayed by the foolish fantasies and fictions of the philosophers of change. It is Britain's desire for the greater blessings which our people enjoy that has turned the majority of them to a trial of socialism. But our absurd philosophers of change still say:

"Let us turn to socialism too. Let us abandon the system of free enterprise which has brought and is still bringing us the good things which the English covet. Let us abandon the way that has made us the wealthiest and most powerful nation on earth—and kept us free all the while—in order to accept a system that has never been tested long anywhere, and has never brought any people any of those blessings so far as it has gone."

All such counsel is goofy. Regardless of the epithets of selfish or self-deluded philosophers of change, let us stand with those who still trust such aged commonplaces as the Ten Commandments, the Golden Rule, and the idea that two and two make four.

Caste System Irritates GI's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 4, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Lester Allen from the Boston Sunday Post of February 3, 1946:

CASTE SYSTEM IRRITATES GI'S—"BRASS HAT" PREROGATIVES OVER RANK AND FILE OF MEN IN SERVICES TENDS TO DISCOURAGE VOLUNTEERS

(By Lester Allen)

The caste system of the Army and Navy, which the average enlisted man sees as the most undemocratic offshoot of a democratic nation, is the chief factor in slowing down voluntary enlistments in the security forces of the country, and the most important consideration to a Congress now weighing universal military training against a voluntary recruiting system.

Both the Army and Navy are considering the abolition of certain phases of the caste system, but the "brass hats" are merely considering, not acting. The prerequisites and prerogatives of officers are their dearest and most cherished possessions, and, always keeping the need for "discipline" in the forefront, officers will defend the inequities to the utmost.

While in actual practice there are grave social inequalities in civilian life insofar as economic status is concerned it is also true that within his means every American is a king, and has been encouraged to think of himself as an individual, equal to all other individuals before the law.

No one in the United States would change that even if they could. In fact, it is a matter of constant concern to foster the growth of liberty and independence and individual security. But, with the war and the induction of millions of men and women into the armed forces, a grievous curtailment of individual liberty was imposed upon citizens in an age group which is inclined to be impatient of restraints upon the freedom acquired after the age of 18 to 21.

While these millions are sacrificing equally with the officers in the fighting of a war, they have experienced serious abridgments of their individual rights through the soulless exercise of carrying out orders and commands.

Reduced to the simplest possible terms the gripes of enlisted personnel in the armed forces can be summed up. The regimentation is irksome and necessary, but too frequently the "brass" goes far beyond the articles of war in indulging the whims of command. Throughout their military and naval service enlisted personnel is at the mercy of the whims of brass hats.

They are told when they may leave camps, posts, ships, and shore stations; where they may and may not go; what they can buy and what they can't buy; whom they can and cannot associate with, and when they must return, regardless of the exigencies which may crop up in the course of liberty or leave or furlough.

OFFICERS GRAB QUARTERS

The living quarters for officers are ever so much better than those for enlisted men, wherever they may be. There are instances of soldiers being "ranked" out of foxholes, innumerable cases of officers grabbing quarters which enlisted men have repaired for their own use in war zones. Everywhere the enlisted man goes the officer takes the best living quarters, regardless of the rights of the situation.

In the matter of food the enlisted man always comes off second best, even in those rare cases where an enlisted mess happens to be superior to that of the officers. In this latter case the officers declare themselves in, and take the pick of the food.

Nowhere is there any provision for the enlisted man to buy a drink stronger than beer. Overseas officers received a liquor ration, and, it is all too rare to find even a junior officer who is generous enough to see to it that enlisted men receive a small share.

An officer can get soused to the eyes and it is regarded merely as deplorable but a minor peccadillo. But the enlisted man who steps out of line and takes a little too much liquor is snapped up by MP's or shore patrols if away from his post, or punished by court martial if on his post. There is tolerance for the officer who drinks too much, and very little but regulations for the enlisted man who drinks too much, although both probably have disgraced the uniform.

The special privileges given to officers are particularly irksome to the enlisted man. Officers can go where they choose, to off-limits places of amusement, to the best seats at post theatres, and their post exchanges or canteens are stocked only with the best merchandise while, too frequently, the enlisted man finds only gimcrack stuff at his exchange.

The enlisted man cannot cast sheep's eyes on commissioned nurses or WACS or WAVES or SPARS. They are staked off to be escorted only by officers. And automotive equipment is never available to the enlisted man for other than assigned duty. If the enlisted man ventures to use such equipment for personal use, it is a serious offense. But officers joyride all over the place.

MADE MENIALS FOR OFFICERS

The enlisted man is frequently made a hewer of wood and drawer of water for officers. He doesn't like being a "dog-robber" or a waiter in an officers' mess or a menial for brass in any shape or manner. And he doesn't like to see officers in the field loading their combat equipment into jeeps or on the back of some enlisted man. But it is done.

Similarly punishment for offenses is unfair. A commanding officer may hand out up to a week at hard labor at his own discretion for an enlisted man's offense, and court-martial offenses bring much longer periods of confinement and loss of pay. For an identical offense an officer will at most be reprimanded to quarters to meditate his sins or fined.

The salute is one of the most abused of the officer privileges. Most sensible officers forego the salute except when actually on duty, but there are "saluting demons" who throw their rank around 24 hours a day and make themselves a mortal nuisance to all enlisted men.

Honors given to men in the fighting forces are the most unevenly distributed of all. It's the enlisted man who takes the lumps and the officers who get most of the honors. The ratio of decorated officers in the Navy to decorated enlisted men is 13 to 1. In the Army it is 3½ to 1. It is an old GI gripe that no one ever sees the GI when he is heroic, but when an officer is heroic it seems that everyone all the way up to the commanding general is looking that way. In brief, the reports going back to the place where the medals are awarded are made by officers—and they give themselves the gravy.

And, when officers and men are finally separated from the service, the officers draw terminal pay for accumulated leave up to 12 days. But the enlisted man who hasn't had his quota of leave is just out of luck.

You will never find an officer commissioned in the field who has served in the ranks who will not tell you that it was a shock to move from among the enlisted men into the privileged world of the officer class. And all the officers so commissioned have been secretly resentful that the comrades among whom they served were treated so shabbily. And, when the brass tells them it is not dignified or that it is bad for discipline to fraternize with the men, these new officers have a hard time holding back their bitter criticism.

This class distinction between officers and men has grown in the interests of discipline and efficiency. In the Revolutionary War and in the Civil War foreign officers who observed American troops had the same curt criticism of American soldiers. They said that they were "insubordinate." From their viewpoint this may have seemed true, but from that of Americans the insubordination was more the exercise of individual freedom.

It is true that a certain amount of class distinction is necessary to discipline. Even the Red Army, where it was assumed that the caste system was a relic of the decadent aristocracy, had to set up formal distinctions between officers and men in order to achieve fighting efficiency and strict discipline.

All too frequently officers conceal an unfitness for command by the exercise of a loud voice and a brusque manner. All too often officers of the regular forces look with ill-concealed contempt upon those who are not graduates of the service schools. There are castes within castes.

VOLUNTEERS HOLD BACK

In the present situation the fighting forces are faced with a manpower problem. Either universal service must be imposed upon the country, or a regular reinforcement must come from volunteers. The latter will not happen as long as the relationship between officers and men remains as it is now.

Too many enlisted men have found to their great chagrin that the enlisted man has no rights other than those his officers are pleased to allow him, and these rights vary under different commanders. There is something to be said for adding to the fitness reports of officers scheduled for promotion an approximation of how the enlisted men regard the officer. The average GI knows better than the brass whether his immediate commanding officer knows how to do his job.

They either love him or loathe him. Except for the lowliest junior officer, the enlisted man learns early that when his commanding officer says he will lead him into battle what he actually means is that he will follow him.

Revision of the caste system is the first requisite for maintaining a volunteer fighting force—and the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps know this. What they are doing now is holding together a conscript force in which every gripe has its beginning in the caste system.

Terminal-Leave Pay for Enlisted Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 4, 1946

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I am once again taking this means to appeal to the House and especially the House Military Affairs Committee to act favorably on my bill H. R. 4893, a bill to grant to enlisted personnel of the armed forces the same benefits of accumulated leave as apply to officers now.

The thousands of letters which I have received from enlisted men is ample proof of the desire on their part that this inequality be done away with. As a former enlisted man of the First World War, I am interested that the enlisted men of this war be given full terminal-leave pay on a 30-day-a-year basis and that it be made retroactive to the beginning of the Selective Service Act. In this way this inequality which has existed too long in this respect will be done away with and justice given to all.

If the Government can afford the higher ranking, higher paid officers, terminal leave with pay, then they can also afford to give this benefit to the enlisted men. It is true that this would cost the Government plenty to rectify this wrong, but as long as the officers have been given this compensation, and the Government has been and continues to afford this expenditure, then we can afford to pay the enlisted men, who have suffered the many differences in rank all during service.

I believe that terminal-leave pay to enlisted men should be passed in the form of my bill, and soon. I believe I express the wholehearted concern and approval of all enlisted men and their families in this measure and I am hopeful that the Military Affairs Committee will report out my proposal in the very near future.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted me by the House, I am including with my remarks a few of the many letters I have received on this subject:

HELENA, MONT., *January 14, 1946.*

DEAR MIKE: Recently I read in the local paper about your interest in enlisted men being given the same consideration as officers in regard to terminal leave. While I was overseas we often remarked about the unfairness of this furlough deal. Returning home on the ship several of us decided to write our Congressmen to get some action on this matter. After all, Mike, it is a known fact that enlisted men overseas have it a lot tougher than officers, and in more than one way. So, therefore, I feel that enlisted men should be shown the same consideration as officers.

I have heard a great deal of comment on this issue since I have been home, and after your article was in the paper MIKE MANSFIELD was a pretty popular man in the ex-GI's books.

I think you are doing the veterans a big favor in pushing this bill, and you have everything to gain and nothing to lose by giving this issue your wholehearted support.

I sure appreciated your call before you returned to Washington, D. C. I have been home nearly 3 months now, and believe me, Mike, it is a grand feeling. My wife and baby are fine and my business is better than ever, so I feel mighty fortunate.

In closing, Mike, I want to thank you for all the interest you are showing in the affairs of the veterans, and I assure you it won't be forgotten.

Sincerely yours,

FRAN PURCELL.

BILLINGS, MONT., *January 14, 1946.*

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Representative from Montana,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please allow two former enlisted men to compliment you on the stand you take in regard to terminal leave for both officers and enlisted men. We heartily agree with you. It seems a shame to bring the officer-enlisted man system from the Army on into civilian life.

At this same time, we would like to mention an additional few ills of the present discharge set-up. First, the housing set-up. There are numerous ex-servicemen looking around for some place to stay and all the time the Government has a good stock of portable houses and trailers. Supposedly the vets have preference to buy GI material for business use and yet it isn't possible for them to obtain an immediate necessity. The only reason given as to why these houses aren't released at least to the general public is that there is no price set on them yet. Then there would still be the idea that a vet's priority doesn't extend to cover anything that he can't use in his actual work.

Then there is a new gripe from fellows in the service on the discharge of aviation cadets regardless of the number of points they have. This most certainly isn't fair to fellows who have actually done some fighting.

We realize that no possible system could cover all complaints, but these few seem so apparent and so far-reaching that it is well forth mentioning. With the particular stand that you have taken on the terminal-leave issue, we are sure that you will give some thought to these difficulties.

Respectfully,

C. R. OEHLERKING,
F. J. NELSON.

WHITEFISH, MONT., *January 16, 1946.*

The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
Representative in Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I read with a good deal of interest a short news article in the Spokesman Review concerning your decision to work for terminal leave for enlisted men.

The language in which your argument was stated had hardly the forcefulness that has been in mine this last month or so since getting out of the Navy, but is much better nonetheless since mine could not be used in the polite company of the drawing room.

I wish to thank you sincerely for championing this cause. I thought that about the time the services were ready to discharge men, that rank privilege, caste, etc., would be forgotten and we should all go out under the same conditions—as free and equal citizens of the United States of America. It seems, however, that the "powers that be" wish to carry these undemocratic principles to the bitter end and beyond.

It shouldn't be necessary to add to your argument. it is sufficient in itself for fair-minded men, but there are other facts which might be added:

1. Officers were already getting considerable more pay for doing their jobs, which in a great many cases were no more difficult than jobs many enlisted men were called upon to do, and it seems hardly justifiable to further enhance their superior position by the exclusion of enlisted men from the rightful benefits of terminal leave.

2. Enlisted men gave up more as a whole than the average officer, not because in civilian life they had more (many of them did), but because in their service life they had so much less.

3. Excluding the question of officers—a condition is created by this system, in which one enlisted man, stationed in the States or regularly back in the States, collects all of his leaves, while another who spends most of his service time on some forlorn island or on the sea or some such place where conditions were at their worst and the real winning of the war, as far as the serviceman was concerned, was taking place, loses most of his. To sum up this argument briefly—it's an all-or-nothing-at-all policy.

May I repeat my thanks again for your interest, and good luck in your crusade.

Sincerely,

GEORGE D. ABENDSCHEIN.

BILLINGS, MONT., *January 14, 1946.*

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: In the Gazette this morning an AP dispatch from Washington says that you are going to introduce legislation for the purpose of having enlisted personnel of the military services given the same benefits as officers, under terminal leave.

I am very glad to learn you are doing this because I do not think there is any one thing that has caused more bitterness among enlisted men than the fact that officers who are not only much more highly paid, but frequently of inferior ability, are receiving pay for their unused furlough time, while enlisted men, receiving one-fifth as much pay, are discharged without getting any reimbursement for the leave-time to which they are entitled. I know of a number of cases in this vicinity where family men were drafted into the service from well-paid positions, while college students with no family obligations, were enabled to obtain commissions because of ROTC enrollment. When these enlisted men return from the service, most of them have to begin to work immediately in order to support their families, frequently taking any work they can obtain, while the officer has the advantage of his terminal leave for time to locate suitable employment. In any event, the practice is grossly unfair, and I have been surprised that Congress would permit it. I have heard several expressions of appreciation of your efforts in behalf of the enlisted men, with respect to the proposed legislation.

With kind personal regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

GUY C. DERRY.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to call your attention to the bill now before the Congress of the United States dealing with the payment of full pay and allowances to enlisted men of the Army of the United States for accrued furlough time.

In view of the fact that officer personnel of the Army of the United States are authorized full pay and allowances for unused accrued furlough time up to 120 days; in view of the fact that many of the enlisted men have been deprived of practically all of their allowed furlough time; in view of the fact that, comparatively speaking, their earnings have been small during the richest period of our country's history, I urge that this bill be given your wholehearted support.

Many enlisted men of the Army, particularly those with families, with dependents; those with obligations at the time of their entrance into the Army, will return to civilian life with little savings. They have

given much these past few years. They have accepted their lot, which did not include vacations with pay, days off, and holidays. Surely they are entitled to this consideration which is only a matter of paying what is their due.

Again I urge—Support this bill.

Chas. Kestle, Mrs. Carl McCallum, Mrs. Geo. Williams, Mrs. J. Jones, Mrs. Pat O'Brien, Mrs. Ed. Penny, Mrs. Jack Darlow, Mrs. Robert Quick, Mrs. Thomas Eva, Mrs. Alfred Lowry, Mrs. Elizabeth Sullivan, Mrs. Alice Johnson, Mrs. George Gill, Mrs. John Weber, Mrs. Millie Holman, Mrs. Josiah James, Mrs. M. Driscoll, Mrs. M. Harne, Mrs. John Williams, Mrs. Geo. H. Symons, Mrs. Gladys Martin, Mrs. Thos. Sanders, Mrs. E. N. Bartlett, Mrs. Sylvan Galahan, Geo. A. Fitzpatrick, Mrs. M. Penhall, Mrs. Charles L. Day, Mrs. J. H. Barrenstein, Mrs. John Weldon, J. A. Weldon, Mrs. George Burns, Mrs. Pat Dennehy, Mr. Dave Sullivan, Mrs. Dave Sullivan, Mrs. Marshall Hager, Mrs. Wm. Powers, Mrs. Ruth Gould, Mrs. Geo. Labranche, Mrs. M. S. Gemoljez, Mrs. H. Hughes, Mrs. Agnes R. Murphy.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I wish to call your attention to the bill now before the Congress of the United States dealing with the payment of full pay and allowances to enlisted men of the Army of the United States for accrued furlough time.

In view of the fact that officer personnel of the Army of the United States is authorized full pay and allowances or unused accrued furlough time up to 120 days; in view of the fact that many of the enlisted men have been deprived of practically all of their allowed furlough time; in view of the fact that comparatively speaking, their earnings have been small during the richest period in our country's history, I urge that this bill be given your wholehearted support.

Many enlisted men of the Army, particularly those with families, with dependents; those with obligations at the time of their entrance into the Army, will return to civilian life with little savings. They have given much these past few years. They have accepted their lot, which did not include vacations with pay, days off and holidays. Surely they are entitled to this consideration which is only a matter of paying what is their due.

Again I urge—Support this bill.

MRS. EDNA YOUNG.
LOUIS YOUNG.

FORT GEORGE WRIGHT, WASH.,
January 14, 1946.

Representative MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This letter is to thank you for your efforts concerning terminal leave pay for enlisted men of the armed forces. Those of us who have served in this capacity greatly appreciate the fact an effort is being made to give us accumulated leave pay as officers now receive.

While I have not had the fortune of meeting you personally, I know of the fine job you did at the University of Montana. I am a native of that State and attended the State Normal College, graduating in 1942. I had the pleasure of meeting your brother when he was stationed at Baxter Hospital.

Thanks again for remembering us. Hoping I have an opportunity to meet you sometime, and if I can be of help to you in the future I will be glad to do so.

Respectfully yours,
RAYMOND E. SCHULTZ,
Staff Sergeant, Army Air Corps.

PULLMAN, WASH., *January 15, 1946.*

Representative MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: In the Spokane Sunday Chronicle (January 12) I saw an account of your proposal for legislation to grant enlisted men terminal leave or pay for accumulated leave the same as officers. I am completely in favor of such action as is any enlisted man or former enlisted man to whom I ever talked.

This terminal leave business is just a final slap in the face to the enlisted men who have watched and envied the special privileges that officers enjoy under the military system.

Up until July 29, 1945, I had had 7 days leave in 3½ years naval service. This 7 days I had to go to the chaplain to obtain. However, on July 29, 1945, I arrived back from 2 years continuous duty in the Pacific (I was then a chief radio technician in charge of radio and radar maintenance aboard a small aircraft carrier) and received a 30-day leave. The war ended fortunately while I was home.

Some men have not been so fortunate as that. Men that arrived in the States after the war ended and rated leave but also were eligible for discharge did not get the leave with pay entitled them but waited until they could be shipped to a separation center. You can suspect they weren't very happy about losing 2 or 3 months accumulated leave while an officer in the identical situation got all of his accumulated leave at home in the form of terminal leave—with pay.

I have been out of the Navy since October and your legislation on this matter if successful may not help me unless it is retroactive, but it will surely help what few "all the war" enlisted men who have yet to get out of the service and who have a lot of accumulated leave to their credit.

I am not one to see the national debt further enlarged but it seems to me that to make your proposed legislation retroactive would do justice to all and wouldn't increase the present huge national debt very materially.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Senator WHERRY from my home State, Nebraska. I wish you every success with your proposed legislation which may rectify at least one injustice to the enlisted man.

Very truly yours,
JACK F. CARTER,
Graduate student under the GI bill of rights at the State College of Washington.

Roosevelt Answers Pearl Harbor Accusers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 4, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article which appeared in Look magazine of February 5, 1946, entitled "Roosevelt Answers Pearl Harbor Accusers," by Roscoe Drummond:

ROOSEVELT ANSWERS PEARL HARBOR ACCUSERS

(By Roscoe Drummond, Washington correspondent, Christian Science Monitor)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—How would President Roosevelt have answered the charge that he was responsible for Pearl Harbor? To answer this question, the author interviewed a great many men who knew Roosevelt intimately during the war. From their opinions, he wrote this imaginary speech, which they believe the President might have made at the hearing if he were yet alive.)

Members of the Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack, gentlemen: My name is Franklin Delano Roosevelt. My occupation (at present, although it will not always be, I hasten to assure you) is President of the United States.

You are aware, I know, that even before its inception I favored and supported a congressional investigation which would honestly and fearlessly and constructively expose all of the reasons why Japan's infamous attack on Pearl Harbor was, momentarily, so tragically devastating. And I'm sure you now see, gentlemen, why we had to postpone this inquiry until the war's end. Not only would earlier investigation have revealed to the enemy that we had cracked Japan's most secret codes, but it would have diverted time, and energy and attention of men like General Marshall, Admiral King, and others of our great military commanders who had to spend every waking hour to win this fight for survival.

Why have I asked to appear before your committee, when the facts have already been spread fully upon the record? The reason is that, thus far, the record has been so overlaid with distorted argument, with partisan demagoguery by those who are willing to smear America if thereby they could smear Franklin Roosevelt, and with plain or garden-variety lies by the isolationist press, which never learns anything and never forgets anything.

This is the technique of the dead dictator, Adolf Hitler. His theory was never to use a small falsehood—always the big lie.

That is the logic of these baseless and horrible fabrications, horrible not to me (I am used to it), but horrible to the overwhelming majority of Americans whose Government never has picked a fight with anybody—but will not be trodden upon.

What are the facts? Did the President of the United States, did any responsible official of the United States, military or civilian, have advance intelligence that Japan would attack Pearl Harbor? The testimony has demonstrated that we regrettably did not. The overwhelming consensus of military judgment and military information was that Japan was preparing to extend its aggressions to Southeast Asia and to the South Pacific. Maj. Gen. Sherman Miles, then Chief of G-2, gave it as the military's highest estimate that Thailand was the most likely target.

At no time did I possess any information nor did I receive any information except from my own Chiefs of Staff.

These are the high lights—in question and answer form—of the points Mr. Roosevelt probably would stress in his Pearl Harbor hearing speech:

QUESTION

Did I, as your President, keep vital security knowledge from our commanders in the Pacific?

ANSWER

I could not withhold information I did not possess, and the Army and Navy were in possession of all intelligence information before it came to the White House. I had no source of information not available to them.

General Marshall thought, Admiral Stark thought, and I thought that Japan would attack to the South (that she didn't was Japan's greatest military blunder); and in your testimony is an affidavit from Gen. Douglas MacArthur (who is today doing his work with magnificent skill in Tokyo) that he received "ample information" from Washington for alerting his Philippine command "on a war basis."

If it could be conceived that the President of the United States would withhold information, the absence of which would jeopardize the United States, he would hardly have alerted what his military advisers considered the Nation's most exposed outpost.

QUESTION

Did I calculatedly taunt Japan by retaining the United States Pacific Fleet at Pearl Harbor?

ANSWER

I accept the responsibility of retaining our Pacific Fleet in American waters at America's major Pacific base, and I am willing to be judged by the verdict of history on the rightness and wisdom of that decision. Secretary Hull, Under Secretary Sumner Welles, Ambassador Grew, and I were united on the validity of this action. My military advisers were not in agreement. General Marshall has testified that he supported the decision. Admiral J. O. Richardson has testified that he opposed it.

The highest diplomatic as well as military factors were involved. The Japs wanted us to move out of the Pacific entirely. Secretary Hull has testified that to have withdrawn the fleet would have been construed by Tokyo war lords as a cowardly, backward step, openly inviting them to attack sooner and enabling them to spread their conquests farther.

I held that view then. I hold it today. And Admiral Richardson (an honorable officer and a good one) has told you that in his judgment the presence of the fleet at Pearl Harbor did not hasten the attack.

In this imaginary but typical speech, the late President answers the charge that he fumbled the peace and planned to force war on the Japs.

QUESTION

Or did I so fumble our peace efforts that Japan decided this was the best time to strike?

ANSWER

The fact is that we strove for peace unceasingly, and to such consistent effect that Japan's militarist government had to resort to attack to drive us into war. We presented no ultimatum; we committed no hostile act. As Secretary Hull has said, we offered to Kurusu and Nomura a program of just and equitable terms, which any peaceful nation "would have been delighted to accept."

To have done less would have been to abdicate our hopes of peace; to have conceded more would have been to abdicate American principles, and to collaborate with the Axis in inviting Japan to sweep its conquests throughout southeast Asia and the East Indies and to make a juncture of forces with Nazi Germany in the Middle East.

My memoranda show that as late as November 27, when Nomura and Kurusu came to the White House with Secretary Hull, I stated to them: "It is clear that the majority of the American people are anxious to maintain peaceful relations with Japan. I am one of those who still harbor much hope that Japanese-United States relations will be settled peacefully."

And Secretary Hull told them with full candor and clarity: "While we here are putting our best efforts into attempting to bring about peaceful settlements of the Japanese-United States differences, neither your Premier, nor your Foreign Minister, nor any other influential person utters a single word or moves one finger to facilitate these talks of ours. On the contrary, they insist upon promoting the establishment of a new order through might."

To the moment when Japan broke negotiations, our attitude was one of frankness, patience, and flexibility—a flexibility which sought every avenue of peace except collaborating in Japanese conquest.

The record shows that I rejected a proposal from Prime Minister Churchill to join in a parallel warning which might have been construed as a warlike act. The reason was that the United States was using its negotiations to resolve its differences with Japan in order to keep the peace, even though, as we now know, Japan was using its negotiations in preparation to break the peace.

I strove for peace in a final appeal on December 6 to the Japanese Emperor himself—an apeal so reasonable and just that the Japanese militarists did not dare to deliver it to him until the attack had been consummated.

I strove for peace to every point short of condoning and collaborating in aggression. That was the only final alternative. I leave it with those who would have had their President do differently to defend that alternative.

QUESTION

Can it be said, then, that the President of the United States planned to force war on Japan?

ANSWER

Yes, without truth and without honor, it can be said—and it has been said over and over again by the isolationist newspapers and magazines and isolationist politicians.

It can be said—by apologists of Japanese aggression. It can be said by those who would have had the United States (in the negotiations with Kurusu and Nomura) sign a diplomatic "Munich"—a "Pacific Munich" which would have given Japan America's blessing upon its spreading conquests and ultimate juncture with Hitler, who then jointly would stand astride a conquered Europe and a conquered Asia.

But a free America could not have lived in a world half slave, and I do not regret having rejected terms so repugnant. I do not believe the American people regret it either.

QUESTION

And can it be said that I let war come while our defenses were still pitifully inadequate?

ANSWER

The most ridiculous and the most understandable of all these falsifications is the charge that my administration failed to prepare for the war which was coming. I doubt whether even Goebbels would have tried that one. For even he would have known that Americans would not forget that many narrow-visioned, partisan, isolationist leaders in the Congress and outside the Congress tried to thwart and block nearly every attempt which I made to warn our people and to arm this Nation.

I proposed—and the little-preparedness minority fought—the Lend-Lease Act which galvanized our great industries to a new level of war production, and helped to hold the Axis at bay while we got ready.

I proposed—and the little-preparedness minority fought as fantastic and unnecessary—the 50,000 airplane program which was the very foundation of the great American air armada which crippled Germany and crushed Japan.

I proposed—and the little-preparedness minority came within one perilous vote of dismantling—3 months before Pearl Harbor—the Selective Service Army which, under the brilliant leadership of Generals Marshall, Eisenhower, and MacArthur, defeated our enemies on land as our Navy defeated them at sea.

To those who say, "Remember Pearl Harbar," I also say "Remember Guam," and the little-preparedness group which refused to heed the plea of this administration to improve its fortifications in 1939.

CONCLUSION

The other evening, I attended the Gridiron Club dinner; and in one of its penetrating skits it portrayed the Emperor of Japan in an imaginary conversation with Col. Robert McCormick, who, oddly enough, was explaining to him the virtues of American democracy.

"So sorry, please, about Pearl Harbor," the Emperor began in mock humility.

"What did you have to do with Pearl Harbor?" exclaimed the publisher. "Are you a New Dealer?"

"Japan willed the war"

No American, I say, President or plain citizen, let war come. It came not because of anything the American Government did or did not do. It came because Japan willed it, conceived it and actually began it while the American Government was striving to avoid it.

Why, then, gentlemen, have these criminal and callous fabrications been conjured up and repeated over and over again? Why has this legitimate and potentially valuable investigation been so sedulously distorted by the isolationist press?

These have not been careless lies nor casual lies. They have been deliberate and calculated and purposeful. Their disseminators know what they are up to. They have their designs and their schemes, and I do not believe for an instant that the American people will fall for them when the distortions and innuendoes are shorn from the record of the Pearl Harbor inquiry.

Their purpose is to dupe and deceive the American people into believing that it was their Government—not our enemies—which was responsible for the war; that we were to blame, not Tojo and Hitler and their kind; that if America had only conceded a little aggression here, and collaborated in a little conquest there, America could have continued then—and could continue today—in an isolationist sleep-walking dream.

"They Were Wrong Then—"

I wish to point out to you, and I wish to point out to the Nation, that these distortions come from those who, when the war clouds were gathering, chose to call them a mirage; who either misread the meaning of the spreading tentacles of the Axis or were not displeased by them; and who thought—or prtended to think—that this war need never concern an "isolated" America.

They were wrong then, and they are wrong today; and they have such a vested interest in their wrongness that they are apparently ready to go to the length of accusing their own Government of provoking war.

Because the fruits of victory can never be easily nor promptly realized, they hope that they can create a new isolationist miasma out of temporary disillusior and total falsehood. They succeeded in smearing the great Wilson with the lie that he led us into war in 1917.

This time their lie is that Franklin Roosevelt planned and plotted war for the American people—Pearl Harbor and all. That lie will not succeed.

Even if it should take my life, I am grateful that I have been called by the Nation to serve this fourth term as President, if only to answer these accusations against the American people and to share in placing the United States at the pinnacle of world leadership.

For myself, I ask no one's good opinion. I will leave that to history. But I do petition of the American people their faith, and their fervor, for America and her destiny today, tomorrow, and forever.

The Case Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1946

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am including a telegram from Mr. Thomas Kennedy, secretary-treasurer of the United Mine Workers of

America. This telegram is in opposition to the so-called Case bill.

Mr. Kennedy is former lieutenant governor of Pennsylvania and is a man of the highest integrity and sound judgment. His opinion on this matter is one which would be well taken to heart.

The telegram follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 31, 1946.*

Hon. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Case bill, H. R. 5262, before the House is putrid. It is an insult to labor, which it seeks to enslave by extra legal processes. It should be defeated and placed in the Smithsonian Institute with other relics of the Dark Ages. The United Mine Workers of America respectfully urges defeat of this obnoxious measure.

THOMAS KENNEDY,
Secretary-Treasurer, United
Mine Workers of America.

The FEPC Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED GOSSETT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1946

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of Members of Congress who may still have open minds on the subject, and for the further information of the American people, I want to place in the RECORD a speech delivered by me over more than 100 stations of the National Broadcasting Co. The speech was delivered in the city of Washington from the studios of WRC at 10:45 p. m. last Friday night.

When the American people know all the facts they are the fairest jury in the world. When they understand the provisions of H. R. 2232 they will be overwhelmingly opposed to it.

The speech follows:

I am unalterably opposed to pending bills for the creation of a Fair Employment Practice Commission. The arguments to be made here are not addressed to bigots who oppose such legislation because of religious and racial prejudice, nor to radicals who favor such legislation hoping to destroy American democracy. However, many social, political, and religious organizations, from the best of motives, and not because of bigotry or radicalism, have urged Congress to pass legislation to create a permanent FEPC. Few of these people have the slightest idea of what the pending bills would do to them. In Christian charity they oppose intolerance and discrimination. They assume the label "fair employment practices commission" to mean just that. In this they are sadly mistaken.

Let's examine briefly the background and provisions of pending bills. Acting under pressure from ill-advised minority groups, the President in May 1943 set up as a temporary war agency a small commission known as the Fair Employment Practice Committee.

I wish I had time to discuss the record of this committee, how it confused segregation with discrimination, how it created strife, how it interfered with the purely personal affairs of the people. It even caused strikes. The transportation system in the great city of Philadelphia was paralyzed during critical war days when FEPC tried to promote Negro workmen over white workmen. Trouble occurred in a big Baltimore plant when FEPC ordered both blacks and whites to use the same washrooms instead of separate facilities as had been their practice. In Texas the Dallas News advertised for a colored man to work in a pressroom. FEPC promptly ordered this paper to delete from its advertising any reference to race, color or creed, holding the same to be discriminatory.

If this small committee with few employees, with limited authority and with limited funds caused so much trouble in wartime, what will it do if given increased powers, statutory authority, unlimited personnel, and unlimited funds during times of peace. But let's get back to the history and vices of pending bills.

Both Democratic and Republican Parties wrote the FEPC into their 1944 platforms. Each party thought it must get the Negro vote in New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, and Michigan in order to get the entire electoral votes of these big industrial States and thus win the election.

Shortly after the convening of the Seventy-ninth Congress the House Labor Committee reported out H. R. 2232, the so-called FEPC bill. The President gave this legislation his blessing. Nevertheless, if a secret vote were taken in the Congress, less than 25 percent of the Members would vote for this bill. However, through political pressure, and for political reasons, on a record vote in the Congress this legislation would doubtless pass. Therefore, it is high time the American people understand the danger to them which lurks in this situation.

This bill is 16 pages long. We will just summarize a few of its main provisions. It would set up a permanent Fair Employment Practices Commission of five men with overlapping 5-year terms at annual salaries of $10,000 each. The Commission is authorized to establish such regional, district, and local offices as it may desire and to employ as many people as it thinks necessary. The bill declares that discrimination in matters of employment and in related matters is promoting domestic and industrial strife. The bill then proposes to remove all this alleged discrimination, based, it says, upon race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry. The bill gives authority to the Commission, which the Commission can delegate to any agent, to pass judgment upon both public and private employment, to decide what is discrimination, and who are qualified employees. It's broad enough to cover the butcher, the baker, the candlestick maker, the county clerk, the school teacher, the farmer—everyone, if you please.

Again, the bill provides that the Commission shall have the right to make, and I quote, "such regulations as it deems necessary to carry out the provisions of the act." Thus, a new board is given authority to enlarge its powers and to write its own regulations. No bureau was ever known to resist such temptation. Finally, the bill provides that, quoting, "any person who shall willfully resist, prevent, impede, or interfere with any member of the Commission or any of its referees, agents, or agencies, in the performance of duties pursuant to this act, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both."

Thus FEPC agents become roving czars. Their agents can enter anyone's place of business, examine his books and records, file a complaint against him, compel him to produce evidence against himself, find him guilty, and assess punishment upon him. This roving czar becomes grand jury, petit jury, prosecutor, and judge, all rolled into one. At no time in the history of English-speaking jurisprudence has any individual been clothed with such arbitrary power. For all practical purposes there is no appeal from a judgment of conviction. This Caesar of tolerance need not possess any of the qualifications of a Federal judge, but has vastly more authority.

The smaller the employer, the fewer the employees, the more onerous and oppressive this legislation would become. The employees of a small shopkeeper are his constant associates, the relationship is intimate and personal. Such a person should have the right to select individuals because of his personal likes and dislikes. He should be permitted to hire all Irishmen, all Poles, all Englishmen, all Jews, all Negroes, all Protestants, all Catholics, or all Menonites if he wishes.

If the proposed bill should become law, then, to be consistent, we should abolish all social, fraternal, and religious organizations based in whole or in part upon race, color, creed, or ancestry.

Let me summarize a few serious objections to the bill:

First, it would make permanent the most needless, meddlesome, and dangerous of all the wartime agencies. With its unlimited powers over employment, with its authority to write regulations having the force of law, within a short time this agency would doubtless grow into the largest and most expensive bureau of the Government. If the law were enforced ruthlessly and with vengeance, as it might well be since many enforcers would be aggrieved members of allegedly oppressed minorities, it would require a million employees backed up by a secret Gestapo.

Second, the bill would completely change our philosophy of government. It would make racial and religious tolerance a matter of law instead of a matter of morals. It would make certain Federal agents self-anointed keepers of the individual's conscience.

We should remember that tolerance and brotherly love are taught in the home, church, and school. These virtues grow in our hearts, but cannot be imposed upon us by the State. Men may be led, but cannot be driven, into Christianity.

Third, such a law would create disrespect for all law. We talk of educating the Nazis out of racial prejudice, but we would force our own people out of it. On the deep-seated prejudice of foreign enemies we will use education, but on the mild, diversified prejudices of our home folks we will use force. The strong arm of the law cannot remove discrimination based upon either race, color, creed, national origin, or ancestry. To pass any law which cannot be enforced or that will not be enforced, is to bring all law into ill repute. To make suspected lawbreakers out of great masses of our best citizens is to undermine the very foundation of good government.

Four, the proposed law would impair, if not destroy, many of our most cherished liberties. It would impair freedom of speech, of press, and of worship. It would restrict freedom of contract and freedom from unreasonable searches and seizure. It would, in fact, deprive persons of both liberty and property without due process of law and in violence to all our concepts of justice.

Five, the proposed law would increase rather than decrease racial and religious prejudices and discriminations. It would set apart, emphasize, and magnify the differences and distinctions between our many races and creeds. It would defeat and destroy the very objectives claimed for it by many idealistic proponents. In this case certainly the medicine would be far worse than the disease. An honest title to this bill would be "An act to create an unfair employment practices commission."

For the sake of American democracy, therefore, for the good of minorities as well as majorities, write your Congressman to join in throwing this bill into the legislative ash-can where all such proposals should sleep in perpetuity.

Proposals for Expansion of World Trade and Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 5 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from a document entitled "Proposals for Expansion of World Trade and Employment." These proposals were developed by a technical staff of the United States Government in preparation for an international conference on trade and employment.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREWORD BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

The proposals contained in this pamphlet have been developed by experts drawn from several agencies of the United States Government, working together under the general chairmanship of William L. Clayton, Assistant Secretary of State, and are published, for consideration by the people of the United States and by the peoples and the governments of other countries, in preparation for an international conference on trade and employment.

It is important that such a conference based on these or similar proposals, should meet as soon as possible. Nations are now determining the policies which they will apply to trade in the postwar world. It is urgently necessary that these policies should be agreed upon, in order that the world may not separate into economic blocs.

The Government of the United States, therefore, believes that such a conference should meet, under the sponsorship of the United Nations, not later than the summer of 1946. The representatives of the United States in the appropriate organs of the United Nations will urge that this be done.

The success of such a conference depends on adequate preparation. This preparation should go forward immediately. The present publication and the careful work that lies behind it represent a determined effort to come to grips with the problems that will confront such a conference and so to prepare the way for its success.

JAMES F. BYRNES,

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, November 1, 1945.

MR. SECRETARY: I hand you herewith "Proposals for Consideration by an International Conference on Trade and Employment," together with a statement of their purpose.

These proposals have been developed over many months by a group of experts drawn from all the interested departments and agencies of the Government. They are intended to suggest a way in which the United States and other countries may concert their policy and action in the field of international trade so that the enormous productive powers which lie all about us may be released to operate fully for the general benefit. They are not regarded as final and perfect, but as a working basis for discussion and, I hope, for international action in the near future.

It is important that international agreement on the range of questions covered by these proposals be reached soon. All countries are faced by serious commercial problems and are taking action on them every day. Unless they act together, they will act at cross purposes and may well do serious damage to each other. But if they do act together, there is every possibility that the peoples of the world may enjoy, in our lifetime, a higher degree of prosperity and welfare than they have ever had before. Powers of production are now the greatest the world has known. To bring them into play requires agreement on principles of exchange and distribution which will permit trade, production, employment, and consumption all to expand together.

I therefore recommend that these proposals be published as a basis of discussion and I would hope that such discussion might lead to an international conference on trade and employment, to meet under the sponsorship of the United Nations, not later than the summer of 1946.

Respectfully,

WILLIAM L. CLAYTON,
Assistant Secretary of State.

EXPANSION OF WORLD TRADE AND EMPLOYMENT—ANALYSIS OF THE PROPOSALS

The main prize of the victory of the United Nations is a limited and temporary power to establish the kind of world we want to live in.

That power is limited by what exists and by what can be agreed on. Human institutions are conservative; only within limits can they be moved by conscious choice. But after a great war some power of choice exists; it is important that the United Nations use it wisely.

The fundamental choice is whether countries will struggle against each other for wealth and power or work together for security and mutual advantage. That choice was made in principle at San Francisco and has since been ratified by the overwhelming majority of the governments concerned. The business of the immediate future is to give that decision the necessary body of common institutions and so to support those institutions that the experiment may succeed.

Success requires that the United Nations work together in every field of common interest, in particular the economic. The experience of cooperation in the task of earning a living promotes both the habit and the techniques of common effort and helps make permanent the mutual confidence on which the peace depends. The United Nations have therefore created not only an Economic and Social Council but special bodies to help them work together on many practical matters. Already there exist, or are in process of creation, agencies to deal with emergency relief, with currency, with international investment, with civil aviation, with labor, and with food and agriculture.

The United Nations should also endeavor to harmonize their policies with respect to international trade and employment. An International Trade Organization is still to be created. To this end, it is now proposed that an International Conference on Trade and Employment should be called by the United Nations, to meet not later than the summer of 1946.

The common interests of countries in world trade are obvious. Science and technology have enormously increased the productive powers of man. Limits upon human welfare are imposed today, not by the ultimate poverty of nature's resources, but by failure to use human powers to the full. Among the factors which obstruct our march toward the goal of freedom from want are excessive restrictions on exchange and distribution. Progress requires release from these restrictions.

Every country has its arrangements for the organization of production and distribution within its borders. To make the best use of these arrangements, countries must exchange their products. World trade is not only the device through which useful goods produced in one country are made available to consumers in another; it is also the means through which the needs of people in one country are translated into orders and therefore into jobs in another. Trade connects employment, production, and consumption, and facilities all, three. Its increase means more jobs, more wealth produced, more goods to be enjoyed.

Countries should therefore join in an effort to release trade from the various restrictions which have kept it small. If they succeed in this, they will have made a major contribution to the welfare of their peoples and to the success of their common efforts in other fields.

International trade is kept small by four things:

(1) Restrictions imposed by governments;

(2) Restrictions imposed by private combines and cartels;

(3) Fear of disorder in the markets for certain primary commodities;

(4) Irregularity, and the fear of irregularity, in production and employment.

The proposals which are herewith published deal with each of these problems.

I. RELEASE FROM RESTRICTIONS IMPOSED BY GOVERNMENTS

Governments have restricted the freedom of traders by many measures and for many reasons. They will continue to do so. No government is ready to embrace "free trade" in any absolute sense. Nevertheless, much can usefully be done by international agreement toward reduction of governmental barriers to trade.

These barriers take many forms. A transaction between a willing buyer in one country and a willing seller in another may be prevented because the tariff of the buyer's country creates an added cost too great to be borne; or because the paper work required for export or import is so burdensome that the deal is not worth while; or because the seller cannot get an export license; or because the buyer cannot acquire the seller's currency to make a payment; or because importation is restricted by the buyer's country to a quota which has been exhausted; or because it is forbidden altogether. Or the seller may discover that the tariff of the buyer's country discriminates against him in favor of sellers located elsewhere.

All these restrictions and the red tape connected with them have undoubtedly prevented many business transactions, cut down the total of world trade, and reduced to that extent the benefits which trade might bring to all the parties concerned.

Barriers of this sort are imposed because they serve or seem to serve some purpose other than the expansion of world trade. Within limits they cannot be forbidden. But when they grow too high, and especially when they discriminate between countries or interrupt previous business connections, they create bad feeling and destroy prosperity. The objective of international action should be to reduce them all and to state fair rules within which those that remain should be confined.

This has often been attempted between two countries at a time or among several countries with respect to a single problem. These attempts have not been adequate because the many barriers are interdependent. Every country has its own kind of restriction, adapted to its own situation, and can hardly be expected to throw off its peculiar armor unless the other kinds of armor, employed by other countries, are thrown off at the same time. What is needed is a broad and yet detailed agreement, among many nations, dealing at one time with many different sorts of governmental restrictions upon trade, reducing all of them at once on a balanced and equitable basis, and stating rules and principles within which the restrictions permitted to remain should be administered. To prepare such an agreement should be one

of the main tasks of the international conference on trade and employment.

The proposals now published afford a basis on which agreement might be reached. Rules are suggested to limit quotas and embargoes to carefully defined cases and to avoid discrimination in their application. Provision is made for the substantial reduction of tariffs and the elimination of tariff preferences. Subsidies, especially subsidies on exports, would be brought under supervision. Local taxes on imported products would be limited to rates no higher than those levied on like products produced at home. Agencies of governments conducting foreign trade would be asked to give fair treatment to the commerce of friendly states, to make their purchases and sales on economic grounds, and to avoid using a monopoly of imports to afford excessive protection to domestic producers. On these and other points the proposals try to state fair principles acceptable to all and of benefit to all.

The proof of any principle is in its application. Therefore, effective preparation for the conference must include detailed negotiations on trade barriers to commerce as soon as possible. These negotiations should get down to cases, seeking to reduce tariffs, to eliminate preferences, and to lighten or remove other barriers to trade, whatever they may be.

In the United States, such negotiations are conducted under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, which was renewed by Congress in June 1945 with an increase of the authority conferred upon the President. The use of that authority is one of the most important contributions which the United States can make to the success of the conference.

Accordingly, this country should undertake negotiations under the Trade Agreements Act with several other governments as soon as a mutually satisfactory basis can be found, the required notices published, the statutory public hearings held, and their results considered. These negotiations cannot practicably be conducted with all countries at the same time, but the effort should be to get forward with the work, commencing before the general conference convenes and continuing until every friendly country has participated in the enterprise.

Together, if they will, the countries of the world now have it in their power to free their trade from excessive governmental barriers. When that happens and to the extent that it happens, more ships will sail with fuller cargoes, more men will be employed, more goods will be produced, and more people will have better things to eat and wear and otherwise consume.

II. RELEASE FROM RESTRICTIONS IMPOSED BY PRIVATE COMBINES AND CARTELS

Trade may also be restricted by business interests in order to obtain the unfair advantage of monopoly.

In many lines this has not happened, but in others, as experience discloses, firms have banded together to restrain competition by fixing common selling prices, by dividing the world into exclusive markets, by curtailing production, by suppressing technology and invention, by excluding their rivals from particular fields, and by boycotting outsiders. These practices destroy fair competition and fair trade, damage new businesses and small businesses, and levy an unjust toll upon consumers. Upon occasion, they may be even more destructive of world trade than are restrictions imposed by governments.

Goods can surmount a tariff if they pay the duty; they can enter despite a quota if they are within it. But when a private agreement divides the markets of the world among the members of a cartel, none of those goods can move between the zones while the contract is in force. Clearly, if trade is to increase as a result of the lightening of government restrictions, the governments concerned must make sure that it is not restrained by private combinations.

The proposals therefore contemplate that countries will act, individually and cooperatively, to curb those restrictive business practices in international trade which interfere with the objectives of increased production and trade, access on equal terms to markets and raw materials, and high levels of employment and real income.

To this end, it is suggested that a special agency be established within the International Trade Organization to receive complaints concerning restrictive practices of international combines and cartels, to obtain and examine the facts which are relevant to such cases, and to advise the Organization as to the remedies that may be required.

Enforcement against private violators necessarily rests with member governments. It will be the function of the Organization to recommend to these governments that they take action under their own laws and procedures. In the United States, enforcement would continue to be by judicial proceedings under the antitrust laws.

III. RELEASE FROM FEAR OF DISORDER IN THE MARKETS FOR PRIMARY COMMODITIES

After a great war there is danger of violent and rapid movement in the markets for primary commodities. The production of some things has been increased enormously to meet a war demand or to replace sources of production cut off by enemy action. Some time after the end of the fighting, the war demand subsides, goods held by the armies are returned to normal channels, and old sources of production come back into the markets and add to supplies. There is suddenly too much of some commodities and the prices react accordingly. Many countries learned after the last war that such changes can be devastating.

If the proposals so far discussed can be put into effect, a great advance will have been made toward increasing trade and business activity. The resulting expansion of incomes and consumption should go a long way toward enlarging the demand for primany commodities. The best cure for any surplus is more money in the pockets of consumers. And general prosperity will make it easier for people caught by a particular failure of demand to shift to other lines where opportunities are better.

Such shifts are occurring all the time in any progressive society. Public policy should not seek to prevent them, for they are a necessary part of the process by which the economy meets the changing needs of the people. But if the changes come too fast they may bring serious distress to many small producers and to their communities. It is important that the needed changes be made gradually.

When excess supplies threaten, the first effort obviously should be to increase consumption. But if study discloses that that cannot be done rapidly enough to be effective, other measures may be needed. And since action by one country is quite likely to affect producers and consumers in another, there should be consultation between governments.

Consultation may result in a proposal for an intergovernmental commodity agreement. Such agreements are not intended to freeze existing patterns of production, but rather to provide a program of adjustment and a period of time within which the essential changes can be made without undue hardship.

During the transition, it may be necessary to restrict production or exports, to fix prices, or to allocate shares of markets among producing countries. Controls of this sort should not be applied in any case unless the need is real and serious, affecting many people, and not curable by the normal process of competition. And when they are set up they should be strictly temporary, lasting no longer than required to carry out the necessary shifts. Their purpose is not to protect vested interests, but to prevent widespread distress during the course of necessary change.

Intergovernmental restrictions on production or on exports might be used—like international cartels—to take unfair advantage of consumers. Therefore the proposals recommend adherence to the rule that consuming countries be entitled to participate along with producers in the original consideration of such agreements and be entitled also to an equal voice in their administration. Furthermore, there should be full publicity about each scheme and all its operations, in order that the world may make sure that it is managed in the general interest.

IV. RELEASE FROM FEAR OF IRREGULARITY IN PRODUCTION AND EMPLOYMENT

Every country will seek so to manage its own affairs that its business life will be free from violent depressions. The object of international action should be to insure that these national efforts reinforce each other and do not cancel out.

The industrial activity of every country is affected by the size and the regularity of its orders from abroad. When industry in any country slows down and its purchases of foreign materials are cut, the effects are felt in every corner of the globe. Full and regular production at home, with increased participation in world trade, is the greatest boon which any people can confer upon producers throughout the world

It is important, however, that nations should not seek to obtain full employment for themselves by exporting unemployment to their neighbors. To seek employment by prohibiting imports or by subsidizing exports would be harmful and self-defeating. The business of the conference, therefore, should be to establish general agreement that each country will seek, on its own account, to maintain full and regular production, that it will not do so by using measures which would damage other countries or prevent the expansion of world trade, and that all countries will cooperate in exchanging information and participate in consultations with respect to antidepression policies.

V. AN INTERNATIONAL TRADE ORGANIZATION

Arrangements on this scale clearly require, for their successful operation, both an international forum where they may be discussed and improved and an international staff to assist in their administration.

The proposals therefore suggest that an International trade organization be created, to stand beside the existing international agencies dealing with currency, investment, agriculture, labor, and civil aviation. It should have a constitution much like those of the other agencies set up by the United Nations, with enough internal specialization to enable it to perform the tasks assigned to it in dealing with trade barriers, restrictive business practices, and international commodity arrangements. Detailed suggestions on this matter are contained in the proposals.

The organization should be designed as the central international agency to deal with trade. It should be brought into relation with the Economic and Social Council in the manner provided in the Charter of the United Nations.

The proposals reflect awareness that we live in a world of many countries with a variety of economic systems. They seek to make it possible for those systems to meet in the market place without conflict, thus to contribute each to the other's prosperity and welfare. In no case do they impinge upon sovereign independence, but they do recognize that measures adopted by any country may have effects abroad and they suggest for general adoption fair rules of mutual tolerance.

The purpose is to make real the principle of equal access to the markets and the raw materials of the world, so that the varied

gifts of many peoples may exert themselves more fully for the common good. The larger purpose is to contribute to the effective partnership of the United Nations, to the growth of international confidence and solidarity, and thus to the preservation of the peace.

The American Indian and Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 30 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The American Indian and Government," prepared by Byron Brophy, long in the Indian Service in this country. Mr. President, I am advised by the Public Printer that the printing of the article by Mr. Brophy will take one-half page in excess of the two pages allowed under the rule without an estimate, and that the cost will be approximately $130.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN INDIAN AND GOVERNMENT

(By Byron Brophy)

"Lo, the poor Indian! whose untutored mind
Sees God in clouds, or hears him in the wind;
His soul proud science never taught to stray
Far as the solar walk, or milky way;
Yet simple nature to his hope has given,
Behind the cloud-topped hill, an humbler heaven;
Some safer world in depths of woods embraced,
Some happier island in the watery waste,
Where slaves once more their native land behold,
No friends torment, no Christians thirst for gold.
To be content his natural desire;
He asks no angel's wing, no seraph's fire;
But thinks, admitted to that equal sky,
His faithful dog shall bear him company."
—*Alexander Pope in An Essay on Man.*

The tragic and important role played by the American Indian in the rapidly moving drama of American expansion and development has been told by Clark Wissler in a previous chapter. In the light of his discussion, we shall attempt to consider some of the problems of the Indians of today. We shall not attempt consideration of those problems that are common to all minority groups, including the Indians, but shall concentrate upon a few of the problems that are outcomes of Government control and that apply only to Indians. These relate to what Dr. Wissler refers to as "so unique a legal and social status" enjoyed by the Indians. They evolved in the process of our national expansion by necessity and have continued as an expression of our complete misunderstanding of problems related to the Indian.

Illustrative of the problems that are outcomes of unique Government control are unanswered and basic questions such as: What is an Indian? Who is an Indian? In a democracy such as ours, and under our Constitution, how can we justify one being a full-fledged citizen and at the same time a ward of the Government? How can Indian Bureau domination of every aspect of Indian life be reconciled with the basic principles of the Bill of Rights and the Constitution, rations and wardship be reconciled with full citizenship? Why do we conduct a Federal system of schools for Indians when public-school education is the responsibility of the State and the right of everyone without regard to race? How do we justify our failure to satisfy the provisions of Indian treaties, and when will these commitments be carried out? How do we justify race legislation for the control of Indian citizens? These are only a few of the problems with which the Indians of today are struggling without too much success.

Since our first contact with the American Indian, our primary concerns have been the acquisition of his possessions and the development of effective devices for his control. Our dominating purpose, conscious or otherwise, and carried out without much real regard for his rights or best interests, has been that of compelling him to submit to our will. This is almost as true today as at any time in our history. The only difference today is a difference of attitude and the means we use to accomplish our purposes.

Our national attitudes and the devices we developed to impose our will upon the Indian have evolved with changing circumstances and needs. Today we are governed in our determinations by misguided sentimental emotionalism quite opposite from the hatreds developed during the period of frontier wars. The resulting paternalism of today is almost as vicious and destructive in its results as was the cruelty and ruthlessness that prevailed during the frontier days. Our great need today is for a sound and consistent program for the assimilation of the descendants of a people whom we conquered. Correction of past mistakes can only come by the elimination of the force philosophy which has always predominated and the substitution of a philosophy of self-determination as provided for in our Constitution.

In order to understand the significance of the various devices and institutions that our Government has devised for the control of Indians, it is necessary to consider them in perspective. Government institutions arise in response to needs but do not always terminate with the termination of the needs that established them. Frequently they crystallize and become a part of the traditional structure. They survive long after the need for them has passed. This is exactly what has happened in our evolving relationships with Indians, as can readily be seen by a brief review of the develcpment of Government control of Indians. The evolution of Government control of Indians roughly divides into four periods.[1]

1. Period of control by community diplomacy with Indians, 1607–1778.
2. Period of control by treaties, 1778–1871.
3. Period of control through segregation and pauperization on reservations, 1871–87.
4. Period of control by legislation:

(a) Americanize the Indian: Destruction of tribal organization and seizure of Indian lands under provisions of the General Allotment Act, 1887–1934.

(b) "Indianize" the Indian: Government efforts at tribal reorganization under the provisions of the Reorganization Act, 1934–44.

Period of control by community diplomacy, 1607–1778: Our earliest relations with Indians were probably the fairest and most satisfactory we have had, because the philosophy of force which dominated all our future relations was less expedient when we were not strong and when we were ever threatened by the potential interference of foreign nations who fully recognized the value of Indian favor and cooperation. Just as soon as these threats were removed and other methods became more expedient for the accomplishment of our purposes, we resorted to them. We should note, however, that the Quakers developed this method very effectively and have never departed from it. During this period each settlement or community dealt with the neighboring Indians by whatever means seemed best to it. The results were dependent upon the wisdom of the leadership on both sides. The record registers many mistakes.

Period of control by treaties, 1778–1871: During this period, we recognized, by implication at least, the sovereign rights of tribes and periodically made treaties with them. The first treaty between the United States and an Indian tribe was made with the Delaware Indians on September 17, in the year 1778. No treaties have been made with Indian tribes since the passage of the act of March 3, 1871, which was based on the theory that the Federal Government cannot recognize an independent nation or sovereignty existing within the borders of its own territory. With the termination of the practice of making treaties as a means of control, we passed to the stage of development in which we are at the present time. Control of the Indian is provided for by special legislation for Indians which in reality is race legislation.

The status of treaties with the Indians is indicated in a Supreme Court decision which in substance held that a treaty with Indians is of no greater force than an act of Congress and that Congress has the right to abrogate the provisions of an Indian treaty. There are approximately 370 Indian treaties on the statute books.

Most treaties were forced upon the Indians by one means or another and were made for the purpose of obtaining some advantage, such as land acquisition, right-of-way, or additional control. In return, they usually made certain provisions for the Indians. Many of these provisions have never been satisfied, and this fact constitutes a retarding influence of major proportions in Indian development. A good example is the claims of the Sioux Nations, which run into millions. Hope springs eternal, however, even among Indians. Each generation plans on acquiring its long-standing claim, and the total effects include bitterness, disappointment, the conviction of persecution, and the loss of a stimulus to struggle.

Settlement of the Indian claims based upon treaties is an urgent need, the satisfaction of which would probably do more to accelerate Indian development than would most of the legislation we could devise. When the treaties are wiped from the books and further claims are impossible, it will be a great day for the Indians. It will then be possible to proceed along intelligent lines without coming into conflict at every turn with some provision of an almost forgotten treaty. Settlement of the treaties finally and irrevocably is an important aspect of the Indian problem, for we cannot expect much faith from the descendants of those from whom we took so much and to whom to date we have returned so little.

As we grew stronger nationally and the threat of foreign nations was removed, there was less compelling reason for recognizing the sovereignty of Indian tribes, and, as we have indicated, the practice was discontinued. Legislation was substituted as a means of control, but it had to be supplemented by armed force until the Indians were thoroughly subdued. New demands resulting from the continuously increasing opposition of the Indians necessitated the creation of new devices for their control. We immediately devised two which have proved their effectiveness. We created the Indian Bureau and the Indian reservation. They are still in effect.

The Indian Bureau was created in 1824, as an arm of the War Department to supplement the efforts of the Department to con-

[1] Lloyd E. Blanch and William Iverson, Education of Children on Federal Reservations, the Advisory Committee on Education, Staff Study No. 17 (1939), U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.

trol the Indian. It remained in the War Department for 25 years, during which time the philosophy of force was so firmly established that it is still operative in spite of all the efforts of innumerable reformers.

From its birth "its mission largely was to treat with the Indians for cession of lands and recommend to the War Department 'chastisement of the hostiles' when the Indians did not comport themselves agreeable to the Bureau. The public of today cannot know the injustices which have come down to the Indians directly from this Department of Government the past 160 years."[1]

The present Commissioner of Indian Affairs, before he became the head of the Bureau, said: "Our Indian Bureau is paternalistic and bureaucratic, and pretends to do through paid employees all and everything which human beings normally do for themselves. Coupled with this paternalism is the Indian Bureau's policy of monopolizing the Indian Service and of duplicating, through pigmy services of its own, the work of the Department of Agriculture, the Bureau of Reclamation, the work of the State agricultural, educational, health, and welfare departments, and even the work of the courts. Mr. Collier has not reduced these services but rather has increased them. The Indian Bureau has had between eight and nine thousand employees, requiring approximately $30,000,000 annually from appropriations and tribal funds."[2] From all sources it has been estimated as high as $60,000,000 in 1 year.

Lyman K. Wilbur while Secretary of the Interior said that the "Bureau of Indian Affairs should work itself out of a job." Mr. Moore's statement quoted above indicates how the self-liquidation of the Indian Bureau should be accomplished. However, it is very doubtful that it will be done until Congress sets a time limit for the Bureau to turn its services into normal channels provided for all citizens. This is what should and eventually will be done.

The cost of the services rendered to Indians by the Bureau of Indian Affairs is constantly increasing. According to Senate Report No. 310, the money spent during Commissioner Collier's administration would have permitted a per capita payment of $2,500 to 200,000 Indians, which is probably considerably more than are actually under Bureau supervision. The same report points out that the $500,000,000 spent would have settled every claim the Indians now have against the Federal Government through treaties.

To free the Indian people from its shackles, the Indian Bureau must be relegated to the scrap heap with all the other devices of control developed to conquer and subject the Indian people. Its period of usefulness has long since passed and, together with the Indian treaties, the Indian Bureau should be liquidated as rapidly as possible. A period of 10 years should be adequate as a maximum time limit allowed for the transfer of all special services such as education, health, agriculture, forestry, irrigation, law and order, land conservation, and so on.

When Franklin K. Lane was Secretary of the Interior he made the following very significant statement relative to the results of the controls we have placed upon the Indians:

That the Indian is confused in mind as to his status and very much at sea as to our ultimate purpose toward him is not surprising. For 100 years he has been spun around like a blindfolded child in a game of blindman's buff. Treated as an enemy at first, overcome, driven from his land, negotiated with most formally as an independent nation, given by treaty a distinct boundary which was never to be changed "while water runs and grass grows," he later found himself pushed beyond that boundary line, negotiated with again, and then set down on a reservation, half captive, half protege.

Period of control by reservations, segregation, and pauperization, 1871–87: Necessity is the mother of invention. The resistance of the Indians to ever-increasing pressure that was being put upon them necessitated the development of effective controls, and between 1871 and 1887 Government policy turned to the segregation of Indians on reservations. Reservations had been established previous to this time, but they were not an important consideration. It would be difficult to conceive anything more destructive to the moral fiber of a self-sufficient people than to round them up like so many cattle and confine them to limited areas from which they could in no way extract a livelihood. As a further means of control the system of rationing them was established. We thus converted by force a formerly self-sufficient people into unwilling wards of the Government.

By 1887 most of the tribes had been separated from their vast areas of land and assigned to particular and restricted reservations. The reservations chosen for them were for the most part in sections of the country then considered unfit for white habitation. The lands taken from the Indians were then opened to homestead entry by the Federal Government.

Most of our Indians are still living on reservations, and rationing is still not too uncommon. These institutions are contrary to every principle of Americanism and have long outlived their purpose. They should pass into history as soon as possible. They are an instrument of the Indian Bureau, and with their abolishment there would be little excuse for continuing the bureau.

An Indian reservation, even today, is a little kingdom or Federal State, ruled over by a representative of the Bureau called the superintendent. With his staff of employees, he attempts to duplicate practically every service normally carried out by the State, and some others. In addition to operating schools, police force, health department, social welfare, agriculture, irrigation, land conservation, and other normal functions of the State, he rules on matters of the most intimate nature, such as authorizing an Indian to spend his own money, stock his ranch, send his children to school, make improvements to his property, and so on. The Sioux call him Ateyapi, or father. He is more than that, however, for he has the power to give or to take. He has jobs and rations and many other gratuities at his disposal. He can truly be an autocrat, if he so desires. Fortunately, however, most superintendents are devoted to the cause of their wards and would be a blessing to them if the policies of the Indian Bureau made it possible. The writer has known many of these men intimately and has the highest regard for their ability, sincerity, and integrity. Their sterling characters, however, are no justification for a system which is totally contrary to every principle of Government we avow. The system is fundamentally wrong, a grave injustice to Indians living under it, and obnoxious to all thinking Americans.

Reservations, segregation, rationing, and wardship all spell inevitable pauperization and degradation. They are devices of control and white domination, the need for which has long since passed. They now constitute major factors in the retardation of the Indian establishing his place and making his rightful contribution to the "democratic way of life." Elementary justice demands that the Indian be freed from these shackles and granted the full rights of citizenship which were granted to him by Congress in 1924. Then, and then only, can he determine his own destiny in this Republic under the same laws that apply to all of us.

Period of control by legislation: Destruction of tribal organization and seizure of Indian lands under the provisions of the Allotment Act, 1887–1934. An outstanding example of the fallacy and menace of class or race legislation, no matter how well intended, is found in the General Allotment Act of February 8, 1887. In a democracy, there should be no class or race legislation, and the truth of the statement is clearly demonstrated in the unexpected results of the Allotment Act. Although well intended by its advocates, it was a severe blow to Indian welfare and particularly to tribal organization. The weakness in such legislation is that it does not provide for self-determination in carrying out its provisions, for synchronizing its departure from common pattern with general practice, or for adequate assistance.

The act provided that eventually every Indian would be given a share of his reservation to be held in trust for a period of 25 years, during which time it would not be taxed and could not be sold. After that time he would be given fee patent and would be declared competent to manage his own affairs. It is estimated that Indians were separated from some 86,000,000 acres, or more than 60 percent of their holdings, in 1887, as a result of the Allotment Act.

Part of the difficulty lay in the restrictions on the sale of the lands. Heirs could not settle their estates except through subdivision, and that became very complicated. Another outcome was the practice of leasing land to whites; and the results of this practice still constitute a major problem with Indians. With good administration, sound supporting education, and provision for flexibility, the results would have been better. However, the matter of how Indians hold their lands should be a matter for Indians rather than Congress to decide. Congress would not dream of legislating similarly for any other minority group. Indians would be better off if all legislation specifically directed at "Indians" could be stopped.

Government attempts at tribal reorganization under the provisions of the Reorganization Act, June 18, 1934,[4] 1934–44: The Indian Reorganization Act is another example of control by race legislation. While the Allotment Act attempted to Americanize the Indians too quickly, the Reorganization Act goes to the other extreme and attempts to "re-Indianize" the Indians. Its general acceptance would establish a bigger and better Indian Bureau permanently. It would give permanent status to Indian reservations and provide for establishing new reservations as needed. It gives the Secretary of the Interior and, through him, the Commission of Indian Affairs, the final say in all matters pertaining to those operating under the act.

A report of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs (No. 1031), June 22, 1944, declares that "the Wheeler-Howard Act has been a perfect failure from the standpoint of Indian welfare and should be repealed." This report in effect states that the act, among other effects, results in:

1. Perpetuating a system of indefinite land titles which insures perpetual Government supervision and control.

2. Complete incompatibility of Indian land policies with the American system of land tenure.

3. Placing more than a half million acres of land under Indian Bureau supervision, much of which will be unused.

4. Providing for complete regimentation of Indians through the system of loans.

5. Strengthening and perpetuating the reservation system, which is obnoxious to all thinking Americans.

The Reorganization Act has the merit of encouraging organization of Indian tribes

[1] Extension of remarks of the Honorable E. H. Moore, Senate of the United States, February 25, 1944.

[2] Ibid.

[4] 48 Stat. 981.

for consideration and action on their own affairs. If it then gave them responsibility for the administration of their reservations, it would be good. There is no such provision, however. The superintendent and his staff remain totally independent of the people they serve. Such a fundamental institution as the schools for their children are entirely independent of the Indian people. They have no voice in the determination of the curricula, employment of teaching personnel, formulation of policies, or any aspects of education. Even in those matters over which they are supposed to have some voice, they are subject to the pressures which the powerful Indian Bureau representative in the person of the reservation superintendent can apply as the need may arise. Reservation superintendents are sometimes very active and effective in controlling those who are elected to the Indian councils. Democratic processes are not always possible under the present system of administration of reservations. Elimination of the Indian Bureau and its representatives is the only way it could be made possible, and the act does not provide for that.

The Reorganization Act provides for granting Federal charters to Indian tribes that accept the provisions of the act. The charter is one of the major weaknesses in the act. If it were a State charter, similar to those granted cities and towns in the State, it would eliminate a host of confusions which now exist. It also provides for a constitution decided on by the people but approved by the Secretary of the Interior. The net result is that the constitutions are the work of the bureau. They have even been standardized by the legal department, which sends them out, and the reservation superintendent has the responsibility of getting the tribe to approve what is written.

Educational controls. The Indian Bureau attempts to duplicate practically every public service, and education is no exception. An extensive system of schools is administered by the Bureau, with little if any reference to the Indian people they are supposed to serve. This is a serious problem to thoughtful Indians. Every change of administration means radical changes representing someone's pet theories about how to solve the Indian problem. The pendulum swings from one extreme to another. At one time vocational education is the cure-all for every evil, then the swing is to agriculture, Indian arts and crafts, home economics, or something else. Continuity and stability is of short shrift. Change is the outstanding characteristic: change of personnel, change of policy, change of curriculum.

However, these are not the most important weaknesses of Indian education, for it would be possible to overcome any or all of them. The great weakness of Indian education is the complete lack of Indian participation in its administration. It is an imposed education, completely lacking in those close community relationships through which evolved the great American system of community schools which are the very backbone of our Nation. Another great weakness of the Indian educational system is that the schools are almost entirely for Indians only. In segregation, the Indian people are expected to acquire the elements of a culture with which their only contact may be their teachers or employees of the Indian Service. Progress has been slow, and it is not surprising.

Indian attitude toward education can be judged from the fact that as early as 1840 the Cherokee National Council passed legislation for the establishment of a system of common schools for the Cherokee Nation, and in 1841 the Council of the Choctaws passed similar legislation. The Five Civilized Tribes also operated their own schools in the early days without Federal assistance, and until 1850 most of the Indian schools were supported from Indian funds. Some of our great universities, too, such as the University of Michigan and Dartmouth, were assisted by Indian grants conditional upon them keeping their doors open to Indians. Most of the treaties contained meager provisions for some sort of education, which also indicates recognition on the part of the Indian of the need for education.

The first education for Indians was provided for by missionaries. By 1860 the first Indian reservation school was established at Yakima, Wash., and 1871 an appropriation of $100,000 became available. The nonreservation boarding school became an important part of the program after 1878. Use of the public schools for Indians began in 1890 and has been increasing gradually ever since. Approximately 50 percent of the Indian children enrolled in schools are now in public schools. For those who are not in public schools or private schools, the Government, with some help from tribal funds, operates so-called community day schools, reservation boarding schools, and nonreservation boarding schools. Contracts are made with mission, private, and State schools, and assistance is provided for higher education.

Since the first annual appropriation of $10,000 in 1819 for Indian education, the annual appropriations have increased to more than $10,000,000 for the education of approximately 65,000 Indian students. Beginning with the Rhodes-Scattergood administration and following the Merriam Report, vast improvements have been made. The most essential step, which has not been taken, is to make the Indian educational system an integral part of our national public schools system, returning control of the schools to the people they serve and eliminating segregation wherever practical.

The report of the Institute of Government Research in 1928 stated: "The fundamental requirement is that the task of the Indian Service be recognized as primarily educational, in the broadest sense of that word." The survey staff found the provisions for the care of the children in the Indian schools grossly inadequate, roundly criticized boarding schools of all types, and commended the growing practice of putting Indian children in public schools where practical. This report resulted in vast improvements in the educational system for Indians.

The report of the National Advisory Committee on Education in 1931 stated that the educational policy of the Federal Government could be regarded as little more than tragic failure and that the policy had, in a large degree, pauperized the Indian and left him about as helpless in the face of a strange economic civilization as he had been before. The report also recommended delegation of the management of Indian affairs to local officials wherever possible.

Education of all children of all races is a constitutional responsibility accepted by most States. Indian children should be educated in the public schools, not as Indians, but as American children. The responsibility of the Federal Government should be to see that schools are provided as needed on bases equivalent to the standards set for white communities. Education is one function of the State that should not be assumed by the Indian Bureau or the Federal Government. The whole so-called Indian problem is essentially an educational one, and the most fundamental need is amalgamation with the public schools, coupled with the recognition that education of an Indian child involves the same considerations required for the education of any child; that the content, methods, techniques of such education must all be adapted to individual abilities, interests, and needs.

Our forefathers wisely recognized the importance of the location of educational control and provided for a system of schools that have truly been the people's schools. Federal control of education, even for a minority group, is extremely dangerous, as has been demonstrated by recent European developments in that respect. Control of education for Indians today is by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, which has vested interests and does not necessarily express the wishes of either the Indian or the general public. The control of Indian education should be returned to the community and the State, and Indian education should become American education, adapted to the needs of Indian children. We would not deny Indians the right to send their children to private or special schools, but that should be their own decision and at their own expense.

In closing, the words of Walt Whitman seem pertinent: "Political democracy as it exists and works in America, with all its threatening evils, supplies a training school for making first-class men. It is life's gymnasium, not of good only, but of all." Or, in the words of Aristotle: "If liberty and equality, as thought by some, are chiefly to be found in democracy, they will be best attained when all persons alike share in the government to the utmost." American democracy must be the same for all, even for the Indian. We destroy it when we try to withhold any part of it, even the bad. It works only on the basis of all or none. In simple justice, then, we should give the Indian his full chance in this great laboratory under the same rules that we demand for ourselves.

FEPC Is Not the Remedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, any discrimination in employment should be met by education rather than legislation.

If legislation be insisted upon, it should be interpreted and applied by court and jury—not by a legislative agency.

The issue was discussed by me over WGN on Sunday, February 3, 1946, and the following is the argument offered:

Tonight's question, "Should Congress pass the FEPC bill?", will be answered in the negative when its inherent defects are studied.

Under the guise of preventing discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry, the bill would create another Federal agency with power to appoint officers and employees without limitation.

The bill authorizes that agency to prevent what it considered to be unfair employment practices by employers engaged in interstate commerce and by the agencies of the United States, its territories and possessions.

Its agent would have the right to examine and to copy the private and business records of any individual or corporation being investigated—an arbitrary search and seizure power expressly forbidden by the Federal Constitution.

Every member of the commission would have the power to require any individual to go from any place within the United States or its possessions to any other place within the United States or its possessions; appear before anyone designated, to testify and produce any and all evidence demanded.

The agency's decisions on questions of fact, when supported by any substantial evidence, would be final, could not be reviewed by any court.

If, in its opinion, there had been discrimination, either in hiring or discharging

an employee, the agency is given authority to force the employer to hire the applicant and to pay back wages from the time employment was first sought. And that without a trial by jury or a court review of the facts.

The grants of power just enumerated and the possibility of their abuse are sufficient to condemn the proposed legislation.

But let us ignore methods and procedure and get to the real issues, which are:

(a) Is there discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; and, if so, (b) against whom is it practiced? (c) Is legislation or education the remedy?

For practical purposes, because there is so little of it, we may eliminate discrimination in employment because of national origin or ancestry. Neither Irish, Italians, Poles, Swedes, Norwegians, the Dutch, nor any one of a half dozen other nationals make complaint.

While there is an overabundance of propaganda charging discrimination against Jews, it is without substantial foundation. There is no foundation for the charge of discrimination against them in employment.

Jews as a race are not laborers. They are craftsmen, traders, merchants, manufacturers, employers, and there is no discrimination against them as professional men, and in politics they hold a greater percentage of worth-while key positions in the Federal Government than does any other race.

One need but to call the roll of the top-flight lawyers, judges, scientists, publishers, merchants, bankers, producers in the movie industry, and in broadcasting, to realize the falsity of any charge that there is discrimination against Jews.

Nor is there discrimination in employment because of creed.

Quarrels growing out of divergent religious beliefs have been personal—no more frequent nor prolonged than those which arise between individuals differing over everyday tastes or conduct.

There has been no civil strife because of religious differences.

We come then to discrimination in employment because of race or color, which is the only grain of wheat in this widespread, persistent flood of propaganda chaff which has engulfed our Nation, distracted its attention from matters of more immediate, vital importance.

The avowed purpose of the present FEPC is the abolition of discrimination against Negroes—I prefer to call them colored people—in employment. But the real purpose of some of those supporting it is to force an intermingling and intermarrying of the races.

FEPC legislation is an attempt to, by law, force those who create and maintain employment to give those jobs to the first applicants, regardless of race, creed, color or national origin, if the applicants, in the opinion of the agency, be of equal ability.

While that policy, if enforced, would, speaking broadly, make all jobs available to all individuals regardless of the causes heretofore enumerated, it would deprive the employer—the man who created the job, the man who pays for the service rendered—of the right to select the individual he thought most capable of performing the service needed; a right which it is only fair he should have.

An employee is needed in a grocery store, a beauty shop; in a factory, a hospital, in a printing shop publishing religious literature.

Four individuals apply for the job—one white, one colored, one a Mexican, one a Jap. They are of equal ability. One is first on the scene and one, in the opinion of the FEPC, should be hired.

The employer is aware that, for reasons over which he has no control, the people whom he serves do not wish the services of the colored individual, or of a member of a particular race or nationality. He does not hire the applicant the FEPC may later think was entitled to the job.

Months afterward, if the FEPC finds that, in its opinion—and I stress the word "opinion"—there was discrimination, then the employer must discharge the man he hired; give the job to the individual chosen by the FEPC; pay him wages from the day he first applied.

In short, FEPC, not the employer, does the hiring and the firing.

If white and colored workers of equal ability apply for jobs in a foundry, or in any occupation where the work is to be performed under extreme temperatures, every employer with any knowledge of the business and any experience will give preference to the colored applicants—foundry workers—for they know that they can withstand the heat far better than can the whites. There, the discrimination is against the white.

Examples which show that a legalized FEPC will bring discontent, disappointment, and perhaps civil strife, are innumerable. A few should suffice.

All major religious groups—Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant—publish literature designed to spread the religious beliefs of each. They need linotype operators, proofreaders, reporters, editors.

Under the FEPC, the publisher of a Catholic periodical would be compelled to employ a Jew or a Protestant; the Jew would be forced to hire a Catholic or a Protestant; and the Protestant would be required to hire a Jew or a Catholic, and each of the three would be forced, if the FEPC so ordered, to employ an atheist or an infidel.

Do you think that procedure would promote harmony or discrimination?

Must the Jewish, the Protestant, the Catholic institution caring for children employ, as a nurse or a governess, the applicant of a different creed?

Must it employ an atheist, who proclaims that Moses was a fraud; that the Tablets of Stone never existed; that the Ten Commandments are a myth?

Or must it employ a Communist, who adheres to the party declaration that there is no God; that religion is a fraud; that priests and ministers are hypocrites, just because FEPC so orders?

From the day when Moses led the children of Israel out of Pharaoh's bondage right down to the present moment, groups of people have preferred each other's society; have preferred to give employment to members of their own group, of their own faith, of their own nationality; and experience has demonstrated that those preferences cannot be eradicated by law.

Sound, honest thinkers must divorce the question of social equality, segregation, and intermarriage from this controversy, for this legislation on its face makes no pretense of dealing with either, and each can only be solved by time and education, for all three are social—not economic—problems.

The noble experiment—prohibition, demonstrated that education, not legislation, is the remedy for social ills.

That the end of discrimination in employment is not the purpose of the proponents of this legislation is apparent when their inconsistency is laid bare.

They refuse to accept amendments which would prohibit discrimination because of sex, membership, or nonmembership in any labor or fraternal organization.

Under their bill, a black, yellow, or brown individual, be he Jew, Catholic, Protestant, atheist, or infidel, if he be a member of a union, is given employment while, though he be white, a Jew, Catholic, or Protestant, but not a member of a union, he may seek employment in vain.

Even his Government will in many cases issue an order denying him a job—yes, a job created by his own tax dollar—because he is not a union man.

His color, his creed, his nationality, will not bar him, but his failure to sign on the dotted line presented by the organizer of a minority group deprives him of the means of earning a livelihood for himself and his family.

While they cry out against discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, or national origin, they refuse to legislate against discrimination against the overwhelming majority of American workingmen and women.

If proponents of legislation to end discrimination in employment are sincere, let them be consistent; include in their proposals an end to discrimination because of sex and membership or nonmembership in any labor organization; let them join with us who believe in constitutional processes, in our judicial system, where, before a court learned in the law and a jury of his fellowmen, all may seek and find equal justice under law.

Once more, waive the defects and the inadequacy of the proposed legislation and get back to fundamental principles.

At present, there is a deplorable lack of confidence in the fairness, the integrity, the efficiency, of administrative agencies. The courts still retain much of the confidence of the people.

The possibilities for the exercise of tyranny, fraud, blackmail, and corruption under the interpretation and administration of this bill, or any other legislation of its nature, are apparent.

The creation of an executive agency to interpret and administer the FEPC would be but another transfer of a portion of the power of the judicial to the executive branch of the Government; another step toward dictatorship.

The bill legalizes an executive agency, which, created to prevent discrimination, has disregarded every principle of equality, of opportunity in employment; has itself practiced the rankest discrimination in giving employment. We have no reason to believe that changing it from an executive to a legislative agency would bring reformation. Legislative approval would but tend to inflate its ego, increase its arbitrariness; give it ground to claim its practices met with congressional approval.

Entrusting the interpretation and administration of any legislation which it is deemed wise to adopt to the judicial branch of our Government is imperative if we are to retain our constitutional rights and processes.

It took the Anglo-Saxon race hundreds of years to obtain, establish, and to a large degree perfect our judicial system, which still, through court and jury, is the most efficient method of administering justice between individuals ever created, in spite of more or less successful attempts to impair it.

To prevent discrimination in employment because of race, creed, sex, color, lack of color, national origin, ancestry, membership or nonmembership in any labor or fraternal organization; to insure equal justice under law, I have introduced H. R. 5216, which provides that there shall be no discrimination in employment against or in favor of any individual because of such individual's race, creed, sex, color, national origin, ancestry, membership or nonmembership in any labor or fraternal organization; and which turns over the interpretation and the administration of that law to an impartial judge learned in the law; to a fact-finding jury impartially chosen through the operation of long-established judicial processes.

This is tonight's question: Should the Congress make legal and permanent the present FEPC; adopt all but five of its personnel and, by so doing, endorse its methods and procedure, when the record shows that it is one of the most discriminatory agencies ever created? When its own record shows that, while created to prevent discrimination, it has given 59 percent of its jobs, spent 54

percent of its money, to Negroes, who number 9⅘ percent of the population?

That is the question, and my answer is an emphatic "No."

Discrimination will not, it cannot, be ended by an agency which itself practices the rankest kind of discrimination.

Education, rather than legislation, is the remedy. If, however, we are to have legislation, the law should be interpreted and administered by the judicial department of our Government, as other laws are interpreted and administered.

Since that discussion, there came to my desk an analysis of the bill, which is printed herewith and marked "exhibit A"; and a statement issued by the New York Commission Against Discrimination as it appears in the Labor Relations Reporter of January 21, 1946 (17 LRR 679), which is printed herewith, marked "exhibit B":

EXHIBIT A

WHAT THE SO-CALLED FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE BILL MEANS TO YOU—HOUSE BILL 2232

This so-called fair employment practice bill is now awaiting congressional consideration and enactment.

The title of this bill is "To prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin or ancestry."

No fair-minded person can quarrel with the elimination of discriminatory practices. There are several ways, however, of accomplishing this objective. The best way is by the process of education, which has already achieved results. The desired objectives can be defeated by improper legislation.

With this in mind every Member of Congress, every employer, and every labor leader should examine the provisions of this bill.

Consider the following words and phrases quoted verbatim in terms of how the national economy might be affected. Note the wording is subtle—the implications are hidden—but authority is written into this measure which can and may destroy the fundamental principles of a successful, private free enterprise.

1. "In the matter of employment, and in matters relating thereto" and "in the matter of compensation with respect to, or in other terms or conditions of employment."

This bill provides for control of your hiring by outsiders—persons not in your employ. It aims not only to tell you whom you may employ—it controls all phases relating to employment, including promotions, wages, hours, retirements, vacations, lay-offs, discharges, and in-plant employee activities.

2. "Against properly qualified persons."

At first thought it may seem proper enough to prohibit discrimination against persons properly qualified. But according to these terms a single outside Government agency or agent can determine for every business or employer in the United States who is properly qualified for employment and advancement in his business. In this bill, properly qualified means properly qualified in the opinion of the Government agent assigned to investigate alleged acts of discrimination. It means qualified by such theories as that outsider determines for your business; not necessarily related to the tests and standards developed through experience and practice by the one whose enterprise is at stake. Your judgment as an employer to select a group of individuals and build an organization which will work together as a team is outlawed when it conflicts with the judgment of an outside agent.

An employer would have to police every line of applicants at his doorway, both to insure that the hiring of the first to come did not result in discrimination and also to prevent the strife and disorder which could be caused by such a law.

3. "The term 'employer' means a person having in his employ six or more individuals or any other person acting in the interest of such an employer directly or indirectly."

By this language, the test is not whether you as an employer of six or more persons, authorized an act made unlawful by the bill.

The above provision makes you liable for back-pay awards, and subject to expensive legal proceedings if the alleged act was done by a person who was acting even indirectly in your interest. These words have been held to include trade associations, civic organizations, counsel, superintendents, foremen, or anyone placed in a position to represent you.

4. "The Commission is empowered (1) to prevent unfair-employment practices by employers affecting commerce; (2) to prevent unfair-employment practices by employers who are parties to contracts with the United States or any Territory or possession thereof, or with any agency or instrumentality of any of the foregoing, and by employers performing, pursuant to subcontract or otherwise, any work required for the performance of any such contract."

Under this section an employer of six or more persons comes under the law if the work of his employees in any way affects interstate commerce. The Supreme Court has held that elevator operators in a building having tenants doing business in interstate commerce come under such language. Moreover, if an employer sells to the Government, or if he is a subcontractor, that is, if he supplies material or services, no matter how remotely, if ultimately the user is the Government or a governmental agency he comes under this law. Anyone who contracts with a governmental agency or instrumentality, will come under this law.

Note: Government agencies and instrumentalities have been held by the courts to include even national banks.

5. "The right to work without discrimination because of race, creed, color, national origin or ancestry is declared to be an immunity of all citizens of the United States, which shall not be abridged by any State or instrumentality or creature of the United States or of any State."

The Constitution of the United States protects recognized privileges and immunities of citizens and under the fourteenth amendment no State may abridge such privileges and immunities. This bill would by the above language, amend the Constitution by applying a strained definition of the word "immunity." It would thus extend the bill to the States and also to creatures of States—that is, to cities, towns, and villages, public schools and State schools and colleges. By invoking the fourteenth amendment through such construction of the word "immunity" freedom of contract guaranteed by a State constitution or law would also be destroyed.

6. "It shall be an unfair employment practice for the purposes of this act for any labor union to deny full membership rights and privileges to any individual * * * to expel from membership * * * to discriminate against any member, employer, or individual seeking employment because of race, creed, color, national origin or ancestry."

This in effect puts governmental agencies in control of labor union membership.

7. "The Commission shall have power * * * to cooperate with or utilize regional, State, local, and other agencies, and to utilize voluntary and uncompensated services * * * to make such technical studies as are appropriate * * * and to make results of such studies available to interested Government and nongovernmental agencies."

In what other law have secret and confidential data and official files involving the rights of the individual citizen been turned over, by specific statutory command, to private, nongovernmental agencies? Who are these mysterious nongovernmental agencies—left undefined and anonymous in the law—and who are these volunteers, clothed with statutory authority to render uncompensated services? The so-called voluntary and uncompensated services might be irresponsible, self-serving, or subversive organizations.

8. "Whenever it is alleged that any person has engaged in any such unfair employment practice, the Commission, or any referee, agent, or agency designated by the Commission for such purposes, shall have power to issue and cause to be served upon such person a complaint stating the charges in that respect and containing a notice of hearing before the Commission or a member thereof, or before a designated referee, agent, or agency at a place therein fixed not less than 10 days after the serving of said complaint."

Before you can prove that you did not discriminate "against properly qualified persons," the following train of events are, by the above language, placed in motion against you:

(1) You would be investigated, prosecuted, and judged by an agency of the Commission, which may be a volunteer and uncompensated agency. This is not a court trial by judge and jury.

(2) You must answer the charges in 10 days and appear in any place designated by the Commission.

(3) The Commission or any agent or agencies thereof would have power to examine or copy your records, or that of any person under such investigation, may issue subpenas for the appearance of witnesses, administer oaths, etc., to effect the investigation.

(4) The Commission may require witnesses to appear and produce evidence from any place in the United States or its possessions at any place designated by the Commission for the hearing.

(5) In case of contumacy (that is, a refusal of a witness to respond to a subpena) the Federal district court in the concerned district would have jurisdiction of the person refusing to respond and could order his appearance before the Commission; a refusal of a court order could be punished by contempt.

(6) The Commission would have power to issue its own rules and regulations.

(7) Anyone resisting the administration of the provisions of the act, as administered by the Commission, and its designated agents, is subject to a $5,000 fine, or imprisonment for 1 year, or both.

(8) If after such an investigation and hearing, the Commission finds you guilty of discrimination, you will be required not only to cease and desist, but to take such affirmative action as will carry out the broad policies of the bill, including reinstatement or hiring with or without back pay as the Commission determines.

9. "Orders of the Commission shall be subject to judicial enforcement and judicial review in the same manner, to the same extent, and subject to the same provisions of law, as in the case of orders of the National Labor Relations Board."

It has been held in many cases under the Wagner Act that this means the Commission will have final power to weigh the evidence, making binding determinations of fact and draw inferences from the facts. In the Commonwealth Edison case, a circuit court of appeals sustained the Labor Relations Board because as the judge said, "We cannot say that the record is wholly barren of evidence to support the charge that they were discriminated against on account of union activities," and this holding was not reversed by the Supreme Court on appeal. In other words, the court can only review the legal questions and not the facts.

Bear in mind that every time an employer hires or discharges anyone, or anyone is elected to or dismissed from membership in

a labor union, a potential crime is committed. If there are 100 applicants for a job, it is possible for charges of discrimination to be brought by the 99 unsuccessful applicants. In this event, the employer must conclusively demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Commission or its agent that the applicant selected was clearly the best qualified for the job. If this is not possible, or if an honest mistake was made, it becomes necessary to prove that there was no intent to discriminate at the time, which it will be conceded is a practical impossibility. Furthermore, if the Commission, having read the employer's mind in retrospect, determine that he did, in fact, have discriminatory thoughts, there is no recourse from its decision, since, where there is any evidence to sustain the findings of the Commission the courts would be powerless to set aside its decision.

When an employer is forced to hire a particular applicant, and the employer and applicants not hired believe that someone else was entitled to the job according to sound standards of personnel administration, ill feeling will be engendered that could only cause racial antagonism and strife.

In cases where hearings are extended over long periods of time and large awards of back pay are ordered, many small businesses could be bankrupt.

EXHIBIT B

NEW YORK LAW AGAINST DISCRIMINATION

The following is a statement recently issued by the New York Commission Against Discrimination as it appeared in the Labor Relations Reporter of January 21, 1946 (17 LRR 679):

"Pursuant to section 131, subdivision 3, of the Law Against Discrimination, it shall be an unlawful employment practice for any employer or employment agency to make any of the following inquiries or requirements in connection with prospective employment:

"1. Place of birth of applicant.

"2. Place of birth of parent, spouse, or other close relatives.

"3. Requirement to produce birth or baptismal certificate or naturalization papers.

"4. Residence address of parents, spouse, or other close relatives.

"5. Wife's or mother's maiden name.

"6. Are you a native-born citizen?

"7. Are you a naturalized citizen?

"8. When did you acquire citizenship?

"9. What is the citizenship of spouse or parent?

"10. Religious affiliation of applicant.

"11. What church do you attend?

"12. Name of parish.

"13. Name of pastor.

"14. Denomination of applicant.

"15. Do you observe religious holidays? If so, what days?

"16. Lineage of applicant.

"17. Racial ancestry of applicant.

"18. Descent of applicant.

"19. Nationality of applicant.

"20. Complexion of applicant.

"21. Organizations of which applicant is a member, unless the question is so qualified as to except therefrom organizations of a religious, racial, or foreign national character.

"22. Schools of a particular religious denomination attended by applicant.

"23. Previous military experience of applicant, unless limited to the armed forces of the United States.

"24. Use of a space on application form opposite title "appearance" by either the applicant or the interviewer.

"25. A requirement by an employer for a photograph.

"These inquiries and/or requirements may, however, be made subsequent to employment provided the information or data thus obtained is not used as a basis for discrimination.

"The following inquiries and/or requirements on applications for employment have been held by the State commission against discrimination to be proper and lawful—oh, yeah!

"1. Are you a citizen of the United States?

"2. Is your spouse or parent a citizen of the United States?

"3. Public or private schooling of applicant.

4. Do you have the ability to use a foreign language?

"5. Do you regularly attend a house of worship?

"6. Do you have any military experience?

"7. A requirement by a privately operated foreign language school that persons applying for teaching positions have been born and received their education in a country wherein the language they intend teaching is the native tongue, and inquiries by the school seeking to elicit that information."

Bevin Gives Vishinsky the "Lie Direct"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1946

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the "confusion of tongues" in UNO seems to have reached the limit on yesterday in the bitter debate between Vice Foreign Commissar Andrei Vishinsky, of Soviet Russia, and Ernest Bevin, Foreign Secretary of the British Empire, in which Mr. Bevin gave Vishinsky the "lie direct."

Under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I am inserting excerpts from both of their speeches as they appeared in today's New York Times.

(The matter referred to follows:)

EXCERPTS FROM RUSSIAN VICE FOREIGN COMMISSAR ANDREI VISHINSKY'S SPEECH TO THE UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL

I would like to deal now with the declaration made by Mr. Bevin at the last meeting of the Security Council. One of the main features of the declaration made by Mr. Bevin was the careless way with which he dealt with facts.

This is why I should like to remind you again of these facts and of the interpretation given to these facts by Mr. Bevin, regarding the matter brought to the attention of the Security Council by the Soviet delegation according to the instructions of the Soviet Government.

I would like to remind you that Mr. Bevin said the question was raised whenever there was a discussion regarding the situation in Rumania, Bulgaria, or Poland. Mr. Bevin added that the Greek question was used as a counterattack against Great Britain whenever other countries in Europe were under discussion. The proof of the biased way in which Mr. Bevin has stated the situation may be obtained from the facts I will submit now.

I would like to remind the Council of the situation in Greece as it was at the time of the conference in Berlin. On the 20th of July, this Big Three met under the chairmanship of Mr. Truman and everyone listened to the declarations made by Mr. Molotov regarding the meeting of the Foreign Affairs Ministers dealing with several questions, including the question of Greece.

MOLOTOV'S ATTITUDE CITED

The declaration read in substance that Mr. Byrnes suggested a tripartite agreement in order to insure that representatives of the free press of the United Kingdom, United States of America, and the Soviet Union could go to Italy, Greece, Rumania, and Bulgaria, and freely travel in the countries and make complete reports on the facts. This report obtained the consent of Mr. Eden but Mr. Molotov did not see at that time the necessity of sending representatives of the press in Rumania and Bulgaria.

Regarding the question of Greece, the point of view of the Soviet Government was expressed in that document in the following terms:

I would like to remind you that in this memorandum submitted on the 21st of July, there was not a word said against Great Britain. We have only pointed out that the situation in Greece was very tense; that, in fact, it was a reign of terror, and this terror was promoted by that Government of Greece which was in power at the time. There was a serious menace of war against Albania and Bulgaria.

Now, I would like to remind you of all the facts which were listed in the document of the 21st of July. I would only insist on the two main points—that is, the two proposals made by the Soviet Government. The first was to reestablish diplomatic relations with Bulgaria, Rumania, Finland, and Hungary, as any delay in such direction would not be justified. The second was a recommendation to the Regent of Greece to take such steps as might insure the formation of a truly democratic government, and this in compliance with the terms of the agreement signed on the 12th of February, 1945, between the representatives of all parties of Greece—the Corsica agreement.

This document, which was then submitted, is now called by Mr. Bevin a tool of counterattack against Great Britain. When we made these recommendations we only had in mind to reestablish a really democratic government in Greece, and we hoped to obtain the support of Great Britain, and now Mr. Bevin says this was a counterattack against him. This may correspond to the funny ideas Mr. Bevin seems to have about what is an attack and what is a counterattack.

Mr. Bevin said in his speech that when the question of Poland, Rumania, or Bulgaria is discussed Mr. Molotov takes out of the deck of cards a king and says, "This is a wise gesture—that is my trick." And Mr. Bevin added, "And then we pull out the ace."

I would like to follow Mr. Bevin and to suggest in my turn that if international conferences be compared with a game of cards or if foreign politics are, indeed, a game of cards, if Mr. Bevin insists on such comparison, I should then follow him and say that the ace Mr. Bevin pulls out is not absolutely like a normal ace. * * *

Mr. Bevin said that the danger to peace in the world is the nonstop propaganda of Moscow against the British Commonwealth, the attack against the British Government. He said there was no friendship between those two countries and this, in his view, is a threat to peace in the world. I must say that it is the opinion of the Soviet delegation that nothing worse could have been said. * * *

Does he think that his declaration, that is, that his "propaganda" is a threat to peace—and I say right now that this declaration has no ground whatever—does he think it is in harmony with what he said about the friendship between our two nations? When we of the Soviet delegation—all of us—heard those words spoken here in the Security Council by the British delegate, we felt the cold breath of an unhappy past and we could not help thinking of the dark shadows who

in the past have worked not for good but for evil relations between our two countries.

I quote Mr. Sophianopoulos (former Greek Foreign Minister John Sophianopoulos): "And now I avail myself of the opportunity to observe that as I have said to British officials in London we cannot speak about the possibility of free and genuine elections unless a wide amnesty is granted. This was not granted by the most inefficient law which the government issued, aimed at 'decongestion of prisons.' Secondly, terrorism by responsible organizations and by state organs must cease. This terrorism was manifested in recent events at Kalamai. Thirdly, the state machine must be purged of all the Fascists and reactionary elements which remain at their posts, although they are remnants both of the dictatorship and enemy occupation."

Now I will ask Mr. Bevin, what will he say as to all these declarations that I have mentioned—declarations made by British political leaders, voicing their anxiety as to the situation which is fraught with grave consequences both for the Greek people and for the maintenance of peace and security: Is that also Moscow? Is that also a counterpart of Moscow? * * *

In his declaration Mr. Bevin mentioned the respective armed forces held in Bulgaria, in Yugoslavia, trying there to demonstrate that the balance of power presented no danger of aggression or aggressive action on the part of Greece. May I say that the figures given by Mr. Bevin were somewhat exaggerated, but the danger does not lie in the fact that the Greek armed forces are small or large; the danger is not linked with the proportion of troops in every country; it is linked with a situation where adventurers who have already possessed themselves of arms get beyond the control of the forces of order.

This is the case in Greece. With regard to this statement made on the military situation in that country this may lead to illusions which will certainly be exploited by the X or the adventurers from the nationalist elements in Greece. I would again like to quote Mr. Cocks when he said that the "irresponsible rightist elements in Greece are encouraged because they think they will get the support of Great Britain in anything they try." This is a dangerous situation and that is why the presence of British troops in Greece is working against democratic elements of the country even, and I may say that those democratic elements are paralyzed by the presence of British troops, whereas the reactionary elements become more active every day.

This is a regrettable situation, and we are compelled to say, as the Latin saying does, "Because Plato is my friend, I treasure his dear name." We do not want to have a foreign intervention; we do not want to have a situation where foreign troops intervene.

That is why the Soviet delegation insists on the immediate withdrawal of the British troops from Greece.

EXCERPTS FROM BRITISH FOREIGN SECRETARY ERNEST BEVIN'S SPEECH TO THE SECURITY COUNCIL

I presume it is necessary for me to take up point by point the complaints made by Mr. Vishinsky.

His first point against me was that in my statement last Friday I said that, whenever questions were raised relative to Rumania, Bulgaria, or other countries in which Soviet Russia was predominant, the question of Greece was immediately raised. The best evidence is the written documents. The United States on July 12, 1945, submitted a memorandum on the Yalta Declaration on liberated Europe, and that dealt mainly with Rumania and Bulgaria. At that time, France, Great Britain, and the United States had agreed to the holding of free unfettered elections in Greece, and the United States suggested that such a course was necessary for the countries I have mentioned.

That brought the memorandum which Mr. Vishinsky introduced about Greece at that conference: But it is rather striking that, notwithstanding his discussions, these are the words of Marshal Stalin. He replied that he had complete confidence in British policy in Greece.

It is rather interesting that Mr. Vishinsky should raise this particular point now, because on each occasion, as I said the last time we met here, the Soviet Government has either not pursued the matter or has expressed confidence in our country.

In London during the Council of Foreign Ministers, the United States Government made a statement that they did not regard Rumania and Bulgaria as democratic Governments, and immediately Mr. Molotov brought in Greece, although, I might say, Mr. Chairman, that with my usual practice I was taking no part in the discussion; I was leaving it to the protagonists. This is what I said: "Whenever a difficulty arose in that Council, Greece was always brought up. Greece was not even discussed between Mr. Byrnes and Mr. Molotov."

Far be it from me to belittle what anybody did in the war, especially in the extremity and difficulty Greece was going through.

GREECE AS ONLY ALLY

I think I ought to make an observation as to why Britain is so attached to Greece. It is not power politics, it is not economic interest; but the world should be reminded that outside the British Commonwealth, from 1940 to 1941, Greece was our only fighting ally withstanding the onslaught of the enemy. I leave the world to guess what everybody else was doing, but Britain was alone, and Greece not only placed her country, but he armies and her effort at the disposal of the Allied cause when it looked absolutely forlorn, and we are not going to forget her now.

I am not unfriendly to Russia; I just want equal treatment with them, that is all.

On the historical propaganda side your case, if I may say so, falls completely to the ground. It is perfectly true—and I acknowledge it—that when there was interference with the trade unions at one period I resisted. You built the Soviet Union, and if anybody attacks it, you fight—and quite right. I built in this country one of the largest unions in the world, which has a great record for raising the standard of life of our people, and at the period that it was attacked, it was my creation, and I fought—and quite right. That is the only time I have ever had any dispute. I do not say with the Government of the Soviet Union, but with the policy it has put over. To sum up: I accuse nobody. I think I have dealt with that matter.

What is the basic charge against Great Britain in which the honor of my country and the Commonwealth is involved? I repeat, in which the honor of my country and the Commonwealth is involved.

It is that we have deliberately put troops into Greece, supported certain elements in Greece, with the object or the likelihood of disturbing and endangering international peace.

Now, does Mr. Vishinsky believe that? If he does, then I ought not to be sitting at this table.

Does he believe the British Government, after all these years of war and bloodshed, to be engaged on a policy of using its troops to disturb or endanger the peace of the world in any way at all, or anywhere?

If that is true, you ought to tell me to leave this table because I am not fit to be with you, because you are established to maintain world peace and I am branded, at the first meeting, as being the one person in the world disturbing and endangering world peace.

It is said that we are suppressing the EAM [National Liberation Front] or, as they are said to be, the majority of the people. I do not know which political party in Greece has the majority and I defy anybody to tell me until we have had the elections. I am told by the Royalists that if the elections take place now they will win. I am told by the EAM that they will win. Well, as an old campaigner, I never decide who has won until they come to ballot, and I think that is a very wise precaution.

I do not mind confessing to this audience I thought we were beaten in the last election, but I woke up to discover we had won, and with the mystery of a free election it is not until the boxes are opened and the votes are counted that you do know, provided the thing is conducted fairly. On that basis it is the policy of the British Government to try and get a stable government out of that election and to carry out what we have told the Greek Government: As soon as they have got that over and they have got their government, they should by that time have the police organized and such army as they need—within a very short time, anyway—and we want to withdraw. I have repeated this to the Soviet Government over and over again and they have always accepted it, so I could not understand why this was put on the agenda here.

In the document that was submitted by the United States Government, a free press and free access was asked for all the satellite countries of eastern Europe, and, in Mr. Vishinsky's own words, you will note that was declined, but there has never been a refusal to the press even when they have been against us and against the Greek Government in Greece. It has been open to the world the whole time.

That is why you get so much information, and bad information at times.

We are endeavoring to build this up on a basis of freedom: As I said the other day, by trial and error endeavoring to assist governments, whoever they may be, so that Greece may come back into her own.

Now I did make a mention of propaganda. I am sure Mr. Vishinsky will not deny that the reference to Greece continuously is very unsettling and he is setting one section of the community against the other. But he says, as I understand it, the British troops are there protecting the right.

I give the lie direct to that.

We have protected all the people whenever the Greek Government has called upon us to do it or whenever we have discovered a danger to public order.

My information about any terror—which I do not admit—is that there were over the whole country, from December 20 to January 13, 122 incidents perpetrated by the Left, 41 by the Right and 58 persons unknown. * * *

I do not believe in wars of nerves by propaganda or press, and that is why I ask, in my closing words, that all our influence should be used in Greece as elsewhere to direct the attention of the inhabitants to economic rehabilitation and reconstruction. That is the great task for us.

I do not feel I am on the defense. The conscience of the British Government is clean and clear. It cannot submit to the condemnation of the Soviet Government, either by inference or implication. Neither will the British people. I think to the tune of nearly 100 percent in this country, they would resent it, and I believe I speak for the whole British Commonwealth when I say it.

We have been hauled before the tribunal of the world without a single word to us, and charged with what I would regard as against humanity the most diabolical crime that any nation could be charged with—of endangering the peace of the world.

Congress Double-Crossed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 5, 1946

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the Bristol (Pa.) Courier of January 31, 1946:

CONGRESS DOUBLE-CROSSED

It begins to look as though the White House pulled a fast one on Congress when the administration talked the legislative branch of government into passing for President Truman the plan which was refused President Roosevelt—the reorganization bill.

President Roosevelt asked it in the name of efficiency. He said in effect that the Federal employees would work harder if he were given the right to hire and fire without question; if the tenure provisions of civil service were made dependent on the will of the Chief Executive and his political associates.

President Truman sought the same powers in the name of economy. The steam was generated by the revelations of Senator BYRD, Virginia Democrat, that the Federal pay roll was at least 300,000 too high for war and 2,500,000 too high for peace.

Implied by the President's request for the reorganization bill was a promise to demobilize the civilian army, so much of which got a free ride on the war effort.

It has been obvious for months that upward of $5,000,000,000 of Federal costs could be saved by dropping Federal employees no longer needed—and that amount of saving would put even the Truman budget into balance.

But the bill has been passed, and the President has signed it into law, and nothing has happened.

Once the bill was in his hands, the President said what he had been careful not to say earlier—that at the very best he couldn't see a chance to reduce the pay rolls more than 25 percent.

His recent Budget message went even further. Somewhat defiantly he told Congress that it would be impossible to economize in the pay roll without cutting off Federal services.

Moreover, he continues to demand new and extravagant measures of Federal activity under which the pay roll could be boosted many times—to 10,000,000 Federal employees or more.

There is little in all this to cause surprise. Congress made the best of a bad bargain when it passed the authority over to the White House instead of trying to use it itself—Congress can control the pay roll only at long range, and can do it efficiently only with White House cooperation.

Doubtless the Congressmen who voted the President the powers he asked took it for granted that the public would thenceforth know that the President had assumed the responsibility for making the economies so urgently needed.

The fact is that the President shows no trace whatever of any true intention to economize. His new budget is 4 times higher than the expenditures of the years just prior to the war, 7 times higher than any rate of taxation in prewar years, and 10 times more than the expenditures of the Republican administration of the twenties—when the debts of the First World War were being repaid.

The "savings" which gave the President much publicity in the early months of his administration consisted of wiping out projected war expenditures. But even this procedure had a catch to it. The excess of appropriations, in many cases, went to the Treasury, and now the President seeks to interpret this surplus as "cash" and use it further to inflate the Nation's buying power.

Federal employment has risen since the close of the war, and the end is not in sight.

What is happening is sufficiently obvious. Democratic Chairman Hannegan has let the cat out of the bag again and again.

President Truman, who learned his politics in the machine school in Missouri, sees only one way to perpetuate his party's power at Washington—and to get himself reelected. That method is job patronage.

In a close election, the votes which 2,500,000 politically chosen Federal employees can control would mean victory to the Democratic Party.

If three out of five of the employees were dropped, as the outstanding Democratic expert in this field says should be done, the Hannegan-Truman chances of holding the Democratic majority in the two Houses of Congress this fall would vanish.

Senator BYRD himself has said he has taken his political life in his hands by insisting that bureaucrats be fired for the twofold reasons that they no longer have work to do and that the cost of supporting them in Federal jobs is driving the Nation toward bankruptcy.

What is this patronage raid costing the American taxpayers? That is not hard to figure.

BYRD's surveys show that at least $5,000,000,000 a year could be saved by dropping unneeded Federal employees.

On the basis of 140,000,000 population in the United States, that is $35.72 a year for each.

Would you like to have your tax bill cut $35.72, starting at once? If you are the wage earner for an average family of five, would you care to keep the $178.60 a year of your money which the Democratic high command is wasting in purely political job patronage?

Those are the figures—check them for yourself.

And the waste, from present indications, will mount steadily until the taxpayers of this Nation make their resentment felt.

Conditions in the Rice Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES DOMENGEAUX
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HCUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 4, 1946

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a letter written by Members of Congress from rice-producing States to Secretary of Agriculture Anderson deploring the unfortunate and desperate situation in which the rice industry of America finds itself and asking his assistance in immediately relieving this situation by the allocation of sufficient rice to take care of domestic consumption in this country:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 30, 1946.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ANDERSON: We are writing to you because of the serious and desperate circumstances under which the rice industry of the United States finds itself in its inability to reasonably supply its normal domestic trade because of the Government's set-aside order on rice.

The best-informed rice-industry sources estimate that as of January 1, 1946, there were available for distribution from all sources of the United States about 8,000,000 pockets of rice broken down as follows:

	Pockets
3 Southern States	6,000,000
California	2,100,000
Total	8,100,000
Recoverable by FMA of approximately 1,500,000 pockets owed in arrears by the mills under the 40-percent set-aside order effective until Dec. 31	1,500,000
Leaving a balance of	6,600,000
Product of proposed 50-percent set-aside in the South	3,000,000
Product of proposed 70-percent set-aside in California	1,500,000
Total	4,500,000
Leaving a balance of	2,100,000
Fit for industrial users only	600,000
Balance	1,500,000
Unshipped against Cuban commitment	1,500,000
Leaving a balance for civilian consumption January through July 1946	0

The above tabulation reflects that there will be practically no rice available for civilian consumption over a 7-month period, or until the next crop, against a normal consumption rate of about 600,000 bags monthly, exclusive of rice suitable only for industrial users.

Information that we have indicates that there is now on hand an infinitesimal supply of rice with wholesalers throughout the country and that the domestic trade can be supplied only after recoverables in arrears of approximately 1,500,000 pockets are made by the mills to the PMA under the 40 percent set-aside order effective until December 31 of last year.

We must all recognize that the only assured market the rice industry will have after postwar readjustments are effected will be the domestic market and we are greatly concerned and fear the recurrence of what happened following World War I when due precisely to circumstances as we have now, a great deal of rice was channeled to offshore areas and the domestic rate of consumption showed a sharp decline which required a number of years to build up to its present figure of approximately 6 pounds per capita. The rice industry has spent millions of dollars in the past in advertising the use of rice. This set-aside order completely destroys this movement and will do much in reducing the per capita consumption in this country.

From the above tabulation it is also shown that of the approximately 8,000,000 bags of available stock as of January 1, 1946, some 5,500,000 pockets are earmarked, or set aside, for the Production and Marketing Administration. Of that total quantity, about 40 percent will go to the Territories in the way of commercial exports and 60 percent is intended for relief in the Philippine Islands and other Asiatic areas.

It is not the contention of the rice industry that our Government should not make every effort to relieve hunger and suffering in the Philippine Islands and other Asiatic areas. It does contend, however, that even though there is a world shortage of rice, it is an established fact that very substantial

quantities of rice are available in some of the surplus producing areas in the Orient and that the equivalent of the relatively large percentage of our remaining stocks could be obtained from these areas, thus not jeopardizing the future of an industry which even under most favorable circumstances is very precarious.

It is contended that although substantial quantities of rice have been found available in the Orient since VJ-day the total quantity is still far short of urgent necessities. That is the feature of the whole situation which the industry feels requires the most careful consideration. In the year 1919–20 the same critical deficit situation throughout the Orient was claimed, particularly by the British Government, who had actually in effect established an embargo on exports from Burma. As a result of that situation the price of rice advanced from 7 cents to as high as 13 cents per pound. In the late spring of 1920, like a bolt from the blue, this embargo was removed and the whole world was flooded with oriental rice under British marketing.

It is the belief of the rice industry that in making rather generous allocations for the Philippine Islands and the UNRRA the Department of Agriculture representatives on the Combined Food Board overestimated the available quantity of American rice, as of January 1, and that if the industry is not to suffer very serious harm from an entire lack of rice in the domestic market over the next 6 or 7 months, the whole picture should be reviewed and at least a reasonable minimum assured for the domestic market before it is allocated for relief in any direction.

We Members of Congress representing the rice-producing and consuming areas of the United States feel very strongly about this and are respectfully requesting that a complete review of this problem be made.

We understand that England has entered into an agreement whereby she is to get free from the Siam Government the equivalent of 1,500,000 tons of rice, twice the normal yearly production of this country. We are in doubt as to when she will get this but there is no question of the fact that she has pocketed this supply. Furthermore we are told that Brazil has negotiated the sale of her excess rice to England. Isn't it very clear what is the inevitable result of these negotiations. England will capture the world rice market and the United States will be left with her surpluses with a reduced domestic consumption caused by this short-sighted allocation program.

We are also informed that because of the very strict grading regulations and requirements of the Government the best rice has been channeled away from the domestic trade leaving inferior rice for domestic consumption. This is, in our opinion, inexcusable.

We have delegated our colleagues, Congressmen DOMENGEAUX and LARCADE, of Louisiana; MILLS and NORRELL, of Arkansas; and JOHNSON of California to discuss and take up this matter with you.

We feel that American industry and the American public should be taken care of first.

With all good wishes, we are

Sincerely yours,

HENRY D. LARCADE, Jr., Member of Congress, Seventh District, Louisiana; JAMES DOMENGEAUX, Member of Congress, Third District, Louisiana; PAUL H. MALONEY, Member of Congress, Second District, Louisiana; WILBUR D. MILLS, Member of Congress, Second District, Arkansas; OVERTON BROOKS, Member of Congress, Fourth District, Louisiana; BROOKS HAYS, Member of Congress, Fifth District, Arkansas; A. LEONARD ALLEN, Member of Congress, Eighth District, Louisiana; C. E. MCKENZIE, Member of Congress, Fifth District, Louisiana; F. EDW. HÉBERT, Member of Congress, First District, Louisiana; J. J. MANSFIELD, Member of Congress, Ninth District, Texas; JAMES P. RICHARDS, Member of Congress, Fifth District, South Carolina; J. M. COMBS, Member of Congress, Second District, Texas; W. F. NORRELL, Member of Congress, Fifth District, Arkansas; MILTON H. WEST, Member of Congress, Fifteenth District, Texas; LEROY JOHNSON, Member of Congress, Third District, California; ALBERT THOMAS, Member of Congress, Eighth District, Texas; E. C. GATHINGS, Member of Congress, First District, Arkansas; TOM PICKETT, Member of Congress, Seventh District Texas; BERTRAND W. GEARHART, Member of Congress, Ninth District, California; JIMMY MORRISON, Member of Congress, Sixth District, Louisiana; CLARENCE F. LEA, Member of Congress, First District, California; EUGENE WORLEY, Member of Congress, Eighteenth District, Texas; A. J. ELLIOTT, Member of Congress, Tenth District, California; ALLEN J. ELLENDER, United States Senator, Louisiana; JOHN H. OVERTON, United States Senator, Louisiana; J. W. FULBRIGHT, United States Senator, Arkansas; W. LEE O'DANIEL, United States Senator, Texas; JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, United States Senator, Arkansas; WM. F. KNOWLAND, United States Senator, California.

St. Lawrence-Great Lakes Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1946

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to say that on January 16, 1946, my colleague, Representative WILLIAM A. PITTENGER, of Minnesota, under his extension of remarks included a copy of a letter from Governor Lausche, of Ohio, to Gov. James H. Davis, of Louisiana, of date November 19, 1945, on the subject of the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes seaway.

Mr. Speaker, in order that the position of my governor on this subject may be known, and in order to keep the record straight, I ask unanimous consent that the letter of Gov. James H. Davis of date November 19, 1945, addressed to Governor Lausche, of Ohio, be also printed in the RECORD, which is as follows:

NOVEMBER 19, 1945.

Hon. FRANK J. LAUSCHE,
Governor of Ohio,
Columbus, Ohio.

DEAR GOVERNOR LAUSCHE: Down here we feel that it would not be economical for the Federal Government to undertake the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes seaway and power project, which, according to the best available information, would cost the taxpayers of the United States upwards of a billion dollars. The Great Lakes region is prosperous and enjoys low freight rates. Other sections of our country are not so fortunate.

We feel that the proposed agreement with Canada was framed with less consideration to the affairs of all the people than should have been given, and that such a project with a foreign country should be considered as a treaty by the elected United States Senate, and are so advising our Senators.

We would be glad to have you join us in this effort, and with kindest regards and best wishes, I am

Yours very truly,

JIMMIE H. DAVIS,
Governor of Louisiana.

Mr. Speaker, it is needless to say, of course, that I agree with the position of the Governor of Louisiana.

If I Were King

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Hon. Samuel B. Pettengill, a former Member of this House:

IF I WERE KING

(By Samuel B. Pettengill)

A great author once wrote a story: "If I Were King." I suppose every decent-minded person wishes, at times, that he were a king, not to feed his vanity with the trappings of thrones, but to use his power to benefit his fellowmen.

If two choices were offered me; one to be the richest man in the world so I could turn my vast estates into public parks (as Caesar did in his last will in Shakespeare's play) or endow churches or colleges, or finance laboratories to seek the cure for some dread plague, I would turn it down if the other choice granted me were the power to get all of my fellow Americans to truly understand the priceless heritage they have in the American Constitution.

I say this soberly and after years of reflection. If this were in my power to do, I know my name would go down in history as a greater benefactor than any, and perhaps all the rich men who have ever endowed public charities. Such an understanding would enable common men everywhere to themselves build their own fortunes. It would lead to a country invincible abroad and happy at home.

Only one thing would I value more, that being my own understanding and ability to teach the laws of God for men, individually and socially. Part of these laws are, indeed, in the Constitution.

The Bible and the Constitution. "And the floods came and the winds blew and beat upon that house and it fell not, for it was founded upon a rock." The storm-tossed stars and stripes is, with one possible exception, the oldest flag that streams anywhere against the wind. It flies over the only undefeated great nation in the entire history of the world.

The American people do have a deep reverence for the Constitution in the same way as they revere the memory of brave but unknown men who long ago died for freedom at Valley Forge or the Alamo.

It has, however, been a long time since Madison, Hamilton, and Jay wrote the Federalist Papers to explain every word and sentence in the Constitution—a long time since the Fourth of July meant much to American youth beside the noise of firecrackers.

We need new Madisons, new Websters, new Calhouns. We need a new Benjamin Hill, who, in the postbellum days of the old South, said, "The Constitution is my only client, and its preservation is the only fee I ask."

Recognizing, as Jefferson did, that "laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind," I still believe, as our fathers hoped, that the basic truths of the Constitution constituted "a new order for the ages"; or as in the Latin words, "Novus ordo seclorum" which they inscribed on America's Great Seal, as you will see it pictured on the back of the dollar bill in your pocket. It was intended to be "for the ages." I believe most of the social and political ills of our time, including depressions and unemployment, are due to the fact that we have veered from the course our fathers charted.

The cavernous bureaus of Government today are spinning intricate and sticky spider webs of countless laws, rules and regulations which entangle the bees from the human hive; the taxes they levy for their support discourage thrift and growth, and in addition the favors of government have become a vast prize, immorally fought for by huge pressure groups which are carrying on a fierce civil war of mutual exploitation.

This is a far cry from the free government our fathers designed where young men might climb the ladder to success by their own efforts, where ambition had its open field, and honest work its earned reward.

I will never believe that millions of men will work as hard to support the wives and children of unknown men in other towns, cities and States, as they will to build a rooftree for their own wives and for their children. (This is the fundamental fallacy of socialism.) We have not yet reached that point, but when the Federal Government takes away in taxes from 20 percent to 50 or 75 percent of what a man earns and gives it to the support of people he never saw, we are fast approaching a stagnant and discouraged America, which can only be revived by the hypodermic of war and death.

Our fathers faced the great issue of individualism or collectivism. They designed the Constitution to safeguard the individual. The State was to serve him and give him his chance; it was not to make him serve it and deprive him of his chance. They did not intend men to make their living like robber bands, preying upon each other with the ballot as their weapon of pillage. They intended, as God said to men in Genesis, "In the sweat of thy brow thou shalt eat bread."

"I am not," said Jefferson, "the friend of an energetic government. It is bound to become oppressive."

Due to popular ignorance of the true meaning and worth of the Constitution, which enshrined the individual and the family at the hearthstone as the very handiwork of the Creator, the materialism of a godless communism is eating its way, like termites in the timbers of a house, into every nook and corner of the American edifice.

It is not the Constitution which has failed us; we have failed it. We have been the unfaithful stewards of the trust our fathers, dying, committed to our care.

With the actual record of great achievement under the Constitution in releasing the energies of free men in the greatest march of progress in the history of mankind, it is amazing indeed that so many Americans in their ignorance are embracing the reactionary philosophies of the Europe our forefathers thought they had left behind them forever, and whose governments now build barbed wire stockades at their frontiers to prevent the escape of desperate men seeking freedom from their cruelties.

Yes, if it were in my power, I would call back from their graves, the brooding spirits of Washington, Franklin, Madison, and Jefferson. I would:

"Wake the dead,
Bid the old heroes rise from their graves and scourge with their tongues
Until this vain and rotting age, revitalized, shall rush
To emulate their deeds, or learn to blush."

I would try, too, "if I were king," to wake the teachers, pastors, editors, lawyers, and the youth of today, so that Americans yet unborn may proudly say, "freedom has still a continent to dwell on."

A Republican Platform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 5, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, Republicans desirous of winning election and restoring constitutional government will do well to read the address of Dwight H. Green, Governor of Illinois, delivered December 7, last. That address reads as follows:

It is a high honor and privilege for me, as Governor, to welcome to Illinois this meeting of the Republican National Committee. We earnestly trust that this meeting may make a real contribution to the welfare of the party and our country.

Although I appear here as Governor of Illinois, I speak as a Republican—a loyal worker in the party which from the time it nominated Abraham Lincoln for President has been the defender of our national unity and strength, and the champion of liberty and opportunity for the American people.

As a Republican I realize the importance, the truly crucial importance, of this meeting, which must make the basic preparations for the congressional campaign of 1946. It is time for all Republicans to give thought to a concrete statement of our fundamental principles and the major issues of the day. I am glad to know that our Republican Members of Congress are submitting to this meeting a set of resolutions upon which they have been working together for some time. I most earnestly hope that this session of your committee will adopt a sound declaration of principles upon which we shall stand in the 1946 campaign and by which we will stand come what may.

To that end may I offer some suggestions which represent my own deep convictions and, I am convinced, the feelings of many Republicans in Illinois and the Middle West. In doing so I face the facts squarely. The Republican Party has lost the last four Presidential elections. It has not won control of either House of Congress for 14 years.

This is a record of failure which we should not attempt to gloss over. Those who minimize our defeats by reference to numerous State and local victories are deluding themselves. The Republican Party was founded to elect, not sheriffs, but Presidents. It was born as a national party, has always been a national party, and, if it cannot win national elections, has lost its main reason for existence.

The time has come, therefore, when we must seek out the causes which produced our record of failure. They are not at all obscure. Our party has failed nationally, chiefly because it has not been true to the faith that is in us.

Thus we believe in private enterprise, but we have offered only feeble protests as private enterprise has been hemmed in and restricted by Federal taxation, regulation, and regimentation until it cries for help.

We seldom have had the courage to tell people who want something for nothing from the United States Treasury that we cannot give it to them.

We believe in balanced budgets, but we have not been sufficiently vigorous in opposing Federal squanderings that make a balanced budget impossible, and a rise in the national debt inevitable. We have said we are against inflation, but we have tolerated inflationary policies to appease various pressure groups.

We believe it is the duty of the National Government to enact and enforce a sound labor policy which protects the rights of labor, capital, and the public, the last being the innnocent victim of many labor disputes. Yet in the past we have failed to propose a concrete program to accomplish that purpose.

We know that our country is today by long odds the strongest of all nations, more than a match for any combination that might be brought against us, but we have too often given lip service to a foreign policy founded upon fear. We have been told that we must not raise our voice against the rape of Java by the British and Dutch for fear of offending some voters; and we have been told we must not even protest against the shameful betrayal of Poland for fear of offending Russia's following over here. We say we don't want Communist votes—and whether we do or not, we can never expect to get them—but we act as if they were about to fall into one lap if only we behave with circumspection.

It is true that the New Deal opposition has employed just such tactics of double talk and deceit with notable success. It does not follow, however, that we can profit by imitation. Indeed, we know—or should know by now—that we can't. If the moral wrong of playing both ends against the middle doesn't deter us, we ought to be restrained by the knowledge that we cannot hope to equal our opponents in making false promises. We are amateurs; they are past masters at that game.

By this time the country knows that the New Dealers cannot be trusted. They promised Palestine to the Arabs and to the Jews at the same time. They gave Poland to the Poles and to the Russians. They told us that lend-lease would keep the Nation out of war when they knew it wouldn't. They told the fathers and mothers of America that their sons would not be called upon to fight on foreign soil. They promised peace when they knew war was upon us.

The country knows all this and much more like it. The people are tired of double talk. No party can be all things to all men. Let us Republicans be true to ourselves and our honest beliefs. I predict that if we do that, we shall gain 10 votes for every one we lose.

The cornerstone of our program must be the vigorous protection of the people of America from future attack. This is the first duty of our Government.

We do not agree that the American people were to blame for Pearl Harbor. We are determined that there shall never be another Pearl Harbor. We demand that the superiority of our Army and Navy and their air arms in numbers and in the scientific weapons of modern warfare shall be rigidly maintained.

Therefore, we are gravely worried at the failure of the Truman administration to take effective steps to insure the holding of the vital air and sea bases for American defense, which we have established during the war at such great cost of American money and American blood. While the Truman administration has dallied with these vital matters, our allies are engaged in a mad scramble to regain their lost possessions, to extend their frontiers, and to establish unilateral spheres of influence.

We demand that our Government take prompt and unequivocal action to insure the permanent retention of these bases under complete American control.

We favor the fullest cooperation with other nations to insure peace, but we insist that the makers of our foreign policy cling to our American ideals of justice and liberty. We must never condone the suppression of liberty in Poland, in the Baltic States, in the Balkans, or in any nation in Europe, Asia, or elsewhere. It must be our vigorous policy to use the leverage afforded by the discussion of forgiveness of lend-lease, or of requests for new loans, and every other peaceful means, to speed the liberation of the people of these nations.

Just as vigorously we must support in our dealings with all nations concerned the right of free Jewish immigration into Palestine. May we not hope that American influence, properly used, can achieve that long-cherished goal of world Jewry with the due protection of the rights of all?

The Republicans of the Middle West will never approve the administration's indifference of the extension of human slavery, whether the victims be the peoples of the nations we ha e defeated in war or the unfortunate natives of Malaya and southeastern Asia.

We believe that Christian principles and the future peace of the world alike demand that the American treatment of the Filipinos must be the model for the future policy of all nations toward the peoples of the Orient.

In short, we propose a complete about-face from the weak and vacillating Truman New Deal diplomacy which has suffered the most humiliating defeat in American history. With the greatest military force in the world, it has lost every skirmish on the diplomatic front. The "four freedoms" and the Atlantic Charter have not only been disregarded, but specifically violated. American diplomacy under Truman, instead of standing as a fortress for the freedom of peoples and the integrity of national existence of small nations, has become the abject servant of British, French, and Communist imperialism. Truman-Democratic-New Deal diplomacy is losing the peace 6 months after American armies and navies won the war. Power politics again rules the world, and the Truman administration has stood helplessly by. We warn that appeasement now can be as dangerous as at Munich, especially when it means compromise with the conscience of America.

Just as firmly we must demand a return to a sound basis in our national economy. We believe the time has come to bring national expenditures down to the tax receipts of our National Government. We must live within our income, and that basic thinking should govern our consideration of loans or gifts to other nations.

We insist upon rigid honesty throughout the national administration, and that there be prompt end to the use of public power for personal gain. Particularly, we urge Congress immediately to enact legislation requiring full publicity to all deals for disposal of surplus war goods or alien property.

We face the fact that the present and future prosperity of America depends on the prompt reconversion of American business to a sound peacetime economy. Increased production of sorely needed materials, tools, and consumer goods is our paramount need today. Without increased production we cannot check the current trend of inflation nor achieve the full employment which is our hope to avoid the equally serious perils of deflation.

We believe that such increased production can be accomplished only by the fullest cooperation of American industry, American agriculture, and American labor under the profit motives of our system of free enterprise. We believe that system has demonstrated its superiority to ny system in the world both in the miracle of our production for war, and in the long-range record of American industrial expansion which has produced for the American people the highest standard of living the world has even known.

We charge that our production has now bogged down mainly because the Truman New Deal Administration has failed to clear away obstacles to reconversion created by appressive Federal tax policies and a maze of Federal bureaucratic regulation. Particularly it has failed to protect the interests and preserve the opportunities of small business in our economic life.

We believe that the regimentation of American business, American agriculture, and American labor must be speedily terminated; that special war controls should be ended as quickly as possible, and that powers of Congress and the State governments, delegated to the President in the war emergency, should be speedily restored to Congress and the States. Freedom from regimentation is the objective of a liberty-loving people; governmental controls should be limited to the prevention of abuses and dishonesty, and the correction of gross inequalities.

We believe that the increased production so vital to our national prosperity can be achieved only under conditions that insure prosperity for both capital and labor. We deplore the tremendous loss in production and the serious delay in reconversion resulting from a wave of labor disuptes which has swept the Nation. The issues in these disputes are almost hopelessly complicated by the efforts of the New Deal tinkerers with our national economy to lead us in opposite directions at the same time.

The basis of practically every labor dispute today is the natural desire of the workers to receive under peacetime conditions a "take home" pay at least equal to the amount they received while working overtime hours during the war emergency. They are supported by those who argue that the levels of workers' incomes must be maintained to provide the buying power required to support the full-employment program for our country. However desirable this may be, from the employer's point of view, it means an increase in his unit cost of production and if he proposes to meet this cost by increased prices he runs into the ukase of another group of New Dealers which says that you can't increase prices. In this situation, the American businessman is chanting the familiar words of a late leader of the Democratic Party who could not stomach the New Deal: "You can't have it both ways." The President of the United States has been unable to show us how we can have it both ways, and I do not believe it can be accomplished by law or by the creation of any additional bureaus or so-called fact-finding bodies.

We endorse collective bargaining. The right to bargain implies the right to refuse terms offered—the right of labor to strike and the right of management to shut down if satisfactory agreements on wages and conditions cannot be reached. Strikes and shutdowns are expensive to the public, but they are more expensive to the employers and employees involved. We believe that most of our labor conflicts could be settled promptly if management and labor were free to negotiate in their own interests. I see no effective solution to this problem until free and unfettered collective bargaining is restored. I trust that the position you take here on labor will be clear and forthright, and that we shall not promise what we cannot perform.

We reaffirm our belief in the Bill of Rights as written in our Federal and State constitutions, and dedicate ourselves to their full enforcement everywhere in our land, regardless of race, creed, or color.

We believe that social security must be placed upon an actuarially sound fiscal basis; that the Truman administration must stop using Social Security funds for the current expenses of the Federal Government, and that the Social Security collections should not be used as an indirect means of raising taxes to be spent by extravagant governmental agencies.

Most important of all, the Republican Party must pledge to the American people the fulfillment of our Nation's obligation to provide a sound and happy future for the veterans of this war. That obligation transcends any supposed obligation to our allies or to the world. It is first in the hearts of the fathers and mothers, the wives and sweethearts, and the sisters and brothers of 11,000,000 fighting men and women. Together they constitute a majority of the American people.

First they ask the speedy return to civilian life of every American at home and abroad whose service is not absolutely essential to our national interests. And the test of the essentialness of any military service must lie in the simple question: Is what that man is doing so necessary that it justifies keeping him from his home, his family and his future?

Our obligation to our veterans is to provide for the disabled every possible care and comfort, and for the able-bodied, full opportunity for normal happiness in their home communities. That depends, above all, on employment with a future and a comfortable home in healthful and wholesome surroundings.

Our veterans are coming home to the greatest housing shortage in the history of America, produced by New Deal policies both before and during the war. Only makeshift arrangements will solve their immediate needs. But it will take real cooperation of American Government and private enterprise to get the American building industry back in high gear, and to relieve the tremendous shortage of American homes. It will take similar teamwork to insure the continued employment of our veterans.

Finally, we believe the time has come to speak out for America; that the efforts of our Government should be turned to benefit Americans; that the greatest service we can do for mankind is to keep America strong.

I believe that the people of America today will listen to straight thinking and plain speaking. I am convinced that here and now is the opportunity for the Republican Party to put our country on the road to prosperity and sound progress.

Detroit Free Press Opposes Case Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1946

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Detroit Free Press of Friday, February 1, in which this independent Republican newspaper with a large circulation throughout the State of Michigan editorially expresses its strong opposition to the proposed Case bill.

I also wish to include an article by Thomas L. Stokes, which appeared in the same issue of the Detroit Free Press, expressing views in opposition to the Case bill.

The editorial and article follow:

ADDING FUEL TO FLAME—ANTILABOR BILLS

There can be no action without reaction. The reactionary labor bills now being pro-

posed in Congress are the logical reaction to irresponsible labor leadership.

That is the biggest danger to the whole union movement.

Emotionalism is taking the place of sound principle.

Evidence of this is the action of the House Rules Committee in connection with the Case bill. The author is Representative FRANCIS CASE, arch-conservative Republican from South Dakota. His measure is backed by a coalition of die-hard southern Bourbons and northern Republicans of the same economic stripe.

It is a catch-all proposition, encompassing most of the extreme suggestions for the curtailment of union rights, such as the repeal of the anti-injunction law.

The Rules Committee stipulated, subject to the vote of the House, that only the Case proposal may be considered as a substitute for President Truman's fact-finding plan.

Because the Truman proposition is no good and will not work is no reason why another unworkable law should be offered as a substitute.

This newspaper fails to understand why this one bill should be considered. It is mad emotionalism of such a nature which leads to anarchy.

No hearings have ever been held on the Case bill. Although it has been kicking around Congress for a long time it was so hastily presented to the Rules Committee Wednesday that it had not as yet even been submitted in printed form.

To take away from the organized workers their long-fought-for gains would please many employers and conservative citizens who are of the basic opinion that no labor union is any good.

The violence of irresponsible labor leaders has given that doctrine considerable popularity. Exasperation at union leaders seeking personal power or the exploitation of cock-eyed economic theories, has brought about that large element of opinion.

But, anybody who has any notion that one extreme can remedy another has little knowledge of human nature and the American system of government.

The Case proposals will not work any more than will the skimmed-milk suggestions of Truman.

All such reactionary measures can achieve is the clamping on of a lid which will make the later explosion all the greater. Its only result will be to give the radical element in labor arguments by which they can add fuel to the flames.

Above all the wild hates, fears, and emotionalism, two facts stand out:

1. The House and Senate together will not agree to any such extreme measures.

2. President Truman would veto such legislation if it were ever presented to him.

It has already been demonstrated at Ford and Chrysler that when labor and management are represented by men of good will and sound common sense, grounds of agreement can be found.

This development would lead to the hope that the flamboyant exaggerations and wild accusations of such labor leaders as Walter Reuther are not typical of the new and growing elements of statesmanship in the labor movement.

The UAW-CIO is only 10 years old. Yet it has matured tremendously since the wild days of the sit-down strikes. If considered in the broad philosophy outlined by Henry Ford II at that recent meeting of the Society of Automotive Engineers, the union will continue to make progress toward sound leadership.

The major factors in letting the radical elements gain free rein and bring about real chaos is just such legislation as is now being proposed under the Case bill.

When honest men of sincere purpose meet there are no barriers to sound understanding. They may disagree in the region of opinion, but deep down underneath they know there is a region of truth. They seek with open minds to explore it—knowing that what is good for America is in the end good for them.

BEHIND THE CASE BILL

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

WASHINGTON.—Something was written here a few days ago about accumulating evidence tending to show a concerted effort by big interests to move in at this time and try to break the power of labor unions and the Truman administration.

Various significant developments were cited. One was the refusal a few days apart of General Motors and United States Steel to accept compromise wage findings by a presidentially appointed wage board, in the motors case, and by the President himself in the steel case.

There was reference also to the coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats in Congress which fought progressive measures in the domestic field all during the war and have intensified their fight since.

Now, another chapter begins to unfold here, openly and brazenly, under management of that coalition. A few simple facts will tell the story, although you'll have to hang on close, for this particular conspiracy involves tricky parliamentary procedure.

After some deliberation, the House Labor Committee finally reported a much-modified version of President Truman's proposal for fact-finding boards. This measure then went to the Rules Committee, which is supposed to be a procedural committee to arrange for consideration of bills by the House, but which long ago arrogated to itself powers far beyond this.

It can virtually nullify the work of regular legislative committees. This committee is controlled by southern Democrats and Republicans.

After a couple of days of public hearings about this bill, which went, as usual, beyond procedure into merits, Representative CASE (Republican, South Dakota) turned up before the Rules Committee Tuesday afternoon with a brand-new bill he had just introduced. It never had been considered by any legislative committee. He didn't even have printed copies—only a few typewritten copies. He asked that the committee grant a rule to make this bill in order as a substitute for the Labor Committee bill on the floor.

Chairman SABATH (Democrat, Illinois), an administration supporter, heard about the bill for the first time only the night before. He wasn't in on the secret. But Republican and southern Democratic Members were thoroughly familiar with it, revealing the plot. Mr. CASE admitted he had help in writing the bill. It was obvious he was the front.

The next day, according to plan, the Republican-southern Democratic coalition on the committee voted a rule for the Labor Committee bill which authorized the Case bill to be offered as the only substitute.

Even for the Rules Committee it is unprecedented to permit the offering as a substitute of a new bill never considered by a legislative committee.

The Case bill, creating a mediation board to settle labor disputes, has a beautiful preamble about being fair to both industry and labor. Yet it carries provisions to abrogate fundamental rights of labor.

These include, for some purposes, repeal of the Norris-LaGuardia anti-injunction law. This law was put on the books 14 years ago, after a long battle, to protect labor from sweeping court injunctions such as that by which Attorney General Daugherty broke the railway maintenance workers' strike in the Harding administration.

The Case bill is recognized as an anti-labor bill by anybody familiar with labor law history.

Recognized as its real sponsors are Representatives SMITH, Democrat, Virginia; COX, Democrat, Georgia, and HALLECK, Republican, Indiana, all veterans on the Rules Committee and active figures in the coalition. When you have watched Congress for many years and have found out the motives of Members, it is easy to smell out one like this and what the real purpose is.

Messrs. SMITH and COX are known for their antagonism to labor and Mr. HALLECK is one of the Republican House leaders.

They have done a job here, make no mistake about that. The facts speak for themselves, both in the brazen way they used the Rules Committee and in the objectives of the bill itself.

This is the story behind this story.

Livestock Food

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1946

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution which was unanimously adopted by the members of the Midwest Feed Manufacturers Association on January 11, 1946:

Members of the Midwest Feed Manufacturers Association are aware of the simple truth that its industry has been acknowledged as an essential and useful class of manufacturers. The scientific conversion of by-products and grains into useful and profitable products for feeders has become an established and significant manufacturing process. The remarkably economical production of food in the last five years has served as final proof.

With this record in the near past, and with the urgent need for food continuing, members of this association fear that any unsound practice in buying, preparing, or selling these feeds will bring quick disaster in the midst of a great opportunity to serve even a greater good.

No practice in history so sharply injures the Nation's agricultural economy and so endangers livestock feeders, poultry feeders, and the feed industry as the practice of widespread and deplorable bartering and tie-in trading that now robs the feed from those who need it most.

Livestock feeders of straight proteins, hog raisers and poultrymen all face a disaster in those areas where trading is not or cannot be practiced. It is for these people that we plead for action: Therefore be it firmly

Resolved, That members and guests of this association gathered here condemn this practice as being wasteful, uneconomic and inspired in many cases by greed; be it further

Resolved, That legislative or administrative action correcting this practice be fostered and endorsed by this association, and that those joining in this resolution be made publicly known to the industry and its allied trades.

Loan to England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1946

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD,

I include the following editorial appearing in the St. Mary's Daily Press of January 31, 1946:

LOAN TO ENGLAND

President Truman yesterday urged Congress to approve an approximate $4,000,000,000 loan to Great Britain on the assumption that such a loan will spur production in this country and world-wide prosperity.

Mr. Truman will have to do a lot of talking to convince Congress and the American people this loan should go through.

We might ask what became of the money we loaned England to get her "out of hock" after the last war.

It is pretty well known we got little of that back, and in addition Uncle Sam was dubbed "Uncle Shylock" for demanding even interest payments on that financial obligation.

Right at this moment we have hundreds of thousands of discharged GI's looking for places to live.

If Congress is going to be so generous with money, why not loan $4,000,000,000 to these servicemen so they can build their own homes.

Give them the money at low interest rates. In this way the money will be kept in the United States, and you can rest assured most of it will be paid back to the Treasury—something we are not assured of if the loan goes abroad.

The able Paul Mallon in his column today says that the United States has no assurance that any part of an approved loan to England will be spent in this country, which rips wide open Mr. Truman's argument that such a financial transaction will be of business benefit to America.

Perhaps England needs this loan, but the Lord knows other nations and other people need it just as badly.

This loan business means something personal to every American taxpayer, for if the loan is not repaid, granted that it might be approved, it will have to come out of their pockets.

As it is now, the loan agreement calls for no interest payments the first 5 years it is in effect, and then no interest if England's trade balance is not favorable.

It is a type of loan no American bank would pass on favorably, yet the United States Government is asked to O. K. it with the faint hope it may bring us more business gains.

Veterans' Preference in Purchase of Surplus Government Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE WORLEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1946

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I insert herewith a letter from Mr. George Schaeffer, of Happy, Tex., veteran of two world wars, outlining in humorous vein all of the red tape and difficulty he and his son, a veteran of this war, had in securing a much sought after jeep. It seems that under the present system of so-called veterans' preference, a veteran would have to have a sense of humor to comply with all of the red tape, and so forth, to get a jeep.

It is imperative that the surplus property disposal agencies immediately cut all this red tape and give these veterans the quick action Congress intended for them to have.

The letter follows:

HAPPY, TEX., *December 17, 1945.*

Congressman EUGENE WORLEY,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENE: Guess I might as well head my letter "We got our jeep" as we really got it. The enclosed missive from the Amarillo News by Henry Fox partially explains some of the problems encountered by the returning veterans. I had served in World War I and took a fool notion that it would be a grand idea to add another war to my record so I enlisted in World War II. After a little over 3 years in this one, one-half of which was spent overseas, I was returned home for discharge. Had always taken a liking to these jeeps and made up my mind to own one someday so when I got home I started to investigate and found out all I had to do was to put in my application with my county agent. As you can tell by my writing I am a farmer and wait my turn. I got home about 1st of July last and put in my application with my county agent in August. Some time in September I got a letter from SWPC saying I had been put on their list as wanting surplus war property and they would remember me. Along in September I got a letter stating they would sell various surplus property at different places during the first 10 days in October and to be at one of these places at that time. So I took out for Fort Sill as it was the nearest place designated. On arriving there I was informed that all jeeps were frozen by order of the Government and all pick-ups were sold but there were still some weapons carriers left over. As you no doubt know these weapons carriers are a sort of cross between a pickup and a truck. They carry about the same load as a pickup and use as much gas as the largest truck, so in order not to be disappointed I decided to try and purchase a weapons carrier. The men in charge at the office assured me that all I had to do was to pick out the vehicle in line I wished to purchase and they would give me the price on it. So I went out and looked over the line of several hundred vehicles. Incidentally, a couple of Kraut prisoners who were servicing said vehicles tried to run me out of there as they said I had no business there but I quickly gave those lousy bums to understand that this was the good old United States of America and that they didn't have a thing to say about what I was doing. I took down a list of about a dozen different vehicles in the line and returned to the office to find out the price on them. After checking them over on his list the man told me there was just one vehicle in my whole list that was for sale as he hadn't received a price on the others in his catalog. He gave me the item number on this vehicle and also the price as it stood so I returned to the lot to investigate this vehicle. Well it was a weapons carrier all right or rather what was left of it. Some of the motor was there but no battery and no tires and the price was $434.30 so as I was there in the family car and no way to haul it back I passed up the bargain and came on back home.

Shortly after this time my son who had also been in the service received his discharge and as he had decided to go into the farming business with me I told him of the wonderful opportunity of securing Government equipment. He also had great dreams of a jeep on the farm so he also put in his application with our county agent's office and about a month later got his O. K. Some time later we both got a notice that all such things had been transferred from the SWPC to the RFC and about 10 days later I got a notice that the RFC was holding a jeep for me at Camp Polk, La., and my son that they were holding one for him at Camp Bowie, Tex. As we figured out we could do with one jeep between us and the one at Camp Bowie was only 250 miles from home and the one at Camp Polk was perhaps 500 or 600 miles we decided to try the nearest so we got in the old family car and headed for Camp Bowie to pick up our jeep. On the way there we blew out a tire and gave $14 for an old third-grade tire to finish the trip but it lasted just the next day and went out also. We then stopped at a county seat town and managed to talk the ration board out of a new tire to get home on, which I think was a great feat in itself. Well, we arrived at Brownwood and saw the jeep, which was just what we wanted. We were informed after inspecting it that we must go to Fort Worth and trade with the RFC, and so out we started for Fort Worth. On the way we blew out another tire, but arrived in Fort Worth on Friday night and reported to RFC Saturday morning only to see a sign on the door that it was closed until Monday morning. So we got busy on the telephone and eventually located someone who agreed to come down and fix us up. He took our certified check for $695 and gave us a slip of paper releasing said jeep to us, so out we started to Camp Bowie once more to claim our jeep. Got there Saturday afternoon and everyone was off duty for the week end, but eventually we located the officer in charge.

Being a very agreeable sort of a guy, he finally agreed that while it seemed very unorthodox to do business on one slip of paper rather than delay us over the week end he would release the jeep to us, so we took it to town to have it registered and start on our journey home. At the tax collector's office they informed us they couldn't stick out their necks and do anything without papers of some sort, so back we went to camp and located the same officer in charge and he fixed us up some sort of typewritten slip on the property and assured us we would have no more trouble. Back to town now and the tax collector's office, which was closed as it was nearly night. Eventually we decided to take the jeep on home without licensing as we decided most of the highway cops were in bed by now. A streak of luck accompanied us as we made it home by Sunday morning without a bit of trouble, and now we are the proud possessors of a jeep. Incidentally, a week later, I got a letter from RFC offering to ship me the same identical jeep as soon as they received a check for the amount. Well, after all, "All's well that ends well." We spent about $150 chasing around after said jeep, as well as the $695 purchase price. No one but former servicemen would have the persistence to see it on through as we did. After all, everyone we came in contact with was helpful and cooperative, so I guess it is the system of ever-changing red tape and not the individual to blame. If it were made any easier, it just wouldn't seem right to the ex-serviceman.

Very truly,

GEO. SCHAEFFER.

P. S.—Incidentally, I might add the jeep was worth all the effort expended in obtaining it. That little machine will do all that a hoss, car, truck, or tractor will do, and do it better. We have herded cattle, pulled posts, dug postholes, pulled tractors to crank them, pulled the truck out of mudholes with it, and a thousand other things. You have no doubt heard the old saying that "it will do anything but climb trees"—well, the old jeep will even do that.

A Letter From an Army Officer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 5, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a letter which was published in the Chelsea Evening Record, Chelsea, Mass., on Tuesday, January 29, 1946. This letter was written by Second Lt. Fred C. Spracklin, of Chelsea, my congressional district:

Dear Sir: I'm writing this letter to you, the representative of my district, in the hope that you will be able to answer a few questions which are in my mind.

My first reference is to a recent statement made in Guam by Secretary of War Patterson, to the effect that he had not known points ceased to accumulate on September 2, 1945. A subsequent statement on his part, to the effect that he had not heard of a message delivered to a joint session of Congress by ex-Chief of Staff Marshall, setting March as the month in which men with 2 years' service would become eligible for discharge, adds to the confusion. This situation alone leads us to ask ourselves, "Who is facing the demobilization problem?" It seems to me that the executive at the head of the War Department should be the first person to know what is going on in all matters pertaining to servicemen. The demobilization, by all appearances, has taken a back seat in affairs back home. There isn't any doubt in my mind, and I speak for countless other army men as well, that demobilization should rank in importance along with such other postwar problems as reconversion and labor.

Army Education Chief, Lt. Gen. Collins, in another recent statement, made it clear that reductions in future discharge requirements would be slowed up considerably and that these reductions would be based on occupational needs rather than the amount of shipping available. What became of the old and familiar cry, "There is a shortage of ships"?

FIGURES 800,000 NEEDED

General MacArthur estimated some time ago that his occupational force in Japan would not exceed 200,000 troops. Allowing another 200,000 for the remainder of the Pacific theater, we find that 400,000 troops can fill Pacific needs. This figure, coupled with a like figure for Europe brings our total occupational needs to approximately 800,000. Selective Service in 1945 alone, covers this amount, not considering the 50,000 inductees scheduled for coming months and the reenlistments in the Regular Army.

Let us look at the so-called "drastic cuts" made to dat in the discharge requirements. As of October 1, 1945, the point score for officers was seventy-five. The entire month of November passed before a two-point reduction was made, effective December 1. The present score is seventy, just five points below that of October 1. The present 50-point score for enlisted men is still extremely high, considering the amount of service one must have to become eligible. In regard to discharges on service alone, the 4-year and 3-year 6-month requirements for officers and enlisted men, respectively, is an insult to the intelligence of all Army personnel.

If more troops are needed over here, and I very strongly doubt it, it indicates wholesale inefficiency on the part of high Army officials. The island of Luzon is crowded beyond imagination with idle men, men who cannot possibly be efficiently used in the entire Philippine Islands. I speak not from hearsay, but as a result of the time I spent there. Here at base F you have the ideal example of wasted manpower.

I should like to see a congressional investigating committee formed to investigate the disposition of troops in the entire Pacific area. An excellent starting point would be here at base F, New Guinea. Let us get the demobilization problem out of the hands of men who desire to remain in the Army.

In closing I would like to say that the above opinions are shared by everyone who wants to return home as soon as possible. I would appreciate any aid you may be able to effect in this regard.

Thanking you, I remain,
Yours sincerely,
FRED C. SPRACKLIN,
Second Lieutenant, Infantry.

What About the Farmer's Rights?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 5, 1946

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the consideration of my colleagues today an editorial from the Times-Record, published in Spencer, W. Va., and edited by Mr. Harold G. Everly.

The editor brings to our attention in a forcible manner the position of the farmer in the situation brought about by industrial strife and pleads for equitable treatment for the farmers, a group which fulfilled every call for increased food production, received less return, and did not fuss about it.

The editorial follows:

WHAT ABOUT THE FARMER'S RIGHTS?

We hear plenty these days about the rights of labor and not enough about the rights of the farmer. Let's talk about those for a change.

We've got a way of life in this country. Maybe it isn't perfect, but take a look around the world and see if there's anything any better anywhere. It's so good that millions of Americans have just fought the costliest, bloodiest war in history to keep it.

We won that war—and now because we aren't solving our industrial problems at home we're in grave danger of losing the peace. We wonder what our enemies are thinking right now. They probably can't make heads or tails of it. Neither can we.

Nobody has done more to maintain our way of life than the farmer. Nobody knows better than he what that way of life means. All during the war he worked long hours to keep food and fiber rolling to our men and women in service and to the home folks. He was up early. He finished late. He had to do double duty because his boy or his hired help went off to fight. He drove himself and his machinery and equipment to the breaking point. He gave us the highest production of food we have ever known.

But his job wasn't finished when Japan quit. He is being asked to increase the yield on his farm. Given any kind of break and he'll do it. But he needs the tools of production, just as the industrial worker needs tools to turn out a day's work.

Here's the rub. Where are those tools coming from now that the United Steelworkers of America—CIO—have gone out on strike? That will stop the makers of tractors, reapers, plows, and all the other steel products needed on farms. That will stop the farmer from getting the replacements and additions he desperately needs this spring. And that will stop a lot of deserving people both here and abroad from getting the food and clothing they are counting on.

We ask ourselves why this strike is threatening to hit us in the most vulnerable spot of all—the bread basket. We're told the steelworkers want more money. First they demanded a general wage increase which totaled $225,000,000. Now, they'll compromise on an increase of $166,000,000. The steel companies have offered $135,000,000. We're told by the union that the steel companies can meet its demand out of hidden profits. The steel companies say they have no hidden profits, and a National War Labor Board ruling backs them up. They say they cannot raise wages unless the OPA lets them raise prices for their steel.

We believe everyone ought to have a fair wage—based on his production. But the steelworkers are already among the highest paid in American industry. They received wage increases between January 1941 and August 1945 of 34 percent. That was more than the cost of living index, as prepared by the Department of Labor, went up during the same period.

We also believe that when two groups sign a contract they have entered into a sacred agreement to keep the terms of that contract. The steelworkers have contracts with the steel companies that last until next October. The steelworkers pledged themselves not to strike during the life of the contracts. If our written agreement can be torn up at the whim of one group, what confidence can be placed in the validity of such agreements?

When one group tears up a contract, ties up an essential industry, deprives the farmer of tools of production, undermines that farmer's livelihood, and cuts down needed food crops, then we say there is something wrong—radically wrong.

The farmer has a right to a decent living, and the right to buy the things he needs to make it. His sweat has earned it. His stake in this work stoppage is big. We hope he'll find ways of making his voice felt—where it will do the most good. We hope he will insist on keeping a way of life that he has stood for and worked for and that he wants to pass along as an American heritage to his loved ones.

Iowa Food in War and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 5, 1946

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement of R. K. Bliss, Iowa Director of Extension Service. Dr. Bliss points out emphatically the value of Iowa food, not only in winning the war but in sustaining our own people. In peacetime it is shown that Iowa food producers are interested in international as well as national high standards of human nutriment. Without question, Iowa's food production will continue to have an important bearing on our internal and international relationships.

GREAT IMPORTANCE OF IOWA FOOD

Last week a friend of mine bought a few pounds of butter in Iowa and took it back to Chicago with him so that his family could have some real cow butter. Another friend

bought some butter to take back to Milwaukee for his family. And remember this occurred at the end of 1945, the highest milk-producing year in the history of the United States.

There are also shortages of certain kinds of meat. It has been difficult to buy bacon and pork chops, even in Iowa. One of the reasons why the Government moved to stop the packinghouse strike was because butcher shops were becoming bare of meat. Even the much maligned and abused egg may become a welcome table visitor.

The fact is that there is a world shortage of fats, milk, meat, and eggs, the kinds of products that Iowa farmers specialize in producing. The fact is that even though milk production in the United States in 1945 was the largest on record there is a marked butter shortage.

We should also keep in mind that this shortage comes at the close of 9 years of high-crop production in the United States. We have had good crop years since and including 1937. In 4 of the 9 years production was increased about one-third in order to meet war needs. Nevertheless Uncle Sam's pantry shelves are short of food.

What has happened to our food supply? One answer is that we lost and wasted food during the war period. Another answer is that we have sent large amounts of food to our allies and to hungry people in liberated countries. Actually, however, this has taken only about 7 percent of our food, while, according to Government reports, the increase in production has been about 30 percent.

The important and significant thing that has happened is that on the average the people of the United States are consuming more meat, milk, and eggs per person than was consumed before the war. All of us like and prefer to eat animal products. People buy when and if they have the money. When low-income groups have good wages they buy more meat, milk, and eggs. When wages are low or when there is unemployment those affected buy as little meat and milk as possible. The increase in the consumption of these products during the war period was mostly in the low-income group who were earning good wages.

There was another reason, too, that had much to do with better diets and certainly will have a permanent future effect. During the war period the entire country greatly speeded up adult nutritional campaigns to get people to eat foods that were better balanced. The purpose was, of course, to increase the health and vigor of our people as a war measure.

American people have been well fed during the war years—by all odds the best fed in the world. In spite of this fact, however, there are millions of people in this country at the present time who do not have an adequate diet. We had a rude awakening in regard to health during the war period. The Army and Navy wanted strong vigorous men and women, who could stand the rigors of military life. The induction centers in the United States literally turned away millions of young men and women because of unfitness. The reason in all too many cases was physical defects due to malnutrition.

There seems little doubt that if the people of the United States had the kind of foods they want and need and also had the money to buy such foods there would be very little danger of a surplus of fats, meat, milk, and eggs. If our people had what they need and also what they want, there would probably not be enough to go around.

At the present moment there is a world shortage of fats and animal protein foods. These foods are urgently needed now to balance the vegetable diets of European peoples. They are needed to put health, vigor, and hope into the peoples of war-torn countries. They are also needed for the health and well-being of our people at home.

What does this mean to Iowa agriculture? It, of course, means that Iowa farmers produce the products now most needed to improve nutrition, that is, milk, meat, fats, and eggs. Iowa farmers are the largest and most efficient producers of these products. Iowa farmers therefore have the best and most important food products in the world to sell. They have products which people want; products which people need for good nutrition.

Iowa farmers are interested in getting their products overseas to other peoples. They should be interested in the international food and agricultural organization as a means of developing foreign markets. They should be interested both from the standpoint of need and from the standpoint of developing a taste and a desire for animal foods.

Iowa farmers are interested in improving the quality of their products so that people will keep coming back for more. Iowa dairy interests are very much aware of the importance of quality and are organizing on a State-wide basis to improve the quality of milk and its products.

Iowa farmers are deeply interested in full-time employment for all workers at good wages. They are, therefore, vitally concerned with labor-management disputes that put people out of work. Widespread unemployment in the United States is the principal bug-bear Iowa farmers have to fear.

Organized agriculture, general farm organizations and cooperatives, in fact all Iowa should vigorously support better nutrition programs. We should organize and support programs to let people everywhere know what we have for sale. We have the best sales products and also the best sales arguments in the world to support our products. To do this is both humanitarian and good business.

Iowa foods at the present moment are effectively working for peace and good will abroad and for health and vigor at home. Clearly, all Iowa should work for the largest use of these products and then perhaps we wouldn't have to worry later on about post-war surpluses.

Reasoning of a Serviceman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, since the din of battle has ceased and our boys are having plenty of time and opportunity to give some thought to our domestic and foreign problems, it is most interesting to note the reasoning and reactions of our servicemen.

Many of these men have now reached the age where they are not only capable of thinking for themselves, but they are beginning to assert themselves. Their ideas are becoming crystallized, and they seem to experience little or no difficulty in expressing themselves clearly and to the point on the problems of the day.

They were told that they were fighting to preserve in the world the American conceptions of life and government. Their thinking has been stimulated by the un-American treatment to which they have been subjected. They have seen the wanton waste, and the disregard for statements made by those in authority; they have seen the reckless manner in which those in authority have dealt with truth and with our cherished American ideals. They resent this bitterly. To think that many of their buddies were forced to give their lives, and many more were brought back crippled and maimed for life, and then the survivors come home to find that we are being led down the very path to totalitarianism along which those we fought were blindly led, is enough to provoke their best thinking and arouse their most severe criticism of the present trends in this country.

Mr. Speaker, while these men were in uniform, they were instructed not to write to their Congressmen. But now that they have shed their uniforms and donned civilian clothing, and are once again standing firmly upon American soil, they are glad to point out the fallacies of the propaganda which the New Deal administration has been, and is, broadcasting over this country and abroad. They unhesitatingly go to the core of these troubles by attacking the problems from the premises and reasoning out to logical conclusions.

The following letter from a veteran of both World War I and World War II, just back from the service, plainly expresses his views on some of the controversial issues of the day. He and many others are now writing their Congressmen, and I am happy that their spontaneous expression is being heard all over this country. Their experiences and observations are worthy of our most serious consideration. They saw, first hand, the things we were supposed to be fighting against abroad. Now they see clearly that we are about to fall into the same errors and pitfalls, and it behooves us to take counsel from them, and steer clear of these dangers.

I am happy to quote the following intelligent and well-reasoned letter from a highly respected veteran, of Bartlesville, Okla.:

BARTLESVILLE, OKLA., *January 30, 1946.*

Hon. GEORGE SCHWABE,
Congressman, First Oklahoma District,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: First, I wish to congratulate you upon your thorough research into the thoughts, desires, and hopes of the citizens in this district during your recent visit. I feel sure that you now know better than ever the trend of thought here relative to both domestic and foreign affairs.

Second, I wish to commit myself with regard to a few of the more important problems of the day as follows:

Labor: I am most friendly toward labor and labor organizations, believing that organized labor has a definite place in the scheme of our national life. However, I firmly feel that labor must, in some manner, be held responsible for the fulfillment of their commitments under negotiated, executed contracts. Also, the rights of non-striking labor must not be interfered with through the medium of picketing or otherwise.

Economy: A little calculating has more than startled me. Although many agencies have been eliminated and reduced we have over 3,000,000 civilian Government employees. Well, at a reasonable wage, with office rent, office equipment and supplies, together with expense accounts, I believe that the burden of this extravagance nears the $10,000,000,000 mark on an annual basis—

perhaps that figure is conservative. No one of sound thinking expects our budget ever to be balanced, the thought of debt reduction impossible, with current proposals of full employment, extended unemployment benefits, and many other ideas that would multiply our obligations many times the present pledges. Obviously, the only possible chance we have for extended prosperity is for all unnecessary governmental expenditures to be drastically reduced. Such a program of economy would encourage both industry and labor and would release billions of Government debts for industrial spending. Eventually there will be some sort of business reaction or adjustment. How soon no one knows or even how severe. Unless our national economic situation becomes much more substantial before that occurs, I hesitate to even think of the terrific mess we all will be in.

Foreign: We should be more firm and definite in our foreign relations. We seem to be the goat and I feel that a firmer stand on our convictions would result in more respect from others and certainly more self-respect. The loan to Britain should be made only upon a sound, repayment basis. The British Empire produces many raw products we must import. A small percent of the value of such imports, guaranteed as to amount of imports and percent of value, should be applied to the loan. If Britain doesn't want it that way let's turn it down.

In general I feel very much disturbed, as do millions of Americans. I have found it necessary to stop allotment purchase of bonds and shall cash in most of those I have bought. I cannot subscribe to and help finance a system of thoughtless, unnecessary, wasteful spending. Billions of dollars can and should be cut from appropriations without depriving one single citizen of the aid or benefits that properly belong to him under our present security and benefit plans. To continue to help support such extravagance, in my opinion, is unpatriotic to say the least. It certainly is not my patriotic duty to encourage it any further. My conscience is clear—veteran of both World Wars, and I am not asking for one single personal thing when I mention that. My country owes me nothing but a return to something that resembles stability.

It is nice to be able to write to you, as I feel that you do not condone the evident principles of the bureaucrats of socialistic leanings. Sorry to take up so much of your time—this is much longer than I expected it to be. By the way, I am an employee—not an employer; and just as interested as anyone in fair wages for a fair day's work.

Yours very truly,

_____.

P. S.—I voted from Guam 2 years ago.

Housing and America's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 5 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address entitled "Housing and America's Future," delivered by me over Station WIND and a group of Wisconsin stations, on February 2, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow-Americans, if you and I were to ask the man in the street what he thinks the three biggest domestic problems facing America today are, he would probably answer this way: The biggest problem is strikes. The next biggest problem is the menace of inflation, due to strikes and underproduction. The most important problem after that is the housing shortage, due to the same causes.

These three problems are interconnected in many ways. Obviously, if we can lick this strike problem, if we can get into full production, then we can help defeat the threat of inflation and we can go a long way toward solving the housing crisis.

We 140,000,000 Americans are not afraid of any one or all of these three crises. We are however tremendously concerned about them.

We faced a crisis on December 7, 1941, and we rose to meet it. We united then to face a foreign foe. We used our God-given ingenuity, our brains, and our brawn to make us adequate.

That is what we must do, now—unite, so as to end the frictions which keep us apart, that prevent us from getting into action as we did after Pearl Harbor.

You remember Abraham Lincoln's words, "A house divided against itself cannot stand." Those words ring truer than ever today.

I am confident that we can be adequate to meet this crisis. Nothing can prevent us from being adequate except our own blindness. Let's take the blinders off. Come, let us reason together, and get the solution.

DEFINITION OF THE HOUSING PROBLEM

Now, let us all—you and I—look closely at the third great problem I have mentioned—the problem of housing.

What does this problem consist of? It consists of not only a shortage of actual homes—a 5,000,000-home shortage—it consists also of the generally run-down condition of America's homes and the fact that we still have a long way to go in helping more Americans who want to do so to own their own dwellings.

Our housing is a vital part of our standard of living. We are proud of that standard of living, the highest of any major power on earth, but we want to improve it.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE HOUSING PROBLEM

Now, lately, you've probably heard a lot of talk from Washington to the effect that bureaucratic "manna" is going to rain down on localities like Chicago and lick this housing crisis. Federal pap is supposed to be the cure-all.

But it definitely will not be the cure-all. Let's debunk some of the synthetic thinking behind this reliance on Federal Government hand-cuts.

The Federal Budget is expected to be unbalanced this year by $4,000,000,000. The national debt is climbing up to $300,000,000,000. Isn't it time, then, that we stop this tendency of running to Washington for funds? If we don't stop this habit, we will be blind and dumb and failing in our obligations to our country and our children.

Mr. Lindsay Warren, the Comptroller General of the United States, recently said a mouthful. He said that a widespread awakening by the American people to the danger of national bankruptcy was imperative.

He said the remedies for the situation were clear:

(a) There must be a drastic reorganization of governmental agencies so as to eliminate waste and inefficiency.

(b) There must be a strenuous effort to balance the National Budget through a sharp reduction in Federal expenditures. This, he commented, would require the wholehearted support by the people of congressional economy moves.

(c) He called for a more conscientious type of public service by those entrusted with the responsibility of spending the people's money.

(d) He urged a reexamination by Congress of its blank-check grants of spending money to certain executive agencies.

(e) He advocated that the States assume a proper share of their responsibilities toward the Union instead of looking to the Federal Government for more and more assistance.

If this be conservatism, then let the radicals make the most of it.

SPECIFIC HOUSING PHONY NOTIONS

Now, let's look at some of the specific phony notions about how the housing crisis will be licked, notions based largely on reliance on Washington pap.

Let's note these truths in answer to the phony notions:

1. Legislation does not build houses: Only honest sweat and toil get production and build houses. Let us not make a fetish out of legislation, particularly legislation with high-sounding titles or glittering phrases.

2. The Federal Government can't solve the housing problem of every local community: When you come down to fundamentals, it is, for example, the city of Chicago and the city of Waukegan and the city of Milwaukee, which have to do the spade work in solving their own housing problems. The Federal Government can, however, take off the brakes so as to enable local communities to get into action.

3. Bureaucratic patchwork isn't going to solve this housing problem: We desperately need temporary housing right now. Every community must seek out all its vacant dwelling space and make that space available and comfortable, particularly to our ex-servicemen.

We don't want our boys who fought in fox holes to live in rat holes as they are being forced to do now.

We need quick constructive action and real long-range planning, too, planning principally by local citizens and builders.

They've got to remember the fact that we are in an atomic age, and aerial age.

Safety through decentralization, speed through air travel, health from already overcrowded cities—these are but a few of the modern factors that must be born in mind.

A NATIONAL HOUSING PROGRAM

Now, my friends, I want to suggest some more further specific points in a national housing program. I have made these points in remarks on the floor of the United States Senate, and I am happy to resubmit them now.

(1) Encourage a revolution in the private construction industry. I said "revolution."

By that I mean we must have new materials, new methods, new plans for home building in this atomic age.

The old ways—slow, costly, obsolete—are not good enough for us today any more than they were good enough during the war.

Abraham Lincoln, that great American whose birthday we will celebrate on February 12, had the right idea when he said, I quote:

"The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty. We must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves and then we shall save our country."

But let us go on with further points in the housing program.

(2) Get rid of monopolies in the building trades.

(3) Get rid of union restrictions in the building trades—the kind of restrictions that require that only so many bricks can be laid in a day and that mass-production methods cannot be used. The country's need is paramount. Good union men see that.

(4) Amend our obsolete municipal building codes so that all of the needless regulations that delay housing construction and make it unnecessarily costly are eliminated.

(5) Prevent landlords from squeezing cash out of desperate renters. But give landlords equitable returns.

(6) Encourage every citizen in every community, together with his local officials, to get underneath this problem and lick it.

This sixth point is the most important point. If the citizen—you and I—do our share, we cannot help but make our country adequate.

We can lick the housing crisis. We can lick the inflation crisis and the strike crisis. This is no time for defeatism or smugness.

It is a time for clear thinking and action—action that will mold our American future.

Let's go, America. It's time for teamwork.

Pauley and Allen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 5 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Pauley and Allen" by Walter Lippmann published in today's issue of the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PAULEY AND ALLEN

If Mr. Edwin. W. Pauley wishes to show that he is fit to hold high office, the best way for him to begin will be to ask the President to withdraw his nomination for Undersecretary of the Navy. That would be a sign that he could learn to understand the elementary principles in the ethical code of a public servant. For having been until recently a collector of campaign contributions as treasurer of the Democratic Party, being still heavily interested personally in oil properties at home and abroad, he ought to know, and indeed the President ought to know, that he is disqualified for any high post in the Navy Department.

For not only is the Navy greatly concerned with our domestic oil supplies, it is also concerned with, and is bound to play an influential role in shaping our policy about, oil supplies in other parts of the world. Where oil is involved the high officials of the Navy Department should be above all suspicion, political or personal, warranted or unwarranted. Mr. Pauley would always be suspected, and every action of the United States Government in critical areas like the Middle East and Indonesia, where oil is so important, would be laid open to suspicion.

Since he has no other experience which makes him indispensable in the Navy Department, it is the plain duty of the Senate to refuse to confirm him if his nomination is not withdrawn.

The fact that it is necessary to argue the point is in itself disquieting. It is like having at this late date to explain to a lawyer why he should not accept fees from both parties in a lawsuit, or to a journalist why he should not be on the pay roll of the National Association of Manufacturers or of the CIO, or to the Secretary of the Treasury why he cannot be a stock broker or an investment banker, or to a judge why he cannot practice law.

But apparently it is necessary to explain it. So for the benefit of Mr. Pauley let it be said that to have been treasurer of a political party and to have collected campaign contributions is not in itself a job he need be ashamed of, or apologize for; nor is being in the oil business. But being treasurer and in the oil business was already, to put it gently, a dubious combination; a sensitive politician or a sensitive businessman would shrink from the mixture. To compound it by seeking a high office in which great national and international decisions have to be made that deal with oil in domestic and international politics is to go completely beyond the limits of public morals. For no matter how honest and conscientious Mr. Pauley may be, he cannot come to these questions with a free, disinterested, and unembarrassed mind. And even if he could, he would not easily convince the American public or foreign governments that he had.

It will also be necessary for the Senate to scrutinize the nomination of Mr. George Allen to the board of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The fact that Mr. Allen has the far-flung and complicated private business connections which the Alsop brothers described yesterday in their column would not necessarily disqualify him. But as they indicate, Mr. Allen's expanding career in business has been coinciding with his expanding influence at the White House. His many directorships would be more impressive testimony to his industrial genius if he did not devote so large a part of his genius to running the Truman administration.

The nomination should, therefore, be investigated carefully to find out why he has become a director of so many corporations when he spends so much of his energy governing the United States. Does he in fact produce and sell airplanes, steel, insurance, and no end of other useful goods and services, or does he produce and sell political influence? This is a fair question, and it is the obvious duty of the Senate to see that it is answered.

It is a disagreeable business to have to challenge two men who are as close as are Messrs. Pauley and Allen to the President of the United States. But the alternative is even more disagreeable: it is to admit that after this war, as after the other war, after the Civil War, and indeed after every other war, the standard of public morals must for a time inevitably fall.

We cannot admit this must happen. But it has been happening in Washington, and once the deterioration of standards sets in, things will go from not good enough to bad, and from bad to worse, as they did under Grant and under Harding. In the early phase of the deterioration there are no scandals; they come later, not because anyone in high place planned them, much less wished them, but because the general laxity develops, and a tolerance of dubious connections. The habit of scrupulous vigilance is weakened. Men who are true public servants become discouraged, are pushed aside, resign, will not accept office, and it is then that the seeds of scandal fall upon well-plowed ground.

So this is the time, and here is the occasion for the responsible leaders of the Democratic Party to take a stand, and compel the President to see before it is too late where blind friendliness is taking him.

Republic or Democracy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 5, 1946

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I thought all Americans were for a democracy. Hence, I was shocked by the implication of the letter written by Mr. Ernie Adamson, chief counsel of the Committee on Un-American Activities, to a veterans' organization in New York on January 29. Mr. Adamson implies in his letter that because the word "democracy" was omitted from section 4 of article 4 of our Constitution, our forefathers did not intend for this country to be a democracy. Furthermore, the Committee on Un-American Activities does not approve of our country being referred to as a democracy. This incredible statement, with the answer to it by Veterans Against Discrimination, follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, January 29, 1946.
VETERANS AGAINST DISCRIMINATION,
New York, N. Y.

GENTLEMEN: Would you please be good enough to send me a list of your officers and your managing committee?

Several of your circulars have been sent to us by citizens of your city and I note that you refer to democracy several times. I wonder if you are sufficiently familiar with the history of the United States to be aware that this country was not organized as a democracy, and that section 4 of article 4 of the Constitution reads in part as follows: "The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government."

Is it your purpose to ask for an amendment of the Constitution or do you propose to conduct a propaganda campaign against the administration of the provisions of the Constitution?

Yours very truly,
ERNIE ADAMSON,
Chief Counsel.

VETERANS AGAINST DISCRIMINATION,
New York, N. Y., February 1, 1946.

MR. ERNIE ADAMSON,
Chief Counsel, House of Representatives, United States, Committee on Un-American Activities, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of January 29 on behalf of the House Committee on Un-American Activities in which you take issue with Veterans Against Discrimination for the use of the word "democracy" is particularly shocking and outrageous in that it is directed to an organization composed of men and women who have just served this country through a bloody struggle for the preservation and extension of democracy.

The only interpretation which can be put on your letter is that the House Committee on Un-American Activities is now publicly on record as opposing the democracy for which Americans have always fought and in which millions of American men and women believe as the fundamental principle of our Government.

Veterans Against Discrimination would like to ask you, Mr. Adamson, whether the Committee on Un-American Activities in-

tends to investigate every organization which believes in America as a democracy? Is it the purpose of the Committee on Un-American Activities to propagandize against democracy? Does the committee propose to change our democratic form of government?

These are the words of our late Commander in Chief, Franklin D. Roosevelt: "Always the heart and soul of our country will be the heart and soul of the common man—the men and women who never have ceased to believe in democracy. * * *"

Men discharged from the United States Army were told by Gen. George C. Marshall: "Start being a leader as soon as you put on civilian clothes. If you see intolerance and hate, speak out against them. Make your individual voices heard, not for selfish things, but for honor and decency among men, for the rights of all people."

This statement by General Marshal' has become the preamble of the constitution of Veterans Against Discrimination. Our active campaigns against the racist policies of the New York Daily News is one phase of our continuing fight for democracy. We will continue to press for the establishment of a permanent Federal Fair Employment Practice Commission and for other legislation which will, through the elimination of discrimination, "promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty."

On behalf of the Veterans Against Discrimination, we emphatically refute the Committee on Un-American Activities' interpretation of democracy and its claim that the United States is not a democracy. Inasmuch as the Committee on Un-American Activities was empowered by Congress only to investigate subversive and un-American activities, it has no right to question the activities of the Veterans Against Discrimination.

Your letter and the insinuations contained in it constitute a flagrant and unforgivable insult to all the millions of American men and women who served to protect our democracy.

Sincerely,

LAWRENCE RIVKIN,
Chairman.
BERNARD MOSS,
Executive Secretary.

Is There a Wheat Shortage?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 5, 1946

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following telegram is added evidence why the Congress should give immediate attention to prices and subsidies:

ST. PAUL, MINN., *February 4, 1946.*
REID F. MURRAY,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

There is a wheat problem, but not one that calls for bread rationing or for use of more wheat in flour, which admittedly would be a coarser and darker flour. Based on the United States Department of Agriculture's figures of January 1, 1946, we had 689,000,000 bushels of wheat on hand. A new wheat crop will pour into market after July 1. Present indications are for at least 700,000,000 bushels of winter wheat. There will be a heavy spring wheat acreage. Allowing for a January disappearance of 89,000,000 bushels, we will need up to July 1 no more than 200,000,000 bushels for flour and 50,000,000 bushels for spring wheat seeding and miscellaneous farm use. This would leave 350,000,000 bushels of present stocks for export, carry-over, and livestock feeding. It would be better to stop feeding wheat than to ask flour mills and bakeries and consumers to adapt themselves to a new product with all the changes necessary to make a straight run of flour using 85 percent of the wheat instead of the normal 72 percent. The public and the processors would resist these far-reaching changes. Farmers will move the wheat to town and sell it if they are given parity treatment. Farmers know that Congress is in doubt about extending the OPA price-control law. That makes farmers doubt that it is wise to sell wheat under present ceilings. Farmers know that on July 1 there will be a big increase in wheat prices if Congress does not extend the OPA law for another year. Farmers have the same intelligence as business people, who have been and are withholding merchandise for the much higher prices which they hope will be realized either through dropping of OPA or through making exceptions, as, for example in the steel industry. Farmers also know that with wage levels in the process of rising, eventually such increases will be reflected in a new and higher parity price, which under law will force the OPA to lift present ceilings on all farm prices. From the standpoint of price, the farmer sees about every advantage in not marketing wheat now. He is not going to succumb alone to any patriotic call when he sees the United States Steel Corp. and General Motors Corp. and others getting away with theirs. The farmer feels that all he has to do is wait.

Another point: The farmer is accustomed to carrying an inventory of wheat on his farm. It is his ever-normal granary and his base money supply. Not for patriotism alone does he intend to market this year both his present inventory and also his new crop. He would then be compelled to pay a 2-year or double income tax. In brief, he is not a fool. He intends to be treated as well as other groups in the economy of the Nation, even if he is the most patriotic. He as much as any other person wants to see wheat shipped to the starving people in other parts of the world. But the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives cannot honestly urge its wheat-producing members to market their wheat so long as the wheat farmer is at a disadvantage as regards ceilings and double taxation. If the farmer knew now what wheat ceiling prices would be until July 1, 1947, and if he could be relieved of double taxation from marketing two crops in the same year, and if he could be assured that he would not be subject to a third tax by the repeal of laws protecting his marketing cooperatives as advocated by the National Tax Equality Association, then we would be on sound ground to ring the bell of patriotism and save the starving families abroad. Further, if all these economic disadvantages were corrected, there is still a transportation break-down, not only from lack of box cars, but from disorganization on the railroads. Now the movement of cars just from the Dakotas to Minnesota frequently takes weeks. We want to emphasize that you can get wheat for export, without upsetting the operations of flour mills and bakeries or changing the food habits of consumers, if you act now on these three problems.

First, give us boxcars and transportation facilities that will work and move the wheat.

Second, decide now, one way or the other, on the future of OPA and price ceilings for 1946–47.

Third, protect the farmer against double and triple taxation.

If and when these three needs are met, the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives and the general farm organizations will advise farmers to move their wheat off the farms. People all over the Nation are now questioning the political integrity and economic sense of both the Congress and the administration. This problem of wheat is not in the hands of the millers or the bakers or the farmers. It is in the hands of the Congress and the administration. We have called a meeting of our grain cooperatives in Chicago on February 8 and 9, and have called officials from the United States Department of Agriculture to confer with us. We also are inviting through this wire the chairmen of the House and Senate Committees on Agriculture to be with us in Chicago. Our National Federation of Grain Cooperatives is comprised of the regional grain cooperatives from Ohio to the Pacific Northwest, and from the Canadian border to the Gulf of Mexico. Its annual handle of grain is close to 400,000,000 bushels a year. Most of the farmers who own these cooperatives also are members of the Farm Bureau, the Farmers Union or the Grange. Thus you can rest assured that you can have the solid mobilized support of agriculture to move the wheat that is needed if the Congress and the administration will just move first.

Respectfully submitted.

M. W. THATCHER,
President, National Federation of Grain Cooperatives.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen fact-finding committees appointed though the fact finders cannot offer very valuable conclusions until they know what the price and subsidy set-up is to be in 1946.

The President's Dilemma: The General Motors Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVAN HOWELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 5, 1946

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, for weeks we have heard a lot of talk regarding the dilemma of solving the current labor-management strife through fact finding. Because this subject is of major importance and its solution of immediate interest to all of our citizens I am placing in the RECORD an article on the subject by John L. Colmar, chairman of the Young Republican National Federation which appeared in the January issue of the Republican magazine, the national party publication.

In this timely and important article, President Truman's Dilemma—the General Motors Case, the young GOP chief states that while on the surface fact finding looks like a simple and reasonable formula for solving the Nation's labor troubles the fact-finding procedure as put into practice by the present national administration would lead, eventually, to a system of socialism.

Mr. Colmar is especially well qualified to discuss this subject. A brilliant young industrial relations expert he has won the respect of both labor and management for helping avert costly strikes. Because of his splendid performances he

was highly recommended by the Chamber of Commerce, employee, and management groups as a member of the recent management-labor conference.

The Republican magazine is rendering an important national service as well as an outstanding party contribution in publishing this article.

THE PRESIDENT'S DILEMMA: THE GENERAL MOTORS' CASE

(By John Colmar)

The President of the United States, apparently without a full understanding of the ultimate consequences of his action, has given his sanction to a proposal that would revolutionize labor-management relations and open the way for a basic transformation of the free-enterprise system in this country.

Such fundamental changes are foreshadowed in the President's seemingly innocent plan for so-called fact-finding boards to settle labor disputes. First advanced as a panacea to halt the Nation's wave of postwar strikes, this plan was promoted to the rank of a proposed permanent solution for industrial strife when Truman called upon Congress to place it upon the national law books.

This fact-finding procedure, as put into practice by the present national administration with its pro-labor bias, would lead eventually to a system of socialism dominated jointly by Government and labor. Under some future administration more prone to favor management, the procedure might give rise to a Government-sponsored nationalism similar in some respects to the economic system that flourished under Italian fascism.

Despite the possibility of these equally inimical changes in the American system that might result from such a procedure, public opinion polls show substantial support for this fact-finding plan. The American people, like the President, have evidently failed to grasp the dangerous implications of the plan.

THE FORMULA LOOKS SIMPLE

On the surface, fact finding looks like a simple and reasonable formula for solving the Nation's labor troubles. It contemplates a supposedly impartial Government board appointed by the President to collect and study all the facts relating to a wage or other dispute involving a particular company and a union. The board or panel would make its study during a 30-day cooling-off period in which labor would be prohibited from striking. The board would then issue recommendations for settling the dispute based upon its interpretation of the facts.

The board's recommendations would be morally, but not legally, binding upon the disputants, since no penalties are proposed in the legislation as now written. Its findings, however, would have behind them the weight of Government sponsorship and public opinion, both of which would be presumed to look unfavorably on either side rejecting the board's decision.

Such procedure seems perfectly simple and straightforward, especially to a Nation grown accustomed, through nearly 4 years of wartime controls, to having the Government step in as umpire to decide every conflict between national groups. This simplicity is deceptive, however, as the first fact-finding board to swing into action soon discovered.

This board was named by the President to investigate the strike involving the General Motors Corp. and the CIO United Automobile Workers before Congress had time to act on Truman's proposal. It ran head-on into a question which knocked the seeming simplicity of fact finding into a cocked hat. The question was: "What constitutes facts?"

ABILITY TO PAY

The board, following the directions of Truman, decided that General Motors would have to supply enough facts about its financial position, plans for future operations, and anticipated profits for the board to determine the company's ability to pay the 30-percent wage increase demanded by the union. The President, in creating the board, had ruled that such facts were relevant to any solution of the wage controversy between the company and the union.

Walter Reuther, vice president of the UAW and director of its General Motors department, was delighted. He had argued right along that the union was entitled to a 30-percent wage boost, because the company could afford to pay that much and still make substantial profits without increasing the prices of automobiles. He evidently believed that company records would prove the union's case.

General Motors, however, answered by withdrawing from the fact-finding inquiry—risking its popular support to state its position in opposition to the consequences of such a procedure. The Corporation asserted that whether or not its future profits would enable it to pay higher wages had nothing to do with its negotiations with the union. The board's attempt to determine General Motors' ability to pay more wages, it added, was nothing less than an attempt to dictate to the Corporation how it should run its business and what its ultimate profits should be. Such action by a governmental board in peacetime, the Corporation noted, would mark the beginning of the end of the free enterprise system.

Other industrial leaders and such employer groups as the National Association of Manufacturers and the Chamber of Commerce of the United States joined with General Motors in denouncing this aspect of fact finding as the opening wedge for Government or union control of business and ultimately socialism.

The following primary objections were leveled at the fact-finding procedure as laid down by the President and the General Motors panel:

1. By subterfuge and indirection it would, among other things, approach the problem of profit sharing without the thorough and deliberate consideration such a program should have in fairness to both labor and management.

It might well be that, as the Nation broadens the base of its economic democracy through evolutionary processes, some such system under which labor as well as investors receive a share of industrial profits will become general. A few businesses have already tried this plan experimentally. Eric Johnston, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, is now testing such a program on a limited scale in his own plants in the State of Washington.

The problem of profit sharing deserves a frank, honest approach on its own merits, and such trickery as is contemplated by fact finding might destroy what could be a genuine solution.

ARBITRATION IS COMPULSORY

2. Fact finding, under the procedure proposed, would also set up a form of compulsory arbitration—to which the majority of both labor and management are opposed. While the recommended law would establish no penalties to enforce board decisions, it would compel both unions and corporations to take part in fact-finding inquiries. If either refused to cooperate, the boards would have power to subpena "facts."

3. At a time when one of the Nation's major aims is to terminate Government wartime controls and restore freedom of action to both industry and labor, fact finding would reimpose Government domination of labor-management relations and Government dictation of industrial operations. These extralegal governmental boards would have the power, in effect, to tell any company how much earnings it could make by the simple expedient of proposing what percentage of its expected profits should go to labor.

4. If early wartime experiences of the War Labor Board are any criterion, the decisions of the boards, while supposedly impartial would actually favor labor. This would be the almost inevitable result of leaving enforcement to public opinion. Labor, which is affected only indirectly by public pressure, could ignore such rulings with relative impunity—as it did many of those of the WLB. Corporations which depend directly upon public patronage for their products could not so readily disregard or reject such decisions.

FACT FINDING IS WORK

5. Fact finding would be a tremendously complicated and burdensome procedure, unless set up on an industry-wide basis, which is not contemplated as this is being written, panels would eventually have to be created for every major company in the Nation. Any major shift in the profit position of industry would bring a new wave of appeals for fact-finding inquiries to revise wage scales. The resulting machinery would be far more vast and complex than that of the WLB which both labor and industry found too complicated anw slow during the war. The WLB, once a national formula for wage increases had been worked out, only had to determine cases in which inequalities or hardships were claimed to exist among certain groups of workers or in certain plants. Fact-finding boards, on the other hand, would have to decide each case involving a union and a specific company on its individual merits.

The American people have been deceived about two features of the fact-finding proposal. One is that the boards merely wanted to examine the "books" of corporations involved in labor disputes so that they could arrive at intelligent decisions on what wages should be paid.

A corporation's books, of course, would disclose its wage rates, its past profits, and its general financial position. Such facts, however, are no secret and could not be withheld by any company even if it wanted to keep them from a fact-finding board. These figures are available in reports to stockholders and in reports made to such governmental agencies as the Treasury Department and the Securities and Exchange Commission.

What it is really intended that fact-finding boards should obtain from industry, however, is its plans for future operations and estimates of future sales and profits. The President and the General Motors panel conceded this, in effect, by promising that such facts would be kept confidential so as not to reveal trade secrets to competitors. Such forecasts and estimates, of course, are not facts at all.

Walter Gordon Merritt, General Motors attorney, pointed this out in announcing the Corporation's withdrawal from the fact-finding procedure at the panel's first open hearing:

"The question of profits and prices for the future, which are the basis by which the union proposes to measure ability to pay, involves forecasts, assumptions, consumer demand—both foreign and domestic—and uncertain variables as to material and labor costs upon which this fact-finding board could not competently pass," he said. "It involves judgment by those familiar with the business, and that judgment is in the minds of men and not in books and documents.

"Facts and figures as to wage rates and earnings, facts and figures as to probable take-home pay, facts and figures which deal

with the question as to whether wage increases have kept pace with the increased cost of living, facts and figures showing at least equal pay for equal work in this industry and in the areas in which the corporation operates—all this and equally pertinent information will be made available if we are assured that the scope of the board's investigation will be so limited."

WARTIME WAGE BOOMERANG

The second fallacy is that the proposal to have such boards investigate "ability to pay" is nothing new—having been followed in previous wage negotiations and similar information having been gathered by other Government agencies. The President himself practiced this deception in seeking to reassure management it had nothing to fear from fact finding.

"Ability to pay" has been used as a basis for wage settlements only during the war. The principle was first established by the War Labor Board in February 1942 in a case involving the Aluminum Corp. of America. There was little objection to the procedure in wartime, with the Government in virtual control of the Nation's industrial machine. The Government, the only customer of most industries, with fixed prices of both raw materials and finished products, made contracts which determined production schedules and limited profits through renegotiation of contracts, excess-profits taxes, and other means. In this situation there could be little objection to Government also fixing wages. A Government attempt to fix wages, prices, and profits in peacetime is quite another thing, however, although price controls still remain in effect by general consent to prevent postwar inflation until full production is restored.

Labor, in the long run, stands to lose as much as management from the proposed fact-finding procedure. Thus far labor has attacked the plan publicly on the ground that the 30-day cooling-off period would violate its right to strike. Many labor leaders, however, have objected privately to the injection of "ability to pay" as a basis for fixing wages and have assailed Reuther for accepting it.

Before the war, labor generally took the position that an employer's "ability to pay" was not a matter for consideration in wage disputes. Employers who opposed wage increases on the grounds that they would be put to competitive disadvantages or driven to bankruptcy were told by labor negotiators that this was strictly management's business. Labor said to employers, in effect, that wages should be based on merit or need, but not on ability to pay. Labor leaders often told employers that they would not consider wage cuts to keep inefficient managements in business.

Labor leaders opposed to fact finding privately expressed these two major objections to the procedure:

1. If this program became national policy, the moment there was a business recession and profits declined, industry would demand fact-finding inquiries to reduce wages. If the procedure operated impartially, wages would have to be cut. Wages would thus be tied to every fluctuation of the economic cycle—a fact that might increase the severity of business booms and depressions since the relative stability of wages now acts as a deterrent to such fluctuations.

DOES EFFICIENCY PAY?

2. Fact finding would also put the brakes on labor's current drive for national industry-wide wage stabilization—one of the pet ideas of the CIO. With wages to be adjusted by fact-finding boards for individual companies on the basis of their profits, more efficient producers would have higher wages and less efficient manufacturers would be required to pay lower rates. Industry-wide wages would be impossible.

Curiously enough, Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., chairman of General Motors, touched upon the same point in listing his objections to fact finding:

"Who would risk money to develop or expand a business under such circumstances?" he asked. "Where would be the incentive to do a more efficient job? Should General Motors, assuming it is more efficient, be required to pay more for materials, for transportation, for services, or for wages than its competitors?"

Resolutions and Petitions of Minneapolis Retail Grocers' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 5, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions and petitions of Minneapolis Retail Grocers' Association, January 16, 1946:

I

Whereas there is an acute shortage of butter and much agitation for higher prices for this product and

Whereas should such higher prices for butter be imposed, many consumers will unjustly blame the retailer for this increase and brand him as a profiteer, the Minneapolis Retail Grocers' Association in meeting assembled on January 16, 1946, do petition Congress, the Department of Agriculture and the Office of Price Administration to take such immediate steps as will insure an adequate supply of butter to consumers at no increase in cost to either consumers or retailers, or any reduction in the present mark-up permitted retail grocers.

II

Whereas retail grocers adjusting themselves to peacetime conditions are confronted with merchandise shortages, manpower problems, transportation difficulties and many other minor but irritating factors and

Whereas the Office of Price Administration continues to keep in effect rules, regulations, policies and practices which are not only impossible for the retailer to observe but also which continuously harass and inconvenience his operation; regulations, rules, policies and practices which in many instances are far afield from the program sanctioned by the Congress of the United States, therefore the Minneapolis Retail Grocers Association in meeting assembled on January 16, 1946, do petition the Office of Price Administration and the Minnesota congressional delegation to see to it that immediate revision of OPA regulations be made, and that these same rules, regulations, policies, and practices of the Office of Price Administration be placed on an equitable and practical basis and that these revised regulations be so written that they are easily understood by the men and women engaged in the retail grocery field.

III

Whereas many products are in short supply and public demand for these products is steadily increasing at this time and

Whereas the eagerness of the public to obtain these products and their willingness to pay excessively high prices for the same would most definitely contribute to bringing about a period of inflation most disastrous to the national welfare, we, members of the Minneapolis Retail Grocers' Association, in meeting assembled on January 16, 1946, do petition Congress to continue price-control regulations until such time as commodities will be in such supply that the need for continued price control shall have become unnecessary.

United States Attorney Edmund Brandon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 5, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article entitled "United States Attorney Edmund Brandon Tireless Worker for Justice," which appeared in the Lynn Telegram-News, Lynn, Mass., on Sunday, February 3, 1946:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY EDMUND BRANDON TIRELESS WORKER FOR JUSTICE

(By Mary S. King)

Far from his unassuming description that he is "merely a cog in the wheel" of his important Federal Department, United States Attorney Edmund J. Brandon is actually the "hub" around which the intricate and multiferious duties of the United States Attorney's office revolves.

Springing from comparative obscurity to the powerful post of regional administrator for the Federal Securities and Exchange Commission of Massachusetts in 1935, the Cambridge-born executive from then on won the plaudits of press and public for his conscientious battle for justice and righteousness in offices which he since filled.

This week, with his office finally getting into the swing of regular hours and systematic routine, a definite relief from the 24-hour schedule which the office maintained for the war's duration. District Attorney Brandon in an exclusive interview with the Lynn Telegram-News spoke of many things pertaining to the details of his department and current happenings of nationwide interest.

When Mr. Brandon took office in the spring of 1939, having received a "personal appointment" from the late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, he recalled having talked with the late Fred Tarr, of Gloucester, who at one time held the post. "Fred told me that he never found it necessary to spend more than 1 hour a day in the office. Of course, those were the times when the department had but few definite assignments.

"I smile now, when I think of it, because during the war this office has run on a 24-hour schedule, with the men working 10 to 14 hours a day, and like all bosses I was obliged to work even longer hours."

He expressed relief at being back at the 40-hour-week schedule. "Then, we worked to do what had to be done. Now we're living up to the labor laws ourselves." There are 20 assistants in the district attorney's department and with office employees, round out a personnel of 64, all going at top speed.

SPY CASES

Perhaps the most exciting of wartime assignments was the espionage and counter-espionage investigations, which brought headaches as so many leads had to be tracked down before the guilty parties were finally apprehended.

The office was instrumental in prosecuting the officers and crew of the German ship, *Fraulein Frederic*, who were found guilty of sabotage and given stiff jail and internment camp sentences until finally deported to Germany.

"I am particularly proud of the record we made in the land damage cases, when it was necessary to take over property for the Government as at Hingham and Chicopee, to make room for Westover Field." Mr. Brandon says:

"Our first assignment was to take over the 10 square miles of territory (about the size of Washington, D. C.), in Ludlow and Chicopee, where 320 families had homes. We managed to get the people off the land (not forcible evictions), found them homes and satisfied all. With the exception of a few minor cases against the city of Chicopee, all the land damage cases have been paid."

Mr. Brandon explained that millions of dollars were spent by the Government to take over the areas they needed for Army and Navy as well as civilian occupancy, adhering strictly to the law of eminent domain.

BLACK MARKET

Black-market exploiters came under the jurisdiction of this office and felt the hand of justice fall heavily on their activities.

"I anticipate within the next few months some very important prosecution of income-tax violations of large amounts of persons dealing with black markets. These cases, I expect, will encompass some individuals who were successful in covering their operations by use of currency in place of a checking account, so as to make it difficult and evade prosecution. The Treasury Department by then will have completed their investigations, which are now going on so that these malefactors will not escape. Evidence will be presented to the grand jury, and transgressors will be tried before a trial jury in Federal court," he declared.

He gave a storied account of the mechanics of the office, which is highly revealing. For the past 12 to 14 years, the jurisdiction of the Federal Government has increased, both civilly and criminally to an extent which couldn't be foreseen.

"At one time," says Mr. Brandon, we were concerned principally with offenses against custom and revenue and a few other matters. Today, Federal criminal law reaches right into the community, even to prosecute violators of common misdemeanors.

"For many years, there was a no-man's land in the jurisdiction between the States and Federal Government, but in recent years that gap has been closed."

CARLIN CASE

"Today, in addition to violations of revenue laws, such matters regarding to transportation in interstate commerce, stolen motor vehicles and goods stolen while being transported interstate, are within our jurisdiction.

"Extortion ranks after kidnaping (the Carlin case, he explained, did not come under Federal jurisdiction because sufficient evidence could not be proven) in ransom demands."

Others, he listed, included immigration and naturalization laws, gold reserve act, frauds against the Government, violation of currency laws, income-tax evasions, use of mails in schemes to defraud, violations of stock fraud cases and national bank laws by embezzlements of employees or officers in national banks and members of the Federal Reserve system; prosecution of violators of the wage and hour laws, Mann Act, for which the department has a definite policy, prosecuting relentlessly immoral rings; the increasingly important narcotics laws; violators of OPA and milk laws; disbursing of obscene literature through mails; food, drug, and cosmetic laws, bankruptcy frauds, navigation and railroad laws, servicemen's readjustment act of 1944, violators of selective service, unlawful wearing of the uniform, impersonating a Federal officer; lotteries conducted interstate and many others.

CIVIL BUSINESS

Mr. Brandon added that there is a great deal of civil business which is under his department's orders, and referred to one especially which is pending, but about which he was unable to comment except to say that it took weeks of preparation before an auditor, and before the final outcome is determined, it is anticipated that the Government might be obliged to spend "billions more."

"We act first, then we talk," he stated, explaining his reticence in giving out pertinent information about current investigations.

SOUND ADVICE

The relative merits of arguing a case before a judge and jury were discussed by Mr. Brandon, who said that if the defendant had a good case it was better to appear before a judge, but if a weak one, a jury selection is advisable.

"I have a confirmed faith in the jury system. I believe, by and large, that real justice is done by this form of trial, and I hope the day will never come when it will be abolished," the prosecutor says.

PRAISES LAWYERS

"I came here as a prosecutor after 20 years on the side of the bar, and since being in the prosecutor's chair, it is my experience with bar members all over the State that any State would be proud of the type of men practicing law in Massachusetts today."

SEX COMES UP

The subject of juvenile delinquency was brought with the revealing information that sex offenses among girls between the ages of 17 and 18 had increased 150 percent during 1945.

"I think that conditions existing in wartime attributed a lot to this and I don't share the belief of so many that we have a 'lost generation.'

"Fundamentally, young people, and I refer to those up to 21, are just as good today and in many ways better than in previous years. They are the victims of the times, as a general let-down in morality is always associated with war," the prosecutor stated.

"At the suggestion of the new Attorney General, Thomas C. Clark, we have inaugurated here a new method of dealing with juvenile delinquents. Instead of issuing warrants against them and branding them as delinquents, a boy or girl is placed on a sort of informal probation.

"The assistant talks to the boy or girl in question and impresses upon him the seriousness of the situation and the necessity of conforming to law, his duty to neighbor and society, and upon the promise of the parent or some other person that close who has supervision will be kept over him, no complaint is filed. The understanding is, however, if there is a second violation, the boy is punished for both.

"This is a new approach to the problem and as yet we have not been able to evaluate the results. It has been tried out successfully in Brooklyn, where conditions are quite serious," he concluded.

AT WHITE HOUSE

President Roosevelt was a close personal friend of Mr. Brandon, and the latter and his wife had often been White House guests. He paid this heartfelt tribute to the late Chief Executive:

"I believe that when the true history of the last dozen years or more is written from the light of a dispassionate, nonpartisan historian, people will come to the realization how much Franklin Delano Roosevelt meant in meeting both the postwar and war—the two greatest crises the country has ever encountered—the economic crisis of '33 and the war crisis of '41. He steered us through the first, giving the so-called forgotten man his proper place in our economic system and at the same time preserved our American institutions.

"He saw with a clarity of vision, the inevitability of our being forced into the war and his foresight was responsible for the tremendous miracle of American production that brought about its victorious conclusion."

In March 1935, Mr. Brandon, as regional administrator for the Federal Securities and Exchange Commission, asserted that Boston was the center for high-pressure stock swindling—and as a result, started a Federal drive to stamp out these operations. He was successful, to the extent that all stock swindling was wiped out of the city.

The soaring-stock quotations of today were commented upon by Mr. Brandon. "Of course, nothing can stop runaway inflation, but there are many safeguards today that didn't exist in 1934.

The Federal Reserve Board's action in upping the margin of 100 percent is banishing the possibility of wild orgies of buying as there is no margin trade at all.

"The SEC now has the power to investigate an untoward activity in the stock and the New York and Boston exchanges, and others throughout the country are cooperating in safeguarding the public interests."

BOATING ENTHUSIAST

In his leisure moments, the Attorney General is a devotee of boating and has pioneered in radio telephone from ship to shore and shore to ship, with a winter hobby for building transmitting sets.

His 65-foot auxiliary schooner, "*Half-Tide*," which he loaned to the Coast Guard during the war, is his No. 1 diversion, although he admits to being an "inveterate first-nighter." The second confession was that his wife is the first nighter—"I go with her."

Color photography, especially movies, holds a great deal of interest for him and as a bit of professional advice, he admonished, "Always use a light meter with color to get best results."

CAMBRIDGE NATIVE

Born in Cambridge, Mr. Brandon was graduated from Boston College with a degree of bachelor of arts in 1915 and from Boston University with a degree of bachelor of laws in 1919. He has this unusual distinction of being admitted to the Massachusetts bar in March 1919, and then being graduated from college in June, 3 months later.

Because of the First World War, during which he was a commissioned officer in the United States Navy, he returned to complete his education and was obliged to cover an entire year's course in 6 months.

He has also been admitted to practice before the Supreme Court of the United States, is a member of the Massachusetts Bar Association, Boston Bar Association, Federal Bar Association, of which he is past president, and American Bar Association. He made an outstanding prosecuting record during 1939 of losing only 1 out of 418 criminal cases in Federal court.

District Attorney Brandon is married to the former Dorothy A. McCarthy, of Brighton, and they make their home at 150 Beacon Street. For years he has been a leader in the Massachusetts Council of the Knights of Columbus and held the highest office from 1924 to 1926.

Contempt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 5, 1946

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to bring to the attention of the Congress an editorial from the Washington Post of February 5, 1946, which is a further indictment of the House Committee on Un-American Activities for its attempts to smear the well-known humanitarian organization, the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee:

CONTEMPT

Generally speaking, contempt of a congressional committee amounts to contempt of Congress. This is altogether proper, of course, for the committee is invested with authority by the legislative body; and this authority must be respected if the essential investigative functions of Congress are to be effectively discharged. Thus there will be an understandable disposition in the House of Representatives, no doubt, to back up its Standing Committee on Un-American Activities which has voted to cite for contempt a Miss Helen Bryan, executive secretary of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, because she failed to comply with an order to produce all the records of her organization.

But this Standing Committee on Un-American Activities is clearly a special case. It has long since become notorious for its abuse of the powers granted to it by the House. It has employed its mandate to investigate un-Americanism, as a general license for the persecution, and vilification of individuals and organizations whose sole offense has been to incur the displeasure of the committee's dominant figure, Representative JOHN RANKIN. Its antics have tended to weaken respect for the investigatory functions of the Congress and even for the Congress itself. Indeed, it has invited and provoked, if it has not justified, contempt as an expression of traditional American independence and self-respect.

Consider Miss Bryan's pending case, for example. Her organization, licensed by the President's War Relief Control Board, is engaged in collecting funds for the relief of refugee victims of fascism in Europe. It is a philanthropic body and undertakes no propaganda activities of any kind. Before making any effort to investigate this organization, the Un-Ameri an Activities Committee sought to have its license revoked by the War Relief Control Board. Then the committee summarily summoned the secretary, ordering her to produce forthwith all books and records—which would have meant, of course, discontinuation of the organization's relief work. Miss Bryan came before the committee but was afforded no chance to answer questions or to explain the difficulty of bringin all her files to Washington. She was not even allowed to consult her counsel during the hearing. The committee voted to cite her for contempt—contempt of an order which was as unnecessary as it was unreasonable. Action before the House has been deferred until the organization's national chairman, Dr. Edward K. Barsky, can appear before the committee tomorrow.

If the House supports this contempt citation, Miss Bryan will have to look to the courts to uphold her civil rights. Perhaps Members of the House will feel bound to support a committee which they themselves have established. But we think that the authority of the House can be better sustained by curbing an arbitrary exercise of it. In truth, Miss Bryan has not been in contempt of Congress; she has only been in contempt of a committee which has itself been contemptuous of its congressional mandate and of the democratic process. And we believe that the House will enhance rather than diminish its dignity by making this committee conform to its established standards.

Of course, the only sure way to curb the Un-American Activities Committee is to abolish it. The House can permit this group to go on acting as its agent only at grave peril to its own prestige. Miss Bryan's case offers a welcome opportunity to administer a rebuke. But what is needed is a major operation.

Atlantic Monthly Attitude Toward Soviet Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 5, 1946

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article that appeared in the New York Times, entitled "Two Writers Assail Atlantic Monthly":

TWO WRITERS ASSAIL ATLANTIC MONTHLY—CHAMBERLIN AND BUELL CHARGE MAGAZINE HAS NONCRITICAL ATTITUDE TOWARD RUSSIA

The Atlantic Monthly is charged with an overly friendly and non-critical attitude toward Soviet Russia, particularly its activities in Poland, in two open letters addressed to Edward Weeks, editor of the monthly, which were published yesterday in the current issue of the New Leader, liberal labor weekly.

William Henry Chamberlin, in his letter, resigned in protest as a member of the Atlantic's editorial staff, a post he hold for 14 years, citing two recent articles on Poland by Anna Louise Strong and the magazine's seeming unwillingness to print anything critical of Russia.

Raymond Leslie Buell, writer and lecturer, challenged Mr. Weeks' rejection of an article on Poland that he said the editor asked him to write. He also cited Miss Strong's articles and said she is "no longer American by inspiration but is a Russian Communist by adoption."

Both Mr. Chamberlin and Mr. Buell are authors of works on European affairs.

Efforts to reach Mr. Weeks in Boston for comment were unavailing last night.

CHAMBERLIN NOTES "WIDE GULF"

Referring to Miss Strong's articles, Mr. Chamberlin, who is an associate editor of the New Leader, said that "the gulf between an editorial viewpoint which would regard these articles as suitable for publication in an American non-Communist magazine and my own is so wide that I don't think my former assignment of submitting opinions on political and foreign affairs articles could be continued with much advantage to either of us."

Of Miss Strong he said:

"It seems to me that an avowed American Communist sympathizer, a former editor of a Soviet propaganda paper edited in English in Moscow and the widow of a Soviet official is not the most reliable source of information about what happened in Poland under Soviet occupation."

He referred favorably to dispatches by Gladwin Hill in the New York Times and the report of Representative THOMAS GORDON, of Illinois, published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, commenting that Mr. Hill and Mr. GORDON also had been recent visitors to Poland.

"If these (Miss Strong's) articles had represented an isolated exception I would not feel so strongly on the subject," Mr. Chamberlin continued. "But it seems to me that they represent only the most extreme expression of a 'Russia can do no harm' attitude which was not characteristic of the magazine when I became associated with it, but which has been markedly reflected in its contents since 1942."

What was regrettable to him, Mr. Chamberlin wrote, was not a willingness to print occasional favorable articles about Soviet Russia, but "the conscious or unconscious closemindedness that lead to almost automatic rejection of capable and informed contributions which contained some note of criticism."

BUELL ASSAILS INDIFFERENCE

Mr. Buell, saying that he had been impressed by the "indifference of a number of Atlantic articles ignoring the question of human freedom," and that "in the kind of crisis which the world is undergoing the hem-haw policy simply aids the totalitarians," continued:

"The issue is not between feudal capitalism and a Socialist utopia. The issue is between social democracy resting on a respect for human dignity, and totalitarian terrorism of whatever variety. The major issue confronting the world is whether individuals are to be arbitrarily sacrificed for the sake of so-called social engineering, or whether changes are to be made by agreement and humanitarian means."

Mr. Buell wrote that Mr. Weeks' letter of rejection seemed to suggest that what had been wanted was an article agreeing "for the most part" with Miss Strong's contributions

"I am concerned about freedom not only in Poland but in America," he continued. "If erstwhile American liberals are not interested in its fate in Poland, can we count on them to fight for its preservation here? I do not believe so. Totalitarianism may yet win this country and the world, due in part to the new attitude of historic journals like the Atlantic."

The articles by Miss Strong referred to were Getting Democracy in Poland in the October issue and Bor's Uprising in the December issue.

Back Home Thought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. COLE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 5, 1946

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem written by F. J. Lyons, of Conception Junction, Mo.:

Should capital and labor be both allowed to flout
A nation just recovering from a war, almost a rout?

I ask this simple question, because I am of those
Millions who have capital and still labor to day's close:
Must we, who are a composite of both the warring clans,
Stand idly by and suffer from both their ruthless plans?
We too, have sustained the nation in the ordeal she has known,
Produced the food by sweat and labor, as we've reaped and sown,
We have thought of our great Nation as a guide to be
To clean and righteous living, a beacon to eternity
Of every warring country so sore beset by strife
To a new and greatly needed, cleaner, better way of life:
Must our Government stand idly by, and complacently abide
While capital and labor, a minority, daringly deride
Its futile efforts to maintain a sorely needed peace
For which a saddened world languishes, and seeks release?
No, I cannot believe, that we, America, having won a global war
Can be so dead to all our history or drifted so afar.

Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL VINSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1946

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I have analyzed the various laws, rules, regulations, and other measures adopted for the benefit of war veterans.

I am submitting for the RECORD a digest of such benefits in the hope that it will be a useful and ready reference of practical assistance to the Members and to veterans:

DIGEST OF VETERANS' BENEFITS

ELIGIBILITY

A veteran must have served in the active military or naval service on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war. He must have been discharged or released under conditions other than dishonorable after active service of 90 days or more or because of an injury or disability incurred in line of duty.

MONEY

1. Mustering-out pay: Service personnel up through the rank of Captain in the Army and Marine Corps and senior lieutenant in the Navy and Coast Guard are entitled to: (a) $300 mustering-out pay if they have performed active service for at least 60 days outside the United States; or (b) $200 mustering-out pay if they have performed active service for at least 60 days no part of which was served outside of the United States; or (c) $100 for any active service less than 60 days.

2. Bonus: Public Law 268 repeals that portion of the law, which provided that any financial benefits received under the act would be deducted from any future bonus authorized.

3. Retirement pay: Service personnel on active duty for more than 30 days and disabled from disease or injury received in the line of duty are entitled to receive the same retirement pay as now provided for regular personnel of the service.

4. Pensions: Discharge or release from service under conditions other than dishonorable is a prerequisite to veteran's benefits. Any veteran having a 10-percent or more disability resulting from disease or injury incurred in or aggravated by war service will, if his application is approved, receive the following amount:

Percent of disability:	*Amount payable per month*
10	$11.50
20	23.00
30	34.50
40	46.00
50	57.50
60	69.00
70	80.50
80	92.00
90	103.50
Total disability	115.00

Eligibility for pensions for non-service-connected disabilities requires honorable discharge and 90 days' wartime service—or if period of service was less than 90 days, have been discharged for disability incurred in service in the line of duty. The disability must be permanently and totally disabling and not due to the veterans' own willful misconduct.

Any single veteran with an annual income of over $1,000, or any married veteran—or with dependent minor children—with an annual income over $2,500, is ineligible for non-service-connected disability pensions. This pension is $50 per month and is increased to $60 upon 10 years of continuous, permanent, total disability or upon reaching the age of 65.

5. Insurance: Service personnel are eligible for the cheapest and best life insurance attainable—the National Service Life Insurance. This is term insurance for 5 years, convertible into ordinary life, 20-payment life, or 30-payment life policies.

Insurance that has lapsed may be reinstated by the veteran, either within 6 months after date of separation from active service, or within 3 months after date of lapse, whichever is later, by payment of only 2 monthly premiums without interest.

6. Readjustment allowances: Unemployed veterans who register with an office of the United States Employment Service are entitled to a readjustment allowance of $20 per week while unemployed. An eligible veteran may receive such payments up to a maximum of 1 year, depending on length of service. Self-employed veterans with net earnings of less than $100 per month may receive an allowance amounting to the difference between net earnings and $100 in any month, up to a maximum of 1 year, also depending on length of service.

7. Loans: Veterans have up to 10 years after official end of the war in which to make application for guaranteed loan at no more than 4 percent interest. These loans are automatically guaranteed if made in accordance with the provisions of the act and if the amount does not exceed the appraisal made by an appraiser of the Veterans' Administration.

Any loan on real estate may be guaranteed up to a maximum guaranty of $4,000 of the loan, with the Government guaranteeing 50 percent of the total loan up to the maximum amount. The business loan guaranty limit remains at $2,000, or 50 percent. Real-estate loans may be amortized over a period up to 25 years, and farm realty loans up to 40 years. Maturity on non-real-estate loans may not exceed 10 years.

Proceeds of a loan may be used to purchase a lot in connection with home construction. Loans may be made for all ordinary farming purchases, and any normal business enterprise, and so that existing indebtedness in default may be refinanced in connection with all types of eligible loans.

8. Income-tax exemptions: Special provisions have been enacted by Congress for the tax benefit of veterans. These benefits include (a) $1,500 of active service pay is excluded from gross income for the taxable year 1943 and until the termination of the present war is proclaimed; (b) mustering-out pay is excluded from gross income for the taxable year of 1944 and later years.

JOBS

1. Employment placement and assistance: The United States Employment Service and the Veterans' Placement Service Board are directed to cooperate in seeing that all veterans, able and willing to work, obtain employment. This assistance includes employment counseling.

2. Employment preference: Preference in job referrals through the United States Employment Service is available to veterans under regulations adopted by the Veterans' Placement Service Board, carrying out the direction of the GI bill of rights that the veteran receive "the maximum job opportunity in the field of gainful employment."

3. Civil-service preferences: Veterans with service-connected disabilities or in receipt of pensions, disability retirement benefits, or compensation from the Federal Government, receive an additional 10 points on their civil-service examination ratings.

A five-point preference is allowed to veterans not disabled.

These preferences will place veterans' names above all other names on the civil-service list except for professional or scientific positions paying over $3,000 a year.

4. Restoration to former Federal job: A veteran who held a permanent, probational, or probational-indefinite civil-service job when called to active service with the armed forces is entitled to mandatory reemployment in his former position, or one of like seniority, status, and pay, provided he has satisfactorily completed his period of service, is still qualified to perform the duties of his position, and applies for restoration within 90 days after separation from active service or discharge from the hospital.

5. Other civil-service benefits: The civil-service rule that not more than two members of a family, living in the same house, may hold a Federal civil-service position does not apply in case of a person entitled to veteran preference.

BUSINESS AND HOME AIDS

1. Small-business aids: Assistance is provided to veterans in establishing small businesses through (a) loans not connected with the GI bill of rights for worth-while manufacturing projects; (b) assistance in obtaining surplus war materials that will be helpful to the planned business venture; and (c) supplying of technical assistance.

2. Material priorities: Priorities for materials are granted by the Civilian Production Administration and the Office of Price Administration to veterans.

3. Purchase of surplus property: Veterans can purchase surplus property to set themselves up and help to maintain themselves in business without buying through regular dealer channels or paying a profit to anyone.

4. Housing priorities: Priorities for the construction or purchase of new houses have been established for veterans in obtaining homes under $10,000.

5. Legal assistance: The American Bar Association has adopted a program of legal assistance to veterans and members of their families.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

1. Education: Any eligible veteran may receive 1 year of education or of training

plus additional education (up to a maximum of 4 years), for total length of active service. There is no age limit nor is there any need to show that a veteran's education was interrupted by war service.

The time during which a course may be initiated is within 4 years after discharge or the end of the war, whichever is later, and the time limit for completion of the course is 9 years after the end of the war.

Short intensive courses may be undertaken and the additional cost prorated against the period of eligibility to which the veteran is entitled at the rate of $500 per school year. No such short course may cost more than $500. Veterans may apply to take a correspondence course but they are entitled to no subsistence allowance. One-fourth of the elapsed time used in pursuing such a course is charged against the veteran's period of eligibility. Total amount payable for correspondence courses for any veteran is limited to $500.

Monthly subsistence allowance, while in school or training, is $65 for veterans without dependents and $90 for veterans with dependents.

2. Vocational rehabilitation of disabled veterans: The purpose of vocational rehabilitation is to restore the employability which has been lost by virtue of a handicap due to a disability incurred in or aggravated by service.

Vocational training involving more than 4 years of training may be begun by disabled veterans, subject to approval of the Veterans' Administration. The time for completing such training is 9 years after the end of the war.

Disabled veterans in vocational rehabilitation training are entitled to receive monthly subsistence allowance of $65 (without dependents) or $90 (with dependents) plus whatever pension they are entitled to by law. The minimum total amount such veteran may receive is set at $100 per month (without dependents) and $115 (with a dependent), plus $10 for the first child, $7 for each additional child, and $15 for any dependent parent. If the veteran would otherwise receive less than these minimum amounts, his allowance is raised to equal the minimum during the period of training and for 2 months thereafter.

HOSPITALIZATION AND DOMICILIARY CARE

1. Hospitalization: The Veterans' Administration provides hospitalization for any veteran of any war who was discharged under conditions other than dishonorable. Veterans with service-connected disabilities are given preference. Veterans with non-service-connected disabilities are eligible if a hospital bed is available and the veteran makes a sworn statement that he is unable to defray expenses of treatment.

The Veterans' Administration has been authorized and directed to expedite additional hospital construction and to establish all necessary administrative offices to make veterans' benefits more readily available.

2. Artificial limbs and prosthetic appliances: Provision has been made to insure ample funds for the Veterans' Administration to purchase prosthetic appliances for veterans and instruct them in the use of such appliances, including payment of any expense involved in the veterans' traveling to and from the center where the appliance is fitted and training given in its use.

3. Guide or seeing-eye dogs: Guide or seeing-eye dogs may be provided for the aid of blind veterans who are entitled to disability compensation or pensions for a service-connected disability under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, including payment of any expense involved in the veterans' traveling to and from the center to become adjusted to the dogs.

Blind veterans are also entitled to mechanical or electronic equipment to aid them in overcoming the handicap of blindness.

4. Domiciliary care: A veteran who is so disabled as to be unable to earn a living, and is without adequate means of support, may be admitted for home care to a facility of Veterans' Administration providing such accommodations.

Grain Situation in New Hampshire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1946

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following telegrams which I have received concerning the grain situation in New Hampshire and in New England:

BOSTON, MASS., *January 26, 1946.*

Hon. CHESTER E. MERROW,
Member of Congress:

With the advance of oats to ceiling we are now unable to buy any wheat, corn, barley, or oats proteins, and mill feeds are also unobtainable. A very serious condition faces New England feeders unless steps are taken to meet requirements in this deficit area. From here we see no hope of getting supplies unless ceilings are removed. Action within 10 days is needed or feedstuffs in many places will be exhausted.

BOSTON GRAIN AND FLOUR EXCHANGE,
J. A. BASSETT, *President.*

CONCORD, N. H., *February 1, 1946.*

Hon. CHESTER MERROW,
Member of Congress:

We wish to call your attention to the following resolution for your consideration:

Whereas we are unable to buy wheat, corn, oats, barley, mill feeds, and proteins; and

Whereas our present supplies will be exhausted within 3 weeks, we believe some drastic action must be taken immediately to prevent a catastrophe to the poultry and dairy industry in New Hampshire: Be it therefore

Resolved, That price ceilings as applied to grain and grain products be removed at once. Only by such action do we believe that the above-mentioned catastrophe can be prevented.

NEW HAMPSHIRE FEED DEALERS AND MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION,
ROBERT B. FARNUM, *Secretary.*

CONCORD, N. H., *February 2, 1946.*

Hon. CHESTER MERROW,
Member of Congress:

We are depending on you to exert every influence in this national grain crisis to provide enough grain for New Hampshire and New England to meet the USDA dairy and poultry quotas. We are at the end of the grain route and this situation will certainly destroy our poultry industry and do serious harm to our dairying unless you are able to find means of getting grain into this area.

GEORGE M. PUTNAM,
President, New Hampshire Farm Bureau.

CONCORD, N. H., *February 4, 1946.*

Congressman CHESTER MERROW:

For your information following wire dispatched today to Secretary Anderson and copy to President Truman:

"New Hampshire is facing desperately serious feed shortage. Supply of feed on hand for poultry and cattle will last only 2 to 4 weeks and replacements cannot be bought at any price. Am informed similar condition prevails generally over New England. As a means of immediate relief I suggest CCC obtain and allocate to this State and this region sufficient quantity grain and feed ingredients to save our poultry flocks from liquidation and starvation and our dairy herds from serious milk production loss and loss of flesh resulting from feeding hay and roughage alone. This situation is desperate and only quick action will save our poultry and dairy industry."

Do not believe ceiling price adjustments can be obtained quickly enough, even if such adjustment or removal of grain from price control is the answer. Therefore suggest CCC or other appropriate Government agency take immediate action to get grain into hands of distributors of this area at once. Sending this wire to New Hampshire congressional delegation.

ANDREW L. FELKER,
Commissioner of Agriculture.

MacArthur Deserves the Support of Our Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1946

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to insert an article from the New York Journal-American of January 25, 1946.

As far as the American people are concerned, our present foreign policy seems to be floundering in secrecy, appeasement, lack of any central responsibility and leadership, undermining and destroying those who display courage and constructive foresight, bolstered by a series of emphatic denials which are invariably followed by a tardy and apologetic admission of the facts when it is too late to do anything about them. As against the frank and forthright attitude of British Foreign Minister Ernest Bevin, we suffer by comparison.

In a recent press conference Secretary of State James F. Byrnes denied reports of friction between General MacArthur and State Department Advisers George Atcheson, Jr., and John Service. Does the State Department seek again to whitewash the charges against men, which were made by Gen. Patrick Hurley? To this day Mr. Byrnes has not seen fit to delve into the charges made by the FBI against John Stewart Service and his associates. Now comes another instance to show that the State Department or its authorized representatives are undermining Gen. Douglas A. MacArthur while he is in the field carrying out Department policies with high distinction and sagacity.

On Thursday January 24, the so-called Japanese-American Committee for Democracy held a meeting at the Manhattan Center in New York City. This meeting was widely advertised in

the Communist press. On January 23, 1 day prior to that meeting, Mr. Howard Rushmore carried a story in the New York Journal-American and the Hearst papers throughout the countries indicating the character of this meeting. The article follows:

RED GROUP LEADS MACARTHUR SMEAR

(By Howard Rushmore)

The smear campaign being directed by the Communist International against Gen. Douglas MacArthur is now firmly rooted in the United States with a new Red group, Japanese-American Committee for Democracy, leading the attack on the Pacific war hero.

Ironically the State Department apparently has enrolled one of its members in this vilification of General MacArthur, for Dr. Hugh Borton, member of the Department, is listed as speaker on a Japanese-American Committee program here tomorrow night.

Dr. Borton will speak at a rally called by the committee at Manhattan Center, 311 West Thirty-fourth Street, in what appears to be the Communists' opening drive to turn public opinion against the Allied supreme commander in Japan.

ROTH WAS INDICTED

On the same platform with Dr. Borton will be Andrew Roth, a former naval intelligence officer and a critic of General MacArthur, who was arrested and indicted last summer on a charge of conspiracy to steal confidential documents from the State Department.

These documents, relating to American policy in the Far East, were in part printed in Amerasia, a pro-Communist publication edited by Philip Jaffee, who made a guilty plea to his part in the conspiracy.

Literature circulated by the Japanese-American committee has featured attacks on General MacArthur as a reactionary and the tie-in * * * will be evidenced at tomorrow's meeting by the reading of a special greeting from the Japanese People's Emancipation League."

CITES MOSCOW TIE-IN

This league operated from Yenan, China, during the war and is one of the many Communist international stooge organizations designed to seize Japan as a Moscow colony.

The message from Tokyo has a sharp attack on the efficiency of General MacArthur's administration and says in part:

"The Japanese militarists have also skillfully started their underground operations. The bureaucrats, who are war criminals, are still in their former positions and the landlords are plotting to keep their old feudalist land system."

Mr. Speaker, despite this timely warning, Dr. Hugh Borton, Acting Chief, Division of Japanese Affairs of the State Department, not only appeared at the meeting, spoke there, but was present with none other than Andrew Roth as the gathering adopted a resolution which read, in part, as follows:

Whereas the United States State Department is carrying out in liberated Europe, in Puerto Rico, in Indonesia, in the Philippines, and in China an imperialistic policy: Be it *Resolved* That we watch for similar action in Japan, and mobilize the people of America to protest.

In other words this State Department representative was openly consorting with one charged with appropriating confidential documents of the Department, while his own Department was the target of Communist attack. This same Andrew Roth made General MacArthur the butt of his remarks. He waxed enthusiastic over recent changes in the State Department "when ex-Ambassador Grew resigned last summer and was replaced by Dean Acheson, John Carter Vincent, and others."

Mr. Speaker, I rise to question the propriety of the appearance of Dr. Hugh Borton, a duly authorized State Department official, at a meeting whose chief function was to attack General MacArthur, now carrying out the directives of this very Department. The incident is a mockery of the assurances given by Mr. Byrnes on the present relations between the State Department and General MacArthur. It is but another example of apparent cooperation between the Communists and certain State Department officials. I wonder what will be the effect on American prestige when the story of this meeting is publicized in Tokyo.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the President has asked that we extend the price-control law for another year. Most of us, I think, are in agreement, but we should try to find some method by which we can save a run-away inflation. In attempting to do this, we must also find a way to open up the gates of opportunity for business. Without this there can be no reconversion. The whole program of price control cannot alone be directed in the interest of the consumers; the machinery which serves the consumers must be given some consideration.

In the attempt to regulate prices—and probably honorably in the interest of the common people—the Office of Price Administration has caused an ever-increasing shortage of materials. They are all too often stopping production. It would seem to me that this agency and its policies can well be reviewed before this Congress grants it a new lease on life. It is entirely right that we should control prices against inflation or spirals, but more than all else we must find at the same time a way to stimulate production.

Under unanimous consent, I include two letters which have come to my attention on the question of price control—one from the Truax-Traer Coal Co., one of the largest coal dealers of the Nation, and the other from the John Leslie Paper Co., of Minnesota:

TRUAX-TRAER COAL CO.,
Minot, N. Dak., January 28, 1946.

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ROBERTSON: Thanks very much for your letter of January 24 with regard to stoker-coal prices in our area.

If OPA informed you that the border cities in Minnesota such as East Grand Forks, Moorhead, and Breckenridge have enjoyed a price differential as against other Minnesota towns on lignite, they are very badly mistaken, as the same prices have prevailed in the entire Red River Valley, including all of Minnesota and South Dakota for at least the last 10 years that I know of.

In establishing the ceiling of $1.70 a ton, OPA recognized that our over-all costs of making stoker lignite is $1.69 and they very generously allowed a profit of 1 cent per ton.

The $1.69 does not take into account the fact that in crushing larger sizes to make stoker nut we lose from 25 to 30 percent of fine coal which is unsalable and when you consider that we have a ready market for the large sizes at $1.90 a ton, it should be easily recognized that $1.70 does not adequately cover our financial sacrifice in making stoker sizes.

OPA was informed that we felt we should have an over-all price of $1.83 on stoker nut which we do not feel unreasonable.

It is true that there are no uniform prices on lignite at the present time, largely because of piecemeal adjustments by OPA. For example, early in 1942 OPA authorized a ceiling price on all sizes of $2.50 per ton f. o. b. mine by off-rail truck mines and at the same time, holding our company to a maximum of $1.63 on lump, $1.44 on furnace, and $1.21 on stoker sizes sold to trucks at our mine. When you consider that our wage scale has always been substantially higher than that paid by truck mines, the unfairness of allowing the latter a $2.50 ceiling and denying the same prices to us should be obvious.

As the matter stands now, there are four different schedules of prices on lignite authorized by OPA in Mercer County alone. For example, the truck mines have a ceiling of $2.50, with still another ceiling granted to the Dakota Collieries Co. at Zap, a third price to the Knife River Coal Mining Co. at Beulah and still a different schedule authorized for our own company at Truax, N. Dak.

Our Burleigh mine at Wilton has still a different schedule of prices fixed by OPA, with our Kincaid and the Baukol-Noonan mine at Noonan being the lowest in the State.

The net result is that because of shortage of production and shipping facilities, dealers are obliged to buy lignite at the present time wherever it is more promptly available and, should they be obliged to buy from a mine carrying a higher freight rate than their normal source of supply, they are not allowed by OPA to add the difference in freight rate to their ceiling prices. They can, however, add to their ceiling prices, the higher f. o. b. mine cost of the lignite if they are obliged to buy from a mine enjoying a higher ceiling than their normal source of supply.

From the foregoing, you will recognize that OPA should make a study of lignite prices and establish a uniform scale on a basis which will encourage the maximum production.

Sincerely yours,
WESLEY E. KELLER, *Vice President.*

THE JOHN LESLIE PAPER CO.,
Minneapolis, Minn., January 29, 1946.

BISMARCK GROCERY CO.,
Bismarck, N. Dak.

GENTLEMEN: We regret there is not a roll of butchers' paper we can ship at the present time, as requested in your letter of January 25, 1946.

We are still holding your letter of October 5, 1945, hoping some of the grocery paper or kraft wrapping or butchers' paper itemized in that letter, would be available for your order, but no such opportunity has developed.

The mills are not interested in shipping kraft and butchers' wrap at the presen OPA prices because of the advances in cost of nearly all the material they used as well as the help employed, in recent months, but with no adjustment in their selling prices.

How long this situation will continue, only OPA knows the answer.

Cordially yours,
THE JOHN LESLIE PAPER CO.,
E. A. CLARE, *Vice President.*

Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 5 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Foreign Policy, delivered by me before the National Citizens Political Action Committee, at the Hotel Commodore, New York City, on January 31 last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Even were we not still under the inspiration of the birthday of Franklin D. Roosevelt, we could not consider the foreign policy of the United States nor world affairs without focusing our primary interest upon the principles and the policies of President Roosevelt. There is a remarkable parallelism in the time that President Roosevelt and Adolf Hitler were in power.

They came to power in just over 30 days of the same time; they died within just under 30 days of the same time. Through these two men two great and opposing ideologies clashed in the fiercest conflict the world has ever seen. Eventually Hitler drew nearly all the human race into the holocaust of war.

Behind the faith and the philosophy of Franklin Delano Roosevelt the democracies of the world arrayed themselves in battle to the death in the war which has just ebbed to an end. Roosevelt stood for the dignity and the sovereignty of the people. Hitler for the subservience of the people and the dictatorship of tyrannical power. Roosevelt, though dead, still lives and symbolizes the faith and the aspirations of the mass of the men and women, boys and girls of the world. Hitler is dead, but "the evil men do lives after them while the good is oft interred with their bones." The evil flames lighted by Adolf Hitler are still burning in many parts of the world. From underground sources and secret, even sometimes unknowing, hands they are fed and kept bright and dangerous.

But the principles of Franklin Delano Roosevelt which triumphed in war under the fiercest assault ever hurled against good causes and good men are still in a great battle. The question still is unsettled as to whether those great moving policies of Franklin Delano Roosevelt at home and abroad shall triumph or whether they shall fail.

It is yet to be settled by the Congress and the country as to whether this great Nation, lifted by Roosevelt out of the abyss of depression, shall fall into another as deep or deeper; whether the masses of the people he lifted up to a new life shall fall back again into the stagnation and squalor of the old; whether we shall again have mass unemployment and "one-third of a nation ill-fed, ill-clad, and ill-housed"; and whether business shall see its tower of profits crumble about its head and its throbbing enterprises idle and cold.

The attack that his unrelenting enemies made upon the principles of Roosevelt continues against those same principles as they have been courageously espoused by his successor, upon whom his mantle has fallen. From every sources the attack has come. The old policy of divide and rule has been the enemy's strategy, and with all their multiple resources they have mobilized their propaganda and arrayed their forces to stifle and to strangle everything which symbolizes democracy and well-being for the men, women, and children of America, and they see themselves vaulting to power upon a disillusioned and confused people whose distress they would make the stepping stones of their political triumph.

Both from Hyde Park, from the quiet garden where he keeps his watch over his country, comes ever stronger to the hearts of men the voice of Franklin Delano Roosevelt calling out again to those who love their fellow men to put together their strength, to unite and move forward against those who have set themselves across the path of man—forward and upward.

The foreign policy of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, too, is at issue in this country today. The good-neighbor policy, American leadership in promoting the welfare and preserving the peace of the world, the unity of the Big Three as the cornerstone of world peace, all these things that Roosevelt stood for as the right course for our country in the family of nations are under the fiercest assault. By direction and indirection, from hands that are sinister, as well as from the short-sighted and ignorant, the blows come.

But we who know that Roosevelt was right have before us the vision he gave us of that right, and the pattern he gave us of how to vindicate it. Every American who is able to raise his eyes above the level of own everyday concerns must know that the Roosevelt vision of a happy and prosperous America in a world united in peace as in war, means that both the ignorant and the sinister must be defeated—the ignorant by the victory-in-defeat of their own political reeducation, the sinister by the massed pressure of all Americans of good will. These imperatives are the immediate tasks which face us all, if we wish to live in a world at peace, unfettered by the twin fears of uranium 235 and of national and international selfishness and greed.

For the great President who sponsored and who urged the development of nuclear fission knew that the powers unleashed by the atom as they were a menace to the whole world, must be subject to the control of the whole world as a weapon of war. He knew that that power must be devoted to alleviating the labors of the human race, not to killing it off. He knew that the birth of the atom bomb made it more imperative that the United States should have at home an economic bill of rights which would assure the equitable distribution of our enormous industrial, agricultural, and scientific resources to all the people. He knew that it could only mean misery and destruction unless it was used by a world united for peace through the instrumentality of international cooperation in the use of our new powers, and international friendship through the spread of the principles of democracy and of the rights of the common man whoever and wherever he may be.

That was Franklin Roosevelt's vision. For the solution of the many problems in international affairs which we face today—problems which he knew would arise—President Roosevelt left us this vision and the United Nations Organization, the tool with which to carry out that vision.

Above all, he saw as the cornerstone of world peace the permanent existence of unity among the Big Three—Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and the United States. It is upon this rock as a firm foundation that he based our foreign policy; and it is upon that foundation that those who are now following after him must base every one of their actions. Of course, there are and will be differences among them—but let me remind you what Roosevelt said so prophetically in 1937 about such differences. In his great Chicago speech given in 1937, a speech which was a considered attempt on Roosevelt's part to show the people the dangers of the route they were traveling, he said:

"No nation ever loses its dignity or its good standing by conciliating its differences, and by exercising great patience with, and consideration for, the rights of other nations."

The world—and America—should have learned by now that nothing can be gained by blindly following a policy of national aggrandizement, or by crawling into an isolationist hole and pulling the hole in after us, or by intensifying differences among the great Allies. Two wars have been fought, two bloody and incomprehensibly destructive wars, within our generation. Both these wars were brought about by policies of all-out nationalism and isolationism. We now know that unshakable unity of the Big Three could have prevented those wars.

In the years preceding this war few of us were willing to assume the grave responsibilities of adult nationhood in a world of competing nationalisms. We did not pick up the gauntlet which had been thrown down. But since then we have taken part in the greatest and bloodiest war the world has ever known. Hundreds of thousands of our young men and women, part of the irreplaceable wealth of our Nation's youth, have died that we might once again have a chance to learn to live at peace in a world united, a world which finally shall have learned the lesson that it is mankind that is important. That security from want and fear is more important than national or private gain.

Today we know we must assume those responsibilities. We have already begun to profit by experience. Spurred perhaps by the ever-present catalyst of fear from the menace of the atomic bomb, but also by the lessons we have learned from the agony and the outpourings of the blood of our youth and of the youth of all nations, we have taken our place among the nations of the world in a great international organization for the preservation of peace. Tennyson's vision of a parliament of the world, Woodrow Wilson's great dream of a League of Nations firmly bound together by a desire for peace and progress among the countries of the world, have finally been brought to fruition by Franklin Roosevelt's concrete plan for an international organization of nations based on the cornerstone of Big Three unity.

Yet still we face enemies, still we have battles to win. There still are selfish and unscrupulous men who place their desires for personal power and profit above the welfare of the Nation and the world, blind and stupid men who are worked upon by the unscrupulous, who are their tools, their helots, obeying their divisive, cynical, and disruptive orders to wreck world peace at all costs.

Chief among the weapons of these sinister forces today is the weapon of anti-Sovietism. Not a morning passes but that I read in the newspaper some new and conscienceless attack upon our great ally—that ally, be it remembered, which for nearly 2 years singlehandedly held the line against the engulfing hordes of the Nazi juggernaut. Intemperateness, intolerance, national selfishness, personal hatred, and avarice motivate many, if not all, of these attacks; but behind them all is one overriding emotion: fear. The forces of reaction and their unseeing tools among the people fear above all the strength and the unity of the Russian people who, as President Roosevelt said in September 1941, "completely destroyed the myth of Nazi invincibility."

These forces of reaction must be defeated if there is to be peace in the world. We have absolutely nothing to fear from the Soviet Union as long as the Soviet Union has nothing to fear from us. But while arrogant, immoral, and selfish individuals and organizations within our midst persist in fanning the flames of hatred against our greatest ally, just so long do we stand in dreadful danger of another war—a war, this

time, which may be the last one ever to be fought by the human race, because after it there may well be no more human race.

Equally dangerous right now is the campaign which is being waged by many of these same forces of reaction against the loan of three and three-quarter billion dollars to Great Britain, which President Truman proposed in his message to Congress yesterday. This loan is essential, as the President said, because it will enable Britain "to buy from the world the supplies of food and raw materials which are essential to the life and the work of the British people. At the same time it will keep open a market for those surpluses of the United States which are customarily exported to the United Kingdom." And finally, as President Truman also pointed out, it will enable the United Kingdom to remove the emergency controls, the exchange restrictions, and the trade discriminations which were made necessary by the enormous drain on her resources during the war. From a purely selfish point of view, we should support this loan for we are not going to be lending dollars abroad. We will be sending goods abroad, thus creating employment and prosperity at home. And I tell you this loan will be repaid.

Yet this loan proposal is under savage and vicious attack by various sectors of American opinion. Among the noisiest are two groups—first, those who still cling to the false slogan, America First, who prefer to think of America isolated from the world rather than cooperating with the world. These are our old friends the isolationists. And second, those who see America dominating the world with her new might and cracking the whip at all other nations. These are a new breed sprung up among us—the imperialists. Strangely enough, the isolationists, in their blindness, are unconsciously asking for a weaker and poorer America—not for a stronger and a more prosperous America. I am sure you have noticed that certain Members of the Senate and House oppose both the British loan and a higher minimum wage. These men are still thinking in terms of world scarcity, of the inevitability of poverty nationally and internationally. They still live in a private world in which they feel themselves surrounded on all sides by enemies—enemies in the other nations of the world, enemies in the great mass of the American people who are demanding full production and full employment at high wages for all. These folks have phosidero-doromophobia—the fear of being afraid of being afraid.

These men and organizations of little faith—men and organizations—who would sell America short, are among the powerful forces opposing the loan to Britain and aid to other countries. But even more powerful are those few ugly imperialists, those international monopolists who want to dominate the world. They oppose the loan to Britain because they are afraid that Britain unbankrupted may take away from them some of the markets of the world, may force upon them the unpleasant necessity of competing for markets. They would rather have the world markets in their pockets, unopposed, unprotected, and nakedly open to their own methods of exploitation.

Furthermore, they are against a loan to Britain because the British Government is a labor government, and they fear it nearly as much they fear the Soviet Union, and for the same reason, because they feel that it endangers their own private monopolies and their own private sources of monopoly profits throughout the world. And I may add—they oppose the loan to Britain because it is a precedent for a loan to the Soviet Union.

But we cannot afford to base our foreign policy upon a policy of special favors for the few, upon a policy of economic war against the many in whatever country they live, upon a policy of America against the world. That was the old rule. We must base our foreign policy upon the new rule, the rule of international cooperation which is the only road to permanent peace and prosperity for us here in America as well as for the world.

That road lies open to us. The way is clear, the way of enlightened self-interest, the way of international peace through internal democracy and full employment and through understanding and friendship between the nations of the world. It is the way of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the way of every American who has the genuine interests of his Nation and his people at heart.

But it is a way which is beset with difficulties. Not only do we who believe in and are fighting for a peaceful America in a world at peace find enemies of peace gnawing at the heart of our own relations with our great allies, Britain and Russia. We find these same enemies assiduously working to promote splits and divisions wherever they have a chance The struggle against fascism is not yet over—let us all remember that. The victory which was so dearly bought on Iwo Jima and the plains of Normandy, before Leningrad and Stalingrad, is not yet a complete victory.

The forces of fascism are still in the saddle in Spain, Portugal, Argentina. They are hiding underground, as today we may be sure they are in hiding in Germany and Japan and must be routed by an aggressive American occupation policy. While we proudly take our seat in the United Nations Organization, and work together with our allies to build a firm structure of international democracy and friendship, we must not permit selfish and antisocial forces to exist and to grow in our own country and we must remove the uncertainty and insecurity before which these forces feed. For our well-being at home we cannot permit these forces to defeat our industrial reconversion program, our promised human reconversion program embodied in the emergency unemployment compensation bill, the full employment bill, the minimum wage bill, and other essential pieces of domestic legislation for the people called for by the President and the country. But these bills are just as important in our foreign policy as they are in our domestic policy, for an America in crisis, an America in depression, means a world in crisis and depression, and the ever-growing dangers of a third world war brought about by international cutthroat competition, aggressions, autarchies, and all-pervading economic struggle for survival.

We must watch every step we take now, both on the national and the international front. Every move we make or do not make will count in the long struggle ahead either for or against world peace and world prosperity. America never makes great decisions to wage war or to create depressions. Only Fascist powers do that. But we can unconsciously create the inevitable prerequisites for war or for depression by accumulating small, seemingly insignificant decisions that make up the total, meaning war or peace, depression or prosperity and full employment.

The loan to Britain is just such a relatively small decision. So is our policy as a nation toward Franco Spain, that last stronghood of European fascism, or toward Argentina, that new stronghold of fascism in the Western Hemisphere. So is our policy as a nation toward the Soviet Union—a policy which is made up of innumerable small problems which must be solved amiably.

And so, finally, the small decisions on full employment, on high wages, on a health program for the Nation, on housing, on taxation, and on the many other domestic issues also have their importance in the great decision for war or peace, depression or prosperity, which will be made for us by the irresistible march of human events. We cannot avoid the responsibility for another war, for it will be totally our responsibility. Nowhere in the world is there today any nation powerful enough to wage war against us, but nowhere in the world today is there a nation which will not, if forced to the wall by the American imperialists, the American isolationists, the American monopolists, try to fight back. And our supreme power in the world will not last.

It is not our great numbers; it is not our resources; it is not our capacity to fight; it is not the atomic bomb which makes America the most powerful nation in the world today. The real predicate of our power is the confidence that the people of the world have in our national integrity, in the affection they have for us in their hearts. It is touching to see from lowly and humble people, as I have in recent months in 20 countries, that confidence and that affection. America to them is not primarily great; it is primarily good. It is not essentially strong; it stands for what is right to them. They do not expect us to be their guardians or their Santa Claus, but they do believe that we will help them save their old people, their women, their children, from starvation, from death and disease. They believe that we will help them repair the tragic devastation of war. They believe that we are clear-headed and farsighted enough to know that it is not only good morality, but good business to help them get their factories and their farms and their enterprises to running again; to help them start the stalled wheels of trade and commerce. They believe that only we are strong enough fearlessly to stand against wrong in the world and that we will. They believe that we can and will take the leadership in building a new world upon the wreckage of the old, and that we shall so apply knowledge and science and skill and that the race of man shall be able to rise above the drudgery and the squalor of the old world to the sunlit expanses of the new. They believe that we can and will keep the world at peace.

They are still trusting and believing in us. They will not change. It will have to be we who shall change if that confidence is lost. If we do not keep our rendezvous with destiny it will be we who will fail the dead and the living. It is not like America to fail, or, if failing once, to fail again the same trust. Even in the wreckage of Europe—yes, amongst the throbbing heartaches of this still war-torn world—louder than the anguished cries of the suffering there is still in the human race hope, and the foundations of that hope are sunken deep in the hearts of the American people. Let that forever be an unshaking and unshakable foundation.

The Dissipation of Our Birthright: Good Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, we find that thoughtful citizens in very part of this country are becoming fearful of the present trends that may lead to the loss of our greatest heritage: Good government, a heritage that means more to the American people than anything they may have inherited.

I am indebted to a prominent businessman, Mr. G. F. Jewett, of Spokane, Wash., for an informative article entitled "Forms of Government" by the president of the Washington State Bar Association, Mr. Frank E. Holman, which I have condensed and present herewith:

The old school books used to classify the forms of government somewhat as follows:

Absolute monarchy: Where the head of state, be he king or emperor, ruled by divine right and the people had no voice in the affairs of state. Louis XIV epitomized this form of government when he said, "I am the state."

Military dictatorship: Of which the ancient world had many examples. In this class also may be put Napoleon's France and Cromwell's England. Such dictatorships rested upon the power and genius of great military leaders and usually passed with the death of such leaders.

Limited monarchy: Where the people, through a parliament or other deliberative assembly had some voice in the making of law and the conduct of government, but where the monarch still exercised the prerogatives of a personal ruler. This was largely the situation in England from the time of the Stuart Kings to the end of the Georges.

Constitutional monarchy: Where the people, through the parliamentary and judicial processes, attained sufficient ascendancy over the prerogatives of the Crown to subject the will of the Crown and the conduct of the state to the restraints of a written or unwritten constitution and to the provisions of law enacted in accordance therewith. This is the England of the last century and a half.

A republic: Where the executive and all other powers of government are derived from the people and exercised with the consent of the governed but within the framework of constitutional guaranties and judicial precedents. There had never been a large scale venture in this form of government until the American experiment was launched following the American Revolution.

A democracy: Majority rule, where the government is dependent upon the will and desires of an existing majority. The simplest form of this was the old New England town meeting and its government by a particular majority voting as a group. It is not so much a government of law as a government of men, and this distinguishes a democracy from a republic. Law stabilized by constitutional guaranties and precedent under the checks and balances of a republic operates necessarily without regard to the particular and transitory passions or feelings of a particular majority. To weaken or abandon constitution guaranties and adherence to precedent is to substitute for a government of law a government dependent upon the will and immediate desires of a particular existing majority. Perhaps we should note in passing that the United States Army Manual states: "The Government of the United States is not a democracy but a republic"; that the word "democracy" nowhere appears in the Declaration of Independence, in the Constitution of the United States, in Washington's Farewell Address, in Jefferson's Inaugural, nor in Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. As applied to our Federal Government it did not come into general use until Woodrow Wilson's famous pronouncement of World War I, "make the world safe for democracy." Since that time the tendency has grown to substitute the word "democracy" for that of "republic" in referring to our form of government and thereby obscure the fact that our forefathers established and intended to establish a republic and not a democracy whereby a particular majority may by its votes and the sheer force of numbers deprive minorities of fair and equal treatment by the agencies of government. Lincoln in his first inaugural said: "If a majority should deprive a minority of any clearly written constitutional right, it might in a moral point of view justify revolution—certainly would, if such a right were a vital one."

The makers of the Constitution conferred upon us, even as against the Government itself, the right to be let alone, the most comprehensive of rights and the most valued by civilized men.

Strange that this freedom of individual action is rarely to be found in the utterances and declarations of recent times. For example, take the four freedoms of the Atlantic Charter. One might have all the four freedoms and yet have no more freedom than the elephant in the zoo. He enjoys freedom of thought; he is also free to speak or trumpet when he wishes; he has freedom from want because his keeper feeds him every day; and he has freedom from fear because his natural enemies like the lion and the tiger are locked up in separate cages. But what about his freedom of initiative, freedom from arbitrary control? He lacks this, as do all persons under an arbitrary government. It is this freedom of initiative and freedom from arbitrary control by government, freedom to work and live, each man according to his abilities, this freedom of individual liberty, which is the basic freedom of freemen. Without this we are without the kind of government our forefathers established. They knew the basic freedom of freemen was, as Justice Brandeis said, freedom from government control—the right to be let alone in our individual lives. That is why, in establishing a structure of government, the makers of the Constitution consciously set up checks and balances to prevent the Central Government and the Executive from becoming all-powerful and regimenting our lives.

Our forefathers understood clearly and definitely that the so-called examples of democracy in the past had usually degenerated into tyrannies by temporary majorities as obnoxious as the tyrannies of dynasties. They understood that tyranny or absolutism on the part of a majority acting by force of numbers could be quite as unreasonable, self-willed, and vicious, and as destructive of individual freedom and development as the tyranny of ruling houses.

Hence they created a republic, not a democracy, along the lines of the New England town meeting, with which they were fully familiar. They consciously established a government of checks and balances. This was not done for the purpose of rendering the machinery of government complicated nor for the purpose of thwarting the ultimate will of the majority. The American Revolutionists were committed, to be sure, to the doctrine of rule by the majority, but they were not committed to the doctrine that a majority at a particular period and particularly during a period of economic and social unrest is necessarily to be interpreted as holding a final mandate to impose upon the whole of the people fundamental changes in their form of government. They proposed that, so far as current political decisions were concerned, the will of the majority at stated intervals should be tried out by and through legislation, framed and passed by the elected representatives of any such majority, but always within the guaranties and the framework of the Constitution. They intended to combine, and did combine, representative government with constitutional government and declared outright that the Constitution is the fundamental law of the land; that if the elected representatives or the elected executive of any given majority or party attempted by legislation or executive action to transcend or violate the Constitution or any of its provisions or guaranties, the judicial department of the Government should independently determine the fact of the violation and that the executive, be he president or lesser person, should impose upon no part of the people any laws, directives, or orders which violate the fundamental rights of any citizen as protected and guaranteed by the Constitution.

Our forefathers felt that the safest form of government to assure freedom was a representative and constitutional commonwealth. They having established for us such a form of government, we have supposed it would remain with us. We think of government as one of the most natural and ordinary facts of life. But no particular form of government continues of its own accord. It is influenced and changed by the plans of men, sometimes sincere reformers, sometimes demagogs. Consider how quickly fascism developed in Italy and nazism in Germany, and communism in Russia.

Mr. HATTON W. SUMNERS, of the House, has put the matter in unmistakable language on several occasions:

"Representative government is withering before our eyes. * * * Bureaus issue what are called directives. One bureaucrat said recently, 'We do make the law. This order supersedes any laws opposed to it.'

"The executive branch has in effect, through its dictatorial policy of executive decrees, usurped the powers of the legislative and judicial branches. Under the influences of these alien ideologies, there has been created a government of bureaus and bureaucrats who make the law, and enforce the law, and interpret the law."

Senator PAT MCCARRAN last year in an address at the commencement exercises of Georgetown University put the matter thus:

"It is no fallacy, and it is no quibble, to say that a large body of our law today is made, interpreted, and administered by appointive officials. Not only by Executive orders, but by a constant stream of directives issued by various administrative agencies of the Government, rules and regulations are continually being put in force and given effect which have had no sanction by the Congress. Yet, without such sanction, and often without color of support from any constitutional source, these rules and regulations have all the force of law; more than that they are law; and frequently they actually supersede laws passed by the Congress.

"Government by administrative law breeds opportunity for personal arrogance; evades the courts; sneers at the rule of stare decisis; affords no precedents; and fortifies itself by pointing ridicule at Congress and other lawmaking bodies of our Nation."

Senator O'MAHONEY, Senator BYRD, and other Democrats have used as strong or stronger language.

Thus bureaucracy has infiltrated and superseded our constitutional processes. History demonstrates that bureaucracy easily becomes the instrumentality of autocratic government. In a bureaucracy as in an autocracy, the laws and the regulations which govern the lives and fortunes of the citizenry are imposed from above. Instead of developing the law by the legislative and judicial process, the law is originated, made, interpreted, administered, and enforced by the executive and his appointees, and the legislative and judicial branches of government are either bypassed or made over into instrumentalities of the executive will.

We are inclined to forget that the world moved on for many centuries without any understanding of, or any apparent desire for, such a form of government as our fathers thought out, adopted, and handed down to us. In truth and in fact as a form of government, a constitutional and representative commonwealth or republic is historically a recent development and more or less an unproved experiment. Autocracy of every kind is opposed to representative and constitutional government, whether it be the autocracy of king and lords or the autocracy of fascism, nazism, or of the proletariat, or

the autocracy of executive fiat operating through innumerable bureaus of the autocracy of state socialism based on paternalism.

The danger of the future lies not so much in the changes already made, though these are far reaching, as in the lack of understanding on the part of the public of what the founders had in mind in adopting and establishing a constitutional and representative government. It is this lack of understanding and the misapprehension of the underlying theory of government that is the fertile field for the promises and grandiose phrases of the politician and the reformer, and we shall move from one change to another until we shall discover that there has been a complete revolution and find ourselves no longer living under the form of government we thought was ours.

The American people, of course, have the right to abandon constitutional and representative government if they wish, and to substitute therefor bureaucracy or state socialism or communism or any other ism, but they should not be tricked into any such substitution by being fooled with high-sounding phrases of a so-called new world liberalism. As lawyers, by the traditions of our profession and by our oath to support the Constitution, we are under direct and solemn obligation to see that the issue is fairly presented and fully understood by the American people.

This is our great challenge of the immediate future—it is a greater challenge than that foreseen by Webster when he stated:

"If disastrous war should sweep our commerce from the ocean, another generation may renew it; if it exhaust our treasury, future industry may replenish it; if it desolate and lay waste our fields, still under a new cultivation they will grow green again and ripen to future harvest. But who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished government? Who shall rear again the well proportioned columns of constitutional liberty? Who shall frame together the skillful architecture which unites national sovereignty with state rights, individual security, and public prosperity?"

The Present Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, there have been many times in the short history of this Nation where it seemed that we are facing a great crisis, and yet through the considered judgment of the great American people these crises have been met and passed. It can probably be well said that we are facing another one today, the question of labor and management, the question of reconversion and the restoration of economic stability of our Nation. If we can only hold the machinery steady, the American people in their wisdom will again meet this crisis as they have the others. It is a time for sane thinking; yes, we must in our sane thinking be very thoughtful of the common man because he makes up the great body and soul of the Nation. But we are needing today leadership as we strive to cure these ills and to meet these issues, and in doing this we will need some uncommon men also.

Under the privilege of unanimous consent, I include herewith two statements, one of which was made many years ago by James Madison, another at a later date made by Abraham Lincoln. It is my earnest request that the Members of Congress read these statements. You have read them before, they are timely, and they should be read again now. The things that disturbed James Madison and Abraham Lincoln were finally mastered to a large degree by the American people and the Congress. The discouraging conditions of this hour will be mastered again if we have faith in ourselves and in the American system.

SIGNPOSTS OF DANGERS AHEAD

"We are free today substantially, but the day will come when our Republic will be an impossibility. It will be an impossibility because wealth will be concentrated in the hands of a few. A republic cannot stand upon bayonets, and when that day comes, when the wealth of the Nation will be in the hands of a few, then we must rely upon the wisdom of the best elements in the country to readjust the laws of the Nation to the changed conditions—intelligence will forever govern ignorance." (James Madison.)

"I see in the near future a crisis approaching that unnerves me and causes me to tremble for the safety of my country. As a result of the war, corporations have been enthroned and an era of corruption in high places will follow, and the money power of the country will endeavor to prolong its reign by working upon the prejudices of the people until all wealth is aggregated in a few hands and the Republic is destroyed. I feel at this moment more anxiety for the safety of my country than ever before, even in the midst of war. God grant that my suspicions may prove groundless." (Abraham Lincoln.)

The White Shirt Scandal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I think everyone knows there is a white-shirt scandal. We men are unable to buy white shirts. The veterans are not able to buy them, nor to buy other necessary civilian clothes upon their discharge from the service.

What does it mean when we read in the newspapers such United Press items as the following:

More than 2,000,000 men's white shirts will go on sale tomorrow, but you—and you—won't get any.

William Beck, wholesale dealer, said tonight that his 2,400,000 shirts will sell for $20.50 per dozen, plus his 3-percent commission for selling them for a Troy, N. Y., company. The shirts originally were made for the Navy, which has all it needs.

"Everybody is bothering me to buy a white shirt," Beck said, "but the catch is the shirts must be sold for export only."

Why are these men's white shirts being sold for export only? The enlisted men cannot wear them. They have to wear the khaki. It is only the officers who can wear the white shirts, and only a few of them. Everyone knows we do not have a need for over 2,000,000 men's white shirts for the few officers of the military organizations of this country who are permitted to wear white shirts. Are we exporting them for the use of foreigners and selling them at $1.71 per shirt? Why not give home folks an opportunity to buy some of these shirts? Who is responsible for this situation, and where are these white shirts going that are sold at the rate of 2,000,000 for export only while we at home do without?

It is interesting to note that the people are growing weary of such an inexcusable attitude on the part of whoever is responsible for such performances. One of my constituents in a recent letter called it "nutty," and I think that is a mild description of such conduct. I quote from him as follows:

The attached (newspaper clipping) is "nutty" to me, and things like this make me wonder why we should support our Government. Why in the hell export the shirts when we can't buy any here, or in this vicinity? If this is true, why can't you and others stop it? The President is the sorriest thing we have had in the White House since Harding, and if this keeps up there are going to be many changes this year and in 1948.

I travel Oklahoma, Kansas, Texas Panhandle, and Illinois, and I can hear rumblings of discontent wherever I go.

Mr. Speaker, another constituent of mine, who is a very intelligent person and head of a large business concern in Tulsa, Okla., has written me as follows:

In the Tulsa World of January 30 was an article with a New York dateline stating that 2,000,000 surplus Navy white shirts would go on sale that day but they could be sold for export only.

I am wondering what kind of monkey business that is? No doubt you know that there is not a regular dress shirt to be had in this part of the country and this has been true for some time. Plenty of sport shirts made of nice material may be had from $4 to as high as you want to go.

Now I happen to have a son who is an officer in the Navy. Only the officers wear white shirts so these are likely those fine quality collarless white shirts that are worn with separate collars and plenty of almost shirtless guys in these United States would like to buy a few of them. I am not thinking entirely of myself but mainly of the millions of servicemen who are getting out of the service and can buy no shirts and who would be very happy to have a white shirt after wearing OD stuff.

No doubt these shirts will go to Britain. They already have our pants literally. Our drawers will be demanded as soon as they get their breath.

I think it is high time such stuff as this is stopped.

Montana's War Finance Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1946

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I am inserting in the RECORD a letter written to me by Mr. A. T. Hibbard, chairman, War Finance Committee for Montana, and also the story of Montana's outstand-

ing contributions to the eight war loan drives. This record is one that Montana's citizens can justly be proud of, and, as their Representative, I share that feeling in our accomplishments.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
WAR FINANCE COMMITTEE,
Helena, Mont., January 30, 1946.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MANSFIELD: We are sending you herewith two copies of the Montana war finance report, which shows the record of Montana in both the Victory loan just completed and in the whole war-finance program.

People of Montana made a record second to none in America, and we know you will be interested in the examination of the several schedules and analyses in this report, and that you will want to keep it also for a permanent reference in connection with this tremendous part in financing the war. We would like to have printed a comprehensive book with the detailed story of the activities in the program, but had no funds to do this, so we worked out this method of preparing the report at nominal expense.

The people of Montana responded tremendously and have made this record, of which we are all very proud. It was possible only through the devoted, intensive, patriotic work of 15,000 men and women in Montana who served throughout the war on the committees all over Montana.

Sincerely,

A. T. HIBBARD,
Chairman, War Finance
Committee for Montana.

Fellow Bond Workers and All Montanans:

When the United States Treasury Department in May 1941 established the Defense Savings Staff to promote aggressively on a Nation-wide scale the sale of savings bonds and other securities to the general public, Montanans purchased $385,000. This was the equivalent of 20,530 $18.75 bonds. During the Seventh War Loan, Montanans purchased 50 times $385,000 when they purchased $19,177,000 in E bonds, equal to 1,022,773 $18.75 bonds. If all issues were included, the Seventh War Loan Sales ($61,511,000) were 88 times more than in May 1941.

If all E bonds purchased from May through December 1941 had been $18.75 bonds, the total number would have been 360,266, or seven for every 10 men, women, and children in the State. This total jumped to the equivalent of 1,463,253 $18.75 bonds in 1942, or three for every man, woman, and child in the State. By 1943 the number would have increased to more than five for every person, to seven in 1944 and more than five in 1945. In other words, E bond sales in Montana were equivalent to 2,562,933 $18.75 bonds in 1943, 3,146,933 in 1944 and 2,550,266 in 1945. Montana's total E bond sales, $189,064,000, broken down to $18.75 bonds, equals 10,084,413, an average of more than 21 bonds for every man, woman, and child in the State. The equivalent of 213,871,320 $18.75 bonds for the Nation (total sales $40,100,874,000) averages 16 per person for the country as a whole. In Chouteau and Daniels counties the average would be approximately 41 $18.75 bonds for every person in those counties.

"Montana is sometimes called the Treasure State, on account of its mineral and agricultural wealth, but its prime asset is its people, who give more than they demand."

That quotation from the Minute Man, national publication of the War Saving Division, of December 15, 1945, is the theme of this all too brief narrative of four crowded years of stupendous accomplishment by the people of Montana and in particular by the army of volunteers who developed the enthusiasm that marshaled Montana's World War II war finance total to $461,666,000. No other State has a better record. No other State received the tribute which Ted R. Gamble, national director, paid the people of Montana and war finance workers in his telegram to State Chairman A. T. Hibbard on December 7, 1945. This telegram is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 7.*

A. T. HIBBARD,
Montana War Finance Committee,
Helena, Mont.:

Congratulations and sincere appreciation for having again set a mile post for the rest of the country to follow. The accomplishment of being the first State in the Nation to reach all of its quotas in the Victory loan making it the eighth consecutive time to have won this award is an inspiration and a challenge to the rest of the Nation. It is a record in which you, your coworkers, and the people of Montana may justly be proud. The Treasury Department salutes you for having written another bright page in the history of war finance. We are especially grateful to you for having exceeded your quotas in this last great drive and want you to know that your work, that of your associates, and the splendid support given by the people of your State is not only helping to bind up the Nation's wounds and care for those who fought the battle but it is also helping the country to establish a firm and solid foundation on which to begin a future of peace.

TED R. GAMBLE,
National Director, War Finance Division.

How did it happen? The explanation is simple. Montana people are proud of their families, their homes, their neighbors, their communities, their counties, their State and their Nation. Montana did the same in World War I, as can be seen by the tables of Liberty Loan sales which are a part of this report. Then, as in World War II, they backed their fighting sons and service daughters to the limit.

Although 1941 might be termed in future history books "As the year of confusion," Montanans molded in that year the foundation for its record in war finance. William H. Bartley, of Great Falls, collector of customs for Montana and Idaho, was called to Washington in April 1941 and given the additional assignment by Treasury Department officials of organizing what was then termed the "defense savings staff for Montana." As deputy administrator, he drafted Fred J. Martin, of Great Falls, then associate director of the Montana Farmer, who assumed his duties on July 1.

A. A. (Bert) Hoerr, of Helena, at that time assistant manager of the Helena branch of the Federal Reserve Bank, was designated first State chairman of the advisory committee, which included a representative group of Montanans. The first meeting was held on July 9. At this meeting it was agreed that county organizations should be established and the members made suggestions relative to county organizations.

In July and August county chairmen were selected. With but one exception those designated accepted the task, and one can see in the roster of county chairmen that the great majority of these stayed on to finish the job. With the cooperation of the Montana Bankers Association a drive was initiated to have every bank qualify as an issuing agent. Montana was the first State in which all banks became issuing agents. The number of post-office and other issuing agencies also was expanded. In addition to county chairmen county committees designated included bankers, postmasters, county AAA officials, school administrators and representatives of business, civic, patriotic, farm, labor, and women's groups.

PREVENT-INFLATION WEEK

A. T. Hibbard, president of the Union Bank & Trust Co., of Helena, and active prior to that time as a member of the State committee, was named State chairman in October 1941, when Hoerr resigned, since he was moving to Seattle. The first intensive step in the State's educational and promotional program was the State-wide observance of Prevent-Inflation Week, November 2-8, 1941. Gov. Sam C. Ford, honorary State chairman, issued a proclamation urging all citizens to give serious thought and consideration to the immediate problem of inflation and how they, individually and collectively, can safeguard present and future home defense and security by participation in the defense savings and other Government programs. He also urged all civic and other clubs, associations, lodges, women's and other organizations, employer, labor, farm, and youth groups to devote at least one program to a thorough discussion on this subject.

State heads of practically every organization and group were named members of a general State committee, and these urged participation of their members. With the help of Boy and Girl Scouts, Camp Fire Girls, and other volunteers in Great Falls, more than 15,000 State and local organizations were contacted by mail. The response was excellent due to the splendid leadership of the State committee, county defense savings chairmen, and their coworkers.

The second meeting of the State advisory committee was held on November 8, 1941, with Gale Johnson, then national director, in attendance. This meeting primarily was devoted to discussion of ways and means of establishing the pay-roll-savings plan. Every employer in Montana was contacted. Labor groups pledged their assistance and a good start had been made by that time.

REMEMBER PEARL HARBOR

But within a few weeks the Nation was shocked and startled by the news of the attack on Pearl Harbor December 7 and our entry into the war. Then these newly formed defense savings committees realized they had a job on their hands. E bond sales shot up from $883,000 in November to $2,616,000 in December, the first month of war. Montana stood sixth in per capita among the 48 States, a place it has consistently held throughout the entire war finance period, even though it ranks nineteenth among the States in per capita income. Treasury analysts in their analysis of E bond sales in December 1941 stated: "Taking sales as a percentage of estimated 1941 income, Montana ranked first." (States which have a higher E bond per capita than Montana with the rank among the States in per capita income in 1941 follow: (1) Oregon, 17; (2) Connecticut, 2; (3) Washington, 14; (4) Michigan, 13; and (5) California, 7. This, of course, does not take into account higher per capita income due to expanded war industries.)

A national meeting, which for earnestness perhaps has no equal in the annals of World War II, was held in Chicago on December 16, 1941. Hibbard, Bartley, and Martin attended. The Defense Savings Staff became the War Savings Staff and defense bonds, war bonds. Plans were outlined for a Nation-wide pledge campaign. Despite 25°-below weather, more than 1,000 men and women from every county in the State attended regional State meetings at Glendive, Billings, Havre, Helena, and Missoula. The call was issued by telegrams to county chairmen, and some committees drove more than 300 miles to attend. For conscientious fervor, these meetings outdid even the historic national one in Chicago. These workers, who dropped everything and came to the meetings at their own expense, pledged themselves to finish the job. The record proves the sincerity of those pledges. They returned to their counties and enlisted the aid of thousands of volunteers to conduct the pledge campaign in January. That voluntary contribution of time, effort, and consistent patriotic devotion has been the reason for Montana's success.

First national, State, and county quotas were fixed in May 1942. The quotas were based on monthly average sales from July 1941 through January 1942. Montana made but 65 percent of a quota based largely on sales in the peak agricultural income period, but the Nation reached only 59 percent. Prairie, along with several other Montana counties, initiated the habit of never failing to reach its quota and reaching it early. However, the continuous monthly quota system, which took no account of varying income periods, particularly in agricultural sections, didn't work out satisfactorily. Campaigns were conducted to buy bomber and fighter planes and other equipment. Intensive campaigns among merchants were organized under the leadership of Leon Singer and Roy Currell, of Great Falls, then cochairman of the Retailers for Victory organization. The great majority of the employers of the State established the systematic pay-roll-savings plan. Life insurance underwriters assisted county committees.

A women's division was organized in August 1942, and Mrs. J. H. Morrow, of Moore, who had been war activities chairman for the Montana Federation of Women's Clubs, and also active in the American Legion Auxiliary, was designated State women's chairman. Women vice chairmen were named in each of the counties by county chairmen. Cooperation, not competition, was the theme, and this worked out splendidly.

FIRST WAR LOAN DRIVE

In the fall months sales mounted, and in December 1942 E, F, and G sales were just short of $5,000,000 in addition to the $18,078,000 of sales in the First War Loan, November 30 to December 23, 1942. The organization which conducted the first drive was sponsored by the Federal Reserve banks. R. E. Towle, manager of the Helena branch, was Montana chairman, with R. B. Richardson, president of the Western Life Insurance Co. of Helena, vice chairman. The State was divided into seven districts, following the group organization of the Montana Bankers Association, with the following chairmen: I, George H. Leick, Havre; II, Axel Nelson, Sidney; III, Theodore Jacobs, Missoula; IV, George N. Lund, Reserve; V, Lee M. Ford, Great Falls; VI, the late J. A. Sanderson, Anaconda; VII, B. M. Harris, Columbus. No county quotas were established and the State quota of $13,000,000 was reached easily. In Montana, as well as throughout the country, subscriptions were limited.

SECOND WAR LOAN

The Second War Loan, April 12 to May 1, 1943, was conducted jointly by the committee in charge of the first and the War Savings staff. The State executive committee included: Towle, chairman; Bartley, vice chairman; Hibbard, Richardson, and Martin, secretary. Results can best be summed up by quoting the Minneapolis Tribune of Sunday, May 2: "Every county in Montana went over its quota Saturday, the first State in the district (Ninth Federal Reserve) to so report." Meagher County with $50.56 topped Daniels' $43.63 for per capita E bond honors. Lincoln reached its quota first, 2 days ahead of Prairie.

Following the Second War Loan a permanent consolidation of the two groups was effected with Hibbard as chairman; Richardson, vice chairman; Bartley, executive director; and Martin, associate director. The latter took leave to enlist in the United States Marine Corps and was succeeded by Arthur Nelson, Helena insurance man and first State chairman of the pay-roll savings committee which was established early in 1941. Tom Moodie, Washington and North Dakota newspaperman, also was named associate director. Moodie resigned right after the Third War Loan to return to the Spokane Chronicle.

THIRD WAR LOAN

"Replace the cruiser *Helena*" was the battle cry in the Third War Loan, September 5 to October 2, 1943. The *Helena*, fightingest ship in the United States Navy, sank in the famous Kula Gulf engagement on July 7, 1943. How well Montana came through is attested by the fact that the Treasure State led the Nation in E-bond per capita with $30.43 as compared to the Nation's $18.95. Preceding the drive, district meetings were held throughout the State. Daniels County was first in E-bond per capita with $68.39. Pondera County made 198 percent of its E quota.

Eugene W. Savage, of Butte, who had successfully organized State civilian-defense activities, was named associate director. Since then, Savage has traveled approximately 50,000 miles throughout the State on war-savings and affiliated activities at no expense to the Government. He is on the staff of the Anaconda Copper Mining Co.

FOURTH WAR LOAN

In the Fourth War Loan, January 18 to February 14, 1944, Chouteau County was first in E per capita with $85.40. Wibaux was high in E percentage with 190 percent. Jack Beauchamp, Helena artist, painted a portrait of Chouteau County Chairman H. F. Miller's daughter as a special award for Chouteau's feat. Martin, then a Marine Corps lieutenant, was assigned to duty at Montana selective-service headquarters in Helena and assisted in the fourth and fifth drives. On November 1, 1944, the date he was released from the Marine Corps, he became executive director and Bartley assumed the post of executive vice chairman.

In the fifth, sixth, and seventh drives Daniels was high with an E per capita of $82.01, $100.88, and $101.27, respectively. The latter two figures were the highest attained by any county in any drive. Daniels likewise was first in E percentage with 197 percent in the fifth, a record of 275 percent in the sixth, and 173 percent in the seventh.

The pattern established in the Third War Loan was followed in succeeding drives except that before the sixth, National Director Ted R. Gamble and Field Director R. W. Coyne came to Montana on October 19, 1944, to attend a State meeting at Helena which was attended by county chairmen and key workers from every county in the State. In the sixth the 30 counties with the highest E percentages sponsored B–29 Superforts. In the seventh, Larry Smith, internationally known NBC radio commentator, made at least three appearances a day during his 2-week visit to the State to assist war-finance committees.

In the seventh drive Montana with 119.8 percent led all States in percentage of E quota. The national E percentage was 99.4 percent. In the sixth the Treasure State was third, sixth in the fifth, fifth in the fourth, and second in the third.

In cooperation with Miss Elizabeth Ireland, State superintendent of public instruction, the schools-at-war program was intensified and schools made a great contribution with Minnie Mae Erickson first, and since October 1945, Helen Chamberlain of the State office in charge. J. A. English, of Anaconda, took over permanently as State theater activity chairman and P. W. Singer, of Helena, as State retail chairman. Oliver H. Campbell, of Manhattan, was appointed State 16-millimeter film chairman prior to the fifth loan and since that time more than 368,367 persons have seen war and war-finance 16-millimeter films. George U. Hill, of Butte, was named chairman of district VI to succeed Sanderson, who died April 17, 1945.

Members of the armed forces also made real contributions to help Montana achieve such a fine record. In each of the drives and during the interim periods regular allocations were received from servicemen all over the world for the credit of Montana. These totaled several million dollars.

In the eighth or Victory drive, October 29 to December 8, 1945, McCone County was first in E per capita with $79.95 and in E percentage with 273.1 percent. North Dakota, which made a brilliant record throughout the war-finance program, topped Montana in E percentage and likewise beat the Treasure State for first to achieve the E quota. North Dakota's E per capita was slightly higher than Montana's. However, Montana was first to reach all quotas since it reached its corporation quota ahead of its neighboring State. Montana corporations, including those which operate in the State but whose main offices are elsewhere, and the State of Montana have been equally as conscientious in their purchases of war-finance securities for the credit of Montana as have been its people. It is most gratifying that their most worth-while assistance helped the State to retain an unblemished record.

The per capita figures indicate the splendid support which has come from the agricultural section of the State, but a study of the total per capita figures will show how effectively the pay-roll savings program has been in the larger industrial counties. This, in large part, has been due to the effectiveness of the systematic pay-roll savings of smelter workers, coal and copper miners, railroad and lumber workers, Federal and State employees, store, bank, and others in every activity. These systematic savings have been carried on in the interim periods as well as during the drives. Cascade County's total sales are more than 12 percent of the grand total for the State and almost 11 percent of the State's E total for the entire period.

EMPHASIS ON E BONDS

The whole war finance program of the Treasury Department was based on the largest possible sale of series E bonds, in order to accomplish the widest possible distribution to the men, women, and children of the country, to give all our people a share in America, to promote thrift and saving, and to provide the most effective weapon against inflation. Emphasis throughout the narrative and in the detail maps, graphs, and tables has been on E bonds because the E bonds, known as the people's bond, were sold in small denominations, which made the E quotas the most difficult to attain. The sale of War Savings series E bonds was limited to $3,750 ($5,000 maturity) to an individual in one calendar year, whereas any individual, corporation, or organization could buy War Savings series F or series G bonds up to $100,000 maturity each year, and there was no limit in the other securities. With this limitation it is easy to understand that to achieve E bond quotas required intensive personal solicitation of all of the people. True enough, there were a few sales in each county of the $3,750 ($5,000 maturity) E bonds, a few more $750 ($1,000 maturity), but the bulk of the sales were for $18.75 ($25), $37.50 ($50), and $75 ($100) issues.

Montana's record would not have been possible without the cooperation of all of the 56 counties on the State's team. In only one drive, the third, did some counties fall down on their E quotas, and in that drive the emphasis was not on E bonds alone but on E, F, and G bond quotas. In the six drives—third through eighth—Montana's percentage of E performance was 136.4 percent and the Nation's 104.3 percent. The Nation fell short in the seventh and third. Montana never failed on any quota in any one of the eight drives. That record is truly an all-Montana one.

It is regrettable that the almost unbelievable effort expended by State, district, county, drive and special chairmen and their coworkers cannot be chronicled in detail. Likewise, it is disconcerting to think that perhaps within a few years the amazing record of pay-roll savings, the schools, the banks, the post offices, women's groups, theaters, merchants, the press, radio, and other groups will be only dim memories. Our hope is that

in each of the counties a historical record will be preserved and this report will be kept by workers as a permanent record.

The only satisfaction or dividend for the intensive effort, the expenditure of personal funds and the vast amount of time given will be the knowledge you had a part in a great accomplishment, one that defies imagination when looked at in retrospect. It is all the more amazing because it was achieved voluntarily, without compulsion or regimentation, and at the lowest selling cost in all history, a fraction of 1 percent.

The State staff will ever cherish the memory of its privilege to have served with you Montanans to do Montana's job and under such national leaders as Harold Graves and Dr. Peter Odegard in the initial stages, and during the drive period under the superb leadership of Ted R. Gamble and Robert W. Coyne. But the splendid national leadership and promotion would have failed if it had not been for volunteer workers throughout the country. You Montana Minute Men set the pace by putting Montana in first place in war finance at the outbreak of World War II and maintaining that record until our fighting men gloriously finished their job. Then, even after the war clouds had disappeared, you stayed on to finish our job in the Victory loan.

War finance will soon be a hazy word. But because of the war-finance effort, the thrift habit was instilled into the overwhelming majority of Montanans and Americans. Inflation is still a threat on the horizon. Our earnest hope is that these pent-up war-bond savings will not be dissipated unwisely. The first appeal to you volunteers in July 1941 was thrift for defense. It's still a timely slogan.

Included with this report are the following:

Roster of county and drive chairmen.

Roster of women vice chairmen.

A comparison by counties of sales of Liberty bonds in each of the five drives in World War I and total sales, as well as the total sales in World War II.

A map showing per capita sales of E bonds by counties.

Tables listing by rank E bond per capita sales by counties from May 1, 1941, to December 31, 1945, the interim period before and between drives, the total for all drives, and the individual drives.

Tables listing total sales in the Nation, Montana, the districts, and counties in each of the drives, for all drives, and the interim period.

A map showing percentages of E bond quotas reached by counties in six drives.

A table, listing by rank, counties on basis of E bond percentages in six drives and for individual drives.

A table listing dates on which counties achieved quotas in seven drives.

A table listing E bond sales by counties, the districts, and Montana in seven war loans.

Sales in the Eighth or Victory Loan compared with quotas by districts and counties and by classes of investors.

Ranking of counties by volume of sales and percentages to State's total for the total sales of all issues and for E bonds.

Montana's total sales in eight war loans compared with quotas by districts and counties and by classes of investors.

FRED J. MARTIN,
Executive Director.
ARTHUR NELSON,
Associate Director.
EUGENE W. SAVAGE,
Associate Director.
A. H. HIBBARD,
State Chairman.
WM. H. BARTLEY,
Executive Vice Chairman.
W. B. RICHARDSON,
Vice Chairman.

Disposal of Surplus Government Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE HENDRICKS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 5, 1946

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

ORLANDO, FLA., *January 31, 1946.*
Hon. JOE HENDRICKS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Have been vitally interested in your statements re surplus-property-disposal methods. Several of us (veterans) down here have been held up on the procurement of property and the general consensus is that the program stinks, and any efforts of legislation and, more likely administration, have been ineffectual. The people have demanded that individuals, especially veterans, be given a better chance to buy. Here is what happens, i. e., a surplus 1½-ton cargo truck.

1. A small, one-day ad is run in the paper, telling prospective buyers they can inspect the equipment.

2. The property is grouped, and often is difficult to find.

3. Inspection takes place. Frequently, no key is in the truck, and buyer cannot start the engine (i. e., Orlando Air Base, January sale).

4. State, Federal, county, and municipal governments may buy the truck ahead of the veteran. (They are in a position to get new equipment ahead of the individual.)

5. Vehicle is priced in the neighborhood of $300 (and all at Orlando had 4 tires—6 required) and are a specialized vehicle not readily adaptable to civilian use, so price is high considering the working value.

6. Veteran may send in a request to buy a vehicle he has not tested, started, or driven at the relatively high price.

7. Frequently conversion, possible repair, and tire purchases make the veteran decide against buying which is apparently what the Army and disposal agency want.

8. Dealers can then come in and buy sometimes 10 trucks for the $800 the veteran would pay for one, and they can't lose. (This is one case, but even if they buy for $400 each, they can outstrip the individual.)

9. After sending in the order, the veteran waits. He has waited for priority, waited for sale, waited for selection. Then he waits for all the Government, large and small, to take their pick. He waits for the bureaucrats to decide to write him. They may or may not since they are shorthanded and are more concerned with office space than the problems at hand.

10. Chances are that he will get nothing, and if he does it will be unsatisfactory for the price asked of him.

It all boils down to: The practice of disposal is unfair and is not carried out in the spirit prescribed by the people.

Difficulties are:

1. Attitude of the Army is liquidation and fear of paper work if individuals buy or the necessary handling of sales, which are not necessary on any scale if the whole lot is sold to one or a few big interests.

2. Disposal agency is about the same, including rudeness and lots of mismanagement as in the above. (Certifying agency is very cooperative.)

3. No regard is given to the value of the amount of money received and paid the Treasury, eventually lightening the tax burden.

4. No regard is given the service to the individual that the sale could give him and other individuals dependent upon the use of the surplus commodities.

5. Pinecastle Air Base contemplates burning of lumber in tent floors and sides which the people here need badly to fill the materials gap in housing.

6. I don't have information on the big stuff, but Orson Welles mentioned it in his program and can probably give you some good ammunition.

Please note that some of the above is second-hand and therefore should be checked, but for everything that is not so bad, there are undoubtedly many worse things. There must be some big pressure groups impeding this program, and should be interesting subjects if brought into the spotlight.

There is a distinctly fascistic trend in the program, and a congressional investigation would be in order, but it must be done quickly if further injustice is to be prevented. Also, if the price of property to the individual were lower and more reasonable there would be less need for giving whole lots of goods to dealers. Even placing unbought goods on consignment with the dealers would be much more fair.

Thanking you and hoping that you will be successful, I am,

Very truly yours,

GILLE V. WOOTEN.

Address by Hon. Sam Jackson Before Tennessee State Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEWART
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 1 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address delivered by a former member of this body, the Honorable Sam Jackson, of Indiana, before the Tennessee State Bar Association at Knoxville, Tenn., in last November 1945. I commend this as most excellent reading. This eloquent, gifted lawyer and ex-Senator of the United States, on the occasion of this address was received most enthusiastically and held his audience spellbound.

I have obtained from the Government Printing Office an estimate, which indicates that Mr. Jackson's address will take two and two-thirds pages of the RECORD, or two-thirds of a page more than is allowed under the rule without an estimate. The cost is estimated to be $138.80.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. SAM JACKSON. Senator STEWART, Mr. Toastmaster, and Governor, I am delighted to be here, because I find myself in the midst of a distinguished bar, one which has long been known to Indiana. I am standing within a few miles of the place of the development of perhaps the most significant device mankind has ever known. I shall not take time to mention the tremendous influence of the atomic bomb upon our peace efforts; I shall not try to explain how devastating it might be. But you know the atomic bomb. It

hangs over our heads like a sword of Damocles, but there are 130,000,000 of them, and we have created a device of which the scientists tell us that if there were 43 of them planted in America—and they could be, secretly—and detonated by radio impulses, a third of the population of the United States could be destroyed in the twinkling of an eye.

Now, I am going to discuss with this bar and your delightful ladies here, what I regard to be the most important question facing mankind. It is a simple question, frequently asked but seldom answered analytically. The question presents itself in bold relief in the presence of the device which we have created which can destroy mankind, to say nothing of his civilization. The simple question is one which must be answered before we can decide what to do or what not to do with the atomic bomb. It is a question which every man, Democrat and Republican, can take to his heart, and men of all religious faiths and men of all races around this whirling footstool.

Is man worth saving, after all? That's the question.

Now, that seems like a silly one. You say: Of course he is. But can you prove it? The Holy Writ tells us that man was created, as the psalmist says, in the image of his Creator. Shakespeare refers to him as the paragon of animals. It is told to us that we do not yet know what he may become. Matthew Arnold says that man has always fed upon the boundless hopes, and he has never been willing to take any simpler fare. But can we examine mankind subjectively, as lawyers would examine a fact, and in the light of what we know about him and his recorded history, and can we honestly and conscientiously say that mankind has sufficient value that he is worth being saved at man's hands?

To be rational and consistent, we are either going to have to believe dynamically in the fact that man is worth saving, or we might just as well resolve ourselves to a slow process of disintegration and self-destruction. If man is indeed nothing more than a burnt-out match in the midst of a black and dismal void, then we might just as well call it a day and let it burn into black ashes and let the endless rains of the heavens pour down through the nights and wash him into oblivion. We are going to have to answer that question.

Now, my lawyer friends, suppose that you were today in some cosmic court having jurisdiction throughout the whole of the created realm. Follow me with your imagination in that. In that great and high court having jurisdiction everywhere, mankind, the inhabitant of this footstool, is charged with not being worthy to be saved. Suppose now that you are selected as counsel for him—and indeed you are. Suppose that you and I were to go up there and would not only have to defend all mankind that lies asleep in the soil, but all the millions that now live, against the charge that he isn't worth saving any longer. I wonder then which one of these distinguished justices around here, sometimes alleged to be a lawyer, we would seek out to write our briefs for us? Where would we go to find Demosthenes to come and make our speeches for us in that great court, if that were our client and that the issue?

Most assuredly now remember, our client, collective mankind, will be accused of brutality and stupidity and greed, of littleness, superstition, arrogance, vulgarity, injustice, corruption, degradation, moral disintegration, and, to cap it all, cowardice. The naked charge, as you stand there with your client before that imaginary sunlit marble throne of justice, whatever it is, the naked charge, separate and apart from the specifications that are going to follow, is enough to make you tremble in your boots and leap at the chance to grab the burden of the issue and prove that he is indeed different from what he is charged with being; that he is kind and intelligent and unselfish and magnanimous, tolerant, humble, pure, and brave.

But as we stand there to hear the charge against our client whom we are appointed to defend, there breaks through upon our senses, I am sure, a kind of flush of terror or bewilderment, all of the things that plague Hamlet. Our ears will be full to overflowing with the testimony against us, but now they are filled to overflowing with the charges against us, and we can't hear any more. We have heard all we have capacity to comprehend, and yet there whispers to us from within "the whips and scorns of time, the oppressor's wrong, the proud man's contumely, the pangs of despised love, the law's delay, the insolence of office, and the spurns that patient merit of the unworthy takes."

Well, here we are. We are paid in advance. We have a great cause to sustain. Now, when the proof comes in, we can expect to hear all the facts; but first, to complete the averments, they are going to tell us about Cain and Judas and Ivan the Terrible and Al Capone and Adolf Hitler. They will parade across the pages of that indictment every felon, every zealot, traitor, bigot, drunkard, the thankless child, and the thoughtless parent, the imbecile, the tyrant, and all of the diseased of mind and body. Those are exhibits, or will be, against us. We will be charged by them recounting the Children's Crusade, the fall of Rome, the slaughter of the innocents, the smelling flesh of burning witches, the Huns and Vandals of every generation, screams from dungeons, and the atrocities of all who have stalked through blood to mount a throne. They will all come back to us. Experts who will be willing to testify against us will be giving their opinions. There will be the defamers of humanity, the cynics, the iconoclasts, and the arrogant. We may hear one brilliant poetess who wrote this:

"Detestable race, continue to expunge yourself; die out. Convert again into explosives the bewildered ammonia and the distracted cellulose;
Convert again into putrescent matter drawing flies, the hopeful bodies of the young.
Breathe, crowd, encroach, expand; expunge yourself, die out—
Homo called sapiens, man who calls himself thinking."

And we are going to have to admit, my lawyer friends, that if we are to go to that great day of trial now, upon such an errand of defense, we are going to have to be careful to wash our hands and clean our shoes and put on a clean suit, because otherwise maybe the very tribunals of the sky can smell away up there the sticky stench of the human blood of this war. We are going to have to speak in good voice that day, lest the great tribunals of the sky hear the screams of starving people within reach of plenty.

"Man's inhumanity to man makes countless thousands mourn."

They are going to quote that against us when we are defending humanity in that great court. They are going to quote it against us—word, volume, page, and line—those words by our beloved poet.

But here's the thing: We are beginning to get a little encouragement now right out of that sample that we thought to be a bad exhibit, as so oftentimes happens in the trial of a lawsuit. Did you ever stop to think that the significent part of that quotation is this? Let me give you the quotation again:

"Man's inhumanity to man makes countless thousands mourn."

The significant part of it is that man can mourn and man does mourn, so we look there for encouragement. Out of the salty residue of tears there springs the triple alchemy of remorse, aspiration, and resolution, those transmitting indifference into charity, hate into love, and inertia into action. We will have the attention of that court yet.

What should we say about the war? It might be said by the one who is opposed to us, if there be those there: Why, the war itself proves that man isn't fit to be saved; all nations fighting each other who have had a free and open opportunity to get a view of the cross. They don't deserve it. I shan't repeat the devastation of the war; you know it too well, and some of you whose boys will never come back know it beyond my poor speech to mention. But I say this: That if all the killings of the wars of all the leaders, all against us and all those with us—that count, if it be written and charged and proved by the record (and it may be stipulated), the answer would be: In the United States of America alone there were 140,000,000 whose will stood between us and the shadow of the swastika and the sword of the despicable Jap. And when the great balance is struck up there, we shall ask to be weighed against the horrors and the errors of this war, the majestic will which stood between the tyrant and the rest of humanity. Doesn't that weigh for something? Isn't our willingness to assume and endure the countless hells in order to extirpate or uproot the tyrant's existence, the existence of evil, isn't that enough to offset all the destruction that the tyrant would have wrought? We lay that exhibit before your celestial and heavenly honors for consideration.

Now it seems to me that if there is a man who can't agree that the sacrifice and the will of a great people like ours and that of all of our allies is worthy of consideration to help to strike down the charge that all man is not worth saving, then to my mind that man parts company with me. He is a philosophical Nazi of some kind, and he must find his refuge in the company of men who are content to say that right shall always be on the scaffold and wrong forever on the throne. We don't hold that.

But let's get away from the war a little bit. If your honors please, we have something else to say. We've got some happy things to say about mankind, if you only want to know it. Mankind created music. Well, what does that amount to? I'll tell your honors what it amounts to. I, one man, this counsel who speaks—I sat before a symphony orchestra and I heard a tune being played. It was the beautiful Blue Danube. As I heard the strains of that music, I was afloat on a beautiful vessel on a broad, sweeping blue stream. I could see the sunlight coming down over the hills and tinting this and that, and sometimes I could see the choppy places on the river where the wind had struck, and again it was a glassy brightness. I got into the swift currents around the bend, and I got into the still places on the near side, and I had more pleasure listening to that music, and I had a finer voyage in my imagination in a few minutes than I could ever have had in an actual boat, and I was free from all the muddy and sordid and ugly details of the river itself, and I could fly like an angel in my imagination, because I had a great ride while I heard that music, and it cost me not a penny.

Well, so what? That sirs, was because there was a man by the name of Johann Strauss one time who was willing to work his life out and pour it out and labor in order that through the majesty of his rhythm and harmony and his creative genius, uncounted thousands if not millions of men and women then unborn might enjoy something sweet which he could reach into the great unknown, into the infinite goodness of God, and bring to people who couldn't create

for themselves. He was one of those, one of my clients.

I have been interested in the statesmen who now sit in the Senate for the State of Tennessee. I am very grateful to my friend Bob Kerr for having mentioned Cordell Hull. You will pardon me if I say that I have always been interested in Andrew Jackson. The gentleman over here at my left told me what a great man Jackson was. He said Jackson was a great Democrat. I said he was, anyhow. I tell you what I mean by that. I go somewhere and now and again I'll see a monument to Andrew Jackson. I've read something about him, I think I've dreamed about him a great deal, tried to comprehend something about what there could be in that man to be the epitome and the personification of this experiment in democracy, in free government upon a new continent, which is uniquely his place in the history of mankind. But I look at his features and I look upon the lines of his body and the action displayed, and I realize that by looking at a monument of him I can find out more by looking on his face what he was like than by reading the books, because somebody that was skilled with a chisel worked on stone or in plaster of paris and molded into bronze. Whenever I see one of those monuments, wherever it is, wherever I travel and look at it, I stop a minute, and it seems to me that I am a debtor to that unknown sculptor who gave me not only the blessings of his art but gave me the blessings again of the man himself. An artist I do not know, whose wage I did not pay, brought for me out of the generations past a benediction from a great American, and makes me better because I stand in the presence of the stone, of the bronze. That unknown man is one whom we bring to this great high court as an exhibit saying that mankind is worth being saved, and it doesn't have anything to do with war or bloodshed, either.

Well, let's see. One will have to admit, O Heaven, that man has been a persistent animal. The yellowing scrolls of history disclose the tenacity with which he has survived famine and pestilence and earthquake and fire, working their devastation in their several seasons and their many ways. All the cankerous growths of innate lust feed upon the heart of man to discourage him. He falters and he stumbles and he falls—but he is up again in the morning. That's the kind of man that it is being proposed that we destroy by our foolishness. Throughout the ages he has sloshed along in the morass, and sometimes you can hear his heels pounding a firm staccato upon the rocky high places. Sometimes up and sometimes down, but always something in him turns his face up toward the sunlight and he goes on.

I remember we had a witness that I predicted the opposition would bring to the stand by the name of Edna Saint Vincent Millay, who said, "Expunge yourself." We'll cross-examine her and we'll turn over in the volume of her poems you can find in your library down here, and we'll see what else she wrote. She also wrote how man meets earthquake and storm and flood. Did you on such and such a day write this?

"He heard the sick earth groan,
Rolling its pitchy lake of scalding stone
Upon his house.
Where did he weep?
With his head between his knees,
Where, said the race of man,
Let me freeze.
By nightfall he had built another town."

"Yes," she would say, "I wrote that." Didn't you on such and such a day write this:

"The broken dike, and nothing left
But floating disarray.
Was this the day man dropped and died,
His burden heavier than a quilt of clay?
No. Above his garden, faintly glimmering,
Still there bulked the plow."

Well, some old graybeard is going to be there. I don't mean anybody just gray enough to be living in this generation; I mean somebody that lived way, way back there. He will say: "You have stoned your prophets, Mankind." Yes, the centuries of us have stoned our prophets, but the later generations of our offspring worship at their shrin.. Our Presidents whose only cause has been that of liberty and justice, we have maligned and persecuted with cunning and hate and fury, but the future generations of our children will look upon their faces in Mount Rushmore and call them blessed.

Tom Paine may be there. He may speak up and say our Government isn't what it's cracked up to be. It probably did not meet his standard of perfection. He said, "Your government is all right when you can say this of it: 'My poor are happy; neither ignorance nor disease is to be found among them. My jails are empty of prisoners, my streets of beggars. The aged are not in want, the taxes are not oppressing. The rational world is my friend because I am a friend of its happiness.'"

Well, your honors, we don't measure up to that, quite. But we had a great statesman, your honors, and a great teacher one time who told us, Lord Haldane, that over on this side is the sphere of human progress in which men are controlled by absolute law, so that will has no place in their process; and over here is a sphere in which every man is a libertine, or may be, for there is nothing to control or check his will or his license. But in between there is a realm and a sphere and a domain in which, with a reasonable amount of law and, as TOM STEWART says, a fair and honest purpose, men have been able to work out a process of governing themselves. And we say to your honors, on behalf of mankind, that in this reasonable middle realm that the great law writer tells us about, under the Stars and Stripes of the United States of America, we have gained greater progress in government than any other government known to the God who sits upon the throne of all government. [Applause.]

Somebody will say: Well, Man, you are almost nothing physically. It's true. The astronomer will say that we are of relatively little importance, size, and achievement. He will point out that our sun and moon and all the several companies and constellations of stars and planets, as the layman sees them, taken as a whole composite group, they form but a speck in the universe. Everything we can comprehend as laymen is a speck in the universe. There are universes of universes which bring into play distances of millions of light years in their apartness. They will show that in this cosmos, this universe of universes, the earth on which we live, to which we bear such a relatively small part and proportion, that whole earth, all of us put together and the land we live on, they will say is nothing more than a rotating shadow which is part of an almost dimensionless whole.

Our answer to that is that bigness doesn't depend upon size. The bigness of a man's soul and of his intellect matches the physical bigness of the creation itself. We will answer that day by quoting Ralph Waldo Emerson, who said, in his essay on history, that man is greater than all of the geography of the world.

Let me give you an illustration of what I mean, if we may take time out to relieve the burden of solid argument. Let's imagine a little worm about an inch long, and I'll put him in the most dismal place I can think of just now. I'll put him out on a weed in the midst of the Sargasso Sea, floating out there in the Atlantic. If you can imagine that little worm, with the use only of his own capacities, with the instrumentalities only that lie within his own reach; if that little worm could somehow look away from his watery home and look around and see what's going on in the world; and in time, if he could comprehend the mysteries of the River Nile, if he could see the heights of Tibet where the lamas live, if he could see and hear the chimes of London, if that little tiny worm could see the TVA project, if he could see Niagara Falls and all the grain in the West, and the sun finally setting like a red ball on the blue pillow of the Pacific Ocean—if that worm could do all that, the phenomenon of his feat would be small compared to that which man has wrought in his conquest of the illimitable universe.

Well, it seems to me that we ought to say, too, that man has taken the lightning out of the sky and put it under his heel. He has conquered the sea and the land and the ether and the air, and now the atom. I have often thought—for baseball players like you, Tom, and others I think that are out here that I think play a better game of ball than you ever could play—that the coordination and skill represented in a good home run, and the precision in a successful forward pass, those of you who are going to a football game tomorrow, and seriously, the precision of invented things, things made by man's hands, that they challenge comparison with the perfections of the physical universe made by the Creator.

Now we are going to have some witnesses. We are going to have lots of them who will give testimony on our behalf. Out of the eons of time in the past, and out of all the space around the earth, they are going to come. Time will be no object, as it isn't sometimes in lawyers' arguments in court. We will have eons of time to try this case. The judge won't have to go up Peachtree Creek fishing, either. But here they'll come, seriously. There'll be Moses, with his tablets of stone. We are defending all mankind; aren't we? We are pleading that he be allowed and that he be given wisdom to save mankind to himself, upon the basis that he deserves to live. There will be Moses with his tablets of stone; Martin Luther blazing the way for the Knoxes and the Calvins; Confucius writing the laws of man's intrinsic nature; Joan of Arc out of the fire; Woodrow Wilson who saw the light of heaven shining on his blade; Socrates draining the world's cup of bitterness and giving back a bigger cup of his wisdom; all the great lawyers of the past, and the great jurists; the dreamers, Keats and Shelley; the wooden shoes that you see in the picture of the Angelus; Thomas Jefferson writing copybook maxims about government of, by, and for the people, for Thomas Lincoln's awkward Kentucky boy to state to all the other statesmen who were to succeed him; the forty-niners, Sam Houston; and all of the heroes of this war. We shall have these witnesses and many more.

Against blasphemies we shall set off "Peace on earth, good will to men." Against the felon we shall set off the just judge. Against ignorance we shall set off the universities and schools and the millions of the teachers of the young. Against intolerance and superstitution we shall set off the devout pulpits bearing like Atlases upon their backs the Holy Bible. Against cheapness and vulgarity we shall set off the Red Cross and the unnumbered other organizations building character in men. Against corruption we will set off the myriads of honest men whom the spoils of office cannot buy. Against avarice we shall set off the philanthropist and the philosopher, and that mud-spattered saint, the country doctor. And against selfishness we will bring into court a little Irish woman, that neighborhood angel who always assuages your bereavement with a fresh cherry pie. We shall match Pilate with Paul, the Benedict Arnolds of the world with the George Washingtons of the world; persecution with Easter. The darkness of those Children's Crusades we shall dispel with the altar fires of Asia and the million lighted Christmas trees.

The best to speak for us will be a lowly Jew, with ragged wounds in Him, in His

hands and in His feet and in His body, and the scar of thorns upon His head; and there will be the most persuasive and authoritative voice of all, because with parable and paradox and beatitude He'll tell what mankind is worth.

And O, great judges of this court, we who are lawyers here, we're just a few of us trying to grope around to find out what it's all about. Let's be honest. Not many people within the sound of my voice, particularly not I, not many of us know how to live at all. But why? There's a reason for these things. Archeologists tell us that many more than a million years we have been engaged in this earth in developing tools and weapons. Archeologists tell us—and both points are proved, and we will bring them into court and lay the evidence down as justification for what we lack in humanity—your honors, we have been developing our tools in this race of ours over a million years, and the best we can show of the development of morality and character and ethics is about 5,000 years.

Man didn't have a conscience before 5,000 years ago, the students tell us. He didn't know what a conscience was, so he couldn't have morality. The fact of the matter is, if I may reduce it to a simple table for this purpose, if a thousand years were laid out on this head table as the length of time during which mankind has been developing his tools and weapons, I'd go down to the end of the table to measure off the period of space in which ethics and morality—and that's the field in which lawyers peculiarly work—have existed, and the period would be 7 days, to strike a comparison. If he halted in his development of his scientific and materialistic endeavor, halted tonight, if not another thing were invented nor improved physically and materially for 9,950 centuries, and if during that 9,950 centuries man devoted all of his energy to the development of his moral fiber and his ethics, it would take that long to catch up, in point of time.

Well, it's no wonder, then, we haven't done so much. We begin to see not only that we can deny the fact that man is unworthy, but that in that in which he is unworthy there is historical justification.

That's the part of my message which is long.

This is the part of my message which is short. Who is to lead mankind to catch up the difference between the development of his ethical consciousness and his material achievements? I know the church has tried it a long time, and I pray to God it will never relax its effort. But again I say the peculiar field in which mankind is lacking to prove overwhelmingly to himself and to the most iconoclastic among him, is the field of the plain old-fashioned lawyer. I have yet to find a field, with all due respect to every other profession, Governor Kerr, I have yet to find a field in which ethics, the fine flower of all the sweetness in which we have not worked hard enough, where ethics is more seriously a part of the fiber and the force of a man than in the field of the law. The short part of my message is: this is your responsibility, and you are elected to defend mankind, whether you like it or not. The assignment is yours. [Applause.] In the very nature of things, the great judge of nature has appointed you counsel for mankind who stands today not knowing how he can save himself from his own self-destruction.

So I say to the lawyers of Tennessee and to all of you here: I wonder when this case is going to be set for trial, and what kind of a continuance can we get? No; it isn't a time for continuance. The trial begins today. Let's not be afraid of the issue. Let's not be afraid to take that case. On the other hand, let's just get firm and real about it. Let's get a deep faith, and to show our deep faith let's get a little bit arrogant about it, let's put on some purple robes, too, and let them flutter in the wind, let bands play and let the banners float in the sky. We are going to march out into that great court and we are going to defend humanity. By tomorrow, which is Saturday; by the next day, which is Sunday; by the next day, which is Monday, shall we in that manner march out, in every slight detail of our lives, once we have the glory and the dignity we would put upon our shoulders if we were going to that great court to defend all who have lived and all who live, such a responsibility upon the leaders of a State and a community.

When we go we'll sing a song to march by:

"I am the owner of sphere,
Of the seven stars and the solar year;
Of Caesar's hand and Plato's brain,
Of the Lord Christ's heart and Shakespeare's strain."

—*Ralph Waldo Emerson.*

Why, the very audacity of the manner in which we take our books to court, the very audacity of it will justify all we claim in vindication; and listening, those timid souls we leave behind will some day hear like rolling thunder the acclaiming verdict of eternity, and you shall be the counsel to win that verdict.

Thank you very much. [Applause.]

President KEY. The sixty-fourth annual convention of this association now stands adjourned.

The final session thereupon adjourned at 10:25 p. m.

The American Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 6 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able and worth-while address delivered by the Secretary of War, Robert P. Patterson, before the American Jewish Committee, at the Waldorf Astoria, New York City, February 3.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ten days ago, I returned from a month-long trip through the major overseas areas of Army activities. In Germany, among other things, I visited the grave of General Patton. We were friends. Aside from the friendship, I felt it my duty to pay tribute to the soldier to whom our Nation owes so much for what he did to win the war.

General Patton lies peacefully among comrades who worshipped a universal God in their separate ways. Among the rows upon rows of simple, white crosses, I noticed the familiar Star of David, the symbol of the Jewish faith. You were well represented among those 8,000 dead in the American cemetery in Luxembourg. You are well represented in every military cemetery where American fighting men have been laid to rest after their last battle. There they rest, equal in death as they were equal in our American life and equal in their devotion to their country's cause.

The graves in that cemetery were dug on a January evening, in 1919, in a Munich beer hall, where an obscure organizer, Anton Drexler, enrolled a former German corporal, named Adolf Hitler as member No. 7 in the German Worker's Party. On that evening the forces of brutal intolerance, the forces that professed to believe that one race was created to ride and the others to be ridden, found a spokesman and a chieftain. Under his tyranny and because of our lethargy, our refusal to credit the evidence before our eyes, those forces in less than a generation drenched the world in blood. It was a straight case of cause and effect.

Intolerance has had its day in other times, though never to the same degree and with such frightful consequences as in the time of Hitler. It is for our generation to shape our destiny so as to make it impossible for such sinister leaders to rise to power again.

Your efforts toward a better world have been described as a counteroffensive to bigotry. They, in fact, are more than a counteroffensive. They are a direct campaign for the eternal principles of our country. Tolerance is the basis of our national unity. Tolerance is the foundation stone of our military structure. Tolerance is vital to our Army's success in battle.

A soldier does not fight alone. He is basically a member of a squad, and the men in the squad are mutually dependent upon each other for survival. They train side by side. They go into battle together, each gaining confidence in the presence of the others.

These men know each other. Differences in race and creed do not concern them, much less divide them. Protestant, Catholic, or Jew, each depends for his life on the others. The infantry squad, the basic unit of the Army, is an all-American squad in every sense. The bonds of mutual trust and confidence are stronger there than in any other group. Life and death depend on the strength of those bonds.

The successful commanding officer, if he is to have an outfit that can follow his leadership, picks his squad leaders on merit. Race or creed or social position does not count. Qualification for the job must be the reason for his choice. If his unit is to survive, he must be tolerant. His unit must be tolerant.

I have here in my hand the roster of Company F of the Three Hundred and Sixth Infantry Regiment of New York's Seventy-seventh Division—the Statue of Liberty Division. I commanded that company in the First World War. In 1943 I bade them goodby at Indiantown Gap before they left for the Pacific. Their energy and fitness for the fight were most inspiring. They fought on Guam and Leyte and Ie Shima and Okinawa, and they never failed. I saw them again, 3 weeks ago, in Japan. But the faces were new. Many of the men, all of the officers, whom I had seen at Indiantown Gap had died in battle.

That outfit was typically American. Here is the roster last summer on Okinawa. I am reading the first 10 names as they appear, in order:

First Sgt. Sidney Stein, Tech. Sgt. Michael Dean, Tech. Sgt. Henry Einig, Tech Sgt. Frank Kulaszewski, Staff Sgt. Charles Allen, Staff Sgt. Sidney Baker, Staff Sgt. Frank Bellusci, Staff Sgt. Edward Borisevic, Staff Sgt. Michael Cap, Staff Sgt. James Gormley.

That is the Army of the United States: 10 names, a cross section of our people. Those men fought together with a wholesome respect for each other and a complet confidence in the loyalty of each other.

Of those 10 men, not one had been in the Army prior to Pearl Harbor. Only a few of them were on the company roster when it left for overseas. They had replaced other Steins and Deans and Einigs and Kulaszewskis and Allens who had fallen on the field of battle because we Americans thought that viciousness in a Munich back street, aggression in a Manchurian village, was none of our concern.

In the Army they were of one mind in their devotion to duty. Common loyalty, common responsibility, common purpose produces the common touch among American soldiers.

The Army can be proud that, under the heat and stress of war, it fostered that common touch. Just as firmly as I believe it was the finest fighting machine of all time, I believe that it was the greatest agent, in our history, for the strengthening of national unity and the democratic way of life.

Ten and a half million men, from every part of the country, from every sphere of life, students and farmers and machinists and clerks and salesmen, entered its ranks. They trained and worked and fought together. In a common enterprise they gained a fellowship and understanding that, when the petty irritations of the moment are forgotten, will be recognized at its full value.

In opportunities for promotion, the Army again gave proof of the value of the individual's own worth. Mistakes have been made. Not all achievements were rewarded. The evidence, however, is overwhelming that merit above all else was the key to selection and reward. We put men in positions of authority who appreciated the value of merit, for it explained in thousands of cases their own selection.

Of the 872,000 officers who served in the Army, 531,000 or three out of five, were former enlisted men, men who had started out as privates. They had earned the right to spend 14 to 24 weeks of discipline and training at officers candidate schools, a training that was exceeded only by battle itself as a trial of the stuff in a man, before receiving their commissions.

Of all our officers, only 18,000 or 2 percent, were Regular Army; 2½ percent were National Guardsmen and 23 percent members of the Officers Reserve Corps. Of the rest, not commissioned on the basis of enlisted training, 96,000 or 11 percent, were commissioned directly from civilian life, most of them as doctors, dentists, and chaplains. Let me point out further, that among the generals who led our victorious Army, nearly 300 had come all the way up from rear-rank privates. Of the cadets now at West Point, 44 percent saw service in the ranks in the war.

The officers candidate school system of training officers, taken from the ranks, proved itself in every military field. Its graduates, by their courage and leadership, enriched our military traditions. They won the respect of professional soldiers throughout the world.

I am sure that the democratic influence of service in the ranks is a desirable prerequisite for success in military leadership. The War Department studies of universal military training provide that in case such training is adopted no individual be commissioned in the Regular Army or permitted to enroll in an officer candidate school, ROTC unit, or to enter West Point, without having completed the training in the ranks required under such a program.

The Army is based on democracy and on good faith. We need both in all human relations, now more than ever. The torch of tolerance you bear should light the path toward a more understanding world and therefore a more peaceful world.

That must be the goal of all men if mankind is to survive. As a Nation, we have pledged ourselves with the other United Nations to an international organization. Its purpose is the prevention of war by the just settlement of disputes. The hope of the world rests in it. The prayers of the world go with it. But we cannot have a world united for peace, unless we have a country united for peace. We achieved unity in war. We must maintain unity now. Tolerance is its foundation.

The time will come when some in this country, out of perverseness or for some other reason, will try to mitigate the war guilt of Germany and Japan. The effort will be made to distribute the responsibility among all nations of the world, this Nation included. That will be a hard job, in the face of the record; but I have no doubt that the attempt will be made. When that time comes, I trust that the record of the last 20 years will remain vivid in our minds, that Americans will not be misled into belittling the fight for freedom and decency that was waged and won.

The End of the Ride

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURTON K. WHEELER
OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 6 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, in the Progressive of Monday, January 28, 1946, appears an article entitled "The End of the Ride," written by Milton Mayer, a brilliant writer and an assistant professor at Chicago University. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE END OF THE RIDE

(By Milton Mayer)

Once upon a time, back in 1940 and 1941, there were some people who argued that America should keep out of the war as long as possible and, if possible, altogether. They argued, these people, that when we had entered the war and won it, barbarism would lower itself over us like a hood over a man to be hanged. They argued that when we had entered the war and won it, nobody would know what to do to solve the world's ills. They argued that, when we had entered the war and won it, the normal, natural, animal passion of revenge would lose us our culture, kill our souls, push us further down toward the abyss, and disintegrate our civilization.

But they were called unrealistic, these people, and one of the persons who called them unrealistic was Louis Fischer.

On the front page of The Progressive, 5 years later (in the December 31, 1945, issue), Louis Fischer writes:

"Barbarism is lowering itself over us like a hood over a man to be hanged. * * * Nobody knows what to do to solve the world's ills. * * * unless we rise above the normal, natural, animal passion of revenge, our culture will be lost. * * * It will kill our souls and push us farther down toward the abyss. Someone has to stop the disintegration of our civilization. * * *"

And he adds:

"This will be called unrealistic, idealistic, Christian, and soft. Well, we have been realistic, practical, pagan, and stern for decades. Has it worked? Where are we today?"

Let me tell you where we are, Louie. (You don't call people you love "Louis.") We are at the end of the ride you chose to go on. We are at the end of the ride the unrealists of 1940 and 1941 opposed. And the end is the end the unrealists predicted. It is the end predicted for the 1917 ride by R. M. La Follette, Sr., and for the 1941 ride by his sons, BOB, Jr., and Phil. It is the end predicted by some men whom you and I admire and by some, such as Colonel McCormick, whom we do not admire. But the people who wanted to go on the ride called them all defeatists, appeasers, Fascists, and fools.

It is the end of the ride, Louie. It is the end of the ride you went on.

And I am not bringing up this unhappy matter to taunt you. Apart from my loving you as a friend, and revering you as a hero, I admire you more, almost, than any man I know for your judgment. No; I am bringing this up, and I know you believe me, because you and I may survive for the next ride, and I want to persuade you now not to choose to go on it then. I want to persuade you now not to say to me then, when we are attacking Germany and provoking Japan, "But, Milton, what else can we do?"

The ride, Louie, is the one that Randolph Bourne spoke of when he said, "He who mounts the wild elephant goes where the wild elephant goes." The ride, Louie, is the ride the little girl goes on when, in a temper tantrum she tears up her dolly and then, seeing what she's done, cries her eyes out. The ride, Louie, is the ride the sinner goes on in Dante, and the end of the ride is the closed gate of Paradise, with the legend inscribed on it, "Too late, too late, ye cannot enter now."

The year 1946 is a year of heroic confession, Louie, and it does not surprise me that you are one of the first of the heroes. You, who prided yourself on being realistic and practical in 1941, are not ashamed, in 1946, to ask, "Has it worked?" and to answer, "No." You are not ashamed, in 1946, to be unrealistic, idealistic, Christian, and soft. You are not ashamed to have discovered too late, too late, that there is no conversion by the sword, no peace by the flame-thrower, no democracy by the bomb.

When men like Robert Hutchins, not to mention his toady, Mayer, begged us to stay out of war on the ground that we were not morally prepared for victory, you did not know what you know today. Now that you know that a war waged by a people morally unprepared for victory terminates in the normal, natural, animal passion of revenge, I beseech you to hang on to your hard-won knowledge when the bugles blow again. Now that you have discovered that each time we lick Hitler he somehow comes closer, I plead with you to hold your discovery always before you.

The lesson is always the same, Louie, and if you and the other members of the little band who fight always for freedom have learned it for keeps, the war was not wholly lost. If you have learned what an eminent Frenchman learned long ago, when he said that war is not the worst of evils but it is the cause of all the others—then the blood and the treasure were not all spent in vain. If you have learned why Oscar Ameringer, another of that little band fighting always for freedom, asked that his only epitaph be, "He tried to keep his country out of war"—then the war was partly won.

Men like you do not make moral failures, Louie, so your failure must have been intellectual. I have been trying to locate it, and I find you and me, as I explore my memory, at Eddie Kuh's house in 1940 or 1941. You were defending me, as you always do, against the pack. You were saying, as I remember, "Milton here is fighting for the same world as the rest of us. What he doesn't understand is that we have to fight Hitler to preserve the possibility of the world we fight for at home. We have got to fight on both fronts at once."

This was before Pearl Harbor, Louie, when the choice was still ours. True, we were shipping the Japanese all the oil and scrap and gold credits they needed to conquer Asia. But we were also provoking them to attack us by telling them that they, but not England, France, or Holland, had to give up what they'd stolen or else.

You, however, were not waiting for Pearl Harbor, like some of our friends, who said, on December 7, "What would you do now, Mayer?" You took your stand on principle, Louie. You said that Hitlerism threatened democracy, just as Joe Pewism did, and that we had to fight them both at once.

But that night at Eddie Kuh's, Louie, when you apologized for my intellectual failure, I was apologizing for yours. I was arguing that there is no fighting on two fronts at

once when one of the fronts, by its very nature, is in inexorable and uneven conflict with the other. I said then that modern democracy was at the mercy of modern war; you say it now.

But, Louie, I hoped then that you would be right and I would be wrong. You know I am serious now; you knew I was serious then. I did not want to live to say, "I told you so," but I have. I may still be wrong; you and I are both arrogant individuals; I, with much less reason than you, the more arrogant. God knows, I was only guessing then but the facts are with me now and, by your own admission, against you.

So you and I, and all of us who fight always for freedom, are not arrogant now. And neither are we defeatist. We, all of us, have one life to live and one world to build; and, though victory shortens our odds, and the vanquished have a better chance than the victor, we will all fight on for freedom. You and I, and all of us who fight always for freedom, will never be defeatist. But neither will we, if only we can keep your discovery green, mount the wild elephant again and cry our eyes out at the end of the ride.

British Loan Endorsed by Texas Cotton Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a letter from the vice president and treasurer of the Texas Cotton Association, and a resolution which was passed by the association concerning the British loan. They are as follows:

THE TEXAS COTTON ASSOCIATION,
Waco, Tex., January 29, 1946.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: We respectfully call your attention to enclosed resolutions adopted by the board of directors of this association with respect to the pending loan to Great Britain. We feel that the extension of this loan will be in the general interest of the people of the United States, and we think it will be particularly helpful in reopening the cotton markets of the world to the American cotton grower. As the foremost cotton exporting State, Texas has a direct and special interest in this important matter because our cotton must have access to foreign markets if the industry is to survive and expand.

Aside from and beyond these direct economic benefits which may be expected to flow from the reestablishment of mutually beneficial trade relationships with other nations we have the conviction that lasting peace will be greatly implemented by a more liberal and realistic exchange of goods and services between the peoples of the world. We trust, therefore, that you will actively support legislation approving the British loan.

Yours very respectfully,

L. T. MURRAY,
Vice President and Treasurer.

Whereas it is imperative in the interest of lasting peace that a free exchange of goods and services be reestablished between the nations of the world; and

Whereas there is now an acute shortage of dollars in the hands of former customers of the United States which stands as a serious threat to the revival of reciprocal commercial transactions; and

Whereas the granting of dollar credits offers the only foreseeable hope of rebuilding orderly international trade relationships without which we feel there can be no hope of lasting peace: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Texas Cotton Association, by these resolutions, earnestly urge Congress to approve the loan to Great Britain of $4,400,000,000 as an essential part of the over-all program for world-wide peace and order; be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and to the Texas Members of Congress urging them to approve the British loan in the interest of the people of the United States.

Who Shot Patrick Carr?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Judge Daniel J. Gillen, of the municipal court of the city of Boston:

WHO SHOT PATRICK CARR?

(By Daniel J. Gillen, LL. B., associate justice of the municipal court of the city of Boston; formerly assistant district attorney, Suffolk County; formerly member of the General Court of Massachusetts)

It is not too late to clear the name of a man even 175 years after a shadow has been left on his memory—when the shadow was undeserved.

So it is my purpose in these few pages to set forth the facts relative to the Irishman, Patrick Carr, who was a martyr to the cause of American independence in the Boston Massacre. At the time of his death he was 30 years of age and employed by Mr. Field, a leather breechesmaker, in Queen Street, now Court Street, Boston.

Five people died as a result of the shooting by the British soldiers on that fateful night of March 5, 1770—Crispus Attucks, John Caldwell, Samuel Maverick, Samuel Gray, and Patrick Carr—several others were wounded.

History tells us that the British soldiers quartered in Boston ruled with an iron hand previous to the massacre. So fearful were the townspeople that it was customary when they went out at night to arm themselves with walking sticks, clubs, and swords as a means of protection.

The soldiers led brawling, riotous lives; assaulted the citizens; disturbed church services on Sundays; made the quiet streets hideous by night with their drunken shouts. On one occasion they seized five townsmen and impressed them for service on the British frigate *Romney* as she lay at anchor in the harbor. A few days before the massacre the soldiers had a "run in" with some of the inhabitants at the rope walk. This affair turned out to be an anticlimax, and the bitterness between them left animosities at a fever pitch.

On the night of March 5, a group that had gathered in front of the Custom House was ordered away by the guard of soldiers, and while scores looked on from nearby points of vantage, words were exchanged, to be quickly followed by the tragic event that was destined to be a high point in the history of America.

Three murder trials followed and all were held in His Majesty's Superior Court of Judicature.

In the first, Captain Preston of the British Army was found not guilty—obviously because there was a conflict of testimony as to whether or not he gave the order for the soldiers to fire.

In the second, eight soldiers were tried as principals and accessories to the murders of the five victims.

In the third, certain persons who were supposed to have fired on the patriots from the Custom House windows were all found not guilty.

No minutes exist of the first and third trials. But at the second trial a shorthand writer was employed and from his minutes a very full report was made and reprinted in 1807 and 1821.

This was the most famous and historic murder trial in the annals of Boston. The prosecutors were Robert Treat Paine and Samuel Quincy, the defense counsel John Adams and Josiah Quincy assisted by Sampson Salter Blowers.

In passing it is of interest to note that Samuel and Josiah Quincy were brothers and some years later Blowers and Samuel Quincy both became tories and left the country.

Four judges presided and each in turn charged the jury. While the charges of only two of them are in the report, it is apparent their exposition of the law pertinent to the case was in general fair and lucid. Citizens of Suffolk County from Roxbury, Dedham, Milton, Braintree, and Hingham sat on the jury, but none from the town of Boston were on the panel.

All the soldiers were found not guilty of murder but two of them, Montgomery and Killroy, were found guilty of manslaughter and were "burnt in the hand" in open court as punishment.

The evidence indicated that Montgomery fired the shot that killed Crispus Attucks and Killroy the shot that mortally wounded Samuel Gray. Apparently the confused state of the evidence as to which of the remaining six soldiers fired the shots that killed the three other victims brought about the not guilty verdicts.

In general, the testimony was conflicting as to whether or not the actions of the civilians warranted the amount of force used by the soldiers.

The Government contended that the blame for the incident was attributable to the soldiers and that the circumstances were not such as to warrant the shooting of the victims.

The defense was that the group of people close to the guard created a "riot" and the soldiers fired into the "mob" in self-defense.

But the jury by its verdict held that more force was used than was necessary and it would follow that it was thereby legally determined for all time, that there was no "mob" present and no "riot" existed.

Only two historians have to my knowledge ever attempted to give Patrick Carr his proper place in the sun.

John Fiske is authority [1] for the claim that Patrick Carr as well as Maverick and Caldwell were innocent bystanders and in no way concerned in the commotion with the soldiers—that these three were not a part of the crowd close to the guard just before the shooting—and the testimony at the trial bears out these facts.

Esther Forbes in Paul Revere and the World He Lived In,[2] describing the massacre,

---

[1] Address of John Fiske—November 14, 1888, at dedication of monument to the victims of the Boston Massacre—Boston Common.

[2] Paul Revere and the World He Lived In, by Esther Forbes—Houghton Mifflin Co.—pp. 156 and 166.

writes—"but Patrick Carr, 'the Irish teague'—who deserves our grateful memory, lived in torture for several days. Three people emerged from what has always been known as the Boston Massacre (Colonel Dalrymple called it 'a scuffle') with great dignity. The two lawyers (John Adams and Josiah Quincy) who risked friendship, fortune, and good esteem to defend them (the soldiers) and Patrick Carr, 'the Irish teague.'"

Carr's part in the massacre, in my opinion, was imprudently handled by John Adams in his final argument to the jury and herein lies the shadow I seek to remove.

In all, about 80 people testified at the trial, and the only evidence that in any way concerned Patrick Carr or Ireland, his native land, came from the lips of three witnesses. Their testimony is set forth in detail as it appears in the report.

Mrs. Catherine Field.

"Question. Did you know Patrick Carr who was killed by the firing in King Street on the 5th of March last?

"Answer. Yes.

"Question. Was he in your house that evening?

"Answer. Yes.

"Question. Did you hear anything he said when he heard there was an affray with the soldiers?

"Answer. When the bells rung he went upstairs and put his surtout on, and got a hanger and put it betwixt his coat and surtout; my husband coming at the time, gave him a push and felt the sword; he wanted to take it from him, but he was unwilling to let it go; my husband told him he should not take it with him. I do not know what he said but one of the neighbors was in the house and coaxed the sword out of his hand and he went out without it. He said on his deathbed, he saw a parcel of boys and negroes throwing snowballs at the guard. He thought the first or second man from the sentinel box was the man that shot him."

John Mansfield.

"Question. Do you know Patrick Carr?

"Answer. Yes, on the night of the 5th of March when the bells rung he would go out. I persuaded him much to stay at home, he did not mind me but took his sword betwixt his coat and surtout. Mr. Field coming in felt it, and said he should not take it with him; with much coaxing a woman who lived next door got it from him.

"Question. Did you hear any acknowledgement by him on his deathbed?

"Answer. I was often at his bedside; and all that I ever heard him say was, he thought he knew the man that shot him, but he never made it known to me."

Dr. John Jeffries.

"Question. Was you Patrick Carr's surgeon?

"Answer. I was in company with others. I was called that evening about 11 o'clock to him; I was engaged with Mr. Paine and could not go; next morning I went; after dressing his wounds I advised him never to go again into quarrels and riots; he said he was very sorry he did go. Dr. Lloyd who was present turned around to me and said Jeffries, I believe this man will be able to tell us how this affair was, we had better ask him. I asked him how long he had been in King Street when they fired? He said he went from Mr. Field's when the bells rung, when he got to Walker's Corner, he saw many persons coming from Cornhill, who he was told had been quarreling with the soldiers down there, that he went with them as far as the stocks, that he stopped there, but they passed on; while he was standing there he saw many things thrown at the sentry. I asked him if he knew what was thrown? He said he heard the things strike against the guns, and they sounded hard, he believed they were oyster shells and ice; he heard the people huzza every time they heard anything strike that sounded hard; that he then saw some soldiers going down toward the custom house; that he saw the people pelt them as they went along, after they had got down there, he crossed over toward Warden and Vernon's shop in order to see what they would do; that as he was passing he was shot; that he was taken up and carried home to Mr. Field's by some of his friends. I asked him whether he thought the soldiers would fire; he told me he thought the soldiers would have fired long before. I asked him whether he thought the soldiers were abused a great deal after they went there; he said he thought they were. I asked him whether he thought the soldiers would have been hurt if they had not fired; he said he really thought they would, for he heard many voices cry out, kill them. I asked him then, meaning to close all, whether he thought they fired in self defense or on purpose to destroy the people; he said he really thought they did fire to defend themselves; that he did not blame the man, whoever he was, that shot him. This conversation was on Wednesday. He always gave the same answers to the same questions every time I visited.

"Question. Was he apprehensive of his danger?

"Answer. He was told of it. He told me also, he was a native of Ireland, that he had frequently seen mobs and soldiers called upon to quell them: whenever he mentioned that he always called himself a fool that he might have known better, that he had seen soldiers often fire on the people in Ireland, but he had never seen them bear half so much before they fired in his life.

"Question. How long did he live after he received his wound?

"Answer. Ten days.

"Question. When had you the last conversation with him?

"Answer. About 4 o'clock in the afternoon preceding the night on which he died, and he then particularly said, he forgave the man, whoever he was, that shot him, he was satisfied he had no malice but fired to defend himself."

Now let us see how John Adams used this evidence in his final argument.

He said in part, "They (the soldiers) were a lawful assembly, and the people attacking them were by every principle a mob. We have been entertained with a great variety of phrases to avoid calling this sort of people a mob. Some call them shavers, some call them geniuses. The plain English is, gentlemen, most probably a motley rabble of saucy boys, Negroes and mulattoes, Irish teagues, and outlandish jack tars. And why we should scruple to call such a set of people a mob, I cannot conceive unless the name is too respectable for them. The sun is not about to stand still or go out, nor the rivers to dry up because there was a mob in Boston on the 5th of March that attacked a party of soldiers. Such things are not new in the world nor in the British dominions, though they are comparatively rarities and novelties in this town. Carr, a native of Ireland, had often been concerned in such attacks, and, indeed, from the nature of things soldiers quartered in a populous town will always occasion two mobs where they prevent one. They are wretched conservators of the peace * * *. And it is in this manner, this town has been often treated; a Carr from Ireland, and an Attucks from Framingham, happening to be here, shall sally out upon their thoughtless enterprises, at the head of such a rabble of Negroes, etc., as they can collect together and then there are not wanting persons to ascribe all their doings to the good people of the town."

Why should John Adams twist the evidence in the manner he did?

There was no testimony that Carr at any time had been concerned in a riot, anywhere. True, he was credited with saying on his death bed that he had seen riots in Ireland but the evidence went no further. Carr, did not sally out at the head of any mob. He watched the people close to the soldiers from a distant point as did many of the townspeople. Was that a crime?

We find as witnesses at the trial the Appletons, the Fosdicks, the Bridghams, the Burdicks, the Crawfords, the Townsends, the Wendells and others, telling the story of what they saw at the massacre—they were all respected townspeople—not strangers. Some of them were so close to the soldiers that evening they were pricked by their bayonets. But no words critical of their actions came from the lips of Adams.

Why? It may be we can find the answer in the fact that at this time John Adams was one of the Representatives from Boston to the General Court. So at least it was the part of wisdom to lay no blame at the door of Boston voters.

No one will question the courage of John Adams in taking over the defense of the soldiers. But should the good name of anyone be handled lightly in order to free them?

It does not seem possible that this keen, alert barrister, then in his prime, was unable to follow the evidence and fell into error. Rather does it appear that at this trial he was just a lawyer with the job of successfully defending his clients as the paramount task, so a little stretching of the evidence here and there was necessary to fit it to the pattern of the defense theme.

In truth it was not a situation as Adams would have the jury believe where the "town born" all stood on the curbstone passively looking on, while a "mob" of strangers set upon the soldiers and thusly brought disgrace on Boston town.

But this was the defense. There must always be a "defense" in a murder trial. However, the jury in this case was not misled by the defense or the argument in its support.

Nor was there any evidence in the case about "Irish teagues." It is the anglicized spelling of the Irish name Tadhgor or Thaddeus. The dictionary defines "teague" as a mischievous, blundering, faithful Irish servant lad in Sir Robert Howard's The Committee, hence, as a nickname, an Irishman.

If the nickname for every Irishman at that period was "teague," the fact remains that insofar as this trial was concerned it was entirely the creation of John Adams—for the only reference to the Irish or Ireland was contained in the testimony of Dr. Jeffries.

To argue that the mob was made up of Irish teagues, when there was no evidence that any Irishman was in the group close to the soldiers, was certainly going all-out to bolster the defense theme.

Reading the testimony of Dr. Jeffries, one wonders how the doctor had any time to treat the wounds of Patrick Carr, he was so busy asking the dying man questions. No lawyer could have done a better job in eliciting pertinent evidence that would later help the soldiers.

What motive prompted the doctor to become a master of detail? His subsequent actions may provide the reason.

A few years later we find him acting as the surgeon for the British soldiers at the Battle of Bunker Hill. On March 17, 1776, he is one of 1,100 tories leaving Boston with General Gage for Canada. After a sojourn in London we again find him back in Boston, following the war, living off the people.

Would a man with this temerity hesitate to attribute to Carr a death-bed statement false in detail?

We now wonder if the doctor was plotting to be the all purpose witness for the defense even while he was ministering to Carr.

While the charges of the judges insofar as the exposition of the law was concerned were fair, one of them, Justice Oliver, surely stepped beyond the evidence in his narration of facts.

He charged in part—"Dr. Jeffries relates an account which he had from Patrick Carr, one of the deceased, who on his death bed repeatedly told him and confirmed it but a few hours before he died, that he went with a desig. against the soldiers, that the soldiers were pelted as they were going to their post."

Why should the "good" judge tuck this statement in his charge? There was no testimony of this nature—that Carr said he went with a design against the soldiers.

His subsequent conduct may supply a reason for this chicanery. The judge was also one of the tories who left with General Gage. History records that he wrote in his diary as he departed from Boston—"And here I bid adieu to that shore which I never wish to tread again till the greatest of social blessings a firm British Government precedes or accompanies me hither."

Would he have inserted nonexistent evidence in his charge to help the cause along?

Some one may say that Patrick Carr attempted to take a sword with him when he went out to witness the events that transpired that night. But it was common custom for the inhabitants to go out armed. Dr. Young a respected citizen of the town was armed with a sword when he endeavored to act as peacemaker just before the shooting, and the prosecutor in his argument paid tribute to him for his efforts, pointing out that the sword was standard equipment for the inhabitants since the arrival of the soldiers.

The inference that flows from the imprudent remarks of John Adams and Justice Oliver relative to Patrick Carr is that he was part and parcel of the group that came close to the soldiers; but the plain truth is there was no evidence that he in any way was connected with the affair at the Custom House. On the entire record he was a model inhabitant of the town and more than that he died as a good Christian, with no malice in his heart toward the man who shot him.

John Adams served America well. No more gripping story can be told in the early history of the country than the privations he endured on his trip from London to Holland in the dead of winter, to negotiate financial loans for the infant Republic—his beloved America. It will ever remain as a tribute to his loyalty to the land of his birth. He was a liberal and broadminded man; and was one of the original contributors to the fund for the erection of the first Roman Catholic Cathedral in Boston.

His position in history is secure. What I ask for Patrick Carr is the same security; he deserves it.

On the monument on Boston Common erected to the memory of the victims of the massacre are two inscriptions.

The one from the pen of Daniel Webster reads: "From that moment we may date the severance of the British Empire."

The other from the pen of John Adams reads: "On that night the foundation of American Independence was laid."

Did Adams in later life change his opinion of what transpired on March 5, 1770? Never after the trial did he boast of his part in it.

In any event, when he wrote the line that is inscribed on the monument, in effect, he credited Patrick Carr and his compatriots with helping to lay the foundation of American independence and surely no man could ask for greater honor.

The bones of Carr have long since mingled with the soil of Boston in the granary burying ground. And Esther Forbes through a sheer sense of justice has done much to give him his proper place in the annals of Boston and America.

If one read only the final argument of John Adams and the interjection of Justice Oliver and failed to digest the testimony of the trial one might conclude that Patrick Carr was an outlaw, wreaking vengeance on the soldiers. The most striking example of this character of error is the treatment of Patrick Carr by John C. Miller, a historian, who dubs Carr as "a seasoned Irish rioter" without factual support.[3]

In an era when it is too common for pseudo-historians to attempt to deflate heroes, this legal analysis of the actual testimony may serve the purpose of forestalling any future endeavor to picture Carr in any role other than the true one—a martyr to the cause of American independence.

Who shot Patrick Carr? A British soldier, whose identity will ever remain a mystery. The indictment set forth that Hugh White was the soldier who killed Carr but the verdict of the jury on this matter was not guilty—so the identity was never settled.

But Patrick Carr "deserves our grateful memory—he emerges from what has always been known as the Boston Massacre with dignity."

It is not too late to clear the name of a man even 175 years after a shadow has been left on his memory—when the shadow was undeserved.

National Foreign Trade Convention—Final Declaration of Thirty-second Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 6 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the well-being of the United States is bound up inextricably with the well-being of the world as a whole. It is therefore important that our foreign economic policies shall be such as to encourage the highest possible degree of world trade and commerce, and thus create higher living standards everywhere.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the final declaration of principles adopted by the National Foreign Trade Convention held in New York City, November 12 to 14, 1945, as a declaration designed to carry out such policies.

I have an estimate from the Public Printer that the cost of printing the declaration will be $234.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FINAL DECLARATION OF THE THIRTY-SECOND NATIONAL FOREIGN TRADE CONVENTION, NEW YORK, NOVEMBER 12, 13, 14, 1945

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

The National Foreign Trade Convention declares itself as adhering to the following principles adopted by the National Foreign Trade Council relating to the conduct of American foreign trade:

I

The purpose of the foreign policy of the United States, in the whole broad field of our international relations, is to assure our security and well-being as a nation and to preserve the integrity of our institutions.

II

The purpose of our foreign economic policy, as a vital factor in these international relations, is to fortify and implement our foreign policy, and to encourage, in the process, the development of an optimum flow of foreign trade.

III

The purpose of our foreign trade itself is to bring benefit to the people of the United States through an increased production, interchange and consumption of useful goods and services.

IV

The well-being of the United States is bound up inextricably with the well-being of the world as a whole. This well-being—in fact the preservation of the very foundations of our civilization—demands an enduring structure of international peace and security. The basis upon which such structure can most surely be built is the achievement everywhere of the higher living standards to which all men aspire.

V

Increased production of useful goods and services is the first requisite to a high level of employment and consumption, upon which a higher living standard depends. The attainment of a higher living standard can come only from hard and unremitting toil by the people themselves who are seeking it.

VI

Living standards in different lands will vary widely with the ability to achieve such increased production through effective utilization of the resources and techniques available. To the extent that adequate resources and techniques are lacking, the people of any land will attain their maximum living standard only if they supplement their own productivity by drawing upon the productivity of others. This recourse to advantageous utilization of the productivity of other lands is the basis and justification for all international trade.

VII

The pursuit of foreign trade policies consistent with these economic realities is in the enlightened self-interest of the United States. An international trading system free of uneconomic restrictions, unhampered by the crippling limitations of bilateral trade or barter, and guaranteeing access on nondiscriminatory terms to raw materials and markets everywhere, provides the most effective means for enabling each nation to achieve an advantageous exchange of its own products for the products of others. Such a multilateral trading system is inherent in the concept of free, competitive enterprise.

VIII

Mutual benefit is the motivating force that underlies all trade. Recognition of this mutuality of benefit demands recognition also of the benefits conferred upon our own economy by both imports and exports. Imports, supplementing our own resources and productivity, enrich our economy with the fruits of the labors of others; exports provide an outlet for the surpluses of our farms and factories, and enable other countries to benefit from our productive efficiency, thus enriching their own economies. Both imports and exports create employment and profits; they are tangible evidence of the availability everywhere of the good bargains which the skills of men can produce.

IX

The only theoretical limit upon the importation of the products of other lands for the use and enjoyment of the American consumer is our ability to pay for these products with our own goods and services. As a practical consideration, however, it is necessary, in our import practice, to safeguard our national defense and to avoid too rapid a displacement of any of our own productive facilities which may be inefficient. The only theoretical limit upon the volume of exports to be sought is our ability to secure payment for them; but we must give ac-

[3] Sam Adams by John C. Miller—p. 189—Little Brown Co.

count, in the transference of these fruits of our productivity to other lands, to the conservation of our own resources and substance.

X

Our status as an international creditor since the First World War has demanded, as the basis for an advantageous exchange of our goods and services for the goods and services of others, an excess of imports over exports. This excess has not been attained, and in the years immediately ahead we cannot hope to attain it, in view of the widespread destruction of productive facilities abroad and the time required for their rehabilitation. Even though our usage of foreign services continues large, and our tourist expenditures increase greatly, this unbalanced condition will continue until, over the longer term, the trend is reversed through a vastly stimulated importation of both raw materials and fabricated products.

XI

America's participation in international trade, on a mutually beneficial basis, necessarily involves more than the exchange of exports for imports. If the productivity of other lands is to be rapidly expanded, thus increasing the benefits we derive from the exchange of our products for theirs, our participation will involve, inevitably, the projection aboard of American capital, techniques, and management.

XII

The projection of capital will have the immediate effect of inducing a further increase in our exports. While this will militate against an early reversal of our export balance, it progressively increases the need for a greater volume of imports to service the newly created obligations. Experience has demonstrated that dependence upon long-term loans and investments as a device to balance a chronic import deficiency is uneconomic, since all too frequently the capital invested is lost. The investment of American capital abroad can be justified only if it facilitates increased production of useful goods and services, and only if we in the United States are able and willing to accept a portion of this increased production for the servicing and repayment of the loans and investments made.

XIII

The motivating force behind all private loans and investments is the creditor's expectation that he will receive an adequate return in his own currency. Loans are made only if there appears to be a reasonable prospect for their immediate servicing and eventual repayment. Equity investments, involving the projection of capital abroad for continuing use and productivity, are also based on the investor's expectation of obtaining a reasonable return over the years.

XIV

These principles, under normal conditions, apply with equal force to Government loans and credits. Deviations from these principles in the period of world reconstruction ahead, whether in the form of loans or outright gifts so labeled, can benefit the United States only if they serve the purposes of national security, or if they constructively promote world order and stability by increasing productivity and opening up the channels of international trade.

XV

An expanding world economy demands, in addition to an abundant flow of goods and services among nations, a free and unrestricted flow of capital and earnings internationally. This can only occur with the elimination of currency blocs, exchange controls, multiple currency practices, barter, and the other artificial restrictions which make the international transfer of funds unduly difficult and costly.

XVI

The foreign economic policy of the United States, as the medium through which the Government exerts an influence on the conduct of American foreign trade, embraces the responsibility for safeguarding and protecting the interests of American enterprise abroad through every political and economic means at the Government's disposal. This responsibility lies in the area of assuring the safety and security of foreign investments against confiscation or discrimination in any form; it lies in the area of seeking the stimulation of American exports through efforts to secure the elimination of barriers against American goods; and it lies in the area of providing conditions which will make possible the receipt of an adequate volume of goods and services in return for our exports of goods and capital.

XVII

Our foreign trade, like our domestic trade, can best be carried on under a system of free, private, competitive enterprise within a framework of Government law and treaty designed to give it encouragement and support. The intervention of the American Government in the regulation of foreign trade—as, for example, in the imposition of tariffs, the conservation of natural resources, and the prevention of abuses arising from American participation in private international agreements—can have its only justification in the service of the national interest, as distinct from any sectional interest or the interest of any individual industry. The actual entry of the Government into foreign-trade activity, including the extension of the loans and credits and participation in international commodity agreements, is admissible only in time of war or other international emergency, or when considerations of national policy in the political or economic sphere outweigh the advantages of private trade and the freedom of the market place.

In seeking fulfillment of the wants and desires of the American people through a more abundant foreign commerce it is inevitable that we shall be confronted in many lands with national economic concepts different from our own. These differences will bring conflicts and difficulties which must be faced, and faced courageously, in the years that lie ahead. It is in the cherished tradition of the American people that we hold to the principles that have made our Nation great, and that as individuals and as a nation we be guided by these principles in solving the problems that lie before us.

There can be no substitute in the pursuit of the ends we have in view for the initiative and resourcefulness of the tens of thousands of individual enterprisers who go out in the world to find the materials and the markets the American people need.

DECLARATION OF POLICY

In fulfillment and implementation of the foregoing principles the National Foreign Trade Convention declares itself as adhering to the following policies, and urges the National Foreign Trade Council, as the authoritative voice of American foreign trade, to seek their general acceptance:

I

Promotion of foreign trade: The convention commends the Congress of the United States and the executive department for the wisdom and statesmanship manifested in the renewal and broadening of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. The convention recommends that the act be vigorously applied in all of its aspects as part of a completely integrated foreign trade and investment program designed to stimulate both imports and exports.

As one means for more effectively and expeditiously removing the barriers standing in the way of an expanded American foreign trade the convention recommends that negotiations under the act be conducted not only with individual nations but with several nations or groups of nations simultaneously.

The convention recommends full utilization by the United States of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations Organization as a medium for further expediting and promoting the development of international trade among all nations, and as contributing to this end the convention recommends that the National Foreign Trade Council designate a liaison representative at the seat of the United Nations Organization as the spokesman for the interests of the American foreign trader.

II

Impletation of unconditional most-favored-nation principle: The convention endorses, as the keystone of America's international economic relations, the unconditional most-favored-nation principle. To further the acceptance of this principle by foreign countries, the convention again recommends, in addition to reciprocal trade agreements, that the Department of State secure treaties of friendship and commerce so drawn as to give basic protection to American foreign traders and investors, including specifically the right to travel, sojourn, trade, and work within foreign countries. Treaties for the elimination of double taxation are also essential, as is adherence to the International Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, which insures the recognition and protection of patents, trademarks, and copyrights.

II

Loans and investments abroad: The convention urges that the foreign loans of the American Government and the foreign loans and investments of the American private investor be guided, alike, by consistent application of the principle of mutual benefit. The benefit we derive from these loans and investments depends upon the ability of the recipient countries to service and repay them. The benefit the recipients obtain depends upon the productivity of the new capital. It is important, therefore, that the volume of our new loans and investments abroad be related directly to the capacity of the recipient countries to put the additional capital to productive use.

To be fully productive, capital exported must be correlated with the most advanced methods of putting it to use, and no restrictions should be placed upon the entrance and employment of competent technical and administrative personnel. Furthermore, while the participation of local capital in such enterprises may in some instances be desirable, such participation should never be required by law.

The convention recognizes the manifest interest of the American people in aiding in the world's economic rehabilitation. America's resources, however, are not inexhaustible. Additional exports, induced by a heavy flow of capital abroad, and uncompensated by an adequate import volume, could jeopardize the capacity of our economy to support the unusual demands to which it will be subjected in the period of reconstruction ahead. It is essential, therefore, that the Government make public at the earliest possible moment a comprehensive statement of the policies and practices it intends to pursue in the use it makes abroad of the American taxpayer's money.

The convention calls attention to the fact that, in the extension of financial and material aid to foreign nations and in the negotiation of treaties and trade agreements and the settlement of lend-lease accounts, an unprecedented opportunity exists to secure elimination of unfair and discriminatory treatment of American interests abroad and to further the cause of freedom in international trade.

IV

Freedom of exchange: Freedom of exchange is a prerequisite to the attainment of an abundant flow of goods and services and the free and unrestricted movement of capital and earnings among nations. Of prime importance in working toward this objective is the elimination of currency blocs, exchange controls and all forms of exchange restrictions.

War conditions have required the adoption of measures in many countries which run directly counter to this objective. With the cessation of hostilities, however, the convention believes that every effort should be bent to secure fulfillment of the economic principles set forth in the Atlantic Charter and the master lend-lease agreements.

The convention endorses the statement issued by the National Foreign Trade Council on the restrictions of the sterling area affecting American foreign trade.

V

Government foreign trade service: The convention welcomes the emphasis placed by the Government on the development of an abundant flow of both imports and exports as a vital factor in promoting domestic prosperity. This emphasis is well reflected in the foreign economic policy the Government is pursuing, but the maximum benefit will be achieved only if the policy itself is intelligently administered and coordinated, and only then in proportion to the capacities and abilities of the men, in all departments of the foreign service, who are charged with its execution. The responsibilities involved are onerous and exacting, and it is essential that the right men be attracted to the jobs to be performed in sufficient numbers to provide the world-wide coverage our foreign-trade interests require. This calls for a standard of remuneration in line with that received by men of comparable capacity in private business. The convention recommends that this need be dealt with constructively.

The convention endorses the comprehensive program recently inaugurated by the Department of State, in coordination with the Department of Commerce and other Government departments, for the training of foreign trade representatives for service both at home and abroad. It commends in particular that feature of this program which calls for the periodic return of such personnel, and their temporary assignment to private industry and business. The convention recommends, as a further factor in the adequate promotion of American foreign trade, that our foreign-service representatives be accorded a status comparable with that of similar representatives of foreign countries; and it recommends specifically that senior representatives in the foreign economic field be given rank equal to that of diplomatic representatives at corresponding levels.

VI

Imports: The convention calls for a greatly increased importation of goods and services by the United States, in the interests of enrichment of the domestic economy and in order to validate to the maximum the transference of our own goods and capital abroad. This objective can, the convention believes, be achieved without detriment to the interests of any efficient producer of industrial or agricultural goods, and with a resultant net increase in the employment of American labor in the fields both of production and of distribution.

The convention recommends, as a step contributing constructively to the attainment of this objective, that the Department of Commerce amplify its program for the encouragement and stimulation of imports of foreign products. This program should embrace the development and provision of information relating particularly to those raw materials of which there is a present or prospective scarcity, and to competitive products, both raw and manufactured, which could be imported to the advantage of the American economy. The Department should also investigate all barriers, including restrictive customs administrative law and procedure, which penalize or render difficult the importation of foreign products; and where circumstances warrant, make recommendations for their removal or relaxation. The Department's program should be supplemented by the efforts of our commercial officers abroad who, in addition to seeking foreign outlets for American products, should bring to the notice of industrial and business interests in the United States any information they can develop relating to possibilities for profitable importation of foreign products.

VII

Buying agencies and missions: The convention recommends prompt action looking toward discontinuance of Treasury and other Government procurement for the account of foreign governments and the liquidation of the U. S. Commercial Company and similar purchasing agencies, with a view to returning the trade now carried on by these agencies to private channels. The convention also recommends that the purchasing activities of foreign missions and agencies in the United States which tend to obstruct the channels of American trade and distribution abroad be discontinued at the earliest possible date.

VIII

Removal of domestic controls over foreign trade: The convention recommends the removal of all Government controls over the movement of commodities entering into foreign trade at the earliest possible moment, with due regard to the temporary necessities imposed by the sharp unbalance, in the instance of certain critical commodities, between world supply and demand.

During the temporary period of short supply of goods in this country the convention recommends to American industrial management the provision for export of a fair portion of their output, in order to lay a solid foundation for a permanent foreign trade. In no event, however, should control over exports be exercised, under agreements or commitments for American financial or other aid to foreign countries, which would compel the exportation of any commodity or product in quantities sufficient to jeopardize the American economy.

The convention endorses the policy of removal of Government price controls on import and export commodities coincident with the removal of price controls domestically on the same commodities.

IX

Disposal of Government surplus stocks: The convention recommends that the disposal of surplus Government property located within or outside the United States be carried out with the least possible interference with American interests. As a means to this end, the convention again recommends that advisory committees be created, composed of executives engaged in foreign trade, and that the views of these committees be taken into consideration on questions of policy and procedure. In order to minimize the danger of disruption of foreign markets, the convention recommends that commercial distribution channels be used wherever possible in the disposal of surplus property.

X

Taxation: The convention welcomes the progress made in the negotiation of tax treaties for the elimination of international double taxation and other unfair or discriminatory foreign tax practices, and urges that these efforts be extended to include the elimination of taxes applied in many foreign countries on exchange remittances. The convention endorses the efforts being made to encourage, through domestic legislation, the establishment of American enterprises abroad, and it commends the tax committee of the National Foreign Trade Council for the work it has done in formulating proposals to improve provisions in the Internal Revenue Code concerning the recovery of property deemed lost or destroyed as a result of the war.

XI

International business agreements: The convention endorses the stand taken by the National Foreign Trade Council on international business agreements as reflected in its resolution adopted in January 1945 which calls for the filing of such agreements with an appropriate Government agency under conditions safeguarding their confidential nature and excluding small or routine transactions and agreements made within foreign countries relating solely to internal business under foreign law, and which calls for modification of the antitrust laws to enable American foreign traders to compete on equal terms with other foreign traders—all as elaborated in detail in the council's resolution.

The convention also recommends that the Government act to secure the adoption by international agreement of a universal code of fair practice governing international trade and investment relationships.

XII

Export Trade Act (Webb-Pomerene Act): The convention reaffirms its endorsement of the Webb-Pomerene Act as beneficial to the interests of American foreign trade, in the instance particularly of the hundreds of small businesses which lack the resources or capital to enter the foreign markets as independent entities. The purpose of this act, in seeking to assist and encourage voluntary cooperation among American exporters, should be recognized and revitalized with a view to enabling American trade to cope successfully with combinations of foreign competitors, both private and governmental. The convention recommends that the administration of the act be centralized in one Government agency to eliminate the existing confusion of interpretation, duplication of function, and division of responsibility.

XIII

War losses and reparations: The convention endorses the proposals of the foreign property-holders protective committee of the National Foreign Trade Council with respect to war losses sustained by the United States and its citizens, and reparations for such losses by enemy countries. In conformity with these proposals, the Convention recommends that appraisal be made of the costs and losses attributed to the war in such categories as are jointly agreed to by the United Nations.

Property rights and interests of which the nationals of any United Nation are the beneficial owners, including the assets of corporations the stock of which is owned by the nationals of any other United Nation, wherever such property rights and interests may be situated, should not be utilized for the purpose of reparations, but should be restored to their owners as promptly as possible.

Reparations in kind should be granted only when they will not lessen the responsibility or ability of the enemy country to make compensation for losses to other claimant nations.

Reparation claims already imposed upon any enemy country should be subject to review, and to modification where necessary, in order to insure equal treatment in accordance with the foregoing principles.

XIV

Telecommunication rates and services: Freedom of communications is an essential

factor in the promotion and safeguarding of American foreign trade interests. The convention recommends that American communication companies have the right, equally with the communication companies or administrations of any other country, to establish communications facilities with any country; and that rates and routings in the international field which discriminate against American users of international communications be eliminated.

XV

Merchant marine: Two wars within a generation have found us with a merchant marine inadequate to the needs of our national defense and of our commerce when the foreign ships upon which it so largely depended were withdrawn. The convention reaffirms the stand it has taken for the past 31 years for the development and maintenance of a privately owned and operated merchant marine capable of serving as an auxiliary to the armed forces, and of carrying a substantial part of our foreign trade.

The convention recommends, to the end of avoiding the military risks and excessive costs entailed by emergency construction when war threatens, that the national shipping policy, as defined in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 be carried out vigorously; that a suitable laid-up fleet should be maintained as a defense resource, and that in disposal of Government-owned tonnage to foreign nations, careful consideration be given to the desirability of retaining our fast superior ships for the future development of our own merchant marine and defense. As to the disposal of any other ships not required for commerce or defense, the Government should seek their outright sale and avoid a policy of charter. It is also urged that disposal to foreign purchasers be made, if practicable, on a basis requiring the scrapping of obsolete tonnage under all flags.

The convention renews its recommendation that American shipping companies should not be prohibited by law or administrative regulation from participation in, or ownership and operation of, overseas air lines, when found to be in the public interest.

XVI

Foreign-trade education: The convention recognizes the increasingly important place of education, not only in the promotion of international trade but also as a factor in international peace. The convention recommends that colleges and universities, including those already having foreign-trade courses, intensify their efforts to meet this new challenge.

The convention commends the work being done in the field of private education by such organizations as the Foreign Service Educational Foundation, and urges that the council continue to encourage all activities designed to foster a more intelligent appreciation of the importance of international trade to the world's well-being.

The convention also recommends continued support of vocational education of foreign students in private industry as sponsored by the International Training Administration. It is important in this regard, however, to distinguish between the education and training of young qualified students who will serve the interests of foreign trade upon their return to their native lands, and, on the other hand, the unwarranted disclosure to representatives of foreign interests of America's industrial techniques, the possession of which is a valuable American asset.

XVII

The Philippines: Because of the unique relationship existing between the United States and the Philippine Islands, the convention feels that exceptional measures are justified to bring about an early restoration of an abundant flow of trade between the two countries, and it therefore cautions against the application of further tariff or other restrictions which would prevent or retard Philippine economic rehabilitation.

The convention recommends that the protection afforded by the War Damage Insurance Act be extended to compensate for losses incurred in consequence of the war.

XVIII

China-America trade relations: The convention commends the Far East Committee of the council for its constructive work in relation to the important problems of trade with China and other countries of the Far East; particularly, as concerns China, in the matter of a commercial treaty, the registration of American firms, and the recodification of Chinese commercial law.

XIX

General: The convention reaffirms the stand it has taken in previous years with respect to the following subjects:

(a) Aviation.
(b) Commercial arbitration.
(c) Documentation.
(d) Foreign trade zones.
(e) Standardization.

Electoral College Is Going To Cause Us Much Trouble Sometime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 1946

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article, written by me, which appeared in the March issue of the magazine This Month:

LET'S ELECT THE PRESIDENT DIRECTLY

(By Representative ESTES KEFAUVER)

Every 4 years the American people mistakenly believe they are electing a President. Actually, they have little to say about it.

Instead of voting directly for our Chief Executive, we cast ballots for Charley McCarthys called "electors." In retaining this moth-eaten and undemocratic method, we are playing with fire. It will get us into trouble one of these days.

Under this system, a candidate with the largest popular vote can be kept out of the White House—as he was on three occasions. Jackson in 1824, Tilden in 1876, and Cleveland in 1888 had more votes cast for them by the people than their victorious opponents who won by greater electoral majorities.

The electoral system makes it possible for a man to become President despite the popular vote being almost 3-1 against him. He can lose 36 of the 48 States and still reach the White House. It is even possible for the electors to choose a President for whom no ballot was ever cast.

What is this defiance of democracy in the method of choosing one of the world's most powerful executives? Briefly, it is a way of selecting the United States President indirectly through a cumbersome, needlessly complex electoral college. It is a college without a faculty, curriculum, or campus. It is a political ghost that has made a wraithlike appearance approximately 40 times in the past 150 years. It meets, but never as a body, does a little clerical work, and then disappears. It is high time it disappeared altogether.

Most Americans know only vaguely how it functions, dimly remembering that it was once explained to them by a tired history teacher when they were in knee pants. Even worse, as adult voters, they fail to realize how flimsy and perilous this method really is.

Contrary to common belief, neither Roosevelt nor Dewey received any popular votes for President in November 1944. The only persons voted for them were 531 electors corresponding to the number of Senators and Representatives in Congress.

When the voter entered the voting booth he received a ballot sheet. That sheet listed the electors for the contesting parties, with the name of their party's Presidential candidate usually appearing at the top for purposes of identification. By tradition, and by tradition only, the electors appearing under the name of a given Presidential candidate are pledged to vote for that candidate.

Who are these electors? Appointed by their respective party conventions, they are sometimes distinguished citizens. More often they are loyal party workers or "fatcat" campaign distributors. They are rarely, if ever, known to the voters. Some States don't even list their names on the ballot. Nevertheless, a President is not legally elected until they have had their say.

After election, every 4 years, on the Monday after the second Wednesday in December, these electors meet separately and simultaneously in 48 State capitals and vote for President and Vice President. Their ballots are than sent to Washington. The party getting the greatest number of votes in a given State secures all the State's electoral votes.

On the second Monday in January the President of the Senate, in the presence of both Houses, opens and counts the electoral votes and then announces the names of the Nation's first and second citizens. That, in brief, is the electoral-college system.

To those who claim that the "college" is sanctified because it was handed down to us by the founding fathers, there is a very simple answer.

The electoral college today is a very different affair from what the founding fathers intended. During the Constitutional Convention, numerous proposals were made on how to choose the President. One proposal, that he be elected by Congress, was adopted but later rejected. Another, that he be elected by the governors of the States was turned down.

Finally, the electoral college was devised, possibly because the founding fathers mistrusted the popular will, fearing that the scattered masses could not become sufficiently informed about candidates.

Our eighteenth century elders envisaged the electors as experienced men of superior wisdom and intelligence who would convene and exercise their independent judgment in choosing those best fitted to be President and Vice President.

Almost immediately this idea backfired. One elector thought he would like to vote for whom he pleased. Those who made him an elector angrily exclaimed, "We chose you to act, not to think!"

Another dream of the founding fathers was soon blasted. One of their hopes in concocting the electoral college was that a President should be elected by independent individuals, rather than by political parties.

Ironically, this precaution to prevent political parties actually caused their formation. The independent action of two electors in 1796, scarcely before the ink on the Constitution was dry, resulted in two lists of "party" candidates for electors soon afterwards. Determined to capture the prized Presidency, burgeoning political parties "pledged" electors to their Presidential candidates in advance of their choice as electors. All the political parties had to do then was to put over the electors. This perversion of the original purpose of the electoral college is something for our constitutional diehards to ponder.

But even the founding fathers themselves soon realized the imperfection of the system they had devised. One of its provisions was that President and Vice President were to be chosen on the same ballot, the latter post going to the runner-up in the election. In 1800, Presidential candidates Thomas Jefferson and Aaron Burr each received a similar number of electoral votes. But Jefferson was a Republican and Burr a Federalist. The ensuing deadlock demonstrated the weakness of voting for President and Vice President on the same ballot and risking the election of a President from one party and a Vice President from another. Party and personal feelings ran high. Dictatorial methods were boldly proposed and revolution threatened.

Conservative Alexander Hamilton, also a Federalist—but an enemy of Burr—is credited with patriotically bringing about Jefferson's election in the House of Representatives on the thirty-sixth ballot, although he regarded the red-headed author of the Declaration of Independence as "an atheist in religion and a fanatic in politics." Burr never forgave Hamilton and later killed him in a duel.

The Jefferson-Burr conflict nearly wrecked the youthful Republic and resulted in the passage of the twelfth amendment in 1804. Its main feature was that the electors were to vote separately for President and Vice President. If no Presidential candidate received an electoral majority, the House was to choose from the three instead of the five highest—as the Constitution originally stipulated.

The second and last time an election was thrown in the House was in 1824. Andrew Jackson had 99 electoral votes, John Quincy Adams 84, William Crawford 41, and Henry Clay 37. No candidate had an electoral majority.

Henry Clay was then Speaker of the House and the day before the votes were counted, unproven charges of corruption were hurled at him. The tense situation invited intrigue with whisperings, bargainings, and trading of votes. When Clay supporters made a deal with Adams the latter was elected President on the first ballot. Clay himself was automatically eliminated because he was fourth in the electoral college. Had the previous provision of voting for the five instead of the three highest prevailed, Clay instead of Adams would have become President. Meanwhile, rugged Andy Jackson—the man with the greatest popular vote—was kept from the White House.

Another "minority" President was elected in 1876. Two candidates were running neck and neck. Democrat Tilden had a plurality but not a majority of the electoral votes. Republican Hayes claimed the electoral votes of four doubtful States.

A special commission was established which upheld the Republican's claims to the disputed votes. Result: Hayes was named President by a single electoral vote even though he trailed by 300,000 popular votes. The Democrats cried that the election was stolen and tried to patch up the electoral college law when they came into power a decade later. By that time, however, their concern with the electoral college had begun to fade and no important changes were accomplished.

During the 1944 election, about half the Democratic Roosevelt-hating electors in Texas and other Southern States threatened to cast their votes for the Republican candidate. It would have meant that a Democratic popular vote would have gone to the opposition candidate in the electoral college. Though these threats subsided, the possibility of their recurrence persists.

To allow the electoral college to continue is criminal neglect on our part. Fundamental democracy demands that the President and Vice President, like our Senators and Representatives, be chosen by popular vote.

Proposals to amend the Constitution to achieve this are perpetually if unsuccessfully advanced. Of course, it is not easy to accomplish. An amendment to the Constitution must be ratified by three-fourths of the States. The smaller States, feeling they would lose some influence under a popular election for President, would oppose it. So would the seven poll-tax States where considerably fewer votes are cast than in the free-vote States.

I have suggested a compromise method to eliminate the antiquated, unrealistic, and dangerous electoral college. Last year I proposed a constitutional amendment (H. Res. 121) allowing the people to vote directly for President and Vice President, but allocating to the States Presidential votes as a unit. Though this change should be acceptable, the resolution is gathering dust in the House Committee on the Election of Presidents. My colleagues have evinced scant interest in it.

With 2½ years before the next Presidential election, this is the time for Congress to consider the question and then submit this amendment to the States for ratification

America's noblest statesmen, including Jefferson, Jackson, Wilson, and George W. Norris, have eloquently urged the abolition of the electoral college. After each Presidential election, the college is usually assailed, but nothing is done about it. It was not until 1913 that Americans were allowed to vote directly for their Senators, and it took a seventeenth amendment to do it.

I realize it is not easy to do away with a device—however it mocks democracy—that has persisted a century and a half. But do we need a catastrophe to awaken us before we act to remedy this deformity in our system?

Scientific Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 6, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the magazine Science for January 18, 1946:

SCIENTIFIC TRAINING

(By Howard A. Meyerhoff, executive secretary, AAAS, Washington, D. C.)

In his recent radio address to the Nation, President Truman gave more attention to the things Congress is not doing than to the things which are getting done. Scientists may take their cue from the President and give thought to one vital question to which altogether too little consideration has been given; namely, the replacement of scientific and engineering personnel lost during the war years.

The question is critical. Many scientists were drafted—commonly late in the war period after the use for their skills was no longer urgent and deferments were canceled. Numerically, the most serious losses were caused by the drafting of 18-year-olds who would have entered the colleges and technological schools. Some of these men may undertake belated training when they are discharged from military service, but many will not. Meanwhile postwar projects lag for lack of men to handle the technological problems involved. Meanwhile, too, the Nation is fast losing to other far-sighted countries the technological preeminence which was a major factor in victory.

Congress cannot be criticized for not attending to this problem, much less solving it, for scientists themselves have done little about it. The American Chemical Society tried, with only a little help from other organizations, to obtain deferment for new recruits in essential scientific fields. One bill was introduced into Congress (H. R. 2827) to achieve this purpose, but it died in committee. Our scientific personnel, both actual and potential, was expendable, but unlike expendable military personnel, no one assumed any responsibility for replacing it.

Now, 5 months after hostilities have ceased, the situation is unchanged. Selective Service, though it may defer students who are partially trained in scientific and technological fields, encounters few 18-year-olds in that category. Universal military service, as proposed, will continue the same indiscriminating policy, if adopted. The shortage of scientists and engineers, though it may be partially offset by returning veterans, will be increased rather than corrected.

During the past few weeks representatives of the engineering societies, the physicists, chemists, and the association have met to consider corrective measures. The drain of trained or partly trained men has been checked but not stopped. It is now imperative to correct the deficit through immediate changes in Selective Service and through specific provisions in the universal military service bill, if the latter is adopted. It may be just as vital to insure replacements of scientific and technological students if universal military service is not adopted.

As a basis of immediate action 12 organizations phrased a resolution which contains a program adaptable to Selective Service and to universal military servie if passed. With some modification it can be effectively utilized if universal military service is rejected. Indeed, the unique importance of science and technology in war and peace has prompted the suggestion by one Senator with whom the program has been discussed that the resolution may be the only program which can effectively prepare us at once for the grim requirements of war and the expanding needs of peace.

Twelve organizations have endorsed the resolution: The American Association for the Advancement of Science, the American Ceramic Society, the American Chemical Society, the American Institute of Electrical Engineers, the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers, the American Society of Civil Engineers, the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, the Electrochemical Society, the Engineers Council for Professional Development, the Engineers Joint Council, the Engineers Society of Western Pennsylvania, the Institute of Radio Engineers.

They are sure others will recognize its importance and will want to take similar action. It is published herewith for the consideration of scientists and scientific societies that recognize the gravity of the current situation and foresee the still more serious problems of the future.

"Whereas national security and public welfare are dependent upon and vitally affected by the quality of scientific engineering and technological research, both fundamental and applied; and

"Whereas fundamental and applied research are entirely dependent upon ample reserves of trained and experienced manpower; and

"Whereas the ranks of scientists and engineers have been seriously depleted since 1941 by the requirements of military service; and

"Whereas the normal flow of students into the colleges and the engineering, technical, and graduate schools has almost completely ceased during the period from 1941 to 1945; and

"Whereas the alarming deficit in highly trained technical personnel will be further increased if selective service is continued without full recognition of the fact that technical personnel is as vital to national

security and welfare as military personnel: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the imperative and immediate need of replenishing scientific and engineering manpower be called to the attention of the President and the Congress; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress be asked to take prompt legislative steps to insure a flow of scientific and engineering personnel through the colleges and the engineering, technical, and graduate schools adequate to national security and the public welfare; be it further

"*Resolved*, That such legislation as may be required be based upon principles consonant with the democratic methods embodied in selective service and with the tested methods of the institutions of higher learning; that to this end the following provisions be incorporated in such legislation:

"1. Young men who have attained their eighteenth but not their twenty-sixth birthday shall be allocated to the colleges, universities, and technical schools after induction rather than through deferment;

"2. Such men should be chosen by recognized and established selective processes, as far in advance of induction as possible;

"3. The selection of these men should be administered by the appropriate Government agency, which shall determine from year to year the number of young men who may be admitted to the training program, so as to bring the total anticipated output of trained personnel at least to prewar standards;

"4. The young men so selected shall be assigned to accredited colleges and institutions of their own choice;

"5. Such colleges and institutions shall not be obligated to impose on these students any requirements other than those normally imposed upon civilian students; but no provision contained in this plan shall exclude said students from enrolling voluntarily in Reserve officer training programs maintained by the Army and Navy in the institutions in which they enroll;

"6. The duration of the training period shall be identical with that designated in the selective service training program; the academic calendar for training shall not exceed 9 months in any 1 year, the remaining 3 months being available to the Army or Navy for military training;

"7. Financial support for trainees during this period shall not exceed that awarded to trainees under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act (Public Law 346);

"8. Failure on the part of any trainee to meet the scholastic requirements of the institution to which he is assigned shall result in immediate transfer to regular military duty;

"9. Trainees admitted to this program shall be subject to the same obligations for subsequent public service as may later be incorporated in a plan of national scholarships and as applied to a training period of equal length; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the acute shortage of scientific and engineering personnel in the colleges, in Government agencies, and in industry be immediately alleviated by adoption of those provisions of the Vannevar Bush report (Science, the endless frontier) relating to the release of scientists and engineers now in the armed forces; and be it finally

"*Resolved*, That full cooperation of the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government be solicited, not only in the implementation of this emergency program which is designed to correct the deficit (now estimated at approximately 150,000) of scientific and technical students, but also in assuring a future supply of trained manpower, adequate in numbers and in skill to meet the involved problems of national progress, welfare, and security."

Profit Urge and Common Good Are Compatible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent having been granted me so to do, I am pleased to insert the following editorial appearing in the Los Angeles Daily News under date of January 31, 1946:

A BACKWARD LOOK AT 1946

Why all this tendency to isolate big industry and big unions from the community? Whose fault is it? Why should such a socially defeating trend prevail?

According to his prejudices, each reader will supply his own answers. But the fact remains that back of the undeclared civil war now raging in industrial circles lies a fundamental cleavage, a cleavage not merely between unions and management but between these two groups and the community.

In a system of free enterprise—in a complex, interrelated economy—in which every man jack of us has a stake in both the national income and the national product, why have we split off into warring factions?

Some future historian, looking back upon our industrial strife in 1946, will probably record that, emerging from a victorious war, we fought one another then because we had not yet mastered the mechanisms of social democracy.

"Chronic confusion prevailed in those days," this imaginary historian would no doubt recount, "because rival groups were more interested in intensifying enmity between one another than in working together for the common good.

"Before the end of World War II," he might write, "the American people had an opportunity to reconcile these rivalries. In 1944, and again in 1945, there was introduced in Congress a measure designed to aid business expansion and to promote full production and employment. It was known as the full employment bill.

"Additionally, on September 6, 1945, President Harry Truman recommended to Congress enactment of other measures which, together with the full employment bill, were designed to form an integrated, all-out attack on the major problems of reconversion. The minimum wage bill, the Wagner-Murray-Dingell health bill, the permanent fair employment practice committee bill, the Wagner-Ellender housing bill—all were blueprinted to help conquer unemployment and gear the Nation's economy to postwar progress.

"But Congressmen were afraid. They viewed each measure as radical or subversive. They did not understand that the economic complexities of 1946 could not be dealt with by piecemeal, unrelated measures. They were by long conditioning accustomed to dealing with emergencies only after emergencies arose. And so the bills were emasculated in their final form, and confusion and strikes were mighty and prevailed.

"Thus, because Government had no overall policy," his account would continue, "individual and group self-interest was unrestrained. Measures designed to encourage business were used by big management as weapons against its rivals, big unions.

"Measures designed to strengthen labor were used by some union leaders against their rivals, management, big and little. Measures, such as court injunctions, designed to protect life and property and insure the public safety, were used by law-enforcement authorities, acting at the behest of shortsighted business leaders, to intimidate those who protested and picketed.

"Finally, after a long cessation of production, the situation went from bad to worse. The conflict was shifted to the political realm, where it finally was resolved in the fall elections of 1946 when the voters swept into office a Congress which swiftly enacted an improved, strengthened version of the original reconversion measures. American democracy had reached another high tide.

"These measures gave the entire Nation confidence in its economic future. New business enterprise developed because these bills had underwritten new business opportunities. Labor settled down because they gave workingmen security against unemployment. Many former radical labor leaders disappeared from the national scene. Wages, generally, increased while prices came down because the volume of production was unprecedented, inasmuch as consumer power was stepped up and the incentive of workers to produce was stimulated.

"America became a land of abundance, with 60,000,000 jobs, diminishing hours of labor, an entire new recreational industry undreamed of in 1946, and a greatly increased standard of living. The poor got richer but the rich did not become poorer. They only became less powerful.

"Those who remembered 'the undeclared civil war of 1946' wondered, in retrospect, why people had not seen earlier that there was a way of reconciling the profit urge with the common good."—R. E. G. H.

Legislation Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 1946

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I submit herewith an editorial appearing in the Evening Star of Washington, D. C., in its issue of February 4, 1946, upon the pending Case bill having to do with strikes and labor legislation:

LEGISLATION NEEDED

The House is expected to enact new labor legislation this week, and the chances are that it will adopt the Case bill, possibly with some amendments.

For several days this bill has been the target of those extravagant critics who habitually oppose any attempt to impose any restraint on even the most vicious types of union activity. For the most part, their criticisms are not worthy of serious attention. There are other critics, however, and there is force to some of their objections.

One substantial criticism is that the bill has not received any committee consideration. Ordinarily, and especially if the House vote was to be the last word on the matter, this would be enough to justify rejection of the bill. But that is not the case. If the House should pass the bill it is certain to receive careful committee consideration in the Senate, assuming that it is not pigeonholed there, and this should provide ample opportunity to make desirable changes. Furthermore, there is no occasion for extended consideration of some of the abuses at which this bill is aimed.

For one thing, it would require both labor and management to live up to contracts to which they have subscribed. Only the most extreme partisans will contend that there is anything unfair about that. The bill is also designed to curb resort to force and violence in support of strikes. This provision is aimed at the so-called mass picket lines, a flagrantly lawless device through which strikers set up a blockade around a struck plant and forcibly deny entrance to others who have a legal right to enter. This is a practice that comes close to anarchy, and there is no rational ground on which it can be defended. Other provisions would deny supervisory employees the status of employees within the meaning of the Wagner Act, and would ban certain types of secondary strikes and boycotts.

On the affirmative side, the bill sets up a mediation board which would attempt to reconcile disputants, but which has no power of decision. It also forbids strikes for a maximum of 35 days, once the board has intervened in a dispute.

It may well be that these provisions can be improved, and there is also room for doubt as to the wisdom of some of the means provided for implementing various sections of the bill. But there will be ample opportunity to deal with these matters before the bill can possibly become law. If it is the desire of Congress to contribute anything toward bringing order and balance into this country's chaotic industrial picture, the important thing is to get some effective legislation—and that means legislation which probably will be opposed by spokesmen for both labor and industry—started through the mill. If the Case bill passes the House, that purpose, at least, will have been served.

The Privileges and Responsibilities of an American Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 6, 1946

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, recently I heard a young lady who was born in England and who lived there until 1936 make a perfectly marvelous speech upon the privileges and responsibilities of an American citizen.

She came to this country upon the death of her parents and has been living with her aunt and uncle, Mr. and Mrs. D. W. Dean, of Cordova, Tenn. I have read it over and over and feel that it should be placed in the RECORD for the benefit of the entire membership. This young lady is Miss Audrey Caughey and her speech is a challenge to all of us. It follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, my subject this morning is the Privileges and Responsibilities of an American Citizen.

I am not going to express my views alone, but also those of American citizens as I see them; due to the fact that I was born in England I am not yet an American citizen, but I shall be. Now, although not a citizen, I enjoy the privileges of an American, and I appreciate them. I shall present an unbiased view of America, as I see it, and as I think the Americans I know see it.

Let us get an inside view of a typical American household by journeying in our mind's eye to the house of John Doe—American citizen. As we draw near we see a cozy white house, set against a background of beautiful trees and pretty flowers; we see Mrs. Doe at the window watching her children at play. I wonder what she is thinking as she sees them there.

"Here, as I stand at my window, I am able to watch my children play. How lucky we are; every day we read of bombings, evacuations, and of death; yet, here we are—I with my children. I haven't had to send them to a place of safety because here they are safe. Here we don't need to fear every plane overhead as a bearer of death and destruction; the policeman on the corner is for our protection, not to harm, nor to kill us. We don't need to fear that our neighbor, Mr. Jones, is a secret-service agent plotting and working against us. How lucky the children are to be growing up in a land where their only work is their daily chores and not hard, conscripted labor. How lucky to be growing up to have a voice in their government and in a country governed according to a just Constitution. The Germans have no such constitution as ours, no, they have only a creed that 'might is right.' A creed that we see is offering them no protection today.

"I was thinking of myself, too; this home is mine; I am safe in it; it is safe. By law no one can search or can seize it; even the law cannot take it from me without due process. When I go to the market I buy according to our tastes and our budget; according to no dictator's decree.

"I, a woman, am free to vote; that is a duty of a citizen, but is it not also a great privilege?

"I am free to join any organizations of my choice, to travel about as I wish; all this without fear of punishment or of death.

"Yes, I was thanking God; thanking Him for my and my children's heritage; thanking Him that we are American."

As we turn from Mrs. Doe we see her husband sitting before the fire with his pipe and his evening paper.

"Mr. Doe, do you ever think of your privileges and your responsibilities; and what do you think of them?"

"Do I ever think of my privileges? Yes, indeed! Everytime I read my paper I go over them again and again. I was just rereading an old story, that of the French suppression. I couldn't help thinking that it's great to be alive here in this free country. It's great to be able to pick up my evening paper and to know that I'm not reading just lies and propaganda. It's wonderful to be able to admit my religion, the religion of my choice. I am in the insurance business; it means a great deal to me that I work under sanitary conditions, with fair pay, reasonable hours, and a chance for advancement. It's wonderful to have a voice in my government. Just think—I, plain John Doe, help to choose and to change my country's officials.

"After dinner I am going to a meeting—we sent off a petition the other day—our local school is growing and the youngsters need more room; we asked for more material but we sent off that petition without fear.

"There is the telephone—that is something else; here in America we don't need to fear that our phone is being tapped or that our mail is opened before we get it. And taxes—taxes are current news lately. Yes; I have heard a bit of complaining but to me all taxes are a type of rent that our landlord, Uncle Sam, cannot carry on without. Extra taxes are keeping our boys just as safe as possible overseas and those boys are mighty close to our hearts. Yes; it makes me pretty humble to realize all that Uncle Sam is doing for me and for everyone like me."

John Doe has a son overseas. I wonder what he thinks about being an American, and the privileges and responsibilities that being an American entails.

"I'm glad you asked me that because when I'm over here in the thick of it I haven't much time to think about anything except shooting straight—and shooting first. But sometimes, like tonight, lying awake in my fox hole, I have time; I have plenty of time to dope it all out. It is my duty to serve my country when she needs me, but it was more than just duty that called me. I'm over here because I want to protect the kind of decency, the kind of freedom that I grew up in and that I want my children to grow up in.

"President Roosevelt said, 'We are fighting today for progress, for security, and for peace. Not only for ourselves but for all men; not only for this generation but for all generations.' He spoke the common mind.

"I had a good education. I was going to college before I entered the Army. I traveled extensively over our great country, and I saw health and I saw happiness on every hand. I want my children to have the kind of education I had. I want them to be assured of good medical care, food, clothing, and shelter. America is the living guarantee of these securities; as long as America lives then they live, but if she dies, then they die. That is why I am, that is why all of us are over here.

"Every fellow over here remembers—he remembers his girl, the corner drug store, the athletic contests at school. He remembers mom and her apple pies; dad and his pipe in front of the fire; the puppy; the kids next door. Over there America is the past, the present, and the future. None of us wants anything more than to get back home to what he left and, please God, he shall."

In conclusion, I should like to quote, from the DAR Manual, an excerpt by Merrill Gates: "Not for us the reg flag of a false and anarchistic internationalism but the red, white, and blue; for which our fathers, brothers, and sons have died; under which, please God, we will live; but for which, if need be, we will die; faithful to the brotherhood of the whole human race by being first of all faithful to our own home, our own family, our own community, and to the land we love."

An Idaho Soldier Questions the Government's Peacetime Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 4, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the distribution of the Nation's armed forces is so far flung and the Government's activities are so vast and varied in the global war we have just fought that there are presented so many opportunities for manipulation and fraud that much of these irregularities and manipulations are beyond the knowledge and reach of the legislative branch of the Government.

While a congressional committee may be investigating profiteering and fraud in one part of the world, the Congress and the committee are unable to know what is being done at other places possibly on the other side of the earth.

The Army is severe with the delinquencies of enlisted men, but we rarely hear of the higher-ups that prove untrue to their trust being brought to book.

It may be that the prodigality of those in charge of our Government policies in the wasteful distribution of the Nation's

assets in all parts of the world has undermined the moral fiber and patriotism of many of our citizens tempted by these wasteful conditions to obtain business advantages by defrauding the Government and the corruption of those entrusted with administering the Government's business and in control of Government installation and supplies. A report of one of our soldiers on existing conditions is submitted herewith:

WITH THE ARMED FORCES,
January 15, 1946.

DEAR SIR: Being just a GI, I doubt whether you will even bother to read this letter, but I'm writing it in hopes that you will.

You are also probably well aware of the subject of this letter: Demobilization.

My first question is: Why the slow-up? I know nothing about the requirements in Europe, but it appears as though that situation is well in hand. I am concerned mostly with conditions in the Pacific. MacArthur stated some time ago that he required only a few thousand men to occupy Japan. Taking this excellent commander at his word, in the belief that he is more aware of the situation over here than anyone in the War Department, or under its command, why is it necessary to occupy these coral reefs all over the Pacific where the populace consists almost entirely of savages? Why do we need the large military force in Honolulu? After all, this island is making a large bid for statehood, and it doesn't appear to me that it requires occupation.

I can't understand why we are kept in the dark about proposed measures along the lines of demobilization. Certainly it shouldn't be a secret, for this being a democratic nation, and not having any aspirations of military conquest, the public is entitled to know what is being done to insure the country's future. I fail to see why they must occupy Allied countries or our island possessions until they present a veritable fortress. The United Nations Organization is supposed to preserve the peace; why not give it a chance and forget the blackjack for a while? Certainly we don't need such an immense army in the Pacific. Our only aggressor is entirely out of the fight, her factories have been dismantled to prevent further manufacture of arms and ammunition, and her people have been bombed, shelled, and beaten into submission, and their main interest is to grow enough food to feed themselves. Surely all of the fight is gone out of that country.

Perhaps your answer to this is to reopen our trade routes; if this is so, then why were our two Liberty ships taken to England, loaded with English troops, and hauled to Indonesia to fight the Dutch? American ships, English soldiers, Dutch colonies, whose trade routes are we protecting? Perhaps we were protecting our trade routes when America took an active part in the Chinese revolution, when plying American boats to her shores loaded with American materials of war, and Chinese troops for the Chinese reoccupation of Manchuria, is it possible that we were protecting Chinese trade routes?

Why don't we stay out of China? Is it necessary that several hundred thousand servicemen stay there to look after American nationals' interests in private industries? The only possible outcome can be for Russia to side the Communists there, and America to continue to side the Nationalists, which would involve us in another war.

Perhaps you wonder where I get all of my information. I hope to say only this: During my service with the Army, I have been fortunate enough to tour the world, and talk to the many peoples that populate it, and it is from their opinions that I have drawn my conclusions.

We have been receiving clippings here from home that were cut out of leading east coast newspapers branding the chairman of the Oahu Serviceman's Committee for Speedier Demobilization as a Communist. We ourselves have been called Communists, Bolshevists, and what have you, merely because we want to get home. Our meetings have been reported to be riotous, and on the stage of mutiny, all of which could not be farther from the truth.

We have every desire to secure the peace for our country, and if we feared that our going home would jeopardize this cause for which so many red-blooded Americans paid the supreme sacrifice we would not be nearly so insistent in our demands.

We are not Bolshevists or Communists, for we have no desire to change our government at all, nor was any such move even mentioned in our meetings. (These meetings have been abolished by our theater commander.)

Our meetings were not riotous or mutinous in character whatsoever, but merely forums to discuss in an intelligent and orderly manner what had been done, and what we could do about it, and along what lines we might lawfully act.

This name calling is to me one of the oldest forms of politics, and one may find it anywhere the defender is backed up to a wall and can't give an intelligent answer. If this person can brand the aggressor with a label, an undesirable name of some sort, the pressure will release and that is just what has happened. Thus, merely because we want to get home, we are branded as a Communist. The War Department, knowing that we have every right in the world to demand an answer, and knowing they can't come out with the answer in back of all this, which is nothing more than blackmailing our families into submitting to a compulsory military training program, sit back and say we are necessary to the occupation policies. I'm not occupying anything, and haven't done anything of value since I came in this Army, nearly 3 years ago. So in order to keep their rank (the generals), they must have a command. If they lose their command they lose their job. In order to keep their command they must have replacements for us. They discharged the bulk of our replacements as surplus back in the States. Thus it appears that if we are to have replacements we must continue the draft. All of this leads to compulsory military training which will insure them of their command for many years to come.

A number of the fellows here have received letters back from their Congressmen in reply to ones they wrote, stating that they are in complete agreement with what they said. If everyone is in such complete agreement then why can't something be done about it?

Having presented my case, I would now like to propose what might be done about it. First of all, why not have a complete investigation; I mean, further, than the heads of the War Department and the immediate chiefs. Why not find out exactly how many men are needed by ascertaining what they are doing? Just how essential is the work they are doing? Just for whose benefit is the work being done?

Our organization, working for the Plant Engineering Agency, a large radio construction concern, is doing nothing now. True, we have some projects that a certain percent of the men are working on. This consists mainly of building radio ranges, radio point-to-point stations, radio direction finders, air-to-ground stations, large transmitter and receiver sites, and radioteletype and weather stations. All of this was contributing somewhat to the war effort during wartime, for it was strictly for use by the Air Transport Command, which played a very essential part in evacuating troops, parachute troops carrying, and the hauling of critical supplies to an area in great need of them. Now, however, the ATC is closing down. They are running less planes, and the ones they have aren't being flown nearly as much. Five months ago, each plane had an average of eight flying hours per day, as compared to 3½ hours today. Yet, our organization is still being built up. We are building more radio stations, laying more control cables, and all of the other aforementioned projects. With the ATC closing down, why do we continue to build? Obviously it is for a commercial concern. The Army Communications Service is a world-wide organization, and it seems to be the present idea to see just how much we can build up for such systems as Pan American Airways, United Air Lines, and other large commercial concerns. No doubt this will be sold at a loss, for the Government always gets the short end of any deal. The labor is much cheaper than these commercial lines could procure, for every man is a specialist in his line, whether it be radioteletype, radio, cable splicer, telephone man, or what have you. It seems that somewhere, someone is taking advantage of this organization for a private purpose. What should be done about it?

Thanking you for allowing me to air my opinions, I remain,

A SOLDIER.

Bias and Hostility of the British Members of Palestine Anglo-American Committee

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, when the announcement was made of the formation of the Anglo-American Committee on Inquiry on Palestine, the American people were startled and Jews in particular were dismayed. The strongest possible Zionist planks has been put into the major parties' platforms. The Labor Party in England had gone even farther than the Zionists had asked for, namely, that the Arabs be removed to make room for the Jews. Morrison, Bevin, and Attlee supported that platform.

Four hundred members of the American Congress had indicated strong espousal of the Zionist cause. Thirty-two governors expressed in no uncertain language the desirability of the establishment of a Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine to be preceded by unlimited Jewish immigration. Both Governor Dewey and the late President Roosevelt campaigned on this plank and espoused specifically the Zionist cause. Surely, these proclamations and campaign pledges and pronouncements by these candidates must have been the result of mature reflection and discussion. The conclusions were not arrived at arbitrarily.

It seemed, therefore, startling that a committee should be formed, again to go into all these facts that had been rehashed and reaffirmed time and again. The American people had formed definite opinions, all favorable to the Jewish aims and aspirations in Palestine.

When the announcement was made of the appointment of American and English members of the committee, surprise and dismay were converted into suspicion and great doubt as to the objectivity and fair-mindedness of the

personnel of the committee. Those doubts have now been confirmed.

The committee has held hearings in Washington and in London and the six American and six British members are now on their way to the continent to determine what is already known to all, namely, that the displaced Jew wants to make Palestine his permanent home. Yet this committee will waste valuable time in developing facts that will lead to this inevitable conclusion. Thereafter, this group is to fly to Cairo and waste another week's time in digesting and reviewing the testimony taken. The month of March will find them in Palestine taking more testimony. Then, they will visit Damascus, Bagdad, and Beirut. Finally, they will retire to Lucerne in Switzerland to draft their report and make recommendations to the United States Government and the Government of Great Britain.

Thus far, nothing new has been developed by the committee. Not one solitary new fact has been added. The story has been told and retold by both the protagonists and antagonists of Zionism. The whole business is sorely disappointing and, in my humble estimation, will yield no fruitful results. The hearings will drag on, the recommendations of the committee will be made. Meanwhile precious time is lost.

The urgency of saving the remnant of European Jewry presses in on all sides, yet the committee continues to take testimony and to review facts which are already known.

It is quite evident that a sense of responsibility is quite absent from the committee. Furthermore, politics has already played a very insidious part. It is well known that the announcement of the committee was held up 2 weeks to suit the Democratic Party so that such announcement would not jeopardize its victory in the municipal elections in New York City.

It is already forgotten by the members of the committee that Palestine was originally set up by the Balfour Declaration as a national homeland for the Jews and that the Arabs in 1917 were under the domination of the Ottoman Empire, when no Arab could call his soul his own. The Allies at that time gave the Arab his liberty from the Turks and the tiny spot of Palestine no larger than the State of Vermont and about the size of Wales was set aside with the agreement of 52 nations, including our own, to be an eventual Jewish commonwealth. All the leading statesmen of that period and of all periods since have acquiesced to such an arrangement—Clemenceau, Lloyd George, Woodrow Wilson, Orlando, Smuts, Balfour, Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, Roosevelt. All this seems to be forgotten by the members of the committee. Under the mighty promise of the Balfour Declaration, millions of money have been brought into Palestine. The desert has been made to blossom like a rose. Britain, instead of fulfilling the terms of the mandate, looked upon Palestine as something to be owned and possessed by herself in entirety. She has stopped Jewish immigration except for a trickle of 1,500 per month. Land purchases have been prohibited. She has flagrantly violated our treaty made with her in 1924 wherein she specifically agreed that there should be no restrictions on land purchases and immigration on the ground of race or religion. The Jew is now denied entrance into his own home.

First, England sets up the plea of absorptive capacity and when a Lowdermilk, famous soil conservationist, clearly indicates that with proper cultivation of the soil and the harnessing of the waters of the Jordan, hydroelectricity could be developed so as to admit 4,000,000 additional persons, then Britain dusts off the old dodge of Arab peril. Britain organizes the Arab League primarily to offset the influence of the Zionists. The Arabs in that league, you will note, can agree on nothing except the English-inspired hatred of the Jews. Someone has said that if there had been no Zionism, the English would have had to invent it to get the Arabs to agree on anything.

There have already been many inquiries. The Mandates Commission, the Peel Commission, the partition commission, the Eisenhower and the Harrison reports. Everything that had to be made known is already known.

This new committee is another British dodge and stall. Unfortunately, the United States fell for it.

On top of all this disappointment is added the knowledge that the decision of the British members of the committee has already been made. The British members, undoubtedly, view the whole situation with a jaundiced eye. They have been hand picked by the Labor Government. The hope of a nonprejudiced report has gradually faded.

The British members in particular have conducted themselves in the inquiries as if they were policemen reviewing a police line-up. They have evidenced arrogance, superciliousness, and downright impoliteness. The British chairman, Sir John E. Singleton, has gone out of his way to be most deferential and sycophantic to the British titled witnesses who appeared before the committee. Even some of the American members conduct the inquiry as if it were in a criminal court and demand "yes" and "no" answers to questions that could not be answered in that summary fashion. The interrogations by the Britons at times showed their annoyance, pettiness, and impatience. The British members took the position that the "King could do no wrong." The attitude of the British members is evident from the question put to one of the witnesses, "Why do you not realize that if an official actually did what you describe he would be removed by the British Government at once?"

As to the British chairman, Sir John E. Singleton, his interrogation of witnesses did not even indicate a pretense of impartiality. He did everything in his power to discredit at all costs the testimony presented in opposition to the interests of his client—the British Government. Sir John was determined to uphold by every means at his disposal the past record and future policy of the British Government. His biased interest was evident in all his questions. As to the Zionist cause, we can expect no justice from him. Although he is a judge of the King's Bench, his role on the committee has dwindled down to that of prosecutor.

The second British member is Maj. Reginald E. Manningham-Buller. He is a barrister and a member of the right-wing Conservative Party, which party has always been anti-Zionist. How in thunder the British could have appointed such a one to weigh judiciously the Zionist cause is beyond understanding. He, too, is bent upon asking questions that will uphold the British reputation "come hell or high water." His position on the committee is all the more dangerous because his manner shows an attempt to be impartial. His true attitude was indicated in the course of private conversations which he had had in Washington during his stay here.

In one of these conversations he attacked the American Government and people as being hypocritical in their alleged interest in the Jewish problem, asking why, if the Americans were so interested in the homelessness of the Jews of Europe, they did not admit them into the United States in greater numbers. As if the American people and Government had asked that large numbers of Jews be admitted into Great Britain. Mr. Manningham-Buller seemed completely to ignore the fact that, while no international law prescribes the immigration policies to be pursued by Great Britain, the United States, and other countries, Palestine was specifically set aside under international law as a place where Jews might come "as of right."

He continued his attack and asked what right the United States had to tell the British how to go about their business in Palestine. He ignored the fact that Palestine is not a British colony, but that Palestine was only entrusted to England and that the mandate demanded certain obligations of Great Britain, among them the right of unlimited immigration of the Jews to the end that there be established eventually a Jewish homeland. He also ignored the fact that it was the British Government that had invited the United States to join the joint committee to review the Palestine problem. He finally indicated his prejudgment of the entire matter by saying he could not see how any solution could be reached but that he was not worried. The Jews were already starting to arm in Palestine and might soon arrive at the stage where they would kill each other off.

The aforesaid should give you an idea of how biased this British member is. He was selected by Mr. Bevin to conduct an unbiased inquiry.

The third member is Mr. Richard S. Crossman, Laborite member of Parliament. He was elected on a pro-Zionist plank in the platform, although he has already forgotten this. He seems exceedingly conscious of the fact that he represented a government whose record and policies in Palestine were on trial. This attitude colored his entire performance and will undoubtedly be the strongest motivation when it becomes necessary for him to formulate conclusions.

Another member is Lord Morrison, old-time Labor hack, once parliamentary secretary of Ramsay MacDonald. He has been recently made a Labor lord. He was rather stiff and correct in his

manner throughout the open meetings of the committee.

Two other members on the British side are Sir Frederick Leggett and Mr. Wilfred P. Crick, both with former British civil-service connections. Both Lord Morrison and Sir Frederick Leggett are both known to have close associations with Mr. Bevin, Foreign Minister, the same Mr. Bevin who attempted to prejudge the findings of the committee and to tell what the British Government would like the future status of Palestine to be on the same day on which it was announced that the committee was to conduct its inquiry. Sir Frederick Leggett and Mr. Crick belong by background and past associations to that very group of the British civil service which, for decades, has been behind every attempt to persuade the British Government to liquidate the policy of the Jewish national home.

None of the British members of the committee has indicated any sympathy with Jews as such, with Jewish people or with the Jewish people's aims and aspirations in Palestine.

The entire British personnel of the committee was chosen by Mr. Bevin, the man who said that if the Jews persist in getting at the head of the queue, they would be inciting anti-Semitism. His attempt to talk himself out of his position was very much like the more recent attempt of the British Gen. Sir Frederick Morgan, who, after having stated that the rosy-cheeked Jews of Poland in whose persecution he did not believe are engaged in an organized plot which may result in a third world war, has also tried to explain that he was misinterpreted and misunderstood. It is not too difficult to guess that the members of the committee on the English side will hew to Mr. Bevin's line.

To my mind, this committee of inquiry has dwindled down to a travesty. It would have made sense for Great Britain to ask the United States to appoint a committee to inquire into the rights and wrongs of British policy in Palestine. If the British did not like Americans to do that, they might have asked the French or the Chinese or the Dutch or the Swedes to conduct such an inquiry. Or they might have asked, very appropriately, the United Nations to appoint such a committee of inquiry. But what can one expect of a committee, a half of whose membership represents the party to be questioned and who will inevitably regard themselves as advocates for their party rather than as impartial judges and observers.

United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 1946

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a resolution passed by the council of the American Library Association in regard to the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization:

Whereas the council of the American Library Association, representing the 15,000 members of the association, having listened with interest to reports about the meeting in London in November resulting in the organization of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, hereby

Resolves, That the Council of the American Library Association meeting in Chicago on December 29, here records its gratification for the organization of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, expresses its hope for fullest support and use of the organization by the government and citizens of the United States, and its conviction of the lasting promise given by this step for better living for the whole world; be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be brought to the attention of the Congressional committee to which legislation will be referred, urging it to approve appropriate legislation.

Shortage of Civilian Clothing for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE B. BATES

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 1946

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter of the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES,
January 18, 1946.

A plan to alleviate the critical shortage of civilian clothing for veterans was presented today to War Mobilization and Reconversion Director John W. Snyder by Commander in Chief Joseph M. Stack of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The plan was prepared after a survey of available surplus materials and manufacturing facilities. It calls for the distribution, through regular retail channels, of 3,000,000 men's suits and 1,000,000 pairs of extra trousers labeled "Exclusively for Veterans."

The VFW survey led to the conclusion that if Director Snyder gives the green light, moderately priced civilian suits will be available to veterans within 6 weeks.

Following is Commander Stack's letter to Director Snyder:

"The critical shortage in men's clothing, particularly suits and extra trousers, poses one of the most difficult problems confronting demobilized service personnel. It is time that something more definite than explanations, apologies, and assurances for future betterment is offered those persons who were called upon to exchange civilian attire for military and naval uniforms during the war.

"The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, composed of more than a million and a quarter men who have served on foreign soil or in hostile waters, after considerable study and conference on the clothing shortage, is convinced there is something definite which our Government, in cooperation with clothing manufacturers, can do to provide prompt relief to demobilized servicemen urgently in need of civilian clothing. We submit the following proposal for your immediate consideration:

"1. Direct and authorize the Smaller War Plants Corporation or its successor to exercise its top priority and lending facilities in the purchase of sufficient Government surplus woolen cloth, cotton and rayon trim, and linings to process not less than 3,000,000 men's suits and 1,000,000 pair of extra trousers.

"2. Enlist the cooperation of Government agencies owning woolen, cotton, and rayon textiles to make available, if not already declared surplus, sufficient yardage to meet the requirements of Smaller War Plants Corporation.

"3. Smaller War Plants Corporation to allocate and sell the surplus cloth, trim and linings to any manufacturer equipped and capable of making men's suits and who will agree to substantially the following conditions:

"(a) Use all of said material for suits and trousers for the exclusive purchase by veterans.

"(b) Process the cloth, trim, and linings into low-cost men's clothing (Schedule K, CPA) to resell at the manufacturers' cut-off price program PR-28 and the retail price designated by OPA (men's suits $33 to $35).

"(c) All garments to be plainly tagged or labeled 'exclusively for veterans.'

"(d) Nation-wide distribution through normal men's clothing retail outlets.

"(e) Manufacturers to obtain agreement from retailers that garments will be sold exclusively to veterans upon presentation of discharge papers and recording of name and serial number of veteran purchaser.

"From available information it seems assured that if this program is approved and authorized, the clothing can be placed in the retail stores and available to veterans within 6 weeks after the yard material has reached the manufacturers. This promise is supported by the following evidence:

"1. Surplus cloth, trim, and linings are available.

"2. Smaller War Plants Corporation has indicated its willingness and ability to carry out its part of the program.

"3. Manufacturers are ready and anxious to put their plants and workmen into production and those who have been surveyed on this type of program are enthusiastic over its success.

"4. Retail stores are mostly barren of men's wear and can be depended upon to cooperate.

"5. Veterans need the clothing.

"It is understood that Smaller War Plants Corporation is to be dissolved and that fact has been taken into consideration. However, the functions and some of the personnel will be taken over by another agency and the program initiated by SWPC could be carried over to its successor.

"Your prompt and favorable consideration of this program is earnestly requested and it is hoped you will immediately order it into effect. Surplus cloth is now being sold without restriction and is being utilized for other than men's clothing or in a price range beyond the ability of the average veteran to pay.

"Respectfully yours,
"JOSEPH M. STACK,
"Commander in Chief."

United States Diplomats Poorly Paid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 1946

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

personnel of the committee. Those doubts have now been confirmed.

The committee has held hearings in Washington and in London and the six American and six British members are now on their way to the continent to determine what is already known to all, namely, that the displaced Jew wants to make Palestine his permanent home. Yet this committee will waste valuable time in developing facts that will lead to this inevitable conclusion. Thereafter, this group is to fly to Cairo and waste another week's time in digesting and reviewing the testimony taken. The month of March will find them in Palestine taking more testimony. Then, they will visit Damascus, Bagdad, and Beirut. Finally, they will retire to Lucerne in Switzerland to draft their report and make recommendations to the United States Government and the Government of Great Britain.

Thus far, nothing new has been developed by the committee. Not one solitary new fact has been added. The story has been told and retold by both the protagonists and antagonists of Zionism. The whole business is sorely disappointing and, in my humble estimation, will yield no fruitful results. The hearings will drag on, the recommendations of the committee will be made. Meanwhile precious time is lost.

The urgency of saving the remnant of European Jewry presses in on all sides, yet the committee continues to take testimony and to review facts which are already known.

It is quite evident that a sense of responsibility is quite absent from the committee. Furthermore, politics has already played a very insidious part. It is well known that the announcement of the committee was held up 2 weeks to suit the Democratic Party so that such announcement would not jeopardize its victory in the municipal elections in New York City.

It is already forgotten by the members of the committee that Palestine was originally set up by the Balfour Declaration as a national homeland for the Jews and that the Arabs in 1917 were under the domination of the Ottoman Empire, when no Arab could call his soul his own. The Allies at that time gave the Arab his liberty from the Turks and the tiny spot of Palestine no larger than the State of Vermont and about the size of Wales was set aside with the agreement of 52 nations, including our own, to be an eventual Jewish commonwealth. All the leading statesmen of that period and of all periods since have acquiesced to such an arrangement—Clemenceau, Lloyd George, Woodrow Wilson, Orlando, Smuts, Balfour, Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, Roosevelt. All this seems to be forgotten by the members of the committee. Under the mighty promise of the Balfour Declaration, millions of money have been brought into Palestine. The desert has been made to blossom like a rose. Britain, instead of fulfilling the terms of the mandate, looked upon Palestine as something to be owned and possessed by herself in entirety. She has stopped Jewish immigration except for a trickle of 1,500 per month. Land purchases have been prohibited. She has flagrantly violated our treaty made with her in 1924 wherein she specifically agreed that there should be no restrictions on land purchases and immigration on the ground of race or religion. The Jew is now denied entrance into his own home.

First, England sets up the plea of absorptive capacity and when a Lowdermilk, famous soil conservationist, clearly indicates that with proper cultivation of the soil and the harnessing of the waters of the Jordan, hydroelectricity could be developed so as to admit 4,000,000 additional persons, then Britain dusts off the old dodge of Arab peril. Britain organizes the Arab League primarily to offset the influence of the Zionists. The Arabs in that league, you will note, can agree on nothing except the English-inspired hatred of the Jews. Someone has said that if there had been no Zionism, the English would have had to invent it to get the Arabs to agree on anything.

There have already been many inquiries. The Mandates Commission, the Peel Commission, the partition commission, the Eisenhower and the Harrison reports. Everything that had to be made known is already known.

This new committee is another British dodge and stall. Unfortunately, the United States fell for it.

On top of all this disappointment is added the knowledge that the decision of the British members of the committee has already been made. The British members, undoubtedly, view the whole situation with a jaundiced eye. They have been hand picked by the Labor Government. The hope of a nonprejudiced report has gradually faded.

The British members in particular have conducted themselves in the inquiries as if they were policemen reviewing a police line-up. They have evidenced arrogance, superciliousness, and downright impoliteness. The British chairman, Sir John E. Singleton, has gone out of his way to be most deferential and sycophantic to the British titled witnesses who appeared before the committee. Even some of the American members conduct the inquiry as if it were in a criminal court and demand "yes" and "no" answers to questions that could not be answered in that summary fashion. The interrogations by the Britons at times showed their annoyance, pettiness, and impatience. The British members took the position that the "King could do no wrong." The attitude of the British members is evident from the question put to one of the witnesses, "Why do you not realize that if an official actually did what you describe he would be removed by the British Government at once?"

As to the British chairman, Sir John E. Singleton, his interrogation of witnesses did not even indicate a pretense of impartiality. He did everything in his power to discredit at all costs the testimony presented in opposition to the interests of his client—the British Government. Sir John was determined to uphold by every means at his disposal the past record and future policy of the British Government. His biased interest was evident in all his questions. As to the Zionist cause, we can expect no justice from him. Although he is a judge of the King's Bench, his role on the committee has dwindled down to that of prosecutor.

The second British member is Maj. Reginald E. Manningham-Buller. He is a barrister and a member of the right-wing Conservative Party, which party has always been anti-Zionist. How in thunder the British could have appointed such a one to weigh judiciously the Zionist cause is beyond understanding. He, too, is bent upon asking questions that will uphold the British reputation "come hell or high water." His position on the committee is all the more dangerous because his manner shows an attempt to be impartial. His true attitude was indicated in the course of private conversations which he had had in Washington during his stay here.

In one of these conversations he attacked the American Government and people as being hypocritical in their alleged interest in the Jewish problem, asking why, if the Americans were so interested in the homelessness of the Jews of Europe, they did not admit them into the United States in greater numbers. As if the American people and Government had asked that large numbers of Jews be admitted into Great Britain. Mr. Manningham-Buller seemed completely to ignore the fact that, while no international law prescribes the immigration policies to be pursued by Great Britain, the United States, and other countries, Palestine was specifically set aside under international law as a place where Jews might come "as of right."

He continued his attack and asked what right the United States had to tell the British how to go about their business in Palestine. He ignored the fact that Palestine is not a British colony, but that Palestine was only entrusted to England and that the mandate demanded certain obligations of Great Britain, among them the right of unlimited immigration of the Jews to the end that there be established eventually a Jewish homeland. He also ignored the fact that it was the British Government that had invited the United States to join the joint committee to review the Palestine problem. He finally indicated his prejudgment of the entire matter by saying he could not see how any solution could be reached but that he was not worried. The Jews were already starting to arm in Palestine and might soon arrive at the stage where they would kill each other off.

The aforesaid should give you an idea of how biased this British member is. He was selected by Mr. Bevin to conduct an unbiased inquiry.

The third member is Mr. Richard S. Crossman, Laborite member of Parliament. He was elected on a pro-Zionist plank in the platform, although he has already forgotten this. He seems exceedingly conscious of the fact that he represented a government whose record and policies in Palestine were on trial. This attitude colored his entire performance and will undoubtedly be the strongest motivation when it becomes necessary for him to formulate conclusions.

Another member is Lord Morrison, old-time Labor hack, once parliamentary secretary of Ramsay MacDonald. He has been recently made a Labor lord. He was rather stiff and correct in his

manner throughout the open meetings of the committee.

Two other members on the British side are Sir Frederick Leggett and Mr. Wilfred P. Crick, both with former British civil-service connections. Both Lord Morrison and Sir Frederick Leggett are both known to have close associations with Mr. Bevin, Foreign Minister, the same Mr. Bevin who attempted to prejudge the findings of the committee and to tell what the British Government would like the future status of Palestine to be on the same day on which it was announced that the committee was to conduct its inquiry. Sir Frederick Leggett and Mr. Crick belong by background and past associations to that very group of the British civil service which, for decades, has been behind every attempt to persuade the British Government to liquidate the policy of the Jewish national home.

None of the British members of the committee has indicated any sympathy with Jews as such, with Jewish people or with the Jewish people's aims and aspirations in Palestine.

The entire British personnel of the committee was chosen by Mr. Bevin, the man who said that if the Jews persist in getting at the head of the queue, they would be inciting anti-Semitism. His attempt to talk himself out of his position was very much like the more recent attempt of the British Gen. Sir Frederick Morgan, who, after having stated that the rosy-cheeked Jews of Poland in whose persecution he did not believe are engaged in an organized plot which may result in a third world war, has also tried to explain that he was misinterpreted and misunderstood. It is not too difficult to guess that the members of the committee on the English side will hew to Mr. Bevin's line.

To my mind, this committee of inquiry has dwindled down to a travesty. It would have made sense for Great Britain to ask the United States to appoint a committee to inquire into the rights and wrongs of British policy in Palestine. If the British did not like Americans to do that, they might have asked the French or the Chinese or the Dutch or the Swedes to conduct such an inquiry. Or they might have asked, very appropriately, the United Nations to appoint such a committee of inquiry. But what can one expect of a committee, a half of whose membership represents the party to be questioned and who will inevitably regard themselves as advocates for their party rather than as impartial judges and observers.

United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 1946

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a resolution passed by the council of the American Library Association in regard to the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization:

Whereas the council of the American Library Association, representing the 15,000 members of the association, having listened with interest to reports about the meeting in London in November resulting in the organization of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, hereby

Resolves, That the Council of the American Library Association meeting in Chicago on December 29, here records its gratification for the organization of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, expresses its hope for fullest support and use of the organization by the government and citizens of the United States, and its conviction of the lasting promise given by this step for better living for the whole world; be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be brought to the attention of the Congressional committee to which legislation will be referred, urging it to approve appropriate legislation.

Shortage of Civilian Clothing for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE B. BATES

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 1946

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter of the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES,
January 18, 1946.

A plan to alleviate the critical shortage of civilian clothing for veterans was presented today to War Mobilization and Reconversion Director John W. Snyder by Commander in Chief Joseph M. Stack of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The plan was prepared after a survey of available surplus materials and manufacturing facilities. It calls for the distribution, through regular retail channels, of 3,000,000 men's suits and 1,000,000 pairs of extra trousers labeled "Exclusively for Veterans."

The VFW survey led to the conclusion that if Director Snyder gives the green light, moderately priced civilian suits will be available to veterans within 6 weeks.

Following is Commander Stack's letter to Director Snyder:

"The critical shortage in men's clothing, particularly suits and extra trousers, poses one of the most difficult problems confronting demobilized service personnel. It is time that something more definite than explanations, apologies, and assurances for future betterment is offered those persons who were called upon to exchange civilian attire for military and naval uniforms during the war.

"The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, composed of more than a million and a quarter men who have served on foreign soil or in hostile waters, after considerable study and conference on the clothing shortage, is convinced there is something definite which our Government, in cooperation with clothing manufacturers, can do to provide prompt relief to demobilized servicemen urgently in need of civilian clothing. We submit the following proposal for your immediate consideration:

"1. Direct and authorize the Smaller War Plants Corporation or its successor to exercise its top priority and lending facilities in the purchase of sufficient Government surplus woolen cloth, cotton and rayon trim, and linings to process not less than 3,000,000 men's suits and 1,000,000 pair of extra trousers.

"2. Enlist the cooperation of Government agencies owning woolen, cotton, and rayon textiles to make available, if not already declared surplus, sufficient yardage to meet the requirements of Smaller War Plants Corporation.

"3. Smaller War Plants Corporation to allocate and sell the surplus cloth, trim and linings to any manufacturer equipped and capable of making men's suits and who will agree to substantially the following conditions:

"(a) Use all of said material for suits and trousers for the exclusive purchase by veterans.

"(b) Process the cloth, trim, and linings into low-cost men's clothing (Schedule K, CPA) to resell at the manufacturers' cut-off price program PR-28 and the retail price designated by OPA (men's suits $33 to $35).

"(c) All garments to be plainly tagged or labeled 'exclusively for veterans.'

"(d) Nation-wide distribution through normal men's clothing retail outlets.

"(e) Manufacturers to obtain agreement from retailers that garments will be sold exclusively to veterans upon presentation of discharge papers and recording of name and serial number of veteran purchaser.

"From available information it seems assured that if this program is approved and authorized, the clothing can be placed in the retail stores and available to veterans within 6 weeks after the yard material has reached the manufacturers. This promise is supported by the following evidence:

"1. Surplus cloth, trim, and linings are available.

"2. Smaller War Plants Corporation has indicated its willingness and ability to carry out its part of the program.

"3. Manufacturers are ready and anxious to put their plants and workmen into production and those who have been surveyed on this type of program are enthusiastic over its success.

"4. Retail stores are mostly barren of men's wear and can be depended upon to cooperate.

"5. Veterans need the clothing.

"It is understood that Smaller War Plants Corporation is to be dissolved and that fact has been taken into consideration. However, the functions and some of the personnel will be taken over by another agency and the program initiated by SWPC could be carried over to its successor.

"Your prompt and favorable consideration of this program is earnestly requested and it is hoped you will immediately order it into effect. Surplus cloth is now being sold without restriction and is being utilized for other than men's clothing or in a price range beyond the ability of the average veteran to pay.

"Respectfully yours,
"JOSEPH M. STACK,
"Commander in Chief."

United States Diplomats Poorly Paid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 1946

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include therein an article from the Manchester Union, Manchester, N. H., of February 5, 1946, entitled "United States Diplomats Poorly Paid," by Wallace R. Deuel:

UNITED STATES DIPLOMATS POORLY PAID—COUNTRY GETS SECOND-CLASS SERVICE BECAUSE OF LOW SALARIES

(By Wallace R. Deuel)

WASHINGTON.—The American people are paying their diplomats too little and too late.

Some of their compensation recently has fallen as much as 6 months in arrears.

As a result of these and other factors, the United States too often is represented abroad by two kinds of men:

"SORRY" REPRESENTATION

Those with private incomes who can afford to work for second-class salaries.

Second-class men who are willing to work for such salaries because they couldn't earn more doing anything else.

But a private income is no guaranty that the man who has it is a fit representative of his country—and a diplomatic service overloaded with rich men is a sorry sort of representation for the American people.

America can no longer afford a second-class diplomatic service, if it ever could.

It's a wonder that able men with no private incomes go into the State Department and the foreign service at all. Yet a large number of such men do. However, they can't do their best work under present salary schedules.

American diplomats abroad are so underpaid that they don't get around much. Therefore they don't learn as much as they should and they don't exercise the influence they should.

PAY OUT LITTLE

As a result, the American people's interests are not adequately looked after in the rest of the world.

This penny-wise and pound-foolish treatment goes for the whole diplomatic service.

The first job of the State Department and the foreign service is to try to prevent America from becoming involved in war. Yet the United States spends on the Department and the service in a year less than it costs to fight a modern war for 8 hours.

The Department and service are costing $77,900,000 a year. Even the last war was costing this country $245,000,000 a day at the end.

From ambassadors and ministers to the clerks and telegraph operators who handle their reports, the personnel of American diplomacy are paid less than they could earn in private employment, less than other governments pay for similar performance and less than they need to do their work properly.

Salaries for ambassadors and ministers were fixed in 1856 and have not been raised since.

BRITISH PAY MORE

The American Ambassador in London is paid $17,500, subject to income tax, and allowances of $12,000, which are tax free.

The British Ambassador in Washington is paid $70,000, all tax free.

The American Ambassador in London is allowed $5,000 a year for entertainment. The British Ambassador in Washington spent $35,000 on entertainment in 1944.

The American Ambassador in Buenos Aires also is allowed $5,000 a year for entertainment. The British Ambassador there gets $13,000 a year for that purpose.

Lower ranking servants of the State Department suffer correspondingly from undercompensation.

Thus a civil servant who supervises 50 employees in an important division in the department, and who is accountable for the paying out of $13,000,000 of public money annually, earns only $3,310 a year.

And State Department and foreign-service personnel are not even paid on time.

Base pay and fixed allowances are up to date. But these are only part of the compensation of diplomatic personnel. The other parts recently have fallen far in arrears.

Reimbursement of personnel for money spent on official travel and overtime payments have fallen 3 to 4 months behind.

Monthly accounts for 1943 of foreign-service officers have not yet been audited and approved.

War bonds that department employees in Washington paid for in August were only delivered last month.

Bonds paid for by diplomats overseas as long ago as July 1, 1945, have not yet been delivered.

If it is true that money makes the mare go, it is no wonder the State Department sometimes acts like the old gray mare.

REA: A Monument to Roosevelt's Faith in the Common Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 1946

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the Capital Times, of Madison, Wis., for Thursday, January 31, 1946:

REA: A MONUMENT TO ROOSEVELT'S FAITH IN THE COMMON MAN

It is fitting that the Wisconsin rural electrification co-ops opened their State convention on the day that the city and the Nation were observing the birthday of the man who made REA possible—Franklin D. Roosevelt.

REA is one of the really great monuments to his memory. It epitomizes the new philosophy which was brought into the Government by the New Deal—a philosophy which held that the purpose of government was to give opportunity and assistance to all the people, rather than to make it easy for a few on the top to reap rich profits from the toil and sacrifice of the many.

In his talk yesterday William Sanderson put it this way: "The employment of the cooperative idea was a far cry from the philosophy of pouring Government funds into the top of partially or completely defunct corporations in the hope that some of it would trickle down and ultimately reach the little fellow."

Indeed, it was a "far cry." Unlike the Hoover administration, which sought to cure the depression by insuring the profits of big business, the New Deal recognized that the welfare of the Nation lay in the welfare of its great mass of workers and farmers. And as was the case with the REA, it recognized that this principle worked best if the people were given the chance to help themselves.

They were given Government help in forming their own electric cooperatives. Farmers joined together under the program to do the job of bringing electricity to their farms and homes, so long neglected by the profit-hungry utilities. They built and managed their own generating plants, their own transmission lines and despite the fact they had to fight the utility crowd every inch of the way, they made a success of it.

They are getting the blessings of electricity without paying tribute to an absentee overlord. They are far ahead in paying back their loans to the Government Today, in this State they are expanding and growing to a degree that has driven the power bund to new heights of hysterical denunciation.

With confidence and hope born of their own accomplishments, Wisconsin farmers are gathered here in their annual REA convention to plan for the future. Their spirit and determination is a tribute to the faith of the New Deal in the common man—a tribute which F. D. R. would truly have appreciated.

Feed Situation Is Intolerable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DUDLEY G. ROE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 1946

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Preston News, Preston, Md., in reference to the present intolerable feed situation, which has chiefly been caused by the meddling regulatory orders of the OPA. The editorial follows:

FEED SITUATION IS INTOLERABLE

There is no excuse for the shortage of poultry and cattle feed which is seriously affecting the economy of the Eastern Shore.

While proteins are still the major bottleneck, we are now coming to learn that the shortage of wheat is really serious. Surplus wheat has been shipped to foreign countries and there just isn't enough to properly take care of our meat-producing population.

Most of our proteins are produced in the South and West from cottonseed and soybeans. Soybean dealers in the Midwest have suddenly become feed manufacturers because they could not get what they considered a fair price for soya beans and by-products. Some of the corn last year was soft and could be ground into feed to better advantage than it could otherwise be sold. The feed these "new" manufacturers are making is far from a quality product. It is not balanced even though the formula would indicate that it is. The East is getting very little of this feed, as poor as it is. But poor feed is better than no feed.

A leading feed dealer on the Eastern Shore has informed the News & Farmer that in most cases prices are no longer being quoted on the materials used in mixing feed. Suppliers are operating almost entirely on a barter or exchange basis. For example, a dealer in the West might be short of bran, but have a little extra soya. He then announces that he will exchange one car of soya for three cars of bran. Actually, local feed mills can hardly offer anything for exchange, and since many can't buy materials, they are having a pretty tough time supplying local needs.

There is one point that should be brought out plainly, and that is that there is a real shortage of feed ingredients and, consequently, feed. Our animal and poultry population exceeds by far our supply of feed, and this is primarily responsible for the barter and other methods of getting supplies. This, of course, means that the East suffers more than the areas where the supplies are produced; because the mills in the West, Midwest, and Southwest are getting the available supplies by barter and making feed that is consumed in these areas, thus cutting short our supplies in the East where we have nothing to barter. In other words, the primary trouble is the shortage of feed ingredients.

There appears to be a "colored gentleman in the kindling." Perhaps if the price on raw materials were increased some of this material might come out of hiding. But, most certainly an increase in formula materials would mean increased feed to producers, and in this land of freedom and plenty, in this country at peace, there should be no scarcity of anything. Let's get the essentials for making feed on the market.

Regular Veterans' Association Active in Behalf of Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 1946

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, a delegation of officials representing the Regular Veterans' Association called at my office the other day and discussed with me their program.

They also told me of some of their objectives for the coming session of Congress. Because I feel that their efforts are of interest, not only to my colleagues in Congress, but to the general public and servicemen as well, I am incorporating a summary of their resolutions in my remarks.

The committee that called on me was headed by W. M. Floyd, national commander of the Regular Veterans' Association of Dutch Harbor, Alaska; Ellis Bubb, zone councilman, of Maryland; James B. Quinn, zone councilman, of New York; Henry C. Funk, judge advocate, of Maryland; Thomas Howard, zone councilman, of Indiana; Jesse Baxter, national adjutant, of Minnesota; and Ed Langdon, national deputy chief of staff, of Pennsylvania.

It has been my pleasure to become acquainted with these gentlemen because of my honorary membership in the Regular Veterans' Association. I visited a number of the posts of the organization in New England, New York, and Maryland, and I know of the fine job that they are doing in behalf of both the peacetime and the wartime veterans.

The resolutions which they presented to me, and which I am glad to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a public service and for public information, are as follows:

Resolution 1: To provide adjusted service pay for those persons who served in the armed forces of the United States during the present war and for other purposes.

Resolution 2: Recommend that Congress provide for compulsory retirement of all commissioned personnel of the armed forces of the United States at the age of 58 years with the maximum of 34 years of active service.

Resolution 3: Recommend that Congress provide that commissioned personnel requirements of the regular armed forces of the United States be supplied from the following categories of commissioned officers:

1. Commissioned graduates of the Military, Naval, and Coast Guard Academies.

2. Former enlisted men of the Regular Establishments who have received commissions during peace or war service.

3. Reserve and temporary officers commissioned during the emergency of World War II.

Resolution 4: Recommend to Congress that all allowances of enlisted men for quarters and rations be increased.

Resolution 5: Recommend to Congress that the quota of appointments from regular establishments for the Army, Navy, and Coast Guard Academies be increased.

Resolution 6: Recommend that Congress provide that the China Service Ribbon be awarded to the members of the United States Army who served in this war zone in 1937 and 1938.

Resolution 7: Recommend to Congress that where a veteran during a peacetime enlistment contracts pulmonary tuberculosis in the service and in line of duty, and where service connection and pension is granted by reason of such and where the tuberculosis has become or does become an arrested case, then such veteran shall be entitled to a pension of not less than $60 per month.

Resolution 8: Recommend that Congress provide longevity pay for career disabled veterans, which would provide that all enlisted men of the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard service who are receiving pensions for their disabilities shall have their pensions increased 5 percent for each 5 years of service, up to and including their twenty-fifth year.

Resolution 9: Recommend that Congress provide that all limitation dates before which to make application for various types of benefits for veterans and their dependents be removed.

Resolution 9: Recommend that Congress amend title II of the act entitled "An act to provide for the creation, organization, administration, and maintenance of a Naval Reserve and a Marine Corps Reserve," approved June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1175), in order to provide more effectively for the national defense by increasing and equalizing retirement and retainer benefits for enlisted men of the Regular Navy, and thereby encouraging a higher type of young men to make the Regular Navy a career, and for other purposes.

Resolution 11: To extend time within which to make an appeal from decisions of rating agencies of the Veterans' Administration.

Resolution 12: To authorize the Veterans' Administration to grant burial allowances to any and all members of the armed forces who have served honorably during peacetime or in any campaign.

Resolution 13: To provide that so-called misconduct shall be bar to the receipt of compensation of pension to disabled veterans only where the disability was due to felonious or willful misconduct.

Resolution 14: To provide that the Veterans' Administration shall not, in the absence of fraud or clear or unmistakable error, reduce any permanent disability rating.

Resolution 15: To provide full payment of compensation or pension to single veterans while hospitalized.

Resolution 16: To provide that compensation, pension, or retirement pay shall not be reduced during the first 120 days of hospitalization or domiciliary care.

Resolution 17: To provide that pensions for service-connected or non-service-connected disabilities shall be increased by 10 percent upon reaching the age of 40 years and 10 percent for each 10 years thereafter. Where the degree of disability changes after age 40, the disabled veteran shall receive the amount payable for changed disability plus the increase for attained age, but not in excess of the amount payable for total disability.

Resolution 18: To provide for additional amounts for dependents to be payable to veterans receiving compensation or pension.

Resolution 19: To provide compensation or pension for the widows and children and dependent parents of deceased veterans who were permanently and totally disabled from service-connected cause, on the basis that death was due to such disability.

Resolution 20: To provide eligibility for pension, if otherwise entitled thereto, to the widows of any deceased veteran, if married to and living with the veteran for 2 years immediately preceding his death or if she gave birth to a child by the veteran.

Resolution 21: To amend Public 257, Seventy-sixth Congress, August 4, 1939, so as to provide pensions to peacetime veterans of the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard suffering from arrested tuberculosis contracted while in the service.

Resolution 22: To extend the period of the Philippine Insurrection so as to include active service with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, between July 5, 1902, and December 31, 1913. (Now H. R. 3251.)

Resolution 23: To provide that applicants for enlistments and enrollees disabled prior to rejection for active service to be entitled to hospitalization, pension, and compensation same as if they had actually been mustered into service.

Resolution 24: To provide pensions or compensation to veterans for disability or death incurred during peacetime service equivalent to 100 percent of the compensation payable to veterans and dependents of veterans of the armed forces for service-connected disabilities.

Resolution 25: To provide adequate pensions for dependents of deceased retired Regular officers and enlisted men.

Resolution 26: Recommends that the Federal Government has responsibility for assistance to all honorably discharged members of the Army or Navy and that in absence of employment opportunities or where there is shown inability to work part or full time, pension entitlement shall be granted such former members of the armed forces.

Resolution 27: To increase pensions to widows and dependents of deceased regulars who have died of service-connected disabilities.

Resolution 28: To amend act entitled "An act granting pensions and increases of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and nurses of the War With Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition, and for other purposes," approved May 24, 1938.

Resolution 29: Supports H. R. 1866, Seventy-eighth Congress, to provide monetary benefits for certain enlisted men of the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard discharged for service-connected disabilities.

Resolution 30: Advocates legislation which would remove discrimination against peacetime veterans in civil-service preference (Public 359, 78th Cong.), by including nondisabled, honorably discharged regulars on a parity with war veterans.

Resolution 31: Recommend a rating of permanent and total for all disabled regular veterans who are found unfit for employment.

Resolution 32: Provide for elimination of regulations which prevent members of United States Soldiers' Home and United States Naval Home from receiving their full pensions while residing in these homes.

Resolution 33: To provide prosthetic and orthopedic appliances needed for any veteran.

Resolution 34: To provide that any member of the armed forces who is honorably separated from service shall be granted hospitalization and domiciliary care by the Veterans' Administration subject to the same restrictions and limitations as are now applicable to war veterans.

Resolution 35: Recommends to extend the Soldiers and Sailors Civil Rights Act of 1940 for the period of 3 years after discharge or after the end of the war.

Resolution 36: To remove the statute of limitations as to claims for emergency officers' retirement benefits.

Resolution 37: To liberalize Public Law 743, Seventy-sixth Congress, act of July 15, 1940, pertaining to emergency officers' retirement benefits.

Resolution 38: Recommends amendment to Public, 140, Seventy-seventh Congress, providing enlisted men not retired or discharged with a total disability as of June 30, 1941, be eligible to the provisions of the act and same be made retroactive for a period of 10 years. To be placed under the act with their consent.

Resolution 39: Amend Public, 140, Seventy-seventh Congress, June 30, 1941, to provide all enlisted personnel surveyed, discharged, or retired under the provisions of prior acts, as well as subsequent to June 30, 1941, be extended the benefits of the act in the same manner and to the degree as men in the Army, whether their service was rendered in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or United States Coast Guard, or any combination of service in any of these branches, if they become incapacitated for further active service in line of duty, and not as a result of misconduct.

Resolution 40: To provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital in southeastern Alaska.

Resolution No. 41: To provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital in central Alaska.

Resolution 42: To provide hospital care for veterans of the armed forces and their families.

Resolution 43: Urges deportation of undesirable aliens.

Resolution 44: To authorize the Secretaries of War and Navy to furnish headstones or markers for graves of all honorably discharged members of the armed forces.

Resolution 45: Provide for preference to all honorably discharged veterans of the Regular Establishment under law and all rules and regulations promulgated by the United States Civil Service Commission, and a law that will require this Commission to publish all eligible lists and to make appointments from the list, in order of merit, with no eligible passed over without legal and adequate reason therefor.

Resolution 46: Preference to all veterans (discharged under honorable conditions) in employment, public and private, on parity with World War II veterans.

Resolution 47: Recommends Congress to provide for compulsory retirement for all Federal employees under civil-service laws after completion of 30 years' service.

Resolution 48: Recommends that Congress provide for a Board of 21 enlisted Regulars with a voice in the management of the United States Soldiers' Home for enlisted men of the Army who have a financial interest in and support the Home and preference for employment at this Home to veterans of the Regular Army.

Resolution 49: Provide uniform charges throughout the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard for the hospitalization of dependents of all officers and enlisted men.

Resolution 50: Provide for equalization of charges to all veterans residing in United States Soldiers' Home and United States Naval Home.

Resolution 51: Provide that all former members of the armed forces be granted same monetary allowances when service is honorable.

Resolution 52: To allow extra credit double time on retirement to all enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard for foreign service; to allow extra credit double time on retirement to all warrant officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard for foreign service.

Resolution 53: To provide for full military rank for members of the Army Nurse Corps, dietitians, physical therapy aides, and for other purposes.

Resolution 54: To provide for full military rank for members of the Navy Nurse Corps, dietitians, and physical therapy aides, and for other purposes.

Resolution 55: To provide for abolition of special temporary enlistment contracts in the United States Coast Guard.

Resolution 56: Urges enactment of legislation providing for retirement of enlisted members of the Regular Army upon completion of 25 years of active service therein.

Resolution 57: To provide for retirement as chief warrant officers upon retirement for disability after 20 years of service or after 30 years of service of those enlisted personnel who served in the armed forces of the United States during World War II and who held commissions during that war and later reverted to their enlisted status.

Resolution 58: To provide that members of the armed forces during World War II shall be advanced, upon retirement, in rank on the retired list to the highest commission, warrant or enlisted grade held during World War II.

Resolution 59: Provide that the same income-tax exemptions be granted retired members as are granted active duty servicemen.

Resolution 60: Recommend that Congress provide for the postwar period through:

1. Maintenance of the Navy at the end of the war in its strength at that time.
2. Maintenance of the largest air force in the world.
3. A permanent standing army of sufficient size to protect the United States.
4. Universal military training before the age of 21.

Resolution 61: To amend section 9 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (Public Law 607) by providing for the computation of double-time credits awarded between 1898 and 1912 in determining retired pay.

Resolution 62: Provide extension of social-security law to every citizen.

Resolution 63: Provide that a national veterans' shrine be built in the District of Columbia in memorium to all veterans of the armed forces of the United States and that all veterans' organizations which are recognized by the Congress of the United States and the Veterans' Bureau shall have office space without cost, the building to be maintained by the Veterans' Administration.

Resolution 64: To incorporate the Regular Veterans' Association as provided in H. R. 1128, Seventy-ninth Congress.

Resolution 65: To provide that the veterans' organizations who are recognized by the Veterans' Administration be given preference in the purchase of building materials, clothing, and food offered for sale under any Government contracts during or after hostilities.

Resolution 66: That when any enlisted person has completed 30 years as a member of the National Guard, including any service in the Army, Navy or Marine Corps and has performed all the service required by law or regulation during such time, except such part as he has been excused by competent authority from performing, he shall, upon application to the President, be placed upon the retired rolls of the Army at 50 percent of the pay provided for active service for the highest rank held during such period.

Resolution 67: Recommend to Congress military training with provisions as follows:

(a) That men from 18 to 21 be required to take military training for 4 months each year for a period of 3 years, then to be placed in the Reserve Corps and organized into units as recommended by the Army and Navy Departments.

(b) That enabling legislation be enacted by Congress which will assure a minimum of exemptions from military training, the basis of exemptions being an incurable disease or crippled persons.

(c) That these men take with them to their homes their individual field equipment and that small arms and ammunition be stored in convenient areas so that in emergency mobilization and arming could take place in the shortest possible time. Thus we would have in every town and section of the country men armed and ready to repel invaders from the air.

(d) That all men who complete the three periods of training be given frequent refresher courses that will keep them physically fit and in touch with military developments until they attain the age of 36; after that they should be placed in civil-defense units and given such refresher courses as needed to take up the duties of civil defense in all parts of the country, including armed resistance to invading paratroops.

(e) That men thus trained be not mustered out of the service until they have reached the age of 60 years.

(f) That plans for industrial mobilization be made which will enable this country to convert to wartime production in the shortest possible time. In past wars this has taken months. In the next war plans must be in effect which will produce equipment and supplies immediately.

Tribute to Mr. Bowles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GALLAGHER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 1946

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following tribute to Hon. Chester Bowles from the Valley City (N. Dak.) Times Record of January 31, 1946:

TRIBUTE TO MR. BOWLES

Right now this Nation is going through the economic jitters of reconversion. We know why we fought this war but now we are starting to wonder how we are going to get what we fought for.

If we, as a nation, are going to get anything near what we thought we were, that will take knowledge and planning and courage, and, of course, cooperation between all groups.

As a nation, we have the material, we have the men, we have the know-how. Right in our public life we have men with courage to go up against the buzz saw of politics.

Chester Bowles has that kind of courage. He has put his head into the lion's mouth again. So, by all the standards of pressure-group politics, Mr. Bowles should be a dead duck. He has baited the National Association of Manufacturers in its own lair. He has flouted the carefully organized automobile dealers; he has stood toe to toe and slugged it out with real-estate boards, steel and auto industries, department stores, and textile mills.

Now, Chester Bowles takes on the congressional cotton bloc. Yet what might seem a kiss of death to an ordinary politician, is a breath of life to Mr. Bowles. He is emerging as one of this administration's foremost leaders.

The Chicago Sun explains that in the price battle, often a lonely one, Mr. Bowles serves two causes. First, of course, is the cause of preventing wild inflations and the depression that would surely follow. By the way, even some of the farm-bloc inflations are pulling in their horns and asking to have wartime controls restored. The effect of these controls, now that they are off, is being vividly

illustrated. If Leon Henderson and Chester Bowles could have had the consumer support in the war, which Bowles is getting now, the whole story could have been different.

But the child has to be burned before he fears the fire. So we had to take off price controls on a lot of items to prove the point which so many conservatives denied during the war. The point is that price controls do check inflation, do keep the cost of living somewhere within reason. Mr. Bowles knows and has the courage to act on that knowledge. He knows that this country can shift into a peacetime economy of high employment without first going through the wringer of inflation and then deflation as we did after every other war. This boom-and-bust cycle is not necessary, but Bowles needs public support and personal courage to hold the price line.

However, Chester Bowles also serves a greater cause. He is proving that a man in public life can fearlessly fight for the common interest of all the people in the face of organized power and economic groups.

It has been said over and over that a modern industrial democracy must find the solution of its problems in the general interest of all parts of its economic life. Mr. Bowles has put that saying into practice.

The case for controlled prices during the present emergency rests upon the common interest of all of us, not upon the special needs of privileged groups. Bowles has shown what a man in public life, with the courage to do, can do. Today the public opinion polls show 72 percent of the people are against dropping price control.

The thing to do now is to put this unorganized public opinion to use, use it by putting it into political action for a planned economy of price stability and full employment and abundant production.

FARMERS UNION GRAIN
TERMINAL ASSOCIATION.

ST. PAUL, MINN.

Resolution of City Council of Lynn, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 6, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the City Council of Lynn, Mass.:

Whereas by the provisions of the GI bill, so-called, being Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, chapter 268, second session, it is provided by section 700 thereof that the Federal Government shall render aid for readjustment of returned World War II veterans and further provides that any person who has served in the military or naval service of the United States at any time after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, and who shall have been discharged or released from active service under conditions other than dishonorable, after active service of 90 days or more, shall be entitled to receive a readjustment allowance as provided therein for each week of unemployment, in an amount and under the conditions set forth therein, not to exceed a total of 52 weeks, and it is further provided in section 800, paragraph D-2 "in determining under subsection (a) of this section the suitability of work, no work shall be deemed suitable for an individual if (A) the position offered is vacant due directly to a strike, lock-out, or other labor dispute, and it now appears that various veterans of World War II who accepted positions after their release or discharge from the armed forces are without employment because of strikes, lock-outs, or other labor disputes, and by reason of such conditions, said veterans are not entitled to the benefits of the readjustment portion of said bill: Wherefore be it

Resolved, That the City Council of the City of Lynn, in meeting assembled, memorializes the Congress of the United States of America that said Public Law 346 be amended and modified so as to provide that any said veteran who is out of employment by reason of strikes, lock-outs, or other labor disputes, shall receive the compensation provided for by said Public Law 346, to the benefits of which any such veteran who has accepted a position or employment and is without the benefit of such position or employment by reason of a strike, lock-out, or other labor dispute, is not now entitled under the present existing law; and be it further

Ordered, That the city clerk, as clerk of the city council, forward a copy of these resolutions to the Congressmen representing the district including the city of Lynn, and the Senators representing the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Letter of Sherman Hickle, of Sanger, N. Dak.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 6, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the first great industry in the United States of America was agriculture. It has continued to make a major contribution to the welfare of the people down through the years, producing an abundance for our own domestic requirements and shipping vast quantities abroad.

Times without number, the farmers of the Nation have been the stabilizers in an hour of crisis. If it can be said that an hour of crisis faces the Nation today, then it is highly probable that the farmers again will furnish the stabilizing influence to hold the machinery in line.

Under unanimous consent, I ask permission to include with my remarks a letter directed by Mr. Sherman Hickle, of Sanger, N. Dak., to the Bismarck Tribune of Bismarck, N. Dak. I include this for the Members of Congress and the country at large because I think it contains fundamental doctrines. I should like to remind my colleagues that the writer of this letter has lived in the western section of Dakota, a country that has suffered greatly from periods of drought and other distressing conditions that have invaded that territory from time to time.

Yet, through it all, by his letter you will see that he remains steadfast in his belief in the United States and the thing we call the American system. Many people in the United States today would be the better for having read this letter that comes from a farmer who lives in a marginal country that has suffered such great hardships.

The letter follows:

FAVORS FREE COMPETITION

SANGER, N. DAK., *January 2, 1946*.

EDITOR, TRIBUNE: I live on a farm and this farm is mine. My Government issued a patent to me for this homestead with the name of Theodore Roosevelt, President of the United States, written on it. That document made me the sole owner of this farm; therefore I am the master here.

When I acquired this farm I signed no pledges nor made any promises to my Government, nor to anyone else, that I would operate this farm in any way but my way. By that silent token I am under no public obligation to operate this farm and when I do till these lands I do so as a duty to my family.

As further proof that I hold rightful and legal possession of this farm, my Government has placed a value on it and levied a tax against it, based on that valuation, and demands that I pay that tax. That is right; I should pay taxes to support my Government so long as it protects me in the exercise of my inalienable rights such as life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, which last right means the right to work to supply my family's needs, the right to acquire and hold property, and, also, the right to use my property as my own best judgment dictates.

As the lawful owner and operator of this farm I have the right to hire other men to work in my fields and if one man is not satisfactory to me I have the right to fire him and hire another one to take his place. Whom I hire and whom I fire is nobody's business but mine, since I own the farm, pay the taxes on it, and bear all the operating costs. It is in perfect accord with the Constitution of my country that when I do not like an employee I have the right to discharge him, and if he doesn't like me or the job I have to offer him, he has the right to quit working for me. That is free enterprise in action and is wholly consistent with the American way of life.

Furthermore, when a workman leaves my employ or because he has been dismissed by me, that moment our relationship as employer and employee ceases and he has no legal nor moral right to remain on my premises nor to occupy any of the approaches to my property nor in any way interfere with the regular operation of this farm.

In a just and honest economy, there can be no Government regimentation of industry, nor Government-established maximum nor minimum wages. A workman is worth what his services are worth to his employer and there is no other honest way to compute wages. That, of course, would mean going back to the old merit system and granting an employer the right to decide just what a certain workman is worth to him.

That system would put labor in the same position industry is now in; that is, labor would also be in the competitive field. Free enterprise means competition and where there is no competition there is no democracy, because that is what democracy means, a competitive system in which thrift and merit win. A fixed wage scale, in which good, honest workmen are paid no more for their services than inefficient and indifferent employees are, is un-American and has no place in a democracy.

What I am building up to is this—that Henry Ford, Chrysler, General Motors or any other industrialist, big or little, individual or corporate, has or should have the same right to operate their respective properties as I have to operate this farm.

They live in the same country that I do. My constitutional guaranties cover them as well as they do me. They pay taxes to support the same government that I do. They pay their own employees, buy their own raw material, and find their markets for the finished products; then why, I ask you intelligent Americans, should they not enjoy the same freedom that I do?

Keep this solid fact in mind, my thoughtful fellow men, that government was not created to give anybody anything but to merely protect all of us while we prove our worth in this competitive world.

SHERMAN HICKLE.

Small War Contractors Under Renegotiations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 1946

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks to include a letter from the War Contracts Price Adjustment Board, I wish to submit the following letter from Col. Maurice Hirsch, Chairman of the War Contracts Price Adjustment Board, Washington, D. C.

The letter has been received in response to an inquiry of mine based upon an earlier statement in the RECORD commenting upon alleged difference in treatment between small war contractors and larger concerns.

A discrimination against concerns would be a distinct violation of the principles embodied in the Renegotiations Act and its amendments. As an example, I would call attention to the exemption in the original act for business totaling less than $100,000 in a year and the extension of that exemption to $500,000 in subsequent amendments.

Consequently, reference to alleged discrimination against small concerns aroused my interest because of my part in the initiating of the renegotiation statute and I submitted an inquiry to the War Department in this matter.

The report of the War Department follows:

WAR CONTRACTS PRICE ADJUSTMENT BOARD,
Washington, D. C., January 16, 1946.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CASE: This is in response to your request for information as to the matters referred to in the remarks on the subject of contract renegotiation by the Honorable ANDREW J. MAY, which appeared on page A5043 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for November 5, 1945. Mr. MAY there raises the question as to whether or not smaller war contractors may have received relatively less favorable treatment in statutory renegotiation than have larger concerns.

Inquiry has been made on this subject on other occasions. The matter received careful consideration by the House Small Business Committee under the chairmanship of the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN. At its request, a report was submitted to that committee by the undersigned as Chairman of the War Contracts Price Adjustment Board. It is printed at pages 6145–6149 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 14, 1945. Your attention is invited particularly to pages 6148 and 6149 at which is presented statistical material derived from more than 3,000 renegotiation cases. It is believed that in the light of those data it is not possible to support a contention that renegotiation authorities have given less favorable consideration to smaller war contractors than to larger concerns.

In any review of this matter it should be noted that the comparison of renegotiation cases solely by reference to percentages of profits on renegotiable sales will lead to improper and wholly unwarranted conclusion. It is a basic requirement of the Renegotiation Act that all the relevant facts and circumstances involved in each particular case should be considered and evaluated in arriving at the determination of excessive profits to be eliminated. Subsection (a) (4) (A) of that act expressly directs the consideration of the six factors therein defined.

Mr. MAY did not identify in his remarks the Company X and the Company Y to which he referred. If it may be assumed, as is believed to be the case, that General Motors Corp. was referred to as Company X and Willys-Overland Co. as Company Y, then the inadequacy of a comparison based solely on percentage of profit derived from renegotiable sales is apparent. Essential and controlling distinctions exist as to the facts presented in the 1943 renegotiation proceedings of these two companies. It is impractical within the limits of this letter to set out the details with respect to each of them, but those hereinafter referred to will be of especial interest.

Initially, the Willys-Overland Co. is hardly a little company when judged by ordinary standards. It had renegotiable fixed price sales of $98,200,000 after renegotiation in 1942 and $153,200,000 in 1943. On this business it retained a net profit before taxes of $9,400,000 in 1942 and $15,700,000 in 1943. Its 1943 total sales, including CPFF business, before renegotiation amounted to $193,851,000 and it realized a profit of $3,246,000 after taxes based upon audit by the Bureau of Internal Revenue and after the proposed renegotiation refund. During 1936–39 its average annual sales amounted to $16,301,000 on which an average annual net loss of $835,000 was realized.

Subsection (a) (4) (A) of the Renegotiation Act requires that consideration be given to volume of production and normal prewar earnings of war contractors. The large expansion of the sales and profits of Willys-Overland Co. during the war period is obvious. Its 1943 fixed price renegotiable business alone was more than 10 times its otal average annual business in the peacetime base-period years of 1936–39. Its profit of $15,700,000 in 1943 from renegotiable fixed-price business, after renegotiation but before taxes, and $3,246,000 after renegotiation and after taxes, is in contrast with an average annual loss of $835,000 suffered during the base period. In comparison, General Motors' 1943 renegotiable fixed-price business was 2.2 times the average volume during the base period and the dollars of profit on that business before renegotiation and before taxes were 2.3 times the average profit derived during the base period. The 1943 profits of General Motors, after renegotiation and after taxes, amounted to $185,247,000, as against its average profit after taxes of $182,600,000 for the years 1936–39, thus showing practically little increase in net dollars of profit even though the volume of business had more than doubled.

The Renegotiation Act requires that consideration be given to the reasonableness of costs and profits and to the risk incident to reasonable pricing policy. In this connection, Willys-Overland's renegotiable fixed price business during 1943 produced profits before renegotiation and Federal taxes amounting to 17 percent of sales. In the case of General Motors the comparable figure is 14.3 percent of sales. It is possible that the narrower margin realized by General Motors was the result of its policy, declared by it even before the enactment of the Renegotiation Act and effective as of January 1, 1942, for the restriction of profits during the war period.

Subsection (a) (4) (A) of the act requires that consideration be given to the complexity of manufacturing technique and character and extent of subcontracting. Willys-Overland in its war production has been relatively less integrated than other large automobile manufacturers. The cost of materials used in its renegotiable business in 1943 by Willys represents 72 percent of its cost of sales, whereas the comparable General Motors' materials cost in the same year was only 49 percent of its cost of sales. The 1943 profits from fixed price war business which Willys-Overland will retain after the renegotiation amount to 38.3 percent of the value which Willys itself added by manufacture to the materials and subcontracted items, whereas the profits retained by General Motors from its fixed-price war production, after renegotiation, amount to 27.6 percent of the value which it added by manufacture to its materials and subcontracted items. The profits retained after renegotiation, in relation to value added by manufacture, are higher in the case of Willys-Overland than in the case of any other of the large automobile manufacturers.

Mr. MAY compares the profits realized by Companies X and Y from their nonrenegotiable business with the profits derived from their renegotiable business. In making such a comparison it is appropriate to consider first that the Price Adjustment Boards have no authority under the law with respect to nonrenegotiable profits. It should be noted also that such a comparison has little effect unless it can be assumed that the character and extent of the nonrenegotiable business of the two companies were practically identical. In 1943 the nonrenegotiable sales of Willys-Overland Co. were less than 1 percent of its total sales. In the case of General Motors Corp. the nonrenegotiable business amounted to approximately 10 percent of its sales. The diversity of products and manufacturing operations of the General Motors Corp. is far wider than that of the Willys-Overland Co. Furthermore, it is of interest to note that the General Motors Corp. applied its self-imposed wartime profit restriction to its nonrenegotiable as well as to its renegotiable business.

It is to be regretted if Company Y will have difficulty in reconverting to peacetime production. If Company Y be the Willys-Overland Co., it should be apparent from the foregoing that such difficulty is not attributable to "inequitable treatment accorded it by the Renegotiation Board" in contrast to what was indicated as "comparatively liberal treatment" accorded to General Motors Corp. The Willys-Overland Co. entered the war period with relatively less working capital to finance a large volume of business than did larger concerns. No new private capital was invested in the business during the war period. Renegotiation authorities in determining excessive profits have sought to give due consideration to the risks, financial and otherwise, to which contractors were subject in the conduct of their war business. They have not, however, allowed a reserve out of excessive profits for the establishment or reestablishment of peacetime business. The allowance of such a reserve out of excessive profits would result in a contribution at the expenses of the Government to the contractor's capital, in addition to a fair payment to him for the work he has done and the articles he has furnished. A proposal to permit the creation of such reserves was considered by the House Ways and Means Committee during the course of the hearings leading to the adoption of the 1943 act. It was recognized that such a provision would operate to the advantage of those contractors who had accumulated excessive profits and to the relative disadvantage of those

concerns which by reason of close pricing had not permitted such excessive profits to arise.

If you desire any further information in connection with this matter, please call upon us.

Sincerely yours,

MAURICE HIRSCH,
Colonel, General Staff Corps, Chairman.

"Where Do I Stand?" Says the Veteran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY J. LATHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 1, 1946

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, following my release from naval service last year, and after I had taken my seat in Congress, many servicemen asked me the question: "Where do I stand? What are my rights regarding educational benefits, hospitalization, loans, and so forth?"

I have received numerous letters from servicemen which clearly indicate that in spite of all the information given them on veterans' benefits, they find it difficult to ascertain exactly what rights and benefits are theirs as a result of their military service. Furthermore, they do not seem to know exactly where to go to obtain these benefits.

I believe it would be of service to veterans who reside in my district to set forth their rights in simple question-and-answer form; also the particular place in their community where help can be obtained by them.

In order that they may have the whole picture before them, I have asked the representatives in the State legislature from my district, State Senator Halpern and Assemblymen Archinal, Rabin, and Preller, to collect for me and enumerate what New York State has to offer the veteran. This they have very willingly and ably done, and I wish to thank them for their splendid cooperation:

First. Am I entitled to any benefits? Yes, if discharged under conditions other than dishonorable and you have been in service for at least 90 days, or suffered injury in line of duty. This applies to both State and Federal benefits.

Second. Can I get my old job back? Yes. You lose no seniority because of your service. However, you take your chances on being replaced by other veterans coming back after you with more seniority. You must remember to apply for your old job within 90 days of discharge or end of hospitalization. If you have any difficulty, you may consult with the Veterans' Personnel Division, Selective Service Headquarters, 1 East Forty-fourth Street, New York City.

Third. Am I entitled to special help to get a new job? Yes. Go to the veterans' representative of the United States Employment Service, 11 West Forty-second Street (twenty-second floor), New York City. For a civil-service job see United States Civil Service Commission, 641 Washington Street, New York City, for Federal; 80 Center Street, New York City, for State; and 299 Broadway, New York City, for city jobs.

Fourth. How about loans?

For purchase of homes and farms? Yes. The Government guarantees 50 percent of a loan, guaranteed amount not to exceed $4,000.

For business purposes, including purchase of stock for farm or merchandise for store? Yes. The Government guarantees 50 percent, guaranteed amount not to exceed $2,000. Must be repaid within 10 years. See State Department of Commerce Office, room 905, 342 Madison Avenue, New York City, or local bank or building and loan association.

Fifth. Do I get a civil-service preference? Yes. On Federal civil-service examinations you get 5 extra points; if you are at all disabled, 10 points; widows of honorably discharged servicemen, and wives of totally disabled servicemen, 10 points. You have preference in promotion and retention in service. In New York State disabled veterans go to the top of the list, and other veterans come next, provided examinations are passed.

You may get information as to examinations and application forms for civil-service positions from any first-class post office, or:

For Federal positions, 641 Washington Street, New York City; for State positions, 80 Center Street, New York City; for city positions, 299 Broadway, New York City.

Sixth. Am I entitled to medical care and hospitalization?

For service-connected disability? Yes; even if merely for aggravation of previously existing condition.

For non-service-connected disability? Yes; if unable to pay the cost yourself. See nearest Veterans' Administration facility. There is one at 92–32 Union Hall Street, Jamaica, N. Y.

Seventh. Am I entitled to unemployment insurance? It is called service readjustment compensation. If earning less than $23 a week or, if self-employed, and earning less than $100 during the previous month, you are entitled to $20 a week for a maximum of 52 weeks. Eight weekly payments will be made for each month of active service up to 3 months, and 4 weekly payments for every month or major fraction thereafter. These payments will not be deducted from future bonus payments. Go to the United States Employment Service Office, 90–01 Sutphin Boulevard, Jamaica, N. Y.

Eighth. Can I go to school with Government help? Yes. You are entitled to 1 year plus time of service, up to a maximum of 4 years. Short intensive courses and correspondence courses may not cost more than $500, and you are allowed a tuition of $500 a year for regular schooling. Subsistence allowances of $65 for single men, and $90 for those with dependents will be made. Consult Veterans' Training Officer, Twenty-fourth Street and Seventh Avenue, New York City, or New York State Veterans' Counselor.

Ninth. If I am vocationally disabled will the Government retrain me? Yes. But course must be completed within 9 years from end of war. Subsistence allowances of $105 for single men, $115 with a dependent, $10 for the first child, $7 for each additional child, and $15 for a dependent parent will be made. See Veterans' Training Officer, Twenty-fourth Street and Seventh Avenue, New York City.

Tenth. Do I get a bonus? Not yet; but both the Federal Government and New York State are considering giving a bonus.

Eleventh. Do I have preference in purchase of surplus property? Technically, yes. But the difficulty of location, selling in small lots, and poor administration have practically nullified this right. The situation may improve, however. Loans may be obtained for purchase of such property. Go to the War Assets Corporation, Empire State Building, sixtieth floor, New York City, to be certified.

Twelfth. Must I pay income tax for my period of service? All war-service pay of enlisted men from 1941 is entirely exempt from Federal income tax. If that is sole income, no Federal return need be filed. Commissioned officers may exclude $1,500 from their income. Reserve officers may apply for extension of time to pay tax on service compensation for years beginning December 31, 1939, and before January 1, 1947. Tax may be paid in 12 equal quarterly installments over 3 years without interest on service pay. You must, however, file a State income-tax return if your net income exceeds $1,000 if unmarried or $2,500 if married. One hundred-and-eighty-day extension is granted on State returns if overseas. See Internal Revenue Bureau, 90–01 Sutphin Boulevard, Jamaica, N. Y.; New York State Tax Department, 320 Schermerhorn Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Thirteenth. Will my military service help me to acquire citizenship? Yes. For veterans there is no fee, no waiting period after filing petition, no restrictions as to age, race, enemy nationality, period of residence in the United States, or ability to speak, read, or write the English language; first papers are not required, and petition may be filed in any court with jurisdiction irrespective of residence. See Immigration Bureau, 271 Washington Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Fourteenth. How about purchase of a new house? During the present housing emergency, veterans are given priority in the purchase of new homes costing less than $10,000, or which are rented for less than $80 a month. See Civilian Production Administration, Sutphin Boulevard and Eighty-ninth Avenue, Jamaica, N. Y., or State Housing Authority, 80 Center Street, New York City.

Fifteenth. If disabled, do I get a pension? For service-connected disability? Yes; ranging from $11.50 a month to $300 a month, depending upon the degree of disability.

For non-service-connected disability? Yes; from $50 to $60 per month if disability is permanent and total, and annual income of veteran, if single, does not exceed $1,000; or if married or with minor children, $2,500. See Veterans' Administration, 92–32 Union Hall Street, Jamaica, N. Y.

Sixteenth. May I continue my Government service life insurance in civilian life? Yes; and it is an excellent thing to do. The rates are low and it can be continued without a new physical examination. However, within 8 years it must be converted from term insurance to ordinary life, 20-payment life, or a 30-payment life policy. Checks should be made out to Treasurer of the United States and sent to Collection Subdivision, Veterans' Administration, Washington 25, D. C., within 31 days of end of period for which premiums were last paid. There is a form for this purpose.

Seventeenth. Did my private insurance policies lapse during the war? Up to $10,000, if held at least 30 days before entry into service, policy will not lapse for nonpayment of premium until 2 years after discharge.

Eighteenth. May I try for a scholarship? Yes. New York State has 2,400 war-service scholarships. One thousand two hundred will be awarded in 1945 and 1946, on the basis of competitive examinations once a year. Annual value of scholarships is $350. Legislation now pending to increase value and number of scholarships. You may also receive training in many State agricultural, trade, radio, aviation, and other technical schools run by New York State. See Director of Veterans' Affairs, 111 Broadway, New York City.

Nineteenth How do I renew my professional license? If you are a licensed doctor, dentist, engineer, architect, embalmer, insurance agent, and so forth, you need only apply for renewal to the board which issued your license, within 3 months of discharge. See your local State veterans' counselor.

Twentieth. What about my driver's license? Licenses may be renewed upon presentation at the Motor Vehicle Bureau, Sutphin Boulevard and Eighty-ninth Avenue, Jamaica, N. Y., of discharge certificate before the September 30 following 60 days after discharge.

Twenty-first. What if I become blind? If service connected see question 15. Even though not service connected, provided lack of vision is sufficient to prevent holding a job, you are entitled to a $500 annuity pay by New York State. See Director of Veterans' Affairs, 111 Broadway, New York City.

Twenty-second. Can I go to a rest camp? Yes. The State of New York provides a beautiful rest camp at Mount McGregor, Saratoga County, N. Y. See your local veterans' counselor.

If you have any questions about your rights under the Federal law I shall be very happy to try to answer them. Write to me, HENRY J. LATHAM, Congressman, Third District, New York, at room 139, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

If you have any questions regarding the State law write to State Senator Seymour Halpern, Assemblyman George Archinal, in the Seventh Assembly District; Assemblyman Samuel Rabin, in the Eighth Assembly District; or Assemblyman Fred W. Preller, in the Ninth Assembly District. They may be addressed at the Capitol, Albany, N. Y.

Your inquiries will be welcome.

Interest of Women in Public Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 6, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan yesterday made a statement to the press in which he suggested that the organized women of our country were being misled and propagandized into action on subjects about which they knew little. My opinion is that the gentleman grossly underrates the women of America. Their organizations have a record of far-sighted civic statesmanship which is a credit to the whole Nation.

While women are less interested than men in partisan politics, they care supremely about matters which affect world peace and the general welfare. When these issues are touched, I am proud to say that they spring into action. Often the women's groups are the only spokesman for the general welfare as opposed to special interests.

The great national women's organizations have committees and experts which watch current affairs and are glad to hear the facts from all quarters. They do not act rashly, however, for most of them accept their programs only after long and careful study. When their long-range considered programs need action on some specific measure I am glad they are organized to be effective.

Stand Up and Be Counted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYLE H. BOREN
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 6, 1946

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, if I may speak parenthetically for a moment—so that there will be no misunderstanding of my words, let me make this very clear at the outset. It is unquestionably the right of any man to quit work, or of any group of men to quit work, except to the extent of his obligation to perform a task that might be in the terms of a contract to which he is a party and which was drawn without duress and of his own volition. This is right, and ought to be. But, the term "strike" as it is used, and as it has come to be known and as it is joined with the claim of a "right" to strike, embodies preventing production, embodies coercing the individual into quitting work against him own individual wishes or preventing him from going to work on his own choice. And, throughout my remarks the term "strike," when used, will be construed to be what is the usual use of the term today in industrial disputes, and what I conceive to be a proper interpretation of the term since, in its general application, it is constructed out of the materials of the closed shop, the picket line, the call to strike in the form of an order from a dictatorial leader, and work stoppage in the sense of preventing any other individual American from taking over a job that has been vacated. The right to quit work, of course, is an individual right, and it is a right, but the right to hold work in abeyance, refusing to let anyone else do it, does not exist as a right in my opinion.

All my life I have heard about the right to strike, and I let that claim go unchallenged until the time when America found its boys dying on Bataan and, shortly thereafter, in all the far-flung areas of war. There were strikes in the plants of war production even in those early days of our war effort when a few more planes or munitions would have returned home many more American boys who now lie buried beneath the ferns and palms of the far Pacific, in the sands and on the crags of north Africa, on Italy's Anzio beachhead and the slopes of Mount Cassino. I heard then the so-called leaders of some of the labor organizations speak of the right to strike. I could not see anything right about it.

Burdened with the tragedy of the loss of personal friends and relatives, fortified by a share in responsibility for the conditions that affected the success or safety or life or death of all America's men-at-arms, and urged by deep anxiety for the heroic men and boys starving and tortured in the prison camps, I arose to challenge that claim of right to strike. I could not see anything right about it, and with some of you here I joined hands in the endeavor to put an end to strikes in war industries and we passed the Smith bill.

It is true that in the ensuing election the CIO Political Action Committee opened its bank account to my opponent and brought the full force of its organized strength into the election contests in the hope of removing me from the Congress, as they did some of you others who also refused to be subservient to their dictation. They will do it again this election, of course. Today I hear in these Halls and cloakrooms and in our office buildings the threat of reprisal at election, and in some quarters, expressions of fear as to the political consequences of what we do here on this issue. Such considerations are too petty to be of any weight in any man's deliberations here today. It is a part of our history that in these Halls served a man whose words were, "I had rather be right than President," and he suited his deeds to his words. As for me, I had rather be right than Congressman, and, suiting my deeds to my words I want to help bring up this bill today including the Case amendment and vote for it and pass it and make it the law of the land.

Let us stand up today and be counted on this issue. Elections will come soon when all Americans will stand up and be counted on this issue. We know, each of us, that this issue envelops all of America. It is today paramount in national importance and it pervades the interest

of every home and affects the welfare of every citizen. Day before yesterday we had a roll-call vote on going into the committee with this bill. Let us fight it out today and then we can fight it out again in the coming elections and settle once and for all whether the people of America and their representatives, or the CIO Political Action Committee, the Petrillos, and the other dictators of organized labor, shall rule America.

Today, again, on every hand, and in half the speeches made in this rostrum there is asserted that there exists a right to strike. Justice Brandeis, who was known as the great liberal, delivered an opinion on the bench of the Supreme Court of the United States in which he pointed out that there is no such thing as a constitutional right to strike.

I have read the Bill of Rights in the Constitution of the United States of of America and no such right is listed. From the preamble of the Constitution to the last word there is not one word that gives status to the claim that there is any right to strike, if the right to strike means the right to keep other people from working.

When I look at the Nation's need today and recognize, as all of us must, that the only reliable prevention of inflation is full production; when I see throughout our country the need of the goods our industry is geared to produce, again I challenge the word "right" when used in conjunction with strike, if the right to strike means the right to stop production and to force every man to quit work whether he wants to or not. I do not see anything right about that.

The freedom, the independence, and the rights guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States are essentially individual in character. In recent years the rights of the individual have been seriously impaired. Even within organized labor the individual union member has had his rights usurped, his freedom impaled, and his independence chained into bondage. If there be any doubt in any man's mind as to the validity of that assertion, I invite him to examine the hearings before your own congressional Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce when the so-called Petrillo bill was under consideration.

There is another principle that is fundamentally American, and that is, freedom does not mean license. The freedom of the individual or the group to follow the dictates of its whim, its fancy, its depredation or its desire, is limited to the consistency of the welfare of the whole people. There is oft told the story of the Irishman coming to this country. When he set foot on our soil he threw his arms in the air and yelled, "Hurrah! I'm in a free country." And, when his wide-flung arms struck a passerby in the face, broke his glasses and bruised his face, the Irishman was promptly knocked down. Rubbing his chin he said, "Faith, and I thought I was in a free country." He was admonished as follows by the man he had hit: "You are in a free country, but your freedom ends where my nose begins." It is as simple as that. That, in effect, is the issue here today.

Let us today pass through the smoke screens, toss aside the propaganda, and stand on the ground of what is fundamentally right for all the people. The siren voice of false claim, nor threat, nor pressure should cudgel, persuade, or influence our decision here. These issues are fundamental. It is clear to my convictions, and I think evident to reason, that neither labor nor management has the fundamental right to decide what is good or bad for the American people. Only the people themselves have the right to decide that. Apply that view to the present problem, as representatives of the people it is up to us to prescribe a system which eliminates a conflict of interest between the employer and employee and which is directed to the advantage only of all the people.

The wisdom that founded the Government of this Nation and built it on the enduring principle of Americanism laid its granite foundation in the principle that all just powers of Government are derived from the consent of the governed. The founders so carefully applied that yardstick to the whole people as to specifically point out that no particular segment was to constitute the whole, hence the separation of church and state, the foundation of public schools, and the safeguards against levying taxes on the whole people or making laws on the whole people in the interest and to the benefit of private institutions, private groups, and so forth. It is quite clear a fundamental tenet of Americanism that no particular group of any kind or character shall rule America. Unionism and the state must be kept apart as surely as the church and the state must be kept apart; as surely as the Elks Lodge and the state must be kept apart; as surely as any other private interest, group, or institution must be kept apart. Any personal or selfish interest or aim, whether it be good or bad, or whether it be on the part of any individual or group must be kept apart from control of Government, and must be kept within the bounds of limitation that prevents its infringement on the rights of the whole people and prevents its action against the welfare of the whole people.

To give a complete transcript of my mind and thought, I feel it my responsibility to add: I do not believe in a closed shop. I believe the closed shop is both un-American and un-Christian. I do not think the individual's opportunity to earn a living should be conditioned on his being compelled to belong to an organization if he does not wish to belong to it. I do not believe that any American individual can rightfully be compelled to join any particular union or, as for that matter, any particular church or lodge.

And, finally, my colleagues, let me reaffirm my conviction that the inalienable rights which are so correctly announced in the charter of our Government are all individual in character and belong to the individual American. Further, let me reaffirm my assertion that neither management nor labor has a right on its whim or caprice to decide the good or bad for all the American people. In the light of the Nation's need and the current chaos in production of needed goods, I say again, with reference to the claim of a "right to strike" meaning the right to stop production, not only the power to compel great numbers to quit work, but the power to prevent others from working—I can see nothing right about it.

Full Employment Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 6, 1946

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I will vote on this bill if there is a roll call as follows: "Present and not voting."

If there is no roll call then I want to go on record now as not being in favor of this so-called full employment bill. This is not full employment, nor is it employment. It does not state anything that has not already been stated by the American way of life. It provides no machinery to see that citizens are assured employment. It is not only watered down but it is washed out.

I am further against this bill because there is absolutely no protection for the minorities of our country. Today, close to 30,000,000 American citizens are discriminated against—because of their color, Negroes; because of their race, Jews; because of their religion, Catholics; because of their national origin, Mexicans. This bill will not in any way help them. The same un-American practices of discrimination will continue. It would have been far better not to have had any bill than this, because this is a compromise. Compromises were proven disastrous at Munich. We should continue to fight until we get a full employment bill, not just any bill.

United States Service Legion of World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 6, 1946

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, there has been organized in my home city of Ironton, Ohio, the Hudson Brothers Post of the United States Service Legion of World War II. This post was organized in honor of Ronald Hudson and Kneeland Hudson, who were brothers and the sons of Mr. and Mrs. Ronald Hudson, of Ironton, Ohio. These two courageous and patriotic young men gave up their lives in the recent great World War. If it was necessary for these two gallant young men to give up their lives for our country then may their devoted parents

take solace in the thought that there is glory in one giving up his life for another. The Hudson Brothers Post has grown rapidly and now has a membership of 385 members. Recently Mr. Harry Burbrink, Sr., the national commander of the Auxiliary of the United States Service Legion of World War II, delivered an address to the veterans of World War II and their auxiliary and friends. Under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include the address which is as follows:

Ladies and gentleman, what I have to say this evening is primarily for the ears of the war veteran of World War II. Yes, veterans; my message deeply concerns you.

It is indeed a pleasure, also a privilege today to tell you about a fast growing organization for World War II veterans only. I refer to the organization known as the United States Service Legion of World War II. This organization had its beginning as an organization shortly after the beginning of the World War II; organized on Memorial Day, May 30, 1942, in the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, and chartered under the laws of the State of Ohio, September 8, 1943, with national headquarters located in the city of Cincinnati, Ohio. The purpose or purposes for which the organization was formed are: "To protect the right and interests and to promote the welfare and benefits of those who have enlisted or have been called to serve in the armed forces of the United States of America."

If you are a veteran of World War II and you feel that the principles for which you fought should not be permitted to languish, if you are concerned with the future welfare of the Nation, you will be more than interested in the program of the United States Service Legion of World War II. I am indeed happy to have this opportunity to introduce this organization to you and to explain something of its activities. Since its inception, this Legion has enjoyed the support and good will of all the veterans' organizations. Senators and Congressmen have expressed favor in the program of this Legion. During the past year other veterans' organizations have been springing up throughout the country and several of these organizations have approached our national officers with the purpose of uniting with their organizations. Their offers were refused due to the fact that this organization was not formed overnight like some of the disreputable ones in existence today who prey upon the veteran.

Membership in the United States Service Legion of World War II is open to any American citizen, male or female, without distinction as to race or creed, who served actively in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard during World War II, and who has been honorably discharged from same. Membership is also open to women who have served with the WAC's, the WAVES, SPARS, Marine Corps, or Nursing Corps, and who have been honorably discharged from same. With more than 15,000,000 potential veterans eligible for membership, the United States Service Legion of World War II promises to become one of the largest and most influential veterans' organizations.

Here in the city of Ironton the Hudson Brothers Post growth has been especially rapid. This post alone has a membership of over 385 members and is still growing. Our other posts throughout the State report likewise expansion.

The Hudson Brothers Post was named in honor of Ronald and Kneeland Hudson, sons of Mr. and Mrs. Ronald Hudson, of Ironton, Ohio, in honor of the glorious fighting spirit and supreme sacrifice which they so willingly made. Today, January 10, 1946, the national officers of this organization will institute and install those officers elected as State officers of the State of Ohio, at the Hudson Brothers Post headquarters. It is indeed a credit to the city of Ironton to have State headquarters located here for the State of Ohio. Also, a credit to the veterans of the organization, all of whom have shown at all times full cooperation in the affairs of their organization, the United States Service Legion of World War II, and I feel confident that the administrative officers of your city are justly proud to know that State headquarters for the United States Service Legion of World War II veterans will be located in your city of Ironton, Ohio. Yes, I might say the city of hospitality.

At this time I wish to extend an invitation to all veterans of World War II to attend the installation ceremony tonight; at the same time I urge all present officers and members to attend.

Many veterans realize the logic and the reason for becoming identified with an organization such as this Legion. Most of the millions of veterans of World War II are convinced of the futility of war as an instrument of national policy. They have seen at first hand the devastation, the indescribable suffering, the heartache, the anguish which attends armed conflict between nations. The veterans of this war are young men and women for the most part. They were not responsible for making this war. They paid and are still paying for the mistakes of an elder generation. They do not want to see those mistakes repeated.

The veteran of today realizes that there are tremendous problems facing our Nation in the days immediately ahead. A war does not end with the treaty of peace, the instrument of surrender. Wars never do. The struggle between armies stops, but the effects of war go on working destruction for generations afterward. The veterans of World War II comprise the major part, the vitally interested part, of a new generation. It is up to them to see that the objectives for which they fought and for which so many of their comrades died are carried over into national life and action.

Individually, the veteran can do little. In order for him to assume a proper and legitimate role in the rebuilding of America, it is essential that he and his former buddies be organized—and organized strongly.

If social and economic justice is ever brought about, if wars and depressions are ever made obsolete, if the letter and spirit of the preamble to the United States Constitution are ever given their rightful place in our individual and collective lives, if a better democratic society is ever achieved by these men and women who have carried into a later active life the aspirations and ideals for which they fought, the instrument through which they can make their influence effective is an organization strong in numbers and strong in principles. Such an organization is the United States Service Legion of World War II.

Permit me to outline briefly a few of the principles to which the members of this legion are pledged. True loyalty to the Government of the United States of America, based upon a respect for and devotion and fidelity to its Constitution and laws made evident by our disapprobation of anything that is disloyal, treasonable, or rebellious, or anything that will in any manner impair the efficiency and permanency of our National Union.

The United States Service Legion of World War II veterans is founded upon loyalty, charity, and patriotism; second to this we are banded together not for self-seeking but to work for the best interests of our veterans.

We believe that our returned veterans are entitled to the fullest opportunity for speedy reconversion to civilian status so that they may once more become constructive citizens.

We believe that Americans should exercise the full rights and obligations of citizenship, to protect our democratic principles, and to promote honesty and integrity in public office.

These are few of the major ideals to which the members of this organization are pledged. I believe these are principles with which all thoughtful Americans are in complete accord.

The United States Service Legion of World War II, has no intention to discredit or detract from the influence of existing veterans' organizations of previous wars. The American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, the Army and Navy Union, these have all made their significant contributions to our American mode of living, and the United States Service Legion of World War II, their counterpart of World War II extends the hand of good fellowship and full cooperation on matters of mutual interest. However we do feel, as most veterans feel, that those who served in this greatest of all wars should have an organization of their own, an organization composed of young hearts and voices which will keep the spirit and temper of a new generation.

For this same reason I earnestly call upon all veterans of World War II to become familia with this organization, to examine its objectives, to join it, and support it. The various posts of this legion stand ready to answer inquiries with respect to the organization and to receive new members, or you may address all inquiries to the United States Service Legion, World War II, National Headquarters, Cincinnati, Ohio, in care of P. O. Box 365. A prompt reply will be sent on receipt of your letter.

Veterans of World War II, here is your opportunity as American citizens, as the generation of tomorrow, to unite in fellowship and patriotism as comrades in World War II under the banner of the United States Service Legion of World War II so as to stand united to protect the rights and interests and to promote the welfare and benefits of all of us who enlisted or who were called to serve in the armed forces of this great and grand country of ours, the United States of America.

I thank you.

International Information Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1946

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a recent article appearing in the Washington Star by Frank R. Kent:

BENTON CALLED UNCONVINCING IN EFFORT TO EXPLAIN INFORMATION AGENCY NEED

(By Frank R. Kent)

The effort of William Benton, the Assistant Secretary of State, who is endeavoring to establish for this country an official international information service, to explain that under him the distribution of news would be "objective" and in no sense, propaganda, is singularly unconvincing.

No doubt Mr. Benton is sincere in his belief and his intentions are pure. Even Elmer Davis believed that he, too, was "objective" in his conduct of the late and unlamented OWI, but the charges that quite often some very crude administrative propaganda got mixed with American propaganda were fully substantiated, and the agency never smelled very good. In time of war, propaganda, of course, is essential and proper; in time of peace, it is wholly out of tune with American precedents principles, and professions.

That is why the Associated Press board of directors, supported now by the United Press, have declined to furnish Mr. Benton's organization with their news for short-wave broadcasting, now the war is over, in the way they did the OWI when the war was on.

VIEW TAKEN BY ASSOCIATED PRESS

Their point is that no matter how well intentioned Mr. Benton may be no Government-sponsored news service, information service, or publicity service, whether supplemental, background or whatever you choose to call it, can ever be really objective; that, no matter how it starts; it inevitably becomes propaganda in the end; that for us to establish such a service as is proposed is to do exactly the thing we have deplored in other nations; that soon or late it means an international propaganda race, sure to create friction and breed ill will, distinctly not in interests of world amity and accord.

Believing this, it is easy to understand why our great press associations refused to put their facilities at the disposal of Mr. Benton. And this refusal was strongly indorsed a few days ago by Mr. Christopher Chancellor, general manager of Reuter, the British news agency comparable to the Associated Press.

In a speech to newspapermen here Mr. Chancellor criticized British propaganda and deplored governmental news sponsorship anywhere at any time.

"News," he said, "is sacred. That is why any handling of news by government is so greatly to be feared. When governments go into the news business, it is very hard to get them out again. The appetite grows with the eating. If once you begin to tamper with the news, even with the highest motives, you find yourself sliding down the slippery slope toward a pit which is bottomless."

Exactly who conceived the idea of converting our wartime propaganda machine into a peacetime publicity machine is uncertain, but it took both clearheadedness and courage for the Associated Press to see through it and take a firm stand against it.

Neither the charges of the exasperated Mr. Benton that it is interfering with the foreign policy of the country and refusing to cooperate with the Government nor the ill-natured slurs of Mr. Davis over the radio, where he seems to be about as objective as he was as head of the OWI, diminish the basic soundness of the AP's position.

CAN'T DISGUISE FACTS

Nor do the local cries that America must not be left at a disadvantage by having no means of making her voice heard in the world disguise the facts, first, that we have gotten along pretty well in the past without this kind of business; second, that, call it what you will, it is certain ultimately, as Mr. Chancellor says, to put us into competition with the propaganda of other nations who can—and always will—beat us at that game.

Of course, there are other objections to the establishment of this far-flung "information service" aside from the one that it takes us along the propaganda road which we have always regarded as reprehensible in peace periods.

One of these is that it is expensive at a time when the great need of the Nation is for economy. Mr. Benton has mentioned a "six to ten millions" deficit, but conservative estimates put the cost at much more than that. A second is that the personnel of the organization is hardly first class. It is largely composed of the dregs of the OWI, which at its peak was none too good.

Several thousands, unable to get civilian jobs when the OWI was liquidated, succeeded in transfering to the State Department pay roll—and there they cling. The plan, it is said, it to man the new service with these.

A third objection is that the scheme is very unpopular with our career diplomats in all parts of the world who look with distaste at the prospect of having these former OWI employees thrust into their embassies and legations. They take a very dim view of the whole scheme—and their feeling is beginning to be reflected in Congress where naturally, they have friends.

It may be that that body, regarding this as no time to enter upon any new and costly experiment, will end the whole affair by simply declining to make the appropriation. Worse things could happen.

The Truth About Yalta—A Year Late

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 1946

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the United States News entitled "The Truth About Yalta—A Year Late":

THE TRUTH ABOUT YALTA—A YEAR LATE

(By David Lawrence)

How can the people of the world trust the heads of governments any more when they make evasive and equivocal statements in their official communiques and speeches, declaring that no secret deals or commitments have been made, and then a few months later the opposite is revealed as the truth?

Just a year ago Marshal Stalin, Prime Minister Churchill, and the late President Roosevelt were meeting at Yalta. They reached a number of agreements. Some were made public. There were, however, vague references to military considerations which prevented full disclosure of all agreements reached. It turns out now that in direct violation of the pledges made to one another under the Atlantic charter, Russia—although still at peace with Japan, our enemy—asked for and obtained from the heads of the British and American Governments an agreement that Japanese territory in the Kurile Islands and in the southern half of Sakhalin Island should be annexed by the Soviet.

But, it will be asked, was it not necessary for the American and British representatives at the Yalta Conference to make such a promise in order to induce Russia to enter the war eventually against Japan?

This is a question which will never be satisfactorily answered. For it implies that Russia was not interested in helping us out against Japan except at a price and had to be bribed with promises of territory in order to cooperate with us. It implies that the help we gave the Red armies with our billions of dollars of lend-lease and with our sacrifices of American lives in opening a second front in France were not sufficient to appease Marshal Stalin. It implies that, although we, by our help in Europe, saved Russia from ignominious defeat at the hands of the Nazis, Russia was not willing to come to our aid in the Far East against the enemy which had attacked us unless given a large piece of Japanese territory.

WHY TRUSTEESHIPS FOR UNITED STATES?

Let us put the most charitable interpretation possible on it—namely, that Russia has had reason in the past to fear Japan and wanted the Kuriles and the southern half of Sakhalin as a measure of security. For in the newly annexed territory she can have air and naval bases close enough to pounce upon Japan with naval aircraft carriers as well as land-based planes. Let's assume that Russia needed all this for her security.

What then becomes of the objections to our full-fledged ownership of the islands we won in the Pacific? Why should those islands be placed under an international trusteeship while Russia is left with complete sovereignty over the Kuriles?

All through the San Francisco Conference we heard much about trusteeships. Many American observers were quick to criticize our own military and naval advisers because they wanted us to retain bases in the Marianas, Iwo Jima, and the Bonins. Even in our own Department of State were to be found arched eyebrows whenever the claim for American retention of the Pacific bases we had won by the sacrifices of our youth was mentioned.

INCONSISTENCY IN STATE DEPARTMENT

What have these officials to say now? How much propaganda did they issue to the American people declaring that we had no right to sovereignty in the Pacific islands and should accept trusteeships and inter-Allied control and that we would be inconsistent if we did otherwise? For it was contended in the Department of State that we couldn't oppose Russia's claims for more territory in Poland and in Europe if we insisted on territory for ourselves—even tiny little bases for our ships and planes in the Pacific to protect our Aleutian Islands which are vulnerable to attack from islands near Japan.

Now the pretense and cloak of hypocrisy has been torn off. All the time the Department of State was insisting on international trusteeships for the Pacific island which was had conquered, the United States Government had in its possession a secret treaty with Russia which would permit the latter to annex outright the Kuriles and the southern half of Sakhalin.

President Truman acknowledges frankly that he did not know about this document until just before he went to Potsdam last July. He had been in the White House since April 12, but he did not know all through the time the San Francisco Conference and discussions on trusteeships were going on that hidden or lost somewhere in his predecessor's personal files was an agreement pledging, on behalf of a President of the United States, a certain action involving the good faith not only of the American people in general but the Senate of the United States in particular. For the Senate must consent to and ratify any agreement before it can be a valid pledge on behalf of the Government of the United States. Japan surrendered last August. Why has this agreement been kept secret from the Senate by Mr. Truman for the last 5 months while important questions of policy have been up for discussion with Russia concerning Japan?

The American people do not wish to see their President repudiated by action of the Senate. The better way would be to disclose, in executive sessions, to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee the nature of any secret understanding and to secure its informal acceptance or rejection then and there. One man should not be permitted to make treaties. The Constitution provides for two branches of the Government to participate in the making of treaties.

If that method has really become obsolete, then some means of holding a President of the United States immediately responsible for his acts—as, for instance, by the parliamentary system—must be established. The British Parliament can turn out a Prime Minister at once who makes a misstep in attempting to commit the Government of Great Britain to a particular course in foreign policy. The American people are entitled to

the same freedom of action and the same democratic process.

It can be argued that Mr. Roosevelt in his speech to Congress after coming back from Yalta significantly served notice on all governments that, under the American Constitution, treaties and agreements require the consent of the Senate. It is true that the annexation by Russia of the Kuriles and the southern half of Sakhalin must be confirmed now in a treaty of peace with some future Japanese Government and ratified formally by our Senate before the Russian demand can be fulfilled.

But a Russian "claim" and a pledge by the heads of the United States and British Governments to "support" a claim is tantamount to an agreement. The United States Senate could, of course, decide that all American "claims" must be duly "supported" by Russia before ratifying any "claims" growing out of the war with Japan or Germany.

ACTIONS CREATE DISTRUST

Mr. Roosevelt was a tired and sick man at Yalta. He may not have been altogether to blame for what he did there. But the many sycophantic supporters of the President who denounced anyone suggesting that personal diplomacy was wrong and who encouraged the private handling of public affairs must bear some responsibility for the fuzzy record which has been made—a record that leaves scars of distrust and deep misgiving about statesmen who tell the people one thing and agree secretly to something else.

On this page about a year ago the writer said:

"For American idealism was defeated at Yalta. American constitutionalism was scorned at Yalta, and the pledges given in the Atlantic Charter that no nation—neither Russia, nor Britain, nor any other country—will seek 'territorial aggrandizement' were flagrantly violated at Yalta."

This was a minority viewpoint then because the propaganda machine of Government had anesthetized large sections of the American press and also many observers who stood in awe of the wording of official communiques and naively accepted them at face value.

MAKE THE SENATE A PARTNER

Today we see the effects of personal diplomacy at its worst. No American President should go alone to represent the United States in any international conference with the head of another state. Government funds should not be allowed by Congress to be spent by the executive branch of the Government in conferences leading to the making of any agreement requiring the consent of the Senate unless representatives of the upper House of Congress are present, to be advised completely and promptly of the text of such agreements the moment they have been made.

This would afford the Senate an opportunity to repudiate or approve at once the signature of any President who attempts to make any pledges in the name of the Government of the United States in our relations with foreign governments.

In wartime the interests of military security can be protected by requiring that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee maintain secrecy on such phases as affect military operations. At least an agreement which necessitates secrecy can be known to more than one person in the Government and can at least be communicated promptly to the coordinate branch of the Government which has the power to ratify treaties.

We spoke a year ago of the tragedy of Yalta. Events have proved it was perhaps the most unmoral and humiliating episode in the history of those modern governments which classify themselves as champions of international morality.

The Next Step in International Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 7 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article dealing with the next step in international relations. The article is by Thomas L. Stokes, and it was printed in the Los Angeles Times of November 21, 1945. I shall read the first two and the last two sentences of the article, and then I shall submit the entire article for printing in the RECORD.

The first two sentences read, as follows:

It is becoming clear that public opinion is moving closer toward the next step in international relations.

This is usually described as "world government."

The last two sentences read, as follows:

The people again seem to be moving ahead of the politicians. The politicians might as well catch up.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEXT STEP

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

WASHINGTON, November 20.—It is becoming clear that public opinion is moving closer toward the next step in international relations.

This is usually described as world government.

The atomic bomb is responsible for this shift of opinion. The shift is discernible in recurring expressions by political leaders who were pioneers for a United Nations Organization, by scientists who helped create the bomb, by organizations which were set up to promote the UNO.

It is significant. It shows that public opinion is moving with the times, which are moving awfully fast.

ONE GOVERNMENT

World government means, in essence, a single government of all the nations of the world, just as the United States is one government of 48 States. Each nation would have to yield up sovereignty, just as our States did when the Constitution was drafted.

Anyone who suggested this when the 54 nations gathered at San Francisco last April was scornfully derided as a starry-eyed idealist by the practical diplomats and politicians there who were still "practical," though most of them came from nations laid waste by war.

But that was before the atomic bomb dropped to end lots of illusions about statecraft and international politics.

It is not so unpopular now to talk about world government.

No one, of course, expects world government to come tomorrow, or the day after tomorrow. But the atmosphere is being created.

It is the most important single factor in the world today and the politicians and diplomats are beginning to take notice.

THE WORLD'S FRIGHT

For that reason it is expected that this change of atmosphere will become apparent when the UNO Assembly meets for its opening session in January, and that the attitude and approach of that body will be entirely different from what might have been predicted just after it was created at San Francisco.

For there is no question that the people of the world have been frightened by the atomic bomb and this fright is being transferred, slowly as usual, to their political leaders.

The signs of the new approach are to be found in the numerous demands—and from responsible sources—for revision of the United Nations Organization, which at least would begin to make it more like a responsible, functioning government with real powers.

TRUSTEE OF BOMB

These demands proceed, in the first instance, from the fact that the UNO must be the trustee or custodian of the atomic bomb. That requires power. Consequently there are demands for change in the veto, so that one of the Big Five powers can't prevent action; for creating a real international police force; for powers of inspection for secret atomic bomb manufacture. Also, and this is in the interest of a real union of nations, there are demands that the trusteeship provisions, now rigid, be changed so that the UNO itself would assume all trusteeships and not leave various dependencies to the whims of those who have ruled them so long.

How good a job the international politicians thought they had done at San Francisco may be gathered from the difficulty with which they surrounded change or amendments to their Charter. It takes a two-thirds vote of the Assembly, including all five of the big powers, to amend.

THE PEOPLE AHEAD?

A constitutional convention to consider amendments can be called by a two-thirds vote of the General Assembly, including a simple majority of the Security Council of seven members.

But the delegates at San Francisco showed how little change they expected any time soon by providing that if such a convention has not been held in 10 years, then a proposal—only a proposal—for such a convention would be put on the agenda of the tenth session of the General Assembly.

The very first session of the General Assembly is likely to get proposals for amendments, now that we have the atomic bomb.

The people again seem to be moving ahead of the politicians.

The politicians might as well catch up.

The "Lone Eagle" Takes a Look at America's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, there is submitted a speech by Charles A. Lindbergh, an intrepid American whose bravery and independence I have always admired:

AVIATION IN THE ATOMIC ERA

(By Charles A. Lindbergh)

We meet in honor of Orville and Wilbur Wright. Most of us here tonight have followed aviation as a profession for many

years; and yet it is difficult even for us to realize the advance our art has made since that first power-driven flight.

It is only 42 years since they catapulted their plane into the air at Kitty Hawk. It has often seemed to me that it must have been centuries ago. Watching bombs falling on some South Pacific jungle or standing amid the ruined walls of a European city, I have had to tell myself over and over again that all this has happened within a lifetime. There is something incongruous in picturing that fragile and harmless craft in the same frame with the terrific detonation of bombs and millions of tons of rubble.

Certainly there was never a time when it was more interesting to speculate on the future of aircraft. How soon will we be crossing oceans at greater speed than the sun? Why can't we land on a planet now that the atom has been split? What speed might an atomic rocket attain in interstellar space? Such questions become dwarfed by the basic problem of how to keep aircraft from destroying the civilization which creates them.

There is little satisfaction in spending one's life developing machines which are likely to bring ruin to one's own people. Our minds are harassed by the damage that has already been done; by the realization that western man has not justified his trust; that he has misused his inheritance from the early pioneers.

The ghost of Lilienthal must glide uneasily over German cities. The devastation that the Nazis brought to Europe, carried on the wings he loved, is a warning to us all. The developments of science, improperly guided, can result in more evil than they bring good. What peaceful men take a thousand years to build, fools can now destroy in fewer seconds. Experience has shown that we cannot depend on political specialists to turn the inventions of science to the benefit of mankind. We can no longer blind ourselves to the future uses of aircraft while we concentrate on their mechanical perfection. It has become more important to control our products than to produce them.

ATOMIC ERA REVOLUTIONARY

Let us survey our present position. It is obvious that all of our ideas must be reconsidered in the revolutionary light of an atomic era. This applies especially to aviation since it provides the carrier for the latest and most deadly of all man's weapons. We know that one airplane, carrying one atomic bomb, can wipe out a city. We know that transoceanic rockets, using fuels already developed, can be built in the near future. The cost of a transoceanic rocket carrying an atomic bomb would be a small fraction of the value of a city. The oceans, therefore, which proved effective barriers to bombing aircraft of World War II, will not protect this country from atomic rockets of World War III, if such a war begins.

In the past, we have developed methods of defense against attacking aircraft. The fighter and the proximity fused antiaircraft projectile have made the sky a dangerous place for bombers. The guided missile may rid it entirely of military aircraft of our present types. But against rockets carrying atomic bombs, traveling faster than a cannon's shell, we see no adequate defense. Counterattack might win an atomic war; but it could not replace our cities or bring back our dead.

Life would be intolerable here in America if we knew that an irresponsible foreign government could, without warning, send an atomic rocket hurtling toward every city in our country. If we permit the world to continue uncontrolled, an enemy could have such rockets aimed at our vital areas waiting only for the pressure of a button to send them off. Then, our institutions, our homes, our families, would be at the mercy of some fanatic's finger thousands of miles away. It would be like living with a rifle pointed always at your head. And it would be only a matter of time before the trigger would be pulled, for where man has had power at his fingertips, sooner or later he has found causes for its trial. From primeval club to atomic bomb, he never invented a weapon so terrible that he failed to use it in war.

If we are able to prevent the misuse of power based on aircraft and atomic energy in the future, that will mark a greater epoch in human relationships than their invention marked in science. Yet, if we fail, the penalty is staggering. We can succeed only by organizing all nations toward this end. For we must face the fact that aircraft and the atomic bomb have brought us to a time when we will either live in an organized world or in constant insecurity.

WORLD ORGANIZATION NECESSARY

To me, it is no longer a question of whether or not we should have world organization, but of what form it should take. Now that such an organization is in its infancy—now is the time to consider seriously its implications. Too few people stop to realize that a world organization may vary between the arbitrary power of a Roman state and government based on the complete equality of man.

I do not believe it would be wise, even if it were possible, for this country to dominate the world by force. Certainly such a policy would be contrary to the ideals we have held. On the other hand, it is obvious that a world state based on the complete equality of man would be controlled by the nations of largest population. In such a state, our country would have less than half the influence of either India or China. We would have less influence than Russia. There is not much indication, either in our wars or our peace conferences, that the nations which have controlled on the basis of ability are willing to turn over their leadership to the nations which would control on the basis of counting heads. That would be contrary to the record of our forefathers and to the history of human progress.

Whatever compromise is made between these extremes of Roman state and mass control, it must contain an element of power to be effective—power to prevent the preparation for an atomic war, power which cannot be blocked by the veto of any single nation. Power—because experience has shown only too clearly that we cannot depend on promises alone. In this age of split seconds and splitting atoms, a world organization must have immediate and overwhelming strength at its disposal. To disarm too quickly, to fail to maintain the quality of our weapons, to underestimate the revolutionary changes the atomic age has brought, would be fatal. A successful military movement must prevent rather than win an atomic war, for one can hardly call a victory in war successful when it is won at the price of a destroyed civilization.

POWER TO BE FEARED

I have advocated tonight a world organization backed by military power, an organization led by the western peoples who developed modern science with its aviation and its atomic bomb. But I must confess to you that I am fearful of the use of power. I plead for strong military forces only because I believe the alternative is worse. We have seen what happens to a people too weak to maintain its rights. We need only think of France in 1940, of Poland, of the Baltic countries, of the Mayan civilization here in America, Hindu in India, the late Roman. Power is essential to survival; it is essential to freedom; it is essential even to justice.

But power alone has limited life. History is full of its misuse. There is no better example than Nazi Germany. Power without a moral force to guide it, invariably ends in the destruction of the people who wield it. Power, to be ultimately successful, must be backed by morality; just as morality must be backed by power. A world organization, to have permanent influence, must wield a power that is guided not by the desire for revenge, not by the intent to exploit or enslave, but by the qualities represented in Christian ideals. To those who say that such ideals are impractical, let us point out the failure of the Hitlerian regime. The philosophy of Christ may have been too intangible for the Nazi Government to understand, but the rubble of Berlin is a sufficiently tangible result of their failure.

CHRISTIAN IDEALS MUST SUPPLEMENT POWER

Can we learn from that failure? I believe we can maintain the necessary power. But can we do what no people has ever done before; can we pass the test of the Christian code? That requires integrity, humility, and compassion that are lacking all over this postwar world. One finds no trace of these qualities in the complacency with which we greeted the inverted hanging of Mussolini's body. There is little indication of them in the court trials of our conquered enemies. There is an appalling lack of them in our attitude toward the famine-stricken peoples we have defeated. But without these qualities, there can be no security, as the Germans learned. Without them, we simply sow the wind with our aircraft and our bombs.

Christian ideals may in one sense seem a far cry from the subject of aviation on which you invited me to speak. But in a deeper sense, they affect every industry and every action. They cannot be left alone to church and clergy. They must live in the philosophy of a nation, in the policies of a world organization, in the use of science and its great inventions.

We in America already have the most powerful Air Force in the world. We have the greatest Navy and the best equipped Army. We have demonstrated that we can outbuild any other nation. We have the atomic bomb. We are a Christian people. The ideals we profess are high. We have all the necessary elements to lead the world through this period of crisis. But can we combine these elements in our daily policies and lives? Whether our western civilization is facing new heights of human accomplishment or whether it is doomed to extinction depends not as much on technical progress as on the answer we make to this question.

The FEPC—A Fair Label on an Unfair Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 7, 1946

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address which I delivered last evening over the facilities of the American Broadcasting Co., Station WMAL, in Washington, D. C., on the subject The FEPC—A Fair Label on an Unfair Bill.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The so-called fair-employment-practice bill bears an attractive label. The American people believe in fairness in all things. The

mere fact that the bill is called a fair bill has caused thousands of people to support it with no knowledge of its far-reaching consequences and its effect upon American business and the American people. The attractive name caught even some Members of Congress and caused them to commit themselves to the measure before understanding its details. The measure has been highly propagandized in emotional appeals. Its details have not been discussed in this propaganda campaign.

Let me say at the outset that despite the efforts to create prejudice by making a sectional issue of the bill, it is not a sectional measure. It will affect every American citizen in his daily life, wherever he may live.

Those of us who are fighting this bill believe that it is misnamed. We insist it is neither fair nor does it provide any employment except for a vast army of new Federal employees to police American business and American agriculture. We contend that instead of preventing discrimination it will bring about discrimination in hiring and firing. We insist that the bill invades and strikes down rights of the individual American citizen always considered sacred.

What does the bill do? It proposes to create a new Federal commission with agents and examiners to police the one and a half million businesses in this country, as well as all farms, where more than six people are employed. These agents will be supposed to see that the employer does not follow any practice, in either employing, promoting, or discharging his employees, which has been declared by the Board to be discriminatory, against any person on account of his race, creed, color, or national ancestry. Any person who contends that he has been denied employment or refused a promotion within a business because of such discrimination can file a complaint against the owner of the business or farm. Thereupon a representative of the Board brings the employer before him for a trial. The ordinary rules of law do not apply The man charged with discrimination is denied the right to be tried by a jury in his home community. He may be tried at any place the Board through its examiner determines. A businessman living in Phoenix, Ariz., can be tried in Detroit, Mich. He is not assured the right of cross-examining the witnesses or even seeing the witnesses against him. The agent of the Board is the prosecuting attorney, the judge, and the jury, and need not observe any rules of evidence. If he finds the accused person guilty of unfair practices, as he is almost certain to do if he files the case, the accused has no right of appeal which would enable him to have a jury trial. His only recourse is to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, which may be hundreds of miles from his home and place of business. This court by the terms of the law is powerless to help him if there is any evidence whatever against the accused. To all practical purposes, the employer is denied a fair hearing anywhere along the line, and this upon a charge as nebulous as that he has discriminated against an individual on account of his race, color, creed, or national origin.

Free American business, industry, and agriculture, which have made this country the greatest and richest Nation of the earth, cannot long endure if some superbureaucracy of the Federal Government has the power to determine all employment policies. Think of a Federal agency having the power to tell a businessman whom he shall promote to a position of trust and responsibility. The bill, by its express powers, will nationalize all jobs in this country. American business, whether in the mine, the shop, the store, or on the farm, cannot maintain itself and go forward if the owner does not have free choice in the selection and promotion of his employees.

It is not strange that every Communist and every Socialist in this country who believes in Government ownership of all business and property are supporting this bill, for its passage is sure to eventuate in the destruction of all rights of private property. The bill has no safeguards for individual rights or property rights. One of its provisions allows the agents of this Commission to examine or copy all the books, records, and private documents of the million and a half businesses and the thousands of farmers brought under its jurisdiction. Any resistance on the part of the owner to this invasion of what has long been considered the constitutional right to be free from search or seizure without a warrant is punishable by a fine of not more than $5,000 or a year's jail sentence, or both.

I repeat, the bill does not create one single job, except the political jobs of the army of agents, employees, and examiners of the Commission, who will be supported by your tax money. Its passage is sure to lessen opportunities for employment. What incentive does a businessman have for creating new jobs and employment opportunities if he has no right to say who will fill them?

So much for the bill's invasion of the rights of owners of business. Let us now examine for a moment the discrimination against the rights of the ordinary, every day, average working American who cannot identify himself with one of the minority groups who may claim discrimination on account of race, creed, color, or national origin. I do not think I am particularly prejudiced against aliens, but I am old-fashioned enough to believe that American citizens should at least be accorded equal rights with aliens. Under the terms of the bill, any alien in this country, or any immigrant who may be brought to our shores would have the right to prosecute an employer before this kangaroo court if he claimed he had been discriminated against in hiring, firing, or promotions. It is very evident that the average American who does not belong to one of the minority groups could not claim that he had been discriminated against because of his race, creed, color, or national origin.

Suppose two men, one an alien recently admitted to this country and the other a garden-variety American citizen, were to apply for the same job. The alien could subject the employer to great expense, including back pay to the alien, much loss of time, and the cost of fighting the proceedings before the examiner, with the possibility of the employer winding up in jail if he denies employment to the alien. The average American does not have the same recourse. This naturally will result in a rank discrimination against the rights of the American to the job. It is bound to result in discrimination in favor of aliens and other minority groups who can cause the employer all of this trouble and expense.

Let us consider the case of a plant or business employing 40 men. Let us assume that 10 of the employees are aliens, or can identify themselves with the minority groups that the bill is designed to help. If this employer has to lay off 8 men, would he be likely to select any one of the group who could take him into this unfair court and cause him such great expense and severe punishment? The natural thing for him to do would be to lay off 8 of the average Americans, who could not sustain a claim of discrimination on account of race, creed, or color, even if they were better workmen than the minority-group members.

If this bill ever becomes a law, it will be a lasting handicap to the average American citizens in the competition for jobs and promotions. It will make more unfairness and discrimination than it can possibly cure. It will bring confusion and prejudice instead of order and harmony among our people.

Time will not permit me to discuss all the unfair provisions of the bill. It claims to promote fairness, but it does not address itself to the two greatest discriminations in employment that this country knows. I refer to discrimination on account of sex and age. It affords no protection to any woman or any person past 40 who might be applying for a job unless such woman or individual can identify themselves with a minority group.

Neither have I time to explain how this proposed law is communistic in theory and concept, and its full impact upon constitutional rights. The powers proposed to be granted could be used to absolutely destroy labor unions, all of whom are subject to its jurisdiction. As a permanent proposition, this proposed law cannot benefit anyone except those who wish to have us adopt a totalitarian system which will make the individual the slave of the state. Under the false guise of fairness, it will play into the hands of those who wish to stir up confusion and strife in our country. If passed, this bill will do violence to the rights of the individual American citizen and to the American way of life under which our land has prospered and grown great.

I know that some of the proponents of this bill are sincere. I say to them that they cannot help a minority group in this country by a law like this, which will impair if not destroy, the rights of the individual American citizens of both minority and majority. I say to them that they cannot abolish prejudice and discrimination by creating a vast Federal bureaucracy to enforce measures which generate prejudice and discrimination against other American citizens.

If this bill be passed in the name of fairness to minorities, it will perpetrate a great injustice on the majority of the American people. The nationalization of jobs and the creation of such a superbureaucracy would be a long step toward destroying the American system and extinguishing the American way of life.

Germany Is Our Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 7 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from Human Events entitled "Germany Is Our Problem," by Karl Brandt. I am informed by the Public Printer that the cost of printing the article will be $156.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GERMANY IS OUR PROBLEM

(By Dr. Karl Brandt)

American arms have won the greatest victory in history. Yet this is only the beginning. The real test, a far greater and more intricate task, is now upon us—the building of a durable peace.

As we search for principles to guide our actions, we must ask ourselves this question: What is the intelligently interpreted self-interest of the American people in the post-war world, and how can we shape our foreign policy wisely to serve that self-interest? That question we will have to answer dispassionately with a cool head, and with a brave, warm heart.

To begin with, nations need a certain area for their existence, and most wars have been fought, at least in part, with the aim of changing the boundaries on the political

map. What, then, has this war done so far to the map of Europe?

In the Atlantic Charter, the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain solemnly proclaimed that their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other, and that they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned. They also pledged themselves to further the enjoyment by all states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world, which are needed for their economic prosperity. These principles were later subscribed to by all members of the United Nations.

At Potsdam, last July, it was agreed by the Big Three that the German territory east of the Oder and the Neisse Rivers should tentatively be transferred to Polish administration. Irrespective of the temporary administrative arrangement, the Polish Provisional Government, with the consent of the Soviet Union, has proceeded to evict the indigenous German population. The Potsdam Declaration contained the statement that any transfers of population that take place should be effected in an orderly and humane manner, and requested the Czechoslovak and Polish provisional governments to suspend expulsions until further examination. Yet there are few Germans left on German soil annexed by Poland, and Germany has been shriveled by fait accompli, not only without plebiscite, but by unilateral action.

Some highly placed officials in Washington, who are frankly unhappy about Potsdam, excuse the state of affairs with the observation that there were a solid 15,000,000 Russian soldiers to endorse and execute every and any territorial change their government wanted. I accept this as a realistic statement of fact.

Quite apart from the moral issue, however, this transfer of people and territories has far-reaching economic and social consequences.

In the German area east of the Oder and Neisse lived 9,000,000 people of German culture tongue, and ancestry while in Czechoslovakia there were 3,000,000 Sudeten Germans. This total of 12,000,000 people have now been deprived of all their property in land buildings, and goods, prior to deportation into truncated Germany. The Potsdam agreement further provides that Germany should be stripped of her industrial war potential.

Potsdam will serve American interests only if it lays the foundation for a better balanced economy and for better international relations among the nations of Europe, and thereby eliminates the inner pressures and tensions which generate war. The security of the United States cannot be built on the simple recipe of "squeezing Germany until the pips squeak," as was said after the last war. Germany has been, and may become again, an important item in the ledger of our foreign relations. The security of the United States depends upon the security of the British Isles. The security of the British Isles in turn depends upon the economic and political conditions of Western and Central Europe. Because of this interrelationship we shall soon be forced to realize that the treatment of Germany concerns every one of us, wholly apart from humanitarian aspects of the problem.

Before the war Germany was never able to produce more than 80 percent of her food. The other 20 percent had to be imported either directly or in the form of feed and fertilizer. The German diet was then in its composition far below the average American fare. The situation after Potsdam, with the loss of the best food surplus areas, leaves Germany with a production of less than 50 percent of food requirements. That country must import a vast amount of food even if its people are confined to a diet of bread, turnips, and potatoes.

The basic arithmetic for this conclusion is simple. The area east of the Oder and Neisse fed its own 9,000,000 inhabitants and supplied all the food for an additional 8,000,000 Germans in the western part of the country. It produced 25 percent of the nation's food supply. Since 12,000,000 evicted Germans from east of the Oder and Neisse and people of German ancestry from Czechoslovakia and Hungary are now forced into what is left of the Reich, and since food surpluses from these areas are lost, an additional food deficit for 20,000,000 Germans is created. Henceforth every second Germany must be fed by imports.

This calculation, moreover, is based on the optimistic assumption that German agriculture can maintain the high yields per acre of prewar years. But the Potsdam Declaration provides for further dismantling and destruction of many basic industrial plants, among them agricultural machinery and fertilizer factories. With next to no fertilizer and no gasoline for tractors, with very few spare parts or new farm implements available, crop yields will be far below what they were. At present, the German population in cities and industrial areas like the Ruhr has already lost heavily in weight. This is the first stage of starvation.

On top of this catastrophic situation, the Russians have dealt a severe blow to the remaining food supply by distributing the land of large estates among farm laborers without any proper preparation. The result is approximately what would take place here if all our highly efficient farms in the Middle West were turned over to the man-and-a-mule sharecroppers of Alabama. The large German estates were the most efficient agricultural producers and the chief food suppliers of the cities. They are no more. Nearly all lie in the Russian zone. All have been stripped of the 140,000 tractors they once owned, and many of the hundreds of thousands of electric motors and horses too are gone.

Unless we are willing to see the Germans die like flies, we shall have to ship seven or eight million tons of wheat to them this winter plus as much in the way of fats as we can spare. We cannot close our eyes to the fact that these people and their country exist, that they believe they have a right to live, and some claim on the future. Nor can we afford to base our policy on the rash conclusion that because Hitler's regime started this war of annihilation, and because the German people are at our mercy today, we have plein pouvoir to do with them as we please.

It might be well to remind the apostles of hate, and the advocates of the planned extinction of the German people, of what President Roosevelt thought about this matter. In a letter to Secretary of War Stimson he wrote: "It is of utmost importance that every person in Germany should realize that this time Germany is a defeated nation. I do not want them to starve to death, but, as an example, if they need food to keep body and soul beyond what they have, they should be fed three times a day with soup from Army soup kitchens. That will keep them perfectly healthy, and they will remember that experience all their lives."[1]

In order to break the power of the German Army, we had to destroy the German railroads and other forms of transportation. But in destroying communications we have isolated the German coal mines, which fed the industries of half of Europe and kept the homes of 150,000,000 Europeans warm in winter. During this winter all Europe, not only Germany, will be without fuel for homes and industries simply because the German coal mines can produce only a small part of their capacity.

This is the case primarily because the railroad system has not been sufficiently restored, and to restore it one needs the restoration or maintenance of the very factories that are condemned as war potential. For instance, at the height of the aerial blitz, in February 1945, only 8 percent of Germany's locomotives were in repair shops. At the time of writing, 70 percent of the country's locomotives are incapacitated, because of the closing down of the industries which used to supply the repair shops with spare parts, tools, and materials. In the wake of the fuel shortage people in Holland, Denmark, Belgium, and France, Italy, and even Switzerland, wholly apart from people in Germany and Austria, will die of pneumonia, tuberculosis, and diseases attributable to exposure. The more you are exposed to cold, the more food you need to keep the body furnace going. The Colmer Committee report on postwar economic conditions in Europe, submitted to Congress in November, stated that the official ration of 1,550 calories per day runs in many German cities as low as 800 calories per person, which is only half the absolute subsistence minimum. With shortage of food and fuel, the weak are easy prey for bacteria which do not stop to make political distinctions. And as innocent women and children die, men resort to revolt. This winter is almost certain to bring civil disturbance and desperate guerrilla fighting in Germany.

For the sake of our own sons, who may be called on to police Europe indefinitely, we must realize that the German economy is a vital part and parcel of the fabric of Europe, which cannot be torn to pieces without continental disaster. Germany's coal mines belong to all Europeans, not just to the Germans. Since those mines cannot be moved, their produce must be allowed to move to all nations in the channels of trade. Since Germany lies in the heart of Europe, her railroads, highways, canals, and airways are also vital to the welfare of all European nations. A ruined Germany means a pauperized Europe and a poverty-stricken England, continuously calling for American financial support.

It has been argued recently that the world will not miss anything when Germany is stripped of her industries because German exports to the rest of Europe represented only 2½ percent of Europe's annual economic output. By the same logic one could assert that the world would not miss anything if all American industry were destroyed, since measured by the total world production its export is similarly small. Such statistical lunacy is like saying that nobody need fear heart failure, since the heart is only a small percentage of the weight of the human body.

The Allies have agreed to demilitarize Germany by dismantling all industries necessary to a war economy. Since there is no modern industry which cannot be converted for war, as we in America fully realize, this decision means the destruction of Germany's means of living. Without export industries, half the Germans have nothing to eat. Alternatively, the whole population is doomed to permanent semistarvation. Democracy finds no footing in that barren ground.

It is America's obligation to her own future to rehabilitate Germany before it is too late to salvage peace in Europe. A few months' delay in intelligent action may prove to be one of the greatest blunders in foreign policy that any nation has ever made. This deep conviction is not based on any sentimental reflections about my former country or on hopes for the survival of liberal Germans who are still alive. It is founded strictly upon my belief that this course of action is in the urgent interest of the United States of America.

The chief question then is, How much leeway does the Potsdam Declaration grant us to adjust our foreign policy to the needs of our own future security?

---

[1] Quoted by Mr. Leon Henderson in The Nation, October 27, 1945.

Germany, being densely settled and possessing a very small share of the world's natural resources, needs her pre-Munich territory. As an ethnic, cultural, and political unit, the German people ought to be kept as a nation, because their separation by force will direct their best energies into frantic efforts to reunite. And so far as the preservation of peace is concerned, it is of no help to create German minorities in adjacent countries by annexation of German-inhabited areas.

Present Allied policies will foment such atrocious economic conditions as to destroy all hope of denazifying Germany.

Why did people in Germany become Nazis in the first place? Because they had suffered years of mass unemployment and depression. They wanted work and bread, not war, although they got the war later without being asked. Now, we deny them employment. This will drive them into a despair far deeper than that which they knew during the world depression of 1931 and 1932. Denazification is first of all a question of hopeful alternatives. The only sensible alternative to militant nationalism and its dictatorial paraphernalia is a decent democratic society in which the people have some opportunity for the pursuit of happiness. This holds true abroad as it does at home.

But denazification is also a psychological affair. We must bring to the fore and encourage the Germans who are most susceptible and amenable to ideas of a free society. Unfortunately, we fumble this ball too often.

After 8 months of occupation, we still keep these democratic Germans behind the barbed wire fence of a noncommunication policy. As this is written millions of American citizens like myself cannot send messages even to close relatives in Germany who were victims of the Nazi regime. Close to 30 percent of our population have German ancestry, and many Americans have friends in Germany. These Americans have served their country loyally and unstintingly, and many of their sons and brothers have given their lives. Yet these free citizens cannot so much as give moral support to the anti-Nazis in Germany, or help create confidence in America as a country that stands for liberation. It is high time that humanitarian organizations be permitted to enter Germany to administer that minimum of aid to which, here at home, we believe even the families of convicted murderers are entitled.

Germany must be denazified. The only question is how. A routine proscription of all who were party members, or the circulation of questionnaires, are pitifully inadequate methods for checking on a form of political creed and behavior. The Nazi regime was efficient because it forced into its fold the large majority of men of competence, regardless of their political convictions. Only a positive approach in reconstruction will produce equally positive results. It demands economic rehabilitation and moral reconstruction, with the aid of the best people surviving in Germany. Months after the total collapse of the Nazi regime the Allied powers are none too united in their intentions concerning Germany's future. There is a silent, yet gigantic, tug-of-war to get that prostrate, bombed-out, half-starved people into one sphere of political influence or another.

Does it make sense deliberately to demolish in the heart of Europe the most vital part of the production capital that has been created by generations of toil and sweat and thrift—this on top of what strategic bombing has wiped out? Can one really believe this policy will work no injury on all the other European countries but on the contrary will somehow make them richer? If this were true, we could argue that Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Nebraska, and Oklahoma would be better off if we would completely destroy the Pittsburgh, Cleveland, and Chicago industrial areas.

Another issue with particular psychological importance is that of the reintroduction of slavery in the age of organized labor. At the Crimea Conference the big powers agreed that, as a sort of atonement and a form of reparation, human slavery should be applied in the case of Germans. At Potsdam, this issue was too hot to be touched, but the United States Government is reported to have filed a mild protest against the mass deportation of millions of people into slavery unless the deportees are individually convicted war criminals.

The fact is, however, that in the absence of an armistice or a peace treaty, German prisoners of war can and are being used as slave labor. German prisoners by the hundreds of thousands are being employed as slave labor in France, often under conditions which have aroused the indignation of American military authorities, and of repatriated French war prisoners. But even worse, one fears, is the unknown fate of millions of German men whom we helped to deliver up to Russia.

To justify this practice by saying that the Nazis employed slave labor is actually self-condemnation. We fought the war to stop this stark atrocity, not to foster or countenance it under our own banners. Every economist knows that slaves are the most inefficient of all workers. Every American agrees that the abolition of slavery was overdue in this country more than 80 years ago. That the Nation which reveres Abraham Lincoln should have fought this last war to abet the reintroduction of human slavery will seem, to historians, almost unbelievable.

German workers should do reparation work in foreign countries on a voluntary contractual basis, as employees of the German Government.

The Potsdam decisions rest on the moral verdict that all Germans are collectively guilty. President Truman outlined this concept of collective guilt in his report to the Nation on August 9, saying: "The German people are beginning to atone for the crimes of the gangsters whom they placed in power and whom they wholeheartedly approved and obediently followed." Those who know what happened in Germany since 1932 cannot approve this verdict.

In 1932 and 1933 the German economy was one-third idle. The German political machinery was deadlocked by the feud over how to cure the depression. Hitler rose to power by trickery on 45 percent of the votes and, once in the cabinet, he and his trigger men slugged down all opposition. I have never heard anyone in this country state specifically what the average German, the man in the street, the worker, the father of a family—people with no extraordinary avenues of escape—should have done to stop Hitler's murderous gang of henchmen once they had gained absolute control.

Too many German refugees in this country, including noted poets and scientists, too smugly and too easily forget, when they condemn their former compatriots, that they themselves did little else but crawl out from the barbed-wire fence when it was lifted and when generous aid from Americans helped them to settle in this country.

It may boost our national ego and make us feel good to say: "Thank God we are not such despicable cowards as the Germans." But I have yet to discover any essential difference between American men and women, with all their great human qualities and their human fallibility, and the German people. When I came to this country, 10,000,000 Americans were unemployed, farmers rioted in Iowa and threatened to hang the auctioneer, economic despair stalked the country, and the people voted dictatorial powers to a leader who promised them employment and bread. Were these people really so different from the man in Germany who had gone through 4 years of a disastrous war, 4 years of ruinous inflation, and 4 years of catastrophic depression?

Many hundreds of thousands of Germans endured years and years of torture in concentration and extermination camps. Even though a large section of the press concealed the fact it should be remembered that the major part of the victims of Buchenwald and the other atrocity camps were Germans. For the most part, those were piles of German bodies which you saw pictured in newspapers and magazines. Literally thousands of men have been butchered like animals for plotting to assassinate Hitler. The heroism of these executed men and women has saved uncounted American lives. It is a story that has not been told yet, but once written it will make many a man and woman in this country ponder and forgive.

Five years after the reign of terror began, the Prime Minister of Great Britain and the Premier of France, armed with the immense knowledge and secret information at their disposal, forced the people of Czechoslovakia into the tyranny of the Nazi brigands and established Hitler in a position of supremacy over all of Europe.

It now appears that this final act of appeasement choked off a solid conspiracy of generals—including Franz Halder, Erwin von Witzleben, Ludwig Beck, von Brockdorf, and von Fritsch—who were ready to arrest Hitler and overthrow his regime. Of these, only Franz Halder survived the war period. The others were shot or hanged by the Gestapo for continued plotting against the Nazis. And other facts now daily come to light which reveal similar acts of courage on the part of Germans in their effort to rid Germany and the world of Adolf Hitler, suppressed by brutal reprisals against thousands and thousands of decent citizens of whom any nation might be proud.

I fully share the horror, disgust, and anger of the American public over the crimes of the Nazi regime. I know only too well, however, that these emotions, natural as they are, cannot fail to blur our vision and reason. We must not now permit emotionalism to control our judgment. Otherwise, we are well on our way to being conquered by the evil spirit of the defeated regime. Unfortunately the brutality of a cruel enemy has brutualized our own thinking, as is obvious from the language in our press, of letters to editors, and in private conversations. If we do not stem this creeping deterioration we shall be unable to establish a sane, decent order in the world of tomorrow.

Mr. Justice Jackson, in his report to the President about the prosecution of war criminals, said: "Early in the Nazi regime, people of this country came to look upon the Nazi government as not constituting a legitimate state pursuing the legitimate objectives of a member of the international community. They came to view the Nazis as a band of brigands set on subverting within Germany every vestige of a rule of law which would entitle an aggregation of people to be looked upon collectively as a member of the family of nations. Our people were outraged by the oppressions, the cruelest forms of torture, the large-scale murder, and the wholesale confiscation of property which initiated the Nazi regime in Germany. They witnessed persecution of the greatest enormity on religious, political, and racial grounds, the break-down of trade unions, and the liquidation of all religious and moral influences."

This is the best and the most authoritative refutation of the concept of collective guilt of all Germans I have read anywhere. Justice Jackson correctly states here that gunman committed a successful hold-up on a whole nation. Since when have we in America held the victim of a hold-up responsible for the crime committed against him?

As the masters of Germany's destiny we, together with our Allies, must take this shattered people back into the family of na-

tions, into a position that promises less trouble for everyone in the future. We cannot achieve that end by converting what is left of Germany into a permanent penal colony, or a concentration camp under the auspices of the United Nations. If we do that, we shall only degrade ourselves to the level of the Nazis.

Even after defeat and surrender, Germany remains geographically, economically, and socially the heart of central and western Europe, upon whom other neighbor nations depend for their lives, just as the Germans depend on their neighbors. It is naive to assume that we can abolish private property and civil liberty in Germany, and yet preserve these fundamentals of political democracy in the adjacent countries.

It is equally naive to assume that 70,000,000 technologically and socially advanced and capable people can be confined in a sort of economic ditch and yet by their poverty and slave labor lift neighbor nations to an advanced standard of living. What happens to Germany affects all of Europe, and the United States as well. Germany's coal basins and other minerals and industries belong to Europe. Her railroads and highways, rivers, canals, and airports, and all the services they render, are an integral part of the European economy, essential to trade among the European nations. A glance at the map and a mere smattering of economic geography ought to convince even a schoolboy of the inevitable unity of Europe's fate, and the cruel stupidity of any plan to revive the continent by laying waste its central part. For France, Belgium, Holland, and Great Britain, the treatment of Germany will decide whether or not Asia and Asiatic standards will move westward to the Rhine, leaving of European civilization nothing but a precarious coastal fringe.

From a military viewpoint the method of protecting the world against German aggression by depriving her of industries is almost as obsolete as would be a prohibition of the use of the bow and arrow. What sense is there in dismantling a steel plant here or there when we and the British have atom bombs which can obliterate all life in the whole Ruhr area instantaneously? Since the demolition of industries does not make practical military sense, its justification can be sought in only two arguments—one involving maximum reparations, the other calling for riddance of unwanted competition.

Reparations can be obtained as a flow of goods and services over a number of years, resulting in a maximum of good to war-damaged areas as well as constructive employment for the people of conquered Germany. Instead, advisers whose wrath got the better of their powers of reason decided to take reparations at once by dismantling factories and shipping them off. They might have recalled the fable of the goose that laid the golden eggs. Now a factory worth $5,000,000 shrinks when dismantled to a scrap value of perhaps $200,000 or less. Much of this dismantled machinery is rusting now on some side track in Poland or farther east because it doesn't pay to move it another thousand miles. Even if reassembled, it is worth only a fraction of the value of the brand-new factory which the Germans could have delivered on reparations account.

The Germans could have built new factories ready for shipment into Russia within a year or two, and could have set them up in Russia. At the Crimea Conference, the figure of $20,000,000,000 worth of reparations in kind was mentioned. But at Potsdam we abandoned definite sums and as a result there is neither any reparations account nor any limit to the destruction of the wealth of central Europe. An economy worth in productive assets probably half as much as that of the United States is quickly being turned into a gigantic junk yard. Only the atomized mosaic of the family farm economy continues to function, but with all the arteries of traffic severed and wilted. Without the purchasing power of consumers to buy their products, even these 2,000,000 family farms will deteriorate in productivity.

Generalissimo Stalin told Senator PEPPER that Germany must be stripped of the Ruhr basin. But to whom can the Ruhr go? To France? Then any reconciliation between France and Germany becomes impossible, and France becomes Britain's competitor. If France eats the Ruhr, she will soon die of it, because the dead corpse of Germany will give her carrion poison. This may or may not be in Russia's interest; it certainly cannot be in the interest of America or Great Britain. The experiment of internationalizing the Ruhr may sound fascinating. In reality it would turn out as productive of trouble as the division of Berlin into four separate zones has proved to be.

The remaining argument is that it is desirable to kill off unwanted competition. It is, strangely enough, the elder statesman Bernard Baruch's open argument and that of some British industrialists. Mr. Baruch proposes to prevent Germany and Japan from ever again exporting industrial goods in order to protect American industry against what he calls "the products of sweated labor."

If this were the case, it would be in America's interest to stop exports from Great Britain and every other United Nation as well. This whole philosophy implies that this war was the best investment ever made, because America and Great Britain are ridding themselves of the nuisance of German industrial competition. No responsible businessman in Great Britain or the United States can possibly share Mr. Baruch's philosophy without tacitly subscribing to Hitler's and Mussolini's recipes of rubbing out competitors with the lead pipe. And the argument will certainly serve to stimulate Russian suspicions, since everything that country exports is produced under dictatorial state control and, in many instances, is a "product of sweated labor."

However, neither apology for, nor criticism of, the jerry-built architectural monstrosity of Potsdam is of much help in the developing emergency. Still less helpful is the conclusion that because our efforts up to now have set a time bomb for chaos in Europe, the safest thing for us to do is to forget why we went to war, throw off the responsibilities victory has brought, and clear out. We, the greatest and most powerful democracy in the world, simply cannot write off Europe as a bad debt. We have really only one choice. We must reconsider, adjust, and reorganize our foreign policy as a going concern, from the standpoint of the best interests of the American people. We cannot return to isolation and dodge the question of Germany just because it may seem insoluble.

We must prevent famine; we must restore Germany, and give her a chance to work herself out of her present misery and to build a better future—for the sake of Europe, Great Britain, and ourselves. The responsibility for such a change in policy does not rest with officials in Washington, or with Presidential advisers alone. It rests in part with every adult citizen of the United States. We must not sit idly by and condemn the Crimea and Potsdam programs as a catastrophe on another planet. We must do our part in getting those policies—which are our policies—revised by democratic processes of government. There is a helpful suggestion in the way the boys in the Army, by their good common sense, have forced the abandonment of the unworkable and inhuman nonfraternization policy.

Indeed, if the sovereign people of this great, free, and wealthy country have no better solution to offer than wantonly to lay waste the center of Europe, to the extent that tens of millions of people are permanently unemployed and hungry, then it would be more humane and more logical to reopen the gas chambers of Belsen and Buchenwald and to blow out the lives of thirty or forty million Germans and other Europeans with lethal gas. Compared with a generation of daily torture, this would be euthanasia. If the plans to force the Germans down to a rural slum are not changed, the terrific repercussions will fall eventually on every citizen of the United States—the veterans, the workers, the housewives, the children, and those yet unborn. After the last war we lost the sense of our national interest in developments abroad. Now, at the birth of the atomic age, we are running the risk of ignoring an ever greater jeopardy that is already looming in Europe. The making of the last war began in Germany. The making of the peace can only begin as Germany is reconstructed.

The vicious circle of atrocity and retaliation and renewed revenge must be broken. Otherwise our entire civilization will end, amid the detonation of atomic bombs.

The Polish People Are Grateful for American Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1946

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an interesting letter received from a Polish recipient of some articles of clothing, contributed in the United States for overseas distribution.

The writer of this letter is one Feliks Sarosiek, of Lomza, Poland. Mr. Sarosiek found in the clothing presented to him a slip of paper bearing the name of John N. Mushevic, of Greenfield, Mass., who was presumably the donor in the United States.

This letter is a translation from the Polish language, and it was sent to the UNRRA offices here in Washington. The letter shows a deep and sincere appreciation to the American people for these much-needed gifts. It also describes the terrible devastation, hardship, and misery that these poor people have undergone during the 6 years of war and German occupation.

Let us urge and hope that the various relief campaigns that are under way in this country for the collection of food and clothing for the miserable and destitute people of Europe will receive the full support of every American. The kindness and assistance that we give now to these poor and unfortunate people will be repaid a thousandfold in friendship, love, and respect for Americans by the people of the world for many years to come. It is our best insurance for respect and honor among the suffering people of the world, and that our future position of leadership in the family of nations will be upheld and supported by them.

The letter follows:

LOMZA, *November 24, 1945.*

On the 20th November, just on the date of my namesday, I and my family received some clothes originating from UNRRA gifts. In the coat which was presented to me, I

found a slip of paper with the following address: John N. Mushevic, 356 Deerfield Street, Greenfield, Mass., USA.

As far as I can guess, the mentioned slip of paper has been put into the pocket by the kind donor to whom I wish to convey my heartiest thanks.

The gifts collected and donated to the Poles by the noble American people represent for us an invaluable help, especially with the advent of winter. The terrible devastations caused by the war deprived us of everything. Our town where we live is situated northeast of Warsaw on the river Narew. Before the war its population numbered about 35,000 inhabitants. It was a tidy and well-organized town. There were many schools, five churches, and a few industrial establishments. Today masonry and wreckage, here and there—like lonesome trees after a storm, stand shattered, gloomy houses. In fire-gutted interiors live people still terrified by the past horrors. Tremendous financial losses and still larger losses in people. There is no home, no family who should not suffer a loss of at least one member of the family. The war hasn't spared me either. The house in which I lived was bombed in 1939 on the second day of the war. Then I had gestapo on my heels and finally was arrested with my 18-year-old son. We were in prison and in concentration camp during 18 months. My second son, 15 years old has been killed by the Germans in guerrilla warfare. My wife and daughter were obliged to live in concealment for fear of the Germans and wandered from place to place. I am a fire-brigade specialist. I am working now at the reconstruction of the fire-brigade teams. My children had no chance to learn all during the war. Now they will start their school again.

Giving the above short description of my present situation, I wish to thank you on my own behalf and also on behalf of those other citizens of our town who received UNRRA gifts. I should also like to express our thanks to all of your acquaintances who contributed to the organization of UNRRA help. If you are interested in any other details, I should be ever so glad to supply them to you.

FELIKS SAROSIEK.

Our Taxpayer's Interest in the British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me over the radio program Congressional Record of the Air, Monday, February 4, 1946:

If the negotiators in the Anglo-American conference to arrange for a loan to Britain thought that the Members of Congress will swallow any pill handed to them in the form of an agreement they must, by now, be having a second thought.

The agreement is the first final termination of a lend-lease account. In all we gave the British Commonwealth $29,000,000,000 of lend-lease, receiving back from the United Kingdom slightly more than four billion. Thus the bulk of lend-lease is written off.

A line of credit of $3,750,000,000 will be available to Great Britain to be drawn upon until December 31, 1951. Great Britain then pays interest and principal on such part of the credit as it is used. Interest is at 2 percent over the 50-year repayment period, which starts 5 years after the ratification of the agreement, so that the effective rate on the entire sum over the 55-year period would be about 1.62 percent. Not so incidentally, when a GI borrows he must pay 4 percent.

The United States then lends to the British an additional sum of between $650,000,000 and $700,000,000 to be used by Britain in final settlement of lend-lease balances. This sum is to be repaid on the same basis as the line of credit, so that the total credit made available comes close to $4,400,000,000.

The agreement is so full of escape clauses, weasel words, and abracadabra as to permit Great Britain to do anything she pleases after she receives the money. The promises to pay are loaded with ambiguities. The qualifications practically nullify the apparent pledges. The double talk is bound to lead to misunderstandings, charges of bad faith, and as they were the last time, Anglo-American relations will be poisoned again.

Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate cannot be persuaded to forget Great Britain's well-known default the last time. Once bitten, they are twice shy. They cannot forget the irritations created and the name calling, such as Uncle Shylock. The British press has already begun sniping. Because the loan was not an outright grant in aid or a loan without interest, Mr. Churchill testily stated, "As it is, we seem to have the worst of it both ways." He even refrained from voting in the House of Commons.

Yet we in the United States, examining the terms, find it would take a Sabbath day's journey to go through the waiver of interest clauses to determine their exact meaning. We will have to pay more than 1.62 percent to raise the money for the loan—pay it to the American taxpayer. Even if Britain pays its obligations entirely, it will cost us an additional $2,000,000,000 to service the loan. I point this out to emphasize to Sir John Anderson, former Chancelor of the Exchequer, that it is not quite so "hard a bargain," as he termed it. I remind Sir John that the clauses providing for waiver of interest payments are wide enough to permit a B–29 to fly through without touching the sides.

Furthermore, it is not generally known that England borrowed in 1941 from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the sum of $425,000,000. There has been disbursed three hundred and ninety millions, leaving a balance upon which she can draw of $253,265,000. We hear little about that. She gave security to the RFC, and at the present moment there are about eight hundred and ninety-five millions worth of securities held by RFC. Over and beyond that, Britain has huge free and clear assets in the United States which include $2,500,000,000 in negotiable securities and investments, a total of over three and a half billions. Why did she not propose that these assets be used to secure the contemplated loan?

Question. Do you see, Mr. CELLER, any relation between this loan and England's foreign policy?

Answer. I certainly do. This loan will be used to support not only the British at home but British imperialism abroad. There is no concrete limitation whatsoever on the use of any of our lend-lease war materials. Our Thunderbolts, our tanks, and our machine guns were used to maim and strafe innocent cititzens in Dutch Indonesia, in French Indochina, and supposedly independent Siam. That lend-lease material can still be placed by British in the hands of Indian and Japanese troops in subduing independence movements in colonial areas, despite the pledges of the Labor Party to encourage self-determination of subject peoples.

The moneys can be used to enable Britain to continue to tear-gas and V-bomb her way into Palestine villages and settlements, there, again, to kill innocent men, women, and children. The moneys can be used to support General Montgomery's cruel refusal to permit Jews fleeing new Polish pogroms to enter the British zone of occupation. I have great admiration for General Montgomery, but he is acting under Britain's callous orders. If the Jews attempt to cross the borders, they are met with guns and bullets. They want to go home to Palestine, but, again, a colonial policy supported by lend-lease guns seals the borders of Palestine against refugees.

Question. It has been stated that this loan will help do away with the trade barriers Great Britain has drawn around the sterling countries. Do you agree with that, Congressman?

Answer. I do not. There is no definite clear-cut agreement in this Anglo-American loan proposal that Great Britain will dissipate the very irritating sterling area bloc pool which so blatantly discriminates against American trade and American traders. We cannot freely trade with India, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Egypt, and other countries in the Levant. What dollars they possessed for the purchase of American goods has been converted into pounds by England and then frozen. The result is when these buyers want to buy American goods to be paid for with their own American dollars, they cannot do so. They can only buy where and in what quantities England permits them to buy.

Moreover, the imperial trade preferences are not even mentioned in the Anglo-American pact. This system, likewise, has a very deleterious effect on American trade and traders because within the British Dominions there is a tariff preference given one to the other, which preferences are denied to American exporters.

I'd like to ask the question now, if you'll let me. Shall we, with four and a half billions, bolster up British imperialism and British economic domination? That's a peculiar kind of way to endorse the Atlantic Charter.

Question. Has Britain asked any of her creditors to scale down her indebtedness to them?

Answer. We have no knowledge of Britain having asked her creditor countries to scale down the debt. I know if she asked India, whom she owes about $5,000,000,000, the people of India would do so gladly but in turn would demand political independence. England will not swallow such a condition. I know that many will be just as surprised as I am to learn that Greece, for example, has obtained a loan of forty-five million from Britain and that presently a Czechoslovakian mission is arranging for a loan from Britain in the announced sum of 25,000,000 gold pounds. If England is stone broke, how can she make these loans to Czechoslovakia and to Greece unless the money we turn over to her is so used? It appears, does it not, that Great Britain intends to get all the gravy and all the good will by making favorable trade treaties with Czechoslovakia and Greece at our expense and with our money.

Question. Now that the agreement is coming close to the time when it will be considered by Congress, do you know how some in Britain view it?

Answer. Well, for instance, Leopold S. Amery, former Secretary of State for India, said only the other day in addressing the Birmingham and Midland Institute of Export, "The way down which America is trying to drive us is the way to ruin." Such loan, he commented, is "national" suicide. If many in England talk that way and we in America talk about the disadvantages of the loan to the United States, I can't see how such an arrangement can lead to peaceful relations between the two countries.

Question. How about the other countries that will follow suit in asking for a loan?

Answer. That's it, exactly, Billy. France has sent a mission over here to make prepara-

tions for the asking of a loan. Russia will want money. So will China, to mention but a few. It seems to me that we ought to take stock of our ability to finance all these countries who are clamoring for loans. It certainly would not make for stable international relations to lend money to one country and not to another. Are our resources inexhaustible? Ought we not ask how much of a burden our taxpayers can carry once we start on the course of lending.

The debt will be like a millstone around our own necks. It will cause no end of friction and trouble. We shall be the wiser in the end, but also the loser. The wisdom will come too late.

The Citizen and Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 7 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Citizen and Foreign Policy," delivered by my distinguished predecessor, Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., before the Foreign Policy Association, at Minneapolis, Minn., on February 4, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a privilege to come before you today, and, for the first time in more than 2 years, to have the opportunity of expressing my inner convictions on some of the problems confronting our country and the world. A lifetime of study and travel, both as a journalist and as a public official, to which was recently added military service in Africa, Italy, France, and Germany, form the background of these remarks.

Our greatest, most overshadowing preoccupation as a people today centers in our relations with the rest of the world, that is to say, our foreign policy. We feel comparatively sure of ourselves when it comes to the waging of war, to the problems of peacetime production or to the decisions of domestic politics. But foreign policy is different. If it is undoubtedly often an enigma to those who are engaged in conducting it, it must to the ordinary man be still more confusing. He must learn to distinguish between facts, which are infrequent; political opinions, which are commonplace; and gossip, which is going on all the time.

It will clear the air to some extent if we automatically distrust all partisan political statements on foreign policy. Such statements have no place in the foreign field and it is reprehensible to seek to derive political advantage from foreign problems. Indeed, in the larger sense, there is often only one possible American policy; the question arises as to how skillfully it is handled by our officials and as to how clearly it is understood and hence supported by the American public.

Foreign policy also lends itself admirably to gossip. So much of the conduct of foreign relations must necessarily be secret. It may be only human for a diplomat to want to conceal his failures; but he is also unable to advertise all his triumphs, lest in so doing he start a reaction which may prevent triumphs in the future. Speaking of gossip and its harmful effect, it may be pertinent to recall that in 1943 a committee of five Senators which had flown around the world visiting the war theaters was asked to address the Senate in what was officially called a secret session. At that meeting I stated the obvious truth that Russian help in our war against Japan, at the proper time, would be of enormous value to us—endeavoring, of course, to make it clear that Russia then had her hands full fighting the Germans and that nothing should be done to hamper her in the war against the Nazis. A few hours later someone at the secret session had leaked to the press and had leaked inaccurately, saying that I had spoken critically of Russia for not fighting Japan at the same time that she was fighting with her back to the wall against Germany.

This is one example of the unreliability of gossip. It behooves us all, whether we be public officials or private citizens, not to believe every passing rumor and to speak with a far greater restraint and care about foreign policy than we are accustomed to speak about our own home politics. Moreover, while it is our traditional right, as freemen, to criticize our public officials, let us here today rather stress the duty incumbent on the citizen in a democracy to act in a serious and responsible manner, free from blind prejudice, in considering our foreign affairs.

Let us here today also stress the fact that we must cease to be greenhorns. We must not treat foreign policy as something apart from our daily lives. Our economic policies, for example, can determine the whole course of foreign relations. The biggest fact about American foreign policy today is that American soldiers all over the world are demonstrating against further service abroad. Actions speak louder than words.

The international war has stopped, but peace has not returned to the earth. The Old World is filled with people who are miserably clad, whose faces are drawn and pinched by hunger, and who live without proper shelter. Years of torture and cruelty have brought tragedy—and hate—into the souls of millions. There is widespread social unrest; the elaborate prewar system for the distribution of the necessities of life has broken down. While international war has stopped, there are civil disturbances in different parts of the earth, the consequences of which are just as deadly for those who get engulfed in them—and which are regarded by many as making a mockery of the principles of the Atlantic Charter and of the four freedoms. The white crosses in numerous cemeteries in foreign lands bear mute witness to the sacrifices which the United States has made. And our own land, so physically untouched by war, can be the object of universal hatred unless we are wise, farsighted and humane. The United Nations Organization, set up to prevent international war, has not yet had a chance to prove its worth. And the advent of atomic energy—the secret of which will soon be known to all nations—makes one feel that we have but a brief period of grace, that the sands are running out and that consequently the future must evoke from every one of us the best that is in us of intelligence, forbearance, farsightedness, and faith.

But alarming as the outlook is, this is no time for despondency or fatalism. We must take stock of our assets as well as of our liabilities. It is, for example, encouraging to realize that we have learned valuable lessons from the mistakes of the last peace. In contrast with the last postwar era, we are at least seeking to maintain the alliance which won the victory. We have separated the building of peace machinery from the detailed execution of specific peace terms, thus avoiding one of the principal reefs on which the last peace treaty foundered. Moreover, we have had among the American people a far greater unanimity on foreign policy than existed after the last war, although possible lines of cleavage are easy to see. Modern science, by largely destroying the advantage which geography conferred on us has convinced the average American that he cannot, no matter how much he might like to, let the rest of the world "stew in its own juice." The ideal of a provincial nation of simple humble people, far from the beaten track, whose forbears came to this country to escape the tyrannies of the Old World, has given way to the realization that we have become the world's greatest power and that, even if we elected to do nothing whatever, we would be inextricably involved in everything consequential that takes place in the world. Another asset is our enormous industrial and military might—if we can keep it—a decisive force in the war just ended and a potential force for good in the days ahead. Nor need we be too despondent because the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms" are not in effect all over the world today. In spite of this fact, the victory was well worth winning. After all, our soil is not occupied by the Germans or Japanese. Both nazism and Japanese imperialism, with the threat which they symbolized to lovers of freedom and to civilized society, have been destroyed. To this extent and in this way the war completely achieved its purpose. Finally, while it is true that the United Nations Organization is still in its infancy, there is cause for great encouragement in the fact that at least we have got an international organization and that the recent meeting at Moscow showed what Secretary Byrnes called such a friendly spirit as to justify some real hope for its growth.

With these broad considerations in mind what can we say more specifically about the immediate outlook? One does not have to look far. Overshadowing the entire international scene is one subject—the atomic bomb. Overshadowing all international relations are our relations with Russia.

Insofar as the atomic bomb is concerned, we can at the moment but hope that the unanimous vote of the United Nations Assembly creating a commission to consider problems arising from the discovery of atomic energy will lead to effective international inspection of atomic bomb production facilities and effective international control of this weapon. We must hope for such control under the auspices of the United Nations Organization. In devising such a control our minds must be bold and unhampered by precedent or old legalisms. We may well remember that a man whose home town has been hit by an atomic bomb has very little sovereignty left. The true object of government is the welfare of the citizens and not the preservation of any particular system, outdated or otherwise. Lincoln said: "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves."

The bomb not only proves the need for effective international action; it also proves the need—if proof were necessary—for a strong America, strong in its productive power, strong in its faith in its institutions, and consequently strong in its military might. It is hard to follow those who see an inconsistency—not to say disloyalty—in one who fervently desires to promote international collaboration and at the same time wants a strong Army, Navy, and Air Force. After all, it is well to have two strings to your bow—although this is not the primary reason for keeping America strong. A prime reason is that our military might is an essential prerequisite to an effective foreign policy. Let us hope that we have learned one bitter lesson from the past, which is that your foreign policy is only as effective as the strength in readiness behind it. Words and resolutions, threats and bluffs, are of little avail when international relations get strained. While excessive armaments have been a cause of war in certain places, the

United States has never once been involved in war because we were too well prepared. The contrary has more often been the case. As General Eisenhower said, our fighting forces "have but a single mission—to discourage or to repel aggression."

And the future will be worse. It is estimated that we will have 30 minutes' warning of the approach of hostile bomb-laden aircraft or missiles. We will no longer have a year or two in which to get ready. The next time we will be the first country to be struck; not the last. Our entire salvation, therefore, may depend on being immediately ready. Marshal Foch is said to have remarked: "For a Nation to be respected, it must be worthy of respect. Victory doesn't last very long."

There are those who oppose military preparedness who ask, "Whom are you going to fight?" There are many answers to this question. One answer is to ask the question: "Who are the criminals against whom you maintain your police force?" No one knows who they are or who they may be 10 years hence; but we do know that we need a police force. Indeed the mere existence of such a force may prevent certain criminals from ever developing. It is also worth noting that in 1919 and 1920 exactly this same question was asked whenever national defense legislation was under consideration. And in 1919 we had just finished a war in which two of our allies were Italy and Japan.

We not only want a strong America—we want a kind and a generous America. Whoever has been in Europe recently knows the stark and tragic prospect ahead. He has probably seen old people and small children lining up in mud-soaked fields with tin cans in their hands in which to catch the leftovers of the American soldiers' meals. Common humanity demands that we help these miserable people. Those who are not moved by the humanitarian appeal should realize that America treads a dangerous and a lonely path as the only well-fed Nation in a starving world—and that the terrible epidemic diseases resulting from undernourishment are no respecters of frontiers.

Our spending abroad must not only be done humanely, but with efficiency and good judgment. Improper use of such supplies cannot be condoned. Foolish and wasteful expenditures abroad arouse justifiable resentment. The question of economic loans, as distinct from relief, should be decided on a broad and farsighted basis. We must always satisfy ourselves of the probability that the terms of these loans will be complied with. To set up requirements which will not be complied with leads inevitably to bad feeling and therefore defeats one of the major purposes of the loan. Let the terms therefore correspond with the facts and the probabilities. Such loans, even though they may appear to some to be unusually liberal, can in the end be helpful not only to the country which receives them, but to the United States as well.

Just as the atomic bomb is the prime issue confronting the nations, so do our relations with Russia at present overshadow all international relations. The emergence of the two so-called superstates—the United States and Russia—is one of the revolutionary consequences of this war. Both countries occupy vast land masses; the population of both countries stem from differing racial origins; both have in varying degrees, and alone among the nations of the world, the mass population, the natural resources and the strong central government essential to the prosecution of modern war. In neither country is thinking shackled by the dead hand of the past.

Both countries have vast natural resources within their own borders which are clamoring for development. Both have expanded into unsettled areas—we to our west; they to their east. Both have engaged in defensive wars to preserve the freedom of their respective countries. In 1863 Russia made a gesture of friendship to the Union by sending its naval vessels to New York. But the great bond, of course, is the grand alliance with Russia against Nazi Germany. No one of us—American, British, or Russian—could have defeated Germany alone. It required a grand alliance. Not only will the world not forget Stalingrad, but there are many American soldiers who will remember with gratitude moments last year when Russian troops drew German troops from the western front.

Last year, to be sure, we could not talk of the differences between us. Our authorities adopted the attitude that there could be no criticism of our allies. The unfortunate result of this suppression of all criticism is that today, when free speech has returned, the normal human faults of our allies are exaggerated, sometimes with explosive force and dangerous possibilities.

There is, to be sure, many a difference, many a broad ideological gulf between us and the Russians. Our ideas on religion, on democracy, on individual freedom, and on free enterprise are widely different. Their system of government is just about the opposite of ours in many respects. We believe in uncontrolled publicity, and they believe in what Senator VANDENBERG calls "the iron curtain." Even words like "democracy" mean different things to each of us. Public opinion here is relatively unorganized and divided, which necessarily reflects itself in the policy of our Government. We have strong historic ties with Poland and some of the smaller countries in eastern Europe. Russia has taken unilateral steps with regard to these countries which cause us sincere concern.

Maybe we cause the Russians disquiet. After all, they know us no better than we know them. It is estimated that there are not more than 250 Americans in Russia and not more than 2,000 persons in the United States holding Russian passports. How can we fail to be ignorant? Our philosophy about publicity may strike them as dangerous and excessive. They may be puzzled by our intense interest in countries so close to them. They may recall that in the past Americans have supported the White Russians in preference to the Bolsheviks and that in the Russo-Japanese War we certainly appeared to be sympathetic to Japan. They may look at our Navy and air force with at least as much awe as we contemplate their huge ground army. We can perhaps get an idea of how they feel about our possession of the atomic bomb by asking ourselves how we would feel if Russia alone had the bomb and, having used it, refused to share it. In fact, we have each done much to insult, antagonize, and thwart the other. In the past few months the loose talk has grown to proportions which to me seem dangerous.

Because, my fellow citizens, here we are in 1946. We want peace with them and I'm convinced that they want peace with us. We do not compete with each other—unless you see a competition in the realm of political ideas. There is no place today where our truly vital interests touch. We have the word of one American Ambassador who, while speaking of his conferences with Russian statesmen, said that while he seldom agreed with them, they never misled him. Moreover, we all know that with the United States and Russia together there will be international peace for all. Others may disturb the peace of the world; only we two can destroy it.

Why not face all these things frankly? Why not recognize that vituperation defeats its own purpose? If angry talk could improve the lot of one human being or could advance even an inch the cause of religious tolerance, there would be justification for it—but we know that such talk can only worsen the conditions which they are designed to improve.

Needless to say, there is no suggestion here that we change our beliefs or our ways. We cling passionately to our system, with its guaranty of religious liberty, of free enterprise, and freemen. There can be not even a suggestion of surrender of principle. Indeed, no question of like or dislike is involved. We have the word of Marshal Stalin himself that he wants his country judged dispassionately. "Just judge the Soviet Union objectively," he recently remarked. "Do not either praise us or scold us. Just know us and judge us as we are and base your estimate of us upon facts and not on rumors."

This means that we not take some alarming, though isolated, incident, and in our minds carry it to its logical extreme. Let us remember that, fortunately, things seldom go to their logical extremes.

It means being firm and definite and not talking too much.

It means keeping your word whenever you give it—and not necessarily giving it very often. The man who is firm and definite is respected and gets results; he who indulges in abuse and rumor-mongering achieves only trouble for himself and for those whom he seeks to help.

It means that we should always remember that the Russians are a practical people, who have come along in a hard school of international relations, and who realize that force, after all, is the ultimate unit of international politics.

To what conclusion about Russia does all this lead us? To this: That we must have an efficient working arrangement with Russia. There is indeed, as the Catholic bishops of the United States recently said, "a clash of ideologies," but, they continue, "the frank recognition of these differences is preliminary to any sincere effort in realistic cooperation for peace * * *." There must be "honest, promising discussion even on diverging plans." Accordingly, "our country acted wisely in deciding to participate in this world organization. It is better than world chaos."

"Better than world chaos." That is the point. And chaos is what we may have unless we develop a working arrangement with Russia. This involves not only our diplomats; it imposes an obligation on all of us to think clearly and fairly and to speak with firmness and restraint.

High on the list of problems between the United States and Russia is, after the atomic bomb, the treatment of Germany. If agreement on the policy to be followed toward Germany is achieved, it will make a host of other problems easier to solve.

In thinking about Germany, the following suggestions are submitted:

Germany's capacity to wage modern war must be eliminated. This involves, among other things, elimination of Nazi personnel from posts of authority, destruction of military installations and organizations, and of heavy industry having military potential.

Germany's pacification must be conducted so as to enable her to the maximum extent possible to subsist without external assistance.

Germany's currency and transport systems should be unified on a national scale. The present division of Germany into zones is responsible for much needless hardship and for much extra trouble and expense for the occupying forces.

Germany's interior administration, as General Eisenhower has said, should not remain under American military government now that the war is over. Our military-government officers, in common with other Army personnel, want to return to civilian life. The sooner civilian administrators can take over their functions, the better.

We should announce to the world and to ourselves that we intend in the long future to maintain an active interest in what happens to Germany and that we will support that interest with whatever is necessary. We should be breaking faith with those who died in this terrible war and we should be inviting future trouble for ourselves if we allowed the hard-won gains of this war to evaporate simply because we had lost interest in the future of Germany.

Germany's military occupation is essential, but it is to be hoped that the United States will not indefinitely have to furnish a large army of occupation for that purpose. Such duty goes against our grain, and the citizens of other countries do such work with more liking than we do. Prompt and detailed study should be given to the practicability of recruiting a force among the stateless young men in Germany who would make a life work of policing the country. There are surely many there who would willingly join a properly organized military force and who would not find the task of policing Germany uncongenial. There is the great possibility that such a program could materially reduce the demands on the United States to furnish occupation troops. It is indeed quite conceivable that such a constabulary could take over all functions except those to be performed by our American officers and by our technically trained troops. It might conceivably reduce American troop requirements in our zone in Germany to a few separate tank battalions. The idea should be thoroughly explored.

If agreement is obtained on basic policies, it will be time to consider whether Germany can, for administrative purposes, be placed under the jurisdiction of the United Nations Organization. It is perhaps not too much to hope that Austria could be so placed within a short space of time. Remember that, insofar as man-made devices are concerned, the United Nations Organization is our best hope. We must give it things to do so that its muscles may grow strong by exercise. We must be careful, insofar as we can control the problems which come before it, to give it in its early years only those problems which are virtually sure to have a successful outcome.

To sum up:

1. The citizen in his approach to foreign policy must beware of gossip and rumor; avoid partisan politics; and talk and think with restraint.

2. America must be generous and help the distressed in other lands.

3. America must be strong, especially in her Army, Navy, and Air Force.

4. Effective control under the United Nations Organization, with thorough inspection and other safeguards, of the production and possession of the atomic weapon is the prime objective of foreign policy.

5. An efficient working arrangement between the United States and Russia is of paramount importance to peace.

6. Germany to be demilitarized.

7. A constabulary recruited from stateless persons to police Germany could materially reduce the demand on the United States to furnish occupation troops and should be thoroughly, vigorously, and promptly expored.

8. Build up and strengthen the United Nations Organization.

Yes, build it up; it is our best hope. It is, as your own distinguished citizen, Governor Stassen, truly remarked, "a vital beachhead" in the battle for peace. It is an instrument which, as Mr. Bevin recently declared, "if all nations resolve to use it, can establish a rule of law and prevent war." He said further:

"I say 'resolve to use it' because to my mind here is the essence of the problem. Just as no system of inspection or control of weapons is to avail without good will, so no international organization, however carefully framed, will be of any avail unless the nations resolve to lay aside war and threat of war as an instrument of policy—unless they determine to establish between themselves such mutual confidence that war is unthinkable."

Indeed in the words of the Scripture, "the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." The abiding answer to the question of whether we shall have peace lies in the hearts of men. This spirit is stronger and more all-pervading than any organization, system or device. "The Kingdom of Heaven is within you." Indeed systems and devices to be successful, should follow closely the development of human nature and not try to act as a strait jacket for human passions. The strength of the United Nations Organization lies in the fact that it is an honest document, corresponding to the sentiments of the times. We all hope that it will grow because its growth connotes a growth in those spiritual values which are decisive in our quest for peace.

In conclusion, let us be inspired by the thought that such a growth is by no means out of the question. In the war just ended we saw some manifestations of the human spirit which were sublime enough to achieve anything. Men lived—and died—dangerously for ideals that were close to them. On the home front the American people were united by a common ideal. There was unity in Congress, reflecting the unanimous desire throughout the land to win the war, regardless of consequences. On the fighting fronts we saw this unity to an even more marked degree. General Eisenhower not only commanded Army, Navy and Air; he also commanded the troops of many different nations. I saw this international command at very close range in the extremely effective generalship of General Devers, who had all French combat units in Europe under his orders. These international commands had elements of great difficulty, since war is always difficult. Orders had to be issued, as they always are in war, spelling life and death. To take life and death orders from a foreigner is different from taking them from one of your own. Yet, in spite of these manifold opportunities for bitter feeling, we ended the war as friends with our allies.

May this partnership on the battlefield be the forerunner of successful cooperation in the larger field of international relations so that the ordinary men and women of the world may live their lives and rear their children in peace.

Indian-American Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, a sad lack of information about India exists in the United States. The same lack of information about the United States exists in India. Whatever information we do manage to get about India is so colored by British propaganda that it hardly serves the purpose.

The average American sees the Indian either as a bizarre turbaned person or as an untouchable in a loin cloth. The picture of the American the Indian has is hardly more accurate or flattering. Americans are either vacuous illiterates or racketeers. Such misconceptions hardly serve to build up friendly, understanding relations between the two peoples.

During the war, India supplied us with millions of dollars of war materials. As a result thereof, she has with us a favorable trade balance in the sum of a billion and a half dollars with which she could and wants to buy our goods if and when the restrictions of the British sterling area bloc pool are lifted. This fact is not generally known in America.

The opportunities of mutual trade between the two countries are boundless. But the lack of knowledge of each other creates barriers which are disadvantageous to such mutual trade.

Public relations between the two countries can best be served by India setting up its own information service in the United States. She must no longer rely on the slanted items sent out by the British Information Service or the British Embassy. Until she does that India remains for the vast majority of Americans an enigma. Such information service will offset the statements of British lecturers and writers in this country who are constantly disparaging India and minimizing the India independence movement and who are constantly ballooning out of all proportion the differences between the Moslems and the Hindus.

Our own press has been anything but generous in printing articles and dispatches about the 390,000,000 people of India. For example, the sister of Nehru, Mrs. Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit was in the United States on a speaking tour. She is a charming and dynamic personality. Yet, the American people read scant notices of her talks and the enthusiastic receptions accorded her.

How much has appeared in our press, for instance, about the Bombay plan for the industrialization of India?

The Associated Press and United Press are now, fortunately, widening their coverage of India. They should be congratulated in getting a better message about America to India.

India should know that many of us in the United States are genuinely interested in India. We want more and more knowledge of her aims, aspiration, culture, and history.

Treasury Enforcement Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1946

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, annually the Treasury Department issues a release in reference to the activities of the enforcement agencies. This is always very interesting reading.

All enforcement agencies of the Treasury Department are under the Chief Coordinator, Hon. Elmer L. Irey.

Under the permission granted me, I include as part of my remarks the statement just released. It follows:

Officers of the United States customs service today saw statistical evidence of the shift of world trade and travel toward a peacetime basis with emphasis, from the enforcement point of view, on the traditional contraband of undeclared luxury merchandise—diamonds, furs, watches, and such.

Elmer L. Irey, Chief Coordinator of Treasury Enforcement Agencies, reported to Secretary Vinson that seizures of all types of smuggled commodities increased sharply in 1945, to 17,009, compared to 10,215 in 1944. Two elements swelled the total: First, the disposition of travelers to attempt to bring in or export scarce commodities, from beefsteak to nylons and automobile tires, in violation of wartime regulations; and in the closing months, conventional smuggling growing out of relaxed conditions of trade and travel. With the easing of the United States supply situation, liquor seizures declined.

E. J. Shamhart, Deputy Commissioner of Customs, said today that the Agency is applying improved inspection techniques and equipment developed as a wartime protective service to the peacetime checking of travelers and their luggage and shipments of merchandise through customs. He said those attempting to avoid payment of duties on merchandise will have a tougher gauntlet to run than ever before.

Mr. Irey reported that the United States Secret Service continued to depress money counterfeiting toward the vanishing point; but that theft and forgery of Government checks and bonds increased, although relatively slightly in comparison with the huge increase in such items being issued or outstanding. More than 23,000 checks were involved in Secret Service investigations during 1945, compared to 15,700 in 1944; and 1,841 persons were arrested on forgery charges. Discovery of coin counterfeiting within the walls of Missouri State Penitentiary was a spectacular incident of Secret Service investigative activities.

The Alcohol Tax Unit of the Bureau of Internal Revenue reported a decline in illicit distilling operations as reflected by still and mash seizures, but said the traditional moonshine States of the South witnessed fairly substantial substitution of cane sirup and home-made sorghum for scarce sugar, with operations continuing about as usual.

The 14 Southern States contributed 95 percent of all the stills seized, 92 percent of the mash seized, and 85 percent of the persons arrested for liquor law violations.

For the entire country, still seizures in 1945 were 7,521, compared with 7,762 in 1944, with arrests of 9,492 compared to 11,911 in 1944.

The Treasury's smallest investigative unit, the Foreign Funds Control Compliance Section, continued its policing of funds of enemy firms and nationals, with its outstanding case being the blocking as German of some $5,000,000 in cash and securities in five New York banks. These assets were held in the name of a Swiss company, which, investigation disclosed, was in turn owned by a German company.

During 1945, 11,012 persons were convicted in Federal courts of violations of laws administered by the above agencies and the Bureau of Narcotics and Intelligence Unit of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, which, collectively, make up the Treasury enforcement agencies. In 1944, convictions totaled 10,888.

Typical of the cases developed by Customs in increasing numbers during the closing months of 1945 was the seizure, from a professional entertainer returning from Latin America by plane, of 32 cut diamonds and other gems concealed in baggage. The passenger paid $4,000 in penalties and surrendered the gems for forfeiture to the Government.

Customs officers broke up a small scale rum-smuggling conspiracy operating between Cuba and Florida, and involving the masters of three vessels and officials of a steamship company. They sought to evade payment of duties by means of false manifests.

In the same area, officers foiled an extensive plot to export critically scarce truck tires. The conspirators sought to evade export control regulations by mounting the new tires on the wheels of decrepit automobiles and then exporting the automobiles. The "wrecks" were driven or towed through mud to conceal the newness of the tires.

Other cases involved illegal exportation of gold for sale abroad, and an attempt to export to the Orient, without license, quantities of medical supplies.

The Secret Service continued to combat counterfeiting and check forgeries with widespread use of educational films, newspaper and magazine publicity, and radio warnings designed to alert the public and storekeepers to the methods followed by these racketeers.

Two abortive attempts to make counterfeit currency were smashed during the year, one in Washington, D. C., and one in St. Petersburg, Fla. Plates and equipment and bogus money were seized in each case, and only one note got into circulation in the two ventures. One man was arrested in each case.

The coin-manufacturing plant in Missouri Penitentiary involved 20-year-old William L. Patterson, who was serving a 2-year sentence for burglary. While working in the prison foundry, he is alleged to have made sand moulds for manufacturing counterfeit nickels, dimes, quarters, and half dollars out of iron and aluminum, which he spent in the prison commissary. His activities were discovered only 2 weeks before he was due for discharge, and he is now under indictment and awaiting trial on the counterfeiting charge.

Chief Frank Wilson of the Secret Service reported that losses to the public from circulation of counterfeit currency and coins dropped to a new low of $25,666 in 1945, compared to $28,067 in 1944. In some years in the middle thirties such losses ran to more than a million dollars a year.

The most spectacular check forgery case of the year was solved with the arrest of Arthur Moses in New York on November 24. Moses confessed he had made a living by victimizing merchants with more than 1,000 stolen checks since 1938, realizing at least $50,000. He operated in Detroit, Louisville, Chicago, Cincinnati, Philadelphia, and other cities, in addition to New York.

The Secret Service received for investigation more than 6,500 bonds stolen and fraudulently negotiated during the year. In one case, in Philadelphia, Stanley S. Gnagey, 19 years old, was arrested in connection with theft and forgery of $1,240 worth of bonds, the proceeds of which he exhausted on a New York spending spree. He was sentenced in State court for the burglary and faces other charges.

Chief Wilson warned bond owners to keep their securities in a safe place and to keep a record of bond serial numbers separately to aid in recovery if losses should occur.

In addition to its perennial war against moonshiners, continued prosecution of liquor black marketeers of the recent shortage years and evaders of the floor tax stipulated in recent revenue acts, the Alcohol Tax Unit tackled a new problem in 1945. The Unit, charged with enforcement of the National Firearms Act, conducted a Nation-wide campaign to register automatic weapons such as machine guns, submachine guns, and machine pistols brought in as souvenirs by returning servicemen. The Unit sought to persuade the owners to render these and other weapons unserviceable for the protection of their families and to decrease the possibility of such weapons falling into criminal hands.

Stewart Berkshire, head of the Unit, said the campaign was considered imperative in view of a rapidly developing wave of crimes of violence in which such weapons brought in originally as souvenirs figured. He pointed out that the law provides a tax of $200 on each transfer of automatic weapons, a liability which can be avoided if the guns are made unserviceable.

Hon. John Elliott Rankin, the Gentleman from Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1946

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article appearing in the Washington Post on February 3, 1946, by Miss Virginia Van der Veer, concerning the service rendered his district, his State, and his country by my good friend and colleague, Hon. JOHN RANKIN, of Mississippi:

JOHN RANKIN: A BARRYMORE IN SOUTHERN SOUND EFFECT

(By Virginia Van der Veer)

JOHN ELLIOTT RANKIN—tousled hair, Barrymore profile and southern sound effects—has an alert eye cocked at 1971.

It's an anniversary the fiery Democrat would like to keep—his 50-year mark in Congress.

The small man with the big voice from Mississippi's northeast corner is halfway there. On March 4 he'll round the corner into his second quarter-century on Capitol Fill.

Drop around the big dome about 7:30 any morning but Sunday. The wiry, slightly stooped man in a black suit, hot-footing it across the Capitol's front yard toward the House Office Building is JOHN E. RANKIN. He's been making this same trek, from home in the nearby Methodist Building, since 1928.

NICKNAMES APLENTY

Newsmen in the press gallery who hear his daily harangues call him "Silent John." In the early scrapping days of Government electric power he was "Kilowatt John." Recent opponents have applied the titles of "Republican Leader of the House" and "Gadfly." He has been accused of being antiunion and antilabor. RANKIN says he isn't. He says he believes in the right of labor to bargain collectively, but is opposed to "racketeering."

RANKIN is perhaps better known for his dislikes than his likes. Among his dislikes: Communists, un-American activities, the Fair Employment Practice Committee (FEPC), anti-poll-tax moves.

He is equally positive about his likes, but not quite so vociferous. These include: the late Gen. George S. Patton, Thomas Jefferson, rural electrification, servicemen, and veterans, mockingbirds and politics.

It was as a 38-year-old Tupelo, Miss., lawyer that RANKIN first came to the House on March 4, 1921. Colleagues probably saw little unusual about the new Mississippi Member—a sawmill operator's son, Methodist, war veteran, and married man.

Yet of the 205 newcomers to Congress that day, RANKIN is the only one still serving in the House. And from the point of view of service only 15 Members outrank him.

REAL "POWER LINES"

In the 13 elections since that year no opponent has carried more than one county against RANKIN. Few have carried one.

Why? RANKIN points to a map on his office wall. The long, first district on Mississippi's east border is crisscrossed with patterns of green lines.

"Know what those are?" asks Kilowatt John. "They're power lines. Electric lights for farmers, and electric milking machines, and electric refrigerators, and some day a new, all-electric veterans' hospital at Tupelo.

"That's my biggest job in these 25 years. If I hadn't been here I don't think those farmers would have had lights for 50 more years."

RANKIN likes to hark back to the days of famous congressional battles.

His first victory, he recalls, was "the battle of Shiloh Road," when the new Member first learned the value of Thomas Jefferson's manual on House rules. His parliamentary adroitness—now a House legend—won approval for a concrete road between Corinth, Miss., and Shiloh Battlefield.

SCRAPS GET BIGGER

RANKIN went from Shiloh to bigger scraps. He supported Nebraska's Senator George Norris in getting the Tennessee Valley Authority created by Congress. His amendment raised monthly base pay of World War II servicemen to $50. It was RANKIN who led the successful drive in January 1945 for a permanent committee on un-American activities.

A House session seldom opens without the fiery-voiced Mississippian. He likes to be on hand also at the close of each day's affairs. "That's when the skullduggery is done."

NOT AFRAID OF WAR

His days are busy. "I'm too conscientious," says RANKIN. Besides his chairmanship of the Veterans' Committee, the Mississippian holds high rank on four other House committees.

The Rankin office usually closes promptly at 5. The boss crosses the Capitol lawn again, eats with his family, goes to an occasional movie or early to bed.

Folding up his first quarter-century on the Hill, RANKIN already has plans for the next. He wants: A Tennessee-Tombigbee waterway, more lights for American farmers, better things for veterans, "a safe, free Nation."

War? The Mississippian doesn't think he'll see another.

"There's only us and Russia," he figures. "And neither wants anything from the other. If we sit tight and keep our powder dry, we won't fight again."

The Case of Robert Morss Lovett, Goodwin B. Watson, and William E. Dodd, Jr., Versus the United States

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1946

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, there are those who feel that Congress, through its power over appropriations, can deny continuation of employment to public officials. Congress recently tested this out in the case of the above-named gentlemen. Those men took their case to the United States Court of Claims which handed down a decision on November 5, 1945. Because the matter was pending for considerable time and is of vital importance to the country, I believe the reprint of the opinion would be of interest to my colleagues and the Nation. The opinion speaks for itself. It is as follows:

IN THE COURT OF CLAIMS OF THE UNITED STATES—NOS. 46026, 46027, 46028—DECIDED NOVEMBER 5, 1945—ROBERT MORSS LOVETT V. THE UNITED STATES, GOODWIN B. WATSON V. THE UNITED STATES, WILLIAM E. DODD, JR., V. THE UNITED STATES

Mr. Charles A. Horsky for the plaintiffs; Mr. Edward B. Burling, Miss Amy Ruth Mahin, and Covington, Burling, Rublee, Acheson & Shorb, were on the briefs.

Mr. Rawlings Ragland, with whom was Mr. Assistant Attorney General Francis M. Shea, for the Attorney General. Messrs. Donald B. MacGuineas and Henry Weihofen were on the brief.

Mr. John C. Gall for the Congress of the United States. Messrs. Dean Hill Stanley, William F. Howe, Karl M. Dollak, Joseph G. Butts, Jr., John E. Ritzert, and Clark M. Robertson were on the briefs.

This case having been heard by the Court of Claims, the court, upon the stipulation entered into between the parties, makes the following special findings of fact:

NO. 46026. ROBERT MORSS LOVETT V. THE UNITED STATES

No. 46026. *Robert Morss Lovett* v. *The United States:*

1. Plaintiff, Robert Morss Lovett, is a citizen of the United States and at the time of the filing of this suit was a resident of the Virgin Islands.

2. Plaintiff was commissioned the United States Government Secretary of the Virgin Islands on April 28, 1939, having been appointed by the President pursuant to section 21 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Island (act of June 22, 1936). Plaintiff took the oath of office on July 17, 1939. On August 26, 1943, plaintiff was appointed executive assistant to the Governor of the Virgin Islands by the Secretary of Interior, pursuant to authority granted in section 23 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands (act of June 22, 1936) to succeed Mr. W. M. Freeman, who had resigned. Plaintiff entered on duty as such executive assistant on October 12, 1943.

3. The compensation for the position of Executive Assistant to the Governor of the Virgin Islands is fixed at a base rate of $4,600 per annum plus a 25-percent differential for services outside of the continental United States, plus overtime computed in accordance with the War Overtime Pay Act of 1943. Plaintiff has performed the duties incident to the position of Executive Assistant to the Governor of the Virgin Islands from October 12, 1943, through March 13, 1944. On March 6, 1944, Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, wrote plaintiff as follows:

"MY DEAR MR. LOVETT: Last November I authorized you to continue your services to the Government after November 15, in spite of the provision of section 304 of the Urgent Deficiency Act (Public Law 132, 78th Cong.), which prohibited the use of appropriated funds for the payment of your salary. The principal purpose of that authorization was to make it possible for you to test by legal action the validity of section 304. You have continued to serve the Government without receiving your salary since November 15, 1943.

"As you no doubt know, this Department has been bitterly criticized by the Congress in recent months for continuing to accept them after you had worked for a period which would permit you to test the constitutionality of congressional action. In these circumstances I have concluded that I have no alternative but to request your resignation.

"The matter is now before the Court of Claims, and I believe that the position taken by this Department and by yourself will be vindicated, in which case you will receive all the salary which you have earned. I want again to acknowledge the respect and affection in which you are held by the people of the Virgin Islands and to assure you of my own highest regards and esteem.

"With best wishes to you and to Mrs. Lovett, I am

"Sincerely yours,

"HAROLD L. ICKES,

"*Secretary of the Interior.*"

On March 13, 1944, plaintiff wrote Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, as follows:

"MY DEAR MR. ICKES: In accordance with your request, I am sending you my resignation as Executive Assistant to the Governor of the Virgin Islands, effective at the close of March 13, 1944. I do so with regret because of my pleasant relations during the past 5 years with the people of the Virgin Islands. I thank you for the opportunity of living among them and serving them in conjunction with my colleagues of all departments whose friendship and cooperation will always be a happy memory. For your own encouragement and support, and that of the Department, I shall always be profoundly grateful. It is obvious that the Department should not bear any longer the burden of the personal hostility toward me of Members of Congress, and that I can best serve the people of the Virgin Islands by leaving them.

"Sincerely yours,

"ROBERT M. LOVETT."

4. Harold L. Ickes is the duly appointed, qualified, and acting Secretary of the Interior of the United States. As such, he is head of the Department of the Interior and exercises general supervision and control over the executive branch of the government of the Virgin Islands. As Secretary of the Interior, he has the power of appointment of various of the executive and administrative officers and employees of the United States in the executive branch of the government of the Virgin Islands, including the appointment of plaintiff to his postion as Executive Assistant, pursuant to authority granted in the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands (act of June 22, 1936). As Secretary of the Interior, he, or someone acting on his behalf, has the duty of signing all requisitions for the advance or payment of money out of the Treasury for expenditures of business of the Department, including expenditures for the administration of the Virgin Islands.

5. On February 9, 1943, the House of Representatives of the United States adopted House Resolution 105. Pursuant to this resolution a special subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations was appointed, and on March 23, 1943, the subcommittee adopted rules of procedure. These rules were first published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 2, 1943 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 78th Cong., 1st sess., Appendix, p. A2762). The subcommittee conducted hearings from April 9 to April 15, 1943, to investigate certain charges made, inter alia, against plaintiff. The hearings before the subcommittee were held in executive session. Plaintiff was invited by letter handed him on April 14 to appear in person before the subcommittee on April 15 and make such statements or explanations under oath as he might desire, and to answer such questions as might be propounded. The invitation advised plaintiff that if he was unacquainted with the charges and allegations concerning him, a copy would be furnished upon request. No such request was made by plaintiff. Plaintiff was shown at the hearing 54 charges made against him by the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, acting pursuant to H. R. 282. The evidence and other materials gathered during the

course of prior investigations by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, by the Committee on Un-American Activities, and by others, which were considered by the subcommittee in connection with plaintiff's case, were and are confidential, except that the charges formulated by the Committee on Un-American Activities were shown to plaintiff at the hearing as above stated. The Solicitor of the Department of Interior, on the day before the hearing on April 15, 1943, requested permission to appear at the hearing before the subcommittee with plaintiff. He was advised by the committee that his request to appear as an observer for the Department of the Interior would be considered. On the following day the Solicitor was informed that the policy of the subcommittee, already formulated in prior hearings involving persons connected with the Federal Communications Commission, was to hold its hearings without any persons other than the subcommittee, its staff, and the witness being present. The plaintiff was not proffered, nor did he request, the opportunity to produce witnesses in his own behalf or to use the compulsory processes of the subcommittee to require other persons to appear before it to testify or to submit to cross-examination, nor were any witnesses called or heard by the subcommittee on behalf of plaintiff. No witnesses, other than plaintiff, testified before the subcommittee with respect to plaintiff. Plaintiff was questioned with respect to his membership and activity in various organizations and with respect to various writings, speeches, and activities on his part. Plaintiff was given at the hearing full opportunity to make any statements or explanations he desired with respect to the subject matter of the investigation. At the close of the hearing plaintiff was also accorded an opportunity to make any statements he wished, but registered with the subcommittee no complaint as to its procedure or its treatment of him.

6. On May 14, 1943, the special subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations reported to the Committee on Appropriations. On May 14, 1943, the Committee on Appropriations submitted a report (H. Rept. No. 448, 78th Cong., 1st sess.) approving the findings of the said special subcommittee and proposing an amendment to the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1943 (H. R. 2714). Section 304 of the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act of 1943 of July 12, 1943, as finally enacted (Public, 132), provides as follows:

"SEC. 304. No part of any appropriation, allocation, or fund (1) which is made available under or pursuant to this act, or (2) which is now, or which is hereafter made, available under or pursuant to any other act, to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States, shall be used, after November 15, 1943, to pay any part of the salary, or other compensation for the personal services, of Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Jr., and Robert Morss Lovett, unless prior to such date such person has been appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided*, That this section shall not operate to deprive any such person of payment for leaves of absence or salary, or of any refund or reimbursement, which have accrued prior to November 15, 1943: *Provided further*, That this section shall not operate to deprive any such person of payment for services performed as a member of a jury or as a member of the armed forces of the United States nor any benefit, pension, or emolument resulting therefrom."

The President did not appoint plaintiff under section 304.

7. By letter of November 23, 1943, Morris F. de Castro, Commissioner of Finance of the Virgin Islands and the officer authorized to certify the payment of salary to plaintiff, advised the Secretary of the Interior that in view of section 304 of the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act of 1943, he would not certify for payment the salary of plaintiff after November 15, 1943.

8. By letter of November 26, 1943, Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, wrote plaintiff as follows:

"MY DEAR MR. LOVETT: When you were last in Washington I discussed with you the implications of section 304 of the Urgent Deficiencies Act. During these conferences I urged, despite the prohibition, your staying on the job after November 15, for the reason that the limitations contained in section 304 are, in my opinion and in the opinion of my solicitor, an unwarranted interference with my executive powers.

"I wish to repeat the request that you continue in the office of executive assistant to the Governor. Funds may not be available to pay your salary until the unconstitutional prohibition of the Urgent Deficiencies Act is declared invalid by the courts. I am confident, however, that the prohibition will be so adjudged, and a principle fundamental to democratic government will be upheld.

"In no case are you to consider yourself discharged. You will continue to perform the duties of your office and to exercise all the authority conferred upon you by law.

"Sincerely yours,

"HAROLD L. ICKES,
"Secretary of the Interior."

9. On November 29, 1943, the Secretary of the Interior wrote the following letter to plaintiff:

"MY DEAR MR. LOVETT: The commissioner of finance of the Virgin Islands has advised me that in view of section 304 of the urgent deficiency bill (Public Law 132, 78th Cong.) funds are not available to pay your salary after November 15, 1943.

"During the past 4 years you have won the respect and affection of all of the Virgin Islanders, and you have, under very trying circumstances, served the Governments of the Virgin Islands and the United States with credit and distinction.

"If there were some appropriate way to avoid the effect of the provision of the Deficiency Act, you would, of course, receive your salary. I should like very much for you to continue in the office of executive assistant to the Governor. It would be most difficult for me to find someone to replace you. The matter, however, now is beyond my control. I made every effort to prevent the adoption of the prohibitive provisions of the bill. The action taken by Congress has been very disappointing to me. I hope that you will be successful in challenging the constitutionality of the measure which otherwise prevents the disbursing officers of the Government from paying you the salary for which you are rendering such valuable services.

"With my best wishes, I remain,

"Sincerely yours,

"HAROLD L. ICKES,
"Secretary of the Interior."

Plaintiff demanded that he be paid for the services rendered to the United States as Executive Assistant to the Governor of the Virgin Islands from November 15, 1943, through March 13, 1944. This demand was refused.

10. Plaintiff, because of section 304 of the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act of 1943 and the fact that the President did not appoint him thereunder, has not received compensation from November 15, 1943, through March 13, 1944, nor has plaintiff ever received his pro rata annual base salary, plus differential and overtime, or any part thereof, for the services rendered during that period. The defendant, acting through Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, his agents, assistant, or subordinates, and solely because of the operation of section 304 of the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act of 1943 and the fact that the President did not appoint him thereunder, has refused and failed to pay to plaintiff any compensation for the period from November 15, 1943, through March 13, 1944, nor has the defendant ever paid plaintiff his pro rata base salery, plus differential and overtime, or any part thereof, for the services rendered during that period. The amount which has not been paid to plaintiff, and which has been withheld solely because of the operation of said section 304 and the fact that the President did not appoint him thereunder, is $1,996.40.

NO. 46027. GOODWIN B. WATSON V. THE UNITED STATES

1. Plaintiff, Goodwin B. Watson, is a citizen of the United States and at the time of the filing of this suit was a resident of Washington, D. C.

2. Plaintiff was appointed Chief of the Analysis Division, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Federal Communications Commission, on November 16, 1941, by the Federal Communications Commission in the exercise of its authority granted by section 4 of the Federal Communications Act of 1934. Plaintiff took the oath of office on November 16, 1941.

3. Since October 20, 1942, the compensation for the position of Chief of the Analysis Division has been fixed at a base rate of $6,500 per year plus, since May 1, 1943, overtime computed in accordance with the War Overtime Pay Act of 1943. Plaintiff has performed the duties incident to the position of Chief of the Analysis Division, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Federal Communications Commission, from November 16, 1941, through November 21, 1943. On May 2, 1944, plaintiff wrote to Dr. Robert D. Leigh, Director of the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Federal Communications Commission, as follows:

"DEAR MR. LEIGH: As I understand it, the reduction in appropriation for the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service makes necessary the elimination of the Analysis Division and the absorption of some of its work by other groups and other agencies. That seems to me to mark the termination of the work which I came to Washington to do, and is hence an occasion on which I submit my resignation.

"In this last official document, I want to express to you, to the other administrative officers, and to the Commissioners and Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission my warm appreciation for the intelligent and courageous support which they gave to the war effort, to the FBIS, to our division, and to me personally. I am glad to have had a little part in what I believe was a helpful war service, but I shall treasure as the most valuable part of my Washington experience, the friends I have made here and the opportunity to work along with my fellow officials in the Federal Communications Commission.

"Cordially yours,

"GOODWIN WATSON."

On May 3, 1944, Mr. Leigh replied as follows:

"DEAR GOODWIN: I have your letter of May 2 presenting your resignation as Chief of the Analysis Division of the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service.

"It is true that the position which you held and which was kept vacant for you has been eliminated, so that there is no practical reason for continuance of you on the rolls of the FCC. Your resignation coming in this way makes it very clear-cut that the act is voluntary.

"From the point of view of good governmental operation in the prosecution of the war effort, I would like to frame your resignation with double black edges—the first line would represent the detriment to the analysis work by your enforced leave of absence due to the act of Congress. The second would

represent the hindrance to the war effort by the reduction in the FBIS appropriation.

"Sincerely yours,

"ROBERT D. LEIGH, *Director*."

On May 24, 1944, plaintiff received a notification from the Director of Personnel of the Federal Communications Commission that his resignation had become effective on May 21, 1944.

4. The Federal Communications Commission has general supervision and control over the agency which it heads. It has the power of appointment of various of the officers and employees necessary in the execution of its functions, as provided in the Communications Act of 1934, including the power of appointment of plaintiff. T. J. Slowie is the duly appointed, qualified and acting Secretary of the Commission and as such T. J. Slowie, or someone acting on his behalf, is authorized to approve before presentation for payment itemized vouchers for all expenditures of the Commission which may be necessary for the execution of its functions, including compensation to plaintiff, as provided by the Communications Act of 1934.

5. On February 9, 1943, the House of Representatives of the United States adopted House Resolution 105. Pursuant to this resolution, a special subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations was appointed, and on March 23, 1943, the subcommittee adopted rules of procedures. These rules were first published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 2, 1943 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 78th Cong., 1st sess., Appendix, p. A2762). The subcommittee conducted hearings from April 9 to April 15, 1943, to investigate certain charges made inter alia, against plaintiff. The hearings before the subcommittee were held in executive session. Plaintiff was invited to appear by letter dated April 7, 1943, as follows:

"DEAR DR. WATSON: In accordance with House Resolution 105, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, a copy of which is enclosed, the special subcommittee appointed thereunder has before it files from the Committee on Un-American Activities, the United States Civil Service Commission, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Federal Communications Commission relative to your qualifications and suitability as a Federal employee.

"The committee will examine these files beginning Friday, April 9, 1943, at 10 a. m. and you are instructed to appear at room 449 Old House Office Building at such time when opportunity will be afforded you to answer these charges and interrogations by the committee.

"A statement and list of the charges preferred against you before this committee by the Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, is immediately available for your inspection at the office of this committee.

"Very truly yours,

"JOHN H. KERR,

"Chairman, Special Subcommittee."

Plaintiff's reply, addressed to the chairman of the subcommittee, and dated April 8, 1943, was as follows:

"GENTLEMEN: Thank you for your invitation to appear and make a statement before the Kerr committee. I have the highest respect for this committee and welcome an opportunity for a thorough and judicial review of my case.

"I have prepared the accompanying statement of what seem to me the most relevant facts. With your permission, I should like to present this statement to the committee, and I shall then be glad to answer any questions.

"Yours respectfully,

"GOODWIN WATSON,

"Chief, Analysis Division."

The letter of April 7, 1943, advised plaintiff that if he was unacquainted with the charges and allegations concerning him, a copy would be furnished upon request. No such request was made by plaintiff. Plaintiff was shown at the hearing 29 charges made against him by the Committee on Un-American Activities, of the House of Representatives, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, acting pursuant to H. R. 282.

The evidence and other materials gathered during the course of prior investigations by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, by the Committee on Un-American Activities, and by others which were considered by the subcommittee in connection with plaintiff's case were and are confidential, except that the charges formulated by the Committee on Un-American Activities were shown to plaintiff at the hearing. The general counsel of the Federal Communications Commission appeared at the first session of the subcommittee with the first person summoned before it and requested permission to appear as an observer for the Federal Communications Commission, but was advised by the subcommittee that it had decided to hold its hearings without any persons other than the subcommittee, its staff, and the witness being present. The general counsel thereupon withdrew. Plaintiff was not proffered nor did he request the opportunity to produce witnesses in his own behalf or to use the compulsory processes of the subcommittee to require other persons to appear before it to testify or to submit to cross-examination, nor were any witnesses called or heard by the subcommittee on behalf of plaintiff. No witnesses, other than plaintiff, testified before the subcommitte with respect to plaintiff. Plaintiff was questioned with respect to his membership and activity in various organizations and with respect to various writings, speeches, and activities on his part. Plaintiff was given at the hearing full opportunity to make any statements or explanations he desired with respect to the subject matter of the investigation. Plaintiff registered with the subcommittee no complaint as to its procedure or its treatment of him.

6. On April 21, 1943, the special subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations reported to the Committee on Appropriations. On April 26, 1943, the Federal Communications Commission, having considered the report of the special subcommittee, concluded that it would retain plaintiff in its employment and issued a report thereon. On May 14, 1943, the Committee on Appropriations submitted a report (H. R. 448, 78th Cong., 1st sess.) approving the findings of the said special subcommittee and proposing an amendment to the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1943 (H. R. 2714). Section 304 of the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act of 1943 of July 12, 1943, as finally enacted (Public, 132), provides as follows:

"SEC. 304. No part of any appropriation, allocation, or fund (1) which is made available under or pursuant to this act, or (2) which is now, or which is hereafter made, available under or pursuant to any other act, to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States, shall be used, after November 15, 1943, to pay any part of the salary, or other compensation for the personal services, of Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Jr., and Robert Morss Lovett, unless prior to such date such person has been appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided*, That this section shall not operate to deprive any such person of paymen for leaves of absence or salary, or of any refund or reimbursement, which have accrued prior to November 15, 1943: *Provided further*, That this section shall not operate to deprive any such person of payment for services performed as a member of a jury or as a member of the armed forces of the United States nor any benefit, pension, or emolument resulting therefrom."

The President did not appoint plaintiff under Section 304.

7. On November 22, 1943, T. J. Slowie, Secretary of the Federal Communications Commission, in which capacity he acts as certifying officer for the Commission, wrote the following letter to the plaintiff:

"DEAR MR. WATSON: The Commission's records show that you have been on active duty with the Federal Communications Commission from November 7 through November 21. Since the position which you hold pays a base salary of $6,500 per annum, your compensation for this pay period, with overtime, would ordinarily be $297.01. However, in your case there is a provision of law which makes it impossible to pay you the full sum to which you would otherwise be entitled.

"Section 304 of Public Law 132, Seventy-eighth Congress, provides as follows:

* * * * * *

"Because of this provision, it is possible to compensate you only for your services from November 7 through November 15, 1943, and your compensation for this period with overtime is $178.21. Accordingly, after adjustment of tax deduction $23.60 and retirement deduction $8.13, there is enclosed a check for $146.68.

"If you desire to avail yourself of the benefits of the proviso which preserves your right to receive compensation for annual leave accrued prior to November 15, 1943, you should file an application for leave in the usual manner.

"Very truly yours,

"T. J. SLOWIE, *Secretary*."

Plaintiff demanded that he be paid for the services rendered to the United States as Chief of the Analysis Division, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, from November 16 through November 21, 1943. This demand was refused. Plaintiff was given no instructions by the Commission to cease working on November 15, 1943. The Commission permitted plaintiff to remain at his desk as Chief of the Analysis Division, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, from November 15 to November 21, 1943.

8. Plaintiff, because of section 304 of the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act of 1943 and the fact that the President did not appoint him thereunder, has not received compensation from November 16 through November 21, 1943, nor has plaintiff ever received his pro rata annual base salary plus overtime, or any part thereof, for the services rendered during that period. The defendant, acting through the Federal Communications Commission, its agents, assistants or subordinates, and solely because of the operation of section 304 of the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act of 1943 and the fact that the President did not appoint him thereunder, has refused and failed to pay plaintiff any compensation for the period from November 16 through November 21, 1943, nor has the defendant ever paid plaintiff his pro rata base salary plus overtime, or any part thereof, for services rendered during that period. The amount which has not been paid to plaintiff, and which has been withheld solely because of the operation of said section 304 and the fact that the President did not appoint him thereunder, is $101.78.

NO. 46028. WILLIAM E. DODD, JR., V. THE UNITED STATES

1. Plaintiff, William E. Dodd, Jr., is a citizen of the United States and at the time of the filing of this suit was a resident of Arlington, Va.

2. Plaintiff was appointed editorial assistant, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Federal Communications Commission, on December 1, 1941, by the Federal Communications Commission in the exercise of its authority to appoint such employees granted by section 4 of the Federal Communications Act of 1934. Plaintiff took the oath of office on

December 1, 1941. On December 22, 1942, plaintiff was appointed assistant news editor, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Federal Communications Commission, by the Commission pursuant to said authority.

3. Plaintiff has performed the duties incident to the respective positions of editorial assistant and assistant news editor, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Federal Communications Commission, from December 1 through November 21, 1943. The compensation for the position of assistant news editor is fixed at a base rate of $3,200 per year, plus overtime computed in accordance with the War Overtime Pay Act of 1943. Since November 21, 1943, plaintiff has been on a leave-without-pay status at the Federal Communications Commission, and is in that status at the present time.

4. The Federal Communications Commission has general supervision and control over the independent agency which it heads. It has the power of appointment of various of the officers and employees necessary in the execution of its functions, as provided in the Communications Act of 1934, including the power of appointment of plaintiff, T. J. Slowie is the duly appointed, qualified and acting secretary of the Commission and as such T. J. Slowie, or someone acting on his behalf, is authorized to approve before presentation for payment itemized vouchers for all expenditures of the Commission which may be necessary for the execution of its functions, including compensation to plaintiff, as provided by the Communications Act of 1934.

5. On February 9, 1943, the House of Representatives of the United States adopted House Resolution 105. Pursuant to this resolution, a special subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations was appointed, and on March 23, 1943, the subcommittee adopted rules of procedure. These rules were first published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 2, 1943 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 78th Cong., 1st sess., Appendix, p. A2762). The subcommittee conducted hearings from April 9 to April 15, 1943, to investigate certain charges made, inter alia, against plaintiff. Plaintiff was invited by letter to appear in person before the subcommittee and make such statements or explanations under oath as he might desire, and to answer such questions as might be propounded. The plaintiff requested the clerk of the subcommittee to exhibit to him any charges against him, and was advised by the clerk that the subcommittee had formulated no charges. The evidence and other materials gathered during the course of prior investigations by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, by the Committee on Un-American Activities, and by others, which were considered by the subcommittee in connection with plaintiff's case, were and are confidential, except for the testimony of plaintiff before said committee. The general counsel of the Federal Communications Commission appeared at the first session of the subcommittee with the first person summoned before it and requested permission to appear as an observer for the Federal Communications Commission, but was advised by the subcommittee that it had decided to hold its hearings without any persons other than the subcommittee, its staff, and the witness being present. The general counsel thereupon withdrew. Plaintiff was not proffered nor did he request the opportunity to produce witnesses in his own behalf or to use the compulsory processes of the subcommittee to require other persons to appear before it to testify or to submit to cross-examination, nor were any witnesses called or heard by the subcommittee on behalf of plaintiff. No witnesses, other than plaintiff, testified before the subcommittee with respect to plaintiff. Plaintiff was questioned with respect to his membership and activity in various organizations and with respect to various writings, speeches, and activities on his part. Plaintiff was given at the hearing full opportunity to make any statements or explanations he desired with respect to the subject matter of the investigation. At the close of the hearing, plaintiff was also accorded an opportunity to make any statements he wished, but registered with the subcommittee no complaint as to its procedure or its treatment of him.

6. On April 21, 1943, the special Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations reported to the Committee on Appropriations. On April 26, 1943, the Federal Communications Commission, having considered the report of the special subcommittee, concluded that it would retain plaintiff in its employment and issued a report thereon. On May 14, 1943, the Committee on Appropriations submitted a report (H. Rept. 448, 78th Cong., 1st sess.) approving the findings of the said special subcommittee and proposing an amendment to the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1943 (H. R. 2714).

Section 304 of the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act of 1943, of July 12, 1943, as finally enacted (Public, 132), provides as follows:

"SEC. 304. No part of any appropriation, allocation, or fund (1) which is made available under or pursuant to this act, or (2) which is now, or which is hereafter made, available under or pursuant to any other act, to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States, shall be used, after November 15, 1943, to pay any part of the salary, or other compensation for the personal services, of Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Jr., and Robert Morss Lovett, unless prior to such date such person has been appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided*, That this section shall not operate to deprive any such person of payment for leaves of absence or salary, or of any refund or reimbursement, which have accrued prior to November 15, 1943: *Provided further*, That this section shall not operate to deprive any such person of payment for services performed as a member of a jury or as a member of the armed forces of the United States nor any benefit, pension, or emolument resulting therefrom."

The President did not appoint plaintiff under section 304.

7. On November 22, 1943, T. J. Slowie, secretary of the Federal Communications Commission, in which capacity he acts as the certifying officer of the Commission, wrote the following letter to the plaintiff:

"DEAR MR. DODD: The Commission's records show that you have been on active duty with the Federal Communications Commission from November 7 through November 21. Since the position which you hold pays a base salary of $3,200 per annum, your compensation for this pay period, with overtime, would ordinarily be $159.51. However, in your case there is a provision of law which makes it impossible to pay you the full sum to which you would otherwise be entitled.

"Section 304 of Public Law 132, Seventy-eighth Congress, provides as follows:

* * * * *

"Because of this provision it is possible to compensate you only for your services from November 7 through November 15, 1943, and your compensation for this period with overtime is $96.51. Accordingly, after adjustment of tax deduction $5 and retirement deduction $4, there is enclosed a check for $87.51.

"If you desire to avail yourself of the benefits of the proviso which preserves your right to receive compensation for annual leave accrued prior to November 15, 1943, you should file an application for leave in the usual manner.

"Very truly yours,

"T. J. SLOWIE, *Secretary*."

Plaintiff demanded that he be paid for the services rendered to the United States as assistant news editor, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, from November 16 through November 21, 1943. This demand was refused. Plaintiff was given no instructions by the Commission to cease working on November 15, 1943. The Commission permitted plaintiff to remain at his desk as assistant news editor, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, from November 15 to November 21, 1943.

8. Plaintiff, because of section 304 of the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act of 1943 and the fact that the President did not appoint him thereunder, has not received compensation from November 16, through November 21, 1943, nor has plaintiff ever received his pro rata annual base salary plus overtime, or any part thereof, for the services rendered during that period. The defendant, acting through the Federal Communications Commission, its agents, assistants or subordinates, and solely because of the operation of section 304 of the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act of 1943 and the fact that the President did not appoint him thereunder, has refused and failed to pay plaintiff any compensation for the period from November 16, through November 21, 1943, nor has the defendant ever paid plaintiff his pro rata base salary plus overtime, or any part thereof, for services rendered during that period. The amount which has not been paid to plaintiff, and which has been withheld solely because of the operation of said section 304 and the fact that the President did not appoint him thereunder, is $59.83.

Conclusions of law

Upon the foregoing special findings of fact, which are made a part of the judgments herein, the court concludes, as a matter of law, that the plaintiffs are entitled to recover.

It is therefore ordered and adjudged that plaintiff Robert Morss Lovett (in case No. 46026) recover of and from the United States the sum of $1,996.40; that plaintiff Goodwin B. Watson (in case No. 46027) recover of and from the United States the sum of $101.78; and that plaintiff William E. Dodd, Jr. (in case No. 46028) recover of and from the United States the sum of $59.83.

Opinion

Whaley, Chief Justice, delivered the opinion of the court:

On August 26, 1943, plaintiff Robert Morss Lovett was appointed Executive Assistant to the Governor of the Virgin Islands by the Secretary of the Interior, pursuant to authority granted in section 23 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, 49 Stat. 1807, 1813. He took the oath of office and entered upon the duties thereof October 12, 1943. He performed them thereafter through March 13, 1944, at which time his services ended. He has not been paid the salary of his office for the period November 15, 1943, through March 13, 1944, which amounts to $1,996.40, and this sum he sues to recover.

Plaintiff Goodwin B. Watson was appointed Chief of the Analysis Division, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Federal Communications Commission, November 16, 1941, by the Federal Communications Commission, and took the oath of office and entered upon the duties thereof on that date, and performed them thereafter through November 21, 1943, when his active services ended. His appointment was made under section 4 of the Communications Act of 1934, approved June 19, 1934, 48 Stat. 1064, 1066. He sues to recover the salary of his office from November 16, 1943, through November 21, 1943, amounting to $101.78, which he has not been paid.

Plaintiff William E. Dodd, Jr., was appointed assistant news editor, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Federal Communications Commission, December 22, 1942, by the Federal Communications Commission under section 4 of the Communications Act

of 1934, immediately entering upon the duties of that office. He performed those duties thereafter through November 21, 1943. He has not been paid the salary attached to that office for the period from November 16, 1943, through November 21, 1943, which amounts to $69.83, and he sues herein for that amount.

None of the appointments here involved were made by the President of the United States and confirmed by the Senate.

The three cases have been submitted on stipulations, and they have been briefed and argued together. The general question raised has been the constitutionality of section 304 of the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1943 (57 Stat. 431, 450).

The plaintiffs assert that the section is unconstitutional setting forth their reasons for that assertion. The Attorney General having heretofore also taken the position that the section was unconstitutional, and still adhering to that position, the Assistant Attorney General, appearing for the defendant, supports the plaintiffs. Special counsel appear in the cases as amici curiae, having been employed to defend the constitutionality of the disputed section. The special counsel are designated variously in the record as representing the House, the Congress, the United States. Their brief is entitled "Brief for the Congress of the United States," and they sign as "Special Counsel for the Congress of the United States." They will hereinafter be referred to as "special counsel."

Insofar as the law involved in these three cases is concerned, they are not to be distinguished one from the other.

Special counsel raise the question of jurisdiction. Section 145 of the Judicial Code governs. The general jurisdiction of this court in pay cases is too well known and established to justify reexamination. Section 304, which will be quoted verbatum, in no way indicates that this court is without jurisdiction. There is not a line or word to that effect. Inferences will not be employed to go to the extent of holding that Congress went so far as to deny these plaintiffs their day in court. The jurisdictional statute is general, and section 304 contains no exception.

Section 304 is as follows:

"SEC. 304. No part of any appropriation, allocation, or fund (1) which is made available under or pursuant to this act, or (2) which is now, or which is hereafter made, available under or pursuant to any other act, to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States, shall be used, after November 15, 1943, to pay any part of the salary, or other compensation for the personal services, of Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Jr., and Robert Morss Lovett, unless prior to such date such person has been appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided*, That this section shall not operate to deprive any such person of payment for leaves of absence or salary, or of any refund or reimbursement, which have accrued prior to November 15, 1943: *Provided further*, That this section shall not operate to deprive any such person of payment for services performed as a member of a jury or as a member of the armed forces of the United States nor any benefit, pension, or emolument resulting therefrom."

If section 304 is unconstitutional and of no effect, recovery follows. Special counsel argue that it is not severable. Their argument is not convincing. We are in no doubt about our jurisdiction.

If, on the other hand, section 304 is a valid exercise of constitutional power, but notwithstanding that plaintiffs are entitled to recover, then it becomes a matter of indifference whether the section is valid or invalid as an exercise of constitutional power.

The Court will not reach out gratuitously to avail itself of questionable but inapplicable elements in an act and thereby hold it to be unconstitutional. There is always the presumption of validity. The Court will not undertake to say that, because provisions in section 304, not here operative, are invalid, the whole of the section falls for invalidity.

Much of the argument presented seems to be based on a supposed lack of appropriation. But there was an appropriation. Section 304 refers to an actual appropriation, an "available" appropriation. If available, the appropriation, as far as these cases are concerned, was available for the payment of these salaries. Availability of the appropriation for other purposes is beside the question. The disbursing agency could divert no part of an appropriation to purposes other than those for which that appropriation was made. Section 304 does not say "otherwise" available, and important words may not be put into the statute that Congress did not place there. There was an appropriation, it was available for the payment of these salaries. If it was not available for the payment of these salaries, then it was clearly not available to the administrative bureau. Congress did not limit the appropriation. What it did limit and what it was directed to, was the activities of the disbursing agency. There, and there only, did Congress apply the brake.

Section 304 is notable for what it did not do, as well as for what it did do.

It did not terminate plaintiffs' services. Special counsel insist that it did not work removal from office, and so stated on argument of the cases.

Removal from office is not made an item of damages here. The claim made is only for salary of the office during the time of service, and no longer. We are therefore not concerned with the cause of termination, or in what situation, except for lack of pay, the plaintiffs found themselves thereafter.

This limitation upon the claims made explains why it has not been necessary in reviewing the facts, to gather in many things that are of record, or of which judicial notice may be taken. Many of the circumstances are interesting only, and in no sense material to disposition of the cases.

There is nothing in section 304 which disturbed plaintiffs' incumbency in office. Special counsel in their brief say:

"All that the statute did was to say to the disbursing officers of the Government: After November 15, 1943, you shall not pay out any money to Watson, Dodd, and Lovett unless prior to that date they have been appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. This was merely a direction to disbursing officers, and in itself created no legal rights in anyone."

We repeat, the Court, in passing upon the constitutional validity of a statute will not gratuitously reach out to make use of that which is irrelevant to the case in hand. It was said in *Watson* v. *Buck* (313 U. S. 387, 402):

"A law which is constitutional as applied in one manner may still contravene the Constitution as applied in another. Since all contingencies of attempted enforcement cannot be envisioned in advance of those applications, courts have in the main found it wiser to delay passing upon the constitutionality of all the separate phases of a comprehensive statute until faced with cases involving particular provisions as specifically applied to persons who claim to be injured."

Section 304 does comprehend more than a direction not to pay for the isolated services here rendered. But that "more" is here irrelevant. In terms the section extends to all available appropriations, all disbursing officers, all departments, agencies, or instrumentalities of the United States, all personal services of the instant plaintiffs, and is without limitation in time. But in the cases before us we have for consideration only one specified period of employment, and the conditions of that specific employment. We cannot introduce situations which are not before us, and which may indeed never come into being. It may be repeated, that here we have no claim for damages for removal from office, no petition for compulsory process, solely a claim for the as yet unpaid salary of an office, the duties of which have been performed by the undisputed holder of that office. These are not suits for reinstatement to office. As was said in *California* v. *San Pablo etc. Railroad* (149 U. S. 308, 314):

"The duty of this court, as of every judicial tribunal, is limited to determining rights of persons or of property, which are actually controverted in the particular case before it. When, in determining such rights, it becomes necessary to give an opinion upon a question of law, that opinion may have weight as a precedent for future decisions. But the court is not empowered to decide moot questions or abstract propositions or to declare, for the Government of future cases, principles or rules of law which cannot affect the result as to the thing in issue before it. No stipulation of parties or counsel, whether in the case before the court or in any other case, can enlarge the power, or affect the duty, of the court in this regard."

The incumbent of the office held it de jure. There was no irregularity in the appointment. There was no removal of the officer from the office, no removal of the salary from the office. The appropriation was made and designated as "available." The only appropriation here, in praesenti, is the appropriation available to pay these salaries.

The closer the statute is examined, the more clearly does it appear that with reference to the particular situation we have here, Congress confined itself to one thing—prohibiting the disbursing agencies from paying the salaries of the plaintiffs. The act is very carefully framed to avoid denying pecuniary obligations. It is a bare caveat issued against the disbursing agency.

As special counsel contend, Congress did not remove from office. The original appointment was unaffected, the office was undisturbed, the compensation was unchanged, the incumbents were not separated from office. They held de jure.

Quoting again from the brief of special counsel:

Section 304 did not deprive plaintiffs of any right to salary. Section 304 denied to the Federal Communications Commission and to the Secretary of the Interior the funds with which to pay plaintiffs; and since under 47 U. S. C., section 154g and 48 U. S. C., section 1405v, the power of those agencies to grant plaintiffs a right to salary depended upon the existence of such funds, section 304 prevented these agencies from granting the right plaintiffs assert.

We are not free to conclude that section 304 accomplished deviously that which for certainty's sake should have been accomplished directly, if it could be accomplished at all. What it did do directly, not indirectly, constitutionally, or unconstitutionally, and nothing more, was to stay the hand of the disbursing agency.

There would have been no occasion for section 304 to stop payment if the plaintiffs were not holding their respective offices in fact and in law. No disbursing agent had authority to make payment of salaries to men out of office or not entitled to office, and a direction to such an agent not to pay the salary to a legally displaced officeholder would have been something less than an empty gesture. The obvious circumstance that the section was dealing with was one where the plaintiffs were legally and actually in office. Section 304 did not remove them.

It is to no very useful purpose to inquire into the reason for enactment of section 304. But it may be remarked in passing that it is impossible to conclude that Congress meant that in the final outcome service was to be free to the Government, because the plaintiffs were, in its opinion let us say, unfit for office. It is plain that the plaintiffs, if unfit, were just as unfit serving the Government

for nothing as serving it for something. There is no logic to the proposition that the plaintiffs were to serve the Government for nothing. The proposition is irrational. Unfitness could not be converted into fitness by withholding salary. Yet the statute allowed these plaintiffs to continue in office.

Section 304 is not to be construed beyond its express, explicit terms, nor beyond its incidence in time. It effectually halted the disbursing process in a special situation, at a particular time. We are not here concerned with other situations, other times. The situation, the occasion, has now passed into history. The accomplished event is not now before the Congress and never has been. But it is here and now before this Court.

It is urged that plaintiffs must fail, because the procedure was not followed of having an appointment "by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate," as provided for in section 304. It has been observed that section 304 is notable for what it does not say. It does not say that the services of the plaintiffs are terminated, that they shall not continue on under their current appointments. In other words, as special counsel observe, the section did not remove them from office. The plaintiffs did not have to have a Presidential appointment in order to continue in office. They did continue in office. It is only the period of their continuance in office, after November 15, 1943, that is involved in this controversy.

In a long line of cases it has been held that lapse of appropriation, failure of appropriation, exhaustion of appropriation, do not of themselves preclude recovery for compensation otherwise due. (*King* v. *United States* (1 C. Cls. 38); *Graham* v. *United States* (1 C. Cls. 380); *Curtis* v. *United States* (2 C. Cls. 144); *Grant* v. *United States* (5 C. Cls. 71); *Collins* v. *United States* (15 C. Cls. 22); *Briggs* v. *United States* (15 C. Cls. 48); *Parsons* v. *United States* (15 C. Cls. 246); *Huffman* v. *United States* (17 C. Cls. 55); *Dougherty* v. *United States* (18 C. Cls. 496); *Ferris* v. *United States* (27 C. Cls. 542); *Sherlock* v. *United States* (43 C. Cls. 161); *Strong* v. *United States* (60 C. Cls. 627); *Danford* v. *United States* (62 C. Cls. 285); *McNeil* v. *United States* (64 C. Cls. 406); *Cogswell* v. *United States* (68 C. Cls. 694); *Palmer* v. *United States* (69 C. Cls. 260); *Crist* v. *United States* (74 C. Cls. 283); *Conrad* v. *United States* (74 C. Cls. 289); *Wilson* v. *United States* (77 C. Cls. 630); *Leonard* v. *United States* (80 C. Cls. 147); *Miller* v. *United States* (86 C. Cls. 609); *United States* v. *Langston* (118 U. S. 389); *United States* v. *Vulte* (233 U. S. 509).)

The provision in section 304 that no available appropriation shall be used to pay the salaries of these plaintiffs, here in question, does not reach this Court. Speaking with reference to the constitutional provision that no money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law, this Court said (*Collins* v. *United States*, supra):

"That provision of the Constitution is exclusively a direction to the officers of the Treasury, who are intrusted with the safekeeping and payment out of the public money, and not to the courts of law; the courts and their officers can make no payment from the Treasury under any circumstances.

"This court, established for the sole purpose of investigating claims against the Government, does not deal with questions of appropriations, but with the legal liabilities incurred by the United States under contracts, express or implied, the laws of Congress, or the regulations of the executive departments."

Section 304 made no pretense to determine a legal liability. It assumed no judicial function. It simply prevented a particular disbursement from a particular fund, no more than that if it be taken for just what it says, without inferences. We are confining ourselves, of course, to the precise claims asserted.

In *United States* v. *Dickerson* (310 U. S. 554), it was held that an appropriation act could suspend the operation of a prior statute granting certain reenlistment allowances. Granted that an appropriation act may be something more than an accounting process, in the case we have here section 304 makes no attempt to change or do away with compensation attached to the offices held by the plaintiffs. It merely stopped payment in three specific instances (no other instances are here involved), regardless of obligation.

The obligation was undisturbed. The act did not say it was destroyed, or even subtly attempt to destroy it, unless we are to indulge in inferences, which we are not disposed to do. It did not say to the plaintiffs, "You are discharged." The status of the plaintiffs was untouched.

The cases cited indicate survival of the obligation in spite of lapse, exhaustion, failure of appropriation. Other reported cases not pay cases, are crowded with instances of unliquidated damages recovered, recovery against the United States being had in the absence of any appropriation at all to pay unliquidated damages, and in the absence of any authority in the disbursing agency to satisfy the litigant's claim.

In the three cases now here considered there was more than in the cases cited. There were in existence available appropriations. As heretofore indicated, full value must be given to the express word "available." It cannot be changed to "unavailable." If the appropriations could not be used for these offices, then they were unavailable. The statute says they are available, and they must be so considered.

We have pointed out that section 304 was without time limitation. Congress cannot bind itself to discontinue legislation, if it is to go on as a constitutional body. It may therefore repeal section 304. Section 304 is statutory, not a part of the Constitution. It may or may not turn out to be permanent legislation.

Congress, by enacting section 304, did not foreclose itself from thereafter appropriating for the payment of these salaries. Congress even now may appropriate, and authorize a selected disbursing agency to pay them. Claims therefor, presented to Congress, may be satisfied by an appropriation to pay them, as claims. Judgments, recovered here, may be satisfied by any appropriation out of which the judgments may be by act of Congress payable.

The statute did not separate the plaintiffs from office, it did not take away the salary of that office, it did not prohibit plaintiffs from receiving their salaries. The act did provide an appropriation for the payment of their salaries. The appropriation for the pay period was there, but it was not made use of. The plaintiffs were appointed lawfully, they continued in office lawfully. Section 304 in no way disqualified them, and we can find no rational basis for construing the act otherwise than as a mere stoppage of disbursing routine, nothing more. To construe it as something more is to volunteer inferences. Whether the Congress had the constitutional authority to stop payment, within the limitations of the act, is immaterial. That which is material is that the salaries have not been paid, that the obligation was never destroyed, and that the obligation continues to this day.

In the conclusion arrived at, it is immaterial whether section 304 of the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1943, or any part thereof, is constitutional or not. We do not decide that question. The plaintiffs are entitled to recover in either event. As previously indicated, consideration of section 304 is necessarily confined to narrow limits, as narrow as the claims themselves.

Plaintiff Robert Morss Lovett in case No. 46026 is entitled to recover $1,996.40; plaintiff Goodwin B. Watson in case No. 46027 is entitled to recover $101.78; and plaintiff William E. Dodd, Jr., in case No. 46028 is entitled to recover $59.83. Judgments will be entered accordingly. It is so ordered.

Littleton, Judge, concurs.

Whitaker, Judge, concurring:

I desire to state very briefly the reason for my concurrence in the result reached by the court.

In the brief filed for the Congress it is argued that the power of that body to appropriate money is without limitation and, hence, that it can attach any condition it pleases on the use of the money appropriated. Even if we accept this statement without limitation, still, section 304 goes much beyond a mere restriction on the use of the money appropriated by that act. It not only prohibits the use of the money thereby appropriated to pay plaintiffs' salaries, but it also prohibits the use of any money theretofore or thereafter to be appropriated to pay their salaries, either in their present positions or in any other governmental positions, except as jurors or members of the armed forces. This amounts to depriving plaintiffs of their rights as citizens to enjoy the emoluments of office. It is, therefore, an act inflicting punishment upon them without a judicial trial.

The passage of such an act is prohibited by clause 3 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution, which reads: "No bill of attainder or ex post facto law shall be passed." A bill of attainder has been defined by the Supreme Court as "a legislative act which inflicts punishment without a judicial trial. If the punishment be less than death, the act is termed 'a bill of pains and penalties.' Within the meaning of the Constitution, bills of attainder include bills of pains and penalties." (*Cummings* v. *Missouri* (4 Wall. 277, 323).)

I have no doubt that section 304 of this appropriation act violates this provision of the Constitution; no judicial tribunal has found them guilty of any crime, but by this act they have been denied the salary attached to any office they may now or hereafter occupy. Patently, this violates this provision of the Constitution. If it does, it is void, although it was enacted in the exercise of the power of Congress to appropriate money. The grant of any power by the Constitution is subject to the limitation that it must not be exercised in a way that would nullify another provision of the Constitution. See, for instance, *Marbury* v. *Madison* (1 Cranch 137); *Rhode Island* v. *Massachusetts* (12 Pet. 657); *Knowlton* v. *Moore* (178 U. S. 41); *Dick* v. *United States* (208 U. S. 340).

Since I am convinced that this act does violate this provision of the Constitution, I find it unnecessary to consider the other constitutional objections to it, to wit, whether it amounted to a removal of these men from office or a denial of due process of law.

Courts never take pleasure in saying that a coordinate branch of the Government has exceeded its constitutional powers; certainly in this case I take no pleasure in saying that Congress has done that which it had no power to do, but since I am convinced that the restriction amounts to a bill of attainder, I am under compulsion to say that the restriction is invalid and, hence, cannot operate to deprive these men of the salaries to which their positions entitle them.

Jones, Judge, concurring:

I concur in the result.

The single issue in this case is whether section 304, as worded, is a valid exercise of the constitutional powers of the Congress.

The authority of the Congress to make appropriations, within the framework of the

Constitution, is plenary. The power to make appropriations carries with it the power to withhold or deny appropriations. That power has been exercised for generations.

This is as fundamental as the Ten Commandments.

As to the wisdom of granting or withholding appropriations the courts have no right to pass judgment, granted, of course, that the Congress is acting within the scope of its authority.

The Congress has the sheer power to grant or withhold current appropriations to individuals except for services already rendered, regardless of whether the action taken is wise or unwise. It does not have to assign a reason for such action, and we have no right to ask for a reason.

A Member's constituency alone, under our philosophy of government, has a right to call such Member to account.

Having the power to appropriate for specified purposes it has the power to limit the use of such funds so long as it is merely a limitation.

If section 304 merely forbade the use of funds in the bill, or other funds already available in other bills, I would have no hesitancy in holding it a limitation on appropriation.

The true issue is narrowed to whether the expression "or which is hereafter made available under or pursuant to any other act" transforms it from an appropriation to a legislative provision, and whether such legislation deprives plaintiffs of valuable rights as citizens which they would otherwise have under the Constitution.

The language quoted goes beyond a mere limitation on appropriation and beomes, unless affirmatively repealed, a permanent denial of plaintiffs' rights as citizens. A rose remains a rose even though someone calls it a lily.

No one has a right to be employed by the Government, but every citizen, whose rights have not been legally forfeited, is privileged to apply for any position within the Government and to have his application considered on its merits. This is a thing of value not only intrinsically, but because of the satisfaction it brings a man regardless of whether it is ever exercised. The knowledge of its possession is a powerful element in the pursuit of happiness. Section 304 forecloses this right and closes that door of opportunity.

The National Government is one of delegated powers in all its branches. All powers not delegated remain with the States or with the people.

The tenth amendment is as follows:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

The ninth amendment is as follows:

"The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

The power to provide or deny appropriations is vested in the Congress. There is no other way to take money out of the Treasury. The Constitution provides (art. I, sec. 9):

"No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law."

If section 304 were a mere denial of appropriation, however unjust it might be, it could not be successfully questioned. But it does not stop with a mere denial of appropriation. It goes far beyond this. It forbids on a permanent basis employment in the future. It thus becomes a permanent legislative ban.

I cannot find within the four corners of the Constitution any power lodged in the Congress to deny these privileges to any citizen, except in the manner prescribed in the Constitution.

The principle of equality was written in the Declaration of Independence before we had a constitution. It was the result of a long struggle of English peoples upward toward the plains of liberty. It is one of our proudest traditions. It was carried forward into the Constitution. It shines through almost every provision in that instrument. The Constitution provides for liberty, equality, and fair play; and freedom from every form of new- and old-world caste and privilege, and from the tyranny of wealth and birth. It throws every safeguard around the rights and privileges of the individual citizen.

The right to seek employment is one of the most highly prized rights of the Anglo-Saxon race. When a citizen by his conduct forfeits any of his rights, privileges, and immunities, a method is provided for establishing that forfeiture. That method was not pursued here. One of the chief glories of the Constitution is the fact that you cannot take the shirt from the back of a ragged street urchin without either securing the lad's consent or paying for the rags in the manner prescribed by law. The same is true of his privileges in every form. *Truax* v. *Raich* (239 U. S. 33, 41); *Yick Wo* v. *Hopkins* (118 U. S. 356, 370); *International News Service* v. *Associated Press* (248 U. S. 215, 236).

Section 304 in making a permanent ban on the rights and privileges of the plaintiffs, exceeds the authority delegated to the Congress by the Constitution.

Madden, Judge, concurring in the result:

I agree with the decision of the court, but, because of the importance and variety of the problems presented, I make the following additional observations.

Nothing is claimed to have been done or said or written by any of the plaintiffs which was unlawful. No statute or legal doctrine is brought forward under which it is claimed that they could have been restrained before utterance or action, or punished thereafter by so much as a penny fine. And no indirect adverse legal consequences were attached to what they said or did by any legal doctrine, or by statutes such as the Hatch Act, or the various provisions in other acts disqualifying for Government employment members of organizations which advocate the overthrow of our constitutional form of government. It is not claimed that they violated those laws. In short, what they did was completely innocent and of no interest or consequence to the law of the land as it then was, or, as to all persons except the three plaintiffs, as the law still is. And this was true without any resort to constitutional protections of freedom of utterance or action. The law, wholly apart from the Constitution, did not touch what they had done. But as a consequence of their having done what they did, the three plaintiffs find themselves excommunicated, reduced to the status of three second-class citizens among all of the millions of their fellows. They find themselves subject to the same obligations as their fellow first-class citizens to obey the laws, pay taxes, and serve in the armed forces and on juries; but completely and perpetually disqualified from serving their Government in any of the thousands of positions in which any of the rest of us, if technically capable, may serve. It is not claimed that the three plaintiffs were not competent to perform, or did not faithfully perform, the duties of the positions they held.

Has Congress the power to remove, by statute, named individuals from Government service, and make them perpetually ineligible to hold positions in Government service because they have engaged in conduct which was entirely lawful? Section 304 purports to do this. If it in fact accomplishes it, it has accomplished, under the guise of law, a shocking and outrageous injustice, unique in our history, and discouraging because it follows 150 years of experience under the best Government men have devised. The court's problem is not, of course, whether section 304 is unjust, but whether it is unconstitutional. But when the injustice of the particular law is so shocking, and the threat of its repetition and extension is so menacing to our institutions, as in the case of section 304, one can hardly be blamed for saying to himself, even before he consults the text of the Constitution, "If the Constitution is the charter of liberty and free government which I have always supposed that it is, it does not permit this."

If section 304 is valid, Congress can disqualify for public office or service racial minorities, political minorities, and, probably, religious minorities. To do so would, indeed, be less unjust than what is done by section 304. If a racial minority were excommunicated, the statute would at least have one quality of what we have been accustomed to regard as law, the quality of generality of application to all persons of an ascertainable class. No individual would have the finger of the State pointed at him, as these three plaintiffs have, saying, "You are degraded, not because of the kind of person you are, for there may be thousands of persons just like you in all essential respects, who are still full citizens; not because of what you have done, for there may be thousands of persons who have done the same things, so far as those things are relevant to a rational state, as you have done. You are degraded because the State has selected you for degradation." And a racial or other minority could, under the constitutional protections which would apply even to second-class citizens, pool their resources and agitate for the repeal of the statute with some slight hope that in the turn of political events a powerful party might need the votes of this minority to insure its success, and hence would espouse its cause. But three individuals, such as these plaintiffs, are helpless. If they speak, who will listen? If they should happen to have the money to publish, who will read? Their appeal would appear to be completely selfish. The reaction would be: "Who are these persons, of the dominant race, of many generations of honorable American ancestry, to be complaining of discrimination? I don't know just what has happened to them, but if they can't take care of themselves, nobody can." And nobody can, if section 304 is valid.

Section 304 is asserted by the plaintiffs to be unconstitutional because (1) it purports to remove the plaintiffs from executive offices, and no power of removal resides in the legislative branch of the Government, except by impeachment; (2) it is a bill of attainder, or its equivalent, a bill of pains and penalties, which the Constitution forbids; and (3) it deprives the plaintiffs of liberty and property without due process of law, in violation of the fifth amendment.

I have no doubt that section 304 is a bill of pains and penalties and is therefore unconstitutional. It has the ancient flavor of the bills of attainder which were so odious to the makers of our Constitution that they forbade such laws in the main body of the Constitution and before the Bill of Rights later embodied in the first 10 amendments was thought necessary, in that it, like the bills of attainder that the fathers were familiar with, selects its victims as named individuals, and not as persons belonging to any describable class. It punishes them by removal from office and income and disqualification from ever again serving their Government for compensation except in military or jury service. It thus imposes the same penalty which the Senate is authorized to impose, on conviction by a two-thirds vote after impeachment by the House, upon officers guilty of "treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors." The question of whether the forfeiture of the right to pursue a public calling was punishment, so that a statute imposing it for past innocent conduct is an ex post facto law and a bill of pains and penalties was settled right in the cases of Cummings, the priest, 4 Wall. 277, and Garland, the lawyer, 4 Wall. 333.

I think section 304 violates the fifth amendment in that it attempted to deprive the plaintiffs of liberty and property without due process of law. I recognize that the fifth amendment does not, like the fourteenth, which applies only to state governmental action, expressly assure equal protection of Federal laws. But a statute which selects persons for punitive action on a completely personal basis, with no attempt to treat similarly other persons similarly situated, is so foreign to our concepts of law that it is difficult to think of it as law at all, though it bears the stamp of legislative enactment. If a legislature refuses to define the conduct which it desires to punish, if done by A, in such terms that B and C and D will be equally punishable if they do it, but instead merely provides that A shall be punished if he does it, the legislature engages, not in law making, but in arbitrary action. And this would be true, even if the statute did not, as section 304 does, attempt to make punishable conduct which was wholly innocent when engaged in. There are indications in opinions of the courts, though the necessity for deciding the questions has not hitherto arisen, that the due process of law which is required by the fifth amendment would not be satisfied by the arbitrary selection by the legislature of certain named individuals to be the sole victims of penal laws. In *Hurtado* v. *California* (110 U. S. 516, 535), where the arbitrary action of a State was in question, the court said:

"But it is not to be supposed that these legislative powers are absolute and despotic, and that the amendment prescribing due process of law is too vague and indefinite to operate as a practical restraint. It is not every act, legislative in form, that is law. Law is something more than mere will exerted as an act of power. It must be not a special rule for a particular person or a particular case."

The cases of *Nichols* v. *Coolidge*, 274 U. S. 531; *Wallace* v. *Currin*, C. C. A. 4, 95 F. (2d) 856; *Minski* v. *United States*, C. C. A. 6, 131 F. (2d) 614; *United States* v. *Ballard*, W. D. Ky., 12 F. Supp. 321, also indicate the same attitude toward governmental action in the guise of law which penalizes persons unequally. I think, therefore, that section 304 is forbidden by the fifth amendment.

It is urged that section 304, even if it would otherwise be invalid as a trespass by Congress upon the executive function of removal of executive officers, is saved by the provision that these plaintiffs might keep their positions if, within the period of a few months set by the statute, they were appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. But no other person in the country had to pursue such a course in order to obtain or hold those positions, or identical or comparable ones. The requirement was intended to be, and was, discriminatory and oppressive as to three selected individuals out of all the people in the country. Under a system of equal justice under law, the three plaintiffs should not be subjected, in order to get or hold a Government position, to any other or different requirements than the rest of us are subject to. And the Constitution, I think, forbids their being so oppressed.

It is, in effect, urged that even though section 304 is unconstitutional for any or all of the reasons suggested, there can be no relief for its victims because the section is a part of an appropriation act, and the power of Congress to control expenditures is absolute. It may well be that under our Constitution, and under any constitution which might be devised for a free people, one branch of the Government could, temporarily at least, subvert the Government. The judges might refuse to enforce legal rights or convict criminals. The President might order the Army and Navy to surrender to the enemy. Congress might refuse to raise or appropriate money to pay the President or the Justices of the Supreme Court and the other courts. But any of these imagined actions would not be taken pursuant to the Constitution, but would be acts of subversion and revolution, the exercise of mere physical power, not lawful authority. And conduct by any branch of the Government less ruinously subversive, but, so far as it goes, equally unconstitutional, is likewise an exercise of physical power rather than lawful authority. I do not think, therefore, that the power of the purse may be constitutionally exercised to produce an unconstitutional result such as a taking of a citizen's liberty or property without due process of law, a conviction and punishment of a citizen for wholly innocent conduct, or a trespass upon the constitutional functions of another branch of the Government. And to whatever extent it is within the jurisdiction of a court to which the question is presented in litigation, to give judgment according to the Constitution, even though that requires the court to disregard a statute which conflicts with the Constitution, the judges are bound by their oaths to give such a judgment. In this case, therefore, we must disregard section 304. Without it, the plaintiffs are in the position of having performed services for the Government, under lawful appointments, for which the Government has refused to pay. Each of them is, therefore, entitled to a judgment.

A true copy.
Test:

_____,
Clerk, Court of Claims of the United States.

Amvets Reach First Base in Fight for National Medical Center for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 7, 1946

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following insertion by my young friend, Joe Leib, who is evidently putting up a fight for a cause which is near his heart:

AMVETS REACH FIRST BASE IN FIGHT FOR NATIONAL MEDICAL CENTER FOR VETERANS

(By J. H. Leib, national legislative director)

It is gratifying to report that the Veterans' Administration is now on public record to the effect that a national medical center for veterans to replace Mount Alto Hospital will be completed by October 1, 1947.

Thus, the American Veterans of World War II (Amvets) have succeeded in reaching first base in a long fight to replace the shamefully overcrowded, inadequate, and gloomy veterans' facility located in the National Capital.

But October 1, 1947, is a long way off—in fact 20 long, bitter months in the unforeseen future, and still the Veterans' Administration is complacently looking for a suitable site before the long-delayed construction can get under way.

In the name of logic what are the veterans in need of medical care and hospitalization going to do while the Veterans' Administration attempts to make up its mind?

On January 10, 1946, the Washington papers carried a statement by Dr. Griffith, manager at Mount Alto, in which he announced that the hospital "is classed as one of the most overcrowded veterans' hospitals in the country." Veterans who come to Washington for special treatment are being shipped to out-of-town Government institutions for necessary professional care. Action is needed immediately.

At this point I would like to present a letter I addressed to President Truman relative to this matter, and the reply received from General Bradley. They follow:

JANUARY 10, 1946.

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: More than a year ago I had inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a number of articles relative to the urgent need of a new medical center for veterans here in the National Capital.

General Hines, then Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, assured me of the great need for such a hospital. On May 29, 1945, he publicly urged the construction of this center. Three months later General Bradley assured newspapermen that he would end overcrowding at Mount Alto.

In today's Washington Star there appeared a story that Mount Alto "is classed as one of the most overcrowded veterans' hospitals in the country. Dr. Griffith said the hospital was still operating over its authorized capacity of 327 beds."

Mr. President, the District of Columbia should have the finest and most modern hospital in the whole country as a model and example of medical care for veterans. Instead it is probably the worst of all such Government institutions.

Is it not about time that something is done about this unfortunate situation?

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH LEIB,
National Legislative Director, Amvets.

The reply:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C. January 23, 1946.

Mr. JOSEPH LEIB,
National Legislative Director, American Veterans of World War II, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LEIB: The President has referred to me your letter of January 10, 1946, inquiring as to the status of our plans for veterans' hospital in the District of Columbia, and urging the desirability of establishing a veterans' hospital that would serve as an example of medical care for veterans.

I am most appreciative of your suggestion with regard to this hospital, and agree with you that the veterans' hospital for the District of Columbia should represent a model for the rest of the country.

Congress, in the 1946 deficiency appropriation, provided funds for the establishment of a 750-bed general medical and surgical hospital for the District of Columbia. We are, at the present time, making site surveys for the purpose of selecting a suitable location for this hospital. As soon as recommendations can be made to the Federal Board of Hospitalization and approval of the site can be obtained from the President, we hope to proceed with plans for establishing a hospital such as you outline.

Sincerely yours,

OMAR N. BRADLEY,
General, United States Army,
Administrator.

Finally, I would like to ask—why did the Veterans' Administration wait until now to start making site surveys? Why wasn't this problem foreseen and cleared away long before the present crisis presented itself?

In this connection attention is called to two letters that General Hines, former Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, wrote which shows who was basically responsible for delaying this long overdue Federal project. This correspondence speaks for itself. It is sincerely hoped that General Bradley will be able to unravel himself from the bureaucratic red tape and dodging and ducking tactics that so engulfed the Administration before him.

Here are the masterpieces of procrastination:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., February 22, 1945.

I have received your letter of February 12, 1945, that forwarded a clipping that appeared in the Washington Times-Herald, concerning the construction of a medical center for veterans residing in the District of Columbia.

While it has been determined that there is a need for expanded facilities for the hospitalization of beneficiaries of the Veterans' Administration in the District of Columbia area, provision for the establishment of additional facilities has not been made in our present program. It is expected that such a project will be included in our next submission to the Federal Board of Hospitalization.

Very truly yours,
FRANK T. HINES, *Administrator.*

Obviously, this letter was as clear as mud. Further specific data was respectfully demanded. Here is the second reply—equally as indefinite:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., February 23, 1945.

Reference is made to the inquiry from your office regarding the erection of a medical center for veterans in the District of Columbia area.

As stated in my letter of February 22, 1945, it is expected that the inclusion of such a project will be made in our next submission to the Federal Board of Hospitalization. Our next program of additional hospital construction will be submitted not later than July of this year.

Very truly yours,
FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator.

This as expected was just another stall. A call to the Veterans' Administration to ascertain who made up the Federal Board of Hospitalization brought forth the amusing revelation that the Chairman of this all-powerful group was none other than General Hines himself—believe it or not.

Here we are a year later—February 7, 1946—and all we have gotten is an obscure date when the much needed hospital might be completed. Veterans will not stand for this stupidity much longer.

Great Speech by Secretary Anderson on Importance and Constructive Work of Farm Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, at the recent convention of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives held in Chicago, Secretary of Agriculture Anderson made one of the truly great speeches of recent years.

Under unanimous consent I include the account of this speech which appeared in the Co-Op Review, the official monthly publication of the Pennsylvania Farm Bureau Federation, for February 1946:

From the pen of Secretary of Agriculture Clinton P. Anderson, the aims, the methods, and the validity of American farm cooperatives have just received the soundest endorsement probably ever given by a Cabinet member.

The message was spoken at the annual meeting of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives at Chicago in January.

When the last word fell from the Secretary's lips, the mighty audience of cooperative executives that had gathered from coast to coast, and from the Lakes to the Gulf, arose as one man and cheered, and cheered to the echo. His breadth and warmth of understanding of their aspiration to lift American farming onto a self-dependent level, above the fear of encroaching monopoly, fairly lifted them from their seats. With penetrating statements he had inspired them with a new and deeper faith that farm cooperatives, fully in line with the power of the American farm tradition, are preserving the family-size farm and individual ownership against the insidious trend toward corporate ownership and operation—and maintaining their identity in a world of economic giants.

"Sheer economic giantism" was, in fact, the apt word-coinage of Secretary Anderson.

"We have moved," he said, "into an economy of 'bigness'—sheer economic giantism"—not only America's industrial plant, but agriculture, too. "It has become in the past generation a high-powered, mechanized business," and, while he had "nothing against big business just because they are big, at the same time size does carry with it some inherent dangers, as the dinosaurs of a bygone age found out.

"We would be dodging one of the most vital issues of the times," the Secretary contended, "if we did not acknowledge that the same forces which brought great size and concentration of economic power in our industries are also bearing heavily on agriculture.

"The major point I wish to make is that the farmer and the other small businessmen of today must operate in a world of economic giants, yet they must retain their identity and their flexibility as individual enterprisers. They can do that only by becoming just as efficient as the large operators.

"They must recognize that they face direct and indirect competition with multi-million-dollar organizations that are constantly extending, constantly on the alert for new processes or new short cuts that will yield competitive advantage."

The Secretary, indeed, went so far as to say with obvious emphasis that, he believed—

"There is little doubt that, except for the power of the American farm tradition, the growth of cooperation, and the definite, deep-seated Federal and State policy of encouraging the family-type farm as something of fundamental national strength, the big corporations might have taken over as much of agriculture as they have of other parts of our economy. It has happened all around us; it has been a part of our industrial and business growth; but I am positive that it is not what agriculture wants. We can, I believe, find other ways of producing the same results—we have done it, and we are going to continue to do it."

Cooperatives, as the Secretary developed his address, are simply a tangible expression, "with an extremely high value," of "the very nature of farming in America from the time of the first settlers." He spoke of the pioneer families that pushed westward across the country; faced great personal dangers and natural hazards against which the individual alone was powerless—and who through cooperation "found a source of strength that enabled them to bring the raw new land under the plow, to build homes, churches, and schools in the face of the peril of Indian wars, storms, drought, and lack of all but the most elementary facilities for civilization."

Here the Secretary found the spiritual note of his message—the precious spirit of neighborliness—of which he said the "highly developed formal cooperatives in agriculture today are a direct outgrowth."

He contended, moreover, that this "binding that holds them together, the essential force that makes them go on, is nothing more nor less than an extension of this spirit into present-day conditions. Without that human force, a cooperative is in real danger of becoming just another business, abstract in its aims, and divorced from the lives of its members and customers."

Cooperatives, he said, go back, indeed, to the day of Benjamin Franklin, "one of the sponsors of perhaps the first cooperative, well known as the 'Hand-in-Hand'—the Philadelphia Contributorship for Insurance of Houses from Loss by Fire, a mutual that was organized in 1752."

Today, cooperatives "have come to play an integral part in the life of the farmer—and of the businessman," so that "it is estimated that fully half the farmers in the United States are members of cooperative associations that are performing some vital service in purchase of farm supplies, processing or distributing farm products, or providing other essential farm-business services.

"Today, more than ever before, there are many services that the individual farmer cannot provide for himself—he must, if his efforts are to be effective, join with his neighbors in large-group endeavors.

"Today, to that farmer the term 'neighbors' has a much broader meaning; it takes in farmers like himself over the entire Nation. You don't have to look very far around modern agriculture to see how helpless the individual would be in dealing with many of his problems if he had no opportunity for joining his strength with that of his fellow-farmers."

Secretary Anderson pictured the size and strength of modern farm cooperatives in this manner:

"Some 7,500 farmer associations are engaged primarily in marketing farm products. They report 2,750,000 members.

"Two thousand mutual insurance companies serve almost half of our farmers with protection from losses from wind, hail, fire.

"Twenty-seven hundred associations, with 1,500,000 farmer members, are engaged in purchasing farm supplies. Their volume of business runs over $1,000,000,000 a year.

"Four thousand mutual irrigation companies serve about 150,000 farms.

"Eight hundred rural electric cooperatives provide service for more than a million farms.

"Fourteen hundred livestock improvement associations carry on programs to improve the productivity and quality of the products of our beef cattle, dairy cows, swine, poultry, and other farm animals.

"One thousand and seven hundred national farm loan associations are providing farm mortgage loans on a cooperative basis to 890,000 members. Five hundred and thirteen production credit associations are providing 370,000 members with short-term seasonal credit."

Secretary Anderson at no time mentioned the attacks upon the cooperatives by the National Tax Equality Association—yet, in effect, he answered the tirades supposedly emanating from "small businessmen" goaded on by NTEA by saying that "business, too, has developed many forms of cooperation and many specific cooperatives which operate almost exactly like farmers' cooperatives and which are taken for granted.

"There has been a strong trend running in small business to meet the competition of big business by combining into cooperative organizations; thus obtaining the advantages of massed buying power and mass-sales methods while retaining individual ownership. Thousands of independent retailers, wholesalers, manufacturers, and service firms have formed purchasing, marketing, advertising, or credit cooperatives.

"It is interesting to note, in passing, that these cooperatives, returning their savings

to the individual enterpriser and to his customers, have no income of their own, and hence are free of income taxes, although they are subject to other taxes common to most types of businesses.

"You can see these business cooperatives all around you. Independent grocers, competing with the large chains, have their cooperative retail grocery chains, which operate warehouses and represent their members in spending their pooled purchasing power, obtaining carlot rates, and merchandise of high quality, beyond the ability of the individual retailer.

"There are many so-called mutual drugstores, which are owned by cooperating independent druggists who have formed organizations to operate warehouses and to exercise definite standards in buying.

"We don't ordinarily think of it as such, but one of the most extensive of our news-gathering agencies, the Associated Press, is nothing more or less than a cooperative of newspapers, bringing to its members news that no individual publication could gather by its own efforts."

True cooperation, the Secretary reaffirmed, is "a part of the American way of life.

"When you strip cooperation to its fundamental elements, the story is a simple one, easily understood"—and then, as though to answer NTEA, he added "it reveals at once the reason for the legal right of cooperatives, and their legal obligations.

"It leaves no doubt as to the place of the cooperative in the system of free enterprise—in fact, it demonstrates that cooperatives are the very essence of free enterprise in that they actually represent groups of farmers acting together for the purpose of carrying on their individual free enterprise more efficiently. Nothing could be more American in its basic spirit and purpose than that.

"It is this basic objective of farm cooperatives that has caused Congress and the courts to recognize generally, and in specific legislation, and to affirm repeatedly, the right of farmers to organize cooperatives, and the public welfare obligations of cooperatives.

"Shorn of all technicalities, it is this basic purpose that frees cooperatives from income taxes, if they return to members and patrons the savings they may be able to make in the transaction of business for their members and patrons."

The Secretary made just as plain that the cooperator also has his obligations on the tax question. "Obviously, such (patronage) returns are a part of the income of the individual enterpriser—the farmer—and as such are subject to taxes as a part of his income. Outstanding and simple as that fact is, it has often been overlooked. It should be made clear that the farmer in this respect is in exactly the same position as the independent businessman or partner; he pays taxes on his income, including any savings he receives through cooperative action."

And again, by inference, Mr. Anderson refuted the groundless charges of the critics and enemies of cooperation that they don't pay taxes. "It should be made entirely clear," he declared, "that cooperatives are not entirely free from taxation—that, while they may not pay income taxes, they do pay their share of real estate, social security, and other taxes, just as do most businesses which are operated for profit."

The general welfare came repeatedly into Secretary Anderson's address as the focal point of both the power and the obligation, the privilege and responsibility of cooperatives.

BASICALLY AMERICAN

"Cooperatives are the very essence of free enterprise in that they actually represent groups of farmers acting together for the purpose of carrying on their individual free enterprises more efficiently. Nothing could be more American in its basic spirit and purpose than that. Farm cooperatives are not seeking profits as a group, but are seeking to use modern business methods to maintain their way of life. That is their aim, their purpose." (Secretary of Agriculture Clinton P. Anderson.)

"To be successful, and to live up to the responsibilities of free enterprise," he said, "the cooperative must genuinely serve both its members and the public.

"It is a part of the American way of life—it is as much a part of agriculture as is the family-type farm—and the two are dependent on each other—

"But the implications go even deeper than that.

"Cooperation is a two-way street.

"Farmers are justified in using the cooperative device, and the legal privileges that have been accorded it, only when it offers a sound means to solve an economic problem for the benefit of the cooperative and the public. Neither farmers nor anyone else have the undisputed privilege of combining their interests to seek monopoly or unfair advantage."

But there was no doubt in the Secretary's mind that "farm cooperation as a whole has served the public welfare. With very few exceptions, farm cooperatives have kept closely to the basic principle of service to their members and to the public."

He made the claim—as so often made in this journal—that "in a true sense, cooperatives have provided a valuable yardstick. As you well know, cooperatives have been pacesetters in improving the quality of farm products supplied the public—and they have done it by seeking higher and higher standards, better methods of marketing, and seeking to return to the producer who produces high quality the reward that such quality brings in the market."

The Secretary went on in a specific instancing of how cooperatives do operate in the general welfare:

"Farmers' cooperatives have been in the forefront in experimenting with and encouraging better grading, packing, and other means of assuring the housewife that she is getting her money's worth when she buys groceries.

"In the purchasing field, cooperatives have led the way toward known standard, efficient products for the farmer at the lowest possible cost, and in many cases the methods they have developed have spread, like ripples from a stone thrown in a pool, throughout our merchandising system. Such things as open-formula feeds—where the buyer knows exactly what he is buying—high-analysis fertilizer, and seeds of known origin and germination have been pioneered by cooperatives.

"Cooperatives have fought without let-up to eliminate marketing abuses, to break down monopoly, and to implement the public's right to know what it is buying.

"Cooperative organizations have sought to spread useful information. They have worked closely with the research staffs of the land-grant colleges and the United States Department of Agriculture to bring to their patrons and members the benefits of the latest scientific discoveries and the most up-to-date specifications.

"And finally, farm cooperatives can look back with honest pride on the service they gave to farmers and to the public during the war, when they played an important part in processing and marketing the capacity production of our farms, and in finding and distributing fertilizer, feed, fuel, machinery, and other supplies so essential for continued high production. That was service, not just to their members, but to the United States in time of war."

Farmer cooperatives need to clear their sights and determine their target in the future. "We must face the problems and the economic and technical developments that lie ahead," declared the head of USDA.

And here again Mr. Anderson reverted to his plea that ran like a thread through the discourse—a plea for the "maintenance and improvement of the family farm."

"We want it to be a fully productive, highly efficient farm—but we want it to be the traditional family type, capable of holding its own in our economy, capable of maintaining farm and home as a way of life.

"We want it to fit into a national pattern of a fully productive agriculture, turning out vast amounts of high-quality food and fiber, capable of supplying the Nation with a bountiful diet at a reasonable cost.

"We definitely don't want our farms to become soulless factories, owned by impersonal stockholders, and operated by hired managers and hired workers, with success or failure measured entirely by dollars and cents figures in company ledgers.

"To allow our machines and our impetus toward bigness to bring that about would be to take the American spirit out of farming; it would mean relinquishing the solid values of farm life that we have prized highly since the first settlers put the plow to the fresh soil of this continent."

No doubt was left that we are speeding into a high-powered economy. The thought on the Secretary's mind was that, since "the farm co-ops must play an increasingly important part in farm life and farm business (if we are to maintain and improve the family farm), it is absolutely essential that we give serious thought to the possibilities of the future in agriculture and determine the ways in which cooperatives can increase their aid to farmers in achieving the kind of agriculture we will need—and can aid the public even more in realizing to the full the benefits of our productive agriculture."

"It seems to me that one of our first jobs is to gain greater public understanding of what farm cooperatives are, and how they serve the Nation's welfare. I realize that a great deal has been done in education of farmers in cooperation, and that a great deal of information is available about the principles, methods, and aims of cooperation—for farmers.

"But, frankly, I think we have been talking to ourselves too much—and to the public too little!

"Furthermore, we have been talking in a special jargon that tends to make the idea of cooperation too complex.

"As a result, I think the public is somewhat confused about cooperatives. I believe that our language has caused means to be confused with ends—methods with purposes—implements with principles."

If anyone wanted to know what Secretary Anderson's personal understanding and appraisal of cooperatives were, he got it in concise terms as he went on in this wise:

"When I think of farm cooperatives, I think of them not as complex business concerns, but as groups of independent farmers banded together to do some job that is too big for them as individuals.

"They are not seeking profits as a group, but are seeking to use modern business methods to maintain their way of life. That is their aim, their purpose. The methods by which they seek to maintain their way of life may vary according to the economic problem they are attempting to solve by cooperation.

"If credit is their problem, their cooperation may take the form of a farm loan association.

"If marketing is their problem, their cooperation may take the form of a marketing association.

"If buying supplies of known quality at prices they can afford to pay is a problem, their cooperation may take the form of a purchasing cooperative, giving farmers the same advantages that big business enterprises have in skilled, large-scale buying."

Cooperatives have already written a dramatic story "of new and better products for the American dinner table." "New processes, quicker handling, fresher food, reduced costs

and margins." "It is a part of the story of better nutrition and health for our families," thought the Secretary, and "we in agriculture need to do a more aggressive job of informing the public of the many improvements and benefits that have come to consumers through farmers' cooperatives"—a story, indeed, of "better food brought to the American family at the lowest possible cost."

But the days of pioneering in cooperation are not past. Let him who thinks so "study some of the problems facing agriculture and the family farm.

"The frontier of ideas is always wide open, and we certainly are going to need ideas, plus the courage to give them a fair trial.

"We should not forget that agriculture has been in a seller's market for the past several years, with the Government taking great chunks of our output for the armed services. Certainly, finding new markets and enlarging the old ones is going to take all of our selling skill—and I, for one, have long believed that agriculture has not done the job of promoting its products, of creating new tastes and larger demands, as well as it could be done.

"Efficiency and lowest possible cost in producing, processing, and distributing farm products are going to loom more important than in the past, and may rapidly become the deciding factor between a thriving co-op and a defunct one when the going gets tough. Here alone is need for practically every cooperative to re-examine its operations with a most critical eye."

Cooperatives must be as modern as any other business, in their facilities. Many "have creaked by with obsolete equipment and old-fashioned methods during the war."

The farmer cooperative's service in keeping the farmer up with the times, and to aid him in maintaining his independent position, said the Secretary, was "among the greatest of challenges." He wouldn't attempt to guess what all this would add up to, but he did opine that "increased mechanization; increased use of refrigeration on farms and all along the way to market; development of many new methods of packaging; new forms of transportation, among other things, promise us a most exciting decade ahead."

In his conclusion, Secretary Anderson circled back to his cardinal theme—that the maintenance and improvement of the family farm is "the basic purpose" of the cooperative.

Directors and management must keep this eternally in mind as they guide the destinies of their cooperatives and accept the "great opportunities they have for service."

"We want cooperatives to remain human institutions, accurately reflecting the desires and interests of the individuals who make up their membership" for "cooperatives, too, can suffer the curse of bigness—they can become so huge and complex that, unless real effort is made, they lose contact with the lives of their farmer-members and their patrons. We don't want that to happen."

Of their future, Secretary Anderson was plainly unworried. As before observed, he was anxious of even the existence, much less the fulminations, of the organized opposition (NTEA) and the threats to force Congress to cripple the cooperatives by tax legislation. He had only one prescription for their conduct—and that was that they be responsive to the American tradition of the family farm, and keep on working for the public welfare. He put it in these words:

"If we keep our cooperatives interwoven into the lives of farmers and their customers from the grass roots to the city dinner tables, if we keep before us the realization that in the last analysis the only thing a cooperative has of its own is the service it provides its members and customers, then we need have little worry about the future of farmers' cooperatives."

Workers and Employers Team Up To Save British Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 7, 1946

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the discussions that we have been holding in the last few days the following article by Stanley High which appeared in the February issue of the Reader's Digest is particularly timely:

WORKERS AND EMPLOYERS TEAM UP TO SAVE BRITISH INDUSTRY

(By Stanley High)

I went to Great Britain to see how labor would go about preparing the free economy of Britain for Marxist burial. I found, instead, that labor has teamed with management to rejuvenate British enterprise. Britain's workers are tackling the job of building the nation's future as full-fledged and responsible partners in a joint undertaking.

As a result, Britain's industrial atmosphere is not blanketed with gloom. It is remarkably invigorating. British industrialists are not shaking in their boots, holding up or moving to Canada. They are giving British industry the most promising overhaul it has had in 100 years.

These are more startling and important facts than the socialism which officially flies at the Labor Party masthead. For Britain, they are a bigger potential asset than loans, credits or Empire preferences.

To get British industry going again full blast, new wage and hour settlements have been voluntarily negotiated in coal, agriculture, cotton, the building trades and in many smaller industries. Cherished trade-union practices have been modified. War-born labor controls are being continued, with labor's agreement, to insure maximum peacetime production. Through joint production committees in more than 5,000 factories, labor's productive know-how is being pooled with management's.

There is, of course, a thin red fringe—led by the articulate and unheeded Professor Harold J. Laski—which would go all-out Socialist at once and damn the consequences. But to British trade unionism, which furnishes the Labor Party's bone and sinew, the consequences mean more than the socialism.

The consequence that means most—more than Marx on the left or capitalism on the right—is a higher British standard of living. There is one way to get that, says British trade unionism. Shake the backwardness and inefficiencies out of British industry; by the best and shortest route, put it into maximum peacetime production.

No one speaks for British workers with greater authority than Herbert Morrison, the Labor Party's floor leader in the House of Commons. "The nation wants a much higher national income; it wants full employment, big exports, efficient production—and we're going to get them," he says. "If the nation has to give marching orders to big business, the nation must give them. What matters is to get the results. A case can be made for private enterprise. There is no case whatever for private unenterprise.

"We do not stand for nationalization for its own sake or as a party slogan, but so that our national resources may be used with greater efficiency for the common good. If only nationalization will secure this result, then we must nationalize. If only private enterprise can do it, then let private enterprise remain."

A leader in the Trades Union Congress recently said: "A considerable amount of satisfaction can be derived from 'beating the bosses.' But it is very bad for industry and it is very bad for production. In meeting postwar demands we shall all require a united pull. I suggest that an honorable partnership is the best way of securing it."

There were strikes in Britain during the war. There have been strikes since, notably the dockers' unauthorized walkout. But Britain's industrial partnership has already gone far enough beyond the talking stage to foreshadow the end of industrial conflict over wages and hours.

British labor, during the war, worked under far more rigorous conditions than in World War I. Hours were longer. Working conditions were worse. Concessions demanded from trade-unionism were much more serious. Yet man-hours lost from strikes per year in World War I were almost five times as high as in World War II.

The end of the war did not blow off the lid. Instead, from January 1 to October 1, 1945, the total of man-hours lost by strikes was only one-third as high as between January 1 and October 1, 1944.

This does not mean that labor has ceased seeking better wages and working conditions. It means that labor is accepting its share of responsibility for the productive well-being of the industrial goose from which it expects to get many golden eggs.

The Amalgamated Engineering Union has 870,000 members in the metal trades. Before the end of the war, the AEU made three exhaustive studies, to assemble the workers' conclusions as to what was necessary "to reestablish Britain as a first-class industrial country."

That such an inquiry should be made at all is remarkable enough. More remarkable is its discovery that, "though complaints about earnings appeared in many answers, this was mostly associated with other negative factors such as bad cooperation with management or bad workshop procedure, lack of machine tools, misuse of labor, idle machines. Increased earnings were regarded as only one spur, but not the greatest, to the work people's enthusiasm for the production drive."

Says Sir Stafford Cripps, president of the board of trade in the Labor Cabinet: "The days are passing when a trade-unionist needed to be only a tough negotiator fighting a running battle with the employer for better wages and conditions. The trade unions more and more will have to take their share in the responsibility of production. Without this truly democratic partnership, there will be little hope of producing efficiently."

As a first measure for enlivening Lancashire's dispirited and lagging textile industry, the government appointed a commission to work out a new wage policy—four cotton-mill owners, four trade-union men, and, as chairman, a distinguished jurist. The commission's conclusions were unanimous. It called for basic pay raises of from 15 to 20 percent; the same wage for the same work for women; reduction in the employment of juveniles; increased facilities for training skilled workers; elimination of blind-alley jobs.

Such a report had in it the makings of a first-class uproar from labor leaders who aimed to get more or from owners who aimed to give less. Instead, labor, management, and the government hailed it as a magna carta for the industry.

Almost as significant as the agreements, peaceably arrived at by this employer-employee commission, was its conclusion that "it is essential to establish the belief that management on the one hand and operatives on the other are not serving opposing interests but are concerned to promote the health and efficiency of the industry."

Britain's developing industrial partnership did not spring, full-blown, from the war. It has been coming to maturity through a long history.

The earliest British trade-union leaders were largely recruited from the nonconformist churches—Methodist, Baptist, Congregational. Their ambitions were as far above reproach as their morals. They were driven solely by an evangelical determination to "improve the lot" of British working people.

For the growth of their unions, they did not rely on the compulsion of law or the intervention of government. The case they made was a moral case. They rested it on the increasing intelligence of the workers and the conscience of the British people.

In Great Britain, organized labor has now reached a more powerful position than in any other large industrial nation. But there is no British law to compel the closed shop. There is none to require a worker to join a union as a condition of employment. There is no check-off.

Save for a case involving one union officer a quarter of a century ago, there has never been a scandal among British labor leaders. Today the men who direct that movement are paid, as they have always been, only a little above the wages of the workers in the unions they lead. That means about $2,500 a year. The salary of Sir Walter Citrine, who, as general secretary of the Trades Union Congress, is the Nation's top labor executive, is about $5,000.

No law compels British trade unions to make annual reports to the government of receipts and expenditures. But virtually all of them do.

The two key words of British industrial relationships are "voluntary" and "good faith." The collective-bargaining structure covers virtually all British industry. Yet there is no law to compel any British employer to bargain collectively. There is no law to enforce, against either the employer or the union, the observance of any collective-bargaining agreement. Its observance, by both parties, rests wholly on good faith. That has proved sufficient.

Ernest Bevin, who came up from the ranks the tough way to his post as Foreign Minister, says that "in thousands of cases wage settlements are based on two men's word, often without anything being put into writing. It is simply a matter of the foreman or the manager and the trade-union official agreeing to it. Sometimes the matter is settled over a telephone. Yet everybody accepts it as an honorable bargain. No other country has yet been able to find a way of doing this with the same confidence."

The settlement of employer-employee disputes likewise proceeds without the strong arm of the law or the government. There is no machinery for compulsory arbitration, but the great majority of British industries have voluntarily set up their own boards of arbitrators. The history of these boards shows an almost unbroken record of loyal observance, by both sides, of the decisions of arbitrators.

Labor's healthy, productive status in British society is a result of that history. Industrial Britain, therefore, is not quailing before labor's rise. It has known the character of British trade unionism too well for too long.

I saw a chart, prominently thumb-tacked above a shop steward's desk in a Birmingham factory. It was headed: "Union provision for avoiding disputes." In diagram it gave the step-by-step procedure for keeping peace in the plant. There were eight such steps.

"Until these stages of procedure have been carried out, there shall be no stoppage of a partial or general character.

The first four measures were all within the plant. If they failed, step No. 5 called for a meeting of the works committee, with outside union officials present. "At this meeting the divisional organizer may be present, in which case a representative of the employers' association shall also be present."

Recently the British Broadcasting Corp. presented a discussion of jobs for all. A British industrialist and a trade-union leader participated.

The industrialist said: "If we get full employment, the employer will have to change his attitude considerably. The businessman has to look on himself less as a private man developing a private opportunity and much more as a public servant."

The trade-union leader said: "We agree that government must use its powers to control the location of industry and possible investment. What about the control of labor? I think the government must continue to control and direct labor. The trade unions will cooperate."

The industrialist: "The businessman has to take the public more into his confidence; to meet in very open fashion criticism of production costs and price policies; to develop more understanding between management and men. The whole thing has got to be a partnership—a team."

A trade-union leader recently said: "If we are going all out 'to enlarge the cake,' the union side would like to make efficiency more of its business. Under a full-employment policy, trade unions will not block improvements. On the contrary, they will be asking for new methods, new machines. If the workers are told what is going on and consulted about methods, they will put their minds and backs into production."

To keep the workers informed of what is going on and to consult them about methods is now widely accepted as a matter of good business. A recent newspaper poll showed a large majority of leading industrialists in favor of continuing wartime joint production committees in their factories.

Coventry, Britain's Detroit, went through the war and is now going through reconversion without serious industrial strife. In one of its automobile plants, management, through the joint production committee, put the problem of reconversion squarely up to the workers. Among the cards it laid on the table was the $165,000,000 of orders for new cars which were already on the company's books. I saw the first of these automobiles coming from the assembly line, and visited the new factory which was due to double this company's best prewar production.

"We'll never go back to running this plant from the top down," said a member of the board of directors. "We couldn't afford to."

I talked about joint production committees with the regional head of the British Board of Trade in Manchester. It is part of his job to attend many of their meetings. He said, "In dozens of them you can sit for an hour and not know who is there for management and who for labor."

In a plant I visited near Manchester, the chief shop steward, cochairman with the plant manager of the joint production committee, pointed to certain machines. "Formerly," he said, "it was a man to each machine in this department. In the old days, we, on the labor side, would have insisted on keeping it that way. But here the men worked out their own labor-saving method. Now, instead of operating only one machine each worker operates three."

The organized workers in this plant lodge complaints against three supervisors—union members—on the ground that they were inefficient and slowed up production. They got the men fired.

These are typical incidents. British labor is convinced that, to get more pay, better homes, and more of the good things of life, British industry first must get more business. It is prepared to agree that getting more business will require, for some time to come, more give than take.

Where necessary to serve the revival of the Nation's economy, labor accepts the transfer of workers from place to place; has agreed to the shifting of workers, as required by urgent production needs, from one trade into another. It was not management but the general council of the Trades Union Congress which proposed that any person who refused a job at a union rate in any vital industry should be denied unemployment benefits.

As a stopgap answer to the critical housing shortage, British industry is building prefabricated houses. The agitation, from the union side, is not the familiar outcry against prefabrication. It is a trade-union demand that prefabricated construction be speeded up. Through their respective unions, the bricklayers, joiners, plumbers, plasterers, and laborers abandoned their traditional opposition and agreed to join in assembling the new-type houses. The sole requirement was that standard craftsmen rates be paid.

When Britain was backed to the wall for lack of war equipment, labor and management jointly supervised scores of training centers for the production of skilled war-workers. The employers supplied vast quantities of shop equipment. From their own pay rolls, they provided many of the teachers. The unions, for their part, voluntarily made substantial modifications in their apprenticeship requirements. This plan is continuing for the requirements of peace production. Thirty-three such centers are already operating in the building trades. Many more will be started.

It is only reasonable to suppose, declares a writer in the journal of the Amalgamated Engineering Union, that "concessions have to be made from the workers' side in the sweeping away of certain hampering safeguards and the scrapping of certain trade-union practices which militate against efficiency."

Samuel Courtauld, one of Britain's greatest industrialists, recently sized up the current trend. What is being worked out between Britain's employers and employees, he said, is not socialism but the discovery of a productive "middle way" between Right and Left extremisms "which will bring the greatest attainable good." That, if it should come to pass, would be a pioneering achievement as important as any since the Machine Age began. The prospect is promising.

Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1946

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Toledo Times which has been mailed to me by the Honorable Harry N. Hansen, outstanding civic leader of northern Ohio, who has written his Congressman and suggested that this should have the attention of every lawmaker. Mr. Hansen is a former legislator, soldier, and is one of our citizens who totally forgets himself and just goes about doing good. The author of the article is Harold H. Hartley, public-spirited citizen and outstanding journalist who dares to speak the truth.

IT'S CHEAPER TO GIVE THE BUTCHER A NICKEL

If one examined all of the individual records of man since his beginning, it still would be difficult to find who invented the subsidy. Generally, subsidy means putting money, or

other wealth, into something which does not pay its own way.

Businesses, trades, and professions have been subsidized by individuals, other businesses, and by the governments.

If an auto maker wishes to make his own tires, he subsidizes the company. This means he puts up the money and operates at a loss until his tire company begins to make a profit. Individuals have been subsidized, both honorably and dishonorably, since the beginning of time. A college professor may be subsidized by a large corporation to enable him to carry on valuable research. Or a whole university department may be subsidized. On the other hand, a purchasing agent may be subsidized if he is so unscrupulous as to accept a secret discount which he puts into his own pocket.

In modern times a subsidy often means persuasion with money. Sometimes the line between an outright bribe and an honorable subsidy is dim, indeed. There are all kinds of subsidies with all kinds of motives.

When one uses the word subsidy today, he usually means a Government subsidy, which is nothing more than a little help from the Federal Treasury, seldom without some political significance. Labor unions, for instance, are exempted from taxes. So are charitable organizations and nonprofit foundations. These are subsidies paid in tax exemptions which are cash subsidies just as much as if the Government laid the money on the barrel head.

The country also has fallen prey to outright Government cash subsidies. Most of us are unconscious of the fact that the Government is paying part of our meat bill, our egg bill, our bread bill, our butter and milk bill, and our cheese bill. And there are others.

The whole practice of cash Government subsidies is open to serious question.

The Government has no money of its own. Every cent in the Federal Treasury belongs to the people. So, when the Government subsidizes meat prices from 3 to 5 cents a pound, the Treasury pays this much with the people's money. The same applies to bread, eggs, milk, cheese, and butter.

In doing this, the Government gives the impression that it is helping both the farmer and the consumer. The farmer gets more for his products and the consumer pays less. This is the mistaken idea which goes hand-in-hand with subsidies.

Actually, what difference does it make whether we pay 50 cents a pound for meat at the butcher's and 5 cents to the Treasury for the Federal subsidy, or whether we pay the whole 55 cents over the butcher's counter?

Subsidies really make food cost more. When the 5-cent subsidy goes through the tax office into the Treasury and out to the farmer-producer, the consumer pays not only the nickel but the cost of handling it through the tax and distribution systems. The overhead on the nickel takes in administrative, clerk, and stenographer hire, the keeping of records, tax deputies, tax accountants to make sure everyone pays, stationery and other paper supplies, filing cabinets, office space, equipment and janitor service, telephone service, lights, ink, typewriters, mailing machines, mimeographs, and a host of workers on the Federal pay roll, not to mention the added burden on the mail service.

This is the big load the subsidy nickel is asked to carry.

If we pay the nickel across the counter to the butcher, we escape all of this political overhead, and meat actually becomes that much cheaper.

If we apply this same principle of subsidy overhead to all other subsidies, it is easy to see that we are paying the real cost of the food, plus the subsidy, plus the maintenance of a Federal patronage system which too often becomes a political machine in election years.

If we throw out the whole idea of Government subsidies, our food will be cheaper by millions of dollars a year. Common sense tells us it would be much better to pay the butcher the extra nickel right over the counter. Then we would know who gets it.

The Case of the Millers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1946

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Tribune of February 2, 1946:

THE CASE OF THE MILLERS

One of the first rules of sound journalism is that news and editorial comment should be strictly segregated. Nevertheless, every so often a news story bobs up which, without any conscious effort on the part of the writer to make it one, turns out, through its sheer simplicity and factuality, to be as effective an editorial as any that could be purposefully contrived.

Such a story is the half-column account sent in to the Wall Street Journal this week from New Canaan by Staff Correspondent Sydney B. Self on what happened to the Miller brothers of that little community, which borders on Stamford, Conn. The Millers, Mr. Self explains, are three brothers, who were brought up on a farm, knew all about dairying (and put all their savings into it), but who had "reckoned without Local 338 of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Stablemen, and Helpers, A. F. of L."

"Last week end," writes Mr. Self, "was probably the most trying in the lives of the Millers." The union had called out their drivers, demanding a new contract which was tantamount to a 50-percent increase in the pay roll, asked for an increase of 66⅔ percent in commissions, and barred the Millers from doing any manual work around the dairy. Although the Millers had only 7 or 8 drivers working for them, the union sent in from 200 to 250 pickets from out of town to police the dairy (which necessitated the use of 60 State troopers to maintain order). When women customers drove up to the dairy to get milk for their families the tires of their cars were slashed.

The employees decided they had had enough and quit. And the Millers followed shortly. The Millers didn't have an accounting staff, but they could add and subtract, and they got out paper and pencil and did just that. Their business (around 2,000 quarts a day) grossed about $1,000 a week, out of which a $455 pay roll had to be met, in addition to the cost of trucks, gasoline, pasteurizing, bottles, and other necessary expenses of doing business. It did not take much figuring to see that with the pay roll jumped to between $600 and $700, themselves barred from working, and with other expenses continuing as usual the Miller brothers, as they wrote to Frederick Conrad, union president, in signing the proposed contract would simply be "signing a petition of bankruptcy in advance."

The union had a solution for this problem. Why, they suggested, didn't the brothers sell out to a larger concern, which would be better able to meet the union's wage demands? To this the Millers, who had built up a quality business, with butterfat content of the product well above the legal minimum, answered with a flat refusal, "We don't propose to ask our customers," they declared, "to go blindly to another, merely because we have turned over our route books and have written glowing praises of our successor—obviously put into our mouths."

The battle between the powerful teamsters' union and this little Connecticut enterprise was short, and the defeat was a crushing one. But it was more than a defeat for the Millers; it was one more defeat for the thing that over the years has been this country's greatest source of strength—the right of an American citizen to go into business for himself with a fair chance of making a success of it if he works hard and produces something that the community wants and needs. That is the essence, not only of free enterprise, but of the only kind of equality that is consistent with the dignity of man—equality of opportunity. There are many threats to that system today, but none is greater than that presented by organized labor grown to manhood with respect to power, but with no corresponding increase in responsibility. As Congress prepares to write a new labor law, one could wish that every member had the case of the Millers before him. Because the case of the Millers is neither more nor less than today's labor problem in America presented in simple microcosm.

Foreign Trade and the British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1946

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, the attached editorial written by Fred C. Christopherson, editor of the Daily Argus-Leader, published in Sioux Falls, S. Dak., merits the careful consideration of the Congress and the country.

Mr. Christopherson is not only a comprehensive student of economics and foreign affairs but on the matter of the British loan he speaks with a considerable degree of personal experience made possible through an intimate study of international trade as he has had an opportunity to observe it in visits to England and Europe.

The clear-cut facts set forth in this editorial have a direct bearing on the problems growing out of the British loan proposal now being urged by President Truman. Economics and national solvency are matters which cannot be settled on the basis of sentimentality.

If America and the world are to prosper, it must be on a basis of reality and one of the undeniable realities in the picture is the fact that a bankrupt United States not only cannot be helpful to the rest of the world but it would actually go far toward destroying the private enterprise system in every country and on every continent.

FOREIGN TRADE AND THE BRITISH LOAN

Paul McCracken, director of research of the Federal Reserve bank of Minneapolis, told the Sioux Falls Rotary Club yesterday that it was desirable for the United States to make the $4,500,000,000 loan to Great Britain.

But, though his remarks were interesting, they were unconvincing.

It was his opinion that the United States would have to provide this credit to Britain

if we were to maintain our proper position in world trade. If we did not finance Britain, he contended, the British would proceed to make individual trading agreements with other nations and the United States would be left on the outside of this charmed circle.

Thus, it seems—if we are to accept McCracken's opinion as the right one—the British lion is still the mightiest power in the world and that she is in a position to crack an economic whip that would make the United States stagger.

That is accrediting to an impoverished nation an almost incredible influence and might.

Actually Britain has no such power. She has lost her capital and is in desperate straits financially. In truth, she doesn't enjoy a full trading control over even the countries that comprise the British Commonwealth.

McCracken discussed foreign trade at some length. He pointed out, quite accurately, that England is potentially a great buyer of the world's goods. She would welcome the wheat from Argentina, for example, and would gladly buy from her providing that Argentina purchased some of her factory products. In fact, England is a market for foodstuffs in great quantity because she doesn't produce enough to serve her own people.

The United States, on the other hand, is a surplus producer of foodstuffs. We have food to export and have very little occasion to import it. Thus Argentina can't find a market here for her major export goods.

That, of course, is an economic fact and there's nothing in the British loan or any other loan that will alter the picture.

We could give Argentina $2,000,000,000, as an instance, and she would be willing to use that amount to buy American machinery, automobiles, refrigerators, radios, and sewing machines. But once that $2,000,000,000 was exhausted, she would cease buying our products unless we could provide a market here for her wheat. Fundamentally, she can't buy from us unless we buy from her.

So it is with England. England just now would welcome an opportunity to purchase great quantities of American products. And she could do so with the loan now under consideration. But once that sum was exhausted, she would be compelled to quit buying from us unless we bought from her.

Actually, it isn't credit that the world needs from us in order to do business with us.

The fact is that if we expect to sell goods to other nations we must be prepared to buy from them in equal quantity.

There is no purpose now in repeating the mistake that was made after the First World War. Then we financed the world—and found foreign outlets for our products. When the credit was exhausted, the markets were eliminated.

Surely we should have acquired enough learning through this experience to make an effort now to place our foreign trade on a sound basis. Such a basis would require a matching of our exports and imports. If we are unwilling to do that, we might as well prepare to forget about foreign trade.

The Argus-Leader doesn't question for a moment the fact that England needs financial aid and needs it badly.

She is a nation that is in acute distress primarily as a result of her tremendous sacrifices during the war. If we are to help her, let us do so on the basis of a direct contribution through the UNRRA or some other suitable organization. Then we'd be dealing factually with the problem and know exactly what we were doing.

When we extend aid in the guise of a loan, we are only kidding ourselves and perhaps many Britishers as well about its meaning and its possibilities.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1946

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, after the President's recommendation to the Congress of a $3,750,000,000 credit to the United Kingdom, I inquired of the President as to what further requests would be made for loans to other nations. The President, in a letter to me of February 2 stated that "Naturally, there will be requests for loans from a great many countries, some of which we shall expect to accommodate." But, the President failed to clarify the administration's position as to exactly what other loans and the amounts of such loans would be recommended by it. Certainly, it is difficult for this Congress to pass upon any one loan such as the proposed loan to Great Britain unless we know the whole story. I think it is imperative, therefore, that the President advise this Congress, either directly or through the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives just what loan commitments to foreign nations he has made and what demands have been made upon us by other nations in the world, other than Great Britain.

In this connection, I believe it will be of interest to the Members of the House to read the correspondence between the President and myself on this subject, hereto appended:

JANUARY 30, 1946.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: After listening with deep interest to your message today, in which you recommend to the Congress the approval of a $3,750,000,000 credit to the United Kingdom, I concluded that it would be very helpful to my determination as to how to vote on such a measure if you would advise me as to whether the request for the United Kingdom will be followed by further requests of credits for other foreign nations.

Will there be a request for Russia, and for what amount? Will there be a request for France, and for what amount? Will there be a request for China, and for what amount? Will there be requests for other European nations, for South American nations, and for other Asiatic nations, and for what amounts?

Mr. President, I hope that in recommending the loan to the United Kingdom you are taking into consideration possible demands from other nations, and likewise the embarrassment which would accrue to us were we to grant a loan to the United Kingdom and not one to Russia, and to the other powers.

Will you please supply me with the requested information at an early date, and thinking you in anticipation of it, I am

Sincerely,

J. PARNELL THOMAS.

FEBRUARY 2, 1946.

MY DEAR MR. THOMAS: I appreciated very much your letter of January 30.

Naturally there will be requests for loans from a great many countries, some of which we shall expect to accommodate. The Bretton Woods arrangement and the Export-Import Bank were set up primarily to meet some of these demands.

Since we spent some $300,000,000,000 to carry on a war, for the thing for which we stand, it seems to me that we ought to be willing to contribute financial aid to devastated countries and to our allies to implement the peace for which we fought.

I am inclined to think that we are willing to do just that.

These loans are entirely different from the contributions we made in wartime. We, of course, shall expect their repayment.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

FEBRUARY 6, 1946.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I wish to thank you for your prompt answer to my letter of January 30, in which I made specific inquiries regarding prospective loans by this country to foreign powers.

I am constrained to observe respectfully, however, that your letter contributes little to the clarification of the questions in which I am interested. I wrote you, if you remember, of my concern with regard to my vote on a proposed loan to the United Kingdom. My concern in the matter is based upon a feeling that other loans, to other nations, are in prospect, and my conviction is that I would be in a much better position to vote upon the British loan if I knew how much our administration proposed to lend to other countries.

The letter asked, for instance, how much it was proposed that America lend to Russia. Similar questions were asked regarding possible loans to other countries, named in my letter.

It is still my feeling, as it was when I wrote you last month, that the Congress should be fully informed in this vital matter, and that it is the duty of the administration to let the Congress know precisely what it intends to do regarding other loans.

Sincerely,

J. PARNELL THOMAS.

Settlement of Labor Disputes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ROLAND KINZER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1946

Mr. KINZER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement before the Committee on Education and Labor of the United States Senate on February 5, 1946, by H. W. Prentis, Jr., president, Armstrong Cork Co., Lancaster, Pa.:

My name is H. W. Prentis, Jr. I reside in Lancaster, Pa. I have been in the employ of the Armstrong Cork Co. for 39 years and since 1934 have served as its president. The business was started in 1860. The company has 15 factories in the United States with approximately 12,000 employees in this country and some 2,500 abroad.

I have accepted the courteous invitation to appear before you, which your chairman, Senator MURRAY, extended me, not because I claim expert knowledge in the field of labor relations, but because I believe it is the bounden duty of every citizen, when called on, to make whatever modest contribution he can to the solution of public problems. And certainly no question confronting the Nation today is more critical and difficult than that which this Committee has before

it; namely, the devising of a sound national policy to promote industrial peace.

The gravity of the situation—taking into account its long-range implications—can scarcely be exaggerated. For history shows that no form of popular self-government can long exist in the face of acute class cleavage. The strength of the American Republic in the past has rested on the fact that we have divided on vertical rather than on horizontal lines. In politics, for example, no party has represented any particular class at all. Labor troubles create class consciousness and class consciousness, if accentuated sufficiently, will eventually spell the end of liberty as we have known it since 1776. If this tendency is to be avoided, the same basic rules must be applied to every group in the Nation. Special privileges, acquired either by legislation or by hunger for power, finally tend to create a state within a state which destroys freedom. As Woodrow Wilson said: "The business of government is to see that no body or group of men, no matter what their private business is, may come into competition with the authority of society."

I was in Pittsburgh yesterday, where a strike is in progress at our company's local plant. We had had no labor trouble there for 49 years prior to the passage of the Wagner Act. In this case, as in many others throughout the land, a small group of individuals, organized as a labor union, have arrogated to themselves the "authority of society" by refusing admission even to the office building of company employees who have nothing directly to do with the current production or shipping of products manufactured at that particular factory. Even the plant manager is denied entrance unless he exhibits this pass, which I thought the members of the committee might like to see.

I, for one, am no labor baiter. I was an advocate of collective bargaining—I prefer to call it collective negotiation—long before the Wagner Act was passed. As an American citizen, however, I submit that it is a sad travesty on American principles when government abdicates to a private organization the right to determine who shall or shall not come and go peacefully over public highways to his place of business. To such an undreamed pass has the exercise of power without commensurate responsibility brought us today.

Grave as the present picture is, the conditions that have led up to it are not of recent origin. They have been developing for years. And those conditions cannot be remedied overnight. I earnestly hope, therefore, that instead of recommending piecemeal legislation designed to put out the present fires in the field of industrial relations, Congress will center its attention on over-all measures calculated to prevent labor conflagrations in the future.

Government's function in the prevention or minimizing of industrial warfare should, it seems to me, be threefold in character: First, Government should set the rules; second, it should provide machinery (along with the help of the courts) to administer those rules efficiently and impartially; third, it should function as an umpire, not as a czar—except in the case of public utilities, whose rates are regulated by public authority. Government should stay out of the collective-bargaining process, which can only be really effective when conducted on a free basis at as nearly the plant level as possible.

There are many bills dealing with labor problems now pending before Congress. There are three measures, as I understand it, before this particular committee. The Ellender bill (S. 1661), the McMahon bill (S. 1419), and the Ball-Hatch substitute (S. 1661). Needless to say, I am in thorough sympathy with the objectives of all three of these bills; namely, to promote industrial peace. Measured by the three standards to which I have just referred, however, none provides the comprehensive fire-prevention methods and apparatus that the long-range problem requires.

For example, fact finding is only one piece of the mechanism that, in my judgment, should be set up to handle industrial disputes. The procedure is useful, but limited in application in the way in which it is currently being applied unless we are prepared ultimately to adopt a planned economy in which Government would take full responsibility for our economic life. Fact finding with one corporation may indeed create a whole series of problems in other companies and industries. What has happened in recent weeks, I think, bears out the truth of that assertion. Hence I cannot regard the Ellender bill (S. 1661) as the final solution of the over-all problem.

Conciliation and voluntary arbitration are most important steps in promoting industrial peace but, after all, they are only parts of the administrative machinery. They do not go to the roots of the difficulty. Therefore, in my opinion, the McMahon bill (S. 1419) is only a partial palliative—not the remedy.

The Ball-Hatch substitute (S. 1661), it seems to me, probes deeper into the basic problem, since it requires *both* labor and management to negotiate in good faith to make and maintain collective-bargaining agreements and provides that failure to do so is a violation of law, subject to the civil action in the courts. These stipulations are, moreover, accompanied by carefully thought out provisions for improved procedures in conciliation and voluntary arbitration and under certain conditions for special fact-finding commissions. But even this substitute does not go, in my opinion, to the core of the Nation's present problem; namely, to require in the public interest that labor organizations assume legal responsibility commensurate with the power they now possess under the laws of the land. Justice Brandeis hit the nail on the head when he said: "Industrial liberty, like civil liberty, must rest upon the solid foundation of law. Disregard the law in either, however good your motives, and you have anarchy. The plea of the trade-unions for immunity, be it from injunction or from liability for damages, is as fallacious as the plea for lynchers."

But even the establishment of the principle that legal responsibility and authority must go hand in hand will not cure all industrial trouble. My personal conviction is that a certain amount of economic friction is inevitable if we are to remain freemen politically, intellectually, and spiritually. There are no labor disturbances in Russia because, as the Federalist Papers said in 1789, "Power over a man's support is power over his will." Certainly all of us will agree with the statement of Mr. Matthew Woll, of the American Federation of Labor, sometime ago: "American labor wants no traffic with European despotism which has destroyed free trade-unionism and free private enterprise and has destroyed any voluntary form of collective effort in social, religious, and economic fields."

So as freemen, determined to remain free, we come back to the question: What can we do to minimize industrial friction without destroying our freedom on the one hand and without penalizing the consuming public on the other? Note that last phrase about the consuming public. I shall have something further to say on that point later.

Few men in history have demonstrated that human character can maintain its integrity under the corroding influence of unbridled power. A former Presidential candidate on the Democratic ticket once observed to me that men will do things out of the desire for prominence and power that they would never do for money. On the other hand, the assumption of moral and legal responsibility has a distinctly sobering effect on any man's attitude and actions. Public servants, like you gentlemen who are trying to solve this perplexing problem of industrial relations, need no reminder of that fact. Responsibility and power must be joined in all fields of human endeavor if social disintegration is to be avoided. Their divorce leads ultimately to anarchy.

If a man wants to be a general and exercise the authority that goes with the job, he must take responsibility for his brigade or his division. Otherwise there would be chaos in the Army. If a corporation executive aspires to such authority as now accompanies his position, he is required—and properly so—to assume legal and moral responsibility for all his actions 365 days in the year. While it is true that this responsibility may not have always been wisely exercised, nevertheless the legal responsibility of business managers does exist in statutory law. The responsibilities of labor leadership must now be clearly fixed also.

The arbitrary exercise of power brought down the Interstate Commerce Commission Act on the railroads in 1887. The selfishness of great industrial combinations brought the Sherman Antitrust Act in 1890; the Clayton Act in 1914. Abuses in the security markets brought the Securities and Exchange Acts of the thirties. Refusal to concede to labor the right to organize resulted in the National Labor Relations Act, and since organized labor has not found voluntary means of curbing its excesses, Congress should now do so in the public interest.

As long as a labor organization can negotiate an agreement with an employer backed by the full authority of the Federal Government without being held legally liable for faithful performance, is it not obvious that that organization is likely to be more extreme in its demands than it would be otherwise? What would happen to our intricate business and banking structure if executive authority and responsibility were not bound in legal wedlock? For example, there are things I wish our company might do but which as its legally responsible executive head, I dare not ask it to undertake because I fear it could not carry them out, and failure to do so would involve the corporation in financial or other difficulties. If I were freed of all responsibility as an executive, I hope I might prove to be a benevolent autocrat but I am afraid I should soon go the way of other big and little dictators and think of my own interest or our company's interest almost to the exclusion of the welfare of the other fellow. There are exceptions, of course, but that is where many a labor leader—hard pressed by his adherents—finds himself today. Devoid of legal responsibility, he is encouraged, and sometimes compelled, to press his claims on the employer to such a degree that he allows his union to take on contractural obligations which it cannot fulfill. When the inevitable lapse occurs, the employer finds himself with virtually no recourse. Ill-feeling, inflammatory statements, strikes, and lawlessness ensue in a vicious spiral. Local communities not infrequently find themselves in a state of civil insurrection. The right to negotiate collectively and the right to strike must and should be held inviolate in a free country. But the right to civil order, and the right to work so as to get the production that the Nation so sadly needs to combat inflation, are equally sacred.

Let me draw an illustration of the effect of legal responsibility from the moot question of freedom of speech in industrial disputes. If I, as a corporation executive, make assertions that are biased or untrue in respect to a labor union, our company can immediately be haled before the National Labor Relations Board for having indulged in an unfair labor practice. On the other hand, the labor leader is completely untrammeled in what he may say about me or our company. Only a few days ago in a pending labor dispute, an important labor leader made the public statement that if a certain

corporation broke even in 1946, it would receive refunds under the carry-back provisions of the Federal Income Tax law. Apparently he was mistaken because the company in question did not earn enough in 1944 and 1945 to pay any excess profits taxes whatever. Now suppose the labor leader who made that mistaken assertion could, under the law, be charged with an unfair labor practice. Is it not a reasonable assumption that he would have been more careful as to what he said and that he thus would not have thrown additional fuel on the flames of an already critical dispute?

Industrial peace can be promoted only by requiring that responsibility and authority go hand in hand. Unless that principle is established, all of the machinery that can be set up for conciliation, mediation, voluntary arbitration and fact-finding will never accomplish satisfactory results in protecting the public interest. One can hold this conviction firmly and yet have great sympathy—as I do—for the labor leader who finds it impossible to discipline his membership and at the same time hold his job. No man, of course, should permit himself to assume more authority than he can ethically and efficiently exrcise. But the laws of the land should certainly be cast in such form as to help the labor leader maintain—with his membership—a sound position of responsible leadership.

In surveying the question of promoting industrial peace, we should never lose sight of the fact that the opportunity for a labor union to exist does not arise until some individual has had the initiative to establish a successful business. I think it is not too much to say that a successful economic enterprise is a desirable end in itself from the broad viewpoint of the well-being of the whole body politic. On the other hand, a well-run labor union—although fraught with deep social significance—is simply a worthy means to help accomplish that desirable end. So any action of Government that results in reversing this concept and makes the union the desirable end and the enterprise merely the means by which the labor union can continue to exist, is bound to be disastrous in the long run to the national economy and our high standard of living. Hence in the interest of encouraging the development of new businesses and promoting the growth of those already established, it is essential, in my opinion, that some better balance in collective bargaining power between the unions and the employers of the Nation be established as quickly as possible.

Only last week there was an article on the front page of the Wall Street Journal for January 30th that illustrates that necessity in striking fashion. Three brothers by the name of Miller started a dairy 4 years ago at New Canaan, Conn. They put all their savings into it, worked themselves from morning till night and gradually built up a nice business producing Jersey milk of superior quality for local consumption. The Teamsters' Union came along and called a strike of the seven or eight drivers that the Millers employed. When wage demands could not be met, the union sent 200 men from out of town to picket the Miller dairy. Women customers who came to get milk for their babies had their automobile tires slashed. For the owners to go ahead meant bankruptcy, and since the Miller brothers were not willing to adopt the union's suggestion that they sell their business to a larger concern which could meet the union's demands, they simply went out of business. William Miller, in a concluding letter to the union said: "You have won a brilliant victory. I applaud you—the golden goose is dead, the eggs, no more."

Take the case of *Senn* v. *Tile Layers Union* (301 U. S. 468) (1937). The employer, who was a small contractor in Wisconsin, I believe, was willing to sign up for the union shop, even though none of his employees belonged to the union, but he found it impossible to accept the condition demanded by the union that he himself refrain from doing any of the work. So the union picketed his establishment, notified architects and contractors that Senn was on the black list, and ruined his business. Senn had four employees, and the year before this situation arose, he netted only $1,500 from his business. The Supreme Court, in a divided opinion, held that under the Wisconsin law this was peaceful picketing and a "labor dispute." The minority opinion pointed out that the union's purpose was not to establish better wages, hours, or other conditions of work but to compel Senn to quit working as a tile layer. Is it in accordance with the principles of American freedom that a man should not have the right to follow any of the common occupations of life that he may select? Was there anything approaching equality of bargaining power in this case? If Mr. Senn had been provided under the law with adequate recourse against the all-powerful union that took such an arbitrary stand, the outcome would probably have been quite different, and the old American ideal of opportunity and freedom for everyone would have been upheld.

This case, among many others, illustrates how important it is that in any remedial legislation that is enacted there should be clear-cut definitions of what wages, hours, and working conditions as used in the Wagner Act, actually comprehend. The reports of the committee on management's right to manage at the recent labor-management conference clearly demonstrates that organized labor is not willing to draw any line between those matters in the operation of a business that are properly subject to collective bargaining and those which are clearly the functions and responsibilities of management. The result is that entirely too much of management's time today is spent in defensive activity instead of being applied to the extension of the frontiers of existing business in order that there may be more job opportunities for all our citizens. The degree to which the minutae of collective bargaining procedures have been carried in many instances, is illustrated in an actual case quoted in an article by Daniel T. Pierce, assistant to the president of the Sinclair Oil Co., in the January 1943 issue of the magazine Factory Management and Maintenance.

"The chairman of a workmen's committee was called to the superintendent's office to be reprimanded for loafing while he was supposed to be on his job. He did not deny the charge, but put in a claim for 15 minutes' overtime occasioned by the interview. When this was refused, the international office demanded arbitration of the complaint. This necessitated the appointment of two arbitrators, and a conciliator of the Department of Labor as the third arbitrator. No decision has yet been rendered, but the arbitration is certain to cost the management, the union, and the Government at least $500 in time and traveling expenses."

Obviously the method of handling grievances provided in a collective bargaining agreement should be fair and exact but union leadership that was required to assume responsibility would be encouraged to have the backbone to refuse to take up trivial and invalid complaints from the membership even though such complaints were insisted upon by individuals or local groups. Time does not permit a discussion of the serious impact on the functions of management of the iron-clad seniority rules that are now being written into so many collective bargaining agreements. If the present tendency is not arrested, the quality of leadership that has been responsible for the dynamic American economy of the past will deteriorate and the public interest will suffer.

Perhaps the greatest problem that faces any business manager is the creation and maintenance of esprit de corps in his organization. No matter how good the plant and equipment may be; no matter how excellent the raw materials and product engineering; no matter how much capital may be available, it is "the spirit that quickeneth." And no organization can achieve high efficiency unless there is a dominant loyalty to the corporate organism of which the employee is part. The present inequality in bargaining power is driving a wedge between the employer and his employees which makes it increasingly difficult for even the best intentioned management to develop and maintain such loyalty. Yet the spirit and willingness to do, growing out of loyalty to the enterprise of which one is a member, has been one of the major factors contributing to the driving power of our American economy. Today—and I am not criticizing labor leadership for so doing—the union leader seeks to have the employee focus his devotion on the union rather than on the enterprise of which the employee is a part. Union leadership, with some outstanding exceptions, usually feels too little responsibility for the success of the business with which his union is connected. The employer is frequently belittled. The employees' suspicions are aroused. Distrust is substituted for confidence. The union gains while the enterprise on which it lives is hampered and the national economy suffers.

No one would be more willing than I am to acknowledge that management has failed at times to discharge its social stewardship in dealing with employees. However, it must be recognized also that organized labor of the United States has now come of age. It is no longer an infant industry. The arguments formerly used to justify legislation and judicial decisions granting special privileges to labor, because it was the underdog, no longer hold water. To preserve a free society there must be checks and balances on all groups: governmental, economic, educational, and so forth. Thus extremes are counterbalanced and reasonable social equilibrium is preserved, provided all men and groups stand equal before the law. The only alternative of an economic system in which there are checks and balances obtained by reasonable equality of bargaining power, is outright Government control. Neither business, nor labor, nor the public wants that. We shall, however, drift into some such situation if business on the one hand does not exercise intelligent social stewardship in its day-by-day decisions and if labor leadership proves it is unwilling to accept legal and moral responsibility in its administration of all of the notable gains it has achieved in recent years.

Greatly to the regret of all friends of the labor movement, there has developed a tendency on the part of the unions to make the public pay for labor peace. In the early days of the railway unions, for example, when management rode high, wide, and handsome in the saddle of uncontrolled power, there were good sound economic and humanitarian reasons for defining a day's work on a train, as 8 hours or a run of 100 miles. But the public asks today, is there any reason why it should pay a Pennsylvania Railroad engineer on a fast electric train running from Washington to New York—something over 200 miles—2 day's pay or more for about 4 hours' work? Or is there any valid reason why it should cost $112 more to distribute a carload of vegetables through the New York City market than in neighboring regions that are free of labor union exploitation. Mr. Thruman Arnold cites that case in an article in the Reader's Digest for June 1941, along with many others. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the reports of the congressional committee for years past are replete with information showing the degree to which one-sided laws and the legal interpretations thereof permit Mr. Petrillo and others like him to conspire not only against employers but against the public in matters that bear little or no relationship to wages, hours, health,

safety, or working conditions. If management indulged in practices that are now legalized for unions, management would properly be cited for violation of the Sherman Act and of the Clayton Act. Is the maintenance of such an unequal situation in accordance with the public interest? Is it not a sine qua non of popular self-government that all men and all groups must stand equal before the law? The attitude of mind created by the lack of legal responsibility finds growing expression in slow-downs, lawless picketing, and utter disregard for the employers' and the public interest in jurisdictional disputes.

One of the most grievous disappointments that I had as a member of the recent Labor-Management Conference was that labor leadership proved unwilling to bring forward a voluntary plan to eliminate disputes between unions themselves—in the face of which the employer is absolutely helpless. Since labor leadership takes that position, it becomes the duty of Congress, as I see it, to provide legal procedure for the resolving of jurisdictional disputes with adequate penalties for violation of the decisions reached. As President Truman indicated to the Labor-Management Conference, strikes as the result of such controversies are indefensible.

The right to work freely at a lawful vocation of one's own choosing was regarded as so obvious and undebatable by our forefathers as not even to require specific mention in the Bill of Rights. In the Turgot edict of 1776 in France—which was well known to them—by which the industries of France were emancipated from the previous state monopolies, we find this affirmation: "God, in creating man with necessities, has compelled him to resort to labor, and has made the right to labor the first, most imprescriptible right of man." And a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States in an early decision stated: "There is no more sacred right of citizenship than the right to pursue unmolested a lawful employment in a lawful manner."

The processes of democracy are hard to establish and maintain in any field of human effort. They can only be preserved in the political sphere if the citizen is free to express his satisfaction or displeasure through the exercise of freedom of speech, freedom of petition, freedom of assembly, and the secret ballot. How can the worker maintain his freedom if similar privileges are denied him through any form of union organization? Theoretically, such rights may still exist under the closed shop; practically they do not. The actions of management are not only under legal control but are regulated every day by the reactions of employees, customers, and stockholders. The employee may refuse to work; the customer may refuse to buy the product; the stockholder may sell his stock. In a free society it cannot be otherwise. Similarly, if the labor union is to be a truly great instrumentality for the preservation of human freedom, it must be equally willing to subject itself to appropriate checks and balances. None of the coercive or undemocratic racketeering aspects of trade-unionism can long exist, if members can resign when they see fit, and management is free to employ any qualified individual whether he is a union member or not.

In discussing the difficult question of the closed shop or any form of so-called union security, we should always keep in mind that closed shop agreements and the check-off are unknown in England and Sweden and the check-off specifically forbidden by law in the Railway Mediation Act in this country. The absence of union security in these instances has certainly not inhibited the growth of union influence and power. In this connection I want to endorse very heartily the approach to this subject in section 23, paragraph 8, of the so-called Ball-Burton-Hatch bill (S. 1171) introduced in the Senate in June 1945.

And now to sum up as briefly as I can my own suggestions:

1. Whatever legislation is enacted should provide definitely that both labor and management should stand equal before the law. This means that the Wagner Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Act should be amended and the immunities now enjoyed by the unions under the Sherman Act removed.

2. Provision should be made for the enforcement of collective bargaining agreements by providing that unions as entities can be sued for damages, and that defaulting unions or their members shall lose their rights under the Wagner Act.

3. Existing machinery for resolving representation questions can be made more useful and the public interest better protected by affording the employer greater access to this procedure.

4. Adequate machinery should be available for the full use of conciliation, mediation, and voluntary arbitration.

5. Procedure for fact finding—which as recently used amounts almost to compulsory arbitration—should be confined to public utilities which vitally affect the health and safety of the public, and whose selling prices are regulated by public authority.

6. The definition of "employee" in the Wagner Act should be amended to exclude all persons who devote their time to managerial functions.

Besides the three bills presently before this committee, namely, S. 1661, S. 1419, and substitute S. 1661, there are also pending before the Senate and House a number of other measures dealing with labor relations. Whatever measures are enacted should cover the whole problem. Principles and procedures are of equal importance. The setting up of machinery which some of these bills propose will not be sufficient to accomplish the desired objective. The rules must also be established and the fundamental principle underlying those rules is to require the assumption of equal legal responsibility by both labor and management. The chassis and the body of labor relations legislation must be joined together if we are to minimize industrial disputes.

Without attempting to go into too much detail, whatever legislation is enacted should be drawn with the following basic principles in mind: Recognition that monopolistic and unfair practices in the field of labor are as harmful to the public interest as similar practices are in either manufacture or distribution; recognition that employees are entitled to choose their representatives without coercion of any kind; recognition that employees have an equal right to join or not to join a labor organization; recognition that while employees have the right to quit work, either individually or collectively, they have no right to prevent others from working or any right to intimidate customers or their employers. In the interest of employees, no strike should be permitted which has not been approved by a secret ballot by those directly involved.

In revising the rules, the terms "rates of pay, wages, hours of employment, and other conditions of employment" (as used in the Wagner Act) should be clearly defined. Cognizance should also be taken of the fact that collective bargaining between employers and employees should never be used to compel either party to surrender basic principles, or to permit them to establish collusive agreements between themselves to the disadvantage of the public. To insure union responsibility, legislation should provide for the distribution of audited financial reports to members, the regular election of union officers at reasonable intervals by secret ballot, and the prohibition of unreasonable initiation fees and dues as well as political contributions. In the public interest, all of these legal restrictions have long been applied to business. In the public interest, they must now be applied to organized labor also.

Lord Moulton, the great English lawyer, asserted that there are three areas of human conduct: At one pole the area of complete freedom—to eat what we want or to fall in love with whomever we please; and at the opposite pole, the area of legal control—laws against thievery, murder, etc. The segment in between he termed "the area of good manners." Obviously, the more that labor and management can broaden this in-between area by voluntary adherence to high standards of conduct in which the public interest is placed above all group interests, the less will be the area of governmental intervention. Representative democracy is that kind of government in which self-restraint is substituted for external restraint. So if labor and management really want the spiritual, intellectual, and political blessings that our Republic brings, we will conduct ourselves accordingly. I tremble to think what will happen to our whole system of government if we in labor and management cannot find a satisfactory solution of our problems by peaceable negotiation with equal legal responsibility on both sides. If we constantly call in government to settle our difficulties we shall finally arrive at compulsory arbitration and rear a Frankenstein monster that will ultimately devour all the liberties that we hold so dear. We both know what happened to labor and management in Italy, Germany, and Russia long before the recent war broke out. With the destruction of the freedom of labor and the freedom of management in those countries also went the abolition of civil, religious, and political liberty.

If management will universally do its utmost to make collective bargaining work successfully; if it will universally refrain from any semblance of unfair practices such as labor-union baiting in any form, or discrimination against any man who wants to join a union; if labor will relinquish its efforts for any form of coerced union membership; if the labor union will regard itself as an integral part of the business enterprise in which it operates and give support to management in the intelligent handling of wage rates and the maintenance of production efficiency—only by such procedure can America remain the land of the free, in which our children will continue to enjoy the blessings of liberty long after we are gone.

The Wheat Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the question of wheat is again claiming the attention of the people of the Nation. The question involved is whether we have a sufficient quantity on hand to take care of our domestic requirements before the production of another crop, and at the same time continue to supply the foreign countries with this product.

It is apparent that an order will soon be issued by the Secretary of Agriculture ordering mills to make dark flour for public consumption figured on percentage basis to the effect that 51 pounds of flour would be ground out of 60 pounds of wheat. This naturally necessitates grinding millfeed into the flour.

This is one way to reduce the use of bread and in the final analysis would be

a great blow to the grain farmer of the country.

Under unanimous consent, I include herewith a telegram received from R. M. Stangler, general manager of the North Dakota Mill and Elevator:

GRAND FORKS, N. DAK., *February 4, 1946.*
Hon. CHARLES ROBERTSON,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

Have information through Northwestern Miller that there is a possibility an order will be issued by Secretary of Agriculture, in effect ordering mills to make dark flour for public consumption, figured on percentage basis to the effect that 51 pounds flour would be ground out of 60 pounds wheat, which naturally necessitates grinding millfeed into the flour. This is one way to reduce the use of bread when normally speaking there generally is far more wheat in the country than can properly be used. It certainly would be a blow to the grain farmers of this country. From the information I can gather I am told that we have exported too much wheat and flour to the extent some countries have far more than they can properly use. I might refer to England, who, I understand, has over 6 month's supply of wheat and flour on hand at this time. Asking the mills to grind black or dark flour putting in millfeed naturally reduces the feed supply when there is a shortage of feed as it is. Surely, such an order should not be issued before the mills, through a committee, could be heard. It doesn't seem reasonable we should get to the point of rationing bread and then tell the people they must eat black bread. That in itself will have a tendency to reduce the consumption of bread that will take years to rebuild. It is a detriment to the wheat grower. Speaking for myself I think it is the most ridiculous thing I have heard for a long time. I think the details on the exporting of wheat should be investigated. This same wire going to each of our Congressmen and Senators.

R. M. STANGLER,
General Manager, North Dakota Mill and Elevator.

The Case Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1946

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me by the House I include the following editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle of Tuesday, February 5, 1946, urging defeat of the Case bill which unfortunately has just been passed by the votes of a majority of our Members. I feel that I would have been derelict in my sworn duties in behalf of my constituents if I had voted in favor of this hastily-drawn unfair bill. I am glad that the congressional delegation from Brooklyn was unanimous in opposing it.

The editorial follows:

CASE BILL, JUMBLING MANY ISSUES, SHOULD BE DEFEATED

What this country needs, even more than a nickel cigar, is a lot less politics on the part of our Congressmen in Washington. The most important matter before the people today is the question of labor relations. The issue should be faced squarely and sincerely without fear or favor to anyone. Major problems should not be mingled with those of minor moment. Things relating to industry should not be commingled with other nonrelevant topics.

The Case bill points up the question. There is a Committee on Labor in the House which is so prolabor that any bill of a slightly restrictive nature will be buried in committee. During the war the simplest technique used by antilabor advocates or even those who sincerely desired a reform of some kind, was to bypass the Labor Committee and tack a rider onto a bill which would go through some other committee. Lest essential war legislation be defeated or delayed, the rider would sail along with the nonlabor proposal. That is not good lawmaking.

The promoters of the Case bill took no chances on any committee. They brought it directly to the Rules Committee, which decides which proposals will be put before the House for debate and vote. Representative CASE comes fom an agricultural district, so he can afford to introduce an antilabor measure. The bill jumbles a number of issues together which should be treated separately.

At least it is good to see that the bill was amended yesterday so that the Norris-LaGuardia Act preventing promiscuous use of the injunction against labor unions would not be practically emasculated. Labor has fought too hard and too long to have that protection inserted in the law of the land to have it now wiped out.

There is a section for penalties to both labor and management for violation of contracts. Certainly the sacredness of the contract is an essential for stable industrial relations. Are there no statutes now existing which could be properly amended to fit the specific situations that arise in labor disputes? If not, Congress has been asleep longer than we suspected.

Severe penalties for disorderly conduct on a picket line are prescribed by the bill. Disorderly conduct, whether it occurs on a picket line or anywhere else, is a misdemeanor that can be satisfactorily dealt with by alert local authorities. There is no need to invoke the machinery of the Federal Government for such matters.

These proposals of Representative CASE should be defeated decisively and the whole thing sent back for serious consideration. The odds are that it won't be. But that will merely show that we need some changes in the complexion of our present Congress.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1946

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Michigan Tradesman, Grand Rapids, Mich., for January 30, 1946:

END PRICE CONTROL

The price-control question is coming up in Washington, following introduction January 29 of a bill in the House of Representatives to extend the price control and wartime stabilization laws. The measure was introduced by Chairman SPENCE, of the House Banking Committee, and hearings are to begin February 5 before that committee.

Democratic Leader BARKLEY indicated that the administration may be willing to abandon some of its price-control authority—provided it gets a year's extension of such authority—and even intimated that some modifications may be expected in the too rigid controls.

Meanwhile, it is public knowledge that some difference of opinion among Government officials has arisen. Price Administrator John D. Small says: "Maintenance of a firm price line means little if goods are not available for purchase," but he wants to continue price control to withstand severe inflationary pressure. He thinks such controls should be used to bring about the most rapid increase in production. "To my mind," he says, "lack of production is the worst thing."

Mr. Small's ideas are about the same as those of Secretary Anderson of the Agriculture Department. At the same time OPA Administrator Bowles insists that price control must continue even while he says he is worried about the lack of production.

Into the picture comes the National Association of Retail Grocers, whose executive board has just passed resolutions that the Government price manipulators can't disregard. These resolutions, which you can read on page 3 of this issue of Michigan Tradesman, go right to the heart of the matter

The retail grocers insist that price and other wartime controls should end as soon as possible because the war is over and existing control agencies no longer are necessary. They demand that Congress should make an investigation with a view to ending quickly all those controls. They tell the blunt truth in this statement:

"Through its absorption and other mistaken price policies, OPA is retarding and distorting production and thereby creating additional inflation both by perpetuating and aggravating existing shortages and depreciating quality."

The retailers present a scathing arraignment of OPA, asserting that this Federal agency has used "indefensible practices" in order to break down violators of regulations and bring confessions. They charge OPA delays issuance of price-control lists, also delays corrections in community ceiling price lists when errors of calculation are made by OPA.

They demand removal of ceilings on butter in order to permit increased production. They demand forthwith removal of price ceilings on nonessential, non-cost-of-living luxury items.

From time to time, Michigan Tradesman has laid bare the defects of the price-control program as it applies to peacetime and has insisted that the war be declared officially ended by Government proclamation, thus automatically ending the powers of the Federal agencies that have been regulating our daily lives in wartime. We have declared that if price controls were abandoned, industry would bring about a fair stabilization of prices through competition. We have said that inflation is not to be feared if manufacturers could get materials.

The public has huge savings to spend for things it needs. The inflationary trend in evidence now is due to the fact that people are forced to buy inferior grade goods at prices that should give them the best possible products. It appears to be slowly filtering through some of the price fixers' minds that the country needs production more than price regulation.

Price regulation has brought the black markets in all kinds of merchandise. The sorry spectacle of prohibition days is repeated over and over in the things we need for sustenance, for wearing, for use otherwise. The collection of old clothes for European war sufferers is going stale because people can't get new clothes and therefore are clinging to what they have left to wear.

As a side light on what is going on is the tremendous demand for lower grade securities in the financial markets. Prices for these securities are going up, as are prices for real estate and commodities of all kinds.

Civilian Production Administrator Small gave utterance to a mouthful of truth when

he said: "The maintenance of a firm line means little if goods are not available for purchase." But we do not believe that any kind of price controls in the hands of the present Washington manipulators will be used to bring about "the most rapid increase in production." The "planners" won't abandon their so-called "plans." They must be forced to give us their real and assumed authority.

Adjustment of Labor Disputes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 6, 1946

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 5262 is now being considered on the floor of Congress and many amendments are being offered and some accepted, both by the opponents and proponents. I firmly believe that all of us are sincerely trying to get a fair, impartial, and workable piece of legislation enacted. I am certain we all want fair and just treatment and a decent living wage so that we can have sufficient income to live and raise our families in the true American way.

I firmly believe in the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively with employers. The processes of such bargaining must be protected and strengthened. Demands of either labor or management should be kept within the bounds of reason and fairness, and both sides must recognize the rights of the general public. Wrongful and unlawful conduct on either side is destructive to collective bargaining and a hindrance to the individual rights of us all. American labor and American management have repeatedly and conclusively demonstrated their fine patriotism and adherence to American ideals. Knowing these conditions, I am certain that an honest, workable, collective bargaining program can be established.

Mr. Speaker, I am not completely satisfied with H. R. 5262, but I am going to vote for it rather than take a do-nothing attitude. I think this legislation can be made a basis upon which labor and management can come to a closer understanding.

Wages and Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 7, 1946

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arthur Krock from the New York Times of Thursday, February 7, 1946:

IN THE NATION—"MAGIC FORMULA" THAT NEVER VARIES

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, February 6.—For a long time before Pearl Harbor and afterward, the Roosevelt administration stubbornly maintained the position that effective anti-inflation controls need not include any ceiling on wages. Until the strike against the United States Steel Corporation became a fact recently, the Truman administration stubbornly maintained the position that substantial wage increases could be allowed in key industries without any advance in the general price level.

A PROCLAMATION COMING

The facts have always been against both positions, which were political measures to hold the support of organized labor at the polls and never based on economic realities. These realities forced the Roosevelt administration, with the "little steel" formula, to add wage controls to the others. And now the Truman administration is on the verge of relating prices to the cost of production, in which wages are the major element. Soon after this article appears, unless signs that point one way have misled all who have noted them, this second surrender to immutable facts is due for proclamation.

It will probably be couched in the same pious and hopeful terms that were employed on many occasions in the past when makeshift politics had worn out, and New Deal economists were confronted with the necessity of calling inflation desirable or belatedly accepting fundamental means to resist it. Since all formulae to "prevent" inflation after inflation has arrived are compounded largely of hope and politics, and the essential cooperation of labor, industry and the country at large is far from implicit in the formulae, the composition of these announcements seems to have fallen into the hands of a special group of rhetoricians; they all sound alike, and each lasts about as long as its predecessor.

THE HENDERSON-NELSON PAPER

The first document in the series that comes to mind was signed by Leon Henderson and Donald Nelson. It appeared in a Harvard Business School publication and was called The Result of Our Thinking So Far. The task before these gifted authors was to explain how wartime inflation, then threatening at close range amid loud, continuous, and unheeded warnings from B. M. Baruch, could be held in check by a series of Government and other controls from which wages were excluded. That was the electoral politics of Mr. Roosevelt at the time, and valiantly did the gifted economists do what they could for it. Some tooth of conscience, sharper than usual, gnawed at the authors before the article ended, for they conceded that wages are an important cost factor and must bear a relation to the other elements they listed. But they contented themselves with expressing the hope that labor and management would be wise and patriotic enough not to let this factor get out of hand.

The snorts of Mr. Baruch over this thinking reverberated in the capital. But they did no good. Not until wages had been pushed up to the wartime level—that in turn brought the rise in living costs on which recent organized labor demands for still higher levels are based—was the flexible ceiling of the Stabilization Act awkwardly and belatedly placed over the uneven structure. And any large strike could punch a hole in it.

Now the ceiling is shot full of holes again, as was inevitable in the circumstances. And once more a blueprint is being drawn up which is to be new only in the sense that the figures are larger. This sequence was made inevitable when, in devising a series of anti-inflation controls in which even rents and priorities were included, wages were left out. That led logically to Mr. Truman's effort to try to find the exact point to which wages could be advanced in 1946 without a general advance in the price level. Like the earlier attempt to flee from an economic fact by saying it wasn't there, this one ended with the administration's exploratory proposal of a higher price for steel.

BROKEN PLEDGES OF THE PAST

That proposal has now grown into another general formula which has been urged on the President by some of his economic advisers, a new magic prescription that may be on the mimeographs as this is written. Based on the sound and undisputed theory that full production will solve most of the income and earning troubles of organized industry, this formula would achieve it by raising the general wage-price level in return for certain pledges, thus drawing another line that must and will be held against inflation.

But the working of such a formula, and the attainment of the full production which would indeed be worth a certain general wage-price rise, depends, as all its predecessors have, on the answer to the same question: Will the pledges be kept? The mood of the industrial combatants must alter considerably and swiftly if the next labor contracts are not to be broken as current ones have been and as the no-strike pledge was shattered, despite the fact that the Nation was in desperate war. This latter promise was given by labor in exchange for a War Labor Board promise to adjust (which nearly always meant increase) wage scales. But it was violated thousands of times. If this is to be the fate of pledges on which any formula for full production must succeed or fail, then the new stabilization period will never operate for the duration. And then full production will be the goal of still another effort, within another and higher line that must be held.

American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 7, 1946

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a letter I have received, addressed to the Honorable James F. Byrnes, Secretary of State, regarding the present trend of our American foreign policy:

To Honorable Members of Congress:

I ask your kind consideration of the contents of letter below, addressed to Secretary of State James F. Byrnes.

This is an expressed opinion regarding the present trend of our American foreign policy, an opinion shared not only by 6,000,000 Americans of Polish origin, but also by millions of Americans of other backgrounds.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES ROZMAREK,
President.

JANUARY 24, 1946.

Hon. JAMES F. BYRNES,
Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BYRNES: The Polish American Congress, Inc., shares the grave concern felt and expressed by millions of Americans regarding the announced agreements recently entered into by you, Mr. Secretary, in Moscow with Messrs. Stalin, Molotov, and Bevin. We feel in duty bound to advise you that we have gained no encouragement from the explanations which you gave the American people in your last radio speech on December 30, 1945. On the contrary, your speech has only confirmed our apprehensions and increased our profound uneasiness concerning the present trend of our American foreign policy.

It is our considered opinion that, contrary to the interests of American security, which the Polish American Congress regards

as the basic aim of American policy—and contrary to our country's obligations toward the peoples of Europe and Asia who have been our loyal allies in this war—you have on behalf of the USA:

1. Agreed to recognize as free and valid the "Hitlerite" elections in Yugoslavia, although these elections can by no stretch of imagination be regarded as an expression of the free will of the Yugoslav peoples at present enslaved by Soviet Russia acting through her faithful comintern agent, Tito.

2. Agreed to the incorporation into Soviet Russia of the three small democracies: Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

3. Agreed to become a party to the "legalization" and, thereby, the perpetuation of a Soviet-sponsored regime in Rumania and Bulgaria.

4. Agreed at present to accept the Soviet formula by virtue of which the task of preparing and drafting of the final peace treaties is to be carried out virtually by the big powers alone, a formula which you yourself have previously rejected as unacceptable at the preceding London Conference. Your acceptance of this formula makes the United States of America directly and actively participate in preventing the smaller nations from taking a substantial part in the establishment of the peace settlement, in utter disregard of their joint and respective contributions to our common victory won in the name of allegedly common principles of justice and democracy.

5. Agreed, contrary to your own previous stand, to accept Soviet Russia's participation not merely in an advisory capacity, but as a principal in the problems of the Far East and the Pacific Ocean.

6. Advanced considerably on the way towards the disclosure to Soviet Russia of the secrets of atomic energy.

7. Tacticly agreed to Soviet Russia's aggressive policy against Iran and Turkey.

Thus, by concessions to Soviet Russia, and particularly those referred to in points 1, 2, 3, and 7, direct encouragement has been given to Soviet Russia's expansionist imperialism in Europe and the Middle East and likewise the holding of a totalitarian type of elections now pending in other Soviet-dominated countries, such as Poland, has been encouraged.

By the action as described in point 4, the further spread of an overbearing and ruthlessly selfish power political concept, irreconcilable with a just and durable peace, has been encouraged and affirmed most unfortunately on behalf of our American democracy.

By the action referred to in point 5, the infiltration of hostile totalitarian Soviet policies into the Pacific area has been assented to, thereby enabling Soviet Russia henceforth to extend her imperialist activities, hitherto limited to the European Continent, to the Asiatic Continent and to the Pacific Ocean and its islands, which we regard as a serious direct menace to United States security.

In the matter of atomic energy, in our opinion the American delegation in Moscow has acted contrary to the repeatedly expressed will of our elected Senators and Representatives in the United States Congress.

We consider the stand adopted by the American delegation in Moscow as a complete retreat from the commendable attitude which you had taken at the recent London conference, and we solemnly urge you to inform the General Assembly of the United Nations Organization that the American people and its duly elected representatives are not prepared to regard as binding any agreements secretly arrived at and detrimental to our own security and to world peace and welfare. We can assure you that you will find, not only in the United States but also among most of the United Nations now assembled in London, wholehearted support for a courageous repudiation of the appeasement policy which is now inevitably setting the stage for another war. May the ruins of London evoke in your mind the memory of the late Neville Chamberlain, whose unfortunate and ill-fated policy of Munich should be a timely reminder of the lamentable consequences of appeasement. To those of your counselors who now guide our foreign policy down the road of appeasement proclaiming that only thus can be preserved "the unity of the Big Powers"—we beg you to remind them of the following prophetic passage of President Woodrow Wilson's message to Congress of April 2, 1917:

"A steadfast concert for peace can never be maintained except by a partnership of democratic nations. No autocratic government could be trusted to keep faith within it or observe its covenants."

In this crucial hour of American destiny, we most earnestly request you to take the opportunity afforded you by the Assembly of the United Nations, meeting for the first time after this unprecedented total war, firmly to reject any and all attempts at power politics whatever their source, and steadfastly to abide by the truly democratic American ideals and principles so clearly expressed in President Truman's 12-point declaration on America's foreign policy which our American delegation is pledged to follow and not renounce or alter in any way.

So far the war has failed of its objective—liberty. We have not had 1 day, 1 hour, or 1 minute of real peace, all the shouting and all the hopes and all the prayers of millions notwithstanding.

The United States must not become a partner in any wrongdoing. On the contrary, it should use all peaceful means at its disposal to help allied Poland and all the other nations bordering upon Russia to regain the freedom they enjoyed prior to 1939.

Final victory in the Second World War will not be attained until and unless the ideals, for which our defenders fought and died, prevail.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES ROZMAREK,
President.

(Mrs.) HONORATA B. WOLOWSKA,
Secretary.

Freedom and Self-Determination for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 7, 1946

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a speech which I recently delivered over Station WSPR, Springfield, Mass., under the sponsorship of the Polish American Congress:

My friends, I am very much honored and privileged this afternoon to speak on this program dedicated by the Polish people of Massachusetts to the cause of human freedom.

Sometime ago in Congress I introduced a resolution in behalf of the Polish people, not only expressing sympathy with their aspirations for a completely free status, but pledging the assistance of the American Congress and people to their aims for a democratic government of their own choice.

At that time our Secretary of State was engaged in important international conferences in Moscow and I took occasion to urge upon him, as the representative of the American Government, that he might move successfully to fix an early date for the negotiation of permanent treaties of peace and thus end the dangerous policy of international drifting which appears to be generating feelings of distrust and suspicion that may well sow the dragon seeds of future war.

This is another most appropriate occasion to consider great questions which involve on almost a world-wide scale the freedom of millions of worthy democratic-minded peoples.

Above all, this is also the time to move for and arrange the early negotiation of final treaties of peace which will determine just, durable, and effective settlements and thus put an end to patchwork, piecemeal diplomacy and the policy of drifting and equivocation on vital international issues before this drifting leads us to the threshold of another great war. I have already urged our Department of State to press these questions, and earnestly hope that they may be considered and favorably acted upon.

In connection with the discussion of freedom and self-determination, it is most appropriate for me once again to bring to the attention of the Congress the unfortunate continuing plight of the gallant Polish people and other Baltic and Balkan States which are now suffering from, or threatened with, oppression and unwarranted denial of freedom.

It would seem very clear that there is in some places here and abroad the belief, desire, and hope that previous settlements of the Polish question and other related Baltic and Balkan questions heretofore arrived at by unilateral action or in informal conferences between some of the leaders of the United Nations would, after original protest, be ultimately accepted and approved by the people of the United States. The theory underlying this view is that, if long enough continued, our Nation will forget or overlook these gross and indefensible violations of the Atlantic Charter and our own cherished principles of freedom and justice. And I am not confining my remarks to the areas mentioned above because they are pertinent to informal arrangements heretofore made which affect many other nations and areas. They are equally pertinent to the brutal encroachments of imperialism wherever it reappears in ugly form throughout the world as to the brutalities and violations of totalitarianism

Be that as it may, so far as I am concerned as a Member of Congress, I am not prepared and will not be prepared at any time to forget or overlook these injustices. I endorse as a step in the right direction the principle stated not long ago in substance by our State Department that this Government would not accord diplomatic recognition to autonomy over any nation that was based on force, conquest, or aggression.

Some of the Allied Nations, including our own, have protested the political systems prevailing in central Europe. The Secretary of State has sharply criticized the situation in formerly hostile Bulgaria in particular, because he regards it as permitting a puppet dictatorial government in that country contrary to the interests and wishes of the people. In logic, the same protest is even more applicable to our faithful ally, Poland, where a puppet government, a ruthless dictatorship based on force, is established by our acquiescence and compliance which, if we can believe reports, is proceeding to throttle freedom and perpetrate outrage after outrage against the God-fearing, liberty-loving, peace-seeking Polish people. This is certainly a great inconsistency and glaring paradox of our current international policy.

If anyone is under the impression and is proceeding on the theory that this situation is going to blow over, that the delivery of gallant Poland, heroic Lithuania, and other brave Baltic and Balkan nations into the special sphere of Russian influence is going

to blow over and be forgotten by the American people or by the American Congress merely through inertia and the lapse of time, he is making a great mistake.

The irregular and ill-advised action on Poland by our Government and our allies has provoked the deepest resentment and bitterness among millions of decent, liberty-loving American citizens and this resentment and bitterness is not confined to those of Polish blood but is burning in the heart of every American citizen who loves liberty and believes in and stands for the principles of self-determination and the Atlantic Charter for which precious American blood has been so lavishly spilled all over the world.

What could be more destructive of our professed war aims than for this great, free, and powerful Nation to join with the other nations in turning over the Polish people to an undemocratic and ruthless regime against their will, and without their consent and without action by the United States Senate whose approval of foreign treaties is required by the Constitution? Could we believe for one moment that the United States Senate would ever sanction this outrage?

I am conscious that some Allied statesmen have talked about the political mistakes of the Poles, have advocated the so-called Curzon line as the solution to Poland's territorial problems and have made accusations against the good faith and fair dealing of the Polish people that are most unwarranted. No one should know better than some of these statesmen themselves that the Polish people not only do not accept the Curzon line, but have no voice whatever in present policy or acts of the present puppet-masters of Poland.

Those who participate in, recognize, and condone this outrageous violation of the God-given right of the Polish people to maintain and conduct a free government of their own choice must bear due guilt for the evil consequences of their acts and weak excuses and patent subterfuges will never delude the fair-minded, democratic-minded peoples of the earth here or elsewhere.

It is even more outrageous and indefensible to accuse the Polish people of the terrible inhuman crimes that have been and are being committed in eastern Europe, especially the slaughter and exile of the religious, when it is a known fact that all means of self-defense as well as self-expression have long since been taken away from the impoverished and defenseless Polish people by the oppressive puppet regime in Poland.

These poor people cannot speak and protest let alone procure or use the arms with which to defend their lives, families, and possessions. It has become fashionable in some supposedly enlightened and liberal circles to make scapegoats of the Polish people in order to distract attention from those responsible for their horrible plight.

But there is not a fair-minded Member of Congress, and there is not a freedom-loving American citizen in the Nation, who does not recognize that this situation now obtaining in Poland, to which I regret to say our Government apparently has consented, is an affront to all conceptions of honesty and justice. It is a repudiation of the basic principles of freedom and self-determination. It is a cruel betrayal of one of our most loyal allies in the war. It is a calloused, unpardonable abandonment of the so-called "four freedoms" which were alleged, as we were so often and so positively assured when our boys were being sent off to slaughter and death in all corners of the earth, to be the aims for which they were fighting, bleeding, and dying—our hope for a brave new world of peace and plenty.

It is pertinent now, and it will be pertinent until this question is finally settled under principles of international justice, amity, and decency, to ask whether or not it is the intention of our State Department and Government to consent to the perpetuation of this violation of the fundamental rights of the Polish people. To abandon them and leave them helpless before the powerful ruthless tyrants who are now holding them by the throat and stifling their last free breath is an unconscionable offense against the law of nations and the law of God which the decent opinion of this great free American Nation will never condone or sanction.

No, my friends, this episode of betrayal of gallant Poland will not blow over. It will not be forgotten. It lives in the minds and hearts of all our countrymen who love freedom and it will live in our minds and hearts until Poland is restored to its honored and rightful place among the free nations of the earth.

Some officials of this Government may glibly argue that compromise is a necessary part of world statesmanship but that is a principle that never has been and never will be accepted by the American people. The principle of compromise with terrorism, compromise with injustice is not an American principle; it is offensive to the very spirit of free America. Like every other nation in this world which has fought and struggled and sacrificed for self-government throughout the ages as gallantly and bravely as Poland has done, Poland is entitled to her freedom, Poland is entitled to reestablish and maintain her own government, Poland is entitled to her own territories and her own possessions, and Poland is entitled to her birthright as a free nation. Nothing less than that will ever satisfy the spirit of fearless devotion to liberty that animates the Polish people, and nothing less than full political, social, economic, and ideological protection for Poland as an independent and sovereign nation can or will be recognized by the American people.

Fellow citizens, as an American, I object to small peoples and small nations being kicked around by the strong and the powerful because I do not like injustice or brute force, and, moreover, because I understood that this war was to end that sort of thing for all time. I am out of patience with those who pursue the principle of compromise through appeasement and supine submission to the will of radicalism and imperialism. The time has come for our Nation to declare a strong, forceful foreign policy. We seek no selfish gains; we pursue no greedy aims; we ask not for territories or possessions of other people; we demand only that the principles on which our own Nation is based and for which we entered the war and for which so many of our loyal sons have offered up their lives shall be respected throughout the world; we demand this in the name of those who died that human liberty and American liberty might live.

It is time to let other nations understand—and I care not how strong or powerful they are—that we do not intend to sit idly by and watch cynical forces of totalitarianism or imperialism just as evil in their purposes and as ruthless in their methods as Hitler ever was employ brutal force and unwelcome infiltration to sweep across Europe—sweep across the Orient—threatening to destroy or throttle every spark of freedom and justice wherever the withering hand of tyranny is laid.

In our own self-interest as well as for justice it is time for us to act and urge that our State Department declare a strong affirmative position in this matter and serve notice on every nation to which it may be applicable that we will no longer tolerate oppression and betrayal of the Polish people or any other people desiring freedom, that we will regard continued domination of such peoples against their will and in violation of international morality to be acts of bad faith toward the principles and aims of the United States of America and the United Nations Organization.

Sincere and wholehearted international cooperation may well bring peace through justice but further appeasement of nations who through aggression and conquest insist upon making a mockery of our war aims and the accepted principles of human decency can only lead to another world war. Let us correct this threatening situation before we bring ruin upon the whole world, before we drift or are drawn into the vortex of another war that will decimate not only ourselves, but all of civilization. Now is the time for a show-down.

Let us go forward militantly and courageously. Let us carry on the fight for Poland until we have recorded decisive and lasting victory for freedom and justice.

Residential Race Restrictions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1946

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Architectural Forum Magazine of Building for January 1946:

GOOD NEIGHBORS—CALIFORNIA JUDGE KNOCKS OUT RACE RESTRICTIVE COVENANT AS UNCONSTITUTIONAL

One big question which many a city will soon have to face got a decisive answer in a Los Angeles courtroom last month. Superior Judge Thurmond Clarke decided that 57 of the city's Negro families may keep the homes they have bought in a race-restricted neighborhood.

Moving slowly into old but still gracious colonial houses in once fashionable West Adams Heights, well-to-do Negroes (among them Movie Actresses Louise Beavers, Hattie McDaniel, Ethel Waters) had created what many a property owner fears—the "mixed" neighborhood. But most Sugar Hill property owners, glimpsing the spruce lawns, the careful maintenance of their new neighbors, soon lost their fear. Only a few protested the neighborhood change. Finally the protesting handful went to court, brandishing a race-restrictive covenant.

Judge Thurmond Clarke's decision was not the first to deny enforcement of a race-restrictive covenant. But it was the first in the United States to state clearly why such covenants cannot be recognized as legal: "It is time that members of the Negro race are accorded, without reservations or evasions, the full rights guaranteed them under the Fourteenth Amendment to the Federal Constitution. Judges have been avoiding the real issue too long."

Drawn like iron bands around bulging Negro neighborhoods in most northern cities, race restrictive covenants have been tightened by war housing shortage. They have been written to apply to almost all minority groups—one court ruled that two American Indians might be restrained from occupying property covered by a covenant proscribing "persons not of the Caucasian race." But their biggest social cost has been paid by the biggest United States minority group: Negro citizens.

Restrictive covenants have bottled Negroes in densely crowded areas, where two out of every three houses are substandard, where competition for living space means high rents, where three of four families must occupy space inadequate for one. Sample: a single Harlem block houses 3,871 persons; at a comparable concentration, the whole United States population could be housed in one-half of New York City.

NEW LAND COVERED

Initiated principally as barriers to Negro expansion into older city neighborhoods, restrictive covenants have by now spread to cover undeveloped suburban land. Said lawyer Oren Miller, who represented most of the defendants in the Sugar Hill case: "No Los Angeles subdivision is opened now without such covenants being written into the original subdivider's deed."

MARKET BLOCK

New building will ease the acute housing shortage for most Americans. But an important sector of building's market will be blocked by race restrictions on the land available for building. Nor can racially banned buyers take up housing released in older city neighborhoods as home buyers move to the suburbs. Smart real estate brokers have already realized how much restrictive covenants artificially limit the market for older houses. In some cities brokers have made a specialty of opening neighborhoods to Negro buyers.

Ever since the late, crusading President Franklin D. Roosevelt personally bawled out former Federal Housing Administrator Stewart McDonald for reported FHA discrimination against Negro home buyers, this agency has been a major target in the fight against restrictive covenants. Said the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, "FHA is preventing the Federal Government from assisting Negro citizens in meeting their housing needs. It does this by demanding as one of the bases of its guaranty the protection of racial restrictive covenants; by insisting upon the extension of these racial covenants into new areas and, with the use of Federal funds and power, thereby requiring residential segregation."

Biggest bone of contention is FHA's Underwriting Manual, which says, "If a neighborhood is to retain stability, it is necessary that properties shall continue to be occupied by the same social and racial classes." Thus, while FHA will insure mortgages in all-white or all-Negro neighborhoods, it will not accept mortgages in changing or buffer neighborhoods. The manual also warns valuators that deeds should include "prohibition of the occupancy of properties except by the race for which they are intended."

The NAACP has fought for the last 6 years for deletion of these and other discriminatory instructions from the FHA Manual. Refusing to budge, FHA has argued that neighborhood stability and mortgage security would be jeopardized. FHA is now re-writing its manual. Whether it has changed its mind about race restrictions in view of Sugar Hill and a few other court-approved examples of mixed but stable neighborhoods, remains to be seen.

DOOR TO RACE STRIFE?

Those who advocate race restrictive covenants advance two major reasons: (1) appearance of a minority group in a neighborhood means property deterioration and general decline of values; or (2) mixed neighborhoods precipitate racial strife. There is much evidence against both these arguments.

FHA itself has said: "On the basis of credit analysis we consider Negro mortgagors as good or better risk than white mortgagors." Negro spokesmen have pointed out that restrictions on type of occupancy, requiring building owners not to sell or lease except to single families, would be a far more effective check on property deterioration. The National Association of Real Estate Boards has collected opinions of its members, all giving Negro owners and renters a good risk-rating.

Do mixed neighborhoods open a door to racial strife? Public housing experience as well as countless city neighborhoods have demonstrated that many kinds of neighbors can live happily together. The Detroit riots of 1943 supplied dramatic evidence: rioting occurred in sections where white and Negro citizens faced each other across a color line, but not in sections where the two groups lived side by side.

VIOLATION OF PUBLIC POLICY

Race restrictive covenants have no deep root in United States public policy. They began to occur only after the Supreme Court ruled in 1917 that city ordinances restricting residential areas according to racial groups are unconstitutional. With zoning segregation knocked out, property owners began to insert race restrictions in property deeds and to band together in covenant agreements. These have been upheld by a majority of State and municipal court rulings. So far the Supreme Court has ducked the question of race restrictive covenants, having refused permission to hear several such cases.

While the United States groped for its own solution to this painful but imperative question, a Canadian justice wrote a new chapter in the body of law regulating real estate transfers. Invalidating a deed restriction barring property transfer to Jewish citizens, Toronto Judge Mackay ruled it violated public policy. To define public policy, Judge Mackay drew, probably for the first time in civil jurisprudence, upon the San Francisco Charter for precedent. He quoted:

"We, the peoples of the United Nations—

"Determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and

"To reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small * * * and for these ends

"To practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors."

American Public Opinion Supports Philippine Rehabilitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLOS P. ROMULO

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER OF THE PHILIPPINES TO THE UNITED STATES

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1946

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a series of editorials taken at random from the American press during the last few weeks in which the problem of Philippine independence and Philippine rehabilitation are discussed. They are an expression of how the American feels toward the Filipino people. My people are grateful to the editors and publishers of these newspapers for their sympathetic interest displayed in all these articles. While on the question of independence some of them do not seem to have complete information—and in my speech on the floor today I hope to give them the background necessary for a proper comprehension of Filipino psychology to correct their wrong impression and allay their misgivings—they are unanimous in advocating that America should extend to the Philippines the assistance that we need for our rehabilitation and reconstruction.

These editorials follow:

[From the Wilmington (Del.) News of January 2, 1946]

WITH RELUCTANT FEET

It is not particularly surprising that many Filipinos look forward with increasing reluctance and apprehension to the prospect of independence 6 months from now. Four years of war, in which many of the chief cities of the islands have been ruined, have left the Philippines economically prostrate. They have also deprived the people of time which they badly needed to prepare for the day in which they would cut loose from the United States and strike off on their own.

This is a matter on which the Filipinos must take the initiative themselves, however, if there is to be any postponement of the date on which a free Philippine Republic is to be set up. There is nothing the United States can do to postpone the separation. We cannot change the independence day fixed 10 years ago, or even suggest a delay, without incurring charges of bad faith.

As matters stand, there is little likelihood that anything will be done to defer the date. Even though public opinion in the Philippines is reported to be overwhelmingly in favor of a 5-year postponement, Filipino politicians have committed themselves too strongly on this issue to reverse themselves. They have been screaming for independence for nearly half a century and they are afraid they would be risking political suicide to take a different position now.

However, the United States can and should do its best to help the islands to stand on their own feet. This will mean a far larger measure of financial support than was envisaged when the legislation granting them their freedom was originally passed. But it would be foolish and unfair to set the Filipinos adrift without giving them a reasonable chance to create a stable nation, and they have also earned special consideration by the gallant fight they put up at our side during the war with Japan.

[From the Pittsfield (Mass.) Berkshire Eagle of January 1, 1946]

THE FILIPINOS RECOGNIZE THE DRAW-BACKS OF INDEPENDENCE

An American observer in the Philippines reports that in his opinion 80 percent of the Filipinos are leary of immediate independence and wish the United States would wait another 5 years before releasing the islands from its aegis. The minority who disagree includes, of course, all the prominent politicians, who desire an immediate opportunity to establish themselves as heads of a new nation.

The majority are to be commended for their common sense. They evidently are aware that independence and self-rule are not the keys to an immediate paradise. Dependence has its drawbacks but it also has its advantages; if the Philippines will no longer have to subordinate their own wishes to those of the United States, they will also have to solve their own problems and skin their own skunks from this time forward. And they are going to find what every other new country has, that whatever may be said in favor of democracy, it is the most difficult form of government; it is in some ways the most inefficient; it is by all odds the most exacting and imposes the greatest demands on the intelligence, the time, and the patience of the individual. Rule by a tyranny may be oppressive but it requires no initiative and no intelligence and no effort on the part of the citizen who is willing to obey without question.

In passing from a colonial status direct to independent democratic government, the Filipinos are doing what the inhabitants of the United States did more than 150 years ago. They will do well, in looking toward

the future, to consider well the teachings of American history and to recall the long, slow struggle, the number of mistakes, the difficulties, dangers, and internal strife which the people of this country underwent before they succeeded in establishing their republic on a firm basis. If they become discouraged by failure to attain perfection in a decade or two, they will have failed to learn their lesson.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe of December 29, 1945]

PHILIPPINE STATUS

By including the Philippine Commonwealth among the members of the Far Eastern Commission, which will determine policy regarding Japan, the Moscow Conference has emphasized the growing international status of the islands, whose independence has been promised July 4 next.

While the Japanese occupied his country, the late President Quezon signed the Declaration by the United Nations, along with representatives of the British Dominions. The Philippines were therefore represented at San Francisco and signed the Charter. Now the Commonwealth is to sit on the board which will govern its invader.

During the war, the islands' growing international status, implying as it did recognition of the Commonwealth by other nations—with full approval of the United States—was concrete evidence that this country intended to keep its promises, at a time when Japan was beating the drums with the slogan, "Asia for the Asiatics." Today a colonial section of the world, both rulers and ruled, sees a genuinely self-governing American possession accorded an important position, heroically earned, in the council of nations. Such examples often act as solvents of widespread problems which seem very difficult.

[From the Durham (N. C.) Herald of December 24, 1945]

READY FOR INDEPENDENCE?

The Filipinos who dreamed of independence for 40 years even while the United States was building up the economy, health, and education of their country, little dreamed that the time would come when they would dread that independence.

But that situation, for some of them, now exists. Three years under the Japanese have nearly destroyed the economic life of the Philippines. A desperate effort is being made to restore that economy to a functional condition before granting them independence.

High Commissioner Paul V. McNutt declares that the initiative for a postponement of the granting of independence to which we are committed must come spontaneously and uninspired from the Filipinos themselves.

The Filipinos know that the vast amount of American investments needed to restore their country will not be made so readily as long as independence is so near.

But whether independence comes as scheduled next year or not, this country is making an effort to turn over to the Filipinos a nation that is functioning, not a war-ravaged, impoverished wreckage.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Republican of January 14, 1946]

THE PHILIPPINE TRAGEDY

In delaying action on certain important economic questions directly related to the independence of the Philippines, Congress is fast approaching an embarrassing dilemma. Independence next July for the Commonwealth has been fixed by law, yet the Filipinos are in no condition to undertake the sole responsibility for the independent government of the archipelago. The Filipino economy has been almost ruined by the Japanese invasion and by the later military operations for the liberation of the islands. Independence sentiment among the native population has begun to waver. One prominent Filipino has recently stated that statehood in the American Union would be welcomed, although no conceivable solution seems more improbable from the American viewpoint.

Our statutory promise of independence for the Philippines has been an American boast during the war. Other powers facing difficult colonial problems in the Orient and elsewhere have been reminded how we have solved our Philippine problem on anti-imperialistic lines—the smug suggestion being that they should follow our unselfish example. This fact makes politically difficult, if not impossible, any postponement of the date fixed for the proclamation of independence, even at the request of the major political parties now functioning in the archipelago. They, too, would be embarrassed in asking for an extension of American sovereignty, in view of the fact that for many years they have capitalized the nationalist sentiment of the native population.

To set the Philippines adrift would involve no danger of foreign military intervention in the near future, in view of the quasi-protectorate which the United States would practically maintain from the naval and air bases to be ceded by the Philippine Government under the terms of the definitive independence treaty. The menace of Japan to an independent Filipino state has been removed for many years to come. American sea and air power can be dependent on to protect the islands from external enemies.

What is not so well assured is the Philippine Government's power to maintain itself against domestic uprising or disturbances, which might develop because of the poverty of the people and the slow revival of the insular economy. The present United States High Commissioner, Paul V. McNutt, reported last spring to Congress: "It will take 2 years, probably 3, to even revive the sugar industry. * * * Much machinery (in sugar mills) was shipped to Japan. * * * Most bridges are destroyed. * * * Fifteen percent of all buildings in the islands have been destroyed (notably in the cities)."

These facts indicate the menace of low-standard social conditions and of the revival of native banditry in the countryside. Banditry was not obliterated for several years after the United States Army took over the pacification of the island 45 years ago, after expelling the Spanish forces and then quelling the native nationalist movement of Aguinaldo, Mabini, and the other native leaders of that period.

Assuming that Philippine independence will be established next summer in accordance with the timetable, an economic program to safeguard the undertaking must be sanctioned by Congress. The several Tydings bills, hitherto sidetracked, include a grant of $100,000,000 for insular rehabilitation under American supervision, provision for war damages to be paid both by the Japanese and our own Government and one or two others transferring excise taxes still held in the United States Treasury and certain physical properties. Of more vital importance is the tariff barrier which may be set up against trade between the Philippines and the United States.

The truth is that the decision of Congress back in the 30's to grant independence to the Philippines was largely influenced by American agricultural and business interests which felt the competition of imports, notably sugar and cocoanut oil, from the islands. These imports came in under a special scale of duties permitting the trade to survive. Many votes in Congress for Philippine independence were cast with the purpose of applying to the Philippine trade the same high tariff which was applicable to all other foreign commerce. If that protective tariff sentiment is still as strong in Congress as it was 10 or more years ago, the question of how to surmount it arises in connection with the establishment of the Filipino republic on a going financial basis.

The Tydings tariff bill for the solution of this problem would start with low United States duties on Filipino imports and gradually raise them over a 20-year period. In the House the Bell bill would provide for free trade over the entire 20 years between the United States and the infant far eastern republic.

The Bell bill would have had no chance of American acceptance, probably, had there been no war. Yet today, the conditions in the Philippines being as tragic as they are admitted to be, complete free trade for a 20-year period seems the least the United States can do to make the independence of the Philippines a successful venture.

[From the Lewistown (Mont.) Democrat News of January 9, 1946]

EDITORIAL VIEWS AND REVIEWS

UP TO THE FILIPINOS

The American Government has definitely fixed July 4 this year as the date for granting the Filipinos complete independence. There has been some question as to whether or not the people of those islands will desire to accept full responsibility for their government at that time. Conditions throughout the archipelago are more or less chaotic. The long Japanese occupation has left their public finances in bad shape. Their capital, Manila, as well as other important centers of population, has suffered heavy physical damage from bombings and the willful destruction of the Nipponese. Most public utilities are in need of repairing or rebuilding. Much internal discord prevails. It is assumed in some quarters that the responsible people of the islands might desire the Americans to remain in charge until these conditions have been improved. That, however, is a matter which should be left strictly up to the Filipinos themselves. Our Government must be prepared to pull out at once except for such military forces as are required to remain there to take care of the enormous quantities of war material we have there.

[From the Easton (Pa.) Express of January 16, 1946]

PHILIPPINES AND DEFENSE

July 4, which this year will be independence day for the Philippines as well as for this Nation, is a long way off but already we hear the uneasy whisper that Philippine independence will be premature, that the Filipinos are not ready for it, and that our defense needs forbid it.

That point of view arises, we hope, merely from a misapprehension of United States intentions with regard to the Philippines once their independence becomes a fact. There is, so far as we know, no suggestion that this Nation drop the Philippines like a discarded garment, and allow this unhappy victim of aggression to face its future unaided.

In building its new framework, the Philippine nation doubtless will need economic aid. This Nation owes such aid to its political ward. It will need help in defense matters, and in giving it the United States will be building its own defense and providing air and sea bases which keeping peace in the Pacific promises to require, and which will be mutually profitable for commercial uses as well.

The Philippine nation is a nation of islands, but it comprises large area and population. It can become a notable nation and a valuable friend of the United States

in their joint progress toward the kind of world for which they both have fought. Its independence, and our help in establishing and maintaining that independence, will hasten Philippine adulthood and effective participation in the community of nations.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of January 11, 1946]

PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE

A recent dispatch predicts that Philippine independence, which will become effective on July 4, will be followed by disorders, if not revolution. Former guerrillas are still in possession of their arms, and the proclamations of President Osmeña and of the provincial governors asking surrender of those arms have been ignored. In some sections of the islands armed bands are said to be terrorizing the peaceful inhabitants.

Reconstruction problems are also acute, being aggravated, of course, by the delay of Congress in passing the bill for settlement of war-damage claims and in outlining a new trade policy between the islands and the United States. Inflation is giving officials grave concern. War has left the islands such a heritage of trouble that many Filipinos are said to be skeptical and regretful over the forthcoming dawn of independence. Some writers from Manila go so far as to say that a majority of the Filipino people no longer want unqualified independence.

We do not believe, however, that the situation justifies the suggestions repeatedly made in some quarters that the date of Philippine independence be postponed or that some other status for the islands be agreed upon. The predictions of disaster in the war-ravaged islands after July 4 seem to be predicated on the assumption that the United States-Philippine partnership will come to an abrupt end. That, of course, is an illusion. The nature of that partnership will change, but the partnership itself must continue in effect for the protection of the Philippines and for the greater security of the United States against external aggression. As we have previously pointed out, the American naval and air bases to be established in the islands will necessarily link the defense systems of the two countries inextricably together.

To this extent Philippine independence will be limited. We feel that the Filipino people understand this joint defense arrangement and overwhelmingly approve of it. Consequently, it will be only reasonable for them to ask and expect continued aid from the United States in reconstructing and stabilizing their country until the new governmental system is operating smoothly. And, of course, the United States could not decline such requests without undercutting the pledge that it has given to the Filipino people in addition to our own security in the Far East. The basic fact to remember is that independence for the Philippines will not take them out of the orbit of our close and immediate interests any more than the independence of Cuba broke the intimate ties between that country and our own. We think that any satisfactory approach to the islands' formidable economic and governmental problems must be made from this point of view.

[From the Scranton (Pa.) Times of January 3, 1946]

TROUBLE IN THE PHILIPPINES

The question of when full independence will be granted the Philippines is not the only one disturbing the Filipino people. A sharecroppers' revolution in Luzon's rice bowl has developed into a real, serious situation. The country is agitated over the demand for the division of big estates, which has become an issue in the present presidential campaign.

President Osmeña is stressing the Philippines' need for 20 years more of free trade with the United States and is reminding also that the late President Roosevelt in 1942 pledged assistance for the full repair of ravages caused by war. In this connection Congress has authorized the appropriation of $500,000,000 for war damages to Filipino private property. It is expected also there will be other grants for rebuilding destroyed and damaged public buildings and replacement of shipping or restoring of interisland trade.

While the Filipinos are making a big effort at rehabilitation the task is seemingly beyond them, and they must have financial help. In the Philippines about 5 percent of the people own the land, and before the war sharecroppers earned about 75 cents a day. They are now demanding a 70–30 or a 60–40 split of the products of their toil. Farmland reform is being agitated as a plank in the campaigns of both presidential candidates. It is believed certain that whichever side wins the large landowners will be forced to turn their land over to the Government for resale to tenant farmers on long terms at low interest.

As for the independence of the islands, there is divided thought in the Philippines. Many Filipinos who before the war were urging that Uncle Sam immediately give up any semblance of control are now hesitant and believe independence ought to be conditioned on a United States protectorate of some sort until the work of restoration is completed and the world peace program is worked out and put into full operation.

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Union of January 10, 1946]

PHILIPPINE ISLAND INDEPENDENCE IS ASSURED

WANT ECONOMIC FREEDOM

The people of the Philippines want something. When July 4, 1946, comes they want to quit being a colony. Not only political independence, but economic freedom, is what they want:

An end to the oppressive sharecropping, under which tenant farmers keep at the very most 50 percent of their crop (the top rate in the United States is 75 percent). A beginning of consumer industries, to give jobs to the city people and to furnish goods cheaply to the rest of the Philippines. Government ownership of the public utilities and of the big land holdings—held under a feudal set-up established when Spain ruled the Philippines.

Industry and agricultural improvements financed by Government loans from the United Nations under the Bretton Woods plan—not financed by private loans from Wall Street by private landowners and commercial interests devoted to making profits on the improvement of the standard of living.

One correspondent, at least, getting all his inside dope from a night-club waitress, has announced that the Philippines don't want independence now; they want to stay tied to United States apron strings. This is not true. In the Philippines I have not met one representative of the populace—radical or reactionary—who did not want independence as fast as possible.

WANT INDEPENDENCE

Even Roxas said: "There are some people who think we should postpone independence until we have recovered the losses suffered in the war But any man who came out publicly for that would automatically be out of politics." The people of the Philippines want independence and Roxas, an astute politician, knows it. His friends might want to continue the Philippines as a colony—but he wants to stay in Philippine politics.

[From the Syracuse (N. Y.) Herald-Journal of January 7, 1946]

ORIENT LOOKS TO UNITED STATES LEADERSHIP

(By David Wallace)

"America's voice must be dominant. The Far East wants that because America's word can be trusted."

Those were the electric words used last night by Brig. Gen. CARLOS P. ROMULO, last man out of Bataan. Officially he was aide to Gen. Douglas MacArthur, now Philippine Resident Commissioner to the United States. He was in Syracuse to speak at Lincoln Auditorium.

In personal talk he answered a direct question as to his views on the tangled international situation. That was whether he thought the United States should assume leadership in settlement of far-eastern problems. He said he felt the moral position of America, as he always calls it, was so important our Government must step out in front to bring about lasting peace.

He feels the United States has acquired such prestige and power through the Far East and such moral strength in upholding dignity of the human soul that now it must stand fast in its position for its own reputation as well as for the good of mankind.

In his own words: "After the American record in the Philippines, eyes of the Orient have been opened to the workability of a pattern unheard of in that part of the world before America came into the Philippines in 1898. America's occupation there, conducted as it was, paid dividends in loyalty of the Philippines through the last global war, loyalty not shown by any other dependent nation.

"Now other peoples there are asking themselves what America will do to prove how those principles can be applied to them. America dared to blaze a trail. Colonials of the Orient are hoping America will continue that policy which means respect for dignity of the human soul."

General ROMULO elaborated this theme in his lecture under theme of "America's Stake in the Pacific." The Right Reverend David F. Cunningham, chancelor of the diocese, presided. Municipal Judge William E. McClusky conducted the forum which followed, and Bishop Foery sat in the audience. The auditorium was crowded.

General ROMULO began with indorsement of the drive to raise a million dollars to start LeMoyne College here, relating what the Jesuit college, Ateneo de Manila, had meant in service to his own country before the Japs destroyed it. He said Syracuse would be fortunate to have such an institution. Then he commented on the difference between circumstances when he spoke here in 1943, haunted by his experiences at Bataan, worried desperately about the fate of his own wife and family, prisoners of the enemy.

His family have all been rescued, flown out in planes, through efforts of his son, Lt. Carlos, Jr., who went in as a guerrilla through the Jap lines after the American Army returned. "Tonight," he said, "we feel the throb of drums in victory." But he warned that while victory had been achieved, peace was not here yet.

He went on to outline what it meant to the Orient when American forces first entered the Philippines during the Spanish-American War. Two policies were possible for this Government then, he said, to continue the old course of imperialism or something untried in that part of the world, respect for the dignity of the human soul.

America passed by imperialism which meant exploitation, imposing will of the stronger nation upon the weaker, and pursued a benignant policy, incurring much criticism thereby. But when America installed in the Philippines this new policy it reached not only the islands, but all the Far East, and then all the world. That meant the beginning of a change in colonial policy.

The test came, said General ROMULO, in the last war, when the Japs struck and colonial empires long established fell like a house of cards. Sovereign powers had to fight natives as well as the Japs. In contrast, the United States, while hard hit at Pearl Harbor, found support in the Philippines. There were only 10,000 American soldiers there to fight a horde

of Japs, but Filipinos fought to the death beside them. "What a lesson that is for the world," he exclaimed. "What an eye-opener for mankind!"

After relating various personal observations of and experiences in the desperate combat there, he rose to his climax: "America's stake in the Pacific is moral. She must assert leadership. The founding fathers when they declared all men were free and equal did not limit that principle by the Equator or any line of longitude. If Lincoln were alive today his words would not be limited to a nation, but he would be likely to say: 'A world cannot survive, half slave, half free.' What is done in Chungking is felt in Tuscaloosa. Reverberations in Kalamazoo are felt over in Athens.

"One billion pairs of almond-shaped eyes are watching America. Your moral leadership was never more needed in the Pacific than now. I bring to you a message of good will, not a plea for tolerance but for friendship. One billion potential customers for American products are there in the Far East, available when there is understanding such as has been given to people in the Philippines. They expect deeds, behavior, action not of the ordinary sort. Don't let the lure of the gold dollar break the spell you have already cast over the billion people of the Far East.

"What happened at Hiroshima and Nagasaki has shown that material resources can be destroyed in a moment. But friendship, faith, freedom, those intangibles, can't be destroyed. Your country's greatness can't be destroyed."

General ROMULO was thoroughly occupied during the few hours he spent here yesterday.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Herald of January 8, 1946]

FILIPINO FEARS

After years of clamor and with independence scheduled for July 4, the Filipinos are reported to be apprehensive about their impending freedom but afraid to back down. The major fear arises from the firearms in the possession of the natives. During the war, some 40,000 stand of arms were distributed among the Filipinos—much of it by their own native military—for use against the Japanese. Today it is not easy to disarm these erstwhile guerrilla bands, which are likely to make trouble for a new government. There may not be enough unrest to invite a revolution, but there is more than the native police can cope with. Add the lawlessness in the wake of war and the situation causes considerable anxiety.

For a time problems of economics and reconstruction can be handled with the aid of the American Government. Bills already before Congress provide for rehabilitation, payment of war claims, and special tariff privileges. But there is still the question whether a new native regime can establish sufficient stability to attract investment capital.

It is too late for any major changes of policy In all probability Congress will enact laws to assist the Philippine economy. To do more might prove dangerous, any delay or postponement of independence being more damaging to the United States than to the Filipinos.

We have been proud of our record in the islands. During the war the natives remained loyal. To withhold independence would not only be an act of ingratitude, but would be legally impossible, according to some authorities.

[From the Tyrone (Pa.) Herald of January 8, 1946]

STILL NO SUGAR

In another 6 months the Philippine Islands will become independent and on their own. But the United States is not going to give them up—and the Philippines are not going to give us up. The population of the Philippines, at the time of taking the 1940 census was 16,350,000 and the land area of the Islands was 114,830 square miles.

Reciprocal free-trade relations have existed between the United States and the Philippines since 1909. Under the new relationship covering the forthcoming independence of the Philippines free trade will continue for 10 years. The most important shipments of the Islands to our own country has been sugar. The Philippines are insisting that its sugar should be shipped without any tariff to the United States, indefinitely.

But the United States is being accused of letting Cuba down by failure to provide the market for all of its sugar.

All restrictions on the shipments of sugar from Hawaii were removed by an order by President Roosevelt in 1942. So Hawaii figures in our three-cornered sugar puzzle.

A lot of people keep right on asking why sugar production is not developed in the United States so as to take care of our own demands. Ah, there is the rub! A half dozen of our own Southern States have grown as fine a quality of sugarcane and sugarbeets as has ever been produced in any part of the world.

[From the Mount Morris (N. Y.) Enterprise of January 9, 1946]

THE PHILIPPINES

On our next Fourth of July the Philippines will become independent, in accordance with acts of the Congress of the United States. Those acts were passed several years ago and ratified by further congressional authority on June 29, 1944.

The Philippines were one of our prizes of the Spanish-American War, and the first interest we had in the islands was Admiral Dewey's victory over the Spaniards, in Manila Bay. We took them but we had a hard time holding the Philippines.

But in the last 47 years what might be called a beautiful friendship has grown up between the Filipinos and the American people. We aren't going to push them aside, and tell them to paddle their canoe, and we are not going to withdraw our promise of independence scheduled for July 4, 1946. We had a pretty tough time in driving the Japanese out of the Philippines—but we did it.

Now, we are going to help the Filipinos establish their own government, and that program is progressing as rapidly as possible, supported by every branch of the United States Government. Such strong men as the late President Quezon, and the present-day leaders, President Osmena, and General Romulo, are doing an A1 job for their countrymen.

In another 6 months the Philippine Islands will become independent and on their own. But the United States is not going to give them up—and the Philippines are not going to give us up. The population of the Philippines at the time of taking the 1940 census was 16,350,000, and the land area of the islands was 114,830 square miles.

Reciprocal free-trade relations have existed between the United States and the Philippines since 1909. Under the new relationship covering the forthcoming independence of the Philippines, free trade will continue for 10 years. The most important shipments of the islands to our own country has been sugar. The Philippines are insisting that its sugar should be shipped without any tariff to the United States indefinitely.

But the United States is being accused of letting Cuba down by failing to provide the market for all of its sugar.

All restrictions on the shipments of sugar from Hawaii were removed by an order by President Roosevelt in 1942. So Hawaii figures in our three-cornered sugar pool.

A lot of people keep right on asking why sugar production is not developed in the United States so as to take care of our own demands. Ah, there is the rub. A half dozen of our own Southern States have grown as fine a quality of sugarcane and sugarbeets as has ever been produced in any part of the world.

[From the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune of January 5, 1946]

DELAYS IN PHILIPPINES

Charges that military bungling and profiteering by American businessmen in the Philippines have been responsible for the delays in rebuilding war-ravaged cities in the Philippines have been convincingly denied, but it remains true that only a very little has been done so far.

Economy in the Philippines is far from being restored. The Filipinos have been given little hope in Washington of any interest in the revision of their Independence Act to provide for more equitable trade, and the rehabilitation and reconstruction programs have all but stood still. The blame, if it must be fixed, is probably shared by the haste of demobilization, Congress, and certain Federal agencies.

In many ways the Philippines are our peculiar responsibility in the Pacific. Our bombs and shells did most of the damage there, for we had to fire on the islands to liberate them. Hungry Filipinos who fought with us against the Japanese cannot fail to wonder as they see their sugar mills still flattened, rubble remaining in their cities, and few signs of activities toward carrying out the promises we have made. Among top items on the calendar when Congress meets after its holiday should be quick action to make up, as best it can, for delay and confusion.

[From the New York Times of January 28, 1946]

FAIRNESS TO THE PHILIPPINES

There are two bills now before Congress which do not mean a great deal in an immediate material way to most of the people of the United States. But to 16,000,000 people in the Philippines the passage of these bills before July means almost literally life or death. They are a bill to grant $450,000,000 in rehabilitation aid against the estimated $1,000,000,000 of war damage suffered by the Philippines and a bill to revise the tariff provisions of the Tydings-McDuffie Act of 1934. If the two bills are not passed before July 4, the Filipinos will gain their independence as a war-desolated, impoverished Nation which has been denied even the means—in trade with the United States—to help itself.

Action on both bills has been lagging. The ostensible reason why pressure has not been exerted to pass them is that Filipinos who collaborated with the Japanese still go unpunished. The thought is that it is up to the Filipinos to clean house first before legislative aid is voted them. The defense made by those accused of collaboration is that they served the Philippines best by pretending to cooperate with the Japanese while doing little and thus mitigating the severity of the occupation.

To us it seems that the question of collaboration is one that might well be left to the Filipinos themselves to decide. They will have an opportunity in April, at the ballot box, to deliver their own judgment on these men. Passage of the rehabilitation aid bill and of the new Philippines Independence Act, however, is something the Filipinos cannot do themselves. For that they can only hope. The longer that hope is in question, the longer deferred will be the process of rehabilitation in the Philippines.

[From Export Trade and Shipper of February 4, 1946]

THE TWO-POINT PROGRAM FOR THE PHILIPPINES

With their political independence only 5 months away, the people of the Philippines face a dark future unless Uncle Sam comes to their rescue. No less do American traders with the islands.

We are happy to report that a rescue party has been formed in Washington; it needs only the authority of Congress to get under way.

It is interesting to note that a member of this rescue party is Senator MILLARD E. TYDINGS, Democrat, of Maryland, a cosponsor of the original Tydings-McDuffie Independence Act of 1934, a bit of legislation which today is a frightening spectre to Filipinos.

When enacted, the original act was generally thought to be a fair and workable program of raising tariffs on Philippine exports to the United States after independence became a fact. However, after 4 years of Jap domination and destruction, the terms of the act are not only onerous, they are ruinous; not only to Filipinos, but to American traders.

Knowing all this, Senator TYDINGS has introduced a new bill. It is titled "Rehabilitation and War Damages Act of 1945," bearing the serial number S. 1610, and is now before the Senate Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs and the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives.

This bill provides for funds to cover public and private war damages inflicted by the Japs between December 7, 1941, and October 1, 1945, in the amount of $330,000,000. An additional $120,000,000 is requested for restoration and operation of public services. A little less than 10 percent of the $330,000,000 is to be used for the purchase of United States surplus military property, such as engineering and other equipment to aid in rehabilitation of the land and industry. Philippine currency is to be held at its present relation to United States currency, 2 to 1.

On January 21, Representative C. JASPER BELL, Democrat, of Missouri, sent a companion bill to the Ways and Means Committee of the House. This bill, H. R. 5185, and called the Future Trade Relations With the Philippines Act, provides that no duties will be imposed on Philippine goods until July 3, 1954.

But it does establish quotas on imports. Sugar, the islands' "bread and butter" export, is limited to 850,000 unrefined and 50,000 long tons refined; coconut oil to 200,000 long tons; cigars to 200,000,000, and cordage to 6,000,000 pounds. Pearl buttons and embroideries, two other important sources of income for the Filipinos, are also on quota, at about the same rates of shipments as made just before the outbreak of the Pacific war. Also interesting is the provision eliminating processing taxes on either American or Filipino products.

Eight years after independence becomes effective, the United States is to impose a tariff of 4 percent, increasing this impost at the rate of 4 percent annually until the full tariff becomes effective a quarter of a century later.

The Bell bill also provides for equal business rights in the islands for Americans and Filipinos, until 1979. It is also stipulated that there will be no discrimination against Americans in respect to citizenship, naturalization, and residence.

These are the high lights of the two-point rescue program Uncle Sam is planning for the Philippines. Lou Wagner, veteran American trader in the islands, has the two bills as meeting the economic requirements of the coming Philippine nation and American exporters and importers. He says the Tydings and Bell bills are like Siamese twins, inseparable without fatal injury to both the Filipino and American business body.

The Philippine-American Chamber of Commerce also seems pleased with Uncle Sam's rescue party and its equipment. Created in 1920 to foster trade between the United States and the Philippines, its activities necessarily were limited during Japanese occupation. Last month, at its annual meeting, it announced plans for accelerating its promotional work.

One of the chamber's first acts was to urge early passage of S. 1610 by the House, and equally expeditious action by the Senate and the House in respect to the Bell bill, H. R. 5185. The chamber expressed its opinion that there can be no hope of rehabilitation of the Philippines until both of these bills have been enacted into law.

It is obvious that American exporters cannot safely lay plans for doing business with and in the Philippines until they know with certainty the terms and conditions under which they will have to work. According to reliable report, it should be equally obvious that there might not be any Philippines to trade with in the prewar volume to which American exporters have been accustomed if these twin bills are not passed by Congress, and soon.

For that reason we suggest that all American foreign traders urge their Congressmen to pass the bills, and quickly.

[From the Washington Evening Star of February 6, 1946]

PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION

Philippine High Commissioner McNutt, arriving here from Manila to seek quick congressional action on pending legislation to extend rehabilitation aid to the war-ravaged Philippines, has placed proper emphasis on the obligation we owe to the courageous people of that Far Eastern outpost of democracy. After winning from Congress their right to be free and independent, as of July 4, 1946, the Filipinos were caught in the maelstrom of the Pacific war. They fought side by side with American forces to resist the Japanese invaders, from Luzon to Corregidor; shared the horrors of the death march and of prison camps, risked the dangers of guerrilla warfare and helped to pave the way for MacArthur's triumphant return to the islands. Through it all, those who survived saw their once beautiful cities and countryside devastated, their industries destroyed or damaged, their whole future under the independence program imperiled.

True to its pledged word, the United States will give the Philippines complete independence on July 4 next, but unless we keep a collateral promise made to the Filipinos the forthcoming Independence Day will be a hollow mockery of what we and the Filipinos had intended it to be. That collateral promise, Commissioner McNutt points out, is that we should take definite steps to help the Philippine people prepare for independence. They will not be prepared to assume the heavy responsibilities of an independent nation unless they are extended an immediate helping hand.

Such assistance is provided for in two bills now pending in Congress. One is the Bell free-trade bill, designed to eliminate tariff duties for 8 years after independence, to permit Philippine trade to get back on its feet; and the other is the Tydings rehabilitation bill, authorizing payment of more than $400,000,000 to help in rebuilding shattered homes, churches, and business houses. Both bills are awaiting action by House committees—the Bell bill by the the Ways and Means group and the Tydings bill by the Insular Affairs Committee. The Tydings measure already has passed the Senate, but the Bell bill has yet to reach either floor. Congress has before it, of course, a lot of other important legislation, but Mr. McNutt is correct in contending that economic aid to the Philippines is a matter of great immediate urgency, justifying prompt attention by Congress. Only effective action now can forestall chaotic conditions when Philippine independence becomes a fact a few months hence.

Wirthmore Feeds Weekly Chat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article which was forwarded to me dated February 2, 1946:

WIRTHMORE FEEDS WEEKLY CHAT

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1946.

A vicious circle has just been completed. It is now impossible for us here in New England to even buy oats. It looks to us that as far as the feed industry is concerned we have the greatest scarcity we have ever faced among plenty. Unless something is done to correct the distribution of available supplies of feed and grain throughout this country, it is our prediction that by early March New England feed manufacturers will be virtually closed and New England livestock and poultry will be out of feed.

Definite action on correcting the situation has been delayed so long that unless something concrete is done within the next 2 to 3 weeks at the very latest we do not see how any New England farmer can continue to feed his cows and chickens. This is a very serious statement, but we are very confident that it is factual.

We have been endeavoring to warn the feeding interests of New England for the past several months, that unless something was done we would eventually reach the end of the road. Many New England farmers apparently haven't given too much serious thought about these warnings. They have felt the feed industry has been talking pessimistically many times in the past, but up to the present time they have been able to get feed of one kind or another from some source, but this time we are sorry to say that it looks as though they would be unable to get supplies in sufficient quantities from any source that we know of.

Now, what is the cause of this very serious feed shortage, and what can be done? We sincerely believe, as we have been advocating for some time now, that the low ceilings that exist on many feed and grain items in comparison with the very attractive ceilings or support prices that have been placed on livestock and poultry productions, has not only created an apparent over-production based on peacetime needs, but has also caused considerable waste of valuable feeds out in the Midwest and has also been responsible for the greatest maldistribution and black market and bartering operations that this country has ever experienced. This price ceiling setup has completely eliminated competitive buying—has made money worthless, and has caused nothing more or less than unadulterated discrimination.

Let's take up one of these at a time. Certain proteins, when you consider the profitable feature of raising and feeding livestock and hogs, must be being wasted within the Grain Belt. A concrete example of why is that soybean meal on a Boston basis is worth $57.35 a ton, or only a 28-percent increase over the price of this commodity in December 1940. On the other hand, ground oats have been quoted as high as $66.50 per ton, Boston basis recently, as against a price of $35.75 in December 1940—an increase of somewhat over 80 percent. Is this price structure inducive to waste of soybean meal? We say yes.

Another illustration—wheat has increased in price since December 1940 approximately 77 percent. Corn on the other hand has increased over the same period only approxi-

mately 47 percent. The authorities are very much worried about the tremendous amount of wheat that has been used for feeding, but what could deficit areas do when corn is worth $1.70 per bushel to the western farmers inside of a hog, and New England is only allowed to pay approximately $1.40 per bushel under the present price ceiling. Of course, we could not get corn. We had to take the high-priced substitute wheat.

Take bran and midds. The present ceiling price here in New England is $46.17, an advancement of only 26 percent since December 1940. New England has been unable to buy in volume any wheat feeds for the past 3 years. Why? They are just about the cheapest feed ingredient available under present ceilings, and here again they are being consumed very close to the point of production, and here again the deficit feed area has had to turn to ground and flaked wheat as a substitute, at a price of $25–$30 per ton over the ceiling of bran and middlings.

For a time we have struggled along with substitutes, even though in many instances it not only meant an additional cost of $5–$8 per ton to the New England farmers, plus the fact that the quality of feed had not been as good as it would have been if New England had been able to secure the proper ingredients, but now the substitutes themselves have entirely disappeared.

We have a very attractive hog program set up which runs for sometime in the future. We have no penalty, insofar as we know, on the weight limit of hogs; consequently, the western hog farmer, with the very attractive price on feeds, is feeding his hogs to untold weights because it is profitable to do so. We wonder how much feed is being wasted through that sort of a program.

If you have not already heard of the bartering and trading that is going on out in the Midwest, let's give you a few illustrations. Nylons, fence posts, sugar, butter, new automobiles, and a million and one other scarce items are being offered to the farmer as an inducement to sell his corn, soybeans, etc. Folks who have a surplus of corn are trading corn for soybeans or meat scraps or bran and midds. Those who have a surplus of soybean meal are trading it for corn or bran and midds. This goes on endlessly.

That is why we say our money is worthless, and make the definite statement that competition in buying feed supplies for deficit feed areas, such as New England, has completely stopped by these unfair, unjust, and uneconomical price controls. If anyone can tell us what economical service a small western mill is performing for the United States of America by taking whole corn, which it normally sold to the deficit feed areas, as such, grinding it into meal, putting it into sacks, adding $4 per ton over ceiling price of corn plus the cost of sacks, and then shipping it over here to New England to a feed mixer, we certainly would like to know. We could grind this corn ourselves, as we have done for years, and deliver it to the New England farmer at considerably less than $4 per ton for this service. This fact can be easily proved by our records.

What economical service is a processor performing, when in lieu of selling us straight soybean meal under present ceilings, he mixes 80 percent or 90 percent of soybean meal and 10 percent of ground oats or wheat, and charges us $6 to $8 per ton over the soybean ceiling. Certainly this is not an economical function.

We sincerely believe that the only thing that can be done at this late date to prevent in many instances complete liquidation of farm animals and poultry here in New England, it the removal of price ceilings so all of us can compete at open market prices with the surplus producing areas of this country on an equal basis. If corn is worth $1.70 to the western hog farmer under our free American economy structure, the New England poultryman and dairyman should have the equal privilege of bidding $1.70 for his corn.

Farmers all over America will continue to produce only as long as it is profitable. If by the removal of price ceilings certain commodities went beyond this level in the price structure, you would get liquidation and, consequently, the demand for that item would commence to drop off and its value in dollars and cents would very quickly reflect the change in the situation. This is nothing more or less than the functioning of the good old fashioned sound and substantial law of supply and demand—a law under which this country of ours has prospered and become the leader of the world, the most desirable place in the world to live. We believe that some action should be taken immediately to bring us back to the good old American way of doing business, the way we were taught by our grandparents, and we sincerely believe that unless we get back to this American way of doing business we are apt to live to regret the alternative.

JIM THE FEED MAN.

Achievements of the Negro Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1946

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following quotations:

QUOTATIONS FROM RACE AND DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY

(By FRANZ BOAS)

No one has ever proved that a human being, through his descent from a certain group of people, must of necessity have certain mental characteristics. We may safely say that at a time when our own ancestors still utilized stone implements or, at best, when bronze weapons were first introduced, the Negro had developed the art of smelting iron, and it seems likely that their race has contributed more than any other to the early development of the iron industry. The beautiful iron weapons of central Africa, which excel in symmetry of form, and many of which bear elaborate designs inlaid in copper, are of admirable workmanship.

One of the features of Negro social life that deserves special mention is the legal trend of mind of the people. No other race on a similar level of culture has developed as strict methods of legal procedure as the Negro has. The power of organization that manifests itself in Negro communities is quite striking. In the Sudan the true Negro, the ancestor of our slave population, has achieved the very advances which the critics of the Negro would make us believe he cannot attain. He has a highly developed agriculture, and the industries connected with his daily life are complex and artistic. His power of organization has been such that for centuries large empires have existed which have proved their stability in wars with their neighbors. The achievement of the Negro in Africa demonstrates that the race is capable of social and political accomplishments; that it will produce its great men here, as it has done in Africa; and that it will contribute its part to the welfare of the community.

It does not even require a marked difference in type, such as we find when we compare Negro and white, to provoke the spirit that prevents us from recognizing individuals and compels us to see only representatives of a class endowed with imaginary qualities that we ascribe to the group as a whole. We find this spirit at work in anti-Semitism as well as in American nativism, and in the conflict between labor and capitalism. This is obviously the phychological basis of the present situation of the American Negro. To the popular mind the Negro appears as a class, and the impressions made by the life of the poor Negro are generalized by the white man and are combined with dogmatic beliefs regarding the physical and hereditary mental make-up of the race. Every moment of his life the self-respecting Negro feels the strain of his inability to overcome the prejudices that merge him in a type.

The existence of any pure race with special endowments is a myth, as is the belief that there are races all of whose members are foredoomed to eternal inferiority. The claim that mental qualities of races are biologically determined is not tenable. Much less have we a right to speak of biologically determined superiority of one race over another.

Hon. Fred M. Vinson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1946

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Raleigh News and Observer of January 25, 1946:

WELCOME VISITOR

Secretary of the Treasury Fred M. Vinson, who addressed the Newspaper Institute at Chapel Hill last night, was a most welcome visitor.

There is no indispensable man, but in the war period and the reconversion period which has followed it, Fred Vinson has been a close approach to an indispensable man. The outbreak of the war found him on the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, to which he had been appointed after a distinguished record in Congress as a Representative from Kentucky. Almost at once he was made chief judge of the Emergency Court of Appeals which was created to deal with OPA cases. But Vinson did not stay on the bench. Early in the war President Roosevelt appointed him Director of Economic Stabilization, a position in which he performed outstanding service and held the line against inflation with a devotion to duty that disregarded pressure from every source. Later, he was named as Federal Loan Administrator and still later became Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, a position so important that its holder was generally called the assistant President. One of President Truman's first Cabinet appointments was that of Secretary Vinson, a selection that was widely applauded.

Secretary Vinson, as one of the negotiators of the proposed loan to Great Britain, last night presented the case for the loan to North Carolina editors who, regardless of their views on the question, found the presentation informing and helpful.

Petition of Florida Townsend Clubs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE HENDRICKS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 7, 1946

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD a form of a petition circulated through my district and signed by the members of the Townsend Clubs of St. Cloud, New Smyrna Beach, Daytona Beach, Port Orange, Holly Hill, Cassadaga, and Kissimmee. These petitions were signed by 1,350 members. I want this to go in the RECORD as evidence of the fact that the people of this Nation want action on the Townsend bills, H. R. 2229 and H. R. 2230. The petition is as follows:

A PETITION TO MY CONGRESSMAN AND MY TWO SENATORS

GENTLEMEN: With millions of employees being dropped from industry's pay rolls during this transition period and with millions of soldiers being returned jobless to civilian life, we fear that American business may go into a downward spiral leading toward great depression unless Congress quickly adopts some program to keep purchasing power at high levels among the masses of the people. A bipartisan measure represented by twin bills, one introduced by a Democrat and one by a Republican, which, I believe, would accomplish this end, is now before the House. The House bills are H. R. 2229 and H. R. 2230, respectively. Senate bills are Nos. S. 690 and S. 809, respectively. It would provide high monthly annuities, as they retire from the labor market, for men and women past 60, for the blind and disabled, for mothers with dependent minor children. It would raise the money for such annuities by a 3-percent tax levied monthly upon the gross incomes of all business and upon that portion of gross individual incomes in excess of $100 a month. Please use your influence to see that this measure, embodying principles of the Townsend plan, gets a quick and complete hearing by the Ways and Means Committee and then by the Congress as a whole. Please demand a roll-call vote upon it. Please vote for its enactment when it comes upon the floor. I am authorizing the distributors of this petition to inform me, by mail, of your helpful action on this measure, so that I can reciprocate in the only way I, as a voter, know how.

Thank you.

Tribute to the American Civil Liberties Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 7, 1946

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, the American Civil Liberties Union, a great national organization devoted to the militant preservation and protection of the Bill of Rights in these United States, an organization of which I have the honor to serve as a member of the national committee, recently celebrated its twenty-fifth anniversary. The ACLU has not been afraid to make enemies. Sometimes it treads on the toes of the left. Sometimes it offends the delicate sensibilities of the right. But its soul goes marching on. Freedom of speech means freedom must be accorded those with whom one violently disagrees, in disseminating their ideas in the press, on the platform, over the radio. In this field, it is often difficult for liberals to stomach the rantings of tories, and vice versa; but it is at that very point that the ACLU never hesitates to take a stand, proclaiming the right of all to speak and write freely their unvarnished opinions on controversial issues.

President Harry Truman and the Honorable Thomas Dewey, Governor of the great State of New York, both sent messages of greeting and congratulation to the ACLU on the occasion of this anniversary. Because these messages contained thoughts well expressed and observations thoroughly sound, and incorporated a well-deserved tribute to this great organization, I am asking my colleagues for their consent to have the same included as a part of my remarks and appended hereinafter:

DR. JOHN HAYNES HOLMES,
Chairman, Board of Directors,
American Civil Liberties Union,
New York:

I send you warm greetings upon the completion of 25 years of fighting for the civil rights of all Americans. The union is most publicized for its protection of minority groups, but I know that your over-all objective is that inherent constitutional privileges be granted to every person, citizen or alien, with no thought of race, color, or creed. I know, too, that you fight for the rights of majorities threatened by illegal monopoly and repression.

I believe with your members that whatever a man's political thinking, whatever his background, environment, or education, he must, if he be a real American, respect the aims of organizations such as yours. The integrity of the American Civil Liberties Union and of its workers in the field has never been, and I feel, never will be, questioned. Officers, directors, and members of the union have performed outstanding service to the cause of freedom.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

TO DR. JOHN HAYNES HOLMES,
Chairman, Board of Directors,
American Civil Liberties Union,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR DR. HOLMES: I am happy to send warm greetings to all members of the American Civil Liberties Union and all men and women present at the national convention you are holding on November 24th on the theme, What's Ahead for American Liberties.

It is a matter of just pride to the citizens of New York State that the American Civil Liberties Union was incorporated under the laws of the Empire State on whose soil so many hotly contested struggles for the liberty and dignity of the individual were fought and won, struggles not only on the battlefield but in the courts and other arenas of the unending contest for freedom.

Of the quarter century of your existence you have established an enviable record. You have established, also, beyond all possible doubt, proof that the American Civil Liberties Union is an essential part of American life. It is essential not merely to the individuals whom you have helped against injustice, but to the self-respect of the community and of all citizens who appreciate our priceless heritage of personal, political, and religious liberty and regard for the dignity of the individual.

The war for freedom is an endless one. The worst attacks are those which do not affect the majority—the insidious attacks. Without the American Civil Liberties Union, there would be no organization to take up the cudgels for lone, oppressed individuals.

It has been inspiring to observe that the American Civil Liberties Union has stood unwavering on the principle of defending everybody's rights without distinction. It has championed the rights of unions and of employers, of union-workers and non-workers, of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews. On the racial front, it has stood firmly for the liberty of every racial minority.

It is a pleasure, therefore, to hail the gallant part that the American Civil Liberties Union has taken in upholding the principles for which this Republic was founded and to extend my warm good wishes for continuing success.

THOMAS E. DEWEY.

Understanding Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 7, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the final installment of a series of penetrating articles on the internal situation in Russia:

[From the Minneapolis Star-Journal of February 1, 1946]

MICROSCOPE ON MOSCOW—RUSSIA IS GOING ISOLATIONIST (MAYBE) WITH A FOOT IN UNO

(By C Sverre Norborg)

Since Moscow's painful discovery that a social-democratic Europe is emerging, it has heard again the bugle call of a Socialist isolationism as the only safe, sane Russian way of the future.

Led by President Kalinin, A. A. Andreyev, Security Police Chief Beria, and Bulganin (chairman of the Foreign Affairs Commission), the Moscow isolationists argue that the time is not ripe either for international cooperation or for international communistic experimentation.

They insist that the Soviet Union concentrate on the job at hand: rebuilding, reconstructing, and expanding the vast Socialist experiment inside Russia itself.

In this view Kalinin, the old Bolshevik President of the Soviet Union, is receiving the solid support of his old-time friend, Lazarus Kaganovich, the czar of Russian heavy industries.

The popular following of the isolationist school consists of industrial dreamers and planners, together with many of the premiers of the autonomous republics under the vocal leadership of S. N. Kruschev, of the Ukraine.

Above all, hundreds of thousands of Red Army men, who feel they have seen more than enough of the war and the world, are turning isolationist.

Beria joined the Moscow isolationist group not only for security reasons, but also because it gave him a welcome opportunity to emphasize personal differences of long standing between himself and the internationalist A. Y. Vishinsky, Soviet brain truster. A similar clash of personalities is said to be the reason behind the strangely neutral conduct of Marshal Voroshilov, who, as commander of the Red occupation army in Hungary, has shown no interest in helping any of the Communist imperialist dreams of Vishinsky.

Thus pressure from Russian isolationist quarters is steadily growing on the foreign office. And one of the rivals for Stalin's throne, Andreyev, who wields a tremendous influence as chief of the Communist Party control committee, is known to have expressed definitely isolationist convictions after the Potsdam meeting.

Diplomatic sources in Moscow report that no single event has driven the Russian isolationist stock so violently high as British Foreign Minister Bevin's frank declaration of his labor cabinet's unqualified imperialist policy.

Mr. Andreyev has as his lieutenant in the isolationist fight the intelligent and shrewd politician, N. Bulganin.

Thus the old-time Bolsheviks, the industrial expansionists, the party control leader and the security chief, together with certain top men of the autonomous republics, have created a strong isolationist bloc which is fighting the Communist imperialists and may well succeed in convincing Molotov, and even Stalin, that Russia's immediate interests lie within the borders of the Soviet Union itself.

European observers seem to agree that the old-line Comintern leaders are having a hard time in postwar Moscow. Vishinsky and Dimitrov met with signal misfortune in their dreams of a Red Europe. They obviously believed that the end of World War II would be the great hour, when the European nations would leap up with joy, as Lenin prophesied, to unite in a real people's revolution throughout the continent. Now even Poland begins to look doubtful, and only backward Yugoslavia still retains the Red Star on its national horizon.

In fact, the present Moscow leaders of the "communism-for-export" school of thought are running into a double head wind.

On the one hand are the isolationists, who are too intensely practical to feel any elation about Russia helping the proletariat of European nations.

On the other are the Russian internationalists, who are realistic enough to know which way the international winds are blowing. Neither party is disposed to listen to ideological weathermen of yesteryear.

Also, Moscow realists realize very keenly the great danger of having Marxist purists play havoc with the international good will which the Soviet Union has won for itself during World War II. The Moscow internationalists insist that respectability may pay great dividends for the Soviet Union—not least in the Far East.

Maxim Litvinov used to preach collective security in Geneva. He was Commissar of Foreign Affairs in those days, until the international wind shifted and Vyaschelav Molotov took the helm at the Foreign Office.

Years later Molotov turned up in San Francisco. He came late. Russians, like the emperors of old, seem to love to be late. Apparently, it strikes them as being an impressive technique. Or maybe it is just an old bad habit of revolutionary times, when the security and significance of a leader was measured by the time he kept his audience waiting for his appearance.

The overshadowing novelty in Russian foreign policy is the fact that Soviet leaders of today already have a long record of international "conferencing" at Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam, San Francisco, London. The recent Moscow Conference may prove to have been the decisive turning point in Russian acceptance of its duties in international cooperation for peace.

Upon his return to London from the San Francisco meeting, I asked one of the top-ranking European diplomats if he was satisfied that Russia was in the collective internationalist family to stay. He waited a while with the answer:

"We will know early in 1946. The Moscow leaders will not be able to settle that problem with themselves until 6 to 8 months after VE-day."

A few months later we met again on the continent. In the light of new international happenings, I repeated the question. This time his answer came with the precision of a machine gun:

"Russian internationalism, which wants collective security through the United Nations' Organization, is running into real trouble in the politburo.

"Molotov's strange tactics at recent international meetings indicate he is a spokesman for a supercabinet in which the isolationists are pressing for a wait-and-see policy.

"Having committed the USSR to Marshal Stalin's policy of trusting cooperation with the other nations, Molotov, who intends to outmaneuver both Andreyev and Zhdanov for the top job, is caught on the horns of a dilemma. He cannot go against Stalin. Neither does he dare to offend Andreyev and Beria. He will need them both when he becomes premier of what may very well be an isolationist Russia.

"You Americans tend to forget that the war in the Far East was not a war which ended as good orthodox wars are supposed to end. Your atom bomb exploded that war out of existence. Therefore, you will now have to wait for Moscow, since VJ caught her without any settled over-all foreign policy."

The most significant point made by this skilled observer was that during the first months of peace Molotov was keeping relatively aloof from the Moscow struggle between isolationists and internationalists.

The latter group was reported by the late summer of 1945 to be led by Nalonkov, Litvinov, Mickoyan, and Marshal Zhukov.

A. I. Mickoyan is the Commissar of Foreign Trade and has met with trade delegations of many liberated nations, seeking an expansion of their trade toward the East, now that Germany has been eliminated as a great commercial power.

The most significant event in this connection is the new French-Russian trade pact recently signed in Moscow by Mickoyan and Catroux.

No observer who have seen the utter desolation of Europe can doubt that international commerce will be the decisive answer to the reconstruction problems of Europe and of Russia.

In its own interest, the Soviet Union will have to seek long-range trade connections with the western nations.

And since the United States now is extending commercial loans to these same nations, it is safe to predict that along trade routes, real international good will will flow, building more international fellowship than political discussion ever could.

Marshal Stalin was not talking. For weeks rumors had him with one foot in the grave. Stupid speculation even had him on the way out of the political picture. But on Christmas eve 1945, he gave a banquet to the visiting foreign ministers.

STALIN WAS STILL THE BOSS

As a realist and statesman, Stalin towers immeasurably above Molotov or Vishinsky or any other Russian leader.

He realizes that only through international stability can he meet the paramount need of his nation.

That need is to give the Russians a living standard which can stand comparison with what the Russians have seen outside the Soviet Union.

Molotov thinks in paragraphs. Vishinsky is worried about prestige and ideology. Marshal Stalin has never grown away from his people.

Like the late President Roosevelt and the late Wendell Willkie, Josef Stalin has never lost sight of the fundamental fact that great statesmanship springs from a human soil and is directed toward the safeguarding and enhancement of human values.

From time to time, Soviet foreign policy will undoubtedly continue to puzzle the western mind. The Russians are rough and tough-minded. They do not bring much sentimentalism with them to the international conference table.

Their very presence will insure that the United Nations Organizations will not be permitted to become another futile League of Nations, built on a talkative and dishonest idealism.

On the other hand, the challenge before American statesmanship is to remind both the Russians and the British that power politics has definite, moral limits; that to be big is not necessarily synonymous with being great.

The atomic age is here. One day big power politics must end in the solemn halls of the world court.

Much water will go under the international bridge before that happens. In the meantime, it is the duty of the people of the United States to remind the foreign policy makers of all powers, great and small, that greater than foreign policy is the dignity of man.

True peace can only grow in a moral climate.

Food for Thought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1946

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am happy to include a column by Constantine Brown which I think drips with real importance to anyone who is striving to understand what is wrong with this chaotic old world of ours.

Certainly no one denies but that a healthy world is important to all of us, not only in the promotion of our own prosperity and security, but also of importance in any over-all attempt to avoid World War III.

In this column, Mr. Brown reviews some of our mistakes. I think it is a rather comprehensive review and worthy of your reading:

UNSELFISH USE OF MIGHT VITAL TO KEEP PEACE ALIVE—VIOLATION OF PROMISES AND POLICY OF APPEASEMENT ROUSE FEARS THAT WORLD IS DRIFTING DANGEROUSLY

(By Constantine Brown)

Early in January one of the highest-ranking officers in Washington said bluntly at a small gathering, attended by some of the country's most responsible political men, that unless America's diplomacy changes radically from a policy of expediency and appeasement to one of realism "we may have another war within the next 5 years, whether we like it or not."

Here I might comment that it is so hard to be firm when we do not have a clear foreign policy, England has—commercial expansion and maintenance of the Empire. Russia has—political expansion and maintenance of the Bolshevist technique. Thus there is need to understand the American purpose at home and abroad.

Because this gathering was informal and strictly off the record, the name of the officer cannot be divulged. But he is known to have both feet on the ground and has never been a "Red baiter." Quite the contrary. He has been extremely understanding of Russia's actions, even when they appeared to be contrary to the pledges and agreements Premier Stalin had accepted at the various tripartite conferences.

It is too early to pass judgment on what the UNO will accomplish in the future. But one thing is obvious: Moscow does not believe in the rights of the little nations and wants this association of powers to be nominated by the Big Three. Of these, the United States and Great Britain are soon to be much weaker militarily than Russia. The demobilization in this country has already been so speeded up that today we can no longer be described as a strong military power. Britain has had such losses and is in such bad shape that she has only a negligible force.

RUSSIAN FORCES STRONG

Thus, when the American high-ranking officer adopted a gloomy attitude about a lasting peace, he took the point of view that if the United States, as she did after the World War, sets the pace of disarmament "by example," Britain will be compelled for economic reasons to reduce further its weak military potential, and Russia will become the world's dominating military power. Today Russia still has 15,000,000 men under arms; her aviation is intact and she is planning to build a powerful navy.

Compulsory military conscription in Russia and in satellite countries in Central Eastern, and Southeastern Europe will increase the standing armies of the Soviet bloc.

But this in itself might not be damaging to the peace of the world if powers which base their policies on military strength rather than moral issues would use their might unselfishly in the same way we have used it during the First and Second World Wars.

Here Mr. Brown approaches what is the nub of the matter. It has been said that the League of Nations enjoyed some influence and some power for 15 years after the end of World War I, but that UNO was still-born, having been killed before its organization by secret agreements and too great emphasis on the veto power.

It is perhaps worthy of note at this point that the League of Nations was an association of far more compatible national units than those attempting to erect a workable pattern out of a babble of tongues, economies, and religions, such as we find in UNO.

But, to go on with Mr. Brown's article:

We in the United States have had two periods which were described in their own particular fashion. There were, for instance, the gay nineties, when life was gay and pleasant. Then after the World War we had the hectic era described as the roaring twenties. Both had their counterpart across the Atlantic in modified form. Now we live in an era which eventually may be described as the lying forties.

PROMISES BEING BROKEN

Promises are being made by governments and are being broken within a few months; solemn pledges are being conveniently forgotten when selfish interests come into play and morality is at a low ebb. Words have lost their real meaning. The words "democracy" and "democratic" have one meaning in the United States and another meaning in Russia, eastern Europe, and China. The same applies to the words "liberal" and "liberalism." Unlike after other wars, tripartite or individual "agreements" are, in fact, replacing peace treaties, although a make-believe peace conference will take place eventually between the victors and the vanquished.

With this change of principles, it is difficult to forecast how a nation which keeps its military power intact will act in the future.

The French have a saying, "L'appétit vient en mangeant," which means "the more you drink the thirstier you get." Today it applies to politics more than to eating or drinking.

The Soviet Government indicated to the Germans and to the French and British Governments in 1939 that the price for its assistance in the war would be the incorporation into the Soviet of a part of eastern Poland and the Baltic States.

POLICY OF APPEASEMENT

The territorial thirst of the Kremlin leaders increased, however, as time went on and after Russia became a member of the United Nations. There was a time when the Russian thirst could have been quenched by a determined stand by Washington. But the fear that the Russians might change horses in the middle of the stream and abandon the Allies led our policy framers to adopt a yielding attitude. The increased Russian demands for complete and exclusive control of Europe from the Baltic to the Mediterranean were accepted by the American leaders, because, they said, it was more important to defeat the Axis quickly than to bother about the fate of those troublesome nations.

We thus embarked on a policy of appeasement of the type which we criticized so severely when Messrs. Chamberlain and Daladier were yielding to the Germans. The juiciest morsels of Europe were handed over to the Russians by secret agreements from 1944 on. Thus when VE-day came we could not stop. The situation could not be changed except by a policy of force which we were neither willing nor able to undertake.

Some American policy framers saw the writing on the wall, but felt that they were helpless. We put all our peace eggs in the UNO basket, although those familiar with the Yalta conversations knew that Russia was lending only lip service to the Organization.

The sending of a delegation to participate in the discussion at San Francisco was merely a polite gesture to President Roosevelt. Many people have forgotten by now that for 2 days after President Truman assumed office no one at the White House and the State Department knew whether or not the Russians would go to San Francisco since the set-up in Washington had been changed. It was only after a number of urgent messages had been exchanged with Moscow that Foreign Commissar Molotov was persuaded to come to this country. And he took such a long time in arriving that for several days high-ranking officials wondered if he had changed his mind en route.

THIRST FOR POWER GROWS

But even after VJ-day, when hostilities between the United Nations and the Axis ended, we continued a policy of appeasing our Russian friends. After a short-lived resistance at the Foreign Ministers' Conference at London, and after President Truman asserted he could see no reason for further tripartite meetings since all outstanding questions could be ironed out at meetings of the UNO—a conference of the Big Three foreign ministers was arranged in Moscow at the instigation of Secretary of State Byrnes.

In Moscow we followed the same appeasement policy which had characterized the previous sessions of the Big Three.

In the meantime, Russia's thirst for power increased. It extended to Iran and was rewarded by the creation of a "democratic autonomous government" in the oil-rich Azerbaijan.

It extended to China by way of a demand—contrary to the Sino-Russian treaty—for a 50-percent participation in the development and exploitation of the riches of Manchuria. And it is expected that before spring is over Turkey will have to accept the Muscovite demands for large territories in eastern Anatolia, in Thrace, and bases between the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus.

At the same time agents in the pay—ideologically or otherwise—of Moscow are increasingly active in South America and particularly in Brazil, where the United States is described as the last stronghold of ruthless and exploiting capitalism. High officials in the State, War, and Navy Departments are fully aware of what is going on, but prefer to say nothing lest the "harmony" among the Big Three should suffer.

ANSWER HARD TO FIND

The question raised by some "realists" like the high-ranking officer who fears another war within 5 years is where will the Russian drive stop? It now embraces the whole of Europe; it is making visible progress in Asia and it has begun to take a concrete shape in South America.

It is not easy to find an answer according to those few who are aware of the progress of Russia's thirst. But two constructive suggestions have been made. One is that we immediately stop humoring our Soviet friends. There is nothing much we can do in Europe henceforth except adopt a policy of nonrecognition of those governments which have been placed in power with the aid of the Red armies and are being maintained in the same manner against the wishes of the overwhelming majority of the population.

Governments which do not conform to the Yalta and Potsdam agreements should be outlawed, so far as this country is concerned. At a first glance, this would appear as an academic action. But the United States alone can provide the war-torn nations with tools and supplies for their reconstruction. Russia herself is now negotiating an imposing loan, although she has billions of dollars in gold hidden away somewhere. A policy of not recognizing present and future satellite states would make it impossible for Russia herself to reap the fruits of her expansion.

NO COMFORT IN SITUATION

The other solution is a total demobilization of the armed forces of all the nations in the world. Germany and Japan are down and out. They can be controlled by a small force which can see that they do not become a menace to the world peace.

America is demobilized, in fact, although not yet formally. There still are too many men in service, but we do not have an Army which may be described as a cohesive force.

Britain is attempting to hang onto her own meager national forces and to the Polish and Serbian "mercenaries" who are in Italy and Germany. The fear of something dramatic happening in the world has compelled the War Office to retain control over about 400,000 German prisoners who might conceivably be used as mercenaries in the same manner the British used the Hessians in the Eighteenth Century.

If Moscow would agree to order a thorough demobilization of the Red armies and maintain on active duty, say, only one-third of its present force, there is no question that the situation would appear less laden with dynamite. Talk of the possibility of another conflict would then become idle talk.

Mr. Speaker, there is, of course, still another solution. It will require the highest type of ability to effect and to maintain. Yet, it is, to my mind, an intelligent compromise between firmness, as Mr. Brown indicates above, and the hope of demobilization. Firmness supported by military might, of course, could be the preface to World War III.

With regard to the total demobilization which Mr. Brown indicates above, I

personally believe that total demobilization could be promoted into an overwhelming sentiment in our own country. I certainly doubt—and I have been to Russia—that the Soviet would agree. I feel also that there are many other countries who would either evade or refuse any program of total demobilization. However, I personally would like to see a sincere and earnest attempt made.

The third solution is the one that has already been suggested—was in fact suggested when we first started talking of ways and means to preserve the "coming" peace; that is, how to set up and make effective, and just, a world police force.

Certainly we know that militarily, at least, we are making many mistakes in the use of our occupational forces. We know now that we should have prepared two armies. First, of course, there should have been the combat army. This we did and its record of valor and achievement will go down through the years in the history of military science. Then, with victory apparent, we should have begun an intelligent training of armies of occupation. Unlike armies of combat which have to exist for the destruction of the enemy and his sources and depots of supplies, the occupational army should have been trained for the altogether different task of rebuilding, reconstructing, and liberating of self-government in the conquered areas. It could have been a work of real and glorious purpose.

I hold that the experience of our occupational armies should have given us a valuable background for making a contribution to and working for the success of the maintenance of a constructive peace.

If an unselfish use of might is vital to keep peace alive, then we must not lose any opportunity to learn how to use might unselfishly.

United States Commitments to Aid Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLOS P. ROMULO

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER OF THE PHILIPPINES TO THE UNITED STATES

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1946

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, with the unanimous consent of the House, I am inserting some of the commitments made, during and after the war, by the leaders of the American people, both in the executive and legislative departments of your Government, commitments which were accepted by the Filipino people as emanating from the legitimate representatives of the American Nation. Because the United States High Commissioner, the Honorable Paul V. McNutt, has just arrived in the United States from Manila and has made a plea to this Congress that American promises made to the Filipinos during the war be fulfilled, I feel that some of these commitments must now be called to the attention of this Congress.

They are:

December 28, 1941: President Roosevelt, pledge broadcast to the Philippines; reiterated on August 13, 1943:

The people of the United States will never forget what the people of the Philippine Islands are doing this day and will do in the days to come. I give to the people of the Philippines my solemn pledge that their freedom will be redeemed and their independence established and protected. The entire resources, in men and in material, of the United States stand behind that pledge.

November 15, 1942: President Roosevelt, broadcast to the Philippines on the occasion of the seventh anniversary of the Commonwealth of the Philippines:

The United States and the Philippines are already engaged in examining the practical economic problems of the future—when President Quezon and his government are reestablished in the capital of Manila. He and I, in conference last week, agreed to set up a joint commission of our two countries, to study the economic situation which will face the nation which is soon to be, and to work out means of preserving its stability and security.

This typifies the highest form of good faith, which now exists between our two governments.

August 13, 1943: President Roosevelt, broadcast to the Philippines, reiterating his pledge of December 28, 1941:

I said then:

"I give to the people of the Philippines my solemn pledge that their freedom will be redeemed and their independence established and protected. The entire resources in men and materials of the United States stand behind that pledge."

We shall keep this promise just as we have kept every promise which America has made to the Filipino people.

* * * * * * *

* * * I give the Filipino people my word that the Republic of the Philippines will be established the moment the power of our Japanese enemies is destroyed. The Congress of the United States has acted to set up the independence of the Philippines. The time will come quickly when that goes into full effect. You will soon be redeemed from the Japanese yoke and you will be assisted in the full repair of the ravages caused by the war.

October 6, 1943: President Roosevelt, message to the Congress of the United States:

Since the Japanese launched their attack on the Philippine Islands, I have on several occasions addressed messages on behalf of the American people to the courageous people of the Philippines—expressing our admiration of their heroism and loyalty. I have assured them that the Government of the United States of America will see to it that their independence will be promptly established, and—still more important—that it will be protected. The resources of the United States, in men and materials, stand behind that pledge to the people of the Philippines. We shall keep that promise just as we have kept every promise which the United States has made to the Filipino people.

* * * * * * *

If the Congress takes this action, there are several steps which, in my opinion, are necessary to make good our pledge that the independence of the Philippines will be protected in the future, and to give them the opportunity of economic rehabilitation which is their due.

* * * * * * *

(3) That the Congress make provision for the physical and economic rehabilitation of the Philippines made necessary by the ravages of war which the invaders have inflicted upon them.

All of this is due to the Filipino people in recognition of their heroic role in this war, the political ties which have bound us together and the bonds of friendship which will join us together in the future.

November 15, 1943: President Roosevelt, telegram message on the occasion of the eighth anniversary of the Commonwealth of the Philippines:

Today, on this anniversary, and on every day that shall pass until the Japanese enemy is finally and totally defeated, the American people send messages of hope and faith to you, the gallant people of the Philippine Commonwealth. We work and we fight for the day of your liberation—for the day when your Government shall be restored to Manila—when you shall enjoy the true freedom and independence and national dignity which you have so fully earned.

November 15, 1943: Secretary of State Cordell Hull, statement on the occasion of the eighth anniversary of the Commonwealth of the Philippines:

The President's pledge to redeem the Philippines is certain of fulfillment. His message to the Congress on October 6, 1943, recommending that authority be granted to him to proclaim the legal independence of the islands as soon as feasible and to provide measures for their protection and rehabilitation, is but a step in that direction.

June 29, 1944. The Congress of the United States, Senate Joint Resolution 93:

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the United States shall drive the treacherous, invading Japanese from the Philippine Islands, restore as quickly as possible the orderly and free democratic processes of government to the Filipino people, and thereupon establish the complete independence of the Philippine Islands as a separate and self-governing nation.

* * * * * *

SEC. 4. Meanwhile the resources of the United States, both of men and materials, are pledged for continued use to redeem the Philippines from the invader and to speed the day of ultimate and complete independence for the people of the Philippine Islands.

June 29, 1944: President Roosevelt, statement upon signing Senate Joint Resolution 93 and Senate Joint Resolution 94:

We are ever mindful of the heroic role of the Philippines and their people in the present conflict. Theirs is the only substantial area and theirs the only substantial population under the American flag to suffer lengthy invasion by the enemy. History will attest the heroic resistance of the combined armies of the United States and the Philippines in Luzon, Cebu, Iloilo, and other islands of the archipelago. Our character as a nation will be judged for years to come by the human understanding and the physical efficiency with which we help in the immense task of rehabilitating the Philippines.

October 19, 1944: President Roosevelt, statement on the landing of the American troops on Leyte:

In the 6 years before the war broke out, the Philippine Government, acting in harmonious accord with the United States, made great strides toward complete establishment of her sovereignty. The United States

promised to help build a new nation in the Pacific, a nation whose ideals, like our own, were liberty and equality and the democratic way of life—a nation which in a very short time would join the friendly family of nations on equal terms.

We were keeping that promise. When the war came and our work was wrecked, we pledged to the people of the Philippines that their freedom would be redeemed and that their independence would be established and protected. We are fulfilling that pledge now. When we have finished the job of driving the Japs from the islands, the Philippines will be a free and independent republic.

There never was a doubt that the people of the Philippines were worthy of their independence. There will never be a doubt.

October 20, 1944: President Roosevelt, message to President Osmeña:

Our plans for the dignity and freedom of the people of the Philippines have been ruthlessly—but only temporarily—brushed aside by Japanese acts of exploitation and enslavement. When the Japanese invaders have been driven out, the Philippines will take their place as a free and independent member of the family of nations.

February 4, 1945: President Roosevelt, message to President Osmeña:

We will join you in that effort—with our armed forces, as rapidly and fully as our efforts against our enemies and our responsibilities to other liberated peoples permit. With God's help we will complete the fulfillment of the pledge we renewed when our men returned to Leyte.

May 5, 1945: President Truman, statement after several discussions with President Osmeña:

As a result of the discussions I have had with the President of the Philippines, I am prepared to endorse and carry through to their conclusion the policies laid down by President Roosevelt respecting the islands and the independence of the Filipino people.

* * * * *

In view of the special relationship between the United States and the Philippines as created by Senate Joint Resolution 93, I believe that suitable reciprocal trade between the two countries should continue for such time, after independence, as may be necessary to provide the new Republic with a fair opportunity to secure its economic freedom and independence—a permanent blessing for the patriotic people of the Philippines.

* * * * *

It will be my constant endeavor to be of assistance to the Philippines. I will be only too happy to see to it that the close friendship between our two peoples, developed through many years of fruitful association, is maintained and strengthened.

October 3, 1945: President Truman, statement after conference with President Osmeña:

I propose to confer again with President Osmeña and to formulate a broad program for this Government with respect to the Philippines. This program will, of course, reflect the traditional friendship of the people of the United States and of the Philippines, and it will take account of the heroic and loyal conduct of the Filipinos during the war.

* * * * *

It would be neither just nor fair to the loyal people of the Philippines, who have been our brothers in war as well as in peace, to proclaim their independence until the necessary program for rehabilitation has been worked out and until there has been a determination of the fundamental problems involved in our mutual relationship after independence. Additional time is also required to enable the Philippine Government to set its own house in order and to hold a free democratic election.

To assist in the orderly working out of these problems, I am taking this opportunity to state that I do not intend to consider advancing the proclamation of Philippine independence to a date earlier than July 4, 1946, until the necessary measures which I have outlined have been taken.

October 25, 1945: President Truman, statement after several conferences with President Osmeña:

All Americans feel a very warm friendship for the Filipino people, who stood by us so heroically throughout the war and who now are in dire need of help. I consider a program of assistance to the Philippines essential for our relationship with the people there.

November 15, 1945: President Truman, statement on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the Commonwealth of the Philippines:

The Filipino people are spiritually worthy of independence. They have won their spurs as a nation. We will honor our promise and our pledges to them. The United States stands ready to aid the heroes of the Philippines in every way we can.

November 15, 1945: United States High Commissioner to the Philipines Paul V. McNutt, statement on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the Commonwealth of the Philippines:

But they need American help to rehabilitate both people and economy. We Americans cannot fail.

Let us remember on Commonwealth Day that the institutions of the Philippine Commonwealth have grown from American roots. And let us salute the courage and the will to liberty of the Filipino people. We look ahead to July 4, 1946, when the Filipino people will enter the world community of nations as a nation who has already gloriously earned its democratic name—the Philippine Republic.

January 21, 1946: President Truman, message to the Congress:

We have already determined that the Philippine Islands are to be independent on July 4, 1946. The ravages of war and enemy occupation, however, have placed a heavy responsibility upon the United States. I urge that the Congress complete, as promptly and as generously as may be possible, legislation which will aid economic rehabilitation for the Philippines. This will be not only a just acknowledgment of the loyalty of the people of the Philippines but it will help to avoid the economic chaos which otherwise will be their heritage from our common war. Perhaps no event in the long centuries of colonialism gives more hope for the pattern of the future than the independence of the Philippines.

North Shore Sportsmen Hit Game Preserve Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article which appeared in the Daily Evening Item, Lynn, Mass., on Wednesday, February 6, 1946:

NORTH SHORE SPORTSMEN HIT GAME-PRESERVE PLAN—CLAIM SYSTEM OF DEEDING LAND TO GOVERNMENT AIDS WEALTHY

Charging that Attorney Samuel Hoar, of Boston and Concord, prominent member of the executive committee of the Massachusetts Fish and Game Association, favors setting up a caste system in America and seeks to set a pattern for having taxpayers meet the cost of hunting preserves for the rich, the North Shore Sportsman's Club has sent an open letter to Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes, calling attention to a possible pattern for future land grabs.

The open letter to Secretary Ickes, signed by Dr. Raymond A. Harpin, and Earl M. Lawrence, secretary-treasurer, seeks to point out the type of man in favor of the Parker River Wildlife Sanctuary "grab."

A hearing on the issue is scheduled for Friday in Washington by the Joint Senate-House Committee on Agriculture. Dr. Ira Gabrielson will speak in favor of the Federal Government taking the Parker River land, with David Coddaire, assistant attorney general, presenting the case for the State of Massachusetts in opposition.

FOR RICH ONLY

Dr. Harpin, of the North Shore club, stated today that the open letter to Mr. Ickes calls attention to a "possible plan for the wealthy to have the taxpayers pay the cost of private hunting preserves." The Lynn sportsman claims that if the plan is followed "there will be no place in America for the poor man to hunt or fish."

It is claimed that Attorney Hoar and others "would deed to the Federal Government acres of land, that the Government would stock the preserve, but that only the owner, his children and their guests would be permitted to hunt there."

The open letter to Secretary Ickes, entitled "It Can't Happen Here," follows:

"It can't happen here?

"An open letter to Secretary Harold L. Ickes.

"The subject matter of a deed, executed at Suffolk County, and recorded in the Middlesex County Registry of Deeds, should be labeled 'Required reading' for all taxpayers of the United States of America.

"Especially should it be recommended as up-to-date supplementary text in the classroom, for study, shall we say, immediately following a lecture on the glorious accomplishments of our Democracy, in protecting and advancing the rights and interests of the 'common man'."

THE DEED

Excerpts from said deed follow:

"I, Samuel Hoar of Concord, Middlesex County, Mass., for consideration paid, grant unto the United States of America, to be held in perpetuity as a wildlife sanctuary, subject to the provisions hereinafter set forth, all by right, title, and interest in and all of the land, water rights * * * Said property is granted subject to a written license to hunt, shoot, and possess migratory water fowl given by the grantor to his son, Samuel Hoar, Jr., dated May 3, 1944, to be recorded herewith * * * excepting and reserving to the grantor, for the remainder of his life, the following rights and privileges with respect to the property hereby granted, namely: The right alone or together with my son, Samuel Hoar, Jr., or one guest at a time, to hunt, shoot, and possess migratory water fowl * * * and to erect and maintain blinds and to use boats upon said property. * * * The grantee by its acceptance of the within conveyance hereby covenants, that * * * it will at all times keep and preserve the property hereby granted as a wildlife sanctuary; will not at any time permit the use of

said premises or any portion thereof for any other purpose; will not at any time permit any hunting or shooting upon said property other than that specifically reserved to the grantor and his said son and their guests * * *; will not permit the use by the public of said premises * * * There is no consideration for this deed, it being a gift to the United States of America." (Middlesex ss. Dec. 29, 1944, 12:01 p. m. Received and recorded (Book 6826, p. 226. Attest: Ralph A. Neilson, Asst. Reg.))

"Mr. Samuel Hoar has long been a prominent member of the executive committee of the Massachusetts Fish and Game Association, the same organization commonly regarded as sponsor of, and still fiercely supporting, the Parker River wildlife sanctuary land grab, perpetrated by Dr. Ira Gabrielson's Federal Fish and Wildlife Service.

"Approval and support by these vested interests of this bureaucratic seizure continues defiantly in the face of solid nonpartisan opposition by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, as made manifest through its distinguished senators, representatives, governor, and entire legislature.

A NEW PATTERN

"Can it be, Mr. Secretary, that Dr. Gabrielson and Mr. Hoar are setting a new pattern for future landtakings?

"Sportsmen, taxpayers, through the good offices of your obedient servants, upon you falls the signal honor and privilege of furnishing through taxation enshrouded by law the funds necessary to post, police, and otherwise maintain the private hunting preserve of Mr. Samuel Hoar, his son, and their guests, henceforth officially titled by the United States of America, a wildlife sanctuary.

"A handful of duck hunters, Doctor? In the public interest, Mr. Secretary?

"If historical Concord's celebrated Paul Revere and revered Henry Thoreau could today be called to witness, might not they inquire, 'What price gentlemen, what price wildlife sanctuaries?' "

Citation Awarded B'nai B'rith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 8 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, last Monday, in the office of Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Army Chief of Staff, the national executive committee of B'nai B'rith, meeting in annual session in Washington, was received by General Eisenhower and presented with a special citation awarded B'nai B'rith by the War Department in recognition of the organization's outstanding contributions to the morale and welfare of Army personnel. The citation is signed by Secretary of War Robert Patterson and Maj. Gen. Joseph W. Byron, director of the Army's Special Services Division.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the remarks of General Eisenhower in awarding the citation, the reply of Mr. Henry Monsky, of Omaha, Nebr., national president of B'nai B'rith, in accepting the citation, and a statement entitled "B'nai B'rith Serves the Army."

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF GENERAL EISENHOWER IN PRESENTING THE CITATION

Mr. Henry Monsky, president of B'nai B'rith; Col. Elliott Niles, of the National War Service Committee; members of the executive committee of B'nai B'rith, throughout the world, men and women, enlisted men and officers, have been the recipients of, and are grateful for, the unselfish services of the men and women of B'nai B'rith.

No one will ever know how much these services did in keeping high the morale of the armed forces during the terrible days of this war. I know that B'nai B'rith's service to the Army long antedated Pearl Harbor. I am familiar with the great many recreational rooms which you have furnished and continued to serve. Yes, millions of our soldiers will always be grateful, among other things, for the games, books, and magazines, the parties and the dances, and the free lodgings which you have provided.

I am especially happy to learn from Colonel Niles that your splendid work is going to continue and you are not forgetting our veterans. I know your services to these veterans will be as welcome to them now as it was during the war.

All this being done on a non-sectarian basis by the nation's oldest and largest Jewish service organization is proof enough that the preservation of our democratic traditions is worth fighting for.

The Army is mindful of all that you have done and desires to recognize it officially by the presentation to you of this citation, the first of its kind to be so awarded.

The citation reads as follows: "The War Department expresses its appreciation for patriotic services to B'nai B'rith in recognition of outstanding accomplishments in behalf of Army personnel and of meritorious contributions to its welfare and morale."

REMARKS OF HENRY MONSKY, OMAHA, NEBR., NATIONAL PRESIDENT OF B'NAI B'RITH, IN ACCEPTING THE CITATION ON BEHALF OF THE MEN, WOMEN, AND YOUNG PEOPLE AFFILIATED WITH B'NAI B'RITH

This is a moment of rare privilege; to stand in the presence of one of our contemporary immortals who has become the symbol of America's will and determination "to do justice and to pursue it," is indeed a great privilege.

It is my privilege, as president of B'nai B'rith, to accept from the hand of such a symbol a citation for service rendered to our beloved country. B'nai B'rith was not conscious that it was rendering a special service. It was following a tradition of more than a century, to be worthy of the blessings of American life by giving unstintingly of loyalty, sacrifice and treasure, so that our country can continue to serve the cause of world peace. It is gratifying to be singled out as a service for a citation. It cannot be and is not interpreted as thanks from our government. The gratitude is rather on our part to the United States Army for having been accorded the opportunity to utilize the forces of our organization for the welfare of the armed services.

It will be interpreted by our membership as a challenge to continue their services to returning veterans, the machinery for which has already been established, in their devotions to the task of keeping America the home of liberty, of inter-faith and inter-group amity, and preserving it as the land wherein there shall always exist the concept of our brother's keeper. Thank you, General Eisenhower.

B'NAI B'RITH SERVES THE ARMY

In the closing months of 1943 the weekly influx into Los Angeles of tens of thousand of men in uniform created a housing crisis. Hotels and rooming houses were jammed and thousands of Uncle Sam's finest were compelled to sleep in hotel lobbies, doorways, on lawns and sidewalks, and even against buildings and lamp posts. B'nai B'rith, the Nation's oldest and largest Jewish service organization, decided the situation required action.

The Hollywood lodge of B'nai B'rith opened a small dormitory in Hollywood but that only scratched the surface. In December 1943, B'nai B'rith obtained from one of its members the use of the long-vacant Alexandria Hotel annex with rent, heat, and light free, for use as a free dormitory for servicemen.

On the strength of this generous gift, B'nai B'rith created the B'nai B'rith Hospitality House, the world's largest free dormitory for GI's. All men in uniform, without regard to race or creed or color, were welcome. Since the hospitality house opened on Christmas eve, 1943, it has been host to better than 150,000 servicemen, an average of some 600 every week end.

The first man to register at the hospitality house coined a phrase when he learned everything was for free. Said he: "You mean all this is for free? It doesn't cost a cent? Geez! You guys are O. K."

Throughout the world, the men and women of Uncle Sam's Army have echoed that GI's words—"You guys are O. K."—as they saw and heard what B'nai B'rith has been doing for the men and women of the Army since 1940 on a completely non-sectarian basis.

B'nai B'rith's service to the Army long antedated Pearl Harbor. A few weeks after the first camps for selectees were opened in 1940, B'nai B'rith began providing Torah scrolls for use in conducting Jewish religious services at Army chapels. By VJ-day 200 of these scrolls had been made available to Army chaplains. Later, B'nai B'rith also furnished a number of the chapels with special equipment not provided by the Army.

Early in 1942, B'nai B'rith launched what was to become its No. 1 war-service project—the furnishing and equipping of recreation facilities at Army installations. The first of these was furnished at Fort Custer, Mich., in May 1942. Since then, B'nai B'rith has equipped 1,507 recreation facilities in every State of the Union, Alaska, and the District of Columbia at an estimated cost of $750,000 in material, furnishings, and equipment.

These facilities included: 592 company and squad rooms, 587 hospital solaria, 132 recreation centers, 48 reading and writing rooms, 58 game rooms, 19 service clubs, 12 lounges, 13 chapels, 10 libraries, 8 induction and separation centers, 6 loudspeaker systems, 5 theaters, 6 canteens, and 4 kitchens.

The facilities furnished by B'nai B'rith were located at 227 different camps, forts, and barracks; 81 air bases and airports, 53 Army hospitals and veterans' facilities; 22 Army training schools and Wac barracks; 24 service clubs and USO centers; and 5 induction and separation centers. Among the facilities were 73 for units of Wac's and Negro troops.

In addition to outfitting these facilities with all manner of furniture and equipment to help officers and men relax during their leisure time, B'nai B'rith provided a constant flow of special services for the men using these facilities. These services included sewing, refreshments, magazine and newspaper subscriptions, motion pictures, recorded messages for the home folks, stationery, games, musical instruments, athletic equipment, amplifying systems, washing machines, electric irons, and telephone funds.

Isolated antiaircraft batteries and desert units received the same attention from B'nai B'rith, as did the men stationed at large camps and forts. The first recreation facility furnished in Alaska was provided by B'nai B'rith.

When American battle casualties began coming home early in 1944, B'nai B'rith broadened this program to include service to the men in Army hospitals. As the need for recreational facilities at Army camps lessened, new facilities were furnished by B'nai B'rith at Army hospitals. Solaria, sun porches, music rooms, and game rooms were equipped by the score. In a number of instances B'nai B'rith undertook to provide complete recreational facilities at Army hospitals. At Vaughan General Hospital B'nai B'rith expended over $150,000 to outfit 26 rooms, including 1 complete recreation building for enlisted men and a club room for officers. The huge Army Service Forces Convalescent Hospital at Camp Upton had 219 rooms in 78 separate buildings outfitted by B'nai B'rith. The Camp Edwards Convalescent Hospital had 64 rooms furnished by B'nai B'rith. One Army hospital commandant remarked that "visitors to the hospital see so many signs of B'nai B'rith's generosity that half the time they think B'nai B'rith built the hospital."

Not content with providing the facilities for recreation, B'nai B'rith embarked on an extensive program of hospitality for the Army's wounded. This program included almost the entire gamut of entertainment and relaxation activities. Special traveling entertainment units visit many hospitals and put on shows regularly. Outings, fishing, and boating parties, carnivals, week-end parties, are arranged, with B'nai B'rith committees acting as hosts and providing transportation.

In many hospitals, B'nai B'rith set up the machinery to enable convalescent GI's to send recorded messages to the folks back home. Special efforts were made to provide entertainment for battle-fatigue cases. Telephone funds were raised to enable the men to call home. Movie equipment was furnished and sound systems installed to enable recorded programs to reach every man in a ward. Since VJ-day, B'nai B'rith has been furnishing collapsible wheel chairs, projected books which enable patients to read material thrown on the ceiling, portable libraries, and special bedside radios. In the Chicago area B'nai B'rith created a special week-end camp—Camp GI Joe—to which convalescent GI's were taken for a 3-day period of recreation.

In recognition of its unique efforts, the Army invited B'nai B'rith to be the first organization to provide special services to wounded men returning on hospital ships. Thousands of men on 24 hospital ships were furnished with all manner of gifts by B'nai B'rith. There was also a regular supply of birthday gifts made available for the wounded. At ports of debarkation, B'nai B'rith made its business to arrange welcome-home parties for the wounded upon their arrival.

Besides its hospitality program in the hospitals, B'nai B'rith also undertook to aid in the rehabilitation of the wounded. In cooperation with the Red Cross and Army special service officers, B'nai B'rith has equipped at Army hospitals a variety of hobby and occupational therapy rooms. These rooms were furnished with tools, shop equipment, and materials. In some hospitals B'nai B'rith provided electric bed lamps and electric razors. Thousands of dollars were raised for Army hospital welfare programs through B'nai B'rith shows in many parts of the country.

When the weekly influx to Los Angeles of tens of thousands of GI's on week-end leave created a major housing crisis, B'nai B'rith stepped in and created the Los Angeles B'nai B'rith Hospitality House. For more than 2 years this dormitory has been the week-end home of an average of 600 GI's and enlisted men. They received a clean bed, linen, shows, towels, writing material, shaving equipment, and coffee and doughnuts, with everything on the house. Some 150,000 men have thus been guests of B'nai B'rith.

Similar housing units with somewhat more limited facilities were provided by B'nai B'rith in Hollywood, Daytona Beach, Fla.; Evansville, Ind.; Raleigh, N. C.; and Miami, Fla. No wonder a Brooklyn corporal of Italian ancestry wrote to his mother that B'nai B'rith "in Jewish means a place of rest." In Miami, B'nai B'rith not only provided housing for lone GI's but organized a city-wide campaign to obtain apartments for the families of enlisted men and officers and set up a clearinghouse for purchasing.

Roadside shelters for hitch-hiking GI's; aid in the WAC recruiting campaign; hundreds of volunteer male orderlies at Army hospitals; hundreds of thousands of holiday gift packages shipped to all corners of the world; mobilization of an army of 70,000 blood donors for the armed forces; establishment of baby-furniture exchanges for wives of GI's; tours for the wounded; sponsorship of GI weddings—these were some of the other services given by B'nai B'rith to Army men and women, without regard to race, creed, or color.

Through its vocational service bureau, B'nai B'rith published a now world-famous chart entitled "What You Can Do With Your Army Training as a Civilian," which has been widely utilized by Army educational and counseling officers. Designed as a graphic guide to point up for discharged Army veterans the relationship between civilian employment and the skills acquired in 124 jobs most common in the Army, the chart took the form of a two-color illustrated wall document. Army authorities throughout the world have paid tribute to this unique chart as an invaluable contribution.

In all of these services to the Army, B'nai B'rith was motivated only by its century-old tradition of service to the Nation, a tradition that encompasses a proud record during the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, World War I, and World War II.

B'nai B'rith takes pride in the fact that these services played their part in keeping high the morale of our fighting men and are now helping rebuild the lives of the wounded. As the commander of an Army service base said: "Minus soldiers without guns, such as you, there would be no army."

STATISTICS

One thousand five hundred and seven recreational facilities equipped for the Army.

Two million seven hundred and fifty thousand servicemen entertained at B'nai B'rith sponsored hospitality programs.

Two hundred and twenty-five thousand Army men housed at B'nai B'rith dormitories.

Seven hundred thousand gift packages and service kits contributed to Army men by B'nai B'rith.

Two million games, books, and magazine subscriptions provided to Army men.

Two hundred Torah scrolls made available to Army chapels.

Fifty-three Army hospitals received B'nai B'rith recreational equipment and hospitality.

Twenty-four Army hospital ships served with recreational material and gift packages.

Seventy thousand B'nai B'rith blood donors recruited for armed forces through Red Cross.

Shortage of Building Materials

REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 8, 1946

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, there has been a very great shortage of building materials and building supplies in this country. That shortage still exists. This shortage is materially interfering with the desire of the people to build houses and homes. Our returning veterans need, and they want, houses in which to reestablish their families. They want to rehabilitate themselves as quickly as possible. But there is a scarcity of houses, and there is a scarcity of building materials, including lumber, plumbing materials and supplies, and other essential commodities—and because of this existing shortage it is impossible for the builders to proceed with their work, and it is impossible for the people, who desire to build, to go forward.

We have learned that much lumber, and building supplies, are now being sent to Europe, and elsewhere. Recently I observed that some 250,000,000 board feet of lumber was to be sent to Europe during the first 3 months of 1946. Of course, that vast amount of lumber would be very helpful in repairing and building houses in this country, which are so badly needed.

Mr. Speaker, one matter has been called to my attention regarding this very great shortage of building materials by a group of people from Indiana who are now touring through several countries in South America. Mr. Maurice Early, of the Indianapolis Star, Indianapolis, Ind., is one of that party of Hoosiers who are making that trip. He states in an article sent back to his newspaper, "that upon leaving Indianapolis, where all building is at a standstill, we were amazed to find that virtually everything used in the construction work down here comes from the United States." They were at the time that statement was written in Caracas, Venezuela. He further reports that trucks coming into that city are loaded with building materials, and the ports are crowded with ships and vessels loaded with construction steel, cement, and other building materials, including lumber and other essential commodities. We know that these countries were not engaged in this late war. They have not suffered either from invasion or the ravages of war, yet they are securing vast quantities of building material, and they are building new homes. In many of those cities, it is reported, blocks of slums have been razed to make way for new houses and homes. Our country is furnishing the material necessary for the construction of the buildings which are now going up. Yet we know there is a dire need for buildings, houses, and homes in this country, but the scarcity of all kinds and types of necessary building materials prevents the construction thereof.

Mr. Speaker, many people who are engaged in the contracting business, and as builders, and many who are engaged in the sale and distribution of building materials and supplies, are greatly disturbed and distressed because of this policy on the part of our Government. It appears to them, naturally, that they are being discriminated against in this particular, because they are prevented from pursuing their business because of this scarcity of building material, while our Government permits, and actually

approves, the sending of this needed building material to these South American countries so they may proceed with their building programs. Of course, this is a very unjust discrimination, in my opinion. Our own people, our returning veterans, need houses, and this very unwise and unjust procedure is preventing them from obtaining them.

Mr. Speaker, in order that all may read the report, I ask unanimous consent to insert the article written by Mr. Maurice Early, of the Indianapolis Star, of Indianapolis, Ind., at this point in the RECORD.

THE DAY IN INDIANA—CAPITAL BOOMING—UNITED STATES MATERIALS—CARACAS REBUILDING — GROUP ENTERTAINED — OUTLINE PLANS

(By Maurice Early)

CARACAS, VENEZUELA, January 28.—This capital of Venezuela is experiencing a building boom that resembles the feverish construction activities in American cities during the boom days of the 1920's. To outsiders this tearing down of ancient structures and the building of the most modern kinds of houses, apartments, and office buildings is amazing.

What is more amazing to the Hoosiers, who have just left Indianapolis, where building is at a standstill and the housing shortage is acute, is that virtually everything used in the construction work here comes from the United States.

There is a constant procession of trucks winding up the mountain road from the port of La Guaira to Caracas. They are loaded with construction steel, cement, and the other building materials. Walls of all the houses and other buildings here are made of brick that is manufactured in Venezuela. Some of the cement is made locally. But all other materials, including plumbing and light fixtures, modernistic glass, aluminum for decorative effects, come from the United States.

Rebuilding of Caracas did not start after the end of the war. It has been going on during the war years. Last year a mammoth government housing project was completed. Blocks of slums were razed to make way for wide streets and seven apartment buildings with 800 living units. They cost $12,500,000, loaned by the government to the housing authority. The loan is to be amortized by the rentals. The development is just as modern and attractive as any new section of a city in the United States.

As a result of the construction activity there is no severe housing shortage here even though the city has grown rapidly during the war.

There is only one explanation here for the fact that building material from the United States is coming now, and has been coming during the war, when construction in America was strictly rationed.

Materials sold in the United States are subject to ceiling prices. The United States Government would have no interest in regulating the price of materials sold to Venezuela. Consequently the materials are going to buyers who will pay more than the restricted prices paid by the construction industry in the United States.

New buildings include a large school, an eight-story office structure for one of the newspapers, apartments, and residences. There are few places in the old business section where buildings are not coming down to make way for new ones. In the suburbs, up the valleys, there are double-lane streets, regular American-type filling stations, neon lighted stores, and there are three large groceries. In all other parts of the town the food stores are mere stalls not much larger than stands in the Indianapolis city market. If Caracas could get all the materials it wants from the United States there would be $18,000,000 of new construction a month.

At the direction of the President of Venezuela, the Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce group was entertained by two members of the cabinet at a fashionable resort restaurant outside of the city. All members of the group declared this was the most important contact that any group interested in business promotion could have made. The government officials were lavish in their entertainment. The dinner meeting lasted from 9 o'clock in the evening until after midnight. Officials giving the party were Perez Alfonso, minister of commerce, and Valmore Rodriguez, minister of the interior. They explained their plans for industrial development of the country and for the improvement of the living conditions of the poor class which is now suffering from malnutrition. Tuberculosis is rampant. Minister Alfonso said there are 7,000 homeless children in Caracas.

Mr. Speaker, many of our lumber dealers and plumbers have but a very small amount of stock on hand. They cannot obtain lumber, and they cannot obtain plumbing materials and supplies, and this has prevented the building of houses which are badly needed. It is abhorrent for the people to know that these very supplies which are now needed for building purposes are being sent, in large quantities, to the various South American countries. By this practice, those countries are going forward with their improvements while our returned veterans and our own people have to stand by and await the time when they can secure those necessary materials for building in our own country, and our businessmen and our building contractors are compelled to await the time when those materials are available.

The people in our own country want to proceed with their businesses, and they want to build and develop in our own country. The people want the United States of America to go forward. They do not want the other countries of the world to build and develop, while we are forced to sit idly by and await the time when available materials may be secured. In other words, we are now witnessing a stoppage in building because we are all too generous in sending our needed building materials to other countries who do not need the same as greatly as our own Nation. This procedure should be stopped. Let us build in our own Nation.

Shipments of Wheat

REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 8, 1946

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, in the discussion of the current wheat crisis too little attention has been given to the question of transportation. It has been intimated in the press and elsewhere that a part of the current shortage of wheat is due to the fact that farmers are holding it for higher prices. That definitely is not the situation at the present time. Of course, some farmers normally carry wheat from one year to another. Many of them have adequate storage on their farms and, irrespective of the price situation, many farmers like to hold at least a part of their wheat until they see what their crop prospects are for the next year. However, there is no need to worry about that situation now because there are millions and millions of bushels of wheat in this country now on farms which cannot be moved because of a lack of rail transportation. The last figures I saw a few days ago indicated that more than 500 country elevators throughout the country are now closed because they are full and cars are not available to move the wheat stored in them. I am advised that unless some drastic action is taken this situation will grow worse rather than better. As an illustration of the situation which exists in many localities in the wheat country, let me quote the following letter from the manager of a grain elevator at Johnson, Kans.:

We read in the papers how the farmers are holding their wheat when the mills are needing it so badly and what a big job the farmers have ahead of them for 1946 to produce enough food to avert a famine.

This is all disgusting to read when out here in the country all the elevators and most of the farm bins are bulging with wheat—much of it going out of condition. It cannot be moved because of the shortage of grain cars.

Johnson has received since the 1st day of November an average of slightly over two cars a day, and there never has been a day that a car came to town that it was not loaded in an hour or two after it was spotted. The elevators were full when the car was loaded and some farmers had to haul their grain home again. Furthermore, farmers have hauled their grain to any point they could unload it. Right now about 3,000 bushels a day are being hauled from here to mills in Texas.

Basing an estimate on the number of bushels of grain, mostly wheat, that is in the Johnson territory we will have to have an average of six and one half cars a day from now until harvest to get this year's crop out before another harvest. A lot of the wheat if not moved soon will be condemned as unfit for human consumption.

This condition exists not only in Johnson but in all of this part of Kansas. Is there anything that can be done to relieve the situation?

It will be noted that not only is the movement of wheat being delayed in this community, but if it is not moved soon the deterioration which is taking place will render it unfit for human consumption.

I do not want to be critical of the railroads. They are up against a situation where it is impossible for them to move all the goods that are waiting to be moved. They simply do not have the rolling stock to do it. I am advised that, in addition to the shortage of rolling stock, the 5-day week has resulted in reducing the supply of cars. Estimates which I have seen place this loss at as much as 10 percent. The prevailing strikes have also contributed to this loss of cars as many cars are tied up in strike-bound plants.

What must be done if this crisis is to be met is to give some top over-all direction to the problem. If it is more essential to move wheat than some other commodity, then someone ought to have the authority to say that preference must be given to wheat movements. Furthermore, there should be top direction and coordination in the way of surveys and exchange of information to a greater extent than exists now. I am convinced that a considerable amount of transportation is now being wasted in long hauls from one part of the country to another which could be avoided with more coordination from the top. The letter above quoted speaks of hauling wheat from western Kansas into Texas. I am advised that at the present time 3,000 bushels of wheat per day are being hauled by truck from one shipping point in western Kansas to mills at Amarillo, Tex. This is ridiculous when it is recalled that Amarillo is the center of a great wheat-growing area. I understand wheat is being shipped from North Dakota to Texas and from the Pacific Northwest to Kansas. This at a time when Kansas farmers have millions of bushels of wheat which they want to sell but cannot because there is no transportation.

This is the time of year when farmers have time to haul wheat. Later on they will be busy with their spring work and it will be much more difficult.

The present situation has existed all fall and winter. It is getting worse. Unless some real effort is made to move wheat now on farms, some of it deteriorating, we will be faced with a real crisis. Prompt action now is essential and should have priority over all other steps to meet the food situation. Farmers are anxious to sell. They are demanding transportation. Do not blame them for the shortage.

United Nations' Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 8 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a radio broadcast which I delivered on the Congressional Record on the Air program over Station WHN, New York, N. Y., on Monday, December 3, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I had the privilege of representing the United States on the American Delegation to the United Nations' Educational and Cultural Conference held in London, November 1 to 16. I have returned from that meeting with renewed hope for the establishment of a lasting peace.

Representatives of 44 nations there agreed on a constitution to form the basis of cooperation among peaceful nations in advancing through international, educational, and cultural relations the objectives of peace and human welfare.

These nations through their representatives declared that:

"Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed. Ignorance of each other's ways and lives has been a common cause throughout history of that suspicion and distrust which all too often results in war."

It is the purpose of this organization to build understanding and confidence in the world as a basis for peace. It will encourage the free flow of information and ideas through the press, radio, and motion pictures and through educational and scientific exchange. It will help teachers, scientists, writers, and others to work together throughout the world in support of the peace aims of the United Nations.

The Conference in London showed that the people of the world are agreed on the fundamental proposition that the best weapon against war is understanding. Common knowledge and understanding among the nations of the world removes the danger of violent dispute. The greatest danger today is the feeling which has been developing in the minds of too many men in this country and abroad—that already the next war is inevitable. Debates have taken place even in the Congress in which this fear has been expressed. This organization of the United Nations is dedicated to proving the falseness of that psychology.

It can be done.

It must be done.

I am sure that Americans, to whom education has, since its very founding, been a priceless heritage, will be especially quick to appreciate that in a world emerging from a war not over boundaries nor colonial domains, but to preserve the very soul of democracy, the cooperation of the nations of the world in educational and cultural endeavors presents one of the best guarantees of continued peace.

Because Americans have been able to educate their children and because American scientists and cultural leaders have been free to pursue their research and their achievements, the United States is prosperous and united. The years just behind us have surely taught us that our own prosperity is largely dependent upon the prosperity and the unity of the world. It is possible, perhaps, to prevent aggressor nations from actually waging large-scale wars by invoking the powers of the Security Council of the United Nations, but a mere police force is not enough. Human beings are peacefully inclined, so that it becomes unnecessary to call upon the police force, only when they are educated and fully accept the fundamental principles of a common morality and when they find constructive outlets for their energies in promoting the economic and cultural life of the world.

The formal title of this organization is the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. Using the first letter in each word of the title, we have the abbreviated title "UNESCO" by which name it will be generally referred to.

I believe that the American people and the Congress of the United States will find the constitution which was developed in London fully acceptable and that this Government and the governments of the United Nations will take prompt action in approving it and making it possible for the Organization to begin functioning in the near future.

I am convinced that it will aid immeasurably in preventing war. International organizations to be effective must have the support of enlightened world opinion. The success of UNESCO depends on the brains and will of the peoples of the world to make it work. America has made an incalculable contribution to the winning of the war. We now have an opportunity to organize the world for peace. With great power comes great responsibility. America must give leadership in the building of the new world.

Question. Senator MURRAY, you have commented several times since your return that you were much impressed by the reports of devastation of educational and scientific facilities in the countries occupied by Axis nations. What does UNESCO plan to do about this?

Senator MURRAY. UNESCO is not to be a relief organization. It is designed to engage in spreading education, knowledge, and culture among the masses, to encourage peace by removing racial prejudice, intolerance, and ill will from the minds of people and inculcating in their place the principles of human dignity, equality, and mutual respect among men. Such a program could not be expected to carry on relief activities.

The Conference at London, however, provided a preparatory commission and the establishment of a special technical subcommittee to examine into and report on the needs of devastated countries with a view of bringing such conditions to the notice of governments, organizations, and persons wishing to assist in such relief problems.

Question. Has the Government of the United States committed itself in any way about this organization?

Senator MURRAY. Well, this is one of the objective programs of the United Nations authorized at the San Francisco Conference. The United Nations Charter, adopted at San Francisco, provides in article 57 for 'various specialized agencies, established by intergovernmental agreement with wide international responsibilities in economic, social, cultural, educational, health, and related fields. Furthermore, both Houses of the Congress have unanimously passed resolutions favoring the establishment of an international organization for educational and cultural cooperation."

Question. How soon will the United States become a member and what is the mechanism of that?

Senator MURRAY. The United States will become a member through the adoption by Congress of a joint resolution accepting the constitution of this organization and agreeing to membership.

Question. What about Germany and Japan—will they be members?

Senator MURRAY. The membership is confined to members of the United Nations Organization. However, states not members of the United Nations Organization may be admitted to membership upon recommendation of the executive board by a two-thirds majority vote of the general conference.

Question. I understand that Russia did not take part in the London Conference. Can you tell us why and are there grounds for anticipating her participation later?

Senator MURRAY. Russia did not take part in the London Conference but it was the universal judgment of the delegates to the Conference that Russia would find the organization acceptable in every way. She approved the idea of such a specialized agency at the San Francisco Conference. A position has been held for Russia on the executive committee of the preparatory commission, and I hope that she will play an active part in the planning activities now going forward in London.

Question. How will the organization operate to be effective in promoting peace in the world?

Senator MURRAY. The plan of action is provided for in article I of the constitution The organization will contribute to peace and security by promoting collaboration among the nations through education, science, and culture in order to further universal respect for justice, for the rule of law and for the human rights and fundamental freedoms which are affirmed for the peoples of the world. It will collaborate in the work of advancing the mutual knowledge and un-

derstanding of peoples through all means of mass communication and will recommend such international agreements as may be necessary to promote the free flow of ideas by word and image. The Organization, however, is prohibited from intervening in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of nations.

The Sugar Situation

REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 8, 1946

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, for sometime I have been wondering what is being done, or will be done, relative to the sugar situation by the Department of Agriculture or any other department having jurisdiction over this commodity. Last year, thousands upon thousands of bushels of fruit and vegetables were wasted because there was not sufficient sugar available for canning. Certainly the department that is responsible for the supply of this commodity has had full knowledge of this condition for sometime and it is regrettable at this date little has been done to correct it.

On January 21 I wrote the following letter to the Honorable Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture:

I am wondering just what is being done in order that we will not have a sugar shortage this coming summer, and what is being done that we will have sufficient amount of sugar for canning purposes, both summer and fall of this year. Last year a definite drive was made for home production of food, and yet thousands and thousands of tons of fruit and vegetables spoiled because of the lack of sugar for preservation. It would appear to me that we should make preparation for this before the time of emergency, and am therefore wondering what the status of the subject is.

Also I am wondering, Mr. Secretary, what happened to the approximately 1,600,000 tons of sugar that our armed forces found on the island of Java.

In your opinion, will it be necessary to increase the price of sugar, either in the form of subsidy or an increase in price to consumers, in order that we may have the sufficient amount necessary to meet the needs?

I hope that you will give this request a full detailed reply, and if legislation is necessary, so inform us, so that your recommendations may be given serious consideration and study at the earliest possible moment.

Assuring you that I appreciate your prompt attention to this request, I am, with kindest regards,

Respectfully yours,
J. HARRY McGREGOR,
Member of Congress.

On February 4, 1946, I received Secretary Anderson's reply which reads as follows:

This is in reply to your letter of January 21 in which you asked what is being done to assure that there will be a sufficient amount of sugar for canning purposes this year.

In an effort to stimulate sugar production for the harvests which would be available for this year's consumption, the Department of Agriculture made early announcements of support payment programs for sugar beets and domestic sugarcane, both continental and offshore. Such support payments were designed to stimulate sugar production in a manner which would not be inconsistent with the Government's program of economic stabilization. Growers of sugar beets and sugarcane have responded to such payments with increased acreages. There is nothing further that can be done in connection with such programs to increase sugar production for consumption this year. The Department already has announced support programs for the sugar beet and continental sugarcane crops which will be harvested next fall for use late this year and during the first 9 months of next year.

We are negotiating for the purchase of the 1946 Cuban sugar crop. We have offered Cuba a price of 3.675 cents per pound for its 1946 production which is an increase of .575 cents per pound over the price paid for the 1945 crop. Since the harvest of the 1946 crop already is under way, there is nothing further that can be done to increase this year's Cuban production.

It has not been possible to move any part of the 1,600,000 tons of sugar reported in Java because of the current internal political difficulties. It is not possible to predict when such difficulties may be settled in such manner as to permit the shipment of any part of the sugar.

In order to assure the prompt availability of this year's sugar production, it will be necessary to increase the price of sugar substantially or to obtain legislative authorization to incur losses on 1946 crop operations. Such action is not necessary to stimulate this year's production, since such stimulation has been given by the Department's early announcements that it would make the announced support payments if necessary to assure growers certain levels of income which were deemed necessary to achieve increased production. However, such offers, as announced, are contingent upon legislative authorization to incur losses on 1946 crop operations. We have submitted a request for such authorization to the Congress, which, if granted, would permit the importation and distribution of Puerto Rican and Hawaiian sugar of the 1946 crop, the harvest of which has just started.

We are attempting to work out agreements with producers which will permit interim shipments of sugar from these areas pending our receipt of the required legislative authorization. This is being done to avoid any delays in shipments of sugar during the period of the most critical shortage. If such authorization is forthcoming in the near future, there will be little interruption in the orderly movement of new-crop sugar supplies as rapidly as they become available. The ceiling prices of raw and refined sugar will be increased in the near future by an amount which will permit the importation and sale of 1946 crop Cuban sugar by Commodity Credit Corporation without loss.

Further legislative authorization will be necessary to permit the fulfillment of the Department's support payment program for 1946-crop sugar beets and continental sugarcane which will be harvested next fall. We expect to submit a request for such authorization soon.

Sincerely yours,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Secretary.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you will note that some of my questions were not fully answered and at this time no definite program has been arranged. I am fearful that we will soon be placed in the same category as in the past—that is, "too little and too late."

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that an investigation be made by the proper committee of Congress of this entire subject, and at an early date report back to Congress the findings so the people will have a definite knowledge of what they can expect so far as quantity of sugar is concerned. This subject is a most urgent one, and I request that immediate action be taken.

Let's Get Our Bearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 8 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which was delivered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], one of the ablest Members of the Senate, at the Hotel Astor, New York City, February 5, 1946, before 1,200 prominent businessmen. The address was broadcast over a national hook-up. At the meeting, which was held under the auspices of Brand Names Research Foundation, awards were made to more than 150 companies which have maintained successful brands on the market for 50 years or more.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am honored by being present with this distinguished group of businessmen who have wisely used brands and trade-marks to develop successful business and vast employment under our American system of free men.

Tonight, at this great meeting, under the auspices of Brand Names Research Foundation, at which are present more than a thousand of America's leading businessmen, recognition has been given to business institutions which have established and maintained for 50 years or more, trade-marks and brands which became known by the public as symbols of quality and integrity in connection with the products and materials offered to the public by these institutions.

It is fitting they should receive citations from Brand Names Research Foundation in recognition of their accomplishment.

The future of our American life of free men is hanging in the balance tonight, and that is why I have chosen the subject, Let's Get Our Bearings. There never was a time in the history of the American people when it was more important for us to get our bearings than at the present moment.

We all know we have been in two World Wars, and principally as a result of the last war our national debt approximates $280,000,000,000. This is not the worst threat to our future liberties. The worst threat comes from an organized movement in this country to destroy the American system.

At the present moment there are factions in this Nation who would destroy the great American system of business, which is commonly called our free enterprise system. They have so stated for publication.

One of the targets they have chosen for attack is the brand-name system as it is used in the distribution of goods and services in our economy. It has been chosen for attack for an obvious reason.

The brand-name system, as it has developed in American life, is the keystone of distribution. Distribution is the arch which

supports our whole economy. Distribution—the movement of goods produced, to the consumer for his use—is, in four words, our standard of living.

One of our heritages from the war is a tremendously expanded productive capacity. If it can be used to the full, and the products of our farms and mills and mines and forests and fisheries and factories find full distribution, maximum employment will be the automatic result—and a national debt that would have destroyed an earlier America need not unduly worry us.

But another of our heritages from the war is an expanding social unrest.

Abroad we have seen it upset governments. We have seen it change nations' faces to the economic left. We have seen it deny the virtue of the economic system by which America waxed great, and through which America supported her allies in this war while the courage and devotion and sacrifice and precious blood of our uniformed forces sealed world confidence in American prestige.

At home we see social unrest blazoned in the daily newspaper's headlines. We stand uneasily on a powder chest. Let distribution fail—let factories close and fields lie fallow from failure of distribution—and what has happened elsewhere can happen here as the fatal aftermath of the war our strength has won.

I am recently returned from a trip to Europe, made as a member of a United States Senate committee. I do not know which of the weary evidences of years of brutal conflict I saw oppressed me more. Cities blown to shreds were dramatically horrible. But worse, I think, was the deadly apathy, the smell of defeated personalities, which blanketed whole populations.

America can be saved from that. But those who wish to destroy American free competitive distribution precisely do not want to save us from that. Because from wreckage, from an economically defeated people, from such apathy as I saw, they hope to build an economic revolution.

That is why destruction of the brand-name system is important to them.

I have never been able to understand why they would destroy it, why they wanted revolution by economic defeat, because I have studied our economic system from an impartial standpoint. I have studied it for 50 years—when I was a worker in overalls, when I was a clerk in an office, when I was an executive in business institutions, and from the point of view of a public servant holding office by the people's vote. The obligation of a man who assumes such responsibility is a solemn thing.

Tonight we are honoring fulfillment of an equally important obligation.

We are honoring those who have kept faith with the public and rendered a great public service to the Nation under established brands and trade-marks. A brand name or trade-mark is notice to the world that the product it represents is of a certain standard which the owner hopes the people, over a period of time, will decide represents the best value for the money.

Any brand that lasts and endures must have kept faith with the public, both in quality and price. Character has something to do with keeping that faith, but also business judgment compels an intelligent owner to keep faith because the owner of the brand or trade-mark has an increasing investment of time and money in the brand.

If he breaks faith with the brand or the trade-mark, thereby with the public, he is injuring himself many times more than he injures any particular individual. If he destroys the faith and confidence in the public mind regarding brands or trade-marks, then, all of his time and all of his investment have been destroyed.

I know there are those who say that because millions of dollars have been spent in advertising a given brand or trade-mark the public has to pay the bill.

Nothing could be further from the truth. I could cite a business—in which I was interested for many years—in which the cost of production of a single piece of merchandise was $12 and the wholesale selling price $18.

In the beginning the volume of business was very small. The brand and trade-mark, plus bringing the facts regarding it and its value to the public, cost the company millions of dollars. Advertising increased the demand for the product by millions of units.

This process led to a reduction of cost, which made it possible to sell the product to the consumer for approximately $5. These are facts that can be proven from the record, and they dispute the false propaganda that advertising is nothing but a waste of the consumer's money.

I could show in hundreds of cases, and particularly in the automobile field, where advertising and resultant increased production brought automobiles to the consuming public for less than one-quarter of their original production cost.

These brands and trade-marks are responsible for building good employment jobs at high wages for millions of workers. They are the very essence of our American success in making a living.

Brands and trade-marks, if successful, create business and profits for their owners as well as employment for vast numbers.

To be successful, their originators must advertise by newspaper, magazine, and radio, etc.

The whole process of telling the people creates business for the newspapers and magazines, thereby giving them income which leads to a better financed press and publications, with more employment.

It also gives substantial business to the radio stations and broadcasting systems. The income they receive from this source supports the radio in giving to the public programs of music, debate, and religion which are not available elsewhere in the world without cost to such an extent as here.

There are some in our executive branch of Government who would limit the time of exclusive use of brands and trade-marks to the owners of such trade-marks to a certain number of years only and then open them to public use. Think of it. They would have the diligent create and the slothful absorb the benefits. They would let John Smith create, establish, and maintain his triangle brand, and then, if it becomes successful, they would let John Doe watch its development and use it in its success.

We might as well let John Doe use Smith's name for all purposes if Smith made his name mean something in life. This is a weird and thoroughly un-American suggestion, but it indicates the current of thinking, and it would lead to communism.

The whole world is looking to America to help save them from themselves. There must be a reason. Why do we have to protect ourselves with rigid immigration laws? There must be a reason why the people of all countries in great numbers want to emigrate to this country. Let us save America so we can help them save themselves.

It is fair to find a parallel between the history of brands and trade-marks, with their years of growth and honest successful life, to that of the average American. Each started as infants, hoping for its share of success in a fair competitive world. The American economy assured them both the right to that hope.

There are few, if any, other places in the world, where the poorest man can, by his own industry, education, thrift, and the use of the genius with which God has endowed him, take himself from the lowest rounds of the ladder to the highest.

That has been done in America so often it needs no illustration.

No one familiar with the conditions in all the countries throughout the world will dispute the fact that under our system the individual has the greatest opportunity to move forward, improve his living standard and reach success in business, the professions, the ministry, or government.

Under our system the laborer of today can become the capitalist of tomorrow.

Labor has just as much right, under our system, to work lawfully for the improvement of its conditions in the business and industrial world as has ownership and management lawfully to seek profits through reward, invention, and increased efficiency.

If we are to continue, our laws must be fairly interpreted and apply with equal vigor to the rich and the poor, the high, and the low. Great power in the hands of any individual or group must carry with it great responsibility under our system. If that responsibility is not voluntarily accepted by those possessing such power, it then must be fixed by law.

It has been fixed by law in connection with corporations and large business organizations through the enactment of the Sherman antitrust law and the Clayton Act.

The interest of the public now demands that it should be fixed fairly as to the great labor unions and organizations which are collecting from the workers hundreds of millions of dollars.

No law enacted in the heat of passion or for other purposes than proper control in the interest of the people as a whole will be successful among a free people.

Government regulation should be limited to absolute necessity, and we should all remember that when we cease to function under voluntary cooperation we must, of necessity, become a regulated people with Government as the master and the people the servant, rather than as we were established, with the people as the master and the Government as their servant.

Great problems can only be successfully analyzed by simple and direct procedure.

I ask myself, "What enabled this country of ours to make the contribution it did in World War II for the benefit of humanity and civilization?"

The answer comes back clearly: "It was because the individual here was not only a freeman but he was stimulated to use his genius and ability by just reward for accomplishment, protected by law."

For more than a century and a half he was protected in the right to keep a substantial part of that reward in the form of property rights under a well-defined system, protected by the majesty of the law.

Abraham Lincoln said: "Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him work diligently and build one for himself, thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built."

Let us get our bearings and not destroy the great system that put our Nation in a position to furnish the vital materials required to win World War II. World War II was a great victory for freemen, providing we, who are charged with the making of peace, keep faith with those who gave their lives to win the war.

To keep that faith you must recognize that blessings brighten as they take their flight, and eternal vigilance, the price of liberty, means attention to your right of suffrage at the primaries first, then at the general election. That is the only way to keep communism from supplanting our American system of freemen.

Remember, every faker or demagog gives lip service to free competitive enterprise when he talks in public. Behind the scenes he does the things that destroy it. The faker knows the thinking people want to

keep free competitive enterprise because it's the essence of freedom. It's the freeman's way of making a decent living and the best in the world.

The political faker and the Communists hope to function as termites, boring into the foundation of free enterprise and destroying it before the people realize what is happening to them.

You won't save our American system unless you elect as your representatives, honest men, who believe in saving our American form of government and its system of making a living.

Don't trade a success for a failure.

I think this meeting, under the auspices of the Brand Names Research Foundation, is a fine thing to bring to the attention of the people of the United States the fact that builders of fine brands and trade-marks, who have kept faith with them, are being honored here tonight for having kept that faith and helped build America.

If our system was a failure, or there was any system in the world paralleling it, I might be willing to help exchange it, but I, for one, am not apologizing to anyone for referring to our American free enterprise system, or, as I put it, our American business system, because it is the greatest success in the world; and no one in his right mind who understands the facts, will lend any help to those who would undermine and destroy it for reasons of their own, which I have not yet been able to fathom.

I have heard of apologizing for failure, but it is a new thing for me to hear people apologizing for success. I have heard of getting a successful man into an organization to change the work of an unsuccessful man, but I have never heard of getting a man to bring in an unsuccessful system to supplant a successful system.

There are those who sneer at the free enterprise system, and recently men, high in the ranks of certain labor movements, have suggested that the "four freedoms" cannot be accomplished without the destruction of our free enterprise system.

That means that we Americans have an issue which must be faced immediately—are we going to permit those who would destroy our system to succeed in doing it, or are we going to get organized and take the necessary steps to preserve it?

If we will avoid the evil effects of false propaganda and give only fair and sound consideration to the relative conditions of the various people of the earth, we will arise to defend our American system before we have lost the power of action.

Another thing which gave us the power to accomplish the miracles of production that saved the Allies in World War II is found in the statement that for nearly 150 years this Government functioned on the plan that the Government should never interfere in anything which the people can do for themselves and as well as or better than the Government.

We citizens are yet the master of our Government, and if we perform our duties as citizens we can yet harness Government to continue as our servant rather than become our master.

America must accept the penalty of leadership in the world, but to perform the duties of leadership America must first preserve at home the full freedom of the individual, combined with individual acceptance of responsibility.

I ask myself, "What produced the revenue in connection with our great accomplishments and contribution to the winning of the war?" I ask myself, "What produced the revenue that produced the things that made us so powerful?"

The answer comes back, "Freedom of the individual, guaranteed by the Constitution and carefully protected by those in authority in this Government for almost 150 years."

That revenue that produced the industrial and business organizations was the accumulated earnings and profits of diligent and thrifty men who helped to pioneer this great Nation of ours and develop it.

Let us remember they were not all successful for themselves. Most of them lost all, or a substantial part, of what they put into their pioneering ventures and yet the ventures were ultimately beneficial to the people as a whole.

Again I ask myself, "Why should we destroy the American system of business and industry which produced the revenue and made possible the production of materials used in the war by our marvelous fighting men, who brought to us victory on the battlefields."

The answer is—85 to 90 percent of the American people, including workers and owners, will band together to make secure the preservation of this great system if they understand it is being destroyed.

We must analyze, before too late, where we will go if we destroy it. We must soundly appraise the results in other nations which have followed practices that we are being asked to install here, and assume if they have been failures there they will be failures here.

The facts are that we are what we are because of the course we have followed. Liberty is freedom, but freedom is not free, and all we need to do to destroy our individual freedoms and our great American system of business is to tinker with the delicate machine that relies for its success upon proper human relationships, with voluntary, wholehearted cooperation as its foundation.

You can't legislate our system into success. You can't legislate employment. "You can lead a horse to water, but you can't make him drink."

By the same reasoning I know that you cannot legislate that private ownership will do exactly what the politicians or the labor leaders want them to do, on the one hand, nor can you legislate that labor will go to work and do exactly what you want it to do because the law says it must.

The fruits of common effort must be fairly divided. Capital is nothing more than stored-up labor and it is entitled to its just reward when it is invested in business with its hazards and chances.

Labor, on its part, is entitled to a fair reward for its work in producing the fruits of common effort.

Our great system can no longer function if we consider labor a commodity, or we disregard the fact that private capital will only find a working place to create profit and employment if opportunity for reward is secure under the law. Understanding cooperation and tolerance by all groups, coupled with the determination to preserve it is the only answer.

In your own self-interest, Mr. American Citizen, don't forget what happened in Germany when Hitler promised to do everything for the working man and everything for the capitalist.

Don't forget what happened in Italy when Mussolini made similar promises. Remember in every country where the government has promised the millennium and guaranteed security, the people have learned to their sorrow, through misery and suffering, that the millennium cannot be given by government and only comes from work and sweat and the use of the talents given to the individual by Almighty God.

No one but you can make yourself successful.

Isn't it strange that we, with our system of human relationship, are the only people in the whole world to whom a distressed world can turn at this time. This should cause every American to pause and think well before he becomes a party to the destruction or breaking down of this great American system.

Responsibility for where we are going from where we are is an individual responsibility on every working man and woman in the United States, as well as all those in management and ownership. No one group can preserve this precious possession.

Again I repeat it is the duty of every American citizen to do his part in preserving the great system and improving it fairly as we go along. If we lose it, we won't get it back, and I make this statement unequivocally at the moment, that if we lose it, 90 percent of America will be in tears when they find they have not followed the admonition that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

We owe it to the boys who fought this war to preserve this system of opportunity and guard it with their help, so that it stays the outstanding example to the world.

The Parliament of Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 8 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Parliament of Man," by George E. Sokolsky, published in his column under the headline These Days, in the New York Sun of January 26, 1946.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

THE PARLIAMENT OF MAN

So the Russians want UNO to punish the British for their conduct in Greece and Java. Note that the Russians do not yet complain about British conduct in Palestine. Perhaps the day is not far distant when the Russians will bring a bill of particulars into UNO against American conduct in Japan under MacArthur. They have already, by the devious medium of the Tass News Agency, accused MacArthur of high misdemeanors in Korea.

Of course, no one brings a complaint into UNO against Russian conduct in Latvia, Esthonia, and Lithuania. No one has one word to say about the tragic betrayal of Poland, which is now totally a Russian puppet. Mr. Byrnes, representing free and liberal America, warns the Persians not to burden the infant UNO with complaints against the Russian octopus lest the Russians become angry and either smash Iran or the UNO for interfering with an insatiable land appetite. No one has offered a bill of particulars against the imposition upon China of the Manchurian terms of Japan's twenty-one demands by Soviet Russia—terms against which we protested in 1915 when Japan tried to force China; but supported by the United States in 1945 when Russia succeeded in forcing them upon China. There have been no American protests against Russia's claims to the Kuriles—claims publicly denied by Roosevelt; privately acknowledged by the same Roosevelt.

Russia is making a monkey out of UNO right from the start. It has rejected Bretton Woods. It has refused to join the air conferences and agreements. It has established a veto over the parliament of man. It has destroyed De Gaulle. Its adherents revel in the strikes in the United States. It denounces MacArthur. It has reduced sovereign states to the level of puppets. It has made itself the dominant state of the world, with and by the consent of the United States

of America, which, possessing the substance but not the spirit, the riches but not the character, consents, consents, consents, while the other vetoes, vetoes, vetoes.

There are men who say that this is not the time to raise such questions. When is the time? When will be the time? If the Russians continue their relentless war on Great Britain, will they not in the end succeed in accomplishing by diplomacy and propaganda what Hitler failed to accomplish by war? Is a propaganda and diplomatic blitz less harmful in the end than a military blitz? And is not the elimination of De Gaulle a preliminary to placing Thorez at the head of France; and is that different from placing Laval on that citadel of western civilization? And is it not within the margins of truth that should Thorez, the war-dodger of his country, who took refuge in an alien land rather than defend her boundaries, become the ruler of France, Pétain and Laval and all of Vichy will have been justified by history? Is a puppet of one country any better than a puppet of another?

Was it not Franklin D. Roosevelt who once said that the Rhine is our boundary? And what of the Rhine today? Is it still our boundary in a Russian-held world from Calais to Darien? Where is our boundary now?

No wonder that that UNO commission, looking for a site for its headquarters, acted so arrogantly in New York. They wanted living quarters for a thousand persons and their families in a city in which there is not a flat or a hotel room for a returning veteran. Throw the Americans out of their quarters! What are Americans in America in this one world? And they demand office space in a place where there is no office space. What difference that there is no room? Make the room! Kick out those who stand in the way of the new dispensation. Make room for the dawn of the new day—the day of the conqueror.

And so the British are now the defendants in the UNO and the little American public-opinion makers will be shrieking their heads off about Greece, but they will say nothing about Poland, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Iran, Manchuria, Korea. Nobody is plaintiff in that case.

Let's Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 8 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Let's Trade," by Frank C. Waldrop. The article was published in today's issue of the Washington Times-Herald.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S TRADE

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Now the world is on its knees to the United States of America again, begging for help. This time the world wants not guns, not butter, not even dollars. It is panhandling for a little bread.

And it isn't kidding.

The United States of America, at this strategic moment, literally holds the power of life or death for millions of people in Europe and Asia. Oh, they won't die today or next week, maybe. But their lives will be hell for as long as they live, and the first snap of inevitable disease epidemics will carry them off at high rate unless we send food, and fast.

England is probably able to make her way all right, though unhappily, for she has so much overseas empire to draw from, and so many brussels sprouts at home. But there is nowhere on the European Continent itself a food reserve.

France hasn't got anything. Germany has less than nothing. Spain is begging. Italy is the same. The Balkans are shot. And the great Soviet Russia, which has been doing so much damning and finger pointing and loud talking at UNO—what has she got?

Now is the big chance for the Communists to ride to the rescue of the imperiled maiden, if they've got a "hoss" and can ride.

Asia, likewise, is wide open for the Communists to demonstrate in. If they can. But the fact is that they can't. They're as hard up as anybody and begging, too.

In all the world, there is only the United States of America that can stand off starvation. And there is no doubt that we will do it. It means pulling down our own standards of living some more, and going back into wartime economics again.

But there is no reason why we have to be a pack of "Patsys" while we are about it.

During the war we made ourselves the "Patsys" of the world. Mr. Roosevelt was so worked up being a great strategist and genius that, beginning with lend-lease and going right on down through Yalta, he managed to get us into every involvement that came along without getting, in return, a single gain for the United States of America.

Lend-lease, for instance. We loaned loose to the British in prodigious quantities. And in the end? Why the British are grumbling because Congress is considering whether to lend them $4,400,000,000 with which to balance up lend-lease and start up as a Socialist empire to try to put us out of business.

That "balance up" business simply means we lend them the money to pay us for goods we shipped them under lend-lease.

They come out clean on the deal. We pick up the check.

And if they have any little troubles with the $4,400,000,000 new loan they can call off interest payments any time they like. Tough, isn't it?

For 25 years, Communist Russia has carried on a stated campaign of war to the death with our way of life. That isn't any news to anybody who has read or heard the Communist doctrine.

The Communists claim that in the long run there isn't enough room on earth for them and capitalism, too. And they have stated it for the record that every move they make at home or abroad is aimed toward the violent overthrow of every other government in the world except their own.

Don't forget in that connection: Joe Stalin pulled the trigger for World War II when he signed up with Hitler in August 1939 and gave Adolf the green light to plunge into Poland.

Don't forget, either, that when the double-cross got crossed again and Adolf plunged into Russia, it was no time at all before Joe was all over us with bear hugs, begging for lend-lease.

And then after Pearl Harbor, nothing was too good for the Americans—in the line of caviar and champagne for the visiting firemen in Moscow.

But what, in the end, did we get back?

Look at the Communist party line swerving back today to the same old direction: War on capitalism. War on the very system that saved Russia in the vital hour of her life.

Britain is Socialist, with a stated aim of eating the foundations out from under capitalism bit by bit. Russia is Communist, with a stated aim of knocking capitalism down and beating the life out of its body with a club.

And the little nations of Europe and Asia are sweating as they try to figure out which way to jump. Most of them are already edging toward Russia or being pulled there by Communist parties in their midst.

But one thing they all have in common: They can't even live without the capitalist United States of America. They couldn't live during the war without us, and they can't live now without us.

Well, let's not be Patsys again. We muffed our golden chance during the war to talk some sense into those people. Now we have a second chance. Before that food goes abroad, let's see how fast they can call off their dogs over here. And you know what that means as well as they do.

A Jersey Farm Boy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 8 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a story about a New Jersey farm boy, which I think will be most interesting to all who may read it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A JERSEY FARM BOY

Recently my attention has been called to the exploits of a 17-year-old New Jersey farm boy—a neighbor of mine from Somerville. His name is Allen La Fever and the whole Nation is talking about him. Allen is the kind of boy who will lead our Nation in the future. He's a member of the 4-H Club, Boy Scouts, quarterback on his high-school football team—and owner of a prize purebred Jersey calf named Phoebe. What makes Allen outstanding is the fact that as of this date he has lifted Phoebe for 111 consecutive days trying to prove the old adage "If a farm boy lifts a calf every day, he will be able to lift it when she becomes a cow." Allen, only 150 pounds himself, finds no trouble lifting Phoebe, even though the calf now weighs more than 230 pounds.

Every Saturday, over a coast-to-coast Columbia Broadcasting System network, Allen is interviewed on the Border Co. County Fair broadcast. He then lifts Phoebe and collects the sizeable amount of $10 a pound for each pound that she has gained during the week. So far, Allen has banked well over $800 toward his college career. Millions of listeners have shown interest in this boy and his calf. People have visited the Somerville farm by the hundreds. Scores of newspaper and magazine articles have featured his picture and story. New Jersey has found a brand new ambassador of goodwill in young Allen La Fever. He represents the kind of all-American boy typical of our lovely farms and bustling industrial cities.

The People's Health: A National Asset

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 8 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject of the pending national health insurance bill, delivered by the Honorable Watson B. Miller, Federal Security Administrator, before the Medical Society of the county of New York, on December 17, 1945. His remarks were so convincing that even the editors of the medical journal New York Medicine, which reprinted the address in full, stated editorially:

This paper deserves a careful reading and analysis by friends and foes alike of compulsory-health insurance. With much of Mr Miller's analysis no one can differ. His factual summary of the health and medical problem is largely unexceptionable and many of his conclusions will appeal to most physicians as being reasoned and sound. We welcome this sincere and masterful statement from the head of the Social Security System.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the cost of printing the address in the Appendix of the RECORD will be $138.80.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From New York Medicine of January 5, 1946]

THE PEOPLE'S HEALTH: A NATIONAL ASSET

Ever since your invitation reached me, I have been thinking of this meeting as, in itself, a peculiarly revealing commentary on our times, and on our mutual problems and hopes. Here am I, the veriest layman, called upon to speak before one of the great medical associations of the Nation. You have not only paid me the signal honor of asking me to address you, you have asked me—and I quote your cordial letter of invitation—to talk on a "timely social economic medical problem." And I, with all the enormous leeway this subject offers, have chosen what may seem, but it is not, an oversimplified generalization. When I discuss the people's health as a national asset, I am anchoring my feet squarely on the common ground which brings us together—you as medical men, myself as a layman, and all of us as citizens.

I am neither an economist, nor a physician, or a Daniel come to judgment. Yet I do share your active concern not only for the people's health and for the unique and irreplaceable contribution of the Nation's doctors to our common welfare, but also for the complex social and economic setting in which people, including doctors, today live and move and have their being.

For many years, throughout a long period of service in a private voluntary organization before I even envisaged myself as a Government administrator, I was very close to this problem. As an interested and active, and, I trust, somewhat useful, party of the third part, I knew at first hand thousands of men who had to some degree lost the priceless asset of health; I watched, with humility and profound respect, the skill and the self-sacrificing devotion with which their medical advisers helped them regain health; and I discovered for myself both the practical, inescapable necessity of Government participation in the health field, and also the problems Government must face in this field.

Now I come to you as a public servant—as Administrator of that agency of the National Government most concerned with health. Of the constituent units under the Federal agency, there is not one which does not make some contribution in this field—directly through the Public Health Service, the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, the Food and Drug Administration, the Social Security Board, and the Federal hospitals under our wing including Freedmen's and St. Elizabeths; and indirectly through such agencies as the Office of Education. It is in recognition of this Government stake in the Nation's health that you have asked me to participate in this discussion.

Through my long and intimate association, outside of Government as well as within, I have come to have a deep admiration not only for the results of modern medical science, but also for its methods. More than any other scientific pursuit, medicine applies the techniques of objective research to the solution of subjective problems; its progress in combatting disease is based inherently on a profound scientific distrust of taking anything for granted, coupled with the equally profound and still more subtle art of applying scientific knowledge with due allowance for that supposedly unscientific and certainly unpredictable something called, by laymen like me, the human equation.

This evening I propose, in my perhaps less precise but no less sincere way, to try to apply the method of reasoned observation to the health issues now confronting this Nation—the national issues high lighted less than a month ago by the President's health message to the Congress.

This is the first time in our history that the Chief Executive has ever devoted a congressional communication exclusively to health. But it is not an isolated phenomenon. At the time when the health message was transmitted more than 120 bills, touching nearly every aspect of health, were before Congress. The basic premise to which the President addressed his recommendations is one to which your profession and the people at large have long stood committed. "The right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health" is not a point at issue. But it is entirely proper, and indeed necessary, to ask why it takes a national health program to implement this right, and in particular why the Federal Government should constitute itself the spearhead of such a program.

The answers to these two questions are all old facts, but seen in the new and often lurid light of this postwar world they take on fresh meaning.

I know, for example, that standards of medical practice and of hospital care in this country are second to none in the world.

I know also that the death rate has declined and the average span of life lengthened in parallel, mounting curves of hope and progress over the years. The fact that there were only 11 deaths per thousand in 1940 as against 17 or 18 per thousand in 1900 represents the statistical distillation of heart-warming scientific advances against human misery and death.

But it does not represent any cause for complacency. Since 1920 the pace of progress has been slowing down—70 percent of that 40-year reduction in the death rate took place in the first 20 years of this century and most of the rest of it before 1930. Since then—and disregarding the war—we would seem to have been marking time. Moreover, I believe I am right in recalling that most of this progress has been in fighting diseases where mass methods of control and prevention can achieve mass results—in the communicable diseases subject to control by sanitation, quarantine, immunization, public education, and similar measures. Saving a man from typhoid to let him fall victim of diabetes is too close for comfort to the spectacle we are now witnessing of medical efforts to put some of the world's war criminals in shape to stand trial.

If death from preventable disease is to be prevented, we must provide not only expanding mass controls but also ready access for everyone to the individualized and often highly specialized care called for by degenerative and other noninfectious diseases.

Furthermore, we must not be content with the negative measure of health represented by a decline in mortality. The 5,000,000 or so young men who failed to measure up to health standards for military service bid us look to the morbidity of our whole people. I am not going to belabor in any detail these frequently discussed military findings. I am familiar with the analyses of these data which point out that no amount of medical care could have rendered fit for military service those men who had lost a limb or who lacked normal intelligence. I do say, making all due allowances for the fine points obscured by any 5,000,000 generalization, that we still have no cause for complacence in the physical showing of our healthiest population sector—the young men of military age.

Nor shall I argue the pros and cons of our health status among the nations of the world. There are too many imponderables, too much need for further refinement in definitions, to leave much significance in contentions that the United States is, or is not, the healthiest Nation in the world.

Health is not a matter of competition among nations. Nor should it be among groups within the Nation. Yet as you know even better than I, our record is vastly more favorable for some preventable disease than for others, for some geographical and economic groups of our people than for others. Even diseases which are almost 100 percent controllable are not universally under control—diphtheria, typhoid, and paratyphoid, for example, have caused no deaths in some States in some recent years; in others three or four deaths per hundred thousand still occur annually from these causes. Or compare tuberculosis death rates—five or six times as high in the State with the poorest record as compared with the best. If the whole country had made as good a showing as the State with the most favorable record in 1943, well over 40,000 lives would have been saved in that single year.

The same kind of contrast—the same kind of tragic and needless waste—is revealed by infant mortality reports. The lowest rate reported by any State in 1943 was 30 deaths per thousand live births; the highest showed more than three times that many deaths; and at least half of these could probably have been prevented if the accident of geography had provided these infants with a more favorable birth place.

Even in the same community there are often shocking differences in infant mortality. You are probably familiar with the studies made in Cleveland from 1920 on, over a period of 17 years. In 1937, the last year of this survey, the infant mortality rate was 50 percent higher in families in the most meager income group than in those in higher economic levels.

These facts do not, of course, add up to a complete and definitive picture. But even if they are no more than straws in the wind of progress, they do point up the uneven sweep of the forces that make for health and illness across this broad land.

These forces are of many kinds—economic, social, and educational—as well as those which fall more strictly within the province of medicine. Poor housing, ignorance, inadequate community health protection all

go hand in hand with lack of essential medical care.

But a comparison of death rates and of medical care, if available, would, I think, leave no question that direct medical services hold the key position as a decisive factor in the Nation's health. The relationship between infant mortality and medical attendance at birth offers one significant glimpse of a situation which exists all too frequently, for in the 10 States where infant mortality was lowest in 1940, nearly 80 percent of the births took place in hospitals and less than 1 percent lacked medical care In contrast, the 10 States with the highest infant mortality showed less than 35 percent of hospital births and 26 percent without any medical care whatsoever.

In spite of all that public hospitals and clinics can do, in spite of the really heroic generosity of individual doctors in their private practice, it is not usually true that the very poor, along with the very rich, get adequate care. Facts, as you well know, do not confirm the too easy comfort of this generalization.

All in all, illness robs American working people of somewhere between four and five hundred millions days on the job each year.

Obviously, there isn't any easy answer to such a problem. Neither the President, nor the Congress, nor the medical profession can pull any rabbits out of the hat to solve it. What we can do—what we have done—is to break down the most astronomical total of our national need into its component parts and tackle each, one by one.

In analyzing these health needs, the President's message simply crystallizes the joint thinking of doctors, public servants, and the people themselves. It maps the five major sectors that together go to make up this broad front:

1. The need to expand existing public health services, including those for maternal and child health;

2. The need for better distribution of hospitals and other health facilities throughout the country;

3. The need of additional support for medical research and medical education;

4. The need to safeguard individuals and families against the loss of family income when the breadwinner is disabled; and

5. The need of Nation-wide provision for spreading and prepaying the cost of medical care.

To meet these five needs, the President's message proposes that the Federal Government extend its existing partnership in the Nation's health. In principle, there is nothing new in this proposal.

Medical care for the indigent is an accepted Government function, though its adequacy varies enormously from one place to another. But Government provision is by no means limited to the indigent. Something like 80 percent of all our tuberculosis beds are in Government hospitals; and Government institutions have taken over practically the entire job of caring for the mentally ill. For the armed forces and for veterans, Government responsibility is unquestioned—and increasing. In the next 30 or 40 years, for instance, it will probably be providing hospital and medical care for somewhere between fifteen and twenty million veterans.

Add to all this the workmen's compensation laws, through which State and Federal Governments assure medical care when accidents and illness occur on the job.

Add also the Federal and State programs for vocational rehabilitation, including medical or hospital care for both the physically and the mentally disabled.

Include Federal grants to the States for maternity and child health services and for the care of crippled children, to say nothing of the wartime program under which $45,000,000 has been provided in the past 3 years for maternity care of servicemen's wives and infants.

Finally add in the cooperative venereal disease control program, the work on malaria control, the strengthening of research activities, and of the national tuberculosis program under the new public health law passed last year.

The sum total of all these existing services represents the substantial figure of almost a billion dollars in Federal, State, and local money spent for health last year. This is just about one-fifth of the Nation's over-all annual health and medical care bill.

To that rather sizable extent the Government is already in this picture—and no one, so far as I know, wants it to pull out. Its participation is right in principle and imperative in practice. If the purpose of a democracy is, in Lincoln's words, to do for a people what they cannot do so well for themselves in their private and individual capacities, then protecting health is the Nation's business. The question is not whether Government has a place in this picture, but rather the extent and method of its participation. And even here there is a broad area of substantial agreement.

We are all agreed, I believe, that community health services must be strengthened and that the Federal Government must provide additional help to see that this is done. A county health department means one thing in a great metropolitan area like New York—and something quite different in a lot of other places. In one-third of our 3,000 counties it means practically nothing at all, because full-time public-health service is simply nonexistent. And that in turn means that some 40,000,000 men, women, and children in this country still live in communities without any public-health provision or at best with part-time, untrained, and precarious protection.

Many of our communities are similarly lacking in hospitals and in other facilities which you in our great cities can pretty well take for granted. Here in Metropolitan New York, I understand that you have more than 5 hospital beds for every 1,000 people—well above the national goal of 4½ per thousand; and the same favorable proportion obtains in such States as Massachusetts and California. But the picture is different elsewhere—in Kentucky and Arkansas, for instance, there are only about 2 hospital beds for every 1,000 and even these are not equitably distributed.

To meet the really desperate situation in the boom towns created by the war, we had the emergency hospital construction program under the Lanham Act. This was a temporary stopgap measure. It helped us over the hump. But we still have the long pull ahead. For that, the Nation will need something comparable to the integrated hospital plan proposed by the Public Health Service and endorsed by the American Medical and American Hospital Associations. This plan, as I am sure you know, envisages a Nation-wide network of cooperating institutions, including regional hospitals and research centers, general hospitals serving more localized areas, and a series of outpost health centers and clinics which would bring medical care within reach of even the more isolated rural communities. Federal grants to the States for hospital construction, as suggested by Mr. Truman, would be a long step in this direction.

The most rugged individualist would hardly carry his reasoning to the ultimate, though logical, absurdity of denying that hospital construction is a task for joint action, for public responsibility. If he has no hospital to go to, it doesn't make very much difference whether a man can afford it or not.

But distribution of hospitals is only one part—the implementing part—of a still more basic question. And that is the distribution of medical personnel—of doctors, nurses, dentists, and the ancillary services.

I applaud and respect the standards of the medical profession which lead a well-equipped physician to seek a practice in a place where the facilities and the teamwork necessary to effective medical service are accessible. But the result, in prewar years, has been a peak and valley distribution that looks like nothing so much as a malaria fever chart. I understand, for instance, that you doctors here in Greater New York stood in a ratio of 1 to every 434 of the general population in 1940, whereas in the southern mountains and elsewhere there was only 1 doctor for more than 3,000 people. And with fifty-thousand-odd doctors in military service, this adverse ratio has spread until it applies to almost one-fifth of all the counties in the country.

With the return of young doctors from military service, we have a never-to-be-repeated opportunity to better this situation, for both the public and the medical men themselves. But we cannot ask well-trained men to assume a carpet-bag, circuit-rider practice.

Answers to the questionnaire sent to doctors in uniform by the postwar medical service committee of the American Medical Association are probably our most revealing guide to their personal plans and preferences. You are no doubt even more familiar than I am with Colonel Lueth's report; but some of its findings are, I think, worth recalling to your attention. It shows, for instance, that more than three-fourths of all specialists came from large cities; that only about a fourth of the men who came from communities of less than 2,500 wish to return to them; and that even among those from towns up to 250,000, half want to seek still larger cities. The trend toward the great centers, which has its roots so deeply in our past, will not be stemmed as long as opportunity beckons only in that direction.

But voluntary redistribution which would locate physicians in communities that most need them is not a closed issue, particularly among the young men who have left our medical schools in the past 8 years. And the answers on this point are so significant that I should like to quote directly from the AMA report:

"About 13 percent (of the doctors questioned) stated they would be willing to go to such an area if an office were already established; 11 percent would go if a subsidy were provided for several months; more than 15 percent would be willing to move if diagnostic facilities were available, and nearly 29 percent would go if there were hospital facilities. From a study of the graduation groups involved," the report concludes, "it appears that the younger men are willing to move into communities needing physicians, under certain preferred conditions."

But as you well know, neither the construction of hospitals nor the willingness of this significant number of young doctors to man the outposts of medical practice will provide for what are, in effect, our great open spaces of medical desert. We need more doctors if the hospitals and health centers are to be staffed even after they are built, if all the people of the country are to be served. The President's proposal of Federal grants-in-aid of medical education, as of research, would help to make up the long lag in the recruitment of promising students, as well as the arrears in medical ranks resulting from the war.

On the research front, I earnestly hope that the benefits of wartime cooperation between Government, universities, hospitals, and foundations may be extended to the even larger tasks of peace. Since 1941 the Office of Scientific Research and Development on the recommendation of the Committee on Medical Research has executed 496 contracts with 125 institutions. More than 95 percent of these costly medical investigations—representing nearly $8,000,000 in 1 year—were conducted in universities or hospitals, the remainder by governmental agencies such as the National Institute of Health. If the concerted efforts of medical investigators which

have yielded so much of value during the war are to be continued on any comparable scale, they must be adequately supported. Government help will no doubt be made available—probably through some such council as is now under consideration in Congress.

But suppose we had surmounted all these hurdles in practice—as indeed we have in principle. Ill health would still remain one of the major economic hazards of that highly precarious business euphemistically described as "everyday living." Unemployment, old age, death of the family breadwinner, and illness remain the four horsemen of poverty and disaster.

Against the first three of these economic hazards, we already employ the familiar protection of insurance. Although this system is still relatively new and not yet complete, 10 years' experience with the Social Security Act has proved that it is effective.

There seems no reason why the existing system should not be extended to disability. Certainly the man of 25 or 30, who is a victim of tuberculosis while his children are still young, has an even tougher problem to face than the hale and hearty 65-year-old who retires by virtue of his age. He suffers the same wage loss, but at a time when his family's needs are greater and when society has an even larger stake in helping him keep it together.

According to estimates of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, some 150,000 persons are disabled annually by accident and illness, and the cumulative total of the handicapped who need rehabilitation now comes to something like a million and a half.

This cost, the cost of supporting the handicapped and their families, is not new. Families and friends, neighbors and local governments the country over already bear this burden. Social insurance simply pools risks and resources and spreads the cost broadly not only among many people but throughout many years.

The President proposes that we apply what Winston Churchill has called the magic of averages not only to wage loss, but also to payment for medical care. This proposal is neither so new nor so revolutionary as some of the comment on it implies. Every State but one already has such a system of health insurance in operation—for workmen's compensation is health insurance, and the major difference between this long-standing program and that proposed by the President is that it covers only on-the job accidents and illnesses, whereas the proposed plan would cover nonoccupational accidents and illness. No one seems to question that, even with the inadequacies inherent in any partial plan, workmen's compensation is a benefit both to the worker and the physician. A broader plan would assure better care to more people and more adequate compensation to the doctors and hospitals who serve them.

Without going into legislative and technical details which are properly a concern of the Congress, I want to review with you some of the fundamental issues involved in this proposal. The most frequent is simply "Why?" Why can't ordinarily self-supporting families pay their own doctor bills?"

The plain fact is that they haven't got the kind of money it takes to meet the cost of medical care, either on the emergency basis of a sudden, catastrophic, and costly disaster, or on a long-time basis of continuing prevention.

Ten years ago, when the last comprehensive survey was made, more than 92 percent of the people in this country were in families that had an income of less than $3,000. Even with the upswing since that time, the majority of people in this country still have less than $3,000, and as we all know, a dollar doesn't go as far today as it did 10 years ago. Dr. Leland, former Director of the Bureau of Medical Economics of the AMA, is authority for the statement that an income of less than $3,000 a year provides no safeguards against medical indigence when costly or prolonged illness strikes. Putting these two facts together, we cannot escape the conclusion that all but a tiny fraction of our people live below this margin of safety.

Granting that we must spread the cost of medical care, why can't the individual obtain his own insurance? Hard facts again spell the answer. Most of us cannot afford to pay the full insurance premium. Even those who are normally self-supporting have immediate wants which seem to outweigh possible future costs that human optimism always hopes may not actually occur.

True, many people do carry hospital or medical care insurance. The Blue Cross movement, in particular, has shown remarkable progress in the last 10 years. But even so, it covers less than 13 percent of our entire population, and is made up chiefly of city people in the middle-income brackets. All told, perhaps 40,000,000 persons have some such protection through private insurance. Its adequacy is in some cases another question. Further, this is too often just another instance of the old saying that "them as has, gets"—those who least need this protection are best able to afford it. And those who experience more frequent and more serious illnesses cannot afford it. Public opinion polls show that something like 30 or 40 percent of the people in this country put off going to the doctor because it costs money.

Voluntary insurance, significant as it is, thus does not provide a complete or adequate answer. Many State medical societies have worked hard to set up systems for prepayment of medical care. These plans represent an earnest attempt on the part of organized medical groups to spread the costs. Though they have encountered great difficulties, several of these plans have had considerable success. One of their major problems has been the hazard of adverse selection. Any prepayment plan which people can enter and leave at will is subject to this handicap. But a general social-insurance system obviates the possibility of adverse selection because it covers the good risks as well as the bad.

Health insurance spreads costs widely through the familiar device of a pooled fund—the incoming contributions flowing mainly from potential beneficiaries and their employers, the outgoing payments flowing to doctors who continue to practice medicine on the time-honored and time-tested basis of their own professional standards.

Professional control over medical practice is an ancient prerogative—older than the Hippocratic oath. The guidance, the direction, the supervision, the discipline of doctors are primarily matters for doctors to handle. Subject to Government regulation through licensure, the responsibility has always been yours and should remain so. But just as public licensure gave the profession a new opportunity to deal with these problems, just as grading of medical schools, registration of hospitals, administration of workmen's compensation, and establishment of voluntary insurance plans—to mention only a few—have given you new opportunities to exercise professional controls, so health insurance would constitute still another advance in the long evolutionary movement for high ethical and qualitative standards. On this broad question, health insurance presents no threat—but a new, great opportunity.

It provides not only a great opportunity to render the best possible service when and where it is most needed and will do the most good, but, as the President made very clear, it also provides for the adequate remuneration of physicians—and surely no one has a better title to this basic consideration. Doctors themselves have traditionally recognized the necessity of spreading the cost of medical care, and they have attempted to approximate that purpose through the so-called sliding scale of fees.

Since health insurance would provide more medical care for more people, it is reasonable to anticipate that it should provide a comparably more adequate average income than doctors throughout the country now receive.

I would be the last to pretend that putting all these proposals into effect would be easy. But when has any advance in medicine—or for that matter in the whole structure of living—been easy? Democracy itself was once a great and untried experiment.

There are those among us today who would say, in effect, of the national health program, "Among * * * strange notions * * * there is one which has lately seized the minds of men, that all things must be done for them by the Government, and that they are to do nothing for themselves. The Government is not only to attend to the great concerns which are its province, but it must step in and ease individuals of their natural and moral obligations. A more pernicious notion cannot prevail. * * * It has given us a premium for idleness."

Yet this was not said in the first instance of health; nor was it spoken in 1945. These are the words with which John Randolph of Virginia in 1829 spoke out against the pernicious and revolutionary doctrine of public education.

Through the ages, social and scientific innovations have encountered this same reluctance and viewing with alarm. This deep seated human resistance to embrace change without good cause should arouse neither rancor nor fear. It should be welcomed, as the foundation of permanence, and built upon as the testing ground of progress.

We should be as little concerned or confused by the label pasting—if not outright name calling—which is part of this testing process. It is a kind of oratorical shorthand through which we exercise our democratic right to a certain poetic license. Take the term "socialized medicine." To some "them's fightin' words"—the brand, the label, for something the more fearful because ill-defined. Others—among them outstanding leaders in your own profession—insist that "socialized" precisely describes what the doctor's work is and has always been—the provision of needed care to all, regardless of the money return.

I am even less concerned about the exercise of these semantic privileges in this field than I would be in some others. Doctors are the last people in the world to be taken in by them. All your training in diagnosis—all your age-old creative study of cause and effect as it applies to the living realities of sickness and health—have given your profession the inestimable advantage of the open mind guided by a trained and critical intelligence.

Nor should we fear controversy. Any proposal which in the first instance does not provide leeway for honest and constructive differences of opinion should be suspect as too watered down to have any meaning or use. The great lesson of all history is that conflicts are the growing pains of progress. The advance of medicine and of science in its service has again and again dramatized issues not unlike and no less difficult than those which confront us today. Their resolution reenforces the great hopes which I hold for a truly national health program.

With the President's message, we have all been briefed for a joint mission toward great and imperative goals. With the cooperation of medical men, this mission is assured the best guidance on its professional and scientific fronts. With our abiding faith in the demonstrated capacity of the average citizen to come out with the right decisions, once he has all the facts, we may confidently look

forward to a practicable and workable solution. That is the essence of democracy, the mainspring of progress, and the assurance that the cause of health will be promoted as the Nation's most priceless and enduring asset.

Red River Lateral Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 8, 1946

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by E. B. Wilson before the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in behalf of Red River Valley Improvement Association in regard to Red River lateral canal:

My name is E. B. Wilson. I am traffic manager of the Shreveport Chamber of Commerce and have had the privilege of serving that organization in their traffic department for over 21 years. I am presently on loan to the Red River Valley Improvement Association and represent that association in this hearing.

Prior to the time of my association with the Shreveport Chamber I was connected with a railroad auditing department whose line operated through the Red River and Mississippi Valleys between Shreveport and New Orleans.

W first wish to congratulate both the division engineers office and the Department of Public Works of the State of Louisiana on the detailed studies made in connection with the prospective traffic and savings on that traffic for this proposed project.

The department of public works study is entitled "The Case for the Red River Valley Lateral Canal" and accompanied the interim report as exhibit 1 (see subject 37).

It seems rather remarkable that the total tonnage and savings should be so near equal when consideration is given to the fact that different years were used and the material available for the separate studies was secured from entirely different sources and by different methods.

The selection of the year 1939 or 1940, we feel, was proper as these years more nearly reflect normal conditions than would any of the war years or the depression or semidepression years prior to 1939.

While we, of course, are not advocating the use of years other than those selected, we feel it is well to print out that had any of the years 1941 to 1944, inclusive, been selected greater tonnage and savings would have resulted.

To substantiate this, we have prepared a study showing the increases that have occurred in both freight revenue and tonnage of the Southwestern Rail Lines since 1939. This statement is marked "A" and shows increases up to 115 percent in tons originated, 75 percent in tonnage terminated and revenue up as much as 167 percent when compared with the 1939 figure.

As we have previously stated, we feel that the traffic studies of both the Division Engineers Office and the State of Louisiana are very complete and by complete we mean they cover the fields they were intended to cover, but there are other factors of great importance that are not fully developed and should have a great effect in arriving at proper conclusions in this report.

These omitted factors are of a varying nature. We will endeavor to develop them separately.

UNDEVELOPED TONNAGE

It is our understanding that the tonnage and savings shown in the appendix of the Division Engineers report as Table 9 were secured from the study of rail waybills made by the Board of Investigation and Research in 1939.

If this understanding is correct, it is proper to point out that a substantial amount of traffic has been omitted from this report.

Such omission includes all traffic that moved by Common Carrier Motor Truck, private truck, as well as that tonnage which originated on barge or steamship bills of lading and were terminated by other modes of transportation in the territory covered by the report.

To illustrate, we are aware of heavy movements of pipe and cereal beverage as well as a great deal of high rated tonnage that could not have been included if the study was confined to rail waybills.

We are aware of the difficulty that would be encountered in making such an over-all survey but we respectively submit that some consideration and allowance should be made for this excluded traffic.

We suggest that this might explain the difference between the total tonnage shown in the Department of Public Works' report and that of the Division Engineers Office as the figures submitted by the Valley shippers and receivers to the State Board included all traffic they received regardless of the character of the carrier performing the service.

There are several other small items such as the sugar and newsprint tonnage in Table 9 of the appendix of the Division Engineers report that we feel are rather low but realize that when spot tests are made exaggerated figures both low and high are bound to occur. We, therefore, will not press for any increase in these or other estimates that might be low.

In the Department of Public Works Traffic Study, it is stated that it does not include all available traffic as the time element precluded complete coverage. We believe that they should have allowed some increase in their estimates to cover this feature.

There is another point in that study that is worthy of note and that is the terminal cost shown in Table VI on page 33 covering petroleum and its products.

While we, of course, are not in a position to contradict the figures used, we believe them to be high, as in cases before the Interstate Commerce Commission where the railroads were endeavoring to lower freight rates, terminal costs have been considerably below these figures. In fact, they are as low as 1½ cents per 100 pounds in at least one case.

In F. S. O. 16066 gasoline and kerosene to river points in Alabama (216 I. C. C. 127), this amount is shown as one of the cost factors used to reduce railroad rates to meet barge competition from the New Orleans district to Alabama.

Again turning to the division engineers' interim report we find under subject 35 on page 13 the folowing statement "Analysis indicates reasonable probability that lower cost transportation will stimulate commerce in the Red River Valley, but affords no convenient basis for estimating specific volume and savings on future commerce."

This, we respectfully submit, is a matter that should have been developed further as we sincerely believe that undeveloped or only partly developed tonnage alone could justify this project.

Chief among this category would be the iron ore deposits in East Texas, the savings that would accrue from the refining of petroleum in the vicinity of its production and the distribution of pipe into the important oil fields of the Southwest.

To substantiate this, we submit the following:

PETROLEUM AND PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

In an exhibit of letters of declaration of intention and other matters submitted to the division engineer on 28 November 1944, on page 13, there is a statement showing crude oil production in East Texas and North Louisiana which indicates that there was produced over 28,000,000 tons of crude oil within 100 miles of the proposed northern terminal of this canal.

But by reference to page 15 of the same report, it will be noted that the construction of refineries within the same area has not kept pace with the crude oil production.

To supplement information now in the hands of the engineers we have prepared a 3-page statement showing the production of crude oil, oil refineries, and crude run to still in the area near the proposed northern terminus of this canal. It is marked "Statement B," pages 1 to 3.

The conditions shown, we submit, are brought about by the fact that transportation costs of the refined product out of the producing area is too high when compared to the cost for points where barge service is available.

Should barge transportation be made available to the source of production of the crude oil, then it would be more economical to refine this commodity at its source than to pipe it to the refinery on a navigable stream and then ship via barge to the territory normally served by North Louisiana, East Texas, and South Arkansas refineries.

To substantiate this contention we have prepared a statement marked "C" showing the freight rates on petroleum prescribed by the Interstate Commerce Commission in their Docket 17,000, part 4 and part 4a, to selected points in the southeastern United States and at border points along the Mississippi River.

We have compared with these Commission-prescribed rates the present rates in effect to the same points from Shreveport, La.; El Dorado, Ark.; and Baton Rouge, La.

There is also shown on the right-hand side of this statement the difference in transportation cost per gallon, represented by the different rates and on the bottom the tank-car price quoted in Shreveport on December 5, 1945.

As pointed out at the outset of this statement, I have been connected with the Shreveport Chamber of Commerce for over 21 years and during the early part of my service there was a division of the chamber known as the Oil Refiners Division.

The duties of this division were to handle traffic matters for the several Shreveport refiners and in the handling of this phase of their work it was necessary to keep accurate reports of the shipments of petroleum from all the refiners who were members.

I had access to these records as the work was done at an adjoining desk and at times I participated in their work.

Considering this background, I feel that I can say without fear of successful contradiction that at that time one of the best, if not the best, markets for Shreveport products of petroleum was in the States of Mississippi, western Tennessee, Kentucky, and to somewhat lesser degree the points east of that territory.

In recent years the refining interests in Shreveport have seen this market slowly disintegrate and when consideration is given to the lower transportation cost of their competitors along the navigable streams we believe the reason becomes readily apparent.

When consideration is given to all the factors; that is, the location of the proposed canal with relation to the greatest oil fields in the world with resultant lower net in-bound cost and the demonstrated ability of the interior refineries to meet competition when

transportation costs are equal, we can see no reason why petroleum could not be marketed at great savings to the public from the producing district into the entire central United States.

It was done when transportation costs were equal and we firmly believe that it can be done again at a lower cost when this lateral canal is completed.

We respectfully submit that this fact should be given consideration when future tonnage for this project is being considered.

Before passing from this subject of petroleum we think it would be well to call the attention of this board to the demonstrated inability of existing transportation agencies to develop the oil-refining industry.

While there has been rapid expansion in crude-oil production in the territory proposed to be served by this canal, no corresponding increase in refining has resulted in the same district.

IRON PIPE

Also in the Red River Valley exhibit of letters previously referred to, attention was called to the advantageous location of this project when the distribution of iron pipe to the heavy pipe-consuming area of the Southwest is considered.

This reference is made on pages 8 through 11 and by exhibit 4. Copy of exhibit 4 is attached and marked "Statement D."

The territory included within the border of the red line on this map is the territory that could be served by Shreveport with iron pipe at less over-all cost than through either Memphis or Houston.

This line takes into consideration the barge cost from Pittsburgh to Memphis and Houston found to exist in Interstate Commerce Commission cases and an estimated cost to Shreveport.

The cost to Memphis is $3.60 per ton, to Houston $8 per ton, and the estimated cost is $6.20 to Shreveport. This is the rate that would be applicable to Camden, Ark., on the Ouachita River with its 6-foot channel.

This estimate to Shreveport, we feel, is very conservative.

Added to these costs are the out-bound rail rates as published in tariffs lawfully on file with the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The green line shown on this map is the point at which Shreveport rail freight rates meet those of Memphis and Houston on iron pipe when no consideration is given to the in-bound costs. This is shown as a matter of information only.

In view of the fact that only 100,000 tons of iron pipe, as well as steel articles, are shown, we feel that this potential traffic and the vast saving that would be realized from such traffic have been almost entirely overlooked.

It will be noted that Memphis, Tenn., and Houston, Tex., alone during the year 1939 received 399,059 tons of barge pipe. This, of course, does not take into account the vast quantity received at other river ports, such as Vicksburg, Miss., Indian Village, La., and ports along the Ouachita River.

When the territory that could be served by Shreveport with greater savings is considered, we feel sure that this board will agree that the canal would soon be the major terminal point for this commodity in the South.

The fact that iron pipe constitutes a continuous and heavy-moving item into the Southwest is brought out. This study shows the tonnage of pipe handled by the southwestern rail carriers during the years 1938 to 1944, inclusive.

It will be noted that 1939, the year used in this traffic study, is one of the lighter traffic years, and, in spite of wartime difficulties, this article has continued to move into this area in ever-increasing volume.

A brief explanation of marketing practices of a number of large pipe producers will, we believe, assist this board in its deliberation.

When normal transportation and marketing conditions exist, pipe manufacturers ship in bargeload lots to distribution points along navigable streams from Memphis, Tenn., on the Mississippi River, to Houston, Tex., on the intercoastal canal. This movement is principally from the Pittsburgh area. When their products arrive at the barge terminal, they are placed in storage yards and distributed to the consumers in the Southwest as needed by rail and truck.

The reshipment, of course, is made from the distributing yard offering the least over-all transportation cost from point of manufacture to consumer.

This method of handling does not require fast service to the distributing points as full stocks are maintained at all times. However, when it comes to distributing the pipe to consuming public, speed of service is often a factor as in the oil and gas fields it is very often necessary to have available pipe in varying quantities in the shortest time possible.

Shreveport's nearness to the great oil- and gas-producing areas in the Southwest would make it an ideal center for quick distribution of pipe at the lowest of cost.

The benefit of having large stocks of pipe near the point at which they are to be used, we believe, is best demonstrated by the fact that some distributors stored bargeloads of pipe in Shreveport in spite of the fact that it was necessary to move this commodity by rail into Shreveport from river terminals such as Vicksburg, Miss.

The Interstate Commerce Commission, in their decision in Investigation and Suspension Docket 4699, wrought-iron pipe from Memphis to Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas (237 I. C. C. 161), have a rather complete coverage of the iron-pipe situation into the Southwest should the board desire more detailed information on this subject.

STATEMENT OF THE RAILROAD

Through courtesy of a representative of the railroads we have been furnished with their statement titled "Statement of the Railroads Before the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors November 26, 1945, in Regard to Red River Lateral Canal" in which certain aspects of the department of public works' "The Case for Red River Lateral Canal" are criticized.

While addressed to figures and conclusions of the State body, and we are sure they have or will reply in full, we cannot refrain from pointing out several inconsistencies that appear even to those of us who have had only limited contact with the preparation of material submitted by this State body.

Throughout this statement they refrain from submitting terminal costs on petroleum and its production that are more nearly in line with the figures that have been used in their cases before the Interstate Commerce Commission.

In brief, what they have done is to criticize the line-haul costs used by the State for the reason that they are under those prescribed by the OPA as ceiling but have consistently refrained from calling attention to the terminal costs which they themselves have submitted in cases before the Interstate Commerce Commission when they desired relief to reduce rates to meet water competition.

Also on page 10 of their statement, criticism is made of the metal product ratings used, especially those in table VIII and by their exhibit 2 attempt to show that the rates in that table are too low.

This is done by comparing the ratings used with those applicable to Ouachita River ports. But in this connection, it should be noted that the rates shown in their exhibit are lower than those used in table VIII.

In spite of this fact, they, by some method of averaging not exactly clear to us, claim that the savings shown should be reduced.

In conclusion we wish to point out several fundamental errors made throughout the statement of the railroad.

The first is that they apparently assume there is no cost to the public for handling of shipments other than the published tariff rates when the movement of commodities is by a land carrier. This is not often the case as loading or unloading of vehicle is a cost item regardless of the mode of transportation used.

The second of these errors is that they seem to assume, with the possible exception of petroleum, that common carriers are used in handling interior traffic to the barge terminals.

Investigation, we are sure, will dispel this belief, as all types of private carriers are also employed including drive-away of automobiles.

At several points in their statement reference and comparison are made to Ouachita traffic and costs.

We feel it is not proper to compare the conditions existing on the Ouachita with its 6-foot channel to those that would exist on a 9-foot channel as proposed for this project as the costs would be entirely different.

Possibly the most erroneous assumption made is that no savings should be allowed when traffic can be secured near the consuming point.

This assumption is shown on page 23 where it is stated that "undoubtedly the only cement that could be handled to Shreveport by barge is that originating in the Houston district" and again on page 24 a statement is made that brick are produced in Waskom, Tex.

We feel that it is not necessary to point out to this Board that business is not transacted in that manner. Articles are not always bought or sold at the nearest point of production. Too many other factors are involved.

Compulsory Peacetime Military Training—A Teacher Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, Washington said, "Guard well the Constitution." Now that we with our form of government have attained a preeminent place among world powers, we must guard well the education and advancement of the youth of this country. There is inserted herewith a letter expressing the views of a State leader of educators of this country:

OMAHA, NEBR., *February 4, 1946.*

Representative COMPTON I. WHITE,
Representative of Idaho,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: During the next 2 or 3 weeks there will be hundreds of 18-year-olds graduating from high schools and completing one semester of college work. What is their fate? The draft, of course, unless there are enough Congressmen who believe that drafting minors is a

forward to a practicable and workable solution. That is the essence of democracy, the mainspring of progress, and the assurance that the cause of health will be promoted as the Nation's most priceless and enduring asset.

Red River Lateral Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 8, 1946

Mr. **BROOKS.** Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by E. B. Wilson before the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in behalf of Red River Valley Improvement Association in regard to Red River lateral canal:

My name is E. B. Wilson. I am traffic manager of the Shreveport Chamber of Commerce and have had the privilege of serving that organization in their traffic department for over 21 years. I am presently on loan to the Red River Valley Improvement Association and represent that association in this hearing.

Prior to the time of my association with the Shreveport Chamber I was connected with a railroad auditing department whose line operated through the Red River and Mississippi Valleys between Shreveport and New Orleans.

W first wish to congratulate both the division engineers office and the Department of Public Works of the State of Louisiana on the detailed studies made in connection with the prospective traffic and savings on that traffic for this proposed project.

The department of public works study is entitled "The Case for the Red River Valley Lateral Canal" and accompanied the interim report as exhibit 1 (see subject 37).

It seems rather remarkable that the total tonnage and savings should be so near equal when consideration is given to the fact that different years were used and the material available for the separate studies was secured from entirely different sources and by different methods.

The selection of the year 1939 or 1940, we feel, was proper as these years more nearly reflect normal conditions than would any of the war years or the depression or semidepression years prior to 1939.

While we, of course, are not advocating the use of years other than those selected, we feel it is well to print out that had any of the years 1941 to 1944, inclusive, been selected greater tonnage and savings would have resulted.

To substantiate this, we have prepared a study showing the increases that have occurred in both freight revenue and tonnage of the Southwestern Rail Lines since 1939. This statement is marked "A" and shows increases up to 115 percent in tons originated, 75 percent in tonnage terminated and revenue up as much as 167 percent when compared with the 1939 figure.

As we have previously stated, we feel that the traffic studies of both the Division Engineers Office and the State of Louisiana are very complete and by complete we mean they cover the fields they were intended to cover, but there are other factors of great importance that are not fully developed and should have a great effect in arriving at proper conclusions in this report.

These omitted factors are of a varying nature. We will endeavor to develop them separately.

UNDEVELOPED TONNAGE

It is our understanding that the tonnage and savings shown in the appendix of the Division Engineers report as Table 9 were secured from the study of rail waybills made by the Board of Investigation and Research in 1939.

If this understanding is correct, it is proper to point out that a substantial amount of traffic has been omitted from this report.

Such omission includes all traffic that moved by Common Carrier Motor Truck, private truck, as well as that tonnage which originated on barge or steamship bills of lading and were terminated by other modes of transportation in the territory covered by the report.

To illustrate, we are aware of heavy movements of pipe and cereal beverage as well as a great deal of high rated tonnage that could not have been included if the study was confined to rail waybills.

We are aware of the difficulty that would be encountered in making such an over-all survey but we respectively submit that some consideration and allowance should be made for this excluded traffic.

We suggest that this might explain the difference between the total tonnage shown in the Department of Public Works' report and that of the Division Engineers Office as the figures submitted by the Valley shippers and receivers to the State Board included all traffic they received regardless of the character of the carrier performing the service.

There are several other small items such as the sugar and newsprint tonnage in Table 9 of the appendix of the Division Engineers report that we feel are rather low but realize that when spot tests are made exaggerated figures both low and high are bound to occur. We, therefore, will not press for any increase in these or other estimates that might be low.

In the Department of Public Works Traffic Study, it is stated that it does not include all available traffic as the time element precluded complete coverage. We believe that they should have allowed some increase in their estimates to cover this feature.

There is another point in that study that is worthy of note and that is the terminal cost shown in Table VI on page 33 covering petroleum and its products.

While we, of course, are not in a position to contradict the figures used, we believe them to be high, as in cases before the Interstate Commerce Commission where the railroads were endeavoring to lower freight rates, terminal costs have been considerably below these figures. In fact, they are as low as 1½ cents per 100 pounds in at least one case.

In F. S. O. 16066 gasoline and kerosene to river points in Alabama (216 I. C. C. 127), this amount is shown as one of the cost factors used to reduce railroad rates to meet barge competition from the New Orleans district to Alabama.

Again turning to the division engineers' interim report we find under subject 35 on page 13 the folowing statement "Analysis indicates reasonable probability that lower cost transportation will stimulate commerce in the Red River Valley, but affords no convenient basis for estimating specific volume and savings on future commerce."

This, we respectfully submit, is a matter that should have been developed further as we sincerely believe that undeveloped or only partly developed tonnage alone could justify this project.

Chief among this category would be the iron ore deposits in East Texas, the savings that would accrue from the refining of petroleum in the vicinity of its production and the distribution of pipe into the important oil fields of the Southwest.

To substantiate this, we submit the following:

PETROLEUM AND PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

In an exhibit of letters of declaration of intention and other matters submitted to the division engineer on 28 November 1944, on page 13, there is a statement showing crude oil production in East Texas and North Louisiana which indicates that there was produced over 28,000,000 tons of crude oil within 100 miles of the proposed northern terminal of this canal.

But by reference to page 15 of the same report, it will be noted that the construction of refineries within the same area has not kept pace with the crude oil production.

To supplement information now in the hands of the engineers we have prepared a 3-page statement showing the production of crude oil, oil refineries, and crude run to still in the area near the proposed northern terminus of this canal. It is marked "Statement B," pages 1 to 3.

The conditions shown, we submit, are brought about by the fact that transportation costs of the refined product out of the producing area is too high when compared to the cost for points where barge service is available.

Should barge transportation be made available to the source of production of the crude oil, then it would be more economical to refine this commodity at its source than to pipe it to the refinery on a navigable stream and then ship via barge to the territory normally served by North Louisiana, East Texas, and South Arkansas refineries.

To substantiate this contention we have prepared a statement marked "C" showing the freight rates on petroleum prescribed by the Interstate Commerce Commission in their Docket 17,000, part 4 and part 4a, to selected points in the southeastern United States and at border points along the Mississippi River.

We have compared with these Commission-prescribed rates the present rates in effect to the same points from Shreveport, La.; El Dorado, Ark.; and Baton Rouge, La.

There is also shown on the right-hand side of this statement the difference in transportation cost per gallon, represented by the different rates and on the bottom the tank-car price quoted in Shreveport on December 5, 1945.

As pointed out at the outset of this statement, I have been connected with the Shreveport Chamber of Commerce for over 21 years and during the early part of my service there was a division of the chamber known as the Oil Refiners Division.

The duties of this division were to handle traffic matters for the several Shreveport refiners and in the handling of this phase of their work it was necessary to keep accurate reports of the shipments of petroleum from all the refiners who were members.

I had access to these records as the work was done at an adjoining desk and at times I participated in their work.

Considering this background, I feel that I can say without fear of successful contradiction that at that time one of the best, if not the best, markets for Shreveport products of petroleum was in the States of Mississippi, western Tennessee, Kentucky, and to somewhat lesser degree the points east of that territory.

In recent years the refining interests in Shreveport have seen this market slowly disintegrate and when consideration is given to the lower transportation cost of their competitors along the navigable streams we believe the reason becomes readily apparent.

When consideration is given to all the factors; that is, the location of the proposed canal with relation to the greatest oil fields in the world with resultant lower net in-bound cost and the demonstrated ability of the interior refineries to meet competition when

transportation costs are equal, we can see no reason why petroleum could not be marketed at great savings to the public from the producing district into the entire central United States.

It was done when transportation costs were equal and we firmly believe that it can be done again at a lower cost when this lateral canal is completed.

We respectfully submit that this fact should be given consideration when future tonnage for this project is being considered.

Before passing from this subject of petroleum we think it would be well to call the attention of this board to the demonstrated inability of existing transportation agencies to develop the oil-refining industry.

While there has been rapid expansion in crude-oil production in the territory proposed to be served by this canal, no corresponding increase in refining has resulted in the same district.

IRON PIPE

Also in the Red River Valley exhibit of letters previously referred to, attention was called to the advantageous location of this project when the distribution of iron pipe to the heavy pipe-consuming area of the Southwest is considered.

This reference is made on pages 8 through 11 and by exhibit 4. Copy of exhibit 4 is attached and marked "Statement D."

The territory included within the border of the red line on this map is the territory that could be served by Shreveport with iron pipe at less over-all cost than through either Memphis or Houston.

This line takes into consideration the barge cost from Pittsburgh to Memphis and Houston found to exist in Interstate Commerce Commission cases and an estimated cost to Shreveport.

The cost to Memphis is $3.60 per ton, to Houston $8 per ton, and the estimated cost is $6.80 to Shreveport. This is the rate that we applicable to Camden, Ark., on the Ouachita River with its 6-foot channel.

This estimate to Shreveport, we feel, is very conservative.

Added to these costs are the out-bound rail rates as published in tariffs lawfully on file with the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The green line shown on this map is the point at which Shreveport rail freight rates meet those of Memphis and Houston on iron pipe when no consideration is given to the in-bound costs. This is shown as a matter of information only.

In view of the fact that only 100,000 tons of iron pipe, as well as steel articles, are shown, we feel that this potential traffic and the vast saving that would be realized from such traffic have been almost entirely overlooked.

It will be noted that Memphis, Tenn., and Houston, Tex., alone during the year 1939 received 399,059 tons of barge pipe. This, of course, does not take into account the vast quantity received at other river ports, such as Vicksburg, Miss., Indian Village, La., and ports along the Ouachita River.

When the territory that could be served by Shreveport with greater savings is considered, we feel sure that this board will agree that the canal would soon be the major terminal point for this commodity in the South.

The fact that iron pipe constitutes a continuous and heavy-moving item into the Southwest is brought out. This study shows the tonnage of pipe handled by the southwestern rail carriers during the years 1938 to 1944, inclusive.

It will be noted that 1939, the year used in this traffic study, is one of the lighter traffic years, and, in spite of wartime difficulties, this article has continued to move into this area in ever-increasing volume.

A brief explanation of marketing practices of a number of large pipe producers will, we believe, assist this board in its deliberation.

When normal transportation and marketing conditions exist, pipe manufacturers ship in bargeload lots to distribution points along navigable streams from Memphis, Tenn., on the Mississippi River, to Houston, Tex., on the intercoastal canal. This movement is principally from the Pittsburgh area. When their products arrive at the barge terminal, they are placed in storage yards and distributed to the consumers in the Southwest as needed by rail and truck.

The reshipment, of course, is made from the distributing yard offering the least over-all transportation cost from point of manufacture to consumer.

This method of handling does not require fast service to the distributing points as full stocks are maintained at all times. However, when it comes to distributing the pipe to consuming public, speed of service is often a factor as in the oil and gas fields it is very often necessary to have available pipe in varying quantities in the shortest time possible.

Shreveport's nearness to the great oil- and gas-producing areas in the Southwest would make it an ideal center for quick distribution of pipe at the lowest of cost.

The benefit of having large stocks of pipe near the point at which they are to be used, we believe, is best demonstrated by the fact that some distributors stored bargeloads of pipe in Shreveport in spite of the fact that it was necessary to move this commodity by rail into Shreveport from river terminals such as Vicksburg, Miss.

The Interstate Commerce Commission, in their decision in Investigation and Suspension Docket 4699, wrought-iron pipe from Memphis to Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas (237 I. C. C. 161), have a rather complete coverage of the iron-pipe situation into the Southwest should the board desire more detailed information on this subject.

STATEMENT OF THE RAILROAD

Through courtesy of a representative of the railroads we have been furnished with their statement titled "Statement of the Railroads Before the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors November 26, 1945, in Regard to Red River Lateral Canal" in which certain aspects of the department of public works' "The Case for Red River Lateral Canal" are criticized.

While addressed to figures and conclusions of the State body, and we are sure they have or will reply in full, we cannot refrain from pointing out several inconsistencies that appear even to those of us who have had only limited contact with the preparation of material submitted by this State body.

Throughout this statement they refrain from submitting terminal costs on petroleum and its production that are more nearly in line with the figures that have been used in their cases before the Interstate Commerce Commission.

In brief, what they have done is to criticize the line-haul costs used by the State for the reason that they are under those prescribed by the OPA as ceiling but have consistently refrained from calling attention to the terminal costs which they themselves have submitted in cases before the Interstate Commerce Commission when they desired relief to reduce rates to meet water competition.

Also on page 10 of their statement, criticism is made of the metal product ratings used, especially those in table VIII and by their exhibit 2 attempt to show that the rates in that table are too low.

This is done by comparing the ratings used with those applicable to Ouachita River ports. But in this connection, it should be noted that the rates shown in their exhibit are lower than those used in table VIII.

In spite of this fact, they, by some method of averaging not exactly clear to us, claim that the savings shown should be reduced.

In conclusion we wish to point out several fundamental errors made throughout the statement of the railroad.

The first is that they apparently assume there is no cost to the public for handling of shipments other than the published tariff rates when the movement of commodities is by a land carrier. This is not often the case as loading or unloading of vehicle is a cost item regardless of the mode of transportation used.

The second of these errors is that they seem to assume, with the possible exception of petroleum, that common carriers are used in handling interior traffic to the barge terminals.

Investigation, we are sure, will dispel this belief, as all types of private carriers are also employed including drive-away of automobiles.

At several points in their statement reference and comparison are made to Ouachita traffic and costs.

We feel it is not proper to compare the conditions existing on the Ouachita with its 6-foot channel to those that would exist on a 9-foot channel as proposed for this project as the costs would be entirely different.

Possibly the most erroneous assumption made is that no savings should be allowed when traffic can be secured near the consuming point.

This assumption is shown on page 23 where it is stated that "undoubtedly the only cement that could be handled to Shreveport by barge is that originating in the Houston district" and again on page 24 a statement is made that brick are produced in Waskom, Tex.

We feel that it is not necessary to point out to this Board that business is not transacted in that manner. Articles are not always bought or sold at the nearest point of production. Too many other factors are involved.

Compulsory Peacetime Military Training—A Teacher Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, Washington said, "Guard well the Constitution." Now that we with our form of government have attained a preeminent place among world powers, we must guard well the education and advancement of the youth of this country. There is inserted herewith a letter expressing the views of a State leader of educators of this country:

OMAHA, NEBR., *February 4, 1946.*

Representative COMPTON I. WHITE,
Representative of Idaho,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: During the next 2 or 3 weeks there will be hundreds of 18-year-olds graduating from high schools and completing one semester of college work. What is their fate? The draft, of course, unless there are enough Congressmen who believe that drafting minors is a

vicious thing and who will work to end the draft as of September 2, 1945, immediately.

To force these youngsters into Army camps since September 2, 1945, where they must submit to the iron heel of militarism is one of the quickest ways for the present Congress to end the American way of life. It is common knowledge that no democracy is practiced in any Army camp at any time. Besides there is ample opportunity provided for these children to learn to loaf, to drink, and to carouse. The statistics on venereal diseases among the members of the American Army are a disgrace. What decent men and women can throw 18-year-olds into such environment, thus aiding and abetting the delinquency of our American youth on a national scale? Evidently the Canadian people think more of their youth than do the American Congressmen. The Canadian 18-year-olds are not being drafted. They have freedom.

Any honest Army man will admit that voluntary enlistments and reenlistments are plentiful enough to make drafting unnecessary now. I have been told so by a responsible officer in a recruiting office. Then, why is the administration and Congress so determined to continue drafting 18-year-olds? It is reasonable to suspect that there is some insidious reason for the procedure. Could there be another Pearl Harbor coming up which the leaders know about and desire to keep a secret?

Yours very truly,

FLORENCE B. REYNOLDS.

To Think and Speak Clearly Without Confusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 8, 1946

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, a British statesman, who during the closing days of the First World War, came to the United States—I think with reference to a little loan—made a speech in my home State of Ohio, and said among other things that England already had suffered so severely that a century of sorrow would follow that conflict in their islands. He was, being an Englishman, a first-rate orator. You know what I mean—the voice, the accent, the world-weary air, the glittering phrases, the chairman-of-the-board clothes, and the main-dining-room manners. He made a great impression on those who heard him and the next day the paper printed practically everything he said. It was a fair and generous news treatment, I would say, but the man who wrote the editorials differed somewhat—although he praised the orator highly—with the speaker. A century of sorrow, remarked the editor, would madden the world. He suggested that while he got the gentleman's point, he felt that the visitor had somewhat overspoken himself. Britain has had tough going, the editor said, but so have a lot of other people, and history records no instance of one tragic act or a tragic era of several years becoming a century of sorrow.

"Even the Confederates," he said, "stripped of their fortunes, deprived of their slaves, undernourished and badly clothed, half sick and bereft of their loved ones, achieved a measure of happiness in a very short time, and were lighthearted and gay long before 1870. By 1872 they were producing no end of comedians," said the editor, "and sending most of them to Congress." The gentlemen from the South will please remember that I am quoting an editorial and that the sentiments expressed therein do not necessarily represent any opinions of my own, although I have been accused of worse offenses and with more accuracy. Anyway, that is the kind of editorial it was. You have to be in the mood for it, I suppose, as you do for this speech of mine. There was, of course, a sponsoring committee of the chamber of commerce which had brought the English visitor to town and they were indignant. They did not see the pictures of the man on page one, and apparently did not even look at the three and a half columns of news, or the eight-column line on the front page. They went directly to the editorial, and picked out the one sentence or two in which the editor had suggested that maybe the visitor had unwittingly exaggerated a bit, and how they raised hob with that editor. I do not know how the controversy ended but the chamber of commerce was mad at the editor for a long time, a situation which has happened before and since in many cities and in time everybody forgot about it, as is the way of all flesh.

Shortly after the First World War and in its final stages we had a quick-tempered period of a year or more, during which nobody seemed to want to get along with anybody else. We had held our tempers and had worked together, and it was quite a strain. Finally we got rid of the pressure and then we started in to hammer each other again.

We again are in a condition, having whipped Germany a second time, comparable to that of 1919 and 1920. We are quick tempered and most of us are hopped on one subject or another, and this time in our history, as was 1919–20, has become a time of irresponsible oratory. Oratory, as you may have heard, has been defined as indiscretion set to music. About our native American oratory at this time in our history, as was the case in 1919, there is the flavor of cocksureness. Whether a man is speaking on the necessity for sharing the secrets of the atomic bomb or is advocating a Government subsidy for the National Plant-More-Trailing-Arbutus Society he seems to be certain, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that unless everybody votes his way, all the voyage of our lives will be bound in shallows and in miseries.

The condition I describe is peculiar to war. I am intimately familiar with the postwar oratory of the First World War and of the present or recently ended, we hope, World War. The similarity is unmistakable. I am familiar also through childhood memories of tales my uncles told me and through my reading with the postwar period following the Civil War. The same "my way or nothing" tone was in the speeches of the seventies and eighties too, I can assure you. Whether it was Thaddeus Stevens and his followers or the men from south of the Potomac, or the newly returned generals in my own Ohio, it was always the same. To have heard James J. Blaine tell it, there was no future for America unless he was able to build the Fort Smith and Little Rock Railroad, and to hear Henry Woodfin Grady tell it at Atlanta, there was no chance for the Southern States or the Northern States either, unless the cotton planters started to raise something besides cotton. Well, to mention an instance, they are still raising nothing but cotton and the world has not yet come to an end, that is, unless some oratory I heard the other night forecasts the end of everything. If I remember correctly this latest argument was to the effect that the word "fissible" instead of the word "fissionable" be used in S. 1717 relating to the atomic bomb, research having to do with it, and patents which later may be obtained relating to it. Disaster will follow unless the word is changed.

I started to do this speech as a magazine article and call it Some Aspects of Oratory of the Postwar Character, Showing the Similarity Between War as Indicated by the Finality of What Spellbinders Say, but the article was too long, and so was the title, so I decided to do it as speech and merely call it The Horrors of War.

I would be neglecting the subject if I did not devote at least a part of the time I have to the postwar oratory of the left.

For the left, ladies and gentlemen, surpasses all other groupings of American life at least in one respect. They are surer than anybody else that unless they have their way something worse than anybody else has ever suggested will happen to everybody. The motto of the left used to be "Arise, comrades, you have nothing to lose but your chains." That stirring Marxist injunction has now been changed. What they are saying now is "Damn your story; listen to mine."

Maybe that is due to the fact that nobody on the left has any chains any more. The chains, if we believe everything we hear, are now shackling free enterprise. Anyway and whatever the reason, you do not read much about chains now except in PM, the adless newspaper, and then it is only in connection with a recommendation that chains be affixed to somebody they do not like.

The extreme right, called Fascists by the left, is calling the left communistic, and shaking their heads in solemn belief; they finally have sold themselves that the American way of life is gone forever.

Oratory, emitted from the lungs of orators with cathedral chimes and Waterbury movement, was never more interesting than it is right now, and I urge all of you to hear as much of it as you can and to remember as little of it as possible.

Some of you may be able to make a nice piece of change out of collecting and studying it, for nothing that any person can write will be quite as ridiculous as the excerpt itself, and I imagine that a grouping of these excerpts will provide delightful reading. You can call the collection Not Quite Gone With the Wind, and it should be a best seller.

All of which is preliminary to a few words I have to say today which I assure you are not oratorical. The fine-drawn tempers of most of us, the preoccupation with the various causes we espouse, the misplaced emphasis on things which most of us, quite sincerely, set heavy importance, together with the habit of the times, I refer to the habit of pointing to complete disaster as the alternative of our own particular frustrations, should cause us to do a little calm reflecting. We have got to practice the practical, and we must eternally remind ourselves that the world is not coming to an end tomorrow—or even soon thereafter.

While the atomic bomb changed the character of warfare and is changing the nature of international relations, while it conceivably can change communications, industry, shipping, and many other related activities of man, we should remind ourselves that it has not changed man at all.

He continues to be pretty much the same sort of creature he always has been. He knows a little more now than he ever did, and he is frightened by things which were undreamt of in our knowledge of a few years ago.

But the lessons he learned in the home in which he was reared, the precepts of Poor Richard's Almanac and the unchanging and irrefutable lessons of Holy Writ are forming his conception, as they always have, and singly and in the mass, will determine his course of action.

I am aware that I may now be accused of being naive, and comparable to that well-meaning gentleman who a few days ago dismissed the controversy between the CIO and the United States Steel Corp. by saying that the whole matter should be left to the Golden Rule and principles of Christian adjudication.

I know quite well that if that remedy were feasible it would work. I know also that if we had had for 1,900 years a genuine widespread devotion to the Christain faith in practice and performance we would have had no wars, even those which were definitely excited by religious differences.

But I am childlike enough to hope and to believe that devotion to the faith of our fathers will help us at least to achieve a certain calmness in these distressing times, particularly with reference to the extreme bitterness which controversy has aroused.

After all, what can we do in the face of these frightening problems which press down upon us? We can recognize the truth of the fact that one man's life and preachments are isolated and futile. He can be effective only when acting in unison. What should be his course? His course should be formed on the basis of his experience. He can do only what seems to be best to him. What should guide him? Obviously there is nothing better than Christian principles. What are his reliances? They are the common ordinary reliances of life as we know it. Work, thrift, prudence, unity, the recognition that every man would like to be a little bit better than he is. The essential good will of all peoples once they are informed. Education. Information. Understanding.

Oratory has forced a lot of us to think that we must present some answer, as unusual and as breathtaking as the atomic bomb, to the questions we face merely because they are big and unprecedented and frightening. My point is that we can face them only with the assets we have always possessed, and these I have just recounted.

As a Nation we owe two hundred and ninety-seven billions. That is quite a problem. Here in our own country and with reference to other countries, we face the problem of what to do about the atomic bomb. And that is truly a frightening question. All over the face of the earth people are in rebellion, and that poses many a question for us. We are in Japan and in Germany. How long should we stay? Or should we? Great Britain wants to borrow $4,000,000,000 or more. Can we afford to lend it? Can we afford not to lend it?

These are the questions, some of them. Our weapons are the capsule weapons of our daily lives. We Americans know enough to go to those among us who are better informed than we are for advice. We have experts and we call on them. But the basis of our procedure is the essential common sense of the common man. We must practice the practical.

I need hardly point out the fact that Russia and Great Britain have foreign policies which cause a lot of us to look for the indirect and the mysterious and the delayed effect of cause. We are looking for them to pull, as the saying goes, something smart. I think that a sound study of either proves that common sense is at the basis of what they do, the moves they make, the plans they propose. Self-interest in varying degrees enlightened and common sense guide them, and these virtues should guide us. There is nothing smart about them. They are intensely practical. They make use of the experts among them and these experts are guided by the common sense of their leaders, who are common men lifted slightly in stature.

We can well afford to do the same. The year 1946 instead of being a year of controversy and baffling and confusing ideas, each pushed by a group of fanatics, ought to be a year of national common sense. As a Nation we are greater than either Russia or Britain and greater than our late enemies. All we need to do is to use the assets, mental and physical, that we have, and guide the use of them on the basis of practical procedure, the procedure we have always found workable. It built our country, our cities, our great schools, and our great businesses, and in it is the solution for our difficulties of today.

Label Thinking Our Greatest Danger to Democracy — Well-Informed Public Opinion Is Vital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 8, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me, I take pleasure in presenting and inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD what I think is one of the finest contributions in editorial writing which I have ever read. I believe it to be especially appropriate at this time, especially in the history of our Nation and in our international relations.

As a Member of this great Congress I wish to again emphatically say it will mean everything to the permanency of our democratic way of life if some ways or means can be found and some methods used whereby people of America can learn what the facts are and then learn to think through these facts themselves, then participate in the political life of their Nation as the result of informed thinking. Both sides of every issue should be known to all people who have to determine the issues. Only by an informed democracy can there be an enduring one. Only as the individuals who make public opinion think through for themselves by having facts of both sides before them can there be an enduring democracy.

This editorial appeared in the Long Beach Independent, which is one of the two newspapers printed in my home city of Long Beach, Calif., under date of February 1, 1946:

LABEL THINKING

A well-informed public opinion can usually be depended upon to make the right decision. No people in the world have such an opportunity of being well informed as the American people. But few take advantage of the opportunity. With the opportunities available to read or hear both sides of each issue most of our people let someone else do their thinking for them.

A well-balanced newspaper has columnists presenting all sides of controversial issues. Some of these columnists are definitely to the left, some to the right. Some present views and conclusions opposite to those of the editor of the paper. But when all are read and considered, a well-balanced view of all issues is ascertained.

The trouble is that some newspapers will not carry columnists who are opposed to the views or policies of the paper. But even where such controversial viewpoints are presented the readers are prone to read only those with which they agree. If newspapers slant their news and use only columnists with which they agree, the tendency is to have only one class of subscribers and readers.

The same condition is true of the radio. The average listeners who have a favorite radio commentator turn off the commentator who has expressed views with which they disagree. The result is that they become label thinkers. They actually do not think, but rather accept the views of someone who expresses opinions that fit into their social or economic class.

Business and professional men have the habit of meeting only those who move within their economic and social groups. They meet the same people in the office, at luncheon, and at social functions. Because they all have the same views and problems they come to feel they know what the public is thinking. Their daily lives are like being on a merry-go-round. They get off at the same place each day. Their thinking or conclusions are labeled. They have not exposed themselves to any ideas not expressed within their own limited circles.

This is also true of workers. It is particularly true of union members. They read their union bulletins or papers. They associate chiefly with other union members, listen to radio programs recommended by the unions. They become labeled and class conscious. Rarely do they make an effort or have the opportunity to meet the employer or professional man. They have little understanding of the employer's problems.

Between these two groups is the two-thirds of our people who are neither employers or union members. They are the white-collar workers, farmers, clerks, school teachers, and individually employed people. These people are the best balanced in their thinking and attitude toward our social and economic problems. But even these people fall into label thinking. They fall into the habit of only reading or listening to those who express views with which they agree.

There are many sides to each issue, and all sides are available to anyone seeking the facts. Our freedom of press and of speech makes it possible to express different views. Where there is competition between newspapers and radio the people are assured of such facts and views being presented. But if the individuals are too lazy or too narrow to expose themselves to all the facts and views, they become label thinkers. Label thinkers are the greatest danger to a democracy where a well-informed public opinion is so vital.

L. A. C.

The Labor Bill Offers Both Sides Equality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 8, 1946

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the Toledo (Ohio) Times:

THE LABOR BILL OFFERS BOTH SIDES EQUALITY

The so-called tough labor bill seems destined to win approval in the House of Representatives despite vigorous opposition.

The Case bill, as it is known, has withstood the impact of at least 20 amendments, all designed to compromise its regulations. Members of the House are determined to restore order to chaotic industrial conditions through justice established by law.

If there is anything wrong with the bill, it is probably calling it "tough." Actually it demands nothing more than orderly reasoning in the settlement of labor disputes which are threatening to restrict production for years.

The bill would set up a Government mediation board with the power to step into labor situations, and with enough authority to forbid lock-outs or strikes for a period of 30 days. It also would permit the use of court injunctions against both management and labor. It would outlaw boycotts and violence on the picket lines. And, most important, it would provide for civil suits which could be filed either by labor or management.

The bill seeks equality in the treatment of unions and industry. In doing this it invests unions with a financial responsibility which has been missing from the labor picture. The bill would make it possible for a union to sue a company, and for a company to sue a union. Fines and other penalties could be levied against either through regular court procedure.

The bill is not "tough" or unfair to anyone. If a company violates a contract, that company could be sued. The same applies to unions. This is the kind of equality and justice upon which the firm foundation of our independence has been erected. It is justice as we have come to recognize it through our court system. In business life, if a man violates a contract, he can be, and often is, sued. And if the courts find him at fault, his assets can be attached until settlement is made.

Such a bill would stabilize labor. It would make the union member realize that his union has made a contract for which he is personally responsible. It works the other way with equal effect. If a company breaks a contract, the union can sue, instead of striking, get a court judgment, and collect damages in cash.

What the Case proposal provides is that we shall, if it becomes a law, throw our labor disputes, just as we do with all other deadlocked business disputes, into the courts. Under such a program, most of our labor difficulties should soon disappear.

If a company should lose a decision, its funds could be impounded until settlement is made. The same principle would apply if a union lost a court decision. And you can rest assured that the unions are not going to pay much out of their treasuries to employers without getting wise to the fact that law is law. So long as it would work both ways, nothing could be fairer.

The law also discourages violence in picket lines. It would contribute much to making order out of the chaos which already has frozen much of America's production.

The Case bill will never injure an honest and just man, whether he represents a company or a union. Both would receive the same justice upon which we have built our whole system of personal security.

Statehood for Hawaii Important to Future American Policy in Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 8, 1946

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to present some of the opening paragraphs of an article in the Christian Science Monitor of January 14 by DeWitt H. John on the question of statehood for Hawaii.

The author of this article is a staff writer of the Christian Science Monitor who served in the Hawaiian Islands as a naval lieutenant on the Pacific Fleet staff of Fleet Admiral Chester W. Nimitz.

Mr. John has pointed out very effectively the importance of the question of statehood for Hawaii to future American policy in the Pacific in the paragraphs of his article that follow:

Should Hawaii, melting pot of many diverse races, cross roads of Pacific commerce, strategic outpost of American military power, be admitted as a full-fledged State in the American Union?

This question, vigorously debated in the decade preceding Pearl Harbor, is of particular urgency today because of its relation to future American policy in the Pacific.

The present is a transitional period. The pattern of American peacetime policy is just beginning to emerge.

By deciding the Hawaiian issue, Congress will take an important step in deciding the character and extent of United States policy and influence in the Pacific.

* * * * *

If Congress, in a formal vote on the Hawaiian bill now pending before a House committee, were to reject Hawaiian statehood, this step—plus prospective American relinquishment of authority in the Philippines and eventually in other Pacific-Asiatic areas—well might be interpreted in foreign capitals as presaging an equivocal or weak-kneed American policy in the Pacific.

If, on the other hand, Congress should decisively grant statehood to Hawaii, American hegemony in the Pacific would be confirmed. Such a vote would move the domestic frontiers of the United States proper 2,200 miles westward, establish the first overseas American State, and establish an American lake between San Francisco and Honolulu secure beyond reach of any vicissitudes of policy. It would serve notice on the world anew that the Central and Western Pacific constitute a defense zone of the United States.

The Great Falls Army Air Base

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 8, 1946

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am including in the RECORD a letter and a brief in support of the retention, by the Army, of their air base at Great Falls, Mont. The letter and the brief explain far better than I can, the need and the usefulness of this base. I know, Mr. Speaker, I speak for my colleagues from Montana in the House and Senate as well as for the people of my State on this matter. It is my hope that the Army and the Congress will see fit to retain this exceptionally good base. To quote the words of Mr. Charles B. Anderson, chairman, airways committee of the Great Falls Chamber of Commerce: "We believe that common sense in planning for the defense of our country in the future, demands that this base, above all others, be retained as a permanent installation."

The letter and brief follow:

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Great Falls, Mont., January 29, 1946.

The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
The House of Represenatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MIKE: The No. 1 project of the Great Falls Chamber of Commerce for the year 1946 is to see to it that the Army air base east of the city, known as the East Base, be made a permanent air-base installation. We earnestly solicit your assistance in this project. While we understand this base has already been selected by the Army as a permanent site, we nevertheless believe that its ultimate destiny will rest with the Congress.

Our reasons for wishing this Army air base to be made permanent are not entirely selfish, though we believe it would be a fine thing for both our city and the State of Montana. Primarily, however, we believe that common sense in planning for the defense of our country in the future, demands that this base, above all others, be retained as a permanent installation.

To support our beliefs we have prepared the enclosed information for your study and consideration. We trust that you will direct this information to the proper committees when this matter comes before the Congress and that we may have your assurances of support. If you desire further evidence of the necessity for the retention of the Army air base at Great Falls as a permanent base, or if you wish additional copies of this brief, please feel free to call on us at any time.

We have discussed this matter with Mr. E. W. Rising, our Washington representative, who will be glad to cooperate with you in every way possible. Mr. Rising's address is 710 Atlantic Building, 930 F Street NW.

With kind personal regards for your continued success, we remain,

Respectfully yours,
GREAT FALLS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
C. B. ANDERSON, *Chairman,*
Airways Committee.

BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF RETENTION OF THE ARMY AIR BASE AT GREAT FALLS, MONT., AS A PERMANENT ARMY AIR BASE

(Prepared by airways committee, Great Falls Chamber of Commerce, January 29, 1946)

THE ARMY AIR BASE, GREAT FALLS, MONT.

Strategic geographical location

The Army air base at Great Falls, Mont., is located in a highly strategic spot in any defense system for the country. It is the most northern base just east of the protective Rocky Mountain barrier where weather for flying is as nearly perfect as can be found anywhere in the United States. (See attached exhibit.) It is the nearest fully equipped Army air base to the friendly Canadian Province of Alberta, with which a fine community of interest has been developed during World War II. It is the only such base in a very extensive surrounding area and thus necessary as one of a chain of such bases extending either east-west or north-south. It is the only ATC base between Michigan and the Pacific coast.

A port of embarkation

The Great Falls Army Air Base has served as the principal port of embarkation for men and material destined for Canada, Alaska, and Russia all during the war and has proved itself as the logical point for such operations. On a recent map issued by the National Geographic Society, Great Falls is designated as the only principal inland "kick off" base to foreign points in the United States, all others being located at coastal points. This base is the United States terminus to the only fully equipped air route to western Canada and Alaska. (Facilities on this inland air route are given in detail in this report.)

The airfields and facilities along this route are so complete that it can be flown, and has been flown, by so-called short-range aircraft. It is the only route to Alaska that now can be flown by such aircraft, which makes it of great importance to the private flyer in the coming postwar years.

Gateway to the top of the world

It is generally admitted that in the future it will be particularly important to control the air routes over the "top of the world." Great Falls is the natural gateway to this area from the United States. Not only is it on the shortest air route from some 41 percent of the land area in the United States (see map) but it is nearest to the Canadian border which is an advantage (though perhaps not a controlling one) for border clearance and customs.

Labor market for aircraft maintenance at Great Falls

An important necessity for the operation of an air base is the quantity and quality of available labor. The Great Falls Army Air Base now employs between 1,300 and 1,400 civilians, with a monthly pay roll of approximately $225,000. Most of this labor force consists of men and women experienced in aircraft maintenance. Additional sources of such labor are available from the west coast factories whose operations are now being curtailed and to which many of our previous citizens went for the duration. They can be expected to return if work is available here. Other sources which can be expected will derive from the transfer of certain ATC operations from Canadian points to the Great Falls Army Air Base during the next 3 months.

Facilities at the Great Falls Base are "tops" for maintenance

A special section is appended outlining the equipment and facilities at the Great Falls Army Air Base. It should be noted that these facilities are the best available for the work that would be done at a permanent base.

This base is of great importance as a stopping point for military aircraft. Here, singly or in groups, planes in transit may be serviced completely. It is being used for such purposes daily at the present time, and the importance of this factor cannot be overemphasized.

A field for Reserve fliers

We are advised that there will be a large number of men with commissions in the reserve forces of all branches who must of necessity maintain their efficiency ratings through constant study and by flying a certain number of hours each month. There is no field properly equipped to provide the planes and service which they will need within several hundred miles of Great Falls which is the only field available to men of Montana, Wyoming, northern Idaho, and western North Dakota. This is an important factor to consider in connection with the maintenance of a trained Reserve in case of emergency.

National Guard Air Force

It is probable in the future that squadrons of the National Guard Air Force will be based in Montana. Being centrally located, the Great Falls Army Air Base would logically be used by a portion of this air force both for regular training and for summer maneuvers. It is the only base fully equipped now to handle such operations in Montana.

An air squadron is composed of 35 officers and 200 men.

Proven support of the Alaska wing

It has been amply demonstrated that the Great Falls Army Air Base is an essential unit to the support of operations in Alaska. During the war a truly remarkable record in the transport of planes, men and material north from Great Falls by air was established. This record is summed up in an article printed in the Great Falls Tribune, a copy of which is attached.

Plans are already under way to conduct many Alaskan operations aimed at a full understanding of the North Polar regions and at the protection of our country from attack over the pole, which to and from many world centers provides the shortest route and one which is easily flown with modern equipment. Information about facilities for this research work in Alaska is still in the category of restricted information.

The Alaska Highway

The importance of the Alaska Highway was also proven during the war. Its length is bordered by emergency landing strips used by the smaller fighter aircraft which were not equipped with radio and thus had to fly contact from Great Falls to Fairbanks. The highway runs parallel to the established air route more fully described herein. It is a means for maintaining the telephone and telegraph lines erected during the war from the United States to Alaska.

The Alberta government and the United States Government appear to recognize the desirability of maintaining this highway as a permanent road both for the military and the tourist. As a means of communication it is all important as are those other means which it parallels. Great Falls is virtually the southern terminus of all these means of communication being on the only direct route to the southern end of the Alaska Highway by road.

Importance to Montana

As mentioned above, the civilian pay roll at this base amounts to about $225,000 per month. Total disbursements, however, exceed $1,000,000 per month. Thus the air base must be classed as big business and as such it would be of considerable importance to the economy of the State.

Climate in Great Falls, Mont.

While Great Falls is a northern city it is a comfortable city in which to live. A letter appearing in the Great Falls Tribune from a soldier who had been stationed here for 2 years, written as he was being separated from the Army on October 28, pays us a nice compliment in this respect: "Having lived in the Middle West for many years and on the east coast for 15 years prior to entering the service and with the completion of 2 years in Montana, my choice for a year-around climate would be right here in Great Falls."

We have had extremes of temperature but neither heat nor cold are oppressive due to the absence of moisture in the air. Humidity is low in summer and winter, thus one neither shivers in winter nor drips in summer. Evenings are always cool in the summer and there is nearly always a fresh breeze to temper any heat during the day. The famous Chinook winds in the winter soon break a cold spell and snow seldom remains on the ground for long except in the mountain areas.

Average rainfall is only 14.8 inches. We boast of approximately 300 clear days a year. Examination of the weather reports at Gore Field (Great Falls Municipal Airport) for the 12 months ending February 28, 1945, reveals that there was not a single day in the 12-month period when it was impossible at some time of day for multiengined equipment to land and depart. On an hourly basis, which is decidedly the most unfavorable basis on which to make a study, the records show that only 2.8 percent of the hours during the entire year were closed to flying, and only 3.4 percent required the use of instruments.

Meteorological data on Great Falls

Annual precipitation as taken from the records of the United States Weather Bureau:

Annual precipitation for past 6 years

	Inches
1939	9.89
1940	12.09
1941	17.64
1942	14.55
1943	13.96
1944	14.21
1945	13.51

Average annual precipitation for past 54 years, 1892 to 1945, inclusive—14.8 inches.

Weather	Mean temperature	Temperature		Total precipitation inches	Total snowfall unmelted in inches
		Highest	Lowest		
45—December	24.1	53	−3	1.72	25.0
November	33.4	66	−1	.32	2.0
October	51.6	78	28	.80	4.8
September	54.6	92	28	2.60	.6
August	70.2	93	48	.85	0
July	71.7	97	47	.20	0
June	56.8	93	36	3.24	T
May	51.1	82	31	1.49	T
April	38.8	70	20	.67	1.1
March	35.6	67	−15	.76	5.5
February	23.6	43	−9	.53	8.5
January	28.6	54	−3	.32	5.7
Total				13.51	53.2
1944—December	28.6	53	−6	.99	7.6
November	33.8	57	−6	.50	10.4
October	55.4	78	29	.04	0.0
September	59.4	89	27	1.31	T
August	64.8	89	46	1.44	0.0
July	67.6	94	43	1.24	0.0
June	57.8	93	36	3.88	0.0
May	57.2	86	29	1.15	T
April	47.2	74	30	.75	T
March	25.3	58	−8	1.47	16.3
February	24.1	52	−5	1.44	16.0
January	33.3	57	10	T	T
Total				14.21	32.3

Brief description of airports, distances, and facilities on the Sunshine international air route from Great Falls, Mont., to Fairbanks, Alaska

Airport name	Distance from last field (air miles)	Standard lighting [1]	Length of paved runways (feet)	Radio range	Control tower	Direction finder	Low-approach system
Great Falls (east base)	Terminus	Yes	8,850	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Cut Bank	88	Yes	8,600	Yes			
Lethbridge	75	Yes	3,700	Yes			
Calgary	117	Yes	4,700	Yes	Yes		
Penhold	70	Yes	3,400	Yes			
Edmonton	100						
Namao (satellite)		Yes	6,800	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Municipal		Yes	5,400	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Grande Prairie	237	Yes	6,500	Yes	Yes		
Fort St. John	111	Yes	6,700	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Fort Nelson	188	Yes	6,400	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Watson Lake	152	Yes	5,500	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Whitehorse	217	Yes	7,200	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Northway	269	Yes	7,500	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Tanacross	49	Yes	5,100	Yes	Yes		
Big Delta	88	Yes	7,500	Yes	Yes		
Fairbanks	90						
Ladd Field		Yes	9,200	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Weeks (municipal) [2]							
Mile 26 (satellite) [3]		Yes	6,600				

[1] Standard lighting includes beacon and boundary lights, obstruction lights, flood and runway lights, and in most cases, instrument approach lights.

[2] Weeks, the municipal airport at Fairbanks, has 5,300 feet unpaved runway. It has runway lighting only, and control tower part time.

[3] Mile 26, the satellite airport at Fairbanks, has 6,600 feet paved runway. It has standard lighting, control tower part time on request, and a practice low approach system.

NOTE.—There are landing strips at frequent intervals along the Alaska Highway, which parallel the inland air route. These were used by the men who flew fighters and other ships too small to be fully equipped with radio and instruments and who thus flew contact all the way to Fairbanks.

Between most of the major fields described above there are other emergency landing fields which are unpaved but into which the larger aircraft could get in case of emergency. These fields have lighting facilities consisting of boundary and obstruction lights.

A telephone line parallels the Alaska Highway and there is a teletype system in operation between Great Falls, Fairbanks, and Anchorage.

Source: Public Relations Office, Great Falls Army Air Base.

Facilities at the Army air base, Great Falls, Mont.

1. Maintenance is so set up at the Great Falls Army Air Base that work can be done here, which means that the whole job of major overhaul can be done besides modification and ordinary maintenance. The shops and hangar facilities listed below are among the finest in the Nation and are in operation now, thus assuring an available labor force.

(a) Field class: 89H R1 L5 S6.

R1: Voice station, tower, range, homing device.

L5: Beacon, boundary obstruction lights, flood light, contact runway lights.

S6: Fuel, storage, major aircraft, major engine repair.

89H: Hard surface runways, 8,900 feet.

Instrument approach systems:

Radio range.

SCS 51 (for practice only).

CAA instrument low-approach system.

AACS communication systems available.

Army weather—regional weather station: Controls all weather for entire route from Great Falls to Fairbanks, and also long-range forecasting, and so forth.

CAA weather available at Great Falls.

ATC traffic-control center located in Great Falls.

(b) Runways:

Four runways, each 8,850 feet by 300 feet wide; 150 feet in center of each runway is 5-inch concrete; gross weight, 120,000 pounds.

Taxi strips: 22,350 feet (linear feet), 75 feet wide. Constructed of 5-inch hot mix.

Ramp: 4,889 feet by 500 feet. Constructed of 5-inch concrete.

2. Twin hangar (permanent buildings): All concrete; roof, wood and built-up roofing; each hangar, 64,000 square feet; shops, 80,200 square feet; office space, 12,000 square feet.

3. Building No. T-280—Hangar (permanent building): 26,329 square feet; floor and foundation, concrete; walls, concrete and wood; roof, wood, 45-pound rolled roofing; over-all floor space, 206 feet by 127 feet.

4. Building No. T-210—Hangar (permanent building): 43,026 square feet; floor and foundation, concrete; walls and roof, wood, 55-pound paper.

5. Bomb sight storage building: 1,217 square feet; floor and foundation, concrete; walls, concrete and wood; roof, wood, 45-pound rolled roofing.

6. Air Corps supply warehouses (temporary buildings): 11 warehouses, 1,520 square feet; 1 warehouse, 2,000 square feet; 7 warehouses, 8,977 square feet; 1 warehouse, 9,000 square feet; 1 warehouse, 9,040 square feet.

7. Quartermaster warehouses (temporary buildings): 3 warehouses, 9,600 square feet.

8. Storage tanks: Gasoline, 11 underground tanks, capacity 275,000 gallons; oil, 3 oil tanks, underground, heated, capacity 17,625 gallons each: Diesel oil, 1 tank, underground, capacity 15,300 gallons; drain oil, 1 tank, underground, capacity 15,300 gallons.

9. Railroads: 7,410 linear feet.

[From the Great Falls Tribune of November 23, 1945]

8,645 PLANES FLOWN NORTH THROUGH HERE—5,590,000 POUNDS OF CARGO, PASSENGERS, MAIL TO ALASKA AND RUSSIA

Emphasizing the importance of Great Falls as the principal point of departure for aircraft ferried to Alaska and Russia and as a major port of aerial embarkation to the north during the war, figures of the Army Air Forces show that 8,645 aircraft and more than 5,590,000 pounds of cargo, passengers and mail passed through the east base and Gore Field.

The Army Air Forces report covers the period from April 1942 to August 1945 and discloses that aircraft passing through Great Falls for Alaska included 80 heavy bombers, 842 medium bombers, 1,394 light bombers, 5,367 fighters, 844 transports, and 118 other types of aircraft.

Traffic originating at the Great Falls Army air base from December 1943 to August 1945, and flown north included 10,450 passengers, 3,055,974 pounds of cargo and 15,688 pounds of mail. Weight of the passengers and their baggage totaled 2,518,696 pounds.

It was disclosed in the communication that under present plans the Great Falls Army air base will continue to be used by the Air Transport Command as a base for scheduled services to Alaska at least through June 1946. Plans for the period after next June will depend on future military air transport and ferrying requirements.

Lincoln Day Address of Maj. Gen. Edward Martin, Governor of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 8, 1946

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Maj. Gen. Edward Martin, Governor of Pennsylvania, at the annual Lincoln Day banquet of the Republican Members of the House and the Women's Republican Club of the District of Columbia, Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., Thursday evening, February 7, 1946:

Mr. Toastmaster and fellow Americans, in this time of critical and momentous decisions, it is appropriate to consider American policies at this Lincoln anniversary meeting. Abraham Lincoln more truly typifies our way of life than any other American. A Republican meeting is an appropriate place for such discussions, because under Republican Party leadership this Nation has made its greatest material, cultural, and spiritual progress.

Lincoln was born in poverty. He knew the value of work, tolerance, thrift, and persistence. He advocated equality of opportunity for every American. He urged everyone to acquire property. He took part in government. He was proud to be a politician. He suffered political disappointments, but he did not sulk. He believed in party discipline.

Lincoln's place in history is secure, and the Republican Party needs no apology. His way of life and the accomplishments of our party are a great part of the real America. The greatest honor we can pay him is to strive for a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

To do this in a representative republic we must have two great political parties. If one becomes too powerful, the country may drift into dictatorship. Germany and Italy were examples of one-party government. With more than two parties, party responsibility is lost. France is an example of party paralysis.

Our parties have decided the great issues of the past: State rights, banks, central government, sound money, territorial expansion, slavery, free trade, imperialism, conservation, education, labor policies, taxation, the public debt, the Monroe Doctrine, the protective tariff, and a host of others.

Our political parties must again decide great issues. The Republican Party has always been the progressive party. Today, as the minority party and the loyal opposition, it must again declare its position on the great issues of these times.

The preservation of freedom is the basic issue. America is a land of dreams. It has been so since the days of the first settlers. They came here to escape tyranny. They wanted to be free to work out their own destiny, to worship as their conscience dictated, and to govern themselves. They carved a Government out of the rough to maintain certain inalienable rights. They have fought for these rights in their courthouses, in legislative halls, and on bloody battlefields. The story of America is the most dramatic story in history. We should recite it with pride and reverence, because freedom is costly. Millions have paid for it with blood.

There are great words in the story of the American Nation and its Government: "Independence"; "freedom"; "inalienable rights"; "the pursuant of happiness." They are sacred words. Wars have been fought to maintain them. Through the fabric of our laws runs a golden thread preserving the rights of the individual.

The word "liberal" once meant much to Americans, but its integrity has been destroyed by the blatant, breast-beating, rabble-rousing, tub-pounding politician, seeking votes at any cost. "Liberalism" once meant freedom. Today it is used by Communists, Socialists, and revolutionaries, and many so-called liberals would now extend Government at the expense of individual liberty.

The Bill of Rights is the keystone in the arch of our liberties. Every attack upon it must be defeated. Legislation destroying property, the rights of the public, the right to work at the job of our choice; public grants and governmental subsidies—all these must be watched by the picket posts of freedom.

The right to liberty and the pursuit of happiness is older and greater than those three great documents, the Magna Carta, the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution. It is a God-given right. Free governments are constituted to preserve it. That is why religion is hated in dictator-ruled and communistic countries.

Strange doctrines are now being preached in the United States. They menace freedom. Discontent is being sown here as it was for generations in Europe. Ways are being opened here like the roads over which Hitler and Mussolini marched the people of the Old World to destruction and death.

Many politicians are playing with communism. They are playing with political death and national suicide. Communism teaches hatred. It rules by hate and raw force. It offers something for nothing until it gains control, and then sets its steel-shod boots upon the neck of the common man.

Are we following that pattern? We are now offering everybody something—lower taxes, higher wages, more subsidies, more profits. Are we trying to fool ourselves?

The Republican Party must face the threat to national financial solvency. We are told tax reduction is coming and the Budget will be balanced a year from now. We heard the same solemn announcements before the war. Year after year we saw the Budget swing farther out of balance. Budgets can be balanced only by spending less money than we collect in taxes. Beware of fancy bookkeeping.

Germany and Italy started downward over the road of bad fiscal policy, and in the end led their people through the red gates of war. As the party of loyal opposition we must demand a sound fiscal policy, with a balanced Budget and an equitable tax system. We need a complete audit of the United States, for in 12 years the New Deal has spent at least $500,000,000,000. The records should be examined to see where this money went. The audit should be extended to social security, pump-priming, public projects, and to the costs of the war itself. This was the people's money, and they are entitled to know how it was used.

There should also be an audit of all our commitments, actual and proposed, to the nations and to the peoples of the world. How much have we loaned or given? How much do we propose to give and loan?

What is the reason for much of our trouble? It is the debt. Today, it totals two hundred and seventy-five billions. It is the greatest debt in all history. Sixty billions of it existed before the war started—sixty billions spent on doubtful projects and huge Federal pay rolls.

What can be done? We can demand the swift demobilization of the huge army of Federal pay rollers. Senator BYRD says there are at least 2,000,000 surplus Federal employees, who are adding a burden of more than $5,000,000,000 a year. This is a terrific waste, in view of the fact that the entire cost of the Federal Government in any peacetime year prior to 1932 was less than four billions.

"Tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect"—that is still the New Deal formula.

We know it is bad; we know it is dangerous; we know that all expenses must be cut; we know we must start to liquidate that giant debt and stand as a solvent America in an insolvent world.

The Republican Party has another heavy responsibility. It must give a sense of direction and balance to American foreign policy. For years before World War II the New Deal muddled, side-stepped, and evaded on foreign policy. Its blundering diplomacy may now fumble away the peace. The present national administration has no battalion of direction.

We saw what happened before the war; we saw Mussolini move; Japan drive into China; Germany march into the Ruhr—but we did not get ready. We came down to Pearl Harbor unprepared. The people are entitled to know who blundered there, for an army or navy may be defeated, but there is no excuse for a surprise. After years of warning, we came unready into battle, fighting for our lives almost barehanded.

Certainly we did a magnificent job after the war started. Certainly we organized and trained the greatest and best Army, Navy, and Air Force in the history of warfare. Certainly we fought all over the globe and destroyed the undefeated armies of the world.

After Pearl Harbor we did build 72,000 ships; 250,000 airplanes; 100,000 tanks; 3,400,000 motor cars. We did make 43,000,000,000 rounds of small ammunition; 17,000,000 rifles and pistols; 600,000 cannon, and 1,000,000,000 artillery projectiles.

But remember that much of this great undertaking could have been done, and should have been done, before the guns roared at Pearl Harbor. Remember, also, that it was done under the free competitive enterprise system, fostered and encouraged by the Republican Party for half a century, in a free land where men work in freedom at the job of their choice.

The Republican Party must guard against over-centralization. Our forefathers were farsighted. They feared centralized government. They set up plans for checks and balances to protect us against ourselves. They gave us three branches of government: legislative, executive, and judicial. They created three levels of government: local, State, and Federal. They tried to bring government closer to the people. They gave the citizens of each local unit power to govern themselves. As Republicans we must as a sacred duty maintain these wise checks and balances.

Republicans must deal with another and vital domestic problem. We eagerly seek the industrialization of all suitable sections of the country. This can be done gradually in the spirit of free enterprise. It cannot be done by Government direction, for Government cannot change the bases of industry without destroying the morale and the welfare of the worker. We cannot do it in the Russian way.

Nor can we deal with labor in the Russian way. Republicans have recognized that labor has three inherent and inseparable rights: the right to work where it chooses; the right to organize and bargain collectively; and the right to strike. The Republican Party should and will defend these rights.

We should encourage sympathy, understanding, confidence, and cooperation between employee and employer, and make Government the impartial friend of both. All organizations must be responsible organizations whose agreements are kept. Before employees and employers can join with Government in a national effort for production, prosperity, and good will, Congress must lay down a clear and definite labor policy. That policy must be based upon laws and not men.

In fixing wages we must never forget that the worker's savings at the end of the year are what count. The worker as well as the employer must have a profit.

Our tax programs must encourage risk capital. Taxes must be kept as low as possible. They are paid by the sweat of labor. Taxes are deducted from the gains of both labor and capital. Subsidies and grants are paid in taxes. They must be sparingly made.

We Republicans will remember that our Nation has earned world leadership. The war has shown that the American form of government and our way of life are the soundest in the history of organized nations. Dictatorships, limited monarchies, and parliamentary governments all failed to stop the savage drive of the Axis Powers to enslave the world.

America must assume leadership in the movement to insure world peace. That effort will require all the intellectual, material, and spiritual resources of the world's best nations. It must be based upon justice and righteous living. Its terms must be fully understood by the people of the contracting nations.

Material gains and new territory are not American objectives. We do seek the privilege of living in peace and good will in a friendly, liberty-loving family of nations. We do not demand that all groups accept the pattern of the American Republic, but we do insist that all war-breeding forms be eliminated.

Spot assistance—food for the hungry, clothing for the naked, and warmth and shelter for the unfortunate—must, of course, be given to the limit of our ability to give.

Loans of money and industrial goods must be made more guardedly. In the past we have helped nations and they have used that aid against us. These forms of foreign help must be scrutinized. The American people must know about these loans. They can be a cause of future disagreements, disruption and conflict. The people should know the purposes, terms and security of these advances. Before they are made we should know whether we have the money to loan and the rate of interest. We cannot remain solvent if we loan at an interest rate less than the money costs our taxpayers.

For the long pull, the best foreign aid is prosperous trade. Regardless of all the solemn nonsense of the economic morons, money and profit make the wheels go round, abroad as well as at home. World prosperity depends upon large scale and profitable exchange of goods.

The Republican Party has always believed in world trade. It is a fact that the sound progress of commercial relationships among nations, as well as the industrial expansion of America, has always advanced under Republican administrations. Our party has always favored a trade policy giving all nations equal access to world markets.

In noncompetitive goods, which form two-thirds of normal trade, that is simple enough. It is not so simple in competitive goods.

Living standards must be considered. We cannot lower the living standard of American workmen and farmers. We hope to raise the living standards of other nations to our own level. We cannot do this by destroying our own economic stability.

In the field of foreign policy, America has not defined its intentions toward Germany and Japan. Our job in these conquered nations is to prevent future aggression, harness the energies and abilities of their people to useful purposes, which in the fullness of time will permit them—chastened and sobered—to reenter a friendly family of nations as full members.

Here again, as in all foreign relationships, our help must be spiritual as well as material; perhaps as much of one as the other. These demoralized people need inspiration as well as food, courage as much as coal, and guidance even more than cash.

It is time for action here at home. We must form our order of battle against the forces of regimentation and governmental control; against bureaus and commissions; against hundreds of thousands of political Federal employees; and against Government by Executive order. Congress must again assert its full powers.

Free competitive enterprise, with the freedom of the individual, is at stake. The day of the political opportunist and patronage hunter must end or we can fail as a nation. It is a time for courage. The Republican Party can win in 1946, but it must stand for the old-fashioned American ideals of thrift, tolerance, hard work, and the love of God. It must be aggressively led and aggressively organized. It must be aggressively financed by all those who believe in its principles and value their liberties. The "dollars for freedom" program announced by Chairman Brownell today offers the opportunity to help in a great cause.

We can help make America solvent by hard work and common sense. It cannot be done by "planned economy" that is planned by men who never earned a dollar. It takes more than planning to create wealth. It is created at the forge, in the mine and in the fields by men with tools in their hands—by the bitter sweat of men's bodies and brains.

America has seen wealth created by men seeking work, making work, and finding work. It has seen men carrying the Bible, the rifle, and the ax carve a land of plenty out of the wilderness. That same spirit still lives.

The inalienable American right to the pursuit of happiness for which 12,000,000 men and women in uniform served and suffered is sacred. It must be preserved.

Every consideration must be given to the veteran and his dependents. Remember, he is the cream of the crop, the doer and producer of the future, and he will pay the greater part of the tax bill.

In the memory of Lincoln and of the more than 1,000,000 Americans who, in all our wars, have died that liberty might live, let us by humble, sincere, and thoughtful effort safeguard the ideals for which they perished.

The war that has ended was the worst catastrophe in the history of mankind. No other war approached it in magnitude. It was both the greatest effort and the greatest disaster in the annals of the world.

The scope, the accomplishments, and the unselfishness created by its terror and brutality have given America a mighty asset in the millions of fine, brave, and self-disciplined men and women who can be depended upon during these critical times. They know their America was a wilderness continent that has been made into a land of industry, plenty, culture, and good will. They know it is a land of deep religious convictions. They know it became great through free, competitive enterprise, and under the inalienable right of the individual to the pursuit of happines.

These veterans want a land of opportunity. We all want a land of opportunity. We want a free and dynamic America. We can have it by all working together, through Divine Providence and under the Constitution.

Let us glory in American achievements. Let us keep the watch and avoid a surprise attack from within our gates.

Address of Hon. Margaret Chase Smith, of Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 8, 1946

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of my colleague, Hon. MARGARET CHASE SMITH, before the Women's National Republican Club in New York on January 26, 1946:

Mrs. Pratt, Captain Stassen, distinguished guests, and fellow Republicans, the welfare of the people of America is the responsibility, and should be the accepted objective, of the Republican Party. Welfare means jobs, homes, health, and happiness. The approach to the attainment of this goal must always be objective rather than subjective. We cannot judge the desires and living conditions of others, especially of 140,000,000 people, by our own desires and living conditions.

In other words, we must determine and appreciate what the other fellow wants and what he has to put up with, in order to give him what he desires and deserves. It's again time to talk about a Republican program, and it must be patterned along these lines if we are to retain the support of the electorate.

Now is the time to apply this approach. The public sees in the Democratic Party, and in the present administration, a great conflict of suspicion, selfishness, and subjectiveness of various groups, all clamoring for themselves, completely disregarding the desires and rights of any group other than their own.

The Democratic Party and the Democratic administration have grown decadent. They are plagued with lack of initiative, imagination, and ability to get things done.

We cannot completely discount all of the effective things done by the Democrats while they have held control of the Federal administration. We must particularly give them credit for some of the social reforms which they have fostered. These changes have raised the standard of living of the common man. But whatever the Democrats have provided on this score in the past, their program now seems to have reached a dead-end street.

The present administration has bogged down at the end of a blind alley because of its "do nothing" policy of coasting. There is only one way to coast—down hill. The administration is relying on time, instead of action, to work out the many complicated and crucial problems confronting us.

But we can't criticize unless we can offer something better. We can't find the solutions unless we analyze the problems.

What are those problems, and what are the attitudes of the factions vitally affected by them? They are:

1. The international organization for permanent peace and our relations with the United Nations, particularly Britain, China, and Russia.

2. Domestic reconversion and industrial peace.

3. The continuation of social reforms.

Of course, it is fundamental and obvious that all nations of the world desire permanent peace and national security. There are no differences among nations in this desire.

But there are vast differences in the views of the various nations as to the manner and procedure. Unfortunately, it is this difference as to approach, rather than to the object itself, which has created and aroused

suspicions of the nations of each other as to each nation's real desire.

We want bases in the Pacific because we feel that peace in the Far East and the Pacific can best be guaranteed by us. Russia is suspicious of our desire for Pacific bases because to her it represents a potential threat to her national security rather than the best means of maintenance of peace in that area. Similarly Russia wants bases in the Mediterranean. England regards this as a threat to her life line. The occupation of Germany and Japan has aroused suspicion among the leading United Nations because of their differences of opinion as to the best way to keep Germany and Japan from threatening the world again.

The atomic bomb has created the greatest suspicion among nations. This is more graphically understood when one realizes that it is possible for any nation in this world to be subjected to an atomic bomb attack without knowing who the attacker might be. In such an atmosphere suspicion is almost inevitable.

Means to remove these suspicions cannot be developed overnight. The only way that we gain confidence in others is through knowing them better, knowing them as well as possible. True friendship cannot be obtained without association, without exchange of ideas and opinions, and, most important of all, without determining and appreciating the desires and living conditions of the other fellow—our world neighbors.

It will take time and great effort to learn what we need to know about our neighbors of the world. To obtain their friendship and to encourage closer association, we must also aid the people of other nations to learn about us.

Too often political discussions are motivated by irresponsible charges of one party against the other—of irresponsible accusations of communism or imperialism in derogative comparisons with other nations. This is not the desired approach. It is wholly ineffectual because the American public is too intelligent to be swayed by cries of "wolf, wolf" which they have heard too often. This approach is not only ineffectual, it perils mutual confidence and interest among the nations.

Any Republican who resorts to this irresponsible course does his party and Nation a disservice. It is not the way to make friends and influence people—it is not the way to get votes for the Republican Party.

Suspicion and selfishness equally threaten our domestic peace. This is most unfortunate when we are on the verge of a new world—a world of peace that offers a fuller and happier existence. I say we are on the verge of this new world because we have yet to reconvert our energies, capacities, and facilities from the wartime objective of destruction to the peacetime objective of construction.

While millions of Americans are pleading for homes, for automobiles, for household appliances, for clothing, for food, this Nation is afflicted with critical shortages of these items. It is ironic that such shortages exist when our potential civilian production is greater than it has ever been before.

During the war the production of food, clothing, housing, and transportation equipment for military purposes was the greatest the world has ever known. But with the war having ended nearly 6 months ago, we still have no promise of substantial civilian production of living necessities in the near future.

How does it happen that we have these shortages in this land of plenty? It is because, while World War II has been won and is ended, this Nation is in the grips of another war—domestic and industrial. What prompts this? Suspicion and inability of the warring groups to understand and to appreciate the desires and rights of each other.

Labor is suspicious of management—because of management's past history in exploiting labor to the fullest. Management is suspicious of labor because of labor's ever-increasing demands and refusal to accept responsibility. The public is suspicious of both because each demands greater monetary returns for which the public is called upon to sacrifice.

But labor, management, and the public have become suspicious of the Democratic administration because of its do-nothing attitude. It has exhibited a distressing lack of imagination and courage to meet the problems squarely.

Herein lies the great opportunity of the Republican Party to secure public confidence by supplying a specific and progressive program for the solution of differences between labor and management. We cannot win by merely accusing the administration of letting things coast along. We must offer something that is better and more specific.

This problem is similar to the experiences of the three great powers at London. You will recall that the foreign ministers of the United States, England, and Russia closed that meeting without tangible progress. Most observers considered it a complete failure, but their later meeting at Moscow brought about very definite results.

What accounts for this difference? Just this—the London meeting prepared the way for what happened at Moscow. The ministers got acquainted by talking frankly, often bluntly, with each other. They prepared themselves to do business when they should next meet. I am confident that the more these foreign ministers meet, the better they know each other, the sooner practical and working friendly relations will materialize.

Now what happened in the industrial war at home? A meeting of the "ministers" of labor and management was called by the President. Like the London Conference this labor-management get-together was a failure—no agreement resulted.

But can't we take a cue from the second meeting of the foreign ministers—the one they held at Moscow—the one that produced agreement? Because the first labor-management conference failed is not any reason we should give up such attempts.

I believe that the President should call a second labor-management conference or as many as are needed. The more they meet, the less their differences, the greater their understanding and agreement.

The Democratic Party has abandoned its number one program—social reform. It is true the President has urged the passage of legislation on such measures as the FEPC, full employment and unemployment compensation, but the controlling factor in the shelving, frustration, and defeat of these bills by Congress has not been the Republican Members. It has been the key and pivotal Democrats who, as chairmen and high-ranking members of committees handling these legislative matters, have opposed or encouraged opposition by their committees.

No, the criticism of Congress by the President in his message of January 3 was leveled against the members of his own party. It was an admission by its leader that the selfishness of warring factions within the Democratic Party had resulted in a sit-down strike by the reactionary Members. The President did a disservice to the liberal Members of Congress, Republican or Democrat, who have supported these particular measures of social reform.

Herein lies another opportunity for the Republican Party to accept a specific and a clear-cut leadership on a matter of vital importance to the common man. Our party can and should push through these measures of social reform. By so doing we will keep the faith of the people—a trust which the Democrats have broken. By so doing we will have proved ourselves by actual results instead of promises. By so doing we will have proved that it is now the Democratic Party that is controlled and plagued by reactionaries rather than the Republican Party. By so doing the Republican Party will have provided a leadership of imagination and initiative that rises above the level of ineffectual mediocrity.

It is my sincere belief that suspicion and lack of understanding are the greatest menaces to the solution of vital problems and issues of our country today. This is no time for careless criticism. This is no time for timidity. This is no time for selfishness. This is no time for suspicion.

This is a time for leadership, for imagination and initiative, for confidence, appreciation, and understanding of the position of the other fellow. This is the time to be specific—the time for courage to stand up and be counted. This is a time to be objective. Yes; we must know and understand each other.

The Democratic administration has revealed its ineptitude to meet these problems with courage and resourcefulness. In fact the record of the administration on critical domestic problems is admittedly a long list of failures. This admission is made by Democratic leaders with the excuse that their intentions have been good. We all know that the road to failure is paved with good intentions.

Unless the Republican Party can provide this leadership in a constructive, specific, and unselfish manner, there is little reason for optimism in the affairs of this Nation. The time for winning on the other fellow's mistakes and errors is over. Victory by default is hollow. This is a time for winning by performance, by performance that builds, progresses, and justifies confidence.

If we do this, the electorate will take the much-discussed reorganization of Congress into its own hands, it will return the control of the House to proved leaders, it will reorganize with Republicans.

Statehood for Hawaii Asked by San Francisco Chamber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 8, 1946

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the board of directors of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce adopted unanimously on January 31, the report of its world trade committee in approval of H. R. 3643, a bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States and passed the resolution which follows:

Whereas the people of the Territory of Hawaii have demonstrated beyond question their loyalty and patriotism to the United States;

Whereas they have expressed by majority vote their desire to assume the responsibility of statehood;

Whereas the policy of the United States Government is one of self-determination: that peoples be allowed to choose freely their own form of political status;

Whereas the Territory of Hawaii has attained the stature in every respect to qualify as a State; and

Whereas the Territory of Hawaii now meets the necessary requirements for statehood: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, after full study of the matter, recommend the approval of H. R. 3643 under which the Territory of Hawaii will become the forty-ninth State of the United States and it will form a constitution and State government to place it on an equal footing with the other States of the United States.

The Late Harry Hopkins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 8, 1946

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the late Harry Hopkins, a dominant figure in the administration of the late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, passed away very recently. While he was born at Sioux City, Iowa, he spent the formative years of his life at Grinnell, Iowa, and attended Grinnell College and never entirely severed all connection with Iowa. His father conducted a small-town, yet successful, harness shop or saddlery.

The late Harry Hopkins was perhaps closer to President Roosevelt than any other individual who was in any way connected with the administration and exerted a profound influence upon the policies of the administration. He was Secretary of Commerce, Administrator of WPA, adviser to the President in foreign relations, and, in fact, negotiated some of the agreements with foreign nations, and it appears that he was at all times at the President's right hand for aid and counsel.

I saw and was with Mr. Hopkins at Chicago in 1940 part of the time when he was the controlling figure of the Democratic National Convention when President Roosevelt was nominated for the Presidency a third time. My relations with Mr. Hopkins, while not intimate, were always cordial. I think he displayed at Chicago a technique that many great political leaders might envy and admire. He had complete control of that convention. During a most eventful period in the history of our Republic, Harry Hopkins had a big part.

A very fair estimate of this man appeared in the Grinnell (Iowa) Herald-Register, edited by A. L. Frisbie, a friend of many years who did not at all times agree with the Hopkins philosophy but, nevertheless, was prepared to make a fair estimate of Hopkins' contribution to our times.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Grinnell (Iowa) Herald-Register:

HARRY HOPKINS

There are many reactions in the public press as to the place which Harry L. Hopkins will hold in history, but that he will have a place in the history of these past troubled years no one will dispute.

As the confidant of the Nation's President he was entrusted with missions of the utmost delicacy and the general impression seems to be that he was worthy of the trust reposed in him.

The greatest criticism of Hopkins in public life seems to have arisen from the political angle. He was criticized for alleged WPA activities in connection with elections, which, however, he denied. He was blamed for participation in President Roosevelt's attempted purge of Senators who opposed him, which reacted a good deal like a boomerang. His handling of the political convention which nominated President Roosevelt for his third term was unpopular with many people.

These matters are mentioned as contrasting with some of his real accomplishments as the President's representative on various missions of international import.

No one questions the keenness of his mind and the sincerity of his devotion to his chief, in whose interests he gave up his health and went "the last long mile."

The white-hot vortex of Washington life in the hectic days preceding and during the war burned Harry Hopkins up and when the President died his life work was done.

Harry Hopkins will be remembered as the friend of the under dog. His sympathies and his efforts were for the underprivileged of this earth. This was his burning passion and whatever mistakes he may have made he never deviated from it.

He was not born here but he was a son of Grinnell and of Grinnell College, which shaped his life during its formative stages. He never forgot his early affection for the town which sent him out on his meteoric career. Grinnell people will not soon forget the incident when a distinguished reception committee, waiting to meet him at the train, came hurrying up the platform to find that Harry had gotten off the smoker and was chatting with his old friend Harley Harrington. The incident was typical of the man.

His college honored him, the Nation honored him, but through it all he was plain, wise-cracking Harry Hopkins and that is the way Grinnell will remember him; a man of great parts, a man of devotion, and for all that a very human sort of an individual.

Army and Navy Demobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK L. CHELF
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 8, 1946

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter to Members of the House:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 19, 1946.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Petition No. 19 which I filed last Friday pertains to H. R. 4729.

Briefly, this bill would compel the War and Navy Departments to discharge:

(a) All enlisted men with 35 points, regardless of age, marital status, number of dependents, or length of service.

(b) All who have received wounds for which they have been awarded the Purple Heart.

(c) All who have served as prisoners of war.

(d) Would give to all enlisted men the same terminal leave rights now possessed by only officers.

This legislation has been dubbed by the GI himself as their "junior GI bill of rights." It has been heartily endorsed and unanimously approved by every serviceman with whom I have talked, both overseas and in the States.

The reduction to 35 points should bring the total Army to approximately 1,500,000—the ultimate goal of the War Department for policing and reserves.

Since the GI was "lawed" into the Army, he feels that now, since the fighting is over, Congress should "law" him out, thereby ending all of the doubt, confusion, and promises.

As a former serviceman of World War II, I urge you to sign petition No. 19. "Let us put up—or shut up."

"The war is over, Congress,
That I shall repeat;
Grab the reins from the brass,
Climb in the driver's seat."

Yours for prompt action, I am
Sincerely,

FRANK L. CHELF,
Member of Congress.

Housing Shortage in Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 8, 1946

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily News of Tuesday, February 5, 1946:

THESE PEOPLE NEED HELP

Some weeks ago, the Daily News and three other Chicago newspapers published a questionnaire that readers in need of living quarters were invited to fill out and return.

Statistics rarely stir the emotions, but the tabulation of these questionnaires should make strong men weep—and maybe fight.

Few of those who wanted to move stated a single reason for their desire. On the average, they had 3 complaints with their present situation, and 1 family had 11.

According to the summary prepared by the Metropolitan Housing Council:

"The inference seems to be warranted that people will quite generally put up with, say, the absence of running water or heating facilities—but not when these have to be tolerated in the same situation with a condemned building, overcrowding, danger from rats, and the requirements of several small children."

That is a mouthful for the two-thirds of us, presumably well-housed, to ponder.

One-third of the 3,600 families who answered the questionnaire had to share bathroom facilities, often with more than one family, and in one case with five other families.

More than one-third presented the problem of two or more families sleeping in the same room.

About a sixth had no inside toilet facilities, or were compelled to share them with one or more other families.

A fourth listed one or more of the following difficulties:

No running water, no cooking facilities, no heating facilities, building condemned, sleeping rooms without outside light or ventilation.

Such were the conditions among the 3,600 who took the trouble to fill out these questionnaires and send them in. There was no inducement for them to do so except to make better known the conditions under which some people are obliged to live in the metropolis of the Midwest.

What do they want? Five-sixths want three rooms, four rooms, or five rooms. Many would take anything.

Three-fourths would pay between $45 and $55 a month; of the remainder, the greater part would pay more than $55. Ninety percent preferred renting to buying or building. Few want to build, perhaps because they do not believe it is now practical.

These 3,600 families are only a sample of a group many, many times larger, with similar needs and similar desires.

To supply their basic needs should not only be the desire but the determination of every public official, of every citizen, so placed that he can do any of the many things needed to get building, public and private, started in Chicago.

Most Portland Landlords Obey Rules, Survey Shows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 8, 1946

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, there recently appeared in a national publication an attack upon landlords which would lead one to believe that landlords as a class are predatory animals seeking only to gouge their tenants. I am glad to report that this characteristic does not apply to the landlords in my congressional district. Mr. E. B. McCutchan, Portland district OPA rent director, who has been in charge of that department in my district and who recently retired, reported upon the operations of his department which show Portland landlords, with minor exceptions, obey the rules of OPA. I include as part of these remarks an article appearing in the Oregon Journal under date of January 27, which shows how the landlords of my district cooperate in keeping rentals at a fair level. Unfortunately, a good many of the landlords in this area have been unjustly treated under the operations of the rent-control program and many of them have been compelled to rent their living units at a rental far below an amount that will permit them to maintain their properties and receive a modest return on their investment. Many of them have had to forego making repairs and improving their properties by reason of the small income which will not permit these expenditures. There should be a modification of rent controls so as to require the rent-control director to adjust cases where rents are too low, placing the income on a level with rentals received for like properties in the area and also permitting the owners to charge a fair and reasonable rental which would give them some return on their investment after meeting costs of maintenance and repairs. The article to which I refer is as follows:

TENANT TROUBLES CHECKED—MOST PORTLAND LANDLORDS OBEY RULES, SURVEY SHOWS

Are residential landlords waiting patiently in dark corners to gobble up prospective tenants?

It seems that around the Nation there is growing publicity revealing nefarious schemes concocted for squeezing a little extra from pocketbooks of homeseekers, large numbers of whom are returning veterans.

What about the landlords of Portland? That question is a quick way to start a flowing conversation.

E. B. McCutchan, Portland district OPA rent director, knows the score and points out, however, that the stories about attempts to beat rent ceilings spread like wildfire while the majority of landlords in Portland, who are following the rules, are forced to share the criticism more or less unfairly.

"Portland, as a whole, is the most fortunate major city on the Pacific Coast. Landlords have called no strikes or mass demonstrations against price ceilings and, as a whole, are obeying the law.

"The rotten apples that a first glance make the box look bad are mainly the new, wartime landlords who haven't absorbed ethics of the industry and want to make a killing," he explains. "We've had excellent backing of the Portland Realty Board, Apartment Owners' Association, and similar organized groups."

The pat on the back for landlords in Portland does not, however, whitewash the minority who seem to have irritated not a few local householders as landlords have in other cities.

In some instances new tenants have been required to pay from 6 months to a year in advance—but they ultimately received their money's worth except for what it may have cost to borrow the cash.

In a few cases, so-called security deposits have been as high as $150 to $200 and, for some reason, were entirely eaten up by alleged damages.

In other instances, where varying rates have been charged for the number of occupants, tenants have paid for four occupants when there were only two in the family. The tenant shared the blame for this type of overcharge in many cases by suddenly increasing the number in his family to get a little extra space.

Another landlord decided to add $15 to the rent for laundry service, but investigation showed the service was in another building.

The bulk of complaints now, OPA advises, are not from large apartment units but from single family dwellings where tenants were willing to pay above ceiling during the war. Now they wish to save money.

Evictions are for nonpayment of rent in more than half of all cases aside from house sales. The less desirable types of housing are becoming more available and bring fewer complaints.

It seems to add up to a fairly complimentary picture for Portland's landlords. Most have been following price ceilings, although costs of maintenance have risen at least 30 percent in most instances, according to the record.

Another catch is found in many major cities. Tenants advertise $150, even $250, reward to anyone who can find them an apartment. This reward naturally goes to the landlord who takes the highest bidder. Portland newspapers have not run such ads and the reward game has not flourished here, OPA says

At one time more than a year ago a series of advertisements did appear, telling of furniture to be sold to the prospective renter. This is an excellent racket in some cities.

An OPA investigator followed up the advertisements and discovered that in each case it was the tenant, not the landlord, who wished to sell furniture before moving. Portland was declared clean and pure on this one.

So it seems Portland landlords, as a whole, are an honest group, even though they violently protest ceilings, and are hewing in general to the letter of the law. Such is the opinion of OPA, which should know.

H. R. 4908

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1946

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, the Case bill, in my opinion, is a punitive antilabor bill. I will not support a bill that is anti on one side. I am for both management and labor. I want to help both and I will not approve a punitive antilabor bill, any more than I will support a punitive antimanagement bill. I had hoped that out of the long discussion would come a bill like the Voorhis amendment which was fair to both sides and to the public, but that was not to be.

A bill was forced through that had absolutely no committee consideration, which no members had ever seen and copies of which were not available when it was catapulted into the House by the Rules Committee. No one knew when it was introduced, its far-reaching meaning and implications, but the combination that wrote it and subsequently put it through the House was satisfied that it was a drastic antilabor measure. In the confusion and hasty consideration on the floor amendments have been added which make it more of a mystery than ever.

This certainly is no way to legislate. The bill should have been recommitted to the committee for hearings and normal committee consideration. The passage of this bill is reminiscent of the way the Smith-Connally bill was railroaded through the House by the same antilabor combination. The judgment of those of us who opposed the Smith-Connally bill was vindicated when both management and the public turned against it and demanded its repeal. Even its author repudiated it and asked that it be wiped off of the books.

What is needed in these trying and difficult times is legislation, fair to both sides and to the public, that will bring peace and cooperation in the relations between management and labor. The Case bill only adds to the strife. It illustrates what we always may expect when we legislate by impulse instead of by reason.

As an addendum to my remarks I present an editorial which appeared in the Washington Daily News on January 31 last and which seems to me to be a shining example of sound reasoning and common sense, as follows:

LOOK BEFORE YOU LEGISLATE

Congress, we say once more, is not prepared to pass a law that will do what the Wagner Act promised and has monumentally failed to do, namely "to diminish the causes of labor disputes."

Being unprepared and in a time of crisis, Congress is under pressure to pass hot and hasty legislation that could make bad matters worse.

Before the House today goes a watered-down version of President Truman's fact-finding bill. As a substitute for it, the Rules Committee has held the House may consider an entirely new bill introduced only 2 days

ago by Representative FRANCIS CASE, of South Dakota.

Some proposals in the Case bill may have merit. Others, in our opinion, are unfair and dangerous to labor. There have been no committee hearings on the Case bill. Citizens who oppose it have had no opportunity to state their objections. It cannot be perfected, or adequately considered, in a few days of limited debate on the floor of the House.

We believe the House should reject the Case bill. We doubt that passage of the President's fact-finding bill would do any real good in the present strike crisis. And there is grave danger that passage of ineffective, half-baked legislation now would delay or prevent the preparation of sound, fair, and effective legislation.

The present strike crisis may pass soon. We hope it will. But there will be other crises, without end, until Congress does its duty carefully and properly.

The first step should be a thoughtful study of the reasons why the Wagner Act has failed to keep its promise. Next, there should be thorough hearings on the Hatch-Ball-Burton bill, and all other responsible proposals for industrial peace, advocates and opponents being given full opportunity to be heard.

Then at last Congress would be prepared to legislate—to protect the legitimate rights of both labor and management, to protect the public against abuses of power by either, and to establish conditions under which collective bargaining can work without breaking down into civil warfare.

Terror Grips Red-Ridden East Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 8, 1946

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted I desire to insert in the RECORD an item from the Catholic News, of January 19, 1946, which has been called to my attention.

I believe that our Government is making a serious mistake in condoning acts of terrorism, even though they be committed by an ally. Personally, I cannot see any difference between such acts when committed by an ally and when committed by an enemy. In the final analysis they are exactly on the same level and should be treated alike.

As various facts come to light the American people are becoming increasingly distrustful of the Truman administration's policy of appeasement. We have surrendered to Russia on every point and at every conference. Perhaps it would be well if we stopped further conferences and become a little more realistic. A blood-thirsty tiger cannot be successfully appeased for any length of time.

The Truman administration would do well to remember that we have certain obligations to the vanquished foe and these obligations are not being observed.

The American people cannot understand why this Government should longer refuse to permit shipments of relief packages to the American zones in occupied Europe. Britain permits such shipments but the United States and Russia do not. Nor will this Government permit resumption of full mail service. Can it be that matters are so serious over there that it is not advisable to allow free exchange of news and views?

Can it be that the American policy in occupied Europe is designed to drive the German people to despair and ultimately into the arms of communism? I cannot see any other result and there can be none other.

The article from the Catholic News follows:

TERROR GRIPS RED-RIDDEN EAST GERMANY—NUMEROUS MURDERS, COUNTLESS OUTRAGES AGAINST WOMEN REPORTED THERE

AMSTERDAM.—New reports reaching here from the Russian-occupied zone of eastern Germany give further details of the regime of violence, death, hunger, murder, and rape that has changed a formerly prosperous area into a desert. Among the victims are many priests and ministers.

While the Russian front-line troops, the reports say, maintained a certain degree of discipline and refrained from the worst excesses, the occupation troops that followed "fell upon the land like wild beasts," killing untold numbers of defenseless citizens. Homesteads were plundered and those articles that could not be carried away were ruthlessly destroyed.

Although Stalin is said to have given orders forbidding any violence against priests and ministers, 62 priests are reported to have been murdered in the archdiocese of Breslau alone. Two older nuns were killed when they tried to shield younger sisters from the violence of Russian soldiers. In some villages, the reports say, not one woman, down to 12-year-old girls, escaped being ravaged.

The remaining peasants now receive some food after they have worked all day under a guard of Russian soldiers. Most of the farm implements have been carried away. In the larger communities there is a severe lack of food, particularly milk for children. Only in some isolated instances were Russian soldiers ready to furnish milk from their ample rations for starving children. Last fall it was estimated that of 100 new-born children in the city of Breslau 99 later died from lack of milk.

One Thousand Two Hundred Veterans at GWU Fail To Get Allowances

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 8, 1946

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose the following news item from the Washington Evening Star of February 6, 1946:

ONE THOUSAND TWO HUNDRED VETERANS AT GWU FAIL TO GET ALLOWANCES

At least 1,200 of George Washington University's 1,400 veteran students who entered classes this month have failed to receive their certificate of entitlement for allowances from the Veterans' Administration, according to Dr. Michael Dreese, of the university.

He said a few of the 50 veterans who dropped out of classes last year did so because they were unable to obtain their allowances permitted under the GI bill of rights.

Students who have not yet received their certificate of entitlement will be unable to collect their stipends for at least 30 days after it has been received.

Col. Thomas Rives, of the Veterans' Administration, has been invited to address the university's 1,800 veteran students tomorrow at 9 p. m. The meeting will be held either in the School of Government Building or the auditorium.

National Union for Maritime Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 8, 1946

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, we have heard speech after speech on the floor of Congress and have had editorials in our newspapers discussing the need for labor unity. Yesterday in the city of Washington, a historic conference was concluded, at which time 7 maritime unions representing 200,000 seamen, licensed officers, longshoremen, and harbor workers concluded a 3-day meeting with unanimous agreement on steps leading to the formation of one national union for maritime workers.

The seven unions united in a call to a convention to be held in San Francisco, beginning on May 6, and their proposed program would establish a national organization empowered to promote national agreements, complete the full organization of the industry, coordinate economic action, and in other ways to work for the greatest unity among the member unions, which include: The American Communications Association, CIO; the Inland Boatmen's Union, CIO; International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, CIO; National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards, CIO; National Marine Engineers Beneficial Association, CIO; Marine Firemen, Oilers, Watertenders, and Wipers Association, unaffiliated; and the National Maritime Union, CIO. Invitations are being extended to other unions as well, and at the convention the name and structure of the new organization will be decided upon, subject to ratification by the membership of the respective unions.

I think this is an encouraging portent of growing unity and cooperation in the house of labor, and as such is to be highly commended.

Lincoln Day Address of Hon. Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 8, 1946

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., minority leader, House of Representatives, at the annual Lincoln Day banquet of the Republican Members of the House and the Women's Republican Club of the District of Columbia, Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., Thursday evening, February 7, 1946:

Ladies and gentlemen, in behalf of the committee on arrangements I extend a cordial welcome to our many guests.

In meeting here to again pay tribute to Abraham Lincoln, we are particularly pleased to have as our principal speaker this evening the distinguished Governor of Pennsylvania, a man who in both war and peace has performed outstanding services for our country. He is one upo whom we are depending, in a large measure, to help bring about the restoration of this Nation to peace and prosperity through the election of a Republican Congress.

Governor Martin, we are very pleased that you have consented to come here and bring a message which will go to all Republicans throughout the entire United States.

Nineteen hundred and forty-six is a critical year for America. This is a year of decision in which we face the broadest questions of political philosophy, economic, and human problems of the most crucial importance. W must make far-reaching decisions in world affairs. We must establish principles of cooperatio.. We must find new solutions to old problems—which take on new significance and new meaning against the background of scientific achievement, and the foreshadows of a compelling and complicated future.

His contemporaries aptly describe Abraham Lincoln in two words: "Honest Abe." The guiding spirit of the Republican Party was a man famous for integrity.

So new and so vastly different are the prospects of the future, we must approach all decisions with clear policies and honest purpose. With a new devotion, we must determine that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall again make America strong.

Every American citizen wants to turn away from the violences of war and face forward to the rewards of peace. Americans seek a fresh hope and a new opportunity for a richer, fuller life in the years that lie ahead. This is what America wants.

This is what America wants, but what is America getting?

America but recently stood at the pinnacle of world prestige and moral leadership. Our foreign policy, unstable as a weather vane, shifting with every political wind, has lost us the trust and confidence of other nations. Our pledged word to the small nations has been broken. Secret agreements, just now being revealed, have bartered away the rights and freedoms of helpless peoples. Thus, as a result, we see evidence on every hand of distrust and ill will in place of the faith and friendship which should have been ours. What has America done to its heritage of world-wide good will? Are we to lose even this last gift of America's fallen sons?

No longer do the oppressed people of Poland, Rumania, Estonia, Finland, Java, or Korea look to America for comfort in their age-long struggles for freedom.

We have poured vast wealth into South America to unite in a common bond of brotherhood all the peoples of the two American continents. Yet by meddling in their elections and by assuming the right to dictate to these nations in their internal affairs we have lost much of their good will. Distrust is our portion today in South America.

We Republicans have hoped for a foreign policy that would be sound and permanent. We wanted a policy that would be a permanent American policy, just as the British have a policy which goes on, though governments change; just as the Russians have had a policy which continued even after a Communist government replaced the czars. Nevertheless, constructive foreign policy has not emerged, and it cannot take shape until it is fashioned in the bright light of informed public opinion out of the pure American love of freedom and fair dealing. The American people will rally to worthy causes and objectives, but they want to make these great decisions as an informed people; they want to know all the facts, and not just the facts the self-annointed statesmen wish to divulge.

Now what about the situation at home? What confronts the returning serviceman? He wants a job. But he cannot have it because the country is divided in a bitter industrial battle. Great numbers of our people are out on strike and their absence from the workshops causes millions of others to lose employment.

What has the administration leadership done to relieve this dangerous condition? They have adopted policies which open the breach still wider. Merely as a sop to public opinion, the President recommended a fact-finding bill which practically everybody admits would contribute nothing to the solution.

Failure of the OPA to meet the situation realistically has deprived consumers of necessities; it has deprived workers of jobs and stifled the production vitally essential to defeat of inflation and the black markets.

As a result, when the serviceman wants a suit of clothes, he has to take what he can find, or go without. He wants a white shirt for $3. He has to take a sport shirt for $7. He cannot find a home for himself and his wife and perhaps a growing family with whom he is reunited after 4 long years. No houses to rent. No materials to build. And the price of houses goes sky-high.

He wants to buy surplus property from the Government. He is met by confusion and evasion. There are plenty of goods to be sold to speculators, but too few for deserving veterans. No wonder he is aroused. No wonder he demands a better deal. He, my friends, is America's future, and the future will not be and must not be denied.

Nearly 6 months have elapsed and we still talk about reconversion plans. Snarled in bureaucratic red tape are plans for business activity which wait only for a "go ahead" signal to put people to work to provide the essentials of life for all. Yet the bureaucrats fiddle while the people burn.

The administration talks about balancing the budget. Just sounding brass and tinkling cymbals. Their only proposal is to suggest more billions of dollars of new expenditures. So they continue on their spending—rolling up bills—bills which must be paid some day; paid, as a New Deal candidate for President once admitted, "by the sweat of all who labor."

The deadly poison of bureaucratic waste, irresponsible spending, deficit financing, and deceitful political expediency is pulsing in every vein and artery of the Nation's economy. It can be eliminated only through the election of Members of Congress who can and will purge our Nation of the deadly virus. America is beginning to see this truth; that is why the election of Republicans to Congress is first on the "must" list of millions.

Speaking of "must" lists. I am sure you have not overlooked the efforts to bring back the "good old days" of the New Deal when the White House clique ran things with a high hand.

Mr. Hannegan, who devotes some of his spare time to the job of Postmaster General, is reported to have called upon Bob Nathan, Ed Pritchard, Dave Niles, Leon Henderson, and others of the old palace guard to reestablish the old blackjack technique of bringing pressure upon Congress. He has set up a special group in the House to fight for political "must" legislation. Turn that one over in your mind. Hannegan's action is an attack upon the Democratic Congress by the man who is head of the Democratic national organization.

We have had 13 years of the New Deal. Their theme song today is the same as it was in 1932. The New Dealers still fight shadows of the past. They must talk of the past. They dare not face the facts of the present. They dare not ask for popular support on their record of achievements; that record is too bad, and the Nation knows it. Thirteen years! Certainly that is enough time for any party to make good. Thirteen years, and what do we find? Chaos in foreign policy; everybody suspicious and uncertain as to where we are going. At home, confusion in Washington, strife in industry, fear everywhere. The national debt approaching three hundred billions, and a contingent debt of three hundred billions more. Three hundred billions of national debt means a mortgage of more than $2,000 on every man, woman, and child in the United States, or a debt load of $8,000 on the average American family.

Experts have figured out that under the administration's budget, the Government will spend $130,000,000 every day in the fiscal year of 1947. That means for the wage earner with a wife and two children, that means for the farmer with a wife and two children, that the administration is going to spend $4 every day for each family—$4 a day of the workingman's wage—$4 a day of the farmer's income. How long do you think we can stand that?

Within the last few weeks the Nation has been shocked to its depths by the revelations of secret agreements of which it had not the slightest hint, but which it had been assured by administration spokesmen did not exist. You remember those solemn and reassuring words we were given that "there are no secret agreements." Now we are asked to make good on promises which even the Secretary of State says he did not know about.

The dangers of secret diplomacy and veiled government and deals in the dark diplomatic closets are not new. They have been the tools of oppression for centuries, and the administration, in pursuing these practices in government, is following in the pathways of the most dangerous despotisms of the past. Let me read to you what one philosopher of the seventeenth century wrote, then ponder a moment and see if it might not have been written in 1946, in the United States of America. Listen:

"It has been the one song of those who thirst after absolute power that the interest of the state requires that its affairs should be conducted in secret. But the more such arguments disguise themselves under the mask of public welfare, the more oppressive is the slavery to which they will lead. Better that right councils be known to enemies than that the evil secrets of tyrants should be concealed from the citizen. They who can treat secretly of the affairs of a nation have it absolutely under their authority; and as they plot against the enemy in time of war, so do they against the citizens in time of peace."

Now think of Yalta.

We have learned enough about the secret agreements at the Yalta Conference to feel certain it was a tragic blunder for the United States.

Apparently the most vital and far-reaching promises involving the interests of the American people were secretly given at Yalta. America has the right to know now what they were. All of them.

We stand before the portals of a new era. We must enter it at least knowing the problems and the decisions lying before us. We must have this knowledge and make these decisions as a united people. Otherwise our

fate may be decided for us by force. If the decisions of a nation are made by the leaders of a nation in secret, there is no alternative to the will of the people but coercion.

The months that lie immediately ahead will invoke decisions of the most fundamental character.

What kind of an America are we going to have? Shall it be an America in which individual opportunity will continue to exist alike for all? Shall it be an America in which freedom shall flourish, freedom of speech; freedom of radio; freedom of press? Shall we continue to have the two most precious freedoms of all—freedom of religion and freedom of education? Shall this be our beloved America of the future? Or will we live in an America in which we shall be regimented; an America controlled by Federal bureaucrats from Washington; an America in which individual opportunity shall have vanished; an America bound in the chains of some form of communism, fascism, or state socialism? These questions, my friends, concern every man, woman, and child on this continent. They concern, also, the peoples of other nations who look to America as their torch of life and guidance to a better day and a better life. Those questions will be answered in the elections next November.

The pattern is already set. We know precisely what kind of administration we will have if the New Deal persists in control of the Congress of the United States. We will have the same crushing bureaucracy, arrogance, and waste; the same deceit and double talk; the same weasel words and trick phrases; the same distortion and weird constructions of law; the same kind of secret government at home and secret diplomacy abroad that we have suffered under for these 12 and more long years.

As Lincoln had a supreme faith in the wisdom and common sense of an informed people, so do I have supreme faith in the wisdom and common sense of an informed electorate; but the very first requirement for an informed electorate is an honest, candid, frank administration that is willing to tell the people the truth, and the whole truth, about their domestic affairs and their foreign commitments. I believe the American people know now that the only way to get at that truth is to open the dark halls of this administration, to let the light into the nooks and crannies of bureaucratic intrigue and manipulations, to turn the wholesome light of publicity upon the New Deal in its conduct of our foreign relations. The only hope is to elect an honest, courageous, and intelligent Republican Congress.

I pledge you this, if a Republican Congress is given the responsibility next November, the American people will know the facts about their Government at home and their commitments abroad; they will know what burdens we have assumed in world affairs, what burdens we must assume, and what promises or contracts have been made in their name without their knowledge or consent.

It is eminently fitting that this fight to preserve American freedom should be turned over to the Republican Party, because our party was born to fight for freedom. It has always been the party of freedom. Today, as we honor the memory of our immortal founder, let us take new resolve to rededicate our party to the fight for freedom, not only for the people of our own land but for the people of every land.

How can anyone think of Lincoln without naturally thinking of the Negro race which he liberated. More than 15,000,000 people in our population are of the colored race. In the struggle to maintain free American government, we know the colored race will prove its courage, its valor, and its patriotism. Some of the outstanding heroes of our wars against aggression and oppression are men of the colored race. We have not forgotten such heroic deeds as that of Mess Attendant Charles Jackson French, who swam under shell fire for 2 hours through heavy seas towing a raft on which were huddled his wounded white comrades. He richly deserves a high Navy decoration for his heroism. The Negro race has every reason to be proud of its men and women who have distinguished themselves in war and peace. No race has been more loyal to America than the Negro—from the day Crispus Attucks fell fighting for freedom on the streets of Boston to this good hour. Of course, the Republican Party intends to aid the colored people in attaining complete freedom of opportunity. They are entitled to the right to work as is every other American, without being blocked by any artificial barriers. They have won that right by their loyalty and service to their country. Freedom to work must be preserved as the right of every American, be he white, colored, be he Protestant, Catholic, or Jew. There must be no privileged groups in America if we are to achieve the full promise of our destiny.

Freedom is the concern of the big man and the little man; it is the concern of the rich and the poor; it is the concern of the powerful and the weak. Lincoln wisely said that America cannot long endure half slave and half free, and such slavery can just as surely wreck America if it is political slavery as it can if it is economic slavery.

While the New Deal political monopoly throttles big business, it at the same time is suffocating little business.

Make no mistake, my fellow Republicans, the very foundation of American business is in the small community industries locally owned, locally managed, employing home people. Yet thousands of these small community businesses have withered and died under the New Deal, and thousands more of them are threatened with strangulation today. They have suffered more under the New Deal regulations than the big industries.

I warn you that you can no more wipe out or impair the Nation's small business without wrecking our economy and bringing ruin upon us than you could wipe out the farmers of America and find food and fiber for our necessities in untilled acres given over to weeds and desolation. There is a liberty that is necessary to business and to agriculture just as surely as there is a liberty that is necessary to the happiness of individuals. And the price of that liberty for business and for farm is, as the price of individual liberty, eternal vigilance. The portents before us today are too plain and too strong to be ignored. The trend toward communism on the one hand and fascism on the other must be met and turned back. The channels of free government, free economy, and free society must be reopened by a Republican Congress determined to clean out the rubbish of regimentation and bureaucratic red tape.

There is something very significant about the fact that over the last 13 years of its domination of American government, the New Deal has criticized large incomes, yet has constantly and consistently beer graduating its bureaucrats into twenty-five, fifty, and seventy-five thousand dollar-a-year jobs. There is always a New Dealer around when the plums fall. Curious, isn't it, that a party which says it is for the common man should find so many favors in the group it was supposed to fight.

In this forthcoming campaign we will see tempting subsidies and handouts, which have to be paid for by the people in heavy taxes, offered to maintain bureaucratic control of the Government. We must all be on guard against the wiles of the bureaucrat who would buy continuance of office by handouts of the taxpayers' money.

The cornerstone of freedom is equal justice. If equal justice under the law is reestablished in America it will be done only by the Republican Party through a Republican Congress. If we are to have officials who will construe the law and who will administer the law according to its plain intent, we must have a Republican Congress to see that it is done.

Both workingmen and employers have their just rights and those rights must be fully protected. No just right of any citizen or of any group of citizens can be preserved or served by the violation of the just rights of any other citizen or group of citizens.

One of the crying evils in America today is the broad shift from statutory to administrative regulations which are given the force of law. So long as the laws for the government of the people are made by Congress the people's liberties are safe. When bureaucrats, never standing for election to office, but hiding far back in the recesses of government, can issue administrative orders having the force of law, then the people's liberties are in danger. Government under laws enacted by the people's Representatives in Congress assembled is a government of, by, and for the people. A government operated by administrative orders where bureaus and commissions can be prosecutor, judge, and jury, is government of, by, and for the bureaucrats and their privileged friends.

The Republican Party today needs 27 additional Members to control the House of Representatives. We ask the people of America to send us these reinforcements. If they do, we guarantee that the way of life which has made this Nation the greatest economic power of all time shall be preserved. If they do, we guarantee to the people of America that communism, fascism, or any other form of state socialism will not flourish here.

We ask the American people to guarantee the continuance of American principles through the election of a Republican Congress. If the people give that guaranty, we will then enter upon an era of progress, prosperity, and hope that will bring a better and happier life to all Americans everywhere. The great American ideal—government by consent of the governed—shall once more light the way of men, and direct the genius of a great people to a rich and enduring peace.

Demobilization of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 8, 1946

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter written to the editor of the Stars and Stripes by two Purple Heart wearers, one of whom is a constituent of mine:

JANUARY 7, 1946.

To the EDITOR: In your paper, dated January 6, the editorial gave Lt. Gen. Lawton Collins' statement concerning the slowdown of demobilization. According to him, "troop requirements overseas during the first half of 1946 will exceed the rate at which the Army is capable of maintaining troops through replacements." This is, in our opinion, a feeble excuse for the number of men being sent overseas to relieve veterans. During the course of the war the draft boards managed to keep the "repple depples" well stocked with men to fill the gaps left by our wounded and killed. Perhaps you at home have the idea that since hostilities have ceased, there is no longer any necessity for speeding the return of the men who were sent over to represent the United States in total war. In

other words, since we are already here, it's not going to hurt us to remain a little longer than was at first thought necessary.

To go further, General Collins stated that the number of men still overseas who heard a short fired in this war is not very great. In our company at present—a line company—there are 130 men; of these only six have not seen combat. Perhaps the general had better go further than the Pentagon Building for his data before making statements to the press.

Both of the undersigned have been in the Army for 31 months, 15 of which have, and are being, served overseas in the Infantry. It is simple mathematics to determine the number of months combat each of us saw. This is not an isolated case; at least 10 percent of the men in infantry companies overseas are in the proverbial rowboat with us.

Both of the undersigned were in college at the time our greetings came, in fact we had only turned 18, 3 months previous to our induction. We both went into ASTP where we remained until the Army broke the promises made us. At this time, March 4, 1944, ASTP closed its doors on 90,000 of us, and we went into the Infantry. From then on it has been one hard road for which we have no complaints—we had company.

Let it be understood that this letter is not intended to bring sympathy. We are both proud of the fact that we shared in the glory of the Queen of Battle. Rather, let it be understood that the vicious propaganda being fed to you—the public—by the War Department is as much a crime as was the literary food fed by Goebbles, Inc., to the people of Germany.

In closing we want to say that it is our fervent hope that you at home will bring pressure to bear where it will help most. Stop believing the War Department when it says that there are no more combat troops over here. It's all unmitigated lies.

TWO PURPLE HEART WEARERS,
Company C, Forty-seventh Infantry.
DACHAU, GERMANY.

Effective Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 8, 1946

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following testimony of Leo Goodman, secretary, CIO cost-of-living committee before House Postwar Planning Committee, December 14, 1945, and Senate Small Business Committee, December 19, 1945:

FOR EFFECTIVE PRICE CONTROL

The CIO is very glad to have this chance to appear before your committee to urge the maintenance of price control and to point out some of the things that must be done if price control is to be of maximum service to this country.

It is generally known that labor is very much concerned about price control. It is not generally known that the CIO has had a committee working on price control since the middle of June 1943. This committee, of which I have the privilige of being Secretary, consists of six representatives of CIO international unions. In the last three and a half years, we have participated in frequent discussion of OPA price and rationing policies, and have studied carefully the regulations issued by OPA.

We have approached the problem of effective price control with the idea in mind that this agency has two responsibilities to the people of America:

1. To hold down the cost of living.

2. To maintain those price and cost relationships which will be conducive to prosperity and full employment when the war and the reconversion period are over.

BUSINESS CHARGES AGAINST OPA

We have observed the clamor from business and industry groups against price control as such, and against specific actions taken by OPA. Most of these groups have declared that OPA regulations were hampering or wrecking business because they either limit profits drastically, or eliminate them altogether. There may have been some few instances where OPA regulations were unnecessarily severe on business. But in most cases, the reports of industry earnings which are issued by governmental agencies, as well as by private research organizations, completely refute these charges.

The figures show that under price control there has been very generous profits both for big and little business, and for practically every type of business operation.

I am at a loss to know how much time to give to these figures in this statement because they have been presented to Congress on so many occasions, and they have been publicized widely. However, they are actually not common knowledge, primarily because of the determination of business groups to discredit the figures and to becloud the issues.

Last June, the CIO discussed these figures with the Banking and Currency Committee of both the House and the Senate. At about the same time, Mr. Bowles released some of these figures to the public and commented as follows: "Average profits, industry by industry, range from earnings, by a bare handful, only slightly in excess of industries' prewar profits to earnings 10 and 12 times what was realized by the industries before the war.

"For corporations of all sizes in all fields, Department of Commerce studies show profits before taxes in 1943 were about two and one-half times greater than in prewar 1939. Even after the payment of high wartime taxes, 1943 earnings were more than double earnings after taxes in 1939.

"In 1944, profits before taxes continued to rise above the record-breaking 1943 level. And earnings after taxes in 1944 were about the same as in 1943, despite the increased tax rates."

I want to emphasize that these high profits have prevailed in industry after industry which have, nevertheless, appeared before OPA and before Congress to shed the bitter tears of poverty and plead for even higher profits.

Now that the war is over, the story has changed a little bit. The plea for price increases is being made now, not so much on the basis that present prices are too low for present costs. Instead, industries are arguing that prices must be increased to anticipate cost increases which may take place in the future.

An example of this kind of an increase is the one currently being made for shoes at the manufacturing level. A survey made by the OPA in response to a request by shoe manufacturers showed that the 1945 rate of profit on civilian shoe sales is 8.16 percent. The rate of profit which would be needed in 1946 to satisfy the industry earnings standard would be only 2.9 percent. Nevertheless, OPA has already announced that the shoe industry will be given a price increase, effective around the first of the year, of 4.5 percent.

This increase to an admittedly highly profitable industry was made because the industry may make certain changes in styling in the months ahead and may incur certain costs in making those changes, and these costs may reduce profits below the prewar profits earned by the manufacturers as a group.

The industry people have advanced, as another argument in favor of this price increase, the fact that they are now going to be able to resume the use of the higher quality materials which were denied them during the war. These higher quality materials cost more, they contend, and therefore the price should be raised now that they are again available.

The fact that these higher quality materials are available is absolutely no guaranty that they will be used. The deterioration in shoe quality during the war has been notorious. I see no reason for assuming that the shoe industry will hasten to replace the low-quality materials with higher-quality materials without some pressure from Government. Where this pressure is to come from I am unable to see.

However, the whole argument over the cost of materials falls of its own weight when it is remembered that OPA raised the ceiling on shoes when the industry began substituting the low quality materials on the grounds that these were more expensive than the usual materials used by the industry. It seems queer price control to raise the ceiling when the industry goes to wartime materials, and to raise it again when the industry returns to its original materials.

Business Week of December 8, 1945, reports that manufacturers of low-priced shoes felt glum about the 4.5 percent increase that OPA has announced because they feel they need a 10-percent increase instead of the 4.5 percent given them. But, the magazine continues, privately they admit they have cause for satisfaction.

It cannot be that OPA doesn't know these things about this price action. As a matter of fact, representatives of the CIO spread these facts before the OPA price people, and the decision to make the increase was made in full knowledge of the facts. Why then was the increase made?

I am not in the confidence of the OPA, so I cannot tell why the increase was actually made. However, it is told about that the industry threatened to come up here on the Hill and get 15 percent increase in prices if OPA didn't agree to a reasonable increase on its own initiative.

Perhaps I should emphasize that I have selected this price action only as an example to indicate the kind of pricing being done currently. It is not the only one being made today, nor is it typical of OPA's procedures at this time.

One of the most effective ways of increasing profits has been to lower the quality of the commodity at the same, or even higher, prices. This practice may be called quality deterioration or up-grading depending on the circumstances in which it occurs. It could manifest itself in the sale of lower quality goods at each of the current price lines, while the price tags remained unchanged, or, as happened so dramatically in clothing, it could manifest itself in the complete disappearance of the low end price tags, while the quality of the goods sold at the remaining price levels became lower and lower. Since neither OPA nor the WPB ever set real quality specifications, the manufacturers and sellers both have had a practically free hand in this respect.

It must be pointed out that OPA did try to regulate price on the basis of quality standards in a number of fields, until Congress ordered OPA to stop it. In the food industry, the result was that consumers paid grade A prices for large quantities of canned foods which were undoubtedly of grade B or even grade C quality. That this was bound to happen with the Army buying practically all the high quality pack was clear even at the time Congress forbade the use of grade labeling.

Canned foods were not the only foods in which the up-grading took place. Butter

and meat were other foods which were sold at top price, regardless of whether the sales were actually top quality. The cost to the consumer was undoubtedly terrific. The windfall to the packers and sellers was undoubtedly also very large.

In clothing, the disappearance from the market of the low end items from each line has been very dramatic, and very expensive to the consumer. In women's dresses, for example, the $1.59 house dress early disappeared from the market. Or perhaps it would be better to say that the $1.59 price tag disappeared and that the dress stayed on the market bearing a $2.75 price tag instead. Who was to know the difference, or be able to prove that the difference existed? After all, there was no standard by which to measure the quality of either price line.

Month after month during 1943 and 1944, the BLS reported that clothing prices were going up, at least in part because of the complete disappearance of the low cost items. Perusal of the BLS monthly reports shows warnings on:

DATE AND ITEM

June 1943: Cotton underwear, pajamas.

July 1943: Women's percale house dresses, men's business shirts, chambray work shirts.

September 1943: Women's fur-trimmed coats, women's wool coats, children's shoes.

January 1944: Cotton and rayon dresses, girdles.

February 1944: Men's work shoes, men's and women's felt hats, women's rayon underwear, girdles.

March 1944: Work clothes, men's felt hats, men's shirts, men's shorts, men's pajamas, women's underwear, women's cotton night clothes.

April 1944: Women's inexpensive rayon dresses, girdles, women's percale dresses, men's and women's felt hats, business shirts.

May 1944: Girdles.

August 1944: Fur-trimmed coats, untrimmed sport coats.

September 1944: Children's clothes, underwear, house dresses.

October 1944: Women's cotton house dresses.

November 1944: Cotton house dresses.

An OPA statement made in February of 1945 stated that five-sixths of the increase in clothing prices was due to the disappearance of these low end price tags.

As an example of what this could mean in just one item, I quote from a trade publication for shoe distributors, Hides and Leather Shoes, which reported on April 15, 1944, that, "Footwear quality has declined under wartime pressure by an average of 29.4 percent, according to 440 shoe distributors who set the percentage of decline at levels varying from 5 to 77 percent."

The influence of this situation, profitwise, can be seen in the following figures: The cotton textile industry earned $28,000,000 per year before the war; at the beginning of 1945, the industry was earning profits at the rate of $365,000,000 per year.

The shoe industry earned 4.8 percent on sales before the war; during the first half of 1945 the industry was earning 8.1 percent on sales of civilian shoes. (Figures derived from sample study by OPA of firms making over one-half of all shoes.)

The apparel industry reported to OPA that between 1939 and 1944 sales increased 65 percent. Profits, however, increased 282 percent.

Over the same period of time, retail sales of apparel went up 93 percent by OPA's figures. The increase in profits on these sales, by OPA's conservative figures, was 360 percent.

This disappearance of low end lines, and deterioration in quality so that high prices were charged for lower quality than usual, with consequent penalty to the consumer and profit to industry, has taken place in practically all fields under price control. Not only must this situation be taken into account when analyzing the complaints of manufacturers and sellers; I urge that this committee give positive consideration to making recommendations for plugging this tremendous leak in the price-control dam.

DECONTROL

Just as we have advised with the OPA about policies during the war, we have made efforts to consult with OPA officials each time a change in the war situation has required a rethinking of price-control policies. Each time the program has been redeveloped, we have pointed out and argued against the inflationary aspects of the policies being adopted. Time and time again, we have repeated President Roosevelt's admonition that the way to hold the line was to hold it, not to find reasons for raising things a little here and a little more there.

The latest of these price-control developments is the decontrol program. This is the program, outlined in a directive issued by Economic Stabilizer Will H. Davis on July 13, 1945, for removing ceilings from items now under price control.

Incidentally, we first learned about the proposed decontrol program by reading the Journal of Commerce, not from the OPA. It is noteworthy that consultation by OPA with the groups which benefit from its price increase has been fulsome, while consultation with the representatives of those who have to pay the price increases has been haphazard and infrequent.

On July 27, 1945, after studying OPA's decontrol proposal and the directive issued by the OES, labor protested both the announcement of a decontrol plan at that time and the specific provisions of the plan which had been developed.

We pointed out that publication of a decontrol plan at that time would encourage all the anti-price-control forces in the country to press for the end of price control on specific items as well as for the end of price control in general.

We pointed out, too, that the directive would permit the decontrol of items which are significant in the cost of living if, at the time of exemption, these items were selling below ceiling prices. However, if these prices did later rise, ceilings would be restored only with difficulty, and at levels higher than those of the previous ceilings.

Under the plan, also, exemption is permitted for items which were not regarded as significant in the cost of living even if a future price increase was regarded as possible. However, no practicable definition was given to indicate which commodities, or how many of them taken together, significantly affect the cost of living.

Later events showed how sound our position actually was. However, immediate confirmation came in the form of the expressed opinions of OPA's own field people. For example, on August 14, 1945, a price executive operating in the outlying possessions wrote to the national office as follows:

"A large number of merchants here have started licking their chops in anticipation of the widely heralded intention of the national office to exempt a considerable number of so-called luxury goods from price control. We have thought the problem through very carefully for the past month, as I indicated in my last progress report, and have come up with at least a dozen arguments both pro and con for local exemptions. After considering all these arguments and after obtaining the best possible sample of community sentiment, I have decided as a matter of general policy that we will not fall into line as a matter of course with the exemption orders to be issued by the national office for the mainland. Atomic bombs and Moscow notwithstanding, this area is and will remain a tremendous inflationary bubble for a long time. After 3 years of listening to us talk about holding the line the community has become almost convinced of the salutary effect of our actions here and expects us to continue to hold the famous line so long as the need is evident."

The opinion expressed in this statement, and the description of the inflationary tendencies inherent in the situation, apply to Hawaii. However, experience and opinions of other price executives showed that the same tendencies existed in this country as well. For example, in August of 1945, the San Francisco office of OPA commented as follows:

"We have recently learned that decontrol actions are of two types—avowed and concealed. The avowed actions, are, of course, the exemptions and suspensions. There are also, however, actions in the other forms, which look like regular price actions, but are, in fact, actuated by a decontrol motive. The outstanding example to date is the automatic pricing formula under reconversion for manufacturers having a volume (annually of) under $50.000. It was a relief to us to learn recently that this action was a concealed exemption, and was taken for valid reasons with full knowledge that this would be its effect. One practical problem emerges, however. It is apparent that some orders and amendments will in the future be issued on a liberal basis with the real intention of effecting exemptions; others will be formulated under ordinary price-control standards. It is vitally important for the field to know which is which, as we should obviously take a different approach when we are administering a 'we don't really care' ceiling rather than a ceiling intended to effect tight price control. If the national office is scrupulous in giving us these explanations, it will be possible for us in the field to appreciate and evaluate national policy correctly. Otherwise, these looser pricing actions, which may be genuinely motivated by sound policy considerations, will look like mere surrender in the face of pressure.

"It is easy to recognize at this point the vital importance of price control in the future, particularly in such fields as food, clothing, consumer durable goods, consumer services, building materials, and construction services. We must also be prepared to face greater difficulties as a result of the removal of other controls which formerly helped us. As rationing dwindles, it becomes that much harder to hold the price line. The same is true of controls being dropped by other agencies such as WLB, WPB, ODT, and WMC. It is obvious that it will not be sufficient to relieve the pressures by decontrol in less essential fields; we shall also have to do a better job affirmatively in the fields which remain."

Now, as to direct operation of decontrol:

In August, food still needed price control; the public still wanted it. However, OPA was already in the decontrol business. The effects of its decontrol orders began to be felt immediately. For example, on August 1, 1945, one of the price executives out in the field reported to Washington as follows:

"The suspension of ceiling on several fresh-vegetable items resulted in increased prices and widespread consumer complaints. This was particularly true of snap beans, where prices advanced from a community ceiling of 17 cents to as high as 60 cents per pound. Lack of demand and increased supplies have now reduced this item to a price range of 19 to 35 cents per pound. Lack of more specific control on tomatoes continue to bring in consumer complaints against 4 to 43 cents per pound prices."

The administrative burden of decontrol and its effect on prices is serious. The effect of the decontrol policy, which may or may not have been anticipated by OPA, is best described in the words of the Deputy Administrator for Price, Mr. Jerome Ney:

"In recent weeks much time has been spent in discussing the advisability of taking decontrol action in specific instances

upon principles going beyond the provisions of Directive 68. As a result a heavy workload has developed in a number of the branches and this workload threatens to continue and even increase to the point where it may interfere seriously with day-to-day work to the deterirnent of over-all price control and to the disadvantage of industry in general."

EFFECTS OF DECONTROLLING

I have already shown the direct results of this policy as far as snap beans are concerned. You may recall that after the removal of ceilings the price of beans went from 17 to 60 cents per pound. Even after an increase in supply, the price, although it declined, remained higher than the previous ceiling, with some people still being required to pay more than two times the previous ceiling price.

In the case of citrus fruits, OPA removed ceilings on Nov.mber 19; the following day prices began to jump. OPA's field offices reported increases ranging as high as 100 percent. on the same qualities and sizes. For instance, the Chicago regional office announced that, "large California oranges long held to the OPA ceiling of $5.28 were sold for $9.95 per case on the first day following suspension of ceiling prices, by today were down to $8.20."

Spokane, Wash., reported on November 27 that Texas pink grapefruit has gone up 58 percent; in Seattle increases ranged to 68 percent. Similar increases were reported from all over the country on all citrus fruits.

On November 28, OPA turned down labor's request to reinstitute the price ceilings, prefering to "watch the prices" for another week. At the end of that week—that is, on December 5—OPA was sufficiently impressed with the seriousness of the situation to recommend to the Office of Stabilization Administration that the ceilings be reimposed. The Department of Agriculture and the citrus growers objected to this action, so it was decided to again postpone the decision another week. The result is that citrus fruits remain without price control during the pre-Christmas buying season—the period during which control was most needed and the people will pay a large sum of money because of the Government's eagerness to remove economic controls.

The newspapers told the story of what happened to the price of coconut when price ceilings were removed. This item sold before the war, according to newspaper reports, for $15 per thousand pounds; during the war the ceiling was maintained at $55 per thousand pounds. Recently the ceiling was removed and the price shot to well over $200 per thousand pounds. Candy manufacturers have found themselves unable to buy an item which is very important in their business. At the same time the people who held stocks of coconuts at the time of decontrol have cleaned up some very tidy windfalls.

Some of you may recall what happened to the price of Alaskan seal fur when, on August 15, 1945, OPA removed the price ceilings. The price had been held at a ceiling of approximately $45 per skin; when the ceiling was removed prices shot up. Recently sales were being made at $110 per skin.

I have dwelt at length on the decontrol problem because even after all that has already happened there seems to be no inclination to greater caution. Even the strictures of Mr. Ney, which I quoted above, are confined to decontrols beyond the provisions of the decontrol directive, No. 68. Decontrol under the terms of the directive proceed as before, even though it has been under these terms so much damage has already been done.

I could go on with many other examples to show what the effect of the removal of price ceilings has been. I think that the case is already clear. I think that one would be hard put to find the words to describe adequately the irresponsibility, the sheer economic criminality involved in the proposals now being put forth and actually before Congress at this time, that price control be abolished in toto, or that the decontrol of OPA be extended at this time.

RECONVERSION PRICING

In the field of reconversion prices, as well as in its going price-control program, OPA has proceeded as though the poverty claims of industry were correct, and its own knowledge of the situation could not be relied on.

The Labor Policy Committee of the OPA entered into the discussion of reconversion pricing in July of 1944. In September of 1944, after some discussion with the OPA of the reconversion price policy that it was already drafting, the CIO Cost of Living Committee recommended to OPA that reconversion prices be set at no higher than the 1941–42 level. We declared that it was the responsibility of OPA in this tremendously important area to protect the standard of living of the American people against further increases in the cost of living, and to provide a postwar price level conducive to full employment.

We urged that increases from these 1941–42 prices be permitted only after a manufacturer had operated under his old price for a period long enough so that reliable operating data could be obtained. Of course, our recommendations provided for exceptions to this policy where circumstances clearly required an immediate price increase.

We believed then, as we believe now, that industry would be well protected by the 1941–42 level, by the reserves amassed during the war, and by tax and other governmental guaranties against hardship during the reconversion period. We believe that after reconversion is over, the profits that would have resulted from production at 1942 prices, especially as they would be affected by operation at high levels of output and increased productivity, would have been at least ample for industry. They might even be so great as to threaten the stability of the entire Nation.

The recommendations we made on OPA reconversion pricing were not adopted. However, since we made those recommendations, reports have been issued by the War Production Board, the Department of Commerce, and the Office of War Mobilization which have at various points supported the validity of our position. President Truman evidenced the same kind of thinking which we had done when he suggested that industry make voluntary wage increases and then wait 6 months before asking for consideration from OPA of price relief.

OPA, too, has since admitted the validity of our position by pointing out, in its press release of November 18, 1945, that its reconversion policy is based on the 1941 levels of production, and that 1946 levels should provide the opportunity for higher profits than those which prevailed in 1941. Let me point out that even 1941 profits were higher than the prewar profits which OPA is required by law to protect. A recent study of 2,085 manufacturing companies made by OPA showed that their profits were 2.7 times as high in 1941 as in 1936–39.

In spite of this high-profit situation, arising out of postwar production prospects at even prewar prices, OPA has made price increases for the manufacturers of practically every reconversion commodity.

Washing machine manufacturers have been given a price increase of 7.7 percent.

Vacuum cleaner manufacturers have been given a price increase of 5.5 percent.

Lawn mower manufacturers have been given a price increase of 17 percent.

Metal toy manufacturers have been given a price increase of 14 percent.

Radio set manufacturers have been given a price increase of 12 percent.

Radio parts manufacturers have been given price increases which will bring in approximately $100,000,000 per year.

Fractional horsepower motor manufacturers may raise prices 9 percent.

Automobile manufacturers are being treated on an individual basis. Two of them have already received their increase factors: Ford, for whom increases will average about 6 percent, and Studebaker, for whom they run around 12 percent. However, there is already evidence to show that manufacturers who receive no increase factors, or whose factors may be low, will reap their windfalls through price increases for specification changes, rather than through admitted reconversion increases.

In all of these reconversion industries, production will be far higher than it was in 1941. The profits of these higher prices plus those resulting from increased levels of output, and from increases in productivity which will soon be felt, will yield profits so high that depression and unemployment are inevitable in the near future.

Most of the industries involved complain to the world in general and to Congress in particular that OPA is "ruining them." If there is any validity to that charge, it is that OPA's generosity in making price increases, rather than its ungenerosity in refusing them, may ruin American industry.

BASIS FOR PRICE ACTIONS

A. Secrecy of negotiations

It has been our position that fewer of these harmful increases would be made if OPA were required to reveal to the public the facts on which the decision to make a price increase is arrived at. Labor's repeated requests for public information have been just as repeatedly denied by OPA. Labor has been told that individual firms would feel aggrieved if OPA revealed its data to its competitors. And then we have been told that there would be objections from an industry as a whole when we have asked for data which did not reveal facts about individual firms. So the negotiations between OPA and the industry asking for a price increase is carried on in secrecy, with no chance for the public to get the real facts.

B. Insufficiency of data

This extreme solicitude for those wanting price increases has been shown by OPA in many other ways. Let me cite an example. In the case of radio parts, price increases ranging from 9.5 percent through 26.3 percent were made after OPA had had the following experience with the parts manufacturers. (The quote is from OPA's press release of October 11, 1945.)

"Despite repeated requests by the Office of Price Administration for the submission of cost data for use in computing the increase factors for radio parts, and despite assurances of representatives of the industry that such cost data would be supplied, cost data were not submitted to OPA as promised, OPA said."

As I pointed out above, the price increases (made after this refusal by the manufacturers to supply data) are expected to yield the manufacturers approximately $100,000,000 per year.

In our discussions with OPA, we have been told repeatedly of cases where OPA's accountants had to be sent from the Washington office to go over the books of an individual firm in order to get the data upon which a price increase was to be based.

C. Unverified data

OPA's decision involves the transfer of large sums of money from the pockets of the buying public into the treasuries of the sellers. The business which is asking for an increase might be expected to prove its case up to the hilt, before the regulatory

agency, even if not before the public as we have asked. Quite the reverse is true. Figures submitted by manufacturers who are asking for price increases are accepted by OPA without further review or verification.

How many millions of dollars have been added to industry prices in this manner cannot be estimated. I do know, however, that the automobile increases are being made on exactly this basis.

Frequently, however, the decision to make a price increase seems to be made with no relationship to what the figures show about the profits of the manufacturer. Let me quote from a series of OPA truck price increases, made during 1944 and 1915.

Corporation	Date	Percent increase	Reason [1]
Divco Corp., Detroit, Mich	Oct. 18, 1944	16	It appears that the applicant's over-all profit position is "unfavorable."
Chrysler Corp	May 5, 1945	9	The applicant's current over-all profits have a "normal relationship" to its over-all profits during the base period, 1936-39.
Diamond T Motor Car Co	Nov. 3, 1945	6, 11, 23	It appears that the applicant's over-all profits position is "very favorable."
General Motors Corp	May 11, 1945	27	No description in OPA's statement of consideration as to what the profit situation was

[1] Quotations ours.

D. Net worth adjustments

A type of statistical legerdemain which underlies all OPA's price determination is known as the adjustment for increase in net worth. That is, in judging the fairness of a particular price OPA inspects the return on the net worth of the industry which results from that price, as compared with the return on net worth earned by that industry before the war. If the net worth of an industry has increased during the war, a price increase may have to be made in order to protect the rate of return.

However, the net worth increases which have taken place have in large measure been the result of the accumulation by industry of large cash and bond holdings. These have resulted from large profits earned by an industry and become part of the new base; and the reason for additional price increases which contribute further to the profits of the industry.

E. General rescue

In presenting to Congress and to congressional committees their allegations about OPA's pricing cruelties, industry pressure groups generally have omitted any reference to the special price increasing mechanism which OPA has provided for those individual firms or groups of firms which are not satisfied with the specific regulations themselves.

Among these special mechanisms there is one referred to in OPA as the general rescue regulation. This regulation provides relief whenever a current price threatens to put any manufacturer out of business. Such a manufacturer may apply to the OPA regional and district offices for a price increase, which will assure him of recovery of the total cost of producing an item.

In our judgment, the regulation is so loosely drawn as to remove from under price control the products of any manufacturer who feels that his activities are not significant enough to invite careful OPA review of his pricing methods. It removes a large share of the economic pressure on an inefficient manufacturer to become more efficient. It underwrites a plant which is producing at less than capacity, when capacity production might be necessary for economic production. It provides for price control on the basis of self-regulation with only the most perfunctory and rubber stamp type of review by OPA. It is a surrender to a kind of price control which OPA had resisted in the past as being inflationary, and as price escallation rather than price control.

SUMMARY

In summary, we have seen for a period of 3 or 4 years the price-control agency, which was set up to hold the price line, yield again and again to pressure for price increases from industries and business groups which could show no economic justification whatsoever for the price increases. The evidence for this lack of need for price increases is contained in the financial statistics of every governmental agency which collects such figures.

These increases were made at the expense of consumers who were caught by war shortages and by the necessity of adjusting to other wartime conditions. They are made at the expense of the veterans and of every other group in the national economy whose living depends on full employment and prosperity, rather than on unemployment and depression.

We have often congratulated ourselves on the fact that the cost of living in this war has risen less than during World War I. There may be some cause for satisfaction in this comparison. However, this is indeed a weak test of the effectiveness of this crucial economic operation. We had as much right to expect victory on the economic front as on the military front. We have the right to test the increases in the cost of living by the necessity there may have been for making them. The evidence shows that the people of this country could have been saved billions of dollars in their own purchases and in the expenditures of the Government if price increases had been made only on the basis of need.

We are conscious of the fact that OPA made some of these increases only as the result of great outside pressure. We are conscious, too, that the pressure often came from individual Congressmen and groups of Congressmen, and that OPA at times yielded reluctantly because it could not stand up to the pressure exerted on it. It is neither our duty nor our responsibility to apportion the blame for pressure-made price increases as between OPA and some Members of Congress. This committee is in a far better position than we are to do that job.

We do request, however, that this committee use its influence on behalf of price control, conceived in the terms in which price control was originally adopted; that is, the protection of the consumer, the protection of the economy of the Nation as a whole, the protection of Government expenditures.

While OPA cannot undo much of the harm that has been done, we insist that OPA be permitted and required to maintain its specific price controls until there is clear evidence that price control is no longer needed, and to administer its price controls on the basis of protection for the country as a whole instead of a segment thereof, and prevent further damage to the consumer and to the Nation as a whole.

Strike Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 8, 1946

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to authority heretofore granted I include the following editorials with respect to recent strike legislation, one of which appeared in the Oregon Journal, Portland, under date of February 2, 1946, and the other in the Portland Oregonian on the same date:

[From the Oregon Journal of February 2, 1946]

A 2 TO 1 VOTE CAN OVERRIDE A VETO

E. T. Marr, secretary of the Oregon Federation of Labor, A. F. of L., has formally protested the strike-control bill introduced by Representative FRANCIS CASE, of South Dakota, calling it a threat to all liberties including freedom of speech and of the press. By a vote of more than 2 to 1, the House has indicated its preference for consideration of the Case bill as substitute for fact-finding legislation asked by President Truman and subsequently weakened by the House.

The Case bill is directed against all labor groups. It is inspired by a growing public resentment against creeping economic paralysis. The bill would establish a national labor-management board to help settle labor disputes construed to be contrary to public interest. It also would outlaw violent picketing and boycotts, provide for civil suits against violation of labor contracts, and make unions subject to injunction.

It is commonly predicted that the Case bill or one similar to it will pass the House. The practicality of the situation indicates a compromise to "turn off the heat." Politically, the Case bill is a "hot potato."

[From the Portland Oregonian of February 2, 1946]

THE STRIKE CONTROL BILL

The Case strike control bill may never become law in its present form, but the 258-to-114 vote by which the House of Representatives substituted it for President Truman's fact-finding legislation is indication that Congress finally is ready to do something about the national headache. The vote was a threat to union labor and an expression of lack of confidence in the Truman administration.

If the bill ever becomes law it will have to be over the veto of President Truman. There is no possibility that he would withstand the pressure of organized labor and the New Deal residue of the Democratic Party, without whose support he could not hope to win in 1948, whether or not he believes the Case bill good legislation. Yet, if this vote is a true test, Congress is sufficiently aroused to force through some measure which will greatly restrict the power of the unions.

Marquis Childs, in a column on this page, interprets the vote as the political reflection of a plot by organized industry to break organized labor. Unquestionably, Congress is in the mood to restrict, if not to punish, the unions. But this is not an attitude born overnight as the sole result of industry's efforts to lay all the blame on labor. It is the cumulative result of many labor excesses, of demonstrated impotency of the executive branch to meet the crisis strongly and impartially, of conviction no longer to be denied that America is on the brink of an economic

debacle which, if it occurs, will pull the whole world structure down with it and endanger the peace.

For many years Congress has been passing legislation to protect and advance the claimed rights of organized labor. If the pendulum swings the other way, labor cannot hold itself entirely blameless. Too often in the struggle between unions and management the interests of the public have been sacrificed.

The Case bill would require unions to be responsible for their actions, and it would authorize civil suits for damages against either employer or employees for violation of a labor contract. It would prohibit violent picketing and organized boycott, and subject unions to the liability of injunction. It would establish a national labor-management mediation board and require unions to give 30 days' notice before striking.

Some of these provisions adapt themselves to abuse, and safeguards should be erected. Fair-minded persons do not wish to see the unions destroyed, nor do thoughtful persons believe that they can be destroyed by this or any other legislation in our time. But with 1,200,000 workers already on strike, can anyone wish to continue to drift into disaster? The unions should have equal responsibility with management.

Butter Situation Critical

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 8, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, so many of us have taken the floor to protest critical shortages that have existed for some time in the hope that the situation would be corrected. I rise again to protest and call attention to the situation existing with one of our most important foods, namely butter. Apparently all I can do is raise my voice in protest against those policies which have been established by the OPA and which today are responsible for existing conditions.

I have a letter from a most prominent constituent who is a retail merchant. It is couched in strong language and I set it out solely for the purpose of bringing to the attention of this House the attitude of men in business toward the OPA and its pricing policies. Mr. Speaker, we can trace all of these shortages to OPA. I submit herewith a copy of a letter and have purposely omitted his name, so that the Government "gestapo" will not retaliate and attempt to put him out of business. The letter follows:

FEBRUARY 4, 1946.

DEAR LARRY: The enclosed booklet was of great interest to us fellows who are trying to serve the public. When you have people coming in offering to pay any reasonable price for butter and we have to refuse, it just isn't fair. People who work must have butter. The past 2 weeks have seen the biggest black market that I have ever seen in all of my years of business. It stinks. Why in h— don't they allow the law of competition to control the price and quantity of foods. For 100 years that law has worked. We fellows who are trying to do right get caught with unfair competition who are in the black market, with the result that they are taking our customers away. It just isn't right.

Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the charge that this OPA is responsible for a black market condition referred to by a man who knows just what the situation is because he is confronted with it every day. The time has come for Congress to take some action.

Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the fact that butter production and holdings have decreased to the lowest point on record. Obviously some action must be taken to correct this situation. We are confronted with a situation where consumers face an exceedingly low supply for several months to come and unless OPA corrects its policies many creameries which produced butter will go out of business. When these creameries shut down it will mean that hundreds of thousands of dairy farmers will find no market for their milk. It is well to remember in this connection that in 1941, 115,500,000,000 pounds of milk were produced. In 1945 it appears that the total production reached about 123,000,000,000 pounds. Notwithstanding this increased milk production the butter manufactured in 1945 was some 471,000,000 pounds less than in 1941. This represents a loss in butter production of about 25 percent and when Army needs were met civilians had 43 percent less butter last year as compared to 1941.

I call attention to a further pertinent fact, namely: that the production of butter during December of 1945 was 50 percent less than the corresponding month of 1941. This is indeed an alarming situation. Not only are the consumers short of this important food item but the markets for the farmers are steadily decreasing also and ultimately we will be faced with a critical condition on the farms and in the cities.

During the war emergency, specific price formulas were issued by Government agencies that were intended to divert production from butter to cheese, whole milk powder, evaporated milk, and so forth. Restriction orders were placed on the sale of whipping cream, fluid milk and coffee cream, ice cream, and the manufacture of certain cheeses other than cheddar, to insure the production of sufficient butter and other dairy products for the armed forces, lend-lease, and civilians. These limitation orders were terminated September 1, 1945, and a tremendous demand has developed for fluid milk and sweet cream. With prices of sweet cream at 80 cents to $1 per pound of butterfat, the butter manufacturer cannot compete with those prices when his product is fixed by the 1942 ceiling of 46 cents per pound of butter wholesale, Chicago.

It is interesting to note that approximately 850 creameries have ceased to operate since 1941. This represents about one-fifth of the creameries operating in the prewar period, and is evidence of a serious casualty in an important segment of the Nation's small businesses. It is a fair question to ask: Why did those creameries close? The answer is that the creamery industry is the only dairy producers' industry which was forced by Government controls to go through all of the war with less than normal total volume. The creameries were compelled to cease operation or face financial disaster because of a condition created by the Government.

Mr. Speaker, this is a matter which demands attention and the time has come for OPA to change its pricing policies regarding this important agricultural industry. It is one of the most important foods we have today, and it should be accorded every consideration by the governmental agencies which exercise jurisdiction over it at the present time.

The Order of St. Augustine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 8, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an address which was delivered by Rev. Charles F. Hart, O. S. A., of St. Mary's Parish, Lawrence, Mass., over a local radio station:

THE ORDER OF ST. AUGUSTINE—CONTRIBUTION TO THE RELIGIOUS, EDUCATIONAL, AND CULTURAL LIFE OF THE COUNTRY DISCUSSED BY REV. CHARLES F. HART, O. S. A., SUB-PRIOR OF ST. MARY'S PARISH, IN A RECENT RADIO ADDRESS

The contribution of the glorious Order of St. Augustine to the religious, educational, and cultural life of this country, including the Greater Lawrence area which it has served for almost 100 years was discussed by Rev. Charles F. Hart, O. S. A., of St. Mary's Parish for a radio audience recently when he was guest speaker on the Catholic Truth period.

His address which contains many facts of particular interest in this community follows:

The name "Augustinian" is one which is familiar to most of the faithful of the archdiocese of Boston. In Lawrence and Andover, of course, they know this order because Augustinians have for almost a century been their parish priests. Others know the order through its mission band which has for the past 50 years been preaching retreats, missions, and novenas in their churches. There are some, too, in the archdiocese who know the order of St. Augustine because their sons or cousins or nephews have entered the order as priests or brothers. But, no matter how well people know individual Augustinians, it seems that they know little about the order, its history, its characteristic spirit, its numbers. They also know very little about the story of the Augustinians in the Boston area, how they came to make their foundations here, how long they have been here ministering in our midst.

The Order of St. Augustine is one of the so-called mendicant orders. Such orders are called mendicant because originally they supported themselves by begging. Only four such orders exist in the church; the others are the Franciscans, the Dominicans, and the Carmelites. As the name "Augustinian"

would indicate the order traces its foundation to St. Augustine. Doubtless there is no one who does not know something about St. Augustine. He was so versatile a saint and excelled in so many things that almost everyone reveres him for a different reason. For some he is the great sinner who became a great saint; he is for them the humble author of the Confessions. Others think of him as the majestic doctor of the church, the brilliant thinker who, because of his untiring labor in defense of the church, became known as the hammer of the heretics. Others still think of him as the great preacher, the kindly, lovable, simple man of God who taught them the truths of their religion in a language which everybody could understand. One could indefinitely relate the many-sided genius which he was; one would have to mention his fame as a philosopher, a psychologist, a man who penetrated the mysteries of religion, a theologian who is regarded as one of the world's great stylists.

Few people, however, seem to be aware that St. Augustine was also one of the founders of the monastic life. When he was 33 years of age, by the grace of God working through the wise counsels of St. Ambrose and through the prayers and good example of his mother, St. Monica, he returned to the faith of his childhood. He went back then from Italy to his home in north Africa. There he was joined by friends and disciples and with them he began to live the life of a monk. His sister imitated his example and founded a similar group for women. For all of these he wrote his rule. This rule of St. Augustine, one of the earliest in the church, shares with the rule of St. Benedict and that of St. Basil the honor of antiquity and venerability among all the various rules which have been composed for the guidance of monks and nuns. Some hundreds of other institutes have chosen it for their religious guidance. So great was Augustine's love for the common life that he continued in it even after he had become a bishop. After the death of the saint, many monasteries were founded in Africa, Europe, and Asia which followed his rule. These monks were called frequently the Hermits of St. Augustine, though they never united into one order. As a matter of fact, before the thirteenth century, there were no orders in the sense we know them—as great unions of religious—all living under the same constitutions and obedient to the same general superior. It was not until 1256 that Pope Alexander, desirous of obtaining unity among the various independent Augustinian monasteries, brought them together under one name and decreed that their organization was to be similar to that of the recently founded mendicant orders.

The history of the Order of Saint Augustine during the Middle Ages was a glorious one. There were at one time in Europe 30,000 Augustinians in 25 provinces. Augustinian scholars taught at Paris and Oxford. Augustinian missioners sailed with the first Spanish explorers to the New World. There was an Augustinian on the first ship that reached the Philippines. It was an Augustinian who founded the first university on the North American continent, that of Mexico. There were Augustinian missioners in Japan as early as the sixteenth century. Father Gregory Mendel, the world renowned discoverer of the laws of heredity, was an Augustinian. Unfortunately, the growth and expansion of the order was interrupted by the religious revolution of the sixteenth century and very many of the flourishing provinces of Europe were destroyed. It was only in the countries which remained completely Catholic that the order continued in its previous happy state, that is, in Italy, Ireland and Spain. The monastery, college, and university of the Escorial are conducted by the Augustinian Fathers. One hundred and seven Augustinian Fathers of the Escorial Monastery were murdered in the recent Spanish Civil War.

It was from Ireland that the first Augustinians came to this country. In 1794, just 5 years after George Washington was elected first President of the United States, Father John Rosseter came to Philadelphia from Dublin. Seven years later in 1801, the first Augustinian church, that of St. Augustine, was erected a few blocks from the Delaware River in Philadelphia. During the first 50 years of our existence in the United States, Saint Augustine's, Philadelphia, was the cradle and mother-house of the province. This latter title it had to eventually relinquish to Villanova. From this foundation missioners went forth through Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York and into New England. There are at the present time over 50 Augustinian foundations in this country. There are houses of the order in the archdioceses of Philadelphia, New York, Chicago, Detroit, Milwaukee, Los Angeles, Boston and Havana, Cuba; and in the dioceses of Brooklyn, Camden, Ogdenburg, Albany, Lansing, San Diego, Rockford and Tulsa. In addition to its parishes and mission band, the order conducts many high schools.

Villanova College, located a few miles from Philadelphia, was founded in 1842. It is the oldest Catholic college in Pennsylvania and the leading Catholic engineering school of the East.

The Preparatory Seminary is at Staten Island, N. Y., the Novitiate at New Hamburg, N. Y., the Collegiate at Villanova, and the School of Theology at Washington, D. C.

The second apostolic delegate in the United States was Msgr. Sebastian Martinelli. He was an Augustinian and at the time of his assignment he was also created archbishop of Epheus in August of 1896. At this time he was serving his second term as prior general of the Augustinian order. He was made cardinal on April 15, 1901.

As long ago as 1818 an Augustinian, Father Philip Larisey, labored in this archdiocese. He came first to New Bedford, where he built a small church. Then for a few years he engaged in missionary work in Boston, where he built a small chapel which he named St. Augustine's of South Boston. Previous to 1818 he had done missionary work in Newfoundland. He was the first to preach in Irish in Boston. It is recorded that Bishop de Cheverus, of Boston, kept in his desk a document appointing Father Larisey, vicar general and administrator of the diocese, in case of the bishop's death.

Later on the Augustinians established parishes in Lawrence, Andover, Methuen, Ballardvale, and Wilmington. At the present time they have seven churches in Lawrence, of which St. Mary's is the largest and most beautiful in all New England with the exception of the cathedral in Boston. They also have the Immaculate Conception Church in Lawrence, which will celebrate its one-hundredth anniversary this year.

In the fall of 1848, the Reverend James O'Donnell, O. S. A., built St. Mary's Chapel on Oak Street, Lawrence. The holy sacrifice of the Mass was first offered there in January of 1849. The cornerstone of the present magnificent edifice was laid on August 19, 1866.

The present church was completed under the direction of Father Galberry and was dedicated on September 3, 1871. Father Galberry, O. S. A., became the fourth Bishop of Hartford, Conn., in 1875.

In August of 1859, Father O'Donnell introduced the Sisters of Notre Dame, who established the parochial school that has developed to such great proportions. These sisters, at the present time, administer to the spiritual education of the children of the four Augustinian parishes of Lawrence as well as to the children of St. Augustine's parish in Andover.

The Xaverian Brothers were invited in the year 1889 to teach the boys of St. Mary's parish. It would be impossible to compute the good that has been accomplished in St. Mary's parish under the guidance of these brothers, nine of whom now teach the older boys in our schools.

Rev. James T. O'Reilly, O. S. A., came to Lawrence in 1886. During his long pastorate of 39 years much was accomplished for Catholicity in the city.

The oldest Augustinian in the United States, and the second oldest priest in the archdioceses of Boston is the Reverend Daniel J. O'Mahoney who has spent 65 years in the priesthood and having passed his 4 score and 10 years is still active at St. Mary's. On the occasion of his sixtieth anniversary of his ordination Cardinal Dougherty of Philadelphia wrote the following:

"Upon my arrival in Manila in 1903, it was a happiness to meet yourself and the late beloved Father McErlain, your companion, and to learn from you, who had already labored in that difficult field, the state of affairs in that country and especially the difficulties which confronted all of us because of a schism and the effects of the insurrection first against Spain and then against the United States.

"It was due in no small measure to yourself and Father McErlain that the interests of the Catholicity in that country is in a flourishing condition."

The Very Reverend Mortimer A. Sullivan, serving his third term as provincial of the Province of St. Thomas of Villanova, is a native of Lawrence. There are 35 parishes in the province. Two hundred and fifty-four priests in the province devote themselves to educational, missionary, and parochial duties.

Loyalty to the church, to its teaching, and to its head and confidence in supernatural strength, gained through the sacraments, especially the blessed eucharist, are the sovereign remedies which the Augustinian Fathers of this archdiocese have ever recommended to the faithful.

They have always considered it a great privilege to be able to share in the good work of this outstanding center of religious faith. A manifestation of religious faith was exemplified, under the leadership of His Excellency Archbishop Richard J. Cushing, in the recent campaign for a Catholic hospital in Greater Lawrence. The present vital need of such an institution was realized by a doctor, who is an alumnus of Villanova College, and by Augustinian Fathers.

Archbishop Cushing, an apostle of charity to this city, promised, at the solemn pontifical Mass of thanksgiving, in St. Mary's Church on Saturday, September 22, 1945, a refuge for the old folks in appreciation of the cooperation and generosity of the people of Greater Lawrence.

The Augustinians remember with great pride the contributions which have been made by their brethren who have gone before them and who now enjoy the reward of their labors. They have confidence that the Augustinians of the future will continue to bring to the faithful, whose servants they are, the good tidings of the Gospel and the spirit of their illustrious founder, who said "Thou has made us for Thyself, O God, and our heart is restless until it rests in Thee."

Fifteen Billion Dollars More?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 8, 1946

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to leave heretofore granted, I include in my remarks the following article by Frank C. Waldrop, which appeared in a

recent issue of the Washington Times-Herald:

FIFTEEN BILLION DOLLARS MORE?

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Money. Money. Money. Everybody cusses it, yet everybody collects it if he can. Nobody knows who invented it and very few people even claim to understand it.

And though practically everybody knows how to get rid of it, not so many know how to hold onto it. Strange stuff.

Through a great deal of luck, energized by brains and work, we Americans of the present day have inherited the greatest power of wealth ever known to man.

Our natural wealth is converted and made effective through the medium of money. And it could not be made effective in any other known way. No other invention has ever been brought forth for measuring and trading in values as efficiently as in terms of money.

It is also true that nothing can get away from you quicker than this same money if you don't have sense in using it.

Let's do a little figuring and see how our present generation of Americans are handling their money. We have just come out of a world war with a public debt now rising past $275,000,000,000.

Whether this capital debt will ever be paid off, nobody knows. But one fact we can all take a look at now: It costs us in the neighborhood of $5,500,000,000 a year just to pay the interest and service charges.

The war has produced some very interesting developments on United States money abroad in case you are one of those people who says, "Oh, well, after all we only owe the debt to ourselves. We spent it all right here at home so no harm is done to the total national wealth."

The latest figures show that between March 1941 and October 1945 we spent $46,040,054,000 on the lend-lease program. This represents a considerable amount of wealth of the United States distributed through lend-lease agreements with the following countries:

Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Columbia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iraq, Liberia, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, South Africa, Turkey, United Kingdom, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Venezuela, and Yugoslavia.

The foregoing is just a list of nations with which we had formal agreements. It does not by any means signify that we didn't send lend-lease anywhere else in the world, or otherwise spent money abroad.

We also developed Army and Navy Establishments throughout something like 45 major depots around the world outside of our own borders and spent as yet incompletely totaled billions to maintain and supply them.

And of the billions of dollars worth of United States goods exported abroad for the maintenance of our fighting forces, by far the most will stay wherever it now is.

So chalk up X billions in United States wealth abroad over and above lend-lease yet to be totaled.

Even that isn't all. For now that the shooting is over, in come our handsome allies with their hands out again. Our Socialist British Allies are asking $4,400,000,000 and are grouching because they don't get more. Communist-tinged China wants $2,100,000,000 minimum. Socialist-Communist France is talking about $2,500,000,000 minimum. Communist Russia has suggested that she won't take less than $6,000,600,000. There are other countries lined up behind with hands out, too.

In all, we are asked to make direct loans of not less than $15,000,000,000 abroad to finance countries which publicly and officially denounce capitalism and the dollar sign.

Over and above that we are asked to be the principal underwriter of the international bank designed at Bretton Woods.

So you can see that the much-abused United States dollar is somewhat in demand abroad. And very popular, too. But the United States taxpayer who will have to finance all these glamorous enterprises—Oh, well! He's very rich, very generous. And he doesn't need it, anyhow.

Red River Lateral Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 8, 1946

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following arguments in favor of the Red River lateral canal by Ed C. Burris, general manager, Shreveport Chamber of Commerce, secretary-manager Red River Valley Improvement Association:

It is gratifying indeed to have the privilege of coming before this Board in support of a project that means so much economically to the community in which I live and to the area that constitutes its trade territory. I first appeared before this Board approximately 5 years ago in support of this project. Since that time, world-wide event have precluded your honorable body from devoting any time or energy to civil projects except those of primary concern to our military program.

It is gratifying indeed that we can now once again turn our attention to those projects that have for their prime purpose the building and strengthening of the economy of our great Nation.

The Army engineers have been most conservative in their studies of navigation to Shreveport, La. They are to be congratulated for their conservatism, even though those of us who reside in communities, the fortune of which are at stake, would have you be a little more lenient in your analysis. We are proud, however, to observe that navigation to Shreveport has stood the acid test of your conservatism and has met with the approval of your district and division engineers.

We observe the Army engineers have selected the year 1939 as the basic year for their study. Each intervening year since that time has had more tonnage originate and terminate in the Southwest than was evident in that year.

A study of reports made by the engineers on navigation projects discloses that in past years four major factors were considered in arriving at the total benefits to be incurred. First, the tonnage available for shipment by water as of fixed year upon which the study was based. Second, undeveloped tonnage, that is, tonnage that the survey could not establish because of the inadequate opportunity of making proper contacts and proper analysis. Third, the future growth of the area. Fourth, other benefits such as drainage, recreation, and indirect savings; and, of course, balanced against these was the cost factor of construction, maintenance, operation, and amortization.

We observe that the ultraconservatism of your division engineer has precluded his use of some of the factors. He has based his entire report, as applied to this project, upon the first and fourth of these steps, leaving out entirely the undeveloped tonnage and future growth of the area. We believe these, too, should be considered by this Board when making your recommendations. These we shall discuss later.

Your engineers selected the year 1939 as the base year for your study—this is understandable though we believe it to be a comparatively light year. We can find no fault for your having accepted it as the basic year and, since it was so selected by the engineers, we believe that it should be adhered to quite rigidly all the way across the board in the course of your study. We emphasize this point because the opponents of this project have proposed that this Board consider the recent closing of one industry as a basis for refusing the acceptance of the division engineer's recommendations. We maintain this should not be done because:

1. Some base year has to be accepted.

2. If decreases are accepted, then increases would have to be accepted and a whole new study would evolve; and we all agree that this project has been in the hands of the engineers long enough. Therefore, we believe 1939 should be adhered to as rigidly as possible.

It shall be pointed out later today that percentage-wise, the over-all tonnage shipped into and out of the area has increased tremendously during the past 5 years and, accordingly, any decrease made possible by virtue of one industry having shut down would have been more than offset by increases in other industries, were a later year accepted.

Even so, I should like to place before your honorable body some information relative to the petroleum industry in our area. A locality that has produced oil since 1906 and has for many years produced some 28,000,000 tons of petroleum annually, has seen within the Louisiana section, to say nothing of the east Texas area, some 33 different refineries since 1927, the earliest available records. Now, as a matter of fact, there has not been 33 differently constructed refineries. The one that recently announced that it would be closed down has been reorganized three times previously and we have reasons to believe this may happen again. It has not been dismantled or destroyed.

Then, too, new oil fields are being discovered at frequent intervals, the latest having been announced on January 6 of this year in Natchitoches Parish, La., adjacent to Red River. New oil fields are contributory to new refineries and increased refining capacity, once shipping mediums are provided that will enable refineries to operate economically and ship their products to markets throughout the Nation on a competitive basis, the refining industry in the Red River area will become more stabilized and will undoubtedly increase in capacity.

Even though there have been 33 refineries since 1927, there never have been more than 10 or less than 5 at any one time. The daily crude capacity has never exceeded 70,000 barrels and never less than 44,000 barrels. The average for period was 53,000 barrels and for 1945, 50 530 barrels. Thus, the refining capacity has remained rather constant, despite periodic reorganization of various refineries.

We were most interested when analyzing the reports prepared by the Corps of Engineers comparatively with that prepared by the Department of Public Works of the State of Louisiana. We were first impressed by the relative closeness of their estimate in arriving at tonnage and savings to be incurred. On the other hand, we were equally as impressed with the differences that existed in the reports.

It is easily understandable that there would be discrepancies between the two reports because the studies were approached quite differently. There was available to the Army engineers information that was not available to the department of public works. On the other hand, the department of public works, with the aid of specialists secured from the University of Louisiana, together with the voluntary assistance secured up and down the river, were able to make a more detailed study in some directions than was possible for the representatives of this board during the brief period of time they had to devote to the project.

So we observe that the Army engineers have submitted approximately 300,000 tons per annum that does not appear at all in the report of the department of public works. On the other hand, the department of public works, on several different commodities, have shown an appreciably greater tonnage than was shown by the Army engineers. This, too, is understandable, if the approach to the problem is taken into consideration. The Army engineers analyzed waybills which were mostly, if not all, the waybills of rail carriers. Consequently, they could not indicate tonnage hauled by contract carriers and shippers who hauled their own products because they could do so more cheaply than was possible under existing shipping conditions.

As a result, the department of public works report shows some 90,000 more tons of cotton will be shipped by this medium than does the Army engineers. Their estimate on iron pipe and steel products is approximately 266,000 tons greater than was the estimate of the Army engineers. The department of public works shows 122,000 more tons of beverage than does the survey of the Army engineers and approximately 21,600 more tons of canned products and corresponding proportional increase in other products. These estimates have to do with shipments both north and south bound.

If these two studies were combined and if the top figures were accepted in each of the studies, there would be added to a gross overall tonnage available some 597,000 more tons than now exist in the present engineers' report, or a grand total of 1,789,000 tons. The figures are quite impressive, but even more impressive are the savings. The 597,000 tons additional represent a savings of $1,866,000 which, when added to the estimates of the Army engineers, brings the grand total to $5,061,000. Should not this Board accept this tonnage? It was arrived at honest men, experts in their field, after a careful survey.

The department of public works will justify their own estimates, but I should like to point out a few factors of interest. They were a little too conservative to satisfy many. The economic specialists working for that body went to rather extended lengths in their efforts to find every possible cost that could be deducted from potential savings. Take petroleum as an illustration: During the course of their analysis of shipping cost of petroleum products by barge as compared to other carriers, the construction, liquidation, and amortization, and operation of terminal facilities both at the point of origin and the point of destination, were included by the economists. An analysis of their work sheet will convince any individual that there is no padding in their potential tonnage or in their potential savings.

It is realized, however, by all, that during the short period available to them for their study, it was impossible for them to study all commodities and, consequently, only selected products were analyzed. This study was also confined almost exclusively to river points, rather than points of origin, 15, 20, or more miles from the stream, even though this would appropriately come within the territory involved. Much of the tonnage shipped to other cities within the area could appropriately clear through these river points were water navigation available, although it does not clear through these points at this time. Therefore, any study confined to river points cannot possibly include the total possible savings.

At best, such studies are merely indicators. They are not claimed by those who compiled them to be absolutely correct since many and varied forms of transportation by which tonnage is shipped makes it impossible to make a complete study, hence the variances in the two reports.

The engineers' report does not include undeveloped tonnage—we believe it should. Undeveloped tonnage might better be referred to as undiscovered tonnage—much of it was in existence at the time of survey, but was not discovered by those doing the research. It has been the previous practice of Army engineers in their analysis of every project that it has been my privilege to analyze, to give percentagewise, an allowance for undeveloped tonnage. In the reports we have studied this has varied from 15 to 25 percent. We are not disposed to indicate what allowances should be made relative to this project, but it does seem that in all fairness a similar, proportional, percentagewise allowance for undeveloped tonnage on this project would be sound. The experience of the engineers we believe has, with very few if any exceptions, justified such allowances. The tonnage on projects upon which they have made estimates has, after a short period, increased substantially beyond their estimate, the most glaring illustration of which is the intercoastal canal. Most inland waterways are carrying more tonnage than was estimated by the Army engineers during the course of their study and most of these studies included a percentage for undeveloped tonnage.

The trade territory of Shreveport includes a radius of approximately 100 miles, consisting of 25 parishes in northwest Louisiana, some 20 counties in east Texas, and 5 counties in southwest Arkansas. This is the area that can best be served from Shreveport as compared to any other major distributing point. The city of Alexandria, farther downstream, can best serve the whole of central Louisiana on products of which the cost of shipping constitutes a major portion of the selling price. A tremendous tonnage for that whole area would be developed were navigation possible. More especially would this be of value to the Federal Government in connection with maneuvers and the operation of Camp Polk, in central Louisiana, the last camp having been recently declared by the Army to be one of their permanent installations.

The Corps of Engineers, in making this study, made no allowance for future growth of contributory areas, although this has been previously practiced by the engineers in connection with such studies. It is fully realized that any projection of estimates into the future may prove a harzardous fallacy. Even so, the steady growth of the area in the past indicates continued growth in the future and points to an expansion over the life of this project that deserves consideration.

Such growth in tonnage may be influenced by several different factors: First, population; second, industrial expansion; third, distribution development; and then, of course, the discovery of new basic resources. We shall deal with each of these briefly.

To increase the number of people does not necessarily indicate a proportional increase in tonnage available for the proposed canal. On the other hand, one can scarcely deny that people do serve as an index for estimating tonnage. Therefore, the population growth of the area might prove of interest during the course of your deliberation relative to this project. From 1910 through 1930, over a period of 20 years, the increase of population in area tributary to Red River was 22.8 percent or slightly more than 1 percent per annum. Whereas, the growth during the decade of 1930 to 1940, the last available census report, was 13 percent gain for the period. I do not know what it has been since that time as we have no accurate estimate. There is no reason why this increase will not continue under any normal conditions and there is every reason to believe that the construction of this proposed canal would substantially augment this increase since it would make possible the erection and successful operation of business enterprises that, at the present time, must seek location elsewhere because of advantages made possible to them by transportation channels constructed at the Government's expense.

In our opinion, one of the prime factors deserving of consideration when approaching a project of this kind, is what effect will it have upon the economy of the area and of the Nation. For this reason, we believe that consideration of the future effect of this project upon the area tributary to Red River is of prime importance. The possible future tonnage should be given every consideration by the Army engineers in their study.

With each increase in population, existing avenues of distribution will handle more merchandise and new avenues will be established, if the population is to be adequately served—hence more tonnage will be shipped.

For example, nearly 2,000,000 people reside within the Shreveport trade area, an area that can best be served by Shreveport under present conditions, as against competitive distribution points. This population, percentagewise, is showing a substantial growth from year to year. This natural growth will call for increased tonnage by itself, but on the other hand, when a lower cost shipping medium is made available, so that in-bound freight can be brought into the communities along Red River at a lower cost than at present, the trade area will be extended. Furthermore, a greater percentage of the materials necessary to supply these people will be shipped through these river ports, thus adding to the future growth of the tonnage to be carried by the proposed canal.

There is within the Red River area vast basic undeveloped or only partially developed natural resources that will provide much tonnage for this proposed canal. Chief among these, perhaps, is the vast iron ore deposits near the head of the proposed navigation canal. A large $24,000,000 blast furnace was built by the Government during the course of the war, near these deposits. At the present time, private capital is making arrangements to construct auxiliary plants that will use pig iron from these great furnaces, thus developing and assuring the future of this enterprise. Once it gets underway, large quantities of these products will be shipped via this proposed canal. Then, too, economic studies have indicated that coal from either the Alabama, Tennessee, or West Virginia areas will be shipped by barge into the area to blend with existing coal supply so as to make a better coking coal. This is all future tonnage, but it is real. It's the type of tonnage that such canals will aid in developing and, by doing so, aid the great steel industry of America to further decentralize so as to be less vulnerable to attack in event of future wars.

There is an evident tendency to further decentralize industry throughout the United States. This trend will undoubtedly gain momentum during the years immediately ahead. The construction of this canal will serve to bring into the area adjacent to Red River many of the heavier industries that look to water transportation as their prime medium of shipping. These new industries, many of which are making inquiry now as to localities throughout the area, plus expansion in the existing pulp and paper industry, plus the developing of the iron industry and steel-fabricating industry, as well as industries that will utilize other basic resources of the area,

give substantial assurance of a more than average growth over the life of this project.

The engineers have allowed on other projects as much as 25 percent of the established tonnage as of the date of the survey for future growth and development. Therefore we believe you would be justified in allowing 25 percent additional tonnage for future growth on this project. This would be in keeping with previous practices of the engineers, and would, we believe, prove extremely sound in the years ahead.

There is one other factor that we would like to call to the attention of this honorable board. That is, the cost of financing this program. It is estimated by the engineers that this project would cost approximately $42,000,000 and that the annual cost of interest on this project based at 3 percent would be $1,355,000. You will observe that the rate is 3 percent. Under current conditions, we believe this project could readily be financed with bonds bearing 2 percent or less. This would make possible an annual savings of approximately $450,000 or a sum equivalent to approximately 14 percent of the full estimated savings in the engineers' report. We would recommend that the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors reanalyze the cost of financing since a substantial savings might be possible and thus provide a broader margin in the economic justification of this project.

We assure you that we offer no criticism of the conservative methods used by the division engineer in arriving at his recomendation, but we do believe that this honorable body would be justified in adjusting this estimate of the cost of financing so that the project may have the full benefit of its sound economic position.

In conclusion, we respectfully recommend: First, that the Army engineers adhere to the fixed year, a basic year, in the course of their study so as to avoid the necessity of further survey. Second, that you allow a minimum of 15 percent of the established tonnage for undeveloped or undisclosed tonnage. Third, that you make a similar allowance of at least 20 percent of established tonnage for future growth. Fourth, that you reanalyze the interest rate, that is the cost of financing, and adjust your cost of amortization accordingly and; fifth, that this honorable board increase the benefits allowed to the valley by this canal as a drainage measure (see Department of Public Works report) and that recreation and natural defense be considered during the course of deliberation.

In presenting this paper, I have dealt primarily in broad, though factual principles. I have left for presentation by the paper that is to follow, much detail that will substantiate these principles.

Loan to Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT THOMAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 8, 1946

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions of the Houston Cotton Exchange and Board of Trade submitted January 30, 1946:

Whereas there is before the Congress of the United States a proposed long-term loan to Great Britain involving substantially over four billions of dollars, and we believe that the economic welfare of this country is to be greatly enhanced by the approval of this loan; and

Whereas in the present demoralized condition of the world, we believe it highly essential to the restoration of all the nations that we do everything possible to preserve Great Britain as a first-class power, not only because they are our natural allies but more especially in this work of restoration and rehabilitation our nation can not do all the things needed by itself. We believe also that enlightened self-interest dictates the necessity of aiding this country so that they in turn may contribute to this great work which is so vital. There is no question but what this loan will be of enormous benefit in opening to us the export and import markets of all nations; and the consequent prosperity derived from this more than justifies the risk which is involved: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Houston Cotton Exchange and Board of Trade wishes to go on record as unanimously approving the ratification of this loan.

The Disposal of Surplus Property Should Be Investigated Thoroughly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1946

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, if there is anyone that contends that the disposal of surplus property is being handled efficiently and in accordance with the intent of Congress, I have been unable to locate such an individual. Reasonable people are finding just cause for complaint when they attempt to buy any of the surplus property offered for sale by the Government.

Certainly something is wrong with this entire set-up. What conniving is going on back of the scene in connection with the disposal of surplus property that makes it impossible for a veteran, a farmer, a small-business man, or an educational institution to secure what they need. Why was it, that the Honorable Guy Gillette, a former Senator from the State of Iowa, resigned after wrestling with this problem for some time. Mr. Gillette's honesty and integrity is unquestioned, and the question has been asked Why would not he go on with the handling of surplus property? Great hope was placed in Mr. Stuart Symington, who was made Surplus Property Administrator. It was predicted that he would display great organizational ability and would set up an efficient program of disposal. Now Mr. Symington is leaving. I think that it is time to ask the question, what is wrong?

It might be well to recall the circumstances concerning the passage of the original Surplus Property Act. It was late in the summer of 1944. The Congress was in recess and a call was sent out to hurry to Washington and enact a Surplus Property Disposal Act right now. Most of the New Deal legislation is put through at the last minute, and under the threat and plea that a crisis or emergency exists. That was true when Congress acted upon the Surplus Property bill. Congress was urged to rush the legislation. Whenever the Congress is forced into a position where the battle cry is "Rush the legislation—don't read it," the legislation usually results in the creation of a bureau and a vast delegation of authority to that bureau, instead of the Congress approaching the subject and writing a law concerning it. This is not an accident, it is exactly what the New Deal bureaucrats want. It gives the bureaus power to regulate and control. It makes it possible for a bureaucrat to say to his stenographer, "Miss Jones, take a law."

A returned veteran, who wished to again take up farming in Nebraska and who was unable to buy any farm machinery from dealers, because of the strike and other work stoppages, writes as follows:

I've also tried to buy from the Office of Surplus Property which is a total flop as far as benefiting the veteran, then I find in the paper where the recent sale at Fort Crook, Nebr., brought in the most money of its kind in the United States, which alone proves little benefit do we get out of it, and anyone should understand that a veteran's financial standing isn't very high in comparison to the public who has benefited from the high wages and prices.

An enterprising business concern in Nebraska set out to create a new industry to employ veterans. Those gentlemen needed certain equipment and they proceeded to Omaha, Neb., to contact those agencies handling surplus property. I wish to quote a portion from that letter leaving out, of course, the names:

We are attempting to set up a small factory to employ returning veterans. We have already rented a building, hired one veteran as foreman and have several other veterans ready to go to work. Our factory is going to be utilized in building not only our own store fixtures but various related items. We need a complete set of shop equipment including lathes, table saws, band saw, jig saw, sander, etc.

The first of this week we made a trip to Omaha to attempt to buy equipment. While there, we contacted the Reconstruction Finance Corporation located at 601 Woodmen of the World Building, Omaha, Neb. The first individual we contacted informed us that he had nothing and we passed to another individual who likewise had nothing and we were taken to a third individual who also had nothing but who referred us over to another branch of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation located next to the Town Hall Theater and the same procedure was repeated with the exception that they referred us back over to a fourth person at 601 WOW Building where we again met without success. In both of these places there were a lot of high-priced RFC employees and stenographers, apparently doing very little, if anything.

All this happened on January 14. On January 16 the following ad appeared in the World Herald and I suppose in every other paper in the country. This is the identical office that we attempted to buy this scarce equipment from. They were listing exactly the items that we attempted to buy. Now obviously, either they don't know what they are doing in the office, they don't know what merchandise they have on hand, or they are just wasting a lot of the Government's money running these ads.

In the State of Nebraska most of our counties have a veterans' service office.

This was set up by the Legislature of Nebraska and it is not financed by Federal funds, but local funds. The situation in respect to the disposition of surplus property of veterans is so bad that one of our outstanding service officers, from a Nebraska county, recently wrote the Surplus Property Division of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at Omaha, as follows:

I have this morning received your circular designated as OM List No. C-3, January 21, 1946, containing 16 pages of surplus steel, aluminum and brass in bars, sheets, and tubing, being offered for sale.

Although we were promised on October 29, and thereafter by letters from your office, that we would receive listings of all surplus property being offered for sale through your office, yet this far, the listings which I have received have all been of the nature of the one above referred to—namely, property in which no one in 1,000 veterans in this vicinity is at all interested. This is particularly irksome in view of the fact that in the Omaha World Herald of January 22, 1946, you ran a large paid advertisement, listing many articles of surplus property now available and for sale, including such items as paint, and similar commodities in which the veterans in this State are interested. Is there any reason why you can send circulars on nonwanted material, and not give us information on the items in which veterans are interested? Thus far the circulars I have received describing surplus property available have been limited to such items as steel sheeting, bulk plumbing supplies (in quantities much too large for veterans to handle), oil dealers' supplies, and horses in Wyoming.

The service officers of this State are familiar with the property needed by the veterans in their community, and if we could be advised of the sale of such commodities as you listed in the World Herald yesterday, we could get the information out to the veteran through our local papers, and by other means available. Nothing is accomplished, however, by your circulars advertising for sale surplus property in which not one in a thousand of the veterans can possibly be interested, and withholding from us information on those items in which the veteran is vitally interested.

The disposal of surplus property is such a disgraceful failure that many people are alarmed about it. Only this last week in a conference sponsored by the Labor Department the following resolution was passed:

Whereas the administration of the Surplus Property Act has operated to the disadvantage of veterans of World War II, and to the advantage of larger business firms; and

Whereas the military services have failed to act as expeditiously as possible in declaring property surplus; and

Whereas in actual practice the process of obtaining surplus goods is so onerous, complicated, and involved that it is practically an impossibility for the individual veteran to make purchases; and

Whereas in the disposal of surplus property no actual preference has been given to the veteran; and

Whereas it is essential to the economic well-being of millions of veterans that they be afforded a real opportunity to make purchases of such surplus war goods: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by this conference of representatives of the Governors of the States and Territories called by the Retraining and Reemployment Administration and assembled in Washington this 5th day of February 1946, That—

1. Congress take such steps as are necessary to insure that a continuous and vigorous procedure of declaring property surplus be immediately instituted by the armed services.

2. Congress designate one agency to be charged with the disposal of war goods in quantities suitable for individual purchase. That a streamlined procedure be established to the end that veterans may acquire surplus war goods with a minimum of effort, travel, and cost.

3. Congress provide that veterans be given a preference over all other, including governmental units; and be it further

Resolved, That the Retraining and Reemployment Administration be requested to bring this matter to the attention of Congress and take any steps within its power to effect the provisions of this resolution.

Under the provisions of the GI bill of rights, which this Congress has passed, the colleges and universities of the country are playing a very important role. They are unable to get the surplus property that they need to better serve the veterans. The colleges do find out that there is much inefficiency, blundering, incompetency, and negligence in the handling of surplus property. The head of the physics department of one of our fine midwestern colleges, in a letter to the president of the board of trustees, which was passed on to me, said:

We have been supplied with a property list, issued from the RFC, coming from the Office of Surplus Property, Aircraft Division, Educational Disposal Section, which gives specific names and catalog numbers of items that are now available.

You will be interested in some of the facts concerning the above property lists which are of great concern to a college science department which is supposed to be working with basic science and not with trade-school problems. In the first place, this list, which is identified as exhibit A by the RFC, carries such things as brake assembly, bulb, air filter, ignition harness, etc., the whole being useful only as museum pieces now and are of little value for instruction in a physics class. The whole list contains only seven items which are of any practical use in science work, namely, some of the gyroinstruments. It seems that the colleges may become places for dumping scrap iron from the Air Forces.

The most significant thing about the list, exhibit A, is the type of material not listed thereon. There are no pieces of electrical equipment of any kind listed—such things as radio sets, radio components or repair parts, cricuit-building materials, electric meters, radio tubes—all of which are essential in teaching electronics. There are no optical units listed; such items as discarded lenses, sighting telescopes, sextants for teaching navigation are all desirable items in class and laboratory work.

I have talked recently with many ex-servicemen, both officers and enlisted personnel, and they tell of seeing large quantities of such things as the above articles being destroyed. They tell of large piles of optical, electrical, and mechanical equipment which are found around any of the airfields, but which are not made available to anyone. I do not see any reason why such material cannot be passed on to the colleges for they will not be able to get such practical equipment in any other way for a long time to come.

It appears to me that if a small businessman wants to secure some surplus property to retail to his customers, that he is faced with passing the buck, changing rules, and a good old runaround. He would have every reason to believe that it was never intended that he should have any of this surplus property. It looks like the game is to wear a potential purchaser out, to the end that he becomes disgusted and quits trying to buy any surplus property. The small businessmen, as well as the farmers, veterans, and colleges, are not getting the surplus property that Congress intended that they should get.

Mr. Speaker, an appropriate committee should at once conduct a searching and fearless investigation of the entire program for disposing of surplus property. The responsibility for efficient and honest administration in the sale of surplus property is something that cannot be escaped by this administration. Is the majority trying to permit this whole program to be cleaned up, or are they going to let a huge scandal break?

The Future of Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 8, 1946

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to leave heretofore granted, I include in my remarks the following editorial which appeared in the Portland Oregonian January 28, 1946:

THE FUTURE OF ALASKA

In his annual message on the State of the Union the President proposed that Alaska be granted statehood as soon as the people of the Territory express such a desire. A few days before Mr. Truman's message reached Congress news dispatches from Seattle told of hundreds of ex-servicemen booking passage to Alaska in search of new economic opportunity.

These events are closely related. They also are of great importance to the Pacific Northwest. Alaska is, in effect, a continuation of this region. The Northwest is the gateway to Alaska. Alaskan prosperity will help the Northwest. With the new land of continental United States now greatly restricted, Alaska stands as one of the last vast frontiers under American sovereignty.

Yet our treatment of Alaska is not something of which we can be proud. The natives of the Territory are the victims of the highest tubercular rate in the world; there are fewer natives in Alaska now than when we acquired the Territory from Russia in 1867. Alaska has neither economic nor political independence. The Territory is administered from the Department of the Interior in Washington, D. C., 5,500 miles away. Most of its resources are held in absentee ownership, either in Seattle or in Wall Street.

In August of 1944 the late President Roosevelt returned from Alaska and said he had met many soldiers there who hoped to settle in the Territory after the war. He announced an intention of setting up aids to help these men get started. Yet nothing has happened. Secretary Ickes submitted an inadequate plan to Congress, which consisted of nothing more than an expansion of the old-line bureaus under his aegis. It offered no tangible

assistance to veterans, and Congress wisely rejected it.

In a new book on our northern rampart, Opportunity in Alaska, published by the Macmillan Co., George Sundborg points out that "had the Nation been settled at the leisurely pace which has prevailed in Alaska, we would not yet have reached the Alleghenies. Time—not just the clock and the calendar, but the time that measures ages—has been standing still in the North."

Mr. Sundborg, a veteran Alaska newspaperman now living in Portland, goes on to insist that soldiers going to Alaska need genuine guidance and help lest they lose their savings. He adds that this guidance and help are not now in prospect.

In 1944 President Roosevelt compared Alaska and Scandinavia. He pointed out that Alaska is a land of vaster distances and greater natural wealth than the Scandinavian peninsula. Yet Scandinavia has 12,000,000 inhabitants, Alaska fewer than 75,000. Why is this? One definite reason, according to Mr. Sundborg, is the lack of either political or economic sovereignty in Alaska.

The salmon pack constitutes the Territory's single most valuable resource. Yet of Alaska's 434 fish traps, 396 are owned by people who are not residents of Alaska. This means that the wealth of the Territory is sluiced off; it does not permanently benefit the people who live in Alaska. In addition, the canneries bring up thousands of nonresidents to butcher the fish and can them. Most of these men receive their wages in Seattle. None of the money which they earn is spent in Alaska.

Mr. Sundborg has pointed out, too, that Alaska has the highest shipping rates in the world. The average family in Juneau, one of the southernmost cities in the Territory, pays $250 a year in ocean freight rates on its food alone. Mr. Ickes, despite many protestations of liberalism, has not moved to end the economic monopolies which have regarded Alaska as sort of a private colonial empire.

In October of 1946 the residents of Alaska will vote on statehood. This may well be the decisive moment in the Territory's modern history. Some elements in Alaska are opposing the referendum. Today Alaska, according to Gov. Ernest H. Gruening, is "the most lightly taxed entity under the American flag." The Territory has no sales tax, income tax, or property tax. The opponents of statehood fear that status as a State would force the levying of local taxes. Advocates of statehood reply that as long as Alaska is held in political serfdom by the Interior Department, it will be treated as a colonial empire—"our India," as one young Alaskan put it.

We cannot regard with pride our record to date in the North. The death rate from tuberculosis among Alaska's Indians and Eskimos is 650 per 100,000 population annually; this contrasts with 45 in the United States. The white man took to Alaska germs to which the natives had no hereditary immunity. Our duty to provide adequate hospitalization and treatment has not been fulfilled, claims Washington's Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON.

Foreign Service, publication of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, states that thousands of veterans of World War II plan to settle in Alaska. So long as we continue to hold our vast domain in the North in political and economic vassalage, we are not fulfilling our obligation to these soldiers who have such high hopes. It is desirable that President Truman begin at once studies of the transportation facilities, communications, and similar services necessary to make colonization in Alaska a genuine possibility.

The Nation should not let soldiers lose their stakes in Alaska. The day when cheechakos could be allowed to rush headlong into the Northland is gone. And we have a special obligation to settlers who have served their country on the field of battle.

Food Production in North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 8, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, yesterday this House of Representatives passed an appropriation of $3,000,000 for a part of the Missouri River program which is located in North Dakota. This is the beginning of a great irrigation program that will finally lend stability to this northern and western country.

There have been drought periods when the lands of the West and North, as well as the South, failed miserably to produce their share in the Nation's food supply, and consequently the people in these areas were obliged to call upon the national treasury for assistance.

There have been other seasons when the productive capacity of North Dakota has rivaled any state in the Union. The history of North Dakota in the purchase of bonds during the war is one of the brilliant records among the many States of the Union. This brilliant record was made possible because it has been favored by abundant rainfall for the past few years. It will not always be so favored—the law of averages works against us.

With the beginning of the great water program, made possible by the appropriation yesterday, it will be only a question of years until this country will utilize the waters of the great Missouri River to make it self-secure against these recurring drought periods.

Those of you who so graciously supported the program yesterday, which included the Garrison Dam and its reservoir, might be interested to read the record of North Dakota's production last year. Under unanimous consent, I include herewith compiled figures which tell this interesting story of food production in North Dakota at a time when the Nation was so badly in need of it:

NORTH DAKOTA FARMERS GROSS $533,814,000—EACH AVERAGES $7,600 AS CROPS, PAYMENTS SHATTER ALL RECORDS

(By Lorne Wilde)

North Dakota did it again in 1945.

For the fifth consecutive year, farmers of this State came through with production of "bumper" proportions, smashed record after record, established another all-time high in the gross value of the foods and fibers taken from the soil.

North Dakota's 69,649 farms this year produced gross wealth from the soil of the State amounting to $512,814,000. In addition Government conservation payments, flax incentive payments, and subsidies paid to producers of milk, beef, and lambs received by the farmers exceeded $21,000,000, for a grand total of $533,814,000.

That is an average of more than $7,600 a farm.

That's the highest gross ever received by North Dakota farmers, comparing with $483,174,000 in 1941, the previous high record.

In 1945, North Dakota farmers produced the State's greatest wheat crop and the State's greatest potato crop.

In addition, the State:

Led the Nation in the production of flax.
Led the Nation in the production of barley.
Was second in the production of wheat.
Was fourth in the production of potatoes.
Was third in the production of rye.
Was third in the production of wild hay.
Ranks among the leading buttermaking States.
Is one of the high meat producing States.
Ranks high in the production of poultry and eggs.

That is a remarkable record, but the cumulative record of the last 5 years—the critical years of the war when an all-out production of foodstuffs was of vital concern to the Nation—will go down in the books as something phenomenal.

North Dakota never, previous to 1941, had two truly bumper crops in a row. Each of the last 5 years has produced superlative results in yields and quality.

The gross cash wealth produced in the last 5 years amounts to $2,046,812,000. Here is the record by years:

1941	$248,559,000
1942	353,035,000
1943	449,230,000
1944	483,174,000
1945	512,814,000
Total	2,046,812,000

In those 5 years North Dakota contributed to the national supply 1,736,328,000 bushels of wheat, corn, oats, barley, flax, rye, and potatoes

It produced 3,663,000,000 pounds of beef, pork, mutton, and lamb—live marketable weight; 85,000,000 pounds of turkeys; 242,843,000 pounds of chickens; 2,907,000,000 dozen eggs and 11,156,000,000 pounds (about 5,500,000,000 quarts) of milk.

The following tabulation shows the 5-year record:

	Bushels
Wheat	774,890,000
Corn	114,734,000
Oats	370,028,000
Barley	289,349,000
Flax	49,987,000
Rye	37,725,000
Potatoes	99,605,000
Total	1,736,328,000
Livestock produced:	*Pounds*
Cattle	2,048,000,000
Sheep	334,000,000
Hogs	1,281,000,000

The following table shows the gross value of North Dakota farm crops for 1945 and 1944, based on the assumption that one-quarter of the oats, one-half the barley, one-tenth of the corn grown for grain, and one-tenth of the loose hay is sold for cash, the remainder being fed to livestock.

The crop figures are based on the Government's final estimates on production for 1945 (with the foregoing exceptions) times the average price for each item—to the farmers—as of November 15. The livestock figures are for the amounts and values of livestock marketed or to be marketed in 1945, as estimated by Ben Kienholz, United States Federal statistician for North Dakota.

The prices used were: Wheat, $1.52; oats, 60 cents; barley, $1.04; corn, 95 cents; rye, $1.63; potatoes, 80 cents; hay, $6.60.

	1945	*1944*
Wheat	$246,070,000	$224,666,000
Corn	903,000	1,726,000
Oats	12,373,000	10,870,000
Barley	27,955,000	29,531,000
Flax	37,908,000	21,670,000
Rye	3,941,000	2,000,000
Potatoes	18,928,000	18,788,000
Hay	1,036,000	2,228,000
Other crops	5,000,000	5,000,000
Total crops	354,114,000	316,479,000
Cattle	48,000,000	42,137,000
Hogs	21,200,000	42,252,000

	1945	1944
Sheep	36,500,000	36,742,000
Dairy	39,500,000	40,427,000
Turkeys	5,800,000	4,970,000
Chickens	11,500,000	10,544,000
Eggs	16,600,000	15,382,000
Wool	6,500,000	3,259,000
Other products[2]	1,000,000	982,000
Total livestock	148,700,000	166,695,000
Grand total	512,814,000	483,174,000

[1] Other crops include sugar beets, grass and clover seeds, soybeans, buckwheat, peas, beans, millet, and truck crops.

[2] Other products include horses sold for cash, honey, hides, and other items.

The 1944 livestock figures are the revised figures of the United States Department of Agriculture.

Address by Attorney General Clark at Meeting of Tennessee State Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEWART
OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, February 9 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by our very able Attorney General, Hon. Tom Clark, on the 1st of November 1945, at Knoxville, Tenn., at a session of the Tennessee State Bar Association. The remarks of the Attorney General are very enlightening and interesting, and I hope they will be widely read.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It has been my good fortune to serve in the Cabinet of the President of the United States for some 4 or 5 months. You know the Cabinet room is a very historic room. When you walk into the west entrance there, you see before you a rectangular room with a fireplace at the end, with a mantel over the fireplace, and above the mantel is a portrait of one of the great Presidents of the United States, Woodrow Wilson. [Applause.] He seems to look down on the deliberations of the Cabinet and see put into effect the great policies and principles for which he stood twenty-odd years ago. And on the left side of this portrait is a portrait of Madison, and next to that is a portrait of Jefferson, the founder of democracy. And the Cabinet table is a very interesting table. It is made out of pure mahogany, a table some 30 feet long, some 6 feet wide, tapering down to square corners at the end, and by the center of that table sits the President of the United States. On his right sits the Secretary of State, and next to the Secretary of State sits the Secretary of War, and next to him sits the Postmaster General, and next sits the Secretary of the Interior. On the President's left sits the Secretary of the Treasury, and next to him the Attorney General, and then the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of Agriculture, and last the Secretary of Labor.

I have been there and have seen the problems that have faced the Cabinet. I have heard them discussed there, as we say down in Texas, just throwing it out on the table with the cards up. I have seen the President grasp the issues involved. I have seen him probe the facts in order that he might see both sides. I have seen him understand the problem. I have seen him decide the issues, and decide them with that rare judgment, with that uncanny accuracy that comes from one who, like you and me, is of the people, a great Missourian who has that common, ordinary horse sense that today leads us to victory in the peace. I think that today we should thank God that in the White House we have Harry S. Truman. [Applause.]

Tonight I thought I might tell you just a few things about the Attorney General. I'm just brand new there, you know; I haven't been there long. I started out in the Department in 1937. I think I met Charlie McCarthy in 1938. Back there then, we had to room two or three of us to an office. I remember many times when Charlie left town, he'd come back and his office would be moved, and I remember many times when mine was moved while I was out of town, and we would have to scramble around and try to find the files that we had been working on. That's how crowded your Department of Justice was.

You know the Attorney General has many problems. He has many petitions that are presented to him; he has many pleas that are made in behalf of persons; and he has many that are made against persons. One of his most arduous tasks is the selection of judges. There are some people who think that the Attorney General, in selecting a person to recommend to the President for a judgeship, just reaches his hand down in a hat and kind of shuffles the cards and comes up with a name. That is far from the truth. We watch the districts very closely. We have a department that does nothing but watch the districts with reference to judges, the circuits with reference to circuit judges, the Justices of the Supreme Court, and the United States attorneys. Of course many times we do not know, we can't foresee that a vacancy will occur. For example, a vacancy might be caused by a death. But many times we can foresee those things, and long before that vacancy might occur we have already been canvassing the field to see just who might be fitted for that type of work.

While I am your Attorney General, it shall be my purpose to recommend to the President for the trial bench those who have had trial experience, those who have had the hard knocks in the courtroom, those who have learned, as the Saturday Evening Post said, to wrestle with juries, those who have had the practical experience. In addition to that, we shall look into the background, into the education, into the home life, into the social aspects of each of the various persons who might be recommended for positions. And when we come to the conclusion that a certain person has those attributes, those qualifications that in our opinion will permit him, in fact will demand from him, that he allow that simple, everyday, ordinary justice that the litigants in that court deserve, that is the person whom we will recommend to the President of the United States to be made a trial judge.

Now as to the circuit bench. We intend to recommend for that bench those who have had experience in court, those who have presided in the court. I don't mean by that particularly the Federal court; I don't mean to say that we are going to elevate only trial judges from the Federal bench, although I do believe in promotions. But we shall go into the State benches, as we did in Nevada not long ago when we took the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and put him on the ninth circuit out in California. And as to the Supreme Court. As we did in the case of Mr. Justice Burton, we shall seek out that type of man who has had the experience that will enable him to deal out that type of justice which litigants in that court are entitled to receive.

As you know, my office is a pretty big office. It has 27,000 people. Down in Texas we'd call it like being in the tall cotton. It's sort of ornate when you come into it. You walk in and you have this reception room, and then you have another room where the secretaries stay, and then you have a room as large as this room here where there is a private office, and behind it you have a little office where you do your work. Of course, Charlie knows that the Attorney General does very little work; he depends on his assistants to do that. Then behind that little office you have a small library room. Next to that you have a sitting room. And I'm going to let you in on a secret; up above the sitting room there is a little bedroom.

Now that bedroom has created a story. When Bob Jackson was appointed Attorney General, after he was confirmed he took a little vacation. After you get confirmed by the Senate you are entitled to a vacation. [Laughter.] I have been through that two or three times, and I know. Well, just before Bob was there, Mr. Justice Murphy was the Attorney General, and Mr. Murphy had just gone on the Supreme Court of the United States. Well, two ladies came in to see the Attorney General while Bob was gone. One was a very charming movie actress and the other was the beautiful wife of a Georgia politician who was very prominent in party circles. Of course, the office was a bit flabbergasted because of these beautiful ladies calling on the Attorney General, and also because the Attorney General was out of town.

Now Hugo, the executive assistant to the Attorney General, is the man who handles the hot problems that the Attorney General wants to pass on to somebody else. He saw these ladies and he was a little bit perturbed, but he was showing them through the offices, thinking that perhaps he might satisfy them. He got back to this little library I was telling you about, after leading them through the various offices, and they didn't seem to be very well satisfied. So he decided to do something that had never been done before, and that was to show these two ladies this little bedroom. As he came into the sitting room he said, "You know, there is another room to this suite of offices that the Attorney General never uses. It's a room that was just sort of an architect's dream. The Attorney General never has any time to use it, but you ladies have been so nice and you have been so considerate because the Attorney General is out of town that I want to show you this room." So he took them up the staircase of 10 or 12 steps. This room is very secluded and has no telephone, and that is one of the best things about it. As they walked in he was showing them the room. There was a couch and the blankets were in order and the sheet was turned back sort of like they turn them back in the Waldorf-Astoria and the ladies looked around the room. Miss de Havilland was the movie star and she has a very discerning eye. She was looking around and she walked over to the couch and looked at it. Then she looked at Hugo and said, "You say the Attorney General never uses this room?" He said, "Yes; never uses it." She said, "Well, how did this hairpin get here?" [Laughter.]

A few days later the Attorney General came back to town, as Attorneys General will do, much to the consternation of some of the help. Hugo was going over the long list of things that had happened. You can't imagine what a long list it is until you happen to be there some day. When I get there in the morning, although I have only been gone this one day, I'll venture to say the list will be 8 or 10 pages long. As I said before, Hugo was going down that list, and he came to the notation he had made about the two beautiful ladies calling on the Attorney Gen-

eral. He said, "You know, Mr. Attorney General, I am somewhat embarrassed at this. But these two ladies came, and I was trying to take care of your business, and I thought I'd just show them that I was really going all out—and I took them up in the little bedroom. What do you think! Miss de Havilland found a hairpin up there."

Mr. Jackson burst out laughing—you know he's mighty quick on his feet—and he said, "You know, Hugo, that's the best story I ever heard on Frank Murphy." [Laughter.] Yesterday I sat next to Mr. Justice Murphy, and I told him about using this story. He didn't verify it, but there was no denial, so I take it that I have his consent to use it. [Laughter.]

One of the most important things in the Attorney General's office, I think, and a thing that is possibly much in the minds of lawyers today, is the enforcement of the antitrust laws and the laws that affect business. I was reared in that division, so I thought I might bring you a few words about the policy I hope to carry out.

Heretofore the Anti-Trust Division investigations have been made largely by the attorneys in the Anti-Trust Division. We'd take boys who had been out of school a short time, put them in a group of three or four, put a man of experience above them, and send them out to investigate a case. I don't intend to do that while I am the Attorney General. I intend to use the Federal Bureau of Investigation on antitrust cases. The reason I am doing that is twofold. One is that I mean business on this antitrust. I mean to go after it on a Nation-wide basis. I don't mean to use groups. I mean to use the full facilities of the Department of Justice to see that so long as the Congress keeps the antitrust laws on the books, they will be enforced. They'll be enforced in a practical way. I don't mean by that that we are going to have any witch-hunting; we're not. We're not going to have any so-called fishing expeditions. We are going to have just everyday, hard-fighting practical law enforcement of the antitrust laws and all other business laws. So long as the Government can stay out of business, I think it is to the great benefit of the people as well as of business, but I intend to use the antitrust laws to see that business keeps open the channels of trade and gives to every person the right to go into business, the right to mantain the type of business, so long as he does not violate the law, that he wants to maintain, and to keep those channels clear.

In that regard, I do not intend to permit, so long as I am the Attorney General, any business or any industry to be indicted by criminal indictment or information that has engaged in practices for many years, practices that are publicly known, practices that have for many years had the sanction in good faith of the lawyers that have represented that business or that industry. In other words, so long as industry has followed a practice that is so publicly known and has been so publicly followed, and that has the approval of that industry's business and is known to the Department, I intend to go by the civil remedy of injunction, rather than by the grand jury or by criminal information.

I do not want you to think for a minute that I intend to be soft in this regard. I do not. Whenever there is any price fixing, any present willful intent to violate the statute, I intend to present those facts to a grand jury or to request the United States attorney to file criminal information against those who are culpable in that regard, but I do not intend to use the indictment or the criminal information to hit business over the head in order to make it comply with my ideas of economic policy. I intend to enforce the statute as it is written, and give business a fair deal and a fair roll of the dice, as we say down home.

In that regard, I invite the lawyers of business to come to Washington or to come to the United States attorneys and talk over their antitrust problems with them. If you have a problem that you want to talk over, some problem that you are doubtful on, as to whether it is legal, we will be glad to talk with you and to give you our ideas. I don't mean by that that we are going to give you a rubber stamp or we are going to legalize something that is not legal. I mean by that that we are going to attempt to work with you in an effort to help business to carry on in such a way that it may know what the Government's idea is with regard to the antitrust laws under which that business works. So much for the antitrust laws.

The second thing that I intend to spearhead is the collection of taxes. You know the person who fraudulently evades his taxes, whether they be income taxes, or processing taxes, or any other type of taxes, that are due to the Government is taking money from your pocket and mine. I intend to make those people pay, and I intend to do it by criminal prosecution. I mean by that, that I intend to present or have presented to grand juries those facts that come to my attention with regard to the violation of the income tax or any other tax laws of the United States, in an effort to bring to justice those who do not pay the lawful taxes that are assessed against them. We have been doing that now for some 3 or 4 months. Soon after Mr. Vinson was appointed Secretary of the Treasury he and I and the Secretary of Agriculture and Chester Bowles, the OPA Administrator, had a meeting in which we decided on this policy. We shall continue that policy. There are those who think that they can evade taxes, but they can't get away with that. They are going to get caught up with sooner or later.

Now, there is a policy that has brought the Government in quite a lot of taxes ever since it was announced, and that is the policy of what is known as voluntary disclosure. If you have a client who has a bad conscience and knows that he has violated the law and owes some taxes, and you bring him in to the internal revenue collector and say that he owes so much for so many years—if that is done, we won't go after him criminally. If he owes that tax, he will have to pay it and the fraud penalty incident to it, but there will be no criminal prosecution if he comes in and makes a clean breast of it. But if he doesn't, when the intelligence service catches up with him, you can bet your bottom dollar that he will be prosecuted to the limit of the law. We intend to try to get the limit on that type of law violation.

In my office, besides the rooms I have described, there is another room. It is a circular room that has a door that goes into each of these offices that I have described, so that if you want to keep people in two or three different offices and take them out without their seeing one another, you can carry them out through this room. I usually carry them out through that room, because written on the walnut panels that mark the walls is this phrase: "The Government wins when justice is done." So long as I am the Attorney General, that shall be the motto of the Department of Justice. The Government wins whether the defendant is found guilty or not, so long as he is given a fair trial. The Government wins when justice is done. We represent both sides. As your Attorney General, I am the people's lawyer. I am not the lawyer to persecute; I am the lawyer to represent all the people. I don't care whether they be Democrats, whether they be Republicans, or what they be, I shall represent them all. I shall attempt to get the facts as they exist, and after getting the facts and hearing both sides, if the defendant's side wishes to be heard I shall proceed, regardless of what the consequences might be or what the uproar might result in. In other words, I intend to carry out just the motto that "The Government wins when justice is done."

The Attorney General has a lot of pleasant things to do, too. Some of you may have read the story about me in the Saturday Evening Post. I wasn't characterized there as the people's lawyer; I was characterized there as the President's new lawyer. I'm proud to be the President's lawyer, because I have the greatest client that ever lived, the President of the United States. No lawyer could have a finer client, no lawyer would work any harder for a client than he would work for that client. But at the same time, as I told you, I feel that I represent the people, that I'm the people's lawyer. In that article they had me making pancakes and had me, I think, standing up there flapping some flapjacks. Down in Texas we used to call them battercakes. Well, you know since that time I've gotten the fifth griddle-skillet. I had about 10 letters that said I used the wrong kind of utensil. They had noticed that I used a skillet rather than a griddle to fry these pancakes, so yesterday I got this combination griddle-skillet, which was made by the Dow Chemical Co. of magnesium. It is very light. I didn't know what was in the package until I opened it up and it was a combination griddle-skillet. They were taking no chances on whether I was wrong or whether I was right in using a skillet. We also got a lot of pancake flour, and I have a lot of new recipes that came in. I haven't tried them all out yet. Some of them call for corn meal and some of them call for buckwheat and some of them call for plain flour. It's just a conglomeration.

In addition to that, you will remember the writer mentioned something about little trinkets that were given to the Attorney General. One was a little watch. I don't have it with me; I gave it to Mary. Mary is my wife. I thought it was more appropriate for her. It's a little black watch, about a couple of inches long and an inch wide, and when you open it the face shows up, and it winds itself when you open and close it. It's a beautiful little thing. I had been down in what we call the great hall and shaken a few hands, about a thousand or fifteen hundred, and a gentleman came up, and said, "I just want you to have this to carry through your term as Attorney General." I was shaking hands, so I took it and put it in my pocket. It was just a little note of some kind. I thought. I get a lot of them, and some are nice ones, and some are sort of bad. It brings you down to earth when you get those. So when I got upstairs I took my coat off and threw it on the desk, and I heard it thump, which reminded me of the gift. I looked in my pocket and pulled out this package, and it was a beautiful watch. It was in a little Dunhill sack.

I wondered who gave it to me. There is a statute on the books that prohibits one in the Department of Justice from giving a superior a gift and prohibits the superior from accepting a gift. There are a great many people within the Department—so I wondered just who it was that gave it to me. I asked Edgar Hoover to check into it, and he said he had no clues, but he'd see what he could do. In 2 or 3 weeks he came back and said he had found out who had given me the watch, and it was not a person in the Department. The way he found out was that there were only three of those watches, although they didn't cost but $8 apiece, and one went to the President of the United States, one went to Bob Hannegan, and the third one went to me.

I was with Mrs. Truman and some other people the other night at a little dinner, and I wanted to check up on it just to be sure, although I have the utmost confidence in the FBI. I have found out that they can really do things I never dreamed they could do. In fact, they gave me their bullet-proof car. I

don't know why they gave it to me. I was talking to Edgar one day about it and I said, "I suppose you thought I was hotter than you were, and that's why you gave me the car." I asked Mrs. Truman about the watch and she took out of her purse one that was exactly like mine. That night I gave mine to Mary. [Laughter.] I follow the steps of my boss.

When I came into the Department, I didn't realize that the juvenile delinquency in the United States had increased so much in recent months. One day a man came into the office from a Midwest city, and he told me about an indictment that had been returned against his boy, 17 years old, who had been paroled by the Army to go to school. He was going to school, and his daddy was a very fine man. But this boy got in with an ex-convict and was induced to join in on a scheme to sell airplane tickets.

The third man in the scheme was an employee of one of the air lines. This employee would issue these tickets—of course they were not paid for—and give them to the ex-convict, and the ex-convict would give them to the boy and the boy would cash them at an air-lines office. Of course he couldn't go back to the same air-lines office twice, because he would be caught up with pretty quickly, so they suggested that he go over into another State, which he did, and then into a third State. The FBI caught him after he had cashed some twelve or fourteen hundred dollars' worth of these tickets. So he stood indicted for this felony in the United States District Court. His daddy sat there and told me, "You know, I've been busy in war work, I've been trying to help get the war won, and I've lost my boy. If anyone should be punished, it should be me, because he didn't know what he was doing. I've neglected him during the last 3 or 4 or 5 years. I didn't know just what was going on." I picked up the phone and called the United States Attorney in that district and asked him to look into the case and see just what the conditions were and just what type of person this boy was and what his daddy was and the rest of the family. I found out that the boy had never been in trouble before. I found out that, in all probability, if he got over this hump he would be a law-abiding citizen. So today that boy is not in the penitentiary, and he's not in a reformatory. Today he is on probation, and he is serving in the active Army of the United States. He is not in school but in the active Army. I hope and I am sure that he will be a good citizen.

There are thousands of boys like that, and there are thousands of girls. I asked Edgar Hoover to get me up some figures about it. Much to my surprise, I found that in one offense by girls 16 years of age and under, the percentage had increased 357 percent for the first 6 months of 1945. Another offense, larceny, by girls 16 and under, had increased 105 percent. I found out that for the first 6 months of 1945 of all crimes of all types, by all persons, 54 percent were by boys and girls under 21 years of age. So I thought it was time for somebody to do something.

I think it would be a great idea if the bar associations of the United States could get together and have a program that might help in saving these boys and girls. I don't have anything concrete to suggest, other than that perhaps you might establish some youth center, sort of like the USO. I suggested this to some New York lawyers and radio executives, and they now have several youth centers in New York where these boys and girls can go and kick up their heels rather than doing it in the back seat of a stolen automobile as they do now. I think that you could do something that would be of great benefit to your country if you would look into this situation. Perhaps the youth centers are not the answer. But figure out some answer, something that the lawyers can devote themselves to that will be a monument to them, a monument to the citizenship of tomorrow, because these boys and girls are going to be the men and women who run the country tomorrow. We must help them. Some of them are not as fortunate as your boy or my boy, or your girl or my girl. I hope that this bar association will appoint a committee to look into this deplorable situation. Edgar Hoover and I will be glad to give you every cooperation. In these percentages, I am not speaking of Federal crimes. I am speaking of all crimes, including State crimes.

We have a lot of problems in Washington besides cooking pancakes and one thing and another, and we need a lot of good suggestions in the Department of Justice. We are trying to run a law office. It's a pretty big one. I'm just a small-town lawyer. I need the help of the lawyers all over the country.

When I first came into the Department, I was a little bit scared to talk to the Attorney General. Not that I was afraid of him, but I just was a little bashful about talking to him. When I became Attorney General, I set up outside of my office what we call a suggestion box, and I wrote a little note to all the employees of the Department of Justice and had it mimeographed. I told them that I was setting out this suggestion box and that I had the key to it and nobody else would have it, and that I hoped they would give me their suggestions for the betterment of the Department. If they could sign them, fine, because I knew then that they meant what they said; if they couldn't sign them, they should send them in anonymously and I would consider them anyway.

One night I went out and scooped up these suggestions and took them home with me, and I was looking over them along with some other stuff that was official business. About midnight I came across this letter, written on the typewriter. It said:

"DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: You should not wear bow ties. Besides, the bow ties that you wear are too loud.

"Your wife does not have the proper hairdo. The wife of the Attorney General should have a very dignified hairdo, and I would suggest that she go to the beauty parlor and have her hair done over."

Well, Mary had gone to bed and I didn't want to show that to her and disturb her rest the remainder of the night, so I waited till the next morning. She was very much interested in that last paragraph. I decided I would check up on this note, so I called the FBI around and they checked into it. The next morning Edgar came around. He had the letter with him, and he said, "Well, we've checked the typewriters and we have pinned it down to four or five typewriters, but there are about 10 or 15 lawyers that use those typewriters, through their secretaries, and we don't know just whether it is the lawyers or the secretaries. So," he said, "I sent it over to the fingerprint section and I've found out who it was."

"Who in the world was it, Edgar?" I asked.

He said, "Well, I'll tell you. It was your boy, Ramsey." [Laughter.]

Now the reason that I am wearing a bow tie tonight is that Ramsey is in the marines. He's about 3 inches taller than I am, and I am no person to cope with him, but I do want to have your suggestions. If you can't come to Washington and come to see me when you are there, I hope you will write me. Of course, if you can come there and bring a little bit of Tennessee like I saw today, it would really make my heart glad to see you and to get your suggestions. But if you can't, write me. I want to hear about it if you have any suggestions to offer for the good of the Department of Justice. I intend to carry on the Department just like you would want your law office run. It's your law office. I'm just your leader there. I want you to feel that it's your law office. I don't want you to think by that that you can run it, because you can't, but you will get a fair deal, your client will get a square deal, and the people will be dealt with as they should be.

It is a great personal privilege to be here today and tonight. It's always good to meet with lawyers. You know we get our heads so far in the public trough sometimes that we lose our perspective. When we get out and meet with folks such as you, we get our outlook back, we get to seeing things as we should, and for that reason I deem it a particular privilege to be here and to meet with you. So I bid you goodnight. [Applause.]

The Case Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 8, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times editorial of February 8 points very mildly to the futility of snap-blanket legislation. That editorial reads as follows:

THE NEW LABOR BILL

Wholly apart from the merits or the contents of the Case bill, the most significant thing about it is that the House, for the first time in several years, has passed by a large majority a measure to which the spokesmen for organized labor were known to be opposed. The House has done this only two or three times since the passage of the Wagner Act, more than 10 years ago. In June of 1940 it passed, by a vote of 258 to 129, sweeping amendments to the Wagner Act. In December 1941, just a few days before Pearl Harbor, it passed by a vote of 252 to 136, the Smith strike-control bill. In June of 1943 it passed the Connally-Smith bill. The first two bills were buried in committee in the Senate and never came before that body for action. The Connally-Smith bill originated in the Senate and so became law. The action of the House in passing the Case bill yesterday by a vote of 258 to 155 means that the present wave of strikes has once more stung Congress into action.

Wholly apart from its contents, however, the Case bill is one more illustration of how not to legislate. It was put before the whole House without study or hearings by any committee. Drastic amendments to it were made on the floor. In this respect it was not unique. The Smith strike-control bill of 1941 was slapped together and passed without so much as a week's study or debate. The Connally-Smith law, still on the books, was also largely written on the floor.

Yet most of the very people who criticize the new bill on this ground, as they criticized its predecessors, fail to recognize or to acknowledge that the trouble goes much deeper. Congress and the administration have had more than 10 years in which to appoint an authoritative and impartial commission to recommend a rounded program of labor legislation. Neither of them has ever done so. The members of the Labor Committees of the House and Senate, respectively, are usually placed on those committees because they are "pro labor"—that is, because they want only the legislation that the unions ask for. They do not represent the opinion of either the House or Senate as a whole on what labor legislation is desirable. For more than 10 years they have systematically opposed every bill, regardless of its merits, to which organized labor raised the slightest objection. The Senate Labor Committee has made it its business to see that even labor

bills approved by more than a two-thirds majority of the House never see the light of day again and never come to a vote in the Senate. This is not a picture of majority rule or of proper democratic process.

As to the merits of the Case bill, they are, as one might expect in the circumstances, mixed. On the one hand it proposes some reforms that are long overdue. Surely it is time that some Federal legislation spoke out against the use of force, violence, or intimidation by either side in a labor dispute; or the unlawful destruction or seizure of property; or the violation of labor contracts. This the Case bill does. Surely unions that are guilty of such practices should be deprived of the special protections of the Wagner Act, whether or not any positive penalties are imposed on them. Insofar as the Case bill directs the National Labor Relations Board to take cognizance of such conditions it does what the Wagner Act should have done from the beginning. Similar comment may be made regarding the Case bill's provisions against boycotts, and its more specific removal of foremen and other supervisory employees from the provisions of the Wagner Act (though the language of the original act in this last respect is plain enough if the NLRB had been content to interpret it sensibly.)

Other provisions of the bill are more dubious. It is uncertain whether some of its provisions could be enforced. It sets up machinery in some respects modeled on the War Labor Board and in some respects on the Railway Labor Act. A realistic appraisal of the record of WLB and a study of the Supreme Court decision against the Toledo, Peoria & Western Railroad raise serious doubts whether this machinery would work as its sponsors intend.

The bill declares that the term "employee" shall have the same meaning as in the Wagner Act—almost immediately after it has given it a different meaning from that in the Wagner Act. One of the greatest mistakes of all is the failure not only to guard against jurisdictional disputes between the new National Mediation Board and the NLRB, but the failure to repeal the Smith-Connally Act, as part of the new measure, though the Case bill both duplicates and contradicts the Smith-Connally Act.

The Case bill has, however, some good provisions to build on. Let us hope that it is not buried, like its predecessors, in a Senate committee, but is made the basis for sincere study and considered amendment in such a committee and that the result, without too much delay, is allowed to come before the full Senate.

In the Washington Post of February 9 is the following:

MORE BOLD THAN WISE

The 258-to-155 vote of the House for the Case strike-control bill is more important than the bill itself. We hope that the bill will not become law in its present form. But we welcome this evidence of determination in Congress to provide more effective governmental machinery for dealing with strikes and for enforcement of fair play in the collective-bargaining process. We think that the House membership has accurately reflected the temper of the country in speaking out boldly and resolutely on this controversial issue. Its salutary action would have aroused far more enthusiasm, however, if the wisdom in the bill had matched the determination behind it.

While the measure starts with the key problem of effective mediation, it would turn this task over to an independent board composed of labor and employer representatives as well as public members. Mediation is the task of Government, not of unions and management. In our opinion, the mediation agency should be composed of the country's leading experts in the settlement of industrial disputes, and they should represent only public authority. What the House proposes is a peacetime WLB. At best the WLB was only a makeshift war agency. We think the problems now confronting the country call for an agency to guide the collective-bargaining process on a peacetime basis and solely from the public point of view.

No less serious is the mistake of backing up this board by force. The courts would be authorized to enforce its orders by means of injunctions for the maintenance of existing working conditions or the postponement of strikes for a period of 30 days. That is in deference to the absurd notion that a "cooling off" period may somehow prevent employees from striking. What is desired, of course, is merely time for a governmental agency to step in and use its good offices to adjust employer-employee differences before a strike occurs. This obviously cannot be obtained by force. A mediation board which started out by using force would end its usefulness forthwith. All it can do is to direct employees not to strike or employers not to change working conditions while negotiations are going forward. Since the board would unquestionably have public support in such undertakings, any party refusing to cooperate would bring automatic punishment upon itself—perhaps the penalty of losing its case. But, in any event, a mediation board cannot start out by using force.

We have previously expressed the opinion that some provisions of the bill are desirable and constructive. The bill would authorize suits for breach of contract. It would outlaw violence and threats of violence in connection with hiring and firing and picketing. It would penalize the destruction of property in strikes and use of the boycott to induce recognition of a union or compliance with its demands. Likewise it would remove "supervisory employees" from the groups whose bargaining rights are protected by the National Labor Relations Act.

Taken as a whole, however, the bill is a patchwork. Being an illegitimate offspring of the Rules Committee, sent to the floor without the approval of any legislative committee, it is by no means finished legislation. For that the Labor Committee is perhaps as much to blame as any other group because of its failure over many years to report out constructive labor-disputes legislation. In effect the action of the House is a rebuke to its Labor Committee for dereliction of duty.

The Senate Committee on Education and Labor is likewise notorious as a graveyard for legislation dealing with labor disputes. Will it now continue to keep its head in the sand until the Senate finds it necessary hastily to patch together a labor-disputes bill, as the House has done? The committee has a chance to render a great national service by rewriting the House bill in line with sound principles of mediation and fair play in collective bargaining. But there is no indication that the Senate or the public will wait indefinitely. The committee has the alternative of bringing out a reasonable and courageous bill or of risking, because of its own inactivity, the enactment of rash and undigested legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the House has no excuse for not considering amendment of the basic law, NLRA.

In March of 1940 and on February 1, 1946, there was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the National Labor Relations Act and proposed amendments. The House just will not take time to give study to much-needed legislation.

Farmers Condemn Strikes in Essential Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. H. MOORE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, February 9 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Grady County Farm Revolt," dealing with the action of approximately 300 Grady County farmers at Chickasha, Okla., who met in protest against strikes in essential industries which work hardships on them. The editorial was published in the Daily Oklahoman of January 29, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRADY COUNTY FARM REVOLT

About 300 Grady County farmers met at Chickasha Saturday to voice indignation against strikes in essential industries that work hardships on them. A resolution was passed warning Congressmen that the farmers will vote against those who do not "act at once to protect our Nation, by forcing labor and management to live up to their written contracts."

Since management has not been accused of living up to its contracts, the shoe seems to fit the steelworkers' union, which had a wage contract extending to October 15, 1946, one provision barring strikes during that period.

United States Steel had offered the workers an average wage of $51.60, besides overtime for a 40-hour week, or $2,683.20 a year. The union leaders turned down this offer. The workers had already had more than 33-percent increase in wages since 1941—more than offsetting any increase in cost of living.

It is safe to say that no Grady County farmer works an average of less than 60 hours a week, and $2,683.20 a year looks like pretty big income, even though living costs may be slightly higher in the big cities.

The situation at General Motors, General Electric, International Harvester, and other struck plants is much the same. General Electric had experienced no real labor trouble in 24 years. Wages are now 51 percent higher than in 1935. But CIO moved in, and now there is a strike.

At the International Harvester Co. there had been a period of 22 years without strikes. There were works councils in which labor and management sat down around a table in the good old American way and talked things over when trouble threatened. But the Wagner Labor Act forbids this method of talking things over, and now the workers of the UFE union of CIO are on strike, though the average wage was boosted from 85½ cents an hour in 1941 to $1.16 an hour, excluding overtime. They have made 42 different demands, including a 3 weeks' vacation each year on pay, eight holidays, closed shop, guaranteed annual wage, and other things. The result is that 10 factories are closed, and not even repairs are available.

Steel, of course, is the key industry, and if the steel strike is continued long, this will close down all farm-implement factories—in fact, most of the important industry in the country.

The Wagner Labor Act was gotten up by a man who was born in Germany and has spent all his life in New York since coming to this country. He knows nothing of the temper of the American people—particularly he knows nothing of the problems of the farmer. His point of view comes out of the old Bismarck days and the program which finally gave birth to the monstrosity of national socialism. His law is one of the most pernicious pieces of legislation ever foisted upon the people and made possible by the cowardice of legislators, who feared the pressure blocs of labor bosses.

It is scarcely necessary to argue this case. The undeniable facts are so obvious that they make their own argument.

The farm crops all over the Nation are threatened with great depreciation, spoilage, and lack of facilities for tending and harvesting them. That is the immediate problem of the farmers. The issue extends to a greater sphere however, for it covers the entire population and threatens the lives and health and welfare of all of us.

If the farmers all over the Nation will take up this cause, they can win a great and important battle for themselves and for the Nation.

Economic Adjustment Our Present-Day Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, our national economy is out of adjustment, an unfavorable condition the Congress and the national administration has been working to correct ever since the last war and even before that. Many factors must be resolved in any successful program that will bring business and industry into an equitable adjustment. The present unstable conditions and the unfavorable results of the plans the administration and the Congress have devised and followed to restore a stable national economy has demonstrated, as I see it, the futility of any effort that fails to provide a sound, adequate, workable money system and the maintenance of free and fair competition.

Without going into a detailed discussion of the cause and effect of the many factors that have contributed to the existing unstable economic conditions. I commend for consideration a valuable treatise that reached me among the many pronouncements arriving daily in the congressional mail from thoughtful and earnest citizens seeking to enlighten and assist the Members of Congress in protecting and preserving the priceless heritage we enjoy—good government.

AMERICAN ECONOMIC STABILITY

(An address delivered by A. W. Robertson, chairman of the board, Westinghouse Electric Corp., before the Economic Club of New York, Hotel Astor, November 29, 1945)

One who expresses himself on economic matters today would do well to provide a fox hole, or at least a shield, to fend off rockets of criticism. This is particularly true when a businessman speaks. So I present my shield in the words of Pericles: "We need no Homer to praise us; rather, we have opened the whole earth and sky to our enterprise and raised everywhere living memorials to our fortune."

Where else but in America is each new baby a potential derby winner and at maturity is able to look forward to an old age of comfort and honor?

The national economy in broad outline consists of the sum total of all our efforts, whether playing, working, spending, or saving, as well as the emotional effort which we put into life. In fact, all of us, from our birth to our death, affect it and are conditioned by it—the white-collar worker, the man in overalls, the taxi driver, professional man, artist, farmer, businessman (big and little), banker, technician, housewife, Government and civil-service employee.

The world is suffering from the economic dislocation of war. The United States didn't pay the full economic price for the war while it was being fought, so we must pay for it after it has been won. No doubt, millions of our people will rebel against doing what the payment will require. Economic, social, and political convulsions as powerful as an earthquake are undoubtedly future possibilities.

In order to narrow somewhat the broad implications of the subject, I propose to take on The Rules Are Obsolete. As an approach to the subject, let us first consider the course we have followed to this point in our lives.

In the days before our economic life became so complicated and individuals became so dependent upon each other, the rules didn't matter greatly. Life then was like the boyhood game of one old cat, which, as I remember it, consisted of a batter, a pitcher, a catcher, and fields, and was so simple even the family dog could play it. Life is no longer so simple.

In recent generations we have given up the economic independence that was the source of pride of the pioneers for the dependence that arises from membership in a highly specialized civilization. The self-sufficient Jack-of-all-trade citizen of our grandfathers' day has become the highly specialized citizen of today. Our plan of life encourages diversities and differences, and we need common standards to bind us together.

The division of employment and of interest took place gradually and peacefully. Man did what he wanted to do rather than what he must do, and did it better. The mechanic found machines to work on. The outdoor man found outdoor work; the clerk, paper work; and the manager found plenty to manage. As a result, the over-all economy of the world was greatly changed. As specialists we added wealth and luxury to life; created comforts and conveniences unknown before. We reduced the effort necessary to produce goods. Mass-production methods of manufacturing were discovered. Some of the results are worthy of special note.

During the last 50 years the quality of our mechanical conveniences has risen and the price has dropped continuously. This brought luxury products within the reach of all. It enabled the employer to pay higher wages for less work. Fifty years ago the average wage earner worked 55 hours a week for $10. The early part of this year he was working 45 hours a week with an average pay of $50. Yet the prices of many products have been steadily reduced due to the fact that manufacturing output has multiplied as the power used in manufacturing increased and improved techniques were adopted. This is a world's record.

As stated in a recently published occasional paper of the National Bureau of Economic Research, "we know little that is comprehensive and accurate about the changing relations between production and labor" even though the ratio of these two quantities is an index of a basic condition of human existence.

Our homes became rich with comfort: central heating under thermostat control, light from a push button, power from a floor plug, ice cubes in every glass, automatic cooking while we shop, luxuriant baths, vacuum cleaners, and air conditioning—all wonderful luxuries furnished by specialists—but to keep them going we became slaves to the serviceman and to the factories in far-off cities. We learned this only too well during the manpower shortage of the war.

This specialization changed our manner of living. Great cities grew and grew and boasted of their size. Mass transportation, mass working, and mass living became general. Most citizens depend entirely upon other people for the necessities of life. They work at special jobs for wages and spend the money so obtained to purchase necessities and luxuries. It has been said that the modern city is only 3 days removed from hunger, and that means 3 days from revolution and bloodshed. If this is too short, make it 3 weeks.

The farmer became a specialist, too. He is now a wheat grower, a corn raiser, a potato specialist, a cotton grower, and so forth; seldom a general-purpose farmer supporting himself. As long as the intricate pattern of specialized functions fitted into basic human needs our economy grew and developed at amazing speed. Like Jack's bean stalk it almost reached the sky. But, as our standard of living grew higher each year, it also became more complicated, because of more specialization and more things added to those we had. The complexity grew geometrically. If we had three times as many luxuries, we had nine times as much complexity. This was an outgrowth of work—an economy of action.

As more and more effort, and therefore more and more of the economic product or value, was reflected in luxuries, conditions became more and more sensitive to change. In a rich society there is a surplus of luxury products—furniture, radios, clothes, etc., which the people can do without at will, thus stopping all flow of goods in this particular field without complete ruin; whereas in a bread-and-butter economy things continue to function on a low grade of subsistence, or famine and starvation result.

However, as long as the ratio of production to the expenditure of labor was on the favorable side and we were making more than we were spending, in the terms of Benjamin Franklin's illustration "with an income of $200 and an expenditure of $199," all was well, with happiness and prosperity on every hand. A national economy resembles a top in that the faster it spins the more stable it is. During this giddy period of rising well-being, with more and more for less and less effort, we did not clearly realize our complete dependence upon each other. And when I say each other, I mean groups of men that seem to have no connection whatever to each other. Certainly the city man has no conscious knowledge that he depends for well-being upon the cotton grower or the shepherd on the mountain sides of Arizona. And much less does the cotton grower realize that he is dependent upon the city man.

However, during the depression we reached the stage that resembles Franklin's example of spending $201 with an income of $200 with resulting unhappiness and instability. Our spinning economy top began to show signs of running down and to show a dangerous loss of balance. The city girl who made artificial flowers for milady's hat was jobless when hats were not bought. A farmer found himself with wheat that no one wanted. Fear gripped the country.

Even so we did not fully sense what our dependence on each other meant. Dependent groups were too far apart, separated by both geographical miles and emotional experience. We did not accept the full implication that each of us in this highly specialized and complex society is his brother's keeper.

As the danger of falling from our high estate attracted attention, remedies were suggested. Obviously our economy didn't bring wealth, happiness, and prosperity to every citizen. Some were born poor; others attained poverty; and some had it thrust upon them. Honor and wealth were not evenly divided. Much fault could be found with the results of life, and it was easy to forget that bad as it was it is the best in the world, and the United States of America is the only country where workmen rode in automobiles and their wives wore silk stockings.

We must not lose sight of the fact that it is the state of affairs that we had used all our efforts to produce. Man's ambitions since the dawn of history have been directed to making things for his comfort and to relieve him from effort, although paradoxically the only worth-while fun he ever has is in work or effort which he sometimes designates as sport or play. He finally attained an environment almost wholly mechanical, or at least of man-made contrivances.

Many of the suggested remedies were untried so that it was difficult to refute the optimistic claims of their sponsors. Since our affairs had outgrown the book of rules and, since there was no duplicate of America in the world, weaknesses and faults were misunderstood and misinterpreted. It is perhaps not to be wondered at that the remedies suggested were about as sensible as a witch's brew or the medical advice of a radio commentator. Champions of the unfortunate arose in numbers. It was a pleasant role for people with a mission, for who could question the statement that the hungry should be fed, that wrong should be corrected?

Some of the remedies tried were distinctly harmful. We tampered with the money standard. The measure of value was the dollar. It was the common denominator of all effort and of all value and wealth. We changed this unit of value to the advantage of some and the disadvantage of others. Life became a mathematical problem in which new unknowns were being constantly introduced. Changing the unit of value had an effect something like using a rubber cord for the linesmen at a football game. When it is retracted it is in favor of the offense; when it is stretched it is in favor of the defense. Its use effectively prevents a fair game, or as a matter of fact, any game at all.

We followed this by increasing the quantity of money out of all proportion to things and services, following a course that had caused a complete break-down of the sound economic life of other nations. In other words, we invited a runaway inflation. This abnormal condition was made dangerously explosive by financing a large part of the colossal expenditures of the war through the banking system. We printed currency and exchanged bonds for new bank deposits and in these and other ways pushed our supply of funds up to two and one-half times the size of the money supply of 1940. This supply is now the tremendous sum of $163,000,000,000. It was only $67,000,000,000 5 years ago. We have produced a financial bomb which threatens to blow our economy to destruction.

Other remedies to cure the real or fancied ills appeared on every hand. We did not follow the laborious and painful road of honest effort to find what was wrong. It was pleasanter to listen to the plans of those who knew how to improve things without either study or work. Volunteer masters of ceremonies were common. We began to change from an economy based on work to one of catch phrases. "A few selfish men" became responsible for all our troubles. "The ill-fed, ill-housed, and ill-clothed" were not responsible for their condition. Taxes were levied against "those best able to pay"—in the eyes of the tax collector—and "pump priming" and "mural painting" recommended. Our economy was weakened by termite terms. We talked a better life.

A plan will share the wealth; a declaration will end want and fear; the unfit shall become fit by fiat. "We planned it that way" and expected it to work even though our wise men confessed that they didn't know too much about the anatomy and functioning of our economy, and swung like a pendulum from an economy of scarcity to an economy of plenty.

One ever-present remedy was Government intervention. You know the phrase, "If you don't do something about it, Government will." That was intended to carry the strong implication that Government would be able to do the right thing. The hurricane of managed economy roared in a wind of words round an area of low pressure centered over Washington. It may not blow itself out in our time.

During this period we talked ourselves into a high state of alturism with justice and champagne for all, and at the very same time were guilty of action of great injustice. Remedies were oftentimes surprisingly superficial and literal. Killing little pigs or paying farmers not to plant their fields or boondoggling, pretzel bending, window trimming, tea tasting, or what not, or the present drive to raise wages of former war workers regardless of production or circumstances are scarcely basic cures. These remedies may have served the purpose of an aspirin tablet, relieving the economic pain, but they are certainly not true remedies that cure the cause of our distress.

The scourge of ideologists descended upon us like a cloud of grasshoppers. They insisted that if we would only think differently all of our woes would end. One of the most verbose of all preachers of ideologies is Harold J. Laski. During preparation of this talk I imagined a debate with Laski. If you would see a headline "Laski Debates Robertson," you would know who won without reading further. It would be Laski. However, wait until you hear the whole story of this imaginary debate. The subject is Economic Stability, but as in all good arguments we are not going to discuss the subject.

Laski will argue with ability and conviction that American ideology is so wrong that America couldn't have given England in her months of need $25,000,000,000 of war material and other vital necessities nor could it have supported Russia in her desperate plight. And with its wrong ideology it could not possibly have carried on successful warfare on two fronts thousands of miles apart. If you listen closely to him you would begin to think that with so wrong an ideology America must have lost the war.

I, on the other hand, shall attempt to prove that on a diet of soggy boiled potatoes, brussels sprouts, and stringy beef, England could not have presented an unbroken front to the enemy no matter how hard pressed. And on such a diet she never could have produced the peerless leader with his ability to pronounce the ringing phrase at the psychological moment. I am convinced the English diet could not support such people and such deeds. Whatever the outcome, I prefer my argument.

I have joked about ideologists, but do not misunderstand me. I know we need to learn more about our complex economy so that we may help to keep it in equilibrium through the changing years. In the past we have fortunately survived technological change, shifting standards of morality and ethics, wars, and industrial revolutions. If we could only use our dynamic balancer, we could find out what is wrong in a minute. But, alas, the economy of life is not only the product of material things, money transactions, etc., but there is a strong element of emotion emanating from the human beings that are living in it which affects everything. Economy is a part of living and as long as we are alive the show must go on no matter how poor the performance. We can't stop it as we would a machine and examine it and determine what is wrong before running it again.

Any opinion is little better than a guess, but I think the root of our present troubles, in addition to the threat of inflation, is our dependence upon others without a clear comprehension of what this implies. I know this approach leaves unanswered the threat to civilization in the atomic bomb, the spending-to-guarantee-prosperity problems, the mature-economy bugaboo, the saving-is-antisocial cult, destructive taxation, and so forth, but this is only one speech on one evening by one man.

As our lives have grown more complex and our need of common standards more imperative, we may need more rules to guide us, which probably means more government in our affairs, although I shudder at the thought. Most of us think of government rules as preventing us from doing something rather than helping us to do it. However, that is not always the case if the rules are wise and wisely enforced. When our grandfathers jogged along the country road behind the plow horse, they didn't need traffic laws and red and green lights at intersections, because there wasn't enough traffic to justify them. Now traffic laws are absolutely necessary, and they expedite and do not slow traffic. Can you imagine how far we could get on a national highway if we traveled forward on the left side as well as the right side and picked our way through approaching vehicles? Everyone and every vehicle would necessarily be reduced to a snail's pace, with traffic jabs innumerable.

The English common law, on which most of our known rights and duties rest, was based on a simple economy. Certain things were yours; and I couldn't steal them from you or interfere with them without punishment. There was no need to recognize the deeper interdependence of society. The concept of freedom was simple. It meant keeping out of jail. Practically no one depended greatly on anyone else. Each person was relatively self-sufficient. All this is changed.

The man who works for 20 years at a machine in a shop of his employer, tending the monster with loving care, has some kind of a right to work at that machine if there is work for it to do. In an inarticulate manner his employer and fellow workmen recognize this right.

Striking workmen in crowds exercise rights which no individual has. In other words, 10 or 10,000 may do something as their right which one man could not do without committing a crime. This is now accepted in all society, and we commonly use the phrase, "the right to strike." Obviously it is a vague term and needs definition. For instance, may the milkman who delivers milk to my door, which my granddaughter needs to sustain life, strike and prevent anyone from delivering milk, thereby causing the death of the child? Could the milk company refuse to deliver it? Society cannot safely be at the mercy of groups of men or organizations. Freedom has taken on a new definition.

The thought of a few men having control of the atomic bomb jogs us into a realization that their power should be curbed, but what difference is there between having your business blown to atoms and having your business ruined by the same group of men preventing you from using your property? In both cases you suffer equal loss. We need to realize that power to destroy must be curbed wherever it is found, or freedom will be lost.

How could we live in a city if the employers of the electric power company, or the company, refused to furnish electric power, which is absolutely necessary if the life of a city is to continue for 24 hours? As a people we seem to shrink from facing issues of this kind. Perhaps we don't want to admit how utterly helpless we have become. As far as I am concerned, the man who takes from me by force what is not rightly his is a

robber even if a vote is taken on it or his number is legion. Tyranny may be exercised by the many as well as by one.

Imagine, for instance, meeting two robbers on the Brooklyn Bridge at night. They place a gun against my body and demand my wallet. And if I had the temerity to question their right to the wallet (which under the circumstances takes considerable imagination), the robbers might answer, "We want to be fair about this matter. We will submit the question to popular vote." Then they vote on whether or not they shall take my wallet. The two vote "yes," and I utter a quavering "no," whereupon my wallet goes to the majority. But the fact remains that it was taken from me by force and a strong arm.

We need to awaken to the fact that there is no end to the business organizations or groups of people who can, by the simple act of stopping work and preventing others from doing their jobs, hold up the rest of society and extract any penalty they wish. We need to acknowledge duties as well as rights. The company which delivers milk to my home has a grave responsibility which it cannot escape. Society at large should know and evaluate this fact, and employment and remuneration should reflect it. Unless there is public acceptance of duties as well as rights, our economy will slow down by right checkmating right until we are literally doing more and more and producing less and less, and the unbalance will become so chronic that we may ultimately run down entirely.

To keep going, and go we must, the modern specialized workman must know his rights and duties in terms of modern social needs. It is equally imperative that the employer know his rights and duties in terms of social needs. And all of us, whether employer or employed, must recognize and accept the fact that certain rights and duties are fair, reasonable, and necessary to the well-being of society. Here is the point where a common standard of understanding must be found if we are to escape the disunity inherent in the diversity of our interests. Due to the confusion of rights without duties, the time of citizens is taken up in disputes that cannot be settled because of lack of accepted standards. Alleged rights are insisted upon. Duties are unknown. Liberty is threatened.

It is also necessary that we establish some simple, local, and inexpensive method of determining defined rights and duties. Remedies cannot be applied until our ills are diagnosed in terms of rights and duties. There are plenty of rules controlling corporations and employers. The Interstate Commerce Commission and legislation regulate the railroads. The public-utility laws and other legislation regulate public utilities. Our banks are regulated, and industry generally is regulated by countless laws.

Is it not time that we, the people, insist on everyone and every organization standing in line and waiting its turn? A little unrest and confusion may be overlooked in our swiftly changing world, but in the end order is of necessity the basic element in our economic stability.

Nation-wide Mapping Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. P. CARVILLE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, February 9 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. CARVILLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Nation-wide Mapping Program Should Be Encouraged," published in the October 1945 edition of Surveying and Mapping, a publication of the American Congress on Surveying and Mapping.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATION-WIDE MAPPING PROGRAM SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED

(EDITER'S NOTE.—The following is an excerpt from an address by Gov. E. P. CARVILLE, of Nevada (now United States Senator), at the Conference of State Governors, Mackinac Island, Mich., July 3, 1945.)

It behooves us well to employ every possible means, and pursue every practical step to conserve and intelligently develop our seemingly boundless natural resources. If that be done, we, of the present generation, may reap the greatest benefits, and at the same time retain a heritage of permanency for our progeny. It is just common sense to do so.

I do not believe we have reached the danger point as yet. We have not reached the stage of a "have not" Nation, and we do not want to reach that stage. Currently we have ample resources to carry on for some years to come, but let us take heed.

In this light, it would be a constructive and pregressive step for each State to effectuate a systematic method of checking, or taking stock, of its natural resources in all their categories. Let us survey the various fields and know definitely what supplies are visible, what are potential supplies, and what prospects we should have for newly found supplies.

One important step leading to the development of a program of conservation should be immediate action to overcome serious handicap caused by the lack of adequate maps of those regions containing our natural resources. Few people realize that the greater part of this country is inadequately mapped; and in the Western States especially, vast areas have never been properly charted.

We should promote a program to complete the mapping of this country at an early date; for until this is done, it will not be possible for us to inventory and catalog our resources and plan for their efficient use. At present there is a great deal of activity in many of the States to develop a Nation-wide mapping program, and this work should be encouraged.

E. P. CARVILLE.

A Look Ahead in Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 11, 1946

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a speech which I delivered on January 26 at a State meeting of county agricultural conservation associations held at Salina, Kans.:

It is pleasant to be in Salina this week and discuss with farmers important questions and issues of interest to all of us. We meet here in a friendly and peaceful atmosphere about as far as one can get from the turmoil and strife prevailing throughout most of the outside world, and even in some parts of our own country today. Yet, the fact that we are meeting under these favorable conditions cannot blind us to the fact that no matter where we live today we cannot escape being affected by what is going on in other parts of the world.

We have won a great war. The fighting is ended but as yet there is no peace. Strife and disorder still exist in many lands and labor troubles threaten our own country. Victorious nations are not yet considering peace treaties. People in half the world are destitute, hungry, and homeless. The great problem for the next 50 years is to rebuild this shattered world and to exercise the will and devise the machinery to keep the peace.

America emerged from the war as the world's most powerful Nation. That power brought us responsibility. We may wish that we didn't have this responsibility but there is no way we can escape it.

The devastation of war has accentuated the contrast between material conditions in this country and the rest of the world. Here we have everything. Many countries have nothing. The average per capita income of those engaged in agriculture in India is $22 per year. In China the returns are not much better. The poorest Kansas WPA or FSA client in the depression and Dust Bowl days lived in luxury compared with normal living conditions on collective farms in Russia and on individually owned farms in many other parts of Europe. With us the big question just now is how soon will we get a new car, or radio, or electric washing machine. In many parts of the world the big question millions of people are asking themselves is, Will we get through the winter without freezing or starving? If the world is to be rebuilt, we shall have to help whether we want to or not. If the world is to have peace, we shall have to furnish the leadership whether we want to or not. If democratic governments are to continue in the world, it must be through our example and leadership. We must do those things because there is no one else who can do them. If worst comes to worst and there is a third world war, the whole world may go down together if scientists and military men are to be believed. They talk of atomic bombs, not just the puny little bomb that wiped out Hiroshima, but superbombs many times as powerful and dropped by planes able to fly across the widest ocean and return without refueling.

But I will say no more on that now, because I did not come to talk of world affairs or military and diplomatic matters. I came to discuss agriculture, but no discussion of agriculture, either from a domestic or international standpoint, is worth two cents unless it is made against the background of world conditions as they exist today.

What do the years ahead hold for agriculture, and, more specifically, for the Kansas farmer? What can we expect during the next 5, 10, or 25 years? For the last 5 years a combination of favorable weather, skilled utilization of labor-saving machinery, and, most of all, good management, hard work, and long hours on the part of the individual farmer and his family, has resulted in the greatest aggregate agricultural production in our history and by far the greatest output per man in all the world's history.

It is a record of which every farm family and every American may well be proud. During this 5-year period the American farmer increased his production by more than one-third over the average of the previous 5 years. He supplied the men in our fighting forces with the finest rations ever consumed by any army or navy. He contributed vast food supplies for the use of the armed forces and the civilian population of our allies, and fed our people at home better than they had ever been fed before. In addition, the farmers of this country and Canada created a commodity surplus, without which it would be impossible to carry the world through this winter without mass starvation. If we recognized achievements in

agriculture as we have in industry and in the military service, then most American farmers would deserve an E award and millions of farmers would be wearing the Distinguished Service Medal.

And the end is not yet. For industry 1946 is a year of reconversion. For agriculture it is still a wartime year if a hungry world is to be fed. This means for farmers continued hard work, long hours, and full productive efficiency.

But reconversion in agriculture must come and this is probably the last year when full wartime production will be needed. Our Army and Navy are rapidly being demobilized. Agriculture in the war-torn countries will be the first industry to recover and, with favorable seasons, production there will soon return to normal. As industry reconverts it finds an expanded and waiting market for everything it can produce. Agriculture, on the contrary, will find its market reduced. Even if domestic demand continues high, as it well may, military outlets will largely disappear and exports will shrink. Perhaps when it comes, farmers may welcome a relaxation of the pressure to produce under which they have labored. Many of them will want to rest and rebuild their land and they might well seize for themselves and their families the opportunity for rest and relaxation which they have so richly earned. Then, too, we cannot expect a continuation indefinitely of the favorable weather conditions which have proved such a godsend during the war years. Inevitably, there will be some years of poor yields and lower-than-average production.

All of these factors may postpone but they cannot prevent the arrival some time in the future of our old bogey, agricultural surpluses. Call it what you will—overproduction or under-consumption—there will be times in the future when the supply of agricultural products will exceed demand to an extent which will surely affect market prices. I know thoughtful farmers are looking ahead to that time with some misgivings and apprehension and it is not too early to be thinking of how we are going to meet that situation when it arises. We are fortunate in the fact that Congress has established by law a stabilization of prices on most commodities during this reconversion period. Stability of prices for the basic crops is provided by the 1938 Triple A Act as amended, and price supports for many nonbasic commodities are provided in the Steagall amendment which will be applicable during the 1946, 1947, and 1948 crop years. We are fortunate in the fact that this legislation eliminates the necessity for emergency action now and gives time for careful and deliberate consideration of postwar agricultural policies.

However, the fact that we have the AAA as to basic crops and the Steagall amendment as to many nonbasic ones, does not mean price support on unlimited production. As to the basic commodities, there are provisions for marketing quotas if supplies get out of hand. In the case of the Steagall commodities, while there are no restrictions in the law as to the quantity upon which the price can be supported, it is implicit that it may be necessary to establish some limits on quantity, either by law or regulation, since a guaranty of 90 percent of parity will probably stimulate production beyond demand in the case of some commodities.

In view of the cataclysmic political and economic changes which have taken place in world and domestic conditions during and following the war, it is likely we will want to review and reconsider our entire agricultural program between now and the end of the period covered by the Steagall amendment. We have behind us almost 17 years' experience in agricultural marketing and price stabilization legislation, beginning with the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1929. This experience has been invaluable in showing what can and what cannot be done through stabilization and price supports. We know so much more now than we did in 1929 that we can legislate much more intelligently and effectively than we could then.

One of the questions which actual experience has settled beyond a shadow of a doubt is that prices cannot be supported above market levels indefinitely without control of production or marketing, or both. It can also be said that the amount of control and regimentation necessary is directly proportional to the extent by which it is attempted to raise prices above the market. We might, for example, attempt to support the price of wheat at $3 per bushel but unless all other prices, both industrial and agricultural, are advanced in proportion, we would soon be in trouble. There would be shifts from other crops. Industrial workers would start coming back to the farm. Acreage allotments and marketing quotas would have to be put into effect. Producers in new areas would produce without allotments. Producers in old areas would have their acreage and allotments cut down. The surplus would pile up. The costs to the Treasury would mount. Export markets would be lost. Feeding and industrial uses would be eliminated and consumption generally go down as production went up. Controls would increase, everybody would be unhappy and finally the whole program would break down.

I do not believe farmers want that kind of support prices. Neither do they want to again be in a helpless position when a situation like that of 1931 and 1932 confronts them. Indeed, if there is any one principle which has been accepted by the American people during this 17-year period of experience in agricultural legislation, it is that of support prices. In spite of the fact that support-price programs have not always been successful, they have received the endorsement of both major political parties and, undoubtedly, will be continued in some form or another. What we must do now is to apply the lessons learned in the past and make these programs more efficient and effective.

There are differences of opinion, of course, but if I am any judge, what farmers generally want is stability of prices at a fair level. They feel that extremely high prices which cannot be maintained are in the end just as detrimental as low prices. Since we have already spoken of wheat, let me ask what is a fair price at which to stabilize wheat prices? I think that's the most important question confronting wheat producers today. Do they want to stabilize at a price so high as to reduce consumption and destroy the export market? Do they want to have unrestricted production and take their chances on the matter, or do they want stabilization somewhere in between? If so, what is a fair place at which to stabilize the price? Should it be at parity or above, or below? How much flexibility should there be? That is, should a large crop be stabilized at a lower price than a short crop? Should prices be related to the cost of production? Should cost as related to volume be considered? How much control would producers be willing to accept in return for stabilization? All of those questions can properly be taken into consideration in working out a postwar wheat program and, certainly, the experience which we have had during the last few years puts us in a good position to give the correct answers. It seems to me that the ultimate answer depends upon final agreement as to what relationship between price and volume will give the most favorable return to the producer with a minimum amount of control. I shall not take time to go into the mechanics of proposed wheat programs because with the experience already available the mechanics can be easily worked out when we decide upon the principles which we want to apply.

This discussion of prices naturally brings up the question of parity which is receiving much consideration just now. It is of greatest importance for agriculture to hold onto the parity concept. It is our means of relating agricultural prices to other prices and keeping agricultural purchasing power constant. I don't think that necessarily means that we must hold strictly to the 1909–14 basis. There have been many changes in agricultural production since that time. The cost of producing some agricultural products has increased.

In the case of others the use of labor-saving machinery and technological advances have resulted generally in lower costs per unit. The fact that there have been changes in cost and working conditions on the farm since the base parity period has brought about a considerable demand for a revision of parity. Several proposals to change the parity basis have been tentatively suggested by farm organizations. I think we might well consider revisions but I do not believe we should be in too big a hurry to make drastic changes. We are interested in wheat out here. I think the present parity formula is favorable to wheat. However, there are commodities such as dairy products and beef cattle, to name two of the most important, where conditions have changed enough since the 1909–14 period that a parity price based on those years does not now seem adequate. If a formula could be worked out which would take into consideration changes in production costs and other factors affecting these commodities, it should be given consideration. Of course, parity is only a yardstick. It does not actually affect prices except as they may be supported on the basis of parity or some percentage thereof. If there is to be a general price-support program on farm commodities, however, it is important that the price relationship between the various commodities be equitable and economically sound. For instance, if the parity price on wheat resulted in a support price on that commodity which was more favorable than the support price on dairy products, then we might expect a shift from dairy production to wheat, which would result in overproduction of that commodity. That would be good for neither dairy products nor wheat.

Of course, what we would all like is fair farm prices on a stable basis without the necessity of any Government support price or controls. If buying power at home and abroad is sufficient to result in a good demand for farm commodities, that is the best possible kind of farm relief. For that reason farmers are particularly interested in general governmental and business policies. If we have full employment in this country at good wages, and if there is a flourishing world trade, we may confidently count upon a sufficient amount of buying power to result in good prices for farm products. For that reason, farmers are interested in domestic policies which result in business prosperity and full employment and they are directly interested in international policies, especially insofar as they bring about more prosperous international trade.

I know of no possible way by which the wheat farmers of this country can maintain a normal wheat acreage or make the most efficient use of their land and machinery unless there are export outlets. The same thing is true of cotton farmers. Export outlets for pork and lard and for certain kinds of fruits have contributed to agricultural prosperity in the past. However, we have been and are still pursuing a somewhat contradictory policy in that we are trying to raise the general level of prices in this country above world levels and at the same time are attempting to increase exports. Standing alone, the two policies are incompatible. At the present time there is a sharp conflict of policy between the State Department, which urges that we promote foreign trade by letting the price of export commodities drop

to the world level, and the policy of Congress and the Department of Agriculture in attempting to maintain domestic prices above world levels. If we are going to have high domestic prices in this country, and attempt to export on a world market which is lower than the American market, there would seem to be only one method which could make this possible. That is some form of a two-price system. The State Department, however, takes the position that two-price systems are not practical because they bring about trade wars and dumping. There is some historical basis for this argument. However, in my opinion there is an answer to this argument and a way to operate under a two-price system and still avoid trade wars and dumping. That is through the medium of international trade agreements. As all of you know, an international wheat agreement between the four big exporting countries of the United States, Canada, Australia, and Argentina, and the importing country of Great Britain, was entered into some time ago. Its operation, however, has been suspended during the war. There is talk now of a new agreement which would not only embrace the parties to the previous agreement but other importing countries as well. If there could be an international agreement upon prices and percentage allocations to nations of the international wheat market, then it seems to me that the objection which has been raised to a two-price system would not apply. There have been proposals also for international agreements in cotton and they could very well be formulated as to sugar, rubber, and other international commodities.

This Government has invited a number of other nations to join with it in a world-trade conference for the purpose of bringing about freer and more profitable world trade. We may think that we are not interested in world prices and world trade in commodities other than those which we export, but I do not believe we can overlook the fact that historically, agricultural prices in this country have generally followed world prices. The collapse of farm prices from 1929 to 1933 was a world collapse. The increase in farm prices which took place during and following the First World War was a world increase. In recent years and during the present war, our agricultural prices have not followed world prices so closely because we have maintained them at artificial levels. Undoubtedly, however, expanding world prosperity and better world prices will be directly reflected in better prices and markets for American farm products.

The biggest domestic danger confronting us today is inflation. It offers just as many dangers economically as the atomic bomb does militarily. None of us likes price controls. We want to get rid of them and other war-time controls as soon as possible. The lifting of price controls now would, undoubtedly, result in higher prices for some farm commodities. Temporarily, it might look like a good thing. In the end, it would be a snare and a delusion. And increased costs of the things farmers buy would more than absorb any profits. No phase of inflation causes more grief than that affecting land values. Any substantial increase in farm prices now would mean higher land prices. So far farm land prices generally are not badly out of hand but in some localities they are approaching the danger point. It is well to remember that the big increase in land values 25 years ago came after the war, not during it.

The surest preventive of inflation is a plentiful supply of goods. The sooner people get back to work the sooner we can get rid of price controls. Every production day lost through strikes means we are taking a big chance on inflation and further postpones the day when we can get rid of ceiling prices.

From where we stand today things look good for farmers as far as the immediate future is concerned. They will be good in the long pull if we don't make too many mistakes. Industrial prosperity for the next few years means good markets, not quite so good perhaps as during the war, but good. If world trade can be expanded and world living standards increased, there is hope of increasing exports, particularly if Europe gets back on its feet, as it will in time with our help. The emphasis which is being placed on food and nutrition in this country and throughout the world, as exemplified by the setting up of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, means much. The more interest the consumer takes in food and nutrition, the larger the portion of his dollar he will be willing to spend for food. The people in this country who ate better during the war than ever before will probably continue those new food habits if they have the buying power.

All this does not mean automatic prosperity. There will be periods of hard times ahead. That is where support prices and stabilization will come into play. That is where farmers will have to exercise good judgment, not only in their individual operations but in cooperating with each other in production and marketing. That is where full advantage must be taken of new and more efficient farming methods and of improved varieties of crops and breeds of livestock. These things can and will be done. Along with them must come increased attention to soil conservation. I wish I had more time to go into that now. Yes; and we must pay more attention to human conservation on the farm. We must have better schools, better farm-to-market roads, and better hospitals and medical care for rural people. We know there will be more of other things which make for easier and better living. Rural electrification, for one, and all the conveniences which come in its wake, conveniences which will soon come to be necessities.

One thing more I want to see on the farm. That is more leisure, especially for the farm wife. Labor-saving devices in industry have meant more leisure. For farmers I don't think that has been generally true. Certainly, during the war years it hasn't. It has meant more production but still the same long hours. But after this year, when the pressure to produce will slacken, what about shorter hours on the farm? Industry has a 40-hour week. That doesn't look practical on the farm just now, but certainly the long hours of the past can be cut down as labor-saving machinery comes into general use.

And what of the atomic bomb? What is going to come out of the chaotic world situation today? Is it going to make our hopes for better agriculture in a better world impossible of realization? Perhaps so. I think it depends on many things. I have already said a lot hinges on the leadership which this country may be willing to offer. That leadership, if it is to be effective, demands sacrifices on the part of all of us. It means that we have to put as much effort in winning and holding the peace as we did in winning the war. To do that we must be strong morally, economically, and militarily.

But strength alone is not enough. We have got to learn to cooperate better with our fellowmen, both at home and abroad. Isn't that pretty much the answer to our strike problem? Isn't it the answer to international difficulties? Recently I attended the meeting of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization at Quebec. Forty nations were represented. They worked together on the vital problems of food and agriculture which are of concern to everyone. They agreed upon a program and set up a permanent organization. To me this was an inspiring occasion. If the nations of the world can get together on the vital subjects of food and agriculture they can get together on other things. Sir John Boyd Orr, who was elected as Director General, described the organization as the world's answer to the atomic bomb. It seems to me he had something there. Isn't strength, courage, vision, and, above all, cooperation between nations, the only possible answer?

Semper Fidelis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1946

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following self-explanatory letter from General Vandegrift to the publisher of the Washington Post:

HEADQUARTERS UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS,
Washington, D. C., February 1, 1946.

Mr. EUGENE MEYER,
Editor and Publisher, the Washington Post, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On December 12 there appeared in the Washington Post an editorial entitled "Semper Fidelis," dealing with the alleged shelling of a Chinese village by a detachment of United States marines on December 4. Although the report upon which the editorial was based was admittedly fragmentary, the editorial was written in a manner tending to disparage the good name, and good faith, of the Marine Corps. For that reason I requested that further comment be withheld until fuller and more accurate information became available.

Through a naval court of inquiry which investigated every phase of the incident I now have that information. In justice, I believe that it should be published.

In the first place, this atrocity which your editorial writer compared to the German invasion of Poland and the conduct of the Japanese in the Philippines entailed no bloodshed whatsoever. Property damage was limited to the breaking of two window panes. The shells (from a single 60-millimeter mortar) were not fired into the village but were carefully placed outside its walls, as a step in what appeared to be the only practicable method of trying to apprehend murderers and recapture stolen weapons, and to insure against possible recurrence of murderous assaults against Americans.

To understand why it was considered necessary to resort to such an expedient, one must understand something of the locale where the incident took place. It is a region which for many years has been without effective civil government. Although the traditional Chinese village system still has some ability to regulate, according to custom and usage, the affairs of the inhabitants of each individual village as among themselves, it is incapable of regulating transient persons who are not amenable to the moral suasion of the village elders; or, for that matter, of villagers who engage in activities of questionable nature, so long as they do not affect adversely the village group or one of its members. Moreover, the village system rests on no visible or tangible organization. Thus, in this region in general, and particularly in the sections lying outside the limits of towns and villages, there is no local civil government

in the sense that it is understood in this country.

Constant warfare over a period of years has affected the stability of the population. In the absence of an effective civil government, bandits, brigands, dissident groups, and irregular armed bands have been free to operate with no restraint other than that imposed from time to time by the presence of organized military forces. Consequently, the whole population has come to recognize and respect force and little else. Manifestations of hesitancy in the administration of affairs, or even of what we in this country might call leniency or kindliness, are apt to be looked upon as evidences of weakness or incompetence which in many cases are promptly taken advantage of.

This, then, was the setting. What follows is a factual, chronological account of exactly what happened, based on the testimony of witnesses, both American and Chinese.

About noon, December 4, 1945, two marines stationed at an outpost at bridge 74, on the Peiping-Mukden Railroad, set out to hunt rabbits. This was legitimate recreation, and they had obtained permission from the noncommissioned officer in charge. They had just shot a rabbit when they were approached by three Chinese of ordinary appearance. These stood by while the marines picked up the rabbit. As they turned to go back to their camp, the Chinese fell in behind them, followed them for a moment, and then without warning fired several shots from an automatic pistol, instantly killing one marine and wounding the other, who fell to the ground feigning death. The Chinese fired once more into each of the bodies and then searched them, taking carbines, ammunition, and personal effects, after which they set out in the direction of the village of Ta-tien-chuang, about 400 yards away.

The wounded marine, with the assistance of a Chinese boy whom he encountered en route, made his way back to the outpost.

A report was immediately submitted to the platoon command post at An-shan village, 2½ miles away. A party consisting of two officers, an interpreter, and about 25 marines was assembled which followed the murderers toward the village of Ta-tien-chuang. The officer in charge halted the party outside the village. Patrols were dispatched to each side to intercept and examine anyone who might leave it, whereupon the officer in charge and the interpreter entered the village.

The officer in charge, through the interpreter, informed the villagers that he wanted the men who had done the shooting and the weapons they had taken delivered to him within 30 minutes. In the event this was not to be done, the inhabitants should clear the village immediately, because if the murderers or information concerning them was not delivered, he would shell the village to rout out the latter.

At the end of 30 minutes the murderers had not been surrendered. Neither had the inhabitants evacuated the village. Moreover, it was growing dark and any chance of apprehending the fugitives was rapidly diminishing. The officer in charge, therefore, directed the firing of the mortar with which the party was equipped.

His purpose was twofold: To bring the inhabitants out of the dense village into the open where he could question them and search them for firearms; and to remind the community, which appeared to him to be harboring the assailants, that force was available and would be used, if necessary, to prevent assaults upon marines.

The field of fire was plainly visible to him. The fire was not directed into the village but into the open ground before it. All of the 25 rounds which were fired fell, as was intended, outside the wall surrounding the village. As previously stated, no civilian inhabitant was in any way injured, and property damage was limited to the breaking of two window panes in a building adjacent to the wall.

The party of marines did not at any time enter the village nor invade the domicile of any of its inhabitants in the effort to apprehend the fugitives. After searching and questioning the inhabitants who emerged from the village following the firing, the marines, deeming further action impracticable because of darkness, returned to the outpost at bridge 74.

Upon receipt of reports of the incident by the general officer in command, marines were ordered to remain clear of the vicinity. Chinese Central Government forces subsequently moved to secure and organize the village, following which a United States Naval Court of Inquiry was convened to investigate the entire incident.

In view of the circumstances detailed above, it is apparent that the action of the officer involved in this incident was designed to apprehend the perpetrators of an unprovoked, cold-blooded, and brutal murder of an innocent American, and to recover stolen weapons which might later be turned against other marines. It was the type of positive action which appeared to him to be indicated as a means of promoting the future safety of other marines. Considering all the circumstances, it occurs to me that any course of action short of that which was followed might have left something to be desired as regards the discharge of the officer's responsibilities to his men, to their parents, to their wives and children, and to the Nation which called them into service.

These marines were members of units moved into North China from combat duty on Okinawa. The proximity of peril no longer sustained them. They fought against the feeling of homesickness which developed among fighting men when the more obvious tasks of the war had been completed, and, at the same time, shouldered the grave responsibilities which were assigned to them in China. In a delicate and confusing situation, they have performed their tasks with exceptional tact and intelligence.

To what values, asks the Washington Post, rhetorically, are marines faithful? Is there in all the land a man or a woman who entertains a genuine doubt that they are faithful to the corps with which they serve and to the ideals and interests of the Nation which called it into being? Who does not know that they are unsurpassed in their devotion to duty and in their service to the Nation? Certainly there are many who feel as I do: that these men merit, not hasty and intemperate criticism, but the respect, admiration, and appreciation of us all.

Respectfully yours,

A. A. VANDEGRIFT,
General, United States Marine Corps,
Commandant of the Marine Corps.

Site for UNO Headquarters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. HANCOCK
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1946

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Sun for February 8, 1946:

EXPERTS CHALLENGE GOVERNMENT'S RIGHT TO COMPEL LAND SALES FOR UNO CAPITAL—CONSTITUTIONS CITED TO SHOW ACQUISITIONS MUST BE FOR SPECIFIED USAGE AND THAT CONGRESS CANNOT DELEGATE ITS RULE

(By Malcolm Johnson)

In the opinion of legal experts, as expressed to the New York Sun today, the Federal and State Constitutions may preclude the United Nations Organization from obtaining title to land for a permanent home site in Westchester, Conn., or anywhere else in the United States, except by direct negotiation and purchase from the individual property owners.

The letter of the Constitution of the United States, of the Constitution of the State of New York, and of the Constitution of the State of Connecticut thus was brought into bold relief to make it uncertain as to whether the Federal Government, or the governments of the two States, have any legal right or power to transfer private property for a capital for the UNO.

One authority, recognized by jurists as unexcelled in this particular field, told the Sun that, in his opinion, it may very well turn out that the only legal way in which the UNO may acquire land would be by negotiation between the UNO and the individual owners. "And in that event," he concluded, "neither the State nor the Federal Government could compel an owner to sell."

POWERS OF CONGRESS

There is but one reference in the original American Constitution to the matter of acquisition of private property by the Federal Government. Article I, section 8, paragraph 17, says that Congress shall have power "to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over such district—not exceeding 10 miles square—as may, by cession of the particular States and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like authority over all places purchased by the consent of the legislature of the State in which the same may be, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, and other needful buildings."

In the New York State Constitution, bill of rights, article I, section 7, it says "(a) Private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation. (b) When private property shall be taken for any public use * * *."

The Connecticut Constitution says, article I, section 11: "The property of no person shall be taken for public use, without just compensation therefor."

FOR FOREIGN USE

The first point in question is that of whether the land and buildings would be for Federal use, or for the use of foreign powers. That the United States would be a member of the group of powers is an argument which one authority will not concede as squaring the matter with the Constitution.

Assuming, for the sake of argument, that the Federal Government should succeed in acquiring the desired land. Under the Constitution, Congress may buy land with the consent of State legislatures for arsenals, forts, or "other needful buildings." But then Congress has sole sovereignty. And so here's a legal tickler: Can Congress delegate its sovereignty to an outside power? Up to now, the Supreme Court has always said no. "That sovereignty cannot be delegated or abrogated to any outside agency—absolutely not," one legal expert emphasized today.

QUESTION OF SOVEREIGNTY

Looming largely in the discussion is article 7 of the proposed Convention of the United Nations which is the draft of a constitution for the world body. This tentative provision

states that "the zone shall be entirely under the control and authority of the United Nations." Of course, this provision has not been ratified by the UNO and perhaps never will be. But it is assumed, since it has been proposed, that the spirit in the UNO is that UNO's capital shall be sovereign, beyond outside control. Thus, it is held, that while it is all very well to assume that the UNO will waive sovereignty, it is another thing to have the British, French, Russian, Chinese and other individual governments do so officially. The decision here, a very important one, must rest with the official action of UNO, in regard to any provision in its constitution such as the proposed article 7.

Next, the New York State Constitution says that the legislature may condemn land "for public use." This means for the public use of New York State and its citizens—and nothing more. If the land goes to the UNO how can that be interpreted as being for New York's public use? Here alone, according to another view, is the basis for suit by the property owners. In the event the State, without Federal request, attempts to obtain the land through condemnation, the owners could sue on the grounds that it is not for public use, as defined by the law of New York and Connecticut. In this same event, there would arise the pretty question of whether the State or the UNO would govern the area.

UNO ARGUMENTS

The parties speaking to The Sun, on both sides of the question, asked that they remain anonymous because of the possibility they may be called in cases arising from the issue.

Unofficial spokesmen for UNO emphasized two points in their argument. They maintained that the question of sovereignty was not involved, that the Federal Government could treat the Westchester-Connecticut domain of the UNO in the same manner that it treats the individual foreign embassies and legations in Washington. By this it is meant that the Federal Government would not yield sovereignty but would "waive" it, thus tacitly admitting a degree of extraterritoriality to the UNO district. As to the condemnation of the property, that is the taking of it from the private owners, these UNO spokesmen revert to the doctrine of eminent domain, contending that the Federal Government may take any property anywhere in the United States upon legal payment for the same.

Such a stand as the above did not impress other experts. These could not see anything analogous in the matters of foreign governments buying or leasing land and buildings in Washington or other cities for their diplomatic and consular needs and of the United States Government itself setting up a vast exclusive district mainly for foreign governments in States distant from Washington. In the first instance the foreign governments deal directly with the private owners, and no one has ever claimed for the Federal Government the power to sequester private property to provide homes, offices, highways, and parkways for the representatives of foreign governments. Furthermore, Washington is the Federal capital, built on land not seized or sequestered by the Federal Government but voluntarily ceded to Congress by the States of Virginia and Maryland.

BALDWIN PUZZLES

The Constitution-minded observers were quite puzzled by the statement attributed to Governor Baldwin, of Connecticut, after a visit to the State Department, that Connecticut would retain its sovereignty over any UNO district in the State of Connecticut. How, they asked, can anyone get around the constitutional provision that once a State legislature assigns property to the Federal Government the sovereignty is vested in the Federal Government and Congress is compelled to govern in exactly the same manner as it governs the District of Columbia?

One commentator interjected the thought here that the hopes and aspirations of the UNO cannot, in law, preclude anticipations that the UNO may change its nature, may at some time decide to move its seat of government, or may dissolve. He asked: What is the legal status of UNO? Or does it have a legal status as now constituted? And assuming the UNO should acquire this property in the United States by whatever means—either through condemnation proceedings or by direct purchase from the owners—what would happen if in the future the UNO should move or be dissolved? If the UNO possessed title, how could the land be recovered? And by whom? By purchase, and if so from whom? What nation or group of nations? By condemnation again, and if so, how? And how, if sovereignty has been surrendered, could this land be policed in time of emergency, such as war?

EMINENT DOMAIN

The Sun called to the attention of Harry T. Dolan, Special Assistant to the Attorney-General of the United States, the constitutional points thus raised. It did so because Dolan, in charge of the condemnation section of the lands division of the Department of Justice, directs the largest field office of the Government, which had acquired $200,000,000 worth of property in this area since 1939. He has written numerous articles on the subject for the University of Virginia Law Review and has lectured before legal associations. Speaking informally, Dolan said that it must be recognized that problems novel and knotty will arise should the affair get to the courts but, of course, he could not venture opinions.

On the question of eminent domain it was interesting to note that Dolan, some weeks ago and entirely without connection to the UNO matter, spoke to the Nassau County Bar Association on this subject and the association reprinted his address in a booklet.

It is a widely held proposition, supported by acts of Congress and judicial decisions, that the Federal Government holds, inherently, the power to take what it wants for Federal purposes, paying for it according to due process. As has been noted, UNO people stress this doctrine and attribute to it a finality. Yet it is most interesting to note that the present, celebrated Ickes-Pauley affair in Washington centers upon a suit to determine whether or not the Federal Government or the States involved control tidelands oil. Noted also is the fact that the Federal acquisitions must be for constitutional Federal purposes and even the most liberal-interpreting justices of the Supreme Court have been careful in setting forth that the Federal Government may not act "arbitrarily" in exercising the so-called implied powers.

A DECISION IN 1875

In his address, on the subject of eminent domain, Dolan said in part:

"The power of eminent domain derives from the sovereignty of the United States and is to be distinguished from the powers granted by the Constitution. Although the power of eminent domain was well known when the Constitution was adopted, there was no express provision incorporated granting this power to the Federal Government. The power is inherent and an attribute of sovereignty and does not require specific authority from the States. For fear, however, of antagonizing the advocates of State rights and possibly from doubts whether a power which had not been specifically granted in the United States in the Constitution could exist independently in the Federal Government, there was an early reluctance to exercise this power on behalf of the United States. In 1875 the Supreme Court first definitely established the right of the United States to exercise its power of eminent domain adversely in Federal courts within the States. On August 1, 1888, the first Federal condemnation statute was enacted which authorized the exercise of this inherent power by all officers of the Federal Government authorized to acquire land. Numerous Federal statutes were passed during the First and Second World Wars authorizing the seizure or requisition of private property for public use."

FIFTH AMENDMENT

"The power of eminent domain has been variously defined. A composite of judicial opinion might be summed up as the inherent sovereign power to appropriate any property within its geographical limits for use in any of its constitutional activities, upon making just compensation therefor. The power is essential to the independent existence of the sovereign and cannot be eliminated or abrogated by contract. The power is without limitation, except as the people limited it by constitutional inhibition. The principal and important inhibitions arise out of the fifth amendment, which forbids the taking of private property for private purposes or without making just compensation therefor. This requirement of compensation serves the purpose of transferring through taxation the burden of the public improvement from the individual owner to the public. The power is not limited to private property but includes all public property as well which is owned or held by the States, counties, cities, or other political subdivisions and the words 'private property' in the fifth amendment have been construed to include the property of the States and their instrumentalities when taken by the United States.

"The power, though implied from the fifth amendment, is not, however, the creature of statute of constitution. It cannot be abdicated and is as broad as are the legitimate functions of the Federal Government. It may be exercised in aid of any such functions and when so employed is synonymous with public use."

Of historical interest, and perhaps also of legal interest, is the fact that the acts of Congress and the Supreme Court decisions cited, came immediately after the Civil War when the theretofore dominant State Rights Party was disenfranchised and practically unrepresented in Congress and the Supreme Court. Today not a few Republican leaders and governors in the North are as strongly State rights as their opposite numbers in the South. In very recent years two New England States challenged the Federal Government's right as to control of water power, and the Federal Government then declined the issue. It is well known legally, but apparently not generally, that decisions of the Supreme Court remain subject to reversal by succeeding courts.

EMINENT DOMAIN OF STATES

One interested party called attention to a contention that the very wording of the seventeenth power of Congress definitely established that the Federal Government did not hold eminent domain in the matter of the property of the Thirteen Original States, which included New York and Connecticut. Concerning Special Assistant Dolan's notation that the doctrine of eminent domain was not in the Constitution because of the matter of State rights, he pointed out that it was not in the Constitution because there could not have been any constitution or any Federal Government had the document, offered to the Thirteen States for ratification, granted to the Federal Government the right of eminent domain in those original States. The 13 sovereign States did not yield an iota of their rights of eminent domain.

The framers of the Constitution and the ratifying States understood this thoroughly. Therefore, after the Government of the United States had been formed and was functioning, Congress had to go to the States and ask that the States give the Federal

Government the land upon which to build and establish the Capital of the Nation. Also it was stated expressly that when the Federal Government wanted land for military and naval establishments, for customhouses, post offices, and courts, outside of the area of the Federal Capital, Congress had to have the authority of the legislatures to acquire such land. It is held to be self-evident that had eminent domain resided in the Federal Government, the Constitution would not have stated specifically that property in the Thirteen Original States could not be acquired by the Federal Government without the express consent of the States and for express purposes. Territories ceded to the Federal Government and lands it acquired by purchase, such as Louisiana, may be something else.

If the UNO decides to go through with a request for the Westchester-Greenwich area, undoubtedly the procedure will be a Federal one, with Congress asking the States of New York and Connecticut for the condemnation of the private property for needful buildings. It is not expected that Congress or the Government will attempt to move directly through the Federal courts since the proposition of setting up what must be great Federal districts in States distant from Washington, without consulting the legislatures, would constitute a mountain of political and legal dynamite.

After such a step the issue is joined nationally and in the States of New York and Connecticut.

Boiled down, there are two fundamental legal problems involved: (1) Does the power exist for either the Federal or State governments to acquire this land for this specific purpose of UNO through the right of eminent domain? (2) Can the sovereignty of Congress or the States be surrendered to foreign nations? There are doubts by experts as to the first, and there is an overwhelming opinion that the second can't be done short of amending the Constitution of the United States.

Methodist Peace Commission on Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1946

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to the statement presented to the House Committee on Military Affairs by the Reverend Charles F. Boss, Jr., executive secretary of the Commission on World Peace of the Methodist Church. Believing that the statement will be of interest to the Members of the House generally, and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under permission granted, I place it in the RECORD at this time:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee on Military Affairs, I am Charles F. Boss, Jr., executive secretary of the Commission on World Peace of the Methodist Church, and am speaking officially for the commission. I have been a member of some international conferences, both in Europe and in this country, serving also at the United Nations Conference in San Francisco as an accredited observer and consultant to the United States delegation.

May I be permitted first of all to express the appreciation of our Commission on World Peace, and of the Methodist Church, for the patient, thorough, and courageous consideration which you are giving to policies of grave importance to our Nation and to the world in these days of world-wide tension, disorder, and distress.

The commission on world peace is an official agency of the Methodist Church. It holds a similar organizational relationship to the church as the board of missions, the board of education, the board of temperance, and other boards of the church.

CREATED BY THE CONFERENCES

Its organization and purpose are determined by the general conference, which is the highest authoritative body of the denomination. Part of its membership is elected by the general conference upon nomination by the council of bishops, the remainder being elected by the six jurisdictional conferences of the Methodist Church, which cover the United States. Its membership is composed of bishops, pastors, and laymen. There are youth representatives elected by the official youth organization of the denomination.

Decisions and actions adopted by the commission are released as actions of the Commission on World Peace of the Methodist Church.

The headquarters of the commission are in Chicago. Our educational cultivation covers the work of over 22,000 pastors serving 40,000 churches.

Many official groups within the Methodist Church, such as the Woman's Division of Christian Service, the National Conference of the Methodist Youth Fellowship, annual conferences (as for example, the Virginia conference), have taken action in opposition to peacetime compulsory military training. As yet, no official group within our church, to my knowledge, has taken action in support of peacetime compulsory military training.

OVER-ALL POLICY INVOLVED

Mr. Chairman, it is our conclusion that the issue of compulsory military training cannot be decided wisely when considered in segmental form, but only when considered in relation to the whole problem of our foreign policy and international plans for world security.

The report of Gen. George C. Marshall was presented to the Nation by the press under the headline "Prepare or perish." The implication of the report was that we must prepare for war or perish. I believe that General Marshall, as all great soldiers, shares the hope of mankind that war may be abolished.

General MacArthur, at the Japanese surrender ceremonies said, "war is no longer an alternative" for man. He said, "We have had our last chance. If we do not now devise some greater and more equitable system, Armageddon will be at our door." The central question of our day is not how to prepare for war but, in this age of atomic energy, how to prepare for peace—lest we perish.

During recent months the science of atomic energy has been disclosed to the world, and with it the potential power for destruction, first observed at Alamogordo and later by the terrible flashes which wiped out the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Further, an array of top scientists of the world have jolted us out of our inertia by presenting convincing evidence that the potential destructiveness of atomic warfare could be the virtual destruction of an entire nation in an hour's time. The potential destruction of new scientific discoveries—not only the atomic bomb—is demonstrated as being so vast as to include the possibility of chain reaction which might turn this planet upon which the only human life exists, so far as is known, into a planet barren and lifeless. Confronted with the potentialities of these discoveries, so clearly demonstrated by science and interpreted by scientists, where lies the value of a slogan, such as, "We must prepare for war"?

NO KNOWN MILITARY DEFENSE

Scientists have stated that there is no known defense against an attack with such weapons; clearly the preparation cannot be the obsolete strategies and techniques of a preatomic era. These cannot prevent us from perishing. Our hope lies in a different direction.

The abolition of war from the world is an end which is highly desired by persons of all points of view, in all nations. Gentlemen of the committee, there is no halfway house; there is no midway point at which we can stop. Our objective must be the complete abolition of war from the world.

It is significant that Franklin Delano Roosevelt, late President of the United States, wrote the following words in preparation for the Jefferson Day address, which he never lived to deliver: "We seek peace—enduring peace. More than an end to war, we want an end to the beginnings of all wars—yes, an end to this brutal, inhuman and thoroughly impractical method of settling the differences between governments."

He went on to say: "Today we are faced with the preeminent fact that, if civilization is to survive, we must cultivate the science of human relationships—the ability of all peoples, of all kinds, to live together and work together, in the same world, at peace." Then before he closed he said, "The work, my friends, is peace, more than an end of this war—an end to the beginnings of all wars, yes, an end, forever, to this impractical, unrealistic settlement of the differences between governments by the mass killing of peoples."

CONDITIONS CHANGE

It is possible that someone may ask, "But, did not Mr. Roosevelt recommend the adoption of peacetime compulsory military training"? He did. We must remember, however, that his recommendations were made in advance of the testing of the atomic bomb, and the terrible destruction demonstrated at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, a fact confirmed in the press just a few days ago by Dr. Vannevar Bush.

Furthermore, the late President's death preceded the San Francisco Conference, ratification of the Charter by the Senate, and the progress since, which will culminate this coming January in the meeting of the General Assembly and the organization of the various sections of the United Nations. No man knows what the late President's mind would be now in the light of developments.

The scientists are right. Failure to abolish war is certain to result in atomic warfare with its potential devastation and destruction in practically all nations of the world. Under such conditions what could military victory mean? Granting that some life on this planet would survive, what a throw-back to civilization we must contemplate. But, fear of the atomic bomb will not of itself bring peace. International organization must be brought into line with known principles which support the peaceful solution of man's problems.

GIVE THE PEOPLE AN ALTERNATIVE

It is clear that the pressure for peacetime compulsory military training is not primarily due to an upsurging demand from the people. Rather, it comes as a proposal from the top with a power drive for its enactment on grounds of security, strength, bargaining power in international negotiations, and reserve manpower for war emergencies.

I would like to add here for the RECORD, if I may, Mr. Chairman, the result of the poll of the National Opinion Research Center of the University of Denver: I will not give all the details but merely summarize by saying that when the people are given an alternative, as

for example, the universal abolition of conscription by agreement through the United Nations, they vote by strong majority for the alternative. What does this mean? It means that the people turn to compulsory military training only because they have not been confronted with an alternative.

Outstanding educators have presented grounds of opposition to this position hence we are not adding to the details. In passing it may be said, however, that the history of peacetime compulsory military training in Europe, and past experience, give no ground for such hope.

Consideration of the chief arguments for the passage of peacetime compulsory military training legislation led our Commission to the conclusion that security, strength, successful international negotiation, and manpower, in an age of atomic energy and with the facilities of the United Nations Organization, are not best attained by the means proposed.

Prepare or perish. Since this means unilateral preparation for possible war it is strange language to come officially from within a Nation which this very year was host to the United Nations Conference on International Organization at San Francisco; a Nation whose Senate ratified almost unanimously, the United Nations Charter; a Nation which thereby pledged itself to those goals, principles, and organizational plans for cooperation by which the peoples of the United Nations are determined, as the Preamble of the Charter states, "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind."

The security of the United States or any other individual nation is bound up with the security of all nations.

It is, therefore, essential that the United States, already the wealthiest, strongest, the most powerful Nation in the world, should exercise restraint and great wisdom, putting forth its ablest leadership for the development of enduring international friendship, trust, and mutual confidence among nations; yes, leadership to the end that justice, cooperation in providing employment, higher standards of living, expansion in production and in world trade—and, a richer share of the educational, scientific, and cultural achievements of mankind—might furnish the basis for lasting peace.

To this end, therefore, we ought not to take unilateral action so radical as to break America's history-long precedent as a stronghold of freedom and democracy, and as the sanctuary of refugees from the oppression of compulsory military training.

LEAD IN AIMS WE PROFESS

There is only one way to establish confidence among the nations; that is to give leadership in securing international agreements on matters of reduction and control of armaments, including the universal abolition of conscription by all members of the United Nations, making peacetime conscription illegal for Germany, Italy, and Japan, and by supplying necessary forces to carry out genuine international police service, and then by faithfully living up to the agreements we ratify.

It seems illogical to argue, as some Government officials do, that if we break American precedent by adopting what we believe all nations should agree to reduce or abolish we will be in a stronger position to bargain with Russia and others to unite with us in the universal abolition of conscription. It is not only illogical; it appears to be pure rationalization.

There is, gentleman, an unsound principle frequently used in support of huge military establishments; it is that successful foreign policy is that policy which is backed by great military and naval power. Gentlemen of the committee, if the 48 States or the Thirteen Original Colonies had built upon this policy, where would the Union be today?

No; a successful United Nations Organization is in direct ratio to our willingness to establish international policies in an organization designed to abolish war; an organization in which we have solemnly agreed, by our ratification of the Charter, "to refrain * * * from the threat or use of force" over our neighbors "inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations." Ideal, you say? So was the Federal Union ideal, but our forefathers had faith to believe in it, to support it, and to make it work.

Question from a member of the committee: "But did we not have a civil war to preserve the Union?"

Answer: Yes; the States became divided. I think, however, the South and North might present different views with regard to the economic and other causes of the Civil War. If the nations do not build their agreements upon the basis of justice, or if they continue oppression of racial or religious groups for the exploitation of native peoples and continue international economic warfare, we could have a civil war on a world scale, even with the United Nations or a world federation or world government.

The preparation we need is preparation for peace. We contend that the enactment of the proposed legislation would create, not security, but a false sense of security which might quiet the fears of those who believe that, even in the age of atomic bombs, radio controlled rocket shells, and supersonic planes, national isolationism, and an adequate unilateral national defense against all comers, is possible.

In the light of atomic scientific warfare the proposals to train teen-age youth appear as obsolete as the shining armor displayed in London Tower, or a year's training with bow and spear following the advent of gunpowder.

Peacetime compulsory military training in an age of atomic bomb warfare may prove to be only an obsolete appendix, more likely to be a source of infection and danger to the body politic, than a source of national health and robust strength in a freedom-loving, democratic America. Our true security rests in successful cooperation through the United Nations for the security of the world.

America's strength has been in its inner impulsions of love of liberty and its support of free institutions founded in a democratic inheritance and tradition. This tremendous reserve strength of character, purpose, and achievement has appeared in emergencies of wartime as well as during the years of peace. Of course, the Nation must be on guard lest it perish through overconfidence, arrogance, or decay, but we are not convinced that the way to preserve this vital strength and loyalty lies in radical departure from the very foundations which have made us strong.

COMMISSION'S FORMAL STATEMENT

With such considerations before it, the Commission on World Peace therefore, on November 16, unanimously adopted the following statement:

"We live in a most critical time. Mankind now has the means to destroy itself utterly. The possibility of an all-engulfing catastrophe is not, however, a ground for despair. The issues of history are in the hands of God whose purpose of good is beyond defeat. We may strive on in full confidence that we shall know at the last a joy and good beyond anything we have dreamed and hoped for.

"This conviction as to the outcome of life does not, of course, relieve us of responsibility for the course of events in our time. We must do all we can, under God, to prevent another war, knowing that war at the atomic level might mean the release of forces that would leave this earth as barren and lifeless as the moon.

"We rejoice in the existence of the United Nations Organization which offers the opportunity of international cooperation for world security and survival. This organization must now be made to work for the ends of justice, security, and peace. There is no other way whereby the peace can be won.

"In the present world situation the quest for security by individual action must give way to united efforts toward security and justice for all peoples. Military policies in all nations must be evaluated in terms of this fundamental principle. We oppose individual action by any nation to maintain a vast naval and military establishment, including the provision for military training. For any nation to take individual action in this direction indicates a lack of trust in international cooperation and invites other nations to turn to similar individual and separatist action as a means of defense.

"Accordingly, we urge the Government of the United States to instruct our delegates in both the General Assembly and the Security Council to seek, through international agreement, reduction and regulation of armaments and universal abolition of peacetime compulsory military training. This is necessary to prevent a race in armaments whose end might well be the destruction of civilization and possibly mankind itself. Specifically, we urge the establishment of international control over atomic power.

"Further, we strongly oppose the adoption by the United States of compulsory peacetime military training before it has undertaken through international agreement and action to make such training unnecessary.

"Fear and distrust between nations must be removed. In particular, there is need for the most earnest effort to promote understanding and friendly relations between the United States and Russia. War between these two great powers is unthinkable; it would mean mutual annihilation. This is not a time for angry, irresponsible speech or writing. It is a time for patient, persistent effort to find the answer to crucial international problems. Friendship between the United States and Russia would hold the promise of security and peace for all mankind."

We do not, of course, assume that we represent the opinion of every individual Methodist. We are submitting the following:

I am presenting as item 1 the statement adopted by the Council of Bishops of the Methodist Church just 3 days ago. There are 33 active bishops in the Methodist Church. They supervise the work of the Methodist Churches in the United States. They are responsible for appointing nearly 22,000 pastors to the 40,109 churches which they serve, some of these pastors in rural territories serving two or more churches. Bishop Charles C. Selecman, Dallas, Tex., is the chairman of the council; Bishop William C. Martin, Topeka, Kans., served at acting secretary in this session; Bishop Paul B. Kern, Nashville, Tenn., was chairman of the committee which drafted the statement.

STATEMENT OF THE BISHOPS

"With a solemn sense of responsibility to our Nation and to our Church, the bishops of the Methodist Church desire formally to express their conviction that the passage of a law requiring universal peacetime military conscription or compulsory training is unwise. We believe that the protection of this Nation and all other nations must be achieved through international agreement and cooperation and not by the unilateral action of any one people. We express our confidence in these principles and processes initiated at San Francisco. We call upon our Government to take the lead in implementing them into a united world structure. It should not rely for its defense upon independent standing armies but upon the broader base of an international security

guaranteed by all nations for the benefit of each nation.

"We believe that universal military conscription in times of peace is:

"1. A denial of the spirit of the Atlantic Charter;

"2. A betrayal of our historic democratic tradition;

"3. A possible step toward bureaucratic fascism by setting up a powerful military caste in this country;

"4. A threat to the moral life of our youth subjected in a crucial year to an extended period of unwelcome futility and character disintegration.

"The proposal is untimely in an age whose patterns of life and national defense are as yet unfixed because, (1) new and revolutionary scientific discoveries are making obsolete traditional methods of defense, (2) such an unprecedented step may lead to a false sense of national security, and (3) the present tension in our international relationships will be heightened by any move which leads to suspicion of our national aims and will result in protective rearmament upon the part of other nations. This is the path to war and destruction and not to peace and national safety.

"We call upon the Congress of the United States to give to the world a decisive demonstration of faith in the possibility of achieving a world unity resting upon good will and mutual respect rather than upon force and material power. The practice of the principles of the Christian religion still remains our ultimate and most practical security.

"We reaffirm with deepening conviction the words adopted by the general conference of 1944: 'The time is at hand when the church must rise in its might and demand an international organization which will make another war impossible.'" (Adopted by the Council of Bishops of the Methodist Church at Buck Hill Falls Inn, Pennsylvania, December 5, 1945.)

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this action of the Council of Bishops of the Methodist Church, which was practically unanimous, makes it apparent that this movement is no minority movement in our church; nor is our opposition a passing fancy. It is a steadily growing and developing movement of opposition.

OTHER METHODIST EXPRESSIONS

2. The editorial policy of the Christian Advocate, the official paper of the Methodist Church, is in opposition to the proposed legislation. The circulation of the Christian Advocate is approximately 350,000.

3. Editorials opposing peacetime compulsory military training have appeared in the Michigan Christian Advocate and Zions Herald, the latter published chiefly for the New England States, and in the Alabama and New Orleans Christian Advocates.

4. The Woman's Division of Christian Service of the Methodist Church, which represents some 3,000,000 women members, has taken action in opposition to peacetime compulsory military training.

5. The National Conference of the Methodist Youth Fellowship, the official agency of a half million Methodist youth, who are organized in every Conference and State, has taken action in opposition to the compulsory military training measure.

6. The Association of Schools and Colleges of the Methodist Church, through its executive committee, on November 15, 1945, adopted the following resolution:

"The National Association of Schools and Colleges of the Methodist Church expressed itself at its last annual meeting as being opposed to the enactment of any law by the United States Government during the wartime which would establish compulsory universal military conscription for peacetime. Since no formal announcement has been made by the United States Government that the emergency has ended, we want to renew our protest against peacetime conscription.

"The total program for universal military training that has been requested threatens the continuation of our traditional program of higher education in the United States and endangers the perpetuation of our democratic way of life. We earnestly request that those agencies, such as our educational institutions, that are devoted to the cultivation of attitudes leading to peace may be kept free from any handicap such as will come through universal military training." (Certified true copy by Boyd M. McKeown, secretary.)

Respectfully submitted.

CHARLES FREDERICK BOSS, Jr.,
Executive Secretary,
Commission on World Peace
of the Methodist Church.

Resolution of New York Lumber Trade Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1946

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution unanimously passed at the annual meeting of the New York Lumber Trade Association held in New York City on January 23, 1946:

Whereas the major problems confronting the Nation's domestic economy at the present time are that of stimulating construction of housing, reconversion of industrial plants, maintenance and repair, and modernization; and

Whereas it is necessary that this problem be solved without delay; and

Whereas one of the principal obstacles in the path of a solution of this problem is lack of production of lumber and building materials; and

Whereas in our opinion the chief obstacle to the stimulation of production of lumber and building materials is the unrealistic policies being pursued by the Office of Price Administration: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the New York Lumber Trade Association strongly criticize the Office of Price Administration, particularly the lumber and building materials branches for—

1. Failure to heed the advice of the lumber industry advisory committees;

2. For the issuance of unrealistic and unworkable price controls;

3. For pursuing unreasonable enforcement policies;

4. For failure to restore normal differentials in pricing of different items so as to insure speedier and better production for home building and housing now that the war is over;

5. For failure to make provisions for compensation to wholesalers; and

6. For pursuing an unreasonable and inflexible absorption policy in respect to retailers.

We therefore recommend that there be a change in policies and personnel of the Office of Price Administration insofar as they control and affect the lumber industry, or as an alternative that the agency terminate on June 30, 1946.

Another Voter Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1946

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from one of my constituents:

MAUSTON, WIS., *February 6, 1946.*

Mr. STEVENSON.

DEAR SIR: Your bill H. R. 3939 is one of the most intelligent lines of decent and humanitarian thoughts, I have yet heard from any Congressman.

Either everyone has closed their eyes to the suffering of cancer and TB or they haven't bothered to think out a course to be followed in bringing these diseases under control. I am confident that both could be conquered in a short time if the funds were available.

You might at the same time give some consideration and thought to a health-insurance program—not necessarily the President's compulsory plan, but a plan whereby we middle-class folks are not shoved on the brink of bankruptcy by necessary continued expensive medical treatment.

I have changed my mind on compulsory military training since the atomic bomb. The old ways of warfare and military training are outmoded, to my mind.

What we need now is a highly up-to-date, specialized Army, at a rate of pay which would make Army a career. Thirty-dollar-a-month privates can only be depended upon for the value they put upon their services.

Routine training can be, and was, well taken care of in the National Guard program. They didn't let us down, but their obsolete equipment at training camps did—an expensive program, yes; but I believe personnel could be reduced considerably.

Also give the revision of the social security some thought. There are many old farmers who would retire if they could depend on a small monthly compensation. Their small savings wouldn't allow for too many years of retirement, and the pension plan of the State deducting from your estate is unfair to those who have been hard-working, frugal, proud people.

Keep up your good work.

Sincerely,

R. M.

Stalin's Charge Against the Capitalist System

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1946

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in his speech on last Saturday Premier Stalin said that the "capitalist" countries of the world were responsible for the last two World Wars. In other words, the system of Government we have in the United States of America was responsible for all the world's ills. The intimation being that communism, which is based upon

Carl Marx, atheism and hatred for Christianity, and which makes every individual the slave of the state, would cure all the world's ills overnight.

He gives no credit in his speech for what we did in the recent war and for the untold billions of dollars worth of supplies that we furnished him. He did not refer to religion a single time, nor did he make any reference to UNO.

Mr. Speaker, what does he mean by a capitalistic country? He means a country in which a man may own his own home, his own land, his own factory, his own farm, or his own filling station, and where a man is free to work where and when he pleases.

There is no more freedom in a Communist country today than there is in the penitentiary of Michigan, Mississippi, New York, Ohio, or Texas. If it had not been for the materials this country furnished Russia, and sacrifices of American fighting men, Hitler would have long since been dining in the Kremlin at Moscow.

I say an attack like that on this and other capitalistic nations that really won the recent war is unjustifiable from every standpoint.

In order that everyone who reads this RECORD may understand just what this Communist dictator did say, I am inserting the following excerpts from his address.

The matter referred to follows:

Comrades, 8 years have elapsed since the last elections. This is a period rich in events of a decisive character. The first 4 years passed in strenuous work of the soviet people in the fulfillment of the third 5-year plan.

During the past 4 years the events of the struggle against the German and Japanese aggressors developed—the events of the Second World War. Doubtless, the war was the main event of that period.

It would be incorrect to think that the war arose accidentally or as the result of the fault of some of the statesmen. Although these faults did exist, the war arose in reality as the inevitable result of the development of the world economic and political forces on the basis of monopoly capitalism.

Our Marxists declare that the capitalist system of world economy conceals elements of crisis and war, that the development of world capitalism does not follow a steady and even course forward, but proceeds through crises and catastrophes. The uneven development of the capitalist countries leads in time to sharp disturbances in their relations and the group of countries which consider themselves inadequately provided with raw materials and export markets try usually to change this situation and to change the position in their favor by means of armed force.

As a result of these factors, the capitalist world is sent into two hostile camps and war follows.

Perhaps the catastrophe of war could have been avoided if the possibility of periodic redistribution of raw materials and markets between the countries existed in accordance with their economic needs, in the way of coordinated and peaceful decisions. But this is impossible under the present capitalist development of world economy.

CAUSES OF TWO WORLD WARS

Thus, as a result of the first crisis in the development of the capitalist world economy arose the First World War. The Second World War arose as a result of the second crisis.

This does not mean, of course, that the Second World War was a copy of the First. On the contrary, the Second World War is radically different from the First in its character. It must be kept in mind that the main Fascist states—Germany, Japan, and Italy—before attacking the Allied countries had abolished at home the last remnants of the bourgeois democratic liberties, had established a cruel terrorist regime, had trampled under foot the principles of sovereignty and freedom of the small nations, declared the policy of seizure of other peoples' lands as their own policy, declared for the whole world to hear that they strove for world domination and spread of the Fascist regime throughout the world.

Thereby, in the seizure of Czechoslovakia and the central part of China, the Axis states had shown that they were prepared to carry out their threats at the expense of the enslavement of all the freedom-loving people.

In view of this circumstance the Second World War against the Axis Powers, as distinct from the First World War, assumed from the very beginning an anti-Fascist liberating character, having also as one of its aims the reestablishment of democratic liberties.

The entry of the Soviet Union into the war against the Axis Powers could only strengthen and did strengthen the anti-Fascist and liberating character of Second World War. On this basis was established the anti-Fascist coalition of the Soviet Union, the United States of America, Great Britain, and other freedom-loving countries, which subsequently played a decisive part in the rout of the armed forces of the Axis Powers.

ORIGIN OF WORLD WAR II

What about the origin and character of the Second World War? In my opinion, everybody now recognizes that the war against Fascism was not, nor could it be, an accident in the life of the peoples; that the war turned into a war of the peoples for their existence; that precisely for this reason it could not be a speedy war, a lightning war.

As far as our country is concerned, this war was the most cruel and hard of all wars ever experienced in the history of our motherland. But the war has not only been a curse; it was at the same time a hard school of trial and a testing of all the people's forces. The war was with us at the rear and at the front.

For us this was an excellent school of experience, heroism, honesty, and devotion. [A few words inaudible.] This war has shown many of our Soviet people in their real light and thus helped to judge them as they deserve.

These were the "positive" sides of the war. For us it has a great importance, because thus we had an opportunity to pass judgment on our party and our people.

During the war we were obliged to judge the activities of the representatives of our party, to analyze them, and to draw the necessary conclusions. So our conclusions, which will be drawn now, will be certainly right. And so, what is the balance of the war? What are our conclusions?

FOE LOST BEFORE HE BEGAN

There is one general conclusion, and on this basis all other conclusions can be drawn. The general balance of the war lies in the fact that even before the war was begun the enemy lost the war and we, together with our allies, were the victors. We have achieved a complete victory over the enemies.

But this conclusion is too general and we cannot stop there. Obviously to smash the enemy in such a conflict as the Second World War—in a war as never occurred before in the history of mankind—was to achieve a historic world victory. However, in order to understand the great historic importance of our victory, it is necessary to go further.

Now victory means, first of all, that our Soviet social system has won, that the Soviet social system has successfully stood the test in the fire of war and has proved its complete vitality.

As is well known, the assertion often has been made in the foreign press that the Soviet social system is a risky experiment, doomed to failure; that the Soviet system is a house of cards, without roots in real life, and imposed on the people by the organs of the Cheka (secret police) and that it would be sufficient [two words inaudible] for this whole house of cards to smash.

Now, we can say that the war has refuted all the assertions of the foreign press as without foundation. The war has shown that the Soviet social system is a truly popular system, issued from the depths of the people and enjoying its mighty support. The Soviet social system is a form of the organization of society that is fully capable of life and stable. Moreover, the point now is not whether the Soviet social system is or is not capable of life [some words inaudible] none of the skeptics any longer dares to come out with doubts as to whether the Soviet social system is capable of life or not.

HAILS SOVIET SOCIAL SYSTEM

The point is that the Soviet social system has proved to be more capable of life and more stable than a non-Soviet social system, that the Soviet social system is a better form of organization of society than any non-Soviet social system.

The assertion has been made in the foreign press that the multinational state represents an artificial structure, and in the case of any complications the disintegration of the Soviet Union is inevitable, that the Soviet Union would meet the fate of Austro-Hungary. Now we can say that the war has proved these statements of the foreign press false and devoid of any foundation.

The war has shown that the Soviet multinational state system has successfully stood the test, has grown still stronger during the war and has proved a completely vital state system. Now we can say that the analogy with Austro-Hungary cannot be substantiated, since our multinational state has grown up, not on a bourgeois foundation, which fosters feelings of national mistrust and national animosity, but on a Soviet foundation, which, on the contrary, promotes the feeling of friendship and fraternal collaboration between the peoples of our state.

Moreover, after this war no one dared any more to deny the vitality of the Soviet state system. Now, it is no longer a question of the vitality of the Soviet state system, since there can be no doubt of its vitality any more. The point now is that the Soviet state system has proved an example of a multinational state system where the national problem and the problem of collaboration among nations are solved better than any other multinational state.

Third, our victory implies that it was the Soviet armed forces that won. Our Red Army had won. The Red Army heroically withstood all the adversities of the war, routed completely the armies of our enemies and emerged victoriously from the war.

WORLD'S MISGIVINGS RECALLED

This is recognized by everybody—friend and foe. The Red Army was equal to its great task. But the matter did not stand like this some 6 years ago in the prewar period. Many recognized authorities in the art of war abroad stated frequently that the condition of the Red Army filled them with great misgivings, that the Red Army was badly armed and had not the requisite commanders, that its morale left much to be desired, that it might perhaps serve for defense but would be useless for an offensive, and that in the event of a blow from the German troops the Red Army would fall to pieces like a colossus with feet of clay.

Such statements were made, not only in Germany but also in France, Britain, and America. Now we can say that the war has made these statements look ridiculous. The

war has shown that the Red Army was not a colossus with feet of clay but a first-class modern army with completely up-to-date armament, most experienced commanders, and high morale and combat qualities.

One should not forget that the Red Army is that same army which routed completely the German Army—the terror of all the armies of peace-loving states. It should be noted that there are fewer and fewer critics of the Red Army. And, in addition, the foreign press begins to publish more and more frequently statements about the high qualities of the Red Army and the skill of its soldiers and commanders.

This is understandable after the victories at Moscow and Stalingrad, and, of course, Kursk and Begorod, Kiev and Kirovograd, Minsk and Bobruisk, Leningrad and Tallin on the Vistula and Niemen, the Danube and the Oder, at Vienna and Berlin. After all this, it is impossible not to recognize that the Red Army is a first-class army, which could teach others quite a lot.

This is how we understand concretely our country's victory over its enemies. This is a rough summary of the war. It would be a mistake to think that one could win such a historic victory without preparing the whole country beforehand for active defense. It would be no less erroneous to assume that this preparation could be carried out in a short time, 3 or 4 years.

It would be even more erroneous to think that we had won a victory only, thanks to the courage of our troops. It is impossible to win a victory without courage, but courage alone is not enough to finish the job and overpower an enemy that possesses a large army, first-class armament, well-trained officer cadres, and fairly well organized supplies.

To be able to meet the blow from such an enemy, to counter it, and later to inflict on him a crushing defeat, it was necessary to have, in addition to the unprecedented bravery of our troops, completely modern armament in sufficient quantities and well-organized supplies, also in sufficient quantities. But this in turn demands the possession in sufficient quantities of such things as metals, equipment, and tools for enterprises, fuel for the work of the enterprises, transport, clothing, etc.

Can it be said that, before its entry into the Second World War, our country already possessed the minimum supplies necessary for satisfying in the main all these requirements? I think we can give an affirmative answer. The preparation of this enormous task involved the carrying out of three 5-year plans of national economic development. It is precisely these three 5-year plans that helped to create these material positions.

RECALLS DEFENSE PREPARATIONS

In this respect our country before the Second World War, say in 1940, was several times better off than in 1913 before the First World War. What material possibilities were at the disposal of our country on the eve of the Second World War? In order better to understand this, I will give you a brief report on the activity of the Communist Party in the preparation of our country for active defense.

If we take the data available for 1940 and compare them with those of 1913, the eve of the First World War, we see the following picture:

In 1913 our country produced 4,220,000 tons of pig iron, 4,230,000 tons of steel, 29,000,000 tons of coal, 9,000,000 tons of oil, 21,600,000 tons of marketed grain, 740,000 tons of raw cotton—such were the material resources of our country with which it entered the First World War.

This was the economic base of old Russia, the basis which it could use to conduct the war. As for the year 1940, in that year our country produced 15,000,000 tons of pig iron, almost four times as much as in 1913; 18,300,000 tons of steel, four and one-half times more than in 1913; 166,000,000 tons of coal, five and one-half times more than in 1913; 31,000,000 tons of oil, three and one-half times more than in 1913; 38,000,000 tons of marketed grain, 17,000,000 tons more than in 1913; 2,700,000 tons of raw cotton, three and one-half times more than in 1913.

Such were the material resources with which our country entered the Second World War.

This was the economic base of the Soviet Union, the base which it could use to conduct the war. As you see, the difference is colossal. Such an unprecedented development of a country from backwardness to progress. It was a leap into an advanced country, from an agrarian country into an industrial one.

GAINS BEGAN IN 1928

These historic transformations were achieved in the period of the three 5-year plans, starting from 1928—the first year of the first 5-year plan. Before that, we had to occupy ourselves with the restoration of industry that had been destroyed and with healing the wounds of the First World War and the civil war.

If we take into consideration the fact that the first 5-year plan was completed in 4 years, and that the execution of the third 5-year plan was interrupted by the war in its fourth year, it appears that the transformation of our country from an agrarian into an industrial country required only 13 years.

Thirteen years is an incredibly short period for the realization of such a gigantic task. This, indeed, explains the fact that the publication of these figures aroused disputes in the foreign press. Friends decided that a miracle had taken place. Foes declared that the 5-year plans were Bolshevik propaganda and inventions of the Cheka. But since miracles do not exist in this world, and our Cheka is not so powerful that it could abolish the laws of social development, public opinion in Europe had to reconcile itself to the fact.

The point now is: What was the policy by the aid of which the Communist Party succeeded in securing these material resources in our country in such a short period?

First of all, it was by the aid of the Soviet policy of industrialization of the country. The Soviet method radically differs from the capitalist method of industrialization. In capitalist countries industrialization usually starts with light industry, since light industry requires smaller investments and the turn-over of capital is quicker, and it is easier to obtain profits than in heavy industry.

LENGTHY PROCESS INVOLVED

Only after a considerable time has elapsed, in which light industry accumulates profits and concentrates them in banks, only then comes the turn of heavy industry, and a gradual transfer of accumulated capital into heavy industry starts, creating the conditions for its development.

But this is a lengthy process, requiring a long period of time, several decades, during which one has to wait for the development of the light industry [some words inaudible].

It is clear that the Communist Party could not take this path. The party knew that war was approaching, that it was impossible to defend the country without heavy industry, that it was necessary to begin the development of heavy industry as quickly as possible, and that to be too late in this task meant to lose. The party remembered Lenin's words that without heavy industry it would be impossible to safeguard the independence of our country, that without it the Soviet system could perish.

Therefore, in our country the Communist Party reversed the usual path of industrialization and began the industrialization of our country with the development of heavy industry. This was very hard but not impossible to achieve. A great help in this task for us was the nationalization of industry and banking, enabling us to transfer money speedily into heavy industry.

It would have been impossible to achieve, without this, the transformation of our country into an industrial country in so short a period of time.

Second, a factor in carrying out our policy was the collectivization of the rural economy. Here our aim was to give to the country more bread, more cotton. And it was necessary to change from small-scale peasant economy to large-scale agricultural economy, for only the large-scale farm is in a position to apply new, modern technique and to use all its achievements to increase production.

It was necessary to make large-scale agricultural economy a collectivist one. The Communist Party could not adopt the capitalist method of developing the rural economy not only because of reasons implicit in our principles, but also because the capitalist type represents a slow development and implies a ruination of the peasants.

That is why the Communist Party embarked on the road of the collectivization of the rural economy through uniting individual peasant properties into a new form—a "kolkhoz." This collectivization proved itself a beneficial experience, not only because it did not involve the ruination of peasants but also, and in particular, because it gave the chance of covering the whole country—within a few years—with a net of large-scale collective farms.

Without collectivization we would not have been able to eliminate the age-old backwardness of our agriculture in so short a period of time. It cannot be said that the party's policy did not meet with resistance in this respect. Not only backward people, who always resist everything new, but also many others of the party systematically held back the party and tried in all sorts of ways to drag it on to the usual, capitalist line of development.

These were machinations of Trotskyites and rightists, participating in the sabotage of the measure of our Government [a few words missing].

PARTY ALWAYS IN THE LEAD

The further merit of the party consists in the fact it "was not sleeping over the chestnuts" and was following the road it once entered. It did not adjust itself to the stragglers and at all times kept its leadership.

There can be no doubt that only thanks to this firmness and grit did the Communist Party come out on top, not only in industrialization but in the collectivization of agriculture as well.

The question now arises, was the Communist Party able to utilize correctly all these material conditions to increase war production and to supply the Red Army with the necessary equipment. I think that it was able to do so, and to do so with the maximum success. If one does not count the first year of the war, when the transfer of the industry to the east retarded the full swing of mass production, then, in the course of the three main years of the war, the party was able to achieve successes which gave it the possibility not only to supply the front with sufficient quantities of artillery, machine guns, rifles, planes, tanks [some words inaudible] our equipment being not only not inferior in quality to the German but on the whole being superior to the German.

Our tank industry in the last 3 years at least produced on the average over 30,000 tanks, self-propelled guns and armored cars per year. It is also known that our aircraft industry produced in the same period about 40,000 planes per year. It is also known that our artillery industry produced annually in the same period about 120,000 guns of all calibers, about 450 000 light and heavy

machine guns, over 3,000,000 rifles and about 2,000,000 automatic rifles.

HUGE MUNITIONS PRODUCTION

It is also known that our mortar industry in the period 1942–1944 produced on the average about 100,000 mortars per year. It is obvious that in the same time a corresponding quantity of artillery shells, various kinds of mines, air bombs, and rifle and machine-gun ammunitions was also produced.

It is known that in 1944 alone more than 240,000,000 shells, bombs and mines were produced and more than 7,400,000,000 cartridges.

Such is the general picture of the supplies for the Red Army in regard to equipment and ammunition. As you see, it does not resemble the picture which the supplies of our armies presented during the First World War, when the front experienced a chronic shortage of artillery and shells, when the Army fought without tanks, and when one rifle was issued for every 3 soldiers.

Regarding supply of the Red Army with food and uniforms, it is generally known that the front not only did experience no shortage in this respect, but even had the necessary reserves.

That is how the matter stands with regard to the work of the Communist Party of our country during the period before the outbreak of the war and during the war.

PARTY'S IMMEDIATE PLANS

Now a few words on the plans for the work of the Communist Party in the near future. As is known, these plans are confirmed in the very near future. The fundamental task of the new 5-year plan consists in restoring the areas of the country which have suffered, restoring the prewar level in industry and agriculture, and then exceeding this level by more or less considerable amounts.

Apart from the fact that in the very near future the rationing system will be abolished, special attention will be focused on expanding the production of goods for mass consumption, on raising the standard of life of the working people by consistent and systematic reduction of the cost of all goods, and on wide-scale construction of all kinds of scientific research institutes to enable science to develop its forces.

I have no doubt that if we render the necessary assistance to our scientists they will be able not only to overtake but also in the very near future to surpass the achievements of science outside the boundaries of our country. As far as plans for a longer period are concerned, the party intends to organize a new mighty upsurge of national economy, which will enable us to increase the level of our production, for instance, threefold as compared with the prewar level.

To achieve this we must endeavor to see that our industry produces 50,000,000 tons of pig iron per year, 60,000,000 tons of steel, 500,000,000 tons of coal and 60,000,000 tons of oil.

Only under such conditions will our country be insured against any eventuality. Perhaps three new 5-year plans will be required to achieve this, if not more. But it can be done and we must do it.

Such is my brief account of the work of the Communist Party in recent past and its plan of work for the future. It is up to you to judge whether the party has worked and is working correctly, and whether it could not have worked better.

Some say that victors should not be judged, that they should not be criticized, or checked. This is not correct. Victors can and must be judged, they can and must be criticized and checked.

This is good, not only for the cause but also for the victors themselves. Why? Because there will be less conceit and more modesty. I consider that the election campaign is the judgment of the electors on the Communist Party as being the party of the rulers.

The results of the elections will signify the verdict of the electors. Our party would not be worth much if it were afraid to face this verdict. The Communist Party is not afraid to receive the verdict of the electors.

NEW UNITY IS STRESSED

In the election struggle, the Communist Party does not come forward alone; it enters the elections together with the nonparty people. In former days Communists had an attitude of a certain mistrust toward nonparty persons. This is explained by the fact that the "nonparty" banner frequently masked certain bourgeois groupings, who did not find it advantageous to present themselves to the electors without a mask. Such groupings existed. There was such a state of affairs in the past but now times have changed.

Nonparty people are now separated from the bourgeoisie by a barrier which is called the Soviet social system. This very same barrier unites the nonparty people with the Communists into one common collective of Soviet peoples.

Living in one common collective, they fought together for the strengthening of the might of our country. Together they fought and shed their blood at the fronts for the sake of the freedom and greatness of our motherland. Together they forged and created the victories over the enemies of our countries. The sole difference between them is that some of them are members of the party and others are not. But this difference is only a formal one.

What is important is that both Communists and nonparty people are fulfilling one common task. Therefore, the block of Communists and nonparty persons is in my view a natural and common cause.

In conclusion, permit me to express my gratitude for the confidence which you have shown me in nominating me as candidate for Deputy to the Supreme Soviet. I will try to justify this confidence.

Capt. Mildred McAfee Horton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1946

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, the resignation of Capt. Mildred McAfee Horton, USNR, from her duties as Director of the Women's Reserve marks the completion of 41 months of devoted service to the Navy and to the Nation. Captain Horton was the first Wave and was commissioned a lieutenant commander in the Navy August 3, 1942, 4 days after the Women's Reserve was authorized by Congress. Since that time Captain Horton has participated in all phases of the formulation of plans and policies affecting the Women's Reserve and her vision and imagination contributed in large measure to the effective utilization of Waves in many types of billets. Under her leadership the Women's Reserve expanded until at the time of the surrender of Japan there were 86,000 Waves, nearly eight times the original number the Navy had estimated was needed.

At that time Waves were serving at 900 stations in the United States and Hawaii. These represented nearly every type of naval shore activity, including hospitals, navy yards, air stations, supply and ammunition depots, district headquarters, and communications activities. Approximately 20,000 Waves were serving in the Navy Department and the Potomac River Naval Command and Waves composed 55 percent of the uniformed personnel in the Navy Department in Washington. The high standards of performance which were set by members of the Women's Reserves, many of whom were engaged in duties which they had learned in the Navy and which were formerly reserved for Navy men, are a lasting tribute to Captain Horton.

From the original four ratings of seaman, yeoman, storekeeper, and radioman open to Waves, enlisted women today have qualified for 38 different ratings. To supplement the civilian skills which these women brought to the Navy an extensive training program was set up which at its peak included a large recruit school for enlisted Waves in New York City, a midshipmen's training school in Northampton, Mass., and advanced schools at more than 40 naval activities. The advanced schools included preparation of enlisted women for duties of pharmacist's mate, hospital apprentice, aviation machinist's mate, aviation machinist's mate—instrument, aviation metalsmith, parachute rigger, radioman, storekeeper, yeoman, cook, baker, mailman, gunnery instructor, key punch operator, link trainer instructor, chaplain's assistant, control tower operator, aerographer's mate, barracks master-at-arms, camera repairman, link celestial navigation trainer operator, sound motion picture technician, and pigeon trainer. Advanced schools for officers prepared them for duties in supply, aerology, technical and administrative radar, communications, air combat information, Japanese language, chemical warfare, ordnance, photographic interpretation, aircraft recognition, and link celestial navigation instruction.

For her services as Director of the Women's Reserve, Captain Horton received the Distinguished Service Medal in November 1945. The citation reads as follows:

For exceptionally meritorious service to the Government of the United States in a duty of great responsibility as Director of the Women's Reserve of the United States Naval Reserve, from August 3, 1942, to August 31, 1945. Qualified professionally and intellectually for this unique service, immediately purposed toward the full utilization of women in the nation's organized war effort, Captain Horton was directly instrumental in the initiation of plans and policies affecting the administration, welfare, and public relations of members of the Women's Reserve, and was in large measure responsible for procedures motivating their effective performance in the continental United States and the Fourteenth Naval District. Keenly perceptive of the potentialities of an ideal, she inspired in the general public her own confidence, translating her experience-based theories into actuality in the generally recognized acceptance of women as an integral part of the naval service. Under her capable and devoted leadership, the standards of integrity, loyalty, and enthusiasm were met by 86,000 members of the Women's Reserve, reflecting the highest credit upon Captain Horton and the United States naval service.

Captain Horton was admirably qualified by virtue of her civilian experience to serve as Director of the Women's Reserve. As president of Wellesley College, she was known in educational circles throughout the country. Previous to her appointment to that position in 1936 she served as dean of college women at Oberlin College. During the war Captain Horton has been on leave of absence from her duties at Wellesley.

The new Director of the Women's Reserve is Capt. Jean T. Palmer, of Omaha, Nebr. Captain Palmer, in civilian life, was a graduate of Bryn Mawr College and business manager of the Association of Junior Leagues of America. A Wave officer since the establishment of the Women's Reserve, she worked with Captain Horton in setting up the initial organization. Ten months later she became assistant for the Women's Reserve to the director of enlisted personnel, and for her services as an adviser on all matters of policy affecting enlisted women in the Navy she received a citation and commendation ribbon from the Secretary of the Navy. Captain Palmer was appointed Assistant Director of the Women's Reserve in November 1945. Captain Palmer will have as her assistant Commander Grace Chaney.

Wheat Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1946

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, on Friday I pointed out in the House that the greatest immediate difficulty as far as the wheat situation is concerned is a breakdown of transportation. I pointed out at that time that farmers in the Wheat Belt are anxious to sell their wheat but are unable to get cars to do so. I pointed out also that because of this lack of transportation, some wheat is becoming unfit for human consumption.

In further support of this contention I submit herewith an extract from an editorial in the Denver Post for February 7:

Some western wheat growers declare the wheat shortage situation is exaggerated and wonder if the object is to justify the imposition of more bureaucratic controls. Carl Smith, a member of the Denver Livestock Exchange, who is extensively engaged in farm and livestock operations in western Kansas and Nebraska, says the shortage is one of freight cars, not wheat. He insists Washington can get plenty of wheat if it will provide the railroad cars to get it out of western Kansas and Nebraska.

"The Government has been appealing to farmers to let loose of their wheat," Smith said. "They've been trying to do that but they can't get cars to ship it. I had 75,000 bushels of wheat piled on the ground at Goodland, Kans. It got wet before I could get it shipped. I have 50,000 bushels in storage in western Nebraska. I can't get cars. The railroads want to move this wheat but they say their cars are tied up by the Government. The whole situation is so nonsensical. If one department of Government wants wheat, all it has to do is get another department to get the cars to move wheat that is available."

Achievements of American Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1946

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, we too often lose sight of the great production record of agriculture during the war. The American farmer under an unusual handicap of labor and machinery shortages has met every production goal and more besides. The following editorial taken from the Sioux City (Iowa) Journal gives us a picture of the remarkable achievements of American agriculture during the past few years:

FARMERS BREAK RECORDS

Establishment of new production records was so much the order during the war period that only passing attention was given to any individual achievement in that line. Everyone knew, of course, that American farmers were keeping pace with the accomplishments of other war workers, and doing it under an unusual handicap of labor and machinery shortages.

Now that we are into the postwar period, there is time to pause and consider the remarkable achievement of American agriculture in the last 9 years. Records show that our farms have been made to yield higher than average crops during that number of seasons. In some of these years weather conditions were unusually favorable, aiding efforts of the farmers; in others just the reverse was true.

Last year, for example, was one of the worst seasons of recent years for producing a large corn crop. Yet the 3,018,410,000 bushels produced was close to the record 1944 crop yield, and 25 percent higher than the national average only a few years ago.

Planting a year ago was seriously delayed by wet weather. Farmers were unusually short of manpower to meet such delays. But machinery was recruited, the corn planted, and use of early maturing hybrid strains helped to produce a big crop. It is true, of course, that a lot of corn was damaged by frost, a condition not considered in Government crop statistics.

Corn, being the leading crop in this section, gets first attention in a survey of farm production records. But it should be noted that yields for all farm crops in 1945 was fully 30 percent above the 1923–32 predrought average. Acre yields of oats, potatoes, and sugarcane reached new high records last year.

Certainty of increased heavy demand for foodstuffs in this country and abroad has influenced the Government to propose an increase in land under cultivation of 9,169,100 acres for this year. Larger plantings of sugar beets, dry beans, flax, and some feed crops are asked. A 10-percent reduction in soybean acreage is suggested, due to some restoration of some foreign sources of oil-bearing crops.

Will it pay the farmers of the Nation to continue their efforts and turn in another record crop? Government sources anticipate a decline of about 10 percent in farm prices during the year, plus an increase in production expenses, chiefly in the cost of machinery and in transportation. Net farm income is likely to be about 15 percent below the 1945 peak, it is expected, provided, of course, that farmers do not organize and insist on no decrease in their take-home pay.

Reign of Terror in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1946

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a telegram that was sent to the Secretary of State, Hon. James F. Byrnes, by the Polish-American Congress of Chicago, Ill., and also copy of a statement that appeared in the American press throughout the country, dealing with the political murders and the reign of terror going on in Poland:

FEBRUARY 1, 1946.

Hon. JAMES F. BYRNES,
Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.:

We commend you for voicing America's disapproval of the political murders of democratic elements taking place in Russian controlled Poland. The Polish-American Congress has consistently warned our American Government ever since the Yalta Conference that it should take a firm stand in demanding elections be held immediately in Poland and not when all the democratic leaders will have been liquidated. Your expressed concern over the deplorable conditions in Poland has the approval of all fair-minded Americans.

CHARLES ROZMAREK,
President, Polish-American Congress.

Secretary Byrnes is to be commended for voicing America's disapproval of the political murders of democratic elements now taking place in Russian-controlled Poland.

Ever since the Yalta Conference the Polish-American Congress has consistently warned our American Government that it should take a firm stand in demanding that the elections in Poland be held immediately and not when all the democratic leaders have been liquidated.

The accusation made by the Moscow-appointed Polish Ambassador in Washington that General Anders is responsible for the reign of terror in Poland is not only ridiculous but malicious.

General Anders is in Italy, whereas the Russian-installed Polish puppet government and the Russian Army are in full control in Poland. Liberty is slowly bleeding to death in prostrate Poland. Countless thousands of patriotic Poles are being rounded up. They are either being executed or deported to Siberia, where a fate worse than death awaits them. Instead of a general political amnesty, additional arrests have occurred. The secret police, backed up by the Red army, have put the quietus on all opposition.

All this amply explains the reason why Poles and Jews are fleeing from Russian-occupied Poland into American and British zones of occupation and are deliberately avoiding entry into Russia or Russian-occupied Germany.

Warning to Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 11, 1946

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Mankato Free Press, Mankato, Minn., entitled "Warning to Labor":

WARNING TO LABOR

The thinking, working, loyal members of labor unions are having a valuable lesson disclosed to them in the action of the House of Representatives, in according such strong support to the so-called Case bill and in beating off all attacks and efforts to amend that measure.

Observers are generally agreed that this is a strong bill. It imposes definite curbs on strikes and takes away from labor unions valuable rights against injunctions which have been won only after long years of struggle and effort. Probably over the long pull it would be regrettable if such stringent legislation should become law. However, the Members of Congress supporting this bill feel that they have the full support of a majority of their constituents in sponsoring such legislation.

That is the point that some of our radical labor leaders have forgotten. It is the point that thinking members of unions should remember. Labor was not able to elect a mayor in Detroit, strongly union though that city may be. Labor could not, by itself, elect a President. Labor can make gains and win greater consideration and rights only in cooperation with the public as a whole. And when labor's policies become hostile and damaging to the public as a whole, there is the strength, the support, and even the demand for Congress to impose stringent curbs and restrictions on the freedom of action of union labor.

Granting that it might be a mistake to pass legislation as drastic as the Case bill, the measure has served a useful purpose if it awakens a majority in the ranks of labor to the dangers they are facing. In the future labor may choose a leadership that will respect rather than flout the rights of the general public.

"Honest Abe" and Honest Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 11, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, February 12, America will observe the birth date of one of our greatest statesmen and our greatest souls, a man whose faith in God and his fellow man made him a benefactor to the human race which will cause him to be remembered for all time. He is one of America's immortals.

In Lincoln's Day his contemporaries needed but two words to describe his spirit, his principle, and his guiding star of statesmanship. That description was, "Honest Abe."

Abraham Lincoln believed in government of, by, and for the people. He knew the real meaning of government of, by, and for the people. Therefore he gave his Nation that kind of Government. His great concern always was to preserve, uphold and advance government of, by, and for the people.

What a long way, and what a sad way we have drifted from Abraham Lincoln's concept of government, under which the people were permitted always to know what commitments were being made for them to fulfill, and why such commitments were made. The Nation has, within the past 2 weeks or 3, been shocked to its depths by the revelation that the protestations regarding the Yalta meeting by the then President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and numerous other spokesmen of that administration, were meaningless, and intended to deceive the people. We have learned, that neither Mr. Churchill, when he stood before the Parliament and solemnly gave it the unqualified assurance that no secret agreements had been reached at Yalta between the Big Three nations, except the granting of three votes in the World Council to Russia, nor Mr. Roosevelt when he gave his Nation the same assurance by implication, stated the truth. It is entirely possible that Mr. Churchill did not know of the agreement between Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Stalin in which the Kurile and Sakhalin Islands were given over to Russia.

The Yalta Conference was some 6 months before Japan surrendered. Therefore the Kurile Islands and Sakhalin Island were under the sovereignty of a power which had not yet been defeated, and which had not surrendered to the United States. Mr. Roosevelt was, therefore, at the time of Yalta, without any more power or authority, constitutionally or otherwise, to turn the Kurile and Sakhalin Islands over to Mr. Stalin than would any other private citizen of the United States have been. There is nothing in the Constitution, and certainly under any sane concept of international law, there could be no possibility of the President's war powers embracing the power and authority for him to dispose of the territory of one sovereign nation by grant to another sovereign nation before the first sovereign nation had been defeated or had surrendered.

The Kurile and Sakhalin Islands are important not only to our future defense in the Pacific, but to our open-door policy in China. It was in those islands that the springboard of the Japanese successful attack upon the Aleutians was located. Will they in the future again be the springboard from which another attack will be made upon us? The Kuriles lie between the Aleutian Islands off of our Alaskan coast and Japan, which is now under our sovereignty.

If Mr. Roosevelt made a secret agreement with Mr. Stalin granting Russia the right to occupy and possess the Kuriles and Sakhalin without either the constitutional power or any power under international law, and without the advice and consent of the United States Senate, the act was not that of a clear-minded man, and the only conclusion is that Mr. Roosevelt was so sick at the time of the Yalta Conference that he was not fully aware of the implications of his acts.

My point in this discussion is not merely a criticism of Franklin D. Roosevelt. There is another point, very vital and very much more disturbing, involved in this matter. Let us for a moment consider the aspects presented to America within the last 2 weeks.

Secretary of State James F. Byrnes has advised the country that he knew nothing of this secret agreement between Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Stalin at Yalta until sometime after VJ-day. In that interim Stalin had moved his troops into the Kuriles and Sakhalin, and had literally and actually taken forcible possession of islands which were then under the control and sovereignty of the United States of America. We are now the sovereign power in Japan. The Japanese Emperor and his government are merely executives operating under the policies and orders of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, who represents the sovereign power of the United States in Japan, and whose decisions, in event of disagreement between the Allies, shall be final.

After this revelation relating to Secretary Byrnes' lack of knowledge of this secret treaty, and his statement that he did not even know when President Truman first learned of the secret Yalta agreement, President Truman nonchalantly stated at a press conference that he had known of the agreement since before the Potsdam Conference. He further said the agreement was a document in writing, and that the document was in his personal files at the White House. He further hinted that there were other secret agreements at Yalta which he observed would be revealed to the American people at the proper time. It was intimated that he would have to get the permission of Mr. Stalin and the British Government before he would feel at liberty to advise the Congress and the American people what other secret agreements had been entered into binding them to courses of action wholly without their knowledge and consent. Mr. Truman went even further at that press conference to say that he made foreign policy and that the State Department merely carried it out, and his attitude was by unmistakable implication that it was not necessary for the State Department to know about secret agreements unless the Chief Executive chose to inform this Department.

Incalculable damage has been done by this series of developments to the people's confidence in their Government. Who are the people to believe, and what are the people to believe, if they cannot believe the most solemn assurances of their Chief Executive and State Department spokesmen? What may we have been committed to if a secret agreement as bizarre and irresponsible as the grant of the Kurile and Sakhalin Islands to Stalin by Mr. Roosevelt 6 months before we had achieved sovereignty over them could be carried through and kept secret by Mr. Truman for all these months?

The time—the proper time—for the American people to know about these secret agreements is now. The people are entitled to know about all secret agreements now. Any pretense that the secret agreements must be kept secret because of military security has now completely vanished. It vanished on VJ-day. Therefore when Mr. Truman takes the position, as he apparently does, that the American people and their Congress cannot know about these secret agreements binding upon them without the permission of Joe Stalin in Russia and the British governmental officials, such an attitude becomes both incomprehensible and indefensible. The American people are entitled to know the commitments made in their name by their public servants and any assumption by any Chief Executive that secret diplomacy agreements reached in the dark recesses of mysterious diplomatic intrigue are so sacred the American people cannot know about them, at once brings to mind a statement once made by that seventeenth century philosopher, Baruch Spinoza, who declared:

> It has been the one song of those who thirst after absolute power that the interest of the state requires that its affairs should be conducted in secret. * * * But the more such arguments disguise themselves under the mask of public welfare, the more oppressive is the slavery to which they will lead. * * * Better that right counsels be known to enemies than that the evil secrets of tyrants should be concealed from the citizens. They who can treat secretly of the affairs of a nation have it absolutely under their authority; and as they plot against the enemy in time of war, so do they against the citizens in time of peace.

Any course by any Chief Executive which involves concealment of facts or deception of the American people concerning agreements made in their name, and binding upon them, is indefensible from any standpoint. It is bad government. It is bad practice. It is bad world relations, and it is bad for the morale of our own people.

These United States of America are not a private institution of any man, President or other. Mr. Truman's first duty and first loyalty are to the people of the United States, and neither he nor any person in the State Department owes a greater duty, or a greater loyalty, to the Soviet Government or to the British Government than he does to the people of the United States. Any doctrine that Mr. Truman owes it to the departed Mr. Roosevelt to deceive the American people, or to keep from them facts which are of vital importance to them, is indefensible, and the people should raise their voices against it now.

Woodrow Wilson condemned secret diplomacy. Our whole scheme of Government is based upon open, honest, candid diplomacy. Europe and the Orient have been embroiled in suspicions and wars for a thousand years and more because of secret deals and agreements. We are beginning to realize that George Washington knew what he was talking about when he advised this Nation to be wary of becoming entangled in that sort of diplomacy and intrigue with the countries of the old world.

We must regain as soon as possible the concept, the spirit, and the kind of government to which "Honest Abe" Lincoln was ever faithful, government of, by, and for the people.

Case Strike-Control Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT K. HENRY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 11, 1946

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to include an editorial which appeared in the Waukesha Daily Freeman, Waukesha, Wis., under date of February 8, 1946.

CASE STRIKE-CONTROL BILL

Passage of the Case strike-control bill in the lower house Thursday indicates that Congress is becoming conscious of the duty it has to prevent the American public from being victimized by Nation-wide strikes like those which are gradually strangling our economy. Unfortunately, however, the measure will have rough going in the Senate where there is no coalition of Republicans and Democrats to see it through.

The Case bill makes no attempt to deprive unions of any rights to which they are, or ever have been entitled. By making them amenable to civil rights in the case of contract violations, it makes the status of unions the same as that of employers. There should never have been any difference. It provides that injunctions may be issued against unions when they use force or violence in their picketing. It does not deny them the privilege of striking to enforce their demands when other means of obtaining a settlement have failed.

Passage of the Case bill would be so much in the public interest that Congress should proceed forthwith to enact it into law, over President Truman's veto if necessary. It is not an attempt to break the unions. It is an honest effort to prevent unions from breaking the country. With the entire reconversion program hanging in the balance as a result of the present wave of strikes, the need is urgent for a law which not only will restore industrial peace now but will prevent similar battles in the future.

Why a British Loan?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 11, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald:

WHY A BRITISH LOAN?

President Truman day before yesterday sent Congress a message repeating the conventional arguments for the proposed "loan" to Great Britain and asking Congress for a hurry-up O. K. on the loan.

The transaction would add up to $4,400,000,000. Of this, $650,000,000 would go to clear the lend-lease slate between the United States and Great Britain. The other three and three-quarter billions would constitute the loan. Interest would be at 2 percent. Neither principal nor interest payments would begin until 1951. In years when times were sour in Britain, we would just forget about the interest.

TRUMAN'S MESSAGE

This deal, says the President in his message, will grease the wheels of international trade, enable Britain to recover from the war more quickly than it could recover under its own steam, promote business between the United States and the British Empire, avert a trade war between Britain and this country, and in various other ways speed the mopping up of the war's financial and economic wreckage.

With all of the above, we disagree.

Let's reduce this proposition to human, individual terms, so that anybody can understand its implications. Suppose the family black sheep went around and promoted various loans from the substantial members of the family, then blew the money on race horses. The second time he came around for loans, he might get them. But if he blew these loans as he blew the first ones, his third money-raising trip around the substantial part of the family would probably net him little if any jack.

UNCLE SHYLOCK RIDES AGAIN

We helped England out of World War I. We put up 2,000,000 men for the western front, and loaned Britain about six and one-half billions—which in those days was not hay. Britain repaid some of the money, then quit paying, and set up Empire preference tariffs against our goods, while British statesmen called us Uncle Shylock because we made some mild objections to all this welshing.

And now, here we go again. We extended $29,000,000,000 worth of lend-lease goods to the British Empire during the late war. That is to be washed out, along with the $12,000,000,000 in lend-lease that we gave other nations.

We also contributed about 3,500,000 men to the war in western Europe—three times as many as Britain contributed—and pulled Britain's Far East Empire out of the fire virtually single-handed, except for Burma. The British are back in Hong Kong now.

But as if this were not enough, Britain's Socialist government now wants another "loan" of about $4,000,000,000—and Parliament had the supreme gall to pretend to be hesitant about accepting the "loan" on the ground that the terms were too harsh.

If Britain gets the $4,000,000,000, what argument can there be against "loaning" Russia the $6,000,000,000 Stalin told some Congressmen he wanted? Then why not "loan" France the $2,500,000,000 it is reported willing to accept? After that, why not just tell Iran, Iraq, and every other nation that wants some of our money to come and get it?

This money, we should all bear in mind, will not be manna from the skies or stage money pulled out of a wizard's hat. It will come from the pants pockets of United States taxpayers, which means all of us directly or indirectly.

We throw this two bits' worth of ours into the loan argument because we believe it, not because we fancy that any winged words of ours can block the British loan.

President Truman thinks it good politics to follow along with the Roosevelt-Morgenthau gibberish about one world, and all that. It looks as if Congress will O. K. this loan, which on World War I precedent will be nothing but a gift, and as if the people won't

be able to do a thing about it until and unless they can change control of our Government at the polls.

It seems to us that the sensible thing to do would be teach England that war is a horrible and costly jag, by letting England sweat out its World War II hang-over unassisted.

WE SHOULD SPEND THE MONEY HERE

As for the four or ten or twelve and one-half or twenty billions we're thinking of "loaning" out on dubious terms to dubious borrowers—if we must spend that money, why not spend it in our own country? Why not split it about 50–50 between a real long-range national-defense program and generous bonuses for our own veterans of World War II?

At least, our veterans would spend the money in this country. Even the money they spent wastefully would stay here. Foreign debtors may, as promised, buy a lot of United States goods with this "loaned" money; but if they don't pay it back, we will merely have given them the goods.

We think our World War II veterans should join the American Legion in overwhelming numbers, and go out after these bonuses.

Wages and Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1946

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include three editorials from the January and February issue of Extension magazine published in Chicago. These editorials come from the pen of Mr. S. A. Baldus, and appeared in the February issue:

THE TRIUMPH OF FAILURE

Because the national labor-management conference, set in motion by President Truman, adjourned after 4 weeks with disagreement on all major issues and without setting up the much-talked-about machinery for settling labor disputes, the conference has been declared a complete failure. We hold a contrary view. It was at least 50 percent successful in that management, presenting as always, a united front, came out of the conference with flying colors. Its greatest victory was that with the help of several of the representatives of labor, it succeeded in keeping the wages question—for the settlement of which the conference had been called—from being discussed.

But as far as labor is concerned the conference was indeed a failure. Labor didn't score a single point. The reason for its defeat is that organized labor is badly disorganized—a house divided against itself. There is no unity among the different labor groups whose leaders, swayed by jealousies and personal ambitions, are engaged in iternecine rivalries, pursuing tactics that are harmful rather than helpful to the rank and file of workers. Then, too, they seem to be lacking in wit and intelligence. Take, for example, their present demand for more wages. As one group phrased it, "We want 52 hours of 'take-home' pay for 40 hours of work." Whoever invented that slogan ought to have his head examined. It's about as sensible as asking for 135 cents of change for a dollar. Such ill-advised and poorly considered claims have the effect of putting workers generally in a false light with the public and fastening the stamp of unreasonableness on their demands.

Confining ourselves to the wages question, labor leaders seem to be entirely oblivious (or shall we say—ignorant) of these fundamental facts.

1. That every demand for more wages was invariably preceded by an increase in prices and living costs. Prices went up first; then came the demand for more wages.

2. That every increase in wages was promptly followed by another increase in prices and living costs.

3. That in not a single instance did wage increases ever catch up with the increase in prices and living costs. In not a single instance was the increase (grudgingly granted—and generally after strikes costly to labor) sufficient to meet the advance in prices and living costs.

In the 60 years since organized labor came into existence—and in spite of the tens of thousands of strikes for better wages—organized labor has never won a single clear-cut victory, even as regards the quantity of its wages, to say nothing of their purchasing power. A few basic wage facts clearly show this. According to statistics compiled by Williford I. King—in 1910 over half of the families in the United States had an income of less than $800 a year; over 80 percent of the families had an income of $1,200 or less—most of them less.

Thirty years later—in December 1939—the average weekly earnings of all those engaged in the manufacturing industries amount to $26.27 a week, $1,366 a year. This doesn't show much progress as regards the size of the wage worker's pay envelope, in spite of all their strikes during 30 years, does it?

Then came the war, and with it improvement in the wage situation. In January 1945, when war production was at its height, the average weekly earnings of those engaged in the manufacturing industries, before deductions for taxes, social security, etc., and on the basis of time and a half for work in excess of 40 hours, averaged $47.52.

But the war is over and the drift is back to the prewar level of wages. The present minimum wage is 40 cents an hour—$16 for a 40-hour week—$832 a year. The enactment of a wage law stipulating 65 cents an hour would mean a wage base of $26 a week, or $1,352 a year, which is less than the earnings of those engaged in the manufacturing industries in December 1939. Where is the progress?

And in the meantime the cost of living has risen progressively so that today an income of $2,250 is considered as minimum for the maintenance of a fairly decent standard of living for a family of five. Even $1 an hour—$40 a week, for all workers would fall short of this standard.

What we should like to impress upon labor leaders, and workers generally, is that there is no salvation for them in a mere quantity wage. They may ask, as some are doing now, for $2-a-day increase, or a flat 30-percent increase in wages, but it would inevitably be taken away from them through the medium of higher prices. The labor leaders of the two respective groups may be right when they insist that the wage increases they are demanding could be paid without increasing the prices of automobiles or steel products but, and this is the important point, the prices of a thousand other items of consumer goods produced outside of the automobile and steel industries would go up. The cost of living would increase. And then where would they be?

"LET THERE BE LIGHT"

Last month we tried to impress upon labor leaders and workers generally that the quantity of wages is not the important thing, that no real benefits can or will ever accrue to them from a larger number of dollars in their pay envelope as long as the purchasing power of the dollar is low—that is to say, if the prices of the things they must purchase in order to live and the prices of the things they produce remain high. To merely demand more dollars of low purchasing power is stupid, and gets labor nowhere.

And the worst part of it is that demanding a larger quantity of dollars and launching strikes to gain this objective has placed labor in the unenviable and altogether false position of being held responsible for high and still ascending prices and mounting living costs. Actually there is no connection whatever between wage increases and prices. Certainly they are not cause and effect. Let us never forget that in all cases prices went up first; then came the demand for more wages. But labor, especially organized labor, is too blind to see, and too obtuse to stress this easily demonstrable fundamental fact.

This writer has examined, computed, and correlated hundreds of sets of statistics pertaining to wages and prices covering a period of 50 years, and has found absolutely nothing to justify the claim, so persistently publicized, that the excessive wage demands of labor are responsible for rising prices and increases in living costs. To prove the point we select only one from a hundred items for which relevant data are available—showing conclusively that wages or wage increases are not the cause of high prices—namely steel rails.

In 1898 the price of steel rails was $17.62 a ton. In 1901 the United States Steel Corporation was organized. In 1902 the price of steel rails was raised to $28 a ton and kept at that price until 1913. After the war broke out in 1914, the price was increased to $40 a ton in 1917, and to $57 in 1918. Then it was dropped to $54.42 in 1920. In 1923 the price of steel rails was fixed at $43, and held at that figure until 1932. It went down to $36.38 in 1935. The ceiling price of steel rails was $43; it was recently raised to $46 by the OPA. And the same price gyrations are observable for all the other steel products.

The point we want to emphasize is that the wages of the steel workers had absolutely nothing whatever to do with these sundry price increases and fluctuations. The wages of steel workers have always been notorious as the lowest in industry. Up to 1915 the wages of workers in steel plants ran as low as $2 to $2.50 a day—for a 12-hour day. Between 1917 and 1920 wages varied from $3 in 1917 to the highest point—$5.06 in 1920. (The 12-hour day and 7-day week—84 hours—which had been in effect for years, was not abandoned until 1924.) In April 1938 the average weekly earnings of steel workers was $22.28. From these few data it is clear that the high prices of steel rails cannot be attributed to the high wages paid in the steel production industry.

Take any other group of factory workers in whatever line of goods production they may be engaged—suits, shoes, shirts, hats, ties, gloves, dresses and wearing apparel for women and children, suitcases, paints, rugs, carpets, furniture, pottery, etc.—and you will find that the comparatively small increases in the quantity of their wages do not account for the considerable increase in the prices of the goods they produce. We must look elsewhere for the seat of the trouble.

A VENTURE IN FACT FINDING

It is a great mistake to imagine that the present controversy between labor and management is of concern and interest only to a few thousand corporation managers and officials and to a few million organized wage earners. No. It is the most important topic that has ever been presented to the American people; it vitally concerns all of us—every man, woman, and child—for the reason that the outcome of the controversy will determine the economic destiny of this and the next generation.

Reduced to its simplest terms, the present fight—for it is nothing less than a fight—is a desperate attempt on the part of labor to

break the shackles of the centuries-old "iron law" of wages which the so-called classical economists formulated a century and a half ago, and which, alas, hireling economists have defended ever since, namely, that those who work are entitled to nothing more than a mere subsistence wage—that is to say, just enough wages to enable them to meet the cost of living. The corollary of this "iron law" of wages is that the usufruct of labor and all the emoluments and perquisites belong exclusively to the employers of labor.

These, therefore, are the two basic and interlinked questions: Is labor entitled to nothing more than a bare subsistence level of wages, and is it right—is it just that enormous profits be garnered by those who own or control the various industries and enterprises? Let it be understood that we are friendly to legitimate capitalism; we hold that productive capital is entitled to a fair and decent reward; but we put the emphasis on "fair" and "decent." During the past 50 years, however, a system has been developed under which profits are collected not only on capital actually invested but also on fictitious and nonexisting capital. The statistics show that the amount of fictitious and nonexisting capital entered upon the books of corporations is vastly greater than the amount of capital actually invested in the various industries and business activities. The determination to make a profit on this fictitious and nonexisting capital has fastened on our country the twin evils—high prices and low wages. In short, prices are high and wages are low because the industrial and other corporations are grossly overcapitalized.

What do we mean by overcapitalization? We mean the capitalization of corporations on the basis of an inflated valuation, that is to say—capitalized for an amount largely in excess of the real value of their properties and assets. It is an ingenious system perfected by that sinister genius and rugged individualist, J. Pierpont Morgan.

This is how the system of overcapitalization works. When Mr. Morgan organized the United States Steel Corp. in 1901, he caused to be issued nearly a billion dollars of securities—stocks and bonds—in excess of the actual value of all the properties and assets of the several companies merged into this one gigantic corporation. We can give only a few examples to illustrate the procedure. One of the companies whose plants and assets had been liberally valued at $19,000,000 was capitalized for $80,000,000. Against another company whose properties were valued at $33,000,000, $200,000,000 of securities were issued. Against the properties of another company whose total assets amounted to $100,000,000, $492,000,000 of stocks and bonds were issued. And so on for all the other companies taken into the consolidation.

From that time on the overcapitalization of all kinds of industries and enterprises became general. Manufacturing, mining and mercantile industries, railroads, transportation systems, public utilities, etc., were organized, or reorganized, on the ingenious basis of overcapitalization. Prices and profits were computed—not on the amount of money invested in whatever properties, but on their fictitious valuation—on an amount of imaginary capital that had no existence and was not employed in production—and therefore was not entitled to any reward. But in order to continue to reap a profit on this nonexisting capital, and also pay dividends and interest to the holders of the securities—stocks and bonds—issued against an investment that was never made, it was necessary to do two things—keep prices high and wages low. There you have the answer.

The point to be emphasized here is that the thing that determines the amount of overcapital—and the issuance of stocks and bonds—is profits. According to Prof. Edward Sherwood Mead, "We may define overcapitalization as that condition in which the par value of the securities of a company exceeds their actual value based on profits." In short, profits are used as the basis for computing the amount of overcapitalization. The greater the profits—the greater the overcapitalization. And the greater the overcapitalization, the higher the prices; and the higher the prices, the lower the purchasing power of wages.

Why was the system of excessive overcapitalization put into effect? The answer is simple—to disguise the immense earnings and to conceal the enormous profits that were being made. This is the line of reasoning that was followed. If a plant actually worth $500,000 made a clear profit of, say, $60,000 in a given year, this was computed not as 12 percent on $500,000 but as being the equivalent of 6 percent on $1,000,000—and which, according to capitalistic logic, justified raising the capitalization to $1,000,000. And if the following year (on account of the increase in prices) the profits were $120,000 this would be computed not as 24 percent on $500,000, nor as 12 percent on a mythical valuation of $1,000,000, but as 6 percent on an arbitrary and fictitious valuation of $2,000,000. And so on.

We have merely scratched the surface. This is no attempt to tell the complete story of the dastardly economic crime of overcapitalization, and the terrific penalties that the people in the role of wage earners and consumers have been paying and will be compelled to pay in all the years to come, in order to maintain and support the ingenious and outrageous free-enterprise system of overcapitalization through which prices have been kept high and wages low.

Our concluding comment is that unless the fact-finding committee recently appointed by President Truman will make an intelligent and honest effort to get at the root of things, by going back to their beginnings, nothing of permanent worth will be accomplished.

The Inflation Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1946

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Mark Sullivan which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune dated February 10.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that Mr. Sullivan's article is most timely and involves one of the most important problems facing us today. We all agree that we must keep down inflation and to do it we have to increase production. We cannot increase production with a continuation of strikes. I have tried to impress that fact on the labor leaders in my district when they criticize my vote for the Case bill. I know the great majority of the people, workers as well as employers, who sincerely want to see the Nation's domestic economy pull out of this paralysis, agree that legislation was necessary.

The Case bill may not be perfect, but it surely is a start in the right direction. If it becomes necessary to keep price controls a while longer, let us insist that the OPA pursue realistic, workable, and reasonably flexible policies.

FULL PRODUCTION OF GOODS HELD BEST WAY TO BAR RISE IN PRICES—MARK SULLIVAN CALLS DELAY IN OUTPUT GREAT DANGER TO UNITED STATES—SAYS OPA CEILINGS SEEK TO PREVENT RESULT OF INFLATION, NOT TO CURE ITS CAUSE

(By Mark Sullivan)

WASHINGTON, February 9.—President Truman has asked Congress to extend price control—as the law now stands it would expire June 30. He asked further that Congress act promptly, so that businessmen may be able to estimate well in advance what prices they must pay for materials, and what they may charge.

For promptness of decision, one way or the other, the argument is obvious. It would be an unnecessary addition to our troubles to let business and industry remain in doubt. As of today the common assumption is that control will be extended. But in the debate ahead there will be strong argument that the better and quicker way out of our troubles would be to let prices go free.

Public understanding of the coming debate may be helped if there is agreement on the underlying factors, including the meaning of familiar but loosely used words. This writer has received a reproving letter from Mr. Ralph Saylor, of Pottstown, Pa., who has gone to the dictionary and found "inflation" defined as "the excessive and abnormal coinage of money and currency."

DEFINITION IS HELD SOUND

A dictionary is not an authority, though it is commonly accepted as such, even by courts. A dictionary is a record of usage, and because it is that, definitions change in successive editions. A future dictionary, recording present usage, may say that "inflation" has as many meanings as in fact it has in the talk and writing now current. To each person the meaning of a word is the meaning it has when it arrives in his brain through his eye or ear.

In the definition quoted the word "coinage" is obsolete, for most of our money and currency is not now coined of metal but printed on paper. Yet essentially the definition is sound. Inflation means an excessive and abnormal quantity of money.

By that definition it is misleading to ask, "Will we have inflation?" It is here now. Stark figures show it. Before the war the amount of currency in circulation—that is, money in people's pockets and merchants' tills—was a little more than $7,000,000,000; today it is more than $26,000,000,000. Before the war the amount in checking accounts in banks was some $27,000,000,000; today it is some $69,000,000,000.

In the light of these figures the phrase used by many, including President Truman, "preventing inflation," is misleading. What is meant is averting the consequences of inflation. And the particular consequence many have in mind is rise in prices. The problem is how to prevent, or at least ameliorate, rise in prices.

Facing that problem, we encounter a formidable condition, namely, scarcity of goods. The twin condition—scarcity of goods coupled with abundance of money—is a perfect mechanism for causing high prices.

For cure, we have put official ceilings on prices. But that—and this is important to grasp—is merely an attempt to prevent the result, it is not a cure of the cause. For curing the cause, the surest practicable way is to increase the quantity of goods. Upon this there is growing agreement, and this agreement, eliminating many fallacies, is the starting point for sound decision and effective action.

Full production of goods by industry is our great need, the postponement of it our great danger. For the postponement, there are several causes. The most obvious is the strikes. But, assuming the strikes will be ended somehow, the question to be decided

by Congress, in replying to President Truman's request for extension of price control is: Would the extention work for greater and prompter production of goods in the greatest possible quantity, or the contrary?

CONGRESS FACES DILEMMA

Answering that question, Congress faces a dilemma and a paradox. Ending price control would most certainly result in an increase of prices. But to that, advocates of the ending make a reply. They say that the increase in prices would be only temporary; that presently, with goods being produced in great quantity, prices would gradually fall.

The difference between temporary effects and long-term ones is at the heart of the debate, with the two frequently confused. Advocates of continued price control say that the continuation would be only temporary, that as soon as goods are produced in great quantity the control would be dropped. That position is taken by Price Administrator Chester Bowles. To this, opponents say that the continued control will of itself prevent production in great quantity, because control checks freedom of enterprise.

The debate is confused by the existence of a school of thought which believes in price control for its own sake, and believes generally in greater control by Government over many phases of industry. If the ending of price control were left to this school of thought, the ending would be never. The school does not include President Truman. No one could question the sincerity of his belief, frequently expressed in plain words, that Government controls, not only of prices, but others, should be ended as soon as practicable.

Warship "Iowa" Makes Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1946

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include herewith a splendid article relating to ships of the United States Navy which took part in World War II and which bear the names of Iowa landmarks:

WARSHIP "IOWA" MAKES RECORD—FIGHTING VESSEL ACTIVE IN DRIVE AGAINST JAPAN

When the history of World War II is written ships of the United States Navy bearing names of Iowa landmarks will play a prominent part.

Foremost among the 22 ships bearing names of cities, counties, and rivers of the State, was the 45,000-ton battleship *Iowa*.

One of the most powerful units of the fleet, the *Iowa* was commissioned on February 22, 1943, at the New York Navy Yard. On March 24, 1943, she put to sea on her shake-down cruise with 3,000 officers and men.

The *Iowa* carried the late President Roosevelt to north Africa for the historic conference with Winston Churchill and Joseph Stalin at Tehran, Iran, in November 1943.

JOINS PACIFIC FLEET

On January 2, 1944, she sailed from Chesapeake Bay for the Pacific. Passing through the Panama Canal, the *Iowa* arrived at Funafuti, Ellice Islands, and took part in the amphibious assault against Kwajalein Atoll in the Marshall Islands. On February 4, 1944, when the operation was completed she entered the anchorage at Majuro Atoll.

On March 18, 1944, the *Iowa* sortied from Majuro Island and helped bombard Mille Atoll. There she received her only damage of the war. Two Jap shells struck her, one bursting on the deck with small damage and the other entering the ship's side, bursting in an empty compartment. The only casualty was one man with a cut face.

In support of Task Force 58, the ship was in position with carriers of the group, on March 30, 1944, as they launched air strikes on Palau and on Woleai Islands, of the Caroline group. The next action found the same force setting course for Humboldt Bay, New Guinea, where they supported landings by striking at Hollandia, Aitape, and Wakde during the period of April 22–28.

SERVES AS FLAGSHIP

Turning northward, approach was made on Truk and on the 29th air strikes were carried out. Two days later with the *Iowa* serving as flagship the island of Ponape was bombarded.

The Marianas compaign, culminating in the invasion of Saipan, Tinian, and Guam, found the *Iowa* still in the support units of Task Force 58 carrying on air strikes against those islands and in the bombardment group that blasted Tinian on June 13.

There followed, June 19–21, the battle of the Philippine Sea, often called the "Marianas turkey shoot" by Navy fliers who shot down nearly 500 planes and inflicted severe damage on Jap carrier and fleet units.

SUPPORTS OPERATIONS

July 1944 was spent in Marianas' waters, supporting operations on Saipan and Guam and carrying out an air strike on Palau on the 24th. Early in August the force retired to Eniwetok.

Under way again early in September, now a part of the Third Fleet, the *Iowa* arrived for an attack on the middle Philippine Islands on September 12. Turning eastward, she struck the Palaus on September 17 in support of the landing operations on Peleliu Island. Four days later, in position 80 miles offshore, air strikes were made against Luzon.

Moving southward on the 24th, the Visayas Islands were again targets for the carrier planes, followed by retirement of the force to Saipan and then Ulithi Atoll.

SERVES AS PRESS SHIP

In October 1944 the *Iowa* commenced serving as press ship for the fleet. From her modern radio broadcasting room, teletype, and wirephoto facilities, the leading newspapermen and radio commentators of the United States and Allied Nations transmitted first-hand news of the war at sea.

On October 10 the *Iowa*, with other units of Task Force 38, arrived in position off Okinawa and began a series of air strikes against the Ryukyus and Formosa.

On October 18 aircraft were launched from a position north of Luzon for attacks on that island in preparation for the Leyte invasion. At the beginning of the battle for Leyte Gulf the *Iowa* steamed in toward the central Philippines, with carrier-launching aircraft which attacked the Japanese central force headed for San Bernardine Straits.

CONTINUES SUPPORT

During the remainder of October and through November the forces of which the *Iowa* was a part continued to give air support in the Philippines area with repeated strikes. Air attacks from the fast carriers were continued through December, but the *Iowa* suffered shaft trouble and was ordered to the States for navy yard overhaul, arriving in San Francisco January 15, 1945.

Leaving Hunters Point drydock, San Francisco, March 19, 1945, the *Iowa* joined Task Force 58 off Okinawa. On May 12, the force retired briefly to Ulithi, but returned to the area off the Ryukyus and struck southern Kyushu with repeated air strikes. About June 13, retirement was made to Leyte.

Departing from Leyte July 1, the support force, with the *Iowa* serving as flagship, moved into position off Japan for sustained air attacks upon the homeland which continued intermittently until August 15.

ATTACKS STEEL MILLS

The first air strike was made on Tokyo on July 10. The next against northern Honshu and Hokkaido on the 14th. On July 15, the *Iowa* did her part in blasting the steel mills and other targets of Muroran, Hokkaido. On the 17th she bombarded Hitachi, Honshu. The *Iowa* fired more than 600 tons of ammunition in these two bombardments.

Rejoining the carriers again, they struck Tokyo on the 18th. The next air attack was on July 24 against the Dure-Dobe area. These attacks continued throughout the remaining days of July, and included the Nagoya and Tokyo areas.

On August 15 word of the Japanese surrender halted air attacks prepared for the Tokyo and Nagoya area.

On August 27, 3 years to the day after her launching, with her log reading 190,313 miles, the *Iowa* dropped anchor in Sahami Wan, an open bay, 30 miles southwest of Tokyo. On August 20 she moved into Tokyo Bay, and there acted as one of the support ships for the first landings on the Japanese home islands on August 30.

Along with the *Iowa*, the heavy cruiser *Des Moines*, the frigates *Burlington* and *Davenport*, the gunboat *Dubuque*, the cargo ship *Red Oak Victory*, and the net cargo ship *Keokuk* were taking part in important actions around the world.

Christened with names of counties of the State were the following: Cargo ships *Muscatine* and *Appanoose*, the attack cargo ship *Union*, and the attack transports *Clay*, *Fayette*, *Fremont*, *Warren*, *Wayne*, *Adair*, *Shelby*, *Grundy*, *Clinton*, and *Audubon*.

Bearing names of rivers were the gasoline tankers *Maquoketa* and *Nodaway*.

Marine Corps Record in Demobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1946

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, at the time General Eisenhower and Admiral Nimitz reviewed the status of the demobilization in the Army and the Navy for Members of the Congress at the Library auditorium, I was struck by the fact that nobody said anything about the Marine Corps.

I said as much to the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], who promptly suggested to Admiral Nimitz that a statement on the situation in the Marine Corps be prepared for me. I discussed the matter with Admiral Nimitz and with Brig. Gen. Merritt A. Edson, United States Marine Corps, pointing out the then prevalent questions about the large body of marines in north China.

Subsequently, a statement on the status of demobilization in the Marine Corps

was prepared for me by the Commandant of the Marine Corps, which I desire to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for its historical value and general information.

It will be noted from the statement that the Marines have reduced from a peak of 484,000 men at VJ-day to 301,070, as of January 11, and that as of that date, the Corps has discharged 48,000 more than originally planned and was 6 weeks ahead of its demobilization schedule.

On the other hand, the marines who went into China were obliged to remain longer than was anticipated, with the result that high-point men among them were not released as early as men of similar service in Japan, where replacements were made more easily.

The crediting of points for discharge is the same in the Marine Corps as in the Army, but the Marine Corps has been able to reduce its separation score more rapidly at times. The present critical score for discharge in the Marines is 45 points.

The letter and statement from General Vandegrift referred to are inserted at this point with permission of the House:

HEADQUARTERS, UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS,
Washington.

The Honorable FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives.
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CASE: Following Fleet Admiral Nimitz's statement to Members of Congress concerning Navy demobilization, you requested information relative to the Marine Corps' demobilization system, particularly as it applies to China.

Pursuant to that request I am sending you the information herewith by Brig. Gen. Merritt A. Edson, United States Marine Corps:

(a) The Marine Corps point system for discharge is identical with the Army's insofar as the crediting of points is concerned. The Marine Corps has, however, been able to reduce the critical score for separation slightly earlier than the Army.

The Marine Corps point system has universal application within the corps. This means that, regardless of whether a marine is serving within the continental United States, a Pacific island, Japan or China, the same rules, and requirements for separation are applied to him.

The present discharge score is 50 points for male officer and enlisted personnel.

(b) At the time the Marine Corps forces entered Japan and China, those forces contained a large percentage of high-point men who had participated in fighting across the Pacific.

The initial Marine Corps occupying forces in Japan and China were of almost equal strength. In the case of Japan, there has been a reduction in the strength of Marine Corps forces as a result of which almost all high-point men have been withdrawn.

On the other hand, in China there has been no substantial reduction in Marine Corps strength, with the result that high-point men have remained in China longer than they did in Japan.

Two other factors aggravated this condition. For a while it appeared that the marines would be withdrawn from China at an early date. Therefore, only small numbers of replacements were ordered to China until it became evident that the marines would be there longer than was contemplated originally.

I know you understand that the time required to transport men to China as replacements and thereafter to return the high-point men who have been relieved from China to the United States for separation, was a controlling factor in the speed with which men from China could be discharged.

(c) More than 11,000 replacements have arrived in China since the 1st of December. Some of these replacements were obtained through redistribution of low-point personnel in the Pacific. The majority were shipped from the United States. Additional replacements have recently arrived at other destinations in the Pacific and more are en route.

As a result of the replacement program, the majority of the 50-point men in the Marine Corps, including those from China, will be discharged in January and practically all of the remainder will be discharged in February.

(d) The Marine Corps has already announced that on February 1 it will reduce discharge requirements from 50 to 45 points. Pursuant to this reduction, 28,000 additional men will become eligible for discharge on February 1.

Whenever the Marine Corps tasks permit further point reduction in order to speed separations, such reductions will be made. No announcement thereof will be made until shortly before the effective date in order that the expectations of those to be separated will not be frustrated by unforeseen contingencies which might arise.

(e) The Marine Corps strength on VJ-day was approximately 484,000.

Between that time and January 11, 199,640 personnel, or about 41 percent of the VJ-day strength, were released. During that period the Marine Corps discharged 48,000 more personnel than original plans indicated could be released.

I am pleased to advise you that at this time the Marine Corps is actually 6 weeks ahead of its planned demobilization schedule.

Sincerely yours,

A. A. VANDEGRIFT.

Data on U. S. Marine Corps demobilization

(Compiled as of Jan. 11, 1946)

Marine Corps strength VJ-day	484,631
Demobilization by months:	
August	4,135
September	19,555
October	44,605
November	61,238
December	54,007
January (1–11, inclusive)	16,100
Total	199,640
Joining since VJ-day:	
Selective service	[1] 6,957
First enlistments	9,210
Reenlistments	[2] 1,057
Total	17,224
Marine Corps strength, present	301,070

[1] Last call on selective service in November.
[2] Included in both VJ-day and present strength.

PRESENT DISTRIBUTION

Marine Corps strength in United States, available	119,461
Eligible for discharge, 50 points	6,926
Eligible for discharge, but retained (specialists)	419
Eligible for discharge, other than on points	993
Eligible for overseas duty	26,069
Not eligible for overseas duty	72,541
Women's Reserve	8,303
Arrived from overseas, not reflected in strength returns	3,210

PRESENT DISTRIBUTION—continued

Marine Corps strength overseas	129,770
Fleet Marine Force:	
China	45,981
Japan	25,152
Other Pacific	50,343
Total	121,476
Non-Fleet Marine Force:	
Pacific, island commands, security, etc	6,150
Atlantic	1,234
Total	7,384
Ships detachments approximately)	5,000
Nonavailables (hospitalized, recruits in training, in transit, etc. (approximately))	46,839
Total	301,070
Overseas, eligible for discharge—50 points	23,209
In transit to United States (approximately)	20,000
Under orders (approximately)	3,209
Planned rate of return from overseas	59,101
January (majority of 50-point men will be discharged this month)	24,219
February (practically all 50-point will be discharged)	6,102
March	11,149
April	8,039
May	7,596
June	1,996

NOTE.—At present, Marine Corps demobilization is 6 weeks ahead of the planned schedule. Forty-eight thousand officers and men have been sparated from the corps in excess of the scheduled demobilization plan.

Relative strengths of Regulars, Reserve, and selective service:	
Regular Marines (voluntary enlistments)	77,041
Reserve Marines (voluntary enlistments)	177,000
Selective service	47,029
Total	301,070
Recruited and reenlisted (Jan. 1 to 9, 1946, inclusive)	1,219

The Wheat Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the suggestion that the country meet what apparently is an extreme shortage of wheat by shifting from white-flour bread to dark bread is causing the country great concern. This is especially true in that section of the country where wheat is the major crop and where most of us are familiar with the fact that there is no shortage of wheat.

Under unanimous consent, I include herewith a statement taken from the St. Paul Pioneer Press in which Mr. Thatcher, one of the great cooperative leaders and authorities on farm questions, offers a solution for this problem:

WHEAT LOANS BY FARMERS PROPOSED—THATCHER SUGGESTS GOVERNMENT BORROW GRAIN IN EMERGENCY

(By Alfred D. Stedman)

Government borrowing of wheat from farmers to smash the current relief shortage was proposed to President Truman's special Cabinet committee in a surprise move Wednesday night by M. W. Thatcher, cooperative grain leader of St. Paul.

The surprise plan for cracking the wheat shortage, so that millions of starving people in the war-torn countries can be fed, was submitted to Secretary of Commerce Wallace, who is a member of the President's special supercommittee on wheat. Secretary Wallace has started to work on the plan.

It offers a way out of controversial remedies proposed, such as requiring a shift from white flour and bread to brown flour and bread, which Wednesday caused Philip W. Pillsbury to protest directly to the President.

The proposal by Thatcher, who is general manager of the Farmers' Union Grain Terminal Association, is brand new and is a wide departure from all of the other plans that hitherto have been under intensive study in Washington.

Thatcher is understood to have discussed the plan directly with Washington by long distance telephone Wednesday.

Under the plan, the Government would call upon farmers throughout the West who still hold wheat to lend it to the Government. The Government would pay nominal interest or none at all on the loans of wheat. The loans would be repaid to farmers, not in the form of wheat but as cash at full face value of the wheat, whenever the farmers wished it repaid.

Since wheat is at ceilings, the value would not change unless the ceilings were changed during the period of the loan.

The genius of the surprise plan is that it goes to the heart of the income-tax difficulty which now is encouraging large numbers of farmers to hang onto their wheat until a new crop is in sight next summer or fall.

About 85,000,000 bushels are estimated to be held on farms in North Dakota alone, and the total in all States is about 200,000,000 bushels.

The income-tax trouble is that, if farmers should sell their wheat holdings now, and then under later pressure from the Government should sell their new 1946 crop before January 1, they would concentrate the income from two crops in 1 year. That would run their income taxes up in the surtax brackets. As a result, some would have virtually to give away the return on a considerable part of the two crops. But by choosing just when to take repayment in cash of the loan of wheat, the farmer could take it at such a time as to assure that he would pay taxes on income from only one crop of wheat in 1 year.

The situation is illustrated by the case of a farmer having in storage on his farm wheat worth $8,000. If he should respond now to Government pleas to sell, then should raise another equally valuable crop this year and also should respond to Government pressure to sell that before next January 1, he would have a 1946 taxable income of $16,000, which would run his taxes into high figures. But if he should lend his $8,000 crop to the Government, he could accept payment on it this year and pay a tax on the $8,000, and then lend his second crop to the Government and accept repayment of that next year, again paying the tax on the income from one crop.

Ultimately, however, the farmer would have to pay a tax on 2 years' wheat crops in 1 year, for there is no loophole in the plan for missing a year's taxes. However, farmers are not looking for recent bumper crops and high prices to continue indefinitely. So they expect the tax problem would largely solve itself.

The present tax situation is due to three factors. The first two are the big yields and the good prices that have combined to increase Federal income taxes. The third is the fact that many farmers held over their 1945 wheat crop into 1946, either in order to take advantage of lower income taxes this year, or in expectation of higher wheat prices or through difficulties in getting rail transportation.

It is to crack loose the dam-up of wheat on the farms that Thatcher now has proposed his novel plan of asking farmers to lend their wheat.

Thatcher also asserts that further steps will be necessary. These include, he says, cracking the jam of railroad transportation, and letting farmers know definitely and promptly that wheat price ceilings are to stick. These steps combined with the wheat borrowing should get the wheat moving to seaboard in the volume needed by the Government for relief, he says.

Thatcher has called the National Association of Grain Cooperatives, of which he is president, to meet in Chicago Friday and Saturday to consider united recommendations to meet the shortage. Thatcher declares there is enough wheat to meet the needs, and that the problem is to get farmers to release it. That is the purpose of the unusual proposal for Government borrowing of wheat that he now has worked out.

One of the plans hitherto proposed has been for calling the Government's loans on wheat, in order to get the wheat as collateral or induce farmers to sell.

Farmers Know the Farm Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1946

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, during the war, whenever the American people wanted a fresh insight into the progress of the Allies action on either the diplomatic or battle fronts, they heard it from Churchill. Our administration kept it dark. It seems that in peace also we are going to have to get our news from British sources.

While we have been aware of the suffering and hunger of the war-torn countries of Europe, we also have been led to believe that the billions we appropriated for UNRRA and the military occupation forces were adequately handling the situation. Remember the recent campaign of Mr. Lehman?

Now from the tongue of Lord Halifax, speaking before the food processors and distributors of America at Atlantic City, we learn "that we are not far off from famine in Europe." Immediately thereafter President Truman announces that our Nation's food supplies must be rationed. An ironical twist is that Secretary of Agriculture Anderson, who has blown hot and cold on the food shortages, during this meeting failed to say a word about the food crisis. In fact, from his report the food representatives were hopeful over the outlook.

Naturally, we are all willing to do everything we can to relieve the suffering of the stricken populations of Europe.

Farmers of this country know the farm facts of life. If the administration were to learn them, perhaps both domestically and abroad our food shortages could be alleviated.

The farmers, however, have serious cause for confusion over what the administration will do next on farm policies. But they are not confused about farming. Feed for the farmer and food for the family table are two different things. You cannot have beefsteak or fried chicken without first having feed on the farm. It takes the farmer to know how to get these things produced. We were not getting enough milk and butter recently because the farmer was not getting enough for his butterfat. He sent his milk to the ice cream manufacturers. There is an unprofitable price ceiling on butterfat. Under the price ceilings, the farmer could make more after paying for his feed, the cost of growing it, and feeding it to his cows, by selling whole milk. For the same reason, corn is not reaching the feed market—administration red tape and unreasonable price controls.

The administration must realistically appraise the farmer's problem which is based on supply and demand, with a legitimate profit, or we will flounder into deeper water. In a few short weeks the farmer will be working his ground for the coming season's planting. What can he expect from the administration? More ceilings and controls on his production, or a freer rein to produce the crops essential to the health and well-being of this country and the people abroad.

Dental Health for the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1946

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, in recent years two bills authorizing the appropriation of Federal funds for dental research have been introduced into the Congress and have failed to pass. It is inconceivable to me that Congress could have overlooked the importance of such measures; that Congress could actually fail to consider legislation that would be of such direct benefit to every human being, that could quite conceivably have to do with lengthening our lives and those of our friends, relatives, and acquaintances.

Dental defects are the most common of all physical ailments. At one time or another all of us, as has nearly everyone alive, have suffered pain, discomfort, and direct or indirect impairment to our total health, as a result of dental troubles. In many sections of our country dental manpower is shockingly inadequate. Many Americans cannot pay the price of dental health. Such things must be remedied.

The prevention and control of dental disease needs perfecting. This depends on research. It came as a surprise to me to find out that we actually know relatively little about the causes of decay of the teeth and diseases of their supporting structures, though many tooth-paste ads have tried to convince me that my cavities resulted from a failure to use that particular product.

There are two bills now before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor which would immeasurably aid dental health in this country. If the Senate would act, these bills will eventually come to us in the House of Representatives for consideration.

S. 190 provides for a Federal appropriation to equip a National Institute of Dental Research in the United States Public Health Service. This institute would seek every means to promote and stimulate research and would itself work on the causes, diagnosis, and treatment of dental diseases. The institute would endeavor to coordinate other research so that its results could be used most effectively.

Additional appropriations are authorized, in this measure, to foster dental research in other public and private agencies, and to provide grants-in-aid to universities, hospitals, and laboratories.

S. 1099 authorizes appropriations to enable both the Surgeon General of the United States and State and municipal health authorities to engage in an active campaign of dental-health education, to institute and maintain dental-health programs, and to care for school children. This also is of major importance for past research has demonstrated that dental defects in later life will be much less prevalent if the individual has had superior treatment as a child.

One of my constituents, Dr. Harry R. Hancock, of Santa Barbara, Calif., an outstanding dentist and a member of the California Dental Association, wrote the following in a letter to me regarding the need for the passage of S. 1099 and S. 190:

> Dental decay is not as spectacular as some of the diseases for which we spend huge sums on research, but certainly it is more universal and economically it is much more costly to our people. We cannot afford, it seems to me, to pass up any chance at controlling this health menace.

Health is as necessary to us as the food we eat or the air we breathe. If there are human beings who cannot secure health because they cannot afford it, if health can be supplied to all our people more efficiently with the Government's aid, then it is one of the first responsibilities of the Government to do all in its power to make a healthy Nation possible. I cannot believe that the Congress will refuse to face its primary duty to the people.

Governors of South Dakota, Wyoming, and Nebraska File Brief With United Nations Organization on Subject of Locating the World Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 8, 1946

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, in view of the great wave of protests which has developed over the recommendations of the UNO site committee that the new world capital be located in an area taken from Connecticut and New York after uprooting the residents and business establishments from that historic and densely populated area, I believe the Congress and the country will be interested in reading the following brief, which is now on file with the United Nations Organization in London:

BRIEF ON THE SUBJECT OF LOCATION OF THE PERMANENT HEADQUARTERS OF THE UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

(Submitted in behalf of the beautiful Black Hills mountain country of South Dakota, Wyoming, and Nebraska—Presented to and filed with Dr. Stoyan Gavrilovic, chairman of Interim Site Committee of United Nations Organization, at New York, N. Y., January 31, 1946, by M. Q. Sharpe, Governor of South Dakota, for the States of South Dakota, Nebraska, and Wyoming in which States is the beautiful Black Hills mountain country)

INTRODUCTORY

None of the committees or subcommittees of the United Nations has yet discovered the location which the United Nations need for their permanent headquarters. In the northeastern part of the United States of America to which their investigation has been limited they can only take the best they can get; they are unable to get what the United Nations need. The reason for this is that what the United Nations need for a permanent headquarters does not exist in the northeastern United States. It does not exist along either of the coasts of the United States nor within the range of influence of any single great city of the United States. This brief will show that it does exist within the beautiful Black Hills mountain country of South Dakota, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Keep in mind that we are going to speak of what the United Nations need; not what is the best they can get in some restricted area.

In formulating this brief we shall assume that the United Nations Organization will succeed and will be a permanent world government growing in its importance and dominion as the nations commence to experience the benefits of centralized world control. We shall assume that the United Nations Organization is destined to be a great, continuing, growing influence for good throughout the world and throughout the future. The steps that it takes now and the direction which those in charge now give it must therefore be considered with the ever-present idea of a great, powerful, growing organization with world-wide jurisdiction and control.

With these introductory ideas in mind we take our first step in reasoning on the subject of where the permanent headquarters ought to be.

WHAT IS THE WORLD ENTITLED TO FROM THE VIEWPOINT OF TRAVEL DISTANCE TO AND FROM ITS PERMANENT HEADQUARTERS?

If a spot could be found which by mathematical computation could be determined as being more equally convenient from travel-distance standpoint to all the nations of the Organization than any other spot on the globe, it would have to be accepted as the proper spot if this one factor alone were involved. This spot exists in the midcontinent area of the United States of America, according to the world map which we heretofore submitted to the Preparatory Commission of the United Nations Organization as a part of our invitation to locate the headquarters in the beautiful Black Hills mountain country. (See world map and array of arguments on file with the United Nations Organization Secretariat.)

It must be assumed that all the nations of the world will travel to and from their headquarters. In years to come some nations now weak will grow in strength and power; some now strong will decline; changes will occur in these factors but changes will not occur in the land mass or distances between land areas on the globe. Therefore, a location having the indisputable permanent factor of being the most equally accessible to all the member nations should be one of the first and continuing considerations of those vested with the power of deciding this important question for all time to come. The midcontinent area of the United States of America holds this indisputable permanent factor. The map proves it. It exists that way because of the shape of the land mass of the world and the way such land mass is divided into nations.

The beautiful Black Hills mountain country is almost in the center of mid-continent North America. A headquarters there would be within two or three hundred miles of British-Canadian territory; within a few hundred miles of Russian territory; close to all South American countries; more conveniently located to all the nations of the world considered in the aggregate than any other spot that has been investigated for the location. Move to any other location and you are penalizing some country of the world with extra travel, for the benefit of some other country. You are the trustees of this important decision now and for the future. Recognizing this self-evident factor of the decision and giving it due consideration and weight hereafter is one of the duties with which the people of the world have entrusted you.

IN ADDITION TO ITS FAVORABLE GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATION THE BEAUTIFUL BLACK HILLS MOUNTAIN COUNTRY HAS CLIMATIC AND HEALTHFUL LIVING CONDITIONS UNEXCELLED ANYWHERE IN THE WORLD

The most favorable location from viewpoint of geography may not alone control the decision. Other factors must coexist with it. Those who will attend at the world headquarters permanently or transiently should have good climatic conditions and healthful living conditions. Few places on earth equal and none surpass the beautiful Black Hills mountain country in the possession of both of these. Their climate is a Temperate Zone climate. It has all the distinctive seasons of spring, summer, fall, and winter. You can choose your own altitude from the surrounding grassy plains at an elevation of 2,400 feet to the tip of Mount Harney, 7,242

feet. The country is one of varied terrain, from level plains to rolling hills, to mountain country, with long flat valleys, mountain plateaus, abundantly covered with forests of giant ponderosa pine and other forest trees. Rivers, lakes, and mountain streams furnish the finest of pure water. This variety of elevation, terrain, and land coverage by great forests modifies any extremes of heat or cold so that the beautiful Black Hills mountain country possesses one of the most equable, salubrious, and energizing climates to be found any place on earth.

The statistical arguments as to health show South Dakota as number one State of the Union. Its soldiers and sailors in the recent war were the healthiest of all furnished by this country for the war. There has never been an epidemic of any kind in the beautiful Black Hills mountain country.

As you proceed with your investigation and analysis of the important subject of location of permanent headquarters, note those two important factors for the beautiful Black Hills mountain country: 1. Most favorable location from viewpoint of equality of travel distance; 2. Unexcelled climatic and health conditions.

THE NATIONS OF THE WORLD SHOULD HAVE ATTRACTIVE INTERESTING SCENERY AND RECREATIONAL FEATURES AT THEIR PERMANENT HEADQUARTERS

In the last normal year of tourist travel before the war more than one million tourists visited the beautiful Black Hills mountain country. These came from all over the United States, from Canada, Mexico, South America, Honolulu, and to some extent from the world at large. The reason they came is that they had learned of the attractive, interesting scenery and the pleasant living and travel conditions. Tourist travel to the beautiful Black Hills mountain country has been growing greatly each year as the knowledge of its content and environment spreads.

Generally the scenery can be described as grand, majestic, colossal, towering, impressive. The things that produce these reactions upon you are: long flat valleys girdled with pine, birch, aspen, cedar, oak and numerous other beautiful trees; towering mountain peaks of gray granite whose jagged outlines stick up into the sky through belts of deep green ponderosa pine forests; forest floors like a Brussels carpet from the accumulation of ages of the annual shedding of needles and bark by the forest trees; beautiful crystal mountain streams and lakes, with their fishing, boating, surf riding, and elegant resorts, hotels and cabins rapidly growing to meet the ever-increasing tourist travel; ski ways for winter sports; granite natural statuary resembling castles, towers, pinnacles and pillars of heroic size; the beautiful and interesting Mount Rushmore statuary of the faces of Washington, Lincoln, Jefferson and Roosevelt carved out of the mountain side to the scale of men 460 feet tall; beautiful and interesting underground caves of limestone, exposing crystals, prisms, and colors of rare and interesting beauty, many of these developed with lighting and pathways for miles underground. Here are found gold, silver, tin, manganese, mica, agate, beryl, bentonite, feldspar, and other precious and useful substances. Herds of buffalo, deer, elk, antelope, big horn sheep, and flocks of pheasants, ducks and partridge are a part of this area which is, literally, 5,000 square miles of country filled with all the interesting specimens of the animal, mineral, and vegetable kingdoms, and within easy travel distances of cities like Denver, Omaha, Cheyenne, Minneapolis, Chicago. Located within the area itself are many thriving, growing cities and towns of smaller size. All these, together with the numerous resorts, camping, boating, bathing, and recreational sites, are connected by a fine system of State highways open for travel and kept in good travel condition the year around.

The beautiful Black Hills mountain country has an individuality and a unique setting in midcontinent America, which for years has made it the wonder and delight of all who see and experience its many attractive, pleasant, and interesting features. It is cosmopolitan in its physical content and environment, containing mining, lumbering, agriculture, herding, milling, manufacturing, processing, transportation, and communication facilities of modern kinds. All the great occupations and professions of man are active within the area. It is reputed to contain the richest 100 square miles of territory on earth.

Location of the permanent headquarters in this beautiful Black Hills mountain country will afford all the attractive interesting scenery and all the pleasant wholesome recreational opportunity which any normal person should desire. The ever growing tourist traffic and vacation enterprises throughout the area prove this with increasing certainty each year.

THE WORLD HEADQUARTERS SHOULD BE IN AN ENVIRONMENT WHERE THE NATIVE PEOPLE ARE AGREEABLE TO THE GRAND OBJECTIVES OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The midcontinent area of the United States is the last great empire building operation of the world at large. Into this area during the past 100 years have poured many thousands of Englishmen, Frenchmen, Belgians, Dutch, Spanish, Germans, Scandinavians, Russians, Italians, Greeks, Austrians, Yugoslavians, Czechs, Chinese, Japanese, Ethiopians; in fact, all the great blood strains of Europe, Asia, and Africa. Here are found numerous nationals of the white, yellow, brown, black, and red races of the world. We have a population of conglomerate origin. Throughout the years they have developed this great midcontinent area with the newest of culture, science, invention, education, commerce, and industry known to the world. They have done this working together as equals under the constitutions and laws of the country. They have all had a voice and a hand in shaping its direction and accomplishment. As citizens they have been equal in fact as well as in legal rights. This great fusion of the blood strains of the world has laid the foundation here for a "world race" which is certainly one of the objectives of the United Nations Organization looming up majestically for future attainment. How appropriate a location for the permanent headquarters of the United Nations.

In this area there is now and always has been a complete freedom of religious belief and practice. There is a complete separation of the church and the state. Although the region is predominantly Christian in religion, only a few years ago the South Dakota Supreme Court held that a statute providing for reading of the Bible in the public schools was unconstitutional and prohibited the attempt, because of a constitution which guarantees complete freedom of religion and separation of church and state.

Equality of race, religion, and opportunity is an established fact and not merely an ideal in this area.

No more appropriate spot will ever be located by any committee of the United Nations, so far as equality of race, religion, and nationality are concerned. It is an inviting prospect for the permanent headquarters. It presages harmonious relations with the entire area and success for United Nations objectives from the beginning.

THE UNITED NATIONS CAN HAVE IN THIS BEAUTIFUL BLACK HILLS MOUNTAIN COUNTRY CERTAIN CONDITIONS WHICH IT NEEDS AND WHICH IT WILL HAVE MUCH DIFFICULTY IN FINDING ANYWHERE ELSE IN THE UNITED STATES

The United Nations needs and ought to have a zone containing at least 100 square miles which would be ceded to it and be internationalized so that it would have complete authority and control without restriction from any nation in the world. It should have an independent site, of at least this size, and with all the other factors heretofore specified in this brief. It should own this site.

In the beautiful Black Hills mountain country are many such sites which can be ceded to the United Nations in short time together with unrestricted access to the site. There are many such sites with such sparse permanent settlement that the few people occupying them can easily be persuaded to exchange them for other locations or to sell them so that complete possession can be given to the United Nations Organization as rapidly as it is ready to make use of them. Very little inconvenience will be caused to anyone.

It is reasonably certain that if the United Nations Organization selects one of those sites in the beautiful Black Hills mountain country and desires cession of complete sovereignty over it that the Congress of the United States and the Legislature of South Dakota will immediately give favorable consideration to the request with possibly one reservation. That reservation would no doubt be that if the United Nations Organization abandons use of the site as a permanent headquarters for a period of 5 years or more the site will then revert to the Nation and State with the same sovereignty as before the cession to the United Nations.

WHAT ARE THE OBJECTIONS TO LOCATING THE WORLD HEADQUARTERS IN THE BEAUTIFUL BLACK HILLS MOUNTAIN COUNTRY?

It appears from the foregoing pages of this brief that the beautiful Black Hills mountain country does hold within it all the really important physical features of an ideal location for a permanent headquarters. The only objections ever expressed against the site, we think, are trivial and no august body, charged with the future success of this world organization will ever be much influenced by them. Nevertheless, we shall state them and show their triviality and inapplicability, and how easily time will obliterate them.

If any of the cities of New York, Boston, Philadelphia, or Chicago were located within 50 miles from the beautiful Black Hills mountain country there is little doubt that it would now be the selected site for permanent headquarters. It has everything else in the criteria of the United Nations Organization except a large city. Is the proximity of a large city an essential? Would it add anything to the abilities of those who will be charged with the duties of world organization and administration, to do the important work entrusted to them? Will it add to their thinking or working ability in any way? The answer is plain. It will not. On the contrary it will detract from them; it will be a continuing invitation to distractions from them; it will overshadow what ought to be the most important center of the world, with its own already established importance, world connections, and size. History proves this beyond doubt. Few of the great movements in racial progress or development have originated from the great cities.

When Buddha was assembling the beautiful principles announced in his eight-fold path to righteousness, which are still the delight and solace of more people than follow any other religion, he sought the seclusion of the countryside and abandoned the great cities of his empire. Under the quiet of the Bo tree he announced them.

When Mohammed was evolving the mild, dignified philosophy of Islamism, those ideals

which presage general peace and quiet and the recognition of equality of all persons according to their own personal merits, he frequently retired to a small cave in the foothills to contemplate. There from 611 to 622 he evolved those great principles which still direct the conduct of a large portion of the world's population.

When Jesus was slowly assembling the majestic concepts of the kingdom of heaven and the principles of conduct leading to it, he went about the humble homes of ordinary people, he frequented the lonely areas by the Sea of Galilee away from the distractions and turmoil of the world.

The treaty of Westphalia (1644–48) was formulated at two small towns, Munster and Osnabruck, not only as a treaty of peace but to end an era of religious warfare and inaugurate a world-wide attempt at tolerance.

The Council of Trent (1545–63) met in a mountain country 44 miles northeast of Verona (at that time a greater distance than two or three hundred miles is today) and there accomplished the chief definitive work of Catholic reform.

In this country we early passed by New York and Philadelphia to select an isolated site on virgin territory for our permanent Capital at Washington, D. C.

In fact all great cities were wilderness originally. History proves definitely that proximity to a large city is not an essential or even a favorable element for production of great ideals requiring thinking, study, analysis and courageous pioneering work.

We might just as well face the real facts and they are that the only reason for wanting proximity to a large city is for the purpose of social life, entertainment and fun. It is the age-old temptation to follow the flesh pots and wine casks of riotous living which detract from, rather than add to, our ability to think, work, and act accurately and courageously.

Those in charge of United Nations destinies should put the location of their permanent headquarters on a higher plane than this. In the beautiful Black Hills mountain country they can find the natural grandeur and majesty appropriate to the headquarters of a world organization which we hope will be the salvation of the world and its continuing advance along the line of racial equality, development, and civilization. We submit that a decision to that effect would at once radiate throughout the world the idea that the United Nations Organization is approaching and making its important decisions with sincerity and singleness of purpose; that purpose being always at every step to do the very best thing to attain the great objectives expressed in the Charter.

The only other objection we have ever heard against the beautiful Black Hills mountain country is to the effect that there are no facilities there ready for immediate occupation and operation of the general headquarters. While this is not a correct statement of fact, and while we can furnish ample facilities for temporary use, we propose to answer the objection in a way more beneficial to United Nations operations.

It seems to us that there is a present tendency in United Nations operation to proceed with too much haste. There seems to be a propensity to try to hurry everything along the lines of setting up some new business corporation or some new industrial organization. We respectfully submit that there is no need for haste and that too much haste may breed distrust among the members, may preclude smaller nations from asserting their various interests, and may prevent attainment of the right decision on many important questions in the formative period of the Organization's existence. The United Nations Organization, or its members, is in charge of the world. The enemies of its ideas are under complete restraint. Therefore, why not give to these important questions the research, analysis, and time for decision to which they are most certainly entitled.

We suggest that the Organization did very well at San Francisco during its stay there. It has been doing very well at London and could continue there temporarily until its facilities at the new site were made to its own order and convenience. It could move to Stalingrad for a temporary stay, then to Peiping, then to Paris. Maybe it would be a great thing for the various nations of the world to see their capital and government in actual operation in their midst for a short time. Maybe it would show them that it was theirs; that they were a component part of it; that its capital and government could operate in their midst successfully. Gradually the Organization can be assembling its personnel, composing its procedure, and accumulating the experience which will enable it to go ahead methodically and efficiently when it occupies its permanent headquarters. We did this in the original establishment of permanent capital of the United States and it proved both practicable and successful.

We respectfully submit, therefore, our answer to the objection of no facilities for immediate use, as follows: (1) We can provide them if early occupation is an essential; (2) it would be better to construct them to your own order and design from the start and gradually occupy them as you developed the international zone of 100 square miles of territory.

WOULD THE UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION BE WELCOME TO THE BEAUTIFUL BLACK HILLS MOUNTAIN COUNTRY?

We have heretofore advised the United Nations Organization of the signing of a joint declaration by the governors of 10 sovereign States of midcontinent North America, specifically asking the Organization to establish headquarters in the midcontinent area and pointing out the many advantages of doing so from the viewpoint of United Nations success. This is the largest block of official influence that has so far issued from the United States of America on the regional location of the permanent headquarters.

One of the first invitations to be lodged with the United Nations Organization was that of the beautiful Black Hills mountain country signed jointly by the Governors of South Dakota, Wyoming, and Nebraska in which sovereign States the region lies. During all the time the matter has been considered we have in various ways shown our desire to have the permanent headquarters located in this area.

Therefore, there is no doubt on the question: The United Nations Organization would not only be welcome, but we are anxious to have you locate your permanent headquarters in the beautiful Black Hills mountain country.

We respectfully submit, therefore, that this brief establishes the fact that the most appropriate and the best decision which the United Nations Organization could make for the permanent benefit of the Organization and the successful attainment of its majestic objectives, so far as selection of its permanent headquarters is concerned, is to select the beautiful Black Hills mountain country, which always welcomes you here.

Dated January 30, 1946.

DWIGHT GRISWOLD,
Governor of Nebraska.
M. Q. SHARPE,
Governor of South Dakota.
LESTER C. HUNT,
Governor of Wyoming.

Tennessee Valley Authority Electric Light and Power Rates

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 7, 1946

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, 12 years ago today the Tennessee Valley Authority entered upon its first contract to distribute power generated on the Tennessee River to the people of that area. That great organization has grown until it is capable of generating 12,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year.

As coauthor of the bill creating the TVA, and one who has fought its battles in Congress from that day to this, I am proud of the wonderful record it is making.

It has proved to be the greatest development of ancient or modern times. It has done more for the power consumers of America than anything else that this Government has ever undertaken, in supplying a yardstick to show the American people what electricity is worth and what it should cost the ultimate consumer in every section of this country.

Before the creation of the TVA, the private power companies were buying power from the Government at Muscle Shoals at a little less than 2 mills a kilowatt-hour and selling it to the residential consumers at an average of more than 9 cents a kilowatt-hour. The average residential consumer in that area used from 30 to 40 kilowatt-hours a month. The average commercial consumer used less than 100 kilowatt-hours a month and paid about the same rates for it as did the residential consumers.

The farmers got no electricity at all.

Today the average residential consumer in that area is using 156 kilowatt-hours a month and paying an average of 1.81 cents a kilowatt-hour, and the commercial consumers are using an average of 392 kilowatt-hours a month and paying an average of 2.01 cents a kilowatt-hour.

Tens of thousands of miles of rural power lines have been built in the TVA area, which includes every one of the 10 counties I represent. Hundreds of thousands of farmers throughout the area are being served with TVA power at TVA rates, bringing to them light, hope, inspiration, and relief from drudgery. It brings them everything the man in the city has—except the noise and city taxes.

Again I say it is the greatest single development of ancient or modern times.

At this point I am inserting a table of electricity sales, statistics of the TVA for the month of November 1945.

Please study it carefully and compare its figures with the electricity consumed and rates paid by the people you represent.

Then you will begin to understand what the TVA really means.

(The matter referred to follows:)

Electricity sales statistics, retail distribution of electricity at TVA resale rates, November 1945

Distributors, grouped according to fiscal 1945 gross revenue	Wholesale purchases		Number of customers			Residential customer statistics				Commercial service	
	Kilowatt-hours for month	Mills per kilowatt-hour	Total month	Percent rural for month	Added during month	Number of customers	Average kilowatt-hours per customer during month	Average cents per kilowatt-hour	Percent using less than 25 kilowatt-hours [1]	Kilowatt-hours per customer-month	Cents per kilowatt-hour, month
MUNICIPAL DISTRIBUTORS											
Group A (over $750,000):											
Chattanooga, Tenn.	50,448,522	3.70	48,007	18	171	42,597	238	1.55	10	573	1.99
Huntsville, Ala.	7,938,958	4.42	10,605	21	39	9,126	193	1.64	16	437	1.96
Knoxville, Tenn.	29,482,415	4.09	45,593	16	40	40,405	205	1.67	8	564	1.70
Memphis, Tenn.	55,261,802	3.75	83,830	12	197	70,001	108	2.26	12	399	2.53
Nashville, Tenn.	39,480,305	4.16	67,119	5	277	57,005	215	1.66	9	493	1.73
Group B ($251,000 to $750,000):											
Bristol, Tenn.	2,352,915	4.63	5,895	21	37	5,030	146	1.94	12	459	1.94
Bristol, Va.	2,347,047	4.72	4,423	18	35	3,639	129	2.03	12	507	1.91
Clarksville, Tenn.	2,586,720	4.59	3,801	0	0	3,147	216	1.61	11	547	1.99
Cleveland, Tenn.	2,069,600	4.15	4,923	15	36	4,184	160	1.75	16	453	1.75
Clinton, Tenn.	1,933,539	4.87	3,339	35	40	2,746	125	2.05	11	465	1.95
Columbia, Tenn.	2,485,840	5.33	4,995	21	25	4,147	207	1.64	16	434	1.91
Decatur, Ala.	5,301,600	4.41	5,498	0	34	4,770	238	1.18	11	535	1.36
Jackson, Tenn.	4,922,640	3.91	8,141	17	37	6,927	135	1.97	14	495	1.92
Johnson City, Tenn.	4,268,228	4.52	9,768	35	73	8,312	127	2.01	22	444	1.91
LaFollette, Tenn.	2,124,840	5.53	3,503	19	14	2,971	127	1.92	16	456	1.89
Maryville, Tenn.	1,841,162	4.92	4,865	18	34	4,183	221	1.60	12	525	1.65
Murfreesboro, Tenn.	1,661,858	5.16	3,558	13	−13	3,002	239	1.55	9	510	1.90
Sheffield, Ala.	2,789,400	4.05	3,909	28	47	3,356	231	1.56	14	416	1.79
Group C ($101,000 to $250,000):											
Athens, Ala.	1,159,220	5.40	3,674	57	36	3,120	183	1.69	19	441	1.71
Athens, Tenn.	1,323,500	5.27	3,647	13	20	3,138	153	1.83	19	546	1.78
Bessemer, Ala.	984,967	4.59	4,281	0	22	3,671	107	2.11	23	466	1.79
Bowling Green, Ky.	1,415,201	5.11	5,407	1	72	4,591	84	2.48	20	504	1.90
Carroll County, Tenn.	970,536	5.15	3,388	38	14	2,642	139	1.88	18	275	2.15
Columbus, Miss.	1,741,200	4.72	4,300	0	45	3,586	128	1.46	20	409	1.45
Dickson, Tenn.	1,049,400	5.14	2,931	38	58	2,447	135	1.93	16	330	1.85
Elizabethton, Tenn.	1,079,819	5.38	4,000	51	14	4,248	120	2.09	13	330	2.15
Erwin, Tenn.	1,022,400	4.74	2,046	51	29	1,776	146	1.93	16	319	2.07
Florence, Ala.	2,240,600	4.21	4,373	0	26	3,654	276	1.15	8	480	1.44
Gallatin, Tenn.	606,600	5.14	1,739	1	10	1,376	148	1.91	15	405	1.98
Greeneville, Tenn.	1,226,800	5.39	4,586	55	28	3,817	132	1.99	16	397	1.92
Harriman, Tenn.	1,749,504	4.50	3,522	28	34	2,977	180	1.77	11	524	1.68
Hopkinsville, Ky.	1,216,940	4.69	3,894	1	43	3,119	102	2.30	19	428	2.00
Lawrenceburg, Tenn.	[2] 658,200	5.72	2,791	28	29	2,236	139	1.89	15	338	2.04
Lebanon, Tenn.	835,200	4.96	1,986	5	15	1,578	195	1.71	13	498	1.70
Lenoir City, Tenn.	1,527,000	4.70	3,404	41	47	3,072	179	1.69	14	523	1.65
Lewisburg, Tenn.	737,000	5.06	1,410	1	16	1,119	253	1.16	10	594	1.34
Mayfield, Ky.	754,175	5.09	2,975	0	4	2,472	87	2.39	16	378	2.07
McMinnville, Tenn.	1,464,600	4.82	4,300	25	23	3,469	154	1.78	20	333	2.07
Milan, Tenn.	837,600	4.83	1,845	44	3	1,564	228	1.43	18	532	1.68
Mount Pleasant, Tenn.	2,222,000	4.82	1,341	5	4	1,128	192	1.66	10	473	1.86
New Albany, Miss.	677,700	5.37	2,368	34	−6	1,881	149	1.77	23	286	2.28
Newport, Tenn.	706,800	5.09	2,739	59	30	2,332	108	1.93	20	389	1.89
Paris, Tenn.	1,170,000	4.97	3,446	34	37	2,894	171	1.75	14	427	1.96
Pulaski, Tenn.	1,366,986	5.23	2,926	44	7	2,459	180	1.70	13	357	1.82
Ripley, Tenn.	739,242	6.29	2,015	15	20	1,529	133	1.92	19	313	2.27
Rockwood, Tenn.	865,800	4.78	2,153	27	0	1,806	177	1.72	16	583	1.78
Russellville, Ala.	976,960	5.76	1,446	4	22	1,254	168	1.69	18	471	1.75
Shelbyville, Tenn.	1,829,800	4.81	2,414	0	10	2,015	201	1.64	11	505	1.91
Springfield, Tenn.	793,800	5.06	1,721	0	22	1,294	171	1.67	18	458	1.86
Tupelo, Miss.	1,421,250	4.51	2,784	3	18	2,267	179	1.28	15	616	1.29
Weakley County, Tenn.	896,400	5.67	3,644	28	36	2,970	130	1.93	16	279	2.25
Group D ($51,000 to $100,000):											
Aberdeen, Miss.	336,000	5.61	1,259	2	3	984	152	1.78	18	348	1.92
Albertville, Ala.	816,300	4.93	1,311	0	24	1,071	201	1.68	16	400	1.84
Amory, Miss.	404,800	5.01	1,324	14	17	1,096	116	2.09	17	489	1.71
Bolivar, Tenn.	389,867	5.40	1,097	32	14	824	147	1.80	18	267	2.15
Brownsville, Tenn.	312,000	5.88	1,034	0	13	785	114	2.12	17	381	1.93
Cookeville, Tenn.	[3] 459,000	5.30	1,403	0	4	1,068	176	1.72	13	519	1.86
Dayton, Tenn.	387,960	5.35	1,350	17	13	1,130	168	1.71	14	495	2.08
Etowah, Tenn.	408,000	5.36	1,523	22	0	1,340	147	1.93	14	408	1.95
Fayetteville, Tenn.	637,140	5.16	1,566	0	8	1,364	212	1.56	11	468	1.77
Fort Payne, Ala.	564,000	5.18	1,485	0	21	1,235	181	1.72	12	456	1.72
Guntersville, Ala.	790,800	4.80	1,247	8	17	1,039	193	1.69	17	446	1.80
Holly Springs, Miss.	345,100	6.29	1,250	33	23	938	210	1.49	20	256	2.63
Humboldt, Tenn.	528,000	5.05	1,617	2	13	1,373	113	2.04	29	423	1.87
Jellico, Tenn.	386,400	5.70	1,695	42	−6	1,460	58	2.90	29	327	2.09
Lexington, Tenn.	582,310	5.70	1,934	19	25	1,449	182	1.69	18	298	2.17
Loudon, Tenn.	569,400	5.64	1,957	28	18	1,716	155	1.76	18	324	1.87
Louisville, Miss.	427,000	5.72	1,528	0	25	1,014	106	2.09	22	275	2.27
Murphy, N. C.	379,800	5.64	775	16	3	559	228	1.46	19	499	1.78
Murray, Ky.	515,322	5.28	1,678	2	21	1,329	128	2.08	19	325	2.12
Okolona, Miss.	408,600	6.00	1,204	47	6	989	195	1.57	23	294	2.69
Philadelphia, Miss.	414,000	5.77	1,200	14	19	931	195	1.62	23	433	1.99
Russellville, Ky.	316,000	6.08	1,284	2	7	956	73	2.55	23	290	2.26
Scottsboro, Ala.	501,600	5.35	1,223	0	12	997	232	1.55	16	531	1.67
Sevierville, Tenn.	477,774	5.38	1,421	36	−2	1,065	153	1.77	22	587	1.78
Starkville, Miss.	790,400	4.81	1,464	6	14	1,243	126	1.51	20	433	1.43
Sweetwater, Tenn.	599,562	5.36	1,575	38	8	1,353	154	1.82	29	381	1.91
Tarrant City, Ala.	307,333	5.08	1,349	0	4	1,220	153	1.96	7	303	2.10
Trenton, Tenn.	530,000	5.36	1,041	0	13	837	225	1.14	12	391	1.46
Tuscumbia, Ala.	672,836	4.68	1,559	0	11	1,339	335	1.37	6	[4] 605	[4] 1.96
West Point, Miss.	407,000	5.27	1,339	0	15	1,065	98	2.24	16	434	1.92
Winchester, Tenn.	406,800	5.55	1,171	8	15	942	230	1.56	18	454	1.99
Group E ($50,000 or less):											
Benton, Ky.	128,700	6.16	726	21	11	602	80	2.39	24	230	2.49
Benton County, Tenn.	193,680	5.89	802	14	28	622	128	1.92	21	296	2.14
Courtland, Ala.	115,800	7.38	343	0	3	263	221	1.42	29	274	2.14
Franklin, Ky.	246,000	5.91	1,171	0	11	889	60	2.66	32	293	2.21
Hartselle, Ala.	253,600	6.00	940	0	3	758	199	1.64	14	280	2.14
Macon, Miss.	190,800	6.11	530	0	1	400	150	1.87	20	367	2.16
Muscle Shoals, Ala.	159,600	5.41	408	0	8	380	319	1.42	12	560	1.86
Newbern, Tenn.	160,000	6.25	520	0	0	408	165	1.76	13	420	1.99
Somerville, Tenn.	212,348	5.97	443	11	10	317	250	1.44	14	401	2.05
Water Valley, Miss.	272,000	5.48	995	6	17	798	143	1.79	22	285	2.46

[1] Median kilowatt-hours and percent using less than 25 kilowatt-hours are October figures for all distributors.
[2] 105,600 kilowatt-hours generated by Lawrenceburg's own plant not included.
[3] 73,600 kilowatt-hours generated by Cookeville's own plant not included.
[4] Data for period longer than 1 month.

Electricity sales statistics, retail distribution of electricity at TVA resale rates, November 1945—Continued

Distributors, grouped according to fiscal 1945 gross revenue	Wholesale purchases		Number of customers			Residential customer statistics				Commercial service	
	Kilowatt-hours for month	Mills per kilowatt-hour	Total month	Percent rural for month	Added during month	Number of customers	Average kilowatt-hours per customer during month	Average cents per kilowatt-hour	Percent using less than 25 kilowatt-hours [1]	Kilowatt-hours per customer-month	Cents per kilowatt-hour, month
COOPERATIVE DISTRIBUTORS											
Group B ($251,000 to $750,000):											
Duck River Electric Membership Corp., Tennessee	4,201,761	5.23	8,699	65	75	7,516	141	1.88	18	277	2.09
Gibson County Electric Membership Corp., Tennessee	3,108,750	5.16	8,750	59	167	7,425	123	1.98	21	225	2.39
Middle Tennessee Electric Membership Corp., Tennessee	1,744,170	5.55	6,980	85	87	5,989	156	1.87	17	221	2.33
Sequachee Valley Electric Cooperative, Tennessee	3,392,040	4.91	4,561	34	29	3,741	137	1.86	20	319	2.04
Volunteer Electric Cooperative, Tennessee	1,699,700	5.39	6,853	55	72	5,886	103	2.20	24	289	2.03
Group C ($101,000 to $250,000):											
Alcorn County Electric Power Association, Mississippi	1,928,200	4.30	3,860	44	47	3,206	227	1.16	12	434	1.42
Appalachian Electric Corp., Tennessee	1,579,400	5.13	3,128	56	26	2,693	134	1.85	20	280	2.06
Cullman Electric Corp., Alabama	510,000	6.21	4,951	93	38	4,322	65	2.88	24	141	2.91
Cumberland Electric Membership Corp., Tennessee	1,260,535	5.97	7,351	72	106	6,492	121	2.20	18	183	2.65
Four-County Electric Power Association, Mississippi	1,182,372	5.95	5,282	69	58	4,452	113	1.95	29	151	2.64
Holston Electric Corp., Tennessee	643,500	5.28	3,330	80	33	2,913	90	2.18	28	295	2.04
Marshall De Kalb Electric Corp., Alabama	814,720	6.03	3,198	72	44	2,736	101	2.12	37	271	2.01
Meriwether Lewis Electric Corp., Tennessee	912,423	5.86	2,994	35	49	2,347	126	1.99	17	296	2.16
North Georgia Electric Membership Corp., Georgia	1,569,522	4.80	7,132	100	127	6,568	100	2.17	25	153	2.87
Pennyrile Rural Electric Cooperative Corp., Kentucky	721,320	5.87	4,087	41	38	3,386	110	2.39	17	178	2.70
Pontotoc Electric Power Association, Mississippi	667,200	5.50	2,782	58	33	2,360	104	2.04	27	206	2.26
Southwest Tennessee Electric Membership Corp., Tennessee	1,495,565	5.79	4,274	69	28	3,499	147	1.85	24	202	2.76
Tombigbee Electric Power Association, Mississippi	784,800	5.72	4,689	66	51	4,043	95	2.11	26	143	2.77
Tri-County Electric Membership Corp., Tennessee	1,102,920	5.52	7,447	58	69	6,184	75	2.44	28	208	2.43
Upper Cumberland Electric Membership Corp., Tennessee	782,678	5.79	4,669	59	23	3,820	99	2.17	25	224	2.24
Group D ($51,000 to $100,000):											
Central Electric Power Association, Mississippi	251,100	6.39	2,385	100	54	2,058	72	2.85	16	95	3.38
Cherokee Electric Corp., Alabama	424,800	5.93	3,701	87	46	3,461	60	2.58	36	153	2.61
Fort Loudoun Electric Corp., Tennessee	441,600	6.03	2,547	86	20	2,269	96	2.20	28	282	2.16
Joe Wheeler Electric Membership Corp., Alabama	629,950	6.69	2,761	73	41	2,283	125	2.05	15	238	2.26
Lincoln County Electric Membership Corp., Tennessee	727,861	5.33	2,117	86	68	1,844	121	2.11	21	185	2.73
Mountain Electric Corp., Tennessee	243,425	6.45	2,570	71	25	2,410	49	3.29	45	127	3.19
Natchez Trace Electric Power Association, Mississippi	575,400	5.99	2,863	53	40	2,268	104	2.04	32	201	2.48
North Alabama Electric Corp., Alabama	589,800	6.06	1,913	46	24	1,603	111	2.06	26	218	2.28
Pickwick Electric Membership Corp., Tennessee	393,500	6.38	2,089	47	56	1,742	103	2.08	29	302	2.01
Plateau Electric Corp, Tennessee	407,838	5.85	1,593	74	15	1,314	88	2.32	19	305	2.21
Prentiss Electric Power Association, Mississippi	595,000	5.53	2,307	49	41	1,925	144	1.76	19	311	1.94
Sand Mountain Electric Corp., Alabama	490,892	6.50	3,325	87	30	2,744	81	2.37	26	158	2.62
Tallahatchie Valley Electric Power Association, Mississippi	645,600	5.64	3,456	89	83	2,975	98	2.23	27	178	2.63
Tennessee Valley Electric Corp., Tennessee	395,180	6.19	1,682	13	17	1,331	133	1.88	21	302	2.11
Tippah Electric Power Association, Mississippi	409,200	6.25	1,346	32	22	1,047	134	1.82	17	255	2.04
Warren Rural Electric Cooperative Corp., Kentucky	389,537	6.28	2,919	70	43	2,479	84	2.56	19	163	2.95
West Kentucky Rural Electric Cooperative Corp., Kentucky	392,963	6.84	3,378	77	32	3,031	70	2.96	21	120	2.96
Group E ($50,000 or less):											
Blue Ridge Electric Association, Georgia	187,500	6.32	1,651	72	27	1,355	71	2.39	32	119	3.05
Caney Fork Electric Corp., Tennessee	187,200	6.79	2,165	100	21	1,982	63	2.90	31	70	3.59
Chickasaw Electric Corp., Tennessee	189,694	6.24	1,069	72	23	890	117	1.98	32	147	2.89
East Mississippi Electric Power Association, Mississippi	258,680	6.55	1,663	76	17	1,447	79	2.73	25	167	2.61
Forked Deer Electric Corp., Tennessee	195,546	7.11	1,956	100	18	1,817	71	2.61	25	74	3.85
Hickman-Fulton Counties Rural Electric Cooperative Corp., Kentucky	162,000	6.85	1,258	100	16	1,190	98	2.67	27	115	3.11
Monroe County, EPA., Mississippi	198,000	6.76	1,424	86	27	1,229	80	2.24	23	115	3.30
North East Miss. EPA., Mississippi	173,400	6.50	994	100	21	861	96	2.05	22	73	3.52
Tishomingo County EPA., Mississippi	282,940	7.02	1,484	32	20	1,212	118	1.86	30	184	2.81
PRIVATE COMPANIES											
Bells Light & Water Co., Tennessee	111,600	6.74	339	0	1	263	133	1.85	23	234	2.62
Franklin Power & Light Co., Tennessee	580,000	5.40	1,345	0	11	1,072	231	1.58	10	420	1.83
Tennessee Light & Power Co., Kentucky	39,600	6.77	235	22	1	183	141	2.01	13	141	2.77
TVA DIRECT OPERATIONS											
Copperhill District, Tennessee			2,198	28	7	1,800	149	1.79	21	295	2.16
Lauderdale District, Alabama			2,334	82	9	2,027	128	2.00	17	172	2.67
TOTALS											
92 municipalities	275,487,173	4.24	471,909	16	2,380	399,026	173	1.75	13	451	1.96
46 cooperatives	39,942,582	5.54	162,025	68	2,047	138,535	108	2.09	24	218	2.32
3 private companies	731,200	5.68	1,919	3	13	1,518	203	1.64	13	348	1.98
2 TVA direct operations			4,532	55	16	3,827	138	1.89	19	243	2.32
Grand total	316,160,955	4.41	640,385	29	4,456	542,906	156	1.81	16	392	2.01

[1] Median kilowatt-hours and percent using less than 25 kilowatt-hours are October figures for all distributors.

These are the rates we hope to see spread throughout the entire Nation and extended to every farm home in America.

Who Can Give Away Part of United States to UNO?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1946

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a thought-provoking article by George E. Sokolsky, well-grounded and highly respected news commentator. This article appeared in many of the Nation's newspapers Friday, February 8:

WHO CAN GIVE AWAY PART OF UNITED STATES TO UNO?

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Who can give the United States away? Who can give any part of it away? Who has the authority to deed it to another country or any group of countries? The Constitution of the United States says nothing on the subject.

Yet, the fact is that the UNO wants to take 42 square miles out of the United States to make it a separate and distinct country, a foreign settlement, an extraterritorial area governed by foreigners and not subject to the laws of this country. Who has the right to authorize the seizure of American land in the States of Connecticut and New York?

Judge John Bassett Moore, America's greatest authority on international relations, defines extraterritoriality thus:

"Owing to diversities in law, custom, and social habits the citizens and subjects of nations possessing European civilization enjoy in countries of non-European civilization, chiefly in the east, an extensive exemption from the operation of the local law. This exemption is termed 'extraterritoriality.'"

Of course, the actual premises of embassies and such buildings are acknowledged as extraterritoriality by mutual consent and common practice. But 42 square miles is not a building, nor can one regard 1,500 persons and their families and hired help as ambassadors. All these people will live in America; none will live under American law. As Judge Moore says:

"Under this system, jurisdiction is exercised by foreign officials, most frequently the diplomatic and consular officers, over persons of their own nationality."

COULD HAVE OWN POLICE

In the past extraterritoriality has existed in Borneo, China, Japan, Korea, Madagascar, Muscat, Morocco, Persia, Samoan Islands, Siam, Tripoli, Tunis, Turkey, and Pacific islands. Under this system, if an American were kidnaped and killed in the UNO 42 square miles, no American court would have jurisdiction unless especially called in for that specific purpose by the UNO authorities. If they so desired, the UNO would have the right to set up their own police force or maintain their own army in Connecticut.

I lived under extraterritoriality for 13 years. I have, in my own house in Shanghai, given refuge to men who today are prominent in the Chungking government but who could not be arrested by their own government, because they were in my house, which was extraterritorial.

Once at a dinner party in the French concession in Shanghai Chiang Kai-shek had been loosely discussed. Chiang wanted to arrest some of those present. One, who afterward became Chiang's Minister of Foreign Affairs, hid in my house. Chiang knew where he was, but he also knew that no warrant would serve, as my house was extraterritorial. The writ of the country did not count.

The American Minister to Siam, Mr. King, in the course of a note maintained "that the provision in the British treaty that 'British subjects, their persons, homes, premises, lands, ships, or property of any kind shall not be seized, injured, or in any way interfered with by the Siamese,' applied equally to United States citizens under the most-favored-nation clause and that the entire jurisdiction over the interests of the United States in Siam belonged exclusively to the consulate general of the United States."

KINGS IN OWN RIGHT

And we all lived that way. We were little kings in our own right. The government of the country where we were situated had no authority over us, no civil, no criminal jurisdiction of any kind. All we had to do was to keep out of the friendly American court in Shanghai. I have seen Chinese abused and humiliated in their own country because extraterritoriality made the foreigner, the alien, a king in another's land.

What law will obtain in this 42-square-mile enclave in Connecticut? Will it be English common law, the Code Napoleon of the French, or the barbaric police jurisdiction of Soviet Russia?

We are letting ourselves in for a lot of trouble. There is no reason why UNO requires 42 square miles of extraterritorial territory. There is no reason why the wives and children, the stenographers and personal servants of all the delegations should enjoy special privileges and exemptions. American soil must remain American everywhere, under all circumstances, and let him who signs away an inch of it be cursed a traitor.

Loan to Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, for many weeks now—in fact since the end of the war—you have been hearing much about lending money to Britain to finance the future of the new British Socialist Empire. Distinguished visitors from England, and some of them not so distinguished, have been reminding us over and over again that just as it was our duty to help the British win the war, it is now our duty, with our money, to help them recover from it.

Well, it has finally been announced, after a series of secret conferences in Washington, that we are going to lend money to the British, and a lot of it. It adds up to $4,400,000,000.

Now this so-called loan was first disclosed from London. It was all kept secret from the American press until after the British newspapers had announced it the day before the American people were informed. This has been the technique employed in giving information to us regarding matters vital to our interests.

The announcement was one of those long legal documents that would frighten a lawyer and terrify a banker. The important thing about this document is that it tells everything about the so-called loan except what it really is, a gift by the American people to His Majesty's Socialist Government, a gift of $4,400,000,000 to finance a Socialist experiment. You can finance a lot of socialism for nearly four and a half billion dollars.

Now, this loan which we are giving the British does not tell the whole story of our financial aid to Britain. It is only a small part of the whole story. Only $4,400,000,000. The loan agreement also contains a clause which cancels lend-lease to Britain to the tune of $29,000,000,000.

To be sure, the British paid us back an exceedingly small part in reverse lend-lease. They paid back about $4,000,000,000 in goods and services, including charges for transporting our troops and equipment in their ships and on their railways. That leaves a balance of $25,000,000,000 which the agreement now disposes of as a gift, and not a loan, although it was made under the fictitious name of lend-lease.

Let us not forget the $6,500,000,000 which Great Britain owes on her debt growing out of the First World War, upon which she has not paid one dollar since 1933. This, together with the $25,000,000,000 of lend-lease and the proposed gift of $4,400,000,000, makes a grand total of $35,900,000,000. This does not include the billions upon billions of dollars in interest on this huge amount which we had to borrow in order to loan to the British. This interest must be paid each year until such time as we reduce the national debt in this amount. At 2½ percent the interest alone amounts to $918,750,000 per year. Just how many years' interest must we pay before we have reduced our debt sufficiently to liquidate the $35,900,000,000 gift to Britain? It will be a tidy sum in the aggregate, I would say, our taxpayers will have to dig up before our taxpayers will have worked and earned enough beyond their living expenses to pay this part of our national debt.

Under the circumstances, the most important point to remember about this so-called new loan is that it opens the door for every country in Europe and Asia to come to us and demand a gift camouflaged as a loan. Soviet Russia already is reported to be interested in accepting as much as $6,000,000,000 from us. There are rumors that China will be needing about $10,000,000,000 of our money also. France already has received a credit from us of $3,500,000,000 and is now asking for more. There is even talk of lending money to Italy to help her over the rough spots ahead. Do not be too surprised if before long we are asked to furnish the money with which to build up a new Germany.

In the case of Russia we may have to let her have some of our money if we give the British this $4,500,000,000. She was our ally too. She made many sacrifices during the war and suffered more destruction in property and manpower than anyone else. True, she looked with complacence when Hitler started the war. True, Russia fought the Nazis, but only after they had invaded her in violation of the solemn treaty of peace between them. Uncle Joe Stalin can, of course, put up a very good argument that if we can afford to contribute money for the reconstruction of Britain we can just as well afford to help in the reconstruction of Russia.

Stalin can do even more than ask for a loan. He might well force us to make one. He can argue, with what would appear to the Russian mind to have some degree of truth, that by lending money to Britain, and refusing it to Russia, we are starting the formation of a bloc of western powers which may some day turn against the Soviet Union. He can say that if we want Russia to be friendly with us, how about a little friendly loan—or gift.

Now if our Government, after a free and open discussion, decided it would be to our benefit to give money to the British to help them finance their new form of government, that would be quite another thing. But let us be honest with the American people. Let us not call a gift a loan when it is not a loan—but is an outright gift. Let us be honest with ourselves, especially when we are dealing with the money of the American people, the money for which in the years to come they must down the years work to earn.

You do not need to take my word that this so-called loan is a gift. You do not need to take anybody's word. Just look at the agreement itself, and recall the statements of the British visitors who came here to negotiate it.

The agreement sets an interest rate of 1.62 percent on the so-called loan, we must pay 2½ percent for the money which we loan to her. But payments on principal and interest are not to begin until 5 years after the loan. Then there is a joker in the agreement under which the British do not have to pay any interest at all, if they find making such payments will financially embarrass them.

The principal negotiator of the loan for the British was John Maynard Keynes, a new-style economist who advocated repudiation of the debt the British owed us from the last war. He also

was one of the principal advocates of deficit spending during the depression, and was influential in persuading President Roosevelt that you can spend your way to prosperity with money that you have not got. When Keynes arrived in the United States a few months ago to discuss aid to Britain he openly admitted that a gift, rather than a loan, would be welcome.

Keynes was followed to this country by the Socialist leader, Harold Laski, and the Red Archbishop of Canterbury who both sneered at the old-fashioned successful business economy of the United States when compared with the future glories of British socialism.

Now under our old-fashioned business economy, which was successful enough to furnish the materials of victory throughout the world in two World Wars, we usually consider that a loan should be backed up by security.

You have all heard the phrase about "the British Empire on which the sun never sets." Well, that phrase applies equally well to the new British Socialist Empire. They have many military bases on this side of the Atlantic and in other parts of the world, most of which were built by we Americans at our expense, which will be helpful to us to keep them and us out of another war. They have islands and bases in both the Atlantic and the Pacific, many of the former at our very doors, which would be useful to us in establishing military and civil aviation routes to all the parts of the world we are expected to protect.

Have you heard any talk from the British about putting up any of these bases or islands as security for a loan from us, just to prove that they might be thinking of really paying us back? You have not, and neither has anyone else.

The British also hold about $5,000,000,000 in securities in American business and industry. Was there any suggestion that they put up these holdings as security for a loan? Not that you or I or anyone else ever heard of.

The principal argument of those favoring the gift or a loan to Britain is that the money eventually will come back to us.

The British will take the money, the argument runs, spend it for American goods, and then pay us for those American goods with the money we gave them. The money will come back to us, but the goods it buys will go to Britain. It looks to me as though someone will be holding the bag—and it will not be the British.

The reasoning behind this argument is like the idea that our tremendous public debt does not really matter because we owe the money to ourselves.

Now, let me try to explain in simple terms how this arrangement with Britain will work. Suppose you have a grocery store. I want to buy something at your store but I have not any money—at least I tell you I have not. So I persuade you to lend me $5. I then spend the $5 to buy groceries from your store. You get the $5 back but I get the groceries. It is all as simple as that.

International dealings are not much different from dealings at the corner grocery store. Grocery stores extend credit to their customers, just as we as a Nation have done in the past. But if the owner of a grocery store gave money to his customers with the belief that he would get it back just because his customers spent it in his store, he would soon go out of business. It is the same in international dealings.

Some believe there are reasons why we should lend money to Britain on a sound business basis. But there are many reasons why we should not give money to Britain, or to any other nation. We have been giving more than plenty during the war through lend-lease and relief. It is time we received something in return.

This so-called loan to Britain will not go into effect until it has been approved by Congress. Its terms were arrived at in secrecy—secrecy over how the money you contribute to your Government in taxes is to be spent by a Government that plans to promote socialism.

It is time for open discussion on how your Government is planning to spend your money abroad. It is time for open discussion on how the new British Socialist Government plans to spend your money. It is time that the American people who have slaved and sweated to achieve victory should know how our resources are to be used to preserve the peace.

R. M. Davis, West Virginia Businessman, Proposes Business Manager for the Federal Government

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 11, 1946

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, Congress by the passage of the recent reorganization legislation, has indicated its desire to give to the President of the United States the opportunity to initiate realinement of agencies and bureaus. This would be done in an effort to bring order and coordination into the operation of our hodge-podge of Federal activities.

We need, as I indicated in my remarks during the debate on H. R. 4129, October 3 and 4, 1945, to eliminate the overlapping functions and duplications found in our sprawling governmental structure.

We are, also, aware of the necessity for the operation of our Federal Government, at the lowest possible cost commensurate with a responsive program of efficiency for the best interest of our Nation and the well-being of our citizens.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with this important subject matter I herewith include a most noteworthy letter, from a business leader in my district:

MORGANTOWN, W. VA., *February 8, 1946.*
HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: For a long time we have recognized that the most difficult position for any man to hold in this world is that of President of the United States. The duties of the office have increased enormously during the period of World War II and the problems the President faces today are so complex and baffling that only by specialization can we possibly hope to solve them. He should be relieved of many of the tasks besetting him in these times, particularly matters of financial concern which require expert analysis and administration. We should remember that the Government of the United States is the largest financial organization in the world and has become a permanent multibillion dollar corporation.

Never before in the history of this country has so much uncertainty existed in the minds of the people as to what the future holds for them. With a national debt of nearly $300,000,000,000, with taxation at the highest level in our history except for the year 1945, the people are entitled to know now just what kind of a plan the Government will have to offer in solving the complex problems that we are now faced with.

Something must be done to hold the continued faith and confidence of the people in our Government and in private enterprise. Without further delay, the President and the Congress should pass the necessary legislation for the appointment of a business manager for the Government of the United States. Such a person should be appointed by the President, for life or during good behavior, with the approval of both Houses of Congress. He should be subject to removal from office only by joint action of the President and the Congress, and then only on charges of misfeasance or malfeasance in office. These safeguards are absolutely necessary to give him the required independence of action and to protect him from political interference. The business manager should be a man who has had a wide business experience in positions of progressively increasing administrative responsibility. His salary should be set at $150,000 per year with all expenses paid. This will aid materially in getting a top-flight man who will be interested in the position on a permanent basis.

One of the first duties of the business manager would be a complete overhauling of our national financial structure. In the performance of this duty, he must not be subject to restrictions by either the executive or legislative branches of Government. Then he should develop a 20-year program of taxation and amortization of the national debt. Let labor and management and the people generally know what their taxes are going to be over a long period of time, subject to such revisions as may be necessary to meet emergencies, and you will provide one of the most stabilizing factors in labor-management relations. Let the people know that some concrete plans are being made to reduce the national debt and you will eliminate one of the most important reasons today for inflation and the threat of further inflation.

We have heard a great deal during the last 13 years about Government planning for the future. Let's first have some real long-range planning to put the finances of this country in some understandable form. We shall then have a firm foundation upon which to build other long-range plans, such as transcontinental highways on a self-liquidating basis which I proposed to the President and Congress in the year 1933. This may seem to be advisable for the general welfare.

In addition, the business manager must have authority to supervise the budgets of all Government Departments, even the armed forces. This must include the power to institute sound business practices in the expenditure of all Government moneys to eliminate duplication of effort and inefficiency by the various agencies of the Government. A decided drop in the number of persons on the Federal pay roll would be inevitable with a consequent saving of millions of dollars to the taxpayer.

Let me implore you, therefore, to give serious consideration to the required legislation to carry this proposal into effect. Neither labor nor management can offer any objection to a plan which has for its ultimate objective the stabilization of financial conditions in the country whereby both the employer and the employee can plan for the future. In this way, the general welfare of all the people of our country will be served.

Very sincerely yours,

R. M. DAVIS.

P. S.—A copy of this letter has been sent to each Member of Congress.

Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 8, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the House February 7, passed what it calls a labor bill, but in one respect it was just as unfair to labor as the Wagner Act is unfair to employers. If it is passed by the Senate and enforced, it will destroy unions, but in my judgment it will not pass in its present form. I voted against it. I will vote for and will continue to advocate legislation regulating unions.

Am printing herewith copies of two bills I introduced, dealing with public strikes and interference with interstate and foreign commerce.

February 7, the House passed the Case bill, designed primarily, it was said, to lessen the causes of labor disputes and to minimize strikes, the injurious and economic results thereof. The sponsors of the bill and the Committee of the Whole refused to accept an amendment adding a new section designed to prevent strikes, affecting public-service corporations, which supply some of the necessities of life, such as power, light, electricity, transportation, and communications. The amendment which was rejected by the proponents of the bill and the committee is carried in H. R. 5114 printed herewith and marked exhibit A.

Proponents and the committee also rejected an amendment drawn to limit the penalty imposed by the Case bill for violations of sections 11 and 13. The penalty imposed for violation of those two sections deprives an employee throughout his life of the right to join a union, to bargain collectively, to be represented by a union. Such a penalty is expressly forbidden by the eighth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which prohibits cruel and unusual punishment.

Such a limitation was embodied in bills H. R. 4951 and H. R. 5202 offered some time ago and which, had they been enacted, would have accomplished the same result. They will be marked exhibit B and exhibit C and printed herewith.

EXHIBIT A

H. R. 5114

A bill to aid in maintaining essential public services by public utilities by requiring collective bargaining contracts to include provision for adequate notice of intention to strike

Be it enacted, etc., That when used in this act—

(1) The term "public utility" includes only a public utility which is engaged in commerce or whose operations are such that a slow-down or stoppage thereof would burden or obstruct commerce or the free flow of commerce.

(2) The terms "employee", "representatives", "labor organization", and "commerce", shall have the meaning assigned to them in section 2 of the National Labor Relations Act.

(3) The term "strike" includes any concerted action which results in a slow-down or stoppage of work.

SEC. 2. After the date of the enactment of this act, no public utility shall enter into any contract with any labor organization concerning the wages, hours, or other terms or condition of employment of any of the employees of such public utility, unless such contract provides that such employees will not engage in any strike until after the expiration of 60 days from the date on which they or their representatives give to such public utility written notice of their intention to strike together with a statement of their reasons for such intended strike.

SEC. 3. If any employees of a public utility engage in any strike which continues for more than 24 hours, in violation of a provision required by section 2 of this act to be included in the contract with respect to such employees, whether or not such provision is included in the contract, or in violation of a provision in a contract with respect to such employees, entered into before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this act, which prohibits a strike or requires the giving of notice before engaging in a strike, then, from the time of the beginning of such strike until the expiration of 12 months after the termination of such strike—

(1) the employees who engage in such strike shall not be entitled to any rights, privileges, or benefits under the National Labor Relations Act, with respect to their employment by such public utility;

(2) the labor organization with which such contract was entered into by such public utility shall not be recognized as a labor organization, or as a representative of employees, under the National Labor Relations Act insofar as any matter relating to the employees of such public utility is concerned; and

(3) the National Labor Relations Board shall not require such public utility to bargain with such labor organization as the representative of any of the employees of such public utility.

SEC. 4. If such strike continues for more than 24 hours, the employees engaged in such strike shall cease to be considered employees of the public utility.

EXHIBIT B

H. R. 4951

A bill to make certain labor practices and boycotts unlawful

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be unlawful for employees of any person who is engaged in business as a carrier of property for hire, to attempt, by means of a concerted refusal to transport the property of, or to transport property to, another person—

(1) to induce or require such other person to recognize, deal with, comply with the demands of, or employ members of, any labor organization; or

(2) to induce or require employees of such other person to become or remain members of any labor organization;

in any case in which the property to be transported is to be transported in interstate or foreign commerce, or in which such concerted refusal directly affects interstate or foreign commerce.

SEC. 2. It shall be unlawful, by means of a strike against any person, or by means of a concerted refusal to work on, handle, or otherwise deal with articles or materials belonging to any person, to induce or require, or to attempt to induce or require, another person to recognize, deal with, comply with the demands of, or employ members of, any labor organization, in any case in which such strike or concerted refusal directly affects interstate or foreign commerce.

SEC. 3. It shall be unlawful for any labor organization, or for any officer of any labor organization, to induce or require, or to attempt to induce or require, any of the members of such organization to perform any act which constitutes a violation of section 1 or 2.

SEC. 4. Whoever violates any of the provisions of sections 1, 2, or 3—

(1) shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine of not less than $100 nor more than $1,000, or by imprisonment for not less than 30 days, nor more than 1 year, or both; and

(2) in case such violation is by a labor organization, shall upon conviction thereof cease to have and cease to be entitled to the status of a representative or labor organization under the National Labor Relations Act, for a period of not less than 90 days, nor more than 6 months.

EXHIBIT C

H. R. 5202

A bill to protect employees and employers engaged in interstate and foreign commerce

Be it enacted, etc.—

FINDINGS AND POLICY

SECTION 1. The Congress hereby declares that—

(a) It is the policy of the United States to foster free competitive enterprise, the investment and the protection of private capital in trade and commerce, and in the development of the natural resources of the United States.

(b) All Americans able to work, seeking and finding work, shall be protected in the exercise of their right to work.

(c) All individuals, copartnerships, corporations, associations, and organizations creating and maintaining jobs shall be protected in the right to hire and give employment to any individual without interference through force or violence by any individual or organization of any kind.

SEC. 2. Whenever any act mentioned in this or any subsequent section shall obstruct or interfere with interstate or foreign commerce—

(a) It shall be unlawful for any person, alone or acting with another or others, directly or indirectly, by force, coercion, intimidation, or by show or threat of force, or attempt to use force, to force or attempt to force any person to become, be, or remain a member of any labor organization; or, by force, coercion, intimidation, or threat of force, or attempt to use force, to force or attempt to force, any person to refrain from engaging in or remaining in employment, or, by force, coercion, intimidation, or by show or threat of force, or attempt to use force, to interfere or attempt to interfere with any employee or other person on his

or her way to or from employment, or while seeking employment, which in any way contributes to the production of anything which may become an article of interstate or foreign commerce.

(b) It shall be unlawful for any labor organization or the officers thereof, or for any other organization or the officers thereof, to commit any of the acts herein made unlawful when committed by a person or a group of persons.

SEC. 3. Interference in the manner prescribed in section 1 with each employee or other person is hereby made a separate and distinct offense.

SEC. 4. In addition to any other penalty imposed by this act, every person or organization violating the terms hereof shall be liable to every employee or person deprived of employment by violation of section 1 for double the amount of damage suffered by such employee or other person, which said damages shall be not less than the sum of $50, together with the costs of such suit, including an attorney fee of $25, which said damages shall be recoverable in any Federal court sitting in the State where such violation may occur, and jurisdiction of such actions and of the persons and organizations involved therein is hereby conferred upon such courts.

SEC. 5. Any person violating any provision of this act shall, for each act, be subject to a fine of not more than $1,000 and imprisonment of not more than 1 year.

SEC. 6. If any provision of this act, or the application of any provision, to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the remainder of the act, or the application of such provision, to any person or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

Peacetime Sabotage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 11, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, from time to time some administration spokesman talks about economy and the taxpayer and he usually indicates that he is for both at the same time. Observation leads us to note, however, that neither economy in public expenditures nor the taxpayer amount to very much in the eyes of the average New Dealer. To use the old phrase, "They aren't worth a continental." This does not refer to their intrinsic worth or value which is indispensable to any New Deal program which always includes more jobs, bigger jobs, and in the language of one of the late New Dealers, "Spend and spend and tax and tax." In other words, there must necessarily be a waste of public funds, or else there is no fun.

We have pointed out on many occasions that this reckless and irresponsible policy of wasting funds is going to ruin the Government, but administration leaders do not seem to pay any attention to it. I was talking the other day with a high grade, competent person in one of the newly created Government Departments. This party is rated as a person of executive capacity, able to take shorthand and typing and look after business matters and is on the pay roll for only $3,000 in New Deal money. I quote this party:

> My job is all right and I have no kick about the pay, but it is in one of those reconversion bureaus where I have absolutely nothing to do. There are a lot of other people who are also on the pay roll, and they have nothing to do. My, but time hangs heavy on our hands, and we think it a crime to take our pay checks when we don't give the Government value received.

This is a true story and illustrates just what is going on under the New Dealers down here at Washington.

It is unpleasant for me to tell these facts Mr. Speaker, but people are entitled to know them. They are evidence of what a man said the other day, namely the bureaus and departments have gotten so big here that they not only run Congress, but they also run their own bosses.

I quote from a statement furnished me by our colleague the Honorable JOHN TABER, of New York, in which he says:

> I wish to call your attention to a table which I placed in the RECORD of February 7, 1946, on page 1111, indicating an increase of 116,982 man-years, or 125,000 new jobs in civil agencies of the Government, excluding the Army and the Navy, as proposed in the President's 1947 Budget estimates.
>
> These positions would require an increased pay roll of $232,000,000 and seem to me to indicate better than anything else the attitude of the administration toward spending.

Now, Congressman TABER is recognized as one of the outstanding men in the United States who believes in fair dealing, stating the facts correctly and protecting the American people against all irregularities and misdeeds. He is pointing out what amounts to 125,000 new jobs when the war is over, and we ought to be decreasing these plum trees and replanting the orchards with wheat and corn and other productive increments. Mark you, he says that he has not even gotten to the Army and the Navy which notoriously waste the taxpayers' money at every opportunity. In wartime we called their expenditure necessary, and no one questioned them. In peacetime I feel they will find out too late that a different yardstick is in existence.

HENRY WALLACE AND HAROLD ICKES

It made me feel sad yesterday, Mr. Speaker, when I read an article from the Houston Chronicle of Houston, Tex., under date of January 27, 1946. This referred to the fact that the Department of Commerce has boosted its budget estimate $77,000,000 as between the fiscal years of 1946 and 1947. Now the Secretary of Commerce is the Honorable Henry Wallace, long recognized as a God-fearing son of Iowa, than whom there are none greater in their love for the common people and their desire to benefit all of our neighbors. I was surprised to learn that Mr. Wallace's budget estimates for peacetime purposes had been boosted. He surely ought to be able to borrow a few thousand employees from one of those wartime agencies which has been theoretically abolished. Of course, its name has been changed but everything else remains the same. This story in the Houston Chronicle just shows how the bureaucrats who work under Henry Wallace are bigger than their boss, because a man of his progressive and liberal tendencies, if left to his own inclinations would never be guilty of the charges made in the Houston Chronicle.

Then there is that outstanding and distinguished Secretary of the Department of the Interior the Honorable Harold Ickes, "Honest Harold" for short. The Houston Chronicle relates that Mr. Ickes' Department picked up $212,000,000 more for the fiscal year of 1947. This is just another case where a God-fearing man like Secretary Ickes has become submerged and is likely to become a victim of a watery grave of bureaucracy. This is the time and place Mr. Speaker, when both of these distinguished gentlemen, Henry Wallace and Harold Ickes, need the protection of Congress.

Lest I do anyone an injustice, I quote from the Houston Chronicle, of Houston, Tex., January 27, 1946, as follows:

HENRY AND HAROLD SCORE HIGH IN BUDGET BATTLE

(By Norman W. Baxter)

WASHINGTON, January 26.—There are broad smiles these days in the Department of Commerce and the Department of Interior and a few sly grins in the Bureau of the Budget. For the three uppercrust survivors of the Roosevelt administration—Henry Wallace, Harold Ickes, and Director of the Budget Harold Smith—have succeeded in playing a tune on the first Truman peacetime budget that has all other Washington bureaucrats slighty dizzy and entirely envious.

There is no question as to who gained the most ground. Honest Harold has picked up $212,000,000, or 140 percent, in funds allotted to his Department from VJ-day through fiscal year 1947, the budget for which has just been announced. Mr. Wallace, who got a slower start, has managed to boost his budget estimate approximately $77,000,000, or 89 percent, as between the fiscal years 1946 and 1947. The answer may lie in the fact that Mr. Ickes has had uninterrupted practice, while Mr. Wallace has only come back to the budgetary orchestra in the last year. There is, however, no denying the fact that they are both good—good at raiding the Treasury, particularly with the help of social-minded Budget Director Smith. Any other member of the President's Cabinet or agency head will admit this ruefully. In many respects Mr. Wallace's accomplishment is the more remarkable, since some of the budgetary gains that he has registered run into several hundred percent. Here are some shining examples:

THREE HUNDRED PERCENT INCREASE

The funds allotted to the office of the secretary in the Department of Commerce are 300 percent above any previous year in the last two decades. The most money the Budget Bureau ever allowed for this purpose heretofore was $2,467,000, when Herbert Hoover was President. Mr. Wallace has been authorized to seek congressional sanction for $7,685,000 for his own secretarial force.

In its heyday, when the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce had agents all over the world—as it now no longer has—it was never permitted to ask for more than $5,334,000. Mr. Wallace has been given the green light on $11,670,000 for fiscal year 1947, which is more than 400 percent above the amount

this same Bureau has had in any year since 1941.

The Bureau of the Census has been given a pat on the back to ask for $33,500,000, approximately 300 percent more than it got in each of the two previous years, and $11,400,000 more than it was granted in 1940, the year of the last decennial census, when every resident of the United States has to be counted. For $33,500,000 Mr. Wallace plans only a manufacturers and business census.

ONE THOUSAND TWO HUNDRED PERCENT UP

The real hurdle that Mr. Wallace cleared was in the estimate for field offices of the Department of Commerce. Three years ago the Bureau of the Budget refused to allow any money for these field offices. Budget Director Smith said they were not needed. The cost was then approximately $500,000. The funds at that time were restored only through congressional intervention. This estimate now has been upped to $6,500,000, an increase of more than 1,200 percent.

Both the field offices appropriations and the census funds will be spent principally for manpower—in other words, for patronage to help Mr. Wallace in his campaign for President.

Budget Bureau spokesmen have sought to make it appear that the tremendous additional sums granted Commerce resulted from the presence in that Department of the Civil Aeronautics Administration. The administration does get the largest single share of Commerce appropriations—$69,508,000 for 1947—but its percentage gain between 1946 and 1947 amounted to a picayunish 33 percent.

HOOVER BADLY BEATEN

There is a fiction around Washington that Herbert Hoover really got the money from Congress for the Department of Commerce. He did pretty well for it, both as Secretary and as President. He shoved its appropriations up from $21,100,000 in 1924, when he was Secretary, to a high of $58,795,000 in 1930, when he was President. But Mr. Wallace, if Congress lets him get away with it, will beat the Hoover high by more than $100,000,000.

Mr. Ickes must have done some real suffering during the war years. The expenditures of his Department, exclusive of war expenditures, got down to $65,000,000 in the fiscal year 1943, $159,000,000 in 1944, and a low of $151,000,000 in 1945. It looked as if he would get along on about the same amount in the present fiscal year, 1946, when along came VJ-day. Mr. Ickes dashed up to Congress and got supplementary authorizations and appropriations which jumped him $90,000,000 (exclusive of war expenditures) within the single year. And then, in the Budget which the President has just submitted to Congress, he ran the total up to $363,000,000, an additional gain as between '46 and '47 of $147,000,000. When you compare $363,000,000 with $151,000,000 it looks as if Mr. Ickes' Department might put on some weight. More than $163,000,000 of the total for the fiscal year 1947 will go to the Bureau of Reclamation, which in 1946 had only about $45,000,000 of anticipated expenditures.

KNOW THEIR WAY AROUND

Of course both Henry Wallace and Harold Ickes had two advantages over their associates in the higher echelon of the Truman administration. They knew their way around Washington, and they were old friends of Harold Smith, the Director of the Budget, who is a good man to know. Under the Government budget procedure the various departments and agencies make their case for the appropriations they think they will need to the Bureau of the Budget. The Budget Bureau in turn presents the figures to the President, but no Chief Executive has time for any complete and detailed analysis. If the Budget Bureau eliminates or slashes a department's request, it takes a virtual earthquake to overrule Harold Smith. If, on the other hand, Harold Smith knows you and smiles on your monetary desires, the battle is half won. It evidently did Henry Wallace and Harold Ickes no harm to know Director Smith. Their two departments alone got more than $200,000,000 of the $458,000,000 increase which was made in the general expenses of the Government for fiscal year 1947. This means that these two old Roosevelt boys got almost as much in the way of increases as did all the remaining 50 or 60 other departments and agencies of government who were not on such intimate terms with Harold Smith.

How Wallace and Ickes pulled out the plums

Year	Department of Commerce				Department of the Interior
	Office of the Secretary	Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce	Census	Total	
1938	$1,016,000	$3,127,000	$2,208,000	$39,513,000	$127,000,000
1939	2,135,000	2,750,000	2,065,000	44,710,000	160,000,000
1940	1,292,000	3,079,000	22,100,000	51,408,000	213,000,000
1941	1,233,000	2,184,000	18,140,000	34,524,000	212,000,000
1942	1,483,000	2,268,000	7,060,000	74,809,000	213,000,000
1943	1,584,000	1,853,000	5,311,000	82,091,000	165,000,000
1944	1,388,000	1,853,000	5,442,000	68,592,000	159,000,000
1945	1,600,000	1,520,000	11,250,000	72,500,000	151,000,000
1946 [1]	1,946,000	2,445,000	11,401,000	86,929,000	216,000,000
1947 [1]	7,685,000	11,670,000	33,500,000	163,956,000	363,000,000

[1] 1946 and 1947 figures for Department of the Interior are estimates, other figures for Interior are expenditures. Commerce figures are all estimates.

must lie idle. In this connection there is submitted the first-hand observation in a letter from a good farm woman in Utah:

SNOWVILLE, UTAH, *January 29, 1946.*

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WHITE: In 1938 I married a dry farmer and came to Juniper, Idaho, to live. It is a lovely little valley with the pine-covered Black Pine Mountains to the west and cedar hills to the north and east. I immediately loved the place, and told my husband I would be happy to make my home here. But little did I realize the problems this would make.

There was something strange about this valley. Scattered about among productive farms were other farms being deserted. In answer to my questioning I was told that they were being sold to the Resettlement Administration.

"Why did the previous owners want to sell them?" I asked. It seemed foolish to me because I had seen them harvesting their last crops, which averaged about 20 bushels to the acre. "Weren't they making a good living?"

Then it was explained to me that these people were harvesting the biggest crop they had ever had, probably due to newer types of farm equipment. If they hadn't already sold their farms before this they probably wouldn't have done so at all. Life hadn't been easy for them. No wells—they hadn't drilled deep enough. We have a very good well at 150 feet, and there are others here now. But at that time wells were few and water had to be hauled 5 or 6 miles, not only for human use but for stock as well. No wonder life was discouraging.

I had heard of the Resettlement Administration before this and thought it a good plan. But here it seemed to be misapplied. What the people needed was help in getting wells and the expensive dry-farm machinery rather than removal from their land. Our farms now are averaging 30 bushels to the acre. These idle acres would do as well.

Two years ago we built a $6,000 home here. It was rather foolish, in view of the fact that we have children who will need to attend school. But we still had hopes that, somehow, the community might grow and reassume its school and church activities.

Next fall our little boy will start to school. Others in our community have already reached this milestone. This means renting or buying a home in town—a divided home, family, and business. The nearest town offering a suitable wintertime occupation is 75 miles.

The six or seven families who live here at least half of the time are not sufficient in number to maintain school, church, or social activities, nor to encourage any community projects, such as electrification and telephone system.

So, if you can help us by getting an amendment to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act passed whereby this land might be sold, we would be everlastingly grateful to you.

Respectfully,

ROSALIE B. CAMPBELL.

Practical Farming Versus Technical Farming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO

Wednesday, February 6, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, our departments are loaded up with technical men who try to apply preconceived notions of farming and land use. In carrying out the well-intentioned programs set up by Congress, the Government administrators pay little attention to changing business and financial conditions. When hard times are with us, and the average farm fails to pay, these Government agents proceed on the assumption that depressed financial conditions are permanent and direct their efforts to the conversion of so-called marginal land and the concentration of farmers in the more fertile agricultural areas. Now, when times are good, food is short, and prices are high, good productive land

Impeachment of Federal Judges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HATTON W. SUMNERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1946

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, permission having been granted, I

present for printing in the RECORD a timely, forceful editorial recently appearing in the Washington Post which is self-explanatory. This editorial is followed by excerpts from a report submitted by the majority of the Committee on the Judiciary in support of the bill referred to in this editorial:

[From the Washington Post]

IMPEACHMENT

A curious substitute for impeachment of judges believed to be crooked has been applied by the House Judiciary Committee. By a vote of 12 to 8 the committee adopted a report branding former Federal Judge Albert Johnson, of Pennsylvania, as a "wicked and malicious judge" who is guilty of "high crimes and misdemeanors" in at least 10 cases. The effect of a subcommittee's investigation was to drive Judge Johnson from the bench and induce him to give up all retirement rights. Now the committee's report has utterly discredited him, no doubt with ample justification.

All this has been accomplished, however, without a trial of the man who is reported to have so shamefully betrayed his trust. The committee says that it did not request impeachment because the result would be only to remove the judge from office and he had already resigned. Was not the real reason the fact that the Senate has no time to conduct impeachment trials? We regard the outcome of this case as another emphatic demonstration that the impeachment procedure as a means of dealing with lower court judges accused of wrongdoing is rapidly becoming obsolete.

Obviously the Senate doesn't have time to try such impeachment cases. It cannot drop legislation on urgent national and international issues to sit for days or weeks as a court. That is why the House has tried on two occasions to provide a new arrangement for the trial of Federal district and circuit judges who may be impeached by that body. The impeachment charges would be heard, under this plan, by three judges selected by the Chief Justice of the United States from the circuit courts of appeals, with the right of the accused judge to appeal to the Supreme Court. That arrangement would have the great advantage of affording a fair hearing to accused judges and of relieving the Senate of a burden that it can no longer reasonably bear. The manifest unfairness of condemning judges without trial should induce the House once more to pass the bill in question and give the Senate another chance both to redeem itself and to escape from an unreasonable burden.

TRIAL OF THE ISSUE OF GOOD BEHAVIOR OF CERTAIN FEDERAL JUDGES—CONSTITUTIONALITY

This bill depends for its constitutional warrant not only upon the universally recognized inherent power of Government to protect itself, which power constantly is being exercised in removing civil officers subject to impeachment by other methods, including judicial procedure, but also upon a specific provision of the Constitution, article III, section 1:

"The judges, both of the Supreme and inferior courts, shall hold their offices during good behavior * * *."

This is the definite specific provision that when a judge does not behave himself well he forfeits his right to hold his office. This is a justiciable question which belongs in a court and nowhere else.

It would be helpful in the examination of the constitutionality of the bill if it be held constantly in mind that the provisions of this bill have no connection with or relationship to the provisions of the Constitution with reference to impeachment. It also would be well to have constantly in mind that there is no constitutional provision with reference to the impeachment of a Federal judge as such. If the good-behavior provision above quoted were stricken from the Constitution, that would not affect in the slightest degree either power or procedure, or anything else under the impeachment provision. At no time in the impeachment proceedings of a Federal judge are the Senators sitting as a court of impeachment influenced by, nor do they consider in the least degree, the "good behavior" condition in the judicial tenure clause. The only provision under which a Federal judge may be impeached is found in article II, section 4, of the Constitution:

"All civil officers of the United States shall be removed from office on impeachment for and conviction of treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors."

There is nothing in the Constitution about impeaching a Federal judge, as such. Federal judges are subject to impeachment solely because they are civil officers. Whatever rules of construction apply to other civil officers with reference to their being subject to judicial procedure for their trial and removal, apply equally to Federal judges. If other civil officers subject to impeachment under the provisions of the Constitution may also be removed by court procedure, it follows that those civil officers who happen to be Federal judges may also be removed by court procedure. Federal judges are not distinguished from other civil officers. They are no higher, no lower, no different. They are all in the same impeachment class together.

When we separated from Great Britain, we brought into our Constitution from the British Constitution, which was also ours by virtue of our having been a part of that Government, the provisions of the British Constitution with reference to impeachment, and those with reference to good behavior of Federal judges. At that time, as it is agreed among commentators on the British Constitution, and recognized in practice, the power to remove by impeachment did not exclude the ordinary processes of government, including the institution of ouster proceedings in the court by a writ of fiere faceas. Applicable here is the well-recognized rule of construction that that which has been brought from another jurisdiction comes into the new structure modified by the construction which obtained at the time of its taking, in the jurisdiction from which it came. It is not necessary to rely on that construction, however. With uniformity unexcelled in governmental history from the beginning of procedure by impeachment in the fourteenth century, until the present time, and from the beginning of our independence from Great Britain from whence our impeachment provisions came and which are practically identical with those of Great Britain in both the Federal and States' jurisdictions, it has been the established holding that civil officers removable by impeachment may also be removed by judicial procedure.

In order to hold that impeachment is the only method by which Federal judges may be removed from office, it would be necessary not only to hold against the uniform constructions of centuries that civil officers removable by impeachment also may be removed by judicial procedure, but it would be necessary also, with regard to Federal judges, to hold that the condition in the Constitution that Federal judges shall hold their offices during "good behavior," is dead language in the Constitution. As is universally held, there is no dead language in the Constitution. Most of it, however, requires legislative action to release its vitality. Not only does the same right and power obtain to remove Federal judges by judicial procedure, which obtains with reference to all other civil officers which the courts hold thus removable, but with reference to Federal judges there is also this additional specific condition upon which their right to hold office depends; namely, "good behavior," written into the Constitution, which can be enforceable only by judicial procedure. Senators sitting as a court of impeachment cannot do it. Their entire jurisdiction and power as a court of impeachment is derived from and is held within the boundaries fixed by article II, section 4, of the Constitution, the provision last quoted.

Impeachment originated in England during the fourteenth century. It was not an ordinary procedure of government even then, though the House of Lords, in which the impeachments were filed, was a real court, the highest court of the realm, and impeachment was a real criminal indictment, with the possibility, in the event of conviction, of a judgment of confiscation of property and of death. The most pronounced of its unusual characteristics was the fact that the House of Commons, representing all the people of the Kingdom, was the prosecutor. The reason stated at the time for that procedure was that there were great offenders who, it was claimed, were too powerful to be reached and punished by any other procedure. It also was stated that it was beneath the dignity of the House of Commons to appear in a lesser court than the highest court of the realm.

As the democratic characteristics of the Government of England developed, the powers of government separated themselves into legislative, executive, and judicial branches, functioning each through its own personnel; the House of Lords losing its former judicial characteristics which shifted to the developing judicial branch of the Government, the personnel of which were correspondingly increasing their judicial powers and responsibilities and establishing uniformity and stability in procedure which came to be recognized as being as important to the ends of justice as is substantive law.

By the time of our separation from Great Britain, impeachment had become practically obsolete. During the century before our separation and in the more than century and one-half since our separation, there has not been a dozen impeachment cases in England; probably not more than half a dozen. Impeachment is retained in the law of that country, however, for such occasions and situations as were responsible for its origin; namely, the necessity to proceed against a great offender, beyond the reach of the ordinary processes of government—just as it should be retained in our governmental machinery for use in a similar emergency which would result if it should be deemed necessary in the public interest to attempt, for instance, to remove a President from office for bad conduct, or a Justice of the Supreme Court. It would be very difficult to provide a court as a part of our judicial machinery in which to try an ouster suit against a President. In that situation it would be necessary to proceed in the Senate under the impeachment powers. In such a grave proceeding, Senators would suspend their ordinary duties and given concentrated continuity of attention, practically speaking, not possible in an ordinary impeachment. To attempt to have all the Senators suspend their regular duties as Senators and try to sit as judges in the determination as to whether or not one district judge should be removed from office, has no justification in necessity or common sense, and has no place in the scheme of democratic government. In practice, if this bill is enacted into law and is held constitutional, and it is constitutional, the justiciable issues which arise when a district or circuit court judge is charged with bad conduct probably always would be adjudicated in a court where that adjudication, under the nature of our system of government belongs, leaving the Senators to attend to their senatorial duties and assigning these judicial duties to the judges of the courts.

If enacted, this bill would remove the requirement that the entire personnel of one of the Houses of the legislative branch of the Government suspend its legislative duties,

and assume the duties of the judicial branch of the Government. It would send a citizen charged with grave offenses to the sort of tribunal in which his right to be tried is fixed by the most basic philosophy of our system of government, and approved by experience and would give to the people the same sort of tribunal in which to have adjudicated matters arising out of their complaint of bad behavior on the part of Federal judges exercising jurisdiction over them. Article I, section 8, of the Constitution provides:

"The Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or officer thereof."

Congress owes the duty speedily to enact legislation to relieve the personnel of the Senate, busy as they are with great national and international problems of the country, called upon to give advice to the President with reference to many matters, under necessity to act as intermediary between the people of their States and the various administrative agencies of the Government, burdened with a deluge of correspondence, challenged to exercise the highest type of statesmanship ever required by the circumstances of any people. Enactment of this bill would relieve the Senate of the necessity of having its entire personnel under duty to sit as a court of impeachment, putting aside all their ordinary duties and sit for days and weeks perhaps, listening to testimony with reference to receiverships, private bank accounts, conspiracies, and things of that sort, attempting to determine whether a civil officer who happens to be a Federal judge should be removed from office. These Senators will not and cannot do justice to themselves, to the Nation at large, to the individual being tried, or to the people whose public interest is involved. While the trial is going on the Senators are called here and there by duties they must attend to, going in and out of the trial chamber, mostly out, while testimony is being given upon the weight of which depends issues for the individual as vital as his life, and the right of the people to have the proper sort of Federal judge. If managers on the part of the House should be able to prove against the judge being tried that he had tried cases in his court in the same manner as he is then being tried, there would be no need for additional testimony.

Under conditions which obtain at present, public pressure and public demand are moving the Department of Justice toward the institution of a suit on its own motion filed in a trial court, to oust a Federal judge guilty of flagrant violation of the condition of "good behavior." If and when the Department of Justice feels itself compelled to bring such a suit, the probability is that the court will hold the suit properly brought. When that is done a great, new executive power will have been extended over the Federal judiciary. If that occurs, the responsibility for its happening will belong to the Congress. If the Congress will enact proper legislation now, it can fasten in the law for the protection, security, and independence of the judiciary, the provision requiring a preliminary examination and certification by the House of Representatives before an ouster suit can be instituted, and public opinion will hold it there.

As to the suggestion that a committee of the Senate could take the testimony in the impeachment of a Federal judge, that would not remove the malallocation of governmental power or harmonize its exercise with democratic processes. It would be too much like a jury, after having been sworn to try a case, deputizing a couple of its members to hear the testimony while the rest of the jury went about their ordinary duties.

Three Proposed Amendments to the Case Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, there are printed herewith three proposed amendments to the Case bill:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: Page 6, line 18, add a new subsection to read as follows:

"(g) Section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act as amended to read as follows:

" 'Employees shall have the right to self-organization, to form, join, or assist labor organizations, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in concerted activities, for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection, free from coercion from any source.'

"(h) Section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act is amended by adding two new subsections numbered (6) and (7) to read as follows:

" '(6) It shall be unlawful for any labor organization, officer or representative or member of a labor organization to violate the provisions of, or interfere with the rights granted under section 7, of this act and any such violation shall be deemed to be an unfair labor practice.

" '(7) Any labor organization, any officer, representative of labor, of any labor organization, guilty of an unfair labor practice under subsection (6) of section 8, or of a violation of section 7 of this act, shall, in addition to all other penalties, be deprived of all benefits, privileges, and exemptions under this act.' "

On page 6 of H. R. 5262, after line 18, add new subsection (g), as follows:

"Amend section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act which, in part, reads as follows:

" 'SEC. 8. It shall be an unfair labor practice for an employer', by striking out the words 'SEC. 8. It shall be an unfair labor practice for an employer' and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

" 'SEC. 8. (a) It shall be an unfair labor practice for—

" '(1) Any person to threaten, restrain, or coerce employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 7: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall abridge the freedom of speech or of the press' and also by inserting after subsection 5 of section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act the following subsections:

" '(6) It shall be an unfair labor practice for a labor organization, any member of a labor organization, or any officer or officers of a labor organization, or any agent or agents of a labor organization, or anyone acting in the interest of a labor organization, or for an employee, or for employees acting in concert—

" ' (a) To interfere with, restrain, or coerce employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 7.

" '(b) To resort to or engage in, during the course of any labor dispute and in connection with such dispute, any act or practice which is a violation of any criminal law effective in the jurisdiction in which such act or practice occurs.

" '(c) To interfere by threat, intimidation, or force or threat of force, with the exercise of the right by any employee to continue at his work or to go to or from his place of employment.

" '(d) To strike in violation of a valid contract or agreement.

" '(e) It shall not be considered an unfair labor practice for an employer to discharge or to refuse to reemploy any person who, under the terms of this act, is guilty of an unfair labor practice; nor shall it be considered an unfair labor practice for an employer to refuse to bargain with any organization which or employee who fails to recognize or be bound by the official certificate of collective bargaining representatives issued under section 9 hereof or willfully violates the terms of a collective bargaining contract.

" '(f) It shall not be considered an unfair labor practice for an employer to fail to reach an agreement after it has bargained collectively.' "

Amendment to the Case bill, offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: On page 12, strike out all of section 11 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 11. Violence and intimidation: (a) Whenever any act mentioned in this or any subsequent section shall obstruct or interfere with interstate or foreign commerce—

"(b) It shall be unlawful for any person, alone or acting with another or others, directly or indirectly, by force, coercion, intimidation, or by show or threat of force, or attempt to use force, to force or attempt to force any person to become, be, or remain a member of any labor organization; or, by force coercion, intimidation, or threat of force, or attempt to use force, to force or attempt to force, any person to refrain from engaging in or remaining in employment, or, by force, coercion, intimidation, or by show or threat of force, or attempt to use force, to interfere or attempt to interfere with any employee or other person on his or her way to or from employment, or while seeking employment, which in any way contributes to the production of anything which may become an article of interstate or foreign commerce

"(c) It shall be unlawful for any labor organization or the officers thereof, or for any other organization or the officers thereof, to commit any of the acts herein made unlawful when committed by a person or a group of persons.

"(d) Any individual who violates any of the provisions of this section shall on and after such violation cease to have, and cease to be entitled to, the status of any employee for the purposes of sections 7, 8, and 9 of the National Labor Relations Act, or the status of a representative for the purposes of such act for a period of 6 months.

"(e) Any labor organization or the officer thereof violating or participating in the violation of any of the provisions of subsection (a) of section 11, shall on and after such violation cease to have, and cease to be entitled to, the status of a labor organization for the purposes of the National Labor Relations Act for a period of 1 year."

Amend section 11 by striking out all of section 11 after the word "provisions" in line 2, on page 13, and then insert:

"(b) Any individual who violates any of the provisions of this section shall on and after such violation cease to have, and cease to be entitled to, the status of an employee for the purposes of sections 7, 8, and 9 of the National Labor Relations Act, or the status of a representative for the purposes of such act for not more than 6 months

"(c) Any labor organization or the officer thereof violating or participating in the violation of any of the provisions of subsection (a) of section 11, shall on and after such violation cease to have, and cease to be entitled to, the status of a labor organization for the purposes of the National Labor Relations Act for a period of 1 year."

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: Page 12, beginning with line 14, strike out all of

section 11, down to and including the word "act", in line 17, on page 13, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That it shall be unlawful for employees of any person who is engaged in business as a carrier of property for hire, to attempt, by means of a concerted refusal to transport the property of, or to transport property to, another person—

"(1) to induce or require such other person to recognize, deal with, comply with the demands of, or employ members of, any labor organization; or

"(2) to induce or require employees of such other person to become or remain members of any labor organization;

in any case in which the property to be transported is to be transported in interstate or foreign commerce, or in which such concerted refusal directly affects interstate or foreign commerce.

"SEC. 2. It shall be unlawful, by means of a strike against any person, or by means of a concerted refusal to work on, handle, or otherwise deal with articles or materials belonging to any person, to induce or require, or to attempt to induce or require, another person to recognize, deal with, comply with the demands of, or employ members of, any labor organization, in any case in which such strike or concerted refusal directly affects interstate or foreign commerce.

"SEC. 3. It shall be unlawful for any labor organization, or for any officer of any labor organization, to induce or require, or to attempt to induce or require, any of the members of such organization to perform any act which constitutes a violation of section 1 or 2.

"SEC. 4. Whoever violates any of the provisions of sections 1, 2, or 3—

"(1) shall on and after such violation cease to have, and cease to be entitled to, the status of an employee for the purposes of sections 7, 8, and 9 of the National Labor Relations Act, or the status of a representative for the purposes of such act for not more than 6 months;

"(2) in case such violation is by a labor organization, shall upon conviction thereof cease to have and cease to be entitled to a status of a representative or labor organization under the National Labor Relations Act for a period of not less than 90 days, nor more than 6 months."

Kunkel Bill for Men in the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, from time to time we take note of criticisms either over the radio or in the newspapers of alleged discriminations against men in our armed forces, where officers are favored. Congress ought to do everything it can to remove any cause for that kind of criticism. One source of irritation is the fact that under the law an enlisted man does not get accumulated leave on the same basis as do commissioned officers. In other words, claims have been made from time to time that there is favoritism and that the advantage lies with the officers and against the enlisted men.

To remedy that condition, our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable JOHN C. KUNKEL, has introduced a bill, H. R. 4422, granting to enlisted personnel of the armed forces certain benefits in lieu of their present rights under existing law. The purpose of this legislation is to grant to these soldiers pay for accumulated leave at the rate of their regular pay and allowance, as is now done in the case of officers. There is basis under existing law for the claim that we have a caste system in the Army and such a condition should not exist. The enlisted men are entitled to fair treatment and I earnestly hope that the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives will take favorable action either on the bill introduced by Congressman KUNKEL or on some similar legislation, which will accomplish the same result. This will rectify a mistake that has been permitted to exist entirely too long.

From time to time members of the American Legion call attention to this proposed legislation or other legislation of a similar character, and I am glad to see their activity in behalf of such a change in the law.

Suspension of Argentina From United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a document which every Member of Congress should read and support, for it offers incontrovertible evidence that the Peron regime is following the pattern created by the Nazis and that its purpose is crime against humanity and crime against peace.

It is a memorandum submitted by the Nation Associates to the General Assembly of the United Nations requesting the suspension of Argentina from the Organization "as an enemy of peace and security on the score that it has violated the United Nations Charter and the Chapultepec agreement, is a totalitarian regime patterned after the Nazi model, and is organizing the country for a war of aggression." The authenticity of the charges are vouched for by the characters of the signatories—Freda Kirchwey, president of the Nation Associates and editor of the Nation; and Dr. Frank P. Graham, president of the University of North Carolina, who is the chairman of the advisory council of the organization.

When, on April 4, the Farrell-Peron regime signed the Chapultepec agreement, it was hoped that at long last hemispheric solidarity might be achieved. On the basis of this hope and the belief that in exchange for membership in the victorious United Nations, the Argentine Government would adhere to its pledges, the United States delegation at San Francisco took the initiative in urging and obtaining the admission of Argentina to the United Nations on April 30, 1945.

Nine months have now passed since the San Francisco Conference. During this period Germany has been defeated in Europe, and Japan in the Far East. During this period, too, the Farrell-Peron regime has become an outright totalitarian government, fashioned in the image of Nazi Germany, with Peron the undisputed dictator. Deliberately and brazenly it has violated the agreements of Chapultepec and the United Nations Charter.

The entire country is being mobilized for war; more than 50 percent of the national budget has been allocated to military purposes. Children of both sexes, from the age of 12 on, are subject to military training. Civil liberties have been suppressed. Education has been regimented. The democratic press has been intimidated or destroyed. Freedom of labor has been vanquished, and important labor unions converted into puppet organizations. More recently, the Peron regime, adopting the scapegoat strategy of the Nazis, has made anti-Semitism an integral part of its program. A police gestapo, under the direction of Peron and his satellites, now supplements the army. The concentration camp and the torture chamber have become every-day instruments of internal control.

Following the pattern of his Nazi masters, Peron is now planning to obtain so-called legal sanction for his totalitarian rule by a presidential election scheduled to be held on February 24, 1946. The outcome of this election can be forecast today. The democratic parties are making a courageous and united stand against Peron's candidacy; but the Government controls the police, the military, and the electoral machinery.

At Nuremberg an Allied military tribunal is conducting the trial as war criminals of leaders of the Nazi Party and their military satellites. Read the indictment of Judge Robert H. Jackson and you will see how, step by step, Peron is following the pattern of crimes which led to World War II.

There is no reason whatsoever to believe that any possible change will occur in the character of the regime. The man who seeks the office of President has openly proclaimed his belief in war "as an inevitable social phenomenon to which all other activities must be subordinated, not simply by the armed forces of the nation but through the subordination of all governments, private institutions and the entire people."

Peron is the man who announced boldly, 4 months after his admission to the United Nations: "I have no fear of civil war. On the contrary, I am prepared for it. I have at my disposal 300,000 soldiers and 4,000,000 workers armed with clubs."

Peron is the man who is responsible for the fact that while thousands of Argentinians are in prison for the sole crime of favoring freedom, Axis agents, schools, and businesses fluorish unchallenged. Fifty percent of German firms in Argentina are still doing business as usual at the same stands. Ricardo Staudt, Ludwig Freude, Fritz Mandl, all Nazi agents, enjoy the personal protection of Peron who has bestowed upon them some of the richest Government

contracts since his admission to the UNO.

Peron is the man who is permitting 191 of the 200 German schools in the country, and 15 of the 16 Japanese schools in the country, to continue. Peron is the man who operates with a Himmler-trained gestapo, 30,000 of whom are to be found in the city of Buenos Aires alone.

What is the United States waiting for? Mr. Braden, the Assistant Secretary of State, whom we called to office as an expert on Latin-American affairs, warns us that this is a Nazi regime. Dean Acheson, the Acting Secretary of State, tells us that the United States will not conclude a military treaty with that regime. Secretary of State Byrnes assures us that the United States approves the Uruguayan proposal for multilateral action against a country which has violated its agreements and destroyed basic human rights.

When will we give reality to our lip service to principles? What is proposed here is an act of self-protection. In this atomic age, a new war would mean the destruction of civilization. There is every reason, therefore, for the American delegation to support, if it does not initiate, a proposal to banish the representatives of Peron from the UNO as an enemy regime.

Once this action is taken it will be possible to isolate Peron and pave the way for a return of democracy in Argentina, as we have in other satellites of the Axis. If we do this, we will not have the travesty of our State Department denouncing the Peron regime as Nazi, the President of the United States urging Peron to send more wheat to the victims of nazism. We will not have the bitter jest of Peron's representatives offering to join the UNRRA and to pay their share of maintaining Hitler's victims. It is time that our foreign policy assumed reality. There is still time to stop a new appeasement. If we want to protect ourselves and the world, we must move immediately against Peron.

A REQUEST FOR THE SUSPENSION OF ARGENTINA FROM THE UNITED NATIONS—MEMORANDUM SUBMITTED TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS BY THE NATION ASSOCIATES, JANUARY 1946

INTRODUCTION

On March 27, 1945, the Farrell-Peron regime of Argentina declared war on Japan and Germany.

On April 4, 1945, it signed the Act of Chapultepec incorporating the agreements of the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace.

Thus it fulfilled two conditions precedent to its admission to the United Nations Conference at San Francisco.

The first condition was laid down by the inviting powers; the second by the Inter-American Conference on the Problems of War and Peace which met early in March in Mexico.

On April 30, 1945, acting on the initiative of the American delegation and backed unanimously by the Latin-American Republics, the San Francisco Conference voted to seat Argentina.

On September 8, 1945, the Farrell-Peron regime formally ratified the United Nations Charter.

On October 24, 1945, the United Nations Organization came into formal existence after all 51 member nations had signed and filed their ratifications.

THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

The preamble of the Charter sets forth the principles which are to guide the United Nations Organization in its functioning, as follows:

"We, the peoples of the United Nations,

"Determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind; and

"To reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small; and

"To establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained; and

"To promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom; and for these ends

"To practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors; and

"To unite our strength to maintain international peace and security; and

"To insure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest; and

"To employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples, have resolved to combine our efforts to accomplish these aims.

"Accordingly, our respective governments, through representatives assembled in the city of San Francisco, who have exhibited their full powers found to be in good and due form, have agreed to the present Charter of the United Nations and do hereby establish an international organization to be known as the United Nations."

Chapter I, article 1 of the Charter establishes the fundamental purposes of the United Nations as follows:

(1) To maintain international peace and security.

(2) To develop free relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples.

(3) To achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

THE ACT OF CHAPULTEPEC

Implicit recognition of the agreements of Chapultepec is given in article 52 of the United Nations Charter sanctioning:

"The existence of regional arrangements or agencies dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action provided that such arrangements and agencies and their activities are consistent with the purpose and principles of the United Nations."

A. In the agreements reached at Chapultepec, the American states—

(1) Reiterate and fervently adhere to the democratic principles which they consider essential for the peace of America.

(2) Declare that "the purpose of the state is the happiness of man in society; the interests of the community should be harmonized with the rights of the individual; the American man cannot conceive of living without justice just as he cannot conceive of living without liberty."

(3) Proclaim "the adherence of the American Republics to the principles established by international law for safeguarding the essential rights of man and declare their support of a system of international protection of these rights."

B. The American Republics further declared their firm purpose to collaborate for the attainment of:

"A constructive basis for the sound economic development of the Americas through the development of natural resources, industrialization, improvement of transportation, and the improvement of labor standards and working conditions, including collective bargaining, all leading to a rising level of living and increased consumption."

Further, they resolved "to consider of international public interest the enacting by all the American Republics of social legislation that will protect the working class and that will embody guaranties as well as rights on a scale not inferior to the one recommended by the International Labor Office."

C. The Chapultepec agreement further undertook:

(1) To recommend to the governments of the American Republics the most careful delegation from the official textbooks used in their schools of everything which might tend to jeopardize the inter-American system.

(2) To recommend to the Governments of the American Republics that they exercise the greatest vigilance to see that the teachings in their schools are based on the principles of freedom, peace, justice and equality that are found in the bases of the inter-American system.

(3) To recommend to the governments of the American Republics the deletion from official textbooks used in their schools of everything which sustains directly or indirectly racial or totalitarian theories or which might therefore be susceptible of compromising the friendly relations between the states of the continent.

D. The Charter of Chapultepec recommended:

(1) That the American Republics recognize their essential obligation to guarantee to their people free and impartial access to sources of information.

(2) That having this guaranty in view, they undertake upon the conclusion of the war the earliest possible abandonment of those measures of censorship * * * which have been necessary in wartime. * * *

(3) That the governments of the American Republics take measures, individually and in cooperation with one another, to promote a free exchange of information among their peoples.

(4) That the American Republics * * * make every effort to the end that when a juridical order in the world is assured, there may be established the principle of free transmission and reception of information, oral or written, published in books or by the press, broadcast by radio or disseminated by any other means, under proper responsibility and without need of previous censorship, as is the case with private correspondence * * * in time of peace.

E. At Chapultepec it was also resolved:

(1) To reaffirm the principle, recognized by all the American states, of equality of rights and opportunities for all men, regardless of race or religion.

(2) To recommend that the governments of the American Republics, without jeopardizing freedom of expression, either oral or written, make every effort to prevent in their respective countries all acts which may provoke discrimination among individuals because of race or religion.

F. The parties to the Act of Chapultepec further agreed:

(1) To recommend that the governments of the American Republics do not give refuge to individuals guilty of or responsible for or accomplices in the commission of such (war) crimes.

(2) To recommend that the governments shall upon the demand of any of the United Nations * * * surrender individuals charged with the commission of such crimes

to the United Nations making the request. * * *

(3) To reaffirm the determination * * * to prevent individuals or groups within their respective jurisdictions from engaging in any activities fomented by the Axis Powers or their satellites for the purpose of prejudicing the individual or collective security and welfare of the American Republics:

(a) To intensify efforts to eradicate the remaining centers of Axis subversive influence in the hemisphere. * * *

(b) To take effective measures to prevent Axis-inspired elements from regaining or securing any vantage points within the territory subject to their respective jurisdictions from which such elements might disturb or threaten the security or welfare of any republic.

(4) They resolved that measures be undertaken "to uncover, disclose, immobilize, and to prevent the concealment or transfer of property and rights located within the American Republics * * * which * * * whether or not in name belong to or are controlled by or for the benefit of Germany or Japan or individuals or entities within those countries."

These agreements, only 10 months old, have been and are being violated in principle and practice by the Peron regime.

As a result, international peace and security are in gravest jeopardy.

A PROPOSAL FOR ACTION BY THE UNITED NATIONS

The first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations is now in progress in London. Its purpose is to establish the machinery and initiate the acts through which the principles of the United Nations Charter may be implemented.

Article I of the Charter provides that the initial function of the United Nations "is to maintain international peace and security."

In the interests of international peace and security, we propose that the General Assembly initiate action to suspend Argentina from membership in the United Nations Organization.

This action is proposed on the score that:

(1) The present regime in the Argentine is a totalitarian government which has persistently and deliberately violated all obligations assumed under the United Nations Charter and the Chapultepec Agreement.

(2) That its purpose is aggression.

When the representatives of the Peron-Farrell regime were admitted to the United Nations Conference at San Francisco in April 1945 no one was under any illusion about the character of the regime. It was known to be a military dictatorship, totalitarian in form and method. It was known that many Axis agents and much Axis wealth were finding a haven in Argentina.

The military dictatorship which Colonel Peron controls made its first bid for power when the government of President Castillo was overthrown by a military coup in June 1943.

In February 1944, 1 month after the government of General Ramirez had announced a break of relations with Germany and Japan in accordance with the Rio de Janeiro Agreement of 1942, power was seized by Gen. Edelmiro J. Farrell and Col. Juan D. Peron. According to a Bulletin of the United States State Department issued on July 26, 1944, extremist pro-Axis elements forced the change in government. The Farrell-Peron regime refused to implement the break with the Axis. Instead, Axis agents and spies arrested by the Ramirez regime were released and affirmative assistance was given to Axis business concerns both through large Government contracts and through the requisitioning of critical materials from firms friendly to the democratic cause.

Pro-Axis newspapers enjoyed official support and assistance in obtaining newsprint, and carried on a bitter propaganda campaign against the United Nations and in behalf of the Axis.

These charges are made officially by the State Department of the United States. As a result of Argentina's acts the United States and all the Latin-American Republics withdrew diplomatic recognition from the Farrell-Peron regime in 1944.

On January 11, 1945, another State Department Bulletin declared:

"Argentina is being used as a base for intensive Axis subversive activities directed against the American continent and the United Nations. * * * Axis diplomatic officials were flagrantly abusing the principles between civilized nations. * * * These diplomats had organized and were directing, financing, and coordinating the activities of different groups or cells of agents, and it was also shown that diplomatic channels were being used for the transmission of information to the high command in Berlin."

Although Argentina was not present at the Chapultepec Conference, every effort was made to secure its subsequent agreement to the proposals accepted there. When on March 27, Argentina finally grudgingly declared war, it was notable that the declaration was made first against Japan, and second against Nazi Germany, on the score that Germany was an ally of Japan.

When, on April 4, the Farrell-Peron regime signed the Chapultepec Agreement, it was hoped that at long last hemispheric solidarity might be achieved. On the basis of this hope and in the belief that in exchange for membership in the victorious United Nations, the Argentine Government would adhere to its pledges, the United States delegation at San Francisco took the initiative in urging and obtaining the admission of Argentina to the United Nations on April 30, 1945.

Nine months have now passed since the San Francisco Conference. During this period Germany has been defeated in Europe, and Japan in the Far East. During this period, too, the Farrell-Peron regime has become an outright totalitarian government, fashioned in the image of Nazi Germany, with Peron the undisputed dictator. Deliberately and brazenly it has violated the agreements of Chapultepec and the United Nations Charter.

The entire country is being mobilized for war; more than 50 percent of the national budget has been allocated to military purposes.

Children of both sexes, from the age of 12 on, are subject to military training.

Civil liberties have been suppressed.

Education has been regimented.

The democratic press has been intimidated or destroyed.

Freedom of labor has been vanquished and important labor unions converted into puppet organizations.

More recently, the Peron regime, adopting the scapegoat strategy of the Nazis, has made anti-Semitism an integral part of its program.

A police gestapo, under the direction of Peron and his satellites, now supplements the army. The concentration camp and the torture chamber have become everyday instruments of internal control.

While the population of the Argentine is suffering cruel oppression and the denial of fundamental freedoms, important Nazi agents continue to find protection and Axis business and Axis schools flourish.

Following the pattern of his Nazi masters, Peron is now planning to obtain so-called legal sanction for his totalitarian rule by a presidential election scheduled to be held on February 24, 1946. The outcome of this election can be forecast today. The democratic parties are making a courageous and united stand against Peron's candidacy; but the Government controls the police, the military, and the electoral machinery.

PERON FOLLOWS THE NAZI PATTERN

At Nuremberg an Allied military tribunal is conducting the trial as war criminals of leaders of the Nazi Party and their military satellites. The principal charges against them are crimes against humanity and crimes against the peace. The indictment presented by Presiding Judge Robert H. Jackson emphasizes that the first act of the Nazi Party was to acquire totalitarian control of Germany in order to carry out its objectives.

The indictment charges that—

"(1) The Nazis set out to undermine and capture the German Government by legal forms supported by terrorism. Their terroristic arm was the storm-troop organization.

"(2) In order to make their rule secure from attack and to instill fear in the hearts of the German people, the Nazi conspirators established an extended system of terror against opponents and supposed or suspected opponents of the regime. They imprisoned such persons without judicial process, holding them in protective custody in concentration camps and subjected them to persecution, degradation, despoilment, imprisonment, torture, and murder.

"(3) The destroyed the free trade-unions in Germany by confiscating their funds and properties, persecuting their leaders, prohibiting their activities, and supplanting them by an affiliated party organization.

"(4) Annihilation of the Jews became an official state policy carried out by official action and by incitement to mob and individual violence.

"(5) In order to make the German people amenable to their will, and to prepare them psychologically for war, the Nazi conspirators reshaped the educational system and particularly the education and training of the German youth * * * imposed a supervision of all cultural activities, controlled the dissemination of information and the expression of opinion within Germany.

"(6) They directed Germany's economy toward preparation and equipment of the military machine * * * embarked upon a huge rearmament program and set out to produce and develop huge quantities of materials of war and to create a powerful military potential."

In the following pages we present evidence of the extent to which the Peron regime, following the Nazi model cited above, has already succeeded in its totalitarian aims and in its preparations for war.

PREPARATIONS FOR WAR

The philosophical basis for the war policy of the Peron government was set forth in June 1944, by Colonel Peron himself, in a speech at La Plata University in which he stated that "war is an inevitable social phenomenon," and that "all other activities must be subordinated to the purpose of national defense. Not simply by the armed forces of the nation, but through the subordination of all Government departments, private institutions, and the entire people." He continued:

"Throughout the ages there have lived philosophers (and I will not hesitate to call them Utopians), who have stated that it is possible to avoid war. Always within a short space of time some new conflagration has broken out to disprove this theory. * * *

"The concept of 'the nation in arms' or 'total war' which was expounded by Marshal Von der Goltz in 1883, is in a certain sense the most modern theory of national defense by which nations direct in time of peace as in time of war every living force within the state in order to attain a political objective. * * *

"It is essential that all the intellectuals of our nation, whatever may be their particular field, should study and understand war, realizing it to be the only means of solving a situation we may be called upon

to face, should God one day decide that war must reach our borders. * * *

"If diplomacy is unable to procure the desired political objectives then it is imperative to be prepared to do so by force, whenever the situation compels the use of such extreme methods. * * *

"Domestic policy is of the greatest importance in the preparation of a country for war. Its role is simple and obvious but difficult to achieve. The maximum number possible of healthy young men of high moral standing and imbued with great love of the fatherland must be incorporated into the armed forces. This will act as a focal point from which all the armed forces will become infected with the same high standards and will readily develop a true spirit of war and sacrifice. * * *

"The following is a summary of the points I have made in my speech:

"1. War is an inevitable social phenomenon.

"2. All so-called peaceful nations (and among them our own), if they desire peace must prepare themselves for war.

"3. The problem of national defense of the fatherland is one to which all activities must be subordinated. National defense cannot be improvised at the moment that war is at our door, but requires many years of constant and conscientious preparation. It cannot be regarded as a problem for the armed forces only, but must be established through the harmonious integrated work of the different Government agencies, private institutions, and all the people of Argentina, whatever may be their particular sphere of work. National defense gives rise to such enormous problems requiring profound professional knowledge that no single person can be absolved from taking part. Finally, whatever demands it may make on us represent contributions to the glory of our Nation and the happiness of our people."

In line with this position, on November 7, 1944, a new organic law of the army was announced compelling all Argentine citizens to prepare for the defense of their country. While conscription for active military duty applies only to males, girls and women are to be prepared for service to the army in various women's auxiliary corps. Military training for men falls into three periods—preconscription, conscription, and postconscription. Preconscription begins at the age of 12 and continues until the age of 20 when conscription starts for a maximum of 2 years. Upon their discharge, all males are subject to postconscription until the age of 50.

During the year 1945, the military budget of the Argentine Government was five times as great as that of 1942, the year before the Peron-Farrell revolution. Since the declaration of war against the Axis, in April 1945, a month before the cessation of hostilities in Europe, was purely symbolical, no legitimate justification for this huge increase in military expenditures can be offered. For the year 1946, presumably a year of peace, the Peron regime has passed appropriations for military expenditures approximating 50 percent of its entire budget. This at a time when the national deficit is mounting and many other department budgets have been cut, notably the National Board of Education.

As a supplementary arm, a nation-wide secret service and police force of over 30,000 has been established in the past year, parallel in its functions with the gestapo and the storm troops in Nazi Germany.

The neighboring Republics of Chile and Uruguay live in constant fear of acts of aggression. Paraguay and Bolivia are already under the domination of Argentina.

"The size of the standing army has been increased, and military construction along Argentina's frontiers with Chile, Brazil, Bolivia, Paraguay, and Uruguay is greater than ever before. New barracks have been built in frontier areas, most of them by German companies which were on the Allied blacklist because of Nazi connections," according to Joseph Newman in the New York Herald Tribune on January 10, 1946.

On January 29, 1945, Mr. Gabriel Gonzalos, Chilian Ambassador to Brazil, charged the Peron regime with having as its principal objective a war on the continent and warned that Chile would be its first victim.

In October of 1945, Dr. Juan Antonia Rios, President of Chile, during a visit to New York, corroborated the fears of the threat against Chile.

The Government of the United States is presumed to have in its possession information concerning shipments of arms by the Peron regime into neighboring Republics to provoke revolutions for the establishment of regimes favorable to the present Argentine Government.

Indicating knowledge of the aggressive intentions of the Peron regime, Dean Acheson, as Acting Secretary of State of the United States, on October 4, 1945, announced: "In view of recent developments in Argentina, the United States Government does not feel that it can properly negotiate or sign with the present Argentine regime a treaty of military assistance."

That this is still the attitude of the United States Government was confirmed by Acting Secretary of State Acheson in a public statement on January 11, 1946.

THE TOTALITARIAN CHARACTER OF THE REGIME AND ITS METHODS OF TERROR

As far back as July 26, 1944, the State Department of the United States publicly characterized the Farrell-Peron regime as totalitarian. In a Bulletin issued that day, the State Department declared, "The dominant power in Argentina was and continues to be in the hands of pro-Axis elements determined to impose their desires. Furthermore, it is signicant that these same elements control the most important ministries and agencies of the National Government, as well as the governments of the Provinces, and have rapidly and energetically implanted a dominant totalitarian system that fully complements and supports their pro-Axis foreign policy through control of the press, the courts, and other key institutions. The basic civil rights have been either nullified or so modified as to have no real meaning. Every effort was made to stamp out democratic opposition to the Government's totalitarian program."

The seizure of power by Peron on October 18, 1945, served only to advance the development of the totalitarian system in the Argentine. How a program of repression and intimidation has been carried out in torture chambers by methods borrowed from the Nazis and applied by a gestapo trained by leading operatives of Himmler, was described by John White, one of the most informed writers on Latin America, in an article appearing in the Nation of March 3, 1945.

Declaring that the gestapo's barbaric use of torture had been transplanted to the Western Hemisphere, Mr. White charged that soon after the Farrell-Peron regime came into power, gestapo agents from Germany expanded a city detective bureau in Buenos Aires into a great national organization specializing in persecution and torture. "This organization," he said, "has set up concentration camps for political prisoners similar to those in Nazi Germany, tortured thousands of victims guilty of nothing more serious than belonging to labor unions or democratic political parties, killed or caused the death of hundreds of people bearing Jewish, Polish, or Russian names, and caused the disappearance of other hundreds."

In describing the techniques used, he said that diplomatic agents of United Nations governments had sent information corroborating the use of these techniques to their home governments:

"The electric spur is the favorite instrument of the new school of native sadists who have been trained by gestapo experts. It is a simple electric cable with several fine steel needles at the end. These electric needles are applied to the most sensitive parts of the naked body, such as the eyelids, the sexual organs, and the rectum. The torture usually is applied at two or more parts of the body simultaneously and has such terrific effect on the entire nervous system that it frequently produces insanity. In less extreme cases it paralyzes the muscles and causes great painful swellings and deep sores. It is persistently reported that at least 5,000 people in Argentina have been tortured with the electric spur.

"A simpler but equally effective method is to jab long hatpins through the testicles. Another frequent treatment subjects political prisoners, women as well as men, to a third degree in which their naked bodies are burned with lighted cigarettes in an effort to force them to answer questions the way the political police want them answered.

"The cup is a device in the form of a funnel which is pressed against the body and from which the air is then pumped out. The resulting vacuum causes a huge swelling inside the cup and draws the blood to the surface, leaving a large black-and-blue sore. This device is used on prisoners known to be suffering from heart ailments. When applied in the region of the heart it aggravates the affection and often causes death from heart failure.

"The bucket is a huge vat filled with urine and excremen The prisoner who is given this treatment is hung by his feet from the ceiling and then lowered until his head is submerged in the contents of the vat. This particular technique has the attraction of producing two forms of torture at the same time—semidrowning in filth, and congestion of the brain from the downward flow of the blood.

"One form of torture makes use of a familiar office appliance. In many European and South American countries letters, contracts, and other business documents are written in copying ink and preserved in duplicate by being put between the pages of a copybook which is then squeezed between iron plates. The Argentine political police have found this office press a convenient method of smashing the fingers of prisoners who refuse to sign certain declarations.

"The slab is a torture machine made of two huge sheets of steel. The victim is placed between the sheets, which are pressed together gradually until he suffers internal hemorrhages and vomits blood.

"The whip and the rod have been seen in the movies. The long leather whip is usually dipped in water before the lashes are applied; the rod is made of fine steel bars that cut into the flesh like knives.

"Professional boxers are employed to beat up certain prisoners since they know how to produce the desired effect without leaving telltale wounds.

"One highly refined form of mental torture drives the prisoner almost to the point of insanity without actually causing any physical hurt. The victim usually is awakened at 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning and told that he is to be executed by a firing squad. He is then taken for a ride in an automobile, accompanied by two or three guards armed with rifles and obviously members of the firing squad. Finally he is stood against a wall and the firing squad is lined up, but at the last minute he is reprieved and taken back to his cell. (This is one of several techniques which are reported to have been used on the Bolivian tin-mine owner, Maurice Hochschild, after he was kidnaped by members of the young army officers' lodge in La Paz last year.)

"Sometimes as a variation a prisoner who is to be released is taken for a ride in an automobile, accompanied by armed guards.

When the automobile gets to a deserted region outside the city, the prisoner is told that he is at liberty. Being familiar with the famous ley de fuga by which prisoners are shot while supposedly trying to escape, he stands there afraid to move and under mental torture that may induce insanity.

"La razzia is an importation from the Sicilian Black Hand societies and is used for intimidating the opposition, especially the working classes. Gangs of armed thugs terrorize entire neighborhoods by breaking into and wrecking houses and by storming meetings of associations and trade-unions, beating up those present and destroying the furniture and fixtures on the pretext that the meeting is plotting against the Government. Schools, libraries, and newspaper offices have been raided frequently, and on two occasions movie theaters in Buenos Aires were stormed while crowded with people.

"Even when they are not tortured, political prisoners are demoralized and intimidated by being subjected to what is popularly known as el mal trato. Women of the working classes, especially wives and daughters who have refused to testify against their husbands and fathers, are put into cells with prostitutes and women criminals. They are not permitted visits from their families or from a lawyer; nor can they receive decent food from outside the jail.

"The mal trato is applied to men prisoners in even worse form. If they are ill they usually are sent to regions where it is certain that their illness will get worse. They are given very poor food or deprived for entire days of anything to eat or drink. They receive no medical attention and may be put into cells with criminals of the lowest order.

"So many lawyers have been punished for defending political prisoners in Argentina that it is practically impossible now for prisoners to find lawyers, except the ones who occasionally are assigned as 'defense lawyers' by the Government."

There is every reason to believe that the system of torture and intimidation has been extended by Peron himself.

SUPPRESSION OF CIVIL LIBERTIES

In the agreements reached at Chapultepec the American states—

1. Reiterate and fervently adhere to the democratic principles which they consider essential for the peace of America.

2. Declare that "the purpose of the state is the happinesse of man in society; the interests of the community should be harmonized with the rights of the individual; the American man cannot conceive of living without justice just as he cannot conceive of living without liberty."

3. Proclaim "the adherence of the American republics to the principles established by international law for safeguarding the essential rights of man and declare their support of a system of international protection of these rights."

In possession of the military, backed by a police gestapo and a civilian army of bureaucrats, the Peron regime, since its admission to the United Nations Conference, has proceeded systematically to destroy the rights of its own citizens, in defiance of elementary principles of human decency and in violation of its commitments under the Chapultepec agreement and in the United Nations Charter.

On May 3, 1945, police deliberately charged and opened fire on unarmed citizens celebrating the fall of Berlin.

On August 15, 1945, similar assaults were committed by the police on persons celebrating the Japanese surrender.

On August 16, crowds of soldiers, commanded by noncommissioned officers, terrorized the center of the city, killed two citizens and wounded many others. They laid siege to the building of the prodemocratic paper, Critica, which they attempted to set on fire. Cheering Hitler, Mussolini, and Peron, and shouting "death to the Jews," soldiers were permitted to commit their outrages without any interference from the police. According to Dr. Alberto M. Candioti, former Argentine Ambassador to Mexico, the rioting soldiers told him that they were obeying superior orders.

On August 18, Colonel Peron announced that civil war was the only solution to the situation existing in the Argentine. In an interview with Dr. Pedro Cue, director of the Cuban Daily El Mundo, Peron declared: "I do not fear civil war because I am prepared for it. I have at my disposal 300,000 soldiers and 4,000,000 workers armed with clubs."

On September 27, 1945, wholesale arrests of prominent citizens guilty only of signing declarations in favor of freedom, took place. Among them were editors of liberal papers, political leaders opposed to the Peron regime, and ordinary citizens who had expressed a belief in democracy. Peron himself went to the Buenos Aires jail to look over the prisoners. Included among those arrested were three of the six rectors of Argentina's national universities.

On October 7, the police charged a crowd near a cemetery paying homage to a 19-year-old student killed in a clash between university students and supporters of Peron. In a wholesale lockup 1,594 students were arrested, including 149 girls. The University of Buenos Aires was closed, its president and executive officers dismissed. Six professors were also taken into custody.

On October 21, 1945, Arnaldo Cortesi, writing in the New York Times, declared:

"Argentina again is witnessing the shameful spectacle of citizens being obliged to find protection against their own Government in foreign embassies. The Peruvian Embassy, for instance, has taken in several persons, including former Federal Judge Ramon S. Vasquez who filed a complaint in court against the police for having tortured political prisoners. In the Uruguayan Embassy, along with others, are former Foreign Minister Jose Maria Cantilo and the family of Rear Adm. Leonardo MacLean. * * * Several newspapers were attacked in various parts of Argentina, as were also some private homes, such as that of Dr. Alfredo Calcagno, rector of La Plata University. In some industrial districts of Avellaneda anyone who appeared in the streets wearing a tie was subject to assault. In Cordoba the offices of the Argentine North American Cultural Institute were stoned while police looked on without interfering. * * *"

On December 9, a mass meeting of the Democratic Union (a coalition of four political parties including the Radicals, Socialists, and Communists, opposing Peron in the coming elections), comprising between 150,000 and 200,000 persons, assembled to hear speakers urge the defeat of Peron in the presidential election, was fired upon. Two persons were killed and 60 seriously injured. The shooting, according to the New York Herald Tribune of that date, was supposedly intended to stampede the throng and break up the meeting.

On December 19, Norah Pines reported in the New York Post:

"Supporters of Colonel Peron were urged to release a wave of terrorism to insure his election, and if he lost to put the country on fire, in a speech by Dr. Federico Cantoni, political boss of San Juan Province and one of Peron's top advisers. Dr. Cantoni threatened that should Peron lose the election, 'we will paralyze the country with one strike after another as long as it is necessary to impose our will.'"

The extent to which the elementary rights of man have been subverted in the Argentine was described by Spruille Braden on August 29 in his farewell speech in Buenos Aires prior to his return to the United States. He declared:

"One by one there appear all the elements used by fascism in its stupid stratagems since the day of the so-called march on Rome. Subversion and disorder, organized by the Government itself and using paid assassins under an honorable disguise; utilization of coercion by the state, not to suppress but to protect subversion; bragging by the coward who attacks those he believed fallen, but humbles himself before the powerful; calculated and underhanded use of violent methods; cunning maneuvering showing false respect for established norms and launching its attack while hiding its origin; violation of the law of hospitality which forbids any treacherous attack on him who is sheltered under the same roof; practice of the so-called 'tactics of confusion' * * * use of intimidation and threats against the precise persons whom that Government was under obligation to protect and respect."

On October 27, after his appointment as Assistant Secretary of State in charge of Latin-American affairs, Mr. Braden said: "The Argentine regime is just as Fascist as any which existed in Germany and Japan." And the following day, he amplified that statement by declaring:

"The state of siege recently imposed on Argentina by Peron is the negation of that very bill of rights for the preservation of which we have fought this and other wars. In more concrete terms, a state of siege permits swaggering officers to beat any peaceful citizen because he refuses to hail the leader. It permits a hoodlum with brass knuckles to strike the face of a young girl because she cries 'long live democracy.' It permits arrests without charge; it permits torture, saber-wielding, mounted police to ride down men, women, and children."

In the city of Buenos Aires, with a normal police force of 8,000 to 9,000, the police force is now composed of more than 30,000 officers, who, according to Police Commissioner Velazco, "would rather charge a crowd than eat." Campo de Mayo, once Argentina's most powerful garrison, with a peak force of 27,000 men, has been reduced to a complement of 6,000 or less, while the security authority has been turned over to Velazco. This, according to a report in the Inter-American Monthly of January 1946.

Another army of supporters of the Peron regime is the civil-service bureaucracy, which in the 3 years since the dictatorship was established, has been increased 50 percent from 172,000 to 250,000, with the number of employees rising sharply. This means that more and more employees are dependent for their livelihood or those who control the state. The increase in civilian employees has been matched by wholesale dismissals of Government employees who do not sympathize with Peron's regime, according to a report in the New York Herald Tribune on December 29, 1945.

REGIMENTATION OF EDUCATION

The signatories to the Chapultepec Act agreed:

1. To recommend to the governments of the American Republics the most careful deletion from the official textbooks used in their schools of everything which might tend to jeopardize the inter-American system.

2. To recommend to the governments of the American Republics that they exercise the greatest vigilance to see that the teachings in their schools are based on the principles of freedom, peace, justice, and equality that are found in the bases of the inter-American system.

3. To recommend to the governments of the American Republics the deletion from official textbooks used in their schools of everything which sustains directly or indirectly racial or totalitarian theories or which might therefore be susceptible of compromising the friendly relations between the states of the continent.

The regimentation of the education of the Argentinian population is part of the program of the Peron regime.

In the primary schools of the country children are taught to copy and discuss the following phrases in accordance with a ruling of the Ministry of Justice and Public Instruction, from the text of which we quote in part:

"Women to procreate heroes—not mothers of renegades.

"Argentine woman must fulfill faithfully her natural obligations.

"New Argentine needs women strong, healthy, and clear.

"The fatherland is always right.

"To be worthy of our traditions, we must live arrogantly.

"We are a liberating nation and therefore have the right to carry out corrections in Latin America.

"To be an Argentine does not mean pacifism, speculation, or anything literary; it means one must be dynamic."

The extent to which the Peron regime has attempted to regiment the higher institutions of education can be judged by the fact that on September 29, 1945, all six national universities decided to suspend their activities as a protest against the unprecedented wave of oppression.

On October 5, this act of defiance was countered by the police who stormed and took by force the University of La Plata, imprisoning 315 unarmed students. Following this act, the Government prepared a decree dismissing all university presidents and replacing them by so-called Government intervenors.

On October 8, according to the New York Times, the police themselves reported that some 2,100 students were being held in jail. According to this report five or six rectors of the universities, many deans of faculties, and dozens of university professors had passed some time in jail during the previous two weeks.

On December 5, the New York Herald Tribune reported that students of the University of Buenos Aires refused to take their annual examinations as a protest against the Peron regime. The only students reporting for the examinations were a handful belonging to the antidemocratic nationalist faction.

While regimenting its own educational system, the Argentine regime has permitted to continue unmolested a system of Japanese and German schools. All but 9 of the 200 German schools and all but 1 of the 16 Japanese schools continue to function. As a token of its adherence to the Act of Chapultepec, the Government has dismissed 27 foreign teachers.

SUPPRESSION OF FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

The Charter of Chapultepec recommended:

1. That the American Republics recognize their essential obligation to guarantee to their people free and impartial access to sources of information.

2. That having this guaranty in view they undertake upon the conclusion of the war the earliest possible abandonment of those measures of censorship * * * which have been necessary in wartime.

3. That the governments of the American Republics take measures, individually and in cooperation with one another, to promote a free exchange of information among their peoples.

4. That the American Republics * * * make every effort to the end that when a juridical order in the world is assured, there may be established the principle of free transmission and reception of information, oral or written, published in books, or by the press, broadcast by radio or disseminated by any other means, under proper responsibility and without need of previous censorship, as is the case with private correspondence * * * in time of peace.

* * * * *

The Peron regime has imposed direct and indirect censorship upon the democratic press of the country. It has arrested editors and arbitrarily suspended the publication of opposition papers. It has harried foreign correspondents.

Police maintain a strict supervision to make certain that nothing in opposition to the Peron regime is published.

For their refusal to obey orders, hundreds of provincial papers throughout the country have been suspended and their editors jailed.

In addition to silencing published opposition the Peron representatives function actively to insure that every statement by the Government is published.

Typical of the brutality and intentions of the Peron regime is the fashion by which it acquired the support of Critica, prodemocratic evening newspaper with a circulation of between 200,000 and 250,000. On October 18, 1945, 5,000 armed supporters of Peron, accompanied by 100 policemen and supported by four armored cars, attacked the paper. The assailants poured lead into the Critica, according to the New York Herald Tribune, for 2 hours. The police then took over, arrested 66 employees, and closed the paper. A week later Critica was permitted to resume publication, but was told "either cooperate or be destroyed."

Raul Damonte Taborda, publisher of Critica, was dismissed through a legal action and the operation of the newspaper turned over to an official interventor after Mrs. Salvadora Medena On Rubia de Botana, who inherited the enterprise from her husband, had decided to make peace with Peron. The interventor took over in an official ceremony after midnight attended by Mrs. Botana and representatives of Peron.

Foreign correspondents have been subjected to intimidation. On July 2 Joseph Newman, correspondent of the New York Herald Tribune, took refuge in the American Embassy because of threats made by telephone by a man claiming to be Captain Moretti, of the Ministry of War.

The United States had to intervene officially with the Argentine foreign office because of the coercion exercised upon John Nash of Newsweek. Before permitting him to leave the country, the Peron government tried to force Mr. Nash to sign a statement saying that his cabled material had been incorrect.

The Associated Press, the United Press, and the International News Service, on various occasions, were informed that all their dispatches would be censored. Early in October, the censorship was lifted, but only after a strong official protest to the Argentine Foreign Ministry by the United States Government.

In contrast is the permission granted for the publication of a new German language newspaper, Freie Press, on December 1. The editor of the new publication is M. Mueller, an Austrian, for many years on the editorial staff of the Deutsche La Plata Zeitung, a Nazi-controlled paper.

As late as September 1945, moreover, pro-Nazi publications such as Junges Volk, organ of the Hitler youth, Teutonia, and the Herald were still operating.

On January 17, 1946, the American Embassy in Buenos Aires released a number of documents showing Nazi connections with the Argentine Government officials and its partial control of the Nazi press.

The story, recounted in the New York Herald Tribune, shows how the Nazi-subsidized press serves now to push Peron's candidacy for president.

The Herald Tribune dispatch, dated Buenos Aires, says:

"BUENOS AIRES, January 17.—The American Embassy in Buenos Aires released to the press today part of a quantity of documents discovered by American authorities in Berlin, proving Nazi connections with Argentine Government officials and Nazi control over part of the Argentine press which at present supports Col. Juan Peron for president.

"On authorization from the State Department, John Moors Cabot, American Chargé d'Affaires, made public 13 of 400 German documents which were sent here from Washington. They consist of 'top secret' telegrams sent between March 9, 1942, and July 6, 1943, to the foreign office in Berlin by Otto Meynen, then Chargé d'Affaires in the German Embassy in Buenos Aires.

"REVEAL CLANDESTINE LINKS

"The telegrams reveal the clandestine links between the Germany Embassy and a number of Argentine newspapers, including 'El Pampero,' 'Cabildo,' 'El Pueblo,' 'Ahora,' and the 'Deutsch La Plata Zeitung.' They explain how these Nazi propaganda organs got newsprint despite the efforts of the United Nations, in accordance with the Rio de Janeiro resolutions, to prevent their getting it. They also disclose how the German Embassy used these organs to influence Argentine internal political affairs.

"The first telegram asked the German Government for authorization to spend 73,450 reichmarks monthly to subsidize these papers (the mark was worth about 40 American cents at the time). The greatest amount, 42,000 marks, went to 'Pampero.' Directors and members of the staff of 'Pampero' now publish 'La Epoca,' Colonel Peron's principal political organ.

"Three thousand marks were allocated to El Pueblo. Asked by reporters why El Pueblo was never placed on the Allied blacklist with other Nazi organs, Mr. Cabot explained that it was also the principal organ of the Roman Catholic Church in Argentina, and was kept off the blacklist out of deference to the church.

"PAYMENTS TO PRESS AGENCY

"The second telegram shows payments and relations established by the German Embassy with Andi, an Argentine news agency which the Argentine military Government selected last year as its official Government news agency but later abandoned as a result of public opposition. The telegram says, 'Andi was induced by the Embassy to place press agents in the Ibero-American countries who are obligated to send the regular press survey down here. In this way, the Embassy could thus receive material and political information which goes beyond the North American agency reports.'

"A third telegram disclosed plans to continue distribution of Nazi material to Argentine newspapers in the event of a rupture of diplomatic relations between Argentina and Germany. It suggested the Embassy 'leave certain sums of money behind in loyal hands.' This correspondent was informed that Ludwig Freude, one of the principal Nazi agents in Argentina and now one of Peron's close collaborators, was one of the men in whose 'loyal hands' the German Embassy left money.

"Antonio Delfino, who resigned only 2 months ago as director of the Argentine National Bank, a Government-controlled institution, was named as the man with whom arrangements were to be made for the transfer of funds to Argentina from neutral countries. He was president of the Hamburg-American Shipping Line and is a known Nazi agent.

"Fulvio N. Cravacuore was named as the agent to whom religious material was to be sent for El Pueblo. Cravacuore is now one of the principal writers for Democracia, one of Peron's new newspapers.

"BIRTH OF A NAZI PAPER

"Another document revealed the German Embassy's relations with Manuel Fresco, former Governor of Buenos Aires Province. It said, 'Fresco has just come directly to the Embassy with a concrete proposal for the creation of a new popular morning newspaper, La Tribuna, and asked for a financial contribution for the purchase of newsprint that allegedly will be furnished to him by President Castillo.'

"This Nazi organ actually appeared under the name of Cabildo and assumed the name of La Tribuna only recently, after Cabildo was suppressed by the present regime in its attempt to show its support for the United Nations. Cabildo was described as a paper 'oriented to the support of the governmental policy of Castillo and the maintenance of Argentine neutrality,'"

SUPPRESSION OF LABOR UNIONS

The American Republics agreed at Chapultepec to collaborate for the attainment of:

"A constructive basis for the sound economic development of the Americas through the development of natural resources, industrialization, improvement of transportation, and the improvement of labor standards and working conditions, including collective bargaining, all leading to a rising level of living and increased consumption."

Further, they resolved "to consider of international public interest the enacting by all the American Republics of social legislation that will protect the working class and that will embody guaranties as well as rights on a scale not inferior to the one recommended by the International Labor Office."

On October 31, 1945, the International Labor Office, then meeting in conference, refused to admit the Argentine workers' delegate and his adviser, Juan Rodriguez and Manuel E. Pichel. The reason given was that the Argentine Government was a de facto war government that had established a state of siege in the country, suppressed essential human liberties and rights that are incorporated in the ILO's constitution, and deprived trade unions of freedom of action and even of their leaders. Under present conditions, workers' organizations in the Argentine Republic do not enjoy freedom of association, freedom of action, or freedom of speech.

Rodriguez, it was subsequently disclosed, is a paid employee of the Secretariat of Labor, a branch of the government established by Colonel Peron.

The attempt to take over the labor unions was begun by Colonel Peron in 1943 when he served as Labor Undersecretary. At that time he began a general reorganization which, following Nazi lines, has had as its objective to win the political support of the working masses, especially the unorganized and unskilled.

The fashion in which this was done is described in the New York Herald Tribune of December 26, 1945, by Joseph Newman, Buenos Aires correspondent of that paper:

"It was not an accident that the first office which Peron himself created and directed after reaching the Government was the secretariat of labor and social welfare. This was actually a new ministry, but was not so described because the constitution limits the number of ministries to eight and the Government was not yet ready to flout the constitution openly.

"From the secretariat of labor Peron began to convert the purely military revolution into a national Socialist revolution. He was aware of the great poverty which prevailed among the masses, despite the agricultural wealth of Argentina. The great landowners who ruled Argentina through their conservative party up to 1943 did less than they might have done to raise the economic and educational level of the Argentine population. * * *

"Like Hitler and Mussolini, Peron began to agitate the working masses, making them conscious of their poverty and of the disproportionate wealth of their employers. He did this through branches of the labor secretariats which were established in cities, towns, and villages throughout the country. His propaganda agents turned out literature by the tons and Peron himself made hundreds of speeches in person and over the state radio urging industrial and farm workers to unite behind him for a better deal. To factory workers he promised more pay, better working conditions, and paid vacations. To peons and exploited agricultural workers he promised some of the rich lands of their wealthy landowners. * * *

"As part of the secretariat of labor he established a national agrarian council which is preparing to divide up big estates and turn them over to the workers. As in the Axis countries, his labor secretariat organized Government-controlled unions, which all workers were urged to join. Independent unions which refused to submit to Government control were suppressed and their leaders were jailed.

"As a result of internal and external pressure, independent unions were permitted recently to resume restricted activities. Though these unions may have succeeded in regaining control of most of the 500,000 organized workers, no one knows the extent of the influence and control which Peron has secured over the 2,500,000 unorganized workers."

On September 13, 1945, police closed the headquarters of the local labor union, comprising some 200,000 members, and arrested 6 of its leaders. The union included such independent labor groups as construction, meat, textile, metallurgical, printing, shoemaking, restaurant, and associated industries.

Seven days later Colonel Peron issued a decree by which a general increase in wages was granted to workers and employees throughout the country.

Joseph Newman, writing in the New York Herald Tribune of December 21, characterized the measure as follows:

"It was clearly designed by its author to win the labor vote. From the point of view of the democratic opposition, it constitutes a form of veiled fraud by attempting to buy the labor vote almost on the eve of the election through the official device of ordering all-around increases of 30 percent in the annual income of the working class. This involves many millions of pesos, which, in political terms, amounts to forced contributions by employers to Peron's campaign."

Such independent union groups as are still able to function are supporting the Democratic Union opposition to Peron.

Peron's tactics in destroying the freedom of the labor unions is described by Peter Edson, feature writer of the Scripps-Howard press, in an article appearing on January 12, 1946, in the New York World-Telegram:

"The story how Peron has bid for labor support in the Argentine is worth going into because it points some morals for the United States.

"Peron himself is of lower middle-class origin, but until his rise to the dictatorship he was unknown to the working classes or their leaders. Who his father was has never been proved, and the record of his birth has never been found. A poor boy with ambition and no little ability, Peron stayed in the army after conscription and got his education in the Argentine school for officers.

"On military duty, Peron went to Italy. In Milan he attended a Fascist leaders' school. He got most of his ideas there. When he returned to the Argentine he was assigned to the office of the Minister of War, Gen. Pedro Ramirez. In time Ramirez double-crossed President Ramon Castillo and Peron double-crossed Ramirez to become the strong man. This was June 1943.

"At this point there enters the picture one Jose Figuerola. He had been a labor adviser to Dictator Primo Rivera of Spain and was plenty smart. Driven out of Spain and becoming an Argentine citizen, he also became labor adviser to Peron. His advice was that he could not consolidate his position in power unless he had the support of labor. Figuerola wrote the necessary laws and decrees.

"First step was to destroy existing labor organizations. They were simply declared illegal. In their place a Government-controlled general federation of workers was formed. Peron or Figuerola got three strong Socialist labor leaders to run it, but it isn't polite to ask how they were persuaded to switch ideals.

"They were smart in their strategy. Instead of trying to control all labor, they concentrated on the key men in transportation, public utilities, and meat-packing industries. Controlling these, Peron could tie up the whole country, though membership of the Peron unions may be only from 15 to 25 percent of the workers. But this minority carries blackjacks and probably pistols and has the support of the police, while all other workmen are unarmed.

"But to conciliate and get at least the passive support of all other labor, Peron put through laws to freeze rents, put ceilings on prices, and raise all wages.

"Peron then called a conference of leaders in industry, management, estate owners, bankers, and businessmen. The idea was to sell them on his plan.

"Management, however, wasn't having any. They broke with Peron and joined forces with what was left of the old organized labor movement and political parties which saw that the Peron program was leading only to ruinous inflation.

"Peron then had to prove he was labor's real champion. He has put through one law after another, ending up with general grants of from 10 to 30 percent wage increases plus bonuses.

"Naturally the low-paid working people are all for it. Naturally they threaten a general strike because employers refuse to pay. Naturally they'll vote for Peron for President if his law is upheld."

ANTISEMITIC PROGRAM

At Chapultepec it was also resolved:

"(1) To reaffirm the principle, recognized by all the American states, of equality of rights and opportunities for all men, regardless of race or religion.

"(2) To recommend that the governments of the American Republics, without jeopardizing freedom of expression, either oral or written, make every effort to prevent in their respective countries all acts which may provoke discrimination among individuals because of race or religion."

The Peron regime has recently instituted, in its emulation of the Nazi pattern, a program of terror against the Jews. On October 20, 1945, the return of Colonel Peron to power was signalized by anti-Semitic riots which were described by Joseph Newman in the New York Herald Tribune:

"Bands of Peronistas, celebrating the victory of their leader, entered the extensive Jewish quarter of Buenos Aires and stoned individuals, homes, and buildings. With the tacit approval of police, they engaged Jewish youths in fist fights and shouted offensive slogans. Carrying Argentine flags and posters bearing portraits of Peron, the Peronistas cried: 'Death to the Jews. Viva Peron.' Police stood by, permitting the bands to go about their work in freedom. Some were

seen giving the Peronistas a lift in police cars from one block to another.

"As the streets were deserted, the Peronistas shouted: 'Jews, come out and fight.' They approached the synagogue on Paso Street with rocks in their hands and were intercepted by a group of Jewish boys who engaged the band in a fist fight and dispersed it. Another group of boys entered the basement of the synagogue and arrested 20 of the defenders. These were later released, but this is believed to be the first time police have violated the immunity of a religious edifice in Argentina.

"Peronistas attempted to stone El Diario Israelita, a Yiddish newspaper which was closed by the military regime when President Pedro Ramirez was in power and permitted to reopen after a vigorous denunciation by President Roosevelt.

"Another clash occurred in front of the Jewish bank, called Banco Industrial, the walls of which were painted with slogans such as 'Death to the Jews. Viva Peron.' On Avenida de Mayo, the principal avenue, the following inscription can still be seen painted on the sidewalk: 'Kill a Jew and be a patriot.' In Plaza de Mayo, where Peronistas had staged a mass demonstration and had been addressed by their leaders the previous night, impromptu speakers harangued small groups with speeches blaming Jews for all the ills of the country and of the world."

On November 25, a new attack on the Jewish quarter was made by 30,000 of Colonel Peron's supporters. Reporting the episode, Arnaldo Cortesi declared in the New York Times:

"Anti-Jewish disturbances of considerable gravity took place in Buenos Aires during the night after a meeting of 30,000 or so of Col. Juan Peron's supporters invaded the Jewish quarter of the city, where they broke the signs of several Jewish-owned shops and insulted everyone in sight, attacking and brutally beating anyone who attempted to protest or defend himself. * * *

"The police, who were present in great force, stood by passively while the Jews who had been knocked to the ground were savagely kicked. Finally, the police intervened, but only to arrest the victims instead of the perpetrators of these aggressions. Later, the police raided a peaceful Jewish social club, pointing their revolvers at about 100 persons inside. Then they arrested several of the club's officials and members for no apparent reason. * * *

"The disturbances * * * have occurred with such regularity whenever large numbers of Peronistas have gathered that it is hardly possible to doubt any longer that anti-Semitism forms a part of Colonel Peron's political stock in trade. This circumstance is perhaps owing in part to the fact that he now has the support of a considerable section of the Nationalists who adopted anti-Semitism along with many other ideals of clearly Nazi character."

Three days later Cortesi reported again:

"Several episodes of anti-Jewish hooliganism occurred last night after a relatively small crowd of former Vice President Juan Peron's supporters had held demonstrations in the center of the city. * * * This time the attacks on Jews were carried out by small bands of about 50 young ruffians who entered the Jewish district shouting 'Long live Peron' and 'Death to the Jews' and proceeded to damage property and to assault passersby. More than 30 pistol shots were fired and some noise bombs were thrown. * * * No casualties were reported.

"The police took no effective measures against the assailants and eventually arrested one man who, judging by his name, is a Jew. * * * When it became known yesterday that a sudden meeting of Peronistas had been called, many Jews sought refuge away from their homes. Others barricaded themselves in their houses. The pro-Peron paper, Epoca, said today that the anti-Jewish demonstrations were staged by Colonel Peron's enemies, who thus planned to bring him into disrepute. * * * This suggestion is sufficiently disproved by the attitude of the police, which never showed mercy for Colonel Peron's opponents, but stood passively by while Jews were being attacked."

On December 19, Dr. Federico Contini, one of Peron's top advisers, discussing the anti-Jewish demonstrations, declared in a speech: "It is a pity that a substantial number of Jews were not killed. It would have served to frighten the others."

On December 30, 1945, Joseph Newman, in the New York Herald Tribune, disclosed that the committee against racialism discovered a plot which originated in police headquarters to stage a pogrom after planting bombs and leaflets in Peron's political party offices and in Catholic churches, attributing them to the Jews. The plot was publicly denounced during the first week in December and therefore failed to materialize.

PERON HARBORS ENEMY AGENTS AND AXIS BUSINESSES

The parties to the act of Chapultepec further agreed:

1. To recommend that the governments of the American Republics do not give refuge to individuals guilty of or responsible for or accomplices in the commission of such (war) crimes.

2. To recommend that the governments shall, upon the demand of any of the United Nations * * * surrender individuals charged with the commission of such crimes to the United Nations making the request * * *.

3. To reaffirm the determination * * * to prevent individuals or groups within their respective jurisdictions from engaging in any activities fomented by the Axis Powers or their satellites for the purpose of prejudicing the individual or collective security and welfare of the American Republics:

(a) To intensify efforts to eradicate the remaining centers of Axis subversive influence in the hemisphere. * * *

(b) To take effective measures to prevent Axis-inspired elements from regaining or securing any vantage points within the territory subject to their respective jurisdictions from which such elements might disturb or threaten the security or welfare of any republic.

(4) They resolved that measures be undertaken "to uncover, disclose, immobilize, and to prevent the concealment or transfer of property and rights located within the American Republics * * * which * * * whether or not in name belong to or are controlled by or for the benefit of Germany or Japan or individuals or entities within those countries."

Committed by the Act of Chapultepec and the UNO Charter to turn over enemy agents and to expose enemy holdings, the Peron government has done neither.

On November 30, 1945, Dr. Carlos Adrogue, secretary of the Committee for Vigilance and Liquidation of Enemy Property, resigned, accusing the Foreign Minister of unwarranted interference with the committee's work. The committee itself declared that the Foreign Minister had introduced a number of legal technicalities to prevent the liquidation of the Ricardo Staudt Co., chief Argentine operator in wool, with a capital of between forty and seventy million pesos. Its head, Ricardo Staudt, a German by birth, came to the Argentine in 1924, to avoid punishment for his criminal activities in Belgium during World War I, and obtained Argentine citizenship. In 1941, Adolf Hitler conferred the Order of the Grand Eagle on him for his "outstanding services to the Nazi cause in the Argentine." Counsel for Herr Staudt is the law firm of Cooke Bros., of which Juan I. Cooke, Foreign Minister of Argentina, is a member. The fact that on January 8, 1946, Dr. Adrogue was kidnaped and beaten up by thugs seems more than a coincidence.

Colonel Peron, himself, has on various occasions intervened in behalf of top German industrialists, among them Ricardo Staudt, Ludwig Freude, and Fritz Mandl. Ludwig Freude is allegedly one of the key leaders in Nazi underground activities on the South American continent. Although on the United States and British blacklist, Freude's firm, Compania General de Construcciones, early in 1945, had a contract with the Argentine Government for 22,000,000 pesos. In February 1945, an investigation commission made an attempt to examine the books of Freude's company. Before this action could be completed Argentina declared war on Germany. Again an investigation of Freude's activities was ordered. This time, Colonel Peron appealed personally to President Farrell, vouching unconditionally for Freude, with the result that the investigation was suspended. Moreover, the report of the interrupted investigation of Freude was torn out of the minutes of the commission and destroyed on an order from Colonel Peron.

On October 26, the Commission for the Liquidation of Enemy Property determined to seize all the property of Ricardo Staudt on the grounds that investigations show that large funds had been transferred from his company to Germany during the war, and that he, himself, regarded Berlin as his headquarters. Staudt, warned in advance of the impending action, secured an injunction. The Commission appealed to a higher court and resolved to proceed with its seizure. But this action was vetoed by Foreign Minister Cooke, with the result that Staudt is still in possession of his property. Staudt is alleged to be the principal financier, together with Fritz Mandl, of Peron's campaign for the presidency.

The charge that the seizure of Axis property would impair Argentine economy was strongly denied by Assistant Secretary of State Spruille Braden, then Ambassador, on June 19, in a speech before the British Chamber of Commerce in Buenos Aires, where he declared: "The Nazi and Japanese firms here clearly are of no importance whatever to Argentine national economy. They often were established for other than commercial reasons—reasons so obvious as to call for no comment. There are, however, many enemy firms with established industries that must be continued as units of Argentine production. They are in treacherous hands so long as they are in enemy hands. Luckily the solution is simple. The Axis firms in question can be easily converted into Argentine enterprises."

On June 25, Assistant Secretary of State William L. Clayton, testifying before a subcommittee of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, declared that the Nazis' grandiose scheme for finding safe haven in neutral and other countries for a German stake for another World War was a matter of grave concern to the Allies. He said that in Argentina where 108 major Axis economic enterprises are known to be operating, not one of these Nazi spearheads had been wholly eliminated.

On November 5, 1945, Virginia Prewett, writing in PM, reported:

"Despite official assertions to the contrary, many known members of the Nazi economic spearheads are still operating in Argentina with perfect freedom and bright prospects for the future. * * * On September 11, the Government officially reported that it was meeting its pledge (made at Chapultepec) to extirpate Nazi influence. However, only a little more than 50 percent of the long list of German firms have been placed under Government control. * * *

"The Compania General de Construcciones has continued operations with immunization from governmental interference. It is now

working on fat Government contracts and is bidding on others. * * * Its head is Ludwig Freude, who received the Cross of Merit from Adolf Hitler. * * * Among the contracts that the untouchable Freude has received from the Argentine Government are: Construction of a new military air base at Reconquista, 6,500,000 pesos. Contracts for building military barracks in towns of Ezequiel, Junin de los Andes, and San Martin de los Andes, 17,000,000 pesos. Freude is also constructing a Government shipyard at Rio Santingo and a torpedo depot at Puerto Belgrano. * * * His company built the new big state hotel at Llao-Llao * * * where the German agent Hans Nobel—who also circulates freely—teaches Argentine high society how to ski. * * * With the exception of two German banks and six insurance companies, all the important German spearhead firms in Argentina still retain the titles to their businesses which are now more flourishing than ever.

"Since the Government's statement last September that it was 'eliminating' Nazi-controlled business, the following German-owned firms have obtained Government contracts: Wayass & Freytag, associated with a firm of the same name in Germany, signed a contract to do the concrete work on bridges 3, 4, 7, 8, and 11 at the new national airport * * * outside of Buenos Aires. Compania General de Obras Publicas, which is a branch of the Philip Holtzman firm of Berlin, has signed for the concrete work on bridges 5, 6, and 16 at the same airport. Since the Government statement, the Government has also received bids now under consideration for construction of state roads, etc., from the following: Compania General de Construcciones, Wayass & Freytag, Compania General de Obras Publicas, Siemens-Schukert, Thyssen-Lamental, Gruen & Bilfinger, and Calera Avellaneda."

As recently as December 6, 1945, Assistant Secretary of State Braden made new representations to Argentina because of its alleged failure to deport 71 Nazi agents.

On August 24, 1945, Nelson Rockefeller, former Assistant Secretary of State, and largely responsible for the admission of Argentina to the United Nations Organization, announced 5 months after Argentina's declaration of war against the Axis: "Of the 15 Japanese and 223 other persons investigated for Axis espionage, only 70 German agents are under arrest. There is very little, if any, control over the directors and officers of Axis firms and associations, and practically no progress in seeking out Axis individuals and assets which may be seeking refuge in Argentina and whose existence is therefore concealed."

On September 15, 1945, the New York Times declared that among the men released, 33 have definitely been identified as enemy agents. No enemy agent has been interned or deported. On that same day Spruille Braden, on the eve of his departure from Argentina for the United States, said, as reported in the New York Times: "The Nazi element is still extremely dangerous. Unless it can be extirpated, it will remain a serious threat for the future. I am not competent to state whether there will be an aggressive Germany again, but if there is to be one, then, in my opinion, the Nazis here in Argentina would be a spearhead against this hemisphere and the United States."

On October 20, 1945, Damonte Taborda, former chairman of the Argentine Committee on Subversive Activities, charged that the political upheaval in the Argentine was the result of a Nazi plot to regain military supremacy and world power. He suggested even the possibility that Nazi research on atomic power was continuing in Argentina.

Even arrested Axis espionage agents receive special treatment. Augustine Rodriguez Aray, former radical party deputy, held as a political prisoner by Peron for many months, in a formal charge to the Federal court, accused the police of aiding and abetting Axis espionage agents. He said that during his 5 months' stay in the Villa a de Vota Prison in Buenos Aires, Colonel Velazco's treatment of convicted Axis spies was so friendly, partial, and benevolent that they were allowed to continue their operations both outside and inside the prison. In their cells were short- and long-wave radio sets, photographs of Hitler, typewriters, and all the material they needed for their work, as well as ample stores of food. What is more, they were allowed to leave the prison without guard day and night, some remaining absent for as long as 2 days.

A further instance of how the Argentine Government is protecting Nazi agents was reported in the New York Times of December 5, 1945: "Seven notorious Nazi agents were ordered deported over the weekend. One escaped, another obtained a medical certificate saying he was too ill to be moved, and the third, a very rich man, had a charge of burglary of $22.50 trumped up against him and claimed he must remain in Argentina to stand trial. Of the remaining four, three applied to the courts for writs of habeas corpus. The Ministry of Interior thereupon forbade the departure of all of them."

CONCLUSION

We submit that the actions of the Peron regime, as cited, are identical in practice and purpose with the actions of the Nazi regime when Hitler came to power. The Nazi Party also began its war program by acquiring totalitarian control of the Government and by instituting a terror against the opposition within Germany. From this point it proceeded systematically to apply the same methods against other countries; conquering half of Europe bloodlessly, and finally precipitating the war which has only just been concluded. The Peron regime, if left in power, will certainly launch a war in the Western Hemisphere.

On September 29, 1944, President Roosevelt discussed the extraordinary paradox of the growth of the Nazi-Fascist influence and the increasing application of Nazi-Fascist methods in the Argentine. "The Argentine Government," he said, "has repudiated solemn inter-American obligations on the basis of which the nations of this hemisphere developed a system of defense to meet the challenge of Axis aggression." He insisted that "unless we now demonstrate a capacity to develop a tradition of respect for such obligations among civilized nations there can be little hope for a system of international security, theoretically created to maintain principles for which our peoples today are sacrificing to the limit of their resources."

On January 5, 1946, Assistant Secretary of State Spruille Braden, speaking on an official State Department broadcast, again branded the present regime in the Argentine as Nazi, and explained its ability to stay in power in the following terms: "They have the police, an important section of the army, armed action groups, and a typically National Socialist program, not excluding the old formula of bread and circuses for the millions. Following recognized Nazi tactics, they secure control of certain strategic labor unions, take over the transportation facilities and a few important unions. With the help of the police you can control a nation."

We submit that the United Nations in proof of its intention to protect world peace, should act at the earliest possible moment to brand the Peron regime as an enemy of peace and security, and as such, to suspend it from the United Nations. Such an undertaking by the UNO is clearly an act of self-protection which will be supported by freedom-loving peoples everywhere.

The millions of casualties of World War II should guard the conscience of the world against a new appeasement. The time to act is now.

Governor Tobin's Address on Kosciusko Bicentennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 12, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of the Governor of Massachusetts:

As Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts I am grateful for the opportunity to address our tens of thousands of citizens of Polish birth or ancestry who are observing the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thaddeus Kosciusko.

May I add that not only our people of Polish blood but all other true Americans revere the memory of the great apostle of freedom who was born on February 12, 1746. We revere his memory not only because of his heroic service to the Colonies in their struggle for independence, but also because he symbolizes mankind's incessent aspirations for liberty the world over. As Kosciusko himself remarks on one occasion: "I have never fought except in the cause of human freedom, and I can never serve in any other cause."

The early life of the great hero was spent in the happy surroundings of a typical Polish home—a home that was relatively poor in this world's goods, but rich in spiritual resources. His father was a notary and was highly respected in his community for his excellent character. The family was noted for its domestic virtues, and the children were encouraged to improve their minds through study.

Thaddeus was an apt pupil, especially in military engineering, and was graduated with honors from the Royal Military Academy at Warsaw, the Polish West Point, in 1768.

A few years later, when Kosciusko learned that the American colonists had taken up arms in the defense of their God-given rights, his innate enthusiasm for the cause of human freedom impelled him to cross the ocean at his own expense, and to volunteer his services to the Congress of the young Nation.

Kosciusko's career in the American Army gave ample evidence of his superior abilities. To him were entrusted many of the most responsible tasks, and his special talents in the building of fortifications proved invaluable. He was engaged in the building of defenses at Philadelphia, at Ticonderoga, at Saratoga, and finally at West Point.

In every instance the superlative skill of the Polish officer won the immediate and complete confidence of his fellow officers and the men in the ranks. Moreover, historians are unanimous in the opinion that the tactics and the fortifications planned by Kosciusko were one of the major factors in the success of General Washington's armies.

In particular, the work done by Colonel Kosciusko at West Point was of vital importance. Washington himself emphasized the strategic value of this position and urged that the best available intelligence and ingenuity be employed to erect the necessary redoubts.

The best available intelligence and ingenuity proved to be Kosciusko's, so to him was assigned this critical task. His accomplishments won high praise from Washington and the members of the staff. General Armstrong declared: "Kosciusko gave the fortifications such strength that they frightened the enemy from all temptation of even trying to take the highlands." To appreciate

the full meaning of that statement one must realize that if the enemy had succeeded in capturing West Point, the situation of our American forces would have been extremely desperate. Indeed, it has been stated that Kosciusko's outstanding work at West Point was one of the really decisive elements in the eventual triumph of Washington over the British.

No wonder that the commander in chief and other American generals, as well as the Congress and many leading citizens of the new Nation, vied with one another in paying sincere tribute to Thaddeus Kosciusko. George Washington never lost his admiration for the valiant Polish hero. Thus, when Kosciusko returned to the United States for a visit in 1797, his former commander wrote: "I welcome you to the land whose liberties you were so instrumental in establishing. No one has a higher respect and veneration for your character than I have."

And with similar appreciation Thomas Jefferson said of Kosciusko: "He is as pure a son of liberty as I have ever known, and of that liberty which is to go to all, and not to the few or the rich alone. The mass of our countrymen have the highest attachment to his character."

Rightly, therefore, we celebrate the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of this extraordinary man, this noble-hearted son of Poland whose devotion to the ideals of human liberty has been an inspiration to every genuine American since the dawn of our country's independence.

But even as we eulogize the character and the achievements of the great Kosciusko, and as we call to mind the splendid accomplishments of Polish Americans through all the years of our Nation's history, our thoughts turn naturally to the distressful situation in which Poland finds iself today.

A recent copy of the bulletin issued by the Polish American Congress describes the plight of Poland so graphically that no right-thinking person could fail to be dismayed at the manner in which Poland's rights have been ignored.

It is a tragic commentary on international diplomacy that the world conflict which brought victory to Poland's allies brought defeat and loss of her independence to Poland—Poland, which was the first nation to fight against Hitler, and which contributed so much to the common victory.

As the former Polish Ambassador to the United States remarked on July 6, 1945:

"The fate of Poland will be better understood when it is realized that even defeated Nazi Germany loses less through this war than Allied Poland has been forced to give up. Moreover, Poland has been left under the uncontrolled occupation of a foreign power which is imposing upon her a government and a political, social, and economic system that are alien to her.

"Poland's record as a fighting member of the United Nations during this war is unassailable. Her armed resistance to German aggression in September 1939 gave to France and Great Britain the time necessary to prepare their defenses. Later her army, navy, and air force fought in Norway, France, in the Battle of Britain, in Africa, Italy, Normandy, Belgium, Holland, and Germany, while her underground home army performed miracles of sabotage."

We all know that while the war lasted Poland's resolute efforts were frequently lauded by her allies. She was called the inspiration of nations and was given numerous promises of independence after the cessation of hostilities. Now that victory has been won, who can explain to the courageous Poles that the principles for which they and the other peoples of the United Nations fought are not to be applied to Poland herself? Who can convince the Poles that their nation should be carved up or realined to suit the purposes of mightier neighbors, in defiance of the principle of self-determination for small nations?

Justice demands that Poland be accorded her rights, chief among which is the right to a free and unfettered election by the Polish people themselves, to establish their own government on their own terms.

As Governor of Massachusetts it is my earnest hope that this situation will be settled, not upon the basis of political expediency, but upon the basis of liberty and justice. America was founded upon that basis; America has gone to war in defense of those ideals; America wants to see those ideals applied in the case of gallant Poland. Only then can we hope for the establishment of permanent peace; only then will the principles for which we have waged and won a global conflict be vindicated before the nations of the world.

That is my message to all of our splendid citizens of Polish birth or ancestry as I join with them in honoring the memory of Thaddeus Kosciusko. Let us earnestly hope—yes, let us fervently pray—that liberty and justice may not be denied to the Polish people, the pages of whose history have been crimsoned with the blood of countless martyrs to the freedom of their fatherland.

God grant that the indomitable spirit of Kosciusko may hearten his compatriots in this, the most recent of their tragic travails. May the memory of this valiant son of Poland be a source of strength to those who share his nationality and who likewise share his zeal for his country's independence.

May I conclude my tribute to this gallant soldier, whose bicentennial we are now celebrating, by quoting from a beautiful tribute composed by the masterful poet, Keats, in December 1816:

"Good Kosciusko, thy great name alone
Is a full harvest whence to reap high feeling;
It comes upon us like the glorious pealing
Of the wide spheres—an everlasting tone.
It tells me that on a happy day,
When some good spirit walks upon the earth,
Thy name, with the great of yore
Gently commingling, gives tremendous birth
To a loud hymn, that sounds far, far away
To where the great God lives forevermore."

Our Martyred President Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 12, 1946

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, America is especially rich in her heritage of great men, and for that reason the month of February has always been to me a sacred month, because it is the birth month of Washington, the Father of his Country and the founder of its Constitution, and of Lincoln, the savior of his country and of its Constitution.

Emerson in his very delightful essay on self-reliance, says:

Every true man is a cause, a country, and an age; requires infinite spaces and numbers and time to accomplish his destiny, and mankind seems to follow in his footsteps as a train of clients. A man, Caesar, is born, and for ages after we have the Roman Empire. Christ is born and millions of minds so grow and cleave to his genius that he is confounded with virtue and the possible of man. An institution is the lengthened shadow of one man.

If Emerson's statement is true, and it is, then America is the lengthened shadow of Washington and Lincoln and those other distinguished men that have helped to found and perpetuate this great Republic of ours.

Just 9 years after the death of Washington a babe was born in a log cabin in the lowly hills of Kentucky; a babe that was destined to continue the work that Washington had started.

Born in the lowliest of circumstances, under the most abject poverty, the boy Lincoln grew to greatness, attending school less than one calendar year, and yet acquiring an education in the broader and better sense that has awakened the admiration of the world.

The question is often asked: Where did Lincoln get the beauty and the glory of his English? The answer is, From the beauty and simplicity of the Bible, from the grandeur and the glory of Shakespeare.

From his earliest boyhood he was a constant reader, walking many miles to secure books, studying them carefully, and making the thoughts of the author and the language of the author ofttimes his own thought and his own language. Lincoln's Gettysburg Address will always stand as a specimen of pure English, and the occasion upon which this address was delivered has long been impressed upon my mind.

You will recall that after the Battle of Gettysburg, the State of Pennsylvania and the National Government created a national cemetery which was to be dedicated on November 19, 1863. The Honorable Edward Everett, then probably one of the greatest orators in America, was to deliver the principal address, and President Lincoln was invited to be present.

A large platform had been erected at the cemetery, and 20,000 people gathered there to hear Edward Everett, the great orator of the day. For nearly 2 hours Mr. Everett held the audience spellbound by the power of his eloquence and the beauty of his English, during which time, it is said, Lincoln sat upon the platform, part of the time with his head bowed in his hands, apparently saying to himself, "What can I say to this splendid audience after this great orator is through?" At the conclusion of Mr. Everett's address round after round of applause was given him.

Then President Lincoln was introduced; he walked to the front of the platform, stood there for a moment with his head bowed and his eyes dull, and even Lincoln's friends wondered just what the President could do under the circumstances. Then President Lincoln's form was drawn to its full height. Into his dark eyes came the light of liberty, and for 4 minutes, and 4 minutes only, the President delivered an address the like of which is probably unknown in the English language.

At the conclusion of that address no applause was given, but the reason was apparent. You do not cheer a prayer, you do not applaud a benediction, and

Lincoln's Gettysburg address was both a prayer and a benediction.

The language of Lincoln's Gettysburg address is known practically to every adult schoolboy in America, and the beauty of the English therein has awakened the admiration of the world; let us quote the following from this wonderful address to get the spirit thereof:

It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

As I study the life of Lincoln, two great thoughts become apparent. First, Lincoln taught the doctrine of opportunity, and his whole life illustrates the thought that one can accomplish great things if he is willing to work, regardless of the circumstances under which he works. Hundreds of thousands of young men each year since the death of Lincoln have received an inspiration from his life, and by that inspiration have surged ahead regardless, in many instances, of the lack of their own education.

A love of books permeated Lincoln's life and a love of books and literature implanted in the minds of the youth of our land cannot help but develop them to better and greater things.

Second, he loved the American Constitution, and his whole life was devoted to a reverence of that great document.

Lincoln's whole concept of the Constitution, the great love he had for it, and the place he thought it should occupy in the minds of Americans is well illustrated in Lincoln's own language, where he says:

As the patriots of seventy-six died to support the Declaration of Independence, so to the support of the Constitution and laws let every American pledge his life, his property, and his sacred honor.

In these days when old landmarks are being removed and when we are inclined to look slightingly upon many of the great principles of this Government of ours, which have become our heritage, should we not pause and give heed to these words of Lincoln and renew our faith to our Government and to our Constitution? This House of Representatives and the millions of people representing this Nation all owe to that Constitution their complete allegiance and support.

In conclusion, I wish to give two of my favorite quotations with reference to Lincoln, one by Joseph Fort Newton, in which he says:

Tall, angular, homely, eloquent; a child of the South, a leader of the North, who grew up in the back yard of the Nation; the son of a pioneer untrained in schools; a village fabulist, postmaster, and country lawyer; hater of slavery and lover of men; a humorist with a heart full of tears; a logician with a soul of pity and pathos; a high priest at the altar of blood and fire and terror, unbendingly firm, incredibly merciful, infinitely patient; a martyr in the hour of victory; the tallest soul of his time—Lincoln, the savior of his country.

But my favorite quotation, the one that I think presents the finest summary of Lincoln's life, was given by the great Spanish statesman and orator, Emelio Castallar, who, in reviewing the life of the immortal Lincoln and the great things accomplished by him, said:

And when the slave evil became more virulent, when the slave holders uttered their war cries, and the slaves their groans of despair, the woodcutter, the boatman, the tall son of the great West, the descendant of Quakers, the humblest of the humble in his own conscience, the greatest of the great in history, ascends the Capitol, calm and serene in his conscience and his thought. Before him, a veteran army; behind him, hostile Europe; England favoring the South, France encouraging reaction in New Mexico, in his hands a riven country.

He arms 2,000,000 men, gathers a half million horses, sends his artillery 1,100 miles in 1 week from the banks of the Potomac to the shores of the Tennessee, fights over 600 engagements, reenacts before Richmond the deeds of Alexander and of Caesar, and after emancipating 3,000,000 slaves, that nothing might be wanting, he falls at the moment of victory, like Christ, like Socrates, like all redeemers, at the foot of his work. His work, sublime achievement, over which humanity shall eternally shed her tears and God pronounce His benediction.

Wheat Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 12, 1946

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a wire received from Mr. M. W. Thatcher, president of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, of St. Paul, Minn.

The National Federation of Grain Cooperatives represents over 500,000 cooperative grain farmers in the central section of the United States. They are thoroughly familiar with the wheat problems of the Grain Belt and I urge that these suggestions be given consideration by the administration:

ST. PAUL, MINN., *February 11, 1946.*

Hon. FRANK CARLSON,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

After discussing the President's wheat program for 2 days, and after hearing it explained by a representative of the United States Department of Agriculture, the annual convention of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, meeting at Chicago, February 8–9, wired the President the following message: The federation represents over 500,000 cooperative grain farmers from the Canadian border to the Gulf, and from Ohio to the Pacific. "To effectively handle the wheat emergency and make available the maximum amounts of food possible for other nations' needs, the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives believes there are some realistic requirements which must be immediately understood and met: (1) The railroad-transportation system is broken down so far as the immediate requirements are concerned; we as practical operators can demonstrate that fact; (2) transportation equipment exclusively directed to wheat to the exclusion of feed grains will defeat the wheat program because of spoilage from wet corn and other grains needed for the total feed program; (3) more than half the wheat is on the farms, not enough wheat will move off the farms unless the future of ceiling prices and OPA is determined now. Too many farmers will not market both their inventory and the coming crop because of the income-tax burden which would fall upon them in 1 year. Farmers would loan wheat and feed grains to the Government if protected by a program to assure 90 percent of parity price and to permit the farmers to elect the year for price determination and sale."

Respectfully yours,

M. W. THATCHER,

President, National Federation of Grain Cooperatives.

Palmer Hoyt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 12, 1946

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., of February 6, 1946:

A PUBLISHER FOR THE POST

In becoming editor and publisher of the Denver Post, Palmer Hoyt accepts a highly challenging opportunity.

It is not merely that the Post is one of the country's most valuable properties, with a remarkable circulation. There is also the unique fact that it is the dominant publication over a wider area than can be claimed by any other paper. From the Missouri Valley to the Cascade-Sierra Nevada barrier, and from Canada to Mexico, Denver is the only class A city (over 300,000) and the Post is the only class A newspaper. Thus the Post is the logical claimant to spokesmanship for the entire intermountain region. (The strategic position of Denver may be judged from the fact that it has more Federal offices than any city except Washington, D. C.)

It is complimentary to the Oregonian, of course, that the owners of the Post, surveying the Nation's newspaper operations for a successor to W. C. Shepherd, retiring because of his years, should have come to this paper and to Mr. Hoyt. But it is not surprising—certainly not to our readers, to the Northwest as a whole or to the Nation's press. During the period when Mr. Hoyt served as managing editor, from 1934 to 1938, and since he has been editor and publisher, from 1938 until the present, the Oregonian has more than kept abreast of the times and has progressed dramatically in public acceptance and approval.

Modern typography and format have been adopted but without sacrifice of a traditional dislike for sensationalism. Editorial comment has been strictly separated from news coverage but without modification of the editorial forth-rightness which our readers have learned to expect and respect through nearly a century. There has been a liberal outlook but with a strong love for that individual enterprise which built America and in particular built the West. As a consequence there have been many honors. Most important has been the confidence of the people. But the honors also have ranged from a Pulitzer prize to the University of Missouri award for distinguished service.

Meanwhile Mr. Hoyt has found time for varied public activities. Notably, as the original war-bond administrator for Oregon he set up the organization which ultimately, through Ted R. Gamble, became the model for the Nation, and which kept this State at the head of the bond list throughout the war. Then he himself went to Washington for 6 months as Director of the Domestic Division of the Office of War Information—a most successful 6 months. And there have been many other activities, local and national.

But when all this is said, it is still only the cold, black-and-white record. So far as the Oregonian's hundreds of employees are concerned, and Mr. Hoyt's thousands of acquaintances on the outside—all of whom call him "Ep"—he will be remembered longest for his unmatched capacity for friendship. For this he becomes a permanent tradition among the newspaper fraternity of Oregon.

There will be no misgivings here as to his personal and professional success in Denver, or as to his ability to make the Post increasingly accepted as the voice of the intermountain States. We wish him the best. And all who know him will envy Denver his company.

Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. SAVAGE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 12, 1946

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my great admiration for Abraham Lincoln on this anniversary of his birthday by including with my remarks an editorial from my home-town paper, the Shelton-Mason County Journal, Shelton, Wash., of Thursday, February 7, 1946:

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Although more than four score years have passed since that fateful night in April 1865 when an assassin's bullet cut short the earthly career of Abraham Lincoln, his place in the hearts and minds of his countrymen as one of the Nation's great heroes was never more secure

This tall, gaunt man with the deep-set, brooding eyes, who was born in a humble log cabin and rose to the highest office in the land, was no ordinary individual. Yet few persons in American history have so embodied the noble qualities of the common man as did he.

His genial wit and wisdom, his simplicity and earthiness, his patience and humility—his love of country and humanity—these were the things that have so deeply endeared him to the people of America.

A cold appraisal of the historical records reveals that Lincoln possessed no magic powers, and that at times he was bewildered, indecisive, and blundering. Sometimes his moods probed the depths of depression; at others, they scaled the heights of inspiration.

But through it all—through the ebb and flow of his spirits, his political and family fortunes—his true greatness gradually emerged until it reached full expression and marked him as an outstanding figure of the ages.

In observing his one hundred and thirty-seventh birthday anniversary on February 12, the American people honor him as the preserver of the Union, as the friend of all humanity.

Statement of Hon. John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 12, 1946

Mr. BARRY. I concur, and I am sure all good Americans do, in the following statement of my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]:

The baseless charges in the Soviet-controlled newspaper Izvestia that the 32 new cardinal-designates, and particularly the attack on Cardinal-Designate Spellman, of New York, were selected to spread reactionary policies throughout the world could be ignored if it were not for the vicious spirit behind such attacks.

Everyone knows when Izvestia writes it is the Soviet Union speaking. This unnecessary, false, and malicious attack follows a number of others made against the Catholic Church. It appears to be part of a deliberate plan of misrepresentation aimed to divide the people of countries where western civilization exists. These attacks and other actions of the Soviet Union are causing many who believe in world peace to wonder if the Soviet Union is sincere.

To defend the Catholic Church is unnecessary. To expose the reason for the false attack is necessary.

It seems to me the Soviet Union is trying to prevent world peace through international action. This and past attacks, contrary to the truth, are the wrong journey to take to contribute to future world peace. Not only are they false, but they are provocative; they show a dictatorial attitude and an attempt to impose the will of the Soviet Union on the rest of the world. Stalin and those associated with him ought to learn the lessons of history.

Americans of all creeds respect Cardinal-designate Spellman. He occupies a position of respect and affection in our minds. Reactionary? Cardinal Spellman is the opposite. He has always been a leader, as a priest, as an archbishop, and he will be a leader as a cardinal in progressive and humane activities.

The result, if not the purpose of such attacks, is destructive—in that they try to divide the forces of decency throughout the world, and such attacks impair the chances of future world peace.

It is not within my province to give advice to Stalin, but if he used common sense and if he wanted to make a real contribution toward permanent peace and progress he would cause such attacks to cease and instead of attacking he would try to reconcile.

Army Demobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 12, 1946

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an excerpt from a letter written by one of our soldier boys. This boy is a well balanced young American and has a splendid American background. The statements he makes and the questions he asks cannot be lightly dismissed. I hope Secretary of War and other policy-making officials in the War Department will give serious thought to the statements made in the letter and the questions asked.

The excerpt from the letter is as follows:

Today's Stars and Stripes is full of unhappiness, and has prompted me to write and ask you to send me such things as will make the next 10 or 12 months more bearable. We had begun to delude ourselves into believing that we'd soon be home, but that was foolish. Last fall, when General Marshall announced that beginning in March men with 2 years' service would be eligible for discharge, it was something to look forward to. * * * Now the Secretary of War is quoted in Stars and Stripes in reference to 2-year discharges in March: "I didn't know that was the case." Someone should have introduced the Secretary of War to his former Chief of Staff. * * * We are trying to avoid the Battery Club with its cognac and women, both of the worst imaginable quality. Of the six men in our house, three of us have managed to avoid the place most of the time. * * *

In my letters home I've tried to avoid complaint, or even mention of how all of us feel, and how I in particular feel, about the Army. My reasons for doing this have been several: I didn't want to cause you to worry too much about me, I didn't think it would do much good to be complaining constantly, and I hoped that when I did blow up that you would realize that it was something more than self-pity. Here goes. Several days ago the Secretary of War made a public statement to the effect that (1) he didn't know (10 months after its inception), how the point system works; (2) that his Chief of Staff was an irresponsible man whose public promises were of no interest to the Secretary; and (3) that regardless of the fact that the Navy had announced it was retiring several troop transports as surplus, that the only reason for failure to ship men from the Pacific was the lack of ships. Each of these statements was made before a different group (at different stops on his world tour) but the next day's paper printed his claim to have been misinterpreted or misquoted (he apparently didn't know which).

The same paper carried other statements of others present at one of the press conferences (about points) confirming the Stars and Stripes quotation and interpretation.

Then everyone began talking about how we still have a big job to do, how we must not withdraw from Asia and Europe without fulfilling our world obligations. What soldier has ever denied that? I know we can't pull our forces out of here for years. So do almost all of the men over here. What we have asked is: Why must we who have already suffered years of humiliation and torment do the job? Why cannot we now be replaced, and why conditions cannot be made steadily better, instead of steadily worse? First-class mail which used to take 6 to 10 days takes 20 to 40 days now. During the war we had—here in Europe last spring and summer—plenty of good fresh food. Now we have a menu of dehydrated eggs, boiled macaroni, Spam, either no butter or canned butter which tastes like face cream and bologna. The wonderful education program has died quietly—except for a few schools with a total enrollment equal to about 2 or 3 percent of the troop strength—and has been replaced by spasmodic, disorganized attempts to begin basic training again.

Our officers treat us with less consideration than ever, which is pretty bad. * * *

To such complaints Truman replied today that the emergency is more critical than at any time during the war. He should tell that to the draft boards, especially those boards like No. 2 of Rushville, Ind., which resigned last summer and those which are supplying hardly half of their quota.

If the War Department is doing such a wonderful job, why, even if the Secretary doesn't quite know what it's all about, can't they come out and tell us what they are doing and what they will do? If they have no replacements, why are men with 20 points or less being discharged as surplus?

Lincoln, Friend of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 12, 1946

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today we observe the anniversary of the birth of one of America's greatest men, Abraham Lincoln.

In looking into history, studying the life of Lincoln, and reading with great interest his many words of wisdom, I came upon these words of the Great Emancipator which would certainly be timely today:

I am glad to see that a system of labor prevails under which laborers can strike when they want to, where they are not obliged to work under all circumstances, and are not tied down and obliged to labor whether you pay them or not. I like a system which lets a man quit when he wants to, and wish it might prevail elsewhere.

I am certain that if Lincoln were serving in this body today he would be aligned on the side of the progressive, liberal men who believe in the supremacy of human rights. I am sure that under the leadership of a Lincoln the men who like to claim him as the symbol of their party would have been persuaded to vote against the vicious, antilabor legislation known as the Case bill, which was passed in this House just a few days ago.

Throughout the Nation today, party orators will be singing the virtues of Lincoln—and they have a fertile subject. But the sad thing is that most of them will ignore, both in their speeches today and in their votes in Congress hereafter, Lincoln's liberal and progressive ideas.

Eighty-fifth Anniversary of the Oregonian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 12, 1946

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., of February 4, 1946:

AT THE AGE OF 85

It is with no disposition to complacency that the Oregonian today completes its eighty-fifth year of daily publication. There is little time for relaxation and self-congratulation for an institution which deals so intimately in the lives and fortunes of the community and the region, and in which its own success is interwoven. These are times as challenging as those tense days before the Civil War when the late Henry L. Pittock put the first edition of the Daily Oregonian to bed.

No oldster in carpet slippers, the Oregonian keenly anticipates the economic and social changes which lie ahead. It is better prepared than ever before to keep the people informed, swiftly, reliably, and without bias, of the newsworthy happenings of the Pacific Northwest and of the world. It will continue to express its opinions, boldly and independently, in the tradition of the late great editor, Harvey W. Scott, on the editorial page.

The Oregonian soon will be a centenarian. Most of the 600 residents of Portland gathered around a big bonfire at Front and Morrison Streets the night of December 4, 1850, when Thomas J. Dryer printed the first edition of the Weekly Oregonian on a Ramage press in a frame shack. The weekly was not suspended until March 30, 1922, though for many years it was overshadowed by the daily, and by the Sunday Oregonian which came into being on December 4, 1881.

Mr. Pittock went to work as an apprentice printer in 1853, became the owner in 1860 and on February 4, 1861, started the daily. At that time, Portland's population was about 3,000, and the Oregonian was the fourth daily. The Commercial Advertiser and the News were well established, and the Times, learning that Mr. Pittock was in San Francisco to order a new press, launched its daily during this absence. Obviously, the field was too crowded.

The enterprise, imagination, fair, and thorough presentation of news, and sound business policies which permitted the Oregonian to outlive scores of competitors through the years were demonstrated from the beginning by Mr. Pittock.

The Civil War was shaping and Mr. Pittock took immediate steps for the best possible coverage of military and national news. While the other newspapers were content to get their dispatches from San Francisco by monthly steamer, the Oregonian arranged for news by telegraph from San Francisco to Yreka, pony express to Jacksonville, and stage to Portland. The Oregonian stood stanchly for the Union, while the Commercial Advertiser became a semidemocratic secession paper and lost most of its following in loyal Oregon. The other papers were indecisive, editorially.

But aside from policy, Mr. Pittock was a businessman, enterprising, fair, and honest in all his dealings. At the close of many a week he went home without a dollar in his pocket, but his employees had been paid in cash. Fifty years after the daily was started, Mr. Pittock recalled: "The Times people didn't attend closely to business. One of them played the violin and the other the bass viol at social functions; I played neither the violin nor bass viol; but I kept at work." The rivals soon folded.

Perhaps the hardiest opposition of the early days of struggle came from Railroad Builder Ben Holladay's Oregon Bulletin, which lasted from 1870 to 1875, when Holladay's foreign capital was exhausted. The Oregonian was caught, too, in the senatorial struggle between H. W. Corbett and John H. Mitchell, the latter backed by Holladay. Mr. Pittock temporarily lost majority ownership of the Oregonian, but regained it later, when Mr. Scott became a partner.

The Oregonian's liberalism in the early eighties, when it vigorously opposed driving out the Chinese, resulted in threats to burn the printing plant and the formation of a mob which stormed around the building but dispersed without causing damage. "The election that year hinged on whether or not Governor Pennoyer should have a Chinaman wash his shirts," Mr. Pittock recalled dryly.

The strong, clear editorials of Editor Scott, one of America's foremost scholars, established the Oregonian as the great newspaper of the West. The newspaper was in the forefront of every effort to develop the region. Mr. Scott's penetrating editorials against free silver, in opposition to the community sentiment for cheap money, helped keep Oregon in the Republican column when neighboring States sailed for William Jennings Bryan for President in 1896.

The Oregonian today, as in the beginning, continues to stand up and be counted on any issue which affects the welfare of the thousands of persons it serves. It is proud of its position in the community, and it will continue to put forth every effort to merit the confidence of its subscribers.

Strike Settlements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 12, 1946

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Council of the City of Mansfield, Ohio:

Resolution recommending settlement of strike at an early date

Whereas wages during the war emergency were stabilized to prevent inflationary trends; and

Whereas since said emergency has passed wage earners have suffered a cut in take-home pay through shorter workweek, downgrading from higher to lower grade, skilled jobs, and decrease in incentive earnings; and

Whereas there has been a steady rise in the cost of living since January 1, 1941; and

Whereas this combination of circumstances has caused wage earners an insufferable loss in real wages and lower standard of living: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Council of the City of Mansfield, State of Ohio, That in the greater interest and welfare of the community at large, council recommends that industry and labor engage in collective bargaining in good faith to the end that accord and a satisfactory agreement be reached at an early date by granting a fair and substantial increase in pay.

Passed February 5, 1946.

W. E. BRADFORD,
President of Council,
Mansfield, Ohio.

Approved:

ROY W. VAUGHN,
Mayor, Mansfield, Ohio.

Attest:

CHARLES J. STECKER,
Clerk of Council,
Mansfield, Ohio.

The FBI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 12, 1946

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I seriously recommend the reading of the following article on the FBI, written by Mr. George E. Sokolsky and which appeared in the New York Sun on February 8, 1946. I doubt that even the fanatical Russia-first group in America can stomach J. Edgar Hoover being referred to as Himmler's understudy:

THE FBI

(By George E. Sokolsky)

The Daily Worker, organ of an alien international conspiracy for the destruction of American democracy and the substitution for it of a world revolution, recently produced an editorial entitled "Himmler's Understudy."

And by Himmler's Understudy, the Daily Worker means J. Edgar Hoover, an American if ever there was one, whose services to his country equal those of our best generals and admirals. Utilizing the technique of the smear amalgam, by which it is possible to denounce a man by association with unrelated symbols, the Communist organ says:

"Hoover slanders the American Communists as 'foreign agents.' This is the old gag. In England, the Tories used to say that 'communism' came from 'radical America.' In Czarist Russia the police used to say that 'communism' came from Germany, while in Germany the police used to cry it came from Russia."

It does not matter to Americans where England or Czarist Russia or Germany said communism came from. What does matter is that a systematic, insidious, undercover campaign is being waged against J. Edgar Hoover, against the FBI, against all the effective agencies in this country for national defense and security against an alien conspiracy designed to destroy our way of life, our political, social, and economic institutions.

Mark what this same editorial says:

"Communist parties, organizing the people for the establishment of a higher social system, socialism, defend every democratic liberty and every economic measure beneficial to the people. They arise wherever there is poverty and exploitation."

This is said of the United States of America, the country which, after two wars in a quarter of a century, still has the highest standard of living on earth, whose people live in freedom under the law, protected by a free press, and possessing savings of $163,000,000,000 which is their own, to do with as they choose, without Government interference. This is the country that gave to Europe and Asia as a gift $40,000,000,000 in lend-lease, including $10,800,000,000 to Soviet Russia, a poverty-stricken country, so backward that it still employs slave labor.

The Daily Worker, existing in the freedom of America, publishes this denunciation, using the words "poverty and exploitation" as a vile comparison in a fight against J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI. They hate the FBI because it alone of intelligence agencies rejected Communists during the war. They got into the State Department and the Army, and while some were shielded by the secrecy of actual membership, others disclosed their affiliations and were even defended by their superiors in such an agency as the OSS. The FBI kept them out because it is a permanent bulwark of national security.

We are all accustomed to the kind of war that is associated with armies and navies, with airplanes, submarines, and bombs. But most of us do not recognize the insidious and prolonged warfare that undermines a country as termites eat away the sills of a farmhouse. It is warfare that goes into the schools and colleges, that makes labor unproductive, that dissipates national energy in internecine strife, that cultivates bitterness between majority and minority groups, that breaks down national unity by making the entire nation class and group conscious. It is a warfare that goes on day and night, enlisting sentimental people as aids over particular issues but soon engulfing them in its destructive program. It is a warfare that corrupted France before the Nazis conquered her, that has resulted in puppetizing a large number of nations in Europe.

A nation should protect itself from this warfare as from foreign armies and navies. It should fight it by every means at its disposal. Only a cowardly people avoids this fight. Only a cowardly people refuses to see it when it is so apparent and obvious.

Is the FBI essential? It seems to me that the FBI should receive from Congress the largest appropriation in its history—so large that it can really serve America competently in this fight.

Make Democracy Live

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 12, 1946

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, for many years now, this distinguished House has been plagued by a dangerous growth, which has now become almost cancerous in character. It used to be called the Dies committee. Through some very clever parliamentary manipulating, the committee has been made a permanent body of the House. I'm sure that all of us were shocked recently when we heard Drew Pearson's report on the air that the counsel for this committee, Mr. Ernie Adamson, had written a letter condemning the use of the word democracy at the end of each one of Drew Pearson's broadcasts, when the distinguished commentator says, "Work, fight, give. Make democracy live."

Mr. Speaker, this is as un-American an activity as I have ever heard. I say that Mr. Adamson is unpatriotic and un-American-minded when he uses his position in this manner. Let us leave it to the Hitlers, Tojos, and Mussolinis to sneer at democracy. It was tactics like these which brought Europe to its knees.

I was gratified to see that a gentleman on the other side of the House, Mr. MUNDT, of South Dakota, has now seen fit to repudiate Mr. Adamson's stupid and vicious activities. I hope that the other members of the committee will once and for all clean their own house before they further besmirch the good names and high ideals of millions of Americans who believe in democracy. Mr. Pearson is to be congratulated for his exposure of such un-Americanism in our midst.

GI Writes His Congressman of Ambitions To Help Humanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 12, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, when I was home in the Eighteenth Congressional District of my native State of California for a few days this Christmas recess, I met with and spoke to a considerable number of men and women who are members of the American Veterans' Committee at Long Beach, Calif. It was an evening affair and they not only listened to me, but they asked questions. It was a group I had never met with before, nor had I met any of the group leaders. The following letter from John Baker, president of the Veterans' Committee, seems to be so inspiring and indicative that it is well worth the reading by anyone. Here it is:

AMERICAN VETERANS' COMMITTEE,
LONG BEACH CHAPTER,
January 10, 1946.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DOYLE: This will be both a bread-and-butter note and a personal letter.

First of all, on behalf of the membership of our chapter and myself, many, many thanks for your taking time off from your duties and well-deserved rest to speak to us last week. We all appreciated the fact that you have been so swamped that your time can be measured in value. But, more important, we appreciate the fact that your measure of our worth (in the future) warranted your criticism, comments and suggestions, and your obvious sincerity. Again, we thank you.

I go next month to the University of California to begin a course in social and political philosophy which will last 7 years. I am now 25 years old, which means I shall be more than 30 when I begin my active career.

At 21 I entered the Army with no idea of the future, knowing only that the world was certainly a queer mess. Now, I have, at least, a vague goal and an overwhelming desire to get there. That goal is to help humanity attain a spiritual equality with its technological advance.

I don't know yet how to do this but I do know that until the desire for money, material comforts, and social position, is subordinated to the quest for moral values such spiritual quality will not be attained. If that means a different economic system, so be it. The only factor to consider is any change or continuation is the individual, or collectively, the people.

The people are everything: nothing is without the people. That is why I have faith in AVC and why I work for it as an organization that must be successful. It is an organization of, by, and for, its members (potentially 12,000,000 people) as members of humanity.

It is hard for a young person to realize that an older person can or does have any awareness of change and youth's values of life. When we find such an older person we look to him for guidance and leadership. I know that you will not fail the people.

Be assured that your son and our comrades did not die in vain. Good luck.

Sincerely,

JOHN BAKER.

Can We Have a Democratic Army?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH DE LACY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 12, 1946

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege granted me, I desire to call attention of the Members to a provocative article, Can We have a Democratic Army? by Benjamin J. Atlas, able veteran Washington correspondent, which appears in the March issue of Everybody's Digest.

Mr. Atlas' article raises sharply the criticism of our armed services which we have heard from so many of our returning servicemen. Believers in democracy, having been reared in a great democratic tradition, these men were taken from their normal lives and made a part of our wartime Army. They reject the term "people's" army, since while it was an army of the people, it lacked the concept of democracy so dear to our people.

Just at the time when we are desirous of increasing our enlistments, Mr. Atlas' excellent article urges upon us full consideration of possible reforms within the ranks of our armed services. For that reason I call it to the attention of Congress. The article follows:

CAN WE HAVE A DEMOCRATIC ARMY?

(By Benjamin J. Atlas)

Maybe it's still a military secret. We've searched the public papers prepared by the brass hats. We've read their requests for a standing Army and Navy four times bigger than any in the Nation's peacetime history. We've examined their blueprints for training a million citizens yearly in addition to the Regular Army. We've combed their diverse other demands which have been driving Congressmen to the dispensary. But the brass hats still haven't shown that the peacetime Military Establishment will be shaped into a democratic one.

That's a mighty important detail. Practically all Americans who have been vocal on the subject agree that we ought to have an effective peacetime military body. At the same time, there is more than passing concern over whether or not that peacetime Army and Navy will practice democracy.

Many of our present and former GI's, for example, have been coming up with provocative questions. They want to know if the permanent military machine is going to be just a more lavish version of the archaic model that preceded Pearl Harbor. They want to know if it's merely going to mean an expansion of officers' country clubs and military caste. They want to know if it's going to be just a luxury Army of goldbrickers and bickering bureaucrats.

They want to know—because if these things are so, we are letting ourselves in for the fattest, most politically powerful, and most incompetent Army of professionals that every saddled a peacetime Nation.

The GI letters and cartoons in the late Yank, the popular Army weekly, were never more waspish than when dealing with the democratic shortcomings of our present Military Establishment. Without the slightest diminution in esteem and gratitude for the brilliant leadership that pressed the war to victory, the healthy GI gripes are a stern rebuke against the antidemocratic ways of the old Army mule and its Navy counterpart.

The GI quarrel is with the failure of the military professionals to broaden the chances for men to rise to leadership. The quarrel is with military caste. The quarrel is with the waste involved for the masses of men in a peacetime Army whose training objectives haven't caught up with the atomic age. The quarrel is with a static peacetime leadership that taboos instructing its men in the ways of people, government, and the world.

It might help if the brass hats—as well as Congress—studied for themselves a random few o. the GI thoughts from Yank and its fellow publications:

"We might as well face the fact that the Army, as we know it, is about the last place we should put our youth for character building."

"Few of us could deny that the bully and the toady get ahead in the Army. * * *"

"If the Army runs true to form, trainees (under universal conscription) will be so disgusted with Army stupidity and bungling, its politics, its crass caste system, and its undemocratic processes, that they will go out determined that they never will have to be in service again."

"What we need is to keep abreast of the mechanical and scientific aspects * * * and not to have a large Army that only knows how to make a bed for Saturday inspection."

"I was tol' that as a private I was not supposed to think, just do as ordered. Over here (Germany), a GI that didn't think wasn't worth a damn."

If the brass hats are familiar with complaints like those, their plans for the peacetime establishment don't show it. There's not a trace anywhere to indicate that the brass hats are willing to part with caste, politics, and all the other evils revealed in a rising mass of evidence from the military ranks. The democratic demands of the recent wartime mass Army apparently have failed to budge the professionals from their traditional leanings.

The Army and Navy Bulletin, an unofficial publication prepared by citizen reserve officers, has reported, for example, that selection of officers of the Regular Navy for flag rank (rear admiral or higher) "has taken on some of the aspects of a popularity contest." The procedure "has stimulated the well-known art of 'polishing the apple,'" wrote the critics, and "it has put a premium * * * on the social side of Navy life, on how many people you know—or don't know."

Wholesale discrimination by the professionals in the awarding of honors has been exposed by the same publication. Although the ratio of Reserves to Regulars in the Navy was nearly 10 to 1 up to last August, the Regulars received 3½ times more medals.

Despite the fact that the Reserves "played a major role in fighting the war and suffered a proportionate number of casualties," wrote the Army and Navy Bulletin, the pros received 27 times more Medals of Honor, highest decoration the Nation can give for heroism in combat. Not a single reservist had been awarded the Distinguished Service Medal, although 139 had been given to Regulars. And here is the pay-off: Officers received 13 times more medals than enlisted men, in proportion to their numerical strength.

The effectiveness of the peacetime Military Establishment is already jeopardized as a result of this kind of favoritism. A carefully conducted poll of Navy personnel, according to columnist Drew Pearson, has revealed that most of the enlisted men, including 90 percent of the Regulars themselves, are fed up with the system.

Only 5 percent of the gobs expressed willingness to stay in the service, according to the poll Pearson said was taken in consultation with experts from such well-established survey organizations as Gallup's and Elmo Roper's. Two-thirds of the men who wanted to get out and stay out gave such reasons as "caste system," "dislike of officers," "officers are heels," "enlisted man is always wrong," and "it's an officer's Navy." Sixteen percent cited regimentation and lack of freedom.

Not a single sailor complained of food, sea duty, danger, crowded bunkrooms or similar personal discomforts as a reason for wanting to cut loose from the Navy. Nor did the majority hope to make more money by returning to civilian life.

As though to set at rest the public's fears, brass hats have been talking vaguely about a peacetime citizens army. By all intelligent standards, their definitions of a citizens' army are hopelessly hollow. The War Department's idea of a citizens' army, for instance, is a comparatively small professional force backed by a big citizens' reserve, fed yearly from men in compulsory training. According to current plans, that comparatively small professional force is estimated conservatively at 1,500,000 men. Estimates run as high as 2,300,000.

Who will be the leaders of this record-size military outfit? The peacetime bigwigs will originate, as they always have, from such hallowed sources as West Point and Annapolis. There is nothing in the blueprints to indicate otherwise. Commissioning and advancement will continue to be influenced by social graces, seniority, family background, race, and religion.

The professional clique system stands as the most stubborn of all barriers to Army progress. In the interest of getting rid of the deadwood, the Army could take a leaf from the original prospectus of its wartime college specialized-training program. The prospectus called for selection of soldiers strictly on their merits for college work in specialized fields. Don't get the idea that the program was a thumping success. It definitely was not, in the opinion of reliable educators as well as military men. The aversion of old-line regulars to products of "book-larnin'" just about wrecked the show.

Furthermore, according to the records, there was plenty of bungling in the selection of the trainees. In addition, the colleges were kept largely in the dark, month after month, on what the program was all about and on how many soldiers were going to be trained.

In fact the Army's possible use of the traineess remained in the realm of inscrutable military mysteries to the high command itself. Relatively few of the graduates went on to commissioned grades. And tens of thousands of them wound up in assignments for which their college specialized training wasn't needed.

All in all, though, honest evaluation by the educators shows that the men picked for the training were generally superior. Anyway, there was something sound and, so far as the Army was concerned, completely novel in the original idea of picking a soldier-trainee on his own abilities without inquiring into his father's social achievements.

With characteristic inflexibility, the Army is refusing to reexamine not only its leadership processes but also its training standards for a peacetime organization.

The Army's training manuals are offering little to stir the democratic incentives of a soldier, whether he is to become a part of an international police force or whether he'll take a post at one of our domestic defenses. Peacetime GI Joe is learning how to repel or attack an imaginary enemy. He is learning about antiaircraft firing, handling a rifle, map-reading, chemical warfare, and use of grenades. He is being toughened by drill, marches, and bivouac. He is getting technical training, too, in a particular branch or service. He is learning how to be a cook,

a baker, a telephone lineman, or any one of the hundreds of other occupational specialties needed in a modern army.

All of this, as far as it goes, apparently is useful to a soldier. Beyond this, however, the soldier's training is at a standstill. Correspondence courses which are available to him are strictly in the category of sops to leisure time. Overseas university classes which the qualified soldier may attend are in the nature of temporary expedients for restless GI's waiting to be demobilized. These are not part of the Army's serious permanent training program.

As a step for preparedness and cooperation in a world whose dimensions have been reduced by jet propulsion and cosmic energy, the Army's training formula is far from adequate. It discounts the value of man's greatest weapon—the human mind. General Marshall himself has cautioned the Nation that "the German soldier-philosopher Clausewitz described war as a violent form of political action."

Anne O'Hare McCormick, New York Times correspondent, reporting from Germany recently on discontent and disinterest among GI's, observed: "This is the proof that they really did not know what they were fighting for and this in turn means failure somewhere to make the issue so clear that they could no question the cardinal importance of the watch on the Rhine."

Brig. Gen. William C. Menninger, director of the Neuropsychiatry Consultants Division in the Surgeon General's Office of the War Department, reported recently:

"The average inductee regarded his induction with a certain degree of fatalism—certainly with no enthusiasm. It was largely left to the Army to provide him with the conviction that the war was important. The absence of motivation contributed significantly to the high incidence of psychiatric casualties."

What is the incidence of psychiatric casualties from "lack of an ideal" in the peacetime Army? How grave will the consequences be in an armed force whose global responsibilities already surpass those entrusted to any previous peacetime armed body in all the world's history?

No army today can boast democratic aims without developing in its enlisted men something more than the skills required for firing a gun, saluting an officer, typing supply forms, or, for that matter, operating radar. The peacetime training objectives are in urgent need of revitalization.

The task is far too big for the brass hats. It requires borrowing—as the military pros finally did in World War II—the talents and resources of the civilian educators. To do otherwise would be to turn over to the brass hats a political instrument which, falling into evil or incompetent hands, could wreck democracy at home.

Congress, in planning a democratic Army, must decide now on just what the balance will be between the brass hats and the civilian institutions. Beyond the basic and technical training which the soldier gets at military camps, the fundamental background of knowledge applicable to his military life can only come from the civilian schools and industries.

In tackling the military plans, it would be worth Congress' efforts to explore the way the Army and Navy handled their vast wartime powers and funds in contracting for aid from civilian industry and education. Severe complaints of military officiousness, bad planning, and red tape have appeared in many of the published evaluations. The military begged off its errors during the war as unavoidable in an emergency whose demands could not be foreseen. Such an excuse is no longer tenable. There is nothing in the brass-hat plans to provide the faintest hope that the military would not repeat those costly mistakes.

Congress, in legislating for a democratic armed force, has no choice but to limit the military professionals to a technical role. Any other course could only invite a military oligarchy or a recurrence of the post-World War I popular reaction against military preparedness.

The task of planning a peacetime Army and Navy is already badly engulfed in politics, greed, and confusion. Congressmen have been forced to retreat to their domed citadel under a bombardment of piecemeal military demands for presumably wholly unrelated decisions on universal military training, Army-Navy strength, Army-Navy unification, and atomic bomb control.

The battle between Army and Navy brass hats on the issue of a unified command has enlivened but not improved the scene. The pulling and hauling among the goldbraiders has been an unsavory reminder of the sort of professional rivalries uncovered in the Pearl Harbor inquiries.

In the present tumult, it is high time that the brass hats recalled the warning of their former Chief of Staff, General Marshall, against a large standing army subject to the behest of a group of schemers. The natural antipathy of GI's to the undemocratic ways of the brass hats melted in the heat of a war that had to be won. Today in the cold uncertain light of peace the urgency for democratization is real and solid.

The problem cannot be decided judiciously under pressure from the military. Congress and the President can hardly expect to get an honest answer to one of the biggest questions of our time without counsel from impartial, civilian-directed investigators.

Getting the answer to that question will require resolving a lot of issues which so far we've been shrinking from. We'll have to decide where we're heading internationally before we can mold a permanent military machine. We'll have to face the reality that there's no future in continuing to plant buffer states against former Allies. We'll have to make up our minds to work cooperatively with our global friends in preventing new Hitlers from rising in Germany, Japan, Italy, or anywhere else. We'll have to stop playing favorites on the atomic secret. We'll have to figure out how the newest scientific discoveries will affect the pattern of our peacetime armed force.

We'll have to consider ways to help the schools and colleges gird for a big share of the responsibility we once left—in sheer ignorance—to the brass hats. We'll have to clean out the deadwood in our military house and open the doors to advancement along democratic lines. We'll have to wipe out the holdovers of military caste for which any sensible veteran has only contempt. We'll have to liberate our soldiers from their present political imprisonment. We'll have to call a halt to framing our military plans in the narrow concept of an army and navy dominated by a professional clique.

Only a democratic Army, whose leaders spring from the heart of the people, will effectively guard the Nation, police the vanquished, and help commit us eventually to economic and political participation with the world.

One World Language

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1946

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to call attention to the very fine work being done to promote one world language.

On January 29, 1946, Hon. JERRY VOORHIS of California, called attention to the great importance of one world language as a means of promoting international understanding and effective cooperation.

This demand is now being considered in London by the representatives of the United States, and has the general approval of the Ministers of Education of the European nations, who passed resolutions in London over a year ago urging one world language.

The maximum gross products of the United States alone in 1944 reached one hundred and ninety-eight billions—see the record of the Federal Reserve Bulletin for September 1945, page 873.

There is little doubt that this rate of production of goods and services can be achieved throughout the world by the use of the global alphabet devised by former Senator Owen from Oklahoma, as explained in the hearings of November 7 last before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate.

The explanation therein set forth is complete. The proof of the adequacy of this alphabet, to make visible the audible sounds of all words in the English language and in other languages, cannot be successfully denied. This alphabet was approved by the Representatives of Oklahoma in the Congress of the United States a year ago, and by the Legislature of Oklahoma on the 26th of April 1945, the same day that the United Nations Charter was approved in San Francisco.

The production of the United States increased nearly 300 percent in 1944, from that of 1933.

Two-thirds of the people of the world are said to be unable to read and write their own language, and their exportable products have been negligible because of their being uninformed as to the modern methods of production, transportation, and distribution. If they could produce to the average of the citizens of the United States for 1944, the products and services of the nations of the people now illiterate would approximate two thousand billions, and create a new world of overflowing abundance, giving employment to the merchant marine of the United States, as well as to the full employment of the people of the United States. It would also enable the people of the world to liquidate the war debts and restore the destruction of war and firm establishment of durable peace and mutual understanding.

It should be obvious that no investment could surpass the investment put into the prompt establishment of one effective world language.

The director of the Committee on World Literacy, Mr. Frank Laubach, has stated in his book, The Silent Billion Speak, that $5,000,000 would suffice to abolish illiteracy. His experience is of importance, for he has directed the teaching of over 80 different nationalities how to read and write their native dialects in phonetic alphabets which can be learned in 1 day.

The expansion of the production of the world through knowledge of modern processes, and the use of one world language going into the billions makes an investment in education the most valuable investment ever conceived in the history of man.

The Congress of the United States is fully committed to the policy of world education in the United Nations Charter. Its representatives, through the delegation sent to the General Assembly of the United Nations in London, realize the importance of establishing one world language.

I wish to commend the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], to which I have referred, and to the record made on the 7th of November 1945, before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate.

The radio has announced that Hon. Eleanor Roosevelt proposes to sponsor a resolution before the General Assembly of the United Nations favoring one world language. Such a resolution would meet with unanimous favor in the United States.

Lincoln and the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 12, 1946

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, in commemorating the birthday of President Abraham Lincoln, Mr. Horace C. Carlisle, a native of Alabama, has written a very beautiful and appropriate poem which I gladly insert as a part of my remarks in the RECORD:

LINCOLN AND THE SOUTH

Abraham Lincoln, true history's theme,
Sculpture's idol, and poetry's dream,
Lives in America's worshipful heart,
Greater and grander, as decades depart—
Loved by the North in whose int'rest he wrought,
Praised by the South whom he fearlessly fought.

Long as the Union continues to stand,
Lincoln's great life will enlighten the land—
Though the South thought him her fearfulest foe,
Lincoln's sad death was her heaviest blow—
For, when death closed the great patriot's mouth,
Hope winged its flight from the heart of the South.

In the dark days, when the South in her grief
Needed a Lincoln to lend her relief
From carpetbaggers' and free negroes' scorns,
Scalawags scourged her and crowned her with thorns,
Under whose rule Reconstruction, by far,
Hurt the South worse than the horrors of war.

If the great Lincoln, humanity's friend—
On whom the helpless could always depend—
By his assassin's gun had not been slain,
He might have fought the war over again—
Lincoln's great heart through his pen or his mouth
Never decreed such a curse on the South.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Appraisement of Abraham Lincoln Makes Him a Man Who Shaped Destiny—Citizens of Other Nations Also Appraise Him Superlatively

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 12, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, because this great legislative body is this day simply but very sincerely observing the birthday of a former Member of this House, Abraham Lincoln, and because we, as proud Americans might rightly be pardoned for expression of just pride and commemoration, I thought that it would be instructive and inspiring for Members to have before them the appraisal of Abraham Lincoln as made by some of the outstanding leaders of thought and statesmanship in other parts of the world, as well as some of our own. So out of the vast number of appraisals which have been made and which I have been pleased to get together from time to time, I submit the following as merely samples of hundreds and hundreds of others similar in import and finality:

I have heretofore spoken on the floor of this House of the great inspiration the life of Abraham Lincoln as a boy, as a young lawyer, as a legislator, and as President has been to me. I am so glad that historians and scholars are more and more placing full emphasis and effort in ferreting out the truth about Lincoln. Neither mythology nor gossip nor rumor—none of these things should have any place in the known facts about a great American so recently deceased. And because it does seem to me that our Government has not emphasized the ascertaining of the truth and the preservation of facts about him, I respectfully urge that our Government spend whatever time, effort, and money which is necessary to ascertain and preserve as quickly as follows the facts and the truth about him. This, of course, will cover his ancestry as well as his parents, himself, and his entire life and place in history. I do not relate this incident with a thought of criticism of any person or governmental department, but as illustrative of how the things can be taken at face value—which have no factual basis for their truth or veracity in connection with Lincoln lore. I will say that shortly after coming to Washington, on my first visit to the Ford Theater, I saw in the showcase an ordinary-sized business card, and outside the case there was affixed another card saying that it was Lincoln's business card. The card in the case contained the following text in print:

A. Lincoln
Attorney and Counsellor at Law
Springfield, Illinois

To whom it may concern:

My old customers and others are no doubt aware of the terrible time I have had in "crossing the stream", and will be glad to know that I will be back on the same side from which I started on or before the 4th of March next, when I will be ready to [Note: In italics] Swap Horses, Dispense Law, Make Jokes, Split Rails, [end of italics] and perform other matters in a SMALL WAY.

The more I studied it the more it worried me and upon prompt inquiry from the director as to whether or not the Government had verification of this card as bona fide and genuine, I was informed it did not. It was then sincerely explained to me that it had been owned for several years in the Oyrode collection. But the director agreed with me that until or unless it could be actually authenticated, it was hardly appropriate to display it as genuine and to keep it on display in a museum where 10 cents admission was charged, and in a museum where everyone had a right to expect everything to be genuine unless otherwise indicated. So the card came out. This incident will illustrate something of what I urge upon my Government in relation to Lincoln lore and Lincoln history. Increasingly I feel that if Abraham Lincoln were alive today again in the Halls of this Congress, he would take his seat and logically and emphatically take his stand along with those who freely admit that they conscientiously believe that there will be no freedom in our Nation until there is economic freedom for all, regardless of race, creed, or color. I believe his actions prove that he would so conduct himself if he were now alive. In a like manner, if he had been alive last week when we were discussing the Case bill and strikes and the matter of the relationship of labor and management, profits and losses, I believe Abraham Lincoln would have been found on the side of those who promptly recognized that there was no substantial progress on the part of the working people of America until there was organized action on the part of the working people of America. Along this line of thought and action about Abraham Lincoln, it will no doubt be significant and informative to many to read that in Hartford, Conn., on March 5, 1860, Abraham Lincoln said "Thank God we have a system of labor where there can be a strike."

Now I list the appraisements that I previously mentioned:

SAVIOR OF THE REPUBLIC

The memory of Lincoln will live and endure among you, gathering reverence from age to age, the memory of one who saved the Republic by his wisdom. (James Bryce.)

DIVINE HUMAN

A more divine human never has lived. (S. Parks Cadman.)

UNDERRATED

He was misunderstood and underrated in his lifetime, and even yet has hardly come to his own. For his place is among the great men of the world. (Lord Charnwood.)

INSPIRATION OF LIBERTY

The man whom the world honored and loved and who has inspired all the world to love liberty. (Georges Clemenceau.)

BASIC ELEMENTS

He surpassed all others in those attributes which men feel are common to them all. In him they find the pure and unmixed elements. (Calvin Coolidge.)

REINCARNATION

Lincoln does not die. He moves on. He reincarnates. He is the advancing common sense of us all. (Frank Crane.)

ETERNAL NAME

The name of Lincoln will be one of the greatest that history has to inscribe on its annals. (D'Aubigue.)

ABSENCE OF CEREMONIES

In the very accessories of his almost latest moments there is something so homely and so innocent that it takes the subject, as it were, out of the pomp of history and out of the ceremonials of diplomacy. (Benjamin Disraeli)

GREATEST OF RECENT CENTURIES

Not only the greatest American, but greater than any men France, England, or any other country has produced in the last few centuries. (John Drinkwater.)

CONTINENT'S REPRESENTATIVE

The true representative of this continent, an entirely public man, father of his country, the pulse of twenty millions throbbing in his heart. (Ralph Waldo Emerson.)

TRIUMPHANT BUT GENTLE

He was one of the few great rulers whose wisdom increased with his power and whose spirit grew gentler and tenderer as his triumphs were multiplied. (James A. Garfield.)

TRANSFORMING POWER

I may feel free to speak of him as I might speak of Plato or St. Paul or any other of that little group of men but for whose lives and thoughts we should all be different from what we are. (Lord Halifax.)

TITLES TO REGARD

His life and achievements give him titles to regard second to those of no other man in ancient or modern times. (Rutherford B. Hayes.)

BELOVED OF GOD

Abraham Lincoln was the glory of his time, dear unto men and beloved of God. (Newell Dwight Hilles.)

SERVANT

The great-souled servant of the people. (Charles Evans Hughes.)

GENTLEST MEMORY

He is the gentlest memory of our world. (Robert G. Ingersoll.)

GREATEST AMERICAN

He is the greatest man grown on the American continent. (Lloyd George.)

REPRESENTATIVE MAN

He is so eminently our representative man that when he speaks it seems as if the people were listening to their own thinking aloud. (James Russell Lowell.)

AN ENDURING THEME

A thousand years hence, no story, no tragedy, no epic poem will be filled with greater words than that which tells of his life and death. (William McKinley.)

GOD-SUSTAINED

God-given and God-led and sustained we must ever believe him. (Wendell Phillips.)

RACIAL EXPRESSION

He expressed the deepest and holiest feelings of his race for all time. (Elihu Root.)

JUDICIAL TEMPERAMENT

Lincoln had the most judicial temperament of any man in history. (William Howard Taft.)

SAINT OF HUMANITY

He was a Christ in miniature, a saint of humanity. (Leo Tolstoi.)

GOD'S ELECT

Surely he was one of God's elect. Recurring to the doctrine of inspiration, I say again and again, he was inspired by God. (Henry Watterson.)

GREATEST ANGLO-SAXON

Perhaps of all the men born to the Anglo-Saxon race in the nineteenth century, Mr. Lincoln deserves the highest place in history. (Sir Spencer Walpole.)

PERMANENCY

I think we are safe in including Abraham Lincoln in our list of six permanently great figures. (H. G. Wells.)

GRANDEST FIGURE

The grandest figure yet on all the crowded canvas of the nineteenth century. (Walt Whitman.)

INSTRUMENT OF HUMANITY

He was like some great instrument of humanity, wherever life touched him he spoke back its meaning, gave forth fire to kindle its life. (Woodrow Wilson.)

A MAN FOR THE AGES

He belongs not to our age but to the ages, and yet, though he belongs to all time and to all peoples he is ours, for he is an American. (Stephen S. Wise.)

A Tribute to the State Department and Administration Leaders in Reverse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 12, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, we cannot add to or detract from the atomic bomb power of an editorial which appeared in the Daily News of Washington, D. C., for today, February 12. This editorial is a challenge to the administration, and its foreign policy, and I hope that every person who loves America will read this carefully. I do not have to tell you that time after time we were told there were no secret agreements. I do not have to tell you that we know now that these statements were bare-faced falsehoods. This editorial reads as follows:

SECRET, SORDID, AND STUPID

If there was ever a more sordid deal by the United States than the needless bribery of Russia to enter the Jap war, we can't recall it. Now that the text of the agreement by Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin at Yalta has been made public, it turns out to be even worse than feared.

It violated assurances by the President and State Department that no secret political agreements had been or would be made.

In giving the Kuriles and South Saghalien to Russia, it violated the first and second pledges of the Atlantic Charter against territorial aggrandizement, and the United Nations declaration. It violated the Cairo agreement which said Japan would be expelled from territories taken by violence and greed—which does not cover the Kuriles.

In agreeing to "hand over" to Russia the Jap territories, it usurped power of the Allied peace conference. This peace conference authority was underlined by President Truman in his statement on Potsdam. It was reasserted by Secretary Byrnes last week in his comment that the secret Yalta pact—which had been hidden even from him for 7 months—would be subject to peace-conference decision. But the secret text provides that these Soviet claims "shall be unquestionably fulfilled"—regardless.

This was also a denial of the United States Constitution and the Senate's treaty powers.

Besides giving Russia the Jap territory, the pact invaded the sovereign rights of our Chinese ally. It gave Russia special privileges at Port Arthur and Dairen and in control of Manchurian railroads, and it separated Outer Mongolia from China. Since none of this could be delivered without the consent of Chiang Kai-shek, the President agreed to "take measures in order to obtain this concurrence on advice from Marshal Stalin." So the later Chinese-Russian treaty, making good on the Big Three deal, was under this duress.

The deal was stupid, because no bribe was needed. It was more to Russia's interest than to ours that she fight Japan; because Japan was a nearer threat to her than to us, and because only by fighting could Russia get a stake in the postwar far eastern settlement. We would lick Japan without her help—and virtually did anyway.

The deal was stupid not only for us, who had a reputation of international integrity to maintain, but also for Russia. She easily could have obtained from the legal peace conference legitimate trusteeship and bases in south Saghalien and the Kuriles.

We believe the Big Three outsmarted themselves. Roosevelt and Churchill unwittingly undermined an orderly and just peace structure. And Stalin has tipped his hand to America, that he is playing a game in the Pacific of grab and ruthless power.

Do you not think it about time, Mr. Speaker, in view of the serious charges made in this editorial, that the American people should be advised now if there were other secret agreements? Perhaps some were made with other countries besides Russia. We ought to have the facts. So far as Russia is concerned the American people were sold down the river. It was American troops and American valor that conquered Japan. There is no reason why Russia should have been promised or should now be given the Kuriles. If there are other secret agreements, now is the time to repudiate them. Surely the political leaders of this country should concede some rights to America and its citizens.

The Closed Door to Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, recognizing the importance of opening the Great Lakes to ocean transportation for the progressive development of commerce and industry in the heart of the United States, there is inserted herewith a letter and resolution received from one of the railroad brotherhoods, and my reply thereto:

BROTHERHOOD OF LOCOMOTIVE FIREMEN AND ENGINEMEN,

Washington, D. C., February 11, 1946.

To the Members of the House of Representatives:

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The national legislative board of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen just completed its sessions here in Washington. This board is made up of chairmen from every State in the Union.

They directed me to send you the enclosed resolutions passed by them regarding legislation now before Congress.

Sincerely yours,

J. A. McBRIDE.

Resolution opposing the St. Lawrence seaway

Whereas there is before the United States Senate Senate Joint Resolution 104 for development of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project; and

Whereas it was first promoted as a waterway; then as a power project; then as a joint waterway and power project; then in 1940 it blazoned forth as a great national defense aid; and

Whereas the necessity of this seaway and power development as a national or international defense is now a thing of the past; and

Whereas the completion of the St. Lawrance deep waterway is intended to decrease the movement of traffic via United States rail lines, and if successful, will be detrimental to the best interests of our national system of transportation and to the public in general; and

Whereas the railroads of our Nation employ a large number of workers, it is a matter of deep concern to the railroad centers of the country as to the proposals to alter commercial routes and transfer of freight through Canadian outlets subject to laws now in effect or proposed in Canada, whereby freight must be routed through that country; and

Whereas the immense investments in railroads constitute an important part of our tax-paying properties, so consideration should be given to the economic questions involved and to the unemployment resulting if the changes occur; and

Whereas there is a surplus of rail transportation, including terminal facilities in the United States, the very existence of which is dependent not only upon traffic now being handled which waterway proponents contend would be diverted, but is also dependent on increases from every available source; and

Whereas it has been clearly shown that the preponderance of benefit derived from completion of this waterway will inure to Canadian traffic and that the traffic change contemplated, if successful, will divert from New Orleans and North Atlantic seaports the larger proportion of export grain products: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the national legislative board of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, representing 48 States in the United States, is opposed to any agreement designed to bring about development of the St. Lawrence waterway and power project.

DEAR MR. McBRIDE: What is the matter with the St. Lawrence seaway? Why oppose a plan to make our Great Lakes coast line accessible to ocean transportation to all the world?

Must we keep closed the door of opportunity to the States of this great central region?

Must we bar vast potential development to these United States lake-shore communities? Must our most productive States be deprived of enlarged markets at our very door?

Could not you and our railroads with equal propriety oppose navigation on the Ohio River through the industrial Pittsburgh district where auxiliary transportation has increased railway tonnage in such a marked degree?

Sincerely,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 12, 1946

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including several important resolutions for the benefit of the membership which were passed at the last meeting of the United States Conference of Mayors:

GENERAL HOUSING BILL OF 1945

Whereas the general housing bill of 1945 (S. 1592) sponsored by Senators WAGNER, ELLENDER, and TAFT, and now pending before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, constituted one of the most important subjects of discussion by officials of more than 300 American cities gathered in conference at the Hotel Astor in New York City, December 10, 11, and 12, 1945, and which conference developed the following facts:

1. Returning veterans and war workers are being confronted with the most critical housing shortage in the history of this country and this shortage is becoming more acute daily;

2. Serious blight and slum conditions already have overtaken approximately one-fifth of the areas of cities, creating tremendous social and health problems affecting the well-being of more than 25,000,000 people living in these blight and slum areas;

3. The entire local real-estate tax base in cities is being undermined by billions of dollars of assessable property already scrapped by adverse blight and slum conditions and the rapid expansion of blight is destroying annually additional billions in property value: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States Conference of Mayors herewith endorses the general objectives of said general housing bill of 1945 (S. 1592).

HOUSING

Be it resolved by the United States Conference of Mayors, That where a landlord arranges for a room or rooms in the landlord's own living quarters and sharing the home with his own family, to a veteran of World War II for housekeeping, including cooking on the premises, the OPA rent regulations as to landlord-tenant relationship governing tenure shall not apply; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be submitted immediately to the Director of Reconversion and the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration.

RESOLUTION ON HOUSING

Whereas legislation is now pending in the Congress of the United States providing for a housing appropriation of $190,000,000 for the purpose of making available 100,000 temporary family units; and

Whereas in many cities of the country the housing situation is so critical as to require the immediate use of such temporary units even though it is recognized that such temporary units provide no final answer to the housing shortage and that their need and use is due entirely to an emergency condition; and

Whereas it is urgent that no delay occur in making emergency family housing units available: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States Conference of Mayors petition the Congress to enact the pending legislation at the earliest possible moment; and be it further

Resolved, That such temporary housing units as may be turned over to the cities be operated and administered by the city housing authorities or other appropriate agency of the municipal government to the end that the municipal authorities, which are closest to the problem, may insure that the people most desperately in need of housing are provided for.

CONTINUATION OF RENT CONTROL

Whereas throughout most of the cities of the United States there exists a drastic housing shortage; and

Whereas it is the consensus of opinion of the mayors of the cities of the United States that if rent control is discontinued, a serious inflation in housing rentals would result; and

Whereas such an inflation would work a hardship, particularly upon veterans and their families along with displaced war workers in every section of the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States Conference of Mayors here assembled in annual conference urgently petition the Congress of the United States to extend the expiration date of the Emergency Rent Control Act until the present housing shortage conditions are eliminated.

HOSPITAL AID LEGISLATION

Whereas there is great need for the expansion, construction, and modernization of municipal health and hospital facilities; and

Whereas the Education and Labor Committee of the United States Senate has given approval to a program of Federal aid to municipalities for hospital construction, expansion, and modernization: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States Conference of Mayors in annual conference assembled urges the adoption of pending legislation as recommended by the Senate Education and Labor Committee.

Legislation Like Railway Labor Act Can Inspire Permanent Industrial Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 12, 1946

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I wish to state that the Republican leadership in achieving harmony and unity in the field of labor-management relations has been clearly defined during our national history. One of the pioneers in carving out legislation and bringing light and objectivity to our national policies in this respect was none other than a native Hoosier, the former Senator Jim Watson.

The predictions which former Senator Watson made more than 20 years ago, and the legislation which he sponsored, have come into their true significance during the current industrial strife. He farsightedly faced our social, economic, and political problems with an understanding of the human elements involved and of the responsibility our industrial and labor leaders owe to the public. This was clearly shown in the legislation he introduced as chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce—

legislation which was to become the Railway Labor Act.

If only the party in power today had this kind of leadership and vision, we could safely predict the rapid reconversion of our domestic economy to a sound, productive basis. It would eliminate the serious and irresponsible acts of selfish leaders which rock our national security. It would inaugurate an orderly solution of our labor-management relations without disrupting our entire economy.

In the current issue of the National Republic is an article showing how well-conceived legislation like the Railway Labor Act can inspire permanent industrial peace and eliminate the menace of strikes.

The article follows:

"Sunny Jim Watson—his friends formerly called him. Prophet Jim Watson is what they now name him."

With the above words Mark Thistlethwaite—nationally known newswriter—recently broadcast from an Indiana radio station some new laurels which have been bestowed upon the former Indiana Senator. The laurels are based upon two predictions which he made in the Senate 20 years ago.

One of the predictions has been fulfilled. The other has promise of being fulfilled when Congress enacts into law President Truman's proposed antistrike legislation, which is based upon so-called cooling-off periods, in threatened strikes, and the establishment of fact-finding boards.

As chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, Watson in 1926 sponsored legislation that became the Railway Labor Act. It is after this law that the President has fashioned his proposal for permanent industrial peace and a plan to terminate the menace of strikes. In behalf of the bill which he was sponsoring, Watson said in the Senate on May 6, 1926:

"I am bold enough to prophesy that if this plan shall be adopted, no railroad strike will again occur in the United States."

Nearly 20 years have passed, and, as yet, no strike on railroads has occurred under the law. Thus Prophet Watson's first prediction still stands.

In the same speech the Hoosier Senator went further and said:

"I am bold enough to say that if this legislation succeeds, it will become the standard by which similar machinery will be set up in the whole industrial world of America. Who does not wish for that glad day in the settlement of these disputes?"

The Watson legislation of 1926 did succeed. Congress is now at work on the proposed Truman legislation to apply the principles of that Railway Labor Act to all major industries. Congress has been asked to do exactly that when the President, in his message of December 3, 1945, said:

"I recommend that for the settlement of industrial disputes in important Nation-wide industries there be adopted the principles underlying the Railway Labor Act."

In respectful and good-humored fashion, friends of Watson are saying that the President, in that message, was doing all in his power to make "Prophet Jim's" second prediction come true.

Those efforts of President Truman to pass this legislation were renewed on January 3, 1946. On that evening the President broadcast an appeal to rank and file Americans—"the most powerful pressure group in the world"—to prod Congress into taking action on his domestic legislation, including strike legislation. On strike legislation he said:

"I recommended certain fact-finding procedures which I believe can go a long way toward meeting these problems. I had hoped Congress would follow my recommendations or would at least propose a solution of its own. It has done neither.

"Experience has shown that once the public knows the facts it can make its opinion known in a practical way. In order to give a fact-finding board a reasonable chance to function before a strike is actually called, I suggested that there be a 30-day cooling-off period."

Watson, in that speech of May 6, 1826, made statements of similar tenor. He then originated the term "cooling-off" time, when he said:

"This period of repose * * * this cooling-off time will give the public full knowledge of the situation."

When President Truman, in his broadcast, said that "experience has shown that once the public knows the facts it can make its opinion known in a practical way" he re-echoed again wholesome utterances of Senator Watson of 20 years ago.

In that same speech of May 6, 1926, Watson quoted certain language from a decision by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Pennsylvania Railroad Co.* v. *United States* (261 U. S. 72, 80), as follows:

"The decisions of the Labor Board are not to be enforced by process. The only sanction of its decision is to be the force of public opinion, invoked by the fairness of a full hearing, the intrinsic justice of the conclusion * * * and the full publication of the violation of such decision by any party to the proceedings. * * * The function of the Labor Board is to direct public criticism against the party who, it thinks, justly deserved it."

President Truman, in his radio address of January 3, 1946, said:

"Experience has shown that once the public knows the facts, it can make its opinion known in a practical way."

Former Senator Watson, in the Senate, May 6, 1926, said:

"The only sanction of the Labor Board's decision is to be the force of public opinion. The functions of the Board is to direct public criticism against the party who, it thinks, justly deserves it."

The sentiments of Watson in 1926 are repeated in thought—almost in the same words—by President Truman on January 3, 1946.

The Railway Labor Act applies to railroads and to air lines. The original proposal for the law came from several brotherhoods and also the railroads. The legislation was enacted without opposition. It was enacted with the leadership of railroad labor. Railroad labor has through the years commended it to workers in other industries.

The act does not forbid strikes, but it does provide a cooling-off period in which adjustments result and disputes are ended without even threat of strikes. Railroad workers have always represented a high degree of intelligence; they have successfully used the machinery of the Mediation Board in settling differences without the country in peacetime or wartime being menaced by a cessation of transportation.

Most differences between railroad employees and management are adjusted without reference to the Mediation Board. An Adjustment Board, composed of employees and management, takes care of most disputes amicably. But should adjustment fail, a Board of Mediation may be named.

As a final resort, the President may name an Investigating Board that would report to the public. But under the act no strike or lock-out shall result within a 30-day period—a cooling-off period. The result is amicable relations between railroad workers and management.

Actually thousands of differences between labor and management have been peacefully settled since the enactment of this legislation. During the fiscal year 1944 the Railroad Adjustment Board disposed of 3,280 disputes involving interpretation or application of rules and employee grievances. "The entire record," reads one of the Annual Reports of the Board, "warrants full confidence that the railroads and air lines, in making their contributions to the national defense, will not be hampered by labor controversies."

During the 20 years' life of this law, comment has frequently been made that, since the law has operated so successfully, the principles represented by it should be extended to workers in all other branches of industry. It was this sentiment which President Truman recognized when he made his proposal to Congress. The point was well brought out in the annual report of the Board for 1944, which states:

"The Railway Labor Act often has been cited as the model law governing the handling of labor difficulties. It is the fruit of over 50 years' experience in Federal legislation in this field. The law was, with amendments, a good one, and has functioned well since 1926."

The National Mediation Board is little known to the country and seldom appears in the newspaper headlines. This situation is due to the fact that it operates with satisfaction to railroad labor, railroad management, and to the public. It causes no public attention or alarm. It does not get in the headlines. Its members are Harry H. Schwartz, Chairman; George A. Cook; and Frank P. Douglass.

The operations of the National Mediation Board are in sharp contrast with the National Labor Relations Board. The latter has been known to the country as being constantly associated with labor strife and turmoil. The latter has been under attack from the American Federation of Labor because of the belief that membership of the Board was prejudiced and had alliances with a rival union. Management and industry have through the years persistently attacked its rulings as being biased and prejudiced.

Calvin Coolidge was President when the Railway Labor Act was passed. He issued a public statement when he signed the bill which is replete with wisdom and based on the genuine interests of labor, industry, and welfare of the public. A monument made from President Coolidge's Vermont granite, might well be erected in Washington in his honor. On it should be written his words on the evils of strikes uttered when he signed this bill. Those words are:

"A strike in modern industry has many of the aspects of war in the modern world. It injures labor and it injures capital.

"It injures the economic welfare and general comfort of the whole people. It tends to embitter and divide the community into warring classes and thus weakens the unity and power of our national life.

"Labor can make no permanent gains at the cost of the general welfare."

Should the OPA Be Extended?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1946

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, a barrage of pressure-group propaganda designed to force Congress to extend the OPA has begun.

Inasmuch as the OPA still has war-granted unlimited powers over the American system of individual freedom, Con-

gress is entitled to demand a liquidation pattern for OPA—if this war agency is not being slyly used to bring about a totalitarian state in America.

My efforts to secure enlightenment on this all-important question from Mr. Bowles have not succeeded. Is OPA unwilling to promote the restoration of normal economic processes? The following correspondence with Mr. Bowles leaves that question in doubt:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., November 27, 1945.

Mr. CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator, Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOWLES: Your letter of October 30 submitting your Senate report, together with an inquiry for suggestions, has been received.

I have read your report.

I do not find any plan for the orderly elimination of this war agency. Will you please send me one?

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD BUFFETT,
Member of Congress.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., December 12, 1945.

The Honorable HOWARD BUFFETT,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BUFFETT: You have asked for a plan for the orderly elimination of the Office of Price Administration.

It seems to me that, in the first place, the elimination of price control must be determined not by a set time but by a condition. I am as anxious as anyone else to reach the end of the necessity for such control, but if we go into a postwar inflation, as we did after World War I, millions of Americans will face economic tragedy. If we hold things steady until production permits lifting of controls without inflation we should be able to go forward into an era of long-lasting prosperity.

In a chart presentation made before the Senate Small Business Committee on December 4 I tried to give a factual statement of the inflationary forces now at work in the country. I am enclosing a copy of these charts for your information.

Last July it was believed that cut-backs would, in general, free both manpower and materials in substantial quantities with, however, considerable variation in both geographical and commodity areas. As the transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy was then forecast, it was thought advisable to suspend controls of significant items only when the Price Administrator could form a judgment that an increase in the general level of prices for the commodity would not result. This was set forth in directive No. 68, dealing with exemptions and suspensions and issued by the Economic Stabilization Director on July 25, 1945.

The importance of this restriction was stressed by the requirement that the Administrator terminate any suspension and reinstate the prior ceilings if prices for the commodity should rise or threaten to rise above the level of the ceilings in existence at the time of suspension.

Under section 1 of the directive, the agency has moved to suspend ceilings on a few commodities, such as ingot and pig aluminum and magnesium, where production facilities during wartime were increased many times to the point where they were completely adequate to supply any considerable demand. It should be noted that most suspension actions under section 1 were based upon the assumption that labor would become available in increasing quantity.

Under section 2 of the directive, the agency removed controls over a large number of minor items, control of which presented administrative difficulties out of proportion to the net benefit to price control. In each of these actions under section 2 the Administrator found that there was no substantial threat of diversion of materials, facilities, or manpower. In most actions of this type no possible threat of diversion existed because of a limited possible demand for the commodity involved. In other of these actions, however, it was felt that no threat of diversion existed because of the anticipated increasing availability of manpower and materials.

Shortly after the Japanese surrender it was generally believed that almost immediately manpower and materials would soon become available in abundance. From this assumption there followed quite logically the conclusion that OPA would be able to act swiftly in removing controls even at some possible risk of temporary slight price increases. On the basis of this assumption, it was also felt that it might well be safe to eliminate the diversion criterion from section 2 of the directive.

Accordingly there have been many discussions within the agency and with members of industry looking toward the advisability and mechanics of adopting a more aggressive and liberal decontrol policy than that embodied in directive 68. Also there have been public statements indicating the possibility of such a policy. As a result, there is a growing feeling in OPA, and on the part of industry and the public, that rapid selective decontrol is in immediate prospect. The effect has been an increase in the pressure for decontrol applied by some and against it by others. Hundreds of businessmen have urged OPA not to move hastily in removing controls.

Events subsequent to VJ-day have not affected the general principles governing decontrol but they have demonstrated the error of the assumption that manpower and materials would promptly become available to industry in abundance. We have had to reexamine the advisability of requesting the amendment of directive 68 in such a way as to permit a more rapid decontrol policy.

Under prevailing conditions manpower and materials are not generally available to industry in anything like the required quantities. This is particularly true of manpower. It seems that this situation may continue for some time. It has, therefore, been concluded that, for the time being and until the materials and manpower situations have been corrected, no request will be made by OPA for the amendment of directive 68.

The conclusion from the foregoing is that directive 68 is, and until further notice will remain, the price department's guide in considering the suspension and removal of controls and in discussing these subjects with members of industry. In recent weeks much time has been spent in discussing the advisability of taking decontrol action in specific instances upon principles going beyond the provisions of directive 68. As a result a heavy workload has developed in a number of the branches and this workload threatens to continue and even increase to the point where it may interfere seriously with day-to-day work to the detriment of over-all price control and to the disadvantage of industry in general. For this reason, members of the price department are instructed to base discussions of proposed decontrol measures on the directive.

In connection with the directive some further clarification seems appropriate at this time. Mr. Brownlee's memorandum of July 25 did not discuss the weight to be given the possibility that wage increases might follow decontrol action. The recent Executive orders removed the prohibitions against wage increases and returned the determination of wage rates to collective bargaining. This fact has added to the difficulties in making findings under section 1 that prices will not rise over preexisting ceilings. Moreover, actions may not be taken under section 2 unless the Administrator forms a judgment that exemption will not have the result of wage increases which would produce a substantial diversion of manpower from production that is essential to the transition to a peacetime economy. Furthermore, shortages of materials in many areas persist, and this fact must be given consideration in applying the diversion criterion in section 2.

In summary it may be said that for the time being we must move more slowly in the removal of controls than we anticipated at the time of the Japanese surrender.

It is for the foregoing reasons that I reiterate again my statement earlier in this letter that the end of price control must be based not on a time but on a condition. Just as soon as supply and demand come into balance on each commodity so that controls can be removed without a rise in prices, we will move to decontrol.

Sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 7, 1946.

Mr. CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator, Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BOWLES: This is in answer to your letter of December 12, following my request of November 27 for your plan for the orderly elimination of the Office of Price Administration.

In your letter you reported that no plan had been prepared yet and you also indicated that you currently saw no prospect of formulating such a plan. Instead, you expected certain conditions to be reached eventually which would facilitate the elimination of price control.

Since that time several facts have become clearly apparent. One is that the operation of the Office of Price Administration has decisively restricted and discouraged production and/or distribution in various lines of business. Notably among these are butter, building materials, and various textile items. Considering these examples, it would seem that to wait until full production had been achieved before eliminating price control would mean perpetual price control. If removal of price control is to be contingent upon attaining full production, it is your No. 1 responsibility to secure full production. What constructive steps are you taking to get full production?

As price control is a dangerous economic narcotic, it must be rapidly removed from our economic diet if the habit is not to become disastrously permanent. Consequently, it appears that a precise plan to taper off and eliminate this economic narcotic should be a peacetime responsibility of the OPA of equal importance to that of preserving an orderly price structure.

If that length of time is required, it seems possible that the Office of Price Administration should be given 12 months from July 1, 1946, in which to complete the transition to a free price economy. Such extension would mean that the OPA had been continued for a period of 22½ months after the end of the war and almost 26 months after the defeat of Germany. Considering American's productive capacity, this length of time should be more than sufficient to restore a free economy, if there is the willingness and competency within the OPA to carry out this task.

Accordingly I am hopeful that in your appearance before the House Banking and

Currency Committee shortly you will present to us a plan for the orderly elimination of price control by a definite date.

Referring to the closing paragraph of your letter, I wish to add one comment. You state "that the end of price control must be based not on a time but on a condition. Just as soon as supply and demand come into balance on each commodity so that controls can be reversed without a rise in prices, we will move to decontrol."

My answer to this proposition is that if the Office of Price Administration cannot achieve this happy condition in 22 months with the absolute powers it now holds, it can never achieve the condition which you designate as necessary. Consequently, unless the OPA is able to prepare such an orderly program for restoring free economy by a definite date, it must of necessity become apparent that it is either not trying to restore a free economy or is incompetent to do so.

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD BUFFETT,
Member of Congress.

Radio Address of Hon. Fred Bradley of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED BRADLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 1, 1946

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my broadcast of this week put on the air over Stations WSOO, Sault Ste. Marie; WMAM, Marinette, Wis.; and WDBC, Escanaba, Mich.:

In my first radio broadcast to you this year—just about a month ago—I referred to the so-called British loan. I said in part this: "This $3,750,000,000 of British credit (to which our State Department has apparently committed us) is to be loaned them at 1.62 percent without any guaranty whatsoever to insure its eventual repayment and that 1.62 percent of interest which they presumably will pay us comes out of your pockets in the form of taxes which cost you about 17 percent on every dollar you earn. And how are you going to float it? There is only one way, and that is to take it out of your own pocket in the form of a new loan, 'Dollars for Britain,' and that is not all. Soon it will be dollars for Russia, France, China, and dollars for every other Nation on the earth if this loan goes through and Congress rubber stamps it."

I had previously explained to you that the so-called British loan provides first of all that we should liquidate for a mere $650,000,000 approximately $25,000,000,000 worth of lend-lease material and equipment that we sent over to Britain to prosecute the late war, and I pointed out that that $650,000,000 was to be spent solely within the realm of the United Kingdom, namely, for the purchase of property and for the construction of superduper American embassies in the various parts of the British Empire or for educational purposes, namely, to educate American youth into the glories of the British Empire so that we could have in effect more Rhodes scholars operating within our Government to make sure that the sun would never set on the British Empire.

I pointed out to you then that I do not blame the British statesmen for coming over here and striking a sharp bargain with our State Department. I admire them. They are doing a good job for Britain. They believe in Britain first, last, and always, and more power to them. I was, however, extremely critical of our own State Department, who are pulling the wool over the eyes of the American people and seeking to give our sum and substance away to the world. In other words, they are leading Uncle Sam on a world-wide "good-time Charley" jag, hoping thereby to get the "good-time Charley" more friends. But, friends, no "good-time Charley" ever made lasting friends that way. As soon as his money runs out—and heavens knows ours must be running out pretty soon—then, unless he continues dealing out the dollars to the hungry, he is the worst accursed individual on the face of the earth—and we are not far away from that day of reckoning. Incidentally, I'm heartened to believe from the comments I have heard on the floor that the British loan, when it comes on the floor of the House, at least, is going to have pretty tough sledding, and I would not be surprised to see it defeated by a good margin. In other words, I would not be surprised if the House of Representatives served notice on the world that Uncle Sam has a new modern pocketbook on which he has pulled the zipper at this time.

But, as I predicted to you then, if we grant this loan to Britain, we would be obliged to grant a larger loan to Russia and heaven knows how many other countries might come to us as they did under the lend-lease program and ask for similar loans, and, once having set the pattern, I fail to see how our State Department would hesitate in committing us to loan any amount of the Treasury they deemed advisable at the time. And remember, as I pointed out to you in my broadcast of 2 weeks ago, having to do with the attempt of the Communists to oust Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, head of the FBI, that this political prodigy whom they have dug up to replace him, one Mr. George F. Schwarzwalder, who is now engaged in streamlining the State, War, and Navy Intelligence Services, has, perhaps, had his finger in the pie when it came to upping the personnel and the appropriations for the State Department from a personnel of 3,600 in 1939, with an appropriation of $18,000,000, to a present personnel this year of about 10,000, with an appropriation of $75,000,000, and a request next year for a personnel of 25,000 and a budget of something like $150,000,000. If that is streamlining in efficiency of personnel and expenditures, then that is one for you to answer. I also pointed out in that broadcast that Mr. Schwarzwalder had brought some new blood into the State Department and had infused it with men who, "while not conversant with actual diplomatic work, are fully familiar with and sympathetic to the new trends in the world."

Now this past week it has come out in the open that our State Department is now negotiating a loan of $6,000,000,000 for a deserving war victim—Russia. We find on inquiry that Russia possesses gold reserves of some two to ten billions and is producing gold at a rate exceeding $168,000,000 a year. And you will recall that before the war, we were purchasing gold from Russia at $35 an ounce that could be produced in this country as low as $20 an ounce. In other words we were then subsidizing Russia. The fact of the matter is that we cannot tell anything definite about Russia now nor have we been able to in the past. She is so reluctant to let the United States, her benefactor in this last war, know just what is going on in Russia that she refuses to permit us to know just exactly what her actual gold balance is just the same as she has steadfastly refused to let us known just how much of the lend-lease billions that we sent her has actually been dissipated in the war or just as she refuses to permit us to know just how much of those lend-lease billions in actual fighting equipment are now being employed to implement the Russian expansionist program in eastern Europe, in Iran and wherever else Russia seeks to expand her influence. And then, too, you will recall that Russia went along at the start with the so-called Bretton Woods pact and then backed out at the last minute. Why? Because Russia would have to tip her hand under the Bretton Woods pact and tell us just how much gold she had laid away for a rainy day. It's just another example of how our amateurs in the State Department are taken for a merry-go-round ride at the international world political circus. Let me revert back to Britain for a moment. According to columnist Arthur Sears Henning, Britain today has unmined gold reserves of twenty-four and one-half billions and unmined diamond reserves of eight billion eight hundred millions. Then she has a little matter of some foreign investments amounting to some $14,000,000,000 including three and one-half billions that she has invested in the United States alone and in other American countries. But she still does not hesitate to accept from us a goodly loan which you and I know full well will always be a gift, if granted by the Congress, in order, that the sun shall never set on the British Empire. The British we know refused to pay the First World War debt—amounting to some six and one-half billions—when good old Uncle Sam was called Uncle Shylock—and you know full well that they have no desire nor intention whatsoever of repaying this present proposed $4,000,000,000 loan.

Now I want to say this, that the Soviet Union has been very scrupulous in repaying her debts to us, with the exception of the money which the former Czarist Government borrowed from us in World War I, and which they said at one time they hoped to repay, but which they have not done so far. To quote Mr. Henning: "Russian secrecy concerning Soviet gold resources and credit facilities also operated to reduce by two-thirds the amount of relief funds allocated to the Soviets by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. The Russian Soviet Republic made an application for 700,000,000. Because, under the UNRRA rule, funds could not be allocated to a country possessing ample resources to finance its own relief, Assistant Secretary Clayton opposed any allotment to Russia contending that the Soviet Union had 'not only gold but a certain amount of credit facilities.'

"The Russians pleaded poverty but, when pressed to reveal their gold resources, withdrew their application for the Russian Soviet Republic and substituted applications for the Ukraine and Byelorussian Republics. They thus avoided any revelation of the amount of their gold hoard and gold-production rate. Finally UNRRA allotted 189,000,000 to the Ukraine and 61,000,000 to Byelorussia."

And now get this—and I quote again from Mr. Henning's article: "Although the extent of the Russian gold reserve has been known to the Truman Administration for several months, State Secretary Byrnes recently said that a loan of $1,000,000,000 to Moscow had been earmarked by the Export-Import Bank."

Well, I repeat what I told you a month ago. If we are going to open the bomb-bay doors of our Treasury to Britain and then to Russia, we've got to open them to the entire world.

We did under lend-lease and under that act we granted the President power to extend the facilities of lend-lease to any nation which he felt could contribute to the defense of the United States. You have heard of the so-called Atlantic Charter—simply an idealistic memorandum drawn between Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt to provide for the famous "four freedoms"—freedom from fear, freedom from want, freedom of speech, and freedom of religion. Where do you find it in the world today under the present British imperialistic expansion

program and under the Russian expansionist program? I'll tell you where. If you look about the world today, you will find that $5,000,000,000 worth of lend-lease arms and equipment is engaged in local and international war in every quarter of the globe. And each tank—every gun and every aircraft; yes, and every shell has stamped on it "Made in the U. S. A." How do you like that bill? And, do you like the returns you are getting? And about how long do you think that Uncle Sam will be looked upon in India and the Malay States and in Central and Latin America as the great lover of freedom and the deliverer? Think it over, folks.

Early in this broadcast I said I admired the British statesmen for looking after British interests first, last, and always. I was critical of our own amateur statesmen in the State Department. Maybe they are not so much to blame after all. Maybe they are acting under orders from the White House in making good on commitments made by the late President Roosevelt. I hate to rattle the bones of a skeleton in the closet but here are the facts. When he was campaigning for a fourth term, Mr. Roosevelt told the American people: "After my return from Tehran, I stated officially that no secret commitments had been made. The issue then, is between my veracity and the continuing assertions of those who have no responsibility in the foreign field." Now the facts are that in the 10 months since Mr. Roosevelt passed away, at least a half dozen of his secret commitments have come to light. For instance, he agreed with Stalin at Yalta that the Communists should have extra votes in the United Nations Organization. Then we learned that at Yalta also, he had agreed that Germany should give up $20,000,000,000 in reparations, of which Russia would get half—and now she is asking us for an additional six billions of American dollars. And, we find also that former Premier of France Daladier revealed that as far back as 1938, he offered to start repaying France's World War I debt to the United States, but Mr. Roosevelt refused the offer and told neither the Congress nor the American people about it.

Then we remember, also, that during his fourth-term campaign, Mr. Roosevelt told the Jews in America that he favored the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine, but we find that he also had a joker up his sleeve in that one by having a secret agreement with King Ibn Saud, of Saudi Arabia, in direct opposition to his promise to the American Jews. But, perhaps, the worst deceit that he practiced on the American Congress and on the American people was in his last personal appearance before the Congress of the United States when he told us he had made no secret agreements at either Tehran or Yalta. Later a committee of Congress, among other things, designated the Kurile Islands—laying between Japan and Alaska—were basic to the defense of the United States. We now learn officially from Secretary Byrnes, of the State Department, that at Yalta Mr. Roosevelt agreed with Uncle Joe Stalin to give these islands to Russia after we had conquered Japan. And so, in conclusion, I wonder just how much may later come to light as to Mr. Roosevelt's commitments for the United States to provide substantial financial gifts under the guise of so-called loans not only to Britain and Russia but to any other nation on the face of the globe. This, of course, Mr. Roosevelt did entirely without any authorization from the Congress, which is supposed to control the purse strings of this Nation; and I assure you that as your Representative I will not vote to loan or give one red cent of the American taxpayers' money to any nation on the face of this earth. We had over a million casualties in this last war. Over one-quarter million boys will never come back home. Those who did come back home are going to come to the Congress eventually for a bonus and if I am still here I shall vote for a bonus to our American boys but I will not vote one cent to be sent outside of the United States to nations who should be loaning money to us but who are coming to us with their hands outstretched.

Address of Hon. Overton Brooks, of Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 12, 1946

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the four-State Red River Valley Improvement Association meeting at Shreveport, La., on valley development, January 28, 1946:

Mr. President and representatives from Oklahoma, Texas, Arkansas, and Louisiana, it is certainly a real pleasure to come back home and meet with such a splendid gathering as we have here today. The pleasure is intestified by the realization that all of us come together for one single purpose—namely, the development of the Red River Valley for flood control and navigation.

I left Washington yesterday morning and I expected to be back in Washington tomorrow. It is therefore fitting, I think, that I give you the Washington viewpoint in reference to the flood-control program. As others have indicated, the interim flood-control program totaling $7,500,000 was built up and approved by the Vicksburg office of the Army engineers, working in collaboration with State department of public works and the Red River Valley Improvement Association and other organizations. Late last fall the report of the district engineers arrived in Washington; and recently it was approved by the Board of Engineers there.

Last week, it received the approval of the Chief of Engineers, General Wheeler, and has been sent to the several States and to the Flood Control Committee of the House of Representatives, under whose resolution the report was made and presented. It gives me much pleasure to realize that I introduced a resolution in Congress which was approved by the House Committee on Flood Control and which formed the basis for going to work on this masterly report.

At the present time, we in Washington are awaiting a report from the States affected; and I was pleased to read in the press just before leaving Washington that our own Governor had already approved this comprehensive report. As soon as other States have approved it, the matter will be returned to Washington for action. I have already talked to Chairman WHITTINGTON, of the House Flood Control Committee, and other members of the committee asking for speedy consideration there. In the Senate our own senior Senator, Senator JOHN H. OVERTON, chairman of the Commerce Committee, will be waiting the opportunity, I am sure, to push most diligently and expeditiously every phase of this important matter.

Even before the report is approved we have work to do. As you know, funds were appropriated in December, after a hard fight in the House, to complete Wallace Lake at a cost of $194,000; to begin the construction of the Bodcau Bayou Dam and Reservoir, costing almost $3,000,000; to clear Loggy Bayou, for which $67,000 has been appropriated; and to begin the stabilization work and bank protection on Red River, of which $500,000 have already been appropriated to begin a program costing $3,000,000.

This statement does not include the preliminary work contemplated in Arkansas, Texas, or in Oklahoma along the Red River. We have local representatives here from those areas and they, no doubt, will cover the projects which we have in mind and are interested in promoting. This, however, represents money—large sums of money. It represents tremendous work projects but, after all, the problem of making the Red River Valley safe from floods and crevasses is a mammoth project. The Red River originates in New Mexico and flows eastward and southward some 1,300 miles in Texas, along the Oklahoma-Texas boundary line, in Arkansas, and in Louisiana. At last it forms a confluence with the Mississippi and the Atchafalaya at Barrie Landing. The Red River Basin consist of 91,000 square miles and is 75 percent rural at the present time. The census figures show the 1940 population to be something less than 3,000,000 people and our principal occupations agriculturally are the growing of cotton, corn, hay, oats, potatoes, and sugarcane. Industrially, we are large producers of petroleum, salt, cement, sulfur, iron, aluminum, and fertilizer.

From time immemorial, Red River has risen above its banks and flooded the surrounding territory. Between the years 1843 and 1900, six great floods occurred, causing loss of lives and an immense amount of property loss. The 1843 flood equaled and perhaps was greater than all others to date. Other great floods since, of course, are the floods of 1908, 1938, and the flood last year, 1945. At Shreveport, during the course of the flood, the waters descending Red River measured 303,000 cubic feet, although the capacity of the stream measured from 100,000 to 130,000 cubic feet per second.

This very fact showed that 3 cubic feet of water had to be carried down Red River when only 1 cubic foot of water could be transported in the restricted channel available at the flood stage. This could only result, as it did result, in a flood of appalling destruction.

The plan of the Army engineers, briefly, provides for eight reservoirs, which will cost $360,000 annually for maintenance and operation. Local interest will be required (1) to furnish lands needed without Federal costs; (2) to take care of construction damages; and (3) to maintain and operate all works following construction.

I have here some brief figures in reference to the destruction caused by floods in the Red River Valley. I want especially to give you the figures available from the flood of 1945, which is last year's flood. When these waters receded from our landscape they left a tremendous toll of property damage. In fact, congressional reports show that damage for the entire country from floods last year totaled $103,800,000, and that this damage was divided between agriculture and industry as follows: Namely, $45,000,000 was agricultural damages and $58,000,000 was other damages. Of this amount of $103,000,000 for the whole Nation, the damage in Red River Valley from last year's flood totaled $12,600,000.

An interesting sidelight of this occurred during the course of the vigorous debate over including flood-control items in a certain appropriation bill last fall. The amount which was being asked for by proponents of flood control to be appropriated was something like $120,000,000, as I recall. I showed at that time that the amount of loss was over $100,000,000 and that had floods been prevented in 1945, due to our flood-control program, this great amount of money would have been saved to our people.

It is interesting to note that Red River did not play a favorite among States in spilling waters over the countryside. Louisiana had 2,624,000 acres inundated; Arkansas, 1,211,000 acres inundated; Oklahoma, 249,000; nd Texas, 395,000, making a total flooded acreage in Red River Valley last year of 4,510,000 acres. In Louisiana, the lands flooded were divided by parishes as follows, to wit:

Parish:	*Acres*
Rapides	83,000
Grant	79,000
Natchitoches	280,000
Winn	10,000
Red River	75,000
De Soto	33,000
Bienville	20,000
Caddo	140,000
Bossier	86,000
Webster	9,000
Avoyelles	208,000
Caldwell	132,000
Ouachita	147,000
Richland	83,000
Franklin	71,000
Union	62,000
Morehouse	169,000
West Carroll	6,000
Catahoula	295,000
Pointe Coupee	3,000
Concordia	390,000
La Salle	125,000
Tensas	110,000
West Feliciana	8,000
Total	2,624,000

CONCLUSION

Perhaps the greatest individual phase of the Red River improvement program, as we presently have it, is the navigation project. This contemplates the construction of a navigation channel west of the river parallel more or less to its banks from Shreveport down almost to the Atchafalaya River. I have traveled through northwest Louisiana during the course of many years; and I have found all groups of people interested in this navigation project. Every group realizes water transportation will help this entire Arkansas-Louisiana-Texas area. I have talked to many farmers and they realize the construction of the navigation channel will mean lower freight rates for their produce and another means of getting cotton and other agricultural products to the market. The businessman realizes water transportation will mean an over-all saving to every business which requires either the bringing in or shipping out of any large amount of material. The industrialist knows that it is vital to this general area of the Southwest. Even the housewife who, during these inflationary times, is doing her best to keep her budget balanced, realizes that lower transportation rates will mean an actual saving to her in the purchase of food and other household needs.

For this reason, there has been a general clamor throughout this territory for the navigation channel. Only last week a large group of outstanding businessmen appeared from this area and made a strong presentation of the navigation project to the Board of Army Engineers in Washington. I think they did a splendid job; and I believe the Board of Engineers will approve it and send it to Congress at an early date. Of course, this means more work on your Congressman and your Senators. This means that the time for preliminary work will be at its end and the time of genuine hard shovel work will be at hand. I believe, however, that both projects have an excellent chance of being approved by Congress in the year 1946; and I am working to this end.

Mr. President, the present population of this valley, one of the largest valleys of the world and as rich as the Biblical Garden of Eden, is less than 3,000,000 people. It has 91,000 square miles of territory in its basin; and there is an average of only 33 people per square mile in this valley. This means cities, towns, hamlets, and farms all included; more than 20 acres of this rich valley are available to every man, woman, and child, were it equally distributed.

Why is this? A land as luscious and as desirable as any on earth with only 33 people per square mile shows lack of development. This is because of lack of protection from floods which perennially sweep the valley, bringing death and devastation. It is because of lack of cheap water transportation which is sorely needed by all of our people. Our national population is increasing almost 1,500,000 people per annum; and it behooves our National Government to reclaim the fertile land such as lies in this valley to make it inhabitable for the teeming millions of persons who, as the years go by, are going to demand a place to make a living.

Wherever water transportation has gone in the past there has been development. There is development along the Mississippi River and great industrial development along the Ohio River because of navigation. The Erie Canal has had a tremendous economic importance to a large part of the eastern area of the country, and away down here in the deep South the intercoastal canal is performing a major function in developing a great sweep of territory from Corpus Christi to Florida. The same result will be evidenced when our canal project becomes a completed one. The population of the valley will jump, I predict, from 3,000,000 to 10,000,000, and we will find here, after our labors are done, a happy, prosperous valley people, thankful that minds conceived and hearts promoted the work of building this barge channel.

Mr. President, in the Civil War days use was made of the Red River for navigation. History shows that Shreveport was an active inland port during the days of the Civil War. Our old-timers can remember that large river boats were built right here where the city of Shreveport stands and were piloted down the river to be used in a large trans-Mississippi commerce which was built up as a supply line for the Confederacy from the far West. As Grant besieged Vicksburg these boats navigated the Red, the Atchafalaya, and the Mississippi, bringing farm produce and other merchandise to points along the Mississippi for transportation overland to the Confederacy in Virginia. One of these well-known boats was named *The Star of the West*. Another was used in an attempt to run the blockade from Red River down the Mississippi by New Orleans.

After Vicksburg fell, the Red River Valley campaign was supported by a flotilla of gunboats under General Banks. We can remember the waters of Red River became shallow and the gunboats were in distress. Then occurred the building of a dam across the Red River to float the gunboats downstream, which, by the way, was done by the Army engineers and constituted the first navigation project on Red River, as far as I can find out. The heyday of river transportation was reached around 1870, when packet boats ascended the Red to Shreveport and Jefferson, Tex., bringing large quantities of needed materials and supplies and taking other huge quantities with them upon the return trip.

My friends, we meet here today to express our desire to see a return of those days along the Red River. We want, and we are ready to fight for, a further development of this great valley which will surely follow the building of this lateral canal. We who meet today visualize a completion of this project and we hope to hear again the shrill whistle of the river boat as it echoes across the fertile plantations and wooded hills of the Red River Valley. We hope to hear again the noise of the gangplank touching bank, the process of one loading the river barges all in our minds, denoting the opening of a new era for Ark-La-Tex and for the people of Red River Valley.

America's Dead and Dying Rivers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 12, 1946

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Reader's Digest for October 1945.

AMERICA'S DEAD AND DYING RIVERS

(Condensed from the American City by Holman Harvey, with additions by the author)

When America can get back to her own housekeeping she has a pressing chore to tackle, the job of liberating our waterways from pollution.

The other day I rode the ferryboat across the Delaware River from Philadelphia to Camden. Some 360,000,000 gallons of raw sewage from the two cities was churning down the stream. The paint on ships and on buildings along the banks was blackened by sulfurous gases rising from the contaminated water.

Next day I went downstream to Chester, Pa. The city's drinking water for its 60,000 people comes from this river and is so heavily weighted with purifying chemicals that many buy bottled water. Bathing in the river is unsafe, and fish life has all but vanished.

Chester's plight is by no means unique. More than 3,400 American cities and towns, inhabited by 29,000,000 people, discharge a daily volume of 2,500,000,000 gallons of raw sewage into our waterways. Another 2,900 communities, with 22,000,000 inhabitants, dump their sewage after a lick-and-a-promise treatment that leaves it still 65 percent disease laden. In addition to sewage, vast tonnages of factory wastes are drained into our streams. Such pollution of our water sources, with its continual threat of epidemic disease, is wiping out waterfront property values, corroding dams and bridges, obliterating bathing and other water sports over large areas, and progressively destroying our once-abundant fish life.

Three-fourths of the Nation's waterway pollution centers in the densely populated industrial belt stretching from the Atlantic coast to St. Louis and Chicago. In the Ohio River Basin the drinking water of hundreds of communities is endangered, despite Herculean efforts to stave off infection by filtration and heavy doctoring of the water with purifying chemicals. In 144 communities in the basin, annual death rates from diarrhea and enteritis have risen during the past 12 years to as high as 91 per 100,000 persons.

Absolutely "pure" water does not exist even in streams untouched by man. Therefore all American communities, other than the tiniest, filter their drinking water and treat it with chlorine and other chemical purifiers, the degree of treatment depending on the amount of impurities in the water. The extent of pollution is determined by what public-health bacteriologists call a "coli count"—the number of harmless coliform bacteria, normally present in all human sewage, which are found in a measured sample of water. The coli are readily detected, whereas disease organisms often are difficult

or impossible to identify. It is assumed that disease germs may be present in water containing more than six coli to the pint; therefore, this maximum count is the official purity standard of the United States Public Health Service for safe untreated drinking water—or for safe public bathing. And the Public Health Service considers that the most modern and effective purifying treatment now known cannot safely be depended upon to remove all the disease organisms from water which contains more than 100,000 coli to the pint.

The most comprehensive colicounting ever undertaken was completed 2 years ago in the Ohio River basin by the Public Health Service and the Army Engineer Corps, aided by a consulting civilian scientist. At 1,160 out of 2,000 locations tested, the water was unfit for bathing and of questionable quality as a source of drinking water supply.

Pollution is severe in the Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, and Louisville areas. Along the 90-mile stretch between Pittsburgh and Wheeling, W. Va., the average coli count was 125,000 to the pint, and at one place it was 405,000. The safety limit, remember, is 100,000. Below Louisville the coli count ranged from an average of 320,000 to a maximum of 1,200,000.

While water-borne typhoid fever has been virtually eliminated in most communities by purification of the drinking water, death rates indicate that the organisms causing diarrhea and enteritis often survive treatment. And periodic outbreaks of so-called intestinal flu have been traced to polluted water. This disease has swept over hundreds of cities in recent years. Moreover, the mysterious origin of infantile paralysis may at last be found in waterway pollution. The Journal of the American Medical Association has reported that the poliomyelitis virus has been isolated from water containing raw sewage.

In its natural state, a healthy stream can cleanse itself of waste matter—animal, bird, and fish excretions and carcasses, decaying plant life, and a very considerable volume of sewage—within a few miles. But its capacity to purify itself breaks down when the load of waste becomes too heavy. The self-functioning stream "dies," and becomes merely a lifeless conduit.

A stream purifies itself chiefly by means of its own bacteria—the aerobic bacteria which can't live without oxygen, and the anaerobic bacteria which can't live in the presence of oxygen. The anaerobes devour the solid materials which settle to the river's bed, while the aerobes attack the dissolved and suspended solids which remain in the water above. As the waste passes through their microscopic bodies it is converted from complex, organic material into inorganic, or mineral, material which no longer can putrefy.

Neither the aerobes nor the anaerobes attack the human disease organisms present in sewage, but these are devoured by microscopic animal organisms, the aquatic protozoa.

As the aerobes feed they multiply; and as they multiply they use up more and more of the available oxygen in the stream. However, a healthy stream passing over rocks and rapids and falls aerates itself, drawing oxygen from the atmosphere. Also the tiny plant organisms, the algae, return oxygen to the stream as sunlight strikes their green chlorophyll and brings about the miracle of photosynthesis. And while the algae thus are providing the aerobes with oxygen they feed upon the mineral matter which the aerobes are manufacturing from the waste. As the algae consume this inorganic matter it is changed back into living organic matter; and so is completed one of the mysterious, complex, and never-ending cycles of organic life.

Finally, as the wastes are consumed and converted, the aerobes, with a dwindling food supply, themselves subside in number and make less and less demand upon the stream's oxygen. The elaborate process draws to a close; the natural balance of the stream is restored. Cleansed, vigorous again with oxygen, it is ready for the next assault upon its purity.

Thus, left to their own devices, many rivers carry vast burdens of sewage to the sea without serious injury. But when the load becomes too heavy and too continuous, this is what happens:

The aerobes, attacking the fluid wastes, reproduce in such numbers that they use up more of the stream's vital oxygen than the stream can replace. For lack of oxygen the aerobes and disease-destroying protozoa die. Up then from the stream's bottom, into the the oxygenless upper waters, move invading multitudes of anaerobes. With an abundant food supply, safe now from the hated oxygen, they soon take over the entire stream. And as they avidly feed they extract hydrogen from the water and sulphur from the waste and combine them into the evil-smelling hydrogen-sulfide gas which you have noticed rising from the surface of a sluggish stream.

The algae die away as the beclouded water blocks off their life-giving sunlight. Deprived of sufficient food and oxygen, fish life languishes. The stream is dead.

In treating sewage, before it is discharged into our waterways, sanitary experts follow the stream's own purifying methods, but speel them up. The solid material, or sludge, is allowed is settle in vats. Then it is placed in airtight tanks for from 30 to 60 days. Here the anaerobic bacteria "digest" it, as on the river bottom. The gas produced by the anaerobes often is used to heat and light the treatment plant. Any surplus is sold or given away.

Settling out the solids achieves only about 35 percent purification of the total sewage. To accomplish 85-percent purification the "effluent" (dissolved and suspended matter) is placed in tanks exposed to oxygen, where it is attacked by aerobic bacteria and protozoa.

For a theoretical 100-percent disinfection the treated effluent also is chlorinated. Where public bathing beaches are located near the point of discharge, this final treatment is considered advisable.

Some communities package and sell their treated sludge as a fertilizer. Notable are Milwaukee's "Milorganite," Toledo's "Tolegro," and Grand Rapids' "Rapidgro" and "Grandgro," the latter fortified with additional chemicals. The financial return to these cities is of considerable help in defraying the cost of treating the sewage.

Numerous cities, among them some of the long-time offenders, have become aroused to the need of freeing our streams from the dead weight of pollution. Pittsburgh is considering a $50,000,000 plant. Philadelphia, under a No. 1 priority over all other postwar projects, plans to spend $45,000,000. Camden, Cincinnati, Louisville and others are expected to install treatment plants.

But an Aegean job remains. According to an official United States Public Health Service report issued last year, only 1,300 of the 16,750 incorporated communities in the United States have adequate systems for collecting and treating their sewage. Local inertia, politics, and the apathy of industry have obstructed progress. It is for this reason that the Public Health Service believes the only practicable way to solve the problem is to deal with each river basin as an entity and recommends that Congress authorize all States contiguous to interstate waterway basins to enter into cooperative compacts to set up and carry out coordinated regional abatement programs.

Six bills providing for waterway-pollution abatement now are pending before Congress. They would encourage cities to build modern sewage-treatment plants, and industries to solve the knotty problem of waste-disposal. Legislation favored by the conference of State health officers, and approved by the Public Health Service, would authorize the Federal Government to extend grants-in-aid to communities, and loans to stream-polluting industries, to a total of $1,000,000,000 over a period of 10 years, provided that equal amounts are expended by the communities, and that all loans are to be repaid in full.

The annual cost to the Nation of operating and maintaining a complete system of sewage and waste treatment for the liberation of our waterways would total about $100,000,000—almost exactly the estimated annual economic loss now caused by pollution. The gain in the resulting safeguarding of the public health, and the imponderable recreational and esthetic values, cannot be evaluated.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 12, 1946

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent of the House I present for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial on the British loan that appeared in the Indianapolis News, one of the country's foremost newspapers, on January 17, 1946, as follows:

THE BRITISH LOAN

With the return of Congress, it is apparent that a very determined effort will be made to block or defeat approval of the $3,750,000,000 line of credit to Great Britain. The opponents already are attacking the agreement. If one can believe these gentlemen, the loan is an unparalleled example of international philanthropy.

Few people understand the mechanics of world trade, and fewer still can comprehend international finance, so it is not surprising that these Congressmen have found considerable support at home. To most men $3,750,000,000 sounds like, and is, a lot of money. The interest rate is less than on GI loans, on government bonds, or the note that the citizen must pay at the bank. So it is easy to oversimplify the issue and ask why we should be more generous to a foreign government than to our own citizens.

Nor has the attitude of the British conservatives, the London papers and a considerable portion of the English public helped the chances of the loan. If this, as is asserted abroad, is a sell-out of British commercial interests for a pittance, how can it be, from the American standpoint, such a bad bargain as the isolationists would have us believe?

The fact is that the loan should be good business for the United States, and for the world. In return for the credit of $3,750,000—to be spent for goods produced by American factories—the United States is given access to one of the richest markets in the world, hitherto rigidly controlled by the sterling bloc.

That is a selfish reason. From the standpoint of statesmanship this loan is the entering wedge against economic nationalism that sows the seeds of war and spawns depressions. On this basis $3,750,000,000 does not loom so large. Two weeks of war would cost as much, a year of depression would cost more.

American-Born Wives Denied Commissary Rights in Canada

REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 8, 1946

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, enlisted men have bitterly complained of unjust treatment and also of discrimination against their dependents. They complain that the Army discriminates against their American-born wives in Canada. They claim their American-born wives are denied the right to purchase food and necessaries in the American Army commissary in Canada. But Canadian-born wives can purchase at will. I believe a thorough investigation should be made and the people given the facts.

I am including a statement of more than 17,000 words from these men in Canada covering this denial of food and necessaries to their American-born wives, and I ask unanimous consent to include this in the RECORD, showing discrimination by the Army against American-born wives of enlisted men in Canada.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

MEMORANDUM: ARMY ABUSE AND CONTEMPT FOR ENLISTED MEN BELOW THE GRADE OF STAFF SERGEANT WHO HAVE AMERICAN WIVES IN NEWFOUNDLAND

Recently a brilliant piece of policy was established by the commanding officer in charge of Fort Pepperrell, Newfoundland, as evidenced by exhibit D, an exact copy of the Daily Bulletin, of Headquarters, Newfoundland, dated November 16, 1945. In it will appear that men below the first three enlisted grades (below the grade of staff sergeant, that is) who have married Newfoundland girls (foreigners) will be furnished family quarters at Fort Pepperrell, Newfoundland, while enlisted men of the same ranks (sergeants, corporals, privates first class, and privates) whose American wives have come to Newfoundland with the United States State Department permission and permission of the Newfoundland immigration authorities but without a permit from the War Department or local Army commander are denied the right, even though request has been submitted to local Army headquarters, to have family quarters on the military reservation of Fort Pepperrell. (See pars. 1 and 2, exhibit D.)

Although to some extent enlisted men whose American wives are here without Army permits receive commissary privileges (right to buy groceries, etc., at the Army store) temporarily, and, as the staff of the commanding officer makes plain, only at the whim or discretion of the commander, it would appear that unless the commander and his staff of officers receive instructions from Washington to correct their stupidity, they will, after January 1, 1946, deny commissary privileges to these enlisted men with American wives. (See par. 6 as related to par. 4, exhibit D, the Daily Bulletin.) In addition it is plain in paragraph 6 of exhibit D that authority to ration separately (a money allowance) will be denied these men (sergeants, corporals, privates first class, and privates) with American wives after January 1, 1946, and in fact although several men with American wives have applied in the past months for separate ration allowance, their request has been denied. At the same time, enlisted men of the same grades (sergeants, corporals, privates first class, and privates) who married Newfoundland girls (foreigners) receive without hesitation or question, commissary privileges and authority to ration separately (a money allowance). (See exhibit D.)

In addition, while these enlisted men with American wives (sergeants, corporals, privates first class, and privates) are prohibited from getting family quarters and living on the post (military reservation) at Fort Pepperrell by authority of the above-cited daily bulletin (see exhibit D), they are prohibited by the same daily bulletin, paragraph 6 thereof, from living in town off the post (St. John's is one-half mile away). And, further, the daily bulletin indicates that these men not living on the post at Fort Pepperrell will not get commissary privileges for their families. Is not the Federal law on Government housing (see exhibit D, p. 6) authorizing tenancy for all ranks a higher authority than Army restrictive measures?

This obvious arbitrary, unreasonable discrimination in favor of enlisted men with foreign wives (Newfoundlanders) and against men of the same grades who have married loyal American citizens is really unbelievable, except that it is so typical of the stupidity in high ranks in the War Department and in local Army commands. Or is this policy part of the inducement to have men who have married loyal American girls to reenlist in the Army? Perhaps to save the country and its material bounty for the comfort of foreigners while denying the same comforts to Americans?

This policy shows even more contempt for these enlisted men (sergeants, corporals, privates first class, and privates) with American wives when it is set beside the lavish quarters furnished at and on Fort Pepperrell for families of officers and the first three grades of enlisted men (staff sergeants, technical sergeants, and master sergeants) as authorized by congressional law and Army regulations (see AR 35–4520, exhibit I; AR 35–4220, exhibit I; AR 210–10, change 13, exhibit K), and this is true for this privileged class (officers and the first three enlisted grades) regardless of how good, bad, or indifferent a foreigner the wife might be or if she is American or not. In addition to family quarters, these wives, foreigners or Americans, of officers and the first three grades of enlisted men get other luxuries such as deliveries of food from the Army commissary store by means of Army transportation (see exhibit C), rental allowances for officers of sums greater than the actual rent (see AR 35–4220, par. 5, exhibit I), subsistence allowances for officers (AR 35–4220, par. 1, exhibit I), and for enlisted men of the first three grades (see AR 35–4520, par. 1 and par 13, exhibit I) and family quarters for enlisted men of the first three grades (exhibit I). The list of other special privileges for this class could perhaps be lengthened ad infinitum.

Now of course the ridiculous reason the local staff of officers give for refusing to enlisted men below the first three grades—below staff sergeant—who have American wives the privileges of buying food at the Army commissary store; and of living in apartments at Fort Pepperrell; and of receiving ration allowance is that the War Department—and consequently its counterpart, the Army locally—has forbidden wives of enlisted men below the grade of staff sergeant to leave continental United States by virtue of War Department Circular 125 dated April 25, 1945, section II, paragraph 1d, as amended by War Department Circular 252 dated August 20, 1945, section V (see exhibit A), wherein the following undemocratic class distinction verbiage is used: "Travel to Newfoundland by dependents of United States Army and Navy personnel whose grade, rank, or rating entitles them to transportation of their dependents at Government expense * * * is authorized."

These men of genius reason that because of AR 55–120, paragraph 8 (see exhibit G) and AR 35–4880, paragraph 1 (see exhibit H) only dependents of enlisted men above the fourth grade—fourth grade meaning the equivalent of the grade of sergeant—and dependents of commissioned officers are entitled to transportation at Government expense by reason of the language "when any officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man above the fourth grade * * * the United States will furnish transportation in kind from funds appropriated for his dependents." And so the similar language used in circular 252 (exhibit A) is such that only dependents of staff sergeants or higher or of commissioned officers are permitted to leave continental United States. Wives of enlisted men of the grade of sergeant or less are by these regulations prohibited from coming to Newfoundland at their own expense or even of leaving continental United States for any place outside thereof where any other American citizen is entitled to go. (For equal stupidity refer to exhibit M which quotes General Eichelberger as desiring the same discrimination for the occupation troops in Japan.)

Since when does the War Department or the Army in peacetime have jurisdiction to prohibit an American citizen, who is not in the armed forces, from traveling outside the United States? Is not such travel by such citizens the sole province of the State Department? Especially when the State Department has passed rules or orders allowing any American to travel to Newfoundland without even a passport?

Not only are wives of officers and of the first three enlisted grades permitted to come to Newfoundland but by AR 35–4880 paragraph 1a (see exhibit H) they are authorized to reimbursement from the Government for their expenses of travel, and are entitled to the expense of transportation back to the United States by reason of War Department Circular 287, section X (see exhibit I), which removed the previous restriction of one movement of dependents at Government expense for those dependents of officers and the first three enlisted grades (staff sergeant or higher) which restriction of one movement was originally imposed by AR 35–4880 paragraph 9 (see exhibit H). In fact the above-cited Circular 287 (exhibit I, p. 1) has made it permissible for wives of all men above the grade of sergeant to be transported at Government expense any number of times indefinitely, whereas wives of men below the grade of staff sergeant are not permitted by the War Department or Army to even come to Newfoundland or anywhere else outside the United States (however they do come anyway because the State Department in fact permits them). Perhaps this principle of discrimination and inverted, perverted democracy practiced by the War Department and Army is what we enlisted men below the grade of staff sergeant with American wives have been sacrificing time, money, separation, and effort to preserve? Or would not Hitler's democracy be just about as good as this type set up by the Army?

In short, because of all these conflicting and confused Army regulations and orders devoted to help the privileged few and to destroy the family life of men below the grade of staff sergeants married before the war to good American girls, the local commander and his mistakes find their justification to enact equally ridiculous Army orders here in Newfoundland, supplementing the perverted restrictions of Circular 125 as amended by Circular 252, thus permitting only wives of men above the grade of sergeant and of officers to come to Newfoundland (see Newfoundland Base Command Memorandum No. 63, par. 2, dated August 27, 1945, and par. 4 of Adjutant General's letter attached thereto; exhibit B).

It is no secret that the War Department made the order contained in circular 252 (see exhibit A), allowing wives of the higher ranks to travel to Newfoundland because of specific request to that effect by the local Army commander suggesting the language: "by dependents of United States Army * * * personnel whose grade, rank, or rating entitle them to the transportation of their dependents at Government expense." Why was no request made for the same privileges for men of all grades and ranks, in view of the fact that many apartments at Fort Pepperrell still remain vacant? And when ample accommodations can be obtained in the town of St. John's (and have been obtained—at high rents, of course—by many privates whose wives came without Army permission but with State Department permission and permission of Newfoundland immigration authorities)? The answer is plain: Arrogance, conceit, stupidity, and selfishness of those Army officers in Newfoundland who control this policy prevented it. The size of these attributes rivals those in the Adjutant General's Office in Washington, where these insipid policies are finally determined.

So the local United States Army officers go from this War Department-Army policy of prohibition of travel to Newfoundland for wives of men less than staff sergeant in grade to their asinine conclusion that no other privileges normally given other men of the same grade can be granted these dastardly men who brought their loyal and true American wives from the United States, while the same privileges would be granted to any soldier who picked up with any sort of foreign woman, good or bad, as a wife.

Furthermore, is not the denial of commissary privileges to any enlisted men of any grade a violation of the will of the people of the United States as expressed in Federal law, Title 10, United States Code, Section 1237, enacted by our United States Congress and which is just as binding upon our Secretary of War or local Army commanders as upon any other citizen? (See sec. 1237, exhibit BB.) This law definitely specifies "the officers of the Quartermaster Corps shall procure and keep for sale to officers and enlisted men at cost price * * * for cash or on credit, such articles." Is it not plain that the Federal law uses the word "shall" which is a command or mandate to do a thing, and that it specifies sale to "officers and enlisted men" without making any distinction as to rank or grade? When the Federal law gives no authority to create a class distinction as to rank and grade, how can the War Department staff or local commanders and staff be arrogant enough to create classes in open defiance of Federal law, an authority greater than theirs? Also, does not the War Department's pronouncement on this subject of enlisted men buying food at the Army store as contained in AR 30-2290, dated August 10, 1938, paragraphs 1 and 2 (see exhibit BB), also clearly state that sales shall be made (par. 2a (1) (a)) to "officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Army" without specifying any right of local commanders to withhold privileges from men of any grade or rank? Just where do despotic, dictator-minded commanding officers get their authority to withhold privileges from enlisted men of lower grades who have good American wives in direct violation of both Federal law and War Department order? Does any officer's twisted mind sincerely believe the restriction on travel of dependents to Newfoundland as contained in Circular 125 as amended by Circular 252 (exhibit A) is sound basis for such stupid refusal of commissary privileges to men with American wives?

With reference to the Newfoundland commanding officer's refusal of family quarters to enlisted men below the third enlisted grade with American wives (see Daily Bulletin, November 16, 1945, pars. 1 and 2; exhibit D), is it plain, grade-school common sense to use the travel restriction of wives of enlisted men as contained in Circular 125 as amended by Circular 252 (exhibit A) as justification for this refusal of family quarters? Especially is it sensible when Army regulations impose no such restriction upon the commander on the subject of assignment of family quarters, and instead expressly exhort the commander to make assignments for the best interests of the service? (See AR 210-10 and change 13 thereof; exhibit K.) Is it for the best interests of the service for any Army commander to assign all enlisted men with foreign wives to quarters while enlisted men of the same grades with American wives are denied family apartments or quarters; and, furthermore, when the quarters available are numerous enough to house all married men and families no matter how foreign or American the wives are? A commander who knows as little as some in the field would perhaps answer "Yes" to this question. In fact, the local commander is giving corporals (and in some cases privates) with Newfoundland (foreign) wives reenlisting in the Regular Army permanent quarters, which quarters are in as excellent condition as officers' quarters (see exhibit D) and designed for use by officers and the first three grades of enlisted men. And is all this sensible when a Federal law authorizes renting Government housing to all ranks? (See exhibit D.)

As for the separate rations allowance, the travel restrictions of Circulars 125 and 252 (exhibit A) are again used by the local commander for justification in denying separate rations allowance to enlisted men below the grade of staff sergeant with American wives in Newfoundland, while granting them to enlisted men of the same grade who have married Newfoundlanders (foreigners) (see exhibit D). Is this good judgment or observance of the express direction of the War Department as contained in Circular 134 dated April 8, 1944, paragraph 1 thereof (see exhibit J) where it is stated: "The post commander * * * may in his discretion and with due regard for the best interests of the service * * * authorize individual men to mess separately"? This item thus falls in the same category of customary military stupidity as the denial of family quarters to men with American wives residing with them in Newfoundland.

Even foreign domestic servants and maids of officers get better consideration than the American wives of enlisted men below the grade of staff sergeant with regard to receiving family quarters at Fort Pepperrell by virtue of the authority of AR 210-10, Change 13 dated January 8, 1944, paragraph 13e. (See exhibit K.)

The last straw to all this discrimination against enlisted men below staff sergeant with American wives is that the local commander has urged the equally perverted Adjutant General's Office and the War Department to back up his decision in denying transportation at Government expense back to the United States from Newfoundland for those American wives of such enlisted men below staff sergeant, which wives have come to Newfoundland with State Department permission but without Army permits. Several such enlisted men have made requests and have been refused orders allowing transportation of their dependents back to the United States by Government conveyance or at Government expense. This the local commander is doing although the War Department over General Marshall's signature has stated, contrary to that decision, in circular 245 dated August 11, 1945, paragraph 3 and 3a that transportation at Government expense will be furnished to dependents of all military personnel (regardless of rank or grade) on duty at stations outside continental United States (see exhibit F). How can any intelligent person read an exception into this so as to exclude American wives who came to Newfoundland with permission of our United States Government through the State Department but contrary to the Army's ridiculous verbiage in circulars 125 and 252 (see exhibit A), the Army having no jurisdiction in peace at least to restrict travel of civilians?

Furthermore, is not the War Department, General Marshall, and the Army required—like any other citizen—to obey Federal laws enacted by our United States Congress, and specifically the Federal law known as the Military Appropriations Act, 1946 (see exhibit E), and are they not required, if they issue Army regulations on a subject covered in this law such as transportation of dependents, to follow the Federal law? Is not the Federal law a higher authority than the War Department, General Marshall, and Army? It will be noted that the Federal law expressly says that dependents of such military personnel without regard to rank or grade may be moved, and shows no intention that foreign wives shall alone be a privileged class to the exclusion of good, loyal American wives. And if the law is interpreted to permit such exclusion of American wives, what principle of American democracy justifies the transport at Government expense of millions of dollars 100,000 or more British, German, French, and a varied assortment of all colors and nationalities of foreign wives back to the United States while at the same time denying the small expense of transporting the relatively few American wives back to the United States? In addition, other American wives and foreign wives of enlisted men, staff sergeant or higher, and of commissioned officers get free rides at Government-taxpayers' expense back to the United States; and as mentioned before, no longer are they restricted to one move at Government expense because of circular 287, section X, September 20, 1945 (see exhibit I, p. 1). In fact, one staff sergeant, a bigamist, in Newfoundland took his second illegal foreign wife which he married in Newfoundland back to the United States at Government expense; and had such authority by the above Army regulations regardless of how many times his lawful American wife might have traveled at Government expense.

The apex of the ridiculous was reached lately when a staff sergeant recently so promoted here in Newfoundland was threatened with denial of benefits, such as family quarters on the post, etc., to which other staff sergeants married are entitled, because his wife was brought here without an Army permit at a time when he was only a corporal in grade. His wife came from the United States. Yes, circular 125, as amended, was given as the reason for this foolish attitude.

By way of contrast, the Canadian Army in Newfoundland all during the war by its quota system permitted in practical effect all its personnel of any rank or grade to bring their wives from Canada to live with them. And that was true also of the Canadian Navy stationed in Newfoundland. The Canadian Army and Navy treated none of its personnels' wives, no matter what grade the serviceman held, as an outlaw. Certainly, the Canadians would not have been so stupid as to give privileges to Newfoundland wives marrying Canadians which they would deny their own Canadian wives married to Canadians. So one can see that Canada follows a Christian policy of fostering family life where it does not interfere with military activity, in complete contrast to what we in America consider as sensible, but which is really a pagan, immoral policy. However, one must admit the greater democracy in Canada, and must also admit that Canada probably has a greater proportion of people with sound religious principles controlling their Government and the armed services than the proportion of the same controlling the United States Government and Army. Even the people living in Newfoundland think the American policy is stupid and antireligious. (See exhibit L.)

Are these the intelligent principles, Government and country for which all enlisted men fought? It might be if the War Department and Army were cleaned of its stupid characters and parasites whose unearned portions of their pay coming from the United States Treasury far exceeds the Government cost of transporting a few American wives to the United States and the cost of other benefits (commissary benefits, rations allowance, and family quarters) unjustly denied them in violation of Federal law or Army regulations, or common sense.

Do these local drains on the Federal Treasury wearing uniforms have the same intense desire to stop Government costs or fill the Federal Treasury when they take, as they have, ten 1942 Army staff cars in excellent condition, declare them surplus property, have the Army recondition and paint them, put on new tires, and sell them to the officers only of highest rank (themselves) at less than one-third or one-half their market value (about $450 in United States money)?

All these matters might be good advertisement for the current Army enlistment drive, especially the prospective soldiers who have American wives.

LIST OF EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT A

Circular 125: Travel of dependents.
Circulars 197 and 203: Travel.
Circular 252: Travel to Newfoundland.

EXHIBIT B

Memo 63 (Newfoundland headquarters): Travel to Newfoundland.

EXHIBIT BB

AR 30-2290 and U. S. C. 1237: Commissary.

EXHIBIT C

Price list of commissary store, Fort Pepperrell.

EXHIBIT D

Daily Bulletin (Newfoundland headquarters), November 16, 1945.

Special Order 172: Public quarters for private with Newfoundland wife.

Special Order 168: Family quarters for corporal and sergeant married to foreigners.

Special Order 170: Separate rations to private married to Newfoundlander.

Authority to ration separately for private married in Newfoundland to foreigner.

EXHIBIT E

Federal law: Transportation at Government expense of all dependents to United States.

EXHIBIT F

Circular 245: Transportation of dependents from overseas.

EXHIBIT G

AR 55-120: Transfer of dependents at Government expense.

EXHIBIT H

AR 35-4880: Reimbursement for transportation of dependents.

EXHIBIT I

Circular 287: Transportation, and AR 35-4520, quarters and subsistence for third-grade men.

AR 35-4220: Subsistence and rental allowance for officers.

EXHIBIT J

Circular 134 and Army Regulations re enlisted men mess separately.

EXHIBIT K

Authority for assigning quarters.

EXHIBIT A

CIRCULAR 125

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., April 25, 1945.

(Effective until October 25, 1946, unless sooner rescinded or superseded)

I. Enlisted men: Every enlisted man 42 years of age or over, whose service is honorable and who voluntarily applies in writing to his immediate commanding officer for a discharge, will be sent to a separation center, as provided in current instructions, for discharge under the provisions of AR 615-365 (Convenience of the Government) and this circular. Such applicants overseas will be returned to the appropriate separation center in the United States in excess of rotation quotas. Military necessity or other requirements or limitations will not be a bar to discharge; however, this authority will not be used in lieu of disciplinary action, nor when discharge under other Army regulations is appropriate, nor when the individual concerned is under medical or surgical treatment. The provisions of this circular do not apply to enlisted women of the Women's Army Corps.

[AG 220.8 (17 April 45)]

II. Travel: 1. Civilian dependents of military personnel and of War Department civilian employees may enjoy the same travel privileges accorded to other civilians but they may not proceed to a theater, base, or command outside the continental United States in which military or civilian personnel upon whom they are dependent are stationed except—

a. When they are bona fide members of—
(1) Army Nurse Corps.
(2) Women's Army Corps.
(3) American Red Cross.
(4) United Service Organizations.

b. When they are dependents of bona fide members of military attaché staffs or offices and military commissions or missions in Latin America, provided such travel is appropriately authorized in War Department orders.

c. Upon specific request of a theater or base commander for their employment in a capacity necessary to the war effort.

d. With respect to the Bahamas, the Caribbean Defense Command, and Brazil, in accordance with joint Army and Navy policy, travel by dependents of United States Army and Navy personnel, whose grade, rank, or rating entitles them to the transportation of their dependents at Government expense, and by dependents of War and Navy Department civilian employees on permanent duty in these areas, is authorized subject to the following conditions:

(1) That the travel is for the purpose of establishing residence with (not visiting) the personnel concerned;

(2) That in each area the appropriate Army and Navy commanders will coordinate local implementation which will be governed by availability and suitability of housing, the availability of medical supplies, and other pertinent local conditions;

(3) That in each area the appropriate Army and Navy commanders, respectively, will determine the order in which applications for authorization for dependent's travel will be granted;

(4) That no Government transportation will be furnished except as may become available as surplus;

(5) That reimbursement for transportation of dependents will be effected in accordance with existing law;

(6) That no household goods or private automobiles will be transported via Government transportation or at Government expense;

(7) That no increase in Army or Navy personnel assigned to the above areas will result.

2. The fact that a member of the Army Nurse Corps, Women's Army Corps, American Red Cross, United Service Organizations, or a civilian is a blood relative of, or marries, a member of the armed forces or a War Department civilian employee in an oversea theater, base, or command, will not be allowed to effect an advantage or disadvantage in the assignment or duty of either person, nor will it be allowed to preclude the privileges normally allowed to such persons. Assignments of personnel under military control to duty overseas and authorization for others to proceed will be made solely on the basis of military necessity and without regard to the personal relationships involved.

3. Section IV, Circular No. 228, War Department, 1944, pertaining to the foregoing subject, is rescinded.

[AG 510 (17 April 45)]

By order of the Secretary of War:

G. C. MARSHALL,
Chief of Staff.

Official:

J. A. ULIO,
Major General, The Adjutant General.

CIRCULAR 197

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., June 30, 1945.

IV. Travel: The last sentence of paragraph 2, section II, WD, Circular 125, 1945, is changed as follows:

Assignments of personnel under military control to duty overseas and authorization for others to proceed will be made solely on the basis of military necessity and without regard to the personal relationships involved, except as provided in section V, WD, Circular 47, 1945.

By order of the Secretary of War:

G. C. MARSHALL,
Chief of Staff.

Official:

J. A. ULIO,
Major General, The Adjutant General.

CIRCULAR 203

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., July 6, 1945.

VI. Travel: Paragraph 1e, section II, WD, Circular 125, 1945, is added as follows:

e. Travel to Bermuda by dependents of United States Army and Navy personnel whose grade, rank, or rating entitles them to the transportation of their dependents at Government expense, and by dependents of War and Navy Department civilian employees on permanent duty in Bermuda, is authorized subject to the conditions enumerated under d above.

By order of the Secretary of War:

G. C. MARSHALL,
Chief of Staff.

Official:

J. A. ULIO,
Major General, The Adjutant General.

CIRCULAR 252

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., August 20, 1945.

V. Travel: Section II, WD, Circular 125, 1945, as amended by section IV, WD, Circular 197, and section VI, WD, Circular 203, 1945, is further amended by adding paragraph 1f, as follows:

f. Travel to Newfoundland by dependents of United States Army and Navy personnel whose grade, rank, or rating entitles them to the transportation of their dependents at Government expense, and by dependents of War and Navy Department civilian employees on permanent duty in Newfoundland, is authorized subject to the conditions enumerated under d above.

By order of the Secretary of War:

G. C. MARSHALL,
Chief of Staff.

Official:

EDWARD F. WITSELL,
Major General,
Acting The Adjutant General.

EXHIBIT B

MEMORANDUM NO. 63, TRAVEL OF DEPENDENTS TO NEWFOUNDLAND

HEADQUARTERS,
NEWFOUNDLAND BASE COMMAND,
UNITED STATES ARMY,
APO 862, CARE OF POSTMASTER,
New York, N. Y., August 27, 1945.

1. Attention of all concerned (only officers and first three grades) is directed to con-

fidential letter AGO, subject, Travel of Dependents of Military Personnel to Newfoundland, dated August 17, 1945 (classification reduced to "Restricted"), copy of which is appended hereto as enclosure No. 1.

2. All United States military personnel or War Department civilian employees coming within the purview of paragraph 2, enclosure No. 1 (see AG letter, next sheet), who desire to have their dependents establish residence with them in Newfoundland will make application, through post commanders, for permission therefor to the commanding general, Newfoundland Base Command. Application forms for this purpose may be procured from the Adjutant General, Newfoundland Base Command, or from post adjutants.

3. Before request is approved, applicants will be required to show that suitable housing is available for their dependents, either on or off the post. Post commanders in their forwarding endorsements will indicate either (1) that suitable quarters are available on the post or (2) that the individual has procured suitable housing in the neighboring community.

4. If no Government transportation is requested: When application is approved, the commanding general, Newfoundland Base Command, will issue to the applicant a letter of authorization for the travel of dependents. This letter must be sent to the dependents concerned, and will be used in lieu of a passport. It must be in the possession of dependents at all times while travel to Newfoundland is being performed.

5. If Government transportation is requested. Lists of dependents approved by the commanding general, Newfoundland Base Command, for travel to Newfoundland will be forwarded in accordance with paragraphs 6 and 7, enclosure No. 1, to The Adjutant General, and the commanding general, Army Service Forces. Persons requesting Government transportation for their dependents will instruct such dependents to take no action in connection with Government-provided transportation prior to receipt of instructions and invitational travel orders issued by The Adjutant General.

6. Medical care for dependents. Due to the limited Medical Department personnel to be stationed in Newfoundland, it will be necessary, initially, to restrict medical care for dependents as follows:

(a) Only out-patient treatment and emergency care, which in civilian practice is equivalent to office calls and residence calls, will be provided for dependents of United States Army personnel at post hospitals in Newfoundland.

(b) A baby clinic will be operated one afternoon each week for the purpose of routine physical examinations and immunizations for children of preschool age.

(c) Hospitalization of cases of any type, dental treatment, and maternity service (including prenatal care) will not be provided.

7. Immunization: The following immunizations are required prior to departure from the United States.

(a) Smallpox vaccination unless immunized within the past year. Waiver of smallpox vaccination in the case of infants under 3 months is authorized.

(b) Typhoid and paratyphoid (triple typhoid vaccine) unless immunized within the past year. This immunization consists of three inoculations administered at weekly intervals which will require a total of 2 weeks. Waiver of the requirements for triple typhoid vaccine for infants under 1 year of age is authorized.

(NOTE.—In this connection, it is suggested that dependents contact the commanding officer of a general hospital, general dispensary, Army airfield, or Army camp, post, or station nearest their homes who will be in a position to administer the necessary immunizations. A private physician may administer immunization inoculations, but if so, a certificate for same must be obtained for presentation to military authorities when required (AG–10).)

By command of Brigadier General Connell:

A. H. WARREN,
Colonel, G. S. C., Chief of Staff.

Official:

[SEAL] F. J. MATTHEWS,
Captain, A. G. D., Adjutant General.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
THE ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., August 17, 1945.

Subject: Travel of dependents of military personnel to Newfoundland.

To: Commanding Generals, Eastern Defense Command, Governors Island, N. Y.; Newfoundland Base Command, APO 862, care of Postmaster, New York, N. Y.

1. War and Navy Departments have agreed to the following provisions governing travel to Newfoundland by dependents of United States Army and Navy personnel and dependents of War and Navy Departments civilian employees stationed in Newfoundland:

2. Travel to Newfoundland by the dependents of United States Army and Navy personnel, whose grade, rank (nobody below staff sergeant), or rating entitle them to the transportation of their dependents at Government expense, and by dependents of War and Navy Departments civilian employees on permanent duty in Newfoundland is authorized subject to the following conditions:

(a) That the travel is for the purpose of establishing residence with (not visiting) the personnel concerned.

(b) That the commanding general, Newfoundland base command, will coordinate with the commandant, United States naval operating base, Newfoundland, upon local implementation, which will be governed by availability and suitability of housing, the availability of medical supplies, and other pertinent local conditions.

(c) That in each area the appropriate Army and Navy commanders, respectively, will determine the order in which application for authorization for dependents' travel will be granted.

(d) That no Government transportation will be furnished except as may become available as surplus.

(e) That reimbursement for transportation of dependents will be effected in accordance with existing law.

(f) That no household goods or private automobile will be transported via Government transportation or at Government expenses.

(g) That no increase in Army or Navy personnel assigned to the above areas will result.

3. Action is being taken by the War Department to amend section II of Circular 125 so as to include Newfoundland among the excepted stations mentioned in subparagraph d. Attention is invited to the fact that Circular 125 is not applicable to the transportation of dependents from overseas stations to the United States.

4. There is at the present time no surplus space on Government transportation to Newfoundland. However, in the event that surplus space should become available in the future, instructions relating to the application for and the use of such space is included herein.

5. Dependents will be required to complete the inoculations prescribed for Army personnel assigned from the United States to Newfoundland. Dependents will be required to make their own arrangements for transportation to the port of embarkation when notified by The Adjutant General that they are to travel via Government transportation to overseas station. When dependents elect to travel via commercial transportation (rail, water, or air) at their own expense, they will be required to make their own arrangements for transportation to final destination.

6. Lists of requests for surplus Government transportation approved by the commanding general, Newfoundland Base Command for the travel of dependents will be forwarded in triplicate by air pouch to The Adjutant General (attention: Operations Branch, AGO), War Department, Washington 25, D. C., and in quadruplicate to the commanding general, Army Service Forces (attention chief of transportation), Washington 25, D. C. Lists should contain the following information:

(a) Christian name, sex, ages, addresses of dependents, and names, ranks, and Army serial numbers of individuals upon whom they are dependent.

(b) Method (air or water) and approximate date of travel desired.

(c) Order of precedence of movement within both the air and water categories.

(d) A class IV air priority designator for those personnel for whom air transportation is desired.

The applications that will be considered by the commanding general, Newfoundland Base Command, will include requests of all military personnel wherever stationed within the territorial limits of Newfoundland.

7. Dependents of Government civilian employees, traveling under provisions of War Department Circular 125, may travel by surplus air transport but at their own expense, unless such dependents are traveling to accept Government employment in Newfoundland Base Command, in which case they may travel at Government expense.

Dependents of military personnel may travel by surplus transportation available to the War Department, either air or water, at Government expense. The authority for travel will be contained in War Department invitational travel orders issued at the request of the commanding general, Newfoundland Base Command.

8. Personnel under Newfoundland Base Command will be instructed to inform their dependents to take no action in connection with travel on Government-provided transportation prior to receipt of instructions and invitational travel orders issued by The Adjutant General.

9. For your information, copies of instructions for procedure involving either air or water transportation as issued by The Adjutant General to the dependents for whom transportation is requested by overseas commands are attached hereto as enclosures 1 and 2.

10. Copies of local implementation plans based on the policy set forth above will be furnished to the War Department at the earliest practicable date.

11. The commanding general, Newfoundland Base Command, is authorized to reduce the classification of this communication when deemed advisable and is directed to advise the War Department when reduction has been accomplished.

By order of the Secretary of War:

EDWARD F. WITSELL,
Brigadier General,
The Adjutant General.

Certified a true copy:

F. J. MATHEWS,
Captain AGD, Adjutant General.

EXHIBIT BB

COMMISSARY SALES (FOOD AND PROVISIONS)

The people of the United States have expressed their will, through their duly elected Representatives in Congress, on the subject of commissary provisions for members of the Army by means of the Federal law embodied in title 10, United States Code, section 1237, as follows:

"1237. Sale at cost prices of articles designated by officers of Inspector General's Department; accounting:

"The officers of the Quartermaster Corps shall procure and keep for sale to officers and enlisted men at cost price (except that overhead costs shall be charged, as prescribed in sec. 1231 of this title, in the case of articles of clothing and equipage) for cash or on

credit, such articles as may, from time to time, be designated by the officers of the Inspector General's Department of the Army. An account of sales on credit shall be kept, and the amount due for same shall be reported to the Chief of Finance. (R. S. par. 1144; Aug. 24, 1912, ch. 391, par. 3, 37 Stat. 591, June 3, 1916, ch. 134, par. 7, 39 Stat. 169; June 3, 1916, ch. 134, par. 9a, as added June 4, 1920, ch. 227, par. 9, 41 Stat. 766.)"

Necessarily subordinate to the will of the people of the United States as expressed in the above Federal law are the Army regulations propounded by order of the Secretary of War, as follows:

"ARMY REGULATIONS No. 30-2290

"WAR DEPARTMENT,
"Washington, August 10, 1938.

"QUARTERMASTER CORPS: SALE OF SUPPLIES AND SERVICE

"SECTION 1. Sale of subsistence articles:

"1. General: a. Such authorized articles of subsistence supplies as it may be practicable to keep and as are required from time to time will be kept by sales commissaries in reasonable quantities for sale to those entitled to purchase the articles.

"b, c, d, e. * * *

"2. Kinds of sales and to whom made: a. Cash sales.

"(1) Definition: Cash sales are those paid for at the time of purchase, and will be recorded on W. D., Q. M. C. Form No. 386 (cash sales slip), or as provided in paragraph 10a (5), AR 35-6660.

"(2) To whom made: Cash sales are authorized to be made to the following for their own use or for the use of dependent members of their families:

"(a) Officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard on the active or retired list.

* * * * * *

"(j) Civilians employed with the Army, including duly accredited representatives of nationally recognized welfare organizations, at stations so located as to make the purchases from civilian agencies impracticable, upon written authority of the post commander."

PRICE LIST, COMMISSARY SALES STORE, NOVEMBER 1945, FORT PEPPERRELL, NEWFOUNDLAND

1. Deliveries will be made to family quarters at Fort Pepperrell.

* * * * * *

Sales are made to the following:

(a) All members of the United States armed forces.

Enlisted men living (enlisted men below staff sergeant with American wives, because by local Army order they are not permitted to live outside their barracks (see Daily Bulletin, November 16, 1945; exhibit D, par. 6)) in barracks will not be sold fresh meat or dry and canned goods, except personnel on authorized reconnaissance and recreation.

EXHIBIT D

DAILY BULLETIN

HEADQUARTERS, NEWFOUNDLAND BASE COMMAND AND FORT PEPPERRELL, NEWFOUNDLAND,
New York, N. Y., November 16, 1945.

Paragraph 1. All concerned: Enlisted men below the first three grades who have married in Newfoundland (married foreigners), will be furnished family quarters for their dependents at Fort Pepperrell, provided they submit an application therefor through their organization commanders to this headquarters. Personnel of the Regular Army who held the grade of T5g (corporal) or higher can be provided permanent quarters normally assigned to men of the first three grades. Upon occupying these quarters men having class F allotments will have 90 cents per day deducted from their pay for family quarters furnished them as outlined by change 5, paragraph 29-c, AR 35-4520, dated January 21, 1944.

PAR. 2. Married privates, first-class, and other enlisted men below the first three grades who have married in Newfoundland, who do not elect to reenlist in the Regular Army, will be assigned family quarters at Fort Pepperrell for their dependents. These quarters are located in buildings T-265 to T-273, above and slightly west of the West Side Gas Station. Deduction for quarters will be made wherever class F allotments exist.

PAR. 3. It is planned to have an apartment in building T-269, west side, and an apartment in the east side NCO quarters 709 available for inspection of prospective occupants Sunday afternoon, November 18, 1945, from 1300 NT to 1700 NT, at which time there will be displayed in each quarters the furniture and equipment now available for issue to married enlisted men on memorandum receipt.

PAR. 4. Enlisted men taking advantage of this opportunity can be provided telephone service at the rate of 75 cents per month and will not be required to sleep and live in barracks. Commissary privileges will be extended to these enlisted men on the same basis and conditions provided for other military personnel living at Fort Pepperrell with their families.

PAR. 5. Enlisted men who have married without permission will not be permitted to occupy family quarters at Fort Pepperrell until disciplinary action imposed by a court-martial or otherwise has been adjudged and after termination of punishment.

PAR. 6. Garage space is available for married military personnel living at Fort Pepperrell. In this connection, attention is called to Circular 50, Newfoundland Base Command, dated September 25, 1945. Effective January 1, 1946, married enlisted men who do not live on the Fort Pepperrell reservation will not be granted authority to ration separately or to be quartered outside the reservation when not on duty.

By order of Colonel Warren:

F. J. MATHEWS,
Major, AGD, Adjutant General.

SPECIAL ORDER No. 172

HEADQUARTERS,
NEWFOUNDLAND BASE COMMAND AND FORT PEPPERRELL, NEWFOUNDLAND,
UNITED STATES ARMY,
APO 862, CARE OF POSTMASTER,
New York, N. Y., December 7, 1945.

4. Under the provisions of AR 210-10, Pvt. Daniel B. Turner (married to Newfoundlander; reenlisted in Regular Army), 34427450 (605), 3294, Quartermaster Carrier Detachment, Fort Pepperrell, Newfoundland, APO 862, is assigned public quarters, apartment 410-C (permanent quarters built for officers and first three enlisted grades; quarters built with funds appropriated by Congress solely for such ranks), effective December 10, 1945.

By command of Brigadier General Connell:

A. H. WARREN,
Colonel, GSC, C. of S.

Official:

F. J. MATHEWS,
Major, AGD, Adjutant General.

SPECIAL ORDER No. 168

HEADQUARTERS,
NEWFOUNDLAND BASE COMMAND AND FORT PEPPERRELL, NEWFOUNDLAND,
UNITED STATES ARMY,
APO 862, CARE OF POSTMASTER,
New York, N. Y.

1. Under the provisions of AR 210-10, the following-named enlisted men (with dependents), Headquarters Company, Newfoundland Base Command, and Fort Pepperrell, Newfoundland, APO 862, are assigned quarters indicated, effective dates indicated:

Rank	Name	Army serial No.	MOS	Apartment No.	Effective date
Tech. Sgt.	Albert Domalavage	6897883	2601	707-D [4]	Dec. 1, 1945
T4g [1]	Ralph T. Martino [3]	12041381	648	705-A [4]	Nov. 28, 1945
T5g [2]	Ralph F. Maurstad [3]	32256446	319	701-A [4]	Do.

[1] Sergeant.
[2] Corporal.
[3] Married Newfoundlander and reenlisted in Regular Army.
[4] Permanent quarters built by funds appropriated to provide quarters for officers and first 3 enlisted grades.

2. * * *.

By order of Colonel Warren:

F. J. MATHEWS,
Major, AGD, Adjutant General.

SPECIAL ORDERS No. 170

HEADQUARTERS, NEWFOUNDLAND, BASE COMMAND AND FT. PEPPERRELL, NEWFOUNDLAND,
United States Army, APO 862,
Care of Postmaster, New York, N. Y.,
December 4, 1945.

7. Pvt. Ellis M. Caraway, 38739423 (590), Headquarters Company, Newfoundland Base Command and Fort Pepperrell, Newfoundland, APO 862, is granted authority to ration separately (ration money allowance) effective Dec. 5, 1945. Authority: Circular 134, WD 44.

By command of Brigadier General Connell:

A. H. WARREN,
Colonel, GSC, CofS.

Official:

F. J. MATHEWS,
Major, AGD, Adjutant General.

SPECIAL ORDERS, No. 171

HEADQUARTERS, NEWFOUNDLAND BASE COMMAND AND FT. PEPPERRELL, NEWFOUNDLAND,
United States Army, APO 862,
Care of Postmaster, New York, N. Y.,
December 6, 1945

1. * * *
2. * * *, etc.

4. Pvt. Carl F. Haught 42240166 (745), Headquarters Company, Newfoundland Base Command and Fort Pepperrell, Newfoundland, APO 862, is granted authority to ration separately effective this date. Authority: Circular 134, WD 44.

By command of Brigadier General Connell:

A. H. WARREN,
Colonel, GSC, CofS.

Official:

F. J. MATHEWS,
Major, AGD, Adjutant General.

BULLETIN No. 12

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., July 16, 1945.

IV. Government housing: The following act of Congress (Public Law 120, 79th Cong.)

is published for the information and guidance of all concerned:

"An act to permit members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Public Health Service, and their dependents, to occupy certain Government housing facilities on a rental basis without loss of rental allowances

"Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of any other law (including any laws restricting the occupancy of housing facilities under the jurisdiction of Government departments or agencies by personnel, and dependents of personnel, of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard above specified ranks, or by personnel, and dependents of personnel, of the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Public Health Service), personnel of any of the services mentioned herein and their dependents may be accepted as tenants in and may occupy on a rental basis any such housing facilities (no distinction as to rank or grade mentioned in this Federal law. No distinction against American wives or in favor of foreign wives mentioned either) other than public quarters constructed or designated for assignment to and occupancy without charge by such personnel and their dependents if any, and such personnel shall not be deprived by reason of such occupancy of money allowances to which they are otherwise entitled for rental of quarters."

Approved July 2, 1945.

BULLETIN No. 12

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., July 6, 1944.

Appropriation for military establishments, fiscal year 1945, and other purposes: The following act of Congress (Public Law 374, 78th Cong.) is published for the information and guidance of all concerned (helpful in interpreting terms of Government housing law (see exhibit D, p. 6)):

"An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes

"Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, namely:

* * * * *

"SEC. 21. During the fiscal year 1945 occupancy of Government facilities under the jurisdiction of the Military Establishment on a rental basis by personnel of the services mentioned in the title of the Pay Adjustment Act of 1942 or by their dependents shall not deprive such personnel of money allowances for rental of quarters." (Personnel mentioned in Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 are all grades and ranks.)

(NOTE.—For the personnel of the services mentioned in the title of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, see Bull. 28, War Department, June 25, 1942, as set forth below:)

BULLETIN No. 28

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, June 25, 1942.

I. Act of Congress. Pay Readjustment Act of 1942: The following act of Congress (Public Law 607, 77th Cong.) is published for the information and guidance of all concerned:

"An act to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service

"Be it enacted, etc.,

"SEC. 2. The base pay of any enlisted man. * * *

* * * * *

"SEC. 9. The monthly base pay of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard shall be as follows * * *."

EXHIBIT E

BULLETIN No. 13

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., June 17, 1945.

Appropriation, Military Appropriation Act, 1946: The following act of Congress (Public Law 126, 79th Cong.) is published for the information and guidance of all concerned:

"An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes

"Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, namely:

* * * * *

"During the fiscal year 1946 the dependents and household effects of such military and civilian personnel (without regard to rank or grade) in and under the Military Establishment on duty at stations outside the continental limits of the United States, or in Alaska, as may be determined upon by the Secretary of War, may prior or subsequent to the issuance of orders for the relief of such personnel from their stations, or subsequent to the discharge or release of such military personnel from active military service, be moved (including packing and unpacking of household effects) from such stations outside the continental limits of the United States, or in Alaska, to such locations as may be designated by such personnel, by the use of either Government or commercial means of transportation, and later from such locations to the duty stations to which such personnel may be ordered, and current appropriations of the Military Establishment available for travel and transportation may be used for this purpose, the decision of the Secretary of War to be final as to the dependency of any individual sought to be affected by this provision except as to travel performed subsequent to arrival in the United States: * * *."

EXHIBIT F

CIRCULAR 245

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., August 11, 1945.

(Effective until February 11, 1947, unless sooner rescinded or superseded)

TRANSPORTATION OF DEPENDENTS FROM OVERSEAS

1. Purpose: The purpose of these instructions is to clarify War Department policy concerning the movement of dependents at Government expense from overseas to the United States and to its territories or possessions, for the guidance of oversea and United States port commanders.

2. Definitions: (a) The word "dependents" as used herein refers only to wives, (all wives) husbands, and children of military personnel and of that civilian personnel defined in paragraph 3a(2).

(b) The term "Government expense" shall include transportation of dependents in kind, or reimbursement of expenditures actually incurred not to exceed the cost of transportation if same had been provided in kind by the Government.

3. Policy: The Secretary of War has determined that, effective July 1, 1945, the transportation at Government expense of the personnel enumerated below is warranted and directs that transportation be furnished, when available, in accordance with the policies outlined herein:

(a) Personnel to be affected:

(1) Dependents of all military personnel, regardless of rank or grade, (including those who have been separated from the service under honorable conditions) who are, or have been, on duty at stations outside the continental limits of the United States, or in Alaska, at any time since September 8, 1939.

(2) Dependents of employees of the American Red Cross (for whom water transportation only is authorized under these instructions) and of full-time civilian employees directly employed by the War Department or the Army.

(3) Dependents of military and civilian personnel who are not themselves entitled to transportation to the United States or its Territories or possessions by reason of the circumstances of their separation from the service or termination of employment overseas are specifically excluded from the provisions of this circular.

(4) Fiancees of military personnel are specifically excluded from the provisions of these instructions. They must provide for their own transportation and travel as commercial passengers at their own expense. Theater commanders may, however, render such assistance as may be practicable to fiancees in arranging for transportation, upon the request of the service personnel concerned.

(5) Dependents of deceased personnel are also excluded from the provisions of these instructions. Transportation of these individuals is governed by the provisions of section XIV, WD, Circular 140, 1945.

(b) Transportation to be provided:

(1) In all cases the transportation of dependents will depend upon the military situation, the amount of surface shipping available, and current instructions of the War Department. Transportation of dependents by air at Government expense or by military aircraft is not authorized without the expressed approval of the War Department.

(2) Vessels available will be used in the following order of precedence:

(a) Army transports (i. e. vessels owned by or bare-boated to the Army and manned and operated by the Army) or Navy transports.

(b) Other vessels of American registry.

(3) Dependents, if embarked by the Army on a War Shipping Administration vessel will be given a copy of the letter of authority covering their transportation as required by paragraph 13, WD Memorandum 55–44, September 29, 1944, subject, Transactions Between War Department and War Shipping Administration.

(4) Transportation to be provided under the provisions of these instructions will be effected from an oversea port to a location in the United States or its Territories or possessions. Port transportation officers will furnish transportation only from ports of debarkation to inland points in the United States designated in the travel orders of the individuals, or to an appropriate United States port of embarkation in connection with further ocean travel which may be necessary under such orders, except that the port transportation officer may amend orders of dependents to authorize travel to another point in the United States, upon request of the military or civilian personnel upon whom they are dependent, when in his opinion such action appears justifiable.

(c) Charges for subsistence: Charges for subsistence will be made in accordance with the following:

(1) On Army transports, in accordance with paragraph 20b, WD Memorandum 55–44, December 22, 1944, subject, Transactions Between War Department and War Shipping Administration.

(2) On Navy transports—as prescribed by the Navy Department.

(3) On War Shipping Administration vessels—as prescribed by paragraph 17, WD Memorandum 55–44, September 29, 1944, cited above.

(d) Authority and priority:

(1) The movement of dependents will be strictly controlled by the theater commander or his duly authorized representative, who shall furnish the dependent with appropriate travel orders, citing this circular, and stating the inland destination in the United States,

its Territory, or possession, of the individual concerned. Such orders will be issued only upon written request to the oversea theater or base commander by the military or civilian personnel for whose dependents transportation is authorized. This request will include the location to which transportation of dependents is desired.

(2) Space priorities for dependents referred to herein will be as determined by the theater commander under the provisions of WD letter (AG 510 (19 Apr. 45) OB-S-E-SPTOM-M), May 8, 1945, subject, Priorities for Personnel Returning to the United States by Other Than Air.

4. Relation to other regulations: These instructions are not intended to, and do not in any way, affect regulations or requirements of the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice, and of the Department of State, nor do they in any way affect such restrictive measures as may be taken by competent authority relative to travel to or through restricted areas. Furthermore, these instructions in no way affect transportation of dependents of military personnel from the United States to oversea commands.

5. Restriction: These instructions are not intended to limit or restrict the rights of personnel who may be otherwise entitled by law or regulations to transportation of dependents. Where dependents are transported to inland destinations in the United States under the provisions of this circular, the transportation authorized will constitute the "one such movement" contemplated under existing instructions.

6. Shipment of household effects: Transportation of household effects under the provisions of this circular will be limited to those of military or civilian personnel who were living with their dependents overseas at the time of their induction or employment by the Government, and by the amount of surface shipping available. The provisions of paragraphs 12 and 34, AR 55–160, will be waived in the case of household effects transported under the provisions of this circular.

7. Rescission: WD letter (AG 510 (23 Oct. 44) OB–S–E–M), November 23, 1944, subject, Return of Dependents from Overseas, is rescinded.

By order of the Secretary of War:

G. C. MARSHALL,
Chief of Staff.

Official:

EDWARD F. WITSELL,
Major General, Acting The Adjutant General.

EXHIBIT G

ARMY REGULATIONS No. 55–120

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, April 26, 1943.

TRANSPORTATION CORPS—TRANSPORTATION OF INDIVIDUALS

* * * * *

8. Dependents:

(a) To whom transportation furnished:

(1) Military personnel, permanent change of station:

(a) When authorized: Subject to (b) below, and also (4) below, effective June 1, 1942, when any officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man above the fourth grade (above sergeant) is ordered to make a permanent change of station, the United States will furnish transportation in kind from funds appropriated for his dependents, provided that if the costs of such transportation exceed that for transportation from the old to the new station, the excess costs will be paid to the United States by the officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man concerned. See section 12, act June 16, 1942 (sec. I, Bull. 28, WD, 1942).

(b) Restriction changed by Circular 287 (see Exhibit I): For military reasons, for the duration of the present war, only one such movement of dependents is authorized on and after September 1, 1942. Present regulations governing the movement of dependents of military personnel returned to civil life through retirement, discharge, or relief from active duty remain in effect and are not modified by the foregoing limitations.

(c) Permanent change of station defined: The words "permanent change of station" as used in (a) and (b) above include the change from home to first station when an officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man, including retired personnel and members of the Reserve components of the Army, is ordered to active duty other than training duty and the change from the last station to home in connection with retirement, relief from active duty, or transfer to a Reserve component. See section 12, act June 16, 1942 (sec. I, Bull. 28, WD, 1942). An enlisted man discharged in order to enable him to accept an appointment as an officer and ordered as such to proceed to another station for duty is an officer ordered to make a permanent change of station within the meaning of this paragraph.

(2) Army of the United States personnel: On and after September 8, 1939, and until 6 months after termination of the war or such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President by proclamation may designate, dependents of personnel of the Army of the United States will be furnished transportation in kind, under the same rules and regulations that govern the issuance of transportation in kind for dependents of Regular Army personnel. (See sec. 4 (a), act June 5, 1942 (Bull. 27, WD, 1942).)

EXHIBIT H

ARMY REGULATIONS No. 35–4880

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., April 19, 1945.

FINANCE DEPARTMENT—REIMBURSEMENT FOR TRANSPORTATION OF DEPENDENTS

1. Authorization of reimbursement for transportation of dependents: (a) Reimbursement equal to commercial cost authorized: When any officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man above the fourth grade (above sergeant), having dependents as defined in paragraph 2, is ordered to make a permanent change of station, the United States shall furnish transportation in kind from funds appropriated for the transportation of the Army to his new station for such dependents: *Provided further*, That if the cost of such transportation exceeds that for transportation from the old to the new station, the excess costs shall be paid to the United States by the officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man concerned: *Provided further*, That transportation supplied the dependents of such officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man, to or from stations beyond the continental limits of the United States, shall not be other than by Government transport, if such transportation is available as may be determined by the Secretary of War: *And provided further*, That in lieu of transportation in kind authorized by this section for dependents, the President may authorize the payment in money of amounts equal to such commercial transportation costs for the whole or such part of the travel for which transportation in kind is not furnished when such travel shall have been completed. (See sec. 12, act June 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 364; 37 U. S. C. 112, M. L. 1939, Supp. II, sec. 1371c–12 (6); sec. 1, Bull. 28 WD, 1942).)

(b) Delegation of authority to Secretary of War to make payments: The Secretary of War is authorized, in lieu of transportation in kind for travel of dependents of officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men above the fourth grade authorized by (a) above upon permanent change of station, to make payment in money of amounts equal to commercial transportation costs for the whole or such part of the travel of such dependents for which transportation in kind is not furnished when such travel shall have been completed. (See Executive Order 9222, August 15, 1942 (sec. IV, Bull. 45, WD, 1942).)

2. Dependent defined: (a) General: The term "dependent" as used in these regulations, except in section IV, shall include a lawful wife and unmarried children under 21 years of age. It shall also include the father or mother of the person concerned provided he or she is in fact dependent on such person for his or her chief support: *Provided*, That the term "children" shall be held to include stepchildren and adopted children when such stepchildren or adopted children are in fact dependent upon the person claiming dependency allowance. (See sec. 4, act June 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 361, 37 U. S. C. 104; M. L. 1939, Supp. II, sec. 1371c–4; sec. I, Bull. 28, WD, 1942).)

* * * * *

9. (Rescinded by circular 287.) (See exhibit I.) Reimbursement for only one movement: (a) General: For military reasons, for the duration of the present war, only one movement of dependents, as distinguished from a movement in connection with evacuation or relief from active duty, is authorized on and after September 1, 1942. (See AR 55–120.) Where claim for transportation of dependents has been filed by the individual concerned and payment has been made thereof by the issuance of a check covering cost of travel in question, said claim may not be withdrawn and check canceled in order that transportation for a subsequent move may be claimed.

EXHIBIT I

CIRCULAR No. 287

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., September 20, 1945.

X. Transportation.—1. Dependents: The one-move restriction on the transportation of dependents of military personnel (dependents of soldiers above staff sergeant can now ride at Government expense any number of times), which has been in effect since September 1942, is removed. The lifting of this restriction is applicable, under the provisions of AR 55–120 as modified below, to—

(a) Dependents of personnel on orders directing permanent change of station issued on or after November 1, 1945.

(b) Dependents of personnel on orders directing permanent change of station subsequent to September 1, 1942, from the last permanent duty station to present permanent duty station only. This travel is authorized only in cases wherein dependents have not previously joined personnel upon whom they are dependent at their present permanent station and where travel is commenced on or after November 1, 1945.

By order of the Secretary of War:

G. C. MARSHALL,
Chief of Staff.

Official:

EDWARD F. WITSELL,
Major General, Acting the Adjutant General.

ARMY REGULATIONS No. 35–4520

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., April 19, 1945.

FINANCE DEPARTMENT—MONETARY ALLOWANCES FOR QUARTERS AND SUBSISTENCE FOR ENLISTED PERSONNEL IN A NONTRAVEL STATUS AND FOR QUARTERS FOR DEPENDENTS OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL OF FIRST, SECOND, OR THIRD GRADE

1. Authorization of allowances.—a. To each enlisted man not furnished quarters or rations in kind there shall be granted, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, an allowance for quarters and subsistence, the value of which shall depend on the conditions under which the duty of the man is being performed, and shall not exceed $5 per day. See section 10, act of June 16, 1942

(56 Stat. 363; 37 U. S. C. 110; M. L. 1939, Sup. II, sec. 1371c-10 (1); sec. 1, Bul. 28, W. D., 1942).

* * * * *

13. Personnel entitled to allowance: Each enlisted man of the first, second, or third grade, in the active military service of the United States having a dependent as defined in paragraph 14 shall, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, be entitled to receive, for any period during which public quarters are not provided and available for his dependent, the monthly allowance for quarters authorized by law to be granted to each enlisted man not furnished quarters in kind: *Provided*, That such enlisted man shall continue to be entitled to this allowance although receiving the allowance provided in paragraph 1 if by reason of orders of competent authority his dependent is prevented from dwelling with him. See section 10, act June 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 363); 37 U. S. C. 110; M. L. 1939. supp. II, sec. 1371c-10 (2); sec. I, Bull. 28, W. D. 1942).

14. Dependent defined: The term "dependent" as used in these regulations shall include at all times and in all places a lawful wife and unmarried children under 21 years of age. It shall also include the father or mother of the person concerned provided he or she is in fact dependent on such person for his or her chief support: *Provided*, That the term "children" shall be held to include stepchildren and adopted children when such stepchildren or adopted children are in fact dependent upon the person claiming dependency allowance. Section 4, act June 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 361; 37 U. S. C. 104; M. L. 1939, supp. II, sec. 1371c-4; sec. I, Bull. 28, WD, 1942).

By order of the Secretary of War:

G. C. MARSHALL,
Chief of Staff.

Official:

J. A. ULIO,
Major General, The Adjutant General.

ARMY REGULATIONS No. 35-4220

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., November 17, 1945.

FINANCE DEPARTMENT—SUBSISTENCE AND RENTAL ALLOWANCES FOR COMMISSIONED OFFICERS AND OTHERS ENTITLED TO SIMILAR ALLOWANCES

1. Statutory provisions: (a) Commissioned officers below grade of brigadier general.—Each commissioned officer on the active list, or on active duty, below the grade of brigadier general or its equivalent * * * shall be entitled at all times, in addition to his pay, to a money allowance for subsistence. The value of one subsistence allowance is hereby fixed at 70 cents per day. To each officer * * * receiving the base pay of the first, second, third, or sixth period the amount of this allowance shall be equal to two subsistence allowances, and to each officer receiving the base pay of the fourth or fifth period the amount of this allowance shall be equal to three subsistence allowances: * * * Section 5, act June 16, 1942 (56 State. 361; 37 U. S. C., Supp. III, 105; M. L. 1939, sup. II, sec. 1371c-5).

* * * * *

5. Statutory provisions: (a) Commissioned officers below the grade of brigadier general.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, each commissioned officer below the grade of brigadier general or its equivalent * * * while either on active duty or entitled to active-duty pay shall be entitled at all times to a money allowance for rental of quarters.

To an officer having a dependent, receiving the base pay of the first period the amount of said allowance shall be $60 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the second period the amount of this allowance shall be $75 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the third period the amount of this allowance shall be $90 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the fourth period the amount of this allowance shall be $105 per month, and to such an officer receiving the base pay of the fifth or sixth period the amount of this allowance shall be $120 per month. (Same statutes as quoted in paragraph 1 above.)

By order of the Secretary of War:

G. C. MARSHALL,
Chief of Staff.

Official:

J. A. ULIO,
Major General, The Adjutant General.

EXHIBIT J

CIRCULAR No. 134

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., April 8, 1944.

III. Enlisted men: Pending revision of AR 210-10, December 20, 1940, and the printing of changes in AR 30—2210, March 15, 1940, the following changes in those regulations are published:

1. AR 210.10: Paragraph 11b is rescinded and the following substituted therefor:

11b. The post commander, or in the case of class II installations, the commander submitting consolidated ration requests, may in his discretion and with due regard for the best interests of the service, authorize individual men to mess separately. See paragraph 13b (6), AR 30-2210, and sections IV and V, AR 345-400.

2. AR 30-2210: Paragraph 13a (6) is rescinded and the following substituted therefor:

13a(6) Rations due for individual enlisted persons authorized to mess separately will not be included in the ration return.

By order of the Secretary of War:

G. C. MARSHALL,
Chief of Staff.

Official:

ROBERT H. DUNLOP,
Brigadier General, Acting the Adjutant General.

ARMY REGULATIONS No. 35-4520

MONEY ALLOWANCE

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., April 19, 1945.

9. Separate rations: Enlisted men who are authorized by competent authority to mess separately are entitled to the commutation value of the ration, as announced in current War Department circulars, which will be paid on regular monthly pay rolls or supplemental pay rolls. The period for which due will be shown in the remarks under the name of the individual concerned. See TM 14-502.

By order of the Secretary of War:

G. C. MARSHALL,
Chief of Staff.

Official:

J. A. ULIO,
Major General, The Adjutant General.

EXHIBIT K

ARMY REGULATIONS No. 210-10

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, December 20, 1940.

POSTS, CAMPS, AND STATIONS ADMINISTRATION

13. Quarters: (a) General.—The post commander will make all assignments of quarters, except that if the quarters for assignment to him personally are considered by him to be inadequate, the facts will be reported to the next superior commander for final determination and assignment.

(b) For officers.

(1) Assignment.

* * * * *

(d) For noncommissioned officers (corporals or higher).

(1) Noncommissioned officers entitled to quarters are not entitled to make selection thereof in accordance with their grade. Subject to the restriction contained in (2) below, the post commander should make such assignment of available quarters as he deems for the best interests of the service.

(2) Due consideration should be given to the fact that certain quarters have been constructed from funds appropriated by Congress for quarters for a specified class of noncommissioned officers, such as those of the Medical Department.

By order of the Secretary of War:

G. C. MARSHALL,
Chief of Staff.

Official:

E. S. ADAMS,
Major General, The Adjutant General.

AR 210-10—CHANGES No. 13

POSTS, CAMPS, AND STATIONS ADMINISTRATION

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., January 8, 1944.

AR 210-10, December 20, 1940, is changed as follows:

13. Quarters: (a) General: The post commander will make all assignments of quarters, except that if the quarters for assignment to him personally are considered by him to be inadequate the facts will be reported to the next superior commander for final determination and assignment. At posts, camps, and stations where no quarters for officers are maintained, the commanding officer thereof will so advise the Office of the Fiscal Director, Army Service Forces, attention: Receipts and Disbursements Division, the Pentagon, Washington 25, D. C. (see AR 35-4220). Amendatory report will be immediately furnished in cases where changing conditions render original report inaccurate.

(b) For officers:

* * * * *

(d) For noncommissioned officers:

(1) Noncommissioned officers entitled to quarters are not entitled to make selection thereof in accordance with their grade. Subject to the restriction contained in (2) below, the post commander should make such assignment of available quarters as he deems for the best interests of the service. When noncommissioned officers are assigned to occupy any public quarters with their dependent, the monetary allowance in lieu of quarters (AR 35-4520) on account of such dependent will cease on the day of such assignment.

(e) For civilians (more than American wives of enlisted men below staff sergeant get): The post commander may grant permission to servants and civilian employees to occupy such quarters as are available. The post commander will be responsible that payment for or reduction from salary of the value of such quarters is effected as prescribed in AR 35-3840.

By order of the Secretary of War:

G. C. MARSHALL,
Chief of Staff.

Official:

J. A. ULIO,
Major General, The Adjutant General.

EXHIBIT L

By way of further contrast between the Canadian armed services and the American armed services, Canada again shows more equitable and Christian concern for the family unit, fostering and encouraging it, in contrast with the American policy which shows no interest in the sacred relationship except for an overexaggerated, sentimental concern for those men who have two or three children and are in service, by way of the demobilization regulations. It is true that in America each child counts 12 points up to 3 children; but the married man who through no fault of his own has no children, regardless of how long married, receives no points toward the total required for discharge, and so is in no different position than a single man no matter how long the married man has been married.

However, in Canada, every married man as of March 31, 1945, regardless of children or no children, receives a grant of 20 percent of his total discharge points to add onto his total points and so arriving at a grand total in determining his eligibility for discharge.

But in America a married man married on March 31, 1945, would get no extra points to add to his score for discharge purposes, unless he were blessed with children.

By way of further contrast, the American Army gives an unmarried man who has an illegitimate child which he has by approved agreement, for as low a sum of $500 for a period of several years, agreed to support, a grant of 12 points toward discharge. Yes, this is understandable, for it fits into the rest of the pattern of discouraging normal family life and rewarding immoral conduct, which seems to be the policy of the American Army and Government.

Question: Does America still think it is the moral leader of the world? The people of Newfoundland, who know of the reward for illegitimate children and no reward for marriage even of long standing, hardly admit it. They put America just one small step ahead of atheistic Russia.

EXHIBIT M

TODAY'S WAR NEWS

1. PACIFIC THEATER

NEW YORK.—Optimistic over the current state of the Jap occupation, Lt. Gen. Robert L. Eichelberger (what a super an American general can be), commander of the Eighth Army, reiterated yesterday his proposal that the wives of officers and first three graders (staff sergeant or above) be permitted to join their husbands in Nippon.

In explanation of his arbitrary limitations, he said that most enlisted men in the lower grades were too young to have wives (married men up to 38 years old were drafted without any hesitation. Is that too young to be married? And are all married officers older than that?)

2. ASIATIC THEATER

Shanghai: General Marshall, new American envoy to China, stepped briskly from his silver C–54 transport plane at Shanghai's airfield yesterday afternoon ready to begin his admittedly difficult assignment—bringing peace and unity to China.

Washington: With General Marshall about to try his hand at settling the problem of Chinese unity, the State Department aired America's views on two other Asiatic trouble spots.

Statements issued by the Department expressed concern over Indonesia and hope that Dutch and Indonesian leaders soon could make peace and disclosed that the United States has several times asked Britain not to sign a peace treaty with Siam until British-American discussions on Siam are concluded.

Tientsin: Six heavily bearded marines, who said they had been guests—under armed guard—of Chinese Communists for 38 days and once clashed with rifle-firing soldiers in a frustrated escape, returned Wednesday to this marine headquarters. They were given food parachuted by their buddies and were reported in good condition when they returned.

3. OTHER NEWS

WASHINGTON.—Congress passed a broad revision of the GI bill of rights on Wednesday, liberalizing the rules on loans and education for veterans.

The most important changes made in the original law were removal of the requirement that tuition fees, unemployment compensation, and defaults on loans be deducted from a future Federal bonus; increase in the subsistence allowance for GI students from $50 to $65 monthly to individuals without dependents, and from $75 to $90 monthly to individuals having one or more dependents; removal of the age requirement on the education section of the law; increase in the Government loan guaranty from $2,000 to $4,000.

WASHINGTON.—President Truman yesterday nominated five delegates and five alternates to the United Nations first General Assembly in London next month.

Heading the list is Edward Stettinius, who was named chief United States delegate and America's representative on the powerful World Security Council. Other delegates are Secretary of State James Byrnes, Senator TOM CONNALLY, Texas Democrat, Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, Michigan Republican, and Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt.

Plans call for the President to exercise power to direct the votes of the United States delegates, invoke economic sanctions against aggressors, and use American troops within quota limits to back up the decisions of the Security Council.

WASHINGTON.—The Senate unanimously approved a measure yesterday to cut red tape for the entry into the United States of wives whom servicemen married abroad.

Washington: Eligible Army officers who have watched promotion pass them by now can make the grade before leaving the service.

The War Department announced yesterday that officers up through lieutenant colonel who have served long periods in grade and meet the requirements will be promoted on the first day of their terminal leave.

The provision applies to lieutenants who have been in grade 18 months, captains and majors for 24 months, and lieutenant colonels for 30 months. Fifty percent additional credit is given for time overseas. To receive this promotion officers must have an efficiency index of not less than 40.

Washington: Government fact-finding to settle labor disputes met crucial tests yesterday in three far-reaching wage controversies—tests that may have an important bearing on legislation now before the Congress.

Fact-finding boards in the General Motors and oil industry controversies face decisions which are fundamental, whether to consider a company's profits in recommending possible wage increases.

One of the chief provisions of the proposal submitted to the Congress by President Truman is to empower Government fact-finding boards to subpena company's books in labor disputes.

Detroit: As the Ford Motor Co. again sat down at the bargaining table to discuss wage demands of more than 100,000 Ford workers in the United States with the United Auto Workers Union, the strike across the river at the Ford plant in Windsor, Ont., ended after 99 days—the longest walkout in Canadian labor history. The union members voted to return to work under the Government proposal to negotiate and if necessary arbitrate the dispute.

Miami Beach: The International Ladies Garment Workers Union executive board approved a resolution instructing all locals to extend their aid to war veterans in entering the trade whether prewar union members or not and to accept them as members without the payment of fees any time within 6 months of discharge.

Washington: Selective service halted the drafting of fathers Wednesday night. It also instructed local boards not to accept as volunteers fathers with three or more children.

Washington: The Navy joined the Army in liberalizing its discharge procedure with cuts in point requirements for discharges for all personnel ranging from one to eight points effective January 1, January 15, and February 2.

New York: The buying public, apparently convinced that the best is none too good for the first peacetime Christmas in 5 years, is boosting gift buying to the highest levels in history. Sales records are being set all over the country and Macy's in New York reported its highest single day's sales in history as well as the $3,000,000 sales day this season—only once before has the store ever sold over $1,000,000 worth of goods in 1 day. An exclusive fur shop reported a great demand for mink coats from $6,000 up. Evening gowns costing $150 and more are so popular that some stores cannot supply enough of them.

Rio de Janeiro: American sailors on a good-will tour of South America were ordered to remain aboard the United States cruiser *Little Rock* at Santos as police investigated clashes between some 350 seamen and angry Brazilians Wednesday night at Sao Paulo.

Police said rioting began when some sailor who had been drinking began lifting the skirt of a young woman standing in a bus line. Six Brazilians and several sailors were injured in the fighting in which firemen brought hoses into play to hold back the crowds.

New York: More than 50,000 troops at three East coast ports during November in the world's greatest transoceanic movement in history, the American Merchant Marine Institute reported yesterday. Twelve GI's a minute went down the gangplanks at New York, Boston, and Hampton Roads during the month.

Editorial by Hon. Kenneth Romney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 12, 1946

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial written 20 years ago by Hon. Kenneth Romney, Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives for the Seventy-second, Seventy-third, Seventy-fourth, Seventy-fifth, Seventy-sixth, Seventy-seventh, Seventy-eighth, and Seventy-ninth Congresses. It is as applicable today as when published two decades ago.

The editorial is as follows:

THE SHRINE OF A NATION

The log-cabin birthplace of Abraham Lincoln, a shrine at which democracy will ever kneel and weep, is now the property of the United States Government. President Wilson, speaking for the Government, accepted the magnificent memorial housing it in a speech of fine felicity and noble sentiment.

There is nothing in America so filled with inspiration as the Lincoln cabin. It is tenanted with associations that overwhelm the senses, with thoughts that buoy the spirit, with sentiment that soothes the soul. It is a place of brooding reverence.

Abraham Lincoln is the ripest fruit that the American democracy has borne. The genius of free government flowered fullest in him. He was the disciplined, tempered product of a people that is striving painfully to achieve the ideals of democracy, ideals that have their abode among the stars. Probably he was the best that human government can develop.

A keen current philosopher, Winston Churchill, in his recent book, A Far Country, declared that democracy is the great adventure of mankind. The truth of this is written across the history of the world. Democracy is indeed adventure, attended by all its trials, all its high fervors, all its anguish. And Abraham Lincoln was the great adventurer, who knew the pain, the

joy, the triumph of it; he led his people nearer their ideal than they had ever been before.

We are glad that Lincoln came out of a cabin and that his birthplace was all but as lowly as that of Christ. It adds incalculably to our faith in America. It adds beauty and sublimity to the life picture he left us, the great picture that throws its tremendous shadow across the short history of our national life. It encourages aspiring youth and gives dignity to honest poverty. It is the touch the master artist would have added to his career.

Lincoln was disciplined for his tasks as few have been. Adversity pinched him. Sharp misery wore him to the bone. Sorrow cut his face. Humility made a brother of him. But Nature stored his mind with uncanny wisdom, filled him with quaint conceits, mellow humor and wonderful sympathy and led him on to his high mission in the world.

President Wilson in his Hodgensville speech touched on Lincoln's loneliness in these impressive words:

"This strange child of the cabin kept company with invisible things, was born into no intimacy but that of its own silently assembling and deploying thoughts."

A great unearthly figure, hearing voices none other heard, seeing visions no other eye beheld, having faith that would have broken in a heart less strong and bold.

America will not last forever, unless history reverse itself. It will, unless the warning of history be heeded, follow the democracies of Greece, the Republic of Rome, the monarchies of modern times into that vast gulf we call the past, that vague, intangible realm where fact fades into fable, truth into legend. But when that distant age shall come, the student of history, looking back, will see the mighty figure of Lincoln standing serene and secure in a Nation founded on principles of democratic government which with unerring vision he labored to establish and preserve

Republican Form of Government Versus Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 12, 1946

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, Ernie Adamson, chief counsel of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, has seen fit to write to various progressive-minded individuals and officials of liberal organizations arguments that there is no such thing as democracy acceptable in the United States. Mr. Adamson postulates that under the Constitution only a republican form of government is to be tolerated, that our country was not organized as a democracy, and that there is something dubious and questionable about the very word itself. I suggest that Mr. Adamson do a little further research in history and political philosophy. I suggest that a counsellor for a committee of Congress has gone far afield from his authority and rights in broadcasting letters throughout the United States, arguing against democracy. Think of it, Mr. Speaker. A committee formed for the purpose of combatting un-American activities and ipso facto, an exponent of American institutions, is permitting its chief counsel to excoriate citizens of the United States for following in the footsteps of Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt, because of their proclaimed devotion to democracy. What is there inherent in the word democracy which should frighten us? Are we afraid of democracy?

Recently the Veterans Against Discrimination, of New York City, an organization comprised of thousands of war veterans and their families, received a letter from this same Adamson, in which said Adamson implied that the recipient organization was about to conduct a propaganda campaign against provisions in the Constitution, which, in itself, is an idiotic statement. By inference, that statement would indicate there was something reprehensible or criminal in an organization asking to change the Constitution or amend it by lawful means. Because the letter from Mr. Adamson is an amazing document, which should startle all students of American history, and because the reply of the Veterans Against Discrimination is devastating and pointed, I am including the letters herein below. They are as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, January 29, 1946.
VETERANS AGAINST DISCRIMINATION,
New York, N. Y.

GENTLEMEN: Would you please be good enough to send me a list of your officers and your managing committee?

Several of your circulars have been sent to us by citizens of your city, and I note that you refer to democracy several times. I wonder if you are sufficiently familiar with the history of the United States to be aware that this country was not organized as a democracy, and that section 4 of article IV of the Constitution reads, in part, as follows: "The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government."

Is it your purpose to ask for an amendment of the Constitution, or do you propose to conduct a propaganda campaign against the administration of the provisions of the Constitution?

Yours very truly,
ERNIE ADAMSON,
Chief Counsel.

VETERANS AGAINST DISCRIMINATION,
New York, N. Y., February 1, 1946.
Mr. ERNIE ADAMSON,
Chief Counsel, House of Representatives, Committee on Un-American Activities, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of January 29 on behalf of the House Committee on Un-American Activities in which you take issue with Veterans Against Discrimination for the use of the word "democracy" is particularly shocking and outrageous in that it is directed to an organization composed of men and women who have just served this country through a bloody struggle for the preservation and extension of democracy.

The only interpretation which can be put on your letter is that the House Committee on Un-American Activities is now publicly on record as opposing the democracy for which Americans have always fought and in which millions of American men and women believe as the fundamental principle of our Government.

Veterans Against Discrimination would like to ask you, Mr. Adamson, whether the Committee on Un-American Activities intends to investigate every organization which believes in America as a democracy. Is it the purpose of the Committee on Un-American Activities to propagandize against democracy? Does the committee propose to change our democratic form of government?

These are the words of our late Commander in Chief, Franklin D. Roosevelt: "Always the heart and soul of our country will be the heart and the soul of the common man—the men and women who never have ceased to believe in democracy * * *."

Men discharged from the United States Army were told by Gen. George C. Marshall: "Start being a leader as soon as you put on civilian clothes. If you see intolerance and hate, speak out against them. Make your individual voices heard, not for selfish things but for honor and decency among men, for the rights of all people."

This statement by General Marshall has become the preamble of the constitution of Veterans Against Discrimination. Our active campaigns against the Fascist policies of the New York Daily News is one phase of our continuing fight for democracy. We will continue to press for the establishment of a permanent Federal Fair Employment Practice Commission and for other legislation which will, through the elimination of discrimination, "promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty."

On behalf of the Veterans Against Discrimination, we emphatically refute the Committee on Un-American Activities' interpretation of democracy and its claim that the United States is not a democracy. Inasmuch as the Committee on Un-American Activities was empowered by Congress only to investigate subversive and un-American activities, it has no right to question the activities of the Veterans Against Discrimination.

Your letter and the insinuations contained in it constitute a flagrant and unforgivable insult to all the millions of American men and women who served to protect our democracy.

Sincerely,
LAWRENCE RIVKIN,
Chairman.
BERNARD MOSS,
Executive Secretary.

A letter discussing this same subject matter issued by the American Civil Liberties Union reveals the attitude of this great organization, which is the chief protagonist in America of the Bill of Rights, with reference to the amazing attitude shown by this man, Adamson. The ACLU letter is as follows:

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,
New York City, February 8, 1946.
To the Members of the House of Representatives:

Ladies and gentlemen, the following letter addressed to the Speaker of the House should be of interest to you:

FEBRUARY 8, 1946.
Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The standing Committee of the House on Un-American Activities has employed a chief counsel, Ernie Adamson, who in the committee's name is engaging in what seems to us both improper and absurd activities.

The latest exhibit to be called to our attention is a letter under date of January 29, addressed to the Veterans Against Discrimination, New York City, which reads as follows:

"GENTLEMEN: Would you please be good enough to send me a list of your officers and your managing committee?

"Several of your circulars have been sent to us by citizens of your city and I note that you refer to democracy several times. I wonder if you are sufficiently familiar

with the history of the United States to be aware that this country was not organized as a democracy, and that section 4 of article IV of the Constitution reads in part as follows: 'The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government.'

"Is it your purpose to ask for an amendment of the Constitution or do you propose to conduct a propaganda campaign against the administration of the provisions of the Constitution?

"Yours very truly,

"ERNIE ADAMSON,
"Chief Counsel."

The clear implication of this amazing letter is that the advocacy of democracy is un-American and that any organization committed to it is properly subject to House investigation. It would also logically follow that undemocratic movements are American. This sort of nonsense would justify investigating even the Democratic Party. One wonders whether the chief counsel is prepared to revile the works of Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt among the other illustrious leaders of American democracy, who constantly use that word to describe the United States.

We are not concerned with silly semantics but with the gross impropriety of such inquiries, which reflect upon the good sense and good faith of a House committee and thus upon the House itself. Taken together with other recent activities by the committee, or officially on its behalf, the conclusion is inescapable that the conception of un-Americanism which dominates the committee is contrary to our principles and traditions. While we are wholly in favor of the utmost use of the congressional power of inquiry, this committee has so abused it that its abolition is plainly justified on its record. Apparently no curb short of abolition can be put on it by the House. We earnestly urge your support of that course.

We are,

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES,
Chairman, Board of Directors.
ARTHUR GARFIELD HAYS,
General Counsel.

Abraham Lincoln—Thaddeus Kosciusko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 12, 1946

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate the birthday of a great American who fought without ceasing to preserve the Union, and to foster the true spirit of America—the spirit of freedom and liberty and justice for all. Our Nation's debt to Lincoln, the great humanitarian, is indelibly written in the history of our country and in the hearts of our countrymen.

Today also marks the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of a man whose native land holds him in no less esteem than that which we Americans have for our great emancipator. I speak of another fighter for freedom and liberty, Thaddeus Kosciusko, who fought not only for the freedom and independence of his native Poland, but also for the freedom and independence of our own America. No greater contribution was made to the cause of American independence by any of those who came to our aid from foreign lands, than that of Kosciusko. I need only recall his part in the defeat of Burgoyne at Saratoga, and in the South Carolina campaign. The measure of his assistance may be gained from the fact that on October 13, 1783, our Congress made him a brigadier general in the American Army.

On this two hundredth birthday of Thaddeus Kosciusko we Americans are enjoying the independence for which he so fiercely fought. One may question whether his own native land is enjoying the independence which he vainly fought to gain for it during his eventful life. True, Poland is now free and independent, but disquieting stories of political murders and Communist terrorism continue to leak out of that devastated land. Such is our American debt to Poland, the land of our benefactor's birth, that I strongly urge that we, as a Nation, continue to exhibit the livelist concern in the welfare of Poland. Under various international agreements, we are committed to guarantee free and unfettered elections in the liberated lands. I strongly urge that our State Department follow up Secretary Zyrnes' remonstrances on the terrorism existing in Poland, and throw the great weight of America behind the fight of all true Poles for a truly free Poland.

Lincoln's Last Message to the Thirty-eighth Congress, December 6, 1864

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 12, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I know that it will be interesting and valuable to the Members of this House and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to have before them a brief outline of the text of President Lincoln's last message to the Congress. Its contents reveal that it lacks the usual gems of literary achievement which most of his state papers contained, but your reading of this outline will indicate the unusual variety and large number of subjects which he communicated to Congress about. Here it is:

Fellow citizens of the Senate and House of Representatives, again the blessings of health and abundant harvests claim our profoundest gratitude to Almighty God.

I. FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The condition of our foreign affairs is reasonably satisfactory.

1. Mexico: Theater of civil war.
2. Costa Rica and Nicaragua: Transit route.
3. Colombia: Intimate relations.
4. Venezuela: New liberal institution.
5. Peru and Spain: Civil war averted.
6. Chile, Argentina, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Paraguay, San Salvador, and Haiti: Most friendly relations.
7. Liberia: African slave trade.
8. Europe: Overland telegraph.
9. Great Britain: Ocean telegraph.
10. Egypt, Barbary powers: Satisfactory relations.
11. China: Rebellion suppressed.
12. Japan: Friendship for United States.
13. Foreign merchants: Contraband trade.
14. Brazilian and British ports: Political difficulty.
15. Great Britain: Treaty adjustments.
16. Canada: Reciprocity treaty.
17. European states: Immigrants.

II. FINANCIAL AFFAIRS

The financial affairs of the Government have been successfully administered during the last year.

1. Increased taxation proposed by Congress.
2. Receipts during war, $1,394,796,007.62.
Disbursements, same basis, $1,298,056,-101.89.
Balance in Treasury, $96,739,905.73.
3. Source of receipts.
4. Disbursements for civil service.
5. The public debt, $1,740,690,489.49.
6. National banking system.

III. REPORTS

1. Secretary of War. A document accompanying message. (See conclusion of address.)
2. Secretary of Navy:
(a) 671 vessels carrying 461 guns.
(b) 51,000 men in naval service.
(c) Total expenditures from March 4, 1861, to November 1, 1864, $238,647,262.35.
(d) Construction of navy yard.
(e) New rank of vice admiral.
3. Postmaster General:
(a) Postal revenues for year, $12,438,253.78.
(b) Expenditures, $12,644,786.20.
(c) Deficit, $206,532.42.
(d) Ocean mail steamships.

IV. SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

1. Population scarcely been checked.
2. Admission of Nevada consumated.
3. Territories show rapid growth.
4. Public lands, 4,221,342 acres located.
5. Pacific railroad progress.
6. Minerals mined valued at $100,000,000.
7. Reorganization of Indian system.
8. Pensions for soldiers and sailors.
9. District of Columbia institutions.

V. AGRICULTURE

1. Peculiarly, the people's department.

VI. CONDUCT OF WAR

1. All important lines and positions steadily advanced.
2. General Sherman's operations most remarkable feature.

VII. ORGANIZING LOYAL STATE GOVERNMENTS

1. Arkansas and Louisiana successful.
2. Missouri, Kentucky, and Tennessee at work.
3. Maryland, completely successful. "The genius of rebellion will no more claim Maryland. Like another foul spirit, being driven out, it may seek to tear her, but it will woo her no more."

VIII. SLAVERY

1. Proposed amendment to Constitution:
(a) "I venture to recommend the reconsideration and passage of the measure at the present session."
(b) "The common end is the maintenance of the Union, and among the means to secure that end—constitutional amendment."

IX. POPULAR ELECTIONS

1. Most reliable indication of public purpose.
2. No candidate for any office whatever, high or low, has ventured to seek votes on the avowal that he was for giving up the Union.
3. Election proved we do not approach exhaustion in manpower.

X. NEGOTIATION FOR PEACE WITH INSURGENTS

1. It is an issue which can only be tried by war, and decided by victory.

2. They can at any moment have peace by laying down their arms and submitting to the national authority under the Constitution.

3. The executive power itself would be greatly diminished by the cessation of actual war.

4. The door of pardon and amnesty has been for a full year open to all except such as were not in condition to make free choice.

5. I repeat the declaration made a year ago that while I remain in my present position I shall not attempt to retract or modify the emancipation proclamation nor shall I return to slavery any person who is free by the terms of that proclamation, or by any of the acts of Congress.

If the people should, by whatever mode or means, make it an executive duty to reenslave such persons, another, and not I, must be their instrument to perform it.

In stating a single condition of peace, I mean simply to say that the war will cease on the part of the Government whenever it shall have ceased on the part of those who began it.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

America's Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 13 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, on January 25 the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] delivered an address on the subject America's Foreign Policy, at the Mayflower Hotel, in the city of Washington, before the American Coalition.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is apparent that America's foreign policy is the last thing many Americans want to discuss, or think about, today. The average man is occupied with many other problems—inflation, strikes, making enough money to keep body and soul together and to keep the children well fed and adequately clothed. Besides, the war is now over, many say, and there will be no need to worry about foreign policy unless another war threatens.

Nothing is so interesting to a people—just before a war—as foreign relations. But, to our great hurt, the vast majority of the people lose interest in the subject once the war is decided. Yet, the best time for every American to think of foreign policy is right now, right after the most destructive war in world history, for the decisions that are made today will determine the road we shall follow for years to come. If, through lack of public knowledge of the issues, if through decisions made without understanding and endorsement of the people, the foreign policy of our Nation is faulty this year and next year, then the results several years from now will be disastrous. A careless people today may be an angry and disillusioned nation tomorrow.

Every Senator, I am sure, gives a disproportionate share of his time to thinking about America's foreign policy, for it has been apparent for many years that wars are more costly than depressions, natural catastrophes, and carelessness combined. And when I have considered that the stupidity of men—men here and men of all other nations—have made wars possible at all in our lifetime, I have been aghast at the price we have paid for our stupidity.

Therefore, I do not hesitate to say that the subject of foreign policy is America's most pressing problem today, even in view of the admittedly crucial problems on the home front.

In my judgment, America's foreign policy today must be based on four essential points:

First. The creation of an American foreign policy that is so clear and understandable that he who runs may read and understand it, both in America and in nations whose peoples hitherto have had different concepts from ours. It must be America's own foreign policy and not a mere duplication of some other nation's.

Second. That this foreign policy preserve the Monroe Doctrine as our guiding lamp toward freedom from interference in this hemisphere by nations of other parts of the world.

Third. That this foreign policy be clearly based in justice for all peoples and all nations, including those people who are living in restraint under governments of our allies, as well as those people who lived in serfdom under our enemies.

Fourth. The strengthening of our American system of representative government at home and continued emphasis on promoting the health, physical resources, and comfortable living of our own people.

Let me discuss those points in greater detail. First: The creation of an American foreign policy so clear and understandable that all our citizens, as well as peoples of other lands, may understand it.

The more I have studied foreign policy, the more convinced I have become that if the United States is ever going to make progress toward eliminating wars, and the causes of wars, it is going to be done through the prompting of an enlightened populace, an aware people. No real progress is going to be made in carrying out our American ideals abroad until the vast masses of our own people understand clearly the issues at stake in every instance.

The prime requisite to help the people understand, of course, is simplicity and clarity in the words of our diplomats. We must see to it that the words used to tell the people of our foreign adventures are not meaningless, or subject to varying interpretations.

Just take the simple word "democracy," which is used so blithely by our Secretary of State, James F. Byrnes. The same word is used by Stalin and Molotov. But does Byrnes mean the same thing when he says the word "democracy" as Molotov means when he says it? Every thinking person knows that the two men, while using the same word, are thinking of two entirely different concepts.

When, as in the case of Bulgaria, the Russians claim that "democracy" has been inaugurated, they see no reason why they cannot use the word to apply to a system in which only one political party was allowed on the ballot. What a travesty. Yet, our Secretary of State does not tell our people that when he speaks of democracy he means a representative government, a republican form of government as defined by innumerable historians through the decades. He lets Molotov use the word "democracy" again and again unchallenged, when Molotov, of course, is really referring to a new form of tyranny which has been fastened on the people of Russia for more than a quarter of a century and now is being fastened on Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Rumania, Bulgaria, Poland, Finland, and many another bit of territory that has fallen within the orbit of Soviet Russia.

The people of America want to cooperate with other nations in building for a just and enduring peace. The people, I know, want to work with the United Nations Organization, and they will do everything within reason to help it succeed where other attempts have failed for centuries past.

The people will not be hoodwinked. They do not want to be included in a system of big-power politics which ignores and scuttles the rights of individual citizens by the millions in nation after nation, and which will bring disaster when the balance of power shifts.

In many cases, of course, we have a firm policy, but in others we have no policy at all. In China, as we know, we are actively on the side of the men who are fighting the growth of communism. Yet in eastern Europe it appears that we are encouraging the Communists. Frankly our policy in the American section of occupied Germany is so obscure today that I do not believe anyone can tell what are our Nation's aims there.

True, we have soldiers there, and certainly we have a great number of representatives of Government agencies and observers there, but whether we want a strong Germany, a weak Germany, whether we want Germany dismembered or unified again, or what our Government wants done with Germany and with Germans we have no way of knowing.

Several days ago two prominent churchmen came to Washington after a journey in Europe and urged the President simply to allow church people in this country to send packages of food to needy persons in Germany. They found the President woefully uninformed or misinformed about the actual distress in Germany and were astounded at his seeming lack of interest in seeing to it that old women and young children in Germany be permitted to receive gift packages donated by Americans, not help from the American Government. After all the old principle, "If thine enemy hunger, feed him," is the best policy in building for peace in a new generation. [Applause.]

The people ought to be told what our Department of State plans for Germany. They ought to be told what this Department plans for the Far East, for the Near East, for all the sections of the earth in which there are trouble spots that may be breeding the germs of another war. Our soldiers will serve in those foreign areas with greater patience if they know something of the call for their sacrifice.

There are those intellectuals who believe that foreign policy, as domestic policy, should be made by a few persons in the Department of State, or in the White House, who are supposed to have some kind of magic power which gives to them the immediate and correct answer to all our varied problems. But I cannot help thinking of that masterful quotation from the Federalist Papers, in which Hamilton wrote:

"The history of human conduct does not warrant that exalted opinion of human virtue which would make it wise in a nation to commit interests of so delicate and momentous a kind, as those which concern its intercourse with the rest of the world, to the sole disposal of a magistrate created and circumstanced as would be a President of the United States."

The second point in my foreign policy for America—preservation of the Monroe Doctrine—may sound ancient in these days of atomic energy, but I would remind you and all Americans that Russia does not find the principle ancient. It was pointed out by a well-known columnist only last week that while Stalin appears to be paying lip service to the United Nations Organization General Assembly in London, Russia continues playing a lone hand where her vital interests seem to be affected. Russia goes right ahead lapping up new territories and proclaiming what amounts to a modern version of the Monroe Doctrine for Europe and Asia.

The United States must make it crystal-clear at all times today and tomorrow and for many a day to come, I think, that the Monroe Doctrine is still the policy of this Nation in regard to this hemisphere. [Applause.] It has been reinforced by the support of many of our southern neighbors.

There are those who say that the United States already is making this clear, and that the Monroe Doctrine works today as ever. Generally, I would agree, but there are increasing signs that Russia would like to increase its influence in Latin America, taking the place of the Nazi influence which we all know was in great evidence there before and in the first phase of the late war.

Not many months ago, I saw a most interesting news dispatch in the New York Times relating how the Soviet Embassy in Cuba and Soviet representation generally in many other Latin-American nations had increased greatly in the past 10 years, in fact, out of all proportion to actual Russian financial interests in those countries. It occurred to me, as I know it will occur to every thoughtful American, that our Department of State can never be too watchful, can never tell us, the people, too quickly of factors, such as this one, pointing toward an unusual interest of any foreign power in an American Republic.

My third point—that our foreign policy be clearly based in justice for all peoples and all nations—must be the keystone of our foreign relations. Unless this Nation, at present the most powerful physically in the history of the world, uses its position of leadership to see that men everywhere are given justice under law, that all nations, large and small, act with mercy and justice toward other nations, we will have wasted the blood of the men who fell so valiantly in the late war.

Justice, as we know, is not just a beautiful concept: it is a code by which men live and move and have their being. Freedom is a quality of an individual, rather than of a nation. No matter how much we might talk of justice in America, we would not have it if one citizen were denied the right of trial by jury, of the writ of habeas corpus, of the right to have his home free from illegal search and seizure.

Likewise, no matter how much we prate of international justice, we know that we do not have it as long as the people of one country unjustly remain under the bondage of another. We know that there can be justice under law for none unless there is justice under law for all. It is to be ardently hoped that when the assembly of UNO gets through the preliminaries and really gets down to business, these problems of the small nations will receive prior consideration. As a man is judged by his smallest habits, so that organization will be judged by its manifestation of interest, or lack of interest, in these so-called small problems, which altogether make up the one big problem facing the world.

We Americans love peace; yes. We seek it desperately and cling to it. But we want peace with justice for all. We know, as no other people know, that if peace is not based on justice it is built on the shifting sands of expediency and that it will not, it cannot, be a lasting peace.

My final point—the strengthening of our American system of representative government and promoting our own continued strength—can hardly be challenged by any of our citizens. We hear it said so often that America has come to leadership in the family of nations and that all nations look to America to lead them out of the confusion which seems to have fastened itself upon present-day international relationships. The greatest nations of the world cried to America to save them when their freedom was at the point of destruction. America responded magnificently. This Nation sent the best of her youth into the war and gave more than 300,000 of her choicest young men, poured out the products of her mines, her oil wells, her factories, and her treasure unstintingly in the warfare against totalitarianism. There is no question in our minds that to America belongs the credit for saving the world, although this credit may be begrudgingly recognized by other nations.

And why was America able to do this? The answer to that question is, because of the peculiar genius of our system of representative government. It was through that system that we have been able to out produce all our enemies as well as all our friends because here in America labor and industry have been free from the heavy hand of bureaucratic control for the most part during all our long, glorious history. Our very freedom has made us strong, developing in our citizens all the latent potentialities in man in the field of science, education, the arts, and industrial "know how." We owe it not only to our own land but to civilization itself to see that America remains strong.

But while we recognize this fact—that America must be strong; and most Americans pay lip service to the ideal, we know that many persons, some in high authority, imagine that we can make America strong by depleting our natural resources and diluting our freedoms with totalitarian concepts taken from nations we saved or destroyed. They tell us that by giving our material resources to other lands, we are making it possible for the other nations to regain strength and to become better customers of ours.

Theoretically, and on paper, this sounds wonderful, but unless there is constant supervision by our Nation over the economy of other nations, and no one urges that, it will not be possible. I doubt that, in the long run we will ever make a penny net profit—in cash or good will—from any such sleight-of-hand international transactions. Export businesses here and there undoubtedly will prosper through our Government waste, but the end result will be a net loss to the citizens of the Nation as a whole.

There can be no real and lasting progress by the various nations we thus attempt to help unless there is a basic change in the character of the inhabitants of the various lands and a change in their government structures. It is useless for us to contribute funds and materials to governments which have nothing in common with ours and whose leaders look with contempt upon our ideals of freedom.

Just as an individual does not gain in moral caliber and intrinsic worth through receiving charity indefinitely, so the other nations of the world will never put forth their best efforts to feed and clothe their own people and then to increase their real wealth as long as they know that Uncle Sam will bail them out of their difficulties from time to time. We should serve notice on the world that we will give aid to the suffering and export food for the needy, that we will export ideas that can be used to make real wealth, that we will be glad to export a résumé of our history and our form of government which made such a glorious history possible, but that beyond these essentials, there isn't much else we can do. Our humanitarianism demands that we help see that no one starves, but it does not obligate us to see to it that people live comfortably for years at the expense of the American taxpayer, without working out their own economic salvation the hard way. [Applause.]

As James Madison wrote in the Federalist Papers, "every man who loves peace, every man who loves his country, every man who loves liberty, ought to have it ever before his eyes, that he may cherish in his heart a due attachment to the Union of America, and be able to set a due value on the means of preserving it."

If we have a due attachment to our Union, and have set a due value on the means of preserving it, we certainly have recognized that not for always can the wealth of America be dissipated without bringing to us increased inflation, fewer goods, and eventual shortages in this land of supposedly perpetual plenty.

Religion, Common Sense, and the Race Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, February 9 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, Rev. A. Powell Davies, pastor of All Souls Church, Washington, D. C., delivered an able address on January 13, 1946, the title of which was "Religion, Common Sense, and the Race Question." I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the RECORD.

I have an estimate from the Public Printer that the address will take two and one-half pages of the RECORD and will cost $130.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whenever human beings are faced with a persistently difficult problem, they apparently try to do one of three things with it—forget it, misrepresent it, or sentimentalize about it. The thing they are utterly reluctant to do is to understand it.

There may be several reasons for this attitude. One might be that understanding a difficult problem is prone to be laborious, and the human mind is characteristically lazy. Another doubtless is that understanding often brings a change of outlook, and most people prefer their outlook to remain what it is. Then there are the crystallized opinions, emotionally loaded, which in other people we identify as prejudices (in ourselves, we try not to identify them). We do not like to lose the shelter and protection which prejudice so promptly and dependably affords. Moreover, we do not want to think effectively because effective thinking often leads to doing something, and we are more afraid of that than of all the other things combined. For in dealing with difficult problems doing something is very apt to lead to trouble. And trouble is a thing we are eager to avoid.

When someone tells us that unless we brave out the trouble at the beginning, it is certain to grow worse before it catches up with us at the end, we feel resentful. We do not like to hear that trouble will catch up with us, not because we believe otherwise, but because we want to keep the thought of it suppressed. And so, as I say, we try to keep the problem out of sight.

If this is impossible, then we try to make it seem a different problem than it is; we do this in one of two ways, or perhaps in both. We misrepresent it: that is to say, we make it appear that nothing can be done about it, or that nothing ought to be done, or if something can and should, then very little. Or perhaps we make suggestions so extreme and drastic that no one could possibly hope to adopt them. Although this is done from an opposite point of view, the result is the same: and so sometimes, but not always, is the motive. It provides a virtuous feeling inexpensively.

If, however, we are of another temperament, we take the whole problem to our hearts and sentimentalize about it. The outcome of this is vague promises in beautiful language—promises which soon become ironical, while the lovely language festers and becomes a sickening jest.

All this is folly. Mature minds should look upon it as beneath them. Moreover, it is certain that important problems will resist this childish treatment and insist upon responsible solutions. In the end, it is impossible to forget such problems, disastrous to misrepresent them, and recklessly stupid to sentimentalize about them. This is now the case with the race question.

If we are ever to gain control of the problems of race relationship and adjust them in such a way that they do not bring us to calamity, that time is now. Notice that I said gain control of these problems, I did not say solve them. In my opinion, no one is entitled to a hearing on this question who does not understand that full solutions will not come until the races of mankind are indistinguishable. Until, in short, there is no race problem. As long as there are races, there will be race problems. In the same way that as long as there are young and old, there will be problems between the generations, and as long as there are men and women, there will be problems between the sexes. The very fact of difference makes for problems. Therefore, I say, until the racial differences are gone, there will be one degree or another of difficulty. This is a basic fact of human nature—indeed, of the nature of all living things—and it is dishonest not to reckon with it.

History records no instance, so far as I am aware, of two or more races inhabiting the same territory for a considerable length of time without the race problem being ultimately solved either through absorption or extermination. My assumptions, therefore, are the following: First, that this will continue to happen and that absorption will be the final method of solution; second, that it will not happen very promptly, the resistance of all races being generally strong against it; third, that until it does, race problems will not be fully solved but only increasingly reconciled, adapted, and adjusted. In saying this, I am thinking not only of race problems in America but throughout the world, and I recognize that in this larger sense, the white race has been dominant for less than 500 years and is clearly a minority.

I repeat, then, that if ever we are to gain control of race problems, and adjust them in such a way that they do not bring us to disaster, the time is now. And if anyone thinks that adjustment, as against solution, means only something slight and inconsiderable, he has not begun to understand the urgency of present needs. At the moment, we are in the position of the driver of an automobile with faulty brakes, careening along somewhat bumpily and steering rather crazily, but for the time being down a fairly gentle grade. Soon, the grade will be steeper, much steeper, and we shall be helpless unless by then we have gained control.

And this is true, not only here at home, but everyhere throughout the world. Nothing is more short-sighted than to think of the race question as a local problem or a national problem, or as a series of unrelated problems. It is one of the all-inclusive problems of the age, a universal problem, and, as such, entirely inescapable. What was the doctrine that started Hitler on the path to Armageddon? Surely, the doctrine of a master race. Hitler's intention was to bring about a racial hierarchy, Germans on top, other white peoples on a series of descending levels immediately below, and the other races of the world at the bottom. This was Hitler's attempt at adjustment and we know what it cost us to overthrow it.

That was across the Atlantic. Across the Pacific, the Japanese were trying a similar plan. They intended, first, to be the masters of the Orient, then, later, of the world. Their propaganda was not entirely ineffective. There is a population of one and a quarter billions in the Far East, all increasingly racially conscious. We might pass on from there to the Middle East, and then to Arabia and Africa. We might allow our thoughts to linger for a fleeting instant in Central and South America. Wherever we look—no matter where—the question of race relationships is one of the liveliest, most entangling, most tenacious problems of the modern age. And whatever is done about it in one place has instant repercussions in every other place throughout the world. This, as I see it, is a fact to keep in mind—to keep quite zealously in mind. Unless we wish to suffer the consequences, in this as in other things, of a course of action which is summed up in the rather grim and gloomy phrase, "too little, too late."

Let us therefore recognize that the race question is not something conjured up by agitators, or harebrained radicals, or visionary idealists—disagreeable people who are so inconsiderate as to be willing to make us uncomfortable. The race question arises because mankind, to begin with, is of several different races, because these races are in contact with each other, because they are competitive, and finally because they now must live together, dependent upon each other, in a single world community. The race prejudice and injustice of the past, if it continues, will surely prove ruinous in the future. And all this, I say, is not produced by agitation, or made controversial by people who want to do something about it; it is a part of the situation as we find it, and people who want to do something about it—something sufficient to the need—are the only people who are showing any understanding of it, or who take a prudent attitude toward it.

The notion that prudence consists in doing nothing about a problem because it is troublesome and urgent is both shocking and fantastic. Do we do nothing about a general conflagration because our own particular house is not as yet on fire? Do we go on doing nothing when the sparks are falling on our roof? Do we do nothing until it is too late to do anything? My own idea of prudence, I must confess, is to act promptly, adequately, and responsibly, and the more troublesome the problem the more necessary is such a course of action.

Now the title of this sermon promises that the subject will be treated at the level of common sense, and that is what I have been trying to do. It also promises, however, that the treatment will be religious. Let me say at once that I see no opposition between the two. Common sense that ignores the claims of conscience and makes no recognition of religious values is too shallow to be really common sense. The prophets of all ages have given us warnings that in the end were always recognized as common sense. Sometimes the recognition came too late. But still, it was common sense. The Golden Rule is common sense. Justice is common sense. All that a true religion asks is always common sense. On the other hand, when religion—or something that calls itself religion—offers us misty, vague emotions instead of something real, what we are getting is not religion, and neither is it common sense. When we are told to love our black brothers and brown brothers and yellow brothers, just as we love ourselves, without being told to put it into practice, we are being cheated of the meaning of religion, and accepting something trivial and sentimental.

Religion is not a veil between ourselves and facts; religion is the strength to handle facts. Of course, it's dangerous. If Jesus had never cleansed the temple, if he had only talked about it vaguely, probably nothing would have happened to him. The authorities would have left him alone. They might even have encouraged him to talk, for he talked interestingly. But on the other hand, the religion of Jesus would have been dead, too. Killed by Jesus, because when he had the chance to do something, he left it undone. And while it was dangerous for Jesus to cleanse the temple, it was still more dangerous to allow the temple to go on in the same old way. That is what the people did—after Jesus was out of the way. And in a few years, just as Jesus had told them, the temple was destroyed. When it comes to dangers, the weighing of the greater against the less is not only good religion, if people had the intelligence to see it, they would know that it is also common sense.

At the level, then, of candid, genuine religion, which is also the level of common sense, what should our attitude to the race question be? I cannot within the compass of this single sermon take up its international aspects, or even all its national and domestic aspects. I cannot take up, just now, the anti-Semitic question. I must concentrate upon the Negro question. I do so because in the United States this is the most urgent of our racial problems, as it surely is in Washington.

At the present time, taking advantage of the opportunities brought about through the war, our Negro fellow citizens are asking for equality. They mean not only equal treatment as a separate people but equal treatment in common with all people. They ask for equal economic status. They want a chance for better kinds of work, for more important positions. They seek equality in living space, in enfranchisement, in public life, in cultural pursuits, in education. In addition, they resist most kinds of segregation.

Now, what is the justice, the spiritual validity, the common sense of this? Surely, there is no one who would honestly and openly declare himself against it.

I admit that if I were a Negro I would try to understand white people rather circumspectly. I would counsel other Negroes to remember caution and restraint. There is always the risk of losing everything—at least in this particular generation—by trying to get too much at once. If I were a Negro I would say to other Negroes, something like this: "White people, at every step, must be given a little time. Not too much time, of course, or they will take all the time there is. But still, a little time. Because white people do not adjust to uncomfortable changes as easily as colored people do. They do not adjust to them easily, even when no racial question is involved." I might say that, and I might add this: "That many times when white people seem to be discriminating against Negroes, they are really discriminating against poverty. This is far from being a virtue, but still, it changes the picture quite a little. White people forget that the conditions Negroes must endure do not always encourage cleanliness and good civic behavior and social hygiene. And so they sometimes get confused. They are afraid of things that are not particularly racial, and they mix them up with things that are." And I might conclude: "Do not strive for mere rhetorical victories, or put first the most difficult kinds of equality. Negroes, too, insist, among themselves, upon preserving social layers, one above another: and so they must realize how resistant white people also are about such things. Try to make equality substantial. Seek it first in economic justice, in a higher income, in access to better jobs; seek it in equal housing conditions, opportunity of equal health, equal hygiene, equal education. Then, with these things in hand, other adjustments will come more readily." This, I think, would be common sense for me to talk, if I were a Negro—and as it involves forbearance, patience, and restraint, it might be good religion, too.

But then, of course, I am not a Negro. And so I must say to myself and to other white people, "The time has come for justice for the Negro people—for all non-white people, both here and everywhere. It is not common sense to resent it, because resentment will only increase the difficulties. It is common sense to know that the Negro claim is a just

one. It has never been shown scientifically that there is any such thing as a superior race. It has been shown that only tragedy results when people of one inheritance or color try to dominate another. There is nothing but disaster in holding to the notion of a master race. It is good common sense—and good religion—to start all your thinking with just the human race. To acknowledge that the founding principle of the United States is true: that all men are created free and equal. To acknowledge that the religious principle of universal brotherhood is true, and to try to act upon it. It is not reasonable to expect the Negro race to wait forever. It is not just, not rational, and not religious, to try to keep them down. Let us move now, and as rapidly as we can, to equality of opportunity, equality of privilege, not only in words but in deeds."

But suppose this much is granted?—and by an increasing number of people, I think it is. Suppose we are ready to support all useful and practical measures which will lead toward these aims, in the economic life of the Nation; and the political; and in housing and education and the like. I do not know how many people are really willing for these things—as I say, I think it is an increasing number—but certainly I am ready for them myself. And I know perfectly well that some of the adjustments involved will not be easy. No one needs to tell me so—though I can always be grateful to the many charming people who are so intent upon informing me.

Let me be perfectly candid about this matter of uncomfortable changes. Just as much as anyone else, I could find it comfortable to get along with things as they were. Comfortable in everything but conscience. But that is mere temperament, not conviction. I propose so far as in me lies to act upon conviction. Let it be understood that such adjustments as are now in process will not be always easy; let it be acknowledged that there will be many kinds of friction, many possibilities of strife. Still, the claim of justice cannot be denied. Its time has come. The Negro claims for equal treatment must be granted.

But suppose this much is allowed. There still remain two other questions—social equality and nonsegregation—and I shall say what I think about them as plainly as I can. First, social equality. Wherever the occasion is unforced and natural, I am in favor of it. But where there is artificiality and constraint, I would prefer to wait. I believe, for example, that educated Negroes should move freely among other educated people in whatever activities would naturally draw them together, irrespective of the color of their skins. And I could doubtless give other illustrations. But having read such careful treatises as the recent one by St. Clair Drake and Horace R. Cayton—Black Metropolis—both of them Negroes of very fine minds and fair, impartial judgment, I doubt the wisdom of trying to force too many kinds of social mingling too energetically and too soon. As for intermarriage, I think that for some time to come it will happen, by percentage, rather rarely. The case histories studied are not often encouraging. This is not a mere matter of white resistance to such alliances. Negro resistance to intermarriage, especially on the part of the Negro women, is just as strong. In fact, there are deep resentments among the Negro people—and I am bound to say that most of them seem justified—which are a great impediment to social freedom in the mingling of the races. It is important to overcome these resentments. But in doing so, it is necessary to avoid new ones.

It seems to me that this is an area where Negroes and whites should be more candid in conferring together. For it will take the wisdom of both—not of either of them, acting separately—to meet the problems which must be adjusted. If social equality means freedom in social mingling, and that is what it usually means, then I am in favor of it so far as it leads to increasing understanding between the races; but I am cautious about it where mutual constraints or mutual resentments would damage the progress which might otherwise be made. So far as I know, I am without prejudice about it, for on this particular subject I was not brought up with any. But I am inclined to think, subject to whatever might increase my knowledge or improve my confidence, that it is better to work most for economic justice, and for other equalities which may make social mingling less a problem than it is.

As for public segregation, it seems to me to have no basis, except in prejudice. If there is to be segregation at all, I would like to suggest a new and better scheme to equalize it: there should be in every public auditorium where such discrimination is the practice, three sections, one—and no doubt the largest—for white and colored people who are willing to be together; one for white people who refuse to mix with Negroes, and one for Negroes who refuse to mix with whites. If there is to be segregation, I recommend my scheme as eminently fair, and I await the criticism of any who deny its justice. The three sections might be labeled very aptly. The largest one (for both Negroes and whites) might bear upon its sign the simple word "Americans," seeing that the American founding principle is the one they honor and respect. The other two signs might be respectively, "For Americans, Substandard, White," and "For Americans, Substandard, Nonwhite." This would be an honest, and, I hope, a satisfactory arrangement.

When it comes to churches, and particularly Unitarian churches, the question is somewhat different. It was settled long ago. Christianity—even traditional Christianity—is based upon the equality of all its worshipers before the one God and Father of all mankind. Unitarianism is based, in addition, upon freedom. All who accept its basis are equally entitled to its opportunities. There can be no segregation in a Unitarian church without its ceasing to be Unitarian. It does not follow, of course, that every Unitarian will live up to his church's highest standards, but no Unitarian would want to reduce his church's standards to the level of his own or wish to have the flag of freedom down.

Presumably, because it is very difficult for Negroes to join a predominantly white church—difficult because the Negro people would regard it as desertion of their race—it may be a long while before people of all colors worship regularly together. Yet, it seems to me essential that they do so sometimes. If the problems of race are not to be settled at the level of religion, they will have to be settled at a lower level. I find this possibility far from reassuring. An eminent American Negro told a friend of mine that the only place where Negroes can find equality—genuine equality—is the Communist Party. I have thought about this and have come to the reluctant conclusion that in the sense intended, it is probably true. I am not, I hope, unjust to the Communist movement—I do not wish to be—but I do not want the race question adjusted at the Communist level. I want it adjusted at the religious level. And I will take my share in trying to bring it about. I cannot forget that all scholars are agreed that the crucial factor which brought about the triumph of Christianity during the decline of the Roman Empire was its universality. It included all who were willing to be Christians—all. And I notice that the Communists are ready to include all who are willing to be Communists. I recommend this as a parallel well worth studying. One of the best scholars of modern times, Prof. John MacMurray, has written an excellent little treatise on it, a treatise called the Creative Society. These are things worth thinking over.

I say again, I want, and desperately, the race problem met and adjusted, and in the end, solved, at the religious level—the religious level and the level of common sense. I invite you to accept this level, every one of you, as your own. Every lower level is dangerous. It will grow more so, I mention this, and yet my appeal is not to fear. Every lower level is unworthy of us—unworthy. We know—nothing can excuse us—what the requirements of conscience are. We know what is demanded of us. The choice is plain before us, and the future will depend upon the level of our decision.

I have stayed quite closely today to what I thought was obvious and persuasive. It may be less so than I think, but that was my intention. But now a word in closing. There are times when I stand aside and wonder at the strangeness of this world of ours. The years of all of us are short, our lives precarious. Our days and nights go hurrying on and there is scarcely time to do the little that we might. Yet we find time for bitterness, for petty treason and evasion. What can we do to stretch our hearts enough to lose their littleness? Here we are—all of us—all of us upon this planet, bound together in a common destiny, living our lives between the briefness of the daylight and the dark. Brothers in this, each lighted by the same precarious, flickering flame of life, how does it happen that we are not brothers in all things else? How strange and foolish are these walls of separation that divide us. When I think of these things I wonder. I wonder at the patience of God. While the dream still lives in our hearts, God waits. While the vision shines in our eyes, God hopes. How long shall we keep Him waiting?

Prayer: O Thou, who at the beginning didst breathe into us all the one breath of our common life, breathe deeper now, and bring us to our soul's awakening. Amen.

Address by Secretary Wallace Before National Citizens Political Action Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 13 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Commerce, before the National Citizens Political Action Committee at New Haven, Conn., on February 8, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Political action against reaction is the challenge of our time to people like you—and me.

Political action to you and me means determined, effective, progressive political action—action against the real and present and deadly danger of political, economic, and social reaction. That is why people like you all over the country are organizing such independent movements as the National Citizens Political Action Committee.

That is why we are here tonight.

Political action means votes. So this, then, is not just a time for ringing speeches. It is a time for ringing doorbells.

This is not just a time for fancy phrases that make the eagle scream. It is a time for action at the ballot box by voters who understand a few simple basic facts.

The foremost of these facts is the fundamental relationship between political and economic power. For our democratic way of

life has been—and must continue to be—based upon maintaining a balance between political action and economic action.

The unceasing force of economic action, if not checked by the proper political action, leads us inevitably to reaction with all its cost in human misery. Then, unless vigorous, enlightened political action provides a remedy through the full use of the ballot box, we shall certainly be faced with ultimate revolution and the destruction of our free institutions.

Some people may say that this is an oversimplification of the economic and political processes, but I do not believe that you here tonight could hold such an impression. We have lived through part of this process. And I believe you will agree with me that, just a few years ago, we were saved from economic and political disaster only by the bold, courageous political action which brought forth Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal.

The ballot box gave us a remedy then—and just in time. And that lesson we must not forget now.

That experience, and the social-economic progress that followed, gives convincing proof that it is only dynamic political action that spells out progress in our democratic system—dynamic because it reflects the needs of our people.

That experience, coupled with lessons of the past, also stands as proof that the Democratic Party has best served the needs of the people of the United States. But the Democratic Party itself has flourished only when it fought the good fight of progressive political action.

We here tonight know that when the Democratic Party ceases to be the people's party, it will die—and it will be well dead.

Some of you here tonight are businessmen, and you are concerned not only with keeping and strengthening the freedom of our free enterprise system; you are also concerned with obtaining the maximum of business opportunities under full and fair employment conditions that will provide a continuous high level of fair profits.

Some of you here are workers equally concerned with maintaining a maximum of opportunities under conditions of full and fair employment—so as to guarantee a decent annual wage and a continuous chance for advancement.

Others of you are housewives who, in the arduous task of running your homes in wartime, learned well the lessons of price controls—and who, today, as a result of your wartime experience, can appreciate the need for holding the line on prices.

And still others of you come from the academic world and can best appreciate the necessities of more and better education—of more and better scientific research and teaching facilities available to all the people—of the need particularly better to equip all of us to meet the new problems of living at peace, one nation with another, in an atomic age, and at the same time, to direct the peaceful functions of atomic power into socially useful channels.

For myself, I am here tonight still fighting for the things Franklin Roosevelt fought for—and supporting President Truman in his fight for the progressive legislation that will continue to make the Democratic Party the party of progress in this country. And I know quite a bit about this kind of a fight—from the inside of my own family. My grandfather and my father, out in Iowa, fought the fight against the forces of privilege in the Republican Party. I joined in the same fight—and I learned, as my grandfather and father before me learned, the utter hopelessness of looking to the Republican Party for national progress. I have the utmost sympathy with those progressive Republicans who still look to the Republican Party for progress on a national scale—I shared their faith once—and was disillusioned.

That is why I am here tonight as a Democrat. I campaigned for Alfred E. Smith in 1928—and I will keep up the fight as long as the Democratic Party remains the people's party.

But political parties are not ends in themselves. They are merely the instruments of the people's power—the political expression of the people's will. There is need—an indispensable need—for political action independent of organized political parties. There is need for organized but independent effort to stimulate thought and action by the individual voter—to awaken political consciousness, to keep political parties aware of popular needs, and to keep political controversy on a national level. There is an urgent need for independent pressure through such organizations as the National Citizens Political Action Committee.

So, again, that's why we are here tonight. And here in Connecticut you have an excellent opportunity to see what the people's power means in action.

You now have in Connecticut four good Representatives in Congress who have a splendid voting record—all Democrats—who are progressive right down the line on both domestic and international issues.

I refer to JOSEPH RYTER, HERMAN KOPPLEMANN, Mrs. CHASE WOODHOUSE, and JAMES GEELAN from here in New Haven.

How do you get good Representatives like these? You get them only by getting out the independent vote—not only in Presidential years but especially in the off years.

To emphasize the importance of the off years, let us take the case of HERMAN KOPPLEMANN, a progressive businessman who understands that the real interests of free enterprise cannot be separated from the interests of the whole of the people. He was first elected to Congress in 1936, a Presidential year. He was defeated in 1938. He was elected again in 1940, another Presidential year. He was defeated again in 1942. He was reelected again in 1944, again a Presidential year. His record in voting in the people's interest is perfect. Why, then, was he not reelected in the off years? Simply because too many voters of his district—as all too often happens in too many districts of the United States—slumbered on election day.

It is the job of the National Citizens Political Action Committee—it is the job of every independent voter—to see that there is no slumbering in the coming off-year election. Stop the slumbering and you need have no fear of losing Representatives like Mrs. WOODHOUSE, HERMAN KOPPLEMANN, JOSEPH RYTER, and JAMES GEELAN.

Stop the slumbering and you will have plenty of opportunities of public service for good progressives like Lieutenant Governor Snow and Margaret Connors.

Stop the slumbering and you can have from Connecticut, even in an off year, a solid progressive Democratic bloc of six Members—just as you had in 1936 and again in 1940.

Too much emphasis cannot be placed upon the necessity for watchfulness in every single congressional district in the country. What does one vote mean? Well, just a short time before Pearl Harbor, one single vote in Congress saved the extension of the draft law. Every Congressman counts. Furthermore, continuity in Congress is a matter of very specific concern to everyone interested in progress.

Again let us take Congressman KOPPLEMANN's case. Had the voters of his district not slumberered in the off-year elections, KOPPLEMANN would have had 8 years' seniority instead of 2. As long as the committee systems in both the Senate and House are organized as they are on the basis of seniority, this would have given the progressive voters of Connecticut a much stronger voice in Congress.

But you in Connecticut stand to lose one or more—perhaps all—of the four excellent representatives if you don't get out the vote. This year is another off-year. You must reverse the usual trend of off-year voting. Is this possible? Is it superhuman? I do not think so. To reverse the trend requires only that you keep after the one voter out of eight who voted in 1944 but who will stay home in 1946 if he follows past habits. Remember—only one out of eight. And if this one citizen who would otherwise remain at home realized how closely the off-year elections are tied to his personal interest—just as closely, in fact, as the Presidential elections—he would be bright and early at the ballot box.

The answer is up to the people like you here tonight. It is up to you to do the job. It is up to you to awaken these part-time citizens to their own interest. It is up to you to reach them wherever you see them—in your churches, at the drug store, at the movies, everywhere. In the end, it means you ring their doorbells and talk to them as neighbors.

But I came here tonight not only to plead for a continued progressive Democratic delegation from your State. I came because other national servants badly needed for our national safety happen to come from your State. And they also need help and need it now.

One of these is your very able Senator BRIEN MCMAHON who is the chairman of the most important congressional committee ever set up in these United States—the Special Committee of the United States Senate on Atomic Energy.

BRIEN MCMAHON is giving this committee, to this overwhelming international problem of atomic power, an intelligent and enlightened leadership. His own bill for controlling atomic power and for the application of atomic power to peacetime life is an excellent bill. I testified in behalf of this bill last week, and I call upon you here tonight to give BRIEN MCMAHON and his bill, S. 1717, your complete and active support.

There are three atomic energy bills under study. The McMahon bill is the only one which maintains the principle of Government responsibility to the people. It is the only one which places control of the atomic energy commission completely in the hands of the electorate and its chosen representatives. The McMahon bill stands for the traditional principle of civilian control over military matters—which has always guarded against military domination or dictatorship. The McMahon bill best provides for the development of the peacetime uses of atomic energy through the channels of free private enterprise under careful Government control and licensing. It best provides for the utilization of atomic energy for the betterment of all of the peoples of the world.

There are powerful forces arrayed against BRIEN MCMAHON and his committee. These forces can be defeated only by mobilizing of the support of the people behind men like BRIEN MCMAHON who are fighting the cause of the people's peace.

I came to Connecticut tonight for a further reason—to strengthen, if I can, the hand of another of your leaders of the people's cause in Washington. That man is Chester Bowles.

I know a little something about being on the receiving end of brickbats, and I am sure that Chester Bowles has received more brickbats in the past 6 months than anyone else in Washington. And why? Because he has so successfully resisted every pressure except the pressure of the general welfare. In any popularity contest among the plain people buying food and clothes—and trying to find a place to live or trying to build a home—I am sure that Chester Bowles would rate just about 100 percent. But Chester Bowles is not asking for the bouquets that are long overdue him. He is asking for support. He needs it now.

There is no need here for a textbook lecture on the dangers of inflation. But there

is need here to point out that the danger of inflation does exist today—more than ever before. You can avert this danger again only by mobilizing public opinion behind Chester Bowles in his fight to hold the line on prices. There is no time to lose.

Now, I want to mention one other item of business—the need for intelligent consideration of international financial action. The immediate occasion is the necessity for congressional approval of the British loan—an arrangement negotiated over many months by men whose integrity and experience commands our respect. Approval of this loan is also a part of the fight for the people's peace. The issues involved are not complex as some financiers and their economists would have you believe. The issues in fact are simple.

The loan amounts to $3,750,000,000, a big sum, but still only the equivalent of what it cost us to fight the war for a period of 15 days. Britain needs this money to get on her feet again. We are the only nation in a position to lend it to her. If she does not get this money from us, she will be forced to embark on a program of restrictive trade. The world, then, will quickly become divided into competitive blocs, the sterling bloc of Britain, the dollar bloc of the United States, and the Russian bloc. The fight for the people's peace can fail on this one issue alone.

Tonight, I have set forth some of the items of the people's business which demand your immediate and constant attention—if we are to obtain and maintain this peace of abundance that we and the peoples of our Allied Nations earned through horrible years of war.

Some people of little faith in the democratic process would seem to believe that we lost this war for peace and security for all. The views of these people have been well expressed by the recent advertisements of the Society of Sentinels, Inc.—a fit successor to the Liberty League. Now the Society of Sentinels, bespeaking the privilege of the few against the general welfare of all of us, advocates the elimination of nearly every progressive constructive measure enacted since 1932.

These agents of reaction, camouflaged beneath high-sounding labels, would lead us back to the days when there was no social security—no protection of legimate investment in the market places—no minimum wage laws and no guaranty of collective bargaining—and no government protection against those monopolistic practices endangering all business activity.

They would lead us back to mass unemployment and plenty of starvation—back to another economic break-down with all of its frightening potentialities.

Did we fight and win our costliest war to be so fearful of democratic progress? Are we so weak as a people that we must cower before the problems of a peace that holds out more hope of opportunity for all—more real and lasting prosperity for all—than we have ever before known?

We take pride in being a Nation of intelligent, enlightened people. And I do not believe that the intelligent people of this country, given the facts, will knuckle down to the forces of defeatism.

Progress is in our blood. Progress has always been the life stream of these United States.

It is the kind of progress that spells out full and fair and continuous employment, and a continuous chance for advancement for the worker—full production and a continuous level of fair profits for the businessman—and a fair break for the consumer who represents all of us.

It is the kind of progress that spells out the uses of atomic energy not for purposes of universal suicide—but for purposes of universal plenty.

This is what I mean by the people's peace. The answer lies with you—the people. You can have it—but the time for your decision is here and now.

Policies Upon Which the President and Congress Do Not Agree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND
OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 13 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Policies Upon Which the President and Congress Do Not Agree," written by Fred Brenckman and published in the February issue of the National Grange Monthly.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLICIES UPON WHICH THE PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS DO NOT AGREE—MANY LEGISLATORS DOUBT THE SOUNDNESS AND WORKABILITY OF CERTAIN MAJOR FEATURES OF THE PROGRAM MR. TRUMAN ADVOCATES

During the course of his radio address to the Nation on the night of January 3, President Truman gave Congress full credit for its loyal cooperation in the field of foreign affairs, but he remarked on the domestic front the legislative branch of the Government could offer no similar record of achievement. Declaring that the domestic problems with which we are faced during the postwar era are just as serious as those with which we have to grapple on the world stage, the President took Congress to task for not having acted with more alacrity on some of the legislative proposals he has sponsored.

He specifically mentioned the need of legislation authorizing the appointment of fact-finding boards as a help in the settlement of disputes between labor and management; the prompt enactment of the full employment bill; the bill increasing the minimum wages now provided by law for unskilled workers in industry; the measure providing for Federal funds to supplement the unemployment benefits now paid by the several States; together with the bill making permanent the Fair Employment Practice Committee.

In his radio address, the President appealed to the American people, whom he termed "the most powerful pressure group in the world," to bring their influence to bear on Congress in behalf of his legislative program. He indicated that if Congress did not like his program it should adopt one of its own.

It is not that Congress is unwilling to cooperate with the President under proper conditions in dealing with some of the subjects mentioned in his address. This applies with particular force to the prevailing unrest on the industrial front, which is seriously retarding the transition from a wartime economy to one of peace.

The truth is that many Members of Congress, regardless of party, seriously doubt the wisdom and soundness of some of the major legislative proposals advanced by the President. These doubts and misgivings are not confined to the members of the legislative branch of the Government alone; they are shared by large segments of the population.

DEALING WITH INDUSTRIAL UNREST

For example, while the proposed legislation for the establishment of fact-finding boards in the adjustment of labor disputes meets with the approval of Walter Reuther, vice president of the United Automobile Workers, CIO, it is not approved by William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, and those for whom he speaks. Mr. Green declares that the passage of this legislation would create a worse situation than that which it is intended to cure. Some labor leaders have remained discreetly silent. Of course, Mr. Green and other labor leaders are aware of the fact that if the principle of "showing the books" should be established, it would often mean that labor would have to accept a reduction in wages. On the whole, labor has not been friendly to profit-sharing plans, because the adoption of such plans would also mean the sharing of losses.

When General Motors Corp. was asked to show its books to the fact-finding board which President Truman appointed in advance of any legislation on the subject, in an effort to get an understanding of the issues involved in the strike at the numerous plants of the company, it refused.

"What is the UAW-CIO really after?" asked the company. "Is it seeking facts or new economic power? Does it want to know things or to run things?"

Continuing, the statement of the company declared:

"The obvious fact is that the UAW-CIO has gone beyond its rights under the law and is reaching, not for information, but for new power—not for a look at past figures, but for the power to sit in on forecasting and planning for the future.

"A LOOK AT THE BOOKS

"A 'look at the books' is a clever catch phrase intended as an opening wedge, whereby unions hope to pry their way into the whole field of management. It surely leads to the day when union bosses, under the threat of strike, will demand the right to tell what we can make, when we can make it, where we can make it, and how much we must charge you—all with an eye on what labor can take out of the business, rather than the value that goes into the product. If the union can do this in the case of General Motors, it can do it to every business in this land of ours."

Someone has suggested that what is needed in the present situation, even more than fact-finding boards, is principle-finding boards! In any event, if the books of General Motors Corp. had shown that the company was in a position to pay the full 30-percent increase in wages demanded by the striking workers, such an arrangement would not have been fair to the competitors of the company, nor to the general public.

The people who buy the products of General Motors Corp. or of any other manufacturing concerns are entitled to share in any benefits that may accrue from improved processes or the economies effected through mass production. In the past the people have received their share of such benefits in the form of lower prices. Under the plan put forth by the UAW-CIO, the workers would monopolize all these gains, leaving the public entirely out of consideration.

AMENDING WAGES AND HOURS ACT

Turning to another of Mr. Truman's requests for legislative action, take the bill amending the Wages and Hours Act of 1938. This act at present fixes the minimum wage of unskilled labor in industry at 40 cents per hour. The pending bill in this connection would immediately raise the minimum to 65 cents per hour, with a goal of 75 cents an hour in 2 years.

Every well disposed person naturally wants to see all workers properly compensated. There is truth and justice in the Biblical saying, "The laborer is worthy of his hire." But when the Federal Government or any other unit of government, undertakes to tell an employer in private industry how much he must pay his workers, regardless of economic conditions, and without the Government contributing anything whatsoever to the pay roll, it is violative of all sound principles of government.

It has well been observed that the chief function of the legislator is not to make laws, but to discover them. There is a higher

law than that which is passed by Congress; there is a higher law than the ruling that may be made by some governmental board or bureau, and that is the economic law. When the economic law is violated the penalty is always swift and sure.

While in a narrow sense agriculture is exempted from the workings of the wage-hour law, officially known as the Fair Labor Standards Act, actually the farmer must compete with industry in the labor market. Who would want to work for the farmer at a rate within his reach, based on the returns he receives for his products, if it were made illegal for an employer in industry to pay less than 75 cents an hour, even for the most inefficient and unskilled labor in the country? Aside from the agricultural angle, there are many thousands of marginal industries scattered all over the land that could not afford to pay such a minimum wage, unless the further progress of inflation should greatly reduce the value of the dollar.

It would appear, therefore, that however good the intentions of the proponents of a minimum wage of 75 cents an hour may be, the effects of the enactment of the pending bill would be to throw countless thousands of people out of work, because nobody could afford to hire them. Perhaps this may explain why Congress hesitates to enact such a measure.

THE FULL EMPLOYMENT BILL

The title of the so-called full employment bill, also advocated by the President, has an alluring sound. During the latter part of September the Senate passed this bill after quite a few changes and amendments, intended to protect the public interest. The measure was referred to the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, headed by CARTER MANASCO, of Alabama, who commands the respect of all his colleagues. There are quite a number of able and conscientious men on this committee.

Lengthy hearings were conducted on the Senate bill by this committee. A number of House bills bearing on the same subject were also considered. The committee had so little confidence in the Senate-approved measure that it was voted down, 17 to 3. Then the committee proceeded to prepare a substitute bill, which was reported to the House and passed on December 14. The bills are now in conference between the two branches of Congress, and it is difficult to predict what may emerge.

The bill passed by the Senate declares that "All Americans able to work and seeking work are entitled to an opportunity for useful, remunerative, regular, full-time employment, including self-employment in agriculture, commerce, industry, and the professions."

Very briefly, the Senate bill provides that to the extent that full employment cannot be furnished by private enterprise, there shall be "such volume of Federal investment and expenditures as may be needed * * * to achieve the objective of continuing full employment." An amendment was included which provides that this shall be done in a manner "consistent with the needs and obligations of the Federal Government and other essential considerations of national policy."

In its original form, the bill made no provision whatever for raising the money necessary to finance public-works programs undertaken to provide full employment. As passed, the Senate bill provides that at the beginning of each regular session the President shall transmit to Congress a "National Production and Employment Budget" for the ensuing fiscal year and such longer period as he may deem appropriate. This budget is to estimate the number of employment opportunities that will be open in private industry during the ensuing year, and the President is directed to make such recommendations as he may deem necessary to take up any slack in the labor market. This message or report is then to be referred to a joint committee of the Senate and House, which committee, in turn, is to report its findings and recommendations to both branches of Congress not later than April 1 of each year. A Senate amendment provides that any program for Federal investment and expenditures in providing full employment during times of peace shall be accompanied by a program of taxation.

HOUSE COMMITTEE STATES OBJECTIONS

In reporting its substitute bill to the House, Chairman MANASCO's committee said:

"All are agreed that high levels of employment in the United States must be maintained. All are not agreed on how this objective is to be achieved. Both the Senate bill and the two companion House bills adopt the theory that the maintenance, not only of high levels of employment but of continued 'full-time' employment * * * is the responsibility of the Federal Government. * * *

"This committee substitute unqualifiedly rejects this theory, under which employment through private enterprise would be perfunctory, and the guaranty would really rest on Federal investment and expenditure—a gigantic and unworkable proposal contemplating improvised expenditures and unwholesome Federal concentration. The adoption of such a theory not only would inevitably entail continued deficit spending, but would also destroy the system which has made this Nation great and strong—the system of free competitive enterprise, under which the highest standard of living in history has been attained."

Entertaining such convictions, it will readily be understood why the members of the House committee did not feel they would be discharging their responsibility to the American people by perfunctorily putting the stamp of approval on the bill passed by the Senate, or by reporting out either of the two House bills which were considered.

In the meantime, nobody has been injured because the committee took the time that was needed to give proper consideration to the weighty proposal that was placed before it. It is interesting to note in passing that while Government economists estimated there would be 6,000,000 unemployed people during the early part of the reconversion era, the best figures available today indicate that there are only 1,500,000 unemployed; and such is the demand for labor that these unemployed can easily be provided with jobs under our system of private enterprise. This goes to show how far wrong the guesses of Government economists can sometimes be.

The bill passed by the House discards the term "full employment," and substitutes as a title "The Employment Production Act." It places heavy emphasis on preserving, maintaining, and encouraging our traditional system of free enterprise. The bill provides for the appointment of a council of three economic advisers to the President, each of whom shall receive a salary of $15,000 per year. This council is directed to prepare an annual report on economic conditions and place it in the hands of the President not later than the 1st of January each year. The President, in turn, is directed to forward this document to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, which is to be established by Congress. The several committees to which this report may be referred shall report to Congress as a whole not later than the 1st of May, making such recommendations as they may deem advisable.

That, in simplified form, is the gist of the House bill, which the President declares is not acceptable to him

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE BILL

Perhaps the most controversial measure touched upon by Mr. Truman in his radio address is the fair employment practice bill, which is intended to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry.

This bill was favorably reported to the House from the Committee on Labor on February 20, 1945, by Mrs. MARY NORTON, head of the committee. Both the Democratic and the Republican Parties have given pledges to support the principles contained in this measure, which is in danger of becoming a political football during this election year. A majority of the members of the Rules Committee of the House is against the bill, and a petition is being circulated to discharge the committee from further consideration of the measure in order to bring it to a vote in the House. To accomplish this, 218 signatures to the petition are necessary, or a majority of the entire membership of the House.

The bill calls for the appointment of a Commission of five members, each of whom shall receive a salary of $10,000 a year and this Commission is to be given broad and sweeping powers to carry out the purposes of the act. The Commission is to be empowered to make its own rules and regulations, which can only be set aside by the passage of a concurrent resolution by Congress within a period of 60 days after the issuance of such rules or regulations.

Under the provisions of the bill, headquarters of the Commission will be in Washington, but there is no limit fixed as to the number of branch offices that may be established. The rules laid down by the Commission are intended to apply to employers in private industry, together with the Federal Government and its various agencies, as well as the State governments and their minor subdivisions, including counties, cities, townships, and school districts. The term "employer" is defined as a person having in his employ, six or more individuals, or any person acting in the interest of such employer, directly or indirectly.

Any employer against whom a complaint might be filed would not be entitled to a jury trial. The Fair Employment Practice Commission would decide the case. If the defendant should be found guilty by the Commission, he could be forced to desist of the practice complained of, and could be required to hire, rehire, or promote the complainant, as the case might be, with back wages from the time the alleged act of discrimination occurred.

Any person willfully resisting, preventing, or impeding the work of any member of the Commission or its agents shall be subject to a fine of not more than $5,000 or not more than 1 year of imprisonment.

PICTURED AS PANDORA'S BOX

In a minority report on the bill filed by Congressman CLARK FISHER, of Texas, a member of the Committee on Labor, he says:

"This bill is a departure from the traditional American system of free enterprise, with respect to the light that has always been enjoyed by employers to use their own sound judgment and discretion in selecting loyal and capable employees. * * * It therefore follows that the proposal to deprive the businessman and the farmer affected by this bill of the basic privilege of passing judgment on the choice of his employees, and of transferring that final determination to a bureau in Washington, smacks strongly of totalitarianism.

"The bill, if enacted, is extremely unfair to the Negro race in America, for whose alleged benefit it is designed. The measure would be unenforceable. Its attempted enforcement would have the natural effect of resulting in strikes, riots, and violence and in bringing about racial prejudice and discrimination. It is manifestly unfair to the American Negro, because it would retard his progress and would be calculated to foment racial feeling and bitterness against him."

Mr. FISHER is further of the opinion that the enactment of this bill would set the stage

for a new era of racketeering and blackmail in America; that it would result in thousands and thousands of lawsuits being filed by troublemakers and professional agitators. He declares the measure would legalize and dignify the activities of those who would practice shysterism and blackmail in America. The constitutionality of such a measure is, of course, extremely doubtful.

The unemployment compensation bill, to which the President referred in his address, passed the Senate on September 20. It was referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means. The committee considered the measure but came to the conclusion that it would be unwise to enact it, particularly so because of the large number of strikes that were called following the surrender of Japan.

The bill provides that during the reconversion period, ending June 30, 1947, unemployed persons shall be entitled to compensation at the rate of $25 per week, not exceeding 26 weeks in each year. To make this possible, Federal funds would be used to supplement unemployment compensation payable under State laws, and to equalize such payments.

FRED BRENCKMAN.

Collective Bargaining Can Work

REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL C. MICHENER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 13, 1946

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, whether or not collective bargaining between management and labor is effective necessarily depends on the attitude and the approach of those doing the bargaining. Fairness, understanding, and reasonableness on both sides are essential. Success depends much upon the approach in each case. Rule or ruin, vindictiveness, hatred, and desire to punish, have no place in a collective-bargaining conference. Good faith must be the cornerstone of every conference.

In these troublesome management-labor days, it is gratifying to report that collective bargaining can, will, and does work, if both sides want it to work. Interdependence must be recognized.

Mr. Speaker, I make reference to an industry in my district in which both management and labor have done an outstanding job throughout the war, where labor strife has not interfered with war production and all because there exists the proper spirit on the part of those in the front offices as well as in the production rooms. I make reference to the Monroe Auto Equipment Co. of Monroe, Mich. What I mean is best explained in a front-page news article, appearing in the Monroe Evening News of February 11, which reads as follows:

AUTO EQUIPMENT WAGES UP 18.5 CENTS—NEW WAGE AGREEMENT, RATIFIED BY UNION, PROVIDES SECURITY CLAUSE

A wage increase of 18½ cents an hour, effective March 1, was announced today for all employees of the Monroe Auto Equipment Co. A joint announcement was made today by officers of Local 878, UAW–CIO, and representatives of management who met with the bargaining committee of the union. The increase granted is plant-wide, including office workers who will receive a minimum of 18½ cents an hour increase based on their salary.

Negotiations have been in progress for the past 2 weeks and the agreement was approved at a special meeting of the local held Sunday at the high school.

Both management and the union emphasized that negotiations were completely amicable throughout. The company's contract with the union runs yearly to September 1 and provides for wage negotiations at 6-month intervals instituted by either management or the union.

A security clause for the company is a part of the agreement and is the first to be granted by the union. Under this clause any employee involved or participating in an unauthorized work stoppage or strike will forfeit any part of the company's profit-sharing fund accrued to his benefit from the beginning of the fiscal year up to the time of the disqualification. Any disqualified person, upon reinstatement, shall participate in the fund from the time of reinstatement to the end of the fiscal year. The money involved during disqualification shall be added to the general fund and distributed to all persons not involved in the unauthorized strike or work stoppage.

Negotiation for the wage increase was at the request of the union and the amount of the raise is based on what appears to be the pattern of the big three of the automotive industry—Chrysler, General Motors, and Ford—union members said. The local company has extensive manufacturing contracts with the Chrysler Corp. Chrysler and Ford have already signed similar contracts.

The company's profit-sharing plan has been in effect since 1938. It places 25 percent of the profits after normal taxes in a pool for distribution upon a percentage basis to the employees. Payment is usually made in December for the fiscal year ending June 30.

The wage increase will affect approximately 1,400 employees of Auto Equipment plants in Monroe, Petersburg, Temperance, and Frenchtown. It brings the company's base minimum rate to $1.01 for a 40-hour week.

James Morgan and John Adams, international representatives of UAW-CIO from Pontiac region 1–B, were in Monroe yesterday for the meeting with the union. The bargaining committee of the local unit included Marvin Otterpohl, Robert Redding, Carlos Gastambile, Mike Birch, and Ben Trombley, in addition to Irving Bruhn, union president. Company representatives included B. D. McIntyre, W. D. McIntyre, officers; George M. Streicher, plant superintendent; and Carl Savage, director of personnel.

Mr. Speaker, this employer and these employees have not only helped themselves but they have rendered a service to the public, and are entitled to the thanks of all of us. May I express the hope that others will follow this precedent?

Secret, Sordid, and Stupid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 13, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of February 12, 1946:

SECRET, SORDID, AND STUPID

If there was ever a more sordid deal by the United States than the needless bribery of Russia to enter the Jap war, we can't recall it. Now that the text of the agreement by Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin at Yalta has been made public, it turns out to be even worse than feared.

It violated assurances by the President and State Department that no secret political agreements had been or would be made.

In giving the Kuriles and South Saghalien to Russia, it violated the first and second pledges of the Atlantic Charter against territorial aggrandizement, and the United Nations Declaration. It violated the Cairo agreement which said Japan would be expelled from territories taken by violence and greed—which does not cover the Kuriles.

In agreeing to hand over to Russia the Jap territories, it usurped powers of the Allied peace conference. This peace conference authority was underlined by President Truman in his statement on Potsdam. It was reasserted by Secretary Byrnes last week in his comment that the secret Yalta pact—which had been hidden even from him for 7 months—would be subject to peace-conference decision. But the secret text provides that these Soviet claims "shall be unquestionably fulfilled"—regardless.

This was also a denial of the United States Constitution and the Senate's treaty powers.

Besides giving Russia the Jap territory, the pact invaded the sovereign rights of our Chinese ally. It gave Russia special privileges at Port Arthur and Dairen and in control of Manchurian railroads, and it separated Outer Mongolia from China. Since none of this could be delivered without the consent of Chiang Kai-shek, the President agreed to "take measures in order to obtain this concurrence on advice from Marshal Stalin." So the later Chinese-Russian treaty, making good on the Big Three deal, was under this duress.

The deal was stupid, because no bribe was needed. It was more to Russia's interest than to ours that she fight Japan; because Japan was a nearer threat to her than to us, and because only by fighting could Russia get a stake in the postwar far eastern settlement. We could lick Japan without her help—and virtually did anyway.

The deal was stupid not only for us, who had a reputation of international integrity to maintain, but also for Russia. She easily could have obtained from the legal peace conference legitimate trusteeship and bases in South Saghalien and the Kuriles.

We believe the Big Three outsmarted themselves. Roosevelt and Churchill unwittingly undermined an orderly and just peace structure. And Stalin has tipped his hand to America, that he is playing a game in the Pacific of grab and ruthless power.

Is This What He Fought For?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 13, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the union prevents even a veteran doing what he thinks is a day's work. Here is the story from the Grand Rapids Herald:

WORKS TOO HARD, LOSES JOB

A 39-year-old Army veteran, with 2 years' service in the Pacific, charged Thursday he

has been deprived of his job at the Fox De Luxe Brewing Co. plant here because union workers decided the veteran worked too hard.

The veteran, Charles F. Samalot, 310 Lafayette Avenue SE., recently employed by the brewery, told Clarence Case, director of the veterans' counseling center, three union members told him his work permit card had been suspended when he approached the time clock Thursday morning.

The union, United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, and Soft Drink Workers of America, has a closed-shop agreement with the brewery.

L. R. Brand, secretary of the union's local, No. 254, verified the veterans' charges saying Samelot was "doing two men's work." The union has other charges against the veteran, Brand said, but did not offer details.

"We want to keep as many of our members working as possible," Brand explained, adding that "when somebody does two men's work he's keeping somebody else out of a job."

A hearing in the case is scheduled Saturday when E. G. McCann, the union's international representative, is due here from Detroit.

Samalot was described as "very satisfactory" by a spokesman for the brewery who said management "would like him to remain with us."

"However," said the brewery spokesman, "the union has canceled his card."

Samalot, married and the father of an 11-year-old son now ill, said he would make a fight for his job.

Although the union is independent, Local No. 254 is affiliated with the Kent County Industrial Union Council (CIO).

DAR Reply to Mrs. Luce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 13, 1946

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a letter from Mrs. Julius Young Talmadge, president general of the Daughters of the American Revolution, replying to the remarks of the lady from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE].

The matter referred to follows:

NATIONAL SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS
OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION,
Washington, D. C., February 12, 1946.

Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. RANKIN: The Honorable CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, of Connecticut, published an extension of remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, of Monday, February 4, concerning the Daughters of the American Revolution, which contained misstatements requiring correction.

It appears that Representative LUCE has attempted to secure the list of chapters and the list of members of the DAR for her personal use. She requested this list through Mr. Ernest S. Griffith, director of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

Mr. Griffith was told by letter from Mrs. Raymon C. Goodfellow, organizing secretary general of the DAR that the organization's mailing list is not available to the public.

Representative LUCE has raised the point that the DAR is required in its corporation to report annually to Congress. This is incorrect. The DAR is required to report annually to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution concerning the proceedings of its own continental congress.

Representative LUCE complains that since the mailing list of the DAR is not available to the public it is impossible for any Member of Congress "to seek the opinion of all chapters concerning the 'white artists only' clause in the Constitution Hall contracts."

That also is incorrect. Any Member of Congress can secure from national headquarters the viewpoint of chapters in upholding or opposing the rules governing Constitution Hall in accordance with customs prevailing in the District of Columbia.

If Representative LUCE, however, complains that the mailing list of the DAR is not available to those who want it for political purposes she is 100 percent correct.

Communists, radicals, propagandists, and un-American troublemakers have long sought access to the mailing list of the DAR in order to stir up strife and discord. They would like to destroy the DAR. It is the same technique used against other organizations and societies to break them up. Therefore, the DAR declines to give out its membership list to any person, even to its own members. We are sure Members of Congress recognize the need for this and approve this policy. In fact no Member of Congress with the exception of Representative LUCE has ever made a request for the mailing list of the DAR.

Representative LUCE has attempted to use the power of a Member of the Congress to secure the DAR mailing list for her use as a member of the DAR engaged in a dispute over the use of Constitution Hall. Representative LUCE is aware that no member of the DAR has access to the mailing list.

The Members of Congress know that all information concerning the activities of the DAR is available at any time and that any reasonable request will be granted.

In order to keep the record straight we respectfully ask that this letter be inserted in the RECORD.

Sincerely,

Mrs. JULIUS Y. TALMADGE,
President General.

Assistance for Central Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 13 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech recently delivered in the city of Washington by Dom Odo, Duke of Wurttenzberg, OSB, honorary chairman of the Central European Rehabilitation Association, Inc., and chairman of the International Catholic Help for Refugees and War Victims.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In 1928 I founded the Catholic underground because I was convinced at that time that we in Germany would turn either to communism or to nazism. On January 30, 1933, the very day Hitler came into power, the terror against the people who did not agree with him and against the churches started. We had no arms to resist; only a moral, mental or spiritual resistance would be possible. On April 30, 1934, I was forced to leave Germany and go to Luxemburg and from there to Switzerland. Three times I was sentenced to death by the gestapo. Other countries were then contacted for the purpose of organizing resistance; first Austria—but with no great success and later Czechoslovakia and then Poland were also contacted. In late 1939 and early 1940 we brought, through the underground, 28,000 Polish soldiers who were interned in Romania out of that country and into France.

Before the invasion of France, several German officers came to me in Switzerland with the plans for the coming offensive against the French. These plans were given to the Allies but apparently did no good. I told these officers that the offensive would be a great success but that finally the United States would step in and liberate Germany from Hitler after the collapse of France. Admiral Canaris, Chief of the German Intelligence Service (later killed by the gestapo in 1944) who hated Hitler and nazism, came to see me secretly in Switzerland. He was desperate concerning the victories of Hitler. My answer to him was that "Hitler would finally be defeated when the United States of America came into the war."

After the Pearl Harbor disaster, I told the underground "do not despair—many ups and downs will come but finally the United States will bring victory and liberation of Europe."

When the African invasion started, hopes of the underground arose; thousands of secret radio listeners were sentenced to death by the gestapo. How strong the resistance within Germany can best be shown by the following figures:

During the Nazi regime the gestapo killed 300,000 German Jews and 1,200,000 German Christians, both Catholic and Protestant. Soon reports placed the latter figure at 2,000,000 which is probably exaggerated.

Invasions of Italy and France—D-day came.

All antagonists of Hitler and nazism were full of hope—with the coming of the Allies everything would be changed for the better.

Finally came the liberation. In the east the Russians raped, killed, looted, and reports from Silesia tell that conditions are worse than Dachau and Belsen ever were. First the Russians and the Red Poles forced the German population to leave land which they had lived upon for centuries. Now the Russians and the Red Poles have a new plan—by starvation and terror they hope to force the remaining Germans into "voluntarily" leaving the country. There is no official food ration in Eastern Germany but the people manage to scrape together about one meal a day. In the eastern areas all children under 2 years of age are dead. In one Silesian town of 20,000 inhabitants 80 adults die weekly of typhoid and infant mortality has approached 100 percent.

In the city of Hof, in Bavaria, displaced persons from the Baltic States, East and West Prussia, Mecklenburg, Pommern, Poland, Silesia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and other Balkan states have been assembled here. The number runs into the millions. Among them are over 3,400,000 children, nearly all orphans since their parents have been killed or deported to Siberia to be slave laborers for the Russians.

In Wurttemberg alone French Morocco troops raped more than 40,000 women and young girls, even down to children 4 years of age. As a result venereal diseases are rampant and looting and killing took place on every hand. Similar situations took place in the French zones at Vorarlberg and Tyrolia in Austria.

Displaced persons mill aimlessly about other parts of Germany. Misery is prevalent in Norway and the Netherlands. Belgium faces many hardships and she must rebuild many of her cities and historic buildings, such as the Louvain, which were destroyed by the Nazis.

In tiny, independent Grand Duchy of Luxemburg 40 percent of the homes were destroyed by the changing tides of war. Of the

14,000 Luxemburg boys who were forcably inducted into the Nazi Army and slave-labor battalions, over 4,000 are dead and 2,000 are still missing. These are prisoners of the Soviet.

France is miserable. The lack of adequate food supplies and the fact that industry has not as yet revived has had a profound effect upon the economic life of this country and as a result, much of the continued difficulties of France are now felt by some to be due especially to the irresponsible radical elements in her Government.

In Italy hunger and starvation are events of the day. And is this the promised liberation from Hitler and nazism?

Now the peoples of Europe are beginning to say, "Under Hitler we had enough to eat, but now we are starving." The situation goes from bad to worse. The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse ride across the face of Europe.

Only one country can help—the United States, and through the United States Latin America can also participate.

Please do not permit that the peoples of Europe shall be deceived in their faith in the United States. If help to Central Europe, and especially to central Germany, are not permitted, then we have to count upon four great dangers:

1 Epidemics already now in the eastern part of Germany—typhoid and typhus have reached the epidemic proportions. These epidemics can affect United States occupation troops and even come over to these United States.

2. From hunger arises troubles, riots, and revolutions. There is the danger that more American boys might lose their lives.

3 Germans deceived in their faith of the United States will find that nazism and fascism were better. They will then say there was enough to eat under the Nazis. Then the Nazi criminals will become heroes and martyrs For when people starve, unsound philosophies and theories as fantastic as they may be, sound good to a hungry man, and he then becomes excited and returns to these fallacious ideas.

4. And, further, if the Germans are deceived in their faith in the United States they might be driven into the arms of bolshevism. They will feel that it is better to become Bolsheviks than to have their families starve to death and, so, in order to save the lives of their wives and children, they would turn to this dangerous theory. If Germany turns to communism, then also France and all other countries of Europe will so in turn. Russia will have the whole manpower and the brains of Europe for the coming fight with the United States.

All these dangers can be banned by helping the starved people in all countries of Europe without excluding any people or any country. Help is urgently needed, but it must come quickly or otherwise it is too late, and then complete disaster will fall upon the world.

No Gestapo and No Discrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 13 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask leave to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer of February 11, 1946. This editorial was written by Hon. Josephus Daniels, who was Secretary of the Navy for 8 years during President Woodrow Wilson's administration, and who more recently served as Ambassador to Mexico for more than 10 years under President Roosevelt's administration.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO GESTAPO AND NO DISCRIMINATION

Twice in recent years have visionaries, sectionalists, and bitter partisans joined forces to force inept legislation that would dig up more snakes than it would kill.

The first was the attempt to transfer the enforcement of criminal law from the individual States to the Federal Government at Washington. Lynch law shocked and infuriated good people in the North and the South. Naturally, there was demand to end this savagery and punish the perpetrators of the indefensible crime. Some good people, seeing that in some southern States punishment was not meted out to lynchers, hastened to offer a remedy that would not be ineffective. They overlooked the fact that southern governors—Bickett in North Carolina and Vardaman in Mississippi, and others—went into the ranks of would-be lynchers and saved the lives of the men charged with the most repulsive crimes. The sentiment in the South, after the horrors of reconstruction, set itself to end lynchings, which the records show were not confined to the South. White leaders and Negro leaders in the South united to end the worst of crimes, which invoked indignant people to take the law into their own hands. Not only that, but they cooperated to see that those charged with crime should be tried by the courts, and, if guilty, punished in a civilized manner. Because the repulsive crime and repulsive lynchings did not cease at once some people jumped to the conclusion that Uncle Sam should step in and oust State direction of the criminal law and take control. They drew up an antilynch Federal act and brought to bear every influence to put it on the statute books. When the Senate failed to pass that inept act, the prediction by its good and bad supporters was that the failure to put Uncle Sam in charge would be followed by an increase in lynching. But they were false prophets. Without a Federal act, lynchings have decreased to the vanishing point. Birmingham is as much opposed to lynching as Boston, and New Bern as antagonistic to the savagery as New York.

Indeed, jealous of their reputation, the southern people of both races have left no stone unturned to wipe out the crime. Unfortunately, now and then some raucous voice of partial excuse for the lynching of a brute in human form has been falsely paraded as the sentiment of that community. Though there is no difference in the attitude of good people in the North and South as to lynching, good southern people, because most lynchings have occurred in the South, are more hostile to it than those in other sections.

Unmindful of the teaching of history in the matter of lynching—proof that no Federal legislation is needed—because of some discrimination in employment, some theorists joined hands with politicians to put on the Federal statue books what they called a Fair Employment Practice Act that would prevent any discrimination by employers because of race, religion, or place of birth of their employees. Charges of discrimination have been more numerous in the North than in the South, including complaints that Jew employers discriminated against non-Jews; that gentile employers would not employ Jews; that Protestants gave the cold shoulder to Catholics, and vice versa; that white people discriminated against Negroes and that no Negro institution or concern would employ a Jap citizen or any white people if they applied. As to the South, where segregation in schools and churches has always prevailed, some of the advocates of the FEPC bill openly declared the purpose of the bill was an entering wedge to end all segregation in the South, where the Negroes are numerous. The bill also found some support because in some parts of the South, the Negroes are not given good schools, Negro teachers are underpaid, and dirty coaches sometimes are provided for Negroes by transportation companies. All parts of the South were not free from these charges. However, as Senator HOEY, of North Carolina, demonstrated by citing the improvements in this State and other Southern States, there has been steady and fine progress in recognition of the duty of the State to all its citizens, white and colored. And better conditions in health, education, and homes is the watchword and must become universal, law or no law.

The remedy of FEPC was regarded by most southerners and many others as not a remedy for discrimination, but as being as inept and unworkable as the old antilynching measure. Because of this, and because some of the supporters did not hesitate to say the act was a big stick directed at the South, the southern Senators felt justified in resorting to a filibuster to prevent its passage. Under the act, so able Senators asserted, there was opportunity for a gestapo, and the punishment of men charged with violation of its un-American provisions, without the right of trial by jury.

There is deep-seated opposition to the filibuster and the inability of the majority to promptly put their wishes into law. The opponents of the measure were embarrassed by this feeling of majority rule. Their answer was that the Senate is the only forum where the fullest and freest debate is permitted, with no cloture or other rules to prevent the consideration deemed wise when a measure of a new and drastic character is being pressed for action. Long ago, the Senate elected to continue to debate as long as Members desired to be heard. This does not always operate to the public good. It has serious disadvantages and sometimes has resulted in denial of legislation needed for the common good of the whole country, as when a few men in the Senate defeated the much-needed merchant marine bill before World War I, and the willful men prevented the arming of merchant marines to protect American ships on the high seas. On the other hand, the lack of cloture has prevented a bare majority from hastily rushing through legislation which had not the approval of the American people. The good and the bad are both present in the absence of the right of a majority within a few days under rules like the House to cut off debate and pass measures. Even so, the Senate in all its history has denied cutting off debate unless two-thirds of the Members vote for cloture. In the present instance, the advocates of the bill lacked only a few votes to invoke cloture. They would have succeeded if all who professed to favor the FEPC bill were more for it than their opponents to cloture.

It is well known that some who protested loudest for the bill were only giving it lip service and were glad to see the measure sidetracked. The southern Senators have come in for severe criticism, but at least they fought in the open and stood up to be counted and did not look both ways, as a few northern Senators are believed to have done.

The FEPC bill is dead. It died because it ran afoul of the right of the individual and the individual State and had so many openings that would have been contrary to American methods of freedom and hate of Gestapo practices. But the purpose of the sincere advocates of the measure have not been affected by the disposition of the bill. All the southern Senators declared—and most of them with perfect sincerity—that they stood as firmly against injustice and discrimination

on account of religion or race as any of its advocates. All people, North and South, should carry out of their own free-will policies of justice and fairness, without any of the discrimination that shames Americans.

The South put an end to lynching without Federal legislation.

The South must be free from unfair discrimination without Federal legislation.

Fair employment and fair compensation are essential to all people, all creeds, all nationalities, and all races.

Citation and Investiture of Leo T. Crowley as Knight Commander With Star of the Order of Pius IX

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 13 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, on January 28 I had inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, beginning at page A271, the remarks made by Cardinal Stritch at the impressive ceremony in connection with the investiture of Hon. Leo T. Crowley as knight commander with star of the Order of Pius IX. I now ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks made on that occasion by Archbishop Kiley, of Milwaukee.

There being no objection, the remarks of Archbishop Kiley were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the office which we priests are obliged to recite every day, and which is composed of passages from sacred Scripture—from both the Old and New Testaments—in yesterday's office we read, in the passage taken from St. Paul's letters to the Romans, "Give to all men their due when it is due, custom to custom, honor to whom honor is due." The church, recognizing how proper and equitable this counsel is, has followed it down through the centuries. Churches have honored rulers who, because of their beneficent rule, have manifested earnest and genuine solicitude during their reign for the spiritual and temporal welfare of the people whom they governed, thus proving themselves worthy of some recognition, and on this account the church bestows recognition of some kind on them. The same is true regarding statesmen, heads of families, and individuals who display patriotism and public-spiritedness to distinguish themselves among citizens as people of conspicuous work.

Even in other times the late Holy Father, Pius XI, honored many men who had attained preeminence in their particular field of endeavor by making them members of the Pontifical Academy of Science. Among those were several non-Catholics, one of whom, a university professor, died a few months ago in California, so that it is the policy of the church to recognize merit wherever it is found, to foster and encourage science, and to honor real scientists, but not pseudo scientists. The church, recognizing the fact that the marvels of science and their connection with the material world are something good in themselves, has always endeavored to carry on this work. What science does—and we sometimes lose sight of the fact—is to unlock that vast storehouse of treasures wherein an infinitely wise Creator has stored riches for the welfare of man. Since God is the authority of science and religion, there can be no conflict between religion and genuine science. Science is nothing else than the discovery of hidden secrets of nature's laws and in the course of time the application of those laws heretofore known only to the Creator of man. For this reason the church and God—the authority of religion and science—honor real, genuine science as powerful.

In contrast to what we see in other parts of the world, many persons in our own land, speaking in the language of today, have made good in a big way, even though they perhaps spent their youth in a country or small town and did not have the opportunities of those who were reared in the larger urban sections. Some tell us that this success, beyond their native talent and ability which is essential, is due to the fact that, coming from these sections, they are not overawed by occasion and do not take too seriously the artificial standards which often influence and handicap the city-bred man. To have respect for everyone, not because of the street on which he lives, the club of which he is a member, or the college which he attended, but because of his accomplishments and because, over all else, he is a square fellow, and to show supreme indifference as to whether his associates are in the bluebook or only in the telephone book—this attitude of mind liberates these people, who have made their way up from the bottom, from the infamous chains which often shackle the man who permits the social column of the Sunday paper to play too dominant a part in his life.

We may note in the life of Mr. Crowley, to honor and felicitate whom we are gathered here, that the impelling movement in all his actions has been fidelity to duty. Being unaffected and of straightforward character, he could never countenance or subscribe to anything that was merely for show. Thus, real fundamental things are the only objects worthy of his attention in every office entrusted to him. He gave himself wholeheartedly to each project, and, once in office, his first efforts were to determine exactly what that office required of him and then faithfully and conscientiously he carried it through to the end. For me to enumerate his achievements would be like carrying water to the ocean. His accomplishments, locally here in Madison, throughout Wisconsin and the Nation, as a statesman, giving advice and counsel during the critical period from which the Nation has now partly emerged, are well known to everyone here. In honoring him for his accomplishments and all his efforts in behalf of the enslaved peoples in the lands beyond the seas, the Holy Father was following a custom centuries old and expressed in the beginning by no less a personage than St. Paul, who said, "Render to all men their due, tribute to whom tribute is due, custom to custom, honor to whom honor is due."

My dear Mr. Crowley, may you be blessed with continued success in your undertakings and those you are called upon to assume. May you be blessed with length of days and joy in the high honor which the reigning Pontiff, Pius XII, has conferred upon you.

Inconsistent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE R. HOEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 13 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Inconsistent," which appeared in the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer, one of the leading dailies of the South.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INCONSISTENT

In the debate on the bill for a Permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, has touched the Republican supporters of that measure in a vulnerable spot.

The Senator reminded them that they had cried out most sonorously against Government bureaucracy; they had fulminated against the growing army of Federal factotums who send their snoopers into every office and factory until no businessman can any longer call his business his own.

Republicans, Senator BYRD recalled, have clamored for Government economy and have shuddered at the amount of money paid out in salaries to these hosts of meddlesome parasites on the United States pay roll.

Why then, asks the Senator, are these same Republicans so earnest in their support of this bill that would produce the granddaddy of all the bureaucracies and would result in Government snooping into private business on a grand scale that has not yet even been approached?

This bill, Mr. BYRD reminds the Republicans, provides for five commissioners with a salary of $10,000 each.

The army of investigators, inquisitors, detectives, and snoopers required to carry out its provisions can only be estimated by looking at the act itself.

It will control the right of every employer with more than six employees to hire, fire, or promote. There are 1,500,000 such employers in this country. The number of snoopers required to look into the employment practices of that many firms would run into the thousands, not to mention the examiners who would have to hear all complaints that somebody was hired, fired, or promoted because of race, religion, national origin, or ancestry.

These investigators, the Senator reminds businessmen, would have the right to enter any place of business, examine the books and pay rolls without any process of court. The bill would deny the employer his constitutional rights by forcing him in this way to give evidence against himself.

This evidence could then be used by examiners to try the employer without benefit of counsel or jury, and from the examiner's arbitrary decision there would be no appeal.

It assesses fines, imposes jail penalties, hails an employer to Federal court far from his home, and provides heavy punishment for interference with the agents in any way. This last clause is so broad that it could cover almost anything.

This is carpetbaggery with a vengeance.

It is, as Senator BYRD says, inconsistent, to put it very mildly, for the very people who have protested most vociferously against bureaucratic interference in business to promote the most arrant case of such meddling that has yet been devised.

District of Columbia Suffrage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 13 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, the Washington Sunday Star of February 10

printed an able article by Jesse C. Suter in support of the Sumners-Capper bill, now pending in Congress. I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Suter's article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUSTICE FAVORS AFFIRMATIVE REPORT—DISTRICT NEEDS VOTES, NOT STATEHOOD

(By Jesse C. Suter)

CITIZENS OF UNEQUAL STATUS AT HEART OF NATION

The Declaration of Independence lays down the fundamental truth that all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, but today at the very heart of the great American Republic 170 years after the signing of that immortal document at Independence Hall, there exist two distinct classes of American citizens, divided by the place of their legal residence.

They all live here and are engaged here in various capacities in both private and public employment. In the aggregate they probably exceed in numbers 900,000 people. In the first class, there are those who possess legal residence in a sovereign State and by reason of that fact possess the right to vote in national elections for Senators and Representatives, as well as for Presidential electors, and thus participate in the Government of their country. Second, there is another class of American citizens here who occupy a peculiarly lower political status, because they lack legal residence in a State and therefore hold allegiance to no individual State.

Because of this accident of residence, they are denied all participation in the Government of their country to which they hold sole allegiance. They are not permitted to elect Members of the two Houses of Congress or to participate in the election of President and Vice President. The only opportunity for the individual citizen to participate in the Government of the United States is through the election of Senators and Representatives who compose the Congress which is the supreme legislative power in the Nation and in its Capital.

These American citizens of this lower political status have been likened by some great statesmen to subjects of the Republic and thus really slaves rather than free men. Diligent study of the Constitution and the debates on that great document furnishes ample evidence that the failure to provide an equal political status for the people of the Nation's Capital was due to omission rather than intent. A tragic feature of this omission is that not only was it a failure to provide a definite political status for these voteless and unrepresented Americans, but it was also a failure to provide the Congress with the power to cure this anomalous situation.

It has been found that the only possible cure is through an enabling amendment to the Constitution of the United States which would give Congress the power to provide that these individual isolated Americans at the Capital be given their inherent right to vote for Members of both Houses of Congress and Presidential electors.

The Sumners-Capper proposed amendment (S. J. Res. 9, H. R. Res. 62, 79th Cong), when added to the Constitution, would simply give Congress the required additional power. It would in no way affect the political status of the District of Columbia as one of the geographical divisions of the Nation, as it would in no way diminish the exclusive supreme legislative power of the Congress over the seat of government

As the Constitution stands now the only representation by the people in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President is through the States. A provision for representation of these isolated Americans at the Capital in a distinct manner without recognition as citizens of a State comes as a shock to some people in the Congress who fear that in some unexplained, mysterious manner the District of Columbia through such representation would become a State. This fear has been raised time and again during the long years of consideration of this vital problem.

In his argument before the House Committee on the Judiciary in January, 1921, Theodore W. Noyes, chairman of the Citizens' Joint Committee on National Representation for the District of Columbia, stated: "The effect of this amendment is not to admit the District into the Union as a State, but to give the (then) 437,000 Americans residing in the 10 miles square under the exclusive control of Congress the same representation as citizens of a State in Congress and the electoral college. Not a new State, but a new political status is created or evolved.

"This amendment operates as a supplement of the 10-miles-square provision, defining explicitly in view of the changes of more than a century the political status of the residents of the Federal District. It alters the existing law of congressional and electoral college representation, and creates a new American constituency with representation in Congress and the electoral college; not a new State but a politically uplifted District of Columbia, an enfranchised 10-miles square, already created and made unique by the Constitution.

"This new factor in our scheme of National government representation may be unusual, peculiar, extraordinary, but it is not so unusual, peculiar and extraordinary as the original creation and present-day retention by the great republic of the totally unrepresented 10-miles square, a district physically within the United States, even containing its Capital, but politically outside of the United States."

The remedy proposed by the Sumners-Capper amendment is no more unique than the un-American situation which it would cure.

SUGGESTED REVISION OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary in its favorable report has proposed to amend the proposed constitutional amendment by adding the following: "The number of such members shall not exceed two in the Senate, a number in the House of Representatives equal to the number of Members of the House of Representatives to which a State having the same population as such district would be entitled, and a number among the electors equal to the sum of the number of Members which the Congress authorizes such district to have in the Senate and in the House of Representatives."

The citizens' joint committee respectfully recommends that the committee amendment be revised and clarified so that the proposed amendment to the Constitution be reported to the Senate reading as follows:

"SECTION 1. The Congress shall have power to provide that there shall be in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President Members elected by the people of the distrct constituting the seat of the Government of the United States, with such powers as the Congress shall determine. The number of such Members shall not exceed two in the Senate, a number in the House of Representatives to be determined by apportionment on the same population basis as provided for the States and a number among the electors equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the said district may be entitled. All legislation hereunder shall be subject to amendment and repeal.

"SEC. 2. This artcle shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within 7 years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress."

It is understood that Senator O'MAHONEY considers this suggested revison an improvement on the subcommittee version. This suggested revision is much clearer in its statement and is in conformity with the language of the Constitution.

NO VALID OBJECTION HOLDS TO SENATE REPRESENTATION

It is the inherent right of every American to participate in the Government of this Naton. That Government is chiefly exercised by the Congress, which is the supreme legislative authority. The Congress does not consist simply of the House of Representatives, but also of the Senate.

How can Americans in the Congress reconcile the idea of permitting some American people to be represented in the Senate while similar representation is denied to other Americans? Surely my mysterious sanctity surrounds the Senate and its Members to warrant such discrimination. The people of the District of Columbia need to be represented in bouth houses of Congress, as in no other way can they become real participants in the Government of their country. These Senators who are also Americans elected by the American people of their States, should surely be sufficiently sympathetic to see that justice is done.

There are special and general reasons for the people of the District of Columbia being represented in the Senate, aside from the exercise by Congress of the supreme legislative power. The power of the Senate to ratify treaties, to confirm Presidential appointments, etc., vitally affects the people living in the Federal District, and to deny them such representation will be to perpetuate a gross injustice.

WHY TIE THE HANDS OF A FUTURE CONGRESS?

This age-old question should be settled now by the passage of the pending joint resolution. If the power of Congress under the proposed amendment is reduced, it will simply put the burden on these voteless and unrepresented people of continuing to seek an amendment which will grant the necessary power. There seems to be no good reason why the Senate Committee on the Judiciary of the Seventy-ninth Congress should tie this matter up in such a way as to prevent the Eightieth, the Eighty-first or any other Congress from extending to these subject people by simple legislation the powers in the National Government which they need in order that they may be recognized as full-fledged American citizens.

SUGGESTED FEARS ARE GROUNDLESS

In the first place, there can be found no ground whatever for a fear that the granting of representation in the two houses of Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President would make the District of Columbia a State. If anyone will simply contrast the attributes of a State, with its Republican form of Government, its own legislature, its power to make a constitution, etc., with the entire lack of all such powers in the District of Columbia, which is and would continue to be subject to the supreme authority of the Congress, the fears will be found to be groundless.

Another fear which has been suggested sometimes is that should the Sumners-Capper amendment be approved, it would open the way for large cities of the country to demand that they also be admitted to representation. It should be borne in mind in this connection, first, that the people of these large cities are all represented in both House and Senate and in the electoral college, and

in the second place, that without any amendment to the Constitution, but by action of a State legislature and approval by Congress, any of them can be separated from their own States and admitted into the Union as sovereign States. These are points which many of the inventors of pretexts against favorable action appear to overlook.

Letter From a World War II GI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL STEWART
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 13, 1946

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Corp. Maurice A. Shade, a veteran of World War II:

A JOINT LETTER TO OUR CONGRESSMAN BY A WAR II GI WHO FOUGHT UP FRONT, NOT IN THE REAR ECHELONS, TO THE HONORABLE E. M. MOORE, SENATOR, AND THE HONORABLE PAUL STEWART, REPRESENTATIVE

MCALESTER, OKLA., *February 11, 1946.*

GENTLEMEN: I believe it has come timely for us returned War II veterans to tell Congress where we stand, what we know of Europe, and what we are finding out since our return.

I was over there so know whereof I, and my buddies, speak. Our knowledge was not learned at a pink tea in a hotel or club room, but in the fox holes where bullet and shells had no respect for person.

I've seen buddies die with the last words: God have mercy, Mom (or wife's name)—murmured from their lips.

I've helped my squad pick up buddies with their arms or legs torn off, and we did it in the heat of battle. One of my squads all are dead and I came back crippled for life.

We boys went over and fought for the "four freedoms," country, and home. And no damn politician, be they in the White House, Congress, or bureaus, is going to shear us of our heritage or change our views.

We veterans are watching, like a cat at the rat hole, to peg our candidates from the highest to the lowest office in the land. Good men will be reelected if they choose to run. But those who have and are playing into the hands of Wall Street speculators, strikers who made big money while we were in the fox holes, those who would like to make this Nation totalitarian or communistic, will lose.

By the time of the general election 6,000,000 or more of War II buddies will be back. Multiply that number by six (our mothers, fathers, wives, sisters, and brothers), you will have 36,000,000 that can beat any union, any Communist, any bureaubrats who believe in feathering their own nest and the hell with the rest.

Meat: England, France, Belgium, Holland, according to size of country, have more fat cattle than the United States, so why new meat rationing?

Wheat: Russia now has more than the United States of America. What they didn't raise they took from the countries they now control, so let Russia feed them, in place of asking that "we the people" cull our chickens, kill our cattle, hogs that the people who knifed us in the back may not starve. If that is even common sense then all of us veterans have come home shell-shocked, and we will shock them again this fall by cleaning house from the top down. Good men have nothing to fear.

If I thought that you two men had a hand in this Washington planning, I wouldn't even take the time to write you, but fight you hell-bent at the polls in 1946. So will my buddies, many of whom I have interviewed since I returned from overseas 4 months ago.

We all believe in—feed the people of our Nation first. Feed them well. Then what is left give it to Europe. We say give, because we'll never get a dime back.

We, and our folks, haven't forgotten War I and the years that followed. And how Hoover made a million out of sugar.

We haven't forgotten, will not forget, the scrap iron that the United States of America exported to Japan and the Japs returned to us in bullet-and-shell formation.

We, the veterans of War II, and our folks, will not be fooled this year by political balderdash speeches, propaganda, and radio "bull." We will pick our man, be he a Democrat or a Republican, if his past record is good, and can stand sunlight.

Please do not take personal exception to this letter unless the shoe fits. From what I hear, both of you gentlemen can be reelected unless you turn to the leftest crowd.

Be right, and fight like hell, even if you loose a congressional battle at the Capitol. Christ hated the Pharisees, cowards, "whitewashers," and double-crossers, so do we vets.

Enclosed you will find clipping which you may have already read. There are many other articles that you are making the voters' whiskers grow.

Very respectfully yours,
Corp. MAURICE A. SCHADE.
MCALESTER, OKLA.

Lumber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 13, 1946

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, those of us who reside in California and who are familiar with the serious shortage of lumber and other building materials in that State are unable to understand how our Government can continue to export large quantities of lumber abroad. In this connection, I wish to include the following self-explanatory wire just received from Governor Warren, of California, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and the cognizant Federal agencies:

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., *February 12, 1946.*
Hon. JACK Z. ANDERSON,
Washington, D. C.:

Since VE-day differentials in favor of export trade in lumber have siphoned off at least hundreds of millions of board feet of lumber urgently needed in this country and particularly in our State for home building. In spite of our protests, I am informed that Federal Government is increasing quota of exportable lumber. I have also been advised that the OPA is considering a differential on water-shipped Douglas fir which will have the result of siphoning off the remainder of our western lumber. This is unfair to the Western States and particularly California, which has absorbed a new population of 2,000,000 people during the war with very little new housing, and which has recently received over 600,000 veterans who are in distress for lack of housing. I am signing a bill submitting $1,000,000 bond issue for veterans' homes and farms, but such legislation is of little value if there is no lumber for home building. This telegram is being sent to California congressional delegation in the hope some action can be taken to make our western lumber available on fair terms to the people of the western States.

EARL WARREN, *Governor.*

"Our Choice—Decentralization of Governmental Responsibility or Government by a Centralized Bureaucracy"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HATTON W. SUMNERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 13, 1946

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, leave having been granted, I present herewith for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement made by me 21 years ago before the Rules Committee and later printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under the title "Our Choice, Decentralization of Governmental Powers, or Government by a Centralized Bureaucracy."

This statement gives a picture of the conditions then existing, 1925. It should be valuable in a comparative examination of causes, direction, and rapidity of trends, and should help to arouse even so governmentally indifferent a people as we are to a realization of what we are paying in money and in the loss of opportunity to live in a free government—what we are paying for what we have imagined we are getting for nothing.

The statement referred to is as follows:

"OUR CHOICE—DECENTRALIZATION OF GOVERNMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY OR GOVERNMENT BY A CENTRALIZED BUREAUCRACY"

(Extension of remarks of Hon. HATTON W. SUMNERS, of Texas, in the House of Representatives, Thursday, February 26, 1925)

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, leave having been obtained, there is being printed herewith, in part, copy of a resolution pending before the Rules Committee, together with a statement made before that committee with reference thereto.

I wish it clearly understood that in what is said no reflection upon the personnel of Federal bureaus and departments is intended. Whatever of criticism there may be is directed against the policy of government under which bureaucracy develops and not against those who are carrying out that policy. I hope there will be no confusion on this point.

The resolution is as follows:

"Whereas the vast increase since its organization of the territory in which the Federal Government has jurisdiction, the natural development in such territory, and the shift of new governmental responsibility to the Federal Government have created an aggregate of Federal responsibility which is overloading its machinery and rendering it increasingly difficult to discharge with efficiency and economy through the agencies at its command either its original or its acquired responsibilities, and under which increasing responsibilities it is difficult, if not impossible, to prevent the Federal Government from becoming distinctively bureaucratic in its operation: Therefore be it

"Resolved, etc."

STATEMENT OF HON. HATTON W. SUMNERS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS, BEFORE THE RULES COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman, this resolution proposes the creation of a joint committee to investigate and report back to the next Congress, if it can determine, how the Federal Government may be relieved of its governmental overload in order that it may be able thereby properly to discharge its Federal duties. That is the primary purpose. Conferences with State officials and, as far as practicable, with the people are contemplated.

Let us consider briefly the condition in which the three branches of the Federal Government find themselves at this time. First, the legislative branch.

THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

In the legislative branch of the Government gentlemen know from observation and from experience that matters of tremendous importance are acted upon without the membership, generally speaking, having had an opportunity to give the consideration which safety and good legislation require. Congress must have to do with the vast country between the oceans, from Canada to Mexico, with the Territory of Alaska extending up into the Arctic region; to the south in the West Indies are the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico; farther down is the Panama Canal Zone; out in the middle of the Pacific Ocean are the Hawaiian Islands; and on the other side of the earth are the Philippines. Congress not only has to legislate for this territory in interstate, national, and international matters, but under our present system Congress is more and more being called upon to legislate as a State legislature, going further and further into the domain of State responsibility.

There are thousands of bills coming in each session. If Congress legislates wisely it must not only study the proposed legislation, but it must know conditions in the sections of the country with which it deals. If a personal reference will be excused, during vacations I go into the country and get all the first-hand information I can. But there are several States in which I have never been. I have not been in Alaska, the Virgin Islands, the Hawaiian Islands, or the Philippines, and yet I must help legislate for them. We have our committee work; we are called upon by our constituents to aid them in getting consideration of their matters with these bureaus which we are creating; and thousands of letters must be replied to in the course of a session. It is not a question of the ability of the present membership of Congress, but of human capacity. I do not care whom the people send here, this accumulated governmental responsibility cannot properly be discharged by them. Nobody thus pressed can give the time and thought to the problems of the Federal Government which those problems require. There is not the slightest use for us longer either to deny or to undertake to hide that fact. That condition has to do not merely with efficiency but with the possibility of efficiency.

DELEGATION OF RESPONSIBILITY TO COMMITTEES

In trying to take care of the ever-increasing demands the Congress has already divided itself into what in many respects are little legislative bodies—we call them committees, but they are more than committees as committees were originally intended to function. The Members of Congress, not because they wish to do it, but because they are compelled to do it, follow to a dangerous degree the judgment of these small groups of men as distinguished from their own independent judgments based upon knowledge. It is beyond human capacity.

DEVELOPMENT OF A BUREAUCRACY

Not only that, but even with this dangerous arrangement, which increases capacity to handle volume at the sacrifice of safety, the legislative branch of the Government cannot take care of its overload, so that it makes a further sacrifice by turning over important legislative powers to the various rapidly multiplying bureaus of this Government; that is to say, the Congress will enact a general law and delegate to these bureaus the power to legislate as to details. We call their enactments rules and regulations. But in practical operation, insofar as the average citizen is concerned, they are laws. Not only that, but there is given to these bureaus the power to construe the rules and regulations which they make and the power to enforce them—the three powers of government. Contrary to our traditions, to our philosophy of government, contrary to all the things we profess to believe and against all the warnings of history, we are placing the three powers of government—legislative, executive, and judicial—into the hands of the same personnel, not one of whom is elected by the people.

Not only has that happened and is happening to a greater and greater degree each year, but, as the power delegated to these bureaus accumulates around the heads of the bureaus those nearer to direct responsibility in turn are compelled to pass them on down to subordinates and from these subordinates to other subordinates, until the point is reached where some subordinate many times removed from anybody whom the people have had the opportunity to elect goes to the private citizen carrying with him all the powers of the great Federal Government.

When he goes to that individual he does not go as one whom that individual has had a voice in selecting. He goes not as a responsible agent of popular government, responsible to the public; he goes as an appointed governor of the private citizen. As a practical proposition what can the private citizen 2,000 miles from this Capitol do to resist such an agent of the great Federal Government? That is the test. We have gone so far in increasing numbers and in increasing Federal powers that there is not, in fact, any elected person who in good conscience can be held responsible for the acts of these appointed persons. There are now around 500,000 persons scattered over this vast territory operating the machinery of the Federal Government. Only 533 of them are elected by the people, and all of them are located here in Washington, one little spot on the eastern border. There is no elected person who it can be charged, knows what the individuals of this appointed personnel are doing.

THE JUDICIAL BRANCH

Passing to the judicial branch of the Government, the thing which has happened with regard to the Federal judiciary is very interesting and indicative of what has happened with reference to the increase of governmental responsibility of the other branches of the Government. Until 1891 practically all appellate jurisdiction in the Federal system was vested in the Judges of the Supreme Court of the United States. At that time Congress created circuit courts of appeals to relieve the Supreme Court. We now have nine of such circuit courts exercising appellate jurisdiction, much of which the Supreme Court formerly had.

Notwithstanding that, the Supreme Court, in the judgment of this Congress, is compelled to have further relief and by a unanimous vote of both Houses a bill was passed by this Congress shifting much of the obligatory jurisdiction from the Supreme Court to these circuit courts of appeals. But no such possibilities of relief for the other two branches are to be found in our system. There can be but one President and but one Congress. It is true the State governors and State legislatures afford possibilities of relief, but instead of moving legislative and executive responsibility away from Washington, as we are moving judicial responsibility away from Washington, the current of movement is toward Washington, the point where the overload already is.

THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

I beg o direct your attention now to the executive branch of the Government. There is but one man belonging to that branch of the Government, the President of the United States, elected by the people, and that only in a qualified sense. Under the President there are more than 500,000 people on the Federal pay roll, operating the machinery of that one branch of the Government. I shall not discuss the element of expense, of unnecessary burden upon the taxpayers, of the system which we have developed of having the Federal officers and State officers working at the same governmental jobs, or of the policy of sending the tax gatherers into the States to collect money from the people, bringing it up to Washington and sending it back to the people from whom it was collected, or rather whatever part of it has not been eaten up by the army of nearly 600,000 Federal employees now on the pay roll, and fooling the people into the belief that they are getting something for nothing from Uncle Sam. I am talking about the result upon general governmental efficiency of this policy of concentration, without regard to cost.

Has anybody little enough sense to imagine—when the duties of the President, dealing with all sorts of international questions and great national questions are considered, with the duty to make recommendations to Congress, the duty to examine and the power to veto every bit of legislation that we pass here, the necessity to make nomination of all the chief officers, and to do hundreds of other things—that Calvin Coolidge or anybody whom God has ever created or ever will create can supervise and direct any considerable part of what is being done by these 500,000 people who are operating the executive machinery of this Government within our own territory out among the States everywhere and into the farthest corners of the earth? Of course, he does not know what they are doing. And yet he is the only elected person of all that half million people, the only one directly responsible to the people.

There is no use complaining of bureaucracy so long as the total of governmental responsibility concentrated in Washington is beyond the capacity of a government of the representative type to discharge.

When the capacity of the ordinary machinery of the Federal Government becomes overloaded, these bureaus are the only agencies to which the overload can be shifted. When these bureaus have transferred to them such powers of government as it is necessary now to place in them, and they exercise those powers without effective supervision by elected agents of the people, as is now the case, we have a great Federal bureaucracy far toward its full development, regardless of what the Constitution provides.

NATURE AND DEVELOPMENT OF OUR SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENT

In this connection I would like to say a few things with reference to our Constitution, which I believe pertinent to this consideration. I will attempt only to touch a few high points. I am convinced that much of our confusion and of our difficulty has come from our acceptance as actual facts of the mythological tales peddled over this country by Fourth of July orators and others of like sort as to the origin and nature of our system of government. These stories are all very fine and thrilling, and during our formative period were helpful, no doubt, to hold us together until we could develop into a Nation, but they are utterly hurtful and confusing since that stage of national development has passed and the serious, prosaic task of operating the governmental machin-

ery which was established has come to challenge the genius of this generation. We must get it out of our heads that the fathers established a self-adjusting, self-operating, bombproof, foolproof government. Our history runs counter to the fairy tales told to us by these Fourth of July orators. The fathers, all honor to their memory, were too wise and too patriotic to attempt so impossible a thing as is ascribed to them. They well understood—those who assembled in the State constitutional conventions and those who assembled in the Federal conventions to complete the work begun in the State conventions—they understood that written constitutions cannot create a popular government, but that popular governments create written constitutions. The fathers in 1787 understood that the constitution of popular government inheres in the nature of things; that it can no more be placed in the pages of a book than can a living human being be written into the pages of a book. What they wrote was descriptive, declaratory, interpretative, facilitatory, in a sense fixative, and was supplemental to the State constitutions which had already been adopted.

Insofar as our Constitution is written, and in the sense that it is written for each citizen, it is to be found in the document called the constitution of his State; there is where most of his constitution is to be found; and in the Federal Constitution. They are parts of the same thing. In theory, no; in fact, yes. We have passed the theorizing stage and are dealing with the facts of government now.

I am taking a little time here, because I am convinced that there are a few basic things which we must get straightened out before we can properly consider what we should do in our present circumstances or how to do it.

Our Constitution within historical times has been in process of development under natural law since the second century. I cannot cover that. It is an important thing, however, to have in mind. As a bearing upon our own task, it is necessary for us to have in mind also that in our own country we have passed through two periods and are now in the third. It would be more exact to say that we have passed through one period and are in the second. The colonial period was in fact a part of the formative period of our separate national development.

During the formative period of our National Government, of any national government, where different territorial units are brought together into one governmental organization, there is tremendous pressure from the inside outward. During that period strength moves—it seems to move naturally—to the point of weakness. That is the period of concentration of governmental power, naturally and properly so.

A constitution, written words, can never hold within itself the element of cohesive strength, especially among a people whose philosophy of government was, as expressed in the words of the Declaration of Independence, which became the battle cry of the colonies, that governments "derive their just powers from the consent of the governed."

During that period the Constitution acted as does the tape of the horticulturist, binding parts of different plants together. But the tape does not unite. It can only hold in proper adjustment and give nature a chance. Our Federal Constitution held exactly that relationship during the formative period of our National Government.

I do not know when we had grown together, but it is clear from the views expressed with reference to the annexation of Texas that by 1843 no minority of States in point of military strength could have left this Union without a civil war. If New England had undertaken to separate, we of the South would have joined with the other sections of the country to coerce those States back into the Union. There was one great weakness. I do not want to inject a matter that may raise controversy, but the tariff and slavery together helped to put an element of weakness between the two great sections, North and South. Those issues were as foreign substances between the sections. There was not the possibility of complete union between those sections until slavery at least was gotten rid of. At every other point there had been complete union. The States of these sections had united, but the sections had not. Suffice it to say that the Union of the States is now a fact. The first period is now history. We have reached the point where no controversy can ever again reach through to test the strength of the Federal compact, whatever it may be. We are a Nation, created not by words nor Federal compact, but by nature. To all practical purposes we have ceased even to have a dual system of government. I know gentlemen will question that. I am just stating my judgment.

We have a system of government, a Nation, a part of the governmental power of which is lodged in the municipality, part in the smaller units of government, part in the county, part in the State, and part here. In its construction it was built from the smallest unit upward. It functions from the bottom upward. That is its nature. We seem to have overlooked that fact. We are trying to operate it from the top downward. It cannot be done.

OUR RESPONSIBILITY

Our duty now and our responsibility is entirely different from that of those who in the constitutional conventions undertook to recognize and to declare the fundamental laws of popular government and to set up the machinery through which such a government may properly function. Our duty and our responsibility is also entirely different from that which obtained during the period when it was a question whether the central government—I do not use that designation in an exact sense—could hold the States together until they could grow together and thus form a nation. That has been an accomplished fact, at least since the Spanish-American War.

We now have no further need for our very interesting mythology. I do not underestimate its former usefulness. Of the composite virtues, magnified, of the great men who wrought in that period, we builded a national shrine around which all the people of all the States could gather. That helped to strengthen at the point of weakness. I would not detract from those men or lessen in the slightest degree popular love and gratitude for them, but I would put them where they belong, upon a sane, humanly possible, historically true basis. That would better enable us truly to honor them by preserving the fruits of their labors and the heritage of centuries of governmental development, which, in a very definite sense, they transmitted to us.

Popular governments grow as a tree grows. Man can help but he can not create, and he can help only when he works in harmony with nature. Not only must those who establish the visible evidences of a popular government and provide its functioning machinery work in harmony with natural law, but those who operate that machinery must do that thing also. We seem to have overlooked that fact. We seem to have overlooked the fact that everywhere there is law which directs and limits human discretion. The physician recognizes it. The farmer recognizes it. The builder recognizes it, and those who operate the machinery of this Government must begin to recognize it. We will have to face about. Nature compels respect for her plan as much by the limitation imposed upon human capacity as by the capacities given to human beings. When the limit of human capacity is reached, that is the end of argument.

Is there anybody in position to know the facts—Democrat, Republican, Socialist, or what not—who does not know that the total of governmental responsibility concentrated at Washington is beyond human capacity to discharge through any agency susceptible of popular control?

REACTIONARY MOVEMENT

Gentlemen, the present direction of movement is not progress. It is reaction; I do not care what sort of brand the individual puts upon himself who advocates it. I lay down this proposition, sound in theory, sound in governmental philosophy, and established by history, that after the completion of the formative period of a popular government, all true governmental progress, by the very nature of that system of government, must be in that direction which moves governmental power away from the central governmental agency where it accumulates during the formative period back toward the people into those governmental agencies more directly and more completely under popular control. The reasons for that are not founded in theory; they are founded in necessity. We face that necessity now. That is why I have introduced this resolution. This is not left to the will of statesmen. It is fixed in the economy of nature. Popular government is not an accident. It is necessary for human development, and nothing necessary for human development is left to chance. Human respect for nature's plan is secured by natural laws which human beings must respect or pay the penalty. We are paying the penalty not only here but in the States.

DESTROYING STATE EFFICIENCY

We are not only destroying the efficiency of our system of government at the Federal end by an overloaded governmental machinery, but we are destroying the efficiency of the States. If we want to destroy the States as virile, efficient agencies of popular government, there could be no more effective method than our present policy of taking from them the necessity to discharge the powers that rest naturally within the scope of their governmental jurisdiction. That is what we are doing and doing largely by State and popular surrender as distinguished from Federal usurpation. That is a most remarkable fact. Can anybody question that the States are losing their dignity, their independence, their importance, and their vigor as sovereign units of government when he sees them bereft of responsibility, begging at the door of the Federal Treasury? That is not a beautiful figure. It is not a beautiful fact, either. There are exceptions as to individual States and as to individual officials of States, but this is true generally, not only as to States but as to the citizenship of the States.

That is not all. We are not only destroying the efficiency of the Federal Government by the overload, and the vigor and governmental capacity of the States by this process, but we are doing a far-greater harm than that. By taking governmental responsibilities from those units of Government that are close to the people we are taking from the private citizens the necessity of a more direct grapple with the problems of their Government, which problems and the necessity to work them out in good providence come to develop them for the bigger responsibilities of tomorrow.

SYSTEM DEPENDENT UPON GOVERNMENTAL CAPACITY OF CITIZENS

If this system of government is to endure, it must depend for its strength in the crises that are to come not so much upon its laws or upon the written provisions of its Constitution, or even upon the capacity of

men in official position, but upon the virtue and the governmental capacity of its private citizenship. The present policy of creating a feeling of dependence upon a great central government is not calculated to develop such a citizenship. It is the sense of responsibility that sobers judgment, that develops civic virtue; it is the strength which comes from the struggle, from the grapple with the difficulties incident to the operation of a system of popular government which gives capacity. Nor can the lesson, taught by the penalty imposed for mistakes made, be dispensed with. How can we hope to develop a citizenshhip capable of dealing with the greater difficulties of tomorrow when we are constantly moving the power and responsibility, the necessity to govern, away from the people, away from those units of Government wherein the private citizen has the more direct control and the larger share of responsbility? We have turned our backs on the lessons of history and are trying to operate our system of Government from the top downward, in violation of the laws of its nature, and in violation of the laws of human nature as well.

I do not care what the form of that government is, I do not care what the political philosophers say; if you injure the governmental capacity of the people, you strike at the foundation of governmental strength and at the ability of the people to protect their right against governmental and private oppression. We have not only to stop concentration, but we have to begin an intelligent decentralization of governmental responsibility.

Whatever may be thought of the other reasons which I have given, there is one reason which no informed person will question either as to the fact or as to its sufficiency. This Federal Government has accumulated a total of governmental responsibility which is beyond human capacity to discharge through any governmental agency susceptible of popular control. I do not know whether or not what I have proposed would do any good. I believe it is the way to begin. I believe that if a joint committee were created to study our problems from the Federal end, to confer as I have indicated with State officials, to go really to the bottom of this situation and let the people of this Nation know the truth, it would help. We have not been telling them the truth about this situation, because men do not like to go home to their respective constituencies and confess their lack of knowledge or the limit of their capacity. We are too much like a certain type of the old-fashioned school teacher who seemed to have the idea that they had to impress their students that all knowledge was an open book to them. I am willing to admit the truth when I say that important items of legislation pass through this Congress, with regard to which I have very imperfect information, because it is the fact.

Mr. BERTRAND. Have you any plan in mind?

Mr. SUMNERS. As indicated in this resolution. I know we cannot drift along this way; I know this Federal Government is today more bureaucratic than it is representative, and is drifting more rapidly each day in that direction. I am not unmindful of the difficulties before us. It is a big job. It is getting bigger all the while. The quicker we move the less will be the task. We can do it because it has to be done. Things which have to be done can be done.

I do have some ideas as to how to start, but I do not believe it would be good strategy for me to indicate now how I think this thing should be done. I mean decentralization brought about. I will say this: It cannot be done—I am speaking now as a practical proposition—unless the people will that it be done. Of that I am certain. That was had in mind when the resolution was framed. I have the most profound confidence in the capacity of the people of the United States to operate a system of self-government if those with official responsibilities will discover the facts and tell them the truth. I do not underestimate the importance and the necessity of wise leadership. If the material for such leadership is not here now, it is in the body of the citizenship and can and will be sent here when the facts are made known to them.

The CHAIRMAN. The general proposition with you is that you want someone to study the situation that has grown up here of concentration of power at Washington. That is the general idea?

Mr. SUMNERS. Yes, sir; and to confer with State officers. This matter has to be handled as much at the State end as here. There is no use of the States deploring the loss of powers to govern unless they exercise the powers they have. They have to stand on their own legs. They can not hold the strength they have, much less grow stronger, by leaning on the Federal Government in matters which lie within their governmental capacity.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no question but that this is a very important proposition and so considered by very many Members of the House. It is an interesting study and will take a lot of time to accomplish definite results.

Mr. NELSON. You would have to delegate a great deal of power to people who are not responsible.

Mr. SUMNERS. Yes. And if we could get rid of non-Federal matters which destroy the possibility of supervision, it would be all right to do that.

There are some things the Federal Government ought to do which it is not doing, but which under its present overload Members of Congress hesitate to commit the Federal Government to do. We hesitate to place more power in these bureaus because not only do we create these bureaus and turn over to them these powers but the little group of elective agents of the people are so busy with responsibilities, which cannot be shifted, that they cannot supervise or control for the people what is being done by the appointed personnel which operates these bureaus. We are not only turning over the governmental powers to an appointed personnel, but to an unsupervised personnel. They are becoming with tremendous rapidity not agencies of popular government effectuating the public will but the unsupervised actual governors of the people, not only expending their money but exercising over them the most absolute and far-reaching governmental powers. Somebody elected by the people may find out about things that are done months and years afterwards, more often never at all. There are things which this Federal Government ought to do and would do if it could get rid of those things which the States can do, which are cluttering up the whole Federal machinery.

Mr. NELSON. What the gentleman said was enormously true during the war. One lieutenant somewhere could bind the Government in a marvelous way.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Gentlemen, the plain facts about the matter are that we have made an awful mess of our job. It was the business of the fathers to establish this system of government and it is ours to operate it. They established the machinery for a system of government with such a distribution of governmental powers as to render it susceptible of popular control, and we, with a rapidity unequaled in the governmental history of the world, by a concentration of those powers, are converting that marvelous system into a great Federal bureaucracy—a type of government in many respects the least efficient, the most expensive, the most susceptible of corruption and of tyranny of any of the known systems of government. Nobody can deny that. Is that not an important fact? Is it not time we were giving that fact earnest patriotic consideration?

Regardless of who is responsible for the condition in which we find ourselves, whether the Congress in not having more vigorously resisted the pressure for centralization or the State governments in not having insisted on the retention of their powers, or the people in having urged their representatives in Congress to function for them in shifting these governmental responsibilities, we face a situation which requires the united, cooperative effort of the people and of their officials—State and Federal.

It is my opinion that in one way or another responsibility is fairly well distributed. I will accept mine and have no time to quarrel with those who say they have none. I am trying to help deal with this situation. I feel confident that if a joint committee should be created and during this coming vacation devote itself to a study of our general governmental problems and of our governmental resources, consult with State officials, and, wherever opportunity presents itself, with citizens of the country, and formulate a clear statement presenting the situation as it is, I believe—I am certain to whatever degree judgment can give me certainty—that great good would result. Gentlemen, the general attitude of the public mind gives promise of helpful cooperation at this time. This is the time to act.

The Merger Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED. V. IZAC

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 1946

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article appearing in the February issue of Naval Affairs:

THE MERGER ISSUE

No group of people in this great country are more interested in matters affecting the national security than the members of the Fleet Reserve Association. Our interest is attested by the fact that we have dedicated the most vigorous years of our lives to serving our country in peace and in war, and even though we now wear civilian clothing and are engaged in many and diverse business and professional vocations we have a common bond in our loyal and affectionate sentiment for the service whose uniform we wore.

One of the most vital issues before the Nation today is the question of merging the existing Army and Navy into one department under a single Cabinet head. Despite the importance of this proposal public reaction is inclined to be apathetic, probably because other matters such as demobilization, strikes, and economic legislation have more immediate appeal to the civilian mind. However, this attitude of indifference cannot be entertained by citizens with our own background of service to our country.

The proposal to merge the armed forces into one department is not new. It has appeared and reappeared in various forms over the past century, both in this country and in England. Legislation has been introduced in the Congress from time to time to effect such a unification, but the evidence of advantages to be gained has never had sufficient weight to convince the Congress and the people that they should discard a winning combination for an organization which has never proved successful in any country where

it has been used. Now that we have successfully fought the greatest war in the history of mankind by the cooperation and coordination of effort of our magnificent Army and Navy, backed by the organized productive resources of our industry, we find proponents of the merger making extravagant claims that the job could have been done better, more efficiently, and more cheaply as a single department of the Government.

Always bearing in mind that our interest and our intent is to advocate and support any measure which will strengthen the national security, it is pertinent to examine any proposal which claims to achieve that goal. Also we should guard against broad and general statements which claim sweeping advantages without showing how the end is to be attained. When a man claims that he can do any job better than it has been done before and still save 25 cents out of every dollar previously expended, we believe that he should show in detail just how he proposes to effect such saving. We believe that the proposals to merge the Army and Navy should be examined in just that light, a calm, impersonal, and judicial examination to determine where increased efficiency and economy will result from such a measure.

The Honorable James Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy, is a gentleman of unquestioned ability and integrity. He has made an outstanding success in the business world and has rendered distinguished service to the country in his posts as Under Secretary and later as Secretary of the Navy. When Senator DAVID I. WALSH, chairman of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee, requested Mr. Forrestal's views on the proposals to unify the armed services into a single department the Secretary applied an accepted principle of the business world in approaching the question * * * he secured the services of a well-qualified and impartial civilian, Mr. Ferdinand Eberstadt, to study the question to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the existing structure and to make recommendations as to steps to be taken to strengthen the national security. As a result of Mr. Forrestal's action the Eberstadt report stands as the only exhaustive and scientific study which has been made available to the Congress as to the advantages and disadvantages of our existing system.

Without going into the details of Mr. Eberstadt's excellent and exhaustive study his conclusions and recommendations may be stated briefly:

CONCLUSIONS

(a) That unification of the War and Navy Departments under a single head would not improve our national security.

(b) That the weaknesses of the existing structure are defects of coordination; gaps between foreign and military policy—between the State Department and the Military Establishments; gaps between strategic planning and its logistic implementation—between the joint chiefs of staff and the military and civilian agencies responsible for industrial mobilization; gaps within and between the military services—principally in the field of procurement and logistics; gaps in information and intelligence, between the executive and legislative branches of our Government, between the several departments, and between the Government and the people.

RECOMMENDATIONS

(a) That the military forces be organized into three coordinate departments, War, Navy, and Air, each headed by a civilian Secretary of Cabinet rank, supported by a civilian Under Secretary and such Assistant Secretaries as may be necessary, and commanded by a military officer.

(b) That a National Security Council be established to afford a permanent vehicle for maintaining active, close, and continuous contact between the departments and agencies of our Government responsible, respectively, for our foreign and military policies and their implementation.

(c) That legislation provide for the continuation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff which should include among their duties:

(1) Preparation of strategic plans and strategic direction of the military forces of the United States;

(2) Preparation of joint logistic plans and assignment to the services of logistic responsibilities, in accordance with such plans; and

(3) Approval of major requirement programs—material and personnel—of the services in accordance with strategic and logistic plans.

(d) The creation of a National Security Resources Board in order that there may always exist an organization ready and able to implement military plans in the industrial mobilization and civilian fields.

(e) The encouragement of scientific research and development by the appointment of an Assistant Secretary for each branch of the services to head research particular to that service and to cooperate with and link military and civilian research.

(f) The creation and training of the Army, Navy, Air Forces, and Marine Corps to insure their integration into a balanced program designed to instill a mental attitude of cooperation and alert understanding of the many-sided character of modern war, without impairing technical proficiency or the morale which grows out of tradition and service pride.

(g) The creation of a Central Intelligence Agency to collect, analyze, evaluate, and disseminate intelligence information to all agencies of the Government.

In forwarding his study, Mr. Eberstadt stated that prior to undertaking the task he had generally favored a single department, and it is pertinent that his opinion was changed by his careful examination of all phases of the complex structure. It is quite probable that many people of the country who do favor a single department have been swayed in their decisions by the broad and sweeping claims of greater efficiency and economy of one organization and that unification will in some obscure manner cure all the existing deficiencies and defects in the present separate departments.

Current comment in the press indicates that the subcommittee of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, which is drafting legislation to provide for one Department of Common Defense, is disposed to accept some of the important features of the Navy plan for national security, including the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Central Research and Development Agency. If this information is correct, little remains to be done toward reconciling the divergent views of the two services as to the details by which full coordination can be effected. However, there remains the basic and vital question of one Department with one Secretary and one Chief of Staff of the Armed Forces as contained in the proposal being considered by the subcommittee as opposed to three Departments with three Secretaries and the Joint Chiefs of Staff composed of the chief military officers of the three services advocated by the Eberstadt recommendation and in only slightly different form by the Navy plan for national security.

Concentration of the responsibility for the operation of all the armed forces of the Nation in one Secretary in the Cabinet is too big a job for one man. During the recent hostilities we had 11,000,000 persons in uniform and were expending 80 percent of the National Budget; under these conditions, the Secretaries of War and Navy were tremendously overburdened men, yet under the present proposal their combined responsibilities would be heaped upon one man. We believe that in 1950 we will be expending 30 percent of our National Budget for the armed forces, and we believe that the job will still be too big for one man. In addition, we question the ability of one man to insure that the interests of three services are treated with equal adequacy and moderation, and believe that any conflict of policies can be resolved more advantageously for the best interests of the Nation by three men than by one.

We view with concern the proposal to establish a chief of staff of the armed forces, for we believe that such a concentration of military authority in one individual will destroy the balance which must exist between all military arms in modern warfare. We have witnessed the defeat of two powerful nations—Germany and Japan—who placed their fate in the hands of imperial general staffs dominated by one service * * * that the domination in both instances was by Army officers is not pertinent to the point at issue, for domination by any one service will surely result in unbalanced decisions in the conduct of modern war. And modern warfare demands, as does no other human problem, the ultimate in coordination, cooperation, and teamwork from all participants.

As members of the Fleet Reserve Association we advocate the best, and only the best, organization of our armed forces which can be conceived by the leaders of our country. We do not want to be sold something of unproven worth on the strength of unsubstantiated claims that it will eliminate all inefficiency and waste. We do want to effect such reorganization of our existing system as is necessary to bring it up to date and remedy recognized weaknesses brought to light during the war, but we prefer to retain a two- or three-department organization until someone can guarantee against the mistakes of armed forces dominated by one service which so surely led to the defeat of France under Napoleon, Germany under Wilhelm II, and again under Hitler, and Japan under Tojo.

Instruction of German Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT M. COLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 1946

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I herewith submit the following:

We, the student council of Hamlin Rural High School, Hamlin, Kans., do hereby entreat you, our popular Representative to the Halls of the Federal Government, that you do all in your power without any reservation whatsoever to see that the children of Germany receive instruction in the democratic way of life by teachers who firmly believe this philosophy to be the only one which will give us world peace and freedom from fear for ourselves and our children yet unborn.

We, the members of the student council of Hamlin Rural High School, of Hamlin, Kans., herewith affix our signatures and recommend that the student body also sign.

Gerald Hanson, President, Student Council; Butch Musselman, Senior President and Council Member; Julie Schilling, Junior Council Member; Maxine Arnold, Sophomore Council Member; Jimmy Burgert, Freshman Council Member; Wayne A. Meyer; Newt Barnes;

Cis Barnes; Rachel L. Pyles; Jo Anne Pyle; Stanley Charles; Paul Armstrong; Floyd Titus; Floyel Armstrong; Austin Heise; Jack N. Pyle; Stanley Trull; Bill Arnold; Dewey Pyle; Evelyn Wood; Joan Hanson; Georgia Titus; Eleanor Bates; Helen Shields; Valeta Burgert; Patricia Kay Burgert; Molly Barnard; Bill Schilling; Lavern Whaley; Raymond Rison; Lawrence Puvogel; Jean Devine; Webb Guilliam; Marvin Puvogel; Victor Abby; Robert Meyer; Marjorie Miller; Kenneth Bauman; Virginia Burgert; Raymond Puvogel; Russell Sauver.

FEBRUARY 1, 1946.

Alexandria Labor Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. SAVAGE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 1946

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, the following letter from the editorial page of the Washington Post of February 10, 1946, written to the editor, states that only 3,000 out of 65,000 citizens vote. If these figures are correct it means that less than 5 percent of the people vote. The letter implies that the Alexandria courts and judges are controlled by machine politics. The person who wrote the letter seems to know what he is talking about.

Such things as this is the reason workers are opposed to the poll tax. Such things as this is why the workers of America take political action and I venture to say we are going to see more of it in the future.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the letter, I include a news article from the Washington Daily News of February 12, 1946, about the Alexandria labor case. Besides being interested as an American in the principles involved, I am a Virginia taxpayer. I own a home very close to Alexandria. I often hear my neighbors over there say, "they will not pay a poll tax to vote because they believe it is a travesty on their American rights." The letter and the news article are as follows:

[From the Washington Post of February 10, 1946]

"JUSTICE" IN ALEXANDRIA

Equal justice under law—the noble sentiment carved in stone above the entrance to the Supreme Court of the United States—the ideal for which Americans have fought in every war—becomes a hollow mockery when workingmen are hailed into the courts of Alexandria.

An Alexandria police judge sentenced two labor leaders to 3 months in jail and fines of $550 apiece and 3 years good behavior. Their names are unimportant. What is important is that on the same day the court fined two persons $25 and $50, respectively, plus a suspended 30-day jail sentence, on other charges of disorderly conduct when convicted of beating another with an axe and a beer bottle.

What is also important is that the president of the Central Labor Union has been pointing his finger at the rottenness of machine politics in Virginia. Particularly he objected to the machine putting labor stooges on the State pay roll and then encouraging them to take over central labor unions.

According to eyewitnesses the "machine" stooges advanced from the rear of the hall and jumped on the secretary and beat him. The action was well coached and concerted. This sort of thing is old hat and routine for "machine" politicians and their henchmen. Only this time the cure didn't take. The secretary had boxed in college, had been an amateur champion and had worked his way through Catholic University in Washington by boxing, and so the tables were turned.

Unable physically to whip the secretary, they called on their mentors, the machine politicos. They swore out warrants, charging the secretary, whom they attacked, and the president, who had rapped for order and hadn't left his chair, with assault.

No counterwarrants could be secured by the secretary and president though their attorney went as high as the Commonwealth attorney. No one who knew the courts of Alexandria with its machine-controlled judges had any doubt of the outcome of the trial. They knew the men would be found guilty. But the severity of the sentence is astounding.

Only in a lynch court in a city where 3,000 carefully chosen citizens vote out of 65,000 citizens can such grave miscarriages of justice occur.

This isn't Berlin or Tokyo "justice" which I am writing about, remember, but "justice" in Alexandria, Va.

AMERICAN.

WASHINGTON, *February 7.*

[From the Washington Daily News of February 12, 1946]

FEELING RUNS HIGH IN ALEXANDRIA LABOR BATTLE

Participants in Alexandria's explosive political-labor fight started when two AFL leaders were given heavy sentences for assaulting a Virginia labor inspector at a union meeting last month, today indicated storm warnings will be kept flying for at least another month while a new trial date is being set.

A motion by Defense Attorney Maurice D. Rosenberg of Alexandria, asking for postponement of the hearing until March 11, when a new term opens, was granted by Alexandria Corporation Court yesterday. Mr. Rosenberg plans a vacation of several weeks in Florida because of ill health.

Defendants George D. Hardman, 39, president of Alexandria Central Labor Union, and James C. Turner, 29, delegate to the AFL central body, were sentenced to 3 months in jail and fines of $550 each on three assault charges filed by J. Fred Kirchner, 30, labor inspector of northern Virginia and former president of Alexandria CLU. The fracas occurred at a union meeting January 7.

Public Land Grazing Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. P. CARVILLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 13 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. CARVILLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to me under date of January 17, 1946, by the central committee, Nevada State Grazing Boards, dealing with public land grazing policies, together with a statement on the same subject.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CENTRAL COMMITTEE,
NEVADA STATE GRAZING BOARDS,
Reno, Nev., January 17, 1946.

Hon. E. P. CARVILLE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Enclosed is a copy of a statement on public land grazing policies adopted at a meeting of this committee in Reno, January 11, to which rancher organizations of practically every region of Nevada sent representatives.

The following is an attempt to briefly outline the viewpoint of the stockmen as expressed at the meeting:

FOREST SERVICE

Those presently in charge of this Federal agency seem to have decided that it has moved too slowly in the past to adjust grazing use of a number of range allotments in line with their ideas of range capacity. To make up for the past they feel that reductions in numbers of livestock actually grazed in 1945 of as high as around 30 percent are necessary. In addition it is conceling many nonuse permits. Following strong complaints by the range users, they are now showing a disposition to spread these reductions, to some extent, over 2 or 3 years.

The range users feel that:

In too many cases, inexperienced officials are trying to determine grazing capacity without any real knowledge of the regions concerned.

That instead of calling the users and other local interests together to help work out the problem in some organized practical manner, with least possible upset to the users' dependent property investments and the local tax and business structures, the Forest officials are merely using their arbitrary powers to force through these reductions, regardless of their ruinous economic results to the users and the local economies concerned.

That, if such ruinous policies are applied now to the individual users presently concerned, they soon will also be applied to users in general, with no apparent end in sight since no definite assurances so far are forthcoming from the officials that additional reductions will not be applied to place new users on the ranges or that overuse of ranges by big game will be controlled.

That the spreading of these heavy reductions over 2 or 3 years merely means a short postponement of their ultimately ruinous effects.

GRAZING SERVICE

To avoid repetition, am advising that, in general, the same situation as outlined above exists in the efforts of the Grazing Service to adjust livestock grazing use to range capacity on grazing districts through its so-called work-sheet plan and in some cases by officials with little or no experience with actual conditions in the regions affected and with the attitude of forcing through their theories without regard for the collective opinions of the users concerned.

UNITED STATES LAND OFFICE

At the Ely, Nev., grazing-fee hearings the end of May 1945, the Grazing Service Director promised that no further areas would be included in grazing districts without local meetings and majority vote. Then the Land Office representatives stated that if the vote was against grazing districts they would apply the lease plan of section 15 of the Taylor Act.

The stockmen affected feel that this confronts them with the threat of being forced, whenever the Grazing Service chooses to hold the local meetings, to have their ranges go under either one or the other of the two

plans. They fear the grazing-district plan because of the trouble it has brought in the areas where it is being applied. They fear the lease plan because they do not know what it may mean under the broad, autocratic powers available to the Secretary of the Interior under the said section 15. Many of them have had experience under the broad, autocratic-power plan of range regulation by the Forest Service and want no more such plans.

They do not believe that as it originally was and still is written by Congress section 15 was intended to apply to the big range areas such as theirs. This section provides that it shall apply only to areas that are so situated as not to justify their inclusion in grazing districts. The fact that the Grazing Service has been trying to put these areas in grazing districts even against the will of the users, proves to the stockmen that that Government bureau feels they are so situated as to justify inclusion therein and that the only reason they are not in is because the local users have voted against it. They cannot understand how the Land Office, after the Grazing Service has decided the areas are so situated as to justify inclusion in grazing districts and have tried to get the local users to vote them in, can then turn around and put the areas under section 15 because it, as another bureau, chooses to feel they are not so situated as to justify inclusion in grazing districts. Either they are or they are not. If they are, then what is the Land Office's reason for trying to force the section 15 lease plan upon them? If they are not, why is the Grazing Service trying to put them in grazing districts?

IN GENERAL

The stockmen feel that they have but one chance for relief in all these matters affecting Forest Service, Grazing Service, and Land Office policies, this being a congressional investigation of this whole matter of public land and grazing policies; that unless Congress will take steps to hold up the application of these policies and provide for their investigation the officials of the bureaus concerned will force their will upon and ruin their dependent investments beyond hope of recovery.

They also feel, with opportunity to prepare their case and have it heard before an authorized congressional committee, ways can be found to solve the problems concerned in sensible and practical manner with a minimum of injury to the future of their enterprises and the entire economies of their regions.

They also feel, if Congress will not or cannot find a means of speedily holding up application of these arbitrary ruinous policies by the bureaus concerned, that their Nevada congressional delegation should work together to hold or tie up their appropriations so that no part of these could be expended to carry on these harmful policies in those regions of Nevada concerned.

The stockmen also understand that the President of the United States, under a recent grant by Congress, now has the power to put both grazing district and forest grazing administration under either the Forest or Grazing Services and that the Secretary of Agriculture, who now has the Forest Service in his Department, recently has stated that he soon also would have the Grazing Service, which now is in the Interior Department. The stockmen feel that since they are the users and since their lifetime endeavors in the way of developed, dependent land and water holdings are at stake, they should have opportunity to be heard before any such action is taken. They therefore are asking the members of their congressional delegation to place this matter before the President as quickly as practicable.

As will be observed from the signatures to the enclosed statement, original of which is on file here, there have been few, if any, occasions upon which so representative a group of range users of Nevada ever conferred upon and joined in a statement of this kind.

For the Central Committee of Nevada State Grazing Boards.

VERNON METCALF,
Consultant to the Committee.

STATEMENT REGARDING PUBLIC LAND GRAZING POLICIES

Firmly convinced that the Forest and Grazing Services both are employing, in many cases, in Nevada, arbitrary and high-handed methods in their administration of grazing on forest and grazing district lands, especially in the matter of ruinous reductions in grazing permits and without proper steps to give the grazing users fair opportunity to help work out the problems confronted in a way which will not cause such disastrous economic results to the investments in their settled holdings and the business and tax structures of their local communities and that the United States Land Office is threatening to apply an autocratic and arbitrary system of range leases on the open domain, contrary to the letter and intent of the Federal statutes, we, a group representing grazing users of all forest, grazing district and open domain grazing regions of Nevada, in meeting at Reno, Nev., this 11th day of January 1946, under the auspices of the central committee of Nevada State grazing boards, respectfully petition and strongly urge all Members of our congressional delegation to do everything within their power to secure a deferment in the application of these ruinous actions on the part of the Forest and Grazing Services and United States Land Office, and to arrange as speedily as possible for a congressional investigation of our country's entire public land and grazing administration policies, with public hearings in the public land regions where the grazing users and other interests directly concerned can have opportunity to appear and be heard.

We feel that if the arbitrary practices of the said Federal agencies just cannot be curbed in any other manner, our congressional delegation should take steps under which no part of the annual appropriations granted said agencies by Congress would be available for carrying on their activities in this State until the problems involved can be properly investigated.

In the event that he should consider consolidation of the Forest and Grazing Services we hereby petition the President of the United States to first consider the wishes of the grazing users concerned.

Central Committee of Nevada State Grazing Boards, Reno, Nev., by Fred Strosnider, temporary chairman, Yerington, Nev.; E. R. Marvel, Battle Mountain, Nev.; W. M. Gilmer, Wells, Nev; Clyde Mathews, Panaca, Nev.; W. L. Blackwell, Coleville, Calif.; Gordon Griswold, Elko, Nev.; Irving H. Cowles, Reno, Nev.; Lincoln County Livestock Association, Pioche, Nev.: By P. A. Delmue, J. A. Wadsworth, John H. Conaway, C O. Bastian, Dan Stewart, Delegates; Nevada State Cattle Association, Elko, Nev.: By W. M. Gilmer, A. J. Dewar, Delegates; Nevada State Farm Bureau, Reno, Nev.: By Geo. F. Ogilvie, President; United Sheep and Cattlemen's Association, Ely, Nev.; By Geo. N. Swallow, C. E. Horton, John W. Cole, Delegates; Eureka County Livestock Association, Eureka, Nev.: By A. C. Florio, R. J. Wright, Delegates; Western Nevada-High Sierra Livestock Association, Mindon, Nev.: By Norman T. Annett, Warren Simpson, Steve Landa, Delegates; Paradise Valley Cattle Association, Paradise Valley, Nev.: By Geo. J. Miller, Delegate; Livestock Division, Nevada State Farm Bureau, Reno, Nev.: By Geo. J. Miller, Chairman; North Toiyabe Cattle Association, Austin, Nev.: By Howard Akins, Roy A. Brown, Delegates; South Toiyabe and Nye County Livestock Associations, Tonopah, Nev.: By Jim Butler, Chairman; Esmeralda County Livestock Association, Gold Point, Nev.: By Jim Daniels, Delegate; Eastern Nevada Wool Growers Association, Ely, Nev.: By Lloyd Sorensen, President; Jack Bordoli, Tonopah, Nev., D. C. Robison, Ely, Nev., W. S. McGill, Austin, Nev., Bruce H. Chichester, Coleville, Calif., Nevada Wool Growers' Association, Elko, Nev.: By Gordon Griswold, President.

Mrs. Luce and Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 13, 1946

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bridgeport Post of February 11, 1946:

MRS LUCE AND LINCOLN

At a Lincoln-Day celebration in Washington last week CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, Congresswoman from Fairfield County, made a masterful plea for fair, just, and equal treatment of the colored race in America. It was certainly an appropriate occasion for the uttering of such sentiments and Mrs. LUCE rose to the occasion with the eloquence, the compassion, and the logic which are characteristic of her public discussions.

Indeed her speech bears rereading in full as a statement so noble in spirit and so logical in thought, that it seems to leave nothing further to be said. There are few Members of Congress with the heart, the mind, and the background to formulate such a doctrine and none, so far as we know, to present it so beautifully.

If there ever were an example of Christian ethics in action, this was it.

From the context of Mrs. LUCE's speech the Hartford Courant has unwisely chosen a single paragraph at which to cavil. The real meaning of this paragraph cannot be appreciated without study of the whole of Mrs. LUCE's argument. But in any case, the analogy which the Courant attempts to draw is singularly misleading.

Mrs. LUCE had said that the passage of the Fair Employment Practice Act would be immensely helpful, regardless of the difficulty of enforcing it, because, "it would exert a constant pressure on the moral attitude of law-abiding citizens in a law-abiding community, urging them by the force of moral pressure to conform with the declared judgment of a whole Nation."

To this the Courant somewhat carpingly retorts that if this line of reasoning were true, why was the eighteenth amendment such a failure? Was it not passed by two-thirds of both Houses of Congress and ratified by three-fourths of the States?

The answer, of course, which ought to be apparent, is that there is no resemblance whatever between the issues involved. The eighteenth amendment was an attempt to

impose a narrow sumptuary judgment, generally not held by the people. To give force to this judgment it attempted to take away from the people something which they already had and to which a large majority thought they were entitled. The evil which followed might have been foreseen. It was logical and inevitable.

Mrs. LUCE for her part does not advocate taking anything away from anybody. She was talking about restoring to a very substantial part of our population those civil, economic, and equal rights which have been unjustly denied to them in disregard of our Constitution and in defiance of our avowed purpose in the Declaration of Independence.

Not even the most bitter defenders of discriminatory treatment against the Negro race dare assert that they are doing the morally right thing. They defended themselves entirely on the grounds of expediency or that they know what is good for the Negro better than the Negro knows for himself. If that isn't an utter rejection of the principle of our Government we don't know how to state it in the English language.

Mrs. LUCE asks that the true principle be stated in law in the firm belief that the moral judgment of the people will sustain it. And if the Great Emancipator himself had been able in spirit to hear her speech, how his heart would have been warmed by it. For here was proof, to a man whose single rule of life had been not to harm people because he hated them but to help them because he loved them, that his example and his words had not been in vain.

Another Bureaucratic Absurdity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 13, 1946

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include Tale of a Doorknob, taken from the leaflet What's Happening in Washington, published by Prentice-Hall, Inc., February 11, 1946, issue:

TALE OF A DOORKNOB

Gate-Way Manufacturing Co. (Los Angeles) figures housing shortage means a lot of doorknobs; decides to make some. May 21, 1945, applies to OPA to set price; receives application forms from Los Angeles regional office; prepares in 3 weeks; mails to Washington before middle of June.

After waiting a month, company in mid-July asks: "How come?" OPA Washington replies: "Unable to determine jurisdiction." Three weeks later: "Send photos of doorknob." Photos are sent in early August. Nothing happens.

Early in September Gate-Way wires Washington: "Production stopped. Workers laid off." Washington wires back: "Expect decision next week."

September 20. Gate-Way wires Washington: "Can we do anything to expedite?"

September 27. Los Angeles regional office urges Gate-Way to keep after Washington.

October 1. Los Angeles regional office itself wires Washington.

October 3. Washington's answer to Los Angeles regional office: Gate-Way can sell its doorknobs at price just equal to cost of manufacture.

October 4. Gate-Way appeals Washington's decision.

October 12. Washington denies Gate-Way's appeal.

October 13. Gate-Way decides not to make doorknobs.

Release of Hoarded Clothing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. HOOK
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 13, 1946

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, on January 30, last, I inserted into the RECORD a wire from the CIO cost of living committee to President Truman urging action to make available 3,000,000 shirts and 400,000 men's suits to the American people.

On February 1, the Department of Justice issued a statement which is carried in the following article in the Washington Post.

Today Mr. Samuel Wolchok, president of CIO's Retail and Wholesale Workers Union wired President Truman further suggestions for freeing 4,000,000 pairs of nylons, 3,000,000 shirts and 1,000,000 men's suits to the American people and particularly to the returning veterans who want to return to civilian attire.

I feel strongly that some immediate action should be taken to force release of these items of clothing so that the returning veterans especially may be able to purchase clothing that they need and not be forced to go ragged on the streets or pay exorbitant prices for the things which they buy or that they need as civilian attire.

[From the Washington Post of February 2, 1946]

CLARK ORDERS SHIRT-HOARDING INVESTIGATION—JUSTICE DEPARTMENT TO SEE IF MAKERS ARE HOLDING BACK

Attorney General Tom Clark yesterday ordered an investigation of reported hoarding of clothing, especially shirts by manufacturers.

Both the Antitrust and Criminal Divisions of the Justice Department were ordered to investigate complaints that clothing was being withheld from the markets, the acting head of the Justice Department public relations section said.

"Complaints are being received by the Department all the time about the clothing situation," the official who refused to permit use of his name, said, adding: "Returning veterans generally cannot get clothes and what they do get is high priced."

The official said the inquiry would seek to determine (1) if clothing was being hoarded by manufacturers and, if so, for what purpose and (2) if the alleged hoarding violated Federal laws.

ASSISTANCE TO CONTINUE

The Government will continue to aid manufacturers obtain rayon and cotton fabrics for inexpensive garments at least through June 30, the Civilian Production Administration announced.

The agency said some time ago that a similar program setting aside woolen materials for low and moderately priced clothing would be carried on until then.

Continuation of the programs beyond next June hinges on whether Congress extends the Second War Powers Act, under which manufacturers receive priorities assistance.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., of February 9, 1946]

SHIRT-NYLON STOCK PILES HIT BY CPA

WASHINGTON, February 9.—The Civilian Production Administration yesterday cracked down on a number of shirt and nylon hosiery manufacturers who were reported to be hoarding supplies.

In telegrams to unnamed firms with "excessive inventories," CPA ordered the producers to halt immediately any further production of these items until their stocks are reduced "to more reasonabl· levels."

CPA also informed the companies that until their inventories are cut "to a practicable minimum," they must not accept delivery of yarn or fabric or place new orders for such materials.

The agency said its action resulted from investigations conducted by the CPA Compliance Division.

Firms to which telegrams were sent are charged, CPA said, with violating a priorities regulation which is designed to prevent accumulation of excessive inventories of scarce materials.

Morris S. Verner, Jr., Director of the Compliance Division, said OPA investigators discovered that "one Pennsylvania manufacturer of nylon hose was carrying an inventory of more than 1,760,000 pairs of nylons as of last January 31."

He said this figure included unfinished as well as finished hosiery, and "is substantially higher than this particular manufacturer's total production for January."

Mr. Verner said records of another Pennsylvania nylon manufacturer showed an inventory of 352,596 pairs as of January 31, while only 7,716 pairs had been shipped by the firm.

The company explained, CPA said, that it has approximately 4,000 customers and did not wish to ship any hose until it had sufficient inventory to provide minimum shipments for all customers.

[From United Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Employes of America, CIO, New York City]

WOLCHOK, DEMANDS RELEASE OF HOARDED MERCHANDISE

NEW YORK.—In a wire to President Truman, Samuel Wolchok, president of CIO's retail and wholesale workers' union, today demanded immediate release of stocks of hoarded clothing, in order to assure veterans and consumers much needed clothing.

Wolchok endorsed the proposal of the CIO cost-of-living committee in its recent wire to President Truman that these hoarded clothing items be seized under the Second War Powers Act and made available to the American people through the Surplus Properties Administration."

He urged this action particularly in view of the need for clothing by many returned hero war veterans who cannot purchase suits, shirts, or other clothing under present market conditions.

Wolchok pointed to Department of Justice reports that 4,000,000 pairs of nylon hosiery, 3,000,000 men's shirts, and 1,000,000 men's suits are being held in storage while the manufacturers of these commodities pressure OPA for further price increases.

Wolchok, whose union represents thousands of workers in department and apparel stores, said: "In addition to denying the consumer this much needed clothing, the withholding of these stocks from the market denies our members the opportunity to sell them and thereby earn their livelihood. This situation is serious.

"Hundreds of workers are losing employment or receiving reduced take-home pay because of the greed and avarice of these apparel manufacturers.

"Strong Government action is needed to force these inventories into the channels of trade. Those who say production is needed to break inflation ignore the seriousness of the extensive hoarding by clothing manufacturers. Distribution as well as production is necessary to secure the filling of consumer demand."

He stated that withholding of materials, as ordered by the Civilian Production Agency, successor to the War Production Board, will not provide sufficient pressure to clear the inventories out of the warehouses. He pointed out that the warehouse space was also needed for other storage purposes and that no justification would be advanced for the withholding of these clothing items.

Lincoln Day Address of Hon. Clare Boothe Luce, of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 13, 1946

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, of Connecticut, at Lincoln Day meeting in Maxwell House, Nashville, Tenn., February 12, 1946, broadcast over WLAC:

I am happy to be here and grateful for your cordial reception to me as a Republican woman in politics.

It is a winter vacation to come again to Nashville—the Athens, as it has been called, of the South. You are the home of three Presidents: Gen. Sam Houston of the Texas Republic, James K. Polk, and Andrew Jackson. How sorely America needs again a President of their calibers and convictions.

In the time of Abraham Lincoln, when a great principle was at stake, you were a border State battleground, torn between the armies of Hood and Thomas. You know better than most the terrible price a nation, or a community, must pay when some among them are desperately determined to resist the laws of common humanity, which demand justice and liberty for all.

Perhaps that is why the spirit of Tennessee in this new time of human crisis is becoming Republican.

We are come together here today to celebrate the birthday of our greatest living American, Abraham Lincoln. I said "living" because everything is mere matter, dead or dying, which cannot survive its physical self, in endless resurrection. The oratorical resurrection of Abraham Lincoln, on these stated birthday festivals, is a common and happy phenomenon of American political life. But no ordinary phenomenon is the way his spirit really walks through all the land, nay, intimately commands every mind and heart in the civilized world, in times of great trouble and conflict. In times such as these, when brother is locked in mortal combat with brother, seeking to slay him, to starve or torture him into submission, to poison him with soft words, or paralyze him with false promises, all in order to prepare his limbs for the fetters of slavery—in such days Abraham Lincoln alone seems to be a wholly live man, with a shining face and loud ringing words on his lips. And many, who walk among us today in positions of power and authority, mumbling their dreary political inanities, seem to be the dead men.

What did Abraham Lincoln mean? What did he stand for? What was the essence of his belief? When we know that, we know the secret of his triumphant resurrection.

Above all, I think, Abraham Lincoln believed in the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God. From this fundamental rock-like credo all his articles of political faith most naturally and nobly derived. A man who held such a belief never talked in terms of "Negro rights" versus "white rights" or "southern rights" versus "northern rights," or the rights of the property holder against those of the propertyless, or the rights of nation versus nation. His belief led with inexorable logic to the conclusion that there are no rights but human rights, and that all human rights derive from man's membership in the whole human family, each member of which is a creature of God, regardless of birth, color, race, nationality, or political condition. Other reasonable corollaries of such a belief were that right makes might; that the conqueror must ever treat the vanquished with malice toward none, and charity toward all; and that as no man would be a slave, so none should seek to be a master. Lincoln believed that in these practices of a profoundly religious definition of political fraternity, lay the genius, the strength, and the glory of American democracy. And Lincoln knew that for Americans to betray this conception of democracy at home, or in our dealings with other nations, would mean in the end, the betrayal of America itself—and of the whole world. Then, as now, the American which stood for this conception was the last best hope of man on earth.

Thus Abraham Lincoln knew that while peace is ever more to be sought and striven for than war, an evil peace is not to be preferred to a good war. So he fought a good war to establish the truth of the dignity and equality of every individual rather than accept a bad peace which would compromise that truth.

In 1918—and again in 1941—this Nation made the Lincolnian decision. This time the masters and tyrants who would enslave their brothers were Germans and Japanese, and their cohorts. And once again we Americans and our great allies vanquished these tyrants. Once again the tree of liberty was watered with the blood of heroic freemen.

No nation, Lincoln said, can long endure half slave and half free. Do we deny today that no world can endure half slave and half free? The drama has widened in scope. The players are numbered by the hundreds of millions instead of millions. But the proposition which was true in the days of flintlock and cannon is no less true in the age of rocket plane and atomic bomb. They merely emphasize the fact that our peril is greater if we do not accept it.

Let us face this fact, too. Abraham Lincoln did not come to his profound belief in the dignity of the individual man and the nature of his rights by consulting Gallup polls or Drew Pearson's column, or even the shrewdest statesmen of his own or other nations. He tells us himself that he came to it on his knees—he got it from God. It is one of the tragic paradoxes of divine justice that those who will not get their political direction on their knees from this Supreme Authority are driven in the end anyway to their knees to get it from a tyrant, with this difference: God lets us rise from our knees to walk like freemen. We stay on our knees for the tyrant.

It is in the light tonight of these cardinal beliefs of Abraham Lincoln, which all Americans share, that I wish to consider the conduct of America's foreign policy since the days of Teheran and Yalta.

Now there are very few Americans who, when the facts are presented to them, do not know the difference between right and wrong even in so-called foreign questions. For example, every American knew, regardless of what he thought his Nation ought to do about it, that Hitler's persecution of the Jews was wrong. He knew that the Fascist suppression of all minority rights, and expressed opposition to that suppression was wrong. He knew that Japan's attempt to dismember China was wrong, and that the rape of Nanking was wrong. And there is not an American today who does not know that a political system like the Soviet system, which keeps 18,000,000 people out of 180,000,000 in concentration and forced labor camps is wrong—morally wrong—however much apologists for that system may seek to justify it in terms of the well-being and comfort of those fortunate enough to stay outside of those camps. Now, it may well be that the Soviet system of secret police, and firing squads, and the obliteration of all minority expression with propaganda or bullets may one day produce a free and prosperous society. All things are possible to the hearts and minds of man, for they are always capable of transfiguration, so we may yet see Russia pluck the figs of liberty from the thistles of oppression. But the present is what it is. And today's crop of evil cannot be justified by the hope of tomorrow's good harvest.

I mention Russia's teeming concentration camps, and multitudinous slave labor gangs, whether native or imported from conquered countries, as they are today, with the acquiescence of our State Department, because this day is sacred to the memory of a man who condemned slavery everywhere. Perhaps some will feel that to mention this most wicked and yet characteristic aspect of our world neighbor, Russia, is to agitate the waters of international comity, and prejudice the goal of international understanding. My retort to any such, is the retort of Lincoln, "You will never get me to support measures which I believe to be wrong, although by so doing I may accomplish that which I believe to be right."

And yet—you will ask at once, should not the Soviet Government enjoy the same right of sovereignty over their internal affairs that we enjoy and must always demand for ourselves? They should decidedly. But this political fact of sovereignty over their internal affairs in no wise alters the moral fact that, wherever our Government and our State Department give aid and comfort to Russian policies or propaganda which seek to extend, and solidify the area of concentration camps, and to acquire from other nations human fodder for them, we are abetting the cause of tyranny and betraying the cause of liberty for all mankind. I cannot speak more plainly, for if I could I would do so. Nor do I exempt from censure our administration's acquiescence in the colonial policies of the Dutch and British and French in Indonesia, where hundreds of natives are being slaughtered for the crime of seeking the freedom promised them by the Atlantic Charter.

Yes, my Republican friends, this administration has abetted the cause of tyranny in many areas through the world, ever since the days of Teheran. I will not burden you with a detailed recital of those betrayals, great and small, of our democratic faith which was once rooted in Lincolnian principles. You know them as well as I do.

In 1914 the conscience of the whole civilized world was outraged when Kaiser Bill referred to his agreement with little Belgium

as a "scrap of paper." And what shall we say today of the Atlantic Charter? This document guaranteed to martyred Poland, no less than every nation in the world, the right to determine its own government by free domocratic processes. Is that an honored document, or isn't it also just a scrap of paper now? Ask Latvians, Estonians, Lithuanians, Hungarians, Austrians, and almost any central European. Ask the Yugoslavs who are alive to answer, or do not fear to answer. The total is staggering of European and Asiatic peoples who fought in this war on our side, valiantly in the open, or hunted like beasts in the undergrounds, because they believed the promises given them by a democratic American administration that if they did so they would win the chance to have an American-type economy, an American-type of representative system, an American kind of freedom. Without them we might not have won the war. What do they think of American honor now?

I ask you, in the name of Abraham Lincoln, why since Teheran has all this been so? Why, why, why, do millions of innocent men, women, and children—the starving, hunted, persecuted, Siberia-bound men, women, and children of our allies, no less than the vanquished ones to whom Lincoln addressed the phrase, "malice toward none and charity toward all" think today that is an American idea that was buried with Abraham Lincoln?

What is the explanation? We must seek it in our own hearts, no less than in the hearts of our leaders. For the slow and bitter betrayal of our noblest American principles in the conduct of our foreign affairs since the days of Yalta and Tehran is a matter for which we may quite suddenly and terribly be called to account in an atomic age.

Three explanations suggest themselves: The first is the kindest—and the most unlikely: The Democratic administration which has conducted our foreign policy for thirteen long years may no longer know the difference between right and wrong. After all, they may have grown hopelessly wedded, through long days in power, to the fashionable thesis that man is altogether an economic animal, and not a moral one. Such a belief goes hand in hand with the thesis that the end always justifies any means, and that the sole end of men and nations is material security. Such men will be forever asking, will this or that policy protect our physical shores, increase our trade, maintain our position as the world's leading power? Such men will never inquire how these policies will affect the liberties of men everywhere, or if they will increase liberty at home or abroad. Such men will not know—or care—that it was wrong to make the promises we did in the Atlantic Charter, and then to break them, because it is difficult or risky or dangerous, or costly to keep them. Such men did not know—or care—that it was wrong to accede to the dismemberment of Poland, when we promised we would not; to fail to carry out our guarantees of free elections in Europe; to fail to resist with every diplomatic means at our disposal what is happening in Indonesia. Above all they just may not know—or care—that it is wrong to allow the innocent nationals of many European countries to be shot, imprisoned, or sent into slavery in vast numbers. I know as you do, that there are men in this administration who are so blinded by that vengeance which properly belongs to the Lord, that they cannot see through the red curtain of their hate that it is wrong for this Nation to adopt economic policies in Germany which will result in the wholesale starvation of children and pregnant women; policies which, if they are not changed, will in the end, turn all of Europe into a pestilential poorhouse. That some members of this administration and the previous one may have lost their moral sense, so that they do not know right from wrong, charity from hate, freedom from slavery, truth from lies, a Christian conscience from a barbarian one, is, as I say, possible. But it is not likely. For all Americans, who are not totalitarians in disguise, have too long lived in the climate of freedom to be easily deceived on such matters. Their forefathers and sons, who died in many wars that it should be preserved, have left them a most intrusive legacy of liberty.

Secondly, the men who conduct our foreign policy may know the difference between right and wrong, but may wish to avoid contemplating it in terms of our Allies and our neighbors, because to do so is too painful to the American mind, which is naturally optimistic, naturally inclined to see the best in everything, naturally indulgent to the ways of others. We are, perhaps, no longer a nation of Pollyannas, but like little Orphan Annies, it takes an awful lot to disillusion us.

I sometimes think that our present policy might be called the "three monkeys policy": "See no evil, hear no evil, say no evil." But, alas, the oceans have been breached at last and troubled Europe and Asia, once so remote, are on our very threshold. This is the age of rocket bomb, atomic bomb, radio and radar which reaches to the moon. This is one world, and Europe and Asia are in it, and there is evil there, such as we have never known here, or had to deal with before. If evil is to be vanquished, it must be understood, it must be seen and heard; and hard and true things must be said of it, that it may be shamed, which, by God's mercy it often surprisingly is. And we must be encouraged to face it, in order that we may resist it, and diminish it, before it can thrive and grow beyond our strength to resist or diminish.

If only our own leaders knew today how a little plain courage, some honest speaking of the truth, a small but clear challenge to man's love everywhere of freedom, could stop much of this evil dead in its tracks. There is nothing more infectious than courage. And if our leaders did not know this yesterday, they should know it today, since Prime Minister Ernie Bevin, that proletarian, horny handed and exceedingly rude son of toil, spoke up at London.

So there are two possibilities which might explain the pusillanimous conduct of our foreign affairs by New Deal statesmen, (a) that they have not known, since Teheran, the difference between right or wrong, and (b) that like optimistic monkeys, they have ignored the moral obligation placed on men, to look right and wrong squarely in the face and choose between them—at least in their utterances. Either ignorance or fatuousness or both may have formed a foreign policy, which is carrying us and the world to the brink of another catastrophe.

But there is a third and, I believe, sounder reason, why the men of this administration have all but failed the cause of international justice to which the Atlantic Charter, no less than the blood of our sons have pledged us.

The answer, I believe, is fear, outright, downright, funk. Fear for their political fortunes and their offices.

We hear them tell us that the world is wearied of war, wearied to a point of despair, so that every appeasement is justified as a charitable act which spares the world even the shadow of a shudder about further bloodshed. Is it not then remarkable that in Europe and Asia today many men who have already endured long terrible years of fighting and bombardment and pestilence and famine, are still not too wearied to risk torture and exile and slavery, and still seek arms to defend their political convictions? Does this not suggest that the question in Europe is still not settled? Certainly Americans are wearied of the war and want peace; want their men home; want to disarm; want to get on with their American lives and fortunes. And this weariness is certainly something of which even the most fearless statesman today must take cognizance. But this is not altogether the reason why our New Deal statesmen gloss over every European and Asiatic incident which might agitate our war-torn nerves. The reason is that they will not, dare not, tell the American people the plain truths and the solid facts of the European and Asiatic situations, that have developed as a result of Teheran, Yalta, London, and Potsdam. They will not, or dare not, tell us the commitments that were overtly or secretly made in moments of war's extremities by a mortally ill President, and perhaps mortally scared State Department advisers. Some of these commitments were bad, and ought to be reviewed by the whole American people before they are fulfilled; some of them are good, but cannot be fulfilled without a realistic and idealistic explanation of why they must be fulfilled, even at the further sacrifice of our national wealth and individual comforts. Why is it so hard for the men in power today to tell these truths? Because the man in the White House today, and the men who run our State Department, have inherited from a former administration and furthered, alas, a policy full of commitments so complex, so oblique, so secret, so confused, so personal, and whimsical, that it would take a political genius to unravel it alone. But perhaps if it were laid before all the people, perhaps all of us together could unravel it.

Perhaps all of us together, if we were inspired anew with the principles of Lincoln, would see the gigantic rehabilitation program through, to which we have been committed. Cowardly men now in office fear that we shall rebel as a nation if asked to assume it. And, oh how they fear our wrath when we discover all that has been done, or left undone, to make a peace in Europe. So, unable to confess the failure of a previous administration, with whose prestige their own is politically linked for better or worse, Democratic leaders today, in House and Senate and in State Department, have been forced to adopt appeasement as their policy—appeasement of nations that they fear to speak up to, or back to, lest secret agreements, or agreements that now seem to betray the common man of Europe and Asia, be angrily revealed, and the revelation will blast them all out of office; appeasement of the electorate, that is naturally demanding the reward that a previous administration promised so lavishly out of this war—an immediate, long, happy democratic peace in the world. Dare these men who served that administration and also serve this one, admit that this peace has already been frittered away bit by bit? They do not. The old New Deal curse now falls upon far less inspired and less adroit successors. They are doomed still to please everybody every Monday morning—and to promise endlessly what no man alive can deliver: A painlessly achieved Utopia come next Michaelmas. However, they are wise enough to know that even though they told the truth, it might save the people, but it would not save them. For when Americans see that New Deal statesmen scuttled the ship, they are certainly not going to vote for them to salvage the cargo.

What is the result of a foreign policy which sometimes cannot distinguish between right and wrong, which sometimes does not wish to see, hear, or speak of evil, and which always fears to tell the people that evil has been done by ourselves, and by others? The men in power hope that the result—the immediate result will be reelection, power, prestige, patronage. Yes, plums for the few today, but what for the many tomorrow? You know the answer to that. It was the same thousands of years ago, it is the same today: a time of parlous peace, and dubious prosperity. Men will buy, sell, prosper a little, marry, build houses, eat, drink, and be merry—and then the flood, or the fire, the

rain of atomic bombs upon our cities, wiping out millions. Then, indeed, we may all fall on our knees—but too late ever to rise as free Americans.

Will this come to pass? Quite honestly I believe that it will not come to pass. Because I believe that there is no situation in Europe or Asia today which is not amenable to wise statesmanship. And I believe that in the crucial years ahead we will choose wise statesmen, and an administration whose policies will conform to the principles of Abraham Lincoln. Then the ways of peace will begin to open for all men.

The way to begin is to elect a Republican Congress in 1946, and a Republican administration in 1948. And only in this way shall we learn the truth about the conduct of our foreign policy—the truth that when revealed will set us free to work in the cause of freedom everywhere. The choice is the people's. It is our task to lay before them the nature of the choice. Let us see to it.

And then indeed this Nation, under God, will have a new birth of freedom. And government of the people, by the people, for the people, will not perish from the earth.

Gen. Omar N. Bradley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 13, 1946

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following editorial from the Shreveport Times of February 10, 1946:

IS BRADLEY TOO BIG FOR HIS BOOTS?

The curt refusal of Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Administrator of the Veterans' Bureau, to attend a special session of the American Legion executive committee for a man-to-man talk on GI problems is direct affront to every member of that organization. His trite statement that he is too busy to attend the Legion committee session called by National Commander John Stelle, but that the committee may call at his office if it wishes is amazing indication of narrow and picayune viewpoint. It is in no way compatible with efficient and sympathetic handling of vital problems of millions of men who wore their Nation's uniform in two world wars.

General Bradley's job is not to dictate to veterans and their representatives, but to seek to serve them in every possible way. He is not now holding down a battlefield combat post where everyone must go forward or backward at the snap of his fingers. He is in a post of civilian administration of billions of dollars worth of postwar benefits provided by Federal law for millions of men who have gone back to civilian life, or shortly will do so.

The invitation of Commander Stelle to General Bradley was courteous and timely. It followed the exchange of statements in which Mr. Stelle, in his official Legion capacity, revealed that GI benefit cases and queries of several hundred thousand veterans are stalemated in the Veterans' Bureau—7,000 of them being cases requiring immediate hospitalization and more than 200,000 of them being applications for medical attention. General Bradley never has answered these charges adequately. He merely has cast personal aspersion on Mr. Stelle—and now deliberately has slighted the guiding body of the whole Legion. Mr. Stelle went all the way in calling a special session of the executive committee and in offering to turn its whole session over to General Bradley in the hope that some means could be found to end the confusion, delay, and incompetency which concededly exists in various activities of the Veterans' Bureau. Instead of seizing this opportunity to help the GI's, General Bradley turned his back.

General Bradley should realize that no man is too big to go to the American Legion on its invitation and in behalf of the problems of veterans. Presidents of the United States never have hesitated to do so and General Bradley, even with his record of combat leadership, still is only one veteran among millions who fought in two wars, and who made him great, and he still is only one general among scores of magnificent generals. He should realize also that every law on the Federal statute books today in behalf of veterans was put there mainly with the backing and sponsorship of the American Legion and that the GI bill of rights, which is the "constitution" under which the Veterans' Bureau operates today, not only was conceived and put through Congress by the Legion, but was conceived and spearheaded personally by Mr. Stelle.

All of the GI benefits which General Bradley now administers, and all of the power and prestige of the office from which he administers them, stem directly or indirectly from the American Legion as an organization or from its members as individuals, with other minor organizations giving all the help they could. If General Bradley is not big enough to understand that and to profit by the knowledge, then in our opinion he is not big enough for the biggest veterans job in the world and Commander Stelle may have been entirely right in suggesting that it would have been better to have appointed a civilian with greater administrative perspective, broader viewpoint, and more sympathetic realization of the job at hand.

Cut Bank Jaycees Send Invitation to UNO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 13, 1946

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an article from the Cut Bank Pioneer Press, Cut Bank, Mont., February 8, containing the text of a letter received from Mr. Wilbur P. Werner, president of the Cut Bank Junior Chamber of Commerce. In addition to the paragraphs contained in this article, Mr. Werner added the following postscript:

The UNO delegates to San Francisco meeting are familiar with Glacier National Park, for their special train stopped 1 day on their return east.

JAYCEES SEND INVITATION TO UNO

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following, inspired by the objections of some of the landed aristocracy in New England to having the center of the United Nations Organization located in their back yards, was dispatched early this week to Associated Press and United Press for publication in eastern newspapers.)

The Cut Bank (Mont.) Junior Chamber of Commerce views with alarm and amazement the inhospitable attitude of certain areas along the stern and rock-bound coast of New England, in protesting the location of headquarters for UNO. The smug silk-stocking residents of that part of America by this act are casting discredit upon the entire Nation.

The friendly and hospitable mountain west wishes to save our country further embarrassment by suggesting consideration of Glacier National Park as the permanent home for this peace-promoting organization.

Here they will find a haven of detachment amid the Nation's most scenic surroundings, a perfect spot for rest, recreation, contemplation and inspiration, far removed from the foggy and soggy locales of the eastern seaboard or the congested industrial areas of the western coastal country, with rail, plane and highway conveniences to transport them at leisure periods to other nearby scenic places, particularly the majestic Canadian Rockies.

Nearby is the reservation of the West's most romantic and dominant Indian tribe, the Blackfeet, once robust and gallant warriors, who now dedicate their days to the arts of peace. Their contribution to two World Wars was outstanding and their returning sons would give warm welcome and wise counsel if such were solicited to the leaders of this world organization.

Montana's congressional delegation is being urged by the Cut Bank Jaycees to present the Glacier Park invitation to the proper UNO authorities.

WILBUR P. WERNER,
President, Cut Bank (Mont.) Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Obstacle to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 13, 1946

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by George Fielding Eliot which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of February 8, 1946. It is well worth reading:

NINETEENTH CENTURY NATIONALISM CALLED OBSTACLE TO TWENTIETH CENTURY PEACE—RUSSIA IS SEEN LAGGING BEHIND UNITED STATES AND BRITAIN BY CLINGING TO OLD SUSPICIONS, OLD PRESSURE POLITICS, AND OUTDATED IDEA OF SECURITY

(By George Fielding Eliot)

One of the chief obstacles to fruitful progress in world organization is the tendency to think of twentieth century problems in nineteenth-century terms. Future relations between the Western World and the Russians will depend almost entirely on whether we of the West can get the Russians to come out of the nineteenth century and join us in the twentieth.

The nineteenth century was the century of nationalism. The struggle between nations for power, for wealth, for colonial possessions was its unvarying motif. It saw the partition of Africa and much of Asia among the European powers. As it closed, men were talking—some with anxiety, some with eager greed—of the partition of China. It saw no great wars after Waterloo, but it sowed the red seeds of the two most terrible wars in all history.

The twentieth century is the century of peoples. It is the century in which man must face the fact that the machines he has made with which to carry on national struggles will destroy him as an individual unless they are controlled in the common interest of all men. It is the century in which imperialism and nationalism become obsolete because they are no longer compatible with human survival. It is the century in which the rights and the necessities of man as an individual must take precedence over the ambitions of nations, else we shall have

neither men or nations remaining on the face of this blackened planet.

In general, the American people have faced up to this elemental change. Not wholly. Not without reservations and nostalgia for the good old days. But pretty definitely, for all that. In general, the British people have faced up to it. It may not have penetrated the centers of intrenched conservatism in either country, but the average man is beginning to understand it, and that is having its effect on Government policy.

So we see Americans in China, for all the mistakes, hesitations, and wrong starts, doing on the whole a good job of helping the Chinese people to stand on their own feet and assume responsibility for their own future—and their share in responsibility for the future of the world. We are no longer thinking in terms of the Chinese market. We are thinking in terms of getting 400,000,000 human beings into useful participation in the world's affairs.

We see the British doing much the same thing in India. The "lifeline of the British Empire" is a nineteenth-century myth. Three million Lancashire cotton spinners no longer exist on the basis of making shirts and loincloths for 400,000,000 Indians. The responsible twentieth-century Englishman is now thinking of India in terms not of "how much can we make out of this country?" but rather "how can we get all these people into a position where they can govern themselves and become responsible citizens of a world community of which we are citizens, too?"

It's becoming pretty generally understood that enslaved people or miserable people anywhere are a danger to all other peoples; that such conditions tend to form a vacuum into which forces which are perilous to all of us may move and where they may take root.

But the Russians do not yet seem to be applying these twentieth-century principles to the conduct of their relations with other States. The Soviet Government has accomplished a literal miracle in its ecenomic progress. The condition of the Soviet citizen as compared with that of the subject of the czars is so vastly improved as to beggar comparison. But the Soviet rulers are still not people's rulers. The few still control the affairs of the millions, rather than being controlled by them. The statesmen of the Kremlin are far less subject to popular anxieties than are the politicians of Washington and London. Their fears and supicions born of nineteenth-century conditions and nineteenth-century survivals are still with them. They still seek nineteenth-century solutions of the problems of Russian security. They still think in terms of buffer states, of acquiring by pressure and intrigue the lands and resources they think they need. They are unwilling to trust others, because they do not yet understand how clearly the American and British peoples see the compelling necessity of a people's peace. They do not understand that we who are living in the twentieth century may be far more frankly dealt with, far more surely trusted, than we could have been 50 years ago, simply because the majority of our citizens are coming to realize that unless we lay the foundations of confidence we shall never build our world-wide edifice of peace and justice--and that we will all perish in the ruins of that failure.

It is not a question of superior morality. It is a question of understanding the necessities of self-preservation.

If, as has often been remarked in these articles, the central political problem of our times is to establish confident cooperation between the Russians and the two great western democracies, surely the heart of that problem is to find means to bring the Russians into the twentieth century—politically as well as economically—to induce them to see that there is no real security and no real hope in the method and devices of the imperialist age.

Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 13, 1946

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oregonian, of February 10, 1946:

THE FORTY-NINTH STATE

Congress should hesitate no longer in making the Territory of Hawaii the forty-ninth State of the Union. The report of the subcommittee of the House Territories Committee recommending statehood ought to banish any lingering doubts as to the social, economic, and political readiness of Hawaii's heterogeneous 502,000 residents to take their place in the society of States.

There was a time when politicians of isolationist leanings opposed the admission of Hawaii because of fear that if the Japs attacked the state the United States would have to go to war. The refutation of this shameful theory has been complete. The Japs attacked the Territory, and none hesitated to defend it.

Since the end of the war, in which Hawaiians of all ancestries played a magnificent part, the principal objection to statehood has been on racial grounds. The apprehension has been expressed openly that Japanese-Americans, voting as a bloc, might dominate elections and send Senators and Congressmen of that race to Washington.

We make no distinction between Americans of Japanese or other ancestry. The Hawaiian Nisei have a glorious combat record and there is no reason to believe they would do less well in politics. Of the 1945 population of the Territory, 34.4 percent were Caucasians, 32.5 percent Japanese, 2.2 percent pure Hawaiians, 12.2 percent part Hawaiians, 1.8 percent Puerto Ricans, 6 percent Chinese, 1.4 percent Koreans, 9.3 percent Filipinos, 0.2 percent of other racial origins. While the Caucasian population has increased steadily, the number of persons of Japanese ancestry has declined from a high of 42.7 percent of population in 1920, because of immigration restrictions.

The Japanese have not been active in Hawaiian politics in proportion to their numbers, while the fewer Chinese have been very active. The subcommittee formed the opinion that bloc voting by Japanese-Americans is not likely to assume serious proportions because they are divided among themselves on political, social, and economic questions as markedly as other racial groups. The non-Caucasian and nonnative residents of Hawaii do not look toward the old countries for guidance. Their interest is in Hawaii and the United States.

In any event the population of Hawaii was mixed when the United States annexed the islands. It was not a bar to annexation, and is not an obstacle to Statehood.

The truth is that the people of the islands have learned the lessons of democracy better than many on the mainland. The varied races live and work together harmoniously. Racial intolerance and bigotry are almost nonexistent. Intermarriages have increased. Economic standards are high. Education is far advanced. Legislative movements have been initiated to limit the financial, industrial, and agricultural dominance of the "big five" families, and small business ventures have multiplied.

Hawaii has been a Territory for 46 years. In the plebiscite of 1939 its citizens voted in a majority of 67 percent for statehood. Mainland polls show about the same sentiment for admission of Hawaii. Distance is no longer a barrier—flying time to the mainland is from 12 to 18 hours. The Territory's population is greater than that of any other, except Oklahoma, at the time of admission to the Union.

Hawaiians of all ancestries have adequately demonstrated their patriotism and loyalty and their qualifications for equality of status in the United States of America.

Feeder Air Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 13, 1946

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the January 28, 1946, issue of the Minneapolis Star-Journal, entitled "Feeder Air Lines":

FEEDER AIR LINES

America already is far into the air age, but the maze of aviation routes visioned years ago hasn't developed. There isn't a single regularly scheduled feeder line in Minnesota and only one application has been heard by the Civil Aeronautics Board—that of North Central Airways of Alexandria.

About 50 towns and cities in the State have fixed base operations with planes available for charter. Some of these charter flights are virtually scheduled runs, as the Bemidji-Twin Cities route and the summer hop between Robbinsdale and Nisswa.

Several others are in prospect for the vacation season between the Twin Cities and northern resort centers. Also, a group of returned veterans, organized as Northern Airways, has filed a brief with CAB, asking a Duluth-Chicago permit.

But there is little indication of the board's attitude on feeder lines. Insofar as it has been expressed by individual members, it is that such lines should develop from charter service.

Perhaps "feeder lines" isn't the best description for the smaller operations. They might better be known as short-haul routes, in contrast to the long haul, trunk lines. Part of their service, of course, could coordinate with that of the main airlines. They would hardly be competitors in any way.

Yet the big lines almost automatically oppose any applications which originate in their territories, just as they vociferously oppose any route extensions of any other big line. Such opposition is an accepted part of commercial aviation tactics and the many briefs filed with CAB on a simple application may largely account for the long-delayed decisions of that agency.

It was refershing, at the CAB hearings at Des Moines last March, to find Northwest Airlines friendly to the application of North Central Airways for routes to serve smaller cities in Minnesota and the Dakotas.

Naturally CAB's main attention is given to national and international air routes. There is little time to give to feeder lines within a State or region. Action is held up for months and the whole application procedure is too expensive for small operators to undertake.

Why wouldn't it be desirable, then, for the national board to establish working agreements with State authorities? Minnesota has an aviation commission which has done splendid work in encouraging sensible air projects. The commissioner knows the situation in this State thoroughly. Yet when

he takes part in a case, it is on the same basis as an individual or company or city which may be interested in the matter before CAB.

Unless some such cooperation can be worked out, CAB is going to get so involved in hundreds of applications that decisions will be delayed even longer than in the past.

Hundreds of military pilots now home are eager to get going on short hauls. New planes will not be available for some time, but surplus Government ships, like the twin-motored Cessnas, can be acquired. Airports are ready.

The main bottleneck seems to be CAB.

International Problems Multiply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 13, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, today's headlines offer a lot of food for thought. Not only Members of Congress but the average American citizen can take heed of some developments now going on. Sooner or later, in some form or another, a multitude of questions resulting from World War II will come before Congress for solution.

EIGHTEEN YANKS HURT IN CALCUTTA RIOTS

The above is a headline in a newspaper item from Calcutta. Just read these two paragraphs which directly concern every family and every American home where there are sons eligible for military service. One paragraph reads:

Police fired into a threatening mob of Indian Nationalists in Calcutta's Wellington Square today, adding an undisclosed number of casualties to the toll of 17 to 20 killed and 200 wounded in the rioting of the past 2 days. Eighteen Americans were among the injured.

This newspaper item then goes on to say that there were demonstrations, which in our language means riots, and that British troops had orders to shoot down the rioters, and so forth. Then here is another paragraph:

United States headquarters announced that 5 officers and 13 GI's were injured in Calcutta Tuesday when they were stoned by the mobs.

I am just wondering if we have the answer to a lot of questions. Why are these American soldiers in Calcutta, India? Who put them there? When are they coming home? Why does the mob throw stones at American soldiers? Is this part of that universal brotherhood which is developing out of international thinking? Are demonstrations such as these responsible for the Administration's announcement that the Selective Service Act will be continued when it expires March 20, if Congress will pass the necessary legislation? These are only a few pertinent questions.

Another headline says that 900,000 men have enlisted for military service in the last 5 months. Another question: Why continue the draft law? All of these questions add up to the one big question which a lot of us would like to have answered. What is our foreign policy and why? In this connection let me read another suggestive headline in today's paper:

JILTED GI BRIDES LEFT HOLDING THE BABY AROUSE BRITISH IRE

Under the above headline I quote a portion of the newspaper article which reads:

LONDON, February 13.—The town guardians of Dartford, Kent, sent a resolution to the British Health Ministry today urging Government action to protect GI brides against being left "holding the American baby." Thousands of United States officers and men were stationed at Dartford during the war and many of them married local girls. The guardians were perturbed at the number of brides being divorced after their husbands returned to the United States.

The article goes on to say that there was indignation shown by our English cousins against the American soldiers who had been extended hospitality and then apparently changed their minds after getting back to the United States. I am not concerned with the merits of the situation. But I do point out what is going on to show that after wasting our treasure and blood on foreign soil, the outcome seems to be an additional full measure of hatred for America. Is this a part of our vaunted good neighbor and universal brotherhood program? Where is it leading us? Then again I read this headline in today's paper:

MRS. F. D. BESTS RED IN UNO CLASH

LONDON, February 13.—Defeated twice on major issues yesterday, one in which Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt defeated Soviet Delegate Andrei Vishinsky in a debate over a refugee issue, Russia faced another UNO show-down today over demand for a Security Council commission to investigate the Indonesian crisis.

The newspaper item then goes on to say that Mrs. Roosevelt asked one of the Russians this question:

Are we in the United Nations so weak that we are going to forbid human beings from saying what they believe to be true?

Of course this question was answered in the affirmative by the Russian delegate.

No questions are necessary in order to demonstrate that different countries differ widely from each other in the name of friendship, love, and truth. In this connection, let it be noted that the military occupation of foreign countries, and especially Germany, is producing nothing by ill will and hatred. How did we start this idea that the United States would remake and reshuffle the peoples of the earth? How do we know that it will work? Were the American people fully advised of its implications and responsibilities? Do we want to make German policemen out of our American soldiers? How long will they continue to be policemen? Sometime the American people will demand a day of reckoning. The administration would do well to take Congress and the American people into its confidence. It should tell us now if we have a foreign policy, and if so, we should be fully advised about that foreign policy.

Proposed Policy-Making Facilities for the Department of State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article written by Milton Patterson Thompson which appeared in the January 1946 issue of the American Foreign Service Journal. Mr. Thompson was formerly a foreign-service officer and is now a personnel assistant with the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, Washington, D. C.

The article is as follows:

The Department of State has undergone a tremendous expansion in its duties and activities since the start of World War II. Many of its wartime accretions were superimposed upon an organization which was reasonably adequate for the restricted demands of former days. But the advent of the postwar era, with its ever greater requirements, raises the question as to the sufficiency of the existing departmental machinery.

A new era in foreign relations has arrived and there is the accompanying need for facilities to cope with new problems and conditions. The time was when Thomas Jefferson personally formulated and executed our foreign policy with the aid of a handful of clerks. It therefore is no disparagement of the pre-World War II Department of State to say that changed circumstances might call for structural and functional modifications in it. It is the considered judgment of some persons that the crux of the Department's ability to meet satisfactorily the new and heavier exactions, imposed by both the American people and the international community, is the perfection of a mechanism to provide over-all policy-making, advance planning, analysis, research, and liaison. Some persons hold that previous reorganizations have failed to come to grips with the heart of the problem.

This blueprint envisions a staff to define true objectives and to insure uniform, deliberative, and expert direction of the line, as well as to make a logical division, with attendant advantages, between planning and execution. It would be a staff of four echelons headed by a career assistant secretary, or better yet under secretary, whose status should be permanent and not subject to frequent change in order to insure continuity of policy and the effectuation of a program of long-range planning. The head of the staff would report directly to the Secretary of State. The staff would be divided into these major units, called offices, each having subunits: Intelligence (S-1), formulation of policy (S-2), execution of policy (S-3), management planning (S-4).

The symbols following the titles may be used for convenient reference, the letter "S" standing for staff.

Such centralized, policy-making functions would have to be based on accurate knowledge, hence it would require the establishment of an intelligence unit. The formulation of policy should be a deliberate, thoughtful process, and it is recommended that a second office be established for this purpose. Policies merely adopted but not applied are ineffective and valueless. There consequently would be needed a unit to initiate action and supervise the adoption and implementation of the decisions reached. A fourth office would be desirable to facilitate the work of the first

three and the Department; it would be concerned with management planning. This arrangement would appear to rest upon a logical sequence of activities.

This plan is calculated to enhance the effectiveness of the Department and the foreign service and to enable them the better to discharge their increasingly difficult responsibilities. It should permit them to cope more easily with emergencies and to anticipate future developments. New operational activities, on a large scale and global basis, accentuate the need for more effective policy-making. The Department is the senior in the Government and closest to the President, which, with its exclusive functions in the conduct of foreign relations, give it a rightful place as foremost among all other departments. Proper liaison, planning, and leadership can influence the other agencies tacitly to recognize that role. The State Department is the logical agency for the analysts of international political and economic matters. They should be centralized there and the Department should furnish appropriate reports, warnings, and indications of policy to other departments and agencies, some of which now maintain their own specialists and operate independently. The Department already has taken steps to create a more workable relationship between it and the American people. One goal of the suggested mechanism is the strengthening of that tie, which would minimize public criticism.

It is hoped that only profit would result from this plan and that the position of no one would suffer or be prejudiced. It would be of inestimable value to the Secretary of State. New Secretaries, who rarely can be as experienced in the foreign field as their office demands, would find in it a continuing entity in policy making and experience. No person or unit should be displaced, although transfers would be inherent in the regrouping. The now overburdened geographic divisions would be relieved of having to determine policy under the present extremely difficult conditions. They would be given more freedom and time in which to conduct the vital relations and negotiations with other countries. The foreign service should benefit in having its field operations facilitated. Foreign-service officers, moreover, would serve in the proposed new organization, and some of them might prefer careers in it. There would be the greatest demand for ability and the rewards should be satisfying.

The present staffless State Department is reminiscent of the War Department prior to the secretaryship of the farseeing Elihu Root, who, at the turn of the century, inaugurated its first general staff.

The above concept of a staff for the Department of State is opposed to the present system in which the same officials both plan and execute policies. They are so burdened by administrative, routine duties and an unending flow of papers over their desks that they have little or no time for the detached study of policy and objectives. Inevitably the results sometimes are unsatisfactory. Some of the decisions so reached are major ones, of far-reaching consequence, which go to form that body of precedents which, perforce, must exercise tremendous influence in such an agency as the Department of State. There nevertheless at times have to be improvisations and temporizations, made on a day-to-day and ad hoc basis, under relentless pressure, and without due regard for precedent and the repercussions. A concomitant weakness is that there is insufficient coordination and correlation between units. An over-all policy-making staff would be a safeguard against the course of action pursued in one line division being at variance with that in another division. Under reasonably optimum conditions, it would also place planning on a nonpersonalized basis, thereby removing, or reducing, the opportunity for the adoption of the personalized ideas, programs, and even whims of individuals.

The necessity for more analysis, which essentially is a staff activity, is shown by its limited use now. I believe that only one office (American Republics) wisely has any formalized provision for political analysis, except for the particularized Office of Special Political Affairs. The latter is the nearest existing approximation to a staff, but neither it nor the Joint Secretariat wholly fill the void nor completely meet the challenge. There are also the Divisions of Foreign Service Planning and of Management Planning, which have very restricted scopes of activities. However, the Offices of International Trade Policy and Financial and Development Policy are believed to operate along the lines of the proposed staff in the economic field.

With the foregoing not fully adequate exceptions, it is understood that the Department has no organized instrumentality to weigh new ideas, suggestions, and proposals. It has been charged that the Department is lacking in creative imagination and initiative. Those rare qualities can be expected to flourish in direct proportion to the facilities provided to produce and to nurture them.

The staff would offer the necessary instrumentality for the needed integration of all phases of our national policy in the international field, and especially as among the State, War, and Navy Departments for the national defense. This function would be simplified if the two fighting services were to be merged. It is patent that there must be closer correlation between our foreign policy and our national defense policy. It is convincingly stated in these words, addressed to the writer, by a brilliant professor at West Point and authority on geopolitics:

"From now on, the sphere of statesmanship and generalship are inseparably linked. We return them to their separate pigeonholes after the war only at a very real peril."

A staff in the Department of State is indicated to correlate and integrate the multifarious activities abroad of numerous Federal agencies, now only too often working uneconomically, and in competition with and duplicating each other.

The broadened scope of the interests of the Department call for such a facility as a staff. The Department undoubtedly must play a more assertive, active, and diversified part henceforth than it has in the past. Examples of this increase in the range of its responsibilities are found in the anticipated early cessation of such agencies as the FEA, OWI, and OSS, some of whose activities can be expected to devolve upon the Department of State.

The staff would be in addition to the Department's mechanical organization as presently constituted, for this study proceeds on the assumption that that organization will continue to perform line functions. The geographic divisions would remain as the nucleus of the line. Some functional divisions would be integrated into the recommended staff. Doubtless all of the terminated units in the existing organization would be re-created in the staff, so it would amount to a transfer, or, better said, regrouping, for more efficacious operation. This charter, it may be added, does not attempt to go so far as to specify the detailed organization of the components of each of the constituent units of the staff. Such amplification would follow the adoption of this over-all plan.

This staff would not interfere with most of the existing activities of the nuclear geographic divisions. It would not emasculate them nor usurp their true functions; much less would it supersede them.

The closest and most cooperative relations between the staff and the line would be necessary for success. Teamwork could be attained only by mutual efforts. Frequent meetings and discussions between the line and staff are contemplated. The staff must command the respect of the line because of demonstrated merit and usefulness and not only because it has the support of the Secretary of State, which it, of course, must enjoy. The members of the staff could not function in the rarefied atmosphere of theory and the academic world. They, on the contrary, should be practical and realistic persons—a reasonable number of whom would have first-hand knowledge of other countries.

Members of the staff should be sent abroad, at Government expense, to acquire information in person. This is essential, as there are imponderables about countries which cannot be learned vicariously or from books. A parsimonious financial policy with respect to expenditures for the staff and the level of salaries paid to its members obviously would impair its value. It is imperative that foreign-service officers be detailed to the staff. Members of the staff would call upon qualified persons outside the Government as consultants and advisers to supplement themselves.

The proper operation of a staff is believed to offer more promise in the adequate meeting of our weighty postwar obligations, with their truly awesome implications, which are already offering tests, than any other solution. It unfortunately is questionable whether the majority of the American people are prepared for this country to assume the world leadership expected of it by the remainder of the world. Hence there is the greater need for the foresight which it is proposed a staff would help to supply. "Where there is no vision the people perish." Let American ingenuity devote itself to international affairs. A staff would correspond to a research laboratory, but influence the entire body politic. It would be a safeguard against that state of bankrupt diplomatic relations called war, which von Clausewitz has rightly defined as the continuation of policy by other means. We, as a people, must recognize that there are inescapable requisites of a dawning world society, calling for the breaking with many time-honored traditions which now are obsolete and whose discontinuance would be no real loss to our fundamental, cherished ideals.

THE OFFICE OF INTELLIGENCE (S–1)

The suggested activities of this office would be as follows:

"Collects, catalogs, analyzes, and speedily distributes appropriate information received from the foreign service and other sources, including the submission of proposals for the public dissemination by the line, of information regarding foreign policy and relations consistent with security and obligations to other countries. Cooperates closely with G–2, ONI, and the FBI. Plans security measures in the field of intelligence to protect the United States, with emphasis on the foreign aspect. Maintains liaison and (assisted by S–2 and S–3) exchanges with the War and Navy Departments full information for the defense and welfare of the United States at all times. Cryptography."

It would be the counterpart of, and exchange material with, G–2 of the Army General Staff and the Office of Naval Intelligence. It should be concerned with improved and expanded sources of information, such as American travelers abroad and Americans resident in other countries. While it would be concerned primarily with the foreign field, it would be in possession of pertinent information touching the domestic scene, which latter would be received from the FBI, among other sources. Subversive ideologies and activities in the United States, particularly those having foreign ramifications, are embraced in this category. This twofold interest would be necessary to enable it adequately to furnish complete, timely intelligence to the appropriate departmental units, especially S–2 (Formulation of Policy).

This office should undertake without delay a comprehensive survey of the organization and operation of the espionage and counter-espionage systems of the leading foreign powers, especially the excellent ones of Great Britain. Our past efforts in this highly technical field have been too characterized by dilettantism. The writer makes that assertion on the basis of intimate knowledge of both peace and wartime activities abroad of the military and naval intelligences services and the FBI, and also as a foreign-service officer, before and during World War II, who had practical foreign experience in this work. The United States has placed itself at an immeasurable disadvantage in its failure to operate in this field under conditions of at least equal advantages with other countries in gaining intelligence and, on the other hand, of coping defensively with the international practice of other powers in the premises. It is a recognized and universal medium of obtaining information and our authorities should be in possession of all possible information to enable them to plan intelligently. Not only would the United States be acting for itself, but for international peace. In appropriate cases, information of contemplated breaches of the international peace would be made available to the United Nations Organization. The atomic bomb and jet propulsion place a premium upon time and the element of surprise in initiating war. Once the formula is known, that obliterative bomb doubtless will be within the financial ability of many of the smaller countries. These new circumstances revolutionize the functions of the services of security and self-defense. The present offers an unsurpassed opportunity to initiate such a long-needed change, before the experiences of World War II are dimmed, organizations disintegrate, and personnel is lost. It is a matter that calls for the most serious study. The most outstanding personnel of military and naval intelligence and the Office of Strategic Services should be obtained for this office.

It would cooperate with the Office of Formulation of Policy in the determination of policy as to the public dissemination of information regarding foreign policy and relations, being guided by the principle that, in a democracy, the people, who constitute the mainspring of authority, should be taken into the confidence of the Department to the fullest possible extent. An effort might be made to present factually to the American public the position of other governments, the delicacy of which task is appreciated, yet it is not insuperable. A broad policy would be in the interest of keeping the people informed, and of stimulating public interest in world affairs. It is the plan most tenable in the democratic process. How otherwise can the people fulfill their function of sustaining the Department? There also is the necessity for additional action to bridge the gap between the Department and the people it serves under the President and the Congress. More satisfactory public relations should be established.

The division of activities in the drafting of material for the Department, public statements, press releases, and news digests could be reached subsequently between the Office of Intelligence and the line.

It should be charged with the most essential duty of maintaining liaison with the War and Navy Departments for the complete interchange of intelligence and knowledge of plans to insure the full defense of the United States at all times. The antecedents of the attack on Pearl Harbor testify to this need.

THE OFFICE OF FORMULATION OF POLICY (S-2)

"This office formulates national policies, present and future, in the field of foreign relations and affairs, and makes recommendations thereon to the Secretary of State, both on its own initiative and in response to directives, being duly governed in this function by the principles of legitimate geopolitics, precedents, the interests, policies, traditions, public opinion, and political philosophy of the United States. Devises over-all diplomatic strategy of an adequate and timely nature and coordinates the policies abroad of all Federal agencies. Considers all determinants (domestic, vis-à-vis other powers, and within other powers) and, as a result, defines those positive objectives essential to the welfare of the United States and its citizens. Plans so to stabilize relations with and among other countries as to make for equitable peace. Maintains close relations with the Army and Navy to the end that harmonious and sound national policies shall prevail at all times. Its scope embraces the political, economic, and social spheres. Periodically examines international agreements and commitments to determine their status. Devotes particular attention to national social psychology and the science of human relations in its understanding and appraisal of foreign peoples. Recommends the enactment of legislation. Prepares reports and studies, outlines trends, makes forecasts, and digests noteworthy publications. Keeps research facilities, including complete geopolitical files on all foreign countries, absorbing the archives of OSS. Draws freely upon the resources and services of all Federal agencies and reciprocates in appropriate cases. Maintains liaison with pertinent governmental agencies."

Its discharge of the above heavy responsibilities would offer a supreme test for sound, creative imagination, evaluation of the lessons of history, apperception of the foundations of other powers, and sense of timing. It would bring to bear perspective in the study of historical diplomatic objectives, stressing the thread of continuity, of all powers. Historical precedents and courses likely to be followed by modern powers, including those of the late Axis, would be inherent in its task. The destiny of the Nation would rest appreciably in its hands. It would forcefully engage in efforts to preserve peace as the alternative to atomic warfare.

It would use the most modern tools and methods. This might require that the study of the principles of legitimate geopolitics be fundamental to its mission. Note that "legitimate" geopolitics is specified, which is done to prevent confusion with the prostituted and egregious variety of the Nazis and the Japanese. Geopolitics is only a synonym for power, the possession of which by ourselves and other leading nations is plain and must be taken into consideration in foreign policy. This is not imperialistic nor is it deprecatory of the nascent United Nations Organization. The basic essentials of that science probably have been vindicated in World War II. Sir Halford Mackinder's theory of the command of the world being made possible by the rule of the world island following the rule of the heartland and eastern Europe is of greater interest than ever incident to changed international positions after World War II. Some authorities are of the opinion that geopolitics holds the key to lasting peace. One quintessential task of this office, in collaboration with the Army and Navy, would be to ascertain the feasibility of a North American heartland as a defensive counterpoise. This is not an alarmist attitude; even less is it directed against any specific foreign power or powers. It is only that realistic forethought must be given to the continued welfare of the United States.

Another branch of modern science which has a major contribution to make to equitable and amicable relations between nations is that of social science. President Roosevelt declared, just before his death, that "if civilization is to survive, we must cultivate the science of human relationships." The specific approach contemplated is what might be called national social psychology for want of a more explicit term. It offers a promising orientation to understanding, and hence coping with, such enigmas as Hitler's Germany, Japan, and Argentina. More fruitfully it affords even greater hope in assuring a lasting peace. Miss Dorothy Thompson has mentioned a national psychoanalysis for Germany at this critical juncture of history. Dr. Richard M. Brickner has written a book, Is Germany Incurable? which, regardless of his own postulates, poses the absorbing question of the possession by the entire Germanic people of a psychosis—paranoia. As Lange puts it with unassailable logic:

"Emotions are not only the most important forces in the life of the individual human being but they are also the most powerful forces of nature known to us. Every page in the history of nations testifies to their invincible power."

Can a modern foreign policy afford to ignore such a field? Dr. Harold Lasswell, author of World Politics and Personal Insecurity, and the Psychopathology of Political Behavior, is an authority in this unfolding field.

It is suggested that this office devise a formula of pertinent conditions and requirements which would be considered in connection with all questions and matters in the field of foreign relations and affairs. A formula of this type would preclude the probability of any errors or oversight, especially in cases of emergency when pressure might be severe. Another reason calling for such a safeguard is the increasing complexity and number of aspects of such matters, requiring consideration by various persons and organizations.

This office would have the necessary facilities and material for that intensive and extensive research precedent to the formulation of policy. This service likewise would be useful to other governmental agencies and to private entities and individuals.

In the field of background intelligence this office would serve as a depository of the most complete geopolitical information, indexed and evaluated, on all other countries. The absorption by it of the files of the Office of Strategic Services would be a good first step. This facility would serve a function similar to that of the famous Institut Fur Geopolitik at Munich of Dr. Karl Haushofer, which gave such a tremendous political and military advantage to the Third Reich. Such knowledge is required even more by a peace-loving democracy than by a predatory nation.

The office would supply background knowledge, cataloged, digested, and correlated, on all countries, for its own use in planning, for the remainder of the staff, and for the Department. It thus would analyze current developments in the framework of history and forecast future trends. Included in this function would be the study of contemporary printed material and literature in appropriate fields. The facilities of the Office of Intelligence would be freely utilized by it.

It would coordinate the policies in the foreign field of all Federal agencies and harmonize them with the over-all policy of the Department of State.

It would function with the Office of Execution of Policy in taking the necessary preliminary action incident to international conferences and meetings.

While primarily concerned with the foreign field, the office also would be fully informed of conditions within the United States and the prevailing public opinion as determinants in the casting of foreign policy. This imposes on it the dual function of having accurate, full, and timely knowledge of (1) all interests, regions, and segments of the United States and (2) of all foreign powers, bringing to bear a global point of view and the realization that the welfare and security of all of the countries of the contemporary world and international peace are indivisible.

It should be consulted by the legal adviser in legal policy and cases to assure conformance with over-all policy. The legal adviser should retain his present independent status and not be integrated into the staff.

This office should evaluate the conclusions submitted by the Advisory Council on Foreign Policy (hereinafter described) and make recommendations based thereon.

It would advise with the Division of Intelligence on the democratization, as much as is expedient, of foreign policy and relations.

The duties to be performed by this office and that of execution of policy are so important that it might be advisable to have one person head both units. This would insure desirable integration in the closely related functions of policy framing and its implementation. It would not overgrade the specifications and responsibilities of the position if it were given the rank of an assistant secretaryship. The incumbent, of course, would be subordinate to the Assistant Secretary or Under Secretary in charge of the entire staff.

THE OFFICE OF EXECUTION OF POLICY (S–3)

The description of the responsibilities of this office follows:

"Develops specific methods and formula by means of which the line organization can implement the policies and recommendations decided upon by S–2 and approved by the Secretary of State. Its function relates to diplomatic tactics and embraces the actions abroad of all Federal agencies, exploring and deciding upon the most satisfactory methods and techniques of achieving objectives. Operates in the closest cooperation with S–2 and the line, particularly the geographic divisions in their relations and negotiations with other countries. Performs the supervisory functions of follow-through and follow-up. Is concerned with relations (collaboration, reportorial, and communication in general) between the staff, and the line and the field. Cooperates with S–1 and S–2 in keeping the War and Navy Departments appropriately and currently informed as to the diplomatic relations with foreign powers."

This office would assume the staff function where the Office of Formulation of Policy (S–2) terminates its role. There otherwise would be a vacuum without provision for responsibility for developing the specific methods for the translating into action by the line of the plans and decisions reached by S–2. It would insure over-all uniformity and coordination in the execution of policies in all areas of the world.

A primary weakness in the administration of agencies of the Government and private business is the lack of follow-through. Admirable conception may launch a program, but there are too many cases where inertia or other activities supervened slowly to strangle it to death. This office would supply the follow-up function and hence offer another point in favor of an over-all staff.

There accordingly is no conflict between this office and the line and the former would not encroach upon the latter.

The relationship between this office and the line and the field make it the logical unit to be concerned with the relations, in the large sense, between the staff, and the line and the foreign service. This applies especially to collaboration, reportorial activities, and communication in general.

It would cooperate with the Office of Intelligence in liaison with the War and Navy Departments in assuring a full exchange of information regarding the status of diplomatic relations with foreign countries to insure the welfare of the United States at all times.

THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT PLANNING (S–4)

This is a summation of the proposed jurisdiction of this office:

"Plans in the sphere of management and administration to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of the Department and foreign service. Performs broad personnel planning, including recruitment and training. Determines the proper salaries and allowances conducive to the most satisfactory functioning of personnel, particularly abroad. Makes studies and recommendations as to appropriations to be requested. Maintains current files of persons, Americans and aliens, in the United States and abroad, with such qualifications as might be useful, particularly in time of emergency. Cooperates with and advises institutions of higher learning in their curriculums and methods to prepare students for official and private activities in the foreign field in keeping with the new international orientation of the United States."

This office would apply the principles and findings of the science of management in an effort to increase the operating efficiency and effectiveness of the Department and the Foreign Service.

Its functions in the field of personnel would be on the top level. It would serve in an advisory role to the President and the Secretary of State in the selection of the increasing number of higher appointees in numerous capacities in the international field. It would maintain a current file on persons, Americans and aliens, in the United States and abroad, with such qualifications as might be useful, especially in time of emergency.

In the fulfillment of its functions with respect to the foreign service, it would not impinge upon the duties and powers of the Personnel Board of the Foreign Service. This office could perform investigations and make studies in the personnel field for the Secretary of State.

A prerequisite to the planned expansion of the Department and the foreign service is the obtaining of sufficient appropriations from the Congress. It is highly doubtful if the Congress will deny the necessary funds where convincing presentations are made to it. This office would perform that vital function and be staffed with competent personnel for that purpose.

THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON FOREIGN POLICY

The essential data concerning this new organization[1] may be summarized thus:

A nonpartisan body, of representative officials and citizens appointed by the President, to assemble in Washington at stated periods or in emergencies, on the call of the Secretary of State, to deliberate in executive session on questions of foreign policy, whose confidential, advisory conclusions and recommendations would be made to the Secretary of State for his discretionary guidance as a reflection of public opinion, as befits the operation of a democracy. Membership might consist of:

All living former Presidents of the United States;

All living former Secretaries of State;

A senior representative of each executive department of the Government, including State;

The chairman and ranking minority member, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations;

The chairman and ranking minority member, House Committee on Foreign Affairs;

A Justice of the Supreme Court;

A representative each of industry, labor, agriculture, education, scientific research, social science, political science, political economy, and finance;

And perhaps other citizens from strategic professions and vocations, and also citizens qualified to make suitable contributions.

This body well might mirror geographical and regional viewpoints, the alleged absence of which in foreign policy has been criticized. One course is to include the governors of strategic States and even the mayors of certain cities.

The advisory council would have an executive or interim committee, which would be available on shorter notice than the entire council and whose conclusions would be more quickly reached because of its smaller size. It would convene on the call of the Secretary of State and be composed of the following 10 persons:

The Secretary of State;

The Secretary of War;

The Secretary of the Navy;

The chairman and ranking minority member, Senate Foreign Relations Committee;

The chairman and ranking minority member, House Foreign Affairs Committee;

One representative each from scientific research, industry, and labor, appointed by the President.

It would be calculated to further the democratization of foreign policy by furnishing a group of responsible citizens to bridge the gap between the Department of State and the public. The people and the Congress, the fountainheads of power and on whose support and mandate the Department is dependent, thus would have as effective a consultative voice in the conduct of foreign relations as would be feasible, and within the framework of the Constitution.

President Truman has shown a marked policy of including Members of the Congress in the conduct of foreign policy, which is a statesmanlike recognition of contemporary realities and complexities. The executive branch would not relinquish any of its constitutional power or prerogatives in the field of foreign relations by the operation of the Advisory Council. The fundamental idea underlying the inception of this Council is to make permanent and to formalize the salutary principle exemplified in the advisory and consultative roles played by Members of the Congress and public opinion in the vital conferences of Chapultepec and San Francisco. The public criticizes the Department for being too removed from the people of the country and as being too inclined to confront the people with fait accompli, at times to the surprise and disapproval of the public.

The composition of the Council should not exceed 35 persons to prevent it from becoming unwieldly. As outlined above, a more compact group of 10 persons would be at the disposal of the Secretary of State in his discretion, as might be preferable in emergencies or in the consideration of certain subjects.

CONCLUSION

This project has been in the mind of the writer for a long time, but it has been reduced to writing within only the last few days. It is realized that there are imperfections in it and that refinements will result from more deliberative and prolonged consideration. No effort has been made to engage in research.

If this memorandum, by indirection, has seemed to place the major emphasis on the political aspect to the exclusion of the economic, it was unintentional and not meant to understimate the essentiality of economic

---

[1] Since drafting this proposal for an Advisory Council, it has been discovered that Senator WILEY proposed a somewhat similar body in 1942 to be known as the Foreign Relations Advisory Council. But his idea called for its restriction to the Secretary and Under Secretary of State, technicians of the Department of State, the chairmen and ranking minority members, Senate and House Foreign Relations and Affairs Committees, and other Senators as designated by the President. The more representative character and broader base of the body now proposed are manifest. A precedent in the field of trade promotion work for the projected Advisory Council on Foreign Policy is the current establishment by the Department of an advisory committee of businessmen, which was announced after the completion of this memorandum. Also, the Business Advisory Council for the Department of Commerce, consisting of 60 active members and more graduates, founded over a decade ago, is reported to be very successful.

activities—economics being politics in action. This applies especially to the wholesome expansion of our export trade and, as a condition precedent to a stabilized, international, economic structure, purchases from other countries. A staff would devote appropriate attention to this necessary phase and serve as liaison with other agencies of the Government, notably the Department of Commerce.

It might be that this concept of an initial staff is on too comprehensive a scale and that a smaller one of diminished functions would be preferable at this time. Be that as it may, it is submitted that an over-all staff of some description appears to be indicated. While not a panacea, such a staff is thought to be the logical instrumentality to answer that at times perplexing departmental questions. "What is the policy?"

Prevention of Strikes in Public Utilities

REMARKS
OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I think we are all aware that what we have been trying to do in the House is to lay down some future rules and guides which will improve the very troubled relations existing between labor and management. The present wave of strikes is vexatious and very hurtful to reconversion; but it must be remembered that to a large extent it is a byproduct of reconversion. It is inevitable that our national economy should have some struggle to adjust itself in the difficult transition from war to peace. It is to be hoped therefore, that in the heat of the moment, and in the very laudable effort to improve industrial relations, the House does not go too far in infringing upon the well-recognized and fundamental rights of labor to bargain collectively, and to strike when collective bargaining fails. Likewise, if labor leaders are prudent they will refrain from opposing every type of regulation which is suggested. Certainly, labor itself does not condone violence in connection with strikes, and yet even attempts to prevent violence are bitterly opposed by some groups. No one believes more firmly than I in the rights of American labor to obtain its proper share of industrial profits by means of adequate and generous wages, nor in their rights to obtain the best possible working conditions. They must have the right to bargain collectively by representatives of their own choice, and most certainly the right to strike in an effort to effect these conditions where other means fail. But even these rights, as is the case with all rights, must be modified in the public interest.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced there is a limited field in which there is not the right to strike at all. There should be no interruption which threatens the health and very lives of the American people.

I propose, therefore, that the Congress give mature and careful thought to the special field of public utilities and other establishments whose interruption paralyzes society. I certainly do not propose that we rush into this subject today or this week. What I suggest is that the Committee on Labor give the fullest kind of consideration to this problem, and for that purpose, I am introducing a resolution, which reads as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption hereof, the Committee on Labor shall investigate proper and equitable means to prevent any interruption of work in any industry or establishment the continuous operation of which is necessary to life and health.

Such industries or establishments, for the purpose hereof, shall be limited to all operations now defined as public utilities, and to hospitals, and the processing and transportation of essential foods and fuel.

In the course of its investigation, the committee shall give full attention to special compensation, pension rights, and other forms of security to workers in such industries.

No report shall be made by the committee until a full and fair hearing is afforded to labor, management, and the public.

Mr. Speaker, the Governor of New Jersey, in his annual message to the State legislature on January 8 1946, said:

There is no right at any time to strike against the security, welfare, and lives of the people—and heat, light, power, transportation, water, and food are the life essentials of the people.

I think this is so.

But if we are going to ban interruptions in these essential public services, we are likewise going to have to provide a special compensation and special type of job security to the workers. If a worker in such essential industries renounces the right to strike, he must have special rights to protect and compensate him. My resolution provides that the committee shall give full consideration to this requirement.

Mr. Speaker, this is a difficult and complex problem. It obviously cannot be decided at once, nor without full and fair hearings. It must be thought of in an atmosphere of calm impartiality, and with primary consideration to the social welfare of the people. I am not even sure that the approach I am suggesting is the correct one, but I am quite sure that it is an approach which requires careful and conscientious attention of the Congress. The problem is hard, but the goal is worth achieving. Its solution is vital to the health and lives of Americans; moreover, the elimination of such strikes will reflect an everlasting benefit on organized labor generally. For when the public is deprived of food, fuel, and other necessities of life, it is seriously hurt, and will strike back at the cause, regardless of the merits of the dispute, and the fundamental rights of labor will ultimately be impaired.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution will be adopted, and that the Seventy-ninth Congress will deal with this great problem with calmness and courage.

[From the Camden (N. J.) Courier-Post of January 11, 1946]

BAN STRIKES IN UTILITIES?—IF WORKERS GET SECURITY

With the telephone strike spreading rapidly, "Mike" Quill threatening a general strike in New York City, and a walk-out of PTC workers in Philadelphia set for February 11—

There's intense public interest in the proposal of Governor Edge for outlawing utility strikes.

This newspaper, on a number of occasions, has urged a similar step. On November 24 last, the Courier-Post said editorially:

"Just as the right of free speech does not include the right to holler 'Fire!' in a crowded theater, so the right to strike must not include the right to paralyze a State.

"Every human right is limited by the public safety.

"Legislation is needed to regulate labor in essential public utilities as well as in police, fire, and water bureaus."

At that particular time, electrical workers of the Public Service Corp. were threatening to strike throughout New Jersey, but Governor Edge didn't want to come back from his vacation in Georgia.

Finally, he did so, chiefly, he admitted, because the Courier-Post newspapers demanded the Governor be on the job.

We are flattered that Edge has further followed our suggestions—by proposing to outlaw utility strikes.

But—and this is a big but—

Governor Edge's message omits the other half of this newspaper's proposal. We said:

"Utility labor must renounce the right to strike in exchange for special compensation, extra perquisites, pensions, etc."

Edge says nothing about giving utility labor any concessions in exchange for giving up the right to strike. He merely proposes compulsory arbitration in utility labor disputes. And that's not enough.

When a man takes a civil-service job, as a cop, or a fireman—or a judge—he forfeits some rights and gains some privileges.

The cop and fireman give up the right to strike and gain economic security, in the form of sick leave, vacation pay, pensions. The judge gives up the right to be active in politics and gets not only a pension for himself but in most States a pension for his wife.

If utility workers are to be put in the same class; if, when a man takes a job at a power plant, he gives up his right to strike, then he, too, should get security benefits in exchange.

How far the ban on strikes in utilities should extend is a question.

Obviously it should include those who operate power and light plants, water and sewer services and the transportation of food. Those are essentials, without which communities could be hit by epidemics.

Whether telephone, bus, trolley and taxi service should be included is debatable. It can be argued that all the public suffers from a strike in those fields is inconvenience.

Anyway, most reasonable Americans agree with Edge's statement:

"There is no right at any time to strike against the security, welfare, and lives of the people."

If labor is wise it will make clear that it does not want the right to wreck a whole community to punish one employer.

[From the Washington Post]

STRIKE LEGISLATION

(By Walter Lippmann)

If Congress is to go further than that, into what we might call a second phase, it should then, it seems to me, fix its attention on measures to prevent strikes in the essential public services. Strikes which isolate communities, or deprive them of light, heat, power, transportation, medical care, and essential foods, are in a class apart, and there can be and should be no doubt that the public interest is paramount. Here the people have an indubitable right to enforce peace upon the owners and the employees.

Soldiers, policemen, firemen have no right to strike. The fact that they are employed

by the State whereas the workers in public utilities are employed by privately owned companies has to be taken into consideration. But public utilities are not private enterprises. They are Government-created monopolies, which exist by virtue of a public franchise, and they are privately owned and managed only because the people prefer to let this kind of public business be carried on in this way. Those who own them, manage them, and work in them are in fact public servants, and Congress and the State legislatures would be fully entitled to legislate on that principle.

No one is compelled to invest his money in a public utility. No one is drafted to work for a public utility. But if he invests in one or takes a job in one, then it might well be stated in the law that the service may not be interrupted, that disputes must be settled without interrupting the service. If this means compulsory arbitration, let it, and anyone who dislikes it should not go into the utility business. For it would be the condition of his investing and of his being hired that the public service must go on.

Loan to Great Britain

REMARKS

OF

HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, it was interesting on Tuesday last to read in the newspapers Secretary of State Byrnes' sales talk on the proposed $4,000,000,000 loan to Britain. Mr. Byrnes said it would provide "tangible, firm gains for the United States and the rest of the world."

However, when he came to analyze these "gains" the Secretary of State dribbled off into saying what we would gain was a "chance" for certain of those gains; and that if the loan is approved we can "expect" certain of those gains.

Now the difficulty with those of us who are realistic is that in the past we have advanced loans of real "dough" for such a "quid pro quo" of chances and expectations, and they have never materialized. So, in this respect the Secretary's sales talk leaves a realist quite cold, even though he may have enlightened self-interest.

And then the Secretary gives us this gem in his sales talk:

> This credit is not a precedent for anything. It is unique because the position of Britain in world trade, her need for working capital, and the effect upon world trade of her acquiring that working capital, all are unique.

I do not cite this quote of Secretary Byrnes to show that it will be a precedent. That would only be argumentative. Nor do I want to show that he contradicts himself a little further on, when he says that the loan will be used for "food and basic raw materials, some of which are in surplus here"; nor do I desire at this time to call attention to the fact that Britain stands to lose much of her trade with her dominions in the nature of importing food and raw materials, and that we are being asked to supplant these colonies and dominions in furnishing food and raw materials to Britain for competition in world trade; nor do I wish to emphasize that in addition we are asked to furnish the purchase price, which, of course, the colonies and dominions never did. We will just pass all of that over.

The point we wish to stress in the above quotation is that the Secretary says the loan is unique, and that in fact everything about it is unique. With this statement we are in full accord. The proposed loan is unique, which means the only one of its kind, being without equal, singular, uncommon. Synonyms for "unique" are odd, queer, anomalous, bizarre, crotchety, curious, droll, eccentric, erratic, fantastic, funny, grotesque, laughable, ludicrous, peculiar ridiculous, strange, unmatched, unusual, whimsical.

Yes, Mr. Speaker; the proposed loan to Britain is unique, and all and everything about it is unique. We might even go a little further and say with charity that the State Department is unique in its dealings with Britain.

I said a moment ago that all we gain is a "chance" or an "expectation." In past dealings, that is all we ever got from Britain for our cash. And I am not referring to the First World War loan or to lend-lease.

We have only to go back to the propaganda of the State Department in seeking the second contribution to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, commonly called UNRRA. I discussed that on page 11494 of the December 5 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The State Department showed that 17 United Nations made contributions totalling $1,835,000,000. Of this amount, $1,350,000,000 came from the United States, and $485,000,000 from all the other nations, including $319,000,000 from the United Kingdom.

The most unique thing about their accounting and propaganda was that it showed that by February 1, 1946, the United States account would show a deficit of $188,000,000, while the other United Nations' account would be paid in full up to that time. Now, that is unique. It will be noted that the ratio of contributions is 72 percent for the United States and 28 percent for all the other nations, let us say, roughly, 75 percent and 25 percent. Now, if anyone of you was to go on a hunting trip with me in which we figured that the supplies would cost a hundred dollars, and you would generously offer to put in $75, asking me to put in only $25, certainly every dollar, yes, every penny of our combined funds would be spent simultaneously; and even the last penny that was spent would be three-quarters yours and one-quarter mine. There could be no such thing as your money giving out before mine did. And yet, for the purpose of propaganda, the State Department showed that this unique, queer, and odd thing had happened. Newspapers, commentators, and so forth, accused Uncle Sam of dishonor, being a welcher, and so forth, so we would hurry and put up another $1,350,000,000.

The report was unique in that it gave the receipts in columnar form and the expenditures in prose paragraph form. The latter, of course, is difficult to check, especially if it is a conglomeration of allocations, obligations, commitments, shipments, expenditures, and so forth.

Another thing that was unique and intrigued me was a statement above the list of contributions which read, "Paid or available on request." When I asked what was meant by this "available on request," and why, if UNRRA was so desperately in need of funds it was not all paid instead of leaving some of it lying around available on request, I received no satisfactory answer. However, in a remote part of the statement of expenditures from the fund of the other United Nations, I read that of $485,000,000 contributed by countries other than the United States, $183,000,000 had been spent for supplies, and so forth, and $122,000,000 obligated for supplies and delivery in November, December, and then this little statement, "The balance of $180,000,000, consisting chiefly of sterling from the United Kingdom contribution, will be spent for commodities in Great Britain." This, of course, cleared up what was meant by the words, "Available on request," above the list of contributions. It simply meant that at least Britain had, instead of contributing commodities, made available $180,000,000 in sterling, which was nothing more than an I O U. And why did the United Kingdom give an I O U for $180,000,000? The answer is, because the United Kingdom must import foodstuffs and similar commodities herself to survive and therefore has none to contribute to the war-stricken and devastated nations on the Continent.

If I may again advert to the hunting trip, if, instead of contributing my $25 in cash, I put a worthless I O U in the kitty, there would, of course, be a different situation. But still you would not want it said that you were in default and welshing when, of course, it was I that was in default.

It is a fair and simple deduction that as long as we were providing England her lend-lease, of which billions of dollars consisted of these same kinds of commodities, the United Kingdom could use our lend-lease in making her contribution to UNRRA. But when lend-lease stopped she was unable to further contribute, except in sterling, which, of course, is useless. UNRRA cannot buy relief goods outside of the United Kingdom with it, and the United Kingdom cannot spare relief goods within the Kingdom.

In other words, it is a fair conclusion that the United Kingdom never made any contributions to UNRRA out of her own resources, and whatever was supplied under her subscription of $319,000,000 was supplied by her out of United States lend-lease goods.

In spite of repeated demands, I was never furnished with a balance sheet showing the receipts and expenditures of $1,835,000,000 in one account. Finally I did receive two tabulations, one for the United States and one for the other United Nations. These were furnished me by the State Department too late to get into the hearings for the second UNRRA authorization, and I inserted them in the record above stated. They not only verify the foregoing criticisms, but show that up to October 31, or about as long as lend-lease lasted, the ratio of expenditures was three to one, three for the United States, and one for the other

United Nations, as it should be according to the subscriptions. But from there on it will be noted that the State Department stepped up the ratio to four to one, in which we were supplying it all, and Britain's $180,000,000 sterling was simply divided for the months of November, December, and January as available. This they do not say is being spent, but will be spent when commodities are available in the United Kingdom. The fact that these books are out of balance $180,000,000, and that they are raising our contribution by the same amount, does not seem to be of any consequence.

In conclusion, I want to say that I cannot subscribe to or vote for these unique dealings of our State Department with the United Kingdom. The American people are entitled to the facts so they can do their own thinking and form their own opinion.

The New Deal has engaged in too much of Hitler's philosophy on propaganda as found in Mein Kampf, where he says:

> What we mean by the words "public opinion" depends only to the smallest extent on the individual's own experiences or knowledge, and largely on an image, frequently created by a penetrating and persistent sort of so-called "enlightenment."

The American people probably know, and I know, that the situation in the United Kingdom is such that she cannot contribute to UNRRA, and for that we cannot blame her. But the State Department should give us the facts and not propagandize us with unique, queer, odd, and misleading propaganda.

With our national debt at three hundred billions, our budget threatening to run from twenty-five billions annually upward, we cannot extend these proposed loans without imperiling our own security. It is high time that sanity instead of uniqueness again be restored in our administration of government.

The Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following answer by Lewis Ayer Smith to the problems of our age:

THE ANSWER
(By Lewis Ayer Smith)

Eons ago,
From beyond our ken,
An impulse came to Earth.
For countless ages,
In ways incomprehensible.
It evolved.
And yesterday a baby was born.
For unnumbered generations,
The baby quested; ever striving
For mastery over himself.
Today, the baby holds in his hands
The atomic bomb.
Realizing that he now has the power
To destroy himself,
He cries aloud to his God, asking
"What must I do to be saved?"
And his God replies, saying,
"I gave you the answer
One thousand nine hundred and forty-five years ago,"
But the baby, clutching his bomb, mutters
"It is easier to kill than to love."

Winds Can Be Harnessed for Electric Power on Farms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have been a strong champion for rural electrification during my years in Congress. Long strides have been made in the past few years to bring electric power to the farms of America, and I earnestly hope that this progress continues.

My district is located in the extreme northwest corner of the State of Minnesota, and many areas there are sparsely settled. The extension of REA power lines into some of these areas is a remote possibility for years to come. In the meantime, the hardy, pioneering farmers and farm women who are literally cutting farms out of old timberlands are compelled to do without labor-saving electric equipment and appliances which is available to farmers in more settled regions. This fact hampers the settlement of these more isolated areas.

It is my belief that in communities where there are too few farms to justify the present methods of the extension of REA power lines, some provision should be made for the loaning of REA funds, on a long-term basis to farmers for the installation of individual farm electric plants.

Last October a subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was presented with information to the effect that individual farm electric plants, particularly those operated by wind power, could adequately serve the farmers to whom REA power lines were not available.

Because much of the following information was not printed in the committee hearings on H. R. 1742, I am incorporating in these remarks a letter directed to me by Mr. R. F. Weinig, vice president and general manager of a manufacturing concern in Sioux City, Iowa, engaged in the production of individual farm power plants operated by wind.

The letter follows:

WINCHARGER CORP.,
Sioux City, Iowa, December 12, 1945.
Hon. HAROLD C. HAGEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAGEN: We in the individual farm electric plant industry are 100 percent for economical area coverage, since farm electrification is both a social and economic necessity. We believe that every farmer and rancher deserves electricity, and that every farm and ranch should be electrified. But let's give each farmer and rancher the benefits of electricity at the lowest possible cost per kilowatt-hour. The facts included herein should help establish whether central-service power line electrification, or individual farm electric plants will yield the lowest cost energy in each individual instance.

I stated to the subcommittee of the House of Representatives Committee on Foreign and Interstate Commerce on June 15, 1945, that I believed the cost of electricity delivered by power lines to individual farmers and ranchers in the sparsely settled areas could be calculated. Since that time we have been able to establish what we believe to be a fair and accurate estimate of the cost per kilowatt-hour of electricity delivered by REA power lines, assuming these lines to be both self-liquidating within a period of 35 years, and self-continuing without additional Government financing after the initial loan.

Along with these figures I shall present the estimated cost of electricity from certain individual wind electric plants. The cost of power-line electricity was developed from REA reports and data, and from the United States Census reports. The calculations have all been traced to their original source, the method of calculation approved and audited by David Himmelblau & Co., a firm of certified public accountants, who are located in Chicago, Ill.

Table 1 shows the estimated cost per kilowatt-hour of power-line electricity, based on actual REA experience, under conditions assuming the user's average electrical load to be 71 kilowatt-hours, 89 kilowatt-hours, or 100 kilowatt-hours per month.

TABLE 1.—*Estimated cost per kilowatt-hour on present REA lines in the States shown* [1]

Name of State	Number of miles energized to Dec. 31, 1943	Number of consumers connected to Dec. 31, 1943	Number of consumers per mile	Estimated cost (in cents) per kilowatt-hours of energy delivered if line is to be both self-liquidating within a period of 35 years and self-continuing without additional Government loans beyond that period		
				Monthly load of—		
				71 kilowatt-hours	89 kilowatt-hours	100 kilowatt-hours
Arizona	620	1,313	2.118	10.359	8.436	7.602
Colorado	5,955	14,851	2.494	7.656	6.353	5.796
Kansas	9,306	17,085	1.818	8.090	6.745	6.162
Montana	3,075	7,052	2.293	8.046	6.673	6.078
Nebraska	10,782	19,811	1.837	7.778	6.410	5.817
Nevada	112	433	3.866	7.707	6.227	5.585
New Mexico	1,247	2,462	1.974	8.793	7.232	6.555
North Dakota	2,967	5,931	1.999	7.948	6.592	6.003
South Dakota	2,226	4,184	1.880	8.323	6.975	6.389
Texas	37,913	86,756	2.288	6.161	5.097	4.637
Wyoming	2,071	5,053	2.440	7.487	6.294	5.776
Total 11 States	76,364	164,931	2.160	7.012	5.808	5.286

[1] Based on method demonstrated in table 2.

Table 2 shows in general the method which was used to determine cost per kilowatt-hour of electricity delivered.

TABLE 2.—*Method used in calculating the cost of REA power line electrification*

Construction cost per mile: $89,994,927 (total funds allocated for distribution systems, generation and transmission, but not including wiring and plumbing)÷90,972 (Number of miles to be constructed)	$989.26
Cost per mile per year for amortization of loan, depreciation, and maintenance:	
Annual cost per mile if initial loan is to be repaid in 35 equal annual installments (with interest at a 2-percent rate):	
Annual amortization of total cost per mile ($989.26×0.04000221[1])	39.57
Annual depreciation per mile ($989.26 ×3.48 percent[2])	34.43
Annual maintenance expense per mile	$7.00
Total annual cost per mile	81.00
Average number of consumers per mile as connected as of Dec. 31, 1943	÷2.16
Total annual amortization, depreciation and maintenance per consumer	37.50
1943 operating expenses per consumer, excluding power and maintenance[4]	13.20
Annual cost per REA consumer, excluding power	50.70

Revenue required per kilowatt-hour of energy:

	Number of kilowatt-hours used per month		
	71	89	100
Annual cost per REA consumer excluding power	$50.70	$50.70	$50.70
Annual cost of power[5]	9.04	11.33	12.73
Total annual cost	59.74	62.03	63.43
Divided by number of kilowatt-hours used annually	852	1,068	1,200
Revenue required (in cents) per kilowatt-hour	7.012	5.808	5.286

[1] Amount of annual payment required to repay principal of $1 in 35 years at 2-percent interest compounded annually. Source: Handbook of Financial Mathematics, Prentice Hall, Inc., 1929, p. 1124.

[2] Annual depreciation rate recommended by REA for distribution plant. Source: Depreciation Procedure as applied to REA Financed Systems, Jan. 1, 1944, p. 5.

[3] Annual service cost per mile as estimated by Mr. Neal of REA. Source: REA letter, Feb. 27, 1945, from William J. Neal, Acting Administrator, to CHARLES B. HOEVEN, House of Representatives.

[4] 1943 operating expenses per consumer, excluding power and maintenance, is based on REA's 1943 Annual Statistical Report for the States of Arizona, Colorado, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Dakota, Texas, and Wyoming. It is calculated as follows:

Operating pay-roll for year ended Dec. 31, 1943	$1,371,393.00
General expenses for year ended Dec. 31, 1943	754,860.00
Insurance, taxes, and miscellaneous for year ended Dec. 31, 1943	489,587.00
Total	2,615,752.00
Number of consumers connected as of Dec. 31, 1943	÷164,931
Average operating expense per consumer, excluding power	15.86
Annual cost of maintenance per consumer. Source: REA letter, Feb. 27, 1945, as above	−2.66
1943 operating expense per consumer, excluding power and maintenance	13.20

[5] Annual cost of power per consumer is based on the REA's 1943 Annual Statistical Report for the States listed above and is calculated as follows:

REA cost of power, year ended Dec. 31, 1943	$2,557,026.00
Kilowatt-hours billed, year ended Dec. 31, 1943	÷240,900,759
Cost per kilowatt-hour	$0.01061
$0.01061×852=$9.04	
$0.01061×1068=$11.33	
$0.01061×1200=$12.73	

Table No. 3 shows the estimated cost per kilowatt-hour of electricity from power lines if they were extended to cover every farm or ranch in the more sparsely settled counties in a group of our Midwestern States. In none of these counties will the farms average more than 1.25 per square mile. In the aggregate they average only 0.517 farms per square mile, and we believe would therefore average only 0.517 potential consumers per mile of power line, if every farmer were to accept power-line service.

TABLE 3.—*Estimated cost per kilowatt-hour if REA should extend power lines to every farm. (Only those counties are considered where the farms average less than 1.25 farms per square mile)*

Name of State	Counties	Farms	Farms per square mile	Maximum potential farm or ranch consumers per mile[1] (estimated)	Estimated cost per kilowatt-hour (in cents) if all farms and ranches are electrified, and all REA lines are both self-liquidating within a period of 35 years and self-continuing without additional Government loans		
					Monthly load of—		
					71 kilowatt-hours	89 kilowatt-hours	100 kilowatt-hours
Arizona	11	12,571	0.331	0.331	46.838	37.537	33.502
Colorado	39	24,292	.673	.673	18.800	15.259	13.723
Kansas	32	20,839	.845	.845	13.691	11.213	10.138
Montana	47	34,291	.493	.493	24.843	20.073	18.003
Nebraska	33	23,352	.600	.600	18.992	15.356	13.778
Nevada	13	2,314	.411	.411	49.999	39.965	35.613
New Mexico	26	24,750	.432	.432	29.526	23.772	21.273
North Dakota	28	31,127	1.031	1.031	12.746	10.419	9.410
South Dakota	36	25,456	.644	.644	17.927	14.637	13.208
Texas	99	44,862	.388	.388	25.371	20.422	18.276
Wyoming	21	13,766	.321	.321	34.846	28.120	25.201
Total	385	257,620	.517	.517	20.999	16.966	15.217

[1] Based on 1 mile of line per square mile of land area.

These electrical loads used in this study were not selected at random. Seventy-one kilowatt-hours per month was the load used by the average REA consumer in 1943. Eighty-nine kilowatt-hours per month was the average load used by consumers who had been connected for 61 or more months. One hundred kilowatt-hours is the load we recommend for a representative wind electric plant when properly installed in a suitable location. Based on REA experience, it appears that 100 kilowatt-hours per month meets the average farm or ranch electrical load requirement, and provides in addition latitude for an increased load. Incidentally two or three such plants in multiple could handle loads greater than 100 kilowatt-hours per month.

I believe that tables No. 1 and No. 3 accurately show the increased cost per kilowatt-hour which can be expected and which must be borne if power line farm and ranch electrification is used exclusively in these areas. And I do not believe such costs can be borne by the average farmer in normal times. I do not believe, however, that the progress of rural electrification need be retarded, nor the farmer penalized, because of these facts. Nor is subsidization either by Government or present users of electricity needed to promote speedy electrification. The use of individual farm electric plants to augment the power line can provide the solution, and thus speed sound rural electrification by providing the farmers or ranchers with adequate, dependable, and economical electricity.

By analyzing the foregoing and the following table, I believe the relative cost of electricity from central service power lines and individual wind-electric plans can be determined:

TABLE 4.—*Estimated cost per kilowatt-hour from a representative wind-electric plant*[1]

[Cost in cents per kilowatt-hour when the monthly load is 100 kilowatt-hours]

Purchase plan	10–12 miles per hour	12–14 miles per hour	Over 14 miles per hour
No. 1. Cash purchase	6.63	6.20	5.80
No. 2. 10-year loan with 2-percent rate of interest	7.19	6.71	6.27
No. 3. 10-year, 2-percent loan with reserve for replacement	9.01	8.37	7.78

[1] When properly installed in a suitable location.

Take, for example, the State of Texas. As of December 31, 1943, there were 86,756 REA consumers receiving electricity at an estimated average cost of 6.161 cents per kilowatt-hour for 71 kilowatt-hours per month, 5.097 cents per kilowatt-hour for 89 kilowatt-hours per month, or 4.637 cents per kilowatt-hour for 100 kilowatt-hours per month. It is estimated that should every one of the unelectrified 44,862 farms and ranches located in 99 of the more sparsely settled counties in Texas be electrified by power line only the average cost of electricity would be 25.371 cents per kilowatt-hour for 71 kilowatt-hours per month; 20.422 cents per kilowatt-hour for 89 kilowatt-hours per month; 18.276 cents per kilowatt-hour for 100 kilowatt-hours per month.

Now, by referring to table No. 4, we note that the estimated cost of electricity from the representative wind-electric plant, under the conditions shown in our examples, would not exceed 9.01 cents per kilowatt-hour. Under certain conditions, the cost might be as low as 7.78 cents per kilowatt-hour, based on 10-year financing at a 2 percent interest rate and setting up a reserve for depreciation to provide replacement as outlined in the example used in my testimony of June 15, 1945.

Clearly then, individual electric systems can provide much more economical electricity than could power lines for many of these Texas farms and ranches. It will be noted that this is also true for many farms and ranches in the other States shown in tables No. 1 and No. 3.

On the basis of the facts which I have shown, what then can be said to be the point of minimum farm or ranch density, above which point power-line electrification can serve most economically, and below which point individual wind-electric plants are most economical?

To answer that question I refer you to table No. 3. The 28 counties of minimum farm population density in North Dakota contain 1.031 farms per square mile. This area is the most densely settled of all of the State areas considered in table No. 3, and it happens that this North Dakota area has a farm density almost exactly equal to the average of 1,000,000, farms—in the 17 States west of the Mississippi River—which average in density 1.1 farms per square mile. As shown in table No. 3, the estimated cost of power-line electrification, if carried to all of the

farms and ranches in the 28 counties under consideration in North Dakota, would be 9.41 cents per kilowatt-hour on the basis of a load of 100 kilowatt-hours per month.

Referring to table No. 4, plan No. 3, the estimated cost per kilowatt-hour of 100 kilowatt-hours per month of electricity with the representative wind-electric plant would be 9.01 cents per kilowatt-hour. Twelve- and fourteen-miles-per-hour average velocities could be expected in North Dakota. As shown in table No. 4, these higher wind velocities could have the effect of lowering the cost per kilowatt-hour of the wind-electric energy to under 9.01 cents per kilowatt-hour.

In view of all these facts, we feel that REA should use individual farm electric plants as well as central service power-line electrification, each to the extent it is most feasible and economical. Further, REA should determine the minimum number of customers per mile of farm and ranch power line where central service power-line electrification will be used, and below which point of farm and ranch density individual electric plants will be used.

It appears that the 1,000,000 farms in the 17 Midwestern States which average under 1.1 farms per square mile, would generally come within the category where individual plants can serve most economically and should, therefore, be used.

To permit REA to finance individual farm electric plants appears to require an amendment to H. R. 1742, which has been referred to as the individual farm electric plant amendment. It is the adoption of this amendment that I urge in the interest of a complete, swift, and economical program of rural electrification.

Very truly yours,

WINCHARGER CORP.,
R. F. WEINIG,
Vice President.

Exportation of Critical Building Materials

REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, the building-material situation constitutes one of the major problems now confronting the Nation. It follows that the situation relative to lumber, lumber markets, and lumber prices is of supreme importance. In many sections of the country there is a critical shortage of building material, particularly pine and hardwood lumber. Veterans are trying unsuccessfully to obtain pine lumber with which to construct homes. Home owners want boarding for long-needed and long-delayed repair of their residences. Large and small industries wish to increase the space of their buildings, or to repair the buildings they already have, with little lumber on the market. It is, therefore, pertinent to call to the attention of the proper committee of this House one of the factors causing this lumber shortage.

It was called to my attention recently by the engineer of a manufacturing company in my district, now trying to carry out plans for the erection of an addition to its plant which will mean jobs for hundreds of people, that he attempted to purchase lumber from several of the large lumber mills in my State and found that they were not interested at all in getting out planking for the home market, under domestic ceiling prices, because they could get higher prices in the export trade.

I immediately began an investigation of this situation because it is obvious that, if lumber manufacturers can secure export licenses and higher prices abroad for their lumber than are allowed in this country under our existing ceiling prices, they are going to sell abroad, and our postwar-building program for veterans, other private individuals, and businesses which plan to increase their production, will receive a stunning blow.

When I took this matter up with OPA, I found that this agency is not chiefly to blame. It was admitted that export licenses have been granted for shipment of some lumber to foreign ports at a higher price than our own ceiling price. I was further informed that there is an established trade practice which allows a higher price for export lumber, but that the difference is actually a brokerage rather than a premium. As to the effect of this differential, I was advised that, although 1,043,000,000 feet of lumber were authorized for export in 1945 and export licenses were granted for about 700,000,000 feet, the amount actually exported during the year amounted to only about 380,000,000 feet. The total production of lumber in the United States in 1945 was about 27,500,000,000 feet. This means that about one and one-half percent of the total production was exported last year, whereas in normal times, exports amount to about 6 percent.

Mr. Speaker, these facts and figures may be correct as to 1945 which was a war year. But this year, I am reliably informed, the monthly export percentage is far and above what it was last year and is increasing steadily. If so, something should be done about it or our reconversion building program will be stalled. The manufacturer is simply not going to sell his lumber on the home market when a higher price is allowed for it abroad. Either no export licenses should be granted for shipments abroad at a higher price than the domestic ceiling price, or the home markets should be subsidized to the extent of the difference.

I believe that Mr. Bowles, OPA Administrator, fully comprehends the disaster lurking behind this situation. His efforts are hamstrung to some extent, however, due to the fact that export quantities are allocated by the Civilian Production Administration and export licenses are issued by the State Department. I have requested the Civilian Production Administration to explore this field at once with a view to correcting existing inequities between domestic ceiling prices and prices allowed for foreign shipments of lumber. It is a serious situation and must be corrected if our own people are to receive a fair deal and the United States is to go ahead with reconversion.

Aged Entitled To Pension, Not a Dole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, during these flush days when the present administration is willing and anxious to loan billions of dollars to most any nation in the world, we are continuing to ignore the older people pioneers of our own country who are existing on as little as $15 and $20 a month pension.

A great many people who are entitled to old-age assistance will not even apply for it for two major reasons. First, our State and Federal Governments so grudgingly hand out a mere pittance, that it is obvious in many instances that pensions are in fact a dole and nothing more; and secondly, in some States, including Minnesota, the State has laws called homestead liens which require persons applying for old-age assistance to execute a lien upon their property and give it to the State and Federal Governments, with the view to wholly or partially diverting that property into the hands of the State and Federal Governments at the time of their death in payment for the "pension."

Following is an article which appeared in the October 6, 1945, issue of the Townsend National Weekly, relative to the homestead-lien laws, which will be of interest to my colleagues and to the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SURVEY SHOWS THREE STATES RECENTLY REPEALED LIEN LAWS

WILLMAR, MINN.—An extensive survey on old-age assistance laws, with especial emphasis directed toward lien laws and homestead exemptions, has just been compiled by Charles Nelson, Seventh Congressional District chairman. It took 3 months to complete.

Nelson was prompted to launch his investigation by conditions existing in Minnesota, which legally require oldsters applying for age-aid to execute a lien upon their property while living, which lien, upon execution, will result in one-half of the property being diverted to the Federal Government.

Why, asks Nelson, shall Minnesota people, or people of any State, for that matter, be required to pay back money to the Federal Government, as long as 35 of the 48 States have no similar laws?

Three States, according to the report, have recently repealed their lien laws and canceled their back-pay accumulation of assistance. They are Florida, Kentucky, and Oregon. Arkansas proposed a lien law this year but it failed of passage.

There are 21 States where there is definite protection to home owners against execution by reason of debts and judgments. These States have no homestead lien laws, according to Nelson.

The following table shows how the States stand on lien laws, homestead exemption, and average old-age assistance payments according to Social Security Board figures.

The following table is the result of a letter which was addressed to each of the attorney generals of the 48 States, except Minnesota:

Homestead lien laws existing in the States in connection with old-age assistance, June 1945

State	Lien	No lien	Exemption	Age aid
Maine		No	Yes	$38.88
New Hampshire		No	Yes	28.80
Vermont	Yes		No	21.92
Massachusetts		No	No	41.38
Connecticut		No	No	38.37
Rhode Island	Yes		No	38.98
New York		No	Yes	35.34
Pennsylvania	Yes		Yes	26.36
New Jersey	Yes		No	30.81
Delaware		No	No	15.08
Maryland		No	Yes	26.98
West Virginia	Yes		No	18.14
Virginia	Yes		No	13.38
North Carolina		No	Yes	11.93
Georgia		No	Yes	11.23
Florida	Repealed	No	No	28.50
Alabama		No	Total exempt.	15.88
Mississippi		No	No	14.98
Louisiana		No	Yes	22.42
Tennessee		No	Yes	16.92
Kentucky	Repealed	No	Yes	11.32
Ohio		No	Yes	29.45
Indiana		No	No	25.00
Illinois		No	Yes	31.01
Michigan		No	Yes	30.00
Wisconsin	Yes		No	24.44
Minnesota	Yes		Yes	29.38
North Dakota	Yes		No	32.58
South Dakota	Yes		No	24.09
Iowa	Yes		No	30.66
Nebraska		No	No	28.09
Wyoming		No	No	32.89
Montana		No	Yes	30.39
Kansas		No	No	28.89
Oklahoma		No	No	38.81
Missouri		No	No	28.96
Arkansas		No	No	18.92
Texas		No	Yes	21.79
Colorado		No	Yes	31.31
New Mexico		No	Yes	23.21
Arizona		No	No	38.98
Idaho	Yes		No	38.98
Nevada	Yes		Yes	30.33
Oregon	Repealed	No	Yes	34.83
Utah		No	No	37.01
Washington		No	No	48.50
California		No	No	47.37
South Carolina		No	Yes	13.95
Total	13	35	22	[1] 29.50

[1] Average.

Unless OPA Removes Ceilings on Louisiana Strawberries, Growers Will Suffer Tremendous Losses This Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter which I have written to Hon. Chester Bowles explaining the plight of the Louisiana strawberry farmers. If the OPA does not remove these ceilings on strawberries or increase the same, the growers of Louisiana will suffer a tremendous loss due to unfavorable weather conditions and the lateness of their crop. The following is my letter to Mr. Bowles:

DEAR MR. BOWLES: On January 23, 1946, the Honorable Harry D. Wilson, commissioner of agriculture of the State of Louisiana, wrote you requesting that price ceilings be removed on fresh strawberries.

I cannot too emphatically support Mr. Wilson's position and as the representative from the largest strawberry shipping district in the United States, I ask that you give this your immediate attention and that the ceiling be removed.

Unless the ceilings are removed, the growers of Louisiana will take a tremendous loss, as the crop this year appears to be the latest of record, and, if indications for this late crop continue with the unfavorable weather conditions thus far encountered, together with the greatly increased costs of the present crop, with the present ceilings in effect, these growers will suffer a tremendous loss.

Last season the crop was abnormally early, and for that reason they were able to show a small margin of profit, notwithstanding existing ceilings.

In contrast this year's season is abnormally late and the cost of production has increased more than twofold over last year.

The United States Department of Agriculture has stated and recommended that ceilings be removed on such perishables as strawberries. On several occasions your associates in OPA have stated that ceilings on strawberries were unworkable and that they suggested that they be removed.

If you wish price control to be continued for another year and you want to do the fair thing, I feel sure that immediately after giving this matter your earnest consideration you will go ahead and remove the ceilings on strawberries due to unusual and abnormal crop conditions as set forth above.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. MORRISON,
Member of Congress.

The following is a letter from the Honorable Harry D. Wilson, commissioner of agriculture of the State of Louisiana, which explains the plight of the Louisiana strawberry growers and how the present ceiling price will be disastrous if not changed:

LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND IMMIGRATION,
Baton Rouge, January 23, 1946.

Hon. CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator, Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOWLES: I am writing you in the interest of the Louisiana strawberry growers to protest the ceiling on strawberries for the following reasons:

Present indications are that the crop will be quite late. We experienced a drought during the fall months that prevented the setting of plants in the field to the latest date in the history of the berry industry. The drought was followed by excessive rains, with no relief at present, which has caused wet fields and the growers have been unable to work the plants which are now full of grass. In addition, this has prevented the top dressing and mulching of the plants which will add to the lateness of the crop.

My observation is that this has been, up to the present time, a very unsatisfactory season.

Another point I want to call your attention to is that the cost of labor has increased from 75 to 100 percent

I want to appeal to you to abolish the ceiling on strawberries this season. It is our understanding that the United States Department of Agriculture has recommended that the ceiling be abolished, and we sincerely hope we may have your cooperation by removing the ceiling on berries.

Thanking you for anything you may do for us in this most important matter, and with best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

HARRY D. WILSON,
Commissioner.

Collaboration Between Argentina and Nazi Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a comprehensive story in the New York Times of February 13 by Harold B. Hinton, Washington correspondent, based on the now famous blue book of the State Department showing the existence of collaboration between Argentina and Nazi Germany during the war. Mr. Hinton's article sets forth clearly the complicity which existed between these two nations and shows the assistance and sympathy which Nazi Germany received from the Argentine leaders, against the best interests of the United States.

The article follows:

UNITED STATES REPORT FINDS ARGENTINA GUARDS SEEDS OF NAZISM—OTHER REPUBLICS GET DOCUMENT DETAILING AID TO GERMANY IN WAR AND UP TO PRESENT—FRANCO LINK BROUGHT OUT—TOTALITARIAN ECONOMIC SET-UP FIRMLY IMPLANTED IN BUENOS AIRES, STATEMENT HOLDS

(By Harold B. Hinton)

WASHINGTON, February 12.—Charges that the Argentine Government and its predecessors since Pearl Harbor not only gave active support to the German war effort, even after Argentina's declaration of war against Germany, but furthermore still gives refuge to powerful Nazi interests which may result in the resurgence of nazism in the world were filed today by the United States Government with 19 other republics of the Western Hemisphere.

The indictment took the form of a printed memorandum of 131 pages which had been prepared since 1943. Copies were handed to the chiefs of all Latin-American diplomatic missions here except that of Argentina with the request that they be formally handed to the foreign offices in each capital.

Little official comment was available, but the document's issue was obviously timed for its possible effect on the Argentine elections on February 24 and on the Inter-American Conference, to be held in Rio de Janeiro late in March to draw a pact of mutual assistance, to be implemented by the creation of a permanent military agency charged with the defense of the hemisphere.

"GRAVE COMPLICITY" CHARGED

Officials have publicly stated on several occasions that the United States will not sign such a pact along with Argentina. Today's memorandum reiterates that position, referring to the "grave complicity with Nazi Germany" charged to the regime in Buenos Aires and expressing doubt whether this regime "can merit the confidence and trust which is expressed in a treaty of mutual military assistance among the American Republics."

At this press conference today, Secretary of State James F. Byrnes said only that the United States had been scrupulously following a policy of nonintervention in its dealings with other American Republics and that it would not now assume to speak for the others in respect to their possible association with Argentina in a mutual-assistance treaty.

The memorandum contained much material that has been made public during the interchanges of oral and written communications between the two Governments in the last 3 years. It also included added documentation obtained not only from scrutiny of German papers seized since the end of hostilities but also from the interrogation of German diplomats and others.

TALKS BEGAN LAST OCTOBER

"In October 1945, when consultation concerning the Argentine situation was requested by the United States," the memorandum stated, "it had substantial reason to believe from the evidence then at its disposal that the present Argentine Government and many of its high officials were so seriously compromised in their relations with the enemy that trust and confidence could not be reposed in that Government.

"Now the Government of the United States possesses a wealth of incontrovertible evidence. This document, based on that evidence, speaks for itself. The Government of the United States looks forward to receiving from the other American Republics the benefit of their views in the premises."

The activities of the Argentine Government, from the Castillo regime through its various military successors to the present time, were pictured as a conspiracy on the part of a handful of totalitarian-minded persons against the Argentine people, the American Republics, the Allies, the United Nations and, finally, the peace of the world.

No American Republic, in the official view, could safety entrust any of its military secrets to the Argentine Government for reasons of security.

CURE IS SUGGESTED

"Such lack of trust will not be cured by decrees of administrative orders, by signature to charters or by adherence to final acts of conferences," the memorandum said. "It can be cured only when our brother people of Argentina are represented by a Government which inspires full faith and confidence at home and abroad."

It was charged that the rulers of Argentina, despite changes in personalities and jobs, had desired throughout the war the victory of the Axis Powers and had believed almost to the date of Germany's surrender that such a victory would result. Such a hope and belief was first expressed by Acting President Castillo in 1942 and lasted to the end, it was said.

On the extent of German influence in Argentina the report said:

In Argentina the Germans have constructed a complete duplicate of the economic structure for war which they had in Germany. They possess today in Argentina the economic organization—industrial, commercial and agricultural— which they need to provide a base for the reconstitution of German aggressive power during the period when the homeland is still occupied."

Among the specifications of "grave complicity" was included a long account of continuing efforts by the Argentine Government, with the assistance and active interest of the Franco government in Spain, to obtain arms from Germany.

Starting in 1942, negotiations continued undisturbed by the coup of June 1943, which put the Ramirez regime in power, until the arrest of Oscar Hellmuth in Trinidad in November 1943, when he was en route to Berlin, via Spain, to clinch the deal.

HIMMLER ACCUSED OF BUNGLING

The publicity surrounding Hellmuth's seizure caused the Argentine Government to disassociate itself with the affair and aroused considerable resentment in Berlin. Foreign Minister Joachim von Ribbentrop accused Heinrich Himmler of bungling and apparently convinced Hitler finally that Argentina would be more of a liability than an asset if she became an ally.

According to the evidence presented by the State Department, the various Argentine regimes wanted substantial military material, including tanks and antiaircraft equipment, for hostilities against other American countries, notably Brazil, in the event their hand was forced and they declared war on the side of Germany.

The memorandum presented a picture of ineffective, uncoordinated plotting to get the arms from Germany. One group, which included Gen. Domingo J. Martinez, then head of the Buenos Aires police; Ambassador Aunós, head of a Spanish economic delegation to Argentina, and Oscar Ibarra Garcia, Argentine Minister to Denmark, then in Buenos Aires on leave, was negotiating with Erich Otto Meynen, German Chargé d'Affaires.

Another group, which included President Ramirez, Colonel Gonzales, Major Filippi, the President's aide and son-in-law, and Major Bernard, personal aide to then War Minister Farrell, was dealing with Hans Harnisch, a key secret agent of the German intelligence service. Neither group apparently knew of the activities of the other for some time.

Encouraged by their German contacts, both groups went on to ask not only arms but also U-boat escorts for convoys between Argentina and Spain in an involved-barter scheme. Since Argentina was officially neutral, the Spanish Government was to import from Argentina articles critically needed by the German war machine, such as foodstuffs, diamonds, quinine, iodine, oils, mica, platinum, insulin, and vitamins for reexport to Germany.

The Spanish Government was to sell to the Argentine Government arms and war materials to be supplied from Germany. Deals of this character, the memorandum said, were continually under negotiation and failed not for a lack of effort in Argentine authorities but for a lack of interest by the Germans, added to Germany's increasing inability to spare arms for such a distant outpost as Argentina.

Col. Juan D. Peron, former Vice President and now the dictator as well as candidate for the Presidency of Argentina, was depicted as principally occupied in heading an organization of Nazi agents and native collaborators whose object was the formation of a Nazi bloc to be composed of Argentina, Chile, Bolivia, Paraguay, Uruguay, and possibly Brazil if the Integralistas under the leadership of Dr. Raimundo Padilha, who was then in hiding, could be assisted to overthrow the government of Getuleo Vargas.

BLAMED FOR BOLIVIAN COUP

About the only success given to the clique in the memorandum was the fomentation of the Bolivian revolution of December 1943, which it said was engineered by President Ramirez, War Minister Farrell, Colonel Peron, Paz Estenssoro, who is Bolivian finance minister, Gen. Angel Rodriguez, and a few others.

The German Embassy in Buenos Aires was kept currently informed of all these plots, according to the memorandum. Among the informants named was Alberto Uriburu, son of a former President of Argentina, who was then Argentine ambassador to Peru, and Foreign Minister Ruiz-Guinazu. The plan apparently lost German approval and financial support after the Bolivian revolution had aroused great hostile sentiment in Latin America.

Another chapter of the memorandum was devoted to the aid and protection given by Argentine authorities to Axis espionage. After Pearl Harbor, vigorous action by the authorities of the other American republics drove Nazi agents to seeking their only remaining refuge, Buenos Aires. There they came under the command of Johannes Siegfried Becker, German security chief for all South America.

All the ramifications of the Nazi intelligence and sabotage machine in the Western Hemisphere have not yet been uncovered, the memorandum said.

LOSSES BY ESPIONAGE ADMITTED

"What is known," it continued, "is that these Nazi forces carried on in the Americas an attack against the Allies as dangerous as a Nazi advance on the battlefields. Through them the Nazi war leaders received important information on the war effort of the American Republics needed to plan Nazi strategy; through them the Nazis were enabled to torpedo Allied ships and otherwise destroy Allied resources and manpower; through them the Nazis carried forward their objective of fostering disunity, discontent, and divisions among the peoples and the Governments of the American Republics, a strategy of first importance and value in the Nazi concept of total war."

When Colonel Farrell and Colonel Peron took over the government from President Ramirez they informed the German security service, according to the memorandum, that the rupture of diplomatic relations with Germany was to be viewed lightly, as it had been made merely because of pressure by the United States and that the new regime would continue to be pro-German, as its predecessor had been.

Quoting testimony of an unnamed "informed official of the German Foreign Office," the memorandum named Col. Filomeno Velazco, Buenos Aires, chief of police; and Gen. Armando Verdaguer as the officials who could be trusted to get Axis spies quickly out of jail on the rare occasions when they were arrested by mistake. This German informant said that the Buenos Aires jail was known in the foreign office circles as the Hotel Velazco.

DIPLOMATIC POUCH USED

Captain Ceballos and Colonel Santillana, Argentine naval and military attachés in Berlin, and Juan Carlos Goyeneche were said to be the principal agents through whom valuable information from Argentina was passed to the German authorities. The information was sent to them by diplomatic pouch to the Argentine Embassy in Madrid.

At the Argentine end of the pipe line the German Chargé d'Affaires listed among his valued and valuable friends Admiral Leon Scasso, inventor, of the Province of Cordoba; Dr. Carlos Ibarguren, president of the National Cultural Commission; Gen. Juan Bautista Molina, head of several nationalist organizations; Gen. Basilio B. Pertine, Mayor of Buenos Aires; Manuel Fresco, publisher; Dr. Justo Dergada Mujica, legal adviser to the German Embassy; Dr. Homero M. Guglielmini, secretary of the Cultural Commission; Dr. Gregorio Araoz Alfaro and a dozen or more lesser lights.

The memorandum dealt with the difficulties experienced by the United States and Britain in obtaining the expulsion from Argentina of known German agents, many of whom were interned. As lately as last month, none had been deported, although the Argentine Foreign Minister had assured the State Department that he hoped to repatriate 30 or 40 German nationals.

A number of Argentine newspapers were listed as having been subsidized by the German and Italian Embassies. They included the Cabildo, Choque, Clarinda, Crisol, Cruz del Sud, Epoca, Fronda, Hechos, Mediodia, Momento Argentino, Neuvo Orden, Pampero, Restaurado, Pueblo and Tribuna.

Turning to the present situation, the memorandum charged the Argentine Government

with protecting German economic interests in its country, adding that the sequestration of German firms and assets folowing the Argentine declaration of war had served as a shelter for them.

Argentine military expenditures, the memorandum said, reached a total of 1,428,000,000 pesos (about $356,000,000) in 1945, a sum described as 105 percent of the nation's ordinary total revenue.

The Hall Plan To Feed the World's Starving Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, last week I expressed emphatic opposition to the administration's plan of feeding starving Europe because I felt it to be too late and therefore ineffective in saving hungry millions.

Since it is not fair to criticize one proposal without offering a better one, I submit the following suggestion for what it is worth.

It is my understanding that the President under his war powers is drafting an order to mill the darker flour. There is, of course, nothing anybody can do to prevent such an order.

Realizing the inevitability, then, of the use of dark flour as the result of President's Truman's action, I foresee a way of feeding Europe's starving without taking away any of the normal bread supply from the United States.

A prominent official in the Department of Agriculture told me that experiments are now being made which show that 100 pounds of wheat will produce about 10 percent more flour under the latest Presidential decree than formerly. This being true, the same amount of wheat can be milled into more flour, thereby creating a surplus large enough to bake into bread for starving Europeans.

I quote from a letter written me by a GI:

> I was in Rheims, which is the champagne center of the world, and grain is needed for champagne. The conditions were so bad when the Germans left, the French left their farms and celebrated in the villages and let their grain go to waste and ruin from lack of men to harvest.
>
> I have seen thousands of German prisoners of war in the fields harvesting this grain for the French Government with American GI's as their guards.

Will grain sent by the United States to Europe be used for making champagne? The President will not permit grain to be made into liquor in this country, but how can he prevent such a thing happening in France?

If we follow the plan of the present administration to ship grain to Europe that is needed in America, we will fail to save the starving millions over there and in addition deprive our own people of their basic diet.

It is stupid to believe that Europe can make bread out of raw grain in her present crippled condition. Scarcely a mill or bakery, for that matter, remains standing after the bombings sustained during the recent war.

If those who clamor the loudest to denude our granaries are sincere in their desire to see Europe fed and fed immediately, I invite them to consider the plan which I herewith submit.

It will take time for starving nations to change raw wheat to flour. Even if they are sent flour, all they can make is paste because there are no facilities to bake bread in any amount. Millions of people are wandering over Europe without even an oven to say nothing of a home and dying by the roadside. Young orphaned children roam and grope among the garbage dumps. How can they bake bread for themselves?

What starving Europe must have is bread, baked in American ovens and flown directly to the scene of hunger. We have the ovens and we have the planes to carry the bread to the hungry.

Let us keep our grain to mill into flour to make the bread which must be sent now in order to save our allies and our former enemies from starvation.

I am willing, my six children are willing, the country is willing, to share our food if it will save those lives. But the bread must be sent now. A month from now, or 3 months from now, will be too late.

Our planes can fly the bread and this will make it available to the starving within a few hours. I repeat, it is stupid to think we can save Europe by the plan of shipping millions of bushels of grain that will rot on some far-off shore because it cannot be used, just as the prefabricated houses which the United States shipped to England are doing now when we are needing them so badly here in our own housing crisis, as I am told by another GI.

Let those sincerely interested in solving this awful problem follow the plan I now offer and really bring salvation to the countless unhappy peoples throughout the western world.

I am hereby introducing the following resolution which I hope will be adopted and its provisions carried through by the President of the United States:

Whereas shipments of grain to Europe will not meet the immediate and pressing demands of feeding millions of starving men, women, and children due to utter lack of facilities in European countries for handling grain; and

Whereas thousands of ovens in the United States are available for and capable of turning surplus flour into millions of loaves of bread immediately; and

Whereas there exists ample cargo space in transocean air carriers to send enough bread to feed starving areas in Europe and Asia: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Congress request the President of the United States, through the War Powers Act, to direct that an adequate supply of bread be flown immediately to nations now suffering from acute lack of food.

Exportation of Critical Building Material

REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the exportation of lumber may I say that I have received a copy of the same letter from the State Department that the gentleman from Michigan received, and I am at a loss to know what kind of lumber cannot be used for the construction of homes that they state in their letter is being exported. I do not think it is possible that lumber, any kind of lumber, cannot be machined to be used for home construction.

Mr. Speaker, I received a telegram from the Governor of California who states that he definitely protests the exportation of lumber and that he is about to sign a $1,000,000 bond issue for the building of homes for veterans in California. The OPA is proposing to ship lumber from the Northwest—Washington and Oregon—to the east coast at a premium of $2.50 in order to send coastwise vessels back there with a load, leaving California without sufficient lumber to build needed homes for returning veterans and civilians who are living in chicken coops, auto trailers, and every conceivable type of structure, waiting for permanent homes. I think the exportation of lumber should be stopped. We need homes here too badly.

The telegram I received from the Governor of California follows:

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., *February 12, 1946.*

Hon. GORDON L. McDONOUGH,
Washington, D. C.:

Since VE-day differentials in favor of export trade in lumber have siphoned off at least hundreds of millions of board feet of lumber urgently needed in this country, and particularly in our State, for home building In spite of our protests, I am informed that Federal Government is increasing quota of exportable lumber. I have also been advised that the OPA is considering a differential on water-shipped Douglas fir, which will have the result of siphoning off the remainder of our western lumber. This is unfair to the Western States, and particularly California, which has absorbed a new population of 2,000,000 people during the war, with very little new housing, and which has recently received over 600,000 veterans who are in distress for lack of housing. I am signing a bill submitting $1,000,000 bond issue for veterans' homes and farms, but such legislation is of little value if there is no lumber for home building. This telegram is being sent to California congressional delegation in the hope some action can be taken to make our western lumber available on fair terms to the people of the Western States.

EARL WARREN, *Governor.*

Surplus Building Materials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on December 12, 1945, I addressed a letter to President Truman calling attention to the extent to which surplus materials were being frozen or hoarded by various Federal agencies. Not having received a reply after a month of waiting, I decided to communicate with Wilson Wyatt, the new housing expediter, calling his attention to my letter to the President.

Mr. Wyatt's reply to my communication has just been received and I wish to call it to the attention of the Congress and the country. It is gratifying to learn that the Army and Navy have now taken positive steps to place into normal construction channels any surplus materials not immediately required by them. If the Government will put these materials in the hands of our building constructors and stop excessive shipments of building materials abroad we will have gone a long way toward solving some of our immediate housing problems.

The exchange of correspondence follows:

JANUARY 21, 1946.

Mr. WILSON WYATT,
Housing Expediter,
Washington Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WYATT: I am enclosing herewith a copy of my communication to the President in connection with the critical housing problem which confronts the country today.

I have not yet received a reply from President Truman but I am convinced that if he will take the action indicated in the enclosure a great many critical items can be released for the construction of much needed homes

I would appreciate having your views on the subject.

With every good wish, I am,
Sincerely yours,

JACK Z. ANDERSON.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., December 12, 1945.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am becoming more and more concerned over the increasingly serious housing shortage which exists throughout the entire country. Nowhere is this critical situation more apparent than in the congested areas of California. Something must be done at once to relieve the problem or literally hundreds of thousands of American families are going to be without homes. This, of course, will include a large number of returning veterans who have been married during the war or who are contemplating marriage when released from the service.

It is now conservatively estimated that approximately 3,000,000 veterans and their families will be without homes by the end of 1946, unless there is an enormous increase in the rate of construction of new homes. Private building contractors are ready and willing to assist in the immediate construction of private dwellings and apartments, but the acute shortage of lumber and other building materials has slowed their efforts to a standstill in many sections of the country.

In this connection I continue to hear rumors and to receive numerous communications to the effect that the Army, Navy, and other Government agencies are hoarding lumber, plumbing supplies, roofing, and many other critical building materials that are in short supply. I have made numerous inquiries in an effort to obtain the facts about the matter, but so far have received little in the way of information.

The National Housing Administrator in reply to one of my recent inquiries said in part: "This Agency is actively working on the problem of trying to stimulate production of building materials which are in short supply and trying to secure release of surplus materials held by other Federal agencies." This would seem to indicate that Mr. Blandford is aware of the fact that some agencies are indeed holding fast to surplus materials that are badly needed in the housing field. He does not, however, indicate how much of this material might be made available in the immediate future.

I am personally of the opinion that through your high office the facts can be obtained. In this connection may I call your attention to an incident that occurred last March, when a special subcommittee of the House Naval Affairs Committee visited the Hawaiian Islands in an effort to assist in solving a critical housing shortage which existed there at that time. Here, too, the building industry was confronted with a shortage of lumber and materials, plus the bottleneck of approximately 2,400 miles of transportation by water and not enough cargo ships to go around.

Soon after our subcommittee arrived we were advised by the ranking Army and Navy officials in the area that there was no lumber or other materials available in Army and Navy stock piles for the construction of badly needed dwelling units for civilian workers and other island residents. However, visual inspections by members of the committee, plus testimony by various witnesses, indicated otherwise. At the repeated and urgent insistence of the committee the Army and Navy finally agreed to resurvey their stock piles, and before we left Hawaii for the return trip to the mainland the two services advised us that they would be able to release approximately 4,000,000 board feet of lumber for the construction of badly needed housing units.

Mr. President, I am firmly convinced that a similar survey at this time, and by your direction, would disclose a vast quantity of surplus stocks that could be made immediately available to the home-building industry throughout the United States. May I respectfully request that you use your good offices to expedite this necessary and desirable action at an early date?

Thanking you for past courtesies and with my very best wishes to you and your family for a happy holiday season, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JACK Z. ANDERSON,
Member of Congress.

The Honorable JACK Z. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ANDERSON: Thank you for your letter of January 21 and for giving me an opportunity to review the communication you addressed to the President concerning the hoarding of lumber and other building materials by the Army and Navy and other Government agencies.

Both the Army and the Navy have now taken positive steps to place into normal construction channels any materials they have which are not immediately required by them. They have also issued orders restricting their construction activities to that which is essential to maintenance, health, and the preservation of life. They are permitting the sales to builders and contractors of materials and supplies to the value of $300, whether surplus to their needs or not, when such materials and supplies are needed to complete the construction of new homes and are not obtainable from commercial sources. They have established minimum inventory requirements at their various facilities, and materials in excess thereof are declared surplus. In cooperation with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, they have arranged for on-site sale of such surpluses.

In the sale of surplus materials referred to, 30 percent is offered for preferential sale to the Federal Government and its agencies, States, and local governments and their agencies for a period of 10 days. Thereafter, any part not sold reverts to the stock pile. Seventy percent of the surplus materials, and any unsold materials originally offered for preferential sale, are sold to the holders of HH priorities or to dealers who will hold the materials for sale to the holders of HH priorities. For your information, the HH priority is designed to give assistance to builders and others who wish to construct homes for sale or rent within established ceilings to veterans of World War II.

We realize that housing conditions in urban centers in California are particularly acute and we wil keep this in mind as our program to meet the present emergency develops. The passage of the amendment to title V of the Lanham Act, making it possible for the National Housing Agency to utilize existing public temporary housing for veterans, and the issuance of Civilian Production Administration Priorities Regulation 33 can be considered as preliminary steps in our program. We feel, however, that additional measures and possibly drastic measures must be taken immediately in order to avoid a national housing crisis in the months immediately ahead.

If you desire additional information or have suggestions or recommendations, I hope you will feel free to write me.

Sincerely,

WILSON WYATT,
Housing Expediter.

School Lunches and Child Care Centers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, to women a vitally important bill is the Flannagan school-lunch program, which would also assist in nonprofit child-care centers. This measure would provide for grants-in-aid to the States, with the States at first matching Federal funds and then gradually increasing their share up to 80 percent. The program would aid children whom the local school boards find unable to pay for their lunches. It would also provide for nutrition education and supply a ready way of disposing of farm surpluses. Selective-service experience tells us that 70 percent of our boys who were ill fed, grew up physically unfit. Surveys have

also shown how school attendance and good work are closely related to adequate meals. This bill concerns our most precious resource, the youth of America. It would supplant the present temporary program based on agricultural surpluses which today is serving some 557,300 Illinois children at some 1,742 schools, and 8,223,900 at some 47,635 schools in the United States. Letters and telegrams are coming to me from all over Illinois in regard to this measure. One petition from the Illinois Parents Council for Nursery Schools, Inc., has 7,000 names, in behalf of the child-center section.

OPA Should Be Extended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 12, 1946

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, pending in Congress are legislative proposals for the continuation of the Office of Price Administration for a period from 6 months to 1 year after the end of the fiscal year 1946. At the head of this organization is a remarkable character, Chester Bowles. Though a businessman himself—and a successful one—though his political and social interests throughout his life have been with management and with the operators of businesses, large and small, Chester Bowles has managed to look at the whole Nation objectively and to see the side of the consumer as well as the producer. He has stood like a rock against enormous pressures for lifting price ceilings. True, some of his subordinates have at times made errors and have been obstinate and occasionally unreasonable in their decisions, but on the whole the OPA has been a very effective instrument with which to combat inflation and by which to protect all Americans from the disastrous rise in the cost of living.

Whatever weaknesses have developed have been due to the fact that the conservatives in Congress have refused to provide the OPA with sufficient inspectors and operative appropriations to enable them to do the job as efficiently as they would like.

In the Seattle Daily Star appeared recently an editorial which sums up the situation accurately. Here it is:

OPA'S LIFE EXTENSION SHOULD BE GRANTED NOW

The Government's power to control prices should be extended beyond June 30, the present date of expiration.

Legislation extending this power should be enacted soon, as recommended by President Truman. If Congress waits until just before the expiration date to act, many holders of scarce goods will have "jumped the gun" and raised prices. Black markets may develop on such a scale that they never can be controlled thereafter. Moreover, continuing uncertainty as to whether price control powers will be extended undoubtedly will have the effect of encouraging goods to be withheld from the market, in the hope that better prices can be obtained later.

In seeking the extension of price control powers, the administration should make it plain that these powers will be used realistically and fairly.

It is plain that wages are going up, throughout industry. They should go up, certainly to the extent of compensating workers for increases in living costs. And in this connection the matter of take-home pay becomes a big factor. The worker who was able to keep ahead of rising living costs through his overtime earnings, and perhaps because other members of the family also had war-time jobs, is plainly in a different position when he operates on a 40-hour week basis, with no time and one-half, and when he is the only breadwinner in the family.

Granting that wages are going up, they cannot go up indefinitely and allow industry to operate profitably if no leeway for price increases is permitted. Industry simply will not operate, under a profit and loss system, unless there is at least the hope of profit. And this country's best hope of checking inflation is to get full scale production, as soon as possible, from all branches of industry.

This doesn't mean that all prices should be raised to buy the cooperation of industry by offering extortionate profits.

On the contrary, increased production, in all branches of industry, probably will permit many, if not most industries, to operate profitably on present prices. Every manufacturer has a "break-even" point for a given level of wages. If he produces less than a certain number of automobiles or brooms or washing machines he loses money. If he produces more he begins to make a profit.

Of course, if the wage level is raised, so is the "break-even" point. More volume is required to keep the industry out of the red.

While our national economy is going through this transition period some agency of government must be in a position to determine what price increases are justifiable and which are not, whenever such proposals affect the necessities of life or seriously affect the general economy.

That is the function of the Office of Price Administration. Many will say Chester Bowles, the present Administrator, has done a difficult job as well as anyone could do it. Many others voice specific criticisms, and a considerable number want OPA done away with, lock, stock, and barrel.

In our judgment, these outright opponents of OPA are wrong. We believe OPA should be continued. We believe it should operate flexibly, because it is obvious that a high degree of flexibility is necessary when wage levels are being changed as they are. But to abolish OPA at present, or even to create serious doubts as to its operations beyond June 30, would be to invite economic anarchy.

Founders Day 1946 Resolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, by leave granted me, I include in my remarks resolutions unanimously adopted at the annual Founders Day celebration held at Lincoln, Nebr., February 12, 1946:

Whereas we are again assembled to celebrate the anniversary of Nebraska's statehood on the anniversary of the birth of that most distinguished American who was the first Republican President of these United States, Abraham Lincoln, for the annual meeting of Republicans on Founders Day; and

Whereas we are proud of our pioneers and of the development of our State in resources, governmental programs and the well being of this great State, and are proud of that great American, Abraham Lincoln, who as a President was matched only in ability, patriotism, and sound Americanism by the great Washington; and

Whereas the Republican Party throughout the history of this State has at all times led in progressive action for the welfare of all classes of our citizens and for the advancement of good government; and

Whereas the second or Truman edition of the so-called New Deal has by pursuing and pressing fundamentally unsound economic and political philosophies, stimulated strikes, encouraged irresponsible labor leadership from communistic ranks, pressed for legislation that encourages loafing, chiseling and dependence on Government hand-outs, blown up the Nation's debt balloon until it is about to burst, applied price controls under the false guise of assisting the war effort in a manner that cuts production rather than increasing it, and has permitted and abetted the issuance of orders by a small group of collectivist so-called labor leaders resulting in the paralysis of our great Nation so that communism may sweep the Nation and throw into the discard all those virtues and industry that made this Nation the greatest that history has ever known: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this meeting does congratulate all the Republican governors of the United States and the other officials of this State upon their contribution to the development of a prosperous and progressive government and people and that this meeting pledges the Republican Party to continue its leadership in keeping Nebraska in the forefront of all the States of the Union.

We hereby acknowledge our indebtedness to Governor Baldwin and Congresswoman BOLTON for coming to Nebraska to assist in making this meeting a success. We know they have done so at considerable sacrifice of their time and energy, and we express our recognition of our great debt to them for this effort on their part.

We deeply appreciate the presence of Gov. Dwight Griswold and the other State officers at this meeting. The progress of our State and its preeminence both in wartime activities and those of peace under the leadership of Governor Griswold, and the sane and economic administration of our State government is a source of pride and satisfaction and lends hope to all of us for the future.

We are proud of our Senators and Congressmen from Nebraska and have watched with satisfaction their efforts to further everything designed to successfully prosecute the war and to win the peace, and to preserve our constitutional Republic at all times. We are happy that Senator HUGH BUTLER and Congressmen STEFAN, CURTIS, and MILLER have honored us with their presence at this meeting and regret that Senator WHERRY and Congressman BUFFETT were forced by pressure of their official duties to be absent. We know they would be present were such a thing possible: Be it further

Resolved, That this meeting stresses the necessity for a return to our constitutional form of government as a republic, and we denounce the attempt by the present national administration to destroy the Republic and substitute a vile form of staism or communism no matter under what pretext as among the gravest of crimes.

Under the Constitution which exists until changed in a lawful manner the Congress is the policy-making agency of the American people. American government is based on the principle that the people shall be subject to only such laws as they have assented to through their chosen representatives, the Congress. We demand that Congress enact the laws and that the Executive honestly

administer such laws only as the Congress after open debate shall enact.

The consent of the governed must exist if we are to remain a free people. When policies and restraints which have the effect of law are determined and imposed by administrative agencies which do not come from the people on a free ballot, then government assumes authority without the consent of the governed and we are no longer a free nation.

Our Constitution requires the consent of the United States Senate to all treaties with foreign nations, and we denounce any and all agreements by the present or any other Chief Executive which attempt to subvert that rule and bind the people without the consent of their chosen representatives, the United States Senate.

Our Constitution is based on a dual system of government, with the Federal Government supreme within its sphere and the States supreme in their sphere, and as the present administration and the one which preceded it are attempting to destroy the States for the purpose of imposing a communistic dictatorship on the people, we declare that the maintenance inviolate of the rights of the States, and especially the right of each State to order and control its own domestic institutions according to its own judgment exclusively, is essential to that balance of power on which the perfection and endurance of our political fabric depend.

We welcome home the veterans of this late war. We demand that the administration return our citizen Army and Navy to their homes as soon as possible, and we denounce the maintenance of a wartime Army since hostilities have ended. The boys must come home, and we welcome them in the Republican Party as being truly representative of the principles for which they fought and for which so much blood and treasure has been expended. We demand for them the opportunity of a free America.

We demand a square deal for the American people. The late move of the President to seriously harm the farmer who is the one who feeds us all for the benefit of the people of some other lands must be prevented. We do not want to deprive anyone of the necessities of life, but we demand that the President recognize the right of Americans to live, and he must not be permitted to destroy the American farmer, no matter by what means he attempts to do so. We recognize that the American farmer is a strong bulwark against attempts to communize America, and we pledge ourselves as Republicans to do everything possible to prevent the President from liquidating the American farmer.

A Republican majority in Congress after the election this fall can do much to thwart the attempt of this administration to foist a combination of communism and Pendergastism upon the United States. It must be done.

We thank our president, Earl Moyer, and our vice president, Mrs. Ruth Thornton, our junior president, James Anderson, our junior vice president, Mrs. Maxine Fiss, and all the officers of Founders Day for their long hours of effort spent in producing this splendid meeting. We congratulate them on their success.

We thank the Nebraska newspapers, the radio stations and the press associations in making known the program of this occasion and the high ability and reputation of our honored guests from other States. A free press and a free radio service are vital to a free people. We should be ever alert to defeat attempts to throttle that freedom, regardless of the guise in which it is offered.

We thank the management of the Cornhusker Hotel for the efficient supervision and courteous service that has contributed so much to make our meeting successful.

Many others too numerous to mention have contributed to the vast amount of planning and carrying out of details so necessary to a meeting of this kind. We wish to make due acknowledgment to them of our appreciation.

Respectfully submitted.

HERBERT T. WHITE,
Chairman.
ZELMA DERBY.
LADD J. HUBKA.
E. D. BEECH.
MERRILL KARNAPP.
JOHN R. DUDGEON.

Letter of Capt. George S. Wuchinich

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

ARMY SERVICE FORCES,
REGIONAL STATION HOSPITAL,
Fort Belvoir, Va.

ALBERT KAUFMANN,
Burgess, Borough of Brentwood,
Pittsburgh, Pa.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you as burgess of my home town in Pennsylvania to ask you to use your good offices in requesting our serviceman Congressman JIM FULTON to put this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for me so that my views and experiences may be brought to the attention of our elected Representatives and get a wide circulation.

I am a paratrooper now receiving hospital treatment pending my discharge from the Army. Since 1942 I have been attached to the Office of Strategic Services and have served nearly 26 months overseas—19 in Europe and 7 in the Pacific. Those in Europe were in the Balkans, and in the Pacific in both north and south China. For my work in Europe I was awarded the DSC by General McNarney, now American commander in Europe.

In Europe I jumped behind enemy lines in northern Yugoslavia in November 1943, 8 months before D-day, and served that whole time until the end of July 1944 working with Tito's Partisans in Slovenia. In November 1944 I returned to America for a month's leave and volunteered to fight in China. In North China I served with both the Nationalists and Communists during the period from July to October 1945. In fact, I am the only American officer in the world who has been with both the Yugoslav Partisans and Chinese Communists. This is a unique privilege of having had close personal contact with two big people's movements that fought so well against the common enemy in World War II.

When I left Europe I was convinced of the solidarity of the Yugoslav people in their desire for democracy, and this view of mine has further been confirmed that the people of China have the same feeling and goal.

While I lay here on a hospital bed trying to get well the thought of what took place in China and what has been printed in our press, especially the statements of General Hurley, is a bit hard for me to understand. It is true that I have not seen the whole of China, yet I have been both in the north and south, and have seen both sides. I can truthfully say that if I had seen only the Nationalist side I would have left China a pessimist and without hope of China's people ever advancing toward democracy. I am an optimist and know that there is the yeast in the Chinese people that will bring out those things we take for granted in our own country—a democracy built around the direct and secret ballot, bill of rights, woman suffrage, a decent livelihood for the average Chinese, and the right of the people through their own elected representatives to determine the kind of laws they shall have and live under.

In South China, at Kunming, where I stayed during June 1945, I saw no regard for the Chinese peasant by the government. It was a province under the Nationalist flag and is called Yunnan. Taxation was set by landlords without process by law, inflation was rising—in 3 weeks the Chinese dollar went from 1,200 to 3,200 for one American dollar. I saw beggary and misery side by side with wealthy Chinese riding in big American Buick limousines, model 41. Elections were unknown, and schools in the small villages were very rare. And China is 95 percent small villages. This province lived by the old feudal principle of a big shot living in Kunming as governor, and drawing his rake-off from the whole province of Yunnan. He maintained a private army, which was nominally on the Nationalist side, and the recruits for this army were peasants who were impressed. Those who could bribe their way out were only the wealthy and merchant-landlord class. The poor guy had to take it in an army in which the officer could flog and beat the soldier if he (officer) so wished.

I was glad to go north on my assignment, because I had the hope that maybe I would find different Chinese generals, officials, government, and a bit of real fighting against the Jap. My mission was to get behind Jap lines in Shansi Province and this I did on August 8, 1945, where I served with a Nationalist general by the name of Marshal Yen. It was no different behind enemy lines with Marshal Yen. He followed the same pattern of not caring for his people. The same lack of schools, hospitals, and general social care was evident. He, too, did not hold elections. He appointed himself 32 years ago as the war lord, and if anybody did not pay taxes he simply used the famous feudal measure of flogging. He set the taxes, had a private army and everybody paid. Yen maintains a feudal province, and he was supposed to be our ally; yet I lived only 3 miles from Jap garrisons and never heard a rifle shot. In fact, he placed us in a beautiful Chinese home and did his best to wine, dine, and entertain us.

I had hoped that there would be a feeling of resistance against the Japs, and what I found was collaboration of Yen with the Jap. He had no intention of fighting and when we tried to go farther north to find out just what he was doing he very nicely arranged a trap for us which might have resulted in our death. At a place 5 miles east of Fenyang, a big city in Shansi Province, he, through one of his generals who was our guide, led us into a crossfire between the Jap puppets and the Communists.

However, the best of betrayal plans go awry and instead of the Communists killing us in the crossfire, which is what Yen hoped, we were in reality rescued by them. The Communists won the battle, which was all around us, and, in driving off the Jap puppets, came across us. The Communists, who were guerrillas, were at first suspicious, then quickly became friends and at night led us past Jap garrisons still holding Chinese towns. For 3 days and nights we marched swiftly to their headquarters and from there we marched for 6 weeks in north China for a distance of over 600 miles.

We saw a different spirit for the first time in China. The people liked their army, and when we heard this we could hardly believe it. They simply said, "It is a good army because it keeps the Japs away who have only three purposes—to kill, to burn, and to loot." Nowhere in China had we heard a Chinese civilian say an army was any good. We saw children learning to read and write, and doing their homework on the soot-blackened sides

of their cave homes. We saw hospitals, farmers' clinics, newspaper plants, libraries, cooperatives, and a general healthy being of a people united in a common purpose of driving out the invader and raising their own standard of living. At night we heard rifle shots, machine-gun fire, and mortar explosions. It was like Yugoslavia all over again. Here was a land and a people really at war with an enemy all Americans have hated since Pearl Harbor.

People were better dressed, better fed, and we saw no beggars—not a one. As allies, we were welcomed in every village, and many old slogans on the walls plainly said, "Long live the victories of the allies of the Chinese people—England, America, and Russia." Nowhere else in Nationalist China had we seen any slogans praising the west. We saw no slogans attacking the Gissimo; instead, they all called for unity and a coalition government for China. We saw and talked to men who had been farmers, small businessmen, teachers, students, workers, and others who came from low social levels and who now were in command. They were all elected, and old women, farmers, muleteers, soldiers, etc., explained to me that they held elections; all could vote who were 18 and older, except criminals, idiots, and those collaborating with the enemy. We visited small village schools with less than 20 pupils in a town of 100 persons, and from these went to universities such as the one at Yenan, which has several thousand students. We visited the art school and medical school at Yenan University and saw activity similar to that in our own schools, except that the facilities were much poorer.

The Nationalists have blockaded them for years so that nothing comes in. The doctors told me that one of the things done was the blockade on medical supplies and surgical tools being maintained at Chungking by the Nationalists. Thousands of Chinese people have died because of lack of these, and they are bitter about this inhuman practice of Chungking. Despite this, north China wants a coalition government. They do not want one to dominate it. They ask that the Gissimo only broaden the base. There are liberals in Chungking who are afraid to speak out because of the Nationalist secret-service head, Dai Li, who had stifled all free speech. The Communists are willing to include their armies in a Nationalist force if the Nationalists will allow free elections and give an opportunity to all of China to vote freely. Plainly put, the word "Communists" is fooling a lot of us. Hitler tried scaring us, and in the end we had to fight him.

My judgment is based only on what I saw and if America continues to support the Nationalists in their present drive toward a one-party system and dictatorship we shall be guilty of putting up on one side of the world what we help destroy on the other.

It is my opinion that our marines and other armed forces be drawn out at once, and that any economic help we give China be based only on the understanding that a real broad political government be formed including all parties and all sections of the Chinese people.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE S. WUCHINICH,
Captain, Army of the United States.

Conditions in Europe and the Middle East

REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on last October 15 the Wickersham committee, of which I was privileged to be a member, issued a report on its investigation in Europe and the Middle East.

In that report we called attention to the painful plight of millions of the European victims of war. We noted especially the need for proper succor in the following words:

Cold, hungry, starving, sick, and dying people in Europe are easy victims for dictators. This widespread condition and the need of transportation, coal, food, clothing, medicine, and shelter increases as the supply diminishes. It will be necessary for us to exert every effort to prevent delay in fulfilling at least a portion of their needs; otherwise, a revolution may ride in the wake of want. Even then, we were told that countless thousands upon thousands would die of hunger, exposure, and lack of proper aid. Peace cannot be built on misery or despair. We fought a terrible war. But it will not have been fully won until the people can secure bread, work, food, shelter, medical aid, clothing, and stability.

Today, exactly 4 months from the issuance of this warning, we find that our direst predictions are being fulfilled.

Reports multiply that millions of Europeans are starving, and it must be confessed that we have not followed up the recommendations of the Wickersham committee when it said, "It will be necessary for us to exert every effort to prevent delay in fulfilling at least a portion of their needs."

Even now, however, it is not too late. We must triple our efforts to lend instant aid to these millions of our fellow men.

Recently there came to my attention an appeal by the Save Europe Now Committee, of South Bend, Ind., which clearly indicates the need for action and the steps which must be taken.

In the belief that these suggestions will go far toward alleviating the present horrible conditions in Europe, I wish to include in my remarks the statement issued by this committee, as follows:

The dire conditions in Europe call for immediate action. To delay means misery, suffering, and death for hundreds of thousands of innocent victims in war-devastated Europe. It is our duty and right to exercise humanity and charity toward all, whatever their religion and nationality and war status.

The Save Europe Now Committee, composed of Americans of all faiths and creeds, offers a program in the interests of peace and human reconstruction, a program recommended in whole or in part by the Catholic bishops, the Federal Council of Churches, the Central Conference of American Rabbis, the American Friends Service Committee, and the 34 Senators who have signed a petition to President Truman. This program stresses:

1. An urgent appeal to Congress to authorize a humanity loan necessary to do the job of relief and rehabilitation in a way worthy of Americans.

2. It is also imperative that the Government mobilize with all speed food and transport so as to raise the minimum diet in all countries, including Italy, Germany, Austria, and Hungary, to 2,000 calories a day, and in the liberated countries to 2,600 a day.

3. In addition to UNRRA, which should be fully supported, private relief agencies such as the Red Cross and American Friends and other religious groups should be given the fullest freedom of operation.

4. The mails to Austria and Germany should be opened at once, so that private persons can send food, medicine, and clothing.

These are some of the facts:

1. The infant mortality rate in parts of Germany is estimated at 90 percent, and the death rate in Berlin is said to be 4,000 a day, and in a year and a half the population will have perished.

2. No private persons or agencies are allowed to furnish relief of any kind in certain ex-enemy countries, where it is needed most; and we hold as a principle that a government has not the right to forbid persons or groups to exercise charity.

3. UNRRA at the present time provides no food for the following ex-enemy countries: Bulgaria, Germany, Hungary, and Rumania.

4. The United States is supposed to furnish 1,550 calories a day per person in its zone of Germany; but the Colmer committee of the House of Representatives said that the official ration "now runs as low as 800 to 1,300 calories a day." Even a diet of 1,550 calories, if continued, means certain death, since it amounts to less than two-thirds of a normal diet.

5. Over 7,000,000 are homeless as a result of air bombing and 20,000,000 are now driven back and forth, presumably to build new frontiers, but in fact to freeze and starve.

6. Human Events reports (December 19, 1945) that the yet secret directive for the deindustrialization of Germany sets a permanent ceiling for the German standard of living: The diet would never rise above 2,600 calories and industry would never rise above the depression level of 1932; and no allowance is made for rebuilding cities or rehousing or any reconstruction.

Of course, to save the starving is but a temporary measure. What is more important is a positive and constructive policy. We want reconstruction that moves toward hope and peace, and an economic and industrial policy that can take care of itself. It is contrary to religion and to any constructive rehabilitation program to attempt to punish humanity with deportations by the millions and a semistarvation diet. Vengeance can do no good to anyone. For the good of Europe and the good of the world, we must find ways of reconstructing Europe and of safeguarding military security without breaking down the economic and spiritual life of the people. The sooner we learn that a reconstructed Europe is our problem, the better. We cannot afford to dismantle industry, particularly nonmilitary industry, or destroy the economy of any nation. Such a procedure must inevitably lead to misery, starvation, and unrest, and revolution.

The Save Europe Now Committee calls for a long-range objective of reconstruction in industry and agriculture for all peoples.

Employees and Employers Pay for Reuther's Fiddling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the following letter and statement show how innocent employees and employers, who want no part in strikes, get drawn in—employees deprived of their wages; employers of a profit:

EVANS PRODUCTS CO.,
Detroit, February 9, 1946.

Hon. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOFFMAN: I address this letter to you not only in my capacity as president of Evans Products Co., Detroit, but

as national chairman of the Nonbasic Steel Coordinating Committee.

Copy of a news release which will shortly be distributed on a Nation-wide basis is inclosed herewith together with a copy of my letter written about 2 weeks ago to Mr. John W. Snyder, Reconversion Director, at his request, following a conference in his offices in Washington.

Since you may not be apprised of the facts in connection with these some 700 miscellaneous companies who are involved in the so-called steel strike, I think this information should be helpful to you in giving a true picture of what is happening to these small business enterprises who have been drawn into this strike not only in the State of Michigan but throughout the Nation and from coast to coast.

As pointed out in the news release attached, these companies have never been given an opportunity to be represented nor heard in the deliberations in the steel case. The only consideration that seems to have been given has been to the manufacturers of basic steel and Philip Murray, head of the CIO United Steelworkers Union. This despite the fact that when the union called the strike of its steelworkers it included not only the basic steel-producing companies but the miscellaneous nonbasic companies who held contracts with the steelworkers union.

As a matter of fact, these nonbasic companies have no dispute with their employees; they have not been given an opportunity to bargain collectively. They have been called out needlessly and uselessly in this strike merely to support in numbers, if for no other reason, the strike of the union in its demands against basic steel.

I know that you, like many others, will be surprised to learn that economically and from a collective point of view, these nonbasic workers represent between 350,000 and 400,000 of the workers belonging to the steelworkers union. Yet many of these companies do not even handle nor use steel in the fabrication of their finished products. Included in this group of nonbasic companies are producers of pork and beans, ceramics, wood boxes, mattresses, fire and paving brick, abrasive grinding wheels and a wide variety of other products. How in the name of common sense can they be classified as being on a steel strike?

Philip Murray constantly refers to the "750,000 steelworkers on strike." I ask you if any workers in the list given above could, by any wide stretch of the imagination, be termed steelworkers.

A grave injustice has been done these nonbasic workers by calling them out on strike. They should at least have been given the opportunity to settle by means of collective bargaining any dispute that existed between them and their employer.

In your own State of Michigan, for example, there are 98 such companies and in the city of Detroit alone there are 50. They have not been told by their union that any settlement arrived at between the President, Benjamin Fairless, and basic steel will not automatically apply to them. On the contrary, they have been told the exact opposite. As a matter of fact, many of these companies cannot stand a wage increase at this time. They are caught in a two-way squeeze. Not only must they pay whatever increased tonnage price is allowed the basic steel companies but they also face the settlement of their cases by allowing a wage increase.

I bring these matters to your attention in your capacity as Congressman from this State so that you will be fully apprised of the true status of affairs relating not only to these small companies but to the employees as well. I also trust that you will discuss this matter with your colleagues so that we can proceed with the great task of reconversion and settle any and all disputes that might arise by means of peaceful, honest, sincere collective bargaining.

Sincerely yours,

E. S. EVANS, JR.,
Chairman, Non-Basic Steel Coordinating Committee.

DETROIT.—Small industry with its hundreds of thousands of workers is quickly being placed in the position of "the forgotten man" despite President Truman's assertion that small industry is the backbone of our national economy, according to E. S. Evans, Jr., president of Evans Products Co., Detroit, and national chairman of the Nonbasic Steel Coordinating Committee.

"In the so-called steel strike, now 3 weeks old, more than 700 companies who hold contracts with the steelworkers union have been called out on strike by national headquarters in Pittsburgh. None of these companies has any relation to basic steel except that some of them use steel in their finished product and that they hold a contract with the steelworkers union. Other than that there is no similarity.

"As a matter of fact, these nonbasic workers have needlessly been called out on strike to support the union in its fight against the basic steel manufacturers; that is, the actual producers of steel, of which there are only 16 companies.

"These nonbasic companies represent approximately 80 percent of the companies holding contracts with the steelworkers union. Despite the fact that these nonbasic companies employ between 350,000 and 400,000 workers and are, therefore, numerically and economically greater than basic steel, they have not been given an opportunity to place the facts of their cases before the administration in Washington. On the contrary, the only persons who have been in on the President's conferences have been basic steel and the union, and no consideration has been given to these hundreds of companies employing hundreds of thousands of men upon whom the union hopes to impose the same pattern of settlement that is eventually arrived at in basic steel.

"It would be just as logical to set a pattern of settlement of a dispute in the carpenters' union and then have the union employ this settlement as having established a pattern for settlement of a dispute in the teamsters' union. The illustration is apt. Many of these nonbasic companies do not even use steel in the fabrication of their finished product. For example, you may take those companies that manufacture pork and beans, wood products, clay bricks, glass boiler injectors, wooden toys, cedar products, cement companies, cooperage companies, some textile workers, mattress manufacturers, and many others.

"This great group of some 700 miscellaneous companies, whose manufacturing activities extend from coast to coast, face a double squeeze play in the present steel controversy. Not only would they have to meet any tonnage increase that is allowed basic steel, but they would also face the possibility of increased wages.

"Many of these companies are little fellows employing as few as 10 persons. They face, along with a number of larger companies, the possibility of being forced completely out of business.

"While many of these companies need price relief at the moment, even before facing these possible increases in basic materials and wages, there are also many to whom price relief by the OPA actually would be no relief at all. I refer to those companies who are selling their products in a close competitive market on a close margin against manufacturers who are not subjected to this double squeeze and in those cases many of such companies would be priced right out of competition.

"The cases of these widespread miscellaneous companies are totally different from those of basic steel who produce only the basic product and not heterogeneous masses of things such as these fabricators do. Their cases are entirely dissimilar from those of basic steel and not by the widest stretch of the imagination should they be classified in the same category.

"I say again that a great injustice has been done the workers in these miscellaneous plants by calling them out on strike to supplement the dispute of the basic steelworkers. It was purely a means to give strength of numbers in what the union is pleased to term 'strike of the steelworkers.' Certainly, no workers in the nonbasic plants are so naive as to believe that the basic steelworkers will, in turn, go out on strike to give support to them while their conferences with management are under way.

"No consideration has been given to the fact that the settlement of the basic steel dispute will not settle the cases of these some 700 nonbasic manufacturers. When the steelworkers return to their jobs, the nonbasic workers who are now on strike will still have to bargain collectively with their separate and individual employers, since any basic steel settlement will not in any way predetermine the cases of these individual companies. I am convinced, from my talks with many workers now on strike, that they were misguided in the belief that any settlement arrived at in basic steel would in turn apply to them. This is a grave injustice perpetrated upon these men and their families. There is no sane reason why these men in the nonbasic companies should not have been permitted to work throughout this period instead of being called out on strike, thus causing them to lose collectively millions of dollars in wages."

Letter of Resignation of Secretary of the Interior Ickes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the letter of resignation of Hon. Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior:

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have concluded to resign as Secretary of the Interior and this letter is for that purpose. I understand that hearings on the proposed Anglo-American oil treaty, which I have nurtured and raised by bottle from the beginning, will begin on March 4. I would like to be here for those hearings.

Moreover, it will be no easy task, shorthanded as I am in the Secretary's office, after such a long tenure, to put the affairs of the Department in order for my successor. For these reasons I propose that my resignation take effect at the close of business on March 31, but if you desire an earlier date I will be glad to comply with any wish that you may express.

In thus presenting my resignation without recourse, I am moved by compelling circumstances over which I have had no control. I cannot stay on when you, in effect, have expressed a lack of confidence in me.

NO APOLOGIES FOR TESTIMONY

I shall go somewhat at length into my reasons for resigning as Secretary of the Interior because I owe a full explanation, not only to you, but to the country, in view of the evidence that the political gnats in Washington are already swarming. Despite them,

I cannot accept the theory that I should have told to the Naval Affairs Committee anything less than the truth. I have no apologies for having done so, although I did regreat the unhappy personal position in which I involuntarily found myself.

You will remember that on July 6, 1945, I took to you personally my written resignation to take effect the following August 31. I told you that the 12 years of the great adventure that I had shared as a member of the Roosevelt administration had been an inspiring experience, adding that they had required me to remain in continuous Government service much longer than any man would wish and had left me beyond desire for further official work.

UNDERSTANDING ON ACTION

You insisted that you did not want me to resign and that your wish had been that I should continue as Secretary of the Interior. You had no one in mind to take my place, you said, and the office was a danger spot in the administration. So it was left that I would continue. If at any time I should feel that I could no longer remain, I was to tell you first and you volunteered that if you should decide that you would like me to resign you would tell me first and directly.

I had understood that this meant a personal conference between us. But since I have not been able to get an appointment with you from the time that I undertook to do so on Tuesday afternoon, February 5, I have decided that, while I would have preferred to talk with you personally, the only course left open to me is to write you this letter.

Several days have already elapsed since your press conference of last Thursday and I cannot remain longer than is necessary in the equivocal position in which certain of your remarks on that occasion placed me, although I shall continue to be available for further hearings on the Pauley nomination. Therefore, I feel that I owe it to myself to make my position known publicly before noon of tomorrow.

OTHER EXPRESSIONS OF TRUST

I deeply appreciate the wish that you made known to me on the occasion mentioned that I continue as a Member of your Cabinet. During the interval there have been other expressions of trust and confidence on your part that have meant much to me. Now, in view of your evident conclusion that you no longer feel as you did, coupled with the desire that I have had for many months to retire from Government service, my resignation seems to be in order.

You may recall the passing allusion to my possible retirement at our interview on Wednesday, January 30, on which occasion you told me that you wanted me to stay on to help you solve some of the problems that lay ahead. At the previous Cabinet meeting you had asked me not to wind up the affairs of the Solid Fuels Administration until May 1, and in explanation of this you told me during this Wednesday interview, that, in the event of a strike of the coal miners on April 1, you wanted me to handle that situation.

However, since that interview, some of your close friends have felt moved to resent keenly the fact that when called as a witness by the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs to testify on the nomination of Mr. Edwin W. Pauley to be Under Secretary of the Navy, I told the truth, which I later verified.

DUTY TO SPEAK TRUTH

I am at a loss to understand what these gentlemen think I could or should have done in the circumstances. I am willing to believe that their view is that I should have committed perjury—it will be remembered that I was under oath—or that I should have spoken anything less than the truth. After all, the constitutional provision that calls for ratification by the Senate of a nomination of this sort imposes a duty upon all citizens, if called as witnesses, to speak the truth.

I feel that it is my due that I should recall certain circumstances with reference to this nomination and my appearance before the Naval Affairs Committee upon a telegraphic summons by its chairman, Senator WALSH.

On no occasion did you ever tell me that you proposed to nominate Mr. Pauley for Under Secretary of the Navy. I had seen reports to this effect in the newspapers and this possibility seemed to be on the tongue of many people in Washington. Having the convictions that I have about the propriety of putting a man active in the oil business in a position in the Government, except under the pressure of necessity during a war emergency, where one of his important duties would be to deal with oil matters on behalf of the Government, and anticipating that you might have in mind the nomination of Mr. Pauley to be Under Secretary of the Navy, I suggested to you on two or three occasions, as you will doubtless recall, that the administrative responsibilities with respect to petroleum that lie in the Navy Department be transferred to a commission consisting of the Secretaries of War, Navy, and Interior.

SUGGESTED EXECUTIVE ORDER

Your reply was that you had been thinking of doing this. Time continued to run and, not hearing from your further on this matter, I caused a suggested Executive order to be drafted which I sent to you. The signing of this order would have removed this aspect of the question of oil so far as Mr. Pauley and the Navy Department were concerned. Unfortunately the order was not signed, so that when Mr. Pauley's nomination went up there immediately arose the question of the propriety of nominating an active oil man for a job that carried with it responsibility for Government oil.

Word came to me indirectly that Mr. Pauley himself had told you of my probable opposition to his nomination. In the circumstances, it surprised me that you did not frankly ask me what might be the basis of such opposition. You will recall that, after the Cabinet meeting on January 18, you stepped aside with me into the corner of the room. We discussed one or two matters relating to my Department.

The nomination was undoubtedly at that moment on its way to the Senate, if indeed it had not already been received there. It was that same afternoon that I learned from the news ticker that the nomination had gone up. Yet during this interview you did not mention Mr. Pauley, although his nomination was no longer a secret and you already knew from Pauley himself that I had reservations about his qualifications.

WORRIED OVER SITUATIONS

On the day to which I have previously referred, January 30, as I was about to leave your office, I told you that I wished that, on occasion, I could feel that I might talk frankly and freely with you. There were, I remarked, situations arising from time to time that worried me.

Your answer was a general one to the effect that some day we would "sit down and talk things over." Persisting, I brought up the name of Mr. Pauley, remarking that it was not true, as had been printed in an oil journal the preceding week, that I had inspired the fight against his nomination. You replied that you knew this. I added that it was not my intention either to initiate any opposition to Mr. Pauley or to "plant" anything with respect to him. Mr. Pauley's name was thus brought definitely into our conversation. Still you did not ask me what objections, if any, I had to him.

Late Thursday afternoon, January 31, I received a telegram from Senator WALSH, chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate, asking me, at the request of Senator TOBEY, to appear before his committee on the nomination of Mr. Pauley the following morning at 11:30. The Cabinet met at 10 o'clock that day. At almost exactly 11, as we were about to adjourn, I left my chair so as to reach you first and showed you the telegram from Senator WALSH. However, you still refrained from asking me if I had any objections to this nomination.

BEGAN ON FALSE SCENT

I proceeded to the meeting of the Naval Affairs Committee and I think that the record will show that I did everything that I could in behalf of Mr. Pauley except to forswear myself. The committee, it seemed to me, had gotten off on a false scent by considering evidence about Mr. Pauley's interest in building and operating a 100-octane gasoline refinery in Mexico.

I could not see that this had any bearing upon his qualifications to become Under Secretary of the Navy. However, this presented an occasion to criticize sharply Mr. Max Thornburg, at one time petroleum adviser to the State Department. When Senator TOBEY asked me whether, in any conversation with me, Mr. Pauley had ever linked the proposition of campaign contributions from oilmen in California with the possibility of abandoning any claim of Federal title to the offshore oil lands of that State, my answer was "yes."

At that time Senator TOBEY did not pursue the matter further than to ask whether anyone was present at this conversation and whether I had made a memorandum of it. My answers were that Under Secretary Fortas had been present and that I had made a memorandum.

Mr. Pauley followed me on the stand. Senator BREWSTER asked him whether he had heard my evidence that morning to the effect that he had suggested to me that if he could be assured that the tideland bill would not be filed, he could raise $400,000 or $500,000. Mr. Pauley replied, "That statement is not true." Subsequently I received another telegram from Senator WALSH in response to which I attended a further meeting of the Naval Affairs Committee on the afternoon of Tuesday, February 5.

This summons required me to take with me all memoranda relating to conversations with Mr. Pauley with respect to campaign contributions and Federal title to offshore oil lands in California. Of course, I responded to this summons. On this occasion, under questioning from Senator TOBEY, I read my memoranda—there were several of them on the subject—to the committee and introduced them into the record.

POSITION MADE UNTENABLE

I followed your press conference on Thursday, February 7, at which you definitely alined yourself with Mr. Pauley as against me, thus making my position as a member of your Cabinet untenable. Of course this was your privilege but, if I may, I should like to question the propriety of your saying that I had not consulted you in advance of my testimony with respect to Pauley and particularly of your statement that "Ickes can very well be mistaken as well as the rest of us."

It seemed to me clear from what you said at this press conference that you had prejudged this case without giving me a chance to be heard. In any other circumstances that I can conceive of I would have considered it my duty to continue in my present post until the issues had been finally determined. In the circumstances I see no such duty. On the contrary, I feel that as a matter of principle it is clearly my obligation to submit my resignation now.

As to your statement that I might have been mistaken in my testimony, my feeling is that, since you were not present at the hearing and presumably had not read the record, it was not proper for you, even although you be the President of the United States, to pass judgment on a question of veracity between Mr. Pauley and myself.

After all, I am a member of your Cabinet at your own request and I do not have a reputation for dealing recklessly with the

truth. On the issue of veracity as between Mr. Pauley and myself, I am ready to appear before any competent tribunal at any time, although, of course, I should want one that would not announce, or even form, its opinion in advance of a full and careful consideration of all of the evidence.

WAS WILLING TO TALK

As to whether I had or had not consulted you in advance of my testimony on the Pauley nomination, my reply is that you had full notice of the probability of my embarrassment, plus several opportunities, in addition to those that you might create at will, to ask me the reason why I might oppose him.

After all, one may not thrust his unasked advice upon the President of the United States and I did not feel that I could go further than to indicate to you, as I clearly did, that I was willing to talk to you about Mr. Pauley, although, of course, you did not need such an affirmative assurance.

Even at the risk of making this letter too long, I would like to explain why I was shocked by the suggestion that liberal campaign contributions might be forthcoming if the Government should forego whatever claim it might have to the oil-rich lands lying off the coast of California. Above all departments, the Department of the Interor must always be on guard against any association of money with politics, and even overzealous, by the standards of some men, in defending the Government's legal proprietary rights. The forces that ruined Secretary Fall will always be playing upon anyone who is Secretary of the Interior.

It is not now certain that other departments will be immune to similar sinister pressures, and the forces that ruined Secretary Fall because he made the mistake of deciding that, politically he had to yield to them will always be seeking to oust or to discredit any Secretary who will not surrender to them.

Always, in one form or another, they will be urging (a) that because of what it has to give out to the public treasure the Department of the Interior can be made a flush source of money for use in politics, and (b) that a Secretary who insists upon protecting the public domain, as if it were his own property, from the encroachments of men politically and acquisitively ambitious is an intolerable scold and a brake on progress.

WARNS OF CLOUD

The incapacity to resist this kind of political pressure spiritually wrecked the Republican Party in the days of Secretary Fall, long before its debacle in 1932. And so, as I leave the Department, I feel that I ought to warn you of a cloud, now no bigger than a man's hand, that my experience sees in the sky.

This cloud is the brash criticism of me voiced by party members other than yourself for the alleged failure of my Department to make a contribution during the last national campaign of an amount deemed satisfactory. That I have found it necessary on occasion to decline to produce lists of the names and addresses of the Department personnel to be used for purposes of political solicitation is quite true. My justification has been that such a procedure would be against my principles and, furthermore, would violate the law.

It is also undoubtedly true that my personal contributions have not been as large in terms of money as those of some others, although I have contributed within the limit of my ability to do so. Aside from financial contributions, I doubt if many members of the administration have given more than I. However, even if I could afford it, I would not care to enter into a competition for political favor on the basis of cash contributions made.

It continues to be a source of satisfaction to me to recall President Roosevelt's word to me at my home on the Sunday afternoon following the last election. He said that he had come out to thank me personally for my services in the campaign, services which he appraised so generously that I refrain from quoting his exact words.

NEED STEADY SUPPLY OF OIL

I need not emphasize the concern that I have felt about the oil situation along the Pacific coast, where we have a steadily declining production with a paucity of new discoveries. For strategic as well as for domestic purposes, we need in the Pacific Coast States a steady and reliable supply of crude oil.

Naturally, in view of my responsibilities as the head of this Department, I have felt that the national interest in the oil lying off of the shore of California should be carefully guarded. It may be that our future supplies in this area will come more and more from under the waters of the Pacific Ocean.

I have felt that the national interest requires the determination of the ownership of this oil by the branch of government set up by the people to decide such questions, namely, the courts. It is for this reason that I have for a long time pressed for the prosecution of a suit so that the courts might say whether or not the Federal Government has any title in or to any part of this oil.

For the same reason I have opposed all proposals that, without waiting for the courts so to decide, Congress simply quit claim any interest of the United States to other and private interests. It would be strange if, in view of my interest in the oil situation along the Pacific coast, I should not feel some concern about the business affiliations and the natural aptitudes of any man nominated for the critically important post of Under Secretary of the Navy.

INTERIOR STAFF PRAISED

I cannot understand why any American should be afraid to entrust to the courts such a question as they were instituted to pass upon—and I am suspicious when I find such distrust. You must know how much I appreciated your instructions to the Attorney General to file an original suit against the State of California to test this question directly in the Supreme Court of the United States, thus moving to resolve legal doubts much more quickly and definitely than could be done in the suit that was pending in the District Court of Southern California.

I will leave the Department grateful for the opportunity that President Roosevelt gave me and humble in my appreciation of the help and loyalty that I have had at all times from as fine a group of public servants as can be found in the Government. It is they who have moved the Department forward into new ground.

I have been fortunate in being permitted to work shoulder to shoulder with the splendid men and women of Interior whose only politics have been the desire to accomplish for their country without self-seeking or partisanship. I thank you, too, for the opportunity that you have given to me to continue my public service to this date.

And so, Mr. President, I shall vacate my office on March 31 next unless it is your desire that I should retire at an earlier date.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

Price Stabilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the matter of stabilization, I am including a discussion by Carl A. Schmidt, of Dayton, Ohio, entitled "An Approach to Moral Justice," together with a news item from the Dayton Daily News, of Dayton, Ohio, commenting on Mr. Schmidt's plan of stabilization.

Mr. Schmidt is a native of my district who has spent a number of years in the study of money and its relationship to our economy.

The matter follows:

AN APPROACH TO MORAL JUSTICE—AN EXACT SCIENCE

(By Carl A. Schmidt)

If democracy means anything, it means self-government, self-rule, self-control. If we are to govern ourselves with no rulers to tell us what to do, surely then it must be done according to God's law and God's will. With this thought, I wish to bring to your attention an approach to economics as an exact science.

In bringing to your attention certain claims that I have made, it must be understood that I am asking no one to agree with what I say, all I ask is a hearing.

It took much effort to get a hearing from our Government. I was finally heard and certain statements were made. If these statements are truth, then many other things will have to be adjusted to these truths. If others govern us we must put up with their conditions, if we govern ourselves, then we must set up other conditions.

As an approach, I will relate some things concerning the efforts made to get a hearing in Washington, then pass on to the set-up as printed. Much of what I have written must be explained that there be a proper understanding. Questions will be welcome. A subject as broad as the one I am discussing must be studied, and it is extremely difficult to begin and to end. However, if there is a willingness to study, then progress can be made.

I have set out these six subjects, which are fundamental. These are, of course, subdivided many times.

1. Price and wage.
2. Stable price and stable money.
3. How money behaves.
4. Correct tax.
5. System of reward.
6. The number of individuals.

1. PRICE AND WAGE

It was no easy matter to get the newspapers to publish my advertisements 3 and 4 years ago. The ad which is, "The argument," was at first turned down. The original draft contained the sentence, "In order that we may know our respective worth." I was forced to eliminate that so the rest could be published. The reason for the study of economics is, "How much shall I get?" The other question is, "How much does it cost?" In my business we generally accept economics as it is taught in the schools. All is guesswork, because the problem is never correctly stated. We fill a prescription. The rule for getting the selling price is the cost of ingredients plus the labor charge plus the profit. That is the selling price. This formula is used throughout industry and is the cause of misunderstanding. We use money as a measure, and money measures what we buy, not our services. Our services are measured by what we accomplish. What we produce should tell us how much we should get. If it takes me twice as long to perform a service, should the same service cost twice as much because I performed it, or should I get less because I am less efficient?

If economics is an exact science, then we must start with price and figure pay from that end and not figure pay into price. Experience is the best teacher. In my business I have never accepted the classic formula for price and wage and therefore have no trouble in understanding what I am trying to point out.

2. STABLE PRICE AND STABLE MONEY

When I was a young man there arose a great argument as to what money was. Some thought of it as gold, others as of silver, and some as of both gold and silver. The truth is that money is the relation of prices, and gold and silver may be security for money. The argument then arose as to the relative value of gold in terms of silver. This is a function of money, for money should show the relative value between all forms of wealth. An ounce of gold was assumed to be worth 16 ounces of silver. Silver and gold arguments are still going on and will become very great should we have inflation. Suppose we use the 16-to-1 proportion to illustrate what is meant by a stable price and a stable money. If we confine ourselves to a simple problem we will understand each other, remembering that through proportion we can solve the more complex problem if the simple problem is solved. One ounce of gold equals $16. Sixteen ounces of silver at $* an ounce equals $16. Together we have a total of $32. If we wish a stable money, then the sum 32 is the starting point of our calculation. We make 32 a constant. If we add another ounce of gold and 16 more ounces of silver, then the value of each ounce of gold is reduced to $8 and each ounce of silver to 50 cents. That is what is meant by a stable money. A stable money becomes a very, very intricate problem. However, suppose we add an ounce of gold and 16 ounces of silver and keep the price the same, we have then a total of 64, which tells us that there is more of something than there was before. Price becomes the constant. This problem is much simpler to perform and it is the formula suggested for our economic use.

3. HOW MONEY BEHAVES

We are all familiar with the behavior of money as it circulates. It passes from one to the other and from the individual to the bank. We have formed an idea that money was only a medium of exchange, forgetting that money is first of all a measure. We try to think that money measures our services in regard to what we buy. Here is a fundamental error. It must never be thought that money can form a proportion between what we give and what we get. The proportion is between various items of wealth. This is important. For each of us money measures only the proportion of the various items that we buy, not what we do to obtain money. Money is the relation of prices. Money could also measure wealth if it would not circulate. This is easier to understand if we think of a ticket. The ticket tells us exactly what we are entitled to. Under a stable price, all our money would be like a ticket; that is, we would always know just what it was good for. It would not circulate from one person to another, but would be issued like a ticket and would be canceled as it was used. By using money in this form we would always know what we were working for. There would be no guesswork.

4. CORRECT TAX

Government is established principally to enable people to trade. Because of this function, it has also set out to punish people. Tax enables government to sway trends of trade and to influence the lives of people. Wide search has been made for correct method of taxation. If we understand the function of money, that is, money is the relation of prices, then the correct method of tax becomes evident, at least theoretically. All wealth is measured by money, therefore wealth and money are equal. Wealth is what money buys. It must be sacred to the individual. A money system is provided by government, therefore the proper tax is a tax on money, not on wealth. This is theory and in practice could not be put into effect because of the difficulty in figuring price starting with a stable money as explained above.

5. SYSTEM OF REWARD

A system of reward which is the system used by all industry would enable us to put into effect the science of economics. There would be no debt. All of it would be paid, that is, money would be issued for all debts. There would be no tax because money would be issued for all new wealth, whether this were natural increase without effort or a studied increase through labor. If more money were outstanding we would know that we were richer. If less money were out, we would know we were poorer. This brings us back again to the problem, have we faith enough in God and in each other to set up a system of reward? Can we adjust ourselves to His law and His will so that we can live in peace with one another?

6. THE NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS

In thinking of replacing tax by reward, the problem of the number of individuals becomes very acute for it is clearly seen. If we have a pie to divide among four boys, we can divide it equitably or equally. We can give in proportion to what each deserves or we can just give the same amount to each. No matter how we divide, if we have more boys it is evident that there will be less all around than if there were only four. If there were three, the pieces would be larger. Proportion tells us that the number of individuals has a bearing on the economic problem. Many methods of tax have been tried to encourage or discourage the birth rate. Some nations encourage large families, others discourage them, because the number of individuals has a bearing on the economic problem.

The science of economics makes it possible for every man, woman, and child in the world to become self-supporting from birth to death through insurance. The problem involved is: Can this be done in conformity with God's will without violation of His law? First we must study all the facts; that is, we must know the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. In a system of reward, government becomes the sole customer of industry, that is: Everyone works for himself and is paid for his services by government. This includes everybody, no exceptions whatsoever. Government becomes sole guardian of all wealth. No one gets anything without a ticket. Nothing, no nothing at all without a ticket. If everyone were self-supporting for life and everyone knew the conditions, everyone would only punish himself if he failed to provide for emergency. Such a system would be better than putting a person in jail for he would be his own judge and jury. If God's law were observed and God's will were clearly understood, then we could have both economic and moral justice.

God's law is found in the Ten Commandments. God's will is that He does not wish for the sinner to perish, but that he might live. This means eternal life. Jesus taught us to pray, "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven." If this means anything, it means that God does not wish a single family to perish, but that each family should live on and on. Life has come from Adam to me and should go forward on earth from generation to generation; the only exception are those, who through greater love devote their lives to serving God.

Moral justice must come with economic justice and we can have it without violation of God's law. Another petition in the Lord's prayer is, "Give us this day our daily bread." This petition is automatically answered by the science of economics, for that would be our first concern, namely: To see to it that each individual received bare necessities. "Forgive us our debts as we forgive those indebted to us," could mean, relieve us of all debt, public and private so that none of us would ever again be in debt. Stabilization of price will pay every debt. "Lead us not into temptation." All of us must exercise self-government and self-control so that each family will become a sacred unit as it should be, and it is easier to avoid temptation than to resist it and much more satisfactory.

All of this would "deliver us from evil, for Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory, forever and forever. Amen."

[From the Dayton Daily News of February 5, 1946]

OFFERS STABILIZATION PLAN—DAYTON DRUGGIST DISCUSSES RELATION OF MONEY TO PRICE

(By William L. Sanders)

Carl A. Schmidt, Dayton druggist, outlined and discussed his price stabilization plan at a meeting of the St. Borromeo Society, University of Dayton, Monday night in the Albert Emanuel Library.

The plan rests on the assumption that money is not only a means of exchange but also a measure of wealth, Schmidt explained.

"If a dollar is stable, price must vary. If price is stable, the total number of dollars must vary. A stable dollar is forever the same fractional part of all the money. However, when we speak of stability of money, we mean that price has been worked out for us, and we need not concern ourselves that the price problem will confront us," Schmidt insisted.

To illustrate his theory, Schmidt said, "Let us look at one transaction. For example let us have 10 cents on one side and a loaf of bread on the other. The bread represents wealth and the dime money. If the bread were all the wealth and the dime all the money, then the dime would be stable money for it would represent all the wealth. Now let us add another loaf of bread; then the two loaves would be all the wealth and 10 cents would be all the money. The price would have to be computed in proportion."

The druggist then declared, "If money as we know it were stabilized, every bit of additional wealth would of necessity reduce price so that it would be a great advantage to have money. To remedy this situation, it has been practice to add to the total amount of money either through debt or other means, so that prices would not fall."

According to Schmidt, "a currency in which price is stabilized removes debt." Stabilization, he asserts, will automatically remove debt. "Every debt will be paid, none canceled."

How then will bankers be paid? he asked. How will endowments be sustained? How will we get money when we can no longer work? How about insurance as we know it? Bankers would be paid like every other individual, by the Government, Schmidt said. "Endowments, interest, and insurance would all be paid by the Government, to living individuals by a new form of insurance which would replace debt, and which would be all-inclusive. Stabilization would change only the method of accounting, Schmidt emphasized.

As Schmidt envisages economics, there would be only one middleman, the authority that issues money. Money, he says, would be received by every individual in proportion to his worth to society for the wealth he produced and he in turn could buy anything he desired at the same price every other individual would pay. "This would stabilize prices because we would always have money and wealth balanced," he held.

With respect to taxes, Schmidt said taxes should be levied on money, not on wealth. Linking taxes with the individual, the druggist suggested that "if we are to govern ourselves, no one can tax us; instead, we would be obliged to reward each other." As explained by Schmidt, such a form of government is suggested by a self-serve restaurant. "An institution of this kind requires intelligent management. If we wished to live in a world in which each individual governed

himself, we would have to reason together as to just what changes must be brought about. In a self-serve restaurant each customer chooses the food he wishes and can afford. Much choice is offered. In a real democracy, each individual would contribute whatsoever he desired to the welfare of others and would receive, therefore, whatsoever he wished and could afford in return. This would be real self-government."

Schmidt's address evoked a great array of questions on all phases of his proposals. Among these, one stood out, "What is the role of government in this stabilization proposal?"

"Government," Schmidt said, "would be one giant corporation which owned nothing but acted as custodian of all the wealth."

Schmidt's Approach to Economics was presented to the Seventy-seventh Congress on April 16, 1942. On October 31, 1945, it was presented personally to the Department of Commerce in the east wing of the White House.

Schmidt has been in business for himself 27 years, 10 of them at 114 West Fifth Street. All that time he has been studying the American economic system.

Asked what prompted him to go into business for himself, he said, "To show how the individual must compete with the power of money; that is, how the individual can compete with the chain store."

Americanism—A Chapter From a Book the President and Every Member of Congress Should Read

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, it is inspiring to find a clear-cut expression of American ideals in a book that has recently come to my attention, which I submit for the consideration of every American with the best interest of our country at heart:

(Extract from the book, England's Decadent International Economy, by Dr. William F. Hauhart, Ph. D.)

Since I am not willing that we should underwrite England and her empire for the future, it is appropriate to indicate the path that I would like to have my country follow in making her contribution to peace and international progress. I have indicated on various occasions that I am a nationalist so far as my wishes for the future of my country are concerned. This means that I should like to see her long-time interests considered and cultivated in an appropriate fashion.

On the the other hand, there seem to be a number of Americans who wish to save and exalt other nations and apparently forget about the interests of their own homeland, which should be one of their prime responsibilities. Shall we explain this by saying that they feel that we cannot stand on our own feet? I am not sure about this, but believe that I am safe in saying that we shall have to depend practically altogether upon ourselves in the future—the United States with Canada and Latin America as friendly unallied neighbors.

There are indications that when this war is over the people of the United States will have no desire to participate again in Europe's quarrels in a military way. Our present enemies will then be defeated and it would be useless for us to intervene in any contest between England and Russia. The U. S. S. R., with its huge land empire, can hold its own, and England is too weak to cross swords with Russia even with the help of our military might, which some Americans would no doubt be willing to throw into the scales. We surely would not wish to make the same mistakes which were made by Napoleon and Hitler in trying to pursue the Russian bear to his uttermost haunts. With all our power, we are geographically too far removed from the scene of struggle to make ourselves really effective in eastern Europe.

Hence the suggestion that we devote ourselves to the development of the economic resources and the cultivation of the people of the Western Hemisphere. We would fight, too, if necessary, but only in self-defense. We would concentrate our interests geographically and this would permit us to carry out an extensive program of internal development. This would not mean that we could not then help materially and morally in any part of the world wherever the opportunity presented itself. It has recently again been brought out that the American people have never failed to offer assistance to other groups whenever a specific project was held in view. They do shy away from vague global concepts of world betterment and security, so-called, which would dissipate their material and moral resources.

Our economic productivity, our science, and our genius for business management should all be at the disposal of human projects everywhere, not in the sense that we should pour out our resources in prodigal fashion to enable other countries to engage in practically continuous wars, but they would be available partly as gifts to mitigate distress at home and abroad, and partly, let us hope, as model methods of internal governmental procedure and as instruments for the cultivation of international good will.

Mr. Lin Yutang, the well-known writer, has expressed his thoughts concerning the future position of the United States in international affairs as follows:

"I am not worried lest America may not be able to assert a leadership of force and power: I am worried lest she may. I am concerned to see America assume a moral leadership, a leadership of humility, so that the world may pay her glad homage and uphold her forever. Like the great river that nourishes life along its valley, she shall by the exuberance and richness of her life be a blessing upon the peoples of the earth. She shall stay above, and the world shall not feel her weight; she shall walk in front and no one will wish her harm. For she shall then lead in kindness and unselfishness and justice and by that secret of unused power bring a new era of brotherhood to mankind. No one can dethrone her because of her power for goodness, and no one can take away from her, because she does not take possession. She shall not contend, and no one in the world can contend against her, and because she takes no credit, the credit can never be taken away from her. This is my dream America. Will it come true?

I know that this does not satisfy the ambitions of some of our citizens who want the United States to use its Military Establishment in all parts of the world. The suggestion looks forward to the time when our influence may be a world force in a moral sense only. Oliver Wendell Holmes once expressed in his unique way how we might teach our type of democracy to the world. "Not by aggression but by the naked fact of existence we are an eternal danger and an unsleeping threat to every government that is founded on anything but the will of the governed." Some time ago Senator CAPPER said over the radio: "American leadership toward a better world can best be made effective by this Nation working out its own destiny." In that way only can we become strong and develop along the path envisaged for the United States by Mr. Lin Yutang.

I am aware of the fact that we are supposed to get ready now to participate in all the world's troubles everywhere in a military way. Dire forebodings are held before us if we fail to undertake that responsibility as a nation. Opposition to such a plan is to be stifled, if possible. I shall, no doubt, be dubbed an "isolationist", that supposedly deadliest of derogatory terms that can now be applied to an American citizen. If that is deemed necessary, I shall accept it cheerfully. Also, if someone wishes to call this book, or any part of it, propaganda, I shall offer no objection, except to suggest that some of it was intended to be counterpropaganda. The latest threat held before us is that war weapons are becoming so terrible that we all have to huddle together to prevent any groups except the peace-loving nations, so-called, from using them. I have been wondering why universal disarmament, at least progressively over a period of time, is not a better suggestion. It should be mentioned that the eighth point of the Atlantic Charter, in part, reads as follows: "They (the signers?) believe that all of the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of the use of force."

There are certain groups who have aimed to take the attention of the American people from their interests at home and direct their eyes to Europe. They did not encourage us to become self-reliant, to depend on our own resources, and stand on our own feet. We have been told repeatedly that our strength lies in a combination with Europe with its ages of feuds, wars, and bickerings. In a subtle fashion, our moral nature was appealed to. We were told that we had the duty of giving our all to Europe and the world at large. Thus, our attention has been often turned from our own interests, from developing and strengthening our homeland, to distant parts of the earth where lie the interests of imperialistic nations. As the end of the war is approaching and we are trying to win the peace as well as the war, we are gradually getting acquainted with our allies. We are learning by and by what their aims are and what their purposes have been in urging us to use our resources at the four corners of the earth.

NO LASTING NATIONAL COMITY

After every war the victorious nations that have fought on the same side are obsessed with the idea that they are going to remain friends ever after. Even the most recent history shows that two nations, Italy and Japan, who were on our side from 1914 to 1918, have been our enemies in the current conflict. The international attitude of nations may change very quickly as a further study of history will abundantly show. Then, too, the evolutionary process in human and national affairs is bound to produce shifts, regardless of the number of seals and ribbons that were placed on the last signed agreement.

Certain groups at the present time particularly seem to think of the problem of international comity and peace mostly in terms of organization. And the Dumbarton Oaks proposals have been brought forth as the basis for a league to enforce peace. However, we have no idea of the type of peace that the Dumbarton proposal is supposed to guarantee. We do know that the clause to provide for subduing aggression will not apply to the Big Three. The small nations and the defeated nations only can be prevented from becoming aggressors. The League as planned, therefore, turns out to be a military alliance of nations holding permanent membership on the Council. There are five of those members, the Big Three, together with France and China. The proposed Charter is silent on imperialism, and colonial peoples

have no chance even to get a hearing. Any member of the Big Three can veto consideration of its own aggression, and any action on cases of that sort by the League would, therefore, be out of the question.

Since colonial disputes have been ruled out as domestic issues, England's desire to take the island Pantelleria off Sicily, several provinces of Haile Selassie's domain, and repossess Hong Kong, if consummated, either in a peace treaty or by unilateral action as things are now being done, could not be called into question by the Dumbarton league. I suspect that the haste which is now urged in suggesting that each member nation, including the United States, be ready to act at once in case of aggression, is thought advisable in order to squelch immediately colonial uprisings in all parts of the world. Colonial disputes are to be considered domestic issues, but it appears that if any aggression occurs on the part of any colonial domain the members of the league nevertheless would be expected to put it down. The Dumbarton Oaks proposals have been informally discussed in the United States Senate. One Senator declared that "it would be pointless for the President to send the Dumbarton Oaks proproposals to the Senate unless Russia and England completely changed their present policies in Europe."

Is there a possibility for such a change? President Wilson's experience in Europe would seem to answer this question. It was there that he received the blow that broke him when he found out that his idealism was not wanted or appreciated by the people whom he wished to assist and to whom he had previously sent our armies. He was seriously offended by the lack of response to his overtures and the refusal of England to take the lead in Europe by modifying her imperialism in the interests of future peace.

The thought has been assiduously cultivated in this country that Mr. Wilson's disappointments were due althogether to the small group of willful Senators who refused to approve his League of Nations and the Versailles Treaty. His pride may have been hurt by this, but he knew that the principles he was fighting for had been irretrievably lost at the peace table. Moreover, the League of Nations was regarded by European members as an instrument of power politics. Nevertheless, many Americans seem to insist today that if we had been members of the League, we could have used our influence to modify the imperialistic ambitions of European nations and could have guided them in such a way that the Second World War would have been avoided. Let them observe the situation as it prevails in Europe today, and the difficulties which we are having in making our influence felt.

APPLICATION OF ATLANTIC CHARTER

A good many of us missed from the Dumbarton Oaks proposals some of the principles which were enunciated in the Atlantic Charter. Recently there has been a revival of this Charter in the thoughts of the American people. The signers and authors themselves seemed not to welcome this rediscovery. It is often thus with political statements made chiefly for political purposes. Shortly after the meeting of the two statesmen at which the Charter originated, Mr. Churchill reported that when it was finished, "we sang: 'Onward Christian Soldiers,'" and suggested further, "We had a right to feel we were serving a cause for the sake of which a trumpet had been sounded from on high." But not long after he announced that the Atlantic Charter did not pply to India, and later on he assisted in emasculating it still further.

When the original of the Charter recently seemed to be lost, Mr. John O'Donnell, a newspaper correspondent in Washington, traced it to the Smithsonian Institute where a signed copy was hanging on the wall. He was told that the OWI printed and distributed about 300,000 copies to schools, colleges, libraries, and others. Later the same day Mr. O'Donnell went back for another view of the Smithsonian framed copy, but found that it had been removed in the meantime. A copy of the Atlantic Charter is printed in the appendix of this book by courtesy of the Dallas Morning News.

Reverting to the main topic we may ask again: Shall we continue to support England and her imperialism after this war? Also, can we save her and her possessions even if we give her our utmost support? She seems to have the pious hope of preventing the plans of Russia from clashing with her own. Of course, she wishes to reinsure a goodly part of that risk in the United States, if we will only submit to it. We should, in pondering this question, consider that the Orient is awakening and no one knows how long the imperialism of the white man will be tolerated there. Since Russia will very likely hold the whip hand in the future in both Europe and Asia, England's possessions can no longer be defended by force. After this war she would seem to be safe as long as her interests do not clash with Russia.

FINANCIAL HELP

Nevertheless England seems to want from us a continuous drawing account, moral and material, and imagines that in this way her possessions can be held with our help. She wants a moral drawing account consisting of our promises which she can use in a diplomatic way in her quarrels with other nations. And she wants a practically unlimited material drawing account to support her in any way. And now she has come to the point where she even needs our material support in times of peace. Her own white paper, as recently published, pleads for practically continuous lend-lease from the United States.

There are many of us who would offer no objection to the economic support of England by the United States after this war if there were a good chance of having her restored to the economic position which she occupied at the beginning of this century. But this possibility does not exist since her geographical position and the forces of natural evolution have made her island economic setting obsolete. She has been unable, since 1914, to maintain an active trade balance, and the prospects for the future have continually worsened since that time.

There is not involved in this discussion an estimate of the efficiency of the individual Englishman. To be sure, while his economic position was becoming worse, he did show a tendency to rest on his laurels and at times lacked the ability to adapt himself to rapidly changing world conditions. The latter applied, I would say, more definitely to the managerial or political element that had to do with international business which was the most important part of England's economy. The individual worker and technician usually did his part as well as could be expected.

Environmental influences to a great extent brought England to the apex of her economic achievements in the nineteenth century and environmental influences have placed her at a considerable disadvantage during the twentieth century. During the nineteenth century she was the first to exploit her own resources of coal after inventing the steam engine. With the help of these two elements, she could produce enormous quantities of manufactured goods that could be sold on a world-wide scale. Through her early success a century ago in textiles, chiefly cotton, which she manufactured and sold at a great profit, she laid the basis of her foreign investments. To be sure, there was some exploitation of labor in this process which helped to bring forth that margin of profit which could then be invested in foreign countries. In shipbuilding she was supreme after steam had been applied to the propulsion of vessels. Her own ships brought her income by carrying the goods and passengers of other nations. Her primacy in shipbuilding enabled her to sell tonnage to foreign countries on a large scale. In short, she paid for her imports not only by exports of manufactured goods, coal, etc., but also by rendering services of shipping of capital and of credit on a world-wide scale.

During the twentieth century these environmental influences went into reverse. Keen competition came from the United States and from the Continent. During the nineteenth century most of her international business was monopolistic, since other nations were not in a position to compete very much, but the turn of the century brought this competition to the fore. Since 1900 her costs of production increased. Her navy and her high-class ships now had to be propelled by oil which she did not produce, and therefore oil became one of her necessary imports that had to be paid for by other goods and services.

CONTRACTION BRITISH FINANCIAL CARTELS

But fate was most unkind to her when a goodly part of her foreign investments disappeared as a result of the First World War. We allowed her to forego the payment of an indebtedness of about $4,000,000,000 to us at that time so that her foreign capital investments were not reduced by that amount. But she bought heavily of war goods and foods from other countries during the conflict, and since she could not produce civilian goods on a large scale in the emergency, this forced a reduction of her foreign investments and there followed a relative reduction of dividends and interest income.

There is considerable discussion of this point at the present time. The answer which the English themselves give is: We must increase our exports so that we can pay our necessary imports. This increase in exports is expected to be 50 percent, according to some estimates. Other estimates are much higher. There are two questions involved in this: (a) Can England produce the additional goods to make up these hoped-for exports? (b) Will there be markets available to absorb these exports?

England's far-flung network of commerce and finance as it spanned the entire world was unique in its structure and relationships. Compared with the system of other nations, it may even be called somewhat artificial. It stood up well as long as the invisible elements involving the services of capital, credit, and shipping could be kept in a sound, active condition. When England engaged in wars of the magnitude of the First and Second World Wars, she had to consum a goodly part of her foreign investments. The winning of the war would leave her in a greatly weakened economic condition. It was then extremely difficult to build up again and replenish her foreign investments because her other international business had suffered and her profits were not sufficient to rebuild her capital in foreign countries.

It seems to take practically a monopolistic position to maintain an economy such as England's through all the vicissitudes of wars, intensified competition of other nations, as well as the falling off in demand for manufactured goods on the part of those nations who are striving to become more self-sufficient. I have called her economic position during the nineteenth century a natural monopoly, since she was the first on the scene with industries that could supply a world market with manufactured goods. When she lost her advantageous position in the early part of the twentieth century the heyday of her economic supremacy was soon over.

Now, she has been trying hard by various methods to establish an artificial monopoly by means of cartels and special bilateral arrangements, through both of which she hopes to be able to exploit the consumers of some of her goods with higher prices than she could get in a free competitive market. Two instances may be mentioned. The Stevenson Rubber Cartel which for a number of years forced American consumers to pay higher than competitive prices. The rubber was

grown largely in the British and Dutch East Indies and the cartel was operating under the aegis of the English. Another instance is the cocoa monopoly or cartel which the English have organized, including first of all their own colonies in Africa, Gold Coast, and Nigeria. The future program provides for the incorporation into this monopoly of the supplies of cocoa from Bahia, Brazil, and French West Africa. These imperialistic cartels increase their incomes not only by exploiting the consumer through high prices, but they also exploit the laborers in the colonies by low wages.

Their nineteenth century natural monopoly gave them bountiful profits and enabled them to accumulate large amounts of capital investments. And now they hope to find prosperity in the cartels, price agreements, and other methods of exploiting the consumer on top and the producing laborer below. The latter cannot be done domestically any more as it was effectively carried on by the English in their textile factories once upon a time in Lancashire. But they still expect to do it with the colonial laborers in other parts of the Empire as their proposed handling of the British state cocoa monopoly for the Gold Coast and Nigeria well shows. Inordinate profits they would like to have in many of their industries. Otherwise they cannot pay for the large amounts of imports which they need to sustain the living standards of their people and provide themselves with indispensable raw materials.

We may summarize the reason for the inability of England to equate her international trade balance in the future without assistance in the form of lend-lease. Most of the points relate to the narrowing market areas for British exports as well as the need for rationalizing her industries more extensively.

1. The trend toward self-sufficiency in practically all actively producing countries is growing stronger all the time. The spread of technology has helped to promote the manufacturing industries in many countries that formerly were producers of foods and raw materials and depended for their manufactured goods mostly upon imports from England and other industrial nations. The increased output of synthetics and plastics has also contributed to make nations less dependent on imports. In general, the number of commodities that it is necessary to exchange between economic areas is constantly diminishing.

2. One of the factors which facilitated England's exports in the past was her investment policy in foreign countries. When a good-sized city, let us say in a South American country, wished to introduce electrification, England stood ready to furnish the engineering skill, the capital loans, and then sell the city the necessary machinery and equipment. Today there is in some of these countries a disposition to frown upon foreign investments in their economy. A prominent lecturer from a South American country recently informed an American audience that these investments, particularly when made for the development of some natural resource, were looked upon as a form of exploitation. The origin of this prejudice is hard to determine but it does hamper the influx of foreign funds for investment, and as a secondary result it lowers imports of foreign goods and services.

3. Competition among industrial nations in selling manufactured goods in export trade has become more and more intense. England's costs of production apparently have been higher than those of some continental countries. She may have paid better wages in some cases. In some instances the high costs of production were due in part at least to lack of modern up-to-date equipment and management.

4. During the two wars England's investments in foreign countries have to a great extent been consumed, chiefly by the necessity of supplementing her own production of the sinews of war by materials of other countries which could not be sent to her on a lend-lease basis. This reduction of her investments in foreign countries has not only reduced her income of dividends and interest but it will have repercussions on her ability to expand her foreign trade after this war is over.

5. England has adopted a policy of protectionism. After nearly a century of free trade she changed over to the imposition of customs duties on many of her imports in 1932. Her empire preference agreements with the dominions came under this head, too. It is doubtful, even in the minds of some leading Englishmen, whether this will improve her foreign trade position or not. This is part of the general policy of economic restrictionism which has recently been adopted by England.

But most unpalatable to the United States is her plan to foster a great development of cartels and cultivate more extensively various kinds of special trade agreements with other nations who may be induced to cooperate with her. Hence there is today a disagreement between the United States and England in their discussions of trade and finance. We are talking of multilateral trade on a world-wide scale, while the English are talking in terms of cartels and special bilateral arrangements or group agreements among the trading nations. England would like to have us come over to her point of view. Hers is a siren voice which seems to be saying: "You and I together can control the world" of commerce and finance if you will but join me in the cartelization of all the world's business. It remains to be seen what the people of the United States will decide to do about this.

We as a Nation may have a strong urge to help perpetuate England and her empire. No serious objections would be offered to such a program if it were possible to carry it through permanently and effectively. But that is the question. We might pledge her our military might for the future, but her economic problem would remain what it has been since 1914. There is no way by which she can restore her erstwhile favorable active trade balance except by continuous lend-lease shipments from other parts of the empire or the United States.

The dominions have a small population and are not economically strong. Their loyalty may be excellent in time of war, although internal difficulties may in the future prevent cooperation with the United Kingdom even in war. Since the dominions are in the developmental stage, they are prone in time of peace to look upon the English chiefly as competitors who do not welcome their industrial developments but would prefer to have them buy their manufactured goods in England. The United Kingdom, sensing this attitude and knowing the insufficiency of the help which the dominions could give in time of stress, has always turned first to the United States for assistance, the part of the original empire which she lost.

Unofficially some Englishmen have recently suggested that if we do not join them wholeheartedly in their economic and political plans, England may decide to associate herself with Russia. I would be inclined, as one American citizen, to accept that suggestion, because it would tend to relieve us in the United States of a great burden. But Russia, as I see it, does not need England at all, and what England needs most of all after this war she cannot get from Russia. She needs mostly a continuous stream of lend-lease goods and a guarantee of her colonial possessions. Russia will not be in a position for a number of years to lend-lease materials to other countries, and she seems at present unwilling to guarantee the integrity of any territorial possessions except her own.

So the suggestion of English-Russian cooperation, without the United States, is probably an empty threat—if it was meant to be a threat. And those Americans who wish to perpetuate England and her Empire, at whatever costs to the United States, are still perturbed. It should be suggested to them that their program would tend to become more burdensome year after year; that it will continuously draw more resources from us as time passes on. The colonies are becoming more and more restless. If we undertake, nevertheless, to underwrite England and her empire, we may find ourselves in the position of Sisyphus of old, who had the enforced task of rolling a stone to the top of a hill, but the stone at intervals, in spite of all his efforts, rolled back again.

A Halo for Herbert Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RALPH E. CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Oscar Vogl, from the National Food Distributors' Journal for January 1946:

HALO FOR HERBERT HOOVER

(By Oscar Vogl, merchandising and public relations counselor)

If the forgotten soldier could voice his sentiments he would no doubt have something to say about the forgotten public servants. In the hustle and bustle of limelight it is generally overlooked by the men and women in the street that we are fortunate to still have with us the one living ex-President of the United States of America, who from demonstrated experience could contribute much to the welfare of the world.

He was a retired businessman when World War I found him abroad and drafted him into service where he emerged as the greatest food administrator the world had ever known. Though not then and really never inclined toward politics, he again was selected for the difficult post of Secretary of Commerce. Without fanfare or publicity promotions, he quietly and efficient-mindedly organized, organized, and organized this Department until it became an outstanding world-wide functioning operation. Thus, he laid the foundation to the good-neighbor policy and really aided big and small business alike to expand in world markets. Elected to the Presidency following the golden-age period of Coolidge, he accepted the task, fully realizing that it was no sinecure.

Few men have lived and seen so many heartaches and radical changes on this planet of ours. Few men have been in position to observe impartially and hold their own council and tongue, awaiting the time when a higher power beckons them to action.

It is not only timely, but proper that we who work in the food industry should give proper recognition to one who has served long and faithfully in that field. One who handled food distribution world-wide without a single one on his staff acting improperly though temptations were as great then as they are today.

Indeed, Herbert Hoover, now past three score and ten, deserves not only a vote of thanks from this Nation and others in the world, but before his departure to the other side, the Congressional Medal of Honor for distinguished services rendered efficiently at all times.

When all is said and done, Herbert Hoover is neither a partisan politician nor a spellbinder, he is and always was an organizer,

statesman, and at heart a humanitarian, a Quaker. One who loves to serve humanity without regard of consequences.

Thus in his retirement he is donating much time to the boys' club movement, same as he diligently fed the starving women and children in the war stricken areas after World War I, irrespective of nationality or religious affiliations.

After his recent visit to the White House, he wrote to a friend: "I am certain Harry S. Truman is trying to do the best he can for the American people."

Whatever the smear campaigners may say or have said and whatever narrow-minded souls may think, Herbert Hoover is the living ex-President we can proudly hail and endow with a halo. He is another American boy off the farm and the land we love so dearly who made good.

(Oscar Vogl is not only well known to our members and readers as our merchandising counselor, but as a capable writer and lecturer who pulls no punches. During World War I he was one of the first to volunteer his services to the American Relief Committee in London. He also was one of Herbert Hoover's minutemen in this country, lecturing on food conservation before leading women's clubs and church organizations. While visiting in Vienna after the war, he induced the city fathers of the gay waltz town to change the name of Kaiserstrasse to Herbert Hoover Strasse. In World War II he served as a consultant on the War Production Board and as public relations counselor for Appreciate America. While his comments are his own and do not necessarily present the views of this Journal, we recommend them as worth while.—The Editor.)

In another Journal item the following statement is made concerning Oscar Vogl:

OSCAR VOGL KNOWS HIS GROCERIES AND HIS MERCHANDISING

He received his early training on the sales staff of the H. J. Heinz Co. of Pittsburgh, where he was constantly listed among the first 25 leaders of a sales force of over 400 top-notchers.

As sales manager of Steele-Wedeles Co., Chicago's live wholesale grocers, he managed a staff of 100 salesmen of all nationalities so successfully that the firm reached its highest volume under his direction. He was the first to introduce label saving through church organizations, the first to inaugurate one-cent grocery sales, the first to introduce 5- and 10-cent grocery departments. He was a regular food feature writer for Hearst's Chicago Examiner and as such founded the Standardized Food Bureau of Illinois.

When some Pittsburgh steel men searched for a man to bring the German monopoly of the potato-flour industry to this country, he was selected to do the job. Aided by Herbert Hoover, he studied the business abroad and set it up here, helping the farmers utilize profits out of formerly worthless cull potatoes.

His articles in our Journal have caused Nation-wide favorable comments and some like Sell 'em Enough have been widely reprinted, having been selected by Business Digest as the best of the month.

He is a fearless fighter and an enthusiastic supporter of honest government and high ethical standards in business. He is never tied down by tradition.

In passing, it is interesting to note that his father, the late Carl Vogl, was for years James Gorden Bennett's European representative of the New York Herald. His mother, an English woman, is closely related to royalty as first cousin of the late Princess of Monaco, the Duchess de Richelieu, and Princess de la Rocca. His son, Oscar J. Vogl, Jr., is a flying cadet at the West Point of the Air at Randolph Field, Tex.

Educated here and abroad, Oscar Vogl has a wide circle of contacts and experience to draw from. His comments are worth while listening to, and, as one well-known editor remarked, he possesses the rare faculty to express himself forcefully, correctly, tersely, and epigrammatically.

"New Dealirium" Exposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, since the President's fireside chat requesting the people to write their Congressmen and express their views on the issues of the day, we Congressmen have been receiving an avalanche of mail, pro and con. Most people who think for themselves and are not tied into the administration in any way, directly or indirectly, but who like to create and maintain their own security, emphatically express themselves as being against further encroachments of bureaucracy. They do not hesitate to expose this "New Dealirium."

We have had "New Dealocracy" for 12 years, and now we have "New Dealirium." The people are not delirious—but the bureaucrats are. The people have found out that the bureaucrats have become so steeped in their bureaucratic theories that it amounts to a delirium.

As example of what the people are thinking and writing their Congressmen, I am pleased to quote the following letter from a man and his wife, constituents of mine, just everyday Americans who love and cherish American ideals and principles. They write:

FEBRUARY 6, 1946.

Hon. GEORGE B. SCHWABE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: My wife and I are not politicians and are little known. However, we are completely disgusted with this special annual build-up for the continuance of the OPA. In this evening's paper we are again threatened with rationing. As long as that simple organization is permitted to exist it will be threatening someone.

It has been only a few months since they wanted grain fed to stock. Now we are supposed to eat black bread, and so forth. Production is the price control we want. Please give our businessmen, laborers, and other workers a chance for full employment.

Please put the OPA out by June 30, and give our country a chance.

Yours very respectfully,
Mr. and Mrs. ——— ———.

Another constituent of mine, who lives in one of the thriving little cities of my district and who has always supported himself by his own efforts without handouts from Uncle Sam, has voluntarily written me as follows:

FEBRUARY 8, 1946.

Hon. GEORGE B. SCHWABE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: While I think I know what the majority of people around here are thinking about the labor situation, I am talking only for myself when I say that the New Deal has everything jumbled up. They are still experimenting. Of course we, the people, do not expect them to bite the hand that is feeding them, and we know the labor moguls voted them into power, and now the New Deal has no choice but to take orders from the unions, but we do expect our duly elected Representatives to vote out these wartime restrictions which are now entirely unnecessary. The New Deal and its rationing has caused the shortages and waste. The OPA has made hoarders and liars out of the American people. I know, because I worked on the ration board for 3 years.

The unions are now demanding higher wages from the New Deal and the New Deal has no choice but to dance; but they are unable to get higher wages for the unions without raising prices, so the employers are raising their products, taking advantage of the situation, and raising them way out of reason, in many instances 100 percent, and the public is being crushed to death in the middle. Of course, the result is inflation. But the people expect inflation. A nation cannot waste its resources without paying. Every citizen knows that we will have another depression. The New Deal, the UNO, or even the smart guys who think they can stop time in its flight, can do nothing about it. As night follows day, so starvation, want, death, and depression follow war and times of great waste.

The proper reconversion would have been for the unions to have allowed manufacturers to produce plenty, and even a surplus, in order to give all returning servicemen work; and the increased purchasing power would then have brought about a certain prosperity, and that prosperity could have brought about normalcy. But the New Deal and the unions saw a chance to raise wages while the veterans were still overseas and before they could come back and make their wishes felt in running the country; so they came out for higher wages for the union members, and, of course, higher prices always follow higher wages, and higher prices always cause inflation—and now the sky is the limit.

There is only one way to stop higher prices and that is for the people to boycott all business and quit buying until prices get to a decent level, and that is almost impossible because the war has lasted so long that folks are pretty much out of everything; and now the New Deal is helping to make things more scarce by calling it patriotic for people to give away their clothes to foreign countries, which articles they may need themselves before long in order to keep clothed.

Yes; we will have to take our medicine for not having been prepared for war when it came, and then going into it at high prices and cost-plus contracts. A country can prepare for war when war material is cheap, and then it can wait until prices are exorbitant—and the latter is what we did. Prices will not go down now until the New Deal allows the law of supply and demand to control our economy. With this system in effect, prices will go up, but they will come down again when the supply exceeds the demand and there is competition in business. But the artificial interferences and control of the New Deal will cause prices to be up all the time.

Yours truly,

——— ———.

During the recess of Congress the latter part of December and early part of January, I visited every community in my district, and I found the overwhelming sentiment of the people to be just that expressed in the above letters. They are not being fooled; and the propaganda that is being put out by the New Dealers is not swaying very many of them from their normal American equilibrium. They know what is back of the scene well enough to know that the theories of the

bureaucrats are not right. They may not always be able to appraise the consequences of the programs that are being advocated, but they are literally fed up on expediences and every known form of contrived scarecrow to get them to believe that we should turn from our American ideals and be guided by "New Dealirium."

Former Representative Ramspeck Advocates Better Pay and Retirement Benefits for Members of Congress—Collier's Magazine Endorses Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to join with more than 350 friends of former Representative Robert Ramspeck at a testimonial dinner in this city February 11. The Honorable Fred M. Vinson, Secretary of the Treasury, acted as toastmaster, and the speakers were the Honorable Sam Rayburn, Senator Walter E. George, R. R. Zimmerman, administrative assistant to the President, and myself. The remarks which Mr. Ramspeck made, in part, follow:

Whatever I may have done in benalf of the employees of the Government has been accomplished in an effort to provide our people with better administration of their affairs.

Fair pay, reasonable hours, adequate vacations, and proper retirement system are a necessary part of any good personnel policy.

To this must be added fair opportunity for promotion and reasonable assurance of security of employment, if good people are to be retained in the Government service.

I am not one who believes that political endorsement is a disqualification for employment in the Government. I do believe that no one should be employed if not qualified for the position sought, regardless of political considerations.

I have long believed that the best policy for any political party is to do a good job. The best way of accomplishing this is to employ only well qualified persons—and to keep them without regard to political changes.

Of course, the policy-making positions should be filled with persons in sympathy with the party in power. However, there is no reason why expert career employees cannot serve either party in other positions without regard to their personal political beliefs.

In the early days of the history of our Nation government at the Federal level was simple. It affected very few of our people. It had little effect upon economic conditions. That day has passed. Now government at the Federal level is complex. We cannot do a good job without trained employees. We must have the best brains we can attract. We must keep them after they have acquired experience. No political party will succeed by following the outmoded patronage system of appointing unqualified personnel simply because they have political endorsements.

Good government is less a matter of law than of personnel. Good administration can make poor laws satisfactory. But unqualified personnel can destroy the results of beneficial legislation.

The first and most important qualification of any public employee is ability to get along with people. They must also have the ability to do the work, but no matter what their education and training may be, if they do not understand dealing with the public they have no place in Government service.

Pay scales in the higher-level positions in the executive branch of the Government have not kept pace with the times. Our country is losing too many experienced employees. Private employment is taking them away and paying them much more than they can receive in the Government.

The pay of Senators and Congressmen has also lagged behind. If $10,000 per year was reasonable pay in 1925, it is certainly too little now. It should be increased at once.

I can understand why the average citizen thinks the pay of Senators and Congressmen is sufficient. It is because most of them do not make that much. However, the public does not understand that at least half of this salary must be used for expenses incident to holding the job. In private employment no such situation exists. If a privately employed person receives $10,000 he uses every cent of it for his own personal needs. That is not true of any public official. Every city, county, State, or Federal official, elected by the voters, will testify to the accuracy of this statement.

When the present salaries of legislative officials was enacted in 1925, the executive branch of the Government had about 300,000 employees. At the peak of war employment there were 3,000,000. Just prior to the war there were approximately a million.

Every increase in the size, and all expansions of the operations of the executive department of our Government, bring a corresponding increase in the burden placed upon Senators and Congressmen.

Neither the pay nor the personnel and facilities of the legislative branch have kept pace with this increase in the volume of work thrown upon the legislators because of the expansion of the executive branch of our Federal Government.

When a great State like Virginia loses three fine Members of the House, within a period of a year, due to their need for better incomes, it is time for the people to take notice of this trend. Other Members from other States have left, or have failed to stand for reelection for the same reason.

It is not too much to expect that men make some sacrifice in occupying the high office of Senator or Representative, but when that sacrifice becomes too great, the country will suffer the loss of many men of experience and ability. That situation has been reached today. I have personal knowledge that many Members of the House are finding the sacrifice required by their service difficult to bear.

The people would serve their own interests if they would encourage the Congress to increase the pay of its Members. I also believe that a proper retirement system should be provided.

The committees of the Congress should have experts to advise the Members, and each legislator should have an assistant capable of handling all but legislative duties.

With increased pay, a retirement system, and more adequate staff assistance, it would still be a sacrifice for most men to serve in the Congress. That is true today because of the vast expansion of governmental activity, the press of public demand upon each Member, the long sessions, and the constant play of opposing opinions which keep the Members torn between opposite points of view. It is a most difficult service and many men cannot stand up under the grind.

In a country ruled by the people the legislative branch must be strong or freedom will be lost. Our people should remember this. They should be willing to have the Congress provide whatever is necessary to preserve the legislative branch at full strength.

None of us would like to see a legislative body composed only of men of wealth. None would like to have it composed of men willing to serve under conditions of inadequate pay, no security for old age, and without proper assistance.

If present conditions are not changed we may get just such a condition.

My colleagues, I believe you will be interested, as will citizens generally, in reading the following editorial from Collier's magazine for February 9, 1946:

MORE PAY FOR CONGRESS

Congress recently had another of those arguments about raising its own pay. This one flared up in the Senate, on a proposal to increase Senators and Representatives' salaries from $10,000 to $13,300 a year. It ended in the usual way. Congressional elections are coming next November, and the Senate voted down the proposal.

To help along a cause which we consider good toward what we hope will be eventual victory, we will here restate a few pertinent facts about Congress.

For one, these men and women do not have soft jobs. They are among the hardest worked of our public servants. Attendance at House and Senate sessions is only one of their manifold duties.

In addition, there is a large amount of committee work to be done, plus innumerable chores to be attended to for constituents, plus heavy correspondence to handle, plus a lot of people (bores and otherwise) to be seen every day.

For another thing, a salary of $10,000 a year is not as big as it looks. The Internal Revenue Bureau takes a husky income-tax bite out of that congressional salary; and whoever else may be able to do a bit of polite tax dodging here and there, a Member of Congress can't. There are numerous unavoidable expenses connected with being a Member of Congress; and Washington is one of the highest-price cities anywhere.

We don't pay Congress enough. Then we yell bloody murder when now and then it fails to measure up to public expectations and acts from timidity or bullheadedness or plain misinformation. Some of us yell the loudest when some Congressman takes his courage in both hands and suggests that Congress' pay be raised to somewhere near Congress' importance as a legislative body.

It is much to be hoped, we think, that public opinion will catch up with these facts of congressional life before long, and will not only favor a substantial salary increase but will insist on it.

Mr. Speaker, Bob Ramspeck's service in the House of Representatives covered exciting and critical years for our Nation. New and ever-changing problems have thrust increasingly heavy responsibilities on the Federal, State, and local governments. As our society and economy have grown in size and complexity with the advancing years, the Federal Government has been forced to play an ever greater role in meeting problems of a kind, intensity, and scope previously unknown. It is now clear that the Federal Government must accept an important part in effecting a successful transition from war to peace. The unfolding problems of peace demand, for their successful solution, a Federal Government adequately prepared from the standpoint of both policy and administration.

To meet the needs of coming years, the management of Federal affairs must be further improved. Much will naturally depend upon the soundness of the policies determined by the Congress. Of equal importance will be the skill and leadership of officials in the executive branch.

We must attract able personnel to the Federal Government and find ways of holding them in its service. Only in this

manner can the public business be effectively and economically conducted. More specifically, it is essential that the intermediate and higher administrative positions be filled by persons with imagination, courage, and competence. They must be able to think and act in terms of the general public good and not solely on behalf of any single segment of our society.

We must make a calculated effort to select, train, develop, and assign administrative personnel to the end that men and women of caliber are attracted to executive posts and that they reach high places by intent and as a result of wise personnel policies, rather than by luck or favoritism or in spite of doubtful personnel practices.

The administrative gains achieved, in large part as a result of Bob Ramspeck's influence, over the past 10 years must be held and extended. I have previously made public some shocking facts which indicate the waste in lives and dollars, resulting from our negligence in dealing with this problem. As President Truman has well stated, "The Government should lead, not lag, in the important field of employee safety." We should conserve our human resources in Government through adequate employee health services. We should emphasize the development and placement of people to the end of maximum utilization of personnel in peace as well as in war. For the next few years, particularly, we should emphasize the employment and proper placement of veterans.

We should also eliminate those in Government who are unwilling or unable to do their share, even after we have tried remedial measures of training, transfer, and discipline.

Now that the war is over, American citizens, through their elected Representatives, are demanding a discriminating tax dollar. We should strive to have fewer, more competent, better-paid personnel in Government. Unnecessary personnel, duplication of agency effort, and preventable red tape must go. With the rising cry for governmental services, we are challenged to use our utmost ingenuity in promoting administrative efficiency and economy.

Government by teamwork is essential if we are successfully to meet this challenge. The legislative and executive branches must work together more effectively, and a common feeling of pride and enthusiasm for the public service must be developed.

Bob Ramspeck has pointed the way toward many of the future goals. The rest of us must do our part to achieve them.

Bonneville $17.50 Per Kilowatt-Year Will Pay Out Federal Investment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following release from the Bonneville Power Administration:

The basic rate structure of $17.50 per kilowatt-year for wholesale power from Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams fully protects the Federal investment in the two Pacific Northwest projects and in the Bonneville Power Administration transmission systems, two reports transmitted by Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes to Representative WALT HORAN, of Washington, disclosed today.

"I feel certain that these reports will give all the needed information for a detailed examination of the $17.50 per kilowatt-year rate upon the basis of which Columbia River power is sold in the Northwest," Secretary Ickes wrote Mr. HORAN.

The reports, which had previously been requested by Representative HORAN, include a study by an independent public accounting firm, Arthur Anderson & Co., and a comprehensive study of the pay-out structure of the projects based on current Government wholesale power rates, made in conjunction with present discussions of the adequacy of the Bonneville rate in paying off the Federal investment in the three projects, Dr. Paul J. Raver, Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, said.

"The audit demonstrates that the fiscal position of the projects is sound and has become increasingly so as operations have progressed," Dr. Raver declared. "Not only have aggregate revenues been sufficient to meet all financial requirements from the inception of construction of the Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams and of the extensive transmission system in Oregon and Washington, but at the end of the last fiscal year had accumulated net revenues of $11,572,052 above all costs of power operations, including interest and depreciation on the Federal investment.

"Of the $11,572,000 accumulated net revenues more than $3,000,000 has been applied in addition to the $10,000,000 provision for depreciation, as advanced repayment on the Government's investment, leaving a net surplus of more than $7,500,000 over and above all costs and scheduled amortization of investment. This net surplus, together with $5,800,000 of estimated net surplus from the current year's operations will enable the Administration to continue to meet its full obligations through the reconversion period despite the loss of temporary war loads," the Administrator said.

"The Administration takes considerable pride in presenting these reports to the people of the United States," Administrator Raver stated. "We have sought to have this and this audit made for several years. Arthur Andersen & Co. is regarded by financial and business leaders of the country as one of the outstanding independent firms in the field of accounting. For many years it has audited the books of companies owning more than half the private electric utility plant in the United States."

The Administrator said that the audit and pay-out reports show that operations have more than satisfied the Administration's financial obligations to date, and that there is "every reasonable prospect" for the full satisfaction of its total obligations in the future "with a reasonable margin of safety."

"And this can be accomplished under the present Bonneville basic rate structure of $17.50 per kilowatt-year," he stated.

The pay-out study was based on figures set up in the allocation of costs for the Bonneville Dam as determined by the Federal Power Commission. The allocation of costs for the Columbia Basin—Grand Coulee—project set forth in House Document No. 172, Seventy-ninth Congress, and from the financial statements certified by Arthur Andersen & Co. in its audit for the initial operating period ending June 30, 1945.

Revenues from the sale of Bonneville and Grand Coulee power by the Power Administration under existing regulations are required to repay (1) $58,708,309 of the estimated completed cost of $85,610,872 for Bonneville Dam, (2) all of the cost of the Bonneville-Grand Coulee transmission system, representing a current investment of $82,486,594 and an estimated completed investment of $168,332,747, and (3) $382,547,068 of the $506,459,180 estimated ultimate cost of the Columbia Basin project. The Columbia Basin project amount of $382,547,068 includes irrigation costs to be repaid by power revenues and $35,519,577 for river regulation benefits to future downstreams hydroelectric plants.

The Administration's power revenues of an estimated $1,863,000,000 over the repayment period will provide 93.07 percent of the total funds required to repay reimbursable construction costs and operating cost, including interest and a reasonable margin of $160,000,000 for contingencies, on the Columbia River Basin program embracing Bonneville Dam, Grand Coulee Dam and irrigation works and the transmission system.

The pay-out study, Administrator Raver said, shows that the present wholesale rates will fully cover the operation and maintenance expenses and that reimbursable construction costs, including replacements, allocated to power will be returned to the Treasury with interest within 50 years from the date that such construction costs are incurred, and that construction costs allocated to irrigation will be returned within 50 years after water is first made available to each block of land.

The construction costs of the Bonneville-Grand Coulee transmission system and of the Bonneville Dam project—allocated to power—are to be returned within 50 years with interest at 2.5 percent, the approximate average cost of money on long-term United States Treasury bonds during the 11 years ended June 30, 1943. This is in accord with the findings and order of the Federal Power Commission.

In addition to repaying the construction costs of the Columbia Basin project allocated to power within 50 years, provision is made for 3 percent interest annually on the unamortized balance of such costs and for repayment of that portion approximately 65 percent of the construction costs allocated to irrigation which exceeds the repayment ability of the landowners. In no case are the costs not to be repaid, and in every case provision is made for interest annually on balances of power costs remaining to be repaid. The subsidy to irrigation of $228,404,676 is in fact a contribution to the Federal Treasury in lieu of taxes.

Dr. Raver stated that in view of the withdrawal to date of 300,500 acres from the project and the increased efficiency of earth-moving operations, he doubted whether the total subsidy required from power for irrigation would be increased beyond the original estimates. In case 1945 construction costs were actually experienced for the irrigation works, an additional 11 years of power subsidy would repay the $74,000,000 increase, he said.

Administrator Raver asserted in commenting on the pay-out study that full consideration had been given to the cut-back in war-borne loads which resulted in a 500,000 kilowatt reduction in sales during the latter part of 1945. He added that an upward trend in power use and revenues from Grand Coulee and Bonneville was certain following a 2-year period of adjustment to peacetime conditions. He predicted a drop from $22,990,000 in revenue during 1945 to $13,800,000 in 1948 and then a gradual rise to $25,500,000 annually by 1953. The estimates, he said, were conservative and that present indications were that it might be necessary to revise them upward. Substantial demands from peacetime operations were already in evidence. Domestic consumption is moving up rapidly and in some areas at the present time there is an actual scarcity of power, he said, be-

cause of the inadequacy of existing facilities in certain areas which had to be left with insufficient supplies during the war years because of construction difficulties.

The GI's Can't All Be Wrong About Unfair Demobilization—Just Read This Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I quote the following letter written to Hon. Powers Higginbotham, mayor of Baton Rouge, La., from a GI still stationed in Manila:

MANILA, P. I.

MR. MAYOR: Those of us who have spent between 2 and 3 years in the Army, many months overseas, have wondered for some time if there were any common denominator for the continued bungling which characterizes the redeployment situation. Our immediate experience and our personal interest in the problem have brought to light a few facts which we would like to have you see. We need your help in arousing sufficient public opinion to get us home. For we are all too well aware that if demobilization is left in the War Department's hands, we will waste additional months in the Pacific.

Here is how the situation looks from our vantage point. During the early postwar months the War Department assured us and the general public that, as soon as transport became available, all men of two or more years' service would be returned and discharged. Despite proven failures to use available shipping during this period, Army authorities claimed that they were doing their best. But, now sufficient shipping is available to return all men within this category by the end of February. What happens? Although all the shipping after the 10th of January in Manila Harbor is surplus, the authorities refuse to drop the points until February and then less than five, according to Lieutenant General Collins. Worse still, after a person does finally become eligible under this snail's program, he still can be held overseas for another 3 months.

Both these turn-abouts are wholly inconsistent with the earlier statements. The War Department's record is a constant series of lies and unfulfilled promises. Unless you and the rest of the American people lend a hand in rectifying this confusion, we shall wonder if we were fighting for our freedom and liberties or for the greater glory of the War Department. If one looks behind the haze of Army claims, denials, and contraclaims one fact stands out: The War Department and its General Staff desire to perpetuate as much personal power for themselves as the American people will tolerate.

You are being told at home that we are needed overseas because, "Our overseas forces would be dangerously under strength in occupying hostile countries if all eligible men were returned before sufficient replacements arrive" (Lieutenant General Collins). MacArthur said long ago that only 200,000 men would be necessary to occupy Japan. Since when were the Philippines, Hawaii, or the like hostile countries? Sounds silly doesn't it? But it is with trumped-up excuses such as this that we, the citizen soldiers of the United States, are being kept in forced exile. You see, the dangerous part of demobilization is that too many generals may lose their jobs. And, it may be considered that a good many men on Capitol Hill will lose their jobs at the same time.

Do you know what our occupation duties consist of in the Philippines? Beyond waiting on each other we have absolutely nothing to do except keep ourselves from stagnating. The Philippine people are as capable of looking after themselves as they were before the war, and our being here is but a hindrance to their return to normal life.

Well, there is the situation. Will you please lend us your help?

The University of Texas World War II Memorial Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to state that on January 26, 1946, the Ex-Servicemen's League of the University of Texas inaugurated a campaign to raise $1,000,000 for a University of Texas World War II memorial scholarship fund. It is proposed that the fund will be used to provide educational opportunities at the college level for the widows and children of men who lost their lives, and to construct a permanent addition to the housing facilities of the university.

I consider this scholarship program to be an inspired concept of what a war memorial should be—an unusually vital and appropriate commemoration of the names and spirit of the men who made the supreme sacrifice on battle fronts throughout the world in order that we might continue to live as freemen and to improve, through education, our individual and national standards for democracy and all things that are really worth while.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this scholarship fund campaign at the University of Texas will serve as a model for war memorials throughout the country, and I am confident it will receive the wholehearted and unselfish support of all good citizens.

I am including for printing in the RECORD the radio program and the very thoughtful and inspiring address delivered by Prof. Walter T. Rolfe at the ceremonies on January 26, 1946, which launched the University of Texas Memorial Scholarship Fund. The program and address follows:

ANNOUNCER. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, we are speaking to you tonight from Gregory gymnasium on the campus of the University of Texas, where thousands of students of the university and veterans of World War II are dancing for a purpose. The gym tonight is the scene of a benefit dance sponsored by the Ex-Servicemen's Association of the University of Texas—the kickoff in a University of Texas servicemen's campaign toward a million-dollar memorial fund. The past weeks have been busy ones for campus ex-servicemen. In addition to attending classes and working at part-time jobs in the city of Austin, many of these veterans have taken time out to set into motion this million-dollar drive. To explain to you the organization of the University of Texas World War II Memorial Scholarship Fund, Inc., sponsored by the Ex-Servicemen's Association of the University of Texas, its objectives and the plans for their realization, we present to you at this time Walter T. Rolfe, chairman of the Department of Architecture at the University of Texas, a veteran of World War I, and a member of the Memorial Fund's board of directors. Professor Rolfe.

ADDRESS OF PROFESSOR ROLFE

Dr. ROLPH. Ladies and gentlemen, tonight we begin again. This night can well be one long to be remembered by us here at this friendly party. It can be the beginning of an idea that will never be forgotten in this great country of ours. This is the time when great spiritual impulses should guide our thinking to a plane far above the backwash of war, which is gruesome and ugly. It is also even more fitting that this impulse shall have come from the men who did the fighting in that war—from the men and women who served their country through its greatest period of peril.

It is therefore a distinct pleasure to be selected to say these words here tonight and to help enlist your thinking, your loyalty, and your contributions to this idea and program. I say what I have to say with sincere and deep convictions. For the 14 months prior to November 1, 1945, it was my pleasure to serve our returning service people as coordinator of the university's veterans' advisory service. From that delightful experience I came to know veterans and, I feel, to understand them and their desires, their hopes and plans. They have my respect—and my affection. Never have I known such a mature and thoughtful group of students at such young years. It is natural that their thinking should soon turn to such a program as I am about to relate to you.

Purged of their small fears in the awful heat of mortal combat, impaled within the gloom of impossible fox holes, they fought, some died, but many thought of the things they wished to see done if they were allowed the freedom of home and country again. Those who came back carry in their souls a hallowed memory of those who lie tonight beneath the regiments of little white crosses from Normany to Salerno, from Sicily to Iwo. They cannot forget the thousands of little crosses that might also have been had we been forced to invade Japan. They are glad to be alive, for well they know the fate of fortune that might have left them, too, on some lonely shore forever.

They are fully conscious that in the larger good, the lone individual becomes another sailor, another marine, and another soldier. However, in the spirit of our democracy, no one of these is small, no one unimportant. In the tomb of any unknown soldier, in our spiritual thinking, lie the hopes of a great people.

Some died that others might live and, in the baptism of death, came a greater strength that binds men together with a bond as strong as right itself and as lasting as eternity. Men who have come back from these awful yet moving experiences, now pause to propose a fitting memorial. In their search for an appropriate idea or theme for this memorial, it became more and more apparent that its living qualities should be uppermost. This was to be no monument of stone or bronze alone. It should be a commemoration of the gallantry and group magnificence of all those who served. It should be an appreciation of those who fought and lived as well as a benediction for those who fought and gave their lives for their neighbor's welfare. There is in this group spirit, a challenging example to all of us who would win

and hold an adequate peace. We are therefore here tonight to initiate this idea of a memorial that shall live.

MEMORIAL SCHOLARSHIPS

The first thought of this memorial is for the wives and children who were left only a name instead of a husband and father. They too are entitled to a larger share of the fruits of peace. For them it is proposed that a system of scholarships be created to meet their needs and to offer them encouragement to carry on the task that was begun for them. It is fitting and proper that all of us should extend a sincere hand to help our veterans do this thoughtful and lasting act. We surely can see that this living thoughtfulness has a more permanent value than some costly show of marble that soon will pall upon us all. This is what we mean by living commemoration.

MEMORIAL HOUSING

The second theme of the memorial is that of housing veterans while they attend the University. This again is a realistic yet very worthy plan for doing community good where it is most needed. The national housing emergency only lends emphasis to this good planning by the men and women who so recently have come back to us.

MILLION DOLLAR FUND

To accomplish this broad program the Ex-Servicemen's Association has founded a Corporation known as the University of Texas World War II Memorial Scholarship Fund, Incorporated. The men, whose names appear as charter members of this corporation, have pledged their honor that by intent and act all funds given to this worthy plan shall be used only for these purposes just described. The board of regents of the university are the trustees for the fund, as provided by charter.

The corporation proposes to secure a minimum of $1,000,000 from all those who appreciate this opportunity to thank those who went away to do a piece of work for us and our country, which we could not do. This is indeed a small way for us to express our thanks for the splendid performance they gave in every fighting theater in the world. When we compare what they did with what they ask, the amount is indeed modest.

Of the million-dollar fund, the first $100,000 shall be set aside for scholarship purposes. The remainder shall be used for erecting a dormitory on the campus, of such design and construction as to be comparable with our present high standards of permanent student housing. The income from the dormitory over and above immediately operating and maintenance budgets shall also accrue to the scholarship fund. The housing program will thus serve two very useful purposes at the same time. This program has been approved by the board of regents of the university.

The corporation shall be limited to the collecting of funds for this program and such funds shall be deposited with and disbursed by the auditor of the university. No part of the subscriptions to the memorial shall be used for operating expenses or any other purpose. The operating expenses for the raising of the memorial fund shall be maintained in a special account to be known as the World War II memorial operating fund. Any balance remaining in the operating budget on the dissolution of the corporation shall be transferred to the memorial fund.

To raise a fund of these proportions is indeed no small task. It requires capital to operate. To date, more than $1,000 have been raised for this purpose, not including the accomplishments of this program tonight. The members of the corporation are very sure that this operations budget should be adequate before such an important memorial plan is projected. They have been particularly careful to safeguard all interests and the future of such a proposal. It is the sort of planning we appreciate from mature people—the sort of initiative that won our greatest war in such unbelievable haste.

We have come together tonight to enjoy ourselves once again, to share the pleasures of being normal people again in a world at peace. We have the pleasures of song and laughter, of dance and food. We can enjoy this gay throng with lessened inhibition and fear of the unknown that have held our nerves in tense restraint these many months just passed. The golden bars of service are giving way to the golden eagle of the civilian—the kind of wings so many of you have waited so long to receive. This is our kind of a night—the kind you dreamed about in jungle, in tent, and fox hole—in prison camp. We hope no one is disappointed.

But if pleasure alone were all, then this higher purpose would be lost to us. We could feel a lot more free, much more cheerful, if we knew this party was the beginning of another important plan in our first days of peace. We can find a greater release in the knowledge that we, too, have given to an ideal that is beyond our personal gain; that we have stopped these few minutes this unusual night to offer our humble and simple gratitude to those who did so much more for us than we can ever repay.

But tonight we can only begin. We have told you what this plan contains. We have pledged our work, our loyalty, and our sincerity. We now look to you to work with us in this worthy cause—to tell your fathers, your mothers, your friends, and any person who may find it in his heart to share with us this privilege. This plan, we believe, is as large as Texas and we hope that its very size will prove the challenge that will set the minds of millions of us in Texas to work. We want everyone to help us at least a little.

This twofold plan is imaginative; it is challenging, important. By building the housing unit, the united income will provide additional help to those who deserve and need it. I am personally proud that these young citizens of the university have thought through this plan to this constructive conclusion. To those who may have some doubt about the straightforward thinking of those who have been our able representatives abroad, this sort of straight thinking is recommended.

May these thoughts mean much to you and may they clearly express what is intended to be expressed. The charter of this corporation is open to your inspection. The acts of this body are for you to scrutinize. May this program be given the broadest of expression and then—may the eyes of Texas be upon us all.

Surely in a land that has so freely spent more than three hundred billions for war we cannot fail to find a mere million for peace—for our widows and children and the education of our youth.

Should the OPA Be Extended?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, Congress will make some decision soon about the Office of Price Administration. Seeking to influence Congress by public pressure, the OPA is carrying on a gigantic propaganda drive. It seems designed to force Congress into extending the OPA for a year or more with blanket powers.

OPA HAS POWERFUL PROPAGANDA MACHINE

Obviously, a propaganda machine fueled by OPA's $150,000,000 appropriation is well financed. With gigantic tax funds, plus effective use of the radio, the administration has propaganda weapons to mold most people's opinions on inflation and prices. These weapons, like those of the late Nazi propaganda minister, Goebbels, would seem to be irresistible.

Accordingly, getting the inflationary problem fairly before the people may become almost impossible. If the administration, to protect its political power, determines to mislead the people, it may do so successfully.

So the road back to economic freedom in America may be very difficult.

Besides the propaganda blitzkrieg, other devices are being used to fool the people on price control. Examples are the peacetime subsidy on coffee, the citrus fruit frameup, and the hamstringing of the building industry by OPA.

Everyone wants low prices on the things he buys and high prices for the goods or labor he sells. That is human nature. President Truman has proposed higher wages and lower prices at the same time. Suggest to your barber, like I did, that he lower his prices and raise his wages at the same time. You will quickly learn how unfortunate the President's assertion was.

OPA PROVIDES CUNNING PEOPLE RICH GAINS

However, this kind of talk in high places is not fooling the rich and well-informed. The burden of such deception falls on the humble people, who place full faith in official utterances.

Shrewd people have long been buying jewels, land, houses, stocks, paintings, and other tangible property. Shortages are increasing this desire to trade currency for goods. But instead of permitting increased production to offset this demand, OPA creates new restrictions. These spread the decline in confidence in the future value of our money. Is a ruinous increase in the cost of living to result?

It can be avoided only if President Truman will plan First, a balanced budget; second, instruct OPA that production of goods must be their paramount objective; and third, announce the date for the end of the OPA.

These three simple acts are immediate leadership responsibilities. Only these actions promptly can prevent a smash-up in reconversion.

If these three steps are not taken promptly, disaster is ahead—and not too distant. Who says so? The history books.

HISTORY OF PRICE-FIXING IS A RECORD OF DISASTER

Fiat Money Inflation in France, by Andrew Dickson White, details a French price-fixing experiment that our OPA has paralleled to date. It ended in hunger and misery, and before it was over the streets ran red with the blood of the common people. How Nazi Germany Has Controlled Business, issued by the Brookings Institute, details price control under Hitler. That report outlines Nazi

price-fixing policies. OPA today is its almost exact duplicate.

The causes of inflation in America go back many years. But the battle against inflation thus far has been a constant retreat. Why? Because there is little understanding of this economic disease.

WHAT CAUSES INFLATION?

The truth about inflation and the high cost of living is not so easy to understand as propaganda slogans. But the truth will be a more digestible and helpful diet for the American people. What causes inflation?

The OPA says that high prices bring inflation. Let us measure that claim against the testimony of the top administration man on money and prices, Marriner Eccles.

In official hearings, Mr. Eccles, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, testified:

Inflation comes from appropriations of congressional or legislative bodies in excess of their willingness to impose taxes to pay for the expenditures.

Compare that statement of what causes inflation with the OPA's claim. Either Eccles or the OPA is deceiving us.

Stated more simply, Mr. Eccles declares that when the Government spends more than the amount it collects in taxes it is inflating. So inflation begins with deficit spending. We will not remedy this situation until this fact is generally understood. Deficit spending is the cause of inflation and high prices are the consequence.

What does a parent do with a child who gets the stomach ache from eating green apples? Obviously the vital move is to stop the child from eating green apples. Similarly, to stop inflation, first deficit spending must be stopped. The administration must balance the Budget.

CAN THE OPA STOP PRICE RISES?

Millions of humble citizens have been led by propaganda to believe that the OPA can stop higher prices. What are the facts?

The OPA did a necessary job of wartime price control. The OPA was used to prevent sharp price rises resulting from short production of civilian goods. But the war is over. Now shortages can exist only if the OPA causes them by shackling production. There is no shortage in America of productive capacity.

OPA IS NOW OPERATING AS A NARCOTIC

The OPA does not stop price rises because the OPA does not combat the cause of price rises—inflationary deficit spending. The OPA now operates as a narcotic. A drug which conceals pain or other symptoms can deceive an ill person, and such a delusion may be fatal.

We face the danger that the OPA may now similarly mislead us. Deficit-financing goes unnoticed by the same groups that want the OPA continued. Thus the OPA already is fooling these people into believing price controls can evade the natural law of supply and demand.

The OPA now has a further evil effect. A drug often stops normal healing processes. Now the OPA is preventing natural economic healing processes from keeping prices down.

For example, ordinarily a scarcity of bricks results in a higher price for bricks. That increase both causes many factories to step up production and also slows down demand. Both the increased supply and decreased demand multiply the supply of brick. The increased supply makes a market surplus and this condition brings prices down again.

The OPA prevented that natural remedy from expanding brick output for 6 months in 1945. As a direct result, thousands of homes for veterans were delayed many months. Finally OPA adjusted the price, brick labor wages were raised, and with adequate labor the brick output is increasing sharply.

IF RECKLESS SPENDING CONTINUES CAN PRICE FIXING STOP HIGHER PRICES?

What is ahead if the Government continues to create billions of dollars of excess purchasing power, and tries to hide this evil by price-fixing?

We then face one of two alternatives.

One alternative is much higher prices, by black markets or official prices. In either case the frugal, thrifty, and trusting citizens will be systematically and ruthlessly cheated by their Government. The buying power of their savings, now in war bonds, insurance, and other dollar obligations will become smaller and smaller. During inflation, those who have invested their savings in forms of cash, present or future, have a uniform fate. They all get poor. That happened in Germany and elsewhere.

Already price rises from diluting our money is bringing distress to the humble people and workers generally. It is rewarding the cold-blooded, cunning, and heartless. It is destroying honesty among all citizens by frequently requiring black-market deals to get necessities of life.

As individual economic distress becomes acute, serious social disorders are probable.

The President and Congress have been warned about this danger many times. But even President Truman does not seem to comprehend that the root evil is the deficit spending, and not the high prices that must result from more dollars than goods.

IS AN AMERICAN GESTAPO AHEAD?

The American people have not been told about the other alternative of continued deficit spending. It is ruthless regimentation. Price fixing is crippling production. As plants lose money and close down, goods disappear from the market place. Then a ruthless gestapo is set up to cope with the shortage scramble to get food, clothing, and shelter. Witness the effect of the closing already of over 500 butter-making plants.

The Nazis controlled inflation by using a gestapo. Already the OPA is copying the mild early methods of the Nazis. Ruthless gestapo methods will come later, unless OPA is soon eliminated.

LABORING PEOPLE ARE CHIEF VICTIMS

Always the crushing blow of price control falls hardest on the working people and the white-collar classes. That is why the humble people of America are so disturbed today.

The fixed incomes and small earnings of teachers, public employees, and pensioners cannot stand large price rises. Will the frugal financial independence of the great middle classes of America be broken and destroyed? Undoubtedly the communistic elements in the OPA gleefully anticipate such a catastrophe. But I am likewise sure the patriotic Americans within the Administration do not want this tragedy to happen.

President Truman and the OPA can tell the people the truth—that deficit spending causes price rises by creating purchasing power in excess of production. They can also tell the people that price-fixing slows down production and creates the shortages that make prices go up. Only a balanced budget, plus a Government policy that encourages full production, will keep prices down. In this direction is found the only genuine solution for the high cost of living.

Extending the OPA without such action puts us in the position of the opium smoker who knows that the habit will destroy him, but who lacks the courage to face the distress resulting from breaking the habit.

Extending the OPA without balancing the Budget and encouraging full production will make black marketeering, bootlegging, and thievery necessary for survival. It will destroy the fundamental morality upon which our Christian civilization is based. How? By crippling production, OPA will make legally impossible the satisfaction of human needs for food, clothing, and housing. But these needs must be met. Americans will satisfy them by transactions outside the law. Our current experiences with black markets, to say nothing of the prohibition era, have demonstrated that Americans know no law when their needs or appetites are thwarted by arbitrary governmental decrees.

Should the OPA be extended? Only if these three conditions are met: First, if Congress secures assurance of President Truman of genuine cooperation in balancing the Budget; second, if Congress can get adequate assurance that the pledge Mr. Bowles made at Hartford June 15, 1945, will no longer be simply campaign oratory for the OPA. That pledge declared "that OPA pricing policy shall not stand in the way of all-out production of civilian goods and services which is the only final answer to tremendous inflationary pressures now threatening our economy." And, third, if the extension provides for its elimination by a definite date.

Should Congress now fail to insist on the restoration of free production and free markets quickly, it will mean that this generation has given up for a mess of temporary pottage the American birthright of liberty, justice, and opportunity.

Oregon's Tax Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD,

and hold an adequate peace. We are therefore here tonight to initiate this idea of a memorial that shall live.

MEMORIAL SCHOLARSHIPS

The first thought of this memorial is for the wives and children who were left only a name instead of a husband and father. They too are entitled to a larger share of the fruits of peace. For them it is proposed that a system of scholarships be created to meet their needs and to offer them encouragement to carry on the task that was begun for them. It is fitting and proper that all of us should extend a sincere hand to help our veterans do this thoughtful and lasting act. We surely can see that this living thoughtfulness has a more permanent value than some costly show of marble that soon will pall upon us all. This is what we mean by living commemoration.

MEMORIAL HOUSING

The second theme of the memorial is that of housing veterans while they attend the University. This again is a realistic yet very worthy plan for doing community good where it is most needed. The national housing emergency only lends emphasis to this good planning by the men and women who so recently have come back to us.

MILLION DOLLAR FUND

To accomplish this broad program the Ex-Servicemen's Association has founded a Corporation known as the University of Texas World War II Memorial Scholarship Fund, Incorporated. The men, whose names appear as charter members of this corporation, have pledged their honor that by intent and act all funds given to this worthy plan shall be used only for these purposes just described. The board of regents of the university are the trustees for the fund, as provided by charter.

The corporation proposes to secure a minimum of $1,000,000 from all those who appreciate this opportunity to thank those who went away to do a piece of work for us and our country, which we could not do. This is indeed a small way for us to express our thanks for the splendid performance they gave in every fighting theater in the world. When we compare what they did with what they ask, the amount is indeed modest.

Of the million-dollar fund, the first $100,000 shall be set aside for scholarship purposes. The remainder shall be used for erecting a dormitory on the campus, of such design and construction as to be comparable with our present high standards of permanent student housing. The income from the dormitory over and above immediately operating and maintenance budgets shall also accrue to the scholarship fund. The housing program will thus serve two very useful purposes at the same time. This program has been approved by the board of regents of the university.

The corporation shall be limited to the collecting of funds for this program and such funds shall be deposited with and disbursed by the auditor of the university. No part of the subscriptions to the memorial shall be used for operating expenses or any other purpose. The operating expenses for the raising of the memorial fund shall be maintained in a special account to be known as the World War II memorial operating fund. Any balance remaining in the operating budget on the dissolution of the corporation shall be transferred to the memorial fund.

To raise a fund of these proportions is indeed no small task. It requires capital to operate. To date, more than $1,000 have been raised for this purpose, not including the accomplishments of this program tonight. The members of the corporation are very sure that this operations budget should be adequate before such an important memorial plan is projected. They have been particularly careful to safeguard all interests and the future of such a proposal. It is the sort of planning we appreciate from mature people—the sort of initiative that won our greatest war in such unbelievable haste.

We have come together tonight to enjoy ourselves once again, to share the pleasures of being normal people again in a world at peace. We have the pleasures of song and laughter, of dance and food. We can enjoy this gay throng with lessened inhibition and fear of the unknown that have held our nerves in tense restraint these many months just passed. The golden bars of service are giving way to the golden eagle of the civilian—the kind of wings so many of you have waited so long to receive. This is our kind of a night—the kind you dreamed about in jungle, in tent, and fox hole—in prison camp. We hope no one is disappointed.

But if pleasure alone were all, then this higher purpose would be lost to us. We could feel a lot more free, much more cheerful, if we knew this party was the beginning of another important plan in our first days of peace. We can find a greater release in the knowledge that we, too, have given to an ideal that is beyond our personal gain; that we have stopped these few minutes this unusual night to offer our humble and simple gratitude to those who did so much more for us than we can ever repay.

But tonight we can only begin. We have told you what this plan contains. We have pledged our work, our loyalty, and our sincerity. We now look to you to work with us in this worthy cause—to tell your fathers, your mothers, your friends, and any person who may find it in his heart to share with us this privilege. This plan, we believe, is as large as Texas and we hope that its very size will prove the challenge that will set the minds of millions of us in Texas to work. We want everyone to help us at least a little.

This twofold plan is imaginative; it is challenging, important. By building the housing unit, the united income will provide additional help to those who deserve and need it. I am personally proud that these young citizens of the university have thought through this plan to this constructive conclusion. To those who may have some doubt about the straightforward thinking of those who have been our able representatives abroad, this sort of straight thinking is recommended.

May these thoughts mean much to you and may they clearly express what is intended to be expressed. The charter of this corporation is open to your inspection. The acts of this body are for you to scrutinize. May this program be given the broadest of expression and then—may the eyes of Texas be upon us all.

Surely in a land that has so freely spent more than three hundred billions for war we cannot fail to find a mere million for peace—for our widows and children and the education of our youth.

Should the OPA Be Extended?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, Congress will make some decision soon about the Office of Price Administration. Seeking to influence Congress by public pressure, the OPA is carrying on a gigantic propaganda drive. It seems designed to force Congress into extending the OPA for a year or more with blanket powers.

OPA HAS POWERFUL PROPAGANDA MACHINE

Obviously, a propaganda machine fueled by OPA's $150,000,000 appropriation is well financed. With gigantic tax funds, plus effective use of the radio, the administration has propaganda weapons to mold most people's opinions on inflation and prices. These weapons, like those of the late Nazi propaganda minister, Goebbels, would seem to be irresistible.

Accordingly, getting the inflationary problem fairly before the people may become almost impossible. If the administration, to protect its political power, determines to mislead the people, it may do so successfully.

So the road back to economic freedom in America may be very difficult.

Besides the propaganda blitzkrieg, other devices are being used to fool the people on price control. Examples are the peacetime subsidy on coffee, the citrus fruit frameup, and the hamstringing of the building industry by OPA.

Everyone wants low prices on the things he buys and high prices for the goods or labor he sells. That is human nature. President Truman has proposed higher wages and lower prices at the same time. Suggest to your barber, like I did, that he lower his prices and raise his wages at the same time. You will quickly learn how unfortunate the President's assertion was.

OPA PROVIDES CUNNING PEOPLE RICH GAINS

However, this kind of talk in high places is not fooling the rich and well-informed. The burden of such deception falls on the humble people, who place full faith in official utterances.

Shrewd people have long been buying jewels, land, houses, stocks, paintings, and other tangible property. Shortages are increasing this desire to trade currency for goods. But instead of permitting increased production to offset this demand, OPA creates new restrictions. These spread the decline in confidence in the future value of our money. Is a ruinous increase in the cost of living to result?

It can be avoided only if President Truman will plan First, a balanced budget; second, instruct OPA that production of goods must be their paramount objective; and third, announce the date for the end of the OPA.

These three simple acts are immediate leadership responsibilities. Only these actions promptly can prevent a smash-up in reconversion.

If these three steps are not taken promptly, disaster is ahead—and not too distant. Who says so? The history books.

HISTORY OF PRICE-FIXING IS A RECORD OF DISASTER

Fiat Money Inflation in France, by Andrew Dickson White, details a French price-fixing experiment that our OPA has paralleled to date. It ended in hunger and misery, and before it was over the streets ran red with the blood of the common people. How Nazi Germany Has Controlled Business, issued by the Brookings Institute, details price control under Hitler. That report outlines Nazi

price-fixing policies. OPA today is its almost exact duplicate.

The causes of inflation in America go back many years. But the battle against inflation thus far has been a constant retreat. Why? Because there is little understanding of this economic disease.

WHAT CAUSES INFLATION?

The truth about inflation and the high cost of living is not so easy to understand as propaganda slogans. But the truth will be a more digestible and helpful diet for the American people. What causes inflation?

The OPA says that high prices bring inflation. Let us measure that claim against the testimony of the top administration man on money and prices, Marriner Eccles.

In official hearings, Mr. Eccles, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, testified:

Inflation comes from appropriations of congressional or legislative bodies in excess of their willingness to impose taxes to pay for the expenditures.

Compare that statement of what causes inflation with the OPA's claim. Either Eccles or the OPA is deceiving us.

Stated more simply, Mr. Eccles declares that when the Government spends more than the amount it collects in taxes it is inflating. So inflation begins with deficit spending. We will not remedy this situation until this fact is generally understood. Deficit spending is the cause of inflation and high prices are the consequence.

What does a parent do with a child who gets the stomach ache from eating green apples? Obviously the vital move is to stop the child from eating green apples. Similarly, to stop inflation, first deficit spending must be stopped. The administration must balance the Budget.

CAN THE OPA STOP PRICE RISES?

Millions of humble citizens have been led by propaganda to believe that the OPA can stop higher prices. What are the facts?

The OPA did a necessary job of wartime price control. The OPA was used to prevent sharp price rises resulting from short production of civilian goods. But the war is over. Now shortages can exist only if the OPA causes them by shackling production. There is no shortage in America of productive capacity.

OPA IS NOW OPERATING AS A NARCOTIC

The OPA does not stop price rises because the OPA does not combat the cause of price rises—inflationary deficit spending. The OPA now operates as a narcotic. A drug which conceals pain or other symptoms can deceive an ill person, and such a delusion may be fatal.

We face the danger that the OPA may now similarly mislead us. Deficit-financing goes unnoticed by the same groups that want the OPA continued. Thus the OPA already is fooling these people into believing price controls can evade the natural law of supply and demand.

The OPA now has a further evil effect. A drug often stops normal healing processes. Now the OPA is preventing natural economic healing processes from keeping prices down.

For example, ordinarily a scarcity of bricks results in a higher price for bricks. That increase both causes many factories to step up production and also slows down demand. Both the increased supply and decreased demand multiply the supply of brick. The increased supply makes a market surplus and this condition brings prices down again.

The OPA prevented that natural remedy from expanding brick output for 6 months in 1945. As a direct result, thousands of homes for veterans were delayed many months. Finally OPA adjusted the price, brick labor wages were raised, and with adequate labor the brick output is increasing sharply.

IF RECKLESS SPENDING CONTINUES CAN PRICE FIXING STOP HIGHER PRICES?

What is ahead if the Government continues to create billions of dollars of excess purchasing power, and tries to hide this evil by price-fixing?

We then face one of two alternatives.

One alternative is much higher prices, by black markets or official prices. In either case the frugal, thrifty, and trusting citizens will be systematically and ruthlessly cheated by their Government. The buying power of their savings, now in war bonds, insurance, and other dollar obligations will become smaller and smaller. During inflation, those who have invested their savings in forms of cash, present or future, have a uniform fate. They all get poor. That happened in Germany and elsewhere.

Already price rises from diluting our money is bringing distress to the humble people and workers generally. It is rewarding the cold-blooded, cunning, and heartless. It is destroying honesty among all citizens by frequently requiring black-market deals to get necessities of life.

As individual economic distress becomes acute, serious social disorders are probable.

The President and Congress have been warned about this danger many times. But even President Truman does not seem to comprehend that the root evil is the deficit spending, and not the high prices that must result from more dollars than goods.

IS AN AMERICAN GESTAPO AHEAD?

The American people have not been told about the other alternative of continued deficit spending. It is ruthless regimentation. Price fixing is crippling production. As plants lose money and close down, goods disappear from the market place. Then a ruthless gestapo is set up to cope with the shortage scramble to get food, clothing, and shelter. Witness the effect of the closing already of over 500 butter-making plants.

The Nazis controlled inflation by using a gestapo. Already the OPA is copying the mild early methods of the Nazis. Ruthless gestapo methods will come later, unless OPA is soon eliminated.

LABORING PEOPLE ARE CHIEF VICTIMS

Always the crushing blow of price control falls hardest on the working people and the white-collar classes. That is why the humble people of America are so disturbed today.

The fixed incomes and small earnings of teachers, public employees, and pensioners cannot stand large price rises. Will the frugal financial independence of the great middle classes of America be broken and destroyed? Undoubtedly the communistic elements in the OPA gleefully anticipate such a catastrophe. But I am likewise sure the patriotic Americans within the Administration do not want this tragedy to happen.

President Truman and the OPA can tell the people the truth—that deficit spending causes price rises by creating purchasing power in excess of production. They can also tell the people that price-fixing slows down production and creates the shortages that make prices go up. Only a balanced budget, plus a Government policy that encourages full production, will keep prices down. In this direction is found the only genuine solution for the high cost of living.

Extending the OPA without such action puts us in the position of the opium smoker who knows that the habit will destroy him, but who lacks the courage to face the distress resulting from breaking the habit.

Extending the OPA without balancing the Budget and encouraging full production will make black marketeering, bootlegging, and thievery necessary for survival. It will destroy the fundamental morality upon which our Christian civilization is based. How? By crippling production, OPA will make legally impossible the satisfaction of human needs for food, clothing, and housing. But these needs must be met. Americans will satisfy them by transactions outside the law. Our current experiences with black markets, to say nothing of the prohibition era, have demonstrated that Americans know no law when their needs or appetites are thwarted by arbitrary governmental decrees.

Should the OPA be extended? Only if these three conditions are met: First, if Congress secures assurance of President Truman of genuine cooperation in balancing the Budget; second, if Congress can get adequate assurance that the pledge Mr. Bowles made at Hartford June 15, 1945, will no longer be simply campaign oratory for the OPA. That pledge declared "that OPA pricing policy shall not stand in the way of all-out production of civilian goods and services which is the only final answer to tremendous inflationary pressures now threatening our economy." And, third, if the extension provides for its elimination by a definite date.

Should Congress now fail to insist on the restoration of free production and free markets quickly, it will mean that this generation has given up for a mess of temporary pottage the American birthright of liberty, justice, and opportunity.

Oregon's Tax Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD,

I include the following article by Tom C. Watson from the Sunday Journal, Portland, Oreg., of December 16, 1945:

TWIN EVILS THREATEN OREGON'S TAX ECONOMY

(By Tom C. Watson, Multnomah County assessor)

John Stuart Mills, noted English philosopher and economist, once said:

"History shows that great economic and social forces flow like a tide over communities only half conscious of that which is befalling them.

"Wise statesmen foresee what time is thus bringing, and try to shape institutions and mold men's thoughts in accordance with the change that is silently coming on. The unwise are those who bring nothing constructive to the process, and who greatly imperil the future of mankind by leaving great questions to be fought out between ignorant change on one hand, and ignorant opposition to change on the other."

The writer lays no claim to prophetic wisdom, but it must be apparent to a great many that we are now faced with what may well be considered as the most critical national and international economic problem ever experienced in world history.

No matter what pattern is adopted for future national economy, we may well be assured that high taxes will prevail in spite of all efforts to postpone the liquidation of our public obligations, and let us hope that the people, through its own initiative and through our national and local lawmakers and administrators, will not promulgate unnecessary additional excessive tax burdens.

During the reconversion period, as well as during normal peacetimes, most careful consideration must be given to prevent the power of taxation to utterly destroy the ability to pay.

LOCAL TAX BURDEN UNRELATED TO INCOME

In our State of Oregon prior to the recent war, and in many other States, the bulk of our local tax burden was not related to income. The principal source of tax revenue was derived from property. Property, in its various forms, is the foundation and source of all wealth and income of whatever nature. It naturally follows that excessive tax burdens imposed on property tends to exert a powerful and destructive influence on all income of both business and labor. Such a condition gradually breeds economic depressions and leads to eventual bankruptcy followed by moral and mental degeneracy of many of our people.

Property taxation in Oregon in its present trend will soon reach a dangerous point approaching property confiscation unless other sources of public revenue can be found to relieve the tax pressure on property. This situation is further accentuated by the increasing extension of subsidies in the form of property-tax exemptions which are taking on alarming proportions. The diminishing quantity of taxable property in the State is forced to assume the additional tax burden shifted from nontaxable property, although tax-exempt property receives the same benefits and protection of governmental service as taxable property but at no cost to its owners for this service.

Property tax exemptions have been too generously interpreted and too freely granted. As a general rule, tax exemption laws in this state have been rather loosely drawn. Exemptions have not only been too freely granted, but the laws, in many respects, are lacking in specific directives in the application of the laws. This ambiguity leads to many puzzling conjectures as to where to draw the line between taxable and nontaxable properties.

It is doubtful if many of our taxpayers are aware of the fact that subsidies in the form of tax exemptions are granted to some of the property of certain profit-seeking enterprises that are not of an eleemosynary or of a public character. In Multonomah County alone these exemptions amount to nearly $2,500,000 of assessed value on the current property tax roll.

While the total value of all tax-exempt property in Multnomah County has not yet been determined, it is probable that the figure will run well over $100,000,000 in assessable value, which is approximately one-fifth of the total assessed value in the county.

Tax exemptions for property of the State and its political subdivisions are vital and necessary to public welfare. But there are two schools of thought as to what, if any, exemption should extend to privately owned property of other institutions. This is a matter for the people and its lawmakers to decide.

The fact remains that increasing demands for more governmental service and increasing tax-exemption demands for nonpublicly owned property are exerting a tremendous tax load pressure against taxable property. This tendency discourages home ownership and industrial expansion.

If we are to encourage new industries to locate in Oregon we should at least be able to show a fair and reasonable tax rate.

The value of all tax-exempt public and privately owned property in the State represents a very considerable amount. There is no existing record of the summation of this value; but through an act of the 1945 legislature, the assessor of each county of the State, commencing with the 1946 assessment, will be required to evaluate tax-exempt properties and report the summaries annually to the State tax commission. It is hoped that these reports may provide sufficient facts to form a basis for future constructive legislation without endangering public and quasi-public institutions.

FEDERAL HOLDINGS VASTLY INCREASED

Closely correlated to the subject of State and local tax-exempted property is the matter of the increasing encroachments of land acquirements by the Federal Government from the States and their subdivisions.

At the present time approximately 54 percent of the land area of Oregon is federally owned and tax exempt.

A few of the counties receive some revenue from revested Oregon and California railroad grant lands and from war emergency housing projects. According to reports from governmental sources, more than 50 percent of the land area of the 11 Western States is owned by the United States, and Federal acquisitions, exclusive of military requirements, are building up at the approximate rate of 1,000,000 acres per year.

According to a report of September, 1944 of an interim committee of the Seventy-eighth Congress appointed to make a study of public lands in connection with the effect of tax exemptions on State and local government, recent acquisitions of the Federal Government have created fiscal problems in a number of the counties of Oregon. Also, in the Portland area, shipyards and defense establishments have created problems similar to those created in other areas. Excerpts from the report are quoted as follows:

"Multnomah County, Oreg.: This is the smallest county in area in the State. It has 272,000 acres. About one-third of that area is occupied by the city of Portland and its immediate suburban district. In the last year 73,000 acres, or 27 percent of the total area of the county were federally owned, 69,000 acres being forest land, and the remaining being various Federal agencies. It was brought out that the area of the port of Portland has been one of the largest developments in the shipbuilding program; the Maritime Commission, the Federal Housing Administration, the Navy, Bonneville Administration have made some special acquisitions, have acquired tracts of land, not large in area, but among the highest valued land in the city of Portland and in Multnomah County. The tax loss on the property acquired for the air base by the Maritime Commission now amounts to over $600,000 annually in Multnomah County.

"With reference to the question of acquisition of lands, the cities of the State of Oregon have not been very greatly hurt in the lands taken over. However, the city of Portland has been hurt and other cities can be hurt, in that if lands without a corporate boundary of the city are taken over, then the additional burden of county taxes on that property will be thrown on the remaining property of the county and the cities will then have to bear an additional burden of the property tax.

"The combined levies of counties, schools, and cities in the State of Oregon for cities over 2,500 population last year averaged 62 mills. The average assessed valuation ran somewhere between 45 and 50 cents on the dollar, and it is obvious that $6.20 taxes on that valuation is excessive. If there is more thrown in that tax, there will be a practical limitation reached where additional taxes can't be charged, and that is aside from our constitutional limitation. If that practical limitation is reached, then certain services of the Government will not be given and citizens will demand those services, and it is only reasonable to expect they will be furnished by a more centralized government, and it will continue the trend toward centralization of government and take it away from the people where it should be."

BULK OF ACQUISITIONS IN WESTERN STATES

The bulk of all Federal acquisitions of lands for national purposes has been acquired in the 11 Western States. These appropriations have reached such proportions as to seriously reduce the tax revenue producing area of these States.

The cost of government is increasing in relative proportion to the rapidly increasing populations in these Western States. Consequently the gradual encroachment of Federal ownership of property in the area is presenting a serious fiscal problem.

The burden created by this problem should be shared by the other 37 States of the Union, and a fair distribution of the load could be accomplished through payments of taxes by the Federal Government to the States in which the property acquisitions have been made. The matter of some such relief is under consideration by the Congress at the present time. This should be given further impetus by the motivated interest of citizens and public officials.

It is the opinion of the writer that all property situated in any locality of a sovereign State, appropriated for any national public use other than for the corporate administrative use of the Federal Government, should bear its fair relative share in the support of the local government in which it is situated.

Unless our people make an organized and concerted effort to solve these fiscal problems provoked by increasing tax exemptions, property taxes will soon reach the danger point approaching property confiscation. It is high time that the people of our Oregon communities should take an active interest in the problem here presented.

Address Before Breen McCracken Post, American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with my unanimous-consent request, which was granted, I am insert-

ing the following remarks which I made on February 11, 1946, at a meeting of the Sixth District, the American Legion, at the Breen McCracken Post, No. 270, 1 North Fiftieth Street, Philadelphia, Pa.:

I suppose it was inevitable to have been introduced to you as Congressman WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN. While I am proud of the opportunity to serve you in the House of Representatives I think I should prefer to speak to you tonight as just BILL GRANAHAN—legionnaire.

Among you tonight I see a good many young fellows. They are the fellows who just polished off the minor incidents we've been bothered with during the last 5 years. They are the fellows who have taken part in the greatest war in history. We of World War I can appreciate to some extent the hardships you have endured. Ours was the lesser; yes, yours, the greatest in world's history.

The truth of the matter is that all war is tough. War is cruel and ugly. No matter what your job in the armed forces; no matter where you found yourself—stateside or overseas—war was tough for you in relation to your civilian status. The discipline you endured; the physical punishment you took; the long hours of watchful waiting; the days and months of gnawing loneliness you suffered were experienced by all men, in all wars. The difference was in the degrees we experienced it—not in the things themselves.

Recognizing this, then, we can sense a spirit of comradeship between men of both wars. We can acknowledge the relationship between the legionnaire of yesterday, and the legionnaire of today. Our experiences were pretty much the same except they happened to different individuals, in different generations, and in varying degrees. The thing itself ever remains the same—ugly, horrible, wasteful.

There are those who take the position the new veteran needs an organization of his own. They say he needs to be the keeper of his own destiny. They say that we, of the first world war, cannot bridge the gap between us. They say all these things not really believing them because they can't be true. Logic tells us they can't be true.

Everyday in Congress I bridge that gap. In fact, for me, there is no gap.

Man's problems, fundamentally are the same. He is hungry, tired, sick—he may be all of those things together, and at the same time, but it doesn't make any difference whether he served in World War I or World War II. He can be just as hungry, tired, or sick, as those who served in either war or for that matter, in no war at all. The difference lies in the degreee of his suffering. The treatment is invariably the same.

No matter what a new organization can accomplish, the American Legion has already accomplished. No matter what problem the new veteran can, and does, present, the American Legion is already familiar with it—and its treatment. Years of bitterness, heartache, and men's lives have gone into the growth of the American Legion. Today it stands as a monument to the greatness of the American ideal:

"For God and country; to uphold and defend the Constitution; to maintain law and order; to inculcate a sense of individual obligation to the community, State, and Nation; to combat the autocracy of both the classes and the masses; to make right the master of might; to promote peace and good will on earth; to safeguard and transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom, and democracy."

Can any new organization do more than that?

Yes, comrades, there is a kindred spirit between us of the last war and those of this. We have all made the same identical sacrifices and pretty much for the same purposes. We served our Nation to the best of our individual ability and we can face the future with pride in the knowledge that we were strong, fearless Americans—Americans who bow before no man; Americans who have never been vanquished in battle; Americans who stand ready to defend, again and again, the great principles of democracy.

Yes; we have won wars, but what about the peace?

I don't mean peace as we have come to read about it in the press. I mean the individual peace of each man and his family. I mean the peace of mind and soul so precious to every man. I mean the peace that comes only from individual security, a job, medical care, education, and the right to free enterprise.

What about these things? How will they be accomplished and by whom?

The answer to that lies in legislation which only you can make possible. You can make it possible by your desire to accomplish certain aims. You can make it possible by looking upon me—and all elected officials—as your friends. I am not only willing to create—and endeavor to have passed—legislation beneficial to veterans—I am eager. I want to do it because I am one of you. I understand your problems and I want to help.

I can't do it without your help. I need your support, your energy and your power to make my office effective. We cannot pass our days in apathy toward these problems and expect satisfactory results. We cannot, feeling secure in our own job, ignore the comrade who has none. We cannot find satisfaction in our own health knowing our comrade needs care. We cannot be pleased with our own well-being, knowing our comrade shows the burning marks of war on his mind and body.

We have got to be strong in unity to help one another. We cannot be divided in ideas and ideals. We cannot allow our comrades to foster small, ineffective organizations and hope to accomplish the things for which this, and other, wars were fought. We must go forth and preach the gospel of unity and oneness of purpose we have got to back ourselves to win if this war for security of the individual is to mean anything more than empty phrases and vacant, useless lives.

We must be living examples of man's responsibility to man.

I stand ready to help you with every ounce of energy; every waking minute; with every resource at my command. I am a Legionnaire. I am a veteran. I am a Congressman. I am your elected representative because you helped to make me so. I can do much on my own initiative. I can do more with your help.

To me this need for helping our fellow man is more than just an ideal—it is a deep and abiding conviction that therein lies the salvation of all mankind. We must give to get. We must help each other. We must have faith in each other; faith in the future; and above all, faith in ourselves. Only with the deepest of faith in the motives and purposes of our fellow man can we progress.

Tonight, right now, there are those who cry out in anguish for help. They are here; they are in foreign lands; they are everywhere—the world over. They need us. They need you. They need me. We, comrade, need each other. I'm ready. Are you?

Housing Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article from the February 1946 issue of the American Federationist, official magazine of the American Federation of Labor:

HOUSING CRISIS

The American Federation of Labor, its central labor unions, building and construction trades councils, and other affiliates in local communities are organized and prepared to give the fullest measure of cooperation to the industry and to the government, Federal and local, in a concerted drive to meet the Nation's critical housing shortage.

The building and construction trade unions of the A. F. of L. are formulating a series of positive programs to assure to the Nation an ample supply of building trades mechanics and laborers in all classifications of skill in every community to build the volume of housing construction urgently required under the existing conditions.

Fullest cooperation is being given by our unions in developing and putting into effect apprentice-training programs to provide employment opportunities under fair labor standards to returning veterans and to workers displaced from war jobs. Our unions have assumed their full share of responsibility in expediting these programs, which have already been set up in cooperation with construction contractors under the standards approved by the Apprentice Training Service of the Department of Labor. There are today nearly 12,000 contractors who have joined with unions in establishing area-wide programs in 800 communities. The executive counsel commends the building and construction trades department for its leadership in this vital work.

Acute shortage of certain scarce building materials is the biggest barrier in the way of rapid expansion of home construction. We urge the adoption of the following emergency programs to accelerate increased home construction and expedite reconversion:

1. Congressional appropriation to establish a revolving fund for loans and special financial aids to building materials manufacturers which would enable them to expand production to capacity volume. Requirement of minimum wage standards as a condition of such financial aid.

2. Immediate action to raise the low wages which prevail in the manufacture of certain building materials to a fair standard. Provision should be made for price adjustments in cases where wages have been actually corrected, but only where there is a proved need to modify price ceilings for this purpose.

3. A temporary emergency program of allocation of scarce building materials which would:

(a) Assure a supply of materials for the essential minimum of industrial and other nonresidential construction, and

(b) Direct the flow of the bulk of building materials into the construction of moderate-priced and low-rent homes under firm quality standards. This temporary allocation program should be decentralized in order to fit the needs of different areas and should be subject to quarterly revision. Allocation should be terminated as soon as the supply of materials is adequate.

Wage incomes are being generally reduced. Wage earners and veterans must be protected against further increases in the cost of living due to the inflated cost of shelter. Continuation of effective rent control until the supply of rental dwellings is adequate is a vital necessity to all workers and to the whole Nation.

The postwar housing emergency was aggravated but not created by the war. It is the outgrowth of a quarter century of failure to provide an adequate supply of moderate-priced homes within reach of families of small means.

America's housing emergency will not be met by emergency means alone. We make

an emphatic call upon Congress to enact without delay the Wagner-Ellender-Taft general housing bill, S. 1592, which embodies a long-range program for housing families of all incomes with the maximum reliance on private enterprise and local initiative.

This bipartisan legislation contains the major objectives of the national housing policy formulated by the A. F. of L., and has the unqualified support of the great mass of wage earners. It is the only program which will provide the complete answer to America's housing need.

The executive council welcomes the appointment of Wilson Wyatt as the national housing expediter, and his nomination as Administrator of the National Housing Agency. The A. F. of L. will give Mr. Wyatt fullest cooperation in every sound measure he undertakes to accomplish his difficult task. The Nation-wide drive just launched by President William Green and Chairman Harry C. Bates of the A. F. of L. housing committee in 800 communities for labor's active aid in carrying out local housing programs is evidence of labor's preparedness to make a real contribution to the public interest.

An Open Letter to the Congress of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED. V. IZAC
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article appearing in the February 1946 issue of Seapower, by Ralph A. Bard, president of the Navy League of the United States:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES FROM RALPH A. BARD

As president of the Navy League of the United States, I want to comment on President Truman's recommendations to Congress covering the unification of the armed services. While the Navy League agrees that coordination of the armed forces must be accomplished, we do not agree with the program as outlined by President Truman in two important respects.

Although President Truman held his present high office and acted as Commander in Chief of the armed forces for but a few months of the war just concluded, his presentation definitely indicates that he is well informed and that his conclusions as to the necessity for coordination are sound. However, with all due respect to the President, many other men who have served their country loyally and with distinction have been in an even better position, over a longer period of time, to observe the operations of the armed forces both on land, in connection with their business procedures, and in the field, and their honest views deserve thoughtful and deliberate consideration before final action is taken. That there is no need for further discussion of this most important subject, we do not agree.

Speaking both for the Navy League and from my own experience as Assistant and Under Secretary of the Navy for 4½ years ending July 1, 1945, I respectfully disagree with the President's conclusions as to the best method of achieving this coordination in two important parts of his program.

We believe that the top military command should reside in a joint chiefs of staff rather than in a single chief of staff; the Joint Chiefs of Staff should be composed of the Chief of Staff to the President, and the military heads of the Army, Navy, and Air Forces.

We also believe that the civilian control of the armed forces, which, under the President's plan, would be a single Secretary of National Defense, should not be placed in the hands of one man appointed by the President, but that it should reside in a national security council composed of the Secretary of State, Secretary of the Army, Secretary of the Navy, Secretary of Air, and the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, an agency which should be created to coordinate domestic and economic policies somewhat comparable to the War Production Board in the war just concluded. Either the President of the United States could be the Chairman of this National Security Council or the President could appoint the Chairman.

It is our opinion that this is the type of control of the military forces of this country which fits a democracy such as ours and which I am convinced that majority of our citizens would support and prefer.

No single individual except the President of the United States, who is elected and not appointed, has ever been in control of both the Army and the Navy in our history, and this autocratic power over our military forces in the hands of any individual, either a military man or a civilian Secretary not elected by the people but appointed by the President, is not in line with our past democratic procedure, and such a departure from precedent is unnecessary at this time, if ever.

We are of the opinion that the coordination of the armed forces can be made more effective under the program as outlined by the President with these two changes.

Decisions of greatest importance emanating from a Joint Chiefs of Staff or a National Security Council will have received more expert consideration, with a broader viewpoint, and should be wiser than those emanating from a single Chief of Staff or a single Secretary of National Defense, and I am confident that such decisions will be more readily accepted by our citizens. This will be particularly true if we are to have compulsory military service.

It is our belief that, with these two important changes in the plan presented by President Truman, a coordinated program acceptable to all branches of the service and to the great majority of our citizens can be worked out.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the February 1946 issue of the American Federationist, official magazine of the American Federation of Labor:

PRICE CONTROL

America is already afflicted with a high spending fever—the unmistakable first symptom of inflation. The flush of false prosperity can be detected not only in Wall Street but in every grocery store in the Nation. Prompt action is required to check the infection.

Past experience has taught us that economic upheavals travel in the wake of wars. The uncontrolled boom that followed World War I collapsed in 1929 with a shock which upset the entire world's economy. In America the ensuing depression was never overcome until a new war started. Our country must not embark upon that disastrous cycle again.

Yet conditions are ripe for another economic spree. The American people, starved during the war for necessities and comforts which modern civilization provides, are stampeding empty markets, begging for a chance to spend their savings in a hurry. Speculative activities and luxury spending are reaching new heights. Pressure for higher prices obtains powerful support from the shortages of supplies and materials which inevitably will continue for many months, until production for peacetime needs reaches greater volume.

Under these circumstances it would be suicidal for our Government to drop price controls on June 30, when the present law expires.

President Truman has asked Congress to extend the law for another year, until June 30, 1947. The executive council of the American Federation of Labor supports that recommendation. It also urges that action be taken promptly because uncertainty as to future policy already is slowing down production. Business is reluctant to make advance commitments in the dark.

Let it be clearly understood, however, that the American Federation of Labor regards price control as a necessary evil. In normal times we would vigorously oppose any such Government interference with a free economy. Even now, controls should be exercised cautiously and selectively. The moment production of any particular article comes within safe range of meeting the demand for it, the OPA should remove its artificial ceilings and allow natural competitive forces to bring the selling price down to its natural level.

The administration of price control during and after the war has been spotty and needs to be tightened up. Even with price control, the Government admits the cost of living has gone up 30 percent since 1941. The actual figure is closer to 50 percent, in our opinion, because of the devious artifices by which the law has been evaded and the public victimized.

Despite the many obvious failures of price control, the American people realize how much worse they would have fared without it. They also understand how dangerous it would be to drop price controls now. For example, rent ceilings, which have been fairly successfully enforced, would burst right through the roof because of the acute housing shortage.

It has been argued that price controls cannot be maintained without parallel wage controls. The impression seems to be that the Government has dropped wage controls. This is not the case. The Government's policy, administered by the new Wage Stabilization Board, forbids the granting of wage increases which would be used as the basis for an employer's demand for a higher price ceiling. Departures from this rule will be made only in exceptional hardship cases.

Hon. J. Harry McGregor, of Ohio, Offers Aid to Housing Needs and Urges Stopping Exports of Critical Building Materials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, housing is one of the major problems con-

fronting us at this time. Legislation will soon come before the Congress covering this subject. I am wondering if any legislation is actually needed. Would it not be better to do away with some of the strangling rules and regulations that are now hindering production, construction and repair, so that our people can be given a free opportunity to carry on this program with a minimum of Federal regulations. I think we are all in agreement that housing should be made available at the earliest possible date.

The new national housing executive, Wilson Wyatt, recently made a suggestion that Congress enact legislation to put ceiling prices on all houses, old as well as new, and that price controls be extended to building lots in cities as the means of bringing the cost of housing down into line with veterans' pocketbooks. Another Federal official has recommended the use of subsidies to spur construction. Congress will soon be given the opportunity to decide what policy they want to follow.

Mr. Speaker, I contend that regimentation and subsidies are the stock solutions of bureaucrats to any problem. I insist that we tackle this problem with logical weapons and not simply allow more controls and more Federal spending. The facts of the housing situation are well known. The cost of home building could be materially reduced if common sense were applied. Wartime restrictions were imposed on home building to save materials and labor. Home building is one of the basic hopes for high postwar employment, and certainly, Mr. Speaker, the country needs millions of new houses.

I am of the firm conviction that mandatory restrictions discourage new building, inflate the price of homes already built, and allow black market in housing. Federal directives and red tape are preventing private capital from constructing new homes and from making necessary repairs.

I firmly believe that private industry can and will build new houses at fair prices if they are not "bossed" by Washington bureaus. What my people want is an opportunity to build and repair without Government interference and access to the materials necessary.

Mr. Speaker, building supplies are critical. Such being the case, why are we shipping millions upon millions of board measure feet of lumber prefabricated houses, and other critical housing materials to foreign countries? Let us look at the record in order to prove that we are not doing everything possible to help the housing situation. Recently I contacted the Foreign Trade Division of the Bureau of the Census and asked them to give me figures relating to the export of lumber and building materials during the year of 1945. I find in the figures obtained that we exported from the United States in 1945 the following amount of lumber, in round figures:

January, 28,000,000 feet; February, 32,000,000 feet; March, 29,000,000 feet; April, 26,000,000 feet; May, 30,000,000 feet; June, 24,000,000 feet; July, 38,000,000 feet; August, 44,000,000 feet; September, 41,000,000 feet; October, 43,000,000 feet; November, 39,000,000 feet; December, 49,000,000 feet.

This represents approximately 423,000,000 feet of lumber exported for the year of 1945.

Under the quota set up by the present Civilian Production Administration, they are contemplating exporting 1,000,000,000 feet of lumber in 1946, and, Mr. Speaker, definite arrangements are now in effect to export 225,000,000 feet of this lumber during the first 3 months of this year.

In addition to this, we are exporting approximately 300,000 doors, trims, and so forth, per month that are necessary for house construction, 14,925,000 brick per month, and nearly 3,000,000 square feet of plaster and wallboard; also, I might add that we are exporting in excess of 27,000 bath tubs and fixtures per month.

Now, I firmly believe that, in all fairness, we should put the blame where it rightfully belongs, and I, therefore, insist that our Government immediately stop exporting this building material which is so critical in our country and which is so badly needed for house construction and repair work.

In order that my colleagues may know where some of this lumber has been exported, I beg to cite the record as furnished me by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, and, in order to be perfectly fair, I am citing figures covering the period since VJ-day:

To Canada there were exported from the United States, in October, 5,249,000 board feet of lumber; November, 5,710,000 board feet of lumber; December, 4,539,000 board feet of lumber.

To Cuba: October, 1,705,000 board feet of lumber; November, 2,053,000 board feet of lumber; December, 1,506,000 board feet of lumber.

To Mexico: October, 1,253,000 board feet of lumber; November, 892,000 board feet of lumber; December, 1,363,000 board feet of lumber.

To United Kingdom: October, 20,247,000 board feet of lumber; November, 11,141,000 board feet of lumber; December, 29,310,000 board feet of lumber.

To the Netherlands: October, 1,100,000 board feet of lumber; November, 622,000 board feet of lumber; December, 613,000 board feet of lumber.

To Palestine and Trans-Jordan: October, 3,898,000 board feet of lumber; November, 2,795,000 board feet of lumber.

In addition to this, may I call your attention to the fact that in October 1945 we shipped 1,159,462 square feet of plaster and wallboard to France, and in November 1,471,928 square feet of plaster and wallboard.

Mr. Speaker, I think this program of exporting is seriously affecting the entire building program within the United States, and especially affecting our veterans in their efforts to secure homes upon their return from service overseas.

I do not deny that we have a greater demand for housing material than we have the supply, but it certainly seems ridiculous to me that we continue to reduce that supply by this large program of export. I think this administration should take immediate action and, before coming to Congress and suggesting a continuation of bureaucratic control, it should stop the exportation of lumber and other building materials. We want to truthfully say we are leaving no stone unturned in our endeavors to solve the housing problem. Let us give some definite consideration to our people here at home.

What Price Strikes?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, the Kansas City Labor Bulletin is the official weekly publication of the American Federation of Labor local unions in the greater Kansas City area.

In the issue of February 8, 1946, the editor, George J. Harrison, points with pride to the fact that A. F. of L. unions have succeeded in obtaining benefits for their members with a very few strikes, and that they have kept their demands within such a range that wage hikes would not require price hikes. He observes that when wage demands are such that price ceilings must be lifted the workers obtain no real gain, but in fact sustain a serious loss.

In the same editorial column Mr. Harrison presented the following:

WHAT DOES A STRIKE COST?

Some strikes are unavoidable because management refuses to bargain in good faith. The AFL maintains, however, that a strike should be the last resort, used only after genuine efforts at collective bargaining, conciliation, and arbitration have failed. The reason for this is clear. Count the cost of a strike to the workers:

Suppose the workers are earning an average wage of $1 per hour. The company offers an increase of 12 cents to $1.12, but the union turns down the offer because they think a Government board may give them more. They go on strike and stay out for 8 weeks. Each worker loses an average of $358 (pay for 8 weeks of 40 hours at $1.12 an hour). At the end of that time the Government board awards 18 cents, 6 cents more than the company offered. The company accepts the award and grants 18 cents, but it will take the workers nearly 3 years' work before this extra 6 cents will amount to enough to repay their loss. If, as seems more likely, the company refuses to accept the award and gives only 3 cents more (15 cents in all), then it will take the workers nearly 6 years of work before their extra 3 cents per hour will add up to the amount they lost by the strike, if the extra 3 cents per hour will add up to the amount they lost by the strike. If the extra 3 cents or 6 cents breaks a price ceiling, workers may take losses they can never regain.

If, on the other hand, the workers had avoided the strike and used every means to build up a sound relationship of good will between their union and the company, and both sides had turned their attention to getting out production, they could have gained much more than the extra 3 cents or 6 cents in further wage increases. They could have saved their strike loss and won public good will by turning out the products other people were waiting to buy. That is why responsible AFL leaders bargain in good faith and make every effort to avoid strikes.

The sound, logical, common sense of this editorial should appeal to the reasoning of every member of organized labor in every instance where wage questions are discussed.

With such a labor philosophy prevailing, is it any wonder that in Kansas, American Federation of Labor unions are able to point to their record of no major strikes either during the war or since VJ-day? It is a record of labor-management harmony unsurpassed in any of the other States.

Samples of CIO Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, Walter Reuther, leader of the General Motors strike, and his brother, Victor Reuther, once went on a tour of social engineering in Europe. This was in 1933. They liked the Communist set-up in Russia so well that they spent 16 months working in a Communist factory in Gorske in order to orient themselves in the industrial system of Russia. They returned to the United States in 1935 and were leaders in the Michigan sit-down strikes of 1937.

The Reuther brothers were Socialists before they went on their tour of Europe. Today they condemn the American way of life and our free enterprise system. Victor Reuther in an article in Common Sense magazine says:

> Private ownership of monopolistic industries (General Motors) must be replaced by forms of social ownership such as TVA and cooperatives, all fundamentally democratic in character.

This quote, coupled with their Socialist background and their Communist indoctrination while in Russia, gives the key to the Reuther brothers' program for the future of American industry. Is that the road we want to travel?

Mr. Speaker, in connection with my statements concerning the Reuther brothers as leaders of the CIO, and to show how ruthless and inaccurate the CIO leaders are in their publicity program, how they distort facts in an effort to further their power, I include as a part of my remarks the following article by Frank Kent, taken from the Washington Evening Star of February 13, 1946:

THE GREAT GAME OF POLITICS—WRITER SAYS CIO'S ATTITUDE PREVENTS REASONABLE ACCEPTANCE OF CLAIMS

(By Frank R. Kent)

It does seem that since the inauguration 8 months ago of the calculated effort to force submission of both industry and Government to its demands, the character of the CIO arguments, the absurdity of its accusations and the general quality of its propaganda would make it impossible for reasonably sensible persons to accept its claims or support its position.

True, the CIO has great publicity advantages over the other side, but the stuff it has been putting out recently is so largely phony and unfounded that, however palatable it may be to the gullible masses, it is difficult to understand how it can fail to revolt any fairly informed person. The truth is that in its controversy with the General Motors and the United States Steel, the CIO has utilized its superior propaganda position to consistently distort the facts and misrepresent its opponents.

DISTORTION OF FACTS CHARGED

Normally that would seem a serious charge against any organization. It is not a serious charge against the CIO because there isn't even a pretense of being accurate or fair about its propaganda or about its propagandists. They are unconcealedly determined to present the best case for themselves and the worst for industry with which they possibly can get by, regardless of the facts.

With an easier and less costly access to the channels of communication, it is their shameless practice not only to denounce as false everything the other side puts out but to repeat their own false statements after they have been disproved. Unencumbered by ethics or standards, the CIO propagandists regard that as a perfectly sound policy and are rather contemptuous at the failure of industry to operate along the same lines.

EXAMPLES ARE PLENTIFUL

Examples of CIO distortion are plentiful. In the General Motors strikes the basic charge was that there is an "organized plot" upon the part of the automobile industry to "destroy organized labor." Over and over this was repeated. And then Ford and Chrysler signed up and settled with the union, leaving General Motors to fight alone.

This seemed the complete answer to the "plot" charge, but it has not prevented it from being repeated and repeated again and again. A second example is the charge that United States Steel would receive under the existing tax law a huge refund as a result of the shutdown.

United States Steel promptly answered that it would receive no refund at all, quoting the law and citing figures. Completely ignoring the figures and the reply, the CIO merely repeats the charge.

CIO ALTERS ATTITUDE

Another striking example is the CIO attitude toward the President. When Mr. Truman first made his fact-finding proposal Philip Murray and his publicity machine denounced it as a "vicious betrayal of labor." But when Mr. Truman's Fact-Finding Board recommended an 18-percent increase and Mr. Truman approved, Mr. Murray and his aides eagerly lined up behind the President and have been berating the company for "defying the Government."

If Mr. Truman had not created his Fact-Finding Board and endorsed the 18-percent increase (which is more than they expected to get when they started their strike), it is conceded the union would have no chance at all of getting any large increase either in this or the steel strike.

Yet a few days ago Mr. Thomas, of the CIO Automobile Workers' Union, went before a Senate committee, denounced Members of Congress as "old fuddy duddies," and branded Mr. Truman, who saved his union from defeat, as "weak." This is a sample of union gratitude which politicians of both parties might well take to heart.

LEADERS IGNORE CHARGES

Also, though the language of its contracts with the General Motors and United States Steel do not permit of even a reasonable doubt that both strikes violate the existing contracts, the CIO leaders blithely ignore the charge and continue to assert that the companies, acting in bad faith, are out to "destroy organized labor."

Actually, there is not on record any campaign publicity of such consistent disregard for the truth and such wholehearted misrepresentation of the situation. The appeal is entirely to the emotions, through sensational allegations which are continued with unabated enthusiasm long after they have been refuted.

Through the intervention on their behalf of President Truman (whose help they accept, but whom they still ungratefully berate) the CIO has averted defeat. The ultimate outcome, of course, will be a gain in wages for the workers, increased prices for the companies, with the public paying the bill and inflation brought a little closer. But the methods and manners of the CIO leadership, as revealed in these strikes, can hardly fail to damage it in public esteem—and in political circles.

General confidence, never very high, has been lessened in the intelligence and character of the labor leadership. And the tolerance of the great unorganized majority has been worn a little thinner.

Maximum Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 15 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that those who opposed the full employment bill from the time it was first introduced are now attempting to misconstrue and misinterpret the final legislation, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to an editorial entitled "As a Starter," which appeared in the Nashville Tennesseean on February 6.

This editorial states that the full employment act is "an important pioneering advance and as such should be accepted as a beginning which can be improved in the light of experience." The editorial also points out that the final legislation "is far better than the sickly thing concocted by the House reactionaries."

Let me also quote the following statement from the editorial:

> Under a liberal President and a responsible Congress the substitute bill can be made a means to achieve an expanding prosperous economy. Under a conservative President and a recalcitrant National Legislature, the strongest measure possible could be reduced to a mere front behind which the majority could chant a pious belief in full employment while doing nothing. It all depends upon the zeal and faith of those who administer the act.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Nashville Tennesseean, to which I have just referred, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AS A STARTER

After a month of conferring, the joint Senate-House committee on the full employment bill has agreed on a compromise which will probably be enacted into law and signed by the President. While it is far from the formula proposed by President Roosevelt, endorsed at the polls in the national elections of 1944, and recommended by President Truman, it will represent an important pioneering advance and as such should be accepted

as a beginning which can be improved in the light of experience.

The compromise measure makes it the Government's responsibility to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power. It sets up a permanent board of specialists in economics who will aid the President in preparing an annual report showing trends in employment, production, and consumption and carrying the President's recommendations for strengthening the economy.

Though the measure does not mention full employment, it would not prevent the President from setting that as his goal in submitting his recommendations. And though nothing is said about an annual budget of production and employment, the conference bill would not make it impossible for the President to make his recommendations in the form of such a budget.

The original bill provided nothing more than a statement of economic objectives, machinery for annual and quartely factual summaries of the condition of our economic health, and a mandate for Congress and the President to consider what immediate steps, if any, were necessary to keep the national economy in good health. The conference bill weakens but does not destroy the statement of economic objectives. It creates a board which is expected to inquire into the economic facts of life less thoroughly than the budget board set up under the Senate bill, but it does leave the way open through later legislative action to make this agency a most thorough research body when time, experience, and a better knowledge of political economy among our Congressmen point the way.

Under a liberal President and a responsible Congress the substitute bill can be made a means to achieve an expanding, prosperous economy. Under a conservative President and a recalcitrant National Legislature, the strongest measure possible could be reduced to a mere front behind which the majority could chant a pious belief in full employment while doing nothing. It all depends upon the zeal and faith of those who administer the act.

In the face of serious unemployment, no administration or congressional majority can pursue a do-nothing policy and survive. The unhappy fate of the Hoover regime is a reminder. Henceforth, no administration which fails to take precautions to prevent a break-down in the national economic health can long survive. The American people take no stock in economic Calvinism. They believe that the economic cycle can be forestalled, that millions are not foreordained and predestined to unemployment and insecurity, that the commitments of science and religion hold the promise of a real economy of abundance.

The half-a-loaf substitute full employment bill makes it possible to take preventive steps against economic crises. Thus far we have lacked the information on production, consumer demand, and the labor supply to diagnose our economic health. Risks of free enterprise have been grave because of guesses in the dark about the market. Thousands upon thousands of business failures annually may be attributed to ignorance of the nature and strength of consumer demand, the national stock of goods, production plans, and other fundamental economic data. For many years we have needed a national agency constantly collecting, studying, and interpreting such data. The research staff to be established will perform this all-important work, which of itself will remove many of the unnecessary risks which have weighted the neck of free enterprise.

The bill also makes it incumbent on the Government to use its vast powers in the Federal Reserve System, the Security and Exchange Commission, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Treasury Department, and the revitalized Commerce Department to achieve the goals of maximum production, employment, and consumption. Beyond that lies a budget of public works held in the reserve which the President and Congress can call upon.

If the bill is not what had been hoped for, it is far better than the sickly thing concocted by the House reactionaries. Let it be translated into action without further delay. If the program has merit, the deficiencies will be supplied.

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 15 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Abraham Lincoln and the New Emancipation," delivered by me at a banquet given by the Lincoln Club, at Louisville, Ky., on February 12, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABRAHAM LINCOLN AND THE NEW EMANCIPATION

I am glad to be here in Louisville and in Kentucky in the midst of thoroughbred Republicans.

Yours is a city and a State with which every American schoolboy and schoolgirl is acquainted. Your commonwealth and your city are parts of the woof and the warp of this great Nation.

The very mention of Kentucky brings before us the panorama of the Nation's westward march. It is the pioneer land of Daniel Boone. Though known as the Blue Grass State, it is divided in sections which differ sharply in geography, culture, economics, and activity. One Kentucky Methodist preacher is reported as saying, "Heaven is a Kentucky of a place."

Your city of Louisville blends the commerce and the industry of a northern city with a southern city's enjoyment of living. It speaks to us who live outside your borders in terms of prosperity, the Kentucky Derby; a city of beautiful homes, churches, and schools; the city where John James Audubon lived; a city of stalwart men and beautiful women.

It has been my privilege to know both of your Senators, Senator BARKLEY and Senator STANFILL. In the brief time I have known your junior Senator, I have become very fond of him. He is a man of fine character and ability, who is interested not only in the economics and politics of better government, but in the spiritual things of life. In the short time that he has been in the Senate, he has made many friends and is doing good work. Your senior Senator, though of different political faith, I have admired for his ability and energy.

Your former Senator, now Congressman JOHN M. ROBSION, is a Lincoln type of a fellow. For hours he can entertain you with the stories and sayings of Lincoln.

THE OCCASION FOR OUR MEETING

Yes; I am very happy to be with you this evening to commemorate the one hundred and thirty-seventh birthday of one of Kentucky's sons—one of humanity's truly great men.

"The Lord must love the common people; He made so many of them."

As you so well know, my friends, these are the homespun words of the sixteenth President of the United States, Abraham Lincoln. He spoke of the common men—the builders of America, the sustainers of America—the men of thrift, of industry, and conviction. Here in America there is no caste system, no classes, but every man here is a king in his own right.

The Lord must have loved Abe Lincoln just as the Lord loves common folks. For Abe Lincoln was of the stuff of common folks. He lived and died for common folks. He lived and died to set them free and keep them free and united.

The Lord must have loved Abe Lincoln, for He made this lowly backwoodsman adequate to meet the greatest challenge ever faced by his Nation—the challenge of union or division.

On February 12, 1809, he was born in a log cabin over in Hodgenville, in your fair State. Self-taught, schooled in the university of hard knocks, he became a rail splitter, a storekeeper, a country lawyer. At last he rose to the highest office of the Republic—the Presidency. In that office he did his noblest work. In that office he made the supreme sacrifice.

THE REASON FOR THIS CELEBRATION

Why do we celebrate the birthday of this humble, homely man in this and every year?

This celebration is no empty symbol. It is no meaningless gesture, no mere formality.

We celebrate Abe Lincoln's birthday in order that we of this generation may, in his words, "dedicate ourselves to the unfinished work which lies before us." It is the work of securing justice for the common man, the work of maintaining and strengthening the Republic and building a better world.

We celebrate Lincoln's birthday in order that we may emancipate ourselves anew from the forces of bondage which rise in every generation to chain us as individuals and as a nation.

We celebrate his birthday so as to bring about the new emancipation—the emancipation of ourselves as individuals from hate and bigotry, from doubt and fear, from worry and inadequacy; the emancipation of our Nation from strife and subjection to selfish interests.

EMANCIPATION OF THE INDIVIDUAL

Fellow citizens, let us see a few of the personal lessons which Abe Lincoln taught us and which we may use in our own individual lives.

1 He taught us love of the Republic.

This was Lincoln's great love—the love of the soil which bore him, of the freedoms which gave him opportunity. Lincoln respected his responsibilities and obligations as a citizen and as a leader under the Republic. He approached public office as a servant of the people and not as their master. He sought to husband the spiritual and material resources of the people rather than to squander them as a prodigal. He knew that he was but the trustee of the great values which future generations would enjoy. And he wanted to pass those values to them vital and unimpaired.

He wanted to make sure that, in his own words:

"This Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

This, then, is the first of Lincoln's great loves—the love of the Republic. She needs our love and attention today.

But his heart was warm enough to hold many pure loves, and another of them was the love of motherhood.

You remember his devoted words:

"All that I am and all that I ever hope to be I owe to my sainted mother."

We've seen Lincoln's love of the Republic, his love of motherhood; now let us see more of his lessons for us. Like him, we know life has meaning. We want to learn.

Next, he taught us the value of humor. Who among us could forget his fame as a spinner of wholesome, rib-tickling yarns?

He used humor—to relax men, to refresh men, to save them from the iron grip of taut nerves and high tension. We, ourselves, can use humor today—to emancipate ourselves from these old chains of nerves and tension.

A fourth lesson from Lincoln's life is that he used prayer effectively. He said:

"I have often been driven to my knees in prayer in the conviction that there was no other place to go."

Yes; Abe Lincoln communed with his Maker and gained strength from his Maker. He knew that God is greater than any of our problems and could help us to solve our problems. Like the darky he knew "Lord, there is nothing you and me can't handle."

And so, Abe Lincoln taught us another lesson, a fifth lesson: How to meet defects and overcome them. What disappointments he had, what failures, what tragedies, and how he overcame them by faith and work. He said: "I'll study and prepare and be ready when the opportunity comes."

His beloved mother, Nancy Hanks, died when he was but 9. His sweetheart, Ann Rutledge, was taken from him, too. He entered business, failed, and spent 17 years paying up the debts of a worthless partner. He tried to get an appointment to the United States Land Office but failed. He ran for the Senate and failed. He was a candidate for the Vice Presidency but was defeated. He lost out in a race for the Senate to Stephen Douglas.

When at last he became President, the South seceded. A dreadful Civil War came. The Union forces suffered defeat after defeat. Voices such as Horace Greeley's called to him to let the South go.

But Abraham Lincoln persevered. He would not sacrifice his principles. He would not down. He came smiling through and the Republic was saved.

What would have happened had he listened to the siren voices of the Greeleys of his day, had he allowed the South to secede? Ours would have been not one Nation, but many nations—quarreling, jealous, hating one another. Our continent would have been another Europe, torn by the endless feuds of national States.

How fortunate it was that God raised up Abraham Lincoln, this man of vision, and that the divided situation which I have just pictured did not come to pass. The Union was preserved. You remember the words of the Bible, "Without vision the people perish." Abraham Lincoln had vision, therefore, the Republic stands.

These lessons add up to greatness. What finer lessons could you and I learn from any mortal—love of the Republic, love of motherhood, use of humor, use of prayer, and faith that could not be licked, that could move mountains. Abe was a growing soul. Life to him was a garden for the soul of man to grow in.

EMANCIPATION AS A NATION

But, my friends, I have said that from Abe Lincoln we can gain inspiration also for our new emancipation as a Nation. How?

Well, just listen to Abe Lincoln telling us what the attitude of labor should be today. I quote:

"The strongest bond of sympathy outside the family relation should be the one uniting all working people: nor should this lead to a war upon property or the owner of property. Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him labor diligently and build one for himself; thus by example assuring himself, his own will be safe from violence when built."

Hear what Abe Lincoln tells us today about the role of Government. I quote:

"The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot do so well in their separate or individual capacities. In all that people can individually do for themselves, the government ought not to interfere."

Now, let Lincoln speak to us on our relations with our former foes and our care of our ex-servicemen:

"With malice toward none, with charity for all, with a firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle, for his widow and his orphan, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

But there are so many other great thoughts of Lincoln which have dynamic meaning to us today. Listen to these, good friends, on how we may triumph over our difficulties:

"Intelligence, patriotism, Christianity, and a firm reliance on Him who has never yet forsaken this favored land are still competent to adjust in the best way all our present difficulty."

It was Abe Lincoln, too, who told us of the need for national unity. He said:

"A house divided against itself cannot stand."

It was Abe Lincoln who told us how to face great new challenges, such as those of the atomic age. He said:

"The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves, and then we shall save our country."

Yes; it was Lincoln, too, who taught us to respect the traditions of the past while moving ahead in progress. Here are his words:

"I do not mean to say that we are bound to follow implicitly in whatever our fathers did. To do so would be to discard all the lights of current experience, to reject all progress, all improvement. What I do say is that if we would supplant the opinions and policy of our fathers in any case, we should do so upon evidence so conclusive, and argument so clear, that even their great authority, fairly considered and weighed, cannot stand."

And so, my friends, we have visited with the Great Emancipator—in his thoughts and words and spirit. Let us take a few moments and apply the same to the challenges of the President.

BUILDING A BETTER WORLD

One of the responsibilities which I have stated are upon us is that of building a better world. It is a responsibility which Lincoln carried on so well but which we of this generation, in this atomic age, must advance still further.

It is my belief that every American might well in his own mind prepare a statement of his creed for a better world.

Let me present to you a few points in what constitutes my own creed for a better world.

I believe that the United Nations Organization will be a success and will be adequate to its responsibilities if the peoples of earth follow the injunction of Lincoln and disenthrall themselves. Disenthrall themselves from what, you ask? From limited man-made views, from international lust for power, from international rivalries—economic and political.

Individually, and as a Nation, it is well for us to remember the song of Solomon, wherein it is written:

"Take (from) us, the little foxes, that spoil the vines, for our vines have tender grapes." These ancient words are particularly applicable today to international relations. The "little foxes" of misunderstanding and fear, at home and abroad, are gnawing at the infant vines, and devouring the embryonic grapes of international relationship. The snarls of recrimination can be heard in the air. Let us hope that these differences are coming out in the open to be eliminated and that the United Nations Organization will become effective.

Lincoln said, "As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew." This calls for putting first things first. It calls for keeping our perspective and not magnifying the molehills of international difference into mountains. We must be patient. We must remember that we are dealing for all time to come. We must consider issues from the other nations' point of view. There are many things that unite us. But on those things that would divide us, we must seek to find a common ground for adjustment. Yes, we must iron out disagreements in a rational manner. As individuals, so with nations, let us develop poise, not poison, within ourselves—humility, not bravado—restraint, not rashness.

We know that the mere signing of treaties or international agreements will be of no effect unless there is back of the contracting parties the will, the intent, the purpose, and the faith to fulfill those agreements. We must not lose our hope and our faith for a just and lasting peace.

In Lincoln's words, "the occasion is piled high with difficulties." The carnage of World War II stares us all in the face. The threat of the atomic bomb and rocket warfare hangs over mankind. The world's need is for world understanding. (And never before was there such a need.) This should spur the nations to a demonstration of their adequacy.

America, as the most blessed Nation on earth, has the responsibility of being a good samaritan, helping the world, so it can again become competent to help itself. The road ahead is no easy road. It is filled with difficulties—yes; even road blocks—which must be removed. America must not be divided in this great adventure. Like Lincoln, we must rise with the occasion.

BUILDING A BETTER AMERICA

The international house of nations must not be divided, and America's own house must not be divided, in order that we may successfully meet the problems of the stormy present. The great need of America today is for full production. Without such full production, such uninterrupted production, this Nation may be in for ruinous inflation. If this takes place, we will not be able to pay with sound money the interest on our $300,000,000,000 national debt. We will not be able to fulfill our international responsibilities for relief and foreign trade.

Americans must unite to gain full and uninterrupted production. The epidemic of strikes must be halted for the good of the general public, for the good of labor, and for the good of management. But how are we going to do all this?

I have proposed on the floor of the Senate a 10-point program designed to get full production now. May I read to you the items of this program?

1. Reevaluate the entire Wagner Act. That act obviously filled a certain need in bygone years, but it is hopelessly obsolete and even harmful today to the best interests of the American people, including labor. It is a segmental act, designed for only one segment of our population. It must be revised in the interest of the public welfare. We have legislated segment-wild. We have made legislation for this segment and that segment. But one great over-all segment has not been regarded, and that is the public.

Now, if we have any vision, we are going to see to it that the public is not disregarded.

2. Immediately enact legislation to have machinery for compulsory arbitration so as to protect the public interest in the case of utilities and Nation-wide industries.

3. Establish the policy of having representatives of the public participate in every labor-management conference.

4. Enact any necessary clarifications of the draft law so as to insure full protection of the reemployment rights of veterans.

5. Insure full protection by law enforcement officers to all veterans and others who want to take up jobs vacated by strikers.

6. Establish the legal responsibility of unions for all violations of contract in the form of wildcat strikes, and so forth.

7. Require the full and accurate reporting of union finances and officers in the same manner as we require such reports from corporations.

8. Establish the labor-management-public conferences in Washington on a continuing basis rather than on a one-time basis.

9. Request of labor leaders that they themselves come forth with suggestions for legislation that will end the menace of strikes.

10. Amend the Sherman Antitrust Act so as to make labor organizations whose members are engaged in interstate commerce subject to that act.

Prohibit them from engaging in unreasonable restraints of trade, for example, those restraints designed to compel the hiring of useless labor, to prevent the use of cheaper materials, improved equipment, or more efficient methods.

I believe that if Lincoln were alive in the flesh today, he would stress to the American people the importance of keeping intact the constitutional American way of life, he would stress the importance of seeing to it that this house were not divided and the importance of maintaining our system of checks and balances so that no group could get a stranglehold on the liberties of the common man.

The Bible to Lincoln was a source of light, faith, and inspiration. Listen to his words: "I have been reading the Beatitudes and have at least one claim for the blessings there unfolded. It is the blessing promised on those who hunger and thirst after righteousness."

CONCLUSION

And so we have reviewed the ways in which our American house and our international house may be made to stand. We have seen the ways in which Abraham Lincoln, born 137 years ago, guides us as individuals and as a nation, and how his ideas and spirit can be made to guide the nations. He guides us toward our new emancipation.

It was his ideal, as it was the Master's, to help the meek to inherit the earth. It was Lincoln's ideal that the common people of all the earth—the builders, the sustainers—should truly come into their own.

Yes; the Lord loved Abraham Lincoln, for Lincoln loved the common people, and the Lord loves the common people. In that spirit let each of us carry on the unfinished work which lies before us.

The President's Wheat Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURTON K. WHEELER
OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 15 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram from M. W. Thatcher, president of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, with reference to the President's wheat program.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. BURTON K. WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.:

After discussing the President's wheat program for 2 days, and after hearing it explained by a representative of the United States Department of Agriculture, the annual convention of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, meeting at Chicago, February 8-9, wired the President the following message:

"The Federation represents over 500,000 cooperative grain farmers from the Canadian border to the Gulf, and from Ohio to the Pacific.

"To effectively handle the wheat emergency and make available the maximum amounts of food possible for other nations' needs, the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives believes there are some realistic requirements which must be immediately understood and met:

"1. The railroad transportation system is broken down so far as the immediate requirements are concerned. We, as practical operators, can demonstrate that fact.

"2. Transportation equipment exclusively directed to wheat to the exclusion of feed grains will defeat the wheat program because of spoilage from wet corn and other grains needed for the total feed program.

"3. More than half the wheat is on the farms; not enough wheat will move off the farms unless the future of ceiling prices and OPA is determined now.

"Too many farmers will not market both their inventory and the coming crop because of the income-tax burden which would fall upon them in 1 year. Farmers would loan wheat and feed grains to the Government if protected by a program to assure 90 percent of parity price and to permit the farmers to elect the year for price determination and sale."

Respectfully yours,
M. W. THATCHER,
President, National Federation of Grain Cooperatives.

Lincoln Day Banquet Address by Governor Martin, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 15 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an able address delivered by Maj. Gen. Edward Martin, Governor of Pennsylvania, at the annual Lincoln Day banquet held by Republican Members of Congress and the Women's Republican Club of the District of Columbia, at Washington, D. C., Thursday, February 7, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster and fellow Americans, in this time of critical and momentous decisions, it is appropriate to consider American policies at this Lincoln anniversary meeting. Abraham Lincoln more truly typifies our way of life than any other American. A Republican meeting is an appropriate place for such discussions, because under Republican Party leadership this Nation has made its greatest material, cultural, and spiritual progress.

Lincoln was born in poverty. He knew the value of work, tolerance, thrift, and persistence. He advocated equality of opportunity for every American. He urged everyone to acquire property. He took part in government. He was proud to be a politician. He suffered political disappointments, but he did not sulk. He believed in party discipline

Lincoln's place in history is secure, and the Republican Party needs no apology. His way of life and the accomplishments of our party are a great part of the real America. The greatest honor we can pay him is to strive for a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

To do this in a representative republic we must have two great political parties. If one becomes too powerful, the country may drift into dictatorship. Germany and Italy were examples of one-party government. With more than two parties, party responsibility is lost. France is an example of party paralysis.

Our parties have decided the great issues of the past: State rights; banks; central government; sound money; territorial expansion; slavery; free trade; imperialism; conservation; education; labor policies; taxation; the public debt; the Monroe Doctrine; the protective tariff; and a host of others.

Our political parties must again decide great issues. The Republican Party has always been the progressive party. Today, as the minority party and the "loyal opposition," it must again declare its position on the great issues of these times.

The preservation of freedom is the basic issue. America is a land of dreams. It has been so since the days of the first settlers. They came here to escape tyranny. They wanted to be free to work out their own destiny, to worship as their conscience dictated, and to govern themselves. They carved a government out of the rough to maintain certain inalienable rights. They have fought for these rights in their courthouses, in legislative halls, and on bloody battlefields. The story of America is the most dramatic story in history. We should recite it with pride and reverence, because freedom is costly. Millions have paid for it with blood.

There are great words in the story of the American Nation and its Government: independence; freedom; inalienable rights; the pursuit of happiness. They are sacred words. Wars have been fought to maintain them. Through the fabric of our laws runs a golden thread preserving the rights of the individual.

The word "liberal" once meant much to Americans, but its integrity has been destroyed by the blatant, breast-beating, rabble-rousing, tub-pounding politician, seeking votes at any cost. "Liberalism" once meant freedom. Today it is used by Communists, Socialists, and revolutionaries; and many so-called "liberals" would now extend government at the expense of individual liberty.

The Bill of Rights is the keystone in the arch of our liberties. Every attack upon it must be defeated. Legislation destroying property, the rights of the public, the right to work at the job of our choice; public grants and governmental subsidies—all these must be watched by the picket-posts of freedom.

The right to liberty and the pursuit of happiness is older and greater than those three great documents: the Magna Carta, the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution. It is a God-given right. Free governments are constituted to preserve it.

That is why religion is hated in dictator-ruled and communistic countries.

Strange doctrines are now being preached in the United States. They menace freedom. Discontent is being sown here as it was for generations in Europe. Ways are being opened here like the roads over which Hitler and Mussolini marched the people of the Old World to destruction and death.

Many politicians are playing with communism. They are playing with political death and national suicide. Communism teaches hatred. It rules by hate and raw force. It offers something for nothing until it gains control, and then sets its steel-shod boots upon the neck of the common man.

Are we following that pattern? We are now offering everybody something: lower taxes; higher wages; more subsidies; more profits. Are we trying to fool ourselves?

The Republican Party must face the threat to national financial solvency. We are told tax reduction is coming and the Budget will be balanced a year from now. We heard the same solemn announcements before the war. Year after year we saw the Budget swing further out of balance. Budgets can be balanced only by spending less money than we collect in taxes. Beware of fancy bookkeeping.

Germany and Italy started downward over the road of bad fiscal policy, and in the end led their people through the red gates of war.

As the party of loyal opposition, we must demand a sound fiscal policy, with a balanced Budget and an equitable tax system. We need a complete audit of the United States, for in 12 years the New Deal has spent at least $500,000,000,000. The records should be examined to see where this money went. The audit should be extended to social security, pump priming, public projects, and to the costs of the war itself. This was the people's money, and they are entitled to know how it was used.

There should also be an audit of all our commitments, actual and proposed, to the nations and the peoples of the world. How much have we loaned or given? How much do we propose to give and loan?

What is the reason for much of our trouble? It is the debt. Today it totals two hundred and seventy-five billions. It is the greatest debt in all history. Sixty billions of it existed before the war started—sixty billions spent on doubtful projects and huge Federal pay rolls.

What can be done? We can demand the swift demobilization of the huge army of Federal pay rollers. Senator BYRD says there are at least 2,000,000 surplus Federal employees, who are adding a burden of more than $5,000,000,000 a year. This is a terrific waste, in view of the fact that the entire cost of the Federal Government in any peacetime year prior to 1932 was less than four billions.

Tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect—that is still the New Deal formula.

We know it is bad. We know it is dangerous. We know that all expenses must be cut. We know we must start to liquidate that giant debt and stand as a solvent America in an insolvent world.

The Republican Party has another heavy responsibility. It must give a sense of direction and balance to American foreign policy. For years before World War II the New Deal muddled, sidestepped, and evaded on foreign policy. Its blundering diplomacy may now fumble away the peace. The present national administration has no battalion of direction.

We saw what happened before the war. We saw Mussolini move; Japan drive into China; Germany march into the Ruhr—but we did not get ready. We came down to Pearl Harbor unprepared. The people are entitled to know who blundered there, for an Army or a Navy may be defeated but there is no excuse for a surprise. After years of warning we came unready into battle, fighting for our lives almost barehanded.

Certainly we did a magnificent job after the war started. Certainly we organized and trained the greatest and best Army, Navy, and Air Force in the history of warfare. Certainly we fought all over the globe and destroyed the undefeated armies of the world.

After Pearl Harbor we did build 72,000 ships; 250,000 airplanes; 100,000 tanks; 3,400,000 motor cars. We did make 43,000,000,000 rounds of small ammunition; 17,000,000 rifles and pistols; 600,000 cannon; and 1,000,000,000 artillery projectiles.

But remember that much of this great undertaking could have been done, and should have been done, before the guns roared at Pearl Harbor. Remember, also, that it was done under the free competitive enterprise system, fostered and encouraged by the Republican Party for half a century, in a free land where men work in freedom at the job of their choice.

The Republican Party must guard against over-centralization. Our forefathers were farsighted. They feared centralized government. They set up plans for checks and balances to protect us against ourselves. They gave us three branches of government: legislative, executive, and judicial. They created three levels of government: local, State, and Federal. They tried to bring government closer to the people. They gave the citizens of each local unit power to govern themselves. As Republicans we must as a sacred duty maintain these wise checks and balances.

Republicans must deal with another and vital domestic problem. We eagerly seek the industrialization of all suitable sections of the country. This can b done gradually in the spirit of free enterprise. It cannot be done by Government direction, for Government cannot change the bases of industry without destroying the morale and the welfare of the worker. We cannot do it in the Russian way.

Nor can we deal with labor in the Russian way. Republicans have recognized that labor has three inherent and inseparable rights: the right to work where it chooses; the right to organize and bargain collectively; and the right to strike. The Republican Party should and will defend these rights.

We should encourage sympathy, understanding, confidence, and cooperation between employee and employer, and make Government the impartial friend of both. All organizations must be responsible organizations whose agreements are kept. Before employees and employers can join with Government in a national effort for production, prosperity, and good will, Congress must lay down a clear and definite labor policy. That policy must be based upon laws and not men.

In fixing wages we must never forget that the worker's savings at the end of the year are what count. The worker as well as the employer must have a profit.

Our tax programs must encourage risk capital. Taxes must be kept as low as possible. They are paid by the sweat of labor. Taxes are deducted from the gains of both labor and capital. Subsidies and grants are paid in taxes. They must be sparingly made.

We Republicans will remember that our Nation has earned world leadership. The war has shown that the American form of government and our way of life are the soundest in the history of organized nations. Dictatorships, limited monarchies, and parliamentary governments all failed to stop the savage drive of the Axis Powers to enslave the world.

America must assume leadership in the movement to insure world peace. That effort will require all the intellectual, material, and spiritual resources of the world's best nations. It must be based upon justice and righteous living. Its terms must be fully understood by the people of the contracting nations.

Material gains and new territory are not American objectives. We do seek the privilege of living in peace and good will in a friendly, liberty-loving family of nations. We do not demand that all groups accept the pattern of the American Republic, but we do insist that all war-breeding forms be eliminated.

"Spot assistance"—food for the hungry, clothing for the naked, and warmth and shelter for the unfortunate—must, of course, be given to the limit of our ability to give.

Loans of money and industrial goods must be made more guardedly. In the past we have helped nations and they have used that aid against us. These forms of foreign help must be scrutinized. The American people must know about these loans. They can be a cause of future disagreements, disruption, and conflict. The people should know the purposes, terms, and security of these advances. Before they are made we should know whether we have the money to loan and the rate of interest. We cannot remain solvent if we loan at an interest rate less than the money costs our taxpayers.

For the long pull, the best foreign aid is prosperous trade. Regardless of all the solemn nonsense of the economic morons, money and profit make the wheels go round, abroad as well as at home. World prosperity depends upon large-scale and profitable exchange of goods.

The Republican Party has always believed in world trade. It is a fact that the sound progress of commercial relationships among nations, as well as the industrial expansion of America, has always advanced under Republican administrations. Our party has always favored a trade policy giving all nations equal access to world markets.

In noncompetitive goods, which form two-thirds of normal trade, that is simple enough. It is not so simple in competitive goods.

Living standards must be considered. We cannot lower the living standard of American workmen and farmers. We hope to raise the living standards of other nations to our own level. We cannot do this by destroying our own economic stability.

In the field of foreign policy, America has not defined its intentions toward Germany and Japan. Our job in these conquered nations is to prevent future aggression, harness the energies and abilities of their people to useful purposes, which in the fullness of time will permit them—chastened and sobered—to reenter a friendly family of nations as full members.

Here again, as in all foreign relationships, our help must be spiritual as well as material; perhaps as much of one as the other. These demoralized people need inspiration as well as food, courage as much as coal, and guidance even more than cash.

It is time for action here at home. We must form our order of battle against the forces of regimentation and governmental control; against bureaus and commissions; against hundreds of thousands of political Federal employees; and against government by Executive order. Congress must again assert its full powers.

Free competitive enterprise, with the freedom of the individual, is at stake. The day of the political opportunist and patronage hunter must end or we can fail as a nation. It is a time for courage. The Republican Party can win in 1946, but it must stand for the old-fashioned American ideals of thrift, tolerance, hard work, and the love of God. It must be aggressively led and aggressively organized. It must be aggressively financed by all those who believe in its principles and value their liberties. The "dollars for freedom" program announced by Chairman Brownell today offers the opportunity to help in a great cause.

We can help make America solvent by hard work and common sense. It cannot be done

by planned economy that is planned by men who never earned a dollar. It takes more than planning to create wealth. It is created at the forge, in the mine, and in the fields by men with tools in their hands—by the bitter sweat of men's bodies and brains.

America has seen wealth created by men seeking work, making work, and finding work. It has seen men carrying the Bible, the rifle, and the axe carve a land of plenty out of the wilderness. That same spirit still lives.

The inalienable American right to the pursuit of happiness for which 12,000,000 men and women in uniform served and suffered is sacred. It must be preserved.

Every consideration must be given to the veteran and his dependents. Remember, he is the cream of the crop, the doer and producer of the future, and he will pay the greater part of the tax.

In the memory of Lincoln and of the more than 1,000,000 Americans who in all our wars have died that liberty might live, let us by humble, sincere, and thoughtful effort safeguard the ideals for which they perished.

The war that has ended was the worst catastrophe in the history of mankind. No other war approached it in magnitude. It was both the greatest effort and the greatest disaster in the annals of the world.

The scope, the accomplishments, and the unselfishness created by its terror and brutality have given America a mighty asset in the millions of fine, brave, and self-disciplined men and women who can be depended upon during these critical times. They know their America was a wilderness continent that has been made into a land of industry, plenty, culture, and good will. They know it is a land of deep religious convictions. They know it became great through free, competitive enterprise, and under the inalienable right of the individual to the pursuit of happiness.

These veterans want a land of opportunity. We all want a land of opportunity. We want a free and dynamic America. We can have it by all working together, through divine providence and under the Constitution.

Let us glory in American achievements. Let us keep the watch and avoid a surprise attack from within our gates.

America Alert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to have been present at an Americanism meeting sponsored by the American Legion Auxiliary of the District of Columbia on Lincoln's birthday. It was a most inspiring gathering. One of the speakers was Rear Adm. Robert B. Carney, USN, formerly chief of staff for Admiral Halsey. This fine officer thrilled the audience by the timeliness of his remarks. I include his address in full for all of it is pertinent to our problem of national defense in the postwar world:

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, and fellow veterans, I deem it a great privilege to be able to speak to this group of the American Legion. It was suggested that I might talk about the Pacific War, but, as I see it, the Pacific War has been settled, whereas the future holds all sorts of knotty problems which will require our best efforts and our undivided attention without wasting time admiring ourselves for the job we did on our recent enemies.

The dedication of a month to the contemplation of Americanism is timely and smart; and the self-dedication of the American Legion men and women to the task of making people Americanism-conscious should augur well for the future. I say "should" advisedly—the American Legion, with its great membership of proven patriots, can be a powerful instrument for good in this country, but those members are only people, and people today are beset on all sides by perplexities the like of which the world has never seen before. The American Legion and its auxiliaries can exert a powerful influence in channeling public opinion into lines of sound conclusion on this matter of Americanism, but that ideal can only be reached if the doctrines you preach are rooted in broad understanding and are free from any taint of narrow selfishness.

I would probably be forgiven if I came before you today advocating a big Navy, selling you a bill of goods on sea power, or telling you of the Navy's contribution to winning this war against the Axis. However, "Americanism as a topic appeals to me strongly as an American citizen, a taxpayer, a veteran of both World Wars, and one still vitally interested in the maintenance of the peace so recently begun (you will notice that I say nothing in the presence of Washingtonians about being a voter). I believe that if we can write some specifications for Americanism we can make progress toward constructing a yardstick for measuring the problems of the future in terms of our country's welfare. So instead of attempting a brass-hat lecture on sea power and big navies, I am going to explore this subject of Americanism to see if we can find a definition, or set of definitions, which will guide us in our future thinking; and wherever I bring the Navy into the discussion it will only be as a factor in the over-all picture—and, of course, as the subject about which I happen to be best informed.

With such an approach, then, the first thing to do is to define Americanism. Maybe we are inadvertently taking in a little too much territory, because the people of South America call themselves Americans, too. To the people down there we are North Americans; possibly this month should have been dedicated to "USA-ism." However, be that as it may, we know what we are talking about, so let's get on with the definition. "Americanism" is actually a creed or a code of citizens' duties, and for the purpose of a short discussion such as this, these duties divide themselves logically into three more or less geographical groups—internal, hemispherical, and global.

Internal Americanism comprises those convictions which relate to the form and expression of government, the Bill of Rights, the national economy, questions of prices and wages, inflation, labor and management, veterans' affairs, etc. These are questions in which you will be guided by your political and economic beliefs. And I will leave discussion of such matters to those better qualified to discuss them than I am. However, I have no such hesitancy with respect to hemispherical and global Americanism, for those two are inseparably bound up in our foreign policy and our willingness or unwillingness to back up—or back out of—our foreign policy commitments and obligations. The armed forces are an instrument of foreign policy, and so, as a member of the armed forces, I have a stake in external Americanism and some limited qualifications to discuss it.

There certainly can no longer be any doubt in the minds of thinking Americans that isolationism is a practical impossibility; whether we like it or not, we are vitally concerned in world-wide well-being and in any festering spots that threaten the health of the world community; we are up to our necks in world affairs and world politics. Now, what are some of the world problems which vitally affect us and about which we, as Americans, will have to make decisions? Let me list a few of them.

(a) Policing our defeated enemies.

(b) National security and such related questions as bases, trusteeship, etc.

(c) Promoting future peace and curbing frictions which might lead to further armed struggles.

(d) The United Nations Organization as mankind's greatest hope for future peace and security.

(e) The atomic bomb and its implications for the future; these, and matters like them, are typical of the problems with which our country is confronted now and will be called upon to consider in the future; and because our country is a democracy, our Government will eventually act in accordance with the will of the people. If the people are well-informed and think clearly in terms of good Americanism, our solutions to these problems will be good—if our people are ill-informed, or indifferent, or selfish, the over-all results will be detrimental or even dangerous to the United States.

Let me very briefly subject these problems to the Americanism test: First, the policing of our defeated enemies. On this point we need the ladies' support for a special plank in the Americanism platform—I am probably rushing in where even General Eisenhower fears to tread, but I am going to risk it. A large number of unfortunate devils are going to have to occupy Germany and Japan and other overseas areas to look out for our postwar interests; thousands of Navy officers and men will have to bear with the burden of overseas service. These things must be done or we will sacrifice the goals and gains we fought for; we will lose our place as a strong but beneficent world leader; we will get pushed around as we were before the last war—and, in our ultimate resentment of being pushed around, we will get embroiled again just as sure as death and taxes. Now, the women of this country can do great good or great harm, depending on their attitude toward postwar overseas activities. It seems to me that American women, believing in the practice of Americanism, can prove that belief by at least refraining from any insistence on unsafe reduction of our overseas forces.

Any thinking American knows that there is a deep-seated American distaste for large standing armies—the aversion is rooted in the very reasons for the first colonizations of North America. Good United States citizens gladly take up arms in times of national peril, but when the danger is passed they passionately want to return to their normal civil pursuits; this is so, this is a fact, and yet some modification of this concept now seems necessary if the United States is to fulfill the overseas obligations it has incurred. A streamlined, modernized Americanism must replace the Americanism of 100 years ago just as modern Supreme Court interpretations of the Constitution have given legal recognition to many accomplished changes in the American picture. I believe that in this new era Americanism must sponsor a greater military establishment and one which may normally expect to endure a new and hard obligation of citizenship: the obligation of foreign service in support of vital United States policies.

If we as a people cannot stomach a new concept of a larger United States Army doing prolonged foreign occupation and garrison duty, possibly we might extend our traditional acceptance of the idea that it is the duty of the Marine Corps to guard United States' interests abroad. That would be nothing new nor startling to the marines and would only involve the authorization of a larger Marine Corps.

I merely throw that one into the pot as something to think about.

Another problem is Americanism—and the next in immediate urgency as I see it, is that

of national security, which is something that cannot wait. Into the big design of national security we must weave the lesser designs of potential threats, of the composition and size of our armed forces, of overseas and other external bases, of trusteeships, and of the whole subject of collective security. From a practical standpoint we need not worry at the moment about any threatening sea power. There simply is no existing sea power which threatens our safety at the moment; and because there is no sea power which threatens us, we can also eliminate any momentary threat of invasion of our shores; we might be vulnerable to some extent from the air, and the specter of the atomic bomb has all hands worried, but it is most unlikely that any nation could gain a decision over us even with atomic bombs in the course of the next few months at least. These things all point to the fact that for the moment we can retain some reasonable part of our wartime strength and be safe while we are sizing up the world situation—and that is virtually what is being done.

There does not seem to be any possible source of immediate danger to us from the direction of the Atlantic, but the Pacific does present problems; this last war proved that only the United States can amass and project the forces necessary to keep the Pacific pacified, so for our own security, and for the good of the world, it is our obligation to maintain sufficient strength in the Pacific to keep it under control. Any military man—even the most rabid exponent of aviation—will say that adequate bases are necessary for the extended operation of our forces in the Pacific, and therefore these matters of bases and trusteeships are of vital interest to the United States, and it is our moral and bounden duty to make sure that we retain the necessary rights to such bases without any possibility of interference from outside sources; this may not be idealism but it is sound Americanism, and if we do not stick by our guns in this matter we are not profiting by the agonies of 1942, 1943, and 1944.

Moving on from the matter of immediate security, we logically come to the consideration of ways and means to curb frictions which might lead to further armed struggles and thereby disturb the peace of the world. The means at our disposal include diplomacy, moral persuasion, the use of our prestige as a lever, and the offices of a worldwide organization. Diplomacy and persuasion will work just as long as we can make the other fellows see it our way, and it is regrettable but true that many powerful groups in this world are only impressed by strength and the conviction that such strength may be used against them; therefore, until there is a world organization that can keep things under control, we must rely on the prestige inherent in our strength. Men of good faith from all parts of the world met last summer in San Francisco to draft the beginnings of a decent, righteous, and effective world organization. The nations of the world endorsed the principle, and we are watching the birth pangs of the UNO today. If there is to be any escape from pure jungle law in this world it must be through the UNO as mankind's one real hope for enduring peace and security. But in the meantime, if we completely tear down our military structure we leave ourselves not only in a helpless position but also distrusted even by our allies because they doubt our ability to back up our beliefs—in other words precipitate disarmament can actually create doubt and suspicion rather than allay them.

Now then, with these things in mind, Americanism points clearly to a wholehearted backing of the United Nations Organization and, as an absolutely essential corollary, to the maintenance of sufficient force to lend weight to our policies—and to a willingness to apply that force, as a last resort. In its early trials, the UNO may or may not succeed in all of its aims but that is most certainly no reason for condemning the ideal; no such organization can spring full-grown from its cradle—if it is to grow to vigorous maturity it must be fed, exercised, and nurtured like any other organism—it must try its wings and must grow in wisdom through profiting by its own efforts and its successes and mistakes. Specifically then, Americanism would seem to obligate us to standing firm on American convictions, to wholeheartedly supporting UNO, to refusing to be stampeded into appeasement, to living up to our commitments and insisting that others do likewise, and to maintaining the necessary strength to lend convincing support to our policies.

And who knows better than the legionnaires that strength is a universally understood language, and weakness an invitation to trouble?

As to the atomic bomb and its implications for the future, in a few minutes I will offer some ideas and comments on the Navy in the postwar era and at the same time will offer some ideas concerning the atomic bomb. For the moment, suffice it to say that the atomic bomb is being introduced as a factor in many of our current problems, and public opinion is being confused by a great many unsupported statements and arguments on the subject. About all we can do at the moment is to throw out any claim or statement that is not supported by clear and factual reasoning in order that our ultimate policies concerning this vital new factor may be logical and workable.

Summarizing then, with respect to global Americanism, it seems to me that our duty will be defined by security needs, by the tenets of civilized decency, by enlightened self-interest, by self-respect, and by dignified pride in our achievements and our righteous strength. The external problems that can arise are innumerable, but honest adherence to these beliefs should do much toward keeping our feet in a safe and honorable path.

Now let me touch briefly on hemispherical Americanism. The need for Western Hemisphere Americanism is so obvious that it is almost an insult to good intelligence to advocate it. In the first place, the prime requisite of security demands that no dangerous force or movement be allowed to gain any foothold in the Western Hemisphere; for that reason, if for no other, it is imperative that there be a Western Hemisphere solidarity founded in mutual understanding and trust. Such obvious benefits as brisk and profitable trade, and the good satisfaction of liking and being liked by one's neighbors should require no sales talk and are the best arguments for prolonged peace. But from time to time irritations are bound to creep into the Western Hemisphere picture—ideological irritations such as trouble our relations with the Argentine—boundary disputes—trade problems and problems of finance—the natural differences of viewpoint to be expected in discussions between peoples of quite different temperament and national origins. But, after all, these are just normal phases of human relations and none are insuperable. And in this business in keeping things peaceful and profitable in the Western Hemisphere we discover the pleasant fact that for once enlightened self-interest and sensible altruism are one and the same thing and do not conflict.

You will see much in the daily papers about Canada, Mexico, Central America, and South America, and as United States citizens you cannot better serve true Americanism than by exerting your influence toward genuine tolerance, mutual understanding, and fairness, for therein lies our greatest assurance that this stronghold of our fiercely guarded democracy will be impregnable.

Speaking of getting acquainted with our neighbors, I have the feeling that the greatest single factor in really getting acquainted would be a good motor route from Canada to Cape Horn. We are an itchy-footed lot—we love to go places—we are not the least impressed by distances as long as there is a good road and a car that runs. If we could hop into the car and drive to Rio or Santiago it wouldn't be long before we were on first-name terms with our neighbors to the south. Of course, we might squabble a bit—that would be natural between Yanks and Latins—but eventually we would come to understand each other, and real friendships would grow out of social and business contacts. That highway idea makes sense to me as a factor in bringing all of the Western Hemisphere peoples to a common belief in a common Americanism.

So far I have said little about the Navy or the other armed forces in the postwar picture. Instead, I have talked about your project—Americanism. Now I find that if I am to discuss my own pet subject—the postwar Navy—then my thoughts on that subject, too, must be shaped in terms of Americanism.

The subject of postwar armaments is a vast and complex study, but at least we can high-light some of the chief problems if you will bear with me a few minutes longer.

Let me go back into the past for a few moments as the best way to explain how we figure what we need at any time in the way of armed forces.

Back in the 1930's the Navy had worked out elaborate war plans designed to cope with each and every major country, or combination of countries, which might conceivably clash with the United States to the extent to resorting to war. Of course, enemy action is usually not wholly predictable, and degrees of success or failure cannot be forecast over a very long period, so practical planning could only go just so far, making the best possible provision for foreseeable events. The later phases of a long war must be planned after war starts and the situation can be better sized up. So it was in, say, 1935; we had a plan in case Japan attacked us. Much of that plan proved to be good and much had to be changed or scrapped. The Army planning was done under a peculiar handicap because at that time to plan another AEF would have virtually been a crime—and most certainly cause for an investigation.

In 1945 we had the forces and techniques for subduing our enemies. By July 1945 we knew what it took to defeat those enemies and in the case of the Navy the emphasis was on the submarine, antisubmarine measures, the carrier air forces, and the weird and terrible amphibious steam roller. Then a new and more awe-inspiring weapon than the world had ever seen before burst on the scene in August 1945—the atomic bombs over Hiroshima and Nagasaki—and all our calculations and future planning were profoundly affected.

Now then, in 1946, how shall we plan an armed force and its employment? Although the world is in a state of unsettled transition, as I have told you, there is no immediate threat to the actual safety of our continental shores. So we make some stop-gap plans for the present, and we begin a close study of foreign policy trends and of the nations and combinations of the nations with which we can conceivably come into disagreement, and we will make plans under each foreseeable contingency.

As Admiral Nimitz has announced, the Navy has already moved to modernize its organization in accordance with lessons learned and geared to progressiveness, research, and rapid developments. As you know, the Navy is planning exhaustive examination into the possibilities of the atomic bomb, and this summer will conduct the first experiments on a vast and unprecedented scale. In other words, the Navy, during this period of comparative safety, is conditioning itself for the future.

I wish to empnasize the fact that the Navy is taking a cold, open-minded, and judicious attitude toward the atomic bomb, and it might well behoove some of our armchair strategists to adopt the same reserved attitude. We read every day where "The atomic bomb has rendered navies obsolete"; "We want to know just how obsolete the Navy is"; "The next war will be won and lost in the first round"; and similar pronouncements in tones of ominous finality. One scientist recently said that the Navy's scheme of spreading ships all over Bikini atoll would prove nothing because they were so widely scattered. Obviously he did not know that great fleet cruising dispositions covered many square miles at sea. Or possibly he wants them all bunched up, Pearl Harbor style, to prove by their destruction that ships are washed up. You might just as well say that houses are obsolete, or soldiers, or the air planes that sit on airfields between missions. I think we had all better await the outcome of the tests, military men, John Q. Public, and the commentators alike, before laying any bets on the line.

One thing seems certain: Until all peacetime and wartime commerce, travel, and traffic becomes exclusively air-borne, the sea will be used by ships—ships vulnerable to enemy submarines, enemy guns, enemy air attack—ships that must be defended, and by what? Rather obviously, by a navy designed, built, manned, and trained to secure the use of the sea for our side and deny its use to the enemy. It may be a navy having many of the old familiar types, or it may be a Buck Rogers affair; time alone will answer that one; but until the ocean is useless to us and to our enemies, we will need a navy.

Perhaps by 1947 or 1948 our armed-force needs will be discernible, but it would be boyish optimism to predict that they would be clear. Each of the vital questions will be batted around in the press and on the radio; smart patriots, misguided patriots, and speakers of doubtful allegiance will air their views. Isolationists and their opponents will argue; the do-gooders will undoubtedly preach some brand of disarmament; the professional military men will beg for appropriations and other groups will endeavor to divert the money to their own pet projects. Nevertheless, by 1947 or 1948 we may know just how far we can depend on the UNO Security Council to police the world; and if it still looks as though we must be ready to protect ourselves in the clinches, we should be able to figure pretty closely what nations or combinations of nations could conceivably be hostile to us in the course of the next decade; and, consequently, we will be able, by evaluating their strength and intentions, to figure just about how much Army, Navy, and Air Force we should keep on hand to prevent an early defeat, and how much we would ultimately need to secure the final victory. These questions will be translated into terms of ships, planes, equipment, and personnel by the various planning groups, and the military departments will go before Congress and ask for the necessary authorizations and appropriations to guarantee the Military Establishments needed for our safety and success. You will have to listen closely to the pros and cons—you will have to weed out the arguments of the crackpots from the logic of the trained thinkers—and on your judgment may rest the fate of the United States, because it will be your judgment, the judgment of the people, which will find expression in the final action by the Congress.

No, my friends; it won't be easy to sort out the right answers, but a group dedicated to Americanism can be counted on to seek the right answers, and it will be every citizen's duty to try to sift out and support the projects that will further true Americanism at home and abroad.

Finally, at the risk of being repetitious, let us take one last look at a definition of Americanism in the light of the things we have considered here tonight. In its simplest terms we could say that wise Americanism is that policy which finishes the job on our Axis enemies; which furthers peace by lending our weight to UNO; which maintains an armed strength and prestige great enough to impress those who are only impressed by strength and the fear that it will be used; which stamps out in the Western Hemisphere any ideology or movement that threatens the way we choose to live in this hemisphere; which furthers mutual trust among all American peoples; which properly safeguards our commitments and our justified interests abroad; and which is constantly alert to counteract blind, dangerous, and un-American selfishness and bigotry from within. Virtually every project can be given the Americanism test by asking, "Does it do these things or does it violate any of these policies which I believe to be the foundation of Americanism?"

Without a gift for looking into the future, none of us can dedicate ourselves in much more detail than that, because, like the practical war-planners and tacticians, we cannot predict enemy reactions (in this case, trends harmful to our country's well being) very far in advance. We can only learn the good, basic principles, think and speak honestly and fearlessly, and be ever on the alert. The record is not too encouraging in this matter of profiting by our mistakes, but maybe we Americans have learned something this time—and certainly the American Legion and other organizations of unquestionably patriotic and democratic convictions can render a great service to the United States and to mankind, by helping to shape and guide public opinion into channels of sound, decent, and workable Americanism.

The Wheat Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 15 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address on the subject of the wheat shortage, delivered by Gordon Roth, director of public relations, Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, on February 3, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening from GTA.

There is talk in the papers about bread rationing—talk about a flour shortage and a black-bread diet for the American people. And at the same time there are the prayers for wheat from starving millions of people in Europe and Asia and Africa—prayers that America may "give them this day their daily bread." The people in those countries need 37,000,000 bushels of wheat a month to carry them through the year.

Now, that sounds pretty gloomy. It sounds as though you will not have enough to eat in this country. Bread has been a symbol of our abundance of food, that 10-cent loaf of bread you get at the grocery store, or the bread you bake in the oven at home, bread that you take for granted, but that millions of people in other parts of the world are begging for. The thing for us to do is to try and understand what this talk about shortages of wheat is all about. How serious is it—this shortage of wheat? Can we believe all that we read? And if we cannot, what can we believe?

Let us get at the facts. If there is stupidity, let us root it out. If there is confusion, let us correct it. If there is selfishness, let us expose it. The first thing that you should know is how much wheat there is in the country. After you know that, the next question follows: Is there enough? Right now there are about 600,000,000 bushels of wheat still on the farms and in the elevators in the United States. That is what the Government says—600,000,000 bushels of wheat to carry us to July 1 when the winter wheat crop moves to market.

Now, for the next question: How much wheat do we need until then? Here is the answer: We need about 200,000,000 bushels for flour here at home. Then we need about 150,000,000 bushels to export. That wheat will go to feed people in other parts of the world. Then we also need to plant spring wheat. It will take about 40,000,000 to 50,000,000 bushels to put in the 1946 spring crop. That adds up to 400,000,000 bushels of wheat. So when you subtract 400,000,000 from 600,000,000 bushels, you get 200,000,000 bushels left over. That is what is called a carry-over—200,00,000 bushels of wheat on hand next July 1 when the winter wheat crop starts to move into market.

That is a good supply. All the people talk about supply and demand. You know that law—that the supply on hand decides what the demand is, and the demand decides what the price is. Well, right here we have a supply and demand that just about balances each other. But what happens? Nobody seems to like it. The millers do not like it. The exporters do not like it. None of the buyers like it. But the farmers do. About once in every 50 years the farmers get a good price. That price is good because there is a heavy demand and the farmer has a crop to sell. Funny, isn't it? When supply and demand works, nobody likes it. It is only something good when it is used as an argument to support low prices. The wheat is here, but the catch is that nobody can get it. The farmers are not selling enough of it, and even when there is wheat for sale the railroads are unable to move it fast enough.

Now, all this scare talk about bread rationing and black bread and not enough wheat started this way. The Government needs wheat to export to keep people from starving. The mills need wheat, too. The Government has first call on the wheat. That means the mills must cut their inventories—that is, cut down the supply of wheat in their elevators to a couple weeks or a month. That is one plan. The other plan is to make the millers use more of the wheat in grinding flour. Right now the mills use about 72 percent of the wheat. The Government wants the mills to grind 85 percent of the wheat berry into flour. It would be a coarser flour and not so white. Of course, if the mills used 85 percent of the wheat instead of 72 percent, they could get about 13 percent more flour out of each bushel of wheat. On the face of that you would say, "Go ahead; why not do it that way, then?" But it is not as simple as that. In the first place, you would not save any wheat. You would get more flour out of each bushel, that is, but the amount of "red dog," the coarse flour that goes into feed, would be cut down. So you have more flour, but less feed.

And the millers point out, with some logic, that to change from a 72- to an 85-percent flour, means that the bolting sheets which sift the flour must be all changed. Their processing and grinding operations must be changed. And, of course, the bakers would set up a howl. They have got their ways of baking bread, and a different kind of flour would mean that they would have to make changes. And then, of course, the public would set up a howl. Maybe you and I

wouldn't but a lot of people would. Remember what a howl went up in the war when the Government put a stop to ready-sliced bread? You would have thought that our whole civilization collapsed because you had to slice your bread at home instead of getting it ready-sliced. And so, besides all the inconveniences, you can bet your bottom dollar that this plan would be a terrible political blunder. Men have been beaten for office on things less important than changing the color of bread. If you think that is funny, then you do not know your Congressmen.

But here we are—we have the wheat—then why is there a scarcity? The answer is in the following telegram we want to read you. It was sent to President Truman, Secretary of Agriculture Anderson, Secretary of Commerce Wallace, and several key Senators. It was sent by M. W. Thatcher, speaking as president of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives. It is a fighting telegram and one that calls for a showdown. GTA is on the warpath against the blunderbusses in Congress. The telegram was sent today after 3 days of conferences and phone calls with Washington officials and representatives of the grain and milling industry and officers of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives. I am now quoting from the telegram:

"There is a wheat problem, but not one that calls for bread rationing or for use of more wheat in flour, which admittedly would be a coarser and darker flour. Based on the United States Department of Agriculture's figures of January 1, 1946, we had 689,000,000 bushels of wheat on hand. A new wheat crop will pour into market after July 1. Present indications are for at least 700,000,000 bushels of winter wheat. There will be a heavy spring wheat acreage.

"Allowing for a January disappearance of 89,000,000 bushels, we will need up to July 1 no more than 200,000,000 bushels for flour, and 50,000,000 bushels for spring wheat seeding and miscellaneous farm use. This would leave 350,000,000 bushels of present stocks for export, carry-over, and livestock feeding. It would be better to stop feeding wheat than to ask flour mills and bakeries and consumers to adapt themselves to a new product, with all the changes necessary to make a straight run of flour, using 85 percent of the wheat instead of the normal 72 percent. The public and the processors would resist these far-reaching changes.

"Farmers will move the wheat to town and sell it if they are given parity treatment. Farmers know that Congress is in doubt about extending the OPA price control law. That makes farmers doubt that it is wise to sell wheat under present ceilings. Farmers know that on July 1 there will be a big increase in wheat prices if Congress does not extend the OPA law for another year.

"Farmers have the same intelligence as business people who have been and are withholding merchandise for the much higher prices which they hope will be realized either through dropping of OPA or through making exceptions as, for example, in the steel industry. Farmers also know that with wage levels in the process of rising, eventually such increases will be reflected in a new and higher parity price, which under law will force the OPA to lift present ceilings on all farm prices.

"From the standpoint of price, the farmer sees about every advantage in not marketing wheat now. He is not going to succumb alone to any patriotic call when he sees the United States Steel Corp., and General Motors Corp., and others getting away with theirs.

"The farmer feels that all he has to do is wait.

"Another point: the farmer is accustomed to carrying an inventory of wheat on his farm. It is his ever-normal granary and his base money supply. Not for patriotism alone does he intend to market this year both his present inventory and also his new wheat crop. He would then be compelled to pay a 2-year or double income tax.

"In brief, he is not a fool. He intends to be treated as well as other groups in the economy of the Nation, even if he is the most patriotic. He as much as any other person wants to see wheat shipped to the starving people in other parts of the world.

"But the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives cannot honestly urge its wheat-producing members to market their wheat so long as the wheat farmer is at a disadvantage as regards ceilings and double taxation.

"If the farmer knew now what wheat ceiling prices would be until July 1, 1947, and if he could be relieved of double taxation from marketing two crops in the same year, and if he could be assured that he would not be subject to a third tax by the repeal of laws protecting his marketing cooperatives—as advocated by the National Tax Equality Association—then we would be on sound ground to ring the bell of patriotism and save the starving families abroad.

"Further, if all these economic disadvantages were corrected, there is still a transportation break-down, not only from lack of boxcars but from disorganization on the railroads. Now the movement of cars just from the Dakotas to Minnesota frequently takes weeks.

"We want to emphasize that you can get wheat for export without upsetting the operations of flour mills and bakeries or changing the food habits of consumers if you act now on these three problems:

"First. Give us boxcars and transportation facilities that will work and move the wheat.

"Second. Decide now, one way or the other, on the future of OPA and price ceilings for 1946–47.

"Third. Protect the farmer against double and triple taxation.

"If and when these three needs are met, the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives and the general farm organizations will advise farmers to move their wheat off the farms.

"People all over the Nation are now questioning the political integrity and economic sense of both the Congress and the Administration. This problem of wheat is not in the hands of the millers or the bakers or the farmers. It is in the hands of the Congress and the administration.

"We have called a meeting of our grain cooperatives in Chicago on February 8 and 9 and have called officials from the United States Department of Agriculture to confer with us. We also are inviting, through this wire, the chairmen of the House and Senate Committees on Agriculture to be with us in Chicago.

"Our National Federation of Grain Cooperatives is comprised of the regional grain cooperatives from Ohio to the Pacific Northwest, and from the Canadian border to the Gulf of Mexico. Its annual handle of grain is close to 400,000,000 bushels a year. Most of the farmers who own these cooperatives also are members of the Farm Bureau, the Farmers Union, or the Grange. Thus you can rest assured that you can have the solid mobilized support of agriculture to move the wheat that is needed if the Congress and the administration will just move first.

"Respectfully submitted.

"M. W. THATCHER,
"President, National Federation of Grain Cooperatives."

That is the blunt, forthright telegram that Mr. Thatcher sent in the name of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives to the President of the United States, to two of his Cabinet officers, and to key Members of the United States Senate.

Now the Federation is following up with an emergency meeting. The meeting will be held in Chicago this Friday and Saturday. Represented at that meeting will be cooperatives that handle almost 400,000,000 bushels of grain a year. They will sit down to make plans to get that wheat moving. Government men, whose job it is to help move the wheat, have been invited to attend.

Certainly the plea, the fervent prayer of millions of people in Europe today, is the prayer for wheat—"give us this day our daily bread." America cannot fail them.

Good evening, and we ask you to remember that GTA is the co-op way.

Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 15 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Robert Lasch appearing in the Chicago Sun, February 11, 1946, dealing with the organized fight being waged by the drug industry against the Wagner-Murray-Dingell health insurance bill.

The drug manufacturers seem to regard this legislation as opposed to the welfare of the drug industry. The theory, apparently, is that the improved health of the Nation would mean serious curtailment in the manufacture and sale of drugs, and therefore they want to preserve the status quo.

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

DRUG MAKERS WAGING FIGHT ON HEALTH INSURANCE; WHY?

One of the best arguments I have yet seen for the health-insurance plan proposed by President Truman fell into my hands last week.

The plan, embodied in the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, would set up a new method of paying for medical care. Some people call it "socialized medicine," but that term has little meaning. The bill provides for weekly contributions by workers and employers to a national health-insurance fund. Out of this fund the Social Security Board would pay the doctor and hospital bills, with suitable limitations, of insured workers and their families.

The result would be a tremendous improvement in the distribution of medical care. Communities and low-income families which now lack adequate care could get it under health insurance. For every insured family, the financial burden of sickness, which is often concentrated and unexpected, would be spread over a long period. Hospital facilities would be enlarged and multiplied. Group practice would be encouraged, and doctors who now tend to congregate in the large cities where incomes are highest would be induced to practice in small towns and rural areas which under the present system must go without adequate service. A long-run improvement in the national health is an almost certain consequence of the change.

A REASON TO CHANGE

It is a strong reason to make the change when we find the drug and pharmaceutical industry waging an organized pressure campaign against it.

The drug industry, if it were interested in national health rather than profits, would

have no special incentive to oppose the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill. How patients pay their doctor bills is no concern of the drug manufacturer and dealer. Their business is to sell drugs and medicines.

Yet when you go into a drug store nowadays you are almost sure to see a pile of pamphlets entitled "Political Medicine." This tract, published by the so-called National Physicians Committee for the Extension of Medical Service, contains a vicious and unprincipled attack on the national health-insurance plan. It is full of misstatements, distortions, and exaggerations.

Not only the druggists, but the entire pharmaceutical industry has been organized to attack the health-insurance plan. For example, the salesmen for Abbott Laboratories last month were busily spreading the word. They had instructions to visit 10 persons every day for 10 days, asking each, on the chain principle, to make 10 other contacts. The objective, as Abbott Laboratories told their salesmen, was to "roll up a blizzard of a half million or more" communications to Congress against the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill. Abbott Laboratories called the campaign "a constructive contribution to the welfare of the industry and to the American way of life."

MAJORITY VOICE NEEDED

What is the welfare of the drug industry? Does it conflict with the improved national health which is the goal of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill? Would the sales of medicine, and the habit of self-medication which contributes to those sales, be impaired by a health-insurance system which makes good medical care more readily accessible to the people? If so, then this is the best of all possible reasons for inaugurating health insurance.

There is no question that the drug manufacturers, the druggists, and the doctors have a perfect right to register their opposition to the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill. But the people who would benefit from the bill, which means the great majority of the working population, should take note of this carefully organized effort to preserve the status quo in the practice of medicine. If the money and sales organizations of the drug companies can produce a "blizzard" of messages to Congress against health insurance, the unorganized people who favor the bill should bring off a blizzard of their own.

According to a survey by the National Opinion Research Center, 82 percent of the American people think something should be done to make it easier for people to get medical care when they need it, and 68 percent think it would be a good idea for social security to cover doctor and hospital care. This majority must make its voice heard above that of the organized minority.

How OPA Paralyzes Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. VORYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 15, 1946

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks earlier today I referred to a letter I have received from Mr. E. C. Raney, president and general manager of Ranco, a company in Columbus, Ohio, manufacturing the highest quality controls for heating, ventilating, and air conditioning. I have secured leave to extend this letter in full in the RECORD.

When I was home during the recess I talked with Mr. Raney and he analyzed for me the specific problems which his company is facing, caused by OPA. His problem was so typical, and his analysis was so interesting, that I urged him to write me a letter telling the full story.

Mr. Bowles has been so notoriously blind and deaf to the pleas of the practical manufacturer that I felt it would be useless to send him Mr. Raney's letter. I heard, and hoped, that Mr. Bowles might be going out of OPA and I thought it might be better to send the letter to his successor. Within the last 24 hours I have learned with dismay that Mr. Bowles is to be Economic Stabilizer, with even greater power, and that Mr. Paul Porter is to come in under him as head of OPA. I have read over carefully the President's Executive order and can spell out no relief from its verbiage for old-line manufacturers who are not having labor troubles. This order probably gives Mr. Porter sufficient discretion to correct this situation, for bureaucratic discretion is sprinkled throughout the order. There is nothing in Mr. Porter's background that shows that he knows anything at all about prices and production and manufacturers' problems, but I am hoping for the best, and wishing him well, and am sending him this letter which shows how OPA is paralyzing production. It does not state a unique situation, but a typical situation, which is probably familiar to every Member of this House.

HON. JOHN M. VORYS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VORYS: As a Member of our Congress, I feel that you should be interested in knowing how we in industry are progressing under the present OPA's so-called price control.

As a matter of background our company, Ranco Inc., has been in business since 1913, and since 1926 has been engaged in the development and manufacture of thermostatic controls for refrigerators; in the last 2 years, prior to the beginning of the war in 1941, we were also providing thermostatic controls for automobile heaters.

During the time we were engaged in manufacturing refrigerator controls prior to the war, we made constant improvements in methods of production so that the cost of our product to the customer in 1941 was only 20 percent of what the manufacturers were paying for thermostatic controls when we started the manufacture of refrigeration controls. We believe that this was typical of the contributions which have been made by large numbers of manufacturers in the refrigeration industry and was responsible for the cost of electrical refrigeration being brought down so that domestic refrigerators were in reach of practically everyone.

At the same time, we were reducing costs by engineering developments and new production methods, we were also increasing the wages and salaries of our employees so that in 1941 we had established wage rates and prices which now make our situation a very difficult one to solve. The cost of the materials which we use in our refrigerators since the start of the war has risen greatly and different items which enter into our production now cost us anywhere from 10 percent to 100 percent more than they did in 1941.

We have also granted our employees wage increases between 1941 and the present time so that our total manufacturing cost is now more than 30 percent higher than in 1941, while our selling prices have only been permitted, under OPA price control, an advance of 5 percent.

In addition to the higher wages and salaries we are paying, our production efficiency is now greatly reduced and it now takes more than 1,000 employees to produce as much volume of the same items as was produced by 700 employees in 1941. In simple arithmetic, on the net sales for the 3 months, September, October, and November, 1945, our operating deficit is approximately $200,000 on total sales of less than $800,000.

There seems to be a general impression in Washington, particularly in the OPA, that manufacturers like ourselves will be able to get back into peacetime production on a profitable basis at the old prices, due to the things the OPA seems to think we learned about production during the war. As a matter of fact, there was nothing which we learned during the war which has enabled us to reduce our costs in the slightest degree, due to the fact that we had already spent about 20 years of development in cost reduction on these items, and there is simply no possibility of effecting any immediate reductions that will enable us to break even on costs, let alone make a profit. The production rate at which we are now operating is comparable to that before the war, so that we cannot look forward to an increase in production great enough to cure our difficulties.

A great many manufacturers like ourselves showed some remarkable cost reductions on producing war materials, but this was due to the fact that these items had never before been produced in large quantities nor large production mass technique applied to them prior to the war. It was the technique that industry already had developed on other mass production which enabled them to turn these techniques to such tremendous advantage in building war materials at lower costs.

Speaking for our own concern, and I am sure this was duplicated by hundreds of other companies, we developed and built gages for the Army Air Forces which had been sold in small quantities and produced without the benefit of any tooling and mass production technique at prices as high as $175 to the Air Corps; but on our contracts to the Air Corps we started off with prices under $50 and as we progressed through the war we made voluntary reductions to the Air Forces from time to time so that at the end of the war we were producing these same instruments at a profit, and selling to the Government at around $20. However, if we were to continue producing these same instruments over a period of years, further cost reduction could not be expected in the same proportion that was made in the early months of our production, and if we had not had experience in mass production prior to the war I am sure that this record could not have been achieved because we simply applied techniques with which we were familiar to the production of these new devices.

I think it absolutely out of the question to think that any of the manufacturers who had done a good job of reducing prices up to 1941 and who were operating in a highly competitive market can be expected today to produce the prewar items at any ways near the prewar costs, due to the fact that so many uncontrolled items of cost have entered into present-day manufacture.

It seems to us that the only thing that has remained constant in our case is the OPA idea of "price freeze" instead of "price regulation."

On many of the items which we now purchase for our products the vendor from whom we purchased these items prior to the war can no longer supply them to us at the old cost; and wherever OPA prices are still effective it is absolutely necessary for us to find new sources of supply, and these new sources do not have to abide by any prewar price

fixing. As an illustration, we buy large quantities of bakelite moldings which are made on our own tools. The original suppliers cannot make these at the old prices because their labor and materials have increased, and as a result they tell us to take our tools elsewhere. When we do this, the new molder who never made the part before has no price restriction and is free to increase prices to us so as to cover his cost and make a profit.

Another item is regarding tools which we purchase when we are having new tools made. There is no OPA limitation on these tools, so that we have to buy at a much higher price than we formerly did. In the matter of machines, such as punch presses, of which we use a large number, we cannot get delivery from the old manufacturers because of OPA price regulation, but newcomers in the field are permitted to charge any price they may see fit, and we have been quoted as much as $3,000 for machines which were formerly purchased for $1,000 or less. We cannot see how this sort of price regulation is or can prevent inflation. As a matter of fact, inflation is all about us, and, except for individuals who refuse to see and believe, we are all aware of this inflation.

It seems to me that since inflation exists, the price control should be either honestly and fairly administered or else abandoned entirely.

We have no quarrel with the general idea of price control during the war, but we feel that the administration of price control has failed entirely to carry out the intent of the Price Control Act, and we strongly feel that we should have either complete abandonment of price control or a new set-up for administering the existing laws so that selling prices can be made consistent with costs.

The present series of strikes and the Government's approval of wage increase will mean financial ruin to thousands of manufacturers unless prices are adjusted all the way across the board to take the increased costs into consideration. Washington will have to make up its mind whether we have industry bankruptcy or sane price and wage regulation.

Very truly yours,

RANCO, INC.,
E. C. RANEY,
President and General Manager.

Note that before the war this company had reduced costs in its regular lines 80 percent in 15 years, and that the benefits of this reduction were shared with employees and the public through higher wages and lower prices.

Note that during the war costs on Army equipment were reduced by this manufacturer from $175 to $20 a unit, a reduction of 88 percent in 3 years.

Note that this once successful company had a post-VJ-day operating deficit in 3 months of $200,000, or 25 percent of its net sales, in manufacturing its old line under OPA regulations.

Here is the apparent theory underlying the idiotic OPA regulations which have had these tragic results: the bureaucrats, who know nothing about manufacturing, have seen the marvelous reductions in costs which efficient manufacturers have accomplished in making war items; they know of the prewar reductions in costs which were typical of American know-how; they, therefore, blithely planned that these old-line manufacturers would be forced to make similar reductions in costs immediately upon resuming the manufacture of their former peacetime lines, utterly forgetting that competition and ingenuity had already brought these items near the saturation point in cost reduction when their production was stopped by the war; not realizing that it takes time, ingenuity and competition to make such reductions, but gleefully planning that these reductions could be accomplished instantaneously and indefinitely, merely because OPA demanded it. The result has been a creeping paralysis over production which is becoming a galloping paralysis, penalizing experience and efficiency, hamstringing the manufacturers, depriving the public of products, and leaving losses instead of a possibility of increasing wages.

To show that this situation is typical and not unique, here is part of a letter I received today from a sheet-metal and building-supply jobber:

I wonder if you and others are fully informed of the terrible mess OPA is making of our economy. I was for it up to the last week but I do not believe that a price rise of double the present prices would be as bad for everyone as the terrible inequalities the present OPA rules are making. No steel mill will make box or common nails because they can sell all of the nails they can make that have a high extra, so why make common nails? But common nails are nonexistent and an across-the-board rise in steel will never help this situation. In fact, it will hinder it. Everyone is bending their efforts to use their production for things they did not make and are not needed but will sell because of demand. The things that are needed are not made. Then Mr. Bowles looks at an annual statement and sees that the company is not in the red and gives it no help on the nonprofitable items and the management again goes out for new products. Roofing felt cannot be bought for built-up roofs, the commonest kind. It is all going into roofing shingles. Insulating sheathing cannot be bought because the pulp is all going into decorating tile. Integrated steel mills are using all of their common galvanized sheets to make finished products which they fabricate and the small manufacturer can get no raw material. These are not steel-mill strike problems. They existed before the strike.

OPA has been saying to manufacturers "Off with the old; on with the new." Instead, OPA should have said to them "On with the old; compete with the new." If Mr. Porter will only prepare quickly some simple regulations that will permit a manufacturer to make profitably the things he can make best and cheapest because they are his old line, realizing that competition and taxes and collective bargaining will keep that profit from getting out of line, this will go far in speeding up production and avoiding further inflation.

The Full Employment Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 15 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, ever since the final full employment legislation was reported from the Senate-House conference committee a desperate effort has been made by its enemies to misconstrue it and thereby render it ineffective. On Monday, February 11, 21 national, civic, labor, and veteran groups addressed a letter to the President pledging their support to the legislation and emphasizing the need for courageous and effective administration. In this letter the following statement is made:

We have been fighting for a congressional statement of policy which would recognize that it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to use all its vast resources to assure employment opportuities to all of our citizens able to work and secking work. This is accomplished by the conference bill.

A similar point of view has been taken by the Christian Science Monitor, whose editorial of February 8 described the full employment bill as "a surprisingly vigorous measure." This editorial concluded on the following note:

In the last analysis, how this legislation works will depend on who is President, whom he appoints as advisers, and what sort of implementing acts each Congress passes. But the bill does pave a road down which both the Executive and the lawmakers must travel as each year rolls around.

I should also like to refer to the column entitled "Full Employment Juggling" by Peter Edson, which appeared in the Washington Daily News of February 11. In this column, Mr. Edson says that—

If anyone will sit down and read the full—pardon—the Employment Act as passed, he will see for himself that it accomplishes nearly everything the original bill set out to do.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the documents to which I have just referred: the letter to the President, the editorial from the Christian Science Monitor and Mr. Edson's column.

There being no objection, the letter, editorial, and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The undersigned organization have, for a period of many months, been actively engaged in mobilizing support for a full employment program of which the full employment bills (S. 380; H. R. 2202) was the first essential step.

We are completely convinced, and our opinion is substantiated by all public-opinion polls, that the overwhelming majority of the American people are prepared to support the strongest possible legislation designed to assure the objective of full employment and to avoid the periods of boom and bust which have heretofore marked the course of American history and which, if continued in the postwar period, can lead only to national and international disaster.

Despite this overwhelming support for effective legislation, and despite your vigorous efforts in its behalf, a small but powerful minority has steadfastly opposed any and all efforts to obtain its enactment. Indeed, this articulate minority, by virtue of its strategic representation in certain committees of the Congress and its disproportionately powerful control of the organs of public opinion, almost succeeded in preventing passage of the necessary basic legislation.

While the bill which has been reported out by the Senate-House conference committee does not contain the language and provisions that we believe the overriding significance of the issue demands, it is nevertheless with a sense of real satisfaction that we note that the conference bill makes a distinct contribution to the solution of the basic prob-

lem. The contribution is made along the following lines:

1. The bill establishes the responsibility of the Federal Government "to utilize all its resources" for the purpose of "creating and maintaining * * * useful emloyment opportunities * * * for those able, willing, and seeking to work, and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power."

While the conference bill does not use the term "full employment," nor does it measure up to our concept—and your concept—of what an ideal bill should contain, we feel called upon to insist, despite the contrary insinuations of some of the opponents of adequate legislation, that we have not been fighting a battle of catch phrases or of slogans. We have been fighting for a congressional statement of policy which would recognize that it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to use all its vast resources to assure employment opportunities to all of our citizens able to work and seeking work. This is accomplished by the conference bill.

2. The bill calls for an annual Presidential report to the Congress on the national employment situation, and specifies that that report should include the basic analyses included in the national employment and production budget proposed in the original legislation.

3. The bill establishes a Council of Economic Advisers to assist the President in this undertaking.

4. Finally, the bill establishes a joint committee of the Congress to receive and analyze the President's report, and to transmit it to the Congress with recommendations.

Thus the conference bill provides you and the Congress with a clear declaration of national policy of full employment and with machinery for discharging the Federal Government's responsibility for full employment. Again, we may not think it is the most perfect machinery—and you may not—but we are satisfied that, in conjunction with all of the agencies in the executive departments, this machinery will work if a genuine and sincere effort is made to make it work.

We, therefore, believe that the Congress should approve the conference bill, and we trust that you will sign it.

But we hasten to add, Mr. President, that the will to make the machinery work is more important than the machinery itself. This is particularly true in view of the fact that the conference bill imposes upon you full and complete executive responsibility for carrying out the provisions of the bill. While the Council of Economic Advisers established by the bill is required to assist you and can, therefore, serve a most significant function, in the final analysis the success of the program in the executive branch of the Government rests squarely upon your shoulders, where it should rest.

In the very first instance, the question of whether or not this program is implemented depends largely on the appointments you make to the Council of Economic Advisers and on the appointments made by the presiding officers of the two Houses of Congress to the joint committee.

Our organizations, representing many millions of Americans committed to an economy of full employment, will necessarily judge the administration's intentions by the caliber of the men named to fill these strategic positions. The three members of the Council of Economic Advisers must be men who have given proof, in action as well as in expression, of their devotion to an America of full production, full employment, and full consumption. They must be men with sufficient courage to refuse to listen to the apostles of defeatism who have so consistently opposed the progressive principles for which you and we have been fighting a common battle.

Insofar as the joint committee is concerned, the appointments must be made by the presiding officers of the two Houses, both of whom are members of the majority party, the Democratic Party, your party. We are therefore justified in assuming that a majority of the 14-member joint committee will be composed of men who, like the members of the Council of Economic Advisers, are committed to a full employment program.

The passage of the Employment Act of 1946, if adequately implemented in terms of personnel and program, can mark the beginning of an American crusade for economic security, stability, and justice, and consequently a contribution of enormous significance to the cause of international peace. Unless, however, the act is adequately implemented, history will record it as a mockery and an affront to the millions of Americans who are determined that our free institutions shall not again be threatened by the curse of unemployment.

Most respectfully yours.

LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS WHO SIGNED THE LETTER TO PRESIDENT TRUMAN

Council for Social Action of Congregation of Christ Churches.
Americans United.
National Council of Catholic Women.
National Council of Negro Women.
Veterans of Foreign Wars.
National Women's Trade Union League.
National Planning Association.
National Association of Ornamental Metal Manufacturers.
National League of Women Shoppers.
Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees.
National Education Association.
Public Affairs Committee of United Council of Church Women.
National Lawyers' Guild.
National Catholic Welfare Conference.
American Federation of Labor.
Independent Citizens Committee.
National Board of YWCA.
Congress of Industrial Organizations.
United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers.
Railway Labor Executives Association.
National Council of Jewish Women.
American Retail Federation.
Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
National Council for the Social Studies.
National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs.
New Council of American Business.
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.
Disabled American Veterans Department.
Progressive Businessmen, Incorporated.
American Veterans Committee.
National Farmers Union.
American Association of University Women.
American Public Welfare Association.
Southern Conference for Human Welfare.
General Federation of Womens' Clubs.
Synagogue Council of America.
Friends' Committee on National Legislation.
American Jewish Congress.
National Consumers League.
Alpha Kappa Alpha.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of February 8, 1946]

SURPRISINGLY VIGOROUS

The compromise version of the so-called full employment bill, which just passed the House and seems sure of Senate approval, is a surprisingly vigorous measure. The original House version ran the danger of being so full of generalizations and reservations that an unsympathetic President might have fulfilled the letter of its requirements by more or less meaningless gestures. The compromise bill, like the Senate version, specifically directs the President to assess annually the state of the Nation in definite terms of jobs and all that goes to make jobs.

By its wording the original full employment text had laid itself open to two kinds of misrepresentation: (1) That Government fiat could guarantee jobs for all under a free-enterprise system. (2) That the net effect of the bill would be unlimited Federal compensatory spending. The measure just passed avoids the term "full" and speaks of "maximum" employment. It apparently has quieted fears about spending, for even Senator TAFT is said to be supporting it now.

The basic issue all along has been whether or not the Government should be formally committed to a policy of full utilization of the Nation's capacity to produce and consume—hence, to employ—and to forthrightly placing its influence and resources behind such a policy. Senator MURRAY and Representative COCHRAN, both sponsors of the original measure, say they are satisfied the present bill meets this test. Certainly, the Council of Economic Advisers which the bill authorizes for the President, and the joint committee which it sets up in Congress to consider the President's report, should work toward greater consistency in policy.

In the last analysis, how this legislation works will depend on who is President, whom he appoints as advisers, and what sort of implementing acts each Congress passes. But the bill does pave a road down which both the Executive and the lawmakers must travel as each year rolls around.

[From the Washington Daily News of February 11, 1946]

FULL EMPLOYMENT JUGGLING

(By Peter Edson)

Supporters of the much cussed and discussed Full Employment Act are chuckling quietly over the slick job of word juggling they did to get the measure passed by both Houses of Congress.

It isn't called the "Full" Employment Act anymore. It's just the Employment Act. This is typical of the compromises made to secure passage. Enemies and opponents of the full employment theory think they scored a great victory in knocking out all the objectionable experimental economics stuff. Senator TAFT, of Ohio, went so far as to say that the act passed is definitely not a victory for Truman.

If TAFT, Congressman CARTER MANASCO, of Alabama, and WILL WHITTINGTON, of Mississipi want to think they scored a great victory by watering down the original draft of the bill, they can. But if anyone will sit down and read the full—pardon—the Employment Act as passed, he will see for himself that it accomplishes nearly everything the original bill set out to do. That makes it definitely a victory for Truman and for Senator JIM MURRAY, of Montana.

The way this job was done is one for the book. It took six meetings of the conference committee of Senators and Congressmen to iron out differences between the Senate and House versions. MANASCO and WHITTINGTON sat tight on their watered-down version. They were supported by Senators TAFT, BUCK, of Delaware, RADCLIFFE, of Maryland. It looked like a deadlock. So the other Senators—BARKLEY, of Kentucky, MURDOCK, of Utah, TAYLOR, of Idaho, and TOBEY, of New Hampshire—suggested changes in language.

For instance, take the preamble of the act as passed. It says that Congress declares "it is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government * * * to * * * utilize all its * * * resources * * * to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power."

That's boiling a 100-word sentence down to 20 words to get at the guts of it. But ask yourself what's the difference between "maximum" employment and "full" employment? Tweedledum and tweedledee.

Opponents of the original bill also objected to the declaration that it was the Federal Government's responsibility to provide such volume of expenditure as may be needed to assure full employment.

So that was cut out. Put in its place was this statement that "It is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to utilize all its resources to promote maximum employment." and so forth. What do you think the Federal Government does when it "utilizes all its resources"? You could spend a trillion dollars, fight another war, or try to make the Mississippi River run backward under that phrase.

Take the next section: The original draft called for a "national production and employment burget," to be prepared by the President. Critics said that was dangerous. So the "budget" was stricken out and an economic report was substituted. What's the difference what you call it if the report covers the same ground that the Budget does?

In putting over this substitution and getting the House to accept the compromise, the bill's backers were equally smart. In the House were some 84 votes opposed to any kind of full employment bill. If they had been stirred up, opposition might have grown and the bill might have been killed. Congressmen PATMAN, of Texas, MURRAY'S cosponsor in the House, and JOHN J. COCHRAN from Truman's district in Missouri both spoke briefly on the floor, then asked leave to extend their remarks in the RECORD. What they said on the floor was innocuous. Their full analysis of what the bill does is given only in their extended remarks, which few people will ever read.

The whole job was one of the smoothest pieces of legislative legerdemain ever pulled off in Congress.

Surplus Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 15, 1946

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

AMVETS TESTIMONY BEFORE THE HOUSE EXPENDITURES COMMITTEE ON SURPLUS HOUSING, FEBRUARY 14, 1946

Mr. Chairman and members of this committee, my name is J. H. Leib. I am the legislative director of the American Veterans of World War II, better known as Amvets.

We are the largest veterans' organization that has come out of this war, with approximately 30,000 members.

We are extremely interested in the surplus legislation now before your committee.

While we are naturally concerned with the whole surplus situation, we are at this time particularly anxious to see that the veterans are given a fair break in the sale of Government housing, now declared surplus by the Defense Homes Corporation. These projects come under the jurisdiction of the RFC and the Surplus Administration.

Briefly here is our story:

Last December our local post organized a corporation and publicly invited all veterans' organizations to joint us, in the hope of purchasing the McLean Gardens, which is now up for sale by the Government.

Since submitting our bid—we have run into all kinds of conflicing regulations and red tape.

We have heard a lot about veterans preference regarding the sale of surplus property—but so far, it has just been, empty promises!

Sick and tired of these promises we appealed to Chairman MANASCO and out of a conference with him came House Joint Resolution 297, which asks for a clarification of the Surplus Property Act in regard to the sale of defense housing for veterans.

This committee now has an opportunity to back up those promises with action.

We plead with every member of this committee to study House Joint Resolution 297 very carefully.

Time is short.

We respectfully demand that no Government housing—particularly McLean Gardens—should be permitted to be sold until the Congress has an opportunity to clarify what preference it intends to give to veterans.

The Defense Homes Corporation are attempting to rush the sale of these projects before Congress can act on House Joint Resolution 297.

Everyone realizes that no veterans' group can compete with powerful insurance companies or well-heeled speculators.

We believe that it is the duty of Congress to insist that all bids be made public in the sale of these properties.

Furthermore, just a week ago, veterans read in blazing newspaper headlines, that Wilson Wyatt, new Housing Administrator, would seek ceilings on the sale of private housing, and yet the Defense Homes Corporation is attempting to sell Government surplus properties to the highest speculative bidder!

Why doesn't the Truman administration and the Congress make up its mind on how it is going to solve the housing crisis.

This committee and the Congress must decide immediately before the Defense Homes Corporation can sell its projects out from under the veterans what the policy should be.

It is obvious that this Government agency is attempting to rush the sale before Congress can look the situation over.

Will this committee give the veterans some consideration?

Don't forget that this war is not over until every veteran has a decent roof over his head! Thank you.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of February 14, 1946]

AMVETS RAP DHC WITH NEW CHARGE

The Defense Homes Corporation was charged today with trying to "sell out" McLean Gardens and other Federal housing developments in the District from under World War II veterans.

The statement was made before the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments by J. H. Leib, legislative director of the American Veterans of World War II.

In a bitterly worded charge before the House committee, Leib said his group had been given the "run-around" by the DHC and had concluded the term "veterans' preference" is nothing but empty promises.

CORPORATION FORMED

Leib said his organization respectfully demands that no Government housing, particularly McLean Gardens, should be permitted to be sold until Congress had an opportunity to clarify what preference it intends to give veterans.

The Amvets formed a corporation in December, said Leib, to buy McLean Gardens. Since submitting a bid they have run into all kinds of conflicting regulations and red tape, he testified.

Raymond Sawyer, president of the local chapter of Amvets, told the Congressmen his group had offered three different bids to DHC, all of which have been rejected. In the last bid the group made an offer of $9,000,000, stating they would pay 10 percent of that sum when they had a 50-percent occupancy.

In reply to a question by Representative MANASCO (Democrat), of Alabama, chairman of the House committee, Sawyer said any veteran could join the Veterans Cooperative Housing Association, which desires to purchase McLean Gardens.

AMENDMENT SUGGESTED

He told the Congressmen the corporation has 250 members, each of whom has put up $25.

At the suggestion of committee members, Leib said he would draw up an amendment to the Surplus Properties Act to clarify the status of veterans' preference on the disposal of Government prop rty. He also said the amendment would provide for making public bids on Government properties.

Leib urged immediate congressional action so the DHC would not sell out the veterans in favor of their own interests.

"Just a week ago," he concluded, "veterans read in blazing newspaper headlines that Wilson Wyatt, new Housing Administrator, would seek ceiling on the sale of private housing and yet the DHC is attempting to sell Government properties to the highest speculative bidder."

[From the Washington Times-Herald of February 14, 1946]

AMVETS TO ASK COURT TO BLOCK HOUSING SALES

The American Veterans of World War II yesterday asserted that they would ask for an injunction against the Defense Homes Corporation to prevent immediate sale of Federal housing developments here to private interests.

In a scathing denunciation of the Corporation, J. H. Leib, national representative of the veterans, charged that Philip Klutznick, president of DHC, and other members of the agency, "are disregarding veterans' rights because of special business interests."

VET PRIORITY CLAIMED

Leib said that veterans have the privilege of priority purchase of the Federal properties "under the Surplus Property Act."

"But DHC isn't interested in the veteran, since the agency is staffed with businessmen who lock out for their friends and own interests. The veteran just doesn't have enough speculative cash for them," he charged.

The Amvets' stand developed after DHC rejection Thursday of its cooperative bid for purchase of the huge $11,000,000 McLean Gardens. The veterans offered $9,000,000 for the property, with a 10-percent down payment.

Earlier an Amvets' offer to purchase the property at an appraisal price under terms of the Surplus Property Act had also been rejected, Leib said.

HEARING TOMORROW

Meanwhile, Representative MANASCO, Democrat, of Alabama, announced that a hearing will be held at 10 a. m. tomorrow on the Amvets-sponsored bill for clarification of the Surplus Property Act. The bill would also halt immediate sale of the properties.

MANASCO scored the DHC for its refusal to make public the list and prices offered by 99 bidders on the six Federal projects up for sale in the Washington area.

"I think the bids should be scrutinized by the public. They will have to give me a lot of good reasons for keeping this information secret," MANASCO declared.

The board of the Defense Homes Corporation yesterday announced receipts of bids on McLean Gardens, Fairlington, Naylor Gardens, Meridian Hill Hotel, the Lucy Diggs Slowe Hall, and George Washington Carver Hall.

FAIRLINGTON BIDS REJECTED

All bids on Fairlington were rejected and Naylor Gardens was offered to the Amvets cooperative and present tenants jointly. The

board did not disclose disposition of the bids on McLean Gardens and took no action on Meridian Hill Hotel and the Slowe and Carver Halls.

Raymond Sawyer, commander of District Amvets, sponsors of the Veterans' Cooperative Housing Association, said its bid on McLean Gardens was rejected.

Commenting on the board's action on Naylor Gardens, Sawyer said, "We will of course accept any opportunity to meet with Government officials to see if anything can be salvaged for us there.

"But if all residents out there decide to buy in on the cooperative there will be no room left for us. It looks as if the veterans have been outbid on McLean Gardens by private capital and are about to be sold out by the Government," he added.

Give Truman a Break

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. R. EWING THOMASON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 15, 1946

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News for today:

GIVE TRUMAN A BREAK

Harry Truman has made some mistakes since he entered the White House. Who else wouldn't?

None of Mr. Truman's mistakes has been fatal. They have been small and human errors, reflecting the trustful qualities of the man who is loyal to his friends and has faith in the good intent of others.

Anyone of any fairness, or sportsmanship, or understanding of the great political and economic forces that sweep our Nation and the world today must admit that even had Mr. Truman possessed superhuman judgment and clarity of vision, even had he done everything exactly right, still, his administration would be in trouble. The difficulties and confusions that beset his administration are largely the legacy of global war, suddenly ended. They are the deluge, coming after another administration which had not prepared for peace. Mr. Truman's mistakes have added, comparatively, only a little to his woes.

Four years of war, destroying most everything produced, and 12,000,000 men to be demobilized from the far corners of the earth. Four years of curtailed or halted production of the things civilians depend upon, while what they had was wearing out. There was bound to be hell to pay. Meanwhile, the development through political pressures of a wage and price structure that didn't add up to getting more production of those things so urgently needed. And into this mess steps Mr. Truman, with malice toward none, seeking the cooperation of groups and factions which had been led for years to live by class conflicts and strife. And he had to start off with Cabinet officers and administrators who felt they owed no allegiance to him.

He has tried to build a new administration, loyal to him and with no axes of self-aggrandizement to grind. Some of his choices of men have been unfortunate. Therein lies most of whatever part of Mr. Truman's troubles have been of his own making.

We think, and hope, and trust, that Mr. Truman will learn by his mistakes—that in time he will gather about him men who have know-how as well as loyalty.

The great rank and file of Americans believe Mr. Truman to be of their own kind. They look to him hopefully for leadership. And they are a little fed up on all the shrill caterwauling and brickbat hurling now being directed at him.

GOP Urged To Make Campaign Hay Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 15, 1946

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I am including an interesting political article which recently was published in the Washington Evening Star:

GOP URGED TO MAKE CAMPAIGN HAY NOW—PUBLIC IS BLAMING DEMOCRATS FOR STRIKE WAVE, SAYS WRITER

(By David Lawrence)

President Truman may or may not choose to run in 1948—the left-wingers are already trying to persuade him not to be a candidate—but November 1946 is much nearer and the whole House of Representatives and one-third of the United States Senate will be up for election.

If the Republicans have any sense left they will not waste time making campaign speeches or soliciting campaign funds. All they need to do is call attention to what is happening in Congress and then wait for the votes to be counted and they will find that in the Democratic strongholds of Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, and New York, and elsewhere the shift to the opposite party will be amazing.

For the public is sick and tired of the Democratic Party's indifference to the need for some legislation to prevent strikes. The Democratic leadership in the Senate is stalling on the matter of labor legislation. The House has acted promptly, though it will be noted that the Republican Party made that step possible.

WAVE OF IRRESPONSIBILITY

The country is suffering from a wave of irresponsibility on the part of certain employers and employee organizations.

Vital facilities are tied up either by refusing the reasonable demands of labor or by labor's insistence on demands that are unreasonable. It seems incredible that democracy, which rests on the principle of the consent of the governed, should be unable to exercise its judgment and bring about the passage of legislation to limit strikes, especially in fields closely related to the public safety.

But, judging from the behavior of the Democratic Party, which controls the Senate, there is no alternative available to the American people except to vote out of office the party in power or to make their contemplated action so plain ahead of time that it will have a stimulating effect on the Democrats who control the committee where all labor legislation is now buried and bids fair to remain buried unless the public bestirs itself.

The alliance between the labor union politicians and the Democratic Party in the Senate is so strong that the chances of dislodging the committee majorities which hold the balance of power there depend on the election of Republicans to those committees.

PEOPLE CAN HAVE REDRESS

If the public wants a continuance of economic anarchy and wishes to see the situation disintegrate still further, it can remain indifferent to the real power of the Senate. For, when a President is weak or incompetent, the people can have redress through the Congress if they insist upon it.

Mr. Truman has the influence to force early action in the Senate on his labor proposals, and it should not need the prodding of a President to stir the Senate to action. The newspaper headlines reveal what economic damage the strikes are doing. Whether one believes that the managements are recalcitrant or that the unions are pressing their demands too far, the fact remains that some means of settling labor disputes by orderly processes has not been provided, and the responsibility for keeping new labor legislation off the statute books for 10 years rests solely with the Democratic Party in Congress.

Whatever be the faults of the Republican Party—and they are many—it does present at this moment the only alternative to a continuance of economic unrest and the development of a Nation-wide depression. The labor leaders are so much misled by what political power they have accumulated in the past that they do not realize they are committing suicide and doing more in a few weeks to injure the rightful causes of labor and to imperil the true rights of the workers than all the reactionaries and extremists among employers have been able to accomplish in many years of effort.

A Document for History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 15, 1946

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of January 26, 1946:

A DOCUMENT FOR HISTORY

The report on statehood for Hawaii of the House Subcommittee on Territories, just made public in Washington, ranks as one of the great documents in Hawaii's history.

With the thousands of pages of exhibits and statements which are part of the record now, it is the most extensive and the most intensive treatise on statehood for the islands that has ever been compiled or presented by any committee here or in Washington.

Its documentary evidence is imposing. Its minute examination of scores of phases of history, or industry, of politics, of education, of culture, of race relations, of sociological factors, is authoritative.

Most impressive is the fact that six Congressmen, from widely separated parts of the Union, have united wholeheartedly and cordially in this report asking early congressional action on statehood.

No magic accomplished this. No legerdemain was used on the visiting group. They were available alike to friends and opponents of statehood. When day after day the witnesses almost without exception were speaking for statehood, the committee emphasized its invitation for opponents to appear. Almost none did so. Of these, only two or three had any organized objections to set forth. The others were mostly shouters and gripers.

The committee reached its unanimous conclusion that Hawaii is ready for statehood on the basis of extensive open hearings, and even more extensive study of all pertinent aspects of Hawaii's history and life today.

The report which this six-man subcommittee made to the full territories committee

will take rank at once as a standard reference work on Hawaii. And, as it will be put into printed form and issued to Members of Congress, it will be available to interested persons.

The Star-Bulletin published it in full Friday so that everyone in the Territory could get it quickly and fully. It was telegraphed from Washington—probably the longest public document ever sent by land wire and wireless from the Nation's Capital to Hawaii.

Sam Daube

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL STEWART

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 15, 1946

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I read with a heavy heart of the passing of Sam Daube, a pioneer citizen of Ardmore, Okla., who was one of the outstanding business and cattle man in my district. Not only was he an outstanding businessman and cattleman but he was a philantropist as well. He did not render assistance to his fellow men for the sake of publicity, and but little is known to the public of his ceaseless efforts to assist the needy and unfortunate.

For more than half a century, to know southern Oklahoma was to know Sam Daube. The Third Congressional District, the State of Oklahoma have lost a great citizen and the Nation has lost a man of the type that made this country great.

I am inserting here an editorial from the Daily Ardmoreite which pictures the life of Sam Daube:

SAM DAUBE

Death has removed from Ardmore and the southern Oklahoma community one of its most picturesque and lovable characters.

Sam Daube, who came into this area when the country was raw and new, in those days that now exist only in the highly colored memories of the older men, had seen the district pass through an endless series of dramatic changes—watched it shift from the rugged days of the pioneer, through the hectic and stirring interval of oil boom, into the staid and genteel era of modern times.

He lived through three periods in Ardmore when war was the topic on every tongue. He had seen America grow, too, in those long years and he had the satisfaction of knowing that he had a part in that growth.

Fortune favored Sam Daube, but there was more to it that the mischance flare of luck. He was an able businessman, marked by a tenacity of purpose and the kind of vision that saw far into the future.

By the combination of these factors, he was able to accomplish much as a leader in industrial and mercantile activities. He became a dominant figure in the district, his influence spread to all the State, and he was known in all parts of Oklahoma and in far-flung sections of the Nation.

Nor was his interest centered wholly in the career of businessman, industrialist, and financier. He had a strong humanitarian trend—a generous heart that he yielded to in countless thousands of instances.

Only a few of these instances are known; it was not any desire to be known as a philanthropist that urged him to be generous and kindly to the unfortunate.

Ardmore will seem strange without Sam Daube.

There will be something missing; something lacking; something that will be sad to contemplate.

Later

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 15, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, a very large number of Members of the House voted for the Case bill because they felt they had to vote for something. I have little doubt that a clear majority of the House feels entirely dissatisfied with the legislative job that was done in passing the Case bill and realizes full well that no practical results at all, let alone any beneficial ones, can flow from the action taken by the House.

Obviously what is needed now and what has been needed for a long time is a careful, judicious, and fair consideration of the whole problem of labor-management relationships in the United States with a view to devising workable, equitable, and beneficial legislation, and bringing it before the House and Senate for action. This cannot be accomplished either by those who have little understanding of the aims, purposes, and critical importance of labor unions in our national life, nor any good will toward labor organizations, nor can it be done by those who frankly state that they are against any legislation at all. I am confident that a majority of Congress falls in a middle group between these two extremes. That majority has to find a way to work its will.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include an editorial appearing recently in the Washington Evening News concerning the Case bill and setting forth the general point of view which I have just expressed:

LOOK BEFORE YOU LEGISLATE

Congress, we say once more, is not prepared to pass a law that will do what the Wagner Act promised, and has monumentally failed, to do—namely, "to diminish the causes of labor disputes."

Being unprepared, and in a time of crisis, Congress is under pressure to pass hot and hasty legislation that could make bad matters worse.

Before the House today goes a watered-down version of President Truman's fact-finding bill. As a substitute for it, the Rules Committee has held, the House may consider an entirely new bill introduced only 2 days ago by Representative FRANCIS CASE, of South Dakota.

Some proposals in the Case bill may have merit. Others, in our opinion, are unfair and dangerous to labor. There have been no committee hearings on the Case bill. Citizens who oppose it have had no opportunity to state their objections. It cannot be perfected, or adequately considered, in a few days of limited debate on the floor of the House.

We believe the House should reject the Case bill. We doubt that passage of the President's fact-finding bill would do any real good in the present strike crisis. And there is grave danger that passage of ineffective, half-baked legislation now would delay or prevent the preparation of sound, fair, and effective legislation.

The present strike crisis may pass soon. We hope it will. But there will be other crises, without end, until Congress does its duty carefully and properly.

The first step should be a thoughful study of the reasons why the Wagner Act has failed to keep its promise. Next, there should be thorough hearings on the Hatch-Ball-Barton bill and all other responsible proposals for industrial peace, advocates and opponents being given full opportunity to be heard.

Then at last Congress would be prepared to legislate—to protect the legitimate rights of both labor and management, to protect the public against abuses of power by either, and to establish conditions under which collective bargaining can work without breaking down into civil warfare.

The Lake Breezes Whisper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 15, 1946

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, the Fairmont Daily Sentinel is one of the outstanding daily newspapers in Minnesota. I know Republicans who call it a Democratic paper and Democrats who call it a Republican issue. Some men holding public office have referred to it as the "loyal opposition." This should make it an independent newspaper.

Claude N. Swanson, one of its editors, affectionately known and highly regarded by all, has for many years ably edited a column under the by-line The Lake Breezes Whisper, which reflects the opinion of that section of the country. His column of February 9, 1946, has aroused widespread comment and approval and is an outstanding message to Congress as an indication of how the wind blows.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this column:

THE LAKE BREEZES WHISPER

(By Claude N. Swanson)

The present administration is following in the footsteps of the New Deal—asking us to eat black bread so Europe won't starve.

We don't want anybody to die of starvation, least of all the women and children in the Nazi war-devastated countries. But if these same people, starving now, had been on the alert while the Hitlers and Mussolinis were waxing fat and preparing for war, they wouldn't be starving.

Someone should have told them that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

And that goes for the people of the United States, too.

It may not hurt us—in fact may be good for us—to eat black bread. But if we are to do it, let it be by choice, rather than by Government regulation.

Our boys have fought a good fight, won indisputable victories, and we have backed them up.

We've fought for freedom, justice and democracy. Let's start enjoying some of it. We've paid a good price for it.

Even though State, Federal, and local taxes take about 25 cents out of every dollar we

earn, this is still the best Nation on earth in which to live. Let's keep it that way.

Instead of thinking up laws, regulations, devices, and directives, to hamstring individual initiative, let's restore that liberty which gave us our great industries without which we could not have won the last war.

Let's restore that certain type of American opportunity which gave us our Fairmont Railway Motors, our Henry Fords, our Andrew Carnegies, our Thomas Edisons, our Walter P. Chryslers, our Jim Hills, our Pillsburys, our John D. Rockefellers.

There was no limit on initiative, ambition, and industry, in those days. That's what made America great.

Now we are engaged in not only feeding but in policing a good share of the world. Without doubt, we are in the best position to do that very thing. But somebody should tell our Representatives in Washington not to spread our forces so thin and so far that some great power will come in and grab us off.

As for eating black bread, we have not yet forgotten—nor are we likely to forget—the New Deal having us plow under our pigs, restrict our crop acreage; plow under our cotton, and the rationing that followed.

We're still short of shirts, dress materials, meats, and long on taxes.

Right now we have an opportunity to show warring European nations that it pays to pursue the path of peace and industry.

Let them make an honest effort to get on their own feet. Let them learn, through experience, what it means to provide for themselves; to improve their own conditions.

The longer it takes them to get their bellies full and back on their feet, the longer it will be before we'll have to send our sons and grandsons over there again to save civilization.

Let's not be in too big a hurry to save the rest of the world. There's work to be done at home—first.

Before we concern ourselves too much with either our late allies or foes, let's get about 2,000,000 men back into production in the steel mills, the packing plants, the mines, the lumber industries. Let's get the flow of material started. That will promote jobs.

Unless we do that, and soon—somebody will have to feed this country. And then there'd be nobody to borrow from.

We've been in Europe. We were there not too long, but long enough to see there hadn't been much progress there in the last 500 years—except in the art of war making. They still farmed the same old way. Their houses, most of them of stone or brick, had been unchanged in design or appearance in the last 200 years. The natives didn't seem to have any ambition beyond acquiring a bottle of wine and a loaf of bread for the day.

A stagnant, decadent, worthless civilization if ever there was one. If any one of them had an original idea in the last 400 years, there certainly is no evidence of it.

If we had such a colony in Martin County—people who'd be satisfied to live in shacks—dress in rags, exist on bread and wine and a few potatoes—with never any trace of ambition on the part of any of them to improve their condition, we'd probably ask them to move.

We do have such people here, but they're not colonized. They're on relief. But we don't go hungry to feed them. We don't lend-lease 'em.

We showed the above to one of the leading legal minds in Minnesota. "There's more genuine food for thought in that than in anything I've read in months," he said. Then he added:

"If every citizen would take at least 1 hour out each day, to think about these things, we'd get this Nation straightened out."

And there is truth in what he says. Not only do we have local, State, and national politics and politicians to watch, but from here on out international politics must be considered.

So we can't afford to be caught asleep at the switch, or we may wake up to find it is too late. "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

United States Troops in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 15, 1946

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, due to the general public interest concerning the number of American troops in China, I wish to take this opportunity to call the attention of the House to the following exchange of correspondence between the War Department and myself:

FEBRUARY 1, 1946.

Hon. ROBERT PATTERSON,
Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The enclosed communication from one of my valued constituents is self-explanatory.

In view of the statements contained therein I should like to be advised as to why additional Army troops are necessary in China, and when we may expect that the troops now stationed there can be withdrawn.

Please return the enclosure with your reply.

Thanking you for any information you can furnish me and with best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours.

FEBRUARY 12, 1946.

Hon. JACK Z. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Patterson has asked me to reply to your letter of February 1, concerning United States troops in China and the questions raised by your correspondent, Mrs. Genevieve Woelfl.

Contrary to your correspondent's information, our forces in China are being reduced in strength, and it is hoped that by July 1, United States Army strength in the China theater will be reduced to approximately 6,000. Such additional men as are now being sent to China are being sent as replacements to enable men who have had long service to be returned to the United States for discharge. To the largest extent possible volunteers are being used for these replacements.

The mission of the United States forces in China is to assist the Chinese in accordance with the policy toward China announced by the President and the Department of State. Obviously in such a large country with limited transportation facilities, air transportation is a necessity. However, in view of the reduction of our activities in China, only recently the number of air transport groups has been reduced from two to one-half a group, and our over-all forces have been reduced from 65,000 to a strength of 7,700 men.

It is true repatriation of 3,000,000 Japanese from China to Japan is being carried out with the cooperation of the Navy, Chinese, and the Japanese themselves, but the over-all planning, supervision of loading, and establishment of schedules is done by the Army.

We are completing rapid disposition of our surplus property in China, and as the most economical method of disposal have negotiated a sale of equipment in West China to the Chinese Government. After this agreement it was possible to fly almost 45,000 United States troops in West China to India-Burma for return to the United States.

With reference to the question your correspondent raises regarding formation of a military advisory group in China, I should like to tell you that this is merely in the planning stage. A small group of officers in the Headquarters, China Theater, are working on plans for such a group for submission to the War Department. You may be assured governmental approval will be obtained before there are any directives establishing such a group.

I trust the above will provide you with the information you have sought.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MARTYN,
Administrative Assistant.

Ceiling Prices on Old Homes Completely Protect American Home Owners—Real-Estate Speculators Fight for Selfish Profits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 15, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, within the past few days it has come to my attention that the real-estate speculators are propagandizing American home owners with the falsehood that putting a ceiling price on existing homes would somehow penalize every home owner in the Nation.

Anyone who has read my proposal with an open mind for putting ceiling prices on existing homes could not fail to clearly understand its simple wording. It only states that an owner would be permitted to sell his home for any price he can get in today's hungry market, and that that sale price would become the ceiling for that particular house for the short period of some 18 months—the estimated duration of the housing crisis. I cannot see how such a provision would penalize a legitimate home owner; on the contrary, it would completely protect him in the present rising market.

Of course, the difficulty in my program is that it would penalize those unscrupulous speculators who are willing and eager to squeeze from the home-hungry their hard-earned dollars. They would sell and resell our homes, with a higher speculative profit each time. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it would penalize those who are willing to sacrifice the security and stability of our people in the coming years ahead for lush profits for themselves today.

I do not see how any housing program can be a success without ceiling prices on existing homes. Without such a provision we are pouring water into one part of the inflation fire, while we allow it to rage unchecked elsewhere. We are trying to attack the problem with one hand tied behind us.

I fail to see the logic of saying to speculators: Go ahead, buy all the existing houses you can, sell them for any price you can get, make your profit at the expense of the veteran; while, on the other hand, we are saying to the builders of new houses: You can only get so much. We ask your help in holding down prices so that our veterans can obtain homes—we need your cooperation. The result of

such a two-faced policy—if it can be called that—would be a cry of injustice from the legitimate builders. It would be an incentive for black-marketing that would undermine the whole of our housing program. Only a week ago Mr. Wilson Wyatt, the new National Housing Expediter, told a Nation-wide radio audience that his program would suffer a serious handicap without price control on existing homes.

In many ways this threat of inflation in the housing market has become more serious with the President's contemplated easing of price policies. This danger is familiar to all of us. The headlines are full of the facts on skyrocketing prices on real estate. I dare say every one of the Members has received scores of letters from veterans and others, complaining because they cannot find homes at prices they can pay.

It is now expected that more than 3,000,000 veterans will be in the market for houses by next Christmas. I want you to remember that Mr. Wyatt does not expect, under the most favorable circumstances, to be able to provide more than 1,200,000 homes this year. That even includes a lot of converted barracks and house trailers. On the basis of these figures, I predict that the housing situation is going to be worse before it gets better. It is time now that we prevent our veterans from being gouged by putting some ceiling on the houses they must buy.

Builders all over the country have been admitting inflation in real estate prices for months. In Philadelphia, houses which generally sold for $6,000 before the war now are selling for $9,000—$3,000 in velvet profit to feed the speculators. In Detroit, some $8,000 houses are bringing $12,000. Here in the Capital, $12,000 homes have gone to $15,000, and even higher. Most of these increases have taken place in less than 90 days' time. Our spiral toward inflation has started, and the question is: Have we the common sense to hold it now?

I know these prices cannot be rolled back to the level that they should be. Our opportunity to do that has long since passed. I am not suggesting it—my proposal would not provide for that, as some have said. It would set the ceiling at the price today's home owner gets when he sells his house—after the passage of this legislation—and that is all it would do.

Mr. Speaker, I shall speak on this subject again. We owe it to our veterans to see that housing prices are kept at decent levels. We owe it to ourselves as well. This Nation provided well for its men in battle. Let it not be said that this Congress failed them at home.

Legislative Program of VFW

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the digest of the legislative objectives of the Veterans of Foreign Wars adopted at the national encampment in Chicago, Ill., in October 1945.

The matter referred to reads as follows:

DIGEST OF CURRENT LEGISLATIVE OBJECTIVES OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, 1945–46

This digest has been prepared by Mr. Omar B. Ketchum, national legislative representative, and is based on resolutions adopted at the forty-sixth national encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and formal actions of their national council of administration and national legislative committee. Where a bill has been introduced to cover the objective, the bill number, author, and committee is noted.

1. Enactment of an equitable adjusted service pay act for veterans of World War II, based on length and type of service. Payment of $3 per day for home service and $4 per day for sea or overseas duty, plus a premium of $500 for combat wounds. A limitation of $3,500 for home service or $4,500 for combined home and overseas service would be established, exclusive of the $500 for wounds. H. R. 127, by Mr. LESINSKI. House Ways and Means Committee.

2. Grant pensions to veterans of World War I on the same basis as Spanish-American War Veterans, i. e., $20 for one-tenth disability; $25 for one-fourth disability; $35 for one-half disability; $50 for three-fourths disability; $75 for total disability or upon reaching 65 years of age; and $100 if so helpless or blind as to require attendant. H. R. 2859, by Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

3. Amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to provide the following options: Lump-sum payment of benefits; payment in continuous monthly installments throughout lifetime of beneficiary with 240 months certain; or payment in continuous monthly installments throughout lifetime of beneficiary with 120 months certain. H. R. 4965, by Mr. RANKIN, referred to House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation; and companion bill, S. 1677, by Mr. JOHNSON. Senate Committee on Finance.

4. Establishment of statutory employment seniority equivalent to time spent in the armed forces for veterans of World War II who qualify for a job in competition with non-veterans who have equal or less actual seniority. H. R. 3746, by Mr. KNUTSON. House Committee on Military Affairs.

5. In reduction of Federal civilian personnel, preference shall be considered in the following order: (1) Military preference, (2) length of total Federal service, and (3) efficiency ratings. When competing employees have equal standing they shall be released on the basis of their standing in the next lower category. Repeal section 12 of Veterans' Preference Act. H. R. 4069, by Mr. REES. House Committee on the Civil Service.

6. Amend section 800 (b) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to permit payment of readjustment allowance to World War II veterans during periods of unemployment caused by strikes which they have not supported. H. R. 5379, by Mr. GIBSON. House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

7. Amend section 800 (b) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to permit payment of readjustment allowances to World War II veterans during periods of unemployment caused by strikes in States where, and upon the same conditions that, non-veterans receive unemployment compensation. H. R. 5355, by Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

8. Protection of servicemen's rights under Social Security Act by allowing insurance credits to veterans for military service under the old-age and survivors' insurance at a wage rate of $160 a month. Retroactive to September 16, 1940. H. R. 1970, by Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. House Committee on Ways and Means.

9. Establish effective veterans' priority in purchase of surplus government property, second only to Federal agencies, and permit veterans to purchase such property for their personal, as well as business, use. S. 1757, by Senators MAYBANK, O'MAHONEY, and CHAVEZ. Senate Committee on Military Affairs.

10. Authorize accumulation of annual leave for enlisted men at the rate of 2½ days per month of active military service, and upon discharge or release, a lump sum payment, computed at the rate of pay and allowances received at that time, to be paid to cover unused accumulated leave. H. R. 4051, by Mr. ROGERS of Florida. House Committee on Military Affairs.

11. Formulas, processes and equipment used in development of the atomic bomb shall be retained by the United States Government; but atomic bombs may be made available to any world security force in which the United States is an active participant. Funds shall be appropriated to continue research work, under strict Government control, to develop further the utilization of fissionable and radio-active materials for medical and industrial purposes. A committee shall be appointed to exercise supervision and control over the development and use of atomic power as representatives of the American people. S. 1717, by Mr. MCMAHON. Special Senate Committee on Atomic Energy.

12. Establishment of peacetime military training, using a revitalized National Guard system as a nucleus upon which to build a training staff and a program capable of indoctrinating the youth of this country in basic military techniques sufficiently to make it possible to mobilize effective military units in a minimum of time and thus meet the threat of modern blitzkrieg warfare.

13. Deny admission to the United States and naturalization of aliens who have served in the armed forces of countries at war with the United States, or who have been members of parties or organizations supporting nazism or fascism. H. R. 3663, by Mr. GOSSETT. Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

14. Housing program: It was urged that (1) the President declare the housing shortage a national emergency and take necessary steps to allocate and divert building materials and surplus housing to alleviate the crisis, calling upon the construction industry for full cooperation in granting priority in rentals, construction, and sale of homes to veterans; (2) that an immediate survey be made to determine materials available for conversion into temporary housing, along with a program liberalizing on-the-job apprentice training in construction, and more flexible rent-control provisions to encourage remodeling and reconversion of existing property for temporary housing; (3) that maximum ceiling price on homes constructed under the President's emergency program be $10,000, but that only 15 percent of the dwellings be constructed to sell at more than $6,500, and not more than 15 percent of the rental properties to rent at more than $52.50 per month; and (4) that a Veterans' Relocation Authority be established with power to place veterans in available temporary housing in preference to all other tenants. The President's emergency-housing program for veterans; and S. 1592, by Messrs. WAGNER, ELLENDER, and TAFT. Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

15. Urge creation of one major committee on veterans' affairs in the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively.

16. Enactment of legislation that will speed up settlement of differences between labor and management, restore economic balance,

and protect veterans in their right to work at a steady job with a fair living wage.

17. Consolidation of the Army, Navy, and Air Forces on a coequal status into a single Department of National Security, under one Cabinet member.

18. Amend title IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to provide that all veterans' employment representatives shall be war veterans, and shall be placed directly under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Employment Service.

19. Amend the Civil Service Commission Act to provide that at least one member of the Commission, at all times, shall be a war veteran.

20. Amend veterans' regulation 9 (a) to increase allowance for burial of war veterans from $100 to $200. H. R. 1939, by Mr. RANKIN. House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

21. Prohibit all quota immigration for a period of 10 years after cessation of hostilities. H. R. 545, by Mr. RANDOLPH. House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

22. Construct north-south, east-west superhighways as self-liquidating, employment projects.

23. Establishment of combined foreign intelligence office, in line with recommendations of Maj. Gen. William J. Donovan and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

24. Grant pensions to orphans of war veterans equal to child dependency allowance during father's service.

25. Increase maximum income limitation from $1,000 to $1,500 for childless widows and unmarried veterans otherwise qualified to receive pensions. H. R. 4485, by Mr. RICHARDS. House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

26. Amend title V of Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, so that no veteran shall be ineligible to receive the readjustment allowance during the first 60 days after discharge from the service, or discharge from a veterans' hospital if he entered same immediately upon separation from the service.

27. Provide for naval personnel to wear gold stripes denoting foreign service. H. R. 2889, by Mrs. BOLTON. House Committee on Naval Affairs.

28. Amend the act of March 20, 1933, so that no veteran who applies for domiciliary care and hospitalization in Veterans' Administration facilities shall be required to state: (1) The value of his real and personal property, or (2) whether or not he is financially able to pay. H. R. 2413, by Mr. WICKERSHAM. House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

29. Pensions payable to veterans for non-service-connected disabilities shall not be reduced to less than $20 per month while veteran is undergoing hospitalization in a Government hospital. H. R. 1832, by Mr. KILBURN. House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

30. Direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to extend a minimum rating of 1 percent to the claim of any war veteran based on any injury, disease, ailment, or disability incurred in active service in time of war. H. R. 1495, by Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

31. Disabled veterans whose life expectancy is shortened by their disabilities, shall be placed on civil-service register for which qualified, but on appointment to Federal positions they shall not come under the Civil Service Retirement Act but shall be entitled to Federal old-age and survivors' insurance benefits under Social Security Act. H. R. 314, by Mr. MCMILLAN of South Carolina. House Committee on the Civil Service.

32. Amend existing law to provide that insurance judgments shall be binding on the Veterans' Administration until modified by order of district court. H. R. 722, by Mr. GIBSON. House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

33. Amend existing law to extend eligibility to a widow otherwise entitled to pension providing she was married to and living with a veteran for 2 years preceding his death, or if she gave birth to a child by the veteran, being married to and living with him at the time of his death. H. R. 2150, by Mr. HAGEN. House Committee on Invalid Pensions.

34. Amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for voluntary retirement from civil service after 30 years, without regard for age, and that time served overseas in the armed forces will be credited as double time for purposes of retirement and retired pay. S. 402, by Mr. DOWNEY. Senate Committee on Civil Service. H. R. 310, by Mr. MCMILLAN of South Carolina. House Committee on the Civil Service.

35. Place the Indian veteran in same status as other veterans, giving him full American citizenship, removing all property restrictions, divorcing his affairs from control of the Indian Bureau, and improving educational standards on all Indian reservations.

36. Amend Public Law 359, Seventy-seventh Congress, to provide that pensions and compensation be paid to World War II veterans under the 1925, 1933, or 1945 schedule of disability ratings, whichever is most favorable for the individual.

37. Amend section 3 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended, to provide additional Government positions with competition restricted to veterans.

38. Extend pension benefits to those veterans engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the Islands of Samar and Leyte, between July 4, 1902, and January 1, 1914, and to their unremarried widows and their children. H. R. 3251, by Mr. LESINSKI. House Committee on Invalid Pensions.

39. Amend Federal income tax law to continue the special exemption of $1,500, in addition to the normal exemption, to all honorably discharged personnel of the armed forces of World War II, for a period of 1 year for each year served, or major portion thereof.

40. Enactment of legislation to grant a certificate of priority to each honorably discharged veteran of World War II who served 90 days or more, which shall be valid for 3 years from date of enactment, and shall be honored as a priority to purchase a car or truck from any person, firm, or corporation engaged in the retail or wholesale business of selling motor cars and trucks.

41. Restore the retainer pay of the Navy to the schedule in effect before July 1, 1925. S. 1438, by Mr. WALSH. Senate Committee on Naval Affairs.

42. Enlisted personnel of the armed forces advanced to commissioned rank shall be entitled upon return to enlisted status (1) to promotion of not less than one grade for each year of commissioned service, (2) to retirement (when eligible) with the grade, pay, and allowances of chief warrant officer. H. R. 737, by Mr. KEARNEY. House Committee on Military Affairs.

43. Authorize payment of compensation to veterans for a partial service-connected disability plus a computed percentage of his permanent total non-service-connected disability. H. R. 555, by Mr. RANKIN. House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

44. Authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish certain medical, surgical, and dental services and orthopedic or prosthetic appliances to veterans discharged under conditions other than dishonorable. H. R. 1581, by Mr. RANKIN. House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

45. Amend Veterans Regulation 1 (a), part III to include the provision that a non-service-connected disability is permanent and total when it is established that the veteran is unable to perform manual labor. H. R. 106, by Mr. VOORHIS of California. House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

46. Prohibit reduction of the pension, compensation, or retirement, pay of a veteran during his hospitalization in a Government hospital. H. R. 4464, by Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

47. Permit suit to be brought at any time on automatic, yearly renewable term, or Government life (converted) insurance, with no application of State or other statutes of limitation to suits filed, and suits already thus barred may be reinstated. H. R. 1293, by Mr. PETERSON of Florida. House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

48. Permit Government employees with 25 years service to retire voluntarily at the age of 55 with an annuity equal in value to the present worth of a deferred annuity at the age of 65. H. R. 1445, by Mr. MUNDT. House Committee on the Civil Service.

49. Removal of all limitation dates before which to make application for various types of benefits for veterans and their dependents. H. R. 1932, by Mr. RANKIN. House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

50. Amend existing laws so as to provide that the amount of compensation or pension payable to any veteran for his service-connected disability shall be increased by 20 percent upon reaching 40 years of age, and 20 percent each 5 years thereafter, but not to exceed the amount payable for total disability. H. R. 1582, by Mr. VOORHIS of California. House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

51. Redefine the status of the United States army of occupation serving in Germany between November 11, 1918, and July 2, 1921, so that they may participate in all of the benefits provided for veterans of World War I. H. R. 5266, by Mr. HUBER. Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

52. Redefine the terms "compensation" and "pension." Payments for service-connected disabilities are compensation; payments for non-service-connected disabilities or age, and payments made to dependents of deceased veterans based upon service-connected or non-service-connected death are pension. H. R. 1938, by Mr. RANKIN. House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

53. Provide for the fingerprinting and identification of all persons within, or hereafter to enter or pass through, the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and that such fingerprints shall be filed with the Federal Bureau of Investigation. H. R. 601, by Mr. SPRINGER. House Committee on the Judiciary.

54. Recognize foreign service by increasing by 20 percent rates of pension, compensation, or retired pay of veterans with war service outside the continental United States. H. R. 729, by Mr. KEARNEY. House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

55. Extend the filing time on applications for benefits under the World War Adjusted Compensation Act to January 2, 1950. H. R. 1124, by Mr. CARLSON. House Committee on Ways and Means.

56. Authorize the Veterans' Administration to grant burial allowances to deceased honorably discharged veterans who served in a recognized campaign, expedition, or occupation. H. R. 649, by Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

57. Redefine "misconduct" for compensation and pension purposes. H. R. 560, by Mr. RANKIN. House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

58. Provide for a statutory award of $10 per month to any war veteran who was wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled by an instrumentality of war in a zone of hostilities. H. R. 138, by Mr. VOORHIS. House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

59. Restore 100 percent compensation to veterans of World War I whose disabilities were re-established as service-connected under the act of March 28, 1934. H. R. 733, by Mr. KEARNEY. House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

60. Redefine "permanent and total disability," for compensation and pension purposes, to include (1) ratings without regard to fixed evaluations of the Veterans' Administration, and (2) defects of mind or body which render a veteran totally incapable of manual labor or earning a support. Each case shall be rated according to the circumstances and capabilities of the individual, and they shall not be adjudged upon the basis of a hypothetical average veteran. H. R. 106, by Mr. VOORHIS. House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

61. Amend existing law to provide that the widows, orphans, and dependent parents of deceased World War I veterans suffering from permanent total combat-incurred disabilities shall, regardless of the cause of death, be entitled to the rates of pension which would have been payable to them if the veteran had been killed in action. H. R. 2047, by Mr. HAGEN. House Committee on Invalid Pensions.

62. Insurance benefits shall not be considered as income as to veterans receiving pension or compensation for nonservice-connected disabilities. H. R. 1183, by Mr. MCMILLAN. H. R. 1113, by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

63. Fix Federal Government's responsibility for assistance to honorably discharged war veterans, and in lieu of employment opportunities, or inability to work full or part time, pension entitlement shall be granted such veterans having at least 90 days' service. H. R. 563, by Mr. RANKIN. House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

64. Fragmentary periods of employment of a veteran shall not be considered as evidence of employability. H. R. 105, by Mr. VOORHIS. House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

65. Unemployable veterans who served in any war or recognized campaign beyond the continental limits of the United States and were honorably discharged shall be entitled to total disability ratings for pension purposes. H. R. 734, by Mr. KEARNEY. House Committee on Invalid Pensions.

66. Widows and children of World War veterans who were entitled to disability benefits as a result of injuries caused by examination, hospitalization, or medical treatment shall be entitled to benefits under 38 United States Code 503–7. H. R. 567, by Mr. RANKIN. House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

67. Pensions to veterans for disability or death incurred during peacetime service shall be equivalent to 90 percent of the compensation payable to war veterans for service-connected disabilities. H. R. 279, by Mr. LESINSKI. House Committee on Invalid Pensions.

68. Eliminate the income limitation as to eligibility for pensions to widows of certain World War Veterans. H. R. 315, by Mr. MCMILLAN. House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

69. Any person who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during a recognized campaign or expedition, who was honorably separated from such service, shall be granted hospitalization and domiciliary care by the Veterans' Administration subject to the same conditions as are now applicable to World War veterans. H. R. 650, by Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

70. War risk insurance policies, including reinstated converted policies, shall be incontestable 2 years after the date of issuance, reinstatement, or conversion except for nonpayment of premiums, or because applicant was not a member of the armed forces. H. R. 565, by Mr. RANKIN. House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

71. Grant the franking privilege to all veterans who are patients in facilities of the Veterans' Administration. H. R. 111, by Mr. CARLSON. House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

72. A veteran who is (1) permanently and totally disabled, and (2) has paid 240 installments or more on yearly renewable term, automatic, or United States Government life insurance, shall be conclusively presumed to be disabled for life. H. R. 566, by Mr. RANKIN. House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

73. When a veteran is shown to have been in combat with the enemy or to have been subjected to any other arduous conditions of active military or navy service which can be considered as causing or aggravating the disabilities on which a claim is based, service connection shall be established. H. R. 151, by Mr. VOORHIS. House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

74. When the disability rating of any veteran of World War I to whom disability compensation is allowed under the act of March 2, 1933, as amended, has been in effect for 10 years, such rating shall become permanent, except in cases of fraud. H. R. 573, by Mr. RANKIN. House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

75. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall pay a claim, timely filed, notwithstanding a prior denial, when right thereto is clearly demonstrated. H. R. 564, by Mr. RANKIN. House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

76. Any nature of certificate issued by the Secretary of War, Navy, or the Treasury giving the date and place of birth, as shown on the service records of former members of the armed forces, shall be accepted by the Federal agencies in lieu of birth certificates. H. R. 736, by Mr. KEARNEY. House Committee on Military Affairs.

77. Deductions shall not be made from the earnings of civilian officers and employees of the Veterans' Administration for subsistence, quarters, or laundry unless such services are voluntarily accepted and used. Facilities when voluntarily used, shall be furnished at cost. H. R. 495, by Mr. LUDLOW. House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

78. Reduce the minimum retirement age under the Social Security Act to 55 years, providing that the retirement pay shall remain the same as at present allowed for at the age of 65. An increase of contribution by Government employers and employees is authorized, if necessary, to permit such allowances to be paid. Retirement at 55 shall be voluntary, and those who retire at a later date shall receive an allowance based on their accumulated contribution.

79. Prohibit reduction of compensation, pension, or retirement pay of a veteran of the War with Spain during hospitalization in a Government hospital. H. R. 1294, by Mr. PETERSON of Florida. House Committee on Pensions.

80. All war veterans employed by the Civil Service under war-service appointments, for the duration of the war plus 6 months, who have efficiency ratings of "good" or better, shall be placed on a permanent basis and without further physical or mental examination. H. R. 2213, by Mrs. ROGERS. House Committee on the Civil Service.

81. The act of January 27, 1936, entitled "An act to provide for the immediate payment of World War adjusted-service certificates and for the cancellation of unpaid interest accrued on loans secured by such certificates and for other purposes," should be amended by changing the period at the end of section 3 (a) to a colon and adding: "*Provided*, That where the maturity date of a certificate, as referred to herein, precludes waiver of interest as provided by section 2, and/or payment of interest on adjusted-service bonds as provided by this act, such maturity date shall be extended by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for a period of 5 years."

82. War veterans wounded in action, if otherwise qualified, shall be exempt from passing a physical examination as a prerequisite to employment in the Federal civil service.

83. Extend to veterans of World War II the same statutory awards as those extended to veterans of World War I in service-connected cases of arrested tuberculosis or loss of procreative powers through injury or disease of one or both testes.

84. Extend the benefits offered to service-connected sightless veterans of World War II to similarly disabled veterans of World War I who may wish to avail themselves of such privileges.

85. Extend the benefits of the National Service Life Insurance to all members of the armed forces while in active service, without time limitation, regardless of their physical condition.

86. Amend existing law so as to reduce the interest rate on United States Government (converted) insurance policy loans from 5 percent to 3½ percent per annum. H. R. 343, by Mr. WICKERSHAM. House Committee on Ways and Means.

87. Increase payment of compensation by 20 percent for service-incurred disabilities to men who have served overseas in time of war, provided that such increase only applies to the degree of disability and shall not be applicable to a statutory rating or award.

88. Amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to provide that a veteran of one war or recognized campaign or expedition may not displace another war veteran from employment when the latter has equal or greater employment seniority.

89. Petition the Congress to set aside 1 day of the year when the veterans of all wars may celebrate the victories they have attained by their sacrifice and hardships, and that this day shall be a legal holiday in the United States of America and her possessions, officially known as Victory Day.

90. Amend Public Law 483 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, approved December 14, 1944, to provide for pension payments to parents of deceased veterans of World War I, whose disabilities were non-service-connected, as defined in the said act.

91. Amend existing law to provide that members of the armed forces be paid an additional 50 percent of their base pay when they are retained in the service as essential although having enough points for discharge.

Cleveland Conquers Typhoid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 15, 1946

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Cleveland Press of February 11, 1946:

CLEVELAND CONQUERS TYPHOID

Typhoid fever is a filth disease that early in our century was taken as a matter of course by the public. The city dumped its sewage into Lake Erie and pumped its drinking water out of it. There was some typhoid fever every year, and ever so often there would be a serious outbreak.

There was an epidemic of typhoid in 1903, following which city officials decided to go further out in the lake for the water supply.

But not until Newton D. Baker's administration in 1913 was any official action taken toward filtering the city's drinking water and then not until doctors and health officials had been aroused by a sharp increase in the number of typhoid-fever cases. As an emergency measure, the city started to treat the water with chlorine.

In the course of time, filtration plants were completed. After years of planning, sewage-dispcsal plants also were put in operation to take care of most of the city's sewage.

In the meanwhile, the disease was tackled from other angles. A whole new sanitary code was enacted. Fly-breeding places were cleaned up. A typhoid vaccine was developed. The city lacked authority to require innoculations against typhoid fever. Thousands of its citizens who served in World War I and World War II, however, received these anti-typhoid shots—which are intended to confer immunity against the disease.

What has been the result? A small news item the other day told the story. For the first time in history there was not a single death from typhoid fever in Cleveland last year. Typhoid has been licked. This does not mean, of course, that our public-health armies are to be withdrawn. Vigilance must be maintained. The successful fight against typhoid, however, does point the way for the conquest of other diseases, now grown more formidable.

Shortages of Housing Materials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 15, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the need of lumber, not alone for building of new homes, but for the repair and modernization of others, has reached a point bordering on the state of revolution, if correspondence coming to my desk is any indication.

From every part of my State come volumes of correspondence urging that some action be taken by the Congress to stop the deportation of lumber to European countries until in some measure we are able to catch up with the vitally needed shelter for humanity within the confines of our own country.

Under unanimous consent, I include herewith an article on the shortage of material causing the delay of housing construction from the Fargo Forum, of Fargo, N. Dak.:

SHORTAGES BIG CAUSE OF DELAY IN HOUSING CONSTRUCTION HERE

The shortages of housing materials, which are blamed for the delay in much renovation and construction in the Fargo-Moorhead area, include especially shortages of soil pipe and fittings, plumbing fixtures, especially bath tubs and sinks, hardwood flooring, trim, sheet rock and rock lath, plywood, dimension lumber, common brick, furnaces, and millwork, according to Homer W. Ludwick, executive secretary of the chamber of commerce.

Ludwick summarized the situation in response to a request from the United States Chamber of Commerce, which was making a Nation-wide survey of such shortages.

In a telegram to the national chamber's offices in Washington, Ludwick termed the Fargo housing situation critical, with more than 300 veterans' families hopelessly house-hunting. Ludwick told of the press, radio, and pulpit campaigns to ease housing, of the attempt to get grain bins for 100 temporary housing units.

Suggested reasons (for housing shortage), said Ludwick, include the fact that rent control, either psychologically or in fact, is retarding the opening up of additional housing units. He suggests the removing of newly created living units from rent control.

Increased production of housing, said Ludwick, is the real answer to the shortage, with the uncertain labor situation and unrealistic OPA pricing attitude making industrialists reticent to go all out.

The national survey boiled down to the following reasons for continued delays in making new housing available: OPA reluctance to make price adjustments, need to speed release of old Army barracks and prisoner-of-war camps, delay in releasing plumbing and other supplies now held by Army and Navy, diversion of lumber for export.

Unless OPA ceilings are relaxed, to break up the log jam of housing needs, materials shortages will continue to exist, Fargo contractors and building materials dealers agreed in a meeting in the chamber of commerce offices Tuesday.

The emphasis of Government intervention might better be toward putting a green light on production than a strict allocation of short supplies of building needs, the builders agreed. Besides spending too much time dividing up a too-short supply of building needs, said the contractors, the Government has developed elaborate machinery for credit assistance to those who wish to buy or build homes. In reality, they believe, people have more money today, less need of credit assistance, than ever before.

C. A. Williams, chairman of the chamber's housing committee, was chairman of the meeting called to evaluate what is being done in Washington, what can be done in Fargo-Moorhead.

Reporting on an application placed with the Federal housing authority, asking temporary housing units for Fargo, Williams said the agency has applications already for 45,000 such units, can supply only 8,000.

Congress, it was reported, has authorized the Civilian Production Administration to issue priorities to builders and contractors who wish to get supplies for creating dwellings which will be occupied by veterans.

Major Farm Organizations Endorse School-Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 15, 1946

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a statement addressed to Members of the House of Representatives and signed by representatives of the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, and the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation:

FEBRUARY 14, 1946.

To Members of the House of Representatives of the United States:

The school-lunch program has the unanimous endorsement of all major farm organizations. Its principles are embodied in H. R. 3370 by Representative John W. Flannagan, Chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture; a bill to establish a permanent system of Federal-State supported lunches for school children. Among the reasons why we favor enactment of this measure are:

Control of the program rests in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture.

It places on a permanent instead of a year-to-year basis a program that already has proved its value in the improved nutrition of children. With a permanent program assured, additional schools will be encouraged to install equipment. Thus the program should produce increasing results for the expenditure involved.

The school-lunch program in general assures increased food consumption and consequently enlarged market for some farm products.

The annual appropriation of $50,000,000 in Title I, does not put any additional strain upon Federal finances since about this amount has been annually spent by the Secretary of Agriculture from funds authorized by the Congress.

The proportion of State funds to that of Federal funds is increased each year until, in 1950 and thereafter, the States will be bearing 80 percent of the total cost.

As revised and reported, the bill in the main incorporates the recommendations of the farm organizations.

For the above reasons, we hope that you will give us your support in carrying on and expanding the school-lunch work which already is helping more than 8,000,000 children.

Respectfully submitted.

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
EDWARD A. DAHL, *President.*
THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
A. S. GOSS, *Master.*
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES,
JOHN W. DAVIS, *Executive Secretary.*
NATIONAL COOPERATIVE MILK PRODUCERS FEDERATION,
CHARLES W. HOLMAN, *Secretary.*

Neither Fish Nor Fowl

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 15, 1946

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in view of the action taken by the Rules Committee on yesterday, refusing to grant a rule on H. R. 4982, entitled "The interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills between the people of the United States and the peoples of other countries," I feel the accompanying editorial from the Daily Register Mail, Galesburg, Ill., under date of January 7, 1946, is of timely interest.

To demonstrate how quickly the plans of an agency expand, the $13,000,000 referred to in this editorial was the surplus left over from the OWI. Now it is contemplated to ask for an appropriation of $29,000,000 for the coming year.

As I indicated in my remarks, appearing in the RECORD of February 13 on this same subject, it is difficult to estimate how much such a program will cost when it gets going full blast as these agencies, once established, keep growing like Topsy.

NEITHER FISH NOR FOWL

The State Department has $13,000,000 to spend on its proposed Foreign Information

Service during its first 6 months of existence. It has jobs for some 2,600 persons in 62 countries. All it has to do now is persuade Congress to breathe the breath of life into the new agency.

Given that, we shall have a permanent successor to the late OWI and Office of Inter-American Affairs whose object, according to Assistant Secretary of State Benton, is to give foreign peoples "a full and fair picture of American life and of the aims and policies of the United States Government." Its instruments will include world-wide short-wave broadcasts and wireless bulletins every day, newsreel and documentary films, periodicals and such like.

Mr. Benton has said the new agency has no intention of competing with foreign propaganda abroad. He has likewise declared that it is not intended to compete with or supplant existing private news services.

Perhaps Mr. Benton is wise in making this explanation, since both foreign government propaganda agencies and nongovernment news services are strongly established in their opposite fields. But he leaves us with the odd and hesitant inference that the State Department is going in neither for propoganda nor for factual news distribution.

Only one thing seems definitely certain in this tepid declaration of an expensive project. Most foreign readers and lookers and listeners are going to accept the State Department's foreign information output as slanted American propaganda. They've been fed too much Government-issue news and views in the past to believe otherwise.

The State Department implies, by its declaration of this proposed agency's purpose, that foreign peoples have been getting an inadequate and unfair picture of this country, and a distorted impression of its Government's intentions. But will these foreign peoples believe that a Government information agency, confronted with a choice, will ever fail to show that Government's activities in anything but the most favorable light? We doubt it.

We do not question that the State Department's intentions are the best and most honest in the world. Nevertheless, this information agency seems doomed to sow more confusion and to reap a harvest of cynical suspicion.

It might be more realistic if the State Department would cease to disclaim any propaganda intentions and to try to compete with foreign propaganda agencies as best it could. Or, much better, it might throw its influence behind the growing efforts to promote a greater freedom of the press throughout the world.

For that world is badly in need of a free access to news for agencies which are known and trusted, and which will give the most straightforward information that human frailty and prejudice will permit. And we doubt that more Government handouts will meet that need.

OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, to judge by the many complaints demanding the removal of price controls and that the OPA be abolished, it appears that many people fail to realize the danger in existing conditions and present price trends.

In this connection, there is submitted for insertion in the RECORD a letter with editorials on the OPA and my reply thereto:

I'll go Wilson's Vice President Marshall one better. What the country needs is a good two for a nickel cigar. Try and get it and retain OPA.

What's the use of holding prices at a place where manufacturers don't produce and you can't buy?

A man convinced against his will, remains of the same opinion still. The war is over, and I still think it is time to liquidate Chester of the House of Bowles—and confiscate his castles of OPA.

Some of the things that have come under my observation:

Suits with one pair of trousers. On my job, I always wear my trousers out in the rear before the coat shows wear. Net result, two suits instead of two pair of trousers. Is that saving?

Then no cuffs on trousers.

Then double-breasted suit without vest. Am developing a sort of Milwaukee front, which would be less noticeable in a double-breasted coat—but no vest—no place to carry my watch, small change, and pen and pencils.

Cigars—standard brands just occasionally available at nearly double the pre-war price. Show cases filled with imported cigars (of about two-for-a-nickel pre-war quality) priced at fancy prices, and practically all of them rotten smokes. Is that economy?

About half the time the grocer is out of butter, mayonnaise (hope that is spelled near enough correctly that you can tell what I mean), salad dressing, bananas, ham, sometimes eggs and meat. These are only a few. Free enterprise would furnish these, but price controls prevent a profit and destroy incentive.

Shirts, underwear. If they don't get some ordinary shirts and underwear on the local market soon, so that I can take my annual bath, I'm going to have to quit circulating.

Handkerchiefs, 59 cents—I believe I have heard—for a cotton rag? I haven't bought any, so can't speak of this first hand.

Cars. 1940 Chrysler laid up for 4 months. All I could get from the repairman was he didn't know when he could get it going. Finally sold it to him. Thought I had a record and was telling my story, when someone told of a farmer that had one in the garage 2 years. New cars not available and not being produced in any appreciable quantities. Why? Because price controls will not let free enterprise function, and has brought about (together with all New Deal vote-catching labor laws) the greatest industrial unrest in the history of the country.

Did you ever notice the papers along last spring when Congress was debating extending OPA for another year. The number of suits OPA was filing in Idaho? And I assume elsewhere. Did you ever investigate these and see what there was to base them on?

Building material. Understand it is common custom to represent that you need some lumber to repair one's chicken coop and if one can get it at two prices use it to repair his back steps or some other part of his house to make it usable. Is that holding prices?

I've been paying grocery bills for a good many years, and I don't believe OPA is holding the line.

"The best government is that which governs least."

Probably doesn't apply to the politician.

The question is bigger than booms and depressions.

I realize that the Supreme Court has amended the Constitution until Congress now has the power to do anything, so until Congress sees fit to redefine interstate commerce, there is no provision for State rights in our fundamental law.

However, aside from (I believe about 75 percent) the majority of our Federal judges having been appointed by one man and all presumably with the New Deal "phobia"; other than the Supreme Court packing bill, there has been no direct attempt of which I am conscious of trying to destroy the "holy trinity of democracy," the three independent departments of Government—legislative, executive, and judicial. As I understand it, the OPA act does this. The department makes its rules and regulations, prescribes the penalties, says when they are violated, and the victim has no appeal to the courts.

The fear of dictatorship is not all political "hooey."

These political bureaus are like body lice. They grow and multiply and annoy and sap the strength and serenity of the people. And now the UNO is starting a world bureaucracy for the American taxpayer to support.

Congressman HENRY DWORSHAK is strictly on the job. During 1945 he was absent only on 11 of the 211 roll calls. His voting record shows him as a militant foe of big Government spending and domination. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reported that during the first session which ended in December, DWORSHAK stood with his fellow Republicans in four attempts to liberalize ration controls. He voted "yes" on proposals to transfer food control from OPA to the Agriculture Department, to give meat packers relief from OPA, to give the Secretary of Agriculture a veto on OPA food regulations, and to make OPA penalties reviewable in Federal courts.

Our HENRY is strictly on the job.

NINE STATES PROTESTING

SAN FRANCISCO.—Independent meat packers of nine Western States, in what they term a "fight for existence" against Office of Price Administration regulations, have joined together for the first time on a permanent basis.

The packers determined to organize, probably as the Western Federation of Meat Packers, at a meeting here earlier this month. Final details, including the establisment of a headquarters and selection of officers, will be completed at a second meeting here shortly.

More than 250 independent packers of California, Oregon, Washington, Neveda, Idaho, Arizona, Utah, Wyoming, and Montana will be represented.

Dan M. McKinney, secretary of the California Cattlemen's Association, said the problem of compliance with OPA regulations was an almost impossible task under western conditions, and is one of vital importance to producers and consumers as well as the packers, for on their staying in business depends the bulk of the distribution of western meat.

"Certainly producers could ill afford to lose the independent packer as a customer for cattle," McKinney wrote in "Hot Irons," the cattlemen's weekly trade bulletin. "It appears that the independent packer has a legitimate complaint and one in which all western producers have a vital concern."

First move of the new packer organization, McKinney said, will be to seek OPA compliance regulations which will permit western independents to qualify for Government subsidies "with which they could break even and show a profit as provided in the Barkley-Bates amendment to the Price Control Act."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 13, 1946.

Mr. W. C. LOOFBOURROW,
Attorney at Law,
American Falls, Idaho.

DEAR FRIEND LOOFBOURROW: The wide expanse of white paper on the front page of

your letter which came in just now with the clippings and other enclosures tempts me to write my comments in blue pencil across the face of this page as I do on some of these insistent communications that come from eastern centers. However, you are a good friend of mine, whose sound opinions and good advice I prize very highly.

Now about OPA. Maybe we, you and I, should look this thing over a little more before we jump at conclusions. You know we got our price structure all out of joint as a result of the last war and have been trying to bring our national economy back to adjustment ever since. With a lot of legislation, with not much success, and with all the high prices we had in the country then, we only had a peak of $6,500,000,000 in currency in circulation at any time during that period, and no OPA. Now we have $29,000,000,000 of legal-tender money out in circulation, and the people of this country are still turning in the Government bonds and the banks are still turning out paper money, being printed by the Government Bureau of Engraving, of course. Now, as the thing stands, I am afraid to go along with you, and liquidate this Bowles fellow, or whoever the Price Administrator is.

I will admit that the OPA is a rickety castle, but just being a taxpayer, with some county, State, and Federal taxes to pay—and you know we must keep all these public officials in proper style—I do not want to see this price thing get completely out of control, because when farm prices go up and get way out of sight all the other industries start seeing which one can get the best prices, and when they get things fixed about right for themselves, then the utilities, the railroads will have to raise their rates and charge you a lot more for a train ticket. The electric-light people will have to charge more, and then will come the telephone and the telegraph. Then when everything gets out of reach naturally the boys in the courthouse, State capitol, and all the whole raft of Federal employees will insist upon, and maybe get, a raise, and then maybe the bottom will drop out of the whole thing. It usually does—then poor old Congress will have a worse mess on its hands than it did after the big slump in 1929. Boy, I'm scairt!

Maybe we had better keep some kind of OPA to hold down prices until things sort of settle down, because those railroad and utility fellows are hard to deal with when it comes to trying to get them to let down prices. You will agree, I know, that Government pay rolls never come down. Ever since our national economy was thrown out of adjustment, due in a large measure to disparity in prices, the Congress has been trying to get things back in order. Let's try not to make things any worse than they are.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

Text of Ickes' Broadcast Explaining Resignation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 15, 1946

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the prepared text of Secretary Ickes' broadcast delivered on the evening of February 13, 1946, as follows:

I am here tonight to explain why I chose to resign after almost 13 years in the high post of Secretary of the Interior, with which President Roosevelt honored me on March 4, 1933.

My task is no easy one, nor was the decision to resign an easy one. But a man has to live with himself. I have to spend the rest of my life with Harold L. Ickes, and I could no longer, much as I regret it, retain my self-respect and stay in the Cabinet of President Truman.

In my letter of resignation to the President I proposed that my resignation take effect at the close of business on March 31. My reason for this was that the hearings on the proposed Anglo-American oil treaty will begin on March 4. I am proud of this treaty, which I nurtured and raised by bottle from the beginning. I think that I had more to do with setting it up than any other man in the Government. I wanted to be here for those hearings. However, I told the President that if it was his desire that I should retire at an earlier date, I would be glad to do so.

PRESIDENT SETS FEBRUARY 15

In a brief note late this morning, he told me that my term of office would end on February 15, the day after tomorrow. I suppose that after being here almost 13 years I shall have no trouble in picking up in 2 days the odds and ends which have accumulated during that period. He also said that he considered that my resignation terminated all of my other governmental activities. I regard this remark of the President's as in the nature of supererogation. It was like saying that when a tree falls to the ground all of its branches go with it.

On no occasion did the President ever tell me that he proposed to nominate Mr. Pauley for Under Secretary of the Navy. Of course, I had seen reports to this effect in the newspapers and this possibility seemed to be on the tongue of many people in Washington.

Word came to me indirectly that Mr. Pauley himself had told the President of my probable opposition to his nomination. In the circumstances, it surprised me that the President did not frankly ask me what might be the basis of such oppcsition. Late Thursday afternoon, January 31, I received a telegram from Senator WALSH, chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate, asking me, at the request of Senator TOBEY, to appear before his committee on the nomination of Mr. Pauley the following morning at 11:30. The Cabinet met at 10 o'clock on that day. At almost exactly 11, as we were about to adjourn, I left my chair so as to reach President Truman first and showed him the telegram from Senator WALSH. He still refrained from asking me if I had any objections to this nomination. All that he said was "of course, you will have to tell the truth but be as gentle as you can with Ed Pauley." In the light of succeeding circumstances, I may be permitted to doubt whether the President was not speaking in a Pickwickian sense when he told me to tell the truth.

SHUNNED PERJURY

I proceeded to the meeting of the Naval Affairs Committee and I think that the record will show that I did everything that I could in behalf of Mr. Pauley except to perjure myself. It is rather shocking to me to learn that certain members of the Democratic Party, of standing and supposed reputation, evidently are incensed that I did not commit perjury. Even if I could subscribe to the theory that a man obviously unfit for the office for which he has been nominated should be confirmed by the Senate, I dissent vigorously from the motion that one should forswear himself in order to get an office for an unfit man, or even for a fit one.

Mr. Pauley followed me on the stand. Senator BREWSTER asked him whether he had heard my evidence that morning to the effect that he had suggested to me that if he could be assured that the tidelands bill would not be filed, he could raise three or four hundred thousand dollars. Mr. Pauley replied, "That statement is not true." Subsequently, I received another summons from the Naval Affairs Committee which required me to take with me all memoranda relating to conversations with Mr. Pauley with respect to campaign contributions and Federal title to offshore oil lands in California. On this occasion, under questioning from Senator TOBEY, I read my memoranda—there were several of them on the subject—to the committee. In one of these memoranda, written only a few days after Mr. Pauley visited me, I wrote that he had made me the "rawest proposition that I had ever heard." I feel no desire to modify that characterization.

At the President's press conference on Thursday, February 7, he definitely alined himself with Mr. Pauley as against me, thus making my position as a member of his Cabinet untenable. Of course, this was his privilege, but I question the propriety of his saying that I had not consulted him in advance of my testimony with respect to Pauley and particularly of his statement that "Ickes can very well be mistaken as well as the rest of us."

It seemed to me clear from what President Truman said at this press conference that he had prejudged this case without giving me a chance to be heard.

My feeling is that, since President Truman was not present at the hearing and presumably had not read the record, it was not proper for him, even although he be the President of the United States, to pass judgment on a question of veracity between Mr. Pauley and myself. On this issue I am ready to appear before any competent tribunal at any time, although, of course, I should want one that would not announce, or even form, its opinion in advance of a full and careful consideration of all of the evidence.

As to whether I had or had not consulted President Truman in advance of my testimony on the Pauley nomination, my reply is that he had full notice of the probability of my embarrassment, plus several opportunities, in addition to those he might create at will, to ask me the reason why I might oppose Pauley.

CHALLENGES PAULEY STATEMENT

I wish that every American could read the record of Mr. Pauley's testimony before the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate. At the very least, I hope that the Attorney General of the United States will assign one of his best lawyers to a scrutiny of Mr. Pauley's denial under oath of activities that he admits in other parts of the record. He said that he had "never asked any Senator or Representative to vote in favor of or against any bill involving tidelands rights or any other matter related thereto." He insisted that "never at any time" did he request "President Roosevelt or Attorney General Biddle to delay, postpone, or withdraw any suit relating in any way to the tidelands." He categorically denied that he had "presented his viewpoint on the tidelands issue to President Roosevelt, Attorney General Francis Biddle * * * to Secretary Ickes, and * * * others."

I challenge these statements. To the contrary I charge that Mr. Edwin W. Pauley was not speaking the truth when he said under oath that he had never attempted to influence President Roosevelt, Attorney General Biddle, or myself with respect to these tidelands suits. Such a statement is simply not true. Why, I remember his coming to my office to tell me that he had made representations to others in the administration against these tidelands suits. It is on record that he solicited Attorney General Biddle in the same behalf. He left no stone unturned to prevent the filing of suits that he now, with pretended innocence, declares that he had so little interest in that he never said anything to anyone on the subject.

GLAD TO GO

Things have come to a pretty pass if, under pressure from party organizations, men are not only expected but are urged to testify under oath to what is not true. I wonder what President Truman meant in that last hurried colloquy that I had with him when he said, "Of course, you must tell the truth, but be as gentle as you can with Ed Pauley." I told the truth and my oral testimony was supported by written memoranda made immediately following the visits of Mr. Pauley to my office. I told the truth with the result that the President for several days, although I was a member of his Cabinet, was unwilling to see me. I told the truth with the result that following my voluntary resignation I have been graciously allowed less than 3 days to clean up the accumulation of 13 years in the Department of the Interior.

I am glad to go. But I want to make it clear that I applaud President Truman for advocating the policies for which his great predecessor, Franklin D. Roosevelt, fought. I want also to make it clear that he has made some excellent appointments—men of character and ability who are devoted to the public welfare. However, lately I have noticed a trend that has seriously disturbed me as a citizen. Recently there has been a decided and alarming deterioration in the quality of his appointments. Now it is all very well to advocate policies that are in the interest of the people, but policies are not self-enacting any more than laws are self-enforcing. Policies and laws must be fought for and enforced or their substance will ooze away and nothing worth while will remain. It takes men of character, strong men, men who expect to speak the truth and to hear the truth, to give form to the policies and the laws for which President Roosevelt fought and which President Truman favors in his speeches.

So, men and women of America, this was the way in which the problem presented itself to me. Should I have put the country first or the administration first? So long as I can remember, I have owed allegiance to America. I have never subscribed to the view that party allegiance should override the interest of the country. I do not now subscribe to that view. Nor have I ever believed, as the Nazis did in Germany, that the interests of the party and the interests of the country are always identical. I do not now believe this.

I have enjoyed my 13 years as Secretary of the Interior and I feel a sense of loyalty and obligation to the fine men and women who have served that Department with me. Although I am about to retire from public office, the fight for good government and good administration that I have waged all of my life will go on.

Thirty-nine Economists Against Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 15, 1946

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, the New Republic for February 18, 1946, has an interesting article called Thirty-nine Economists Against Inflation, which I should like to call to the attention of the House:

THIRTY-NINE ECONOMISTS AGAINST INFLATION

The economists of this country are badly worried about the immediate danger of inflation. They favor continuation of price control, and many of them advocate strong and integrated action on a broadened front to check inflationary pressures.

These opinions are indicated positively in messages to the New Republic, received February 5, 6, and 7, in response to a telegram sent from the Washington office of this magazine on February 4, addressed to 49 university and business economists and groups of economists. Twenty-six replies, signed by forty-three economists, were received within 3 days.

The New Republic asked the economists to indicate "whether you feel price control should be continued and strengthened in order to minimize danger of inflation. Whether answer favorable or unfavorable, do you advise additional steps against inflation, and if so, what?"

All the first replies disclosed that these men felt the problem was of great urgency. Thirty-nine of the forty-three said that the Price Control Act, which expires June 30, should be extended without delay. Three said no, and one gave an equivocal answer. Of the 39, one qualified his answer by recommending strong price control on basic raw materials and wholesale commodities, with some relaxation on finished products. Four suggested improvements in administration of the extended act, such as achieving a better balance among price ceilings, permitting some rise in the general price level and not holding business too closely to 1936–39 profit levels.

On the other hand, 29 of those who recommended price-control extension said it should be strengthened. Two suggested the necessity of extending control to cover the sale price of houses, which is specifically exempted from the present act. Two others emphasized that there must be no crippling amendments or impairment of the powers of the Office of Price Administration. Although they were not asked for how long the act should be renewed, four suggested a full year's extension. Five others thought control would be necessary until there is a reasonably good balance between production and demand.

Of the three who thought price control should be discontinued, one stated his belief that any effort to maintain a controlled economy is self-defeating; he would stop further monetization of the debt and, in unspecified ways, "bring all possible production into force." Another opponent suggested the necessity of 11 other controls which, if instituted, would make price control practically unnecessary. The third thought that the administration's abandonment of other controls has made price control impossible.

Responding to the second part of the question, all but 4 of the 43 economists suggested other controls to combat inflation. Twenty-two proposed wage adjustments or controls, while 10 suggested measures for avoiding work stoppages through industrial disputes; the chief concern on this point appeared to be the achievement of a balance between wages and prices. Twenty-eight would maintain at least the present tax rates; 10 of these advocated steeper taxes or additional taxes. Twenty-six suggested various means to reduce bank credit and the amount of money in circulation, or proposed other monetary and credit controls. Twenty-one favored reinstatement of priorities and allocations of essential materials, particularly building materials.

Space prevents publication here of all the telegrams, but the sampling that follows is fairly representative.

Dr. I. L. Sharfman of the University of Michigan, just retired as president of the American Economics Association, said:

"Continuation and strengthening of price control are indispensable if movement of inflation is to be checked. Authority should be extended for not less than 12 months with least possible delay to remove motive for withholding goods from market and for intensifying demand in expectation of further price increases. Controls should be exercised firmly in each important sphere until adequate flow of goods is attained. Most urgent additional need is to adjust labor disputes to eliminate actual or threatened work stoppages. Full production under genuinely competitive conditions and supplemented by intelligent monetary and fiscal policies constitutes the basic safeguard against inflation."

Dr. Frank D. Graham of Princeton University:

"In the absence of strong price controls while we catch up on production of civilian goods, prices will tend to rise out of all proportion to costs. This will do nothing but give swollen profits to business at the expense of consumers. Controls should not be so stringent as to prevent production, but by the same token we need official resistance to wage-rate increases at this time. Checking inflation calls for maintenance of existing wage rates coupled with full production. While profits pile up, ceiling prices on the goods involved should be lowered."

Dr. Sumner Slichter of Harvard University:

"I believe that price controls should be continued after June 30, 1946, until business enterprises are in a position to assume responsibility for preventing a disorderly rise in prices. Arrangements for correcting serious lack of balance in price ceilings need to be made more effective. Many concerns find their output limited because of inability to obtain parts or raw materials which are produced in limited amounts only because of the lack of balance in price ceilings. Some firms could sell for less if they were allowed to pay more for necessary parts or materials. The problem in a rough way is analogous to the problem of intra-plant wage inequities formerly faced by the National War Labor Board."

Gen. Leonard P. Ayres, of the Cleveland Trust Co.:

"Attempted controls over commodity prices cannot be made effective unless they are accompanied by controls over wages and over the allocation of key materials. Since the administration has abandoned its controls over wages and materials, and cannot now reassume them, it should abandon its futile attempt to continue price controls. If that should be done, the volume of production would rapidly increase instead of shrinking as it is now doing largely as the result of continuing attempts at price and profit controls."

An economist for a big New York bank, who asked that his name be withheld, said: "Strongly favor unimpaired price control. * * * Also favor controls on sale price of new and old houses and other buildings. Recommend special capital-gains tax and no tax reductions. Advise tightening controls to prevent further increase in bank credit. Also rapid use of Federal cash balance to reduce debt held by banks."

Dr. J. J. Spengler, of Duke University:

"Present situation three times as serious as 1918 when credit inflation facilitated postwar inflation. Present actual and immediately potential money supply can permit trebling of prices despite maximum possible production increase. Rid Truman's official family of inflationists. Support Bowles unreservedly. Raise through taxation more than is expended. Sponge up about fifty unneeded billions through stabilization-loan drives. Imposed proceeds and disburse as annual interest, thus sustaining future purchasing power. Rigorously curtail bank-credit extension. Control all prices and costs. Reinforce with priorities. Congressional failure to act along these lines will destroy much of value of veterans' benefits, insur-

ance, war bonds and savings, and prepare way for fascism. But given the above monetary and fiscal policies we can remove price controls in 2 or 3 years."

Dr. Alvin H. Hansen, of Harvard University, said: "A continuation of price controls is most urgently needed. Without it, I feel that we are in very serious danger. An extension of the control now would itself have a stabilizing effect."

Dr. A. B. Wolfe, of Ohio State University, former American Economics Association president believes OPA powers should be increased if politically possible as "it is the only agency which can or will save us from disastrous inflation." He suggested government take over plants in which labor and management refuse to start production on the basis of the Administration's current proposals, and stated that "at present any general increase in either prices or wages is bound to start the inflationary spiral."

Dr. Mabel Newcomer, of Vassar College, feels there is no assurance that higher prices will achieve full production. Favoring stronger and continued price control, she commented: "Unprecedented profits—after taxes—in recent years indicate that with industry operating to capacity, current prices should be adequate, even after substantial wage increases."

Dr. Kenneth Boulding, of Iowa State College, thinks that the abandonment of price controls would make inevitable a 100- or 200-percent rise. Suggesting stronger controls on basic raw materials and wholesale commodities, along with relaxation on finished products, he felt that some rise in the price level is "probably inevitable."

Dr. C. L. Christensen, of the University of Indiana, doubted if price controls can prevent inflation unless increased taxes on income can be used to balance the Federal Budget.

Five University of Texas economists—C. E. Ayres, A. R. Allen, G. V. Stocking, C. A. Wiley, E. E. Hale, and R. H. Montgomery—favored stronger price control, along with higher progressive income taxes to drain off existing excess purchasing power.

Fifteen of the University of California economics faculty—T. Grether, R. A. Brady, W. J. Fellner, C. A. Gulick, R. A. Gordon, S. Daggett, L. Kidner, A. H. Mowgray, P. Mason, L. A. Doyle, M. M. Knight, E. H. Huntington, M. M. Davisson, I. B. Cross, and C. Landauer—noted that pressures are approaching a breaking point. They favored continuing price controls with strengthened authority for another year, holding wages and prices in a balanced relationship, holding tax revenues at a high level, allocating strategic materials, and increasing Federal Reserve Board powers over reserve requirements.

Dr. Frank Albert Fetter, of Princeton University, on the other hand, found present policies hopeless, and price control more evil than good since the war. He suggested restoring the gold content of the dollar, contracting the money volume, increasing the bank reserve requirements, increasing the interest rate on bonds in the hands of individuals, enabling the exchange of cashable bonds bonds for old-age annuities, replacing strikes and labor violence by compulsory courts, permitting wages to rise to competitive levels, strengthening and enforcing laws against monopoly prices, increasing production, delaying demand for consumables, reducing public expenditures, and balancing the Budget.

Other replies, all affirmative and generally urgent, came from Dr. Harold M. Groves, of the University of Wisconsin; Dr. B. F. Haley, of Stanford University; Dr. Ben W. Lewis, of Oberlin College; Dr. Seymour E. Harris, of Harvard University; Dr. J. M. Clark, of Columbia University; Dr. Leo Rogin, of the University of California; Dr. Alan Sweezy, of Williams College; Dr. Earl Rolph, of the University of California; and Dr. Joseph S. Davis, of the Food Research Institute.

Aubrey G. Lanston, vice president of the First Boston Corp. of New York City, replied that he favored the immediate relaxing of control and some inflation which can be curbed by attaining full production, instead of a later, far more disastrous result. An answer was received from President Robert R. Wason of the National Association of Manufacturers, although the inquiry was addressed to one of its economists, outlining the well-known stand of that organization for dropping price controls.

New Deal Blunders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD W. LANDIS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 15, 1946

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, a new day is dawning. Americans are awakening to the dangers of the course the Nation has been traveling. This great Nation cannot be allowed to drift. The American people will not stand for too many major blunders. Americans are looking to the Republican Party for leadership to clean up the New Deal mess.

Now let us look at the mess we find ourselves in. Strikes and threats of strikes have interrupted our reconversion program. For a long time everyone has been interested in reestablishing labor-management peace and getting the Nation safely back on the reconversion road.

America can blame the New Deal for removing the War Labor Board last fall before the reconversion program could get under way. If the War Labor Board had been continued for another 6 months and the Little Steel formula increased some 15 to 20 percent, we would be in full production today. Prices could have been raised enough to allow management to pay the wage increase. A serious threat of inflation would have been avoided because production is our best guaranty against inflation.

As a result of this blunder our postwar program has been delayed 6 months and many workers have cashed their war bonds and spent their war savings. Thousands of retailers and wholesalers have lost money and hundreds of thousands of workers are out of jobs. Millions of our people will be forced to wait several months to purchase important items and materials. Many of our workers will have to start all over and earn enough to buy the necessities of life before they will be able to purchase automobiles, radios, electric washers, and refrigerators.

Someone in the administration got a bright idea that you could raise wages materially without raising prices. The OPA must have a flexible policy in adjusting price ceilings or thousands of little businessmen will have to retire.

The administration also had an idea that collective-bargaining agreements should be based upon the employer's ability to pay. Obviously some employers are better able to pay a high wage scale than others. But would you put a premium upon lack of thrift? Would you stifle initiative and business ingenuity which in a large part has made this Republic the wonder of the world? Is it fair that one manufacturer be required to pay a high wage scale and another a low one when they are in direct competition with each other? Is it conceivable that this is to be regarded as a sound economic policy?

Now, let us take a look at another New Deal blunder in the housing situation. The present shortage of lumber is due to shortage in production, absence of pipe lines, and maldistribution of available lumber supply. Yellow pine lumber is less than half full capacity. Labor is scarce and insufficient. Much of their equipment is worn out and replacements are not available. Surplus disposal of lumber, price adjustment, recruitment of labor and preventing the exportation of lumber and logs are some of the steps that should be taken immediately.

Housing Shortage

REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 15, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I am beginning to get letters from people about the housing shortage. I had an interesting letter this morning from a man who is engaged in the business of building houses. His remarks are nothing new, his message is nothing new. He makes a plea that Congress get busy and shake off the shackles of bureaucracy so that they can begin under our system of a free economy to produce building materials so that they will be available for men who want to hire labor and buy building materials to build houses. The New Deal is straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel, maybe an elephant; I do not know.

The policy of the administration seems to be somewhat uncertain and it is my hope that those party leaders in Congress who have the votes to determine just what bills should be acted on by other Members, make some announcement as their housing program. We know that the mayor of Louisville, Mr. Wyatt, is the new Housing Administrator, and that the President and Mr. Wyatt have announced something in the nature of a subsidy to encourage building; that they plan to train a million and a half men for housing and construction work; also that they intend to turn over a lot of business to the prefabricated housing manufacturers. They also plan ceiling prices on old and new houses. No one seems to understand the new program and everybody feels that it is part of the performances of the past—namely, create another bureau and let bureaucracy run wild again. Peaple are already telling me that this is not the way to get houses.

Then the House Committee on Banking and Currency has reported out a bill which as I understand it, is entirely different from the program as reported by the President and his new National Housing Administrator, Mr. Wyatt. The House Committee meets again Monday and they do not seem to know whether they will draw up more housing legislation or just what they will do about it. As I understand it, announcement has been made by the majority leader that we will consider housing legislation on next Wednesday and Thursday.

May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, now that we are on a peacetime basis, the sensible procedure would appear to be a lifting of wartime controls, so that American labor and American businessmen can produce the building materials needed for houses, and then build the homes in the good old American way. This may be unorthodox in certain circles, but it will get results, and it is better than the other alternative of having the Federal Government go into the business of building homes.

I just received a letter this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, from a man who is thoroughly familiar with the construction of homes and other buildings. His comment, which is typical of the opinions of thousands of good, energetic American citizens, reads in part as follows:

It looks to the writer as if the last releases by the President are merely so much propaganda to help put over the Ellender-Wagner-Taft bill, S. 1592. You can fill the Congressional Library full of legislation and it is not going to get any housing built, particularly if you give the National Housing Agency such sweeping control over housing as the above-mentioned bill will do.

This country and our actions are so much under the control of the bureaucrats at the present time that we hardly know where to turn, and sometimes wonder how far Washington is going with this planned economy stuff. What we need to build homes for veterans and others at the present time is materials to build with, not legislation, and if somehow, out of this confused mess of price control, wage control, and what-have-you, something could be devised whereby the manufacturers of building materials could put on the market enough materials to allow us to build what the people want to build, the housing situation would soon right itself.

We hope you will give this housing situation and the bureaucratic controls proposed your attention, so that we will not be tied up with any more red tape than is necessary, for we in the building game are always anxious to furnish and build homes as anyone else in the country is, and will be only too pleased to do so if we are allowed to.

If there is anything wrong with the views of this man who is in the building business, who knows how to build houses so he can support himself and his family and furnish employment to carpenters and other men in the building trade and incidentally, produce houses for people who need them, I wish somebody would give me the answer. It seems to me that the views of this small-business man are entirely correct and as you know, he is fearful that the administration is going to sell him and tens of thousands of others like him, down the river again.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 18 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the statement made this morning by the Under Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Acheson, before the subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for the St. Lawrence seaway and power Project. I also ask leave to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD in connection with this statement a letter addressed to the Secretary of State under date of February 16, 1946, by Robert P. Patterson, Secretary of War, setting forth the position of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in support of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

I have had an estimate of cost of printing made. The cost will be $130.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the legislation before you is to increase the wealth of the United States by developing one of the greatest natural resources in the world, the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin.

The St. Lawrence seaway is as old in its conception as the history of our country. The search for easy water communication to carry the commerce of the world led explorers and traders through this route 400 years ago. For over half a century the Governments of the United States and Canada have worked toward the development of a waterway from the Atlantic Ocean to the great farm lands and factories of the interior of our continent. The seaway is not a new project. In fact the legislation before you provides merely for a series of improvements of an already existing inland waterway which are the logical sequel to the construction by the United States of such great works as the MacArthur Locks at Sault Ste. Marie and by Canada of the Welland Canal connecting Lake Ontario and Lake Erie. Today the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system lies like a great highway of commerce stretching for 2,400 miles from Newfoundland into the industrial and agricultural heart of the United States and Canada, its potentialities for producing wealth limited only by some rapids between northern New York and Montreal where the existing canals are too shallow for most oceangoing vessels. The question now before you is whether this short obstruction should be removed.

Secondly, the legislation would provide for the construction in the International Rapids section of hydroelectric power works which would convert the torrential flow of the St. Lawrence into one of the greatest sources of cheap power in the world. The single power dam to be built will have a generating capacity of 2,200,000 horsepower half of which would be made available to Canada and half reserved to the United States. The bill before you would wisely provide that the United States share of these power facilities be turned over as a public power project to the State of New York which will share with the Federal Government in the cost of the project.

It is estimated that all of this will cost the United States some $285,000,000 on the basis of 1941 figures, of which about one-third would be paid by New York so that the total cost to the Federal Government would be something under $200,000,000. Some of the work allocated to the United States and included in this estimate, such as the MacArthur Locks, has been done since 1941 and there will be some changes in these figures as the result of price variations. The Corps of Engineers will address themselves to this point.

What is the interest of the State Department in this mattter? The obvious basis of the State Department's interest is that for geographical reasons the St. Lawrence project must be built in cooperation with Canada. The working out of the plans have required negotiations over a period of many years with the Canadian Government on a variety of questions such as sharing of the cost, engineering plans, and so forth, in the negotiation of which the State Department has cooperated with other agencies of our Government. The result of these negotiations is the agreement of March 19, 1941 with Canada the approval of which is provided for in the pending legislation. The negotiation and execution of this agreement in cooperation with Canada would in itself constitute a remarkable example of international cooperation.

But, it may be asked—aside from this are not the issues involved pretty much of a domestic character just as in any other public-works program? The answer to that is obviously "yes—in part"—but there is a larger interest that our Department has in the matter which in turn is intimately related to the principal question which must be asked about this legislation, namely—What does the United States get out of all this to justify the expenditure involved?

From the standpoint of our national security, the answer to that is clear. I have here a letter from the Secretary of War which states that the construction of the seaway is a matter of importance to our national defense. The full statement which I hereby offer for the record, reads as follows:

FEBRUARY 16, 1946.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF STATE.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In conformity with your request of November 5, 1945, the Joint Chiefs of Staff have examined the matter of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power projects and their effect on the national security.

The principal factors which influence the consideration of these projects in the interest of the national security are that, in the event of a national emergency, they would provide:

(a) Shipbuilding and ship-repair facilities, located in a relatively secure area, capable of expansion and of conversion for handling deep sea vessels, which could be used to supplement coastal shipyards.

(b) An additional line of communication, navigable by ocean shipping, which could, by diversion of some cargo for overseas destinations, ease the strain during wartime on rail transportation and port facilities of the east and gulf coasts. This seaway could also serve as a reserve route to be used in the event of interruption of other routes by enemy action.

(c) A large source of cheap, dependable power, which can be generated without the use of coal or other critical combustibles and without use of crowded rail or highway transportation facilities; this power would be available in an area which, during World War II was a power deficit area.

The foregoing factors prompted the Secretaries of War and the Navy to support the projects in 1941 in the interests of national defense. In the light of the experiences of

World War II, in which total mobilization became a near actuality, it is evident that the prospective increase in our war potential that would have been contributed by these projects, had they been completed, would have been of material assistance in prosecuting the war. It is probable that attainment of success in any future world conflict would require utilization of the ultimate production and transportation facilities of the United States and possibly Canada. The Joint Chiefs of Staff consider that it would be in the interests of national security to complete projects, such as these, which would have distinct military advantages and would materially increase the industrial and transportation potential of the United States.

Although the St. Lawrence Valley is a possible route for invasion of eastern North America, the Joint Chiefs of Staff consider that construction of the proposed works would not facilitate invasion by that route since the power plants, locks, and canals could readily be rendered unusable in the event such action became necessary.

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War.

But from the standpoint of the development of our national wealth the advantages of the construction of the seaway are even greater. The heart of our agricultural and industrial wealth lies in the great middle section of the United States around the Great Lakes. Almost unique among the highly industrialized sections of the world, our Middle Western manufacturing areas have grown up far away from ocean transportation. One of the chief reasons for this, of course, has been low-cost inland transportation on the Great Lakes. But since the First World War this area has progressively grown into a surplus producing area which now must ship its products not only within the United States but to foreign countries, and which must procure its raw materials not only from within the United States, but increasingly from abroad. For all of this a water route to the sea is needed. Our farmers in this area have competed in world markets despite their transportation disadvantages.

The time has come when we can no longer be profligate with our natural resources. To maintain our production in the Middle West at the increased rate which will be necessary to supply jobs for our working population—including returned servicemen—at the standards of living to which our people justifiably aspire, we must make use of every single profitable resource that we have available. Our great civilization in the Middle West has competed in the world market despite our higher living standards and higher costs, not only because of the special genius for production of the American people but because we have had in the United States conditions of climate, natural resources, and fertility of soil which have made it possible for us as a nation to get more out of what we put into the job of producing goods, relatively speaking, than any other country in the world. We have had in other words a margin of superiority in this respect that is the basic reason for the miracle of our industrial development and of the staggering production performance of the United States during this war. We must make our plans carefully to maintain this margin of superiority and to go constantly forward in our industrial and agricultural development. For this purpose we have negotiated and submitted to the Congress for approval the agreement with Canada that is now before you.

The St. Lawrence project has been described in the Department of Commerce Survey of 1941 as "among those projects which will reduce the expenditure of human energy per unit of product produced." It will make it possible not only to cope with the transportation problems which will arise as our present Great Lakes industries call upon the outside world for more and more raw materials, but it will also help to serve other industries which may be expected to develop in this area in the next 30 years. It will enable the farmer to get more out of his wheat crop and perhaps to make his crop larger to the extent that he can economically compete in the world market. Finally, as our efforts to build up an expanding world economy are successful, the seaway will assist us in maintaining our share of the markets of the world—and will make it physically possible to move the increased volume of trade to which we must look forward.

Added to this we shall be harnessing the waters of the International Rapids section so that we can utilize to the fullest extent this great source of cheap electrical power. The results are incalculable in terms of increased wealth and added purchasing power for our Nation. We have already seen what the TVA, the Boulder Dam, and the Grand Coulee have done for their respective areas. The part of the United States which would be served by the St. Lawrence power development has been a power deficit area and also needs the stimulation of low cost power. The value of water power has long been recognized in other countries. The committee members undoubtedly have seen recent reports that water power generated in Norway will be made available across the Skagerrak for consumption in Denmark. In the Soviet Union, China, and other parts of the world, water power development is constantly increasing. We must make certain that the development of our power resources keeps pace with our industrial development. While the deep water navigation through the St. Lawrence will promote international trade, the power made available by this project will serve the same end. Every bit of power that we add to our capacity increases our ability to use the world's raw materials and to provide the finished goods which are needed in our own and other areas. The time has come when we can no longer afford the enormous waste of wealth that is involved in our failure to harness the energy of this river.

Not least among the advantages of the St. Lawrence project will be the benefits that it will bring about also for our neighbor Canada. For years the waters of the St. Lawrence have been a source of mutual concern to our two countries. The Canadian Government has already made important improvements in the waterway at its expense which the United States is entitled to and does utilize free of charge. The cost to Canada of the Welland Canal and certain less important improvements in the system has been about $133,000,000. It is proposed that Canada will be given credit for these expenditures in arriving at the over-all division of cost between the two countries in the construction provided in the pending agreement. Furthermore, the economic development of the Great Lakes Basin in Canada is naturally of interest to us since Canada has long been our second best customer and we in turn are Canada's best customer. The stronger that Canada becomes, the better it is for us.

The Department of State realizes that there are interests in this country that object strongly to this program of construction. Some railroads believe that their capital investment will be prejudiced through diversion of traffic to the seaway. Certain port cities entertain the same fear of loss of traffic. Great Lakes shipping interests believe that the entrance of oceangoing vessels into their territory will injure them economically. Coal interests allege that they will lose all or part of the Canadian markets. And power interests raise the controversial issue of public power. Other witnesses will appear in favor of the St. Lawrence project who can testify with greater authority on these matters than I. However, there is good authority for saying that these fears are unjustified. The St. Lawrence survey of the Department of Commerce, completed in 1941, indicates, for example, that the prospective increase in freight traffic in the United States over the next 15 years will be such as to make the St. Lawrence seaway an absolute necessity to help in handling our ocean-bound traffic. Similarly, the survey indicates that many or all of the port cities deemed to be affected will gain new traffic as the result not only of normal growth in the United States but of the industrial expansion that will be stimulated through this project.

Every technical and mechanical advance in the history of the world has been viewed by some with alarm. This was true of the railroad, the automobile, the airplane—of the development of each new resource and of each section of our country. But our country has become great, not by listening to these fears but by utilizing every resource of brain or nature.

Fears have also been raised by the opposition to the St. Lawrence project that the pending agreement with Canada may not constitutionally be acted upon by the Congress through legislation, but must, so the argument goes, be a treaty. The Department of State believes that this position is incorrect and that the participation of the United States in the construction of the St. Lawrence project may legally be brought about through legislation to approve and effectuate the pending agreement. In support of this contention I have filed with the chairman of the subcommittee the full legal argument to substantiate this position. The memorandum also contains a statement of the historical and legislative background of the St. Lawrence project. Since the memorandum is voluminous and since sufficient copies have not yet become available for distribution to all members of the subcommittee, I shall be glad to appear again later during the hearings if the subcommittee desires in order to discuss this aspect of the legislation further.

Under the Constitution, Congress is given power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States. This clause has for over 100 years been construed by the Supreme Court to vest in the Congress plenary powers to control navigation and to authorize the construction by private interests or by the Federal Government of projects relating to the improvement and utilization of navigable waters including the hydroelectric projects. Under these powers the Congress has authorized the construction by the Federal Government of navigation and power projects of profound significance to the economic life of the United States such as the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Boulder Dam and the Columbia River projects.

The Congress is not deprived of its powers to enact legislation to authorize the construction of projects of this nature simply because such legislation is related to or is designed to effectuate an agreement with a foreign country. In fact there are many precedents in the history of our relations with Canada and with other nations of the exercise of the powers of Congress to authorize, to approve, or to carry out agreements with foreign countries in the field of the delegated powers of Congress. Congress has authorized the President to enter into postal treaties; to make agreements with foreign countries with respect to patent and copyright protection, and to enter into reciprocal trade agreements and it has successively extended the trade agreements legislation over claims that the procedure involved is unconstitutional. The Congress through joint resolution has authorized United States participation in

the International Labor Organization, UNRRA, and the Food and Agriculture Organization, and finally in the last session of Congress passed the Bretton Woods Agreements Act authorizing the President to participate in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. The latter was one of the most important pieces of legislation ever passed in relation to an agreement with a foreign country. During the consideration of the agreement in the Senate the question was raised as to the constitutionality of the procedures and the State and Treasury Departments filed with the committee a memorandum supporting the procedure on the ground that the legislation was within the power of Congress to legislate on financial and monetary matters. Other examples of agreements entered into by the United States in conjunction with legislation are the international silver agreement, the international wheat agreement, the stabilization agreement of 1936, and various aviation agreements, all of which have been entered into under the authority of existing legislation, and the debt-funding agreements after World War I which were negotiated by a committee of representatives of the executive and legislative branches of the Government pursuant to congressional authorization and later submitted to the Congress for its final approval.

These agreements would appear to establish that matters of importance to the foreign relations of the United States have since the early days of the Republic been concluded through agreements entered into by the executive branch with legislative sanction. The validity of agreements with foreign countries has been frequently passed upon by the Supreme Court and never has the validity of an agreement so executed—or of legislation with respect to such an agreement—been held invalid by the Court.

It is not claimed that any foreign negotiation may be concluded in this manner. There are obviously certain classes of foreign arrangements which must be reserved exclusively for the treaty power. During the last session of Congress probably more important treaties were submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification than in any other corresponding period in recent history. Furthermore, it should be made clear that in considering the St. Lawrence agreement we are not dealing with the type of so-called Executive agreement that can be entered into by the President under his own, exclusive powers as Chief Executive and diplomatic officer of the Government and Commander in Chief of the armed forces. There are admittedly numerous types of purely Executive arrangements of this nature which are not relevant to the problem at issue here. What we are concerned with in this case is a foreign agreement, which by its terms does not become effective until the necessary enabling legislation of the two countries has been obtained, and which, because of the very nature of its subject matter, cannot be carried out in the absence of such legislation. The precedents and cases referred to above make it clear that it is entirely appropriate for United States participation in this great project to be authorized in this manner.

The history of our relations with Canada contains many examples of arrangements of great importance to the economic relations of the two countries which have been concluded through the enactment of reciprocal legislation by the legislative bodies of the two countries. Thus joint commissions have been created to supervise the construction of great bridges over international streams, such as the Niagara and St. Lawrence Rivers, and to supervise the operation of these bridges. In 1893 the two countries concluded through the passage of reciprocal legislation and simultaneous proclamations—an agreement extending to nationals of both countries reciprocal privileges to render aid to vessels of their respective nationalities in distress in the waters of each country. In 1911 President Taft concluded an agreement with Canada for the reciprocal lowering of tariffs, which agreement provided that it would come into force when the necessary enabling legislation had been obtained in both countries. The United States Congress acted favorably upon the agreement but it did not become effective in the absence of corresponding action by Canada.

It has also been lightly said that Congress cannot authorize the expenditure of funds for construction in foreign countries. The memorandum filed refutes this contention by numerous and long-standing precedents. Rivers and harbors legislation has frequently, beginning as early as 1874, authorized the improvement by the United States of boundary streams, including connecting channels in the Great Lakes system, even though work has been required to be done in Canadian territory at the expense of the United States. Legislation of 1939 authorized the expenditure of some $30,000,000 in improving the connecting channels between Lake Huron and Lake Erie near Detroit. The Alaska Highway, although finally built under the President's war powers, had a long record of legislative action by Congress, such as the act of August 1935, authorizing the President to enter into an agreement with Canada for the survey and construction of a highway between the United States and Alaska. Similarly there is a long record of congressional action with respect to the Inter-American Highway, which has been built in large part with appropriated funds.

A further basis for action by Congress on this project is furnished by the previous treaties to which the United States is a party and under which the United States is given the same rights as Canada to navigate in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system, including the wholly Canadian sections thereof. These treaties having vested in the United States reciprocal rights to navigation in boundary waters and in the other waters of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system, the only question remaining is the method of further developing the usefulness of these rights through reciprocal improvements. For this purpose the parties agreed upon such a method in the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, whereby special agreements may be entered into by the two countries expressed by concurrent or reciprocal legislation, to provide for uses, obstructions or diversions of boundary waters. The 1941 agreement with Canada is a special agreement which, under the 1909 treaty, may be brought into force as specifically there provided by reciprocal legislation.

Finally it has been said that the 1941 agreement may not be brought into force through legislation because articles VII and IX purport to affect rights created by previous treaties. Because of the doubts raised by this contention and in order to facilitate consideration of the project on its merits, the pending legislation provides for the omission of these articles from the approval of the Congress. The Department of State will, of course, follow the provisions of the bill, if Congress enacts it, to negotiate a treaty with Canada covering these two articles. This removes the argument.

Thus it is hoped that the way has been cleared for the consideration of the agreement on its merits with full assurance of the constitutional validity of the procedure which has been used.

A Senator Looks at Office Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 18 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "A Senator Looks at Office Work," written by me, and printed in the Office Economist.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SENATOR LOOKS AT OFFICE WORK

(By Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator from Wisconsin)

Imagine now that you are a United States Senator. You have a staff of about half a dozen people, a small suite of offices, and a very modest office expense appropriation. Your crew works with you from 9 to 5:30 6 days a week with the exception of one afternoon which each member of your staff has off on different days.

Now, in that time, with those resources and your own personal resources, you must be adequate to accomplish the following work within and outside your office:

(a) Read, assimilate, act upon, and answer an average of 300 pieces of correspondence a day. This correspondence includes everything from recommendations on bills to personal requests, inquiries, and appeals, together with many other types of subject matter.

(b) Make, answer, and act upon innumerable local and long-distance telephone calls on behalf of your constituents.

(c) Greet and talk over problems with innumerable visitors and delegations from back home.

(d) Attend and participate in an average of half a dozen committee meetings a week.

(e) Attend and participate in the meetings of the Senate.

(f) Prepare for your legislative work by reading and assimilating hundreds of newspapers, magazines, committee hearings and reports, CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS, bills, legislative documents, etc.

(g) Speak to press and radio representatives and perform other public functions, including attending receptions and dinners, speaking before groups, making radio talks, writing articles, and doing similar tasks.

That, perhaps, gives you a fair idea of the functions and problems which your 96 Senators face and substantially those which your 435 Representatives face.

It is understandable, therefore, why your Congressmen should have a keen appreciation of the work of office managers and business executives. Congressmen are themselves each the directors in a little nonprofit public-service "business" at the behest of their constituents. Each Congressman manages an office and faces problems of personnel, budgeting, organizing, etc., similar to my readers' problems, albeit probably on a smaller scale.

He, too, must file his letters, his speeches, his documents in a manner that will permit him to get them speedily and accurately when he wants them. He, too, must have an orderly system of records disposition, a clean-cut system of correspondence procedures, a workable office lay-out, etc. In a larger sense, Congressmen can, of course, ap-

preciate the absolutely indispensable role which office work played in planning and executing the gigantic war work of factory and mine, fox hole and airfield in the military victory just achieved. Congressmen can, too, keenly perceive the mighty role which American office management is playing in our reconversion and is going to play in our continuing prosperity.

Perhaps, therefore, you will feel that I, for one, with my background as a United States Senator and as for over 30 years a practicing lawyer, am qualified to present some of the precepts which have guided me in my own office work. These precepts may be of some help to you; they definitely have been to me.

Here they are:

1. Plan: Someone has defined planning as "organized foresight based on corrective hindsight." But, however you may define it, effectiveness of planning is crucial to any successful business.

Planning demands vision and perspective. It demands an estimate of your tasks up ahead and the resources—men, money, material, and time—with which you can handle these tasks. It demands a certain fixity and yet flexibility in execution.

Perhaps my habit of planning may be most simply illustrated by my practice of layout. Each night before my departure from work, the "must" tasks and the "optional" tasks (that is, those to be done if time permits) for tomorrow's work.

2. Delegate: It has always been my endeavor to make sure that each member of my crew clearly knew what he was to do and how, when, and where he was to do it. Delegation is more than a matter of conferring authority and responsibility. Viewed in a larger sense, it is a matter of equipping each individual to fulfill his given tasks; it is a matter of training. With a Congressman away from his office so much of the time because he is in committee or in congressional session, his staff must have the clearest possible conception of their duties and must be competent to handle them.

3. Evaluate: All work can and must be evaluated and insofar as possible that evaluation must be objective, that it, against objective standards. In my own office, we can gage our effectiveness by, for example, the fact that we have satisfactorily processed (as we usually do) all incoming mail pieces the same day they arrived. We can gage our effectiveness by the number of letters of appreciation from constituents reporting satisfaction with our efforts in their behalf. Much of our work is, of course, relatively intangible in its nature and its effects. Yet somehow we can, if our eyes are open, always find some criteria to judge how well we are doing the job for the folks back home.

4. Inspire: This is a toughie. Yet management is the science of getting things done through people. Management is therefore really "humanagement"—of ourselves and others. And so, the successful manager must continuously inspire his crew b, displaying that zeal for his work, that appreciation for others' efforts, that willingness to pitch in and help in the humblest job if necessary, that confidence, that faith which gives the crew a lift, a sense of adventure and of triumph. It is almost inevitable that during the workday and workweek, energies will flag and tempers may become frayed. That is why the captain must antidote these reactions, must constantly inspire his crew by radiating enthusiasm and good will. This is truer perhaps in a congressional office, subject as it is to vast pressures from all sides. But I am certain that the need for the captain's inspiration is manifest in your own office too.

5. Aspire: Life is growth. It is unfoldment, development, improvement. We must not be guilty of arrested development either in our personalities or in our work. We must not fall into a rut of outdated procedures and processes in our office labor. We must ever seek the better way, the faster way, the more economical way of doing things. We must use our evaluation technique to refine our work standards and devise new methods of beating those standards. We must constantly seek to become better salesmen—of ourselves and our ideas.

These then, are a few of the precepts which have been of service to me in my senatorial and other office work and which may, in turn, be of service to you in whatever your vineyard of toil.

Foreign Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAPMAN REVERCOMB

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 18 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address upon the subject of foreign loans, which I delivered on February 5, 1946, over radio station WTOP, in Washington, D. C., over the Columbia Broadcasting System.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I want to talk with you tonight about loans to foreign governments. The administrative side of our National Government has definitely indicated that it will embark upon a policy of loaning large sums of the money of the American people to foreign governments. Already the terms of a loan to the British United Kingdom have been drawn whereby we are to loan several billions of dollars to them if Congress will approve it.

I use the word "policy" because if this loan to Britain is made, similar loans to other nations will follow. There can be no just or equitable ground upon which to refuse the requests of others if such a policy is started. Naturally Russia, France, China will all ask the same consideration.

The newspapers already report that Russia suggests that she borrow $6,000,000,000 from us. And just week before last the press carried the statement of an officer of the new French Government saying that France must have a loan of two and one-half billions from America if her economy is to be saved. They ask for America's money. They do not seek it elsewhere. They have not gone yet to the international monetary funds to which we have already made the largest commitment by far of any of the nations.

This apparent course is the same policy of loaning American money that was followed after the First World War. It did little good. Certainly it did not prevent war. And from a commercial point of view it was a poor investment, particularly with respect to repayment by the borrowers. Vast unpaid amounts are still outstanding.

This problem is one of immense interest to you, the American people, because it is your money that will be loaned. It will be money exacted from you through taxation or given over by you in the purchase of Government bonds.

We can but determine the wisdom of making the British loan by consideration of its principal features. I submit to you that the terms should not be accepted.

It provides that this Government shall loan three billions seven hundred and fifty millions to the United Kingdom from money to be appropriated by Congress. In addition, there is added to that sum, to be repaid, the amount of six hundred and fifty millions, which is in full settlement by Great Britain to us for all that we have advanced under lend-lease; for purchase of all installations erected by us, including airports and other structures; for all goods now in transit; and for all surplus property of the United States now located in the British Isles.

The net amount advanced by us to Great Britain under lend-lease is $25,000,000,000.

In other words, the terms of this loan accept a settlement of six hundred and fifty millions for twenty-five millions net lend-lease, and, in addition, for the American installations and surplus property now located in Britain. The six hundred and fifty millions is to be paid over the period of 50 years, just as the three billions seven hundred and fifty millions is to be paid, making a total indebtedness of $4,400,000,000.

The three billions seven hundred and fifty millions may be used by the borrower at any time before 1952, and may be called for as needed.

Beginning in 1952, Britain is to begin payments in annual installments over a period of 50 years, the contract being to pay the debt back by the year 2002.

Interest of 2 percent may be charged, but even the interest charge of 2 percent is not positive because it is provided in the written terms of the proposed agreement that the United States, under certain conditions, upon request of Britain, will waive the interest. (Secs. 5 and 6 of Financial Agreement Between the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom.)

It is interesting to note here that 4 percent interest is charged to our veterans when this, their own Government, loans them money.

Thus, we have our Government exacting 4 percent interest from its own veterans who may need funds and charging at most only 2 percent for money loaned for the benefit of the people of another nation.

This is a glaring example of how far the administration has gone in its fast-moving policy of looking after the well-being of the rest of the world and forgetting its own people.

It is claimed that this loan will guarantee great benefits to America because the money will be used by Britain to purchase American-made goods and thus create for us a better market abroad. Writers and commentators have been trying to convince the American public of this view. Nothing could be more misleading; nothing could be more unfair to our people.

The written agreement itself (sec. 3) expresses the purposes of the loan. Here I quote the declared purpose:

"3. Purpose of the line of credit: The purpose of the line of credit is to facilitate purchases by the United Kingdom of goods and services in the United States, to assist the United Kingdom to meet transitional postwar deficits in its current balance of payments, to help the United Kingdom to maintain adequate reserves of gold and dollars, and to assist the Government of the United Kingdom to assume the obligations of multilateral trade as defined in this and other agreements."

Thus, four purposes are recited for which this loan of money may be used. It is not limited to the purchase of American goods. And most glaring is the absence of any provision whatever as to what part of these billions should be used to trade with us.

The United Kingdom would decide what part of the fund may be used for any of the named purposes.

Perhaps some light is thrown on the planned use of this money by a statement of Sir Arthur Cripps, president of the British Board of Trade, as reported by an Associated Press dispatch appearing in the press last Sunday. In an address before automobile workers in Birmingham he is quoted as saying: "Assuming we get the United States loan—and it looks as though Congress might turn it down—we shall have 3 or 4 years in which to build up our export trade."

Then the dispatch went on to say: "He added that if the trade wasn't restored in that time 'we shall have wasted the assistance we got from the loan'."

In truth, the real purpose of the loan is to establish competitive British commerce—not particularly to establish trade with us.

Many people believe that the British United Kingdom is a free-trade nation. Nothing could be further from the truth. For years—and prior to the recent war—she had and exercised preferential control over imports into her markets.

She exercised what is known as Imperial Preference Tariffs, through which she gave preference to imports from other British dominions and territories and which certainly excluded the goods of this country, and this she did in the face of an existing indebtedness to us of more than six billion dollars. Also, she imposed import and export quotas, fixing the extent of commodities taken from us.

She required trade in her own currency, pound sterling, in countries whose trade she dominated—known as the sterling bloc—that required purchase of her own products and merchandise—keeping a balance in those countries usable only for the buying of English goods to the exclusion of American products.

This agreement to some extent attempts to relieve America from the discrimination resulting from these British trade practices. But the terms are so hedged with exceptions and provisos, as to make the agreement indefinite and uncertain in practical results.

For example: It is agreed (section 9) that neither Government will discriminate against imports from the other, except in several instances. One instance is where there is special necessity to assist a country whose economy has been disrupted by war.

Where, indeed, is the country whose economy has not been disrupted by war? There is not a single one—victor or vanquished.

Australia, Canada, India, British Dominions—all have been disrupted economically. This exception would allow discrimination in their favor—just as discrimination was carried on under the Imperial Preference scheme to the exclusion of American products.

So I say to you that there is no assurance that American trade will be helped.

This plan is backed by those who have set out pell-mell upon a course of benefaction to the world. That motive is high—but it must be performed with a regard to the well-being of our own people. This Government must realize that those here in office are the trustees of the welfare of the people of this country and the future of our Nation.

We seek the friendship of nations, but that is not to be bought. We shall act in concert with friendly nations for happier world relations, but that does not mean that we must settle all the burdens of the world upon the already heavy-laden backs of our own people. The time has come to be frank and fair upon this subject and not to deceive ourselves or others.

America will be generous. She has been and she will continue to be. Let us note what has already been done.

Since the close of the war we have contributed 72 percent of the funds expended for the relief of the needy people of Europe.

We have authorized the spending of $2,600,000,000 and already appropriated $1,350,000,000 for the aid of needy in Europe alone. We have given nearly three-fourths of all the money given by the world for that helpful purpose.

We have provided for a contribution of almost $6,000,000,000 to the Bretton Woods funds, from which other contributing nations may borrow to rebuild and to meet their national needs and to save monetary systems that may become shaky. Our contribution there is 30 percent of the whole amount. We ourselves will probably never draw a penny from it.

Here arises an interesting inquiry. Great Britain has agreed to contribute the sum (measured in American dollars) of $2,600,000,000 to the two funds of the Bretton Woods agreement. If she is really in need of this proposed loan for trade, then whence is she getting her great contribution to Bretton Woods?

Let us go on—we have appropriated $3,500,000,000 of dollars to the Export-Import Bank, to be loaned to other countries to help build up trade for them and for us.

Yes, we have been considerate and generous of others with the money of our own people. Each man, woman, and child in America today must carry through life a debt of approximately $2,000. That is not conducive to stable financial conditions of a people. The time has come to start reducing that debt, not to add to it.

Soon Congress will act on this, the first loan. By that decision it will declare whether this Government will embark upon an almost endless process of loaning American money to foreign governments. We did that after the last war. It did not help. It did not prevent conflict or save us from it. It will not do so again. It is but a commercial proposition in which certainly the welfare of our own people should receive first consideration. I learn from a United States Treasury statement of July 1, 1945, that Great Britain still owes us on loans prior to World War II the sum of $6,415,664,782. She has paid only $434,181,641 on the principal indebtedness—$1,590,667,175 in interest.

Just what commercial institution in this land would loan any American citizen money upon that record and expect to receive repayment?

It is my hope that the Congress will not start upon a policy of loaning the money of the American people to the governments of other countries. It can mean only more burdens and a harder road ahead for those to whom we owe the highest duty of protection.

If the administration now holding control of our National Government continues to insist that this country owes the duty to other nations to carry their burdens of finance and to build up their commercial trade, and that this Government must take the attitude of raising that money from our people, for the use of others, then let bonds be issued, clearly marked and plainly understood, to be sold for the purpose of raising money to make the British loan, or similar bonds issued for any other loan abroad, and let the purchasers know that they will receive all funds received in payment of the bonds and that they will take any losses that may arise from nonpayment.

This plan is not original with me, but it appeals to me as fair. Then those among us who desire this policy of loans abroad could back up their views with these funds, and those opposed would not be compelled to contribute. The profit or the loss would come to those who decide that the loan is good. That is a way out if the administration insists that American money must be loaned to other nations.

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. William A. Stanfill, of Kentucky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 18 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting address delivered by the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANFILL] on February 12 last, Lincoln's birthday, at Paducah, Ky.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is good to come to Paducah and western Kentucky to meet with the men and women whose sole purpose at this meeting is the advancement and the success of the Republican Party. Paducah has always had a reputation for good cheer and hospitality and you are living up to that reputation tonight.

On this the one hundred and thirty-seventh anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, it is fitting and proper that we gather ourselves to gether to talk over and analyze the conditions with which our party and our country are confronted today. Undoubtedly these are perilous times both in our Nation and in the whole world.

I am speaking to you tonight for the Republican Party which polled more than 22,000,000 votes in the last Presidential election; a party now successfully governing 23 States of our Union; certainly more than one-half of the population of our Nation; a party which is now within striking distance of winning in our National Congress. The Republican Party today nationally is a minority party, but it is a very formidable minority.

Let us look at our situation in Kentucky. A little more than 2 years ago we had:

A Democratic administration at Frankfort.

A Democratic administration in Louisville.

We had not a single judge on the court of appeals.

Many of our circuit court districts, normally Republican, were in the hands of Democrats.

We had only 8 or 10 State senators.

Look at the picture today:

We have a State administration, except for the Secretary of State

We have 17 State senators.

We have a complete administration in Louisville and Jefferson County except for the mayor.

We have three members of the court of appeals; two of whom have just been elected, one from a district which has not had a Republican judge for 60 years.

We have redeemed many of our judicial districts and now have Republican judges where only one and one-half months ago we had Democratic judges.

I recall in one county, Wayne, we elected a full Republican ticket last year for the first time in 50 years.

Our State administration is showing Kentucky a philosophy of government, the like of which has never been seen in this State. Good government is the watchword; every department of our State government is carrying out this slogan; and the people of Kentucky, regardless of political affiliation, are now awakening to the salutary effects of such a philosophy of government and are rallying to its support. Your fellow Kentuckian and my good friend, the Honorable Simeon Willis, is the head of and the activating force behind this movement for good government in

this State, and I here and now pay tribute to him as a great leader and as a man who will not be swerved from his course by petty politics or differences or jealousies and he will go down in history as the best governor Kentucky has ever had. I know his fellow citizens are and have the right to be proud of his achievements.

Turning now to the national scene, I call your attention to the fact that President Truman in his radio address on the evening of January 3, 1946, said "I can say with emphasis that the legislative branch of our Government has done its full share towards carrying out its responsibility in foreign affairs."

He failed to say that the Republicans in Congress supported the United Nations Charter, that we, the Republicans, helped provide for full participation by the United States in the United Nations Organization; that we Republicans approved the appropriations for UNRRA; that we Republicans implemented the Bretton Woods agreement and in fact have supported every measure for world peace and well being.

In England, the minority party has the right to question the Government leaders and, at all times, to demand a clear statement of their domestic and foreign policies. The governmental leaders give these statements regularly so that the people are well informed on the basic political issues.

In this country no such system is followed. We are only told what the administration chooses to tell us, when and if the administration chooses to let us know. Too often it has chosen not to speak.

It is, therefore, the obligation of the Republicans to scrutinize every act of this administration, taken pursuant to the United Nations Charter. If these acts are imprudent we shall call that to the attention of the American people. If necessity arises we shall make constructive suggestions for carrying out American policy under the charter.

Many Americans look with deep misgivings at the world today. We see a large section of Europe shrouded in ominous mystery. We see whole nations in which American Government officials, despite the advent of peace, are restrained in their activities, and where the American press and radio have not yet been permitted to send representatives and report freely.

These are areas where millions of Americans had their origin, and where they are vitally interested for the well-being of their parents and relatives. In spite of promises made in the Potsdam declarations, there appear to be no substantial improvements realized in these important matters. Does the administration intend to press for improvement and for the realization of these American hopes in the United Nations Organization in Assembly and Security Council of the United Nations? We trust the administration will soon give some assurance in these matters to the American people.

We Republicans are concerned as well for the political future of these areas abroad. Shall we see the realization of our understanding of free elections and the expressed will of the peoples? Or shall something quite different, but under the same names, be carried out?

As we view the mass deportations of people and large transfers of territory being made, evidently with the acquiescence of the administration, we remember that similar acts in history resulted in the sowing of seeds of rancor. Particularly have we felt that where people have maintained their culture in an area for centuries, the uprooting of these people and their culture has left hatred and the urge to revenge in its wake.

We wonder about the scope and import of our manpower and fiscal commitments abroad. Are those commitments such that our boys are to be drafted to police foreign countries; and, if so, how many of them? Are we going to take our 18-year-old boys, many of whom are still in high school, and send them to police the European, Asiatic, and other countries? Are they to be sent to these foreign countries to act as a police for the world? These are some of the questions which are confronting the Members of Congress, and they are some of the questions with which we know the people of this country are concerned.

As nearly as can be figured, from the very indefinite information given us, without including any lend-lease sums, and without counting costs of our armies of occupation, the fiscal commitments of the United States Government abroad are already in the neighborhood of $15,000,000,000. Of this amount, three and one-third billions are to be channeled through the Export-Import Bank; another three billions or more through the newly created International Bank; still another two and three-fourths billions, through the International Monetary Fund, and at least one and one-third billions through the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Authority. Now we have the British loan. These commitments total over fifteen billions—not millions—of dollars.

In America the people are faced with a taxation program. Before the tax-reduction program is framed, we would like to have more information about our foreign commitments in dollars. These fragments of lending fit into a general picture; we would like to be reassured that the administration is accepting these colossal obligations as part of a matured plan, and not as a day-by-day improvisation of our economic-fiscal relationships with the rest of the world.

These questions are not asked in any quarrelsome attitude; they are basic to the future welfare of our country. Any opposition or minority party which did not demand the answers to them would be failing its duty to the American electorate. Of course, we are told that some of the answers to these questions are necessarily delayed by the changes of personnel being made in some governmental departments, and the systematic dismissal of appointees of the late President Roosevelt which seemingly is being carried on. Answers must be forthcoming soon, if reconversion is to be accomplished with a minimum of human suffering and economic dislocation.

Many other questions in the international field remain to be answered. What will happen in the Pacific area? More than for any area in Europe our Nation is pledged to the territorial integrity of China. Our Government spokesman for the past 15 years have been particularly insistent that the province of Manchuria is Chinese and must remain so. Shall we find that as a result of this war China's sovereignty over this area has been impaired or destroyed?

The Big Three have met by two's and three's repeatedly at Quebec, at Cairo, at Tehran, at Yalta, and at Potsdam. The administration leadership has told us only what they chose about their decisions, and some of the telling has been very, very belated. Witness the recent disclosure of giving the Kurile Islands to Russia. And yet these decisions are almost irrevocable. Make no mistake about it, however much these rulings may seem to be subject on paper to decisions by a future peace conference, all the influence of our powerful Nation cannot undo them after our President has acquiesced. All that a peace conference can do in respect to Germany will be to write down what has already been decided, except in minor details. They told us at Potsdam, and Tehran, and Yalta that various questions were raised and various agreements reached. What were the questions which remain unanswered? What were the problems upon which no agreement was found? You have not been told and neither has your Congress. The Senate of the United States has not passed upon these decisions and the people of the United States have not been given an opportunity to voice their views. Some day, when the time is ripe, the people of this country will hold the administration to strict accountability.

These are some of the thoughts in the hearts of thinking Americans. We hold that this war was fought to defend our Nation, and to bring about, so far as in us lies, freedom for the individual and free development of governmental processes abroad which are consistent with the principles upon which our Republic is based. Therefore, we are bound to see to it that the administration never looses sight of the purposes for which our boys were fighting. We shall urge incessantly and insistently that the great influence of this country be brought to bear for the achievement of these American ideals.

We have met tonight to venerate the memory of Abraham Lincoln, first Republican President of the United States.

Not only is Abraham Lincoln the heritage of all the American people but he is peculiarly the heritage of the people of Kentucky. His birthplace is a shrine to which in each succeeding year come increasing numbers from the corners of the earth, the great and the small, to cherish in humble reference the memory of this man of the ages.

It seems to me that there is no more reverent way to pay tribute to the memory of this greatest of Americans than to seek, by study of his character and of his words, to find and to express what advise he might desire to give in these tragic days to the great political party of which he was the leader.

He would look backward at 12 years of defeat, and he would seek to determine the reasons for our defeats, and the reasons why, in four national campaigns, the voters of this country have retained in power an administration whose principles are the contrary of the principles which were his own. He would study and weigh, in an effort to discover why the voters of the United States maintained in power an administration they mistrusted; whose intentions they feared; with whose planning of our domestic life they disagreed; and whose integrity they doubted.

I am confident he would reach the conclusion that these New Deal victories were not the result of a superior political organization on the part of our opponents; not because of vast sums of money squandered to influence votes; not because of spurious humanitarian principles, nor because of alliance with such radical organizations as the Political Action Committee. Most certainly he would be assured in his fine mind that these victories were not the result of splendid principles calculated to better the common condition of our citizens and to make of America a finer, happier, healthier land.

He would say that the Republican Party must never be lacking in that most vital of all political assets—the courage to stand for what it knows is right, and to condemn boldly what it knows is wrong. He would say that the Republican Party must always stand like a rock, and never allow itself to be blown aimlessly about like a tumbleweed.

He would say that the only way the Republican Party can marshal votes behind its banner is by casting awey forever the demagog's method of winning votes. The only way the Republican Party can win the next election is by opposing what seems to be popular and by standing fearlessly for what is right.

Thousands of men in thousands of places from coast to coast are asking, "What has the Republican Party to offer?"

This is a question the Republican Party must answer and answer quickly and positively. It will not be enough to answer it with phillipics against Franklin Roosevelt. It will not be enough to answer it by saying that we stand for most of the things the New Deal stands for, but that we can administer them more efficiently.

You cannot sell your bill of goods by telling the customers that your competitor

carries an inferior line of merchandise. You must stock your shelves with honest wares, honestly manufactured and worth the customer's money. And you must advertise those wares and display those wares until the customers see for themselves that you are running a better store than the firm across the street. You must convince them that you carry in stock articles which are to their advantage to buy; that your business methods are honest, and that you stand back of your advertisements.

We must not be afraid of the word "conservative" in this day when the multitude is shouting the word "radical." To conserve means to save. It does not mean a shellback who does not believe in human progress. It does not mean a flint heart who has no sympathy for the poor, the hungry, and the oppressed. It does not mean a reactionary who places property rights above human rights. It does not mean a fool who believes we can go back to the bad old days of greed and exploitation and unregulated gouging of the people by the avaricious. It means—the word "conservative" means—a man who labors to save. First, to save the Nation from ruin; second, to save the individual from the serfdom of regimentation; third, to save the sacred right of equal opportunity for all; fourth, to save the right of every man to make the most of his abilities in the business or calling which he chooses, and the right to lay aside and keep his surplus earnings to insure him security in old age. And next it means to save, to conserve, to insure those national morals, those national virtues, which made this Nation great and rich and happy for a hundred and fifty years. That is my understanding of the meaning of "conservative." The Republican Party must adopt it and make it its own, and have courage to use it as a challenge and a watchword and a battle cry in the tragic days that lie before us.

The Republican Party has spoken well upon foreign issues. We have stated our position insofar as it can be stated until all the postwar facts are in our possession. We cannot speak with exact definiteness until we know in what respects our allies, Great Britain and Russia, will be willing to cooperate with us to prevent future wars; until we are informed of their territorial war aims. We have defined our position and our willingness to do our part, and the country is satisfied with our declaration.

But there remains vital domestic matters. Until we make clear to the citizens what we have to offer with respect to these, and until we compel them to believe in our sincerity they will not entrust us with the administration of our affairs.

Under the guise of war necessity we have been required to surrender our personal rights to freedom of action. We have not been watchful. We have given up more than was essential in our common eagerness to bring the war to a speedy and victorious conclusion.

These rights must be returned to us when peace shall come, not curtailed but enlarged, and so surrounded by safeguards that they never can be taken away from us again.

The Republican Party has taken a definite stand on the question of labor. Every intelligent man knows that one of the greatest stabilizing forces in the world is organized labor So long as labor is permitted to organize, socialism, communism, nazism, and fascism cannot come into control of the state. Before any one of these parties can impose itself upon the Nation it must first destroy organized labor and organized religion. The right of any individual to associate himself with other individuals for their common protection and betterment is an essential part of democracy. But to make their will and their desires effective, democratic processes must govern the union as well as the Nation. Union action must come as the result of the will of a majority of its members just as national action must come as a result of the will of the majority of the Nation's citizens. There must be no dictatorship in labor unions as there must be no dictatorship in the Nation. Each union must be a republic within a republic, acting as a unit for the benefit of its members, dealing for them, bargaining for them, negotiating for them.

But just as monopolies are abhorrent in business, so monopolies are abhorrent in labor. Just as business must be fairly supervised to prevent excesses and injury to the people, so must labor be supervised for the same reason. The individual must be assured of protection against labor exactly as the individual must be assured of protection against capital. Every individual shall be defended in his right to join a labor organization.

Every man must be guaranteed the right to membership in a trade union appropriate to his trade or calling and to his place of residence. This right is not to be denied by discriminations based upon race, creed, color, sex, national origin, or political affiliation, nor by the imposition of restrictive or excessive initiation fees, nor by any other limitations on membership than incompetence in his trade or calling, bad moral character or a record of antiunion activity.

He should be guaranteed of the right to democratic participation in the conduct of the union to which he belongs. This right obviously requires democratic organization of the union, inclusive of local, district, State, national and international units. Among the principles to be safeguarded in democratic organization of trade unions are: provisions for regular meetings or conventions held at reasonable intervals, fair elections, free discussion within the union of all union problems and control of dues, assessments, and financial matters by the membership together with clear and authentic periodic reports to members on union finances.

Concentrations of capital are forbidden to contribute money to any political party or organization; concentrations of labor, for the same reason, should be forbidden to contribute money to any political party or organization. And neither capital nor labor should be permitted to evade the law of subterfuge.

Our party has spoken on this subject in a statement of the aims and purposes, issued by the Republican Members of the House of Representatives and of the Senate of the United States, December 5, 1945. The labor question is treated as follows:

We reaffirm our belief in the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively with employers as one of the cornerstones of competitive enterprise. The processes of such bargaining must be protected and strengthened if we are to have real jobs and prosperity for all.

For that purpose we believe that governmental decision must not be substituted for free agreement, but governmental machinery to promote peaceful settlement of disputes should be improved.

Demands by either side must be kept within the bounds of reason and fairness, and both sides must recognize the rights of the general public.

The desired end of bargaining between management and men is a contract. Once that contract is made, it should and must be equally binding on both parties as to agreements made.

Free collective bargaining and contracts resulting therefrom must not be nullified or destroyed by resort on either side to willful violence or unlawful destruction of property.

The Republican Party must pledge itself to revise and to make efficient our present cumbersome, inequitable, and blundering system of taxation. We must tax for revenue and not for revolution, and to spend and spend, elect and elect. We shall, for years to come, be crushed under a great burden of taxation. But that burden must be made as light as possible to the individual and to the industry of the Nation. It must be given stability so that the individual will know what he will have to pay and for a reasonable time into the future, in order that he may plan to meet the requirements and organize his affairs. Taxes must be fairly distributed. They must be so levied as to encourage and not to discourage; to create and not to destroy.

The Republican Party must pledge itself to decrease the powers of the Federal Government and to increase the powers of the several States. It must free itself of powers and responsibilities better performed by the States, and it must compel the States to assume them.

It is alarming to know that since VJ-day the civilian pay roll of United States Government has increased in numbers more than 15 percent. The Federal civilian pay roll still has 3,500,000 employees who are being paid more than $9,000,000,000 a year. The war emergency has created countless jobs for people who are now on the Federal agencies pay roll. Despite publicity to the contrary, only a few straggling functions have been terminated and, so far as I know, only the Office of Censorship, among the major agencies, has gone out of business. The others have learned from their older brothers and sisters—the depression agencies and functions—the art of getting themselves, their employees, and their appropriations transferred wholly or in part to some less obvious location in some other agency.

Therefore, when you read, for example, that a war agency, like the Federal Emergency Act has been abolished, and afterward learn that, out of its 3,400 employees, 2,900, together with most of its funds, have been transferred to other departments of the Government—well, it is not just an amusing statistic.

Our standard of living depends on how much wealth we produce, and Government work, generally speaking, is not wealth-producing. Our Government workers are fed, housed, and clothed by the labor of others. If you are not a Government worker, you are helping to pay for the support of the Federal bureaucracy.

We cannot go back to the old days of root hog or die. We must care for the sick; we must keep starvation and misery from the door of the unfortunate and the helpless aged, and the worthy who have, through no fault of their own, fallen upon evil days; we must give sufficient aid in flood, famine, and calamity. But, in season and out of season, by day and by night, we must preach the doctrine that the dignity of man—the integrity of the individual—demand that he exert himself to the utmost to provide himself, to support his wife, his children, and his aged parents—and that the only thing that can be safely guaranteed to him is the opportunity to work, to earn, to save, and to become secure through his own splendid efforts. We must guarantee opportunity; the citizen must avail himself of it. Under any other way of life the Nation dies.

It cannot be denied that the Federal Government is faced with the most perplexing world problems of all time, and the manner in which it meets these obligations will determine the course of the world. It is absolutely necessary in the face of these world conditions that the United States, in assuming its position of leadership, must be invincible, domestically. It is doctrine that sound liberalism and leadership must be built upon fiscal conservation. Conditions prior to the war were sufficient to indicate the wisdom of withdrawal from the extravagancies of the Federal programs; but now our new obligations make it imperative that we abandon domestic waste and paternalism.

We must not allow ourselves to approach the tremendous international situation in the "too little too late" position in which the war overtook us. Our war allies who fought the delaying actions while we tightened our belts will be in no position to repeat their heroics in an atomic peace.

The spirit of Lincoln is alive and always will be; as long as the English language lasts his simple and majestic oratory will move the hearts of men; as long as the world strives for social justice, we will be inspired and rendered steadfast in our search for truth by the example of the man who "saved America and freed the slaves," as long as popular government stands or as long as men struggle against the insidious or open attacks of privilege or corruption, they will gain courage from the courage of Lincoln.

I venture to say there was never greater need for the example and inspiration of the living Lincoln than there is today. In his immortal Gettysburg Address he did not dwell upon the past but looked bravely to the future with the high resolve that from all the sacrifice and suffering there should be a new birth of freedom. We, too, have passed through troubles and the world is in peril. The cause of democracy and justice for which Lincoln worked and died has fallen on evil days. Can we not highly resolve that the cause of international peace, based on a spirit of sympathy and good will "shall not perish from the earth."

Let us hope that the spirit of Lincoln will move and guide the statesmen of the world in the working out of the United Nations Charter. These men can be guided by no wiser admonition than the words of Lincoln uttered many years ago—"Let us beware of military glory. It is a rainbow made of drops of blood. Like the fascination of the serpent, it charms only to destroy."

Let us then—our Republican Party—be bold, be courageous, be daring to stand for what we know is right. This Nation will know the right when it sees it, and will rally around the cause of right, of wisdom, and of integrity. Down this road, and only down this road, does victory lie—and with victory the safety and permanence and happiness and serenity of this land that we love.

Statistical Record of B'nai B'rith During World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 18 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I should like to have inserted in the RECORD the statistical record of B'nai B'rith war service during World War II.

Mr. President, this great American organization made a very noteworthy record of assisting in the Nation's war effort. The many contributions it made, materially aiding the morale of our troops, furnishing many services to the armed forces, and conducting many programs, very naturally should be commended by the Senate of the United States. So I ask unanimous consent to have this statistical record included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the B'nai B'rith News of September 1945]

STATISTICAL RECORD OF B'NAI B'RITH WAR SERVICE DURING WORLD WAR II

On the occasion of VJ-day, marking the end of World War II, the B'nai B'rith News presents this statistical record of B'nai B'rith's contribution to the war effort. The figures are based on information published in the B'nai B'rith News since Pearl Harbor:

Thirty-one thousand two hundred and eighty members of B'nai B'rith, Aleph Zadik Aleph, BB girls and Hillel Foundation serving in Army, Navy, Marines, WAC, WAVES, and SPARS.

Five hundred members of B'nai B'rith, Aleph Zadik Aleph, BB girls and Hillel Foundations killed in action or line of duty or missing in action.

Four hundred and sixty-six members of B'nai B'rith and members and alumni of Aleph Zadik Aleph, and Hillel Foundations decorated for bravery since Pearl Harbor.

Seventy-two thousand members of B'nai B'rith, men and women, and members of AZA and Hillel have donated blood to the American Red Cross.

One thousand four hundred and ninety-five recreational facilities, including company, squad, and battalion rooms; recreation rooms; lounge, game, and cardrooms; chapels, service clubs, and recreational centers; and hospital solaria have been equipped and furnished at 394 Army, Navy, and Marine installations and hospitals in the United States, Canada, and Alaska.

Six hundred and fifty fighting ships of the Navy and gun crews of merchant-marine vessels and 28 Army and Navy hospital ships have been supplied with recreational equipment, athletic equipment, musical instruments, mechanical cows, and libraries, while 225 portable organs have been shipped to Navy and marine units throughout the world.

Six hundred and fifteen million dollars in war bonds sold by B'nai B'rith lodges, auxiliaries, BB girls and AZA chapters and Hillel Foundations in seven war loans.

Three hundred and twenty permanent war-bond and stamp booths in stores, office buildings, banks, theaters, and clubrooms manned and sponsored by B'nai B'rith lodges and auxiliaries.

Nine hundred thousand dollars contributed to the Red Cross and other war relief agencies of United Nations by B'nai B'rith's war service and emergency relief funds and by individual B'nai B'rith units.

Sixty-seven pieces of mobile equipment presented to the American Red Cross by B'nai B'rith units, including canteens, station wagons, ambulances, and blood donor units.

Two million and five hundred thousand service men and women entertained at parties, picnics, dances, shows, holiday services, hostels, dormitories, and other forms of hospitality sponsored by B'nai B'rith, AZA, Hillel, and BB Girls.

Six hundred and fifty thousand service and gift kits and packages, including 20,000 birthday gifts for returning wounded men, provided by B'nai B'rith lodges, auxiliaries, Hillel Foundations, and AZA and BB Girls units.

Two million games, books, and magazines contributed to the armed forces by B'nai B'rith groups, men and women, and youth auxiliaries.

Twenty-six million pounds of scrap metal and rubber and waste paper collected by B'nai B'rith and AZA and BB Girls salvage units.

Five million surgical dressings and 380,000 sewn and knitted garments turned out by Red Cross production units of B'nai B'rith women and girls.

One hundred and fourteen Torah scrolls furnished to Army and Navy chapels for use in Jewish religious services.

Twenty-one thousand five hundred and seventy B'nai B'rith women and girls served in 283 B'nai B'rith-sponsored Red Cross sewing, knitting, and bandage-rolling units.

Eight million seven hundred and fifty thousand packages of cigarettes contributed by B'nai B'rith groups to members of the armed forces overseas.

Forty-six thousand B'nai B'rith men, women, and members of youth auxiliaries served in civilian defense volunteer services.

One thousand five hundred members of B'nai B'rith in 35 States served in the home guard, State militia, and home defense corps.

One hundred and twenty college campuses served by Hillel Foundations with religious and recreational programs for Jewish student trainees in uniforms, while BB Youth Organization maintained youth houses for community war services.

Three hundred and fifty thousand dollars spent by B'nai B'rith's national war service fund for national war service projects.

Two hundred and fifty thousand Jewish service men and women throughout the world read B'nai B'rith National Jewish Monthly which was distributed free every month since Pearl Harbor to servicemen's libraries, chaplains, USO centers, and company day rooms.

One hundred and seventy-five thousand youth and adults received wartime job information through regional guidance counselors of B'nai B'rith Vocational Service Bureau.

Four hundred thousand copies of B'nai B'rith's wartime job journal, the Career News, distributed.

Nineteen thousand B'nai B'rith women and girls served as hostesses, chaperones, and dancing partners at servicemen's canteens, lounges and clubs.

Fifty-four servicemen's recreation huts furnished for Canadian troops by Canadian B'nai B'rith, in addition to education building and servicemen's hostels.

Three hundred and forty-two thousand United Nations troops entertained by traveling theatrical units sponsored by Canadian B'nai B'rith.

Three hundred and sixty thousand gift boxes and holiday packages for servicemen contributed by Canadian B'nai B'rith men's and women's units.

Thirteenth Annual Victory Christmas Party, Rock Hill, S. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 18 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD the proceedings in connection with the thirteenth annual victory Christmas party sponsored by the Rock Hill Printing and Finishing Co., held at Rock Hill, S. C.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH OF SENATOR OLIN D. JOHNSTON, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. Chairman, Governor Williams, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is an honor for me to be on this program on the occasion of the thirteenth annual Rock Hill

victory Christmas party. An occasion such as this is inspiring—it makes us feel that our faith in our way of life has not been in vain.

Here today we have an industry that located in this State 16 years ago, and with steady growth has become the largest plant of its kind in the United States.

It has given steady employment to you good people of Rock Hill. It has meant much to the State of South Carolina.

This growth has come about only, however, through the cooperation of you folks who work here and the management, but that is not all—this cooperation must go further—the good town of Rock Hill must and has played its part, too.

It takes this working together all the way down the line and up the line—in the Federal Government, too, to make for the harmonious America that our fathers always meant it to be, and to that end I have pledged myself to do my part.

But above all else (as is evidenced by the presence of these 5,000 handsome little children), love of our fellow man, consideration for the other fellow's problems, his happiness and that of his family—that's what it takes above all else. What more beautiful thing can a Christmas party symbolize, but this—

It is a fine thing, and fitting, too, to pay tribute at this Christmas season to those who have sacrificed their careers and their very lives. It should make each of us stop and think and ask ourselves: "Are we going to be satisfied with just a military victory?"

Or, are we going to shoulder our part of the load of perpetuating the peace, and implementing the democratic principles for which the 26 young men of this plant gave their lives. What could possibly surpass in splendor and glory a memorial that will further the cause of peace by bringing the people of all walks of life, and of the world, together in understanding and fellowship.

Yes, your job and mine has only just begun.

I want to pay tribute, also, to the foresight of Mr. Lowenstein and his splendid organization, known to us all as the Rock Hill Printing and Finishing Co., for having made possible such a world famous event as this party. In no less degree, I doff my hat to the great citizenry of Rock Hill for so patriotically and enthusiastically cooperating year after year.

Yes, my friends, let us carry on, all of us—this great plant the thousands of people who make it work, and all the citizens of Rock Hill—by working together to build a better plant, a better Rock Hill, a better State, a better Nation, and a better world, by constantly keeping in our minds and in our hearts the truly wonderful significance of Christmas: "Peace on earth, good will toward men."

SPEECH OF ARCHIE O. JOSLIN, TOASTMASTER

Honored guests, soldiers and sailors, veterans, friends, and children, as we start the Christmas party today I am sure we all have the feeling in our hearts and souls that we are assembled together this December—December 1945—in the happiest Christmas—a victory Christmas.

Foremost in our minds is the thought that this Christmas party is a peactime celebration. We greet our friends and neighbors with a feeling of intense happiness, intermingled with a sense of relief and security, and a prayer of thanks to the Almighty in our souls for having made all this possible. We are thankful that families have been reunited. This victory Christmas will be a milestone in the lines of many children who, for the first time, truly understand and visually appreciate the significance of the word "peace." We know that these children will be the guardians of peace and of our national security for years and years to come.

In honoring you men in uniform we are paying tribute not only to you, but through you to the millions of boys who have been and are in the armed forces—who have fought so gallantly in every war theater around the globe and made possible this happy celebration. I say to you all, on behalf of the thousands who are assembled here—thanks for a job well done!

Today, our Christmas party combines the spirit of victory, with the traditional Christmas feeling of the brotherhood of man. We see it evidenced in the expressions of our honored guests, our friends, and particularly the thousands of children all assembled here, who are overjoyed with enthusiasm and thanksgiving to you boys and the host of others you represent, who have sacrificed so much for all of us back home.

During your absence, we, back here at the Rock Hill Printing & Finishing Co., and in the distributing offices of our parent company—M. Lowenstein & Sons—carried on with all the vigor we could command under difficult, man-shortage conditions. You all know, I am certain, the variety of war-essential items we produced during the global conflict, such as airplane cloth, camouflage cloth, uniform cloth, cartridge cloth, gas-mask fabrics, tent duck, raincoats, and other fabrics so necessary for the war effort.

You boys have undoubtedly come in contact with most of these products in the various war theaters around the world. Of course, we made the goods as did all American industry, that the Government required, but what was even more important, we delivered them on time; our products were referred to as weapons of war, and well named, because they, the weapons, contributed their share efficiently, though silently, in the air, on the land, and on the sea.

Soon after some of you left, back in December 1941, it was the policy of our company to go all out for the war effort. The extent of our efforts and all-out policy has been emphasized in acknowledgment and tributes that we have received from time to time from the different branches of our Government. We did not stop with official commendations. Having you men of the armed forces in mind, we thought it also most important that we maintain the proper morale back here at home. We realized that you fellows, scattered throughout the world, could do a better job if you knew that your own folks and children back home were being taken care of. Let me assure you now, we did not let you down..

During the last 4 years, while you were away, there was no interruption of the normal things that the bleachery has always been known to do. For example:

No. 1. Maintaining a proper relationship with our employees. This relationship has been on the highest possible level, a relationship that I know all Americans can be truly proud of. I know it will always continue to remain so. There is nothing remarkable in such a statement. It just resolves itself into the simple fact of consideration and respect for one another's rights as human beings. In short, live and let live. May this spirit of good will continue for decades to come.

No. 2. We continued this glorious Christmas party each year, when your children have each received 8 or 10 gifts, in that same old Christmas spirit. Christmas continued with them as usual, in spite of their daddies being far, far away.

No. 3. We have expanded our plant; our parent company. Mr. Lowenstein & Sons has increased its distribution, and we are continuing to grow, having in mind the one essential fact, that when you boys returned there would be jobs open and opportunities available for you, as well as for those who have worked in your place during your absence.

No. 4 The Rock Hill Printing & Finishing Co., and I may add the town of Rock Hill as well as the State of South Carolina, play a major part in contributing to the welfare of the country as a whole. If we pause and consider the importance of our enterprize, in relation to the well-being of this city, numerous communities, the State and Nation, we can then fully appreciate the responsibility which rests upon all connected with our plant.

No. 5. We have continued to maintain the same standards of character in the bleachery as you remembered it before you left for the service.

I say to you fellows, in the presence of this great gathering—I am happy to welcome you home. We are greatly indebted to each and every one of you for a job which you undertook and which you carried out in the tradition and spirit of the founders of this great Nation.

SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN J. P. RICHARDS, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. Chairman, Governor Williams, Senator Johnston, General Dozier, guests, ladies, and gentlemen, as the Representative of the Fifth District of South Carolina in the Congress of the United States, it is my proud privilege to be on this platform today to pay homage to the 180 young men from Rock Hill on the occasion of the thirteenth annual victory Christmas party sponsored by the Rock Hill Printing & Finishing Co.

I have naturally watched with keen interest over these past dozen years the growth of this Christmas party, born 13 years ago in the mind of Mr. Leon Lowenstein; have seen it mushroom from a vague idea to a Nation-wide event that has made Rock Hill, S. C., a mecca for Christmas pilgrims throughout the Nation. That such a party should have been designed for such a beautiful holiday as Christmas is somehow fitting for the city of Rock Hill and for the State of South Carolina. That the thirteenth Christmas party, and the largest, should have been held in conjunction with a special tribute to 180 former employees of this company is the final touch of esteem that could have blessed such an event.

I am proud to be the Congressman of a district that contains within its confines a city like Rock Hill, which could give rise to an idea and to an event such as this Christmas party. As I look about me, it seems to me there is a very symbolic and significant sign—the employees and citizens of this community representing one generation, the returning young servicemen representing another, and the thousands of young children, our leaders of tomorrow. I think it is fitting and proper that on a holiday such as this, celebrating peace on earth and good will to men, that all these fine young children should see their daddies and older brothers back home again, once more within a generation having made the world safe for their democracy and their future.

I want to especially pay tribute to Mr. Joslin, and through him to Mr. Lowenstein, and the other executives of the Rock Hill Printing & Finishing Co., for having established America's finest Christmas event in our own beloved city of Rock Hill.

I thank you all.

SPEECH OF ADJ. GEN. JAMES DOZIER

Mr. Chairman, Governor Williams, Senator JOHNSTON, Congressman RICHARDS, guests, and ladies and gentlemen; this is, in my opinion, the highest tribute that could have been paid to me as commander of the South Carolina National Guard—the awarding of these Victory bonds to the 180 returned servicemen, representing the cream of Rock Hill's young manhood, all of whom are employees of the Rock Hill Printing & Finishing Co. The record of these boys in the armed forces of our country is something that needs no laudatory remarks from me or anyone else, for their deeds on behalf of our country are today a matter of official record.

I know that the fighting men of these 48 States of ours have been of the highest cal-

iber among all military armies of the Allied Powers, but there isn't the slightest doubt in my mind that there is no par among the fighting men to equal the exemplary courage and fortitude under fire displayed by these fighting lads from Rock Hill.

Before progressing any further, I want to tell you about 26 young men from Rock Hill who are not with us today in body, but will always be with us in spirit. These boys—all former employees of this plant—died in the service of their country. Their names, my friends, are: H N. Barnes; Charles Blair; Eugene R. Cowan; Marion Clark; Francis H. Campbell; Wm. L. Dixon, Jr.; John K. Dorsett; McNeill Epps; David Edwards; Robert L. Edwards; Charles Ford: Coley B. Gibson; M. F. Gordon; Hazel Hough; Thomas Hart; John Lock; Calvin P. Lockridge; J. N. Mitchell; William McKibben; Blain W. Robbins; D. L. Roddey; W. H Rodgers; M. A. Stewart; John Gwin Smith; Charles Warmouth, Sr.; Lewis Williams

I realize how futile any gesture can be to assuage the grief of our people in Rock Hill who knew and loved these 26 boys, but the realization that their efforts were not in vain, that the sacrifice of their lives brought a great victory, should in some small measure compensate us and them for this overwhelming loss.

In my opinion the city of Rock Hill and the Rock Hill Printing & Finishing Co. stand in a unique spot in the United States today. Of approximately 2,200 employees, over 1,300 have served in the armed forces. This ladies and gentlemen, represents over 50 percent of all the employees of an organization the size and importance of this plant.

I am not a statistician, nor an economist, but I am willing to wager everything I own that there isn't another town or city, and certainly not another single industry in the United States that can equal this record.

When I saw these 180 young men, representing the latest group of employees to return from the armed services, march to the grandstand, I felt a justifiable pride in the knowledge that these young men were born and bred right here in Rock Hill, S. C.

Before presenting the Victory bonds to these young men, on behalf of the Rock Hill Printing & Finishing Co., I do sincerely take this opportunity of paying my respect to an organization whose feet are planted in the very soil of American patriotism, exemplified by this beautiful gesture heretoday in the form of the thirteenth annual victory Christmas party, and as evidenced by the awards for these returned service men.

SPEECH OF GOVERNOR WILLIAMS OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. Joslin, Senator Johnston, Congressman Richards, General Dozier, Mayor Carothers, veterans and other distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I feel that this occasion is a very important one in the history of Rock Hill and for the entire State of South Carolina, because this thirteenth anniversary of the annual Christmas party—this year the victory Christmas party—has reached national proportions to such an extent that it is now favorably compared to such well publicized events as the Easter Sunday Mass in Pasadena's Rose Bowl. To me the remarkable thing is that this great pageant, as you may call it today, was originated in a town the size of Rock Hill, and that the germ for this tremendous and wonderful celebration was born in the mind of one man 13 years ago. I think we all know that the creative genius behind this idea was Mr. Leon Lowenstein, whom all of you know as the president of the Rock Hill Printing and Publishing Co. of this city, the cosponsor, together with the city of Rock Hill, of this Christmas party.

To me, this seems to symbolize something more than just a Christmas party, especially in these days of international chaos and political mistrust among nations generally, in days where—thank God not in South Carolina—we hear of industrial unrest, of bitter class struggles in—mind you—a dangerous atomic era, of other disturbances on the ordinarily calm surfaces of American life. All these, I say to you, are somehow minimized in my mind, as despite their potential explosive possibilities, I look at what ordnarily might be considered as only a Christmas party.

As the Governor of this great State, I realize that this party is not just a Christmas party but is symbolic of a great effort on the part of a splendid American industrial organization to display a magnanimity, a humanness toward its neighbors, employees particularly, and to industry and labor generally. To me, this Christmas party symbolizes the most forward step ever taken to assure the American people of higher standards of employee-employer relationship, and, despite my high office, I am proud to take my hat off to men like Mr. Lowenstein, Mr. Joslin, and other thousands of men and women who sincerely and enthusiastically represent the company and city that are sponsoring this annual party.

When I look around on this grandstand and see such men as Senator Johnston, Congressman Richards, General Dozier, Mayor Carothers, Mr. Joslin, and other leaders in industry and statesmanship in our State and country, I feel a justifiable pride in the knowledge that this city and this State of ours should have been chosen as the locale for so significant and beautiful an event.

And to the servicemen who have just paraded on toward this grandstand, and who—I understand—are all employees of this plant, I want to extend the sincere welcome and convey the appreciation of the people of this great State for the role they played during the recent global conflict. I am just as proud to see you back in your home town, back at your prewar positions, as are the people of this community and the executives of this plant.

I want to take this opportunity of congratulating the executives of the Rock Hill Printing & Finishing Co. and all the thousands of men and women who constitute its personnel and the mayor and citizens of the city of Rock Hill, S. C., for having made this annual Christmas party possible.

I thank you.

Tribute to Albert Goldman, Postmaster of New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 18 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, on February 9 I attended a testimonial dinner to Hon. Albert Goldman, postmaster of New York City, tendered to him by the Association of Postal Supervisors.

Mr. President, the title "A. P. O., care Postmaster, New York," has become a legend with our troops all over the world. Because of the magnificent performance of the postmaster and the New York post office, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a greeting and testimonial to him by the postal supervisors, a letter from the Secretary of War, another from the Secretary of the Navy, another from the admiral in charge of the Coast Guard, as well as the statement which I made at the dinner on the occasion to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONIAL TO THE HONORABLE ALBERT GOLDMAN, POSTMASTER, NEW YORK, N. Y., ON THE OCCASION OF THE DINNER TENDERED TO HIM BY THE ASSOCIATION OF POSTAL SUPERVISORS, BRANCH 100, NEW YORK, N. Y., AND HIS FRIENDS, AT THE HOTEL ASTOR, ON FEBRUARY 9, 1945

Whereas by the grace of Almighty God, the combined might of military, naval, and industrial forces of the United States and her Allies has resulted in the cessation of hostilities and brought World War II to a victorious conclusion; and

Whereas in fighting this global war, the Honorable Albert Goldman, as postmaster of the New York, N. Y., post office, maintained a highly efficient postal service despite the many difficulties due to the war, taking into consideration also the greatest increase in quantity of mail handled and postal receipts in the history of the New York, N. Y., post office; and

Whereas it was the responsibility of Postmaster Albert Goldman to supervise the handling of unprecedented volumes of mail for our troops overseas; to maintain constant liaison, much of which was of a highly secret and confidential nature, with officers of the Army and Navy, the Post Office inspection service, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the United States merchant marine, the District Postal Censorship, the Foreign Economic Administration, and other Government and civil agencies, as well as arranging for the dispatch of international mails; and

Whereas the handling of the mail constituted a close tie between the people of the United States and the military personnel, as well as with people in foreign countries, and so helped considerably to maintain the high morale of our fighting forces; and

Whereas Postmaster Albert Goldman has shown his constant interest in the welfare of the employees of the New York Post Office, as well as demonstrating his ability as a civic leader and public servant; and

Whereas Postmaster Albert Goldman has displayed exceptional executive and organizational ability marked by outstanding leadership, initiative, resourcefulness, untiring energy and fidelity and devotion to duty: Be it

Resolved, That the Association of Postal Supervisors, Branch 100, New York, N. Y., records its appreciation to Hon. Albert Goldman, for his interest in our membership and for his outstanding meritorious services to the armed forces of the United States and to the people of the city of New York; and be it further

Resolved, That this testimonial be suitably engrossed and presented to the Honorable Albert Goldman, postmaster.

JOHN J. GILLEN,
President.

HENRY J. WEGENER,
Recording Secretary.

GREETINGS

The Postal Supervisors of New York, N. Y., cordially welcome the official family of the Postmaster General of the United States, the Honorable Robert E. Hannegan; the Honorable JAMES M. MEAD, United States Senator, and friend of postal employees everywhere;

Members of Congress; representatives of our State, county, and municipal governments; postmasters and other distinguished guests; fellow employees; members and friends; to this testimonial dinner to the Honorable Albert Goldman, postmaster of New York, N. Y., whose efficient administration, devoted public service and abiding civic consciousness are a source of pride and admiration to his fellow citizens and to us, his associates of the New York post office.

We are happy to have you with us, and trust you will find the evening a most enjoyable one.

JOHN J. GILLEN, *President.*

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, December 21, 1945.

Hon. ALBERT GOLDMAN,
Postmaster, New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. GOLDMAN: You now have successfully discharged the major responsibilities involved in handling the unprecedented volume of mail for troops overseas. I wish, therefore, to express to you the appreciation of the War Department for the efficient and expeditious manner in which this task was accomplished. The unstinting service and cooperation rendered by the New York Post Office under your diligent and conscientious direction was of inestimable value in maintaining high morale of troops overseas, and you may feel justly proud of this notable contribution to victory.

The devotion of your supervisors and employees to the postal service's traditional ideals of superior service has been noteworthy, and I shall be pleased if you will convey to them the appreciation of the War Department for their assistance in making possible this outstanding accomplishment.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War.

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, January 14, 1946.

Mr. ALBERT GOLDMAN,
Postmaster, New York, N. Y.

MY DEAR MR. GOLDMAN: Now that our country is once again at peace, we of the services have the opportunity to view retrospectively a number of the factors which contributed so greatly to our final victory. One of the more important factors was the delivery of mail to our fighting men and the consequent effect it had in maintaining a high level of morale.

The generous and willing cooperation as well as the professional counsel given by the New York post office proved helpful to the Navy in expediting the handling of mail for our men overseas.

I, therefore, wish to take this opportunity to convey to you and the employees of the New York Post Office the Navy's sincere appreciation for a job—well done.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD,
Washington, D. C., January 7, 1946.

Mr. ALBERT GOLDMAN,
Postmaster, New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. GOLDMAN: Now that the major portion of the distribution of the mail to the members of the armed forces has been completed, we think it is fitting that official notice of the excellent service you have rendered be taken by the United States Coast Guard.

The steady flow of mail to the members of the Coast Guard was always a vital factor in the maintenance of morale and consequently in the winning of the war. The unselfish cooperation and untiring efforts of the staff of the United States post office in New York has contributed in large measure to that end. Under your guidance and enthusiastic leadership, your post office may well feel proud of the record you compiled.

It is hoped that you will convey the appreciation of the United States Coast Guard to all the supervisors and other employees of your staff for a war service discharged with distinction.

Sincerely yours,

J. F. FARLEY,
Admiral, USCG, Commandant.

ADDRESS OF HON. JAMES M. MEAD OF NEW YORK, AT POSTAL SUPERVISORS OF NEW YORK AT TESTIMONIAL DINNER DANCE TENDERED TO ALBERT GOLDMAN, POSTMASTER, AT THE HOTEL ASTOR.

The past 4 years were perhaps the most trying in the history of the Republic. We recruited the biggest Army and Navy the world has every known and the youth of our country went to the four corners of the globe. The strain placed upon the postal service was in keeping with the monumental task of defending our freedom.

The only tie that bound the families to their loved ones was the United States postal service. This undertaking, your Postmaster Al Goldman and his staff at the New York Post Office, carried out the tradition for speedy carriage of the mails under any and all circumstances. To you, Mr. Postmaster, and to all of the postal workers assembled here this evening, I wish to add my word of congratulations and grateful thanks for the splendid job which you have accomplished. To you men who handled the millions of pieces of mail daily, figures, as to volume of business, become a matter of fact. Nevertheless, would be remiss if I were not to mention the highlights of the strain placed upon the New York office.

The peak load was reached last fall during the period September 15 to November 15 when more than 48,000,000 Christmas parcels were distributed and in almost 3,000,000 sacks, with each sack labeled to a respective Army unit and then turned over to the Army for dispatch overseas.

These Christmas parcels carried with them the love and affection of the relatives and friends at home and brought the Christmas spirit to the front lines in Europe, in the Pacific, to the lonely outposts wherever our gallant men were daily braving the dangers of the terrible conflict.

Last Christmas, as in each preceding year, that took our men from their firesides, the United States Post Office Department made it just a bit easier for all those who were separated from home and country.

Of course, in addition to handling Christmas packages there was a steady stream of incoming and outgoing mail through the New York Post Office that welded the home front to the battle front—airmail letters, ordinary letters, and V-mail letters. The month of March 1945 the average number of letters distributed daily at the New York Post Office for the Army overseas was nearly 2,500,000 airmail letters, 1,250,000 ordinary letters, and over 600,000 V-mail letters. This was in addition to 250,000 parcels and more than 1,000,000 newspapers and other prints which were being handled daily.

The incoming business to be handled likewise was tremendous with an average of over 1,500,000 pieces being received at New York each week via steamers; 500,000 airmail letters every day via Army bombers, and processed V-mail letters averaged 500,000 a day.

In addition to all other duties, the postmaster at New York had the responsibility of seeing to it that operating supplies were provided for the APO's within the district. Nor must we forget that 4,000 naval postoffice units located on warships, large and small, and the naval installations in all parts of the world were assigned to the New York Post Office.

Another field peculiar to the function of the postal service during the war was the censorship operations handled in the New York Post Office under Postmaster Goldman and, of course, the registration of aliens prior to our entry into the war and the alien registration function necessitated after our entry into the war required much detailed work.

The South Holds the Balance of Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THEODORE G. BILBO
OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 18 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able and thought-provoking article by the Honorable Thurman Sensing, director of research of the Southern States Industrial Council, at Nashville, Tenn.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOWN SOUTH

(By Thurman Sensing, director of research, Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn.)

THE SOUTH HOLDS THE BALANCE OF POWER

The successful fight just concluded by the Senators of the South against the passage of a bill establishing a permanent FEPC illustrates most dramatically the fact that the South must look out for its own interests, that no one else will do it for them. It demonstrates beyond question that the South is a region with problems distinctively its own and that these problems can only be settled by united action on the part of the people of the South and their representatives in the Halls of Congress.

As a matter of fact, it would appear to be the destiny of the South to hold in its hands the responsibility for preserving those principles of government which have made this country great and have brought its people the highest standard of living the world has ever known. Powerful and well-organized forces now exist in this country directly opposed to these time-honored principles. These forces have studied the political control of this Nation and have centered their efforts on those particular spots or those particular groups which seem to hold the balance of power in elections. These spots have been the heavily populated urban areas and these groups have been the minorities which can be influenced to act as units. This method has worked and will continue to work unless a large segment of our general population can also work together as a unit in counteracting it.

The method referred to, however, has been predicated on the assumption that the South as a region always votes one way. In other words, here is a great region of the land comprising one-third the Nation's area and containing one-third the Nation's people that can be counted upon to throw its entire strength to one party regardless of any other considerations involved. Therefore, in order to control this party and accordingly control the Nation, all these forces needed to do was to organize their followers in the densely populated cities and among the minority groups outside the South so that their vote alone would enable this party to stay in power. This gave them the balance of power and control of the party.

They can hold the balance of power only so long, however, as the South permits them to hold it. That the South itself can easily hold the balance of power in this country should be readily apparent to any thinking person. The marginal balance of power outside the South is a very slender one indeed and should the South at any time decide to throw its strength against this slender margin, it can very quickly "upset the apple cart."

This brings us right back to the successful fight of the Southern Senators against the establishment of a permanent FEPC. This battle was not fought upon party lines. The measure was introduced by a Democratic Senator outside the South and yet its passage was defeated by a group of Democratic Senators within the South. It was defeated because these Senators could see that the attempt to establish a permanent FEPC was simply part of the larger scheme of those who thought they held the balance of power to undermine the principles on which this Government was founded, to replace individual freedom with bureaucracy, to supplant constitutional democracy with State socialism or communism. It was defeated because these Southern Senators were statesmen before they were politicians, because they placed the welfare of the Nation above the welfare of their party.

Not without reason has it been said many times lately that the South represents the greatest remaining stronghold of true Americanism in this land. It will be to the eternal credit of the South if its people and their representatives in Congress shall use their unquestionable balance of power to retain for the whole Nation those things for which so many of our people have fought and died throughout our history—the American way of life.

St. Lawrence Seaway Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 18 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a newspaper article entitled "Hearings Open on St. Lawrence Seaway Project," published in the Washington Post of today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEARINGS OPEN ON ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PROJECT

A Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee today starts hearings on the controversial United States-Canadian St. Lawrence seaway and power agreement which the Government estimates would cost this Nation about 200 million dollars.

The project, advocated by four Presidents, has the support of Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson who has been called to testify. It is opposed by the railroads and public utilities on grounds that it would hurt private business.

The agreement negotiated by the late President Roosevelt before Pearl Harbor, would open 2,700 miles of inland waterways and the heart of the continent to oceangoing ships. It calls for a channel depth of at least 27 feet from the coast to Duluth, Minn., and dredging of about 258 miles. It will provide more electric power than the entire TVA system.

The Senate defeated the project when it was presented in treaty form in 1934. The Pearl Harbor attack ended House hearings on a revised agreement and the Seventy-eighth Congress defeated it when it appeared as an amendment to the rivers and harbors bill.

The project has been backed by Presidents Coolidge, Hoover, and Roosevelt and President Truman has termed it "one of the great projects of the world."

The FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 18 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial entitled "A Service by Senators From the South to All the People." The editorial was written by a former Member of this body.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SERVICE BY SENATORS FROM THE SOUTH TO ALL THE PEOPLE

(By Roger C. Peace)

In a world just emerging from 5 years of savage and brutal warfare—in a country, the United States, where great decisions are to be made concerning the peace of the world—it seems a shame that the whole business of the United States Senate should be stalemated for better than 3 weeks to discuss a bill known as the Fair Employment Practice Act.

Yet that has taken place and the public has wondered why. Unfortunately, too few people except those directly interested have troubled to inform themselves about this strange manifestation of democracy. The issues have been so confused that very little information about the vital phases of the bill have been disseminated.

Outwardly it has been made to appear that a majority of the Members of the Senate are intent upon giving all persons in the United States an equality of opportunity in the matter of employment; that a handful of reactionary southern Senators, hopelessly outclassed in voting power, have engaged in a filibuster to prevent a vote on the bill; that the only way to stop them was to invoke cloture, which requires a two-thirds vote the majority was unable to summon. There is much more to the case than that.

To understand the law, the philosophy, and the politics behind the FEPC should cause intelligent Americans to be everlastingly grateful to the southern Senators who have set up a barrier against this heinous legislation. For although the legislation is aimed directly at the South, its enactment would cause chaos and injustice throughout the land that would resound for generations.

The FEPC was set up by President Roosevelt in the early months of the war in response to pleas of pressure groups that certain minorities—notably Negroes, Jews, and Mexicans—were being denied jobs in war industries. The theory behind this Executive order (it never had legislative sanction, nor required it) was that the sinews of all our people were needed to bring the war to the earliest possible conclusion. But, as so often happens, it was an entering wedge that the minority groups were hell-bent to preserve when the war ended.

The administration of the FEPC under Executive order was not notable. For one thing, more than 50 percent of its employees were Negroes, although only 9 percent of our population is colored. Nor did the experience disclose widespread discrimination evils in the South, even though that was the main purpose. Only 10 percent of the cases examined originated in the South.

Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, was the first to call national attention to the maladministration of the Commission when he sought to eliminate all funds for its support. That was before the end of the war. He did not entirely succeed, but a series of compromises resulted in whittling appropriations to a minimum.

The pressure groups got busy when Congress reconvened and had some bright boy polish up a piece of legislation to be known as Senate bill 101. With the support of the Republican National Convention endorsing a permanent FEPC, this bill was thrown into the hopper and is the cause of the present uproar.

In the meanwhile, during the past 2 years, the pressure groups have gone into 20 States and tried to have enacted fair employment bills. Of course, none of these States were in the South, because they did not believe they had a chance here. They were all in the North and West. And with what results? Eighteen States turned them down. Only two—New York and New Jersey—produced any kind of fair-employment legislation, both of which measures are as milquetoast compared to the severe bill introduced in the Senate.

So the pressure groups have come knocking at the door of Congress, asking it to pass legislation that is nauseating and distasteful to a majority of the people of the United States, if their own State legislatures are representative.

The leading sponsor of the bill is Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ, of New Mexico, an able and idealistic legislator. Himself of Spanish descent, a large number of the people of his State are American citizens of Mexican lineage. He is vehement that many of them should be denied employment because of that ancestry. The way to cure that situation, if it can be cured, is by the people of New Mexico. Yet when a bill to that effect was introduced in the legislature of the State, it died in committee. Evidently the proponents could not muster enough strength to have it brought to the floor.

And so with most of the other States where such legislation has been tried. There has been no indication whatever that the American people, other than the minority groups that maintain active and aggressive lobbies in Washington, have made any outcry for laws to outlaw discrimination in the matter of employment. Of course, fair and intelligent people deplore conditions where men and women are denied jobs because of the color of their skin, the origin of their race, or the kind of religion they practice. They acknowledge, however, that the millennium, wherein such will not exist, cannot be produced by the force of legislation.

It is unfortunate but true that in national politics the Negro holds approximately the balance of power. In such States as New York, New Jersey, Illinois, and Michigan, the Negro's vote is numerically small, but as a bloc it is often the dividing point between success and failure for the major parties. Hence the competition between leaders of the parties to outdo each other in the wooing of the colored vote. That is why the Negro exercises such a tremendous political power outside the South. That is why the Negro associations, aided and abetted by other minorities that wield similar political strength, are able to get such legislation as the proposed FEPC before Congress. That is one salient reason why Senators from sections outside the South, both Democrats

and Republicans, fall all over each other trying to get the bill passed.

The politicians of these other sections have not forgotten that President Roosevelt could have been reelected last time if he had not received a single electoral vote from the South. To them the South is no longer a political power, not even to the northern Democrats, although the South held the Democratic Party together for more than 50 years. Without the South the party would have gone with the wind a long time ago. So that, when Negro associations come to them with legislation such as S. 101, hoping to embarrass and humble the white man of the South, the northern Democrats and Republicans rise up almost solidly to do their bidding, hoping it will help them and their party in the North, meanwhile reposing in the belief that the South doesn't amount to a tinker's dam, politically anyhow.

Then when a group of southern Senators try to stop this outrageous maneuver by taking advantage of unlimited debate, the proponents shout persecution and make an effort to invoke cloture. It is only natural the southern Senators should take advantage of every parliamentary device that is to their advantage. Senator CHAVEZ tried it first when he sprung the bill on the Senate without advance notice. The southerners were quick on the trigger, moving to correct the Journal as of January 17. Technically there has been no debate on the FEPC, but a daily correction of the Journal. In that way the southerners have circumvented cloture which is just another name for the limitation of debate. Senator MCKELLAR, the President of the Senate, ruled that a petition for cloture was out of order because there was no pending legislation before the body.

Actually it is, of course, a filibuster and though generally speaking there is much to be said against that practice, no recourse was left to the southern Senators unless they were willing to have rammed down their throats another "force bill" of the type that came along during the days of reconstruction.

In the press reports of this legislative battle, little attention has been given the elements of the bill itself. It has a sweet-smelling title, "Fair Employment Practice," but just what is involved in the act? Not given to extravagant statement on any occasion, Senator CLYDE HOEY, of North Carolina, has rendered perhaps the best summary of the proposed legislation. This is his analysis of it:

First. It denies to any person who employs as many as six people the right to select his own employees. (That is, he must select them without regard to race, creed, color, nationality of origin, or ancestry).

Second. It prevents him from discharging an employee if he is not satisfactory. (In other words, he cannot discharge them for any of the above reasons.)

Third. It sets up a commission of five in Washington to have charge of the employers of the Nation, individuals and corporations.

Fourth. It provides this Commission with an army of investigators to send over the Nation to work up charges against employers upon any complaints.

Fifth. It gives these investigators the right to enter a person's place of business and examine his books and papers without process from any court, in an effort to get evidence upon which to bring charges against him.

Sixth. It forces a man to give evidence against himself, depriving him of his constitutional rights.

Seventh. It provides for an examiner to hear evidence and send the record off to Washington where a decision can be rendered against him in absentia.

Eighth. It denies him any right of appeal from findings of fact against him.

Ninth. It denies him a trial of his case by a jury or before a judge of any court.

Tenth. The Commission can order the employer to hire anybody that it names and make him pay back wages for having refused to hire him in the first place, and it can assess fines and penalties against the employer and have him placed in jail if he refuses to obey orders.

Eleventh. It can have the employer brought into the United States circuit court, hundreds of miles from his home and place of business, to have its orders put into effect, and when he gets there, the court cannot overrule the Commission's findings if there is any evidence to support them, however flimsy the court may find the evidence to be.

Twelfth. It provides a fine of $5,000 and 1 year in prison for any person who hinders or interferes with the Commission or any of its agencies in any of its works.

These are the elementary principles of the bill, and, reading them, everyone should applaud the heroic stand the Southern Senators have made against letting this kind of legislation become the law of the land. Even some of the proponents of the bill have admitted that the bill is too severe and should be amended. But they could of course give no guaranty that their colleagues would be of such like mind as to give majority consent.

Small wonder, then, that the bill has been renamed, "Unfair Employment Practice Commission," by some who see the truth that it is the very opposite of what it purports to be.

Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 18 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Lincoln," published in the Bismarck (N. Dak.) Leader of February 14, 1946. I call the editorial particularly to the attention of the Republicans on this side of the Chamber. The newspaper in which the editorial was printed is a cooperative newspaper owned by approximately 400 farmers in North Dakota.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LINCOLN

This week was the birthday of the Great Emancipator, Abraham Lincoln. Abe was a man of the common people. Yet no man in our history was more maligned and persecuted than was he. One has but to look through the press of his day in the archives at the National Capital to learn that which history does not teach. He was attacked alike by the arrogant industrial class of the North as well as the slave-holding aristocracy of the South. There was no Mason and Dixon's line when wealth was concerned. Neither was there any line drawn when the so-called Cliveden set of England conspired with the Nazis of Germany at Munich.

Yet Lincoln was of the common people. He understood them and they understood him. During all the disappointments and disillusionment of the Civil War, he remained grounded in his implicit faith in the common man. Had he lived there would not have been the carpetbaggers and the crimes committed on the South by the Reconstructionists of his own party. The Nation today is still paying the price of that travesty on justice forced upon the South by those who only saw in victory an opportunity for loot and pillage.

There is a great lesson in that period of our history as it applies to conditions of today if we will but read history.

There is also a lesson for the Republican Party of today if this party is to continue to live and exert an influence upon the Nation. This week the Republican Party holds its Lincoln Day programs. Would that the leaders of the party would spend a few hours reading the speeches and the opinions of the Great Emancipator. For the Republican Party was born of the common people and it will again attain leadership in the Nation only if it is returned to the common people.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURTON K. WHEELER
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 18 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a discussion on the British loan participated in by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], Mr. Sterling Fisher, and myself. The proceedings were under the auspices of the NBC network broadcast on Our Foreign Policy.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Subject: The British Loan: II.

Participants:

1. Senator BURTON K. WHEELER, Democrat, of Montana, chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee.

2. Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON, Democrat, of Colorado, member of the Finance and Interstate Commerce Committees.

3. Sterling Fisher, director of the NBC University of the Air.

ANNOUNCER. Here are headlines from Capitol Hill in Washington:

Senator WHEELER says some State Department officials seem to be more interested in welfare of other countries than in welfare of the United States; claims proposed British loan should be considered a gift, not a loan; says if vote were taken in Congress today, loan would be defeated.

Senator JOHNSON advocates financing loan to Britain through private sources in America; says proposed British loan would be precedent for applications for loans from other countries, which our Government could not deny.

ANNOUNCER. This is the fifty-third in a series of broadcasts entitled "Our Foreign Policy," presented by the NBC University of the Air. This time, in response to a request and in accordance with our practice of presenting both sides of controversial questions, we present a discussion of the British loan by Senator BURTON K. WHEELER, of Montana, chairman of the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee, and Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON, of Colorado, a member of the Finance and Military Affairs Committees. Sterling Fisher, director of the NBC University of the Air, will be chairman of the discussion. Mr. Fisher.

Mr. FISHER. Five weeks ago, Secretary of the Treasury Fred Vinson and Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson presented the case for the proposed loan to Great Britain on this program. Since this is a controversial issue, we are glad at this time to present the views of two United States Senators who oppose the British loan. On that previous broadcast, we brought up the principle

arguments against the loan, for Mr. Vinson and Mr. Acheson to answer. This time we shall reverse the procedure, and bring up the principal arguments for the loan, for Senators WHEELER and JOHNSON to answer

But before we get into that, let's restate the terms of the loan agreement itself. Last December, after prolonged negotiations, American and British officials reached agreement on a proposal involving the settlement of Britain's lend-lease for the sum of $650,000,000, and a loan or line of credit to Great Britain of $3,750,000,000—making a total of $4,400,000,000. The British agree to pay back this amount plus 2 percent interest, over a 50-year period starting 5 years from now. The loan is supposed to help Britain restore her commerce and industry to peacetime levels. In return, the British agree to lower trade barriers in the areas they control, in the interests of increased world trade. Is that a fair summary of the agreement we are discussing, Senator WHEELER?

Senator WHEELER. There are several points that are open to question, as you have stated them, Mr. Fisher. On this matter of the interest rate—the British themselves have stated that the rate is only 1.8 percent. That takes into consideration that the loan will be free of interest for the first 5 years. And the interest rate could average as low as 1.62 percent, if the British were to draw the full amount of the loan immediately after its passage.

Mr. FISHER. You'd like to see our officials get together with the British on this point?

Senator WHEELER. Yes; and there is another aspect of this interest rate that we should not overlook. Under the proposal, England will begin to pay interest at 2 percent, but only if she is able to do so. We have agreed that if British gold reserves are low, if the conditions of international exchange are bad, and if British income from foreign trade is below certain standards, the interest payment will not merely be deferred or postponed, but will be forgiven, wiped off the books. How would American veterans like to borrow money for homes, for farms, for businesses, at such rates?

Senator JOHNSON. I have a good many letters from veterans, and this is what they say: "In the GI bill of rights you charge veterans 4 percent. Then you loan money to Britain at 2 percent or less. Why not treat the American veterans as well as you treat the British?"

Mr. FISHER. The veterans have a good point there, Senator JOHNSON.

Senator JOHNSON. In presenting the proposal for a British loan, the State Department and the Treasury have not been frank with the Congress and the country. Mr. Vinson makes the bold statement that the British loan "is in no way a precedent for other loans," and yet every American schoolboy should know that almost every European and Asiatic nation wants a similar loan, and that the British loan will, and must, set the pattern for all of these loans. It is my opinion that our State and Treasury officials who are now planning huge loans to all the world are using the British loan to start an avalanche of foreign loans. It is the foot in the door, the camel's nose in the tent. The British loan is indeed a precedent, a mighty bad precedent.

Mr. FISHER. On that point, the argument was made in the other broadcast that the British are in a unique position with regard to world trade. That is, their world trade is much more important than that of Russia, France, or any of the other countries, and so the British loan would not be a precedent for other large loans. Senator WHEELER, would you comment on that?

Senator WHEELER. Of course, I appreciate that the world trade of Great Britain is very important, but I don't think for one moment that a loan of $3,000,000,000 or $4,000,000,000 is necessarily going to put Britain on a sound economic basis.

Senator JOHNSON. I don't know what the balance of trade running against Britain is at the present time, but I imagine that what Britain needs is an injection into her economy of about a billion dollars a year from now on.

Mr. FISHER. But I take it, Senator JOHNSON, that you don't advocate such an injection.

Senator JOHNSON. Not out of our Treasury; no. Britain's problem is chronic. Loans are adapted to overcoming temporary difficulty, but here you are dealing with a fundamental problem which will last as long as there is an England and may even grow worse. The new techniques of trading and banking have left Britain high and dry.

Mr. FISHER. How would you handle applications for loans such as the British have made?

Senator JOHNSON. Applications for loans from all nations should be considered by us at one time. To grant a loan to one nation and deny it to another is very serious business which would involve us in a bitter international crisis. We would deserve to be universally despised if we played favorites. This would lead to international jealousy, and eventually to war. Senator WHEELER, isn't there something in the argument that Congress ought to have the whole picture of what all the nations are going to want, so that we might consider it at one time?

Senator WHEELER. Yes. When I was in Europe recently, not only were the British saying that they had to have a loan, but France, Italy, Greece, Turkey—almost every country on the continents of Europe and Asia—indicated they would insist upon a loan in order, as they say, to build up world trade and to free the economy of the world. Moreover, there are the South American countries to be considered as well.

Senator JOHNSON. We are asked to loan Socialist Britain $4,000,000,000, and nationalistic China $2,000,000,000, and Socialist-Communist France two and a half billion, plus one to six billion for Communist Russia—a grand total of 10 to 15 billion to finance nations that publicly and officially denounce capitalism. The free-enterprise system of America is in open conflict with the closed and controlled economies of Europe. They are the bitter trade rivals of this capitalistic democracy.

Mr. FISHER. But, Senator, don't we need our trade with the British? She was our best overseas customer before the war.

Senator JOHNSON. They'll trade with us anyhow if we have what they want and they have what we require. There is no sentiment or charity in business. Let's take a look at Russia. In a recent speech Marshal Stalin condemned capitalism in no uncertain terms, but he did not condemn American capital. He would like to borrow all of it he could lay his hands on. That would weaken us and strengthen communism. Also Britain wants our capital to aid her in her conversion to socialism. Why this capitalistic democracy deliberately should cut its own throat to promote antagonistic political and economic systems is beyond me.

Mr. FISHER. Is it possible that loaning this money—in the case of Britain, at least—might strengthen free enterprise in England, by enabling it to survive? That argument has been set forth. Senator WHEELER, what about that?

Senator WHEELER. I have been told that the reason we should make this loan to Britain is that if we do not make it, the British Empire will collapse, and if the British Empire collapses, then Russia will take over the whole show. That is, Russia will take not only all of Europe, but all of Asia. At least, that argument is being advanced by some people as a reason for the loan. There may be something in it, but frankly I don't believe that the loan that we are asked to make, of nearly $4,000,000,000, is going to save the situation if it is that bad. If that is the purpose of the loan, then immediately we will be getting deeper and deeper into the European and Asiatic conflict between Russia and the British Empire. And let me add this: The American people are not in favor of keeping the people of India or the people in the Dutch East Indies or in Hong Kong in subjection, and they are not in favor of putting up money so that a few people in Europe can control those countries. I don't believe American blood was sacrificed to save the British Empire and the Dutch Empire in the Far East and in the South Pacific; is that what we went to war for?

Mr. FISHER. Senator WHEELER, how can Britain get back on her feet without some help from the outside? After all, her economy is pretty badly shot after 6 years of war.

Senator WHEELER. The solution of the problem of England is the same as the solution of the problems of the rest of the world, and that is for everybody to tighten their belts and get down to work and produce more goods. We are not going to accomplish that by loaning people money—the people of England, or the people of the United States, or the people of the world. I call your attention to the fact that Britain's debt to us from the first war was nearly $6,000,000,000; lend-lease goods and services already shipped, now proposed to be forgiven, amount to about $25,000,000,000; loan for the payment of new lend-lease items, 650 million; the proposed line of credit extending for 55 years, 3 billion 750 million; plus ships and destroyers and other items which we earlier transferred, of which we don't know the value—a total of perhaps as much as $35,000,000,000. That is what we have given and are to give to Great Britain.

Mr. FISHER. Of course, the British have contributed a lot to our common war effort. Britain's cities have been devastated; and her exports are down to about 30 percent of what they were before the war.

Senator WHEELER. That's right. But there is a limit beyond which the United States can't go. We are talking about Britain, but we had better think about the United States of America. As a result of this war, we have a debt of close to $300,000,000,000. Can we afford to continue to loan to Great Britain and every country that asks for it? What right has the Congress of the United States to give money to some foreign country? After all, this country was not set up as an international banking enterprise.

Mr. FISHER. On that matter of lend-lease, which is the major part of your $35,000,000,000 figure, Senator WHEELER, it has been argued very often that in giving lend-lease we were saving American lives. Mr. Acheson said, "We didn't charge the British for the bombs the RAF dropped on Berlin, and they didn't charge us air mail for delivery."

Senator WHEELER. I saw the statement. But the record of the debate in the Senate when lend-lease was being considered didn't mention that. Then everybody said that lend-lease was for the purpose of keeping us out of war and that it was being loaned and not given. If we forgive the lend-lease that we sent to Great Britain, we are going to have to forgive the lend-lease that we gave to Russia and to every other country.

Senator JOHNSON. Lend-lease cost our taxpayers $46,000,000,000, but if it has saved American lives, it has fulfilled a noble mission and is money well spent. Britain got the lion's share of this gratuity. Under it we gave Britain every conceivable kind of merchandise, ranging from sewing needles to locomotive engines. The bulk of these goods had no direct connection with the war. From us these civilian goods were a gift, but the British Government sold some of them to the British people at full market value and put the proceeds in her treasury. That helped her taxpayers. Now, thanks to our lend-lease program, the per-capita savings of

British citizens during the war years are the greatest in British history.

Senator WHEELER. In other words, we put up the money, we furnished the men, furnished the material, depleted our own natural resources to carry on the war, created a national debt which is approaching $300,000,000,000, and lost hundreds of thousands of American boys killed. And now we are asked, in addition to that, to loan all of these countries money so that they can get back on their feet to compete with us after the war is over. Mr. Churchill said, "Furnish us the tools, and we will do the job." We furnished the tools. I said then we would have to furnish the money. We had to furnish not only the money but the men.

Mr. FISHER. Of course, in justice to the British, we might add their proportion of mobilization was much higher than ours during the war. I believe 75 percent of their industry was mobilized, and manpower also was mobilized proportionately.

Senator WHEELER. That's right, but the fact remains that without the United States the war would not have been won.

Senator JOHNSON. Eighty percent of the troops on the western front were American troops.

Senator WHEELER. If we have $4,000,000,000 more to give away, let us turn our attention to the United States, where we have some very difficult problems. We have millions of veterans coming back. The needs of the veterans to rehabilitate them are bound to make large demands upon the country. We have slums all over the United States where the money could be used profitably for the public good. While I sympathize with Great Britain and the plight that she finds herself in, first of all I am thinking of the United States of America.

Mr. FISHER. During the loan negotiations, economists from Britain and the United States agreed that in the course of a period of 3 years or so, in which British pump would be primed with three and three-quarter billion dollars' credit, Britain will be able to get the raw materials and the machinery which she needs to reconvert. Then she would resume her normal trade relations with us and with the world. Senator JOHNSON, do you agree with that?

Senator JOHNSON. That's just speculation which has no basis in fact whatever. If we loan Britain close to $4,000,000,000 now to save her economic system, and it doesn't save it, will we have to come to her rescue again? It is a continuing process. If we are going to save Britain by this method, other loans will have to follow. For a long time trade balances have been running against Great Britain. She's losing out as banker and merchant in the world markets.

Mr. FISHER. What about that, Senator WHEELER?

Senator WHEELER. What indication has the Treasury Department or anybody else given us that our loan agreement will solve Britain's economic and political problems? What has Great Britain to offer us in exchange that we wish to buy in sufficient quantity to liquidate such a loan? Why have we forgotten that during the war Great Britain doubled her output of agricultural products so that she is now only one-third dependent thereon, for food products? Why have we forgotten that Britain also is trying to make herself nearly as self-sufficient in other lines as possible? Why have we overlooked the fact that the natural trade and financial relationships of Great Britain are with the constituent parts of her Empire and with such great food and raw materials producing countries as Argentina? The Argentine and these South American countries are the countries that will buy machinery and other things that Great Britain produces in return for the raw products which they supply. Europe is the natural market for the raw materials of South America and likewise South America is a natural market for Great Britain's finished products.

Mr. FISHER. You are arguing that she will be a competitor, then?

Senator WHEELER. Exactly. She will be a competitor of ours in South America. She always has been; she is now; and she will be in the future.

Mr. FISHER. Senator JOHNSON, wouldn't the cost of this loan, which the British say they will pay back, be pretty small compared to the benefits to England and, eventually, to us?

Senator JOHNSON. Mr. Fisher, the Treasury of the United States is not a bottomless barrel that can make the whole world prosperous. There is nothing magical about its operation. Every dollar that comes out of it must be returned to it by American taxpayers sooner or later. This Government of ours owes twice as much money as all the rest of the nations of the earth added together. If Uncle Sam should confiscate all the private property in America—all of our homes, our land, our factories, our industries, our railroads, our bank deposits and everything of value owned by private persons—he would not have wealth enough to pay off his debt. Uncle Sam has placed a mortgage on every item of private property in this great country. He has mortgaged it for every cent it will bring on the market. About the only thing that Uncle Sam has left is his shirt and the faith of his people. He will lose both unless he plays his cards close to his belt. He is in no condition to go into the banking business on a world-wide basis.

Mr. FISHER. You don't hold, then, with the argument that this is not such a great drain on the Treasury because a great part of it will be spent in this country and because it constitutes only about 15 days of what we spent during the peak of the war expenditures?

Senator JOHNSON. This is not a loan to end all foreign loans; instead, it is just the beginning of an avalanche of loans.

Senator WHEELER. I wonder if the American people realize that the amount really involved, the $35,000,000,000 which we are forgiving the British from both world wars, is almost as much as the First World War cost us? Thirty-five billion equals about $250 per capita for every man, woman, and child in this country, and about 50 percent of our entire national income some 5 or 6 years ago. In addition to this loan that we are proposing, we have already created for international use the Export-Import Bank, which has a loaning power of $3,500,000,000, and the Bretton Woods Bank and International Monetary Fund with about $10,000,000,000.

Mr. FISHER. You are suggesting that some or all of the loan that is made to Britain should go through these channels?

Senator WHEELER. It should; but if the British went to the Export-Import Bank, of course, they would probably be asked to put up some security.

Mr. FISHER. Could they get as much as they need? These banks are for all countries, and probably couldn't lend such a big amount to any one nation.

Senator WHEELER. I doubt that they could—but the British could get at least part of it from these banks.

Mr. FISHER. But the Bretton Woods bank isn't set up yet, is it, Senator JOHNSON?

Senator JOHNSON. No; but we have agreed to it. The Congress has approved the Bretton Woods agreement for the establishment of an International Bank. I was dubious of the scheme at the time, but with many mental reservations I voted for it. My compelling reason was to avoid direct loans by our Government out of our Treasury to foreign nations. Now I am told by official Washington that the Bretton Woods program is dead unless we go through with the proposed British loan. Either we were deceived then or we are being deceived now.

Mr. FISHER. Now, getting back to the arguments for the loan: As I understand it, the credit is to be applied largely on the purchase of American materials.

Senator JOHNSON. Oh, no. There are no strings to the loan at all. The British don't have to spend it here.

Mr. FISHER. Suppose an amendment were offered to the proposal limiting the credit to what was spent on American goods. Senator JOHNSON, would that alter the picture as far as you are concerned?

Senator JOHNSON. In ordinary times that might be desirable from our point of view. But at the present time we have empty shelves, and credit in this volume will aggravate the present very dangerous inflationary trend.

Mr. FISHER. I think it was Secretary of the Treasury Vinson who made two points on that. First, that the British expenditures will be spread out over a period of several years, and, second, that they will be mostly for raw materials and heavy machinery and things which would not contribute to inflation through competition with the American consumers.

Senator JOHNSON. But there are no guaranties of that kind in the agreement at all. They can spend that money any place on this earth they want to spend it, and for anything they want. If we approve this damnable loan proposal, Congress will sow the wind and the American taxpayers will reap the whirlwind.

Mr. FISHER. Meaning inflation, Senator?

Senator JOHNSON. Yes. Under present Treasury arrangements every dollar of United States bonds sold to our citizens is in actual reality printing-press money and add to our buying power. If the British loan is made by our Treasury, the currency of this country will be inflated to the full extent of the loan.

Mr. FISHER. Senator Wheeler, under the loan agreement the British agree to do away with trade restrictions in the sterling area, and it is claimed that our foreign trade will greatly benefit thereby.

Senator WHEELER. Mr. Acheson, in his statement on this program, said: "The British have agreed to support the American proposals to reduce and eventually to eliminate these special privileges. In some ways the joint American and British statement on commercial policy is the most important part of the agreement. The United States has made certain proposals for consideration by a United Nations Trade Conference, which we expect will be held late next summer. The British have joined us in these proposals for tariff reductions and an end to hampering restrictions of all sorts." Of course the British want us to reduce our tariffs. They want us to reduce our tariffs so they can ship into this country a great many things which would very materially disrupt business in this country. I haven't any doubt that they would like to ship in wool from Australia free of duty. They would like to ship in manufactured goods free of duty in the United States, but if we agree to those things it will simply mean that we will be destroying our own economy at the benefit of Great Britain.

Mr. FISHER. You mean by lowering our own tariffs?

Senator WHEELER. Yes; by lowering our own tariffs. We have millions of pounds of British and Australian wool stored in this country. If we reduce our tariffs and turn that loose, it would put the wool growers in the United States out of business.

Mr. FISHER. We haven't yet touched on the claim that proponents of the loan have made that if we don't grant the loan, the only alternative open to Great Britain will be to tighten up her sterling bloc and try to pull herself up by her own bootstraps. This would mean cutting off as much trade as possible outside the sterling bloc area. In other words, there would be a full-fledged trade

war between British and American interests in many parts of the world.

Senator WHEELER. The British will trade wherever it is to their interest anyway—and with their low wages and low living standards they can undersell us, and will whenever possible.

Mr. FISHER. But in section 7 of the agreement, Britain promises to end all sterling bloc restrictions within a year.

Senator WHEELER. But whether she will actually do it, remains to be seen.

Senator JOHNSON. There are other ways out. For one thing, the British Government has vast holdings of American common and preferred stocks and first- and second-mortgage bonds. Senator MOORE, of Oklahoma, who has been making a study of this phase of the British loan, estimates the total value of these stocks and bonds to be not less than $775,000,000. I am not talking about American property owned by British subjects. I am speaking of American securities owned by the British Government. They can sell them if they want to.

Mr. FISHER. What about your own bill, Senator JOHNSON? Is that another alternative?

Senator JOHNSON. I believe it is. It's a substitute for the administration loan bill, and would authorize the Treasury to see special bonds to American investors on a voluntary basis, the proceeds to go to Britain, and in turn whatever interest and principal is paid by the British Government would be paid to these investors on a pro rata basis. The bonds would be of distinctive design and would bear on their face a statement to the effect that they are not backed by the credit of, or guaranteed by, the United States. The sale of the bonds would serve as a referendum in America on the British loan. It would be anti-inflationary, not inflationary, and if such an investment is not attractive to American investors, it certainly is not right to unload it on the hard-pressed American taxpayer against his will.

Mr. FISHER. Do you think that would work, in the sense of getting three and three-quarter billion dollars from the bonds within a reasonable length of time, so that Britain can reconvert? Would the American people buy British bonds in competition with Victory bonds?

Senator JOHNSON. I earnestly hope there are to be no more Victory-bond drives. The time has come to balance our Budget.

Senator WHEELER. If the American people wouldn't buy them, then the American Congress should not unload this debt on the American taxpayers—not only the present taxpayers but their children and their children's children.

Mr. FISHER. Then you support Senator JOHNSON's substitute proposal, Senator WHEELER?

Senator WHEELER. I certainly do.

Mr. FISHER. Are there other points in that earlier broadcast you'd like to take up?

Senator WHEELER. Yes. You asked this question of Mr. Acheson: "Why didn't we get more of a quid pro quo from the British? They have certain territories in this hemisphere, for example, where we need permanent bases. What about that?" And Mr. Acheson said: "To demand such concessions as a part of the loan agreement would be like saying to Britain, 'Sure, we will help you get back on your feet, but not unless you hand over some of your territories and do things our way from now on.' You can imagine how any self-respecting nation would react to that. They would have felt that we were taking advantage of their necessity to drive a sharp bargain in a totally different field." I don't think this would be a sharp bargain at all. We need some of these bases for our own protection and for our commercial needs. Certainly when Britain is dealing with any other country in the world she looks out for Great Britain's need. The trouble with the State Department in my judgment is that some of the men there think more of England than of the United States.

Senator JOHNSON. We should also consider to what extent loans to these foreign nations are to be used for military purposes. It occurs to me that what we may be doing is assisting other powers into an armament race with us. I haven't heard anyone say just exactly what Britain's postwar military plans are.

Mr. FISHER. I understand that she is demobilizing quite rapidly.

Senator JOHNSON. Demobilizing and an armament race are two different things. The point is this: If we lend money to all the nations of the earth and they use it to arm themselves, then we will have to spend a lot of our taxpayers' money to catch up with them.

Mr. FISHER. Do you think, Senator JOHNSON, that we ought to insist on disarmament as a condition of future loans?

Senator JOHNSON. I don't think you can separate the two ideas. They are tied closely together. Senator TYDINGS brought that point out very forcibly the other day. He said that we must not contemplate a loan to anybody until we know what the disarmament plans of the world are.

Mr. FISHER. Now, with regard to the outlook for the loan, Senator WHEELER. Do both the House and the Senate have to approve it?

Senator WHEELER. Yes; by majority votes.

Mr. FISHER. What do you think are its prospects for passage?

Senator WHEELER. I don't think anybody can predict today what is going to happen in the Congress of the United States a month from now, or even 2 weeks from now. I think if a vote were taken today the loan would be beaten. But I have seen the radio commentators, the newspaper columnists, the magazines, and the motion pictures sell the American people something that Congress wouldn't put across without that pressure.

Senator JOHNSON. I would hate to predict what Congress will or will not do, except that unless the country changes its attitude toward this loan, Congress is not going to enact it. At the present time my observations indicate that the country stands about 3 to 1 against the loan.

Mr. FISHER. There was a poll of public opinion recently which showed that a plurality of those with opinions were in favor of the loan when its terms were explained.

Senator WHEELER. I would be willing to wager that the overwhelming sentiment of this country is against it.

Senator JOHNSON. I never did have confidence in polls. Most polls are a racket or perhaps a clever form of propaganda.

Mr. FISHER. I've read that several organizations—farmers, women, and so on—have come out for the loan.

Senator JOHNSON. Some have come out against it, too. It will make some difference what position the labor organizations take on the loan. But unless the State Department rallies support for this loan, I think it would be very foolish to expect Congress to support it, especially in an election year.

Senator WHEELER. I'd like to add one thing: The proposed loan to Britain must not be confused with relief for the starving peoples of Europe and Asia.

Senator JOHNSON. I agree. I favor dividing our dwindling supplies of food with the war-torn peoples of the world. And a starving German baby or a starving Japanese baby looks just the same to me as a starving Chinese, French, or British child. They are all God's precious children. But the British loan is not to provide relief for starving people. It is to provide relief for a decadent empire. My slogan is: Billions for the relief of starving children, but not 1 cent of American taxpayer's money for the relief of empires.

Mr. FISHER. Well, thank you, gentlemen, for a very hard-hitting discussion of the proposed British loan. Now that we have had one broadcast for and one against the loan, I hope that on some future program we can bring the two viewpoints together in a single discussion.

ANNOUNCER. That was Sterling Fisher, director of the NBC University of the Air. He has been interviewing Senators BURTON K. WHEELER, of Montana, and EDWIN C. JOHNSON, of Colorado. The discussion was adapted for radio by Selden Menefee.

Members of Congress, and officials of the State Department and other Government agencies, will discuss these important subjects. If you have questions on these topics which you would like to have us ask the participants, please send them to the NBC University of the Air, New York 20, N. Y. Your suggestions for future topics will also be appreciated.

Military Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 18 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an article entitled "Military Justice," from the Army and Navy Journal of December 1, 1945. It relates to courts martial. Some time ago the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] offered a resolution on this subject, and this article fits in with his resolution.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILITARY JUSTICE

Following are the points outlined in an opening statement recently made by Samuel T. Ansell, Acting Judge Advocate General during World War I, as counsel in a case before the Secretary of War's Discharge Review Board:

1. This Board, authorized by statute, has an attractive and novel setting in the field of military justice. If justice is the highest interest of man on earth, if to achieve justice is declared by our Constitution as one of the prime reasons for the establishment of our Government, if justice is not a mere generalization but a matter of vital concern to every individual citizen, then this board has a noteworthy place among the instrumentalities of justice. Its members should be, and they doubtless are, inspired by the love of justice.

2. Never before has there been in the service a statutory board of general jurisdiction with authority to review and correct the record characterizing separations from the service, and to grant to an applicant a fair hearing to that end. To me it has always been a matter of some pride that at the close of actual hostilities of the First World War some boards, upon my recommendation, were established by the Secretary of War to correct, in some degree and in some special cases, injustices done by the records of the discharge of enlisted men; but, so far as I can recall, nothing was done, or could have been done, in behalf of commissioned officers.

3. The military record of a citizen is to him a thing of great worth, more than money or other material value. It is a permanent memorial which should truly evidence, beyond doubt or question, the quality of citizenship

exhibited by the citizen while serving in the defense of his land.

4. In the haste and welter of war many injustices in such matters are done—one might say inevitably done. Without assured means of correcting such injustices, war must, and does, leave in its wake innumerable human wrecks—men who struggle, usually in vain, to recover that of which they have been unjustly deprived, or who live on with bitterness for the Government they loved and served, or who sink into despair.

5 It is out of such background of thought we as counsel come before this Board. We come expectantly, because of confidence in the Board and in the facts we shall adduce. We know, of course, that a separation, with its characterization, is backed by statements upon the record. We need hardly remind you that merely because a statement has become embalmed in a military record is no assurance of its truth. Too frequently those facts merit the designation only because they appear on the record; they are not tested or established facts; they are only what somebody, in more or less authority, carelessly or hastily or injudicially accepted as facts; too often they are only what somebody reported or said or thought. Sometimes they are but statements of a commanding officer who is inexperienced, or is unfair, or has been misled; sometimes they are but his own conclusions made or shaded to place himself in a better light; sometimes they are statements made with unworthy design or through servility to some superior view. Sometimes they are nothing better than the groundless report of some pseudo-psychiatrist; sometimes they rest on nothing better than common camp gossip.

6. Facts are at the foundation of all justice but, unfortunately, the obtaining of facts is frequently a task that is irksome, and the proper interpretation of them requires high qualities of care and judgment. It is the duty of a lawyer appearing here to adduce nothing but facts and those inferences which reasonably and fairly flow from them. In doing this he should be as quick to expose an untruthful record as to spurn a resort to untrue statements.

7. During this war there has been a tendency to force resignations for the good of the service in lieu of court martial by means of record statements whose undependability would have been developed by court-martial investigation. Such a policy gives abundant opportunity for injustice. Such resignations are sometimes the result of a species of compulsion. Besides, temporary officers, especially when advised by superiors, can easily be subjected to imposition. Few temporary officers are in a position to apprehend that a resignation for the good of the service has many of the stigmatizing consequences of a sentence of dismissal or dishonorable discharge by general court martial, consequences that deprive them of many military benefits, blotch their reputations throughout life and prejudice them in obtaining employment. Inexperienced officers can easily be stampeded into such ill-advised action by the threat of the court martial alternative. Later, with time to consider, such an officer may seek to withdraw his resignation before it becomes effective and stand court martial, only to find that the War Department refuses the request.

8. Such stigma should be placed upon a soldier's record only when fairest and fullest consideration of every pertinent fact and circumstance leads to no other reasonable conclusion. The tender of a resignation under the circumstances indicated is no evidence whatever of a conscicusness of guilt. Our Government should ever be loath to deprive a soldier of material service-benefits and even more loath permanently to besmirch his reputation. It is still true that "Who steals my purse steals trash; but he that filches from me my good name leaves me poor indeed."

Proceedings and Transactions of Bermuda Civil Aviation Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSIAH W. BAILEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 18 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I have before me certain documents relating to the Bermuda Civil Aviation Conference, recently concluded, the Conference being between representatives of the United Kingdom and representatives of the United States. The delegates to that Conference agreed upon a final act and some collateral acts. I think it is important that the Senate be fully informed of these agreements and some portions of the proceedings. The documents which I have before me consist of 36 typewritten pages. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I have obtained from the Public Printer an estimate of the cost of printing. The estimated cost is $468.

There being no objection, the documents were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOINT PRESS RELEASE OF THE UNITED KINGDOM AND UNITED STATES DELEGATIONS ON THE WORK OF THE BERMUDA CONFERENCE, JANUARY-FEBRUARY 1946

1. Three documents, two to be signed and one to be initialed in Bermuda at 2300 hours GMT (7 p. m. Bermuda time, 6 p. m. Washington time) on Monday, February 11, represent the work of the Anglo-American Civil Aviation Conference, which has been in session there since January 15.

2. The documents agreed upon at the Bermuda Conference represent a sincere and determined effort to reconcile the widely divergent views which were held by the two nations on the extent to which international air transport should be subject to governmental controls. The two Governments are happy to announce that agreement has been reached on conditions which they believe will be satisfactory and advantageous to both nations.

3. The three documents are:

(i) The final act of the Conference.

(ii) A bilateral agreement between the Governments of the United Kingdom and the United States and an attached annex.

(iii) Heads of agreement relating to the civil use of leased air bases.

4. All the chief aspects of civil aviation outstanding between Britain and America are covered and resolved in these three documents. They should provide a firm foundation on which future and closer aeronautical collaboration between the two nations can be built. Both nations had before the Bermuda Conference accepted the multilateral air-transit agreement at the Chicago air conference, which provided for freedoms I and II; that is, the right of the air carrier or carriers of one nation to fly through the air space of the other (freedom I) and to land for nontraffic purposes (freedom II).

5. The chief feature emerging from these Conference documents is that the broad policy agreed between the two Governments offers an opportunity for the development of air transport coupled with provision for later review and adjustment of any practices which are shown by experience to be harmful to the best interests of the two nations.

6. In brief, the high lights resulting from the Conference are—

(i) Rates to be charged by air carriers operating between points in the United Kingdom and points in the United States are to be subject to governmental review.

(ii) The Civil Aeronautics Board has announced its forthcoming decision approving the traffic and rate conference machinery of the International Air Transport Association (IATA) for a period of 1 year (sec. II of the annex).

(iii) Freedom by each country to determine the frequency of operations of its airlines.

(iv) Freedom to carry fifth freedom traffic in accordance with defined principles subject to adjustment in particular cases where such adjustment may be found necessary in the light of experience (sec. I of the annex and paragraph (6) of the final act).

(v) Agreement on an initial schedule of world-wide air routes of mutual interest to the United Kingdom and the United States (sec. III of the annex).

(vi) Clearing of the position of the air bases leased by the United Kingdom to the United States so that they may be opened for civil use as soon as possible wherever such use will contribute to the over-all development of civil aviation along sound economic lines. In effect, this means that when the agreement is finalized the leased bases at Bermuda, Antigua, Santa Lucia, and British Guiana will be opened for full civil use while other bases will be available for civil aircraft as bad weather alternates to existing civil airports. The United States has conditioned its approval of the agreement upon the working out of a satisfactory agreement covering similar problems as regards bases and airfields in Labrador and Newfoundland. (Heads of agreement on leased bases.)

(vii) Agreement that in general any dispute between the two nations relating to the interpretation or application of the agreement which cannot be settled through consultation shall be referred for an advisory report to the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization (PICAO) or its successor (art. IX of the agreement).

7. The final act of the Conference: This document brings together in one place the different documents of the Conference and sets out the principles for the development of international civil air transport to which the two Governments have agreed to subscribe. The deliberate trend of these principles is to encourage the use of air transport and to stimulate air travel at economic rates. At the same time the principles provide for fair and equal opportunity for air carriers of the two Nations to operate between their respective territories and to provide air transport facilities matched to the needs of the public. The fair and equal opportunity referred to above does not imply the allocation of frequencies by agreement, but only the right of each nation to offer the services it believes justified under the principles agreed to.

Special consideration is also given to safeguarding the rightful interest of both countries and to bridging the period during which difficulties resulting from the war might militate to the prejudice of either country.

An important principle is that outlined in paragraph 6 of the final act. This paragraph in referring to the carriage by air carriers of one of the two nations of so-called "fifth freedom" traffic—that is passengers and cargo between two foreign countries—recognizes this "fifth freedom" privilege, granted in the annex, so long as the carriage of these loads does not defeat the primary objective of the agreed international air services which is to provide air transport adequate for the traffic between the country of origin of the aircraft and the country of destination of the traffic.

To this end, the right to carry fill-up "fifth freedom" traffic is to be subject to the general principle that capacity should be related to—

(i) The traffic requirements between the country of origin and the countries of destination;

(ii) The requirements of through air line operation; and

(iii) The traffic requirements of the area through which the air line passes after taking account of local and regional services.

Thus, the privilege of carrying "fifth freedom" traffic has been reciprocally granted subject to the considerations indicated above.

Another important principle agreed on and set out in the final act is that (in paragraph 11) which provides for regular and frequent consultation between British and American Government authorities—in fact the CAB and the British Ministry of Civil Aviation—to ensure that there shall be close collaboration to implement and develop the understandings arrived at in Bermuda and to provide for the solution of new problems of interest to both nations in the field of civil aviation.

8. The bilateral agreement: This agreement follows the line of the standard form of such agreements as drawn up at Chicago. It contains 14 articles which define the conditions under which air services (i. e., regularly scheduled air-line services) shall be operated between the territories of the United Kingdom and the United States. (Details of the routes are set out in sec. III of the annex.)

The agreement sets out (art. 8) that modifications to the annex (other than the route changes provided for in sec. IV of the annex) may be made after consultation and agreement between the aeronautical authorities of the two nations. Further, there is provision (art. 9) that any dispute between the two governments on the agreement or the annex shall be referred to the PICAO or its successor for an advisory report. There is no time limit on the agreement but either nation may at any time request consultation with the other with a view to making amendments which may be desirable in the light of experience. Pending the outcome of such consultation, either nation may give notice to the other of its desire to terminate the agreement. In the absence of an agreement as to the desired amendments the agreement can be terminated 12 months after the giving of notice. But termination of the agreement in this way will not affect the traffic rights which United States air carriers may exercise at any of the leased bases which are to be opened for civil use.

9. The annex: This is a most important part of the agreement from an operative viewpoint. It is divided into five sections: I, Rights; II, Rates; III and IV, Routes; V, Change of Gage.

I. Rights: This section sets out that airlines of the United States and the United Kingdom shall enjoy traffic rights between the territories of the two countries on routes outlined in section III of the annex in accordance with the principles stated in the final act and in the annex.

II. Rates: The two countries have agreed on regulation to ensure economic operation and to prevent rate wars resulting from unfair and uneconomic rates. The CAB has announced its forthcoming decision approving the traffic and rate conference machinery of the International Air Transport Association (IATA) for a period of 1 year from February 1946. Under United States law, rates agreed upon by IATA in all cases where United States air carriers are parties are subject to CAB approval. Furthermore, the executive department of the United States (including the CAB) has agreed to seek from Congress power to fix fair and economic rates for United States air carriers on international air services.

A most important principle has been agreed to in respect to rate regulation. In all cases where disagreement arises as to any rates between points under the jurisdiction of the United Kingdom and points under the jurisdiction of the United States, consultation between the aeronautical authorities of the two countries is provided to the end that if possible agreement as to the proper rate can be reached and such agreement made effective within the respective constitutional powers and obligations of the Governments.

New rates proposed by any United Kingdom or United States air line are required to be filed with both Governments 30 days before the effective date of such rates. If agreed by both Governments, the new rate can go into effect at once.

If, before the CAB acquires its rate-fixing powers, it disagrees with a rate proposed by a United Kingdom carrier and approved by the United Kingdom Government, or the United Kingdom disagrees with a rate proposed by a United States carrier, and if after consultation the two Governments do not agree or if after agreement it cannot for any reason be made effective, the party objecting to the rate "may take such steps as it may consider necessary to prevent the inauguration of continuation of the service in question at the rate complained of."

After the CAB acquires rate-fixing powers, if after 30 days either the CAB or the United Kingdom Government cannot agree on a rate proposed by an air carrier or carriers of the other nation, the proposed rate may, nevertheless, go into effect provisionally at the discretion of the government of the air carrier concerned pending settlement of the disagreement either by further consultation or by an advisory report from the PICAO which each party agrees to use its best efforts to put into effect.

III. Routes: Under this heading both the United Kingdom and the United States have set out lists of proposed air routes which touch their two territories. Although some of these air routes are already in operation, some may be opened shortly and others may not come into operation for some time, all are set down as an indication of how the rights granted in section I of the annex may be exercised.

IV. Route changes: This section lays down that any changes on the routes of one nation in the territory of the other will be made only after consultation and agreement between the aeronautical authorities. Other route changes in third countries may be made at any time, provided that prompt notice is given by the one country to the other of such changes. Any disagreement which may arise and cannot be resolved by the aeronautical authorities of the two countries shall be referred to PICAO for an advisory report. In addition, each country will keep the other informed of new route certificates and authorities extended to their own air carriers.

V. Change of gage: On any long, through, route it may be that it will be more economical to handle the onward carriage of traffic from key points in smaller aircraft than that used on the prior part of the trip. The Conference has recognized this possibility but has provided that in such case the smaller aircraft will operate only in connection with the larger aircraft arriving at the point of change so as to provide a connecting service, specifically scheduled as such, and the smaller aircraft will thus normally wait on the arrival of the larger aircraft at junction points.

VI. Frequencies: The Conference has placed no specific limitation on frequencies. Each nation operating under the principles agreed to is to be free to determine for itself the number of frequencies which are justified services being related to traffic demands.

10. Leased air bases: Heads of agreement relating to the civil use of leased air bases have been drawn up and initialled with a view to the ultimate conclusion of a formal agreement.

When the United Kingdom undertook in 1940 to lease to the United States certain areas in Newfoundland, Bermuda, and the Caribbean area for naval and air bases, the subsequent agreement expressly provided that, except in special circumstances or by agreement between the governments concerned, commercial aircraft should not be allowed to operate from the airfields in the leased areas. It also provided that no commercial activities should be conducted within the leased areas other than with the consent of the governments concerned.

After the lease of these bases, the United States constructed a large airfield at each of them. With the end of the war there are obvious advantages in opening, for use by civil aircraft, airfields in the leased areas in territories in which no other satisfactory civil airfields are available. Such opening would contribute both to the development of air transport and to the territories concerned. But where satisfactory airfields already exist there would not be the same reason for arranging for commercial aircraft to use the base airfields.

Some discussions on this subject between the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom were held in the autumn of 1945. Thus, when arrangements for the Bermuda Conference were made it was suggested that the opportunity should be taken to deal with this question as well as other more general questions relating to civil aviation.

As a result of the Conference, when the agreement now envisaged is concluded, the airfields at the leased bases in Bermuda, Antigua, St. Lucia, and British Guiana will be opened to regular use by civil aircraft. Other similar airfields in Trinidad and Jamaica will be available for use as bad weather alternates in case of necessity.

The opening of the bases to civil aircraft use is contingent upon the making of satisfactory agreements with the Governments of Newfoundland and Canada regarding the use by civil aircraft of airfields in Newfoundland and Labrador, namely Gander, Harmon, Argentia and Goose Bay.

There have been prolonged discussions on the many difficult questions arising on the commercial use of the airfields. These discussions have left some remaining difficulties and complicated legal problems which will form the subject of further discussions between the two Governments.

Agreement has, however, been reached in principle as to the terms on which British, United States, and other aircraft should be allowed to use the airfields. The positions of both the United Kingdom and the United States in regard to the exercise of traffic rights on the bases have been safeguarded and provision has been made to insure that the United States, which will maintain the airfields for military purposes, shall enjoy "most-favored-nation" treatment. Thus it is agreed that no other civil air carrier, including civil air carriers of the United Kingdom, will be granted any greater or different traffic rights at the bases than are granted to United States civil air carriers at such bases, with certain exceptions permitted in the case of United Kingdom traffic between two points under its jurisdiction. There is also provision that the United States shall have the right to carry between the bases in its own civil aircraft certain personnel traveling on business connected with the leased bases.

Other provisions of the heads of agreement relate to the right of either government to suspend for military reasons commercial operations at the base airfields, and to the right of the United States military authorities to insure that no steps are taken in connection with commercial air operations which would prejudice in any way the military use of the bases. There is also a provision that if the United States wish at any time to relinquish the responsibility for maintaining the base airfields the United Kingdom or the colonial governments concerned would have the right to take over that responsibility.

FINAL ACT OF THE CIVIL AVIATION CONFERENCE HELD AT BERMUDA, JANUARY 15 TO FEBRUARY 11, 1946

The Governments of the United States of America and of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, having decided to hold between themselves a Conference on Civil Aviation, appointed their respective delegates, who are listed below:

United States of America: George P. Baker (chairman of delegation), Director, Office of Transport and Communications Policy, Department of State; Harllee Branch, Member, Civil Aeronautics Board; John D. Hickerson, Deputy Director, Office of European Affairs, Department of State; Josh B. Lee, Member, Civil Aeronautics Board; Stokeley W. Morgan, Chief, Aviation Division, Department of State; George C. Neal, general counsel, Civil Aeronautics Board; Garrison Norton, Deputy Director, Office of Transport and Communications Policy, Department of State; L. Welch Pogue, Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board; Oswald Ryan, Member, Civil Aeronautics Board; John Sherman, Liaison Consultant, Civil Aeronautics Board.

United Kingdom: Sir Henry Self, K. C. M. G., K. B. E., C B (chairman of delegation), Director General designate of Civil Aviation, Ministry of Civil Aviation; Sir William P Hildred, C. B. O., C. B., Director-General of Civil Aviation, Ministry of Civil Aviation; W. J. Bigg, Colonial Office; N J. A. Cheetham, Foreign Office; L. J. Dunnett, Ministry of Civil Aviation; Peter G. Masefield, Civil Air Attaché, British Embassy, Washington.

Who met in Bermuda on January 15, 1946.

At the first plenary session, Sir Henry Self was elected chairman of the Conference and the Conference was divided into two committees. The members of the committees and of the subcommittees, appointed by the respective Chairmen of the Delegations, are listed below:

COMMITTEE I. RATES AND TRAFFIC

Chairman: Sir Henry Self (United Kingdom).

United States delegates: George P. Baker, Harllee Branch, Josh B. Lee, Stokeley W. Morgan, George C. Neal, L. Welch Pogue, Oswald Ryan; advisers: Col. S. E. Gates, W. John Kenney, Maj. Gen. L. S. Kuter, Livingston Satterthwaite; consultants: Harold Bixby, Terrell Drinkwater, Julius C. Holmes, John Leslie, John E. Slater, James H. Smith, Jr.

United Kingdom delegates: Sir William Hildred, N. J. A. Cheetham, L. J. Dunnett, P. G. Masefield; advisers: M. E. Bathurst, Maj. J. R. McCrindle, Vernon Crudge.

Subcommittee 1. Policy

Chairman: Sir Henry Self (United Kingdom).

United States delegates: George P. Baker, Stokeley Morgan, L. Welch Pogue.

United Kingdom delegate: Sir William Hildred.

Subcommittee 2. Drafting

Chairman: Stokeley W. Morgan (United States).

United States delegate: George C. Neal; adviser: Col. S. E. Gates.

United Kingdom delegates: L. J. Dunnett, P. G. Masefield; adviser: M. E. Bathurst.

Subcommittee 3, Routes

Chairman, L. Welch Pogue (United States).

United States delegates: Harllee Branch, Josh B. Lee, Stokeley W. Morgan, George C. Neal, Oswald Ryan, John Sherman; advisers; William Fleming, Col. Samuel E. Gates, Maj. Gen. L. S. Kuter, Commander S. Jurika, Livingston Satterthwaite; consultants: Harold Bixby, Terrell Drinkwater, Julius C. Holmes, John Leslie, John E. Slater, James H. Smith, Jr.

United Kingdom delegates: W. J. Bigg, N. J. A. Cheetham, L. J. Dunnett, P. G. Masefield; advisers: M. E. Bathurst, Maj. J. R. McCrindle, Vernon Crudge.

COMMITTEE II, AD HOC

Chairman, L. J. Dunnett (United Kingdom).

United States delegates: John D. Hickerson, Stokeley W. Morgan.

United Kingdom delegate, N. J. A. Cheetham.

The final plenary session was held on February 11, 1946.

As a result of the deliberations of the Conference, there was formulated an agreement between the Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of the United States relating to air services between their respective territories and annex thereto. (Attached hereto as appendix I.)

The following resolution was adopted:

"Whereas representatives of the two Governments have met together in Bermuda to discuss civil aviation matters outstanding between them and have reached agreement thereon; and

"Whereas the two Governments have today concluded an agreement relating to air services between their respective territories (hereinafter called 'the agreement'); and

"Whereas the two Governments have reached agreement on the procedure to be followed in the settlement of other matters in the field civil aviation: Now, therefore, the representatives of the two Governments in conference resolve and agree as follows:

"(1) That the two Governments desire to foster and encourage the widest possible distribution of the benefits of air travel for the general good of mankind at the cheapest rates consistent with sound economic principles; and to stimulate international air travel as a means of promoting friendly understanding and good will among peoples and insuring as well the many indirect benefits of this new form of transportation to the common welfare of both countries.

"(2) That the two Governments reaffirm their adherence to the principles and purpose set out in the preamble to the Convention on International Civil Aviation signed at Chicago on December 7, 1944.

"(3) That the air transport facilities available to the traveling public should bear a close relationship to the requirements of the public for such transport.

"(4) That there shall be a fair and equal opportunity for the carriers of the two nations to operate on any route between their respective territories (as defined in the agreement) covered by the agreement and its annex.

"(5) That in the operation by the air carriers of either Government of the trunk services described in the annex to the agreement, the interest of the air carriers of the other Government shall be taken into consideration so as not to affect unduly the services which the latter provides on all or part of the same routes.

"(6) That it is the understanding of both Governments that services provided by a designated air carrier under the agreement and its annex shall retain as their primary objective the provision of capacity adequate to the traffic demands between the country of which such air carrier is a national and the country of ultimate destination of the traffic. The right to embark or disembark on such services international traffic destined for and coming from third countries at a point or points on the routes specified in the annex to the agreement shall be applied in accordance with the general principles of orderly development to which both Governments subscribe and shall be subject to the general principle that capacity should be related:

"(a) To traffic requirements between the country of origin and the countries of destination;

"(b) To the requirements of through airline operation, and

"(c) To the traffic requirements of the area through which the airline passes after taking account of local and regional services.

"(7) That insofar as the air carrier or carriers of one Government may be temporarily prevented through difficulties arising from the war from taking immediate advantage of the opportunity referred to in subparagraph (4) above, the situation shall be reviewed between the Governments with the object of facilitating the necessary development, as soon as the air carrier or carriers of the first Government is or are in a position increasingly to make their proper contribution to the service.

"(8) That duly authorized United States civil air carriers will enjoy nondiscriminatory "two-freedom" privileges and the exercise (in accordance with the agreement or any continuing or subsequent agreement) of commercial traffic rights at airports located in territory of the United Kingdom which have been constructed in whole or in part with United States funds and are designated for use by international civil air carriers.

"(9) That it is the intention of both Governments that there should be regular and frequent consultation between their respective aeronautical authorities (as defined in the agreement) and that there should thereby be close collaboration in the observance of the principles and the implementation of the provisions outlined herein and in the agreement and its annex."

In witness whereof the following delegates sign the present final act.

Done at Bermuda the 11th day of February 1946.

This final act shall be deposited in the Archives of the Government of the United Kingdom and a certified copy shall be transmitted by that Government to the Government of the United States of America.

United States of America: George P. Baker, Harllee Branch, Stokeley W. Morgan, George C. Neal, Garrison Norton, L. Welch Pogue, Oswald Ryan, John Sherman; United Kingdom: A. H. Self, W. P. Hildred, W. J. Bigg, L. J. Dunnett, Peter G. Masefield.

BILATERAL AIR TRANSPORT AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA RELATING TO AIR SERVICES BETWEEN THEIR RESPECTIVE TERRITORIES

The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the United States of America, desiring to conclude an agreement for the purpose of promoting direct air communications as soon as possible between their respective territories, have accordingly appointed authorized representatives for this purpose, who have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE 1

Each contracting party grants to the other contracting party rights to the extent described in the annex to this agreement for the purpose of the establishment of air services described therein or as amended in accordance with section IV of the annex (hereinafter referred to as "the agreed services").

ARTICLE 2

(1) The agreed services may be inaugurated immediately or at a later date at the option of the contracting party to whom the rights are granted, but not before (a) the contracting party to whom the rights have been granted has designated an air carrier or carriers for the specified route or routes, and (b) the contracting party granting the rights has given the appropriate operating permission to the air carrier or carriers concerned (which, subject to the provisions of paragraph (2) of this article and of article 6, it shall do without undue delay).

(2) The designated air carrier or carriers may be required to satisfy the aeronautical

authorities of the contracting party granting the rights that it or they is or are qualified to fulfill the conditions prescribed by or under the laws and regulations normally applied by those authorities to the operations of commercial air carriers.

(3) In areas of military occupation, or in areas affected thereby, such inauguration will continue to be subject, where necessary, to the approval of the competent military authorities.

ARTICLE 3

(1) The charges which either of the contracting partie may impose, or permit to be imposed, on the designated air carrier or carriers of the other contracting party for the use of airports and other facilities shall not be higher than would be paid for the use of such airports and facilities by its national aircraft engaged in similar international air services.

(2) Fuel, lubricating oil, and spare parts introduced into, or taken on board aircraft in, the territory of one contracting party by, or on behalf of, a designated air carrier of the other contracting party and intended solely for use by the aircraft of such carrier shall be accorded, with respect to customs duties, inspection fees, or other charges imposed by the former contracting party, treatment not less favorable than that granted to national air carriers engaged in international air service or such carriers of the most-favored nation.

(3) Supplies of fuel, lubricating oils, spare parts, regular equipment and aircraft stores retained on board aircraft of a designated air carrier of one contracting party shall be exempt in the territory of the other contracting party from customs duties, inspection fees, or similar duties or charges, even though such supplies be used by such aircraft on flights within that territory.

ARTICLE 4

Certificates of airworthiness, certificates of competency and licenses issued or rendered valid by one contracting party and still in force shall be recognized as valid by the other contracting party for the purpose of operation of the agreed services. Each contracting party reserves the right, however, to refuse to recognize for the purpose of flight above its own territory, certificates of competency and licenses granted to its own nationals by another state.

ARTICLE 5

(1) The laws and regulations of one contracting party relating to entry into or departure from its territory of aircraft engaged in international air navigation or to the operation and navigation of such aircraft while within its territory shall apply to aircraft of the designated air carrier or carriers of the other contracting party.

(2) The laws and regulations of one contracting party relating to the entry into or departure from its territory of passengers, crew, or cargo of aircraft (such as regulations relating to entry, clearance, immigration, passports, customs, and quarantine) shall be applicable to the passengers, crew, or cargo of the aircraft of the designated air carrier or carriers of the other contracting party while in the territory of the first contracting party.

ARTICLE 6

Each contracting party reserves the right to withhold or revoke the exercises of the rights specified in the annex to this agreement by a carrier designated by the other contracting party in the event that it is not satisfied that substantial ownership and effective control of such carrier are vested in nationals of either contracting party, or in case of failure by that carrier to comply with the laws and regulations referred to in article 5 hereof, or otherwise to fulfill the conditions under which the rights are granted in accordance with this agreement and its annex.

ARTICLE 7

This agreement shall be registered with the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, set up by the interim agreement on international civil aviation signed at Chicago on December 7, 1944.

ARTICLE 8

Except as otherwise provided in this agreement or its annex, if either of the contracting parties considers it desirable to modify the terms of the annex to this agreement, it may request consultation between the aeronautical authorities of both contracting parties, such consultation to begin within a period of 60 days from the date of the request. When these authorities agree on modifications to the annex, these modifications will come into effect when they have been confirmed by an exchange of notes through the diplomatic channel.

ARTICLE 9

Except as otherwise provided in this agreement or in its annex, any dispute between the contracting parties relating to the interpretation or application of this agreement or its annex which cannot be settled through consultation shall be referred for an advisory report to the interim council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization (in accordance with the provisions of article III, section 6 (8) of the interim agreement on International Civil Aviation signed at Chicago on December 7, 1944) or its successor.

ARTICLE 10

The terms and conditions of operating rights which may have been granted previously by either contracting party to the other contracting party or to an air carrier of such other contracting party shall not be abrogated by the present agreement. Except as may be modified by the present agreement, the general principles of the air navigation arrangement between the two contracting parties, which was effected by an exchange of notes dated March 28 and April 5, 1935, shall continue in force insofar as they are applicable to scheduled international air services, until otherwise agreed by the contracting parties.

ARTICLE 11

If a general multilateral air convention enters into force in relation to both contracting parties, the present agreement shall be amended so as to conform with the provisions of such convention.

ARTICLE 12

For the purposes of this agreement and its annex, unless the context otherwise requires:

(a) The term "aeronautical authorities" shall mean, in the case of the United Kingdom, the Minister of Civil Aviation for the time being, and any person or body authorized to perform any functions presently exercised by the said Minister or similar functions, and, in the case of the United States, the Civil Aeronautics Board and any person or body authorized to perform the functions presently exercised by the Board or similar functions.

(b) The term "designated air carriers" shall mean the air transport enterprises which the aeronautical authorities of one of the contracting parties have n tified in writing to the aeronautical authorities of the other contracting party as the air carriers designated by it in accordance with article 2 of this agreement for the routes specified in such notification.

(c) The term "territory" shall have the meaning assigned to it by article 2 of the Convention on International Civil Aviation signed at Chicago on December 7, 1944.

(d) The definitions contained in paragraphs (a), (b), and (d) of article 96 of the Convention on International Civil Aviation signed at Chicago on December 7, 1944, shall apply.

ARTICLE 13

Either contracting party may at any time request consultation with the other with a view to initiating any amendments of this agreement or its annex which may be desirable in the light of experience. Pending the outcome of such consultation, it shall be open to either party at any time to give notice to the other of its desire to terminate this agreement. Such notice shall be simultaneously communicated to the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor. If such notice is given, this agreement shall terminate 12 calendar months after the date of receipt of the notice by the other contracting party, unless the notice to terminate is withdrawn by agreement before the expiry of this period. In the absence of acknowledgment of receipt by the other contracting party notice shall be deemed to have been received 14 days after the receipt of the notice by the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor.

ARTICLE 14

This agreement, including the provisions of the annex hereto, will come into force on the day it is signed.

In witness whereof, the undersigned being duly authorized thereto by their respective governments, have signed the present agreement.

Done in duplicate this 11th day of February 1946 at Bermuda.

For the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

For the Government of the United States of America.

ANNEX

I

For the purposes of operating air services on the routes specified below in section III of this annex or as amended in accordance with section IV hereof, the designated air carriers of one of the contracting parties shall be accorded in the territory of the other contracting party the use on the said routes at each of the places specified therein of all the airports (being airports designated for international air services), together with ancillary facilities and rights of transit, of stops for nontraffic purposes and of commercial entry and departure for international traffic in passengers, cargo, and mail in full accord and compliance with the principles recited and agreed in the final act of the conference on civil aviation held between the Governments of the United States and of the United Kingdom at Bermuda from January 15 to February 11, 1946, and subject to the provisions of sections II and V of this annex.

II

(a) Rates to be charged by the air carriers of either contracting party between points in the territory of the United States and points in the territory of the United Kingdom referred to in this annex shall be subject to the approval of the contracting parties within their respective constitutional powers and obligations. In the event of disagreement the matter in dispute shall be handled as provided below.

(b) The Civil Aeronautics Board of the United States having announced its intention to approve the rate conference machinery of the International Air Transport Association (hereinafter called IATA), as submitted, for a period of 1 year beginning in February 1946, any rate agreements concluded through this machinery during this period and involving United States air carriers will be subject to approval by the Board.

(c) Any new rate proposed by the air carrier or carriers of either contracting party shall be filed with the aeronautical authorities of both contracting parties at least

30 days before the proposed date of introduction; provided that this period of 30 days may be reduced in particular cases if so agreed by the aeronautical authorities of both contracting parties.

(d) The contracting parties hereby agree that where:

(1) During the period of the Board's approval of the IATA rate conference machinery, either any specific rate agreement is not approved within a reasonable time by either contracting party or a conference of IATA is unable to agree on a rate; or

(2) At any time no IATA machinery is applicable; or

(3) Either contracting party at any time withdraws or fails to renew its approval of that part of the IATA rate conference machinery relevant to this provision.

The procedure described in paragraphs (e), (f), and (g) hereof shall apply.

(e) In the event that power is conferred by law upon the aeronautical authorities of the United States to fix fair and economic rates for the transport of persons and property by air on international services and to suspend proposed rates in a manner comparable to that in which the Civil Aeronautics Board at present is empowered to act with respect to such rates for the transport of persons and property by air within the United States, each of the contracting parties shall thereafter exercise its authority in such manner as to prevent any rate or rates proposed by one of its carriers for services from the territory of one contracting party to a point or points in the territory of the other contracting party from becoming effective if in the judgment of the aeronautical authorities of the contracting party whose air carrier or carriers is or are proposing such rate, that rate is unfair or uneconomic. If one of the contracting parties on receipt of the notification referred to in paragraph (c) above is dissatisfied with the new rate proposed by the air carrier or carriers of the other contracting party, it shall so notify the other contracting party prior to the expiry of the first 15 of the 30 days referred to, and the contracting parties shall endeavor to reach agreement on the appropriate rate. In the event that such agreement is reached each contracting party will exercise its statutory powers to give effect to such agreement. If agreement has not been reached at the end of the 30-day period referred to in paragraph (c) above, the proposed rate may, unless the aeronautical authorities of the country of the air carrier concerned see fit to suspend its operation, go into effect provisionally pending the settlement of any dispute in accordance with the procedure outlined in paragraph (g) below.

(f) Prior to the time when such power may be conferred by law upon the aeronautical authorities of the United States, if one of the contracting parties is dissatisfied with any new rate proposed by the air carrier or carriers of either contracting party for services from the territory of one contracting party to a point or points in the territory of the other contracting party, it shall so notify the other prior to the expiry of the first 15 of the 30-day period referred to in paragraph (c) above, and the contracting parties shall endeavor to reach agreement on the appropriate rate. In the event that such agreement is reached, each contracting party will use its best efforts to cause such agreed rate to be put into effect by its air carrier or carriers. It is recognized that if no such agreement can be reached prior to the expiry of such 30 days, the contracting party raising objection to the rate may take such steps as it may consider necessary to prevent the inauguration or continuation of the service in question at the rate complained.

(g) When in any case under paragraphs (e) and (f) above the aeronautical authorities of the two contracting parties cannot agree within a reasonable time upon the appropriate rate after consultation initiated by the complaint of one contracting party concerning the proposed rate or an existing rate of the air carrier or carriers of the other contracting party, upon the request of either, both contracting parties shall submit the question to the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or to its successor for an advisory report, and each party will use its best efforts under the powers available to it to put into effect the opinion expressed in such report.

(h) The rates to be agreed in accordance with the above paragraphs shall be fixed at reasonable levels, due regard being paid to all relevant factors, such as cost of operation, reasonable profit, and the rates charged by any other air carriers.

(i) The executive branch of the Government of the United States agrees to use its best efforts to secure legislation empowering the aeronautical authorities of the United States to fix fair and economic rates for the transport of persons and property by air on international services and to suspend proposed rates in a manner comparable to that in which the Civil Aeronautics Board at present is empowered to act with respect to such rates for the transport of persons and property by air within the United States.

III

(A) ROUTES TO BE SERVED BY THE AIR CARRIERS OF THE UNITED KINGDOM

[In both directions; stops for nontraffic purposes omitted]

Point of departure	Intermediate points	Destination in United States territory	Points beyond
Any one or more of the following:	Any one or more of the following if desired:	Any one or more of the following if desired:	Any one or more of the following if desired:
1. London.		New York.	San Francisco and the points on route 7.
2. London. Prestwick.	Shannon. Iceland. Azores. Bermuda. Gander. Montreal.	New York. Chicago. Detroit. Philadelphia. Washington. Baltimore. Boston.	
3. London.[1] Prestwick	Shannon. Iceland. Azores. Bermuda. Gander. Montreal.	New York.	(a) New Orleans. Mexico City. (b) Cuba. Jamaica. Panama. A point in Colombia. A point in Ecuador. Lima. Santiago.
4. Bermuda.		Baltimore. Washington. New York.	Montreal.
5. Trinidad.[1] British Guiana. Jamaica. British Honduras.	Tobago. Barbados. Grenada. St. Vincent. St. Lucia. Antigua. St. Kitts. St. Thomas. San Juan. Ciudad Trujillo. Port-au-Prince. Jamaica. Cuba Nassau. Bermuda.	Miami.	
6. Nassau. Cat Cay.		Miami. Palm Beach.	
7. Singapore. Hong Kong.	Manila. Guam. Wake. Midway. Honolulu.	San Francisco.	

[1] Notice will be given by the aeronautical authorities of the United Kingdom to the aeronautical authorities of the United States of the route-service patterns according to which services will be inaugurated on these routes.

(B) ROUTES TO BE SERVED BY THE AIR CARRIERS OF THE UNITED STATES

[In both directions; stops for nontraffic purposes omitted]

Point of departure	Intermediate points	Destination in United Kingdom territory	Points beyond
Any one or more of the following:	Any one or more of the following, if desired:	Any one or more of the following, if desired:	Any one or more of the following, if desired:
1. Chicago.[1] Detroit. Washington. Philadelphia. New York City. Boston. Baltimore.	Gander. Greenland. Iceland. Shannon.	London. Prestwick.	Amsterdam. Helsinki. Copenhagen. Stavanger. Oslo. Stockholm. Warsaw. Berlin. Frankfurt. Moscow. Leningrad. Points in the Baltic countries.
2. New York.[1] Chicago. Philadelphia. Baltimore. Washington. Boston. Detroit.	Gander. Greenland. Iceland. Shannon.	London. Prestwick.	Brussels. Munich. Prague. Vienna. Budapest. Belgrade. Bucharest. Istanbul. Ankara. A point in Iran— Beirut. A point in Syria. A point in Iraq. A point in— Afghanistan. Karachi. Delhi. Calcutta.

Footnote at end of table.

(B) ROUTES TO BE SERVED BY THE AIR CARRIERS OF THE UNITED STATES—continued

Point of departure	Intermediate points	Destination in United Kingdom territory	Points beyond
Any one or more of the following:	Any one or more of the following if desired:	Any one or more of the following if desired:	Any one or more of the following if desired:
3. Chicago.[1] Detroit. Washington. New York. Boston. Baltimore. Philadelphia.	Gander. Shannon. Greenland. Iceland. Paris. A point in Switzerland. Rome. Athens. Cairo.	Lydda.	A point in Iraq. Dhahran. Bombay. Calcutta. A point in Burma. A point in Siam. A point or points in Indochina. A point or points in China.
4. Chicago. Detroit. Washington. New York. Boston. Baltimore. Philadelphia.	Gander. Azores. Lisbon. (a) Aigiers. Tunis. Tripoli. Benghazi. Cairo. (b) Madrid. Rome. Athens. Cairo.	Lydda.	From Lydda to points beyond as described in route 3.
5. New York. Chicago. Detroit. Washington. Philadelphia. Boston. Baltimore.	Gander. Bermuda. Azores.	London.	From the Azores: Lisbon. Barcelona. Marseilles.
6. San Francisco.[1] Los Angeles.	Honolulu. Midway. Wake. Guam. Manila.	Hong Kong.	Macao. A point or points in China. A point or points in Indochina. A point or points in Siam. A point or points in Burma. Calcutta.
7. San Francisco.[1] Los Angeles.	Honolulu. Midway. Wake. Guam. Manila. A point or points in Indochina.	Singapore.	Batavia.
8. New York. Washington. Baltimore.		Bermuda.	
9. Miami. Palm Beach.		Cat Cay. Nassau.	
10. Miami.	Points in Cuba.	Jamaica.	(a) Baranquilla via South American points to Balboa. (b) Baranquilla via South American points to Trinidad.
11. New Orleans. Houston.	Points in Cuba.	Jamaica.	Aruba. South American points.
12. New York. Miami.	Camaguey. Port-au-Prince. Ciudad Trujillo. San Juan. St. Thomas. Pointe a Pitre. Fort-de-France.	Antigua. St. Lucia. Trinidad. British Guiana.	Via South American points to Buenos Aires.
13. New York.	(a) Azores. Dakar. Monrovia. (b) San Juan. Trinidad. British Guiana. Belem. Natal. Monrovia. Ascension Island.	Accra or Lagos.	Leopoldville. Johannesburg.

[1] Notice will be given by the aeronautical authorities of the United States to the aeronautical authorities of the United Kingdom of the route-service patterns according to which services will be inaugurated on these routes.

IV

(a) Amendments made by either contracting party to the routes described in section III of this annex which change the points served in the territory of the other contracting party will be made only after consultation in accordance with the provisions of article 8 of this agreement.

(b) Other route changes desired by either contracting party may be made and put into effect at any time, prompt notice to that effect being given by the aeronautical authorities of the contracting party concerned to the aeronautical authorities of the other contracting party. If such other contracting party finds that, having regard to the principles set forth in paragraph (6) of the final act of the conference referred to in section I of this annex, the interests of its air carrier or carriers are prejudiced by the carriage by the air carrier or carriers of the first contracting party of traffic between the territory of the second contracting party and the new point in the territory of a third country it shall so inform the first contracting party. If agreement cannot be reached by consultation between the contracting parties, it shall be open to the contracting party whose air carrier or carriers is or are affected to invoke the provisions of article 9 of this agreement.

(c) The contracting parties will, as soon as possible after the execution of this agreement and from time to time thereafter, exchange information concerning the authorizations extended to their respective designated air carriers to render service to, through, and from the territory of the other contracting party. This will include copies of current certificates and authorizations for service on the routes which are the subject of this agreement, and for the future such new certificates and authorizations as may be issued, together with amendments, exemption orders, and authorized service patterns.

V

(a) Where the onward carriage of traffic by an aircraft of different size from that employed on the earlier stage of the same route (hereinafter referred to as "change of gage") is justified by reason of economy of operation, such change of gage at a point in the territory of the United Kingdom or the territory of the United States, shall not be made in violation of the principles set forth in the final act of the Conference on Civil Aviation held at Bermuda from January 15 to February 11, 1946, and, in particular, shall be subject to there being an adequate volume of through traffic.

(b) Where change of gage is made at a point in the territory of the United Kingdom or in the territory of the United States the small aircraft will operate only in connection with the larger aircraft arriving at the point of change, so as to provide a connection service which will thus normally wait on the arrival of the larger aircraft, for the primary purpose of carrying onward those passengers who have traveled to United Kingdom or United States territory in the larger aircraft to their ultimate destination in the smaller aircraft. Where there are vacancies in the smaller aircraft such vacancies may be filled with passengers from United Kingdom or United States territory, respectively. It is understood, however, that the capacity of the smaller aircraft shall be determined with primary reference to the traffic traveling in the larger aircraft normally requiring to be carried onward.

(c) It is agreed that the arrangements under any part of the preceding paragraphs (a) and (b) shall be governed by and in no way restrictive of the standards set forth in paragraph (6) of the final act.

HEADS OF AN AGREEMENT FOR USE BY CIVIL AIRCRAFT OF NAVAL AND AIR BASES IN AREAS LEASED TO THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA UNDER AN AGREEMENT WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM, DATED MARCH 27, 1941.

Whereas by agreement of March 27, 1941 (hereinafter referred to as the "bases agreement") the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland agreed to lease for military purposes to the Government of the United States exclusively certain areas in the Western Hemisphere in which naval and air bases have been constructed with full and continuing rights of military use and control thereof for a period of 99 years as specified in the agreement; and

Whereas article XI (5) of the said agreement provides that "commercial aircraft will not be authorized to operate from any of the bases (save in case of emergency or for strictly military purposes under supervision of the War or Navy Departments) except by agreement between the United States and the Government of the United Kingdom, provided that in the case of Newfoundland such agreement shall be between the United States and the Government of Newfoundland"; and

Whereas the Governments of the United States and of the United Kingdom desire, in order to facilitate the development of air transportation, at this time to arrange for the air bases to be available for use by civil aircraft on the conditions hereinafter stated without interfering with, restricting or limiting the present military rights of, or continued military use by, the United States of the bases in accordance with the said agreement;

Now, therefore, it is agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

The air bases (hereinafter referred to as "the bases") leased to the United States pursuant to the bases agreement will be open for use by civil aircraft wherever such use will contribute to the over-all development of civil aviation along sound economic lines.

(a) In accordance with the above principles the following bases will be open for regular use by civil aircraft: Kindley (Bermuda), Coolidge (Antigua), Beane (St. Lucia), Atkinson (British Guiana).

(b) The following bases which are situated in territories where adequate civil airports now exist, will be open for use by civil aircraft only as bad weather alternates until such time as agreement is reached that experience or other developments indicate the need for their regular use by civil aircraft: Carlson (Trinidad), Waller (Trinidad), Vernam (Jamaica).

The circumstances in which the said bases will be used as bad weather alternates will be determined in the light of any rules established by the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, or its successor, or in the absence of such rules by further discussion between the two Governments.

ARTICLE II

So long as the United States and the United Kingdom are parties to the International Air Services Transit Agreement signed at Chicago on December 7, 1944, the civil aircraft of all countries parties to that agreement may use the bases for nontraffic purposes in accordance with the provisions of section I of article I of the agreement. In view of the special circumstances in the case of these bases, countries which are not parties to that agreement but which are parties to bilateral agreements either with the United States or with the United Kingdom providing for the privileges specified in the said agreement may utilize the bases only with the concurrence of both the United States and the United Kingdom.

ARTICLE III

(a) Any duly authorized United States civil air carrier utilizing the bases shall be entitled, without prejudice to the principle of cabotage, and in view of the special circumstances in connection with the bases, to carry between the bases referred to in article I (a) hereof:

(i) United States Government sponsored passengers (and their personal effects) traveling at the expense of the Government of the United States or on business directly connected with the bases or with United States personnel at the bases; and

(ii) Cargo carried at the expense of the Government of the United States.

(b) The exercise of the privileges granted in these heads of agreement shall be without prejudice to rights (together with any extensions thereof) which may have been granted by the Government of the United Kingdom (or any of the colonial governments concerned) to any United States civil air carrier. In view of the special circumstances in the case of the bases, the Government of the United Kingdom will not grant civil air carriers of third countries utilizing these bases traffic rights incident to the use of these bases beyond the extent that such third countries have granted corresponding rights (though not necessarily on the same routes as those operated by the air carriers of the third countries concerned) in their respective countries to the civil air carriers of the United States.

(c) No other civil air carrier, including civil air carriers of the United Kingdom, will be granted any greater or different traffic rights at the bases than are granted to United States civil air carriers at such bases, provided that United States civil air carriers shall not, by reason of this provision, be entitled to claim the right to carry cabotage traffic between any two points in the territory (as defined in article 2 of the Convention on International Civil Aviation signed at Chicago on December 7, 1944) of the United Kingdom (except to the limited extent provided in paragraph (a) of this article) nor shall civil air carriers of the United Kingdom be precluded from carrying cabotage traffic between the bases concerned so long as United States civil air carriers are entitled to exercise traffic rights at those bases.

(d) For the purposes of this article, the term "civil air carriers of the United Kingdom" shall be deemed to include those of territories under the sovereignty, suzerainty, protection, or mandate of the United Kingdom.

(e) Notwithstanding the termination of the agreement between the Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of the United States of America relating to air services between their respective territories, signed at Bermuda on February 11, 1946, its provisions and those of its annex shall continue to apply to any traffic rights which United States air carriers may thereafter exercise at any of the bases referred to in article I of these heads of agreement until such time as the contracting parties may otherwise agree: *Provided*, That the Government of the United States shall have the right at any time after 15 years from the date on which the agreement referred to in article XII of these heads of agreement becomes effective to give notice of its desire that the provisions of the first-mentioned agreement and its annex shall cease to apply, on the date specified in the notice but which shall not in any case be less than 2 years after receipt of such notice, to the traffic rights exercised by its air carriers at any of the bases referred to above pursuant to that agreement.

ARTICLE IV

Subject to the provisions of article V hereof, civil aircraft of the United Kingdom (including those of territories under the sovereignty, suzerainty, protection, or mandate of the United Kingdom) shall be entitled to use the bases for nontraffic purposes on terms no less favorable than those enjoyed by United States civil aircraft.

ARTICLE V

(a) The United States military authorities will make every reasonable effort to avoid interruption of civil operations at the bases. It is understood, however, that the United States military authorities have the right for military reasons, on a nondiscriminatory basis, to curtail or suspend civil air operations, and, from time to time as may be necessary, to impose restrictions of a temporary or continuing nature on the use of the bases by civil aircraft.

(b) Subject to requirements dictated by military reasons, no limitation on the use of the bases by civil aircraft will be prescribed, except those predicated upon safety or the capacity of a field or its facilities, and any such limitations will be imposed on a proportionate nondiscriminatory basis.

(c) The use of the bases by civil aircraft may likewise on a proportionate nondiscriminatory basis be limited, curtailed, suspended, or subjected to such regulation as may be necessary for security reasons by the colonial government concerned. In such event that government will give timely notice to the United States military authorities.

ARTICLE VI

Subject to the provisions of article VIII (b) hereof, administrative and operational control of the bases will be exercised by the United States military authorities, who may, subject to the provisions of article VII hereof, delegate the performance of certain services to civilian agencies. Such delegation will be without prejudice to the right of the United States military authorities to resume the performance of such services at any time and without delay.

ARTICLE VII

Airport tower control and approach control will be operated by or under the direction of the United States military authorities. The responsibility for area control will be reviewed in the light of the studies and recommendations of the Route Service Organization Conference of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, or its successor.

ARTICLE VIII

(a) Discussions shall be held between the two Governments with a view to making arrangements for the provision of necessary facilities, supplies, and services to civil air carriers using the bases, and the agreement to be concluded pursuant to these heads of agreement shall contain provisions defining such arrangements and shall not enter into force until such arrangements have been made.

(b) At each of the bases where suitable land is not conveniently adjacent thereto for the provision of necessary civil airport facilities, supplies, and services, and for the erection of buildings for customs, immigration, quarantine, and other similar matters of colonial or United Kingdom national interest, the United States military authorities will, if this is possible without conflict with military requirements, designate an appropriate area within the boundaries of the base for such purposes. Except as otherwise specifically provided in these heads of agreement, the provision of the above facilities, supplies, and services and the conduct of the matters mentioned above within the area so designated will be under the control and jurisdiction of the colonial government in the same manner and to the same extent as they would be if they were provided or conducted in an area outside of the leased area, but shall be without prejudice to the right of the United States military authorities to resume complete and unrestricted control and use of the designated area and its facilities should this prove to be necessary for military reasons of overriding necessity. The terms and conditions under which such area will be made available will be as approved by the Government of the United States after consultation between the two Governments.

(c) In connection with fire protection, sanitation, and other matters affecting the military security of the bases, the United States military authorities shall have the right, in collaboration with or after prior notice to the local colonial authorities in the territory concerned, to enter upon and to inspect any buildings or other facilities and services erected or provided in any area designated under paragraph (b) of this article for the purpose of satisfying themselves that adequate precautionary measures are taken in the matters referred to above. If the United States military authorities consider that the precautionary measures taken are not adequate, they shall have the right, in consultation with the colonial authorities concerned, or, in cases where military reasons so require, on their own initiative, to supplement these measures to the extent considered necessary. With respect to terminal and other facilities contiguous to the base area, the location, type, size, hazards to safe operation of aircraft, sanitation, etc., will be subject to consultation between the appropriate local authorities and, as required, between the two Governments for the purpose of safeguarding the military use of the base.

(d) Civil aircraft using one of the bases referred to in article I (a) hereof shall load and unload persons, mail, and cargo only within the area (which shall be either the area referred to in paragraph (b) of this article or outside the leased area), designated for that purpose by the colonial government concerned.

ARTICLE IX

The scale of fees to be charged for the civil use of the bases and for facilities, sup-

plies and services to civil aircraft using the bases, will be subject to consultation between the local United States military authorities and the local colonial authorities and, as required, between the two governments. The terms and conditions of any sublease by a colonial government to a civil air carrier for terminal and other facilities located within the base area and the location, type, size, and other pertinent details of the terminal and other facilities shall be subject to the approval of the United States military authorities.

ARTICLE X

Should the Government of the United States elect for military reasons to place one or more of the bases on a caretaker basis:

(a) The Government of the United States will have no further responsibility for maintaining that base in operational condition for civil use; provided that timely notice of intention to place on a caretaker basis is given to the Government of the United Kingdom.

(b) The Government of the United Kingdom or the colonial government concerned will have the right to maintain the base for civil use; provided that the Government of the United States at any future time within the term of the bases agreement and upon appropriate notice will have the right to resume the maintenance and operational control of the said base.

(a) Nothing in these heads of agreement will be deemed to constitute a limitation or an abrogation of (1) any of the rights or privileges accorded to the Government of the United States by the provisions of the bases agreement, or (2) the sovereign rights of the colonial governments concerned.

(b) The two Governments will consult together to decide what amendments, if any, to the bases agreement will be necessary in the light of these heads of agreement.

ARTICLE XII

(a) The two Governments will consult together and prepare an agreement giving effect to the terms herein contained. Such agreement will become effective on signature on behalf of the respective Governments, and shall continue in effect indefinitely but either of the Governments may, at any time after the agreement has been in effect for 15 years, give to the other notice of termination and in such event, the agreement shall cease to be effective 24 calendar months after the date of receipt of such notice.

(b) The two Governments hereby agree that while the agreement continues in effect, they will consult together not less than once in every five calendar years with a view to reviewing the operation of the agreement and agreeing upon any modifications that may be desired.

(c) The initialing of this document shall not indicate that a contract has been concluded. This document is the agreed basis of, and subject to the preparation of, a formal contract. In the preparation of the formal contract any outstanding points, more particularly the points arising in articles 8 and 11, will be resolved.

United States: Ad referendum: Subject to reservation set out in letter of even date from Chairman of United States Delegation to Chairman of United Kingdom Delegation.

G. P. B.
L. S. K.
G. N.

United Kingdom: Ad referendum: Subject to reservation set out in letter of even date from Chairman of United Kingdom Delegation to Chairman of United States Delegation.

A. H. S.
W. J. B.
W. P. H.

FEBRUARY 11, 1946.

Delegation of the United States of America

FEBRUARY 11, 1946.

SIR HENRY SELF,
K. C. M. G., K. B. E., C. B.,
Chairman, United Kingdom Delegation.

MY DEAR SIR HENRY: In initialing today the heads of agreement with respect to the use of the 99-year-leased bases by civil aircraft, I wish to confirm by this letter the oral reservation which I have heretofore made on behalf of the United States. Final approval and signature by the United States of the agreement to open any of the 99-year-leased bases to civil aircraft is contingent on reaching satisfactory agreement with the Governments of Newfoundland and Canada regarding the use by civil aircraft of airfields in Newfoundland and Labrador, namely Goose, Gander, Harmon, and Argentia.

I am, my dear Sir Henry,
Very sincerely yours,

GEORGE P. BAKER,
Chairman, United States Delegation.

Delegation of the United Kingdom

BERMUDA, *February 11, 1946.*

MR. GEORGE P. BAKER,
Chairman, United States Delegation,
Civil Aviation Conference, Bermuda.

MY DEAR MR. BAKER: You will recall that on February 9 I informed you that the United Kingdom Government wished a reservation to be made at the time of the initialing of the heads of agreement relating to civil use of base airfields, and that they wished articles VIII and IX to be specifically referred to in this reservation as both of these articles provide for discussions on outstanding points. We have since heard from London that the amendments which we have agreed upon in article III of the heads of agreement do not entirely resolve the doubts felt in London in regard to the commitments already entered into by the United Kingdom Government granting traffic rights to Canadian air services operating through Bermuda. I, therefore, take this opportunity of letting you know that the United Kingdom Government will wish to discuss this question with the United States Government at a later stage.

Very sincerely yours,

A. H. SELF.

REPORT ON THE BASES DISCUSSIONS

The discussions on the bases were conducted by a committee under the chairmanship of Mr. Garrison Norton (United States) and composed as follows:

United States delegates; John D. Hickerson, John Sherman; advisers: Col. S. E. Gates, W. John Kenney, Maj. Gen. L. S. Kuter, and Vice Admiral F. P. Sherman; consultant, John Leslie.

United Kingdom delegates: W. J. Bigg, N. J. A. Cheetham, L. J. Dunnett, P. G. Masefield; advisers, M. E. Bathurst, F. Kennedy.

There is submitted herewith a draft of heads of agreement which has been agreed on with a view to the preparation and conclusion of an agreement between the two Governments.

It is recommended that the bases agreement of 1941, and particularly articles IV, VI, IX, XII, XIII, XIV, XVI, and XVII, be examined with a view to determining how far they should apply, if at all, in relation to the use of the bases for civil purposes. It is the intention that United States mail originating at United States post offices established in the bases under article XVI of the bases agreement should be included in the arrangement mentioned in paragraph (a) of article III of these heads of agreement.

It is also recommended that examination be made of the applicability of colonial laws and regulations to the commercial transactions which may be conducted on the bases.

CLOSING REMARKS OF MR. GEORGE P. BAKER, CHAIRMAN OF THE DELEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES

Your Excellency, Sir Henry, Sir William, ladies and gentlemen, 4 weeks ago in my opening remarks I stated that the United States delegation came here with an earnest desire, in the interest of the speedy development of international air transport and the continuing good relations between our two countries of working out a bilateral air transport agreement. We believed that if both sides approached the subject in the light of the over-all economic relations of the two nations, of our comradeship throughout the past years of war, and the seriousness of the world problems now facing us, that we could reach a successful result. That success is now achieved. We have had from the other side of the table the forthright and energetic presentation of the British view coupled with a willingness to seek ways and means of finding common ground when these views sometimes seemed diametrically opposite to ours. We have shared long periods of very concentrated effort. We have shared some periods of anxious inactivity waiting upon the necessary review of our best efforts by the Governments at home. We have shared the enjoyment of this beautiful island. I believe that the cooperation which has begun here augurs well for the future of civil aviation between our two nations and we hope for the development of civil aviation throughout the world, for what has been worked out here may well form the cornerstone on which other nations work out their equally difficult air-transport problems.

We have agreed on some very fundamental principles—primarily upon the desirability of governmental control of international rates; secondly, the desirability of freedom from control of frequency of operation; and thirdly, on through routes and in accordance with general rules, the freedom to pick up en route traffic not originating or terminating in the country of origin of the aircraft involved. All these principles should be seen in the light of an overall agreement that the aeronautical authorities of the two nations should freely consult when either party feels that it has a fair grievance under the actual practices carried out in operation. I believe we have come a long, long way from where we started. I cannot end my remarks without a word of my deep personal appreciation, and I wish to express the appreciation of the entire United States delegation as well, of the privilege of meeting and working with Sir Henry Self and Sir William Hildred. Without their strong and able personalities we should undoubtedly be looking forward to long negotiations still ahead or we would have left long since with no such agreement as we proudly sign our names to this evening.

In addition to the problems involved in the drawing up of an air-transport agreement, we have struggled equally hard with the problem of opening up the so-called leased bases to civil aviation. I am going to ask General Kuter if he will be kind enough to say a few words in that regard.

CLOSING REMARKS OF MAJ. GEN. L. S. KUTER, UNITED STATES ARMY AIR FORCES, ADVISER TO THE UNITED STATES DELEGATION

Your Excellency, Sir Henry, Sir William, Mr. Baker, ladies, and gentlemen, results of the Bermuda Civil Aviation Conference demonstrate conclusively the encouragement being given by our armed forces to global interests of civil aviation.

It is agreed that civil aircraft may use the United States military air bases in Bermuda and the West Indies which were constructed upon areas leased from the United Kingdom. Our agreement is contingent upon satisfactory arrangements between the

United States and Newfoundland and Canada for similar use of military airfields in Labrador and Newfoundland.

Civil use of these bases will be of substantial benefit to international aviation and without prejudice to complete military control of the bases by the United States.

Civil use of air bases under the military control of one nation located in the territory of another involves unprecedented jurisdictional and other problems which it has not been possible entirely to solve at this conference. Some problems which require further experience have therefore been held for continued study and later agreement.

The conference has proved that the spirit of cooperation which existed between the Allied Nations during the war will continue to guide the United States and the United Kingdom and other nations in peacetime extension of civil aviation throughout the world.

CLOSING REMARKS OF SIR HENRY SELF, CHAIRMAN OF THE DELEGATION OF THE UNITED KINGDOM

Your Excellency, Mr. Baker, General Kuter, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the United Kingdom delegation, I should like to express our thanks for the very kind words which we have just heard, and to say how much we have all enjoyed our association with the United States delegation.

Both sides, I believe, came here conscious of the high importance of reaching an agreement, and have steered steadily toward that goal. During the inevitable ups and downs, it has been a source of comfort and hope to know that the members of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the War, Navy, and State Department teams, under the able leadership of Mr. Baker, were searching along with us for common ground.

Well, we have reached agreement, and I hope and believe it to be a good agreement, which will stand the test of time. The overriding aim is to encourage the healthy growth of civil aviation, and to make reasonably sure that it will be neither stunted, as it has been in the past, by overshadowing political and commercial difficulties, nor be itself a disturber of international relations.

It is our belief that the set of principles to which both sides have subscribed in the final act will secure this great purpose. They are the key to the whole matter. With both countries adhering to them, the agreement contemplates a vast expansion of air services, a blueprint of which is to be found in the annex to the bilateral agreement, in conditions which will serve the public interest and in which British and American air lines will vie in friendly competition.

As all of you who have been with us through the weeks of this conference will know only too well, whatever may have been our initial differences, there has never been any difference between the United Kingdom and the United States delegations as to the ultimate objective which we are both trying to reach. We both believe in what is commonly called mass air travel, and I do not think I can do better than quote a passage from the final act of this conference:

"That the two Governments desire to foster and encourage the widest possible distribution of the benefits of air travel for the general good of mankind at the cheapest rates consistent with sound economic principles; and to stimulate international air travel as a means of promoting friendly understanding and good will among peoples and insuring as well the many indirect benefits of this new form of transportation to the common welfare of both countries."

We have also reaffirmed our adherence to the principles and purposes set out in the preamble to the Convention on International Civil Aviation signed at Chicago in December 1944. It was there recognized that the future development of international civil aviation, if properly developed, can greatly help to create and preserve friendship and understanding among the nations and peoples of the world. It was also there stated that in the ordering of international civil aviation one of the main objectives should be to avoid friction and to promote that cooperation between nations and peoples upon which the peace of the world depends.

In stressing the significance of the present agreement as clearing outstanding problems between our two countries, I am not suggesting that from now on there will never be any differences of opinion between us in the field of civil aviation. We know that in a sphere of activity so new and so dynamic as air transport points of difficulty are bound to arise, and I personally regard it as one of the major achievements of this conference that we are both wholeheartedly agreed on the continuing need for regular and close consultation between our respective aeronautical authorities and have provided for it. We have invited the Civil Aeronautics Board of the United States to post a representative in London who will work continuously with our Ministry of Civil Aviation, and in return the United States delegation have invited us to post a representative of our Ministry in Washington, in order to work daily upon the Civil Aeronautics Board. This machinery for consultation will insure that any points of difference that may arise will be handled quickly. Nothing is more conducive to the creation of difficulties than misunderstanding, which often arises merely through lack of knowledge of what the other side is in fact doing, thinking, or planning. Under the machinery which we have here agreed to set up we shall be constantly interchanging information as to what our plans and purposes are. I am confident that in this atmosphere of frankness, mutual understanding will also flourish.

I am not suggesting that what we have done here is ideal or immutable, but we do claim that the principles set out in the final act are, on the situation so far as it can be foreseen, constructive and practical. They have been agreed, following the most frank discussions in what is probably the most representative gathering of aeronautical experts from our two countries that has ever taken place.

Air transport is by its very nature an international business. What we have done here will inevitably be studied with keen interest by all those wherever they are who are interested in this great business. If, as I believe, we have done our work well, what we have done will no doubt be woven into the broad international tapestry. Realizing this we have provided, as you will have noticed, not only for our respective operators to work as far as possible, in and through the machinery of the International Air Transport Association, but also on the governmental level for our two Governments to refer for advice and guidance to the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, which under the distinguished chairmanship of Dr. Warner has already made so auspicious a start. I should like to make it clear that throughout our discussions we have been careful to do nothing that will in any way prejudice the role and importance of that organization.

I cannot end these remarks without saying how great a privilege it has been for me personally and for the other members of the United Kingdom delegation to take part in the conversations and how honored we have been that the United States of America should have sent to Bermuda so large and so distinguished a delegation. The friendships that have been established or renewed here provide the happiest of augurs for the future. Equally, we look forward to welcoming American aircraft and crews and American passengers on our airfields, and to British aircraft and crews and British people becoming constant users of American airfields.

There is one category of airfield where the British and Americans will be joint hosts, namely the airfields in the areas leased to the United States for military purposes. I am particularly glad that during our stay here firm foundations have been laid for an agreement which will reconcile both the requirements of the British colonies concerned and also those of the United States naval and military authorities. It is believed, I think by both sides, that the opening of these airfields for civil use will assist the development of air services both to and in the territories concerned.

Bermuda is one of those territories and her soft airs have been most sympathetic to our labors. Her sky has at times wept, but always smiled through its tears. Bermuda's loveliness and hospitality have been, as His Excellency said they would when we first came here, kindly influences, infusing a spirit of concord among us. We are deeply appreciative and grateful.

Finally, I hope that Mr. Baker will allow me to say that it is in very large measure due to his unfailing courtesy, to his profound knowledge of all aspects of transportation and to his dispassionate and reasonable approach to all problems that such progress has been made here. We regard it as a great honor to have been associated with him and his colleagues in these discussions over these past weeks.

Truman Finally Admits Republican Doctrine Is Best

REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1946

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, tucked away in the President's statement on wage-price policy of February 14 is this sentence:

It is imperative that production in great volume be accomplished.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the questions, "Can we depend on this? Is this to be the policy of the administration from this time forth?" I wonder.

This is the first time any responsible Democratic leader has admitted that production and more production is the primary solution to our present domestic difficulties, not alone in the wage-price crisis into which New Deal bungling has plunged us, but also to overcome food shortages which the President has also finally admitted exist. It is a complete reversal of the New Deal philosophy of scarcity which has been so strongly advocated by New Deal advisers. Will the President dare to adhere to this new policy.

It is gratifying to know, Mr. Speaker, that the administration is gradually coming to the Republican doctrine of plenty. The Republican Congressional Food Study Committee, of which I am chairman, has consistently advocated that production in tremendously increased quantities was a necessary solution to most of our domestic economic ills. As long ago as July 8, 1943, I emphasized this matter in the House of

Representatives, and have repeatedly reasserted that only by a doctrine of increased production could we win the fight against scarcity and inflation. Let me quote from my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 8, 1943. At that time I said:

Although the early policies of the New Deal administration, which advocated that surpluses of foods were dangerous and that scarcity of foods was desirable, had been very disastrous, yet the great productivity of our country would have been sufficient to have overcome this disaster if those in charge of food affairs had been frank and courageous enough to admit their mistakes. * * * Apparently it never occurred to them that no one ever went hungry on a surplus. They should recognize the fact that production must come first. Instead of building on a solid foundation they have proceeded to build as one who would build the second story of his house before he laid the foundation or built the first story. Instead of starting at the beginning with the producer and proceeding from production to processing and distribution they thoroughly disorganized the whole food situation. The only way to solve this food problem now is to increase the production of all kinds of basic food commodities to the maximum.

Let us hope that the administration, recognizing its failure to solve our problems by following the nebulous doctrines of Wallace, Rosenman, and Hopkins, will take hold of and use the good old Republican doctrine of plenty.

Ingratitude to Veterans

REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 18, 1946

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I am completely exasperated and digusted with the treatment which has been accorded the returning veterans of this country, and I demand that the departments of the Government charged with the administration of the disposal of surplus war material and the Federal Housing Administration either be made to carry out the terms of the legislation passed by the Congress in furnishing our veterans with the benefits which have been provided for them, or that they either resign or be removed from their positions from the top to the bottom. Mr. Speaker, in my district and State, and all over the country, veterans seeking to purchase surplus war materials have been given the run-around to such an extent that they have been unable to purchase even automobiles, much less other surplus material upon which they have a priority under the terms of legislation passed by this Congress.

It is a crying shame and a disgrace to this great Nation that men who have fought for their country are unable to obtain a place to live for themselves and their families, and in my district, State, and all over the Nation, those who desire to take advantage of the educational provisions of the GI bill are unable to enter the colleges and universities because there is inadequate housing facilities there, and little can be secured from the agencies of the Government charged with the responsibility of furnishing the same, notwithstanding there is scattered all over this country and other places, all of the housing necessary to take care of these deserving veterans. If this situation is not corrected immediately, it is my purpose to introduce legislation for an immediate investigation of this situation.

The Housing Situation

REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 18, 1946

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it seems that many are doing quite a lot of talking about the housing situation as far as the veterans are concerned. It seems that 5,000,000 rural people went to the cities during the war, and if these 5,000,000 people will go back to where they came from, we would not have so much of a housing problem for veterans. I also call your attention to an open letter to the Congress in yesterday's Washington papers by Mrs. Evalyn Walsh McLean in which she suggests that the Congress take a little action in this matter instead of so much conversation.

Also, there is an article in the Times-Herald by Lt. Comdr. Tyrrell Krum on the same subject. This housing business, as serious as it is, can be met. I think that the first step to meet it would be to give a chance to the people that want to get out in the rural areas to move into houses in rural areas.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include this open letter to Congress and also the article by Lt. Comdr. Tyrrell Krum.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The documents referred to are, as follows:

FEBRUARY 15, 1946.

The Congress of the United States.

GENTLEMEN: I respectfully bring to your attention the following situation regarding our veterans:

When the war was on our boys had priority over everything. They had priority on trains, on ships, and on planes, anything to get them quickly to the battle front where they could kill and be killed. Now that they have won the war they have apparently no priority on anything. Many of them with missings arms, legs, and eyes, and the rest who have come through physically safe but mentally broken can now take a back seat.

Big business steps in—the selfish interests and the leeches who will suck the last penny out of the great victory our veterans have given us. Why is this allowed to happen in our country? Why can't our veterans have a chance to buy safe and solid homes, which are already built? Why must our Government-owned houses like McLean Gardens, Naylor Gardens, and others, be denied our war veterans when they were bought by the Government, and run by the Government, and should be sold by the Government to the veterans who saved our democracy? Why are things made so hard for our boys who a year ago were heroes, who a year ago could have had anything we could give them if only they would win the war? Why now must these same lads live in wretched cheap little houses (if they can find one) when the Government has houses already built that should be made available to them?

Why is the great pool of real-estate interests who are able to bid on these houses just to make money allowed to carry their plans through? I'll tell you why. Our veterans are being double-crossed. Our great heroes of a year ago can't now even have the right to bid on the housing plan and pay for it with their own money. They say it is too big for them to handle. Why? We can give billions to Europe but we can't, apparently, take a chance on a few millions to back our boys. We could so easily give them a 20-year lease on the different Government-owned houses throughout the United States, and if they can't make good in that time our Government won't go broke.

Let's start right here in the capital of the world to let veterans buy these decent, well-built, available houses, and this should be carried out all through the great cities of this country. If there is no law now to give our veterans the right to have the first bid on these Government projects why shouldn't the Congress of the United States manage to take a few hours off a day and see that our veterans get their just due?

It will be 2 years before new homes can be built. Meanwhile, what happens to our veterans? Our boys, who saved democracy for us, who gave everything they had when they were called upon, should now be the first to be considered, to be protected, and to have the best that our Government can give, without red-tape delays or any of the other foolish wicked obstructions which are put up in argument against a peaceful and happy life for them all.

Respectfully,

EVALYN WALSH MCLEAN.

(P. S.—I have absolutely no financial interest whatever in McLean Gardens or any other housing project under consideration.)

VETERANS' AFFAIRS

(By Lt. Comdr. Tyrrell Krum, USNR (retired), Times-Herald veterans editor)

Somewhere in today's edition of the Times-Herald, as well as other Washington newspapers, will be found a full-page paid advertisement containing an open letter addressed to the Congress of the United States over the personal signature of Mrs. Evalyn Walsh McLean.

Every one of you should digest its contents carefully and thoroughly.

And I hope and trust that my charming coworker, Mrs. Helen Essary, whose "Dear Washington" is over to the right and the other writing ladies who deal with the distaff side of Washington life will not consider me infringing on their territory when I include Mrs. McLean in our discussion of veterans' affairs.

Because, unbeknown to most of you, Mrs. McLean occupies a place all her own in the hearts of our war veterans, particularly those maimed and crippled fighting men now edging their way back to health in our Army, Navy, and veterans' hospitals of the Washington area.

Mrs. McLean has long dominated the social life of the Nation's Capital. For years on end her parties and receptions at Friendship, the McLean mansion at Wisconsin and R Streets, have been the focal point of the more fastidious folk of the city who found

themselves fortunate enough to receive a bid from the city's topflight social leader.

Today all this, to a large degree, has been changed. Instead of the glittering jewel-bedecked social matrons and the high-ranking military and naval figures dominating the McLean drawing rooms and spacious garden of Friendship we find the drab GI uniforms and Navy blue of ordinary ex-fighting men.

Without fanfare or public notice, Mrs. McLean has been giving of her boundless energy and unlimited wealth and has practically turned over her palatial mansion each Saturday night in an effort to bring a bit of sunshine and enjoyment to hundreds of wounded and disabled ex-servicemen.

They come in wheel chairs and on canes and crutches from Walter Reed, Forest Glen, and Naval Hospital. Who they were or their station in life makes no difference. Their uniform is their passport into the drawing rooms and the terraced gardens of Friendship to enjoy her food, gulp her beer (strong drinks are taboo), and hold plain old-time "bull sessions" among themselves.

But the parties at Friendship are only a small part of what Mrs. McLean is doing on behalf of wounded war veterans. She is a regular visitor at the hospitals, taking the men in the wards presents, helping them to write letters home, talking and visiting with them, and counseling with them on their problems of the future.

In a number of cases she has personally provided disabled veterans, whose disabilities defied ordinary medical attention, with the best doctors in the profession. On more than one occasion she has had discharged disabled servicemen operated on in private institutions at her own expense by experts high in the medical blue book.

And out of her countless associations with ex-fighting men at the hospitals and at her home, Mrs. McLean has seen the dawning of the ugly fact that our war veterans are in the biggest run-around in settling back to civilian life any returning soldiers have ever been given.

And Mrs. McLean has seen veterans get the "round-around" on one very memorial occasion in the past. That was the time of the "bonus march" on Washington in the early thirties. At that time hundreds of veterans were encamped on the Anacostia Flats, living in shacks and misery while attempting to prevail upon Congress to give them the unpaid portion of the bonus the men on Capitol Hill promised after the last war.

For weeks the "bonus marchers" were forced to stand by awaiting congressional action. But Mrs. McLean didn't hesitate. She personally rallied her household servants, valets, and maids together and took down to the veterans of the First Great War cars loaded with food and supplies that actually kept them alive during those hectic days.

Mrs. McLean sees that same situation emerging from this war unless Government stops binding veterans down in endless red tape and delay. And she is determined to fight it before it reaches the critical stage it did in 1932.

The refusal of the national housing authorities to permit a group of American Veterans of World War II (Amvets) to purchase McLean Gardens, which has been declared surplus and thrown on the open market for sale by the Government, is the spark that has made her fighting mad. Hence the letter to which we referred.

And, it is my opinion that if veterans are still to be held back by housing bureaucrats from rights to decent homes in which to live in peace she's liable to hock her million-dollar Hope diamond, if necessary, to give them an assist.

Emergency-Housing Program

REMARKS
OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1946

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress, interested in the retail lumber business myself, I want to take this opportunity to thank my two colleagues, Mr. JENSEN and Mr. MCGREGOR, for their remarks before the Members of the House last week. Both of these gentlemen are practical men, have had personal experience in home building, and, therefore, I recommend that everyone, who was not present at the time their speeches were delivered, read them.

Mr. Wilson Wyatt, the National Housing Administrator, has announced his emergency program, a goal of 2,700,000 homes in the next 22 months; subsidy proposals for building materials; an increase in building labor to 1,500,000 or three times the present number; and an increase in production facilities for building materials, approximately eight times the present capacity. Roughly, 1,200,000 homes must be started in 1946. Seven hundred thousand will be conventional homes, houses built in the customary way on site; 250,000 permanent prefabricated homes, and 250,000 temporary homes. For 1947, 1,500,000 homes must be started; 900,000 conventional homes and 600,000 permanent prefabricated. It is hoped there will be no need for any temporary units the second year of the program.

Mr. Speaker, this is a tremendous problem but the country has tackled other huge problems and has been successful. In days gone by the building industry, which is the second largest industry in our Nation, has handled this housing situation better than in any other nation in the world. They have accomplished this without the red tape that I fear will interrupt and stall the industry by improper legislation at this time.

Veterans' housing needs are serious, but I believe the great bulk of the present needs can be met by proven and available methods if that one great bottleneck of all our troubles, the obtaining of building materials, is broken. Over 6 months has passed since VJ-day and the Office of Price Administration, to my knowledge, has not yet made any realistic approach toward channeling house-building lumber to the trade. Let us hope that a bill will be brought in that will so outline the duties of OPA that production will be accomplished. If prices have to be increased, set up a rule governing the increase to get production, and let that increase be passed along to the ultimate consumer in dollars, so he knows what he is facing, and so do away with the ridiculous black market proceedings we hear about so frequently. The black market is killing off the legitimate distributor and the public is being gypped no end.

A great part of the new housing program involves prefabricated houses. I am not so sure this type of housing is the answer. From my own experience the old type of the so-called canned house was not too satisfactory. Prices, as announced by Mr. Wyatt for prefabricated houses, sound pretty high for the average veteran by the time land cost and necessary utilities are added. A man's home is his castle. He wants something distinctively his own and unless the veteran can get his money's worth, I am opposed to this type of investment. Of course, it is possible the new prefabricated home is a great improvement over the old type. This may be the answer after all, but we must not forget that large group of men in every community throughout our land, who depend on the construction industry for their living. This group includes bricklayers, carpenters, painters, electricians, plumbers, both skilled and unskilled labor, along with the many classes of building supply dealers, rearing to go, as soon as materials are available. Due to the very influential backing of some of these prefabricated house manufacturers, I greatly fear a large portion of building materials that rightfully should go to the legitimate dealers, will be siphoned off to these new Government-encouraged prefabricating outfits. This type of Government subsidized artificial stimulation, to a large degree, is in an experimental stage and is bound to be wasteful and drain off both critical materials and labor unless very carefully supervised and regulated.

I agree with Mr. Wyatt that a program of this magnitude will require the best efforts of the entire building industry. Therefore, conventional building should receive every possible priority so nothing will retard those available skilled building mechanics, waiting to surge ahead.

Local loaning institutions, working with the Government on insured mortgages, having proven very satisfactory, and the mortgagor was pleased, having the advantage of local builders' and local bankers' advice. This should be continued.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot close this article without bringing to the attention of the House this question of export lumber. In taking this question up with Mr. Bowles, he considered the volume involved as being trivial, only approximately 1½ percent of production. I understand the Civilian Production Administration is contemplating exporting 1,000,000,000 feet of lumber in 1946. In addition to this, we plan to ship to foreign lands thousands of doors, trim, brick, bathroom fixtures, and so forth. The lack of these items are what is making the bottleneck in our domestic building program today. Mr. Speaker, what should we do about this? I believe Mr. Wyatt, by his own authority, can stop this; or, is it better to place an embargo by law on these foreign shipments until our domestic demand is somewhere in balance with the supply? We cannot place the blame for this condition on the producer. The producer gets a much

better price for export material and, therefore, OPA is again unrealistic.

I hope that the rumor, that Mr. Peter Stone in the Lumber Division of OPA is resigning, is untrue. He has tried his best to promote workable features and is a practical lumberman. Many times his advice has been overruled. If Mr. Stone is leaving, I hope his successor will be as practical and try to discourage some of the theoretical theories that have been tried.

The builders in our country must provide the great bulk of our housing. Give these men the tools: free them from the shackles of unworkable red tape surrounding Government restrictions and they will produce the greatest assistance in this housing emergency.

Mental Demobilization—Revamp Congress?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent for me so to do having been given, I am pleased to include in my remarks two significant editorials. Both of them appear in the Long Beach Pacific News printed and distributed at my home city of Long Beach, Calif. The editor of this paper journeyed to San Francisco, Calif., at her own expense, to there attend the sessions of the United Nations Organization. I include the two editorials as follows, Mental Demobilization, dated Thursday, January 3 1946, and Revamp Congress? dated Thursday, January 10, 1946:

[From the Long Beach (Calif.) Pacific News of January 3, 1946]

MENTAL DEMOBILIZATION

Reports from Washington indicate that some Congressmen hesitated to go home for the holidays because they didn't want to face the complaints that demobilization is not being carried out fast enough, even though more than a million men a month are returning to civilian life.

This intense desire to get fathers, brothers, and sons back home again is quite understandable, yet it has a deeper significance than mere emotion. It reveals the swift mental demobilization that is going on in America today. We want to forget war. It's hard to blame people for feeling this way, but the attitude is nevertheless dangerous. Why? Well, this war has caused political, economic, and social dislocations throughout the world, especially in conquered countries, which must be corrected.

If we are too anxious to forget the war, we are not likely to be in a frame of mind that will spur us to stay with these problems until some real progress is made toward their solution. Working them out may take years, but unless they are solved they remain as possible causes of a future war.

We must remember that peace does not come automatically when the guns cease firing. If we are to have real peace instead of a cessation of hostilities then the political, economic, and social maladjustments created by the war must be licked just as effectively as the enemy armies. Until this is done, we should resist mental demobilization.

[From the Long Beach (Calif.) Pacific News of January 10, 1946]

REVAMP CONGRESS?

Congress hasn't overhauled its legislative machinery since 1893. And things have changed quite a bit since then. The boys on Capitol Hill are trying to do business in this dizzy, dynamic age with their old horse-and-buggy methods.

One of the biggest faults among the many in the congressional procedure is that Congressmen have too many things to do—at the same time. For instance, a Senator may be a member of three or four important committees. It is not unusual for two of these committees to meet simultaneously. During that hour an important debate may be taking place in the Senate. As a result, he must either divide his time among the three meetings and not be fully informed on what is going on in any of them, or else he must stick to one and ignore the others. Neither arrangement is desirable.

Another, and more glaring weakness in Congress, is the seniority system which awards membership on the most important committees and assigns the chairmanship of committees solely on the basis of length of service.

Under this method the elderly Congressmen from the Southern States who are returned to office time after time hold the key positions. Some of these men are competent and progressive, but some of them are not.

A system of rotation would give younger and sometimes abler Members an opportunity to serve in important posts, and it would do much to rejuvenate many of the "creaking" committees.

Congress alone can make changes in its legislative machinery. But in view of the antiquity of that machinery we think the question should be put to the lawmakers: How about a thorough streamlining job—now?

Lincoln and New Slaves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 15, 1946

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including an editorial from the Topeka Daily Capital, issue of February 12, 1946.

This excellent editorial is very timely and I recommend its reading to other Members of Congress. The trend of government during the past decade has been toward a greater centralization in Washington. This trend of over-all control of our governmental and private affairs from the central seat of government is dangerous and must be stopped. After all, the Government cannot support the people—the people must support the Government. Democracy springs from the people and is strong only as the individual citizen directs and controls the affairs of the Nation.

LINCOLN AND NEW SLAVES

"Property is the fruit of labor; property is desirable; is a positive good in the world. That some should be rich shows that others may become rich. * * * Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him work diligently and build for himself, thus by example assuming that his own should be safe from violence when built."

Lincoln said that.

Other Americans have said it, in a variety of ways, since this Republic was born. But there are those who would have the Nation believe that Lincoln was wrong, that property is an evil, and that the very possession of property in itself is a mark of dishonor.

There are those who foster a philosophy which encourages minorities to "pull down the house of another" so that they may share in the earnings of others.

There are those who preach the defeatist sermons of planned economy, and hold that our way of life and government has failed, and that we must substitute socialism for democracy.

They sneer at the virtues which have meant most in our national life; they declare that our Constitution is outmoded; they insist that government "of the people," for which Lincoln stood, is ineffective, and that we must follow the dictates of those who would make America over.

For a time, the advocates of centralized authority enlisted converts by holding forth promises to divide the wealth. They made war against "big business," and they told the people that every man was entitled to his share. These arguments were advanced in a receptive atmosphere, for big business in too many instances had overstepped its bounds, and it was necessary for the people—acting through their government—to impose curbs on greed and those evils which acted against the public welfare.

As long as the Government was levying high taxes against great corporations, and in that sense dividing up the wealth, the people believed they were on the path of true democracy. They believed the greatest good was being achieved for the greatest number.

But, step by step, Governmental dictation progressed from the big corporations down through the smaller ones, into every business and industry, and finally into the affairs of every citizen.

Today, the man who is industrious and honest and enterprising finds that he is saddled with the burdens of the man who is lazy and without a will to shift for himself. And there is little inducement to "work diligently and build for himself, thus by example assuring that his own should be safe from violence when built."

The citizen who acquires a modest amount of property, a few hundred dollars in the bank or a little grocery store, is subject to having a part of that property taken from him.

It is taken in a multitude of ways. It is dissipated by high taxes. Its value deteriorates through inflation. Its worst enemy is government—the Government which should be of, by, and for the people.

When it is stated that Government is doing this or doing that to carry us through some emergency, the facts of the matter are that the Government, in most instances, is placing penalties upon success for the benefit of the unsuccessful. It is discouraging thrift and initiative; it is encouraging idleness of the worst sort—the idleness of the mind which permits a man to feel that, if he fails to make his own way, others will do it for him.

When the people of any nation surrender their independence and allow a paternal government to direct their affairs with too much latitude, that government turns to dictatorship. When this happens, the people lose their freedom and become slaves.

Emancipation in Lincoln's time was achieved through bloodshed.

But a type of slavery is returning to the United States in a bloodless revolution, and those who accept dependence upon government and become subservient to governmental dictates are wearing chains of their own forging.

Every time Washington announces a subsidy, whether it is for the purpose of helping build needed houses, or whether it is for the promotion of an unworthy enterprise, we are that much nearer the slavery of socialism.

Today's medicine may be tomorrow's poison.

On this birthday anniversary of Lincoln, as on all other significant landmarks in history, it is desirable to appraise the future on the basis of all which has gone before. Any thoughtful consideration of our current problems, and those which are just over the horizon, will develop the conclusion that, while Lincoln might not have been a great figure if he had lived in a later generation, his principles were identified with no single era.

As in his time, we need a Government representative of all the people, and under the command of the people—not a Government representing the interests of powerful minorities, and functioning under pressure of their political threats.

We need a way of living which calls for the best in every man and woman; not one which places a premium upon weakness and improvidence.

With the excuse that it was attacking "big business" on behalf of the people, our Government has itself become the biggest business in the world. Now, more than anything else, the people need protection from what they have created. The Government won through courage and self-sacrifice can be rescued only through a willingness on the part of all the people to look to themselves rather than to Washington for the solution of their problems.

Discrimination Against War Veterans

REMARKS
OF
HON. BERKELEY L. BUNKER
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 18, 1946

Mr. BUNKER. Mr. Speaker, my attention as well as that of many of my colleagues with whom I have talked in recent days has been called repeatedly to the flagrant and widespread discrimination against war veterans in the disposal of Government surplus property.

Certainly no class of persons is more deserving than these men and women who served our Nation well. Except for their sacrifices and their comrades' it would have passed into enemy hands.

I am therefore introducing a resolution calling for appointment by the Speaker of the House of Representatives of a seven-member committee to inquire into the extent and reasons for discrimination against veterans at distribution points. Most of the Government property that has or will become surplus was intended to be placed in the hands of the now returning soldier when he was on the firing line—for his use, with his life if necessary—to win the war.

We did not begrudge it to him then, whether it went directly to him or the civilian war worker to implement the manufacture and disposition of arms. He demonstrated his ability to use it efficiently and effectively in war. In peace he is entitled to use it likewise—no longer to defend, but now to advance our economy.

The other measure I am introducing today would give veterans preference, second only to the agencies of the Federal Government, in the purchase of surplus property for their own use or use in their business or profession or on their farms.

These returning veterans are facing serious problems of rehabilitation and we have a moral obligation to discharge to them. They deserve every consideration consistent with justice and it is our duty to assist them in reestablishing themselves as honorable, self-reliant citizens desire to do.

I have no quarrel with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which recently inherited the full responsibility for disposing of surplus property. In my judgment, this consolidation will in itself, go far toward simplifying the procedure necessary for acquiring such property. It is the bungling at Pacific coast distribution centers that I am interested in correcting.

Col. Edward J. Kelly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 18, 1946

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me, I include as part of my remarks the speech made by Hon. William E. Leahy, a well-known member of the Washington bar, in reference to the service of Col. Edward J. Kelly, who recently retired as head of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia. It follows:

The career of Col. Edward J. Kelly, in the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia, is a record of exceptional performance and a target of remarkable action for any rookie and member of the ranks, to shoot at in emulation and to strive to equal. It is a monument of honest achievement, more enduring than any words one might use to adorn it and more suitable, just as it stands, than any some sculptor of speech might chisel in his vain attempt to surpass it. It represents the consummation of Colonel Kelly's ambition and it was wrought of his sinews and his strength. It is a gratifying development from the sweat of his brow as he labored long in the vineyard of public service. This testimonial to his commendable accomplishment but attests the constant resolution with which he always pointed the direction of his life; and it is the coveted recognition by his fellow citizens, publicly expressed, that, in the progress of his toil to the peak toward which he set his path, he climbed always up and then still up, with no grade too steep nor way too rough to stay him in the grim but laudable purpose in which he had molded his determination. For every patrolman on his beat this acknowledgment of the conspicuous service of Colonel Kelly constitutes a persuasive and encouraging assurance that he, too, may find at the end of the highway he travels the same opportunity for advancement and distinction, so long as he keeps his feet squarely on the pavement of hard work and strictly between the curb lines of loyalty and duty.

It was just as impossible for Colonel Kelly not to become a policeman as it was for almost any Celt of his day not to wish to be one. He was a cop by nature. He was born to be one. He had every characteristic and trait a good policeman ought to have. First he was a good Irishman; and then his father was a cop before him and a good one, too. The Kellys breathed the atmosphere of the cop. In fact in the Smithsonian Institution today should still be seen the baton contributed to that institution by Colonel Kelly's father, as a relic of those which were once part of the equipment of the old Auxiliary Guard of Washington, with its peculiar spearshaped copper head, which members of the guard were accustomed to use to open shutters of houses in cases of fire or entry. Colonel Kelly's father joined up with the Metropolitan Police when it was first reorganized from the Auxiliary Guard. He had not long before been discharged from Captain Nally's company of the Metropolitan Rifles in which he had enlisted when President Lincoln issued his first call for volunteers. The blood of Lieut. John F. Kelly coursed too hot for work as an apprentice in the brick-laying trade; and, on September 11, 1861, he laid a foundation for his son by becoming a member in the new police force just formed. He was a loyal able police officer, faithful in the discharge of his duties, trustworthy and careful. He won and kept the confidence of his superiors; for we read of him, as the General Inspector of the District, in General Orders of March 23, 1867. And no more apt tribute could have been paid to his leadership, his capacity for good administration and the maintenance of law and discipline within the area of his jurisdiction than we find in his affectionate title conferred upon him by the people of the old Sixth Precinct where he commanded and which included Swamp Poodle within its limits. That spot of song and story, dear to so many, who, in recollection, know, that, out of its loins, issued some of the stanchest and the sturdiest of our citizenry. But Swamp Poodle was then the Poodle; and Lieut. John F. Kelly was known as and called "King of the Poodle."

With such a paternal propulsive force behind him, the introduction of Colonel Kelly as a private in the Metropolitan Police force—on October 3, 1906—was simply the burgeoning of inheritance and the inevitable rsult of an irresistible impulse; but, at the same time, to the department it was reliable guaranty, too, that it had enlisted a promising recruit. And Colonel Kelly has never violated that guaranty or broken that promise. He began as a patrolman where his father had commanded, in old No. 6; and from that day when first he took his oath, throughout the course of his long race of service, he built for himself a veritable ladder of successive promotions, with every rung of it constructed of merit deserved and recognition compelled. His file is replete with commendations and expressions of praise by those whose attention was arrested to such genuine admiration of the effective thoroughness with which he did the job at hand to be done that they felt impelled to transmit their appreciation for official preservation and approval. These refer to him in whatever detail he was appointed and consistently throughout the entire flight of his journey from matriculation on entrance to graduation in self-requested retirement. Individual citizens, associations of citizens, corporations, his superior officers, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, even the President of the United States, and their Brittanic Majesties have each and all put their names to the convincing proof of Colonel Kelly's excelling efficiency, indefatigable industry, unimpeachable honesty, and tested dependability. These documen-

tary attestations, which will remain imperishable so long as the department exists, now become a permanent source of justifiable pride to Colonel Kelly and reciprocally of our public satisfaction that they who are charged with the responsibility of preserving the peace and protecting life and property within this District did not mistake their man nor err in their judgment when they chose Colonel Kelly to fill the many offices which they entrusted to him and which he has administered so well. But the most pleasing stop which stays the eye to attention upon reading these citations and the most refreshing commentary one may make of them as illustrative and explanatory of the character of the man, is not so much the astonishment one feels at their number as the realization of the diversity in the identities and the station in life of those who subscribed them. They mutely assert as indisputable evidence that no man was ever too humble or person too poor to be outside the earshot of Colonel Kelly when help was needed or assistance asked. With him there were neither race nor creed, humility nor poverty when he could render service to anyone whose rights required prompt vindication.

Perhaps the native intelligence and unremitting energy of Colonel Kelly displayed themselves in no assignment so well and so excellently as in his detail to the Detective Bureau. He was an assiduous, persistent, persevering, tireless detective who never allowed himself to be drawn off the trail by false scents. His zeal was unflagging and his courage unfaltering. No hours were too long for him and no difficulties discouraging. He has solved some of the most baffling crimes ever committed in this District and some of them presented only a cold and helpless start when he began their solution, with no clues to work from and no information to guide. Often his success was phenomenal, of the detective-story type. Frequently that success was the occasion for another citation.

But after detection there came the trial for conviction or acquittal. And here may I be pardoned if I add to that of judges and juries my own personal word of sincere commendation of Colonel Kelly on the witness stand. For 4 years we worked closely together to bring to the bar of justice those accused of the commission of almost every offense in the category of crime. I have never known or seen a witness so accurate in his memory, so fair in his recital of the facts, or so just in the presentation of his case as Col. Edward J. Kelly when he testified from the witness box. He never used a note—no matter how complicated the prosecution. He never had to do so. The correctness of his retentive memory first surprised and then fascinated the court, jury, and counsel. As a witness he was superb. To the prosecuting attorney he was not merely a pillar of strength but a pillow of rest; for, when Colonel Kelly was turned over for cross-examination, the work of the prosecutor was finished. He leaned back in his chair, breathed a sight of relief, and, in the peace of undisappointed confidence, listened in comfort to counsel for the defense as he beat his head against the wall of invincible facts Colonel Kelly had built about himself in the witness chair.

Some old wag of classical days said of the dead, "De mortuis nil nisi bonum." But it is right and just, too, pleasurably to speak of the living, and even to his face. And it is not at all unpleasant to know, in the general testimonial enconium and appreciative eulogy in which the citizens of the District of Columbia join upon this occasion, that theretofore the long and outstanding stretch of exemplary service which Colonel Kelly has given to this city has been recognized and applauded by the Congress of the United States. No greater personal triumph could ever be cherished or achieved than that declared for Colonel Kelly when the supreme legislative body of this District, on April 27, 1945, by special act, distinguished him as the recipient of its public and official commendation. Already the Commissioners had conferred upon him the highest honor it lay within their power to bestow, by promoting him, on November 1, 1941, to the rank of major and superintendent of police from that of assistant superintendent and acting major and superintendent—offices to which they had respectively appointed him during the previous August. But as a personal tribute to his 39 years of devoted duty in the interest of public peace and order, Congress, in that act and on that date, created for Colonel Kelly the unique rank of colonel—a grade theretofore never known—and made it applicable in distinction to Colonel Kelly personally and alone. Surely laurel never rested on a worthier brow.

Colonel Kelly, today your fellow citizens of the District of Columbia honor and congratulate you. To you they extend their voice of warmest felicitation. In the happy acknowledgment of their debt of appreciation, they greet you and wish you well. Your past is secure in their gratitude. Your future in retirement will remain close to them, too, in their prayers for your happiness in the life that lies before. Colonel Kelly, ad multos annos. From here on, "happy sailing on a quiet sea"; and, when finally your ship puts in to port, may the harbor be smooth and the landing peaceful. Your work has merited it. Your host of friends wish that it may be so. May a smile be your welcome always and a warm sun shine till the day is no more. Then, after the twilight and in the dawn of that newer day, we will all be with you still, the most honest-to-goodness cop that Washington has ever known.

Introductory Statement by Chester Bowles to the House Banking and Currency Committee Hearings on the Extension of the Emergency Price Control Act February 18, 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

I am very sorry we have had to ask for several postponements of these hearings. I think all of you know that for the past few weeks we have faced a crisis of major proportions on the stabilization front. It was imperative that administration policy be clarified before I could come before your committee to request extension of the stabilization statutes. I appreciate more than I can say the committee's patience in postponing its hearings.

It would be difficult to exaggerate the gravity of the inflationary crisis we face. An expectancy of higher and still higher prices is sweeping the country. The speculative fever is reminiscent of 1929. We can see it in the stock market, in the real-estate market, and even in almost every commodity market.

Everywhere men are betting on inflation. Everywhere the inflationary pressures have reached explosive proportions. It should be obvious to any reasonable mind that only by the most vigorous action—action taken now—can we regain control.

What is at stake is more than our reconversion program. What is at stake is our entire economic future. The answer to our present problems rests with you here in the Congress no less than with us in the executive branch of the Government.

In the next few weeks and months we shall be deciding whether we build a future of prosperity and security for all of us or whether we permit the present inflationary dynamite to go off in an explosion that will smash our economic system beyond hope of repair.

It is, I think, important to review briefly the events that have led up to this crisis. Let me go back therefore to VJ-day.

At that time there was a general expectation that the inflationary pressures would diminish. We expected pay rolls to fall off sharply because of the elimination of overtime, the downgrading of workers, and other factors. And we expected that during the tooling-up period unemployment would reach substantial proportions, further cutting into pay rolls and purchasing power. As a result of all these factors most experts anticipated softening of markets and an abatement of pressure on prices.

At the same time, the whole country was eager to get rid of wartime controls as rapidly as possible. After 4 years of the rigors of wartime controls it was natural for all of us to hope for the speedy restoration of the free market. This was how the country felt; and this was how you in the Congress, no less than we in the executive branch, felt.

The Congress, for example, moved promptly to eliminate the excess-profits tax and to reduce taxes on individual incomes.

In the OPA the staff was put to work to carve out broad areas of the price structure which it was hoped and expected could be exempted from price control during the fall and winter months. And in collaboration with the Department of Agriculture a program, indeed, almost a timetable, based on the expectancy of lower food prices was developed for a progressive removal of food subsidies.

The War Production Board proceeded at once to dismantle its structure of production and other controls. Regulations in batches were pitched into the wastebasket. The same was true of the Department of Agriculture, the Petroleum Administration, the Office of Defense Transportation, and the Foreign Economic Administration.

In all this, needless to say, there was considerable difference of opinion among the various Government agencies; not disagreement on the general policy but disagreement as to timing.

Ordinarily my own record as a prophet is no better than the next man's. But on this issue I happened to be one of those who wanted to play it safe. I was fearful of a repetition of the disaster of 1919 and 1920 when prices soared and then promptly collapsed. I did not feel that price and rent controls alone could carry the burden of inflation control.

Having lived with 4 years of other wartime controls, we could, it seemed to me, take another 6 months or whatever was necessary to be sure we were on solid ground before scrapping those controls.

One element of the program for orderly liquidation of Government control was the wage-price program. It was expected, as indeed it has actually come to pass, that the take-home pay of millions of American workers would be cut drastically. That was why, on August 18, the administration dismantled the complicated and often cumbersome structure of wartime wage controls and restored collective bargaining, setting labor and management free to negotiate wage increases on their own. There was, however, one basic condition—that these negotiations take place within the framework of stable prices.

The President urged management to negotiate wage adjustments in order to cushion

the cut in take-home pay. He pointed out that management could, in general, afford to grant such increases, emphasizing particularly the high profitability of most American industries, the excellent financial condition developed during the war, the protection against the risks of reconversion embodied in the tax laws, and the increase in earnings retained by business resulting from the elimination of the excess-profits tax. But the President emphasized, too, that such wage increases must vary widely from one industry to another depending upon the ability of management to pay these increases without raising prices.

As Price Administrator I subscribed to this policy. Although I knew that it would put some strain on prices, I believed it to be compatible with effective price control and in line with our best labor-management traditions. And indeed I supported the President's entire reconversion program. It was a program designed under the then existing conditions to give us a swift and orderly transition from war to peace.

What, then, produced the crisis which we face today on the stabilization front? Well, first of all, the tooling-up process of reconversion has proceeded faster than anyone thought possible. As a result, while average take-home pay has been cut, the volume of unemployment has not reached the proportions that were feared. That means that total pay rolls have stayed higher than expected with a resulting high demand for all products of our factories and farms.

Second, speculation, which after the last war became a dominant factor only after 5 or 6 months following the cessation of hostilities, this time put in an earlier appearance. The speculators started betting on inflation, and that showed in all our markets. And so, instead of a softening of pressure on prices in key areas of the economy, we have had prices pushing up hard against OPA ceilings all across the board, and prices in the speculative markets which were not under control moving up to new high ground almost from day to day.

Looking back on it, with the knowledge that we have today, and bearing in mind what I have just said about the inflationary pressures, it is perfectly clear that we moved too fast and too soon in stripping off the wartime controls.

Many of the actions taken, reasonable and proper though they may have seemed at the time, have not only meant hardship for our people; they have encouraged hoarding and added fuel to the flames of speculation.

And finally, let me turn to the wage-price policy. On the whole that policy has worked extremely well. Industrial and other wholesale prices as well as retail prices have been held very close to their VJ-day levels, while thousands of collective bargaining agreements involving substantial wage increases have been concluded in an orderly fashion. I am told that 6,000,000 workers have received wage increases during this period.

Nonetheless, the wage-price policy broke down in a number of vitally important areas. Why it broke down in these particular areas can be left to the economic historians and to the theoreticians to decide. It seems to me high time that we stop arguing about "who did what to whom" and get on with the job of meeting a national emergency.

A speculative fever has taken hold of the country. The pressure in the boiler is up to the bursting point. The lobbyists and the profiteers are licking their chops. It is going to take firm and decisive action—it is going to take teamwork and support on every hand—if we are to hold this country on an even keel.

The President last Thursday laid down a new stabilization program. He called upon me to take responsibility for its administration and upon the country to close ranks and see this job through to the finish. I think it is a good program and a workable program, and I mean to put everything I've got into making it succeed. I am confident that the American people will give the President the support he has asked for.

Let me turn now to the program itself, and specifically to the wage-price aspects of that program. I am not prepared this morning to give you all the details. Many of them have still to be worked out. But the basic policy is clear and understandable. Let me say once more, and as strongly as I know how, that the basic principles are good. They are workable. If we have congressional as well as public backing, they will enable us to keep inflation under lock and key and to maintain stability in our American economy.

On the wage side, control has been reestablished. This does not mean a wage freeze. Wage increases within the industry patterns already laid down since VJ-day will be approved by the Government. Every effort will be made to speed up action and to establish streamline procedures. I expect to have an announcement about how this can be accomplished within the next few days.

What does this new policy mean to prices? It means that manufacturers will no longer be required to wait 6 months before the wage increases which they have granted will be taken into consideration in setting their prices. If for any reason an industry—operating at normal volume—is in hardship price adjustments will be granted. These price adjustments will be designed to assure the minimum level of peacetime earnings for that industry during the coming year.

Does this mean general price increases throughout the entire economy? Does it mean a retreat to a new price line—to a new higher level of prices? Emphatically it does not, and it is vitally important that we understand why this is so.

First of all let's remember that the number of industries which have been or are likely to be forced below their prewar earnings for any reason is relatively very small. The present pattern of wage increases can be, and in many instances has already been, established in scores of industries with no price consequences whatsoever. It is generally true of such industries as the food processing and petroleum industries where labor cost is a relatively small part of the total sales dollar. It is true of the apparel industry and many others where labor costs represent a higher proportion of total costs—but where profits generally have been abnormally high. It is less true of some of the metal-using industries where labor costs, direct and indirect, represent a sizeable factor in the total price.

The result of this new wage-price policy will, as I say, not necessitate a retreat from the present price line. It will mean a bulge in one relatively narrow section of that line—a bulge which must not be allowed to spread.

Food prices represent 40 percent of the total cost-of-living line as reported by the BLS index. This new policy will have little or no effect on food prices. Provided Congress continues the present food subsidy program, the line on food prices can be held, as it has been held for 32 months, at roughly present levels.

Rents represent 19 percent of the cost-of-living line. This new policy will have little or no effect on rents. The rent line can and must be held.

Apparel represents about 12 percent of the cost-of-living line. This new policy will have little or no effect on apparel prices. It is my belief that we can continue to step up apparel production at roughly the present average of prices.

And what is true of food prices, rents, and apparel prices is generally true of furniture prices, the prices of house furnishings, and services. It is in some of the metal-using industries, a relatively small section of the cost-of-living line, where some price increases will be needed.

But let me make the situation clear beyond all question. The price line simply must be held. The prices of food, rent, and apparel must be kept from rising. On that all-important sector there can be no retreat.

There will, of course, be loud crys from the "now I want mine" boys. And there will be sober and understandable requests from many farmers for the removal of food subsidies. These objections to a continued hold-the-line policy—both irresponsible and responsible objections—will be based on a plea of fairness. Businessmen will say "labor has had rather general increases in wages. We want general increases in prices." Some farmers will say the same thing.

For this reason, I would like to discuss this subject of fairness of income—group by group. Let me say at the outset that there is probably far more fairness of income distribution in our economy today than at any previous point in our peacetime history. Let me say further that if we strive now to work out all the unfairnesses which remain we shall only succeed in blowing up our entire anti-inflation program with resulting disaster to everyone.

Let us examine first of all the position of labor. There are some people who throw up their hands in horror at the thought of any wage increases at all. Well, let's look at the problem like reasonable men. The fact is that the elimination of overtime and downgrading have sharply cut the take-home pay of millions of American workers.

There are all kinds of figures tossed around about basic wage rates, straight-time hourly earnings, and average hourly earnings. But let's remember that it is take-home pay that buys groceries and pays the rent. And when take-home pay is cut, the family has got to tighten its belt, as the President pointed out in October. The pattern of wage increases established over the past 3 months in most instances provides adjustments that go only part way toward making good the loss in take-home pay.

These wage increases, and others which will be coming along in certain other fields, do not represent a new advantage to labor. They represent a cushioning of the blow that millions of individual workers have had since VJ-day. They do not give labor an unfair advantage as compared to other groups in the community. They are designed rather to maintain something approaching the balance we had in wartime.

Under the new wage-price policy, wages generally will be stabilized according to the new patterns established since VJ-day. A further increase over the present pattern would make economic stabilization impossible. But the fact that many increases have occurred and others will occur in industries where pre-VJ-day contracts are still in effect is, in my opinion, healthy, proper, and in the interests of everyone of us.

How about business? Business is doing very well. American industry on the whole is extremely profitable. Only limited areas of it have been affected adversely by the shift from war to peace. The food industry, the textile and clothing industry, the department stores, the service trades—none of these industries has had to reconvert. They have kept on producing right straight through. They were very profitable during the war, they are very profitable today, and they are going to stay very profitable for a long time to come.

Corporation profits as a whole before taxes are expected to total in 1945 some $22,000,-

000,000 compared to a little under $25,000,000,000 in 1944. It will be said that most of this profit was earned in the first half of the year while the shooting was still going on and that since VJ-day the situation has been entirely different. We don't have the full details of profits quarter by quarter for 1945, but it is significant, I think, that the boards of directors of American corporations declared a billion and a half in dividends in the final quarter of 1945—the period of economic readjustment. This was just as much as they declared in the final quarter of 1944. And total dividends last year were right up to the 1944 level. Needless to say, I know none of my business friends who have had their salaries reduced since VJ-day.

Now it is true that in the reconversion area—and I mean by this not only those industries which have stopped producing war equipment and are now producing civilian items, but also industries like steel which have had to change the character of their production—operations are less profitable at the moment than in other parts of the economy. But let's keep our perspective. All these industries together make up less than 15 percent of the American economy.

No one can know for sure how these industries are making out now. Nonetheless their outlook for 1946 as a whole is extremely favorable. For one thing, they face an almost unlimited demand for their output. Once they really get rolling they will be producing far more than they ever produced before the war, and increasing volume means costs and rising profits.

That the outlook for these industries is bright is confirmed by the fact that the stocks of corporations in the reconversion area have not been lagging behind in the general boom on the stock market. That is why until recently we felt it fair to ask the reconversion industries, as well as all others, to wait 6 months after negotiating wage increases before concluding that price relief was necessary.

So let me say once more—let's keep our sense of perspective. We are not confronted with a situation in which scores of industries and hundreds of thousands of firms are on the verge of bankruptcy. The very opposite is true. On the whole, American industry is extremely profitable. Only 15 percent of it is affected materially by the transition from war to peace. Its prospects, in general, were never brighter. And as I pointed out before, we have never in our entire history had a period in which there was less hardship in American business. In 1945 bankruptcies fell for the third successive year to an all-time low of 810. This compares to 22,900 bankruptcies in the boom year 1929.

Finally, how about our farmers—the group whose extraordinary record during the war is perhaps least appreciated, the group which for more than a generation has profited the least when times were good and suffered the hardest blows in times of adversity.

In 1939 our farmers, representing 25 percent of all of our people, had only 9 percent of our national income. When the experts stress the gains which our farmers have made during this war, they often fail to mention the low levels from which they had to start.

Nevertheless it is a fact that our farmers, like the rest of us, have done rather well since the days before the war. Today net operating income per farm is more than three times as great as it was in 1939, and the increases have been pretty general. On VJ-day the experts generally prophesied that farm prices and farm income would drop rapidly in the following months. But again the experts were wrong. In December the cash income of our farmers, after seasonal adjustments, was 2 percent higher than in August.

To those of our farmers who are inclined to criticize labor and deplore the increases in wages which have occurred, let me point out one all-important fact. The decrease in farm income which they expected 6 months ago has failed to materialize largely because total factory pay rolls in our cities did not drop to the extent expected—because employment held up and increases in wage rates offset in part the loss in take-home pay due to a shorter workweek.

It is not too much to say that our farmers today hold the key to economic stabilization largely in their hands. For unless food subsidies are maintained beyond July 1 the control of the present inflationary dangers will become impossible.

If food subsidies were withdrawn, food prices would rise promptly and dangerously. The index, which has been held steady since May 1943, would immediately rise more than 8 percent. This would force a major increase in the cost of living. This in turn would force compensating wage adjustments on a broad scale. As surely as day follows night we would be started on a spiral of wage and price increases leading directly to disaster.

Very properly, our farmers hate subsidies. I don't blame them for that. Subsidies are a necessary evil, and the quicker we can be rid of them without blowing up our economy, the better off we will be.

But subsidies are absolutely vital to the success of our program. I am hopeful and confident that much as our farmers may dislike them, they dislike and fear inflation more.

The stabilization program has meant much to our farmers. The prices he receives have risen on the average exactly the same percentage in this war as in the last—113 percent. But the prices he pays, including interest and taxes, have risen only 40 percent this time against 94 percent the last time—for the single reason that price and rent controls have been in effect. A good example is farm machinery. In the First World War it rose in price, on the average, 68 percent. The increase since 1939 has totaled only 14 percent.

If the present price line is broken—if inflationary forces break loose—there is no group in America which will more surely suffer disaster and heartbreak than our millions of farm families.

I have come to know our farmers well and feel that I understand many of their problems. I sympathize deeply with their concern over the future. The leaders of farm organizations are my friends. I have confidence that they will rise to the present emergency in the same statesmanlike way in which they have supported price and rent controls during the most critical period of the war.

So much for price and wage policy and its effects on our economy. We have a bulge in our line and a threatened break-through. We must stop the break-through, seal off the bulge, and continue to hold the line where it is. This is our new program. It is a program that will work. It is a program that will stabilize the American economy. To those people who are betting on inflation in the stock market and in the commodity markets, let me say, "You are betting on the wrong horse. There isn't going to be any inflation. We're going to hold the price and rent line as we've held it since May 1943—all the speculators, lobbyists, and pressure groups to the contrary notwithstanding."

It is, of course, expanding production which will bring us to the point where price, rent, and wage controls can be dropped. Production is the only answer to inflation. There are some who say, "Yes, but under price control production is impossible." The record clearly proves that this is nonsense. During the war industrial and farm production under price control rose fully five times as much as in World War I. Today, production is surely at the highest point ever achieved in peacetime. Unemployment is at the lowest peacetime point in 20 years with as many people on our pay rolls as in our best wartime year.

What are those 52,000,000 workers doing if they are not producing? Why is it that industry after industry is crying for more and more employees? Why is it that reconversion has been accomplished in record time? Why is it that every business forecast indicates rapid increases in production throughout 1946? Why are retail sales continuing to higher and still higher levels—all under a program of price control?

As production recovers from recent shutdowns let's forget this propaganda talk about price controls making production impossible. Let's take off our coats, forget our differences, and get out the goods. That's the way, the only way, to get rid of price control without the most disastrous inflation this country has ever seen.

It should be perfectly clear to all of us that we are going to have to retrace some of the steps we have taken since VJ-day. As I pointed out, we're going to have to abandon early liquidation of the subsidy program. We cannot permit an increase in the price of food. The fact that we were ready to liquidate that program, and indeed made a beginning, should provide assurance that that program will not be continued a single month beyond what is necessary for the continued stabilization of our economy.

Furthermore, we shall probably have to restore some of the production controls which were abandoned last fall. Obviously, we shall move with discretion and only where the need is very clear. But we shall see to it that the orders that are necessary to get clothing for our veterans and building materials for the construction industry will be put into operation promptly.

And I mean to make the fullest use of the authority under the Second War Powers Act to prevent hoarding. If there is any doubt on that score, let me dispel it now. That is one thing we simply must not tolerate. Speculators take notice.

If we are to win through in our fight against inflation it will take the best efforts we can put forth in the executive branch of the Government. More than that, it will take action by the Congress. I urge that you renew, without amendment and at the earliest possible moment, the stabilization statutes. The speculative fever in this country has reached such a pitch that it can be overcome only if it is unquestionably clear to everybody that the Congress, no less than the executive branch of the Government, is determined that inflation shall not come. Under other circumstances I would not urge the reenactment of the legislation without amendment. But the dangers today are great. Any sign of weakness will be quickly and greedily seized upon by the speculators and other enemies of inflation control. Delay in reaching a decision will do irreparable damage to the entire program.

I further urge with all the vigor at my command that the Congress enact at the earliest possible moment legislation to stop the inflation in the real-estate market. If this inflation is permitted to continue unchecked it will undermine the construction industry just as it did after the last war. And it will strike a body blow at any hopes we may have for a secure and prosperous economic future.

Mr. Wilson Wyatt has recently developed a magnificent veterans' housing program. It will not only provide the housing which the veteran so desperately needs at reasonable prices, but it will also put the housing industry generally on a firm and solid basis such as it has never before enjoyed. Legislation to prevent inflation of real-estate prices is imperative if this program is to have a chance of success.

Gentlemen, the program the President has laid down is not a perfect program. Under

the circumstances which we face there can be no perfect program. But it is a good program and a workable program. It will prevent inflation, which benefits no one and spells disaster for all of us. And I want to say as strongly as I know how that it is a fair program. Under it we shall not be able to eliminate every inequity in our economic system. That, I am afraid, will never be possible. But we can and we will do broad justice to all the economic groups of the country.

Clearly this program of economic stabilization—or any program of economic stabilization which might have a chance of success—will be attacked by every irresponsible pressure group in the land, such as the group that demanded the removal of all price controls on February 15—last Friday—at the very height of this inflationary crisis.

In the past 4 years of price and rent controls Congress has courageously resisted the pressures of these groups. Congress has consistently turned down their periodic drives for needlessly higher prices, rents, and profits. By taking this stand Congress has, so far, saved the people scores of billions of dollars and prevented a disastrous inflation. Over and over again on this vital issue Congress has proved that the people's case is in good hands.

Let me repeat that it is not unfair or unreasonable to ask American business to live with its present generally high level of profits, with adjustments in prices limited only to those who really need them. The vast majority of businessmen are as reasonable, sensible, and patriotic as any group in the land.

Let me repeat that it is not unreasonable or unfair to ask the farmer to accept the present general level of prices for his products. Some months ago it was expected that farm incomes would decline in 1946 some 15 percent below the levels of 1945. It is now perfectly clear that farm incomes will not decline. If anything, they will go up from the 1945 level. That is due in no small part to the wage increases which have helped to prevent a decline in total wage income. Such a decline in wage income would have resulted in a decline in farm income, too.

Finally, it is not unreasonable or unfair to ask labor to accept temporary Government controls over wages and some cut in their take-home pay as a result of reduced overtime. Much as we might wish to prevent that cut, there is no way in which we can do so without precipitating an inflation in which the workers, like everyone else, has everything to lose and nothing to gain.

You and I and the American people all face a grave responsibility. I am confident that in the face of the danger of inflation we shall close ranks, as the President has called upon us to do, and carry through the program which he has laid down. I am confident that we shall now throw our economic machine—the most productive in the world—into high gear. That is the way, and the only way, in which we can quickly get back to a free market, free collective bargaining, and a free and prosperous America.

Mr. Molotov's Fears

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 18, 1946

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, H. B. Snyder, editor of Gary Post-Tribune, Gary, Ind., in the following editorial, contributes common sense suggestions to Foreign Commissar Molotov:

MR. MOLOTOV'S FEARS

Foreign Commissar Molotov made a rather hysterical, sword-rattling speech the other day in which he accused Russia's wartime allies of keeping anti-Russian forces under arms in Europe and thus encouraging dangerous talk of a third world war.

He spoke particularly of tens of thousands of troops of the Polish Fascist General Anders in Italy, and hinted that General Anders' troops were preparing to attack the new democratic Poland.

Mr. Molotov can't have forgotten General Anders' Poles were Russia's allies, and that many of them fought nearly 6 years against the common enemy. He can't be ignorant of why these troops are not eager to return to the new democratic Poland, or why the United States and Britain are not anxious to send them back.

Many countrymen of these Polish troops have suffered imprisonment and death for the crime of opposing the present, Soviet-sponsored Polish Government. Is it any wonder that General Anders' men prefer to remain outside Poland?

The United States and Britain cannot deport these men to what seems certain punishment. Further, they and other displaced persons can be useful, especially since the American occupation forces are being sharply reduced.

Perhaps if Mr. Molotov could find it possible to soften his own belligerent tone, to cease calling every anti-Communist a Fascist, and to arrange political amnesty for these men who fought and bled against Russia's enemy, he might hear less dangerous talk of a third world war.

County of Los Angeles Official Reveals Unprecedented Growth of Los Angeles County—The East Moves West—Spiritual Growth Linked With Distribution of Economic Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 18, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent for me so to do having been granted, I include in my remarks a letter dated February 12, 1946, to me from Wayne Allen, chief administrative officer of my home county of Los Angeles:

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,
Los Angeles, February 11, 1946.

Hon. CLYDE G. DOYLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I thought you would be interested in the following facts which reveal the unprecedented growth which Los Angeles County is now undergoing:

The population of Los Angeles County is now approaching the 3,500,000 mark.

As of January 1, 1946, conservative estimates prepared by the County Regional Planning Commission placed Los Angeles County's population at 3,456,227. This estimate is compiled by applying the current occupational and vacancy ratios in the various districts against the number of dwelling units indicated by building permits.

The Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, which bases its estimates on a meter count, places the county's population at 3,435,000.

More than three-quarters of a million out-of-State persons came to southern California during the first 11 months of last year by automobile alone.

This statement is based on figures from the Quarantine Office of the California Department of Agriculture. Reports from its inspectors at five southern California ports of entry showed that for the first 11 months of last year a total of 258,715 southern California-bound passenger cars entered the State carrying 759,439 persons. This compared with 185,867 cars carrying 569,758 persons during the comparable period in 1944.

To us, these figures are impressive for they indicate the increasing importance of Los Angeles County in national affairs. Only 9 of the 48 States, for example, had a greater population at the time of the last Federal Census. The figures are also interesting insofar as they tend to support the forecasts now being made that Los Angeles County is entering the greatest expansion era in its history.

Respectfully yours,

WAYNE ALLEN,
Chief Administrative Officer.

As the facts in the letter speak for themselves, I will not comment about these facts except to say that the eighteenth district of California, which I have the honor to represent in this great legislative body, is entirely geographically located within Los Angeles County and therefore not only does my home city of Long Beach, Calif., with an estimated population of 350,000 at this time, share numerically in the total county growth, but each and all of the prosperous growing happy communities of the eighteenth district and the territory between these cities likewise share.

On this floor, I have on other occasions stated that nothing in the experience of mankind—excepting a Nation-wide catastrophe—can stop the natural trend of events, which is—that the East moves West. This has always been true since the earliest landing on our shores. This natural trend of events brought about by all of the natural factors in the experience of mankind will eventually force the powers to be in all the economic realms of our Nation's experience, to make their plans with a just and fair consideration to the deserts and logic of the West. And, I believe in the absence of such sensible consideration by those who claim to, or in fact do, control much of the manufacturing and distribution of the products and wealth of our Nation, there can only result unnecessary postponement of the earliest and fullest development of our great Nation—economic and spiritual. I use the word spiritual advisedly for I strongly feel that only as there is economic security for the resources of the people, all over the Nation—is there the greatest room for spiritual development and growth and strength also. Mr. Speaker, the other busy, prosperous communities in my district, in addition to my beloved city of Long Beach, are as follows: Artesia, Bellflower, Clearwater, Compton, Davidson City, Dominguez, Downey, Hollydale, Hynes, Lakewood Village, Lynwood, Norwalk, Signal Hill, South Gate, and Willowbrook.

Navy Boy Wants to Know About United States Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 18, 1946

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, a 19-year-old enlisted Navy boy who is stationed on Guam, where he has been for several months, wrote an interesting personal letter to his parents. These boys do a lot of thinking.

I believe a few paragraphs from this letter are of sufficient importance to call your attention to them. They indicate some of the things about which many of our boys are thinking these days. I did not secure permission to use the young man's name.

What I wish to discuss is something about which I know little, but it seems to be the general idea around here.

It is that America should be doing something toward betterment of the world. I'll be darned if by reading papers, listening to the news and "what have you," we can figure out what the United States policy is, or what the leaders intend to accomplish. If they continue like they are doing now, even though they think they are accomplishing something, they are in essence doing nothing. They are following in the same old rut.

America seems to be at leisure, while the rest of the countries are struggling for even an existence, in some cases.

Labor differences and internal strife are no doubt a part of forcing mankind into right fields of thought, but those things, more or less, must be subsided if the world is to function as a unit.

It is not that the fellows here know particularly what is best to do, nor do most of them care to take the responsibility to figure it all out, but they are enough interested to look at the question intelligently and to strive in their little way to better things for everyone.

I think they would like to know just what the United States intends to do, in at least three fields, toward accomplishing what everyone wanted done while the war was on—but seems now to have forgotten in order to fight at home, play at the dance halls, et cetera.

One field is the home front—the labor situation, the political set-up, and social conditions. Another field is that of the international movement, the foreign relations of our country, including domestic, social, and the capital adjustments. The third field probably is the least touched but important to the thinkers of America—the religious question in all countries.

If that inside plan the Congressmen and others have figured out for the future were to be exposed, I have a hunch that it would be found rather vague and not substantial under strain. Perhaps no one really knows their true course, but even a course blown leeward by wind is better than being lost.

What say, some of the big boys write out their tentative blueprint and let the public, the fellows overseas and the world at large discuss it? We might pick up some ideas here and there that would benefit them for their duties, as well as instruct us and give everyone an opportunity to be openly a governmental draftsman in effecting a world merger. Certainly no one person feels he can do the job and most persons feel that God is the one to trust and to look to. But, since it is being attempted by mankind to demonstrate this business of humanity, all should be permitted to put their coal in the fire.

"Can we do something here?" the fellows are asking. * * * America fought the war, not to win the war but to win a chance to fight for the peace of the world. Here is the chance and we mustn't muff the wonderful opportunity.

Views of a Young American Industrialist On Present-Day Trends and America's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 18, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, it is apparent from the many communications being sent to the Members of Congress by thoughtful people in all walks of life that there is grave concern for the future of our country and the preservation of our American way of life and the principle of good government. There is inserted herewith one of these communications containing an address of an eminent young American, the worthy grandson of a successful father:

THE CHALLENGE OF HUMAN ENGINEERING
(By Henry Ford 2d)

It is a great honor to be here as your guest this evening.

What I propose to do is to outline a problem. That may not be very considerate of me, but I take comfort from the fact that problems are the business of the Society of Automotive Engineers, and that you have never failed to rise to any difficult challenge. The problem, in my opinion, is one of the greatest which confronts American industry today, for it concerns human relationships—relationships which can either aid or impede our efforts to achieve greater industrial efficiency; and if you can help to solve it—and I believe it needs the benefit of scientific thinking—you will have done much to increase the well-being and the living standards of America.

The ability of American industry to produce has never had the prestige it enjoys at this particular moment in history. The job of war production has been called a miracle. It confounded our enemies and drew praise from our allies. In a very short time we armed the largest fighting force ever mustered on this continent; we built, armed, and fueled combat ships and planes and tanks in quantities never before imagined; we put billions of dollars of weapons into the hands of our allies all over the world.

The mechanical principles which made possible this war-production record are not new to any of us—standardization of parts, line assembly, the use of large, high-cost machine tools. These are the principles all of us have used for many years in the manufacture of automobiles. They are the principles of mass production, and no group of men deserves a larger share of the credit for the rapid development of the mechanics of mass production than you men assembled here tonight.

Mass production is not an end in itself, but a means to an end. It is a tool.

In war, mass production is a tool for making the weapons of war—as many as possible, as fast as possible. We used the tool better than other nations because we had more practice with it and because we were better equipped to use it efficiently.

In peacetime the use of the tool of mass production thrives best in a highly competitive democratic economy, for mass production is a tool which free people use in peacetime to make more and better products at less and less cost. It is a tool for raising the standard of living.

All of us would agree that a standard of living is not a question of money, but of things and opportunities. People are prosperous and enjoy a high standard of living when great numbers of them can afford a great many things and services—refrigerators, automobiles, radios, homes, good food, education, recreation, and all the rest. Through the peacetime use of the tool of mass production, American industry has already made this country a land with an incomparably high standard of living.

And the use to which we can put mass production to bring millions of things and opportunities within the price range of millions of people has in no way reached its limit. It is obvious, for example, how much better off we would be in this country if it were possible to sell automobiles for half their prewar prices. Millions of people who never owned a car could have one. Families which have one could have two. Tens of thousands of private enterprises serving the automobile industry and the people who drive automobiles would benefit, and would expand. Cut the cost of refrigerators in half, cut the cost of radios in half, cut the cost of homes, clothing, and other manufactured articles in half, and the people of America would find themselves vastly better off.

We continually talk about higher incomes, and higher wages, and more money. That is all right. A man should be ambitious. He should try to increase his income. But in our discussion of higher incomes, we must never lose sight of the universal advantages of lower costs—of more and better products brought within the budget of more and more people.

In the face of what peacetime mass production has already accomplished in raising our standard of living, in the face of current world praise of American industry's ability to produce great quantities of things in a short space of time, we may be tempted to think that the potentialities of mass production have been exhausted—that we have come to the end of this road to national well-being. Such a notion is absurd. The mechanics of mass production can still be greatly improved, and they can be more widely adapted.

But there is a whole vast area in which we are only beginning to make significant progress—what we might call the field of human engineering. Machines alone do not give us mass production. Mass production is achieved by both machines and men. And while we have gone a very long way toward perfecting our mechanical operations we have not successfully written into our equations whatever complex factor represents man, the human element.

I am suggesting, therefore, that we try to rewrite the equations to take into account the human factor. If we can solve the problem of human relations in industrial production, I believe we can make as much progress toward lower costs during the next 10 years as we made during the past quarter century through the development of the machinery of mass production.

In approaching the complex problems of human relations, I believe that management must take the initiative for developing the relationships between labor and management. Labor has a great opportunity to achieve stature through assuming greater

responsibility. But I consider that management is in charge, that management must manage, and that the test of management is whether or not it succeeds.

Mass production did not invent the human equation—but it did alter it in a number of important respects which we may have been slow in taking into account. Under mass production large numbers of people flocked to the assembly line, each to perform a highly specialized routine duty. Mass production produced great concentrations of people—and a problem of communicating with them. And it produced the difficult problem of specialization, where the human being loses sight of the social usefulness of what he does.

How badly we have taken the human factor into account is indicated by many statistics. The Department of Labor shows that a total of 216,000,000 man-days were lost between 1927 and 1941 as a result of strikes alone.

I am not here concerned with the justice of these strikes or their injustice. I am saying that some 216,000,000 man-days of work were lost. This idleness was expensive—to the strikers, to the companies and to the Nation. And that cost was part of the Nation's cost of production. Consider how many thousands of automobiles, radios, refrigerators, and other useful and needed products could have been manufactured with 216,000,000 man-days of labor. Or, to put it in another way, consider how much lower would have been the cost of the things that were manufactured if production had not had to absorb the expense of these work-stoppages. Furthermore, when a production line stops, the jobs and purchasing power of hundreds of thousands of people in related businesses all over the country are affected.

We must remember, too, that strikes are by no means the only measure of lost time. That loss, indeed, is only a fraction of the time lost through industrial inefficiency and through mass unemployment. We are all aware of the fact that the man-days lost through unemployment during the same years—1927 to 1941—were of tremendous proportions.

I do not need to tell you that costs are also closely related to the productivity of the individual American worker. We take pride in this productivity, and as a matter of fact we in America cannot compete in world markets with our high wage rates if the American worker does not continue to be productive.

Recent statistics on productivity are confusing because of the factor of war. War necessarily brought into industry a great many less experienced men and women. The armed forces took away a great many skilled workers.

Other prewar mass production industries have found, as have we at Ford Motor Co., that even after allowance for these unusual circumstances the recent record of productivity is not encouraging. We keep detailed records of the time it takes to perform various operations. Those I am about to cite are in every way comparable—that is, the operations have not been changed so that more time should be allocated to their performance. Let me give you the number of minutes required in December 1940 compared to July 1945 to perform certain operations

One group of operations which took 96 minutes in 1940 took 128 minutes 5 years later. Another which took 1,188 minutes in 1940 took, 5 years later, a total of 1,943 minutes to perform. A third group took 28 minutes in 1940 and 49 minutes 5 years later.

On the whole, productivity per worker in our plants declined more than 34 percent during the war period.

I have already pointed out that some of this was inevitable, a result of the war, and I should like to say that I am emphasizing these figures merely to demonstrate how great is the need for improvement in the productivity of the individual worker.

As we look at these problems in human relations, we feel that the solution must be found through a closer understanding between management and labor. If we cannot succeed by cooperation, it doesn't seem likely that we can succeed by any exercise of force. We cannot, for example, expect legislation to solve our problems. Laws which seek to force large groups of Americans to do what they believe is unfair and against their best interests are not likely to succeed. In fact, such legislation can lead to exaggeration of the very problem it is designed to solve. And when freemen give up the task of trying to get along with each other, and pass the buck to Government, they surrender a substantial measure of their freedom.

That, then, is the problem I wanted to lay before you this evening. Let me summarize by stating it more briefly: In a free, competitive democracy, mass production is a tool for raising the standard of living by reducing costs and thereby bringing more and better products within the budgets of more and more people. We have not yet solved the problems of mass production, for our failure in human engineering is creating waste and inefficiency which handicaps the very purpose of mass production—lower costs.

I do not have the answers to this problem. But I am sure that workable solutions can be found if we will only bring to it the same insistent objectivity and willingness to experiment which you and others like you throughout industry have given to the mechanical difficulties in mass production.

In industrial human relations, then, we have a new and relatively unexplored frontier. And beyond this frontier lie opportunities greater perhaps than any of us can imagine.

There are many considerations which we must take into account as we work toward a solution of this problem. I can name some that have occurred to me, and you will think of others.

I assume, for example, that all of us agree that labor unions are here to stay. Certainly, we of the Ford Motor Co. have no desire to break the unions, to turn back the clock to days which sometimes look in retrospect much more attractive than they really were. The truth of the matter is that the unions we deal with rose out of the very problem we are discussing—the human problems inherent in mass production. We do not want to destroy the unions. We want to strengthen their leadership by urging and helping them to assume the responsibilities they must assume if the public interest is to be served.

It is clear, then, that we must look to an improved and increasingly responsible union leadership for help in solving the human equation in mass production. Union leaders today who have the authority to affect industrial production on a vast scale enjoy a social power of enormous proportions. If they are going to be real leaders, they must accept the social obligations that go with leadership.

What is needed today is industrial statesmanship—from both labor and management. Instead, we have a tradition of industrial antagonism Men who in their private lives would not think of entering into a brawl on the street have over the years found themselves blasting each other in the public press by colorful name calling. This tradition has given rise in some circles to the theory that open conflict is inevitable. I have even heard it said that strikes are helpful in "clearing the atmosphere."

With such unhappy theories I do not hold. Modern man, who has done so much to reduce the manpower loss caused by disease, can certainly hope to reduce the manpower loss from industrial conflict. The public interest requires that we find ways to eliminate industrial warfare without impairing or diminishing the rights which both management and labor must continue to enjoy.

We will always have some honest differences of opinion. But we can certainly deal with these controversies more wisely and efficiently. If we are to have industrial-relations program and labor-relations staffs, and spend as much money on them as we do, we should do it expertly and efficiently, bringing to the task the same technical skill and determination that the engineer brings to mechanical problems. We must act on a more human and professional plane.

There is no reason, for example, why a grievance case should not be handled with the same dispatch as a claim for insurance benefits. There is no reason why a union contract could not be written and agreed upon with the same efficiency and good temper that marks the negotiation of a commercial contract between two companies.

In the meantime, there are day-to-day responsibilities of management toward employees which should fit into the whole pattern of the new relationships we seek. Consider, for example, possibilities for improvement in personnel evaluation. Only recently have we begun to develop and use modern techniques which enable us to fit people to jobs, and fit jobs to people, with some degree of science. Too often we have assumed that if a man is a good sweeper he is a good sweeper only, if a man is a good assembler he is a good assembler only. But the results of industrial psychological tests show very clearly that sometimes a good sweeper may also be a good assembler, and an assembler may have qualities of personal leadership that will make him a good foreman. Every company follows a general policy of advancing men in accordance with their capacities. But we can do a more scientific job.

When we have learned to do a reasonably good job of evaluating an employee's capacities at the start of his career, we can do a better job of upgrading. I am not talking now about technical requirements having to do with such things as automatic pay raises and seniority. I mean the development of more opportunities for employees to improve themselves in accordance with their own initiative and desires.

We know that great masses of men work constantly at points below their top capacities, and it is one of our jobs to see that ways and means are provided to help them rise to these opportunities.

Communication between management and employees in large mass-production plants is another important field in which we can work.

In any large group of people working together it is a basic requirement that good lines of communication exist. There will always be plans and estimates, information about new styles and new engineering, and other data, which management must guard closely because they are the very elements on which tough competition is based. But information about company objectives and accomplishments should be made available to all. People want to know what the other people they work with are doing and thinking. They want to know what "the score" is.

It is fairly easy for everybody to "know the score" when there are only 50 employees in a plant. But when thousands of employees work at assembly lines in a single plant they create a problem of communication which has not yet been effectively solved.

In an age in which the world prides itself on speed and efficiency in human communication it is absurd that we should not have been more successful in this field. We have the tools at our disposal—movies, radio, coordination conferences, newspapers, the graphic arts, posters, and all the rest. It is good business to see to it that the members of our industrial teams get information to

make them conscious of the fact that they are on the team. This applies all along the line—shop employees, office workers, supervisory and executive personnel.

I think we can lick this job of better communication. Informed employees are more productive, certainly, than uninformed employees.

I shall not attempt to point out other areas—and there must be many—in which we can work toward better human engineering in mass production. The important thing, it seems to me, is to recognize the problem for the vital one it is and to move forward in hope and confidence and intelligent experimentation toward workable solutions.

As a starting point for continuing efforts in that direction, perhaps management and labor would today agree:

1. That the job of American industry—management and labor—is to make at lower and lower cost more and better products to sell for lower and lower prices.

2. That the only way that job can be done is through understanding and sensible cooperation between management and labor.

3. That the spirit of that cooperation must be a sense of joint responsibility. The public is the "boss," not management or labor. Both labor and management must accept their share of responsibility to the public welfare and live up to their commitments.

4. That mass production has demonstrated its ability to bring high wages, and that higher wages can come only out of greater production and lower costs.

5. That, while no single human institution or industry can promise complete security because of the complexity of modern civilization, management and labor can work toward more certain, more stabilized employment.

6. That American industry should be a place of opportunity—a place in which men and women can grow and develop into better jobs.

If these are our articles of industrial faith, then we are squared away to attack the problem of making mass production more efficient by giving the same hard-headed attention to human factors that we have given so successfully in the past to mechanical factors. The only approach we can take is to live up to the best industrial statesmanship of which we are capable. If we give the best we have, we can hope to get the best in return.

Consequences of the Strike Settlements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1946

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Henry Hazlett from the New York Times of today:

ECONOMICS AND FINANCE—CONSEQUENCES OF THE STRIKE SETTLEMENTS

(By Henry Hazlitt)

It would be pleasant to think that the strike settlements of last week promised a durable industrial peace and that the President's new Executive order seemed likely to solve the problems of production and inflation. But sober analysis does not appear to justify either conclusion.

The strikes were settled in effect, though not always in form, by compulsory arbitration applied against the employers. The decision of the General Motors fact-finding board, that the wage increase in that company ought to be 19½ cents (or 17.4 percent) an hour, set the pattern for the other disputes. This is the figure around which all the settlements have clustered—18½ cents for Chrysler, 18 cents for Ford, 18½ cents for the steel industry, 19 cents for the Aluminum Corporation of America, 18½ cents for the General Motors electrical division.

This was inevitable. When the President's fact-finding board in the General Motors case recommended a wage increase of 19½ cents an hour, it was setting a standard increase for organized labor in general. For the General Motors workers were already in the upper third of American income receivers, and any substantially smaller increase offered to other unions by other boards would have been resented as discrimination on the part of such boards.

It was in vain, therefore, that the General Motors board warned that its decision was based solely on the "particular merits" of that case and was not a "formula * * * to be applied in other cases."

And it was because Mr. Truman himself partially recognized this that he recommended an 18½-cent-wage increase in the steel industry case without even waiting for his own "fact-finding" board to reach a decision or even waiting, according to the President of the United States Steel Corporation, for the board to hear the testimony or evidence that the company had to offer.

In view of the national application of the new wage increase, the way in which its amount was originally hit upon seems capricious and haphazard. It was determined from the particular situation of one of the biggest corporations in the country. It was based on a dubious principle combined with a dubious guess. The dubious principle was that employees are "entitled" to continue to receive practically peak wartime weekly wages even when they cease to work as many hours. The dubious guess (the GM board frankly admitted that its assumptions cannot be proved) was that General Motors was going to have a working week averaging only a fraction over 40 hours in 1946, and that a 19½-cent increase would therefore make up the entire loss of earnings from the reduction of the wartime hours worked in 1944.

By its compulsory arbitration and by the new Executive order the Government has put itself in the business of fixing wages. The Executive order provides that no employer will henceforth be entitled to price relief if he grants a wage increase without prior approval of a Government agency. This provision seems in effect to destroy free collective bargaining. The Federal Government has been buying off existing strikes at the cost of an unprecedented peacetime wage increase on top of unprecedented wartime wage increases. But it may be doubted whether it has bought industrial peace. For other unions will demand at least equal increases. And unions have come to feel that they are striking, not to force employers to pay higher wages, but to force the Government to force employers to pay higher wages.

It is obvious that the new wage level cannot be sustained without raising the existing price level. The $5-a-ton increase in steel prices, therefore, is merely symptomatic. It is true that the complicated and equivocal new wage-price order treats wages and prices together, but it does not treat them on the same basis. It appears on its face to grant an increase in wages of more than 50 percent above prewar levels, while holding profits of individual industries down to their prewar levels. Profit control appears under the order to be more rigid and more definitely established as a principle than ever before.

The new order is accompanied by a great deal of lip service to production, but rigid industry-by-industry profit control of the type contemplated is not calculated either to balance production as among different commodities or to encourage maximum volume of production in general. And in the President's statement accompanying the Executive order last week no mention was made of the increase in the country's money and credit supply or of the continued unbalanced Budget which must in the long run increase it further. This is the basic cause of inflation. Until it is dealt with no measures dealing with the symptoms can be successful.

Lincoln and the Present Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1946

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include a statement that appeared in the Denver Post under date of February 10. In these brief observations, Mr. Oscar O. Whitenack, who is editor of the page appearing in the Post known as the Open Forum, calls attention to the crisis existing in our National Government today, and raises the inquiry as to where the Lincoln is today who can lead this Nation out of its present difficulties. Mr. Whitenack's comments will be of general interest to all who are interested in good government, and his statement follows:

On the highway from Louisville to Nashville, near the town of Hodgenville, Ky., there is a building of white marble in which is carefully preserved a log cabin. Why? Because in this cabin Abraham Lincoln was born, February 12, 1809. When he passed away 56 years later, grief-stricken Secretary of War Stanton exclaimed, "Now he belongs to the ages!"

Why was Lincoln the outstanding man of his century?

To answer this question would require volumes, but briefly it was because he was honest, free of demagogery and hypocrisy, and a straight thinker. He clearly perceived the terrible wrong of slavery, for when in New Orleans he saw a young woman sold on the auction block, he exclaimed, "If I ever get a chance to hit that thing, I'll hit it hard."

He saw the absurdity of a new State voting to admit or reject slavery, for no amount of voting could make it a righteous institution. Hence, he joined the new Republican Party whose platform declared that there should be no further extension of slavery into any Territory of the United States. He became a party leader, and in his debates with Senator Douglas and in his Cooper-Union speech in New York, February 27, 1860, he showed himself a master of logic and set forth the principles of Republicanism as no other man could do.

No one ever prepared the way for his own election to the Presidency as did Lincoln, for he drove the wedge that split the Democratic Party. Senator Douglas indorsed the Dred Scott decision which annulled the Missouri Compromise and opened all the Territories to slavery. A newly admitted States could vote to admit or reject slavery as it saw fit. Lincoln saw his chance and against the advice of Republican leaders he asked Douglas this question: "Can the people of a Territory, in any lawful way, against the wishes of any citizen of the United States, exclude slavery from its limits before it became a State?" Douglas answered, "Yes; by failing to provide laws for the protection

of slave property." This won him the election as Senator, but, as Lincoln foresaw, it lost him the support of the South and made his election to the Presidency in 1860 utterly impossible.

The crisis today is as serious as that of 1860, if not more so. Where is the Lincoln who is able to show us the way out?

O. O. W.

Our Failure Adds to European Starvation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 18, 1946

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, last November in a speech on the floor of the House, I urged immediate consideration for legislation to provide money to UNRRA for the purpose of feeding the starving men, women, and children of war-stricken countries. Congress acted, but unfortunately in a rather dilatory manner. It is not too late for our Government and the various charitable organizations throughout our country to redouble our efforts in aiding the unfortunate war-stricken nations of Europe.

The following editorial by H. B. Snyder of the Gary Post-Tribune, Gary, Ind., is very timely and should be constructive in carrying out of further duties to these unfortunate nations:

OUR FAILURE ADDS TO EUROPEAN STARVATION

American shipments of wheat to UNRRA, the international relief agency, will be less than half the 400,000 tons pledged for January and February unless the job is speeded up. This is one of the reasons for the new stories predicting widespread starvation unless shipments are greatly enlarged.

Our record in the shipment of other foods is much worse. According to the latest decision, UNRRA is to get 24 percent of the 766,000 tons of fats and oils requested for the first 6 months. This means we are falling down on the job abjectly.

The failure can be blamed on the Agriculture Department and other officials who hurried too fast when peace came to get back to normal conditions. Our attention has been fixed to our domestic needs and not enough to our commitments abroad.

This is the reason gray flour is to take the place of white and why there will be a scarcity of various other foods during the remainder of the year. Even then, millions of Europeans will have barely enough to subsist on and some will die.

Yet, we doubt if many Americans would have objected even to rationing if the truth of the situation had been told them. Why are we so continually led to believe everything is improving when the exact opposite is the case?

There have been droughts in many parts of the world and food supplies, already terribly reduced, have been further cut down. Surely there is nothing particularly difficult in determining how much food there is and how long it will last and then making arrangements to get enough additional supplies to prevent starvation.

But even when that is done and when we have learned our proper share we don't seem to be able to supply the needs out of our vast stores. It is not that they are unlimited for they are not and we cannot provide all the food needed, but we do have enough to supply what UNRRA has requested and it should have been supplied on time.

This is the first time on record that this country has fallen down on its job of Christian helpfulness and it is a disgrace. We have sourpusses to be sure, who don't want to provide anything when it keeps them from having all they want, but they have never represented the American idea and they don't now.

Finally, we are to do what we can without going all out to shoot the works. It is time we got off this dead center and started going somewhere.

American Veterans Committee Urges Congress To Put Ceiling Prices on Old and New Houses—Asks for Passage of H. R. 4761 Against Group Demanding "Freedom To Gouge"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 18, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable discussion during the past few weeks over my proposal to establish a $6,000 yardstick with which to gage the cost of new homes to be built for veterans under the President's housing program. Under this provision the Housing Expediter would have the discretion to raise this ceiling in geographical areas where construction costs and special circumstances made it necessary. He could do this so long as the veteran obtained a house at the lowest possible cost.

Many people have been saying that the veteran did not want a $6,000 house—that he could pay more, and should. Most of these statements have come from the professional lobbyists of the real estate speculators, who now see a fine opportunity to rob the veteran of his GI loan under the guise of helping him to find a home. These people wish to use our scarce building materials to build $15,000, $25,000, and $50,000 mansions, and they care little whether the veteran can afford them or not. They know that in the present market they can make their selfish profits.

Today I received a letter from the American Veterans Committee, expressing the views of the average returning serviceman of World War II. The American Veterans Committee has made a considerable study of this housing problem through its own organization. Last week their national policy committee met in Washington to discuss reports they had received from their various chapters over the Nation. Unanimously these chapters wanted houses for their members at $6,000 or under.

With this Nation-wide backing of the veterans themselves, the national policy committee has endorsed my housing program. They have forwarded their recommendations to me, urging that Congress pass H. R. 4761 with the provision establishing maximum sales prices for existing housing accommodations, and demanding that new homes be built to the $6,000 yardstick.

Under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I should like to include, for the consideration of the Members the American Veterans Committee letter endorsing this legislation:

THE AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE, INC.,
New York, N. Y., February 14, 1946.
Representative WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: In order to halt the rising spiral of inflation in home values, which is working particular hardship on veterans and their families, due to their enforced absence for many years from the real-estate market, we urge that the Congress pass H. R. 4761 with a provision establishing maximum sales prices for existing housing accommodations.

We also urge the Congress to restore to the above-mentioned bill powers to be invested in the Housing Expediter or National Housing Administrator for the establishment of priorities over critically short building materals, and the authority to allocate such materials into the construction of homes at price ranges under $6,000 or, at the discretion of the expediter, at a moderately higher maximum sales price in geographical areas where special circumstances make such higher prices necessary to provide housing in volume.

If the Congress fails to do this, it will in effect be providing homes which veterans will be unable to purchase or rent.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES G. BOLTE, *Chairman.*

Bonneville Power Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 18, 1946

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A752, the figure $16,000,000 appears in error; it should be $160,000,000. I have asked that the permanent RECORD be corrected accordingly, and this request has been granted.

The article to which I referred was a news release by the Bonneville Power Administration with respect to the recent audit prepared by Arthur Anderson & Co., which demonstrates that the $17.50 kilowatt-year rate under which power is distributed by the Bonneville Power Administration is sufficient to repay all Government costs for all projects for which power is now being distributed by Bonneville Power Administration, maintain the properties, and provide a substantial backlog for contingencies at the end of the 50-year repayment period. I include as a part of my remarks an editorial appearing in the Oregonian under date of February 12, entitled "Sound Business," which discusses this audit:

SOUND BUSINESS

Persistent pressure from California and elsewhere for higher rates for Bonneville power ought to be relieved as a result of the audit of the Columbia River power system by the private firm, Arthur Anderson & Co., and the report by Administrator Paul J.

Raver to the Secretary of the Interior. The studies showed that there is reasonable expectation that the cost of each unit in the Bonneville and Grand Coulee projects will be repaid, principally from the sale of power, within 50 years of its completion.

The auditors assumed no responsibility for the bases on which the allocations for repayment have been established. As it stands, Federal development of the Columbia River is a sound business proposition. But it is vulnerable to political influence, from Congress or from the Department of the Interior itself. The people of the Northwest, who are the beneficiaries of the power, irrigation, navigation, and flood-control features of the Bonneville and Grand Coulee projects, must guard against changes which might turn the development into a bad business venture.

The estimated revenues from sale of power during the repayment period are recorded as $1,863,000,000. These revenues, returned to the Treasury of the United States, will repay 93.07 percent of the original cost, operating expenses, and interest. Those who buy farm lands in the Columbia Basin project, where 1,000,000 acres will be given life by water pumped from the Grand Coulee Reservoir, will pay a very small part of the total cost. They will have 40 years in which to pay, and need not start paying until 10 years after they receive water.

There is no objection to the assumption of the great share of the load of repayment by power sales. There is objection when California politicians seek to force an increase in the wholesale rates of Bonneville and Grand Coulee power for the sole reason that they are competitive, in attracting industry, with California power rates. The great cost of the Central Valley project in California, and the relatively small amount of power to be generated at Shasta Dam, have put such a burden on power sales there that Bonneville's rate of $17.50 a kilowatt-year has not been matched.

The audit of the Columbia system, demanded by Administrator Raver, should strengthen the insistence of Northwest Members of Congress that a higher power rate in California is California's bad luck. Oregon can't grow vegetables the year around, and there is no remedy for the fact that Oregonians must pay more for California vegetables than do Californians. The Northwest will not submit to political penalty which would cancel out its natural advantages, chief among which is abundant power.

Labor Aims To Control Government, But Lack of Unity Prevents It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL STEWART

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1946

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mark Sullivan, from the Washington Post of February 17, 1946:

LABOR AIMS TO CONTROL GOVERNMENT, BUT LACK OF UNITY PREVENTS IT

(By Mark Sullivan)

It is frequently said that labor, its unions, and leaders have too much power. Or, more strongly, that labor is more powerful than the Government. If these assertions are mere argumentative assertions they ought not to be accepted. They call for examination in the light of facts.

In New York a union of tugboat workers struck. The Government took over the tugboat industry. The union voted to continue the strike. Essentially this is a refusal to work for the Government. This is serious but hardly composes superiority of a labor union over Government.

The tugboat strike, by interrupting the flow of fuel, caused, or threatened, interruption of some public services, such as schools. But this interruption was indirect. The tugboat workers were private employees of a private industry. Their strike was not a direct strike by employees of Government.

NO RIGHT TO STRIKE?

In Syracuse workers on the waterworks, owned by the city government, struck. This was a direct strike against a government function. There are many examples of this—strikes, actual or threatened, by workers in Government-operated transportation systems, garbage collectors, and the like. These go counter to what has long been accepted as a principle, that Government workers have not the right to strike. As once put by President Roosevelt, they have the right to organize and present grievances, but not to strike.

Whether, and how, government can penalize such strikes, raises a distinction. Under existing law, private employers are forbidden to discharge workers for striking, or to refuse to rehire them on that ground. Presumably government is not subject to this limitation. It may be, varying with different States, and as between the States and the Federal Government, that the civil-service laws give, or do not give government the right to discharge an employee who strikes.

Among government functions interrupted by strikes, schools have a special status. Schools are a direct function of government. Government requires parents to send their children to schools and penalizes any who do not. Only government has authority to suspend this requirement. Only government has authority to close schools.

SCHOOLS GOOD EXAMPLE

Yet schools have been closed by strikes. A closing in New York was indirect; the tugboat strike in a private industry interrupted the flow of fuel. But in St. Louis this month schools were closed by a direct strike of government employees.

Another phase of the issue is presented by picketing. In many cases, pickets prevent a civilian from entering a property in order to work. In some cases, they prevent citizens from entering a property to do business with the owner. In a few cases pickets have prevented the owner or his representatives from entering. These are fairly clear deprivals of rights citizens are supposed to be guaranteed by government.

The power possessed by unions raises the question of the relation between labor and Government. Labor organizations seek as much power as they can get, both within government and immunity from government.

LABOR STRONGEST

This sort of thing is not new. Throughout history groups have tried to control government and often have succeeded.

In America today labor is the strongest group. If labor seeks actually to control government it is following a pattern of history. Actually labor does so seek, in America and other countries. In England labor, acting as a political party, has become the government. In America, CIO, with its political action committee, plainly drives toward first controlling an existing party, and through that controlling government.

If all American labor were united in CIO it might have a good chance to accomplish what the Labor Party in England did. Yet much of CIO's political aims are ruggedly resisted by large groups, notably farmers, and by many individuals, including some within the ranks of labor.

Measured by influence in the Democratic Party and the Democratic administration, CIO has much power. Measured by representation in Congress, it has less.

The major immediate effort of CIO will be to increase its representation in the House in the election in November.

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1946

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Claude R. Wickard, Rural Electrification Administrator:

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION MUST BE PROVIDED ON AREA COVERAGE BASIS—LEGISLATION ENACTED BY CONGRESS CALLS FOR SERVICE TO ALL NON-SERVED PEOPLE IN RURAL AREAS; NO EXCEPTIONS

(By Claude R. Wickard, Rural Electrification Administrator)

A few months ago I issued a public statement about rural electrification. It grew in part from my experience in living and working on a farm which did not have central station electric service, and then noticing the changes when the REA services came to my farm. The statement was based in part on my experience in an official capacity and the close association I had been having with the REA program.

The heart of that statement was:

"Rural electrification, if it is to succeed in this Nation as a Government-sponsored undertaking, never can be carried out on a selective basis."

To attempt selective electrification, I then said, "would be undemocratic, alien to our firmly established traditions. If within the areas electrified through the aid of REA, there were to remain darkened regions, we would only be inviting blighted neighborhoods, a depressed farm minority. To permit such conditions by neglecting to provide complete area coverage," I said when I was new to this job, "would be bad for the community and bad for the Nation. * * * If anyone in an area can have electricity, then everyone on the area is entitled to it. * * * That is part of the basic philosophy that animates REA; an implicit condition that goes with every REA loan. * * * REA will not knowingly contribute to the creation of a blighted area by defaulting on its obligations."

After 7 months' experience as Administrator of REA, I am, if possible, even more firmly convinced than ever of the truth of these statements, and I want to repeat them in a magazine which comes very close to a great many of the cooperatives which have borrowed and are seeking to borrow more money through REA.

I find in that early statement one additional thing which I now want to repeat. It is this sentence: "I am certain that our borrowers, their officers and board members, will join with us by doing everything within their power to make electricity available to every farm and rural nonfarm home, every school, church, and community center within their area."

The purpose of REA, as expressed in the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, is to take

central station electric service to people living in rural areas who lack such service. There is no mention of some of the people or even of most of the people, but simply the people—and that can only mean all—who do not then have central station electric service.

It seems to me, therefore, necessarily to follow that an obligation is imposed which neither REA nor any cooperative or other concern which borrows money from it can by any means escape. That obligation is to see to it that, just as soon and just as rapidly as possible, central station electric service is made available to all the rural people of the United States. It seems clear to me that every rural resident, even if he is a one-mule farmer on a mud road away back in the hills, has the right under the law to have central station electricity made available to him.

Of course, nobody believes that the whole of this obligation can be discharged at once, that electricity can be made available instantly to all the people in every rural area. But I believe that all rural electrification can and must be planned that way and that, ultimately, the goal can be reached. I believe—and I think the people of the country concur in that belief—that any rural electrification cooperative which fails to plan that way is falling short of its duty, is defaulting on its obligations.

I said earlier that Congress never intended, in passing the REA Act, to set up a favored, privileged class among rural residents. But Congress did give one group the opportunity of taking the lead in the rural electrification movement. Cooperatives were selected as favored instruments to effectuate the REA program. It is expressly stipulated that cooperatives, democratic business organizations of rural people, are to have preference, together with certain public bodies, at the hands of REA in the making of loans for rural electrification.

The reason for this preference is easy to understand. They can afford to extend their lines into thin territory, to all potential consumers in their areas, more readily than can profit-motivated companies. In short, it is the cooperative which can most easily and readily achieve area coverage in rural electrification. Congress was thoroughly aware of this fact and took it duly into consideration in providing REA with the means of making central station electric service available to rural people who did not then, or do not now, have it.

Because Congress offered this leadership opportunity to the cooperatives, it seems to me to follow that every rural electrification cooperative has a duty, similar to that of REA itself, to do its utmost to carry out the clear intent of Congress in the law which it wrote for taking light into the dark places of this Nation. That intent is, as we have come to phrase it, area coverage. That is the obligation which stems from the preference accorded the co-ops.

Let's think about it for a moment.

In large measure, rightly or wrongly, we have come to gage the degree of our civilization in America by the number and type of mechanical devices we have developed to eliminate drudgery, to make living comfortable. In the early days, the whole economy of this Nation was based on agriculture. Rural life set the national standard of living, and urban dwellers strove to attain it. In modern time, though we still depend upon agriculture for much of our economic stability, the city has far surpassed the country as a convenient place in which to live. Still, the serenity and dignity of living which characterized our early days survive only in rural areas. The only things those areas lack are modern facilities which eliminate drudgery, make living comfortable.

Millions of our young men and young women are coming back from fighting and winning a war for us. Hundreds of thousands of them are returning to the rural areas. They are not going to be satisfied with primitive conditions, and they are going to express their dislike. Anybody responsible for such conditions, anybody who has to explain their existence, is in for a very uncomfortable time of it. It is going to be harder than ever, now, to explain an unelectrified neighborhood next to one which has electricity—the greatest single factor in bringing homes up to a satisfactory American standard of living. I do not want the apologizing job. Do you?

"You" means not merely the cooperatives but the individual members of the cooperatives. Electricity should be available to all on terms that all can afford to pay. It is up to those who have electric service to help their less fortunate neighbors to lift themselves up to a new plane.

The obligation to strive for area coverage is the most important one facing the cooperatives right now, but it is only one of several. The matter of providing adequate, continuous, dependable service must always occupy our attention. As your members learn more and more about using electricity in their everyday living and working, providing service of this high quality becomes more important—and more complicated. Changes and improvements in your systems will probably have to be steady and unending.

The matter of retail rates and minimum bills is another subject on which we are going to have to do a lot of thinking. So is making a record of the equity of each individual member in the cooperative properties. These subjects are in addition to and apart from the pressing day-to-day problems and the continuing need to campaign for adequate wiring, careful planning of plumbing, and careful consideration to equipment selection.

The rural electrification program launched by the Federal Government in 1935 has made much progress, but it is by no means completed. The impetus for the program came initially from the Government and from a few national leaders. Now, with the tough half of the job before us, we must look to the grass roots for the initiative and determination to finish it.

Lincoln Day Address of Hon. James I. Dolliver, of Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1946

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of my colleague Hon. JAMES I. DOLLIVER, at Logansport, Ind., on February 12, 1946:

Ladies and gentlemen, the kindness of your invitation has brought me here on this Republican and American occasion. I cannot proceed without mentioning the very pleasant relations I have had with your own Congressman, Representative CHARLES HALLECK, in the brief time I have been in Congress. I have come to hold an affectionate regard and high admiration for him. As chairman of the congressional committee he is a leader of the Republican Congressmen and he merits that title by virtue of his energy and aggressiveness. You good Republicans of the Second Indiana District have not only rendered yourselves a good service in electing Representative HALLECK, but you likewise have sent to the Halls of Congress a man who is useful to the Nation as a whole.

Tonight we observe the birthday of the first great national leader of our party—the patron saint of the Republicans. Lincoln was a great Republican; he was also a great American. He summed up in his career the virtues of our way of life and of our system of government. Wherever in the world virtue, honor, and freedom are revered, Lincoln's name is among those venerated by all.

Last fall, in returning to Washington from my district, I took occasion to go with my family to the Lincoln shrines that extend through Illinois, Indiana, and Kentucky. I was anxious that my children should see the places where this great American had lived and that they should come to know something of the reverence and affection with which his name is remembered by the communities that knew him best.

For instance, at Lincoln's New Salem in Illinois we saw the very community in which he lived during his young manhood. The State of Illinois has reproduced there the town of New Salem as it existed in Lincoln's time, with the log cabins the various business establishments, the flour and saw mill, and all the other appurtenances of a pioneer town, including the post office where Lincoln served briefly as postmaster. I must say it is one of the best restorations of its kind that I have seen in the country.

Then we came on to Spencer County, Ind., where Lincoln spent his boyhood after moving from Kentucky and before he went further out on the frontier of Illinois. You good people of Indiana have done yourselves proud in erecting there a substantial limestone structure commemorating Lincoln: with the remains of the Lincoln cabin and the revered resting place of Lincoln's own mother, Nancy Hanks.

We next went to Kentucky to see the marble structure over the humble cabin where Lincoln was born.

And finally we went back to Washington where the form of Lincoln has been imperishably reproduced in gigantic size by the sculptor, Daniel French, in the magnificent Lincoln Memorial on the banks of the Potomac.

The story of the man is summed up in that pilgrimage from log cabin to capital through pioneer life, through the early struggle of the young lawyer to the final act of the drama of his life in saving the Union, freeing the slaves, and becoming a martyr to his own high principles.

If America had produced no other great man or if there had sprung from our soil no other noble character, surely here is an indestructible human monument to the American system, a product of such rare quality, of such outstanding excellence, that human beings all over the earth in the far reaches of the future will revere the name of Abraham Lincoln.

Of course, Lincoln was many-sided, but there is one especial quality of his about which I wish to speak tonight: namely, his love of freedom. I think it is no exaggeration to say that our whole social system in Lincoln's day had been cursed by human slavery. Developed from a small beginning, it had become inextricably entwined with the economy of the South. It was the basis of their social system and one of the forms of wealth which was deemed by many of our fellow countrymen to be essential to economic well-being.

By reason of the fact that it involved human bondage, slavery was utterly incompatible with the fundamental ideals of Americanism. Freedom and human slavery are opposites; the two cannot exist in the same atmosphere. As Lincoln quoted so eloquently from the Scriptures: "A house divided against itself cannot stand." And he continued, "This Nation cannot survive half slave and half free."

Not only was the Nation divided geographically by the institution of slavery, but it also

was divided intellectually, emotionally, and economically. Accordingly, the great task that Lincoln performed was to bring unity out of that disunity, to rebuild the house that was divided, and to reunite through the terribly ultimate instruments of fratricidal strife the two sections of the United States of America in a bond of brotherhood which shall forever be indissoluble.

Lincoln was a devotee of freedom. He was a constant adherent of liberty. From his earliest youth he never wavered in the resolution to hit slavery hard if he had the chance, and strike it he did when on January 1, 1863, he signed the Emancipation Proclamation, making free a race of men. The name of Lincoln is synonymous with the word "liberty." It would be an interesting speculation to determine the attitude of Lincoln toward our present day problems in America. Probably his attitude is summed up best by his magnificent statement in his second inaugural address:

"With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and orphan, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

Thus it is apparent that Lincoln's philosophy in the closing days of the Civil War encompassed some of the very problems with which we are confronted today. But we may be certain that, above all other things, he would insist upon maintenance of liberty in America. He would have led the influence of the United States to the maintenance of liberty throughout the world.

For instance, I cannot imagine Abraham Lincoln being a party to a secret agreement whereby the United States without any right or authority agreed to barter away the independence of other peoples in this world at the close of a long and costly struggle in which they were involved. Indeed, I cannot imagine Lincoln being a party to any vicious secret agreements between our country and any other nation, whatever the pressure or whatever the ostensible reason for such behind-the-scenes diplomacy.

The American people are entitled to know what the foreign policy of their Government is. They should not be misled by their Chief Executive into the belief that open covenants are openly arrived at and then, months later, discover an agreement made which was disclosed by the President not even to the Secretary of State.

On the domestic scene, I doubt that Lincoln would have tolerated the spectacle of the Federal Government dipping into the personal and private affairs of every American citizen. The vast bureaucracy which has been built up in Washington during these New Deal times of the past 13 years would shock the Civil War President beyond any measure. It is difficult for anyone to discover the rationality behind the vast increase of bureaucratic government with which we are presently afflicted. One is driven to the conclusion that the New Deal administration would like to turn the American Government into a form which would ignore the rights of local self-government and which would inflict upon the citizens the totalitarian regimes which lately have been so prevalent in Europe. This kind of dictatorship is utterly foreign to our American genius.

I am sure you are not strangers to this kind of thing. Examples could be multiplied, but I cannot help but mention the case of the grocer in my district who, by inadventence, charged 15 cents instead of 14 cents for a can of Campbell's soup, whereupon he was hauled before a kangaroo court and required to pay a substantial fine. This is but one out of the multitude of petty tyrannies which have come into being under the New Deal in the United States.

For one, I hope the American people wake up to this danger before it is too late, and return to power in the Halls of Congress the Republican Party. In all sincerity I say to you that it is the one hope of saving the country. The Democratic Party is tied hand and foot by the New Dealers. Even if they would, they cannot escape the net of their own making. The fact is that the people of the United States will get a change of direction in the policy of this Government only when they turn out the Democratic Party and return the Republicans to power.

For example, ever since the inaugural of the New Deal President in 1933 there has been an ever-increasing public expenditure. In the last Republican administration, the largest annual Federal appropriation amounted to approximately $3,000,000,000. This amount was constantly increased until, at the peak of the New Deal peacetime expenditures, the annual Federal appropriation amounted to $9,000,000,000. This is entirely apart from the war expenditures which all of us recognize were necessary.

But the fact is that the present administration comes up today with a staggering debt of $275,000,000,000—nearly $2,000 for each man, woman, and child in the United States. This is a situation that cannot be laughed off and cannot be shrugged away. It is a financial fact that must be faced, and sooner or later the American people must do so. The Democratic Party will not and cannot face it. This is demonstrated by the recent Budget presented to the Congress by the administration which does not balance; far from it. Expenditures for the first peacetime year since the close of World War II are scheduled at $35,000,000,000, with an estimated income of $31,000,000,000, leaving a deficit of $4,000,000,000. The Budget message does not attempt to disguise this incredibly unsound situation.

It has been truthfully said that the surest way to wreck popular representative government is to destroy it upon the rocks of financial incompetence and extravagance. Certainly these past 13 years have demonstrated beyond all doubt that the Democratic Party cannot administer the financial policies of our people effectively. I have often been tempted to smile a bit ironically at the adulation the Democrats pay to Andrew Jackson. Judging from their talk, he is the patron saint of the Democratic Party, and yet he abhored a public debt above everything else. For the first and only time in American history, during his administration Jackson wiped out any public debt of the United States of America. When Jackson's administration came to a close, there was not one penny owed by this country. What a far cry from the present Democratic leadership which has involved us in a stupendous and staggering debt and which still continues to involve our people in the deep waters of financial insecurity.

Only by electing a Republican Congress in 1946 and a Republican President in 1948 can the American people have any assurance of a change of direction away from unlimited deficit spending and unbounded bureaucracy. The time has come, in my judgment, to secure a change of direction from those destructive and totalitarian policies: to bring our people back to Constitutional Government, to restore local self-government, and to embark the United States and its people upon a new period of prosperity, leadership, and well-being.

Please do not think I am pessimistic about our country. Far from it. With the right kind of leadership, the United States can even more fully be recognized as the foremost Nation of the earth. One fact has emerged from this war with utter and absolute certainty—the gigantic productive capacity of the United States. Many people may not realize it, but the fact is that our own country can out-produce all the rest of the world combined. This kind of productive capacity has come to us because of our free enterprise system, because of the liberty which we and Lincoln cherish. Let us see to it that today's liberty is maintained. Let us never deviate from the ideals of the man whose birthday we commemorate on this day.

Housing and Education of Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1946

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from the national headquarters of Veterans of Foreign Wars:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS URGE HOUSING FOR VETERAN STUDENTS AND CALL FOR EXPANDING EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES

Citing the fact that 12,860,137 veterans from the armed services will be demobilized by the end of this year, the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation and Education of the Veterans of Foreign Wars today urged the expansion of education facilities in the United States.

With current figures of the Veterans' Administration revealing that a total of 657,333 veterans have applied for education assistance under the provisions of Public Laws 16 and 346, the VFW officials also called upon the people of the United States to open their doors and rent living quarters to the hundreds of thousands of veterans who are anxious to continue their education. Since the original law was passed 380,000 applications for educational aid have been approved by the Veterans' Administration with 258,000 not yet located in schools.

"The present rules of the Veterans' Administration prevents them from interfering in any way with the institution that a veteran wants to attend," the VFW office pointed out, "but this problem is directly in the lap of our school authorities. Something must be done and the action had better be forthcoming soon. There was a day when a boy would think of college only if someone in his family had had the advantages of higher education and knew what was best for their children. Today, however, the veterans are school and college conscious because they see in it their means of advancement."

Pointing out that thousands of veterans are being refused admission to universities due to the lack of housing, teachers, and classrooms, the VFW called for planning and direct action from the educational system of the Nation. In New York there is the threat that this month 15,000 high-school graduates will be turned away from school doors because of the influx of veterans who have been given first chance at facilities available.

"The veteran is being urged to utilize the smaller colleges in the Nation," the VFW office stated, "but that alone will not alleviate the future situation. Housing, expanded colleges and universities, physical plants, and the retainership of qualified instructors are all problems that must be met and met within the near future unless education be denied the millions of veterans plus the youngsters of the Nation who will continue education if given the proper opportunity."

Permanent UNO Headquarters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks on the subject of a site that has today been selected in my district as permanent world headquarters for the United Nations Organization, I want to place in the RECORD the following chronological résumé of this historic event:

In December 1945 the Congress of the United States by a concurrent resolution of both Senate and House "invited the United Nations to locate the seat of the United Nations Organization within the United States of America."

This invitation was discussed at considerable length in the Preparatory Commission and was finally accepted and a subcommittee was appointed to select the actual site. The area of selection was narrowed by the whole committee to some spot on the eastern third of the United States, and finally ended as a choice between Hyde Park on the Hudson River, a section near Boston, Mass., and the place on the Connecticut-New York line near Greenwich.

Some of the areas considered, such as Hyde Park, had, through various citizen groups, expressed a local desire to be selected as the seat, and had issued official invitations to the subcommittee which had been ratified by elected officers or by town meetings. Many towns and districts both on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts and inland sent delegations to London, urging the selection of their neighborhood as the logical and most convenient site. The area around Greenwich, Conn., did not send any such delegation, nor urge the selection of itself as the seat of the UNO.

The actual selection was announced on February 3, 1946, by Mr. Stoyan Gavrilovich of Yugoslavia, Chairman of the United Nations Site Selection Subcommittee, which had inspected a number of the proposed areas within a period of a few weeks. In a 35-page report, the 7-man subcommittee unanimously gave its first choice to the 42-square mile section covering parts of Fairfield County, Conn., and Westchester County, N. Y.; taking in parts of the towns of Stamford and Greenwich, Conn.; and Harrison, Rye, North Castle, and Pound Ridge, N. Y.

No statement was given as to the need for such a large area, which is some twenty-odd times larger than the principality of Monaco, an independent sovereignty for the past several centuries, and also is greater in extent than such ancient free states as Andorra, and is two-thirds as large as Europe's prewar tax-free paradise of Liechtenstein.

Also, no statement was made as to the exact terms under which the area would be secured to the United Nations Organization, other than by a treaty with the United States for relinquishment of all national rights over it.

Some concern was immediately expressed by the inhabitants and property owners of the district, as well as by those responsible for the railroads, motor bus, and truck lines, and other utilities which have the main trunks between New York and Boston located within the proposed enclave.

As Representative for Fairfield County, the Fourth Connecticut District, naturally the inquiries came to me. I asked for legal advice in regard to protecting the interests of my constituents not only in their property rights but in their inchoate rights as American citizens to choice of their dwelling places and preservation of their homesteads.

The legal status of the proposed UNO area was found to be very unclear. Preliminary studies are all that have as yet been undertaken by our State Department on the exceedingly complex question. A draft of a convention, or treaty, which was drawn up in London in December 1945 takes no account of individual property rights, but only touches on the ownership by the National Government, which has no such rights under its Constitution nor under the constitutions of the States of Connecticut or New York.

The drafted paragraph reads:

(c) The Government of the United States shall be responsible for expropriating and compensating, so far as necessary, all interests in the land conveyed to the United Nations.

(d) If, and insofar as, the land is not presented as a free gift to the United Nations, the United Nations shall pay to the Government of the United States a fair price for any land conveyed, which sum shall be credited to the United States in the accounts of the United Nations and be set off against contributions due from the United States. In default of agreement, the price shall be determined by an expert selected by the President of the International Court of Justice.

The provisions suggested in this draft of a treaty will, of course, have to be ratified by the UNO in London, or after its transfer to temporary headquarters in New York City. Following that, and before the provisions can have any effect or any steps can be taken under the treaty as drafted, the whole treaty will have to be ratified by the Senate of the United States with a two-thirds vote as provided in our Constitution.

Immediately on announcement of the selection of a site, the attorneys general of Connecticut and New York studied the draft treaty and expressed their belief that there are no constitutional or statutory barriers in either State which would interfere with concluding or fulfilling the terms of the treaty.

On February 6, in London, the site committee of the UNO voted to recommend to the General Assembly that private residents of the selected area be allowed to remain on their former properties for an indefinite period as tenants of the UNO, except in such zones as might be restricted for special nonresidential purposes by the UNO. The question of taxes for such hold-over residents, and for the communities and States losing taxable property to the international Organization was referred for study to a legal subcommittee.

The site committee expressed its hope that it would not be necessary to obtain title through condemnation or expropriation, but that purchase through private agreements could be worked out in every individual case.

All these placatory expressions of desire to proceed along peaceful lines did not fully reassure the residents of the area, particularly in view of reports from abroad in the daily newspapers as to the methods of displacement now followed by some of the governments represented on the UNO site committee.

The citizens of Greenwich, the town selected as headquarters for the UNO, called a meeting for the night of February 5 to discuss the matter and to make known their sentiments as to the disposal of their community by international expropriation.

In response to the invitation of my fellow townsmen and constituents to make known to them my own knowledge and opinion in the matter, I sent a telegram to the town officials which read in part as follows:

The site committee has indicated that it will not oppose the expressed wishes of a majority of the people in the site area chosen. It is my understanding that the townspeople are deeply divided on the issue. In order to accurately gage their true sentiment, I suggest that the issue be quickly submitted to a referendum vote, if the town meeting tonight does not conclusively and formally express the feelings of Greenwich. Whatever action is taken or decision reached by Greenwich and/or Stamford, you may be assured that I will present it as forcefully as I can to the Assembly, to Mr. Stettinius, American Delegate to the UNO, and to the President.

On February 6, I received the following resolution incorporating my suggestion from the town meeting moderator:

We respectfully inform you that representatives of the Town of Greenwich, which includes Greenwich, Cos Cob, Riverside, Old Greenwich and East Port Chester, with a population of 35,000 at its town meeting tonight adopted the following resolutions by vote of 2 to 1 or 110 to 55, 15 being absent:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the meeting that, while the residents of Greenwich are desirous of obtaining world peace through the United Nations Organization, the Town of Greenwich should oppose the placing of the capital of the United Nations Organization in or adjacent to Greenwich; and

Resolved, That a referendum of the residents of Greenwich shall be taken as soon as practicable.

PRESCOTT BUSH, *Moderator.*
HAROLD W. ALLEN, *Town Clerk.*

On February 7, I placed the resolution of the citizens of Greenwich before the Secretary of State, the Honorable James F. Byrnes, and I was assured that the officially expressed sentiment of the town of Greenwich would be transmitted by cable to the United Nations Organization in London without delay.

That this was, in fact, done, was indicated by subsequent news dispatches from the temporary seat of UNO.

Considerable criticism has been voiced in some quarters as to the reluctant

stand taken by the citizens of Fairfield County toward having a world capital set down in their midst. I believe much of this criticism fails to understand the doubts expressed by my constituents. I am sure that all of us are aware of the honor the choice does us and are eager to promote the functioning of this machinery for peace and that we will resist no reasonable demands to provide a site sufficient for the real needs of such an organization. But many others besides citizens of Fairfield and Westchester Counties have expressed their astonishment at the territorial demands or expectations for the headquarters of UNO.

Senator VANDENBERG, one of our representatives to that Organization, made one statement which has met with approval both in the very pro-UNO Washington Post and from the shrewdly well-informed observer Mr. William Philip Simms, whose articles I append:

[From the Washington Post of February 10, 1946]

UNITED NATIONS CAPITAL

Senator VANDENBERG did well to speak out against the "fabulous and fantastic" idea that the United Nations needs 42 square miles of "high-priced area" for its headquarters. "In my humble view," the Michigander is quoted as saying in London, "the equivalent of a comfortable college campus should suffice, and would be far more in keeping with the genius of this precious institution which we serve. Let us not mistake pomp for power." The Senator was echoing many protests already made in this and other countries against the site finders' recommendations. Those protests have at least induced the champions of the North Stamford-Greenwich site to reduce the area they propose to acquire.

What the committee was sent forth to do was to find a suitable headquarters for the United Nations. What it actually did was to select a highly expensive site for a world capital. We think the distinction is plain. An appropriate headquarters would consist of buildings for the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council and the Secretariat, with a reasonable amount of space for future expansion and possibly an airport. On the other hand, a world capital implies a new city roughly comparable to Washington, including, in addtion to United Nations buildings, stores, office buildings, restaurants, theaters, night clubs, and large residential areas. Only if such a city is to be built could the acquisition of 40 to 50 square miles of expensive land be justified.

We doubt that the General Assembly has any intention or desire to creat a full-fledged world capital at this date. If it does, there are many more appropriate sites than the North Greenwich-Stamford area which could be chosen. Indeed, if that is the intention, the whole question of whether the world capital should be located in the United States might well be reviewed. But we think it is safe to assume that a majority of the delegates have no such plan in mind. They probably want only an attractive and convenient site for a headquarters. In that event, the people who operate the world organization will live in an established American community or communities. We think it would be much better this way. If the Assembly takes this point of view, it will obviously wish to choose a less grandiose site than the North Greenwich-Stamford area—one reasonably close to a city in which the United Nations staff and families could be readily absorbed.

UNO PRINCIPALITY

(By William Philip Simms)

Proud though Americans are to have the UNO's permanent seat in the United States, Congress is far from unanimous on the size and location of the establishment.

Whether the site finally chosen goes to the east coast, west coast, or in between, most Members seem to feel with Michigan's Senator VANDENBERG, that 42 square miles, as proposed by the UNO Commission, borders on the fantastic. Something about the size of a university campus, Mr. Vandenberg said, ought to be ample. Nor does there seem to be any pressing need to locate it in an already thickly populated section where land is at a premium.

Those who share this view are all the more inclined to favor a less ostentatious home for UNO because they know that the UNO expects the United States to bear an equitable share of its expenses. An equitable share of UNRRA, it is recalled, was about 75 percent of the total.

The area of Monaco, world playground on the Riviera, is only 8 square miles. It has a population of 25,000—not counting the thousands of tourists who go there annually.

The entire island of Hong Kong, with more than 1,500,000 inhabitants, is only 35 square miles, yet it includes Victoria, one of the earth's finest ports.

The International Settlement known as Shanghai, together with its suburbs, parks, race tracks, and residential area boasts less than half the space earmarked for the UNO. Yet within it are to be found some of the world's greatest banks, commercial houses, warehouses, docks, harbor facilities, and hotels. Shanghai, before the war, had well over 1,500,000 inhabitants.

The old League of Nations, at Geneva, occupied only a fraction of the space now asked for UNO.

Before the UNO meeting in London, the impression of members supposed to know was that the site would go to the west coast. Some went further than that. They said it was "in the bag" for San Francisco. But when the matter came up, Britain, France, and one or two others put up a strong fight to keep it in Europe. They finally agreed, however, to drop their objections to an American site provided it would be on the east coast.

Europeans would not have so far to travel. They overlooked the fact that half the population of the globe live in Asia. The Greenwich-Stamford location, according to the Australian member of the Commission, W. R. Hodgson, was not among the numerous sites offered. The Commission, he said, "discovered" it themselves.

The Australians still want San Francisco. So do a number of Latin-Americans. The French as well as some others are opposed to any site near New York. They say there are too many high-pressure groups there from every quarter of the globe. Some of the small nations fear the Connecticut selection would make for high costs, part of which they will be called upon to pay. And Congress, which will have to finance the deal—and which would have to buy back both land and buildings if the UNO ever decided to move somewhere else—is generally opposed to the creation of any such principality.

Mr. Speaker, in this matter I believe the emphasis should be placed less on width of territory and more on extending the area of human freedom. That is the purpose for which we look to the UNO with hopeful eyes.

The FEPC Filibuster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL STEWART

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1946

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by C. F. Byrns from the Fort Smith (Ark.) Times Record of February 9, 1946:

A FILIBUSTER DEFEATED A CONGRESSIONAL MISTAKE

(By C. F. Byrns)

The long filibuster against the FEPC bill is expected to end Saturday afternoon with complete victory for opponents of the bill.

The Senate will vote on a proposal to limit debate and force the bill to a final vote. It is conceded the bill would pass if put to a vote. It is likewise conceded that the proposal to limit debate cannot get the required two-thirds majority. So it will fail, and the Senate will have to get on to other business. The FEPC is dead, for the present. Probably it will arise again.

This filibuster differs from many which have been attempted in past years. It differs in the quality of men who have carried it on. It differs in the nature of the proposal they were trying to defeat. This was no shoddy piece of demagoguery. It was a sincere effort of the men from the South to keep the Congress of the United States from making a terrible mistake. They have succeeded. In this instance the men who have conducted the filibuster are entitled to the thanks of the Nation, not to the contempt which so often has rightfully been visited upon men who have used this weapon to defeat a majority bill.

Democracy should function so as to protect the rights of the minority as well as to carry out the will of the majority. If those two objectives seem at times to be directly opposed, then they are directly opposed. Yet each is necessary at times. This was one of the times when the right of a Senator to talk as long as he likes has been used to accomplish an excellent end.

If anyone thinks the Southern Senators who have fought so long against the Fair Employment Practice Commission bill were not truly representative of their people, then he is mistaken. Recently, Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, one of the southern filibusterers, sent telegrams to governors of all Southern States and asked whether they felt their Senators reflected the views of their people. Without exception the replies asserted that the people of their States were opposed to FEPC and commended the stand of their Senators.

The sponsors of FEPC have urged it as a measure to protect the rights of minority groups to an equal break in employment. Perhaps some of them think it strange that anybody should be opposed to such a measure. The southern Senators and others who have opposed this measure are not trying to oppress minority groups. Rather they are trying, with imminent success, to defeat a bill which would do irreparable damage to the rights of minorities of every sort all over this country, in the North as well as the South. If this bill ever became the law, we should see the most powerful, most obnoxious, and perhaps the most numerous of all the bureaucracies armed with power to invade every business in America with six or more persons, dictate who should be hired

and who should be fired, who should be promoted and who should be demoted, applying a racial or religious percentage yardstick to the make-up of the employees of every enterprise. Such an effort could only fan into flame smoldering racial and religious prejudices which happily are being gradually eliminated by increasing tolerance and good will between the varying groups which make up America.

A small example of what an FEPC would mean is an incident which occurred under the temporary FEPC in Dallas a year or so ago. The FEPC there tried to force the Dallas News to quit running classified ads advertising for a colored maid or a white maid. The FEPC said that was racial discrimination and the ad should call for only a maid, without distinction as to color. Some people want colored maids. Some want white. It is sheer stupidity and cruelly unfair to applicants to deny them information as to whether they would be acceptable or to try to force an employer to take one when she wanted the other. If the FEPC bill should pass, that sort of stupidity would become commonplace, backed by law and stiff penalties.

The southern Senators have performed a noble service for the most helpless member of the smallest minority groups in America. The majority in the Senate was wrong, terribly wrong. It is fortunate the power to filibuster existed and was used so effectively.

The Strike Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 12 I asked NLRB for copies of the ballots used in the elections held by it to determine whether there should be a strike of General Motors and the steel employees.

The ballots received are as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—WAR LABOR DISPUTES ACT—OFFICIAL BALLOT

For employees of certain companies having collective-bargaining agreements with United Steelworkers of America, CIO.

Major issues involved in the dispute:

The demand of United Steelworkers of America, CIO, for a $2 per day increase in wages for employees covered by contracts between certain companies and United Steelworkers of America, CIO.

Efforts being utilized for settlement of the dispute:

The Secretary of the Department of Labor has been advised of the dispute and is making appropriate settlement efforts.

MARK AN "X" IN THE SQUARE OF YOUR CHOICE

If you spoil your ballot, return it to the Board's agent and obtain a new one.

Do you wish to permit an interruption of war production in wartime as a result of this dispute?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Do not sign this ballot. Fold and drop into ballot box.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—WAR LABOR DISPUTES ACT—OFFICIAL BALLOT

For employees of certain plants of General Motors Corp.

The major issues involved in this dispute and affecting all employees covered by the contract between General Motors Corp. and UAW-CIO are:

1. A 30-percent wage increase.

2. Seniority protection for displaced workers in certain reconverted plants.

3. The establishment of rules in each plant for permanent transfer between occupational groups and for filling vacancies and new positions.

The major local issues involved are: Shift preference; an elimination of piecework and incentive systems; elimination of spread rates for production jobs; the application or establishment of local seniority agreements; operation of grievance procedures; production standards.

Efforts are being made to adjust this dispute by direct negotiation between the parties and by Commissioners of Conciliation of the Department of Labor.

MARK AN "X" IN THE SQUARE OF YOUR CHOICE

If you spoil your ballot, return it to the Board's agent and obtain a new one.

Do you wish to permit an interruption of war production in wartime as a result of this dispute?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Do not sign this ballot. Fold and drop into ballot box.

Mr. Speaker, after looking them over, how would you vote if you were an employee?

The Argentine Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1946

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, an excellent statement concerning reasons for the issuance of the Blue Book by our Government with reference to conditions in Argentina is contained in an article by Mr. Roscoe Drummond, chief of the Washington bureau of the Christian Science Monitor, and appearing in the February 15 issue of that newspaper, and under leave granted I submit same herewith:

(By Roscoe Drummond, chief of the Washington bureau of the Christian Science Monitor)

WASHINGTON.—The charges contained in the United States Government's blue book go far beyond any ordinary diplomatic dispute between Argentina and the United States.

The issue is not one of recognition versus nonrecognition. It has nothing to do with intervention versus nonintervention. It is in no way a personal controversy between bluff, plain-speaking Assistant Secretary of State Spruille Braden and Col. Juan D. Peron, who would like to regularize his Argentinian dictatorship by rigged elections February 24.

Only incidentally is the issue one of American-Argentinian relations.

The real issue is whether the Western Hemisphere is to become an asylum for European nazism—a shelter for those who, failing to kill freedom in the world up to now, are using it to prepare for another try.

It is whether the other American Republics are to stand by idly while in Argentina, Germans proceed to construct a complete duplicate of the military-industrial dictatorship they fashioned at home.

The issue is whether we are watching the seeds of a transplanted nazism be watered and nourished in the Western Hemisphere or whether they are to be subjected to the roughest diplomatic, political, and economic drought which the Western Hemisphere jointly can muster against them.

It is whether, having fought a World War to prevent being conquered by nazism, the victorious nations have to count themselves helpless to cope with resurgent nazism in the peace.

Now the United States is giving to the world in general and to the Western Hemisphere in particular its detailed and documented case that the Argentine regime has been and still is a willing tool of Hitlerism, that it is the home of active and powerful German agents, that it knowingly is providing the base for a new totalitarian war machine, that it is preparing the springboard for a World War III.

At last, fortunately, the facts, many of which already have been printed in Roland Hall Sharp's dispatches in the Christian Science Monitor, are fully in the open, factually supported and officially sponsored by an American Government which has no purpose other than to serve the true interests of Pan-American unity.

But there is no purpose to be served in preserving just a facade of inter-American unity and permitting that facade to cloak and nestle the forces of its own destruction.

It now is evident that the United States, along with the other American republics, made an honest mistake in holding out the good neighborly hand at Mexico City to the Argentine regime, and in accepting, as though they were given in good faith, the pledges that regime gave at the time that in declaring war on Germany it meant to clean out the Nazi agents in its midst. At San Francisco the United States honored that political mistake and reluctantly acted to seat Argentina as a charter member of the United Nations.

While the Peron dictatorship was assuring America and the other United Nations that it was repudiating the Axis, acting to expel its agents and join the Allies, it was assuring the Germans that this was just convenient double-talk. Its assurances to the Germans proved correct. Its assurances to the Allies proved false.

There was understandable pressure by the other American Republics to get Argentina back into the family fold at Mexico City, and at that time the United States did not have a sufficiently final and proved case to resist that pressure. Since then, the evidence has veritably piled in from captured Nazi documents and from the verified testimony of German political and military leaders. The evidence is that the Argentine regime has been in "complicity with the enemy" before the war, during the war, and since the war.

Until this enemy-accomplice regime either falls of its own weight or is effectively repudiated by the Argentinian people—who themselves are victims—it is difficult to see how the American Republics can do business with a western hemispheric Hitlerism.

Deliberate Starvation Must Stop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, if we are to have permanent peace, it must be a

peace based upon justice. If we are to have permanent peace, starvation of millions of the vanquished people, a la Morgenthau plan, must cease. The time has come that we realize that the people of no nation were responsible for World War II. That those responsible for World War II, as in all wars, were the rulers, not the people. Again we must realize that one atrocity does not make another atrocity right.

If we are to have permanent peace the Atlantic Charter must become part of the United Nations Charter. No nation must be allowed to liquidate other nations' people or steal all or part of their territory. These vanquished nations, not all vanquished by Hitler, but some by our own allies, must be assured that they will again be allowed to resurrect their nation without hindrance or interference from any other nation.

It is with these high ideals of Americanism in mind that I call your attention to a letter to the President written by Henry C. Luckey, former Democratic Congressman from Nebraska:

JANUARY 30, 1946.

President HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This letter is written in the most sincere spirit of helpfulness realizing the tremendous responsibilities you are facing.

You undoubtedly have received hundreds of thousands of letters asking what can be done to correct famine conditions and mass starvation and economic confusion in central Europe.

According to the Morgenthau-Potsdam Conference the German people are made responsible for their own welfare. How can this be done with their cities in rubble, their railroads and factories destroyed and stripped, with only 5 to 10 or 20 percent of their industries operating and their fields bare or taken from them? So far there is no semblance of a workable plan for the reconstruction of an European economic entity.

It is not necessary to go into details for these conditions are too well known. Germany has been turned into one great concentration camp the like of which the world has never seen before. By our policies and our apparent approval of this atrocious program of mass starvation we have become responsible for the conditions there now prevailing. By our course we are sabotaging every tenet on which Christianity is founded and we are destroying every basis on which a just and lasting peace can and must be built. Did we lie in 1943 when we promised that the people of the Axis need not fear unconditional surrender to the United Nations—we shall bring food for the starving and medicine for the sick?

As true as there is a just God in heaven these atrocities we now are a party to, will some day rebound against us. A spirit of hate and vengeance cannot build a lasting peace. Only by reestablishing moral norms, and on their basis, can world order and world peace be builded and maintained. If this war results only in vengeance, power politics, spheres of influence and a renewed impetus to imperialism, we have lost the peace and our efforts in World War II have been in vain.

If utter chaos is to be avoided in Europe—which may well engulf the whole world—we must stop deliberate mass starvation and bring about conditions by which these distraught peoples can again rehabilitate themselves, both economically and morally in order to become respectable members of the families of nations.

To aid along these lines the ban on sending relief supplies—food, clothing, and medicines—to the American zone of occupation in Germany must be lifted. Communication by mail must be reestablished. Americans with next of kin in Germany have a right to communicate with their relatives. American religious organizations must be permitted to cooperate with and aid similar organizations in Germany in order to rehabilitate the churches and Christian life. Only the Christian concept can save the world. If this fails nothing is left but force and the atomic bomb—the fruits of a materialistic age.

Mr. President, the evils arising out of the Morgenthau-Potsdam policy can be corrected although much irreparable damage has already been done. You, Mr. President, as the highest authority in the land, have the power to bring about changes for the better. This, in the name of humanity, we urge you to do and to this end you have our full support.

Most sincerely,

HENRY C. LUCKEY,
Member of Congress in Seventy-fourth and Seventy-fifth Sessions.

Atomic Energy and World Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 18, 1946

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include for printing in the RECORD the radio comments of Mr. Paul Bolton, of Austin, Tex., reporting a great address made by Dr. R. H. Montgomery of the University of Texas, who has served his country well in many difficult asignments. This speech impressed me more than anything I have heard or seen with the immediate necessity for effective cooperation of all people and nations of the world, if we are to survive the atomic age. Mr. Bolton's comments follow:

ATOMIC ENERGY AND WORLD COOPERATION

(By Paul Bolton)

Good afternoon, Texans. Today I had a script ready talking about GI education at Camp Swift again. I spent a lot of time on that script. But the GI's at Camp Swift will have to wait.

I went over to the bank at noon today and deposited my pay check and inquired about my balance and felt very set up indeed at its comfortable size, and then I stopped and talked with President Walter Bremond about how terrible prices are on real estate, and I put in the back of my mind, "Do a story soon on real-estate values." But bank accounts and real-estate values seem of very little importance to me right now.

Bank accounts and real-estate values and business deals and GI education, names of returning servicemen, what politician is sniping at what other politician, how many poll-tax receipts Steve Heffington has issued—all of those things aren't very important right now.

Last night I had an argument with my college student daughter over whether advertising is a vice or a virtue and the argument waxed hot and fast and I was very pleased to see her thinking for herself even though our thinking didn't coincide. And I thought some time soon I might make a report on that subject. But it seems utterly unimportant right now.

Because I have just heard a speech, the most important speech I have ever heard under any circumstances.

In the light of that speech nothing is important except what that man talked about.

The speaker was Dr. R. H. Montgomery. He didn't say anything perhaps you haven't already read. But hearing him say it, seeing him sweat with earnestness, I wish I had the power to put across to you the sincerity, the earnestness, the urgency.

Bob Montgomery started off calmly to a roomful of business and professional men. Men like myself, engrossed in their own businesses, each with his own prejudices and follies. Governor Stevenson sat up close to the speaker and stayed throughout the speech, because some of it was directed to him, that part about Edwards Plateau. Men like Fred Adams, who makes extracts, and Joe Carrington, who sells insurance and milk cows, Fine Arts Dean Doty, Capitalist Dave Reed, who brought his wife and sat up close, Bob Montgomery started off calmly enough. He said, "I am not going to make any witticisms. I am going to scare the living hell out of you." And I may add, he did just that.

TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANCES

Bob Montgomery explained that in his early days as a professor he evolved a formula. He's been 25 years trying to prove that formula. Here it is: Social changes are forced by technological change. It is a variation of another natural law: Every action must have an equal reaction. Stated in terms I could understand, what he was saying was that every technological advance made by man—the discovery of fire, sails on a sailboat, the rudder on the same sailboat, the bow and arrow, gunpowder—every technological advance has brought about revolutionary change in men's living. But the earlier advances didn't seem revolutionary because they were slow. The sail was used first on a dugout and scores of years passed before it was put on a ship.

But most of the change has come in the last 100 years—in the years the scientist has been free. Some 300 years ago, they burned at the stake the scientist who invented the telescope. Today scientists are free. And technological improvements have been crammed into a fraction of a second of the world's lifetime, a mere 100 years.

Then Bob Montgomery pointed down at Coke Stevenson and said, "Fifty years ago, when I lived out on the Edwards Plateau where you lived, that section was closer to ancient Egypt than it was to our times today. This month this Science News Letter which I hold in my hand printed the technological achievements of 1945 alone, and it took 20 pages of small type to print them."

Then Bob Montgomery paused and looked at his audience, and put his chin in his hand and leaned on the pedestal in front of him and said, "Now man has reached through the veil and seized the power of the gods."

ATOMIC ENERGY

"Over on that blackboard," he went on, and his voice went up an octave, "over on that blackboard is a formula. If you forget everything else you know, remember that formula. *E* equals *M* times *C* squared. Everything, everything we know as matter, is electricity. The amount of electricity which composed this package of cigarettes is equal to the weight of this package times the speed of light squared. In Washington I took my ring to a jeweler and had him weigh it and I applied this formula to that weight. *E*55 equals *M* times the speed of light squared. In this ring, this ring is composed of enough electricity to equal more than 35,000,000 kilowatt-hours of power." Then Bob grinned over at Max Starke, the LCRA man, and

said, "What does that do to your Colorado River dams?"

Then he held up his ring so we could all see it. "The bombs we dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki," he said, "they were smaller than the stone in this ring.

"I could carry an atom bomb in a hollow tooth which would kill everyone in London.

"When we dropped those bombs on Japan we picked out the smallest cities in terms of civilian population." And when Bob Montgomery said "we," he meant the first person pronoun because he was connected with that unit of government which selected bombing objectives.

He said, "We killed as few people as we possibly could."

He said, "It doesn't kill with explosive force. It's the heat. That heat vaporizes concrete, rock, steel.

"That bomb over Hiroshima, we held it to explode 5 miles up. It pushed the earth down 36 feet in the center of the explosion.

"We're making bombs bigger now. Some say 20,000 times bigger. That means that, if we exploded one of the new bombs 5 miles up, with one bomb we could kill every living thing from San Antonio to Waco."

And the scientists were not certain, when they dropped the first bomb, whether it would or wouldn't start a chain reaction, exploding other atoms, such as hydrogen, in the air.

"I heard one of them testify," said Dr. Montgomery, "that such a chain reaction was quite probable." One scientist told a congressional committee that carbon was the most likely to be affected in a chain reaction. If that happened, the earth would, in one-seventh of a second, become a sun.

"Now," said Dr. Montgomery, "we have this secret in our hands. We have this power of the gods. But how long will it stay ours? The leading nuclear physicist in the world probably is a Scandinavian who is now working with the Russians. And Argentina, a great many of the leading Nazi scientists have gone to Argentina."

THE NEXT ATOMIC WAR

"Probably the thing we'd like to do," he said, "is to kill off our enemies. We've always had to fight. I don't relish not fighting. I like to fight. But the trouble is, if we fight once more, that's it.

"The next war will simply be the last war. There won't be any people left. Nor any life of any kind. The earth will revert to its primal state of electricity or energy or whatever you want to call it."

ATOMIC PEACE

"But if by some luck we don't have another war, and do learn to use this atomic power?

"Well, you can make anything out of anything. Literally. Right now, today, you can send a dime to a laboratory in the East and they'll make it into whatever you want. Gold. Diamond. A glass of water. Or a shot of cyanide.

"It's in the laboratory experiment stage now. Next year you'll be buying a chemical set for your youngster with which he can transmute elements."

"I asked these scientists," Montgomery went on, "whether for purposes of dramatizing my talk I could say you can have streets paved with gold in Austin if you want them.

"And they said for me to tell you, 'Hell, yes, you can have streets paved with gold. It wouldn't make very good pavement. We can also build pearly gates for them if they'd like.'

"And with their new microscopes they're finding out all about germs. It won't be long, if we live, before curing germ diseases will become a job for a high-school boy.

"Inside a year, in my opinion, every germ disease will be gone.

"We are in fact the last earth-bound generation, if we survive. Our children will have the two things for which man has always sought. On the one hand, endless material, to make anything. On the other, the power of the gods to make it. But if our children survive us, we've got to make this a Christian world. We've got to live in a brotherhood of man.

"I don't like the idea, either, of being brothers to Russians. And Africans, and Republicans. And some Democrats.

"But that's the way it is.

"And it's not something for our children to decide. It's up to us.

"Why just a few months ago I had luncheon with the then Secretary of Agriculture, Wickard. He served a filet steak. After we finished he said 'How was the steak; like your Texas steaks?'

"I replied, 'Well, I never did raise any that good but my neighbors did. Is it a Texas steak?'

"He said, 'Your steak was made by the Monsanto Chemical Co. in St. Louis, out of buttermilk and woodpulp.' "

Well Dr. Montgomery said a lot of other startling things. I don't have time to repeat them all. But one of the men who listened asked him a question. This man was C. M. Ellwell, the book salesman. He said, "Bob, I haven't got a bomb. What in the hell can I do about it?"

And Bob shook his head. "I don't know exactly. Except that you can do your best to tell Washington that we want peace and that we've got to have peace. We probably have to have one world government. A United States of the world."

And that was about all of his speech, but when I left the men were crowded around him, bombarding him with questions. And he was trembling and sweating. Because as he said the scientists and the men who have worked on this deal are the worst scared of all.

And Dr. Montgomery is also ill. He has been told to take a rest or they'll be reading memorials to him. So he's going to make just one more speech. He's going to talk next Monday night at the city library auditorium. He says he will talk as long as two people stay there to listen to him. Because he feels this way about it.

He feels very much as his father used to feel about the unregenerate cowboys in the Edwards Plateau country. His father was a Baptist frontier preacher. And that preacher felt that so long as there was a single sinful cowboy on the ranges, he was responsible for that cowboy's soul.

Bob Montgomery feels that so long as there is a single individual in the world who does not realize what the atomic bomb means, he is personally responsible not only for their souls but for their very lives.

And he is preaching salvation, yours and mine. I hope you go out and listen to him Monday night. I'll guarantee this. If he doesn't make you get religion, if he doesn't convince you that we must have a brotherhood of man, he'll certainly do what he did to that luncheon club today. He'll scare the living hell out of you.

Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 15, 1946

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address delivered by me in Cleveland, Ohio, commemorating the anniversary of Lithuanian independence:

Normally, my dear friends, a birthday celebration is a gay and festive occasion. The celebrant is congratulated by his friends and feted by his family in an atmosphere of joy and congratulation. I feel I can speak with authority on this subject, because it happens that my birthday coincides with the birthday of the modern, free Lithuania. I very much fear, however, that the same cannot be said for the birthday we are met here to commemorate today. Because, in celebrating the twenty-eighth anniversary of Lithuanian independence, we find that courageous nation, which should be the true celebrant of the occasion, lying stricken under the occupation of an alien power.

It is quite understandable to me that this anniversary program should be overcast with the grimmest and most foreboding feelings. This deep concern, I am sure, arises not only from a realization of Lithuania's present plight, but from a fear of worse catastrophes to come. I have in mind especially the recent elections conducted throughout the Soviet Union February 10. The Lithuanian people, whose independence is still recognized by the American Government, were forced to vote in those elections as an integral part of the Soviet Union. I do not believe that the full significance of the move on the part of the Soviet has reached the consciousness of either the American people or their Government. The notorious elections of the 14th and 15th of July 1940 were bad news, but from reports I have received, the present elections represent an even bolder usurpation by Russia of the rights of supposedly free men.

The mere fact that Russia has the effrontery to include Lithuania in this universal Russian election is proof positive that she considers Lithuania part and parcel of the Soviet Union. If she is allowed to get away with this without official protest on the part of governments which have pledged themselves repeatedly to sustain the rights of all peoples to self-determination she will consider the matter closed and her predatory objective accomplished. The fact that we still formally recognize Lithuania as a nation will mean little in the face of our tacit consent to Russia's assumption through these elections of control over Lithuania. This is the stuff that appeasement is made of. The nations which should protest let things drift along, while the aggressor nation makes one step after another in pursuit of its nefarious ends. If the United States still holds the position which was expressed by our State Department in 1940, now is the time for it to reaffirm that position. On July 23, 1940, the Acting Secretary of State said:

"During these past few days the devious processes whereunder the political independence and territorial integrity of the three small Baltic Republics—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—were to be deliberately annihilated by one of their more powerful neighbors have been rapidly drawing to their conclusion.

"From the day when the peoples of these republics first gained their independent and democratic form of government, the people of the United States have watched their admirable progress in self-government with deep and sympathetic interest.

"The policy of this Government is universally known.

"The people of the United States are opposed to predatory activities, no matter whether they are carried on by the use of force or by the threat of force.

"They are likewise opposed to any form of intervention of the part of one state, however powerful, in the domestic concerns of any other sovereign state, however weak.

"These principles constitute the very foundations upon which the existing relationship between the 21 sovereign republics of the New World rests.

"The United States will continue to stand by these principles, because of the conviction of the American people that unless the doctrine in which these principles are inherent once again governs the relations between nations, the rule of reason, of justice, and of law—in other words, the basis of modern civilization itself—cannot be preserved."

If, in the words of the State Department, the United States "continues to stand by these principles" then we should raise our voices at this time when they are so obviously being contravened.

In his Navy day speech of last October 27, President Truman voiced the same general principles—these particularly apply to the case of Lithuania.

"We believe in the eventual return of sovereign rights and self-government to all peoples who have been deprived of them by force.

"We shall approve no territorial changes in any friendly part of the world unless they accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned.

"We believe that all peoples who are prepared for self-government should be permitted to choose their own form of government by their own freely expressed choice, without interference from any foreign source. That is true in Europe, in Asia, in Africa, as well as in the Western Hemisphere.

"We shall refuse to recognize any government imposed upon any nation by the force of any foreign power. In some cases it may be impossible to prevent forceful imposition of such a government. But the United States will not recognize any such government."

The issue raised by the Russians' high-handed actions in the matter of the recent elections challenges the conscience of America. Either we mean what we say in these high-sounding expressions of principle, or we do not. When a concrete problem such as this arises, we must speak out or prove faithless to the peoples we have encouraged by stating them. In view of the situation arising out of these elections, I say that our Government should immediately reaffirm and reiterate its recognition of Lithuania as a free and independent nation. Only thus can we keep the record clear and our consciences at rest in the fact of this new form of aggression. Only thus can we prove to the freedom-loving people of Lithuiania that we are neither insensible to their plight nor ignorant of the significance of recent Soviet actions.

In the issue of the national Catholic weekly America for this very date—February 16—I have just been reading a magnificent article entitled "Lithuania Can Only Dream" by Peter P. Cinikas. The story of Lithuania's predicament and the courage of her people in the midst of Soviet oppression is one which should stir the hearts of every Lithuanian. I want to quote some of its revelations as a basis for my second argument:

"Just lately, Vytautas Arunas, special correspondent of Draugas, Lithuanian Catholic daily of Chicago, reported frantic calls from the secret radio of the underground of Lithuania, begging for help and assuring the outside world that the war is still being waged for independence. Further, it has been reported that some 60,000 partisans, or guerrillas, are still hiding out in the dense forests of Lithuania, harassing the Soviet Armies which police the Russian-occupied territories.

"Many reports of new deportations to the various sections of Russia are still coming in. The clean-up before the elections is getting underway, and all the more influential citizens will be gone from their unhappy country before the February elections.

"According to reports coming out of Lithuania's underground, the guerrillas, people in the cities and on farms, and the refugees in the various countries of Europe are even hoping for a war, or something as drastic, to bring them into open conflict with the Soviet Union, in the hope that this may bring them independence."

The passages I have quoted establish one fact clearly—there is fighting going on in Lithuania, more fighting perhaps than in Indonesia.

Mr. Manuilsky, the Ukrainian delegate at the United Nations Conference in London, demanded, until he was voted down on February 13, that a United Nations commission be sent into Indonesia to report on the situation there and the use by the British and the Dutch of troops to put down the native movement for independence. Mr. Manuilsky, it is generally agreed, was acting as the mouthpiece for Mr. Vishinsky. In this case I believe the Communists overreached themselves. Only a blind man could fail to see the similarity between what they are doing in the Baltic states and what they claim the British and Dutch are doing in Indonesia. Mr. Manuilsky demanded that a commission investigate the Indonesian situation because he claimed it was a threat to world peace and the United Nations Organization is supposed to investigate all threats to world peace.

Now I submit that the situation in Lithuania where 60,000 guerrillas are in open resistance to the occupying army is just as great a threat to the peace. If, according to Mr. Manuilsky, there was reason for sending a United Nations Organization commission to Indonesia, there is even more reason right at the present time for sending one into Lithuania. I, therefore, recommend that the United Nations Organization be urged to appoint a commission which shall investigate, without delay, the turbulent conditions in Lithuania to determine whether or not they constitute a threat to world peace.

On October 15, 1940, soon after the Soviet occupation of Lithuania (the first occupation, I mean) President Roosevelt addressed these words to a Lithuanian-American delegation which went to him in Washington:

"It is stated that Lithuania has lost her independence. It is a mistake to say so. Lithuania has not lost her independence; Lithuania's independence has only temporarily been put aside. Time will come and Lithuania will be free again. This will happen much sooner than you may expect."

Roosevelt's prophecy, however, will not come true, if our Government drifts and delays in its policy with regard to Lithuania. We need affirmative action, now, to make his words come true.

I was inspired when I read in the article in America which I have quoted, these historic words which the Archbishop of Kaunas addressed to the Catholic bishops of the world:

"We solemnly declare before God Almighty and our Saviour, His Son, that the Lithuanians are firmly decided to recover their national and political independence and to recreate a real free state. Lithuanians will never consent to become the Russian colony against which they struggled in the past centuries in order to maintain their existence, culture, and Catholic faith. This is why every Lithuanian rebels against any and all suggestions that he undergo the atrocious yoke of atheistic Soviet communism."

Our Government has, up to now, by refusing to withdraw its recognition, aided this determination, at least negatively. It is time now to take positive steps to help Lithuania recreate a real free state.

Wage-Price Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily News of Febuary 16, 1946:

TRUMAN'S NEW WAGE-PRICE POLICY

It is almost exactly 6 months since President Truman announced a wage-price policy in which 6 months' time was an essential element. That policy failed completely, and its failure has been a national disaster.

Now there is a new policy, in which the Government will attempt to hold a new line on wages and prices. The wage line is supposed to be 18 percent. The price line is not definite, but the measure is to be a price which would insure to industry its 1936-39 level of profits.

President Truman has apparently abandoned hope of regulating wages through fact-finding boards. He makes no reference whatever to that expedient, though it was recently the subject of an urgent message to Congress.

One weakness of that plan was that the boards would be operating independently with no responsibility for a general policy—with no specific line to reach or maintain.

Now he reverts to the principle that wages must be held in line if prices are to be held even to the new line. This, of course, is true. The question is whether as prices rise to the new level they will not drive wages to a still higher level and so on over and over again.

The War Labor Board held prices in line during the war. The National Wage Stabilization Board is the instrument which, under the President's directive, is relied on primarily to hold them now.

Having been whipped on by the administration for 6 months to seek higher wages with no specific limit, will labor accept the jurisdiction of this board now? All this time it has been in nominal existence, without publicity, without functions, without prestige or authority. Can all those essential attributes be conferred upon it now?

Even so, its jurisdiction is not entirely clear. It is subject to definition by the Stabilization Administrator, Chester Bowles, the former OPA chief.

Mr. Bowles' own authority and jurisdiction are not entirely clear, still being in some measure subordinate to Reconversion Director Snyder, who does not share all his views.

We hope that the new plan works.

Wages and prices ought to be stabilized, and if either is stabilized, both must be.

To stabilize both wages and prices is a tremendous administrative task. It could bog down completely in paper work, hearings, rehearings and appeals.

Superhuman diligence and skill may make the program work. If the task proves beyond their capacity, or any capacity, we may have to throw all the controls away and let these adjustments work themselves out in the market. This would be dangerous, and for a while, at least, expensive. But stagnation would be still more dangerous. Abundant production, as President Truman truly said, must be achieved if we are to be saved.

A GI's Tribute to Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. STIGLER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1946

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, we are hearing considerable discussion concerning the admission of the Territory of Hawaii as the forty-ninth State in our Union.

A short time back a subcommittee from our House Territories Committee visited the Hawaiian Islands for the purpose of ascertaining whether or not the islands were ready for statehood.

Recently, I received a letter from a very good young friend of mine, who is one of my constituents and who is a seaman, second class, now stationed at Honolulu.

This friend of mine urges immediate statehood. He writes a very convincing letter why this should be done. His remarks are so interesting I include his letter under leave given me to extend my remarks:

A matter of considerable importance has been brought to my attention. It concerns the proposed resolution adopted by the Hawaiian Bar Association and several other organizations of the Territory relating as to the status of the Territory.

The resolution proposes to present to the Congress of the United States an honest and sincere request that the Territory of Hawaii be admitted into the Union as a State.

At this time I am in the Hawaiian Islands and have had considerable time to observe them. It is of my opinion that the Islands should be admitted into the Union. It is not the mere fact that the natural beauty and resources more than justify admittance. As you know, the people of the Islands were the innocent victims of the attack made by the Japanese that was meant to totally destroy the Pacific fleet on December 7, 1941. The people rose up in great magnitude as did all other freedom-loving peoples to destroy the monster that threatened to engulf the world in slavery. Their record in Italy proves beyond a shadow of a doubt that they sacrificed the lives of their loved ones fighting on the side of God and America.

They went to work, and worked. I understand that strikes here stayed at the low level of seven millionths of 1 percent, the lowest, in fact, in all the world. Some of them worked on Government projects and many more of them worked in the fields producing food, and food is ammunition.

The people of the Islands are very much American. Most of them went to American schools. We and they pledge allegiance to the same flag and they love democracy. They have more than proven their faith in America by dying for it. What more could any people do than to give their lives for the high ideals of democracy.

A vast majority of the people here favor statehood and they have undoubtedly earned it. What greater thing could the Congress do for the people here than to make them all citizens of the United States. It would be a great asset to both the United States and the Territory to gift the Islands with statehood.

Let us not be ungrateful for what they have done. Let us act in their favor.

OPA Prices—Scarcity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the following is a typical letter from a businessman sent to Congressmen:

M. E. CROW CO.,
Elkhart, Ind., February 14, 1946.

Representative CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: If you are a man of average intelligence—and you must be or you wouldn't be in Washington—read the attached editorial from a practical lumberman, and then, if you can, suggest how you are going to get homes for GI Joes under Bowles' and Wyatt's price control. Why should an ex-groceryman and an ex-coffee merchant hold executive positions in the Lumber Branch of OPA? The solutions offered by the stabilizers, theorists, and economists suggest subsidies, but we all know that for every dollar going into Washington we can't get over 50 cents back. Subsidies are a snare and a delusion handed to the American public. It would cost the public much less to pay the necessary price to get production rather than a visionary price and a subsidy. You are offered the suggestion that price control will be removed as soon as supply equals demand and this will never happen under the present regulated economy. This country is still operating under wartime controls, although the war was over last August. Apparently Congress and other Government employees hope to keep us under the rules of war indefinitely. Are you afraid of unlimited production and competitive price? Apparently the President and Mr. Bowles are. Who is continuing the steel strike? Not labor, not management, but a little group of men with almost as much power as Stalin are hamstringing the industry of this country and Congress evidently is sitting idly by seeing it happen. I spent over 3 years in the Navy doing my bit and this is what I come home to.

OPA publicity tells me: "OPA has held the line." Is the OPA doing a good job? Although wages are advancing every day, yet—

It has kept the price of doors down. Result, no doors.

It has kept the price of lumber down. Result, no lumber.

It has kept the price of plaster lath down. Result, no lath.

It has kept the price of glass down. Result, no glass.

It has kept the price of plywood down. Result, no plywood.

It has kept the price of corrugated iron and steel items down. Result, no stock.

It has kept the price of flooring, siding, and bundled lumber down, even below rough prices. Result, no stock.

It has kept the price of butter down. Result, no butter.

It has kept the price of nylon hose down. Result, no hose.

It has kept the price of men's shirts down. Result, no shirts.

I would rather pay 6 cents more for a pound of butter than go without. You are shedding tears over the lack of homes for GI Joe. With the steel strike how do you expect to even get nails for the house? Bureaucratic publicity tells us of the need for prompt Government action to solve the housing shortage. If we will abolish impractical, ill-conceived bureaucratic restrictions, industry quickly can give us the proper action necessary—maximum production of building materials and the recruitment of builders to fabricate them. Most of our strikes today are basically caused by price control or bureaucratic regulations.

On January 15 a CPA news release stated that 80 percent of the southern pine lumber produced was going black market. Those intimately concerned with the lumber business felt that this was a fair if conservative estimate. This means that today mills willing to take a chance are shipping lumber at black-market prices which the home builder is ultimately going to pay while production will remain low because relatively few mills will take this chance. However, if OPA would recognize the situation and adjust their prices to approximate the cost of present small black-market production we would immediately see the beginning of tremendous legitimate production which would go far to relieve the bottleneck which is denying home construction today.

Until we give the law of supply and demand free rein this country will never get back to full production and free competition. Have you ever considered that the manufacturers and businessmen of this country know a great deal more about running their business than the economists and star-gazers whom you have allowed to take over in Washington? Why not be honest and admit that raising wages has raised costs? Why camouflage price control with subsidies? Let us see the actual cost of the house and not hide the facts from the public with public money. Do away with price control and you won't need subsidies to get production.

Maybe you don't like this letter; neither do I like what I have come home to. Are you willing to stop and think and reason? If you don't we will wake up some morning to find that the economy of this country has slipped to such a low level there won't be money left to pay your salary.

Most sincerely,

MARTIN E. CROW, Jr.

Progress of the Motion-Picture Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS W. BENNET

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1946

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 18, 1946.

COLUMBIA PICTURES CORP.,
New York, N. Y.

GENTLEMEN: When I was a small boy I remember very well being taken to see the early moving pictures which were then regarded as more or less of a toy.

Still later, when my father was in Congress, I was privileged to attend some of the earliest performances where pictures and sound were combined usually with very weird results.

Through subsequent years I have watched the progress of this infant industry to the point where it has become an industrial and business giant contributing mightily to our country's prosperity and providing countless jobs for skilled Americans.

This progress is a tribute to the perseverance of the early pioneers such as Harry Cohn and Jack Cohn, heads of Columbia Pictures, who overcame great odds, and to

the vision, energy, and business judgment of their successors.

It is hard to imagine what our communities would be like today without the motion picture and it's almost equally hard to see how great projects of public education, campaigns for charity, and similar efforts on a national scale could succeed without the help so generously and cheerfully given by the motion picture companies such as Columbia Pictures and the others, and the people who work for them in various ways.

I wish for Columbia Pictures Corp., an outstanding member of this great family, in the year of its twenty-fifth anniversary of progress, continued and even greater success.

Sincerely yours,

A. W. BENNET.

Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1946

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the most important changes made in the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944—popularly known as the GI bill of rights—as amended by Congress and signed by the President, December 28, 1945. These changes will serve to bring up to date House Document No. 134, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, titled "Handbook for Servicemen and Servicewomen of World War II and Their Dependents, Including Rights and Benefits of Veterans of World War I and Their Dependents," which has proven so valuable:

AMENDMENTS TO HANDBOOK FOR SERVICEMEN AND SERVICEWOMEN OF WORLD WAR II AND THEIR DEPENDENTS, INCLUDING RIGHTS AND BENEFITS OF VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Extension of time

The time during which a course may be initiated is extended from 2 to 4 years after discharge or end of the war, whichever is later, and the time limit for completing the course is raised from 7 to 9 years after end of the war.

Age limit removed

Any eligible veteran now may receive 1 year of education or training, plus additional education (up to a maximum of 4 years), for total length of active service. He need not have been under 25 years when he entered service, nor need he show that his education was interrupted by war service.

Short intensive courses

Courses are no longer limited to a cost of $500 for an ordinary school year. Short intensive courses may be undertaken and the additional cost prorated against the period of eligibility to which the veteran is entitled at the rate of $500 per school year. No such short course may cost more than $500.

Correspondence courses

A veteran may apply to take a correspondence course under the new provisions, but he is entitled to no subsistence allowance. One-fourth of the elapsed time used in pursuing such a course is charged against the veteran's period of eligibility. Total amount payable for correspondence courses for any veteran is limited to $500.

Subsistence allowance increased

Monthly subsistence allowances are increased from $50 to $65 for veterans without dependents, and from $75 to $90 for veterans with dependents.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION OF DISABLED VETERANS

Extension of time

Vocational training under Public Law 16, involving more than 4 years of training, may be begun by a disabled veteran, subject to VA approval, and the time for completing such training is extended from 6 to 9 years after the end of the war.

Subsistence allowance increased

Disabled veterans now will receive a minimum of $105 per month without dependents, $115 with a dependent, plus $10 for the first child, $7 for each additional child, and $15 for any dependent parent. This represents an increase over previous allowances. If the veteran is receiving a lesser pension, he will receive the above amounts while he is in training status. In no event will his pension be reduced by entering training.

GUARANTY OF HOME, FARM, AND BUSINESS LOANS

Guaranty is automatic

These loans may now be made by any lending agency which is subject to examination and supervision by a Government agency, and restrictions of certain Federal laws are removed. A loan becomes automatically guaranteed if the lending agency and the veteran close the deal, the terms being in accord with the provisions of the act. The only other requirement is that the cost does not exceed the appraisal made by a VA-designated appraiser. Loans made by individual lenders (not falling in the class of approved institutions indicated above) must obtain prior approval by VA in order for the loan to be guaranteed.

Amount of real estate loan guaranty increased

Any loan on real estate may be guaranteed up to a maximum guaranty of $4,000 of the loan, as compared with a $2,000 limit under previous law. The Government guaranty remains 50 percent of the total loan up to the maximum amount. The business loan guaranty limit remains at $2,000, or 50 percent.

Amortization-limit extended

Real-estate loans may be amortized over a period up to 25 years, and farm realty loans up to 40 years. Maturity on non-real-estate loans may not exceed 10 years.

Purchase of lots

Proceeds of a loan may be used to purchase a lot in connection with home construction.

Normal value out

Phraseology of the previous law is changed from "reasonable normal value" to "reasonable value" in connection with appraisals of property upon which a guaranteed loan is sought.

Loan purposes broadened

Provisions of the act are liberalized so that loans may be made for all ordinary farming purposes, for any normal business enterprise, and so that existing indebtedness in default may be refinanced in connection with all types of eligible loans.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

No deduction from future bonus

That portion of the law (sec. 1505) which provided that any financial benefits received under the act would be deducted from any future bonus authorized, is repealed.

United States veterans in allied service now eligible

Anyone who served in the active military or naval service of an allied government and was a United States citizen when entering such service is eligible for the benefits of the act and of Public Law 16 (78th Cong.). He must, however, be a United States resident at the time claim is filed, and must not be receiving similar benefits from another nation.

Persons on terminal leave

Educational and loan guaranty provisions of the act, and vocational rehabilitation under Public Law 16, are extended to persons on terminal leave or who are being hospitalized pending final discharge. No subsistence allowance may be claimed, however, by persons taking education or training under the act or under Public Law 16. This section is made retroactive to June 22, 1944, when the original Servicemen's Readjustment Act became law.

Artificial limbs

Provision is made to insure ample authority for VA to procure prosthetic appliances for veterans and instruct them in the use of such appliances, including payment of any expenses involved in the veteran's traveling to and from the center where the appliance is fitted and training given in its use.

Office space for service organizations

VA is authorized to provide office space, if available, to paid, full-time representatives of recognized veterans' organizations.

Veterans' Administration procurement of space

The act makes permanent VA's authority to procure necessary space for administrative, clinical, medical, and out-patient treatment purposes by lease, purchase, construction, condemnation, or declaration of taking. This authority previously was limited to 6 months after end of the war.

PROVISIONS NOT CHANGED

Major provisions of the law which remain unchanged are:

Eligibility requirements

A veteran must have served in the active military or naval service on or after September 16, 1940 and prior to the termination of the present war. He must have been discharged or released under conditions other than dishonorable after active service of 90 days or more or because of an injury or disability incurred in line of duty.

Hospitalization program

VA is authorized and directed to expedite additional hospital construction, and to establish all necessary administrative offices to make veterans' benefits more readily available.

Review of discharge

Ample provision is made for review by the War and Navy Departments of unsatisfactory discharge from service. A new amendment, of minor importance, is designed to clarify the intent of the law.

Job assistance

All previous regulations relating to Government assistance in helping veterans obtain employment are continued. The United States Employment Service and the Veterans' Placement Service Board are directed to cooperate in seeing that all veterans, able and willing to work, obtain employment.

Readjustment allowance

Unemployed veterans who register with an office of the United States Employment Service are entitled to a readjustment allowance of $20 per week while unemployed. An eligible veteran may receive such payments up to a maximum of 1 year, depending on length of service. Self-employed veterans with net earnings of less than $100 per month may receive an allowance amounting to the difference between net earnings and $100 in any month, up to a maximum of 1 year, also depending on length of service.

WHERE TO APPLY FOR BENEFITS

Prosthetic appliances: Any VA hospital or regional office.

Education and training: Any VA regional office or at the school you wish to attend.

Vocational rehabilitation: Any VA regional office.

Loan guaranty: Any eligible lending institution as outlined above. If negotiating with a private lender, any VA regional office.

Review of discharge: The War Department or the Navy Department, whichever was your branch of service.

Job assistance: Nearest office of United States Employment Service.

Readjustment allowance: Register at nearest office of United States Employment Service.

Fair Labor Standards Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 18, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, as the Committee on Labor now considers the question of the Fair Labor Standards Act, I feel it fitting that I should introduce before the Congress a well-written letter from the Farmers Grain Dealers Association of Fargo, N. Dak., signed by Mr. C. H. Conaway as secretary, who writes from a long record of experience on important aspects which will confront this committee as it deliberates on legislation. It is my sincere wish that every Member of Congress will read this important letter:

FARMERS GRAIN DEALERS ASSOCIATION,
OF NORTH DAKOTA,
Fargo, N. Dak., February 12, 1946.

Hon. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Referring to my letter of a recent date concerning the inclusion of country grain elevator employees in the Fair Labor Standards Act and further supplementing that letter with information to you which you may file with the committee at your discretion, I enclose a statement to be filed with the committee as an expression of our views concerning pending legislation and any other that may have a like import. You may read this over and if it will be of any benefit to the committee in their deliberations, they may use it as they see fit.

We are definitely opposed to any attempt to include agricultural labor (this includes labor employed by country warehouses) in any legislation that would have a tendency to industrialize the whole labor set-up. The farmer and his country warehouseman have enough troubles of their own without coming under the domination of some arrogant, unreasonable, and demanding labor leader.

Any successful attempt to draw into the fold of labor organizations the farmer and his employees will result in breaking the back of labor in these United States. We have examples of this all around us. We note the headlines this morning that the great city of New York has decided to close all business houses and places of amusement because of a dock workers' strike that has tied up fuel supplies as well as food supplies.

We cannot afford to place the whole country at the mercy of some labor leader. This should be obvious to everyone, especially Representatives in Congress, and should make it imperative that laws be passed pulling the fangs of labor leaders.

We have finished a war of defense and brought it to a successful conclusion. We must now take immediate steps to foreclose the possibilities of an industrial war within our borders.

We are coming closer and closer to the brink of destruction in our attempt to iron out the difficulties of the common man. We have brought the worker up to a point where he is not willing to recognize any act of his or hers as a contribution to his or her own delinquency. Politicians, hope you are not included, have catered to the whims and desires of the common man to a point where he expects social security without any payment of the premium that goes with it.

Use this information in any way that you see fit—it is but an expression of one who lives in the great Northwest.

Sincerely,

C. H. CONAWAY,
Secretary.

OPA Hot Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 18, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, whether OPA shall be continued beyond June next is an issue that is giving many Congressmen headaches. On the one hand, there are throughout the country millions of consumers who, listening to or reading Bowles' propaganda, are thoroughly convinced that but for OPA the prices of the things they buy would have skyrocketed far more than they have.

As an example, this morning there came to my desk a letter from which I quote these excerpts:

We are of opposite political faiths and your ideas and mine don't jibe nohow. * * * However, in view of the state of affairs in this country today and in the world, frankly, I am losing sleep nights.

Then this:

In the first place, I am heartily in favor of the continuance of the OPA. It has meant in the war years that a little guy like me, on a fixed income, has been able to feed and clothe his family within a reasonable budget.

That is a typical expression of the belief of millions of consumers. Then, there are others—workers in factories, producing essentials for consumers; owners and operators of factories, and some of us—and I am one—who, after listening to complaints about OPA regulations and the way they work out, and to Chester Bowles personally and many of his top-flight men in answer to these complaints, are thoroughly convinced that OPA regulations have created a scarcity of essential merchandise which millions of purchasers with the money in their pockets stand ready to buy; a scarcity which has caused inflation.

Moreover, there are many who, having watched prices soar—butter is now costing seventy-odd cents—fifty-odd which the purchaser pays in the store and the balance in subsidy, but all coming out of the taxpayer's pocket—are equally positive that OPA has not held down prices.

There are merchants throughout the country, and there are millions of would-be purchasers of goods, who know that many times it has been impossible to purchase low-priced, worth-while clothing—yes, many other common items. And many times that scarcity which creates inflation has been traced squarely to the doorstep of OPA, which, before congressional committees, has been forced to admit that many of its regulations have been ruinous.

Note this from the letter of the Democrat who wrote that he was heartily in favor of the continuance of the OPA. I quote:

However, things are already getting way out of line in price—building material, women's and men's clothing. And I can't find underwear for my 4-year-old daughter.

High prices are bad enough, though some think high prices make for national prosperity; but, high price or low price, when you can't buy it, that is something else again.

Because my needs are few, OPA's restrictive regulations have not hit me as they have you. I do not need any new suits, shirts, underwear, handkerchiefs, radios, electric irons, washing machines, refrigerators, oh, dozens of other items, but you do—some of you, anyway—and because OPA follows the policy of limiting the price which producers and retailers may charge now, 1946, to a price comparable to that they charged if they were in business in 1941 and 1942, refusing to make allowances for increased costs, not only are those businessmen and industrialists on the verge of bankruptcy, but they just cannot make the needed merchandise.

OPA was created to attain worthwhile objectives—increased production and the prevention of inflation. The evidence shows that it has done neither, but only yesterday a majority in the House gave OPA an additional billion eight hundred and fifty-four million dollars to hire an additional 1,561 snoopers to enforce its regulations. In my humble judgment, no group of men, however able and sincere, can successfully fix prices on over a million items, render inoperative the laws of supply and demand.

The repeal of OPA would undoubtedly bring added temporary inflation, but supply and demand, American inventive genius, wholehearted cooperative effort on the part of employees, would soon whip it through an abundance of production.

If we were to have an attempt through legislation to prevent inflation, the administration should have adopted the policy offered in a bill introduced by me in 1940 to stabilize, that is, fix, as of a stated period, the prices of things sold and the wages to be paid for services rendered. There is no use attempting to fix the price of the finished product without also fixing, at the same time, the price of the labor that goes into the finished product. But the administration would have none of it. The then President induced Congress to authorize OPA to fix the prices of things—merchandise—but he reserved, and for a political purpose, failed to exercise the right to

stabilize wages. The two must be tied together, as every schoolboy knows.

ECONOMY

While the administration talks economy; while it wants the prices of merchandise fixed, it has no OPA ceiling on its own expenditures for Federal political jobs, Federal political appropriations. Recently, after talking economy, the Department of Commerce asked for a 90-percent increase, the Department of the Interior a 150-percent increase, in employment and expenditures.

ICKES

Honest Harold is out. His announced reason—the President said Ickes didn't tell the truth when, before a Senate committee, he said Pauley, the President's nominee for Under Secretary of the Navy, told him, Ickes, that if he would stop the Government's suit to obtain title to underseas oil lands, he, Pauley, could raise $600,000 for the Democratic campaign fund. Well, Pauley said he didn't; Ickes said he did. Ickes has called upon the Department of Justice to institute legal proceedings to determine whether he or Pauley told the truth before the Senate committee. In the meantime, use your own judgment, or wait until the evidence is in.

SURPLUS PROPERTY

With billions of dollars of surplus property rotting, rusting, thrown into the sea or buried in pits, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is once more holding hearings in an effort to learn how the act providing for disposal of this property should be amended so as to expedite its sale with a minimum of loss.

There is so much of it; it is so widely scattered; it is of so many kinds, designed for so many purposes, that the job is a stupendous one. Even if uncomplicated by greedy, grasping individuals and organizations desirous of making an exorbitant profit out of it, there would be more or less favoritism and waste with chiselers and bargain hunters always around. The job is one which no honest, conscientious individual finds attractive.

I have often thought that if, in the beginning, we had turned over the task of selling the more than a hundred billion dollars' worth of surplus Government property to successful retailers of merchandise, we would have saved millions of dollars.

Organizations like Montgomery Ward & Co., Sears, Roebuck & Co., and other houses selling merchandise through the mail, might have—I think they could have—for a stated percentage, given everyone a fair opportunity to purchase.

So far, administrative expenses of the Government agency have been extremely high and, in addition, not only have millions of dollars of property been destroyed or deteriorated in value, but so far only a small part has been sold.

Every week come letters from overseas men complaining of the waste, of the methods of handling of much of this property.

It is my hope that the committee will find a reasonable solution, and that right soon.

Aid of United States Jews Seen Race's Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1946

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wilmington Morning News, Wilmington, Del., of February 18, 1946:

AID OF UNITED STATES JEWS SEEN RACE'S HOPE—DR. A. A. NEUMAN, PRESIDENT OF DROPSIE COLLEGE, TALKS TO FORUM AT Y. M. H. A.

Actions of American Jewry will shape the future of the Jews in Europe and Palestine, Dr. A. A. Neuman, president of Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning in Philadelphia, declared last night at the third of the open-forum series at the Y. M. H. A.

Dr. Neuman, who appraised the world outlook for the Jews, said "we in the United States are beginning to appreciate the role we must play in our people's destiny."

"Every Jewish academy, museum, library, and center of education in Europe has been destroyed," Dr. Neuman asserted. "What social, political, and cultural influences Jews of other countries had in other periods of history is now centered in the Jews of America, who must act individually and collectively and contribute to a renaissance of our brethren in other lands."

The speaker, rabbi of the second oldest Jewish congregation in this country, Mikveh Israel, in Philadelphia, warned of danger from the Arabs. He stated "the Arabs have formed a league, but they are unable to unite."

"Palestine will be what we make it," Dr. Neuman continued. "Our will can determine the future of that country."

He discussed the Jews of Poland, Rumania, Hungary, Austria, and Germany, and he said "in those countries the greatest tragedies befell our people."

Dr. Neuman also spoke of the Jews in Russia and termed "their status unparalleled in Jewish history." The speaker was introduced by Rabbi Joseph I. Singer, of Adas Kodesch Synagogue.

The Housing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, every part of the country is confronted today with the housing program. The Congress is confronted with the housing program and housing legislation. All too often this congressional approach is from a temporary angle, and all too often the character of the country and the climate is lost sight of as we attempt to legislate horizontal legislation on this question.

I have long held to the principle that the Office of Price Administration, while worthy in many respects, has failed miserably in others, not the least of which is the building industry.

Under unanimous consent, I include herewith a telegram from the Ireland Lumber Yards, of Grand Forks, N. Dak., the management of which represents the best in American thinking and has had a long record of success, and their success is due to the great contribution they have made to the country they serve:

GRAND FORKS, N. DAK.

Congressman CHARLES R. ROBERTSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Modern livable houses cannot be constructed North Dakota for $6,000. Must have full basements, complete insulation, and storm sash, not like California. Whole housing program smells politics. If Bowles would properly adjust prices to material manufacturers, give building industry chance without red tape, problem could be solved. Don't believe better way to create depression than try do all building in 2 years.

IRELAND LUMBER YARD.

Destruction of Fish and Wildlife in the Upper Mississippi River by Lowering Pool Levels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1946

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, all conservation-minded citizens and lovers of outdoor life and Members of Congress who pride themselves on being good sportsmen will be interested to know what is happening to the fish and wildlife and wildlife resources in the upper Mississippi River and its tributaries since the 9-foot channel has been created and the numerous locks and dams have been constructed in the upper Mississippi, creating the pools on the upper side of all dams. You will be interested to know how the fish and wildlife and wildlife resources are being destroyed every winter by the sudden and arbitrary lowering of the water levels of these pools by the Army engineers on orders from the War Department.

The rapid and sudden drawing down of the pools causes countless millions of fish of all species to become stranded in landlocked areas, to smother in water that has become stagnant, and to die in the mud of shallow pools that have been emptied and covered with heavy ice.

These draw-downs are also detrimental to all fur-bearing animals, such as muskrats, that make the pools their habitat. The stumps and snags in the shallow areas which are exposed when the pools are drawn down make it impossible for sportsmen and State crews to remove the fish trapped in such landlocked areas, while the frozen slush and snow and ice make it practically impossible even to locate such landlocked areas before all fish imprisoned therein have died from suffocation.

For several years I have been concerned over the lowering of the pool levels in the upper Mississippi during the winter months by the Army engineers.

As a Member of Congress, representing the Third District of Wisconsin, I have joined with other Members of Congress to voice the objections of the people of the States bordering the Mississippi River in this area to persuade the Army engineers the lowering of the pool levels in this area is detrimental to the wildlife and food for such wildlife in the upper Mississippi River bottoms.

When Congress passed legislation creating the 9-foot channel and authoring construction of the river dams necessary therefor, Congress did not intend that the pools created by such dams should be used by the War Department or any other Government bureau as storage reservoirs to supply water for navigation in the lower Mississippi.

During the war emergency the War Department contended it was necessary at certain times to raise the level of the Mississippi in its lower areas to float barges and vessels of deeper draft than originally contemplated during peacetime. It was the contention of the War Department and Army engineers that the pools in the upper Mississippi be lowered to provide more water in the lower Mississippi to float such vessels and barges used for war purposes, and to move war craft from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico. However, we are now out of the war.

As one Member of Congress I do not intend this course of procedure to continue for the benefit of the shipping interests of the lower Mississippi. The use of the water in the river pools in this area to make navigation in the lower Mississipi for commercial interests in other parts of the United States, with the consequent destruction of fish and wildlife in this area, must stop.

The Wisconsin conservation department has called this matter to the attention of the Army engineers in vain and without effect. It is therefore time that legislation be adopted at once by the Congress of the United States clarifying the present Navigation Act so that the War Department and its engineers cannot continue to interpret the act as they are at present. It surely was never the intent of Congress to give the War Department and its engineers the right to destroy the fish and wildlife and to wipe out all the wildlife resources created by years of conservation effort, for the benefit of a few people who are only interested in shipping their products the year round down the lower Mississippi in barges and boats of ever increasing tonnage and draft. The sooner Congress passes legislation making that clear, the better it will be for the conservation of wildlife in the upper Mississippi regions.

The untold benefits of recreation, as well as the commercial benefits created by the conservation of our wildlife resources in this area, cannot be measured in dollars. Surely the benefits derived for us and for our children and grandchildren from the conservation of our wildlife resources is of much greater intrinsic value than whatever dollar profits might be saved by the commercial interests who are filling their coffers while destroying the wildlife of the upper Mississippi, as well as wiping out all the work of our reconversion resources in which all of us are so vitally interested, for which so many conservation-minded people in this country have been toiling for years past.

I do not want to see the recreation and wildlife resources in Wisconsin ruined for the purpose of providing a mere 2 feet of water for a 2-week period over the Chain of Rocks above the city of St. Louis. The profits the shipping interests reap during this short period shall not be used as an argument to lower the pool levels and destroy our wildlife and conservation resources.

All members of conservation and sportsmen's clubs in the upper Mississippi River region have taken a keen interest in this matter.

The Badger State Sportsmen's Club of my home city of La Crosse, Wis., through its legislative committee, speaking for all sportsmen's clubs and conservation organizations in the upper Mississippi River region, have written me asking for a congressional investigation of the upper Mississippi River 9-foot channel draw-downs.

The entire country will want to read this report; and therefore I am asking special permission and the unanimous consent of the House to have the letter of the Badger State Sportsmen's Club set forth in full at this point:

BADGER STATE SPORTSMEN'S CLUB, INC.
La Crosse, Wis., January 14, 1946.

Subject: Request for congressional investigation of upper Mississippi River 9-foot channel draw-downs.

Hon. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Badger State Sportsmen's Club, Inc., of La Crosse, Wis., is appealing to you in an effort to halt the wild fluctuations and winter draw-downs of pools of the upper Mississippi River 9-foot channel system so that conservation may achieve the full benefits derived from a water-level-stabilization program.

This winter, for the third consecutive season, the United States Army engineers have drawn down the pools of the upper river 9-foot channel system to a state where "open river" conditions again existed. These, substantially, are the same conditions experienced for years in the upper Mississippi Valley prior to the establishment of the 9-foot channel.

Since the United States Army engineers announced on December 20 their plan to begin drawing down the pools as of December 22, there have been numerous telegrams of protest from sportsmen sent to President Truman. Sportsmen of the valley have heard no response from him. Instead they have heard indirectly from the Office of the Chief of Engineers, United States War Department, in Washington.

Our organization, which has a membership of 1,829 sportsmen from the city of La Crosse and La Crosse County, Wis., feels that the problem is of sufficient scope to command some attention on the part of the Chief Executive and the Congress of the United States. Our organization feels that it is presenting herewith the interests of conservation in the entire upper Mississippi Valley concerning this problem. At least 25,000 persons will support our contentions.

Our contention is amplified by the press reports from Washington a few days ago quoting Dr. Ira Gabrielson, of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and other officials that "sportsmen should hunt and fish for pleasure instead of for bag limits."

It is our feeling that agencies of the United States Government dealing with conservation are working at cross purposes. Millions are spent annually by the United States Government for fish propagation, administration of wildlife and fish refuges, development and protection of forests, and for countless other phases of conservation activity. In the case at hand the United States Army engineers are destroying in a period of only a few weeks much of the work that has been done by the United States fisheries, exclusive of the efforts made by the individual States to make it possible for sportsmen to secure reasonable catches of fish. Migratory waterfowl, too, come in for their share of suffering under the water-level fluctuation program, as well as muskrats. Propagation of aquatic vegetation also is involved in the conservation picture.

We, as sportsmen, are familiar with the 9-foot channel from its early formulative stage to its present-day operations. We feel we have a fair knowledge of its ramifications, including the initial construction expenditure and the annual dredging maintenance costs since the deep waterway was placed in operation.

The 9-foot channel in the upper river was demanded by navigation interests, which visualized great volumes of freight moving by fleets of barges and towboats to various ports along the upper Mississippi.

When the United States Army engineers made their initial investigation of the possibility of creating a 9-foot channel out of the then existing 6-foot waterway, Major Hall, who was the district engineer at Rock Island, Ill., and who was a member of the investigating committee, announced an unfavorable report. Later, another board, as we recall it, returned a favorable report. Congress later appropriated the funds, and the War Department instituted proceedings to condemn through United States courts and otherwise acquire lands that would be flooded.

Construction of the numerous dams, locks, dikes, and land acquisition in the 9-foot channel system, according to the original volume of data presented to the Congress by the United States Army engineers was in excess of $126,000,000. The estimates of the engineers were that $3,000,000 or more would be necessary annually for dredging operations to maintain the 9-foot depth for navigation purposes.

Prior to the 9-foot channel, river levels fluctuated according to precipitation, but not to the extent of the wild fluctuations that we as sportsmen believe have been created by the Army engineers through all months of the year in their manipulation of the canalization program. In those days, we had periods when the water was extremely low, experienced during dry periods. We had periods when the water was high, and others when it was at relatively normal levels.

During the days before the 9-foot channel, sportsmen in the valley enjoyed what they called good fishing. Hunting for migratory waterfowl was generally fair, with shooting in the upper valley being somewhat similar each year to that experienced in other parts of the Nation. Muskrats were numerous in the established marshes, and brought a fair livelihood to trappers during the winter and early spring months.

In the days of the old 6-foot channel the United States Bureau of Fisheries, now a part of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, maintained fish rescue work on the upper river annually, in an effort to save fish that would otherwise be stranded in landlocked areas during low-water stages. We, as sportsmen, believe this work was

highly beneficial, for many of the rescued fish were returned to the main channel of the Mississippi. Some were sent by the United States Bureau of Fisheries to stock waters in other States.

During the 6-foot channel era, the United States Army engineers were required to do extensive dredging annually in an effort to maintain the required depth for navigation. Continuous dikes of dredged sand lined both banks of the channel in some sections of the upper river, making it resemble a canal.

When the United States Army engineers held their hearings concerning each of the proposed 9-foot channel dams, locks, and dikes in the various cities nearest to the structures, sportsmen's groups were represented to file their protests.

These protests were generated by the fact that the Government maintained the 9-foot channel solely for navigation purposes, and that conservation interests and flood control were not factors. Waterway interests supporting the 9-foot channel made light of the objections of sportsmen, seeking only their goal by whatever means it might be acquired.

The La Crosse (Wis.) Chapter of the Izaak Walton League of America, then the only conservation organization in this community, made an exhaustive study of conservation in relation to the proposed 9-foot channel. Its special investigating committee reached the conclusion that:

"The La Crosse Chapter of the Izaak Walton League of America was opposed to the 9-foot channel program until:

"1. There was definite assurance from the United States Government that water levels would be stabilized.

"2. Soil erosion would be eliminated or drastically curtailed by extensive forestry and erosion control programs by the United States Government and States in the headwaters of the Mississippi and its numerous tributaries.

"Pollution was eliminated.

"4. Fishways were installed on the various dams."

These objections were adopted by practically every other conservation group on the upper Mississippi River, and were followed to a large extent by the Izaak Walton League of America.

The special committee of the La Crosse Chapter of the Izaak Walton League appeared at practically every hearing held by the United States Army engineers in upper Mississippi River communities on the 9-foot channel project to present in the required quadruplicate the objections enumerated above. These objections should be found in the transcripts of the hearings of the United States Army engineers. It might be added that all three members of the special investigating committee of the La Crosse Izaak Walton League still are residing in this community.

Badger State Sportsmen's Club, Inc., wishes to emphasize that it has no quarrel whatsoever with waterway interests at this time concerning the 9-foot channel. The 9-foot channel is something that was forced upon us against our will and best conservation judgment, but we maintain that judicious administration of the channel through stabilization of waters will solve our problem and be to the best interests of navigation.

Our objections through the years about fluctuations of water levels have brought only the response from the St. Paul district office of the United States Army Engineers that it was powerless to intercede in the interests of conservation, inasmuch as the 9-foot channel was designed and intended for navigation purposes.

We will say at this point that an effort was made by the St. Paul district engineer, Col. Lynn Barnes, during the late spring, summer, and early fall of 1945 to stabilize water levels in the channel pools on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays. This was for the benefit of thousands of fishermen who found relaxation for several hours on those days from their work during the remainder of the week. Except for the flood periods when this stabilization plan could not be effective, sportsmen generally were fairly well satisfied with the results.

There has been some concern among sportsmen of the transition of the 9-foot channel system from one designed for navigation to one intended to act as a series of water reservoirs for the benefit of navigation on the lower reaches of the river during the winter months. We have noticed this tendency of transition since the enactment of the recent Flood Control Act.

We resent, we repeat, any such transition. What we want is stabilized waters. We want to protect some of the common men's heritage of conservation that has been handed down through the generations for those yet to come.

We have been informed, too, and the statement is credited to a representative of the United States Army engineers, that if all of the pools in the 9-foot channel system were drawn down to their original open river status, there would be only 2 feet of water provided for the chain of rocks at St. Louis for a period of only about 2 weeks.

On December 20, 1945, the St. Paul district office of the United States Army engineers sent out to newspapers, conservation agencies, and others interested a notice of the intention to draw down the 9-foot-channel pools, beginning December 22. These notices claimed the Missouri River, because of ice gorges, was not providing adequate flowage for navigation on the lower river.

The late notice gave the States no time to prepare for any measures to counteract damage to conservation interest that might result.

Following is an official protest from the Wisconsin members of the Water Use Council:

"MADISON, WIS.—Conservation interests are receiving no consideration in Army engineers' management of the upper Mississippi River and the upper end of the Father of Waters may well be on its way to a 'biological desert' unless public demand intervenes, the Wisconsin members of the Upper Mississippi River Waters Use Council declared today.

"The Wisconsin members are Adolph Kanneberg, Dr. Edward Schneberger and M. W. Torkelson.

"The Wisconsin members said that Maj. H. J Manger, district engineer at St. Paul, issued a notice on December 20, that conservation on the Upper Mississippi must yield when navigation interests operating on the lower river want the water stored in the upper river pools. All of the 10 pools from Hastings at the mouth of the St. Croix to Cassville near the Illinois line will be drawn down between December 22 and January 1, according to Major Manger.

"'The United States engineers are acting in willful disregard of conservation on that part of the river directly affected by the draw-downs, and attempting to justify their arbitrary action by statements that are hypocritical if not worse,' said the Wisconsin Council members.

"'How', asked the Wisconsin men, 'can a notice issued on December 20, give any notice that will make it possible to prepare for draw-downs beginning on December 22, and continuing through the holiday season, especially in view of the labor shortage? And even if longer notice were given, how could fish rescue work be carried out through the ice which will remain lodged in the shallow pools after the draw-downs? Any effective work would be impossible. The United States engineers have the further effrontery to claim that the advantages to fish and wildlife due to canalization are considerable, even with the winter draw-downs. Such a claim would be only ridiculous if it were not made by the United States engineers who have the power and seemingly the disposition to do what they will with the river in total disregard of everything except navigation on its ice-free portion.

"'The people interested in conservation on the upper Mississippi must realize that they will have to fight for it, otherwise reconcile themselves to the barrenness of a biological desert, where there once was an abundance of game fish, fur bearers, and migratory water fowl.'"

Under date of December 4, 1945, Lt. Gen. R. A. Wheeler, Chief of Engineers, United States War Department, wrote United States Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR., as follows:

"This winter season no water will be released for power purposes over and above normal discharges and withdrawals required for navigation. Further, in recognition of fish and wildlife interests, the upper navigation pools will be gradually lowered to predetermined levels when and as needed, and they will not be raised and again lowered except as may result from the unpredictable natural increase or decrease in stream flow. The time and the extent of lowering the pools will depend to a large degree on temperature and stream-flow conditions."

We submit herewith, in answer to General Wheeler, a table from the United States Weather Bureau which shows the levels of the various pools prior to the draw-down, and the amount of water that was drained from them. General Wheeler maintained that the pools would be gradually lowered. At the Genoa, Wis., Dam, which creates the pool in front of La Crosse, the draw-down in 1 night was 3.1 feet.

Weather Bureau table follows:

Mean sea-level elevations, Mississippi River pools L/D No. 3 to No. 10, 1945–46

Pool	Normal mean sea level elevation	Reading, Dec. 1, 1945	Reading, Dec. 31, 1945	Lowest first January week, 1946	Draw-down (feet)
No. 3	675.00	674.48	670.19	(1)	[2] −4.3
No. 4	667.00	666.40	663.10	(1)	[2] −3.3
No. 5	660.00	659.34	657.27	(1)	[2] −2.1
No. 5–A	651.00	650.33	647.89	(1)	[2] −2.4
No. 6	645.50	645.00	641.58	[3] 640.48	[4] [5] −4.5
No. 7	639.00	638.90	635.93	[3] 631.27	[4] [5] −7.6
No. 8	631.00	629.89	624.57	[3] 624.33	[4] [5] −5.6
No. 9	620.00	619.28	616.70	[3] 615.98	[4] [5] −3.4
No. 10	611.00	610.84	608.94	[3] 608.94	[4] [5] −1.9

[1] Reports not available until end of month.

[2] This represents the maximum draw-down for the month of December 1945, i. e., December variation.

[3] These are the lowest readings taken the first week in January 1946 and lower than those in December 1945.

[4] This represents the maximum draw-down from the 1st of December until the lowest point reached when drained. All elevations are in mean sea level, 1912 level adjustment net.

[5] The maximum draw-down figures given must be considered as those taken directly above the lock walls and do not represent the fall at any distance above it. The greater the distance upstream from the dam, the less this fall becomes until it reaches the control point where the least change occurs. For example the greatest drop at Lansing, Iowa, which is the control point of pool No. 9 was only 0.9 foot. The greatest draw-down at the city of La Crosse, Wis. (control point of dam No. 8) was 1.4 feet.

In the same letter, General Wheeler said:

"During the war the lowering of the upper Mississippi pools throughout the winter months, as an emergency means to insure passage of essential war traffic on the middle Mississippi, may have resulted in the destruction of some fish and wildlife. Investigation has disclosed, however, that visible evidence of such losses has been small. In addition to the withdrawals for navigation, water was released in the interest of power production at the request of the war agencies concerned."

We take exception to the statement that visible evidences of such losses has been small. We question the source of information, if any.

We can produce persons we believe to be experts, because of their positions in conservation fields, to dispute the claim. We can

produce, also testimony of an almost unlimited number of sportsmen to contradict the assertion.

In the same letter previously mentioned, General Wheeler said:

"In accordance with agreements heretofore made with the fish and wildlife and other conservation interests, all known Federal and State conservation agencies will be informed in advance of the time of actual lowering of the navigation pools. This advance notice made possible the organization of fish-rescue crews if the conservation agencies believe fish will be stranded in shallow pools by the intended operation. Further since conservation interests have advised that the loss of fish occurs primarily because of the rapid change in water surface elevation, the pools are generally lowered at a rate not exceeding one-half foot per day which is not as rapid as would occur under natural conditions."

We reiterate a statement previously made by us in this communication that the St. Paul district office of the United States engineers issued the notice of intention to draw-down the pools on December 20, the draw-down to begin as of December 22. State agencies will tell you they had no time to make any preparations for it.

Badger State Sportsmen's Club wants to emphasize that it filed no protests during the winters of 1943 and 1944 when the United States Army engineers said, and later did, lower the pools to aid wartime navigation on the middle and lower Mississippi. We felt it was the patriotic thing to do, although it meant great losses in the field of conservation on the upper river. Now, with the war over, we feel that conservation should have its inning and should have all the attention possible that can be paid it by the United States Government and its innumerable agencies, including the United States Army engineers, and the several States.

It is our contention that the rapid drawing down of the pools caused countless fish of all species to be stranded in landlocked areas, to smother in water that became stagnant, or to suffocate by being pressed into the mud by the heavy ice.

We submit, too, that the draw-down has been detrimental to our muskrat population, which began to reappear in the established marsh areas during the past year in very limited numbers after being almost annihilated the preceding 2 years.

Sportsmen and State crews are making an effort to remove fish trapped in landlocked areas, returning them to free water. The frozen slush and snow covering the thick ice make it extremely difficult to locate any appreciable number of these landlocked areas.

We question the sincerity, and are probably joined by some State and Federal conservation agencies, in the statement of General Wheeler, made in the above-mentioned letter to Senator LA FOLLETTE, that:

"The department is fully cognizant of the importance of protecting fish and wildlife resources in the upper Mississippi Valley and is cooperating closely with Federal and State conservation agencies. For example, joint studies are under way to determine the best order of lowering the pools in the light of ice conditions so as to protect wildlife, such as muskrats. Such lowering of the pools as may be necessary, whether partial or to natural river level, is determined after careful consideration of the effect of the lowered water levels on all interests and facilities, including fish and wildlife, sewers, water-supply intakes, navigation structures, tributaries of the river, levee districts, existing power developments, railroads, and other features. The Department recognizes that any substantial lowering of these pools is undesirable, and every effort will be made to keep the draw-downs to the absolute minimum consistent with the needs of navigation."

We believe that the numerous conferences held between the United States Army engineers and State and Federal conservation agencies to have been wasted time.

Sportsmen's groups along the upper Mississippi were not consulted, nor was there any effort made to confer with them as to the actual existing facts.

We believe that the United States Army engineers, through their policies of operating the upper Mississippi River 9-foot channel, are trying to camouflage the conservation situation.

We as sportsmen of the Mississippi Valley are becoming disgusted with this situation and want definite action for the protection of our conservation pursuits, both for the generations of today and those to come.

Capt. C. F. Culler, formerly superintendent of the entire Mississippi Valley area for the United States Bureau of Fisheries and now fisheries director of the Minneapolis region of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, said when the 9-foot channel was being built that fishing would gradually fade out within 15 years after the channel system was placed in operation.

Ray C. Steele, Winona, Minn., superintendent of the upper Mississippi fish and wildlife refuge of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, has repeatedly warned at public hearings and other conservation meetings of the dangers of winter draw-downs of pools to muskrats and other animals.

In this connection, we understand the United States Army engineers still have considerable land in the Mississippi Valley bottomlands, acquired for flowage, seepage, and other purposes, which has not been turned over to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. We advocate that this be done, so that the conservation interests come under one general administrative department. As it is now, applications for buildings and permits to use some of the lands in the bottoms are filed with both the engineers and refuge office. In some instances, the agencies are working at cross purposes and not to the best general interests of conservation.

We have found that some of the pool areas are beginning to fill up with silt from the numerous tributaries, but that the winter draw-downs of the past 3 seasons have flushed out to some degree the silt in the main channel. Our observations as sportsmen have been made while on fishing expeditions and through our knowledge of conditions as we have found them, both now and before the 9-foot channel.

One of the most glaring illustrations of the effect of high water-impounding dams on conservation is contained in a booklet by Dr. Ellis of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service on the basis of his findings during an exhaustive investigation a few years ago at Lake Cooper, created by the Mississippi River dam at Keokuk, Iowa. He found fish life there had been drastically depreciated and the lake area filled in substantially by silt.

As sportsmen who help pay the Nation's bills, we want to know if we have to submit to the destruction of our conservation resources of the upper Mississippi while the United States Army engineers pursue what they are pleased to call investigations.

As sportsmen, we are appealing to the Congress of the United States for legislation that will bring about the stabilized water-level condition we seek for the upper Mississippi River.

We appeal to Members of the Congress to arrange for hearings by either full or subgroups of the conservation committee or other committees of the House having jurisdiction over our problem.

We would like to have a hearing in La Crosse, and would arrange for testimony from experts in the field of conservation, recreation, waterways, and other fields concerned with the stabilization plan, as well as property owners, that would require two or more days for presentation. We believe the same committee also should hold a hearing along similar lines in Winona, Minn., to receive the opinions of Minnesota sportsmen and conservation leaders.

We appeal to you to help in the establishment of future water stabilization in the upper Mississippi River 9-foot channel system.

Respectfully,
BADGER STATE SPORTSMEN'S CLUB, INC.,
ALFRED W. RICE, *Chairman*,
Dr. J. M. SPIKA,
Dr. H. A. BARGE,
HENRY KREUZER,
FERDINAND KLICH,
Legislative Committee.

What Communists Stand For

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1946

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein statements appearing in the Monitor, of Concord, N. H., of February 8, 1946, on what Communists stand for.

Let us as true and loyal Americans read this platform. In it will be found the roots of much that is happening in the United States today.

The statements follow:

COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA

EDITOR, MONITOR-PATRIOT:

We thought the enclosed excerpts from a Communist propaganda pamphlet now being circulated throughout Europe might be of interest.

Each avowed Communist—including Mrs. Elba Chase Nelson, chairman of the Communist Party of New Hampshire—is recognized as one of the most effective instruments for circulating the latest published creed of communism and the well-recognized 10 commandments of communism which Mike O'Dessa, who has followed the Communist party line for years for the purpose of exposing it to public gaze, has taken verbatim from one of the pamphlets.

Mrs. Nelson, whose attention has been frequently called to the current Red party line, has chosen to remain mute when requested to comment anent Red party purposes, although she has, from time to time, sent you handouts about the right of labor to strike and similar platitudes. Your readers could get a good slant on the prolonging of the present labor struggle if they could be informed of the fancy salaries being drawn by the miscalled labor leaders who not only do not labor but cannot lead the workers anywhere except behind the "8-ball" of lowered income and lost purchasing power.

MICHAEL F. O'TOOLE.

CREED OF COMMUNISM

(By Mike O'Dessa)

I. All Communists know that "to bolshevize" means to "liberate humanity from the slavery created by centuries of Christian barbarities";

II. "To free humanity from the concept of religion";

III. "To free humanity from the concept of national authority"; and

IV. "To free humanity from the concept of private property."

(a) All Communists must remember that our purpose is "to bolshevize the world, no matter how much the cost or in what way";

(b) The task of each individual Communist is "to bolshevize your own surrounding group";

(c) Each such individual knows that his or her task necessarily has "to be limited for the moment"; and

(d) It is the duty of each Communist "to give the working man and woman the illusion that only Communists are free and that only Communist membership and action can free him and her."

COMMANDMENTS OF COMMUNISM—SO-CALLED "DECALOG"

1. Do not manifest the purpose of communism to immature companions.

2. Struggle against those—especially the hypocritical priests, ministers, and rabbis—who say what is more or less true about communism, by denying emphatically that we are opposed to religion, family, and private property.

3. Show with jokes, sarcasm, cynicism, and with a more pleased and happier show of conduct how you are freer without the impediments of religion, making it understood that we who live without religion live better and do more freely what we wish to do.

4. Destroy morals, teaching the inexperienced; create a milieu satiated with that which the clergy of all sects call immorality.

5. Always remove your companions farther from their religion by any and all means, but especially by putting priests, ministers, and rabbis in as bad a light as possible.

6. Destroy the family—especially the Christian family—by planting ideas about freedom in marriage, showing divorce as a more human way of life, and encouraging your people to love, love freely, free love.

7. Educate workers, especially the young ones, to be intolerant of any and all authority, especially police authority.

8. Encourage workers to participate in disorders, to use of brute force, to revenge, and not to have a fear of bloodshed.

9. Be at the forefront in rendering small services to workers; speak loudly and make yourself heard in their behalf; impose yourself into their midst; hide the good which others do for them and make it appear as if you did it; and, to enlist such workers in our cause, be in the forefront of all labor movements and organized opposition to parliamentary proceedings.

10. Struggle constantly against all priests, ministers, and rabbis; against their religions, the morals of all religions, and against their religious organizations and institutions.

Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include the script of a radio program, Congressional Record on the Air, which contains a discussion of housing legislation. It was broadcast over the Mutual network and Washington Station WOL at 8:30 p. m. February 18:

Mr. STUDNEY. From the Nation's Capital you are about to hear the one hundred and thirty-fourth broadcast of Congressional Record on the Air. This well-known public-service feature brings you each week a Member of Congress in a discussion and interview on a subject of national interest. Tonight our guest is a Member of the House of Representatives. He will be introduced to you now by Matthew Warren, ace radio reporter.

Mr. WARREN. Thank you, Ed Studney, and good evening, ladies and gentlemen. For the first time in decades, the house wanted and apartments wanted ads in the classified section of the country's newspapers exceed the house and apartments for rent ads. Across the broad breadth of this land, here in America, the land of abundance, there exists one of the most acute housing shortages in our history—with new housing construction at a standstill since almost the beginning of the war, and with an expanding population the housing shortage is rapidly becoming America's No. 1 problem.

In every city, in every town, in almost every hamlet, it seems the burning question of the day is, "Where can I find a place to live?" And almost unfortunately the man who asks the question most often is a returning GI. American soldiers, sailors, marines, Air Corps men fighting for 1, 2, 3, 4 years to make this a better place in which to live, are coming back. To what? They are coming back to an endless vain search for a place to live; a far cry, indeed, from the pious promises of a year ago. What are we going to do about it? Congress seems to be aroused, for in the House of Representatives as far back as November 20, 1945, one Congressman introduced a bill designed to cure some of the housing headaches; that bill is now being considered by the House Banking and Currency Committee. The author of that bill is our guest on this broadcast of Congressional Record on the Air. He is the far-sighted Representative who long before demobilization envisioned the housing chaos of today. He is Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, Chairman of the House Committee on Small Business and a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee. At this time, Congressman PATMAN will make a brief address on the housing situation, following which he has agreed to answer some of our questions. It is indeed a pleasure to introduce now Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas.

Congressman PATMAN. Thank you, Mr. Warren. I first became concerned with the housing situation late last summer when the War Department announced the speed-up of its demobilization program. It was announced that nearly 3,000,000 men coming home from the war fronts would be looking for homes, and it was quite obvious that, with our already overcrowded conditions, there was going to be no place to put them. The National Housing Administration had estimated that the Nation was some 12,000,000 homes short of the number needed to house our population. And it was generally conceded that our maximum capacity to build was only about 400,000 homes a year.

In addition to this, prices were skyrocketing. National surveys estimated that home prices had jumped 50 percent during the war years. However, in the medium and low-cost homes, the kind we could logically expect our veterans to buy, there was more than a 100-percent increase. Considering these facts, it was obvious that thousands of our veterans would be sleeping in the streets unless something could be done. That was my motive for introducing the housing bill which will come to a vote in the House of Representatives this week.

The measure has a simple objective: To provide the maximum number of homes for our returning servicemen at a price that they can afford to pay. I felt that the crisis was so near and the task of providing these homes so tremendous that only a bold and energetic attack could begin to meet the housing shortage. Therefore, I proposed that the Government and the building industry, working together, attack the housing situation the same way we met similar problems of scarcity during the war.

My housing bill is a legislative foundation upon which the President's housing program will be built. It provides for the appointment of a housing expediter with broad powers to issue directives to other agencies so as to concentrate the Government's attack on the problem. It sets up a priority program to channel scarce building materials into housing for veterans. It also provided for ceiling prices on new and existing homes. It permits the housing expediter to use subsidies as they were used during the war to increase production of building materials. The life of the bill was to be until December 31, 1947—some 18 months. I believe that, if passed, the bill will enable us to meet the President's housing goal of 3,000,000 houses in 2 years, and will provide homes for more of our veterans.

That's all the bill does, Mr. Warren.

Mr. WARREN. Thank you, Mr. PATMAN. There are some points I would like to clear up. Suppose I am a veteran, just returned from overseas. How do I get a house under this program?

Mr. PATMAN. It's fairly simple. You obtain a veteran's priority certificate, work up your plans and specifications with a builder, or you can do it yourself, and take it to your nearest Federal Housing Administration district office. That office is charged with approving your application, helping you to arrange financing, and obtaining a priority certificate to get your building materials. Then you can go ahead and build the house.

Mr. WARREN. Still supposing I am this veteran—how much can I expect to pay for a home?

Mr. PATMAN. That depends, of course, in what section of the country you are living. I intend to offer an amendment to my bill on the House floor establishing a yardstick of $6,000. However, the housing expediter could raise this ceiling in any area where special circumstances, such as higher building costs, would make it necessary. Under this proposal, a house in Washington, for instance, could cost you approximately $7,500. In New York it might go as high as $8,000 in some expensive sections. But it would be a flexible rule, under which the builder could make a profit, and yet give the veteran a home at the lowest possible cost.

Mr. WARREN. That sounds encouraging, Mr. PATMAN. But I haven't seen many places advertised recently that I could buy for $6,000. How do you expect to keep prices to that minimum?

Mr. PATMAN. In the New York area, unquestionably new homes are going to cost the veteran a little above $6,000. However, professional FHA and Veterans' Administration appraisers will be scrutinizing these loan applications to see to it that the estimated building cost and the estimated selling price are reasonable. In other words, speaking frankly, these experts will see to it that the veteran gets his money's worth.

Mr. WARREN. But suppose I'm not a veteran. I'm just an ordinary citizen who must have a place to stay, or who wants to buy a house. Can I get one?

Mr. PATMAN. In the early months of the program, I am afraid you would have to step aside and give the veteran who has been overseas for 4 years first chance. However, there is considerable reason to hope that once we get production rolling on the scale that is being planned that the nonveteran will be able to get building materials to some extent.

Mr. WARREN. Getting back to this question again of the $6,000 ceiling. Suppose I am a veteran and I want a better house than that. Say I have saved my overseas pay and

can afford a $10,000 home. Can I build one under this program?

Mr. PATMAN. I think you will be able to, if your $10,000 home is actually worth $10,000. The control which will be exercised under this priorities program is more to prevent a real-estate speculator from selling a veteran a $5,000 home for $10,000—not so much to stop the veteran from buying a house he can afford. All of us know that many veterans today are being squeezed into paying exorbitant prices for second-rate homes by some unscrupulous dealers. That's what we want to put a stop to.

Mr. WARREN. How about this proposed ceiling price on existing homes, Mr. PATMAN? It seems to me that it's a very unfair proposition, perhaps, to force me to sell my home for less than I paid for it.

Mr. PATMAN. That is one of the most important points in my bill. Under the formula, I propose the present owner could sell his home for any price he could get for it. However, that selling price would become an automatic ceiling price for the duration of the housing emergency—some 18 months. There has been more misunderstanding on that than any other phase of the legislation. It does completely protect the present home owner—its only purpose is to hold down speculative resales, which have ballooned prices to such dangerous levels. I do not see how anyone, knowing the danger of inflation which faces us, could be opposed to that provision. Especially since it is for such a comparatively short period of time.

Mr. WARREN. Congressman PATMAN, many young couples have dreamed for the past few years about the home they were going to build when the war was over. What can they do about building a home to their own specifications?

Mr. PATMAN. If the mister of the household—or the missus, for that matter—happens to be a veteran, they follow the same procedure as I have outlined, by going to their local FHA office. However, if neither husband nor wife has been in the armed services, they probably will have to wait for a few more months, until the more needy of the veterans are housed.

Mr. WARREN. For my part, I venture to say that most of us will agree to step aside temporarily in favor of the returning GI. However, there is another point. You speak of the magnitude of this program. How many actual houses do you think will be built under the President's proposal?

Mr. PATMAN. Personally, I am quite confident that we can meet our goal of 2,700,000 houses by the end of 1947. To many professional builders and others acquainted with the enormous production problems involved, this figure perhaps sounds fantastic. Many of us thought the same thing when President Roosevelt called for the production of 50,000 airplanes and thousands of other items needed for war. However, I believe this goal can only be obtained if we use every resource available as boldly and energetically as we used our industrial potential to attack these war problems.

Industry and the Government must pull together. Many sacrifices must be made. Some types of building must wait. But we do have an exceedingly able man in Mr. Wilson Wyatt, the Housing Expediter. If he is given the proper support it can be done.

Mr. WARREN. Congressman PATMAN, during the war in many of the war-production centers, trailer coaches filled a very serious gap as emergency housing. Do you think there is a possibility trailer coaches again might serve as housing in the peacetime emergency?

Mr. PATMAN. I certainly do. There is a place for them in the President's program. Many returned servicemen—particularly those who are going to school under the GI bill of rights—are neither ready nor willing to settle down and purchase a home. The house trailer supplies an ideal answer to this veteran's problem. Several universities already are providing modern trailer sites in anticipation of hundreds of their GI students using trailers as university living quarters.

Mr. WARREN. Congressman PATMAN, do you think there is any chance for the construction of additional homes from free sources of material, or will all supplies be channeled into the housing program?

Mr. PATMAN. Bluntly speaking, if the program is carried out as intensively as it needs to be, I doubt seriously whether much additional building can be done. Much depends upon the speed with which we can get production rolling, and that, in turn, depends upon the willingness of Congress to grant subsidy funds that will be needed.

Mr. WARREN. That is a point, Congressman, on which I have heard considerable criticism. I understand Mr. Wyatt wants nearly half a billion dollars of the taxpayers' money to spend on this program. That's a lot of money. What are you going to do with it?

Mr. PATMAN. I think much of the success or failure of the entire housing program depends on whether or not this subsidy fund is provided. At the present time it has been stricken from the bill, and I intend to offer an amendment restoring it from the floor.

This subsidy fund may well be used in the same fashion that similar funds were used during the war, to spur production of materials. Let us take a concrete example. A small brick plant has high operative costs, low-paid workers, or some other factor that makes cost of production so high it cannot compete in the market. The RFC would be authorized to pay this plant their premium price for their bricks. This money would go into more wages, more manpower, more material, to increase its production. During the war our experience was that once this production is stepped up, a factory's cost per unit drops to the point where the subsidy is no longer necessary, and the plant continues at top speed.

Of course, there are two ways of getting this increased production—by price increases and by subsidies. We estimate that $1 of subsidy will bring the same benefit as $3 of price increase, so that subsidies will be the cheaper method of obtaining production. However, in some instances incentive price increases, particularly in lumber, are expected to be given. In this program capacity production is the principal goal.

Mr. WARREN. Thank you very much, Congressman PATMAN. You are to be complimented indeed on your spearheading of this highly worthy and most essential objective in the House of Representatives, and it goes without saying that with our appreciation goes our best wishes for your every success. We appreciate the time you have taken tonight from your busy day to discuss these matters with our Congressional Record on the Air listeners.

Committee on Un-American Activities

REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1946

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to refer to the statement made by Prof. Clyde R. Miller, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of Friday, February 15, 1946, on the subject of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

This article quoted from a resolution passed by the board of directors of the Greater New York Federation of Churches. The resolution attacked the committee for its "continuous interference with the freedom of our citizens," and for the "irresponsible and un-American utterances of its most vocal spokesman, Representative RANKIN." The resolution further cited an alleged remark by Mr. Nicklas, a former investigator for the committee, in the presence of Chief Counsel Ernie Adamson, to Prof. Clyde Miller.

As Mr. Nicklas has not been with the Committee on Un-American Activities for the past 6 months, I inquired of Mr. Adamson as to whether there was any truth to the remark, as reported by Professor Miller, and Mr. Adamson said that he knew nothing of any private conversation between Mr. Nicklas and Professor Miller, but that any statement by Professor Miller that such a remark was made in the presence of Mr. Adamson was downright false.

Having no intention of letting the matter stop at that point, I decided to search further, so I checked on Professor Miller's record with the files of the Dies committee, and using the Communist Daily Worker, the Communist New Masses among the references as my source, I find that Professor Miller has had a long record of Communist affiliations, the most prominent being, and I refer to the Daily Worker of March 5, 1941, that Professor Miller was a signer of the statement to President Roosevelt, defending the Communist Party and prior to this, the Daily Worker of July 23, 1940, showed Professor Miller as a signer of an open letter to President Roosevelt, protesting against the attack on the right of the Communist Party to use the ballot.

The complete record of Professor Miller's Communist affiliations as taken from the Dies files, is as follows:

CLYDE R. MILLER

American Civil Liberties Union; signer of letter supporting Gerson; Daily Worker, March 4, 1938, page 1.

American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom; member, national committee; letterhead, September 22, 1939.

American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom; member, New York committee; letterhead, December 1, 1939.

American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom; took stand against Columbia University's president, Nicholas M. Butler, on his views; New Masses, October 15, 1940, page 17.

American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom; signer of appeal on behalf of anti-Fascist refugees trapped in France, sent to Cordell Hull; Daily Worker, July 22, 1940, page 1, column 5.

American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, signer, open letter of five-point program to aid refugees, sent to Secretary of State Hull; Daily Worker, July 25, 1940, page 2, column 3.

American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom; signer of open letter to Nicholas Murray Butler denouncing pro-war stand; Daily Worker, October 7, 1940, page 3.

American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom-Executive Committee; signer of letter of protest to Nicholas Murray Butler; Daily Worker, October 12, 1940, page 4.

American Federation of Teachers; denouncing red-baiting; Daily Worker, January 6, 1939, page 5.

Appeal to lift Spanish embargo; speaker; Daily Worker, February 4, 1939, page 2.

Associated Film Audiences; member, executive board; undated letterhead.

Boaz letter on Franco in reply to Sedgwick; signer; Daily Worker, March 8, 1938, page 2.

China Aid Council; sponsor; letterhead, May 18, 1938.

Communist Party; signer of the statement to the President defending the Communist Party; Daily Worker, March 5, 1941, page 2.

Conference on Pan-American Democracy; signer of call; News You Don't Get, November 15, 1938.

Conference on Pan-American; sponsor; letterhead, November 16, 1938.

Consumers Union; sponsor; undated circular.

Daily Worker, signer of statement against Franco spy ring; Daily Worker, May 12, 1937, page 1.

Descendants of the American Revolution; member; Daily Worker, February 13, 1939, page 2.

Descendants of the American Revolution; sponsor; pamphlet, Descendants of the American Revolution, back page.

Film Audiences for Democracy; member, executive committee; Film Survey, June 1939, page 4.

Films for Democracy; member, executive committee; Films for Democracy, April 1939, page 2.

In Defense of the Bill of Rights; signer; In Defense of the Bill of Rights, a circular, page 2.

League of American Writers; signer, open letter to Secretary Cordell Hull and the Pan-American Conference; Daily Worker, July 31, 1940, page 7.

Lincoln's Birthday Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom; speaker; Daily Worker, February 13, 1939, page 1.

Open letter to President Roosevelt; signer, protest attack on right of Communist Party to use ballot; Daily Worker, July 23, 1940, page 1, column 6.

The Soviet Union and Present World Affairs, meeting at Mecca Temple Auditorium; sponsor; Daily Worker, March 22, 1938, page 2.

Priorities for Veterans

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1946

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there is a very strong editorial in the Washington Post this morning regarding the purchase of Government houses by veterans, like the McLean Gardens housing project for the use of the veterans. Mr. Speaker, it is important to pass legislation along this line in order that the rights and the priorities of the veterans be respected. Certain properties, apparently, under existing legislation can be sold to veterans and priorities given the veterans. There was a question under the Surplus Property Act, under paragraph 23, as to whether the veterans could be considered because the District of Columbia is excluded and war housing is excluded. Certainly we must pass legislation to make possible the purchase of housing facilities by veterans. The Surplus Property Act must be amended.

[From the Washington Post of February 19, 1946]

HOMES FOR VETERANS

As we read the regulations on surplus property disposal, veterans have a right to buy housing projects built by the Government during the war. The rule laid down by the Surplus Property Administrator as to the prices they shall pay is as follows:

"Veterans and the spouse and children of deceased servicemen shall be entitled to purchase surplus real property at a price not to exceed a unit price fixed by the disposal agency after taking into consideration the current market value, the character of the property, and, if income-producing, the estimated earning capacity thereof."

Yet the Defense Homes Corporation has rejected the bid of the Veterans Cooperative Housing Association for McLean Gardens and is apparently preparing to sell this choice wartime project to the highest bidder, probably a speculative real estate operator. It may be that the $9,000,000 bid of the veterans' co-op was too low. As to that, we do not know. But the co-op is now asking Defense Homes and the National Housing Agency to put its own fair value on the property, thus giving the co-op a chance to meet it before any deal with other prospective purchasers is consummated. That seems to be in line with what Congress had in mind when it provided priorities for veterans in the disposal of surplus property. We understand that war housing projects have already been sold to veterans' groups under similar arrangements in Ohio and Utah.

The question of wholesale dispossession of existing tenants does not arise, for the veterans' co-op has agreed not to disturb families now living at McLean Gardens. Apartments there are becoming vacant at the rate of about 40 or 50 a month, and these would be turned over to veterans' families as vacancies occur.

It is true, of course, that the National Housing Agency got a special order from the Surplus Property Administrator for the disposition of six war-housing projects in the Washington metropolitan area without waiting for the exercise of priorities. The excuse was "to take advantage of a present favorable market." We think, however, that there are larger considerations in the disposal of these properties than a favorable market. Where veterans have a prior right to buy them at fair market values, that right should be respected. The public interest in seeing that our defenders are properly housed is certainly greater than making a few dollars' profit out of wartime housing projects.

Housing Shortage in the Detroit Area

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1946

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute on the housing shortage in the Detroit area and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have just returned from Detroit, Mich., where, with Representatives GEORGE SADOWSKI and FRANK HOOK, I have conducted informal hearings on the housing problems of that area.

The hearings were held February 14 and 15, and testimony was presented by representatives of industry, labor, Government, and the public at large on the various blocks and hindrances to the provision of sufficient and adequate shelter to meet the urgent needs of veteran and nonveteran alike.

At the conclusion of the hearings I prepared a summary report containing recommendations based upon testimony and information gained at the hearings. This statement was released to the press at the conclusion of the hearings.

The hearings we have just concluded on Detroit's housing problems have proven to be of great value. The people of the Detroit area have been most constructive in their statements during the hearings. They have given their Representatives in the Congress a clearer insight on the whole of the problem. Industry, labor, local government, and the public at large all indicated in their testimony that solution of the many complex problems involved was a responsibility of the Federal Government.

It was clear that the local governments could not cope with the situation.

It was clear that the local home-building industry's activities were at a standstill.

It was clear that dangerous inflationary trends in prices of used houses and vacant residential land were in evidence.

It was clear that only by the same bold and forthright action which characterized our war-production effort would this problem be solved.

And finally, it was clear that the vast bulk of the people in the Detroit metropolitan area expect this same kind of action from their Government in Washington on this problem. They want and expect quick action on the program submitted to the President on February 7 by Wilson W. Wyatt; they want and expect the prompt passage of the excellent Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill; they want and expect passage of the Mitchell-Kilgore veterans' housing bill; they want and expect passage of a modified Patman housing stabilization bill which will take into account present inflationary costs of vacant residential land.

It is my considered judgment that the people of the Detroit area and the people of the entire nation who are urgently in need of decent shelter, and especially our returning veterans, have a right to expect their Government—their Congress to act on this most vital matter of housing—and to act immediately; to pass the legislation I have mentioned and any other measure needed to implement the excellent program proposed by National Housing Administrator Wilson W. Wyatt.

For my part I shall bend every effort and exert every influence at my command in the direction of securing prompt and favorable action by the Congress on these measures. I have every confidence that my colleagues from Michigan, Representatives DINGELL, O'BRIEN, HOOK, RABAUT, and SADOWSKI, share this view with me.

The time for action on these measures was yesterday. They should have been law today. We cannot do anything to make up the time lost but we can prevent further delays by acting now—today.

Army Stops the Press

REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1946

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the Army, in order to keep from enlisted men its failure, lies, inefficiency, and the fraud it has practiced on the parents of enlisted men, has now gagged the voice of enlisted men in the South Pacific. The serviceman's paper is not even permitted to print Associated Press and United Press dispatches. Our country has always believed in the freedom of the press and we are denying to our own people the things for which we fought. Mr. Speaker, how long is the President going to carry out such a policy through the armed forces, of which he is the Commander in Chief?

I am including a statement from the Daily Pacifican that has just come to me through the mails from a serviceman in the South Pacific, which prohibited the publishing of the names of the Members of the Congress of the United States:

[From the Manila Chronicle of January 12]

DAILY PACIFICAN IS GAGGED

Thirty-three members of the staff of the Daily Pacifican, United States Army newspaper published in Manila, last night issued the following statement disclosing that severe editorial restrictions and limitations have been imposed on the newspaper.

The members of the staff of the Daily Pacifican have received many inquiries in the last few days asking what has happened to the Daily Pacifican. Our integrity as journalists and our loyalty to the democratic principles for which this war was fought impel us to make the following declaration, which embodies the views of the enlisted men on the staff:

"New restrictions on freedom of expression imposed from above no longer enable us to bring full news and truth to our readers. To keep faith with our readers who have come to expect adequate news coverage and the truth as we see it, from the columns of the Daily Pacifican we are compelled to announce that our hands are tied. As loyal soldiers we execute orders as they are received, but our readers and the American public are entitled to know that orders from 'high above' prevent us from any longer keeping our readers fully informed. It has never been our intention to do anything but keep our readers abreast of the news and serve the best interest of the Army. Under the new limitations, Mail Bag, which has given voice to the views of the GI as he expressed them and as he saw events, has already been subjected to severe editorial restrictions and limitations. We have been denied the right even to print Associated Press and United Press dispatches if they reflect any criticism or dissatisfaction whatever with the official policies of the War Department and our theater commanders. In short, we are prohibited from publishing the whole truth.

"On January 10, 1946, after page 2 was completely made up, we had to remake a new page upon the order of the command, which prohibited us from publishing a list of all the Members of the United States Congress in response to numerous requests by phone and mail to Mail Bag.

"As soldiers we carry out our orders, as citizens and as journalists we tell the truth to the entire world."

RESTRICTIONS PLACED ALSO ON FAMED JOURNAL STARS AND STRIPES

HONOLULU, January 11.—Military censorship finally came to the Honolulu edition of the Stars and Stripes, outspoken Army newspaper, as GI criticism of the demobilization program flared throughout the Pacific.

Stars and Stripes was forbidden Thursday by Lt. Gen. Robert C. Richardson, commanding general of the mid-Pacific, to make any discourteous references to the President, the Secretary of War, the Chief of Staff, or any others in authority in the Army. It was also forbidden to publish soldiers' letters which could be construed to be discourteous or derogatory to authority.

The order holds the paper's staff strictly responsible and subject to disciplinary action for violations, but exempts news received from news services (Tokyo AP).

Twenty-six members of the Pacific Stars and Stripes published here charged today the Army newspaper had been usurped in the present "demobilization crisis" and converted into a "house organ for the War Department."

Increased Cost of Living

REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL STEWART

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1946

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I called attention of the House to the disturbed condition of the farmers in a county of my own district. In this morning's mail I received a resolution from the Independent Patriotic Farmers of Logan County, Okla., petitioning the Oklahoma delegation to protect the innocent public by drastic action because our Nation is torn by strikes and lock-outs, and management and labor cannot or will not get together and make settlement of their differences.

The farmers in this agricultural county go on record unequivocably favoring the provisions of the Case bill in its original form.

With some of the major strikes settled by granting an increase to labor and $5 a ton to steel, no one has taken into account the cost to the farmers of producing food. Any reasonable man would know that an approved increase in the price of organized labor and materials that have to be purchased by the farmers in the form of equipment to plant, cultivate, and harvest their crops should be accompanied by an increase in the price of farm commodities.

We have as yet not been able to fathom the most recent ceiling placed on cotton as a raw material for the making of clothing and many other items. Apparently the ones responsible know little or nothing about the food and feed values of the byproducts of cotton. With the agreed increase to organized labor and to the steel manufacturers, a new schedule of increased prices for farm commodities should be approved.

It is our opinion that the farmers in the agricultural States are ready to fight the devil with fire. That is to say, if strikers in industry can deprive the world of such needed articles of housing and husbandry, the farmers can withhold their products from the market, also. We all know it has neven been the disposition of a farmer to go on strike, but should events take such a course, then labor and industry will realize that the farmer can do without new farm machinery a great deal easier than they can do without food.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution passed by the farmers of Logan County is as follows:

We, the Independent Patriotic Farmers of Logan County, hereby call on all farmers of Logan County to join us with the rest of the State and Nation in calling on the Congress to enact legislation which will be effective in controlling strikes by setting up a fact-finding committee to step into labor-management dispute and work out fair and just settlements that will prevent hardships for our entire Nation.

We decry and condemn the stubborn leadership on both sides which cannot and will not reach common sense and permanent solution to their differences without resorting to strikes and lockouts, the continuation of which will destroy the principles of free enterprise in America.

We also appeal to Congress to protect the innocent public, and we think the time has come for drastic action. We take this position because our Nation is torn by strikes and lock-outs, and management and labor cannot or will not get together and make settlement of their differences.

We furthermore resolve that we favor all of the provisions of the Case bill in its original form and that copies of this resolution be furnished immediately to all of Oklahoma's representatives in both the House and Senate in Washington.

Let's Officially End the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1946

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, during the war we surrendered liberties and constitutional rights that were not ours to sur-

render. In the words of Abraham Lincoln, "Necessity knows no law."

But the war is over. Months ago there was an unconditional surrender of all our enemies. Yet Congress has not seen fit to declare the fact that hostilities have ceased. Congress has not kept its promise that the boys were drafted only for the duration and 6 months thereafter.

The GI boys are returning, and those who have not returned demand that they be returned to their families and to civilian life from which they were taken. The Government pledged these boys that they would be out of the service 6 months after the duration. Yet we are listening to the subterfuge of some generals, interested perhaps in keeping their promotion, and continuing millions of these boys in foreign lands. This may be some of the "one world" lunacy, but the time has come for Congress to act, or when the boys return they will act.

I have talked to a number of Army officers, who are in full accord with the views I express here that the boys should be returned. We have over a million who have enlisted now, and that is twice as many as any general has ever dared suggested as needed for occupation duty and home duty.

I am submitting herewith an editorial that appeared in the Jamestown Sun, Jamestown, N. Dak., by Col. Percy M. Hansen, who speaks with authority. The editorial follows:

LET'S DECLARE AN END TO THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY

(By Col. Percy M. Hansen)

The Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, with the efficient assistance of the rest of United States 130,000,000 people, have retaken the Aleutians, the Philippines, and Guam. They have driven the Japanese and the Germans from Africa, Italy, France, Belgium, and all of the islands of the southern Pacific. They, even, have reclaimed the fatherland of Germany from the German militarists and the home islands of Japan from the Nippon worshippers of Mars. They, with the other members of the United Nations, are in complete control of our defeated enemies.

A patriotic Congress, putting aside for the duration all—or practically all—thoughts of personal or political advantage, turned over to our military leaders the complete control of our national affairs. That these affairs, as far as accomplishing the main objective of defeating our enemies was concerned, were well-handled, is obvious, but it is equally as true that the military mind, which is essentially destructive, is not fitted for peacetime economic or political control of the Nation. This is aptly illustrated by the factual stories of the wastage of billions of dollars' worth of equipment all over the world. It is high time that we, in America, recognize that the military mind functions in much the same manner regardless of whether that mind is Japanese, German, Russian, British, French, Chinese, or American, and, recognizing this fact, make sure that Congress regains its functions of government.

About 18 months ago the writer was eating breakfast in the rather swanky dining room of the Imperial Hotel at New Delhi, India, when two other colonels were ushered to the table. "I am glad to know that we have officers here as low in rank as colonel," he remarked to the newcomers, indicating with his glance several general officers in the room. "Oh, this is nothing," one of the officers replied; "I counted 11 generals on the floor at one time at our last regular Saturday night dancing party here at the hotel."

It was very common talk among these colonels and generals, most of whom were Regular Army officers, that "if we can keep the Army up to 3,000,000 men, most of us can retain our temporary ranks." This remark usually called for the rejoiner that, "Well, if we can't hold the Regular Army up to that figure, we can still hold our temporary ranks if we can put over universal military training."

Congress so far has successfully resisted the attempt to rush through legislation providing for universal military training, but the Army and Navy, like good tacticians, stopped in their frontal attack, have obtained their objective by persuading Congress not to declare an end to the national emergency. So long as Congress can be fooled into delaying the declaration, the United States military party has little to fear.

Hundreds of thousands of American boys are "sweating it out" on military, naval, and marine stations all over the world, not because they are needed there or are accomplishing any good but because Brigadier General Blank, who holds the permanent rank of first lieutenant, captain, or major, wants to retain his stars. The writer received letters from two service men this week, one a marine in the South Pacific and the other a soldier in Manila, and both complained of being held in the service. One wrote: "If the war was still on, or if we were really doing any good here, I would not complain, but we are just being held here while our officers try to think of something for us to do. Why doesn't Congress do something? If they would end the emergency, we would at least know that we would be home in another 6 months. The way it looks from here, we will be here at least another year, and many of us were in hopes we could be back in school by next fall."

A few top-flight football players and the sons of United States Senators and general officers have been released. General MacNider had the effrontery to defend the release of his son by special order "so that he could continue his education." Do not the Members of Congress realize that there are hundreds of thousands of boys just as worthy as the son of General MacNider? Many of these boys are beginning to wonder if they fought for democracy or for special privilege, and only President Truman or Congress are in position to prove to them that the United States still stands for the great principle of "all men are born and created equal." From the standpoint of simple justice, it is more necessary to return to their studies the sons of parents without wealth and political influence than it is to release the sons of generals, Senators, and other persons of wealth and position.

A recent news dispatch says that the morale of many of the 50,000 marines in north China is cracking as the men are becoming convinced that they are mere pawns in a great international game of power politics. The same thing is true of thousands of young men in the Aleutians, the Philippines, Guam, Wake, Okinawa, India, France, and innumerable islands and outlying stations all over the world.

Surely these boys should be back in the United States and ready to resume their studies by the opening of the 1946 fall term, and they will be back if North Dakota's four Representatives in Congress—Senators LANGER and YOUNG and Representatives LEMKE and ROBERTSON—or any other group of Congressmen combine their efforts to see that this is accomplished. A declaration by Congress that the national emergency is over, passed immediately after the reconvening of Congress this month, would assure every serviceman inducted for the duration plus 6 months that he would be returned to civilian life by next July or August. If this is done, all who so wish can resume their studies next September.

If it is necessary to continue the drafting of men after next July or August—and we are not convinced that such action will be necessary—Congress still could secure the return of the men who wish to continue their educations by amending the present law limiting the period of service to 12 months or, at the most, a year and one-half.

I quote further excerpts from the letter of Col. Percy M. Hansen. These excerpts should convince Congress that the time for action has arrived. The GI boys are no longer interested in fake promises; they want action.

Will you, as a personal favor, read the enclosed editorial comment and then drop me a note telling me what you can do to accomplish one or more of the following:

(a) Secure a declaration by Congress that the national emergency is ended so that these hundreds of thousands of men in this country and overseas in the armed services will know that they have a maximum of six more months to serve;

(b) Secure the passage of legislation releasing from the armed services all men who were inducted before VJ-day upon their completion of 1 year, or, at the most, 1½ years of service;

(c) Secure the passage of legislation returning to the United States and releasing from service all men who were overseas on VJ-day.

Seriously, Bill, this is only one of the things that I have in mind in connection with our military set-up. Apparently none of our commentators nor legislators dare to hit at the very heart of the matter—the fact that our entire military and naval set-up must be changed from the so-called caste system, one of lords and serfs, to something more in keeping with a democratic nation—and I have spent considerable time on facts and figures in this connection.

I could quote from several letters received only this week, but knowing how busy you are, I will not bother you with them at this time. I want to say, however, that I am more serious about this than I was the famous (or was it the infamous?) capital removal campaign, and I believe that my service in two wars and in all of the grades from buck private to colonel, has given me an insight into the mind of the former serviceman and his family that would justify my present conclusions.

Will you take time out to give me your opinions on this matter, and an idea of what, if anything, you are willing to do in this matter?

PERCY M. HANSEN.

I am confident that this editorial and the excerpts of Colonel Hansen's letter express the sentiments and the will of the vast majority of the American people and 100 percent of the will of the fathers, mothers, and wives of the servicemen.

There are some fifty bills and resolutions pending in the House and Senate, all having for their object the prompt demobilization of our armed forces, in accordance with the pledges made by the Government when the men were inducted into the service.

The time has come for these Members to get together and agree on one or two of these resolutions or bills. It makes no difference to the GI boys which resolution or bill is taken. All they are interested in is that Congress see to it that the Government keeps its pledge and understanding with them when it inducted them into the armed forces for the duration and 6 months.

School-Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 19, 1946

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a letter in support of H. R. 3370 from the Honorable Vernon L. Nickell, superintendent of public instruction, State of Illinois:

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
Springfield, February 13, 1946.

Hon. MELVIN PRICE,
United States Representative, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PRICE: H. R. 3370 is up for consideration. As you know, this bill deals with the appropriation to subsidize the school-lunch program. The bill, in its present form, gives the administration to the States. This is as it should be.

From the experience we have had in Illinois the past 3 years in connection with the school-lunch program, I am convinced that it is a very worth-while and worthy program. It makes a lunch available through the schools to the thousands of children that otherwise would be forced to go without a balanced and nutritious diet. It seems to me that we learned from the war a lesson that is applicable here. We need to look forward toward developing strong healthy bodies in our youth. A good diet is one of the necessary essentials if we are to reach that objective. In this light the program is one which embodies national security and contributes much toward national defense.

As you know, our State assists in subsidizing the program. If this assistance—both Federal and State—were to be denied the schools, it would be a serious error, I believe. It would deny to our children—our greatest asset—an inherent right to develop the strong bodies which they must have if they are to be entitled to contribute their full and just share as American citizens.

May I urge your earnest, serious, and favorable consideration and support of this bill in its present form on behalf of our undernourished youth?

Sincerely,

VERNON L. NICKELL.

The Case Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DUDLEY G. ROE
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 19, 1946

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Baltimore Sun in reference to the Case bill.

The editorial follows:

HAVING PASSED THE HOUSE, THE CASE BILL FACES THE SENATE

It is in line with the precedents that the Case labor bill, having passed the House by a large majority, enters a period of ominous silence on the Senate side. Of course the bill can seem extreme only by comparison with the policies of administrations whose Attorney General once described them as alliances of clever political leaders with the labor unions. The bill provides for no-strike cooling-off periods during mediation of industrial disputes. Mediation failing, it provides for voluntary arbitration. That failing, it provides the unimpeded right to strike. But it does police this right by attempting to curb violence, boycotts, and wildcat and jurisdictional strikes.

Moderate as the Case bill is, however, there is some doubt whether it really touches the vital issues in the labor problem. It is not at all clear, either, that in seeking commendable ends its backers have always selected wise or prudent means. Nor, as already suggested, does the fact that the House has acted mean that anything like the Case bill is certain to go into the statute books. The fact is that the Senate is less enthusiastic than is the House about the bill, and there is no sign whatever of enthusiasm from the White House.

These signs on the road to enactment are threatening. The evidence is in the fact that labor bills very like the Case bill have passed the House on two previous occasions and each time have failed to come to a vote in a Senate oversensitive to White House pressure. In June of 1940 the House voted by 258 to 129 to amend the Wagner Act in an effort to reach many of the purposes aimed at in the Case bill. In December of 1941 the House passed the Smith bill, which at many points was identical with the Case bill. The vote then was 252 to 136.

The fact is that the House of Representatives—that body of the Federal Legislature most representative of the whole people, dependent at the most frequent intervals on their judgment at the polls, and organized on a regional basis giving maximum assurance against domination by any single pressure group—this body has steadily reflected the undoubted national disquiet at the post-1933 labor policies. But the House view on this matter has been as steadily thwarted in the Senate and in the Executive offices, where it is sometimes easier for highly organized pressure groups to bring their pressures to bear. It remains to be seen whether in this instance again the Executive offices and the Senate will ignore what the popular branch clearly shows to be the popular anxiety on labor policy.

The Need for a Sound Labor Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 18, 1946

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the parliamentary situation did not permit my giving a complete explanation of the amendment which I offered to the Adams substitute to the Case bill at the time this important legislation was considered by the House.

My amendment embraced the essential features of the amendment to S. 1661 offered by Senators BALL and HATCH, having eliminated the compulsory arbitration features which were included in the original Ball-Burton-Hatch bill.

My amendment adopted the language of H. R. 5367, which I introduced on February 4 and which contains only one addition to the revised Ball-Hatch bill. The addition appears in section 11 and is as follows:

(c) Any employee who fails to perform the duties imposed on him by section 3 (d) of this act (which subsection relates to maintenance of existing conditions pending exhaustion of settlement efforts) shall not be entitled to reinstatement or any back pay from such employer under section 10 of the National Labor Relations Act.

In order to secure consideration by the House of the mediation and arbitration features of the Ball-Hatch bill, I proposed in my amendment to the Adams substitute only those features of the bill which differed in substance from Mr. Adams' plan. My amendment which appears in the RECORD for February 6 on pages 1021 and 1022 eliminated administrative provisions, but if the parliamentary situation had permitted I would have urged consideration of the full plan as embraced in H. R. 5367.

I had previously pointed out to the House that I sought consideration for this plan because it represented sincere efforts by an important group of public-spirited citizens to find a solution to the strike problem through perfecting mediation and arbitration procedure.

I have reference to the Committee to Promote Industrial Peace, whose report was sponsored by Senators BALL and HATCH, and since the recommendations of that committee were not considered by the House Labor Committee I felt that the House should be given an opportunity to pass upon the Ball-Hatch plan as an alternative to the Case bill. The Committee to Promote Industrial Peace was constituted strictly with the public interest in mind, and its members are not involved in labor controversies. The personnel is as follows:

George W. Alger, lawyer, 55 Liberty Street, New York, N. Y.

Harold Evans, lawyer, 1000 Provident Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

Samuel S. Fels, president, Fels & Co., Seventy-third Street and Woodland Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.

Lawrence Hunt, lawyer, 60 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

William Draper Lewis, director, the American Law Institute, 3400 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; summer address, Northeast Harbor, Maine.

Leon C. Marshall, chairman of the faculty of American University, Washington, D. C.

Charles B. Rugg, lawyer, 50 Federal Street, Boston, Mass.

George B. Sjoselius, deputy Attorney General of State of Minnesota; has charge of legal questions arising out of administration of State labor relations act; State Capitol, St. Paul, Minn.

Kirk Smith, lawyer, 15 Westminster Street, Providence, R. I.

Arthur D. Whiteside, president, Dun & Bradstreet, 290 Broadway, New York.

Donald R. Richberg, chairman, 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; coauthor of the Railway Labor Act, the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and the National Industrial Recovery Act. He served as chairman of the committee and as draftsman, without compensation, as did all other committee members.

The statement of the purposes of this bill, which I included in my comments to the House on February 1, page 791, was prepared by the above-named members of the Committee to Promote Industrial

Peace and their names were inadvertently omitted when the statement was submitted to the House. The committee devoted many months to the study of arbitration procedure and their report reflects painstaking consideration of the problem.

Whether the Case bill becomes law or not Congress will be required to give further consideration to methods for settling industrial disputes. A comprehensive revision of basic labor laws based upon our experience with the Clayton, Norris-LaGuardia, and Wagner Acts will require further study but a beginning has been made. I voted for the Case bill in spite of the criticisms which were offered in debate. It is generally agreed that the bill was improved by certain amendments, and in view of the urgent necessity for some legislation on the subject I think that the House pursued the right course in adopting the bill in its modified form. Our action should have the effect of impressing labor union leadership with the fact that we regard this as a real emergency, and that Congress intends to maintain a stern position regarding strikes and union practices which are against the public interest. At the same time I am anxious that we avoid unworkable methods and certainly we must not deprive labor of fundamental rights.

I have just seen an editorial in the Buffalo Evening News for February 13 quoting in substance my observations on the Case bill and commenting, as follows:

Mr. HAYS correctly appraises the House action as a reflection of present national sentiment.

The wiser labor leaders must know, however, that the one-sidedness of existing labor laws and the flagrant disregard of the public welfare evidenced by so many recent strikes must ultimately bring corrective legislation. Whether a stringent law now could bring order out of our industrial chaos is open to question. But it seems clear that relations between labor and management will move from one crisis into another until the selfish interests of both are subordinated to the public welfare—either voluntarily or by law.

If the Case bill is one-sided, labor's irresponsible militants have brought it upon themselves by a reverse one-sidedness—by foolishly insisting that there must be no balancing of responsibilities under the Wagner Act; by flagrantly abusing their immunity from legal accountability, and by demanding that Government be their ally instead of an impartial umpire.

Their militants themselves have demonstrated the need for corrective legislation that will, first, protect the public against the interruption of services essential to its health, safety, and welfare, and, second, redress the one-sidedness of the Wagner Act so that both unions and employers will be answerable for unfair practices. Responsible labor leaders would be wise to recognize this need and cooperate in meeting it, instead of waiting for the public opinion pendulum to swing so far that it may do real harm to the labor movement.

The Case bill, as Mr. HAYS implies, represents a swing of the pendulum rather than a carefully-thought-out balancing of responsibilities. Legislation better attuned to the latter objective is already before the Senate, however, in the Hatch-Ball bill. It would turn the Wagner Act into an impartial code of fair practices to which both labor and management must submit; effectively outlaw all interruptions of vital public services, and make available a comprehensive procedure for the peaceful and fair settlement of any dispute. The general philosophy and key provisions of this bill are sound, and the News believes that Congress could make no better contribution to permanent industrial peace than to enact it.

Joseph E. Davies' Statement on Atomic Secrets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 19, 1946

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Speaker, Joseph E. Davies, former Ambassador to Russia, has been guilty of moral treason in encouraging Russian spies to steal our military secrets. I call upon the State Department to direct FBI to proceed to arrest those spies.

Ex-Ambassador Davies' statement that "Russia had every moral right to seek atomic bomb secrets through military espionage" is the most shocking and disgraceful statement uttered by a prominent American in recent times, possibly since Benedict Arnold. There is no moral right to defend or advocate the commission of a crime against the United States.

When and if the President consents and the FBI arrests any of their spies, Moscow can now logically express surprise that their secret agents should even be questioned when a former American Ambassador to Russia has told the world that such spies have "a moral right" to help themselves.

The time has come to ask "Pal Joe" Davies who he represents. Is it possible that his law firm has taken on Joe Stalin as a client? If so, is it not time the American people know the whole story back of these shocking invitations to espionage?

Address of Hon. Henry A. Wallace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 19, 1946

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave given to me to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, it gives me great pleasure to insert the thoughtful address by the Honorable Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Commerce, at a banquet in honor of Chester Bowles, given by the Washington Chapter of the National Lawyers Guild on February 15, 1946:

Tonight we honor Chester Bowles. It is very heartening to stand here and talk about a highly successful businessman—a salesman and merchandiser with a brilliant record—who today at 46 has become one of our most outstanding public servants.

Here we have a man who made a great success in the advertising business—and then quit and settled down to enjoy the things that money can't buy. Apparently to Chester one of the main things that money can't buy is the satisfaction of doing a big, tough job in the public interest. Anyway that is what he has done. And this particular job is one that can certainly be literally described as Herculean.

It is an old saying that an organization is the lengthened shadow of one man. In honoring Chester Bowles it is fitting that we also pay tribute to his coworkers in every city and town throughout the country. And especially should we salute his predecessor and trail breaker, the redoubtable man with the big cigar—Leon Henderson, who lit and carried the original torch in the forefront of the battle against inflation. I think we should honor also the Congress which, conscious of the backing of the overwhelming majority of the American people, has given Chester Bowles the tools to work with. With the Price Control Act as his artillery, and with the welfare of the United States as his objective, Chester Bowles has fought and smashed the crawling and snarling and sniping armies of the lobbyists and won a victory over wartime inflation, an enemy hardly less dangerous than the Axis. I should say he has won—so far, but the battle isn't over.

Chester Bowles set the ceiling prices for 3,000,000 business firms and 14,000,000 hungry landlords. His task involved establishing limitations on millions of different items and for billions of transactions. No problem on the home front approached this in sheer magnitude, and no job was harder.

The OPA has dealt with the most complicated and delicately balanced sector of our whole economy. There are few problems more intricate than the factors which go to make up the price of almost every article. And the ramifications and relationships between different prices are far-reaching and often unforeseeable.

The job entailed much more than the establishment of initial prices. The problems of continuing administration and particularly of enforcement were even more manifold and complex. Before the war, it had been customary to say that the problem of fixing and holding prices was far too difficult for any Government agency to undertake. But this defeatist attitude did not stop Chester Bowles.

Prices are inevitably related to profits, and profits touch the heart of the economic system. Anything that even threatens to embarrass profits always encounters terrific pressures from interested groups with large, cold axes to grind. Anyone familiar with the Washington scene can understand what this means in terms of hundreds of powerful Washington lobbyists. They always tackled Chester Bowles, but he almost always answered "No"—politely, firmly, but positively—because he serves the general welfare.

The OPA under Bowles has been concerned with prices in a period when economic pressures to force price increases accumulated on a scale far in excess of any ever known. The mere fact that the Government spent $300,000,000,000 during the war gives some idea of the explosive inflationary pressures against which the OPA prices have been the first and principal line of defense.

In the rationing field, OPA dealt with matters vitally and directly affecting each of the 140,000,000 people in the Nation. Rationing has meant the withholding of goods from people who are anxious to buy and who are well supplied with money.

In spite of the enormous inflationary pressures of the war, the cost of living between August 1939 and October 1945 rose only 31 percent. The increase from May 1943—the date of the hold-the-line order—was only 3 percent. Wholesale prices rose 41 percent during the past 6 years but less than 2 percent during the past 3 years. Contrast this record with the First World War, when we

had no OPA and no Chester Bowles, in which living costs more than doubled and wholesale prices increased by 148 percent.

It is clear also that price controls have not hampered production. During this war, production doubled, whereas during World War I the increase was only about a quarter. Nor have price controls wrecked business. Business profits have been at an all-time high and business failures at an all-time low.

The administration of the Price Control Act under Chester Bowles has been twice approved by Congress with only minor changes. The Price Control Act came up for renewal in the spring of 1944 and again in the spring of 1945. Extensive hearings were conducted by committees of both Houses of Congress and the act was approved in substantially its existing form on both occasions. It is seldom that administration of any statute has had such exhaustive review and reaffirmation by Congress.

A remarkable and democratic feature of OPA operations, both in price control and rationing, was the work of the local war price and rationing boards. Throughout the war some 5,500 of these boards, composed primarily of volunteer citizens of the local communities, have performed vital functions in rationing and price control. This development constituted a broad move toward democratic decentralization in an age of increasing centralization—even under the stress of war. It has been an unusual application of democracy at the grass roots.

Chester Bowles has developed extensively new methods of public education in Government affairs. With great imagination and resourcefulness he has kept the public informed of what the OPA has been doing and the reasons for doing it. For example, each of the war price and rationing boards has had attached to it a volunteer committee whose function it has been to explain OPA operations to the local community. At the same time Chester Bowles kept in constant touch with industry, labor, and consumer groups, not only informing them of developments, but continuously soliciting their advice and assistance.

Chester Bowles is fighting for the only kind of postwar world which can give assurance of full employment and full production under our system of free enterprise. His battle is against a wild inflation, a boom-and-bust period, which would make economic depression inevitable. In essence he is fighting for an economy of high production, low prices, and high income—and against boom prices which will dissipate purchasing power, choke off production and push us soon into another depression.

The battle against wartime inflation has been won. The victory over postwar inflation is in sight. We must not weaken necessary controls now. If we do, the whole war against inflation will be lost. The lobbyists of the selfish few will fight desperately during the next few months to defeat these controls.

We must not forget that the wildest period of inflation came after, and not during, World War I.

We know that price ceilings will be removed, item by item, just as soon as they can be removed without inflation. There is still a great backlog of demand for rental properties, building materials, clothing, automobiles, and electrical equipment. It is, therefore, essential that the Price Control Act, which expires on June 30, 1946, be continued for another year. The quicker the act is renewed the better it will be for all of us.

Price ceilings have no place in America except in emergencies. If we control monopoly, production will soon increase to the point where under normal conditions competition will control prices. But today most people realize that we must continue price ceilings as long as the emergency exists. According to the Gallup poll, 85 percent of our people realize that an emergency still exists.

Similarly, I have talked with hundreds of Americans, and received letters from many more, who say that they are willing, if necessary, to miss one meal a day in order that the unfortunate victims of the war may eat. So say we all. We shall live up to our traditions and share some of our abundance of food with the starving people overseas.

I would like to let you in on a little secret. Chester Bowles is not a prophet without honor in his own country.

I went to Connecticut, the home State of Chester Bowles, the other day to speak for more effective political action by plain citizens voting at the ballot box. I happened to mention in my speech that Chester Bowles is doing a great job. The cheers of the crowd stopped the meeting for some minutes. And I know that tonight the plain people all over America are still cheering the name of Chester Bowles. Chester, I salute you. Your career of public service is only beginning.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1946

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement on universal military training, by Robert M. Hutchins, chancelor of the University of Chicago:

I do not oppose universal military training on the ground that it will hurt the educational institutions of the country. If universal military training is necessary to our safety, the educational institutions must take the consequences without complaining. I favored the Selective Service Act and opposed the Army's plans for the Army Enlisted Reserve Corps, which deferred college students merely because they were college students.

I should add that, if hordes of students are a benefit to a university, the University of Chicago would benefit from universal military training, for it is the only university which offers a boy the opportunity to complete his liberal education and get the bachelor's degree before being drafted.

I do not oppose universal military training on the ground that it is bad for boys or is a poor remedy for illiteracy, ill health, or unemployment. I confess I do not think that the best way to prevent juvenile delinquency is to turn over the young to the care of marine sergeants. And I can conceive of less expensive and more effective methods of dealing with the social and economic evils of our time than putting our youth in the Army. But I lay no emphasis on these issues because the Army and Navy have ceased to emphasize them. The Army and Navy appear to realize that, if universal military training can be defended at all, it can be defended only as a military measure.

I oppose universal military training on the ground that as a military measure it is absurd. And if you ask how a layman, whose only military experience was that of a private in the last war, can contradict the leading military experts on a military matter, I reply that they contradict themselves, for they first show that universal military training is a military anachronism which will weaken the Nation, and then demand it in the name of military strength.

The generals and admirals all insist on the rapidity of technical change. Then they insist that men trained with old weapons are going to be effective in using entirely new weapons. They prove that there is no defense against the atomic bomb, and then ask for an enormous Army to defend us against it. They show that this bomb can be sent into other countries by rockets or smuggled in by agents and then ask for a large Army, Navy, and Airforce to carry it into other countries. They convince us that in an atomic war 40,000,000 of us will be killed in 1 night and then claim that it will be helpful to us to have wasted two or three billion dollars a year in teaching millions of young men close-order drill. They demonstrate that the strength of the country depends on its industrial power and scientific intelligence and then advocate a system which will give us less industrial power and less scientific intelligence, for it will interrupt the training of men for science and industry. They propose, in short, an obsolete, wasteful, and ineffectual method of dealing with the military problems of the atomic age, problems which they themselves admit require an entirely new approach and entirely new ideas.

There is no defense against the atomic bomb. This means that there is no way of preventing the destruction of the cities of the United States, for nobody seriously supposes that there is a secret of the atomic bomb which the United States can keep. If we cannot beat the atomic bomb, we shall have to beat war. There is no other way in which we can save our cities from the fate of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. How we are going to train the survivors of the next war to pick up the pieces, connect the plumbing and telephone wires, and get the water, gas, and electric works going again is a matter of relatively little importance to the majority of us; for the majority of us, or our children or grandchildren, will be killed. Professor Einstein thinks that about two-thirds of the population will be killed, and that is certainly a cautious estimate. But of all the kinds of training which the one-third surviving might need, the most useless is military training. They would need scientific, industrial, perhaps plumbers' and electricians' training, but their military training would do them no good against the atomic bomb.

If we win, that is, if the one-third of us surviving can be said to win the next war, and want to occupy another country, we shall have to get there and shall have to get there in ships or aeroplanes. There may be some need of ships and aeroplanes for transport and a small army for occupation. Universal military training is not needed for such a force. And such a force will probably be blown up anyway at the outbreak of hostilities. Imagine what would have happened to the Hawaiian Islands, to say nothing of the United States Fleet, if three or four atomic bombs had exploded at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941.

We cannot beat the atomic bomb, and therefore we must beat war. The foreign policy of the United States, as announced by Mr. Truman in his Navy Day speech, is to have the largest Army, Navy, and Air Force in the world and thus insure peace. This policy is the sheerest folly, and it will end in disaster. A few well placed atomic bombs can make junk of all these vast preparations in a few minutes. We must beat war. Our strength cannot even lie in industrial and scientific power; for our plants and laboratories can easily be destroyed. Our strength must lie in the intelligence and spirit of our people. This intelligence and spirit must be devoted to producing a world which can stay at peace. If all efforts in that direction fail, we must with fortitude bear the consequences and defend the remnants of our country as best we can.

In the attempt to defend the remnants of our country as best we can, military training

is the most useless of all forms of preparation. An educated, inventive, devoted people, united by a common understanding of their common heritage and filled with a determination to defend it—such a people will have the best chance of winning an atomic war and of reconstructing their society amid the destruction which an atomic war will visit upon both the victor and the vanquished. From the standpoint of defense, survival, and reconstruction the best expenditures of $3,000,000,000 a year in the atomic age would be an expansion of education among all Americans, young and old, until all of us were united in a common understanding and all of us had developed to the maximum the potential character and intelligence we were born with.

This is also the best way to beat war, for it is a start toward the formation of that world community which is our only hope. It is insane, when we have just participated in the establishment of a world organization, to proclaim the futility of it by announcing that we are going to base our plans for peace on our own overwhelming military strength. We blast and betray the only hope we have. The time has come to stop this silly, un-American saber rattling, and get down to the task of laying the foundations of a peaceful world.

Additional British Investments in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 18, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Leslie Gould, financial editor of the New York Journal and American:

FORTY-FIVE OTHER UNITED STATES FIRMS IN WHICH BRITISH HAVE STAKE

In addition to its stake in American insurance companies and leading industrial enterprises, Britain's Socialist government owns either the controlling or a substantial stock interest in 45 other American companies, some of these 45, operating in all lines of endeavor, in direct competition with American companies. Others are companies in which the British are the controlling stock interest, or where individuals or companies were substantial investors. These securities are listed, that is, not traded on an exchange. Title to these was taken by the British Government in 1941, when all foreign investments of British nationals and British companies were sequestered. Control of a few enterprises were sold on this market to American investors, such as American Vicose. The others were pledged as collateral for a $425,000,000 RFC loan, now reduced to around $243,000,000.

On the unlisted securities of the 45 companies, the British in 1941 put a valuation of $115,000,000. Today these are estimated to have a value of $215,000,000—or a profit to the British Government of $100,000,000. To date the British Government has refused to sell these securities to Americans, although several offers have been made for controlling blocs. Yet, the British are so badly in need of dollar exchange that they are knocking at the United States Treasury's door for a $3,750,000,000 loan at interest rates lower than the United States Government must pay its own bondholders who will put up the money. Here is a list of the 45 companies with the number of shares pledged with the RFC:

United States Potash Co., 288,750 shares; Delta & Pineland Co., of Mississippi, 2,980 shares; Delta Planting Co., 3,434 shares; Linen Thread Co., Inc., 78,722 shares; Yardley of London, Inc., 30,595 4½-percent preferred and 87,247 common; Ferguson-Sherman Manufacturing Corp., 6,000 A and 1,500 B shares; Oldbury Electric Chemical Co., 8,400 shares; Lea & Perrins, Inc., 2,107 A and 5 B shares; Arkwright Finishing Co., 7,000 shares; Interlaken Mills, 20,000 shares; Distillers Co., Ltd. (Delaware), 850,250 shares; Morganite Brush Co., Inc., 7,500 shares; Mica Insulator Co., 5,394 shares; C. Tennant & Sons of New York, 7,164 shares; American Thread Co., 1,197,000 shares; Joseph Tetly & Co., 4,580 8-percent preferred and 4,000 common; Dunlop Tire & Rubber, 610 first preferred, 31,600 second preferred, 197,300 common; J. & P. Coats (Rhode Island) Inc., 145,000 shares; Clark Thread Co., 180,000 and 18,607 shares; North Georgia Processing Co., Inc., 800 shares; Stowell-MacGregor Corp., 4,399 shares; B. Priestly & Co., 2,500 shares; Firth-Stirling Steel Co., 2,637 7-percent preferred and 10,173 common; Keasby & Mattison Co., 20,140 shares; Funch-Deye & Co., Inc., 12,000 shares; Twenty-five Broadway Corp., 11,300 shares; Baker Perkins, Inc., 1,051 7-percent preferred and 65,851 common; Pacific Molasses Co., Ltd., 3,750 shares; A. J. White, Ltd., 500 shares; Menley & James, Ltd., 1,550 shares; Hecht, Levis & Kahn, Inc., 2,393 shares; Crown Mills, Inc., 5,000 7-percent preferred and 10,000 common; F. W. Berk & Co., 100 shares; American Association, Inc., 158,325 common and $1,487,000 debentures; Spool Cotton Co., 2,500 shares; Jonas Brook & Bros. (U. S. A.), 1,000 shares; Dentists Supply Co., of New York, 100,765 shares; F. W. Cook Co., 1,005 shares; Norma-Hoffman Bearings Corp., 7,029 preferred and 90,000 common; Ensign-Bickford Co., 10,779 shares; Okonite-Callender Cable Co., 1,000 6-percent preferred and $275,000 first debenture 5s; Pembroke Chemical Corp., 235 shares; Josiah Wedgewood, Inc., of America, 215 shares American B stock.

Anglo-American Relations With Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. EATON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 19, 1946

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very able letter by Mr. Laurence Hunt, a distinguished lawyer of New York, which appeared in the New York Times of Tuesday, February 12, and which deals with the difficult and urgent problem of international relations as between communistic Russia and the capitalistic English-speaking democracies:

APPEASEMENT SEEN IN DISCARD—ANGLO-AMERICAN ACCORD AGAINST RUSSIA REGARDED AS PARAMOUNT

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

I would like to express my appreciation of the firm, common-sense, and temperate tone of the New York Times editorial, Stalin's New Party Line. The editorial is a healthy antidote both to the irresponsible talk about the inevitable WAR with Russia and the equally irresponsible and even more dangerous talk of those who glibly advocate a policy of appeasement of Russian dynamism at the expense of the vital interests of other nations. This latter point should be especially emphasized at this time for the benefit of those who have already forgotten or deliberately rejected the lessons of the last 15 years of appeasement and war.

There are today in this country several so-called "molders of public opinion" who urge in their syndicated columns or over the radio that Russian dynamism should somehow be appeased at the expense of the British Empire and that the United States should act as a lofty, "impartial" mediator in determining how much of the British Empire or of British interests should be sacrificed to totalitarian Russia's expansion.

UNITED STAND ESSENTIAL

A strong British Empire is essential to the security of the United States. Great Britain, existing alone as a second or third rate power, would not be of much help in time of great need. The vast sea-connected British Empire and the great continental American Empire must stand together in peace as they did in war.

Have our present-day appeasers forgotten what a strong British Empire meant to our national existence in 1940 and 1941? Surely Malta is of more vital interest to us than the Channel Islands. We should be willing to come to the aid of Britain in defense of a strategic part of her empire, however it may have been acquired a hundred or two hundred years ago, just as we should expect the British to come to our aid in the event of a serious threat to the Panama Canal Zone, although we acquired it in a notoriously shady manner.

The policy of appeasing Russian dynamism now being advocated in some quarters is tragically similar to the policy which culminated in the Munich affair, in which, let us not forget, we also played an unhappy part. The names and places and dates have changed, but the grim story remains the same.

The Russian cry of "encirclement" is, if possible, more grimly ludicrous than the same German cry in the 1930's. We should frankly face the fact that the United States is today the chief rival of Russia, which is first trying to reduce the British Empire to an ineffectual second- or third-rate power before directly attacking this country's vital interests.

Russia is, of course, pursuing the old policy of divide and conquer, and it is distressing that Americans who should know better are unconsciously giving aid and comfort to that policy.

MEDIATION UNPROFITABLE

An American policy of mediation between Russia and Britain, based on the sacrifice of vital British interests in the hope that such sacrifices will gain us the loving regard of Russia, will not insure a law-abiding world in which the individual man and woman may achieve an increasing measure of justice and liberty. Selling out the British Commonwealth and its empire in the guise of mediation or any other pompous self-deception is not compatible with the honor and the security of the United States.

Whatever their imperfections may be, the American and British Empires together are the greatest force for the protection of human liberty and man's gradual progress toward a better world. Together we would neither threaten nor need to fear any other nation. Let's stand together and make no bones about it.

There will be world conferences, and many of them will fail. There will be all kinds of international formulas, and they will fade away. There will be glittering slogans, and they will be forgotten.

But if the American and the British peoples have faith in each other's purposes, hope in each other's future, and charity toward

each other's shortcomings, then, as friends, as partners, and as allies, they can go forward together into the future, as far as the human eye can see, in dignity, in freedom, and in peace.

LAWRENCE HUNT.

NEW YORK, *February 11, 1946.*

Address by Director Orvis A. Schmidt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1946

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent of the House, I present for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an interesting and informative address made by Mr. Orvis A. Schmidt, Director of the Office of Foreign Funds Control, as follows:

I have asked everyone in Foreign Funds Control to come together to hear first-hand about the present position of Foreign Funds Control. I have done so not only because I understand there are a number of rumors on this question making the rounds, but also because I think we are reaching a significant stage in the development of the Foreign Funds Control program. I feel that it is essential that everyone in the control should know the basic facts concerning the status of our organization. Its status affects the welfare and personal position of each of us. Therefore, I want to tell you straight from the shoulder as much as I know of these facts.

We are all aware that foreign funds control has been fundamentally a wartime operation. It was established in April 1940 to protect the assets of countries occupied by the Germans. When we went to war, the objectives of our program broadened and the importance of our operations increased. Throughout the long war years we performed a grade A-1 job. We carried out our objectives effectively and we did it with an economy and efficiency which I think was outstanding. This is not only my own opinion but has been said time and again by numerous authorities. Statements have come from such separate sources as members of the Appropriations Committee in the House of Representatives and the American Bankers Association. As recently as November 16 the bankers association at their Hershey convention adopted a resolution concerning foreign funds control which not only stresses the importance of our operations to the war effort but places the bankers of the United States squarely behind us in our continuing effort to uncover Axis assets held through neutral countries. Here is what the bankers said:

"The association commends the farsightedness of the United States Treasury for having prepared, prior to our entry into the war, the machinery to protect the property of invaded nations and, as the conflict deepened, to have converted this machinery so promptly into an effective weapon of economic warfare against the Axis.

"The effectiveness of these operations immeasurably advanced our cause, saved the lives of many American and Allied soldiers and civilians and was far more important in our overwhelming victory than can be measured merely in its financial-economic implications.

"We wish also to commend the Treasury most highly for the excellent results it has obtained, and is obtaining, in the disclosure of hidden Axis funds at home and in the Western Hemisphere, Africa, Asia, and Europe, particularly in the neutral nations. This hunt should be continued unceasingly to its ultimate completion to prevent any possible resurgence of the enemy system anywhere in the world.

"Financial control, long continued, is, of course, a deterrent to normal international banking relationships. We applaud the Treasury for its diligence in preparing to lift the controls from current banking operations with the liberated nations. We earnestly hope that further relaxations may be effected for all territories.

"Equally deterrent to the resumption of normal finance and trade is the continuance of control on existing frozen balances. Progress by the Treasury in this direction is contingent upon cooperation by neutral and other nations in disclosing Axis assets, now hidden by cloaking and camouflage. We trust these nations will provide sincere and wholehearted evidence of their desire to work with the United States Treasury to this end and thus bring about the prompt unblocking of their own funds and property."

As we all know, the end of the shooting war brought Foreign Funds Control to a new stage. Its program became that of arranging for an orderly unfreezing of the assets of United Nations in a manner which would protect American interests, insure that hidden enemy assets are not released, and in general, carry to completion the wartime objectives of the freezing control.

Our progress in obtaining these objectives has been rapid. General license No. 94 has eliminated our controls over current transactions with all countries of the world other than Germany, Japan, and the neutrals, the latter of which still have the use of their broad general license. Machinery for unfreezing the prewar assets of the United Nations has already been set up in general license No. 95. Defrosting agreements have been negotiated with France, Belgium, Norway, and Finland. The recent negotiations with Holland have been successful and we are expecting daily to receive from the Dutch Minister of Finance a letter that will enable us to include Holland in general license No. 95.

Today the work still to be done consists of the following general types:

1. We must supplement the defrosting procedure by handling the more complicated types of cases on an individual license basis.

2. We must work out with the neutral countries a program for the ultimate unblocking of neutral assets. This is naturally closely related to the problem of eliminating the German interest in any German assets held in or through neutral countries.

3. We must hold the line on the assets of Italy and the satellite countries (such as Rumania, Hungary, and Bulgaria) until a decision has been made as to their disposition.

4. We must continue to ferret out assets of Germany and Japan and keep them blocked pending vesting by the APC, and at the same time must set up appropriate channels to permit the gradual resumption of financial and commercial relationships with those defeated countries.

5. We must continue our important part in application of the proclaimed list.

Although we have already made much progress you can see from the list that there is very important work yet to be done. However, I think we may say today that we have reached the liquidating phases of our operations in that we may now for the first time begin to form a judgment as to the time and resources that will be needed to bring our program to an end.

When we appeared before the Bureau of the Budget and the Appropriations Committee of the House recently, they asked us for our estimate of the time and resources we would need to wind up the control. We replied that by the end of the fiscal year 1947—that is, by June 30, 1947, or approximately 17 months from now—we could bring the Foreign Funds Control program to a point where a separate agency would no longer be required to handle remaining problems. We said that we did not expect to ask for an appropriation for Foreign Funds Control, as such, to carry us beyond June 1947 as an independent agency.

So much for our estimate as to the time; now what about the resources?

Our appropriation for the current fiscal year is $2,000,000. When we appeared before the Appropriations Committee we estimated that we needed $2,250,000 for this fiscal year. The House Appropriations Committee, however, preferred to recommend that we be given $2,000,000. In this connection, the chairman of the Treasury Subcommittee, Congressman LUDLOW, made specific reference to our work on the floor of the House, saying in part:

"We were impressed with the witnesses who spoke for Foreign Funds Control and their evident willingness to meet economic requirements. * * *

"In making a further reduction of $250,000 in the estimate it was our thought that the other controls are now so well systematized and the possibilities of further economies through the extension of the block system are so promising the estimate could stand this additional cut. We have no desire to do anything prejudicial to the excellent service that is being rendered and if new developments in the unpredictable military field should cause Foreign Funds Control to run into financial difficulties we will not be hostile to the consideration of a deficiency estimate."

However, immediately after VJ-day, the Appropriations Committee reexamined all current appropriations in the light of the termination of hostilities. At that time the committee indicated that they would expect us not to return and ask for a deficiency appropriation. Accordingly, this year, which ends on June 30, we have to live within a $2,000,000 appropriation. Our expenditures during the first 6 months of this fiscal year, if continued, would total approximately $2,250,000—which looks like our first estimate was pretty good. Accordingly, we must cut down our expenses immediately in order to live within our resources for this year.

I might point out, however, that such a reduction would have been required anyhow since our appropriation for the fiscal year 1947—which begins July 1—will not exceed $1,300,000. Smooth transition to this reduced level requires that reductions in operations begin well in advance of the next fiscal year.

We have already begun a concerted drive to cut costs. We have just completed the consolidation of our field work into the Federal Reserve banks of New York, Chicago, and San Francisco. This eliminates the expenses of nine Federal Reserve banks and was made possible by the issuance of general license No. 94 which greatly reduced the number of applications received. We have closed the New York Field Investigative Office. We have closed our office in Puerto Rico. We have stopped printing our own documents. The analytical unit has been eliminated. We have turned back costly IBM equipment. The New York Federal Reserve Bank office has moved back into the main building at a substantial saving. They are also reducing the size of their staff, even though they are assuming the field work of five other banks and Puerto Rico. Despite these and other steps we are still not at the point where we can live within our Budget. Hence, additional steps will have to be taken to whittle down our costs and eliminate operations that can be dispensed with in the light of changing conditions. I hope that every one of you, when you see an area where

we can save money, will call it to my attention.

Inevitably, however, we will have to reduce our staff. Where necessary, reduction in force procedures will have to be used. As you know, the Civil Service Commission has set up specific regulations for reductions in force. Each of us has certain rights and certain protections under those regulations. In general, for reductions in force, all employees in like grades and like work are placed in competition in accordance with their status and length of service. When a reduction is necessary at a particular competitive level, temporary appointees go before war service; war service go before permanent. Veterans' status is also taken into consideration. In accordance with regulations, the personnel office has set up panels on all personnel in Foreign Funds Control. Information on your position on the panel can be gotten from the personnel office.

However, in order to make the necessary reductions with the least hardship to individual members of FFC, we have developed a comprehensive program to assist Foreign Funds Control people in working out voluntary transfers to other agencies of the Treasury and the Government. The personnel office, in cooperation with the administrative staff of the main Treasury, has already taken steps to insure that other agencies of the Treasury will look first to Foreign Funds Control to fill vacancies. It is planned that this program will be expanded as soon as possible into an active campaign of selling the qualifications of any people in the Control who want to take advantage of the program. In this campaign, top personnel of the Control will go out to other agencies to find out where the vacancies are and to recommend FFC people who are qualified to fill these posts, whether they are at grade 2 or grade 15. We have found that efforts in placing people to advantage will be facilitated if the personnel office has in its possession an up-to-date Form 57 so that an individual's experience and qualifications are readily available. Hence, we suggest that persons interested in taking advantage of this selling campaign which will shortly be started fill out up-to-date Form 57's and get in touch with Mr. Synan or Miss Miller of our personnel office, who are coordinating the campaign.

I am happy to report that many persons have already found good permanent positions with other agencies and that the experience gained in Foreign Funds Control has been an important factor in individuals' ability to land their new jobs. I think we all recognize that Foreign Funds Control has offered exceptional opportunities for all of us to gain experience and exercise powers and responsibilities that would not be granted to us in ordinary times. We are all beneficiaries not only of those exceptional opportunities but also of the fact that Foreign Funds Control has established for itself an unusual reputation for accomplishment and efficiency. Other governmental agencies with vacancies are usually happy to find qualified Foreign Funds Control personnel to fill them.

I trust that you will not go away today with any impression that Foreign Funds Control is on the verge of collapse and that everyone will be out of a job tomorrow. That is not the case. The 1947 appropriation of $1,300,000—if we got it, and I see little reason why we should not—while well under our present rate of expenditures, is nevertheless, a substantial amount. The problems to be dealt with throughout the next 17 months will be important and difficult ones and we will need a strong staff of experienced Foreign Funds Control personnel to deal with them. Our staff will differ from that which we have had in that we will not handle the large volume of applications or process the large volume of intelligence material that we have in the past. But we will have a lot of work to clear up in the next 17 months.

When the making of this talk was discussed, question arose as to whether it might have an unduly upsetting influence and discourage many people concerning their prospects in Foreign Funds Control. Fear was expressed that it would cause everyone to want to transfer immediately and that there would be an inadequate staff left to deal with the important problems still remaining. After serious consideration of this point, it was felt by the top staff that this is a chance we have to take. We agreed it would not be fair to withhold any information on the ground that such information might cause individuals to act to better their position. We agreed we are duty bound to lay the cards on the table where all may see and determine their own action.

In deciding to plan for the liquidation of Foreign Funds Control, we had to wrestle with one of the big temptations of bureaucracy. As we all know, any agency whose job is nearing an end can think up at least 15 good reasons why it should continue in business. We might have done that. As a matter of fact, there are some of us who believe that certain of the functions which we are performing ought to be performed in a peacetime world. However, we decided that, since we were created for a specific wartime mission, we are going to stop when that mission is accomplished. We will not try to perpetuate ourselves in office or argue for additional appropriations. As public servants, we must recognize that this is our fundamental obligation to the American people. When July 1, 1947, rolls around we want to be able to say that we Foreign Funds Control people did a real job toward winning the war, that when the job was done, we wound up the Control in a thoroughly creditable fashion, and that we all were ready for the next tasks—whether in Treasury, some other agency, or some private business—of building a great America in a peaceful world.

In order to insure that this information would reach all of you, and to make doubly sure that everyone would get it straight—including those who might not be able to be present today—this talk was written down. Mimeographed copies will be available in the personnel office. You may have questions about what I have said. I'll try to answer those which I can now, and should any question arise after this meeting, the personnel office will give you the answer.

Lowell Lithuanian Group in Appeal to President Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1946

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following appeal to President Truman by a Lowell Lithuanian group, appearing in the Lowell Sun:

LOWELL LITHUANIAN GROUP IN APPEAL TO PRESIDENT TRUMAN—URGES RESTORATION OF SELF-GOVERNMENT TO PEOPLE OF LITHUANIA, LATVIA, ESTONIA

LOWELL.—Local residents of Lithuanian descent met yesterday at St. Joseph's parish hall on Rogers Street, under the auspices of the Lowell committee for Lithuanian independence, to commemorate the twenty-eighth anniversary of the Lithuanian declaration of independence.

It was resolved at the meeting that an appeal be made to President Truman and the Secretary of State to implement the wartime promises of the Atlantic Charter and restore self-government to the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by demanding the immediate withdrawal of the armed forces of the Soviet Union from the Baltic States.

PROGRAM PRESENTED

A fine program of entertainment was presented. Under the direction of Miss Veronica Dzedulionis, organist, a musical program was offered consisting of choral numbers by the senior and junior choirs of St. Joseph's Lithuanian Church. Soloists were Miss Helen Saulon, Miss Rutvila Jonis, and John Kasinskas. Speakers were Very Rev. John J. Jakaitis, MIC, of Marianapolis College, Thompson, Conn., and Anthony J. Kneizis, editor of Darbininkas, Lithuanian biweekly, of South Boston. Music was provided by the Valentine family orchestra. The program was in charge of Rev. Francis W. Strakauskas, pastor of St. Jospeh's Lithuanian Church.

THE RESOLVE

The resolution as unanimously adopted yesterday follows:

"Whereas on January 20, 1946, a noted jurist of the Superior Court of Massachusetts publicly made the following remarks:

"1. All the world knows that godless Russia has torn the Atlantic Charter to tatters and enslaved millions all the way from Finland and Poland to Austria and Yugoslavia.

"2. By one shameless appeasement after another we have failed to uphold our American idealism.

"3. Despite the most solemn international obligations to which we have been a party we are now asked to recognize and ratify the so-called realism 'of these accomplished facts—facts of international robbery and unblushing enslavement of whole nations.'

"STATUS QUO

"4. And after that is done, to guarantee the status quo of those subjugated populations by sending our American boys, even without the consent of Congress, to rivet the fetters more firmly on those helpless and hopeless millions, lest their patriotic youth should ever arise to set themselves free, so that they might recover some of those same God-given rights for which our boys were told they were fighting.

"Whereas many notables of state and church were among those present in the gathering of over 1,500 persons who acclaimed the sincerely spoken truths of the learned justice.

"Whereas Lithuania typifies a nation whose people have been enslaved among the millions, a nation which exemplifies the accomplished fact of international robbery and unblushing enslavement by godless Russia, and unquestionably was one of the nations within the contemplation of the distinguished jurist: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved:

"1. To appeal to the President and Secretary of State to implement the wartime promises of the Atlantic Charter and other policy declarations with actual measures directed toward creating conditions for the restoration of the sovereignty and self-government by the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, by demanding that the Soviet Union immediately withdraw its armed forces of occupation and its administrative apparatus from the Baltic states, thereby enabling the peoples of the Baltic states to form broadly representative interim governments; that, after the withdrawal of the Soviet occupation forces, direct relief be extended to the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by UNRRA; that thereafter the sovereign peoples of Lithuania and Estonia be enabled to hold free and unfettered elections; and, finally, that, pursuant to chapter

II, article 4, of the Charter of the United Nations, the Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia be admitted to the United Nations."

Second Veterans Group Endorses H. R. 4761, the Patman Housing Bill—Amvets Ask Congress To Place Price Ceilings on Old Homes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 19, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a letter received from the American Veterans Committee, endorsing the proposition to impose ceiling prices on existing homes, and asking Congress to pass my housing bill, H. R. 4761.

Today a second organization, the American Veterans of World War II, familiarly called the Amvets, likewise has sent me a letter urging that the Congress take swift action in passing this housing legislation, including ceiling prices on existing homes.

In my opinion we can have no clearer indication of the wishes of the returning servicemen themselves than the views expressed in these two communications. These two organizations represent the voice of hundreds of thousands of our returning servicemen. Their letters are a direct mandate as to what the veterans want and need—houses that they can afford to buy.

Under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include this letter from Mr. Frank Dee Scriven, national executive secretary of the American Veterans of World War II:

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
AMERICAN VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II,
Washington, D. C., February 14, 1946.
Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: In our recent appearance before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on hearings regarding the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, we went on record in support of maintenance of ceilings on existing housing as well as new construction. Amvets' stand is to curb inflation at all of its sources. The deletion of such control on existing housing in your bill will cause inflation in that particular field, bringing about speculative transfer of properties, all of which will work to the advantage of the returning veteran.

Mr. Wilson Wyatt's program has been given our active support, and his program includes the need of ceilings on existing homes. The President's approval of Wyatt's program lends further weight to the need of such price control.

Any emergency housing program that will be effective will take time. Existing housing, then, is all that is now available to the returning veteran. Amvets can see no need for the returning veterans being penalized in attempting to secure such housing in a speculative market caused by a lack of muchly needed control. We hape that you will be personally successful in your fight to reinstate this provision in your act. Amvets support is promised.

Very truly yours,
FRANK DEE SCRIVEN,
National Executive Secretary.

Strikes—Monopolies—The Consumer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED GOSSETT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 19, 1946

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, is the consumer to be squeezed to death between powerful organized industrial monopoly on the one hand and powerful organized labor monopoly on the other? Have labor bosses and industrial bosses grown more powerful than our Government?

Since coming to the Congress I have continually and consistently fought against such a catastrophe. Industrial abuses through trusts and monopolies is an old story in this country. However, during the last decade we have seen the pendulum swing from an era of industrial oppression to what may well become an era of labor oppression. To borrow the phrase which Mr. Roosevelt once borrowed from Shakespeare, we may be forced to say, "A plague on both your houses."

We should not quarrel with big business or with big labor organizations so long as they operate honestly and in the public interest. To compel them to do this, however, it becomes necessary for the Government to write the rules of fair play and then to enforce those rules as an impartial referee. Although we have not used them effectively, we have on the statute books laws under which we can hold industry liable for its contracts, can punish it for trust violations, can restrain its political activities, and can trim its profits. We have no such laws through which we can exact similar compliance from powerful organized labor.

To keep the record straight and to show that I am as much concerned with the civic responsibility of industry as with that of labor, I wish to make two brief references to the record.

On June 10, 1940, in one of my numerous speeches attacking the farm machinery trust I had the following to say:

In 1927 the International Harvester Co. paid a total compensation per officer of $142,940 to each of 11 officers, $147,524 to each of 12 officers in 1928, $161,193 to each of 13 officers in 1929. The president of International Harvester Co. in 1927 received $353,386; in 1928, $405,909; in 1929, $412,860.

I now want to call to your attention that the International Harvester Co. has lost and is losing many millions of dollars in Europe which will probably be charged to the cost of production of farm machinery in America. Some years back this company lost in Russia a plant worth approximately $38,000,000, a sort of contribution to the Communists. In 1938 they owned two plants in Germany, which plants are now doubtless turning out implements of destruction for the Nazi war machine. They own three plants in France whose fate we cannot yet predict.

On December 10, 1945, speaking against the Bulwinkle bill which would, in effect, exempt railroads from the antitrust laws, I made the following statement:

This bill will further enhance their tremendous economic power. This bill decreases rather than increases the protection to which the people are entitled from gigantic monopoly and domination in the transportation field by the Association of American Railroads.

But now back to the question of reasonable controls for organized labor. The two largest, most recent, and most continuous strikes in this country well illustrate how the activities of big labor unions can affect the public welfare. The United Automobile Workers-CIO is composed of almost a million and a half members, and is the largest union in the world. This union absolutely controls all labor in the automotive industry and the farm-machinery industry of America. These workers produce perhaps 95 percent of the automobiles, trucks, tractors, and farm machinery used throughout this country. While only the General Motors workers have been on strike, so far, the whole UAW-CIO union has the power to completely paralyze the business and economy of the entire country. Apparently, they will continue to demand shorter hours of work and increased wages.

The United States Steel strike, which has just been settled by increasing the price of steel and by increasing the wages paid to steelworkers, has seriously slowed down reconversion and could have paralyzed the national economy. Some steel goes into nearly every item of hardware. The 750,000 members of the United Steelworkers Union-CIO make practically all of the steel of the country. Hence, they have a club over our entire economy. Now, before the strike in General Motors, and before the strike in the steel industry, the workers in these two gigantic monopolistic industries received far above the average wage throughout the country. The worker in the General Motors plant received an average of $1.13 an hour while the worker in the United States Steel plant received an average of $1.14 per hour. Whether or not these wage scales were reasonable, big steelworkers at least had a contract to work for such wages until October 15, 1946. This contract had many months to run, and the strikes were in violation of contract. Why then, did they strike? They struck to take advantage of the present dire need of the products turned out by their plants. They took advantage of the country's emergency. Many other wildcat strikes, strikes in violation of contract, could be mentioned.

Would not a decent regard for the public interest have dictated that these powerful unions await a reconversion of the Nation's industry before pressing their demands? Would it not have been fair to have tightened their belts a little, if necessary, until returning veterans found jobs, and the country got back on its feet in civilian production? They then could

have determined what the traffic would bear in the way of a fair and reasonable wage.

The strike of some 2,000 tugboat workers in the city of New York last week, which came near paralyzing that great city of some 8,000,000 souls, illustrates the powerful weapon in the hands of an organized labor union which has a monopoly of the goods and services in a critical industry. When a union, through its control of a bottleneck can seriously injure millions of people, the Government and the people have a right to demand a prompt settlement of a strike.

While most persons recognize the right of labor to organize, to bargain collectively, and to strike, they do not recognize the rights of labor to abuse these privileges to the general detriment of all the people.

The attitude of some of the big CIO bosses is illustrated in a letter to Congressman SLAUGHTER, of Missouri, written from Kansas City on December 12, 1945. CIO Regional Director Irvin L. Deshelter, condemning the Congressman for urging the passage of legislation for the settlement of industry-labor controversies, said:

> Labor willingly sacrificed during the war, but they are not willing to continue to sacrifice anything now that the war is won, for the benefit of the millionaires of this country.

Such a statement is absolutely false and ridiculous. Most organized labor and most industry profiteered out of the war, industry making more profits and labor higher wages than ever before in the history of the world. In fact, the abuse of cost-plus contracts, the hoarding of labor by industry, together with strikes, slow-downs, padding of pay rolls, the 40-hour week, and so forth, during the war added at least a hundred billion dollars to our national debt. Few people sacrificed during the war except members of the armed forces and their families. Someone has said a grafter is a person whose income exceeds his service to humanity. We have too many folks in this country who are willing, even anxious, to become grafters. We cannot permit profiteering and racketeering to go unrestrained, especially during reconversion, if we are to maintain our national and individual solvency.

There are many perils in the present situation.

Perhaps the greatest danger in permitting strikes in critical industries or in settling them by increasing prices and wages is the threat of inflation. We know that living costs are already up some 30 percent. If strikes and the threat of strikes are to keep pushing prices ever upward there can be no avoidance of inflation. Ford officials say they cannot continue to make cars at present prices. If management and labor both have their way we will probably soon pay $1,500 for a $1,000 automobile and $350 for a $100 plow. Uncontrolled inflation would mean that our dollars, our war bonds, our insurance policies, would become worthless.

Another peril in the present situation is the threat to our form of government. Those who would change or destroy a government first seek to create chaos and confusion. They move in under all sorts of smoke screens. They pretend to be benefactors while taking away the liberties of the people. There are some master minds, wolves masquerading in sheep's clothing, particularly in the councils of the Political Action Committee of the CIO, who are scheming and working to force upon this country some form of national socialism. They want a dictatorship by the big labor bosses. The workingman will, of course, in the end suffer most under such a regime.

Mr. Speaker, among many thought-provoking questions now being asked by many serious-thinking people are these: Are the farmers, small businessmen, school teachers, laborers, white-collar workers, and unorganized folks generally to be squeezed to death between powerful industrial monopoly on the one hand and powerful organized labor monopoly on the other? Will a few labor bosses become the political bosses of America? Is uncontrolled inflation to destroy this Nation? Is the public interest in the matter of strikes to be wholly disregarded? Does the right to strike against the national economy take precedence over all other rights? What limitation, if any, should be placed upon this powerful strike weapon? Will our Nation stumble and fall on the very threshold of her greatness, and will she utterly fail to assume her role of responsible leadership? Will weakness and degredation at home make us impotent in international affairs? Are the exponents of national socialism putting on a barrage of chaos and confusion in order to regiment and control this Nation? Will we one day sit in the ashes of a once prosperous economy and morbidly contemplate what might have been? Have we won a victory over selfish and titanic forces abroad only to be destroyed by selfish and titanic forces at home?

These may sound like crackpot questions. I hope they are. Many good people ask them seriously. I repeat them not because I think them to be probable but because I fear them to be possible. Let us not destroy in a few years what we have built up through centuries of toil and struggle.

Lawyers in Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1946

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech of Maj. Gen. Thomas H. Green, Judge Advocate General of the Army, on the subject of Lawyers in Military Service, delivered February 7, 1946, at the fifty-seventh annual dinner of the Brooklyn Bar Association, of which Mr. Hunter L. Delatour, a distinguished Brooklyn lawyer, is the president:

I esteem it as a great privilege to be present at the annual mid-winter meeting of the Brooklyn Bar Association and an honor to be invited to talk to you on the work of the Judge Advocate General's Department during the war and since VJ-day.

I bring you no brief case weighted down with statistics, legal opinions, or official reports, but I do bring you the greetings and best wishes of the Judge Advocate General's Department and its 2,800 commissioned officers.

It is about the latter that I wish to talk, for it is they who have done the job—and are still doing it.

Personally, I think they have done an outstanding feat, but perhaps I am prejudiced. However, I have no hesitancy in making such an assertion before this assemblage, because after all, they are your men as well as ours.

They came from the ranks of the civilian bar to the ranks of the Army. We put uniforms upon them and made them into soldiers and officers, but always they were lawyers and in their devotion to the twin professions of arms and the law they contributed mightily to victory.

Moreover, many of them saw combat service before entering our corps and were therefore all the better fitted to become judge advocates when they won their commissions in the Judge Advocate General's Department.

Now that Army demobilization has set in so strongly, many of these soldier-lawyers are back in civil garb, having handsomely earned their discharges. Some of these veterans are no doubt in this gathering. But others are still carrying on and the duties and responsibilities they are fulfilling are quite as pressing and heavy as during the most critical period of the war.

Let me state emphatically that their loyalty and efficiency in these trying reconversion days reflect great credit upon the legal profession of America. They are still meeting an emergency.

I mention this situation in order that you may understand how deeply we still rely upon the members of the legal profession as a whole to see us through the postwar crisis. It is but natural that when the shooting war ended the lure of private practice should exercise a magnetic appeal upon men who left their offices to serve their country in time of peril. Those who are remaining for a while in the service despite their desire to get back to their civilian duties are therefore entitled not only to the gratitude of the Army but to the respect and admiration of their fellow lawyers everywhere.

This fact was deeply impressed upon me only last week when I attended the final graduation exercises at the Judge Advocate General's School at the University of Michigan Law School, Ann Arbor, Mich. The spirit of the young lawyers who received their commissions there just before the school is to be closed down, and who are to replace veteran judge advocates who are now leaving the service, was typical of those who volunteered for service in our corps during the anxious days of 1941. The high morale of these fledgling second lieutenants made me doubly proud of both the Army and the law.

It is for this reason that I prefer to speak tonight upon the human sides of the work of the Judge Advocate General's Department, rather than upon legal technicalities and documentary evidence of its operations.

The legal branch of the War Department and the Army has never before been beset with such a variety of problems and functions as during the present war. They have necessitated the services of the best brains of the American legal profession. The Judge Advocate General's Department has had the

good fortune of commanding the talents and services of many of the ablest lawyers in the Nation. Without them it could not have performed its mission.

The mission of the Office of the Judge Advocate General, reduced to a minimum definition, is to act as the legal adviser to the War Department and the Army. The Judge Advocate General is the chief law officer of the War Department. During this war he has become, because of the magnitude of the Army, the head of the largest law firm in the world.

When war broke out there were but 105 commissioned officers in the Department. The roster today shows a total of approximately 2,800. Simple mathematics reveals, therefore, that some 2,700 of them came directly to the Army from the civilian bar of the Nation.

When you consider that figure you will recognize, first, the fact that the American bar has served the country well; and, second, that the performance of the functions and activities of the legal branch of the Army has been principally in the hands of your own bar associates.

These are the military attorneys who have served as staff judge advocates; administered military justice to the far corners of the world; settled claims from the South Pacific jungles to the Article Circle; investigated war crimes on two sides of the world and prepared indictments; rendered opinions on international law and the Geneva Conventions; protected the interests of the War Department in patents and copyrights; represented the War Department in civil litigation; counseled Army officers in charge of seized war industrial plants and establishments; supervised the military law training of more than 2,600 graduates of the Judge Advocate General's School; interpreted the laws and regulations of the Army and aided in the drafting of legislation; prepared opinions on all phases of acquisition and use of lands for military reservations; passed upon innumerable war contracts; effected adjustments in taxes saving millions to the Government; and participated, with the aid of some 27,000 civilian attorneys, in the processing of more than 8,000,000 cases of free legal aid to enlisted personnel and their dependents.

These are the men who have been entrusted with the responsibility of safeguarding the legal interests of the Army and the 10,000,000 service men and women who have been subject, at one time or another, to the authority of military laws and regulations.

But a few short years ago these men were pouring over reference books in home-town offices; conducting proceedings in behalf of private clients; prosecuting criminals for the Government or States; sitting as judges in the courts of the Nation; teaching law in the universities of the land and otherwise pursuing the peacetime practice of our profession.

Little did they dream that some day they would be isolated on Army bases and other installations in obscure islands of the seven seas settling war claims and winding up Army affairs; or making 1,500-mile hops with their brief cases as a matter of routine in staff assignments; or prosecuting, and in some instances defending, in the interests of American justice, Axis war criminals accused of committing atrocities against our fighting forces and American citizens still too ghastly to believe.

I cite these examples of their responsibilities and their operations to impress upon you the grave importance of their duties and the loyal efficient manner in which they have discharged them. The salient fact is that Americal law has been able to follow the American flag wherever it went only because of the great reservoir of patriotism and talent provided by the American civilian bar.

For the last 4 years and more I have worked with these soldier-lawyers, who have brought into the Army the same high sense of professional ethics and integrity that distinguished their practice of the law in their prewar days. I know their caliber and their record and I say that they have done an excellent job.

I welcome this opportunity to express the appreciation and gratitude of the Judge Advocate General's Department for their unselfish, capable, and devoted service to the law and to the Army. They have added new luster to their profession.

In particular, I applaud them for the excellent account they have given of themselves in the difficult task of administering military law and justice. We in the Army do not claim that it has been perfect. I doubt if anyone would make such a claim for our civil courts. As in every other activity directly effecting the rights, liberties, and lives of individuals, the human equation and the law of averages must be reckoned with. It is as true of Army life as it is of civil life.

Nevertheless, it has been the aim of this Department and those who represented it, to guarantee to every person accused of violations of military law, the type of fair and impartial trial for which American justice, both civil and military, stands.

Not only do we believe that this object has been accomplished in the main, but that the system of military justice established under the laws of the Congress is substantially sound and that despite some apparent faults, it has been carried out during this war in harmony with American traditions of fairness and efficiency.

Let me reiterate what I recently stated before the annual convention of the American Bar Association at Cincinnati, last December, to the effect that it is always at the end of wars, even victorious wars, from the viewpoint of hindsight, that the Army hears most about its errors of both commission and omission.

I have no quarrel with this attitude on the part of the critics. It is always a part of the mopping up operations. Any organization can learn much to its advantage from constructive criticism. The Army is no exception. It might be pertinent to state, however, that the Army has not been reluctant to admit mistakes in military justice during the war and has never been stiffnecked about correcting them to the fullest extent possible. The record is full of instances in which redress has been made when injustices have come to official attention.

Primarily, the court-martial system is designed to help the Army win its battles. The sanctions of military justice are an instrument of command and form the strong right arm of the military commander in the maintenance of discipline and order within his ranks.

Every officer and noncommissioned officer is taught first that discipline and teamwork can best be developed by leadership. There is no substitute for this quality—not only in the Army but anywhere else. Nevertheless, military men also know that when they are dealing with a cross section of the people, they are dealing with weak as well as strong characters, and with refractory as well as obedient human material.

Punishments must therefore be imposed in some cases of wrongdoing and defiance of constituted authority are to be kept under control. At times the penalties, under the stress and tension of combat conditions, are severe. In such instances they are inevitably subject to reexamination by our automatic review system and reduced where justice so demands.

Any impression that hard-boiled justice is the routine or average product of our court-martial system, is not borne out by the facts. The cases that make the newspaper headlines are the exceptions—and those, of course, we always hear about.

A recent survey of several categories of offenses taken from our files shows a standard of fairness and moderation for which I am afraid we receive little credit, so far as the public is concerned.

For example, of 345 prosecutions for murder during the fiscal years of 1942 to 1945, inclusive, 107, or 31 percent, resulted in acquittals and 92, or 27 percent, resulted in findings of lesser included offenses.

Of 473 cases of manslaughter, 296, or 63 percent, resulted in acquittals, and 39, or 8 percent, resulted in findings of lesser included offenses.

Of 307 cases of rape, 160, or 52 percent, resulted in acquittals and 44, or 14 percent, resulted in findings of lesser included offenses.

Court martial sentences in time of peace are strictly limited by maximums established by the President of the United States. During wartime, these restrictions were modified as required by need and the President delegated some of his powers with regard to death sentences and dismissal of officers to commanders in the field.

Perhaps you have noted through the columns of the press, authority to exercise final decision in death cases has now been withdrawn by the President and all such cases both here and abroad must be referred to Washington for review and final action.

The Army systematically examines the cases of general prisoners in the exercise of this power. In my opinion, no penal system of which I am aware, insures a more intelligent and impartial consideration of the rights of persons in confinement and the interests of the public, than the American system of military justice.

At the present time an advisory clemency board, established last June by the Honorable Robert P. Patterson while Under Secretary of War, is reviewing the records of the cases of more than 32,000 general prisoners for the purpose of equalizing justice and exercising clemency in all cases which merit such action.

This board is under the chairmanship of former Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court Owen J. Roberts. Included on the board is a recognized civilian penal authority and three Army officers, some with combat experience and all familiar with the administration of military justice.

While we in the Army hold that a military prisoner not only is protected by all the rights surrounding a defendant in a United States court and even more, the efforts of the Army to see that every offender obtains fair treatment extend even further.

This is demonstrated by the Army rehabilitation program, under which prisoners are given an opportunity for rehabilitation at disciplinary barracks in both foreign theaters and in this country. By the time the war ended 17,000 men in the United States and 4,000 abroad had been restored to duty by this process.

In fact, approximately one-third of all prisoners sentenced to dishonorable discharge have thus far been enabled to rehabilitate themselves and return to good standing and good citizenship. Not least among the accomplishments of the Judge Advocate General's Department was its vigorous support of the proposal early in the war to establish this program.

Although the number of courts-martial is naturally decreasing with the reduction of the Army in size, other phases of our work are increasing. The pretentious task, for instance, of processing the 32,000 records of cases for clemency consideration by the special boards operating under the Honorable Kenneth C. Royall, the Under Secretary of War, is being done by members of the Office of the Judge Advocate General.

Large numbers of our staff are also engaged in the investigation and prosecution of war criminals in both Germany and Japan, while the tremendous growth in the volume

of claims made it necessary last summer to establish a branch office at the Holabird Signal Corps Depot at Baltimore, Md., to handle the increased business.

The subject of claims is an important one in our postwar activities. Our claims officers are now widely distributed all over the world, settling three types of claims caused by military operations.

The first concerns claims for personal injury, death, or property damage in this country. The second involves claims of a similar nature arising in foreign countries where American troops are stationed and the Foreign Claims Act applies. The third takes in so-called personnel claims filed by service personnel for loss of personal property in transportation, in combat, or in other manners directly incident to service. It was for the purpose of handling claims of the latter type that the branch office was established in Holabird. Up to this time approximately 60,000 claims of this nature have been processed.

The job of settling claims all over the globe has been of such an extensive size that we have adopted a decentralized system of claims judge advocates and claims officers. In the formulation of regulations, we have adopted what may be said to be the average of the conflicting laws of the various States and which follow, in procedure, the recognized commercial claims practice as closely as possible. I might state, parenthetically, that we have not wanted for business.

Many of these claims arise from airplane crashes, troop maneuvers, traffic accidents, maritime operations, etc. We are not ambulance chasers, because we do not have to hunt up clients, but we do insist upon zeal in investigating matters in which we are likely to have an interest. We want to be prepared in the event an administrative claim or the initiation of special relief legislation necessitates a report by the Judge Advocate General.

Moreover, we believe in promptness, as you do in private practice. A fair sample of the speed with which we attempt to work was the Empire State crash of last summer. The airplane which demolished a portion of the tower struck the building shortly before noon. Before the day was over, the accident was being thoroughly investigated from an Army claims office established in the building and staffed by officers from our office and local Air Force officers recruited by telephone. Indeed, most fact claims are being settled within 20 days from the time of filing.

The brief sketch I have given of the abovementioned activities of our Department disclose, I believe, my reasons for stressing the human side of our program. Our work requires trained men, experienced in the law, imbued with a high sense of duty.

Your civilian bar associations have provided them for us. They have done more. Through your war-work committees and your cooperation in our legal assistance plan, you have furnished some 27,000 public-spirited attorneys in civil practice, who have given of their own time and service in behalf of the military personnel of the armed forces and their families.

As you know, the legal-assistance plan is a joint endeavor of the War and Navy Departments and the American Bar Association, to make adequate legal assistance available to servicemen and their dependents.

From reports received by my office it is now established that about 8,000,000 cases have been handled by the Army alone, from the inception of the plan early in 1943, to January 1, 1946. This is an astronomical figure, without taking into consideration the number of cases handled by the Navy.

We are profoundly grateful for this contribution to the welfare and morale of our fighting forces. It has solved not only the headache but the heartache of many an enlisted man or that of some member of his family. I doubt if the public is even dimly aware of the value and sweeping extent of this fine-spirited, voluntary service on the part of members of the bar.

Because of the fact that the legal-assistance plan has been operated on such a large scale, it has brought to light significant trends regarding the types of legal advice sought by thousands of individuals ordinarily unaccustomed to consulting a lawyer.

The experience of the Army in the handling of these matters shows that requests for legal advice fall into five general categories, namely, wills, powers of attorney, taxation, domestic relations, and miscellaneous. The manner in which these categories have changed in the progress of the Army from a state of intensive warfare to one of peace is shown by the following comparison of composite percentages by types of all cases handled by legal-assistance offices throughout the Army;

Types of cases	1943	1944	1945	Last quarter of 1945
	Pct.	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*
Wills	25	25	12.5	5
Powers of attorney	27	26	14	8
Taxation	15	19	35	27
Domestic relations	6.5	7	9.5	14
All others	26.5	23	29	46

These figures reveal that wills and powers of attorney matters were numerous at first but as the war went on and the major shipment of troops overseas was accomplished they declined, while on the other hand the percentage of tax, domestic relations, and other legal problems increased.

These trends are especially apparent when the figures for the last quarter of 1945, which reflect the influence of the ending of hostilities on legal assistance work, are compared with the figures for the year 1945 as a whole and for those for the previous war years.

For example, we see that matters connected with powers of attorney dropped from a high of 27 percent in 1943 to 8 percent in the last quarter of 1945; while miscellaneous matters jumped from 23 percent in 1944 to 46 percent by the end of 1945.

We believe that these facts are not without meaning to the members of the bar as well as to the Army. They indicate that the adjustment of domestic relations and other personal problems, such as real estate, personal property, and contract matters, are the things which are now of most concern to those returning from overseas. Some of these questions they will be able to adjust before leaving the service, but many others will be taken back with them on their return to civil life and will require the assistance of the civilian bar.

Although the fighting is ended and the armed forces are being demobilized at a rate faster than anyone thought possible, there will still be many men in the service for some time to come. These servicemen, particularly on occupational or garrison duty abroad, will also continue to require legal assistance. We in the Army intend to do everything possible to meet this need, which remains basically the same and is diminishing in volume only in proportion to the numbers being separated. However, as lawyers in the Army are also being separated in increasing numbers, more and more of this work, it is evident, will fall proportionately upon the civilian bar.

This leads me to some thoughts regarding the future which I believe are of interest and concern to the profession. In the course of the operation of the legal assistance plan, it has become more and more apparent that these activities have had the broad, general effect of helping large numbers of servicemen and their dependents to realize the value and importance of legal counsel.

Many had never before consulted a lawyer and most of those served undoubtedly have a much greater respect for, and confidence in, the legal profession than they had before. Thus, the profession has obtained the good will of a large portion of our population who have been educated to turn to the organized bar when in need of sympathetic and reliable legal advice and assistance, millions of whom are already out of the service and back in civilian life.

At the same time, this presents a problem to the organized bar as to how best to retain and further develop this gain in public relations with this group. It is manifest that unless affirmative and constructive action is promptly taken in this regard, much of this asset will probably soon disappear.

It is not for me to do more than point out this problem to you with the hope that the profession will find a solution that will benefit it and the public as a whole. Perhaps some feasible program can be worked out so that the large segment of our population which is willing generally to pay within its means for needed legal service, usually of a minor nature, will be able through the organized bar to obtain such service from competent, reliable and sympathetic counsel, when they do not have and do not know a lawyer.

The Army legal-assistance plan basically provided such service through the cooperating bar organizations for servicemen. It is believed that those who have been so served constitute a cross section of our Nation and that the experience had in serving them, if applied to the whole people, would indicate that a small percentage are well fixed financially, about the same percentage are without funds, and the majority are of limited or moderate means. The first group can well afford to pay a lawyer, the second can pay no fees at all, and the last group only reasonable or reduced charges.

The problem is to find a way to make legal service available to members of these different economic levels, particularly those in the last group, who want to, and should, pay reasonable fees commensurate with their ability and the nature of the service rendered, on a sensible and realistic basis.

That, I believe, is the problem facing the organized bar—a problem which has always been present and is only partially the result of our wartime legal-assistance program but which has been clearly demonstrated and made apparent by this unprecedented experiment in providing legal service to such great numbers of persons.

As the Judge Advocate General's office is concerned in providing legal assistance for military personnel, not only now and during the demobilization period but also in the permanent peacetime Army, the action taken by the organized bar on this larger problem will be of importance to us. Consequently, I hope, if it receives consideration, that we may know what, if any, method of referral of servicemen's cases will be available in the future through the organized bar.

Our position in this matter, as on the legal-assistance plan, is one of bringing to the attention of the bar an opportunity to render a public service and to offer our cooperation in working out a program as far as we may be concerned. What should and can be done is entirely a matter for determination by the bar after due consideration of the many factors and elements involved. We only hope that such consideration may be promptly given and the position and disposition of the bar be made known to us so that we can make plans accordingly. I trust that your association, and all the others, will cooperate with the American Bar Association, which I am advised is considering this matter, so that the views and support of all concerned will be coordinated.

And now, in conclusion, let me thank you again for the opportunity of coming here to enjoy your hospitality and discuss some of the affairs of our department.

I have been talking principally about the lawyers in our own corps or those who have worked directly or indirectly with the Judge Advocate General's Department. But they do not constitute the whole story.

I suppose there were at least some 35,000 lawyers and men with legal training in the Army during the course of the war. They did not function there as lawyers, however, although many of them, because of their professional backgrounds, aided in legal assistance work, served on military courts, and performed other services in which their law experience proved useful.

For the most part, however, they were just part and parcel of the rank and file of the Army, slugging it out with the foe on the beach heads of islands and continents, flying bombing missions over most of the world, doing their ordinary duties as plain GI's or commissioned officers along with the rest of their comrades. The bar may well be proud of their record and achievements and of the gold stars which shine on the service flags in many a law office today.

They served in the finest Army in the world. No Army in our history has been as well behaved. We know this from the testimony of the field commanders and from the records of our office. Serious infractions of the regulations governing soldierly conduct were the exception rather than the rule.

I salute the lawyers in uniform who helped not only to attain victory but to maintain the honor, reputation, and good name of the American Army.

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1946

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a speech delivered by me at Webster Hall, New York City, on Sunday, February 17, 1946, at a ceremony commemorating the twenty-eighth anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania, under the auspices of the Lithuanian American Council:

Mr. Toastmaster, I am happy with the opportunity when I realize that with these remarks I pay tribute on this twenty-eighth anniversary to the rebirth of Lithuanian independence and freedom.

Lithuania is a land that commands our attention. I speak of this remarkable nation that has existed on the shores of the far-distant Baltic Sea from time immemorial. I speak of a proud race of people who, down through the centuries, have remained apart from the Teutons, Scandinavians, Finns, and Slavs; a country of noble heritage, small in size, but truly and properly shaped as a heart. And it is this heart that lies in the military pathway of two great rumbling and crushing empires of history, Germany and Russia.

In the fifteenth century Lithuania had claimed a vast domain extending from the Baltic to the Black Seas, and men and women of Lithuanian blood all over the world thrill with pride when their mind goes back through the pages of history to the brave deeds of Vytautas the Great. This great warrior king was certainly the most imposing personality of his time in eastern Europe, and his martial valor was combined with statesmanlike foresight.

Lithuania is a land of surpassing beauty. It is resplendent with lakes, rivers, and beautiful forests. Few hills are to be observed in the softly rolling country. It is little wonder that the people have a deep passion for their beloved homeland and desire only that all invaders will depart and leave them in peace. They appreciate the beauty of their Baltic home and they tenderly care for the soil which so abundantly nourishes them.

Since the day, a quarter of a century ago, when that clear clarion call to awake as a restored republic was issued at Vilnius, the Lithuanian nation has bent every effort to restore her great natural wealth, political prestige, and position among the nations of the earth. The Government followed an enlightened program of doing those things that were for the best interests of the greatest number of its people.

Man is essentially religious, and in his continued search for God he leaves the mark of culture. Through the instrumentality of her great leaders, the Christian faith was introduced to Lithuania and the cross of Christ was placed on the altar within the newly built church, erected on the very foundation of a pagan chapel. This great people knew that a nation should have its own clergy, and Lithuanian youth was encouraged to take up the study for the orders of the church. Down through the years the Lithuanian clergy have been to the forefront in all things that were for the good of their people, their nation, and their church.

My friends, it is quite correct to say the Lithuanian has a great deal of cultural wealth, and daily in the nation's capitol its trumpeters sent out a call which was really a prayer of thanksgiving to the Maker of Man.

It was customary for the Lithuanian-Americans to observe at this national shrine the Fourth of July. Since a replica of the liberty bell had been sent from America as a gift from the Sons of Lithuania, it was fitting that it should be rung on this occasion. And on this bell appear the words, in Lithuanian, which, translated mean: "Forever toll to Sons of Lithuania. Whoever fails to defend their liberty is unworthy of it." This should serve as a token of the everlasting friendship of America with Lithuania.

Let me read for you the resolution of the Lithuania Taryba given on February 16, 1918. By this resolution the die was cast and Lithuania was pledged to the cause of complete and untrammeled liberty. This resolution read:

"The Taryba of Lithuania, as the sole representative of the Lithuanian people, in conformity with the recognized right to national self-determination, and in accordance with the other conferences of Lithuania held in Vilnius, September 18 to 23, 1917, does hereby proclaim the restitution of the independent state of Lithuania, founded on democratic principles, with Vilnius as its capital, and declares the rupture of all ties which formerly bound this state to other nations."

Only a prophet can accurately foretell future events, but a study of Lithuania's past would seem to indicate that the expression "Kas bus, kas nebus, O Lietuva neprazus," which means, "Come what may, Lithuania will always stay," has always been correct. This mighty and ancient people have been bored to hardship and inured to pain and suffering of nations on the move. They have known hardship in warfare against such redoubtable foes as the Crusaders, the Tartar, and the German. They have passed through the crucibles of hate and have never completely bowed before Slav or German. They have always won through to victory.

Many people were prone to think that with the coming of the Bolshevik in 1940, Lithuania was definitely through as a nation. They were quite willing to designate to her a position subservient to Hitler when his legions marched through the land in the 1941 campaign against Russia. However, one recalls that the Lithuanian is not easily uprooted from the soil that has been his since time immemorial. The size of Lithuanian landholdings has varied between 20,000 square miles centering about the Nemunas River to the vast empire of Vytautas, which extended from the Baltic to the Black Sea. Lithuania has learned one lesson that precludes any desire for grandiose expansion. She wants nothing more nor less than that portion of eastern Europe which is hers by right of continuous settlement and which is approximately 35,000 square miles in extent, with Vilnius as the traditional capital city.

Another Lithuanian proverb is to the effect that if one is in a hurry it is wise to go slowly. Patience is required of those who would move slowly and surely forward, but the Lithuanian is eminently fitted for this role in history. Time does not have a great significance if the true ends are eventually served. The fact that Lithuanians will never be content without complete and full liberty is sufficient reason to believe that they will succeed. They are no strangers to hardship and sorrow. They have been hardened by long periods of resistance to their traditional enemies. They have won notable victories over the pressing Teutons.

During her period of twentieth-century independence, Lithuania demonstrated an amazing national vitality. Her financial condition remained sound from beginning to end. She built up a foreign trade that was gaining in strength until checked by the restrictions of war operations in the Baltic and North Seas. She made notable gains in such fields as education, scientific research, and agronomy. Her levels of living advanced far beyond those prevailing around her. She was definitely facing westward and sought the privileges of western civilization.

In keeping with the principles expressed in the Atlantic Charter, and reaffirmed by the great leaders of the United Nations, the breath of life and the enjoyment of liberty, with God's help, will once again be assured to Lithuania.

All around the world there are some ideas which millions of men hold in common, and one of these is the mixture of respect and hope with which the world looks to the United States of America. Our common liberation includes giving to all peoples freedom to govern themselves as soon as they are able and the economic freedom on which all lasting self-government inevitably rests. The way to make certain that we do revere our traditional American way of life for all is to create a world in which all men, everywhere, can be free. The history of Lithuania is the most eloquent advocate of her right to enjoy this way of life.

To students of history of this country, comparatively unknown outside of Europe, I urge a study of this proud nation and its brave people.

My friends, as we join in paying tribute to Lithuania's day of independence in this year of 1946, it is difficult to foresee with complete certainty the exact status of the Lithuanian nation. Sore and troubled, indeed, has been her tragic lot.

But observance of Lithuanian independence day on February 16 is a grim reminder that this anniversary will not be observed in Lithuania itself. For the 2,500,000 Lithuanians in Lithuania, or the portion of them that survives, are not in a position to celebrate. There is no free Lithuania, nor is there likely to be unless the ideals of the Atlantic Charter are translated into action.

In the course of the devastating war against totalitarianism, which has been successfully concluded on all military fronts, through the mutual efforts and expenditures of blood and material resources of the United Nations, the political sovereignty and independence of many small peace-loving nations was set aside by armies of occupation.

The Republic of Lithuania was a peace-loving nation which was geographically in the path of three military invasions, as a result of which it lost its government and independence. The independence of the Republic of Lithuania has long been and is still recognized by the United States and many other nations throughout the world which have conscientiously proclaimed their allegiance to principles of liberty and equality and the right of self-determination; and the policy of the United States as expressed in the Atlantic Charter and affirmed in the official utterance of representatives of the Department of State has consistently and unequivocably supported the principle of the right of all democratic peoples to choose freely, and without external pressure, the form of government which they desire, and of the restoration of sovereignty to those who have been forcibly deprived of this sacred prerogative.

President Truman, in his Navy Day address on the foreign policy of the United States, on October 27, 1945, declared: "We believe in the eventual return of sovereign rights and self-government to all peoples who have been deprived of them by force. We shall approve no territorial changes in any friendly part of the world unless they accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned. We believe that all peoples who are prepared for self-government should be permitted to choose their own form of government by their own freely expressed choice, without intereference from any foreign source. That is true in Europe, in Asia, in Africa, as well as in the Western Hemisphere. By the combined and cooperative action of our war allies, we shall help the defeated enemy states establish peaceful democratic governments of their own free choice. And we shall try to attain a world in which nazism, fascism, and military aggression cannot exist. We shall refuse to recognize any government imposed upon any nation by the force of any foreign power.

"A permanent peace can be secured only through a mutual respect and consideration of the basic principles of justice and right as they affect all nations, large and small, rich and poor.

"Friends of Lithuania, I pledge to you my unswerving loyalty and aid to your cause. I shall work and speak and fight and vote in the Congress of the United States for the active support of our Nation to that end. The Congress of the United States should, without delay, declare that it is the sense of that great democratic assemblage that the President of the United States and the Secretary of State give active support to the principles and devote their efforts and influence with the nations of the world to secure to the people of the Republic of Lithuania a restoration of their independence and the right of free and democratic election after armies of other nations have left and Lithuanian refugees have been repatriated to their homeland, and use their good offices to place the subject matter of Lithuania upon the agenda of conferences with representatives of other nations within a reasonable time and support the principles I have just expressed when the matter of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania is considered in such conference.

"Foreign policy is probably the most consistent and stable phase of any nation-state's progressive development. Ancient state traditions and historical reminiscences exercise much influence in a nation's international relations. It is a natural process, inasmuch as the nation's policy is never based exclusively upon day-by-day developments and needs. It is an evolutionary process reflecting the experiences of many generations of the past and merging the aspirations of past generations with those of the present generation."

For this reason, the people's servants entrusted with the task of piloting the nation's foreign policy must possess a complete understanding of their nation's history and must be able to visualize the mistakes of the past, no matter how recent, viewed retrospectively in the light of political developments.

Regardless of all the Lithuanian fairness and honesty in foreign affairs, and regardless of the sincere friendship which the government and people of Lithuania felt and openly showed in the relations with Russia—the inevitable happened. On June 15, 1940, Lithuania was occupied by the Russians—with the blessing of the Nazis. The government took upon itself the responsibility in ordering no resistance, for it was obvious that any armed resistance against the overwhelming Russian armies would have forced the small Lithuanian army into the arms of Nazi Germany for an inevitable internment in East Prussia—a perspective which the Lithuanian people wanted to avoid at any price. A year later she was submerged by the Teutonic hordes. After three more years of suffering and hardships, Lithuania was once more occupied by the rising Red tide. Now she lies prostrate, together with a dozen other nations, in a firm grip of Red totalitarianism.

All her fairness, honesty, consistent friendliness were of no avail. Power-greedy totalitarian nations could not resist the temptation to seize the progressive and prosperous little country. Both totalitarian neighbors had a share in the destruction of little Lithuania. Now one of them, Nazi Germany, is beaten down to her knees. Should Russia, the former partner of the Nazis and the winner at the moment, persist in its policies, we may logically assume that, sooner or later, she will meet the same fate as Nazi Germany.

It may be timely to ask ourselves: What direction the post-Atlantic Charter world will take in reshaping its destinies? Will it be a return to the false game of power politics, with the Red totalitarianism replacing the Brown-Black one in an attempt to dominate and subjugate the freemen of the world? Or will it be a return to the policy of fairness and international cooperation for peace among the free and self determining nations, all enjoying the Four Freedoms and the effects of the unadulterated Atlantic Charter, as the English-speaking democracies continue to insist?

Moral leadership rests with the United States and Great Britain. It happens that the United States is also the only really strong military and economic power. If America will only realize her power, and use this unprecedented power for effecting a moral leadership for a better world, humanity will triumph. But if America fails to assume leadership—there will be no happiness for mankind, and other legions of American manhood sooner or later will sail again to die on foreign battlefields.

In its declarations addressed to the Lithuanian people and to the governments of the United Nations during the past 5 years of foreign occupation, the supreme Lithuanian Committee of Liberation repeatedly reaffirmed that the Lithuanian people were linking their destiny with the victory of the Western democracies. The climax has been achieved. The Lithuanian people rejoice with other freedom and peace-loving peoples that the hour of victory arrived and that the moment of final liberation of the many peoples enslaved in the recent years of the evil forces of totalitarianism will soon be here.

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, the Government of the United States of America continues to recognize the sovereignty of the Republic of Lithuania. Let us hope and pray that our great Nation never deviates from this position. It is all very well to speak of the history and the traditions and the sufferings of the Lithuanian nation and its people. But to you who have the great honor to be of Lithuanian ancestry and to your friends, I say that there is urgent need that you appeal to our Government pending the reestablishment of national representative government of the Republic of Lithuania, and without prejudice to the sovereign rights of the people of Lithuania to have the United Nations intercede with the Government of the Soviet Union.

1. That repatriation of Lithuanian refugees and deportees from territories occupied by the armed forces of the United States and the United Kingdom to territories occupied by the Soviet Union be immediately stopped;

2. That the military occupation of the territory of the Republic of Lithuania be placed under the supervision of the Inter-Allied Control Body;

3. That the Soviet administration in occupied Lithuania proceed in accordance with international law;

4. That the citizens of Lithuania who were deported to the U. S. S. R. in 1940 and 1941 be released and permitted to return home;

5. That the American relief agencies be given full facilities to extend relief to the inhabitants of Lithuania, and, pending their return home, also to the Lithuanian deportees in the Soviet Union.

At the same time, there must be solemn protest against the reported reign of terror inaugurated by the Soviet administration in Lithuania, more particularly against bloody reprisals, the confiscation of private property, the deportation of its citizens, the suppression of their religious freedom and their individual rights.

My friends, forgive me if I have spoken at considerable length, but your cause, as you well know, is close to my heart, and that heart was touched to its depth with a letter I received from a little 5-year-old Lithuanian boy who now lives in Washington. Please let me read to you his simple and eloquent expression:

"I know that you are very busy and I will try my best to make this letter as short as I can.

"Recently, I have heard how courageously and justly you defended my unhappy country, Lithuania, and her unfortunate people. There are thousands of Lithuanians who would like to heartily thank you. But for them it is impossible since they are not free to do as they want. Living in Washington, I am able on behalf of the unhappy Lithuanian and especially the innocent children to take it upon myself to express their heartiest gratitude and appreciation of everything you have done or intend to do in the future. Just as much thanks as my little heart can hold I send to you.

"I am a small boy, Gabriel Gediminas, age 5 years and 11 months, and crossed the Atlantic at the age of 8 months. I found here in America all that the little children of Lithuania do not have—good, healthy food, lots of orange juice and fruits, warm clean clothes, warm baths, lots of soap, many nice toys and books and crayons. And what is more important—I am free to say my prayers, go to church, speak my mother tongue, and can go where I please. In school they teach me everything that is right and beautiful. I am not forced to do anything against my will. I am not punished unjustly and I can live together with my parents. So, in comparison to the children of Lithuania, I am privileged, and this big difference makes me very happy and grateful to people like you who try to make unhappy people happy and, at the same time, I am so sorry for my unhappy people.

"During the war, I had not experienced any bombardments, hunger, epidemics, and all other war horrors and only because I was lucky enough to arrive in this country. I helped the war effort as much as possible and as much as my age permitted. During air raid practices I saw that all the lights were extinguished and went to the shelter, helped cut tin cans, strained grease, and saved pennies and bought war bonds. And now that I am attending school as a first grade student, I am a paper trouper and have earned 3 stripes.

"I am telling you this, not to praise myself, but just so that you would know that I very much wanted America to win the war and, at the same time, for the well-being of all freedom-loving people of the world and Lithuania. I wish the children could only return and live in free Lithuania and, at least, have part of the freedom we enjoy here.

"Now the war is over and everybody is coming home except the Lithuanians, who are being dispersed because they have no country to come home to and are forced to go where they do not belong.

"And now when Christmas is coming, they are sad and frightened because they do not know where their parents are, and are hungry and in rags, and even though Santa Claus would like to visit them, he is forbidden, because Christmas does not exist for some people. Many times I ask myself why for some people it is very good and for others it is very bad. I know that the Lithuanian children are as nice as other children of the world and yet the Lithuanian children have to suffer so much.

"I know that America is a big country, powerful and just, and that General MacArthur and General Eisenhower fought for those who were underprivileged. Also, there were many boys of Lithuanian descent who fought under them for the freedom of the whole world, including Lithuania.

"I cannot help the Lithuanian children myself. I can only pray. But asking your help in the future, I feel as though I am helping them.

"Thank you for all your help. God bless you. I am praying for you."

The distress signal most frequently heard by ships at sea is "three short, three long, and three short." The call letters are SOS and it would seem fitting to regard this as meaning "Sudiev O Sudiev" Lietuva. Sudiev means "God be with you." May I close this expression of my deep feeling with that word, "Sudiev" addressed to you and to Lithuania. Lithuania is a country which has placed her trust in God, and God will never forsake her.

Dr. Muzzicato Reports on Mission to Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1946

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report made by Dr. Charles Muzzicato on medical conditions in Italy as he saw them during a 2-month survey, which took him from Venice to the tip of Sicily.

As National Chairman of the American Medical Relief for Italy (AMRI), Dr. Muzzicato's mission had the full approval of the President's War Relief Control Board. His survey was facilitated by the military permit granted him by the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the U. S. A. and by his attachment to the Allied Commission—Public Health Subcommission—immediately upon his arrival in Italy. Dr. Muzzicato won great distinction as a New York State senator, and to his present duties he brought a background of wide experience acquired while serving in the senate as chairman of the committee on public health.

The report is as follows:

DR. MUZZICATO REPORTS ON MISSION TO ITALY

I have just returned from a land of suffering; a land of hungry, malnourished people; a land of ragged, shivering souls, a land of disease-ridden and pain-wracked bodies; a land of ghastly panorama formed by the utter devastation of war. It is a tragic, unbelievable sight—one that shocks the American visitor with its grim realism. And yet, I came away with pride and admiration for the steadfast courage and tenacity of the people in that destitute land. For despite their terrible lot, the Italian people infuse the outsider with the depth of their faith and the strength of their hope for the future of Italy. They have the will to live—the urge to dig themselves out of the debris of war, to rebuild from the ashes a new life that will assure them of work, bread, and peace. They have conquered despair with fortitude against adversity. This is my overall impression of Italy as I found it and as I left it. But to start at the beginning:

The first indication of what I could expect to find in Italy came into focus as the steamship *Gripsholm*, on which I was travelling, glided into the Bay of Naples. The sight of half-submerged ships in those beautiful waters verily depicted the situation on land.

People—proud-faced, ragged people—struggling in the flood of rubble everywhere, fighting for life against the elements, against illness, against want, against fear, against insuperable odds.

As a doctor, of course, I was mainly concerned about conditions of health and my first conclusion, as I traveled by car from Naples to Rome, was that there was every opportunity for disease to spread—malnutrition, malaria areas, lack of simple ordinary medical care and supplies, devastated and heatless hospitals, homelessness—and hardly any means to arrest its menace.

DEVASTATION COMPLETE

The destruction which unfolded before my eyes as I motored in a jeep from Naples to Rome, was as shocking as it was complete. In many instances, I saw whole towns completely wiped out, deserted, and cut off as dangerous epidemic sectors. I stopped at some half-buried villages to talk with some of the people. I gulped as I noticed entire families from 3-year-old children to an octogenarian grandmother industriously engaged in carrying stones, and mud plaster, trying to rebuild one room of their shattered home in anticipation of the grim winter ahead. Those who had succeeded in putting a small roof over their heads were crowded 10 to 15 in a tiny room. The fear in the eyes of the adults was apparent—fear, not for themselves but for their young. But that fear was mixed with resignation, determination, and will to hurdle the most terrible obstacles they had ever faced.

ROME APPARENTLY NORMAL

As my jeep entered the city of Rome, I was struck with the contrast of the wreckage I had seen and the apparent normalcy of the eternal city. For in terms of physical destruction, Rome is hardly affected by the havoc of war. At first glance, the city seems bustling with life and activity. But this, I discovered, is a superficial impression. The same unemployment, the same economic paralysis, the same hunger, fear, want, and disease prevail as I found in Naples and other places on my way to Rome.

The hospitals, particularly, lack electric power for lighting and fuel for heating. There are few, if any, medicinals, antiseptics, anesthetics, linens, or blankets to be seen. In most cases, patients are admitted only if they can bring some basic hospital necessities. Such a thing as gauze is washed and rewashed and used many times over—a thing unheard of in medical annals.

I saw operations performed without anesthetics, with the patient strapped down and operated upon with crudely fashioned instruments on bare tables. During one particular appendectomy, bleeding vessels were held with fingers and then tied with ordinary thread because of the lack of hemostats and surgical catgut. The wide-open eyes, contorted facial features and screams of the unfortunate patient registered the deep pain and torture he was undergoing. The immunity to pain and suffering which, as a doctor, I had acquired in my long experience, was neutralized by this awful sight.

The maternity hospitals are the most pitiful of all with babies being delivered in the most primitive fashion—improper sterilization, lack of tampons, gauze, rubber sheeting, simple surgical instruments, etc. Added to this is the almost complete lack of milk—mother's milk included, since most mothers are too emaciated and undernourished to be able to produce any—creating the insoluble problem of proper infant feeding. The result is, of course, a high infant mortality rate—a fifty-fifty chance for the newborn to survive beyond its first year.

As I surveyed these conditions in Rome's best hospitals, I asked myself: What can the situation be in the less fortunate areas of Italy? I shuddered as the thought struck my mind and as the fetid icy air of the hospital seeped into the marrow of my bones. I was beginning to dread the continuance of my survey.

NORTHERN ITALY DESCRIBED

Immediately upon leaving Rome to visit the northern areas, the same panorama of destruction I had seen below the city, again came into view. Tears came to my eyes as I observed the damage to the landmarks of architectural beauty in such old cities as Viterbo, Siena, Livorno, Firenze, Pisa, Milano, Verona, Bologna, and scores of others. The hospitals, medical schools, and health centers seemed to have suffered the worst in every respect. Some are wholly shattered, while others are partially destroyed. But one thing that stood out in all of them was the lack of window glass which had been blasted by bomb concussions and which is irreplaceable. Of course, the supply situation in these institutions was even worse than those in Rome. The Germans in their retreat had done a pretty thorough job of stripping them of everything that was movable. Those scenes I had witnessed in Rome hospitals—scenes of painful, primitive operations and treatments—were repeated a hundredfold and the screams and tortures of the patients are indescribable and unforgettable.

It was the same story everywhere I went. I got as far as Venice and decided to return to Rome for a few days' rest and meditation before starting on my mission below Naples to the tip of Sicily. Besides, I had planned to talk with some high government and health officials.

OFFICIALS HELPLESS, TOO

Italy's leaders are fully aware that their country's plight is pregnant with disaster for the social, physical, and economic pattern. Lieutenant General of the Realm, Crown Prince Umberto, with whom I had a long discussion, was emphatic in stating that only a physically virile people could build a healthy economy. "If their energies are sapped by the enervating lack of life's essentials," he said, "then Italy's political and social future will be a sick one."

His Holiness Pope Pius XII, who paid me the high honor of receiving me in private audience, also showed his deep concern for the tragic predicament of his Italian flock. He and the Vatican are doing all within their power to alleviate Italy's suffering. "My blessings to the people of America for their

generosity toward the destitute Italian people," he said as we parted company.

I spoke with Dr. Zanotti Bianchi, head of the Italian Red Cross, and with Prof. Gino Bergami, Italian high commissioner of health. They revealed some figures which, in view of what I had seen, should have come as no surprise, yet shocked me no end. Three and a half million people, for instance, are affected by malaria all over Italy; the increase in tuberculosis incidence is 300 percent; the death rate has increased by leaps and bounds—with one out of every six people slated to die during the winter unless medical help comes in large measure. This is a dark picture, indeed.

SOUTH ITALY SURVEYED

I was ready for the last lap of my survey as I boarded a plane to return to Naples and from there proceed south to visit hospitals in the various provinces and in Sicily. Upon leaving Naples I stopped at Avellino, Salerno, Potenza, and Bari, and just as I was about to proceed to Taranto I was told by health authorities that an epidemic of the bubonic plague had broken out in that province. Most of the area to the south had been cut off, so I decided to fly directly to Sicily.

Palermo was my first stop. But I touched practically every province and major city in that island. I had been under the impression that since Sicily was the first area liberated on the European Continent some progress had been made in rehabilitation. This impression was shattered as I traveled about the island. Transportation and communication facilities between towns a few miles apart are practically impossible, or, at the very best, difficult. Each little village has to be, in all respects, self-supporting—and you can imagine what that means.

The Palermo Tuberculosis Sanitarium is typical of hospitals all over Sicily. Here, doctors have to work without X-ray equipment so important in diagnosing and studying the progress of the disease. There wasn't even a single sulfa tablet, or worse still, no medicines of any kind. Not one pane of window glass remained in the entire institution—a dangerous situation with the winter setting in. When I spoke to medical men about penicillin or sulfa drugs, it was like talking about diamonds. In fact, one doctor in Cefalu Hospital on the road past Termini, told me he preferred a few vials of the drugs to a barrel of the precious stones. This was the general attitude of doctors in the hospitals of every province throughout Sicily.

ITALIANS LOOK TO AMERICA

It is difficult in this report to give an accurate description of the actual conditions. One has to see for himself to believe them. All I can say in summing up is that the Italian people are facing, with typical courage, the gravest crisis in their history. They are in desperate need. And they look to the people of America for help. If you had seen, as I did, the sick, broken, hungry bodies of the Italian people, I feel sure that you would want to do something to help them. If you could have sensed the mental anguish and noticed the fear-consumed bodies of Italy's mothers listening to the hungry or sick cry of their children, you would open your hearts without hesitation. If you could have heard the penetrating screams and groans that rend the hospital air every day, you would give without stint to ease the terrible pain of the suffering.

The time for words is past. Action is needed now to supply the elementary needs of Italy. Nineteen hundred and forty-six will be a decisive year for AMRI, its friends and associates. We must multiply our efforts in unison and go forward to make it a banner year in this humanitarian cause to which we are devoted.

* * * * *

Dr. Muzzicato also wrote a letter to the editor of the New York Times, published in that newspaper under date of January 1, 1946, which letter is as follows:

Anne O'Hare McCormick in her December 26 column brings up a very interesting fact regarding Italy's prewar and present status which points up the complete failure of the Allies to live up to their promises. Mrs. McCormick writes: "During the Fascist regime Mussolini tried to revive the greatness of the Roman Empire. And for a gaudy interval he succeeded in keeping the spotlight on himself and making Italy a key factor in world politics. Because of defeat and its virtual loss of independence, Italy as a nation (today) swings no weight in the international scale."

This is an obviously true but sad commentary on the Allied policy toward Italy, since it becomes apparent that the Allies tolerated a totalitarian Italy in the international scene and now bar from the same scene a government suffering the labor pains of a democratic birth. The Italian people were promised a bright and glorious future by the Allies if they would throw off the yoke of fascism and German domination, and they had faith in the Allied word. Today they are enduring the pangs of untold misery, yet the Allies show a callous indifference toward the problems of Italy and pursue a dangerous game when they allow a nation whose spirit had always been on the side of the democracies to lose faith.

I have just returned from Italy, where for 2 months I surveyed conditions in that destitute nation for both American Medical Relief for Italy (AMRI) and for the Allied Commission to which I was attached as a member of the Public Health Subcommission. I was privileged to talk with people from every walk of life from one end of Italy to the other, and all of them spoke of the complete let-down by the Allies with bitter resentment.

In a conference with Crown Prince Umberto, lieutenant general of the realm, the regent impressed me with the fact that mainly through material help can a strong democratic government emerge and bring forth a new Italy which will be respected in the civilized community of nations. And this point was well illustrated as I traveled up and down the country and noticed the apathy toward local provincial and national government, since the main preoccupation is to earn or obtain a crust of bread and keep hunger and sickness at a distance. By their failure to send the material aid promised to the Italian people, the Allies are weakening, albeit wittingly, the chances of democracy's rise in Italy.

I must say that I was very forcibly struck by that show of innate pride so characteristic of Italians despite their tragic situation. Everywhere I went I was told that nothing was wanted from anybody except the chance to earn their livelihood and so put their country back on the road to complete rehabilitation. That opportunity must not be stymied but rather encouraged and aided by the willingness of the Allies to assure the economic function of the country.

Finally, I wish to say that when I was received in private audience by His Holiness Pope Pius XII, I was carried away by the conviction that moral and spritual values in Italy have not faltered, due to the efforts of the Vatican to reassure the people and assuage their sufferings. Had these values suffered or been shaken as much as the social and economic structure, Italy might have sunk into the mire of chaos and disintegration and might have also lost its nationhood irretrievably.

CHARLES MUZZICATO, M. D.,
National Chairman, American Medical Relief for Italy (AMRI),
160 E. 89th St., New York 28, N. Y.

Briton Takes Gloomy View of Future Under Labor Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1946

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Flint (Mich.) Journal of February 13, 1946:

BRITON TAKES GLOOMY VIEW OF FUTURE UNDER LABOR PARTY

(By John Flint)

A boyhood chum of the Reverend John H. Balfour, Imlay City, recently wrote from Edinburgh, Scotland, concerning what he described as "deplorable conditions in the British Empire." John Flint, wondering if it could happen here, would like to quote a bit of what this Scotch banker and author had to say.

"I wish I could come to America, for at present this country is not worth living in. We are in a dreadful mess. Many have not had a happy day since Labor went into power.

"Already the Labor Government is more than halfway through the legislation to nationalize the Bank of England, and the financial structure of the country is threatened. Bills to nationalize the coal mines are to be presented, then iron and steel industry, railways, transport of all kinds, port authorities, civil aviation, communications, all to come under Government control.

"No wonder there is a hesitancy about a United States loan to Britain to put her back on her feet. It will all depend upon how the loan is to be used. It can be of great service, but if it is used for this detestable socialism in furthering the ends of Attlee, Bevin, Cripps & Co., in destroying British industry, then the loan might just as well stay in the United States.

"If you want to start a business, you must obtain a license, and if, after dealing with a dozen Government departments, you eventually get a license, you may be unable to get any stock because all materials are being exported, and you can't get wood, raw materials, or goods of any kind.

"The demand for houses in Ireland by British folks, sick of austerity living and socialism, is heavy, and I don't blame them, for this country won't be worth living in.

"As to living conditions, we are much worse off now than we were during the war. We cannot get more than 2 pints of milk a week. People are freezing in their houses because there is no coal. The coal is there, but the miners get such high wages they prefer to work only a few days a week. If they worked all week, they would have to pay the difference in income tax.

"This coal business is, I am afraid, the result of Russian Communist propaganda and the hope that one day Britain's coal business will be ruined. Whatever happens, Britain and the United States must stick together, for Russia is the world's No. 1 enemy. Look how she is behaving in Persia, the Baltic, and Bulgaria. Once she has recovered, she will be in a position to defy the world.

"Winston Churchill is the most farseeing politician of our day, a believer in free enterprise, and represents the enlightened British man's point of view. What a wonderful difference it would have made if Churchill could have had a hand in all this peacemaking business.

"Attlee is only milk and water. You have that Morrison over in Canada and many of the things he has been saying, as reported

here, are quite untrue and must be taken with a grain of salt. For instance he said, 'It is not the policy of his Government to socialize or nationalize free enterprise, but only to control it if in the opinion of his Government it was not doing its job properly.' Who is to be judge of that? A few whippersnappers of civil servants in some top room of a government building.

"We are told we must accustom ourselves to austerity, that is doing without things and manufacture to export, but not for home consumption. We have had no new clothes, furniture, kitchenware, sheets, blankets, and so forth, for all being manufactured must be exported to get raw materials.

"One of the black clouds overshadowing this country at the present time is fear. Fear of what the Socialists will do next. They have their daggers drawn at anyone who has capital. Capitalist is anathema to the Socialist. That is why they are endeavoring by income and super tax to tax them out of existence.

"Anyone who makes a profit is, according to the Socialist's dictum, a rogue. That's why they thought they should get the American loan free of interest. They say all profits should be ploughed back into the business to improve and repair machinery, and all left over should be paid to the worker.

"They disapprove of companies increasing their rate of dividend, paying bonus shares, or giving the shareholders the benefit of increased business.

"They have played traitor to the servicemen. The jack-in-the-box Morrison with his vitriolic tongue is most unbeloved here. Bevin, the foreign secretary, knows more about trade unions than foreign policy. The other Bevan is responsible for the houses and health and has yet to come into contact with the doctors whom he thinks he will band together as civil servants. Then he wants to nationalize the hospitals. Truly, this country has gone insane.

"I suppose if I were an American I would be a Republican and not a Democrat, is that so?"

Seniority in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 19, 1946

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the News-Democrat, Festus, Mo., for February 7, 1946:

SENIORITY IN CONGRESS

One of the local boys has written an article relative to seniority in one of the local industries, which is carried in this issue, and in connection with which we have little information, but the purpose of this editorial is to bring to the attention of the more than 20,000 readers of the News-Democrat the archaic seniority rules that have grown up in Congress, which stand between democracy and the people of this country like a stone wall, and the perpetration of which should not be allowed.

For a long time we have been given to understand that a freshman Congressman or United States Senator is required to sit on the back seat, so to speak, accept places on unimportant committees for a certain number of terms before they are even expected to raise their voices on matters of legislation, despite the fact they are sent there by their constituents to represent them. Now and then a bold newcomer jumps over the traces and says what he thinks, for which he is severely punished and relegated further down the line.

The GI's are doing a lot of squawking about what they call the undemocratic Military and Naval Establishments we continue to maintain, and are demanding that something be done about it, and doubtless the majority of their complaints are justified. Right along that line, it's about time the American people demand that the age-old seniority rules in Congress be thrown out the window.

At the present time the State of Missouri has two freshmen in the United States Senate, and be not deceived, they occupy unimportant places there, and are compelled to bend to seniority rules. However, they do have the privilege of voting, even though they can't speak. This particular congressional district has a new man up there, and likewise he, or anyone else who might be there, is a back seater, hog-tied by the long-haired rules. This, despite the fact he was sent to Congress by a majority of the voters of this district to represent them.

In our opinion, the people of Jefferson County want to be represented, and seniority be damned. A newcomer on the town board is not required to keep his mouth shut when he thinks he should have it open, neither should a Senator nor Representative be required to do so. We believe in democracy from top to bottom, and now's a mighty good time to begin getting the top in order the bottom usually takes care of itself.

School-Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 19, 1946

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

LA CROSSE PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
La Crosse, Wis., February 15, 1946.
Hon. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STEVENSON: I have been advised that congressional action is pending on bills to continue Federal aid for school lunches. As you know the school children of La Crosse have received very real benefits from this school-lunch program. At the present time over 3,000 children are making use of it here in the city. I know that the parents of these children are very much in favor of it and would appreciate your support of any measure which would assure its continuance.

With sincere personal regards.

Very truly yours,
R. W. BARDWELL,
Superintendent of Schools.

Our Stake in Indonesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH DE LACY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege granted me, I desire to include with these remarks an article on Indonesian-Filipino-American relations by Trinidad A. Rojo, for many years a resident of my congressional district, an outstanding student at the University of Washington and a leader of the Cannery Workers Union, and now a student at Stanford University in California. I believe Mr. Rojo's studious article will be of great benefit to Members of Congress in facing the issues created in Indonesia. The article follows:

INDONESIAN-FILIPINO-AMERICAN RELATIONS AND RACE PROBLEMS

(By Trinidad A. Rojo)

The Philippines and the United States, and in fact, the whole world are vitally affected by what is happening and what is going to happen in the East Indies and southeast Asia.

In reading the news about the revolt in Indonesia it is necessary for us to keep in mind that the Indonesians do not have press agents in the United States and other parts of the world. On the other hand, the Dutch and the British are not only spending millions for propaganda in America and other countries, but also control the sources and channels of news transmission from their possessions to the outside world. News from Java and Malaya must pass through their censorship.

ECONOMIC STAKES

The East Indies is too vital to the Dutch for us to expect them to be impartial and objective about the uprising which is directed toward the overthrow of their empire. According to prewar statistics, the Netherlands Indies produced 5 percent of the world's sugar, 6 percent of its coffee, 18 percent of its tea, 18 percent of its tin, 22 percent of its agave and sisal fiber, 28 percent of its coconuts, 37 percent of its rubber, 75 percent of its kapok, 80 percent of its pepper, and 90 percent of its quinine.

Less than one half of 1 per cent of the people were white and overwhelmingly Dutch. However, they controlled the business economy and government of the country, while the Indonesians, who compose 97 percent of the population, had the least economic and political power.

From the point of view of the rebels this is like the tail wagging the dog instead of the dog wagging its tail.

It is a modern version of feudalism, of which the natives are the serfs. The colony is exploited for the benefit of the mother country and its people rather than for the colony.

On the other side of the ledger the Dutch point out with pride that they have accomplished a great deal in the industrial and cultural progress of the East Indies and that the Indonesians enjoy better health and have increased greatly.

But after three centuries of Dutch mastery the illiteracy of the islands before the war was still 90 percent. Of the annual budget only 50 percent was devoted to education, while 25 percent of the national income was spent in the Philippines.

RACIAL ATTITUDE

These are solid facts. There are other things in the Dutch-Indonesian relationships that are not solid at all—but are like sandpaper rubbed against native sensibilities.

In his book, I Saw the Fall of the Philippines, Gen. CARLOS ROMULO relates an incident which is striking to us, but which is quite typical of the Dutch attitude toward the natives.

He met a high-class Javanese woman, who had been educated in one of the best universities of Europe. He invited her to dine with him at the Hotel des Indies. She refused on the ground that Indonesians were not welcome there, but the general prevailed upon her, hoping the hotel might make an exception. When they were seated and

ready to dine in the restaurant of the hotel, true to form the manager told the lady to leave.

General ROMULO attended secret meetings of the Indonesians, who used in their rallies the pictures of Dr. Jose Rizal, the Filipino hero, the greatest man the Malayan race has ever produced, and that of the late President Quezon.

The reaction of the subject peoples of Asia was summarized by such remarks made to the general: "You Filipinos are lucky. You have your militant President Quezon and America.

"To us no change could be worse. Anybody but the Dutch and the British would be better."

Because of the underground rumblings he heard, the general predicted that if war came, the peoples of southeast Asia and the Dutch East Indies would put up only a token of resistance and would welcome the Japanese. The Dutch, the French and British colonial officials ridiculed him as a charlatan journalist, who stayed a few days in one place and then thought he knew much more than the old-timers did.

It was not long before the colonial officials had to flee hurriedly to save their skins. For the accuracy of his newspaper reports on the attitude of the Asiatics toward their rulers, General ROMULO won the Pulitzer prize.

BRITISH NIGHTMARE

We cannot rely much on the British for unbiased, accurate information on Indonesia. It is true that the East Indies do not belong to England, but the British view with alarm any independence movement in any part of southeast Asia, as if it were a wild forest fire which might spread to Malaya, Hongkong, and India, and endanger here investments and trade routes scattered all around.

In 1934 Winston Churchill, in an article published in Collier's, opposed vigorously the granting of independence to the Philippines, for it would be a bombshell thrown to the white man's burden in Asia. He believed the Americans were committing a big blunder. But the United States, which was regarded as the bungling amateur among colonial powers, turned out to have the right policy.

Borneo and New Guiana are partly Dutch and partly British. Malaya, which is peopled with Malays, like the Javanese, and which produces one-half of the world's rubber and much of its tin and spices, is only across a very narrow strait from Sumatra, one of the principal islands of the East Indies.

The granting of independence or a commonwealth status to Indonesia or French Indo-China would make England by contrast an unredeemed villain in India.

UNITED STATES PHILIPPINE PROGRAM

Because of the independence program in the Philippines, the Filipinos, who fought stubbornly against the Americans at the turn of the century, fought with them before, during, and after the fall of Bataan, as soldiers, guerrillas, defense workers, etc., in the hills, in the fields, in the towns—wherever they had a chance. Because of the policy of the United States in the Philippines, she, more than ever before, captured the admiration and confidence of the peoples of the Dutch East Indies, Malaya, Burma, Indo-China, India, Korea, and China. Thus, America won the psychological war in Asia. She had more to give to the peoples there than the Japanese did. Like Russia, America does not need colonies. She is so rich that she can afford to give away a treasure chest like the Philippines, which, if the Japanese won, would have been a cornerstone of their co-prosperity sphere. This cannot be said of the other colonial powers who want to perpetuate their domination of subject states.

Without the American program in the Philippines, the white man would have been practically washed out, insofar as the attitude of the Asiatics is concerned.

PRINCIPLE AND INTEREST

The suggestion that the United States should line up with her allies to suppress the Indonesians, so that the Americans will always have white allies in the Orient, is a postwar version of the racism advocated by Hitler, who modified it to suit his policy with the Japanese.

Needless to state, the suggestion is contrary to American commitments in Asia, explicit and implied. It is not in harmony with the general principle upon which her policy in China is predicated—open door and national autonomy and integrity.

It is contrary to American tradition. The Indonesians are fighting fundamentally for the same principle for which the Thirteen Original Colonies of this country fought against Great Britain. It is not in harmony with the preamble of the American Constitution, the spirit of the Atlantic Charter, and the United Nations Covenant drafted in San Francisco.

It would ever be poor business on the part of America. Before the war the British and the Dutch monopolized the control of rubber in the world. America was the principal customer of rubber and the other products of the Netherlands Indies and Malaya. Those possessions were isolated from Japan who was virtually defeated when the Americans and Filipinos liquidated the Japanese forces in the Philippines. Surely we did not fight to perpetuate British and Dutch monopolies and imperialistic abuses.

Should the Indonesians have more to say in their government, it is reasonable to assume that they will see to it that America will get a square deal, and not be a victim of monopolistic control.

BACKGROUND AND POSSIBILITIES

A pertinent question is: Can the Indonesians govern themselves? Of course they can, if given a chance.

It is not well known in the West, but it is an incontrovertible historical fact that from A. D. 200 to 1292 a great Mayalan empire arose in Sumatra. This included South East Asia mainland. The magnificent ruins of the big temples, built over Indonesia during this period, which still strike tourists with wonder, attest to the high degree of culture attained by the Javanese empire. From 1292 to 1478 this great empire, which drew its ideologies from India, was superseded by another vast Malayan empire in Java, which controlled the Philippines for 150 years through Brunei, Borneo.

Under these empires the Philippines became an important trade emporium carrying on a flourishing trade with the Chinese, Japanese, Hindu, and Indonesian peoples. People who thought that the islands had been in the infancy of savagery when Magellan landed there will be surprised to know that long before Europeans came in contact with the Filipinos, the Javanese had worked Philippine gold mines, some of which were later rediscovered by Americans.

The East Indies rank fourth as the richest region of the world. It has twice the people of Bulgaria, Holland, Nicaragua, Ireland, Belgium, Bolivia, Cuba, and Finland. Its population is only about 10,000,000 less than the entire population of the South American countries. It is clear to the unbiased observer that the Indonesians have the ample resources, adequate population, historic tradition, large territory, and strategic location needed to build a strong and progressive state.

If given a chance, in due time, with or without the help of the Filipinos, their cousins in the north, the Indonesians will have sufficient strength and number to checkmate a resurgent Japan, which has already reached its optimum population, while the Indonesians have still vacant and fertile lands in Sumatra, New Guinea, Celebes, and Borneo, able to support three times their present number.

The Indonesians are pro-Filipino and pro-American. They are appealing to America for moral support. If the United States serves as a mediator for the formation of a sort of Indonesian commonwealth, a long and bloody war, which might spread to India, will be averted. America will be in a key position to inspire and influence the establishment of a democracy that will complement the Philippine Republic. The Indonesians will, in their hearts, build for America, a lasting monument of admiration and gratitude.

But if the Americans help the Dutch and the British strike down the national aspirations of the Indonesians, the Hindus and other Asiatics, the latter will be hostile to all whites, and the seeds of the next world war will start to germinate.

A Filipino-Indonesian-American triangle would be a handy and powerful lever for durable security in the Pacific. In the event that her friends on the mainland of Asia fail her, America still has the mighty triangular leverage to mobilize for peace.

Now let us disregard for a moment the interest of the Americans, Filipinos, and Indonesians. Let us consider the matter objectively, not as members of this or that race, but as citizens of this planet.

We do not have an inclusive democracy and freedom if a very large section of mankind are politically and economically in bondage. The sparkling friction emanating from that bondage is a constant source of danger which might possibly set off the fuse of world dynamite.

"Follow Through" Makes Projects Grow in Brooklyn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1946

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which recently appeared in Editor and Publisher and which is a well-deserved tribute to Frank D. Schroth, publisher of the Brooklyn Eagle, who has contributed much to the civic improvement of Brooklyn:

"FOLLOW THROUGH" MAKES PROJECTS GROW IN BROOKLYN—SCHROTH'S PROMOTIONS DON'T END WITH AN EDITORIAL ADMONITION

(By Jerry Walker)

In Brooklyn, they follow through.

They just don't plant the seeds and let the trees grow. They make the trees bear fruit.

Too often, says Publisher Frank D. Schroth, of the Brooklyn Eagle, a newspaper promotes a civic improvement but does nothing about it after the last story of a series or the last "this should be done" editorial is printed.

"In the Brooklyn Eagle's promotion campaign," said Mr. Schroth, "we follow through."

MEMORIAL FUND STARTED

As a result, Brooklyn has under way at this moment a public subscription drive for $1,500,000 to erect a World War II memorial building which was suggested in a Brooklyn Eagle competition among New York City's leading architects.

Brooklyn also is engaged at the moment in a practical demonstration of the effectiveness of programs suggested by civic leaders

for the correction and eradication of juvenile delinquency. The Brooklyn Eagle was the forum for those programs.

Not waiting for official agencies to get around to compiling history, the Brooklyn Eagle's live-wire publisher, who took over a sick newspaper 7 years ago, has put into the hands of readers a 64-page booklet telling Brooklyn's role in World War II as "America's Largest Staging Area."

It matters not whether Washington imposes a tongue-twisting designation nor whether the big papers in Manhattan insist it's the "New York Navy Yard," it's the Brooklyn Navy Yard to the Eagle—because Brooklynites have always called it that. And the Eagle, a centenarian in a borough of old and proud families, is a Brooklyn newspaper.

BIBLE OF BROOKLYN

When Mr. Schroth moved over to Brooklyn from Scranton, Pa., and Trenton, N. J., in 1938, he told an Editor & Publisher reporter: "The Eagle used to be the Bible of Brooklyn and it is our job to have it considered again as such."

He added: "With careful management and a lot of luck, we will revive the Eagle."

At times in this revival of the Eagle, Mr. Schroth confessed this week that he had been "mischievous." There was, for example, the discussion he started in 1942 by popping the query: "Should Brooklyn Separate from Greater New York?"

Instead of letting it become an ordinary quarrel in the news columns, the Eagle called in Princeton Surveys of Princeton, N. J., to conduct a thorough study of Brooklyn's relationship to the city of New York. Then especially prepared articles based on the experts' summary were published. The final story was headed: "Princeton group finds secession idea unwise."

So Brooklyn isn't seceding from Greater New York, said Mr. Schroth in retrospect, but adding: "We could have had a lot more fun with the idea if we didn't have a world war to win."

TEXTBOOK PROVIDED

Editor Edwin Wilson, who helps to execute many of Mr. Schroth's "follow-through" programs, reminded the publisher that the Princeton survey has provided the Nation with the first and only "textbook on Brooklyn." Besides, he said, it has been held up in the city council as "the Bible of Brooklyn."

Full of facts, figures, and charts, a pamphlet containing reprints of the survey stories was published by the Eagle and it was sent out to hundreds of interested persons.

The Eagle backs up nearly all of its promotion campaigns with booklets. The War Memorial project, for example, is now held together in a handsome, stiff-cover volume which becomes the official document in the drive for public funds. It tells the story of a quest for an idea for a living memorial by the Eagle, and it sets forth in black and white the prize-winning proposals.

SCHROTH'S DINNER GUESTS

"Forget the money it cost us," said Mr. Schroth, but it is common knowledge in Brooklyn's civic circles that the Eagle has an investment of nearly $25,000 in this one project, which grew out of a careful reading of an ordinary news story—a story in which Park Commissioner Robert Moses was quoted as saying, "It would be a sad thing if the pattern for memorials established following the last war were to be followed after World War II."

Instead of the many small neglected eyesores in neighborhoods, why not build a memorial to all the servicemen of Brooklyn? Mr Schroth answered the question and set the Eagle to work. First he called together half a dozen of the most active civic leaders and told them his plans for a contest for architects' plans.

When the competition closed last April 1, Mr. Schroth laid 243 entries before the judges. On May 27, the Eagle announced the winners, first place going to a proposal for a group of buildings in Brooklyn's new Civic Center, which, incidentally, is being developed after years of pounding by the Eagle. The Eagle's building is just off the Center.

The prize-winning memorial plan would cost $1,500,000, the architect estimated. The Eagle didn't quit with that announcement, nor let the whole matter ride as just another newspaper stunt. Mr. Schroth invited 150 of the borough's leading businessmen and officials to be his guests at a dinner. Then he told them: "Gentlemen, here's the memorial we should build. Commissioner Moses is wholeheartedly behind the project. Let's raise the money by public subscription."

As of this week, without any formal drive as yet, the committee had pledges of $250,000, all received by telephone. The Eagle has made it Brooklyn's project, not just the Eagle's.

SERIES OF 52 ARTICLES

The juvenile-delinquency program is another in which Mr. Schroth has applied the follow-through technique. It began a few years ago when the advertising department, scraping for some extra business, sold a series of "do good" ads on a cooperative sponsorship basis.

"When we saw that that type of copy wasn't accomplishing what it was intended to do," Mr. Schroth explained, "we decided to quit it just as soon as the contracts ran out. We adopted a more fitting way of reaching the people on this question of juvenile delinquency. It was in a series of Sunday feature pages in which 52 persons, from J. Edgar Hoover to Herbert Hoover, who had some practical solution for the waywardness of minors set forth their ideas."

Given special type treatment in the best editorial manner, with illustrations by Editorial Cartoonist V. A. Svoboda, the series ran on the back page of the first section each Sunday. The long list of sponsors was held back until the publication of the articles in a booklet.

When the series ended, the presentation wasn't laid away with an editorial. Mr. Schroth invited the members of the Brooklyn Council for Social Planning to a dinner and he asked how the program suggested by the Chief of the FBI, by the former President as head of the Boys' Clubs of America, by the county judge, the school superintendent, the educators, and all the others, could be translated into action. It would require the services of a trained social worker, he learned. So the Eagle's publisher put up $3,000 for a year's salary.

For a year now, the Eagle's juvenile delinquency program has been tested in a selected area of Brooklyn. Many of the ideas from the series, a juvenile court, parental relations, etc., have been given the acid test of practicality, to the extent that the council has decided to spread the program.

Mr. Schroth is contributing another $1,000 toward the expenses, and Mr. Wilson is giving much of his spare time to serving on the council.

Staging Area—Brooklyn, written chiefly by the staff of the Eagle, went out as a section of the December 9 issue. The front cover was a picture of the cruiser *Brooklyn* sailing beneath Brooklyn Bridge and the back cover contained a photomontage of important war headlines and a picture of the supercarrier *Franklin D. Roosevelt* moving out to sea.

No advertising was contained in the booklet, 150,000 copies of which have been distributed. Its pages, Mr. Schroth believes, carry the story of Brooklyn's part in the war.

A particularly good job was done in compiling the record of E and M award winners.

"We haven't heard of a single mistake," said Mr. Schroth.

Some of the chapter headings in the book are: "Brooklyn, an Atlantic coast port"; "Brooklyn Navy Yard"; "Fort Hamilton"; "Floyd Bennett Field"; "Beachhead landings"; "A woman will remember"; "Radar, rockets, and atomic bombs"; "Volunteer services"; "Patriotism and pageantry"; and "An apple for the teacher."

Following through, the Eagle has arranged a series of Sunday stories on the accomplishments of certain firms and institutions whose story couldn't be told until now.

Extension of OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, we are soon to be confronted before this Congress with legislation which has for its purpose the extension of the Office of Price Administration. It is well that we do considerable research before this legislation comes to the floor. Because of the price policies of the Office of Price Administration, there is constantly occurring a greater shortage of many materials.

We were told during the war that nylon yarn was being used for various purposes in the war—cables, and so forth. Now the war is over and nylon is still not available for women's hose. And the situation is even more strange than that because without nylon or silk during the war, women were able to obtain through the good stores of the country 51-gage rayon stockings that were very desirable.

Now the war is over and neither nylon nor rayon hosiery in fine qualities are available. Our capacity for the production of both of these products is quite considerable in this country. Before any extension of the Price Control Act is passed by this Congress, I should like an answer to the reasons for the shortage of both rayon and nylon yarns so essential for the American women.

Under unanimous consent, I include herewith a letter received from Strutwear, Inc., Minneapolis, Minn., explaining the difficulties they have had with the Office of Price Administration. I urge that the Congress read this letter:

STRUTWEAR, INC.,
Minneapolis, Minn., January 25, 1946.

Hon. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ROBERTSON: Under the nylon hosiery order of OPA (MPR 602, November 15, 1945) we are required to make application for a qualified wholesaler's registration number before we ship nylon hosiery bought from other manufacturers (not the nylon hosiery we make ourselves).

We made application on November 27. December 12 OPA in Washington asked us for additional information.

We manufacture women's full-fashioned hosiery and sell to the retail trade. We also buy women's seamless hosiery which we do not manufacture, and sell as wholesalers to the retail trade. We have done this for 20 years. There is no complication as the items are separate and reach the consuming public with all pricing requirements of 602 complied with.

We submitted additional information in a three-page letter on December 18.

On January 4 we telegraphed OPA, no reply; on January 14 we wired again and have received no reply.

In our application we told OPA we buy nylon hosiery from Hanes Hosiery Mills, Winston-Salem, N. C., and asked OPA to find out from Hanes whether or not they consider us a qualified wholesaler.

Hanes, of course, has tried from their end to get Washington to act on this matter. We just phoned Hanes' New York office and are informed by them that they cannot get OPA in Washington to answer the telephone.

Hanes has shipped us nylon hosiery because they consider us one of their distributors and we have in our possession 14,000 pairs which we are forbidden to distribute to the retail stores until OPA gives us a number. Many of our customers have no ladies' hosiery to sell, not even rayons.

Can you do anything to help us get through this red tape so we may conduct our business the same way it has been conducted for 29 years?

Sincerely yours,

K. N. COMER,
Vice President.

American Correspondents Answer Attack on General Stilwell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH DE LACY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, on January 14 the New York Herald Tribune and the Washington Post, both excellent American newspapers, carried a column by Joseph and Stewart Alsop. It is indeed regrettable that two such fine journals and two such excellent writers and commentators as these gentlemen usually are should have lent themselves to the attack upon a great American officer, Gen. "Vinegar Joe" Stilwell, which that column contained.

The column accused the general of "narrowness and inability to grasp issues" and of being convinced of "the cowardice of the Chinese or the impossibility of dealing with them." The Alsops also declared that the present agreement in China would have been impossible if Stilwell's dismissal and Wedemeyer's subsequent accomplishment had not restored the balance between Nationalist and Communist governments in China which had been completely upset by the deterioration under Stilwell.

I have talked with General Stilwell and I know his attitude toward the Chinese. It is grossly unfair to say of a man who knew the courage and the determination of the great Chinese soldiers that he ever thought them cowardly. Nor did General Stilwell, whose words of appreciation for the valor and understanding of the Chinese people I have heard again and again, ever conceive that it was impossible to deal with these great people.

Unfortunately, the Alsops apparently lack accurate information on General Stilwell. He is a general and a statesman. Five of the outstanding foreign correspondents who watched his work and his generalship and who know the reasons for his abrupt dismissal from China have spoken in Stilwell's defense. In addition, Richard Watts, Jr., who was editor in chief of the Office of War Information in China at the time, made his own reply through the columns of the New Republic of February 4.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under the privilege granted me, I wish to include with these remarks a letter addressed to the Herald Tribune by the five correspondents and a portion of Mr. Watts' article from the New Republic. They follow:

THE EDITOR, THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE,
New York City.

DEAR SIR: On January 14 you published a column by Joseph and Stewart Alsop which argued that the recall of General Stilwell from China in November 1944, was an indispensable prelude to the present happy truce in that country. Followers of the Hurley affair could be pardoned for thinking that Stilwell's recall and the blank endorsement of Chiang Kai-shek were largely responsible for the renewal of civil war (there had been a truce for years, though a disturbed one, when he was there) and that only Hurley's replacement, and a partial return to the Roosevelt-Stilwell policy, prevented it from assuming catastrophic dimensions. But the Alsops, the elder of whom was aide-de-camp to General Chennault in his bitter fight against the Stilwell military strategy, would like to present matters differently, and the topsy-turvy reasoning of the column is the result.

We wish to take issue also with the personal strictures passed on General Stilwell himself. The Alsops accuse him of being "a man of prejudice, narrowness, and inability to grasp large issues." But it was Stilwell, not Hurley, who understood that China could only fight Japan effectively if she was united, and who wanted to use American aid to help her unite instead of split. Stilwell is charged with wanting to help the Communists overthrow the Central Government. But all he wished to do was to urge the Government to remove troops blockading the Communists to the anti-Japanese front, and to give the Communists at least a little of the lend-lease material, mainly small arms, which they needed for their operations against the enemy. (They never received any.) Finally, to contend that General Stilwell ever said that the Chinese soldier was a poor fighter, or had contempt for the Chinese people, is a malicious untruth. General Stilwell spent many years in China and long periods with the Chinese Army in the field. His whole doctrine of building up the Chinese front was based on his respect for the fighting qualities of the Chinese people. He did criticize an incompetent section of the Chinese high command which prevented these qualities from being put to full use. But do officers who allow their men to starve merit anything else?

Serving in a subordinate role to Chiang as his chief of staff, General Stilwell was in no position to remedy the conditions existing among Kuomintang armies which he felt were unnecessarily prolonging the war, and even jeopardizing the entire China front and the then American strategy. This belief grew into a strong conviction after the Japanese made spectacular successes with small forces and light casualties in the spring and summer of 1944—which Mr. Alsop charges up against General Stilwell's record despite the fact that he could not give orders to even one Chinese soldier on the entire China front.

Therefore General Stilwell took the position that an American must be given top command. Rightly or wrongly, he saw no other way to throw the full weight of Chinese military strength against the Japanese, to wipe out the corruption that had demoralized Chiang's troops during the 4 years, locally nicknamed in Chungking "the undeclared peace," and to prevent the hoarding of American lend-lease military supplies for future use in internal strife.

Mr. Alsop recounts the known fact that Chiang had consented in principle to allowing Stilwell to take over active command of the front. It seems unfortunate that he compares American demands for Chinese reforms, presented by General Stilwell with General Marshall's backing, with terms "which might well have served for a message from the German Government to the unhappy Schuschnigg." The United States was then making no territorial demands on China. It was not trying to compromise Chinese independence but offering an American officer, as Eisenhower was offered to Britain, to take full responsibility for a joint effort to defend that independence. Briefly, as Brooks Atkinson said at the time, Stilwell was trying to get the generalissimo to commit his strength to the anti-Japanese effort. The Chinese people welcomed this, even if the generalissimo and Mr. Alsop did not.

What suddenly prevented this agreed transfer of military command, together with other promised reforms which would have broadened the political base of the Chinese war effort? Mr. Alsop would have us believe the cause lay in a sudden Stilwell tantrum of the variety so recently demonstrated in Washington by General Hurley, who, Mr. Alsop tells us, was so remarkably tactful in Chungking that he was responsible for maneuvering Chiang into originally accepting the American demands.

But Mr. Alsop lets the cat out of the bag when he admits that Chiang never wanted to accept these American demands, that he only agreed because he was so dependent upon American aid. Obviously no amount of anger or ineptness altered this basic condition. Chiang's sudden refusal was a direct result of his learning from General Hurley that continued American aid was no longer contingent upon acceptance of our terms.

We believe that if Stilwell had stayed and become Allied supreme commander in China American arms would have gone to active fronts, where they would have been expended against the Japanese. Spent bullets do not change the balance of power. We believe also that Chiang would have had to reach a political agreement in 1944 instead of 1946. In the meantime, America's name in the East would not have been besmirched by intervention in Chinese civil strife and the bombarding of Chinese villages. American troops would not be guarding bridges side by side with undisarmed Japanese, and it would not have been necessary to send General Marshall to try and clear up the resulting mess.

The Alsop column is widely advertised as factual and not grinding any particular ax. It is particularly regrettable that it should be used to rewrite established history and besmirch a great American soldier who has already suffered, as the good name of the United States suffered, from his defeat in a political fight in which Mr. Joseph Alsop was one of the active protagonists on the anti-Stilwell side.

Very truly yours,

LELAND STOWE.
ERIC SEVAREID.
ANNALEE JACOBY.
GUNTHER STEIN.
JACK BELDEN.

The portion of the article from the New Republic to which I referred, follows:

It is the feeling of American participation on one side in a great internal struggle that gives General Marshall's position its gravest handicap; and it is this heritage of the Hurley

policy which makes a settlement more difficult now than it would have been in 1944 when General Stilwell and Ambassador Clarence E. Gauss were making notable progress toward effecting at least a working agreement. Then there was a general feeling of American goodwill, which now has to be restored with such great effort. Therefore, it seems all the more unfortunate, and even mischievous, when Joseph W. Alsop so flagrantly misinterprets the respective achievements of Stilwell and Hurley as he did recently in the usual excellent column he and his brother Stewart contribute to the New York Herald Tribune.

The Answer Is "No!"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1946

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial by Uncle Dudley in the Boston Globe of February 15, 1946.

Editorials in the Globe signed "Uncle Dudley" are eagerly read by a wide circle of readers who admire his commonsense approach to vital issues of the day. This particular editorial seems to me to be a most timely contribution to the question of continued military service, and I commend its reading to my colleagues in the House of Representatives. The editorial follows:

THE ANSWER IS "NO!"

The announcement by Secretary of War Robert Patterson, before the National Press Club, that the Army will "probably" recommend extension of the draft act beyond its May 15 expiration date, despite record-breaking success of the campaign for a volunteer Army, should put on the alert every citizen who cherishes the traditions of our country.

This declaration is presumably the opening gun of a renewed offensive which, were it successful, would present the United States with the reality of compulsory peacetime military service, though neither the Congress nor the American people have assented yet to any such policy. The fact that the draft continues today, 9 months after the defeat of Hitler and nearly half a year after the surrender of the Japanese, already sets off present procedures in sharp contrast with the policy pursued at the end of World War I. By the 15th of next May, when the so-called selective-service law is scheduled to cease functioning, this country will have been drafting its teen-aged boys into the Army in peacetime for more than a whole year after Germany's downfall and 8 months after the Japanese capitulation. Obviously, proposals to extend the process still further raise questions profoundly important to the future of a free society.

Only a few weeks ago the Army's own spokesman charged with responsibility for rebuilding the Army on a basis of peacetime volunteers, expressed confidence that recruiting efforts could produce a regular volunteer Army of 1,500,000 men by the end of June. With more than 500,000 volunteers taken into service in less than 5 months, and more than 100,000 a month enlisting, his confidence does not seem unwarranted.

Why, then, does the Army—for it is the Army which speaks—though the voice is that of Secretary Patterson—suppose that the American people will accept, or the Congress approve, of continuing a method of compulsory draft in peacetime which is working havoc with the lives of our youth, which is disrupting their education, which is crippling this Nation's prospects in medicine, science, and the professions, which is denying immature young men, not old enough to register their protest at the polls, the right to move into their normal places and assume their normal roles in society?

That is precisely what is taking place, though the war is long since ended. Premedical students are being denied their futures; the Nation, which badly needs medical talent, is being thwarted of its requirements by this ineffably stupid performance. Technical undergraduates are being hauled away from their essential preparation for life—yet, as the late war disclosed only too well, wide development of technical proficiency among the civilian population of this country is essential to the future security of the Nation. Let us remember that far more civilian scientists and technicians went with their knowledge and skills into the war to establish the immense superiority of our arms than from the professional Army. Neither Britain nor Russia failed to digest the lessons given them in this matter by World War I. Germany, which began by ignoring facts (as our Army continues to do), changed her policy when she found that it was destroying her scientific strength.

This indiscriminate draft cannot by any candid assumption be called selective. It is preposterous. Dr. Charles Allen Thomas, of the Monsanto Chemical Co., states that it will take a decade of normal peacetime arrangements for the American universities to fill the gap already widened in our sciences by its operation. Medical authorities affirm that it will be 20 years before the crippling of our public health and medical services can be overcome.

By this system the spirit of active creative inquiry is being disrupted. Yet that spirit is the vital foundation of our national life and of our security as well.

The war has sufficiently impaired the spiritual, moral, and social stability of our Nation already. The war is over. Let us cease to victimize 18-year-old American boys to the obsessions of a hangover war mentality.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

Republicans and World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1946

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech of the gentleman from California, Hon. J. LEROY JOHNSON:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, this is my first visit to the State of Maine, and I know I am going to enjoy the experience.

Your delegation in Congress is a most estimable and constructive group. Senator WHITE is the leader of the minority in the Senate. He is probably the hardest-working Senator in Washington. His responsibilities and duties are so burdensome that he finds it impossible to get back to Maine as often as he would like to. Senator BREWSTER is a dynamic and capable Senator with few if any equals in his penetrating grasp of public problems.

Your House Members, ROBERT HALE, MARGARET CHASE SMITH, and FRANK FELLOWS are well and favorably known. Each is a distinct personality. Mr. HALE is ably filling the Hale tradition of excellent public service. Mrs. SMITH is an independent and progressive Representative. Her courage and balance have been manifested many times by the votes she has cast upon various measures. FRANK FELLOWS is one of the best-liked Members of the House. He also is a leader in his own right. As a speaker and debater he has few if any superiors in the House. All in all, you are fortunate to have such excellent Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

The Lincoln Memorial in Washington is the one memorial that gives you the greatest emotional thrill. It is hard to describe what the sculptor has put into the Memorial that gives one the emotional uplift that the sight of the Lincoln Memorial does. The statue of Lincoln gives one the feeling of stability and nobility. He is the one American, above all others, who personifies the fact, stated in the Bible, that man was made in the image of God. His life was one of trials, tribulations, and tragedy. He needs no monument to perpetuate his name. He resides in the hearts of all Americans as no other man in our history.

In his noble and simple way, he met the issues of his day. He boiled them down to the fundamentals. He stated that his problem was to save the Union. He pointed out that a Republic like ours could not be half free and half slave. He saved the Union and, as an incident to its salvation, he freed the slaves, and thereby made all Americans free.

The specific problems that Lincoln faced and struggled with to a solution have their counterpart in America today. The solution of his specific problems may not be applicable today, but the manner in which he sought solutions is applicable today. What we say about Lincoln can add nothing to his luster or his fame. What we do in understanding and solving the problems of our day may really honor him. If we can apply the patience, the toleration, and the courage to the solution of the issues of this hour that he did to the problems of his day, then indeed we will be worthy disciples of Lincoln.

In closing his second inaugural address, Lincoln said:

"Let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and orphan, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

To me the overpowering problem of this hour is to see that the peace we attained on VE-day and VJ-day is made a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.

From the primitive nation of Lincoln's day we have grown into a mighty nation, the most powerful in a physical sense of any in the world. We are a mighty industrial machine, and our natural resources are almost unlimited. On VJ-day we had developed the greatest military colossus of all time. On the land, on the sea, and in the air we were supreme.

But our moral force and our political leadership had and still has the possibility of being even greater. We stand on the threshold of the age that may be the beginning of universal peace, the just and lasting peace among the nations of the world that Lincoln spoke about.

We stand in a unique position to be the leader in developing international peace. The Republican Party has by some of its policies furnished the background and set the stage for such an accomplishment. In 1898 we acquired the Philippines. We were charged with imperialism, but the answer given by McKinley was that the Philippines, when able to govern themselves, should have

their freedom. We educated and trained the Filipinos during the intervening years for self-government. On next July 4 they are starting life as an independent nation. This policy, in my humble judgment, is one of the greatest steps ever taken for world peace. Imperialism is, and may continue to be, a barrier to world peace. We laid down the policy that a group of people who occupy a geographic unit, or who are a racial or economic unit, shall, when able to do so, be granted the right to handle their own affairs. Think what such a policy may do to wipe out repressive colonial policies which keep in subjugation great groups of peoples who really should be free and independent.

In 1922, under Republican leadership, we entered into agreements with the leading naval powers of the world for a reduction of armaments. Many people, looking backward, have scoffed at and criticized our action. I, for one, am proud that our Nation, the strongest of all, offered a plan to reduce the armaments of the world, so that these giant war machines would not offer a temptation for the provocation of a war. We also bluntly offered to scrap the most tonnage and did so. Later the plan was scuttled by Japan, but at least we were willing to sacrifice much naval tonnage to move in the direction of world peace. If we talk about reduction of world armaments in the future, we can do so with the utmost good faith and conviction, based upon past performance.

In 1928 we sponsored the Kellogg-Briand Pact. It laid down the principle that all other means to bring about international accord and to settle international disputes should first be resorted to before resorting to war. It, in effect, outlawed war as a national policy in the settlement of differences between the nations. It was an idle gesture, but it did lay down a great policy, which, if properly implemented, might have maintained peace.

Today we stand in the shadow of the Great War. Scattered in all parts of the world are the mortal remains of 300,000 of our boys who died in the struggle. They were told they were fighting for freedom and they believed it. Over a million of their comrades will carry the scars of the war till the end of their days. We must keep faith with them and see to it that the just and lasting peace for which they gave their all is made a reality.

Just as the curtain was dropping on the great tragedy, known as the Second World War, America dropped two small bombs that not only revolutionized warfare but international statesmanship as well. The atomic bomb has changed our whole outlook and approach to international security problems. Man's destructive power has far outrun his moral progress. The bombs dropped are mere pigmies to what can be developed by our scientists. At last man, literally, had developed the capacity to commit world suicide and leave this earth a barren and lifeless planet. By our aviation and radio development the world has been compressed into such a small space that atomic air raids can be made on any part of the world from any place in the world. A small air raid—as measured by the giant raids made on Germany in 1945—could in the matter of minutes level every large city in the United States and destroy all of its inhabitants. Oceans, mountains, and distance on this earth have been removed, as far as our security is concerned.

What shall we do? Shall we make a "Custer's last stand," hoping that by having more atomic bombs than the rest of the world we shall be the last to survive in the atomic war that may come? Or shall we inject the Christianity we profess into our statesmanship and diplomacy, and save ourselves as well as the rest of the world? Christianity teaches wonderful principles and if followed individually and collectively would result in men and nations living and acting like brothers. It certainly must give you pause—as it did me on a trip through Europe and to Egypt and the Holy Land last summer—to realize that in Europe and around the Mediterranean is where all the world wars have been hatched during the last few centuries. Right in the cradle and near the birthplace of Christianity is where wars are generated. Certainly the religion we profess has not helped implement our statesmanship, or we would not have had these bloody wars. Have we the courage to exercise that vision, in tackling the problem of survival in the atomic age, that we have used in the development of our Nation, socially and industrially, into the greatest in all the world?

The groundwork for a warless world has been laid by the creation of the United Nations Organization. On this foundation we can develop world peace. For generations men have been dreaming of a world of law. That means that world force is subjugated to reason and equity. It means that foreign policy can no longer be a policy dependent exclusively upon the military and industrial power of the nation enforcing it. Nor can it be based on the principle that the taking or holding of territory and subjugating populations is only limited by the capacity of the aggressor to take and hold the territory.

If we do not control the power of destruction that we ourselves have developed, the human race faces destruction. Nothing matters much if what we plan and build can be quickly destroyed, unless we create a world order that will prevent its total destruction. Our hopes, our ideals, our aspirations, and our plans will surely go for naught unless we control atomic power. If we do not neutralize atomic power by concerted action of the nations of the world, we will live under the awful fear that at any time everything we have and cherish may be completely obliterated.

The alternatives we must choose from now are whether we want to live by force or by law. We have associated ourselves with our allies and others to bring peace by the settlement of international disputes on the basis of justice. The organization has started functioning. It provides a world forum for all nations. When they speak and advance ideas the representatives of the world's nations hear them. It provides machinery for keeping the peace by putting force behind the law. It contains the germ of world peace. It is the really effective defense to the atomic bomb. It puts into effect the Christian principles of the brotherhood of man and the Golden Rule.

Has our party the vision and the courage to grasp this opportunity and contribute something lasting to world peace? We pride ourselves on giving freedom to the whole world and saving the people of the world from their own destruction. But the danger of destruction is more prevalent now than ever before unless we control atomic power.

Sometimes I think I begin to see a drift away from the course of international collaboration that will bring us world peace. But if we are to be worthy of the sacrifices of our soldiers and sailors and worthy of Abraham Lincoln, we cannot fail to realize that we are at the crossroads of the world and must take the road leading to law and peace and not the one leading to international anarchy and perhaps destruction.

This does not mean that we are going to give away our independence or our individuality. We need not give away our wealth to make the United Nations work. In fact, a strong America is essential to furnish the leadership to make the United Nations a success. There will be discouragements, and changes in the structure of the Organization may be required. You all know the uncertainties and the lack of confidence in the minds of the Constitution makers. Did it not take a bloody Civil War to finally establish the unity of our country and to prove the inviolability of the Constitution? If the moral power is there and the will to make the United Nations work, it will work and unfold so as to bring justice to the world in international disputes. Time alone will unfold the necessary mechanisms to make the Organization work, if the parties really wish it to succeed.

For the present, we must have a strong military set-up. Unfortunately, the persuasive power of a nation at the conference table today is measured by its military might. The small nations are pleading and praying that we will retain the relative military strength we had at the close of the war. They feel that we are their shield against oppression and domination. Unless we keep strong militarily, we will not be able to exert the influence for justice to small nations and helpless people that a strong America will command.

This, however, does not mean that in the future we cannot lead the nations away from militarism into an age of peace, providing the necessary ground work has been laid, so the great nations will abandon the military road as the path to peace. Such proposals as that of Mr. JOSEPH MARTIN, of Massachusetts, providing for the abandonment by the nations of the world of military conscription can become a reality if the United Nations is properly developed.

Russia offers a perplexing problem. It seems that some are deliberately trying to get us into a controversy with Russia. General Eisenhower has said that we can and we should get along with Russia. Our interests are not hostile and there are no differences that patience and diplomatic skill cannot overcome. And that does not mean that we must play the part of an appeaser. Russia may very likely be so engrossed with the development of her vast frontier and her unlimited resources during the next century that if she feels territorially secure she may be too busy to think of military aggression.

The Republican Party has usually been better in administration than the Democratic Party. You know many a good plan is wrecked in its administration. Already Senator VANDENBERG has contributed some really practical ideas that have found their way into the Charter. But behind the words and sentences are the men who must by administration unfold the purposes of the Charter, in the day-to-day problems as they arise. If we obtain a Republican administration in 1948 then we will be in a position to furnish the leadership that will make the United Nations Organization really work.

An idealist has been described as one with his feet on the ground and his eyes on the stars. America is the leading actor in the great world drama that is now unfolding, that may bring world peace. If we keep our national feet on the ground and our national eye on the star of world peace then indeed the dream of the ages for a just and lasting peace will be attained. The leadership for this accomplishment can be furnished by the Republican Party. Have we the capacity and the vision to meet this challenge and rid the world of the age-old curse of war? I believe we have and I hope you do also.

1946: A Year for Political Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1946

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, having been granted unanimous consent by the House, I extend in

the RECORD the following address which I delivered to the Missouri Republican Editorial Association, which held its annual meeting this year on February 8, at St. Louis, Mo. In these remarks I make reference to some matters of concern to the general public as well as to the newspaper profession:

Mr. Chairman, members of the Missouri Republican Editorial Association, distinguished guests, my fellow citizens all, I am vastly honored to be invited to address your annual meeting early in what promises to be an historic year for Republican journalism and election victories. They are intermingled and inseparable. I know of no greater asset the Republican Party has nor any group to which it owes greater obligation than its editors, who fight for the party in and out of season. I know you have been especially kind to me in my district. But everywhere Republican editors have always exercised a vigilant and reliable influence for good in the whole party, State, and Nation.

I fancy that as the son of a man who was a Republican editor, I, too, have a little ink in my veins, if not on my hands. I think that I can appreciate some of your trials, tribulations, and rewards, for I have heard much of them. For some 5 years now it has been my opportunity, in Washington, to observe with what cunning and cost Government is restricting and superseding your efforts through its own agencies of "public enlightenment" which subtly regiment public opinion in cooperation with the curious uniformity of intellectual pattern represented by the kept columnists and flannel-mouth New Deal commentators. I said that the Government was superseding your efforts. This has been increasingly true since 1933. War has accelerated it. Permit me to quote at this point a brief paragraph which appeared in that famous Democratic paper, the Baltimore Sun, January 9, 1946, under the byline of Washington correspondent William Knighton. From this we may see the shape of things to come.

"It was announced today that the Joint Congressional Committee on Printing will have to look into the Government printing situation to find out if the Government, through the use of printing equipment purchased during the war, is to become a competitor of the commercial printing industry now that the war is over. James R. Brackett, general manager of the Printing Industry of America, Inc., national trade association, charged in a letter to Senator HAYDEN, Democrat, of Arizona, committee chairman, that during the war the Government accumulated $300,000,000 worth of printing equipment in plants throughout the world, plans for the continued use of which 'constitute a competitive threat' to the existing commercial printing industry. While the printing industry is extremely eager to obtain equipment, Brackett said, very little of the Government-held material has as yet been declared surplus."

While journalistic debasement in Washington has not yet carried its practices as far as those of the late, unlamented Dr. Goebbels, the general direction of Government propaganda has paid that infamous Nazi leader the sincerest form of flattery. The practice of Government departments issuing their own hand-outs, slanted entirely for their benefit, and refusing other comment and information, stifles news at its source. This, combined with the studied efforts of the administration to undermine public confidence in the press, has had an erosive effect on the minds of many people. Many citizens today pay scant attention to editorials except in the sensational left-wing press which gets the scoops from its ideological pals, the bureaucrats. Many rural editors, faced with a Government-enforced and created shortage of newsprint and help, have been forced to surrender the field of editorial writing altogether to the vocal opposition. In lieu of editorials we are seeing more and more Government hand-outs of questionable validity in the local press. Even so, had it not been for the Republican press, America long ago would have succumbed to the enervating effects of the barrage of New Deal thought capsules. Republican editors are known in Washington as patriotic. They are also known to have a soft spot for appeals for free space when Uncle Sam dresses the appeal in the flag. It is not always possible to see the underwear of self-interest beneath the shining and star-spangled outer garments. But they are coming at you in a full-dress, well-financed, and planned attack, my friends. They are not going to pay you for much space, but they are going to furnish you with an ever-increasing load of free copy in big manila postage-free envelopes. You are going to have to buy some extra cylindrical floor files to throw it in or else increase the size of your papers.

THE HIGH PRICE OF GOVERNMENT PROPAGANDA

Did you know that American taxpayers are paying an estimated $300,000,000 per year for Government propaganda? This sum for publicity, promotion, propaganda, and information, selling the alleged necessity for preservation and extension of a multitude of Government services, may annoy some editors who receive it. But enough of it is printed to convince the New Dealers it is worth the effort and expense to continue to send it in ever-increasing volume.

A republic must live by its intelligence, its integrity, and courage. To the people of a republic must be given all the facts to enable them to form correct opinions. But, it is not always facts you get from the self-serving testimony of Government public relations experts. Their objective is sometimes different. They seek to divert public attention from high taxes, official blunders, and debt. They seek to train people in obedience to officialdom by converting public opinion to the preconceived official viewpoint of the administration on domestic and international issues. They seek to glorify officials through propaganda for which the people pay.

There is a table in the lobby of the National Press Club in Washington. To this table each day before noon the various bureaus of government send bundles of their mimeographed releases for the convenience of the Washington correspondents. In one typical week, an interested reporter relates in the July edition of Nation's Business, that he counted on this table, 376 different news releases put out by 36 Federal agencies. These releases contained a total wordage of 217,135. This flow of hand-outs would be great enough to fill a 16-page newspaper for 6 days, leaving normal space for headlines, illustrations, and advertising. One Washingtonian is reported to have a very nice private business of collecting unused releases which aggregate one ton per month of scrap paper salvaged from this one table. Senate Report 1554 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, a report of a committee headed by Senator MILLARD TYDINGS, Democrat, of Maryland, states as follows on page 16:

"The committee circularized some 30 newspapers in the United States in an effort to determine the extent to which various types of information was being disseminated by the departments and agencies. It was discovered that a single week's output of these releases sent to a single average newspaper weighed 16¾ pounds net. If this material were reduced to newsprint it would take 875 columns, each 22 inches long, of newspaper space to reprint a week's releases. More specifically, these releases, if reprinted in the New York Times, would require, exclusive of advertising, the entire space of that paper for five full days."

In 1943 I had the privilege of proving to Elmer Davis, at that time Director of OWI, the unpleasant fact that Uncle Sam was the world's number one publisher and engaged in the business of putting out 441 periodicals when newsprint restrictions were being tightened on private publishers. Uncle Sam has more periodicals than Carter had pills. In addition to periodicals the Government puts out thousands of "valuable" little pamphlets on a variety of subjects designed to suit a wide range of tastes. Two of these recent ones just hot off the press in time to aid the sagging reconversion program are, The Love Life of the Fleas of North America and How To Spend the Weekend Without a Car. Lest you think that the expenditures I have referred to for Government propaganda were necessary in part for the war effort let me make it clear that I am not talking about the expenditures of Government for such purposes. A great many things were done in the name of the war and military secrecy which had no relation to it and are difficult to separate from the sum total. However, some fairly accurate idea of the extent of Government nonmilitary propaganda can be obtained from reference to the cost to the taxpayers of postage-free mail sent out by the executive department of the Federal Government, headed by the President. Exclusive of mail for the Army, Navy, and Post Office, the figures indicate that for 1945 this executive department mail consisted of 1,841,856,000 pieces distributed at a postage loss of $27,628,000 to the United States Treasury.

Government publicity bureaus are also useful in producing magazine articles and books for their bosses. The official receives a high price for his writing and the citizens pay for public information which the Government Printing Office would otherwise distribute in a pamphlet at cost of production. A nice racket.

In addition to all of the foregoing, the Federal press agents offer photographs, radio scripts, mats, and movie scenarios. They prepare billboards and poster advertising. Why doesn't Congress do something about all this? It feebly tried in 1913.

BIRDS OF A FEATHER

In 1913 Congress outlawed the title "publicity expert." It was replaced on the office doors of Government by a wide assortment of high-sounding substitutes. "Director of Public Relations" is the favorite. A Government press agent may also be a "research coordinator," "public counselor," "liaison officer," "executive assistant," or "deputy administrator," "information specialist," "information director," or "analyst of publications." Congress discovered one assistant attorney general was an ex-newspaperman press agent. It passed a law that henceforth Government attorneys must be lawyers. But whatever you wish to call them, there are approximately 150,000 of these publicity hounds engaged in the business of selling the taxpayers, at expense of said taxpayers, upon the wonders of the present administration and its way of conducting the business of Government. They are also cultivating the people's taste for more and bigger public expenditures, requiring more and bigger bureaucracy, more and firmer regimentation, and more Government propaganda and press agents. It's a vicious circle.

Washington newspapers report, and a personal check by me has confirmed, the fact that three high-pressure top-flight Government press agents are now busily engaged in the novel task of making their boss, Henry Wallace, the well-known butterfly chaser and fair-haired boy of the CIO-PAC, look good to conservative businessmen as Secretary of Commerce.

Typical of the way your money is being used to glorify and glamorize the bureaucrats is a five-page mimeographed news release under date of December 21, 1945, from the Department of Agriculture and relating entirely to the Secretary himself. Let me quote from page 5 of this blurb:

"The Secretary is tall, well proportioned, and of distinctly pleasant appearance. He somehow bears a resemblance to Franklin D. Roosevelt as we remember seeing the late President years ago when he was Assistant Secretary of the Navy. The Secretary also has a wholly admirable platform presence. He is a fluent speaker who talks quietly, clearly, distinctly, without any regional twang, and in a well-modulated, fairly deep voice which carries well. His most characteristic gesture seems to be a partly abortive raising of his left hand. His most natural change of expression is to break into a warm genuine smile which conveys friendliness and sincerity. His manner is easy and informal. He frequently displays a lively sense of humor, yet gives one an impression also of firmness of purpose and superior intellectual grasp. What he says comes right from the shoulder. Above all, he impresses you as fair and square, honest and dependable. He is simple, direct, wholly unambiguous, and not given to evasion in the slightest degree. He evinces deep study and full mental grasp of the many problems which engage him. The moment he opens his mouth you are aware that he is thoroughly human, possesses an attractive and vital personality, and is a cultivated American in the best sense."

The release also tells that he likes horseback riding, and bridge, is 6 feet 2 inches tall and weighs 185 pounds. All not very helpful to the farmer. I am sure the average farmer would prefer the money expended for this unnecessary release be spent for production of fertilizer he could spread upon his fields.

I served in Congress with the Secretary before he went into the Cabinet. I know that he is the charming character here portrayed. But, the misuse of taxpayer's funds to print the release is too obvious for comment. When the Republican National Committee exposed it, this release was withdrawn and another issued under the same date leaving off that portion I have just read. The other four pages might well have been left out, too.

It is an insignificant bureaucrat, indeed, who does not have a publicity man, or staff. Only the Congress has foregone this novel adaption to the requirements of modern politics. The story of Congress and its relation to the scheme of Federal Government is almost unknown to the average citizen. Dr. Gallup, the poll taker, says that more than half the people don't even know who their Congressman is. It seems to me that we have here a challenge to the independent and to the Republican press of America. A challenge to tell the people the story of Congress, particularly the work of the minority party in Congress and to emphasize the importance of voting in off-year congressional as well as in Presidential election years. Congress alone stands between the people and a collectivist state. Perhaps I should more accurately say a Republican Congress can so stand. The chance to erect this barrier will be in November.

I am convinced that with your continued loyal help we can and will win, decisively. But, the winning will not be in November or between August and November. The winning will be from here to there. We enter the political arena this year under most favorable circumstances. Indeed, they could hardly be better had we "planned them that way." Let me direct your attention to a few of the issues which to those of us on the congressional front seem most appealing.

SOME ISSUES FOR 1946

I think it almost goes without saying that we Missourians are the shock troops of political battle this year. Truman, Hannegan, and all the rest of the New Deal jobholders will exert every effort to save the President's home State for their ticket. They have said as much. Already they have done so in two State-wide meetings in my own home town. At one of these affairs Mr. Hannegan, Postmaster General and Democratic National Chairman, spoke to the mass meeting of jobholders and exhorted them with this battle cry which I quote: "It is no longer necessary to coddle the Republicans to get them to go along with America. We don't need them. But, we do need and must get a Democratic Congressman who will be true to Truman from each of Missouri's 13 congressional districts in November, 1946."

By the same token it is evident that Republicans, believers in constitutional government and opponents of Trumanism, offspring of Pendergastism, must, whatever their party, put forth every effort to turn back the gang of election thieves and squanderers who would plunder America as they plundered Missouri and Kansas City. A sweeping Republican victory in Missouri in 1946 might even prevent Truman's renomination. Certainly election of a Republican Congress will wither him on the vine until his waning popularity will be so dried from lack of that life-giving sustenance from the Treasury that he will fall off automatically in 1948.

Not the least among our advantages derives from the historically significant fact that the Lord in His infinite wisdom removed from the earthly scene Hitler, Mussolini, and Mr. Roosevelt in April 1945, all, incidentally, in a single anniversary month of the Resurrection. In so doing he did for the American people what they could not do for themselves. He proved no man is indispensable. We must frankly admit that the four-term President had been in office so long that a majority of the voters remembered no one else as President and that he held together as no other man has or can the diverse elements which make up the unholy alliance which is the Democratic Party of today—the bought vote, the radical element, the corrupt big city political machines, and the solid South, where political thinking solidified in 1865 and has not yet thawed out.

For a while it appeared that the new President would be able to hold these discordant elements together. Before entering his present period of strife with Congress he enjoyed first a political honeymoon and then the period of the drift when he sought to let pressing problems solve themselves aided by cordial luncheons with Members of Congress at the Capitol Restaurant and prolonged poker and bourbon sessions on Jefferson Island. Missourians knew what would happen. They knew the same weaknesses always apparent to us would collapse his house of cards. The Presidential oath does not a benefactor make nor high office a hero with Solomon's brain.

Where are we tonight under the farsighted planning of 16 years of New Deal legislation? They say we are in a period of reconversion. A better name for it would be reconfusion. The President whines over the radio because Congress does not do his bidding. "Buck-passing" is an old game. But, if the President's own party majority in Congress doesn't think enough of his program to enact it, then it bears watching.

For years the New Deal has preached class warfare and fanned the fires of racial and religious intolerance. It's poultry is now coming home to roost. Strikes have hindered production and encouraged inflation. But, the President, political prisoner of labor racketeers, seems unaware that no system of government can work unless the people do. Trying to carry water on both shoulders, he has satisfied nobody in his handling of labor disputes. His spider-legged socialistic economists busily spinning their webs around ballot boxes, have not explained why paying more wages for less work is not just as inflationary as paying more dollars for less goods. They stoke the furnace with printing-press money while the Belshazzar's feast continues to the tune of the on-with-the-dance theories of New Deal politics.

Under the Truman New Deal we have finally learned the sordid truth about Pearl Harbor and how we were corkscrewed into war unprepared and without our consent by the secret conferences, deals, and by the plain falsehoods which were handed us before the shooting started, by Executive order, months before Pearl Harbor and an official declaration by Congress. Mr. Truman says the American people are to blame for our defeat in the battle at Pearl Harbor. To the extent that he refers to those who voted for the late President, he is correct. The Commander in Chief appointed the admirals who were admittedly busy exchanging pictures of their pin-up girls while the New Deal furnished the Japs scrap iron and aviation gasoline to use against us.

Under the Truman New Deal we learn of the graft and corruption which prevailed in high places and among members of the late President's own family. We learn how income taxes were avoided and how favors were granted to selected contractors, radio stations, and labor leaders. The New Deal leaders have been and still are preoccupied with seeking safe ways to be dishonest. Harold Ickes is a possible exception. But, if it's too bad for Honest Harold it stinks to high heaven.

Under the Truman New Deal we see lend-lease obligations owed us by Great Britain in the staggering sum of around $25,000,000,000 is to be settled for six hundred and fifty million which we even loan her to pay off with. We learn that billions of dollars we dug up in war taxes have been dished out to foreign nations who used them in many cases—not to help win the war—but to beat America in foreign trade, to advance Communism in some countries and to socialize others. We learn now it is proposed to continue to play Santa Claus to the hottentots and bankrupt nations of the world, who not only will refuse to repay our so-called loans but who will plunder our markets with the funds, so that we lose both our money and our goods—and then they will again call us Uncle Shylock if we don't give more. There will always be a United States of America if the New Deal doesn't give it away. But that's just what the no-good-do-gooders and down-fallen uplifters want to do with it. Charity begins at home. We have some unmet obligations to our veterans and old folks. But they are going to be among the classes of forgotten men of 1946 if the propaganda campaign of the State Department pays off as planned.

The Wall Street Journal of November 13, 1945, was first to expose the State Department's 100-page plan to drum up support in this country for the British loan. They will use the radio, the press, and public speakers to do the job. In this they will be ably assisted by the British, who are such proved experts at molding and directing American public opinion. It may interest you good people to know that in a 560-page report on the Foreign Agents Federation Registration Act, the Attorney General has grudgingly given some very revealing information on the extent to which foreign propaganda is being used in this country to mold the thoughts of our taxpayers. The administration is permitting 34 governments to engage in such activity here, costing millions of dollars annually. The British Information Services have filed a statement, as required by the law, showing that in 1944 the administration permitted them to spend $3,143,000 in this country for propaganda purposes. Figures for 1945 are not yet available. But this annual investment obviously pays off handsome dividends and has for years. The British Empire has more wealth than we and a smaller total debt.

Our own Government engages in a woo-the-British campaign but without comparatively effective results indicated on our profit ledger. The State Department is asking Congress for in excess of $40,000,000 per year to continue to spread American propaganda throughout the world where 850,000 of our

civilian bureaucrats are scattered on various world-saving enterprises. In that proposal you can see the fine hand of OWI which has moved across the Street from Mellett's madhouse to the State Department and plans to continue its work in peacetime under different letters of the alphabet. You may be interested to know how it worked on the British while they were working on us over here. The OWI, now going under the name of the Interim International Information Service of the State Department, sent for the edification of the British our secret weapon, David Cushman Coyle. Comrade Coyle is a well-known New Deal economic philosopher and pioneer exponent of the spend-to-save theory of government which has had atomic effect on the national debt. He is still on the Government pay roll. Well, Mr. Coyle went to England to explain Americans to the English. The following is his report on his 2-year junket at public expense as given to the Washington News September 6, 1945.

"It was most enjoyable. The British just love New Dealers. It was nice to go about lecturing and getting all expenses paid and being buttered up by the British for just explaining to them why Americans chew gum."

Now let us approach our Truman New Deal foreign affairs policy and personnel from another angle. Under the Truman New Deal we learn that Robert Hannegan, of St. Louis, who sat in on the conspiracy to steal the Missouri governorship in 1940 and who had ghost voters registered in his home, has now been promoted to the Cabinet for his services and together with Sidney Hillman controls Democratic patronage. A few new appointments have been made but they are merely New Dealers from the same old deck which has been shuffled many times in the past 16 years. Cohen, Rosenman, and Frankfurter still help rule the roost. Ah, yes, together with certain local assistance. That great foreign affairs expert, who until 1945 was an insurance man in Jackson County, Francis Pendergast, of Kansas City, now holds down a $6,200 per year job with the State Department. Hail, hail, the Pendergast gang's all in Washington now. Maybe the Pendergast influence indicates the trouble with our foreign policy. I want to say a few things about the great Truman New Deal foreign policy which purports to guarantee us the peaceful fruits of costly military victories.

Let me quote a loyal New Dealer, Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, author of the famous Fulbright resolution. Says the Senator:

"I have come to the conclusion that our Government has lost its bearings, that it is drifting about in a fog of indecision, and I believe that the best hope for a wise solution now lies in the wisdom and common sense of the people of this country. * * * The administration has no plan of action, no principles or convictions to guide us. Our actions or policies in foreign affairs seem to be improvised on the spur of the moment. We play by ear without the slightest regard for the harmony of the composition. Such a method of dealing with serious questions of government can only lead to disaster."

Senator FULBRIGHT said all of that and more in a radio address November 23, 1945.

Now listen to sentiments attributed to another Democrat, this time Senator BURTON WHEELER, an anti-New Deal Democrat and an isolationist:

"We are faced with a rivalry between British and Russian imperialism that has its roots deep in the distant past. For the second time in one generation not one of our allies, after the shooting stopped, has wanted any traffic with American principles, ideals, or moral values. The weakness of American foreign policy has backed us into two world wars. There is a third world war in the making. In diplomacy we are permitting ourselves to be sucked into a power bloc on the side of colonial imperialism against Communist imperialism. I am opposed to both. I still favor a democratic republic and free enterprise."

Yes, both the New Dealer and anti-New Dealer, both internationalist and isolationist, in the President's own party, disapprove of the Truman foreign policy. It must be bad. I think we might say that the Truman New Deal has the "atomic ache." It is disheartening to Americans who believed in the glib promises of the late Atlantic Charter to see American soldiers used in a political chess game in China and to guard British-owned coal properties. They do not like the philosophy behind Secretary of State Byrnes' statement that he has ordered American markings removed from our military equipment being used to slaughter Indonesians seeking their freedom from Dutch and British oppression. They are familiar with the precedents for such a policy. They recall that American gangsters remove markings from their own weapons, file them off, in an attempt to escape detection. These are not honorable precedents for the Government of the United States to follow. They will not fool anybody for long. The sordid obvious fact is, after suffering over a million casualties in war, we have now become not the arsenal of democracy but rather the arsenal of empire. As Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG so well said: "In war we stood by our guns with epic heroism. I know of no reason why we should not now stand by our ideals. If they vanish under ultimate pressures, we shall at least have kept the record straight. We shall have kept faith with those who died."

There are a few other interesting developments under the Truman New Deal on which Republicans need to make their position clear, through the Republican press. One is the proposal to put a premium on loafing, to put unemployment on a salary. It is an offer to provide $25 per week dole for not working 6 months per year. Rocking-chair vacation money you who work must provide in higher taxes. Ointment to take the place of sweat. It is a typical Pendergast-New Deal political blue-plate special, built around pork and bull.

Under the Truman New Deal I have been a member of a committee of the House investigating scandalous conditions in our veterans' hospitals. There we found third-rate medicine for first-rate men and the whole Veterans' Administration has had to be overhauled after 16 years of New Deal neglect. Now they propose to extend socialized medicine to all the people of America, for a slight consideration of a 4-percent additional tax on all incomes, except that those making more than $3,600 per year will not have to pay on that. The forgotten man with a low income gets hit in the purse again. And, of course, if he happens to be a Christian Scientist, he gets it in both neck and pocketbook while he pays for the other fellow.

We have heard a lot about how Americans have been ill-housed, ill-fed, and ill-clothed. What has the New Deal Congress done about it in 16 years? It has brought about food scarcities. We need fewer sacred cows and more butter. It has made it impossible today for a man to find any decent suit of clothes or shirts to buy. It has increased the cost of homes so that the average citizen now seeking shelter finds home ownership and building beyond his means.

Under the Truman New Deal we hear Presidential messages to Congress including 7 of 8 radical CIO legislative proposals plus 10 planks from the platform adopted by the Communist Party at its July national convention in New York. No wonder Democratic Party members gag on it. This is no Democratic legislative program.

Under the Truman New Deal administration we hear a Presidential request for legislation to flood this country with immigrants before our own veterans have all had a chance to find jobs and housing.

Under the Truman New Deal we find that Congress does not take up the matter of demobilization, the majority party preferring to let it be handled by the President and the brass hats who let the boys out only under pressure. We have expected this since Governor Dewey revealed in the last campaign the strategy of Selective Service Director Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, who said: "It is easier to provide jobs in uniform than on another WPA." We find the Truman New Deal unwilling, officially, to declare the war is over and to demobilize unnecessary Government bureaus as well as the armed forces. Why? Because the administration is afraid of, and unprepared, to meet and solve the problems of peace. Its only remedy is to spend more money and ask for more power. We know, and they know, how that prolonged the depression from 1933 to 1941. Now the administration admits it can only survive on a wartime economy with wartime controls indefinitely extended over business, over youth, and over Congress.

So, I say, my friends, that the Democrats are suffering from that dread and fatal disease, "delirium Trumans." They have come to the end of the road. They have their backs to the wall. They are staggering and almost out. Ours will be a certain but not an easy victory in November. We must not underestimate the ramparts of Federal patronage, special privileges for pressure groups and prestige always enjoyed by the aged and defending champion until the challenger knocks him out. It will not be easy to put out the false lights in the swamplands of deficit spending which have run the national debt, including contingent liabilities for congressional authorizations not yet appropriated for, to $636,989,220,145. The national debt was $21,000,000,000 in 1933 when the first New Deal President took office with a pledge to reduce Government expenses 25 percent. It will be difficult to erect a stop-sign against the mad race for pleasure, dollars, and phantom security. It is not always popular to stand up against bigger and better hand-outs from the Treasury for pork-barrel projects and to pressure groups which have waxed so fat and powerful on them that, like the Federal bureaucracy of over 3,000,000 people, they have become Frankensteins and I am not talking about the one who is an official of the CIO United Automobile Workers. It has, indeed, become unpopular in some quarters of this country and among vast parts of our population to speak up for America and her interests and to love this country as much as Stalin loves Russia.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY OFFERS A CHOICE

Republicans, however, face the tests of 1946 united. Concrete, constructive, and thoroughly American programs have been agreed upon by your minority Representatives in Congress and the Republican majority in the Missouri State Legislature and printed in black and white. I commend them to you for your further study. I shall not dwell on them at length tonight for I am sure you are acquainted with them. They draw the clear-cut issue between radicalism, regimentation, all-powerful bureaucracy, class exploitation, deficit spending, and machine politics as against our belief in American freedom for the individual under laws fairly administered for all, preservation of local home rule, efficiency and pay-as-you-go economy in government, and the protection of the American way of life against either Fascist or Communist trends. We must keep this choice before the people clean-cut. Americans do not want to become simple statistics in a socialized state. They want full voice and participation in the affairs of a prosperous nation, firmly anchored in the solid foundation of a representative and constitutional form of government. But, I repeat, they must be given a clean-cut, definite choice. I am con-

vinced that if this Nation is to be saved, if representative government is to continue, then the Republican Party must lead the way. I call upon you to keep your shoulders to the wheel—1946 is a year for political decision.

Tomorrow we will meet in celebration and to pay respect to the memory of that greatest of Republicans, Abraham Lincoln, himself at one time a Republican newspaper publisher. Were he here at this hour he would draw these issues clearly. There is no doubt on what side of the line he would stand. To each generation of Americans is given, in its own way, the task of preserving our priceless heritage. But, we can draw inspiration from those who charted the original course. Let us undertake our task this year in the spirit of Lincoln, lover of freedom, defender of the faith, soldier of country and of God. I have refrained tonight from talking about Lincoln for there is no new thing I can say of him which you have not heard. It is rather to the spirit and purposes with which he led our party and country that I would direct your attention. There can be no new thing said of a man who was so eternally right that his principles of 80 years ago would still be good today. "Nor," in the words of the poet, "is there any new thing to be said of the mountain, of the stars, nor of the sea. The mountains ever tower in majesty above the shifting clouds, the quiet stars ever keep holy vigil above a tired world, the mysterious sea ever sobs on the shore. But, to mountain, to star, and to sea, man ever turns in reverent homage. And thus it was with Lincoln, for he was mountain in the majesty of his thought, star in the steadfast purity of his purpose, sea in the deep undervoice of mystery and of sadness, and he abides."

I appreciate the courteous reception and attention of you Abraham Lincoln Republicans. Long live the Republican Party! May God bless America!

A Needed Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1946

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill making available building materials and facilities for the construction of homes within the price reach of ordinary families and returning veterans. According to information furnished me by John B. Blandford, Jr., director of the National Housing Administration, there is sufficient evidence at hand to warrant the statement that acceptable housing can be built in the $5,000 price range. The need for housing in the lower-cost bracket is great and studies reveal that more than half the families of this country could not afford to build a home costing more than $5,000. Furthermore, as new construction materials and methods are developed through research, there should be a progressive lowering of housing costs and with the will and determination to provide adequate housing at low cost the job can be accomplished.

It is my belief, Mr. Speaker, that the House should give due consideration to my measure because it helps the people who are in greatest need of assistance. The returning GI's are members of average families and they have a right to expect our help in achieving a decent security and a place to live which, over the years, they can afford. Housing is the project which will come closest to the hearts of all Americans and this bill will help to give some degree of assurance to over 3,000,000 American families in the immediate future. This measure will not meet the long-range needs of the Nation, but it will help now. The sooner we get started on my proposed program, the sooner we will crack the inflationary jam of shortages and high prices and begin the great forward movement in employment and production which must carry us through reconversion to stable prosperity. Housing is one of the keys to full employment, to eradicating juvenile delinquency, and to achieving full security for all our people. The time to act is now.

H. R. 5515

A bill requiring that of available building materials and facilities 50 percent be used for constructing homes selling for $5,000 or less, 25 percent be used for housing accommodations selling for more than $5,000, but not more than $8,000, and 25 percent be used for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the President shall allocate, and shall establish priorities for the delivery of, materials and facilities suitable for the construction of housing accommodations in such manner, upon such conditions, and to such extent as he deems necessary in order that of the aggregate supply of such materials and facilities 50 percent thereof will be used for the construction of homes selling for $5,000 or less, 25 percent thereof will be used for the construction of housing accommodations selling for more than $5,000, and 25 percent thereof will be available for purposes other than for use for the construction of housing accommodations selling for $8,000 or less.

SEC. 2. This act shall cease to be in effect June 30, 1947.

Serious Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1946

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Omaha Daily Journal-Stockman, of Omaha, Nebr., entitled "Serious Business."

Mr. Speaker, recently the Secretary of Agriculture announced that it would probably not be possible to keep their promise to the farmers on the price of hogs and other farm products. It is quite evident that OPA intends to make the farmer pay more for the things he must buy and yet depress the price of things that the farmer must sell.

Mr. Speaker, the past bungling efforts and regulations coming from many Government agencies have caused a shortage of food. Broken promises discourage the farmer. If Government has no integrity, and fails to keep its promise to the farmers, it will certainly cause more confusion, with a reduction of the needed food and fiber. The following editorial represents a sound plan for solving the question of marketing hogs and the saving of feed. This plan would be far better than breaking the Government's promise to the farmer.

The editorial follows:

SERIOUS BUSINESS

The Government has unofficially promised "drastic moves" to obtain food for Europe. Just what action will be taken will not be known until these moves are announced, but that it will be drastic seems reasonably certain. There is no use guessing what will be done to force farmers to sell grain and livestock to build up the exports, because there are too many methods, any one of which might accomplish the desired result.

Methods that could be used range all the way from a "freeze" of grain to an elevation of livestock ceilings. A grain "freeze" would starve the livestock feeder into disposing of stock and expand the meat tonnage at the sacrifice of later volume. It would also make available to Federal buyers sufficient corn to make up part of the shortage of other grain for export. This plan has some backing, especially by those who argue there is more food per bushel available if the grain is used as human food instead of converted into meat.

There is some pressure for a lower ceiling on some classes of stock, particularly heavy hogs, to discourage heavy grain feeding. Some suggestions are heard for a temporary higher ceiling on some animals to encourage early selling.

No matter what action is taken to strip the farms of grain and meat animals, it will be accomplished if the boys in Washington go far enough, simply because they have the power to do it.

It is with hope that we suggest that they do not resort to measures that are too drastic. The more drastic the methods, the more the farmer will be hurt. Whenever Federal action is taken to force artificial increases in tonnage by bringing out of season sales of grain and livestock, the farmer, in the long run, is the one that suffers.

If it is necessary to provide such increases through the sale of unfinished animals, methods should be used which will bring the least repercussion to normal farm practices. Instead of a penalty to producers for feeding the kind of animals our Government frowns upon, why not a bonus for the men who feed the kind Washington wants? For example, instead of driving the ceiling on heavy hogs to $14, as suggested in Washington, why not leave the ceiling on heavy hogs where it now stands, and raise the ceiling for light hogs to $16 or $17? The result would be the same, but with less harm to farmers and certainly much less ill-feeling toward the planners.

Or, probably better, why not raise the ceiling for all hogs to $20 for a period of 4 months, with the price to go back to the present level July 1? Another, off-the-record suggestion, is a much higher temporary ceiling for a period of several weeks only, to hustle them to market.

There is no use saying such things cannot be done. They can be done. The boys in Washington have been given the power to do just about anything they want. If the repercussion is great, which it well could be, the blame is entirely at the door where rests the power.

Our advice to them is to step lightly. They may step on eggs, some bad ones.

Does Big Business Have a Divine Right to Rule?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 19, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, one of the factors that has made the German Nation a constant menace to world civilization for a century has been its government by big business. Three times in less than a century the world has been bathed in blood for the sake of German markets, because German big business—the manufacturers, the sellers, the landowners, the mine owners, the steel and coal and dye and chemicals cartels—ran Germany.

It was a terrible shock, then, when C. E. Wilson, president of General Motors Corp., told the world he thought big business should run this country. I can only say, God forbid. We do not want America to become a Germany, Nazi-fied, destroyed, and destroying.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert an editorial from the Philadelphia Record which forcefully expresses my views. Regardless of the views of the staff of the House Un-American Committee, America is a Nation founded on democratic principles; it has a government, under Democratic administrations, of the people, by the people, for the people, and we want to keep it that way.

Text of the editorial follows:

BIG BUSINESS STILL TALKS OF "DIVINE RIGHT TO RULE"

There's a sound old-fashioned notion in this country that decisions on national policy should be made by the Government, elected by the majority for that purpose.

Now we hear a suggestion that this idea is all wrong. It comes from an outstanding leader in industry, Charles E. Wilson, General Motors Corp. president.

At the NLRB hearing on unfair labor charges against GM, Wilson described a conference of industrial leaders last month in New York.

The motors, steel, electrical, and packinghouse industries were represented. They had the common interest, said Wilson, that comes from "looking down the same gun." He meant strikes, or threats of strikes.

There was nothing sinister, he said, in the meeting. He denied that the meeting was a symptom, as labor had charged, that there was conspiracy by industry to smash unions. Then Wilson added:

"In fact, it is too bad that that group cannot make the decisions for the country."

Has Mr. Wilson forgotten?

Big business did run the country once.

Behind the facade of Coolidge, Harding, and Hoover. For 12 years.

It ran the country right into the ground, into the debacle of 1929, and it was helpless to stop the disaster that followed.

Let the leaders of industry and wealth run the country again?

As well trust an expert watchmaker to operate for appendicitis.

Such men as General Motors' Wilson are great production experts. They've given most of their lives to production. We admire their skill in that specialty.

But they are not economists or sociologists, or experts in government.

Let nobody make the mistake of assuming that because they are tops in their field they are better versed than the average man in any other field.

Our domestic economy has been snarled. Wilson was right about that. But what reason is there to believe he and his associates could have done any better?

They didn't in the 1920's. And they had a chance, together with labor, last year in Truman's labor-management conference.

They hadn't the courage then to establish some kind of wage-price policy. They can hardly criticize now with a free conscience.

Big business has quite often confided, in public advertisements, that it really wants to run the country.

The National Association of Manufacturers, which apparently has learned nothing from a depression and liberal evolution in government, is clamoring in advertisements for the removal of the shackles of price ceilings and for a willy-nilly balancing of the Federal Budget.

The Society of Sentinels, secret organization of big business names, demands:

Repeal of the Wagner Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, Social Security, and all laws protecting agriculture.

No group, no special interest, can be trusted to run the Government of these United States.

Ours is a government of all the people. It will only serve all the people as long as all the people have the controlling voice.

Government by the few invariably ends up in government for the few.

Artificial Limb Curbs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 19, 1946

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Aid to the Physically Handicapped some months ago requested the Federal Trade Commission to undertake the regulation of the artificial limb business. I am pleased to report that the Federal Trade Commission has held conferences with the members of this industry, and wish to have inserted in the RECORD a story from the Washington Daily News, of Saturday, January 16, 1946. This story describes one of the very concrete results of the work of your special committee, and an accomplishment on the part of the Federal Trade Commission which, in my opinion, is sure to result in benefits to all amputees.

AMPUTEES BENEFIT FROM ARTIFICIAL LIMB CURBS, FTC FINDS

The new trade practice rules for the artificial limb industry drawn up by an industry conference in Chicago last December are meeting almost no opposition.

This fact was brought out yesterday at a Federal Trade Commission hearing to consider regulations to govern the $20,000,000-a-year industry. The regulations were patterned after those laid down at Chicago.

Henry Miller, head of the trade practices conference division of FTC, said the regulations had been a protection for veteran amputees.

A representative of the Association of Limb Manufacturers, recently named in a grand jury indictment charging illegal price fixing, said his organization had no objection to the rules.

The regulations provide that artificial limb distributors must not use the term "perfect fit" or any other methods which might mislead the purchaser and outlawed misleading demonstrations.

Surplus Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 19, 1946

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a resolution from the American Legion Post at Bayard, Nebr.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution indicates the growing concern, of thinking people, about the inability of the returning soldier to take advantage of and get some needed surplus property. Something is definitely wrong with the operation of the surplus property law. It is not being administered as intended by Congress. It seems certain that one of the great scandals of the next few years will be that of disposal of surplus property, unless some definite plans are initiated, at once, to prevent this scandal.

The returning soldier should be able, by the presentation of his honorable discharge certificate, to take advantage of and get a fair share of the vast store of surplus property. The following resolution indicates the reaction of the American Legion Post in Nebraska, as it relates to the disposal of surplus property.

The resolution follows:

Whereas veterans are finding it more and more difficult to purchase surplus Government property, to which preferential right has been provided by law; and

Whereas the supply of such property is adequate, but due to conditions beyond the veterans' control, little if any of this property is getting into their hands; and

Whereas the veteran is in need of such property, and as rules and regulations now laid down by the certification agency require that he spend considerable time and expense to appear personally at the headquarters of such certification agency to establish his eligibility; and after receiving such certification he may find it necessary to travel many miles and in the opposite direction to make the purchase of property desired; and

Whereas the certification and disposal agencies have been changed numerous times by Executive order and regulations which further curtails and delays veterans' possibilities of obtaining such property for which he is otherwise eligible: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That Bayard Post, No. 200, American Legion, hereby directs appropriate action be taken to make it possible that the presentation of a veteran's honorable discharge certificate to the disposal agency be sufficient evidence to establish priority and eligibility to purchase any surplus Government property within the limits of fair share distribution. It is further directed that a more uniform method of notification of time, loca-

tion, and type of surplus properties offered for sale be made available to veterans; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be spread on the minutes of this meeting and that copies be mailed to the department and national headquarters of the American Legion, the national legislative committee of the American Legion, all Nebraska Members of Congress, and the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the Congress.

Adopted by Lincoln-Stone Post, No. 200, The American Legion, Bayard, Nebr., this 6th day of February 1946.

B. W. MOORE,
Post Commander.
T. O. PRATT,
Post Adjutant.

Wilson Wyatt Chooses To Build Houses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 19, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I had the extreme pleasure of meeting Wilson Wyatt, the President's housing expediter and new head of the National Housing Agency, at a banquet last Friday night. I do not recall a time when I have heard a man talk as forcefully, as logically, and as coherently for 40 minutes without once looking at any notes. He has been in office only a short time; but he proved to us he knows housing and he knows the problems he faces; and he has a clear idea of what he is going to do about them.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that you and all Members of Congress are being snowed under by the deluge of propaganda from the real-estate lobby saying Wilson Wyatt cannot build houses. We read all the old arguments every day, and maybe a new one once in a while.

I have faith in Wilson Wyatt, Mr. Speaker, and I feel we should give him every support here in the House. I was struck by an editorial in the Chicago Sun headed "Wyatt's Choice: Houses, Not Business as Usual." Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting this editorial in the RECORD because I think it states clearly the decision that the President, Mr. Wyatt, and the country have made. We must have houses.

The editorial follows:

They are beginning to chip away at Wilson Wyatt's housing program. The real-estate men want to eliminate his proposal for ceilings on existing houses. The big producers of materials want no subsidies. The lumbermen want an end to price control. If every special-interest group has its way, Mr. Wyatt will have no program left, and the country will not get the houses it needs.

Which do we want more—lots of houses fast or business as usual? That is the choice. If the housing problem is really an emergency—and the desperation of home-hunting families gives the answer—then only a national crusade will solve it.

One goal is the rapid production of houses that returning servicemen and average families can afford. If the turn-over and upward course of prices on existing houses continue unchecked, however, the inflationary pressure on the cost of new houses will be redoubled. That is why prices of old houses must be controlled.

Another goal is rapid production of building materials. Allowing prices to rocket might get the production, but it would concentrate home building in the high-cost field, whereas those most acutely in need of shelter can pay only moderate rentals and purchase prices. That is why we need selective subsidies, as Mr. Wyatt has proposed.

What is the alternative to Mr. Wyatt's program? Let us remember that "business as usual" has already been tried. President Truman and Reconversion Director John M. Snyder were operating on that principle when they hastily threw off priorities immediately after VJ-day. But the so-called natural forces of supply and demand did not give us a vast program of home building.

Mr. Wyatt knows that if 1,200,000 homes are to be started this year and 1,500,000 in 1947, extraordinary measures on many fronts must be undertaken.

War veterans who know from personal experience the vast productive power of this country will not be satisfied with explanations instead of houses. There will be political retribution for any officials or pressure groups that throttle Mr. Wyatt's plans.

Lincoln Day Address of Hon. Andrew F. Schoeppel, Governor of Kansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROSS RIZLEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 18, 1946

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Governor Schoeppel, of Kansas, delivered at Oklahoma City, Okla., on February 12, 1946:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am always happy to have an opportunity to come to the State of Oklahoma. The State of Kansas and the State of Oklahoma have a great deal in common. We are next-door neighbors. Many of the people of Oklahoma originally came from Kansas; and, up in Kansas, we have many Oklahomans who have come into our State.

In many respects our problems are the same; and I think that we view things in pretty much the same light. Candor makes me state that I would be much happier if Oklahoma was more traditionally inclined to meet these problems by delegating responsibility to the Republican Party, and I cannot help feeling that the solution of these problems would be considerably more satisfactory if Oklahoma became accustomed to applying the Republican remedy to many of her ills. But, notwithstanding this difference that I have with what in the past has usually been the majority of Oklahoma voters, I am still always glad to be here.

But tonight I am especially happy and honored to be invited to address you in this annual and traditional Republican celebration. I assure you that of all the trips I have been called on to make to this State, none has given me more satisfaction or more genuine pleasure than to be here with you tonight.

All over the Nation on this birthday of the first great Republican President, the loyal adherents to the Republican philosophy are gathered. They are gathering, as we are here, to renew again allegiance to the principles of Government which are embodied in the doctrines of the Republican Party.

There is something very incongruous about the rival political party attempting to cling to the names of some of the early American statesmen, such as Jefferson and Jackson. The tendency of the New Deal to allude to the Jeffersonian principles, and to use Andy Jackson's birthday as an occasion for gathering is indeed strange. If there is anything left in what used to be the Democratic Party which either Jefferson or Jackson would recognize without receiving a specific introduction to it, I cannot imagine what it is.

But I do not believe that the most bitter partisan could, under any possible stretch of the imagination, find the slightest fault with the Republican practice of using the birthday of Honest Abe as the occasion for our party meetings.

Abraham Lincoln left upon this Nation a mark and a stamp so indelible that it will endure through the ages. He was a personality who brought to the United States in one of its darkest hours a kindly, humorous, sincere, and genuine quality of leadership, which was at the same time so farseeing and so eternally right that it buoyed us up and carried us through the awful peril which we then faced.

So much has been said and so much written about Lincoln that I certainly shall not try to quote extensively. He furnished the inspiration for many of the noblest expressions of tongue or pen. One such comment about him has struck me so forcefully that I would like to read to you just a short excerpt from the excellent little paper of Peter Witt entitled "Abraham Lincoln, the Man of Sorrow." In starting that discussion, Witt said:

"Abraham Lincoln is the one American in American history all Americans agree on.

"About him more books have been published and speeches made than have been published or made about scores and scores of the best known and the most worthy Americans combined.

"He was the storm center in the fiercest civil war ever fought, the victim of the most malicious slanders ever circulated, and the recipient of the foulest blows ever struck at a President of the United States.

"Before it was possible for Abraham Lincoln to come into his own, millions of Americans had to go through a revolution of thought and feeling.

"The men and women who, in life, called him a gorilla, ridiculed him as a boor, and denounced him as a demagog, in death, framed his likeness, repeated his sayings, and hailed him as demigod.

"He comes down to us as the man who is different. Different not only when compared with his contemporaries, but different when compared with all men who left the imprint of their work on the pages of time. Different because he, and he alone, sinks deeper and deeper into the hearts of men as days of his being grown more distant."

It is this man's birthday that we now celebrate. As we consider together some of our present-day problems, let us keep him in mind.

I have often wondered, as I have considered problems which now beset us, just what Lincoln would have thought—what Lincoln would have said—what Lincoln would have done if he were here now to face these problems with us. I recommend such a course of thinking to each of you. If you try to apply Lincoln's philosophy, I believe you will find an interesting yardstick by which to compare values and standards of this day with those of another time.

It is time for somber reflection and serious thought. As intelligent Americans, we owe it to our country to give our time and attention to the situation we face.

Our Nation was founded in an effort and was born of a determination to preserve and protect human liberty and individual opportunity. Our forefathers came to these shores for that purpose. They gained their independence for that purpose. They formulated

a system of government to preserve and perpetuate it.

For many years this Nation grew, developed, expanded, and became strong by adhering to that great purpose and by practicing as individual citizens and as a Nation the homey virtues of thrift, industriousness, frugality, honesty, and truthfulness. That has been the whole basis of our development. It is written on every page of our history. The United States of America has become in only a little more than a century and a half the leader among nations because first, it loved human liberty, and, secondly, because in both its domestic and foreign dealings it was thrifty, honest, industrious, and truthful.

Today, in this year of 1946, we as a Nation have had a national administration which in the last 12 or 14 years has almost completely abandoned the things that have made us. That administration apparently lost sight of the eternal truths which make men or nations great. It has, both at home and abroad, forsaken many of our traditions and our principles.

It has, at home, sold our birthright for a mess of pottage. It has depreciated our liberties and traded our individual freedom for a passing temporal dole. It has sought to make industriousness a form of personal folly; to make honesty old-fashioned and outmoded and has placed a penalty on thrift. It has lowered human rights and elevated in their place a paternalistic superstate. It has eliminated statesmanship and enthroned demagogery. It has destroyed much that our ancestors had built. It has embraced in our National Government elements which do not subscribe to our traditional principles and which would exchange individual initiative for some form of collectivism. This, in a word, is the plight of the United States of America today.

Lincoln stood for honesty; for straightforwardness; for open and above-board dealing. He was direct and was particularly scrupulous in telling the people the truth. I leave it to your own imagination as we catalog these simple virtues to draw the deadly comparisons as we think of the political treatment accorded our Nation today.

For the few moments that we have together tonight, let us analyze, if we can, first the position of our Republican Party today and what our duties and obligations are in regard to meeting current problems.

First of all, the occupant of the White House and the majority of the Members of Congress are members of another political faith. As a result, the Republican Party does not have control over national legislation or national administration.

But this certainly does not mean that we do not have a vital role to fill. Upon us falls the heavy responsibility of actively participating in public affairs and of raising our voices on each major issue so that all may hear. It is only human nature for a legislative majority to seek to paint the rosiest picture possible and to lull the public into a feeling of security. If there does not exist a militant minority, the people will never know the actual facts.

It is, therefore, our duty to speak now as never before to the end that the American people may realize their plight and may protect themselves from the pitfalls that lie ahead while there is still time.

While we perform this vital task, we must do still more. It is our responsibility to formulate now a sound program and to offer such a program to the American people. There is nothing very helpful about assuring a man that the course of public affairs is all wrong unless one can at the same time show him how it should be corrected. No one can expect to receive a public mandate and to be delegated to public leadership unless he has a cause, an objective, and a goal which he has formulated and which he proposes to attain.

Let me make tonight this one prediction: If our Nation is to avoid the difficulties which have heretofore been the lot of every great world power, it can do so only by again delegating to a militant Republican Party the task of administering our national affairs. And, when that opportunity for leadership again comes to us, we must be ready to assume it and to execute it in a manner which will justify the confidence of the American people.

Let us then review very briefly some of the difficulties which our Nation faces. At the outset, everyone of us knows that as a Nation we are heavily in debt. In fact, if our Nation were a private business enterprise, we would be admittedly broke. It does not do any good to keep reiterating how much money we owe, but just so we won't lose sight of the fact, that figure is somewhat above $278,000,000,000. I do not know how much money $278,000,000,000 is. I do know there are some comparisons which are somewhat helpful. For example, back in 1929, when we were just going into a financial depression, and when one of the contributing causes of our financial plight was an overextension of our credit, we had a rather substantial amount of what we call long-term debt. However, in 1929, if you took all of that long-term debt—both public and private—including all of the mortgages on all of the farms, all of the houses, all of the buildings, and all of the stores in this Nation; if you added to that the bonded debt of all of our industrial and commercial corporations, and the bonded debt of all of our public utilities and all of our railroads; if in addition to that you had added all of the debt of our Federal Government, all of the debts of our 48 separate States, our 3,600 counties, and our 16,000 incorporated towns, villages, and cities; and if you had performed that entire stupendous mathematical computation and reached the sum total of long-term debt against which the productive capacity of our Nation was functioning in 1929, you would have found a total of about $116,000,000,000. That $116,000,000,000 amounts to substantially less than one-half of what our Federal debt alone is today.

That does not mean at all that we are complaining about a single penny of that debt that was regularly and properly incurred for the purpose of prosecuting the war to a successful conclusion. Quite to the contrary, we all know that the victory we have won is priceless. What it cost us in material things is a relatively small part of the price we paid to achieve it. In human suffering, human blood, and human life, its cost was a great deal more.

But, the patriotic willingness of all Americans to pay the cost of victory certainly does not form the basis for justifying extravagance, inefficiency, and downright bungling. Some of our expenditures during the war may not have been wise, but were justifiable because of the emergency. Others can never be excused on any basis. No one can deny that, through the political management of our Nation's affairs, billions upon billions of dollars of this debt was needlessly and uselessly incurred. Our victory was a military one in every sense of the word, and credit for it belongs to the men who fought the war and not to the politicians who held the Nation's purse strings.

But, however this debt was acquired, the fact remains that we have aquired it. It is a mortgage upon everything that each one of us possesses, our homes, our businesses, our bank accounts, our insurance policies, our very existence. And we further must recognize that fundamentally there is only one way in which that debt can be discharged. Governments do not create wealth to pay either public or private debts. You cannot do it by legislation or by executive decree. Wealth is created by what we produce from our land, what we take from the soil or from our natural resources, and what we manufacture, build, and create. Wealth comes not by the spoken word or by the stroke of the pen—it comes from the sweat of the man who labors and from the ingenuity of the man who creates jobs.

Notwithstanding this very obvious truth which is one of the first principles taught in any beginning course of economics, this Nation is repeatedly being urged by some of the high-powered social experimenters who form the inner circle of the New Deal that the thing that should be done is to have this country go on trying to spend itself prosperous by borrowing more and more billions and literally broadcasting them to the winds.

When I was a boy on a Kansas farm, I found that occasionally it was helpful to use a little bit of water to prime a pump. But I knew then what I think this Nation needs to know now—that you are not getting anywhere in increasing your supply of water in the bucket if you keep using more to prime the pump than you get back out of the well. There comes a time when what you have to do is overhaul the pump. What we need to do now is to overhaul the type of national administration we have been having, which just isn't working out in solving the problems of this particular well.

But the financial problem is not the only difficulty that has come to us. We have used our natural resources in a way that is extremely serious. The war, of course, was primarily responsible for this drain. But whatever the cause, the fact is that we have used up so much of them that we must immediately look with new and increased concern to our future needs. In Oklahoma and Kansas, we are particularly familiar with our oil reserves. During the war years alone, we produced and consumed about one-fourth of all of our present proved reserves. At the same time we used nearly one-fourth of our zinc, more than one-fourth of our lead, nearly one-fifth of our copper, and about 7 percent of our iron. Particularly disturbing about iron is the fact that our best reserves, the immensely rich Mesabi Range, in Minnesota, will probably start to play out in about 10 years.

We have virtually no tungsten, platinum, tin, nickel, mercury, manganese, chromite, or asbestos. All of this must be imported. Our reserves of silver are only sufficient to last 11 years; lead, 12 years; gold, 14 years; petroleum, 18 years; zinc, 19 years; and copper, 34 years. Whether we like it or not, in many aspects as a producer of raw materials and natural resources we have taken a long step from being one of the "have" nations toward being one of the "have nots." We must consider this in all of our calculations and in our foreign commitments.

Despite both our financial condition and the state of depletion of our natural resources, we have been characterized in all of the four corners of the earth as being willing to play the role of the greatest spender to the whole of the human race. We have about 6 percent of the earth's population and about 7 percent of the earth's area. We have the most ingenious and self-reliant people. But, we cannot expect to support everybody else on the face of the earth in the style to which they would like to become accustomed. You know there is a limit to how many of a wife's relatives that any man can support. The same applies to nations on a larger scale.

This does not mean, of course, that all of us are not perfectly willing to share what we have of food, clothing, and fuel to alleviate the acute suffering of the defenseless peoples of the world. There is no room for political discussion or differences on this point. But that is not where the New Dealers are willing to stop. Their plans go much further and their secret commitments, the extent of which still is unknown to the American people, seem to have sought to commit this

Nation far beyond simply helping to feed and clothe those in distress.

But I shall have something more to say about that a little later. Let us turn now to another phase of our Nation's problems.

During the past 90 days, we have witnessed in this country the most devastating series of labor disputes and strikes that we have ever known. These unfortunate occurrences are serious whenever and however they occur. Coming as these have, at the moment when our Nation was turning from war to peace and was engaged in a period of tremendous economic change (which we have conveniently labeled reconversion), coming with the suddenness and swiftness that they have, they constitute a tragedy which we can scarcely withstand. They mean millions upon millions of dollars worth of wages which have been lost to American labor. They mean millions upon millions of dollars worth of badly needed consumer goods. They have disrupted the whole of our economic life. Everyone is going to lose by them—labor, capital, and the public.

For these difficulties both management and labor are probably partially to blame. But, by all odds, the largest contributing factor is attributable squarely to the national administration. It has made these strikes possible in at least 3 separate ways.

In the first place, the New Deal has already failed to have any clear-cut and concise labor policy. Neither labor nor management has had any way to determine what the Government would or would not do. Labor could not know to what extent the Government would allow increases in wages under its attempts to control inflation. Management could not tell to what extent, if any, Government would relax price ceilings to permit increased rates of pay. Both were left wholly in the dark as to what they might expect from Government.

In the second place, the national administration has failed to make parties responsible for their own acts and their own contractual obligations. There has been nothing done to impress the parties with the fact that the subject upon which they were dealing was an important one in which the public as a whole had a stake. The matter has been treated more as a contest or a game in which moves and countermoves have been made. The responsibilities which inevitably go with power and authority have not been emphasized nor insisted upon.

Lastly, the national administration has failed to make it crystal clear that Government is always ready to occupy the role of an impartial arbiter. Government should not take sides. It should only make decisions based upon the facts. As soon as Government becomes a partisan, we lose the last semblance of orderly and democratic procedure.

The New Dealers have attempted to carefully conceal what their true purposes are—attempting to court favor in various circles and intimating first to labor and then to management that it will accord to each some special privilege or prerogative. This, I repeat, is not the role of Government. Government should not and must not throw away its whistle and start "carrying the ball." It still must be the referee and must not try to "call the signals" and to run everybody's business.

Every thinking man realizes that in an economy built upon individual initiative and private enterprise it is imperative that we keep always before us the necessity of maintaining purchasing power. It is useless to build automobiles unless the people have money enough to buy them. It is useless to refine gasoline, to make tires, radios, washing machines, build houses, or anything else you want to name unless there is the consuming capacity present to utilize and absorb them. Therefore, we are all desirous of seeing to it that labor receives the full fruits of the labor. To do otherwise is pure folly and forbodes economic disaster.

I do not want to be misunderstood in what I am saying. I have no sympathy at all for the labor racketeer who has no interest in the situation at all except to foment trouble and to create for himself a fancy job with a tremendous salary and a fabulous expense account, or to raise huge funds for political purposes and fail to account for them. Too often that labor racketeer has had little interest at all in the welfare of the workingman whom he seeks to represent.

No more serious charge can be laid at the door of the New Deal than its failure to be fair and to act forthrightly in the labor disputes which have confronted this Nation within recent months.

Again, I pause to think what Abraham Lincoln would have thought of a government that so completely failed to be honest with its citizens on an issue which affects them so vitally.

Lincoln was a friend of labor and gave serious consideration to it in his day. Listen to what he had to say about it in his message to Congress in December 1861, and to this I subscribe:

"None are so deeply interested to resist the present rebellion as the working people. Let them beware of prejudice, working division and hostility among themselves. * * * The strongest bond of human sympathy, outside the family relation, should be one uniting all working people, of all nations, and tongues, and kindred. Nor should this lead to a war upon property or the owners of property. Property is the fruit of labor; property is desirable; is a positive good in the world. That some should be rich shows that others may become rich, and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise. Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him work diligently and build one for himself, thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built."

Those words are as profound and as rich in meaning today as they were when Lincoln spoke them 85 years ago. But eternal truths never change, and in Lincoln we can find the expression of many of those truths.

If we may now turn to another problem of government, I would like to say that, to me, it seems rather paradoxical that the same administration which so wholly fails to discharge its obvious obligations as I have just pointed out, is at the same time presently occupied with trying to assume unto itself manifold duties which, in a large measure, do not belong to it at all. One of the crying needs of the United States today is a Federal Government which will do well those things incumbent upon it, instead of a Federal Government which undertakes a host of activities which do not belong to it, and which it either cannot or will not properly conduct.

I particularly have in mind now the terrible tendency toward centralization of government wherein we are apparently attempting to build a huge bureaucracy in Washington that will proceed to run all of the affairs of all of the people.

Through recent years, and most particularly during the past decade, we have been moving steadily toward a greater concentration of power in the Federal Government. Step by step we have watched this become an accomplished fact. Today our counties and our States are rapidly approaching the point of being nothing more or less than departments of the Federal Government. The question is whether or not all initiative and all freedom of choice is to be centralized in Washington, or whether we are to continue to rely upon local Government agencies as active and dynamic forces in our scheme of constitutional democracy.

Let me point out a few of its manifestations. Perhaps one of the most basic concepts we have is related to the ownership of land. Since the beginning of time, men have struggled to possess a little portion of the earth's surface—for a home, for a farm, for a store building, or a factory. The ownership of land has been to a certain extent an index of the worth, the possession, and the power of individuals.

Have you considered the extent of the ownership of the land of this Nation today? Do you realize that an accelerated rate, and in some instances, contrary to the expressed will of the Congress, the various agencies of the Federal Government are taking over more and more of the land of the United States?

This has been pointed out many times before, and I recognize that I am no pioneer in calling it to your attention now. But it is so important that I would like to again remind you concerning it. Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia—who incidentally is a Democrat—in his committee report to the Senate gave us this graphic illustration of the situation. This trend has gone on, until today, the Government either owns outright, or is acquiring the grand total of 395,978,724 acres. Just how much is this, roughly, 396,000,000 acres? Well let's put it another way. The Federal Government and its agencies either own, or are now acquiring, land sufficient in area to comprise the following States: Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, West Virginia, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Ohio, Illinois, and Indiana. Twenty-one States in all. Imagine, if you will, a map of this country with these 21 States blocked out. And that still is not quite enough, because in addition to these 21 States, there would be enough left over to create 32 Districts of Columbia.

Think of it—that area comprises approximately one-fifth of all the land in the entire United States—about 20 percent of the total area of the Nation belonging to the Federal Government.

With this concentration of property in the hands of the Federal Government has come another inevitable effect. That one-fifth of the Nation's land has gone off the tax rolls of the States, the counties, and the townships except for occasional token payments. The control of it has passed away from the agencies of local government. It is no longer subject to the fundamental police power of the communities and States in which it is situated. In effect, one-fifth of the country's land has been taken completely away from all local government.

No one objects to the maintenance by the Federal Government of adequate land to aid in the conservation of our forests and our wildlife. No one objects to the Federal Government retaining necessary reserves of mineral deposits from the standpoint of military preparations for the common defense. But this alone is not the purpose for which the Federal Government has accumulated this tremendous total. The New Deal administration has been acquiring this land for every conceivable purpose.

Here again let us stop to consider how completely foreign this tendency is to the philosophy of Abraham Lincoln. You may have forgotten it, but Lincoln had some very definite ideas upon this subject. When he was President a great deal of the land of the Nation was still in the public domain. Lincoln knew that it was necessary to get this land into production in order to make the Nation strong. Lincoln knew that land kept in the public's name and at the same time kept off the local tax rolls was not a factor strengthening our country, but rather weakening it.

Thus it was that Abraham Lincoln was the President who signed the homestead law.

That piece of legislation, more than any other, helped build the empire of the West. It made possible the building of our Western States. It furnished the impetus for the development of a great portion of this country. It made that land an asset rather than a liability; it caused it to cease being a public charge and to commence producing wealth and contributing to the economic strength of the Nation.

But land alone is not the only criterion. Let us look at the matter of the sheer size of government as reflected in the number of employees. The original plan for our form of government contemplated a relatively small Federal Government created to perform the necessary centralized functions and expected to operate on a modest budget and with reasonably few employees. An all-time high in number of employees was reached during the last World War, when the Federal pay roll rose to a little less than a million individuals—to be exact, 917,760. Following that, the number was sharply reduced to around 500,000. But what is the situation today? In April of 1945 the grand total of Federal employees was 3,569,000. And remember this does not include any military personnel. Nor does it include any civilian employees outside the continental limits of the United States. These are the civilian employees in this country only—over 3,500,000 of them.

But today, taking all of our city, our State, our county, our township, and our school employees, we find that we have only 3,184,000. The application of simple mathematics will demonstrate that there are today more Federal employees than there are employees of all forms of local government.

These examples which I have mentioned, the concentration of property in the hands of the Federal Government, and the unprecedented growth of Federal departments, bureaus, and agencies, are only two among the many items we have experienced. New cases arise almost daily, each demonstrating over and over again the plain and undisputed fact that local government is being put on the shelf.

I do not mean to be facetious, because I do not think that this is a matter to joke about. But in all candor, I want to say to you that we have gotten ourselves into a position where, governmentally speaking, "the tail is wagging the dog." Gradually but nevertheless definitely, step by step and bit by bit, we have developed in this country a Federal Government which is encroaching upon us and is crowding local government completely out of the picture.

I do not believe that this is wise. I feel that it is contrary to the very fundamental concept of a democracy. If the people are expected to govern their own affairs, we must have a plan of government which the people can understand. No man, no matter how wise and no matter how diligent, can understand all the ramifications of a Federal Government employing 3,569,000 people and incidentally, in its functions, owning one-fifth of a territory as big as the United States. And, if there exists no one sufficiently wise to understand such a Government, how is it possible to expect the average citizen to diligently exercise his right of franchise and thereby correctly direct the course of his Government?

To make matters worse, it is my firm conviction that the New Deal has resorted to a policy of deception to accomplish much of this centralization of power. One element of our National Government which has received far too little thought has been the practice of organizing Government corporations which exercise governmental powers without ever being subjected to the scrutiny of the elected representatives of the people, without receiving any of their funds from the Congress (notwithstanding the constitutional provision vesting in Congress the power to appropriate all public monies) and which are not subject to any control or audit over their expenditures.

Today, we do not know exactly how many of these Government corporations exist. Comptroller General Lindsay Warren once told a Senate committee that he was surprised to read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD about three such corporations about which he had never heard before. One report on such corporations gives their number as 51. Senator BYRD, of Virginia, says there are 55. The Budget Director thinks there are 101.

And, these corporations do strange things. Even Harold Ickes who is no stickler for constitutional proprieties, according to my standards, raised a great fuss because one of them, the Metals Reserve Company, had built a big aluminum plant in Canada at a cost of $68,000,000 and that neither he nor the President knew a thing about it. The Congress was never told when another one, the Copper Recovery Company established a bank located in Brazil and in partnership with the Brazilian Government. Let that soak in for a minute. An agency of our Government goes into partnership with another government to go into the banking business, and your representatives and my representatives are never told a word about it.

If all this bungling was kept at home, it would be bad enough; but it is a great deal worse when it enters into the international picture. And that is exactly what has happened. I have yet never been able to find two informed individuals who have exactly the same idea on what the foreign policy of this country is. The New Deal administration has entered into a program of private or secret commitments. When Franklin Roosevelt passed away, it was virtually publicly admitted that it was almost impossible to tell what kind of promises he had made. We have been undergoing the humiliating experience of discovering our commitments piecemeal ever since. Every few days, we pick up the newspaper to find out that theoretically we are obligated to do something different or to undertake another duty or make another loan. We still do not know the extent of these promises. The only thing that we can be certain of is that it is going to cost us more money. That is absolutely uniform throughout.

As a result, we have lost prestige with foreign countries that it will be difficult, if not impossible, to regain. The common practice of people of other nations of referring to this country as "Uncle Sugar" is but typical of the plight in which we find ourselves. In every international conference, we seem to be unfortunately occupying the middle and function chiefly as a rope for the international tug of war. The uncertainty of our position, the lack of a determined definite foreign policy and the tendency toward one-man government and individualized administration of American policy produced, as an inevitable result, a new and all-time low in American prestige.

This, too, I lay directly at the door of the New Deal administration. The Republican Party has never once failed to go as far as it could in seeking to correct this situation. Let me point out that, at the Mackinac Conference, a forthright declaration of the Republican Party's position was set out. If anything like a comparable move had been made by the New Deal, something concrete could have come from it. We listened in vain for a response.

During the political campaign of 1944, the Republican Party sought to take international affairs out of the realm of partisan politics, and Governor Dewey as the Republican candidate appointed a representative to consult with the then Secretary of State. That effort was largely futile because of the unwillingness of the New Deal administration to permit the formulation of a real American foreign policy.

Again, throughout the San Francisco meetings engaged in drawing up the United Nations Charter, and even more recently in London, Republicans have participated and cooperated. Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG of Michigan has been particularly outstanding as the leading figure in this Nation's delegations.

The Republican Party can say to the people of America that it has, to its utmost power, tried to discharge its obligation in the field of international relations. Again, I reiterate, our unfortunate plight in this regard belongs directly upon the doorstep of the New Deal administration.

The Republican Party has long recognized the importance of our international relations. It pioneered in the cause of close cooperation with foreign nations. Listen for a moment to the words of an American President:

"After all, how near one to the other is every part of the world. Modern inventions have brought into close relation widely separated peoples. * * * Distances have been effaced. Swift ships and swift trains are becoming cosmopolitan. They invaded fields which a few years ago were impenetrable. * * * With increasing transportation facilities come increasing knowledge and larger trade. * * *

"Isolation is no longer possible or desirable. The same important news is read, though in different languages, the same day in all Christendom. The telegraph keeps us advised of what is occurring everywhere. * * * God and man have linked the nations together. No nation can longer be indifferent to any other."

That was not a New Deal speech. Those words were spoken on the 5th day of September 1901, by a Republican President, William McKinley. McKinley met his death on the following day. And in the excitement attendant upon his assassination, much of the import of this important pronouncement was lost to the world.

Following him, however, Theodore Roosevelt pursued a similar policy. William Howard Taft, who is frequently asserted to have had the best understanding of foreign affairs of any President that this Nation has ever had, was particularly active and effective in promoting sound international relations. Certainly, nothing could be further from the truth than the ill-conceived attempt of the New Deal to charge the Republican Party with being isolationist, unrealistic, and uncoperative in international relations.

If we had the time tonight, I could further trace for you the effects of the bungling kind of administration we have had. Never before in this Nation has the Government of the United States lost the respect of the people of the United States as it has in this moment. Its waste and extravagance can be seen all about us. Its incompetence is written upon the pages of every newspaper and is heard on every news broadcast. A person would have to be thoughtless, indeed, not to see it all about him.

In the face of these facts, I was particularly struck by the naiveness with which the New Deal wants us to swallow all its propaganda. May I give you just one more concrete example. No man would doubt the necessity during the war and during the necessary readjustment period of controlling prices to the end that inflation will not result, if that was being done. The record is otherwise—ask any housewife. Instead of approaching the problem of price controls in a straightforward, down-to-earth manner, it has set up theoretical over-all standards, impractical

and impossible of attainment. Instead of approaching problems realistically, it has built a huge Frankenstein-like monster made up of inspectors, investigators, and snoopers. It has enmeshed American enterprise with so much red tape and uncertainty that literally thousands of little businesses have thrown up their hands and quit instead of trying to carry on. Instead of preserving our national economy, it has done much to strangle it.

But, when the President of the United States in his annual message to Congress about a month ago blandly told the Congress and the people that they had very successfully managed to keep living costs from rising more than 3 percent, he then attained what, in my judgment, was a record for relying upon the credulity of the human race. There is not a schoolboy who takes his pennies to the candy store who does not know better than that. And how we can ever be expected to believe any such statement in the face of the notorious fact that we are paying subsidies out of the Public Treasury in almost every direction, is more than I can understand. What difference does it make if we pay so many cents a pound for butter at the grocery store or whether we pay a few less cents for it and then have a few more cents added to our income tax to pay the subsidy on that butter?

These conditions which we have been discussing this evening, as well as a whole host of others that we could consider if we but had the time, present a genuine challenge to this. The dangers that arise from them are real. They must be met if we are to continue as a free people and a world power. There is no sidestepping of them; we cannot turn back. We cannot evade them—we must overcome them.

Let me repeat that the Republican Party affords the only answer. As a political party we must rise to the challenge, or it will not be met. That is our destiny.

But we cannot fulfill the role that is ours by merely being faultfinders. Everybody recognizes the evils. Many foresee the dangers. What must be given are the answers. To receive the leadership, we must be ready and able to assume it. The Republican Party must give to the American people a program that they will recognize as adequate, progressive, and fearless, and candidates that they will recognize as competent. We must make clear our determination to avoid the mistakes—and at the same time demonstrate our ability to lead.

Again, I think that Lincoln has given us the keynote that will help guide us. In commenting upon the sacredness of his oath of office, he said:

"It was in the oath I took that I would, to the best of my ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States. I could not take office without taking the oath. Nor was it my view that I might take an oath in order to get power, and break the oath in using the power."

Now, as then, our first concern must be to tell the people the truth. The practices of government by deception must stop. No people can overcome the dangers that beset them unless they know what those dangers are. Their elected officials must tell them. It is criminally wrong to misrepresent the facts involved in public affairs. It is equally wrong to misuse or usurp power. No nation can rise above the level of the moral rectitude of its government and those in official positions.

This Nation needs a return to the fundamental concepts of constitutional government. We need to reestablish the kind of government our forefathers had in mind when they framed the Constitution. We must dare to be honest—honest with ourselves and honest with the American people.

Next, we must firmly resolve to put a stop to the practice of spending more than our Nation's income. We must start living within our means. Deficit financing cannot be permitted to go on forever. The Republican Party should take a firm stand against extravagance in our domestic affairs. We will have to pay the bill sometime. We should start doing it at once.

Again let us turn to Lincoln—who dictated into the Republican platform of 1860 these words in section 6:

"That the people justly view with alarm the reckless extravagance which pervades every department of the Federal Government; that a return to rigid economy and accountability is indispensable to arrest the systematic plunder of the Public Treasury by favored partisans; while the recent startling developments of frauds and corruptions at the Federal metropolis show that an entire change of administration is imperatively demanded."

Further, we must stop making impossible promises to every other nation on the face of the earth. Except for the necessity of mitigating acute human suffering, we cannot afford to go further into debt for foreign nations any more than we can for ourselves. The Republican Party must stand for a realistic approach to our foreign financial commitments.

We must encourage the production of wealth by encouraging capital and labor. We must so construct the financial policy of our Nation as to make it possible for individual initiative and private enterprise to again go forward and to create the wealth which we must have to meet the commitments we have made and to pay for the victory which we have won.

We must stop this concentration of power in Washington, and we must take the Government back to the people where it can be exercised by local agencies which are under the close scrutiny of those who pay for them. Government by secret and devious means such as through boards, bureaus, and Government corporations outside the scrutiny of Congress must stop.

There is not a State in the Union which today is not financially infinitely better off than is the Federal Government. The responsibilities for all such functions of government that can be properly discharged by the States should be immediately returned to them. The Republican Party must have the courage to openly advocate the decentralization of many functions of our Federal Government. We recognize this means opposing the pet theories of many pressure groups. Those individuals who have a particular interest to foster often feel that their aims can best be accomplished by hiding the project at the end of some long corridor of a Government office building in Washington, where the people will never be able to see it. We cannot allow this tendency to prevail. We must be determined to keep the Federal Government out of all activities except those which by their inherent nature absolutely demand national handling.

And lastly we must take stock of ourselves. We must decide once and for all exactly what functions we wish to have Government assume. We must determine to what degree we wish to restrict individual liberties by governmental control. We must keep ever before us the fact that we cannot "have our cake and eat it too." We cannot try to outpromise each other and believe that we can have a Government that engages in the regulation of all forms of human activity and leave us still free men. The fatal error of this kind of thinking has been demonstrated over and over again in a Fascist Italy, in a Nazi Germany, and in every totalitarian government.

Our Nation must decide whether it will be made up of free individuals or of vassals. Having once determined this issue, we should then hue strictly to the line in shaping the kind of government that we have decided upon. Again, the Republican Party must have the courage to lead in this important undertaking.

To the accomplishment of these purposes every patriotic American should pledge himself. As I have said, I believe that they can only be accomplished through the medium of the Republican Party, and only then if the Republican Party adheres to the sound principles which Abraham Lincoln so nobly espoused. But if we have the courage and the conviction our party can lead this Nation from the morass into which it has fallen and upon a genuine crusade for our America.

We have just won history's most terrible war. We have spent the lives of our young men and women to achieve it. We have been fighting to preserve our American way of life. We have fought to keep the right of government for the common people, the. it may be exercised by them and on their behalf.

In peace we may lose it if we do not protect it well.

On another day the man whose birthday we celebrate spoke of another threat to our national existence. Those eloquent words are written upon the heart of every schoolboy and schoolgirl in America. And yet they ring as true today as they did when he gave them years ago. As Republicans, but more as Americans, we should heed them today and should rise to the challenge which they carry.

On this one hundredth and thirty-seventh anniversary of the birthday of Abraham Lincoln I urge that "We here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

Los Angeles County Dairy Area Has Greatest Testing Program—Eighteenth Congressional District, California, Is Portion of This National Achievement in Dairy Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to call attention of Members and all who may read the same, to the write-up which I herein include with my remarks, which article appeared in that authoritative magazine of the dairy industry, to wit, the California Dairyman, published in the prosperous and progressive city of Hynes, which is just one of the numerous busy towns in the Eighteenth Congressional District. This article was in the February 1946 number. I commend its factual recitals therein set forth to my colleagues from Minnesota, Iowa, Wyoming, Colorado, New York. In fact, the record herein printed bears out what I have frequently related about the size of the herds in the Eighteenth Congressional District and in the rest of Los Angeles County. The last line of this article mentions Long Beach, my home city. It does so, however,

merely to fix a sort of boundary line for the area at that point. As the largest herds of these remarkable cows are generally located to the northeast of my home city and in and about the prosperous communities of Hynes, Clearwater, Norwalk, Downey, Artesia, Bellflower, Compton, Lynwood, Southgate, Signal Hill, Lakewood.

The contents of this magazine article will further explain my position taken on this floor at all times in the interests of and for the protection of this great food-producing industry.

Reports to me from time to time show that the herds of the Eighteenth Congressional District, uniformly maintain their high place—up in the top brackets—in all tests.

So, Mr. Speaker, this article further makes it clear that not only does the Eighteenth District of California have the great naval facilities at Long Beach, and the great shipyards there, too, but it likewise has some of the greatest aircraft factories as well as these achieving dairy herds with flourishing towns, small farms, happy firesides; the great oil fields of Signal Hill and Long Beach tidelands, and the world port of Long Beach. These are some of the reasons I remind my colleagues for my varied and expressed interests in legislation relating to industry; agriculture; labor and management; manufacturing; Navy and Army; shipbuilding and marine, and of course, along with all these I mention are the hundreds of thousands of happy homes. But—never enough housing, Mr. Speaker.

Here is the magazine article:

HATS OFF TO THE DAIRYMAN

Los Angeles County dairymen hung up a record of 406.4 pounds of butterfat per cow for all cows in their herds, those milking as well as the dry stock. Figured on the milking herd alone, the year's production amounted to 490 pounds of butterfat, says Earl Maharg, of the Agricultural Extension Service, University of California.

These high rates of production exceed those of any other section in the United States, he points out, and are the result of careful feeding, a rather rapid cow replacement program on the basis of cow-testing records, and good herd management.

Individual high records of production were also attained, he said, citing an animal in North Hollywood which produced 852 pounds of butterfat and another in Azusa, 810 pounds. In addition, there were two herds of over 250 cows each with 506 and 518 pounds of butterfat and one 100-cow dairy with an average of 493 pounds per cow. Seven groups of five selected animals produced from 522 to 722 pounds of butterfat per cow.

"This remarkable production has been achieved by Los Angeles County dairymen in spite of an extremely adverse feed situation, difficulty in securing suitable cows for replacement and trying dairy help conditions. Cow replacement troubles lowered the herd average butterfat production this year as compared to 1944 by some 16 pounds, because dairymen were forced to keep more dry stock and older cows which should have gone to the butcher," said Maharg.

"The feed situation promises little improvement during at least the first part of 1946 because of transportation difficulties. It is more critical now than at any time during the war period. With this condition, dairymen may have difficulty maintaining milk production at comparable levels during 1946."

According to Maharg, there were 20,209 cows under test in the county's cow testing association at the end of the testing year, October 31, 1945. This total is the greatest for any association in the United States and, in fact, exceeds the numbers of cows in all associations in all but six States. He points out that Los Angeles County has the largest number of dairy cows of any county in the United States. This is not due to the size of the county, he says, because 75 percent of the dairy cows are concentrated in a relatively small area between Los Angeles, Long Beach, and the Orange County border.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this great Nation of ours was founded on a new continent, in a new concept of the relations of man to man. It never ceases to thrill me when I read the opening words of our immortal Constitution:

We, the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union; establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

It says, "We, the People," Mr. Speaker, that means all the people. It does not mean just a few people who believe themselves privileged. It says and means all the people.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I have been shocked by the revelations made in recent weeks regarding the procedures of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the attitudes of its staff. I am not alone, Mr. Speaker, and I think there is not a Member of this House who will not be shocked when the full story is told. It is apparent that the employees of this committee should themselves be investigated.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I am inserting a letter which I wrote yesterday to the chairman regarding the improper procedures of the committee counsel, Mr. Ernie Adamson, and the remarks attributed to one Chester Nickolas, who, I am pleased to have learned since writing the letter, is no longer an employee of the committee. My letter does not and cannot tell the whole sordid story. It does express my sorrow that such people should have been permitted a place on the staff of a House committee. It will be to the interest of the committee to be more careful in selection of the staff and not permit any one member to try to determine the choice or the actions of the committee.

Too, I think the whole House has a duty and a right to know what is going on in this committee, which we have clothed with certain powers to investigate actual un-American activities, and not to indulge in witch hunts. We all remember what the old Dies committee did to our colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] by conducting a secret "investigation" and a one-man "hearing" deep in the heart of Texas with perjured witnesses, and then making a sudden and unauthorized public disclosure of the secret "testimony." We remember the willful and deliberate smearing of other Members and of outstanding Americans. We know, too, that there were a good many of us honored by investigative files by the old Dies committee. How do we know that this present committee, without the knowledge of its honorable chairman, even without the knowledge of a majority of its members, is not secretly investigating every Member of Congress who does not meet the approval of Ernie Adamson? I wish the gentleman from Georgia would tell us how many Members have been investigated, if any, and who they are, if he knows.

The text of my letter to the chairman follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON RULES,
Washington, D. C., February 18, 1946.

Hon. JOHN S. WOOD,
Chairman, Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, Washington.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I find myself horror-struck at the callous indifference to the express mandates of this body indicated by the Hitlerlike statements of certain employees of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. With full confidence in your own integrity and your freedom from intolerance and bigotry, I cannot believe that you have or have had any knowledge of these statements, as reported in full detail by the daily press; and I am confident you will be as shocked as I to learn that these statements have been mouthed by obscure individuals who, cloaked in the power of a congressional committee, take advantage of that power to flout good taste and the dignity of this body, contemptuous of the rights of citizens and equally contemptuous of their employers, employers, the committee that hires them.

I refer particularly to a recent statement issued by the board of directors of the Greater New York Federation of Churches, affiliated with the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America. This statement carries within it an extract from the sworn affidavit of Professor Clyde Miller of Teachers College, Columbia University, who reports on a conversation he held with Ernie Adamson, the prolific letter-writer and counsel of your committee, and with one Nikolas, identified as an investigator. Professor Miller's affidavit states that Nikolas, in the presence of Mr. Adamson, remarked:

"You should tell your Jewish friends that the Jews in Germany stuck their necks out too far and Hitler took care of them and that the same thing will happen here unless they watch their steps."

This shameful, degraded type of thinking, this obscene statement that could have been inspired only by a Goebbels or a Streicher, deserves the severest censure. It warrants an investigation by the House Committee on Un-American Activities of its own employees, not only of these two but of all. Such statements as those attributed by Professor Miller to the investigator, without censure from his superior, are as un-American as they are vile, and for counsel and investigator of a committee sworn to defeat subversive activity to publicly exhibit so Nazi-like an attitude and mentality suggests that your committee,

no matter how laudable your purpose, is finding its honest efforts subverted, twisted and torn by your own employees, or even that you may unsuspectingly harbor subversive individuals on your committee rolls.

I am not alone in my deep feeling of indignation. Nor are the directors of the New York Federation alone in their wrath. Great newspapers such as the Washington Post, the Des Moines Register, the Scripps-Howard papers, have called attention to the un-American activities of your committee's own employees, and to the manner in which the employees, especially Adamson, have exceeded their authority, outraged propriety, and mocked the American principles of fairness and honesty, in their attempts to harass, discredit, and destroy American organizations and individuals, possibly without knowledge of the full membership of the committee.

It is significant that the committee gave to Gerald L. K. Smith an open forum to vent that seditionist's Fascist bill before members of the press; yet counsel has admitted he is too busy to go over this man's record of un-American activities and utterances, while he finds time, curiously enough, to bring before the committee in closed executive session Dr. Edward Barsky, an eminent surgeon, because Dr. Barsky is chairman of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, an organization committed to giving succor to Spanish republican refugees, by administering the financial aid given by such groups as Unitarian Service Committee and the Quakers. Is it un-American to be charitable, to extend the helpful hand of kindliness and humanity to men and women and children who are homeless, hungry, ill, and destitute? Yet such a man as Dr. Barsky, such an organization as the Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, licensed and approved by the President's War Control Board, are commanded, at the whim of your committee's employees, to produce their books and records, submit themselves to the inquisitorial tactics of the Nazi-minded counsel, while the same counsel treats a professed Fascist like G. L. K. Smith with kindness, tolerance, and brotherly understanding.

This incident is not unique. Your committee has publicly chided counsel for his flouting of congressional procedure, and for those letter-writing proclivities which have derogated the dignity of a committee of this House. Despite the fact that counsel has been warned to respect the wishes of the committee not to try the committees' investigations in the press, has time and again advised certain portions of the press of the names of American citizens and organizations he intended to pillory. Radio commentators requested by Adamson to submit their scripts to him discovered the request had been made a public document. The action could have been designed only to smear the commentators and to frighten them from the air. In spite of your public admonitions, counsel has continued his own undignified and un-American way.

Counsel, so much in doubt as to his official functions, cannot even understand the principles upon which this great Nation was founded. He has objected in several instances to use of the word "democracy." He has questioned the Veterans Against Discrimination, most of whom wear the Purple Heart and all of whom are honorable men who risked their lives to destroy Hitler tactics in a world of free men; in a letter to these veterans, and I quote his words, he wrote this shocking sentence: "I wonder if you are sufficiently familiar with the history of the United States to be aware that this country was not organized as a democracy." This is an insufferable arrogation of judicial and legislative powers; the statement, moreover, is virtually a quotation from another professed Fascist, Elizabeth Dilling, three times indicated by the Federal grand jury investigating seditious activities.

In the light of his acceptance of the venomous statement of an underling, I wonder if his demand that the National Committee to Combat Anti-Semitism submit to his inquisition does not reflect the same bitter bias against American citizens who are Jews by religion? In his attack upon this group, Adamson denies a basic tenet of the American Constitution, the right of petition. Again to quote his own stupid words, he accused the Committee to Combat Anti-Semitism of "soliciting money for the purpose of controlling the thoughts of American citizens." I am informed that the membership includes former Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes and Bishop G. Ashton Oldham; and their heinous offense was to petition their friends to support House Concurren Resolution 89, condemning anti-Semitism and racism as un-American. Surely a House Committee on Un-American Activities should welcome such support, and not permit its employees to harass those who are fighting a foreign, Fascist, and un-American ideology.

I am persuaded that counsel has not only imitated but exceeded the unfortunate excesses of employees of the old Dies committee. Such tactics by the Dies committee brought not only the committee but the House of Representatives into contumely and disrespect. Present counsel has shown himself to be acting, not for the whole committee, but for a small minority. To protect the House, and the committee, surely counsel and all employees should be examined carefully, and the unprofessional and unprocedural activities which have led to criticism and public contempt should be forsworn and disavowed.

Respectfully yours,

A. J. SABATH,
Member of Congress.

Democracy Has Fallen in With Bad Company

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK A. BARRETT
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 19, 1946

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Montana Standard, of Butte, Mont., dated December 14, 1945:

DEMOCRACY HAS FALLEN IN WITH BAD COMPANY

We believe that the people of this country should return to the practice of calling what we have got here a Republic. In the years past it has been variously known as a Democracy or a Republic. But the word democracy has fallen in with bad company in recent years. It no longer means what it used to mean.

We hear of a democracy in Russia. We are told that democracy is what the people of Poland, Rumania, and Yugoslavia have. We are informed that the Communists of China are more democratic than the government of Chiang Kai-shek.

But we get suspicious about democratic freedom of the press when we learn that the Government owns all the printing presses and newspapers. We get more suspicious when we hear that the Bible is being edited to conform to democratic principles. We are rather skeptical about just how free democratic freedom of speech may be when we know that the gestapo or some other organization is always listening in. We wonder about the democratic procedure of tossing a man into jail and leaving him there without a chance to defend himself. We question the seizure of people's property in the name of democracy.

We are curious about how a democratic election might be carried out with the name of only one candidate on the ballot.

In our more than a century and a half of acquaintance with democracy we have never seen it in such queer garb or associating with such strange people. We have begun to question these strange new benefits which masquerade under the name of democracy.

The peoples of the earth, we believe, also are beginning to wonder about democracy. Their lives are regimented and their freedoms curtailed as much under this new-found democracy as they were under totalitarianism.

So democracy has become a word of many and varied meanings. It no longer means what we have believed it to mean over a long period of years.

Like many other words, its connotations have been broadened so that a host of sins are concealed in its flowing skirts.

In recommending that the people of this country take up the use of the word "republic," or republican form of government, we are merely following the dictates of our own Constitution.

Article IV, section 4, entitled "Republican form of government guaranteed; each State protected," says: "The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion, and, on application of the legislature, or of the executive (when the legislature cannot be convened) against domestic violence."

Actually, there should not be a wide base for argument between usage of the words "democracy" and "republic."

Democracy is defined by Webster as being government by the people; government in which the supreme power is retained by the people and exercised by representation, as in a republic.

Republic is defined as a state in which the sovereign power resides in a certain body of the people, and is exercised by representatives elected by and responsible to them; a commonwealth; also, the form of government of such a state.

The difficulty is, as we have said before, democracy has fallen in with bad company. Until such time as it is rescued and has been shown the error of its ways we should be careful about accepting the things which are being offered under the name "democracy."

Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. KELLY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 19, 1946

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I made at a dinner held at the Morrison Hotel, Chicago, Ill., February 17, 1946, to commemorate the twenty-eighth anniversary of the independence of Lithuania:

Speaking for the independence of the Republic of Lithuania, which was established, on February 16, 1918, as a modern nation,

under a constitutional government; a nation that as early as 1569 showed a determination to achieve independence—and their constant fight to retain that status leaves no alternative but to gain that objective—today we celebrate the twenty-eighth anniversary of that memorial day in the history of Lithuania.

The 16th day of February was made possible by the determination of those gallant souls who never quit in their fight to achieve their independence.

With the passing of the Russian revolution of 1905–06, Lithuanians began openly to demand the freedom of their country.

The determination of the voters of Lithuanian Governments instructed their representatives in all four Dumas to fight for the freedom, the political autonomy, and unification of Lithuania.

The Lithuanian representatives of the Duma complied with the wishes of their constituents and always stood for the autonomy of the country, and were persistent in their demands that Lithuanian people be given the opportunity to determine for themselves their political preference.

The first great war had just begun when members of various political factions organized a political club and committee in Vilna.

To the Lithuanians of America they addressed the following impassioned words:

"Strenuous and telling times are here.

"We must emerge free, or die fighting for freedom.

"Lithuanians have vitality and strength enough to be equals of all other free nations.

"We must earn the right to mold our own destiny and our own future.

"Now is the time to take our fate into our hands—now or never."

With that determination the people of Lithuania can be proud, for it has come down through the ages—yes; to the present time—that you assembled here have never faltered in your courage.

During that terrible war, which, like World War II, almost succeeded in wiping out every vestige of civilization and decency, Lithuania had to bear hostile invasion and suffered severely, the country being devastated alike by alleged friend and avowed foe.

No people have a stronger claim to the right of self-government and independence than do the 3,000,000 people of Lithuania.

For this independence has been temporarily set aside because of geographical location.

Many controversial problems have arisen since the shooting of the war ceased.

While official declaration of the ending of hostilities has not yet been declared, the people of Lithuania and American Lithuanians are left in doubt as to what will happen when the actual peace terms are agreed upon.

We must believe in what President Truman said in his Navy Day address in New York City on October 27, 1945, in restating the high principles and the aims of American foreign policy, which is designed to serve peace with justice.

It is a significant and a gratifying fact that the President's 12-point policy clearly embodies and reaffirms all those principles which were set forth in the statement made by the United States Government on July 23, 1940, and in the Atlantic Charter, both of which apply to Lithuania as well as to the other Baltic states.

And I quote:

"From the day when the peoples of these Republics (Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia) first gained their independent and democratic form of government the people of the United States have watched their admirable progress in self-government with deep and sympathetic interest.

"The policy of this Government is universally known.

"The people of the United States are opposed to any form of intervention on the part of one state, however powerful, in the domestic concerns of any other sovereign state, however weak.

"The United States will continue to stand by these principles, because of the conviction of the American people that unless the doctrine in which these principles are inherent once again governs the relations between nations, the rule of reason, of justice, and of law—in other words, the basis of modern civilization itself—cannot be preserved."

This statement was made in connection with the devious processes whereunder the political independence and territorial integrity of the three small Baltic Republics, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—were to be deliberately annihilated by one of their more powerful neighbors.

It was a clear warning to the Soviet Union to avoid unilateral and arbitrary acts and to leave the independence of the Baltic states alone.

However, the Moscow dictatorship, with Hitler's concurrence, thought otherwise, and the illegal act of annexation, based on fraudulent election, which was conducted in an atmosphere of threat and compulsion, followed on August 3–6, 1940.

Today, Russia would gain much in a moral sense to the world, if the annexation of the Baltic states were now made void by the supreme Soviet authority in accordance with the requirements of the Atlantic Charter, and the Baltic states would be relieved.

The principles of our American foreign policy have a direct bearing on Lithuania's international situation and on her future.

For we believe in the eventual return of sovereign rights and self-government to all peoples who have been deprived of them by force.

We shall approve no territorial changes in any friendly part of the world unless they accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned.

We shall refuse to recognize any government imposed upon any nation by force of any foreign power.

In some cases, it may be impossible to prevent forceful imposition of such a government. But the United States will not recognize any such government.

We are convinced that the preservation of peace between nations requires a United Nations Organization composed of all peace-loving nations of the world who are willing jointly to use force if necessary to insure peace. That is why, on the 1st of November, I introduced House Resolution 390, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to carry out the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the 12-point program of the President of the United States.

That we are determined that those nations who enjoyed their sovereign rights before the war will again enjoy the right of self-government, and, to give active support to the principles hereinbefore referred to, that the President of the United States and the Secretary of State give active support, and devote their efforts and influence with the nations of the world, to secure to the people of the Republic of Lithuania a restoration of their independence and the right of free and democratic election after armies of other nations have left, and Lithuanian refugees have been repatriated to their homeland.

I have known American people of Lithuanian descent, and I never knew a more loyal group of Americans—people like Pete Zuris, Anthony Olis, Al Kumskis and many others who have carried on the fight here in America, undying and unselfish in their devotion to the cause of Lithuania's independence, determined, like us all, that Lithuania and other small countries in the Baltic states shall not be used again as buffer nations, for the protection of warring nations.

For it used to be that in discussion of the rights and defenses of nations, the question of control of certain so-called buffer states was frequently raised, and, in many cases, the justification, on a basis of defense, through buffer states, was recognized—but not any more, for with atomic energy and bombs, there is no cause for the words or uses of buffer states.

No man can know a Lithuanian without discovering that a never-dying passion for the independence of his country is eating into his soul.

Out of the depths there comes a cry from this nation which for centuries has been forced to be inarticulate.

It is not a demand for privilege, for territory to which it might have only a historical claim; it is a cry for life, and if we really believe in our own professions, if the traditions of 1776 have not been effaced, if the definition of self-determinism with which President Wilson sought to change the evil systems of lust and avarice in Europe and the rest of the world after the First World War still lives, we Americans must listen to this cry from the core of the hearts of the Lithuanians.

We cannot close our ears to it.

Lumber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1946

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter from a lumber company at Broadwater, Nebr.

Mr. Speaker, it is quite apparent that the regulations on lumber, coming from Washington, will work a definite hardship on the small lumber companies and communities, because they are not prepared for a mass production of homes. P. R. 33 will make it impossible for the small lumber dealer to get lumber unless he resorts to illegal methods. It will make it impossible for him to secure lumber which will be badly needed by the farmers for the building of grain bins and the necessary repairs on the farm.

Regulations do not build homes. We need less regulation and more freedom for the individual.

Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, I called attention to the fact that in 1945 we exported 750,000,000 feet of lumber. We are still exporting a great deal of lumber. The lumber is being exported because the mills can get a higher price for the lumber they export. Lumber is not being finished and processed, because the raw unfinished lumber brings more, in many instances, than the finished lumber. Government regulations have produced this ridiculous situation. The following letter indicates the reaction of the small lumber companies in Nebraska.

FOSTER LUMBER CO.,

Broadwater, Nebr., February 13, 1946.

Re CPA PR 33 and direction 1 to PR 33.

Hon. A. L. MILLER,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We wish to solicit your aid in abolishing the above regimentation regulation, originated by Civilian Production Administration and known as PR 33 and direction 1 to PR 33.

If allowed to operate, it will mean the termination of many lumber retailers. There is no way left for them to purchase lumber and millwork and other building materials, unless it be through black-market operation, and most of us won't do that, as we feel, or want to feel, that we are still a democratic people, free to operate, free to buy and sell, not under a communistic or socialistic set-up but through our own free enterprise.

This instrument, evidently constructed by some schoolboys and allowed to be put into operation, is a most devastating and ruthless form of governmental control. Its design will injure—not aid—millions of people.

The primary course of this is to aid the returned GI, but he is swindled from the start, and in the smaller towns he won't even be able to buy a 2 by 4. The farmer and rancher is completely stumped; he can't even buy a board to repair a truck or wagon. Why? Because of a Government regulation that stops distributors from buying building material for distribution, a method employed in foreign countries for many years, and a failure, a back-set to any progressive nation.

We who are in the smaller localities cannot get H/H rating because it is not suited to mass regimentation of homes.

This brief outline should give you an idea of the lethal effect of PR. 33, and when you get into the thing you will find a lot of reasons why the regulation should be done away with. Will you go after this thing and hit it hard?

Yours truly,

K. W. CAMDEN, *Manager.*

The Gentleman From Illinois, Mr. Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1946

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted by the House to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a short article prepared by Thomas I. Starr, of Detroit, Mich., entitled "The Gentleman From Illinois, Mr. Lincoln." Mr. Starr is editorial director of the Michigan Bell, employees' magazine of the Michigan Bell Telephone Co., of Detroit.

This is an especially fine article on Lincoln the Congressman. We all know that he served but one term in the House of Representatives, from 1847 to 1849.

Mr. Starr is also the author of a book published in 1941 entitled "Lincoln's Kalamazoo (Mich.) Address Against Extending Slavery."

THE GENTLEMAN FROM ILLINOIS, MR. LINCOLN

Peter Cartwright was a Methodist preacher, an old-fashioned circuit rider, famous througout Illinois as an exhorter and an evangelist. He hated sin and slavery, and against either he could preach a sermon of great intensity and length.

The same Peter Cartwright, rugged at 60, was a politician—a Jackson Democrat, and a good one. His was the skill to combine preaching with politics, and this dual ability had earned him prominence both in pulpit and in party, and, some years earlier, a term in the Illinois State Legislature. To win that office he had defeated an unknown young stripling from the little village of New Salem. Hence he could claim the distinction of being the only man who ever defeated Abraham Lincoln in a popular election, the only time Lincoln was ever defeated in a direct vote of the people.

But this election was a matter of history in May 1846, when the Whigs of the Seventh Illinois District gave Lincoln the unanimous nomination as their candidate for Congress; and the Democrats picked Cartwright. Once more the rail splitter and the preacher were pitted in the political arena. This time the odds were different. Lincoln was not the unknown stripling from New Salem; he was a highly successful practicing attorney in Springfield. During the preceding 14 years he had served four terms in the legislature, had gained a place of leadership in the Whig Party, and had twice been a Whig Presidential elector. He was known throughout the State of Illinois, if not personally at least by reputation. Cartwright, in the meantime, had gone on preaching, saving souls for the Lord and the Democratic Party.

When Lincoln received the nomination it was generally known and accepted in the convention that he would not seek a second term, if elected to the first. For some years there had been a gentleman's agreement between several leading Whigs in the district that the office would be rotated, and the agreement was binding between three men: John J. Hardin, Edward D. Baker, and Lincoln.

Both Lincoln and Cartwright were good campaigners and each had many loyal friends. Cartwright, however, had an advantage over Lincoln. He could carry his campaign into the pulpits of the district, and he did. Speaking at a revival meeting in Springfield one evening he was approaching the climax of his camp-meeting oratory when he stopped suddenly and shot two questions to his audience:

"Will all of you who expect to go to heaven stand up?"

As he phrased his second question he noticed Lincoln seated on a back seat: "Will all of you who want to go to heaven stand up?"

All who didn't get to their feet on the first question came up on the second, all except Lincoln. Said the preacher, "The sole exception is Mr. Lincoln, who has not responded to either invitation. May I inquire of you, Mr. Lincoln, where are you going?"

"To Congress."

And he did, by a majority of 1,500 votes, carrying 8 of the district's 11 counties by a larger vote than Henry Clay had received in the Presidential race, 2 years earlier.

Given $200 to use toward his campaign expenses, Lincoln returned $199.25 after the election, explaining to the donor that he hadn't needed the money. "I made the canvass on my own horse; my entertainment, being at the houses of friends, cost me nothing; and my only outlay was 75 cents spent for a barrel of cider to treat some farmhands."

Campaign costs for a Congressman have gone up in recent years.

Cartwright had said that a vote for a Whig was a vote for the devil, and, apparently, Lincoln didn't believe in taking chances. It is a matter of record—and the Springfield poll book of that election is still in evidence to prove it—that Lincoln cast his vote for Cartwright.

Lincoln was the only Whig elected to the Thirtieth Congress from Illinois. Today people the world over know that Abraham Lincoln was a President of the United States; but very few, even in the United States, know that our sixteenth President served a term in the House of Representatives.

Lincoln was a war President. He was also a war Congressman. When he took the Presidential oath in 1861 the Nation was on the eve of the Civil War. The United States had been at war with Mexico for nearly 18 months when Lincoln entered Congress. While actual fighting had virtually ended 2 months earlier, when Gen. Winfield Scott had stormed Mexico City in a 2-day battle and had raised the United States flag over the palace, there were still a couple of American armies in the field, and a state of war existed until ended by treaty in March 1848.

During the 16 months between the election and the time he took office Lincoln went about his routine of life as a lawyer. Busy almost daily in the State and Federal courts, he nevertheless kept a watchful eye on the progress of the war, but made few comments on it.

Hostilities between the two nations had been brought about by a number of situations, beginning with the secession of Texas from Mexico. For a time Texas maintained its independence, but shortly came into the United States. Mexico hadn't liked that. But the Texas matter was only one of a number of grievances. Certain pressure groups in the United States had covetous eyes on California and New Mexico, both pieces of Mexican territory. Inclined to be unstable, the Mexican Government was subject constantly to rebel groups within its midst; and American interests, by favoring one group or another, helped to keep it unstable. The southern slave States wanted more areas in which to extend slavery. Secretly President James K. Polk seemed to be operating on the theory of Frederick the Great—take possession first, and negotiate afterward.

The troubles reached the shooting stage when a detachment of American troops, commanded by Gen. Zachary Taylor, was ordered by Polk to enter disputed territory because Polk had heard that Mexican troops had crossed the Rio Grande headed in the direction of the same territory. They met; the battle was on; and Americans were killed. As soon as the news reached Washington, Polk was ready to submit a skillfully worded message to Congress, stating that war existed, and that it had been commenced by Mexico on American soil.

The Whigs as a party were in violent opposition to the spirit of the conflict, terming it a war of aggression and an unlawful act on the part of President Polk to add more territory to the United States. Lincoln commented that the action of the President reminded him of the old farmer who said, "I am not greedy about land; I only want what 'jines' mine."

Lincoln could have gone to Congress in December 1846, had he desired. Edward D. Baker, the incumbent, had resigned his seat to accept a commission in the Army. It was offered to Lincoln, but he declined, possibly because the law business was extremely active at that time for the Congressman-elect. During the month of December, he appeared in four cases in the Menard Circuit Court, once in the United States Circuit Court at Springfield, and six times in the State supreme court.

In addition to his law practice, twice during the spring and summer of 1847 he went out from Springfield to deliver temperance lectures in nearby communities. According to the record, he persuaded three to "take the pledge" at Middle Lick Creek, but met with no success at Langston's Settlement. But he did make one journey, early in July, which is of significance. Lincoln made his first visit to Chicago, 200 miles away, as a delegate to the River and Harbor Convention. The fact that it took him 3 days to make the journey by stagecoach may have been one of the reasons why he was always a strong advocate for the building of railroads and other internal improvements.

At that time, Chicago had a normal population of 16,000. The record states that 20,000 official delegates and visitors from all over the country assembled there for the 3-day meeting. The convention had been called to protest against President Polk's veto of a bill making appropriations for rivers and harbors, and to otherwise strengthen the cause

of internal improvements. While Polk was devoting his attention to the adding of more territory, these delegates were concerned with the development and improvement of that which they already had.

Horace Greeley, who covered the event for the New York Tribune, reported that it was the largest meeting ever held in America. Actually, it was a great Whig mass meeting, although little mention was made of the war. Thurlow Weed, of Albany, was another of the hundred or so newspapermen present. Daniel Webster and Thomas Benton made long and able speeches; so did Tom Corwin, of Ohio. Edward Bates, who was to be Lincoln's Attorney General 14 years later, was the chairman. Another speaker, slightly more conservative in his outlook than others, was David Dudley Field, of New York, and to him Lincoln was asked to make answer. The next day, Greeley's Tribune said, "In the afternoon Hon. Abraham Lincoln, a tall specimen of an Illinoisian * * * was called out, and spoke briefly and happily in reply to Mr. Field." Lincoln was getting to be better known, and his reputation was growing beyond the bounds of the Prairie State.

* * * * *

Lincoln, or possibly it was Mary, had decided that the family would accompany the new Congressman to Washington when the term opened in December. They started getting ready on October 23 by giving a lease on the comfortable Springfield home for $7.50 per month, reserving one of the upper bedrooms—which Mary had caused to be built during a long absence when he was traveling the circuit—for the storing of their furniture.

Mary, in sort of an I-told-you-so attitude, determined that they would go by way of her old home in Lexington, Ky. She had left Lexington 8 years before with not the best of relations existing between herself and her stepmother; but now she could return to visit and take along a Congressman-elect and two fine sons—Bob, 4, and Eddie, a year and a half old—as evidence that she hadn't done too badly for herself.

Two days later, on the twenty-fifth, the Lincoln family commenced the 9-day journey to Lexington. It required travel by stage, river boat, and rail, and the Springfield paper carried this personal note in its next edition:

"Mr. Lincoln, the Member of Congress-elect from this district, has just set out on his way to Washington. His family is with him; they intend to visit their friends and relatives in Kentucky before they take up the line of march for the seat of government. Success to our talented Member of Congress. He will find many men in Congress who possess twice the good looks and not half the good sense of our own representative."

For 3 weeks the Lincolns of Illinois were guests in the home of the Todds of Kentucky. First citizen of the same city, and intimate friend of the Todd family, was Henry Clay, thrice the Whig Presidential nominee. There's an old story that Mary Todd, when a little girl, had once told the sage of Ashland that the man she would marry when she grew up would be the President of the United States. Could he or she have remembered that childish prediction when she presented her tall husband to Mr. Clay? But it is known that Lincoln and Clay visited several times during the stay in Lexington, and Whig policies and the Mexican War were the subject of their conversations. Also, Lincoln heard Clay deliver a 2½-hour oration in Lexington's Market Square; and still ringing in his ears when he took his seat in Congress, 3 weeks later, was the retired statesman's thundering pronouncement that "this is no war of defense, but one (that is) unnecessary and of offensive aggression."

* * * * *

The Thirtieth Congress, which convened at noon on December 6, 1847, was perhaps the ablest and stormiest that had ever assembled in Washington. The Whigs controlled the House, but there were able and noted leaders in both parties. The eloquence of Daniel Webster still contended with the philosophy of John C. Calhoun for the mastery of a Senate wherein sat three of Lincoln's four 1860 Presidential opponents: Stephen A. Douglas, of Illinois; John Bell, of Tennessee; and Sam Houston, of Texas. Houston was a picturesque figure who wore a Navajo blanket as a part of his senatorial attire.

Here also were Hannibal Hamlin, Senator from Maine, and Simon Cameron, from Pennsylvania. Hamlin was to be Lincoln's first-term Vice President; and Cameron, Lincoln's first Secretary of War. Jefferson Davis, who, like Lincoln, had been born in a Kentucky log cabin, and who was destined to become the President of the Confederate States of America, was the Senator from Mississippi. In the House of Representatives were two other noted men who were to hold high offices in the Confederacy: Alexander H. Stevens, the Vice President, and his intimate friend, Robert Toombs, the Confederate Secretary of State.

In the House and Senate of that Thirtieth Congress were many men from both North and South, none of whom ever dreamed that their future was to be so closely associated with that of the lean 38-year-old Whig occupying seat No. 194 in the obscure back row of the House Chamber.

Here in the House was Lincoln's second-term Vice President, Andrew Johnson, the tailor from Tennessee, who would become the President after his assassination. Here was George Ashmun, from Massachusetts, who would be the chairman of the Second National Republication Convention which was to give Abraham Lincoln the Presidential nomination 13 years later. Here also was Lincoln's future Secretary of the Interior, Caleb B. Smith, of Indiana; and two who were to be Lincoln's State Department appointees: George P. Marsh, future Minister to Italy, and Joshua R. Giddings, whom Lincoln sent to Canada as consul general.

Here also was James Pollock, a later Governor of Pennsylvania, whom Lincoln named Director of the Mint; and who, in the darkest days of the rebellion, coined the first 2-cent piece placing thereon the phrase "In God We Trust." As a coin in the United States monetary system, the 2-cent piece was short-lived, but the phrase has been on almost every United States coin since that date.

There were many others of equal fame and comparable ability in that Thirtieth Congress. As a Michigan resident, I cite two future governors of our State, Robert McClelland, of Monroe; and Kingsley S. Bingham, of Green Oak, in Livingston County, who were fellow Representatives of Abraham Lincoln. And Senator Lewis Cass had already served Michigan as our first territorial governor after the British occupation. Some others whose names are woven into the history of America were David Wilmot, of Wilmot Proviso fame, who came to that Congress from Pennsylvania; Horace Greeley, New York editor who undoubtedly remembered Lincoln from the River and Harbor Convention; Amos Tuck, of New Hampshire; Howell Cobb, of Georgia; and Tom Corwin, of Ohio, who was Lincoln's minister to Mexico. Some mention, too, should be made of William A. Newell, of New Jersey, who is credited with the founding of the Life Saving Service, which later was to become the United States Coast Guard. And there are reasons why we should not overlook Robert C. Schenck, Congressman from Ohio. He distinguished himself in the Civil War, became United States Minister to England, and there achieved distinction by introducing to the English the honorable American game of "draw poker."

Foremost on the roster of the House of Representatives was John Quincy Adams, venerable Whig, the fifth President of the United States, who as a boy of 10, and many times thereafter, had looked upon Gen. George Washington when the latter was the leader of the Revolutionary Army.

This was a Congress of able men, and not the least able among them was the gentleman from Illinois, the lone Whig who represented the Seventh District. The great majority of Congressmen who are remembered in later years are so remembered because of some law that bears their name. Not so with Lincoln. No law ever bore his name, but his fame will be perpetuated long after the laws of his Congress are repealed or are forgotten. Not that Lincoln's single term in Congress was spectacular; it wasn't; although there were spectacular moments during which he was the leading figure. Destiny had selected Lincoln to be one of America's greatest Presidents, and this term in the Thirtieth Congress was a part of the apprenticeship he served in preparation for that office.

Lincoln was appointed to serve on two committees, the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads and the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department. His bills were few, the majority of them dealing with legislation growing out of the reports of these committees.

Early in the session, while reporting out a bill from the Post Office and Post Roads Committee, his unfailing frankness and honesty brought him a stern rebuke from a Member of the House. Lincoln had secured the floor and began, "The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads is composed of five Whigs and four Democrats. The report has met with the approval of all the Whigs and all the Democrats but one. I want to say further that this"—and right there he was cut short by a Member who in no uncertain terms gave Lincoln to understand that it was not in order to mention on the floor of the House what had taken place in the committee.

To this, Lincoln replied with some embarrassment, "If I have been out of order in what I have said, I take it all back as far as I can." There was much laughter as he continued, "I have no desire, I assure you, gentlemen, to be out of order; although I can never keep long in order."

Lincoln may have been unknown in Congress before this incident, but not after.

As long as our history books record the story of the Mexican War, they will also record the so-called Spot Resolutions. Lincoln was the author and the sole instigator of the Spot Resolutions. They were to become a pain in his political side for some time, causing him some difficulty in his home district where he was given the nickname "Spotty" Lincoln. But painful though they may have been to Lincoln, they were more painful to President Polk. In his first message to this Congress, Polk had accused Mexico of invading the territory of the State of Texas, striking the first blow, and of shedding the blood of our citizens on "our own soil." Fifteen days after this message, Lincoln presented before the House a series of resolutions calling upon the President to inform the House whether the "spot" on which American blood was first shed in the war was not within the territory claimed by Mexico.

Lincoln's Spot Resolutions mercilessly exposed the hollowness of the pleas offered for the administration. He asked questions the President dared not answer, and the evasion which was half forgotten by the country at large was never forgotten by those who knew the sternness of this tall Member from Illinois. Polk had been guilty of unjust aggression, he had sent troops where they should not have been sent, he had wronged the Mexicans, and Lincoln's resolutions were unpitying.

Speaking on his own resolution a few days later, Lincoln said, "The President is in no wise satisfied with his own position. * * * He is a bewildered, confused, and

miserably perplexed man. God grant he may be able to show there is not something about his conscience more painful than all his mental perplexity."

The man who framed such an indictment might be a new Member, but he was not new to legal studies, and he was not a novice in controversy.

Lincoln was not the only Member of the House who spoke on the issue. There was another Whig, a little, sawed-off runt from Georgia, Alexander H. Stevens by name, future Vice President of the Confederacy, and a man with a mighty mind, who spoke for an hour, saying in part, "The honor of this country does not and cannot require us to force and compel the people of any country to sell theirs. * * * The principle of waging war against a neighboring people to compel them to sell their country is not only dishonorable, but disgraceful and infamous."

Little Alex Stevens, from Georgia, and the tall gentleman from Illinois were "charter" members of an unusual inner circle among the Whigs in the Thirtieth Congress. They were the founding members of a group known as the "Young Indians," a group organized for the intent purpose of nominating General Taylor for the Presidency. The center of activities for the Young Indians was around the table in Mrs. Sprigg's boarding house, where Lincoln and several other Whig Representatives resided. The Sprigg boarding house was located on a spot now occupied by the fountain in front of the Library of Congress. It is said that at the Sprigg table Lincoln was the most popular boarder, due largely to his ready fund of stories and illustrative anecdotes, which always found ready listeners. He never told a story twice, and always he appeared to have an endless repertoire, each one of which was pertinently adapted to some passing event.

Mention should likewise be made of one or two other spots which were familiar to Lincoln. There was the bowling alley in James Caspari's hotel, opposite the House of Representatives, on a site which is now a part of the Capitol grounds. Here Lincoln spent many evenings bowling with other Members of Congress and, as usual, delighting them with his stories. As a bowler his average wasn't as high as was his personal popularity with the bowlers.

Another resort of Lincoln was in the post-office of the House. Here his favorite seat, according to newspaper correspondent Ben Perley Poore, was at the left of an open fireplace, tilted back in his chair, with his legs reaching above the chimney jamb. Poore adds, "It was refreshing to the correspondents, compelled as we were to listen to much that was prosy and tedious, to hear this bright specimen of western genius tell his inimitable stories, especially his reminiscences of the Black Hawk War."

Lincoln was always a good friend of the newspapermen. He recognized the power of the press and the need of newspapers. In one of his committee reports he said, "Our republican institutions can best be sustained by the diffusion of knowledge and the due encouragement of a universal spirit of inquiry and discussion of public events through the medium of the public press." He introduced a bill which permitted postmasters at county seats to accept subscriptions for periodicals and newspapers.

For Lincoln the Congressional Library and the law library in the Supreme Court were gold mines of information in which he dug deeply. One librarian recalls that after selecting a pile of books, he would tie them in a large bandana handkerchief, put through the knot a stick which he had brought with him, throw the load over his shoulder and march off to his room at Mrs. Sprigg's. In a few days he would return them in the same manner and go off with another selection.

One day during the first session, there was a commotion in the House, centering around the seat of the aged John Quincy Adams. The old man was suffering a stroke from which he was not to recover. Says the Congressional Globe, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that time, "Mr. Adams was removed to the Speaker's room, where the air was better," and where, 2 days later, he died. During that time the House was adjourned. On one of those days, which was the birthday of George Washington, Lincoln is known to have visited the home and tomb of the first President. For Lincoln this, his first visit to Mount Vernon, was a pilgrimage of devotion on the part of the future President who was to fight to preserve the Union which the first President had fought to create. On the following Fourth of July Lincoln was present when the cornerstone was placed in the Washington Monument.

At the death of ex-President and Congressman John Quincy Adams, Lincoln was one of those named to the congressional committee of arrangements, and later marched with the cortege which bore the body to its temporary resting place in the congressional burying ground.

The Presidential contest between Gen. Zachary Taylor and General and Senator Lewis Cass, as do most Presidential contests, began on the floor of Congress. This gave Lincoln the opportunity to make what is known as his Military Heroes speech. It was a noble piece of rhetoric, and its delivery was a high light of his congressional career. It gave him opportunity to use his matchless ability of narrating illustrative stories. Lincoln, too, had a military background to draw upon for humorous anecdote. Congressman Lincoln's speech of July 27, 1848, is just as humorous and effective to read today as it was nearly a century ago, when it was so devastating to the cause of Lewis Cass, one of Michigan's greatest citizens, who undoubtedly would have made a better President than did Zachary Taylor.

The first stormy session of the Thirtieth Congress adjourned in the middle of August. Mrs. Lincoln and the two boys had already returned to Lexington, and later to Springfield; but Lincoln had party duties to perform. He had been invited to make an extended speaking tour in support of the Taylor-Fillmore ticket. Campaign duties kept him in Washington for a month, and during the following few weeks he spoke once in Maryland, and in nine Massachusetts cities, including twice in Boston. Several times he addressed two or more audiences in a day. In his campaign for Taylor he seemed to be trying out his powers as a stump speaker before audiences as far different from the pioneers of Illinois as one could imagine. He met with great success. Audiences were large and enthusiastic, frequently following him to other towns to hear more.

Closing his campaign tour at a huge mass meeting in Boston's Tremont Temple, he crossed New York State, visited Niagara Falls, and boarded the S. S. *Globe* in the Buffalo Harbor, bound for Chicago, around the Lakes. On the morning of September 28, the *Globe* anchored for an hour or so at Detroit, the one and only time he ever saw the future motor capital. Coming up the Detroit River that morning, he had witnessed a sight which must have brought back memories of a similar event of more than 17 years before. A few miles below Detroit, passengers on the *Globe* had watched the efforts of lakemen to salvage the S. S. *Canada*, which had gone aground on Fighting Island the night before. Back in New Salem, in April 1831, Lincoln's flatboat had gone aground on Rutledge's mill dam in the Sangamon River. Undoubtedly the plight of the *Canada* caused Lincoln to renew his efforts toward the perfection of an idea he had for removing boats from shoals. He applied for a patent on the device before he left Washington at the end of the term, the following March.

Back in Illinois for a short vacation, he also spent some time campaigning vigorously for Taylor, who won the November election. Returning to Washington in December, for the final session of the Thirtieth Congress, Lincoln was named to the committee to plan the inauguration. During the few remaining months of the term he devoted himself faithfully to routine business, participated actively in discussion and debate, and attended to his committee duties.

Many noteworthy incidents in Lincoln's congressional career I have skipped entirely; others are getting only the briefest mention. I have said nothing about his slavery attitude or of the bill he introduced to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia. Perhaps his attitude on slavery can be worded best by quoting from a letter he wrote prior to his nomination for Congress, because these views were consistent with him all during his political career and until near the end of his Presidency:

"I hold it to be the paramount duty of us in the free States, due to the union of the States, and perhaps to liberty itself (paradox though it may seem) to let the slavery of other States alone; while, on the other hand, I hold it to be equally clear that we should never knowingly lend ourselves, directly or indirectly, to prevent that slavery from dying a natural death." (Letter to William Dudley in October 1845.)

His record in Congress shows that he promoted uniform postal rates, that he favored adjusted compensation for soldiers, and that he favored Federal aid for the construction of highways and other internal improvements. One of his notable speeches was in reply to the President's veto message against improvement by Federal aid.

Lincoln never voted or spoke against any measure designed to aid in the conduct of the war. Always he was found to be lined up with the soldiers, voting for all measures favorable to them or to their families. At one time he introduced an amendment to grant bounty lands to men who had served as privates in the Mexican War. He also suggested that bounties be given to all volunteers in the War of 1812. He was faithful to his constituents, performed his duties faithfully, and seldom missed a roll call. Through his ready wit, his capable command of the English language, his unswerving honesty, and his ability to attack his political enemies on the floor of the House, he gained the firm and lasting friendship of both Whigs and Democrats. Very early in his career he secured the friendship of Daniel Webster, and was a frequent attendant by invitation at Webster's "breakfast club."

All sides and periods of Lincoln's life are worthy of study, but inasmuch as the great work he did in later life was so magnificent, it has almost totally eclipsed his political life from young manhood until he came into national prominence.

Most biographers give much less attention to his congressional career than has been given here. They say that he did not come into national prominence until his debates with Douglas in 1858. But I venture to say that he was nationally known, and was something of a political power for nearly a decade before that date.

Came the adjournment of the Thirtieth Congress and the inauguration of President Taylor. Lincoln didn't miss a moment of it. At an early morning hour he departed from the inaugural ball. Somewhere in the crowd he had lost his hat, so he wrapped his cloak around his head to shield it from the crisp March air, and walked the distance back to his boarding house in the darkness of the early morning, little dreaming that a dozen years from that hour he would be the central figure at the inauguration of another President.

The gentleman from Illinois who had occupied seat No. 194 in the back row of the

Chamber of the House of Representatives had yielded the floor for the last time.

* * * * * *

Why was Abraham Lincoln considered a success as a politician and as a President?

To that question there are nearly as many answers as there are people to make answer.

"Lincoln's success," says one writer, "was due to the integrity of his soul and the sublime courage that gave the people faith in him. In him the common man had faith because Lincoln himself was one of the common men, and he never thought of himself as being otherwise. He spoke so simply and so clearly that no one ever had to question what he meant. There were no vague messages to the people that could be interpreted in as many ways as there were interpreters. He spoke naturally and without trickery, and the people understood him. He spoke as one of them gifted with vision, and with a voice that could make their innermost thoughts articulate."

Abraham Lincoln's whole philosophy of life and his every action was summed up in that Cooper Union address, when he said, "Let us have faith that right makes might; and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it."

Would to God that there could rise up in our troubled land today another Abraham Lincoln.

Julius H. Barnes Urges Favorable Action on Legislation for St. Lawrence Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 19, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, hearings on legislation for the development of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project are now in progress before a subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. One of the witnesses appearing in behalf of the project yesterday was Julius H. Barnes, of Duluth, Minn. Mr. Barnes' testimony was as follows:

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 104, ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PROJECT

(Testimony of Mr. Julius H. Barnes, president, National St. Lawrence Association, before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, on February 18, 1946)

Senator HATCH. Will you state your name, Mr. Barnes.

Mr. BARNES. Julius H. Barnes, president of the National St. Lawrence Association.

Senator HATCH. Former president of the United States Chamber of Commerce?

Mr. BARNES. That is right, Senator.

Senator HATCH. Be seated, Mr. Barnes, and proceed in your own way with your statement.

Mr. BARNES. Mr. Chairman, I think you might be interested in knowing that the National St. Lawrence Association is a purely voluntary group. It was formed some year and a quarter ago in order to make a focal point of opinion from men who had served long years in the official study—the Deep Water Association, St. Lawrence Tidewater Associations—some focal point where the opinion could be crystallized and expressed. We were naturally urged to employ promoters and embark on a scale of great membership solicitation. We decided not to do that, to crystallize around these men who had shown their appreciation of the St. Lawrence and the national interests, crystallize around the men in the various communities whom we would select as in our opinion having a reputation for good judgment and public spirit. Today we have in the National Association less than 100 members, yet by our contact through that membership I feel that what I can say today does represent the community opinion of many, many sections and areas and cities.

This St. Lawrence project has been up several times. In 1934 you will recall it did receive a majority of the Senate but not the necessary two-thirds under the treaty form. In 1941, after hearings before the House Rivers and Harbors Committee, that committee did recommend it, 17 to 8, and in 2 weeks Pearl Harbor stopped any further action at that time; it was suspended for the war.

In 1944 after 15 months' suppression of the bill in the Commerce Committee of the Senate, Senator AIKEN made a sacrificing effort to get attention drawn to it, and it was defeated 56 to 25 in that form, still containing some phases which aroused treaty discussion.

It is up again. Senator, I think I express the determination of the whole Middle West, 50,000,000 people, that this question never will be settled until it is settled right; and when I say that, I want to say why I express it just that way. This association will never make a statement of known inaccuracy. It will allow the opponents every freedom of opinion, if they will take the trouble to base their opinion on the consideration of the actual facts. That has not always been done. There is sentiment intertwined with a heartfelt appreciation that this is the greatest national resource left in America today, and a determination to press that point upon the public until public opinion itself and Congress is convinced that that is the truth, that it is not sectional alone, that it has a national application.

We Americans are, as you know, a sentimental people. We fought the Spanish War and we released the Philippines and Cuba without gain, and we have fought two wars since, without any effort to get any material gain, but in our own protection and in response to the appeal of freemen of this world.

It is 32 years ago that I wrote the first article in favor of the St. Lawrence project at the request of Dr. Albert Shaw, of the Review of Reviews, and I wrote it because my lifetime work at that time in grain exporting had given me, I think, an unusual knowledge of what cheap transportation would do in market benefits and in the expansion of traffic; and every experience I have had in the 32 years since—and I have had unusual contacts, at home and abroad—has hardened in me the conviction that the first impression was right, that the vision of what it meant to America was justified, and these last four tragic years have written dramatically, I think, the justification of all the forecasts that we made.

I think that in appearing this way I have a right to express something of personal sentiment, too. My father was in the Bureau of Statistics of the Treasury Department, in Washington, until I was 10 years old, when he moved to Minnesota. My boyish recollection of the Bureau of Statistics was some 20 or 30 clerks. I think they are somewhat larger than that today. But the adaptation to statistics, I am afraid, sometimes creeps out in me. I will try to control it so as to use only those that illustrate some vital point.

Father moved to Minnesota sixty-odd years ago, because, on the map and in the opinion expressed by men of practical business judgment everywhere, the farthest western point of deep-water navigation in the heart of this great continent must be the place of intense business activity and development. He died, over 50 years ago, but he died firm in the faith that that will come; and when I speak of personal sentiment I really am moved somewhat by that parallel endorsement of my business judgment through many types of business.

Moreover, the men with whom he moved to Duluth, the early pioneers, were men of just the type that we are proud of in America. One of my business associates in Duluth up to 20 years ago was Alexander McDougal, who came to the Great Lakes in 1860 and sailed the Lakes when the Soo had only one lock of 8-foot depth. I have heard him tell the resourcefulness of those early pioneers. Before we had lighthouses among the dangerous rocks of Lake Superior, the fishermen were resourceful enough to build wooden frames and put through their waste fish, and the smell and the gulls and the fog always answered the warning light of today. He has told me of the pioneer days in Duluth when at one time we had 150,000 buffalo hides stored there for shipment in the small ships of the early days. Men like that have readapted themselves with the changed conditions. They have been worthy stewards of the advantages that nature bestowed on the Great Lakes and on the area that rests on it—the Middle West.

I remember that, as illustrating what this has meant in the national economy, that he spoke about the rate on the early cargoes of war at $4 a ton—it is not 80 cents. The rate on grain was 18 to 25 cents a bushel—it is now one tenth of that. The development of Lake Superior is one of the romances of America. My accent on it is to show that the men who believed, who staked their fortunes by settling for the development of the far western end of deep-water navigation, were men of such type as we can be proud of, as showing American resourcefulness and energy. Captain McDougal, himself, was the inventor of the whaleback, and the whaleback type was a splendid sea boat. As volume increased in the war carriage of coal and grain, it became necessary also to unload these boats faster. They opened the hatches wider and wider for larger and larger loading mechanism. As you open the hatches wider on the landing boats you weaken them on the edge, and one form passed out of existence; but the boat that is set in the water square is the boat that I have operated for 50 years, after building the first one just after the First War, and it was in service for the Navy, until it was seized at Guam in this last Pearl Harbor Day.

I mean we have tried to do something ourselves for the development of this country. Of course, we want the profits and earnings. That is what maintains business and enables it to spread and expand and hire more men and carry more tonnage, but what I want to get at is the earnestness with which the people of the Middle West now ask your consideration of this great project is based on the demonstration that they themselves did their part in constructing the America that we are all proud of out there.

Now, when father died I went into the grain business as office boy. I ventured with growing years to try the export trade direct. I did it from Duluth because we had a choice of water routes, and I shipped grain in the early days to Buffalo and transferred it to wooden canal boats that were drawn by horses down the towpath, and they are now replaced by Diesel-driven, self-propelled carriers. I operate a fleet of them. We had a choice between shipping to New York by canal or rail, shipping to Baltimore, Philadelphia, or Boston by rail, shipping by water on the lake ships as far as Ogdensburg and Kingston and then they were transferred into a special type of river barge called the pin flap that has passed out of existence since because the type of ship that served that route, with the 50-year-old limitations of 250-foot locks and 14-foot depth of today, just do not suit modern commerce.

Now, west of the St. Lawrence bottleneck that I am speaking of, there has been the finest instance of the keen play of Government and private enterprise that can be found anywhere in the world. The whole world is groping today to find the proper relationship between Government and private enterprise. It will be a shifting frontier guided by experience and argument, but there is no question on the Great Lakes that there was a most beneficial relation between those two phases. The Government deepened the channel successfully. It built successively larger locks and more of them, until there are five great locks today at the Soo. It lighted the channels to mark them, made them safe, and then left to private enterprise the construction of the facilities that used that waterway. That has led to the development, with human ingenuity of a high order, of ships, carriers of bulk cargo particularly on the Great Lakes, that are the marvel of the world. Nothing could be said to exceed the credit to which these men are entitled to have when they have developed a carrier that travels 800 miles up, with no cargo, loads a cargo of ore, carries it back 800 miles to serve the steel mills—and does it all for less than you would pay to have a ton of coal carried across your sidewalk. That, and the docks to fit them, to serve them, were a private enterprise of a high order. It is something that ought to be preserved and developed, because it is a demonstration of the service that Government with its superior resources and authority can contribute in the development of private enterprise, with enormously expanding employment.

Senator HATCH. You think, then, that there is a field for both government and private enterprise, where both can live and both survive?

Mr. BARNES. I certainly do, Senator. I think it is foolish to talk about dominant public enterprise and private enterprise as being something even fixed in their relationship. It will fluctuate with human experience.

Well, I want to emphasize that this early experience in shipping grain all over the world, the economy that it brought, the cheap access to consuming markets in Liverpool and London and Hamburg and Paris, bore in upon me a keen conviction of the worth of that great chain of lakes and of the cheap water highway that served them, more than another man would quite appreciate. I am sure that if we had been using that cheap waterway, reaching into the center of this country, touching the huge forests around the Great Lakes and the newly discovered copper mines and iron mines that helped develop industrial America, that we never could have developed the eastern part of the United States at the same time and had the same economy which did take place and stimulate it. I am satisfied that we never would have lined the streets of our western farm villages with automobiles, if it had not been for the economy of the waterway in marketing the surplus products that they marketed there for years, sir.

I illustrate that, sir, most fitly, in this way. When I was Wheat Director at President Wilson's request, after the Food Administration retired in 1919, I made a study of the effect of this cheap transport cost between our grainfields and the European markets, including with it a study of what it would mean to American grain, particularly, if the European worker ever could set the same table that was common in America, the same concentrated foods that we deem it customary and usual to use, and they do not. These men who were skilled economists reported to me that if European labor ever rose to the same living standards as we had in America, every acre of arable land in Europe would be needed for concentrated foods—cattle, hogs, milk, and so forth—and that their grain areas would have to be shifted overseas to the grain areas of the Dominion of Canada, the United States, Australia, and Argentina. That process is under way. I hope we are in a new way to international expansion that will hasten it, because it will make American agriculture far more secure than it ever can be without it.

I also worked out with Dr. Taylor the estimate that in the 16 States that grow grain, based on the Great Lakes, the total grain production there of substantially 4,000,000,000 bushels a year, wheat, corn, oats, rye, and barley—4,000,000,000 bushels a year—that if you would admit the economic principle that the farm price in that area—and it was, in the export days, at least, determined by the foreign market, less cost of reaching that foreign market—and admit an economy because of this Great Lakes-St. Lawrence highway, of 5 cents a bushel, you would have an annual return to the farms—annually—each year—of $200,000,000 saved.

Now, I was a practical grain merchant for 30 years. I will maintain against any economist that the probability is that the foreign price at which all the supplies and demands of the world crystallized, as in Liverpool or London, that that price is the more stable price, and that an economy in reaching that will reflect itself primarily in the price received by the American farmer, not alone what he actually moves but on the whole level of price, which, after all, is governed by the portion of the crop which does move. If you can picture and believe that on the grain crops alone of this area, this waterway is worth $200,000,000 a year in added returns to the farmer alone, plus other forms of farm product which are affected also by economy of transportation, you can see that it is just economic falsity not to recognize this and open this highway for its 5-cent saving which would be reflected.

Now, these rules do not come into play right now, in our day of subsidy and food control, and artificial food distribution, but inevitably the day is coming when it will be felt and when it can reflect to the benefit of the whole western farming region, and certainly to that extent. I think I ought to say that in the fortunate wide experiences that I feel have helped train me and to crystallize conviction, say my service with the Food Administration when I was President of the Food Administration Grain Corporation for Herbert Hoover, and handled all the shipments not only of grain but milk and sugar and lard and other food products abroad, I touched transportation then on a very large scale. I saw again in a very dramatic, vivid way what an economy of transportation cost meant in the returns to be left in our own hands here. I followed that as Wheat Director. I had the job of making good on the congressional guaranty of $2.20 a bushel for wheat over this country, and I do not think any farmer has ever brought any complaint that he did not get it under the administration, the volunteers, which I organized.

What I am getting at is that that gave me a contact wider than home—contact throughout the world. In 1923, when I was president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, I went as head of the American delegation to a Rome conference of the international chamber, with representatives from 60 nations, in Rome in 1923. The French were in the Ruhr. There was danger of war breaking out under that kind of international bitterness. We devoted considerable study to trying to find a formula that would at least form a bridge that Germany could get over its difficulties at that time and take its place perhaps in some self-respecting way as part of the European economy. I met and talked, as I say, with the best business opinion, I think, in 60 countries. It helped to crystallize again my feeling that there is an international relationship that must be preserved and developed to the benefit of our own people, particularly in the agricultural field. Since then the industrial growth has shifted the weight of benefit to the industrial field rather than to agriculture, but both are there. At Rome in 1923—please realize I am trying to qualify as a witness for the statements I want to make, with extreme earnestness, here. I was head of the American delegation. We framed the resolutions that were the basis of the Dawes Commission. When I came home the Secretary of State, Charles Evans Hughes, asked me to come to his office, and offered me the third position on the Dawes Commission, with General Dawes and Owen Young, and I could not take it. What I am getting at is, when I make these statements, the crystallized lifetime conviction of a businessman of fortunately rather wide experience, I want to feel that they are based on an unusual contact—I will have to claim for myself an effort to make my judgment detached and impartial. I try to be.

In 1938, the League of Nations nominated me to be on the League of Nations Waterway Committee, to see if we could internationalize the river waterways of Europe, and then came the war and nothing was done, but I mean that was the basis of experience, which gave me some kind of world acquaintance, and in all these years I have never found a man of wide experience—I have never found a man of any experience—who, looking at the map at that great waterway reaching 2,400 miles from the ocean into the heart of America, has failed to wonder that this country does not see what it would mean to modernize it on the same scale as it has so intelligently and vigorously done on the Great Lakes themselves. I just cannot conceive why men cannot see what that would mean in the national economy, and to argue that the economy is so real that it must divert traffic from the established rail lines or established Atlantic ports is not only selfish but, to my judgment, it is very short-sighted. The stimulant to industrial activity in the Middle West that would follow the opening of this cheap access to new raw material and access to new vast markets, on an all-water route, a water economy, and to all new lands and new peoples, would be so marked in following the development of cheap rates that would follow that the overflow would certainly make up any diversion of traffic in any direction—Atlantic ports, eastern railroads, Lake shippers, coal mining—all those various areas that Secretary Acheson this morning described as being those interested in opposition and resisting.

I would like to just take an analysis of the opposition we face and see what credence it is entitled to have. For example, he named the electric-power industry as one of those that had evinced opposition—and they had. There is an excuse for their early opposition. In World War I this country only generated 14,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours—14,000,000,000. In World War II we generated 230,000,000,000—15 times as much. It was just growing. This country was just becoming a power-driven, modernized industry, a low-production-cost country, that occasions our miracle performance in this last war, and that makes us the world leader in industry today. We will always need electric power, and need more and more of it, year by year; yet the electric industry in the early days did oppose it. I do not think they do as much, now. Certainly, there is not the same bitterness of opposition that there was in 1934 from the power industry. They have changed their mind. They still hesitate about it because they still have fears of the solution of the question of public-power distribution versus private-power distribution, that is going to be settled by a public opinion schooled by discussion and experience. As far as the St. Lawrence power is concerned, it will be 4 or 5 years to develop public opinion in New York State, which will have the control of it. There will be no power to distribute if we do not get consent and generate the power at

least. Then let us settle how we are going to distribute it; but that point of difference of view is used here by those who primarily aim to defeat or to defer the whole St. Lawrence improvement, to start discussion on efforts that help to check it, as it has in the past. That is unworthy of them.

The power industry has much to be proud of. They have shown a falling scale of rates. They have shown great ingenuity in skill and energy of invention, but they were not always that way. It happens out of my personal experience in 1930, when we had widespread unemployment, when business was frightened, and workers were suspending their ordinary grocery and clothing purchases for fear of getting a "blue slip" at the end of the week, with a discharge. President Hoover had the idea that perhaps if we could start with one great industry and promise a period of advance assurance of employment, perhaps others could follow, and we could stabilize into the ordinary buying and selling practices that helped to maintain the retail trade, and from that, reflect into the factory itself, so at Atlantic City I carried the invitation of President Hoover to the leaders of the power and electric utility interests, that if they would agree to do this, to give their workers assurance, 12 months advance assurance of employment, or 6 months, so that they would be relieved of the immediate anxiety that was all over this country, and the panic, that he would dress up a White House reception for them and give them the vivid dressing which would give them a leadership. Now, we had, back there, in the utility industry of that day, such men as Samuel Insull and Hobbs of Associated Gas. They, through mistaken loyalty to their organization, led that great industry to turn down that very large and fair opportunity to become leaders.

As a rule, probably, that was sound business, and they refused it. Three years later, in 1933, they got legislation which was denominated as a "death sentence." What they would have given in 1933 to have public confidence and support for at least reasonable legislation for control of taxes, which were clearly outrageous. They can think it out, themselves, but when we have a man in our national organization today like Owen Young, I think I am justified in saying that the utility attitude toward the St. Lawrence has changed. I do not think we are going to have quite the same opposition there.

Secretary Acheson also said that among the opposition was the coal industry and the mine workers. That is true. And I think they are mistaken. When I see that the statement is made in their behalf that this threatens an expert coal portion of something like ten to fifteen million tons a year, and when I then look at the figures on production of coal, which have risen from 350,000,000 tons in 1932, the heart of the depression, to six-hundred-and-seventy-odd, last year, it seems to me far more important to have a healthy, stimulated business at home than it is to look at any portion that might be lost in export. Even as to that, I am sure they are wrong about it, that we are more likely to have new markets for export coal than we are to have that, by access to the St. Lawrence, on imported coal. Of course, under today's conditions there is no possibility of importing coal from any part of the world. We are shipping all over the world. Secretary Acheson also named as one of the objectors or opposition to the St. Lawrence improvement certain Atlantic ports and their commercial organizations. Here I feel inclined to speak with considerable emphasis and feeling.

I was president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States for 3 years, in 1922–24, and afterward, called back into service for 3 years more, as chairman, in 1929–31. I knew the men who founded the Chamber of Commerce of the United States—Harry Wheeler and the others of his type; they had a high ideal, under the invitation of President Taft, to make business opinion expressed so fairly and on such exhaustive examination of facts for determining national questions, that their resolution would mean something, would amount to something. They still do that, when they submit a question to their membership, the submission of that question is accompanied by the best statement of reasons for and reasons against, so that we have a chance to measure it. That is not true, I am sorry so say, about the commercial organizations of a city like New York. I belong to all of them—the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, Commerce and Industry Association, the Maritime Association. Those organizations adopt a committee report, and in the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, 130 years old, with a very honorable tradition and inspiring a great hall, the portraits of the men who built New York port—there, twice, I have risen in my place to object to the adoption of a committee report without an examination of the facts stated.

I pointed out less than a year ago in one discussion of one of their reports condemning St. Lawrence, opposing St. Lawrence, that there were inaccuracies, misstatements in the reasons given in the committee report. I pleaded with them to defer action and appoint a committee to examine the facts, submit the facts both ways to the membership so that each member could have his own judgment instead of accepting a committee recommendation without any knowledge of the reasons on both sides, and I was voted down 65 to 47, the first time, and some of the Members told me, afterwards, that in all of their history this was the first word they had ever heard in favor of St. Lawrence in that hall. I mean that closed mind of of the organization attitude of a great commercial organization like the Port of New York, who say openly that they fear that the opening of the St. Lawrence will divert tonnage that now passes over their docks. I have heard their members argue that the stevadore expenditure would be less. I think they are wrong, but at least they come out in the open and say that there is their selfish reason for opposing something valuable, pronounced by six Presidents, who approved it as one of the great projects of the world, and it passed the examination of skilled engineers and all these departments that carry a responsibility for the public interest.

The second time, I arose against the same action, and it is reiterated. They will probably send someone to express their opposition to a hearing—we expect it; I shall be surprised if they are able to justify any reason in the world for their opposition except the selfish one that they fear tonnage will move on the cheaper route and will reduce that which passes over their docks, and as I say, my business judgment tells me they are mistaken in that. Moreover, it seems peculiarly selfish of the great portion of New York. I have an office there, I belong to all these organizations. I operate a fleet from there. I love the city, I admire it. It attracts the superbrains of the country, but when they get there with a sense of power they just lose something of the perspective which they used to have back in the country, and I tell them so. New York City has had $120,000,000 spent on its inner harbor, of national money. It is served by a $100,000,000 investment in the Erie Canal, that is only useful to the port of New York, yet here it is making objections to the expenditure of $200,000,000 to open a seaway that exists, that only needs improvement, modernization, to open up to a longer seacoast than any we have, longer than the Atlantic, longer than the Gulf, longer than the Pacific, and serve more people than any one of those coasts; and America's whole industrial progress has been favored by the fact that it had, as no other country in the world ever had, three natural seacoasts, and now can have a fourth that would give its national progress a great impetus again.

Secretary Acheson spoke about the opposition of the Great Lakes shipping. I have already expressed my admiration of the inventiveness, the ingenuity, the energy and skill with which carriage of the carriers has been carried to an apex that is a world marvel. I still think that they are entitled to great credit. They are men I like and trust and believe in. They are not a unit, and we have some of their members, like Cyrus Eaton and James Davidson who are members of our association, who see broader than today's supposed private interest of protecting these carriers on the Great Lakes, see the broader vision of what it means if these carriers could go clear to the seaboard for exchange of cargoes. They are not suited for ocean carriage themselves. They are of special type, of great economy, designed to serve the Great Lakes transport itself, where refuge harbors are not far apart and where storms are not so vigorous, and where they do not need twin decks like ocean ships for structural strength. They have shown a remarkable adaptability in cheap carriage. But they had better look out, because if it is true that we are exhausting our natural resources, and we in Duluth are worrying about it, because we are supported by the miraculously rich ore of the Mesabi range. When we are told that the high-grade ore can only last, at the last year's rate of consumption, 21 years more, it is time to look ahead. There is lots of low-grade ore around Duluth. There will be lots to carry, that is going to be in use in the furnaces of the East and of the Middle West, which will need the import of high-grade ore, if this 21-year estimate is right—and I have no reason to doubt it. We need to open the seaway. We need to have access inbound for high-grade ore from Laborador, new discoveries, with some possibilities, from Cuba, where already at Baltimore the Bethlehem Steel runs on Cuban ore; from Chile, where the Bethlehem Steel brings to their Atlantic sea plant ore from Chile; from Brazil. These carriers on the Great Lakes have the protection of distance from these other fields. They will always have an ore. They will always have an ore to carry, high-grade or low-grade. They are just wrong in fearing that and opposing a great improvement like this in the national interest by setting up their single supposedly selfish interest.

The other opposition which Secretary Acheson emphasized was that of the railroads of this country. I want to speak on that, and I want to speak with great restraint but great earnestness; and I have a right to. In 1923, I was chairman of the National Transportation Conference, under the auspices of the Chamber of Commerce, for which they spent $50,000 for a study of the proper relationship between the railroads in newly developed highway transport and the waterways. We had 100 members in that conference, men of high grade. I would like to read you some of the men—railroad executives, in the unanimous conclusion. We had men like President Rae, of the Pennsylvania; Storey, of the Santa Fe; Willard, of the Baltimore & Ohio; Holden, of the Burlington; Loomis, of the Lehigh Valley; Markham, of the Illinois Central; Gray, of the Union Pacific; Eliot, of the Northern Pacific. There were 21 high railway executives, members of that conference, who joined and took part and agreed in the unanimous conclusions of the conference. In its expressions—remembering, a unanimous report, in which they had a chance to argue. This cross-section of constructive management joined in the recommendation that—and I quote from the report; I have it—

"A sound national program of waterway development should be determined and actively prosecuted to this end without delaying progress of work on existing projects or interfering with international nego-

tiations, to render possible the St. Lawrence waterway and power development. A national survey should be made by the United States Army engineers. This survey should include a schedule of priorities to insure prompt completion of adequate waterway units in such order as to best augment the national transportation system."

Here is plain recognition by top-drawer railroad management talent, in the year which was still one of constructive phase of railroading, that they recognized the utility of waterway, and especially would they interfere not at all with the international negotiations looking to opening the St. Lawrence by joint action with Canada.

Well, their recommendations were followed. The Army engineers, through two successive boards, recommended the St. Lawrence improvement, and have repeatedly checked the cost estimates. There has been an effort to confuse the cost of that highway by all sorts of irresponsible estimates, some running as high as a billion and a half dollars. There has been no engineering estimate of these several boards exceeding $600,000,000 for the total improvement, to be divided between Canada and the United States.

I do not know how a hundred businessmen—I do not know how you would ever get advance estimates of cost any more reliable than exist in the official records in favor of the St. Lawrence improvement.

In 1920, also in the twenties which followed that development era in railroading, every western trunk line, eight of them, that based on Great Lakes ports, the president of every one of those eight western trunk lines publicly expressed approval and endorsement of the St. Lawrence project. It is a matter of record. The names are on record, and the words they used in endorsement—Presidents Pennington, Jaffrey, Budd, Howard Elliot, Donnelley, Byram, Scandrett, Felton, Sargent, Holden, and Downes. Not a single western railroad failed to recognize the service it would be to their transportation lines under their direction; and certainly the conditions are more promising for them today than then. But in 1934 the Association of American Railroads was formed, a national association, first, and they have been speaking for the whole railroad industry since. I do not think I am unfair to them to say that it is clear that they are dominated by three great trunk lines—the Pennsylvania, the New York Central, and the Baltimore & Ohio.

I think it is not unfair to wonder why, since 1934, these western trunk-line executives have remained silent, not in opposition; they will not express opposition so much, but they will not repeat their endorsements. I think you can draw your own conclusion, whether, either by organization loyalty, which is a commendable quality, or by the fear of the discrimination and reprisal which is not a commendable quality, and not American, they are keeping quiet and letting the association headquarters here in Washington speak for them in opposition to the St. Lawrence, and the only argument that I can see that they can make with any shadow of justification is the argument that they fear it will divert traffic from their lines leading from Atlantic ports to the west—diverted by superior service and the cheaper costs of transportation. If that is a worthy motive against one of great public interest, every man is entitled to measure whether his conception of public interest exceeds that of the proper protection of a great industry like railroading.

I had a long experience with the railroads. I have known their executives personally back at least in the 1920's, when I acted as chairman of that great transportation conference. I have a great respect for most of them. I think they are terribly wrong in putting this supposed interest to their individual lines against the great public improvement like this. I think their record shows that they have rarely acted in a large, generous, intelligent way toward other forms of transportation. They have a great treasury. They have a weekly newspaper, the Railroad Data. They hire pages of magazine advertising. They lay the emphasis, trying to create a public sentiment that the National Government ought not to extend favoritism to highway and waterway transportation while the railroads have to pay their own way. In none of those advertisements have I seen them make the fair statement that the difference is that any American citizen can put a truck or a passenger car on these highways publicly owned; he can put a boat of any size on the waterways and run it; but let him step on the railway highway and he will be arrested. There is a considerable difference, I think, in attempting a comparison of the relations of the public with those three forms of transportation.

Now, always, railroad policies have been aimed to defeat the economy of water service. The Transportation Act of 1920 and its amendments provided for "fourth-section relief," so-called, allowing the railroads to reduce rates to meet water competition on the single commodities. That is a very unfair power. To reduce rates, if not in the loss area, at least to where they do not contribute their fair share of earnings to railroad maintenance, and meeting the natural economy of a water carrier, and then absorb that in a great, massive bulk of all kinds of carriage that the railroad has, is not fair competition; and they are beginning to see it.

There is being created in this country or rising a great reaction, a revulsion from so-called "fourth-section exemptions." Chairman Land, of the War Shipping Administration, spoke of that in his letter to the ICC only a few weeks ago, when he was obliged to take issue with railroad opposition expressed before the Interstate Commerce Commission against the resumption of coastwise and intercoastal shipping service which had been suspended during the war. He was obliged to officially record his opinion of that character of railroad opposition. For instance, let me read you two paragraphs of his letter to the ICC:

"It is a matter of keen regret to me," he writes, "that at the very first opportunity following the close of hostilities, the railroads have adopted a narrow point of view, reminiscent of the 'dog eat dog' philosophy which so adversely affected their own interests as well as those of the water carriers during the prewar days.

"Objections from the railroads come with bad grace. The rails were not asked to abandon their business to competing transportation. They benefitted by the misfortunes of the water carriers. Under our national economy both forms of transportation are essential. We have not passed a single oppressive act in Congress that has not repeated the principle that the objective of regulation was to preserve to each form of transportation the natural economies that it could offer to the public service."

And I have yet to see one honest-to-goodness effort of the railroads to cooperate with the development of either of the competing forms or surface forms, waterway or highway, in any of their acts.

Now, I speak with great feeling there, because in my long life, back in 1912, as a Duluthan and chairman of the traffic commission, we found that railroad-owned lake ships were carrying sugar westbound from New York, loading it at Buffalo, carrying it up on the Lakes and through Duluth, delivering to the Twin Cities at a lower rate than if we stopped it at Duluth. That did not seem right. We brought an action before the ICC. We won it. The railroads were ordered to establish the same rates westbound to Duluth as to Chicago by water, because the water conditions were substantially identical in distance—not all-rail; we cannot compete by rail. We are 400 miles longer on rail haul; but that was the principle laid down, and it was effective for 2 years, until statutory legislation for the ICC, and in those 2 years, which happened to be years in which by the application of the Bingham Act railroads had to divest themselves of the ownership of these lake steamers, 32 of them, during those 2 years, at the reduced rates which the ICC ordered, 62 cents New York to Chicago and 62 cents New York to Duluth, the succeeding Great Lakes Transit Corp. made a million and a million and a half dollars a year. The rate today has risen from 62 cents to $1.74 to Duluth, and we have lost our equality with Chicago, which is now, I think it is, $1.55. That is, our distribution area has been narrowed by the prejudice shown by railroad interests. They do not own the ships, but by control of the origin of traffic and by implication of prejudice in the divisions and in the allocation of traffic they have had their own way and changed the whole rate structure of the country.

I hope to see some men younger than I am, with the same feeling that I have, do something about it before long.

The net result of it was, after we got this order in 1913, that we then tried to get the still railroad-owned ships to take care of the country grain and dairy trade of Minnesota. When I went in the grain business, Minnesota raised a hundred million bushels of wheat. It raises twenty million today because it has shifted to dairy products, butter, eggs, and frozen meats.

In 1914 the railroads had dairy products on their prohibited list for water carriers. They would not take them, and we could not get them to at any rate. We had to go before the ICC and get an order from them and the ships were equipped on a small scale for dairy products transportation. Now, every ship, until they were disposed of in this war, was shipped with refrigerator space to carry dairy products, the most profitable freight they had. That is what we always had to do with the railroads.

In 1915 they applied to the ICC under the Panama Act for permission to continue ownership. We appeared in oppcsition to that, with our experience, and the ICC decision was that the record showed that the operation of those ships by railroad owners had not been in the public interest, and ordered them to divest themselves of the ships, which they did in 1915 by selling them to a private company, the Great Lakes Transit Corp., set up by Connors, of Detroit, the stevedore king of that port. He invited me to become one of the incorporators and directors. I was one of the first directors, and I put in some money, which I afterward gave to the YMCA when I went into Government service in 1920, so as to have no shadow of private interest.

That has been our experience. How can you blame me for feeling in every fiber of my body that the railroads should show some evidence that they will enter into the same kind of competitive situation that exists in other large units in many other kinds of industry? How can you blame me for resenting that they appear in opposition to the St. Lawrence on the selfish ground that it might divert traffic?

They try to argue from that point. Some of their spokesmen say the St. Lawrence will not be used anyway. Some others say it will divert traffic. They cannot argue both ways. The fact is that it will create new traffic altogether in the Middle West and down the Great Lakes.

You know, one could be such an admirer of American railroads, whose arms reach all over America. The whistle of a locomotive

at night is just a symbol of American energy and the enterprising development of America. But how are we going to get into railroad administration if we do not have the spirit of fair competition that was of such great value in so many other industries, promoted the growth of America, and encouraged the development of new, small businesses which grew into large businesses? The incentive to overcome overwhelming influence against you to develop your own energy and ambition is what we have got to preserve.

I am disturbed about that, and I think other men who have done some thinking about that are also disturbed. Senator AIKEN a few weeks ago in Boston expressed distrust of what he called economic colonialism in America. It does exist. Centers of great wealth in New York and other cities do exercise influence over their western subsidiaries. The manager of a western subsidiary may be perfectly competent to be entrusted with its management, but if he wants to subscribe to the St. Lawrence waterway he gets instructions from New York that he had better not do it. That is not a healthy atmosphere for developing initiative, energy, enterprise, vigor, and adventure in American industry. The railroad industry is using these same methods exactly. It touches all parts of industry. Representatives of railroads are not at all above going to see this man and that and impliedly saying that they just had better not appear as public supporters of the St. Lawrence.

I make this charge with full and mature consideration. It is a serious charge.

But we could have a great railroad industry. We could, by cooperation, development, and in relation with the other forms of transportation, create a web of economy that would serve all industry and the national welfare and the defense of it.

But when the railroads appear here before you with their arguments I ask you to understand what the history of those roads has been, as told by a man who has lived through a great many years.

I know that opening the St. Lawrence would be of the greatest benefit to this country. We would have a second surge of development. This subcommittee, the whole committee, and then the Senate and House will have a chance to do something in a big way, as big as the Panama. The St. Lawrence is the greatest natural resource left in America. The country has grown up to it. We need the power; we need the transportation. The new, war-expanded industries in the Middle West, with the newly expanded populations, need access to new farms and markets, and the farms that surround them will find profitable markets if we can do this thing.

Thank you.

Senator HATCH. Are there any questions?

Senator LA FOLLETTE. I have no questions.

Senator AIKEN. No questions, Mr. Chairman.

Senator HATCH. Just summarizing, as I have listened to your testimony, Mr. Barnes, as to those who oppose these industries, while you have indicated there may be some elements of selfishness in some places, almost altogether you characterize it as lack of foresight and vision?

Mr. BARNES. It was that, but now we have grown up to it, Senator. All we have to do is look at the statistics. The Commerce and Industry Association appeared before the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House in 1941 with an engineer who testified that we did not need electric power. Our production generation in America then was 160,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours; it is now 230,000,000,000. At what point do they change their minds? When do they start a fresh survey of new conditions?

Senator HATCH. Thank you, Mr. Barnes. Your testimony has been very interesting.

Knoxville Mill Is Island of Harmony in Nation's Ocean of Labor Discord

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.
OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 20, 1946

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, the management of Appalachian Mills and the 1,200 employees of that company have set an example to the Nation that should challenge the attention of employers and employees throughout the Nation.

I enclose as a part of these remarks a splendid article by Lee Davis appearing in the Knoxville News-Sentinel of Sunday, January 27, 1946:

KNOXVILLE MILL IS ISLAND OF HARMONY IN NATION'S OCEAN OF LABOR DISCORD—APPALACHIAN WORKERS GIVE DINNER FOR FIRM PRESIDENT

(By Lee Davis)

Throughout the country strikes and deadlocks involve almost 2,000,000 people.

And in Knoxville, International Ladies' Garment Workers (A. F. of L.) Local 377, entertain 500 at a dinner and dance in honor of Appalachian Mills President W. A. Brownlee

Imagine how many discouraged Americans must have sat up and taken notice when that News-Sentinel story went out on the wires.

There were no trick angles to that remarkable occasion. We checked into the background and found that the labor-honor dinner for management represented no exaggeration of the long-standing mutual appreciation and respect on the part of smooth, sandy-haired Mr. Brownlee and Local 377.

The explanation for that exceptional relationship? Both the mill president and the local's business agent, angular, youngish Clyde Lee, give the answer in simple and almost identical words.

FORMULA SINCERE

The formula, coming from each in separate interviews, is this:

"Treat the other fellow across the bargaining table as you have a right to expect him to treat you. Try to put yourself in his place and see his side of the picture, too, in order to get an honest perspective of the whole. Sit down to the collective bargaining table with the sincere intention of bargaining straight toward a settlement of the issue in hand. Don't try to mark time or stall, or you had as well not have started the session in the first place."

Almost as handy as the wide main entrance to Appalachian is the open door of Mr. Brownlee's office, situated just inside the entrance and on the workers' main corridor.

"Never liked the idea of a plant head having his office inaccessible and remote from the employees," 48-year-old Mr. Brownlee explained.

WORKERS WELCOMED

"Any Appalachian worker finds a welcome in here at any time. A lot of them do drop in. Not just on union matters, but often with individual problems such as financial and family matters. Whatever it is, I'm always glad to talk it over with them."

Local 377 Business Agent Lee, 36, who started in the mill 15 years ago at $11.20 a week, is perhaps the best authority on the concrete earmarks and results of labor-management smooth sailing at Appalachian, even in these troubled times.

"First, a bit of pre-Brownlee background," he began.

"Our ILGWU local had 200 members signed up when it obtained its charter, December 6, 1940. The membership totals 1,400 now (with 1,200 at present on the Appalachian pay roll).

"The following May the former management agreed to a consent bargaining-agent election. We won, about 3 to 1, and signed our first contract with the company May 15, 1941. But that didn't turn out to be the happy agreement it might have seemed.

"The company soon began taking on nonunion workers; in 4 weeks alone hired 600.

"We went on strike in August, principally for increased wages. When the smoke cleared we had a new contract including an increase and a union shop clause.

"Just a month later Mr. Brownlee became president. That marked the beginning of a new era at Appalachian. Not once since," said the union leader, "has there been a strike or anything like that at our plant."

PUTS CARDS ON TABLE

"From the first day we found the new president ready to sit down at any time, put the cards on the table with us, and go to work to honestly thrash out any complaint or issue. We've matched his sincerity with the same kind of honest effort, as Mr. Brownlee probably would tell you (and he did)."

Then the ILGWU man came up with some samples of the plant head's employer policy:

"The general policy when a shift is cut off is for, say, the machinists, to be carried in that wage classification, although temporarily they may have to be occupied with all kinds of odds and ends of work.

"In this instance a certain machinist was sick when his shift was dropped. When he was able to come back after 3 months, he just took a job as an ordinary worker. Then he got to studying about it and told the shop committee he thought he ought to be back in machinist-pay classification.

"The committee put the matter to Mr. Brownlee. Without hesitation, he spoke up, 'Why, as I see it, there actually is no argument to it. The man is entitled to back pay in line with his regular classification.' And the man got back pay—$325 of it."

TWO RAISES GIVEN

Appalachian workers got a blanket 5-cent raise last May and another 5-cent one in December. "And there wasn't any runaround or stalling involved in those negotiations, either," said Mr. Lee.

"We made a proposal which Mr. Brownlee didn't consider acceptable and he said so right off. He was ready at the next session with a counterproposal which we didn't feel we could take as it stood. We came back next with a counter-counter which wasn't altogether acceptable. Then both sides settled down to working out an agreement, and reached it without any wasted motion."

The union man next cited another facet of the mill president's attitude:

"Some years ago the company set up a cafeteria for its workers and later abandoned the operation. About a year and a half ago the union decided that it would like a go at a nonprofit cafeteria for the employees.

"We took the idea up with Mr. Brownlee. 'Well,' he said promptly, 'take over the cafeteria space and equipment and see what you can do with it. We'll get together sometime in the future on the matter of rent.'

"We have done pretty good with the cafeteria project, plowed back revenue into additional equipment. And Mr. Brownlee has yet to say anything to us about rent."

Local 377's offices and recreation and assembly halls occupy a two-story brick building on the Dale-Fort Sanders Avenue, front corner of the mill property. The union pays the company $20 a month rent and the

latter supplies the heat from the central system.

UNDERSTANDING PAYS OFF

This model management-union understanding can pay off in specific benefits for the outside public as well as for the plant.

Take the case of the Community Chest-War Fund drive. Maynard Baird, Tri-State League of Human Rights director, went out to Appalachian with some appea movies to encourage employee subscriptions.

President Brownlee didn't say "Sure, we're glad to have you show the movie to the workers, and we'll arrange an auditorium for a lunch-hour showing."

"No," said Mr. Lee, "employees were allowed to leave their jobs in order to see the campign film in groups throughout the day.

"Result. Appalachian workers oversubscribed their quota by 130 percent."

Now to circle around again and get another completely different focus on the Appalachian labor-management picture.

"There was the time, about 4 months ago," says Union Agent Lee, "when production took a noticeable drop in one department.

"Our union shop committee went to Mr. Brownlee with the proposal that a committee comprised of two management representatives and two ILGWU representatives investigate the situation together. He studied the idea a moment and agreed.

SITUATION CORRECTED

"The union-company group spent a full 8-hour shift in the department in question, studying production routines and habits.

"On the basis of its findings, the committee worked out suggestions that were adopted, and the result was that the production situation was largely corrected in short order.

"Proper production is equally a matter of pride with the employee and the employer when labor relations are what they should be."

And speaking of production, Appalachian and its workers turned out 12,000,000 pieces of underwear for the United States armed services, lend-lease, and domestic civilian use during the war. For their excellence of war work the mill and its folk were awarded the Army-Navy E pennant and a repeat star.

Here is a list of members of the union's shop committee, or mouthpiece, to show you how representative it is of various types of Appalachian work: Committee chairman, Ralph Hicks, machinist; financial secretary, Ola Childress, machine operator; Paulietta Underwood, machine operator; Bill Mize, knitter; R. T. Kitts, cutter; Charley Lowe, card grinder; Walter Cooper, machinist; and Grace Turbyville, recording secretary.

NEW MEMBERS TRAINED

The ILGWU leader believes another prime ingredient in successful relations is a course of early and comprehensive education for the new union member. Miss Dorothy Knight, Local 377's recreation and education director, is responsible for that department. K. P. Dykes, a plant electrician, is chairman of the education committee.

Each new member is required to attend a new-membership class once a week for 3 weeks (and must have worked successfully at the mill for 28 days to become a full-fledged ILGWU brother or sister). In the new-membership class, rookies are taught union machinery and membership obligations to both the union and the management. They are instructed in the "true meaning of above-board collective bargaining," as to limitations on how union dues can be spent, and the importance of attending membership meetings regularly.

Also there are classes in general school, including the three R's and craftsmanship, and such. Local 377 maintains a large general library in its recreation hall as well as equipment for checkers, cards, and other table games.

Union-sponsored dances and outdoor outings are frequent events.

Each membership meeting begins with a devotional, conducted by Chaplain Bert Hatcher.

HONORED WITH DINNER

Has the foregoing, first and last, given you some idea of the management-labor scene at Appalachian Mills?

Then, extraordinary as it is, it isn't so amazing that ILGWU, Local 377, gave Appalachian President W. A. Brownlee the honor dinner.

Along with Mr. and Mrs. Brownlee, many of the mill's other executives and their wives were on hand, as were the union men and women of all ages, and a galaxy of public officials to boot. Everybody laughed and chatted and danced with everybody else.

Congressman JOHN JENNINGS held the Appalachian relationship up to a troubled Nation as a remarkable example to follow. And that was one speech he has made that didn't get an argument from any quarter.

In the light of President Brownlee's labor record, a glance over some of his personal background might be to the point.

He was only 4 when his family moved from New Orleans, his birthplace, to Knoxville, where he spent a number of his formative years.

WORLD WAR I VETERAN

Young Brownlee's formal education ended when he went into the Army from high school at the outset of the other World War.

He was in 27 months, 18 months with the engineers in France, and was a top sergeant at 19.

"My first experience in directing production workers was not until 1941, when I entered the manufacturing end of the mill operations," Mr. Brownlee says in his somewhat terse way.

He was Appalachian's New York representative from 1924 to 1929, when he came to the home plant here as purchasing agent.

Mrs. Brownlee was formerly Miss Maude Mently, of Gowanda, N. Y. The home is in Westmoreland Heights, and they have two children, William, Jr., 10, and Helen, 6.

Mr. Brownlee likes some hunting and fishing, but seldom plays golf any more. The fact is that his primary hobby probably is his relationship with Appalachian mill folk as a collective union group and as individual friends.

Why Should Schools and Colleges Have So Much Difficulty Purchasing Surplus War Equipment?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 20, 1946

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, many Members of Congress have been receiving letters from administrators of our schools and colleges complaining about the perfectly unconscionable delay and confusion which they face in endeavoring to get for their institutions some of the surplus war equipment now deteriorating in warehouses and in stock piles all over America. Despite the fact the disposal of surplus war property is now in the hands of the seventh successive bureaucratic agency designated to handle it, reports are continuing to reach Congress about the difficulty of purchasers to secure this equipment.

Mr. Speaker, I call attention herewith to a letter received by me from a friend of mine in the Middle West who is a college professor. His institution asked him to make some purchases of surplus war equipment for his college laboratories. The experiences he sets forth in the following letter indicate the need for action in the bureaus down town. It is a sorry saga of red tape, bureaucratic delay, and what I once referred to as "gwibitis"—the chronic affliction which attaches itself to a "Gwibit." A "Gwibit," of course, is a member of the Guild of Washington Incompetent Bureaucratic-Idea Throatcutters!

I hope our collective efforts in Congress can soon bring about changes which will reduce the delay and increase the supplies which confront school and college administrators—as well as many other citizens—when they endeavor to pay cash for the surplus supplies of war which are daily decreasing in value.

The letter follows:

HON. KARL MUNDT,
Representative in Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: You wrote me some time ago asking what progress I was making in obtaining surplus Government equipment for the college. I held off answering your letter in order to include in my report the results of a trip down to Fort Omaha.

It seems to me practically impossible to obtain surplus equipment unless a person has an expense account and can go out and hunt for it. The person to whom you forwarded my list of desired equipment in Chicago sent me a list of available equipment with prices. There were not many of the items that we actually wanted on this list, but we did pick out a few and sent in an order. We were to have priority as a State institution from the 18th of January until the 1st of February. So far I have heard nothing from this order.

In the meantime the office in Chicago wrote and told me that I was in the Minneapolis district and should contact them. The other day I received a list from them which is simply a numbering system whereby I express a preference for certain types of materials and then theoretically receive lists of available equipment. The numbers which would include scientific equipment seem to have been left off this list.

As to my Omaha experience, I went down to the salvage depot just after they had finished a sale of practically all of the equipment accumulated in the warehouse. Max James, who is clerk at the warehouse, spent Sunday afternoon with me and I picked out a bunch of salvage and small lots of things that we might use here at the school. This type of equipment, according to their procedure, need not receive a release from other branches of the service, but can be O. K.'d for distribution by the Seventh Service Command Headquarters personnel. I took this list up to the headquarters and met the officers who would O. K. the list and went over the list with them. Then I returned to the college, made out the proper requisition, and forwarded it to Omaha. As near as I could make out when I was down there, they should have completed putting their O. K. on the list the next day, but, so far, I have heard absolutely nothing from that requisition.

With regard to airplanes and aeronautical equipment, I sent in a requisition to the proper person in the Chicago office about 6 weeks ago. Yesterday I heard from him for the first time and he gave me 7 days in which

to buy a Flying Fortress for $350. The offer does not do me much good because I have to accept delivery of the plane ready for shipment at Altus, Okla. I don't believe the school would want to pay the freight charges on a 33,000-pound fortress to have it sent up here from Oklahoma.

As you can see the present situation for obtaining surplus equipment is not designed to take care of an institution such as ours located at a considerable distance from the warehouses. They want the buyers to come into the warehouse and haul the stuff away. On one or two pieces of equipment such as a testing machine, which on the list was not described so we could tell its capacity or maker, we tried to get information on it so that we would know whether it would fill our needs or not, but we didn't seem to be able to get a description or find out the condition of the machine and we gave up the prospect of buying that. I know that the Minnesota, Iowa, and Nebraska institutions similar to ours have received large quantities of equipment for use in their laboratories, but they were able to get on the spot where the plants were being closed down and grabbed the equipment before it was turned over to the RFC or the new War Assets Corporation. I believe we are going to end up with the same old laboratory we have had for many years.

Thank you for the interest that you have shown in our problems and we do appreciate the help which you have extended to us. With kindest personal regards, I am,

Very truly yours,

L. L. A.

Economic Survey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 20, 1946

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include a very splendid resolution adopted recently by the Allen County Republican Club of Fort Wayne, Ind. The resolution proposes the establishment of a special Senate committee charged with conducting a realistic survey of our short- and long-range domestic economy. It is presented here for the consideration of my colleagues in both branches of the Congress:

Whereas it is known that wars frequently grow out of the efforts of nations or government cartels to grab land, raw materials, markets, and other wealth; and

Whereas the United States is nearly self-sufficient economically, making it unnecessary for this country to engage in belligerent grabs for raw materials or markets: Therefore be it

Resolved, That a committee of the Senate be appointed for the purpose of outlining a comprehensive and realistic survey of our short- and long-range domestic economy.

First. To determine:

1. The raw materials we lack.

2. The type, character, and volume of our profitable markets both in free and hazardous areas.

3. The measure of their importance in our domestic needs of production and employment.

4. A schedule of necessary acquisitions.

5. A sound program for building up stock piles from areas in which wars might be anticipated.

6. The percentage of deficit in our domestic economy in money and employment, if any, after acquiring the stock piles.

7. Methods of making use of and developing our own synthetic and substitute materials that are equal or superior to raw materials secured from hazardous markets necessitating reciprocal war-breeding arrangements.

Second. To determine:

1. The effect of material and power politics on our military security.

2. The measure and extent of military preparedness—including the need, if any, for peacetime conscription—required by methods of reaching out for materials and markets either directly or indirectly in cartel participation.

3. The contrast in our standard of living under the above system compared with a standard effected out of our internal supply that is available without creating hazards from entangling involvements in sanctions, cartels, monopolies, and the various phases of commercial wars that promote armed conflicts.

Third. To determine:

1. Our internal debt commitments for ordinary fiscal needs including those for the Navy and Army, housing, veteran relief, flood control, road and public building, also including in such Federal accounting all short- and long-term commitments of the municipal and State governments.

2. Our direct and indirect foreign debt commitments by Government or governmental corporations.

3. A consolidated national balance sheet of domestic and foreign commitments and their effect through taxation on the lowering of our standard of living, through decreased savings for reinvestment in productive enterprise, and the curtailment of individual spending for goods and services.

Fourth. To determine:

1. The effect of free trade, reciprocal trade treaties, foreign relief and the like on our standard of living.

2. The projected or anticipated cost of acquiring foreign markets and materials by passive power politics or actual war, reflecting the annual dollar profit value of such acquisitions or sales, after providing a proper reserve for military contingencies.

3. The balance sheet of an adjusted standard of living based upon a "live and let live" policy—and whether this would not be more beneficial from every angle than a policy of opportunitistic economic power politics, based on the open or concealed objectives of world reform and world power.

Fifth. To recommend:

1. To what extent the proposed program would permit us to enter into a world government to which we have been committed and the opening phases of which have met with disagreement among the leading powers.

Let Us Be Honest in Meeting the Need for Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 20, 1946

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, when we are ill, we usually turn to our doctor. When the Nation needs food, we look to the farmers to produce it. When we are faced with a scientific problem, we turn to the men who are trained in science. As the Congress takes up the housing problem, and ways and means of meeting a great need for lumber and other building materials, would it not be wise to turn to the lumbermen, and see what they have to say about the subject? Too often when we turn to the bureaucrats we get confusion.

I wish to extend my remarks by including a letter addressed to the Nebraska delegation in Congress from Mr. Austin Braun, of Omaha, Nebr., who is an experienced lumber distributor. Mr. Braun is very active in public matters and he has often appeared as a valuable witness before some of our committees.

The letter is as follows:

OMAHA, *February 14, 1946.*

To Nebraska Delegation:

When I was in Washington working on the lumber mark-up for wholesalers, I learned about the 1st of February that Judge Collet had issued an order raising the price of yellow pine lumber $3.25 per thousand feet provided the mills reached certain production goals which were clearly impossible because the month of January was already past and production in the South had been very bad. This advance did not apply immediately; it was to apply on future production if they made the current production increase on which they were not getting an advance. In other words, after the patient was well they would give him the medicine.

A real lumber expert, Mr. Robert Darrah, of the Southern Wholesale Association in Birmingham, Ala., convinced Judge Collet that this was hardly the thing to do, and the good judge finally withdrew his order, and I understand has issued a new one in which he advances yellow pine $3.25 per thousand feet and is willing to continue the advance beyond August 1 if certain production goals are met.

This is not so bad, but on top of this comes a report from Wilson W. Wyatt, the Housing Expediter, to President Truman under date of February 8. In the first place, he announces a goal of 1,200,000 homes, which is impossible, and he wants a lot of prefabricated and temporary prefabricated houses, which is a waste of material. With characteristic starry-eyed approach and with complete disregard for the facts of life, the gentleman estimates that $200,000,000 will be required to encourage increased production, and he is going to do this with premium payments.

I do not know how he arrives at it, but in the last paragraph of his report he says, "In addition, authority from Congress will be required immediately to provide $600,000,000 for premium payments." That is million dollars, boys—not $600 for premium payments. Let me tell you something about premium payments that existed during the war.

The Office of Price Administration, at the urgent hammering of the War Production Board, agreed to advance boards about an average of $4.50 per thousand feet when manufactured from fir or hemlock, but they put definite expiration dates upon this advance or incentive price, and they furthermore provided that when the Army needs on boards was satisfied, the price would be withdrawn. Consequently, instead of jumping in and making all the boards they could at the $5 advance so that the farmers who have never had enough lumber to repair their plants since the war began could obtain some needed materials, the mills worked with each other to restrict the production of boards to just enough to take care of the Army so that they would not kill the goose that laid the golden egg.

I have worked in this lumber business all of my life, and I know every angle of it, and

I can tell you with absolute certainty that if you start paying subsidies, premiums, bonuses or any disguised form of giving money to somebody who does not earn it, you are going to retard production. People who are not handling that type of order or who cannot handle them simply will not run to increased production.

The only thing to do is to make Mr. Wyatt and his crew realize that if they put a realistic incentive price ceiling on all lumber and remove all conditions, they will have production, and they will soon have so damn much production that the price will come down, and it will not take 2 or 3 years to do it. There are a great many sawmills who would like to see a subsidy plan because of these reasons.

It relieves them of acknowledging that they are getting a better price for their stuff, and they have a mistaken idea that their labor will be easier to handle. Those with the political inside expect to get something the other fellow cannot get. They hope he goes broke, and it restricts production because everybody is going to under-produce to keep the subsidy in effect, and for that reason the gravy lasts longer

It is a costly bungling proposition that will surely retard production and cost the taxpayers a horrible amount of money. The price ceilings are too low to encourage production on the present demand for house building lumber with labor costs what they are, and these costs are never going to come down until you get volume production, and you will not get volume production until you have adequate price ceilings. Don't let the boys with the subsidy plan in the door. It is just awful, and it will do nothing but string our Government control.

A good many short-sighted retailers in the big group who have been controlling things in the OPA are for this because they would not have to absorb the subsidy. Your dealers here at home know that if they had the opportunity of providing a job of 100 or 200 houses they would be tickled to death to dicker for a proper price on the lumber when delivered from the car to the job. They have always done that way, but the gang who is engineering this subsidy have no such ideas in mind. They seek to maintain the cost by hiding it by making the taxpayer pay part of it, and in cases of Government construction, all of it.

Yours truly,

ERAUN, RAY EROS. & FINLEY CO.,
AUSTIN ERAUN, *President*.

Shortages of Building Materials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 20, 1946

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with permission heretofore granted, I am including as part of these remarks, an advertisement by the C. W. Chapman Lumber Co., of Waterloo, Iowa.

This company, with many years of experience in the lumber business, now finds itself stymied by bureaucratic regulations and orders from Washington. In calling this situation to the attention of the public, the company is doing a very real service.

One of the amazing things of our times is the development of Government propaganda. Millions of dollars are being spent every year in an attempt to justify expensive bureaus long after their usefulness has ended. It is regrettable that the full story of their wastefulness and bungling cannot be gotten to the American people. The Chapman Lumber Co. is to be congratulated on its attempt to offset the propaganda put out by these Government agencies.

The advertisement is as follows:

To Our Customers:

This is our fourth letter to you about the causes of shortage in building material.

While Rome burned, Nero fiddled. While the bureaucrats in Washington fiddle, the housing shortage grows worse. Listen to this from the Des Moines Register of January 30:

"DEBATE OVER PRICES SLOWS HOUSING PLAN—SUBSIDIES SUGGESTED TO CURB COSTS

"WASHINGTON, D. C.—The Government's program to meet the Nation's housing crisis is being delayed by a heated argument among President Truman's top economic advisers over whether subsidies or price increases shall be used to step up production of scarce materials."

Mr. Wilson Wyatt, the President's housing expediter (that means a bureaucratic hurry-upper), then goes on to explain he has to have more time to make up his mind. But, in the meanwhile, the bureaucrats want Congress to enact a bill that will assure Federal bureaucratic control beyond next June 30.

Right here we want to go on record with these bureaucrats regarding subsidies from the Federal Government for our business. We are opposed to any free gifts or bribes from Washington for our company at the expense of you taxpayers. Subsidies are a cowardly method used by cheap bureaucrats to cover up their bungling. You people are supposed to be fooled by the apparent low prices—but you pay, and you pay plenty, in taxes. If the bureaucrats haven't the nerve to raise the taxes enough to pay for these subsidies or free gifts or bribes, they add the bill to the Federal debt. This is still more cowardly, because they are loading an unbearable debt on your boy who is just back from the Army or Navy and is trying to get started in business or in farming.

As for price increases, this company will do its utmost to keep building prices down to the lowest possible figure, consistent with good material and good service. Under free enterprise, we are forced to do that anyway. If we should attempt to gouge you customers, we would lose you overnight to one of our competitors. What we want is a free flow of building materials right now. We are prepared to take care of you if we are released from nutty regulations and red tape and allowed to go to work.

The methods used by the Federal bureaucrats to take over private business (including the building business) are old stuff. Hitler used the same tactics. They are, demoralize, then move in and take over. Very few people in Iowa are being fooled. We know what is going on, and we are going to keep right on fighting the bungling bureaucrats until Congress fires a few million of them and allows business, labor, and farming to go ahead without the restrictions, regulations, and red tape under which we are struggling.

Congress has the duty to declare at once an end to a state of war. This will repeal many wartime regulations which are hamstringing the country. Congress must also balance the Federal Budget right now.

Your Senators and Representatives in Washington want your help. Write them today. Tell them just what the bureaucrats are doing to your business or farm. They have grabbed a control over your personal life and your business that no local authority would ever dare attempt. Just think what you would do or say if your town mayor, or your county supervisors, or your State governor would ever attempt to mishandle your business or your farm as these Federal bureaucrats are doing. You would not stand for the monkey business for one minute. You elected your Senators and your Representatives to watch over your rights in Washington, and they will help you if you write to them.

Your Senators are: Hon. GEORGE A. WILSON, care of United States Senate, Washington, D. C.; Hon. B. B. HICKENLOOPER, care of United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Your Representative is: Hon. JOHN W. GWYNNE, care of House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

C. W. CHAPMAN LUMBER CO.,
By J. H. CHAPMAN.
WATERLOO, IOWA.

OPA Folly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 20, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it has often been said that Congress should not pass laws which the people do not want. When the Congress passed the Price Control Act, it did so for the purpose and in the hope that the administration thereof would prevent inflation. It was the further hope as expressed in this legislation that rules and regulations would be reasonable and not coercive and contrary to established business practices. It was never designed to control profits or to promulgate capricious rules and regulations subject to the whim of inexperienced bureaucrats.

Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago the Office of Price Administration was involved with a great many Members of Congress on the subject of regulations involving the pricing of new and used automobiles. A very timely editorial has been brought to my attention by one of the outstanding automobile dealers in my State, Mr. C. H. Pyle, of Racine, Wis. He has sent me an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Daily Tribune for Friday, February 8, 1946. This editorial tells the story of what can happen in the automobile business. In fact it is happening today. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein the editorial entitled "Inside Story of the Sale of an Automobile." I am sure that this editorial will be of great interest to Members of the House:

INSIDE STORY OF THE SALE OF AN AUTOMOBILE

A man we know had a 1941 automobile, which had served him faithfully. Oh, the clutch might need replacing, and the motor was noisier than in its pre-Pearl Harbor youth, but it could get over the roads as well as the next one. So what did our friend have to worry about? Plenty! His tires were a mess, and he had need to drive over country roads occasionally at night.

Nobody could tell him where to get some new tires. The ration board couldn't help. His gasoline supplier, who had been very considerate in time of war, couldn't even make a suggestion. The alderman wouldn't see him, and there was no use going to see his ward committeeman, for he was a Republican.

There was only one way out, and that was to get a new car. One fine day in November

the dealer from whom he had bought cars for years asked him to come and see the new models. Yes, he had one car for immediate delivery to such an old customer, and, of course, at $900, the OPA ceiling. The old car would be taken in trade. The ceiling price on the old car was $950; that is to say, the 1941 car with the worn out tires was worth $50 more than the Government said the new car could be sold for.

The two traders who had done business for years had no difficulty in making a deal, and our friend now has no fears of a puncture while driving over a country road late at night. The dealer did not give his customer a new car and $50 to boot. The allowance for the old car was $450, about what the 1941 car will be worth when new automobiles become plentiful. The dealer probably sold the old car for $950, so that the amount he realized on the 1946 car was not $900, but a good deal more than that.

If OPA is going to prevent supply and demand from determining the selling price of new automobiles and old ones Mr. Bowles will have to have one of his hired men in every auto showroom, or he will have to see that persons desperately in need of tires can get them. Meanwhile, the amount paid to his men will be added to the stream of inflationary money which is driving the price of everything upward.

Hawaii as a State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 20, 1946

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Contra Costa County Gazette, Martinez, Calif., of January 30, 1946:

HAWAII AS A STATE

Few persons will quarrel with the recommendation of a House Territories Subcommittee last week that Hawaii be admitted to the Union as the forty-ninth State.

Hawaii has a population larger than any other State at the time of its admission to the Union except Oklahoma. The heterogeneous peoples of the territory live and work together amicably and democratically. The mixed racial complexion of the islands should not be an obstacle to statehood.

In the past the great landholdings concentrated among a few families has been used as an argument that Hawaii is more of a dependency rather than an integrated economic unit, but recently even cynical Harold, Secretary Ickes, has been satisfied on that point.

According to the subcommittee's report last week, labor has made great strides in Hawaii since 1937 and has contributed greatly to the territory's progress. It said there is growing mutual respect and confidence between management and labor in industrial relations. Tribute was paid to the Hawaiian school system which has produced a "literate population capable of discharging the duties of citizenship."

The report of the subcommittee now will be considered by the full territories committee before further action is taken on legislation admitting Hawaii as a State.

However, the time is not far distant when another white star will be pinned on the field of blue.

Hysteria Rules the House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1946

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted on Monday, February 18, 1946, I wish to insert the following editorial from the Capital Times, Madison, Wis., of February 13, 1946:

HYSTERIA RULES THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The Case antilabor bill, which has been passed by the House of Representatives and is now before the Senate, will probably go down in history as a shining example of hysterical lawmaking and of men in high places behaving like a riotous, revenge-minded mob.

The bill is viciously antilabor in its nature. So bad that even the labor hater Representative CLARE HOFFMAN, Michigan Republican, could not find the stomach to vote for it. Although HOFFMAN called the bill unjust and unreasonable he was perhaps more concerned with the soundness of the bill than with the fact that it sets labor back to the old days of rule by injunction.

Being the kind of an intense labor hater he is, HOFFMAN no doubt felt that legislation aimed at stripping labor of its rights should at least be sound and well-considered. And on this ground he has a legitimate complaint. For regardless of the merits of the bill, regardless of whether one thinks labor should be suppressed or not, there is every reason why the bill should not have been acted on.

For the manner in which the House acted is a terrifying example of what can occur in a democracy when a majority refuses to listen to reason. The bill was called up suddenly and placed in order as a substitute to the mild measure based on the President's recommendation for fact-finding legislation.

It had been hastily thrown together. It was never given one moment of hearing before any committee of the House. There was absolutely no attempt to arrive at any sensible or reasonable approach to the industrial strife which besets the Nation.

The bill was hailed with a whoop and a holler. In 4 days of the worst pandemonium in recent years it was twisted and jerked from one side to another by a series of amendments. Parliamentary snarls were so numerous that the Speaker of the House hardly knew what he was doing.

Out of this riot came the Case bill. No one is certain what it does yet, outside of gut the Norris-LaGuardia Act, which protects unions from the arbitrary injunction power of the Federal courts. One thing is certain. The more level-headed Republicans and Democrats agree that it will mean chaos in labor relations. Representative JOSEPH C. BALDWIN, New York Republican, warned the House that the legislation would "boomerang like the Smith-Connally Act," which was passed in the same white heat of unreasoning passion and which the authors themselves now concede was a mistake.

It is incredible that 258 Members of the House could have voted for such a measure. And we here in Wisconsin, the State once noted for the high caliber of its statesmen, should hang our heads in shame. Half of our representation voted for it. Here are the men who were stampeded:

Representative JOHN BYRNES, Republican, from the Eighth District; Representative ROBERT K. HENRY, Republican, from the Second District; Representative FRANK KEEFE, Republican, from the Sixth District; Representative LAWRENCE SMITH, Republican, from the First District; Representative WILLIAM H. STEVENSON, Republican, from the Third District.

Here are the men who voted against it:

Representative ANDREW BIEMILLER, Democrat, from the Fifth District; Representative THAD WASIELEWSKI, Democrat, from the Fourth District; Representative REED MURRAY, Republican, from the Seventh District; Representative ALVIN O'KONSKI, Republican, from the Tenth District; Representative MERLIN HULL, Progressive, from the Ninth District.

Amvets Fight for McLean Gardens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 20, 1946

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statements by J. H. Leib, national legislative director of the American Veterans of World War II:

AMVETS FIGHT FOR M'LEAN GARDENS

(By J. H. Leib, national legislative director, Amvets)

Every Member of Congress has read about the controversy Amvets—American Veterans of World War II—has had with a number of bureaucrats in the Defense Homes Corporation and the Surplus Property Administration.

Amvets welcomes the support of all Members of Congress, newspapers, and public spirited citizens in this great crusade.

We are most appreciative of the full page ads that are currently appearing in the Washington, D. C., newspapers under the signature of Mrs. Evalyn Walsh McLean concerning our attempt to purchase McLean Gardens for veterans of this war.

The officers of Amvets do not know Mrs. McLean personally, nor did anyone in our organization solicit or seek in any manner whatsoever to influence her aid in our housing project. Purely out of her gracious and humanitarian heart is she giving us her assistance and moral support.

It came to our attention indirectly today that last week while Mrs. McLean was making one of her numerous visits to the painfully depressing wards of Walter Reed Hospital, a veteran of this war passed away.

Grieved by this unfortunate incident, we understand that Mrs. McLean returned home and that night read in the newspapers that Amvets had gone to the Congress in an attempt to get a square deal from the Defense Homes Corporation in the sale of the huge Government housing project that bears her famous name.

We believe it may have been this event that prompted her action.

Absolutely unbeknown to Amvets, she inserted the series of full-page ads in all of the District of Columbia newspapers appealing directly to the Congress urging them to see to it that the interests of the veterans be protected in the sale of surplus Government housing.

We are more than grateful for her generous good will and enthusiastic support—and we

shall never forget her kindness. If there were more people like Mrs. McLean this world might be a better place to live in. She apparently is never too busy to go out of her way to help others—and we say, God bless her.

Newly Naturalized Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER B. HUBER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 20, 1946

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable Tom C. Clark, Attorney General of the United States, February 5, 1946:

Your Honor Judge Holtzoff, ladies, and gentlemen, this is a very solemn occasion. You know, there are no two of us here today who are alike. As many people say, it is very fortunate that my young daughter looks like her mother. Except, you might say, in the case of twins, no two physical appearances are alike. Similarly there are no likes or dislikes that are the same. There are likes and dislikes, aims and ambitions, that various people have; but none are exactly the same. But there is one thing we all agree on; one common aim, one common ambition upon which all Americans agree and see eye to eye. That is American citizenship. That is the common tie, the common bond, that holds the 48 States together.

As has been eloquently expressed, our flag is a symbol of the greatness of 140,000,000 people; it is a symbol of the greatness of the 48 States and the Territories that it represents. It is not just a flag of 13 stripes and 48 stars emblazoned on a field of blue. It represents a pulsating America—that pulsating America that you, after taking your oaths today, will join. It gives you a great protection; it gives you a great privilege. As Attorney General of the United States, I can tell you that there are thousands of people now waiting—waiting in Europe, waiting in the islands of the Pacific, waiting throughout the world—for just one thing, and that is the privilege that is yours this day.

Oh, it is a solemn day for you. It is a day that you should ever remember, because you have been preferred—preferred above the thousands of those who suffered almost unto death throughout Europe—yes, throughout the world. So this day brings to you certain obligations, obligations that you must take seriously.

During the last war and again during this war we heard often of hyphenated Americans. There is no such thing as a hyphenated American. You must wipe out the hyphen. You will be Americans, just as we who are standing before you at this moment are Americans. You must live the life of an American. You must join the American ideals. I know that you will.

You have devoted much study to the history of this great country. I hope that in the future you will find time to devote even more study to it, and that you will study the Government under which you have chosen to live.

Your Government is as good as the interest that you, the citizens, take in it. If you take no interest, your Government will not be the Government that it should be. So in civil life you owe to the Government under which you have elected to live, you owe to those who have fought to make that Government what it is today, your undivided interest, attention, and devotion.

I do not mean just the Federal Government. I mean the government of the State in which you live, or of the District of Columbia. Wherever you live, in your cities or in your towns, take an interest to see that the government is of the best. That is true citizenship.

His Honor, Justice Holtzoff spoke of reverence for law. Of recent years, I have noted, there has been an increased tendency among some people in this country toward disrespect for law, disrespect for government, disrespect for high office in the American system of government. That must not be. You must have, as his Honor has said, a reverence for government, a reverence for law, a reverence for those who are devoting their lives to enforcement of that law and to carrying out the ideals of that government.

I know that it is sometimes difficult to understand our ways. At times, perhaps, you may think that something is wrong. You have, of course, a right to express yourself. One of the freedoms that our flag stands for is freedom of speech. I hope that each of you will always speak out whenever you feel that the matter should be brought into the broad light of public opinion.

My friends, again I say that it is a privilege for me to be here today with you and to welcome each of you into the fellowship of American citizenry. The greatest badge in the world is the badge of American citizenship. As his Honor bestows it upon you, I know that you will wear it, and cherish it with all that is within you, that, if necessary, you will give to it your life, and that it shall not drop tarnished from your hands.

I thank you.

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 20, 1946

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution unanimously adopted by a group of citizens gathered in Cleveland under the auspices of the Lithuanian-American Council of Societies on February 17, 1946, for the commemoration of the twenty-eighth anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania:

Resolution on Lithuanian independence

Resolved, To appeal to the President and the Secretary of State to implement the wartime promises of the Atlantic Charter and other policy declarations with actual measures directed toward creating conditions for the restoration of the sovereignty and self-government of the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, by demanding—

(a) That the Soviet Union immediately withdraw its armed forces of occupation and its administrative apparatus from the Baltic states, thereby enabling the peoples of the Baltic states to form broadly representative interim governments;

(b) That after the withdrawal of the Soviet occupation forces direct relief be extended to the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by UNRRA;

(c) That thereafter the sovereign peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia be enabled to hold free and unfettered elections; and

(d) Finally, that, pursuant to chapter II, article 4 of the Charter of the United Nations, the Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia be admitted to the United Nations.

Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 20, 1946

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter by Dr. Norman Sweet which appeared in the Fort Wayne (Ind.) Journal-Gazette on February 10, 1946:

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

EDITOR OF THE JOURNAL-GAZETTE:

Without approval by Congress, the socialized medicine has been put into practice by the announcement in Tuesday morning's Journal-Gazette that—"List of physicians here approved for treatment of vets." In fact I have another name for it, i. e., "Political Medicine." Here is discrimination against man, worthy physicians for a selective few who are political favorites. Just 17 Fort Wayne physicians and 6 dental physicians. And the list has been passed to Mayor Baals and this is tantamount to saying these physicians and no others are capable of administering to the relief (no one can cure another except that one who is ill, himself. No exceptions, of vets or anyone else). What a catastrophe. And only the individual who is ill can know who can help him to help himself. For no doctor or physician or anyone ever cured anyone. It is the patients' faith in the doctor or physician and his treatments (called medicine) not the doctor or physician or his treatments that restore health. And faith is psychological. (It is the psychology that cures. No exceptions.) It is stated in this same paper that "a Pennsylvania woman has been sticking Christmas seals on her chest under the impression (psychology) that they would keep her from having tuberculosis. She hasn't had tuberculosis either." This woman had faith in the potency of Christmas seals and she kept well. Need I say more to intelligent people? I believe not.

Now, it behooves all the other (boycotted) physicians in this city (and all over the United States) to dynamically protest this communistic and undemocratic procedure at once. Now, I do not use medicine in my psychoanalytic treatment of my clients and I have many veterans who have been incompetently treated by neuro-psychiatrists, et al., and are now "doing nicely, thank you." But it appears that I will have to have some ignorant political "nit-wits" in Washington pass upon my scientific technique and give me a political "socialized medicine license" before any vet will feel safe to come to see me, professionally, if this dictatorial practice is allowed to continue, unchallenged. And we call this democracy. Angels of Mercy defend us.

NORMAN SWEET.

The Ideological Tides

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 20, 1946

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I submit to my colleagues for their consideration an editorial from the Huntington Herald-Dispatch, published in Huntington, W. Va., and edited by Mr. Raymond Brewster. This thought-provoking editorial deals with a timely subject which is foremost on our minds today.

Here we have a great people with enormous pent-up spending power awaiting merchandise which is badly needed but not forthcoming.

While the country is suffering economic stagnation, the administration is groping helplessly in the dark hoping to pull out of the hat some fantastic utopian plan which will give everyone something for nothing. We still have those who think that by some magic formula we can defeat economic law.

Today we have many years of unprecedented prosperity on our doorstep if we can only break the shackles of an inefficient and socialistic-minded administration and let labor and management do the job in the only way we know how—and that is through freedom of enterprise.

The editorial follows:

THE IDEOLOGICAL TIDES

It may not have occurred to Americans in general that the longer these labor wars last, the stronger may be the trend toward socialism. Social tides lately have run that way in conservative old England. And when the final flop came there, after a period of uncertainty, most of the Britishers seemed to welcome it with a sort of relief.

They did not regard themselves as necessarily "radicals" in our American sense. For the most part, they seemed only to want law and order and a chance to go back to work on almost any reasonable basis. But once across the line separating a "free economy" from the "controlled economy" of a Socialist state, it is hard to tell whether new-fledged Socialists will return to their old principles and shibboleths.

And what of America? Perhaps new ideological tides are running here. Yet, so far, our voters and public demonstrators seem to be concerned mainly with such matters as pay, and more labor organization for the sake of unity, rather than revolutionary principles or anything requiring much deep thought.

One of the most unfortunate facts of the present economic situation in this country, as experts explain it, is the apparent tendency of workers to "work below their ability." This trend apparently comes not from laziness or intent to cheat, but from a notion that there is only about so much work to do in this country, and if the workers speed up they will soon find themselves without jobs.

If such an attitude ever was reasonable, it certainly doesn't look so now, to a clear-headed and open-minded citizen. There is so much work to do in this country, as a result of delayed progress during the war and also as a result of new plans, devices, and enterprises, that most experts say the trend will run the other way, and there won't be enough workers when our expanding economic system really gets on the job.

Rights of Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 20, 1946

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following open letter by Evalyn Walsh McLean, published in the Washington Times-Herald of today:

FEBRUARY 19, 1946.

Fellow citizens of Washington, why is it that our war veterans who, collectively, won the greatest victory of modern warfare are now forced to battle alone and unaided to secure the rights for which they fought in foxholes and on bullet-swept beaches all over the world?

Why are war veterans and their wives and children forced to live under almost unbearable conditions when the Government has more than 500,000 publicly owned homes now declared surplus for sale to the public?

Why are the American Veterans of World War II (Amvets), a splendid organization of young veterans, denied the right to purchase McLean Gardens here in Washington at 89 cents on a dollar by the Defense Homes Corporation when that same Government bureaucracy has approved a bid by a CIO nonveterans' group of 80 cents on a dollar for a public housing project in Dayton, Ohio.

Why are veterans subjected to constant run-arounds in getting their old jobs back or in finding new jobs to the extent that 1,035,995 of them are now on GI unemployment rolls to the tune of $25,000,000 a week?

Why are the men who manned the guns, drove the trucks and jeeps, and piloted the airplanes that brought victory now denied their just rights to purchase surplus war goods, which are being gobbled up by wily speculators with well-filled purses and sold back to veterans at handsome profits?

Why are these same brave lads who a year ago were cheerfully given priorities on anything and everything they required if only they would win the war for us now denied priorities on practically anything?

Why do we, the people of the capital of the world, sit supinely back and watch the saviors of democracy be shoved around and shackled in endless red tape and delays by selfish Government officials and private real-estate interests?

Why don't we back them up in their fight by force of public opinion?

Why, I ask you all?

Sincerely,

EVALYN WALSH MCLEAN.

P. S.—I have absolutely no financial interest whatever in McLean Gardens or any other housing project under consideration.

Henry Morgenthau Discusses Foreign Policy With a Special Emphasis on the Argentine Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 12, 1946

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, recently the Honorable Henry Morgenthau made a notable address before the National Citizens Political Action Committee at Milwaukee. In it he forthrightly discusses certain foreign developments. He points out the heavy responsibility of the United States with respect to the growing Fascist menace. He implores our State Department to take a strong stand against Fascist Franco Spain and the current government of Argentina. Here is the speech:

Military victory has been achieved, but the main purpose for which we fought the war—the final elimination of Nazi and Fascist aggression—has not yet been accomplished. In Spain and Argentina fascism is today gaining—not losing—in power. These countries are places of refuge for Nazis, for their wealth, and for their political principles of repression and aggression. So long as nazism remains dominant anywhere, our job isn't finished.

Mr. President and Mr. Byrnes, why don't you do something about it? In the case of Spain, France has taken the initiative of proposing a conference to work out a common policy. In the case of Argentina, Uruguay has taken a similar initiative. In both cases, it is neighboring countries who have most keenly felt the danger to peace and security and the necessity of action. Due to the failure of the United States to assert real moral leadership, Franco and Peron are both gaining in power. We must not allow any mood of let-down, any desire to rush back to business as usual, to control either our foreign or domestic policy. I fear that is precisely what is happening today.

Many people hopefully expected that our military victory would sweep away Fascist regimes everywhere. Why hasn't this taken place? I believe that the explanation is plain. It is to be found in the weak and vacillating policy of the democratic countries. The democracies are torn between the principles for which they fought and an eager impatience to forget all about the war and get back to profitable peacetime trade—business as usual. As a result, the Fascist rulers in Spain and Argentina have come to believe that if they sit tight and don't take too seriously the occasional words of criticism delivered against them, they will be able to pull through stronger than ever.

The United States bears a heavy share of the responsibility for this survival of the Fascist menace. We have emerged from the war stronger and wealthier than ever before. Our cities and our industries are undamaged. But we have not provided a moral leadership that measures up to our strength. Unless we discharge this responsibility we cannot hope to achieve the full purpose for which American lives were spent. Our policy toward Spain and Argentina is a test of our real integrity of purpose.

In the case of Spain, let me read to you extracts from a statement made by the Mexican delegate at the United Nations Conference in San Francisco last June:

"In 1938, at an official ceremony organized to decorate members of the Italian legions who fought in Spain, Franco exclaimed: 'Legionnaires from Italy, soldiers of Imperial Italy, crusaders of the faith and of Occidental civilization, I salute you with the love of a commander and the confidence of a leader, love and confidence born through our comradeship in war. I witnessed your deeds. I felt the warmth of your blood spilled upon the earth of Spain. I am aware of the fact that you abandoned your homes to follow the banners of your Roman legions.' We could mention countless statements in which Franco acknowledges with similar cynical expressions of gratitude the intervention of the Italian legions in his fight against democracy.

"Let me only add that he stated with equal warmth his gratitude to Hitler for the mili-

tary help given by him to Spanish fascism. 'I assure you,' said Franco to Germany in 1937, 'that my gratitude will be deep and enduring.' * * * The German Ambassador at Madrid confirmed this collaboration when he decorated Franco in September 1941 and said, 'The Fuehrer, supreme chief of the victorious German armies, in bestowing this cross upon the generalissimo, the invincible Spanish Caudillo, wishes to testify how intimately are bound together not only our two peoples but especially our two armies whose commanders, officers, and soldiers fought side by side during the first 3 years of this heroic crusade.'

"And still later, in December 1942, at the very moment when the decisive battle of Stalingrad was raging, Franco sent a telegram to Hitler assuring him that he was praying for his triumph. Two days afterwards, he promised Hitler: 'We maintain our traditional policy, our loyalty to the peoples who share our burdens. If some day Berlin is in danger, Spain will send a million men, if necessary, to defend it.'

"Finally, allow me to recall that in a telegram sent to Hitler, Franco said: 'With all my heart, I share your aspirations that the great German Empire may reach its immortal destiny under the glorious sign of the swastika, and under your inspired leadership. Heil Hitler!' "

These facts speak for themselves. Few Americans will be so gullible as to believe the drivel which Franco a few days ago gave to an Associated Press correspondent, when he said that he did not support Nazi and Fascist policies, and that he wanted to progress toward democracy in Spain.

At San Francisco, Assistant Secretary of State James Dunn said: "The United States delegation is in complete accord with the statement of interpretation made by the delegation of Mexico and desires to associate itself with that declaration." The result was that a resolution was passed in San Francisco excluding Franco Spain from membership in the United Nations Organization.

The world was encouraged. This was fine. But what happened next? Unfortunately, little or nothing. After the San Francisco Conference foreign observers almost unanimously reported that the Franco regime was on the ropes, that it would soon be displaced by a new government. Germany was defeated and still nothing happened. At Potsdam the three governments, instead of moving forward, merely reaffirmed the decision already taken at San Francisco. This was an anticlimax, and Franco began to regain confidence. Events since Potsdam have served further to restore his confidence. At the end of the war, our restrictions on trade with Spain were relaxed. Our program to wipe out Axis firms and properties in Spain has not been vigorously pressed; our blacklist has been reduced; our trade with Spain is increasing. We have sold five transport planes to Spain, and we may sell more, under an agreement by which we secure commercial landing privileges for American aircraft. While five airplanes may not seem very much, I don't think we should sell souls to gain a small commercial advantage.

The impression which the Franco regime gains from all this is that, despite a few official statements, our ardor in opposing fascism is just bluff. Recently a prominent Falangist, returning to Spain from a visit to the United States, is said to have given his leader a highly reassuring report regarding present American attitudes toward doing business with Franco Spain. I regret that the President, in an exceptionally long and detailed message on the state of the Union, failed even to mention the growing menace of fascism in Spain and Argentina.

Meanwhile the British Government has made it clear that, while disapproving of the Franco regime, it does not intend to take any action. Answering a suggestion in the House of Commons that Britain break relations with Spain, Foreign Secretary Bevin said: "I am not going to be involved in diversionary tactics of any kind."

The only encouraging event in recent months was the proposal of the French Government last December to Great Britain and ourselves for a 3-power conference on relations with the Franco regime. I am sorry to say that, so far as I know, this proposal has led to nothing. It was rejected by the British. In explaining the British position, Mr. Bevin declared, "When there are so many troubles in the world, I, as Foreign Minister, want to see some of them settled and not create new ones." I wonder what troubles are so serious as to necessitate this pigeonholing of the Spanish problem. In my view, the elimination of fascism is our most important item of unfinished business in the field of foreign policy. It is much more important to the establishment of real peace than many other matters with which foreign offices busy themselves.

I don't believe, however, that Britain deserves all the blame. I have no doubt that vigorous American support of the French proposal would bring the British Government into line. If the democratic countries would speak clearly and with one voice, Franco's days would be numbered. Once the Spanish people become convinced that there is no future for them under Franco, his overthrow will be assured. Despite Franco's rule of terror, his survival is due more to external apathy than to internal strength.

Are we going to permit Spain, which has naturalized thousands of Germans, which has hundreds of millions of dollars of hidden German assets, and airplane and armament factories, to be a jumping-off place for another war in Europe? What are we waiting for? Why did we ever concur with the Mexican delegation at San Francisco, and why did we reaffirm this position at Potsdam? Why hasn't the conference proposed by the French taken place? Which is more important, that we land our airplanes in Spain or that this man Franco be removed? I recommend to the President of the United States and the Secretary of State that they vigorously support the French proposal of a three-power conference and a concerted program which will help the Spanish people get rid of Franco.

So much for Spain.

Now let's take a look at our own record on the Argentine. It is a record of appalling vacillation. Early in 1944, when it had become evident that the new Argentine military dictatorship was pursuing a Fascist course, we withdrew diplomatic representation. But we did not follow through by applying economic sanctions. I have always regretted that such action was not taken in time. Great Britain needed Argentine beef and we were not courageous enough to cut our own beef ration by the 10 percent which would have made good Britain's loss of Argentine supplies. Moreover, our General Staff was fearful that economic sanctions might mean war with Argentina and a diversion of our military strength. All we did was to freeze the balances maintained in the United States by two Argentine official banks, and this step by itself wasn't of much consequence. Had we combined economic with diplomatic measures, the whole course of political developments in Argentina might well have been greatly different. But the diplomatic gesture alone was not enough.

We rapidly tired of our halfway policy of nonrecognition, and a year ago, at the Mexico City Conference, we carried out a spectacular about face. On the initiative of the United States delegation, the Conference passed a resolution which paved the way for speedy resumption of diplomatic relations, for Argentina's admission to United Nations Organization and for her participation in inter-American mutual defense arrangements. All we asked in return was that Argentina go through a few gestures, such as making a formal declaration of war on the Axis, signing the United Nations Declaration, and issuing a few decrees relating to Axis nationals and firms in Argentina. For Argentina this meant merely going through the motions. Of the 94 known Axis agents in Argentina, a recent report indicates that only 11 have been ordered expelled; 12 known agents are at liberty. To be sure, Argentina has appointed public officials to sit in with the management of a large number of Axis concerns, but none of these firms has been eliminated or their ownership transferred to non-Axis hands. Even the gesture of having Government officials share in management has been omitted in the case of the largest and most influential German concerns controlled by Peron's Nazi friends. Instead, these firms get the biggest Argentine military contracts.

This is the fashion in which Argentina carried out the whitewashing job as prescribed at the Mexico City Conference. A short while later, at San Francisco, we railroaded our allies into accepting Argentina as a member of the United Nations Organization. It required a good deal of double talk to do it.

The whitewash, however, was pretty thin, and it soon began to rub off. Mr. Braden, who was sent to Buenos Aires as our ambassador when diplomatic relations were resumed, realized how thin it was. His subsequent appointment as Assistant Secretary of State marked a new and firmer phase in our relations with Argentina.

I applaud Mr. Braden's vigorous attitude. It implies no criticism of his efforts when I say that our Argentine policy is hamstrung by the fault of "too little and too late." Mr. Braden's authority as spokesman for the United States on Argentina has been impaired by our past vacillations, by the Senate's hesitation and delay in confirming his appointment, and by the silence of the President and the Secretary of State on the Argentine problem.

Moreover, economic measures against Argentina are more difficult to apply today than they would have been in 1944. But that doesn't mean that nothing can be done. We aren't selling arms to the Argentine Fascists, but we are selling everything but arms—steel, machinery, chemicals, even transport planes. We're providing Argentina with part of the industrial plant and material on which her swollen armament program depends. We can and should clamp down on these exports, whether or not we can obtain parallel British action. Britain at this time can't satisfy Argentina's requirements alone, and our action would therefore have some effect. Nor do we need to fear that Argentina will suddenly stop exporting food. If she did, we would have to reimpose rationing at home to meet European relief needs, but is this too big a price? We have spent American lives to destroy fascism; we should be prepared, if necessary, to forego a little steak and roast beef. It is only a question of whether our commercial interests should be allowed to overshadow our basic political faith and responsibilities.

There is only one bright spot on the horizon today. Uruguay, a small country bordering on Argentina, has had the courage recently to propose to the other American Republics consultation with a view to concerted action to check this Fascist menace in Argentina.

While we have vacillated, fascism has been steadily consolidating its power within Argentina. Colonel Peron, who learned his fascism as military attaché in Italy, is almost sure to win the coming presidential election. His supporters are organized, the opposition disorganized. His present control of the army and the federal police, and his organized bands of thugs, insure him against any surprises from the ballot boxes. He has taken the Hitlerian step of suppressing free trade-unions and has made a bid for mass support by decreeing wage increases and promising land reforms. The organized,

politically educated workers have recognized these tricks for what they are, but it cannot be denied that Peron has gained a following from the most impoverished rural groups and some of the hitherto less informed, unorganized urban workers. His victory at the polls will intensify the present Fascist trend.

The Association of Democratic Lawyers in Argentina, in a statement entitled "The Nazism of the Impossible Candidate," recently pointed out in detail the close parallel between events in Germany during Hitler's rise to power and recent events in Argentina. Here are some quotes from this statement:

"It is easy to prove that there exists complete parity between Adolf Hitler and the impossible candidate: identity in methods, identity in aims, and identity in the most spontaneous reactions. * * *

"Hitler heads the Workers' Party; the impossible candidate founded the 'Labor Party.'

"Both claim that they are struggling in behalf of the less-favored classes. Hitler says: 'I am struggling for the children of the peasant and workers.' The impossible candidate says: 'We are engaged in the attainment of a higher social aim, encouraged by hundreds of thousands of Argentine workers.' "

The statement goes on to cite many other lessons which Peron learned from Hitler.

If there is anyone who still believes that the presence of fascism is a purely internal matter for the countries concerned, I should like to point out that the Nazis did not so regard it. In Spain and Argentina they have established the basis for an eventual comeback and for a third World War. In both countries about 50 percent of the national budget is devoted to military outlays. In Argentina the large armament program has included the construction of military highways near the Brazilian and Chilean borders. Argentina has her fifth columns in neighboring countries of South America, and in at least one country she succeeded in engineering a military coup d'etat. This is not the sort of thing we can ignore.

Mr. President and Mr. Byrnes, it seems to me that two paths are open to us. One is the path of moral leadership; this path leads to peace and prosperity for all peoples. The other is the path of commercial advantage—business as usual; this path leads to struggle for markets, imperialism, and war. We are a strong and great Nation. Our choice will be of decisive influence. On it will depend the welfare of our children and grandchildren. I submit that, on the basis of our actions to date, it looks as if we are following the second path—the road to imperialism and war. But it is not too late to retrace our steps and get back on the road of moral leadership, peace, and justice. I fervently urge that we do so immediately.

Cut Out the Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 20, 1946

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the Suburban List, Essex Junction, Vt., of February 14, 1946:

CUT OUT THE SUBSIDIES

For many years private business in one form or another has been receiving subsidies from the Federal Government. The principle is all wrong, unsound, and if continued, is going to lead to trouble. As a war measure such subsidies may have been justified. But the war is now over and the country must now get back to good sound business sense.

No less a paper than the New York Times has this to say on this important matter:

"Mr. Truman has asked for a continuation of food subsidies after June 30, 1946. He proposes that this extension should be tied down specifically to certain standards. The standard suggested is that subsidies be removed as soon as it is indicated that the cost of living will decline below the present levels. However, in other sections of his recent message the President emphasized that the inflationary pressures on prices and rents with relatively few exceptions are now at an all-time peak.

"Under these conditions it would seem that no reduction in subsidy payments is to be expected on the basis of the standard suggested for their removal. On the contrary, as events in recent weeks have demonstrated, the continuation of a hold-the-line policy in the face of inflationary pressures which are at an all-time peak will necessitate the adoption of new subsidies. Sugar and coffee subsidies are recent cases in point.

"It is estimated that if all food subsidies were removed, the cost of food would rise 8 percent and the cost of living would rise 3 percent. The President states that 'if prices of food were allowed to increase by these amounts * * * it would become extremely difficult for us to control the forces of inflation.' Does not this statement confuse the causes and effects of inflation? The payment of subsidies is clearly more inflationary than a 3 percent rise in living costs would be, because subsidy payments add to the inflationary pressures by increasing the magniture of the Government deficit."

The fallacy of the subsidy payments is that the people who receive them think they are getting something for nothing. That is what is thought of all payments from the Government. But the Government is the people and those subsidy payments all have to be met in tax payments, either direct or indirect.

The top-notch subsidy payments here in Vermont are for milk. The farmers may think they are getting the benefit. No such thing! Such milk subsidies go to the consumer, although the money is paid to the milk producers.

It must be clear that these milk subsidy payments cannot go on forever. There is a strong probability they will be stopped next July. The argument that if milk is increased to the consumer 2 cents a quart that there will be greatly decreased consumption does not stand to reason.

If increased consumption of whole milk is to be thought of in Boston then let the differential between house delivery and store price be fixed at 2 cents a quart instead of 1 cent as at present. Anyone with common sense knows that the difference in cost for such deliveries is more than 1 cent a quart.

Instead of fighting for a continuance of the subsidy the milk farmers and their organizations should plan to operate their business on their own and demand a price in relation to cost of production. The milk business has got to stand on its own feet sooner or later and the quicker the milk leaders meet that situation the better.

School-Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 20, 1946

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am committed to support some kind of a school-lunch program.

As a member of the subcommittee on appropriations for agriculture, I have repeatedly supported the proposition to obtain a rule in order that the school-lunch program and funds therefor might be included in the agricultural appropriation bill. The House has consistently supported the rule and passed the bill containing the appropriation.

We unofficially served notice on the Committee on Agriculture that we felt that it should initiate legislation to relieve our committee of having to obtain a rule.

Now that has been accomplished, and H. R. 3370 is before us for consideration and for our determination as to whether or not the program for food lunches shall be legislatively authorized.

I do not like certain features and provisions of this bill. Amendments will be offered which should be adopted, but after all is said and done we should not spend billions to feed people and children in devastated areas while we let our own children starve. Charity begins at home—and that could be used as a slogan for a reason for not voting for some other measures now before this Congress.

I have suggested certain amendments which I think ought to be made and they will be offered at the proper time. The bill in all probability will not suit everybody in its entirety as finally it comes to the question of its passage.

When every effort has been made to perfect the bill by amendment, I shall vote for it, hoping that before it becomes a law such necessary changes as are not made in the House may be made in the Senate or in conference. Certainly title II should be amended and I am sure that eventually it will be so rewritten as to meet the objections of those who have protested so vigorously against its provisions as discriminatory.

I have every confidence in the Committee on Agriculture, which has devoted many weeks to the consideration and drafting of the bill. To quote the Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture:

The bill provides basic, comprehensive legislation for aid to the States in the operation of school-lunch programs as permanent and integral parts of their school systems. For the past 10 years we have carried on a school-lunch program under legislative authority included in the agricultural appropriation bill. Of course, this is a year-to-year program, as the Appropriation Committee can only authorize the program 1 year at a time. This arrangement, while handicapped by its lack of permanency, has been highly successful, as shown by the following figures covering its 1945 operations:

Public schools	
Number of public schools	208,235
Number of public schools under program	39,467
Number of children attending public schools	24,562,473
Number of children in public schools under program	6,120,065
Parochial schools	
Number of parochial schools	10,049
Number of parochial schools under program	2,970
Number of children attending parochial schools	2,611,047
Number of children in parochial schools under program	460,650
Child-care centers	
Number of child-care centers	1,059
Number of children served	74,000

This year it is estimated that 48,000 public schools are operating under the program, serving lunches to some 8,200,000 school children. In addition it is estimated that there are many public and private schools, serving lunches to some five or six million children, operating outside the program. Hence, the over-all picture is this: There are some fifty to sixty thousand schools serving lunches to some ten or twelve million children. In addition lunches are being served in some 1,000 child-care centers to some 75,000 children. The great draw-back to the program, of course, is its lack of permanency. This lack of permanency makes it very hard for the Department of Agriculture and the schools to plan ahead. This inability to plan their programs ahead keeps many schools, especially the poorer ones, from working toward the programs they would like to have. Moreover, this lack of permanency has kept many of the States from wholeheartedly entering into the school-lunch program.

H. R. 3370 is a two-title bill. Title I permanently establishes Federal assistance to a school-lunch program upon a firm basis. It follows much the same pattern that we have been following for the past 10 years. It establishes as the policy of Congress the dual objective of: First, expanding the market of agricultural commodities by encouraging domestic consumption; and second, improving the health of the children by providing a nutritional school lunch.

Title I of the bill, which applies to public and nonprofit private schools alike, calls for an appropriation of $50,000,000, 75 percent of the funds to be paid by the Secretary of Agriculture to the State agencies and by the respective State agencies to the schools within the program. In States where the State constitutions prohibit the reallocation of funds to nonprofit private schools the Department of Agriculture is permitted to allot funds directly to such schools. Funds going to the States are apportioned on the basis of, first, the number of children from 5 to 17, inclusive, and, second, the need for assistance as indicated by the ratio of the per capita income of a State to that of the United States. Federal funds are matched in the beginning by State and local funds on a dollar-for-dollar basis, and the matching increases progressively as follows: 1948, two State dollars to one Federal dollar; 1949–50, three State dollars to one Federal dollar; 1951 and thereafter, four State dollars to one Federal dollar.

The plan worked out is a State plan. The funds are disbursed by the State agencies to the schools within the State pursuant to agreements entered into between the State agencies and the schools. The agreements, of course, must be in accordance with the provisions of title I and approved by the Secretary of Agriculture. And the bill expressly provides that neither the Secretary of Agriculture nor the State "shall impose any requirement with respect to administration, teaching, teaching personnel, curriculum, instruction, or material of instruction of any school."

Title II of the bill is new. It authorizes an appropriation of $15,000,000 to be apportioned as provided in title I, but only to the public schools. The funds so authorized are to be used by the States, first, to employ and train school-lunch administrators, supervisors, and managers; second, to equip school lunchrooms; and, third, to develop programs of nutrition education. The funds are channeled through the United States Office of Education to the States. The State educational agency must submit a State plan providing for (a) the development and supervision of school lunches by the State agency and limiting the costs resulting from these activities to not in excess of 15 percent of funds apportioned; (b) distribution of funds only to public schools and school systems of high-school grade or under—including nonprofit private schools of high-school grade or under which receive public funds from the State or any school system thereof for payment of teachers salaries; (c) such schools to furnish school lunches on nonprofit basis in accordance with nutritional standards determined by the State educational agency to be consistent with those established by the Department of Agriculture; and (d) such schools to serve meals without cost or at reduced cost to children who are determined by local school authorities to be unable to pay the full cost of the lunch, and with no segregation or discrimination because of inability to pay.

The parochial schools complain because they are not included under this section. In my opinion, while the parochial schools are not included, they can readily obtain all the advantage of this section except the advantages provided for the securing of equipment. As to equipment, I believe the parochial schools should stand upon the same footing as the public schools. The committee thought otherwise. To my way of thinking, if it is right and proper to provide the parochial schools with food it is inconsistent to exclude them from the provision providing funds with which, for instance, to purchase a stove to cook the food on. Such a policy is in line with the reasoning of the mother who gave, if I may coin the phrase, prohibitive consent to her daughter to go swimming:

Mother, may I go out to swim?
O yes, my darling daughter,
But hang your clothes on the hickory limb
And do not go nigh the water.

Mr. Speaker, we have committed ourselves over and over again as to the value if not necessity of a school-lunch program as annually we have passed the agricultural appropriation bill containing the necessary provisions to partially sustain such a program.

I am satisfied that the program is to become permanent.

We may have to change certain details as experience shows what must be done. Certainly there is nothing in the bill which violates State rights, and the features of the measure which require State supervision and cooperation safeguard the people and conserve the rights of everybody—States included.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY L. TOWE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 20, 1946

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a resolution passed by the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, as follows:

Concurrent resolution memorializing the United States Senate and House of Representatives not to ratify any treaty or agreement with the Dominion of Canada or pass any legislation which may provide for the constructior of the St. Lawrence seaway

Whereas the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, on February 12, 1940, passed a concurrent resolution memorializing the United States Senate not to ratify a treaty with the Dominion of Canada for the proposed St. Lawrence seaway; and

Whereas the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, on January 21, 1941, passed a concurrent resolution reaffirming its position in opposition to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway; and

Whereas it appears that the present Congress of the United States may be called upon to approve or authorize the construction of the seaway: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of New Jersey (the House of Assembly concurring), That this legislature reaffirm its position in opposition to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway because of its economic impracticability, its entire lack of advantage as a defense measure, and its detriment to business in the State of New Jersey; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, and particularly the Senators and Representatives elected from the State of New Jersey, be memorialized and requested to not ratify any treaty or agreement for the proposed St. Lawrence seaway or to approve or authorize the construction thereof; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the United States Senate, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative elected from the State of New Jersey.

What Heaven or What Hell!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, 4 weeks ago today, with eight of my colleagues of the House, I was at Hiroshima. The damage was awful. I saw nothing to approximate it in my visits to the blitzed cities of Germany during the war. There were a few remaining concrete pillars, some twisted steel girders, a number of distorted tree trunks, and leaning grave markers. Otherwise, the picture was one of complete flatness, and the rubble of earth, metal, and glass was a

dusty mixture. Native survivors who were 2 miles away from the center of the blast showed us severe X-ray burns that appeared on their bodies where they had colored coverings.

The challenge to the forces of civilized humanity in what took place here at Hiroshima is emphasized in the following poem written by my constituent, Mr. Louis Ginsberg, of 324 Hamilton Avenue, Paterson, N. J., and appearing in the New York Herald Tribune and the Paterson Morning Call:

ATOMIC BOMB

The vast dilemma of the human race
Is pulsing, restless, in the atom's space.

What magnitudes, that slept in shrunken size,
At man's command, are ready to arise?

As in a genii's bottle, what powers are curled
To pour, gigantic, out upon the world?

What holocausts, that slumbered long, are tense
To be unprisoned and to stretch immense?

From what miraculous mote invisible,
Seethes to rush forth what heaven or what hell?

O may the mighty heat that feeds the sun
Melt science and morality into one!

Address by John W. Snyder Before Economic Club of Detroit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY
OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 21 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Honorable John W. Snyder, Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, before the Economic Club of Detroit, Mich., on the 18th of February.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDUSTRIAL STATESMANSHIP AND RECONVERSION

Mr. Brown, members of the Economic Club, ladies, and gentlemen, I should like to express to you and to your president my appreciation for your invitation to appear here today. It appears to me to be a propitious time—before this particularly appropriate group—to discuss the most vital and absorbing subject of the day—reconversion.

We stand today on the threshold of a period of the greatest civilian production in the history of the United States. We are fighting the battle for peacetime production, and we shall be engaged in that battle throughout 1946. This is a time when output is limited, not by consumer demand, but by the ability of business to produce. Our strategy in fighting the battle for production, and the industrial statesmanship displayed, will determine the shape of our postwar economy. Our future prosperity will depend upon the outcome of the campaign.

We are completing the first phase of the reconversion period during which we reconverted our plants to peacetime production. In 9 months the Nation has swung the pendulum from all-out production for war, which we had achieved prior to the defeat of Germany, to the beginning of an all-out production for peace. The attainment of the goal of full peacetime production is beset with difficulties, but the stakes are as high as any we sought during the war itself. The responsibility for success in our new effort rests, as it did throughout the war, on Government, on industry, and on labor.

But there is one great difference. That is the shift in the division of responsibility for production—from the Government, to management and labor. During the war, production was financed by the Government. Our entire war output was planned. The Government built plants when there were shortages, it directed the distribution of men and materials to essential industries; it regulated civilian distribution through rationing. The Government assumed a direct responsibility for production and Government purchasing provided for half of all that was produced.

Now, however, we face a far different picture.

The Government still has many responsibilities, but it has returned to private initiative the direct responsibility for meeting the Nation's demands for foods and services. The Government no longer finances and directs our production except in a few instances. The Government no longer is the most important customer of business. Industry now looks to the Nation's 140,000,000 customers for its market.

The Government's role in reconversion is to assist industry and labor in meeting the responsibilities which are now theirs. I should like to describe for you the steps which the Government has taken, the policies it has adopted, and the course it may be expected to follow in assisting industry and labor to achieve their goals.

During the initial months of reconversion, the Government has followed a planned program of decontrol to give business back its freedom of action and flexibility so that production for peacetime markets would get underway as rapidly as possible.

Our basic strategy of returning to a free competitive economy required that controls be removed unless they were absolutely essential to transition needs.

In judging the need for maintaining controls, we have been faced in some cases with this dilemma:

To keep too many controls too long, would inevitably clog our business economy and delay production.

To lift controls too soon would cause disorderly conditions and seriously delay reconversion.

The Government has consciously leaned to the side of prompt removal as the lesser of two evils. In fact, in a few instances we have found it necessary to restore some of the controls we have removed; for instance, controls over construction, and over wheat.

Lifting controls is not in itself the easy path to full production. It was recognized from the beginning that further action would be needed to locate and remove those obstacles on the road to reconversion that are slowing down or threatening to halt the industrial machine. The Government is working constantly to break production bottlenecks of materials, equipment, and manpower.

There is enough of most materials to meet the Nation's immediate peacetime requirements but a few important materials are scarce enough to affect the speed of reconversion. The Government is maintaining a continuous analysis of the demand and supply of basic materials. The Government's policy with respect to scarce materials and facilities was restated and reaffirmed in an Executive order of February 14, 1946, which reads, in part, "It is the policy of the Government, in order so far as possible to prevent price increases, that there be prompt and firm enforcement, during the present emergency, of Government controls of scarce materials and facilities." Where direct action is necessary to prevent shortages which might delay reconversion, the Government is using three major procedures:

1. It is taking direct action to expand the supply of critical items by such means as labor recruitments, priority assistance to manufacturers in the purchase of equipment or facilities needed to raise output, expediting the release of Army and Navy supplies, and price adjustments where necessity is demonstrated.

2. The Government exercises control over uses of critical materials. Certain materials, such as tin, natural rubber, and burlap, are so scarce that their purchase must be regulated to insure that supply is available for the most essential uses. The channeling of scarce building materials to low and moderate-cost housing is another example.

3. The Government is maintaining controls to prevent excessive inventory accumulation and hoarding as long as materials are in short supply and inflation threatens, in order to protect producers and distributors from artificial scarcities.

A great deal of time and study has been devoted to the wage-and-price problem. The aim of the Government's reconversion pricing program is to bring peacetime goods back on the market at noninflated prices. The formulas for reconversion pricing were laid down immediately after VJ-day. Since then there has been a continuous review of price ceilings on a number of reconversion products.

We have been engaged in setting a wage-price policy which will, as far as possible, and within certain limitations, maintain wage-earner's incomes without breaking the price line. A fair solution of the wage-price problem is essential to successful completion of reconversion. Without that we cannot get into full peacetime production and without full production we cannot win our fight against inflation. Management and labor must come to a fair agreement with each other on the wages to be paid but the Government has an urgent responsibility on behalf of all the people to make sure that rising wages and rising costs do not result in run-away inflation, for everyone of us would suffer if that were permitted.

The Executive order of February 14, to which I have already referred, directs the Price Administrator to provide for an adjustment of price ceilings in any case in which he finds that an industry is in a position of hardship as a result of an increase in wages and salaries. The adjustment is to be sufficient to enable the industry to earn an average rate of profit equal to the rate earned during the peacetime base period applicable to that industry.

We have not reimposed full control over wages because in this period of readjustment all parties agree it is desirable to permit the fullest degree of collective bargaining within the framework of price control. We hope to prevent hardships resulting from drastic reductions in take-home pay but we also hope to prevent inflationary effects on prices. That would defeat the purpose of wage increases and would cause hardships to all persons receiving fixed incomes. And, above all else, our over-all objective is to lay the foundation for a return to the high-wage, low-price, mass-volume economy which has been the great achievement of the American system of free enterprise and the basis of the unprecedented material progress of our country in this past century.

Our policy to attain these objectives has been set down in the Executive order of February 14, which I have mentioned. In it, the National Wage Stabilization Board was directed in that order to approve wage and salary increases which are consistent with the general pattern of wage or salary adjust-

ments already established in an industry. In case there is no such general pattern, the Board may approve increases to eliminate gross inequities between related industries or plants, to correct substandards of living, or to correct disparities between raises in wages or salary rates in the units concerned and increases in the cost of living between January 1941 and September 1945.

One of the principal purposes of the Executive order is to prevent the unstabilizing effect of unregulated wage and price rises. Hence the Stabilization Administrator has been given the authority to provide, by regulation, that wage or salary increases of a particular class shall be unlawful unless made with the prior approval of the National Wage Stabilization Board, if such an increase is judged to have an unstabilizing effect.

To assist in controlling the effect of wage increases or price rises, the Executive order provided that wage increases granted by employers without the approval of the Wage Stabilization Board cannot be used by these employers as a basis for asking an increase in price or rent ceilings.

All arbitration awards and all recommendations made in the future by publicly appointed fact-finding panels, with respect to wage or salary isues, must conform to the standards of the new Executive order. No wage or salary increases shall be put into effect in accordance with such awards and recommendations until they are approved by the appropriate stabilization agencies.

I am firmly of the opinion, and I am sure that you will agree with me, that the provisions of the Executive order of February 14 which I have briefly outlined to you will prove to be of assistance in maintaining a stabilized economy during the transition period until production can eliminate the threat of inflation.

Estimates of industry show that we are on the threshold of volume production in many reconverting industries. Physical reconversion of plants is almost 100 percent complete. I think you will agree with me that the Government's program of "getting itself out of business," and in decontrolling, has been a potent factor in accomplishing this so rapidly.

The Government plunged, immediately after VJ-day, into the greatest liquidating operation in history—closing out the war. A $60,000,000,000 munitions business is being largely wiped off the books. We are closing out and settling contracts, clearing out some plants, selling others, and disposing of surpluses.

A year ago we had a $60,000,000,000 munitions program and procurement averaged about $5,000,000,000 a month. After the defeat of Germany we slashed production goals sharply downward. After VJ-day a wave of contract cancellations cut munitions procurement to a half billion dollars a month. The few remaining munitions schedules are under constant review, and procurement rates will continue to drop. As an illustration, motor vehicles next June will be bought at the rate of only three-tenths of 1 percent of last July's rate.

The change-over of plants from war to peace has been facilitated by the prompt removal of Government-owned property from war plants. This has, in almost all cases, been done within 60 days after a request has been made.

Paralleling contract termination in importance and far outstripping it in magnitude is the task of disposing of the Government's vast holdings of surplus war goods and property. Regulations for the disposal of surpluses have been completed and the problem now is primarily one of merchandising. About $43,000,000,000 worth of goods and property will be declared surplus by the end of 1946 and another $7,000,000,000 worth will be turned over to disposal agencies in 1947. Of course, a great part of this vast store will be instruments of war such as ships, planes, and munitions that will have no civilian use.

Selling this property calls for energetic use of practically all the commercial methods of Nation-wide selling.

The Surplus Property Administration established basic policies and procedures for the handling of surpluses, and the War Assets Corporation has now taken over the disposal operation.

Disposal of the war-built plants and other facilities—some built with private funds, majority owned by the Government—are potentially a valuable national asset. Naturally, the construction during the war had special characteristics. Aluminum and magnesium production, for example, were increased, not only in response to a high level of industrial activity and to new uses for those metals in industry as a whole, but also to meet the purely military demand for planes and bombs. Thus a considerable amount of conversion and adaptation is needed to fit all these facilities into our peacetime industrial structure, but most of them can be used in one way or another, and their integration into our economy is an essential step in putting men to work and producing the goods we need for a higher standard of living.

The effectiveness of the reconversion measures I have described can be measured in statistics of our national production.

At VJ-day, goods and services were being produced in the United States at an annual rate of just over $200,000,000,000, nearly half of which was for war. The war share of output has fallen tremendously while the civilian production has risen very rapidly, with the result that total national production stands at about $180,000,000,000. We are now producing for our civilian market at a rate of $20,000,000,000 more than we were 5 months ago.

But while we have more food for our tables, more gasoline for our automobiles, more of many kinds of consumer goods than we have ever had in our history, we severely lack other products that we need and want. Housing, for example, is our most serious shortage. It is so serious that only a bold, imaginative program such as the one prepared by Wilson Wyatt and announced by the President could hope to come anywhere near meeting the need.

Most consumer durable products—automobiles, refrigerators, washing machines—have thus far been produced in quantities adequate only for show-window display. The very real progress made in converting our industrial plant has not yet shown itself in output. I hope that the events of the past week will remove the barriers to full production and that we'll begin to get the full effects of the magnificent job that business has done in switching from war to peace.

The backlog of consumer needs and the tremendous pool of savings which has been stored up during the war is a new dynamic factor in the life of the American people. The level of national consumption right now is the highest it has ever been in any peacetime year and there is every indication that it will go higher.

We must realize, however, that this immediately favorable situation is in some part caused by deferred demand. It is not necessarily in itself a permanent part of our national life.

We are shaping our economic policies during the transition to take advantage of this situation. Although, for the moment, the pressure of demand is inflationary, we can turn it to our advantage by generally holding the price line and by encouraging the rapid increase of production to meet this ready market. We can use the pressure of this demand acting on our free business economy to expand our production to a level of full employment.

We do not know how long the deferred demand will maintain a level of full employment, but one thing we do know: The time will come when this deferred demand will slacken and we shall once again face the deflationary problems which beset this and other countries in the 1930's, and which were a root cause of the Nazi revolution in Germany. Sustained prosperity can be assured only by a high level of demand supported by high current income and not by deferred needs which are supported by accumulated savings.

We must make sure that our policies in the crucial war-to-peace change-over will not only assist us to achieve full production and full employment during the immediate postwar period but also that they will assist us to maintain production and employment in the future on a steadily rising level without the extreme fluctuations of the past.

In the long run, the development and maintenance of a market for our production must be the yardstick we apply to all policies during the transition. What we do in the next year or two will, in a large measure, determine whether or not we can avoid another 1929 collapse.

You men, as leaders of this great industrial community, are vitally interested in the plans and policies which the administration proposes to put into effect to accomplish the goal of successful reconversion.

I believe that you can expect that the administration will proceed along the following course:

The Government will hold the line on prices, because runaway inflation would be disastrous to worker, farmer, businessman, and consumer alike.

The Government will maintain direct controls as long as they are necessary to break production bottlenecks and to assure adequate supplies for essential reconversion purposes.

The Government will continue to play its present role in the readjustment process by assisting business and labor to break bottlenecks and, above all, by stabilizing the general level of cost and prices as long as there is threat of inflation.

An, finally, the Government will take such measures as are necessary to deal with urgent special problems which threaten the smooth course of reconversion, or constitute a danger to the health and welfare of the people—such as labor-management relations and the housing shortage.

These will be the steps of the administration, but the full responsibility for production must be assumed by American industry and labor.

These two, working together with the cooperation of the Government, will be an irresistible force in overcoming the problems of the months that lie ahead. It is unthinkable that, after joining together to prevent destruction of our form of free government by an enemy outside our country, industry and labor would fail now in meeting the challenge of these times. I know that management and labor are both anxious to be at work—for ahead of us lies the greatest era of plenty this or any other nation has ever known. In closing my message to you in Detroit is "let us go back to work. Let us do the job together."

Excessive Freight Rates on Government Materials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 21 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "United

States Pays the Freight," published in the Washington Daily News of February 15, 1946, and an editorial entitled "Locking the Barn," published in the Washington Daily News of February 16, 1946, on the subject of excessive freight charges for transportation of Government materials.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of February 15, 1946]

UNITED STATES PAYS THE FREIGHT

(By Peter Edson)

Charges that the Government "has paid and is paying many millions of dollars in excessive charges for the transportation of materials and supplies of the War Department" have now been made public after a year's investigation for the Bureau of the Budget.

The report is a 140-page volume and is one of the most damning indictments of railroad rate-making practices ever made. Credit for making the report belongs fully to Senator BURTON K. WHEELER, of Montana, who asked the Bureau of the Budget to investigate irregularities reported to him on freight rates being charged the War Department for hauling war supplies.

In brief, the report points up five principal methods through which railroads were able to meet excessive rates on Government freight.

1. As a large part of the traffic was between new shipping points, war plants, and bases, there were no established rate schedules. In calculating new tariffs, railroad rate makers arbitrarily fixed them higher than they should have been for hauling commercial freight comparable distances.

2. As much of the war material was classified as new products—landing craft, landing mats, rockets, radar, and combat vehicles, for instance—new tariffs were established. In many cases it is reported these new rates were higher than comparable commercial freight rates on barges, explosives, radios, or autos and trucks.

3. In many of these new rates, railroads were able to put through what amounted to 6-percent increases over established rates. This was done through what are known as ex parte 148 increases, which, of course, needs a little explaining.

In March 1942 the railroads asked for a general 6-percent increase on all freight rates. Interstate Commerce Commission granted the increase, to be effective in November. OPA protested. Going before ICC, counsel for OPA asked that the 6-percent raise in freight rates be set aside as wartime profiteering. ICC listened to OPA's reasoning and on April 6, 1943, suspended the increase as of May 15, 1943.

When it came to setting new rates for the hauling of war materials, however, according to the Budget Bureau investigators, the railroad rate-makers simply ignored the ICC set-aside orders and fixed many new tariffs at 6 percent above established rates.

4. The Government was frequently deprived of reductions in freight rates due it by law from the so-called land-grant railroads—principally roads of the West which were given big grants of public land as a reward for building their lines. Rates on land-grant railroads are by law supposed to be set by the Secretary of War and are not to exceed 50 percent of regular rates. In setting new rates on war freight, it is charged that the railroads did not figure in land-grant deductions.

5. Land-grant deductions were in many cases circumvented by what are known as section 22 quotations, which also needs explaining. Section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act says, ironically enough, that "Nothing * * * shall prevent the carriage, storage, or handling of property free or at reduced rates for the United States Government, such rates not being available to the general public."

The first part seems to have been ignored, but there was a lot of heavy leaning on rates not available to the general public—higher rates. The Budget Bureau's report shows that the carriers insisted on section 22 quotations wherever possible, and that land-grant deductions should not apply on these special rates.

[From the Washington Daily News of February 16, 1946]

LOCKING THE BARN

(By Peter Edson)

When a special committee of three railroad rate experts was assigned by the Budget Bureau to investigate the War Department's freight bill, only a few people had any idea what a 10 months' headache it was going to be.

From January 1, 1943, to VJ-day—2 years and 8 months—245,000,000 tons of war materials were moved. Ninety percent of that went by rail and 75 percent was freight. The Government's transportation bill was over $4,500,000,000.

Even a 1-percent overcharge would be $45,000,000, but no one can make any accurate estimate of how much excess freight Uncle Sam may have paid. The investigators say there are no adequate statistical records, correspondence files are incomplete and scattered in hundreds of desks. The personnel supposed to check freight bills was never adequate for the job and is now scattered.

O. K.'ed freight bills were paid by the War Department Finance Office, subject only to adjustment by the General Accounting Office. GAO is now running from 2 to 3 years behind in its audits. According to the Budget Bureau's investigators—W. B. Hammer, of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Charles B. Bell, and Emory B. Ussery of Washington—bills of lading were O. K.'ed without preaudit, so there is no real check on the reasonableness of many of the rates charged the Government for hauling war supplies.

Before the reorganization of the War Department in March 1942, every branch handled its own freight shipments. Then the Transportation Corps came into being, and a Traffic Control Division was set up. But it was not until June 1944, when the war was a year and a half old, that a systematic approach was made on freight-rate problems, the Budget Bureau probers report.

At that time the War Department named a standing committee of six to handle rate-adjustment problems with the railroads. The procedure was that if the carriers rejected a rate adjustment requested by the War Department, the case was turned over to the Judge Advocate General of the Army, who instituted proceedings before the ICC.

After June 1944, the Budget Bureau report discloses, many protests were made by the Judge Advocate General and there were some compromises with substantial savings. But there are months of delay in ICC proceedings. And hundreds and hundreds of rates were not even examined.

In the cases of rates that were examined, War Department at first requested that adjustments in payments be made retroactive to Pearl Harbor. But when the railroads protested this was unfair, the War Department blandly gave in to a policy of requesting readjustments only to the date on which the application for adjustment was filed.

That retroactive adjustments could have been obtained, however, was proved in August 1945, when the Navy went to the mat with the Abilene & Southern Railroad, and got a retroactive adjustment from the ICC on rates charged for the movement of armor plate.

While it was impossible for the Budget Bureau investigators to check the hundreds of thousands or millions of bills of lading, some of the gross overcharges were uncovered by spot checking.

The Budget Bureau report recommends in conclusion an eight-point program for reorganizing the manner in which Army, Navy and other departments of the Government examine the rates they are charged for freight movements. Senator BURTON K. WHEELER of Montana, chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, is preparing new legislation to see that it is done.

It sounds like a good idea, even if it may now be a little late to lock the barn.

Poland's Right to Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 21 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Poland's Right to Independence," recently delivered by me over station WSPR in Springfield, Mass.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On the 1st of September 1939, just at the dawn of a hot and sunny day, Germany launched her unprovoked attack upon the peaceful Polish nation thereby starting the war in which later the whole world became involved. On the first day of the undeclared war the German Air Force bombed more than 30 helpless Polish cities including Warsaw—the old capital and the cradle of Polish culture—Cracow, and practically every larger or smaller town with or without strategic significance. The forces employed by Germany in her attack on Poland constituted the largest army of a nation which had at any time in history been hurled on the first day of the war against an attacked country. It is generally admitted that the German Army and particularly the armored forces outnumbered the Poles in the appalling ratio of 16 to 1.

But the Poles did not hesitate and they did not even wait for the news whether France and Great Britain would declare war on Germany as committed by their treaties of alliance with Poland.

Under the pressure of infinitely stronger and efficiently equipped German troops the Polish Army, despite their self-sacrificing fight, had to fall back to the east. The plan of the Polish high command was to retreat, thereby lengthening the German lines of communication and gaining the protection of strategically better situated eastern Polish territories where the decisive battle was to take place.

Unfortunately, all of these plans came to naught as a result of the most deplorable Soviet invasion which started in the early morning hours of September 17, 1939, in open violation of the Soviet-Polish nonaggression pact.

The capital of Poland, Warsaw, a city without fortification, defended itself for over 3 weeks. I can well recall how the American people held their breath and watched the heroic fight of the slim military garrison of Warsaw and its civilian population. It was an epic which has been equalled only by another heroic fight Warsaw put up against overwhelming odds in August and September, 1944, when the heroic Polish underground

once more rose against the German oppressor.

Two days after the first Germans moved into the smouldering streets of Warsaw—a new Polish Army began forming in France and only a few months later, when the Germans invaded Norway, the Poles, soldiers of a country overrun by the enemy, were already fighting in Norway, which in turn was attacked by the same enemy.

During the campaign in France in 1940, the Polish Army fought on even when Marshal Pétain negotiated an armistice, and, once more refusing to surrender, the Poles left the soil of Europe's continent to carry on the struggle from Great Britain and to fight in Africa.

They fought in Libya, they created an army in Soviet Russia after this country was attacked by Germany. They fought in Italy where they covered themselves with eternal glory capturing on May 18, 1944, the most inaccessible fortress of Monte Casino; they fought in Normandy during the invasion of continental Europe by the Allied forces, and VE-day saw them on German soil after they had helped liberate Belgium and Holland.

There is not one battlefield of this war where the Polish soldier and aviator, robbed of his family and his country at the very outset, would not have shed his blood. Despite the most cruel persecution and most systematic destruction of Poland the Polish underground forces, known as the home army, challenged the Germans for over 5 years, rendering tremendous services to the allied cause. And it should never be forgotten that Poland has managed to contribute to the war effort of the United Nations the largest army from any of the occupied countries.

During the entire war every responsible allied statesman is on record declaring Poland's right to independence. From many such statements I wish to recall at this time one only, but the most official. On September 4, 1941, President Franklin D. Roosevelt announced that he had authorized the transfer of various defense articles to the Government of Poland temporarily having "its seat in London. The President stressed that the transfer of weapons to the fighting forces under the command of the legal Polish Government in exile is taking place under the provisions of the Lend-Lease Act," and he declared "that the gallant resistance of the forces of the Government of Poland is vital to the defense of the United States." This action, the Presidential statement continued, "demonstrated our intention to give material support to the fighting determination of the Polish people to establish once again the independence of which they were so inhumanly deprived."

Poland took her place in our common struggle as one of the United Nations believing firmly that the aim of the war which we concluded victoriously is not to divide the world anew into some spheres of influence and to hand over smaller nations to selfish foreign rulers, but to exalt freedom and crush forever all forces of oppression.

It is now generally conceded that Poland got an unfair deal from her allies. The fact that millions of Poles and the overwhelming majority of her soldiers remain abroad and cannot return to their country which was proclaimed "liberated" is in flat contradition to the obligations assumed by Soviet Russia in the Moscow declaration of 1943, signed by Messrs. Molotov and Eden and our then Secretary of State.

There can be no question about Poland's right to independence and there can be no question about whether the Poles by their sacrifices during the war deserved fully what was promised to them and for which they fought. The question is only whether or not what was given to Poland as a result of the Yalta compromise deserves the name of "independence." For us Americans, this word "independence" means exactly what it means to the Poles, and permit me to put it very clearly. The Polish state will be independent only when a constitutional Polish president assumes authority on Polish soil when Poland is governed by a government led by that president, when her citizens will be given the right to vote freely and to elect their government and the president, when the citizens of Poland are subject to laws made by themselves and not imposed upon them by foreigners, when there is neither political nor social serfdom, when a foreign secret police does not control the government, when there is no terror or violence, deportation or forced labor, when there are no concentration camps and no persecution, and when the Polish soldier, who for 5½ years has been fighting for freedom, is not being deported to Siberia, shot or shamefully treated, but is a servant of his own people and his own government.

A country to which Polish soldiers taking part in this war as our most faithful allies cannot return without endangering their life, cannot be called free and independent.

The 6,000,000 Americans of Polish descent whose sincere and generally recognized American patriotism has never prevented them from preserving the traditions and virtues of their Polish origin, are rightfully full of admiration for the heroic stand of their Polish kinfolks. These American sons and daughters of Poland are actively and generously helping the country of their forefathers. But rightfully they are grieved about what happened to Poland after their sons and daughters have shed their blood on our American battlefields in the same cause for which Polish blood was shed profusely.

I share the grief of our friends of Polish descent in this country. As an American, I am unwilling to permit the compromise exacted from our leaders to prevail. We must continue our fight for the independence of all the countries to which independence was promised as a reward for their fight. We shall continue the fight to redeem our pledges and to keep the word we have given our fallen sons and the sons of Poland.

The Americans of Polish descent can be assured that every American who understands the meaning of American democratic traditions and the real meaning of American obligations stands united with them in their fight for Poland's well-deserved rights to independence.

Seniority Versus Majority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 21, 1946

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper editorial:

SENIORITY VERSUS MAJORITY

The Washington wire tells of a group of "veteran House Democrats" complaining of the organization of 15 younger Members with the avowed purpose of standing up for Democratic political interests. The older Members apparently fear that somebody is about to take the ball away from them. Their names are withheld, including the name of their spokesman.

The younger group is headed by Representative ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee, who states its aim to "answer Republican campaign propaganda and to affirmatively set forth the Democratic position."

Now, the unnamed senior Members may merely resent the brashness of Mr. GORE's group in presuming to know, much less to set forth, what the Democratic position is. Under the dead hand of the seniority system, latecomers in Congress, no matter what pledges they have given their constituents and no matter what their abilities, are supposed to sing small when their elders are talking and in all matters of party line to follow the example of those colleagues who have managed to put in more time in Washington.

Or it could be that the senior Members are not too proud of the positions they have taken and simply do not relish the light in which they themselves would be cast by junior criticism. The truth is, of course, that it is mainly the older Democratic Members who have been playing the Republican side of issues rather consistently for the past 2 years and hence have more than one finger caught in the opposition pie Mr. GORE and his group propose to expose.

Not unnaturally, these collaborationists of the unholy alliance are importuning the party leadership to see that a civil tongue is kept in the younger Democratic heads. "We had better try to settle the fighting among ourselves," they warn lugubriously, "if we want to remain in control in the House." But it is plain that what it takes to keep the Democratic Party in the ascendancy is what the younger Members have to offer.

Mr. GORE and his group know their political history. They know that unless the Democratic legislative position is the liberal progressive position, the party's hope of holding control of Congress is pale, indeed. They know this always has been true, and they can see, if the elders do not, that nothing is more certain to return the House to Republican control than for Democratic Members to vote as if they were Republicans.

St. Lawrence Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 21 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement on the St. Lawrence waterway, made this morning by Hon. Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Commerce, before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Gentlemen, this is, in my opinion, a most appropriate time for again calling the St. Lawrence project up for consideration—and, I hope, for its final approval. Currently our efforts to deal with the multiplicity of problems that are an inevitable aftermath of war are not without success; but the present situation hardly justifies the view that we can safely sit back and let the future take care of itself. This is a time for taking stock of our needs and our resources, for charting a future course to get us around all foreseeable contingencies, and for starting in motion the machinery needed to bring us to the desired goal.

From this point of view, it seems clear that this great project should now be given its final approval. One reason for this is that our national employment objective has been clearly spelled out. Another is that the arguments which gave us pause on earlier occasions have been broken by the hard facts of recent history. Today, the arguments pro

and con are the same as before; but events have left the arguments pro with all their force, while showing the arguments con to be almost entirely without merit.

Twenty-odd years ago, when the St. Lawrence project first had the serious attention of the Department of Commerce, it was possible to argue that all was right with the world, that the Government had only to let our free-enterprise system go its own way and there would be endless prosperity for everyone. Today, we cannot forget the excesses of the boom and the collapse, or the ravages of the great depression.

A little over 10 years ago it was possible to argue that Government action to develop natural resources would have all kinds of dire consequences for the regions involved, that private enterprise would be hampered and interfered with, and that the social and political development of the community would be retarded. Today, the living light of TVA reveals the transparency of such arguments.

Just over 5 years ago, it was being seriously argued that the curve of our economic growth had leveled off, that our economy had reached its maturity and would never recover the vitality of its earlier years. Today, we look back upon a war-production achievement that exceeded by far even the most optimistic projections, and we recognize that there are no real restraints upon the achievement of still greater heights.

Even as recently as a year ago there were still some who argued for isolationism—for going our own way without regard to the needs of other peoples or to the values that might be obtained by enlisting their cooperation. Today, these arguments are well exploded. Atomic bombs over Japan, nonstop flights of B–29's from Tokyo to Washington, and radar contact with the moon demonstrate the essential oneness of the whole world.

Today, we have no reason to fear projects that will expand our capacity to produce, and to transport goods in trade with our world neighbors. We have only to fear that we shall set the sights too low, and thus fail to realize the potentialities of this great country of ours.

To evaluate the St. Lawrence project adequately it is necessary to consider it in the light of possible national developments in production and trade.

At the present time we are in the initial phase of the postwar recovery. We have settled the strike in steel; and the renewed flow of this basic material will allow production to go forward in all the durable goods industries whose output is so urgently needed after four long years of curtailment. We are also embarking upon a housing program that greatly exceeds any the country has ever known in the past. With these important segments surging forward to new highs, we are bound to make strong over-all advances during the next 2 years. And it must be remembered that we are beginning those advances from a level well above the highest ever reached before the war.

You may wonder that I speak so confidently of the future; but bear in mind that I am speaking thus only of the immediate future. In the period just ahead we have the basis for the kind of recovery I have been projecting. It lies in the deferred demands for durable goods and housing, to which I have already referred, and in the accumulated savings held by our people. The purchasing represented by these tremendous savings continues to be held in check by shortages of goods our consumers need and desire; and this blocking of expenditures gives rise to the inflationary pressures which constitute the most immediate threat to our economic well-being. They constitute such a threat not because we fear the recovery to which they would contribute but because inflation may undermine the recovery and bring a collapse similar to that which occurred in 1920, under similar circumstances following the last war.

Even assuming that we shall be able to avoid the dangers inherent in these inflationary pressures, there is a question of how far the recovery will go and how long it will last. By their very nature the special stimuli of accumulated savings and deferred demand are temporary forces which can be effective for only a limited period. The savings will tend to be dissipated in various ways. The deferred demands will be worked off in several years of full production. When that occurs, the force of the recovery will be gone; and unless some means of maintaining production and employment can be found, we may again find ourselves in a cumulative spiral of deflation whose destructive consequences it is impossible to appraise.

We must be prepared, therefore, to meet the forces of deflation as they develop and to undertake the necessary measures for preventing a repetition of the kind of collapse we experienced in the thirties. We are now almost unanimously determined that large-scale unemployment will never be tolerated in this country again. Though there are differences in interpretation and in the terms we use to state our basic objectives, we have reached essential agreement that there shall be employment opportunities for everyone able, willing, and seeking to work. Congress has given explicit recognition to this fact in the passage of the Employment Act of 1946. Under this act it is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Government to coordinate and utilize all its plans, functions, and programs to promote maximum employment. If we take this pledge seriously and devote our combined efforts to the task, I am sure we cannot fail.

This means not only that we must prepare the specific programs by which we shall achieve the goal but also that we must be prepared in terms of all the necessary auxiliary services which will be required to maintain the economy at that level. We cannot afford to let any specific bottlenecks interfere with the orderly development of our economic processes as the goal is approached. We must be sure that essential utilities like transportation and electric power will be adequate to meet the demand without the strains and dislocations that have been typical of our wartime operation. More specifically, both the navigation and the power aspects of the St. Lawrence project will be required for future economic growth and will in turn help to support that growth.

The Department of Commerce has had an interest in the St. Lawrence project for many years. As some of you know, the Department either made, or participated in the making of, several surveys with respect to the possibilities of the St. Lawrence development. Such surveys were made in 1927, 1934, and 1941; and I think it appropriate that the committee should take official cognizance of these surveys for the valuable information they contain. All of these surveys reached the conclusion that the St. Lawrence project was desirable in promoting the commerce of the United States.

This basic conclusion remains unaffected to the present moment. The war program demonstrated how much larger our production could be. It proved that despite the break in the depression years, the long-term trend of growth still held. For at least two-thirds of a century, we have realized an annual rate of increase that resulted in a doubling of our total output every 20 years.

It is true that in the depression of the thirties we fell far short of our normal capacity to produce; in fact, the loss of production through 12 years of unemployment was enough to pay for the St. Lawrence project hundreds of times over. In contrast, the war program brought us up to a point well above the trend. Our 1944 gross national product of nearly $200,000,000,000 represented a total output we would not have expected to realize under normal full-employment conditions until 1950.

As we near the end of the decade, it is quite possible that our gross national product will again approach this peak level; and we in the Department of Commerce have been giving more than a little thought to what this will mean for various segments of our economy. Recently our analysts have made studies of the transportation situation that would arise in 1948 under full employment conditions, with a gross national product of $190,000,000,000. These studies indicate that under the projected conditions the traffic on the country's railroads will be in the neighborhood of 640,000,000,000 revenue ton-miles. This compares with 373,000,000,000 revenue ton-miles achieved by the railroads in 1940, an increase of almost 70 percent.

We know the roads can handle this huge volume of traffic. They actually handled greater loads in 1943, 1944, and 1945. But these supreme efforts of the war years required the aid of severe Government restrictions on shippers and railroads alike, with inconveniences and delays all around. For example, delays in furnishing adequate transportation for moving grain from our farms in the latter part of 1945 contributed to the present serious world food emergency and to the necessity for imposing new priorities on the movement of grain for the meeting of essential relief requirements. Such Government intervention and the strains of wartime operation can hardly be considered appropriate to normal conditions.

The volume of traffic likely to move on the St. Lawrence waterway, though substantial, is small in comparison with these huge traffic demands on the railroads. The latest survey of the Department, prepared in 1941, approached the problem of estimating the traffic flow from the standpoint of an analysis of 17 important commodities, which might move via the waterway. The survey indicated that the traffic in these commodities, even based upon the depression levels of the thirties, would amount to 4,600,000 tons. On the basis of this partial investigation, the survey concluded that it was not unreasonable to expect that the combined foreign and domestic United States commerce using the waterway would in a few years reach a figure of 10,000,000 tons.

This conclusion is consistent with estimates of the capacity of the waterway, which is figured at about 16,000,000 tons over and above the tonnage normally passing through the present canal system of the Great Lakes. In other words, out of a total capacity of approximately 25,000,000 tons for the combining canal system as a whole, some 16,000,000 tons will be new capacity resulting from the St. Lawrence project. Of this potential 16,000,000 tons of traffic, a considerable portion will undoubtedly be taken by Canada. The 1941 survey assumed that a division of traffic which might occur was roughly 6,000,000 tons for Canada and 10,000,000 tons for the United States. This 10,000,000 tons of capacity represents a combined figure for freight moving out and in over the waterway and includes both foreign and coastwise trade.

Even if all of this traffic represented a direct diversion from the railroads, the total ton-miles lost to the roads would not exceed, at the maximum, 1 or 2 percent of the total ton-miles they might be called upon to handle. Moreover, it can be stated with assurance that not all of this traffic will consist of tonnage diverted from other forms of transportation. Some is bound to be new business that would not have moved at all in the absence of low-cost water transportation. It is clear, therefore, that traffic on the waterway is not going to cripple the railroads. A better way of looking at it is that the capacity made available by the St. Lawrence project will simply take care of a small part of the general increase in commerce and trade which we all hope will take place.

A similar conclusion with respect to the postwar position of our seaports readily follows from analyses of future trends in our foreign trade. The trade possibilities of the next few years greatly exceed the trade which this country carried on before the war. During 1940 our water-borne foreign trade amounted to about $6,500,000,000; of this total, imports were $2,500,000,000 and exports were slightly over $4,000,000,000.

With the country at a stage of full production and full employment, foreign trade could reach a total of $20,000,000,000 before 1950—or approximately three times the 1940 total—made up of almost $8,000,000,000 of imports and $12,000,000,000 of exports. In terms of tonnage, 1940 water-borne foreign trade was 111,000,000 tons. Of this total, about 90,000,000 tons were handled at seaports, with about 41,000,000 tons being imports and 49,000,000 tons exports. It is true that the price level has changed substantially since 1940. Even taking into account these changes in the price level, it appears that the tonnage volume of our postwar foreign trade may still double that which was handled in prewar years.

It should be mentioned also that full production and employment will likewise produce a very substantial increase in our water-borne coastwise and intercoastal trade. In 1940 the tonnage in this trade was 156,000,000 tons. Unlike railroad traffic, our coastwise trade was curtailed during the war period, so that the prospective increase will be entirely in new high territory. In the light of these facts, it would seem reasonable to welcome, not oppose, new facilities for handling part of the increased tonnage.

That the opening up of the St. Lawrence waterway would contribute both to the achievement of a larger volume of trade and to our ability to handle it can hardly be doubted. The waterway would carry the advantages of cheap ocean transportation into the heart of the country. These transport services will become available to an area filled with great cities and prosperous farm lands, in other words, an area with great traffic generating possibilities. This combination of the availability of cheap transportation, coupled with the existence of a very large volume of potential traffic, represents a practically infallible stimulus to trade.

All of the surveys made by the Department of Commerce have indicated that substantial savings in transportation charges would result from the operation of the waterway. The latest survey estimated that on a traffic volume of 4,600,000 tons for 17 specific commodities the freight savings would range between $14,000,000 and $17,000,000 after allowing for any additional insurance charges which might be levied. The report concluded that on the basis of a total American traffic of 10,000,000 tons the savings in freight charges might total $36,000,000—a figure several times the annual cost of maintenance and amortization of the transportation phases of the project.

This conclusion is confirmed by a general review of the comparative costs of different types of transport. Before the war, ocean freighters were able to carry cargo at a rate in the neighborhood of 1 mill per ton-mile. In connection with the traffic on the St. Lawrence waterway, however, it should be pointed out that the full costs of ocean transportation could not possibly be charged to the additional mileage operated over the seaway. Vessels reaching port in this country will have port charges and cargo charges whether they dock at Atlantic ports or Chicago. In other words, the correct appraisal of the additional water transportation costs arising out of using the seaway represents merely the voyage expenses and the proper percentage of overhead charges which result from a lengthened trip. Prewar voyage expenses were generally not in excess of one-half mill per ton-mile, and in some cases were less than this figure.

This unusual economy of water transportation cannot be approached by other means of transport. For example, the cost of 30-ton-carload railroad shipments ranged around 6 or 7 mills per ton-mile on long hauls of from 600 to 1,000 miles. Reports of the Association of American Railroads and the Interstate Commerce Commission indicate that the average railroad revenue is between 9 and 10 mills per ton-mile. Costs of movement by truck need not be considered, since these costs for carload movements over long distances are substantially greater than those of the railroads.

Translating these figures into practical terms gives the following results: The additional cost of transporting 1 ton of overseas freight from Montreal to Chicago, approximately 1,250 miles, should not, even allowing for slower movement through the waterway, exceed $1.50 a ton on the average and in all probability would be less than this. In comparison, carload costs by rail from Atlantic ports to Chicago are not less than $5 per ton and are probably $6 or $7 a ton. The rates on most traffic are substantially higher than this. Without attempting any exact appraisal of the total transportation savings which might occur, therefore, it does seem clear on the basis of relative transportation costs, that the estimate of $36,000,000 in the 1941 Commerce Report is conservative. Needless to say, transportation savings of this magnitude would certainly justify the completion of the St. Lawrence project.

The Great Lakes area, which would obtain the advantages of this low-cost means of transportation, includes almost one-third of the national population and has approximately 40 percent of the national volume of manufacturing. For certain industries, of course, the percentage is much higher; nearly three-fourths of the steel ingot capacity of the Nation is located here and approximately three-fourths of the total production of motor vehicles occurs in this area. About 40 percent of all American farm property, in terms of aggregate value, is located here; and the output of its farms includes 36 percent of the wheat and 67 percent of the corn production of the Nation. These figures are sufficient to indicate the tremendous importance of the region that would be opened up to cheap water transportation.

Let me make it amply clear, however, that we favor the waterway, not because we believe it will serve the interests of any particular region or territory to the exclusion of others, but rather because we believe that, in the long run, the benefits of improved transportation and reduced transportation charges will accrue to the entire Nation. The economic history of this country demonstrates that improvements in transportation, coupled with reductions in the costs of transportation services, have had a tremendous effect in bringing about the vast productivity which this Nation now possesses.

Over a period of time, any expansion in the trade, commerce, and production of the region bordering the Great Lakes is bound to benefit the rest of the country. Manufacturers in the Great Lakes area would purchase more raw materials from other parts of the country. Farmers and consumers in the Great Lakes region would buy more goods not only from manufacturing establishments in the immediate area, but from factories throughout the Nation. Railroads and trucking companies would haul a greater volume of traffic. In short, progress is not compartmentalized. What helps one area or region ultimately benefits all the Nation.

The greatest gains deriving from the project will in fact accrue to the area in its immediate vicinity. This area will gain for some 4 years the 20,000 direct jobs necessary to complete the on-site construction work and the additional jobs necessary for off-site work and supporting services. It will become the permanent home of many of these construction workers and of the trade and service industries auxiliary to the construction and operation of the waterway and power facilities. It will obtain cheaper access to needed supplies. It will benefit from the traffic and travel on the waterway, and from the recreational facilities which this kind of project inevitably affords. But most of all, it will benefit from the availability of cheap electric power.

The development of cheap power has always brought a correlative development of the area which enjoys its benefits. There is no reason why the experience in the upper St. Lawrence territory should be different from that which has occurred in other parts of the country. Power is the heart of American industry. The manufacturer who does not base his operations on the effective use of power cannot compete with our efficient industrial giants. The trend toward power use and the whole maze of technological developments associated with electric power has been accelerated during the war years and is clearly more important now than ever before.

At the same time, all parts of the country now face an increased need for industrial opportunities. With the return of the veterans, there is a growing need for new business establishments and a growing need for increased employment. Cheap power will ease the otherwise severe problem of accomplishing this expansion. It may spell the difference between success and failure for small business enterprises whose birth and growth are essential to the maintenance of our free-enterprise system.

The Department of Commerce has been undergoing a thorough reorganization designed to improve its services in the interest of promoting business, and particularly small business. Small business thrives in a climate of economic expansion. That is the kind of climate engendered by the availability of low-cost transportation and cheap electric power. The potential contributions of this project to our economic future are too important to overlook.

In closing, let me repeat: Our experiences through depression and war combine with our new national production goals to render insignificant the dislocations which any project of this magnitude necessarily involves. Those dislocations are seen more clearly than ever to be few, slight, and temporary. The advantages are seen more clearly than ever to be many, great, and permanent.

Creation of permanent, useful assets is an essential part of any program directed toward the assurance of our future national welfare. Projects like this one, which are in large measure at least self-liquidating, must be in the forefront of the plans and programs we shall have to consider in implementing our national employment policy. If we do not carry through such projects, there can be no assurance that we shall ever undertake less favorable programs, which could not repay their cost to the Government, either in terms of direct receipts or indirectly in terms of taxes deriving from the high levels of income to which they contribute. We cannot afford the indication which disapproval of this project would convey that there is any doubt about our living up to our pledge to provide maximum employment opportunities for all our people.

By the same token, we cannot afford any indication to other peoples of the world that we are in any way unwilling or incapable of doing our part to promote healthy world trade, meaning trade of mutual benefit among world neighbors. Events have made amply clear that economic stability and growth, accompanied by rising standards of living throughout the world, are the primary requisites for peace. Our responsibilities in the new world order reinforce our domestic interests in supporting the approval of this project.

Address by Eugene A. Rose at Testimonial Dinner to Mayor O'Dwyer, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. MEAD
OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 21 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Eugene A. Rose at the testimonial dinner held in New York on January 17 in honor of Mayor O'Dwyer.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"No treason we bring from Erin, nor bring we shame nor guilt;
The sword we hold may be broken, but we have not dropped the hilt!"

Mr. Chairman, reverend fathers, Mayor O'Dwyer, ladies and gentlemen, to be present on this occasion is a privilege not often to be equalled. My privilege is further enhanced by the fact that I represent a group of men in Philadelphia kindred to the magnificent organization under whose aegis this testimonial is tendered. Although the ceremony of installation of your officers is incidental to the main purpose of this occasion, I feel deeply grateful for your kind invitation to be present at that function also.

Mr. Mayor, as I speak, I do so with the absolute assurance that the sentiments I humbly try to express are shared by countless thousands of your friends and well-wishers in New York City, in the Empire State, throughout the Nation, in Ireland—and indeed across the wide expanses of the earth. Particularly do I feel that I voice the sentiments of those of the Irish race everywhere—the citizens of that universal spiritual empire who would be here with us tonight, if the wish could be translated to the fact.

We feel certain that your elevation to the position of chief magistrate of the world's most important city has been more widely acclaimed than any similar event that has gone before. For what race of men has been more widely scattered than that of the Irish? What remote corner of the earth is strange to the name? In every land, from the north frigid zone to that of the south—all around the globe—the Irishman and his progeny have made their homes. An empire in the truest sense of the word, unique in its indestructibility, it is ironical that it should have been created upon the ruins of the most terrible catastrophe that ever overtook that much-persecuted race.

Just 100 years ago, during the dark and dismal days of the British-made famine of 1846–48, the foundation of that empire was largely laid. Neither pomp nor ceremony marked that terrifying event. Suffering, death, and indescribable confusion were everywhere. Although we have forgiven, we can never forget.

On a festive occasion such as we here celebrate, it is, perhaps, not appropriate to recall such a revolting period to mind, but we find it difficult to survey the present and forget the past. It is inevitable, indeed, that in this hour of triumph which we presume to share with you, we should recall the myriad obstacles, told and untold, seen and unseen, that the Irish people, by dogged tenacity and an unconquerable spirit have surmounted—and not only surmounted—but have gone on to achieve the very pinnacles in countless spheres of endeavor.

We are here reminded of a typical incident, or, rather, a series of typical incidents, in this seemingly endless struggle. During the Young Ireland disorders of 1848, nine Irish youths were apprehended, tried and convicted of treason against Her Royal Highness Queen Victoria. With judicial solemnity, the president of the court intoned the names of the young men. They were: Charles Duffy, Morris Leyne, Thomas McGhee, Thomas Meagher, Richard O'Gorman, Michael Ireland, Terence McManus, Patrick Donahue, and John Mitchell.

The usual question was then put to the doomed men: "Have you anything to say before court passes sentence?" The reply, by Meagher, who was chosen to speak for the group, gives evidence of the absolute fearlessness and the traditional sense of humor of the Irish. "My lord," he said, "this is our first offense, but not our last. If you will be easy on us this once, we promise, on our word as gentlemen, to try to do better next time. And the next time, sure we won't be fools enough to get caught."

The solemnity of the court was unruffled. An indignant judge pronounced the sentence: death by hanging. But under a storm of protests from all over the world, the Queen was forced to commute the sentence. Penal servitude for life in what was then savage Australia was their fate.

The years went by, and in 1874 a Sir Charles Duffy was elected prime minister of the Australian state of Victoria. To her amazement, the Queen learned that this was the same Charles Duffy who was transported for high treason! Her curiosity now aroused, the Queen demanded the records of the other so-called criminals. This is what she learned: Meagher was governor of the present State of Montana (which was then a territory); O'Gorman was governor-general of Newfoundland; Michael Ireland was attorney-general of Australia, having succeeded the other so-called criminal Morris Leyne to that office; McGhee was president of the council for the Dominion of Canada; Mitchell was a prominent New York politician, and father of the Mitchell who later became mayor of New York—even as you, sir. McManus and Donahue were brigadier generals in the United States Army—again, even as you, Mr. Mayor.

The scene was now far removed from that of the court trial 26 years before. The curiosity that killed the proverbial cat, unnerved the Queen. "Cursed be the law," she screamed, "that deprive me of such citizens."

We have often wondered, and tonight we wonder again: What are the thoughts of the present-day successors of Ireland's former persecutors, in these days of many triumphs for the Irish—the Irish who have long been depicted as being but half-civilized, and unable to govern themselves? But time weakens, and it will eventually silence, the voices of Ireland's calumniators.

You, Mr. Mayor, have been destined to give the lie, once again, to the defamation of an age-old people and nation. Far from the rolling hills of Mayo, Providence has entrusted the material well-being of this great city's teeming millions to your care. We who are familiar with your background, your spiritual training, and your philosophy, can assure the citizens of New York City that they may look confidently forward to the future. No foreign ideologies will be permitted to influence nor debase your administration; no bar to progress in the old-fashioned American way will be tolerated. The welfare of little old New York you will consider as you would a sacred heritage, remembering the millions of your countrymen who have toiled and sweated here throughout the centuries to make this great metropolis what it is today—a baffling maze of mammoth canyon-like arteries of trade and commerce. Denizens of the underworld and all enemies of our Christian mode of life have long learned to fear you. For them we have nothing but words of caution.

And now, in conclusion, we pray that Divine Providence, who has called you to this task, may continue to smile upon your labors. May the generations of Irishmen and Irishwomen who follow in our footsteps be blessed with the type of leadership, both in Ireland and in the lands of their exiled sons and daughters, that the citizens of New York have so wisely chosen.

While we shall watch with pardonable pride your administration of the affairs of this great city, according to the democratic precept, we shall not for a moment forget, nor shall we ever ignore, the cry of the people of your less fortunate native land for their right to the democratic ideal, which is still cruelly denied them.

But so long as Ireland can furnish the leadership and the spirit that has so often been exemplified in this and other lands, there is no reason for despair. For—

"Ireland is Ireland, through joy and through tears;
Hope never dies through the long weary years.
Each age has seen countless brave hearts pass away—
But their spirit lives on, in the men of today!"

Housing for Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL
OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 21 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Housing for Tomorrow," by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], published in the winter 1946 issue of Housing Progress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSING FOR TOMORROW

(By United States Senator JAMES M. MEAD)

From the viewpoint of the veteran, this statement, "Housing for Tomorrow," is one of the most vacant promises of modern times. Vacant and ineffectual because what the veteran wants and needs is—housing today.

Now is the time to face the issue squarely and to make a bold start toward correcting the conditions to an extent that our lack of planning today by the Federal, State, and municipal authorities will not come back to plague and haunt us in the future.

CAUSES OF SHORTAGE

Many people over this country are wondering just what has happened to cause such an acute housing shortage. Part of this shortage can of course be attributed to the cost we had to pay to fight a global war. Construction of new, permanent homes fell far short of the actual need. This was necessary because a large share of the material needed for home construction had to be diverted to war needs.

But this is not the full picture. Over a period of the last 20 years or more, there have been less new homes built than there were

new families formed. So the need has accumulated. This was particularly true with reference to the depression years.

The building industry has constructed homes at an annual rate ranging from 937,000 in 1925 down to a low of 93,000 in 1933. The average has been around 500,000 a year. Meanwhile families have increased at the rate of about 600,000 a year. Also it must be taken into consideration that many of the old homes have depreciated to an extent that approximately 12,500,000 houses of the total supply of nearly 33,000,000 units in urban centers are either in a very bad condition or are totally beyond repair.

ONE OF "BIG THREE"

The construction industry is rated as one of the three largest industries of our Nation (agriculture and manufacturing, the other two). Modernization of our home-building industry has not kept pace with the industrialization of our two other big industries. Because of this lack of progress and because there are so many interrelating conditions involved that have kept the building of a home within the confines of a custom-built item, we now have a deplorable shortage of adequate housing accommodations.

Will the home-building industry have to reorganize itself along lines of our best manufacturing methods, combining factory assembling of many parts, and better organization of land acquisition, mass puchase of materials, better financing and better over-all production of home both for sale and for rent? Many of our most forward looking builders are convinced this is the only real answer.

NEW METHODS NEEDED

But a solution to the problem will have to be found. It will not be found immediately and it will not have the cloak of magic. It will be an approach within the framework of our present economy. Some of the methods will be as radically different compared to today's methods as the manner in which automobiles are built compared with the way carriages were formerly built, or the way our farms are now cultivated as against the old hand-plow system.

VETERANS' HOUSING

Most of the concern, however, evolves around the problem of meeting the current and immediate need of housing for veterans, of getting a head start on meeting the problem as quickly as possible. As a means of relieving the acute housing needs for veterans I introduced a resolution in Congress, which provided a way for an increase in appropriations up to $191,000,000 to make our surplus war housing available for the returning soldiers. These accommodations, primarily units designed for dwelling purpose, will be moved to a locality of need and reerected to serve veterans and their families. While the 100,000 units that this fund will provide may not be anywhere near adequate, nevertheless some measure of relief will be provided for the most desperate cases, and they will afford clean, comfortable accommodations.

Meanwhile, the Federal Government has faced the situation and is going ahead, doing everything within its power to break material shortage bottlenecks. Congress is now considering long-range housing legislation, the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill. All three Senators, ROBERT WAGNER, of New York, ALLEN J. ELLENDER, of Louisiana, and ROBERT TAFT, of Ohio, have been devoting most of their time and energy toward making this constructive piece of housing legislation as adequate and as well-balanced as possible, to assure a resumption of home building by private industry, to eradicate slum areas, and to provide decent living conditions for our low-income groups.

EXECUTIVE AID

On the executive side of our Government, President Truman has named Wilson Wyatt, former mayor of Louisville, Ky., and a very able administrator, as Housing Expediter. Mr. Wyatt will have the authority under the President's Second War Powers Act to channel the flow of materials into the housing construction field, particularly housing for veterans, and at a construction cost of $10,000 or less.

Admittedly, this year is going to be a very critical one on our home front. The brightest ray of hope in the whole desperate situation is that our country has been made conscious of and fully aware of the deplorable housing conditions. Our National, State, and local governmental officials, and the industry as a whole, will not be satisfied or content until we really provide adequate accommodations for all our people. With enlightened leadership and American ingenuity we can attain that goal.

New Deal Finally Adopts Program Advocated by Republican Congressional Food Study Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1946

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to say that the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee at the beginning of its activities maintained that the doctrine of scarcity was unwise and destructive. At the same time, the committee maintained that the needs of the country would be supplied only by a program of production and more production. The committee maintained that nobody ever got fat on a scarcity and that nobody ever went hungry on a surplus.

I repeat, the Republicans have persistently advocated production and more production. Seldom, if ever, have the higher-ups in the New Deal administration advocated production. On the contrary, so far as we know, most of them have supported the doctrine of scarcity. Many of them have done so reluctantly, but Wallace apparently still supports his program of killing little pigs. So far as I know, Mr. Bowles subscribed to this doctrine of scarcity. At any rate his policies all carry threats to the producers of the Nation as well as to the processors and distributors of food.

Mr. Bowles protests loudly that he is against inflation, yet he has never done anything to increase production. Everyone knows that production is the only complete antidote for inflation.

A few days ago, President Truman indicated that he was seeing the light, for he announced that he favored full production. I do not know whether he made this announcement with the approval of Wallace and Bowles, but chances are he made it without consulting them. If the President is sincere in his announcement, I shall be delighted. If he adopts the program advocated by the Republicans and if he carries such a program through faithfully and loyally, he will bring relief to the producers and processors of food and will do the consumers a great favor by providing them with adequate food supplies through legitimate channels. The OPA has by its tyranny threatened and abused the people shamefully. The black markets are the result of OPA's unwise theories and unreasonable administration.

I wish to comment briefly on another very interesting topic. A few days ago the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee issued a statement with reference to the planting of victory gardens for the coming season. The American people deserve great credit for their efforts through their victory gardens. I doubt whether many of them know just how important the victory gardens were in the food supply of the Nation. These gardens produced thousands of tons of food of all kinds. The statement to which I have referred showed how necessary it is going to be for the people of the Nation to plant and cultivate victory gardens this coming season. It is really more important than it was in past years. A discussion of victory gardens is of great interest to the people. The statement made by the Republican committee to which I have referred was commented upon very freely by many newspapers of the country. The following is an article which appeared on the front page of the Baltimore Sun of Sunday, February 17:

WARNING GIVEN OF SCARCITY IN CANNED GOODS—GOP STUDY GROUP HEAD TERMS CARRY-OVER STOCKS AT ALL-TIME LOW

(By William Knighton, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, February 16.—A warning that the Nation's stocks of canned foods is near an all-time low was made today by Representative JENKINS, of Ohio, chairman of the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee.

With the warning went the plea that victory gardening, which is estimated to produce 1,000,000 tons of foodstuffs a year, must be continued due to the short supply and, as Mr. JENKINS expressed it, "the desperate need of hungry people in other countries for all the food we can send them."

Quoting Department of Commerce figures, the committee chairman said that there will be only 16.7 percent of the normal carry-over supply of canned fruit at the beginning of the 1946 packing season.

49.3 PERCENT OF TOTAL

The canned vegetable figure is 49.3 percent of the 1940 total, which is considered a normal year.

From the 1945 total, the supply of vegetables will be down approximately 4 percent, and fruits will be 61.3 percent below last year.

There will be only 5 percent of the normal carry-over of canned tomatoes, the 1940 figure being 10,000,000 cases, against an estimated 500,000 cases for next year. The next lowest is lima beans, with only 9 percent of the normal carry-over on hand.

FAMILIES DEPEND HEAVILY

"The modern American family has come to depend heavily on canned fruits and vegetables for food," Mr. JENKINS pointed out. "This is also the only form in which many food products can be shipped abroad.

"In the face of the great need in other countries, we have now the comfortless knowledge that our commercial supplies of canned goods remaining at the end of the current winter season will be the lowest at any time since the Department of Commerce started keeping such figures 12 years ago.

"This means we will have to depend for canned goods next fall and winter almost entirely on the crop we expect to produce this year.

"Providence has blessed us for eight successive years with bountiful crops. Even with

these big crops, other obstacles such as shortages of labor and canning materials have made it difficult for the canners of the Nation to carry on to their utmost efficiency.

POSSIBILITY OF SHORTAGE

"There is no assurance that these conditions will improve this year. If they do not, and if we should have a poor crop, we will surely have a shortage of canned foods next winter.

"Government planners tell us there will be plenty of food next winter. But experience is a better guide than prophecy. Prudent consumers will be well advised to assure their own families of adequate fruit and vegetable supplies by producing and canning as much as they are able to at home.

"The time for planting victory gardens will soon be here. The planting season has already started in the deep South. This is the time to start preparations for making the home garden more productive than ever before."

The statement which brought forth the newspaper comment to which I have referred is as follows:

Stocks of canned fruits and vegetables are approaching an all-time low in the United States Victory gardens and home canning will therefore be more important than ever this coming spring and summer.

The quantity of food produced by victory gardens has been tremendous. It is estimated to amount to many thousands of tons a year. If that production were to stop, it would have a serious effect on commercial food supplies.

There are two reasons why it must not be abandoned this year. First, the fact that our stocks of commercially canned goods will be less than 50 percent of normal by the time this year's canning starts; second, the desperate need of hungry people in other countries for all the food we can send them.

The modern American family has come to depend heavily on canned fruits and vegetables for food. This is also the only form in which many food products can be shipped abroad.

In the face of the great need in other countries, we have now the comfortless knowledge that our commercial supplies of canned goods remaining at the end of the current winter season will be the lowest at any time since the Department of Commerce started keeping such figures 12 years ago.

According to estimates recently made by the Department of Commerce, the carry-over of commercially canned seasonal fruits and vegetables will be 16 percent smaller this year than it was in 1945, and 51 percent smaller than it was in 1940—the last year of normal supply. The carry-over is the quantity remaining in the hands of packers and distributors at the time the canning of the new crop begins.

The shortage will be most acute in canned fruits, with a carry-over 61 percent less than 1945, and 83 percent below 1940.

Canned fruit and vegetable juices will be only slightly below last year. But stocks of seasonal vegetables will be about 4 percent below last year and more than 50 percent less than a normal supply.

This means we will have to depend for canned goods next fall and winter almost entirely on the crop we expect to produce this year.

Providence has blessed us for eight successive years with bountiful crops. Even with these big crops, other obstacles such as shortages of labor and canning materials have made it difficult for the canners of the Nation to carry on to their utmost efficiency.

There is no assurance that these conditions will improve this year. If they do not, and if we should have a poor crop year, we will surely have a shortage of canned foods next winter.

Government planners tell us there will be plenty of food next winter. But experience is a better guide than prophecy. Prudent consumers will be well advised to assure their own families of adequate fruit and vegetable supplies by producing and canning as much as they are able to at home.

The time for planting victory gardens will soon be here. The planting season has already started in the deep South. This is the time to start preparations for making the home garden more productive than ever before.

The following table shows Government estimates of carry-over stocks of canned goods for this year, last year, and 1940, with percentage comparisons:

Carry-over stocks of fruit and vegetable products estimated by Department of Commerce

[Basis: Cases of 24 No. 2½ cans]

	Carry-over date	Carry-over at beginning of 1946 packs	Carry-over at beginning of 1945 packs	Carry-over at beginning of 1940 packs	Percentage of change of 1946 carry-over from years—	
					1945	1940
SEASONAL FRUITS						
Apples	Sept. 1	50,000	152,000	1,000,000	−67.1	−94.8
Applesauce	do	100,000	237,000	1,000,000	−57.8	−90.0
Apricots	June 1	300,000	1,167,000	1,300,000	−74.3	−76.9
Berries	do		62,000	500,000		
Cherries:						
Red pitted	July 1		49,000	800,000		
Other	June 1	100,000	118,000	600,000	−15.3	−83.3
Cranberries	Sept. 1	100,000	7,000	600,000	+1,328.6	−83.3
Figs	Aug. 1	100,000	126,000	100,000	−20.6	0
Grapefruit	Nov. 1	50,000		700,000		−92.9
Mixed fruits	June 1	500,000	1,083,000	2,000,000	−53.8	−75.0
Peaches	do	1,000,000	3,773,000	6,200,000	−73.5	−83.9
Pears	do	500,000	769,000	1,300,000	−35.0	−61.5
Pineapple	do	600,000	1,536,000	4,100,000	−60.9	−85.4
Plums and prunes	Sept. 1	200,000	215,000	800,000	−7.0	−75.0
Grapes	June 1					
Total		3,600,000	9,295,000	21,600,000	−61.3	−83.3
FRUITS AND VEGETABLE JUICES						
Total fruits and vegetable juices		12,700,000	13,057,000	12,800,000	−2.7	−0.8
SEASONAL VEGETABLES						
Asparagus	Apr. 1	200,000	462,000	1,000,000	−56.7	−80.0
Beans, green, and wax	May 1	4,200,000	5,002,000	3,400,000	−16.0	+23.5
Beans, lima	Aug. 1	100,000	135,000	1,200,000	−25.9	−91.7
Beets	July 1	3,000,000	2,052,000	1,300,000	+46.2	+130.8
Carrots	Aug. 1	500,000	725,000	800,000	−31.0	−37.5
Corn	do	2,200,000	2,418,000	7,100,000	−9.0	−69.0
Greens, leafy	Apr. 1	1,500,000	291,000	200,000	+415.5	+650.0
Mixed vegetables	July 1	300,000	342,000	800,000	−12.3	−62.5
Peas	June 1	5,000,000	2,925,000	8,700,000	+70.9	−42.5
Pumpkin and squash	Sept. 1	200,000	442,000	1,200,000	−54.8	−83.3
Spinach	Mar. 1	800,000	1,904,000	1,800,000	−58.0	−55.6
Tomatoes	July 1	500,000	2,585,000	10,000,000	−80.7	−95.0
Total		18,500,000	19,283,000	37,500,000	−4.1	−50.7
Grand total, all fruit and vegetable products		34,800,000	41,635,000	71,900,000	−16.4	−51.6

Sea Power and Its Meaning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 8 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address recently delivered by Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz, United States Navy, before the National Geographic Society, in Washington. The address is a very effective summation of sea power and its meaning.

An estimate from the Government Printing Office indicates that the manuscript of Admiral Nimitz' address will exceed by two-thirds of a page the two printed pages allowed under the rule and that the cost will be $138.80.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a pleasure for me to talk to you about an area of the world which is, I know, of particular interest to the members of the National Geographic Society. It is an area with which I have been rather intimately associated for the last 4 years. So, too, were many thousands of other Americans. Whatever else war may be, from a great crusade down to Sherman's definition, it is also a great teacher of geography.

Tonight, therefore, it is not inappropriate for me to review the recent events in the Pacific Ocean areas. That term embraces a great deal of ocean. It also includes a great deal of land. The Pacific is not a lonely ocean, as is the Atlantic. It is studded with constellations of islands. As we shall see, that was an important factor in carrying the American flag across the Pacific to Tokyo.

When Japan touched off its major war plans on December 7, 1941, it set forces in motion that spread northward to the Aleutians, eastward to Hawaii, to the south and southwest throughout Malaysia. For the first 6 months of the war the United Nations had to fight a retreating battle, until the perimeter of Japanese expansion was established at the battles of the Coral Sea and Midway. Thereafter the pattern of warfare saw the Japanese effort radiating outward from the home islands, while ours was a converging fight inward upon Japan in ever-concentrating strength.

Remember, the Pacific is so large an ocean that it could engulf all the land masses of the world and still leave a lot of water. It was necessary to place segments of the great, fan-shaped battle front under different, but coordinated, commands, according to the nature of the territory to be recaptured. My command was the Pacific Ocean areas, in which naval operations had to predominate. The operations under my command, however, were always strategically, and often tactically, related to those in the adjoining Southwest Pacific theater commanded by Gen. Douglas MacArthur, the China-Burma theater, and the East Indies station of the Royal Navy.

I shall not attempt to review all these operations. They are generally familiar to you all. I shall confine myself, rather, to some details of the final course of the war in my area of command.

You will remember that early in the last quarter of 1944 the converging forces under General MacArthur's and my own command were approaching the junction point at Leyte, in the southeast Philippines. In both theaters, large concentrations of Japanese forces had been isolated and neutralized on scores of islands by what has been described as leap-frog tactics. That is a picturesque if inexact description of the strategy of engulfment, of going over and around Japanese strongholds to pinch them off and let them wither on the broken vine of communications.

In the beginning of 1945, just about a year ago, we were in a position where we could choose both the time and place of attack. Your naval forces had brought about the capture of Guam, Saipan, and Tinian in the Mariana Islands. They had also acquired bases in Ulithi and the western Carolinas which neutralized such Japanese strongholds as Truk. We could base, stage, or support forces to strike in any direction, including the Japanese homeland. American seapower had won control of the Pacific to within 500 miles of the Japanese coast and was beginning to penetrate the China Seas.

Indeed, our submarines were virtually in control of those latter waters. The shipping lanes upon which Japan depended to feed her war machine with the loot of Asia were constantly patrolled by our submarines. Japanese tankers, troop ships, and merchantmen were being decimated.

Japan, in consequence, was on short rations. Human beings can accommodate themselves to a starvation diet for a long while, but they can't put ships and guns and airplanes on short rations. Here then is a historic demonstration of sea power. Everywhere the enemy fleet dared expose itself, it met superior forces and was driven farther back with irreparable losses. Our carrier-borne aircraft, and now from captured territory the big Army bombers, were searching out the enemy's ships and raining fire on his industry. His pipe lines of raw materials going into Japan, and processed materials outward bound, were punctured and soon to be cut.

We know now, from interviews with high-ranking Japanese officers and captured documents, that Japan had lost all hope of victory by the dawn of 1945. The most they could hope for was a stalemate. They over-optimistically based that hope on the fact that they had a large reserve of aircraft and that their ground armies were largely intact, well-armed, and of high morale. The war ended with those armies still intact, stunned by the Emperor's surrender. You see, they did not comprehend sea power. They had airplanes by the thousands, but no fuel to raise them from the ground because your Navy had severed Japan's oil lines. The remaining warships had not enough fuel to make a last desperate sortie.

But in January of 1945 we did not know that the war would be over before the middle of August. Maybe we did not ourselves know how good we were. Perhaps it was only sound caution. Anyhow, the central fact of January's operations was the invasion of Luzon, major Philippine island, by the combined forces under General MacArthur. The Pacific Fleet was heavily committed either in combat or transport, or as covering forces. In the latter function the fast carrier task force of the Third Fleet not only neutralized—and kept neutralized—enemy air strength in Formosa and northern Luzon but also made a sweep of the South China Sea.

This sweep resulted in the sinking of 40 enemy ships totaling 127,000 tons and damage to 22 ships displacing 70,000 tons. One hundred and eleven enemy planes were destroyed. The Third Fleet forces then demonstrated the impunity with which American sea power could operate by transiting the narrow straits between the Philippines and Formosa to attack Formosa, Hainan Island, and Hong Kong on January 15–16. The total damage done the enemy by these Third Fleet operations was 91 ships, totaling 293,900 tons sunk, 99 ships totaling 323,100 tons damaged, and 615 aircraft destroyed.

But there was more achieved than this material damage. From this time on no area outside of the immediate Japanese homeland and northern China was safe from assault by our carrier force. Even Japan itself was to feel the weight of carrier raids during the next month. The weakness of enemy air reaction in the entire region of the China Sea demonstrated that the area was wide open for future attack. Further, these successes were achieved in almost continuous bad weather. Once more our seagoing men had shown they could remain at sea and fight under the most adverse conditions. How they were able to do this is a thrilling story in itself, and presently, I shall relate it.

These operations could not be without cost to ourselves. The U. S. S. *Ticonderoga* took heavy damage from suicide attacks southeast of Formosa, and other ships suffered minor damage.

In January land-based aircraft from the Marianas continued heavy assaults on Iwo Jima and irregular and smaller attacks on the Bonin Islands. Likewise our surface forces twice bombarded Iwo Jima and the Bonins. Submarine interdiction continued at its successful high level. Our underwater forces sank 193,300 tons and damaged 95,850 tons of enemy shipping during this month.

In the latter part of January land-based aircraft began to operate effectively in the Philippines and the forces of the Pacific Fleet were freed for use in operations which had long been delayed. Heavy strikes on the main islands of Japan had been scheduled in the latter part of 1944 but had been postponed to support the Philippines situation. These plans were now put back into a place of first priority.

From this point forward until July, the fast carrier task force and related units gave a seagoing performance which, for endurance, ability to absorb punishment without deflection from the goal, and damage done to the enemy has no parallel in naval history. These operations came in three phases:

1. Support of the invasion of Iwo Jima.
2. Support of the invasion of Okinawa.
3. Preparation for final operations against Japan.

Being the largest ocean area over which single actions have ever been fought, the scope of this battle zone is difficult to appreciate without having been in it. It is hard to explain the difficulties involved in a battle whose interdependent movements take place simultaneously hundreds of miles apart. Yet that is precisely what occurred in each of the actions in 1945.

Early in February, heavy fleet forces began to bear down upon Iwo Jima. A group of heavy warships moved toward Iwo Jima to concentrate their huge firing power on the island. From the Marianas the heavy bombers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps shuttled in and out on daily schedules. And somewhere off Iwo Jima, within aerial striking distance, escort carriers of the Pacific Fleet were assembling.

All this activity burst upon the Japanese on February 16. On that date the fast carrier task force of the Fifth Fleet sent its aircraft against the mainland of Japan to destroy more than 500 enemy planes in 2 days of offensive action. Simultaneously, battleships, cruisers, and lesser units of the Pacific Fleet brought Iwo Jima under a bombardment which was not to cease until there were no targets left. And naval aircraft from the escort carriers, with land-based Army, Navy, and Marine planes, raked Iwo Jima fore and aft, day after day.

On February 19 began the land action which will be remembered as long as the war is remembered. The Fourth and Fifth Marine Divisions invaded the island, to be followed by elements of the Third Marine Division. It was a battle which lasted until the latter half of March. When Iwo Jima was won it gave the United States forces in the Pacific safety from air attacks on Marianas bases, an advance base and emergency landing field for heavy bombers and fighters operating against Japan, and a base to secure the flank of our routes westward.

While this operation was proceeding, our fast carrier task forces performed the dual function of immobilizing enemy air strength and preparing the way for the attack on the Okinawa group. Planes of the force struck the Tokyo area on February 25 and ranged southward to strike Okinawa and other islands of the Ryukyus on March 1. In the meantime, the B–29's of the Twentieth Air Force were making their devastating raids on Japanese cities.

This was truly the rolling offensive which we had begun in the Gilbert Islands in November 1943. Now it was about to reach its phase of greatest effect.

On March 18 and 19 our carrier task forces struck Kyushu airfields and inland sea bases, including the large naval establishment at Kure. Its 2-day strike cost the enemy more than 550 aircraft and resulted in sufficient damage to the remnants of the Japanese Fleet to reduce the possibility of serious surface interference in the impending Okinawa operations. On March 24 the fast battleships bombarded the coastlines of the Ryukyus and 2 days later Army troops began to make the preliminary landings in Kerama Retto. And on that date the Japanese learned that forces of the British Pacific Fleet, operating with the Fifth Fleet, were in action. British planes attacked the Sakishima group in the Ryukyus.

On March 28 the old battleships, which had long served so usefully in preinvasion bombardment, appeared off the coast of Okinawa and the enemy knew that his time there had come.

On April 1 the largest amphibious operation of the Pacific war began when the Tenth Army, composed of the Twenty-fourth Army Corps (Seventh, Twenty-seventh, Seventy-seventh, and Ninety-sixth Infantry Divisions) and the Marine Third Amphibious Corps (First Marine Division, Sixth Marine Division, and elements of the Second Marine Division) struck the western beaches of Okinawa. From this day until June 21, when organized resistance was broken, all operations in the Pacific Ocean areas centered on the Okinawa operation.

The battle was costly both to ourselves and the enemy. When it was over, the Japanese had lost about 4,000 aircraft. We had lost 36 ships sunk and 368 damaged, all of the ships sunk being light units. They had lost their most powerful battleship and most of the escorting force with it had been sunk or damaged. They had lost their 32d Army and more than 100,000 men. They had lost and we had won an island base large enough

to support large forces of Army, Navy, and Marine fighters, medium bombers, and heavy bombers. An island which provided seaplane bases for our search aircraft. An island whose harbors provided a repair base for our ships, a major staging base. A base which neutralized Formosa and nearby China, and put us on the threshold of Japan's front door.

The naval power of the United States had made good its promise to drive right through the central Pacific.

When land-based air on Okinawa became sufficiently strong in late June to protect our establishments, our task forces withdrew for rest and repair. Then began the memorable operations against the main islands of Japan by the Third Fleet, culminating in our battleships, cruisers, and destroyers shelling the coastlines of Honshu at Hokkaido at will.

I am convinced that the complete impunity with which the Pacific Fleet pounded Japan at pointblank range was the decisive factor in forcing the Japanese to ask the Russians to approach us for peace proposals in July.

Meanwhile, aircraft from our new fields in the Okinawa group were daily shuttling back and forth over Kyushu and Shokoku, and B–29's of the Twentieth Air Force were fire bombing major Japanese cities.

The pace and the fury were mounting and the Government of Japan, as its official spokesmen have now admitted, were looking for a way to end the war. At this point the Potsdam ultimatum was delivered and the Japanese knew their choice.

They were debating that choice when the atomic bomb fell on Hiroshima; they were debating that choice when the Soviet Union entered the war; they were debating that choice when our ships shelled installations within less than 100 miles of Tokyo.

And the nation which had been so arrogant asked for peace. Japan accepted our surrender terms and laid down her arms on August 15.

Symbolically, the planes of our fleet were over Japan at the hour the surrender was accepted. Our carrier pilots who had looked through the air sights at targets from Tarawa to Tokyo leveled off upon orders of the Third Fleet commander and flew back to the force. It was the only time the officers and men of the Pacific Fleet and Pacific Ocean areas failed to complete an assigned mission.

The atomic bomb merely hastened a process already reaching an inevitable conclusion, but I would have you remember that even that bomb was delivered by sea power to an airplane on an island captured by sea power, which flew with fuel supplied by sea power.

So, you may ask, What is sea power? We know how it works, what it is.

The factors in successful sea power are varied and complex. They arise from the fundamentals of our national strength. They include not only the weapons themselves, the ships and guns and airplanes, but the training and the talents to employ them successfully. As I never tire of pointing out, because I realize so few understand it, sea power has its roots deep in the core of our country. They draw nourishment from the farms and ranches that feed our men. They derive from our mines, our logging camps, our mills and factories. There is scarcely a village in the geographical center of the continent which does not contribute in some way to American sea power. This resource of strength was demonstrated by the manpower and industrial power which enabled your Navy to drive the enemy back upon his own shores, to throttle him, starve him, and literally to pin him to the shelltorn soil.

The way we used that productive strength was as vital as the fact of production. President Roosevelt, the two Secretaries of War and the Navy, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff must be given prime credit for the coordination of productivity at home and its expenditure on the enemy. But in the final application of organized American power, sea and land and air power, industrial and military, it was the strategy of duplicate command and servicing at sea that concentrated the whole effort. Duplicate command and servicing at sea brought to naval warfare in effect the principles of industrial mass production, the industrial production line.

Here is how they worked. Servicing at sea meant that our warships were physically able to operate continuously away from base—continuously. From all quarters of the country the railroads brought to the docksides of California, Oregon, and Washington the products of America's farms, factories, and oil fields.

There the matériel was loaded on ships which steamed in continuous procession to the forward combat areas of the Pacific. They met our fighting ships at sea and pumped them full of fuel oil, replenished their lockers with food and ammunition. The mail was delivered at sea. Mobile repair units patched up our damaged ships at sea, or in the lagoons of captured islands. The sick and wounded were transferred at sea to home-bound ships. Thus the maximum use of every ship and airplane was employed. They could be kept going on the only spot where fighting equipment is any good—where the fighting is. Servicing at sea doubled and tripled the effectiveness of your fleet.

It was a pace, however, that only inanimate machines could endure. The hands and brains that employed the machines had to have rest—a little rest—and time to study and plan new operations. That is where the principle of duplicate commands enters.

Now, you cannot plan an operation while conducting one, any more than you can whistle while eating soda crackers. And so we had one fleet commander and his staff at sea conducting an operation while another commander and his staff were ashore planning the next battle in which the identical ships would be employed. Admiral Halsey would be fighting the ships while Admiral Spruance was at Pearl Harbor or Guam working on plans. When Halsey came back, his mission accomplished, Spruance sailed forth. You see, we reversed the old stage-coach procedure and instead of changing horses we changed drivers. It had the Japanese crazy. They thought we had two identical fleets alternating at sea. What we had were alternating commands and an unbroken line of constant supply. That, ladies and gentlemen, is sea power in the application.

Those sources of supply were not exclusively material and physical. They were also intellectual. The all-over planning for the coordination of warfare on a global scale was the responsibility of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Combined Chiefs of Staff, who represented in the degree of their interest the ideas of the several members of the United Nations.

The whole war had to be fought as a whole. The effect of an operation in Europe or Africa had to be weighed in terms of effect upon the forces engaged in the Pacific. The directives I received from the Joint Chiefs were necessarily and pointedly brief. In other words, the directives gave the broad description of the strategy. The refinement and details of strategy and of tactics were of local responsibility.

Here the joint staff of the Pacific Fleet and the Pacific Ocean areas began to function. The boldness and imagination shown by this staff in execution of broad directives of strategy drove the war ahead at swift pace.

Now, joint staff work means just that—the joint workings of all fighting elements. On my staff I had not only Navy men and marines, but soldiers and Army airmen. The chief of my planning section was a Navy man, with an Army deputy and a marine and an Army Air Forces representative respectively in line. Chief of my intelligence was an Army officer, with a Navy man next in command. Operations was under a Navy officer, whose deputy was an Army officer, with the marines and Army Air to assist. Logistics, which is actually the science of the procurement of supplies, was under an Army officer, with Navy and marine assistants. All communications were under a naval officer, deputized by a marine and an Army man. Army, Navy, and marines, Air Forces and Coast Guard, they all not only worked together but they ate together and slept together.

Together we went to work to translate the directives from Washington into a battle plan, preparing an estimate of all possibilities, completing virtually all the intelligence work and most of the logistics. Then the plans were turned over to the alternate commander of the Third or Fifth Fleet for completion, discussion, and execution. Their execution is a matter of record. With boldness of planning went boldness of execution. It was teamwork such as has never before existed.

The enemy had no such teamwork. Germany, without concept of sea power, let the Wehrmacht dominate. Admiral Doenitz tells us now that the German Navy had plans for supersubmarines before the war which could fight submerged for 70 days and cruise around the world, but the Army would not grant priorities for their building. We asked the Japanese why they did not use their submarines against our supply lines. Their chief of naval operations replies that the Army insisted the submarines be used to carry supplies to the Army garrisons who were being starved by our own submarine warfare against the Jap surface ships.

But on our fighting teams, General Eisenhower and General MacArthur sought the counsel and advice of naval subordinates, even as I had Army and Army Air Force men on my team. The Joint Chiefs of Staff was a team of equals, where Army, Navy, and Air Forces met, planned, discussed, weighed, and made decisions based on teamwork, free from domination of any one service. And of the teamwork that existed on the home front, I have profound admiration and gratitude.

The war ended only 5 months ago. It already seems remote to most of us. But in that short time the demobilization program has reduced our victorious fleet almost to impotency. Only the fact that nobody threatens our security today allows me to contemplate the state of our Navy with some degree of equanimity. Inspired by the record of that Navy in keeping war from America and making it possible to defeat our enemies on their own soil, I hope our present weakness is but transitory. I hope it will never again become a habit. A few days ago I described to the managing editors of the Associated Press newspapers my concept of a sturdy, independent American sea power as a guarantor of peace—not only peace for the United States but for the world. If I can sum up that speech for you in one sentence, I believe that no second Tojo or imitator of Hitler will start a new war of world conquest if he must confront an already prepared United States, and for a maritime nation there is no defense superior to an efficient combination of sea and air power.

My attempt tonight has been to give you both perspective and focus on the achievement of our victory, particularly in the Pacific. I have tried to give you a look at the progress and the effect of combat as I saw it myself. And now I invite you actually to look upon some of the scenes of the war at sea, in motion pictures. I am most grateful to the National Geographic Society for this opportunity to report to you all, "Mission accomplished."

Misleading Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 21, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the recent strikes and before the general public heard a great deal about a substandard wage, excessive corporation profits, the cost of living, the ability to pay, unions and corporations through page advertisements gave figures and what they called facts, but, because of conflicting statements, many of us were unable to learn the truth. As an illustration there was printed in the Washington Post of January 22, 1946, the following:

WHY BILL MASTRIANI IS ON STRIKE

"I've worked for GE in Schenectady for 23 years. Have a wife and two small kids to support. Even during the war we couldn't live decently on what GE pays because of the rise in prices. And now the company has cut us down until we can't live on what we're making. I work as an aluminum molder but the rates are so low my pay is $38.40 [1] for a full week's work. I'm on strike for a $2-a-day increase, for a living wage."

This represents Bill Mastriani's pay for 1 week's work (for services period ending December 13, 1945):

Gross earnings	$23.04
Deductions:	
Federal withholding tax	.30
Additional insurance	.27
Additional pension	.92
St. Clare Hospital	.50
Net pay	21.05

WAGES

The 200,000 men and women of the General Electric Co., Westinghouse Corp., and General Motors (electrical division) are on strike today for a living wage.

The average General Electric and Westinghouse employee is paid less than $40 a week wages (before tax and other deductions).

General Electric and Westinghouse pay their vast number of women employees wages averaging less than $26 for a full week's work.

General Motors employees—earning less than a living wage—are on strike to win their $2-a-day wage demand.

For 4 months up to the day before the strike, Westinghouse employees submitted their request for a $2-a-day wage increase. Yet Westinghouse refuses to make any wage offer whatsoever and asks, "What is there to negotiate?"

For 3 months General Electric employees submitted similar wage proposals. But it was not until they voted overwhelmingly for strike action in a Government poll that General Electric submitted its inadequate 10-percent offer, conditioned on speeding up its employees and cutting wage rates.

Despite the urgent needs of their employees and the sharp rise in the cost of living, none of these companies has bargained in good faith with its employees. Both have canceled their union contract in an attempt to destroy the union.

General Electric, Westinghouse, and General Motors—immensely wealthy corporations—can pay the $2-a-day wage increase asked by their employees.

Low wages can only lead to hard times, unemployment, and depression.

UNITED ELECTRICAL, RADIO AND MACHINE WORKERS OF AMERICA, CIO,
ALBERT J. FITZGERALD, *General President.*
JULIUS EMSPAK,
General Secretary-Treasurer.
JAMES J. MATLES,
Director of Organization.
NEW YORK, N. Y.

Then to my office under date of February 15, 1946, from General Electric came the following memorandum on the Washington Post advertisement, which reads as follows:

MEMORANDUM ON WASHINGTON POST ADVERTISEMENT

In the attached advertisement sponsored by the UERMWA, a GE worker says that he is on strike for a living wage. He says "Even during the war we couldn't live decently on what GE paid." To support his statement, a copy of his pay check for the week ending December 13, 1945, is published in the advertisement.

Here are the facts:

For the four war years he was paid the following amounts by General Electric:

1942	$3,138.76
1943	3,111.75
1944	2,833.74
1945	3,364.82

He was paid these amounts in spite of the fact that he spent several hours a week on union activities for which he was presumably paid additional amounts by the union. This time, taken from his regular working schedule because he is a union representative, amounted to 227 hours in 1945—more than 4 hours a week.

During the week for which his pay check is shown, he worked for General Electric only 24 hours out of his regular 40-hour working schedule. He worked 15.3 hours for the union.

This is what happened to the employee named in this advertisement during the reconversion period following the end of the war. His wartime job disappeared as a result of contract cancellations about November 12, 1945. As was his right under the union contract as a union representative, he declined a transfer to another department on a piece-work job for which he was experienced, which was offered him on December 20, and on which the average earnings of other experienced men exceeded $1.25 an hour. Instead he took the best job available in his old department—tool room mechanic, class B, a job for which he had little previous experience. The breaking-in rate of this job was 88 cents an hour, but he was paid the full job rate of 96 cents an hour as a result of negotiations with the union.

On January 8, 1946, 2 weeks before the union advertisement was published, he accepted an assignment in another department. This assignment is on spot welding, a piecerate job. The recent average earnings of 12 others on this work is $1.32 an hour. So, if he has the same ability, he will be earning $52.80 for a 40-hour week. With the 10 percent wage increase offered our employees, this would be increased to $58.06 a week, a rate of more than $3,000 a year, plus profit sharing, paid vacations, insurance, and other benefits, and an opportunity to further increase his earnings by overtime work.

Apparently Bill Mastriani, in the ad paid for by his union, told the truth when he wrote his pay for one week's work for General Electric was $23.04, but it is just as evident that Bill either forgot or deliberately neglected to state that during the week he worked but 24 hours for General Electric while working 13.3 hours for the union.

When I read Bill's ad, I felt mighty sympathetic and thought General Electric was most unfair to pay either so low a wage or to provide so little employment for an old employee. I don't know now whether Bill gets adequate pay for the work he does, but I do have the figures from General Electric to show that he had an opportunity for a job at $1.25 per hour and they state that if he worked 40 hours a week on the job that is open to him and if he has ability equal to the average, he would be getting $52.80 for 40 hours' work and that with the recent increase, he would be receiving $58.06 for 40 hours' work.

Whether that is enough or whether it is too little for what he does, I have no way of knowing, but I do know that it is a whole lot more than the $23.04 which his ad led me to believe was all he could make during 1 week.

I do know that his ad, when read with the explanation of General Electric, will make me look with not a little suspicion on other ads put out by the union.

[1] Combined GE-Westinghouse wartime profits alone: $424,000,000. Combined GE-Westinghouse reserves: $398,000,000.

The Loan in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

THE LOAN IN CONGRESS

President Truman has at last sent the Keynes-Clayton British loan agreement to Congress for action.

It is now up to Congress to decide whether the United States is to make a gift to Great Britain of $30,900,000,000.

This figure is composed as follows:

Twenty-five billion dollars of lend-lease balances is forgiven by the United States.

Three billion seven hundred fifty million dollars is to be lent to England outright.

One billion five hundred million dollars approximate interest charges paid by the United States over and above the interest charges paid by the British.

Six hundred fifty million dollars loaned to purchase American surplus war stocks now in Great Britain from the United States.

Actual cash in this loan transaction is $3,750,000,000. This amount the British do not have to spend in the United States. They can spend it anywhere they please.

Whatever Congress does about this loan fixes a pattern which must, if this country is not to show preferences, be applied to all our allies. It certainly will apply to Soviet Russia, China, France, Poland, Greece, and lots of other countries.

It is a device for siphoning off the wealth, the raw materials, the food supplies and the productive labor of the United States.

It is making America pay for the war in peace as this country had been paying for it in war.

The President's most telling argument in favor of this loan is:

"The most important of these facts is that the United Kingdom as a result of the war must continue for a long period many of its emergency wartime financial controls unless it obtains additional working capital."

But since VJ-day Great Britain has imposed even more stringent controls.

Giving Winston Churchill the Order of the Boot, the British elected a labor government, which entered upon a career of nationalization, which is a fancy word for socialism. They plan to socialize their principal industries and they plan to do it with American money.

President Truman is honest in his statement that if socialism fails in England, they can default on their interest payments to America. This is what he says:

"We have recognized that conditions may exist temporarily during such a long period of time which would make the payment of interest on such a large amount difficult if not impossible. Accordingly provision has been made for the waiver of interest by the United States Government * * * it is not to our advantage to press for payment of interest when payment is impossible and thus force default and a crushing of international economic relations."

In plain English, the United States holds the bag. If the great British experiment with socialism succeeds, 5 years after the loan is made they begin to pay interest. If their experiment in socialism fails, the United States waives the interest.

This is a monument to vulgar hypocrisy. No matter how you read the agreement, the United States is making a gift of $30,900,000,000 to our cousins across the seas. We made a similar but smaller gift after the last war.

Why not call it a gift? Why not wrap it in tinselled paper, with red and green ribbons, and label it "From Uncle Sam to John Bull, via Santa Claus."

The Ultimate Basis of World Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER H. GROSS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1946

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a sermon by a young country preacher, the pastor of the Quickel's Lutheran Charge, the Reverend Emmanuel James Hoover, of York, Pa. His sermon, entitled "The Ultimate Basis of World Brotherhood," has been published in the February issue of Pulpit magazine, and I believe it should be more widely read. It follows:

THE ULTIMATE BASIS OF WORLD BROTHERHOOD

(By Emmanuel J. Hoover)

"Marvel not, my brethren, if the world hate you. We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren. He that loveth not his brother abideth in death. Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer: and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him. Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us; and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren. But whoso hath this world's goods, and seeth his brother in need, and shutteth up his heart of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him? My little children, let us not love in word, neither in tongue, but in deed and in truth." (I John 3: 13-18.)

Were a visitor from the planet Mars to visit our earth this morning, he would inquiringly wonder what we mean by the term "brother." He would listen to our dictionary definition of the term, but he would look almost in vain to see the genuine conditions of the term at work in human living. He would find this same condition to be true in regard to many of the other noble words which we glibly take for granted, but for whose incorporation into daily living we do so little. Hence our visitor from Mars would return to his home planet more bewildered and confused than when he first set foot upon the earth.

Brotherhood is the crying need of our day; it has been the crying need of every age in mankind's progress. But the necessity for brotherhood is crying a thousand times more loudly today than in any preceding age. And it is the Christian leaven, the church, which alone can supply the tenets for the kind of brotherhood which will make for peace and order and continual alinement in the world. Conditions have so widely separated people in our day, and material progress has so closely drawn people together that we must ask the same question which Malachi asked his people 2,500 years ago: "Have we not all one father? Hath not one God created us all? Why then do we deal treacherously, every man against his brother, profaning the covenant of our fathers?"

Had our visitor from Mars visited the earth during the first century of our Christian era and had he met the writer of the First Epistle of John, he would have returned to his distant planet with a picture in his mind of at least one man who believed deeply in the urgent necessity of the practice of brotherhood. While our textual passage is directed mainly to the Christians of the first and second generations, it has a vital message for our entire world and civilization in this day of chaos and transition. This message from John gives to us the cardinal principles on which Christian and world brotherhood alone can be successfully constructed.

I

In the first place, John says that the citizens of the world must learn to live together as brethren in the practice of love. These are his words: "Marvel not, my brethren, if the world hate you. We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren. He that loveth not his brother abideth in death." The terrible necessity of love is the foundation stone of all genuine brotherhood. Love is an old, old theme, but an ever new and necessary principle of life. Love is the marvelous factor which holds the world together in whatever semblance of brotherhood there may now exist in the world.

Throughout the New Testament the Christian is continually admonished to the practice of love in daily living. The teachings of Christ are unique in the emphasis they place on love, revealing the depths of God's love which becomes the example of man's love of man. Here the New Testament makes its strongest demands upon men: "If a man say I love God, and hateth his brother, that man is a liar." Or, again, hear that statement of the Master himself: "How canst thou say to thy brother: Brother, let me pull out the mote in thine eye, when, behold, there is a beam in thine own eye? Thou hypocrite!" Here, then, we find no evasion whatsoever of the requirement of love in the life of the Christian believer; here is presented a demand which has no loopholes, a demand which is unalterably expected of true followers of Christ, no matter in what age.

It is the Christian who alone has the great secret of life, and if our world is ever to achieve continual peace and brotherhood it must follow the Christian way of achieving this priceless possession. The individual Christian must then say to the world, as Christ says to the individual Christian: "Follow Me; follow Me in the daily practice of love for My fellowmen." The nations of the world and the rulers of the nations need to learn the urgent necessity of injecting the practice of love into mankind's dealings with one another. So long as love does not warm the hearts of the rulers of the world, so long will the world remain in the estate of death. But when once nations and the people thereof learn to love one another, then indeed will the world pass from death unto life; and the nation which refuses to love its brother nation will but continue to abide in death. And abiding in the estate of death will mean for that nation naught but sorrow and pain, struggle and conflict, and in the end hopeless annihilation.

Kagawa has called love the first law of life, and I believe that it is out of that same foun of inspiration that our epistle writer begins with love. Love must always come first, but it must be buttressed and undergirded by other fundamentals. Our world, then, in the building of brotherhood must begin with the practice of love. And in beginning there, we will be but following the example of Christ, of whom John Oxenham sings:

"In Christ there is no east or west,
In Him no south or north;
But one great fellowship of love
Throughout the whole wide earth."

II

In the second place, John says that we must learn to live together as brethren in the practice of forgiveness. These are his words: "Whoso hateth his brother [which is refusing to forgive his brother] is a murderer, and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him." Or, again, hear that statement of the Master: "If thou bringest thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar; and go thy way. First be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift." Here again we see no evasion whatsoever of the New Testament teaching that Christians who would live together in brotherhood must practice forgiveness. So strong is this emphasis upon the necessity of forgiveness among men in the New Testament that it becomes the prelude to God's forgiveness. "If ye from your hearts forgive not every man his trespasses, neither will your Heavenly Father forgive you your trespasses." The practice of forgiveness is, then, the second step of the Christian in the way of living at peace with all men.

By the same principle, forgiveness becomes the second step which the nations of the world must take if they are to live at peace with each other. No time in human history has afforded more incentive for the practice of revenge than our present moment in world history; but that fact makes the necessity of our practice of forgiveness all the more urgent. This world goes forward, not on the basis of vengeance among nations, but upon the foundation of mutual helpfulness and intelligent good will and mutual helpfulness and intelligent good will always begin with genuine forgiveness. The Christian church needs to say loudly today that we can never achieve a just and lasting peace until the nations and the rulers of the world learn the Christian experience of forgiveness. And that demand is especially incumbent upon those who have won the military victory.

The story is told that during the First World War, in the ruins of a little town near the Yser River in Belgium, every night two little Belgian children crept out to say their prayers at a wayside shrine. One night as Jacques and Marcelle were out there praying the Lord's Prayer, Jacques stopped praying when they came to the fifth petition: "And forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those that trespass against us." He stopped and cried out in sobs: "I cannot forgive the Germans; I cannot forgive the Germans." But just then a tall figure stepped out from behind the ruins and kneeling down beside Jacques he said: "I will finish your prayer for you—forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us." Then,

rising from prayer, he disappeared into the darkness, but not before the sentry on guard nearby had recognized him as King Albert of the Belgians. Such a spirit on the part of the world's rulers would do more for brotherhood than all armies and navies.

Forgiveness requires that, insofar as possible, we dismiss from our minds and intentions the tendency of the human heart to repay evil with evil. But in this world of "likes" and "opposites" we find that it is always the "opposites" which win the victory. Darkness never drives out darkness; it takes light to do that! Ignorance never drives out ignorance; it takes intelligence and education to do that! Poverty never drives out poverty; it takes charity and social action to do that! So, with evil: evil never drives out evil; goodness alone can do that! And, you see, forgiveness always requires that we employ goodness, kindness, charity, and mutual helpfulness to destroy whatever evil there may be in the world which disrupts genuine brotherhood. And when we begin to practice forgiveness in such a genuine spirit as that, our world will heartily join with John Addington Symonds in the foretelling of a better day:

"These things shall be: a loftier race
Than e'er the world hath known, shall rise
With flame of freedom in their souls,
And light of knowledge in their eyes.

"They shall be gentle, brave and strong,
To spill no drop of blood, but dare
All that may plant man's lordship firm
On earth, and fire, and sea and air.

"Nation with nation, land with land,
Unarmed shall live as comrades free;
In every heart and brain shall throb
The pulse of one fraternity.

"New arts shall bloom of loftier mold,
And mightier music fill the skies;
And every life shall be a song,
When all the earth is paradise."

III

In the third place, John says that we must learn to live together as brethren in the practice of service to one another. These are his words: "Hereby perceive we the love of God, because He laid down His life for us, and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren." To lay down our lives for the brethren is to render the highest possible service to our fellow men. Such service is but the outpouring of a great love. Jesus said: "Greater love hath no man than this: that a man lay down his life for his friends." And again, it was Jesus Himself who told us that He was among us as one who served. His life was service incarnate. His most beautiful parable of the Good Samaritan became the theme song of all His days, and He forever kept reminding His disciples that the man who liveth unto himself, dieth unto himself. St. Paul and the other apostles caught this spirit of Christ as they exhorted the Christians to be of service: "Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfill the whole will and law of Christ."

Even the most casual reading of the New Testament will not let us escape the conclusion that one of the great demands upon the Christian is to be of service in the world. Put into simple words it is this: If God has served us, should we not serve one another? And our service should not be limited, but rather boundless—even to the point of laying down of life itself. Such strong words coming from the New Testament make the necessity of serving a fundamental requirement among believers. The story of the lives of great saints has always been one of service; the greater the saint, the greater the service which he rendered. From Stephen to Father Damien on the Isle of Molaki; from St. Paul to Martin Luther and on to Kaj Munk—the story of the saints of all ages is the story of men and women who put no limitation on the service which they could render their fellow men and their God.

Thus it is that the Christian saints from generation to generation have introduced into this world what little of good will and peace there is here. They are our pioneers, telling us in the words of the Master that he who would be chief among us must be the servant of all. The rendering of service, then, is the third fundamental tenet of the Christian's philosophy of a peaceful life.

And now again, in the establishing of a peaceful world, the nations have no better blueprint to consult than the one which includes the genuine element of real service. Any other blueprint will reveal in the end that the house of peace which is built upon other specifications will but collapse for want of this spiritual buttress of service. Our world desperately needes a revival of the performance of the small acts of neighborly kindness which will issue in great deeds of international cooperation. The call for genuine Christian service is great today, and woe unto the nation or the world which does not heed that call.

This devastating war through which we have passed has made us greatly aware of the fact that our world is but a medium-sized community and neighborhood. We see more clearly than ever before that with each passing generation and its technological improvements the demands of the Christian faith become all the more imperative and fundamental. For the salvation of the world in a material sense, these Christian demands are more necessary now than ever before in the whole history of mankind. Truly Jesus is, as Dr. Horton calls Him, "Our Eternal Contemporary." O nations of the world, refuse to serve one another, and in another decade you will needs again be at one another's throats.

IV

Finally, John says that the practice of sharing is the crowning witness of the genuineness of one's love, of one's forgiveness, and of one's service. These are his words: "But whoso hath this world's goods, and seeth his brother in need, and shutteth up his heart of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him? My little children, let us not love in word, neither in tongue, but in deed and in truth." Here John is saying that "love in action, or Christian charity, is the final test of the confession of love which the believer may make." As John wrote this marvelous passage of Scripture, he may have been thinking of a beautiful story in which the Master once told of a Samaritan who on the road from Jerusalem to Jericho shares his goods with a foreigner who had been beaten and robbed and had been thrown into the gutter along the road.

Our Master's life was sharing incarnate. Jesus' heart of compassion always prompted Him to share what He had with those who in misfortune evoked the compassion. It is this heart of compassion which is the Christian church's secret as regarding its ministry of mercy, and it is a heart of compassion which makes a Christian more like his Master than any other trait. The true Christian never shuts up his heart of compassion when he sees genuine need, and it is his compassionate heart more than anything else which will bind the Christian to his fellow men and ultimately the fellow men to the Christian.

Here, again, our world could learn much wisdom from the tenets of the Christian way of life. Our world should see the urgency of compassionate hearts in the lives of rulers and nations. The widespread devastation in Europe and Japan is calling for mercy and relief; if the nations who have this world's goods shut up their hearts of compassion as they look out and see the world's need, how can the rule of God, which is the rule of peace, ever come upon the face of the earth? We hear much talk about the world's needs, but we see so very little action. John tells us that we should stop talking about it in words and get busy doing something about it in deeds.

As starvation and devastation face many of our brethren in Europe this winter, the Christian voice in speaking for peace and brotherhood says to gouging and prosperous America, "Share! Share!" And unless we hear that call and obey it we have lost the victory, even though on the surface we may have gained it.

When our world really begins to share in the best sense of the word, we will find that greed and selfishness, which find their zenith in war, will be rendered a decisive and damaging blow.

This, then, is the present-day challenge to our individual Christianity—the challenge to learn to live together as brethren in the practice of love, in the practice of forgiveness, in the practice of service to one another, and in sharing our material possessions with those who have not. But individual Christianity is not an isolated factor which exists all to itself; genuine individual Christianity in its functioning reaches out into all the world and eventually attains a world-wide influence.

Let us pray in these tragic days that that world-wide influence of our Christian living and faith may be felt among the nations of the world before it be forever too late. To that end, let us prayerfully think with the unknown poet who has given us these inspiring lines:

"One knelt within a world of care
And sin, and lifted up his prayer:
'I ask Thee, Lord, for health and power
To meet the duties of each hour;
For peace from care, for daily good,
For life prolonged and filled with good.'
But as he prayed, lo! at his side
Stood the thorn-crowned Christ, and sighed:
'O blind disciple—came I then
To bless the selfishness of men?
My gift is sacrifice; My blood
Was shed for human brotherhood—
Come, leave thy selfish hopes, and see
The birthright of humanity!
Spend and be spent, yearn, suffer, give,
And in thy brethren learn to live.'"

Veterans' Preference in Purchase of Surplus Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1946

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following bill:

A bill relating to veterans' preference in purchasing surplus property suitable for residential purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That as used in this act—

(a) The term "chairman" means the chairman of the board of directors of the War Assets Corporation or the officer, employee, or agency of the United States to which his functions with respect to surplus residential property are transferred.

(b) The term "residential property" means (1) any property consisting of land, together with any fixtures and improvements thereon, located within the District of Columbia, which is suitable for residential purposes, and (2) any war housing, whether located within or outside of the District of Columbia.

(c) The term "surplus residential property" means residential property which has been determined under section 11 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, to be surplus property and is classified by the chairman as suitable for residential purposes.

(d) The term "public notice" means notice given as required by regulations prescribed under section 11 (e) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended.

(e) The term "veteran" means (1) any individual in the active military or naval service of the United States during the present war, (2) any individual who served in the active military or naval service of the United States on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, and who has been discharged or released therefrom under honorable conditions, or (3) any corporation, partnership, firm, association, or other entity either wholly composed of individuals described in clauses (1) and (2) or wholly owned or controlled by such individuals.

(f) The terms "Government agency," "owning agency," "disposal agency," "property," "State," and "war housing" have the same meaning as when used in the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended.

SEC. 2. Whenever any surplus residential property is to be disposed of other than to Government agencies or to States or their political subdivisions or instrumentalities as provided in sections 12 and 13 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, veterans shall be granted a preference in the purchase of such property over nonveterans in accordance with the provisions of this act.

SEC. 3. Surplus residential property shall be subdivided into the appropriate units in which the Chairman deems it should be disposed of, giving due consideration to the character of the property and the objectives of this act to provide preferences in purchases thereof to veterans.

SEC. 4. (a) Veterans shall be given 60 days after public notice within which to signify in writing an intention to acquire any unit of surplus residential property which is offered for sale. The sales price shall be at the reasonable value in a normal market as determined by an appraisal as provided in section 5.

(b) If after signifying an intention to acquire any unit of surplus residential property a veteran declines to purchase it at the appraised value or is unable to meet the terms of the sale public notice shall be given offering the unit for sale to other veterans at the price fixed by the appraisal. Such public notice shall specify a reasonable time within which any veteran may apply for the purchase of such unit at the price so fixed.

(c) Units of surplus residential property not sold to veterans under subsection (a) or (b) may be disposed of to nonveterans, but no such unit shall be disposed of to any nonveteran upon terms more favorable than the terms under which the unit has been offered to veterans.

(d) The terms of the sale of any unit of surplus residential property to any veteran under subsection (a) or (b) shall include provisions requiring that in the case of any resale of such property during the 10-year period beginning on the date of the sale the property will first be offered for resale to veterans at not more than the reasonable value in the normal market as determined by an appraisal as provided in section 5. Except as provided in this section sales to veterans under this act shall be upon such terms as the Chairman may prescribe.

SEC. 5. Units of surplues residential property offered for sale shall be appraised by an appraiser selected by the disposal agency or other prospective seller and an appraiser selected by the prospective veteran buyer or, in case of disagreement of the two appraisers so selected, by an appraiser jointly selected by the first two appraisers. The determination of what constitutes a reasonable value in a normal market shall be based upon reasonable values during the period beginning January 1, 1937, and ending December 31, 1939.

New York Times Calls Attention to OPA's Counterfeit Remedies for Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 21, 1946

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including an editorial from the New York Times of February 20, 1946, entitled "Mr. Bowles' Remedies."

In this connection, I am constrained to point out what may be the most tragic misuse of power of which the OPA is guilty.

The seemingly irresistible OPA propaganda machine could be used to inform the people of America that only a balanced Budget can truly prevent inflation. In this fashion, OPA could use its power to encourage the President and Congress to balance the Budget.

Instead, the OPA has used its propaganda to conceal the ravages of reckless spending, and to make the people believe that price control prevents inflation.

The New York Times editorial follows:

MR. BOWLES' REMEDIES

Mr. Bowles' introductory statement before the House Banking and Currency Committee began, correctly enough, by declaring that "It would be difficult to exaggerate the gravity of the inflationary crisis we face." Unfortunately, however, he did not once mention during his statement the basic cause of inflation—the increase in money and bank credit in the country since the outbreak of the war and the continued budget deficit and Government financing policies that must in the long run increase that money and bank credit further.

Mr. Bowles did mention some of the contributory causes of high commodity prices. He mentioned the shortage of goods. He correctly pointed out that: "It is, of course, expanding production which will bring us to the point where price, rent, and wage controls can be dropped." He mentioned the unprecedented recent wage increases that the administration has encouraged and approved; but to these he also gave his own approval. Why, then, does he believe that "everywhere the inflationary pressures have reached explosive proportions"? The chief trouble, in his judgment, seems to be psychological. "A speculative fever has taken hold of the country." Mr. Bowles' main concern seems to be the speculators, the profiteers, the "now I want mine" boys.

Obviously, however, these groups are only symptomatic. The speculators and profiteers are always with us. Surely there were as many people in 1932, say, as there are now who would have bought stocks or commodities if they thought they were going up, or businessmen who would have raised their prices if they thought they could get more. What we have to examine are the basic conditions which make it possible for people to sell at such high prices today. "Speculation" is the registering thermometer, accurate or inaccurate; but it is not the temperature itself.

It is because Mr. Bowles' analysis concerns itself with the symptoms of inflation and not with the basic causes that he has nothing to offer but continued drastic controls of the American economy. He asks for a renewal of all the wartime controls "without amendment." But we cannot cure inflation until we deal with its basic causes. These causes lie in governmental financial policy itself. Government wage and price control is a temporary expedient that has such serious potentialities for harm that it should be discontinued at the earliest possible moment. The real task before the administration and Congress is to put the Government's fiscal affairs in order.

The National Housing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 21 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD four editorials dealing with the national housing situation, one from the New York Times of February 12, one from the Washington Post, of February 17, one from the Wall Street Journal of February 15, and one from the Baltimore Sun of February 14.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of February 12, 1946]

HOUSING PROGRAM

Wilson Wyatt, Housing Expediter, has prepared a comprehensive program designed to start construction of 700,000 low- and moderate-cost homes by the end of next year. A large proportion of these houses will be prefabricated or assembled on site from prefabricated parts and materials. To achieve this record-breaking production the program aims at a tripling of the number of workers engaged in the building industry and a large expansion in the production of materials. As an integral part of the program Mr. Wyatt proposes the payment of subsidies to obtain a larger supply of materials and to compensate for higher wages; extension of credit by insuring mortgages on low-cost homes to the extent of 90 percent of current costs rather than on long-term economic values; the fixing of prices of old houses, new houses, and housing sites; stimulation of technical research, and extension of authority for priorities and allocations until December 31, 1947.

There can be little quarrel with the desirability of the goal set in this program. There is serious question, however, whether the program can get us there. Although our present problem is too much demand for housing, a further easing of the terms on which houses can be bought, including a lowering of the interest rate, is proposed. Such a development inevitably would accentuate the present unbalance between supply and demand of housing. The same result is bound to follow if we attempt the impossible task of controlling the prices of both new and old houses.

Although the program is designed to prevent a further rise in prices, with its inflationary effects, subsidies of $600,000,000 are proposed. Such subsidies will add to the inflationary pressure already present to a serious degree in our economy. Moreover, by suggesting that "where it is absolutely

necessary, wage increases will be cared for by premium payments in order to stimulate maximum production," the gates would be opened for one of the most dubious of the current inflationary proposals. In this connection, too, it is difficult to understand why the taxpayer must be called upon to subsidize the purchasers of these new homes.

Moreover, this program, with its emphasis upon additional controls, ignores the great incentive provided by profits in overcoming serious shortages. New housing facilities are urgently required. Mr. Wyatt calls this a bold and realistic plan. It would be less bold but more realistic to give greater attention to the role that greater incentives in the form of less Government control can play in overcoming our housing shortage. A relaxation of some price ceilings might add to the individual housing bill, but the alternative of subsidies adds more to the taxpayers' bill and seems less likely to achieve results.

[From the Washington Post of February 17, 1946]

WYATT HOUSING PLAN

Wilson W. Wyatt, the administration's new housing dynamo, has been a very busy man in the last 5 weeks. In that brief period he has outlined a bold, forward-looking, and comprehensive program to meet the housing crisis. "Our sights must be raised," he says, "far above the present target of four or five hundred thousand homes in 1946." He courageously calls for 2,700,000 dwelling units to be put under construction in the next 2 years. In our opinion, this sort of dynamic leadership is necessary to pull the building industry out of its semimoribund state and prepare it for its new responsibilities.

The magnitude of the housing problem stands out with shocking clarity from Mr. Wyatt's report. More than 1,200,000 families were living "doubled up" last October. The situation is rapidly becoming worse because of the great increase in families demanding homes. Even if we can build 3,000,000 homes in 1946 and 1947 through an all-out effort, more than a million families will still have to live with relatives or friends. Here is ample indication that Mr. Wyatt's program is not too ambitious in the number of units sought.

To carry out that program will require some sweeping adjustments. The volume of building materials to be produced in 1947 will have to be increased eightfold over the output of 1945. The present labor force engaged in residential construction will have to be multiplied by three. Of course, there will also have to be an enormous increase in manpower at work in factories producing building materials. Mr. Wyatt's program calls for the revival of many closed plants that used to produce brick, lumber, plumbing fixtures, and so forth, the conversion of war plants to the manufacture of building supplies, and construction of new plants, with special allowance for more rapid-than-usual amortization for tax purposes.

It naturally follows that nonresidential building which is not absolutely necessary will have to be sharply curtailed. The Wyatt program would concentrate most of the Nation's building capacity in the production of housing units to cost not more than $6,000 and rent for not more than $50. It is this type of home that is in greatest demand by returning veterans, and, for that matter, by other families now clamoring for housing within reach of moderate incomes.

The most controversial feature of the Wyatt program is his call for $600,000,000 in subsidies to stimulate the production of building materials and hasten the development of new products. We fully recognize the necessity for stimulation of the building materials industries. That is the first essential of any realistic large-scale home-building program. We are loath, however, to see a heavy draft on the Treasury for this purpose. Payment of such subsidies during the war was justified on the ground that they made possible the production of essential materials in high-cost plants or mines without raising the general price level. We do not think the same argument can be reasonably advanced now for the stimulation of a peacetime building industry.

It is true, of course, that the building industry is suffering from a wartime hangover. But it is not a temporary spurt of construction activity that we need. Large-scale production of houses and many other types of buildings will be necessary for at least 10 years to overcome the shortages accumulated during the war. If this industry is to expand on a sound basis, it must be assured of a reasonable relationship between costs and prices during the period of continued controls, instead of being given a temporary shot in the arm.

Soon or late, moreover, we shall have to abandon the habit of trying to solve every baffling problem by resort to public funds. We cannot indefinitely head off inflation by piling the public debt higher and higher. On the contrary, the continued spending of Government funds to keep prices down spells inflation from a different source. We doubt that Congress will have any sympathy with this effort to postpone the day when price and wage adjustments in the building-materials field will have to be made to put these industries on a par with others which took over their labor in wartime. When those adjustments have been made, controls will certainly have to be maintained to avoid skyrocketing prices. Subsidies would temporarily ease the problem of maintaining controls, but they would also multiply headaches later on and probably jeopardize the long-range slum-clearance plans which necessarily involve the use of public funds.

[From the Wall Street Journal of February 15, 1946]

HOUSING

Some years ago the candidate for governor of a Midwestern State was invited to address a convention of what he understood were real-estate men. He made quite a stirring speech on the merits of each citizen owning his own home. Leaving the hall he discovered that the gathering was one of a special branch of the real-estate business—those in attendance dealt only in apartment houses and multifamily dwellings. Nevertheless, the speech was well received.

In this country anyone who advocates house ownership is on about as safe ground as one who makes a ringing commitment to the Ten Commandments. Anyone who questions the desirability of home ownership is as likely as not to be put in the class with those who would speak disparagingly of the institution of marriage. We intend to take no such risk, but we think it is permissible to say that, like marriage, home ownership ought not to be entered into lightly or hurriedly.

Anyone who has owned a house and some ground knows that along with satisfaction go considerable worry and considerable expense and that one unable to bear that expense may be forced to let his property deteriorate into a considerable financial loss. If a home owner's business makes it necessary for him to move to a new neighborhood or to another part of the country, there is another chance of loss. These are considerations which should be understood because lack of understanding may cause considerable unhappiness.

We now have a housing shortage and to the couple who have tramped from door to door for weeks on end looking for a place to live and four walls look welcome. If within the four walls are some attractive gadgets, if woodwork is freshly painted and floors freshly shellacked, the layout may be more than they can resist. Someone ought to warn them to look carefully. Of all the shoddy that a man can buy, a cheap, jerry-built house threatens the most headaches.

Current publicity from Washington stresses plans to build a large number of individual homes and to concentrate the program on homes costing $6,000. It seems to us, granting the good intentions of the sponsors of the program, that it is permissible to raise questions

There are probably many places in the United States where a small house can be soundly built to sell for $6,000. There are also many places where that cannot be done. Either many people will be disappointed at being unable to buy a house for that figure, or, if houses are built on such a basis, they will be of a character that none will want very much to live in them and will not for any considerable time. Despite the pressing need for housing, caution is in order. If it is not exercised we will within a very few years have vast communities of cheaply built houses, neglected and tumbled-down structures which no one will want and which will represent a loss to the original purchasers.

There also arises the question of whether it is wise to force concentration on small individual-home construction as Washington has done by use of its priority power. Is that the way to provide the maximum of shelter the most quickly? Most individual-home developments are undertaken for sale and not for rental purposes and there is no reason to believe a change is coming. Will not the availability of property for sale and scarcity of property for rent induce purchase by those in no real position to purchase?

Of course, if the Federal program of price fixing and other controls is to be maintained and extended to housing, all the questions raised here are beside the point. If that is done there will be very little building of any kind and very little production generally. We are assuming that such foolishness is near an end, and that production will be allowed to get under way. In such a case, it would be well if Washington would abandon all attempts to make general rules to cover a country where conditions vary widely.

Organized community effort can perhaps be helpful. But in the end the individual who must pay for a house will insist on having the place that suits him.

[From the Baltimore Sun of February 14, 1946]

A LITTLE CRITICISM MIGHT HELP THE HOUSING PLAN

As outlined by its creator, the Housing Expediter, the housing program now getting under way will require premium payments (i. e., subsidies), of $600,000,000, plus $250,000,000 for the relocation and conversion of existing housing. There is no pretense that this $850,000,000 will cover the whole cost to the taxpayers. The unknown factors are too many.

Also, there has been no effort to compute the indirect costs to the ordinary citizen in his capacity as wage earner. Yet there is sufficient evidence in hand to warrant the statement that these indirect costs will be large. In some industries they may be paralyzing.

Part of the plan now being rushed through with so much ballyhoo and so little calm examination calls for the delay or abandonment of all building construction save that of dwelling units. In the original statement of Expediter Wyatt it was said that the only manner in which sufficient manpower could be obtained for carrying out his plan was to divert it from other building projects.

In yesterday's paper the Director of Civilian Production, Mr. John D. Small, carried this thought further. He said that it might be necessary to prohibit the completion of construction projects now under way. And, he added, "anyone who now starts construction runs the risk of not being permitted to finish

the job unless he is able to prove that the project cannot be deferred. * * *"

The connotations of such a policy are almost beyond calculation. Just now, as everyone knows, many industrial concerns have either started or are about to start modernization and enlargement projects. These buildings will provide the housing for new machinery, orders for which are about to be given. The orders will not be given unless the plant accommodation can be provided.

Every factory which is refused permission to modernize or enlarge will automatically defer or cancel its orders for new machinery. Every machinery order canceled will slow down by that much the reconversion of the heavy industry equipped to produce such machinery. It will reduce the employment of the skilled and unskilled workers making that machinery. It will reduce the output of the steel mills, which supply the castings. The point need not be labored. The ramifications are endless.

The worst of it is that the Housing Expediter and his Chief, Mr. Truman, have so far given no indication that they have thought of these ramifications. They have accepted the uncritical approval of a few interested groups—the real-estate men, for instance—as indicating that they have found the panacea for our housing ills.

Mr. Roosevelt, in his callow days, put forward his National Recovery Administration as a similar cure-all. It was foisted upon the country by the same kind of hullabaloo as that we are now hearing. The few persons who insisted upon a realistic examination of its implications were denounced as marplots. The record shows that the marplots had most of the sense on their side.

Federal Aid for School Lunches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM W. LINK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1946

Mr. LINK. Mr. Speaker, there is before us today an opportunity to be of some real assistance to the group of young Americans that are members of our school system. When we provide aid for them we are at the same time helping their fathers and mothers. As Members of Congress it is our duty to provide for the wants of the majority of the people, and in view of this fact I want to register my full support for H. R. 3370, the bill which would provide Federal aid for school lunches.

If we need proof that the bill is desirable, we only have to look at the letters from the children themselves—letters that range from a kindergarten scrawl to a high-school composition. All voice a sincere gratefulness for the privileges that the program extends to all children of school age who are attending school. Their letters further indicate a knowledge on the part of the school children that good diet is essential to health and the development of a good mind. In addition to the messages from the children are expressions from parents, teachers, and service organizations—all of which voice a deep appreciation for the aid that has been rendered and a strong faith that the present Congress will continue the program.

The Seventh District of Illinois is composed of a cross section of the American populace. All of these people are convinced that the money appropriated for the school-lunch subsidy is for the benefit of everyone.

I have received many letters from Des Plaines, from Park Ridge, and from other sections that definitely cannot be called a poor man's district; along with these letters are hundreds of similar ones from sections where the workingman is in the vast majority. All are unanimous in their hopes for the passage of the school-lunch bill.

The operation of the school-lunch program in the past has developed in the minds of the young people attending our schools a knowledge of proper food balance and its relation to good health. Children come to relish the elements of a balanced diet not for taste alone but for the nutrition value of the food—an extremely helpful factor to the parents in the homes.

Again, gentlemen, I want to commit myself as being wholeheartedly in favor of a bill which would make possible the operation of a school-lunch program for all children of school age who are enrolled in the schools of our United States.

Henry Ford 2d Answers Mr. Bowles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1946

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following complete text of a telegram from Henry Ford 2d in Los Angeles last night to the Honorable BRENT SPENCE, chairman, House Banking and Currency Committee:

I have been informed that your committee is prepared to invite me to appear before you to comment on price controls as they affect the Ford Motor Co. I shall, of course, be happy to appear before the committee if there is really any public interest to be served. However, my opinions on this subject have already been expressed publicly in a telegram to the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion on January 29 and again in an address in San Francisco on February 8. Copies of both of these are being mailed to you.

I am sure that everyone who has the best interests of this Nation at heart is doing what we are doing—everything we can to stop the present trend toward inflation. There are differences in opinion on how this can best be done.

Our part, as we see it, is to produce motorcars and trucks—as many as we can, as fast as we can. That has been our purpose since VJ-day. Our employees have cooperated. There have been no strikes at the Ford Motor Co. We have been forced to curtail production time and again because of strikes and shut-downs in the plants of our suppliers. Shortages of steel, caused by a dispute over both wages and prices, finally forced us to stop assembly lines completely.

Of course we know that price ceilings on most finished parts for new automobiles were removed last fall. But the statement of Mr. Bowles in this respect does not reflect all the facts. He does not make it clear that manufacturers who supply our suppliers with parts do have price ceilings. He also ignores the fact that parts for trucks and all automotive replacement parts are still subject to ceiling prices. The OPA supplementary order of August 29, 1945, to which Mr. Bowles referred, exempts passenger car original equipment from price ceilings but specifically excepts tires, batteries, radios, ferrous and nonferrous castings. The regulation also states examples under which such items as glass, electrical wire, forgings, upholstery, and similar items are not classified as parts unless at least partially fabricated.

As I said in San Francisco, a foundry which has supplied us for many years with gray iron castings told us they lost $330,000 during 1945 because the cost to them of producing the castings we needed was above the price at which they were allowed to sell to us. They stopped supply.

Another supplier had been making thousands of small but vital truck parts for us for 50 cents each. His material prices had gone up so much after VJ-day that he asked OPA for permission to charge 61 cents. OPA said "No". They were willing to go as high as 54 cents. But the supplier could not produce parts at that figure and so he stopped manufacture. After considerable delay, we finally found two new suppliers. One is now furnishing us with the necessary parts at 82 cents, and one at 84 cents each, both with OPA approval.

In making public our estimates of last summer that motorcars would cost 55 percent more to make during the first postwar year than they cost in 1941, Mr. Bowles failed to make it clear that these estimates were submitted to OPA before OPA had announced any price regulations on new cars—more than a month before OPA had given us even the basis on which price ceilings were to be calculated.

What Mr. Bowles had to say on this point and the manner in which he chose to say it left the impression that we had secretly applied for a 55-percent increase in existing price ceilings. Actually, we have applied for no price relief on any of our cars since OPA ceilings were established.

Incidentally, those estimates of last July turned out to be pretty accurate. We estimated, for example, that our most popular model, which had cost $512 to make in 1941, would cost us under postwar conditions about $935. These figures do not include cost of advertising and selling or any profit. We found in November, before we reached scheduled production, that it was costing us $963 to make this model.

Since then, we have cut that cost somewhat by increased production efficiency, but in the meantime we have added about $41,000,000 to our annual bill for wages, and have still to absorb increased costs to us and our suppliers due to the new price of steel.

Our OPA price to dealers on this model is $728.

We do not want to get into public arguments with OPA or any other Government agency at this time, especially since the President late last week announced a new national wage-price formula. However, I have stated publicly my opinion that inflation is based on scarcity and that the way to prevent inflationary prices of manufactured products is to produce goods for people to buy with the money they have to spend.

We at Ford Motor Co. are going to continue to act in that belief.

Our job at Ford Motor Co. has always been to make more and more products at lower and lower prices so that more and more people can afford them. We look forward to the time when American industry can get back to this job under the constant stimulus of free competition.

HENRY FORD 2D.

We Need Bomb Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 21, 1946

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily News of February 19, 1946:

WE NEED BOMB CONTROL

More facts will have to be made public before we can fully evaluate the charges of Russian espionage in Canada, which, it is rumored, also extended into the United States.

It has been variously reported that the spies were trying to find out how to manufacture the atomic bomb, how to make certain electronic equipment (radar or proximity fuses or both) or to learn Canadian-United States plans for repelling an Arctic invasion.

All major nations, we presume, maintain an information or spy service prying into the military secrets of their neighbors and alleged friends. When this ugly fact is made public it shocks our sensibilities and arouses our fears.

It is natural that Russia should be trying to find out how to manufacture atomic bombs, a secret that we gladly shared with the British and Canadians, but denied to the Russians while we were all fighting together.

This incident is only one of many that will exasperate international relations and strain our nerves until the United Nations finally set up controls of atomic bomb production that will make the whole world feel at least as safe as it did before the bomb was invented. Better still would be an honest limitation of all arms.

Resolution of Wilmington Grange, of New Wilmington, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 21, 1946

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the Wilmington Grange, No. 1477, Patrons of Husbandry, on February 14, 1946, located at New Wilmington, Pa.:

Whereas the labor organizations, after being coddled and catered to for a number of years, have become obstreperous and should be controlled. After receiving exceptionally high wages during the war are not satisfied to continue working without an increase in pay, and have brought hardship and suffering, not only upon themselves and their families by striking, but will create a condition whereby many aged people, and others who do not have any earning capacity and have been living on small fixed incomes, will not be able to exist without financial aid from some source; and

Whereas employers who provide the money to conduct their business are prevented from operating their plants in a normal business way by labor organizations; and

Whereas the farmers have been producing and selling under price ceilings which in some cases will not cover the cost of production, thus creating a food shortage which requires consumers to stand in line for essential food products which would be produced in sufficient quantities to supply the demand if it were not for Government restrictions and the scarcity and high cost of labor: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we go on record as favoring laws that will control labor organizations and make strikes, as now conducted, illegal, and give the employers an even break with labor, with the right to select their employees and discharge any who are inefficient or a menace to the successful operation of the business; be it also

Resolved, That we pledge our support to lawmakers who will support the enactment of laws to control strikes and provide other methods of settling labor disputes.

We insist on the enactment of laws that will carry a fine and imprisonment for anyone interfering with the marketing of farm produce.

We brand the strike of the Pittsburgh electrical workers as inhuman and should not be tolerated in any civilized country; be it also

Resolved, That since prices of many manufactured articles will increase on account of increased labor costs, that we as farmers insist that either price ceilings be abolished or raised to a point where the price will cover the cost of production of farm products caused by the increased cost of farm labor, all kinds of farm machinery, and other expenses.

Any controlling measures that prevent the farmers from receiving the cost of production will develop a scarcity of food and encourage a black market.

We favor holding prices down to prevent inflation, but since President Truman has favored increased costs and higher prices, we think that the farmers, after working 70 or 80 hours a week, are entitled to cost of production plus a small profit to partially pay for overtime work.

We regret that so many people have been influenced to follow communistic leaders.

We favor a 6-year, one-term office for the President of the United States.

A shortage of food may result, due to the strikes, as many farmers will be unable to secure the new machinery which they had expected to get.

The Yalta Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 18, 1946

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most controversial documents ever signed between representatives of different countries was that embodying the secret agreement consummated at Yalta on February 11, 1945, between President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Joseph Stalin, and Winston Churchill.

In order that every Member of Congress and everyone else who scans this RECORD may have an opportunity to read that famous document, I am inserting it at this point as a part of my remarks, just as it appeared in the New York Times under a Washington date line of February 11, 1946—just 1 year to a day after it was signed.

The matter referred to follows:

TEXT OF YALTA ACCOED ON SOVIET WAR ON JAPAN

The leaders of the three great powers—the Soviet Union, the United States of America, and Great Britain—have agreed that in 2 or 3 months after Germany has surrendered and the war in Europe has terminated the Soviet Union shall enter into the war against Japan on the side of the Allies on condition that:

1. The status quo in Outer Mongolia (the Mongolian People's Republic) shall be preserved;

2. The former rights of Russia violated by the treacherous attack of Japan in 1904 shall be restored, viz.:

(a) The southern part of Sakhalin, as well as all the islands adjacent to it, shall be returned to the Soviet Union,

(b) The commercial port of Dairen shall be internationalized, the preeminent interests of the Soviet Union in this port being safeguarded and the lease of Port Arthur as a naval base of the U. S. S. R. restored,

(c) The Chinese Eastern Railroad and the South Manchurian Railroad, which provides an outlet to Dairen, shall be jointly operated by the establishment of a joint Soviet-Chinese company, it being understood that the preeminent interests of the Soviet Union shall be safeguarded and that China shall retain full sovereignty in Manchuria;

3. The Kurile Islands shall be handed over to the Soviet Union.

It is understood that the agreement concerning Outer Mongolia and the ports and railroads referred to above will require concurrence of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. The President will take measures in order to obtain this concurrence on advice from Marshal Stalin.

The heads of the three great powers have agreed that these claims of the Soviet Union shall be unquestionably fulfilled after Japan has been defeated.

For its part the Soviet Union expresses its readiness to conclude with the National Government of China a pact of friendship and alliance between the U. S. S. R. and China in order to render assistance to China with its armed forces for the purpose of liberating China from the Japanese yoke.

J. STALIN.
FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.
WINSTON S. CHURCHILL.

FEBRUARY 11, 1945.

Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 21, 1946

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer an analysis of measures now in force for the benefit of veterans of World War II. I feel that such a digest of the law will be a useful and ready reference of practical assistance to the veterans. The present program is a comprehensive one, which is intended by Congress to really serve the veterans. Its cost for the ensuing 12 months is estimated at nearly $5,000,000,000.

DIGEST OF VETERANS' BENEFITS

ELIGIBILITY

A veteran must have served in the active military or naval service on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of

the present war. He must have been discharged or released under conditions other than dishonorable after active service of 90 days or more or because of an injury or disability incurred in line of duty.

MONEY

1. Mustering-out pay: Service personnel up through the rank of captain in the Army and Marine Corps and senior lieutenants in the Navy and Coast Guard are entitled to: (a) $300 mustering-out pay if they have performed active service for at least 60 days outside the United States; or (b) $200 mustering-out pay if they have performed active service for at least 60 days, no part of which was served outside of the United States; or (c) $100 for any active service less than 60 days.

2. Bonus: Public Law 268 repeals that portion of the law, which provided that any financial benefits received under the act would be deducted from any future bonus authorized.

3. Retirement pay: Service personnel on active duty for more than 30 days and disabled from disease or injury received in the line of duty are entitled to receive the same retirement pay as now provided for regular personnel of the service.

4. Pensions: Discharge or release from service under conditions other than dishonorable is a prerequisite to veterans' benefits. Any veteran having a 10-percent or more disability resulting from disease or injury incurred in or aggravated by war service will, if his application is approved, receive the following amount:

Percent of disability:	*Amount payable per month*
10	$11.50
20	23.00
30	34.50
40	46.00
50	57.50
60	69.00
70	80.50
80	92.00
90	103.50
Total disability	115.00

Eligibility for pensions for nonservice-connected disabilities requires honorable discharge and 90 days wartime service—or if period of service was less than 90 days, have been discharged for disability incurred in service in the line of duty. The disability must be permanently and totally disabling and not due to the veterans' own willful misconduct.

Any single veteran with an annual income of over $1,000, or any married veteran—or with dependent minor children—with an annual income over $2,500, is ineligible for nonservice-connected disability pensions. This pension is $50 per month and is increased to $60 upon 10 years of continuous, permanent, total disability or upon reaching the age of 65.

5. Insurance: Service personnel are eligible for the cheapest and best life insurance attainable—the National Service Life Insurance. This is term insurance for 8 years, convertible into ordinary life, twenty-payment life, or thirty-payment life policies.

Insurance that has lapsed may be reinstated by the veteran, either within 6 months after date of separation from active service, or within 3 months after date of lapse, whichever is later, by payment of only two monthly premiums without interest.

6. Readjustment allowances: Unemployed veterans who register with an office of the United States Employment Service are entitled to a readjustment allowance of $20 per week while unemployed. An eligible veteran may receive such payments up to a maximum of 1 year, depending on length of service. Self-employed veterans with net earnings of less than $100 per month may receive an allowance amounting to the difference between net earnings and $100 in any month, up to a maximum of 1 year, also depending on length of service.

7. Loans: Veterans have up to 10 years after official end of the war in which to make application for guaranteed loan at no more than 4 percent interest. These loans are automatically guaranteed if made in accordance with the provisions of the act and if the amount does not exceed the appraisal made by an appraiser of the Veterans' Administration.

Any loan on real estate may be guaranteed up to a maximum guaranty of $4,000 of the loan, with the Government guaranteeing 50 percent of the total loan up to the maximum amount. The business-loan guaranty limit remains at $2,000, or 50 percent. Real-estate loans may be amortized over a period up to 25 years, and farm realty loans up to 40 years. Maturity on non-real-estate loans may not exceed 10 years.

Proceeds of a loan may be used to purchase a lot in connection with home construction. Loans may be made for all ordinary farming purchases, and any normal business enterprise, and so that existing indebtedness in default may be refinanced in connection with all types of eligible loans.

8. Income-tax exemptions: Special provisions have been enacted by Congress for the tax benefit of veterans. These benefits include (a) $1,500 of active service pay is excluded from gross income for the taxable year 1943 and until the termination of the present war is proclaimed; (b) mustering-out pay is excluded from gross income for the taxable year of 1944 and later years.

JOBS

1. Employment placement and assistance: The United States Employment Service and the Veterans' Placement Service Board are directed to cooperate in seeing that all veterans, able and willing to work, obtain employment. This assistance includes employment counseling.

2. Employment preference: Preference in job referrals through the United States Employment Service is available to veterans under regulations adopted by the Veterans' Placement Service Board, carrying out the direction of the GI bill of rights that the veteran receive "the maximum job opportunity in the field of gainful employment."

3. Civil-service preferences: Veterans with service-connected disabilities or in receipt of pensions, disability retirement benefits, or compensation from the Federal Government, receive an additional 10 points on their civil-service examination ratings.

A five-point preference is allowed to veterans not disabled.

These preferences will place veterans' names above all other names on the civil-service list except for professional or scientific positions paying over $3,000 a year.

4. Restoration to former Federal job: A veteran who held a permanent, probational, or probational-indefinite civil-service job when called to active service with the armed forces is entitled to mandatory reemployment in his former position, or one of like seniority, status, and pay, provided he has satisfactorily completed his period of service, is still qualified to perform the duties of his position, and applies for restoration within 90 days after separation from active service or discharge from the hospital.

5. Other civil-service benefits: The civil-service rule that not more than two members of a family, living in the same house, may hold a Federal civil-service position does not apply in case of a person entitled to veteran preference.

BUSINESS AND HOME AIDS

1. Small-business aids: Assistance is provided to veterans in establishing small businesses through (a) loans not connected with the GI bill of rights for worth-while manufacturing projects; (b) assistance in obtaining surplus war materials that will be helpful to the planned business venture; and (c) supplying of technical assistance.

2. Material priorities: Priorities for materials are granted by the Civilian Production Administration and the Office of Price Administration to veterans.

3. Purchase of surplus property: Veterans can purchase surplus property to set themselves up and help to maintain themselves in business without buying through regular dealer channels or paying a profit to anyone.

4. Housing priorities: Priorities for the construction or purchase of new houses have been established for veterans in obtaining homes under $10,000.

5. Legal assistance: The American Bar Association has adopted a program of legal assistance to veterans and members of their families.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

1. Education: Any eligible veteran may receive 1 year of education or of training plus additional education (up to a maximum of 4 years), for total length of active service. There is no age limit nor is there any need to show that a veteran's education was interrupted by war service.

The time during which a course may be initiated is within 4 years after discharge or the end of the war, whichever is later, and the time limit for completion of the course is 9 years after the end of the war.

Short intensive courses may be undertaken and the additional cost prorated against the period of eligibility to which the veteran is entitled at the rate of $500 per school year. No such short course may cost more than $500. Veterans may apply to take a correspondence course but they are entitled to no subsistence allowance. One-fourth of the elapsed time used in pursuing such a course is charged against the veteran's period of eligibility. Total amount payable for correspondence courses for any veteran is limited to $500.

Monthly subsistence allowance, while in school or training, is $65 for veterans without dependents and $90 for veterans with dependents.

2. Vocational rehabilitation of disabled veterans: The purpose of vocational rehabilitation is to restore the employability which has been lost by virtue of a handicap due to a disability incurred in or aggravated by service.

Vocational training involving more than 4 years of training may be begun by disabled veterans, subject to approval of the Veterans' Administration. The time for completing such training is 9 years after the end of the war.

Disabled veterans in vocational rehabilitation training are entitled to receive monthly subsistence allowance of $65 (without dependents) or $90 (with dependents) plus whatever pension they are entitled to by law. The minimum total amount such veteran may receive is set at $100 per month (without dependents) and $115 (with a dependent), plus $10 for the first child, $7 for each additional child, and $15 for any dependent parent. If the veteran would otherwise receive less than these minimum amounts, his allowance is raised to equal the minimum during the period of training and for 2 months thereafter.

HOSPITALIZATION AND DOMICILIARY CARE

1. Hospitalization: The Veterans' Administration provides hospitalization for any veteran of any war who was discharged under conditions other than dishonorable. Veterans with service-connected disabilities are given preference. Veterans with non-service-connected disabilities are eligible if a hospital bed is available and the veteran makes a sworn statement that he is unable to defray expenses of treatment.

The Veterans' Administration has been authorized and directed to expedite additional

hospital construction and to establish all necessary administrative offices to make veterans' benefits more readily available.

2. Artificial limbs and prosthetic appliances: Provision has been made to insure ample funds for the Veterans' Administration to purchase prosthetic appliances for veterans and instruct them in the use of such appliances, including payment of any expense involved in the veterans' traveling to and from the center where the appliance is fitted and training given in its use.

3. Guide or seeing-eye dogs: Guide or seeing-eye dogs may be provided for the aid of blind veterans who are entitled to disability compensation or pensions for a service-connected disability under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, including payment of any expense involved in the veterans' traveling to and from the center to become adjusted to the dogs.

Blind veterans are also entitled to mechanical or electronic equipment to aid them in overcoming the handicap of blindness.

4. Domiciliary care: A veteran who is so disabled as to be unable to earn a living, and is without adequate means of support, may be admitted for home care to a facility of Veterans' Administration providing such accommodations.

Statement by Maurice R. Franks Before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 21 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement on the subject of labor relations made by Maurice R. Franks before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor on January 31 last.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ADDRESS BY MAURICE R. FRANKS BEFORE THE UNITED STATES SENATE COMMITTEE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—As the following message delivered by Mr. Franks before the United States Senate Committee on Education and Labor on January 31 incorporated much of the material he had prepared in the form of his editorial for this issue of the Railroad Workers Journal, it was decided to substitute the complete text of his address for the editorial as originally scheduled.—S. F. W.)

Mr. Chairman and members of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, I am pleased to have been invited to appear before your committee, which I understand is charged with the task of reporting on the fact-finding bill that you have up for consideration. I also realize that if I am to be of any genuine assistance to your committee, I must of necessity deal with as many facts as humanly possible.

Speaking of facts, I believe there are one or two you should know about myself. My name is Maurice Franks. I represent the Railroad Yardmasters of North America, Inc.—one of the smallest labor organizations doing business on the American railroads today. I am their national business agent and editor of their publication, the Railroad Workers Journal.

To make this information even more matter of fact, you may be interested to know that there are in the entire United States only about 5,000 railroad yardmasters. Also that this group is represented by two separate and distinct organizations—the Railroad Yardmasters of America and the Railroad Yardmasters of North America, Inc. You will notice that the only difference in title is in our use of the words "North" and "Incorporated." On this point I do not want any misunderstanding to arise in your minds—I do not desire to leave you with any misapprehension as to who I am connected with. I do not represent the Railroad Yardmasters of America—and I doubt very much that they would subscribe in toto to what I am about to tell you. Therefore, kindly bear in mind that I am connected only with the Railroad Yardmasters of North America, Inc.

We are a completely independent labor organization, not connected with any other organization whatsoever. This is a fact, and I should like to stress the point that we are a very small organization and definitely cannot be classed as a pressure group. We are not in a position to favor or foul any politician in the United States to any appreciable extent.

Many people have asked me as to how I came by my views on industrial relations. Well, just to keep the record straight, I have been in the labor movement since the age of 19—as worker, committeeman, organizer, delegate, business agent, and editor. These capacities have naturally afforded me ample opportunity to make a first-hand study of industrial relations as applied to the American worker, his employer, and the general public. And being equipped with this first-hand knowledge, I am all the more convinced that industrial disputes can always be settled amicably if properly approached.

With strikes breaking out over the body of the Nation as measles do over the body of a child, one begins to wonder if there is "a doctor in the house." To be sure, labor has a right to strike in order to attain its just objectives that cannot be otherwise attained. On this point all argument must confine itself to the question as to precisely what constitutes just objectives. The most that I can see in some of our present-day strikes is—just foolish manipulation.

The strategy used by some labor leaders in pulling strikes leaves me, for one, somewhat dubious concerning their quality of leadership. In the first place, everything possible should have been done to reconvert industry as rapidly as possible without interruption from any direction. The wise labor leader, it seems to me, would have bided his time in the interest of over-all strategy. He would have waited until industry was well under way, until industry had started to produce, until it had committed itself to the price of commodities and the profit to be secured from the sale of these commodities. Once found in this position, no employer would have been able to camouflage the actual condition of his company, his ability to meet just demands.

True advantage to labor does not appear to be in the reckoning when we undertake a close inspection of present-day strategy. In fact, the signs and symbols we detect when we scrutinize the chart appear a bit too outlandish to jibe with the formulas which we, as good Americans, have a right to discern. Indeed, it also seems to me that there is considerable effort on the part of certain individuals to throw this country into a state of chaos, through confusing basic issues. Instead of setting up common objectives and bending every effort to achieve those objectives, these certain individuals are doing their utmost to divide the American people, by pitting one class against the other.

Yes, I believe that a lot of our industrial strife is being promoted by an unscrupulous group who would divide the American people in order to conquer them. They know that united we stand and divided we must surely fall. If, however, we Americans allow this group to conquer us, then we are not worthy of the honor to be classed as Americans. If we are to win this economic war we are going through today—and, mark you, we are going through an economic revolution—then we shall have to use as much valor and strategy and downright guts, if you please, as we had to use in winning the shooting war just finished. We shall have to weigh in the balance all that we as Americans possess under our present system against all that we might hope to possess under another system, whether it would be communism, fascism, or some other brand of un-American "ism." Evidence of what these foreign systems offer the common man is flashed to our attention every day through the newspapers, the radio, and the movies.

Although the outlook at this particular moment looks none too bright for what we, as true Americans, cannot help but regard as the classic way of life, I have every confidence that eventually the scales will fall in our favor—and for the very reason that in due time we Americans will prove ourselves to be big enough to face the facts. We know first-hand the benefits of our present democratic system and can only guess what would fall to our lot as a result of some radical change. And I have confidence that the American people are intelligent enough to know what is good for them—and that goes for all Americans—for the American workman, whether unionized or not, for the American industrialist, and for the American people as a whole.

Naturally, the recent war has paved the way for conditions of change, political as well as economic. But nothing has arisen from this war—or any other war—to block the natural course of evolution within the framework of our democratic system of government—nothing, I repeat, which would warrant fundamental changes in the general principles of the Constitution of the United States or the Bill of Rights. We will, if we are to make progress, put through certain changes in keeping with the times, changes beneficial to the Nation as a whole and which will further guarantee our natural prerogatives as Americans. We will streamline wherever necessary. But whatever we do, we will do it in the American way. The man who dares to assert, whether through blindness or diabolical intent, that the process of change, in order to be truly effective, must strike at the very foundation of our system, can be cataloged—and very rightly—as simply one who is anti-American. It is high time we recognized this fact. And it is also high time that we do something about it.

There is nothing wrong with the fundamental principles of Americanism, but there is something radically wrong with the interpretation of these principles by certain individuals who, for purposes of immediate convenience, class themselves as Americans. Some of our fundamental principles are being twisted in such a manner that many of them are no longer to be recognized as truly American. The United States of America was founded on the solid principle that a government to be successful must be one for and by the people. This principle has been distorted to mean a government for and by certain people, if you agree with these certain people.

Laws have been predicated on the principle—if you can call it principle—of making fish of one part of the citizenry and flesh of the other. Such laws, for example, as the National Labor Relations Act, which definitely sets up a condition of dividing and conquering, a condition that promotes disharmony between the citizens of these United States, a condition of distrust between employers and their employees. If you doubt this statement and have not thoroughly analyzed the National Labor Relations Act, I suggest that you do so and that you spend considerable time

on sections 7 and 8 of this act. When I made a study of this so-called Magna Charta of labor—especially sections 7 and 8—I could not escape the conclusion that America is not being run for and by the people any more. It is being run for and by the people who satisfy the whims of the dictators of labor. So long as this labor act remains as a recognized law of the land, we are bound to have labor trouble, strikes and many other evil repercussions.

The National Labor Relations Act, let me remind you, was based on the premise of bringing about a more harmonious relationship between employer and employee, by lessening the causes of labor disputes burdening and obstructing interstate and foreign commerce.

No one can deny that this premise was a noble one. But what has been the net result of this legislation based upon such a worthy sentiment? Since the passage of the labor act, more strikes have taken place than ever experienced in the history of our Nation. For example, in the year 1929—6 years prior to the enactment of this law—the total number was under 1,000. In 1935—the year the labor act was validated by the United States Supreme Court—the number of strikes rose beyond 2,000. In 1944, in spite of the Nation being at war, the number of work stoppages jumped to almost 5,000—five times as many labor disturbances as before the enactment of this law which was to have brought peace and harmony to industry. The situation today needs no statistics to indicate its crippling effect upon the flow of interstate and foreign commerce.

What our experience of the past 10 years reveals is that this law breeds industrial sickness—not industrial well-being. And that the center of infection revolves about its faulty emphasis. They can call all the labor-management conferences they like, they can have them meet every day, 52 weeks out of every year, and yet under the present set-up we will be just about where we are today—exactly nowhere in the industrial relations problem—and mainly because of this law, which plays no small part in promoting conditions of hate and mistrust between the employees and their employers. In the first place, since this law has to do with the relationship between employer and employee, it should never have been placarded as a labor act. This title in itself makes this act stand out as one that calls for partiality in its application, one which leans heavily in the direction of labor, and one which would be, and naturally is, repugnant to the employer.

Since the gentlemen of this committee are seeking information on fact-finding, may I suggest that they accept the fact that there are at least two sides to the problem of industrial relations.

In the first place, this law should have been written to mean one governing the relationship between the employer and his employee, and one with full regard for the general public. Until there is such a law—a law which covers precisely this ground—present legislation will always prove a sore eye to the abused. Therefore, we do most definitely need a change in our labor-management relations, and the first thing to change, if we are really to face the facts, is the National Labor Relations Act.

This act should be stricken from the statute books of this country, for the simple reason that it has proven itself incapable of carrying out the intent of even its own preamble. In its place should come a law capable of attaining this most worth-while objective; in short, a law which sets up a condition of responsibility and protection for all parties affected.

Many people have been prone to criticize the Department of Labor and especially the Secretary of Labor. Well, under present circumstances, it is no wonder that the head of this Department and the Department itself have been sharply criticized. Yet, when you analyze the situation, the Department of Labor and its head are in the position of doing nothing about the situation. When Miss Perkins was Secretary of Labor, she, too, was severely criticized for her inability to cope with conditions, especially those during the 1937 strike epidemic. The great cry of that day was that "This is a man's job. Oh, if only we had a man in there, everything would be hunky-dory." Well, we do have a man in there today, and evidence proves that he is as helpless as was Miss Perkins to make peace in industry. Moreover, if the present Secretary of Labor were to step out of the picture tomorrow, his successor would be in no better position than he is. And why?

Well, indeed, there is real reason for all this confusion. In my opinion, the main reason can be found in our industrial relations set-up, especially as governed by the National Labor Relations Act. It is only natural that a Secretary of Labor heading a Department originally promoted by organized labor is going to act more favorably to labor than to capital, or—if having an unbiased mind—might not act at all. While on this point, let me remind you that until labor and capital can be brought to work in complete unison toward their common objectives, unhampered by bias or indecision, we can never hope to achieve peace in industry. Therefore, to my mind, the idea of a Labor Department as one functioning exclusively in behalf of labor has become a thing of the past. In fact, this Department under its present set-up stands condemned by its own testimony of being an instrumentality unable to cop with present conditions—stands condemned before the jury of American public opinion.

In its place, I suggest, there should be established a Department of Industrial Relations, headed by a Director of Industrial Relations—by one who thoroughly understands the problems confronting industrial relations, by a person who fully realizes that neither side of industry can progress unless both sides do. The man heading this department should be one who clearly recognizes that the workers and their employers are truly partners in industry, that they are both Americans striving together in a common enterprise to produce things of value for other Americans who in turn are equally entitled to fair treatment—I mean the American public.

The Department of Industrial Relations should coordinate the functions of the Department of Labor and the Department of Commerce, so that it would always be in a position of possessing the facts covering the problems of labor and management. The Director could very easily create a board of advisers made up of both sides of industry and the public—a tripartite board, if you please. I might venture to say at this point that had such a department been functioning, with the cooperation and factual assistance of the Departments of Labor and Commerce, we wouldn't be in the midst of the fact-finding mess which confronts this Nation today, especially the type of fact finding aimed at General Motors and other companies.

There has been a lot of talk about fact-finding boards and ability to pay. Union leaders are demanding that corporations open up their books and records, bare their innermost plans and secrets, in order that the unions can capture all possible profit the corporations hope to make.

It is high time that union members themselves set up a fact-finding board of their own to find out just what some of their leaders are up to—to learn what is the underlying purpose they have in the back of their minds as they make these unreasonable, unorthodox, and, maybe, un-American demands.

What would such a fact-finding board find in the case of General Motors? I'll tell you. It would find, first of all, that union leaders have raised an awful fuss about one of the GM officials having publicly stated that the information demanded by these leaders is not even given to GM stockholders. It would find, as it got to the bottom of this, that GM has a perfect right to withhold such information from its stockholders, and that these stockholders themselves do not want it, and are not demanding it, and are almost unanimously opposed to the corporation's giving it to them or anyone.

This fact-finding board would find that Messrs. Reuther and Thomas have a complete record of General Motors' financial position—its sales; the amount written off for depreciation, amortization, etc.; the amounts it has set aside for postwar contingencies and reconversion; the amount GM has invested in other concerns and the profits received from these investments; what the company did with its income last year and every year since it has been in business; what dividends have been paid to stockholders; how much the company has in cash, Government bonds, accounts receivable, and other assets.

This fact-finding board would also find that this is all the information to which the Government, GM's stockholders, the public, and the UAW-CIO are entitled. It would learn that Reuther has stated that what his union wants is GM's predicted production schedule, its estimated sales and profit margin on its production, its anticipated cost of materials, and complete information on its relations with its suppliers, the amount of money the company proposes to spend on advertising, etc.

This fact-finding board would find that if Reuther is right in his contention that the union is entitled to the foregoing information, and the Government should back him in his claim by forcing GM to divulge it, then the Nation can get out its mourning clothes in preparation for attending the funeral of free enterprise and private ownership in America.

This fact-finding board would find that the GM official who stated that such information is not even given to the company's own stockholders need offer no apology for his statement. It would learn that it would be dangerous for the corporation to do so, for what then would prevent an official of a competing concern from purchasing just one share of GM stock, thus obtaining for his company at the cost of a few dollars what has cost GM millions of dollars for research, engineering, planning, etc.? Moreover, such inexpensive snooping could be as easily accomplished by representatives of foreign nations, no matter how belligerent they might be in their attitude, and no matter how desirous they might be of tearing down American free enterprise.

This fact-finding board would also learn that the leaders of the UAW-CIO are not exactly stupid; that they can add two and two and come up with the right answer; that they must be aware that forcing a corporation to reveal its plans and hopes in order to extort the uttermost farthing of prospective profit, will discourage the investment of capital and spell eventual ruin for American private ownership.

This fact-finding board would find that, such being the case, the real and decidedly sinister fact behind these demands of the UAW-CIO leaders involves an attempt to force industry into Government ownership and to carry this Nation into a socialistic economy. And its final finding would be that this is a price which even America, the world's wealthiest Nation, has not the ability to pay.

I firmly believe that a competent Department of Industrial Relations, functioning in line with the principles of the Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights, would be an effective means of avoiding unnecessary confusion and of cutting off at the source any form of assault upon our basic institutions seeking accomplishment through the device of inciting labor to a state of unnatural unrest.

Now I can already hear certain people—especially our "poli-iticians" here in Wash-

ington—those individuals improperly classed as politicians and whose eyes are always beaded on the ballot boxes and will be next November and particularly in 1948—I can hear these "poll-iticians" shrieking from "the top of the hill" that this is a starry-eyed plan of mine. I can hear them crying a poor mouth for the benefit of the voters on the argument that such a Department of Industrial Relations would be an added department of government which would only serve to cost the taxpayers more money—a fair cry if left unchallenged, particularly in these days when the taxpayer is literally tearing himself apart to meet the expenses of Government.

However, gentlemen, who is more costly to the American citizen than constant labor friction, strikes and their constant threat, a perpetually cloudy future resulting from industrial unrest? When industry is at a standstill or moving ahead in a series of jerks and jolts, the over-all effect is that of an economic depression—no matter by what name it is called, and no matter what its duration may be. The cost of depressions, long or short, local or general in effect would far outweigh the cost of an efficient governmental department. As a simple example of the tremendous burden upon the taxpayer for work stoppages, may I remind you that in the few short weeks since the recent strikes began, applications for public assistance have increased by approximately 500 percent.

Indeed, my suggestion does entail the creation of a new department of Government. However, I believe that in the long run it may be the means of getting rid of one or two other departments. Possibly it might lead to the clearing out of a great deal of Government deadwood in the snarled thickets of present-day bureaucracy. Moreover, it would set up a means of achieving full harmony within American industry—a condition which has not as yet been achieved by any existing governmental department.

The strikes which are taking their needless toll from the fruits of American enterprise today will no doubt come to a peaceful settlement. But mark you, until some permanent and constructive action is taken—until changes are made in our conception of fair play on the labor-management front—there will be recurrence after recurrence. There'll be no end to industrial strife.

In conclusion, gentlemen, may I state as a final fact that I am not too seriously worried about the fall of our American system of free enterprise. For I am convinced that we Americans are big enough, intelligent enough, and decent enough to cope with any situation arising to confront us. I believe that both labor and management—apart from certain dubious leadership—are more anxious today than ever before of getting down to the fundamental business of producing the very goods which make for a high standard of living for all parties concerned. Black as the situation appears today, I believe that all of us as Americans possess both the courage and the ingenuity to meet the challenge of the future, and that whatever changes we may decide to make will be made the American way.

And that's a fact. And I thank you.

To Loan or Not To Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1946

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, recent press and radio reports have given additional emphasis to the rumor which has persisted for some time that Leon Blum, representative of Socialist-Communist France, will be next in line at the international soup kitchen, once respectfully referred to as the United States Treasury. Monsieur Blum is right back of Socialist Britain's Lord Keynes and, no doubt, is just ahead of the Kremlin's representative—whose domestic economy requires no cash, but whose international spy rings demands considerable financing in American dollars.

One foreign loan sets a precedent for another. We cannot appease Britain and refuse Russia. I say: Let the American people loan their money to foreign governments as individuals at their individual risk. But, do not permit the American taxpayers' money, taken from the people as taxes by action of this Congress and entrusted to the United States Treasury, to be given to any foreign government or loaned to any foreign government at a rate of interest which is, in itself, a mockery of all ideals of common sense and fair dealing.

In effect, our one-time allies are asking us to exchange our birthright for a mess of pottage. We are asked to fight upstream against the age-old wisdom of Shakespeare's words: "Neither a borrower nor a lender be." Once, Winston Churchill declared that he would not be a party to the breaking up of the British Empire. I do not believe that the American people want to be parties to the movement which is definitely designed to break up and divide the only truly free nation in the world.

The issue is clear for 1946. To loan or not to loan. New Deal or Republican. The Kremlin or the Constitution. Leninism or liberty.

Freedom Comes to the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Francis B. Sayre:

FREEDOM COMES TO THE PHILIPPINES

(By Francis B. Sayre)

(A lawyer by training, Francis B. Sayre gained his first experience in the Far East when in 1923 he served as adviser in foreign affairs to the Siamese Government. In 1925 and 1926 he negotiated in behalf of Siam new political and commercial treaties with the great powers. In 1933 he was called to Washington, where for 6 years he served as Assistant Secretary of State charged with the negotiation of the American trade agreements. The President appointed him High Commissioner to the Philippines in 1939, and he observed the islands closely and fairly during those precarious years when the Commonwealth was finding its feet. In 1942, after the departure of President Quezon, acting under instructions from President Roosevelt he escaped with his wife and young son by submarine from Corregidor when surrender was inevitable.)

I

As American troops move again into the Philippines, a new era of American activity in the Far East opens up. Far more crucial than 1898 will be the years immediately ahead. How will America build for peace in Asia?

Take a look at the map of eastern Asia. Here is China, with her 450,000,000 people bound by abject poverty, but heroic and unconquerable. After the war China will probably crowd into the space of a few years a profound agrarian, plus an industrial, plus a social revolution, as Japan and Russia did before her. Not many years hence China will be intoxicated with the ferment of modernism and resurgent with new power.

Here is Japan, with her 73,000,000 people embittered by the results of their unhappy adventure, crushed for the time being, frustrated and dangerous. Here to the south are French Indo-China, British Malaya, and the Netherlands East Indies, millions of human beings of different races and languages and cultures, looking forward with hope to some new solution under the United Nations of the difficult problem of colonial government.

Here, still farther south, are Australia and New Zealand, vigorous, growing parts of the British Commonwealth, ambitious for a powerful place in the Pacific world and determined that next time, when the yellow or brown races threaten to descend from the north, they will either be in a position to defend themselves successfully or else members of a community of states cooperating and armed to keep the peace.

In the strategic center of all this mass of surging peoples, on the very crossroads of the great paths of commerce between Asia and America and the North and South Pacific, at the inevitable junction point of air-route travel east, west, north, south, a dispersing center for pouring American ideas and American products into the Orient, stand the Philippines.

All of Asia, aspiring to freedom, has its eyes fixed on American conduct in the Philippines. There the drama is approaching climax. One misstep may cost America her chance to exert a profound influence for future peace in Asia. It is of infinite importance that the American people understand the problems of the Philippines and the intimate relationship of those problems to the future peace of Asia.

When I think of the Philippines the picture is filled with beauty. Never have I seen a fairer sight than the breath-taking view from the American High Commissioner's residence at Baguio, the summer capital in Central Luzon. High up among the drifting clouds, from a jutting spur that stands out far above great empty spaces below, we used to look across bottomless valleys to range upon range of towering mountains to the north, fading away in the high distance, constantly under the play of sunlight and shadow and changing greens and blues, never 2 days the same, hauntingly beautiful, unforgettable.

I think of little-frequented roadways in the southern Islands, winding in and out through groves of vivid green coconut palms, skirting along blue, surf-fringed bays. I think of the rice terraces at Bontoc, jeweled mountainsides of jade green color and intricate design, or of the hillsides of abaca trees at Davao, or of the great forests of giant tropical growth in the interior of Mindanao, as untouched as in the days when man first walked in the jungle.

The people who make their home in the 7,000 islands of the Philippine archipelago are a mixture of many races. Approximately 85 percent are an Indonesian-Malay blend. From the far parts of Eastern and Southeastern Asia, between the years 700 and 1450,

came traders, fishermen, refugees, marauders, missionaries, invading conquerors. We know little or nothing about how or why they came. In spite of the unifying influences of three centuries of Spanish domination and of over a generation of American rule, primitive groups still tenaciously retain their ancient ways and individual characteristics. No single language is spoken throughout the islands.

Deep in the mountain fastnesses of Luzon, far from roads or human habitations, I have chanced upon the most primitive beings I have ever met—stray Negritos, shy as wild animals, half-naked, hunting through the mountain forests with bow and arrow, sleeping on cold nights in the warm ashes of their campfires.

Revealing stories are told of them. One afternoon, soon after the outbreak of the Japanese war, a band of Negritos appeared at Fort Stotsenberg carrying two Japanese air pilots tightly bound. "Who are these men we saw descending from the sky?" was their laconic inquiry. "Japanese soldiers," explained Gen. Edward King. "Japan has declared war against the United States." Their leader stepped forward. "Then I, king of the Negritos, declare war against Japan," he exclaimed.

From these primitive Negritos, who number only a few thousands, or from the far more numerous warlike and fearless Moros of Jolo and Mindanao, or from the head-hunting tribes of Northern Luzon, who still on occasion revert to their ancient practices, it is a far cry to the dapper, white-suited students of the University of the Philippines or to the lordly sugar planters who occupy positions of commanding importance in Manila and in the provincial capitals.

Of the total population of the Philippines about 1 percent (166,000) are foreigners. About 70 percent (117,500) of these aliens are Chinese, and according to the 1939 census some 29,000 were Japanese. The Americans in the islands then totaled 8,700, and the Spaniards 4,600.

II

Most casual American visitors gain hasty impressions of the Filipinos from wealthy mestizo families who dwell in affluent Manila homes, or from politicos who adroitly manipulate national and local political machines, or from the jostling and dense throngs of polyglot city peoples who crowd Manila streets or stake their money upon exciting games of jai alai on a hot April night.

But it is not the sugar magnates or Manila-trained professionals or government officials who will determine Philippine destiny. To understand the Philippines and to get to the heart of their problems one must turn to the untutored, poverty-ridden peasants who constitute the majority of the 17,000,000 Filipinos in the islands. The peasant lives simply, close to the land, cultivating with his lumbering carabao his bit of rice or camotes or tobacco; honest, happy-go-lucky, struggling to keep free from debt but proving generally an easy prey to the landlord and the money lender.

His innate good nature shows in his smiling face; and somehow, in spite of his poverty, one feels that he has learned the high art of distilling happiness from life. His children are always at the center of his family life, and also his carabao and his fighting cock. I remember how outraged some were when, on the occasion of one of my inspection trips through northern Luzon, the local governor, unknown to me, had ordered the high road, over which I must pass, cleared of all children, chickens, and carabaos. For 2 days they had to be confined so that the High Commissioner's car could maintain its lordly course unimpeded.

Has the peasant's life been really changed by 40 years of American rule? Perhaps not so fundamentally as many Americans would like to think. But after the Americans came, at least he had uncontaminated water at the village well and was free from cholera and plague and smallpox. He could send his children to a good barrio school where they could learn to read and write English. Good roads and radios exposed him to stimulating outside influences. The ferment of coming independence is in his soul. He thinks of America as a friend who brought good gifts.

When the war broke and Japanese troops were hunting down their prey, it was to the native peasant that many a hard-pressed American or Filipino guerrilla turned for help and shelter. His loyalty through those dark days stands out, shining and unforgettable. The future of the Philippines is in his keeping.

Approximately 100,000 newly mobilized Filipino troops, many of them fresh in from the fields, some 12,000 Philippine Scouts, and some 19,000 American troops were in the islands when the Japanese attacked. On Bataan and Corregidor, Filipinos and Americans stuck it out together, with insufficient food, munitions, and medical supplies, with no airplanes left, fighting a hopeless fight, with nothing ahead but defeat or death. Just before Corregidor fell, General Wainwright, its heroic commander, wrote these words: "As I write this we are subjected to terrific air and artillery bombardment and it is unreasonable to expect that we can hold out for long. We have done our best, both here and on Bataan, and although beaten we are still unashamed."

That heroic fight was a magnificent vindication of 40 years of American tutelage in the Philippines—40 years of patient and understanding effort to train for coming independence a people who had been for centuries held down under alien rule.

III

Never before has there been anything quite like the story of Philippine-American relationships.

Mr. Taft, the first Governor General of the Philippines, inaugurated the policy of "the Philippines for Filipinos." In less than 2 years legislative power over the islands was transferred from the Military Governor to the newly created "Philippine Commission." In the following year Governor Taft appointed three Filipinos as members of this Commission. In 1907 a Philippine Assembly was inaugurated as the lower house of the legislature, with the Philippine Commission serving as the upper house.

In 1913, President Wilson, pressing forward upon the policy of educating the Filipinos in the art of self-government, appointed to the Philippine Commission a majority of Filipinos. He proceeded to Filipinize the administration of the islands as rapidly as possible. "We must hold steadily in view their ultimate independence," he declared in his annual message of December 2, 1913, "and we must move toward the time of that independence as steadily as the way can be cleared and the foundations thoughtfully and permanently laid."

Two and a half years later the passage of the Jones Act still further increased the sphere of Philippine autonomy by abolishing the Philippine Commission and creating in its place an elective Philippine Senate.

During the whole of this time America assisted the Islands with much of the best she had to give—men, ideas, sacrificial effort, money, material resources. She sent out men and women of skill and courage to teach and to serve, pioneers of western democracy. The two peoples, aided by the talents of those from other countries, buckled down to work, to make the Islands one the healthiest and happiest spots in the Pacific. They set up schools and raised the standard of literacy from 20.2 percent in 1903 to 48.8 percent in 1939. They taught English as a common language by which Filipinos of different tongues and different races could achieve national unity.

Americans inspired the building of roadways linking together distant parts of the Islands. They taught sanitation and inaugurated campaigns against disease, so that the scourges of cholera and smallpox were practically stamped out, reducing the death rate from 47.2 per thousand in 1903 to 16.87 per thousand in 1939. Americans and Filipinos together opened up mines, introduced revolutionary changes in agricultural and industrial methods, and developed new industries. The national income, measured by overseas and domestic trade values, increased fivefold. Through these common efforts Filipinos absorbed American ideas and American ways of life.

True, the Filipinos absorbed the bad as well as the good. Furthermore, much remained unachieved. In spite of many salutary and outstanding accomplishments, neither had a sizeable independent middle class been developed nor a sound and balanced economy been achieved. The bulk of the newly created income went to the government, to landlords, and to urban areas, and served but little to ameliorate living conditions among the almost feudal peasantry and tenantry. The relative numbers of these tenants were not materially reduced. Maldistribution of population, of land, and of wealth in many forms continued. The gap between the mass of the population and the small governing class broadened, and many social problems remained unsolved.

But in spite of American shortcomings and failures and of Filipino ineptitude or misunderstanding, the peoples of the Philippine Archipelago, within the span of a single generation, were transformed into a unified, progress-conscious nation, with vastly improved general standards of living, a sound public-school system, good sanitation and public health, modern roads and transport systems, and the developing ability to govern themselves. It was an outstanding achievement. The experiment proved that in the government of alien peoples a policy based upon the welfare of the governed rather than upon power politics and exploitation can be both beneficent and practical.

Exploitation is no longer a practical basis, under twentieth-century conditions, upon which to rest colonial administration. The problem of colonial government never will be solved until we realize that the supreme values to be conserved are human personalities. Because America's underlying objective in her Philippine policy was the welfare of the Filipinos, the Filipinos fought to the death against the Japanese for American ideals and the American way of life.

In 1934 Congress passed the Philippine Independence Act, giving to the Filipino people the right to adopt a constitution, to set up a largely autonomous commonwealth government for an interim 10-year period, and thereafter to enjoy complete independence. The act provides for a commonwealth president and vice president and for a legislative assembly, all freely elected by the Filipino people. Under the provisions of the act the date set for full independence is July 4, 1946.

On November 15, 1935, the new Commonwealth government was inaugurated. Manuel Quezon, one of the most colorful figures of the Far East, was elected as the first president. Always dramatic, charming beyond words to all whom he set out to win, impulsive, adroit, daring, ambitious, he had outwitted and outmaneuvered every rival and stood clearly at the forefront, the unquestioned political leader of the Philippines.

During the 6 years that followed, the Filipino people proved that they are capable of self-government. They organized a smoothly running assembly. They established commonwealth courts. They set up provincial governments. They successfully took over the public administrative services. What was lost in increased costs of government, in

lowered standards, in slackened achievements, was more than offset by newly won experience and national self-respect.

IV

After the inauguration of the Commonwealth government, through the difficult transition stage leading to independence, it became the delicate task of the United States High Commissioner, who represented the President in the Philippines, to give as much help as possible to the Filipino people—largely by personal influence and suggestion rather than by constitutional authority. The exercise, no matter how tactful, of even such residuary power as remained in American hands was frequently an irritation to Filipinos. Quite understandably they wanted to see the Philippine flag flying at the top of the masthead and not underneath the American flag.

Delicate situations constantly arose. For instance, there was the issue of education. For 40 years Americans had labored, and labored valiantly, to overcome the appalling illiteracy prevailing at the end of Spanish rule. They had built elementary government schools in every small barrio, organized high schools and universities, and lifted education above sectarian pressures and politics.

In 1940 the Philippine Assembly passed an act authorizing wide revision of the elementary school system, reducing the elementary course from 7 to 6 years. This was followed by strong agitation on the part of certain sectarian groups to reduce the high school and the college course each from 4 to 3 years. Feeling ran high. The controversy was interrupted by the outbreak of the war. At the same time President Quezon was seeking to establish Tagalog as the national language, in spite of the fact that adequate Tagalog textbooks and Tagalog literature do not exist and that Tagalog is distinctly a minority language in the Philippines. And under the commonwealth form of government these were issues exclusively for the Commonwealth to decide.

Even in financial matters American officials, in the main, had to follow a hands-off policy. By virtue of careful and efficient administration the United States had turned the government over the Filipino people in 1935 a highly solvent administration with considerable surpluses and reserves. Under the 6 years of the Commonwealth government, however, expenditures had increased at such a pace that in spite of augmented revenues there were mounting deficits which were met by the use of surpluses built up under the American administration; and for the fiscal year 1942 the assembly had voted to meet the current deficit by use of the remaining surplus from previous years and by the sale of a bond issue of $10,000,000. The continued expenditure by the Commonwealth government of the large sums turned over by the United States, collected as excise taxes on Philippine coconut oil, varying from seventeen to twenty million dollars every year, and equal to nearly 40 percent of the Commonwealth revenues from all other sources, contributed to the maintenance of prices and production costs at levels well above those of other tropical countries with which the Philippines will have to compete after attaining independence.

In short, 6 years of experience proved the Commonwealth experiment serviceable and workable as an interim arrangement for a youthful people attaining nationhood, but impracticable and unsatisfactory as a permanent form of government. It has spelled irritations and frustrations on both sides. It has meant in the last analysis division of power between two widely different peoples. Such an arrangement is unsatisfactory to both peoples and therefore lacks stability.

In the Philippines the hour has struck. Independence is the only practicable way forward. Commitments have been made and expectations have been built up on the part of both parties. There is no turning back now.

Are the Filipinos ready for independence? There is only one way in which that question can be truly answered. That is through the actual experiment. Was the United States ready for independence in 1776? There were many people at that time who would have answered "no." By actual experiment we proved that we were.

In a strongly rooted independent Philippine Nation America has a crucial stake. For over 40 years we have been at work implanting in the Filipinos our ideas of individual liberty and the democratic way of life. Their success means our success in furthering American ideas and ideals throughout the strategic east.

Last June Congress passed a joint resolution to make good the pledge of freedom. In words portentous for the future of the Filipino people, Congress authorized the President, "after proclaiming that constitutional processes and normal functions of government have been restored in the Philippine Islands, and after consultation with the President of the Philippines, to advance the date of the independence of the Philippine Islands by proclaiming their independence as a separate and self-governing nation prior to July 4, 1946."

Thus America stands committed to give to the Filipino people full independence after the Japanese aggressors are driven out and "constitutional processes and normal functions of government" have been restored to the Philippines. Standing today at the helm of the Commonwealth government in exile is Sergio Osmeña, who as Vice President succeeded President Quezon upon the latter's death on August 1, 1944. President Osmeña, of the same age as President Quezon and formerly his political rival, has for many years been a leader in Philippine public life. Dependable, of tempered and reasoned judgment, wise, respected throughout the Philippines, he promises in the difficult years ahead to prove an able leader, friendly to Americans and always ready to cooperate.

V

Perhaps the greatest difficulty confronting the new government will be how to achieve economic independence. When the Philippines became part of the American Nation in 1898, the Filipinos were given free access to the highly protected American market—one of the richest in the world. This right to send Philippine products into the United States free of duty and to sell them there for remunerative prices, while other nations had to pay high duties on similar imports into the United States, proved to be an economic gold mine for the Filipinos. For instance, because they could ship sugar duty-free to the United States, Philippine sugar producers in 1937 received about $41,000,000 more than they would have obtained if they had sold an equivalent amount of sugar at the world price.

Under such conditions it has been inevitable from the outset that the Filipino people should concentrate their productive effort upon those commodities which could be sold in the United States market at prices maintained above world levels by American legislation. Of the total value of Philippine exports, the United States accounted for 19 percent in 1900, 46 percent in 1910, 70 percent in 1920, and an average of 85 percent in the 5 years ending in 1940.

In short, although during the past 40 years we were doing everything possible to prepare the Filipinos for political independence, the effect of our economic policy was to make them even more dependent upon the United States. With four-fifths of Philippine products before the war dependent upon American markets, the United States could not suddenly shut Philippine producers out of the duty-free American markets without entailing grave injury to the entire Philippine economy.

Permanent free entry for Philippine products in the American market offers no solution. If the Filipino people are ever to have the independence which they crave, clearly their fundamental economy and means of livelihood must be free from dependence upon changeable legislative majorities in the United States Congress. Political independence without economic independence would be a mockery. Furthermore, if stable foundations are to be built for a lasting world peace, the postwar trade arrangements must be built upon equality of commercial treatment to all and not upon special trade preferences and discriminations. If the United States grants and receives exclusive preferential treatment in areas with which it has close political ties, it would be difficult for us successfully to oppose imperial and dominion preferences in the British Empire and elsewhere.

The solution has been sought in gradual and progressive increases of American duties on Philippine products. The Independence Act of 1934 provided for increasing economic limitations and restrictions upon the shipment of Philippine products to the United States during the interim 10-year period. The Joint Preparatory Committee on Philippine Affairs, which explored the problem in 1937 and 1938, recommended that the elimination of Philippine preferences should be achieved only gradually and progressively at the rate of 5 percent a year for 20 years.

The present war has profoundly changed the situation. Since 1941, Filipinos have been able to ship no sugar or other products to American markets. It is reported that sugar cultivation, except for home consumption and the manufacture of alcohol for fuel, has been practically stopped. The copra and coconut oil industry is also stagnant. Attempts to grow cotton as a commercial crop are said to have failed.

When liberation comes, presumably sugar cultivation in the Philippines will be on a home-consumption basis. If the new Philippine Government after the war is wise enough and strong enough to prevent a return to prewar sugar production figures, one of the great milestones on the way to economic independence will be passed.

The building of the new Philippine economy will call for a high order of planning and statesmanship. Largely because of American activity for the past 40 years, the Filipino's standard of living and also his living costs have risen considerably above those of his competing far eastern neighbors.

Of course, the bulk of production will continue to be for home consumption; and here other considerations will apply. But the Filipinos will need imports from abroad; and to buy these, they must produce a considerable quantity of goods for export.

If and when independence shuts the Filipinos out of the protected American markets, they will be forced to sell in world markets in competition with other areas with lower standards of living and production costs. They will have to turn away from the production of surpluses like sugar, which are salable only in the protected American market, and learn to produce goods which they can sell at a profit in world markets. To achieve this, Filipinos must improve and lower the cost of their products through increased skill and scientific knowledge, through labor-saving devices, through utilization of byproducts, through inventive ingenuity along a thousand different lines.

The solution of their economic problem will be a thorny and difficult task. It is not insoluble. American ingenuity and technical skill will be at the call of the Filipinos to help in the solution.

Last June Congress passed a joint resolution (S. J. Res. 94) creating a Filipino Rehabilitation Commission, composed of an

equal number of Americans and Filipinos, to investigate all matters affecting postwar economy, trade, finance, economic stability and rehabilitation of the Philippine Islands and to formulate recommendations based upon such investigations and for future trade relations between the United States and the independent Philippine Republic when established.

Because the present economic dependence of the Filipinos upon the United States is largely of our own making, and because it is to our own interest to build for future stability in the Pacific, the Filipino people must be given their independence under such conditions as will assure them sound economic foundations for their future. The American people will not be content with anything less.

VI

There remains the question of United States naval and air bases in the Philippines. The Independence Act of 1934 authorized the President of the United States to acquire or retain naval reservations in the Philippines, and the joint resolution of 1944 (S. J. Res. 93) authorized the President to withhold or to acquire such bases, in addition to any provided for in the Act of 1934, as he may deem necessary for the full and mutual protection of the Philippine Islands and of the United States.

It is not a question of a great power for its own interests imposing its will by might upon a small, unwilling nation. The responsible leaders of the Commonwealth government want the United States to retain bases in the Philippines. They know that an American base in the islands would have to be protected by American armed forces; and that, modern warfare being what it is, protection of the base would involve protection of the entire Philippine archipelago. From the point of view of the Philippines, the grant of a naval or air base is a cheap price with which to buy protection by the most powerful Navy in the world against foreign aggression.

The real question is whether the United States desirse to acquire such bases at such a cost. The answer depends in part on the issue of what is to be the future role of the United States in world affairs and particularly in the Pacific. Are we henceforth to draw into our own continental orbit and seek to avoid all involvements in the Far East, or are we to continue as a great Pacific power, playing an active, decisive part in the Far East? The present course of international events in reality leaves us no choice.

The world has become a unity. Twentieth-century conditions force either participation in world activities or else atrophy and extinction. The day of "magnificent isolation" is past. The United States is compelled, irrespective of its desires, to play an active part in the Pacific and in the Far East or cease to be a great power.

The peoples of the world today are interlocked economically, socialily, politically. China needs American goods. The United States in the postwar world will need Chinese markets if we are to keep our men at work. The same is true of Australia, of New Zealand, of Malaya, of the Philippines. People cannot sell without buying. Trade is a two-way process. In our twentieth-century closely integrated world, ignorance or backward conditions or disease in any one spot vitally endangers all. If we accept that view, what follows? Should the United States establish naval or air bases in the Philippines?

However, the answer transcends the Philippine problem. It relates in part to the kind of international organization for maintaining world security which will emerge from the present war.

If the postwar world is to be built again upon the outlived nineteenth-century system of competing, rival sovereignties and a continually teetering, ever-precarious balance of power, then the United States will inevitably continue to seek its own security through its own armies and navy and air power; and it it will want its own naval and air bases in those parts of the world where fighting is likely to break out. So will every other great power. If that is to be the course which we and other great powers follow in the postwar world, the retention of powerful Philippine naval and air bases will not save us. For the whole world will then be following the pathway to disaster.

If, on the other hand, the postwar world is to be built upon modern reality; if the United Nations join in setting up a world organization built upon the cooperative effort of all to advance human welfare, to elevate standards of living, and to enforce a common rule of justice and law in place of strong-armed international savagery, the Philippines cease to be an international problem. The independent Philippines then become an outpost in the Pacific for the enforcement of international order in the interest of world security.

It is against this background that the matter of naval and air bases in the Philippines must be considered. The maintenance of justice and law, whether by national or international organizations, requires armed forces. Some strong Philippine base will probably be necessary for the maintenance of order in the postwar world. The vital issue is whether henceforth bases such as these will be held by individual nations, owing responsibility to no one in order to protect and further their own selfish interests, or whether they will be held by or for the world community in order to protect and maintain an organized peace.

The days of imperialism are numbered. Stable peace cannot rest on any system of alien government based upon exploitation. This applies to every country and to every race—white, yellow, brown, or black. The only possible basis for an enduring civilization is equality of human rights, regardless of race or creed or color. The Atlantic Charter is as applicable to the Pacific as it is to the Atlantic. Humanity knows no geographical bounds.

Pacific peoples no less than Atlantic peoples have the right "to choose the form of government under which they will live." Pacific peoples no less than Atlantic peoples are entitled to "access on equal terms to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity."

In the light of these fundamentals the program of the United States in the Philippines assumes fairly distinct outlines. Our first step obviously is to drive the Japanese invaders from the islands.

Second, we must thereupon establish the complete independence of the Philippine Islands as a separate and self-governing nation.

Third, the United States and the new Philippine Government must work out some practicable program for the winning of economic independence. The United States is morally bound to assist the Filipinos in finding a way to achieve independence without economic shipwreck. But continuing free entry for Philippine goods to the protected American market offers no solution.

Fourth, the Filipino people will emerge from the war economically stunned, with many of their properties in ruin. The United States will want to help them to their feet with assistance in the most constructive form possible.

Fifth, the United States and the Philippine Nation must unite in working out common security measures, if possible, with the other United Nations. Such measures will presumably include the establishment of naval and air bases in order to protect and maintain the world's peace in the Pacific.

The eyes of the world, and particularly of every people in Asia, are upon the Philippines. The measure of American influence for good in the Far East for years to come will depend largely upon the wisdom and the sincerity of American conduct in the Philippines.

In 1776, America in the western world struck out along a new pathway for democracy and human freedom. Her achievement forms one of the shining chapters in human history. In the months and the years ahead America has the chance to assist in writing a new chapter in human progress and freedom in the Far East. What is written will depend in large part upon the outcome of the Philippine adventure.

Radio Address of Hon. Lothrop Stoddard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1946

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. Lothrop Stoddard made over the radio on February 17, 1946:

During the years just prior to World War II, when the boundless ambitions and immeasurable ruthlessness of Nazi Germany were being revealed alike by its deeds and its words, a growing number of farsighted minds became convinced that the Nazi peril must, at all costs, be faced up to, met, and mastered. That conviction was perhaps best expressed in the title of a book written by a member of our foreign service who, from a wealth of personal experience in the Third Reich, coined the telling phrase: "You can't do business with Hitler."

The events of the past week have probably done more than any previous period to lead intelligent realists to form a similar conclusion regarding the Soviet Union and to say with regretful conviction: "You can't do business with Stalin," meaning, in this instance, not merely the aging Russian dictator but also the entire knot of implacable and instable zealots associated with Stalin in the Moscow Politbureau, whose inflexible aim always has been and still is to dominate and revolutionize the world, ultimately uniting it in a universal U. S. S. R.—a planet-wide Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

To give the devil his due, the rulers of Soviet Russia cannot be charged with the sin of hypocrisy. They have never concealed their basic aims, but have announced them as frankly as Hitler did his in the pages of Mein Kampf. It is we of the democratic world who have been guilty of intellectual dishonesty and cowardice by chronically refusing to face up to either of these totalitarian menaces until it is too late to deal with it with constructive decisiveness and thereby avert a major disaster.

Regular listeners to these broadcasts will recall that, for the past 3 years I have been warning against the implications of Soviet policy and the dangers of trying to appease it. Those warnings have brought down upon me much criticism and not a little abuse. But Moscow's conduct since the close of the war, culminating in the events of the past week, are opening democratic eyes at an unprecedented rate, and it is to be hoped that the grim lesson may be learned in time to lead to remedial action before it is too late.

The catalog of Moscow's offending is a long one, but this week has witnessed three items of especially noteworthy significance. These are: (1) Stalin's broadcast on election eve; (2) textual publication of the Yalta sell-out; (3) Ottawa's disclosure of the Soviet spy ring in Canada.

Last Sunday I noted the gist of Stalin's speech which was summarized over the radio that Saturday evening, though the full text was not available until the morning papers. A complete reading merely accentuated its menacing character, which spread consternation everywhere outside Communist circles. The address constitutes an uncompromising challenge to the democratic world and its way of life which is condemned by Stalin as a breeder of economic depression, crises, and periodic wars. The logical conclusion is that the Soviet Union should bend every effort to magnify its power and perfect its superiority. No mention of UNO. No hint of genuine understanding and cooperation. Only an assertion of the immense superiority of the Soviet system, the Red Army, and the spread of the Soviet way of life which such combined innate superiority and power necessarily entail.

This imperious manifesto should strip away the last illusions of wishful thinkers and lead to an entire recasting of the attitude and policies of democratic nations toward the Soviet Union and its adherents among ourselves. First of all, it should mean the resolute end of appeasement of every kind. Moscow should be given plainly to understand that it will be held strictly to its international undertakings and that acts of unilateral aggression will be met determinedly even though a major crisis be thereby precipitated. We, on our part, should become aware that if a show-down between ourselves and Moscow must come, as now seems well nigh unavoidable, the sooner it comes the better for us.

This mood of healthy realism should be furthered by the full disclosure of the famous, or rather infamous, Yalta agreement—infamous not only for the needless bartering away of principles on our part but also for the revelation of the true character of Russia's war effort. Our "noble ally" who uttered such fine sentiments and pled so eloquently for a second front when the Nazis were pushing him hard is now seen to have been actuated throughout by purely selfish motives and had to be bribed to extend reciprocal aid to its allies, who, incidentally, seem to have been either too stupid or too craven to have realized that the bribe was needless.

Yet, having gained such vast advantages through Yalta, Moscow has proceeded to evade or nullify its obligations under that agreement, alike in Europe and in the Far East. The latest of these are visible in the pressure brought to bear on the Chungking government for fresh concessions in Manchuria and in the setting up of a Soviet-dominated regime in Inner Mongolia, the exact counterpart of the bogus regime engineered in Azerbaijan. These flagrant dishonesties should be roundly countered by our Government, which should back Chungking wholeheartedly, and should incidentally insist upon a workable formula in Korea and allow no tampering with MacArthur in Japan.

The world-wide scope of Soviet designs is just being brought home to us, perhaps more vividly than ever before, by the Canadian Government's unearthing of an elaborate espionage network in the Dominion. The existence of such a network has been suspected for some time, but its precise objectives have only recently been determined. One of these is now seen to be the theft of vital information concerning the atomic bomb, but suspicions of larger Soviet aims, entertained by the Canadian and American General Staffs, has led to the current Canadian Army expedition known as "Operation Musk-Ox," to explore and strategically open up the wilds of northern Canada, in order to guard against a potential aerial invasion of the North American Continent over the North Pole. The first detachment of this expedition left Port Churchill on Hudson Bay last Friday in a temperature of 43° below zero. Its itinerary will cover 3,100 miles. Such heroic exertions reveal the long-range verdict of military planners both here and in the Dominion regarding future contingencies with the Soviet Union.

Going back to the spy-ring disclosures, it is understood that the ramifications extend into the United States and that our vigilant FBI has made several arrests, but that pressure from our State Department hushed up the matter and prevented legal prosecutions. Another instance of the piddling policy of appeasement which seems so rampant in the Department these days.

When, oh when, will our Government begin the desperately needed education of the American people by officially announcing the realities of the world situation and honestly explaining their meaning? We have just issued a blue book, calling attention to the neo-Fascist danger arising in Argentina. How much more necessary is another blue book setting forth the doings of Moscow during recent years.

Another thing the American public should be officially told is the character and activities of the so-called American Communist Party. Every patriotic citizen should be led to realize that this organization can no longer be considered a joke or a mere nuisance; that, now that Moscow has revealed its program and policy, our local Communists can be counted on to follow a party line which renders them actual seditionists and potential traitors.

Thus far, the only high-placed official of our Government who has had the guts to speak out frankly about our Communists is the one official who knows by far the most about their nefarious plans, acts, and methods. This courageous individual is none other than J. Edgar Hoover, head of the FBI—the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

To me, it is amazing that our press services did not fully report his startling address last December before the International Association of Chiefs of Police at Miami, Fla. After recounting the FBI's extraordinarily successful campaign against Axis plotters and saboteurs during the war, Mr. Hoover continued:

"To the Fascist foe must be added another, the American Communist. These panderers of diabolic distrust already are concentrating their efforts to confuse and divide by applying the Fascist smear to progressive police departments, the FBI, and other American institutions to conceal their own sinister purposes.

"The godless, truthless way of life that American Communists would force on America can mean only tyranny and oppression if they succeed. They are against the liberty which is America—they are for the license of their own. When they raise their false cry of unity, remember there can be no unity with the enemies of our way of life who are attempting to undermine our democratic institutions. The Fascist-minded tyrant whom we conquered on the battlefields is no different from the American communistic corruptionist who now uses the tricks of a confidence man until his forces are sufficiently strong to rise with arms in revolt.

"America cannot exist half democratic and half Communist or Fascist. If we want to improve upon our American form of government, we will do it in our own way, in our own time, and with our own blueprint. Therefore it behooves us to be on guard for an enemy that brazenly and openly has advocated the corruption of America, that spends sleepless nights working one propaganda line after another, that poses behind a dozen fronts, that squirms and twists his way into those great American forces such as the church, the schools, and the ranks of labor."

Since those brave words were spoken, 2 months ago, what turmoil and confusion has spread over the American scene. Crippling strikes, bitter factionalism, mutinous discontent in our armed forces, abject appeasement in our foreign policy, and semiparalysis in our domestic politics. Is all this merely fortuitous? Or is there a hidden hand, reaching out from afar to envenom our local problems and synchronize them in a manner which, unless sternly checked and constructively dealt with, may make us helpless at the very moment when our strength and unity are most needed in the world?

My radio audience, I ask you gravely to ponder on all these things.

Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1946

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily New of February 19, 1946:

BROTHERHOOD

Tolerance is a virtue, but in the United States we need a much richer virtue than that. It is not enough that we should treat those of different race or different religion from ourselves with indifference or even politeness. Unfortunately even that minimum standard of decency is not achieved by some people

We need to cultivate in all our public and private relations the will to seek and know the best among our neighbors of all races, colors, and creeds; to appreciate and foster their good qualities; to learn from them as readily as to teach them; to become their friends and in truth their brothers and sisters, as befits the children of God.

This is Brotherhood Week, sponsored by the Round Table of Christians and Jews, to cultivate brotherhood among the American people. The sponsors are asking for contributions to a fund to promote brotherhood among the diverse elements of American life, to promote research by competent sociologists into the cause of the antagonisms and prejudices that divide too many, and to find ways of eliminating these evils.

This is a good cause that merits the support of good people.

This Speculative Fever

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1946

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following editorial which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal on February 19, 1946:

THIS SPECULATIVE FEVER

It was time somebody talked frankly and forcefully to Congress about the "speculative fever" which is rising in this country. Stabilization Director Chester Bowles did the job neatly in his appearance before the House Banking and Currency Committee.

"This speculative fever," said Bowles, "has developed largely because Congress has failed so far to reenact the price control law." As long as there is a possibility that the law will be allowed to die June 30, or

that it may be weakened by amendment, there will be people who will buy goods or equities beyond their needs, or keep large inventories, just to be protected "in case."

We know this is true. There is evidence that many manufacturers are putting goods in storage, hoping Congress will fail to support the price-control program. We know that many consumers, believing runaway inflation may be in the offing, are turning all their ready cash into commodities, regardless of their needs. We know that these tendencies, by increasing already existing shortages, are making the inflationary pressure greater.

We know, too, that Congress could end this sorry game by the simple act of continuing the present price control law in effect for another year. If the people were assured that controls would not be taken off, they would drop their panicky buying of goods and stocks, and manufacturers would cease storing their finished goods.

What is Congress stalling for anyway? Surely it means eventually to carry on with the protection of price controls. Why, then, does it not act now, before the speculative fever does more damage?

CIO Discloses Its Salaries, Dues, Union Rules, Rights of Members

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a report made by the CIO as to its salaries, dues, union rules, and rights of members as it appeared in the New York Times of Sunday, February 10, 1946, under the heading, "CIO Discloses Its Salaries, Dues, Union Rules, Rights of Members," together with a table by CIO showing finances and procedures of its unions.

The CIO is to be congratulated for this act of good faith. It inspires trust.

The report follows:

CIO DISCLOSES ITS SALARIES, DUES, UNION RULES, RIGHTS OF MEMBERS

(By A. H. Raskin)

WASHINGTON, February 9.—Without waiting for congressional action on proposals to force unions to disclose information on their finances and the extent to which democratic practices prevail in them, the Congress of Industrial Organizations made public today a comparative survey of the way in which its 36 affiliated unions account for their funds and run their affairs.

The survey, made by the CIO Research Department, showed that 25 of the unions paid top salaries to their officers of $6,000 a year or less. Philip Murray, who draws no compensation as president of the CIO, receives the highest salary, $20,000 a year, as president of the United Steelworkers.

Sidney Hillman, president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, is paid $15,000 annually, and Emil Rieve, president of the Textile Workers Union, and Samuel Wolchok, president of the United Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Employees, receive $10,000 each. The heads of all other CIO unions receive less than $10,000 a year, according to the report.

The salaries paid to the union leaders were contrasted with those drawn by executives of the industries with which the CIO has contracts. The report listed the highest salary paid by General Motors as $459,041 in 1943 and by Bethlehem Steel as $221,645 in 1944.

The great majority of CIO members pay union initiation fees of less than $5, according to the survey. The general range is $2 to $10, with one union, the Marine Engineers Beneficial Association, requiring $50.

Twenty-seven unions levied no special assessments on their members last year, when the highest assessment reported was $2. Eight unions do not permit assessments, five vest the power to levy them in executive boards and most others in a national convention or a membership referendum.

Monthly dues were reported to be $1 to $1.50 for most workers, with about half the dues going to the international union and the rest retained by the local. The dues and initiation fees cover all collective bargaining negotiations, strike benefits (except for special assessments and fund-raising drives), publication of union journals and political activities, the CIO stated.

It declared that every CIO union "carefully accounts" to its membership for all money spent and that 32 of the 36 unions publish detailed financial reports, which are available not only to the members but also to the press and all other interested parties.

In 31 cases regular audits are made by certified public accountants. In the other unions the auditing is done by officers or committees especially elected by the membership, the CIO reported.

RIGHTS OF MEMBERSHIP

No worker is barred from any CIO union because of race, color, sex, or creed, according to the report. However, the statistical table summarizing the findings of the research department indicates that the Marine Engineers Beneficial Association leaves the question of admission without discrimination to the discretion of its locals. All other unions said that they prohibited such discrimination.

There are no "second-class members" in the CIO and every member has full and equal voting rights, the CIO said. The officers of all international unions are elected by the membership or by convention delegates selected by the membership, the report stated, and such elections are held annually or biennially in every union except by the United Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Employees, which elects its officers every 3 years.

The supreme legislative body for CIO unions is the international convention, held annually or biennially by 34 unions, the survey disclosed. The other two unions hold conventions every 3 years.

Convention sessions are generally open to the public and proceedings are published in full by 31 unions, it was stated. The remaining 5 unions publish summaries or condensations of their proceedings.

To safeguard the rights of individual members, the constitutions or bylaws of all unions provide that a member has a right to a hearing before he can be expelled, the CIO said. Thirty-three unions have the further stipulation that the member may appeal to the international convention before expulsion becomes final.

PUBLICATION OF RECORDS

No effort was made in the survey to determine the total amount in union treasuries, the number of organizers, and other officials employed, or the sums spent on organizing activities. But CIO officials said that most of this information could be obtained from the published financial statements of the unions.

In summing up its findings, the CIO said:

"This study does not prove that all CIO unions are perfect—no human institutions are. There is no way of compelling people to participate actively in their own organizations and protect their own democratic institutions. Passing laws won't help, either.

"But the survey does demonstrate that CIO unions have provided a democratic framework, a constitution which insures basic democratic rights for all members. And it is clear today that the great mass of industrial workers, through their unions, have found the means of expressing their needs and desires.

"Indeed, the speed with which the unions responded to the great unrest and economic uncertainty which workers experienced after the war ended is strong evidence of their democratic vigor."

Table of CIO showing finances and procedures of its unions

Name of union	Annual salary of highest paid officer	Initiation fee	Monthly dues	How does international report on receipts and expenditures to membership?	Are international books audited and by whom?	Is financial report published?	How often are international conventions held?	How often are officers elected?
Architects, engineers, chemists, and technicians.	$4,680	$3 to $10, usually $3.	$1 to $2.50, average is $1.35.	Quarterly report to locals.	Yes, certified public accountants.	Yes	Every 2 years	Every 2 years.
Automobile workers	9,000	$2 to $15	$1	Semiannual report to locals.	do	do	Annually	Annually.
Barbers and beauty culturists	4,680	$3 to $25	$1 to $4	Statements issued by accountant.	Yes, international auditor.	do	Every 2 years	Every 2 years.
Amalgamated clothing workers	15,000	$10 maximum	Varies, usually $1.40 to $2.[1]	At convention	Yes, convention committee and certified public accountant.	do	do	Do.
American Communications Association.	4,680	$1 to $20, depends on earnings.	$1 to $4 [2]	Published in union journal.	Yes, certified public accountant.	do	do	Do.
Electrical, radio, and machine workers.	5,200	$2 minimum, rarely more.	$1 minimum, usually $1.50.	Monthly statement to locals.	Yes, trustees and certified public accountant.	For members.	Annually	Annually.
Farm equipment and metal workers.	5,000	$2 to $15	$1 to $1.50	Quarterly by executive board.	Yes, certified public accountant.	At convention.	Every 2 years	Every 2 years.
Federal workers	5,000	$2 maximum, most pay $1.	$1.50 maximum, most pay $1.	At convention	do	Yes	Annually	Annually.

[1] Set by locals, usually varies from 25 to 50 cents per week.

[2] Dues depend on earnings.

Table of CIO showing finances and procedures of its unions—Continued

Name of union	Annual salary of highest paid officer	Initiation fee	Monthly dues	How does international report on receipts and expenditures to membership?	Are international books audited and by whom?	Is financial report published?	How often are international conventions held?	How often are officers elected?
Fishermen and allied workers	$4,160	$10 maximum	Set by locals, most 50 cents to $1.25.	Semiannual report by certified public accountant.	Yes, certified public accountant.	Yes	Annually	Annually.
Food, tobacco, and agricultural workers.	4,940	$5 in union shop, $2 elsewhere.	$1.50 minimum	Semiannual report to executive board.	Yes	do	Every 2 years.	Every 2 years.
Fur and leather workers	5,200	$1 and up, as set by locals.	$1.40 minimum [2]	International finance committee regularly audits.[3]	Yes, finance committee and certified public accountant.	do	do	Do.
Furniture workers	5,720	$2 to $15	$1 to $2	Quarterly report to locals.	Yes, certified public accountant.	do	do	Do.
Gas, coke, and chemical workers	3,600	$2 to $5, may be waived.	$1 to $1.50	At convention	do	do	do	Do.
Glass, ceramic, and silica sand workers	5,600	$2 minimum, a few locals charge more.	1 percent of earnings.	Monthly report to locals.	do	For members.	do	Do.
Inland boatmen's union of the Pacific.	(4)	$10, maximum	$1.50 to $3	Certified public accountant quarterly report to locals.	do	No	No conventions.[5]	Do.
Longshoremen and warehousemen	5,080	$1 to $10	Set by locals	Quarterly audit sent to locals.	do	Yes	Every 2 years.	Do.
Marine cooks and stewards	4,840	$32 [6]	$2	Weekly at port meetings and at general council.	do	do	do	Do.
Marine engineers beneficial association.	7,500	$50	$2	None made, but is available.	do	do	Annually	Do.
Marine and shipbuilding workers	8,000	$2 to $10, 80 percent pay $2.	$1.25	At convention	do	do	do	Annually.
National maritime union	7,800	$15 [6]	$2.50	Monthly, in union press.[7]	Books open to members.	do	Every 2 years.	Every 2 years.
Mine, mill, and smelter workers	6,000	$2 to $10, most pay $2.	$1 to $5, majority $1 to $1.50.	Monthly report to locals.	Yes; certified public accountant.	do	Annually	Do.
American newspaper guild	6,750	$1 to $10	$1 to $5	Quarterly, annually, certified public accountant report.	do	do	do	Do.
Office and professional workers	7,800	$2	$1.50 to $3.50	At executive board meetings and convention.	do	do	Every 2 years.	Do.
Oil workers	6,600	$2 to $25	$2 to $3, 95 percent pay $2.	Monthly statement to locals.	do	do	Annually	Annually.
Packinghouse workers	4,500	$2 [8]	Set by local, 95 percent pay $1.50.	Semiannual report	Yes; by auditor	do	do	Do.
Playthings jewelry, and novelty workers.	5,200	$2 to $10 90 percent locals charge $2.	½ pay $1, ½ pay $1.50.	Semiannual audit sent to locals.	Yes; by auditor and accountant.	do	Every 2 years.	Every 2 years.
Retail, wholesale, and department store employees.	10,000	$10, maximum, average is $5.	$1 to $4	Report at each executive board meeting.	Yes; auditor and certified public accountant.	do	Every 3 years.	Every 3 years.
Rubber workers	4,500	$2	$1	Quarterly audit sent to locals.	Yes; certified public accountant.	do	Annually	Annually.
Shoeworkers	5,200	$2, minimum	$1, minimum [9]	Quarterly report to locals.	do	do	Every 2 years.	Every 2 years.
State, county, and municipal workers.	5,000	$1 to $5, most pay $1.	$1 to $2, most pay $1.50.	Semiannual report to locals.	do	No	do	Do.
Steelworkers	20,000	$3	$1 to $1.50	Certified public accountant report to locals.	do	Yes	do	Do.
Stone and allied products workers	3,000	$5 minimum [11]	$1.25 [10]	Annual report to local officers.	do	For locals	Every 3 years.	Do.[12]
Textile workers' union	10,000	$1 to $10 [13]	$1 minimum, most pay $1.50.	At convention	do	Ye	Every 2 years.	Do.
Transport service employees	4,000	$5	$1.50	Quarterly report to locals.	do	do	do	Do.
Transport workers' union	5,200	$3	$1.25 to $1.75 [14]	Semiannual report to locals.	do	do	do	Do.
Woodworkers	5,200	$5 [11]	$1 minimum	Quarterly report to locals.	do	do	Annually	Do.

[2] Minimum dues actually 35 cents weekly, with 12½ cents weekly as regular per capita tax. In a few locals dues are based on a percentage of earnings.
[3] Certified public accountant submits semiannual report to executive board.
[4] No full-time international officers.
[5] Annual conference of executive council is central policy body; its recommendations are submitted to membership referendum.
[6] Helps to cover burial benefit, shipwreck benefit, hospital benefit, etc.
[7] Also semiannually and annually.
[8] A few locals add additional fees for special purposes; none charge more than $5.
[9] Minimum dues actually 25 cents weekly, with 15 cents weekly as regular per capita tax.
[10] A few locals charge $1.50 (with special permission of international).
[11] International frequently reduces charge in case of new locals.
[12] President and secretary-treasurer every 2 years, vice president and executive board every year.
[13] Majority of locals make no charge.
[14] Dues depend on earnings.

Costa Rica: A Rural Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 22 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, in moving to have the article, Costa Rica: A Rural Democracy, from the Washington magazine, World Affairs, inserted in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to say a word about the constructive, wartime work of my friend, Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, educator, author, and lecturer, in winning valuable friends for the United States of America among our good neighbors in South and Central America. This article on Costa Rica, which I am submitting for the attention of the Congress, bears the impress of all the qualities of high-minded friendship which is a gift most attractive to those citizens in Latin America who contributed to the victory of the United Nations. In describing Costa Rica as a rural democracy, Dr. Thorning, one of our most accurate scholars, emphasizes the importance of enlightened principles of social justice for the masses of farmers, miners, and industrial workers in the other American Republics and Canada. At the same time, this Maryland apostle for the good-neighbor policy points out that good health among the little children throughout Latin America is a starting point for inter-American friendship. Although the problems and handicaps of climate, altitude, and food naturally impede orderly socio-economic progress, it is evident from the article of Dr. Thorning that our friends in Latin

America cannot only overcome these difficulties, but also furnish us some patterns for imitation in our own country. The article speaks for itself.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COSTA RICA: A RURAL DEMOCRACY

(By Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, of Maryland)

Costa Rica is one of the most thoroughly democratic states of the Western Hemisphere. Although its people are predominantly Spanish, often described superficially as unfitted for self-government, they have managed to create a republic notable for orderliness. Surrounded by countries where agitation, unrest, and even revolutions abound, Costa Ricans seem to have discovered the formula for quiet, unspectacular progress. Costa Rica (or Rich Coast) lives up to its name as a region rich in the best values realizable in a rural democracy.

Evolution of rural democracy in Costa Rica stems from diverse causes:

1. Relatively wide distribution of land ownership. 2. Fairly homogeneous white population. 3. Deep, practical interest in education. 4. Climate unspoiled by extremes of altitude or temperature. 5. Expanding birth rate. 6. Well-balanced economy, with imports never greatly in excess of exports.

Redistribution of land, described as "the perennial football of Latin-American politics," has constituted the basis for democracy. In 1572, while children of the original conquistadores were still in the land, the 55 Spanish families in and around Cartago, Costa Rica's pioneer community, faced an agonizingly painful dilemma: Either they would have to plow their own fields and produce their own grains, fruits, and vegetables, or they would be doomed. In other parts of Hispanic America, proud, though penniless, hidalgos and swineherds resorted to the importation of slaves and to tenant farming to escape the fancied indignity of manual labor. Vast estates in Argentina, Chile, Peru, and Guatemala, still intact, bear testimony to the tenacity of a landed aristocracy.

In Costa Rica alone was the dilemma resolved in favor of personal service. Only there did Spaniards (or Portuguese) turn their backs upon the delights of the bower-like hacienda, where lords and ladies of the manor adorned the center of a multicolored picture whose frame was compounded of the sweat, blood, and anguish of thousands of Negroes, Indians, mulattoes, quadroons, octaroons, and mestizos. They elected to do farm work themselves, perhaps not so much because of virtue or farsighted wisdom but because they saw slave merchants were uninterested in a remote market where the profits would be infinitesimal compared to fortunes to be gained in the lush fields of Cuba, Santo Domingo, and Brazil. They tilled the soil and built their homes without field hands or house boys. As a result, they formed a democracy of small farmers, each working his own acres without loss of self-respect or social prestige.

Was it fate that the subsoil of the "rich coast" contained no mineral wealth, either in "black gold" or its more ancient rival? While other pioneers dashed off in mad pursuit of silver, emeralds, platinum, or diamonds, Costa Ricans remained loyal to the land. Until the 1820's, the country, although ruffled by occasional political storms, managed to lay foundations for a sane, self-governing community in the era of independence.

Then in 1825, when Spanish domination had become history, they were the first Latin Americans to find foreign markets for coffee. A suitably prolonged dry season, mild temperatures, and porous volcanic soil made a perfect combination. But Costa Ricans were quick to take the initiative. Opportunity came because they had exploited the soil rather than their fellow men. They now had a crop to export and to tax. The coffee rush was on and, by 1829, coffee had become the chief product, a pre-eminence it retains. Costa Rican coffee not only enjoys primacy among tropical crops of the home economy; it maintains a superiority of aroma and taste everywhere. Colombians alone have a right to dispute this claim.

It may be appropriate to insert two footnotes on coffee culture in middle America. The first person to introduce the plant to this part of the world was a parish priest, Padre Félix Velarde. He brought in some seed from the Antilles, where the Arabian variety was making a good showing. In this way, Padre Félix gave Costa Rica her motto: In hos signo vinces. It was a peaceful victory, based on widely distributed land ownership and a highly specialized coffee culture.

The second item is equally interesting. Early in the last century, a widow, Ramona Jiménez de Peralta, found herself penniless, with seven young children. A charming lady of good family, she might easily have captured another man and played a brilliant role in "la gran vida de salón" (the career of a stylish society matron). Instead, Doña Ramona tamed the jungle. This meant plunging into the wilderness around Cartago, with "a compass in one hand and a machete in the other." The widow succeeded where men had failed. Thanks to her intelligence and industry, sugarcane, coffee trees, and cattle began to thrive in the clearings carved out of tropical underbrush. Her fame still clings to the land, enriching the democratic traditions.

Prior to her project, the section around Turrialba had been notorious as a wild and rugged terrain, hostile to man. Today it is rich, alluvial soil, where almost every fruit, grain, bush, and tree growable in the tropics can be cultivated. Here, in and around Turrialba, authorities of other American republics, including the United States, have established the institute which employs scientists and research workers in the cause of bigger and better harvests. Large fruit companies have a huge stake in this center.

Although banana culture, coffee, and vegetable production rank high at the Institute of Tropical Agriculture, other experiments are under way, for example, to raise a species of henequen (suggested substitute for manila hemp) that, like the far eastern product, will resist rot in salt water. Research workers at Turrialba intend to concentrate upon industrial commodities as well as foods or beverages. War in the Pacific focused interest on the institute's experimentations with rubber, drugs, tropical woods, and chemicals useful against tropical disease.

There is no race conflict in Costa Rican rural democracy. Nor is there any appreciable race consciousness. The small colored group introduced by the United Fruit Co. from Jamaica confined itself largely to the coastal banana plantations. More recently, due to a blight which destroyed many banana trees, some Negro workers have migrated to the Pacific coast or settled in remote highland areas. At the Spanish conquest not more than 8,000 Indians inhabited this region. Their descendants are now on reservations.

When banana disease limited work on the fertile Atlantic side, the colored people showed remarkable adaptability. Dropped from the pay rolls of the big American fruit corporations, the Negroes resorted to subsistence farming. Thanks to a few fruit trees, melon patches, kitchen gardens, and a flock of chickens, one-time field hands are making a good living. Impartial observers declare that colored workers are the most successful growers in middle America. Instead of wasting their substance in agitation and revolt, they have transformed disaster into opportunity for service.

The third factor is education. It has been remarked that Costa Rica has more teachers than soldiers. This is an understatement. Whereas there are thousands of educators, on the primary and secondary school levels, there are hardly 500 in the armed forces, including the military band. Costa Rica with Uruguay boasts of the least illiteracy in Latin America.

Costa Rica falls squarely in the tropics. Nevertheless, the climate is notable for moderation.

Throughout all middle America, the heat, except on the seacoasts, is tempered by altitude, and nowhere more equitably than in Costa Rica. On the Caribbean side, average elevation extends from 2,100 to 5,900 feet above sea level. On the Pacific side, the figures taper off to 1,475 to 4,900 feet. Contrasted with the 7,500 average of the Valley of Mexico, the moderate altitude of Costa Rica is much more favorable to human effort. San José, like Caracas, Venezuela, has perpetual spring. Days are warm, followed by cool breezes at night. About 75 percent of the population has strung itself out, crescent-wise, in this highland nuclear zone. It is, in truth, a tierra templada, free from debilitating extremes.

Another cause of prosperity is the birth rate. The population, although not expanding on the scale of Puerto Rico, shows a steady increase. There are no oversize cities. San José, the capital and seat of of the national university, has 65,000 inhabitants, while Cartago, the pioneer settlement, has half that. Nevertheless, the population density near those two cities, 260 per square mile, is almost unique in Latin America. While the population increases there, farmers and stock raisers push toward unexploited lands on the periphery. It is a region of expanding pioneer settlements, of people vigorously at work transforming empty country into ranches and homes.

If there were more areas like this in Ibero-America, so much land would not be bare and not so many rural communities would remain isolated. One illustration of pioneer spirit is visible at Irazú, where at an elevation of 9,800 feet cattle and potatoes furnish a livelihood. While families multiply in the hinterland, there is a constant replenishment of the fountain of life at the center. At Turrialba, site of an ancient mission with an altitude of 2,000 feet, the population grew from 1,068 in 1883 to 21,000 in 1936. Although this is spectacular, it does suggest that healthy children and prosperity go hand in hand, provided that sanitation, education, and moderate living are a national concern. Every child born in the Republic has a decent chance to grow strong, learn, and work the land.

The final factor in the orderly development is a well-balanced economy. In 1938, the Republic exported 2 percent of the coffee in Latin America; 10 percent of the bananas; and 4 percent of the cacao. Considering its size, about that of West Virginia, and its population, about 650,000—hardly that of Milwaukee, Wis.—one must agree that Costa Rica is diversifying agriculture to the limit. In 1939 coffee constituted 51 percent of all exports; bananas 21 percent; cacao 13 percent, while the lowland cattle ranchers carried on a profitable commerce with highland planters and city dwellers. In recent years, the cacao industry has taken up some slack in the banana trade. Most foreign business is with the United States, which in 1939 absorbed 45 percent of exports and supplied 58 percent of imports. Costa Ricans are our good customers as well as good neighbors. The United States market rounds out the Costa Rican national economy.

The country's Ambassador to the United States, Dr. Francisco de Paula Gutiérrez, has summed up the situation: "We citizens of Costa Rica have learned two things: 1, the efficacy of evolution by enlightened law; 2, the importance of free elections.

"The labor code was based on the preamble of part III of the Treaty of Versailles and the social doctrines of the Catholic Church as expressed in the encyclicals Rerum Novarum,

Quadragesimo Anno and Divini Redemptoris, and the Social Code of Malines. We aim to give property owners, farmers, and workingmen a square deal, according to the principles of this social teaching."

Under President Teodoro Picado, cooperation of the farmers of Costa Rica with the United Nations' war efforts was intensified. Asparagus, tomatoes, sweet peppers, bananas, and oranges were flown to the armed services in the Canal Zone in less than 3 hours.

The island of Cocos, off the Pacific coast, figures in postwar plans for naval and air defense of the hemisphere. Experts from the United States Department of Agriculture cooperate with fruit and vegetable growers, supplying choice seeds and new tools. It is hoped that greater cooperation can be developed in education.

In a recent conversation, Ambassador Gutiérrez, waxing enthusiastic about the plain virtues of his people, described the jeep incident. During the presidency of Dr. Rafael Angel Calderón Guardia, the San José public demanded a demonstration in celebration of enactment of the social-security laws. Of course, the chief magistrate was a central figure. President Calderón Guardia was escorted to a jeep that happened to be handy.

Amid shouting and good-natured laughter, the jeep rolled down the principal avenue. Suddenly, to avoid the headquarters of the Diario de Costa Rica, the newspaper organ of the rival (Democratic) party, the jeep was detoured two squares to emerge in front of the modest palace of Archbishop Victor Sanabria, famed for his advocacy of an annual family wage for workers. In response to the shouts of the crowd, Archbishop Sanabria strode out on the balcony of his residence, gave a short speech and then was accorded a place of honor in the jeep. According to Ambassador Gutiérrez, no more democratic conveyance could have been imagined. Certainly, it may be conceded that the jeep was an improvement on the Mercedes-Benz and Fiat limousines in which Europe's dictators paraded. In the hierarchy of values, the jeep begins at the bottom. It is a vehicle as much at home in country as in city. In that sense, it typifies the spirit of Costa Rica's rural democracy.

Statement on Proposed Amendments to the Marketing Agreement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1946

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 15, 1945, I introduced H. R. 5496, a bill to amend the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act relating to marketing agreements and orders. These marketing agreement and order provisions in their present form were incorporated into the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 by the amendatory act known as the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937. Many programs under such marketing agreements and orders have been carried out under the act and such programs are now regarded as essential to maintenance of proper price levels for producers.

The bill has two major objectives. First, it clarifies and strengthens the existing law so as to provide for marketing agreements and orders that would establish and maintain minimum standards of quality and maturity and inspection requirements of agricultural commodities and their products at all times if such orderly marketing would be in the public interest. Second, it provides a method for making the act applicable to other agricultural commodities which are now excluded from the act whenever this will advance the interests of producers and whenever such action is favored by a majority of producers voting in a referendum.

Under the existing act, marketing agreements and orders may include, among other provisions, minimum quality, maturity, and inspection requirements, but these are operative only when the price of the agricultural commodity is not in excess of the parity price level during the season. In consequence such requirements have become inoperative and been suspended by the Secretary of Agriculture when prices have risen above parity. Minimum quality, maturity, and inspection requirements do not necessarily have any direct relationship to maintenance of parity prices. It is in the public interest to keep off the interstate market at all times immature or low quality fruits, vegetables, and other agricultural commodities, even though at a particular time the price of the commodity may be at or above parity. The farmer is thereby protected from unfair competition from culls and immature products, and the consumer obtains a better product. Maturity standards frequently increase the supply harvested for larger yields are obtained when the product is fully matured.

The bill does not in any way modify the existing provisions of the act providing that those order requirements directly affecting price levels as, for example, marketing and purchasing quotas, shall be operative only when prices are not in excess of the parity price level during the season.

The act now provides for the establishment by a marketing order of an agency for the administration of provisions of the order. However, these industry committees cannot carry out their functions at all times since assessments for agency expenses can be made only when prices for the commodity are not in excess of the parity price level during the season. Since the bill provides for order provisions relating to minimum standards of quality and maturity and inspection requirements that may be operative at all times, it is necessary that the agency administering the order be able to function at all times. Also, it is obvious that industry committees administering an order must operate continuously if competent employees and adequate records are to be available. In consequence, the bill provides that the assessment of agency expenses may be made throughout the period the marketing order is in effect and irrespective of whether particular provisions of the order are suspended or have become inoperative.

Under the bill assessments may be made, as heretofore, for the maintenance and functioning of such agencies. In addition, the bill provides for assessments for such purposes as the Secretary of Agriculture may, pursuant to the order, determine to be appropriate, and in such amounts as the Secretary may find reasonable and likely to be incurred by the agency during the period specified by the Secretary. The Secretary therefore retains ample authority to control agency budgets and to prevent wasteful or unnecessary expenditures. At the same time when a project arises that the Secretary determines is appropriate to the better functioning of the order, he may permit assessments and agency expenditures for the purposes of such projects.

Under the present act marketing orders can be issued only for a limited group of commodities and their products, namely, milk; fruits—excluding fruits for canning other than olives, and excluding apples other than Washington, Oregon, and Idaho apples; pecans; walnuts; tobacco; vegetables—excluding vegetables for canning other than asparagus; soybeans; hops; honey bees; and naval stores. Many aspects of the impending surplus problem could be met through marketing orders, particularly by the various types of quota provisions permitted by the present act to be incorporated in such orders. By handling surplus problems in such fashion, farmers can take on responsibility for management of their own affairs and for controlling surpluses and the necessity for subsidies, loans, and other forms of surplus relief is minimized. The flexibility of marketing orders gives considerable room for different methods in dealing with surplus problems and for adaptation of control methods to the peculiar needs of various diverse agricultural commodities and products.

As we approach a period when farm surpluses will again recur, it is vitally important to be prepared to prevent these surpluses from wrecking farm prices. The Government is already obligated to support farm prices of numerous eligible agricultural commodities at not less than 90 percent of parity prices for at least another 3 years under the Steagall Act. These commitments to farmers must be fully carried out. The enactment of this legislation will provide additional means of carrying out these price-support guaranties to farmers and in safeguarding them against ruinous price declines.

The bill, therefore, makes marketing orders available for all commodities subject to certain carefully restricted limitations. The bill does not automatically extend the act to all commodities, but authority is given the Secretary to extend it to any additional commodities or products, or to regional or market classifications thereof, on the basis of two determinations to be made by him—first, that the extension of the act to the particular commodity, product, or regional or market classification thereof, would more effectively advance the interests of producers pursuant to the declared policy, and second, that such extension is approved or favored by a majority of the producers voting in a referendum conducted by the Secretary for the purpose. Strong farmers' cooperatives are essential to the adequate working of marketing orders, and in such a referendum such cooperatives would vote in the same manner as in the other referendums now provided by the act. The action of the Secretary in extending the act to any

commodity, product, or regional or market classification thereof, would not mean that a marketing order would thereby be in effect for the commodity. It would mean only that the act was available for the control of such commodity, product, or regional or market classification thereof, through a marketing order, and that thereafter a marketing order could be formulated and made effective through the detailed procedures already specified in the act.

The special provisions relating to milk now found in the act are left unchanged.

The bill is enabling legislation only. By its provisions farmers would be enabled at all times, if they were willing to assume the responsibility, to control through the marketing-order mechanism the minimum standards of quality and maturity of their agricultural commodities sent to market. Consumers would be given this additional protection against low quality, immature, and inedible agricultural commodities. By enactment of the bill the surplus problem already faced by agriculture in the case of some commodities, and certain to mount as present expanded markets recede, could be met in substantial measure.

OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 18, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, if there is any doubt of the necessity of revising some of the price schedules by the OPA, a perusal of the following letter and list of food items together with prices in 1941 and 1946 will prove the case:

LANSING, MICH., *February 20, 1946.*
Hon. ROY WOODRUFF,
Congressman From Michigan,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ROY: I am enclosing some comparative figures on foodstuff which should be of interest to you.

Frankly, I don't know where we're going to land. How can hotel restaurants, or other food purveyors, make a go of it when raw food costs continue to increase but our retail prepared food prices must remain under ceiling as of April 4–10, 1943.

Very truly yours,

BRUCE.

Item	1941	1946	Increase
	Cents per pound	*Cents per pound*	*Percent*
Stewing chickens	22	39	77
Peanut butter	9½	28	194
Cabbage	4	6	50
Michigan potatoes	1.3	3.24	149
Apples	5	13½	170
Coffee	12½	19¾	59
Eggs, medium Grade B	[1] 17	[1] 35	106
Graham crackers	7½	17	126
Noodles	10	19	90
Rinso, large package	16½	25	51
Hams, string half	23	36	56
Lamb roast, shoulder	16	25	56
Beef tongue	15	35	133
Sugar	4½	5¾	23
Pure lard	7½	17½	133
Prunes	8½	18½	117

[1] Cents per dozen.

The above comparative price figures are taken from actual newspaper advertising of the foodstuffs listed in the Bay City, Mich., area.

How can hotels continue to prepare and sell food under their ceiling if commodities costs are not also controled?

Brotherhood at Home and Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 22, 1946

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by me on Sunday, February 17, 1946, at a regional meeting held under the auspices of the Parent-Teachers Association at the Gloucester City (N. J.) High School Auditorium:

BROTHERHOOD AT HOME AND ABROAD

In selecting brotherhood as a theme for thoughtful consideration in meetings such as this, at this time, and throughout the Nation, the parent-teacher association has directed our attention to a force that can be as dynamic for good as the atomic bomb now is for destruction.

Words cannot express the tremendous influence for good that would result if the spirit of brotherhood was given full play in our individual lives, in the life of the Nation, and, in the affairs of the world.

With its acceptance as the rule and guide of our individual, national, and international actions, there would be an elimination of greed and selfishness, intolerance, and bigotry and domination of the weak by the strong. In their place would be found equity, justice, honesty of purpose, understanding and acknowledgement of the rights of others. The sum total of these beneficent results would be peace. Peace in our individual lives, and peace in national and international affairs.

There is no greater need today in this time of unrest and uncertainty, both at home and abroad, than an acceptance and exemplification of the spirit of true brotherhood.

MEANING OF BROTHERHOOD

What do we mean by brotherhood? Whatever the answer that may be given, no matter how differently expressed or phrased, the result would always be the same, namely, doing unto others what we would that they do unto us. This is all inclusive. It is all embracing. It is right by whatever standard is applied. It includes the best in every creed. It provides a common meeting ground for all men of peace and good will.

Centuries have passed and great changes have come in all the activities of life since the Prince of Peace—the Master Teacher—Jesus Christ—gave utterance to the words—"Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them, for this is the law and the prophets." Notwithstanding the passing of time with all its changes, and the complexity of our present-day life, the force and the logic of those words, constituting the true spirit of brotherhood, remain as effectual as a means of solving our numerous and varied problems today as when spoken centuries ago to a people whose life and habits were less complex than our own. The words He uttered, these words so well named—"The Golden Rule"—remain today words of wisdom and point the way for the settlement of all human difficulties.

WOULD SOLVE PRESENT-DAY DIFFICULTIES

Think in terms of the numerous disturbances that now exist in our land, in other lands, and, between nations. What is the cause of all these disturbances? Determine for yourselves what you consider to be the cause. Having done so, then apply as a means of solution—the spirit of true brotherhood as defined in the words of the Golden Rule: "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." Would it not solve each difficulty if each of the contending parties applied this principle? Of course it would. The fogs and mists that now surround us would disappear as before the rays of the morning sun.

If the spirit of true brotherhood should be accepted and exemplified in the affairs of men and of nations that which now disturbs us domestically and in world affairs would disappear. It would solve our economic problems. It would create tolerance and understanding. It would protect the weak from the aggression of the strong. It would eliminate selfishness and greed that bring conflict between nations. It would make the world a better place in which to live.

This being true, then, we must acknowledge that the parent-teachers have struck the key note, the basic principle, that must underlie and inspire all efforts to promote better understanding between people and nations, when it emphasizes, today, throughout the Nation the importance of brotherhood.

BROTHERHOOD—FUNDAMENTAL NEED OF WORLD

Today the spirit of brotherhood between nations is the fundamental need of the world. The future peace, security, and welfare of the world depends upon the extent to which its principles, based upon equality of man, is recognized, and, governments are founded.

It was to accomplish this ideal of brotherhood, namely, equality of man, that America has participated in two World Wars. We have given unstintedly of our wealth, resources, the precious lives of our young manhood. The principles enunciated in the Atlantic Charter were the principles that underlie true brotherhood among nations, and make for peace and security in the world.

We did not engage in World War I and World War II to advance the prestige of any king, monarch, or dictator. We did not seek territorial or material gain. We did not seek anything that was material in character. We fought for a spiritual ideal—equality and the principles of brotherhood to be applied between nations and peoples.

Notwithstanding victory has crowned our efforts, we see throughout the world a spirit of deep unrest instead of the tranquillity that should come with peace. Fear in its most aggravated form still prevails. Why is this the case? The answer is simple. Because the large nations, the strong nations, the powerful nations, are using their strength and power to dominate smaller nations, thereby destroying the principles of equality and brotherhood for which the war was fought.

DUTY OF AMERICA

What is the duty of America under these circumstances? Our duty is plain. We have no right to equivocate, no right to appease, no right to haul down the flag that stands for liberty, justice, freedom, and democracy, based upon principles of world brotherhood and the equality of man. It is cowardly to do so. It breaks faith with those who have died, and yet I regret to say that this has been in a large measure our course of action since VJ-day.

America—and I say it with a feeling of shame—has stood by and permitted, if not actually participated in, the wrong and injustice than has been heaped upon Poland, our honored ally. Likewise, we have stood by and permitted the Balkan and the Baltic states, Palestine, Iraq, Iran, India, Indo-

china, and Korea to be deprived of that freedom of expression that was guaranteed under the Atlantic Charter. Why have we, the strongest Nation in the world, the Nation that contributed most to the winning of the war, kept quiet and permitted our allies, dependent though they have been and still are upon us, to destroy, repeal, and make ineffective the principles of equality, justice, democracy, and world brotherhood for which we fought and sacrificed?

MORAL LEADERSHIP OF AMERICA

In the First World War, America, through Woodrow Wilson, provided a spiritual leadership, based upon principles of equity and justice, that rallied the strength of the embattled nations and revitalized those who were the victims of that struggle. His Fourteen Points became the rallying cry of the oppressed and the discouraged. They saw Wilson as someone striving to achieve a peaceful world based upon the principles of equality of men and world brotherhood. However, history may record its conception of Wilsonian ideals, it must be granted that for at least a moment it seemed possible for even our allies in that struggle to rise to this American idealistic position. Unfortunately, the vision faded, and with its disappearance another world war became inevitable in the gloom of that failure.

World War II broke upon a world bankrupt in idealism and that had forgotten or discarded the principles of brotherhood. Again the cry of distress from the oppressed brought forth from America a new expression of ideals to provide future peace and security, based upon the principles of brotherhood. It came in the form of the Atlantic Charter—based upon principles of equality, freedom, and democracy. It was embodied in a resolution and adopted by all of the United Nations on January 1, 1942. It became the rallying point against oppression throughout the world. It brought hope and courage to the distressed. It provided the idealism that brought the people of America, wholeheartedly and unreservedly, into the conflict.

Today, however, even after victory has been won, we see these recognized principles of true brotherhood treated lightly, even contemptuously by nations who gave them their support and approval. This should not be. It is wrong. It violates every principle of right and justice. These basic principles must not be dismissed as mere words that were uttered to gain an end, and the end having been achieved can be discarded and forgotten. We must never forget that the principles, enunciated in the Atlantic Charter, marched with our armies. They sailed with our fleets. They flew with our eagles. And they sleep with our honored dead. It is the duty of America to relight the torch of liberty and brotherhood that those who fought and died shall not have died in vain.

Now is the time for America to reassert her claim to the moral leadership of the world. With victory gained, it is our duty to demand that the principles for which we fought shall be recognized by everyone, especially our allies. This is not a time for the rebirth of blocs, power politics, seizure of territory, establishment of regimes upon a basis of force rather than the will of the governed. We owe it to the men who have died in the name of America on the battlefields of this war to keep the faith for which they fought. To whittle it down, to dismiss it as the empty phrasing of wartime oratory or strategy is to make a mockery of all that our people regard most sacred.

The time is at hand for America to assert in strong, clear, and emphatic terms that the principles of equality, based upon brotherhood, for which we fought, must be acknowledged and given support. Failure to do so means that the ideal of brotherhood among nations—that the oppressed nations expected as a result of victory—will not materialize. We are then no better off than after World War I.

Thus far, since approval was given to the United Nations Organization, neither our State Department nor our President has seen fit to utilize the tremendous prestige and strength of the United States to mobilize world-wide sentiment in support of the principles for which we fought. From us has come nothing but pleasant platitudes, easy to speak, easy to ignore.

If we are to rebuild something of value on the ashes of the terrible war, so recently concluded, we must supplement the United Nations Organization for peace, by strong language, condemning the failure to practice the principles of equality, fair dealing, and brotherhood laid down in the Atlantic Charter, and demanding that they be given recognition in present and future actions of all governments. The time to do this is now.

This Nation is peculiarly our brother's keeper and appointed as a steward under God of the civilization of the world. God did not make the American people the mightiest human force of all times without a purpose. He did not endow us with unusual talents without intending that we should carry unusual responsibilities. The mission of America is not only to its own people but to all the peoples of the earth, before whose eyes it is the symbol of human rights and human liberty based upon the principles of equality and brotherhood, toward whom its flag flutters hopes of future happiness.

AMERICA MOST OUTSTANDING EXPONENT OF PEACE AND GOOD WILL BASED UPON BROTHERHOOD

Today as we rejoice in the position of preeminence our Nation has gained among the nations of the world, we can also take pride in the fact that America is the most outstanding exponent of peace and good will in all the world.

The most casual reading of our national history cannot help but reveal to an honest and intelligent mind that this Nation has always been an advocate of peace and good will among the nations, and has constantly sought to avoid war and its distressing consequences. By precept and example, abundant evidence of this fact has been given and so plain is our national desire in this respect that none should doubt it.

Nowhere in all the world is there a more pronounced and outstanding desire for the recognition of the principles of true brotherhood than in America. Nowhere has there been a more ready and willing response to every effort that has been made to substitute these peaceful principles as a means for the settlement of international differences rather than resort to military force. As a people we are justifiably proud of the fact that our Nation, above all others, has led in every movement to establish the principles of brotherhood by which international peace might be promoted. The peace of the world, made permanent and secure, is the sincerest desire of our people—an inspiration of the very heart and soul of America. It was for this that America shed her blood in two world wars. What finer or more sacred contribution to the cause of peace could there be?

Never in the history of the world has there been a finer example of true, genuine idealism upon the part of any nation than that shown by the United States as it sat at the peace table of Versailles. Notwithstanding the fact that our resources of men and wealth had been the determining factor that finally brought success to the Allies, yet we neither asked nor received anything in return for our sacrifices of treasure and blood. As other nations strained and contested openly and in secret, one with the other to gain advantage of territory or other worth-while considerations, America stood aloof from the struggle and refused all material gain, but, with a quiet dignity and majestic spirit, sought only to advance the principles of liberty, true democracy, and justice based upon the brotherhood of men and nations, as would most surely tend to the future peace of the world, that those who died should not have died in vain.

As America in the past has sought to foster and maintain peace and good will through recognition and exemplification of the spirit of true brotherhood, among the nations of the world, so we can with confidence look into the future with the fullest assurance, knowing full well that peace and the spirit of true brotherhood will continue to be the aspiration of the heart and soul of America. May the divine leadership that has inspired us as a Nation in the past and brought our Nation to a position of preeminence, continue to be our inspiration and strength in the days to come.

Not Southern Issue Alone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 22 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Not Southern Issue Alone," from the Arkansas Democrat of February 5, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOT SOUTHERN ISSUE ALONE

The so-called and miscalled fair employment practices bill now agitating Congress is not a southern issue, though the filibuster of the bombastic BILBO, of Mississippi, adds to the contrary belief. It is not aimed at the Negro any more than it is at any other race, though that mistake is made by honest folks who are simply misguided.

Supporters of such a bill in 20 States met defeat in 18, and of those 18 States only 2 were Southern. The two States where such a law was passed were New York and New Jersey, and Senator HAWKES of the latter has added his opposition to a Federal FEP law.

Senator WHEELER, of Montana, and Senator TAFT, of Ohio, have announced their opposition to the law.

The chief objection to the proposed law is that it could not be enforced and would be vicious legislation wherever applied. It would make the old prohibition laws seem mild in its effect upon the innocent as well as the guilty. It would create a gestapo—and how—as evidenced by these facts:

It would apply to employers of more than six workers and provide penalties up to a year's imprisonment and $5,000 fines for violators of FEPC orders. Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, said: "This bill creates perambulatory kangaroo courts which can drag an employer to any place in the United States they wish. That is one of the threats held over the heads of American business, of the American employer, of the American farmer who employs more than six individuals, to make sure that he takes care of all aliens in his employ to the detriment of American citizens who might be seeking work."

This is not an extreme statement. "It is so stated in the bond" (the bill) and members of those legislatures who turned down the proposal recognized that fact. The FEP proposal, for all the pious professions of

its supporters, is an evil and dangerous thing, begotten of sinister politics and can only add to the racial prejudice already too rampant in the Nation today.

Government by Crony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARION T. BENNETT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 22, 1946

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following excerpt from Drew Pearson's column, the Washington Merry-Go-Round, for February 22, 1946. It relates to the character of major appointments being made by the President, and with particular reference to one of these appointments. Today we have government by cronies of the President and many of the cronies are in one way or another associated with the notorious Missouri Pendergast gang which plundered Missouri and Kansas City and is now operating with headquarters in the District of Columbia.

WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND
(By Drew Pearson)

Public memory is short; so perhaps it is not out of order to recall that exactly 1 year ago a man who had served 8 years in the Cabinet and 4 years as Vice President was so pilloried before the Senate that Roosevelt finally withdrew the name of Henry Wallace as head of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

But this week, delightful George Allen, who has back-slapped and wise-cracked with every Senator on Capitol Hill, was confirmed as Director of the RFC after very little cross-examination, almost no debate, and in the end, without even a roll-call vote.

Most remarkable thing about the George Allen vote was that Senator ALBEN BARKLEY, who knows better, championed Allen's right to continue holding jobs with private corporations while still serving in this vitally important Government post.

One corporation of which George Allen is vice president is the Home Insurance Co. It so happens that this company figures very largely in the scandalous graft which sent Harry Truman's old friend, Boss Tom Pendergast, of Kansas City, to jail.

Background of this affair is important. The fire-insurance companies operating in Missouri had been forced to impound $9,676,002 while the question of new rate increase was being threshed out in the courts.

PENDERGAST BRIBE

The company which had most at stake in this $9,000,000 kitty was the Home Insurance Co., of which George Allen is now vice president. Its share was $737,389.31. Naturally it was anxious to get this little nest egg returned to the company's treasury rather than go back to the policyholders.

So a deal was finally worked out between the companies whereby Boss Pendergast was to receive a bribe of $750,000. In return, the court suit was to be compromised, the fire insurance companies getting 80 percent of the nine million, the policyholders getting only 20 percent.

First installment of the Pendergast bribe was $100,000, and it was ponied up by 14 different companies. But, since Home Insurance had the largest amount at stake, it sent more than any other company—$15,000. Later, the fire-insurance companies kicked in a total of $330,000 to Pendergast, but before they could pay the entire $750,000, the Government probe was started and he never got the balance.

It was in 1938, during this Government probe and before Pendergast was finally convicted in 1939, that Home Insurance, in desperate need of friends, made George Allen a vice president. Allen was a former WPA administrator with no great business talents. But he had one great asset—close connections in Washington.

George, who is a very frank and likeable person, doesn't claim to know anything about insurance, but he does know plenty about getting into the Executive mansion at almost any hour of the day or night.

GEORGE ALLEN SITS PRETTY

Following this the fire-insurance companies, including Home Insurance, were indicted by the Justice Department for violating the Antitrust Act. However, the insurance lobby, including George Allen, pushed legislation through the House of Representatives exempting insurance companies from the Antitrust Act. Thanks to highly skillful lobbying, the Justice Department finally compromised the case.

Meanwhile, Home Insurance and other companies operating in Missouri did not go to jail. Tom Pendergast served his time, but not the insurance executives who shelled out $330,000 and were willing to pay up to $750,000.

Harry Truman, of course, has such a blind-spot regarding Pendergast that one of the first things he did after becoming President of the United States was to fire Maurice Milligan, the United States district attorney who convicted his old friend.

Ninety-six Senators, however, are not all supposed to have blind-spots. At least a majority are supposed to have a statesmanlike approach to appointments to high office. That is what the system of Senate confirmation is for.

However, when the current vice president of the company which paid Boss Pendergast his heaviest bribe came up for appointment to one of the most powerful economic jobs in Government, all but one Democrat—FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas—blindly followed the leader.

As a director of the RFC, George Allen is now in a position where he can promote Government loans to insurance companies or to other firms which owe money to insurance companies. It certainly pays to be a charming host at dinner.

Note: Insurance, of course, is only one of George's corporate connections, though it should be enough. Others will be discussed in future columns.

Public Will Pay the Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 22 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Public Will Pay the Bill," from the Arkansas Democrat of February 17, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC WILL PAY THE BILL

The dance is on, the dance of rising wages and prices, and the public will pay the bill. That's the meaning of the Government's announced policy for settling the steel, motor, and electrical and other strikes.

In brief, the policy is this: Wage raises up to 15 to 18 percent will be allowed, and where employers aren't earning enough to stand the cost, they will immediately be given higher prices. Formerly, employers had to wait 6 months before they could ask for this relief.

Wage increases, with some exceptions to be announced later, must be approved by Washington, just as price raises must be. The Government is thus established more firmly in the socialistic program of running the Nation's peacetime affairs.

Included with the plan is another warning about the danger of inflation, and solemn declarations that the new price line is to be held. Let us hope this can be done. The task is made so much harder by the wage and price increases which will have been, and will be, granted.

Inflation is a fire which makes a pretty sight while it's burning, but leaves a spectacle of ruin if it gets out of hand. And a fire isn't easier to control if you let it spread further. That's exactly what's happened now.

Steel prices are to be increased $5 a ton. This will add to the cost of cars, trucks, farm machinery, refrigerators, buildings—everything that contains much steel. In addition, wages will be raised to the workers producing motor vehicles, farm equipment, and various other things. It will all snowball into higher prices.

Billions of dollars will be added to the cost of daily necessities. Largely this must come out of the small to modest earnings of millions, to give higher wages to many already well-paid worker groups. According to recent figures, the steel, auto, and electrical workers averaged from $41 to $46 a week. Meat-plant workers, who presumably will get a raise, averaged nearly $46.

In contrast, surveys in a number of places have shown that from 30 to 80 percent of the jobs open to returning veterans pay from less than $24 a week to $30. Yet out of those wages these veterans must help, through paying higher prices, to boost the $41 to $46 wages of a privileged few workers.

A small aristocracy of labor in the big industrial centers is profiting at the expense of millions of returning veterans, of farmers, teachers, public employees, many professional people whose earnings are modest and other such groups throughout the land.

Raise everybody's earnings? Then you'd have a sure-enough inflation fire roaring through the Nation's economic structure. No; its better to make the best of it and use all our influence to hold the new price line. If the Nation can get full production, that will check inflation. Nothing else can check it long. Goods competing for markets is the only real assurance against runaway prices.

Reds Fail To Pull the Wool Over President Truman's Eyes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 22, 1946

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the Reds and their fellow travelers have failed in their efforts to pull the wool over the eyes of President Truman with reference to the Communist spy ring throughout this country and Canada, just as they are

failing in their efforts to abolish the Committee on Un-American Activities and to get rid of J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI.

If George Washington could speak to us today, on this the two hundred and fourteenth anniversary of his birth, he undoubtedly would say again: "Put only Americans on guard."

He no doubt would warn President Truman to clean house, as the Bible says, "From the tower of the watchmen to the fenced city."

Student Exchange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 22, 1946

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following timely and interesting editorial from the Washington Post of Tuesday, February 19, 1946, entitled "Student Exchange," which has reference to bill H. R. 4982, which has been favorably reported to the House by the Foreign Affairs Committee:

STUDENT EXCHANGE

Friendship between nations as between individuals flows from mutual understanding. It seems to us that there is a great deal of merit, therefore, in two proposals now before Congress to facilitate international exchange of students, scholars, and technicians. This sort of exchange is an invaluable supplement to the program now being undertaken by the new Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs which Secretary Byrnes has established. Americans who are afforded an opportunity to study abroad are likely to find their prejudices about foreign countries dissolved; foreigners who come to American colleges and universities will return to their homes with a fresh awareness of American values. A harvest of good will is the certain product of such a transplanting.

One of the bills for this purpose, introduced just prior to the congressional recess by Senator FULBRIGHT, follows closely a suggestion offered by the Post last September. We said, in speaking of the disposal of our war surpluses abroad, that "a constructive way of handling such transactions might be to let the funds (from sale of surpluses) be used for the establishment of foundations in buying countries dedicated to the diffusion of knowledge of the seller and purchaser countries." The Fulbright bill would designate the State Department as the disposal agency for surplus property outside continental United States and would specifically authorize it to enter into agreements with foreign governments under which local currencies received for surplus property would be used to send foreign students to American colleges abroad, to pay their transportation to the United States, or to meet the expenses of American students studying in foreign institutions.

It would be in the last category, obviously, that this arrangement would be most effective. And it might prove of tremendous value to veterans who wished to pursue studies overseas under the GI bill. The tuition and living allowances due them would be met, then, by the country in which they chose to attend school, out of its own currency, and the United States Treasury would to that extent be spared expense. We can think of no more useful form in which to receive payment for the surplus materials which we do not wish to bring home and which are needed by foreign countries lacking the dollar exchange to purchase them.

Because of a shortage of dollar exchange, many foreign countries will be unable to send students to the United States. A bill introduced by Representative BLOOM would make provision for this need. It would extend to European countries the facilities for exchanging students, scholars, and technicians with the United States which we now maintain in relation to the Latin-American Republics and China. This exchange system has proved immensely fruitful. When the United States remitted about $10,000,000 of the indemnity paid this country as a result of the Boxer Rebellion in China, the Chinese Government placed the money in a trust fund for the education of Chinese youth in American institutions in China and in the United States. The act contributed tremendously to the good relations which have existed between the two countries ever since.

We hope that Congress will give sympathetic consideration to both the Fulbright and the Bloom bills. They are companion or supplementary measures. The meeting of minds, in a literal sense, which they would help to bring about should go far toward promoting the international understanding upon which our hopes of world peace must be founded.

Lincoln Day Address of Gov. Dwight H. Green, of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 22, 1946

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, February 9, 1946, one of the Nation's outstanding citizens who has demonstrated great capacity as an administrator, Gov. Dwight H. Green, of Illinois, delivered an able and inspiring address at the Lincoln Day dinner sponsored by the Republican committee, at Chattanooga, Tenn., and, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the Governor's address:

For me this is a proud and happy occasion. As Governor of the State of Illinois, whose richest possession is the heritage of Abraham Lincoln, it frequently has been my privilege to speak at various celebrations of his anniversary. Yet to me none of them ever seemed more significant than this meeting here in Chattanooga.

That here in this city in the Tennessee Valley, through which more than four score years ago the Union and Confederate Armies surged forward and backward so many times—here where we may look up to the hills in three directions and see majestic heights, sanctified by the blood of Americans who died in three great battles in the War Between the States—that here the descendants of the men who fought on both sides of that conflict can join in honoring Lincoln is proof that his life and his work remain an outstanding service and an eternal inspiration to all America.

We of Illinois know that the greatness of Lincoln lies in the fact that he voiced the aspirations and advanced the cause of the common people everywhere. He belonged to all America. Kentucky, where he was born, my native State of Indiana, where he lived as a boy, and Illinois, all claim him. Yet he seems the heir particularly of those rugged individualist adventurers who, in their pursuit of freedom and happiness, blazed the trail of progress through the Cumberland Gap to the wilderness of Kentucky and Tennessee.

As far as I can discover from the extensive collection of Lincoln lore in our State Library at Springfield, Lincoln never got to Tennessee. Yet he always was tremendously interested in your State. His close friendship for Andrew Johnson began in Washington in 1845, when they were both Members of Congress. Although of opposite parties, they had many common interests, including their limited financial means, which threw them together in a boarding house on Capitol Hill. Johnson told Lincoln of a family of Lincolns living in Carter County, and Abe was much interested to know if they were kinsmen of his Uncle Isaac, who lived farther west in Tennessee, and the young Illinoisan often expressed a desire to go to Tennessee and visit them.

Later, when the people of east Tennessee rallied loyally to the Union cause, and Johnson became their champion with his great speech in the Senate on December 18, 1860, eastern Tennessee became especially endeared to the President. Later he sent Andrew Johnson to Nashville as military governor to start the program of peaceful and friendly reconstruction, which they both envisioned for the entire South. It is one of the tragedies of American history that that plan was never carried into full execution.

It is natural to speak of Lincoln and Johnson, but it is just as natural to associate Abraham Lincoln in the forward march of American liberty with that other Tennessee idol, Andrew Jackson. The Hermitage at Nashville became an outpost for the principles of the rights of man, taught by Jefferson at Monticello. Jackson developed a new concept of the great free nation of the future. And expressed his devotion to that nation in the famous words of his Charleston toast, "Our Federal Union—it must be preserved." It was a natural historical sequence from the Hermitage to the law office in Springfield, where Abraham Lincoln wrote of the dignity of labor and the rights of capital, and put above all else the preservation of the Union. From Jefferson to Jackson to Lincoln the American realization of mankind's universal dreams of individual liberty and progress moved steadily forward.

I am glad, too, that this meeting is under the auspices of the Republican Party of this community. As the man who launched our party on its glorious history of almost a century's service to the people of America, Lincoln is our special hero. Yet in an age when party service is too often looked upon as something less than patriotism, it is well to remember this. Just as there would be no Republican Party today without Abraham Lincoln, he never would have been elected President, and would not now belong to the ages, but for the ardor, enthusiasm, and the effective political organization of the inspired leaders of the new Republican Party of his day.

No one understood better than Lincoln that the political party was the means through which he could advance effectively his ideals of justice and equality and his zeal for honesty in government. In the Illinois Legislature and in the Congress of the United States, he was a good Whig, working with the leaders of that party; in the difficult days of the Presidency, he recognized and trusted the Republican leaders from all sections of the country.

The ideals of justice and equality and the dignity of the common man are deep rooted in the American people. They are still the goal of American life. The need for basic and forthright honesty in government was never greater than today, and if those high

principles are not reflected in the performance of our government—local, State and national—it is because men and women of good will have not recognized fully their duty and their opportunity to serve their country through their party.

So I am glad to speak here tonight as a Republican to my fellow Republicans. I know that the immediate business of the Republican executive committee of the Third Congressional District of Tennessee is to send another good Tennessee Republican to the Congress of the United States, to serve alongside those distinguished Members of the House of Representatives, the Honorable JOHN JENNINGS, JR., and the Honorable CARROLL REECE, your able national committeeman from Tennessee. Important as that effort is to you, it is far more important to the future of the United States of America.

At a time for decisions which necessarily must affect the destiny of our country and the world for generations, the New Deal leadership of this Nation is hopelessly floundering. In world councils the New Dealers lack the courage or the ability to uphold their own high-sounding declarations or the ancient fundamental American principles of security, justice, and decency. Our Nation, which has won the greatest war in all history, seems to be rapidly losing the peace.

In domestic affairs the union and unity of the American people is gravely threatened by turmoil and strife resulting from the collapse of New Deal experiments to regiment the economic life of our Nation, most of which are patterned on strange ideas and ideologies borrowed from the Old World. Our fighting sons are coming home from victory to confusion that borders on chaos.

The New Deal tinkerers, lost in their own maze of bureaucratic theories, can find no adequate solution to our pressing problems of production and reconversion and, bedeviled by 13 years' compromise with pressure groups, are helpless to meet the people's demands even for houses in which to live and tools with which to work.

America is waking slowly and soberly to the realization that the mirage we have been shown for 13 years is only barren and shifting sand. I have no doubt that the confusion of today seals the doom of the New Dealers and that 1948 will see the restoration of a national administration on sound American principles under a Republican President. Let's take the lead now. Let us elect in 1946 a Congress which will stem the tide of New Deal folly and preserve the tremendous, but by no means unlimited, resources of our Nation.

That, as I see it, is the responsibility which confronts the Republican Party today. That is why at the meeting of the Republican National Committee at Chicago 2 months ago, I pleaded for clear thinking and plain speaking on the issues which confront us. I said then, and I repeat it now, the people are tired of double talk; they are tired of a party and an administration which tries to be all things to all men. They want an American Government which will act boldly to restore production and employment at home, which will stand bravely for the advancement of American ideals of peace and justice abroad, and which will quit lying to the American people.

America's greatest need today is a restoration of straight thinking and simple honesty in our Federal Government, from the White House down to the lowest bureau in the New Deal's alphabetical conglomeration. Since the gentlemen from Missouri took over the management of the New Deal the political morals of our National Government have degenerated to the lowest ebb in our history. Despite Mr. Truman's protestations that he didn't want to be President, and the people's realization that he shouldn't have been, it is becoming more and more obvious that the administration's only fixed policy is to perpetuate itself in 1948.

That policy has dictated the aimless economics, the wishful thinking, and the impossible promises of the administration in the postwar reconversion crisis. Faced with the necessity of wooing the Political Action Committee, which had opposed Truman for Vice President before it surrendered to the big-city bosses in the Democratic National Convention, the gentlemen from Missouri decided on an expedient shift to the left. They submitted to Congress a self-styled full-employment plan which few understood; and those who could understand it knew that it never could provide full employment, but that it would fasten permanently a system of bureaucratic control on American industry and labor. Fortunately the Members of Congress, both Democrats and Republicans, saw through their scheme and refused to be stampeded into its enactment.

Still pursuing votes, they told the workers of America that they could have increases in their hourly wages while pretending to the consumers of America, including the wives of the workers, that they might expect to buy the things that labor produced without any increase in price. And when that "eat your cake and have it too" program failed of its own weight, they tried to accomplish it by compulsion.

The Truman policy has reaped its inevitable harvest of strikes and stagnation. Our country has suffered from the greatest series of strikes in our history, and bitter dissension has developed between labor and capital, and within the ranks of each. The long tie-up in the steel industry has retarded production of hundreds of sorely needed products. And the only strikes that have been settled have been those where, by free collective bargaining, it was possible to agree on a resumption of production on terms acceptable to both labor and management.

In the face of these facts, the administration has been obliged to retreat on its price policy. Yet it becomes increasingly clear that the combination of compulsory arbitration, Federal fixing of wages and Federal control of prices in cases where it paralyzes production, to all of which the Truman administration clings so desperately, is the beginning of nationalization of American labor and industry.

The chaos and confusion on the American labor front today is matched by the tragic consequences of our national policy—or lack of policy—in the Nation-wide housing shortage. Throughout America, in the great cities and in the smaller communities, millions of Americans, including hundreds of thousands of returned veterans and their families, are crying in vain for decent homes in which to live. I believe that our soldiers and sailors fought for more than the right to live in a trailer. But the bungling New Deal has failed to provide them even that. Here again, the administration has cruelly deceived the people. Last October they announced with great fanfare the lifting of all restrictions on home building, knowing full well that there were practically no available supplies of basic materials for home building and that under existing labor conditions and prices established by the OPA there was no prospect for immediate increased production of those supplies.

Not until the housing shortage became a national scandal did the Federal Government do anything about it. When the New Dealers did act, they established a new set of controls under which a veteran who wants to build a home may obtain a certificate of priority for bricks and lumber and other materials which are practically nonexistent. It was not until this week that the administration even attempted to break the bottlenecks in the production of basic building materials. It is obvious that the housing shortage will continue until crippling restrictions are lifted from American private enterprise to enable it to build the millions of permanent homes needed by our people. The administration has offered no program to accomplish that purpose.

The simple fact is that this Nation needs not new controls but a prompt ending of those which are shackling American labor, American industry, and American agriculture. It is high time for our Federal Government to admit that the war is over. The pretense and subterfuge by which the New Dealers are exercising war powers in peace must end sometime. Congress should end it now.

We should be honest with ourselves. We should be honest with the youth of our Nation—the GI's overseas and the boys at home, who are being drafted to fight a war which ended 5 months ago. If the Truman administration stands for peacetime conscription, and for peacetime regimentation of American business and labor, let them ask for it, and let Congress grant or withhold such powers. Let there be an end to the attrition of our liberties by month-to-month extensions of war legislation; else the American people, like the puppy whose tail was cut off an inch at a time, will suffer needlessly and be permanently injured.

It is high time also to call a halt on reckless Federal spending above and beyond Treasury income. Here again the New Dealers are receiving the American people. In his recent Budget message the President boasted, and I quote: "For the first time since the fiscal year of 1930 the Budget for the next fiscal year will require no increase in the national debt." That is double talk. Let's look at the facts:

On December 3, last, the national debt was approximately $278,700,000,000. The cash balance in the Treasury was $26,000,000,000, which in all honesty should be used to reduce the national debt. This left a net of two hundred and fifty-two billion, seven hundred millions in the red. The President estimates that on June 30, 1947, the national debt will be $271,000,000,000; but that the cash balance in the Treasury will be reduced to $3,200,000,000. On that date, the "net in the red" will be two hundred and sixty-seven billions, eight hundred millions, and we as a Nation shall be fifteen billions, one hundred million poorer than at the end of 1945. That indicates that between now and June 30, 1947, the New Dealers expect to spend $15,000,000,000 more than their receipts. Such juggling of fundamental facts on our national finances is, I believe, without precedent in the history of the Presidency.

In the face of these extravagant expenditures, the President admits that the American people can expect no further relief from Federal taxes at this time, although the surest way by which real wages can be increased, and prices lowered, is by reducing the size of the bite which Federal taxes take out of the wages of the worker and out of the profits of industry. Congress must stop the administration's reckless spending on a wartime basis or this Nation cannot hope for peacetime prosperity.

Furthermore, we cannot hope for lasting peace unless Congress calls a halt to the New Deal follies for, dismal as is its records on the homefront, the Truman administration's postwar record in international affairs is even more tragic. We emerged from the war victorious and the strongest nation on earth. Yet 5 months after VJ-day the Truman administration seems to be losing the peace as rapidly as our soldiers and sailors won the war. In the flush of victory, we are in full retreat from the ideals of liberty and justice which America has always championed.

A just and lasting peace must be the first goal of America. The fondest hope of every man returning from battle is that his son may never undergo the experiences which he has been fortunate enough to survive. We accept our responsibility to cooperate with other nations to prevent future wars. In that spirit we have ratified the United Nations charter and have taken our seats in the councils of that organization, but in advance of the functioning of that body, we find that two American Presidents and their

weak and vacillating State Department have subscribed to a new regime of power politics. In a futile policy of appeasement they have abandoned the pledges of the Atlantic Charter and have agreed to Russian domination of her small neighbors on the Baltic, in the Balkans, and clear around to Iran. They have agreed to a policy of starvation in Germany, which threatens the economic ruin of western Europe and which must breed in the hearts of its victims a smoldering hate against us, as well as against our allies, which may force us to maintain permanent armies of occupation.

They have permitted the British and the Dutch to reestablish their system of imperial exploitation in the Orient and to use American lend-lease weapons for the destruction of the natives, who cried in vain for freedom. They have dashed the hopes of those who thought that the American example in the Philippines was to be the rule of the future conduct of the white man in Asia. They have become at least a silent partner in the restoration of a regime in the Orient which we know in our hearts can only be maintained by force.

In short, our leaders have lacked, and still lack, the courage to fight at the council table for the principles for which our sons died in the foxholes. They have sacrificed America's tradition as the friend of the weak and oppressed to buy the good will of governments already indebted to us and sorely in need of our future friendship. They will find that they cannot buy good will with money in the world of tomorrow any more than they could in Latin America. Respect and good will must be earned by fortitude and integrity, not by compromise of principles and appeasement.

They have not even won the respect that is accorded a nation that protects its own interests. While meekly agreeing to Russian and British domination of their so-called spheres of influence, our diplomats have done nothing to obtain for us the vital sea and air bases in the Atlantic and the Pacific, which in this atomic age are absolutely prerequisite to the sound defense of continental United States. The Nation was recently shocked to learn that at Yalta our President agreed to the Russian occupation of the Kuriles, the islands from which the Japanese launched their abortive attack against Alaska. The American people were shocked, first, because their President had denied to them that there had been any agreement at Yalta other than those he specifically reported, and he had not mentioned it. They were further shocked because they realized that their Government was failing them in its basic responsibility for national defense. The Truman diplomacy, ridiculous and tragic at the same time, seems to permit Russia and Great Britain to grab whatever they want while submitting our most fundamental claims to some future session of the World Council.

Indeed, the Truman administration works in reverse. In the world-wide confusion since VJ-day one bright spot has shone out—MacArthur's administration in Japan. Truman does nothing about the confusion, but sets a new council over MacArthur. What we need is to set a new Congress over Truman.

The whole New Deal postwar program mocks the noble principles and the brave deeds of the martyred Lincoln. Inevitably at this time we think of the simple plan for the restoration of peace, which he stated in the immortal words of the last paragraph of the second inaugural. They will be quoted many times in the next few days and, if we will listen, they will point the way in the problems which confront us. Let me repeat them:

"With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive to finish the work we are in; to bind up the Nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, for his widow, and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

"With malice toward none." Does not that mean the vanquished peoples we have doomed to slow starvation?

"With charity for all." Does not that mean the subject peoples of Europe and Asia we have abandoned to Communist and imperialistic exploitation bordering on slavery?

"With firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right." Does not that mean all of us Americans, and particularly our national leaders, who would sacrifice our ideals on the altar of the false and insatiable god of appeasement?

"A just and lasting peace for all nations." Certainly we cannot hope to achieve that unless this Nation quickly returns to the Lincolnian standard of justice, brotherhood, and simple honesty.

That is why I say the congressional elections of 1946 are so highly important. We cannot change the incompetent executive department for another 2 years. We can—and we must—give to our people, and especially to the GI's everywhere, a sane and sound Congress which will be our first line of defense for the protection of American interests abroad, and the preservation of our American system at home, and a restoration of constitutional government in these United States.

We must send strong, independent, fearless representatives to Washington—men who will be true to the Lincoln faith. Fortunately we have such men in both the Republican and Democratic Parties. But a Republican Congress will be immune to New Deal pressure, whether it be exerted through patronage bribes or intimidations by White House radio appeals to their constituents.

A Republican victory in 1946 not only will insure such a Congress; it will tell the New Dealers that the American people are through with their policy of giving away America, of promising what they cannot perform, of fomenting division in the Nation, and of encroaching on the fundamental rights of our citizens. That verdict will be most clear, both to the New Dealers and to the Nation, if it is written in part by the votes of the sound Americans of the South, who traditionally have adhered to the party which has been betrayed by the New Deal.

The battle for freedom is never ended. The cause of freedom marches steadily forward. The principles by which Abraham Lincoln lived, and for which he died, have become the creed of the American people and the hope of the world. Our sons have carried their banner to victory in every corner of the globe. That victory will be indeed hollow unless, as a nation and as individuals, we live by his rules.

Therefore, it behooves us once more—and as never before—to be here dedicated to the free America Lincoln loved so dearly. Let us here highly resolve that this Nation shall have a new birth of freedom, and that the liberty of justice and honesty shall truly enlighten the world.

It's Not the Steel Companies That Will Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 22 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "It's Not the Steel Companies That Will Pay," from the Arkansas Gazette of February 12, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT'S NOT THE STEEL COMPANIES THAT WILL PAY

A CIO steel workers union leader who told strikers at Baltimore that an 18½-cent-an-hour wage increase is as good as in your pockets said anyone who thinks the steel companies can get away with any less doesn't know the united steel workers.

But it is not really the steel companies that are going to pay the 18½-cent increase. Industry at large and the public are going to pay it. An increase in the price of steel of around $5 a ton is forecast, although Price Administrator Chester Bowles had recently refused to go along with an increase of more than $2.50 a ton.

It is announced from Washington that steel fabricators, who process steel into various products, may have the right to immediate price review.

We assume that wage increases for steel workers are justified. The steel companies offered higher wages. How much the increase should be we could not, of course, attempt to say. But there should be no difficulty in realizing that when the steel companies pay the proposed higher wages the companies will in effect simply collect the increase from the steel-using industry in general, which will collect from the consumers.

What Is the Dominant Characteristic of the Truman Administration?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1946

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, during the last few weeks there has been much anxiety abroad in the land as to just where the President stands in reference to many of the public questions now confronting the country. Naturally the type of men whom he selects to carry out his policies is most suggestive. There has been a wealth of editorial comment and conjecture. The same has been true on the part of the columnists and radio commentators. I happened to hear the broadcast of Bill Costello the commentator, over the Columbia Broadcasting System at 6:10 p. m. on February 20. This broadcaster expresses his views and presents his analysis in plain, understandable fashion and, pursuant to the privilege granted to me, I include a copy of the transcript of that broadcast which is as follows:

For the last 10 months, official Washington has been engaged in a guessing game which is just as popular now as it was when Harry Truman first took office. The subject of this speculation is: What is the dominant characteristic of the Truman administration? Will it be New Dealish, just plain liberal, or conservative? Where is it heading?

So far, no one has come up with the answer. There are times when it seems to be all things to all people. The President, by his appointments, seems to be riding off in all directions at once. That may be one reason for the political furor over the Pauley nomination. Quite apart from the taint of oil,

Pauley's appointment has been resented in some quarters because it violates one of the patterns of Washington officialdom; it would put a party politician into the Navy Department, and there are a good many people in Government who object on principle to the presence of a party worker in either War or Navy.

Discussion of this problem brings out the fact that Mr. Truman has drawn most of his appointments from four sources—from the Democratic Party machine, from among his old friends in Congress, from a coterie of old personal friends in Missouri, and to a very minor extent from the ranks of the liberal-labor forces which allied themselves with the New Deal under President Roosevelt. Only on rare occasions has the President made excursions into the world of business and professional experts. Somehow he seems to shy away tempermentally from such minds. Those whom the President has chosen for his immediate circle of advisers are mainly the homespun type—men known more for their good nature, their easy familiarity than for their intellectual qualities.

Changes in the Truman administration have come gradually, and many observers still find the trend confusing. Mr. Truman kept some of Mr. Roosevelt's closest advisers for a time, but gradually they have drifted away. There is still no dominant characteristic in a catalog of the new people. It is a curious fact that complaints are being muttered not only among Government personnel, but in the White House itself. The President is fond of complaining he has more than his share of troubles. He made such a remark to a group of correspondents the day after he took office, and he has never left off. He complains to his friends that he cannot get good men to take high offices; he has to spend hours on the telephone persuading them to enter Government service. At the same time, men in the upper brackets of the civil service complain that there is no longer any inspiration for them in Government service. They say they can accomplish nothing when good but incompetent men are given policy-making jobs over them. And it is a fact that scores of such experts are leaving Government for private employment. The nub of their complaint seems to be that the Truman administration lacks character; it is neither fish or fowl; neither courageously liberal nor vigorously conservative. It is one thing in one department and another thing across the street. When you ask for specific details, the answers are vague and unsatisfying. It is something which is felt, but which cannot quite be explained.

Home Sold Out From Under Washington Veteran—Landlord Demands $2,500 Speculative Profit—Price Ceilings Only Way To Stop Legal Swindle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 19, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, for several months I have tried to keep a calm, objective attitude toward both sides of the housing problem, giving due consideration to the interests and the profit of real-estate men and builders as well as to the need of the people for homes.

Today, however, I received from a veteran a letter that would anger any man with a sense of fair play and justice for our returning servicemen. This letter is a concrete example of the type of highway robbery that is being practiced by unscrupulous speculators upon our returning servicemen, who have such difficulty finding places to stay. It is just the sort of thing that I am trying to correct in my housing bill by putting a ceiling price on existing homes.

This is a story of a veteran who rented a house before the war and kept it all through the conflict. The veteran is Mr. Joseph L. Price of Washington, D. C. In 1941 the owner of the house which the veteran had rented offered to sell him the place for $6,500. Mr. Price could not buy the home because he was drafted into the Army. He was discharged November 11, 1945, and his landlord offered to sell the house to him again—this time for $9,000. But the veteran had not yet found a job, so he was unable to finance the purchase. A few weeks later the landlord, a prominent Washington attorney, sold the house for $8,750. Veteran Price now has a job in the War Department, but his home has been sold out from under him and he cannot get another place. Why? Because the speculators have increased the prices of houses so far beyond their true value that Government appraisers cannot approve a GI loan to buy them. I think that the Congress of the United States will be derelict in its duty to the people, it will disgracefully fail its obligation to the veteran, if we allow such legalized robbery to continue. We have a simple question before us. Are we to aid and abet the swindle of these boys who fought for us for 4 long years under the most horrible conditions on the face of the earth? Are we to keep these veterans in so helpless a position that they can be plundered by a few greedy profiteers? Or will we be men enough to protect them and their families until they can make a new start in life? It is only by imposing ceiling prices on these homes and putting a halt to real estate racketeering that this can be done.

Mr. Speaker for the benefit of the Members, I want to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this stirring letter received from Veteran Joseph L. Price of 321 Todd Place NE, Washington, D. C.:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 19, 1946.*
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: If ever a price ceiling was needed on existing houses, it is now. I am speaking as a veteran and a victim of a speculator. My wife and I have resided at the above address for 5 years. At the time of our first occupancy of these premises it was offered for sale when the rent-control law came into effect for $6,500 by the man who owned it, a lawyer who has an office in the Munsey Building. At the time we were in no financial position to take it. I was inducted into the Army, later discharged November 11, 1945. The house was offered for sale then for $9,000. As I had not yet procured a position, I was unable to try to get a GI loan. It was finally sold to another veteran who paid $8,750 for it. I have a job now in the War Department, but my home is sold and as I can only afford a $7,000 house I sure can see where the speculator is making it almost impossible to buy a home as they put the prices so much more than the house is worth, the Government appraiser will not O. K. the GI loan.

In conclusion I would like to say that this is unfair for a man that—not only me but millions of other veterans—risked his life that his home could be secure shows his appreciation by buying and selling mine from under me. He made his pound of flesh by depriving me, one of the men who fought for his home, of mine. Where and when I will be able to get another the Lord only knows, as I went to one real-estate man who had a $6,995 bungalow advertised in the paper—when I asked him to give me a contract subject to approval of the Veterans' Administration he refused, saying it would take 2 weeks to get it appraised by them and then he knew they would turn it down as he had too much experience with veterans and he could not afford to have his property tied up for 2 weeks, for there was plenty of people who would buy it in that time. The speculators have got me up a tree.

Yours truly,

JOSEPH L. PRICE.

They Need a Spanking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 21, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, two would-be czars—little J. Caesar Petrillo, who would force us to pay the fiddler even though he never draws a bow; and big, bluffing Chet Bowles—need what "horse and buggy" fathers applied to make good men out of bad little boys: a barrel-stave spanking in the woodshed, unless, perchance, J. Caesar and Chet have gotten away with so much that a spanking will not cure them and they should be sent to a reform school, there to learn, J. Caesar, that there is a limit to people's patience, and Chet that, after all, he is just a hired man, the people's servant, not their boss, that even he cannot prevent the operation of the law of supply and demand.

Overlong, J. Caesar has been compelling those furnishing music at public gatherings, those broadcasting musical programs, to pay his union for music never furnished, for musicians who never worked. A public gathering, wanting to use its own musicians, is forced to pay Petrillo for an equal number of musicians who never appear nor play a note. Groups desiring to stage a show to raise money for charitable purposes, civic bodies wanting to celebrate the return of local veterans, asking for the services of the Army or Navy bands, were forced first to get J. Caesar's permission. Think that one over. The Army, the Navy, and the marines can lick the fighting men of the world, but are not permitted to whip Petrillo. They can't beat a drum nor toot a note at a civilian function when J. Caesar turns thumbs down. The House just gave J. Caesar his long overdue spanking.

BOWLES AND HIGH PRICES

Chet Bowles has outgrown his breeches. He is a hired man, paid by the taxpayer's money, who has lost his sense of proportion. His head is swelled and his conceit and arrogance are insufferable. He has gotten away with so many abitrary and ruinous rules, regulations, and directives that he seems to think he is infallible. If ever a Govern-

ment official used more of the people's money to spread propaganda to keep himself in a Federal job than has Chet, it is not of record.

An excess of money on hand, a scarcity of goods available, cause inflation. Instead of five billion, we now have $28,000,000,000 in circulation. Instead of an abundance of needed merchandise, there is a scarcity. Yet Chet, heading the organization designed to prevent inflation, increase production, like a kid chasing a butterfly with a net, goes blithely on his way, fixing prices so low that the profit margin is, in many instances, wiped out. Hence the scarcity; hence high prices, in spite of OPA.

Chet can fix prices, but he cannot make shirts. Now and then he deals one from the bottom. Fixing the price on some articles, calling the consumer's attention to that price, he chortles to the consumer, "Look how I hold the price down." But dealing from the bottom of the deck, he asks Congress for a billion five hundred million dollars of the consumer's tax money, to be paid to the producer by way of a subsidy. The consumer, buying his pound of butter, pays across the counter, but he digs again for the subsidy to be paid to the producer for the same butter.

People began to catch on, and this week big, blut., good-natured Chet—seeing his propaganda knocked into a cocked hat, aware that the people, wanting low prices, were not getting them, would rather pay more and get something than to go without—lost his temper. He jumped on the NAM, because it told the people that if OPA would let up, though there might be temporary inflation, production would shortly catch up with demand and goods would be available at a reasonable price within a reasonable time. Chet has been telling the folks just what to write their Congressmen. NAM asked the people to think it over and then to tell their Representatives what they thought about price control. That made Chet really mad, and he gave NAM heck. The reason—he didn't want the people to do any thinking. I might add, he just wanted to do the thinking for them.

Then Bowles jumped on Henry Ford II, head of the company which is willing to lose $33,000,000 during the coming year in order to stay in business, give its employees jobs and the public automobiles. The National Small Business Men's Association, having ventured to propose strike legislation, will be the next whipping boy.

Chet admits inflation is here. He admits we are going to have more of it. He admits that price control is an evil. He says there must be an end to it; but not just now, says he. He wants to prolong the agony, at least until election day, perhaps so that he and his outfit may be assured of continued existence. Some of us are willing to face inflation now, have the men back at work, production in full swing.

Both J. Caesar Petrillo, who would not even permit the school children at Interlochen to study music and put on their concerts without paying tribute to him, and Chester Bowles, who can fix prices but who cannot make shirts, socks, nor automobiles, should be given a long overdue lesson in public behavior.

Address of Hon. Charles W. Taussig

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESÚS T. PIÑERO

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1946

Mr. PIÑERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following address delivered by the Honorable Charles W. Taussig, chairman, United States Section of the Caribbean Commission, at the opening yesterday of the Second West Indian Conference being held at Charlotte Amalie, St. Thomas, V. I., United States of America:

Your Excellency, fellow commissioners, delegates to the West Indian Conference, ladies and gentlemen, you have just heard a significant message from President Truman. It is fitting to recall that another great leader played an important part in the creation of this Commission and this Conference. Franklin Delano Roosevelt knew and loved the Caribbean. He knew your problems and believed in the future of the West Indies. The spirit of his leadership will be a constant inspiration to us in the work that lies ahead.

History tells us that the past always impinges on the present. Nothing we here undertake, no matter how sincere our motives nor how wise our decisions, can abruptly be disassociated from that which has gone before. We are confronted with this fact at every turn in the road that leads to social and economic betterment for the people of the Caribbean. Always the old plantation system with its unsavory byproducts casts a grotesque pattern across our path. As we move forward these shadows become less distinct, their evils less menacing, and our progress more rapid.

Part of the West Indian Conference will be devoted to a review of the progress we have made—and it is considerable; another part will consider the basic problems of West Indian economy and society, and a third will concern itself with specific recommendations for projects promptly to be undertaken.

We will come to these discussions with a new sense of maturity because of our experience in the Caribbean during the past 4 years and because of a new approach to world unity through the United Nations Organization. The United States and Great Britain have welcomed two new associates into this regional fellowship. With France and the Netherlands as full-fledged members of the Caribbean Commission and with 15 Caribbean territories represented in the Conference, new horizons of organization and opportunity will open up to us. We will have to devise effective machinery for the expanded organization. We will have to put into practice in peacetime the aims and ideals which could not be realized in time of war. We will have to show the world that in this relatively small Caribbean cosmos great nations and small territories can plan their regional life in friendly cooperation. If we are successful, the troubled world will gain new hope from our achievement. The details of these plans and the failures and accomplishments of the past will be discussed at length by the delegates to this Conference in the next 3 weeks. It is not my purpose here to review those plans or to anticipate those discussions. My few words to you now will deal with another subject, one not presently on our agenda, a problem less concerned with countering the evils of the past than with successfully overcoming a menace of the future.

As we gather here today we are confronted with a new problem, one that is so fantastic, so apparently unreal, that we barely recognize it as the immediate and urgent concern of this Conference. I refer, of course, to the atomic bomb, the weapon that offers the world the alternatives of durable peace or extinction. Through the centuries man has striven for peace. All of his efforts have resulted in failure. Now we are confronted with the awful implications of this new knowledge. We must make another effort to obtain a lasting peace, a cooperative effort of a magnitude beyond anything that has gone before. Failure this time means obliteration. But if we succeed we have the assurance of scientists that atomic energy can be made to yield unprecedented benefits to mankind. This new effort toward peace will compel many social, political, and economic adjustments. The part that the Caribbean must play is not only of importance to the area itself, but to the world at large. For at this point in history when distance and mere armed might do not assure safety, the problems of each part of the world are vital to all others. Even before the atomic bomb came into being it was recognized that there cannot be peace while the maladjustments of one part or another of this steadily shrinking world go uncorrected.

The Caribbean Commission and the West Indian Conference have been doing their part to focus attention upon and help solve the difficulties that beset this region. We have met with some measure of success. The task still ahead is tremendous. We must continue to think these problems through. We must continue to have conferences to discuss, to argue, to disagree—and ultimately to agree—upon solutions. But we must not overlook the fact that in our desire to be logical and thorough the great menace confronting us today demands speed and more speed in achieving our objectives.

What are these objectives? We have repeated them over and over again—social, economic, and political progress. These objectives are not mere abstract ideals when translated into better fed, better clothed, and better educated human beings. But these practical reforms can become merely palliatives unless built on the foundation of essential human rights. Nowhere on this agenda and at no time in our previous conferences do we find any specific mention of human rights. The race we are running against atomic energy cannot be won alone by economists, scientists, or politicians. We, the people, must define—and precisely—the goal of human aspirations that we seek. There is a unifying purpose in the world today which, if properly expressed, can serve as a guide for those whom we choose as our leaders. This purpose is to be found in the fundamental and simple desires of the common man. I do not exaggerate when I say that these desires are simple. They become complex only when we awkwardly translate them into complicated political and economic formulas.

All mankind, and the people of the Caribbean area in particular, requires two well-defined charters which shall be basic for all that we strive to attain. One is a bill of human rights, a simple statement of what an individual may require of his fellow men to live his life in security and happiness. The other is a bill of human obligations, a statement of the sacrifices that must be made by an individual to assure these basic rights to his neighbor.

There is a growing conviction supported by many scientists and technicians that the only real defense against the misuse of atomic energy is to be found in the spiritual awakening of mankind. Our hope for security lies not in the field of science, but in the realm of morals.

I believe that the people of the Caribbean might well take a leading part in formulating these charters. For here live together representatives of most of the peoples of the world—Africans, Europeans, Americans (North and South), East Indians, Chinese, and many others. Some of the great religions of the world are represented here—Hindu, Mohammedan, Christian, Confucianist, and Jewish. No charter of human rights, nor its corollary, a charter of human obligations, can have world acceptance unless they are derived from the wisdom, the philosophy, the ethics, and the religious aspirations of all the peoples of the world. The time has come, I think, for this Conference to give its attention to this fundamental problem. Perhaps you of the Caribbean, out of the experience of your long and often sorrowful history, can, with the aid of God, bring to yourselves and to the world a working philosophy that will aid mankind in its quest for freedom, dignity, and security.

Chicago Taxicab Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 22, 1946

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Chicago Tribune of February 21, 1946, and the Washington Post of February 22, 1946:

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of February 21, 1946]

END THE CAB MONOPOLY

The veterans who are driving to Washington to seek Federal aid against the Chicago taxicab monopoly may not do much to improve cab service in this city immediately. In fact, they may diminish it, since it seems that a number of their cabs may never get back to town.

But there may be grounds on which the antitrust division of the Justice Department can intervene in the Chicago mess and relieve its citizens of the monopoly agreement, entered into freely, if not for free, by their own aldermen. The management of the Yellow and Checker companies may deny until they are blue in the face that they are under any obligation to purchase their cabs where they do, but the fact remains that they get them from only one source.

That source is a company higher in the holding company hierarchy that controls Yellow, and with which Checker has connections. The suspicion that the two operating companies are being run principally to provide sales outlets for Checker Cab Manufacturing Co. will at least bear investigation. Some courts would undoubtedly hold that such an arrangement was restrictive of interstate commerce.

It's not a good thing for the people of a city to be running to Federal authority for redress against the mistakes, honest or otherwise, of their own elected officials. Sometimes, however, there is no other recourse. This may be such an instance.

A gentleman wrote us after we had commented on the taxicab situation the other day, commending what we said in general, but rebuking us for our naivete in suggesting that the members of the city council are going to do anything to protect their constituents against the present inadequate service. His point was that the aldermen, having been bought by the taxicab monopoly, were going to stay bought.

We don't know whether the aldermen were bought. We do know that they had better not act as if they had been bought, if they want to keep out of hot water from now on.

[From the Washington Post of February 22, 1946]

LOBBY ON WHEELS

The taxi-driving war veterans who have streamed into Washington from Chicago are exercising the elementary constitutional right of petition. That they are exercising it with utmost orderliness and restraint is altogether to their credit. It seems to us, similarly, that the helpfulness of the Army in affording the men shelter and the interest of the Justice Department in promising an investigation of their complaint are also highly creditable. Mass protests brought to the Nation's Capital have been known in the past to evoke hysteria. This particular protest has been conducted and received in the best American tradition.

The veterans have two complaints. One is that the city of Chicago grants licenses for only 3,000 taxis; the veterans would like to see incorporated in the GI bill an amendment giving former servicemen special licenses to participate in any business limited by city ordinances. Despite our sympathy for their situation, we do not see how such a request could be granted without wholly nullifying the restrictions which some municipalities have seen fit to impose upon certain pursuits. Chicago is within its rights in limiting the number of its licensed cabs; that limitation would be meaningless if veterans could ignore it by dint of a Federal license.

The second complaint seems much more substantial and thoroughly warrants the full investigation which Wendell Berge, Chief of the Justice Department's Antitrust Division, has promised to accord it. The veterans contend that one or two large cab companies hold virtually all the 3,000 licenses issued in Chicago. If true, this would appear to have the aspects of a monopoly. Whether it comes within the prohibitions of the antitrust laws, we do not know. It may be that the protesting veterans will have to drive their cabs back to Chicago and present their protest at the city hall. We cannot help hoping, however, that some of them will stay here and enlarge the inadequate supply of taxis in this community.

The Republican Party at the Crossroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES M. LaFOLLETTE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 22, 1946

Mr. LaFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am including the Lincoln Day address which I made at Evansville, Ind., on February 12, 1946:

Mr. Chairman and fellow Republicans of the Eighth District of Indiana, we meet tonight on the one hundred and thirty-fifth anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, the greatest man American has produced to date. We meet to honor him as members of the Republican Party. It is proper that we should honor him, for while he was not one of the founders of the party in the technical sense, nevertheless he, more clearly than anyone else, by his words, declared the principles and purposes for which that party was founded and by his actions expressed them. Since Lincoln the party has had other men who, in varying degrees, have understood those principles and likewise in varying degrees have attempted, by their actions to bring them into being, but none of these others reached his eminence. And this is understandable, for he was of the people, he had a kinship with all people; therefore, having faith in himself, he had faith in the people, and out of that faith grew his conviction that "government of the people, by the people, and for the people" should become a reality.

We people of the Eighth District of Indiana have a particular interest in celebrating the birth of this man and we are entitled to be proud of the fact that his formative years, from 7 to 21, were lived in Spencer County in this district—for experiences has taught us that much of the greatness which men display in later life can be traced to the foundation of integrity, character, kindness, and human understanding which they acquire in their formative years. Those things are acquired from association; therefore, it is logical for us to assume that the humble people with whom Lincoln associated in this Eighth District of Indiana themselves were possessed, to a high degree, of the qualities of this man which have caused the world to honor and revere him.

But if this is true, a proper regard for our obligations requires of us a higher standard of conduct than that required of those Republicans who live in other parts of the world which, in the past, was not so closely related to the life of this man.

There are two kinds of ancestor worship, one of them dishonorable, the other honorable.

The first kind is demonstrated by those weak or base people of the present who try to excuse themselves and find salve for their consciences by continually talking about what a rich or great man "grandpappy" was. Such people have no influence upon the present and because they have either failed to understand the qualities of greatness of their ancestors or lacked the present character to live up to those standards, they succeed only in desecrating the memory of their ancestors and in obtaining for their time either the amused disdain or the loathing dislike of their contemporaries.

But there is an honorable kind of ancestor worship. The people who practice it, studiously study the history of the thoughts and accomplishments of their ancestors, and finding, there, things which are good and clean and pure and honorable, and understanding the things that they find, set for themselves the duty and obligation in their generation to conduct themselves in their day meticulously in accord with the standards of greatness which have preceded them. Such people, because they understand the grandeur of the past, find it with them always in the present and strive humbly in their daily lives to obtain the approval of that ever-present shade. Such people find no need to bolster their standing in the present by glibly calling up the grandeur of the past, for the world, which knows the grandeur of the past recognizes, in them, in some degree, a reincarnation of that grandeur, and the world gives to them its approval and they, in turn, give honor to their ancestry.

Political parties being composed of men are like men and judged in the world by the same standards by which the world judges men. Therefore, wherever Republicans are meeting tonight, the world will know whether in those meetings the people gathered there have, by their acts, honored or desecrated the memory of Abraham Lincoln.

Since the world will know whether we act honorably here, it might be well for us to

investigate the words and acts of Abraham Lincoln in order that we may have a standard by which to judge for ourselves the judgment which the world will place upon our conduct.

The biographers of Lincoln uniformly attest to his love of the Declaration of Independence. It was his handbook. He understood that the Declaration of Independence declared the spirit and the purposes which this Nation was called into being to accomplish. He also knew that the Constitution was merely the tool which the people could use to carry out that spirit and purpose. So if we would be filled with the spirit that filled Lincoln, it is proper that we read the pertinent parts of the Declaration which he loved so much.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.—That whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

Every thought that the adult Lincoln had and every speech that he made gives clear evidence that the grandeur of those thoughts had so completely absorbed his soul, that the mind—the mirror of the soul—gave forth the truths therein set out on every occasion.

Lincoln also was one of those rare men whose acts conformed to their spoken words. Therefore, when we read the words of Lincoln, we find a true measurement of the acts of Lincoln, and it is the acts of Lincoln which we would emulate today, if we would truly honor him today.

In the spring of 1860, Lincoln was a known candidate for the Republican nomination for President at the convention to be held in the middle of May in Chicago. On February 27, fully conscious of this fact, he delivered his great speech at the Cooper Institute in New York. From there, equally conscious of his candidacy and of the effect which every word he said would have upon his candidacy, he started for Exeter to visit his son. On the way, he spoke at Hartford, Conn., on March 3, and at New Haven, Conn., on March 6—less than 2 months before the convention was to assemble.

It is necessary that we understand this background so that we may understand the significance of the New Haven speech. He made the New Haven speech in strong Democratic territory and in an area where industry was more highly concentrated at that time than anywhere else in the country, and consequently in an area where there were more manufacturers and industrialists than in any part of the country. At that same time, there was a strike of shoe workers in New England. Douglas had been there before him and, like the divisionists of the present day, had made a subtle appeal to the avarice of the owners, the misery of the strikers, and the confusion in the minds of the middle class by attempting to lay all the blame for the strike upon the threatened loss of the southern markets which would follow the secession of the South if the Republican Party continued to press the moral issue of slavery and its party pledge to abolish further extension of that evil into the territories. Like the southern Democrats today and the Republicans, who prostitute the memory of Lincoln by lying down in the same bed with them, Douglas was an appeasor, and a finagler, and a cheap politician attempting to obtain votes by appealing to the avarice, the fear, and the confusion which I have mentioned.

Not so Lincoln. He met the issue of slavery head-on; he met the issue of strikes head-on; and, if you read with understanding what he said, he did more than that, he met the problems of his day—which are the same problems of our day—the problems of racial prejudices and discriminations, the problems of full employment, and the problems of fair play for the oppressed of his day.

If we would honor Lincoln, we must act today as he did then. You can't dodge and follow Lincoln any more than you can oppress and follow him.

Now let us see what Lincoln said.

The Democrats of that day had developed and used the following argument:

"When the struggle is between the white man and the Negro, I am for the white man; when it is between the Negro and the crocodile, I am for the Negro."

Lincoln had a burning disdain for that argument, and at New Haven, here is the way he treated it:

"There is a falsehood wrapped up in that statement * * * (it) assumes that there is a struggle in which either the white man must enslave the Negro or the Negro must enslave the white. There is no struggle; it is an ingenious falsehood to degrade and brutalize the Negro. * * * It is like two wrecked seamen on a narrow plank where each must push the other off or drown himself; I would push the Negro off, or a white man either; but it is not necessary—the plank is large enough for both. This good earth is plenty broad enough for white men and Negro both, and there is no need of either pushing the other off."

At another part of that speech, he said:

"I desire that if you get too thick here (in New England) * * * you may have a chance to strike and go somewhere else, where you may not be degraded nor have your family corrupted by forced rivalry with slaves."

The lesson which Lincoln was teaching is simple to understand and its application to the problems of today is clear if we remember that the problems of man have been the same since the beginning of time, but the means which must be attempted for their solution vary with the times in which and the conditions under which men live.

In denying that there was a struggle for survival between the white man and the black; in declaring that there was room enough on this good earth for both, Abraham Lincoln was declaring that the basic problems of man are economic and that if man will but recognize the fact and work together that there are ample good things on the surface of this earth for all.

Thus he stated the problem. He also stated the means which were then presently available to solve it; namely, the opening up of the Government-owned land in the Territories of the United States in the West, if and when the people of New England should become so crowded there that there was not enough for all or enough wealth could not be produced for all. But he wanted this territory to be free—free for all men, black or white—but more than that, he did not want the standard of living of freemen, either black or white, to be lowered by the debasing, degrading institution of slavery.

Free land for freemen was the readiest, simplest solution to the problem of economic sufficiency for all in Lincoln's time. Today the solution is a determination upon the part of Government not to give free land—for it has no more—but to give and afford opportunities for full employment to all of its people who can be gainfully employed. The obligation is to conduct the economy of the country so that the greatest amount of wealth can be produced and employment offered by private employers. But for this to be possible, we cannot forget, after the experiences of the twenties and thirties, that the masses of the people must have buying power in order to keep this capitalistic economy and the machinery of it going. And, if at times it seems apparent that the production of goods of that kind will not furnish sufficient buying power to enable the people to consume consumer goods, then there must be a coordinated system of public works. The local communities which have the funds which they have raised by taxation should expend them for that purpose, particularly for matters of local concern, but the coordination and the timing of the shift from the production of other kinds of goods is an obligation of the Federal Government, just as in Lincoln's time, the making available of the free public lands for the people to emigrate to was an obligation of the Federal Government to relieve economic stress.

This was Republican philosophy. Douglas and the Democrats didn't want full employment, didn't want free labor, and they didn't want freemen. Likewise today, those of us who advocate full employment, full production, a scale of wages in the masses of the public which will make this possible and, when necessary, the expenditure of funds for public works under a federally coordinated plan, are following true Republican tradition; and those people who may be elected as Republicans who get in bed with southern Democrats who fight a bill for full employment, are following true Democratic traditions, the traditions of "division and ruin," the tradition of oppression of the masses, which was the tradition of the Democratic Party when the Republican Party came into existence. And I say to you, that Republicans of that kind ought to get out of the Republican Party and get into the Democratic Party so that there can be a marriage between the two so as to end this present illicit intercourse.

Now let's see what else Lincoln said at New Haven. Abraham Lincoln believed that a man was a man because of what was inside of him and not because of the color of his skin. As we have seen, he denounced an argument which was advanced by the Democrats for the purpose of "brutalizing the Negro." He also said this:

"We wish to allow the humblest man an equal chance to get rich with everybody else. * * * I want every man to have a chance—and I believe a black man is entitled to it * * * when he may look forward and hope to be a hired laborer this year and the next, work for himself afterward, and finally to hire men to work for him."

Surely those words of Lincoln need no explanation for any man to understand them. Lincoln knew and believed with all his soul that thing which is true; namely, that man is a spiritual being; that he is what lies inside of him, not what you see on the surface. Therefore, the color of a man's skin doesn't affect the quality of a man. He knew that there could not be a fatherhood of God without a brotherhood of man; and when Lincoln knew this, most black-skinned people, because they had been brutalized and denied the education and denied the treatment normally accorded to human beings—not because of any difference in them—were almost totally lacking in all of the social graces or those habits of conduct which were found in the white man of his day. We in the North, at least, have spent millions of dollars in the years since Lincoln's death in providing education for this man of black skin, from which it follows that the outward difference in knowledge and character and understanding and social graces of the black man of today is infinitesimally higher than it was when Lincoln knew him and loved him and fought for him and, in effect, died for him. How can we, as Republicans today, in the face of Lincoln's statement that he wanted to see the black man have a chance to work as a hired man, and the next day to work for himself, and the next day to hire other men to work for him—and Lincoln

didn't say "black man," he said, "men"—dare to be here to honor Lincoln unless we wholeheartedly support, without equivocation, legislation necessary to bring about fair employment practices all over the United States. Legislation made necessary because the Republicans, after the death of Lincoln, failed to afford to men of black skin, in this so-called land of the free and of equal citizens, an equal economic opportunity with all other men.

The Democrats in Douglas' time thought otherwise. The Democrats of the South, who are the real Democrats today, think otherwise. How can any group of Republicans meet anywhere in this land and honor Lincoln with sincerity in their hearts unless they can point to a record of deeds and accomplishments calculated to carry out the doctrine of full economic opportunity which Lincoln announced at New Haven, in hostile Democratic territory and at a time when he was facing a Republican convention, just 2 months away, in which his nomination for the Presidency was at stake.

In this New Haven speech Lincoln, 2 months before the Chicago convention, walked into the most highly industrialized part of America of his day and talked about strikes. Lincoln talked about strikes at New Haven, but before we read what he said about strikes at New Haven lets see what he said on the subject of capital and labor 6 months earlier, on September 30, 1859, in Milwaukee, Wis., at a time when he also knew he was being talked of as a potential nominee of the Republican Party for President. There Lincoln was discussing the "mud sill" theory of labor which had been advanced by the Democrats in the South. My God, how I wish some of our Republicans had let the Democrats keep their economic theories instead of attempting to infect our Republican Party with them. This "mud sill" theory, like all Democratic theories on the question of man and labor, was very degrading to the laborer. Having analyzed that theory, Lincoln said this:

"But another class of reasoners hold the opinion * * * that there is no such thing as a freeman being fatally fixed for life in the condition of a hired laborer. * * * They hold that labor is prior to and independent of capital; that, in fact, capital is the fruit of labor, and could never have existed if labor had not first existed; that labor can exist without capital, but that capital could never have existed without labor. Hence they hold that labor is the superior—greatly superior—of capital."

If Lincoln were alive today, he would have the Un-American Committee investigating that one. And he'd also have a lot of so-called Republicans who, knowing nothing about the traditions of their party, consequently having nothing to forget, denouncing him as an unsafe radical. But that is not strange for it was written long before Lincoln, "He came unto His own and His own received Him not."

In order that we may have additional light upon Lincoln's ideas on capitalism and the relation of labor and capital under that system, let us now read what he said at New Haven:

"Now about that shoe strike. Now I don't know all about the matter. * * * At the outset, I am glad to see a system of labor prevails in New England under which laborers can strike. * * * I take that it is best for all to leave each man free to acquire property as fast as he can. Some will get wealthy. I don't believe in a law to prevent a man from getting rich. It would do more harm than good. So while we do not propose any war upon capital, we do wish to allow the humblest man an equal chance to get rich with everybody else."

Lincoln thought so incisely and expressed his thoughts so concisely that almost everything he said was pertinent. This makes it very difficult to pick out particular sentences from his speeches on any subject as being the most revealing, because all of it was revealing. Nevertheless, I shall risk doing this and call your attention to the last sentence of the New Haven speech:

"So while we do not propose any war upon capital, we do wish to allow the humblest man an equal chance to get rich with everybody else."

Only the fool, or what is in fact the equivalent of a fool—a man with intelligence who has closed his mind—will assert that today the humblest man has a chance to get rich equal to that of the infinitely small percentage of our citizens who dominate the productive capital of our country and the financial resources of our country or with those even more powerful people, the group who manage these resources for the people who own them.

I believe that the bulk of the American people think as I think and feel as I feel and that we all feel as Lincoln felt; namely, that a capitalistic system which has been permitted to operate under a system of laws which has permitted relatively few people in our country to continue to acquire, through their capital investments, an increasingly disproportionate share of the wealth which has been produced, has not left the bulk of our people with an equal chance to participate, as vital, living human beings, in our capitalistic economy.

We must understand the basic truth stated in the Declaration of Independence—Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed—if we are to understand its application to our present economic problems.

What was really being said, was this, that people, whether in governments or in the ordinary affairs of life, if they are worthy of living in a democratic society, want to feel that they are really a part of the thing that they are doing and that in some way they participate in the decisions which affect their lives. Under a system where mass-production industries get larger and larger and consequently, fewer and fewer in number, and where much the same thing takes place in the banking and financial structure of the country, it follows that a smaller and smaller number of people control these things, and as that condition grows, it naturally removes from the masses of the people a sense of participation in the creative character of the work which they are doing. I am not sure that this is always conscious in the minds of the workers of America, but people are often moved subconsciously as results of emotions they feel, which emotions in turn are created by the surroundings in which they live. Therefore, it is my very firm opinion that one of the basic reasons for the unrest in America is the increasing hopelessness of the average citizen that in our capitalistic system as it presently exists, the condition which Lincoln felt was a condition precedent to its existence; namely, one in which the humblest man had an equal chance to get rich with everybody else, does not presently exist; and the average man sees no hope of the present trend being stopped and this condition being brought about. Out of this unrest and hopelessness of the average man, and this feeling that he has no real participation in the thing that he is doing, arises the industrial strife in America.

You can't cure these things by repressive labor legislation. You only intensify the feeling of oppression and frustration and hopelessness in the mind and heart of the industrial worker; and those who advocate repressive labor legislation don't understand the basic principles of the Republican Party and have no understanding of the philosophy of Abraham Lincoln. And it makes no difference whether they call themselves Republicans and make big campaign contributions. If Lincoln was the great Republican, then these men are not.

Of course, no one but the rankest left wing ideologist would say that labor is free of fault; of course, in specific instances, the position of labor unions has not been sound. I have always said this; but I cannot, and will not, in the present condition of our economy and when the errors which I have discussed are so manifest, strain at the gnat of labor wrongs and swallow the camel of these greater maladjustments in our industrial set-up. I won't do this to gain one vote, because I can't do it and feel that I am serving my country or actually doing something to preserve the capitalistic system.

The real tragedy is that so many small business people and white-collar workers and small tradesmen and farmers, sensing this unrest in the masses of the people, but not understanding that it is due to the accumulation of wealth and power in the hands of the few which causes the unrest, turn upon the workers who evidence the unrest and ignore their real enemy and the real threat to the survival of the capitalistic system; namely, those people who will not let go their hold and grasp upon the control of the industrial life of the United States.

In Lincoln's time it was different—the slave-owning population of the South which, through the ownership of slaves, owned the real property of the South and dominated its life, were as small in proportion as the group which dominates the industrial and financial life of America today. They were Democrats and they were joined by a great percentage of the industrialists of the North who not only wanted to trade with these men, but who understood that as long as slave labor prevailed in the South, it, of itself, would depreciate the value of services of the men in the North, to the advantage of the northern industrialists. But, in Lincoln's time, the small business people and retailers of the North, the farmers of the North and the vast bulk of the workers of the North understood this problem and knew who their real enemies were and how to strike at them.

It was this understanding of our ancestors which caused the creation of the Republican Party. Lincoln clearly saw it; he was pursuing a policy which was the salvation of capitalism, even thought the slave-owning property owners of the South and the industrial property owners of the North did not see it and denounced him, just as today they denounce any man who sees this thing and wants to follow in the footsteps of Lincoln and help to create a Republican Party true to the traditions of Lincoln; not only to advance the welfare of the factory-working masses, but to preserve this system of private ownership of property to be used in the production of wealth. The tragic difference between Lincoln's time and the present is that today, for some unknown reason, too many of the farmers of the country, the little businessmen of the country, the retailers of the country, and the little bankers of the country fail to see the problem with the same degree of clarity with which their ancestors saw it when Lincoln offered one of the basic solutions of it—the elimination of the property right in human beings and thereby the elimination of the competition of slave labor with the free workers in the northern economy.

Today something must be done to preserve the basic ideas of hope-restoring fluid, capitalism in America, not the perverted, distorted condition of capitalism which presently exists. This is our real problem, but oddly enough some people, who profess to be capitalists, don't even understand that. They think that the capitalistic system comes first and the Government comes second. The philosophy of American life and the purposes for which this Government was created, Lincoln knew and all true Republicans today know, was set out in the Declaration of Independence. The method of carrying that philosophy out was created by

the Constitution of the United States; but the philosophy was to create life, liberty, safety, and the pursuit of happiness of the people. There was nothing said in the Declaration of Independence about saving the capitalistic system. The American people accepted and still accept today the theory that this system would best promote life, liberty, safety, and the pursuit of happiness. But there is not a line in the Declaration of Independence, nor a word in the Constitution of the United States, which requires the American people to retain the capitalistic system in order to obtain life, liberty, safety, and the pursuit of happiness.

In other words, the thing which was claimed as the right of the people in the Declaration of Independence and the thing for which the Government of the United States was set up was the right of the people to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That was guaranteed, not capitalism, as the way of obtaining it. So that if you understand this Government as Abraham Lincoln understood and as he expressed it and as he fought for it and as, indeed, he died for it, you will understand that it is not the Government of the United States which is on trial today; it is the capitalistic system which is on trial today. Therefore, the burden is upon those who cry out the loudest to do something to save it. With the exception of a few misguided people in the middle class—those who cry out the loudest are also those who benefit the most so they have not only the power but the duty to save it.

Lincoln stated the basic condition under which capitalism can be saved and flourish when he said:

"We do wish to allow the humblest man a chance to get rich with everybody else."

Now, of course, there is the obligation of Government to adopt those measures which are best calculated to preserve and make effective the economic system under which the people live. Consequently, this is an obligation of each person whom you send to the Congress of the United States, using the term in its constitutional sense of both Houses of the Congress. But this fact does not destroy the logic of the argument which I have made, namely, that those who benefit most from a system and therefore have the greatest stake in seeing it retained owe an obligation to come forward and to suggest to the Government from time to time a policy which will permit the broadest possible ownership of the greatest number of people of the means of production under our capitalistic system. Have they done that? They have not. It imposes an obligation upon them to learn at least one lesson from the twenties and not to forget it, and that is that when the people are not paid enough to buy the producer cannot manufacture, the automobile dealer cannot sell, the grocery keeper can only extend credit because his customers have no cash, the farmer can't haul his produce to market because the cost of transportation is almost greater than the price prevailing in the market place.

Those who would preserve the system should also understand that it is real wages which the worker must have, so that they are destroying their system if they demand that prices in large mass-production industries be immediately increased to an extent which absorbs all wage increase. Of course, this demand for price increase is a clever device of big business and big capital designed to influence the small businessman, the white-collar worker, the professional man, and the farmer into thinking that it was the workers' wage which increased the cost to him. The manufacturer then not only has his disproportionate share of profit, but he has created a new enemy for the man who works in his factory, and, oddly enough, some middle-class people who ought to know better fall for this.

You hear a lot of cries about the risk which the owner of the plant takes if he is asked to increase wages and hold his profit per unit down, while he is asked to take the sure-thing gamble that in the present market, with the present pent-up demand for goods, he will produce so many units and sell them that he will have the same gross profit in the end. Under present conditions there is little, if any, risk which any large manufacturer takes on his ability to sell an increased volume of his product. But, if he insists on too high a profit by unit, he creates the same snowballing effect of giving too much wealth back to the owner of the tools so that the people who work can't buy, which is destructive of the system of capitalism. When this condition exists, the worker takes the risk; he takes the risk to the health and education of his family because his restricted income cannot adequately feed, clothe, house, and educate them. Under this condition, the farmer and the retailer and the little tradesman take the risk because if the worker can't buy, eventually they will go out of business.

But the owners of the steel industry, the owners of General Motors, the owners of the electric-equipment industry won't take a risk under those conditions and I'll prove it. When the last depression was over, it was the farmer who was hurt, the little-business man who was wiped out, the professional man whose income was reduced, the small stockholder with a few shares in steel and General Motors and the electric industry and all the rest of big business who was hurt; but the real owners, the people who had secured and stuck away and saved the disproportionate profits that they had taken, still owned the plants and started them up again when the depression was over.

These things are so simple that it is incredible to me that I should get letters from little-business men, from tradesmen, and from farmers crying crocodile tears over the risk which the du Ponts and the Raskobs and the others like them are being asked to take if they keep the price of their products per unit down within reason so that people can buy them. Those people rode through the last depression and came out completely whole by adopting exactly the same policy of small production at high prices and low wages. But if we have another, then all of us who want to see a system of free labor, who want to see freedom, who want to preserve an intelligent, fair form of capitalism will be swept aside because capitalism in this country—which is about the last place on earth where it has a chance to exist as a dynamic, living, reformed thing in which people have a real chance to participate in it—will disappear. And it won't be the follower of the philosophy of Abraham Lincoln who brought this about; it will be the people who are standing within the Republican Party and blindly following present-day so-called Republican policies, which were southern Democratic in the time of Douglas, and which still are southern Democratic, who will not only destroy the Republican Party, but they will also bring down the wreck of capitalism on the heads of all of the rest of us who are advocating Lincoln's Republicanism in an attempt to save both.

I refuse to dishonor the memory of Lincoln here tonight by advocating any such policy, just as I have refused to dishonor the memory of Lincoln and the traditions of Lincoln republicanism since I have been privileged to represent the people of the Eighth District of Indiana as a member of Lincoln's party in the Congress of the United States.

The issue is clear; we must broaden the base of ownership by proper taxing methods, particularly revised corporation taxing methods, or any other device which will do it; we must give a real incentive to small people to start new businesses and the workers who will run the risk to work in those new businesses with tax-credit inducements proportionate to the risk that they take and the amount of new capital in the sense of new ownership involved; we must maintain the buying power in the hands of the masses of the people. These are just some of the things which must be done if we are going to create a capitalism which Lincoln would recognize, one in which the worker comes first, for Lincoln said, "the worker is superior to capital, and creates it"; one in which the humblest man shall have an equal opportunity to acquire property and to feel a sense of participation—real participation—in the decisions which affect his economic life and the job which he finds himself performing. Such a policy is Lincolnian; such a policy can well create a capitalism which will create the goals to which the people aspired in the Declaration of Independence; and, if it does, it may well attract the attention of the peoples of the world and serve as their salvation, as well as ours.

It is easy to desert Lincoln today; it is easy to fail to fight against a system in which economics enslave most of our people, black and white, as fully as the institution of slavery enslaved the black man when Lincoln voted against it. So the issue is plain—either we Republicans honor Lincoln by following him and thereby save our party, our country, and our world, or we follow Stephen A. Douglas and his poll-tax Democratic successors today and destroy them. I choose Lincoln.

Let us close as Lincoln did as he ended his Cooper Institute address:

"Neither let us be slandered from our duty by false accusations against us, nor frightened from it by menaces of destruction to the Government, nor of dungeons to ourselves. Let us have faith that right makes might and in that faith let us, to the end, dare to do our duty as we understand it."

UNRRA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1946

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article on UNRRA and the United Nations by Gould Lincoln which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of Thursday, February 14, 1946:

THE POLITICAL MILL

(By Gould Lincoln)

With a full realization that relief and rehabilitation of millions of people in Europe, Africa, and the Far East is essential if the world as a whole is to progress toward peace and a measure of prosperity, the United Nations, at its assembly meeting in London, voted unanimously to back wholeheartedly the work of UNRRA and appointed a committee to encourage contributions and to keep in constant touch with the work of the relief organization.

Under the present set-up—the Council of the UNRRA—the understanding is that the work of the relief organization is to be completed in Europe by December 31, 1946, and in the Far East of March 1947. It was clearly indicated that the members of the United Nations were hopeful that UNRRA will be

able to do its job within those limits, but it was equally understood that conditions might arise which would leave trouble spots still to be aided.

The thought back of the resolution adopted by the United Nations Assembly was that the UNO should stand ready to take over—possibly with part of the UNRRA organization at its disposal—and to proceed with the essential work.

The UNO Committee, which has been appointed to deal with UNRRA and its problems, consists of the following member nations: Canada, China, France, Russia, Britain, and the United States (all the members of the Central Committee of UNRRA), and the Dominican Republic, Greece, New Zealand, Norway, and Poland—11 all told. This committee is directed specifically to do two things. First, it is to urge all states signatory to the UNRRA agreement which have not made or arranged to make further contributions to UNRRA, as recommended last August, to make them with the least possible delay. Second, to urge those members of the United Nations which are not signatory to the UNRRA agreement to join that organization and make their contribution to this great humanitarian task. There are seven such nations. In addition, the secretary-general of UNO, Trygve Lie, is directed to make arrangements with the director-general of UNRRA, Herbert Lehman, to have the relief organization provide the UNO with full reports on the work of UNRRA in the countries that are being assisted.

The purpose of the resolution adopted by the Assembly was twofold—to place the authority and prestige of the United Nations back of the relief and rehabilitation work, and to bring the moral pressure of the UNO to bear on the nations to live up to all their obligations under the UNRRA agreement.

The stark fact that millions of people are in danger of starvation was brought strongly to the attention of the Assembly by Representative SOL BLOOM, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and an American delegate to the Assembly, and by P. J. Noel-Baker, British Minister of State, in their presentation of the case for the UNRRA. The original proposal that the United Nations do something about the UNRRA was advanced, indeed, by Britain, but it was a substitute resolution, prepared by Mr. BLOOM which was finally adopted.

Under the original proposal, any peace-loving nation, i. e., any nation that was not an aggressor in the last war, whether it remained neutral or not, could have been invited to join up with the UNRRA and contribute, like Switzerland, Sweden, Portugal, and Spain. Some of the nations, indeed, wished these nations to be invited. But the thought occurred to some that if the Franco government of Spain jumped into the middle of UNRRA, an embarrassing situation might easily be created—and to some extent it would appear that UNO was giving its blessing to that government.

Every nation taking part in the debate of the UNRRA resolution paid tribute to the generosity of the United States—which has and is providing the lion's share of the entire contribution to the relief organization—and at the same time took occasion to praise Mr. BLOOM, who sponsored UNRRA in the House of Representatives.

Noel-Baker's tribute was clear and to the point. "Without the United States there would have been no UNRRA," he said. "I say with no less assurance that without UNRRA there would have been an unimaginable catastrophe in Europe this winter."

Mr. BLOOM's appeal was to act promptly "because there is starvation facing those poor unfortunate people throughout the world. Time, he said, was of the essence. And nation after nation responded to his appeal by pledging their support.

Washington and the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1946

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, on this the birthday of our first President, George Washington, it is natural that we should devote some time to the consideration of the influence which America's greatest hero, soldier, and statesman has had upon our great Republic.

To me the most outstanding work that Washington accomplished was his invaluable aid in the formation of the American Constitution which, although only 159 years old, is still the oldest, active, political document existing in the world today. Since 1787, when our Constitution was adopted, civilization has been a world of tumbling thrones, prostrated dynasties, overturned constitutions—of new empires, new republics, new and constantly varying conceptions of states—yet in this epoch of upheaval, during the last 159 years, one political entity, and one alone, has remained intact: that is the Constitution of the United States of America.

Our Constitution is not self-perpetuated. If it is to survive, it will be because it has public support—active support; not passive.

The Constitution of the United States is the final refuge of every right that is enjoyed by any American citizen. So long as it is observed, these rights will be secure. Whenever it falls into disrespect or disrepute, orderly organized government, as we have known it for 159 years, will be at an end.

Calvin Coolidge said:

> The Constitution represents a government of law. There is only one other form of authority and that is a government of force. Americans must make their choice between these two. One signifies justice and liberty; the other, tyranny and oppression. To live under the American Constitution is the greatest political privilege that was ever accorded to the human race.

Washington was the President of the Constitutional Assembly which met in Philadelphia in 1787 and which produced the American Constitution. Therefore, Washington can rightly be called the Father of his Country and the founder of its Constitution. I know no better way of commemorating the memory of Washington on this, his birthday, than by calling your attention specifically to the spirit and terms of our Constitution.

To do this, may I turn back the pages of history 159 years to the Constitutional Convention? The time was May 25, 1787, the place the State House at Philadelphia, then a little town of not more than 30,000 people. The Convention met in a hall 50 feet square, whose walls were already eloquent with sacred memories. There the Second Continental Congress had met and there the Declaration of Independence had been signed.

Seventy-two leading men of the Colonies had been originally chosen from the several States as delegates to this Convention. All of the States were represented except Rhode Island, which would have nothing to do with the Constitutional Convention. The greatest actual attendance of delegates from the 12 Colonies was 55, and at the end of the Convention only 39 remained to finish a work which was to make them immortal.

This notable group of men contained merchants, financiers, farmers, doctors, educators, soldiers, and lawyers. Washington was unanimously chosen as president of the assembly and for 4 months, behind closed doors, the attending delegates devoted their thoughts to their country.

It was a young man's convention, the average age being only 40. Franklin was 81; Washington, 55; Madison, 36; Randolph, 34; Hamilton, 30; Charles C. Pinckney, 29; and Dayton, of New Jersey, 27, the youngest man in the Convention.

Out of those 55 men, 39 had been Members of either the First or Second Continental Congress; out of those 55 men, 8 had helped to build the constitutions of their own States; out of those 55 men, 24 of them were college graduates; out of those 55 men, 31 of them were lawyers.

Many great and momentous problems came before the Constitutional Convention and at times the leaders were in despair as to the results, but, after 4 months, on the 15th day of September 1787, the great American Constitution was perfected.

The Convention had been in session for 81 continuous days, probably consuming over 400 hours of actual debate. The original Constitution as completed consisted only of 4,000 words, 89 sentences, and 140 distinct provisions, and even including the 21 amendments the Constitution, after 159 years of development, does not exceed 7,000 words; 65 powers are given to the Federal Government by this great document and 79 are withheld, of which 13 are denied both to the Government and to the constituent States.

Many tributes have been made with reference to the American Constitution. James Bryce, the great English statesman and author of the American Commonwealth, says:

> The American Constitution is the greatest political document ever penned by man.

And Calvin Coolidge in his foreword to Beck's American Constitution says:

> The Constitution of the United States is the final refuge of every right that is enjoyed by any American citizen.

Every American citizen today should study his Constitution. That great body of laws can be read in only 30 minutes of time, and yet it contains every right that we have, direct and indirect.

There are several basic principles underlying our Constitution:

First. It establishes a representative form of government.

Second. It establishes a dual form of government, each citizen living under two forms of government, the national and the State.

Third. It guarantees to its citizens individual liberty, freedom of speech, liberty of the press, right to own property, and the right to worship God according to the dictates of our conscience.

Fourth. It establishes an independent judiciary and created the great Supreme Court, which has well been called the safety valve of the American Constitution, and is pronounced by critics as the greatest intellectual forum in the world.

Fifth. It prevents the concentration of power in the hands of one man or a group of men by checks and balances, creating the three departments of government—the legislative, the judicial, and the executive—each department independent and yet cooperating with each other to the working of a harmonious government. This provision of our Constitution has been the safeguard of the Nation in the days gone, and the perpetuity of our institutions in the future depends upon the independence of these three functions of government.

Sixth. And, finally, it places in the hands of the President and the Senate joint power in determining the foreign affairs of our Nation.

It is especially important in these days of unrest to become students of our great fundamental law. It has been our guiding genius for a century and a half, from the time when our country consisted of 3,000,000 people along the Atlantic seaboard to today with its 135,000,000 people. In a topsy-turvy world in which sins are being committed in the name of democracy, we must distinguish between real democracy and the sham and pretense which seeks to masquerade under democracy's cloak. We must remember that no government can be automatic; that it depends upon the intelligence, the integrity, and the loyalty of her citizens.

Washington made himself immortal as the founder of our Constitution. It is our duty to so administer that Constitution as to guarantee to our citizens those full rights and privileges which are inherently American and which have made America great.

Resolutions of Council of the Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1946

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution, passed unanimously at a memorial meeting in honor of Thaddeus Kosciusko, on his two hundredth birthday anniversary, George Washington, and Abraham Lincoln, sponsored by the Council of the Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware, on Sunday afternoon, February 17, 1946, at Modjeska Hall, Wilmington, Del.:

We, Americans of Polish origin, assembled at the Modjeska Hall, at Wilmington, Del., on Sunday afternoon, February 17, 1946, to honor Thaddeus Kosciusko, on his two-hundredth birthday anniversary, and George Washington for their sacrifices made in winning the freedom and independence which we enjoy this day in these whole United States of America, and Abraham Lincoln for perpetuating this freedom and independence in upholding the union of the whole Nation.

Further, we, as Americans of Polish origin, standing by the American principles that were created at the birth of our Republic, the United States of America, and stoutly upheld to the time of the Tehran Conference, are greatly concerned of the present trend of our American foreign policy.

Whereas the United States has abetted the cause of tyranny in Poland and in many other areas throughout the world, forsaking the cardinal beliefs of Thaddeus Kosciusko, George Washington, and Abraham Lincoln, with breaking the promises of the Atlantic Charter, dismemberment of Poland, failure to carry out guaranties of free election in Poland and other countries in Europe; and

Whereas Poland was sacrificed in an attempt to appease Stalin. Under various pretexts, she was stripped of eastern Poland. Underground leaders who fought nazism were betrayed into coming out into the open and were arrested and imprisoned. Poland was given over to be ruled by men trained in Moscow, delegates of the Soviet Union; and

Whereas today Poland is occupied by Russian armies. The bloodthirsty NKVD, the Russian secret police, with its communistic government, with an alien President, are terrorizing the country behind the same iron curtain of blockade which separates the Soviet Union from the civilized world. Poland is being bludgeoned into a state of receptivity of Soviet statehood; and

Whereas since with the consent of the United States, under its diplomatic pressure and support, fateful decisions regarding Poland, an old, friendly nation and gallant ally have been made behind closed doors at mysterious conferences. The revelation of the political murders that have been committed in Poland in recent weeks should not only shock American public opinion but should arouse stern representations from our Government. Yet nothing is being done about it. A mere disapproval by our Secretary Byrnes is not enough; and

Whereas liberty is slowly bleeding to death in prostrate Poland. Countless thousands of patriotic Poles are being rounded up or are being executed or deported to a fate worse than death. This reign of terror explains why Poles and Jews, by the thousands, are fleeing from Communist-dominated Poland into American and British zones of Germany, deliberately avoiding entry into Russia or Russian-occupied Germany; and

Whereas the accusation, made by the Moscow-sponsored Polish Ambassador in Washington, that General Anders is responsible for the political murders in Poland, is not only ridiculous but malicious. General Anders is in Italy whereas the Russian-installed puppet regime and the Russian Army are in full control in Poland; and

Whereas since the Government of the United States helped to impose upon Poland a Communist government which ignores the will of the people, is it not a moral obligation to take resolute steps to correct this blunder? Even the courts reverse miscarriages of justice; and

Whereas our Government is morally obligated to see at least the promise of free and honest elections is kept now and not when all the democratic elements in Poland have been liquidated. It is our considered judgment that these elections should be held under joint control of the Allies. Polish armed forces in exile and all displaced Poles in Allied occupational zones, fearful of returning to Russian Poland, should be allowed to vote absentia. Guaranties should be given that there will be no reprisals against opposition candidates, otherwise, the Communist slate will be alone in the field; and

Whereas without freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom of the press and radio and without Allied supervision, an election in Poland would no more represent the will of the people than those simulated plebiscites in Baltic countries were true expressions of public opinion; and

Whereas not only is the plight of Poland partly of our making but the lot of this unhappy land is of vital importance to our American way of life. If Russia's will is to prevail there and elsewhere, who is in a position to state America's turn will not come eventually? We are a part of the family of nations and we must share its perils as well as its responsibilities. In the light of Europe's tragic experience, we must be prepared to assume that when the time is ripe, Soviet Russia will not hesitate to violate our neutrality; and

Whereas justice and morality are sacrificed on the altar of modern statecraft-expediency. Will it work? Will peace be obtained as a result of this cynical disregard of elementary justice? Behind the propaganda barrage of twisted definitions—will the sacrifice of Poland's independence satisfy the extending Red menace? One can find the answer by studying the failure of the appeasement of Hitler.

Therefore the United States must not become a partner in any wrongdoing. On the contrary, it should use all peaceful means at its disposal to help allied Poland and all the other nations bordering upon Russia to regain the freedom they enjoyed prior to 1939.

Therefore we, here assembled, demand from our Government that it stop further appeasement of Soviet Russia, which will only lead to another global war. We urge our Government to insist upon the quick withdrawal of Russian troops and secret police from Poland. We demand from our Government a strong international policy that refuses to make compromises with evil. We demand from our Government to keep its promise to Poland that a free election will be held; to demand from the provisional government in Warsaw that such election in Poland be held immediately, if not, its conditional recognition should be recalled.

The final victory in the second World War will not be attained until and unless the ideals for which our sons fought and died, prevail.

The United States has the economic, political, and moral power to change the course of events. There is still time to save the peace.

America, where is thy brother? What have you done to Poland? What are you going to do?

JOSEPH DABROWSKI,
Chairman.

Planning for Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK FELLOWS
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1946

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by President Charles F. Phillips of Bates College, Maine, at the annual luncheon

meeting of Associated Industries of Maine at Augusta, Maine, December 14, 1945:

PLANNING FOR COMPETITION

I

The economic system of the English-speaking world is well on its way toward completing a cycle begun in the sixteenth century. This cycle has taken us from a regulated economy, to one based on little regulation but much competition, and is now taking us back to a regulated system.

I know that there are many people who do not wish to see us complete this cycle—people who do not want a further centralization of economic authority in this country. A few years ago they were vocal in stating their opposition to the trend. But more recently, the trend has been so strong towards a planned economy that they are becoming hesitant in stating their views. In part, their hesitation grows out of the obvious danger of running against the tide. They recognize that Benjamin Franklin was in a very wise mood when he said, "He who spits in the wind, spits in his own face." Yet, if ever there were a time for the danger signals to be raised, this is it.

II

It seems to me that there are four major dangers in the move back toward regulation which those who oppose it should be shouting to the house tops.

First, they should help all of us to realize that it is impossible to have Government guaranties of loans and prices, Government subsidies, and other so-called aids to business, without Government participation in the enterprise to which the guaranties or the subsidies are granted. The Government cannot be expected to guarantee the loans of bankers without taking an intimate interest in the way banks are operated. Neither can the Government be expected to support agricultural prices without assuming some responsibility for the output of various crops and even for the management of individual farms. Put in blunt language, the gradual increase in many of the so-called aids to business leads inevitably to Government participation in business.

Second, those who oppose the trend toward regulation should be making all of us aware that a planned economy cannot be operated on a democratic basis. It is perfectly obvious that a planned economy cannot be run through a democratic assembly such as exists in the House or in the Senate. Consequently, much authority has to be delegated to a group of experts. Thomas Jefferson once wrote about, "timid men who prefer the calm of despotism to the boisterous sea of liberty."[1] I think that anyone who believes that a planned economy can be operated on a democratic basis is merely preferring "the calm of despotism.'

Third, they should help us realize that a planned economy and individual freedom are incompatible. Clearly, the institution of private property with the right of the individual to do with his property in large measure as he sees fit, is essential to individual freedom. In fact, private property is an important guaranty of freedom. While it is not essential that a planned economy should destroy private property, as soon as one can be told what to do with his property, we have in effect destroyed private property as we know it. Suppose you perfect some invention in a regime where private property has, in effect, disappeared. If the planning group is unwilling to develop it, you have no other place to which you may turn. In contrast, where property is divided among individuals, a worth-while invention can always find someone to develop it, even if the inventor himself does not have the means.

[1] Letters of Thomas Jefferson, p. 537.

Fourth and last, they should help us understand that the increasing complexities of modern life intensify the problems which would be faced by a planning group. Of course, I realize that there are those who believe that it is these increased complexities of modern life which call for centralized regulation of business activities. I doubt if this reasoning, however, makes any more sense than the argument that since large cities have more fires than small ones, and since they also have larger fire departments than small ones, the larger fire departments must be responsible for the greater number of fires. Certainly, the job of planning in a complex industrial nation such as we have today, with its complexities of products, its division of labor, its specialization, its complexity of monetary system and tax program make central planning much more difficult than if we were a smaller nation devoted to agricultural products.

As some indication of the difficulties of detailed regulation under our present complex economic society, let your mind roam a moment over the vast amount of paper work which was necessary on the part of industry during the period of wartime control. Some of you may remember the story of the boat builder who was called before the War Production Board to explain his amazing production record. "Would you mind explaining how you chart production progress at your shipyard?" asked a WPB official. "Oh, we have that worked out to an exact science," said the boat builder. "Every day we weigh the boat and then we weigh the paper work you require. When the boat weighs as much as the paper we know that it is completed."

So because government aid to business usually leads to government participation in business, because a planned economy cannot be operated on a democratic basis, because it minimizes individual freedom, and because of the increased complexities of modern life, a considerable number of people refuse to join the group who are willing to accept a planned economy. I find myself one of those not willing to go along with such a noble experiment.

Yet this leaves me facing a dilemma. I can see, and see clearly, these dangers and difficulties if we follow the road which leads to a planned economy. But I can likewise see many undesirable aspects of our prewar competitive economy. Certainly all of us shudder at the thought of another period of great unemployment such as we had in the early thirties. Likewise, we shudder at periods of widespread business and banking failures. Is there no way out of this dilemma?

III

While there is no perfect way out of this dilemma, I do think there is a partial way out. This is a way which combines much of Adam Smith's reliance on individual initiative and some of the planned economy. It is, in brief, that we plan; but that we plan for competition and not for a planned economy.

What is the distinction between planning for competition, and planning for a planned economy? Basically, it is this: That all our planning be based on the premise of retaining a competitive system to the fullest possible extent. We should face each problem by asking ourselves, how can we solve this problem and still make it possible for firms to operate with a minimum of outside regulation? How can we encourage individual initiative to handle this problem? How can we make it more possible for groups of individuals to aid themselves, rather than depending upon the Government? In brief, how can we make a competitive economy work better; and not, how can we plan to replace a competitive system by a Government system? Let me give a few specific examples to make myself clear.

Our corporation tax structure has gradually developed to the point at which it discourages both individuals and firms from undertaking plans for expansion. To illustrate, an investor having an annual income of $15,000 invests it in a new enterprise capitalized at $4,000,000. Even if the new corporation shows earnings of 6 percent before taxes, and even if all earnings are paid as dividends, after both corporation and individual income taxes are paid, the investor receives a net return of 1.8 percent. If his annual income were $51,000, his return would shrink to eight-tenths of 1 percent.[2] In the face of such returns, why take a gamble on a new business? Even Government bonds pay more—without the necessity of hard work. With such a tax program, how can we expect private business to produce a period of full employment? Yet if it does not give a job to everyone, or nearly everyone, people will begin to say, "The competitive system has failed and must be replaced." But it is not the competitive system which has failed; rather, we have failed the competitive economy in that we have developed a tax structure under which a competitive economy simply cannot function.

If I make myself clear, you will see that I do not favor the doing away with planning. We need planning. But we need planning which works toward a functioning competitive economy. In other words, we need to look at our ta program from the point of view of how it can be used to contribute to the success of a competitive economy. We need to plan for competition, not against it.

Or take another situation—the so-called small-business problem. Certainly many small-business men have experienced difficulty in meeting the competition of large firms. All kinds of solutions have been suggested as aids to small-business men. Practically all of them, however, usually involve placing a limitation upon the efficiency of the large company or outright Government aid to small business. For example, chain-store taxes and price floors have been suggested as the answer to the price competition which the chain store brings to the small retailer. Obviously the purpose of these suggestions is to reduce the ability of the chain to sell at the low prices made possible by its inherent efficiency. Moreover, most of the Government aids suggested for small business come down to outright subsidies.

From my point of view, we need neither these taxes on efficiency nor these Government subsidies to save small business. Rather, we need to plan ways in which small business may increase its efficiency to the level of the large company, instead of bringing the efficiency of the large company down to that of the small. Group buying activities and joint advertising which can be carried out by the small firms themselves afford examples of what I mean. These are steps to make competition work better rather than to limit it and they do not involve the use of direct Government aid or influence.

IV

I am sure that at this point a sidenote is necessary or my argument will be misinterpreted. Someone will say that my phrase "planning for competition" means the removal of all governmental controls in the economic field. This is simply not true. For example, competition preserver the freedom of the individual since it keeps economic decisions in the hands of the many. Contrariwise, individual freedom is lost when all decisions in a given area fall into the hands of the monopolists, regardless of whether it is a private or a Government monopoly. Consequently, it should be a responsibility of the Government to see that monopolies do not develop. To this end

[2] "Capital Not on Strike; It's Locked Out," Saturday Evening Post, September 1, 1945.

Government regulations such as antimonopoly laws are necessary. Such type of Government regulation, I think, is of a desirable type since it looks toward the preservation of competition. We should look upon such regulations in terms Daddy used in defining a girdle for Baby Snooks, that is, as "a device to keep an unfortunate situation from spreading."

Likewise, regulations establishing minimum safety requirements and maximum hour rules can still fit within an over-all program of planning for competition. Such regulations merely establish the plane of competition and as such may be desirable.

In other words, I am not suggesting that we adopt a do-nothing attitude. Quite the contrary, I am suggesting that we adopt a positive do-something approach, but that we do it within the framework of a competitive economy—which is the only kind of an economy under which freemen can exist.

V

If there is to be planning—planning for competition rather than against it—who will do the planning?

Henry A. Wallace, our Secretary of Commerce, in a magazine article of last spring makes it clear that he wants the Government to do most of the planning.[3] Without doubt, government must do the planning in some areas. This is particularly true in the areas of taxation policy, tariff policy, and monetary and fiscal policy. But to a much greater extent than is true currently, business should do more of its own broad planning. Through their associations, bankers should work out their own solution to the problem of loans to small business. If the Department of Commerce begins to plan for business as the Department of Agriculture has for the farmer—and this is what Secretary Wallace wants to do—we may expect the same results, that is, small business will begin to compete with the farmer as Washington's best lobbyist. To avoid this, small-business men should form their own research centers by cooperative action. If small business or if the farmer needs a better marketing organization to compete with big business, those in the field involved should get together and set it up. In other words, the basic initiative should come from businessmen themselves.

VI

We should not expect utopia from any program, regardless of whether it is one based on planning for competition or planning against competition. In other words, even with careful planning for competition, we must still expect some seasonal and cyclical unemployment. We must still expect some bank and business failures. As Voltaire wrote years ago, "History is full of the sound of wooden shoes going upstairs and the patter of silken slippers coming down."

But these so-called evils of competition are a small price to pay for individual freedom which no other economic system can provide. We should never lose sight of this fact. We should remind ourselves of it every time we hear someone talking about what is wrong with the world. Like the sailor who walked into the recruiting office and said: "Gimme that ol' sales talk again, I'm getting kinda discouraged," we too need to listen again to the sales talk of competition.

VII

I know that no matter what is said, many will continue to urge us toward a planned economy. To these people the lessons of history are of no value. They have to learn the hard way—like the sailor who enlisted in the Navy because he liked the nice clean ships. He had not been in the Navy long, however, before he wrote home, "Now I know who keeps them that way."

[3] Reader's Digest, May 1945.

These people forget that the competitive system has provided the mass of the people with an abundance and a variety of forms of consumption never before equaled in the history of mankind. * * * And it has accomplished all this while on the whole gradually reducing the hours of labor.[4]

Most important of all, these people also forget that the competitive system is the only way to preserve individual freedom. In the last few years thousands of our sons and daughters have died to give us another chance to make a competitive system work and thereby preserve our freedom. Although spoken in another connection, I think the words of Anthony Eden at the San Francisco Conference should serve as a rallying cry: "We * * * have * * * work to do if we are not to fail these men."

"Let us do it with courage, modesty, and dispatch."

"Let us do it now."[5]

This Is Washington's Birthday—What of England Now and United States?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, believe it or not, the United Nations have won a world war that paves the way for the establishment of the economic government of the world. An insight to British Empire conditions and an analysis of the Bretton Woods international monetary program is clearly presented in a book which I commend to the attention of all the Members of the House—condensed from a book by William F. Hauhart, Ph. D.:

In the heyday of their prosperity the English had developed a conception of life which was attractive and which afforded many of them comfort and leisure. A type of English gentleman arose who did not deign to participate with possible competitors of other countries in the struggle for existence. He was inclined to look upon himself as favored by providence and to believe that his commercial empire was destined to go on forever. When difficulties arose, commissions of experts were appointed who almost uniformly rendered excellent reports. But not much was done about them, because of the general feeling: "Come what may, we will muddle through."

Agriculture had been allowed to lag during the years of commercial supremacy. These imports could be bought only with manufactured exports, or with income from investments, banking, and shipping service. Most of the food and raw materials had to be paid for by exports, or with income from investments, banking, and shipping service. Most of the food and raw materials had to be paid for by exports of goods. But a dangerous competition had arisen. This was not always due to lower wages, but it was in part at least caused by more modern techniques and a new spirit of emulation and progress. The methods of manufacturing textiles, steel, and the mining of coal had needed modernization in England for some time. In the United States and some of the continental countries, improvement of industry was under way, while the English in many instances still relied on their former superiority.

Her visible imports have always exceeded her visible exports. She is, therefore, said to have an unfavorable trade balance—so far as these two items are concerned. But that does not tell the whole story. She also received revenue from invisible items such as dividends and interest from foreign long-time investments. From her banking services for foreign peoples she received what is sometimes called short interest. This means that her banks made short-time loans in other countries or financed, through bills of exchange (usually bankers' acceptances) the foreign trade shipments of other nationals. She also owned a huge fleet of merchant ships which carried goods for other countries when not engaged in English commerce itself. This service netted her a goodly amount of invisible revenue. Then, too, she did a considerable amount of reexport business in the goods produced by other countries. This is commonly known as entrepot trade which brought her good commissions in prosperous times.

According to the present estimates available, England had before the First World War foreign investments totaling approximately $20,000,000,000. As pointed out before, the services of this capital was for her an invisible export. The dividends and the interest which she received could be used for the payment of imports of foods and raw materials and during the most prosperous years, a part of the dividends and interest could be reinvested in foreign countries to maintain or increase the capital investment.

It is generally assumed that England came out of the First World War with about $15,000,000,000 of foreign investments. Naturally, she had consumed part of her foreign loans and securities by exchanging them for the sinews of war which were purchased in foreign countries. To the extent that England would not pay her obligations to the United States after the First World War, she naturally conserved her foreign investments.

England fared somewhat better in recent years with her iron and steel industry. In the beginning, she had a practical monopoly in steel, one reason being that her iron ores were free of phosphorus. Up to 1880 there was no method known for converting effectively into steel the phosphoric ore deposits of Lorraine on the continent. On this account little had been done to modernize this industry in England until after the World War. The competition of foreign countries made it necessary to rationalize the steel industry to some extent. After the Import Duties Act was passed in 1932, the English Government could use pressure on the steel industry to force it to modernize its production processes. The import duties could be regulated accordingly. Adequate protection was given as long as modernization was proceeding apace. Nevertheless, strong competition from other countries caused England to lose much of her former advantage in the export of steel. When metallurgical science had advanced far enough so that the phosphoric iron ores of the continent could be used to advantage, Englind lost her position of primacy in the steel industry of Europe.

Shipbuilding has played a greater role in Great Britain than in any other country. In the nineties, four-fifths of all the ships built in the world were laid down in British shipyards, while in 1937 only one-third of the tonnage launched in the world was built in British shipyards. The industry hit its lowest point during the depression of the thirties. As foreign trade fell off in the world at large, the demand for the construction of new ships naturally receded, too. Continental competition had to be reckoned with also. English shipbuilders were beyond a doubt at one time the most skillful in the world. That gave them a monopoly in this field. Only time will tell whether even this

[4] Barbara Wootton, Plan or No Plan (New York: Farrar & Rinehart, Inc., 1935), p. 102.

[5] Time, May 7, 1945, p. 26.

superiority of skill in shipbuilding can restore this industry to its former supremacy in view of the general falling off of international trade in the world.

The textile industry was once brilliantly successful in England. This was true chiefly of the cotton branch. Four-fifths of all Great Britain's textile workers were employed in the cotton industry a hundred year ago. The rise of this British industry was phenomenal and the enormous profits, which were gained from the export of cotton textiles, laid the basis in those early years for the tremendous capital investments in foreign countries which England so successfully developed. In 1913 three-fourths of this enormous production of cotton textiles was exported. In this industry England enjoyed the greatest start over other industrial countries and it became the historic predecessor of all modern mass-production industries. But today the export of cotton goods from Great Britain is only one-third of the volume of prewar exports.

The woolen-goods industry has been somewhat more stable. It developed steadily up to the outbreak of the World War. By that time British woolens had become famous the world over. Since the World War exports of woolens have declined, but after the depression they recovered somewhat and by 1937 foreign sales had reached about three-fourths of their prewar volume.

The mercantile marine of England has been a fruitful source of revenue in her foreign trade balance. These freighters carried not only the commerce of their own country, but did business all over the world for other nations. At one time practically all foreign shipments of American goods were carried in English bottoms. In the year 1913 this shipping service brought upward of £90,000,000 into English coffers. In more recent years, this income has fallen off severely. The tramp trade deteriorated so much during the world depression that the English Government had to come to its rescue with a subsidy in 1934. It is generally known that passenger liners have been subsidized by the English Government for years, and it is now assumed that the subsidizing of freighters will have to go beyond the tramp shipping service in the near future.

It has been previously shown that 1913 was the most favorable year for England's foreign trade balance. The war which followed disrupted the markets of the world and the peace settlement aggravated this situation. Nationalism, which was to be mitigated by the war, became much worse. Since freedom of trade was severely restricted, the division of labor or specialization could be of little assistance in economic production. Moreover, the war consumed capital on a gigantic scale and broke up the flow of international financing. The gold standard had previously been functioning successfully under the leadership of England. Capital and credit at that time could move from country to country with ease and safety. The war brought disorder to standards of value, to foreign exchanges, and domestic currencies. In the United States, severe monetary difficulties came later, but in Europe, the war left monetary chaos in its train. In England the war was followed by a period of relative economic stagnation, and on the Continent economic disorder reigned supreme.

In the spring of 1925 England and the British dominions, except Canada, returned to the gold standard. In the retrospect, it is generally agreed that in this shift the pound was valued too high. But England wished to reestablish the pound, of which she was naturally very proud, to its former value in relation to the dollar. In this process there was effected a relative overvaluation of sterling and a relative undervaluation of the monetary units of other important countries. The result was that a species of deflation was forced upon English producers at home and her exporters were at a disadvantage in foreign markets. In the former case, through overvaluation of the pound, nominal wages were lowered and this contributed to the dissatisfaction of labor. The concept of real wages or money in its relation to purchasing power is hard for the public to understand, and a nominal decrease in wages may cause labor difficulties, even though real wages are not reduced. With exports the overvaluation of the pound raised the cost to the buyers of English goods in foreign markets and in this way hampered exports.

In November 1929 Parliament appointed a committee known as the Macmillan committee "to inquire into banking and finance and credit. How these agencies can promote the development of trade, commerce, and the employment of labor." The committe presented its report in June 1931, "that the difficulties with which the English were faced were to a large extent peculiar to their country and were not common to the world at large. Up to 1929 we suffered from trade depression in many of our great industries accompanied by a more or less steady figure of 1,000,000 unemployed at a time when some other countries were enjoying a considerable degree of prosperity."

Several months after the Macmillan report was presented the right to draw gold from the Bank of England was suspended. This happened on September 29, 1931. The withdrawal of the bulk of the short-time funds that had been deposited in London brought on the crisis. Britain thereupon adopted a system of managed currency and in this way relieved the pressure from the overvaluation of the pound. This automatically favored exports by reducing their costs in foreign markets.

For the time being—the early thirties—England's foreign trade was better off than that of the United States which was still on the gold standard.

The new tariff system of England had by that time gone into effect. The two main parts of it were the Import Duties Act of 1931 and the empire preference agreements made at the Ottawa conference in 1932. The devaluation of the pound plus the new system of protection by customs duties had a stimulating influence on the economy of England. The London economist seems mostly to deplore the fact that this action of England in surrounding herself with customs duties does away with practically all hope of modifying the trade barrier systems of the entire world.

The extent to which England has shifted her position from free trade to protectionism is not appreciated in the United States. When later the United States entered into the Anglo-American trade agreement, we were not dealing with a free trade nation, but with a protected nation and that was not generally understood here. Mr. George N. Peek, comparing the English situation with our own, said that in the year 1932, all American imports paid an average duty of 17.9 percent; while during the same period of time, the duties collected by Great Britain, spread over all her imports, amounted to 17.4 percent. Peek remarks that British lecturers frequently denounce American tariff institutions and advocate a species of free trade for the United States, while ignoring their own protective duties. Internationalists, so-called, in the United States seem rarely to think of the British tariff, but point out that the American tariff is objectionable to world peace and order. If we consider the whole series of bilateralist agreements which were made by England during the 1930's, she was merely rendering lip service when she gave formal consent to the Angle-American trade agreement.

If we add to this the fact that England is considering a bilateralist program—supplemented by the cartel system—for the postwar period, we would do well to be on the alert.

LEND-LEASE FOREVER

It is reported that the agreement for continued lend-lease is to be sold to Congress on the basis that it is cheaper to set the English up in business again so that they can get back to earning their own way than it would be to have them end the war in an impoverished condition. In considering this point it should not be forgotten, however, that they did not earn their way between the two wars.

During the past few years various Empire units have sent materials to the mother country for which they have not received anything in return. Apparently, however, they expect to collect on these contributions at a later period. Canada sent England a billion dollar's worth of goods during 1942. This seems to have been credited in the form of an interest-free loan from Canada to England. During 1943 Canada again contributed $1,000,000,000 worth of goods, this time to the United Nations. It is not clear whether the latter was also a loan or a lend-lease gift.

For the larger part of their contributions, the various units of the Empire seem to have been credited in the form of London bank balances. But these balances may not be drawn on until they are released, probably at the end of the war. They are commonly rereferred to as blocked balances. The London Economist gives the following data on these balances in its issue of August 7, 1943:

	Thousands of pounds	Date
India	500,000	July 16, 1943.
Eire	121,458	March 1943.
Canada	157,300	August 1943.
Egypt	71,200	December 1942.
Malaya	58,000	July 1943.
Australia	64,000	May 31, 1943.
New Zealand	34,000	February 1943.
Argentina	17,500	December 1942.

These bank balances in London have been growing rapidly. As early as March 1944 the National City Bank Letter reported £700,000,000 as India's deposits in London. Sir John Anderson, Chancelor of the Exchequer, in his recent budget speech, said that England by the end of the last fiscal year had incurred undischarged short-time overseas liabilities amounting to $8,000,000,000, and the figure was rapidly increasing. He warned that England will emerge from this war for the first time in modern history as no longer a creditor country.

Moreover, India also provided the English Army with local currency to pay troops and furnish local help whenever needed. This first caused a repatriation of the Canadian and Indian securities which had been held in England. In other words, Canada and India brought back their securities from England by furnishing her goods and services.

When the values involved in the securities had been consumed, Canada and India received deposit credit in London banks for the additional goods and services which they had furnished, and what they will supply in the future will be credited in the same way. If all these goods and services could have been furnished to England in the form of lend-lease with no thought of repayment, these large London bank balances would not now be hanging like the sword of Damocles over the English economy.

The case of India is unique in this respect. During the latter part of June 1944 a dispatch came from New Delhi entitled "Swollen India Credit May End Up in a Boomerang." It was explained that this credit represents part of the expenses incurred by England in the Far East. "British forces using India as an operational base have needed vast amounts of food, clothing, and fighting material, which of which was supplied by India."

The debt which India previously owed England, mostly in the form of bonds for building railways and public works, has been

wiped out. The values involved have been consumed by England in India and the securities have, therefore, been repatriated by India. Now, the I O U's are accumulating in London as bank balances and by the end $4,000,000,000. How the English are going to settle this debt is the theme of discussion in India. Payment can be made only in goods. Some suggest that no payment will be made at all, and that the most India can expect will be good wishes.

So much for the news dispatch from India. At the end of the war the debt will be approximately the same in amount as the one which England owed to the United States after the First World War. In case that England does default on this India debt, as she did on her obligations to the United States, who will then have to impersonate Uncle Shylock in India?

This situation has naturally troubled financiers and economists in England greatly. In this country, too, much thought has been given to the financial and economic plight of our ally. But it remained for the English economist, Lord John Maynard Keynes, to come up with a plan which he believes would not only stabilize the postwar currencies of the world but would also enable nations—even the impecunious ones—to begin to import goods when the war is over on the same scale to which they had become accustomed in prewar times. This plan was calculated also to lift England by a sort of magic carpet out of the dilemma of these blocked London bank balances.

The one by Lord Keynes above referred to, known as an International Clearing Union, which was published on April 8, 1943. The other was by Dr. White, of the United States Treasury Department, called the International Stabilization Fund of the United and Associated Nations. The two plans were issued at about the same time. It is generally believed that both plans are British, and while one of them was made in the United States, it apparently received its inspiration also from Lord Keynes.

The mere fact that it was proposed in its present form, throws a flood of light on the present economic and financial position of England. In making his proposal, Lord Keynes had clearly in mind the relatively strong position of the United States at the end of this war as well as the financial dilemma of his own country.

Let us turn now to the British plan of Lord Keynes which is called an International Clearing Union. No capital will be required to start the ball rolling. Each member nation is to be given what might be called a line of credit in the form of an overdraft privilege. The amount of the credit or quota of each participating nation will be fixed by the amount of its foreign trade. Seventy-five percent of its total average of exports and imports during the 3 years preceding the war has been suggested. The size of the quota will also determine the share in the management of the fund that will be held by each member nation.

The fund will do business only with the central banks or treasuries of member states. These institutions are to keep accounts with the International Clearing Union with which they would be entitled to settle exchange balances for their citizens equality of debits and credits.

The fund proposed to enable the member nations to begin trading at once after the war by providing a pool which is based on the probable future exports and imports of these nations. Following the idea of debits and credits, the export surpluses of the member countries will be considered favorable (credit) balances and will be offset against the import surpluses or unfavorable (debit) balances of other nations. We may assume that the United States with its large exports would furnish the credit for the nations wtih an import surplus. This would include most of the other member states who will nearly all be hungry for imports. The United States will be the only large exporting country after the war, and we will be expected to offset with our credits the import surpluses of the other nations. There are probably only a few other nations such as Sweden, Switzerland, and perhaps one or two South American countries that would under present conditions have credit (export) balances in the pool of the clearing union. All of the other nations, including England, would have debit (import) balances. It will later be emphasized that the proposed plan is in reality a credit granting institution and only in a minor sense may it be referred to as a clearing union.

Lord Keynes says that his clearing union is nothing but the application of banking to the international scene. In evaluating this statement we should bear in mind that the export or credit surpluses with which he proposed to finance the import surpluses, can never under any conditions be withdrawn by the creditor nation. In ordinary banking the depositor (creditor) may withdraw from the banking pool. In this clearing union it is agreed merely to transfer the deposit from one account to another and never to pay it out in cash.

In the international clearing union the strong currencies of the world are to uphold the weaker currencies. The one currency which may still be called strong is the dollar. Can it carry this proposed load? The chances are that if this plan is put into effect, it will weaken the dollar and all the currencies involved in the union will fall to a lower level. In judging this, we should bear in mind that we have put a considerable strain upon the dollar at home during the past decade, by our devaluation in 1933 and by about 12 consecutive years of unbalanced budgets.

Returning to the purported similarity of the clearing union with a system of banks, the nations with an excess of imports which would continually grow larger might find themselves in difficulty by and by. The Keynes plan controls this largely in quantitative fashion. The member nation's quota rather than its qualitative credit standing seems to be the guide. A member nation may not increase its debit balance by more than one-fourth of its quota within a year without permission. If the debit balance has exceeded a quarter of its quota for 2 years, it may reduce the value of its currency by 5 percent. The object naturally is to give it a slight advantage in exports since increased exports would tend to decrease its debit balance. If there should be a further increase of the debit balance, the governing board is empowered to demand deposits of collateral consisting of gold, currency, or government bonds.

The nations with an excess of exports would naturally develop a credit balance. The proposal states that these credit balances would be looked upon with just as critical an eye as the debit balances. The United States would be the main culprit here and we are suspected to begin with on account of our system of tariffs which prevents imports and makes it difficult for other nations to pay us for our exports. A member state whose credit balance has exceeded half of its quota for at least a year will be asked by the Board for information on its status. Reduction of tariffs, international development loans, and finally appreciation of the Nation's currency will be suggested by the governing board. Lord Keynes even suggests the possibility of eventual cancellation, or investment by compulsion in foreign countries, of excess-credit balances. In case of cancellation, the creditor nation would naturally receive nothing for its export balance.

We should perhaps recall again that the fund proposed by Lord Keynes starts with nothing. It is assumed that no capital contribution will be needed if the various nations can be sold on the plan of a multilateral relationship to the clearing union. Some nations will have credit (export) balances and others will have debit (import) balances. It stands to reason that during the immediate postwar period most of the participants would be in one position or the other continuously for a considerable period of time. If we assume, for example, a biangular relationship between England and the United States for purpose of illustration, we would be furnishing the credit to finance her imports which will be bound to be very large for years to come. It is equally true that our export credits would be comparatively high. As a matter of fact, we would be in the same position we were in immediately after the First World War. At that time we had to take considerable losses, since our loans to European countries were frequently made without discretion and care. But we, at that time, could take our losses and quit, since we had not bound ourselves to participate permanently as we would now do in the proposed clearing union. According to the original Keynes' plan, it would not be possible for the United States or any other creditor nation to give up its membership in the union. A creditor nation that wished to retire could not take its investment out of the fund.

MAIN OBJECTIVE

One of the objects of the Keynes plan was to take care immediately of the blocked balances which are lodged in the London banks. These are demand deposits which are subject to call at the end of hostilities. These blocked balances are growing rapidly and it would have been a great relief to England to be able to sink them into the fund of the clearing union. This would have been a sleight-of-hand performance par excellence by Lord Keynes. I doubt whether he himself thought such a plan feasible. But his lordship was not satisfied until he had tested out the credulity of the American people. Others have given him the answer by this time.

Lord Keynes hoped that the clearing union might become the instrument and support of international policies in addition to those which it is the primary purpose to promote. The union might become the pivot of the future economic government of the world. He also added significantly: "The union would provide an excellent machinery for enforcing a financial blockage."

The Right to Strike—Debate Between Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, and Herbert S. Thatcher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 26 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a debate participated in by Herbert S. Thatcher, associate counsel, American Federation of Labor, and myself on the subject Should Congress Restrict the Right to Strike?

There being no objection, the debate was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAKE UP, AMERICA!

SHOULD CONGRESS RESTRICT THE RIGHT TO STRIKE?

(As debated by Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator from Wisconsin; member, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, and Herbert S. Thatcher, associate counsel, American Federation of Labor)

Senator WILEY opens: "Certainly; yes, Congress must protect the public welfare. The public always gets it in the neck when ruinous strikes occur. The public—labor, management, farmer, all of us—are hungry for goods, for production. Shall we instead allow strikes to grow to the point where a general strike occurs and the Nation is economically paralyzed? That must not happen. In this complex, atomic age, full and uninterrupted production all along the line must be maintained. Therefore, in order to protect the public interest, Congress should: (1) ban strikes in Nation-wide industries and public utilities such as transportation, communications, and so forth; in these instances provide for compulsory arbitration as a last resort and as a substitute for strikes; (2) prohibit jurisdictional strikes between unions; (3) make unions striking in violation of contracts liable for damages just as corporations are liable; (4) change the law so the right to strike does not mean the right to intimidate and coerce others to stop work; (5) provide for cooling-off periods so as to calm tempers and enable reason and judgment to enter into the picture. I submit these five suggestions in order to help save our blessed land from more ruinous strikes. These five suggestions are for the benefit of all of us and are not designed to be either for or against any one segment of our population, but rather to be simply pro-American."

Mr. Thatcher challenges: "The present wave of strikes would be largely avoidable if industry had agreed even to voluntary arbitration. Until all possibilities of voluntary arbitration or fact-finding by public boards are exhausted, there is certainly no call for compulsory arbitration which, as before explained, means Government control of profits and prices, wages and working conditions. Since their representative for bargaining purposes is as vitally important to workers as their representative in Congress, how can we outlaw jurisdictional strikes any more than other strikes? As to a cooling-off period, honestly conducted collective bargaining is a sufficient substitute, particularly since compulsory delay usually works for management and against labor."

Senator WILEY replies: "Ours is a Government of laws, not of men. When labor and management cannot get together and the public interest is violated, Government must legally step in in order to prevent strikes and insure justice for the public. In Sweden (which has a very high standard of living) there are special tribunals attached to the courts. These tribunals get the facts in labor disputes, hand down decisions which are respected by labor and management and thus prevent strikes. Why cannot we here replace destructive wildcat strikes, jurisdictional strikes, etc., with peaceful machinery that is fair and equitable for all?"

Mr. Thatcher opens: "First, it must be recognized the right to strike is the workingman's only means of protection against employer abuse or exploitation—his most effective means of achieving economic betterment and security. Deprivation of that right requires workers to rely upon their employer's beneficence or altruism for a living wage. Do the economic facts justify such reliance? I think not. The history of labor's struggles in this country and throughout the world indicates conclusively working conditions have been improved only where labor has been free to strike. Diminution of that right results only in lower living standards. Further, if labor is deprived of only practical means of enforcing its demands, how is a controversy to be settled? Obviously and necessarily, by some governmental action. Then Government and not the parties directly concerned will determine wages and working conditions; Government will necessarily assume most management and labor prerogatives. If this country is prepared to accept some form of industrial socialization, strike restrictions may be in order. But if individual freedoms are to be maintained, the right to strike can no more be restricted than the rights of free speech and assembly. These rights are basic to our society and any inconvenience resulting from their exercise is the price paid for freedom. The answer is not governmental restriction; the answer is true collective bargaining conducted in utmost good faith—something which employers often lack."

Senator WILEY challenges: "As one who believes in true collective bargaining and the rights of labor, I ask these questions: (a) Does it 'economically better' the worker if a racketeering labor boss orders a needless strike and thus deprives the workman of his daily bread? (b) Does the right to strike mean the right to cripple our production and prosperity? (c) Two thousand years after the birth of the Prince of Peace must we still settle labor-management differences by this destructive method of strikes which help nobody and injure everybody? The answer obviously is: The courts must be used constructively to prevent strikes and curb racketeers be they in labor or management."

Mr. Thatcher replies: "A solution can hardly be found by invective or by a specious linking of strikes with racketeers. Production and prosperity are dependent upon free, not slave labor, upon government by consent, not government by injunction. Strikes are welcomed no more by labor than by management, but in the absence of true collective bargaining, there is no alternative consistent with the freedoms upon which this country was founded and prospered. Let management and labor sit down across the conference table as free agents and explore all the facets of each problem with a regard for the interest of each, and strikes will disappear."

Lumber Exports

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on February 14 a number of statements were made on the floor of the House about lumber exports. While I do not want to get into any controversy on the lumber situation, we want to get at the truth of the matter, and certain facts that have been submitted to me indicate that the situation is not as pictured in some of these statements.

In a letter to one of our colleagues, dated February 19, Arthur Paul, Assistant to the Secretary of Commerce and Director of the Office of International Trade Operations, which administers the export control law, stated:

In issuing export licenses, we are limited by the amount of lumber allocated for export by the Civilian Production Administration, and exports have no priority whatsoever, nor is there any set-aside for export; the allocation simply indicates the maximum amount that may be exported. On the other hand, the Civilian Production Administration, by priorities regulation 33, direction 1, dated January 15, 1946, has ordered an absolute set-aside at the mills of 40 percent of production, an amount determined by the Housing Administrator as fully adequate to meet the proposed national housing program. And, exports and all other purposes are taken care of only out of the balance of production after fulfillment of such objective. In other words, the housing program will not be affected by exports, and the fact that a price differential is allowed does not change the situation, since the total amount that can be exported is already limited, both by the CPA set-aside of production, and by our licensing control over exports. Moreover, it should be understood that the OPA does not allow a higher sales price to the mill for exports, but only applies a relatively small differential to sales by exporters to cover the additional costs involved in such trade.

Furthermore, the exports that are licensed are only those necessary (1) to attempt to meet minimum reconstruction requirements of friendly war-torn foreign countries, or (2) to facilitate and expand essential imports into the United States. For example, we exported, in 1945, to Mexico, about 15,000,000 board feet of hardwoods and millwork lumber which that country does not produce at all, and imported from Mexico more than 50,000,000 board feet, all in construction-type lumber; we exported to Canada about 53,000,000 board feet, and imported therefrom more than 1,000,000,000 board feet, all in construction-type lumber; to Curaçao and Venezuela, we exported lumber for use in oil refinery construction and repair work and for construction of residences for refinery workers, and we imported therefrom large quantities of oil and high octane gasoline; to Cuba, we exported lumber only for use in the sugar mills; and to Bolivia, only for the tin mines and the construction of workers' houses; to the Netherlands, we exported no housing lumber, but only that which was used for repairing the transportation system, the dikes, the wharves, and the docks; likewise, to the Union of South Africa, which is supplying to European countries large quantities of much-needed coal, we furnished no housing lumber, but only that needed in its transportation systems; to Australia and New Zealand, we sent relatively small quantities of lumber to make up for the large drain on their supplies during the war in building hospitals, barracks, as well as wharves and docks, used by our military forces, and also used, even now, to facilitate continued shipments of supplies therefrom to our occupation forces in the Pacific; exports of lumber are no longer going to India and Ceylon, and what was shipped in 1945 was only for military purposes, such as construction of barges and lighters; and what lumber went to the Transjordan area was mainly to facilitate essential oil production in Saudi Arabia.

In summary, therefore, exports have not been, and will not be, so long as we maintain control, a serious drain on our lumber supplies; our housing program is fully protected by the priorities orders of the Civilian Production Administration; as a matter of fact, we import very much more lumber, especially of home-construction types, than we export; and through export control, we are able to assist in overcoming shortages in other essential commodities by directing exports to their sources of supply abroad as aids and incentives to production.

In another letter of the same date to another colleague of ours, Mr. Paul said:

During the calendar year 1945, total exports of sawed timbers, boards, planks,

scantlings, hardwood flooring, and small-dimensioned hardwoods, were 394,331 thousand board feet. This amount represented 1.44 percent of United States production whereas for the 10-year period 1930 to 1939, inclusive, similar exports average 1,200,000 thousand board feet annually; or 6.8 percent of United States production. Moreover, during 1945, lumber imports totaled more than 1,000,000 thousand board feet, or more than than two and one-half times as much as was exported.

It is very apparent from the statements made in the past by various Members and the contents of Mr. Paul's letters that there is a wide difference of opinion. Mr. Paul's letters to our several colleagues convey definite and official information. It is apparent that the statements made by our colleagues were made without an investigation to determine the true facts. These incidents tend to indicate the importance of investigating to ascertain the facts before making statements which, even if believed, are contrary to the true situation.

The Fight on the Home Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech made by me in Detroit, Mich., on February 14, 1946, at the Michigan Citizens Committee rally to aid the General Motors strikers:

Mr. Chairman, I am proud that the Michigan Citizens Committee asked me to come here to night to take part in this great rally for the benefit of the General Motors strikers and their families.

Let's not beat around the bush with pretty words. There isn't time.

I tell you, men and women of Detroit—and well many of you know it out of your own experience—we are in a fight for our very lives as free men and a free people. This is the home-front war after the military war, just as there was a war before the military war. It is the same war, everywhere, at all times. It is part of the peoples long march toward the light.

I am proud to be here by your invitation because Detroit is a center in this home-front war—a war that is not of our making.

Detroit is tonight the center and the stronghold of the fight to defend economic democracy and win the peace—a real, worthwhile, world-wide lasting peace of full consumption, full production, and full employment. It is also the home of the Society of Sentinels, who would turn back the clock to the black days of 1932.

General Motors stands condemned by public opinion and the judgment of many Members of Congress for its defiance of the President's fact-finding board and the President's own recommendations.

For those of us who have studied the General Motors case, this much seems plain:

After failing to lure the General Motors workers into a conspiracy against returning veterans and themselves by lengthening of the normal work week and into a conspiracy against consumers and themselves by raising prices the management provoked and prolonged the strike by refusing to bargain collectively in good faith as the law requires, by refusing conciliation and arbitration.

This is a cold war, an economic test of strength, a war of grocery bills and doctor bills. It is no phoney war; it is real and, as Walter Reuther has said, it is being fought for keeps. Its outcome means security, opportunity, and peace—or insecurity, suppression, and war for my children and yours.

In this strike and in this Nation, we shall win—we the people—who see that in this world of modern technology, of atomic energy, and of ever-increasing abundance—we must have economic democracy if we are to keep political democracy.

Why will we win?

Because the General Motors workers are on the picket lines in 80 towns in 20 States, still determined, after 12 weeks, to win a down payment on the war aims for which the military war was fought and won—a chance to begin "to live 50 percent better than we have ever lived before."

TAKES COURAGE AND SACRIFICE

It was easy to write those words. It takes courage and sacrifice and organization, understanding and cooperation to make them come true. It has already taken more than a hundred million dollars in lost wages, in privation in 200,000 homes.

We will win because right is on our side and because the might of an informed and aroused public opinion is on our side—the side of the General Motors strikers.

We will not win the whole objective all at once. It will take more time, better understanding, and stronger organization to win the full 30-percent increase in wage rates, and go on to the higher and higher incomes which the workers of this Nation must have if they are to buy back, year in and year out, the full production that the farms, mines, mills, and factories are waiting to produce.

The struggle will be harder and take longer because so many men of little faith, mostly in management, a few in labor, and many in Congress are afraid of full production, afraid of plenty, afraid of the abundance that we can produce.

As a practical matter, organized labor and organizations of progressive farm people must take the lead.

High officials in Government, Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate, economists and far-sighted industrialists, and businessmen may take and put into analysis and bills, the aspirations, the convictions and the common-sense demands of farmers and wage earners that we as people should be able to buy back what we produce. They may document them with statistics proving that this way, and this way only, lie escape and salvation—escape from the ever more murderous boom-and-bust business cycle, salvation in well-distributed purchasing power through high and rising incomes paid to fully employed people.

JOB FALLS ON LABOR

But, finally, in our society, with its free collective bargaining (economic democracy), and its right to vote (political democracy), it falls upon labor to put the fine words into effect.

That is what happened in the General Motors case. The UAW-CIO took Judge Vinson and President Truman and Secretary of Commerce Wallace and Reconversion Director Snyder and OPA Administrator Bowles at their words—very fine words, too.

They took the words of distinguished Members of the House and Senate to the effect that if we are to avoid 19,000,000 unemployed after the war, we must produce and consume 50 percent more than prewar.

They took these words into the conference room and General Motors management laughed and read magazines.

TOOK THEM TO PICKET LINES

They took these words, and the facts, and their own need, to the picket lines.

They took these words and the supporting figures before the President's fact-finding board—and General Motors management walked out, refusing to discuss the words or the facts.

The fact-finding board, accepting GM management's second guess that 1946 production would not exceed 1941 production, took the words and the facts to the President and recommended that General Motors pay 17½ percent more now, without increasing prices. The President endorsed the recommendation. He said it was reasonable. General Motors said "No."

The workers took the words and the facts and the findings and the recommendations back to the picket lines.

But, by now, these fine words, these facts, the principle of increasing wages without increasing prices, had become engraved on the public mind.

I predict that they will never be erased. In the whole field of collective bargaining, in the whole scope of our economy, something has been added that will never be taken away.

For the first time millions of workers and the general public believe—and know why they believe—that it is both possible and vitally necessary that wages—real wages in terms of ability to buy more and more—shall rise from year to year to keep pace with a steadily increasing efficiency in production.

OPPORTUNITY MUST BE REAL

It is neither necessary nor desirable for the worker to remain stalled at the same step in the dreary treadmill, compelled to walk faster, work harder, in order to stay where he is. There is a chance to get ahead, to get ahead together. It is vital to our national welfare that that chance be made real, that it be enjoyed. Only as it is enjoyed can our prosperity continue and increase from year to year.

In the eyes of enemies of economic and real political democracy the crime of the General Motors workers is not so much that they have believed and acted on this principle of maintaining purchasing power to keep pace with production. It is more that by their clear-headedness, their courage and determination, and the brilliant and devoted leadership of their vice president, Walter Reuther, they have, in the short space of 3 months, given the American people a lesson in the arithmetic of abundance.

From now on the facts about wages, costs, prices, profits, and increasing volume of production are bound to be part of collective bargaining, with the public listening in, finally participating through the exercise of public opinion. By making their wage demands square with the interests of consumers and investors, and with the over-all public interest, the GM strikers have given new life and validity to free collective bargaining as a method of practicing genuine economic democracy.

NEED MORE POLITICAL STRENGTH

So far, so good. But, along with this fight on the economic front, on the picket lines, and in negotiations, we need more strength in Washington, both in Congress and in executive agencies.

We need more political strength in State capitals, in county governments, and in city halls and school boards.

To get this we need better understanding, better organization all up and down the line, right into the precincts and blocks where we live—running from the grass roots all the way to the Congress and the White House.

At the present time our strength in Congress is weak. Against a coalition of reaction, determined to turn back the clock, to repeat

all the mistakes made after World War I, we can muster only some 155 votes in the House and some 26 votes in the Senate. That is only enough to win moral victories—moral victories that are practical defeats.

Whose fault is that?

Don't say it is the fault of Congress, or of politicians, or of both major political parties. That answer isn't good enough.

And if you say politics or politicians, and act superior to all that, you are giving an alibi that is both lazy and dangerous.

It is lazy because, in a democracy, the credit or the blame for whatever is done or left undone finally rests on the people themselves—on you and me as citizens entitled to vote.

DANGEROUS BECAUSE UNDEMOCRATIC

It is dangerous because it is undemocratic. Politics are necessary in a democracy. Politicians are as good as—and no better than—the people who elect them, or fail to vote them out of office.

You have good progressive representatives in Congress, and you have reactionary representatives, too. Why? Because you haven't worked hard enough throughout the State to promote understanding of the progressive issues, and to organize support for them and for candidates who will do something about them.

That is why the Case bill passed the House; why the words "full employment" were taken out of the full-employment bill before it could be passed; why the Congress has failed to pass a health bill, a housing bill, an adequate unemployment-compensation bill, the anti-poll-tax bill, the bill for a permanent FEPC.

Quite simply, the people who want this country to go forward have got to care as much and work as hard as the powerful few, who want to stampede us all back to the bad prewar past.

HAVE TO WORK AT IT

Democracy, in both the economic and political fields, is something you have to work at, hard, and every day. If you don't, you lose the knack of it and, before you know it, you may lose even the right to practice it.

The General Motors strikers are practicing it bravely and effectively in the economic field.

Many of their friends in the political field are admiring and helping in the fight—hoping that, when this battle is won, the same energy and organization will be aimed at the practice and improvement of democracy in the political field. Both kinds are as closely connected as heads and tails on a dime. Each protects and promotes the other.

Let's face the fact squarely. If the fight of the General Motors strikers for a peace of full consumption, full production, and full employment is to be successful in the long run, success in the economic field must be matched by success in the political field.

That means a better city council, a better school board, a better legislature, a better Congress, elected and supported by better informed, better organized Americans who are not afraid of full employment, of atomic energy, of other peoples, and of the future.

I want to live in a free country and a world made free—free of want and fear and hate and war. I want my children to have that right.

WINNING GREAT BATTLE

The General Motors strikers are winning a great battle in that fight to keep this country free and make it freer—freer of economic injustice and chills and fever. They are fighting for me and mine, for all of us.

As brave, smart, well-organized and disciplined free men—I salute them. They have my thanks and my cooperation. All I ask in return is an improvement—not in pay or hours—but in working conditions in the Congress of the United States. They can start working on that as soon as this strike is won.

In the meantime, starting when this meeting ends, they and all of you, can do your bit to win the home-front war we have been talking about, by wiring or writing your Representatives, your Senators, your President, to support genuine price control and back up Chester Bowles with all the strength they have. And send copies to Mr. Bowles. He's getting plenty of pressure from the nearsighted who think a little inflation can't hurt us.

The fight for real price control is part of the General Motors workers' battle to fight off the deadly wooden nickels of inflation.

It's not easy to stand on a picket line. Strikes are no picnic. They are the last desperate expression of men and women voicing their need.

I know that.

I salute you.

The DAR and Racial Discrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over Station WMCA in New York and Station WWDC in Washington, D. C., on February 21, 1946:

Tonight I want to talk to you about an organization of women known as the Daughters of the American Revolution. There are more than 150,000 of these women, come together to serve their community and their country in groups called chapters. Three thousand DAR chapters are scattered across our land.

Now every Daughter of the American Revolution is distinguished by the fact that she claims one or more ancestors who fought in the Continental Army. This fact is her admittance card, so to speak, into the organization. In the veins of every Daughter of the American Revolution there must flow the blood of some hero of 1776.

Now there are not, I believe, more than a handful of Daughters of the American Revolution who believe that this blood bestows any excellence upon them, in and of itself. Like every other intelligent citizen of our country, a Daughter of the American Revolution knows that all theories of blood or race, which hold that these make one group of people naturally superior to another, are wrong, both on material or spiritual grounds. Such theories deny the equality of all God's children, and such theories cannot be scientifically proved. Hitler's persecution of the Jews was founded on a blood theory. His vaunting of the German as a superman was a race theory. We all know that imperialism thrives on theories of white supremacy. And we know, unhappily, how hard theories of supremacy based on skin color die in our own land.

Long ago Stephen O. Douglas said in a debate with Abe Lincoln, "I do not believe that the Almighty ever intended the Negro to be the equal of the white man. If He did, He has been a long time demonstrating the fact." One might as logically say, "I do not believe that the Almighty ever intended the white man to live in peace, to be happy, or to be saved. If He did, He has been a long time demonstrating the fact." The answer to both of those statements is one and the same: God did intend for man to live in peace, and for men of every color to be the equals of one another. It is we humans who have been a long time trying to demonstrate, by insensate fratricidal persecution and wholesale bloodshed, that God is wrong.

So, although, as the expression goes, the DAR is proud of her Revolutionary ancestry and blood, as she should be, for who should not reverance forefathers more for their nobility? But Daughters of the American Revolution don't think the blood which they have inherited from their ancestors makes them one jot or tittle better citizens, or greater patriots, or more worthy of honor, than any other citizen of our country. I hope I am right in saying that this is how Daughters of the American Revolution feel, and I believe I am, for you see, I am a member of the DAR, too, of the Eunice Dennie Burr Chapter, in Connecticut.

I believe that what makes our organization strong and gives it the right to be proud are not the blood lines or ancestral trees of its members, but the noble spirit and traditions that they have inherited from their ancestors.

And I want to tell you tonight, although presently we shall seem to be scolding the DAR, that it really has richly inherited that spirit, and that Daughters of the American Revolution have always been in the very forefront of patriotic women's groups in this country. I do not particularly applaud them for this, for that is precisely where you would expect to find them, isn't it? If I had all night, instead of only 10 more minutes, I could not tell you the many most excellent things that the DAR has done since its formation 56 years ago.

In the war that has just ended DAR war efforts drew high praise from Government authorities. So the criticism of a few leaders in the DAR which must be made is based on deep pride and praise for many unpublicized but patriotic efforts of the DAR rank and file.

The inheritance of blood has grown thinner and thinner as our ancestors recede into the distance. But—and here is a happy paradox—the inheritance of their spirit has waxed and deepened and become enriched by that very time which impoverishes or destroys all else.

Now what is that spirit? It is the spirit of our revolutionary forefathers' fierce and proud love of liberty under God, for everyone of his children. Our forefathers, defending with their very lives, the proposition that it is just and reasonable for every citizen to be considered equal before the law, won that liberty for themselves in 1776, for themselves and their children, and in the end, for every person born within our borders, regardless of his color, or race, or creed.

And strangely enough it was this very spirit of citizen equality and equal representation which gave a birth to the DAR itself. I wonder how many Daughters of the American Revolution know that their organization was born as a gesture against—against what? Why, against discrimination. In the light of certain unhappy events that have taken place in the Daughters of the American Revolution Constitution Hall since, this may be hard for some to believe. But it is true.

Along about 1883 the Sons of the American Revolution was formed. In 1890 they held an early convention in the city of Louisville, Ky. And what do you imagine the Sons of the Revolution did? They voted, at that meeting, to exclude Revolutionary women from their organization and their meetings, and, therefore, their halls. In short, they discriminated against Daughters of the American Revolution, simply on the basis of their sex, and on nothing else, nothing else at all.

Now American women, in that time, were considered inferior, yes mentally, as well as

physically inferior to men, and so women in that time were considered unworthy or unfit to belong to the patriotic organization that the Sons of the American Revolution had formed.

But when the Sons discriminated against the Daughters they forgot that the spirit is the inherited thing which makes the heirs strong. You can guess what those ladies did. They went out, right here in Washington, too, and formed the Daughters of the American Revolution, as a protest against such discrimination. And in the fullness of time, they got a charter from the Congress of the United States, and because what you know now, one of the most useful and splendid organizations in the United States of America. This is what our charter in article II states to be our purpose, to which we are sworn and dedicated:

"(3) To cherish, maintain, and extend the institutions of American freedom, to foster true patriotism and love of country, and to aid in securing for mankind all the blessings of liberty."

Now that we all quite clearly know how and why the DAR was formed, and also that during their years of history, they have, on the whole, lived up to the spirit, as well as the law, of their own charter, I believe we can, without being accused of destructive criticism, note that the DAR leadership has failed.

I am speaking of the two instances of the closing of the Daughters of the American Revolution Constitution Concert Hall to Marian Anderson and Hazel Scott, simply—and for no other reason—because they were colored.

Now some may think this a small matter, but I assure you, the whole fate of the DAR could be at stake in this matter.

For small incidents, little episodes, often have mighty consequences for great good or great evil. How small a thing in revolutionary times must have seemed the imposition of a stamp tax to King George III—and how disproportionate the row that it kicked up among those stubborn colonists thousands of miles away. But from a series of such small injustices, laid on by a kingly hand, America was lost to that king, and the United States born to the world.

"The mighty oak from an acorn towers;
A tiny seed can fill a field with flowers—
Or one bell alone toll out the death of kings."

Organizations, which are dedicated to the preservation of liberty and its traditions, as the DAR is, which disregard the small causes, have already begun to betray little by little, the great ones. It is the lost nail that sometimes loses the battle, the little leaks which often sink the ship, the light strokes of the axe that bring down the heaviest tree.

So let us review this incident of Constitution Hall contracts in the light of the vast and overwhelming importance of the smallest injustice. The Constitution Hall contracts were drawn up in 1932 by a Washington board of Daughters of the American Revolution, with a clause in them which reads, "for white artists only." In the course of time that clause caused to be barred from the Hall the golden-voiced Marian Anderson. That was in 1939. In the winter of 1945 the same clause barred Hazel Scott. Now the justification for this clause sometimes given by the board is that it complies with the local customs in Washington, which, as everyone knows segregates blacks from whites in schools and most public places, and this is true. But it is custom in Washington, not law.

But I fear I must tell my DAR friends that some of the good ladies in charge of this matter recently have sought, by letter, pamphlet, and public statement, to spread abroad among our members the impression that whereas they individually would very much like to do away with racial discrimination in Constitution Hall there is some law which forbids them to do so. I tell you that no Washington law exists that forbids it. I challenge any of the honorable ladies on the Washington board to produce proof that any law exists today which requires them to put that clause in their next contract.

Let me read you a letter I have received in reply to my own question concerning this subject. It is from Mr. Vernon E. West, corporation counsel of Washington, D. C. I quote:

"DEAR MRS. LUCE: This is in reply to your inquiry today. There is no law of the District of Columbia compelling the segregation of the white and colored races in public places, except in the public schools. * * *

"With respect to public halls and auditoriums, such as Constitution Hall and the theaters, the owners thereof may, if they desire, permit them to be occupied by only one race or the other, but are not required to do so."

Now, what put in that Jim Crow clause in DAR contracts with artists? Partly inertia and a slavish obedience to precedence and mores. For many who would not bow down to men are often grovelling slaves to manners. But mostly prejudice put it there—un-American prejudice. There are ladies on the DAR board who are, as they should be, proud daughters of the South, as well as of the whole Union.

Naturally their racial prejudices die hard. One understands how they feel. But they must be told that when they allow their racial prejudices to operate in DAR matters, they add to the wrong of intolerance the wrong of disloyalty to the DAR. For they have compromised the old and unsullied reputation of Daughters of the American Revolution all over the country. They have made thousands upon thousands of us who do hold no racial prejudices, a symbol of intolerance and discrimination in a field where above all no such intolerance should exist—the field or art, music, and the spirit. This is not to be borne by us. And I want to tell you that so long as there is in us, both the blood and spirit of our revolutionary ancestors, we will not take it lying down.

Mrs. Julius Young Talmadge, of Georgia, is today president general of the DAR. Now, I don't know how many more revolutionary ancestors Mrs. Talmadge can boast than you and I, and I don't care, since it is our ancestors spiritual inheritance we are concerned with, and not quarts, pints, or even drops of blood. So we are going to step right up to her, with that courage we all have—or we wouldn't be Daughters of the American Revolution, and say, "See here, Mrs. Talmadge, of Athens, Ga., you are a fine woman, and a gracious lady, but whether you will admit it or not, in your deep concern for white faces, you are paradoxically enough giving our DAR a couple of terrible black eyes by insisting on this clause in our Constitution Hall contract. It is a small thing, you say, that you are holding ground on. But that small thing may prove a large one. For you are making our organization terribly vulnerable to liberal and enlightened democratic criticism through the land. You are, above all, making us seem to be an organization which follows unhappy, un-American local customs, instead of one which steps forth to lead the Nation in liberty's name." And then I would ask, "If you were to insist on admitting colored artists to Constitution Hall, dear Mrs. Talmadge, what do you think would happen, now honestly? Do you think the few prejudiced people in this Capital would riot against you, break the windows of your house, ride you out of town on a rail? And where, do you think we loyal Daughters of the American Revolution would be—hiding under the bed? No, we would be by your side. Come, courage, Mrs. Talmadge, remember your revolutionary ancestors.

But now, my radio listeners, I want you to help me to help Mrs. Talmadge, and her friends, who may be under the impression that thousands of other Daughters of American Revolution are also either afraid to do what they think is right, or indifferent to what is right. Hundreds of Daughters of the American Revolution have already written to me. I want hundreds more to write to Mrs. Talmadge, pleading with her to have the courage to do away with the "white artist only" clause in our contract. I also hope that every DAR chapter in the USA will do what my own Eunice Dennie Burr chapter, and dozens on the eastern seaboard have done—pass resolutions to submit to the annual DAR convention in May, in Atlantic City, asking that the clause be stricken. I am confident that within 6 months we Daughters of the American Revolution can do this, and show up all our critics who say, because of our unhappy history in this little matter, that in big matters we are a bunch of old foggy, reactionary, intolerant women, interested in nothing but monuments and antiques.

Now there are certain other concrete things that Daughters of the American Revolution can do to effect this reform more readily. Any DAR who is listening to me and would like to, can write me in Washington, and I'll tell her how we can work to accomplish this little change we all so much desire.

Tomorrow is George Washington's birthday. Tonight and tomorrow are good times to remind ourselves of the character of the man who lead our War of Independence. Said Abraham Lincoln in 1842, speaking of Washington: "Washington is the mightiest name on earth—long since mightiest in the cause of civil liberty, still mightiest in moral reformation." Now there we have it from Honest Abe himself: Washington is the mightiest name on earth because he believed in civil liberties for all our citizens—and that means, today, for Marian Anderson and Hazel Scott, too. And because he believed in the moral reformation of the individual, that means he would not think highly of any DAR who in the year 1946 will continue to countenance the exclusion from Constitution Hall in our Nation's Capital, great and gifted artists for no other reason, none, none, none—than that their faces are of a darker hue. The spirit of our founder, and the Father of our Country has spoken. Let's listen to what he says, and then go and do what we have pledged ourselves to do—aid in securing for all mankind the blessings of liberty.

Let's Place Zone Office for Veterans Geographically Where Veterans Will Get the Maximum of Service and the Minimum Waste of Time by Travel and Mail, and the Minimum of Expense—Los Angeles Area Geographically, and According to Population, Center of Zone 12

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent having been granted to me so to do, I introduce into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter, dated February 19, 1946, with the enclosed resolution to me from the honorable chairman, W. A. Smith,

of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, of my State of California. The text of the resolution is self-explanatory. I also include a letter by me to Gen. Omar Bradley, of the Veterans' Administration:

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,
Los Angeles, February 19, 1946.

Congressman CLYDE G. DOYLE,
Eighteenth District, California,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CLYDE: Enclosed you will find a copy of a resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County at its meeting of Wednesday, February 13, 1946.

We are informed that the figures showing applications at this time run about 2 to 1 in southern California against the number applying in the northern part of the State.

With the great expansion of facilities taking place at this time, and the expansion planned in the immediate future of the veteran facility, it seems to us that this is the logical place for the headquarters to be located.

Yours truly,
W. A. SMITH, *Chairman.*

Whereas the United States Veterans' Administration has established 13 zone offices throughout the country for the purpose of a closer personal contact with the veterans and to speed up adjudication of claims; and

Whereas zone 12 is comprised of the States of California, Arizona, and Nevada, with the designated headquarters to be established in San Francisco, Calif., with three regional offices adjacent to San Francisco, one in Reno, three adjacent to Los Angeles, and two in Arizona; and

Whereas more than 60 percent of the veteran population in this zone reside in or near Los Angeles at the present time, and based upon the comparative growth a much greater percentage will reside in the Los Angeles area in the near future, cases presently handled number more than twice as many from the southern area as from the northern area; and

Whereas Los Angeles is the geographical, transportation, and major veteran poulation center of this zone. It requires only an overnight trip from Los Angeles to reach the most remote of the regional offices while it requires a day and a night trip from San Francisco. It requires a loss of a day in the mail from San Francisco. All to the detriment of the veteran: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles at its meeting of February 13, 1946, does request Gen. Omar Bradley, Director of the Veterans' Administration, to establish the headquarters of zone 12 in or adjacent to Los Angeles, Calif.; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Director of the Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., to the Los Angeles City Council, and to the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.

FEBRUARY 25, 1946.

Gen. OMAR BRADLEY,
Administrator, Veterans' Administration,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GENERAL BRADLEY: I have just received a copy of a resolution by the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County, dated February 19, 1946. It is addressed to your attention so that no doubt you have already received it as it applies to the subject matter of the purpose and efficiency of placing the veterans' office for zone 12 in or adjacent to Los Angeles, Calif.

I thought it appropriate to mail you, my honored sir, a copy of my remarks which this day appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Furthermore, I will thank you to fully advise me why the office is placed in San Francisco—instead of being placed at the center of the veteran population. You properly inform the Nation that you will place the veterans' hospitals where they can get expert and ample medical service. Why doesn't the same principle apply to the offices of the veteran? Why don't you place the office of zone 12 where they will have a maximum access to the office with the maximum saving of time and travel expense?

Very sincerely yours,
CLYDE DOYLE,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it would seem, would it not, that in the interests of prompt, efficient service to the veterans, that the great metropolitan area, commonly known as the Los Angeles area be given the prompt and significant placement that its significant location deserves? It would seem, would it not, that if we are primarily interested in serving the human interests of these veterans at the earliest possible date—that we should make the office to which they have to travel the most available to them. This is not done by placing the office to which they have to travel, and which they have to communicate with, at least a day and a night consumed travel time further away from the majority of them than necessary.

Both by travel and by mail time, and because the center of the veteran population is in the Los Angeles area—and will continue to increasingly be there apparently—the headquarters of zone 12 should be in or adjacent to Los Angeles, Calif. If it should not, Mr. Speaker, why should it not be there. I have stated good and sufficient reasons why it should be there. What arguments can be presented why it should not. I know of none excepting that years ago the Federal Reserve System of the United States was set up in San Francisco as headquarters of the Federal Reserve in California. But that is no criterion on which to locate the veterans office.

A. F. L.'s Fine Labor Record

REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, for more than a quarter of a century I have carried a card in the typographical union, which is affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. I have always taken a pardonable pride in this membership because of my feeling that I am a part of a great organization that is dedicated to promoting the welfare of the worker, and to the maintenance of law and order.

I was indeed gratified to read in the morning papers that the American Federation of Municipal Transit Workers, AFL, will not join in the strike threatened by the CIO Transit Workers Union against the city transit system which is owned by the city of New York. This recalled a recent radio broadcast by Fulton Lewis, wherein he compared the methods of the two great labor unions in attaining their ends. The broadcast follows:

It should be said in all fairness that if organized labor as a whole escapes enactment of the Case-Halleck bill, a very major share of the credit should go to the American Federation of Labor for its performance during the entire reconversion period. The thing that spawned the Case-Halleck bill was Nation-wide public resentment reflected in Congress over the national tie-ups by strikes in the automobile industry, the steel industry, and numerous other industries, practically all of which were CIO strikes. While all that was going on the American Federation of Labor on the other side of the policy fence had been quietly sawing wood in wage negotiations just like the negotiations that the CIO has been conducting, and there has been hardly a strike of any appreciable proportion, and there has been no strike of such proportions that continued any length of time. The American Federation of Labor unions have as a matter of record, negotiated and achieved wage increases for between two and a third and three million workers since VJ-day and the size of the wage increases has been, generally speaking, on a par with the increases the CIO has won the hard way, and in some cases not won at all, and production has gone along without a break in continuity—without a lot of name calling and bitterness—without men losing months of wages and families being forced into union bread and soup lines. It is something to think about and something that deserves real attention and note on the part of the average citizen because it has been a real and tremendous service to the Nation and by the very production that has resulted it has been a major contribution in the battle against inflation, while every hour of production that is lost by strikes or otherwise is a contribution to inflation itself.

OPA and Business Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 21, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, to judge by the criticism and complaints concerning the efforts of our Government to protect the security of business and the stability of our national economy by price controls it appears many people fail to realize the danger we face if all price controls are removed. In these critical times it is reassuring to find that this danger is recognized and that efforts of the Government to control inflation has the support of many thoughtful businessmen.

There is inserted herewith a letter from Mr. Robert E. Hosack, of Moscow, Idaho:

MOSCOW, IDAHO, *February 19, 1946.*

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At lunch today we were discussing our current troubles and I remarked that

things had reached the stage where I was considering writing my Congressman to urge that Congress restore rationing. There was such unanimous and hearty approval that I decided I really should write you to that effect.

Every time there is a news release suggesting either a prospective price increase or a future shortage of some commodity, the commodity has promptly disappeared from the shelves of our local stores. This has happened successively in the case of shortening, butter and margarine, cheese, flour, and coffee. All but the first are practically unattainable at the present time. Nor, as you are doubtless aware, is that a complete list of the essential commodities which are so scarce as to be nearly nonexistent. Clothing is an obvious addition.

The result is that even those of us who do not want to add to the inflationary pressure by indulging in panic buying are forced to go and do likewise in self defense.

Congress is reported to be reluctant to extend the life of price control. Failure to do so would be disastrous and the reluctance shows, in my opinion, a serious error in judgment of the temper of the people. Certainly many of your constituents would prefer the stringent but relatively fair restrictions of the wartime-rationing program to the present inequitable and uncertain distribution of the necessities. I can speak with assurance when I say that I and most of my friends feel that the present situation is worse than during the tightest rationing period and is potentially far more dangerous to the welfare of the Nation.

Very sincerely yours,

ROBERT E. HOSACK.

Plan for Army Service

REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which I believe, if it is enacted into law, will be very helpful to the War Department in securing the number of volunteers it will need to maintain our Army at a strength sufficient to meet our security needs and at the same time permit expeditious release of our wartime soldiers who now seek discharge.

My bill provides for the retirement of certain commissioned officers, commissioned warrant officers, chief warrant officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, whose service, as enlisted men and as commissioned officers combined, exceeds 20 years in the Regular services.

Many of these men were in the ranks for many years and were promoted to temporary commissioned grades during the war. Most of them have already given the best years of their life to military or naval service. They are what have come to be known as the Regulars.

Most of them, if they were to return to their prewar ratings in the ranks, would find that due to the wholesale changes in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, as the result of World War II, the positions they formerly held in those ratings no longer exist. New positions have been created and are held by younger men.

Many of the World War II men would remain in the service if they could retain their positions in the higher noncommissioned and warrant officer grades, but if the Regular servicemen are demoted from their temporary war rank, and thus create a surplus in those ratings, the younger men will leave the service rather than take demotions. In other words, there would be insufficient vacancies in the Regular Establishment to absorb all of them, and the consequences would be that the regulars, who should be retired, will hold on to the ratings, and the younger men, the most desirable group, would return to civilian life.

In fairness to the Regulars, therefore, my bill proposes that after 20 years of service—computed on the basis of service as enlisted men and as officers combined—they be permitted to leave the service on retirement pay of 2 percent of active-duty, annual pay at the time of retirement, multiplied by a number equal to the years of active service not in excess of 30 years.

So that all may know why I believe this bill should be enacted into law, I submit the following justification for it and also a table showing the amount of retirement pay provided for the various grades. To simplify the table I have used only the Army grades, but the same rate of retirement pay would apply to the equivalent grades in the other services:

JUSTIFICATION

1. Commissioned officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States with more than 20 years' active service who were formerly enlisted men or warrant officers should be permitted to retire because:

(a) Most of these officers have already given their best years to the War Department, including 3 or more years active commissioned service. They have earned the right to retirement.

(b) The majority of ex-enlisted men and ex-warrant officers, if demoted to their permanent grades, would find that due to wholesale changes in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, as the result of World War II, the positions they formerly held in those grades no longer exist. The new positions created are held by qualified younger men.

(c) There are many exceptionally able young men (now with 4 or 5 years' experience in the new armed services) who would stay in voluntarily if there were sufficient vacancies in high noncommissioned and warrant officer grades to make it worth while. Reduction of officers to fill these grades would hurt the morale of not only the officers concerned but also the younger men they would displace.

(d) Reduction to their regular warrant and noncommissioned grades held prior to the war will create a large surplus in these grades which will have to be absorbed before any promotions can be made, thereby creating a morale situation which will be detrimental to the services. Furthermore, it is not unlikely that Congress, now becoming economy minded, may order reduction in surplus grades, thereby causing these former officers to lose their grades and penalizing them for excellent service performed during the war as valuable commissioned officers.

(e) While many will be offered, and will accept, Regular commissions, the majority will fail to meet the age and physical standards for a Regular commissioned officer. Most officers (former enlisted men and warrant officers) have been specialists, whereas Regular officers must have a general, over-all military or naval education. The majority of the officers offered Regular commissions will be 30 years of age or less, although a few older ex-enlisted men and ex-warrant officers (as well as some National Guard and Reserve officers) of outstanding ability may be offered Regular commissions in field grades.

(f) The majority of those who could, or would, retire under authority of this bill would be 45 to 55 years of age. In general, therefore, they would not be acceptable for Regular commissions.

(g) Many will be offered, and will accept, warrant-officer grades, but the maximum age at which original warrant officer appointment can legally be made is 45.

(h) Permitting them to retire answers the problem of what to do with the older group of ex-enlisted men and ex-warrant officers who have not enough service to retire under present provisions of law and who, because of their age, cannot compete with the thousands of available younger officers who are desirous of either obtaining commissions in the Regular armed services or staying in the services in warrant-officer grades.

(i) It would be an injustice to reduce them to noncommissioned and warrant-officer grades, thereby requiring them to serve under commissioned officers who were lieutenants and captains when they, themselves, were majors and colonels in the Army, and held similar ranks in the other services.

(j) No other provision exists for the retirement, as officers, of Reserve and National Guard officers who have served intermittently on active duty in enlisted and/or warrant and commissioned grades. In this group, 20 years' active service has usually been spread over 30 or 40 years, with the result that the average age of such officers is 50 to 60 years. There is little or no military future for most of them.

(k) Regular Army commissioned and warrant officers are now permitted to apply for retirement upon completion of 15 years active service. (Officers by authority of sec. V, act July 31, 1935, as amended by sec. III, act June 13, 1940, and warrant officers by authority of sec. V, act August 21, 1941).

(l) While recognition of the problems of the high cost of living is being given by Congress to industry, labor, and Government employees, nothing has been done to show the country's appreciation for the excellent service done by these wartime officers who are truly the backbone of any army or navy.

2. The retirement pay of "2 percent of active-duty annual pay at time of retirement, multiplied by a number equal to the years of his active service not in excess of 30 years," is advocated because:

(a) Officers entitled to retire under the provisions of this proposed bill have earned the right to sufficient retirement pay to allow them to live Even under this bill, at least 50 percent of those eligible to retire would receive only $86 to $165 per month, making it more profitable to stay in the Army and retire at the end of 30 years.

(b) Although it is not believed wartime officers should be authorized to 2½ percent retirement pay now authorized Regular commissioned officers who have had the maximum in military education, as well as having had all service and military experience in commissioned grades, the ratio of 4 to 5 (2 percent to 2½ percent) is considered just.

	20 years' service		21 years' service		22 years' service		23 years' service		24 years' service		25 years' service		26 years' service		27 years' service		28 years' service		29 years' service		30 years' service	
	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B
Colonel	$173	$217	$189	$236	$198	$248	$207	$259	$225	$280	$233	$291	$242	$303	$261	$326	$270	$338	$280	$350	$300	$375
Lieutenant colonel	152	190	165	206	173	216	181	226	196	245	204	255	212	265	228	285	236	295	245	306	300	375
Major	130	163	142	177	148	185	181	226	196	245	204	255	212	265	228	285	236	295	245	306	262	328
Captain	130	163	142	177	148	185	155	194	168	210	175	219	182	228	195	244	203	253	210	262	225	281
First lieutenant	104	130	113	142	119	149	124	155	134	168	140	175	146	182	157	196	162	203	168	210	180	225
Second lieutenant	86	108	94	118	99	124	104	129	112	140	116	146	121	151	130	163	135	169	140	175	150	187
Chief warrant officer	------	114	------	124	------	120	------	136	------	147	------	153	------	159	------	171	------	177	------	183	------	196
Warrant officer (junior grade)	------	97	------	106	------	111	------	116	------	126	------	131	------	136	------	147	------	152	------	157	------	169
Master sergeant	------	89	------	98	------	102	------	107	------	116	------	121	------	126	------	135	------	140	------	145	------	155

Columns *A*.=Monthly retirement pay, computed in accordance with provisions of proposed bill.
Columns *B*.=Monthly retirement pay now authorized Regular Army officers, warrant officers, and master sergeants.

Export of Critical Building Materials to South America

REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, recently I made some remarks upon the subject of our American-produced critical materials being disposed of to South American countries, and their huge building program developing by reason thereof. A group of people from Indiana have been touring several South American countries, and they have discovered that our lumber, plumbing materials and supplies, steel and iron, and many other scarce and critical materials have been exported to those countries and are now being used to assist in promoting the very extensive building program that is presently in progress in those countries. Of course, it is tragic, indeed, for us to know that we are unable to secure those same critical building materials in our own country, for urgent and necessary use in building, while our neighbors to the south are able to secure from our country practically all of these same materials for their building and construction in those countries.

On this same subject, Mr. Speaker, I have just received a letter from a building contractor, located in Balboa, C. Z., in which he states the following:

I read where you are protesting the furnishing of so much building material to Latin America at this time. You are right. This is a very horrible situation, and it has been going on for several years and at the time when every effort should have been concentrated on licking the enemy. The sins of commission and omission by United States Government agencies in these parts are worthy of further inspection. The writer, who has lived here for many years, assures you that there is material here of a scandalous nature, much of which is wasted, and much of which is not needed.

Mr. Speaker, the situation which now confronts the people in our own country is deplorable, because they cannot secure needed lumber or materials, either for building purposes or for repairs. Plumbing supplies are almost entirely unobtainable at the present. This very serious situation is obstructing the building of houses and homes. Many veterans want to build a home, but they are prevented from proceeding therewith because of the critical shortage of many of the essential building and plumbing materials and supplies. Many of our civilians desire to build, or remodel, or repair their homes, but they are prevented from so doing by reason of this great scarcity of the needed materials therefor. This situation appears to become more aggravated as time progresses, and the people are greatly distressed because of this situation.

Mr. Speaker, when information comes to us such as I have received, from the reports of the people from Indiana, who are touring in South American countries, and from the letter from the contractor at Balboa, C. Z., regarding the vast amount of our building materials and supplies which are now being sent to Latin-American countries by this country, while our own people in this country cannot secure the same for their own use here, it is a very confusing and ridiculous situation. Great buildings and fine homes are under construction down there, with ample materials of all kinds for their completion, while our people at home are compelled to wait until they can secure the same type and character of building materials for the construction, remodeling, or repair of their homes or business properties in this country.

Mr. Speaker, this very aggravating situation must be remedied. It is very unfair to our people, to our contractors, to our lumber companies, and to our people who handle plumbing and other building supplies to know of this situation. Our people engaged in the sale of building supplies and lumber have no stock on hands, and they cannot supply their customers with these necessities, all because our Government has permitted such supplies to be sent to Latin America in vast quantities so they may proceed with their program of building. And in many instances, as it is reported, these supplies are not needed, and they are wasted.

It is my fervent hope that this very ugly situation will be remedied at the very earliest moment.

Does Bowles Know What He Is Talking About?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 25, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, Chester Bowles is a great advertising man but if he was selling merchandise and his advertising did not come any nearer the truth than does his propaganda about how he is holding down prices, preventing inflation, he would be up for fraud.

The following is a copy of a letter and a statement received from a gentleman connected with the Olds hotels which shows that Chester Bowles has not held down prices on some necessities:

I am enclosing some comparative figures on foodstuffs which should be of interest to you.

Frankly, I don't know where we're going to land. How can hotel restaurants, or other food purveyors, make a go of it when raw food costs continue to increase but our retail prepared food prices must remain under ceiling as of April 4–10, 1943?

Item	1941	1946	Percent increase
	Cts. per lb.	*Cts. per lb.*	
Stewing chickens	22	39	77
Peanut butter	9½	28	194
Cabbage	4	6	50
Michigan potatoes	1.3	?.24	149
Apples	5	13½	170
Coffee	12½	19¾	59
Eggs, medium, grade B	[1]17	[1]35	106
Graham crackers	7½	17	126
Noodles	10	19	90
Rinso, large package	16½	25	51
Hams, string half	23	36	56
Lamb roast shoulder	16	25	56
Beef tongue	15	35	133
Sugar	4½	5½c	23
Pure lard	7½	17½	133
Prunes	8½	18½	117

[1] Cents per dozen.

The above comparative price figures are taken from actual newspaper advertising of the foodstuffs listed in the Bay City, Mich., area.

How can hotels continue to prepare and sell food under their ceiling if commodities costs are not also controlled?

It is the old, old story: Bowles wants an increase in wages; he knows materials

cost more; he intends to hold down prices. He is squeezing all the profits out of business.

Does he know of anyone who is going to do business unless there is a prospect of making a profit? Is it his purpose to socialize us, to squeeze everyone out of business?

At the beginning of the New Deal, Rex Tugwell said:

Planning will necessarily become a function of this Federal Government; either that or the planning agency will supersede the Government. * * * Business will logically be required to disappear. This is not an overstatement for the sake of emphasis—it is literally meant. * * * The future is becoming visible in Russia. Perhaps our statesmen will give way or be more or less gently removed from duty. * * * Perhaps our vested interests will submit to control without violent resistance.

Am wondering whether Bowles hopes that the transition will not be too painful—comparatively bloodless.

Just this morning we learned from the press that wages must go up, prices be held down by money obtained through taxation or the sale of bonds used to pay a subsidy. To put it another way, the price will go up, but the consumer will pay part of it across the counter and another part when he gets his tax bill.

Bowles says price control is an evil thing, but that a little of it is not too bad. He thinks the people have not the courage to take now the dose that they must take, or perhaps he thinks if he can postpone the taking of the bitter dose until after election he and his buddies can continue in power.

Palestine—Program for Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the Pittsburgh chapter of the Hadassah:

It seems to me that I have been speaking endlessly on the subject of Palestine and the problem of the suffering Jewish people now faced with exclusion from the comfort of the only remaining hope—Palestine.

I remember dimly many years ago an old song that was sung, a song that was called A Hundred Years From Now. Perhaps some of you may remember it, too. It was a delightful recital of all the good things that would happen to us—a hundred years from now. And that's what we are being fed—in the disturbing, distressing issue of Palestine today. Wait, they tell us. Be patient. We have to study the problem. It can't happen overnight. "Rome wasn't built in a day," etc., etc. In the meantime, there are wars and pogroms—there are millions dead—there are hundreds of thousands still in government camps—without hope and without dignity. And still we are waiting.

It reminds me of the bewildering incident in which Alice in Wonderland found herself while attending the Mad Hatter's tea party. She noticed that one of her favorite delicacies was missing and she inquired about the jam. The White Queen retorted, in haughty tones: "The rule is, jam tomorrow and jam yesterday, but never jam today."

Remember, Palestine is not a cause that has been relegated to inch notices in newspapers, nor confined to Tuesday noon club discussions. It has been the subject of solemn covenants and international treaties. Its pros and cons have echoed through the halls of the two most powerful democratic legislatures in the world—the Congress of the United States and the Parliament of Great Britain. Every political party in England and the United States, seeking favor with the public, has been pro-Zionist. The Labor Party in Great Britain, the Republican and Democratic Parties in the United States, made room for a Palestine plank in their election platforms. Even Churchill, when on the opposition bench, lashed out against Parliament when the white paper was being debated before passage. Leaders of historic stature—Thomas Masaryk, Lord Balfour, Lloyd George, Woodrow Wilson, Field Marshal Smuts, Lord Wedgwood, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, openly and verbally, at least, championed Zionism and a Jewish commonwealth.

On October 15, 1944, President Roosevelt gave his support to the Democratic Party plank on Palestine and said: "I know how long and ardently the Jewish people have worked and prayed for the establishment of Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth. I am convinced that the American people will give their support to this aim and if reelected I shall help to bring about its realization."

On April 20, 1945, President Truman authorized the statement that he intends to carry out Roosevelt's policy in regard to Palestine.

There was the famous Balfour Declaration. There were 52 nations signing consent to Britain's mandate over Palestine, which called for the establishment of a Jewish national homeland in Palestine. There was the Anglo-American Treaty of 1924, reiterating the terms of the mandate. Strange, isn't it, that all these documents of state and all the party platforms and all the oratory culminated in the inexcusable, nay, despicable retreat exemplified in the Palestine white paper of 1939. Since the advent of Hitler and through 13 years of misery, persecution, homelessness, and murder, the dispossessed Jew of Europe found between himself and salvation a certificate of immigration. In the face of the Jew's overwhelming tragedy, with a smugness and callousness that was unbearable, his lord and master, the British Colonial Administration in Palestine, told him he could not make land purchases—that only 75,000 Jews would be admitted into Palestine at the end of the 5-year period which began in '39. Boatloads of escaping refugees sank off the coast of Palestine. There were no certificates, you see. Like Moses, they saw the Promised Land but could not enter. In 1946, the white paper is still in effect.

Recently it was announced that Britain, out of her boundless mercy, will allow a mere trickle of 1,500 refugees to enter Palestine each month. The guns are silent in most parts of the world, but the Jewish people still await the redemption of a pledge.

The following is a portion from the Conference Record issued by the American Jewish Conference. "It is now 10 months since VE-day. But there are still hundreds of thousands of Jews in concentration camps in Europe, behind barbed wire, wearing their prison clothing, unwilling and unable to go back to their past, knowing nothing of their future, and beginning not to care. And from outside the camps, from the villages and towns of Europe that are liberated but not yet free, there come sordid stories, reminiscent of the past—of pogroms in Cracow, of suicides in France, of discrimination within the very shadow of the Allied flags."

Now, as always, when faced with the need for a decision, the British use the dodge and the stall—another inquiry, another investigation, another appointment of another commission. And so now we have the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on Palestine.

There have been innumerable reports, inquiries, and commissions on the Jews and on Palestine. There was the Peel Commission. There was the commission which resulted in the abominable white paper of 1939. We have had the Harrison report, and we have had Judge Rifkind's report. There are the report and investigation of General Eisenhower, concerning the condition of the stateless Jews in Europe. There was the commission which resulted in the splitting up of Palestine, dividing it into two parts and severing Trans-Jordan from Palestine. There was a report and investigation by the Mandates Commission of the League of Nations.

I have followed the proceedings of the new Committee of Inquiry very, very carefully. There was not a single new fact disclosed not already known to both laymen and officials. All testimony was a reiteration of what has been said for the past 30 years, in one form or another. No new light has been shed on the subject. Indeed, it seemed to me that the atmosphere was hostile and guarded, on the part of the British members, who, of course, are all hand picked in accordance with British foreign policy, while the American members, while trying hard to be judicious, could hardly even be called benevolently neutral. Further than that, it appears that the Inquiry Committee has given opportunity to the villifiers of the Jews to give vent to virulent anti-Semitism. Witness, for example, the testimony given by Maj. Gen. Sir Edward Spears, former British Minister to Syria and Lebanon, before the committee now sitting in London. Quite recently he stated that the Zionist policy in Palestine "has a great many of the earmarks of nazism." That's the most pointed bit of irony I have ever encountered.

I think I know what the trouble is. I think I know what's wrong with us here in the United States—with you and with me. We're not angry enough—we never were angry enough. We need fire in our bellies.

We can't fully appreciate the significance of a degrading experience which we did not endure. We have not known the ravage and the desolation and the destruction, the waiting through one dark night only to meet another hopeless dawn. We try to visualize it—yet somehow we don't quite get the "feel" of it. We have cried out that is a shame and an outrage—and so we thought—but what could we do? We are and continue to be the victims of our own lethargy. Accept the challenge! Because the Jews are a minority group in the United States, they feared to speak up. It was easier to sit back and watch the victims of England's duplicity perish than to initiate a program of militant protest. Not that desire to protest was lacking, not that honor was lacking, but the persistent, insistent fear of a minority group that it must not be too obstreperous—was greater than the other forces combined. We must now flutter the dovecotes.

Having recognized this, we go a step further and realize that a people, who have been scattered over the face of the earth for 2,000 years, without a home and a land of their own, existing by sufferance, can never achieve the full dignity that should be its heritage, as men, and as citizens.

The Jew has been the scapegoat of the political pervert. He has had no place in international bargaining; he has had no national champion—if his own government has not recognized his rights as an individual and as a citizen—there is no one to contend for him, to fight for him. He has not enjoyed any international dignity or stature. That's what happened in Germany. That's what happened in Poland, for instance, following the First World War. A minorities guarantee clause had been written into the peace treaty at Versailles, concerned with minority populations in eastern Europe. But grievances could only be submitted through a national government. Now, if the Jew in Poland had a grievance against the Polish Government, would the Polish Government submit the complaint to the League of Nations? Would—or did—any government so do in behalf of the Jews? Certainly not. No one spoke for him. He was denied the right to speak for himself. The Jews had no national strength behind them. The minorities guarantee clause was as meaningless to the Jews, then, as the declaration of rights in the San Francisco Charter is today, as fruitless as dropping a bucket into an empty well.

I dwell on this point to show that the opening of Palestine is as personal a problem with you, though not so immediate nor so urgent, as it is with the displaced Jew of Europe. To say you are against sin does not abolish sin, and to say that each man must live on an equal plane, regardless of race, creed, or color, does not abolish persecution. For, as Tom Paine has said, "Prejudice, like a spider, makes everywhere its home and lives where there seems nothing to live on." And, further, to say that you are in favor of the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine does not establish it. There must be a program for action now—not a hundred years from now. And that program must be yours, individually and collectively.

It is estimated that only 1,250,000 Jews are alive in Europe today, outside Russia. Translated into personal terms, it means that the Jews of the United States, almost 5,000,000, must bear the brunt of the responsibility for the redemption of these Jews in Europe. We know we are strong and able and we cannot, we dare not, evade that responsibility. It means that we must be the leaders, the moral force in shaping the destiny for all of us. It has been ably demonstrated that we can no longer rely on the political leaders of the world like Churchill and Attlee—they promise their support before elections and we are stunned thereafter by their nonperformance.

When the excuse of military expedience is removed, then the excuse of limited absorptive capacity is raised. Dr. Walter Clay Lowdermilk, the famous and expert soil conservationist, carefully surveys the terrain and assures us that Palestine can safely absorb 4,000,000 more with proper cultivation of the soil and the development of water power. The British rush into the diplomatic closet, haul out the frayed excuse of Arab rebellion, dust it off and parade it again. Right now, Britain takes the line of Arab peril. Actually, how deeply does Britain fear the Moslem-Arab peril? If she is so fearful, what is she doing to the Moslems in Java. Accredited correspondents report that she is effectively maiming them and killing them by the thousands.

England, it seems, never wearies of the game. For many, many years, she has successfully set the Hindus against the Moslems in India, she baits the Catholics against the Protestants in Ireland and she agitates the Arabs against the Jews in Palestine. John Bull, in that regard, is like a crafty lawyer who induces others to strip for a fight and then runs off with their clothes.

Even at the Intergovernmental Committee Conferences at Evian in 1938 and at Bermuda in 1942, Britain refused to permit discussion of Palestine as a Jewish haven.

We can only depend upon ourselves and upon all peoples, Jew or gentile, who hold human rights above political intrigue and honor above greed.

Certainly, a Jewish homeland does not mean that all Jews, no matter where resident, must emigrate to Palestine. That's nonsense. Did the establishment of a free Ireland, which the Americans of Irish descent supported, mean that these Irish Americans had to return to Ireland? Yet, it is just this kind of foolish talk we hear when Palestine is discussed. And I say this, without fear of contradiction, that every Jew residing in the country of his choice, whether it be the United States, Canada, England, or South Africa, will live in greater dignity and security when the Jewish state in Palestine is established.

Our studied purpose should be to continue in our fight for unlimited Jewish immigration into Palestine. The white paper does not exist for us—it is not a law. We should disregard it, as the American colonists thumbed their noses at the stamp and tea taxes in the American Revolution. Land should be purchased wherever and whenever possible for Jewish cultivation. Every effort should be made to bring the refugees across to Palestine, by every means at our command. No man shall be denied entrance to his home.

The Jews have lived through many black eras; they have survived with their culture and tradition intact. If we are fewer in numbers now, our will is that much stronger. We can show the British that we, too, will never, never give up.

The American Federation of Labor Sounds a Serious Note

REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, for more than 50 years organized labor has made an intelligent and successful fight to establish the doctrine of collective bargaining. The American Federation of Labor and the United Mine Workers have been active participants in this intelligent and successful fight.

The American Federation of Labor sounds a serious note in its discussion of this matter in Labor's Monthly Survey just published. It selects for the subject of its discussion the very striking words "Collective bargaining or Government dictation?"

So that I may not lose any of the meaning or implications of this very timely statement I am inserting in the RECORD those portions of the article which deal directly with the subject.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING OR GOVERNMENT DICTATION?

The President has retreated from his wage policy of August 18. Right after VJ-day, when he freed collective bargaining, his sole restriction was that wage increases should not break price ceilings. The federation heartily endorsed this policy and our unions won outstanding wage gains through collective bargaining. None of our gains caused any increase in prices. Even during the peak strike period—January 15 to February 15—we kept right on peacefully negotiating agreements for substantial wage increases. To date we have won wage increases averaging from 10 to 20 cents an hour and up for about 3,000,000 workers. Early in February, when a total of 1,400,000 workers were on strike, only 60,000 of these strikers were AFL members.

Unions outside the federation, however, had other methods. Simultaneous strikes in basic industries, with uncompromising demands, were designed to force Government intervention with fact-finding boards and wage formulas. To meet their demands, the President broke the steel price ceiling, then issued his drastic wage-price order of February 14 to deal with the consequences of this price break. So the Government again intervenes between workers and management, collective bargaining is again frozen, and all workers are put under rigid wage controls. All workers will be robbed of part of their wage gains, for the broken price line will bulge upward and living costs will rise. This is the end result of forcing Government to intervene.

The chart showed the two methods by which workers have raised wages. AFL wage increases were won at the conference table. The raises of 10 to 20 cents and up were all clear gain because employers and workers had considered the facts and agreed on increases which would not break price ceilings. Many of our increases were well above Government formulas set in other industries; in some cases, where employers could not pay more now, we accepted 5 cents now and 10 cents later, or left the wage clause open for further increase when production was restored. This method brought admirable results for workers, employers, and the public. Responsible experienced leaders guided our unions.

The other method shows the Government is brought between management and labor to dictate a wage formula. A substantial increase is awarded. The price ceiling is broken. Workers' living costs go up. It is estimated that the rise in living costs this year will be from 8 to 10 cents on the dollar. So workers pay back part of their wage increase. The rail gain by the Government wage formula thus far announced will be from 8 to 13 cents—or less than this if living costs rise more than 8 percent.

Most American workers are too intelligent to let themselves be fooled. They know that wage increases have to be paid for out of the earnings of the business, or else by a price increase. Tactics which force Government intervention and raise living costs bring a loss in the long run. Collective bargaining is the sure way forward. The President would have done American workers a greater service if he had stood by his August 18 wage policy. For the increase in living costs will rob every worker of part of his wage increase—and more widespread harm than this will be done. For all older workers and widows living on pensions will find the buying power of their dollars shrunk to 90 or 92 cents; everyone with war bonds or other savings will find the value of their savings cut by 8 to 10 cents on the dollar by the year end.

THE NEW GOVERNMENT WAGE CONTROLS

On February 18 Stabilization Director Bowles described the President's first wage-price policy of collective bargaining under price ceilings as "in line with our best labor-management traditions." But, he pointed out, "the wage-price policy broke down in a number of vitally important areas."

The workers of America know that the August 18 wage-price policy did not break down in AFL unions. It was an outstanding success, because AFL unions took responsibility, bargained in good faith under price ceilings, won big wage increases and held the price line. This is proof that the policy was sound and workable. However,

other unions did not want to take the responsibility that goes with freedom. They wanted Government intervention. The AFL has for years kept Communists out of policy making positions. The new wage-price policy is a backward step, a return to Government dictation of wage rates, a body blow at free collective bargaining.

DOES GOVERNMENT CONTROL BRING HIGH LIVING STANDARDS?

American workers have just had a severe lesson in the meaning of Government controls. The new wage-price order robs us of our freedom and freezes collective bargaining in much the same way as the wartime Little Steel formula. But because there are Communist agents among us who are maneuvering to bring about more and more Government control, it is important for union members to know what Government domination of industry would actually do to their living standards.

Under our American free-enterprise system workers have made amazing progress in raising their living standards in the last 30 years. The chart on page 2 tells the story for all workers in private industry, farming, and government. Even after hours of work in industry had been reduced from an average of 54½ per week in 1911 to 40 per week in 1939, the increase in workers' wages was so great that their pay for the shorter week in 1939 was 37 percent above what they received for the longer week in 1911, and their actual buying power was $450 more a year. With 14½ hours more leisure per week and $450 more to spend per year, workers had better homes, better health, more time for their families, and greater home comforts, including autos, radios, home appliances, furniture, etc. In wartime (1944) the 6 added work hours a week at overtime rates, together with wage increases, gave them almost $550 more per year to spend than in 1939, or a total gain of almost $1,000 a year, or 83 percent during the whole 33-year period since 1911.

This increase is especially striking because it represents the entire American working force, including workers in trade, farming, service, and other industries where gains have been less than in manufacturing.

Living standards do not rise by any magic formula. They can rise only when workers produce more per hour and per year of work. The upper line on the chart shows the secret of this progress. Production per worker per year in all private industry rose 43 percent from 1911 to 1939, and the war effort plus extra hours of work brought an even greater rate of increase so that by 1944 production per man-year had risen 108 percent above 1911—more than double. Since hours were shortened during these 33 years, production per man-hour rose a great deal more than this. (Figures from U. S. Commerce Department.) The workers, through their free-trade unions, saw to it that wages rose in proportion to industry's ability to pay.

The chart on page 3 contrasts the rise in living standards under a free-enterprise system in the United States with the experience under a government-controlled economy in Soviet Russia. The figures for Russia are from the authoritative and impartial study of Manya Gordon, which is based on information from official Russian sources. Figures for both countries are in real wages adjusted for living costs, to represent actual changes in living standards.

In Russia, money wages have increased since the Communists brought all industry under government control, as is so often reported. But living costs have risen so much more than wages, that the Russian's wage before the war in 1938 actually bought less than the wages of 1911. During the revolutionary changes and the famine which followed the beginning of the Communist regime in 1917 living standards were below those of 1911, but by 1927 real wages had again reached the pre-World War I level. During the period of Stalin's control, however, living standards declined drastically. From 1928 to 1937 "there was an actual decrease in real wages of something like 40 percent. Communist management * * * instead of registering 27 years of progress between 1911 and 1938 had actually deprived the Russian worker of the hard-won material gains which he had acquired" prior to World War I. In 1938 the average wage of the Russian worker was 259 rubles per month or $49, when the average monthly wage in U. S. A. was $101. David J. Dallin states that "even those few Soviet employees who earned as much as 2,000 rubles a month at the beginning of the war (World War II) lived no better than Americans earning $20 a week." This was due to the high prices fixed by the Russian Government. So it is clear that the average worker whose income was only one-eighth of this had a very low living standard indeed. During the period when American workers raised their living standards 37 percent under free enterprise and free collective bargaining, government control under communism reduced the Russian workers' living standards 40 percent.

Stalin's reduction of living standards was due in part to the drive for industrialization, to produce machinery and armaments, and in part to the fact that government control does not furnish the incentive for efficient production. At present, Russia's maintenance of a hugh army of 15,000,000 men, Stalin's emphasis on military strength in his speech of February 9, and his program to more than double prewar production of heavy industries suggests that a considerable part of Russia's capacity will be diverted to military purposes rather than to raising the living standards of the people. One may well ask: Why does USSR want to deprive her people in order to support so hugh a military force when all other nations are demobilizing and seeking to build a United Nations Organization for world peace and security?

Communism has deprived the Russian people of even such personal freedom as they had and lowered their living standards. This is the lesson of 29 years under a government-controlled economy.

WHY DOES FREE ENTERPRISE GIVE WORKERS THE HIGHEST LIVING STANDARDS?

Our American system of free enterprise means simply this: Any man can work at any job he chooses. If he has enough capital he is free to set up any business he wants. Or workers and others can get capital by joining together and set up a cooperative business. A worker is free to join a union and to bargain collectively for higher wages.

Competition between business firms in a free market tends to bring profits to efficient managers who can produce the best products at the lowest price. This chance to make a profit by doing a better job than someone else has proved to be the most powerful incentive to a good management ever discovered. Workers have a strong incentive to cooperate with management and improve production because their unions can win them a share in the increased earnings. That is why free enterprise brings the highest level of efficiency and therefore the highest living standard.

In a totalitarian state, the government dictates all policies. The government can tell an employer what to produce and a worker where he shall work. There is no chance to make a profit; the worker's union has no power to raise his wage. Security depends on keeping the favor of one's superior officer, and frequent purges are a sharp reminder that death or the concentration camp are the penalties of those who lose favor. This has been true both in Nazi Germany and Communist Russia. Utter ruthlessness on the part of the dictator government brings compliance, but it does not bring a high level of productivity. Production per man-hour in the United States of America before the war was three times that of Soviet Russia.

THE WORLD FOOD CRISIS

Ever since last summer Americans have known that a food crisis threatened Europe and Asia. As we have pointed out in previous issues, people in Europe can receive the 2,000 calories of food per day necessary to sustain life only if other countries with a food surplus send all the food they can spare and every effort is made to overcome transportation difficulties and get the food to the people who need it. Actually, sufficient effort has not been made, and today millions are starving or threatened with starvation in Europe and Asia. While Americans in the United States of America have an average diet of 3,300 calories per day, millions of people in Europe and Asia are living on daily rations of less than 1,500 or even less than 1,000 calories.

Unforeseen events have made the situation far worse even than anticipated. Europe is short 17,000,000 tons of cereal grains; this is the equivalent of grain crops normally produced in the regions of Poland, East Prussia, and Czechoslovakia, where the population has been driven out, and the grain has consequently not been harvested. According to all accounts, only 10 to 15 percent of the crops were harvested in these areas, and much of this was requisitioned by the Russian Army. Also, severe droughts in Latin America, Europe, and North Africa have cut crops in regions on which the world depends for food. Abrupt termination of lend-lease stopped the movement of foods at a time when it was vital to keep supply lines filled. Cyclones and lack of normal monsoon rains have brought widespread famine in India.

The United States has also been at fault in not planning adequately to meet the problems of feeding Europe. In 1943 to 1945 we followed a "bare shelf" policy in agricultural production, which planned no extra food reserve for postwar. This has left us with so little reserve today that we cannot meet the needs of starving people unless we cut our own use of foods and share with them. The administration is planning to eliminate the use of grain for alcohol, to give us black bread, and is urging reduction in grain fed to animals. Americans are today the best-fed people in the world. We can give more than any other nation to meet the world's need. England is cutting her meager food ration. If we ration ourselves we can have much more to send to those who are desperate.

Tribute to Dr. George Washington Carver by Hon. Joseph F. Guffey, of Pennsylvania

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 26 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a brief statement made by me at a banquet given in memory of the late Dr. George Washington Carver, in Harrisburg, Pa., on January 22, 1946.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Secretary Anderson, and friends, there is something particularly inspiring in the circumstance that leaders of Pennsylvania agriculture have gathered here to pay tribute to the memory of the late Dr. George Washington Carver.

I could not have asked for a happier occasion to present Secretary of Agriculture Anderson to Pennsylvania. It is his task to see American agriculture as a whole, and Pennsylvania's recognition of the part played by the great Negro research chemist emphasizes a great truth. I mean, of course, our interdependence, the long chain of cause and effect which causes the farmer of the North to be affected by the activities of the farmer in the South, while both of them are in turn affected by what the western farm does.

We know that Dr. Carver devoted his lifetime in developing an adequate and balanced nutrition level for the poor. Those of his own race were major beneficiaries, solely because so many of them were poor. But science scorns the narrow, petty limits of racial predjudice; the benefits of Dr. Carver's work extended to white as well as black, to rich as well as poor.

It is inspiring to think of the former slave, released from his own physical bondage, laboring a lifetime to release his fellow men from the bitter bondage of poverty and malnutrition. After his people were given their freedom from the master, he worked tirelessly to release them from what seemed a hopeless vassalage to the soil. We have all profited by those efforts, and will continue to profit as our agricultural-research stations continue to build upon the foundation which Dr. Carver and others like him have provided.

The five great regional research laboratories provided by the United States Government—including, I am happy to say, our own just outside of Philadelphia, which laboratory I personally advocated and helped obtain—were established by Congress at the instance of Henry Wallace, then Secretary of Agriculture, to develop and expand the work of such men as Dr. Carver. It goes forward, and with its development comes a new day for agriculture.

The old idea that the farmer was little better than a peasant, a man who earned his living by brawn but had no need of brain, which idea was only advocated by leading political figures of this State, has gone by the board in recent years. The farmer has found himself, in spite of the efforts of those who would keep him in darkness. And when I speak of darkness, I speak not only figuratively, but literally. Those who know the bitterness of the battles to extend rural electrification, and to provide other modern necessities for the farm, will know exactly what I mean.

The farmer, whether he is a Pennsylvania farmer or a Georgia farmer or a California farmer, is coming to realize more and more that he is not simply an individual tilling his own acres, but a member of a vast community of millions of farmers. He is truly a citizen of the world, for the food he grows speaks a universal language, and advances in agriculture which are made in any part of the world eventually find their way into operation on his own acres.

Because of the broad scope of the farmer's problem, we are particularly fortunate to have with us one who is obliged to face every day the larger phases of the problem, not only on the national but on the international front. Secretary Anderson has a man-sized job, particularly during this period of famine abroad and reconversion at home. He is a rare prize that we have been most fortunate to capture for this meeting, and on the broader problems which face the farmer I can assure you that he is one farmer who can not only see the trees, but the forest as well.

When we view our agricultural problems as a whole we quickly reach one definite conclusion—that there is something wrong when the American farmer has to work 16 hours a day to earn a living. A farmer should not have to work more than 8 hours a day if he is able to obtain the necessary machinery and electricity at a reasonable cost. This goes for the farmer's wife, too. As a businessman a farmer should be able to take time out during the heat of the day to study crop and market reports. I think that if we can continue to develop our agricultural science on the one hand, and on the other can end the exploitation which has restricted employment of electricity and modern machinery on the farms, we will begin to see a new era for the farmer in Pennsylvania and everywhere else. So far as I am concerned, it can't come any too soon.

The Ferguson-Freeport Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution and statement:

Calvin F. Adams Memorial Post, 1137, of the American Legion, Department of New York, in its regular meeting assembled February 8, 1946, goes on record in strenuous protest at the brutal mistreatment, slaying, wounding, and jailing of the four Ferguson brothers (Pfc Charles and veteran Alfonzo, murdered; Seaman Joseph, U. S. Navy, wounded; civilian Richard, railroaded to jail) in Freeport, Long Island, Tuesday, February 5.

We request of the mayor and chief of police of Freeport, the district attorney for Nassau County, and of the honorable Governor Thomas E. Dewey that all necessary steps be taken by the aforementioned authorities to see to it that justice is done and retribution made.

We further pledge the fullest cooperation of the Calvin F. Adams Memorial Post, 1137, in any proper and effective action taken to punish the guilty person or persons and to secure right and justice in this case.

We further extend our sympathies to the bereaved family and hereby pledge them our every consideration and support.

We further go on record asking the county, State, and national bodies of the American Legion to concur with this resolution in spirit and in deed.

Copies of this resolution to be made available to the public officials involved, the Legion bodies concerned, and to the press.

Unanimously adopted by the Calvin F. Adams Memorial Post, 1137, American Legion, Department of New York, February 8, 1946.

THE FACTS IN THE FERGUSON BROTHERS-FREEPORT CASE AS STATED BY THE CALVIN F. ADAMS POST, THE AMERICAN LEGION

There are five Ferguson brothers. They range from 21 to 29 years of age. Edward, 29, the oldest, is a Washington truck driver and a member of the teamsters and chauffeurs, AFL. He was at work in Washington at the time of the tragedy.

Charles, a private first class in the United States Army, was living with his wife and three tiny children in the small town of Roosevelt, Long Island (near Freeport). Charles was the first brother slain. He had just reenlisted a few hours before the killings.

Alfonzo, 27, was a civilian at the time he was slain.

Richard, 25, a Third Army combat veteran of over 3 years' service, was injured in action in Europe. He was railroaded to jail.

Joseph, 21, a ship's cook, third-class, in the United States Navy, was wounded.

1. The Ferguson brothers boarded a bus for Freeport, Long Island, N. Y., at Hempstead, Long Island, shortly before 11:30 p. m. on February 4. The bus arrived in Freeport just before midnight. A white woman and her 15-year-old daughter were on this same bus and they testify that the Ferguson brothers were jovial, but were in no sense disorderly or drunk.

2. The four brothers left the bus at Freeport and immediately went into the bus terminal tearoom, where they were refused service by the management. The same mother and daughter were present also at this time and bear witness to the discrimination shown against the Fergusons.

3. Private First Class Charles vigorously protested the discrimination but all the four then left the tearoom in a peaceable manner. Then, the tearoom manager called the police.

4. The Fergusons then went to a Negro bar several blocks away in the Jim Crow district. Witnesses here will testify that the brothers did not drink anything but left this establishment promptly.

5. Returning to the bus terminal some time later, intending to catch the bus to their family home in the nearby town of Roosevelt, Long Island, they were accosted by Provisional Patrolman Romeika, of the Freeport city police.

Romeika arrested the four at the point of his gun, told them to remain there until a patrol wagon arrived and accused them of being disorderly. Pfc Charles protested. Romeika promptly kicked Charles in the groin, at the same time holding the drawn gun on the four.

6. Then Joseph, age 21, ship's cook third class, USNR, protested at this brutality. He, too, received a kick in the groin.

At this point, a fifth Negro came upon the scene and was immediately ordered by Romeika to line up with the four Fergusons. All held their hands high in the air as commanded by Romeika.

7. It must be borne in mind that the five persons were standing in a line and (facing the patrolman, reading from right to left) in the following order: Charles, the newcomer, Alfonzo, Richard, Joseph.

8. Charles continued to protest (Charles is alleged by the authorities to have been carrying a .45 pistol and is allegedly quoted as having told Romeika several times, "I've got a .45." The fact is established, however, that Charles was wearing a tight-fitting short jacket and therefore was obviously unable to have concealed a bulky weapon all this time. Furthermore, authorities found no weapons of any kind on any of the five persons.

9. Patrolman Romeika then shot Charles in the head, killing him instantly. Note again that Charles remained standing on the extreme right of this lineup up to the moment of his murder.

10. The policeman then immediately swung his gun to the extreme left of the group shooting Joseph through the shoulder, critically wounding him. Alfonzo (who had ducked behind his brother Joseph for cover) was hit in the temple, presumably by the same bullet, this critically wounding him. He (Alfonzo) died about 9 hours later.

11. The wounded Joseph, as well as Richard and the newcomer were taken to the police station, Joseph receiving no medical attention until the Navy ambulance picked him up the following morning, at which time he was taken to the Lido Beach, L. I., Navy Center and placed under arrest.

12. Richard, the combat veteran, was jailed, tried, and sentenced on the charge of disorderly conduct to the maximum of 100 days in jail—this without benefit of counsel; the judge acting as prosecutor, judge, and jury. This had all taken place by 10 a. m. of the same morning of the slayings.

13. Patrolman Romeika has not been suspended and is being upheld by the district attorney for Nassau County as well as by the city authorities of Freeport, a notorious center of Ku Klux Klan, pro-Nazi, and Jim-Crow sympathies and practices.

Jewish Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER F. GEORGE
OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 26 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Bernard M. Baruch at a meeting in New York yesterday which opened the drive of the United Jewish appeal to raise $100,000,000.

I commend this address as the mature judgment of a useful citizen who has no interest in men who make failures of their own lives and who make shipwrecks of the political and economic policies of their country.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are gathered here today for a reason that stirs us to our very depths.

Of all the unhappy and unfortunate peoples in the world, the worst off is the pitiful remnant left of the Jews in Europe. They were chosen by the Nazis for extermination—not merely by death but by torments hitherto unthought of.

Added to their physical suffering is their mental anguish, for they have become the unwanted, driven from place to place, welcomed nowhere. Constant fear presses them to move on somewhere—somehow—anywhere away from the persecutions existing even now. They do not want to go back to the countries they left, because there robbery, riot, and even murder stalk the land.

That, too, is the problem of the great numbers of other displaced peoples—Catholics, Protestants, all faiths and nationalities—who fear to return to the homes they once loved, but which have become foreign to them in government, religion, and spirit.

Relieve the physical suffering of these tens of thousands of Jews and you will relieve the world of one of its most pressing problems, and humanity of a bitter self-reproach. That is your obligation and privilege. Pari passu—and equally important—is your obligation to help all other war-injured peoples who need assistance. Believers of every faith and good will were murdered, tortured, penalized by the Nazi-Fascist beast and even now, by some of the victors, who want a peace made only in the image of their own minds without thought of others.

APPEAL FOR "BELOVED AMERICA"

Before there can be any peace and happiness, even within ourselves, a place must be found for all displaced peoples of every religion and race who cry out from hunger and from despair of their future.

Public opinion cannot be bought, but it can be deserved. A people who are eyed suspiciously must live so as to be the more deserving—not by cringing, not by hand washing, not by appeasement, for these have always failed, but by keeping our heads up and our shoulders back ready to help and to lead in those causes that build mankind.

And, too, we must be in the front in protecting our beloved America against its outside enemies as well as those within. Our system is worth fighting for. It is the new Ark of the Covenant of human liberities and human dignities.

I am thankful every day that I, too, am an American. From my childhood my father, a Jewish immigrant, and my mother, whose ancestors were among the earliest settlers of this country, continually—forcefully—told me the story of America, its Constitution, its high purpose—how it was the best form of government created by the minds of men. That belief has become a part of my very being.

Many claim the Constitution should be subject to quick change to meet changing conditions. With that I do not agree. Human nature does not change much. I feel that our Constitution, with its Bill of Rights, should be a dike against transitory emotions.

The Constitution has made America what it is—it was our salvation in the past and it is our hope of the future.

"CONSTITUTION IS OUR BUTTRESS"

At times, incredible follies sweep over the world and cause chaos and untold human suffering. The Constitution is our buttress against these vast panics. It has made us great and powerful. It will make us even greater if we follow its spirit and its laws.

Let us not listen to the preachment of those who have made such a wreck of their countries and brought such miseries upon the world. We are not willing to lessen our freedoms. On the contrary, we wish to expand them and help others to profit by them. The life we Americans have been privileged to lead should make us all the more ardent to protect our institutions from attack and from seduction. Do not sell your birthright for a mess of pottage.

I am no Cassandra. I have no ill prophecy to offer. But at this point I am moved to say to you in all solemnity: Don't let us be the first to disarm. Don't let us scuttle and run—militarily, economically, or spiritually. Don't let us dodge the duty which lies upon us of helping to keep the world's peace. We must be strong.

What country but America could have made—actually did make—the contributions that won the war? What country but America dared face the greatest test—a free election during the very climax of the war?

Not Germany—not even the farce of a one-party balloting. Not Italy. Until last Sunday not for 9 years had there been one in Russia. I am taking the Russian vocabulary and not our dictionary as to the word election. Even England, that home of freedom, held none for 10 years.

But we, regularly, held our elections every 2 years, with Presidential polls in 1940, practically a war year, and again in 1944 at the very peak.

"DEEPLY GRATEFUL TO COUNTRY"

That thought makes me thrill with pride. I am proud of and deeply grateful to this country which has done so much for me. I am so eager but so unable to pay the debt except in small measure.

In speaking at another gathering, I used some phrases that have serious application at this point. I quote:

"I should like to say a few kind words about a certain relative of mine—a relative of yours—the one who made me possible—the one who made you possible—our Uncle Sam. We gaze on him with a sort of toleration and amusement, but he is a pretty sturdy soul. He is always on the side of right, sometimes a little slow getting there, but when he does arrive, he makes himself felt. He is better than we think; he is stronger than we know.

"In assessing our position, let us remember that great as our physical strengths are, they are made even greater by the fact that our spiritual armor is untarnished by self-gain; all our steps toward self-protection are steps to save the world—to bring peace to all nations of good will.

"America has never forgotten—and will never forget—the nobler things that brought her into being and that light her path, the path that was entered upon only 150 years ago, a little more than twice my own age. How young she is! It will be centuries before she will adopt a maturity of custom, the clothing of the grave, that some believe she is already fitted for.

"Our people are hard-bitten. They owe only to themselves what they have, but, somehow, they have always preserved the chivalry and idealism that others mistakenly assume is softness."

Once it was said: "To each according to his need; from each according to his ability." That became the basis of communism. I reject the formula politically, but I accept it as a guide in charity—an American guide.

STATISM VERSUS INDIVIDUALISM

If we want to retain the system of personal initiative, we must support private charity; the two go hand in hand. Abolish private charity and the state takes over, in a grim, organized, statistical way, and we shall be robbed of the joy that lies in giving and the deep satisfaction in rescuing the afflicted.

Today we face a great political and philosophical issue—statism versus individualism. But no matter how rigid organized society may become, in the last analysis each one must rely upon himself for the justification of life. Let us recall that truth, particularly now, when paternalism seems so soft and beguiling.

The process of individual effort which we call the capitalistic system may not be the ultimate but it is the best thus far devised. It has proved itself so in peace and in war. I believe in trying to better that system instead of tearing it down, or repairing that which has carried us so far instead of abandoning it and striking out afoot in new directions.

We must proclaim the lessons we have learned, that we live by the sweat of our brow, that helpfulness to others is helpfulness to ourselves, that these are measures of a social conscience, which we freely accept and enact.

But the higher social levels we seek cannot be attained without realizing that the enterprise system carries personal obligations and that one of them, charity, is greatest at this moment.

Another Jew said 1,900 years ago, the fighting St. Paul: "And now abideth faith, hope, and charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity."

Let us go forth and follow this teaching.

My deep thanks for your attention.

Pennsylvania's Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 26 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the RECORD a short editorial entitled "Pennsylvania's Farmers," published in the Evening Bulletin, of Philadelphia, Pa., on January 24, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PENNSYLVANIA'S FARMERS

Governor Martin from Harrisburg holds the mirror up to farmers to let them see what sort of people they are. In the Governor's looking glass farmers appear as rugged individualists who want neither to be bossed nor coddled. They do not want regimentation from Government, but wish to be free and independent Americans.

The Governor could just as well pay the same compliments to city populations in the State who also show no inclination to give up their rights as free-born Americans.

Such statements, however, should not be taken to mean that farmers are not in a receptive mood for any favors the Government has to pass around. It is true, as the Governor states, that Pennsylvania farmers have not benefited as much from Government subsidies as those in other sections. But our farmers have not refused to cash Government checks.

To protect farmers from the operation of the law of supply and demand Congress has guaranteed parity prices for farm products for 2 years after the end of the war. So far there have been few protests from rugged farm individualists against this suspension of an economic law.

Farmers are restive under Government regulations, as are many nonfarmers. But it is doubtful if many farmers want a return to the good old days before 1933, when they were allowed to plow themselves into bankruptcy by piling up farm surpluses.

A Petition to the General Assembly of the UNO for Amendment of the Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, had the atomic bomb been discovered by the Germans instead of by American and British scientists, the whole world would today be in slavery to Adolf Hitler. This would have been true even if the Germans had not discovered the atomic bomb until a few days before the final capture of Berlin. They could have turned the tide of battle completely in their favor even at that late date. The fact that the bomb was developed by Americans instead of by Germans, therefore, represents one of the greatest strokes of good fortune for humanity that the world has ever known.

On the other hand, the fact that the atomic bomb was developed at all places all mankind in the midst of a terrible and impending danger such as it has never faced before.

The atomic bomb was no accident. It was the natural result of total war. For total war means a war in which all the energy, intelligence, time, and resources of whole nations is devoted to the destruction of other human beings. In any such diabolical circumstance as this we may expect things like atomic bombs.

As matters stand at present the world is in for an armament race in the development of atomic weapons. Since everyone agrees that the only way in which an advantage can be gained in atomic war is by striking without warning and striking first, the whole advantage will lie with the aggressor in the future. Furthermore, in an atomic war all nations, excepting the most backward ones, will see their resources destroyed, their industries wiped out and half their populations killed. This will be true whether those nations win or lose the war.

Humanity therefore is face to face with a direct simple choice between life and death—between total war and total peace. Thoughtful people therefore are devoting all their energies to finding out how we can make it total peace instead of total war. And there is only one answer to that problem.

The answer is that there has to be a world authority or a world government which can control these terrible weapons of mass destruction, which can prevent any nation in the world from possessing them, and to which the nations will give the exclusive right to have such weapons and to use them for the sole purpose of keeping the peace.

From the beginning I have said that in my judgment the United States should join with any nations who are willing to create with us such an international authority, even if not all of them were ready to do so, and that we should then challenge the rest of them to either come into such a world government or else to stand before the eyes of humanity as nations unwilling to cooperate for peace and therefore nations outside the law of peace. But since the UNO is in existence and is functioning, our first attempt ought certainly to be to try to transform the United Nations Organization into an effective agency for keeping the peace—a thing which as presently constituted it cannot be.

It is for these reasons that I have recently signed a petition to the United Nations Organization urging that the Charter be amended. This petition calls for making the Assembly the real governing body, giving to the different nations representation based upon population, resources, strength, and ability to contribute to world peace and welfare. This would mean that instead of each nation having one vote in the Assembly, the representation of the nations would be on the same general basis as that given to the different States of the United States in the House of Representatives. Our petition furthermore calls for a complete abolition of the veto power on the part of any nation and for making the Security Council an executive body to carry out the directions of the Assembly, instead of an all-powerful group completely under the control of any one of the five so-called great powers.

Then our petition gives to the United Nations Assembly the power and right, first, to control all over the world and in every country of the world weapons of mass destruction; second, to prevent either the production or possession of atomic weapons by any country; and, third, to have the exclusive right to possess such weapons in order to preserve the peace. These are the main things in our petition. I signed it because I am convinced that action of this sort is the only way in which my own children and the children of the billion other families around the world can look forward to a reasonable chance to live out their lives as previous generations have had a chance to do.

To those who will object that they do not want to see the United States surrender its right to do whatever it wants to in the field of destructive armament, I would only say that as a condition of America giving up this right we would be given assurance that every other nation in the world was going to do likewise and that a world government strong enough to compel those unwilling to do so was to be created. We would be making an excellent bargain and doing the one right thing which it is possible for us to do under present circumstances, in addition.

The text of the petition and names of those who, in a brief period of 5 days, signed it follow:

A PETITION FOR AMENDMENT OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

To the Members of the General Assembly of the United Nations:

The undersigned citizens and associations of citizens of members of the United Nations hereby respectfully petition the members of the General Assembly for the adoption of amendments to the United Nations Charter whereby the United Nations will be constituted as a world federal government with limited but definite and adequate powers for the prevention of war.

We submit herewith specific proposals for amendments to accomplish this end. We do so in order to indicate specifically the minimum changes in the Charter which we believe to be necessary if the world is to free itself from the scourge of war and the constant apprehension thereof. But in so doing we emphasize the fact that the textual proposals, while the result of long consideration, are submitted tentatively and in order to promote definite discussion and action. We do not presume to submit these proposals as the only or necessarily the best means to accomplish the desired result.

The peoples of the world urgently need a limited world government. The recent appalling increase in the destructive power of modern weapons, including long-range planes and submarines, rocket-carried missiles and, above all, the atomic bomb, has made the prevention of war more than a matter of saving life and property. It has become no less a question than the survival of mankind in a civilized state. Since the problem is of world-wide scope it demands a world-wide solution. Because a world scientific revolution has occurred we must meet its implications by no less revolutionary ideas and plans in the field of world political organization. Reason and experience prove that any league of states, preserving the absolute sovereignty of such states, is plainly inadequate to prevent war. A measure of actual world government is, therefore, no longer merely a desirable goal. It has become a vital and immediate necessity.

However promising the Charter may have appeared when approved in June 1945, events occurring since then—including the application of atomic energy to weapons of war—have changed world conditions and have tremendously condensed the time within which necessary amendments must be made. In-

stead of starting all over again, we should build upon the valuable foundations already laid by proceeding through amendments which will so alter and strengthen the present Charter as to make it an instrument of limited world government. It should be and can be amended to this end.

The fundamental deficiency of the Charter now is that it is based upon, preserves and confirms unlimited national sovereignty—at least so far as the permanent members of the Security Council are concerned. The requirement of unanimity on the part of China, France, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and the United States for all important decisions of the Security Council represents a retention and confirmation of such unlimited national sovereignty. This rule makes it uncertain whether that Council can function promptly in a crisis to prevent war. Reason compels the conclusion that there can be no assurance of effective action where such action can be taken only with the unanimous approval of a number of sovereign nations.

On the other hand the provision that each member in the General Assembly shall have one vote (irrespective of population, natural, industrial, and military resources or any other factor) makes it unreasonable and virtually impossible to vest important powers of decision or action in an Assembly so constituted. It is not in accord with reason or common sense to expect that great and powerful nations with populations of 100,000,000 or more will consent to be bound in important matters by the action of a body in which they have no more voice than small nations of 1,000,000 or less.

Thus, under the present Charter there exists the combination of an Assembly that cannot or will not be granted any important powers of decision—because of the rule of one vote for each country—and a Council in which prompt action cannot be relied upon because of the veto right in the permanent members. This combination has convinced thinking men and women throughout the world that the structure established by the present Charter is manifestly deficient.

The present Charter can be successfully amended. But the amendments, to accomplish the purpose, must alter certain of the first principles and main features of the structure.

GENERAL PROPOSALS

Instead of an Assembly in which the smallest and weakest country has an equal voice with the most populous or the most powerful, the Assembly, it is submitted, should be reconstituted upon the principle of weighted or balanced representation. This does not mean any impairment of the juridical equality of each member country. The smallest and weakest would remain absolutely equal with the greatest powers before the law. It does mean, however, the abolition of the present rule whereby each member nation has one vote without regard to population or any other factor. Instead of this obsolete conception, each member should be equitably represented in the Assembly in proportion not only to its population, but also in relation to such factors as resources, production, and current ability to contribute to world order and progress.

Except in a few special instances, decisions of the Assembly so reconstituted should be by majority vote, as is the case in all the principal parliamentary bodies of the world, and in the International Court of Justice—so that there will be an assurance of prompt decisions. The representatives therein should vote as individuals, according to their individual convictions, and not in blocs as representing the countries from which they come. They would thus vote, so far as human nature permits, for the general welfare of the world and not in the supposed interest of any particular country.

With a General Assembly constituted on a fair basis of balanced representation, the way would be open to increase the authority of the Assembly by vesting in it wider and more important powers. Thus the smaller countries would take part directly on a proportional basis in all decisions instead of exercising the less direct influence to which they are now limited. While, in some instances, their nominal proportionate votes would be less than under the present rule of one vote for each country, their actual positions would become more representative, dignified, and influential.

By reconstituting the Assembly upon such a balanced system of representation, with decisions in most instances by majority vote, it could and should be made the most important organ of the United Nations. It can be clothed with definite legislative powers to prevent or suppress war. These powers to legislate by binding enactment should be carefully defined and limited and yet be adequate to the purpose. All other powers should be reserved to the member countries, or to the peoples thereof, no power being delegated to the central authority beyond what is essential for the survival of humanity and civilization.

Although the power of the Assembly to bind by world law should be narrowly and carefully defined, it will be wise and consistent to retain, in addition to its restricted legislative powers, broad authority to investigate and make recommendations. This authority should extend to a wide range of subjects involving the economic and social welfare of the peoples. The powers to investigate and recommend wisely given by the present Charter appear adequate, as does the authority to appoint and supervise subsidiary agencies. All these powers should be retained. The additional powers to legislate must be sufficient to enable the prevention of war, but at present should be confined within strict limits.

It can, indeed, be forcefully argued that, if we are to have a World Federal Government at all, it should have definite powers of regulation as to such matters as international shipping, aviation, and communications; and even as to labor conditions and the promotion of agriculture, health, and education. But no matter how important the authority to enact world legislation in such fields may seem to be for the general welfare of mankind and the reduction of international friction, it is wise, we believe, to confine the legislative power at the outset to matters plainly and directly related to the prevention of war, leaving the problem of expanding the legislative powers to a time when the governments and peoples have become more accustomed to federalism on a world scale.

These principles envisage the transfer to the Assembly of the basic authority now vested in the Security Council. But the changes do not involve the abolition of that body. It should continue in existence, but it should be chosen by the Assembly, to which it should be responsive and responsible; and it should function pursuant to powers delegated by the Assembly and under voting procedures prescribed by the Assembly. Thus it would operate as an executive committee of the Assembly, rather than as an independent body with independent authority.

The petitioners also respectfully submit that consideration should be given to amending the Charter so as to strengthen the provisions for the decision by impartial tribunals of disputes between nations. Even if it is not now feasible to achieve such a procedure in the case of all disputes between nations, consideration might well be given to an amendment whereby if the General Assembly, or the Security Council acting for the Assembly, determines that a particular dispute between nations is of so serious a character as to endanger peace, the Assembly or Security Council may require submission of the dispute for decision by an impartial tribunal, either by the International Court of Justice or an arbitral tribunal, dependent upon the nature of the dispute.

We believe also that the authority of the Assembly or Security Council on its behalf to enforce compliance with the judgments or orders of the Court or of such arbitral tribunal should be clarified and strengthened.

It is essential that there shall be some final judicial authority to interpret the Charter. Accordingly, we submit that the Charter and the statute of the International Court of Justice should be so amended as to establish beyond question the authority of the Court to interpret the Charter.

The petitioners believe also that, in view of the legislative powers given by the proposed amendments, a bill of rights should be included in the Charter to protect the individual against abuse of the new powers.

Finally the petitioners submit that the procedure for amendment of the Charter should be liberalized. Recognizing that no one is wise enough to anticipate changes that time and experience may make necessary, it should not be possible for any single nation by its veto, as is now possible, to prevent the adoption of amendments agreed to by a great majority of the governments and peoples of the world.

The foregoing general proposals are in accord with the principles stated in a declaration issued October 16, 1945, by a conference of citizens of the United States held at Dublin, N. H., U. S. A.

To give effect to these principles and proposals there are herewith submitted for consideration and discussion the following proposed amendments to the Charter:

SPECIFIC PROPOSALS

I. Amendment of provisions for the General Assembly

In order to make operative the foregoing principles, it will be necessary to amend fundamentally the articles dealing with the General Assembly, firstly, in respect of its composition and voting procedures and, secondly, in respect of its powers.

In respect of the composition of the Assembly on the principle of balanced representation it will be desirable as soon as possible to adopt a formula and procedure whereby the number of representatives chosen by the member states may be periodically adjusted in view of inevitable changes in population and capacity. The formula should, we believe, take into account not only the populations of the respective members but also their natural and industrial resources, production, ability to contribute to world order and progress, and such other factors as the General Assembly may deem relevant.

In the meantime, and in order to make a start, it will be necessary to adopt a definite apportionment for the present members, pending the taking of a world census and the application of the formula determined upon.

The revision of article 9, proposed below, conforms to these ideas. Paragraph 2 of the revised article, while not suggesting a definite permanent formula, indicates its general nature with provision for initial and periodical world censuses.

Paragraph 3 contains a proposed transitional apportionment of representatives.

The suggested transitional apportionment is based on two main assumptions. The first is that the British Commonwealth and Empire as a whole, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as a whole, and the United States as a whole, are entitled to equal representation. They have acted as equals in World War II. Taking all factors, tangible and intangible, into account, they can be said to be equal in influence in world affairs. It is

fair and practical that, under present circumstances, there should be no discrimination between them. It is on this basis that the number allotted to each is placed at 65.

The second assumption is that each member state should have at least one representative, so that every member shall be able to make itself heard and vote directly on all questions in the Assembly. Eighteen members with relatively small populations and resources are, therefore, allotted one vote each, even though in most or all of such cases, the effect is to give more representation to those members than could be justified on a strict basis of relative power and influence in world affairs.

Within these maximum and minimum limits the suggested temporary allotment, which no. computed on a fixed formula, seeks to take into account the factors above-mentioned—population, natural and industrial resources, production, and ability to contribute to world order and progress. Under this suggested transitional allotment, the total number of representatives for the present 51 members would be 367.

It is to be hoped that all the other states of the world will be admitted as members. When the membership is universal the General Assembly would, on the assumed basis, comprise no more than about 480 representatives. Considering that they would represent 2,200,000,000 people and that the British House of Commons has 640 members, the Soviet Council of the Union 647, and the Congress of the United States 531—a membership approaching 500 is not too large for an Assembly representative of the whole world.

In suggesting the following table for the transitional apportionment of representatives we emphasize that while it has been the subject of much study and is believed to be rational, it is submitted by way of illustration only. We realize that the working out of any plan for the apportionment of Representatives is difficult. We believe, however, that the problem is capable of solution with a spirit of reasonable accommodation and understanding. We believe also that it serves a useful purpose to make a concrete suggestion for purposes of discussion.

The following textual amendments are suggested:

Composition

Change article 9 to read as follows:

"ARTICLE 9

"1. The General Assembly shall be composed of representatives chosen for terms of 4 years by the several members of the United Nations. Each member shall be free to determine for itself the manner of choice, but it is desirable that the representatives shall be elected by the peoples of the members of the United Nations through elections participated in by the voters in each member country qualified to vote for the members of the most numerous branch of the national legislature.

"2. [This paragraph should contain a formula for the apportionment of representatives to be chosen by the members. As above noted, such formula should take into account not only population but also resources, production, and ability to contribute to world order and progress. It should provide for an initial world census to obtain the data for the application of the formula and for periodical world censuses, presumably every 10 years, upon which to base periodical adjustments of the representation, in view of changing conditions.]

"3. Until an apportionment is made under paragraph 2 the number of representatives which each member shall be entitled to choose shall be as follows:

"Members of the United Nations (as of Feb. 1, 1946)

	Representatives
The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Byelorussian S. S. R., and the Ukrainian S. S. R. (the apportionment to be determined by agreement among themselves)	65
The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Canada, Australia, the Union of South Africa, New Zealand, and India (the apportionment to be determined by agreement among themselves)	65
The United States of America and the Philippine Commonwealth (the apportionment to be determined by agreement among themselves)	65
China	25
France	25
The Netherlands	12
Belgium	9
Brazil	9
Poland	9
Argentina	8
Czechoslovakia	7
Mexico	7
Turkey	5
Yugoslavia	5
Denmark	4
Egypt	4
Norway	4
Chile	3
Colombia	3
Cuba	3
Greece	3
Iran (Persia)	3
Peru	2
Uruguay	2
Venezuela	2
Bolivia	1
Costa Rica	1
Dominican Republic	1
Ecuador	1
El Salvador	1
Ethiopia	1
Guatemala	1
Haiti	1
Honduras	1
Iraq	1
Lebanon	1
Liberia	1
Luxemburg	1
Nicaragua	1
Panama	1
Paraguay	1
Saudi Arabia	1
Syria	1
Total for the 51 members, as of Feb. 1, 1946	367

"4. Upon the admission of a new member the General Assembly shall fix the number of representatives which such new member shall be entitled to choose."

Voting

In view of the proposed change in the character of the General Assembly whereby it would be constituted as a representative body in which the representatives would vote as individuals and not in blocs as representing their respective national states, and in view of the further purpose that the reconstituted Assembly should be able to reach prompt decisions, important changes in article 18 are essential.

It is suggested that the article be amended to read as follows:

"ARTICLE 18

"1. Each representative in the General Assembly shall have one vote, and the representatives shall vote as individuals."

The present paragraph 2 would be omitted and paragraph 3 renumbered 2, amended to read:

"2. Unless otherwise specifically provided in this charter, decisions of the General Assembly shall be made by a majority of the representatives present and voting. A majority of the General Assembly shall constitute a quorum to do business."

Functions and Powers

Pursuant to the principle of conferring upon the General Assembly the minimum legislative powers necessary for the control of atomic energy and the prevention of war, we suggest that article 12 be amended to read as stated below. The language of paragraph 2 (a), (b), and (c) is adapted from the declaration on atomic energy of President Truman, Prime Minister Attlee, and Prime Minister Mackenzie King of November 15, 1945, and the communiqué of the Moscow Conference issued December 27, 1945. The language of paragraph 2 (f) is largely derived from article 6 of the Constitution of the International Military Tribunal, now in session at Nuremburg.

"ARTICLE 12

"1. The members of the United Nations confer on the General Assembly primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

"2. For the discharge of these duties the following specific legislative powers are granted to the General Assembly:

"(a) To promote the free exchange of basic scientific information between all nations.

"(b) To provide for the control of atomic energy to the extent necessary to insure its use only for peaceful purposes, and to eliminate from national armaments all atomic weapons and all other weapons or means adaptable to mass destruction, and provide that the United Nations shall have exclusive rights thereto for the sole purpose of maintaining world peace and security.

"(c) To provide for such inspections as the General Assembly may deem necessary in order to protect complying States against the hazards of violations and evasions of any laws enacted under this article, and to raise by voluntary methods, maintain, support, and provide for the administration of such inspection forces as the General Assembly may deem necessary for this purpose.

"(d) To raise by voluntary recruitment, maintain, support, and provide for the organization, command, and disposition of such police and military forces as the General Assembly may deem necessary to insure the effectiveness of such inspections and compliance with and enforcement of any laws enacted under this article.

"(e) To define the conditions and establish the general rules under which the measures provided for in chapter VII may be applied to members or other states failing to comply with any laws enacted under this article.

"(f) To define the penalties for violations by persons in any member or other state of any laws enacted under this article and to define and prescribe the penalties for crimes committed by such persons against international peace and security, including the planning, preparation, initiation, or waging of any war of aggression or any war in violation of international treaties, agreements, or assurances, or participation in a common plan or conspiracy for the accomplishment of any of these purposes; to provide for the apprehension of any individuals accused of such crimes or violations; and to establish tribunals for their trial and appropriate means for the enforcement of penalties against convicted criminals or violators.

"3. All powers not delegated to the General Assembly by the foregoing provisions of this article or elsewhere in this Charter nor prohibited by the Charter to the members are reserved to the members, respectively, or to their peoples."

By paragraph 2 of article 17, authority is now conferred to apportion the expenses of

the United Nations among the members, and by necessary implication to levy assessments for such expenses. But since the enlarged powers of the United Nations would inevitably involve far greater expenses than under the powers given by the present Charter, there might well be some qualification of the broad authority now given by paragraph 2 of article 17.

It is suggested that paragraph 2 be amended to read as follows:

"ARTICLE 17

"2. The expenses of the United Nations shall be borne by the members as apportioned by the General Assembly, but no member shall be required, without its consent, to provide a greater proportion of such expenses that the number of representatives chosen by it shall bear to the total number of representatives in the General Assembly."

II. Amendment of provisions for the Security Council

In consequence of the enlarged scope of the reconstituted General Assembly under the foregoing proposed amendments and its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, it is desirable that the Security Council shall be chosen by the General Assembly and function virtually as its executive committee in the field of security. To this end, the following changes in chapter V are suggested:

Composition

Change article 23 to read as follows:

"ARTICLE 23

"1. The Security Council shall consist of 11 members, no 2 of whom may be nationals of the same state. They shall be elected by the General Assembly from among the representatives chosen to the General Assembly. Each of the five members having at the time of the election the largest number of representatives in the General Assembly shall at all times have one member of the Security Council elected by the General Assembly from the representatives chosen by those five members respectively. The six additional members shall be elected from among the representatives chosen by other members, due regard being specially paid, in the first instance, to the contribution of members to the maintenance of international peace and security and to the other purposes of the United Nations, and also to equitable geographical distribution.

"2. The members of the Security Council shall be elected for a term of 2 years. In the first election, however, five shall be chosen for a term of 1 year."

Functions and Powers

Change article 24 to read as follows:

"ARTICLE 24

"1. The Security Council shall execute the laws adopted by the General Assembly and shall perform such other functions as are specified elsewhere in the present Charter, or as may be delegated to it by the General Assembly.

"2. The Security Council shall submit annual and, when necessary, special reports to the General Assembly for its consideration. The Security Council in the performance of any of its functions shall at all times be subject to the general direction and control of the General Assembly."

Voting

Change Article 27 to read as follows:

"ARTICLE 27

"1. Each member of the Security Council shall have one vote.

"2. Decisions of the Security Council on procedural matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of six members.

"3. Decisions of the Security Council on all other matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of six members including the concurring votes of at least three of the five members elected from among the representatives chosen by each of the five members having the largest number of representatives in the General Assembly."

III. Amendment to confer judicial authority to interpret the Charter

Under the present Charter, the authority of the International Court of Justice to interpret the Charter is not clear. It is essential, however, that there shall be an authoritative and impartial method of interpreting a constitutional document of this character and of removing from time to time any doubt as to its scope and meaning. The same is true of any laws enacted under the Charter. This is properly a judicial function and the International Court of Justice is the natural and appropriate organ to fulfill it.

It is therefore suggested that article 96, paragraph 1, be amended to read as follows:

"ARTICLE 96

"1. The International Court of Justice shall have power, at the request of any member or of the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, or the Trusteeship Council, to make a binding interpretation of any of the provisions of this Charter or of any law enacted by the General Assembly under this Charter. It shall have power, at the request of the General Assembly or the Security Council, to give an advisory opinion on any other legal question."

IV. Amendment of provisions concerning amendment of the Charter

The present provisions (arts. 108 and 109) make the process of amending the Charter too uncertain and too rigid. This is especially so because of the requirement that no amendment whatever can come into force unless approved by all the permanent members of the Security Council. These articles should be liberalized and made more flexible. To accomplish this, the following changes are suggested:

Change article 108 to read as follows:

"ARTICLE 108

"Amendments to the present Charter shall come into force for all members of the United Nations when they have been adopted by vote of two-thirds of the representatives in the General Assembly present and voting and ratified in accordance with their respective constitutional processes by a majority of the members of the United Nations, which majority shall include members which have chosen not less than two-thirds of the representatives in the General Assembly."

Change article 109 to read as follows:

"ARTICLE 109

"1. A general conference of the members of the United Nations for the purpose of reviewing the present Charter may be held at a date and place to be fixed by a two-thirds vote of the representatives in the General Assembly present and voting. The number of delegates in such general conference which each member of the United Nations shall be entitled to choose shall be equal to the number of representatives chosen by it in the General Assembly at the time of such general conference.

"2 Any alteration of the present Charter recommended by a two-thirds vote of the delegates present and voting in any such general conference shall take effect when ratified in accordance with their respective constitutional processes by a majority of the members of the United Nations, which majority shall include members which have chosen not less than two-thirds of the representatives in the General Assembly.

"3. At the tenth annual session of the General Assembly following the coming into force of the present Charter, and at every tenth session thereafter, there shall be placed on the agenda of the General Assembly the proposal to call a general conference for the purpose of reviewing the Charter, and the conference shall be held if so decided by a majority vote of the representatives in the General Assembly present and voting."

V. Other suggestions: (A) Decision of international disputes; (B) A bill of rights; (C) Consequential changes

(a) Decision of international disputes: Under the present Charter and Statute of the International Court of Justice, the machinery for the decision of controversies between states is highly incomplete. The International Court has at present no compulsory jurisdiction, except to the extent that states may agree to submit to it any controversies under the optional jurisdiction clause or by a special treaty.

It is true that the most comprehensive provision for the decision of international disputes cannot be a complete answer to the problem of preventing war. This is so because some wars do not arise from anything that can be called a controversy or dispute at all. Nevertheless, there have been and presumably will be many causes of trouble between nations that are capable of decision by impartial tribunals and which, if not determined by authoritative decision, may be the causes of war. Accordingly, the extension of the rule of law in respect of international disputes is of vast importance, even though this cannot alone prevent all wars.

In these circumstances, we believe that consideration should be promptly given to the strengthening of the machinery for the decision of disputes between nations. While we do not now suggest a specific amendment to this end, we believe that consideration should be given to amendments of the Charter and of the Statute of the International Court of Justice whereby the General Assembly, or the Security Council acting for the Assembly, should have definite authority to require submission of any controversy between states either to the World Court or to an arbitral tribunal if, in their judgment, the dispute is of so serious a character as to endanger peace.

We believe also that the General Assembly, or Security Council on its behalf, should have unequivocal authority to enforce compliance with the judgments or orders of the Court or such arbitral tribunal, and that Article 94 of the Charter should be amended to make this authority more clear and definite.

(b) A bill of rights: The adoption of amendments like those above suggested would confer certain powers on the United Nations whereby it would exercise a direct authority upon individuals. This authority would exist, it is true, within a very limited field. There would, for example, be no power to tax the individual but only power to levy assessments against the member countries. There would also be no power to conscript the individual for the inspection, police, and military forces of the United Nations, since the authority to raise such forces could only be exercised by voluntary methods.

There would, however, be power in the General Assembly to pass all laws necessary to insure the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes only and to eliminate atomic and other major weapons from national armaments; to provide for such inspections as are deemed necessary to these ends; to raise and maintain inspection, police, and military forces; and to apprehend, try, and punish individual violators of the kind of laws specifically authorized.

While these powers are believed to be the minimum powers necessary to maintain peace, they are nevertheless substantial and

raise the question of constitutional safeguards against their possible misuse. Such safeguards should certainly include guarantees for fair trial of persons accused of violating any laws passed by the General Assembly. It might also be advisable to prohibit the use of the granted powers in any such manner as to infringe upon the fundamental rights now possessed by citizens of member states, such as freedom of religion, of speech, of the press, assembly, and petition. Under this head, it is true that there is nothing in the proposed powers to justify any perversion of those powers in these directions. However, carefully expressed guarantees against any possible misuse of the delegated powers might give assurance which would strengthen confidence in the United Nations.

A bill of rights of this character would be directed solely to the exercise of the delegated powers of the United Nations. The matter of "promoting respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all," presumably through recommending guarantees of such rights by the member countries themselves, is a separate question which is the responsibility of the Economic and Social Council under article 62, paragraph 2.

(c) Consequential changes. If the above main amendments are adopted in substance, a number of consequential changes will be necessary in order to make the Charter consistent and harmonious.

For example, the term "Organization" in the Charter should be eliminated. The effect of the above main amendments would be to constitute a world federal government with limited but definite legislative powers in the General Assembly, with a Security Council responsible to the Assembly and acting as an executive body in the field of security and with a world judiciary with authority to interpret the Charter and to interpret and apply the laws enacted by the General Assembly. The designation "Organization" would, therefore, no longer be appropriate, so that in all cases where the term "Organization" occurs in the Charter, the term "United Nations" should be substituted.

VI

If and when amendments are adopted substantially in accord with those above suggested, a minimum of centralized control would be provided and a maximum of self-government would be reserved to the separate states. The delegated powers for unity of action would be restricted to those things strictly necessary to the survival of civilization, the development of further powers being left to future evolution and the growth of confidence among the nations, through the successful operation of the limited powers first exercised.

Nevertheless, the delegation of these limited powers would involve a definite modification of the sovereignty of the member states, and this delegation would confer upon the United Nations authority which can only be correctly described as authority to govern within a strictly defined sphere. There would exist, therefore, a true world federal government, even though the powers delegated to it would be far more restricted than those commonly assigned to the federal government in national states of a federal character.

Of equal importance with the delegation of the minimum powers essential to survival are the provisions making reasonably certain the effective exercise of these powers. For it would be of no use to grant powers much more extensive than herein proposed if, as under the present Charter, the machinery for their exercise is such as to make it uncertain whether any decisions can be arrived at, no matter how urgent the need.

We believe that through the provision for balanced representation in the General Assembly, coupled with the provision for decisions by majority vote and for voting by the representatives as individuals, the indispensable requirement for world machinery capable of functioning promptly and reliably, has been met.

Under the proposed (f) of article 12, empowering the Assembly to enact laws to make wars of aggression criminal and to punish individual violators after trial in courts of the United Nations, a tremendous step would be taken. We would have come much nearer to "a world law, with a world judiciary to interpret it" and "with a world police to enforce it."[1]

We believe that only when amendments are adopted which go at least as far as those herein proposed, will the world have a reasonably reliable system for the maintenance of world order and for the promotion of justice among all peoples.

We believe that there is no time to lose in considering amendments of the character proposed. Accordingly, we respectfully petition the members of the General Assembly to take these proposals under advisement at the first opportunity.

Massachusetts Committee for World Federation, by Thomas H. Mahony, Chairman, Boston, Mass.; Missouri State Committee for World Federation, by F. R. von Windegger, Chairman, St. Louis, Mo.; James B. Ames, Lawyer, Boston, Mass.; Douglas Arant, Lawyer, Birmingham, Ala.; Samuel G. Atkinson, Business, Boston, Mass.; Margaretta A. Austin, Former Executive Secretary, Federal Union, Washington, D. C.; Perkins Bass, Lawyer, Peterborough, N. H.; Hon. Robert P. Bass, Former Governor of New Hampshire, Peterborough, N. H.; Kingman Brewster, Jr., Student, Cambridge, Mass.; H. L. Brotman, Lawyer, New York City; Lincoln C. Brownell, Lawyer, New York City; Henry B. Cabot, Lawyer, Chairman of Massachusetts Committee of 1,000 on World Organization, Boston, Mass.; Elizabeth Cady, Executive Secretary, Massachusetts Committee for World Federation, Boston, Mass.; Marie J. Carroll, Research, Director, World Peace Foundation, Boston, Mass.; Grenville Clark, Lawyer, New York City; Louisa H. Clark, Student, Dublin, N. H.; Alan Cranston, Correspondent and Author, Chairman of Dublin Conference Committee on World Government, Washington, D. C.; Howard P. Davis, Lecturer and Author, Bolton, Mass.; John Dickinson, Foreign Correspondent, Arlington, Va.; Dr. Albert Einstein, Institute of Advanced Study, Princeton, N. J.; Rev. William F. English, Clergyman, Norwood, Mass.; Marshall Field, Jr., Lawyer, Chicago, Ill.; Mrs. Richard T. Fisher, Director, Massachusetts Committee for World Federation, Boston, Mass.; Arthur J. Goldsmith, Publicist, New York City; Frank H. Griffin, Jr., Student, Wawa, Pa.; Conrad Hobbs, Treasurer, Massachusetts Committee for World Federation, Boston, Mass.; Palmer Hutcheson, Lawyer, Houston, Tex.; James Imbrie, Business, Trenton, N. J.; Cloyd Laporte, Lawyer, New York City; John J. Mahoney, Professor at Boston University, Boston, Mass.; Edward F. Mahony, Student, Boston, Mass.; J. A. Migel, Merchant, Director, Americans United for World Organization, New York City; Lillian T. Mowrer, Foreign Correspondent, Washington, D. C.; Lewis Mumford, Historian, Hanover, N. H.; Albert Pratt, Business, Boston, Mass.; A. J. G. Priest, Lawyer, New York City; Ivor A. Richards, Professor at Harvard University, British Subject, Cambridge, Mass.; Dr. L. N. Ridenour, Physicist, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.; Herbert F. Rudd, Professor at University of New Hampshire, Durham, N. H.; Joseph H. Rush, Physicist, Manhattan Project, Oakridge, Tenn.; Joseph A. Salerno, Labor Leader, President of Massachusetts State CIO, Boston, Mass.; Richard B. Scandrett, Jr., Lawyer, New York City; Joseph Schreiber, Lawyer, New York City; R. Minturn Sedgwick, Business, Boston, Mass.; Eldon C. Shoup, Business, Boston, Mass.; Rev. Paul T. Shultz, Jr., Clergyman, West Roxbury, Mass.; Marshall K. Skadden, Lawyer, New York City; Louis B. Sohn, Research Fellow in International Law, Harvard Law School, Cambridge, Mass.; William L. Storey, Lawyer, New Yor kCity; Rex Stout, Author, Brewster, N. Y.; Hon. Glen H. Taylor, Senator from Idaho, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.; Hon. Elbert D. Thomas, Senator from Utah, Chairman of Senate Committee on Military Affairs, Washington, D. C.; Gray Thoron, Lawyer, New York City; Hon. Jerry Voorhis, Representative from California, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.; Bruce M. Weinhold, Business, Youngstown, Ohio; Herbert Whyman, Lecturer, New York City; Eugene P. Wigner, Physicist, Princeton, N. J.; Wayne D. Williams, Lawyer, Denver, Colo., Petitioners.

NOTE.—This petition was circulated among a small group in the United States of America February 1–5, 1946. The above-named petitioners are those who signed in that period. It is now intended to circulate the petition more widely, not only in the United States of America, but in other countries, and to file the names of additional petitioners with the Secretary-General.

[1] See the speech of Mr. Ernest Bevin on November 23, 1945.

Child-Care Centers

REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1946

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATOR NOTIFIES REPRESENTATIVE DOYLE CALIFORNIA APPROPRIATES FOR CHILD-CARE NURSERIES

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, in connection with child-care centers, several months ago it developed that my native State of California had one-fourth of the children who were in child-care centers throughout the entire Nation. California and all States needed time to legislate and provide funds. As I regard our children as our greatest natural wealth, I naturally offered a bill, which happened to be the only bill filed in the Congress, and then I appeared in behalf of a congressional group before the Com-

mittee on Appropriations asking for $5,400,000 of the rescission moneys to avoid delay. I asked and received the utmost cooperation of President Truman—and by the way, I want to thank him for his sympathetic and prompt action taken. Also the cooperation of the Committee on Appropriations, and its distinguished chairman. The sum of $5,400,000 was allowed out of rescission moneys. I now am advised by Gardiner Johnson, member of the State Assembly of my native State of California, that the State of California has done that which it indicated to me it wanted opportunity to do. I believed it would and acted accordingly. It is now taking care of its own children in these necessary nurseries and has appropriated by legislation $3,500,000. I know the House will be glad to know this. I thank all Members for their cooperation in the matter.

As the letter from Assemblyman Johnson gives the number of the California bills and the purport thereof, I include same for your information, in case any of your States make inquiry of you.

The letter referred to is as follows:

ASSEMBLY, CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE,
February 23, 1946.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DOYLE: Enclosed herewith I am sending to you copies of the three measures relating to child-care centers that were enacted by the California Legislature at its special session that adjourned last Tuesday evening.

The two bills were signed by Governor Warren on Wednesday morning, February 20, and became effective immediately.

Assembly bill 7 provides for the continuance of child-care centers in California until 90 days after the final adjournment of the next regular session of the legislature.

Senate bill 45 appropriates the sum of $3,500,000 from the general fund of the State of California to support child-care centers until March 30, 1947.

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 3 creates a joint legislative committee to survey the need for child-care centers, nursery schools, kindergartens, and other forms of early training of children, and to report back to the next regular session of the legislature within 10 days after it convenes. The sum of $25,000 is appropriated for the purpose of conducting the survey.

These three measures constituted the full program of the assembly interim committee on public education, of which I had the honor to be chairman, and concerning the work of which I spoke to you in Washington last October.

Knowing of your interest in this subject I thought you would be anxious to have this material available in your files. If you need further information, please do not hesitate to call upon me. The joint legislative committee has already been appointed and I am to continue on as chairman of it.

There are many thousands of people in California who should be exceedingly grateful to you for the fine service that you rendered in securing adequate Federal funds to carry on the work of these centers until such time as we were able to conceive and enact into law the program embodied in these bills. But for your action the entire program would have closed down before the State of California was able to act. You should be very gratified to know that your energy and persistent efforts made it possible to carry on this needed service.

Looking forward to seeing you again, I am, with warmest best regards,

Sincerely yours,

GARDINER JOHNSON.

The School-Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 26 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, the Washington Post printed a fine editorial on February 23 commenting favorably on the school-lunch program now before the Senate. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCHOOL LUNCHES

The federally-supported school-lunch program, instituted a decade ago as a means of marketing farm surpluses, deserves continuation today as a means of improving the health of the school children who have been its beneficiaries. We hope that the Senate will promptly follow the action of the House on Thursday in giving the program a proper statutory basis. Farm surpluses are not, at the present time, a problem, of course, although there are still and probably always will be local surpluses of many kinds of food. But the health of the Nation's school children continues to constitute a very real problem. Henry Wallace's observation the other day that Iowa hogs and heifers are better fed than one-third of Washington's youngsters was no doubt a somewhat irritating extravagance. But it was certainly not without substance; the Iowa hogs and heifers get a more nutritious and scientifically balanced diet than many of the children in low-income homes here and elsewhere.

The national consequenses of malnutrition at school age were made tragically evident during the war. General Hershey has testified that 70 percent of the boys who had poor nutrition 10 or 12 years ago were rejected by Selective Service. The peacetime cost in illness, indigence, and inability to work is incalculable. As Representative ADOLPH SABATH put it, "our children are our greatest national resource, and anything we do to make them stronger and healthier will help our Nation in the future." It seems to us a pitifully penny-wise sort of economy to argue, as some did in the House on Tuesday, that the Government cannot afford a $50,000,000 annual investment assuring such valuable dividends.

Some of the other objections raised against the school-lunch bill seemed to verge on the preposterous. Representative TABER said it "is designed to wreck the public school system of America." Representative WADSWORTH saw it as "statism." Representative BUCK declared that "it begins teaching children at the tender age of 5 that they may eat at the bounty of the Federal Government." The program has been operating for 10 years; the bill passed by the House would give it permanent legislative status, with proper disbursement of the funds through State educational systems. The public school system has thus far survived it and will, we feel confident, continue to do so. And the morale of our 5-year-olds will no doubt withstand a free lunch as well as it withstands a free education. The program does nothing more subversive than to give a glass of milk, or in some cases a good hot meal, to children whose families cannot afford to give them proper nutrition. We shall all be able to eat more comfortably if we know this program is being carried on.

Suggestion That Apostle Islands Be Made Seat of United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 26 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Washburn Times, of Washburn, Wis., entitled "Why Not the Apostle Islands?"

the Appendix of the RECORD an article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY NOT THE APOSTLE ISLANDS?—AN OPEN LETTER TO THE UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

To the Special Committee of the UNO Interim Council Appointed to Select a Permanent Capital for the United Nations:

HONORED SIRS: We see by the papers that you have been having some difficulty in selecting a permanent home for the United Nations Organization. The residents of the North Stamford-Greenwich area you chose apparently decline the honor, not wishing to have their estates transformed into so unimportant a thing as a world capital. We offer a solution to your difficulties by seriously and respectfully proposing a much more appropriate site for the UNO home—a site that is eminently suitable as to historic background, location, climate, area, scenery, and other natural advantages; namely, the Apostle Islands off the northern tip of the State of Wisconsin in Lake Superior. It's a perfect site for your purpose, and it won't cost you much, if anything. And economy is a factor not to be ignored even by the UNO.

With a history going back to the very dawn of time, the Apostle Islands offer an appropriate location for an organization that seeks to bring the dawn of a new era in the unhappy annals of mankind. The red sandstone of the Apostle Islands is considered by many geologists to be the oldest land on earth. It will be good for the ego of the UNO delegates to gaze on those beautiful red shorelines and meditate on the fact that they are the eroded lava of the greatest volcano the world knew, lava that grew cold millions of years ago. Such a thought is enough to reduce the atom bomb to its proper small place in the panorama of earthly time and should be conducive to a recognition of the insignificance of men and their petty affairs and the folly of human conflict.

The human history of the Apostle Islands goes back over four centuries, when the Ojibways established their capital. Later other North American Indians of many tribes congregated on these shores and dwelt side by side in amity and concord, offering an inspiring historic example to their less peaceful white brethren.

Among the first white men to come to the islands were Jesuit missionaries, who gave them their name. These missionaries brought to the Indians the gospel of Christ, the precepts of which must be the foundation of any enduring peace wrought by the United Nations. What could be a more appropriate name for the capital of the peace-dedicated UNO than the name of the men who spread the message of the Prince of Peace?

The present residents of the area adjacent to the Apostle Islands offer a sterling example of friendship and cooperation between men of many origins. Here in peace dwell Americans whose fathers were Indians, French, English, Yankees, Norwegians, Swedes, Poles, Finns, Czechs, Hollanders, and a dozen other nationalities. Here is a healthy atmosphere of democracy and mutual understanding in which the democratic ideals of the United Nations can thrive and grow.

Turning to more practical aspects of the subject, the Apostle Islands offer a suitable geographical location for a world capital. In an age of air travel they stand at the crossroads of the world. Their isolation by land from great cities offers an advantage rather than otherwise. And that isolation by land is offset by their accessibility by air. The proximity of a great city like New York would do more harm than good to men and women dedicated to the preservation of peace and the moral uplift of humanity.

In climate and scenery the Apostle Islands are second to no other area as a suitable site for a world capital. The blue expanses of the world's greatest fresh-water sea reduce men and their troubles to their proper place in the eternal scheme of things. The verdant foliage of the islands offers an inspiring symbol of the freshness and vitality of nature. Lake Superior's breezes wash away the allergies of the flesh and may be helpful in dispelling the racial and national allergies of the spirit that must vanish before we reach true peace. And the trout—ah, there's something to talk about. When delegates quarrel we'll settle things by putting them together in a little boat with an outboard motor and let them troll for trout. No international quarrel will ever survive the mutual adventure of catching some of the world-famed Lake Superior trout. Mountains of discord will become molehills when delegates face each other across plates filled with succulent broiled trout steaks.

We see by the papers that you are prepared to pay $100,000,000 for the 42 square miles in the North Stamford-Greenwich area. You can have all the land you want in the Apostle Islands for a fraction of that and you can spend the difference on something more practical. Some of that coin could be used to pretty good advantage in promoting understanding between the nations of the world, the cause to which you are dedicated.

Presque Isle, 10,000 acres in extent and second largest of the archipelago, is owned by the University of Wisconsin and there isn't much doubt that it could be had for nothing for use as a UNO capital. On the other 22 islands of the group there are hundreds of acres owned by the Federal Government that would be available for nothing and thousands of acres owned by individuals that could be bought at a nominal price. If you want still more land or need a mainland base, the whole end of the Bayfield Peninsula is available.

Well, there's the story and we challenge you to find anything seriously wrong with it. America was picked as the location for the UNO capital presumably because it is a melting pot of all nations and already a world state in many respects. You can look the Nation over and you won't find a more typically American area than this one. You surely won't find it in Westchester County, N. Y. We don't have much money or much metropolitan sophistication around here and our pleasures are simple, but we know and practice friendship and harmony, we hate intolerance and discrimination, and we aren't bored with life or hopeless about the future. Perhaps the UNO delegates could even learn a few things from our way of life. We're willing.

Respectfully,

THE WASHBURN TIMES.

Los Angeles County Needs More Than Three Millions for Flood-Control Projects To Carry Out Federal Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. McDONOUGH. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from the Los Angeles County flood control engineer, H. E. Hedger, to the Honorable William A. Smith, chairman of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, which shows the detrimental effect of the inadequate appropriation of only $3,000,000 for flood-control projects in Los Angeles County, the amount recommended by the Appropriations Committee and passed by the House recently.

I trust the members of the Appropriations Committee will take note of Mr. Hedger's letter, which indicates the necessity for reconsideration of this important appropriation.

The letter follows:

LOS ANGELES COUNTY
FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT,
February 13, 1946.

Mr. W. A. SMITH,
Supervisor, First District,
Hall of Records, Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR MR. SMITH: This office has recently been advised that the 1947 appropriations bill recommended by the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives carries but one construction item of $3,000,000 for flood-control works in Los Angeles County, this sum being allocated to improvement of the Los Angeles River from Niagara Street to a point near Lankershim Boulevard in San Fernando Valley. The size of the recommended appropriation is so small in comparison with the immediate needs of Los Angeles County that it constitutes a serious setback both to the present demand for flood protection to life and property under existing conditions and also to the demand that will arise from future development of the county.

As you know, Congress in 1941 approved a comprehensive plan of flood-control works in this county estimated to cost $186,000,000, of which the Federal Government would provide $163,500,000. Congress has also authorized submission of appropriation requests of a maximum of $50,000,000 to meet Federal obligations under this program. At the time these authorizations were granted it was anticipated that annual appropriations of $15,000,000 or more would be approved by Congress so that construction of the entire program could be completed within a reasonable period of years.

If the current recommendation for a $3,000,000 appropriation is indicative of Congress' attitude toward future appropriations, it is obvious that a period of over 50 years will be required to complete the entire program instead of the 10 or 12 years heretofore anticipated. To make this situation worse, future development of the county will create new flood problems during this extended period.

In order to clearly define the inadequacy of the $3,000,000 appropriation now proposed by Congress, there follows a list of several of the flood-control projects already approved by it for which there is an immediate and urgent need:

San Gabriel River, canyon mouth to Santa Fe flood-control basin	$1,300,000
San Gabriel River, Whittier Narrows flood-control basin	12,500,000
Los Angeles River, Niagara St. to Lankershim Blvd	2,000,000
Los Angeles River, Lankershim Blvd. to Tujunga Wash	2,600,000
Tujunga Wash, Los Angeles River to Hansen Dam	7,500,000
San Antonio flood-control basin and San Antonio Wash to south city limits of Pomona	6,500,000
Los Angeles River, Tujunga Wash to Sepulveda Dam	1,200,000
Lopez flood-control basin and Pacoima diversion channel, from Lopez Basin to Tujunga Wash	7,550,000
Eaton Wash, from Eaton Wash Debris Basin to Rio Hondo	2,750,000
Rubio diversion channel, from Rubio Wash to Eaton Wash	950,000
Compton Creek, vicinity 122d St. to Main St	1,500,000
Sawtelle-Westwood (lower unit)	2,600,000
Centinella Creek, from above Jefferson Blvd. to Ballona Creek	950,000
	49,900,000

All of these projects meet the economic justification required by Federal flood-control laws, and are needed to protect the lives of thousands of people and property valued in hundreds of millions of dollars from future devastating floods.

Since construction of this volume of work would normally require 2 or 3 years to accomplish, an annual appropriation of from $15,000,000 to $25,000,000 would be needed for its consummation. Annual appropriations of less than this order will result in pyramiding of the present hazards to life and property in this county.

It is recommended that all of the congressional representatives of this area be advised of this situation and be urged to make every effort to obtain additional congressional appropriations for Federal flood-control work in this county more commensurate with its needs.

Yours very truly,

H. E. HEDGER,
Chief Engineer.

New Housing Czar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the January 28, 1946, issue of the Evening Star, Washington, D. C.:

NEW HOUSING CZAR

The increasing gravity of the Nation-wide housing shortage fully warrants the Executive order investing Housing Expediter Wilson W. Wyatt with far-reaching authority to act in this crisis. Reports from many parts of the country tell the same distressing story of shockingly overcrowded apartments and houses, of returning veterans standing in line for hours at housing centers and real estate offices, of conditions growing worse instead of better, despite the end of the war.

Here in the Nation's Capital one has but to pay a visit to the District War Housing Center to get an idea of the problem with which local and Federal officials are faced. In the past 30 days more than 6,500 families and individuals have applied there for rooms, apartments, or houses. Two-thirds of the applicants were veterans of the armed services in desperate need of shelter for themselves and families. Only one-fourth of those who apply succeed in getting their wants supplied.

Under the new Executive order, Mr. Wyatt, former mayor of Louisville, Ky., will have emergency over-all power to seek out and redistribute surplus war housing facilities at abandoned military installations, to expedite production of building materials, and channel them into home-building fields and to recommend measures designed to prevent further inflation of home prices. Upon being appointed National Housing Expediter, Mr. Wyatt was directed by the President to try and eliminate bottlenecks wherever he found them "at whatever level of industry or of government—local, State, or National." This is a large order, requiring the exercise of considerable power, especially in the coordination of the many agencies of Government dealing with housing and related problems. There can be no doubt of Mr. Wyatt's supreme authority, for he not only becomes head of the National Housing Agency on February 1, but takes over from Reconversion Director Snyder all the housing activities of the reconversion office. As Federal housing czar, Mr. Wyatt will have the responsibility of directing the Government's emergency attack on the housing shortage. But he cannot do the job alone. He must have the wholehearted cooperation not only of private industry but of State and municipal officials. In the long run, it is only in the field of private enterprise and community action that remedial measures of a permanent nature can be expected.

Get the GI's Out of India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, American soldiers should forthwith be transported home from all parts of the British Empire. They are becoming involved in the independence struggles of colonial peoples against the British.

The excuse that they are needed to guard American surplus property is just eyewash.

They are being embroiled by the British. The natives, for example, as in India, fail to distinguish between British and American uniforms. Tuesday past 18 American officers and enlisted men were seriously hurt by flying missiles. The United States military police used tear gas to protect themselves. These events are forebodings.

The riots in Calcutta are spreading rapidly. The difficulties are being aggravated by famine. The Province of Madras with 50,000,000 people is facing starvation due to crop failures. Most serious repercussions are expected.

The natives look upon the GI as a possible military aid to the British against them. Famine threatens all of India. Our troops should be enabled to clear out. The hungry Indians will wreak vengeance upon British and American alike. They will regard the American doughboy as alien as the British Tommy.

Every ship and plane should be made available. Some 50,000 are in serious peril.

Of course, the British want them there to pull their chestnuts out of the fire.

California Legislature Endorses Minimum Wage Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a joint resolution passed by the California State Legislature this month.

The resolution recognizes the necessity of an increase of the minimum wage in order to maintain a minimum standard of living and to increase the purchasing power of the Nation.

Following is the text of the resolution:

Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress to provide for an increase in the national minimum wage structure

Whereas legislation is pending before the United States Congress to increase the minimum wage, prescribed under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; and

Whereas since 1938 the purchasing power of the dollar has declined sharply along with an increase in prices and cost of living, all of which has resulted in an actual decrease in the amount of real wages represented by the minimum wage of the Fair Labor Standards Act; and

Whereas the need of protecting the national purchasing power and maintaining a minimum standard of living necessary for the health, efficiency and well being of wage earners may be at least partially achieved by increasing the present minimum wage; and

Whereas in view of the demonstrated capacity of our country to produce far beyond prewar levels and the need of attaining an economy of full production and abundance, the raising of the minimum standards is a reasonable beginning to this ultimate goal: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States is respectfully memorialized to enact legislation at the earliest possible date to provide for an increase in the national minimum wage structure; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

The American Medical Association Health Program and Prepayment Sickness Insurance Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted, I am extending my remarks and including an editorial from the Journal of the American Medical Association relating to the national health program of the American Medical Association, covering its health program and sickness insurance plans:

THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION HEALTH PROGRAM AND PREPAYMENT SICKNESS INSURANCE PLANS

At the annual session of the American Medical Association in Chicago in December the house of delegates adopted a resolution instructing "the board of trustees and the council on medical service and public relations to proceed as promptly as possible with the development of a specific national health program, with emphasis on the Nation-wide organization of locally administered prepayment medical plans sponsored by medical societies."

At a series of meetings held in Chicago beginning February 13 the board of trustees and the council on medical service completed considerations which made possible a long step toward protecting the American people against the costs of sickness.

The fundamental step in the development of this plan was the establishment of standards of acceptance for medical care plans which have the approval of the council on medical service of the American Medical Association. Any plan which meets the standards of the council will be entitled to display the seal of acceptance of the American Medical Association on its policies and on all of its announcements and promotional material. In order to qualify for acceptance, the prepayment plan must have the approval of the State or county medical society in the area in which it operates. The medical profession in the area must assume responsibility for the medical services included in the benefits. Plans must provide free choice of a qualified doctor of medicine and maintain the personal, confidential relationship between patient and physician. The plans must be organized and operated to provide the greatest possible benefits in medical care to the subscriber.

Medical care plans may be in terms of either cash indemnity or service units, with the understanding that benefits paid in cash are to be used to assist in paying the costs incurred for medical service. The standards also include provisions relative to the actuarial data that are required, systems of accounting, supervision by appropriate State authorities, and periodic checking and reporting of the progress of the plan to the council.

Coincidentally with the announcement of these standards of acceptance there was organized, as a voluntary federation, an organization known as Associated Medical Care Plans, Inc. This independent association will include as members all plans that meet the minimum standard of the council on medical service of the American Medical Association. The Associated Medical Care

Plans will undertake to establish coordination and reciprocity among all of these plans to permit transference of subscribers from one plan to another and use of the benefits in any State in which a subscriber happens to be located. Under this method great industrial organizations with plants in various portions of the United States will be able to secure coverage for all their employees. Moreover, it will be possible for the Veterans' Administration, welfare and industrial groups, and Government agencies to provide coverage for the people in any given area through a system of national enrollment. In addition the Associated Medical Care Plans, Inc., will undertake research and the compilation of statistics on medical care, provide consultation and information services based on the records of existing plans, and engage in a great campaign of public education as to the medical service plan movement under the auspices of State and county medical societies.

The board of trustees of the American Medical Association also announced establishment of a division of prepayment medical-care plans with a director and a staff who will administer the activities related to the promotion and development of medical-care plans in all the States.

In announcing these proposals for a Nation-wide provision of sickness insurance on a mutual nonprofit basis, the board also presented a complete health program with 10 points, which include the development of services in the field of preventive medicine, maternal and child health, voluntary prepayment plans for protection against the costs of sickness, compensation for loss of wages due to illness, the care of the veteran and the development of a high standard of housing, nutrition, clothing, and recreation.

The American Medical Association last June through its board of trustees and council on medical service announced a 14-point program to improve the health and medical-care situation in the United States. In October 1945 the interpretation of these 14 points and methods of implementation were adopted by the council on medical service. In December 1945 the house of delegates approved the whole program, suggested its rearrangement, and directed the board of trustees to keep the program constantly up to date so that it will stay at least even with and, if possible, a step ahead of the needs of the public.

With this in mind the board of trustees has adopted a restatement of the 14-point program, which clarifies still further the position of the American Medical Association on some of these points and brings into the program more definitely maternal and child welfare, medical research, the medical care of the veteran and the part to be played by the voluntary health agencies.

This restatement follows:

"NATIONAL HEALTH PROGRAM OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

"1. The American Medical Association urges a minimum standard of nutrition, housing, clothing, and recreation as fundamental to good health and as an objective to be achieved in any suitable health program. The responsibility for attainment of this standard should be placed as far as possible on the individual, but the application of community effort, compatible with the maintenance of free enterprise, should be encouraged with governmental aid where needed.

"2. The provision of preventive medical services through professionally competent health departments with sufficient staff and equipment to meet community needs is recognized as essential in a health program. The principle of Federal aid through provision of funds or personnel is recognized with the understanding that local areas shall control their own agencies as has been established in the field of education. Health departments should not assume the care of the sick as a function, since administration of medical care under such auspices tends to a deterioration in the quality of the service rendered. Medical care to those unable to provide for themselves is best administered by local and private agencies with the aid of public funds when needed. This program for national health should include the administration of medical care, including hospitalization to all those needing it but unable to pay, such medical care to be provided preferably by a physician of the patient's choice with funds provided by local agencies with the assistance of Federal funds when necessary.

"3. The procedures established by modern medicine for advice to the prospective mother and for adequate care in childbirth should be made available to all at a price that they can afford to pay. When local funds are lacking for the care of those unable to pay, Federal aid should be supplied with the funds administered through local or State agencies.

"4. The child should have throughout infancy proper attention, including scientific nutrition, immunization against preventable disease, and other services included in infant welfare. Such services are best supplied by personal contact between the mother and the individual physician but may be provided through child care and infant welfare stations administered under local auspices with support by tax funds whenever the need can be shown.

"5. The provision of health and diagnostic centers and hospitals necessary to community needs is an essential of good medical care. Such facilities are preferably supplied by local agencies, including the community, church, and trade agencies which have been responsible for the fine development of facilities for medical care in most American communities up to this time. Where such facilities are unavailable and cannot be supplied through local or State agencies, the Federal Government may aid, preferably under a plan which requires that the need be shown and that the community prove its ability to maintain such institutions once they are established (Hill-Burton bill).

"6. A program for medical care within the American system of individual initiative and freedom of enterprise includes the establishment of voluntary nonprofit prepayment plans for the costs of hospitalization (such as the Blue Cross plans) and voluntary nonprofit prepayment plans for medical care (such as those developed by many State and county medical societies). The principles of such insurance contracts should be acceptable to the council on medical service of the American Medical Association and to the authoritative bodies of State medical associations. The evolution of voluntary prepayment insurance against the costs of sickness admits also the utilization of private sickness insurance plans which comply with State regulatory statutes and meet the standards of the council on medical service of the American Medical Association.

"7. A program for national health should include the administration of medical care, including hospitalization, to all veterans, such medical care to be provided preferably by a physician of the veteran's choice, with payment by the Veterans' Administration through a plan mutually agreed on between the State medical association and the Veterans' Administration.

"8. Research for the advancement of medical science is fundamental in any national health program. The inclusion of medical research in a national science foundation, such as proposed in pending Federal legislation, is endorsed.

"9. The services rendered by volunteer philanthropic health agencies such as the American Cancer Society, the National Tuberculosis Association, the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, Inc., and by philanthropic agencies, such as the Commonwealth Fund and the Rockefeller Foundation and similar bodies, have been of vast benefit to the American people and are a natural outgrowth of the system of free enterprise and democracy that prevail in the United States. Their participation in a national health program should be encouraged, and the growth of such agencies when properly administered should be commended.

"10. Fundamental to the promotion of the public health and alleviation of illness are widespread education in the field of health and the widest possible dissemination of information regarding the prevention of disease and its treatment by authoritative agencies. Health education should be considered a necessary function of all departments of public health, medical associations, and school authorities."

During the coming weeks the Council on Medical Service will announce the activities that will be followed toward promoting the prepayment medical-care plan and also the standards of acceptance that have been developed for such plans. The division of prepayment medical-care plans in the headquarters office will soon be active in aiding the development of plans in areas which do not now have them and in coordinating existing plans.

The policies of the association as expressed in the national health program may well suggest to legislators in the Senate and in the House the point of view of the medical profession as to the part that the Federal Government can play in extending necessary medical services to those who do not now have them.

The St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a statement which I made before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations last Friday, February 22, 1946, in which I stressed again the need for the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. Senator HATCH presided at the hearing, the proceedings of which follow:

Senator HATCH. Congressman RABAUT, it is a pleasure to have you with us this afternoon. For the purpose of the record, will you state your full name and the district which you represent?

Representative RABAUT. Senator HATCH, my name is LOUIS C. RABAUT. I am a Member of Congress from Grosse Pointe, Mich. My district includes a good part of Detroit.

I am very happy to come here today to lend my voice to this most worthy proposition. I am happy to see here Senator HATCH, our colleague, who came to Detroit and did much to convince the citizens of our area of the worthiness of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

Senator HATCH. I may say, Congressman RABAUT, as you know, that with all the business around the Capitol here, the other members of the subcommittee are not here because they are all engaged in other committee work this afternoon. It is just impossible to be in two places at the same time.

Representative RABAUT. I am very happy to talk with the cream of the crop.

Senator HATCH. Oh! We thank you, sir. We understand how your represent your district in Congress.

Representative RABAUT. I, too, am chairman of a Subcommittee on Appropriations, and sometimes I sit alone. But for that reason the witnesses receive no less accord. But I shall get into my statement.

THE TASK AHEAD—UTILIZATION OF RESOURCES FOR THE COMMON GOOD

Today, as in other momentous periods in American history, our Nation is faced with a new challenge to make a democracy work through the voluntary cooperation of its citizens. In the war that has just ended, we were able to mobilize our resources of labor, capital, and management through the limitless initiative of our people. The task that we face in the postwar world calls for the mobilization of our resources in men, machines, and money to achieve, for the happiness of our people in peacetime, production, and employment as great as that achieved for the destructive purposes of war. The achievement of this peacetime objective will be an even harder task, for it must and should be accomplished through voluntary democratic processes rather than through wartime measures of compulsion.

The elements of prosperity after the war consist of full production, full employment, the fullest development of our natural resources, and unhindered exchange of goods and services between nations. The main effort must be made by private individuals and firms to create wealth through the common effort of workers, capital, and management. It should be a basic objective of our Government to create the environment in which our private citizens can exercise their initiative to the fullest for the accomplishment of this result.

There are many undertakings which will contribute to the creation of jobs and opportunities which our people must undertake through their Government, by democratic means. An outstanding example of such an undertaking—one which will create new opportunities for manufacturing and trade—is the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project. Legislation concerning this project is now before the Congress.

The joint resolution, which was introduced in both Houses of the Congress on October 2 and is known as the Barkley-Sabath bill, provides for approval of an agreement entered into between the United States and Canada on March 19, 1941, to develop jointly the navigation and power resources of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin.

The fact that international boundary waters are involved, properly brings this development within the scope of the Federal Government. It is not a violation of the principle of private enterprise to insist that the Federal Government undertake this project for the benefit of the people.

THE ST. LAWRENCE PROJECT—A CHALLENGE TO OUR NATIONAL GENIUS

Let me briefly state what this project is, what it will accomplish for our people, and what efforts have been made and are being made to bring about its approval and construction.

We who have lived on the shores of the Great Lakes and its connecting waters have enjoyed the benefits of cheap water transportation over a distance of 1,200 miles from Duluth, Minn., to Ogdensburg, N. Y. It is correct to state that the agricultural and industrial enterprises of the mid-continent of America owe their existence to a large extent to cheap water transportation on these land-locked seas. We have been handicapped, however, by not having direct access to world markets in low-cost, deep-draft, ocean-going vessels. There is a stretch of 113 miles between Ogdensburg, N. Y., and Montreal, Canada, on the St. Lawrence River, where a series of rapids prevents large cargo vessels from entering the Great Lakes. One of the major purposes of the St. Lawrence project is to build dams and canals along this stretch of the St. Lawrence, with the locks necessary to permit ocean-going vessels to travel from Great Lakes ports, such as Buffalo, Cleveland, Toledo, Detroit, Chicago, Milwaukee, and Duluth to foreign ports. It is the aim, also, to enable deep-draft ships to travel between these inland cities and Boston, New York, and other coastal cities in the United States.

These locks and canals will be located at the International Rapids section of northern New York, at the Soulanges Rapids in the Province of Quebec, and at points near the site of the Beauharnois power station and the city of Montreal at the LaChine Rapids.

The Niagara River and Niagara Falls between Lake Erie and Lake Ontario are already bypassed by the Welland Canal, which was completed in 1932 at the expense of the Canadian Government. This canal, as well as the MacArthur lock at the Sault Ste. Marie, have the same dimensions as the proposed St. Lawrence locks and canals. They will form a part of the completed seaway.

In addition to bringing ocean-going vessels into the Great Lakes, the St. Lawrence project, as provided by the agreement of March 19, 1941, between the United States and Canada, contemplates the construction of a power dam at the International Rapids, near Massena, N. Y. This generating plant will have a total capacity of 2,200,000 horsepower, with an annual average output of 13,000,000,000 kilowatt hours. This amount of electricity, which will be obtained from one dam, is greater than the total amount of electricity produced in 1941 by all of the TVA dams together, and is three times as great as the celebrated Dnieper power project in Russia.

This power will be divided equally between the United States and Canada, with appropriate adjustments of costs between the two countries. Provision is made in the pending Barkley-Sabath bill to have public administration of this power by the State of New York, with the condition that the interests of other neighboring States will be protected. Thus, the people of Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Connecticut, as well as the 13,000,000 people in New York State, can benefit through low-cost power supplied from the St. Lawrence River.

In the Middle West, our interest, of course, is essentially in the seaway. I mention the power project because it has a direct bearing upon the seaway, insofar as the users of power will assume and pay for a substantial portion of the cost of the project. To the extent that the power will be a self-liquidating part of the project, this contribution will reduce the total cost of the seaway.

As an engineering enterprise, this project is even more challenging than Grand Coulee on the Columbia River. As an economic undertaking, it is as promising of great benefits as TVA and the Panama Canal combined.

IT IS READY—LET'S TURN A SPADE AND BUILD IT

The St. Lawrence project has been repeatedly surveyed and studied from the point of view of both engineering and economic feasibility ever since 1895. The right to utilize the waters of the St. Lawrence River has been a public issue ever since 1896, when private groups became interested in developing power. Public interest in its development has been constant since the administration of Woodrow Wilson in the First World War.

Not only is the project deemed feasible from an engineering point of view by eminent international engineers, but the blueprints for its construction have already been prepared. Today the St. Lawrence project stands as one of the few projects in the Nation ready to be put into construction as soon as the United States Congress and the Canadian Parliament approve it. This is an important consideration, because the St. Lawrence project can be ready to provide useful and productive jobs for many of our boys as they return from overseas.

FROM BLUEPRINT TO BULLDOZERS

Over a period of five decades, numerous studies and reports have been presented by the International Joint Commission and especially appointed Canadian-American joint boards of engineers. The most extensive and definite studies were those of 1920, 1926, and 1941.

The economic phases of the St. Lawrence project have also been thoroughly canvassed by the International Joint Commission in 1920, by the Department of Commerce under Herbert Hoover in 1926, by the Interdepartmental Board of 1934, and the most definitive study of all, by the Department of Commerce under Jesse Jones in 1941. These studies conclusively prove that the navigation, as well as the power phase of the St. Lawrence project, will be of great national benefit.

On the diplomatic front the first official steps, looking toward initiation of action by Canada and the United States for the construction of a deep waterway were undertaken 30 years ago. Interrupted by the First World War, it was not until 1919 that the International Joint Commission, established under the boundary waters treaty of 1909, started extensive inquiry throughout the country. The Commission reported favorably on the project in 1921.

In the administrations of President Coolidge and President Hoover, the issue was kept alive, and finally President Hoover succeeded in concluding a treaty with the Canadian Government. This treaty was submitted to the Senate in November 1932. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee held extensive hearings from November 1932 to February 1933. An overwhelming majority of the committee recommended the approval of the treaty.

Through various parliamentary tactics the opposition succeeded in delaying a vote on the project for over a year, until March 1934, when a majority of the Senators voted for ratification, but the treaty did not receive the necessary two-thirds vote.

The opposition then, as now, came from the port cities of the Atlantic and Gulf coasts and from the eastern railroads and utilities, using, of course, their affiliations in other parts of the country. It was a tragedy that the project was not constructed during the depression decade of 1930 so that it would have been ready when the national emergency arose in 1940.

It was not until March 1941 that a new agreement was signed, at a time when the country was already upon the threshold of war. By that time it had already become obvious that all the arguments against the project in 1933 and 1934 had proved groundless, that we were faced with a transportation shortage and deficiency of power to meet the demands of war. In the course of the extensive hearings held by the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors during the summer of 1941, even the opposition admitted that the project would have been of substantial advantage to the defense program if it had been authorized in 1934 and constructed in the intervening period.

Practically the whole Cabinet and most of the principal officials of defense agencies appeared before the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors urging immediate construction of the St. Lawrence project as a national measure of first importance. Among those who endorsed the project were Secretary of

War Henry Stimson, Secretary of Navy Frank Knox, War Production Director William Knudsen, Deputy Chief of United States Engineers Maj. Gen. Thomas M. Robins, and Secretary of Commerce Jesse Jones.

Two weeks later this country was plunged into war. It was not possible, therefore, to undertake this great project. Fortunately, President Roosevelt had the foresight to authorize the United States Corps of Engineers to prepare the engineering designs. The blueprints are ready. The country is now waiting for Congress to act. Let us give the Army engineers the green light so that they can convert the blueprints into cement and mortar. Let us get out of the way of our men and machines so that the returning veterans and war workers and the surplus steam shovels and bulldozers can get to work on the greatest construction job in the world.

THE BARKLEY-SABATH RESOLUTION POINTS THE WAY

Joint resolutions have been introduced by Majority Leader BARKLEY in the Senate and by Judge SABATH and my colleague Congressman DINGELL in the House. These measures have bipartisan support and represent the effort of this Government to fulfill the obligations entered into by signing the Canadian-American Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin agreement of March 19, 1941.

President Truman in his message to the Congress on October 3 urged speedy enactment of this legislation so that work may start at the earliest possible time. He pointed out that the development of similar water resources had shortened the war by many months—even years, and saved countless American lives. The atomic bomb itself which did so much to end the war with Japan was made possible to a large extent by utilization of a large amount of electricity from the Tennessee and Columbia Rivers. He said also:

"The St. Lawrence seaway will make it possible to utilize our war-expanded factories and shipping facilities in the development of international economic cooperation and enlarging world commerce. New and increasing opportunities for production and employment by private enterprise can be expected from this cheap water transportation."

The power resources of the St. Lawrence River will be available for distribution within a radius of 300 miles. This will include most of New York State and New England. President Truman said: "By development of our natural water-power resources, we can look forward with certainty to greater use of electricity in the home, in the factory, and on the farm. * * * This will mean more jobs, more income, and a higher standard of living."

When President Roosevelt said these things the opposition immediately jumped up and said this is "Roosevelt's pet project" and shouted just another boondoggle, or another TVA. This was the theme song for 10 years whenever the subject was brought up in spite of the fact that President Coolidge as early as 1923 considered this project and I quote: "A capital investment which will be reproductive, as evinced by the marked increase in revenue from the Panama Canal. Upon these projects depends much future industrial and agricultural progress."

And when Herbert Hoover signed the Canadian-American Treaty of 1932, he said:

"The signing of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Waterway Treaty marks another step forward in this, the greatest internal improvement yet undertaken on the North American Continent."

Then he continued:

"Its completion will have a profoundly favorable effect upon the development of agriculture and industry throughout the Midwest. The large byproduct of power will benefit the Northeast. * * * The project is of first importance to the whole continent."

AN ALL-AMERICAN JOB

This is not a New Deal, nor a Democratic, nor a Republican project. It is an American job; the greatest constructive project of the continent. The United States and Canada should be proud to undertake it. It is a project that belongs to the whole of North America. And President Truman in strongly endorsing the subject is not speaking for any one section of the country, for Missouri, Michigan, Massachusetts, New York, or any other single part. He is speaking for the whole of the United States of America when he says:

"One of the great constructive projects of the North American Continent, in fact, one of the great projects of the world, which was delayed by the exigencies of war, is the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

"For 50 years the United States and Canada under both Republican and Democratic administrations, under Liberal and Conservative governments, have envisioned the development of the project together, as a joint enterprise.

"Every engineering investigation during the past 50 years, every economic study in the past 25 years, has found the project feasible and economically desirable. The case has been proved; the plans are ready."

THIS IS WHAT WE GET

Let me summarize briefly the things that this great project will do for our country:

1. Through the supply of cheap electricity, it will help the development of new industries in New York and New England States, thereby providing employment, purchasing power, and a higher standard of living to almost a quarter of the population of the United States, which gives the best market for the products of the rest of the country.

2. It will provide low-cost, deep-water transportation from the farms and factories of the Middle West to the markets of the world.

3. It will bring the States bordering Lake Huron, Lake Erie, and Lake Ontario nearer to Europe by water in comparison with present routes via the north Atlantic ports.

4. It will bring cheap water transportation to and from the Great Lakes cities and the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coasts.

5. It will reduce other land transportation costs competitively, thereby increasing total traffic for both rail and water carriers.

6. As a result of greater industrial activity and greater transportation service, it will increase the market for coal.

7. It will protect the steel industry in the Great Lakes area against the possibility of obsolescence due to exhaustion of iron ore reserves in the Lake Superior region.

8. It will generally tend to check monopoly and to induce lower prices of products produced and consumed in the Middle West as well as on the Atlantic coast with the result that the public will be able to buy more and industries will expand production and will have more jobs to give.

No other country in the world would hesitate to develop such a great resource. Soon we shall have to decide in the Congress the amount of financial aid we must give to other countries and the sums will be large. A substantial part of those sums will be spent abroad in the development of just such projects as the St. Lawrence. On the rivers of Europe and Asia, on the Danube, the Volga, the Yangtze, and many other streams of the world, American money and technology will be used to develop waterways and power. And we must admit it is the best kind of use to which they can put their available manpower and the resources they borrow from us, for the improvement of the standard of living of those people is our best chance of peace in the future.

But we would be willfully deficient in foresight if we gave our resources to the development of rivers in other countries, while we declined to take advantage of our great opportunities on this continent. The chance of survival in a world ill at ease is through the development of our natural resources, out manpower, and our technology to the utmost.

LET US ALL PULL FOR THE U. S. A.

In the many years that I have been in Congress, I have supported projects far away from my home State. I have voted for TVA, I have voted for the Columbia River development, I have voted for improvements in California, Texas, Alabama, Georgia, New York, Michigan—all over the country, because I felt that this is all my country, just as it is yours, and any improvement in any part of it is a national asset which we should all cherish without sectionalism.

I appeal to my colleagues in Congress to support this great undertaking which has been proposed by both Democratic and Republican administrations for over 20 years. When the St. Lawrence seaway is completed and in use, we shall be proud that we had a part in creating one of the greatest projects built by mankind.

Senator HATCH. You know, during the years of my life spent in the practice of law, in the trial of cases I always liked to conclude a case, especially if the jury was going out over the week end, with one strong witness. I think you were well chosen by the proponents of this resolution to close their case this afternoon.

General Anders Gives Lie to Soviet Accusations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article printed in the New York Times on February 18, 1946. It is an interview with Gen. Wladyslaw Anders, the heroic leader of the Second Polish Corps, which covered itself with glory during the Italian campaign and won the praise of all the free world when it stormed the slopes of Monte Cassino. General Anders and his soldiers—our undaunted allies—were recently chosen by Soviet Russia and its Polish quislings, such as the notorious Oscar Lange, the so-called Ambassador of Poland in this country, for a target of vicious attacks.

Here is the answer of a brave soldier—not a quisling, like the so-called Ambassador Lange:

GENERAL ANDERS SCORNS RUSSIAN CHARGE THAT POLES IN ITALY MENACE PEACE—PUTS NUMBER OF TROOPS AT 107,000, SAYS THEY GET ALONG WELL WITH ITALIANS AND NOTES THAT THEY FOUGHT FOR FREEDOM

ROME, February 17.—Gen. Wladyslaw Anders, commanding the Polish forces here, ridiculed Russia's charges that his army was a menace to world peace, and he declared in an interview here today that Poland was helpless in the Russian grip. His people are ready to return to Poland, he said, "when Poland is free and ruled by Poles." But not before.

Opposing the idea that the Allies might ship them to Poland willy-nilly, to be dealt

with as the Warsaw Government saw fit, General Anders said:

"We want to be free in Poland just as Americans are in America and the English in England."

Scoffing at the Russian accusation in the United Nation Security Council that Polish troops here are "a possible future threat to peace" and are "aggressive and ostensibly threatening," he asked:

"I wonder who is preparing for war? The 107,000 Poles of the Second Corps or the millions of Russians? Is it one Polish corps of eight brigades, scattered from Udine to Gallipoli (in the extreme south of Italy), that is a danger to the world or is preparing for war?"

CITES WORK OF TROOPS

General Anders said many of his troops were required to serve only on alternate days and that 10,000 of them had been detached for study in civilian schools.

"How could maneuvers be carried out with troops on such short notice?" he asked. He said the troops were occupied chiefly with guarding stores and maintaining bases.

There are 1,000,000 Russians in Poland either in Polish uniform, in ostensibly Polish units or dressed as civilians, General Anders said, all there on the pretext that they are necessary to help the Government keep order.

Asked about the accusation that he organized or directed a terrorist organization against the Warsaw Government, General Anders said, "That is idiotic."

Speaking excellent French, General Anders expressed himself quitely and calmly but with force and with evident deep feeling.

"Does any real Pole want any more Polish blood to flow?" He asked. "We have been accused by the Warsaw Government of dropping weapons and ammunition from the air to terrorists in Poland. If anybody did that it would not be us because even if you suppose we wished to do it we have no aircraft. The charge is ridiculous."

When it was suggested that some compromise must be found to allow their return home, General Anders said:

"Compromise depends on politicians. I am a soldier, but I know the answer must be found in Moscow, not Warsaw. Three-fourths of those directing Poland now are Russian citizens, not Poles.

"We do not want to stay somewhere else. We want to return to Poland—when Poland is free and ruled by Poles. We ask only, as I said, to be free in Poland as Americans are in America."

RELATIONS WITH ITALIANS

General Anders said that in addition to his forces totaling 107,000 there were probably ten or fifteen thousand civilian Poles scattered through Italy and the Middle East who were unwilling to return under present conditions. Of foreign reports mentioned here that Poles were causing trouble in Italy with the Italians, particularly Italian Communists, he said relations were excellent and that any occasional quarrels were individual disputes. He accused some of the Communists of trying to provoke trouble, but he said the best proof of the general attitude was that in Ancona, where he has his headquarters, the local government was headed by a Communist but it had made him honorary citizen.

The same is true in Bologna, where the mayor and deputy mayor are also Communists, he continued. The Fifth Polish Division at Forli has just received a "flag of honor" from the Communist mayor there, he added.

"My men have strict orders not to mix in politics and offenders are severely punished," said the general. "They are free to read any propaganda they wish from the Warsaw Government, and every man is completely free to leave if he wishes."

He said a total of 15,000 of his troops had returned to Poland but that many had made their way back to Italy after seeing the situation in Poland, although the return was extremely difficult.

General Anders declared that there was a false impression abroad that his people represented the middle class or wealthy land owners.

Child Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Washington Post, dated February 20, 1946, on child care, as follows:

CHILD CARE

The closing of child-care centers in the District will work a severe hardship—and a wholly senseless one—upon the mothers and the children who have made use of them during the war. The centers are now financed under a Federal Works Agency fund which will expire at the end of this month. A mother's committee on child care has petitioned the District Commissioners to seek a deficiency appropriation with which to keep the centers in operation for the balance of this fiscal year, that is, until June 30. And they have presented a constructive, practical proposal for the payment of operation costs by those who can afford to do so—public funds to be supplied only to enable the attendance of children whose mothers cannot pay. But the Commissioners have rejected this proposal out of hand, without affording the mothers even a public hearing. They have rejected it, moreover, for as silly a set of reasons as has ever been put on record by a public body.

The Commissioners are reported to have objected to the proposal on the ground that it would amount to a State subsidy to mothers to leave their children for the day and go to work. The Nazi view that women should be confined to Kirche, Kinder, Kueche seems to have found exponents over here. Commissioner Guy Mason, with what seems to us shocking obtuseness if not callousness, told reporters that any mothers who, by working, would be the sole support of their children, could stay home and apply for the program of aid to dependent children—which would allow an average monthly grant of $65.67. That these centers have social utility in themselves and afford advantages to the children as well as to their mothers does not seem even to have entered the consideration of the Commissioners.

The children themselves are greatly benefited by the experience of association with other children and by the constructive guidance of teachers skilled in child care. The time spent in these centers no more deprives them of the advantages of home life than the time spent by older children in the public schools. We believe, indeed, that the child-care program should eventually be made a regular part of the public-school system on a voluntary basis. We should have healthier and better-developed children as a result. But in any case the limited child-care program now in operation should be continued as a matter of urgent need. The mothers desiring it deserve at the very least an open hearing on the part of the Commissioners. It is apparent that the Commissioners have a good deal to learn.

A Little Fellow Writes to His President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Tremon D. McDermott, a small businessman in Detroit, has written an open letter to the President. I feel that Mr. McDermott is representative of thousands of others who, although inarticulate, are seeking leadership in these critical days and are turning to our President.

In a Democratic administration they see the hope for a stable economy where in even the little fellow can live in peace and prosper in accordance with his own efforts.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including this letter, which speaks for itself. It first appeared in the Detroit Democratic News under date of February 22, 1946:

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am just a little fellow who can be just as fair as Benjamin F. Fair-less, president of the United States Steel Corporation, who wrote you a letter and published it as a full page advertisement in the Detroit newspapers recently during the early days of the big strike.

I am just a little fellow, a small businessman like you were in Kansas City before destiny picked you to save America in the greatest labor crisis of all time.

You, Mr. President, know what it means even to go broke in a little business; you know the heartaches and the headaches of all the other little fellows in our country.

As a little fellow, I buy and sell automobiles, used cars and new ones when I can get them. I live in Highland Park, a small community in the big city of Detroit, where people pray, take a shot now and then, and play poker; you know what I mean. We are doing more praying now than asking for college degrees.

I am a little fellow too in politics. I hold a job as a deputy court commissioner—just a little job. In court I am a nonpartisan, on the car lot I am a Democrat. I am chairman of the New Democracy Committee, successor of the New Deal, declared dead by our late President Roosevelt in one of his campaign speeches. We want to build the kind of a new democracy our boys fought for over there.

I, Mr. President, am still a little fellow; you, called by providence, have become a big fellow. But you, Mr. President, are still a little fellow at heart. You are still another one of all of us. We trust you. We are men and women of faith, great faith in God and country.

The hot heads of big business and the hot pants of union labor, now in a finish life-and-death fight, turn to us little fellows for sympathy and support. We little fellows are afraid of both the reactionaries and the radicals in both groups.

But, Mr. President, we are not afraid of you. You are one of our school of thought, humanity first, profits second. Why do you not turn to us in this hour of peril.

You have asked the American people to unite for prosperity. We need a little clarification. Let us be a little more specific on

who shall unite and for whose prosperity. Kerosene and water do not mix. Neither do big shots and little shots.

Why not appeal direct to us little fellows to unite for the good of all?

The small steel maker, the small producer of food products, the small manufacturer, the small businessman, the independent-thinking little fellows of America believe in the good-neighl or policy of cooperation and our country's peaceful way of life.

We little fellows here in Detroit, sitting on the hottest seats in the world today, both Democrats and Republicans, appeal to you, Mr. President, to become the Commander in Chief of the little fellows of the Nation. May we suggest Mr. President, that you pass on the details of the mobilization to the Patman committee of the House of Representatives, the only friend, we believe, we have left in Congress.

Giants, battling in the forest of doubt, reverting to cave-man tactics will never drop the clubs, either for God or country. We little fellows, by united effort, can talk in the language of the savages, overwhelm them both and tie them to the nearest tree.

Who won the war? The GI Joes. Who can win the peace? The Joe Doakes.

Respectfully yours,

TREMON D. MCDERMOTT.

Senator Mead Opposes St. Lawrence Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following which is an address by Senator JAMES M. MEAD, of New York, delivered before the Labor and Industry Committee of New York State, covering the opposition to the St. Lawrence project, which meeting was held at New York City on February 25, 1946. In his address the distinguished junior Senator from New York clearly and forcefully sets forth the bases of his objections to the proposed St. Lawrence project. The address is as follows:

Mr. Chairman and friends, in the past you have heard from speakers who have represented the views of labor, those who have spoken for the shipping, or the railroad interests, and from the point of view of the manufacturer. I desire to speak to you today from the viewpoint of the legislator who looks to the hearings, to the debates, and to the record for the facts and for the justification of the proposals before him for determination. The record, to him, is like the testimony or the evidence before the judge or the jury. The legislator cannot be expected to be intimately acquainted, from the point of view of experience, with the problems that affect each industry of the community he serves. But he can and must familiarize himself with the information that is presented to the legislative body to which he belongs.

In the matter of the St. Lawrence seaway, the record is voluminous, of long standing and it has been presented to the National Legislature on several occasions. On July 18, 1932, the Governments of the United States and Canada signed at Washington, the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Waterway Treaty, providing for the construction of a 27-foot waterway. This treaty was referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and extensive hearings were held during 1933. After these hearings the treaty was reported favorably and considered on the floor of the Senate for a considerable period of time when it was finally voted upon. The treaty was rejected by the Senate in March of 1934 by a vote of 46 to 42, and therefore not approved by the Senate because it lacked the necessary two-thirds vote.

Next, an agreement was entered into between the United States and Canada dated March 19, 1941. This agreement provided for the conclusion of the seaway and power project. Because it was submitted in the form of an agreement instead of a treaty, the matter was referred to the Senate Commerce Committee in the Senate, but no action was taken by that committee on the agreement.

On September 28, 1943 Senator AIKEN introduced in the Senate (S. 1385), a bill to approve the agreement which was entered into on March 19, 1941. This bill was referred to the Commerce Committee of the Senate, and the committee held extensive hearings. The hearings were confined primarily to the constitutional issue of whether the agreement should be submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification as in the case of a treaty. Although no formal report was made by the committee, the committee was of the opinion that the matter properly constituted a treaty instead of an argument and that therefore it should be considered by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee instead of the Commerce Committee. However, an effort was made to bring about the approval of the 1941 agreement through an amendment from the floor of the Senate on a pending rivers and harbors bill. This amendment was defeated on December 12, 1944 by a vote of 56 to 25 and thus the agreement was rejected.

Now a further effort is being made to secure the approval of the 1941 agreement by the introduction of Senate Joint Resolution 104, provision being made in this resolution for excepting from the approval of Congress certain articles of the 1941 agreement, and this resolution has been referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee where hearings are now under way.

Last week the proponents of Senate Joint Resolution 104 were heard by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee while the opponents are being heard this week.

While there are two strongly supported sides to this vital and important question contained in the record, there is considerable evidence presented by reputable witnesses and from reliable sources indicating that the seaway will adversely affect the railroads, the canal systems, especially the rail and waterways of our State the great ports of Buffalo and Albany as well as the greatest of all ports, that of greater New York. There is evidence in the record that it will likewise leave a blight upon the communities of the southern Tier, those along our barge canal system and also those communities whose futures depend upon the big centers of population that will be adversely affected by this legislation.

There is evidence in the record from the spokesmen of the shipping lines on our Great Lakes to the effect that their industry will be crippled by the cheap competition of alien tramp steamers which will compete with them for available traffic. Not only will the fleets that ply the Great Lakes and those that navigate our barge canal system suffer from this competition, but the seamen who man these ships and whose wage standards and working conditions are in keeping with American standards and practices, will find themselves sharing their seasonal employment with the underpaid and overworked seamen employed on foreign flag ships. There are to be found in the record also, statements made by representatives of the power authority of our State. There are likewise to be found, resolutions adopted by our legislative body memorializing the Congress on this subject.

Many spokesmen have been heard who presented their views as to the position taken by our State on this vital question. It is my opinion that a fair and reasonable review of the entire record as it pertains to the policy which our State has adopted, will make it abundantly clear that the State, over the years, has favored the power project, while opposing the seaway.

Naturally, there are to be found men in public office who favor the seaway, as well as those who are pronounced in their opposition to it. But the State policy I have in mind is that which has received the approval of our legislative body when called upon to speak for the people, when resolutions concerning the seaway were before them for action. In the debates upon this question before the Senate of the United States in 1934, the question of separating the power from the seaway was raised and it is my opinion that if the separation had been agreed upon at that time it would, in the end, have unquestionably received the Senate approval.

In the hearings and debates on the legislation creating the power authority in our State, the question of power development was the one question that was emphasized. Because the record with reference to power development is clear, and because I have made my position known time and again in support of power development, I shall discuss with you that portion of the measure which involves the question of transportation.

Under present circumstances we have a surplus of transportation in our State. Our systems of transportation, highways, airways, waterways, and railways, for the most part, radiate from the great port of New York to the principal cities and shipping points of our State and neighboring States. During the war when the air lines, barge canal lines, and highway transportation systems were unable because of material, equipment, and manpower shortages, to make their fullest contribution to the carrying of our heavy wartime traffic, the great burden of the task was placed upon our railroads. You are all familiar with the situation. The Federal Government requisitioned the airships. Maritime workers, along with their ships and barges, were taken from the lakes and canals to duty elsewhere. Shortages of gasoline, tires, or automotive parts all had their effect upon wartime traffic problems. However, and with all the changes and restrictions and shortages, our transportation systems, mainly the railroads, carried the unusually heavy load of traffic throughout the days of the war.

At times they piled up so much traffic along our ocean ports that cargo ships were unable to carry the goods away, with the result that new storage depots and holding points had to be established to store freight while it was held up awaiting shipping facilities. If our canal system had the ships and the manpower it could have carried 50 percent more traffic than it did. If our highway systems had the material, the equipment, and the manpower they too would have taken some of the traffic carried by the rail lines. If we had the air lines and the plants to produce more airships the railroads' task would have been lightened considerably.

Today conditions are vastly different. The remarkable advances made in science and in engineering will make it possible for each system of transportation to carry an ever-increasing volume of freight and passenger

traffic. The railroads, with modern lightweight equipment, with Diesel-electric or steam turbines or electric locomotives, can haul from 20 to 30 percent more traffic than was the case before the war. Our air lines are expanding rapidly throughout the State and throughout the globe. New lines and additional schedules are being added at brief intervals to the existing system. Experts have predicted that there will be 500,000 planes of all types in the air within the next 10 years. The Federal Government constructed thousands of airports during the war and they have already authorized the expenditure of billions of dollars on new airports, to be constructed as rapidly as conditions permit.

The volume of freight, of express, of mail, and of passengers that will travel by air will increase amazingly and continuously with each succeeding month. For the most part, these lines, whether they be intrastate, interstate, or international, radiate out of the great international metropolis of the world, the city of New York. The highway system, with magnificent throughways as well as four and even six-lane freight and passenger highways, will become a reality in the very near future.

New, modern, palatial passenger buses are being manufactured. Strong, powerful, lightweight trucks are on the assembly lines and here again the Federal and the State governments have appropriated billions of dollars for the construction of highways throughout the country. Our highways will compete with every other system in these postwar days for their full share of the load.

New York, of all the States, preserved its waterways. In fact, we even expanded and enlarged our canal system until today, and again radiating out of New York we have a barge-canal system connecting New York with Oswego on Lake Ontario and with Buffalo on Lake Erie. In addition, we have a canal system between Albany and Montreal. From New York to Albany the system is a seaway capable of accommodating ocean-going vessels.

The advances in the development of ships of all types urgently required for military purposes is one of the most constructive chapters of the Nation's war-production effort. Here, great progress is evident. Amphibious boats, landing craft, and small sea-going cargo ships are to revolutionize shipping on our inland rivers and canals. Ships to carry cargo from Great Lake cities to the Atlantic seaboard ports, to Gulf ports, and even to foreign ports are a reality now. These ships will very readily navigate the waters of the Great Lakes, the barge canal, and the Hudson River. Experts tell us that the LST-type of landing craft will take on and deliver cargo, including truck trailers, with or without the convenience of docks and port facilities. This type of ship will reactivate our canal system and increase its carrying capacity tremendously. Amphibious craft, we are told, will save time and costs where bridges and ferrys and long-distance runs are required under present-day conditions.

Proposals have already been made by an Albany transportation company for the purchase of surplus ships of these types. The Ford Motor Corp. is already equipped with cargo carriers capable of navigating the Lakes, the canals, and the Atlantic seaboard. Engineers employed in the designing of small ships tell us that we are on the threshold of the greatest advance in this field of transportation.

With all these improvements in rail, air, land, and water transportation, we will double our maximum transportation carrying capacity within the next few years. With the coming of this intensified competition, with bigger power units, and lighter though stronger equipment, transportation costs will come down and all the traffic from the Great Lakes area will be carried to the sea, most of it to the Port of New York, more speedily, more economically, than ever before. Traffic will be carried over our State systems without that seasonal interruption that will close the St. Lawrence solidly for 5 months in every year. When winter comes and we lay up part of our inland fleet and use the rest perhaps in the Hudson, in the Sound, and in the coastwise trade, our rail, air, and highway systems, if financially sound and equipped with modern equipment, will carry the winter's traffic from the West into the great Port of New York without difficulty.

There are therefore two thoughts that I would like to leave with you. One is the question of the character and the nature of the competition, the seaway will give to these existing systems of our State that now carry the traffic. The other is this—is it necessary for us, under present-day conditions, to bring in that outside competition or would it be better for us to give full play and encouragement to the vast expansion and improvement in the systems that now serve our community and our State. If encouraged they will spend millions on new equipment. If not, they will find themselves where they were before the war.

Congress has already authorized the expenditure of billions of our taxpayers' dollars for improvements in our airways, our highways, and our waterways—all of which will not only add immensely to our traffic-carrying capacity, but will likewise present a problem in competition for our own railroads to meet.

During the war, great reliance was placed upon the railroads of the country. They carried to the ports of embarkation our fighting men, their equipment, and their matériel. Without the railroads, we are told by our military leaders, we could not have won the war. The strain under which the railroads labored left their equipment and the roadbeds in need of repairs. They must rebuild their plant at great expense to them. While doing so they must continue to pay huge sums in taxes to our State, our cities, and to every tiny hamlet through which they run.

With the realization of our absolute dependence upon our railroads in time of national emergency, we must maintain them, either through profitable operations or by means of Government subsidy. If the cream of the summer's traffic is taken from them and routed through the St. Lawrence, they will be left with the less profitable traffic of the winter season when the St. Lawrence is frozen over. If the tramp steamers of other nations are to bring into our Great Lakes ports British and Russian coal as ballast, then no longer will the railroads haul the profitable train loads of coal from our mines to our Great Lakes ports. If the seaway carries the remarkable tonnage its advocates prophecy for it, then the railroads along with the waterways and the highways of our State will suffer from this new competition. If the high standards that characterize employment on our systems were not at stake, the competition would not prove as threatening as it does. The compensating prophesies of the enthusiastic advocates of the seaway, which include the building of a great industrial empire along the banks of the St. Lawrence, might be considered, if it were not for the fact that the project will be closed down for 5 months of the year, that we already have a surplus of shipping, and that science and engineering are about to give us new materials and new equipment that will modify the practices of the past. There may come a time in the future when engineering experts will be able to justify the seaway, but at this critical juncture of our history, in these hopeful days of reconstruction, with new methods, new plans, new systems to promote and to apply, I cannot give my support to the seaway proposal in the pending measure.

H. R. 5559

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include my radio broadcast put on the air over radio station WMAM, Marinette, Wis., February 24, 1946; WSOO, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., February 26, 1946; and to be broadcast over WDBC, Escanaba, Mich., February 27, 1946:

Last Friday, on Washington's Birthday, I introduced the following bill, H. R. 5559, and on which I have been assured by several members of the Military Affairs Committee, to which it was referred, I may hope to get some early action. I want to read it to you at this time:

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the people of the United States of America recognize that the officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States, who were serving in the Philippine Islands, Wake, Guam, Java, and other western Pacific and Asiatic Ocean areas on December 7, 1941, were called upon to make sacrifices above and beyond the ordinary call of duty, without hope of relief or succor, in order to gain time during which the United States could prepare to meet the attack of its enemies.

"SEC. 2. The President is authorized and directed to cause to be designed and struck an appropriate medal with suitable emblems and devices for presentation to each officer and enlisted man within the category described in section (1) of this act.

"SEC. 3. That each officer and enlisted man within the category described in section (1) of this act and who later was taken prisoner by the enemy shall be entitled, upon discharge from the armed forces, relief from active duty, or retirement according to law to receive a pension for life equal to 25 percent of the total pay and allowances, including extra pay for various types of extra hazardous duty heretofore authorized by law, received by such person at the time of discharge, relief from active duty, or retirement: *Provided*, That this section shall not be construed to reduce any pension, retirement pay, or disability benefit otherwise payable under any law: *And provided further*, That the pension provided herein shall be in addition to any pension, retirement pay, or disability benefit which such person may receive under the provisions of any other law.

"SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated from any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act."

I think it is an excellent bill and one that should have been thought of long ago. Of course, a number of bills have been heretofore introduced to grant raises in pay and raises in rank to all of those who were the heroes of Bataan, Corregidor, Wake, Guam, and other places in the Pacific, but, so far as I have been able to determine, this is the first bill that will provide permanent lifetime pensions for those who suffered so grossly at the hands of the Japanese in their inhuman prison camps and who underwent such ordeals as the famous death march on Bataan. I was surprised to learn that no special decoration nor insignia nor service ribbon had been prescribed for those heroes of the Pacific and certainly no pension had been awarded to them. The fact of the matter is that while many of those heroes have moderately well recovered, nevertheless some

of them are so permanently injured physically that they will be unlikely in the future to be able to do a real day's work in competition with those who did not undergo their suffering, and I feel that all of us as taxpayers owe them a debt of gratitude and therefore a commensurable lifetime pension. In my opinion, the pension should be higher than I have specified, but we must regard practical politics as it is and the fact that our Treasury is already some $300,000,000,000 in debt, which debt can only be retired by all of us, including those heroes of Bataan themselves.

I am hopeful of getting favorable action by the House Military Affairs Committee on this proposal of mine and assure you that I shall likewise do everything I can to prosecute it through to successful passage in the House and in the Senate because I sincerely believe that our heroes of the Pacific, stranded as they were due to a policy adopted in the White House that our emergency aid should go to the European front, rather than to the Pacific, realized in advance that their task was hopeless and that they were expendable.

Recently I received a letter from a very close friend of mine, one of our ministers back in the district, who believes that we are headed for militarism in this country. I firmly believe that we are not and I also firmly believe that the American people will never stand for a militaristic government in this country. As I told you last week, on my trip recently through Colorado—where I visited the Army Ordnance Depot near Pueblo, Colo., it was refreshing indeed to see that we are keeping our powder dry and we are ready for any eventuality. I feel, however, that the international situation at present does not necessarily call for a continuation of the Selective Service Act nor will the Congress be likely to pass any compulsory military training bill. I believe that it is, however, within the power of the Congress and with the full approval of the American people, to make permanent—or even temporary—service in the standing Army and in the standing Navy of this postwar world advantageous enough to bring about enough enlistments to make the other compulsory service unnecessary.

When one talks about a desire to impose militarism on this country, I think he is not possessed of facts. I have talked to far too many high officers to believe that they have any desire or any aim to impose such militarism on this Nation. As a matter of fact, most of those to whom I have talked are themselves very anxious to get out of uniform and return to private life. As I have said repeatedly on these broadcasts, with the postwar expanded Army which is necessary there are far from enough so-called professional soldiers of officer's rank in any category to fill the demand. Therefore, it is very likely that any of these professional officers will not suffer an appreciable loss of rank or loss of pay. Therefore, there is no reason whatsoever why they should be trying to increase the peacetime size of our armed forces. They, themselves, are taken care of in advance anyway. Furthermore, the vast majority of those officers with whom I have talked would prefer to handle voluntarily enlisted men rather than those who have been conscripted through the Selective Service Act—or even to train those who might be drafted for a so-called compulsory military training program which, let us not forget, specifically provides that those boys are to be in training only and are not in any sense of the word considered to be active members of the armed forces of this Nation. In other words, those particular boys are in most instances being dragged from their homes, firesides, and schoolrooms and their education and home life is being interrupted and, therefore, they are not inclined to voluntarily accept the training, discipline, and routine of Army life. Therefore, their officers, themselves, realizing this, are not as keen to impress the same amount of discipline, the same amount of routine and training as they would on the part of those who have voluntarily selected the armed forces as their life and who naturally expect to be subjected to real Army and Navy life without question.

There is another phase of this military picture that I want to discuss with you today before I close. As far back as the middle of 1944 and on several occasions since then over these broadcasts and in my weekly news letters I have warned returning servicemen to be very careful to see to it that their discharge papers were accurately in order before they sign on the dotted line. We all know that when the men were being discharged after World War I there were a tremendous amount of inaccuracies in their service records and then as the years rolled by and these men sought to receive benefits under the Veterans' Administration they were constantly faced with these inaccurate records and had to establish service-connected disability before they could be hospitalized by the Veterans' Administration—and they had to establish various other things before they could receive just compensation from the Government.

My secretary for veteran affairs, former Staff Sergeant Alvin Christopherson, who spends all of his time in my office working on veterans' problems, tells me that the same thing is happening again after this war. We, of course, knew that was going to happen because naturally the boys wanted to get home and their parents wanted them home and, in fact, there was a tremendous national hysteria created by the desire to demobilize and in my opinion we did so at too fast a rate. It is my firm opinion that the Army and Navy did their best to speed demobilization in every way. It also is my firm belief that they tried their best to rapidly and yet, at the same time, sufficiently train the personnel in charge with the demobilization routine to accurately fill out the necessary discharge papers. However, the fact remains, as I have repeatedly stressed heretofore, that it was up to the veteran himself to carefully read over his discharge papers and his service record and before signing same and marching on down the line, making sure that they were accurate. Well, the fact of the matter remains, as I said a few moments ago, that was not done and now our office is literally swamped with what we realize is but the very first wave of an ensuing deluge to get these papers corrected in order that the veterans may receive their full benefits in years to come. Mr. Christopherson tells me, for instance, that just the other day we received a letter from one of our veterans requesting that I have his discharge certificate corrected to show that he was single instead of married. The lad never had been married and yet he had signed his discharge paper to the effect that he was married. Other requests come in to ask us to have their papers corrected to show the correct enlistment and discharge dates. Then others want us to show that their correct campaign record be set forth. In other words, corrections of all sorts are requested—all of which proves that the veterans are altogether in too much of a hurry to get released and they are too ready to sign on the dotted line without taking the trouble to look over their records and make sure that they are in order. Or maybe they take it for granted I can clear the discharge waters for them.

So, again I sound this warning—even at this late date—please, you parents—and please you servicemen who are now home on your terminal leave and who may be listening to this broadcast—before you sign on the dotted line be sure your papers are in order. Do not think we are dodging responsibility down here. I desire to serve you in every way possible. That is what we are here for—but remember it is you who is going to get the benefits from having your papers filled out correctly. It is you who will be looking to the Veterans' Administration later for possible aid.

What I am most concerned about is that I cannot help but feel that many of our war veterans have not filed a claim for injuries received or diseases contracted in service—which must be done at the time of separation or within a year after discharge at the latest because in later years should there be a recurrence of such disease or an aggravation of an old injury then, believe me, it will be difficult for you and for us to prove service connection and, therefore, eligibility for veterans' benefits. I appreciate that sick-call slips were often lost in combat zones and we must remember that witnesses and attending nurses and doctors will be almost impossible to locate in later years and so it is up to you veterans—you who have already received your discharge papers—to remember this advice. Check over your papers right now and I repeat—if you do have injuries and diseases contracted in the service, please file your claim now. If we can be of any help to you down here, let us know but do it now because it must be done, according to law, within a year after your discharge.

Now, one final word. Discharge papers and service records may eventually become lost. I presume most of our veterans do not have safety-deposit boxes but you may have something back home in the form of a family safe or even in the form of the old coffee pot sitting on top of the fireplace in which you might file your personal papers for safekeeping. I suggest, however, that you have your discharge papers and your service record recorded by your county clerk. Then, if you should ever need a copy it can be obtained promptly. Remember that when you veterans send your papers to us down here to Washington to have them corrected we should of necessity—and do—return them to you by registered mail with a return receipt requested and, incidentally, that costs me out of my own pocket—and is not provided for by Government expense—24 cents for each of such requests. I am not complaining about the bill but I am again pleading with you—please make sure that your records are in order before you sign that discharge certificate.

Only the Ignorant Nourish Their Prejudices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, so much has been said about intolerance and prejudice that I think many of us will appreciate reading an editorial from the Chicago Sunday Times, issue of February 24, 1946, in which the statement that is the caption to this article is included.

The Times editorial is entitled "Brotherhood Week All Year Round," and the concluding paragraph states: "Perhaps when all of us realize that only the ignorant nourish their prejudices it will become unpopular to whisper unkind things behind our brother's back."

BROTHERHOOD WEEK ALL YEAR ROUND

The observance of Brotherhood Week during the past 7 days has served to throw the spotlight of national attention on the battle against ignorance and prejudice. The ending of Brotherhood Week should not become the

signal for putting our heads back into the sands of indifference. Every week should be Brotherhood Week. That's the idea, brother.

Nazi Germany showed all the world where race prejudice and hate leads a nation when they are allowed to spread like diseases, unchecked, until they become national policy. Hitler was a warning against the Bilbos and the Rankins over here.

There is a difference between political discrimination and social snobbery, of which all of us are guilty to some extent. An overwhelming mass psychosis which condones political and economic intolerance threatens the very pillars of a democratic government. Just how much of our population suffers from this disease of intolerance?

A poll conducted by Elmo Roper and reported in the New York Herald Tribune throws considerable light on this question. Roper, a conscientious poll taker, found out there is no net increase in the number of people who declare a prejudice against Jews, but only an increase in the openness with which the prejudice is admitted. About 9 percent of the population is anti-Semetic—the same as in 1943.

This figure does not give the full picture however. It does not show the degrees of anti-Semitism or the fact that great numbers of anti-Semites are found in industrial areas. Curiously, anti-Semitism is found least in rural areas and small towns, where other prejudices usually abound.

PREJUDICE CENTERS IN BIG CITIES

The greatest numbers admitting to some prejudice (36.2 percent) are found in the great cities. It is more prevalent among the rich and middle class than among the poor, although the well-educated rich seem to be uninfected. One-fourth of those between 21 to 34 showed some tinge of prejudice, 40 percent of those from 35 to 49, and 34 percent of those over 50, owned up to some degree of anti-Semitism.

It is encouraging, therefore, to find a smaller percentage among the young, which might indicate that the comparatively new secular education in brotherhood is catching on. This should give encouragement to those who conducted Brotherhood Week, and who sometimes feel that their hard work and time are of little avail against the tidal wave of prejudice which always seems about to engulf us.

The poll revealed an interesting, and perhaps not surprising, sidelight. Persons with strong anti-Jewish sentiments usually also are prejudiced against the British and the Russians. "In fact," says Roper, "there are indications in the study that people who permit themselves to single out any one group against which to be particularly antagonistic are inclined to extend their antagonism to other groups."

Since all of us have prejudices in one form or another against everyone else, all of us suffer from prejudice.

This point is utilized in a guide to race relations for police officers, recently issued by the department of justice of the State of California. The guide ought to be "must reading" for policemen everywhere, especially young men just starting on their careers.

MYTHS AND FOLKLORE

Drawn up in collaboration with the American Council on Race Relations, the guide declares: "In order to achieve professional standards for police work with minority groups, science and fact must replace the mixture of prejudice, myth, and folklore which, in all too many police departments, are used as guides in relations with minority groups."

The new police officer is told that just as he must learn the techniques of making an arrest or detecting a crime, so he has to learn to be aware of his human prejudices and to curb their expression. An impartial professional attitude does not come naturally. It has to be acquired and cultivated.

Gunnar Myrdal, the Swedish economist who studied American race problems, has pointed out that too little interest is given by police to social and educational viewpoints. As a result, policemen in America are not liked and trusted as much as they ought to be.

Policemen are well aware that many people believe policemen as a group are stupid, brutal, and crooked. This is a harmful attitude. It hinders the honest policeman in performing his duty.

Yet the prejudice against Jews, Negroes, Catholics, Mexicans, blondes, redheads, or brunettes is just as unwarranted and ignorant. The intelligent person thinks in terms of individuals, the ignorant person thinks of groups.

Perhaps when all of us realize that only the ignorant nourish their prejudices, it will become unpopular to whisper unkind things behind our brother's back.

Communists Work While America Sleeps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, according to the Daily Worker's monitoring of Mr. Stalin's recent speech, he said:

Thus, as a result of the first crisis in the development of the capitalist world economy, rose the First World War. The Second World War arose as the result of the second crisis.

In other words, in the opinion of the No. 1 man of Soviet Russia and the International Comintern, both World Wars were the fault of the capitalist leaders, which are the United States and Great Britain.

In the same speech Premier Stalin credits the Red Army with winning World War II and declared that Russian security calls for the Red Army being maintained at peak strength, saying that it can be done by boosting Russian heavy industry production to heretofore unequaled levels.

For Russia, Stalin says, "Build heavy industry, build the Red army—for any eventuality."

For the United States the American Communist Party seeks:

First. Demobilization of American military strength on land, sea, and air.

Second. The weakest possible postwar military strength, on land, sea, or air.

Third. Internationalization of our atomic energy secrets.

Fourth. Slow-down of our heavy industry reconversion and build-up by perpetual strikes in steel, motors, rails, and other heavy industry sources.

In other words, Stalin said, build up the Red army and Russia's all-important heavy industry for war support of the Red army, while the American Communists seek to reduce the United States to a third-class military power and so cripple heavy industry that American heavy industry cannot meet necessary strategic military needs. Our military leaders, of land, sea, and air forces have warned of the dangers of this too-rapid demobilization before a permanent postwar policy has been set up, but little attention has been paid to them. They have been smeared by the mouthpieces of communism, from MacArthur, Eisenhower, Marshall through Patton, Bradley, Hodges, and the other wartime commanders. The decisions of our military commanders were the decisions which won the war—but the Communist credo that no nation—other than Russia—can be allowed to have national heroes has been demonstrated by the leftist efforts to smear all our commanders.

It is time to look, perhaps, into the sources of some of our labor unrest. The CIO—labor sponsor of the Political Action Committee and the National Citizens Political Action Committee—is linked with the recently formed World Federation of Trade Unions. The link is openly admitted by the fact that Sidney Hillman is vice chairman of WFTU. This WFTU sought to be the sole spokesman for labor in the UNO. Communist Russia and leftist France fought to have this brought about. Senator CONNALLY, backed by British, Chinese, and other UNO representatives, fought this down, obtaining equal representation for the American Federation of Labor with the WFTU in any labor advisorship to the UNO.

The leadership of the CIO—Hillman, Curran, Bridges, Carey, on down through the lists—show references in official Government records to affiliations with Communist front organizations.

The CIO-PAC and NCPAC back the deficit spending, leftist program from top to bottom. They lead us into strikes, because only when the financial backlog of workers is wasted, does the discontent follow which leads to the barricades and the revolution that all Marxian ideologies call for.

Communist philosophies all call for overthrow of the government by force and violence. The general strike is their most powerful weapon. Look at the flexing of muscles by the Communist-inspired groups all over the world. Active, shooting revolts in Greece, Indonesia, Egypt, and so forth.

In our own country, Quill, in New York, threatens a general strike to tie up transportation. The telephone strike threatens national communications. The threatened strike in the railroad brotherhoods threatens national transportation, as the Quill threat hits local New York. Lancaster, Pa., has seen a tie-up of transportation on a local scale.

The tugboat strike in New York tied up the Nation's greatest city to a point where all local activities were affected.

The Russian spy activities and more important yet the apologies for such activities by Ambassador Davies and others are examples of how far we have difted. The repeated blocking of efforts to investigate the infiltration of Communist minded men into our State Department—the secret agreements which gave Russia the Kuriles and no one yet knows what else, without approval of our Senate, as required by law, is a further proof of Communist and fellow-traveller power within our Nation.

Russia's indignation that Canada dared to expose the spy plots within Canadian borders is in line with the Davies encouragement of their methods. Only last week the Washington Post released the activities of our FBI in exposing espionage, sabotage, and other foreign activities within our borders, but it did not tell how many of those arrests were of Communist agents. Why not? Why not a detailed reporting of these things?

We have a House Committee on Un-American Activities. It was at one time an active, effect-producing committee. During the war, while Russia was an ally, it was required to soft-pedal Communist activities. The American Legion, once a leader in fighting against Un-American activities, relaxed during the war so as not to affect allied interests. And during the war the Communists, capitalizing on our unwillingness to tell the full truth about American Communism, infiltrated, dug in, moved high into places of bottleneck importance in our Government. Now the war is over. Why should we not be honest with the American people? Why should we not check our Government personnel, name by name, department by department, agency by agency?

We have 3,155,192 employees on pay rolls of the agencies of the executive department as of December 31, 1945, according to the Joint Economy Committee. Senator Byrd, chairman of the committee has repeatedly protested that in peace we need no more than one-third of these.

Why not start now to find out how many of these 3,000,000 are or have been members of Communist or Communist front organizations?

Why not examine the activities of those found to be members of such organization against a background of the sedition laws, against a yardstick of their patriotism and belief in the Constitution of the United States? Why not relieve the bulk of the American taxpayers of the burden of supporting on public pay rolls those individuals found to be working primarily for an overthrow of our system of free enterprise?

Why not weigh, in the scales of the welfare of the 140,000,000 population of the United States, the welfare of the organized, yet unproportionately vociferous minorities who seek to plunge us over the cliffs of unknown foreign activities?

American workers, in the last 33 years, from 1911 through 1944, have increased 83 percent according to the January issue of Labor's Monthly Survey, a publication of the American Federation of Labor. The dollar-increase average is from $1,730 per year in 1911 to $2,189 per year in 1944. This same publication shows that while American labor's real wages went up 37 percent from 1911 to 1939, real labor wages in Soviet Russia dropped 40 percent in the period from 1929, when the Soviet Government figures were available, to 1939, when the last available figures were permitted to reach the public. American labor as a whole should consider those figures.

Congress faces an election this year. Why not go to the people on this issue: Do we want to continue the American system of free enterprise, or do we want to abandon it? Those Members who come back to Congress after the November election will then have a clear mandate from the people to govern their future course of action. I, for one, am willing to go to my constituents on that issue alone.

The Children's Crusade

REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the most pitiful of all war victims are the displaced children. To aid this group some American youngsters have launched a rather wonderful project called the Children's Crusade.

In the displaced persons camps of Germany there are some 95,000 boys and girls under 14, whose nationalities include Czech, Hungarian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Polish, Rumanian, Russian, and Yugoslav. A large proportion of these are orphaned and carry seered into their memories the sight of the torture and murder of their parents. Hundreds have endured the bestialities of the horror camps. Others were torn from their homes, branded with a number, and delivered as farm or household help to some Nazi. All of these are underweight and a majority suffer from rickets, tuberculosis, or other diseases which stem from malnutrition. Thousands of these children possess no shoes or warm clothes and so are kept indoors all winter, although their shelters are also cold. Few of these children can recall any of the joy or care which should be the birthright of all little ones.

UNRRA is doing what it can for these tragic waifs, but supplies are spread too thin. It has been a blessing when other countries have held out a hand to these displaced children. Although exhausted by 6 years of war and living on meager rations, England is sharing what it has with a thousand Jewish youngsters to whom it has been playing host since fall. Sweden and Switzerland have also welcomed some thousands of the boys and girls in greatest need. In America we have left it to the children to take the first step in kindliness.

It began very simply last summer at a camp conducted by a Chicagoan, Miss Mabel Katherine Pearse. One night around the campfire she read a letter to the children from her sister, child welfare specialist with UNRRA, which described the background of her charges. The American children at once decided to do something. They did. They raised $200 for Christmas gifts, warm clothes, and special treats in food, which after a great struggle with a special permit, were sent abroad with personal greeting cards. On Christmas eve they built a bridge of friendship in a beautiful ceremony. Of all the Christmas ceremonies around the world, none could have expressed more poignantly the spirit of Christ. Far across the seas and across differences of race, language, and religion the children joined together in singing carols.

In recent weeks this movement has grown. Every time the story is told the project snowballs larger and a flood of gifts pour in—money, clothes, food, sweets, and toys. For a while lack of postal service was an obstacle. The chaos which results from the bombing of cities and mass migration of peoples makes it still impossible to locate individuals and guarantee general delivery in Germany. But there is not the same confusion in regard to the displaced peoples. UNRRA has registered each, so that reaching these people is possible and, in simple justice, they should be the first to receive supplementary packages from America.

The organization aims at becoming a steadily functioning one, channeling through an ever-widening stream of gifts and good will. On July 25 American children, this time in various parts of the country, will celebrate a midsummer Christmas party to raise money for the real Christmas to follow overseas on December 25. The bridge of friendship, this year a wider and stronger one, will for the second time be cemented by the mutual singing of carols on Christmas eve.

Here is a project to touch the heart of our country. It is one which the children of America should be helped to continue, for its material good and also for the bond of friendship between nations. American children have already found the project the most challenging one which they have ever known. So let us help the children's crusade through Miss Mabel Katherine Pearse, 4700 Kenwood Avenue, Chicago 15, Ill.

What Is Really Going on in Poland?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to draw attention of the Members to a statement, issued in London by the leaders of the four democratic political parties of Poland. They carry on in London and there speak on behalf of the enslaved people of Poland who are unable to tell us the truth about conditions prevailing in their country in direct result of the betrayal performed at Yalta.

The most respected leaders of Poland's democratic parties give us the truth about Poland under Soviet occupation. Here it is:

COUNCIL OF POLISH
POLITICAL PARTIES,
London, January 25, 1946.

SIR: The preamble of the Charter of the United Nations states that a new international organization has been established "to save succeeding generations from the scourge

of war." The United Nations had determined "to reaffirm their faith in * * * the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights * * * of nations large and small and to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained."

But, notwithstanding these solemn declarations, and in violation of all principles on which the postwar order and the peaceful relations between nations were to be built, the Polish nation—after the victory over the common enemy—is again enslaved.

In Poland lawlessness rules supreme. Human dignity is trampled upon. There is no true freedom of religion, of conscience, or of opinion. There is no independent judicature. There is no freedom of speech, of the press, of association, or of meetings. There is no security for the individual. The whole of Poland suffers under the totalitarian yoke which has been imposed upon the Polish nation by foreign intervention, and this regime does not totter only because the country is occupied by a foreign army and is ruled by a ruthless police regime

The worthiest sons of Poland—the men who had built the underground Polish state and had fought the Germans for five long years in the ranks of the Polish Home Army—and every class of her population: Peasants, workers, the middle class, and the intellectuals, the very core of Polish democracy—are subjected to systematic persecution. The education of the younger generation, based on models which are alien to Polish traditions and her national spirit, aims clearly at remolding our youth into soulless robots of the present regime.

Economically Poland is subjected to a system of ruthless exploitation in the interests of the war potential of an alien power. Her people live in wretched poverty which is in striking and irritating contrast with the comparatively high standards of life allotted to those who agree to serve as the tools of the present regime. The inclusion of Poland into the orbit of the USSR has made her a mere province in the vast area of Soviet closed economy and severed all her links with the free markets of the world. A similar fate has been meted out to many other countries of Central Europe.

Fear and hatred have become the guiding principles of the present system of government in Poland. The men who are in control of our destinies keep themselves in power by means of a rule of terror, which takes the form of mass arrests, confinement of thousands of people in prisons and concentration camps, executions and mysterious disappearance of many men and women who are inconvenient to the regime.

The provisional government imposed on Poland has renounced—against the clear will of the Polish Nation—almost one-half of her national territory, with 11,000,000 of population, and it has agreed to recognize her eastern frontier as final at a time when the postwar territorial settlement in Europe is not determined yet.

Thus, on the morrow of common victory, Poland, the stanchest and most faithful ally, has been given a very raw deal, actually much worse than that which has been given to defeated enemy powers. As a result of the war Poland has lost not only half of her prewar territory which for centuries had formed a part of her national home—she has also lost her very independence. This, in spite of the immense and well-known sacrifices which she has borne in the common struggle and the fate meted out to her is the crowning proof that all the ideals for which the war was fought have been betrayed and brushed aside.

Poland fought at first alone her battle for her independence and very existence and later by the side of her allies. She never wavered, irrespective of whether her allies were in a position to come to her assistance or not. When the whole of Poland was occupied by the enemy forces the Polish soldiers fought on in France and Norway. After the collapse of France, when Britain was left alone to resist German might, the Polish armed forces made their way to the British Isles, to continue the battle by the side of the only free country which was still at war against Germany. This was at a time when some powers who later found themselves in the camp of the United Nations were still neutral, while others were even giving every aid and assistance to the German aggressors.

At that time, too, the Polish Home Army, the largest underground force in the world, acting under the direction and guidance of the Polish Government in London, was continuing its sacrificial struggle in Poland itself, and immobilized large enemy forces there, fighting the aggressor simultaneously with the Polish armed forces in Africa, Italy, and Western Europe.

To enslave Poland or to concur in her enslavement is obviously a gross violation of all the principles of international morality and law, and of all the solemn declarations and treaties in force. The enslavement of Poland and of the whole of central-eastern Europe creates a vast center of unrest and discontent which ultimately threatens the peace of the world. It would be an ill omen for the start of the United Nations if conditions in direct contradiction to their pledged principles were permitted to be perpetuated.

An iron curtain now severs Poland from the world. It separates East and West, and bars the free exchange of news, cultural values, and material goods.

The undersigned duly authorized representatives of the chief Polish political parties, acting as spokesmen for the people of Poland, who in the present conditions are not free to speak for themselves, are thus forced to lodge a direct appeal to the United Nations. These are the main points:

1. The so-called Provisional Government of National Unity in Warsaw and its delegation to the United Nations General Assembly do not represent Poland at all.

2. Poland will never renounce her will to independence, political, spiritual, and economic, and her people will never relent in their efforts to recover their full independence and to decide their own fate.

3. No lasting peace will be secured unless moral principles, the respect for the dignity of the individual and of the nation, justice, and freedom are duly safeguarded and applied in practice, not merely in solemn declarations. The principles of democracy should be enforced both in the internal life of the various countries and in international relations.

No new world order can be built on the old foundations of violence, brute force, and enslavement. No lasting peace can be built on the shifting basis of great powers politics.

Poland, which today is enslaved and occupied by foreign forces, demands the restoration of her independence, in the name of the very principles on which the United Nations are built. Poland believes that the United Nations will not find it possible to pass over in silence her loss of independence and the enslavement of the country which was first to resist German aggression in the defense of her own freedom and of the liberty of the world.

We have the honor to be, sir,

Your obedient servants,

TADEUSZ TOMASZEWSKI,
For the Polish Socialist Party Committee abroad.

Dr. STANISLAW OLSZEWSKI,
For the Democratic Party Committee abroad.

HUGON HANKE,
For the Christian Labor Party Committee abroad.

JERZY KUNCEWICZ,
For the Peasant Party "Freedom."

Dr. TADEUSZ BIELECKI,
For the National Democratic Party.

Unwarranted Attacks Upon Government Officials

REMARKS
OF
HON. E. E. COX
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, on February 12 the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] placed a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at a cost of $121, with the consent of the House, constituting what was nothing more or less than an attack upon the Committee on Military Affairs and its general counsel, H. Ralph Burton. The gentleman from Michigan failed to inform the House, however, that his statement was in its entirety taken from the book recently published by Henry Hoke, a writer who devotes his efforts to the publication of unwarranted attacks upon Government officials, and particularly Members of Congress. Hoke's books and articles are, for the most part, innuendos and allegations lacking in truth and unsupported by factual evidence. Following publication of such statements, papers which follow the Communist line take up the trail and engage in publicity as lacking in truth as the books and other sources upon which they are founded. The original falsehood becomes repeated a thousandfold, until it passes with the public for assured and accepted truth. For this reason such innuendos against an able and faithful public servant should not go unchallenged.

Let me tell you how the distorted information in Mr. HOOK's statement and the book by Henry Hoke, from which it was taken word for word, was obtained. About 2 years ago a certain man was recommended by a member of the staff of a local newspaper to the Committee on Military Affairs, and after checking the references which were submitted he was employed as an investigator. Shortly thereafter an investigation was begun into the activities of a Col. Theodore Wyman, of the Army, at one time district engineer for the district of Hawaii, and one Hans Wilhelm Rohl, a German alien, who in December of 1940 was awarded contracts for defense projects in Hawaii. I shall not go into the details of that investigation, but it will be found interesting to anyone who will read the report of the House Military Affairs Committee, No. 1638, Seventy-eighth Congress. Eventually this newly engaged investigator was sent to Los Angeles, Calif., with instructions to follow up certain angles of the investigation there. Soon after his arrival Government officials and friends of the committee reported that his activities in Los Angeles were not in the interest of the committee and should be looked into at once. This was done, and he was recalled and dropped from the committee rolls. From that time on this man has pursued a course antagonistic not only to the committee but to the Congress itself. Recently it has been discovered that he has been employed by Henry Hoke to gather any information

that by vicious twisting and innuendo can be used to vilify not only the Committee on Military Affairs but the Committee on Un-American Activities and Members of Congress. His particular animus is to hit back at H. Ralph Burton, who dismissed him.

This book recently published by Henry Hoke and the statement which appeared in the RECORD on February 12 follow the pattern that has been evidenced in so many Communist publications, and for the purpose of the RECORD I shall refer to some of these briefly.

Hoke states in his book, and this is included in the statement which appeared in the RECORD, that H. Ralph Burton was at one time counsel for Father Coughlin. Of this there is no doubt, as for several years, specifically from about 1932 to 1936, Burton was engaged in his legal capacity by Father Coughlin, and for this he offers apologies to no one.

It is stated that at one time he was counsel for the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution. This is true. Some years ago an attack was made upon this society, proven to be instigated by Communists, and Burton was employed as counsel to defeat this attempt upon the existence of the society, and this he succeeded in doing. For this he apologizes to no one.

It is stated that he was counsel for the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, than which there is no finer organization in this country. I have here a list of the patriotic organizations composing the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, among which are Dames of the Loyal Legion of the United States; Descendants of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence; General Pershing chapter, American War Mothers; Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic; National Camp, Patriotic Order Sons of America; National Society, Daughters of the Revolution; National Society, Daughters of the Union, 1861–65; United Daughters of the Confederacy, New York chapter; and United States Naval Reserve Officers Association, too well known to the Members of the House to warrant further comment. It is true that Burton represented these patriotic societies, and for doing so he need apologize to no one.

Hoke further states in his book that Hans Wilhelm Rohl, the alien contractor who failed to finish his contract on time for the defense of Pearl Harbor, set forth in an affidavit that he had been approached by a witness who had previously appeared before the Military Affairs Committee with a proposition to arrange for stopping the investigation for a certain sum of money, but beyond his unsupported statement he offers no proof. A reading of the report of the House Military Affairs Committee definitely clinches the fact that if such a proposition were made it ended where it began.

He states that Burton is anti-Semitic and anti-Negro, but he offers no proof of this, and that it is not true can be shown if any committee or Member of the House is sufficiently interested to inquire.

I have now come to what is the most inexcusable, the most vicious and lowest type of attack. Not content with endless attacks upon Burton over a period of years, clearly for the purpose of eliminating him from investigations which he has conducted over a period of 9 years for the House and Senate, the Communist group now attacks his son. The latter is a lawyer by profession and enjoys a reputation which is beyond question. He gave up a lucrative practice to enter the Coast Guard in this war, declining to ask for a commission and remaining in the Coast Guard until separated for physical reasons.

I shall not go on further in characterizing these attacks, but I do wish to call attention emphatically to the fact that although Burton has conducted investigations for the House and Senate for nearly 9 years, there has never been filed with any committee which he has served so much as a scintilla of evidence against him. All that has appeared against him in Communistic publications has never been supported by an iota of factual evidence. Now, as to Burton himself.

A man's background is always important. H. Ralph Burton's ancestors along more than one line have been on these shores since the early 1600's. One line settled in Virginia and Maryland. Another ancestor came over with William Penn to found Pennsylvania, his grandson being Caesar Rodney, who signed the Declaration of Independence as a representative from Delaware. Two of his family have served in this House. Truly this is an American background.

H. Ralph Burton was born in Washington, lived here all his life, attended the public schools, Friends School, Columbian, now George Washington, University, and took his degree in law from Georgetown University. He is a member of the bars of the Supreme Court of the United States, the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and a member of the Bar Association of the District of Columbia. In his earlier law practice he was associated with the Honorable John G. Carlisle, formerly Secretary of the Treasury, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Senator from Kentucky.

Early in 1938 he became an investigator for the Senate Campaign Expenditures Committee, of which the Honorable Morris Sheppard was chairman. He covered the States of North Dakota, Kentucky, and Arkansas.

Burton was thereafter named as an investigator for the Works Progress Administration Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, of which the Honorable Clifton A. Woodrum was chairman, and for over a year beginning in 1939 had charge of investigations in the State and city of New York, which were separate administrative units. These investigations covered every phase of the Works Progress Administration activity and included contract relation, construction of airports, school buildings, highways, sewerage systems, accounting, union interrelations and jurisdictions, unemployment, relief, legality of project operation, financing, sabotage, workers' alliance, and Federal project No. 1—Theater, art, music, writers, and historical records survey.

It was in connection with the arts project of the Works Progress Administration that Burton first incurred the hatred of communistic elements. Six weeks after his arrival in New York he had discovered sufficient evidence to cause the Appropriations Committee to deny the use of funds for the continuation of the theater project throughout the United States, resulting in the elimination of thousands of Communists or fellow travelers from the Federal pay roll and the saving of over $15,000,000 a year.

He continued on this investigation for over a year, resulting in extensive corrective results, among which was the requirement that employees of the WPA should work 130 hours a month for their monthly pay instead of being permitted to draw union wages and work only 30 to 40 hours in a month for the maximum monthly wages.

He located Communists working on vital statistics, such as plans and specifications for electric and water conduits in and around New York and had them removed.

So violent became the antagonism on the part of Communists and fellow travelers in New York in 1939 that they staged a demonstration at Columbus Circle which required over 300 police officers to control. Not satisfied with that, they formed a picket line of over 200 around the New Yorker Hotel, where Burton resided. None of these things was allowed to interrupt the investigation which was carried through, covering a period of over a year and involving the checking of over $200,000,000 expended by WPA in New York. To anyone interested sufficiently to do so, it is suggested that the complete record of the investigation can be found in the published hearings and reports of the Appropriations Committee covering that period.

In 1940 Senator Gillette gave Burton assignments in connection with the activities of the Campaign Expenditures Committee for 1940, these having included the States of Maryland, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Maine, New Jersey, particularly relating to Hudson County, and special assignments of a national character in New York.

During the last 5 years, H. Ralph Burton has been general counsel for the Military Affairs Committee, and director of the investigations of the war effort. Many things have been accomplished by the committee. Thousands of lives have been saved by the improvement in the fueling system of airplanes resulting from the investigations and recommendations of the committee. Corners in skilled labor which resulted in exorbitant costs to the Government through having to pay excessive profits to racketeering companies controlling the skilled labor market were eliminated at a saving of hundreds of millions of dollars to the Government.

The House Military Affairs Committee Report No. 839, 79th Congress, contains the most complete account of the plans of the Communists to sabotage the United States Army that has been prepared and this was done under his direc-

tion. Not an item therein has ever been challenged.

The House Military Affairs Committee Report No. 1638, 78th Congress, containing the story of the activities of Col. Theodore Wyman and Hans Wilhelm Rohl concerning contracts for defense projects of Hawaii discloses almost unbelievable facts very largely affecting the attack on Pearl Harbor, and has never been challenged. These are only a few examples of what has been accomplished as the result of the investigations of the Military Affairs Committee which are elaborately explained in their two general reports. A recent investigation, beneficial to the soldier, is that relating to blue discharges in the Army which is resulting in the elimination of injustices from this source in the House Military Affairs Committee Report No. 1510.

I submit to Members of the House that a faithful servant of Congress, whose work has benefited the American people, should not be defamed on the floor and in the RECORD of this House by unsupported and groundless assertions, inspired by personal malice and the hostility of subversive and disloyal elements of the population, without a voice being raised in his behalf.

Housing Bill Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call the attention of the House to two amendments which will be presented by me to the Patman housing bill when it is read for amendments Wednesday.

The first amendment is in the nature of a clarifying amendment, bringing the title, authority, and duties of the chief of the new housing program into line with his existing authority under Executive order. Its adoption will clarify his duties and bring his authority into line with that already provided for under the Executive order issued by virtue of the Second War Powers Act. Because of the uncertainty of the extension of the Second War Powers Act it will be necessary to include this into the Housing Act presented at this time if power is to be given to provide priorities for the veterans' housing program.

The second amendment is the production incentive subsidy authorization, which limits the amount of subsidies to be used in expediting the production of scarce materials by the Housing Expediter to the sum of $600,000,000. It is argued that the Housing Expediter now has authority to use subsidies under the Price Control Act. This amendment would specifically permit and at the same time limit them as to amounts in order to stimulate the production of enough materials to carry on the housing program.

The amendments follow:

AMENDMENT PROVIDING HOUSING EXPEDITER

(a) There is hereby created an office to be known as Housing Expediter; and the President is authorized to designate an existing official of the Government to serve as Housing Expediter, or to appoint the Housing Expediter either within any existing agency or as independent officer of the Government. In the event of a designation of an existing official, he is hereby authorized and permitted to continue in his present post while serving as Housing Expediter, except that he shall receive no additional compensation by reason of his designation hereunder. If, however, such Housing Expediter is appointed, his appointment shall, if within an existing agency of the Government, be subject to the laws and regulations governing the appointment of officers within such agency and he shall receive compensation in compliance with such laws and regulations; if the Housing Expediter is appointed as an independent officer of the Government, then such appointment shall be made by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States and he shall receive compensation at the rate of $12,000 per annum.

(b) The Housing Expediter, in addition to such other functions and powers as may be delegated to him by the President, is authorized to—

(1) formulate such plans and programs as are necessary to provide for an increased supply of housing accommodations of all kinds and, in particular, of homes available for sale or rental at moderate prices to veterans of World War II and their immediate families:

(2) issue such orders, regulations, or directives to other executive agencies as may be necessary to provide for the exercise of their powers in a manner required by or consistent with the execution of the aforesaid plans and programs, and to coordinate the activities of such agencies directed to the execution of such plans and programs. Each executive agency shall carry out without delay the orders, regulations, or directives of the Housing Expediter, and shall, to the extent necessary, modify its operations and procedures from time to time to conform to the directions of the Housing Expediter;

(3) recommend to the President the enactment of such legislation as may be necessary to provide the authority to carry out such plans and programs as are not authorized under existing law;

(4) consult and cooperate with other agencies of the Federal Government, State and local governments, industries, labor, and other groups, both national and local, with respect to the problems created by the Housing emergency and the steps which can be taken to remedy it.

(c) The executive agencies of the Government shall exercise their emergency powers and other powers for the purpose of aiding in the solution of the problems created by the existing housing emergency, the alleviation of which is vital to an orderly transition from war to peace.

(d) (1) All functions, powers, authority, or duties vested in the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion or the Director thereof by the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 which are or may be necessary or suitable to enable the Housing Expediter to carry out the provisions of this title and such plans and programs as such Housing Expediter may develop for the alleviation of the housing emergency, are hereby transferred to the Housing Expediter. The powers so transferred shall include the power to issue orders, regulations, or directives to other executive agencies with respect to the exercise by such agencies of their respective powers and authority.

(2) The powers so transferred shall continue during the period in which this Act is in effect, notwithstanding any other provision terminating such powers contained in the said War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944.

AMENDMENT PROVIDING PREMIUM PAYMENTS

(a) Whenever the Director determines that it is necessary or desirable to employ premium payments for the purpose of increasing the supply of conventional and new types of building materials, such premium payments shall be made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation with respect to such materials, at such times, in such amounts, and on such terms and conditions as may be determined by the Director: *Provided*, That such payments shall be limited to an amount not to exceed $600,000,000. The Director, in determining upon the particular uses of premium payments as authorized in this section, shall take into consideration, among other things, the extent to which other means of increasing materials would not be as effective in adequately increasing the supply of such materials or would be likly to result in increased sales or rental prices of the finished housing accommodations constructed with the use of such materials.

(b) The last paragraph of section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, shall not, during the life of this title, apply to premium payments by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under this section: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed to affect the provisions of Public Law 88 of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Defeatist Thinking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. SAVAGE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, recently I have been very much concerned over the growing tide of pessimism regarding the chances for a permanent peace. It seems to me this trend of thinking is very dangerous because it implies we are not interested enough in maintaining a permanent peace to work at it. If we are going to be forever plagued with suspicions of other nations because their form of government is different than our own, can we blame those nations from having suspicions of their own? It is not a question of whether or not we can keep a permanent peace—we must keep that peace because it is becoming more and more apparent that our civilization cannot survive an atomic war.

I am including with this speech an editorial from the February 20 issue of the Longview Daily News, Longview, Wash., which I think clearly points out the dangers of this type of defeatist thinking:

WHY DO SO MANY SAY THAT WAR WITH RUSSIA IS INEVITABLE?

Five out of six American women, reports the Woman's Home Companion, believe we are on the road to another war. Most of these, an opinion poll of the magazine shows, believe that war will come in 10 to 15 years and will be with Russia.

Is this surprising information? Not at all. On all sides we hear this kind of talk. "War is inevitable." "We'll have to fight Russia." "Stalin blames capitalism for everything and he won't be satisfied until capitalism is wiped out."

These and other similar statements are common in ordinary conversation. It is no wonder that an opinion poll would reveal that five out of six American women believe another war is in the immediate offing.

We would like to have asked those same women what they thought of their own chances of surviving another war. Their sons and husbands of course could be expected to have only the slimmest of chances to survive atomic warfare, but what about the people at home—the civilians—would they live through a war in which one bomb or radio controlled rocket could wipe out the population of an entire city?

People who talk so easily about another war don't think in terms of the total destruction that would result. They are thinking in terms of old-fashioned warfare—of wars fought with smokeless powder and TNT. Those explosives are more obsolete now than the black powder used in Civil War cannon. Atomic energy is today's weapon.

Why do so many consider war with Russia inevitable?

Because they don't trust Russia. They are afraid of her, of her form of government, of her bigness and her potential power. They are afraid of a revolutionary people who overthrew an oppressive form of government in modern times and set up something they consider better.

Do Russians feel the same way about us? Do they think that war with the United States is inevitable? Perhaps they do. After all the people of the United States don't trust Russia, do they? That being the case what's to keep the United States from suddenly loosing its new atomic weapon against the Soviet and removing a potential menace? The United States is the most powerful country in the world. It is opposed to communism and so are most of its Allies. Is not Russia all alone in a world hostile to socialist Russia?

We don't trust them. They don't trust us. How, indeed, can peace come out of that?

But we know that the United States, its people and its goverment, want peace. We know that it isn't true when Stalin or anyone else accuses the capitalist world of encircling him. We joined the United Nations to seek peace.

Why did Russia join the United Nations? If she hadn't it would be a different story. After the last war the United States refused to join the League of Nations. Other nations mistrusted us, and little wonder. What nation is to be trusted that refuses to cooperate in efforts for world peace?

But Russia did join the United Nations. Her representatives signed the Charter. Is that not some evidence that the Soviet Government wants peace? Certainly we know the Russian people, or any other people with only a rudimentary knowledge of the destructive power of atomic energy, have sufficient desire to live to want to avoid war. And governments, but peoples, cause wars.

Just because Stalin expresses the same mistrust in capitalism that we have in socialism is not sufficient reason to go about proclaiming that war with Russia is inevitable. The two countries are different in many respects—their government, their history, their economic way of life. But the Russians are human beings living in a rich, big country, just as we do. Why cannot we assume that the world is big enough for us both?

Are hate and greed and envy so firmly ingrained in the characters of these millions that a war of annihilation is sure to come? That is something for women and men and for children going to school to ask themselves. And if they can see a spark of hope for peace, to determine what they, as individuals, can do to fan that spark into life and dispel the fatalistic pessimism heard all too often these days.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Detroit Times:

THE BRITISH LOAN

The Banking and Currency Committee of the United States Senate now has under formal consideration a proposal to make what purports to be a loan of about four and one-half billion dollars to Great Britain, according to the terms of an agreement negotiated by representatives of the two Governments several months ago.

The public hearings to be conducted by the committee on this matter are expected to last several weeks, during which time the arguments for and against the loan will supposedly be fully and fairly heard.

However, it has been the past experience of the American people in such matters that "public hearings" so conducted do not always reflect the real opinions of the people.

In this instance, it is of the utmost importance that the hearings be truly public, and that the real opinions of the people be consulted.

It would be a wonderful thing, in fact, if there could be a national vote or referendum on the question, for then the members of the committee and of the Senate and the Congress as a whole would know whether a majority of the people are for the loan or against it.

But since there have been no arrangements for such a vote by the people and none are likely to be made, the people are going to have to find their own means of making their wishes known—or else let the issue go by default.

Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY of Nebraska has a pertinent suggestion to make in this respect.

The Members of Congress, he says, would respect a national expression of public opinion on the British loan.

Let the people, therefore, make a national expression of their opinions, he urges.

"The reaction both Senators and Representatives get from their constituents will probably decide whether or not the loan is granted," says Senator WHERRY.

"We know that pressure will be put on from the organized groups controlled by the administration.

"We know, too, how to recognize such 'propaganda mail' and to evaluate it.

"What will count will be the letters, telegrams, and personal visits from people known to us as representing their own thinking and that of their neighbors."

Of course Senator WHERRY is right.

The administration will wield all of its tremendous power to influence approval of the loan.

The internationalists and the interventionists, the one-worlders and the collaborators with various Socialist and Communist regimes will support it.

Surely the American people, who are most concerned in the matter because it is their money that is being loaned away, their taxes and wages and savings, should not stay mute.

The American people know their country is already $300,000,000,000 in debt.

* * * * *

They know there is not the remotest prospect that Britain will ever repay more than a fraction of the loan, if any at all.

They know that the total of our outstanding loans and gifts to Britain, including the unpaid First World War debt and the canceled lend-lease outlays, will be the fantastic and wholly unpayable sum of $36,000,000,000 if this new loan is granted.

Let the American people tell Congress what they think about this colossal and frightening commitment of their resources.

Let them write to Congress and wire their Representatives in Congress and go in person to Washington in as great a volume as possible and make their will known to the Congress.

If the United States are truly a democracy let them function as such and let the will of the people truly prevail.

"Where Are We Going To Get the Money?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, Congressman RICH, of Pennsylvania, has persisted in asking on the floor of the House almost daily during the past 12 years, "Where are we going to get the money?" The following spending proposals now before Congress, over and above the necessary regular governmental expenditures, were indirectly approved by President Truman in his September message to Congress:

	Per year
Federal aid for education	$500,000,000
Vocational education aid	100,000,000
Free food stamp plan	500,000,000
Rural electrification program	500,000,000
Federal aid to hospitals	110,000,000
Federal health program	600,000,000
School lunch program	100,000,000
Sewage treatment program	100,000,000
Federal housing program	80,000,000
Increased Federal salaries	500,000,000

Bills providing for lump-sum appropriations, either now before the Congress or about to be introduced, are as follows:

Veteran bonus legislation	$13,000,000,000
Additional UNRRA contribution	1,350,000,000
Commodity Credit Corporation	500,000,000
Loans to foreign countries	15,000,000,000
Federal aid for highways	3,000,000,000
New river valley authorities	5,000,000,000
Federal aid for airport construction	1,000,000,000

These proposals total $3,090,000,000 per year over and above the regular Budget expenditures, and the lump-sums total $38,850,000,000. Truly, where are we going to get the money?

CAN WE AFFORD IT?

Mr. Speaker, how many of us realize that there are 80,000,000 Americans who own Government bonds? Every bank and insurance company in America has half of its assets invested in Government bonds. These investments must be safeguarded at all costs if we would avoid chaos and worse. Is not it about time for the American people to sit down calmly and figure out for themselves just

how much we can afford to spend on projects that are not absolutely necessary? If they will do this it would relieve the tremendous pressure on Congress to make appropriations for projects that can be postponed until we are in better shape to undertake them. If this wild spending orgy continues we will bring on an inflation that will wipe out all wealth save real estate and other tangible property. This would hit rich, middle class, and poor alike.

WAKE UP, AMERICA!

Mr. Speaker, this writer is disturbed, confused, bewildered. The outlook for the future is anything but encouraging. Taking stock of the present situation, we find:

First. A national debt of $275,000,000,000.

Second. An outbreak of strikes slowing down reconversion.

Third. The administration insisting upon deficit spending.

Fourth. Our diplomatic relations with the rest of the world are at the breaking point.

Fifth. Uncle Sam still acting as Santa Claus to the rest of the world.

Sixth. Government officials afraid or unwilling to meet issues squarely.

Seventh. The average citizen willing to let columnists, radio commentators, and second-class writers do his thinking for him.

Unless America wakes up quickly to the situation that confronts her, it will be too late.

The following editorial taken from the De Kalb Chronicle, De Kalb, Ill., Thursday, February 21, 1946, shows how our Federal taxes have skyrocketed over the past three decades. It is a fitting close to my words of warning, therefore I include the same as a part of my remarks:

HOW TAXES HAVE RISEN IN PAST FORTY YEARS

From Roosevelt to Roosevelt the American citizen's bill for Federal, State, and local taxes has skyrocketed from a total of $1,387,000,000 in 1902 to $52,195,000,000 in 1944. And apparently the end is not yet.

These figures are not propaganda-based statistics cooked up by somebody who doesn't like the Democrats or the New Deal. They are from an article in the 1946 edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica and are written by Government sources.

This rise through two wars and seven Presidential careers means that we components of what the intelligentsia call "the masses" are paying our governmental bodies more than 37 times as much taxes today as they did at the beginning of the century when Teddy Roosevelt was President.

During that time the State and local government tax bill went up from $861,000,000 to $10,067,000,000, almost a 12-fold increase the figures show. Federal taxes went from $526,000,000 in 1902 to $42,128,000,000 in 1944. That means the Federal Government spent just about 80 times more in Franklin's reign than in the times of Theodore.

As late as 1941 State and local taxes combined exceeded those of the Federal Government but the demands of the global war quickly wiped out that ratio. In that year the State tax total was $4,499,000,000 slightly less than the $4,608,000,000 raised by the lower governmental bodies. In that year the Federal set-up collected $7,818,000,000 or about 46 percent of the total 1941 tax bill which was $16,923,000,000. During the war State and local taxes went up about 22 percent while the Federal Government's collections were multiplied almost eight times.

At the present time the fiscal position of the State and local bodies is fairly good. Millions of indebtedness have been reduced or erased and many of the States have massed huge cash balances as a cushion for expected postwar public works spendings. The position of the Federal Government is not so good our debt being considerably in excess of our total physicial and financial assets. We have never balanced our Budget since 2 years before Roosevelt II took over.

Henry Ford 2d Answers Chester Bowles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks a telegram sent by Henry Ford 2d to Stabilization Director Chester Bowles following the latter's apparent ill-advised charges against the Ford Motor Co. during his appearance before the House Banking and Currency Committee this week. Mr. Ford's telegram is a complete answer to Mr. Bowles and should be on record. The telegram, dated February 21, 1946, follows:

Mr. CHESTER BOWLES,
Office of Price Administration,
Washington, D. C.:

Your public statement of today leaves me no other course but to make public certain facts which you either do not know or refuse to reveal.

Our application to OPA on last July 20 was made while we were still at war with Japan. Since fighting had stopped in Europe, the War Production Board decided that limited production of automobiles was in the public interest. A total of 39,910 was fixed by WPB as the maximum number of passenger cars the Ford Motor Co. could produce during the last 6 months of 1945.

Obviously you cannot make 39,910 cars in 6 months in a plant designed to produce more than 100,000 every month without greatly increasing production cost per unit. Low cost depends on volume production as everyone knows. So when the United States Government—not the Ford Motor Co.—fixed production volume, it thus determined cost and selling price.

Let me give a specific example. We decided that 32,750 of the 39,910 automobiles permitted should be Fords. The rest were to be Mercurys and Lincolns. The limitation on quantity fixed our estimated cost on the most popular Ford model at $991.57. The f. o. b. sales price, which included a 5-percent profit and the usual dealer commission thus became $1,388.20. This turned out to be 55 percent more than our last peacetime selling price of $895.

We immediately filed application on prices for these low-volume, high-cost, wartime cars under OPA's wartime general maximum price regulation.

This action had nothing whatever to do with peacetime price ceilings. It was not until early in September, after the end of the Japanese war, that OPA first issued any regulations having to do with peacetime price ceilings on automobiles.

These facts illustrate the point I have been trying to make in my public statements—that high costs and high prices of automobiles are caused by low-volume production.

Our one aim since VJ-day has been to get into maximum production as quickly as possible. We have spared no costs. We have paid higher prices for materials, we have used propane gas when we could not get coal, and we agreed to add $41,000,000 to our annual bill for labor.

But our assembly lines have run by fits and starts because we could not get parts and materials. Actually, we were able during 1945 to produce only 34,439 Ford cars. Our costs per units on this production have been almost exactly what we estimated for that small volume.

Have no fear that the Ford Motor Co. will charge the American people one penny more than it has to for cars. If we did competition would take care of such a situation very quickly.

For your information, Mr. Bowles, to meet competition we are now selling one of our truck models at $100 below OPA ceilings.

We would like to sell all Ford cars below OPA price ceilings, not above. But low costs and low prices depend on large-scale production. That, in turn, depends upon an uninterrupted flow of parts and materials to our assembly lines. When you say that only from 10 to 25 percent of our parts are under OPA price control you miss the point. Shortage on only a few parts can stop the whole assembly line. This, in fact, is what has happened time and again since VJ-day.

May I add that I question the propriety of a Government official's calling "outrageous", actions taken in strict accordance with wartime Government regulations.

HENRY FORD 2d.

Sales of Surplus Government Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERMAN ADAMS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, in view of reports which have been made concerning the activities of commission men and special agents in securing surplus merchandise in behalf of clients, it is reassuring to know that the Government surplus sales agencies are making a sincere effort to prevent Government property falling into the hands of illegitimate operators. The record of transactions in surplus goods is commented upon in an article in the Daily Metal Reporter of February 14, 1946, which, under leave granted me, is included herewith:

RUMORS OF INFLUENCE IN GOVERNMENT SURPLUS SALES CONTRARY TO FACT — TRANSACTIONS SHOW ENVIABLE RECORD

On the fringe of every industry there are the hit-and-run type of businessmen who are out to make a killing by fair means or foul, usually the latter. It is extremely unfortunate but not surprising that this sharpshooting type should have been attracted to the disposal of war surplus property. Such will-o'-the-wisp businessmen, here today and gone tomorrow, thrived at the end of the First World War by buying and selling Government surplus merchandise or by using their influence to obtain contracts by devious means for others. Their operations led to congressional investigations and unearthed a stench which to this very day has not been completely eradicated.

Those who are now in charge of the Government's policy of disposing of billions of dollars' worth of surplus war materials, conscious of their responsibility and desirous

of doing a good job for the Government and for industry, have done everything in their power to prevent any undesirable elements from gaining even a toe-hold in the disposal program. The agencies handling the surplus property disposal program have been criticized for the slow disposal rate but never has their integrity been challenged.

There are thousands of merchants who scrutinize carefully every Government transaction involving surplus war materials. If there had been any shenanigans, any favoritism, any wire pulling, or outright fraud, these misdoings would long ago have been called to the attention of the vigilant congressional committees that have been keeping a sharp eye on the war surplus property disposal program. The record of the SPA policyframers and of those who are responsible for executing these policies has been excellent from the point of view of integrity. The thousands of complaints and criticisms that have been received from disgruntled bidders, have failed to bring to light actual irregularities in any of the large number of transactions made by the surplus disposal agencies.

In spite of this, there are rumors of favoritism and of insiders pulling strings in Government disposal agencies. Most of these rumors originate with unsuccessful bidders who seem to assume that the reason they failed to get an award is because the successful bidder must have had some "in." Unfortunately these rumors take on importance by the fact that every now and then some self-appointed agents call upon the unsuccessful bidders and frequently succeed in convincing them that they have an "in" with the local disposal agency and can turn their previous failures into future success at Government sales. Any number of such self-styled agents are alleged to have been peddling their services on a 5-percent commission basis and have come to be known as the 5-percenters.

If by chance the businessman who was gullible enough to utilize the services of such questionable agents, succeeds in getting an award, he will probably attribute his success to the agent and the agent may be expected to assume responsibility and credit for the award. Thus the businessman who has been played for the sucker, becomes more convinced than ever that pull is needed to get awards and he will shout his convictions from the housetops. That is how rumors start and that is how the 5-percenters feed on them to their advantage.

The surprising thing is that so many seemingly honest businessmen should fall for such a racket and accept rumors as facts. It would seem to us that if honest businessmen are approached by "agents" who claim to have influence with Government agencies, that it would be their duty as citizens and as members of an industry to report such individuals to the proper Government authorities. Such leeches should not be permitted to prey on the industry. We go a step further and suggest that the Government look into the operations of these so-called agents and break up their racket if it exists.

The disposal of surplus war materials will continue for many years to come. It is of the utmost importance for the economy of the Nation that these surplus war materials be liquidated efficiently and honestly. Individuals who boldly assert or merely imply that by the use of unethical methods they can do things which the honest businessmen cannot are a menace to any business. If their operations should remain unchecked, they could easily undermine the public's confidence in the Surplus Property Administration and cast suspicion on the thousands of first-rate, honest, sincere, and efficient executives who are trying to help the Government do a good job in disposing of billions of dollars' worth of surplus merchandise of every description.

As we see it, businessmen should be careful to discriminate between fact and fiction and not believe the fantastic tales of "influence" and "graft" unless proof is offered to substantiate the gossip. Secondly, businessmen owe it to themselves, their business associate, and to the country to report any individual or group of individuals who profess to have back-stair entrance to Government departments, and, finally, the Government itself should run down those who are trying to create a racket among those who desire to purchase war surplus materials.

Harold L. Ickes, Crusader and Conservationist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, for over 25 years before he came to Washington as Secretary of the Interior, Harold L. Ickes fought graft and corruption in Chicago, almost singlehanded. No one ever fought a more relentless nor more discouraging fight against sordid interests trying to undermine the morals of the people and the Government as well.

When he entered the Cabinet, as the suggestion of Senator Hiram Johnson of California, it was not generally known what his views on conservation were. His performance in that regard has received the support and the applause of the most ardent conservationists. No one, perhaps, except one who has served as Secretary of the Interior can really understand the pressure that can be placed upon a man in that position by persons, groups, and "interests" whose desires and interest may be contrary to real conservation.

It is essential to the cause of conservation that the appointee to the office of Secretary of the Interior be thoroughly in sympathy with the broad purposes of conservation. Our natural resources and the public domain must be developed and managed for the benefit of the whole people. Mr. Ickes set a good example in that regard.

Under permission granted me to insert these brief remarks, I also include an editorial from the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee:

ICKES' SUCCESSOR MUST BE FIRST A CONSERVATIONIST

Gov. Vail Pittman of Nevada has launched a movement to have President Truman name a Westerner as successor to Harold L. Ickes as Secretary of the Interior.

That is a splendid suggestion and it is gratifying that all of the men apparently receiving top White House consideration for the post are men from the West.

After all the great bulk of matters administered through the Interior Department affect the western areas and it is only logical that a Westerner acquainted with the problems of the West should be given the post.

However, that is not necessarily the first qualification.

The first measure of the man to be given the secretaryship is that he be 100 percent in sympathy with the preservation of the resources of the Nation for the benefit and enjoyment of the greatest number of people.

Ickes was from Chicago, but it can be said the West never had a stancher friend in the Interior Department post than he.

Under the Department of the Interior are the numerous great water and power projects of the West—the Central Valleys project, Boulder Dam, Grand Coulee, and others.

Ickes fought with all his zeal for the advancement of these projects and to insure that the benefits accrued to the people and did not fall into the hands of corporate interests for private exploitation.

For this he was pilloried and castigated, but he carried on. And the present advanced status of many of these projects is a tribute to the former Secretary's valiant battle for the people.

It is hoped that when President Truman appoints Ickes' successor he will choose a man who has the interests of the West at heart as much as Ickes and is imbued with like zeal and courage.

The Housing Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I enclose a copy of a letter Governor Vivian, of Colorado, wrote to Wilson W. Wyatt, Housing Expediter, Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, Washington, D. C.:

GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
Denver, Colo., February 20, 1946.

WILSON W. WYATT,
Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WYATT: Thank you for your letter of February 7 enclosing copy of your report to the President on veterans' emergency housing. You asked for comments and suggestions as to the feasibility of your program. I am happy to comply.

I submit you are attacking this problem from the wrong premise. You seem to anticipate greatly increased Federal control in carrying out your concept of more houses at the earliest possible date. I note you advocate subsidy payments for increased production.

The one and only way to bring about greatly increased production, unless all the books on economics and sociology are wrong, is to allow the ancient and basic law of supply and demand to operate now. If this were done, there would be a short period of increased prices but only until healthy competition got into full play. Whatever inflation might be the result of discarding the multifarious Government directives, rules, and regulations, would soon be dissipated. Business would soon find a common level upon which to operate and prices would readily conform to the demand and the supply of materials and finished houses. This has been the history of the growth of our country and it will always be that way. You cannot successfully control our economy by beaucratic directives. That is fundamental.

You admit that "private enterprise must assume the leading role in this task * * * and that the building industry and financial institutions must be relied upon as the mainstay of the production program."

That is likewise basic and fundamental.

However, if you are going to allow private industry to do an all-out job, you must first

cast aside the many strangling hindrances which have so long throttled industry and business and give these agencies a green light. If you do this, they will get the job done far faster than if you continue to retard their progress with stifling rules and regulations of wartime origin which simply will not operate successfully in the reconversion period.

You say also that "All existing plants must be brought to capacity operation as speedily as possible."

Yes, if you will say to management: "All wartime controls are off: you are privileged to operate and manage your business as you did before the advent of the New Deal."

Only in this way can you expect full production. There is no incentive for business and industry to progress when management has so little to say about the operation of its own business. Price control retards the creation of supply to satisfy the demand.

You advocate the use of "Government credit where private capital is not available."

With our banks, trust companies, building and loan associations, and other financial institutions bulging with money, there will be no need for Government credit providing you remove all controls. Private financing is "rearing to go" if it is permitted to do so in its own way which is its right under the American way of life as we once knew it when the Constitution and Bill of Rights were the guiding instruments of business. So long as the relief requested is denied, just that much longer is business as usual delayed.

Again, you are contemplating more instead of less governmental red tape and control when you advocate providing "funds for premium (subsidy) peyments to secure increases in production of building materials."

You suggest $600,000,000 for this purpose. Nothing could be advocated which would involve a greater waste of public funds. There is absolutely no necessity for this enormous appropriation, provided you will allow business and industry to operate as usual. They will furnish sufficient funds to accomplish the immediate purpose of more and more houses.

Nor will you need to "protect the veteran against excessive prices if he buys a home now."

The healthy competition set out aforesaid will take care of that. It always has and it always will. You can't change our fundamental economy by directives and regulations. It never has been a success and it never will be. To continue to do so means just one thing: delaying the day when we shall return to normalcy in business.

You have hit upon another basic principle of our form of government when you say: "No program of this magnitude can be directed from Washington alone. We are going to need advice and active participation of courageous community leaders in cities and towns throughout the country."

You will have all that and much more if you nullify the Government controls aforesaid. And if you should do this, you need not worry but what American industry, finance, and business would take off their coats, roll up their sleeves, and get us back very shortly to the American way of life as we used to know it. All that our people are craving for is the opportunity.

Reliable reports furnished this office reveal that there are between 1,500 and 1,800 houses under construction in Denver and environs which cannot be completed because Government restrictions prohibit the allocation of the materials necessary for finishing them.

The only solution of insufficient houses is more houses. That is just common horse sense. These cannot be provided unless the contractors are able to purchase the wherewithal to complete those now being built and to begin the erection of other units which cannot, under existing regulations, be started.

I urgently request, therefore, that the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion and such other agencies as may have control of the situation, immediately make available the necessary materials so that this housing may be expeditiously completed. There just isn't any other answer to the problem. Unless the Government allows this to be done, it is not playing fair with the people who are entitled to live in the homes they are making every effort to complete. This is their constitutional right which has been denied them far too long.

I very much hope you will accede to this request forthwith.

Faithfully yours,

JOHN C. VIVIAN.

DENVER, COLO., *February 12, 1946.*

Representative W. S. HILL,
Washington, D.C.:

The following telegram has been sent to Frank W. Cortright, executive vice president, National Association of Home Builders:

"Quickest answer to housing shortage is completion of those now under construction. In Denver there are over 1,600 homes by actual survey which were started in good faith prior to January 15, which cannot now be completed under existing regulations. One thousand of these homes range in price from $5,000 to $10,000; 400 are rental units and balance in excess of $10,000. Application for CC rating has been denied on theory that they are eligible for HH rating. However, because these houses started when no restrictions on materials, price ceiling granted by FHA is too low to warrant completion according to plans and specifications; consequently application for HH rating cannot be made. One thousand of these homes can be completed within 30 days if materials are available, and balance 60 and 90 days. This condition exists all over the country and your office should exert every effort to have promulgated necessary regulations to see to completion of existing construction. It is also asinine to divert materials to prefabricated and temporary construction when those materials can produce permanent housing at approximately same cost and within same period of time. If this is deliberate attempt on part of Government to prevent private industry from doing its job so that finger can be put on it for failure to excuse public housers for taking over construction industry, matter should be given greater publicity than is now being given by you or any local association."

Your assistance is respectfully requested in obtaining necessary regulations to make possible completion of homes mentioned. We believe this is vital to the building industry and also will solve housing shortage in this area.

STANLEY C. BRANDENBURG,
Executive Vice President, Denver Association of Home Builders.

Our Military Power Not Disintegrating

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Walter Lippmann from the Boston Daily Globe of February 21, 1946:

OUR MILITARY POWER NOT DISINTEGRATING

(By Walter Lippmann)

By using sensational words inaccurately and much too cheaply we are misinforming the rest of the world, and indeed ourselves as well, about the power and influence of the United States in the postwar period. We are telling everyone that the rapid demobilization of our forces is the disintegration of our military power. Now, there is no doubt that the demobilization is rapid, even hasty, and that the efficiency and the discipline of our overseas forces has declined seriously. But to jump to the conclusion that this means the disintegration of American military power is to misunderstand the real nature of American military power.

The error is in supposing that the measure of our power is our ability and our willingness to maintain in time of peace the extraordinary civilian armies which were raised, trained, and equipped for Eisenhower and MacArthur to command. These armies have been the visible sign both in Europe and in Asia of American power in the world. These armies are being demobilized. What remains of them is not now, in discipline and morale, impressive. But it is a mistake to suppose that anyone can measure American power in the future, or even in the present, by the condition of these remnants of the wartime Army. For he is overlooking the basic fact that American power is peculiarly and specially amphibious.

We are an island—a continental island to be sure, but still an island—and we have developed and perfected a kind of military power which is unique. It is a combination of sea, air, and ground forces which can operate at great distances, across the oceans. No one can afford to forget the existence of this extraordinary instrument, or to leave it out of account in calculating the balance of forces anywhere. For there is no other military instrument which has a comparable range and reach, none so flexible, so mobile, so quickly concentrated, or so capable of exerting irresistible force at the point of impact. It would be absurd for anyone to imagine that with this instrument in our hands we cannot speak with equal diplomatic authority in any of the congested regions of Europe, Asia, and Africa.

Yet in Europe, and also here, it is for the moment the fashion to leave it out of account. The Europeans have never really seen the fundamental military power of the United States. The bulk of it was in the Pacific, largely invisible to the masses of the people and not really appreciated by European statesmen and generals who were preoccupied with the terrible struggle for massive land armies. The landings in north Africa, Sicily, Italy, and France, though impressive, did not really disclose the true nature of our amphibious power. For once ashore, the struggle on land obscured the underlying fact, which in the long run has the greatest significance, that here was a military instrument which could cross an ocean and put great forces ashore at the points it selected.

Our own people, including many of our military leaders and our diplomats, do not appreciate at its true value the peculiar instrument of amphibious power. Our Navy has been particularly interested in the Pacific Ocean, as enemy of the Japanese Navy and as friendly rival of the British Navy. Our Army has measured itself by the German Army, until 1942 regarded by professional soldiers as incomparably the best army in the world. Now, there is a disposition to count the number of divisions in the Red Army.

As a result, we are just beginning to understand, we have hardly begun to realize, the uses and significance of our own military instrument, that it is a new instrument and in scale and power and its uses unlike any other force in the world.

It would be advisable, I think, to correct these misunderstandings abroad and at home. It would be a good thing, it seems to me, if the new American Navy went for a cruise in European waters, and paid visits to our allies. The Europeans have seen the American Army going home—not always a pretty sight—and they must have the impression that with these homesick and somewhat demoralized GI's there is departing from the European scene the power of the United States They ought to be given a chance to see the Navy which was in the Pacific—the battleships, the carriers, and something of the great sea trains, which enable the American Navy to take its own bases with it.

It is only fair to them to show them this force, lest they forget its existence and come to think that GI's counting their points are the measure of our interest, our influence, and our power. It would help to correct any misunderstandings and miscalculations, into which land-minded diplomats so easily fall, during the critical negotiations about Germany, the Mediterranean, and the Middle East.

It would also be good for the Navy to see at first hand parts of this world in which this country is bound to be interested, and not to get into a rut and think that there is only one ocean, the Pacific.

The Navy knows all about the islands of the Pacific. It would benefit by an educational cruise not only to the British Isles, Norway, and Denmark, but to Gibraltar, Casablanca, and Dakar, to Marseilles, Toulon, and Bizerte, to Malta, Trieste, Salonika, and the Dodecanese, to Tripoli, Alexandria, Haifa, Beirut, and Suez, and to the Persian Gulf. These places are quite as interesting as Okinawa and Saipan, and it would be to the advantage of all, and would promote good negotiations, if our Navy saw these places, and if the people in these places saw our Navy.

It would not hurt UNO a bit if this were done. In fact it might help it a lot if everyone in the world including ourselves, were shown that, despite the demobilization, we were very much interested in Europe, and how, in the long view, we are able to manifest our interest.

The Patman Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, the Pawtucket Real Estate Exchange has studied the Patman bill, and so that their views may be known to the entire membership of the House, I enclose them herewith as part of my remarks:

PROVIDENCE R. I., *February 25, 1946*

Hon. AIME J. FORAND,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The full membership of the Pawtucket Real Estate Exchange urge you to vote to have the Patman bill and its amendments sent back to the Banking and Currency Committee for further hearing, and if this cannot be done we strongly urge you to vote against the Patman amendments. These amendments would intensify the housing shortage by destroying the incentive to build. Would create a situation such as prevailed during prohibition. Ceiling prices on existing dwellings are not enforceable. Would produce chaos in the already critical housing shortage. Survey recently completed by members of the Pawtucket Real Estate Exchange shows that, because of material and labor costs, a $6,000 ceiling, at least in this area is impossible for construction of one-family dwellings. Contractors agree that such a ceiling under present conditions would completely stop the much needed housing for veterans' program. Thus we are correct, assuming this to be true, in saying that the housing shortage would be intensified. We feel strongly that because this program has never had a public hearing: The pertinent facts that would bear heavily on the necessity for such an amendment have not been brought to life. It has been railroaded onto the floor of the House in a way seldom seen in Washington. Industry and private citizens have never had a chance to testify on it or to submit facts about the effects it will have. They should have that chance. It can truthfully be said that real estate and the construction industry are the foundation upon which rests our American way of life. It is, therefore, too serious a problem to have radical changes made in this basic industry without complete and thorough public hearings. It must be remembered that this is one bill that reaches into every American home. We, therefore, strongly urge that you as our representative in Congress vote against the Patman amendments or do everything possible to secure a full public hearing on this very serious matter.

PAWTUCKET REAL ESTATE EXCHANGE,
PETER J. PIMENTEL, *President,*
GEORGE LAPP, *Secretary.*

Relief for the Philippine Islands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. JASPER BELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor of February 23, 1946:

MCNUTT PREDICTS QUICK ACTION ON BILLS FOR AID TO PHILIPPINES

(By Selden Menefee)

WASHINGTON, February 23.—The log jam holding up long-overdue legislation for the relief and reconstruction of the Philippine Islands has been broken, United States High Commissioner to the Philippines Paul V. McNutt said today.

He confidently predicted the quick passage of both the Bell bill to provide free trade with the Philippines for 8 years following independence and graduated tariff increases for 20 years thereafter, and the Tydings bill to spend $450,000,000 on public works and compensation for the victims of war damage.

Referring to the Bell bill, Mr. McNutt said:

"The House Ways and Means Committee, with complete and generous disregard for petty commercial interests which might benefit from the continued prostration of the Philippine economy, has now approved a bill providing for 28 years of preferential trade relations between the Philippine Commonwealth and the United States after independence is achieved next July.

"This action, which I am sure presages speedy approval by the Congress, is a gesture to the heroic people of the Philippines, and it will not be lost on our wards and allies."

Mr. McNutt said that the Tydings bill was equally essential. In providing funds to enable reconstruction to get under way it is complementary to, and in no sense a substitute for, the Bell bill. The Senate has passed the Tydings bill, and it is now in the House Insular Affairs Committee, of which Representative BELL is chairman. Now that the Bell bill has been reported out, quick action is expected on the Tydings bill.

Proponents of the legislation have been amazed at the lack of opposition from beet-sugar and other interests which in the past have worked to sever all ties with the Philippines, in order to eliminate tariff-free competition. The only real opposition came from within the Government itself—from a clique within the State Department and the Tariff Commission which is more interested in protecting Cuba's preferential sugar tariff than in promoting Philippine recovery. But that opposition has now been defeated

Even with this legislation, it will be at least 3 years before Philippine industries can even begin to export, and a decade before they can be restored to prewar levels. The Japanese utterly wrecked the sugar industry. They tried to substitute cotton for sugar without success. But now instead of exporting a million tons of sugar a year to the United States, as they did before the war, the Philippines must actually import sugar.

Neither American nor Filipino authorities want to restore a sugar-based economy, which Mr. McNutt says is inconsistent with a broad economic democracy. Both parties want much greater diversification than before the war. But according to Lt. Comdr. Julius Edelstein, adviser to Mr. McNutt, a substantial part of the sugar industry—the most efficient part—can be expected to thrive on exports to the United States west coast and to far eastern countries, to the extent of about 60,000 tons a year.

The Tydings bill will pay for less than half of the war damage in the island; total damages are estimated at more than $1,000,000,000.

PROBLEM OF JAP CURRENCY

A major economic issue of recent date has been the question of payments made in Mickey Mouse money—Japanese occupation pesos—during the invasion. Real estate was purchased, sometimes at gun point, and businesses changed hands by payments in this Japanese fiat money.

High Commissioner McNutt, in accordance with a directive from President Truman, recommended to the Commonwealth Government a plan of evaluation for payments and deposits made in the Japanese money, according to a formula worked out by a commission named by President Osmeña.

OPPOSITE BILL PASSED

A special session of the legislature was called to consider the McNutt plan. But while the High Commissioner was in Tokyo last December, the legislature, many of whose members had engaged in transactions in Japanese money, threw out the plan and passed a substitute bill drawn up by the opposition leader, Senate President Manuel Roxas. This would have validated most of the payments made in Mickey Mouse money at its full face value.

President Osmeña signed the Roxas bill. But under the Tydings McDuffie Independence Act, all legislation affecting Philippine currency must be approved by the President of the United States before it can become law. President Truman, on Mr. McNutt's recommendation, vetoed the bill. But it is still an issue in the islands.

POLITICAL CONFUSION

This incident symbolizes the confused political situation as the April 23 election approaches. President Osmeña and Manuel Roxas are the presidential candidates. The race has split wide open not only the Nacionalista Party of the late President Quezon, but also two smaller political groups, the Popular Front and the Democratic Alliance.

Informed Washington sources say that the issue is not a clear-cut one—Mr. Osmeña and the Democrats versus Mr. Roxas and the collaborationists—as some reports have indicated. While it is true that most of the collaborationists support Mr. Roxas, there are a considerable number of politically potent collaborators in the Osmeña camp as well. Mr. Roxas himself was cleared by Gen. Douglas MacArthur of collaborationist charges. Neither President Osmeña nor any of his chief spokesmen have echoed the charges made in the American press that Mr. Roxas is a collaborator.

President Osmeña has the support of most liberals, about half of the guerrilla leaders, and Communists. But he also is privately supported by the wealthy pro-Franco Andres Soriano, who is supplying funds and personnel for the Osmeña campaign. And Mr. Osmeña's party officially offered the vice presidential nomination to Quinin Paredes, who held a cabinet post under puppet President José Laurel and is still under indictment as a collaborator. Fortunately for President Osmeña's reputation, Mr. Paredes turned it down.

Two top collaborationists, Laurel and Jorge Vargas, his Ambassador to Tokyo, are being held for military trial in Tokyo. Others are being tried in Filipino people's courts. Only a handful have been convicted so far.

Most responsible Filipino and American authorities favor going through with the plan for complete independence next July. But they agreed that without the close cooperation of the United States during the next few crucial years, independence will have little meaning for the average Filipino.

Mr. McNutt put it this way in a recent speech:

"The fact of independence on July 4 does not minimize our responsibility. It increases it * * * (we must) recognize the imperative necessity of building here an economic system to keep step with political democracy."

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Newark (N. J.) Star-Ledger:

WASTE OF FEDERAL TIME

We find it difficult to understand the logic of fomenting national debate on a controversial issue such as the St. Lawrence seaway at a time when finding homes for war veterans, increasing production, defeating inflation, and balancing the Budget are crying for concentrated study.

The St. Lawrence project would provide a seaway between the Middle West and the Gulf of St. Lawrence. It would cost an estimated half billion dollars and would take years to complete.

Its proponents argue that it would open great new vistas for the Middle West through cheap transportation. Its opponents call it an outlandish squandering of public funds that, instead of helping anyone, would do irreparable damage to established east coast ports including New York and Newark.

There should be no reason for arguing the merits of such a plan now. It is not the time to debate spending a half billion dollars when Federal finances tremble under the impact of postwar demands. There is no need now for the thousands of jobs this project would provide. Under the rule of first things first, debate on the St. Lawrence seaway could easily be deferred 2 or 3 years until more important problems are settled.

The Credit to Britain and World Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1946

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I would like to include the inspiring address by Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson on the subject of the loan to Great Britain.

After some of the statements and misstatements that have been made about this loan, I believe that Dean Acheson's remarks will come as a most welcome relief:

It is discouraging to some that our problems did not end with the end of the war. Our people strained themselves to the breaking point to win the war, they devoted themselves untiringly to the difficulties which arose and they solved them, and now they would like to enjoy the peace. But, of course, we have always known that keeping the world peaceful was difficult too. That also requires our patience and our best efforts.

Surely there is no problem which affects us more intimately than a prosperous world and a prosperous United States. It is about that question that I would like to speak to you tonight.

From late summer until last winter representatives of the American and British Governments worked together to arrive at a solution of the financial and trade problems which both of us face. When the discussions were completed we had reached agreement as to the means we would employ to secure the chance of a prosperous world.

Those means cover a broad range. They include the settlement of the lend-lease and reciprocal aid account between the two countries, an agreement on the proposals for an international trade organization and the granting of a credit to Britain.

I should like to tell you why I think it makes sense for us to extend a credit to the British, and, second, I should like to tell you why I think the terms of that credit are in our own interest.

A little less than a year ago we presented to the Congress the Bretton Woods agreements for an International Monetary Fund and an International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. We presented those agreements against the background of what we believed were going to be the postwar economic conditions of the world. We stressed to the Congress that when the period of war was over and the period of lend-lease was over, we would abruptly face the problem of supplying the needed imports which foreign countries must have to live. We explained that these countries would find it very difficult to get dollars because they would have few goods to sell and that, without the Bretton Woods institutions, we would run into a whole series of restrictions over world trade, a series of restrictions which would be designed for the purpose of helping each country force its products on the rest of the world so that it might earn enough money to buy abroad the barest minimum of goods it required for its people.

We said that these efforts could only lead to a system of closed blocs; each country would want to fence off for itself a market where it could sell its goods. In fact, it would have to make such an attempt because only by doing so could it earn enough money to purchase from other parts of the world what it needed to live upon. The Congress believed what we said. It believed that that would be the central economic problem of the postwar world, and it passed the Bretton Woods Agreements Act.

The better part of a year has gone by. Everything that was then presented to the Congress has proved to be far too true. I don't think it unfair to say that in that period of time the whole condition of the world has deteriorated far more than we could have thought. It seems to me that it has passed the point of being critical. It has reached a point where only the most timely and vigorous action on our part can prevent a further decay into the conditions of economic anarchy.

Why has that happened? It has happened partly because events have moved far faster than we have been able to provide measures to deal with them, partly because the military occupation has come sooner and lasted longer in some areas than we thought it would, and partly because conditions in the world are generally worse than we thought they would be. It has happened for a hundred other reasons.

Why have I discussed this situation? What is its relevancy to Bretton Woods and the credit to Britain?

Let us think for a moment about the position of the United Kingdom in relation to world trade, world production, world exchange of goods, and world commerce. Let us think of the position of the United Kingdom, not merely because of the tremendous importance of what it buys and sells but also because of the tremendous importance of its currency which together with the dollar, provided the trading mechanism for one-half of the total prewar world trade.

Britain and the United States provide the currency which, after this war and the elimination of Germany and Japan from prominence in international commerce, will be the currency with which two-thirds or three-quarters of the trade of the world is conducted.

Let us look a little more closely at the position of England. Before the war, one-fifth of the entire trade of the world moved in and out of the ports of Great Britain.

That little island was like a lung. It was the breathing in and out, the drawing in of imports and the sending out of exports, which was one of the great activating forces of world trade. Great Britain and the British Empire, the United States, and Canada between them conducted one-half of all that trade. British trade, Canadian trade, American trade, affected every single corner of the earth, affected France and all of Europe, affected Indonesia, China, Japan. Every part of the world was activated by British and American trade.

Now, what is the position of Great Britain today? During the war many things happened to that island. One of the things was that through force of necessity, through the virility of its own administration and its own character, that island converted almost its entire economy to the production of war commodities. It is easy to say that the British had to do that because they were in the middle of the fight and they could not have survived without doing so. But many other people were in the middle of the fight and did not survive because they did not do so. The British took no half measures. They never spared themselves. All of their industries were transformed into the production of war goods; their manhood was scattered over the seven seas and all the continents in the armed services; old men, women, and children were brought into

the factories. Life throughout Britain was completely disrupted to produce materials for the war and to carry on the war. I am not saying this because this loan is a reward for virtue; I am saying it to indicate the condition of that island at the end of the war. British exports were down to 30 percent of what they had been before the war. But that is still only part of the picture.

Another thing which had happened to Great Britain was that, although the United States had provided about $25,000,000,000 of aid through lend-lease, the British had provided us with five billion of reverse lend-lease aid and they had to conduct the war from the Straits of Gibraltar to India and Burma through the use of the British pound sterling. At the end of this year the British will have accumulated $14,000,000,000 in sterling debts to other countries. I don't mention that merely because it is a tough thing for Britain to accumulate debt; we have accumulated debt ourselves. We borrowed billions from our own people. But the important fact about the British is that they accumulated debt to other people. What does that mean in terms of world trade?

It means first, that for decades and decades the British will have to export goods for which they get no pay. Those goods will have to be exported to pay off the sterling debt. That is inevitable. That must happen. That is the burden the war brought upon Britain. It is our hope and the hope of the British that some of their creditors will agree to scale down a part of that debt as part of their war contribution. But there will certainly remain a very substantial amount which Britain will have to work off through exports. And that means that, unless drastic steps are taken to secure an interchangeability of currency, the British must work for their individual creditors, and their individual creditors, if they are to realize upon their debt, must accept British goods and services only. That problem, if not dealt with in some way, would bring about a channeling of economic activity which could only result in the division of the world into closed economic blocs.

I hope it is clear what I mean. In order to buy meat during the war, the British bought it from Argentina. That is where they had to buy it, because that was the only place they could get it. The way they paid for the meat was to say to the Argentine, "We will give you sterling credits in London. You can draw on a bank in London for sterling and that is good wherever and whenever you can use sterling." This transaction, which was repeated again and again in various parts of the world, was one of the most extraordinary financing jobs of the war. People went on taking sterling credits in London because they had faith in the integrity of the British character and the British Government. They could not use this British money for the time being. There was little they could buy with it. They could not exchange it for dollars, francs, or rubles. All they had was the faith that some day they would be able to buy something with it.

If you look at nothing more than the claims on future British goods which arise from Britain's sterling indebtedness to other countries, you can see that for generations people in India who have sterling credits, people in Egypt who have the same thing, and people in near eastern countries and South America would have to look only to Britain for goods and services to extinguish that debt unless the pound sterling can be made exchangeable for the currencies of other countries. That is the situation Britain faces at the end of the war.

What does it mean in terms of world trade? It means that all of the disasters which I began by talking about are more accentuated than they otherwise would be. As the situation stands today, it means that, if Greece wants to deal with Great Britain, it can only deal in terms of sterling. If Great Britain buys something from Greece, all Greece gets is a claim on future British production. It means that Italy, which is in a desperate situation, if it deals with Great Britain, gets only a claim on some possible future production. They get no money they can spend in New York or Paris or Rio; they get merely a claim against future British exports.

That is the situation which confronted the British and American negotiators when they came to discuss a credit to Britain. The agreement which they reached was not couched in terms of the United States simply lending some money to the British.

We had a chance—one last, clear chance—to restore world trade, to put it on a basis which would permit someone who sold goods to England to get some money which he could then take and use in Brazil or the United States or France. We could then again have a condition of multilateral trade, in which every sale gave you a chance to buy in any market you wanted to in the world, a situation which would increase production everywhere because everybody would have a chance to compete freely in every market.

Or we had a chance of taking a narrow viewpoint. We could have said, "Well, we have done enough for the British. We sent them $25,000,000,000 worth of lend-lease during the war. We did all that and now we have our own problems." The result of that attitude would have been that the British would have been forced to adopt the only alternative open to them—a desperate one which offered no real hope to them or anyone else. It was the alternative of trying to pull the Empire closer and closer together, of saying, "We will make a contract to sell to Australia and they will buy from England. Or Australia will sell to South Africa and buy from England." Deals within the Empire: That was the alternative.

It was an alternative which would mean a lowered standard of living throughout the world; it would mean lowered markets for the United States. For the prosperity of this country can no more continue in the face of a descending and impoverished world than it could continue in the period of the thirties.

Those were the alternatives and, faced with that situation, some of the criticisms which I hear seem to me to be uninformed and almost frivolous.

Fortunately those who were charged with the responsibility of negotiating with the British recognized the alternatives which faced us. They said, "It is perfectly clear that over the next period of 3 to 6 years the British will have a deficit in their balance of payments."

Now, what is meant by the phrase "balance of payments"? It means that with all the savings that the British have in terms of the currencies of other countries, with all the currencies of other countries they receive from the goods they can sell abroad, they will still not have enough money to buy the essential goods which they have to import into their island. The British have to import goods in order to live. They must import wheat, they must import cotton, they must import the fundamental elements of food and clothing, but they have to do more than that. They have to import machinery and the means of making machinery to convert the factories which have been making Spitfires and bombs and artillery and tanks into factories which make goods both for domestic and for foreign consumption. They have to do even more than that. They have to import the raw materials which those factories will use in order to make the goods which they can then sell abroad, and from which they can earn money in the form of foreign currencies. In other words, a deficit in their balance of payments means that the British bank account, the bank account in which they have the currencies of other countries, won't balance. They will have to draw more checks on that bank account than they have deposits.

It is to nobody's interest that the British be forced into the situation which I spoke about a moment ago. It is to nobody's interest that they cease to buy abroad because they lack the necessary dollars or francs or guilders. Nobody makes any money when a customer is unable to buy. If that customer is worthy of credit it is to everybody's interest that he be carried over the period of his embarrassment. Therefore, our negotiators said, "What sum of money is necessary to carry the British deficit in their balance of payments over this period? Of course, the British expect to maintain an austere standard of living; they must cut down on many things their people would like; for a while their standard of living may have to be even lower than it was during the war; but they must still be able to exist; they must still have hope; they must still go forward. Now, what is the amount of money that will be required?" That was the question we had to answer. After many calculations, and taking into account loans yet in the offing from Canada and other countries to whom Britain might look for credits, it was determined that $3,750,000,000 would be the sum which, added to these other credits, would carry the British over the next few years, and that amount was agreed upon.

I said that I wished to discuss two questions tonight. The first was whether it was in our interest to extend a credit to Britain, and I have tried to explain what will happen to us and to the whole future of world trade if we do not extend the credit. The second question related to the terms of the agreement which was reached with the British, and I would like to tell you why I think the provisions which have been agreed upon are fair terms and why they will greatly benefit us.

First let me summarize briefly the repayment provisions of the agreement. The British may draw upon the credit of $3,750,000,000 until the end of 1951, and interest payments do not begin until that time. On December 31, 1951, the first payment of interest and a part of the principal becomes due and such payments continue for 50 years until the entire sum of the principal of the loan plus the interest has been repaid. If in any year the British foreign earnings from exports and other transactions fall below a fixed standard, the British may apply for a waiver of the interest. In applying for a waiver they must agree that they will secure a waiver of interest payments on their debts to other countries, and the International Monetary Fund created by the Bretton Woods Agreements must certify that the British foreign earnings are, over an average period of 5 years, below the standard set by the agreement. If these conditions are met the interest is waived; it is not suspended for payment later, but waived completely.

We do not wish to get into a position such as the one which existed with respect to World War I debts. In the 1920's the British paid us over $2,000,000,000 against the debt they had incurred, and, when the depression came and they did not have earnings sufficient to meet their obligations in full, there was no mechanism by which the debt burden could be adjusted to conform to the stubborn facts of the international situation. Default followed, and the problems that it brought have plagued us ever since.

But quite apart from the repayment of the credit with interest, the British have agreed to do a number of other things which are essential to the prosperity of the United States and to the kind of international trade which we as a Nation seek.

When our negotiators sat down with the British they said, "We are willing to extend you a credit. But you must agree to a number of other things, so that we may hasten the time when trade can be conducted more

freely without the hampering restrictions which, even under the Bretton Woods Agreements, you are entitled to impose for a period of 5 years." After a good many discussions the British obligated themselves to do the following things:

First, they agreed that immediately after the credit becomes available any American doing business with the United Kingdom, any American with investments there on which he receives dividends, any American movie company which has payments due on its films, any American who is involved in a current transaction with the United Kingdom, is entitled to receive dollars. He will not have to take blocked sterling which he cannot use or which he can only use for certain things; he will receive dollars which he can use freely in any way he chooses.

Second, the British agreed that at the end of 1 year within the sterling area—the area in which British currency is the medium for doing foreign business and which includes the British Empire, except Canada and Newfoundland, plus several other countries—anybody carrying on current day-to-day business transactions and receiving pounds sterling can walk into a bank and exchange pounds for any currency he wants. This is a tremendous step forward.

Third. The British went on to agree that at the end of 1 year they would not only make pounds convertible into other currencies within the sterling area, but every place else in the world as well. This means that if a Frenchman sells goods to a British merchant and receives pounds, he can walk into a British bank and exchange his pounds for dollars or any other currency In this way the pound and the dollar can operate as the great mediums of foreign business, free of the controls and limitations which during the war prevented those who sold in British markets from using the proceeds to buy from us or elsewhere in the world.

But the British went still further. They agreed, fourth, that from the effective date of the agreement they would impose no import restrictions which would discriminate against the United States. Of course the British, who will be short of foreign exchange for some time, cannot permit their people to spend dollars and other foreign currencies for luxuries when their needs are so great for essentials such as food and raw materials and machinery. But the British do agree that any restrictions they impose upon imports will be nondiscriminatory and that every country, including the United States, will have a free opportunity of trying to supply whatever the British are willing to purchase abroad. That is all we want. We are confident that American businessmen who are permitted to compete freely for trade will prosper and thrive.

The British did not even stop there. They agreed to a fifth thing of great importance. We took up with them the question of their sterling indebtedness which amounts to some $14,000,000,000. This indebtedness to parts of the empire and other sterling-area countries is a very serious problem. It is a tremendous debt which has many trade results that I have already mentioned.

The arrangement we worked out was along these lines. The British agreed that, with respect to a substantial part of the indebtedness, they would negotiate with their creditors to get it written off the books as a contribution to the war. Much of the sterling debt had been incurred in the sterling area for the purchase of war supplies and for services directly related to the war. The countries which extended this credit should consider a large part of it as their contribution to victory. The British agreed that, with respect to an even larger part of this sterling indebtedness, they would seek to convert it into a long-term debt which could be repaid over many years in annual installments, and they agreed that any payments which they made on this part of the debt could be used by their creditors anywhere in the world. The balance of the sterling indebtedness the British agreed to pay off immediately, and they agreed that the sterling which they pay immediately can be exchanged by their creditors into dollars or any other currencies and used wherever their creditors wish to use it. They did, of course, also agree that they would not use the dollars we are lending them to pay any of these debts.

Those are the obligations which the British have undertaken in the financial agreement with us. They are very large undertakings indeed. Surely no one can say that we are simply lending the British money without getting anything in return.

But we did not stop there. We also secured the agreement of the British to support the trade proposals which were published by this Government last fall. These proposals were put forward with a view toward freeing world trade of discriminatory and hampering restrictions of all kinds. The proposals relate to such matters as the reduction of imperial preferences comparable to the reductions in our tariff, the lifting of quantitative quotas and embargoes of a discriminatory nature, the limiting of subsidies on exports to exceptional and well-defined cases, the elimination of restrictions on the commerce of the world by cartels and combines through international action, the handling of the difficult special problems of surplus commodities, the creation of an international trade organization under the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, and the efforts to provide full and regular employment in each country by domestic action which will avoid harmful effects on the employment situation in neighboring countries.

Without the credit which we have agreed to extend to the British, it would be wholly impossible for them to undertake the commitments included in the financial agreement and quite beyond their capacities in the next few years to support our proposals for securing a multilateral trading system in which the businessmen of the United States can freely compete for the markets of the world.

And yet even this was not all that was agreed upon in our negotiations with the British. We had also to think of the lend-lease and reciprocal-aid accounts and of the United States surplus property in the United Kingdom. This was a problem which might easily have been bungled and which might have hung on to strain and endanger and complicate our relations for decades.

During the course of the war we had sent to the British on lend-lease about $25,000,000,000 worth of goods. These goods ranged from tanks and planes and shells to food and blankets and medical supplies. But the greater part of the total had been either blown up or used up in our common effort against the enemy. At the end of the war there still remained a sizable amount of goods. Some of these were of a military nature, some civilian. There was also a very sizable amount of surplus property in the United Kingdom, much of which had little value. The British might have said to us, "We wish now to return you everything that is left and you make take it away with you," but if they had done that, we would have been faced with the absurd situation of packing up all of these supplies and paying enormous amounts in freight and service charges to bring them home. It would have been absurd for another reason, since the British had a use for many of the goods which were there. And, of course, we had large quantities of supplies which we had received from the British on reverse lend-lease. These supplies were in the hands of our armed forces all over the world.

What we did was to look at all that remained in their hands and in ours and agree with the British upon a value for all of it. When the accounts were balanced, it was found that the British owed us $650,000,000 and the British agreed to pay us that amount. This will be paid on the same terms as those provided in the financial agreement in 50 annual installments. The entire slate has now been wiped clean. What we received for those goods which were destroyed or consumed is the effort which our ally was able to put forth in winning the war and that is enough. We have made a fair settlement for what was left, and that should be very heartening to the American people, who always wished that lend-lease should be a great war mechanism and that it should be promptly and fairly settled at the war's end.

I think you will agree that we found solutions to a very considerable number of difficult problems. What we attempted to do in the negotiations with the British was to reach a settlement of all of the outstanding financial and commercial problems which confronted us. We thought it was appropriate that we secure a settlement of all of these problems in connection with the granting of a large credit to the United Kingdom. We did not think it was appropriate to try to use the lever of the credit to practice dollar diplomacy in fields quite unrelated to financial and commercial questions. Questions of territorial sovereignty and other political matters are not subject to solution by such methods.

What we have done is to arrive at an understanding with a nation, whose position in world commerce is unique, to move forward toward the removal of controls and restrictions which hamper and reduce international trade so that both of us and other nations may prosper in an expanding world economy.

Child-Care Centers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. SAVAGE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, there are still a great many women working who are wives of servicemen, and some who have lost their husbands, and therefore it is vitally important to them that the child-care centers be continued.

In view of this fact, I insert this timely editorial from the Washington Evening Star, of February 8, 1946, in the RECORD:

CHILD-CARE CENTERS

On the basis of information supplied to the Board of Eduction and District building officials by social workers who have studied the situation, the scheduled closing of Washington's emergency child-care centers on February 28 would work real hardship on many families. Among those who would be seriously affected are the wives and children of scores of servicemen still overseas, as well as many widows whose ability to make a living for their families depends on their finding means of caring for their children during working hours. This being the case, the Board of Education has been persuaded to discuss with the District Commissioners the possibility of obtaining a deficiency appropriation of $50,000 with which to carry on the work of the centers for the remainder of the fiscal year.

There is considerable merit to the contention that these centers should remain available to worthy families during the period of postwar economic readjustment through which they are passing. A careful screening of applicants will be necessary as the tapering-off process incident to the return

of more normal domestic conditions is effected.

Incidentally, there is a movement in some circles to seek continuance of the centers on a more or less permanent basis. The Council of Social Agencie is conducting a survey which should throw light on the advisability of continuing the centers beyond the emergency period. Whether such a long-view program should be subsidized with Federal funds or supported by community contributions is a matter for future determination. The immediate problem is to find ways and means of continuing the program during the present emergency. And it is an emergency relief measure that the Commissioners would be justified in requesting from Congress the deficiency appropriation sought by the Board of Education.

In Memoriam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK A. BARRETT

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrated the one hundredth anniversary of the birthday of that great American, William Frederick Cody, popularly known as Buffalo Bill. In his day he was the idol of every American, particularly the children.

Buffalo Bill was a man of great vision, and in the early days, before the Federal Government enacted its irrigation law, he promoted an irrigation project near his home town, Cody, Wyo.

At the time of Custer's last stand Buffalo Bill, as one of the chief scouts, fought the Cheyennes in the battle of War Bonnet Creek, on July 17, 1876, near my home town. In this battle Buffalo Bill, winning in hand-to-hand fighting with the celebrated Indian Chief, Yellow Hand, recorded the first revenge for Custer's death.

The following tribute, in the souvenir edition of the Cody Enterprise, February 20, 1946, expresses the high esteem in which this great frontiersman is held by every citizen:

IN MEMORIAM

Col. William Frederick Cody—"Buffalo Bill" in the hearts of every citizen of this and other countries—is gone, but his deeds, words and many accomplishments will never die. During the month of February the world salutes the memory of three great Americans. Washington, the founder of our Nation; Lincoln, the savior of our Nation; and Cody, the great frontiersman.

The blood of a hardy race of pioneers flowed in the veins of Bill Cody. The instincts of the empire builder were his. His heart was as tender as his spirit was brave, and though respected, honored and admired by the greatest of the earth, his real friends—those who loved him best because they knew him best—were his old friends and comrades in and about his home town of Cody, Wyo.

Perhaps there is no person so universally known as Colonel Cody. The idol of all the children, his Wild West Show brought to the world the personification of the romantic dreams of thousands of ordinary people for life that was adventurous and free. He was a great showman, and this quality more than anything else enabled him to place the great future of Wyoming and other Western States before the public.

As a man he bowed to none. With his tall, handsome, athletic frame, and gracious ways he won the hearts of kings as well as common men. Ever alert to his destiny in the West, he spurned an easy life among the world's great, and always returned to his last and greatest love, his home on the frontier in Cody.

Buffalo Bill the individual represents an era in American history that in itself was unique—an era of conquest typified by him who was no conqueror. He played a major part in the greatest period of transition the world has ever witnessed. His roles were numerous, but always important and colorful—scout, Indian fighter, Pony Express rider, buffalo hunter, trail blazer, empire builder, and master showman. His career was one of deeds and accomplishments, the stuff of which nations are built to withstand the blasts of time.

On February 26, Cody, Wyo., the town that was his home, pays tribute to its greatest benefactor, the man who looked beyond the rocks and sagebrush and saw a thriving metropolis rich in minerals, oil, fertile irrigation lands, and freemen.

Cody is no longer the frontier of an advancing civilization, but in the hearts of those who are privileged to dwell in the chosen homesite of William Frederick Cody, the spirit of the frontier will always prevail. In deepest humility we pay everlasting tribute to the memory of our greatest benefactor, Buffalo Bill Cody.

Thinking It Over

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the February 23 issue of the Fair Play of Ste. Genevieve, Mo.:

THINKING IT OVER

Republicans are gleefully whooping up the Truman-Ickes-Pauley quarrel the past week, pointing to it as an outright indication of dissension within the Democratic ranks. The truth of the matter really is somewhat different in our estimation.

Ickes in the true sense was never a party man. His only hold on the Democratic Party was that he was a member of the Democratic Cabinet during President Roosevelt's tenure in office. He was an avowed believer in the Rooseveltian policies and various social reforms, many of which he authored himself with the President's approval. But there the line was drawn. When President Roosevelt died, Ickes died with him—politically. His crack-brained schemes to revolutionize everybody and anything may not have been looked upon with favor by the practical Truman. So—Harold Ickes, like an outraged prima donna, sought to embarrass the President by calling a Presidential appointee a crook.

It has not been so long ago when the Republican press was condemning Ickes for everything under the sun. Now overnight they point to him as the soul of honesty, integrity, and loyalty.

If the Republicans think that about Harold they can have him in their party. But if they think for a minute that his rampage will break up the Democratic Party, brother, they're just whistling in the dark.

Money Facts and Fallacies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important functions of governments everywhere is to provide their people with a stable monetary system.

It now appears from the business and financial conditions prevailing throughout the world that the governments of the past, with their money systems as imperfect as they were, have done better in meeting this responsibility than the several governments—including our own—are doing at the present time with their several so-called managed currency systems.

There is submitted for the information and consideration of my colleagues a letter on the money subject and my answer thereto:

SPOKANE, WASH., *January 31, 1946.*

Mr. CHAS. E. POND,
Peyton Building, Spokane, Wash.

DEAR SIR:

1. A short time ago I wrote asking why the difference in the price of gold in various parts of the world in terms of United States dollars. You never replied but you sent me various articles which I have appreciated, especially the remarks by Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE. In it are some things I understand and some I do not. All remarks following that are in quotation marks are from Hon. C. I. WHITE's article.

2. A miner brings metal to the mint, "it would be minted into coin and handed back to him to do with as he pleased"; "the miner could spend it or keep it as he pleased"; "the collection of interest was not inherent with the creation and circulation of gold and silver money." All of that is plain, simple and understandable.

3. But if the miner wished he could loan it to someone with or without interest. He could have loaned it to Uncle Sam, taking in return a bond that paid interest. The interest had nothing to do with the creation or circulation of the money. The interest was a price paid for the use of the money by a party not owning the money. From the beginning of our Government down to the present Victory loan our Government has borrowed money by issuing interest-bearing bonds. I see nothing wrong in it.

4. The National Bank Act permitted legal tender money to be issued up to 90 percent of the value of the bonds deposited as security. Those bonds did not become the property of the Treasurer. They continued to pay interest to the owner because the Government was still using the money those bonds were originally issued for. The United States guaranteed that legal tender bank note because it had $100 for each $90 note issued. I cannot see anything wrong with that.

5. The miner takes the metal to the mint and receives (1) gold coin, (2) silver coin in return. Often he traded the gold coin for a piece of paper called (3) gold certificate. Usually he traded the silver coin for a piece of paper called (4) silver certificate, because the silver coins were too bulky and heavy to handle. The banker took the United States bonds to the Treasurer and deposited them for a piece of paper called (5) national bank note. All the above five kinds of money were legal. The owner, that is the banker or the miner, could spend, keep or loan as he elects.

6. What I do not understand is: How are the American people burdened with any interest in the creation or circulation of any of that money. Interest does not start until the owner loans his money to a second person and the latter person is willing to pay for that use of that money.

7. The amount of bank-note money issued was not controlled by the banks but by the amount of the bonds the United States sold, which in turn was controlled by the confidence someone had in investing in those bonds. The bank, after securing the bonds, could then control the amount of notes it wished to issue against those bonds. The bonds yielded interest but not the bank notes, that is until they were loaned out at interest as a gold coin or gold certificate or silver coin or silver certificate was loaned out.

8. Anyone can figure that a dollar compounded at 6 percent interest from 1879 until 1945 will be $46.79, if they have the time and the patience. It was nice of Mr. Woodlief Thomas, of the Federal Reserve System, to have done the work but it also added prestige to a weak argument. Why take 3 percent or 6 percent? Why compound annually? During that period banks loaned money as low as 2 percent and as high as 10 percent; took out interest in advance so that they got slightly more than the mentioned rate; loaned it for 30, 60, or 90 days, usually 90 days, so maybe interest should have been compounded quarterly or every 60 days. But on the other hand the banks had to keep 15 to 25 percent reserve, seldom had all their money loaned out, had certain expenses and losses inherent to running a loan business. So you see all this talk of interest means nothing. Just a smoke screen to cover the real issue.

9. "Money of ultimate redemption." What does that mean? Ultimately we redeem a gold or silver coin with what?

10. "Money of unchangeable value." What does that mean? That 1 ounce of gold will at all times buy a certain fixed quantity of wheat or coal or silver? Even in our bimetallic days an ounce of gold bought from 15 to 16.002 ounces of silver.

11. "Bimetallism worked from 1792 until 1873—81 years." Did it? The 1792 ratio was 15 to 1, which was very close to the world market. But the world market changed and by 1795 to 1833 that market changed and the average ratio was 15.6 to 1. That meant that gold was undervalued in the United States and silver was overvalued. You could change 15 ounces of silver for 1 ounce of gold at the United States mint and trade that ounce of gold for 15.6 ounces of silver, making 4 percent on the transaction. And the turnover was fast. The "inexorable force of Gresham's law" was working. Result, we got the silver and gold went to the world markets. And we had to do something about it.

12. So—in 1834 and 1837—the ratio was changed to 16 to 1. United States overvalued gold and undervalued silver. "The inexorable force of Gresham's law" reversed the process. An ounce of gold exchanged for 16 ounces of silver at the United States mint, but you took only 15.33 ounces of silver (in 1853) to the world markets and got 1 ounce of gold for it, making 4.3 percent on the transaction. Result, United States got the gold, silver almost vanished from the United States. Even small coins were melted down and sent abroad.

13. The scarcity of small change was so serious that the public protested, private coins were issued as a convenience, silver dollars were cut into quarters and eighths to be used as small change, bank notes were issued in fractional parts of a dollar and in odd amounts such as $1.25, $1.50, and $1.75, dollar bank notes were torn into halves and quarters to be used as small change.

14. Silver was not demonetized in the United States at this time. England in 1816 (not Germany in 1870) demonetized her silver coins by reducing their silver content and making them fiduciary money. Similar measures had been discussed in the United States. About the middle of the century a beginning was made by coining a 3-cent piece of reduced silver value and limiting its legal tender value to 30 cents. Then Congress reduced the silver value of small coins 7.6 percent less than the dollar so the small coins would not be melted down and exported. The coinage and use of silver dollars was almost negligible. The Government minted $1, $2.50, and $3 gold pieces for the convenience of the public. But Congressman WHITE says, "Silver was pouring into the mints to be coined as money."

15. Then came the Civil War. Specie payments were suspended, greenbacks were issued, and lack of confidence among people caused hoarding. Hoarding of what? Gold or silver or greenbacks? I presume the metal coins, which showed that Gresham's law was working.

16. During the greenback period, when practically no silver dollars were in circulation or had been in circulation for many years and the people were not familiar with the silver dollar, Congress revised our coinage laws in line with those of the rest of the world. Congress discontinued the silver dollar, which put us on the monometallic gold standard. That was in 1873 and caused no particular comment by the silver advocates, by the people, or by Congress. As in 1834, when the gold dollar was reduced from 24.75 grains to 23.22 grains, there was no particular comment about this debasing of the money because there was so little gold in circulation that it affected practically no one.

17. The United States remained on the gold standard until recent times when we suspended specie payments. The country is on a managed-currency basis but we do not like to admit it. The gold and silver in the Government vaults has no connection with the dollar. (See Chairman Eccles, of the Federal Reserve, in his report to the House Banking and Currency Committee.)

18. If you refer to page 7 of Congressman WHITE's article, he talks about population and commerce increasing 3 percent. It is rather vague because his arithmetic is faulty. One percent of a fraction of a quantity plus 2 percent of the balance of the quantity can never equal 3 percent of the quantity.

19. Now this profit in seigniorage we hear so much about: On page 3 reference is made to United States Treasury Bulletin showing 45 percent seigniorage which is a tremendous profit to the Federal Treasury. But on page 8 he again refers to United States Treasury Bulletin of July 1945, which shows a loss of $459,000,000 for a period from sometime in 1944 to May 1, 1945. That calls for some explanation.

20. The concluding paragraph in Congressman WHITE's remarks refers to the various prices of gold in United States dollars in different parts of the world. That brings us back to the original letter I wrote you and I am still wondering why Gresham's law does not correct this.

Again thanking you for the information you have sent me at various times, I remain,

Yours respectfully,

R. A. CROWLEY.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON COINAGE,
WEIGHTS, AND MEASURES,
Washington, D. C., February 23, 1946.

Mr. R. A. CROWLEY,
Spokane, Wash.

DEAR MR. CROWLEY: It is interesting to learn from your letter of January 31, addressed to my good friend, Mr. Charles Pond, of Spokane, in which you raise certain questions concerning statements made in my extension of remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD entitled "The Trouble With Silver," that you are interested in and are studying the money question. It would be better for our country if more of our thoughtful citizens would become conversant with the problems of money, and would direct their efforts to giving this country a sound, workable, adequate money system which would provide the cash necessary to finance the business of our country.

For the sake of convenience in answering the inquiries made in your letter, I have inserted numbers to the consecutive paragraphs.

Now to explain my position and present you with the facts.

The answer to your first question, as to the cause of the varying prices of gold in the several countries, is that these fluctuations result from the forces of economic law; i. e., supply and demand. Since the value of the currency (money) of the several countries is geared under their managed currency system to their national credit and detached from the value of gold and silver, it is natural that as the value of the national credit of any nation rises or falls in international trade, the purchasing power of that country's money in terms of gold or silver fluctuates so the price of gold is higher or lower in terms of this credit money. As an example take France: At the start of the depression back in 1929 when most nations were still on the gold standard the French people were eagerly paying $25 for United States $20 gold pieces. We (the Congress) subsequently legalized by statute what the law of supply and demand had already done; i. e., increased the value of gold from $20.67 an ounce to $35 an ounce.

The statements made in paragraphs 2 and 3 of your letter are correct. The Government, as far as obtaining and disbursing money is concerned, has always treated itself as an independent corporation and procured its income by taxation, the proceeds from which it spent in paying the Government's commitments and running expenses. Like any other corporation, in times of emergency, when its income did not meet its expenses, it proceeded to make up the difference by borrowing money from its citizens or in the market by issuing and selling bonds—a form of promissory note—and, as you say, there was nothing "wrong about that."

Now as to the plan authorized by law for the creation of money under the provisions of the National Bank Act discussed in paragraph 4, a scheme by which the national banks collected double interest on money lent to the Government in the first place, while collecting interest on the same credit by lending it (credit) to its customers in the form of national bank notes to which you say, "I cannot see anything wrong about that." I am unable to agree with you. If there is any interest to be paid for the use of Government credit, it should go to the Government and not to the banks. Besides, this scheme gives the banks power to retire money from circulation by refusing to renew loans or make new loans—in most cases, as we have learned by experience, when cash is needed the most.

The statements made in paragraph 5 are absolutely correct. The issuance of gold or silver certificates with the equivalent of this money metal on deposit in the Government vaults available for redemption on demand made the best paper money in the world, money that was convenient to transport and handle; the kind of money that saved the money users the necessity of paying interest to the banks in order to have this kind of money issued and remain in circulation and also prevented loss of the Nation's money metal by abrasion or misplaced coin.

The answer to the uncertainty expressed in the sixth paragraph is simple. If you have gold or silver coin or gold or silver certificates, otherwise money, which someone wants to borrow at interest, certainly you have every right to collect your interest as long as they want to keep the money. But, that proposition is quite different from the operation of a money system whereby the only source of money creation and supply is given to the

banks operating under a plan whereby the money of the country is supplied to borrowers who must exchange interest-bearing notes to secure the issue of new money or the reissue of old money that has been returned to the banks in payment of previous loans—or maybe get money issued by procuring a loan of mixed new national bank notes and old national bank notes, but in any event all of it paying interest to the issuing bank until this loaned money or its equivalent in some kind of money is brought back to the bank with interest added and the note taken up.

In fact, in the operation of the present money-creating scheme both the note and the money are retired until the next borrower comes along and takes this money out and puts it in circulation again by giving the bank a new interest-bearing note. Thus we find that under our existing Federal Reserve banking system there is a never-ending yield of interest to the bank.

In this connection it is interesting to note that the average money user doesn't realize that he is paying interest on the money in circulation, especially if he has a comfortable bank account and is accumulating, instead of losing, money. But he is paying his share of the interest indirectly even though his earnings or his share of money is only in his possession for a few minutes or days, a brief period on which the current rate of interest is infinitesimal. Ordinarily the interest on the money he handles over the week end or after the monthly pay day is so small it means practically nothing to him, but he pays his share of the interest just the same in the added price to the things he gets from the butcher, the baker, the merchant, the theater owner, or whomever he patronizes. The people who have borrowed money in the conduct of their business must add the interest they pay to the price of the things they sell. To illustrate the magnitude of this charge for the use of the money in circulation, compute the interest on the $25,633,379,605 in Federal Reserve notes and $502,261,413 in Federal Reserve bank notes as shown on the December circulation statement of the United States Treasury and prorate the amount of that figure among the people of this country.

Contrary to the statement in paragraph 7, the amount of bank-note money issued is controlled by the volume of applications for bank loans based on the value of the security offered and the willingness of the banks to make loans: no willingness, no loans—no loans, no money—no money, falling prices—falling prices, little value to the security offered—little value to the security offered, impossible to make sound loans—so the Nation's financial pump has lost its prime and thereby the more liberal banks were powerless to supply the money flow to finance business—then depression, and you and your old man lost your financial shirt—pardon the digression.

Now, explaining the equation and the deduction you make in paragraph 8, if you want to make your calculation conform to the practice of the banks using the Federal Reserve System as applied to business notes classified as eligible paper, we find there is a maximum limitation of 90 days on the maturity date on this class of loan so the interest on the money of the realm, i. e., Federal Reserve notes, comes in every 90 days or sooner, owing to the period of maturity of the eligible note pledged as security for the issuance of this kind of money.

The statement as to idle bank reserves and bank losses is beside the point. The indisputable fact is that the banks collect interest on all money in circulation with the exception of gold and silver coin and gold and silver certificates and, as you know, existing law has retired all gold coin and all gold certificates and operates to keep both these kinds of money out of circulation. The only interest-free money now in circulation is silver coin and silver certificates and when the banks come into possession of this kind of money, as they do all the time, and lend it out again they receive and are entitled to their interest just as you and I are entitled to interest on any loan that we make.

I think you and everyone else will agree with me that the banks of this country perform a most useful and indispensable service in dealing in money and dispensing credit, but when it comes to creating money and collecting interest on the use of the Government's credit with the power to contract or expand the money volume and the flow of credit then the banks have taken to themselves a concession to which they have no right and exercise power that is dangerous to national welfare as experience has repeatedly taught us.

Now as to the smoke screen you see mentioned in paragraph 8, let's brush this screen aside so we can really see the accumulation of interest the banks are taking on the interest-bearing obligation that is supporting the $26,500,000,000 of Federal Reserve notes and Federal Reserve bank notes in circulation calculated, say, at 3 percent annually.

Now when you and I were little kids and went to school the teacher said the way to find 1 percent of any given number was to write down the principal and then point off two places, that is, the last two numbers. Well, here we have $26,500,000,000. Now let's point off two places by marking off the two last ciphers and we find that 1 percent is $265,000,000 and we know that nobody can borrow money from a bank at 1 percent, for as I remember during most of my young life we had to work like everything to pay 10 percent on a farm mortgage and at that quarterly, and later the banks began to lend money at 8 percent. After the Federal land bank came along they made loans as low as 6 percent. That's what most of us have to pay now and we know that Government bonds, until lately, were paying 4 percent. Now the Government is paying you and me, if we wait long enough to get our money, 2½ percent.

There is no point in this discussion in bringing up the amount of interest that the people of this country are paying on the $262,000,000,000 national debt. Well, as 1 percent interest on the Federal Reserve notes in circulation brings us out at $265,000,000 and the banks probably receive an average of 3 percent interest on their loans, so 3 percent on the amount of bank money now in circulation is $7,950,000 a year income to the banks for the use of their kind of money.

Now, as I see it, this smoke screen thing has been draped over this interest-gathering mechanism of the banks and their interest income procured by using Uncle Sam's credit long enough, so you see that all this talk of interest means something, and now I would like to ask, as you see it, what is the real issue? With this smoke screen blown away, the people of this country should be able to see more clearly the real cause and objective of this long-sustained campaign to discredit the use of silver money.

Paragraph 9 evidently calls for a simple answer to a simple question, an answer which until recently was found on the face of every Government bond and most mortgages until the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 was passed, a covenant which clearly stated the obligation was redeemable in gold. At first for a long period after the Civil War Government bonds were redeemable in coin; later the law was changed to make them redeemable in gold. Not in wheat or iron, or labor, or bank credit, or the paper token of another debt, but gold, the money of ultimate redemption. Possibly you have noted that in all the years of this country's existence people did not redeem gold and silver coin with anything. They obtained gold and silver coin in exchange for many things—the products of labor or labor itself.

To define money of unchanging value, the subject of your query in paragraph 10, a better definition would be money of stable value, the kind of money the governments of the world have been seeking to create since civilization began, a quality of money the world needs now as never before.

Consider the French franc coming down to us from the dawn of medieval history. The monetary unit of a great nation, each franc is composed of 100 centimes or five sous, which had stable purchasing power all down through the centuries with a value of 20 cents in United States money. The franc has fallen since a managed currency system was adopted by France until today the value of the franc is 119 francs to one United States dollar, with the purchasing power of about five-sixths of a United States penny.

In considering the financial distress of the French people, one is prompted to ask if this could possibly have happened if francs were minted of silver.

The Italian money unit, the lira, formerly worth 20 cents in our money, is now worth 225 to the United States dollar. It is difficult to imagine how Italian pennies can be used in trade and from what material they could be minted.

The monetary unit in a stable monetary system should remain unchangeable in value as measured by the average commodity price level. Money, in a sound workable adequate money system, should measure values just as the thermometer measures the temperature. The value of the dollar, as nearly as possible, should be as fixed as the zero mark on the thermometer used in measuring the degrees of cold and heat.

The value of all other commodities are subject to fluctuations, influenced by conditions affecting production and the law of supply and demand. But money, the medium of exchange required in redeeming promissory notes and other deferred obligations, must be stable in value to protect the integrity of contracts.

The answer to the contention made in paragraph 11 as to the proven practicability of bimetallism is best answered by a statement made on the floor of the Senate by Senator F. M. Cockrell when he said:

"Here is international bimetallism established by France, Italy, Belgium, Switzerland, and Greece. France alone had maintained bimetallism ever since October 1785. In March 1865, she had called the attention of our Government to it, and Mr. Lincoln (President Lincoln) had appointed Mr. N. M. Beckwith commissioner general. On January 4, 1867, Mr. Berthemy, envoy of France to the United States, submitted to Secretary Seward a copy of the monetary convention of December 23, 1865, and invited the United States to become a party to it.

"That is the only time the United States was ever offered an opportunity to become a member of an international bimetallic union. Here was a bimetallic system upon a ratio of 15½ to 1 maintained by France since October 30, 1785, and all we had to do was simply to subscribe to it. There was no international complication connected with it; nothing to do but simply subscribe to it and agree that we would coin certain coins. In order to come to that, we only had to strike out about 12½ grains of our standard silver dollar, reduce it to 400 grains, and thus bring it down to the ratio of 15½ to 1. Here was the standard perfected, tested for nearly a hundred years."

In reaching our conclusions concerning the influence responsible for the flow of money, evidently you mistake the disparity in the values of the money metals gold and silver in this country and in Europe for "the inexorable forces of Gresham's law." The movement of money metal referred to was occasioned by the difference in monetary ratios of gold and silver, minted by our Govments and the governments of Europe, particularly France, which steadily maintained

a ratio of 15½ to 1 while our Government at first established a ratio of 15 to 1 and then, instead of standardizing the ratio of gold and silver in our money with that of France and other European countries, the United States Government by the acts of 1834 and 1837 adopted the ratio of 16 to 1, thereby undervaluing silver in our money which naturally went to the European mints at the standard value then prevailing in France and other countries at a profit to the exporters in this country.

Later, when the opponents of international bimetallism were successful in preventing this country from standardizing our currency with nations comprising the Latin union and joining an international convention to extend international bimetallism to this country, the profits being made by the silver exporters were used as one of the excuses for demonetizing silver in this country in 1873.

It is interesting to note that the "inexorable forces of Gresham's law" is failing to operate at the present time to drive superior quality Federal Reserve note currency out of circulation by the use of inferior quality silver certificate currency, or vice versa.

In discussing the acute shortage of subsidiary coin mentioned in paragraph 13 with silver undervalued here at a time when the mints of the European nations were accepting silver on a 15½-to-1 ratio, naturally silver flowed to Europe, leaving this country short of subsidiary coins.

As stated in paragraph 14, England did adopt the gold standard after the Napoleonic wars in 1816, with distressing effect on the English people for a long time. It was after the Germans defeated France in 1870 and exacted as a down payment on the war indemnity all the gold in France when the French people patriotically brought their gold to the French Treasury and exchanged it for French bonds, which gold the Germans loaded up on their gun caissons and hauled back to Berlin.

It was after this that the German and English bankers found themselves in possession of 90 percent of the world's gold with France still heavily indebted to Germany for the balance of the war indemnity payable in gold. Germany was quick to take further advantage of France by closing the German mints to silver and dumping the silver on France. This forced France to close her mints to silver, soon to be followed (1873) by the demonetization of silver in this country.

Again, in paragraph 15, you apparently confuse the influence of Gresham's law with the effect of war conditions. It may be explained that due to the uncertainties as to the outcome of the Civil War or which side would be victorious, naturally there was hoarding and metallic money disappeared from circulation. To meet this emergency, President Lincoln resorted to the expedient of drawing on the public credit by issuing non-interest-bearing Treasury notes engraved and printed with green ink, commonly called greenbacks, the total amount of which never exceeded a half million dollars, from which it appears that the Government of that day was more considerate of our people and posterity than the Government is now, because greenbacks were issued interest free.

Paragraph 16 understates the case. Paper national-bank notes were invented and the National Bank Act was passed in 1863 in an emergency during the Civil War. This plan gave the banks the concession to create and issue money that was backed by the credit of the United States Government—a money-creating plan by which the banks collect two interest yields on the circulation of their kind of money, that is, 4 percent on the Government bonds which the banks placed on deposit in the Treasury and the current commercial rate of interest on the money equivalent to the deposited bonds which the banks issued into circulation in making bank loans. Much of this money in that day was loaned at 10 percent.

It is interesting to note that at the time the banks were getting the circulation of their interest-yielding national bank note money under way the opening of western mines was pouring silver into the mints to be coined into money, which for the most part flowed into circulation without being loaned at interest.

In this situation it was the most natural thing in the world for the financiers on both sides of the ocean to set plans in motion to cut off the competition of silver money with their profitable (interest yielding) monetary concession and to keep it shut off.

In making the statement contained in paragraph 17, it is to be regretted that apparently you have overlooked the real effect of the legislation that revalued gold and abandoned the gold standard. Operating under the provisions of this law, the banks have as effectually secured the demonetization of gold in this country as they have silver, accomplished by removing gold and gold certificates from circulation, thereby removing the competition of gold with their interest-yielding Federal Reserve note currency.

Chairman Eccles may be able to fool you and himself as to the importance of gold for security in connection with his managed currency system but it appears from the present market quotations on the price of gold throughout the world, he is not fooling the rest of the people. As to the rate of growth of population of commerce referred to in paragraph 18, it is to be regretted that you are in disagreement with the majority of economists.

In discussing a subject as important as the profits the Government has made on silver purchases under the provisions of silver legislation since 1934, it might be well to call your attention to the fact that the daily financial statements of the Treasury and the table of the monthly Treasury Bulletin are available for the asking. It is to be regretted that evidently you fail to understand the facts concerning seigniorage (profit) reported by the Treasury on its silver purchase operations. An attempt will be made to set you aright by giving you the facts on seigniorage from reports contained in the last monthly Treasury Bulletin, that of January 1946. On page 82 of this report appears a table with the columns containing the separate categories of silver seigniorage totals.

The first column in this table shows the seigniorage on subsidiary coins (dimes, quarters, and half dollars) since January 1934 which amount to $424,300,000. The second item is the total seigniorage on silver revalued since January 1934, which amounts to $917,400,000. The total of the last column is the potential seigniorage on the idle silver bullion carried at cost in the general fund which, if this silver were coined and used as money, would amount to $377,600,000. Taken all together, the silver seigniorage as reported by the United States Treasury since the Silver Purchase Act was passed in 1934 is $1,719,300,000, a tidy sum for the Government to make on a minor Treasury money transaction. If there is any doubt in your mind as to what the word seigniorage means, it is suggested that the exact meaning of the word seigniorage can be found in any dictionary.

It is difficult to understand the motive of anyone with any patriotism who would misrepresent facts concerning silver and the profits that the Treasury has made on its silver transactions under provisions of existing law.

As to the effect of Gresham's law, the subject of the twentieth and the last paragraph of your letter, it appears that the final result of the sustained effort of the banks and the United States Treasury to circumvent the forces of economic law by the operation of a managed currency system in this country must finally end like all attempts to evade natural law when the inexorable rules of economic law will overtake and overturn man's puny effort in due time as it did in recent depression years and naturally will do again.

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

National Forests: Thin Purses' Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Richard L. Neuberger from the Sunday Oregonian of February 17, 1946:

NATIONAL FORESTS: THIN PURSES' PARADISE

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

More than four decades ago an American President with bright teeth, shiny glasses and a love of the outdoors set aside millions of forest acres as a trust to be held for future generations. Thus were the national forests established, nearly all of them in the States of the far West.

"To these solitudes of forest and mountains," said the twenty-sixth President of the United States, "families of limited means will be able to come to find inspiration and health. They will be the vacation land of the average citizen."

Theodore Roosevelt's vision is going to be realized this year in greater proportions and magnitude than even that robust adventurer dreamed.

The United States Forest Service expects approximately 5,000,000 people to visit the national forests of Oregon and Washington during 1946. It will be the record forest vacation season of all time, predicts Frank B. Folsom, of Portland, assistant regional forester in charge of recreation.

GAS BUGGIES CAN AGAIN TAKE TO STEEP ROADS

In 1941, the last peacetime year, the national forests of the Pacific Northwest were used by 2,248,685 citizens. All current travel prophecies expect that figure to be doubled this year. Inquiries from every section of the North American Continent have been received by regional headquarters of the Forest Service, in Portland, as well as by the national offices in Washington, D. C.

Lyle F. Watts, Chief Forester of the United States, says that his organization anticipates a record rush of tourists to the national forests in 1946. "It will be a busy season for recreation," says the Chief Forester, who not so long ago was a resident of Portland himself.

While the war lasted, forest vacations were held to a minimum. Gasoline rationing kept cars off the steep roads leading to these upland fastnesses. Lack of tire replacements confined the relatively few automobiles that were running to pavement; no motorist wanted to risk his precious rubber on wilderness roads. Picnic grounds were overgrown by underbrush and young trees; shelter cabins and fireplaces tumbled into various stages of decay.

Today, motorists once more can give the command, "Fill 'er up!" Tires have been removed from rationing lists. Dealers even are accepting orders for 1946 cars. New camping equipment is available. Shot and shell can be purchased for rifles. Millions of

Americans are looking once more toward the forests and mountains.

FORESTS OFFER BEST GAME HUNTING, FISHING

These vacation aspirations place a special burden and responsibility on the Pacific Northwest. Twenty-three percent of the entire State of Oregon, for example, is within the boundaries of national forests. The State has a total area of 61,188,480 acres; the national forests in this State contain 14,425,571 acres. Of Washington's 42,775,040-total acreage, 8,413,387 are in national forests.

National forests include some of the region's most conspicuous beauty—Mount Hood, Mount Jefferson, the Three Sisters, the Wallowa Range, Mount Baker, Snoqualmie Pass, Lake Chelan, Mount Adams, Mount St. Helens, the Olympic Seacoast, the Rogue River, the 6,100-foot chasm of Hell's Canyon on the Snake. The best hunting and fishing in the Northwest can be found in the national forests; a substantial proportion of the region's big game feeds within forest boundary lines.

MOUNT HOOD LEADS IN VISITORS

Frank Folsom and his assistant, Kenneth Wolfe, expect visitors to trek to the various national forests during 1946 in about the same ratio that they did in the peacetime years just before the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor. There are 21 national forests in the Northwest—8 in Washington and 13 in Oregon, with a portion of two of Oregon's forests, the Rogue River and the Siskiyou, extending gently into northern California.

This is how the 21 forests of the region were used by American travelers and tourists in 1941:

State of Oregon:	
Deschutes	89,530
Fremont	24,955
Malheur	32,635
Mount Hood	636,446
Ochoco	12,515
Rogue River	56,590
Siskiyou	63,100
Siuslaw	82,585
Umatilla	52,100
Umpqua	84,585
Wallowa	31,328
Whitman	25,539
Willamette	134,263
Total	1,326,171
State of Washington:	
Chelan	20,185
Columbia	145,432
Colville	26,700
Mount Baker	133,757
Olympic	35,720
Snoqualmie	397,500
Umatilla	7,890
Wenatchee	155,330
Total	922,514

Both Folsom and Wolfe, the Forest Service officials in charge of recreation, believe that Mount Hood will continue to lead the region's national forests in the number of visitors. They cite several reasons. One is Mount Hood's premier position as a winter sports center. Another is its proximity to the Portland metropolitan area. Few other national forests are as close to a large city as Mount Hood is to Portland.

The Snoqualmie and Mount Baker National Forests stretch to within a comparatively short distance of Seattle, but the Puget Sound region has more competing attractions than the Portland area. Snoqualmie is also famous for winter activities, although both it and the Mount Hood forest feature summer recreation as well. The Milwaukee Railroad has helped build up the Snoqualmie attendance by running ski trains to the edge of the forest. Some of the most diversified recreation in America takes place within the borders of national forests. White-capped streams, snapping at canyon walls, invite rod and reel. The hunter can track nearly every kind of grazing animal. Lakes of cobalt blue and emerald green are ideal for swimming. Thousands of trails offer hiking and walking. Lofty glacial summits challenge the experienced climber. Pack trips offer other possibilities.

The atmosphere, too, is diversified. The Mount Hood National Forest, within sight of Portland's busy streets, is ribbed with several paved highways. Contrasting surroundings feature the Eagle Cap wilderness area in the Wallowa National Forest, a region with no roads, no cabins, and only a few narrow game trails. In wilderness areas, no motorized transportation can be used—no cars, no motorboats, no Cub airplanes. Foot, horseback, and canoe are the sole means of getting about the most primitive parts of the forests of the Northwest.

To assist in the enjoyment of the region's forests, these are the improvements constructed thus far in the woodlands controlled by the Forest Service in Oregon and Washington:

Camp grounds	569
Picnic areas	26
Camp grounds and picnic areas	344
Swimming areas	17
Winter sports areas	54
Organization camps owned by Forest Service	19
Organization camps owned by various organizations	51
Hotels owned by Forest Service	4
Privately owned hotels	45
Privately owned cabins and summer homes	1,664

Of the four hotels owned by the Forest Service, three are located in the Mount Hood National Forest—Timberline Lodge, Cloud Cap Inn, and Multnomah Falls Lodge. The other is Heather Inn on the steep slopes of the Mount Baker Forest in the State of Washington.

RECREATION WILL AGAIN STAY IN TOP POSITION

Throughout the war, recreational needs came second to the imperative job of defeating the enemy. The Forest Service concentrated on lumber production, development of essential minerals, and the protection of the forests against fire. Other duties were postponed. In a recent report to Horace J. (Hoss) Andrews, regional forester, Frank Folsom pointed out, "None of the camp grounds has been adequately maintained during the war. Tables, benches, bridges, swings and other equipment are rotting and falling apart, even when built of heavy logs. Camp stoves are in such bad shape we believe 75 percent of them should be replaced."

Folsom said that this condition prevailed in the face of "a year likely to be as full a one as we have ever had. The whole existing system of public camps and picnic grounds is in need of extensive repair, but, in addition, a number of new areas should be planned immediately and construction started as soon as possible. These are the areas which have been opened up by mineral, timber, or other access roads. Having become suddenly accessible, they will be used for recreation. Provision should be so made."

What are the outstanding forests of the Northwest from the standpoint of recreational possibilities?

In Oregon, Kenneth Wolfe nominates the Mount Hood, Willamette, Deschutes, and Rogue River. For the State of Washington he picks the Columbia, Snoqualmie, and Wenatchee. These all have diversified activities, ranging from placid automobile rides to dangerous alpine ascents. Frank Folsom, the Northwest director of recreation for the Forest Service, once was supervisor of the Wenatchee Forest. He points out that many of the forests in the region feature both "east side and west side recreation."

This is an important combination. The west slope of the Cascades has heavy rain and snowfall. Forests are clogged with underbrush and ferns. Green is the dominant color. Columbian blacktails comprise the deer population. The east side of the mountains is out of the rain belt, for the high summits knock the moisture from the clouds as they are blown in from the Pacific. The forests of the east side are like parks. The ponderosa pines stand up like Greek columns. Sagebrush and bunch grass hem in the forests. Mule deer predominate in the animal population.

PERSONAGES EXPRESS PREFERENCE IN VACATION AREAS

Such forests as the Willamette, Columbia, and Snoqualmie combine both east side and west side scenery. They extend all the way across the Cascade Range. This adds to their recreational attractiveness. Yet many famous visitors to the Northwest swear by particular forests. Justice William O. Douglas says his favorite is the Wallowa, with its immense canyon and rugged lakes basin. A fellow named Harry Truman wants to visit the Mount Baker and the North Cascades wilderness area. Gen. George C. Marshall favors the fishing in the Umpqua. Zane Grey always promoted the Rogue River. James Oliver Curwood once trekked through the Columbia and pronounced it superb.

National interest in the forests of the Pacific Northwest is at its greatest pitch today. Arden X. Pangborn chairman of Gov. Earl Snell's tourist development program, says that thousands of people in every State want to visit the vast wilderness reaches of this region. Gov. Monrad C. Wallgren, of Washington, expects the national forests of his State to be used by twice as many people in 1946 as ever before. He says that President Truman has made him a definite promise to come "and possibly visit Alaska, too."

Even youngsters show this interest. Jack Horton, assistant regional forester, recently received a letter from Bill Skyzypek. "I'm very interested in the forest rangers," wrote Bill, "and plan to be one when old enough. I don't know but could you send me a forest-ranger badge? My gang don't think I mean that when I'm old enough I will be a ranger. If it is impossible to send me a badge could you please send me a button from a ranger's uniform?"

"That kid is on the spot with his gang," said Horton, and so in due time a button from one of Horton's old ranger uniforms will reach Bill Skyzpek, at 1424 East Falls Street, in Niagara Falls, N. Y.

Ever since Teddy Roosevelt's administration, the national forests have been the poor man's vacation land. They also have been the place where civilized people can commune with the primeval, where a last vestige of the original American wilderness remains. A policy aimed at continuing this status will govern the forest of the Pacific Northwest during the 1946 vacation season.

APPEAL MADE TO PEOPLE OF LOW INCOMES

"Particular attention will be given," says a directive from headquarters of the Forest Service, "to facilities for the use of the majority of American citizens, who can enjoy forest recreation only if its cost is small. This means emphasis on camping and picnicking facilities and on organization camps owned by the Government and made available either to individuals or organizations whose members are in low-income groups."

For many years the Salvation Army has maintained a camp system for underprivileged children at Lake o' the Woods, in the Rogue River National Forest. The camp, owned by the Forest Service, is taken over for a period by the Salvation Army. Similar groups use national forest facilities in many sections of the Northwest. No charge is made for the use of Forest Service campground equipment, such as stoves. Entrance to the forests themselves is without toll. All

emphasis is on catering to the citizen with the thin wallet.

In addition the Forest Service seeks to preserve as much as possible of the original fastnesses which Lewis and Clark saw. "The Forest Service will install or permit the installation of facilities only to the extent required to serve public needs," orders Chief Forester Watts. "It will keep to a minimum the introduction of artificial developments in the forest environment."

In the record tourist year now about to begin, Frank Folsom and his associates seek such an objective in the national forests of Oregon and Washington—vacations for men and women of average income in the grandest setting of all, the original setting with which God Almighty endowed the American wilderness.

Attack on Soap Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD. I include the following correspondence:

FEBRUARY 26, 1946.

Hon. TOM C. CLARK,
Attorney General of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CLARK: Enclosed please find a copy of a letter I sent some time ago to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Clinton P. Anderson, concerning the very deleterious situation which has developed in the manufacture of soap in this country.

I also draw your attention to Public Law 458, Seventy-eighth Congress, chapter 480, 2d session, setting up the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion. I specifically draw your attention to section 205 which states, "The Attorney General is directed to make surveys for the purpose of determining any factors which may tend to eliminate competition, create or strengthen monopolies, injure small business, or otherwise promote undue concentration of economic power in the course of war mobilization and during the period of transition from war to peace and thereafter."

The quota that has been established by the War Food Administration strengthens the monopoly on soap manufacturing now held by the so-called big three, Colgate-Palmolive-Peet, Lever Brothers, and Procter & Gamble. These three outfits manufacture about eighty-five percent of all the soap produced in this country.

The quota set up by the War Food Administration has the result never intended by Congress when it passed Public Law 458.

I call upon you to make this survey.

I herewith enclose a second letter which I have sent today to the Secretary of Agriculture, offering an alternate plan to the present system of quota.

Very truly yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

DECEMBER 5, 1945.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CLINTON: Since I saw you the other day with Mr. Kamen, of the Kamen Soap Products Co., on the subject of quotas for inedible fats, oils, and grease, facts, in addition to those disclosed to you, have been brought to my attention.

The fat and grease renderers are bitterly complaining that as a result of the quota they are compelled to channelize the bulk of their product to the so-called big three—Lever Brothers, Colgate-Palmolive-Peet, Procter & Gamble—and other large organizations. They are unable to choose their customers. They must sell to those who are favored with large quotas.

They are cowed and coerced by these big three, even to the extent of compelling them to sell below ceiling price. These fat and grease renderers are afraid to come forward with complaints, either to you or the Department of Justice. The minute they raise their voices in protest, they are met with all manner and kind of irritations set up by the big three.

I know of one case, specifically, but the grease renderer will not allow me to use his name because of his fears. He offered several cars of grease to one of the big three, who insisted upon a deep cut in the price. The fat renderer refused to accept the price cut and then tried to sell elsewhere but was balked in his attempts inasmuch as the smaller operators had such short quotas they could not accept his offer. He continued to seek purchasers but finally was compelled to sell his product to one of the big three at reduced price. This is the type of squeeze that the big three are indulging in all over the country.

Frankly, I am reminded of an old saying, "The more you poke an old pile the more it stinks." The more I hear about this situation, the worse it grows.

May I urge upon you a reexamination of the facts concerning these quotas? May I be permitted to suggest that a public hearing be held, at which time all sides might be heard? Otherwise, I am convinced that these big soap manufacturers will so fasten their hold upon the soap industry as to drive most of the smaller manufacturers out of business.

Remember, also, that we are now in a critical period—reconversion. The smaller entity needs all the aid and assistance that Government can extend to it. Instead of being given this support, he is being hurt by such governmental decrees.

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

FEBRUARY 26, 1946.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am sure you will forgive my importuning you again concerning WFO-42b, the War Food Administration order which establishes quotas on raw materials used for soap making.

Ordinarily, the establishment of quotas is eminently fair and proper, but in the case of soap making, quotas freeze a status quo and freeze the monopoly enjoyed by the three main soap manufacturers, Lever Brothers, Colgate-Palmolive-Peet, and Procter & Gamble. These big three make 85 percent of all American soap.

Assuredly, it was never the intent of Congress in passing the War Powers Act to give any authority to any governmental entity to give aid and comfort to a monopoly through orders establishing quotas. In fact, the War Powers Act expressly provides that no governmental agency shall issue decrees or orders that cause continued violation of the antitrust laws. WFO-42b does just that. It encourages and approves the soap monopoly by the so-called big three, to the detriment of the small manufacturer.

Apparently, you have not been impressed with this argument.

I herewith present another suggestion to you as a way out of this difficulty. In order that the small soap makers have a chance to remain in business, why not provide for a maximum blanket allowance of fats and oils which shall be quota exempt. In other words, quotas would not start until this blanket allowance is consumed. This blanket allowance could be determined by the War Food Administration and equitably arranged so that the smaller manufacturers could remain in business. This general blanket allowance would greatly reduce the available supply of raw materials before the quota would obtain. Such a plan would help the little fellow and to that extent create a more equitable distribution. Of course the big three would not like it.

Such an arrangement would greatly reduce the quota pie. That is the way it should be. Each manufacturer would then get a smaller piece of the quota pie, but he will, in the first instance, have been helped a good deal out of the ex-quota. The little fellow would then get a chance for his white alley.

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

White Elephants Versus Work Horses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL C. MICHENER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, during the war many factories were constructed by the Government or financed by the Government, to meet wartime military production. Many of these plants have been declared surplus by the War and Navy Departments. They are standing idly by, awaiting the day when they will be utilized in manufacturing peacetime commodities. The process of reconversion is lagging. The one thing that is going to do much to meet the requirements of our peacetime economy, remove the cause for price-fixing, and priorities, is production. My attention has been called to a statement recently appearing in the press made by Mr. Brouwer D. McIntyre, of Monroe, Mich., which, coming from a successful manufacturer, is most pertinent. Pursuant to the privilege given to me, I include the release which is as follows:

Turning white elephant war plants into work horse production centers through a more liberal give and take policy by both Government and industry was suggested today by a Michigan industrialist as a fast means of boosting output of much-needed peacetime goods.

Such a policy, he declared, also would help maintain employment, help reduce Government costs and serve to concentrate building activity on homes and apartment buildings instead of new industrial properties.

A still further advantage should be the bringing together of management and labor in a movement that should result in definite benefits to both, it was pointed out by Brouwer D. McIntyre, president of the Monroe Auto Equipment Co., who made the suggestion.

"Countless plants which were Government-financed or Government-operated during the war are standing idle today, even while industry is seeking to expand rapidly to meet civilian demands," Mr. McIntyre said. "Some of these plants were built before the war and are not of thoroughly up-to-date or desirable industrial construction. Others were built during the war for specific needs which do not now exist. All of them are costing the Government money in State and local

taxes, insurance, maintenance, skeleton guards and stand-by personnel, and similar expenses.

"The placing of such plants in immediate production by private enterprise is being halted—or at least delayed or obstructed—by two factors. First, the Government is holding them for sale or lease at appraisal figures which are not based on today's production schemes or values and which offer little incentive compared to the advantages of building a new plant designed to fit specific, individual manufacturing needs. Industry, therefore, is prone to consider Government prices too high.

"The second factor is that industry may be too quick in deciding that the now idle war plants are not modern enough from a production standpoint, not profitable enough from an investment standpoint, and not suitable enough from any one of a number of other standpoints—labor supply, transportation facilities or geographical location, for example.

"Unquestionably, there is much to be said on both sides, and Government and industry each is largely right from its own viewpoint. But all the while, the plants are idle—the white elephants are still white elephants and not work horses as they should be in this reconversion period when people are doing without automobiles and washing machines and refrigerators and many other things they need.

"On the other hand, it would appear that the Government would be quick to benefit if these plants would be placed in immediate production. Certainly, the savings in Government costs of maintaining them in idleness would be worth while to the taxpayers, if nothing else. Industry, too, would be a gainer if it had plant space in which to produce the things people want to buy.

"A solution of the problem lies in the Government reexamining its appraisal values and prices in light of today's conditions, and lowering them accordingly. Industry, then, should reexamine its requirements and modify them in line with the lowered costs of buying already-available plant space, even though it might not offer topnotch manufacturing facilities. Many of the plants can be adapted to immediate needs. Many of them are in excellent locations—often, manufacturing could be concentrated instead of spread out over distant territories. Lowered costs would permit companies to spend money for plant improvements.

"And, apart from the obvious advantage of boosting production when a boost is urgently needed, a give-and-take attitude on the part of both Government and industry would help local communities, it would provide jobs for returning veterans, it would permit the building industry to focus its attention on places to live, and it would be a program acceptable to labor because of its employment features."

Wyatt Housing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article on the Wyatt housing program, by Carl M. Fleming, past president of the Toledo (Ohio) Real Estate Board:

The Wyatt housing program and the Patman amendments propose to socialize the building and real-estate industry.

The Wyatt program is supposed to help the country meet the housing shortage. Actually, it will prolong the shortage by handicapping industry and forcing it into a subsidy program. It will retard construction of homes for veterans by clamping down rigid price ceilings.

Mr. Wyatt has called for the construction of 2,700,000 homes by the end of 1947. This includes conventional houses and unproved prefabricated homes. It involves:

1. Premium payments for increased production.
2. Guaranteed markets for materials manufacturers.
3. Priorities and allocations of equipment and materials.
4. Wage-price adjustments or price increases where they are necessary and not inflationary.
5. Rapid tax amortization for plants which are newly built or converted to produce essential building materials.
6. Absorption by Government of undue risks in developmental work on new-type materials.
7. Use of war plants for prefabrication experiments.
8. Immediate enactment of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill.

Although no specific legislation embracing the Wyatt program has been prepared, Mr. PATMAN has announced his intentions to introduce amendments to his own bill which would seek to incorporate the major points of the Wyatt program.

Nothing has been said about total costs of the Wyatt plan. Here they are:

1. The Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill	$3,960,000,000
2. Subsidies to materials producers	600,000,000
3. Temporary reuse of war housing	250,000,000
4. Tax amortization for materials production	?
5. Training program	?
Total	4,810,000,000

An additional $200,000,000 will probably be required to encourage increased production of new or substitute materials.

The program provides for the impossible by proposing to concentrate home-building materials to houses selling for not more than $6,000. This would exclude 70 percent of the country from participation in the program. Under today's material and labor costs it is not possible to build an acceptable house and sell it complete with lot for $6,000 in 70 percent of the Nation. It simply is not in the cards, and the program would stall on this point.

Mr. Wyatt proposes to subsidize the production of building materials to the extent of $600,000,000. The manufacturers of building materials have categorically declared that they do not want such subsidy. They have stated that the only thing they need to insure 100-percent production is price relief. If they are given reasonable ceilings they can get into capacity production immediately. They estimate that $200,000,000 increase in prices would bring quicker and more permanent results than $600,000,000 in subsidies. And there would be no bill for the taxpayer to foot.

The Wyatt program involves an attempt to force Federal subsidies down the throat of an industry that does not want them and has said so.

The Patman bill and the proposed amendments involve a comprehensive plan subsidized by the Treasury which it is proposed to force upon the building and real-estate industry without permitting that industry to make an appearance at hearings to offer testimony or countersuggestions. It is taxation without representation amplified many times.

This program is intended to provide housing for veterans. Unfortunately, by compelling industry to take a course it does not want, and under which it cannot operate, it will stop housing for veterans instead of building it. It was hastily conceived in star-chamber sessions and is now being offered without the customary benefit of public hearings or an examination by a committee of the Congress. It will not produce housing for veterans. Instead it will deceive them into thinking they will get houses. When the housing is not produced after being promised in this program there will be widespread resentment among the veterans.

It is completely possible to evolve a housing program for veterans under which industry can produce the houses. That should be done. That must be done.

The Congress has the right to demand that such a program—not the Patman-Wyatt program—be presented to it.

The Public Debt

REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] commented on the announcement of Secretary Vinson that the Treasury would pay off in cash $2,800,000,000 of obligations maturing in March. The gentleman then went on to say that the Treasury could pay off $20,000,000,000 of the debt out of the money now in the Treasury.

The House will be interested in a full statement of the facts. The cash balance is now $25,800,000,000. This strong position of the Treasury is the result of the splendid response to the Victory Loan. The Treasury set a goal of $11,000,000,000. The American people subscribed $21,000,000,000. The American people have shown in this way their continued confidence in United States Government securities as the best investment in the world.

The present cash balance is large. But this balance must meet large needs in the next few months. The big expenses of war have stopped. But it takes a good deal of money to redeploy our armed forces and to muster out the returning men and women. In addition, the Government has large maturing obligations, some of which will be paid off in cash and some of which will be met by issuing new securities. The Treasury must take all this into account in handling its cash balance.

The suggestion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that $20,000,000,000 of the Treasury balance could be used now to pay off part of the debt is not in accord with the facts. A large part of the cash balance will be used in the next few months. By June 30, 1946, 4 months from now, close to $15,000,000,000 of the balance will have been used; it will be down to less than half of what it is now. And in the few months after that the balance will be still further reduced to meet the expenses of the Government and such maturing obligations as are paid in cash.

Thus, by the end of the summer, the Treasury balance will be down to a mini-

mum conservative level. And this will be done in an orderly way that will not upset the money market during the important reconversion period. To have the Treasury suddenly pay back $20,000,000,000 of outstanding obligations and then in a month or two come back and again borrow a large part of it would upset the money market and hinder the reconversion program, without any real saving to the Government.

The rapid reconversion of industry is essential to expand our peacetime production to prevent inflation. Every policy of the Government must take this into account. Finance is no exception. A wise financial policy can help smooth reconversion. The present public-debt program is intended to do just that.

A Letter to Laski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 18, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

A LETTER TO LASKI

DEAR PROFESSOR: At a pin't-dawn dinner in New York (with Mrs. Roosevelt at your side) you tell us that "free enterprise and market economy mean war; socialism and a planned economy mean peace."

You are the latest of a long line who have been coming over here to tell us what a rummy country we have. We have been told that the Declaration of Independence was a great mistake. We have been told that General Washington's dream of an independent destiny for Am.rica was a false start in the progress of mankind. But for utter gall and nonsense you tower among your brethren.

You are chairman of the British Labor Party now in charge of what our socialites continue to call our mother country. You are here to tell us, and Lord Keynes is here to sell us. At the same time that Keynes tells us that Britain will collapse unless we send you four billions more, you have the nerve to say that our system of doing business has made starvation a symbol of our power. Just whom have we starved, Professor?

The four billions are to be heaped on top of twenty-five billions of lend-lease, and all we did to save democracy and the Empire in World War I, and to prevent starvation afterward. However, twenty-five billions would have built five million houses here for our returning soldiers at $5,000 each. We need some houses here, Professor.

The brains and enterprise which enabled us to ship 25 billions overseas did not come from following your cockeyed notions of the good, the beautiful, and the true. You have fooled your fellow islanders with your stage magic of a brave new world, cleansed of the profit motive and purified with the selfless incense of politicians. With these four billions you can get your people to thank you for being elected by them. But the dough, the spondulix, the mazuma, and the long green, Professor, still comes from the country whose system you despise; in short, from England's Uncle Sap from the Grand Dupe of Russia.

We did not start this war. England declared war on Hitler without consulting us. And two of your "planned economy" boys, Hitler and Stalin, fixed things up private like before the panzers moved east and the Reds rolled over Poland.

After the "Hounds of Hell" were set loose, Britain fought with pit-dog courage. Americans admire courage even more than monocles. But now that the shooting is over, where is Poland? And the Atlantic Charter? And whose fingers are on the trigger in Iran and Turkey today?

I don't deny that our free enterprisers with their striped-pants helpers in our State Department have sometimes sent marines to collect overdue dividends from the natives. But we have not started two world wars. The "planned economy" boys start the big wars, Professor.

When government runs everything, including foreign trade, then every race for a new oil field becomes an "international incident" and mobilizes a million men with triggers set; whereas, when our free enterprise handles foreign trade it never gets more than a few marines interested, and seldom that.

For a long time, Professor, you had a backdoor key to the White House. A surprising number of us, Professor, have begun to think it is time to change the lock. Mr. Truman, please note.

I close by saying we never expect to see our dollars again, but if we never see you again we will get some return on our investment.

Yours truly,

PLAIN AMERICAN.

P. S.—We will do what we can to feed and clothe the starving victims of your socialistic-planned economies. But if you don't stop advising us, we'll scream.

SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL.

OPA Extension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter from a constituent in my district.

Mr. Speaker, this letter is from a prominent minister who has served, all during the war, on the local OPA board. He served, not because OPA was a salvation of the Nation, but rather to be in a position to try and give the people of the country, the kind of justice and administration of the act, which they expected.

The OPA, by its foolish rules and regulations, has driven many of the old-line manufacturers of shirts, wearing apparel, and other goods out of the market. The show cases of Washington and the merchants of the country are filled with cheap, gawdy-looking sport shirts, which are being sold at a high price, because customers cannot get anything else. It is high time that this Congress do something about the OPA hoodwinking the American public on the pretense that they are holding the line. One needs only compare the prices of 1941 on a lot of the essential items of living, and you will find that the line is not being held, even with consumer subsidies. Production is more important than just holding the line. It is the true antidote of inflation and black markets.

The new Administrator, Paul Porter, made the statement that he did not take over the OPA, to act as liquidator of OPA. He says that the OPA is a going concern, with a faithful and loyal staff. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that there is no intention, in the near future, of ever closing shop, as far as OPA is concerned. As long as it is in existence, and continues its present method of brow beating business and industry, just so long will there be a shortage of essential items of living.

The OPA, a few days ago, spoke about the price of sugar. Bowles said that sugar went up to 30 cents a pound after the last war and gave the impression that this was a hardship. My sugar charts show the price went up to 26 cents a pound and stayed there less than 2 weeks, not long enough to hurt anyone. The truth about sugar after World War I, is this. Sugar stayed at 9 cents a pound during the war. After the war it went from 9 to 26 cents and then back to 8¼ cents within 1 year. It took 5 months to bring the price down to 8¼ cents. In another year, it was down to 4¾ cents. We got sugar. What good is a low price on sugar if you do not get sugar?

Bowles refutes his own argument when he asks Congress to keep up subsidies so he can keep prices down. Another department of government tells us that since people have so much money for spending they must now have subsidies. It is just double talk when they ask for a billion dollars in subsidies to keep the cost of living down a billion dollars. It really costs much more because you have to spend money advertising the program. His program is like putting a ceiling on Joe DiMaggio of 10 homers a year and then subsidizing him.

All this talk of Bowles holding the line against inflation is tommy rot. Inflation is already here. We can either recognize this fact and put in a flexible price control system which encourages production and takes these facts into consideration, or we can plunge this Nation off the deep end into economic disaster.

FEBRUARY 21, 1946.

The Honorable A. L. MILLER,
Congressman,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D C.

DEAR MR. MILLER: As your constituent I am writing to you to ask you not to favor the continuation of the OPA for another year. At least not to have the OPA continue to exercise its present powers, so detrimental to the American way of life and the postwar reconversion.

As you well know the OPA is trying with might and main, using every strategy to perpetuate itself, not only for another year, but for many years to come. The leaders of the OPA speak about holding the line of inflation. They are, it is true, holding the so-called line, but on the opposite end of that line they are choking the life out of the business of thousands of small merchants throughout the land. In spite of the OPA we already have inflation of money, inflation of wages, and inflation of consumer goods. The so-called price control which is so strongly advocated is no price control at all. There is no price control when apples for example sell for $5.50 per bushel—a 200-percent raise since 1941. There is no just

price control when the price of sugar has raised only 15 percent since 1941, whereas 90 percent of other foodstuffs raised 50 to 100 percent At the present price of sugar there always will be a shortage and consequently an OPA bureau. No one can, nor will anyone attempt to cultivate or process sugar to a large extent in this country at such ruinous prices.

The American people in general well understand the dictatorship of the OPA. Although in a less conspicuous form at present, nevertheless it will continue to grow if we permit it to do so, and sanction its existence. The American people are not as fearful about the so-called inflation bugaboo as they are about the continuation of the bureaucratic dictatorship of the OPA.

I have served gratis on the OPA local board during its entire existence in this country, not because I was convinced that the OPA was the salvation of the Nation, but rather I wished to be in a position to help, and see to it that the people of this country received as far as possible some kind of justice and consideration at the hands of the OPA bunglers.

We may not live to read in the future the unbiased history of the OPA in this country, but I am certain that whenever it is written it will go down in history as the greatest act of injustice and tyranny ever perpetrated on the American people since the Boston Tea Party. I believe I can truthfully say that Al Capone and his gang in prohibition days could be declared saints compared to some of the bureaucrats of the OPA and their associates of the black markets.

In conclusion I wish to say that I am not a crank by any means, and I am not writing this letter only to voice my personal opinion and feelings regarding the OPA. I am likewise expressing the feelings of hundreds of my own people, as well as hundreds of others in this country who are not able to, or who will not take the time to write to you personally.

With best wishes in the continuation of your splendid work, and hoping that you can give this matter your sincerest consideration, I am,

Respectfully yours,

A CONSTITUENT OF THE FOURTH DISTRICT, NEBRASKA.

OPA Is Ruining Coffee Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, the subject of coffee is nothing new in my office because over a period of time the Andresen-Ryan Coffee Co. has contacted me relative to the coffee shortage and on other occasions I have had the painful duty of presenting information to the Office of Price Administration. So again I want to take this matter up with the OPA through the mediumship of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I hope I have better success than I have had in past months. I have a telegram which came to the office yesterday and which reads as follows:

DULUTH, MINN., *February 25, 1946.*

Hon. W. A. PITTENGER,
Member of Congress, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

We have just wired the OPA that unless relief is given our plant, in operation here since 1916, will be closed due to lack of coffee. Importers who usually have thousands of bags to offer say they have none or let us have 15 bags, enough for 15 minutes roasting. This means 50 people will be out of employment, and we are not in a position to close and continue again later on. The situation is desperate with us. Please do something.

ANDRESEN-RYAN COFFEE CO.

I set forth this telegram in full, Mr. Speaker, so I cannot be accused of having any bias in this matter. I want to be accurate so far as the facts are concerned. This telegram indicates that like the statistical meat which OPA furnished when there was a meat shortage, this outfit is getting ready to furnish statistical coffee. Right now while OPA is carrying on a propaganda campaign in different parts of the country, trying to convince people that the cost of living has been kept down and that OPA is of great benefit to the American people, this telegram, and other complaints like it, point an accusing finger at the bureau and the bureaucrats.

If American labor and business and industry are to be subjected to such foolish regulations as have been enforced in reference to the coffee problem, then we can expect some long lines of unemployed people, knocking at the doors of shops and small factories and small business establishments which have been closed by these wrong policies of OPA.

Program for Voluntary Service in the Army and Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include herein a letter which I have received from an outstanding public citizen of Toledo whose life has been devoted to the best interests of his country and who has been the friend of the school children of Toledo. He has not only given of his substance but of himself toward the students of our schools.

I might say that I concur in the sound judgment of Mr. Page that we should not begrudge our serviceman a living as good or even better than he could enjoy as a civilian.

Hon. HOMER A. RAMEY,
Ninth District of Ohio,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RAMEY: Before many weeks have passed it will be up to the Congress to determine if our Nation shall have some form of compulsory military training and if the Selective Service Act shall be extended beyond its May 15 expiration date. My personal opinions on both these subjects follow the same pattern of reasoning. I most sincerely do not believe that any form of military service that is even remotely considered to be of a compulsory nature will work in harmony with our democratic principles. In time of war the very life of our Nation was at stake and we patriotically put aside our freedom to assure victory. We are now at peace, and our outlook is different. As long as any man is compelled to serve in the armed forces against his will there will be neither efficiency nor harmony.

If we are, as many national leaders state, destined to play a major role in future world affairs, and if this role is to be strengthened by a continued display of armed might, then let us set about a long-range program to establish this military strength on the only basis that our people will continue to accept—a voluntary basis. You may say that this is easier said than done, which, according to present standards, is quite true; however, this need not be the case if certain changes are made to place our Army or Navy career on a par with dignified civilian professions.

Some suggestions I can offer along this line would be to—

1. Adjust a serviceman's income so that it is comparable with that which he could be normally expected to earn as a civilian. This would cost a lot of money, but if we have a role to play in world affairs and we are all united on our policy to pursue this course, we most certainly should not begrudge our servicemen a living as good as they could enjoy as civilians. Let us not resort to compulsion because it is cheaper.

2. See that all future commissioned officers rise from the ranks of noncommissioned officers and that if certain civilian specialists are required by the armed forces let them be employed in civilian capacities rather than grant them commissions as high-ranking officers.

3. Let all future entrants to West Point and Annapolis come from the ranks of the enlisted men and let their appointments be made on a competitive basis.

4. Employ civilians to "keep house" for the armed forces—and thus restore dignity to the career of a professional soldier.

5. Narrow the gap of special privilege between officers and enlisted men so that we can approach a degree of relationship similar to that which exists in private industry between employer and employee, or labor and management.

In brief, raise the standards of an army and navy career to a plane whereby they can be regarded as professions just as dignified and as well compensated as comparable positions in civilian life. Do this and your problem is solved. Fail to do it and your problem will remain forever the headache it is today.

I should be most interested in your own viewpoints on this subject.

How About Giving GI Joe a Break?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Fort Lauderdale Daily News, and was written by the owner of that newspaper, Gov. R. H. Gore:

HOW ABOUT GIVING GI JOE A BREAK?

The disgusting spectacle of three enlisted marines being thrown into the brig in Honolulu to await action of higher authorities because they allegedly circularized a petition protesting the "slow" demobilization policy of the Corps, should shock every free-minded citizen in this Nation into action to rid our

armed services for once and for all of the tyrannncal and caste-ridden policies which are making a mockery of the democracy we preach.

We are supposedly proud of our rights of free speech and of our rights as free men to protest the actions of our governing authorities. Yet we see our own sons, serving in the defense of this country and its ideals, thrown into jail by some nit-witted officer of the Marine Corps because they allegedly "violated lawful orders" in sending a petition to Washington protesting their slow demobilization.

"Lawful orders," indeed. By what rights does any authority in this Nation, whether in the armed forces or not, deny a constitutional privilege to American citizens. The right of petition to adjust wrongs is one of the cornerstones of our democracy, but it is apparently one of the rights that the "brass hats" want a man to abrogate when he dons an enlisted man's uniform.

The American people have had a 'bellyful" of thes- kinds of incidents. It is time that Congress initiates action to see that a little bit of democracy we are so proud of is installed in our own armed forces.

The vast majority of enlisted men who served during the war came back wit' nothing but utter disrespect for the so-called "channels of command." The unfair "caste system" is one of the main reasons thousands of enlisted men still in the services are clamoring to get out and get back home where they can actually be "free" citizens again.

Congress should investigate the jailing of these men immediately. We need a large Army and Navy but it can't be maintained under the present treatment accorded enlisted men by the "brass hats." We fought for democracy and it's time that we get it in our armed forces.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, a subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate is now holding hearings on the proposed St. Lawrence Seaway. Many distinguished Americans of all walks of life have appeared in favor of this long needed project. I sincerely hope both Houses of the Congress will take affirmative action on the pending legislation in the near future.

As part of my remarks I desire to include a resolution on the seaway passed by the Wisconsin Federation of Women's Clubs and forwarded to the Senate committee:

Whereas President Truman, following in the great tradition of his predecessors, Presidents Taft, Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, and Roosevelt, has recommended to Congress the early enactment of legislation to complete the St. Lawrence power and navigation project; and

Whereas such legislation is now the subject of hearings before the St. Lawrence Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee; and

Whereas the St. Lawrence River is the greatest single undeveloped source of hydroelectric power on the North American Continent, and the past failure to harness this vast energy constitutes an act of neglect and waste which is contrary to all precepts of good housekeeping in Government; and

Whereas the development of the St. Lawrence seaway will extend the benefits of ocean shipping to the industrial heart of America; will facilitate the free flow of trade between interior and seacoast areas which will redound to the economic prosperity and well-being not only of the Middle West but of the entire Nation; and will permit a considerable expansion of foreign trade, thereby implementing our national policy of permanent peace based upon good will and expanded trade relationships; and

Whereas in accordance with recent census figures, the population of the United States has increased by 20,000,000 persons since 1920, with strong indications of a continued growth for several decades to come, and the needs of this fast-growing Nation will require a substantial expansion of its transportation systems—the development of the St. Lawrence seaway being of primary importance in any such expansion program; and

Whereas the industrial and agricultural resources of the Middle West could have been more effectively employed had the St. Lawrence seaway project been available for use prior to the outbreak of and during World War II, by expediting direct shipment of men and matériel from the industrial heart or the Nation to battle fronts all over the globe; and

Whereas World War II has proven the absolute necessity of the St. Lawrence project for the national defense and military security of this country by providing a safe interior location for national defense industries, for storage of strategic materials, and for construction of naval and merchant vessels in sheltered harbors: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Wisconsin Federation of Women's Clubs, That we strongly endorse the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, and request that this resolution be entered in the records of your hearings with the confident trust that after consideration by your honorable committee of the great merit of this important project, you will recommend to the Congress the passage of the seaway legislation now before you.

Time To Stop Appeasement and Set Up Real Program for Dealing With Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article by John Griffin, which appeared in the Boston Sunday Post, Boston, Mass., on February 26, 1946:

TIME TO STOP APPEASEMENT AND SET UP REAL PROGRAM FOR DEALING WITH RUSSIA—ATTITUDE OF REDS TOWARD CANADA IN THE PRESENT SPY REVELATIONS EXPLAINS STALIN'S ONE WORLD PLAN

(By John Griffin)

Few governments have ever been as arrogant as the Soviet in their condemnation of Canadian officials for turning up a spy plot designed to give Russia secrets of the atom bomb. Instead of being chagrined at the revelations, the Russians have taken the offensive and tried to place all the blame on Canada.

They say, in effect: "What do you mean by getting your nose in the way of my fist?" and apparently they expect the world to condemn Canada for having the nerve to expose the workings of the Russian spies.

Undoubtedly they will find some people in this country ready to support them, too. Already Joseph E. Davies, one of America's wealthiest men, has declared that Russia has a perfect right to place spies in this country and every moral right to try to get the secret of our military weapons.

SEES HOSTILITY

Mr. Davies suggests that "if Russia had developed the atomic bomb and the United States were in her shoes, we certainly would try to obtain such information—especially if we faced a potentially hostile world."

Mr. Davies might also have suggested what would happen to spies caught in Russia in an effort to obtain Russian military secrets. Everybody can make his own guess as to that. They can't, however, guess so easily what Mr. Davies means by his suggestion that Russia faces a hostile world.

Does that mean that the United States is hostile to Russia? We are the most powerful nation in the world. Where is the threat to Russia that he is so worried about? Does he see any threat to America at all?

Apparently he would have us turn over all our military secrets to Russia. He was once Ambassador to Moscow and he ought to know that Russia, even when we were allies in war, showed no disposition to give us any of the Russian secrets.

He ought to know that not only were American correspondents refused permission to observe the Russian military effort during the war, but also that the Russians refused to allow official American military observers near the front.

KEPT US AWAY

He ought to know that the Russian Government did all it could to prevent the Russian people from knowing how much aid we gave them in the way of materials and equipment. And even he ought to see through the phony statement of Moscow to the effect that Russia doesn't need any further information about the atom bomb.

If the Russians are not interested in this secret, what are their spies doing in Canada and in the United States? The Moscow statement said that the Soviet military attaché in Canada "received from acquaintances among Canadian citizens certain information of a secret character which, however, did not present a special interest to Soviet authorities. These matters had already been published."

There's a puzzle for those who like difficult problems: How could the information be secret if it had already been published?

It's about time that Americans took a realistic view of Russian activities, and it's also time for the United States Government to settle on some kind of policy besides constant appeasement. Those in this country who have been so loud about the advantages of the one-world idea ought especially to be realistic when they see the Russian idea as set forth in the recent preelection speech of Mr. Stalin.

FOR ONE WORLD

Stalin made it plain that he, too, is for the one-world idea and intends to do everything possible to achieve it. Only his idea of one world is to have it all communistic.

While we, in this country, hear our leaders say that "it is to the best advantage of the American worker that the price line be held" and see in the same announcement a decision that price controls will be relaxed to allow limited increases, and wonder whether anybody here has any idea of definite policy, Stalin goes merrily on his way knowing just what he wants and just how to get it.

He knew what he wanted at Yalta, and he got it, although the man who gave it to him had no right to make such concessions, and in making the concessions paid no attention to the principles set forth in the so-called Atlantic Charter.

The Senate had no knowledge of concessions which they should have been consulted about, and the Secretary of State knew nothing about them either. In fact, nobody seems to know even now if all the concessions have yet been revealed.

Stalin is well on the way to dominating Asia as well as Europe. According to an experienced foreign correspondent of the New York Times, who is just back from Europe, it is only a matter of time before most Germans in the Russian-ruled area of Germany become Communists.

They'll probably have to in order to survive under present conditions. The correspondent put it plainly when he said "the Russian answer to nazism is communism," and "in every way possible it's made very convenient for a German to become a Communist."

FINE EXAMPLE

In Stalin's speech on the eve of the election in Russia he said, "The Soviet state system has proved an example of a multinational state system where the national problem and the problem of collaboration among nations are solved better than any other multinational state."

So there it is. If anybody wants to set up the "one world" system, Stalin will provide the means, and as long as it's Communistic he will be wholeheartedly for it. As for its being democratic, well, he doesn't think so much of that.

He blamed both World Wars onto capitalism, although he found the second war quite different in character. "It must be kept in mind that the main Fascist states, Germany, Japan, and Italy, before attacking the Allied countries," he said, "had abolished at home the last remnants of the bourgeois democratic liberties, had established a cruel terrorist regime, had trampled under foot the principles of sovereignty and freedom of the small nations, declared the policy of seizure of other people's lands as their policy, declared for the whole world to hear that they strove for world domination and spread of the Fascist regime throughout the world."

Analyze that statement and try to see what other nation it fits besides Germany, Japan, and Italy. Perhaps the Russians will now include Canada in that classification. Great, big, powerful Canada ought to be ashamed of bullying poor little Russia. Canada ought to get its nose out of the way of Russia's fist.

Exports of Lumber and the Housing Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY O. TALLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 1946

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I have given several months of earnest study to the housing problem. The RECORD for December 11, 1945, contains a plea I made for constructive action before the last session of the Congress ended. Two days later I introduced a bill for the purpose of stopping the export of lumber and lumber products used in construction, and subsequently I introduced another measure which included plywood.

It seemed wise to me last year, as it does now, that building materials should not be exported in the face of so grave an emergency as that which faced us then and which is even more acute now. It is apparent, however, that the State Department does not share my view, as may be noted from the following letter:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 28, 1946.

MY DEAR MR. TALLE: In accordance with your verbal request of January 25, 1946, regarding the cessation of lumber exports, I should like to make the following comments:

As a general policy, the Department does not look with favor on export embargoes or other artificial impediments to the free flow of international commerce.

With regard to logs, lumber, and certain lumber products, exports are screened thoroughly by the Civilian Production Administration, the Department of Commerce, and the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, and licenses are granted only after this screening.

The subject was discussed with the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion. It was found that figures are not available as yet for 1945, but production of lumber for that year is expected to reach 27,500,000,000 board feet, whereas actual exports will not exceed 375,000,000 board feet, or, roughly, 1.36 percent. The rate of wartime exports was far below the average of the 5 years preceding the war, when it was 4.59 percent, and much lower than the average year in the early 1930's, when exports reached almost 6 percent of production.

United States imports for the first 9 months of 1945 were 742,000,000 board feet, or 3.37 percent of production, and only since the war began have imports been consistently twice as high as exports. Canada is the largest source of imports and one of the principal countries of destination for exports.

It is understood that some sawmills, especially in the Douglas fir region, are equipped to produce sizes demanded for export, and that an export embargo would result in unemployment. These mills could not be converted easily to the production of domestic grades of lumber.

Anticipating the construction of five hundred to seven hundred thousand units of housing in the United States in 1946 at 8,000 board feet each, there would be a demand for about 4,000,000,000 board feet, which is less than one-half of the estimated production of construction lumber for 1946.

A refusal on the part of the United States to share its lumber with its neighbors would be contrary to the President's policy of assisting European countries in reconstruction and rehabilitation. Moreover, adoption of an embargo on exports might result in similar action by foreign countries, with the result that this country might not be able to import commodities necessary to its economy, such as logs, lumber, woodpulp, tin, or natural rubber.

In view of these considerations, including the harmful repercussions which might result from adoption of the proposal, I am sure you will understand the Department's concern.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN ACHESON.

Mr. Speaker, to this statement the National Retail Lumber Dealers replied, as follows:

NATIONAL RETAIL LUMBER
DEALERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., January 28, 1946.

Hon. HENRY O. TALLE,
House of Representatives,
Wasington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. TALLE: I appreciate your forwarding a copy of the letter dated January 28, 1946, addressed to you by the Acting Secretary of State regarding the export of lumber.

There are certain statements made in the Acting Secretary's letter which, although substantially true, are misleading and are apt to create a false impression.

The Acting Secretary points out that the estimated production of lumber for the calendar year 1945 will probably reach, when the final figures are assembled, 27,500,000,000, whereas actual exports will not exceed 375,000,000 board-feet, or roughly 1.36 percent. But the Acting Secretary failed to mention that under the allocation of the Civilian Production Administration for the last 6 months of 1945 it was possible to export 692,000,000 board-feet. The Acting Secretary, in pointing out that the actual exports did not exceed 1.36 percent of the 1945 production, should have mentioned that this small percentage was the result of a combination of the late programming on the part of the War Production Board (August) and the strikes in the west coast industry. In other words, even though the War Production Board made it possible to authorize the export of 692,000,000 feet in the last half of 1945, actual exports were not achieved because the foreign missions in this country were not able to place their orders sufficiently early to get shipment, and even in the cases in which the orders were placed, the shipments were delayed because of strikes. This combination of circumstances is not likely to repeat itself and the export of lumber in the future is apt to reach the actual authorized amount.

A license to export lumber is valid for 1 year after issuance. In other words, if delivery does not take place on orders which have been licensed during the particular quarter in which issued, that license constitutes a potential drain against the supply during the succeeding quarter. It is estimated that there are outstanding valid licenses issued in 1945 authorizing the export of lumber on which 150,000,000 feet of lumber can be, but have not been, exported. In many instances the orders which have been licensed are firm orders which have been placed with the mills. In other words, without granting any further licenses in the first quarter of 1946, there is likely to be a minimum of 150,000,000 board feet of lumber exported in the first quarter of 1946. With an authorization for the Office of International Trade Operations to issue additional licenses for 225,000,000 board feet in the first quarter of 1946, the drain on the domestic supply in the first quarter of 1946 may possibly exceed 250,000,000 board feet. Comparing this with the annual rate of production based on the last quarter of 1945, which will not exceed 6,000,000,000 board feet, this means conservatively that one-twenty-fourth of the lumber produced in the first quarter will be shipped for export consumption. This is 4 percent. However, the Acting Secretary would leave you with the impression that exports during 1946 are not apt to exceed the quantity exported in 1945, which were 1.36 percent of the total production. The Acting Secretary, I trust, has been misled.

The Acting Secretary also states that he understands that there are some mills which produce lumber for export that cannot be converted easily to the production of domestic grades of lumber. The Acting Secretary infers that these mills would shut down if their export market were cut off and that this would contribute to an unemployment problem. I do not know what kind of mill produces what kind of lumber that cannot be consumed domestically, or what kind of mill produces what kind of lumber that cannot be remanufactured for domestic use. This, Mr. Congressman, I would like to see.

The Acting Secretary states: "Anticipating the construction of 500,000 to 700,000 units of housing in the United States in 1946, at 8,000 board feet each, there would be a demand for about 4,000,000,000 board feet,

which is less than one-half of the estimated production of construction lumber for 1946." What the Acting Secretary does not mention is that one of the principal factors which limits the number of homes that can be produced is the shortage of building material—one of which the Civilian Production Administration asserts is lumber. According to Mr. Blandford, Administrator of the United States Housing Authority, the estimated demand for new homes is 1,200,000 units of housing (which I believe is slightly inflated). The Acting Secretary also failed to mention that the estimated domestic requirements for all types of lumber exceed the most optimistic production figure of 30,000,000,000 feet, and that the current rate of production based on the last quarter of 1945 does not exceed 24,000,000,000 feet annually. I might also mention that production in the first quarter and the last quarter of the preceding year are normally about the same—usually the first quarter being slightly lower.

Mr. Congressman, I am afraid that this is another case of one department of the Government attempting to do that which is diametrically opposed to what another department is doing. I regret that it is necessary for me to burden you with these problems, but I feel that the Congress is entitled to know all the facts.

Very truly yours,

NATIONAL RETAIL LUMBER DEALERS ASSOCIATION,
H. R. NORTHUP, *Secretary-Manager.*

Mr. Speaker, it is fair to say that the letter addressed to me by the State Department fails to take account of a number of significant facts:

First. Most of the exports occurred late in 1945, and the percentage does not represent fairly the quantity that might have been exported in the absence of the factors noted in the reply of the National Retail Lumber Dealers Association.

Second. Certainly the export potential for 1946 and 1947 is an appreciable quantity, especially when one considers that an export license is good for 1 year and that a carry-over from 1945 must be taken into account.

Third. The contention that certain "mills could not be converted easily to the production of domestic grades of lumber" leaves me puzzled. In the first place, I do not believe that the contention is valid; and, secondly, if the emergency is so severe as everyone admits, it may be proper to suggest that conversion should take place even if it cannot be done easily.

Wholesale Dealer Protests OPA Ruling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I received a telegram yesterday from Edward J. Lee, Jr., president Lee Distributing Co., calling my attention to what appears to be a new regulation, one of the million issued by the Office of Price Administration. This protest from this businessman is typical of the many calls for help which come to my office and I presume other Members of Congress are similarly situated. The telegram reads as follows:

DULUTH, MINN., *February 25, 1946.*
Hon. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER,
Member of Congress:

Service wholesale mark-up on amendment 45 absolutely ruin us. Such low mark-up will force us to discontinue handling our entire quotas on this merchandise. People in this area are entitled to their share. Meeting at OPA C. H. Keakes dairy and poultry branch, old census building, Third and D Streets, Southwest, Tuesday, February 26, a. m. Your support is necessary.

LEE DISTRIBUTING CO.,
EDWARD LEE, JR.,
President.

This telegram, Mr. Speaker, illustrates better than any claim I might make, the disadvantage which the small businessman faces in his efforts to continue in business. Mr. Lee has called upon his Congressman to participate in a hearing. I presume a similar appeal has been presented to many of my colleagues. If, as Mr. Lee sets forth in this telegram, the OPA regulations will not make it possible for his firm to handle certain lines of merchandise, then it strikes me that I can properly suggest that Congress ought to have some other agency handle the price control proposition.

Consider the Facts—Form Your Own Opinion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan are quite capable of forming their own conclusions, arriving at a correct decision, when they have the facts.

Through propaganda paid for by the taxpayers, Chester Bowles, OPA and a half dozen other Government agencies, having at least the interest of continuing themselves in power, have, through the press, and over the radio and in the movies, presented their side of the controversy.

General Motors, Steel, General Electric, a dozen other corporations which give jobs, meet the pay rolls, and manufacture the things you and I need, have attempted, with comparatively limited resources, to answer the Administration's propaganda.

Other organizations, such as the NAM and McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., Inc., have joined in the effort to give information—present their opinions.

One of the latest follows. You have listened to and read other statements. Here is one more. Use your own common sense; recall your own experiences; form your own opinions. Then, if you have any instructions for your Representative which call for any change in his policy, send them on.

THE PRESIDENT'S WAGE-PRICE POLICY WON'T WORK

(Our attitude on this much discussed and highly controversial subject is expressed in this editorial which is directed to American industry through the March issues of 25 McGraw-Hill publications. You may, if you care to do so, quote all or any portion of it with or without credit.)

The American public had every right to expect that the long-awaited wage and price policy would break the impasse blocking the way to the swift and orderly reconversion of industry from war to peace.

The policy announced offers little promise of such solution, and this may well constitute a national calamity.

There is only one thoroughly constructive feature of the Presidential statement of February 14, and its implementing Executive order. It is the first Government pronouncement since the defeat of Japan to clearly define inflation as the major danger confronting us in the period immediately ahead.

That is a correct appraisal, and one long overdue. Up to now Government spokesmen, almost invariably, have sought to carry water on both shoulders. The administration has justified its policy of promoting wage increases as a measure necessary to forestall deflation—to keep purchasing power from falling and forcing the economy into a violent tailspin. The strict holding-of-the-line on price ceilings has been defended as necessary to prevent run-away inflation. Unfortunately, while the President now exhorts all to enlist in a crusade against inflation with a voice that is clearly Jacob's, his program for dealing with it still employs the hairy hands of Esau to promote the very danger which he is urging everyone else to combat.

The "new" policy provides for a continuation of the wage increases that have been pressured through by Government mediators, "fact-finding" boards, and direct seizures until they have been made general throughout industry upon the dimension established in recent patterns. It offers industry the single concession of prompt hearings and decisions upon claims for price advances, but the yardsticks for judging such claims are exactly those which OPA has applied in the past. Since the past procedure has led us into our present difficulties, it is hard to see how it will serve now to lead us out of them.

PAST GOVERNMENT POLICY FOSTERED DISSENSION

At the war's end it was obvious to everyone that what was needed was the swiftest possible reconversion of industry. It should have been equally apparent that we were faced with the difficult problem of controlling tremendous inflationary pressures which would be particularly insistent until peacetime production could be mobilized at high volume. This was made almost inevitable by the huge backlog of accumulated demand, for both capital and consumer goods, and by the unprecedented volume of liquid funds at the disposal of individuals of all classes. The only circumstance that could have modified the inflationary complexion of the postwar picture was the possibility of such wholesale and prolonged dislocation and unemployment in the process of readjustment that people would have been frightened into freezing onto their savings instead of spending them.

It soon was apparent that just the opposite was taking place. The early transition was extraordinarily swift, unemployment was lower than anyone had dared hope, and civilian spending outstripped all previous records. The circumstances called for strong anti-inflationary fiscal measures, along with a firm maintenance of price and wage controls alike.

Instead of adopting such a balanced program, the Government immediately discarded all wage controls, and in addition started on active campaign for promoting large wage increases. The President, upon a number of occasions, stated flatly that American industry generally could and should grant substantial pay advances without any compensating price rises. His Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion estimated that average increases were practicable to the extent of 24 percent. Given such governmental encouragement, it was inevitable that labor leaders should do exactly what they did—file extravagant wage demands at the beginning of the reconversion process, when accurate appraisal of production schedules and costs were least susceptible of calculation, and when the shortage of civilian goods multiplied the inflationary effect of any increase in purchasing power.

At the same time the OPA was fighting to hold the price line in a good cause, but with singularly inept procedure. It acted, seemingly, upon the premise that it was always better to give less price relief than was needed rather than enough, that relief provided under its formula was preferably to be granted later rather than on time, and that the interests of lower-bracket-income receivers should be protected by a particularly tough resistance to raising prices of cheaper goods. The latter procedure seems to have boomeranged by virtually driving many of the lower-priced lines off the market.

The sum of these wage-price procedures resulted in work stoppages of epidemic scope. Many business concerns faced with the prospect of immediately unprofitable operation, uncertain that new wage demands would not be made with Government support as soon as volume production was established, and without assurance as to when price controls would end, refused to assume inevitable losses even when confronted with combined union and Government pressure. The fight was on.

NEW POLICY DIFFERS LITTLE FROM OLD

With inflation now clearly recognized as the immediate danger, it might have been expected that the new wage policy would reverse the former practice of lending active encouragement to new wage advances. But that would have brought down upon the administration the wrath of all organized workers who had not yet been granted increases already bargained through by other groups. This was avoided by directing the National Wage Stabilization Board in effect to approve any wage increases necessary to give general advances comparable to those already made. The only brake applied on the wage side lies in a directive to the Board not to approve, as a basis for price relief, wage advances that go beyond the established pattern.

On the price side, the new directives to the OPA entail no important departure from its past procedures. Even the concession to review hardship cases promptly rather than after 6 months is only a pious hope, since it is unlikely that OPA is equipped to deal rapidly with the thousands of cases that will arise. A hardship case is defined as one in which, after absorbing an approved wage advance, an industry or establishment in a 12-month period of normal rate operation is judged by the Price Administrator likely to operate at a rate of profits to net worth less than it averaged in the base period of 1936–39.

Let us see what this really means. In the first place, the rate of manufacturing profits in the base period was only moderate. But since the average net worth of manufacturing corporations has increased one-third over what it was in the base period, the application of the OPA formula, assuming that its Administrator correctly appraises the 12-month outlook, seems to provide for absolute profits one-third higher than the 1936–39 average.

The OPA formula, however, applies to profits before taxes. What really matters to stockholders is profits after taxes. Corporation taxes have been increased from an average of 17 percent in the base period to 38 percent now. This means that the price adjustments granted by OPA on average will yield profits after taxes no larger in dollar terms than in the 1936–39 period, although 1946 manufacturing sales are expected to be more than twice as high. Under this procedure the ratio to net worth of profits after taxes will be one-fourth lower than the 1936–39 average. This clearly undermines the incentives upon which production at high level depends.

The workers get wage increases which promote inflation. The Government, bailed out from its previous mistakes, gets political credit for raising wages. And the entire bill is handed to American industry for payment.

BUT THE DANGER OF INFLATION IS REAL

Under these circumstances, there is a growing demand on the part of business groups that price controls be rescinded immediately. It is argued that, once the restrictive influence of price controls is relaxed, capacity production soon will supply sufficient goods to prevent undue price inflation.

It is understandable that business should wish to be rid of Government controls which have operated in such a thoroughly inconsistent and damaging fashion. Unfortunately, there is ground for believing that more harm might result from this cure than from the disease.

There is nothing in our situation that could bring on the kind of inflation that has been experienced by certain countries of Europe and Asia—in which the value of currency deteriorates until it takes a cartload to buy a pair of shoes. But our situation now is definitely more threatening than it was in 1919, after the First World War. At that time wholesale prices and the cost-of-living skyrocketed almost 25 percent within 12 months. If we discard all controls now, as we did then, prices might easily go up from 25 to 50 percent in a year's time.

An inflation of that dimension can do tremendous damage. While it lasts, all those dependent upon fixed incomes are damaged—all bondholders, including those who hold war bonds, all life insurance and annuity beneficiaries, all pensioners. Generally, the purchasing power of wages and salaries would shrink, with white collar and unorganized production workers hardest hit. Controlled-rate industries, such as railways and other utilities, would be squeezed. General business would suffer least of all—while the boom lasted.

But such soaring booms cannot last. The 1919 boom burst in mid-1920. By summer of 1921 industrial prices had fallen 40 percent and industrial production was off 35 percent; farm prices had fallen 50 percent. This time the boom might soar higher and last longer, but that would merely result in an even more precipitous drop. Business would be hard hit along with everyone else, and high wage rates would mean nothing to the unemployed.

CONTROLS MUST BE CONSISTENT AND PROGRESSIVELY RELAXED

But if the Nation cannot afford to risk disastrous inflation by immediately abolishing controls, neither can business afford to accept the program which the administration now proposes.

The wage-price policy will not hold the inflation line so long as the administration is leading the assault to breach that line on the wage side, as it has done ever since VJ-day.

The administration is now going before Congress to ask for a broad extension of its wartime powers for an additional year beyond June 1946.

Congress must see that this is not granted except upon terms that guarantee the use of such power with a consistency that has been conspicuously absent up to now

1. It must provide sufficient price relief to yield profits normal to high-level operation.

2. The basis for price relief must be clearly defined and geared to actual costs of operation at the earliest possible date.

3. OPA administrative procedures must be speeded up and streamlined, or the delays that characterized past administration will become intolerable.

4. It must see that, once established, the new line is held as long as wartime controls are continued by enforcing restrictions on wages as well as prices.

5. It must set an early date for the termination of all wartime controls and provide for progressive and bold steps for de-control to be taken before that date, as soon as production levels in any field are sufficiently high to restrain runaway prices.

6. It must proceed without delay to marshal fiscal and monetary policies to combat inflation, in order that price controls may be discarded at the earliest possible date.

Unless Congress does this—and it will not be easy in an election year—we are headed for an explosion. It will come in one of two forms—either in a continuance of industrial strife, or in a rocketing inflationary boom that can only end in collapse and depression.

JAMES H. MCGRAW, JR.,
President, McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., Inc.

Small Business Takes the Count

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, we have pointed out from time to time the great harm that the Office of Price Administration has done to the American people. Its policy of preventing anyone from making a profit out of any business transaction is not only unsound and silly, if you talk in the language of common sense, but it is full of danger to our American economic system. The way to fight inflation is to get the productive agencies in our economic system to produce. You cannot do this by asking them to operate at a loss. Yet that is exactly what OPA has been trying to do right along and wherever possible OPA has not only ruined existing small business enterprises, but has prevented other enterprises from coming into existence.

Here is a memorandum issued by a representative of small business which came to my desk unsolicited and which tells much more eloquently than I can tell the story of menace and danger of OPA to all of us. This includes the man who works, because if business and productive enterprises cannot keep operating, then we are going to have a lot of unemployment. So when people get lined up before the employment office, wanting jobs, and no jobs available, just remember that OPA has done everything it could to bring that about.

The item which I think will interest every Member of the House of Representatives is as follows:

WHAT OPA IS DOING TO US

FEBRUARY 20, 1946.

The Zinsmaster Hol-Ry Co. is a Minnesota corporation manufacturing exclusively, hardtack rye products. The chief materials used are rye flour, a small amount of salt, and water. The company is operating at capacity 24 hours per day, 6 days per week—does a national business, and employs approximately 50 people.

The company was organized and started operations in 1929. Since 1929 it has built up a national volume of sales of over one-third of a million dollars.

In December 1941 our chief and practically only ingredient—rye flour—cost us $1.90 per barrel. January 28, 1944, we applied to OPA for a price increase as this same rye flour, in carload lots, had increased to $5.82 per barrel. After considerable delay on the part of OPA we were finally granted, on July 7, 1944, nearly 6 months later, a 1 cent per package price increase, equivalent to about 8 percent.

The price of rye flour, with no ceiling, has reached an all-time high, advancing from $5.82 per barrel in July 1944 to nearly $10 per barrel at the present time.

This company, with a low overhead, practically no advertising expense, a good labor contract, and no administrative salaries, has been operating at a loss for several months. Already a competitive company in Minneapolis has recently closed, due to no price relief from OPA.

We have applied to OPA for relief and up to the present time—no action. We have not been able to meet the demand for our rye products and contemplated a new plant in the East. However, with a run-away, uncontrolled rye market, and with rye prices advancing from $1.90 per barrel in 1941 to nearly $10 per barrel in 1946, expansion plans are out of the question.

Unless OPA gives us some price relief in the very near future, it may be the ruination of another small business. If the United States Government believes in free enterprise, we certainly deserve their help. A word from you to OPA in Washington might mean the salvation of another small business, which means so much to our present economy.

Thanking you for any assistance you care to give us, and with kind regards.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY W ZINSMASTER,
President, Zinsmaster Hol-Ry Co., Duluth, Minn.

I charged last fall Mr. Speaker, that OPA has developed into a large propaganda factory for the purpose of taking credit for everything good that happens in America and further they want to blame somebody else for everything bad that happens. This fellow in OPA who yells his head off about inflation, and cries loudly that he is preventing inflation, ought to take the time to tell the people that he is falsifying the facts. He ought to tell the people what his outfit is doing to Mr. Zinsmaster and to thousands of other small businessmen throughout the country. I venture the modest suggestion, however, Mr. Speaker, that the loud speaker, alias the Director of OPA, now deceased, speaking from the standpoint of officialdom, will never admit a mistake and can always be depended on to cover up the true facts.

I am concerned because a lot of good substantial folks are being deceived. They do not seem to realize that OPA tries to create a scarcity in production, because only in that way can they have any excuse for existing. They are afraid to let the productive process work, because when you have plenty of goods, the price goes down and you do not need controls.

So that we can have the record correct when you hear the familiar cry, "We must have OPA or else inflation," I want to repeat what I have said many times before. We need price controls and we need rent controls, wherever there is a scarcity. Those controls should not be used to destroy the productive process. OPA is using those controls for that purpose. We ought to get rid of OPA and have another agency established to take its place, with some men in charge who still believe in our system of free enterprise.

Now, Mr. Speaker, OPA legislation is pending before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House. What are they going to do about the case of Mr. Zinsmaster and thousands of other small businessmen? What is Congress going to do about this case? What are the Members of the House of Representatives going to do about it individually? I see only one answer to these questions. Vote to abolish OPA and serve notice on the administration leaders that we intend to do that. Then let them bring out some decent legislation providing for the abolishment of OPA and the transfer of its functions to some existing Government agency with businessmen in charge.

Resolution to Increase the Aid to Dependent Children Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include therein the following resolution adopted by the General Court of Massachusetts in February 1946:

Resolution memorializing Congress to increase the aid to dependent children program

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to immediately pass legislation to so amend the Federal aid to dependent children law as to permit the matching with Federal funds of all amounts expended by States, or their political subdivisions, on account of aid to dependent children; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent by the State secretary to the President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Members of Congress from Massachusetts.

In house of representatives, adopted, February 5, 1946.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

In senate, adopted, in concurrence, February 11, 1946.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

A true copy.
Attest:

F. W. COOK,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

United Nations Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 27 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered on June 29, 1945, before the Independent Voters of Illinois, at Chicago, Ill., on the subject of the United Nations Organization.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

You are here because you have covenanted with the living and the dead that war shall not again come to curse your loved ones. At last the peoples of the world who pay the price of war have sworn to have peace.

Fifty nations, Tuesday of this week, signed in San Francisco the Charter of the United Nations, in its significance the greatest document in human history. In the presence of our President the signatures of the representatives of the United States were affixed.

With that signing was given the moral commitment of the people and the Government of the United States that we would ratify that Charter conceived upon our own soil, born out of the suffering of all those who have fought and worked through two wars, fathered by two of the bravest soldiers of democracy of all time, Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

This great Charter will reach the Senate from the hand of the President on Monday.

It has been long in the making.

It has been carefully, painstakingly, and prayerfully carved out.

It represents compromise, tolerance, and reciprocal confidence and trust among nations.

It is both a dream and the anvil upon which dreams are beaten into moving reality.

It comprehends the whole order of the earth and the whole reach and scope of man's life.

The eyes of the Nation, of the world, of the wounded, of those still fighting and dying in the war against Japan, the eyes of those who look upon us from the world above are now focused on the Senate of the United States.

The Senate cannot, must not, and shall not fail mankind.

The Senate cannot, must not, shall not be the cruel cross upon which shall be crucified another generation of guiltless men and women.

We cannot but expand with pride in the accomplishment of all those who have played their part in the consummation of this Charter.

President Roosevelt, who called this great Conference, who named our able and bipartisan delegation; President Truman, who commissioned it to new life and gave it new impetus; all the members of our delegation and of other delegations; and untold numbers of others, nameless to fame, who gave themselves to it: these will always be honored in the everlasting memory of history and in the warm heart of the world.

Here truly was democracy functioning at its best.

In San Francisco, significantly chosen as the Golden Gate to the golden future of peace, gathered 50 nations of many lands,

languages, colors, cultures, and creeds. Picture in your mind's eye the variety of peoples which met in San Francisco to weld a new unity.

There was no distinction in this great labor, as there has been none in this great war, of race, color, sex, or creed.

There is but one reservation in our joy—that is, that Franklin D. Roosevelt could not have lived to see how truly and greatly he had wrought.

Yet, he knew that we were going to have this happy day.

Only a few evenings ago a friend told me that 3 weeks before his death he talked to the President.

He had looked fresh and buoyant, so much so that my friend remarked upon it.

The President replied, "I feel better than I have felt in a long time, for a great load has been lifted from my heart—I now know we are going to win the peace."

He knew then, he knows now, that we have won the peace.

This great Charter was not born like Venus, full grown, out of an ocean wave.

It is the crowning achievement of centuries of the slow and painful development of a great idea.

Down through the ages one sees the steady growth of the concept of peace and justice on the earth.

In the city-states of ancient Greece and Italy, even before Rome became great, there were organizations to keep the peace. Again through the Middle Ages, scholars and statesmen sought to establish among nations and peoples that accord and cooperation which would keep the peace and promote the welfare of all.

And again in the jeweled cities of the Italian Renaissance that ideal was renewed.

In modern times we have seen this dream of an organization of nations gain greater and greater force. At Westphalia in 1648, at Utrecht in 1713, at Aix-la-Chapelle in 1748, at Vienna after the downfall of Napoleon, at Paris in 1856, and at Berlin in 1878 and 1885, the nations of Europe, in so-called congresses, tried to set up the machinery for cooperation to prevent war and to maintain peace.

In 1899 nearly every nation in the world assembled at The Hague to consider disarmament and the substitution of arbitration and conciliation for war. A second Hague conference devoted to the same objectives met in 1907. A third was interrupted by the outbreak of the First World War.

We in this country can take a just pride in our own forerunners of this great organization of the United Nations.

On May 5, 1910, Theodore Roosevelt, speaking before the Nobel committee in Norway, cried out for "the establishment of some sort of international police force and power competent and willing to prevent violence as between nations."

The United States Congress added its voice of approval, for in June of 1910 the Congress adopted a public resolution establishing a commission of five members to consider the expedience of constituting the combined navies of the world into an international force for the preservation of universal peace.

The world knows that Woodrow Wilson was one of the principal prophets of peace, for it was he who fathered the League of Nations at the Paris Peace Conference after the last war.

That League failed doubly.

It failed in the Senate of the United States and it failed to prevent World War II. But it was the highest point humanity had ever reached in organizing nations against war and in promoting the welfare of the world.

Altogether, 56 nations were members of that League, even if we were not.

It was housed in a great edifice, the spacious elegance of which even today attests what that League might have been, had its high purpose been kept and had governments, who are the makers of war, given it their support.

It did stop some wars and even yet there are living signs of its great accomplishments, in the international labor organization and in other League functions which still survive.

But the League died as the keeper of the peace, and World War II followed after, to wreck the earth, to drench it in blood, to squander its riches, and to inflict upon it the unspeakable horror of needless death. As Divine Providence, it may be, provided Franklin D. Roosevelt the spiritual heir of Woodrow Wilson, was President of the United States in this war.

He tried to stop it peacefully, but nothing save greater force could stop the determined dictators who were bent only upon war and conquest.

But President Roosevelt knew when the seeds of that war were sown and he knew where they had grown.

He must have prayed that he might be the gardener of the world who would uproot once and for all the poisonous weeds that grew from that sowing.

We see, therefore, the President starting, before we entered the war, the foundation of this great Charter we now have.

You will remember how the world was thrilled in August of 1941 by the promulgation of the Atlantic Charter, born in the Western Hemisphere.

Not a month after the dagger of war was at last driven in our backs, the United Nations was born, on New Year's Day, 1942, in our White House.

President Roosevelt and Churchill gave it that name.

Twenty-six nations subscribed to it, and covenanted with one another to wage a common war against a common enemy and to subscribe to the principles embodied in the Charter.

But this was only a start.

In the midst of war, the United States began working together for peace.

You will remember the conference of 44 nations which, at Hot Springs in June 1943, set up an international food organization.

And the conference at Atlantic City in November 1943 at which 44 nations set up an international relief and rehabilitation organization.

You will remember Bretton Woods where in July 1944, 44 nations put together a plan for an international bank and an international fund to stabilize the currencies of the world.

You have not forgotten that here in your own great city of Chicago, 52 nations met in November 1944 in a momentous international air conference to regulate air commerce among the nations of the world.

All these conferences were laying a firm foundation of international cooperation, establishing the pattern of united international agreement and action.

A few months before the air conference in August 1944, representatives of Great Britain, the Soviet Union, China, and the United States met at Dumbarton Oaks in Washington, and carved out the rough outlines of a mighty political charter for the future international peace and security.

Then, in the truly democratic way, that Charter was made known to the world. Discussion and criticism were invited so that for months the opinion of mankind was brought to bear upon its perfections and its imperfections.

Finally, this great congress of the nations was called to meet in San Francisco to perfect that Charter.

President Roosevelt chose a great delegation, bipartisan in character and completely united in its desire to achieve the purposes for which it was called. And, unlike the secret conclaves of diplomats in the past history of mankind, the public was invited in a representative capacity. The official American delegation was aided and counseled by hundreds of organizations and individuals, reflecting a cross section of the private citizenry of the Nation.

Our delegation went to San Francisco determined to work out a pattern for lasting world unity with delegations from the other nations there present.

Together the statesmen of the Big Five and the Little Forty-and-Five, through long hours day and night, through meeting after meeting, committee after committee, crisis after crisis, fought a momentous battle.

No one man, no one nation, can claim responsibility for the great achievement that resulted.

Mr. Molotov and Mr. Gromyko, Lord Halifax and Mr. Eden, Mr. Stettinius, Senator Connally, Senator Vandenberg, and the other members of the American delegation, as representatives of the Big Three who carried most of the brunt of the battle against the Nazi hordes, ardently and with good will worked together to achieve the desired end, unity in peace, as there had been unity in war.

The tolerance and the willingness to compromise of these men is in large part responsible for the splendor of the Charter.

Mr. Paul Boncour, of France, and Dr. Wellington Koo, of China, added the brilliance of their ideas and the warmth of their hopes for peace.

General Smuts, of South Africa, and Mr. Evatt, of Australia, among many others of equal merit, brought to the meeting their fine ideals and their strong support for the rights of small nations to participate fully in the processes of the new international organization of the United Nations.

Finally, with the world beaming its approval and congratulations, the document was subscribed to in intelligible form on Tuesday last—a date which shall be a milestone in human history.

The dead, this time, shall not have died in vain, if the United States Senate now does its part.

In the preamble of this Charter is to be found the ranking purpose of the Organization. Let me read it to you:

"PREAMBLE

"We the peoples of the United Nations, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and

"To reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small, and

"To establish conditions under which justice and respect for law and the pledged word can be maintained, and

"To promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom, and for these ends

"To practice tolerance and live together in peace as good neighbors, and

"To unite our strength to maintain international peace and security, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods to insure that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest, and

"To employ international means for the economic and social advancement of all peoples, have resolved to combine our efforts to accomplish these aims.

"Accordingly, our respective governments, through representatives assembled in the city of San Francisco, who have exhibited their full powers found to be in good and due form, have agreed to the present Charter of the United Nations and do hereby establish an international organization to be known as the United Nations."

The cynics, the disillusioned, the poor in spirit still choose to sneer at the words I

have just read, and at the ideas those words express.

They choose to believe that these ideals are merely a false face behind which the specter of power politics continues to grimace. They choose to disbelieve in the possibility of lasting peace and international unity. Specifically, they choose to promote as best they can with the weapons of slander and slur the notion that we cannot maintain our war-born unity with the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union gave up much, just as it got much, in the San Francisco Charter. So did the United States, and Great Britain, and France, and China, and all the other nations who signed that great document. Russia has agreed, as we have agreed and as all the United Nations have agreed, to renounce war as an instrument of national policy and to act together with other countries to maintain international security. It will continue to do so. No nation which has lost so much and suffered so much from war as has Russia can want more war. The only people who want war are those who still believe that they can gain personal benefit from the slaughter of the people of the world in combat. And they shall not prevail. The unity that has been forged in the inferno of the greatest conflict the world has ever known is a unity which no petty, self-seeking and Fascist-minded minority in this or any other country can undermine.

The Charter which has been born from this unity is not only high in its ideals, it is practical in the machinery it has established for putting those ideals into effect. It has outlined an organization through which the nations of the world may act to preserve peace, maintain international security, and improve the living standards of all people.

The organs through which this organization shall function are a general assembly, a security council, an economic and social council, an international court of justice, a trusteeship council and a secretariat.

The General Assembly will be the world forum.

In it each member nation shall have one vote.

It will be a meeting place where men may give expression to the hopes and fears of the peoples of the world.

The Security Council, composed of 11 members, of which 5—Great Britain, Russia, China, France, and the United States—shall be permanent members, is the executive body, charged with the administration of the organization and with the maintenance of the peace of the world—if necessary, by force.

The Economic and Social Council, composed of 18 member nations elected by the General Assembly, is new.

This council shall be the agency through which the organization will promote the health, prosperity, culture, and progress of the peoples of the world.

It is the organ through which nations shall work together for the economic and social good of each and all.

It is our hope that this great council shall largely remove or mitigate the economic causes of war and, therefore, make the need for force to keep the peace ever less.

The International Court of Justice is the international organization under the United Nations through which the disputes of nations may be peacefully settled without recourse to war.

Finally, there is established a trusteeship council which shall be the guardian of those peoples who have not yet won their independence but to whom the nations of the world owe an obligation to help them in gaining their independence and maintaining their security.

There will be a permanent staff, a secretariat, of course made up from all the United Nations, because it will be a going organization all the time.

Now, this great ideal of organizing for peace is within our grasp—only the ratification of the Senate stands between this Charter and an effective United Nations in being; for, if the Senate of the United States ratifies it, I am sure no other nation in the world will fail to ratify it.

The Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate will begin hearings on the 9th of July.

We are resolved that there will be no recess, no delay in bringing this matter to the floor of the Senate.

There is every reason for confidence in what the Senate will do, because the overwhelming majority—over 90 percent—of the people want this Charter.

But we must remember that 80 percent of the people of the Nation were for the League of Nations a generation ago.

We must remember that there is still the power of filibuster under the rules of the Senate.

Another little group of willful men could defeat all that has been done in the winning of the war and the building of this Charter. We must remember that the Charter will not be valid unless it is ratified by two-thirds of the Senate. That means it takes two Senators for it for every one against it.

We know that there may be those who will try to sabotage the Charter by amendment and reservation. Yet these Senators are the people's Senators, the Senators who sent the people's sons and loved ones to war.

The people must let their Senators know that they are looking to them in this great moment to save their sons and grandsons, their husbands, brothers, and fathers, from another war.

Every white cross cries out to every Senator to keep the faith. Every broken body, every disordered mind in its anguish, pleads with every Senator to keep the faith.

All those, all over the earth, who sigh for touch of a vanished hand, the sound of a voice that is still, beg, too, every United States Senator to ratify this Charter.

Now is the time for the people to work and to fight, to let no petty partisanship, no ugly prejudice, no scheming obstructionism, no vaulting ambition, deny them this Charter which their gallant warriors, their great leaders, have now put in their keeping.

Let us forge the Nation into united support of this declaration of interdependence. Let us secure its speedy ratification by the Senate, bring to heel the last evil enemy in the Orient, and we can say that God has blest us to live to see the dawn of that happy day of which Tennyson dreamed—when:

"The war drum throbb'd no longer,
And the battle flags were furl'd
In the Parliament of man,
The Federation of the world.

"There the common sense of most
Shall hold a fretful relm in awe,
And the kindly earth shall slumber
Lapt in universal law."

Hold the Price Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include a letter received from Merle Bennett, president of Local 901, United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, Fort Wayne, Ind., concerning the necessity of holding the line on prices.

Mr. Bennett's letter was accompanied by petitions signed by 500 members of local 901, urging that price controls be continued.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who witnessed the inflation which followed World War I, and who remember the hardship and suffering it caused among families with fixed incomes, are not anxious to see history repeat itself.

The threat of serious inflation is greater today, in my opinion, than it was 25 years ago. To combat it, we must use every weapon at our command. And one of these weapons is price control.

Until production approaches normal levels, and until supply and demand are more nearly equal, I believe it would be disastrous to permit uncontrolled prices.

Mr. Bennett's letter, together with several telegrams on this same subject, follows:

UNITED ELECTRICAL, RADIO AND
MACHINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Fort Wayne, Ind., February 21, 1946.

Congressman GEORGE W. GILLIE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GILLIE: We believe you are familiar with the fact that the National Manufacturers Association has opened an all-out drive to destroy price control. Under separate cover we are sending you petitions calling on you to help hold-the-price line signed by 500 of our pickets who are today fighting for a living wage.

Many times we have discussed price control with you and believe you know our sentiments on this matter. It's bread-and-butter economics with us. With price control we are able to buy the bread for our tables—without it, we stand in line for bread.

We have no vested interest in price control. It pertains to the welfare and security of our country and that is why we fight for it. As a representative of the people, you, we believe, should do likewise.

Very truly yours,
MERLE BENNETT, *President.*

FORT WAYNE, IND., *February 19, 1946.*

Hon. GEORGE W. GILLIE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Local Chapter Delta Kappa Gamma Society urges your active support for the extension of price control.

RHODA WILLIAMS,
Chairman of Legislative Committee.

FORT WAYNE, IND., *February 16, 1946.*

Hon. GEORGE GILLIE,
Representative Building,
Washington, D. C.:

If OPA goes out, what will happen to us? My purchasing power went down when I went back to 5 days per week. Help hold the line on prices.

C. R. SCHROCK,
New Haven, Ind.

FORT WAYNE, IND., *February 16, 1946.*

Hon. GEORGE GILLIE,
Representative Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please continue OPA so I can use my savings for a future home.

O. E. STEVENS

FORT WAYNE, IND., *February 16, 1946.*
Hon. GEORGE GILLIE,
Representative Building,
Washington, D. C.:
What will happen to we wage earners if you remove ceiling prices?
CHARLES NULL,
Rural Route 1, New Haven, Ind.

FORT WAYNE, IND., *February 15, 1946.*
Hon. GEORGE GILLIE,
Representative Building,
Washington, D. C.:
All that my family ask is the American standard of living. Please continue OPA. Hold the line on ceiling prices.
VERL BANEY.

FORT WAYNE, IND., *February 15, 1946.*
Hon. GEORGE GILLIE,
Representative Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We are returned veterans of World War II. We came back to find the cost of living for our families going higher and higher. Is this what we fought for? We feel that it is the duty of our Government to hold prices down by maintaining OPA.
GEORGE W. MARSHALL, *Chairman,*
JAMES HODGE,
L. E. SHORE,
C. J. HIMSOTH,
PAUL C. FISH,
Veterans Committee.

FORT WAYNE, IND., *February 15, 1946.*
Hon. GEORGE GILLIE,
Representative Building,
Washington, D. C.:
If ceiling prices are taken off how can I feed and clothe my family on $35 per week?
FRANK C. ANKENBRANDT.

FORT WAYNE, IND., *February 15, 1946.*
Hon. GEORGE GILLIE,
Representative Building,
Washington, D. C.:
How can I feed my family and keep up my home if they take off the ceiling prices? Please help continue OPA.
Mrs. JOYCE TUCKER, *Housewife.*
(And Neighbors.)

FORT WAYNE, IND., *February 15, 1946.*
Hon. GEORGE GILLIE,
Representative Building,
Washington, D. C.:
How can we maintain our standard of living if ceiling prices are lifted? Please help hold the line.
BRYCE DE ARMOND.

FORT WAYNE, IND., *February 15, 1946.*
Hon. GEORGE GILLIE,
Representative Building,
Washington, D. C.:
My family cannot afford to have ceiling prices lifted. Your help is badly needed.
L. E. SHORE.

FORT WAYNE, IND., *February 15, 1946.*
Hon. GEORGE GILLIE,
Representative Building,
Washington, D. C.:
How can I live on $30 per week, take-home pay, if you remove ceiling prices?
PAUL S. MOORE.

FORT WAYNE, IND., *February 15, 1946.*
Hon. GEORGE GILLIE,
Representative Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Please hold the line on ceiling prices. The common people need your support now.
B. H. LOOMIS.

FORT WAYNE, IND., *February 16, 1946.*
Hon. GEORGE GILLIE,
Representative Building,
Washington, D. C.:
How can we keep our standard of living if ceiling prices are lifted? Please help hold the line.
J. C. MACY.

FORT WAYNE, IND., *February 16, 1946.*
Hon. GEORGE GILLIE,
Representative Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Don't remove ceiling prices. My family can barely exist now.
ELDON ZENT.

FORT WAYNE, IND., *February 16, 1946.*
Hon. GEORGE GILLIE,
Representative Building,
Washington, D. C.:
If the OPA goes out it will be doubly hard on the wage earners. Your consideration is needed.
R. R. REGENOLD.

FORT WAYNE, IND., *February 16, 1946.*
Hon. GEORGE GILLIE,
Representative Building,
Washington, D. C.:
This is my first time to correspond with you. And now it is very important. The people of my community are asking that you help hold the line on ceiling prices.
M. WALTERS.

FORT WAYNE, IND., *February 16, 1946.*
Hon. GEORGE GILLIE,
Representative Building,
Washington, D. C.:
I am using all my savings and bonds to maintain my family since I have been working only 5 days a week. Help us to keep OPA.
HOWARD MINIER.

The Terrorist Leader Haj Amin El Husseini and His Cousin Janal El Husseini Should Be Tried as War Criminals at Nuernberg

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 27, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

FEBRUARY 26, 1946.

Hon. JAMES F. BYRNES,
Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: There are two well-known Arab war criminals who should be on the roster for trial at Nuernberg. One is Haj Amin El Husseini, the so-called Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, and his cousin, Jamal el Husseini.

They are notorious agitators whose activities endangered the Allied war effort in the Middle East. Their pro-Hitler propaganda and pro-Axis organization are known facts. They conspired to bring about the revolution in Iraq against the British. They sought to establish Axis bases in Syria and the Levant in general. The Grand Mufti was a Hitler stooge. He went to Berlin under the aegis of the Nazi Party and broadcast to the Arabs all the glories of the Nazi Party and of the decadence of the democracies. He organized the Arab brigade whose members killed many American and British soldiers. Several thousands of these Grand Mufti followers are now prisoners of war at Camp Opelika, Ala. The Grand Mufti is now under residential surveillance in France. This racketeer and killer is frequently seen gallivanting around in Parisian cafes. He has never stopped his nefarious practices of espionage and pro-Nazi propaganda. He has incited Arab riots against the Jews of Palestine as part of the Hitler game. He has even struck out against the British, who now seek to appease him.

There is no doubt about his criminality as a conspirator with the Nazis. Yet the British seem to be aiding and abetting his return to Palestine and are apparently seeking to reestablish this perjurer and murderer as the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem. How the British can condone his crimes is beyond comprehension. Proof has been submitted that he joined with Hitler to exterminate all the Jews in Europe and Asia. It has been said that Brigadier General Clayton of the British Intelligence Service in Cairo has urged London to permit his return to Palestine.

That his return to Palestine is gaining favor with the British is evidenced by the return of his cousin Jamal el Husseini whose return was permitted by the British after 8 years of exile. His violent anti-Semitism is well known. His return is adroitly timed to coincide with the Arab-Jewish conflict in Palestine. His entry was a triumphant one. He was received with honors while the British stood on the sidelines watching him being pelted with flowers and welcomed by whirling dervishes. He is the terrorist leader who along with his cousin instigated the riots in 1936 and 1939.

According to the procedure now obtaining with reference to the indictment of war criminals, it is essential for one of the United Nations to make the request that certain individuals be named as war criminals. Neither Britain nor France has shown the moral courage to name the Grand Mufti and his cousin as such.

It therefore behooves the United States to do so. I ask that you act on behalf of the United States, insisting that these men be included with Goering, Hess, and the rest and tried for their bestiality and for their crimes against humanity.

With assurances of highest esteem, I am,
Sincerely yours,
EMANUEL CELLER,
Representative, Fifteenth Congressional District, New York.

International Agreement To Abolish Compulsory Military Service as a Policy and Practice of Nations

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 27, 1946

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement which I made before the Committee on Military Affairs of the House today in support of my resolution, House Resolution 325, calling upon the President, the Secretary of State, and the

United States representative on the United Nations Organization to work for an international agreement whereby compulsory military service shall be eliminated from the policies and practices of all nations:

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank you and the members of the Military Affairs Committee for the opportunity to appear before you.

You have called me here at a time of mounting world tension. The great powers are so bristling with armaments and armies that the slightest difference of opinion gives rise to fears of war.

The world will never be sure of peace until we have reduced armies and military establishments to a reasonable level. I propose that the most simple and logical step in that direction is to work for the abolition of compulsory military service. It is a step which would cost no nation a single dollar, but on the contrary would reduce every nation's burden.

The machinery already exists in the United Nations Organization to put this suggestion into effect and it is the responsibility of the United States to make this machinery work.

To those who say this proposal is impractical, I say you will not know how practical it is until you try it and the least it can do is to test the good faith of the world powers.

American foreign policy never should be a partisan issue. Let me here and now express my confidence that Republicans will support any reasonable foreign policy based on tolerance, justice, humanity, enlightened self-interest, and friendship toward all nations. The objective of achieving world peace is not the exclusive property either of Republicans or Democrats. It is a problem which concerns all Americans. I wish to make it clear that my purpose in making this proposal is to provide a basic principle on which we can unite as Americans and thus revitalize the leadership of this Nation and broaden its influence for world peace.

I also wish to make myself clear on the subject of the national defense. I propose that while maintaining a strong national defense, we negotiate at the same time for the renouncement of compulsory military service and the eventual reduction of armaments. You will note I have included reduction of armaments. I do so because it may now appear advisable to broaden the scope of my original resolution which referred to compulsory military service only.

It is imperative, Mr. Chairman, that Republicans and Democrats unite to work for a clear definition of foreign policy. The American people are suffering from war nerves. Yet their apprehensions come not so much from fear for their own personal safety as from fear that American leadership will be inadequate. The leaders of this Nation must rise to the greatness of the American people. They must not follow a policy of appeasement; they must not permit America or the world to drift; they must not abdicate from America's position of high moral responsibility and practical influence in world affairs.

This is a time for dedicated service. This is a time for loyalty to America's high principles.

We are a Nation of God-fearing people who like neither militarism nor power politics. We are neither cowards, nor bullies. We are a people who abominate war, yet will stand firm for our rights and our principles and will yield to no one or to no nation the power to dictate to us how to manage our affairs. By the same token we do not wish to interfere with the internal affairs of others. We like to look upon others with the tolerance we expect from them.

Nevertheless, we see in the possibility of another war a threat not only to ourselves but to all humanity. We see that the interests of the whole human race, just as a matter of ordinary common sense, call for the avoidance of war. We are not so cowardly, nor so hysterical that we will permit others to play upon our desire to avoid war and so induce us to betray our highest principles. We will not yield to every pressure and every threat. We seek friendship and cooperation from all other nations in the cause of peace. That friendship and that cooperation must be based on mutual respect.

We are not so foolish as to throw away all our weapons and leave ourselves defenseless in these uncertain times; but we are not so ruthless as to turn this Nation into a menacing militaristic state ready to ride rough-shod over the world. We are not so blind we do not see the disorder, the implicit violence, the forces of desperation and unrest which are at work in this postwar world. Yet we are confident in our strength and we believe we can use that strength with firmness, kindness, and tolerance to influence the nations and the people of the world to discard the psychology of war and turn back to the ways of peace. Certainly the prospect of horror and destruction in modern war is so great as to justify any efforts we can conscientiously make to restore the world to order.

Now how can America best use her strength to accomplish this purpose?

Obviously the very first requirement is to establish a clear, definite, dynamic foreign policy. We must, also, clearly state all our foreign commitments. This policy and these commitments must be laid before the whole people and receive their endorsement. If this policy and these commitments do not have the full support of the American people, then our representatives in international councils cannot speak with the full authority and influence of this great Nation. American diplomacy then will inevitably degenerate from the level of statesmanship to the level of political or secret maneuver. The result can only be appeasement, uncertainty, the loss of American moral influence, and the certainty we will drift toward another war.

Let me say again that Republicans will work with patriotic devotion to support a definite foreign policy, provided only the administration adheres to high principle and is loyal to the interests of the American people.

Let us see such a policy formulated and, once formulated, adhered to—with understanding, but with firmness for the right, and without fear of political or partisan opposition.

The next step, after the administration has clearly defined our foreign policy and our foreign commitments, is to take such measures in the national defense as are necessary to protect ourselves and to enforce our obligations.

I am not a military expert and cannot speak with authority on the details, but any reasonably well-informed person can see the logic of our present situation. Reserves are important and the National Guard should be expanded and better equipped. However, what we need for the national defense right now is not a mass of demobilized Army or Navy Reserves scattered among the grocery stores and factories and farms of the Nation but a strong Army, and a strong Navy, and a strong Air Force in being—that is, mobilized, prepared, fully armed and equipped with modern weapons, ready and able to fend off the kind of sudden blow with which the next war would undoubtedly start. These forces, of course, must be large enough as well to garrison such territory as it is absolutely necessary for us to occupy.

The cost of such combined forces will undoubtedly be very great. It will be a huge drain on the human and financial resources of America. It is a burden which will weigh so heavily on the backs of every American man, woman, and child that we must not overlook any possible way of reducing it.

I must, also, point out that, although these large forces will be a deterrent, they will not be a guaranty against war. In fact, the lesson of history shows that the arming of one nation leads to the arming of another. Development of military power leads to suspicion and fear of it, and begets the development of military power and more suspicion and fear, until all the nations are armed to the teeth and eventually set upon one another. We are approaching that condition today. It is time to assert American leadership now. It is time for a concerted drive to reverse the trend which will otherwise take us straight into war.

It is for this reason I advocate the negotiation of agreements abolishing compulsory military service first, and then carrying negotiations further, as fast and as far as practicable, to reduce the armaments of the world. In other words, while we are now obliged to keep a six-shooter in one hand, we extend the olive branch of peace with the other.

Let us not think of this proposal as a Republican suggestion. It is too big and all-embracing for that. Think of it as the one first step in a series of steps which must be taken by the American people if we are to achieve the peace.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, we must not simply dub this suggestion as impractical, and leave it untried. It is the one proposal which gives some promise of restoring the world to sanity. Surely after the sacrifice of millions of brave American men and women, we can do no less.

It is not a proposal to extend half-heartedly. It is not one for languid or secret diplomacy. It is one for open and dynamic action. It must be expressed as an appeal by the whole American people to the peoples of all nations to banish their fears and unite in, putting aside the weapons, the organizations, and the psychology of war and fulfill the dreams and hopes of the common man everywhere, throughout the ages, for peace.

If the Congress of the United States passes such a resolution and if the President of the United States executes the negotiations and makes the appeal with energy and spirit, the news of it will ring in the hearts of the human race and give them hope. It is not inconceivable that the fear of war pulses so strongly and that this hope would have such dynamic appeal its effect would be revolutionary, and the stabilization of the world be brought about through the common demand of its people. After all, the common people are the same in every nation. They do not want war. They know upon them falls the sufferings and the sacrifices. We can count on them to rally to the call for peace.

Let me emphasize that the necessary diplomatic machinery has already been established for just such action. In three distinct clauses, the United Nations Charter already empowers the Security Council and the General Assembly to consider and recommend methods of disarmament.

It is the express duty of the United Nations Organization to develop a plan for this purpose. What a great opportunity for America to have demonstrated its capacity for constructive world leadership! If only this resolution had been passed by the Congress and been presented to the delegates assembled in London several weeks ago.

Just think, while the United Nations diplomats were arguing over the acquisition of 50 square miles of New York and Connecticut and the erection of great, stately, white temples, they could have gathered in one small hotel room and earned deathless fame by proposing to do away with the initial causes of war—compulsory military service and

armaments. It is up to America to bring the United Nations down to bedrock and make it work. This is one way to make the UNO justify its existence.

Here is a proposal which needs only the support the Five Great Powers of the Security Council to give it force and effect. If America drives for the renouncement of military conscription, it will require only the agreement of Britain, China, France, and Russia to accomplish it. The other nations would follow suit, and here would be the first practical, forward step in promoting amity and good will among nations and restoring this troubled world to order.

We need, then, only to persuade these four nations—and I would like to point out that Russia in 1927 favored abolition of compulsory military service and disarmament proposals far more sweeping than this. I am placing in the record a copy of their proposals for the information of the committee.

We should throw the power and influence of the United States behind the resolution before the committee today, and put it over. It is time for a little American salesmanship in foreign affairs.

Remember, the very least we can achieve by backing this proposal is to find out where the other world powers stand and how sincere is their desire for peace. Either the governments of the world want peace and do not need the regiments and the hardware of war, or we must conclude they want huge armaments because they expect to use them. In either event, now is the time to find out.

If successful, abolition of military conscription will reduce the armies of the world. Then we can proceed to the problems of international disarmament, which is an absolute prerequisite to enduring peace.

If successful, we must recognize a new responsibility. Agreements by the nations to disarm will impose upon each successive administration of the United States the responsibility of seeing that those pledges are carried out in spirit and in letter. It would be one fixed element of a fixed American foreign policy to insist on the adherence to such agreements.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the issue between war and peace involves heavy stakes. What you determine here will have a profound influence upon every man, woman, and child, not only in the United States, but throughout the entire world. You bear a heavy and solemn responsibility. Upon your judgments may depend the welfare of the human race. Either we will use the power, the strength, and the great world-wide influence of the United States of America to tip the scales in favor of peace or we will resign ourselves and deliver all humanity over to the heavy burdens, the bitter sacrifices, and the universal destruction of war. Although America cannot alone decide whether there shall be war or peace, certainly America can make a strenuous and practical effort to make peace possible. If we can persuade the governments of the world to forswear their enormous conscripted armies and their peace-threatening armaments, then we will release the creative energies of the whole human race. Perhaps we can open up an era of unprecedented promise in which at last men all over the world may have enough food for their tables and clothes for their backs and shelter for their bodies. Who knows but what the creative energies and the inquisitive mind of man may then have time to develop new uses for atomic power, other than destruction, uses which may so expand the horizons of the human race that a new and marvelous age may come into being? A magnificent dream, you say? But it is from such inspiring dreams as this have come the great advances of mankind.

We know the alternatives: guns instead of butter; warships instead of housing; mud and horror instead of comfort; blackened rubble instead of rising spires; human degradation instead of human dignity.

Certainly, this proposal is worth trying.

There is no time to waste. America must stage a drive for peace.

The whole world looks for the moral and elevating leadership which will lift all peoples from the valleys of doubt and despair up to the summit of hope. America must provide that leadership.

NINETEEN TWENTY-SEVEN PROPOSALS FOR GENERAL DISARMAMENT SUBMITTED TO THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

The delegation of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics is authorized by its Government to propose the complete abolition of all land, naval, and air forces.

The Government of the Union suggests the following measures for the realization of this proposal:

The dissolution of all land, sea, and air forces and the nonadmittance of their existence in any concealed form whatsoever.

The destruction of all weapons, military supplies, means for chemical warfare, and all other forms of armament and means of destruction in the possession of troops or in military or general stores.

The scrapping of all warships and military air vessels.

The discontinuance of calling up citizens for military training either in armies or public bodies.

Legislation for the abolition of military service, either compulsory, voluntary, or recruited.

Legislation prohibiting the calling up of trained reserves.

The destruction of fortresses and naval and air bases.

The scrapping of military plants and factories and of war industry equipment in general industrial works.

The discontinuance of assigning funds for military purposes both on state budgets and those of public bodies.

The abolition of military, naval, and air ministries, and the dissolution of general staffs and military administrations and institutions of every kind.

The legislative prohibition of military propaganda and military training of the population and of military education both in state and public bodies.

Legislation making the infringement upon any of the kinds of armaments and means of destruction with a view to the removal of incentives to the invention of the same.

Legislation making the infringement of any of the above stipulations a grave crime against the state.

The withdrawal or corresponding alteration of all legislative acts, both of national or international scope, infringing upon the above stipulations.

Address by Hon. Francis J. Myers, of Pennsylvania, at Annual Founder's Day Dinner of the General Alumni Association of Temple University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 27 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at the annual founder's day dinner of the General Alumni Association of Temple University, in Philadelphia, on February 15, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I've never seen an atom and I know none of you have either. But we know enough about it now to make us wish sometimes that we'd never heard of the thing. The tiny atom has put the whole world in a short-sheeted bed—it's made it that we can't pull the covers over our heads anymore.

So we might as well open our eyes and take a look around at things. There are a lot of things we see that we don't like. But, my friends, we've got to keep on looking. Otherwise, that thing we have all learned to fear—that atom—is liable to go off right in our faces.

I don't want to be alarming. I don't think there is cause for alarm. There is cause, though, for concern. If ever citizenship carried responsibility, it's now.

During the war the responsibilities of citizenship were easier to recognize. There was a band playing in our hearts every second of the day. Even those who failed in their responsibilities in those days—the chiselers, the black marketeers, the tax dodgers, the hoarders—seldom, if ever, in their own minds connected their action with the war. No one was so lacking in self-respect as to admit to himself that he wasn't doing his part—or some part—in some way—for the war.

The vast majority of people didn't have to think up alibis. They did what they knew had to be done. They played ball for victory.

Well, the war's over now—thank God. Some day—please God it will be soon—the peace may arrive. Until it comes we can't safely relax.

Some people think we've attained peace already just because the shooting is over. I wish it were true.

That we all want peace—a real peace—a lasting peace—is as certain as was our desire for military victory.

We don't have to worry any more about opposition on that score.

We don't have to fear, as we once may have had reason to, that some people—let's say the munitions makers—want war because it's good for business. That's pretty silly now. The munitions makers like to live, just like the rest of us do, and they have wives and children, too. There isn't any American I know of that we can point to and truthfully says he wants war. The atom took care of that.

That doesn't mean we won't have war. But it's helpful—it means maybe we can avoid it.

We can avoid war in only one way—by wanting peace more than anything else in the world. And we've got to make that desire contagious, so that all people everywhere share it with the same zeal.

How well are we doing in that ambition?

Well, we're doing better than we did 10 years ago—a whole lot better. We've got a better conception of the problem; we have some pretty good tools to work with now that we didn't have 10 years ago, and we have some other advantages.

The world has been rid of its Nos. 1, 2, and 3 public enemy powers and of a lot—but not all—of the small fry who either sat in with the big fellows or would have liked to, in order to get a slice of the loot. So we have made progress.

Also, the United Nations is set up and functioning. We're going to be mighty glad it's there. It has already had some first-class scraps aired before it and the newspaper headlines were recently full of charges and countercharges voiced by various countries against each other, and there'll be more scraps like that and nobody really gets hurt

and that's fine. The air gets cleared, and that's fine, too.

If we can have out all our international fights that way, the prospects for peace will be pretty good.

But there's a whole lot more to the problem than that.

The United Nations can air all the subjects of international discord that there are and seemingly settle every one of them and still we can have war. The settlements have got to be based on justice and on fairness, on compassion, and on understanding or they won't last. And the United Nations can act on that basis, only if all of us and all the people of the other nations—and I mean the people—believe in and insist on such a foundation for peace.

We're not going to have it if Russia believes her own strength is the only thing she can depend upon for her protection and throws her weight around in a never-ending search for complete nationalistic self-sufficiency.

We're not going to have it if the United States and Russia between them, or with perhaps Great Britain and one or two less powerful nations as partners, set themselves up as exclusive arbiters of the world's future.

On the other hand, we're certainly not going to have it if suspicions and fears among the big powers are nurtured and inflamed by hotheads and hate-peddlers at home.

I don't want to scold. Too often, those of us who over the years have had firm convictions on the necessity for close working, international cooperation along the lines we are now developing—were prone to scold. Perhaps there were reasons for scolding then—for being alarmed at the foolish fallacy of isolationism. But there's not reason to scold now. Instead, we need only some reminders.

We need to be reminded that national selfishness won't get us anywhere as an international policy. We need to let our public officials know that too. When a bill is introduced in Congress, as it was the other day, to prohibit the shipment of any wheat overseas until it is established that America—get this—will not suffer any reduction in its normal supply of white bread—that's demagogery and we don't want any of it.

When a bill to guarantee the constitutional rights of large segments of our citizenry is blocked by a minority on phony grounds, that's demagogery too, and we can do without it.

When false issues and false slogans are raised to split the Nation with hates at a time when we must be united in a solid, unflinching front for world understanding and world peace, that, too, is demagogery. It's worse—it's a manifestation of peace criminality.

We need the world and the world needs us. Right now, perhaps at this particular moment, the world needs us a little bit more than we need it. We're in a position, right at this moment, to do all right for ourselves. If ever we could safely be isolationists it's right now, today, this year. But attractive though it might be to say to hell with the rest of the world, the whirlwind we would sow by such a policy could blow us down for good—erase us off the earth.

We've got our big chance now to make friends for keeps. We covet nothing of our neighbors and have much to give to ease his postwar plight. Those neighbors will be back on their feet some day and we're going to be awfully glad at that time if we can sincerely know we were their friends in these trying times of suffering. That goes for all the United Nations.

Since we've got to do it anyway for the eventual safety of our own individual and collective hides, let's be decent about it, and do it with grace—because we want to.

Let's forget the squawks about the cost of being the good Samaritan and think of the rewards.

Let's hoot down the petty complaints about those alleged hardships we must endure—like eating bread that isn't quite white so that others won't starve.

Let's make sure our country remains in a economic position to help others by seeing that we prevent inflation. Yes, that means more price control, irksome as it might be to some.

But all right—so we won't get to be millionaires this year. There will be other years when getting rich may not mean gouging the boys who fought to save our necks. Oh, it's true that the United States is still the strongest country in the world, the richest. It's true that we could get away for a while with not being so decent to other nations. Sure, we're big.

But it's always wise to remember that big as we are, the smallest thing in the world, the atom, can blow us right off the face of the earth.

Cardinal Faulhaber Says He Will Ask Pope To Issue Pastoral Message Against Anti-Semitism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article:

CARDINAL FAULHABER SAYS HE WILL ASK POPE TO ISSUE PASTORAL MESSAGE AGAINST ANTI-SEMITISM

MUNICH, February 10.—Cardinal Faulhaber, archbishop of Munich, told members of the Anglo-American Palestine Inquiry Committee yesterday that he plans to ask Pope Pius to issue a pastoral message calling on all Catholics in Europe to fight anti-Semitism.

The cardinal, who is to leave for Rome today, declared he would present a memorandum to the Pope requesting that he take every step possible to eliminate anti-Semitism not only from Germany but from the rest of the world, particularly Europe.

Cardinal Faulhaber voiced these sentiments during a 2-hour audience he gave Bartley Crum, American member, and Sir Frederick Leggett, British member of a Palestine inquiry subcommittee in his palace here.

"Anti-Semitism is a curse against humanity," Cardinal Faulhaber was quoted as declaring. "The whole Christian religion was founded on the Old Testament, a product of the Jewish spirit, and, therefore, anti-Semitism is completely an act of antichrist. I, as cardinal, will do everything in my power to convince the Catholics of Bavaria that they must eradicate from their hearts any remnants of anti-Semitism.

"A Germany without Jews is unthinkable. We must have Jews in Germany. Jews have the same right to live in Germany as I, having been born in Germany, have a right to live here. The Jews likewise have a right to live in peace here. I hoped to see German Jews return to Germany. I had hoped to see our great Jewish physicians return to our hospitals. I am astonished to learn that only one has returned."

The committee members pointed out to the cardinal that in their questioning of displaced Jews in the American zone of occupation they had found that virtually 99 percent of them wished to go to Palestine. These displaced persons have made up their minds, the committee members said, that there was no future for them in Germany and that if the Americans withdrew from Germany the Jews felt they would be slaughtered, as their relatives were.

Cardinal Faulhaber asked Crum to take up with President Truman the possibility of bringing into Germany canned milk and clothing collected under the auspices of the Catholic Church, which is now being held in Switzerland because it has not been cleared by the American authorities for shipment to Germany. These supplies, he said, would be used not only for Germans but for Jewish children as well.

International Exchange of Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 27 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Idea for Friendship," written by William Philip Simms and published in the Washington Daily News of February 26, 1946, and an editorial entitled "Student Exchange," published in the Washington Post of February 19, 1946, on the subject of international exchange of students.

The article and editorial concern Senate bill 1636, which I introduced last year, and on which hearings have just been completed before a subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of February 26, 1946]

IDEA FOR FRIENDSHIP

(By William Philip Simms)

Few people outside Congress ever heard of Senate bill 1636, hearings on which are now under way before the Military Affairs Committee. But its passage would probably do more to make friends and influence foreigners than almost any other one thing the United States could do.

Its author is 41-year-old Senator FULBRIGHT, Rhodes scholar at 21 and at 35 president of the University of Arkansas, his home State. He would dispose of part of our surplus property in such a way as to create an educational fund to bring foreign students to this country and send American students abroad.

In England, France, Italy, Belgium, Central Europe, Russia, the Middle East, Far East, and elsewhere there are billions of dollars worth of surplus war stocks. Admittedly we can't bring the stuff home. The alternatives, therefore, are to let it rot, give it away, or sell it for a few cents on the dollar. But even the last isn't simple, because few, if any, of the governments concerned have the money.

But William I. Nichols, also a former Rhodes scholar and now editor of This Week magazine, has another solution. In Washington to testify for the Fulbright bill, he proposed conversion of some of these surplus supplies into what he calls cultural currency.

"Where practical," Mr. Nichols said, "we would dispose of them for a certain amount of cash, or goods actually wanted or needed in the United States. But for the major part of the payment we would ask the receiving nation to agree to establish what is, in effect, an 'endowment fund,' dedicated to building better understanding between that country and ours

"Once normal conditions are established, that fund would provide for regular exchange visits between citizens of the two countries. Such exchanges should include groups of teachers, students, journalists, labor leaders, farmers, musicians, artists, workers, scientists, and business leaders. The expense would be borne in whole or large part by the country receiving our surplus goods."

Fundamentally that is what Senator FULBRIGHT is aiming at. Only surplus material outside our continental area and possessions would be available for this plan. In no case would more than $2,500,000 be set up for any one country in any one year.

In principle the Fulbright measure recalls the use to which the United States put the Boxer indemnity. The total for all the allies amounted to some $333,000,000—a fantastic sum for the China of those days. Our share came to about $25,000,000, most of which we returned. To show her appreciation, China decided to use the funds to educate students in this country.

To carry out this purpose, Tsing Hua College was established in Peking. There, until the war came, a constant group of approximately 400 students, chosen by competitive examination, were prepared for entrance to American universities. Thus upward of 100 Chinese were graduated in this country annually to return home, where they became enthusiastic boosters for the American way of life. This has had a profound influence in China and the Orient generally. Nothing the United States ever did ever paid back such big dividends in good will, friendship, and understanding.

[From the Washington Post of February 19, 1946]

STUDENT EXCHANGE

Friendship between nations as between individuals, flows from mutual understanding. It seems to us that there is a great deal of merit, therefore, in two proposals now before Congress to facilitate international exchange of students, scholars, and technicians. This sort of exchange is an invaluable supplement to the program now being undertaken by the new Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs which Secretary Byrnes has established. Americans who are afforded an opportunity to study abroad are likely to find their prejudices about foreign countries dissolved; foreigners who come to American colleges and universities will return to their homes with a fresh awareness of American values. A harvest of good will is the certain product of such a transplanting.

One of the bills for this purpose, introduced just prior to the congressional recess by Senator FULBRIGHT, follows closely a suggestion offered by the Post last September. We said, in speaking of the disposal of our war surpluses abroad, that "a constructive way of handling such transactions might be to let the funds (from sale of surpluses) be used for the establishment of foundations in buying countries dedicated to the diffusion of knowledge of the seller and purchaser countries." The Fulbright bill would designate the State Department as the disposal agency for surplus property outside continental United States and would specifically authorize it to enter into agreements with foreign governments under which local currencies received for surplus property would be used to send foreign students to American colleges abroad, to pay their transportation to the United States, or to meet the expenses of American students studying in foreign institutions.

It would be in the last category, obviously, that this arrangement would be most effective. And it might prove of tremendous value to veterans who wished to pursue studies overseas under the GI bill. The tuition and living allowances due them would be met, then, by the country in which they chose to attend school, out of its own currency, and the United States Treasury would to that extent be spared expense. We can think of no more useful form in which to receive payment for the surplus materials which we do not wish to bring home and which are needed by foreign countries lacking the dollar exchange to purchase them.

Because of a shortage of dollar exchange, many foreign countries will be unable to send students to the United States. A bill introduced by Representative BLOOM would make provision for this need. It would extend to European countries the facilities for exchanging students, scholars, and technicians with the United States which we now maintain in relation to the Latin-American Republics and China. This exchange system has proved immensely fruitful. When the United States remitted about $10,000,000 of the indemnity paid this country as a result of the Boxer Rebellion in China, the Chinese Government placed the money in a trust fund for the education of Chinese youth in American institutions in China and in the United States. The act contributed tremendously to the good relations which have existed between the two countries ever since.

We hope that Congress will give sympathetic consideration to both the Fulbright and the Bloom bills. They are companion or supplementary measures. The meeting of minds, in a literal sense, which they would help to bring about should go far toward promoting the international understanding upon which our hopes of world peace must be founded.

Loan to Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, the following article by George Rothwell Brown of the Hearst papers in their issue of November 11, 1945, which I recently received through the mails, reminds me that my recent utterances on the floor of this House on the presently proposed further loans (gifts) to Britain are simply a continuation of my long-time undertaking to bring about some degree of fairness and honesty among certain other nations in their financial dealings with us. When I ponder the fact that American boys and American money have twice saved the British Empire and that she is again knocking at our door for more billions after naming us Uncle Shylock when we asked the previous loans be paid, I am reminded of the little jingle:

When the devil is sick,
The devil a monk would be.
When he gets well the devil a monk is he.

The article follows:

THE POLITICAL PARADE

(By George Rothwell Brown)

WASHINGTON, November 20.—If Prime Minister Attlee's chief errand in Washington was in connection with the proposed British "loan"—rather than with the secret of the atomic bomb, as many believe—he has not aided his cause in Congress.

Congress may not have the last say with regard to splitting the atom, but when it comes to splitting our Treasury deficit it cannot be ignored.

As pointed out in this place some time ago, Washington is jittery over the application of atomic energy to military purposes. Notwithstanding the United Nations Organization, there are freely expressed fears of a third World War.

So what many realists in Congress are asking is, "In that event, and if Europe cannot prevent another war, why should we finance it?"

It isn't a foolish question at all, for that is precisely what we did after World War I.

On the eve of World War II, 16 European countries owed to the United States Government $11,433,857,404.72, on a total indebtedness of nearly thirteen billions.

All but little Finland had defaulted on interest and principal. The argument was that they could not afford to repay sums which had been borrowed from Uncle Shylock to save them from conquest.

In 1937 in a speech in the House, Representative ROY WOODRUFF, of Michigan, a Republican member of the Ways and Means Committee, made certain statements about these debts, which are being recalled today, as Europe again turns to the United States for financial assistance in fabulous amounts. He said:

"It was officially announced recently that the British Government is to spend for war materials and supplies during the next 5 years the enormous sum of $7,500,000,000.

"His Majesty's Government now owes us the sum of $5,107,000,000. Of this amount $739,446,980.97 in principal and interest is past due.

"Their total debt to us constitutes approximately two-thirds the sum they propose to spend within the next 5 years for their navy and other war equipment—and yet they would have us believe they are financially unable to pay us, their saviors, the comparatively modest sum they formerly agreed to pay."

Mr. Woodruff then went on to discuss the debt of $4,081,227,249 which France then owed the United States—and which France still owes. He thus referred to France:

"And what have they been doing since the day they declined to make further payments on their debts to us? They have been spending more and more each year preparing for war. A small part of the money they are spending each year for this purpose would meet their pledged payments to us, and we would have some assurance that the American people are not going to be taxed eventually to discharge this obligation."

Turning then to Russia—which is again seeking an American "loan," Mr. Woodruff said:

"The Government of Soviet Russia has been recognized officially by the United States. The people of that country owe the people of this country $366,688,455.88. * * * Payment of this debt constitutes a sacred obligation upon the existing (Russian) Government, regardless of its character."

Germany, in 1937, owed the United States, as Mr. Woodruff pointed out, $1,200,000,000. And Germany, he added, was rebuilding her military machine.

How escape the conclusion that it was with money owed to the American people that Europe, after World War I, armed for World War II?

Washington's Birthday Address By Senator Maybank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 27 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered at Charleston, S. C., on the anniversary of the birth of the Father of our Country, before the Washington Light Infantry, one of the oldest National Guard companies in America, which has seen service in every war.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is fitting on this anniversary of his birth that we recall that George Washington, our great soldier and first President, was also the presiding officer of the convention which met in Philadelphia and proposed to the States of the Union the framework of our Government, the Constitution of the United States.

It was Washington who, at a discouraging hour of that convention, when it appeared that its great purpose might fail, arose and said:

"If to please the people we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterward defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and the honest can repair. The event is in the hand of God."

Under the form of government created by the Constitution and adopted by the States of the Union, human freedom and liberty have grown and flourished. Under that form of government, our economic system of free enterprise, with its capacity of production and distribution, has become one of the wonders of the world. Republican in structure, it guards against the evils of totalitarianism as well as the excesses of unbridled democracy. It combines government "of the people, by the people, and for the people" with guaranties safeguarding the freedom of the individual or of any minority from oppression or infringement of legal or constitutional rights.

Twice in the last 25 years there have occurred world struggles between free men and those who would dominate and enslave them. In these two great conflicts, the United States of America has proved to be the deciding factor. Its capacity to mobilize its public opinion and the strength of its men and women under our form of government, and its capacity to produce the weapons and supplies of war under our economic system of free enterprise, have tipped the scales in favor of the cause which we believe to be right. Two World Wars have been settled adversely to those who would threaten freedom and liberty by what we call the American way of life.

And so long as we cherish the fundamentals of our form of government and preserve the economic structure of free enterprise which is a vital part of our American way of life, the verdict of those two wars cannot be reversed by those who would dominate the world and enslave mankind.

We are now in a period of confusion and readjustment following the ordeal through which the Nation has just passed, and there is a tendency to introduce and advocate legislation of one kind or another which, though motivated by good intentions and a sincere desire to solve some problem of governmental, social, or economic nature, is inconsistent with the spirit of our governmental or economic institutions. Too often such legislation is advocated in the name of a kind of democracy which, if carried to its ultimate conclusion, would endanger the legal and constitutional rights of our citizens and lay temporary minorities of our people defenseless against that oppression which our charter of government, the Constitution of the United States, was intended to end forever. Much of this legislation just as effectually proposed a change in our form of government or in our economic system of free enterprise as would result from an amendment duly adopted to the Constitution itself.

Let us constantly keep before us this admonition given to the people of the United States by George Washington in his Farewell Address, when he said:

"The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasions of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country, and under our own eyes. To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designated. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in evil, any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield."

Our institutions have so far been the surest guaranty that freedom in the world has had up to this time. God grant that we shall preserve it to that end.

Labor Unions in the National Economic Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS
OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 27 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Is This Paper Against Unions?" published in a recent issue of the Wabash Plain Dealer, of Wabash, Ind.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS THIS PAPER AGAINST UNIONS?

"Your paper has been banging away at these strikes. Are you against the labor unions?" another subscriber asked us yesterday.

"No," we said, "we are not against labor unions. We feel there is a definite place and responsibility for unions in the national economic picture. But we are for fair and just treatment in a free land * * * in a land of equal opportunity," we replied.

This average newspaper reader didn't take time to read one of our editorials that appeared on the inside of the paper, where editorials normally should appear when conditions are peaceful and the country is not torn apart in a civil war—where editorials should make an attempt to interpret and explain the news of the day.

This editorial we refer to was written by Louis Ruthenburg, an outstanding Indiana manufacturer who has the intestinal fortitude to come right out and call a spade a spade.

We not only call your attention to this again, Mr. Newspaper Reader, but also your attention, Mr. Labor Leader. Here it is again, in big type, on the front page. Read it. Pick it apart. See if you can honestly disagree with what we agree with.

Mr. Ruthenburg said, and we concur:

"American labor has repeatedly and conclusively demonstrated its fine patriotism and adherence to American ideals, but labor is being increasingly victimized by the Communists' subtle and effective technique of boring from within.

(Did you read Mr. Hillman's remarks after the President's wishy-washy labor program in his message to Congress?)

"Under such conditions true collective bargaining is impossible. Shotgun bargaining and collective coercion are the order of the day," Mr. Ruthenburg stated.

"Until all men again stand equal before the law, no procedures for collective bargaining can have real meaning. As an essential preliminary step toward the resumption of reason and democratic processes—as the primary means of restoring essential freedom and human rights—all men must again be caused to stand equal before the law," Ruthenburg said.

"Let an aroused and informed public opinion demand that the Congress of the United States, once more responsive to the broad public interest as opposed to that of an organized minority, take immediate steps which shall be as follows," Mr. Ruthenburg suggests:

"1. Revise the Wagner Act, preserving all of labor's equitable rights of organizing for collective bargaining, but, balancing every unfair labor practice for which the employer is held responsible by an equally weighted practice for which organized labor must assume responsibility.

"2. Enact such legislation as may be needed to rescind all of labor's immunities and special privileges under all laws of the land, not excluding antimonopoly measures, tax laws, and all other laws which apply to business corporations."

These two points are the simple Ruthenburg formula, as he adds:

"Having thus cleared away the rubble, reestablished moral values and reconstructed the foundation of equity, we may proceed with constructive, progressive legislation, with effective agreements, with true collective bargaining and with law enforcement," and he goes on * * *.

"Thoughtful labor, now oppressed or about to be oppressed by monopolistic unions, as well as all other Americans of good will, cannot fail to support this simple, understandable program. Wise labor leaders will support it, if only to avoid the penalties of impending repressive and reactionary legislation."

(Read that last part again, carefully, Mr. Labor Leader. You know, and we know, there are always those who would destroy unions altogether if they possibly could.)

Mr. Ruthenburg goes on, "Unless we thus retrace our path and recapture the moral values we have lost, we shall suffer under flimsy, ineffective, reactionary legislation until chaotic conditions shall have overwhelmed us." (Mr. Congressman, please note.)

He concludes, "Then our cherished institutions may be superseded by stateism and dictatorship—not through the conspiracy of crackpots, but through the fateful sequence

of unemployment, economic maladjustment, and resultant social disorder.

"It is later than you think."

Mr. Newspaper Reader and Mr. Labor Leader, read this over again and again. If you can shoot holes in it, write down your thoughts and bring them to us. We'll be glad to give your arguments to our readers. After you read this, can you honestly think this newspaper is against unions?

Bomb Parachute Was Designed at Wright Plant in West Warren, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 27, 1946

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a recent article from the Springfield (Mass.) Union outlining the magnificent contributions to the war effort of the William E. Wright & Sons Co. of West Warren, Mass., which is located in my district.

This ably managed concern produced the rayon fragmentation bomb parachute with a most commendable ingenuity and resourcefulness, and overcame many obstacles of science and production in order to furnish this critical type of parachute to our armed forces.

The article follows:

BOMB PARACHUTE WAS DESIGNED AT WRIGHT PLANT IN WEST WARREN

WEST WARREN, January 23.—The rayon fragmentation bomb parachute, one of the Army Air Corps' most effective offensive weapons, was designed at the William E. Wright & Sons Co. here, it was revealed today in a now-it-can-be-told story.

Probably the textile industry's most outstanding contribution to the war effort, the 'chute, used on all fighting fronts, was developed at the Wright plant at no cost to the Government, and the adequate use of rayon as against silk or cotton made the experiment one of the most economical of the war, millions of dollars being saved. More than 14,000,000 parachutes, constructed in accordance with the Wright-directed design, were purchased by the Government from manufacturers throughout the Nation.

The Japanese blockade of the silk supply and the inefficiency of the previous bomb 'chutes resulted in the careful designing of the rayon parachute. Prior to the development of the rayon parachute, company officials said, there was grave doubt as to whether the air forces could use extensively the fragmentation bomb, with parachute attached, in low level bombing due to the great number of failures of the parachute, which in each case meant the death of the pilot and the loss of the plane. Combat tests proved the great effectiveness of bomb-carrying parachutes dropped at low level (100 feet altitudes) against enemy personnel and equipment because of their phenomenal accuracy.

Clearing house for the entire experiment, the Wright company joined with the Government in lining up yarn producers, fabric weavers, fabric finishers, and braiders for the shroud lines, to tackle the gigantic task.

Materials were handled between the firms by special messenger, and planes were used in transporting samples where distances were involved resulting in dozens of test lots being prepared. Tests involved a range of fabrics and yarn twist to vary fabric porosity, which it was believed, had an effect on the opening of the 'chute. The tests also involved comparisons of cotton versus rayon shroud line to determine the effect of change in physical properties.

Details of all tests were telephoned to interested parties, the Wright firm serving as nerve center of the busy operations, and impetus point for all schedules for tests, specification outlines and assembly designs.

Data were available March 3, 1942, and 16 days later the final design was selected from the group of 'chutes submitted. But by this time the silk sewing thread which had been used in all tests became so critical that a substitute, nylon, had to be tested, and results were satisfactory.

Following the designing and development work, the Wright Co. began producing parachutes and ranked with the Nation's leaders in all this war project. Of the 446,022 parachutes produced, 78,741 were fragmentation bomb 'chutes; 230,589 aerial delivery; 136,692 flare. Also manufactured by the workers who came from the central Massachusetts towns were 12,997 tow targets. Two hundred and twenty-four carloads, or 6,698,187 pounds, of parachutes left the West Warren plant during the war days.

General Romulo Given Well-Deserved Honor—Rollins College Confers Upon Him Honorary Degree of Doctor of Literature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 27, 1946

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, on the day coinciding with the anniversary of the liberation of Manila by the American forces, Rollins College, of Winter Park, Fla., a 61-year-old American institution of learning, honored our colleague, Brig. Gen. CARLOS P. ROMULO, Resident Commissioner of the Philippines, by conferring upon him the honorary degree of doctor of literature. Rollins College has in the past honored other distinguished personalities such as President Truman with honorary degrees, and I am happy to note that it has seen fit to confer the same distinction on a Filipino who is a worthy spokesman of his people in this Congress and in the United States. The President of Rollins College is Dr. Hamilton Holt, one of America's greatest liberals, who was one of Woodrow Wilson's chief advisers during the drafting of the Versailles Treaty and is revered in America as one of its foremost thinkers and educators.

Dr. Holt was present during the deliberations of the United Nations Conference in San Francisco last spring. It was there that he saw and heard General ROMULO participate in the discussions of the committees and in the plenary sessions of the conference. Under leave to extend my remarks, therefore, I am inserting the citation which he read when he conferred the degree of doctor of literature on General ROMULO and the speech which was delivered on that occasion by the general:

CARLOS P. ROMULO, educator, editor, author, playwright, lecturer, soldier, patriot, I heard you at San Francisco last spring speak with unmatched eloquence for the 600,000,000 inarticulate and dependent peoples of the world. I saw you, who acquired your understanding of Americanism through education rather than through inheritance, stand before the delegates of 50 sovereign nations as the chief champion of liberty and freedom of the world. I witnessed your statesmanship force into the final draft of the Charter the adoption of the statement "that the backward peoples of the world "held as a sacred trust of civilization," had the right to aspire to full "independence," while the American delegation (shades of the signers of the American Declaration of Independence) went slavishly along with the empires on this issue until you turned the tide. You emerged from the conference with a moral grandeur which your imperialist opponents could not fail to recognize.

Since then I have read your three epochal books. In them you have made both east and west meet, which the poet says "never the twain" shall do. And today you are still fighting the good fight and keeping the faith for the rights of man in general and the independence of your country in particular, just as our founding fathers did in this country before 1776. And it is significant that they were young men like you.

Woodrow Wilson has said that the surest way to exert the maximum of influence on one's day and generation is to master the written and spoken word and champion liberal ideas. Thus, General ROMULO, because you have so nobly fought for the freedom of the Philippines and because, by voice and pen, you have constantly fought for the liberty of mankind, Rollins College confers upon you the degree of doctor of literature, and admits you to all its rights and privileges.

General ROMULO delivered the following address at the ceremony:

A NATION IS BORN

Thankful am I indeed for the privilege of being with you today, thankful for this recognition that is not for me but for the Filipino people, who live on the other side of the world in a land very like your own beautiful Florida. On July 4 of this year our people will become independent. President Truman, in his recent message to Congress, said: "We have already determined that the Philippine Islands are to be independent on July 4, 1946."

On your own Independence Day, therefore, we will install with ceremony and prayer a new member in the firmament of nations—the Republic of the Philippines. It will be a small, dim star in the beginning, for it moved into its predestined orbit during the darkest eclipse of reason the world has ever known. It came to birth during the world's desperation. It has been nurtured in darkness. But the time will come when it will shine more brightly because of that dark origin. For no nation in the world's history was born in so much travail and bloodshed, and with so many tears.

You Americans have shared in that bloodshed and travail, and you know that the Philippines has earned the right to stand alone and free. That is why President Truman repeated America's determination in his message to Congress. It is your reassurance of a pledge made long ago, a pledge that is to be redeemed this year on your Independence Day—which shall henceforth also be ours forever.

You who were born in America, whose year of freedom—1776—precedes ours by almost two centuries, you can perhaps have no concept of what this right means for the Filipino soul. That is what I want to unfold for you today.

History, to be exact, must ever be written from two angles:

First, from the point of view of those who are submerged.

Second, from the point of view of those who are on top.

We have seen, within the past year, the overwhelming defeat of a gang of aggressors who wanted to be on top. Over that victory we have seen superimposed the victory of a submerged people who have won their freedom. For the first time in history, a great sovereign power, flushed with victory, is voluntarily relinquishing its rule over a subject nation.

This is history written in a new language, written by those on top from the point of view of those under the wheel. This is an object lesson, not for Filipinos and Americans alone, but for all the world. To us, it is the culmination of a struggle that lasted for centuries and often seemed hopeless.

The struggle began 425 years ago. In the year 1521 Ferdinand Magellan discovered and claimed our islands in the name of the Spanish King. He was killed by a Filipino—the first native protestant against imperialism. From the beginning, the Filipino, like the American 255 years later, had no use for kings. He was a peaceful Malayan tiller of the soil, but he was ready then as now to fight for his land.

But the first siege of the Philippines was won—won by the Christian cross. Muskets and cutlasses had failed, but the priests of Spain, who followed the soldiery, had succeeded in winning the Filipinos and in Christianizing them for all time. What they won, however, was an allegiance to the rule of God, not to the rule of Spain. It was good will, not force, that won our hearts. The Christian faith we embraced with joy. The Spanish rule we hated with an undying ferocity. We fought Spain for more than three centuries. There was a revolt a year in the Philippines under Spanish rule. At last, as the nineteenth century came to a close, our victory had become certain.

At that moment, on May 1, 1898, Admiral Dewey brought your proud American ships into Manila Bay. The siege of Manila was on, and it broke Spain's dying grip on the Philippines. This was the beginning of a new era for us, and for all subject peoples everywhere. For America, too, won us more by good will than by force. America, too, brought us a faith—a political faith that matched the religious faith which was our heritage from Spain.

We rejoiced in that American victory over Spain. We saw in it the harbinger of freedom—freedom after 377 years of alien rule, freedom for the first time since Magellan's blood stained our earth and made it Spanish.

But a nation does not earn its freedom so easily. The struggle was not yet ended. Spain ceded her rights in the Philippines to the United States, and we were, we felt, a nation betrayed. The battle had indeed been won, and Filipino blood had been shed to win it. But the victory was not ours. We had planned our republic. We had written our constitution, taking for its model the American Constitution. But the republic remained only a dream, and the constitution only an exercise in statecraft.

And so the fight for freedom—the Philippine Insurrection—flared again. It was put down, more by American good will and friendship than by American force, bloody though the fighting was. And when it ended, we still fought on, no longer with guns but with ideas, no longer on battlefields but in America's own halls of state, and the fight was called the struggle for independence.

And the strength of our fight, and the wonder, was that it was the American fight. We dared face America on her own terms, for that was the American way. We learned that we could carry the fight into the very heart of America, into Washington, under the Capitol dome, onto the very floor of Congress. Our Manuel L. Quezon could battle there with his brilliant strategy of words. Our Sergio Osmeña, in Manila, could wage the war with all the force of the human heart, the human mind, the light of reason, the faith of Christianity, the rights of man. This was our ammunition. It was handed to us by America, in the American words written in the American schoolbooks and burnt into the hearts of the Filipino children. For America had declared that every Filipino child must have the right to learn, must share in the privilege which had been limited, before America came, only to the children of the rich.

These were the American words that were our ammunition: "We hold these truths to be self-evident * * * that all men are created equal * * * that they are endowed with certain inalienable rights * * * that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Here was our gift from America—a crystallized faith in government of the people, by the people, for the people. America has given us much in a material way. But nothing in her power to give is more precious than these American words.

For them, and with them, we battled for our right to be free. How did America meet our warriors? They were not forced to languish in prison. They were heard with respect. They were treated with honor. They were given an answer to their demands, and this was America's answer:

The Filipino must earn, as the American earned, his right to be free. He must earn it by showing his worth as a man capable of governing himself and guiding the destiny of his nation. And America would show him how that could be done.

In less than 50 years it has come about. In the first 10 years, the Philippine Assembly was created as a proving ground for the future Filipino leaders. Ten years more, and the Jones Act was passed in Washington, promising independence at some future date. Two decades later, the Tydings-McDuffie Act set a definite date for freedom and established us in our Commonwealth Government. Another decade and on July 4, 1946, the redemption of the pledge made by America.

That is the record and how it happened. But the real importance lies not in the how of it, but in the why of it. Why did it happen this way? The answer is the simplest, the most effective, known to man. It was good will.

The Americans had recognized in the Filipinos a Christian people fighting to be free, so eager for the advantages of democracy that they not only accepted these advantages but were ready to fight to preserve them. And the Filipino in turn recognized in America the idealism toward which he had been groping through the long centuries, and he took democracy for his own. When he protested, when he carried on his fight, it was not against America, but for America, because he was upholding the America that detested colonialism and believed that all men should be free and equal.

Ah, there were attempts to divide. In the lands of imperialism, this good will between American and Filipino was looked upon with suspicion. Here, indeed, were dangerous thoughts. And even at home imperialism lurked in the hearts of some men who outwardly pretended to democracy. All the old imperialist tricks were used, but they did not divide us. They were tried in the beginning and they failed. They were still being tried at the very hour of Manila's liberation; they are being tried today, but still they fail.

They fail because the strongest bond between men is their mutual respect for freedom, and this has held the Philippines to America and America to the Philippines.

They fail because we have believed in America's promise. And we have believed in the promise because we believe in America.

America is still young as a Nation. America has a history, but no mythology. We, on the other hand, have been nourished on myths as are the old European countries. Early England had its magical, chivalrous hero, the good King Arthur. Germany had its King Barbarossa, the good ruler with the red beard, who slept enchanted in a cave. And we in the Philippines had our own legendary King Bernardo who had lain hundreds of years imprisoned in a cave on Luzon and who would some day awake to stride gigantically across the land and set us free.

America taught us that only men, not myths, can set a people free. She taught us this in terms of her own history, and she pictured for us her own shrines—Concord, Lexington, Gettysburg, Shiloh—shrines where men had died in their struggle to set their brothers free.

Those were America's legends, but they were real—made real by the names of men whose voices are still heard in America. They had spoken out for freedom in 1776, 1812, 1863, and their voices are still clear and sharp. We heard them as this century began, spoken by American teachers in the new American schools in our country, and we made these men our leaders, their words our laws. We set them beside our own heroes in our hearts; we hung their pictures on our walls—your Washington and Jefferson and Lincoln beside our Rizal and Bonifacio and Mabini. The youngest schoolboy in the Philippines glowed over Concord and the Alamo and Gettysburg, and enshrined them beside our own shrines where men had died rather than submit to foreign power—Balintawak, Zapote, Tirad Pass. In Filipino hearts all these, from Lexington to Tirad Pass, are sacred milestones along the road to democracy, and it was because of our love for them that we joined you in adding these newest names: Leyte, Bataan, Corregidor. We know how deeply these Filipino place names are set now in your own American hearts. They were strange to you once, as your shrines were to us, but now they are ours together.

All this has been brought about within the twentieth century, which is not half over—within my own lifetime—within the lifetime of the majority of men alive today. It has been the product of a simple plan set up, directed, watched over by America:

First, the promise of freedom, with the warning that it must be worked for, appreciated, deserved.

Second, the preparation for self-rule, with the sovereign nation showing how it could be done, but not interfering.

Third, the setting of a specific date for independence.

And last, the redemption of the pledge, the granting of the rights of equality, the taking of our place amid the ranks of free men.

This was the way shown by America in the Philippines. There is no simpler way. It shines bright as a highway through the stars pointing east. Set along this path are the milestones like gleaming stars—Bataan is blazing there, and Corregidor, and all the places where Filipinos and Americans lived together and thought well of one another, and shed blood and tears together. Together we have proven that this is the only road to perpetual peace between men of two races and two worlds.

But before world peace can be assured, that highway must stretch around the world.

It can be built. We made it—11,000 miles of it—in less than 50 years. We had little to build on in the beginning, only resentment and suspicion and the centuries-old antagonism between Oriental and Occidental. We built it slowly. We paved it, step by step, with simple acts of human good will and understanding, with the sharing of books, music, common prayer, racial understanding,

good will toward all men, respect for all women, care and food and protection for all children, small gestures of courtesy, gallantry in action. This is the mosaic of little pieces with which we have paved our shining highway. It may yet serve to divert the armed forces of the world from their endless marchings. It may serve to lead all mankind to the dream of human brotherhood that Christ foretold.

I say that the highway leads 11,000 miles westward, to the Far East, and that its terminus is Manila. But that is not its end. It is no more than the beginning.

Look to the Orient now, for the fruition of the dream is there already, and Asiatic eyes are on it with admiration and longing. Troubled and stirred of blood, the ancient Orient is roused as never before. It may well come about that the traditional distrust of the Orient toward the white world—because of the white world's imperialistic rule through the centuries—will at last be stemmed, that the distrust may die under the new supremacy of simple good will. Java trembles on the brink of promised freedom, and what other country will next force its fearful way toward the edge of liberty? "Freedom was promised the Philippines," they say. "Freedom will be given the Philippines. Why not to us?"

This most potent of revolutionary doctrines—the recognition of human dignity—has been America's gift to the Far East. This most explosive of ideas—that, no matter what their color or creed, human beings have a right to know themselves as men and not as a subhuman species set on earth to serve the ease, comfort, or delight of men of another race—this is America's miracle. Because these forces have worked in the Philippines, we share a mighty victory.

And perhaps it is the greatest of all the victories won in the war that has now ended. Unless all nations mark the importance of this triumph, it may well be the last victory on this earth. For this is the victory over greed, over exploitation, over the feeling of superiority that has wrought so much evil on men.

Unless this victory is marked well and honored, unless it is permitted to spread over the world, all men will live in fear of the next and final war, the atomic war. Greed and arrogance will find little use for their talents then. Superiority, fancied or real, will be of little value to those who may survive.

There need not be another slaughter of the innocents along with the guilty arrogant. There is a way out. We found that way, we Americans and Filipinos, in the Philippines.

"One way there is, and there is no other—
There can be no peace till you call me
Brother."

Imperialism called us hewers of wood and drawers of water.

Democracy called us brothers.

As brothers, we fought with you to hold the Philippines and to shatter the evil ambitions of an aggressive foe.

Now we in the Philippines shall begin the new struggle, the struggle to survive. We start afresh. We shall be free for the first time in 400 years. We shall be free, and very poor, and very proud.

Our past is our pride. It has been harsh and poor and filled with the struggle to break free, but it held for us always the gleaming promise for the future. We dreamed in the past that its very darkness would insure the brightness of the future, but now we know that cannot be. The future also remains to be paid for, as nearly all that we built and planted has been wiped away by war. The Filipinos must fight now to pay for their future before they can live in it economically free.

But we are rich in spirit. We can stand as freemen in the midst of postwar devastation. Though our economic fabric may be unraveled to its outer fringe, we are ready to suffer, and suffer again, for the privilege of calling ourselves citizens of the free sovereign Republic of the Philippines. We have been through fire, and we have stood the test, and that is part of our inheritance from the war. We cannot, indeed, suffer more under independence than we have suffered in the war. We cannot sacrifice more toward our future freedom than we have already sacrificed in the past 4 years.

Spiritually we are ready. By the siege of Manila in 1898, by the siege of Manila in 1945, by other sacrifices heartbreaking to us, we have been prepared. By the Spanish centuries that seemed like aeons we have been prepared. By the Japanese years that seemed like centuries we have been prepared. We have learned that suffering can be endured if one has faith in the future.

Economically we are ready. We are poor but we know that America will not abandon us. Just as we did not abandon America, when we poured our safety, our hard-earned advantages, our very lives, into the crucible of our common destiny.

Physical protection we know will be ours, for American and Filipino power will be one in the Pacific, and our old dread of Japan is removed forever.

A new nation is about to be born, and it shall be born in poverty. But it will possess the spiritual riches of many centuries and of two worlds. Every man, white or brown, who died in this war, has made his contribution to this spiritual wealth. Every man who died has served to lift a little higher the face of the common man from the mud of degradation. This we have learned through suffering and this we shall treasure forever.

We have learned the schoolbook wisdom that partakes of the eternal wisdom—the practical common sense that underlies simple friendship and respect for all men. And there is no more vital part of our heritage than this.

We know now the greatest truth of all: that freedom can never be given. It must be earned. This is part of our equipment and our heritage.

The new Filipino Nation, to be born on July 4, 1946, salutes all America as its sponsor and its friend. All Americans, we know, will wish us well.

Lincoln Address of Hon. Clare Boothe Luce, of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, when she came to the State to deliver Lincoln Day addresses at Johnson City and Nashville, our distinguished colleague from Connecticut, Hon. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, by her charm, graciousness, accomplishments, and demonstrated capacity to understand and forcefully enunciate our national problems, foreign and domestic, won the hearts of Tennesseans; and, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to present the able and inspiring address which she delivered in my home town of Johnson City, February 11, at a Lincoln Day dinner held under the auspices of the Republican Executive Committee of the First Tennessee District.

I am most happy to be here, and grateful for your cordial reception to me as a Republican woman and legislator.

Perhaps my greatest pleasure in being with you is to meet with the friends of my generous and most able colleague, Representative CARROLL REECE, your national committeeman and a leading statesman of our Nation—as you would all know, if you could see as I do, in what high esteem he is held by all his colleagues on both sides of the aisle. And it is heartening, too, to be in a Republican stronghold of the South, which gave 80 percent of its vote to the Republican ticket in the last election. That proves, you know, you are a free people—free as in the days when John Sevier, who became first Governor, marched in to make you free in the war of the Revolution. Theodore Roosevelt, in The Winning of the West credited this vicinity with having the first free government west of the Alleghanies—old Watauga settlement.

It is to that spirit among you, I address myself tonight—first as an American and only secondly as a Republican.

We are come together here today to celebrate the birthday of our greatest living American, Abraham Lincoln. I said "living" because everything is mere matter, dead or dying, which cannot survive its physical self, in endless resurrection. The oratorical revival of Abraham Lincoln, on these stated birthday festivals, is a common and happy phenomenon of American political life. But no ordinary phenomenon is the way his spirit really walks through all the land, and intimately comands every mind and heart in the civilized world, in times of great trouble and conflict. In times such as these, when brother is locked in mortal combat with brother, seeking to slay him, to starve or torture him into submission, to poison him with soft words, or paralyze him with false promises, all in order to prepare his limbs for the fetters of slavery—in such days Abraham Lincoln alone seems to be a wholly live man, with a shining face and loud ringing words on his lips. And many, who walk among us today in positions of power and authority, mumbling their dreary political inanities, seem to be the dead men.

What did Abraham Lincoln mean? What did he stand for? What was the essence of his belief? When we know that, we will know the secret of his triumphant resurrection.

Above all, I think, Abraham Lincoln believed in the brotherhood of man under the Fatherhood of God. From this fundamental credo all his articles of political faith most naturally and nobly derived. A man who held such a belief never talked in terms of "Negro rights" against "white rights" or "southern rights" against "northern rights," the rights of the property holder against those of the propertyless, or even the rights of nation against nation. His credo led with inexorable logic to the conclusion that there are no rights but human rights and that all human rights derive from man's membership in the human family, each member of which is a creature of God, regardless of birth, color, race, nationality, or political condition. Other reasonable corollaries of such a belief were that right makes might; that the conqueror must ever treat the vanquished with malice toward none and charity toward all; and that as no man would be a slave, so none should seek to be a master. Lincoln believed that in the practice of a political fraternity, based on a profoundly religious conception, lay the genius, the strength, and the glory of American democracy. And Lincoln knew that for Americans to betray this conception of democracy at home, or in our dealings with other nations, would mean in the end the betrayal of America itself and of the whole

world. For then, as now, the America which stood for this conception was "the last best hope of man" on earth.

So Abraham Lincoln knew that while peace is ever more to be loved and striven for than war, an evil peace is not to be preferred to a good war. He fought a good war to establish the truth of the dignity and equality of every individual, rather than accept a bad peace which would compromise that truth.

In 1918, and again in 1941, this Nation made the Lincolnian decision. This time the masters and tyrants who would enslave their brothers were Germans and Japanese and their cohorts. And once again we Americans and our great allies vanquished these tyrants. Once again the tree of liberty was watered with the blood of heroic freemen.

No nation, Lincoln said, can long endure half slave and half free. Do we deny today that this "one world" cannot long endure half slave and half free? The drama has widened in scope. The players are numbered by the hundreds of millions instead of millions. But the proposition which was true in the days of flintlock and cannon is no less true in the age of rocket plane and atomic bomb. These weapons merely emphasize the fact that our peril is greater if we do not accept it.

Let us face this fact, too. Abraham Lincoln did not come to his profound belief in the dignity of the individual man and the nature of his rights by consulting Gallup polls of Drew Pearson's column, or even the shrewdest statesmen of his own or other nations. He tells us himself that he came to it on his knees: he got it from God. It is one of the tragic paradoxes of divine justice that those who will not get their political direction on their knees from this Supreme Authority are in the end driven to their knees to get it from a tyrant. With this difference: God lets us rise from our knees to walk like free men. We stay on our knees for the tyrant.

It is in the light, tonight, of these cardinal beliefs of Abraham Lincoln which all Americans share, that I wish to consider the conduct of America's foreign policy since the days of Tehran and Yalta.

There are very few Americans who, when the facts are presented to them, do not know the difference between right and wrong even in so-called foreign questions. Every American knew, regardless of what he thought his Nation ought to do about it, that Hitler's persecution of the Jews was wrong. He knew that the Fascist suppression of all minority rights, and expressed opposition to that suppression was wrong. He knew that Japan's attempt to dismember China was wrong, and that the rape of Nanking was wrong. And there is not an American today who does not know that a political system, like the Soviet system, which keeps 18,000,000 people out of 180,000,000 in concentration, and forced labor camps is wrong, however, much apologists for that system may seek to justify it in terms of the well-being and comfort of those fortunate enough to stay outside of those camps. Now it may well be that the Soviet system of secret police, and firing squads, and the obliteration of all minority expression with propaganda or bullets, may one day produce a free and prosperous society. All things are possible to the hearts and minds of man, for they are always capable of transfiguration. So we may yet see Russia gather the figs of liberty from the thorns of oppression. But the present is what it is. Today's crop of evil cannot be justified by the hope of tomorrow's good harvest.

I mention Russia's teeming concentration camps, and multitudinous slave labor gangs, whether native or imported from conquered countries, as they are today, with the acquiescence of our State Department, because this day is sacred to the memory of a man who condemned slavery everywhere. Perhaps some will feel that to condemn these wicked fruits of the Soviet system is to prejudice the great goal of international cooperation. My retort to that is the retort of Lincoln, "You will never get me to support measures which I believe to be wrong, although by so doing I may accomplish that which I believe to be right."

And yet—you will ask at once, should not the Soviet Government enjoy the same right of sovereignty over their internal affairs that we enjoy and must always demand for ourselves? They should decidedly. But this political fact of sovereignty over their internal affairs in no wise alters the moral facts. Wherever our Government and our State Department give aid and comfort to Russian policies or propaganda which seek to extend, and solidify the area of concentration camps, and to acquire from other nations human fodder for them, we are abetting the cause of tyranny and betraying the cause of liberty for all mankind. I cannot speak more plainly, for if I could I would do so. Nor do I exempt from censure our administration's acquiescence in the imperialistic colonial policies of the Dutch and British and French in Indonesia, where hundreds of natives have been slaughtered for the crime of seeking the freedom promised them by the Atlantic Charter.

It is the plain truth to charge that this administration has abetted the cause of tyranny in many areas through the world, ever since the days of Tehran, and betrayed in so doing a democratic faith which was rooted in a Lincolnian hatred of slavery.

In 1914, the conscience of the whole civilized world was outraged when Kaiser Bill referred to his agreement with little Belgium as a "scrap of paper." What shall we say today of the Atlantic Charter? This document guaranteed to martyred Poland, no less than every nation in the world, the right to determine its own government by free democratic processes. Is that an honored document, or isn't it also just a scrap of paper now? Ask Latvians, Esthonians, Lithuanians, Hungarians, Austrians, and almost any Central European. Ask the Yugoslavs who are alive to answer, or do not fear to answer. The total is staggering of European and Asiatic peoples who fought in this war on our side. They fought valiantly in the open or hunted like beasts in the undergrounds, because they believed the promises given them by a democratic American administration that if they did so they would win the chance to have an American type economy, an American type of representative system, an American kind of freedom. Without them we might not have won the war. What do they think of American honor now?

I ask you, in the name of Abraham Lincoln, why since Tehran has all this been so? Why, why, do millions of innocent men, women, and children—the starving, hunted, persecuted, Siberia-bound men, women, and children of our allies, no less than the vanquished ones—think that "malice toward none and charity towards all" is an American idea that was buried with Abraham Lincoln?

What is the explanation? We must seek it in our own hearts, no less than in the hearts of our leaders. For the slow and bitter betrayal of our noblest American principles in the conduct of our foreign affairs since the days of Yalta and Tehran is a matter for which we may quite suddenly and terribly be called to account in an atomic age.

Three explanations suggest themselves: The first is the kindest and the most unlikely: The Democratic administration which has conducted our foreign policy for 13 long years may no longer know the difference between right and wrong. They may have grown hopelessly wedded, through long days in power, to the fashionable thesis that man is altogether an economic animal and not a moral one. Such a belief goes hand in hand with the thesis that the end always justifies any means, and that the sole end of men and nations is material security. Such men will be forever asking, Will this or that policy protect our physical shores, increase our trade, maintain our position as the world's leading power? Such men will never inquire how these policies will affect the liberties of men everywhere, or if they will increase liberty at home or abroad. Such men will not know—or care—that it was wrong to make the promises we did in the Atlantic Charter, and then to break them. Such men will not know—or care—that it was wrong to accede to the dismemberment of Poland when we promised we would not; to fail to carry out our guaranties of free elections in Europe; to fail to resist with every diplomatic means at our disposal what is happening in Indonesia. Above all they will not know—or care—that it is wrong to allow the innocent nationals of many European countries to be shot, imprisoned, or sent into slavery in vast numbers.

I know as you do, that there are men in this administration who are so blinded by that vengeance which properly belongs to the Lord that they cannot see through the red curtain of their hate that it is wrong for this Nation to adopt economic policies in Germany which will result in the wholesale starvation of children and pregnant women; policies which, if they are not changed, will in the end turn all of Europe into a pestilential poorhouse. That some members of this administration and the previous one may have lost their moral sense so that they do not know right from wrong, charity from hate, freedom from slavery, truth from lies, a Christian conscience from a barbarian one, is, as I say, possible. But it is not likely. For all Americans, who are not totalitarians in disguise, have too long lived in the climate of freedom to be easily deceived on such matters. Their forefathers and sons, who died in many wars that it should be preserved, have left them a most intrusive legacy of liberty.

There is a second explanation: The men who conduct our foreign policy may know the difference between right and wrong, but may wish to avoid contemplating it because to contemplate the growing wrongs in the world is too painful to the American mind, which is naturally optimistic, naturally inclined to see the best in everything, naturally indulgent to the ways of others. We are, perhaps, no longer a Nation of Pollyannas, but like Little Orphan Annies, it takes an awful lot to disillusion us.

I sometimes think that our present policy might be called the "three monkeys policy": "See no evil, hear no evil, say no evil." But, the oceans have been breached at last. And troubled Europe and Asia, once so remote, are on our very threshold. This is the age of rocket bomb, atomic bomb, radio and radar which reaches to the moon. This is one world, and Europe and Asia are in it, and there is evil there, such as we have never known here, or had to deal with before. If evil is to be vanquished, it must be understood, it must be seen and heard, and hard and true things must be said of it, that it may be shamed, which, by God's mercy, it often surprisingly is. We must be encouraged to face it in order that we may resist it, and diminish it, before it thrives and grows beyond our strength to resist or diminish.

So there are two possibilities which might explain the wavering and pusillanimous conduct of our foreign affairs by New Deal statesmen, (a) that they have not known, since Tehran, the difference between right or wrong, and (b) that like the three optimistic monkeys, they have ignored the moral obligation placed on man, to look right and wrong squarely in the face and choose between them.

But there is a third and, I believe, sounder reason, why many of the men of this administration have all but failed the cause of international justice to which the Atlantic Charter, no less than the blood of our sons, have pledged us.

The answer is fear: Fear for their political fortunes and their offices.

We hear these men tell us that the world is wearied of war, wearied to a point of despair, so that every appeasement of their's is justified as a charitable act which spares the world even the shadow of a shudder about further bloodshed. Is it not then remarkable that in Europe and Asia today many men who have already endured long terrible years of fighting and bombardment and pestilence and famine, are still not too wearied to risk torture and exile and slavery, and still seek arms to defend their political convictions? Does this not suggest that the question of liberty in Europe is still not settled? Certainly Americans are wearied of the war and want peace; want their men home; want to disarm; want to get on with their American lives and livings. And this weariness is certainly something of which even the most fearless statesmen today must take cognizance. But this is not altogether the reason why these New Deal statesmen gloss over every European and Asiatic incident which might agitate our war weary nerves. The reason is that they dare not tell the American people the plain truths and the solid facts of the European and Asiatic situations that have developed as a result of Tehran, Yalta, London, and Potsdam. They dare not tell us the commitments that were overtly or secretly made in moments of war's extremities by a mortally ill President, and perhaps mortally scared State Department advisers. Some of these commitments were bad, and ought to be reviewed by the whole American people before they are fulfilled. Some of them are good, but cannot be fulfilled without a realistic and idealistic explanation of why they must be fulfilled, even at the further sacrifice of our national wealth and individual comforts.

The man in the White House today, and the men who run our State Department, have inherited from a former administration and furthered a policy full of commitments so complex, so oblique, so secret, so confused, so personal, and whimsical that it would take a political genius to unravel it alone. But perhaps if it were laid before all the people, perhaps if of us together could unravel it. Perhaps all of us together, if we were inspired anew with the principles of Lincoln, would see the gigantic rehabilitation program through, to which we have been committed. But some cowardly men now in office fear that we shall rebel as a nation if asked to assume it. And, oh, how they fear our wrath when we discover all that has been done, or left undone, to make a peace in Europe. So, unable to confess the failure of a previous administration, with whose prestige their own is politically linked for better or worse, most Democratic leaders today, in House and Senate and in State Department, have been forced to adopt appeasement as their policy—appeasement of nations that they fear to speak up to, or back to, lest secret agreements, or agreements that now seem to betray the common man of Europe and Asia, be angrily revealed, and the revelation blast them all out of office; appeasement of the electorate, that is naturally demanding the reward that a previous administration promised so lavishly out of this war—an immediate, long, happy democratic peace in the world. Dare these men who served that administration and also serve this one admit that this peace has already been frittered away bit by bit? They do not. The old New Deal curse now falls upon far less inspired and adroit successors. They are doomed still to please everybody every Monday morning—and to promise endlessly what no man alive can ever deliver: A painlessly achieved Utopia come next election day. And in one matter they are wise—they are wise enough to know that even though they told the truth, while it might save the people, but it would not save them. For when Americans see that New Deal statesmen scuttled the ship of peace they are certainly not going to vote for the same men to salvage the cargo.

What is the result of a foreign policy which sometimes cannot distinguish between right and wrong, which sometimes does not wish to see, hear, or speak of evil, and which always fears to tell the people that evil has been done by ourselves, and by others? The men in power hope that the result—the immediate result will be reelection, power, prestige, patronage. Yes, plums for the few today, but what for the many tomorrow? You know the answer. It was the same thousands of years ago, it is the same today: a time of parlous peace, and dubious prosperity. Men will buy, sell, prosper a little, marry, build houses, eat, drink, and be merry—and then the flood, or the fire, the rain of atomic bombs upon our cities, wiping out millions. Then, indeed, we may all fall on our knees—but too late ever to rise as free Americans.

Will this come to pass?

I believe that it will not come to pass. Because I believe that there is no situation in Europe or Asia today which is not amenable to wise statesmanship. I believe that in the crucial years ahead we will choose an administration whose policies will conform to the principles of Abraham Lincoln. And then, and only then, the ways of peace will begin to open for all men.

The way to begin is to elect a Republican Congress in 1946, and a Republican administration in 1948. And only in this way shall we learn the truth about the conduct of our foreign policy—the truth that when revealed will set us free to work in the cause of liberty everywhere. The choice is the peoples'. It is our Republican task to lay before them the nature of the choice. Let us see to it.

And then indeed this Nation, under God, will have a new birth of freedom. And government of the people, by the people, for the people will not perish from the earth.

A Funny Man Reflects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 18, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in reading the daily newspapers and following the comments of columnists, it is interesting to find a humorist turned serious, particularly our old friend McLemore, found in his column appearing in the Evening Star of December 20 submitted here:

HEADLINES DISPUTE UNITED STATES GAINS IN WAR

(By Henry McLemore)

Sometime, somewhere, somebody is going to tell the United States what it won by winning World War II. I average 50 or 60 letters a day from people asking me to tell them what we gained by, almost overnight, becoming the mightiest power in the world. They all get the same answer—I don't know.

But, starting with this very paragraph which you are reading, I am going to guess what the United States achieved by conquering the Fascist nations. Nothing. I say it again, nothing. I am no thinker, but I can read. Pick up your morning paper and figure out for yourself what we have gained. You will read headlines like these:

"FBI Chief Hoover says crime wave to sweep country."

"British Mosquito bombers crush Indonesians."

"Hurley says Acheson blocked any chance for United States effort in Iran."

"No democracy in Yugoslavia, says Truman's representative, Mark Ethridge."

"Britain and United States fight for world air lines power."

That's enough to give you an idea. Remember, this is going on above the crosses of the dead. This, mind you, is being done by men standing on ground hallowed by men who gave their lives.

I would like to ask Mr. Truman, Mr. Molotov, Mr. Byrnes, and Mr. Bevin if they believe one single man died in this war to make headlines like those.

I am supposed to be a man who writes on little things in a light manner. I do not work in the field of heavy thought. But there comes a time when even the comedians must think of Hamlet, and Pagliacci must lay down his drum for Macbeth. There is no such thing as watching an American soldier die and ever forgetting it. I saw it. I saw them bury Americans in many strange places. They were all Americans who had fought against what they thought was bad.

It is up to us, the living and unworthy Americans, to fight what we think is bad.

We won't do it, but wouldn't this be a lovely country if we would?

Curbs on Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 27, 1946

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a brilliant article entitled "Curbs on Conscription" from today's New York Times by that eminent military expert, Hanson W. Baldwin.

This article which supports the Martin resolution to abolish conscription is entitled to very careful consideration by every peace-loving American. To my mind, its reasoning and conclusions are unanswerable.

CURBS ON CONSCRIPTION—MILITARY ANALYST FAVORS MARTIN MEASURE URGING WORLD ACCORD TO ABOLISH PRACTICE

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The House of Representatives is the setting this week for an age-old dream of man: the abolition of conscription.

Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., of Massachusetts, minority leader, has scheduled hearings before the Military Affairs Committee on a resolution that would urge the President to support a world-wide agreement to abolish conscription, a step that has been officially advocated by Britain. Representative CARL VINSON, of Georgia, chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, has introduced a bill to establish a special occupation force for Germany and Japan to be composed of volunteers. Its avowed objective is ending the wartime draft.

Both measures deal with different aspects of the same problem. These aspects are frequently confused and a sharp differentiation must be made between the so-called permanent peacetime draft, toward which Representative MARTIN'S measure is directed, and the continuing wartime draft, which would be ended by Mr. VINSON'S legislation.

The wartime draft is scheduled to end May 15 unless extended by Congress. With its essential nature as a wartime measure there can be no quarrel, no matter how much each individual may dislike the principle of compulsion to fight. Continuation of the war-

time draft during this postwar period, when the Army and Navy have been demobilizing but have had to be larger than their eventual peacetime size, was a necessity.

A TROUBLESOME PROBLEM

Just how long it should be extended has been a puzzling legislative problem. Mr. Vinson's desire to substitute a volunteer army of occupation for a drafted army is sound, but even if sufficient volunteers eventually were found, May 15 would be too soon to end the wartime draft.

By autumn the Navy and the Army Air Forces expect to have completed demobilization and to have established themselves on a volunteer basis. By that time, too, the Army ground forces will be largely demobilized and will have had a thorough chance to test the success of the volunteer enlistment drive.

Until then all the services will continue to be in a state of flux, with large personnel turn-overs, and the sudden ending of the wartime draft in May would greatly complicate major personnel problems. Next fall should be the time to end the wartime draft. There is a definite reason for extending it to that time, but from present indications little excuse for extending it beyond then.

Mr. MARTIN'S measure is not concerned with the date of terminating the wartime draft but with the principle of conscription itself and, indirectly, with the proposed establishment of a permanent peacetime draft measure in this country.

The War Department and the President have proposed, as a basic part of our postwar military policy, the establishment of a permanent peacetime universal military training measure, under which the youths of the country would be called up regularly, not for service overseas, but for 1 year of training in the United States.

ENCOURAGED BY BRITISH

As a countermove, Representative MARTIN, encouraged by the British proposal for an international agreement to end conscription, has introduced a resolution that, if approved, would put Congress on record in support of the international abolition of conscription.

Mr. MARTIN'S resolution ought to be supported fully. Though there seems to be little chance that Russia would agree to any such proposal, the attempt should be made, if only to lessen the strain and growing tension of the international situation. Conscription cannot possibly be interpreted as a constructive measure, philosophically, economically, or politically. The only justification for it in this country, where its peacetime perpetuation would mean a sharp break with all American concepts and traditions, would be the military security of the Nation.

If the United States had a "live" land frontier with dangerous aggressive nations bordering us the proponents of peacetime conscription would have a far better case. As it is, our "live" frontiers are in the air and at sea, and a mass of semitrained ground troops could do little to insure the security of those frontiers. Whether a mass army will ever again be useful in the atomic age no one can say; if war comes again armies, navies, and air force in some form will almost certainly be employed, as will also rockets and atomic bombs. But the necessity, indeed, the utility, of the draft in training the kind of atomic-age army that may be needed is open to serious doubt.

Moreover, the experience of this war, indeed, the experience of all past wars, has shown that we can train men far faster after an emergency has arisen than we can equip them. Industrial mobilization is even more difficult than manpower mobilization, and mass production takes longer than mass training.

There is an important doubt, therefore, whether the permanent peacetime draft can be militarily justified for the United States, regardless of what other nations do. The great expense of any such training program, its probable concentration on training large numbers of men in methods certain to be obsolete before the next war and the resultant over-emphasis on the creation of a large, semitrained reserve might—and probably would—hamper the development of far more important security measures, an adequate intelligence system, a comprehensive research program, industrial mobilization, finely trained services of professional soldiers, sailors, and airmen, ready for instant action and cable leaders.

Moreover, the international argument, while it can be overdone, must not be ignored, and it tends to offer support for Mr. MARTIN'S resolution. Developments since the end of the war indicate the unsatisfactory nature of the international situation.

No realistic American can be willing today to rest his country's security entirely on the weak and undeveloped structure of the United Nations Organization. We must still depend in large measure on national strength. However, if UNO is to get a chance to broaden and develop, the world atmosphere cannot be too harshly militant.

FINE BALANCE NEEDED

We have to draw, therefore, in all our military policies, a nice balance between the necessities of national security and our efforts toward international organization. To go to either extreme at this juncture in world history would threaten our own security and defeat our own objectives: the creation of a more secure world for all and a period of protracted peace.

So far most of the emphasis has been on purely national measures of security. No disarmament or arms limitations programs have been started, and yet until some limitation is put on armaments the militant atmosphere of the world—an atmosphere inimical to any sort of international growth—will continue.

The UNO has, it is true, authorized the creation of an atomic bomb commission, but Mr. MARTIN'S resolution urging the world-wide abolition of conscription represents the first real attempt at limitation of armaments. If Britain, whose strategic position is far less secure than our own, can support such a step, we can certainly do so. We do not in any sense imperil our own security by supporting it and we help, even though the proposal be rejected, to advance the cause of international collaboration.

The Martin resolution deserves enthusiastic support.

Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1946

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to comment upon the New York transit strike.

The transit strike in New York is over, but the danger of a complete break-down in the future still exists. Just so long as we have Communists and Red lovers playing Stalin's game, just so long will we have chaos in this country.

The man who threatened the New York transit strike is the type of Communist labor leader who would stoop to anything to gain his ends. If there ever was a union that should be cleansed at the top by the rank and file at the bottom, it is the one headed by Michael J. Quill, the Red Russian lover. The complete record of Michael J. Quill, taken from the files of the Dies committee is as follows:

Michael J. Quill

Affiliation	Activity	Source
American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born	Panel speaker at conference	Program, fifth national conference, Atlantic City, N. J., Mar. 29-30, 1941.
American League for Peace and Democracy	Speaker at aid China rally	Daily Worker, Feb. 4, 1938, p. 2.
American Peace Mobilization	Member, national council	Pamphlet, What is APM?, p. 12; leaflet, To the Delegates to the Emergency Peace Mobilization; Daily Worker, Sept. 3, 1940, p. 4, columns 7-8.
American Peace Mobilization, New York Council	Speaker, Armistice Day peace rally, Mecca Temple, Nov. 11, 1940.	Leaflet, What, When, Where?
Anti-Injunction Committee, United Retail and Wholesale Employees of America	Sponsor	Letterhead, dated July 11, 1938.
Bronx Victory Labor Committee	Speaker	Daily Worker, Oct. 13, 1942, p. 3.
Committee for Boycott Against Japanese Aggression	Signer of appeal	Daily Worker, Feb. 25, 1938, p. 4.
Committee for Defense of Public Education, American Federation of Teachers, locals 5, 537.	Sponsor; will testify at hearing	Leaflet, Come to a Citizens' Open Hearing, Manhattan Center, New York City, Dec. 18, 1940.
Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America	Sponsor	Program leaflet, Call to a Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America, June 7, 1940, p. 4.
Consumers National Federation	do	Pamphlet, The People vs. H. C. L., Dec. 11-12, 1937, p. 3.
Consumers Union	Member, labor advisory committee	Undated circular.
Emergency Peace Mobilization	Speaker, Chicago peace rally, conference	Daily Worker, Aug. 31, 1940, p. 4, columns 1-8.
National Council of American-Soviet Friendship	Sponsor, Congress of American-Soviet Friendship	Daily Worker, Oct. 30, 1943, p. 5.
Do	Member, executive committee	Letterhead, dated Nov. 6, 1940.

Michael J. Quill—Continued

Affiliation	Activity	Source
Newark Peace Action Committee, Transport Workers Union, antiwar rally	Speaker	Daily Worker, Oct. 4, 1940, p. 4.
Progressive Women's Council	do	Daily Worker, Apr. 27, 1938, p. 8.
Public hearing, "Labor Testifies against Hague"	do	Daily Worker, Feb. 9, 1938, p. 8.
Seventh annual convention of United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, CIO.	do	Daily Worker, Sept. 4, 1940, p. 1.
Spanish Refugee Appeal	Speaker, Madison Square Garden rally, Sept. 24, 1945.	Daily Worker, Sept. 25, 1945, pp. 1, 2.
Trade Union Women's Committee for Peace; Chicago Emergency Peace Mobilization.	Speaker	Daily Worker, Sept. 12, 1940, p. 3.
Transport Workers Union	President; photo; biography	Daily Worker, June 26, 1937, p. 3.
Do	President; charged with assault	Daily Worker, Feb. 10, 1936, p. 3.
United Office and Professional Workers Union, CIO	Delegate (president, Transport Workers Union)	Sunday Worker, Sept. 1, 1940, p. 5.
Washington Committee for Democratic Action	Member (154 West 64th St., New York, N. Y.)	Dies committee file.
Transport Workers Union	President; telegraphed protest of the committee's investigation of radio commentators' scripts, Oct. 15, 1945.	Do.
American Federation of Teachers, Local 5	Speaker at conference	Daily Worker, Mar. 31, 1938, p. 3.
American Labor Party	Sponsor, mass rally	Handbill, Protest Brutal Nazi Persecutions!
American Peace Mobilization	Signer of call	Call to American People's Meeting, p. 4, New York City, Apr. 5-6, 1941.
American Peace Mobilization, Brooklyn division	Speaker, mass rally, Brooklyn Academy of Music, Feb. 6, 1941.	Pamphlet, Defend Trade Union Rights, back cover.
American Youth Congress (participating sponsors: Washington Committee for Democratic Action; Washington Negro Youth Federation; Washington Youth Council; Washington Council, National Negro Congress; Washington Peace Mobilization).	Speaker, Town Meeting of Youth, Turner's Arena, Washington, D. C., Feb. 7, 1941.	Leaflet, Hear Ye! Open hearing on H. R. 1776.
Champion	Contributor	Champion, December 1937, p. 8.
Consumer-Farmer Milk Cooperative	Sponsor	Why a Milk Cooperative? back cover.
Consumers Union	Speaker, second annual meeting, May 16, 1938	Consumers Union reports, June 1938, p. 16.
Daily Worker	Contributor (reprint of letter to World-Telegram regarding Stolberg).	Daily Worker, Jan 28, 1938, p. 5.
Do	Interviewed on St. Patrick's Day	Daily Worker, Mar. 17, 1938, p. 5.
Emergency Peace Mobilization, organization meeting, Chicago	Member, national council	Daily Worker, Sept. 3, 1940, p. 4.
Emergency Peace Mobilization	Speaker, rally for peace at Coney Island, Aug. 14, 1940.	Daily Worker, Aug. 13, 1940, p. , column 1.
Gerson supporters	Signer of letter	Daily Worker, Feb. 10, 1938, p. 1.
Greater New York Committee for Employment	Speaker	Daily Worker, May 18, 1938, p. 4.
International Labor Defense	Signer of petition to Japanese Ambassador	Daily Worker, Mar. 19, 1938, p. 2.
International Labor Defense, Hudson County Committee for Labor Defense and Civil Rights.	Speaker	Daily Worker, May 7, 1938, p. 2.
Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee	Trade union sponsor	Pamphlet, I Know You Are My Brother, p. 11.
National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc.	Signer of open letter to the American people	New York Times, May 18, 1943, p. 17.
Do	Signer of open letter to mayor of Stalingrad	Soviet Russia Today, June 1943, p. 21.
National Federation for Constitutional Liberties	Executive committee	Letterhead, July 3, 1942.
Do	Signer of message to the House of Representatives opposing renewal of the Dies committee.	Leaflet, attached to undated letterhead.
National unity convention called by Jewish People's Committee	Endorser	Daily Worker, Mar. 1, 1938, p. 2.
National Unity Convention of Jewish People's Committee Against Fascism and Anti-Semitism.	Speaker	Daily Worker, Mar. 11, 1938, p. 2.
New York Tom Mooney Committee	Sponsor	Undated letterhead.
Petition to the Japanese Government protesting the arrests of Japanese citizens	Signer	Equal Justice, Mar. 1938, p. 1.
Progressive Committee to Rebuild American Labor Party	Candidate for delegate, eighth assembly district, Bronx.	Daily Worker, Sept. 17, 1940, p. 4.
Do	Member, executive committee	Leaflet.
Public Use of Arts Committee	Sponsor	Undated letterhead.
Reichstag Fire Trial Anniversary Committee	Signer of declaration honoring Dimitrov	New York Times, Dec. 22, 1943, p. 40.
Schappes Defense Committee	Sponsor	Pamphlet, In the Case of Morris U. Schappes, p. 9.
School for Democracy	Lecturer	New Masses, Jan. 20, 1942, p. 25.
Do	Guest lecturer	Catalog and program, January 1942.
Town Hall, Transport Workers Union, New York Typographical Union, Local 5, American Federation of Teachers, Trade Union Women's Committee for Peace.	Speaker	Daily Worker, Sept. 18, 1940, p. 5.
Trade Union Committee on Industrial Espionage	Speaker at conference	Daily Worker, Mar. 30, 1938, p. 5.
Transport Workers Union, American Peace Mobilization Club, No. 1	Speaker, Washington	Daily Worker, Sept. 11, 1940, p. 1.
Transport Workers Union delegation to State CIO convention, Rochester	Leader of delegation	Daily Worker, Sept. 20, 1940, p. 4.
Union of Concerted Peace Efforts	Signer of manifesto	Daily Worker, Jan. 11, 1938, p. 2.
United Office and Professional Workers of America; Transport Workers Union; New York meeting.	Speaker	Daily Worker, Sept. 13, 1940, p. 5.
United Youth Committee Against Lynching (organizations participating: Youth section of the NAACP, International Workers Order, Transport Workers Union, Young Communist League, Communist Party, Socialist Party, Federated Youth Clubs, Abyssinian Youth Clubs, Mother Aton Youth Clubs, Workers Alliance).	Speaker, parade for Antilynch bill passage	Daily Worker, Feb. 11, 1938, p. 5.
Washington Youth Council	Speaker, Town Meeting of Youth, Turner's Arena, Washington, D. C., Feb. 7, 1941.	Washington Evening Star, Jan. 29, 1941, p. 4.

Spoke at antiwar, anticonscription rally sponsored by the Brooklyn Community Peace Congress at Coney Island Velodrome, Daily Worker, Aug. 16, 1940, p. 2, column 4.

Attended meeting at Chicago Workers School, reported Communist activities, Aug. 22, 1940.

Endorsed the APM conference to be held in Washington, Jan. 25-27, 1941, Daily Worker, Jan. 14, 1941, p. 1, column 7.

Participated in Town Hall Meeting held in Washington, sponsored by the American Youth Congress. Daily Worker, Feb. 7, 1941, p. 3, column 2.

Housing for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1946

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, during the war years, when the GI was fighting for democracy and all our individual lives, we did not hesitate to meet his needs with daring and with promptness. We saw to it that the materials he needed were produced, we saw to it that materials were allocated to his war needs, we saw to it that these materials were rushed to him promptly. When it was a matter of saving the life of GI Joe and incidentally our own lives, the talk was straight and to the point. Now that the war has ended and we must make provision for the greatest reconversion problem of GI Joe—where he shall live and how he shall live—the straight talk suddenly becomes double talk. Everybody is eager to say that there must be a housing program for the veterans immediately. But when good legislation comes up to provide this housing program, then prompt efforts are made to knock the teeth out of the legislation, leaving it just a hollow gesture which will neither fool the veteran nor the general voting public.

The Patman bill now before us permits allocation of scarce materials to construction of dwelling places for veterans. This permission to allocate materials must be kept in the bill for the simple reason that since there is a scarcity of materials, we must have a guaranty that these scarce materials will not be di-

rected toward nonessential construction. Trusting to human kindness and good will is certainly not going to insure the veteran that when materials are scarce, these materials will nevertheless go to constructing low- and medium-cost homes that he can afford and that he needs so desperately. These scarce materials can just as easily go toward the building of $30,000 homes, theaters, restaurants, and other types of nonessential construction. If this is done, just what chance does the veteran have of getting the 3,500,000 homes that he is going to need within the next 2 or 3 years? We must be realistic. Careful surveys and studies have been made and the average returning veteran needs a $6,000 home. Unless we pass legislation that will permit the allocation of scarce materials to this type of home, we are not going to come anywhere near meeting the great need of the veteran. We must recall that the first important point made by Wilson Wyatt in his report to the President is that there is an urgent need for some 3,000,000 moderately and low-priced homes and apartments during the next 2 years. If we seriously want to try to meet this need, if we are not just paying lip service to the veteran to whom we owe so much, we must give immediate thought to writing back into the Patman bill the authority to the Housing Director to allocate scarce materials when conditions make this necessary.

The question of price ceilings on new and existing construction is another essential part of the legislation now before us. We all clearly recognize inflationary trends in our economy today, and if we are to protect the veteran from harmful speculation and the crippling effects of inflation, we must see to it that price ceilings on both new and existing construction are provided when and if they are needed. There is no intention in the Patman bill of having over-all price ceilings nor of having any such ceilings if they are not necessary. However, if a particular locale, a particular type of construction requires ceilings to give the veteran protection against speculation, then authority to provide this must be given to the housing director and the local administrators of the veterans' housing program.

On the matter of new construction, if price ceilings are to be set, they will, of course, be based on the usual standards of the cost of the land, cost of construction, and comparative price values based on some normal year. In regard to ceiling prices on existing homes, this will be determined by agreement between the owner and buyer and this will be the ceiling price for 2 years, which will prevent inflation during a period when the danger of crippling inflation is very imminent.

Another essential aspect of the Patman bill is the granting of premium payments to speed the production of scarce building materials. When we were trying to win the war, we freely granted subsidies to those who were producing the materials of war, in order to speed the victory. Now we must be willing to grant subsidies for scarce building materials, so that the men who were on the battlefield last year can have a place to live next year. This granting of premium payments, which is another factor urgently recommended by the Housing Expediter to meet our goal of providing some 3,000,000 more dwelling places for veterans, is not now included in the legislation before us, but it must be included to provide the fullest guaranty that we really intend to carry out the program which is so critically needed.

The need of the veteran for homes is not something that has come on us suddenly. It has gradually been building up during the past five war years when materials were of necessity going to war. We must now meet with vision, with honesty, and with courage the obligation that we have to the returning veteran to give him a home to live in which will justify the reason for his living in fox holes for 4 years. We are all agreed on the need for an emergency program for veterans' housing. Now let us agree that the only way to carry out such a program is to back it up with effective and courageous legislation. With the necessary inclusion of amendments to grant premium payments and to grant authority to place price ceilings on existing homes, the Patman bill now before us will go a long way toward insuring the success of the emergency housing program.

Boston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a very interesting article entitled "American Cities: Boston," which appeared in the February issue of the Caravan, a monthly magazine published by the New Yorker Hotel Corp. of New York City, which is edited by Shepard Henkin and whose business is managed by Rose Shokler. In one of the first pages of this magazine there appears a very timely and important editorial by the genial president of the Hotel New Yorker, Frank L. Andrews, which is headed "Hoard bonds, not cash" and reads as follows:

Now, more than ever before, is the time to hold on to your war and savings bonds, which you purchased. For these bonds increase most in value during the latter years of their 10-year life.

No other investment today insures so much security or so fair a return—United States savings bonds pay 3½ percent interest.

The wise man is one who lets his bonds attain their full maturity value, and thereby makes the greatest gain on his investment.

The following is the splendid write-up on the city of Boston:

AMERICAN CITIES: BOSTON

Boston, the oldest large city in the United States, was founded in 1630 by a chartered company of English colonists under the governorship of John Winthrop. Named Shawmut by its Indian inhabitants and Trimontaine by the early colonists, it received its present name on September 17, 1630, after the town of Lincolnshire, England, from which many of the company had come. Two years later it was established as the capital of the Massachusetts Bay Colony and is today capital of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Although religious freedom was one of the principles on which the early English colonies were founded, the Puritan population of Boston soon became intolerant of divergent religious views. Some of the offenders were exiled, Anne Hutchinson among them and others, like Roger Williams who founded Rhode Island, emigrated voluntarily. Between 1648 and 1688 four women were executed as witches and four Quakers, who returned in defiance of their exile, were hanged .

For many years Boston was the largest town in the colonies and it has always occupied a position of leadership. It was the scene of the first American printing office and the first regular newspaper, the Boston News Letter, was published in Boston in 1704. America's first public school which is still in existence, the Public Latin School, was started in 1635. Harvard College, located across the Charles River in Cambridge, the country's oldest institutior of higher learning, was founded in the following year.

Boston, as the natural center of the Colonies that later came to be known as New England, was continuously in the forefront in the long dispute with the mother country that culminated in the American Revolution. Because of the lack of resources in New England—the soil and the climate were not suitable for the raising of the colonial staples, tobacco or cotton or sugar—this section of the New World soon became England's stepchild and came to learn that it had to fend for itself. The various trade and tax laws, imposed by Britain, worked a particular hardship on New England's seaport towns. Therefore, these could subsist only through their shipping among the other Colonies and between the Old and the New Worlds. As a result, Boston earned the name of hotbed of the Revolution, with the Stamp Act and Revenue Act riots, the Boston Massacre, and the Boston Tea Party and the Boston port bill, outward evidence of the city's right to the title. America still respects the names of the many rugged patriots who refused to accept England's punitive measures in silence, such men as Samuel Adams, John Hancock, Paul Revere, William Dawes, and James Otis, among a long list.

Because of the lack of natural resources and its limited agriculture, New England was ready to seize the opportunities offered by the industrial revolution around 1800. Textile mills sprang into being in towns all over New England where water power was available, and not long after the shoe industry followed suit. Boston became the natural center for these industries both as a market for their finished products and as the port of entry for their raw materials—cotton, wool, silk, and leather.

With the finest natural harbor on the Atlantic coast, Boston today is one of the world's leading ports, second only to New York in value of imports and in overseas passenger traffic. During the present war it has been one of the principal ports of embarkation for our armed forces and for lend-lease goods to Europe. During the war the port enormously expanded for Army and Navy needs so that few, if any American ports, will be able to boast superiority in this respect when peacetime trading is resumed.

Boston is the hub of a rail and bus transportation system that adequately cares for the heavy demands placed upon it by a busy industrial hinterland. Located as it is in the far northwest corner of the United States,

Boston is waging a constant battle to maintain equitable freight rates to outweigh its geographical disadvantage. But this position has come to be advantageous in the air transport picture of the future. Because of its nearness to Europe, Boston is destined to be the Nation's principal airport of embarkation for Europe and in keeping with an expected huge demand that will be made on it the city's air-field facilities are now being rapidly expanded. The General Edward L. Logan Airport in East Boston, nearer to the center of the business district than is that of any other large city on the Atlantic seaboard, is right now being enlarged to many times its original size.

The city has maintained its rank as one of the Nations leading industrial centers from earliest times. Before the present war, it still imported better than two-thirds of all foreign wool used in the United States to supply New England mills, but textiles and shoes, have long since had to share the industrial scene with a long and diversified list of products. In the Boston industrial area—the four counties immediately surrounding and including the city—are over 6,000 factories making clothing, confectionery, electrical goods, rubber goods, ships, printing, razors, foundry and machine-shop products, tools, and a host of other goods.

From earliest colonial days fishing has been an important endeavor in New England, first for subsistence; later as a commercial enterprise. Boston is the largest fishing port on the Atlantic seaboard with the world's biggest fish freezing plant. In peacetime more than 300,000,000 pounds of fish are received at the port annually for processing and distribution to inland markets.

Boston has played a leading role in the Nation's cultural growth. Referred to in another era as "the Athens of America" it certainly held undisputed claim to this title for many years. Here—and in neighboring Cambridge and Concord—lived and worked a colony of writers which gave to American letters a distinctive place among the world's great literatures. Names like Emerson, Holmes, Longfellow, the Alcotts, Thoreau, Hawthorne, Aldrich, Lowell, Howells, James, Parkman, and an imposing roster of others form a rich and substantial background for all American writing that has come after them.

In the other cultural fields Boston has likewise played a foremost part. The present Boston Symphony and the perhaps equally famous Pops have always played to capacity audiences because Boston is a city of music lovers.

The Boston Public Library boasts the largest per capita book circulation of any institution of its kind in America and incidentally it is housed in one of the city's show places, an authentic copy of an antique jewel case in true Italian renaissance architecture. Across Copley Square from the library is Trinity Church (once seat of the famous Bishop Brooks), the country's outstanding example of romanesque architecture.

The country's first home of education, Boston is still a city of colleges and universities. Harvard, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Tufts, Boston University, Boston College, Jackson, Radcliffe, Wellesley, Northeastern, Simmons, Regis, and Suffolk are all located in metropolitan Boston and in addition there are literally hundreds of specialized schools such as the New England Conservatory of Music, Massachusetts School of Art, Forsythe Dental Clinic, Massachusetts College of Pharmacy, among a long list that make the city justly famous as a leader in education.

"Yankee ingenuity" which doubtless stemmed from the hardships of colonial days, has made itself manifest in many ways in Boston but especially perhaps in technological advancement. Outstanding among inventions and discoveries born in Boston are the telephone, the telegraph, the vulcanization of rubber and, not far away, the sewing machine. In medical research Boston has played an important part also. Ether was discovered here in 1846 as was the use of liver to counteract anemia and, more recently, synthetic quinine. Boston's hospitals are well up among the world's finest.

The geography of Boston is a subject which causes some confusion. With an area of only 44 square miles, Boston is the tiniest of the country's large cities. The population of the city proper in 1940 was 770,816, ranking it ninth in the country. But to see the true city it is necessary to consider the metropolitan area, consisting of 83 cities and towns by Census Bureau definition still smaller in area than, for example, Los Angeles proper, but with a population of nearly 2,500,000. In this area are many smaller cities such as Lynn, Somerville, Chelsea, Everett, Malden, Cambridge, Quincy, Salem, and Brockton, each an important industrial center in its own right; and, of course, many residential communities. That Boston is the business capital of this area, of the whole New England area indeed, is revealed in the fact that it is the country's third largest wholesale center, third largest retail center, and third largest banking and financial cener; outranked by only New York City and Chicago.

With its innumerable shrines, historical and literary, its beaches and parks and nearby mountains and lakes, its modern factories, its many schools and colleges, Boston is truly one of the showplaces of America.

Housing Priority for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following press statement of Evalyn Walsh McLean, and also a bill introduced by me on February 25:

FEBRUARY 23, 1946.

The Congress of the United States.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: During the past week, your attention was drawn to a scheme hatched by certain high-placed public housing bureaucrats to sell McLean Gardens, Naylor Gardens, and other publicly owned surplus housing projects direct to private real-estate interests and completely ignore the pleas of war veterans desperately in need of decent homes for themselves and their families.

Our brave lads who marched off and sailed away to win the victory we now enjoy, today are happy to know you have taken definite action to thwart this outrageous plan to short-circuit their rights to return to comfortable homes when and if they are ready.

Before you today is a House resolution introduced by Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS of Massachusetts, designed to give war veterans top priority in buying dwellings for their own use. In other words, when you have acted, the men who faced the enemy in this war are to have first choice to the fruits of victory rather than a last chance.

The Defense Homes Corporation, it is interesting to note, quickly changed their plan when the full spotlight of public opinion was turned on. They have announced they will hold up sale of these housing projects until further plans can be worked out. It is well they did.

During the war, combat soldiers, sailors, and airmen talking with one another by radio would end each individual conversation with the word "over." That was their way of telling the other guy to go ahead.

In this fight by our war veterans to secure the rights for which they battled around the world, they are now saying to you ladies and gentlemen of Congress, "Over."

In other words "go ahead—it's up to you."

No time should be lost, there must be no stalling, no more insufferable delays in making into the law of the land the safeguards which will guarantee our war veterans the rights they so richly deserve.

Over!

Respectfully,

EVALYN WALSH MCLEAN.

H. R. 5576

A bill relating to veterans' priorities in purchasing surplus property suitable for residential purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That as used in this act—

(a) The term "Chairman" means the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the War Assets Corporation or the officer, employee, or agency of the United States to which his functions with respect to surplus residential property are transferred.

(b) The term "residential property" means (1) any property consisting of land, together with any fixtures and improvements thereon, located within the District of Columbia, which is suitable for residential purposes, and (2) any war housing, whether located within or outside of the District of Columbia.

(c) The term "surplus residential property" means residential property which has been determined under section 11 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, to be surplus property and is classified by the Chairman as suitable for residential purposes.

(d) The term "public notice" means notice given as required by regulations prescribed under section 11 (e) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended.

(e) The term "veteran" means (1) any individual in the active military or naval service of the United States during the present war; (2) any individual who served in the active military or naval service of the United States on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, and who has been discharged or released therefrom; or (3) any corporation, partnership, firm, association, or other entity either wholly composed of individuals described in clauses (1) and (2) or wholly owned or controlled by such individuals.

(f) The terms "Government agency", "owning agency", "disposal agency", "property", "State", and "war housing" have the same meaning as when used in the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended.

SEC. 2. Whenever any surplus residential property is to be disposed of other than to Government agencies or to States or their political subdivisions or instrumentalities as provided in sections 12 and 13 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, veterans shall be granted a priority in the purchase of such property over nonveterans in accordance with the provisions of this act.

SEC. 3. Surplus residential property shall be subdivided into the appropriate units in which the Chairman deems it should be disposed of, giving due consideration to the character of the property and the objectives of this act to provide preferences in purchases thereof to veterans.

SEC. 4. (a) Veterans shall be given 60 days after public notice within which to signify in writing an intention to acquire any unit of surplus residential property which is offered for sale. The sales price shall be at

the reasonable value in a normal market as determined by an appraisal as provided in section 5.

(b) If after signifying an intention to acquire any unit of surplus residential property a veteran declines to purchase it at the appraised value or is unable to meet the terms of the sale, public notice shall be given offering the unit for sale to other veterans at the price fixed by the appraisal. Such public notice shall specify a reasonable time within which any veteran may apply for the purchase of such unit at the price so fixed.

(c) Units of surplus residential property not sold to veterans under subsection (a) or (b) may be disposed of to nonveterans, but no such unit shall be disposed of to any nonveteran upon terms more favorable than the terms under which the unit has been offered to veterans.

(d) The terms of the sale of any unit of surplus residential property to any veteran under subsection (a) or (b) shall include provisions requiring that in the case of any resale of such property during the 10-year period beginning on the date of the sale, the property will first be offered for resale to veterans at not more than the reasonable value in a normal market as determined by an appraisal as provided in section 5. Except as provided in this section, sales to veterans under this act shall be upon such terms as the Chairman may prescribe.

SEC. 5. Units of surplus residential property offered for sale shall be appraised by an appraiser selected by the disposal agency or other prospective seller and an appraiser selected by the prospective veteran buyer or, in case of disagreement of the two appraisers so selected, by an appraiser jointly selected by the first two appraisers. The determination of what constitutes a reasonable value in a normal market shall be based upon reasonable values during the period beginning January 1, 1937, and ending December 31, 1939.

Commentator Pays Deserved Tribute to Hon. Sol Bloom, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday evening, January 29, Don Pryor, speaking from London, paid one of the most beautiful and deserving tributes ever paid any man in public life when he devoted his entire broadcast to the outstanding contribution made that day by the distinguished and beloved chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Hon. SOL BLOOM.

Throughout his long and remarkably successful political career, SOL BLOOM has always thought and acted in terms of people. In his persuasive address before the United Nations Social and Economic Council, he reminded this great group that if the UNO is to work, people must be the primary object of its concern.

Because SOL BLOOM puts men before machines, people before profit, little folks everywhere have hope that under his leadership the foreign policy of the greatest nation in all the world will be well handled.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the comments of the able CBS commentator, Don Pryor, delivered on The World Today, Tuesday, January 29, 1946, 6:45 to 7 p. m. eastern standard time:

SOL BLOOM, the old war horse of American foreign affairs, who came to London first many years ago as a young song writer of Tin Pan Alley, with a tune to peddle, sold the biggest bill of goods of his life today, on behalf of all the suffering peoples of the world. An American-sponsored resolution, calling on all the nations that are able to contribute to the UNRRA "kitty," was up for consideration by the United Nations Social and Economic Council. It has been passively opposed by some. The delegate of Saudi Arabia—all 51 nations were represented there today—objected to the levy of 1 percent of each nation's national income. The Uruguayan delegate protested that his country had heavy expenses at home.

So, SOL BLOOM, in a slightly rumpled suit, with the large, loose features of his face set grimly and using his hands and liberal, old-style oratorical gestures, pulled out all the stops, as he used to do now and then on the floor of the House of Representatives. "Can you get peace and security," he asked, "where people are starving, when fathers and mothers know what it is to have babies coming to them and pleading for a little piece of bread and for something to keep them warm?" He let the question answer itself. He paid lavish tribute to the work of UNRRA so far, but warned that it needed far more help, if it were to prevent disaster in the form of famine and epidemics. And it needs help this year, he insisted, for next year there won't be any people to feed. "If you can only give a bag of peanuts, give a bag of peanuts." All the opposition there was melted, and the resolution was adopted by acclamation.

The song SOL BLOOM sold when he came over here 40 years ago, The Honeysuckle and the Bee, is still selling, by the way, still giving pleasure to many people. But far more people may be affected by what he did today.

CIO Backs Truman-Wyatt Housing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 27, 1946

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following statement:

President Philip Murray, of the CIO, and President R. J. Thomas, of the United Automobile Workers, CIO, today issued the following statement on the emergency housing program advanced by Mr. Wilson Wyatt:

"The housing program as presented by Mr. Wyatt and approved by President Truman recognizes the magnitude of the need of the homeless veterans, while at the same time it appraises realistically America's potential productive capacity to meet this need. It does so by enabling the building industry and related private enterprises to get going at a rate of peacetime production that will match our high wartime momentum. It will do this with a minimum but essential amount of Government assistance.

"Only those who have no faith in American democracy and American production genius will doubt America's capacity to meet the goals set in Mr. Wyatt's most practical program. Such defeatists are the same ones who only a short time ago attacked our wartime aircraft and shipbuilding goals.

"Actually the housing program will greatly aid the building industry, since not only will it enable it to produce at maximum to meet the present crisis, but will lay a firm basis for many years of full-scale output. When carried out, these measures will make possible for the first time continuous production of low-cost housing for the mass market of middle- and low-income families, for whom it is estimated that over 16,000,000 new houses will be needed in the coming decade. While the approximately 3,000,000 houses called for in 1946 and 1947 will greatly alleviate the present plight of the homeless, we will have to continue to keep our sights high for many years to come if we are to reach our goal of a decent home for every American family.

"The housing program must be put into effect at once. It must be a major part of the national effort to achieve full employment. Its enactment is in the best interest of the veteran and all citizens who want a prosperous American economy. It is now squarely up to Congress to pass speedily the necessary legislation—the Patman bill, the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, and the Kilgore-Mitchell bill—so that the new housing program can go forward."

Target: Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 27, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of February 26, 1946:

TARGET: HOUSING

Congress begins debate today on Mr. Wilson Wyatt's plan to get 2,700,000 homes started in the next 27 months and thus prevent the housing crisis from getting worse. It is our earnest hope that the legislators will dispatch the program promptly—after plugging up two holes which were punched in it last week by a House committee.

The plan was made in one piece and each part was essential to arrival at stated goals on time. Mr. Wyatt defined the goals with the precision by which military production was turned out on time. "Target for 1946: 1,200,000 homes started. * * * Target for 1947: 1,500,000 homes started," said Mr. Wyatt, and he noted: "Neither business-as-usual, labor-as-usual, building-as-usual nor Government-as-usual will suffice." The country apparently agreed. There was hearty applause all around and no criticism to speak of. The only thing that has changed particularly since then is in the public temper—that people are more wide awake to the emergency and less patient.

It is hard to see what prompted the committee members to drop the $600,000,000 premium payments provision by which building stuff—the very first essential, now bottlenecked—is to be brought into the market. Conceivably it was thought that aid to be offered to some producers—premiums for producing more than the usual amount of conventional materials and for making the newer ones, such as light metal and plastics, which incidentally can be turned into houses faster—might upset the present competitive position of the producers. That this would happen is highly doubtful. Producers themselves have said right along that there is demand for far more material than can be made of every sort, and that incentives are

needed. Demand for 1,500,000 homes each 12 months will continue 10 years. There is left the possible objection, on principle, to this subsidy-like aid to private enterprise—a point on which it is worth while to note some recent observations by Senator TAFT, of Ohio, who will certainly be accepted as a stanch defender of our existing economy. In speaking of housing with Federal aid including subsidies for low-cost homes, Senator TAFT noticed that "If the free-enterprise system does not do its best to prevent hardship * * * it will be superseded by a less-progressive system which does."

The premium payments are required to make the rest of the program work, with its priorities to channel the material into moderate-priced home building and preference to veterans, encouragement to the recruiting of additional labor, and control of prices. The House committee also dropped the proposed ceiling on existing homes. This is a pretty tall ceiling, which would affect chiefly the speculators, in our judgment, for the proposition is simply to let whatever price a house is sold for at this time be the price for the duration of the emergency. There is little logic or fairness in putting a lid on new-home prices but none on those which already exist.

Importation of Vacuum Cleaners From Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 27, 1946

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and editorial:

[From the Chicago Herald-American of February 13, 1946]

VACTRIC LTD., CHAPELHALL, AIRDRIE, SCOTLAND

"United States of America orders 250,000 vacuum cleaners from Britain."

No, gentle readers, this is not a faked story or a bit of propaganda.

It is a reproduction of an advertisement in the London Daily Mail, trans-Atlantic edition of January 16, 1946.

Of course we do not believe that this is the vacuum cleaner Winston Churchill and Lord Keynes used on the United States Treasury. That machine must have been much more powerful than the household variety.

The advertisement deals with a gadget as distinctively American as ham and eggs, and it should make clear even to the dumbest politician what is happening to American trade and the prestige of American products not only in world markets but here in the United States.

American production of vacuum cleaners, washing machines, refrigerators, and other appliances is almost at a standstill while President Truman plays politics with Sidney Hillman and the OPA harasses and browbeats industry.

In the meantime, the smart British are not only destroying our world markets for vacuum cleaners and other products, but actually preparing to flood the United States with these same products made by labor which is paid about half of American wages.

What chance do you suppose American manufacturers are going to have to sell vacuum cleaners in South America, Central America, Europe, and Asia when the British can show that although we originated this machine, we buy British vacuum cleaners for our own use?

These people in other countries will never be able to understand that the people of the United States were forced to go abroad for vacuum cleaners because they could not get the superior products of their own factories.

Of course, the smug little Washington bureaucrats have not the slightest understanding of the enormous cost and difficulties of building up markets at home and abroad. Ninety percent of them could not run a hotdog stand successfully.

In England, however, the ablest men in the Empire devote their attention to the development of trade. With no natural resources, England must be intelligent or starve.

Beginning 1 month after Eisenhower's army landed in Normandy and months before Germany surrendered, England issued thousands of permits to businessmen to go abroad and prepare for after-war trade.

The British appropriated $800,000,000 to back export trade.

Lord Woolton, the Minister of Reconstruction, advised businessmen that the Government had made studies of overseas markets in 26 countries and was ready to back the drive for trade.

"The world abroad is hungry for our products," said Lord Woolton, "and we must not tempt our customers overseas to find other sources of supply."

Let us not be silly and get angry at the intelligent British.

Let us use some of these vacuum cleaners to do a thorough spring housecleaning in Washington.

HEALTH-MOR, INC.,
Chicago, Ill., February 25, 1946.

Hon. BARTEL J. JONKMAN,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We wish to call your attention to the attached editorial regarding the proposed importation into the United States of 250,000 vacuum cleaners from Britain. The editorial appeared in the Chicago Herald-American for February 13, 1946, and is a stunning indictment of that kind of Washington muddled political thinking which proposes to assist the introduction of foreign merchandise into the American market in direct competition with American products.

We use the word "assist" advisedly. In the instance involved, 250,000 vacuum cleaners represent one-eighth of the United States record sales in the biggest year the industry ever had. The figure represents a huge slice of the present year's vacuum cleaner market potential. To make more grievous the injury about to be done to American vacuum cleaner manufacturers, there is good reason to suspect that this vast flood of domestic market-destroying merchandise will be financed in part out of the proposed $4,000,000,000 loan to Britain, * * * a loan to be paid for by the very people who will suffer from the import of this foreign equipment.

Since 1941, our organization and thousands of other American manufacturers have been "selling" the public on the vital necessity of waiting for home appliances, like vacuum cleaners, until after the war. Although the war ended 7 months ago, we still have practically nothing save excuses to offer the American public, * * * largely due to Washington-created shortages.

Also, the 45,000 small businessmen who move home appliances from manufacturer to consumer are without vacuum cleaners to sell, * * * although their books are loaded with advance orders from customers who are becoming extremely impatient with the unreasonable delay in securing merchandise. This delay, we may add, is all too frequently ascribed solely to the manufacturer.

Therefore, an industry that is equipped and ready to produce 2,500,000 vacuum cleaners in 1946, with a retail value of over $135,000,000, stands hamstrung with partially shut-down plants and skeleton crews of workers, while a few self-styled Washington "experts" indulge in manipulations that are supposed to adjust our economy to "a more abundant way of life."

Is it possible that we are supposed to accept as a solution to our problem the proposal that the American housewife buy British, while American industry is taught how to run its affairs? That we must stand by and be sandbagged by foreign competition because we have been rendered unable by our own Government to defend our domestic markets with vastly superior American-made products?

In order that public confidence in the vacuum-cleaner industry may not be entirely destroyed, we are proposing to the Vacuum Cleaner Manufacturers Association that a series of advertisements be placed in the principal newspapers of the Nation, telling the people why they must buy foreign vacuum cleaners if they want vacuum cleaners now. The time has come when we, along with other manufacturers who are paying an unearned penalty for un-American economic theorizing, must bring the injustice of our condition to the attention of the public.

You and every other intelligent, unprejudiced American must see the inexcusable stupidity of a condition which for seven long months has held the finest industrial system in the world at a standstill. We urge you, therefore, to take the following two steps in behalf of American industry:

1. Propose a bill that will immediately stop the importation of any article of commerce for which there is ample productive capacity in this country during the period that said productive capacity is held inoperative involuntarily.

2. Do everything in your power to remove the restrictions against reasonable price adjustments that now prevent United States industry from getting into high gear so as to attain maximum production.

Sincerely yours,
HEALTH-MOR, INC.,
ALBERT E. KRAMER,
Vice President.

Hon. Wright Patman, of Texas, Charges Real-Estate Lobby With Deliberate Falsehoods—Reveals Existence of Million-Dollar Slush Fund—Demands Homes for Veterans at Reasonable Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 27, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include the script of a radio program which was broadcast at 10:30 p. m., February 26, over the Columbia Broadcasting System's network.

This public-spirited organization has a weekly feature entitled "Congress Speaks," which has done much to keep the American people informed of worthwhile things that are being done in Washington. Last night's program was

entitled "The Veterans Housing Scandal":

Mr. COSTELLO. One of the strangest aspects of the American postwar reconversion period is the fact that across the broad breadth of America, the fabled land of abundance, there has suddenly appeared the most acute housing shortage the Nation has ever faced. The situation had been intensifying slowly—almost imperceptibly—for several years. Then our armies started pouring home from the far-flung battle fronts over the world, and we faced a housing crisis.

With me in the studio tonight I have Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas. He is the author of the administration's housing bill and leader of the floor fight for its passage. I have asked him to give us some first-hand information about how and why he believes the returning veteran finds himself in such a dilemma. Mr. PATMAN, what are your general views on this housing situation?

Mr. PATMAN. The desperate plight of our returning veterans in their vain search for a place to live is being written plainly on the want-ad pages of our daily newspapers. You can turn to any city in the country—New York, Chicago, Detroit, Dallas, Los Angeles—and read and hear the same story of their misery and need.

One would think, considering the eternal debt of gratitude we owe these youngsters who won the war for us, that Americans would gladly make an all-out effort to help veterans find a place to live when they are discharged from the Army. I think it is almost a national disgrace that this has not been the case. Instead, they are being made the victims of the biggest speculative swindle in the history of our country. They are being forced to pay fantastic prices for jerry-built shacks in order to find shelter.

I can cite literally hundreds of cases from my own mail—specific instances where veterans have been charged $10,000 for a $5,000 home. I have one case of a B–29 pilot who got back to his Chicago home 2 months ago. A landlord, who is not typical, demanded $150 as side-money before renting him an apartment. Literally thousands of veterans cannot afford the tremendous down-payments now required on a home.

In one Texas town there is a veteran who has his home half finished. He has a priority certificate. Last week he went from lumber mill to lumber mill seeking enough material to finish his home. These mills had lumber in their yards, they had wall-board, they had flooring, but the mill men told the veteran, "I'm sorry. This lumber was ordered for commercial construction. It is already sold."

And that's the story. Across the land new stores are being erected; theaters, bowling alleys, all types of commercial structures, are consuming the material that should go into homes for veterans.

We have a plan to put a stop to all this. It is the program recently announced by the President to build homes by the millions; build them faster than they have ever been built before; build them with the same speed and intensity that we built airplanes and ships and guns to supply the battle-fronts over the world: to mobilize the forces of the building industry in the same way that the automobile industry, the oil industry, and the building industry itself were mobilized to meet the problems of war.

The President and Mr. Wilson Wyatt, his Housing Expediter, set a goal; a goal to build 2,700,000 homes in the next 24 months; more than seven times the number that was constructed in 1945. The plan has been set in a framework of broad vision and careful planning. The President has called for bold and energetic action on the part of both Government and industry.

In November I introduced a housing bill to provide the legislative foundation for this program. Its one objective was to provide houses for veterans at a reasonable cost, and to hold down speculation in existing homes until the veteran demand had been met. What happened? The most vicious lobby of the Seventy-ninth Congress has been organized to oppose the measure and all its parts. For a month Washington representatives of the real-estate interest have been button-holing Congressmen, urging them to vote against houses for veterans.

These same interests sent word out over the country to legitimate lumber dealers, urging them to wire their Congressmen to oppose the bill. Thousands of telegrams have been pouring in upon the Representatives and Senators. All this costs money. I conservatively estimate that a minimum of $25,000 worth of telegrams have reached Congress in the past 10 days. Who paid for this campaign? Why would anyone spend thousands of dollars to defeat a plan to help veterans find shelter?

I think I know the answer. It has been reported in various newspapers that the Washington real-estate lobbyists have a slush fund of from one to five million dollars to be spent for such nefarious purposes as these. These lobbyists have stooped to downright falsehoods to dupe and mislead legitimate and responsible lumbermen and real-estate dealers over the country.

I have before me a copy of a publication called "Headlines", which these real-estate representatives sent out last week. It urges that the housing bill implementing the President's program be sent back to committee. It said, "The Wyatt program has been rushed to the floor of the House without the customary public hearings. Industry and private citizens have not been given the chance to submit facts about the effect it will have. Only by such facts will Congress be able to give proper consideration to this vital legislation."

Thousands of legitimate lumber dealers read and believed that statement. The truth was that the housing bill was introduced on November 20, 1945, and hearings were held on it before the House Banking and Currency Committee from December 3, 1945, until February 14, 1946. During this period of more than 2 months of hearings, a volume of testimony was taken. What is more to the point, the same representative who said industry had not been given a chance to testify, himself was heard for one full day by the House Banking and Currency Committee, and his statements occupied 15 pages of the hearing record.

Why should these lobbyists stoop to such practices? I believe there is a quite obvious answer to that. Should this legislation pass, they will be denied the greatest sucker market in history. The only thing they object to seriously in the administration's program is a formula which would prevent real-estate speculation during the housing crisis of some 18 months.

If the legislation passes, Federal appraisers will scrutinize builders' plans for new homes to see that the veteran gets his money's worth. The legitimate builders have found no fault with this, but the group of speculators who are paying these Washington lobbyists well know that the houses they are building will stand no such examination.

I personally know of instance after instance where veterans who have finally found a place to live are being evicted because their homes were sold out from under them by the landlord. These same speculators, worshiping at the great god greed, cry that we are ruining free enterprise when we want to build homes for veterans in the six to seven thousand dollar range. They claim that homes cannot be built in America for six or seven thousand dollars. The truth of the matter is that the speculators can make more profit per house on $15,000 mansions, and, therefore, they have not the slightest desire to build homes for veterans at six or seven thousand dollars.

However, personally I am convinced there are sufficient responsible, thinking Americans in our country who cannot be duped by propaganda and who will join in this program of helping us provide homes for our veterans.

That's a rather lengthy explanation, but I think the American people are entitled to know the facts of the housing situation.

Mr. COSTELLO. Every man to his own opinion, Mr. PATMAN. Now there are several points I would like to clarify in my own mind. You spoke of this formula for holding down speculation on existing homes. What formula did you mean?

Mr. PATMAN. Simply this, Mr. Costello. One of the major sections of the housing bill provides that the present owner of a home could sell it at any time for whatever price he could get for it. That price would then become the ceiling price for the duration of the housing emergency.

It protects the investment of the present owner. Its sole purpose is to prevent the speculative reselling that has skyrocketed the price of so many homes.

Mr. COSTELLO. How long would that ceiling price remain?

Mr. PATMAN. Only for the life of the housing bill—until December 31, 1947—some 18 months. I don't think that will hurt anyone, yet this has been one of the most misunderstood and controversial points of the whole legislation. It does hit the speculators squarely in their pocketbooks, however, and we have heard the resulting outcry.

Mr. COSTELLO. There does exist some sincere criticism of your bill, Mr. PATMAN, particularly on the question of subsidies. Mr. Wyatt is asking $600,000,000 to use for what he calls premium payments which a lot of people object to. What about that?

Mr. PATMAN. I sincerely believe, Mr. Costello, that these subsidies will be the cheapest way for us to get our production goals. All of us know that scarcity of materials is our biggest problem right now.

Some small marginal plants with higher costs are either shut down or operating at only partial capacity. The reason for this in most instances is that they cannot afford to pay competitive wage scales and hence cannot get workers; or their manufacturing methods are not as efficient as their competitors. It is Mr. Wyatt's idea to give these plants a premium price for their product. This extra money can be used to hire more men or take whatever steps are necessary to increase production. Once the plant gets into volume production, and the cost per unit drops, it can then compete and the need for subsidies no longer exists. It acts as a sort of industrial pump primer to get a plant under way.

Mr. COSTELLO. Some of the critics of the program, Mr. PATMAN, have been pointing out that this program will result in the veterans obtaining a lot of cheap, prefabricated homes, and in 10 years they will find themselves much worse off than if they had paid higher prices for conventional homes. Would you care to touch on that, Mr. PATMAN?

Mr. PATMAN. I most certainly would. That's another argument the speculators are using to keep us from building homes for servicemen.

Under the President's housing program, 1,200,000 houses are planned for 1946. Of these 700,000 are conventional homes and 250,000 are so-called prefabricated houses—so you can readily see that the emphasis is going to be on the conventional type home, built by local carpenters and construction firms. The prefabricated houses are expected to fill the gap beyond the capacity of the conventional building methods.

However, these prefabricated homes will be required to meet the same standards of construction that conventional homes do. They

must meet the same scrutiny of FHA appraisers, so that the argument that we will have thousands of prefabricated shacks under this program just doesn't hold water.

Mr. COSTELLO. About these lobbyist telegrams, Mr. PATMAN. Don't you believe that they come from legitimate builders?

Mr. PATMAN. Of course I do—and I answer every one of them which contains sufficient address. In most instances the wording of the telegram itself shows conclusively that the writer has been misinformed about the housing program. In many cases I later receive letters from them explaining that they have been misled and pledging their support of this legislation.

In connection with this, I have one specific instance you might be interested in. I received a telegram from a lumber dealer in Houston, Tex. I promptly and courteously replied to him, explaining my motives for introducing this legislation. He indignantly wrote back saying that he had never sent the telegram and wanting to know the circumstances around it.

I promptly turned the case over to the Department of Justice. It developed that one man came into a Houston telegraph office, gave the clerk a long list of names, and planked down several hundred dollars in cash, asking that the wires be sent to various Congressmen. My friend's name happened to be one of those picked at random by this lobbyist agent, unfortunately for him.

Mr. COSTELLO. What happened to the sender, Mr. Patman?

Mr. PATMAN. Unfortunately there is no Federal law, to my knowledge, Mr. Costello, covering a case like this, but it was a neat example of the methods of lobbyists. These instances I have given you illustrate the type of opposition that is facing those Congressmen who are attempting to carry out the will of the American people, in seeing to it that our veterans will have a place to live. I hope I have helped clarify some of the misinformation that has been bandied about on this bill.

Wyatt's Bold Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 27, 1946

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following editorial from the Detroit News of February 13, 1946:

One of President Truman's appointments that looks to be panning out—though this is perhaps just luck, since the appointee is a power in Kentucky politics—is that of the very able and energetic former mayor of Louisville, Wilson Wyatt, as Housing Expediter. Mr. Wyatt, in office 7 weeks, has put together a plan which he thinks, with the blessing of Congress, may result in the building this year of 1,500,000 family units of housing.

The plan counts on the cooperation, not alone of Congress, but of the building industry and—what is more conjectural—of building trades labor. It goes on the assumption, as indeed it must, that the housing problem cannot be met without adoption in some degree of mass production methods and without some assistance in the way of underwriting the special risks of this innovation on the part of government.

Mr. Wyatt's plan, as might be expected in light of his record as Louisville's mayor, is a bold one. It may prove overbold, when it collides with the conservatism of the building industry and of those who work in it.

But none will deny, we expect, that boldness is a quality in the absence of which the housing problem is not going to be solved, certainly not satisfactorily.

In respect to no want of the people is the gap between demand and supply so vast as in respect to housing—the hardest of all wants to meet rapidly. The gap here is so huge, due to years of war and depression, that the building industry's present capacity would need a decade in which to fill it.

But, as with other commodities, so with housing, the only hope of heading off disastrous inflation of prices is to supply the demand, or a large part of it. Moreover, there can be no such thing as an inflation in realty and housing alone, without pulling other prices skyward with it.

The answer must be an expansion of the building industry's capacity, beyond anything it normally would attempt or risk of its own initiative. This is a large order, but, up to the moment, Mr. Wyatt looks like a man who will have a good try at filling it.

Extension of Emergency Price Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 27, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by John W. Snyder, Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, to the House Banking and Currency Committee on the extension of the Emergency Price Control Act, Wednesday, February 27, 1946:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, in scheduling these early hearings on the extension of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 as amended and the Stabilization Act of 1942 as amended, your committee is performing a very real service to the American people. We must come to grips at once with the problem of keeping inflation in bounds. It is not a threat that may materialize in the future. It is a very dangerous present condition.

There is every likelihood that keeping inflation in check is going to be the most crucial domestic question before us for many months to come. That is why I consider it so important to take steps now for continuing price stabilization measures for a full year beyond June 30, 1946. I am glad that your committee has offered me this opportunity to discuss the problem with you.

American businessmen and consumers rightly fear the effect of inflation upon our economy. And they should know that their Government is prepared to safeguard their earnings and savings by stabilizing prices. And they should know now that the Government is prepared to remain on the price stabilization job until economic equilibrium is within reach.

As you know, I am on record as having said many times that I believe production, in the last practical analysis, is the only real solution to the problem of inflation. I want to take this opportunity to reaffirm that statement. At the same time I want to say, with equal firmness, that I believe we cannot drop our defenses against inflation before supply begins to supply demand.

Price stabilization is a measure we are using to safeguard our economy against the disaster of rising prices and costs.

We need that safeguard until production is sufficient, and the volume steady enough to begin balancing with demand. Demands at present are very heavy. They have built up during the war, and there are new demands at present for many things.

It will take time to manufacture consumer durables, components, materials needed by business and construction materials—and this alone is a big, time-consuming job which requires changing over and adjusting the Nation's complex business machinery from war to peace production. It will also take time to get these things to the markets. The channels of distribution, wholesale and retail, for business and consumers have to be filled up again. Anywhere from a few weeks to many months are necessary for this. And that supply, once volume production has been reached, will have to be maintained for more weeks and months in order to approach demand.

We should ask ourselves what would happen to production prospects if price stabilization were to end before we had allowed enough time for the practical tasks of reconversion. Suppose we entered a period of spiralling prices and costs. It happened after the last war. If it happened again industry would certainly be obliged to stock up with materials for manufacture before prices went higher. It would be natural for consumers to rush to buy what they needed before the cost of living climbed further.

It would be natural, too, for business to withhold finished goods from market, because it would be facing a loss to sell when prices were sure to go higher. This situation would for a time inevitably increase, not lessen, the shortages of both producer and consumer goods.

A disordered price structure, with prices and costs bolting out of control, would give business in general a poor chance to expand its output of goods and services. Many of the industries producing to fill the most troublesome shortages would run into further difficulties.

It is not reasonable to expect that all production would increase if all price ceilings were removed. In specific cases, where lack of production is retarding reconversion, we can divert labor and materials from other uses by granting measured price increases in order to step up output. This can be done effectively only under the stabilization framework. With all prices rising, that advantage would be lost.

At this stage in reconversion there are still a number of obstacles to be overcome before a larger volume of finished goods can flow to market. Shortages of labor, of components, and raw materials, still have to be met. Properly trained workers must be where they are needed and at the right times. Industrial plants and distributors have to reorganize for peacetime trade. Technical changes are still being completed. And labor and management must settle down again into normal bargaining.

These factors must be taken into account when we talk about achieving the kind of substantial production that will eventually smother inflation. But even so, even with practical problems still to be solved, our total civilian production is increasing. There has been noticeable progress in the production and shipment of finished consumer durable goods to market from the reconversion industries.

December shipments of vacuum cleaners, electric irons, refrigerators, electric ranges, washing machines, sewing machines, and radios ran 10 to 30 percent above November shipments. And industry expects shipments of these and other consumer durables to reach at least prewar rates of shipment by June of this year.

Goods from reconverting industries are coming to market in larger and larger quantities. This new production is coming in addition to over-all production for civilian use

that already stands at the highest level in our history.

During the war years production for civilian use, in addition to our unsurpassed war manufacture, outreached any previous peacetime period. And on December 31, production for civilian uses was higher than it had ever been before in peacetime.

During 1945, for example, food production in this country was 35 percent above the average for 1935–38, a peak up to then. An indication of today's volume of production is the amount of goods moving through department stores to consumers. It stands at an all-time peak.

Balance of supply and demand is an eventuality on which we can rely. But it has not yet materialized. It will require time. One reason that it will require time is that present demand for goods is so swollen that even better than ordinary production is not going to be enough to meet it immediately. This factor is one of the inflationary pressures that we have to watch.

Like many other inflationary pressures that have been developing since VJ-day, heavy demand is not itself a bad thing. On the contrary, it provides a bridge which we can use to reach a period of good jobs, stable markets, and better times for all of us. We can reach this period if we take action now to prevent runaway inflation. But if heavy demand and great purchasing power are allowed to dissipate themselves in a boom that can end only in a depression, we will not be able to build a sound economy in the future.

There are other inflationary pressures that have been building up since last August.

Prices continue to press hard against their ceilings. Wholesale prices have been inching higher and higher. Since last September, wholesale prices have risen faster than during any similar period since 1943.

Consumer spending continues to be heavy. Department-store, chain-store, and mail-order sales were higher during the whole of 1945, and higher during the ast month of the year than during comparable periods in 1944. Consumer buying in the last quarter of 1945 was at the highest rate in our history. Retail sales were at their all-time peak as the new year began.

All these evidences of the trend toward inflation must be considered along with another one. And this is the psychology of inflation that is becoming more and more apparent. Trade and business journals frankly cite the probability that prices will go up. We know that both public and private purchasing agents have frequently been unable to contract for future deliveries of goods except by agreeing to "escape clauses" providing for the possibility of a higher price.

The assumption that prices are going up gives business an irresistible motive to withhold finished goods from market in expectation of higher prices and higher profits. We have not yet been able to judge how much this fact accounts for a number of shortages. But we must reckon with it. It is a practice that adds an artificial scarcity to the very real shortage of goods that already exists.

This fear or anticipation that inflation is on the way, the assumption that prices are going up, could very well be translated into disastrous action. And the action would be a rush to buy that would accentuate the already strong demand for goods and services. There is sufficient buying power available among both business and consumers to give considerable impetus to a buying rush.

It is obvious that we will continue to need safeguards against such growing inflationary tendencies. It would appear that, to safeguard consumers against increased living costs, it would be necessary to control only the prices of food, clothing, rents, and housing. This view has been advanced by those who sincerely want to avoid the development of serious inflation.

I very much wish that this were all that was necessary. It would greatly simplify the task of the Congress and the administration. Unfortunately, while inflationary pressures remain as great and as general as they are today, this proposal simply would not work.

It would not accomplish our objective of stabilizing the cost of living, because price increases are contagious. If prices in the uncontrolled sectors boomed—as under present conditions they certainly would—no price administrator could hold back prices in the controlled sector.

Just suppose, for instance, that the prices of all durables—autos, refrigerators, radios, furniture, farm machinery—and all services also, increased materially. And this is not in the least unlikely if all price controls were removed.

Could anyone seriously suppose, to cite one example, that the prices of agricultural products could be held down while the price of durables the farmer has to buy soared?

Another type of argument, also advanced by those who do not want to see a "runaway" inflation, is the contention that continued general price control is really restricting production, and thus contributing to inflation. One main reason for this contention, I think, is that each businessman knows that if his own prices went up, without any change in other prices, he himself could produce more.

This is certainly true. If any single price were raised, while all other prices remained under ceilings, the producer in that line could raise both the wages he pays his workers and the price he offers for materials. He could then attract more labor, get more materials, and produce more. We have taken advantage of this under price control in increased output of materials and products which are bottlenecks in reconversion.

But it does not follow that removal of all controls would have the same effect. Instead, it would destroy the advantage and create disordered markets. Today's high demands can be filled only by many months and, in some cases, years of sizeable, steady production.

Certainly, lifting price controls would not help us complete certain necessary reconversion tasks that industry still is working on. The same practical and technical operations would still have to be finished. It would still be necessary to allow time for distributors to reorganize their sales outlets. Workers would still be relocating themselves. Collective bargaining would still have to operate.

If continued price stabilization were actually restricting all production, we would have been undergoing a very different sort of transition period since VJ-day. Instead of our present rapid progress, we would have had a limping reconversion. Unemployment would have increased much more sharply and quickly than it has.

However, relying on continued effective price stabilization to keep our economic house in order until production begins to approach a balance with demand, does not mean that we are determined on rigid and inflexible control of prices.

Existing stabilization powers provide sufficient room for necessary flexibility in price control. The development of a revised wage-price policy by the Government during the last fortnight illustrates this point. Since VJ-day there has been a fairly narrow category of wage increases that could be used by industry as the basis of request for price relief. We have been depending mainly on free collective bargaining by industry and labor to settle the wage issues, without resulting price increases. Industry, of course, could come in after 6 months and ask for price relief on the basis of wage increases that had been granted and that had increased production costs.

Now we have revised those ground rules. By dropping the 6-month rule, we have expanded considerably the category of wage increases that may be approved and used immediately as the basis for price relief for industry. Collective bargaining still remains the open avenue for wage settlement where no price increases are involved.

At the same time we have put a deterrent on excessive wage increases that would serve to promote a spiral of inflation.

Both the new wage policy and the new price policy put an even heavier requirement for speedy action on the Government. This will mean that the operating stabilization agencies—the Office of Price Administration and the Wage Stabilization Board—must accelerate their actions. And I know they are doing everything humanly possible to speed them up. They will need adequate personnel to assure prompt action.

The revised wage-price policy means that industry in general during the coming year will be assured of at least its minimum peacetime earnings. It means that labor in general will be able to soften the shock of reduced take-home pay that has followed the end of wartime pay rates. And it means that agriculture has a better income outlook for the very reason that labor is able to maintain wage levels and so continue to buy farm products.

This stabilization program can be adjusted to meet the changes of the transition period. It is not a formula for rigid control of the economy. We have already dropped the bulk of the wartime economic controls. The few still effective, in particular, price control, must remain for a time. We will lift these few remaining controls just as soon as conditions permit. As I have said many times before, conditions will themselves determine the timing.

The time will come when price control over many more products can be dropped. They should be dropped on each product as soon as supply is in reasonable balance with demand. This may very well result in price control becoming highly selective before the need for it comes finally to an end. But in the meantime we must maintain the machinery for general price stabilization.

During this war we kept prices and the cost of living from getting out of hand. The real battle is at hand. The pressures toward inflation are heavier now, as they always are following war. And at present, when we are fighting heavier pressures, our weapons of defense are fewer. The main one aside from public opinion has now come to be price control.

Subsidies have also played an essential role in stabilizing the cost of living during the last 3 years. They provided certain producers with sufficient returns to enable them to produce adequately without raising prices to the consumer. This was an important factor during the war in limiting demands for increased wages to meet increased living costs.

Farmers, along with consumers in general, have a stake in keeping the cost of living in line. Stabilization has kept the prices of things farmers had to buy from soaring at the same time that farm income has remained good. The drop expected during the last 6 months has failed to materialize. The December cash income of farmers was higher than the August level, with seasonable adjustments.

Nevertheless, even though the subsidy helps keep the cost of living in line, farmers do not like subsidies, and I sympathize with that view. Nobody likes subsidies. The Government recognizes that it is desirable to get rid of all subsidies as quickly as possible and intend to do so.

The Stabilization Administrator has announced that the remaining food subsidies will be terminated as soon as prices of the nonsubsidized elements in costs of living decline enough so that it will be safe to allow

the cost of the subsidized elements to go up. At the same time, farm incomes will be protected. Here again, as in price stabilization, it is a matter of keeping a balance. But because subsidies continue necessary for cost of living stabilization, it will be necessary to retain the authority to use subsidies, along with price control, during the 1947 fiscal year.

Important considerations of national welfare, as I have shown, make it imperative to extend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 as amended and the Stabilization Act of 1942 as amended. I have discussed a number of these considerations in some detail because each of them is important. It is vital to prevent inflationary trends from developing into a real inflation that will hamper business in its effort to produce. It is vital to keep the cost of living in line so that labor need not press for higher wages. It is vital to keep the cost of major raw materials in line so that production can go forward.

I urge your committee to act promptly so that the two acts on which the stabilization program rests may be extended for 12 months beyond June 30.

Mayor Kelly, of Chicago, Favors the St. Lawrence Waterway Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 22, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, on February 21, 1946, the Honorable Edward J. Kelly, mayor of Chicago, appeared before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to advocate favorable action on the pending resolution on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence deep waterway project. His statement summarizes reasons for favorable action on the project. His views will, I feel, be of interest to the entire country because this project is bound to be advantageous not only to the Middle West and to the Great Lakes region, but to the entire Nation, as it will reduce the cost of transportation and will increase our export as well as our import business. Under leave to extend my remarks, I take pleasure in inserting his statement in the RECORD:

Mr. Chairman, Chicago interests favor the construction of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence deep waterway, in particular the construction of dams and power works in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River, in accordance with the agreement between the United States and Canada of March 19, 1941.

It is my firm belief that the more than 40,000,000 people in the Great Lakes region, in Chicago, and in the Northwest, will benefit greatly if this deep channel to the Atlantic is opened and it becomes possible to ship the products of farms and factories directly to foreign ports, as well as to the Atlantic seaboard. Similar benefits will accrue from the ability to receive imports directly.

This region is the workshop of the Nation and the most productive section in the whole world. This has been demonstrated in the past 4 years of war emergency. It was unfortunate that this connection with the Atlantic was not available in this emergency. It will be unfortunate if it is not now authorized and completed in a reasonable time.

The project is worth more than that, in the interest of national defense. During the 4 years of war more than 1,100 naval craft were built in Great Lakes boat yards and shipped 1,500 miles down the Lakes to Gulf Waterway, which had only a 9-foot draft from Lockport, Ill., to below St. Louis. More than one-eighth of these boats, drawing more than 9 feet of water, had to be lifted by pontoons and towed from Chicago to New Orleans. This was tedious and expensive. More than half of these boats, of shallow draft, had to go by way of New Orleans because they were too long to pass through the present locks on the St. Lawrence canals. Boats destined for the Pacific, of course, lost no time by going down the Illinois and Mississippi Rivers. However, the Great Lakes yards could not be used to build the larger ships, because the Lakes were landlocked. These yards on the Great Lakes are closer to the points of production of steel than are the seaboard yards. This St. Lawrence deep waterway should be opened in the interest of national defense if for no other reason.

Opening of this waterway, being the development of national resources, is bound to promote national welfare and prosperity. It will provide employment during construction, which is a worthy postwar objective. By bringing cheaper transportation to the Great Lakes region, on imports and exports, it is bound to promote growth. Any traffic lost by present methods of transportation should be more than offset by new traffic resulting from increased growth and increased production. The national welfare is promoted by increased production in any part of the Nation.

Statistics on traffic and transportation costs are better left to the experts whose business it is to study such matters and keep information up to date. It is only from such information that it can be determined whether or not it is advisable to make this project self-liquidating. It should be carried out in the interest of national welfare in any case.

Nothing should be done to delay the approval of the pending agreement by Congress. Except for articles VII, VIII, and IX, this agreement of March 19, 1941, provides for the construction and operation of the St. Lawrence seaway, and the distribution of the power developed thereby. In this Senate Resolution 104, articles VII and IX are omitted and the suggestion made that a treaty be negotiated regarding the matters in these articles. Such matters are the perpetuation of navigation rights in the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River and the construction of remedial works above Niagara Falls and increased diversion of water from Niagara River for power purposes.

Article VIII covers matters closely allied to the matters in articles VII and IX and it would seem to be sound judgment to include article VIII in the same category as VII and IX. It certainly would save argument and delay. The ratification of the 1932 St. Lawrence seaway treaty failed March 15, 1934, largely because of the inclusion of article VIII in that treaty in practically the same terms as in the present agreement. The opposition did not come from Chicago interests at that time. More people in Chicago favored the seaway than were opposed. The only man from Chicago who testified at the 1932 hearings advocated ratification of the treaty. Chicago was then and is now in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway. Chicago is also interested in the Lakes to Gulf waterway and wants nothing done to interfere with its successful operation.

The opposition because of article VIII, in 1932, came from the Mississippi Valley Association and the Illinois Chamber of Commerce, a down-State organization, both of which associations were mainly interested in the Lakes to Gulf waterway and objected to the taking from Congress the jurisdiction over the diversion of water for this project. Other opposition was voiced in the Senate by nationalists who objected to the inclusion in a treaty of control over the diversion from Lake Michigan, which was an internal affair.

The Supreme Court decided January 14, 1929, that the diversion of water for purposes of sanitation had no legal basis; and decreed April 21, 1930, that diversion for this purpose must cease by December 31, 1938. The diversion was limited after that date to 1,500 cubic feet of water per second, annual average, for the purpose of maintaining navigation in the Chicago River, as a part of the port of Chicago.

The needs of the Illinois waterway and the Lakes to Gulf waterway have never been considered by the Supreme Court. Congress has jurisdiction over this matter and, on July 3, 1930, authorized that the water specified in the decree of the Supreme Court should be authorized for the navigation of the Illinois waterway. In the same section of the same act Congress intimated that it might take further action. No further action has been taken and perhaps none ever will be taken. There is no good reason, however, for this jurisdiction being taken away from Congress.

The Chicago diversion case has been settled. It was an internal matter and it serves no useful purpose to waste valuable time in argument and recrimination over past events. This matter is safe in the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court and Congress. Being an internal matter it is not a proper subject for reference in an international agreement, and certainly has no particular bearing in an agreement aimed to promote the construction of an international waterway.

The pending agreement would not be weakened by the omission of article VIII and the consideration of its subject matter later along with article VII and IX, but on the contrary its approval would be expedited and every item important to the construction of the deep waterway would be covered by the remainder of the agreement.

In my opinion it would be sound judgment to omit or amend article VIII, to expedite the approval of the agreement for construction, and get the work started.

Lincoln Day Address of Hon. Clare Boothe Luce, of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES M. LaFOLLETTE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 27, 1946

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am very pleased to insert the following Lincoln Day address of my colleague, Representative CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, of Connecticut, given from the studio of Station WSIX in Nashville, Tenn., on February 12, 1946, at 11:32 p. m.

That address speaks for itself. Any observations of mine would add nothing to it, but I do wish to be recorded as endorsing its clarity, sincerity, and high purpose.

All over this land, for many years, February 12, 1809, has been celebrated as the birth-

day of Abraham Lincoln. Rather, we should celebrate April 15, 56 years later, the day that he fell a martyr to the assassin's bullet, for that was the day when he was truly born, never to die, in the hearts of endless generations.

Men all over the world have loved Abraham Lincoln, and love him today for a very simple reason: Lincoln believed that all men are brothers, and that this truth was worth dying for.

Now Lincoln's authority for his belief in the brotherhood of man was God, an authority, incidentally, whom he consulted with a simple trust that many modern statesmen bring only to the Gallup poll.

From his fundamental credo, the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God, all his other articles of political faith most naturally and nobly derived. A man who held such a belief never talked in narrow terms of Negro rights versus white rights, or southern rights versus northern rights, or the rights of the property holder against those of the propertyless, or States' rights versus Federal rights, or even the rights of nation versus nation. His belief led with inexorable logic to the conclusion that there are no earthly rights above human rights, and that all human rights derive from man's membership in the whole human family, each member of which is a creature of God, regardless of birth, color, race, nationality, or political condition. Other reasonable corollaries of such a belief were that right makes might; that the conqueror must ever treat the vanquished with malice toward none, and charity toward all; and that as no man would be a slave, so none should seek to be a master. Lincoln believed that in these practices of political fraternity based on a profoundly religious concept lay the genius, the strength, and the glory of our American democracy, which then, as now, was "the last test hope of man" on earth.

It is a political tradition for Republicans on these occasions of his birthday to quote the founder of our party, in order to prove some current political point dear to our Republican hearts. I shall not be an exception. I, too, want to use these Lincolnian principles as yardsticks of what my party might be expected to do on two important human issues which face us today.

To be sure, all political issues are human issues, for all affect, however indirectly, the lives and livelihoods of our citizens. But some issues affect them very deeply, very violently, very decisively. And accordingly as such issues are decided, they often change the whole course of history.

Such an issue, in Lincoln's time, was the issue of slavery versus freedom. Another was the issue of how, after a victorious war, the vanquished should be treated and the wounds of war healed. They were indeed two of the greatest issues in his Presidency. They are two of the greatest issues today. If the Republican Party fails to solve them, in Lincolnian terms, they will betray Lincoln. If all Americans do not solve them in Lincolnian terms, they will, in the end, betray America and thus the world.

No nation, said Abraham Lincoln, can endure half slave and half free. That is still true. Today, in our land there are 15,000,000 Negroes who are economically in bondage. They were freed physically by Lincoln from the individual master, only to become in many ways the economic slaves of the whole community. Until the Negro has an equal opportunity with every other American to get a job, to acquire an education, and to develop to the fullest the talents God gave him, this will not be a wholly free country, and we will not have completed the great experiment in democracy begun by Abraham Lincoln.

To this task, the Republican Party, born in the tradition of freedom for the Negro, must and will, I believe, increasingly dedicate itself. Said Lincoln: "In giving freedom to the slaves we assure freedom to the free."

So much for slavery at home. And what of slavery in this "one world" in which we live—a world that has been made dangerously small by radio and radar and rocket planes and atomic energy? The proposition still stands: This one world cannot long survive half free and half slave.

However expedient, however practical, however shrewd our present policy makers in the State Department today may feel themselves to be, many of them must have a very uneasy conscience when they see how their so-called realistic policies have led to the betrayal of freedom and the hopes of freedom everywhere. And just so long as they continue to make any deals or compromises, arrangements, or agreements, in open or in secret, with governments which actively oppose the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God, which have abolished the equal rights of every individual, which forbid freedom of speech, press, and religion, but which practice the suppression of minority rights by concentration camps, secret police and firing squads, just so long will these statesmen be betraying freedom at home. Perhaps not they, not we, but our children will live to curse the day they did so. For our strength and security do not lie in bristling armaments, or atomic bomb piles, or favorable trade balances, or bulging banks, or military or economic alliances. In the words of Lincoln: "Our reliance is on the love of liberty which God has planted in us, our defense is in the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men in all lands everywhere." For Lincoln knew that the love of liberty is the most infectious thing on earth. If our statesmen today cherished liberty for all men everywhere only one half as much as Lincoln did, our heads might spin at the speed with which governments of the people, and by the people, and for the people, would return to vast areas of the earth.

Our Government, if it is to follow Lincolnian precepts, must everywhere it can, all over this world give aid and comfort to those who believe, as Lincoln did, in the complete freedom and equality of the individual. Or at least, if it does not have Lincolnian courage to do right, as God gives it to see the right, it must not give aid and comfort to those who practice and seek to extend tyranny.

So much for the great issue, slavery vs. freedom, which took Lincoln to war and has twice carried us to war against the tyrannical Germans and their allies. What of the second issue, which comes at war's end? How to treat the vanquished, and bind up the wounds of war? Lincoln said it: "With malice toward none, with charity for all. * * *"

Today, millions in Europe are starving. The men, women, and children of our allies, no less than the innocent children of our defeated enemies. Do not let us deceive ourselves; many cannot, but millions of us can make a little sacrifice at our tables every day and endure some rationing to put food in the mouths of those who will surely die if we do not. The Republican Party will help this Administration in its announced task of feeding starving Europe.

It is our duty, as the opposition party, to see that it is done without waste, or corruption, and without placing undue burdens on any part of the population which cannot support them. Vigorous criticism of any New Deal program is necessary, for we know the habits of those who have been too long in power and how, when the honey-pot of public funds are handed them, they spend a great deal of time licking their own fingers. But criticize and watch them though we must, we know we should be betraying Lincoln's greatest precept of postwar charity if we sought to thwart the administration in accomplishing its program of relief and rehabilitation of wartorn countries.

Therefore tonight I see as three of the Republican Party's most important tasks in the future: The task at home of raising the economic status of the Negro; and abroad of aiding those governments where no man is a slave and none is master; and of succoring the innocent victims of war. When we have completed these tasks, we shall come at last into our own as the true political heirs of Abraham Lincoln.

Views of President R. J. Thomas of the United Auto Workers, Congress of Industrial Organizations, on Pending Legislation and Problems of Labor

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave given me I insert in the RECORD a speech delivered by Hon. R. J. Thomas, president of the United Auto Workers, who, upon the request and in the absence of Hon. Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, expressed the views of the latter organization on two pending antilabor bills on the occasion of a caucus held on December 4, 1945, in the Old House Office Building. The caucus was attended by over 100 Members of the House, who were desirous of learning the facts about the pending antilabor legislation and who heard, besides that of Mr. Thomas, addresses by other outstanding labor leaders, including William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor; Mr. E. A. Lyon, executive secretary of the Railway Labor Executives Association; Mr. John O'Leary, an official of the United Mine Workers; Mr. Martin Miller, representing the National Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen; W. D. Johnson, vice president of the Order of Railway Conductors.

It is significant, Mr. Speaker, that the attendance of labor leaders at the caucus on December 4, 1945, was the first time in history that representatives of all labor organizations had united and joined in protest to the enactment of labor legislation which they deemed inimical to the interests of labor.

It is my opinion that Mr. Thomas' address applies with even greater force to that monstrosity now pending in the other body, H. R. 5262, which carries many more, and more objectionable, vicious, and restrictive antilabor provisions than in any proposed or previously enacted antilabor legislation considered by the Congress. The text of Mr. Thomas' speech follows:

Chairman SABATH. The meeting will come to order. Many Members have said that leaders and spokesmen for labor were not granted an opportunity to be heard before the Committee on the Judiciary on H. R. 3937 and H. R. 32, two bills which obviously threaten all that labor has gained in two decades.

Therefore, some of us decided to call together Members who desire to hear the real facts in regard to these bills.

I am indeed gratified that there are so many of you here. Do not fear that I shall talk a long time. I shall not. We have here today several gentlemen whom you want to hear and whom you came to hear. They have served equally their country and the cause of labor all their lives and are recognized as spokesmen for organized labor.

I have a telegram here from Mr. Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, from which I quote:

"Due to previous commitments I will not be able to attend this meeting called for Tuesday, December 4. I am asking R. J. Thomas, president of the United Auto Workers, to be present in my absence to give the views of the CIO on these two bills. Thank you for your interest.

"PHIL MURRAY, *President*."

Now it is a pleasure and privilege to call on Mr. Thomas to give his position, and the position of the great organization he represents, on these pending bills.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I, too, want to thank Congressman SABATH for giving us, the representatives of labor, the opportunity to express to the gentlemen of Congress our views on this particular labor legislation which is before Congress. I, too, want to say, speaking for the Congress of Industrial Organizations, that the Congress of Industrial Organizations is opposed to all antilabor legislation which we feel is introduced for no other reason except to smash the labor movement in this country. I want to say that in the past few weeks I was one of the members representing labor in the labor-management conference called by President Truman, and one of the reasons that that conference was called was to get an agreement between labor and management. The reason that it failed, that it fell below the expectations of many people in America, is for exactly the same reason that I am opposed to this sort of labor legislation. That is, the workers of America have some fundamental problems which must be solved. The labor-management conference refused to take recognition of those problems and here we have laws introduced by people who think that these laws, if passed, could create industrial-labor peace in America without taking care of some of those fundamental problems which face the American workingman today. It is exactly the same. It is amputating a man's arm to try to cure him of heart trouble. That sort of operation is never successful.

When the Smith-Connally Act was first passed by Congress and during its discussion by Congress we in labor said repeatedly that the Smith-Connally Act would do nothing, would make no contribution toward labor-industry peace during the war. I think perhaps today everybody in America agrees with us on that proposition. I think some of the things which are causing the problems for labor today, some of the things we should try to think about a little bit and see what we can do to cure, is the problem in the first instance, before strikes and so forth do develop.

For instance, today I find that it's practically impossible for me to get any real collective bargaining in industry, and there are reasons for that. There have been laws passed by Congress that stop collective bargaining as far as our particular industry is concerned, at least.

For instance, in the automobile industry, which I consider, and I think all of us do, an industry that does control to a great extent the economic situation in America, I have found this to be true, that there is no haste on the part of that industry to put automobiles on the market due to the fact that because of the tax laws that have been passed, there is no incentive to put those automobiles on the market. That industry cannot make any more money the rest of this year.

We had another bill which was passed which I know as the George bill, which has carried proposals where industry is reimbursed in case of a strike. Now, I do not believe any Congressman thought of the idea as far as that bill is concerned, that where management and labor had disagreements that industry was to be paid while that disagreement was going on. That is the reason that we have a great amount of labor unrest today and it is not through that sort of thing that the situation will be corrected.

Labor has many different and difficult problems today. Since VJ-day the take-home wages of labor have been cut to a considerable extent. I know when my organization asked for a 30-percent increase in wages many people in America said, "Well, have the dead-end kids gone crazy again?"

The thing I want to impress upon you is that those workers are not asking for an increase in wages. They are asking that their former wages be protected. There has also been considerable down-grading in industry, which again cuts the individual's wages. There has been a continuous rise in the cost of living as far as workers are concerned and industry has been making record-breaking profit.

For instance, in the General Motors Corp., from 1939 to 1941, they made 50 percent of the net worth of that company in a 3-year period; and now after the war is over the company is in even better position, and yet there are people who think that in no other way can they stop industrial unrest except to tie up and hamstring labor.

I agree with President Green of the American Federation of Labor that we of the labor movement do agree with the free enterprise system of America, but we must also have free unions in America. During the past war many people all over America hailed the good job that labor had done during that war, and I remember standing on platforms before my membership time after time and being taken to task because I had agreed to a no-strike pledge for the duration of the war. For what reason? I took that no-strike pledge and carried it through in my union for the protection of my country, but I don't think you are going to ask me to do that for the protection of General Motors because the workers in America think that is discrimination and unfair.

The labor-management conference, as I said, failed to a certain extent because they didn't recognize those problems.

On the new proposed amendments to the Smith-Connally Act it is proposed to outlaw unions as a collective-bargaining agent. I will read from the bill: "The employer shall be relieved of any obligation under the contract and the labor organization shall lose its status as a bargaining agency for the period of 1 year." Now if you don't think this discriminatory legislation, I ask you to consider cases where management incites riots, and my God, gentlemen, that is done every day. Is management's business taken away from them every year? What penalty is put on them for violating a contract? It says that it should be done providing there was a violation of the no-strike pledge.

I have in our particular industry hundreds of contracts with no strike pledges in them, but I have always considered that when I negotiate a contract with management, whether it is to be for 1 year or 2 years—I don't believe we have contracts for over 2 years—I say that management and labor both have an agreement such as that, and to carry out any sort of an agreement there must be a decent relationship between the two.

I have always considered, and I think the majority of leaders of American labor consider, that there should not be strikes for the duration of the contract, whether there is a no-strike clause in that contract or not. A contract in my mind is no good if you don't intend to live up to it, but I say if this particular law is passed I will proceed to do everything I can to see that no-strike pledges are taken completely out of contracts. I say to you gentlemen here that that would promote more strikes in all industry in the United States and would not solve the problem.

There is another section here, which would ban labor from participating in a political campaign. It just so happens that I happen to be active in the national CIO–PAC, and I know that the people who are in favor of this legislation are not in favor of the common people of America expressing their views upon political candidates. They say, "Yes, look at the millions of union members and how they can go out and collect a dollar for each one and raise millions and millions of dollars!"

I know in the last political campaign how much our organization spent, and I know a great many heads of corporations of America that spent as much money as our organization spent. You say that is not discriminatory legislation? Why, the General Motors Corp. alone, through individual members of that corporation, can raise more money in any particular day for a political campaign for something they want than we can in a year. I don't think it's been any secret how much money the du Pont family has put into political campaigns. I don't think it's any secret to Congress how much Mr. Sloan, of the General Motors, has put into political campaigns, and that is all right, I don't object; but I do object when you try to take the principles of democracy from the American people.

I am beginning to wonder with legislation such as I have discussed here—under discussion at least. I thought we had just got through the war fighting nazism and Germany and Japan and some other foreign countries, and right today this Government is sending people representing labor to Germany and Japan and to other countries and saying that for a true democracy to be built in those countries it must be done through a labor movement or at least helped by a labor movement.

Here we are sending missionaries to our defeated enemies to build up democracy while here at home we are taking the other direction. I am beginning to wonder what we fought this war for. I mean the millions of Americans—what they fought this war for. Under this proposal, it seems to me in taking the rights of labor from them we could look back into history, and it seems to be the only way some people know how to solve these problems, is to go backward to what we were in the labor movement a century ago. Next thing I know you will be passing laws making slaves out of the working people of this country. It seems to me that is the trend these laws are taking.

Under the Hobbs bill, which is supposed to curb racketeering, I submit to you that I don't know of an instance where if there is racketeering in labor that it could not be taken care of by laws already on the statute books, and I will say as far as I am personally concerned in my organization, I have known one or two instances where I ran across individuals who would like to do a little bit of racketeering but they never got to first base. My organization has taken care of that and there just is no racketeering, yet we want to pass a bill like this which again I say is discriminatory. As president of my organization if I do any racketeering am I not just as liable under the law as some manufacturer and I know some that do a little racketeering. Being a member of a labor organization does not in any way protect an individual or a group from racketeering as far as the law is concerned.

That is about all I want to say to you except bring out some of the problems which are causing difficulty. I say the people who are advocating these things are not advocat-

ing them for labor-management peace in America—they are advocating these laws to break the labor movement.

I have here a photostatic copy of an automobile news letter, a marketing service for automobile dealers, I would like to read to you, and I can show you what your problem is, one paragraph out of this letter: "Perhaps the only solution is a policy of sitting tight and waiting until the economic pinch forces workers to realize they must stay on the job or starve. At the moment there is no disposition on the part of management to become frantic over labor unrest. A watching and waiting policy is the general rule." And I can vouch that that is the general rule at least in our industry today.

To show you, I have a number of notes here on what has happened as far as our situation in General Motors is concerned. Talk about a cooling-off period! For 97 days we cooled off, trying to negotiate with that company, asking Secretary Schwellenbach to send in conciliation, and we could only get conciliation in on the understanding, if you please, that these men were only observers. They didn't dare to open their mouths and I want to know how those men could do mediation. We could not even get collective bargaining. While we were there with General Motors, reading off a brief, trying to state our case, the people of the corporations sat there reading Liberty magazine and Saturday Evening Post. We asked them to listen to us and they said, "Aw, hell, we can get more out of this magazine."

In any demands for wages increases we have said that if the corporation can prove that they can't pay the wage increase we ask for we will scale down our demands, and as a final plan we offer arbitration, which was denied. And you ask what causes labor unrest in America. I believe that the main cause of it now is that we have no collective bargaining and, as I said before, the tax laws passed by Congress have already taken us out of our collective bargaining position.

To show you, here is just one instance: Paul Renko is one of our members who lives in 14349 Robinson Street, Detroit, Mich. During the war as an automobile worker he took home $65 per week. Now he takes home $38 a week and he has a family of four which must live on that. That is the cause of labor unrest in America. That is the thing that we have got to look into and see what it is that we can correct because of the increased cost of living. People with families cannot live on that sort of wage today.

In the President's message he talked about a cooling-off period. What I would suggest is that we should have a little cooling-off period on antilabor legislation. It would do us all a lot of good, I believe. As I said, we cooled off 97 days in negotiations, in the recent negotiations we have been in. In America, ever since the time of Abraham Lincoln when he discussed it very much, practically every great statesman in America has stated that labor must have the right to strike. Labor must have the right to strike if we are to have free enterprise in America.

Labor must have the right to strike. It is the only chance that labor has. During the war I was a member of the Labor Board and we took many decisions that we didn't like, but we took them for our country to make what contribution we could toward winning the war, and in our particular industry, which gets a lot of publicity for strikes, it may be interesting for you to know that the strikes in our industry were below the national average.

I cannot continue to say to workers forever: Let some board or agency take care of this problem. What we want today in America, in my opinion, is a cooling-off period on labor legislation and give the workers of America an opportunity to work out some of these prblems, and they will be fair, I assure you of that, gentlemen, and I am quite sure that a vast cross section of the workers in America, no matter what organization they belong to, want to see their country go on prosperous but they can't see how it can be done with millions unemployed and they can't see how it can be done with the way workers' wages are being cut and cut.

That, my friends, is the reason for labor unrest in America today, and all this sort of legislation which it is the purpose of some people to have passed. That will not solve the problem.

Again I want to express my thanks to you for the opportunity to be here today and discuss these problems with you.

The Housing Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of the Retail Lumber and Building Material Dealers of Jacksonville, Fla.:

[From the Jacksonville (Fla.) Journal, of February 18, 1946]

TWO MILLION SEVEN HUNDRED THOUSAND; YES, MR. WYATT, IT CAN BE DONE

Is Housing Administrator Wilson W. Wyatt reaching for the moon, asking for 2,700,000 new homes in 1946 and 1947? Recalling that 900,000 in 1925 was an all-time home-building record, that 400,000 this year has been the most optimistic forecast, it seems the answer must be "yes." But, remember the early months of the war, when an annual production goal of 50,000 planes sounded fantastic? Well, we got 100,000. We needed a tenfold increase in ship production, too. Impossible? Sure, but we got it, with tonnage to spare. All along the line, under the compelling need for greater war production, incredible quotas were surpassed, records smashed, time after time. So, Mr. Wyatt, we say, it can be done.

IT WON'T BE EASY

Nobody knows that better than your retail lumber dealers. Besieged by material-hungry builders, begging the manufacturers and mills for scarce supplies, we are on the front line all day, every day. We can see the difficulties on both sides; the builders hampered by restrictive legislation, labor shortages, rigid codes and customs; the mills caught in the wage-price nutcracker squeeze. To solve these and scores of other such problems will take courageous leadership, bold initiative, and above all, a genuine spirit of patient cooperation among all parties—industry, labor, Government, and the public. Then the houses will start going up.

HOW DID WE GET THIS WAY?

People sometimes say, "How did the housing shortage get so bad, so fast?" Well, the fact is we had it even before the war. For the past 15 years fire and obsolescence have been taking 200,000 more houses each year than have been built. And, whereas the United States had a population of 130,000,000 in the thirties, we're now pushing 140,000,000. Even with 12,000,000 men under arms—overseas and in camps—families had begun to double up. Rapid demobilization after VJ-day did not cause the shortage, simply made it worse. Throughout the war, housing was consistently at the bottom of the priority list. Why? Because we had to have the guns, planes, ships, the war plants, and barracks. Since we couldn't have these and new houses too, houses had to wait. But now it's high time the houses were going up.

NOBODY LIKES PRIORITIES

Whether red and blue stamps or A, B, and C coupons; whether AAA or HH ratings; whether sugar stamps or your place in line for nylons—whatever form priorities take, nobody likes them. Nobody liked the war either. Nobody likes inflation, or the black market. But if it's going to take more priorities to channel vital lumber and building material into houses, then we'll grin and bear it. You will too, when the houses are going up.

SUBSIDIES OR PRICE INCREASE?

Part of the Wyatt program provides for subsidies or premium payments to manufacturers exceeding quotas on certain bottleneck items on the critical list. Most manufacturers think a price increase will furnish incentive enough to assure maximum production. What's the difference? On the one hand, you pay the extra freight in taxes. On the other, you pay more for your house. Debate on the question may be long and hot, but the only sense-making answer is the one that starts—and keeps—the houses going up.

We ourselves are only retail dealers in lumber and building materials. Shortages caused by bottlenecks up the line hit us first and when they do, we have to say, "Sorry," to you. Do you think we like that any more than you do? What's more, we have a big stake in Jacksonville—a busting-out-at-the-seams Jacksonville that simply can't help growing still more. That's why we say, Mr. Wyatt, it can be done. It must be done.

Retail Lumber and Building Material Dealers of Jacksonville: John W. Baldwin Lumber Co., Dawkins Building Supply Co., Marshall & Spencer Co., Bond-Howell Lumber Co., Foley Lumber Co., Mason Lumber Co., Thompson Lumber Co., Carolina Portland Cement Co., Lechner Lumber Co., Inc., Taylor Lumber & Appliance Co.

General Motors Head Admits Secret Agreement and Says Industry Should Run the United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I called attention to a conference of Wall Street-controlled industries and industrialists. Some of the representatives present tried to deny these facts. Consequently, the testimony given by Mr. C. E. Wilson, president of the General Motors Corp., at a National Labor Relations Board meeting, as reported in the daily newspapers, is of great interest to me. Mr. Wilson's guarded statements before the Board make it clear that there was an agreement—some might call it a conspiracy—to destroy or at least weaken organized labor.

I should like to know, Mr. Speaker, if this agreement to which Mr. Wilson testified, under oath, is responsible for the delay in settling the General Motors strike?

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I desire to insert a news report of Mr. Wilson's statement as printed in the Philadelphia Record for February 15, 1946. At the same time, I serve notice that I shall insist on knowing all the facts in these statements, or otherwise I shall feel impelled to bring before the House a resolution for Congressional investigation of the industrial conspiracy against the legal and economic rights of organized labor.

Following is the text of the news report:

DETROIT, February 14.- General Motors President C. E. Wilson told a National Labor Relations Board hearing today that a group of American business leaders discussed "the hell of a shape we were in" last December.

He denied, however, the group entered into an agreement for a unified fight against union wage demands and Government price control. Then he added: "It's too bad that group can't make decisions for the country."

TESTIFIES AT HEARING

Testifying at the NLRB hearing on CIO United Auto Workers charges of unfair labor practices against GM, Wilson said the group met at New York's Waldorf-Astoria Hotel last January 9, because "they were all looking down the same gun I was." He explained he meant the threat of strikes.

Wilson identified those present as representatives of GM, United States Steel, Westinghouse and the meat-packing industry. Ford and Chrysler had no representatives there, he said, because they "were not looking down the gun."

Questions concerning the meeting, a luncheon given by GM, were fired at Wilson by Harold Cranefield, regional NLRB attorney.

MISTAKEN ON DATE

Cranefield pointed out that the luncheon was held a day before President Truman's fact-finding board reported its recommendation for a 19½-cent hourly increase for striking GM production workers.

During his testimony, Wilson said the meeting date was December 19, but late today he told the hearing officer he had been mistaken on the date. Both sides agreed to substitution of the January 9 date in the record of his testimony.

"No agreement came out of that meeting," Wilson said. "None were intended. There was nothing sinister about it. In fact, it's too bad that groups can't make the decisions for the country."

WILSON BACKS INDUSTRY

Cranefield asked if Wilson thought the group could make better decisions than the Government makes.

"That's their record for the last 4 or 5 months," the witness replied. "In fact, I think the way the country's been kicked around in the last 4 or 5 months is a crime."

Before Wilson resumed his testimony, Trial Examiner Gerard D. Reilly told union attorneys that a finding that GM failed to bargain in good faith would not insure back pay to the 175,000 production workers on strike since November 21.

Shortly after the NLRB hearing began on January 28, a union attorney said the UAW-CIO felt the Board should award the men back pay for the time they had been idle. Reilly pointed out the union does not charge a lock-out and does not accuse GM of refusing to take the strikers back. Those who were the only two cases, he said, in which the NLRB might hold they were entitled to back pay.

As the Board meeting proceeded, Federal Labor Mediator James F. Dewey continued his efforts to bring GM and the UAW-CIO together again in the wage and contract dispute. There have been no joint sessions since Walter P. Reuther, UAW-CIO vice president, rejected a GM offer of an 18½-cent-an-hour (16½ percent) wage increase last Tuesday.

The Filipino Veteran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLOS P. ROMULO

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER OF THE PHILIPPINES TO THE UNITED STATES

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1946

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, the other day President Truman approved H. R. 5158, the First Supplemental Surplus Appropriation Rescission Act, but took exception to a legislative rider attached to the transfer of a $200,000,000 item for the pay of the Army of the Philippines.

In explaining his objection to this rider, President Truman pointed out that it would bar Philippine Army veterans from all benefits under the GI bill of rights with the exception of service-connected disability and death benefits which are made payable on the basis of 1 peso for every dollar of eligible benefits.

In behalf of my comrades, the Filipino soldiers who fought and died by the side of American soldiers in the war against Japan, in behalf of the widows and the orphans of these men who now live in hardship because the grim destiny of war struck down their men, I want to express our gratitude to the President of the United States. He has once again demonstrated the true American spirit of fair play. In the spirit of simple justice he has raised his voice against injustice. And he has instructed the Secretary of War, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and the United States High Commissioner to the Philippines, who, by the way, since his return here the last few weeks, has been active in supporting us in our efforts for Philippine rehabilitation and for our veterans, to prepare a new plan which will redress this wrong by proposing further legislation which will be submitted to the Congress in March.

Mr. Speaker, it would be bad enough if the Filipino veteran were to be forgotten. It would be inconceivable that he should be discriminated against. I am sure that this is not the real intention of the Congress, any more than of the American people as a whole. We have shared too much, we are too close to one another, we have too much friendship and respect for one another to permit me to believe that there is a deliberate desire to discriminate against the Filipino soldier.

You know the story of heroism in the Philippines—the great and terrible saga of death and heroism, of martyrdom and of courage triumphant, of victory snatched from the jaws of defeat. Your boys played their magnificent role in that drama. And so did ours. The bullets they faced, and the shells and bombs, made no distinction between them. The misery of the prison camp felt the same in the Filipino heart as it did in the American heart. The terror, the determination, the courage of battle drew no line of demarcation between Filipino and American. The grief of bereaved families is a universal emotion, and it feels no different to a Filipino mother or wife than it does to an American mother or wife.

But there is a legal bond between us that serves to complement the moral and emotional bond. Our troops fought, not only as Filipino soldiers but as soldiers of the Army of the United States, as American nationals fighting in defense of the American flag on soil over which the United States had full sovereignty. When they fought, were wounded, were killed, they were Filipinos, yes, but they were also American nationals.

For these reasons, on behalf of our President, Sergio Osmeña, I have placed our views before the President of the United States and I now place them before the Members of the House.

The rider to which President Truman objected would deprive Philippine Army personnel, inducted into the service of the United States Army, of most of the benefits which American law provides to its veterans. Specifically, they would not be able to enjoy the benefits of the GI bill of rights—of the automatic gratuitous insurance against death in line of duty in active service between October 9, 1940, and April 19, 1942—which includes the whole period of the First Battle of the Philippines—of the pension for non-service-connected disability, of medical and hospital treatment and domiciliary care of veterans suffering from injuries or diseases incurred or aggravated in line of duty, including funeral and burial expenses, of vocational rehabilitation for disabled veterans, of civil-service preference, of the mustering-out payment law, of the 6-month death gratuity to dependents of personnel who died in line of duty, of the Missing Persons Act.

The new act, as it stands now, discriminates against Filipino veterans because it prevents them from enjoying the benefits which should be accorded to any veteran who fought under the flag of the United States of America.

The act does appropriate $200,000,000 for the pay of the Army of the Philippines. But this amount cannot possibly cover the benefits it intends to cover.

There is a final great discrimination against the Filipino veteran—the principle that he must be paid the same number of pesos as the number of dollars received by American veterans. In other words, where an American receives $50, a Filipino receives 50 pesos. The Philippine peso is worth 50 American cents. The Filipino veteran automatically receives exactly half of what his American comrade may receive.

I am not proposing today that full equality be restored in all cases. But I do want to call your attention to some of the results of this inequality.

Let us take, for an example, the case of two Filipino soldiers. One is in the Philippine Scouts. The other is in the Philippine Army. As the act now stands,

the Philippine Scout is entitled to exactly the same treatment as any American soldier. The Philippine Army man is entitled to only half. They may have fought side by side on Bataan, or on Leyte, or on Luzon, they may have both been wounded in the same part of their body, but one receives exactly half what the other receives in the way of veterans' benefits. If both were killed in action, the family of one receives exactly half what the family of the other receives in the way of pensions. Both fought for the same cause. Both are Filipinos. Both may have made the same supreme sacrifice. Yet, there the equality ends. It is an equality of sacrifice—but an inequality of compensation.

There is, of course, no true compensation for the ordeal of battle. There is no way of putting a money value on a man's life—the cost in tears, in unspoken sorrow, in the dreary weight of loss that fills the heart. But it is the obligation of those who have survived to make the way easier for the men who have fought and suffered and died so that we might be free.

In this moral obligation, no fine line can be drawn between one group of soldiers and another. When they were fighting, they shielded with their lives the things they held dear and they preserved freedom for us who survived. We cannot shame their memory by becoming accessories to injustice.

That is why President Truman's strong position on this matter has met with a wholehearted response of gratitude and appreciation among my countrymen. That is why we look to the Congress for the redress of a wrong which we know was not intended.

Petrillo Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 21, 1946

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I realize that the sentiment of the country is overwhelmingly in favor of the purpose sought by this legislation.

I realize also that the sentiment of the House is overwhelmingly to the same effect and that a vote against the bill will not be a popular vote.

Nevertheless, unless the House bill is amended, I cannot support the legislation in the final analysis.

The right to strike for legitimate purposes is a fundamental right in America. If that right is to be limited, the greatest care must be used to make certain that the limitation is confined to purposes which are clearly illegal or against the public interest.

As I read the bill as presented to, and passed by the House, the limitations prescribed go far beyond reasonable limitations.

For example, under section 506 (A) (1) of the bill, as I understand it, if any group of employees in a broadcasting business feel overworked and in need of further assistance, if they fail to obtain that additional help after bargaining with management, and if they then strike or even threaten to strike, each and every one of the group will be liable to a fine of $1,000 and to a year of imprisonment, or both.

No such provision, in my judgment, can be justified.

I voted for an amendment and for the motion to recommit which would have eliminated the proposed restrictions on the right to strike for legitimate purposes.

I voted for an amendment which would have eliminated the criminal penalties provided against the right to strike for legitimate purposes.

I voted for an amendment which would have limited the penalties to officers and representatives of any labor organization subject to the terms of the act.

I did not vote for the bill on final passage.

I cannot support it in the final analysis in the absence of proper amendment in conference by the Senate and House conferees.

The Right Kind of Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, recently many editorials have been printed calling attention to the fact that so-called antistrike legislation is not the remedy for labor disputes and strikes.

Often, these editorials carry the thought that until the basic law—NLRA—which organized labor hailed as its magna carta was amended so as to impose equal responsibility, grant equal privileges to parties to collective bargaining, we would not be on the right road toward a solution of industrial warfare.

That thought occurred to me in 1939, when, on March 13, 1939, amendments to the NLRA were proposed and, later, on March 11, 1940, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, paralleling corresponding provisions of the NLRA.

When the present flurry of strikes threatened our economic existence the bill was again, for the fourth time, introduced, bearing the number H. R. 5334, and on February 1, 1946, again the proposed amended bill was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, corresponding paragraphs paralleling the original provisions of the NLRA.

The road is plain and, while no claim is made that the amendments proposed are sufficient or accurately drawn, needed legislation is at least suggested, and some individuals with more knowledge might use it as a pattern.

One of the latest editorials calling attention to this need is that from the Saturday Evening Post dated March 2, 1946, which reads as follows:

ANTISTRIKE LAWS MISS THE POINT

Many efforts have been made to deal with the strikes which threaten to push this country into an inexcusable man-made depression. Too many of the efforts indicated immature thought or lack of courage. High-sounding but hollow expedients are not likely to succeed permanently. Neither are efforts by Congress to rework the Smith-Connally antistrike law. As the Ford and Chrysler settlements indicate, settlements of strikes occur soonest when the Government keeps out of the dispute and lets collective bargaining do the job.

The problem is not to forbid people to strike, but to make it harder for some people to persuade or force other people to strike. There are at least two things which give labor leaders a tremendous leverage in dealing with employees and their own rank and file. One is the Wagner Act, which, in setting up the conditions for collective bargaining, forbids many "unfair labor practices" to management, but none to labor. No one denies that management often deserved this impeachment. There is no important demand to remove legal prohibitions of acts which are actually unfair to workers. However, the power of labor-union leaders has increased since 1933, and we now find many of them employing intimidation, violence, and other pressures in campaigns for the organization of workers. Not one of these acts is forbidden or even condemned by the Wagner Act.

Perhaps the most useful intervention of Congress would be to amend the Wagner Act to make it prohibit unfair labor practices by unions. By judicial decisions and administrative acts, management has been denied the right to do hundreds of things that appear reasonable to the bystander. Since the National Government has undertaken to police the process of collective bargaining, it can no longer safely neglect the practices of labor unions any more than those of employers.

The power of union leaders was augmented during the war by the maintenance of membership clause which provides that, once a worker has joined a union, he must remain a member during the life of the agreement with the employer. If he leaves the union or is expelled, the employer must fire him. If he should be expelled from the union for conduct unbecoming a union member, he will ipso facto lose his job. As can be seen, this gives the labor-union bureaucracy the power actually to starve a minority which carries opposition far enough to be really effective. The maintenance of membership clause was inserted by the National War Labor Board into many union contracts on the theory that, because the no-strike pledge deprived unions of their ultimate weapon, they were entitled to have their membership kept to full strength by Government dictum. Certainly the reason for Government pressure to insist on union membership has long since disappeared. Labor-union responsibility will come into existence faster if the leaders are required to sell their own memberships. The Government should no longer be a party to a system which, as Donald Richberg put it recently, "forces employers to compel the workers to enlist and pay union dues—so they will be able to make war on the public with an imposing but largely conscript army."

Bringing the powers of the union leaders into better balance with those of employers will not settle everything. Much will remain to be improved in our industrial relations, after the parties in interest have been placed in equality. The employers, for example, might propose, where it is appropriate, an annual wage such as many industries have adopted already. They might propose a basic wage contract, with bonuses for production

above a fixed level and, very important, bonuses for individuals who produce more than their fellows. This last many union leaders will not accept because of ideological objection and because some employers abused incentive schemes in the past. Their opposition to incentives is certain to diminish with increasing pressure from the rank and file. In an impressive number of plants incentive pay for individuals has been put into effect over the union leaders' heads because the men at the machines preferred that extra $$ in the pay envelope to the high-domed theories of the CIO intellectuals.

This suggests the truth of what we have long suspected, namely, that men and women who work with their hands are not impressed by a doctrinaire fanaticism which would eventually produce what we have never had in America: a faceless proletariat, from which no man could hope to rise by dint of superior character and talent.

America Sleeps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL C. MICHENER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 1946

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to an editorial appearing in the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot of February 24, which is thought provoking and expressed the viewpoint of many people at this particular time.

Pursuant to the permission granted to me, I am therefore including in these remarks a copy of this editorial, written by Mr. Carl Saunders, the editor. It is as follows:

AMERICA SLEEPS

Canada's discovery of Russian spy efforts to get atom-bomb secrets is a mere secondary phase of a pattern of intrigue aimed at destruction of democracy everywhere.

Canada has had the courage to confront the issue and challenge the perpetrators. The United States Government lacks that courage.

When and if the United States finally realizes that it must fight this enemy in its own house, the revelations will shock complacent Americans. Until those revelations are authenticated by Government indictment any who speak out as we now do will be vilified as disturbers of the peace and witch-burners.

What Canada has uncovered is part of a world-wide conspiracy. These men who gave away the war secrets of the Dominion are not petty hirelings who sold out for cash. They're Canadian citizens who look to Moscow first and to Ottawa second. Some are scientists who lean far left in sympathy with Bolshevist teachings or who are so politically naive they don't know what it's all about.

That is why the thing is dangerous. Here in America the Communist Party claims 100,000 members. Every one of them is an agent for Russia. Not one of them puts allegiance to the United States above obligation to the Kremlin. These people are Russian spies just as surely as though they were actually members of the NKVD (Moscow's world-wide secret police). They have infiltrated labor unions, educational institutions, and politics all over the democratic world.

Some of them are here in Jackson.

Those who know, and this includes many fine American union men, are aware that certain unions are completely dominated by Communists. Gullible spokesmen applauded the GM electric workers for making a contract which put the UAW strikers back of the eight ball. They didn't know that the GM electric workers union is Red-controlled and that it was trying to put loud-mouthed Walter Reuther in a hole. Reuther is a radical, but he belongs to either the Socialist wing or the Communist Party opposition (Trotzkyites). Moscow's Reds don't like him. Reuther is on his way out. His bitter vilification of GM and his early strike tactics made him a liability to the union, but it's the Reds who are helping to push him out.

Some maritime unions are Communist ruled. Their members refused to work when we were sending supplies to embattled Britain before Germany attacked Russia; but the moment Hitler crossed the Russian border they pressured Washington for more and more help for Germany's enemies. These same unions drew the blueprint for political strikes when they walked out in protest because they said troops weren't being brought home fast enough from the Pacific.

These Americans who are not Americans argue today with plausible sophistry the virtues of Russia's phony democracy. Tomorrow or tonight they would trade their American birthright for Moscow's blessing.

In India they foment revolt among the masses. (The real leaders of the Indian freedom movement are not sympathetic to the Communist-inspired Bombay insurrection.)

In India, likewise, they inspire mutiny among crewmen of the Royal Navy and the RAF.

In China they persist in civil war, though Moscow pretends disinterest.

In Indonesia they agitate the natives to rebel at the behest of the Kremlin.

Among our own troops and seamen they incite mass protests and mutiny. Known leaders of the protest demonstrations in both the Pacific area and Europe were active in Communist or fellow-traveler movements here. The form letters which soldiers send to newspapers and Congressmen complaining of Army policies are written by Communists. Reds infiltrated the editorial staffs of Army publications.

In Washington it is common knowledge that Gen. Pat Hurley spoke by the book when he said the State Department was permeated with fellow travelers and Communists. They plague MacArthur. Some among so-called specialists in Government sent to help him in Japan lean far left. They propose to mold Nippon to the Bolshevik pattern.

This threat to democracy is as real as the mutiny in India, the undeclared war in Manchuria, and the rebellion in Java. It isn't child's play. And it isn't just a political nightmare dreamed by moss-back conservatives.

Canada is getting ready to expose just a small fragment of the rotten whole. The thing is an ideological war from within, directed from without by Russia.

Its front-line combatants are the commentators on radio or in the newspapers who condemn Chiang Kai-shek as a dictator but who bow low to the east where sit the half dozen men who rule Red Russia.

Its agents are the men in labor unions and elsewhere who scream in pain when an American protests the needless waste of strikes but who vigorously cheer the Soviet system, wherein any man who strikes is doomed to prison or worse.

Its friends are the masquerading or misguided preachers in the pulpit who oppose any form of military youth training for America but who yield homage to the Red sickle flag under which no man is exempt from armed service.

Its dupes are the loving mothers and wives who cry out against the "slowness of deployment" in the Pacific and Germany, while those who urge them on sing hymns of praise to a Russia which is strengthening its occupation forces everywhere.

Its apologists are the weak-witted dreamers who believe dictatorship by a handful is true democracy. They would substitute the most tyrannical form of government known to the contemporary world for the freedom of America. They are not liberals. They lock backward, not forward.

Canada points an accusing finger at its own special scourge of rats. But in the United States we pamper the disease-bearing rodents whose allegiance is to an alien flag and a foreign ideology.

America doesn't care what kind of government Russia has. That is Russia's business. But the kind of government we have is our business. And a Russia which infiltrates a friendly America with spies and which aims for disaster and chaos throughout the world is toying with trouble. Canada has faced the issue. America should open its eyes.

Political Conditions in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 1946

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter I have received from the Industrial Society of Polish Mechanics, Group 3, relating their views in connection with the present Government now in power in Poland:

CHICAGO, ILL., *February 18, 1946.*
Hon. THOMAS S. GORDON,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: As you are aware, Poland, the Knight of Nations, which was first to oppose Hitler's might, and who fought to the end on the side of the United Nations, has been sold down the line.

Cognizant of this, the Industrial Society of Polish Mechanics, Group 3, of the Polish National of America, the oldest and most influencial group in Chicago, assembled at a regular meeting held Sunday February 10, 1946, at Pulaski Hall, 1715 South Ashland Avenue, Chicago, Ill., has unanimously resolved to appeal to you as Congressman from the city of Chicago, to use all your efforts and prestige, to bring to the attention of the President and the Secretary of State, the fact that the members of our group join the over 6,000,000 of American citizens of Polish extraction, in demanding that the present communistic government in Poland be liquidated without delay, and that a truly democratic government be elected by the people of Poland, in a free and untampered by Russian pressure election, in which the misplaced Poles all over the world, including the Polish Army in exile, be given the right to cast their votes.

We also decry the giving to Russia, Polish lands in the east, and especially eastern Galicia with the city of Lwow, and the Galician oil fields so sorely needed by Poland, which were never under Russian rule.

The peoples of eastern Poland, Poles, White Russians and Ukrainians, who in overwhelming majority are Catholics, want no union with Soviet Russia a fact that Russia is trying to cover up, by wholesale deportations and executions of real democratic citizens of Poland, and by trying to force same people to join the nationalized Russian Orthodox Church against their will.

The members of our group exhort you, not to let anything stop you from the promotion of a just cause, and insist on justice to a heroic nation.

Yours truly,

PETER MACIEJEWSKI,
President.
ALBERT J. DANISCH,
Recording Secretary.

Parasites in Oysters—A Serious New Enemy of the Oyster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1946

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, in 1930 millions of adult oysters died in the Virginia waters of Chesapeake Bay from some strange new disease and since then there have been over 12 similar mortalities on public and private oyster beds in nearly every Atlantic and Gulf coast State from Delaware to Texas. The dying oysters in each case have shown a heavy infection of a microscopic parasite which produces paralysis of the shell muscle and deprives the oyster of its ability to maintain closure of the shell when exposed to air or subjected to attacks of its many natural enemies. The latter includes over 15 species of marine animals such as starfish, drills, crabs, fish, and so forth, which destroy a greater quantity of oysters each year than are harvested by this industry. Of course, it is fortunate that all of the spawn produced by our eastern oyster does not grow to maturity or there would be enough produced in 1 year to completely fill all of our coastal harbors, bays, and sounds.

This new natural enemy of microscopic size is also very prolific and invades the tissues of the oyster to the extent of several million per oyster, of which 100,000 or more become lodged in the circulation of the muscle, depriving it of food and oxygen. Fortunately, the complicated life cycle of this parasite has finally been unraveled by a scientist of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, who found that this pest is transmitted from sick and infected oysters to healthy stock by the small mud crabs which are very abundant on oyster beds. In these intermediate hosts rapid multiplication of the parasite occurs, especially during early fall, when a single crab may release into the water over 5,000,000 of the infective stages which attack the delicate tissues of the oyster, causing great irritation and muscular damage, particularly in the older, spawned-out oysters.

The oyster industry is confronted with the problem of controlling this disease by eliminating the mud crabs or by exercising special care in the selection of seed oysters which are not heavily infected with the sporozoan parasite. The oyster planter is able to dredge these nonmigratory crabs from his beds before they are planted with seed, but it is unfortunate that such a procedure cannot be applied to our extensive public rocks or natural oyster beds. Research on the possibilities of chemical or biological control of the mud crabs is being conducted at the United States Fishery Biological Laboratory at Beaufort, N. C.

Under the leave granted me to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a brief report published in Science concerning the Life Cycle of Sporozoan, Parasite of the Oyster, by Dr. Herbert F. Prytherch, of the Fish and Wildlife Service, who has recently served as area coordinator of fisheries for the Chesapeake Bay and North Carolina region.

I am endeavoring with my committee and the Fish and Wildlife Service to make an intensive study of this disease, and I shall be glad for persons who suspect that their oysters may be affected to write me and give me full information on which their suspicions are based, describing the planted area, its location, and give other pertinent facts.

The insertion referred to above follows:

LIFE CYCLE OF A SPOROZOAN PARASITE OF THE OYSTER

Since 1930 serious oyster mortalities have occurred in five different coastal regions from Mobjack Bay, Va., to Lake Barre and vicinity in Louisiana. In each instance the oysters have shown an unusually weak condition of the adductor muscle and inability to maintain closure of the shell during dredging, transplanting, and shipping operations. Though the exact cause of these epidemics has not been definitely established the microscopical examination of weak and dying specimens from each region has disclosed a heavy concentration of spores in the tissues of the muscle, gills, and mantle, the number per oyster frequently amounting to several million. These resistant, thick-walled spores, ovoidal in form, are generally grouped in variable numbers (1 to 16) in hypertrophied host cells and surrounded by a crescent-shaped epispore. The mature spore (length 20 μ, diameter 11 μ) contains a single vermiform sporozoite folded twice on itself and is the resting or final developmental stage in the oyster.

Studies conducted under natural and laboratory conditions show that the meats of dying, infected oysters are readily devoured by the common mud crabs, Panopeus herbsti and Eurypanopeus depressus, in the intestine of which hatching of the spores takes place. The sporozoite escapes through a micropyle and migrates to the epithelium of the gut, where it becomes attached by a globular epimerite. In 15 to 20 hours it develops into a very small, delicate, cephaline gregarine which soon detaches and undergoes precocious coupling with other sporonts (primary sporadins), forming syzygies of 2 to 10 individuals in chainlike formation. The chains break up and the young gregarines after another short period of attachment, develop into short, cylindrical sporonts (hypersporadins) having a length of 18 to 30 μ. The characteristic gregarine stage in the crab has a granular, spherical protomerite with a lens-shaped, epimeric cap of hyalin material. The long deutomerite, rounded at the end, has a more dense, granular cytoplasm containing a large vesicular nucleus with single nucleolus. A clear, well-defined cuticle surrounds both parts and forms a wedge-shaped "muscular collar" or septum at the point of junction.

The sporonts grow to a considerable size and form syzygies of two individuals of unequal length in which the primites attain a length ranging from 275 to 342 μ and the satellites from 220 to 286 μ. These migrate to the rectum of the crab, and after becoming attached to the cuticle by an adhesive disk, coil up and form strong, thin-walled gametocysts, varying in diameter from 81 to 192 μ. The two gregarines in each gametocyst undergo extreme nuclear division into gametes which, after a period of mixing, fuse in pairs forming zygotes that become arranged radially in small groups around slightly larger central cells. These rosettes of zygotes, or gymnospores, 4 μ in diameter, are released into the water with the rupture of the gametocysts and are carried into the shell of the oyster by the feeding current. The possibilities of heavy oyster infections are great considering the general abundance of the crabs and their close association with the mollusc, and the fact that 40 to 80 gametocysts, containing from approximately 8,000 to 90,000 gymnospores each, may be produced in a single crustacean host.

Experiments with vitally stained gymnospores show that they attach to and penetrate the epithelium of the oyster gill by means of a pseudopod projected from the central cell. Though the zygotes may develop here to maturity they generally are picked up by the phagocytes and transported in the circulatory system to nearly all parts of the body. In the blood vessels and sinuses of the gills, mantle, and muscle the infected phagocytes accumulate in large numbers and increase to a considerable size (diam. 30 to 100 μ) with the rapid growth of the zygotes and their transformation into sporozoites. After each sporozoite has surrounded itself with a heavy, double-walled sporocyst, the parasite has reached the characteristic resting or dissemination stage commonly found in Ostrea virginica. The spores were also found in the following pelecypods: Pecten, Anomia, Ostrea equestris, Modiolus, Venus ziczac, and Martesia, and in the gastropod, Urosalpinx.

The life history and morphology of this sporozoan parasite resembles that of the porosporidae described on the French coast by Leger and Duboscq and Pierre Hatt. It is a heterogenetic gregarine with alternation of hosts, having the vegetative and reproductive phase in the intestine of decapod crustacea and sporogony in mollusks, particularly in lamellibranchs. The resistant, monozoic spores found in Ostrea are similar to those first described as Nematopsis by Schneider in 1892. The American form, which will be described in detail in a forthcoming paper, is a new species for which the name "Nematopsis ostrearum" is proposed.

Studies of the effect of the parasite on adult oysters were conducted in the laboratory, where heavy infections could be produced by keeping them in close association with mud crabs carrying gametocysts or by the introduction of ripe gymnospores. In bulk experiments with several hundred oysters, losses of 66 to 73 percent were obtained over a period of 3 months. Kymograph records of shell movement of 35 heavily infected oysters showed abnormal and frequent contractions of the adductor muscle followed by loss of holding power and death of the molluscs. Retraction of the mantle, cessation of shell growth, and weak attachment of the muscle to the shell are also characteristic of mortalities in the field and laboratory. The injury to the oyster host may be due to a toxin given off by the developing sporozoites, particularly in the sensitive mantle tissue, or to actual physical obstruction of the circulation by the masses of enlarged, infected phagocytes found in the blood vessels of the gills and muscle.

Practical prevention of the infection of oysters by this parasite is possible by control of the primary host, the mud crabs, and by exercising care in the selection of uninfected seed oysters for restocking growing and maturing areas. The crabs do not migrate and can be easily removed, before the beds are planted, by the use of dredges or scrapes equipped with fine mesh bags. In certain regions where valuable oyster beds have been abandoned or their productivity seriously

reduced because of damage by this microscopic pest it should be possible to reestablish and increase production by the procedure suggested above.

HERBERT F. PRYTHERCH,
United States Fisheries Biological Station, Beaufort, N. C.

The Bells That Toll for Mount Vernon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 1946

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my remarks by inserting in the RECORD an article published in the Washington Post Sunday, February 24, 1946, entitled "The Bells That Toll for Mount Vernon":

THE BELLS THAT TOLL FOR MOUNT VERNON
(By Jean Dulaney)

One of the Navy's oldest yet least familiar traditions was founded on a May morning in 1801, just 18 months after George Washington was laid to rest beneath the grassy slopes of Mount Vernon. Brilliant sunshine accentuated the beauty of the white manor house overlooking the Potomac as three frigates sailed past on their way to the new Washington Navy Yard.

Let Commodore Charles Morris, United States Navy, who was aboard the U. S. S. *Congress* that May morning, tell the story:

"Everyone was on deck to look upon the dwelling where Washington had made his home. Mrs. Washington and others of the family could be distinguished in the portico which fronts the river. When opposite the house, by order of Captain Sever, the sails were lowered, the colors displayed half-masted, and a mourning salute of 13 guns was fired as a mark of respect to the memory of Washington, whose life had so recently closed and whose tomb was in our view. The general silence on board the ship and around us, except when broken by the cannons' sound; the echo and reecho of that sound from the near and distant hills, as it died away in the distance; the whole ship's company uncovered and motionless, and the associations connected with the ceremony, seemed to make a deep impression upon all, as they did certainly upon me. When the salute was finished the sails were set again, the colors hoisted, and we proceeded up the river."

Thus the U. S. S. *Congress* inaugurated a custom still followed by the United States Navy. Nearly a century and a half later, every naval vessel passing the tomb of Washington tolls its ship's bell as the bugler sounds taps and officers and men stand at attention and salute.

Until recently, a popular legend insisted that the custom originated with a squadron of British ships which sailed up the Potomac during the War of 1812. But the Mount Vernon Ladies Association, which has maintained Washington's home since 1858, was reluctant to admit that an erstwhile enemy could outdo Americans in honoring their country's No. 1 hero.

The association, therefore, was delighted to find evidence which undermined the legend. The first clew was a photostat letter given them last year by the New York Public Library. Written by Bushrod Washington, nephew of George and proprietor of Mount Vernon from 1802 until 1826, it is dated November 29, 1814, and describes in some detail "the late invasion of this part of the country by the enemy." He writes:

"The squadron lay at this place some days in its ascent and on its return, and yet I do not believe that during the whole time a single barge approached this shore. This distinguished forbearance I owe to the generous feelings of Commodore Gordon for a place which had once been the residence of my venerated uncle. He expressed to one of the Alexandria commissioners, who was deputed to stipulate for the safety of the town, an anxious desire to visit this spot, but was so delicate as to declare his resolution not to do so, presuming that my official situation [Washington was at that time an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court] would render such a step peculiarly embarrassing and distasteful to me."

Just to be on the safe side, however, the ladies turned to the Navy Department for more definite information. They were rewarded with the excerpt from Commodore Morris' autobiography describing the ceremony aboard the *Congress*. This document establishes beyond question that naval vessels had begun saluting Washington's tomb 13 years before the arrival of the British squadron.

Most civilians are unfamiliar with the custom; even Navy men whose orders have kept them far from the peaceful Potomac sometimes confess ignorance of it. President Theodore Roosevelt himself, Navy conscious though he was, was taken by surprise when he witnessed the ceremony from the deck of the Presidential yacht *Mayflower* in 1906. Inquiring about the ritual, he was told that it took place not by official order but merely as a matter of tradition. With characteristic enthusiasm, Theodore Roosevelt immediately issued an order prescribing the ceremony to be observed by all United States Navy vessels passing Mount Vernon between sunrise and sunset.

Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 1946

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oakland (Calif.) Post Enquirer of February 5, 1946:

FAVORABLE ACTION URGED ON HAWAII'S STATEHOOD APPEAL

They are talking about putting another star in Old Glory.

Out on the cross roads of the Pacific where Kamehameha the Great once established an empire, they are looking for the realization of statehood.

Nine years ago when a congressional committee visited the islands, it was favorably impressed but suggested that action be delayed until there was unmistakable evidence that a substantial majority of the residents desired statehood and until the international situation was less disquieting.

The Territorial legislature called for a plebiscite and, in the general election of November 5, 1940, the residents favored statehood by a vote of 2 to 1.

A Gallup poll revealed that public opinion was divided in about the same proportions on the mainland.

At the close of the war the Territorial legislature renewed its appeal.

Another committee was named. It held hearings in Hawaii and its report is now before Congress.

The committee found that the Caucasian population had increased from about 6 percent in 1878 to 34 percent and that well over 85 percent of the present population was born in Hawaii or on the mainland.

It found that Hawaii produced approximately $65,000,000 worth of sugar in 1944 and $45,000,000 worth of pineapples; that it had consistently paid more into the Federal Treasury than it had taken out and that the 1945 contribution amounted to $173,939,227; that in 1944 and 1945 Hawaii had exceeded several States in the total of its internal-revenue collections.

The report was favorably received. Senator SHERIDAN DOWNEY declared:

"I favor statehood for Hawaii and I will support it. The whole Territorial picture, from the standpoint of economy, production, and strategical location, make it very necessary that Hawaii be welded into the Union."

Hawaii was annexed by the United States in 1898 and became a Territory in 1900. Its pioneer American families are, for the most part, the descendants of New England missionaries who came to the islands to convert the natives to Christianity. It has a commendable war record. Thirty-three thousand of its citizens served in the armed forces. Not one single act of sabotage or fifth-column activity was reported before or after the attack on Pearl Harbor.

It was not unexpected, therefore, that the congressional committee brought back a favorable report. They found that "the people have demonstrated beyond question not only their loyalty and patriotism but also their desire to assume the responsibility of statehood."

Hawaii has come of age.

A Statement About the United States Rice Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 21, 1946

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a statement about the United States rice industry prepared by Hon. Frank A. Godchaux, Jr., president of the Louisiana State Rice Milling Co., Inc., from Abbeville, La.

Mr. Godchaux is not from my district; however, his company has millions invested in my district in the way of rice mills, canals, farms, and other interests, and is the president of the foremost corporation who have interests in connection with the rice industry in Louisiana and other States in the United States and therefore, is recognized as a leader and an authority on the subject. The statement follows:

LOUISIANA STATE RICE MILLING CO., INC.,
Abbeville, La., February 15, 1946.

Hon. J. H. DAVIS,
Governor of Louisiana,
Baton Rouge, La.

DEAR GOVERNOR DAVIS: We have read with interest the Honorable Clinton P. Anderson's letter of February 7, addressed to you, in which he challenges your statement that 30,000,000 pockets of Siamese rice have been allocated to England.

I believe we were one of the sources of your information on this point, and one basis for our statement was the Washington Food Report of January 5, section II, page 4, under the head "World rice shortage squeezes United States supply." It read as follows:

"Britain has concluded a peace treaty with Siam, the only far eastern country with a rice surplus. The treaty requires that Siam furnish a minimum of 1,500,000 tons of rice as restitution for assistance given to the Japs during the war. Actual amount that will go to feeding hungry peoples in other British-controlled far eastern areas has not yet been decided. United States believes that 1,500,000 tons is too great and is holding conversations with the British with the aim of getting them to take no more than 800,000 tons. Reason behind our urging the British to be more moderate in their demands is that in prewar years Siam's exports were about 1,500,000 tons. If the British were to take this amount, little or no rice would be available to meet our responsibilities in the Philippines and to aid General MacArthur in helping the Japanese to get through the winter."

One million five hundred thousand tons are equivalent to 33,600,000 pockets. It appears, therefore, that your statement of 30,000,000 pockets, or bags, was on the conservative side instead of being an overstatement. Other publications about this same time carried approximately the same information as contained in the Washington Food Report. We have seen no contradiction of this by any Government reports. It was reasonable to assume, therefore, that the information contained was approximately correct.

The Washington Daily Reporter System, No. 25, issued February 4, reports on page B-14 that the 1945 Egyptian rice crop is relatively large, and that the Egyptian Government has agreed to make available to the British Ministry of Food 330,000,000 pounds, or 3,300,000 pockets, for export and for British requirements in Egypt. They add that "Production of a bumper crop, however, may make possible some additional supplies for export."

We believe it is correct that the surplus of Brazilian rice, which was jointly contracted for by the United States and British Governments, has been allocated by the Combined Food Board to Great Britain.

It would seem, therefore, that the 33,600,000 pockets from Siam, which is almost twice as much as our country produces, and the 3,300,000 pockets from Egypt, together with the surplus from Brazil, is giving Great Britain a rather ample share of the world's available rice.

There is another interesting comment in the Washington Food Report of January 19, section I, page 4, which reads as follows:

"Allocation of 1,925,000 pockets for the domestic trade is misleading. Government take makes it impossible for that amount to be delivered. Large part of the rice remaining after the Government takes its cut is too low grade for the trade to accept.

"British are taking all the rice in Siam until the harvest starts in November 1947. Although the deal with Siam is for 1,500,000 tons, London advices are that they expect to pick up less than that from accumulated stocks. This will be moved to British people in the Far East except that some will go to the Dutch. Crop from present harvesting is about 20 percent less than normal, allowing about enough to enable the British to continue distribution from old stocks, but there will be very little for other oriental demands or possible world markets until January 1947.

"Every report about the rice situation in the Far East is worse than its predecessor. British have grabbed all available rice in Burma as well as Siam. Considerable rice will be needed in China. Picture isn't entirely clear as the British have not been offering as much money as the Chinese want; rice has remained in the interior and accurate estimates as to quantity are lacking."

The best information that we can get indicates that the Philippines will get no more than 1 percent of the rice the Siamese Government has committed to Great Britain, which will amount to 15,000 tons, or 336,000 pockets. If these figures are incorrect, we believe it is up to Secretary Anderson to give us corrected figures. The statements to you in his letter of February 7 are exceedingly hazy. He states that "all rice available in Siam is subject to allocation, recommended by the Combined Food Board." Does "available" mean rice stocks over and above the 1,500,000 tons which went to Britain on treaty agreement? If this large quantity of rice has been turned over by Britain to the Combined Food Board, and if the Philippine needs are so great, then surely more than 1 percent of this amount should be allocated to the Philippines instead of endangering the future of the rice industry in the United States by taking the pitifully small amounts that can be gotten from this country and exporting it to the Philippines.

We will grant that no one in the United States is going to suffer from hunger, even if they get no rice at all, but since we now produce more than twice as much rice as we consume and will, therefore, need to cultivate the consumption of rice in the United States, which must always be our main outlet, it would seem that some consideration should be given to the economy of this country in determining our relief program. If our purpose is to feed hungry people in the Far East, we do not necessarily have to give them rice merely because they prefer it—any food can appease actual hunger.

The Washington Daily Report on Agricultural Commodities No. 32, of February 13, says:

"Among the foods for which consumption per person is expected to be higher than in 1945 are beef, pork, fish, evaporated milk, cheese, fluid cream, lard, processed fruits and vegetables, and potatoes. A little more sugar may be available than last year."

These foods are well established on American tables. If more rice is made available to domestic consumers, less of these and other foods will be required. Many southerners choose for their daily diet between rice and bread. If more rice is allowed them, less wheat products will be required and more left for export. It makes sense that whatever relief we send to the Far East might better be in commodities for which a future demand might be developed, rather than in rice, of which they grow a huge exportable surplus which is used to compete with our production in the Cuban market.

Mr. Anderson also suggests that additional control measures may be necessary to prevent excessive shipments to Cuba and Puerto Rico. Our reply is that practically all the rice we have shipped to Cuba has been of grades that neither the domestic trade nor the Government would take and we have reason to believe that other mills' shipments have been in like proportion. It is neither Cuba nor Puerto Rico that is causing the dearth of rice in the United States. It is the amount that is being exported for relief purposes for which other foods might well be substituted in the interest of our domestic economy.

Everyone interested in growing, milling, distributing, or conserving rice appreciates your efforts to get a reasonable amount released for home consumption, and everyone in Louisiana knows that rice is important to the economy of our State and that when you seek to protect the rice industry you are rendering a service to the State.

Yours sincerely,

FRANK A. GODCHAUX, Jr.,
President.

Number of Small Business Failures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 1946

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, February 15, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] cited some figures compiled by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce of the United States Department of Commerce with regard to the number of small business enterprises in the United States which had discontinued operations during the years 1940 to 1943, inclusive. The figures showed that an average of 25,000 or 26,000 small businesses had discontinued annually during that period.

On the basis of these figures the gentleman from Illinois attempted to show that American small business had fared very badly during the last 4 or 5 years.

I am afraid that the gentleman did not complete reading the document prepared by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce on which he based his remarks.

I have recently had an opportunity to examine this document, and I find that the facts cited convey quite the opposite impression from the one the gentleman sought to convey.

He referred to the discontinuance of these businesses as business "failures." But the document makes it clear that they were not necessarily failures. The gentleman should know that there is quite a difference between discontinuing business and failing in business, especially since the Bureau's document makes this point amply clear.

Just so that there may be no further misunderstanding about this, I quote from the Bureau's remarks on the subject:

> The decline in number of firms has not, on the whole, been accompanied by a similar decline in the profitability or volume of business. Although there have been notable exceptions, production, sales, and profits in most lines—for small as well as large enterprises—have been maintained at a high level during the war. Indeed, a large number of recent business deaths have been due, not to the fact that the economic forces of the war have driven entrepreneurs out of business, but that the owners have found attractive alternative opportunities in war industries or have been called into the armed forces.

The gentleman, to give the real picture of the number of bankruptcies in business during these years, should have used a different set of figures. This is what the Wall Street credit rating firm of Dun & Bradstreet's records show:

Year:	*Bankruptcies*
1940	13,619
1941	11,848
1942	9,405
1943	3,221
1944	1,222
1945	810

It does not seem that business—large or small—has fared at all badly in recent years.

That was not the case, however, under the last Republican administrations. Here is Dun & Bradstreet's record for that unlamented period of American business history:

Year:	*Bankruptcies*
1920	8,881
1921	19,652
1922	23,676
1929	22,909
1932	31,822

These figures speak for themselves. I am sure that the small-business interests of this country will not be misled by the kind of statistical legerdemain that the gentleman from Illinois saw fit to indulge in here the other day.

Trend Toward National Bankruptcy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOBLE J. JOHNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. Frank R. Kent contains much food for serious thought and shows the trend of the present administration toward national bankruptcy:

WRITER BELIEVES 30,000,000 SHOULD WORK FOR LABOR PEACE, INFLATION CURES

(By Frank R. Kent)

There are approximately 80,000,000 persons in the country who own war bonds and stamps. There are 71,000,000 holders of life-insurance policies, and 16,725,733 individual savings-bank depositors as of July 1, last. Of course, there is some duplication in this, but certainly more than 90,000,000 of our citizens have either war bonds, insurance policies, or savings accounts, and more than half the whole population has all three.

This being so, and these investors not being idiots, every one of them must have a primary interest in the soundness of their investments. Given even rudimentary intelligence they are bound to be against anything that undermines their value or lessens their security.

Now, no one denies that the greatest threat to every form of fixed income is inflation. With inflation, the cost of living goes up and the purchasing power of the dollar goes down. With uncontrolled inflation, the dollar becomes debased to the point of having no value at all, and bonds, insurance policies, savings-bank deposits, and all other securities become worthless. A period of complete economic chaos then ensues in which everybody suffers—but, of course, most deeply, the poorer classes.

INFLATION POSSIBLE

It is the custom to say that we will not have that kind of inflation here. And, of course, we ought not to have it and there is no excuse for having it. Nevertheless, it is conceivable and it is possible. With our Federal finances out of control, as they almost are now, once we get into that upward spiral of rising prices and rising wages, inherent in the present situation, there is slight chance to avoid it.

Considering these facts, it would seem that solely out of self-interest the holders of Government securities, insurance policies, and savings-bank accounts would cease taking a passive interest in what goes on in Washington and become as active as they know how. It is clear that the two essentials are a truly balanced Federal Budget and uninterrupted industrial production. Certainly, the many millions of small investors are vitally concerned in seeing that nothing is permitted to block these achievements.

To this end the weight of these concerned citizens ought to be solidly behind legislation in Congress that will find some sound way of settling labor-industrial disputes which strangle the economic life of the country and affect the necessities of life for the people. Also, this weight should be unwaveringly against Federal waste and extravagance and in favor of rigid governmental economy.

INDIGNATION IN ORDER

Yet, it is not exerted in either direction. A labor bill, not as comprehensive as it should be but to which few sound objections can be made, has passed the House but has a poor prospect in the Senate, where the hint is given that the CIO Senators, who most violently denounced the filibuster on the FEPC bill, will filibuster on the Case bill—if it seems likely to go through.

There should be real indignation about this from the aforesaid 80,000,000 bondholders, etc., but there has been small sign of such. Equally, there should come from the millions of small holders vigorous protest against the phony economy preached by the Truman budget message, which isn't economy at all but extravagance.

Not only are there more civilian jobholders on the pay roll today than there were when the war ended, but there is no plan for reducing them—quite the contrary. In addition, it is proposed to spend more in every department in the year beginning July 1 than was spent in the year ended June 30 last. A recent authoritative estimate is as follows: Agriculture, up 22.5 percent; Commerce, up 101.2 percent; Interior, up 47.5 percent; Justice, up 36.8 percent; State, up 144.2 percent; Treasury, up 58 percent; War (civil functions), up 111.1 percent.

TREND TOWARD SPENDING

In brief, we are not going to reduce the Federal pay roll; we are not going to reduce Federal costs; we are not going to reduce the Federal debt. There is literally nothing in the Truman fiscal plans, as one man remarked, "to make any civil-service job holder turn over in his groove."

As under Mr. Roosevelt, the trend is toward spending, not saving. The gestures toward economy are feeble and meaningless. The new State Department propaganda experiment to cost $30,000,000 has the President's support. So has the $70,000,000 UNO site and plant (for which we will chiefly pay), though Senator VANDENBERG, a strong UNO man, insists that both as to size and cost, they are ridiculously large. And certainly, without being penny pinching or cheese paring, they seem so.

These two incidents of new expenditures are mentioned here merely as examples. There are plenty of others. It is a dangerous road we travel, made the more so by a Secretary of the Treasury who, apparently, is not interested in economy. At any rate, he sponsored a tax bill reducing Treasury revenue $7,000,000,000 and exempting 12,000,000 persons from all taxes.

Relationship Between Domestic and Foreign Policies of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. LaFOLLETTE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1946

Mr. LaFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a radio address made by me under the auspices of the Indiana Committee for Victory over Station WFBM, Indianapolis, Ind., on February 10, 1946:

I want to talk about the inescapable connection between our domestic policies and our foreign policies and aspirations for future peace. If I were choosing the easy way, or the politic way, I would not do this because it is a subject which many self-styled liberals on international cooperation would like to avoid. As a matter of fact, this connection between our domestic and foreign policy is the most shunned and avoided subject in America today. The failure to discuss it can be fatal to the hopes of the peoples of America and of the world for peace in the future.

In the parlance of the times, "I don't want any part of" the mealymouthed, emotional, self-styled liberal on the international issue who, now that a United Nations Charter has been written and the United Nations has come into existence, ostrichlike wants to shut his eyes to the economic truths without which no writings on paper, created by the statesmen of the world, can or will long endure.

You cannot have peace in the world unless you raise the standard of living of the people who inhabit the world. If we assume that this is true, and it is, then we must also understand that you cannot have world commerce and world trade, which are necessary to increase the standard of living of the people of the world, unless you make certain that in the United States of America we have full employment, at wage levels high enough to permit our people to increase their standard of living so that they may consume the products which other people can produce without causing domestic unemployment. I am no starry-eyed visionary when I bring these truths to your attention.

In the event you do not know it, may I remind you that the Committee for Economic Development is an organization of leading hard-headed American businessmen, industrialists, and financiers, headed by a Hoosier, Mr. Paul G. Hoffman, of South Bend, who is the president of the Studebaker Corp. This organization just issued a new book entitled "International Trade and Domestic Employment." I now give you two quotations from this book:

"The maintenance of a high level of employment in the United States is the most fundamental condition for keeping in operation a program of international trade expansion. Evidence indicates that the level of our industrial activity is the greatest factor in determining the volume of our imports, on which many countries depend for their purchasing power in international trade."

"If our National Government stands ready to take strong internal measures, whenever necessary in time of depression or threatened depression, to maintain domestic employment, imports need not be feared as a cause of unemployment."

In these quotations this organization has spoken a fundamental truth and they have spoken it forthrightly. In any intelligent use of the term, therefore, their treatment of this subject has been radical, and since I agree with them, I consider it to be an honor and a privilege to stand with these radicals on this issue.

However, you cannot keep a high level of employment in America unless you give to the worker in American industries, particularly mass-production industries, the highest possible wage rate at prevailing prices which are consistent with a reasonable degree of profit to those who own the tools which the worker operates. You must do this because you cannot maintain a high level of industrial activity in America without it. Certainly the experience of the twenties

should teach us that. Furthermore, you cannot obtain for these workers this necessary share of the wealth produced by the workers and the owners of the tools unless the workers have strong unions through which to obtain their rightful share of this wealth. Again the experience of the twenties should teach us that. I am speaking of the intelligent approach to this question, evidenced by the best minds in the labor movement; namely, that there must be a raise in real wages; that is, a greater share to the worker of the wealth produced without any appreciable increase in the cost of the product. Anyone who knows anything about production knows that with the pent-up consuming power presently available in America, we are faced with a period of increased consumption, which means increased number of units produced and, as the number of units produced increases in mass production, the profit per unit increases at the same price level. But this increased number of units cannot be consumed if the owner of the tools takes such a great share of the wealth produced in the form of profits that he repeats the mistakes of the twenties and fails to leave the producers a sufficient amount of money to consume his product.

It follows, therefore, that if you are intelligent, you cannot believe in international cooperation, which depends upon world trade, and at the same time gratify your emotions by labor-baiting, or like a blindly ignorant, uninformed reactionary, cling to theories of economics which in the past have always brought us to depressions and then the wars which follow out of the economic stresses which depressions produce.

Again, if there is to be hope in the world and people are to live in a world in which governments exist with the consent of the governed, without which philosophy there is no freedom in the world, our country must bring the moral leadership to the world which will make this possible. This means that we must assume the leadership which is necessary to say to the white nations of the world, which heretofore have lived by depressing the standards of living and retarding the educational and cultural development of the yellow and the brown and the black peoples of the world, "It is time for you to release your hold and permit these people to realize the freedom which they now desire to attain."

This position is not only sound morally, but it is also again sound from the standpoint of jobs, production, and profits because you can't sell sewing machines, or kitchen ware, or medical supplies and drugs, or oil, or its derivative products, or farm machinery of the simplest kind- let alone radios, ice boxes, bathtubs, and automobiles—to yellow, brown, or black people who receive such a small share of the wealth which they produce—from under the surface of the earth which they inhabit or from the soil upon it—that they can barely maintain themselves as humans under the most primitive conditions. But these people occupy almost three-fourths of the surface of the earth and offer the greatest potential market for industrial goods in the world today. Therefore, it is not only morally sound but it is good business for this country to furnish the leadership which will strike the colonial fetters from these people and relieve them from the economic injustices to which they have been forced to submit for 400 years. However, if America is to furnish this leadership, it must do so by setting an example in its domestic policy on the question of race and economic suppression of dark-skinned people in our own midst, whether they be Negroes or of Indian or Mexican origin, which is consistent with the position we are attempting to assert internationally. America cannot send out into the world a clear bell-like tone of moral sincerity upon this question of race and colonial suppression if we continue to project it from a warped and cracked domestic background. We cannot any longer permit an invidious, irrelevant, and biologically unsound prejudice on the subject of race produce discriminations in economic opportunity in our own country and hope to avoid, out in the world, the charge of hypocrisy, from the white colonial nations of Europe, or the feeling of suspicion on behalf of the yellow and brown and black-skinned people, whom we are professing to help.

It follows, therefore, that even if there are those among us who would attempt to close their eyes to the immorality of our domestic policy on the question of race, they cannot come to me, or to you, or to any intellectually honest person, with a profession of interest in international good will and peace unless they are first willing to take one of the vital steps necessary to bring that condition about; namely, the clearing up of our own situation here at home.

It is one world, my friends. What we do in America determines the effectiveness of our efforts to produce a stable economy and moral justice in the world, without which all of the United Nations documents and all of the provisions for world courts will accomplish nothing in the way of bringing peace to the world or preventing a Third World War. If you fail to understand this, or, understanding it, fail to fight for it here at home, then please be honest with yourself and with the world and abandon your claim to being a liberal on the international issue, for your actions make your definition of yourself empty and meaningless.

A Filipino Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARLOS P. ROMULO
RESIDENT COMMISSIONER OF THE PHILIPPINES TO THE UNITED STATES
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 1946

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD today, I take pride in paying tribute to a Filipino war hero who embodies the courage and the heroism of those who in Bataan, Corregidor, Leyte, and all over the Philippines, fought so loyally for the United States and the ideals and principles for which this country stands.

Man's memory is short. Victory is here, and in the flush of triumph we are too prone to forget those who served the cause at the risk of their lives. During the first days after the attack by the Japanese on Pearl Harbor, a Filipino aviator, then Capt. Jesus Villamor, recently promoted to lieutenant colonel by General MacArthur, gave a display of matchless courage when in a dilapidated training ship he dared attack a Japanese formation of planes and scattered them, thus bolstering the morale of both the soldiers and civilians at a time when everything was dark and desperate for our side. He was the first Filipino officer to be decorated by General MacArthur with the Distinguished Flying Cross. The President of the Philippines decorated him with the Distinguished Service Star.

After the fall of Bataan, Colonel Villamor was taken by one of General Royce's planes to Australia, from where a year later he was sent by General MacArthur in a submarine back to the Philippines, then under enemy occupation, to contact the Filipino guerrilla leaders and coordinate their activities. Again he displayed the same daring and intrepidity and succeeded in unifying the different guerrilla factions, and because of this he materially helped organize and strengthen Filipino resistance against the enemy. For this he was decorated by the late President Quezon with the Medal for Valor, the highest decoration of the Philippines.

The other day he was decorated in the War Department with the Legion of Merit by Maj. Gen. Charles Willoughby in behalf of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur. If any officer in the uniform of the United States Army deserves such a decoration, Colonel Villamor certainly does. His services to the Allied cause should be recorded in the annals of the war as among those to be remembered forever.

The Filipino people are proud that they have men of the character and valor of Lt. Col. Jesus Villamor, than whom there is no greater living hero in the Philippines today.

Speech Before Fourth Ward Republican Club of Marion County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES M. LaFOLLETTE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 1946

Mr. LaFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by me before the Fourth Ward Republican Club of Marion County at Indianapolis, Ind., on February 15, 1946:

The Republican Party can either save itself and America, and indeed the world, or it can destroy itself and America, and the world. The time for decision has run out, so that the day of decision is upon us.

I am pleased that tonight this audience is made up of people who are closely identified with the fourth ward Republican organization and of voters of that ward, who I presume, usually vote the Republican ticket in Marion County, or who usually want to vote the Republican ticket.

Basically, there is no difference between the desires, hopes, and ambitions of people who closely affiliate themselves with the organization work of political parties and those who consider themselves only as members of the party because they usually vote that party's ticket. They are the same kind of people; they desire the same end—an America to live in, in which there is the most equitably possible division of wealth which we can produce in America under an economic system and a Government which, at the same time, grant the greatest degree of true freedom—which exists only when we have rule by law, not men.

Very often organization people, so-called, conclude that the average voting-party member is indifferent, impractical, and at times too demanding, considering the fact that usually he only shows up once every 2 years at a general election, and rarely twice every 2 years, in those years that he takes the time to vote in a primary. On the other hand, party members, who are usually nothing but voting-party members, seem to develop the

mistaken idea that organization workers are too efficient and officious, and too callous toward the so-called theory of government. Both groups are too often wrong in their judgment of the other, and it is a good thing for them to come together occasionally, just for the purpose of learning that the people in each group are very human people, both trying to attain the same goal. I know this is true, because I have stood in precincts, worked to get out the vote, worked with organizations, and I have also fought organizations. From that I have learned that the reason that people gain recognition in political organizations and are effective in working in political organizations is a very simple one, namely, that they put their time and effort into the humdrum, drab, unpleasant work of getting out the vote, and doing the hundred and one other things which are necessary, if a party is to function successfully on election day.

Therefore, it follows that both party voters and party precinct and ward organization workers have an interest in the success of their party and in the advancement of the best interests of their country. Neither deserves to have the interest of the party jeopardized by the "palace guard," a few people sitting near very high places in the party organization, whose only simple desire is selfish, namely, to manipulate the party for their own interests, or for special-interest groups which they try to serve and protect.

I also understand the difference between the obligations of candidates of political parties and the obligations of party organization workers. It is the duty of candidates to present to the public a program and a policy which will make it easier for the organization workers to secure votes for the party. Nothing has a more deadly effect upon a party worker than to find that the candidates, thrust upon him by high leaders of his party seeking to serve their own or other special interests, represent policies which the public is not interested in supporting.

Therefore, we ought to take a look at the traditions of the Republican Party to see what it really stands for when it is true to its traditions, and then we ought to consider whether the things for which the party really stands are the things which the people want today. I haven't found any Republican yet who is willing to denounce Lincoln, even though I hear a lot of them today who, by their talk, are betraying him. Therefore, it ought to be safe in advocating Republican policy to see what Lincoln said about it.

At New Haven, Conn., on March 5, 1860, in discussing the capitalistic system as he understood it, he said this:

"So while we do not propose any war upon capital, we do wish to allow the humblest man an equal chance to get rich with everybody else * * * I want every man to have a chance and—I believe a black man is entitled to it—when he may look forward and hope to be a hired laborer this year and the next, work for himself afterwards, and finally to hire men to work for him."

That is basic Republican doctrine, and upon that doctrine I base my republicanism, and I do not intend to be driven from it by those uninformed, historically ignorant Republicans who are presently running around the country praising something they call "conservatism" and damning something they call "radicalism," but who are actually spouting the Democratic policy of Stephen A. Douglas and his present poll-tax Democratic successors, under a banner of false republicanism. If they are going to do that they should at least be honest enough to denounce Lincoln openly and repudiate him, or to admit that they are so ignorant of Republican tradition that they don't know what the party tradition requires of it today. They can have either horn of that dilemma they choose, but it is about time they grabbed hold of one of them.

Lincoln was espousing the basic principles of radical capitalism—radical in the sense of being fundamental and as stating the only conditions under which capitalism can live and survive, and grow, and become great, as the means of fulfilling the democratic desires of the people, as stated in our Declaration of Independence.

Lincoln was talking about the dignity of the individual. He was stating that people are dignified and have the same basic rights without regard to the color of their skins; that the dignity of man lay inside him, not on the outside of him. He was telling people that as a part of that dignity was the right of every man to feel a sense of participation in his economic life, a personal interest in the thing which he was producing, and that he had a voice in determining his share of the wealth which he was assisting to produce If the Republicans who are declaring that they are going to drive the radicals out of the party and out of office are denouncing that kind of radicalism, then they are not only denouncing Lincoln; worse than that, they are doing their very best to destroy the stake which the industrialists, whom they think they are serving, presently have in the economic system of America. If these industrialists could take a little time off to observe economic and social trends all over the world, to learn a little about the principles and aspirations set out in the Declaration of Independence to which all democratic peoples aspire, then they would truly say of such Republicans, "God save me from my friends."

So far as I am concerned, I cannot accept the philosophy and theories of the Communists, because I cannot see how the evils of oligarchy and bureaucracy, with their static effect upon the economy or the government of a country, can be overcome, so that the system can remain democratic and therefore a vital, dynamic system, over any extended period of time. Furthermore, I likewise cannot accept the ethics, or rather lack of ethics, to which the American Communists almost invariably subscribe. But I do know this, that the mass of the people, if they are eventually driven to a choice between privately owned monopolies, in which they feel they have no part and over which they feel they have no control, and if they continue to become so powerful and strong that they stifle the hopes of the people to participate in the things which affect their own lives, then the people will be driven to accept state ownership of the economy of the country and to reject capitalism solely on the theory and with the hope that since they are a part of the country they will have some measure of control over it. I think if the people make that choice, they will be deluded. Certainly they will be deluded if they do not preserve a strong parliamentary system. For myself, I am not prepared to accept either of these alternatives without trying, to the best of my ability, to create a capitalistic system in which the people feel they have a part and under which we do not continue to have their never-ceasing concentration of power over our economic life in the hands of a few people, and of wealth constantly increasing in the hands of those who own the tools by which the economy of America is operated.

Now, what are some of the things which must be done to create a capitalism which approximates the standards which Lincoln expounded in his New Haven speech?

First, we must broaden the base of ownership of, and participation in, the decisions which control the operation of our mass-production industries. Certainly a revised form of corporate taxation, in which income taxes are for all practical purposes eliminated against corporate earnings and are taxed directly to the stockholders, will have the effect of helping to eliminate the present condition under which the small stockholder is indirectly paying, under our present high corporate tax rate, a much too great share of the taxes, which should be paid by the large stockholder or extremely wealthy stockholder. It is surprising to me that there are as many small stockholders in corporations as there are today when we consider this inequity in corporate taxation.

Second, the development as an immediate first step of real worker-management cooperation, so that the worker can feel such a sense of participation in the decisions which affect his daily work that we may in good conscience exact of him a higher sense of responsibility. Whether we like it or not, it is increasingly difficult for any man, who feels that he is a freeman, and an intelligent man, to have a real sense of responsibility, when he is working for a wage, no matter how satisfactory, under conditions where he has no personal relationship with the owner of the plant in which he is working, or no sense of participation, in any degree, with the owner in the decisions which vitally affect his life as a worker.

Third, as an additional aid to the cracking up of this concentration of wealth, a system of tax relief incentives for both investors and workers in new industries should be developed and varied, if necessary, in proportion to the new ownership of the wealth involved, in addition to the risks involved.

Fourth, all people in this country must have a feeling that they have an equal economic opportunity with all other people, so that we must at once strike down by Government action those invidious and irrelevant discriminations which arise from prejudices on the subject of race, creed, or color, which are morally and biologically untenable.

Fifth, if we are to maintain a capitalistic system, with its inevitable shifts in consumer desire, and its consequent shifts in manufacturing activity to satisfy that desire, we must make provision for both the owners of the tools and the worker who works with the tools, to be carried over until the owner develops a new business and the worker a new skill, without losing both the buying power and morale of either, or both. It follows that no capitalistic system can successfully operate so as to satisfy the people unless there is maintained a broad, adequate social security system, in the broadest possible meaning of that term.

Sixth, certainly we shall have to keep a high standard of real wages in the hands of the masses of the people in order that the people may consume the goods which they produce with the owner's tools. If the owner takes too much of this wealth, he can't consume his product and he deprives the people of the opportunity of consuming it. Thereby, we create another depression which this capitalistic system can't stand and survive. It isn't only the industrialist who is hurt by that, but all the rest of us who are trying to preserve the good freedoms which we think are inherent in it.

Seventh, any person who goes around the country today telling the industrialists and the bankers of America and the middle-class people of America that we are going to have less Government-fixing of rules under which our economy must run than we have had in the past is a false prophet and telling an untruth. Whether he does so willfully or otherwise is not important.

The greatest check against the dangers inherent to an enlargement of Executive power is a strengthened and revitalized Congress. A Congress strengthened in its machinery, made more fluid and responsive to legislative demands of a majority of the people, and staffed and equipped so well that it will have the ability, not only to inquire with intelligence into problems presented to it by the Executive, but also equipped to act as an auditor and as a check upon the activities of the Executive. (This proposal is indeed radical—so much so, that the Scripps-Howard newspapers have been advocating it for over

3 years.) Oddly enough, the so-called conservative Republican leaders, both in Indiana and elsewhere, who are denouncing radicals, have made no contribution, in all their long legislative careers, to the development of this necessary reform. I assure you though, that no man of average intelligence needs to sit in the Congress more than 6 months before the need becomes most apparent.

I have always assumed, because I have represented a lot of them, that businessmen and industrialists and bankers have average intelligence, from which I also assume they should be able to test the sincerity of the public interest and the value of the advice now being offered them by these self-styled conservative Republicans by the fact that they have done nothing about this very necessary reform. Those who can see, let them see; those who can hear, let them hear.

Eighth, another world-wide depression, with the inevitable war which will follow it, will destroy not only the capitalistic system in America but the world with it. Yet, you can't avoid a world depression unless you have world trade. Without world trade you can't have a United Nations, because a charter, no matter how beautiful its words may be, cannot of itself prevent people from going to war in times of economic stress. You cannot have world trade without an economically strong America, and you cannot have an economically strong America without a happy, satisfied, well-paid American people, and you can't have a happy, satisfied, well-paid American people by resorting to the rather negative device of labor baiting. You can only produce such an America by attempting to offer some constructive suggestions for America's economic problems. Therefore, you can't be a so-called liberal on the international issue and privately oppose every constructive attempt to find solutions for the maladjustments in our domestic economy.

I certainly know that the proposals which I offer tonight are not all-inclusive. I do not even believe that everything I have said cannot be said better, or that better proposals cannot be advanced, but I do claim that, more than anything else, I want to produce a system in America under which people can live and be happier and treat each other more fairly and really enjoy living together, so that in this, our country, we may offer to the world a system of economics and government which will come the nearest to solving man's earthly problems. I know this cannot be done without an approach to our present economic system which is fundamental in its character and forthright, and therefore "radical." I further know that a man who is such a political coward that he is afraid to offer proposals on the theory that they might not be popular has no business in public life, because the problems of this world will not be settled by people who close their eyes, sit on their hands, and keep their mouths shut.

It is fundamental that every thought which is publicly expressed stimulates thinking and that the great value of democracy is the freedom to express thought, so that out of this stimulated thinking the correct solutions may eventually be offered to and chosen by the people. Any man who won't assume this responsibility has no right to hold public office in America. Conversely, any person who attempts to deny to me, or to anyone else, the right to speak, in order that the people may consider my proposals, as well as the proposals of anyone else, is not fit to live in a democracy. It makes no difference to me how wealthy such a person may be, or what his so-called social position may be, he is a Fascist at heart and unworthy of the democratic society which the blood of Americans, rich and poor, has won for us from Lexington to Okinawa.

Finally, I do know, that as the result of the growth and the development of Russia under her system and as the result of the growth and development of various forms of totalitarianism throughout Europe and Asia, we in America are faced with a competitive system which is attracting the attention of many of the peoples of the earth, as well as that of many of the people of our own country.

I, for one, welcome that competition with Russian thought, for it happens that I believe in competition. (I am not like certain people who cry for free enterprise and competition but at the same time try to stifle freedom of speech, without which there can be no free enterprise). But I also recognize that there are maladjustments in capitalism, as it is operating in America today, which endanger it because they cause it to hold out too little hope for a chance of real participation in the system to 90 percent of our people. We do not have capitalism as Abraham Lincoln defined the standards under which it could survive and prosper. Therefore, we must examine it fundamentally, forthrightly, and therefore radically, and make such changes as this examination demands, if we are to meet the competition which the Russian experiment has thrust upon us.

I further know that Abraham Lincoln is the greatest Republican that the party ever produced, and he is; and if the party is obligated today to be true to the traditions of Lincoln, then I am a better Republican than any conservative Republican who is presently spouting off on the American scene today. I am also a better American and a better friend of capitalism. But in the final analysis, you are the people who will determine this issue, who have to make the decision.

I leave that decision in your hands.

The Postal Pay Raise Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1946

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, the time has come, in my opinion, when the postal employees of America should receive an increase of pay as a matter of sheer justice.

They are entitled to a raise, and by that I do not mean a mere token increase, but an increase that will be substantial and that will cover advances in the costs of living that are so obvious to everybody and that are being felt so keenly in every household. The basis of the sort of increase to which I think they are entitled is a bonus of $500 a year.

I supported the staggering appropriations necessary to win the war, and now, with the war over, I think we may well direct our attention to the correction of major inequities and maladjustments in our economic system. I shall not balk or hesitate for one second to vote for the amount that is necessary to do justice to the faithful postal employees—an amount that is relatively insignificant and a "drop in the bucket" compared with the money we have spent for big guns and battleships.

Today I appeared before the House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads and asked for a favorable report on legislation to provide a pay increase for postal workers. I also filed with the gentleman from Virginia, Chairman BURCH, of the committee, a letter which reads as follows:

FEBRUARY 28, 1946.

Hon. THOMAS G. BURCH,
Chairman, Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BURCH: I am taking this means of expressing to you and the members of your committee my very deep and genuine interest in H. R. 5059, the bill you have introduced to provide additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the postal service.

I commend you cordially for introducing this timely bill and I hope that the prestige of your name and the backing of your great committee will open the way for its speedy enactment.

There is just one change I would like to see made in the bill. I hope that you and the members of your committee may see your way clear to liberalize the provisions of the bill by making the annual bonus $500 instead of $300. I believe the larger amount is none too much to cover the increased costs of living and to place postal workers on the same plane as others who have benefited by current and past salary raises. Only a $500 bonus will be enough to compensate postal employees for the loss of overtime and Saturday pay and to enable them to meet rising living costs. I am sure that an investigation will show that an increase of $500 in postal workers' pay would be in line with increases now being granted in private industry.

As chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee that brings in the annual supply bills for the Post Office Department and the postal service it has been my good fortune to have been brought into close contact during the last 11 years with the postal employees and it is my considered judgment that there is no finer group of workers in the world. In storm and stress and all kinds of weather they are faithful to their task of seeing that the mails are moved. They have been caught between two millstones—the lower millstone of low fixed salaries and the upper millstone of mounting costs of living—and we, the Representatives in Congress of the Nation they serve so well, will fail sadly in our duty if we do not bring relief to them in the form of an increase of pay that will enable them to cope with the soaring costs of the necessities of life. The temporary raise of $300 we gave them last year has been more than wiped out by the loss of overtime and Saturday pay and their take-home pay is less now than it was before that law was passed.

The time is ripe for action in their behalf and I am confident that Congress will rise to its responsibility and pass the bill (H. R. 5059) introduced by the great chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, with an amendment providing that the annual bonus shall be $500. To that end I pledge my very best efforts.

Yours sincerely,

LOUIS LUDLOW.

Building Material Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1946

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following Associated Press release printed in the La Crosse Tribune, February 24, 1946:

RETAIL LUMBERMEN BLAME OPA FOR BUILDING MATERIAL SHORTAGES

The Wisconsin Retail Lumbermen's Association declared in an open letter to President Truman that the OPA "is more to blame for building material shortages than all other factors combined."

The association also sent a letter to the OPA, protesting the agency's absorption policy, as well as "all other impractical regulations which have and will continue to disrupt the even flow of materials for homes and farms."

Wisconsin lumber dealers, the letter to the OPA said, "are on the verge of revolt."

Both communications were drafted by the association's resolutions committee.

The text of the letter to President Truman:

"DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This appeal is addressed to you after mature reflection to demonstrate the principal reason for the existing housing shortage and to offer concrete suggestions for a solution.

"We retail lumber dealers recognize the extreme shortage of building materials which we desire to furnish to homebuilders. We cannot do this until lumber and other building materials are made available.

"We are convinced that the Office of Price Administration is more to blame for material shortage than all other factors combined. OPA's price-control efforts have been unrealistic, showing astonishing ignorance of manufacturing and distribution procedures and appear to be motivated by an effort to socialize American business.

"These efforts have actually created shortages, caused inflationary prices, and have resulted in black-market operations. Thus far efforts to change OPA's attitude or to obtain a reasonable administration of the Price Control Act have been useless, and unless OPA's philosophy can be modified the only alternative is to abolish the OPA.

"This letter is addressed to you by approval of our membership after 3 days of consideration in our fifty-sixth annual meeting.

"Respectfully submitted.

"THE WISCONSIN RETAIL LUMBERMEN'S ASSOCIATION."

Following is the text of the telegram to the OPA:

"After 3 days of mature consideration 583 Wisconsin lumber and building-material dealers attending their fifty-sixth annual meeting unanimously protest the absorption policy now under way.

"During the war they loyally accepted each and every restriction suggested or required by the war necessity. They now protest the new absorption policy and all other impractical regulations which have and will continue to disrupt the even flow of materials for homes and farms.

"They have taken all of the punishment they can and are on the verge of revolt. Frankly, the dealers will not stand for your absorption policy. They have absorbed increased expenses, wages, and reduced margins, and any further effort to load retail dealers with further burdens will result in a demand for the immediate abolition of the OPA.

"They have directed an open letter to President Truman protesting OPA price policies, which are creating shortages of home-building materials, while other governmental agencies attempt to create false impressions in the minds of the public as to the responsibility for the housing shortage.

"We demand that you give serious consideration to the consequences of your present policy before imposing further penalties on these dealers. They are attempting to stay in business as Americans under our constitutional guaranties in order to serve our GI home builders.

"THE WISCONSIN RETAIL LUMBERMEN'S ASSOCIATION."

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech on the British loan delivered by GEORGE E. OUTLAND, Representative from the Eleventh District of California, in New York City on February 27, 1946. Mr. OUTLAND'S speech is the clearest and most comprehensive presentation of the facts relating to the loan that I have read. It follows:

On November 11, 1918, ended the First World War. Our President had described it in terms which meant much to the great mass of the American people; he called it "The war to end all wars; the war to make the world safe for democracy." Twenty-three years later, on December 7, 1941, we found ourselves embarked on a conflict far more terrible and far more costly. Why? Because in the years following 1918 we failed to take the steps which would have prevented the second war. We were anxious to get back to what an American Presidential candidate ungrammatically called "normalcy"; we were tired of the conflicts of the Old World; we desired only to retreat behind the seemingly safe barriers of the Atlantic and the Pacific and live by ourselves. Our Senate flatly refused to permit us to join the international association of nations which had been conceived by our own President; our Congress insisted on a narrow and short-sighted policy of economic nationalism which proved to be equally fatal. Ignorance and isolationism, prejudice and passion, partisanship and provincialism had their way, and surely, although unknowingly, we traveled down the path to World War II.

Now we have been granted that which is seldom given to nations or individuals: a second chance. Once again a great war has been won by American might. Once again the nations of the world are stumblingly and haltingly attempting to find a formula which will prevent future aggression. Our own Nation has been extremely vocal in its advocation of world cooperation and world peace. We have enunciated over and over again our desires for these goals. But peace does not come merely through hoping for it or wishing for it. We must work for it; we must take concrete steps in addition to lending lip service to the ultimate objective. We must give up certain of our cherished traditions and prerogatives; we must not only participate, but we must set examples to the other nations of genuine internationalism.

Basically, these examples fall into two fields—politcal and economic. America's greatest woman will tell us tonight about some of the political aspects, centering as they do, around the United Nations Organization. It will be my task to discuss one limited field of economic cooperation, namely, the proposed loan to Great Britain. Had I the time I would go into the important implications of the Bretton Woods Agreement, the reciprocal trade treaties, and the proposed international trade conference. This evening, however, I must limit myself to this one vitally needed phase of international economic cooperation—our proposed loan to England. It is not fair to consider the vital importance to us, and to the world, of the British loan, without taking into consideration the whole problem of world trade and its relationship to world peace. In a world where distance has ceased to be important, where blitzkriegs are already out of date, and where the atom is deified, everybody knows we must have peace. We'll have peace or we'll have the end of the world.

I know this concept of an atomic world is almost beyond the threshhold of our comprehension. But we must grasp its true significance or perish. The scientists have discovered the atom bomb; they have proven their theory of matter for they have now harnessed the potential energy inside the atom. We are entering a new scientific era. We simply cannot have another war and survive.

The British loan is one of the steps necessary to prevent economic blocs in which the seeds sown by vicious trade practices might germinate and produce the atom genie which would destroy us all. The British loan is necessary, absolutely necessary to us, as well as to Britain, and to the rest of the world. For it would mark the beginning of the regeneration of British export trade and the free flow of goods throughout the world, and be the prelude which is vital to the success of the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and the International Trade Organization. Those are prosaic titles and musty phrases, but the meaning of those words is neither prosaic nor musty. The meaning of those words is peace, and peace is certainly not prosaic.

Secretary of the Treasury Fred Vinson made a plain and simple statement of fact on January 9. I want to repeat it for all of us. They are monumental words:

"After the last war we had an opportunity to build a world in which our countries could work together in peace and prosperity. We muffed that opportunity. International economic relations were allowed to break down. Instead of economic cooperation, the world resorted to economic warfare. Instead of economic statesmanship, countries resorted to exchange depreciation, exchange controls, trade restrictions, bilateral clearing arrangements and similar measures."

We can't afford to muff our opportunity again. The atom genie is right outside the door, just waiting for a chance. If he gets his chance there might not be any Secretary of the Treasury, or a secretary of anything, for that matter, to say in 1989, "After the last war back in 1946 we had an opportunity to build a world in which our countries could work together in peace and prosperity. We muffed that opportunity."

Just what is this opportunity? What does it mean in terms of the British loan? Why is the British loan as necessary to the iron workers in Indiana as it is to the coal miner in a British colliery?

The answers to those queries are neither long nor complicated. These answers are contained in one phrase: international economic cooperation. As you know, war made a slave of Britain, an economic slave. In order to mobilize, Britain imposed trade restrictions and currency restrictions. These were necessary because Britain, at war since 1939, needed foreign exchange. Foreign exchange, in a complicated economic world, is oxygen to the British, because it is a country which has to import food and raw material in order to survive. In normal times the British export many things and they were able to pay

for their imports as they went along. British exports, her foreign investments, and her shipping and other services, which produced tremendous income for her during peacetime, took a tremendous beating during the war. The factories which produced for the export market converted to the production of war implements and much of the British foreign investments, which had been the lifeblood of the British commercial system all over the globe, were sold. They were sold to provide foreign exchange to pay for the imports which were necessary to British war production. And, a substantial part of her great merchant marine, which moved a large part of world trade from international market to international market before the war, went down before German U-boats and Japanese torpedoes. Britain's foreign debts mushroomed because her exports and services, which would normally have paid for her imports, were curtailed and her factories turned to the making of tanks and guns and planes to replace those which it was no longer possible to import at any price.

And while the British were making these commercial sacrifices they made other sacrifices, which we all should understand. For 6 years the British had no eggs, little meat, practically no gasoline, and everybody worked long and arduous hours—even the old men and women. I was in London during the robot bombings. I saw the pinched faces of thousands of small children driven to sleeping in the subways because their homes were totally destroyed. And as I think back on both their sufferings and their courage, a feeling of shame comes over me when I hear some people complain that they are not going to be able to get all the white bread they want. All of us sat by our radios in 1940 and 1941 listening to Winston Churchill, when his spiritual inspiration to the British and free people everywhere seemed to be the only bar between Hitler and world conquest. By converting its resources, by selling its foreign investments and fighting off Hitler alone for nearly a year Britain bought time, time for the United States and Russia to ready themselves for inevitable conflict. And the price they paid, besides the fallen British soldiers on Crete, in Thailand, in Java, and at Dunkirk, and the fallen civilians in London, Coventry, and many other cities, was that they became economic slaves.

Let me explain it in a little more detail.

During the war England's export industries were converted to war production or shut down. In 1944 she exported only 30 percent as much as 1938. War forced the British to sell $4.500,000,000 in foreign investments, and they lost forever the foreign exchange income which the investments produced. The British used the proceeds to buy goods from us and the other countries. Britain incurred, besides this, $13,000,000,000 in foreign debts. It is in this position that we find England today, needing dollars or currencies convertible into dollars in order to rebuild the British Isles, devastated by bombs, and to rebuild her trade. Her alternative is a series of stifling bilateral agreements with many countries which would form an unquestioned economic bloc strangling the revival of extensive world trade so necessary to world peace.

Knowing all this the British and United States got together and worked night and day for 3 months. They worked out what is known as the financial agreement between the two governments. This agreement is simple enough. We extend to the United Kingdom a line of credit of $3,750,000,000 which can be drawn upon until December 31, 1951. In return, the United Kingdom will end a series of wartime financial and commercial restrictions and practices which have the effect of discriminating against American trade and reducing the flow of world trade, so essential to peace. The Congress must first authorize our Government to extend this line of credit. When the House and Senate authorize it, we send a note to England to go ahead and draw on the funds, and we are then on our way toward a revival of world trade that should bring a better standard of living to Uncle Sam, to John Bull, to the entire world.

Does England need this money? She simply must have it. If the English are to import the food and raw materials essential to their economy, and to provide themselves with the exports by which they will pay for further imports, they must have this emergency credit in order to do it. The English will use this money to buy goods and services in the United States with which to revive their commercial life, and by means of which they can undertake multilateral world trade—not bilateral trade, with specific countries—but multilateral trade, one of the keys to world peace. And remember, under the agreement the English cannot use the credit to pay off the debts they owe to other countries. Nor will the British use it to nationalize their big industries. It will be used only to buy vital imports until Britain can catch her economic breath once more.

At this point somebody always wants to know where we are going to get $3,750,000,000. Well, let's face the facts. Our Government will have to borrow the money from the American taxpayer, and that money will be transferred to an account from which the British will draw, from time to time, until December 31, 1951. They won't draw it all at once, nor will they necessarily draw all of it. In return for this loan, we will receive the principal of $3,750,000,000 and about $2,500,000,000 in interest, so the net result is that this loan should not cost the taxpayers of this country a dime. But let me make this clear: it would be a good investment for America in terms of long-range peace and security even if we should lose some part or even all of the money, for without British trade revival there will be economic sores festering continually, awaiting for the infectious germ of world depression to start the atom plague. Beginning in 1952 the British will pay us back $140,000,000 a year in interest and principal. The interest rate is 2 percent. This repayment sum will not only take care of the projected line of credit, but also the payment by the British for the surplus and lend-lease property they have bought. If, in a given year, world economic conditions are in such a state that to make the British pay the interest would be harmful to the United States, Britain, and the whole world, the interest may be waived. But we still get the principal, and we still have some economic security, and we have removed one of the basic threats to world peace, which I consider all important.

The next question that comes from the pondering American public is, why don't the British borrow from somebody besides us. England has already borrowed from others; England has accumulated $13,000,000,000 in debts during the war. This very minute the clerks in London are adding up new sterling accumulations, new debts for raw materials, and services pouring into war-torn England. Those clerks will be busy for several months, if not years, doing the same thing, adding, adding, and adding, while the English industrial machines retool for production of exports which will eventually pay her debts.

Well, says John Q. Public, I should think that the English would quit spending so much money when they can't pay for the things they are buying. They have. Why do you think the British are still on an austere wartime rationing system? Why can't they have eggs for breakfast, unlimited gasoline? Why? Because those things cost money and the British are prepared to do without everything they can until their industries reconvert, and until their exports rise to a level which will enable the British to take their place in a world cooperative scheme of multilateral trade agreements, which will ensure us economic prosperity all over the world, and not just in England, or in the United States, or in Moscow. The scheme of world trade is so inextricably bound together by full production everywhere and free exchange of goods that it will fail completely if one of the main trading nations of the world is forced to curtail its activity.

If I sound a little technical on some of these points, it is not because of any desire to confuse, or to veil the real issues. I want to reiterate that the real issue is peace, and that these somewhat musty explanations of trade and finance and of the British position are made with one thought in mind—peace and the expansion of United States trade and United States prosperity, with the attendant economic revival and prosperity of not only countries and continents but the world. Peace without salutary economics is a time bomb, ticking away in the economic trenches, waiting to blow up. Only this time it's an atom time bomb, and when it goes off there won't be any more time bombs. There won't be any more time, for that matter. It will have run out.

But if we keep our heads about this affair, and realize what it means to the United States in terms of prosperity, as well as what it means to the rest of the people on this planet in terms of potential peace, we won't have to worry about time bombs or atom bombs. For the United States, as a result of the British loan, or more correctly, the British line of credit, will move ahead into a greater world market than ever before. Today the entire world wants to buy from us, and we haven't even supplied our domestic market yet.

Unless the British line of credit is authorized by Congress we will suffer a great loss in world markets. We will lose the great potential market which economists refer to as the sterling area. Practically every country in the British Empire, Canada and Newfoundland excepted, is part of the sterling area. Besides the Empire, the sterling area includes Egypt, Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, Iraq, and Iceland. In those countries—or the sterling area, as the economists prefer to call it—the British have built up huge debts of British sterling. Those countries supplied the British with vital raw materials and war imports throughout the war. All the British Isles could give in return was their word that they would pay. They gave credit in British sterling. England had to limit the use of those sterling credits during the war. Those credits, for the most part, were not convertible into dollars. The English were justified in restricting the flow of sterling during the war. They had to. Otherwise their debts to one nation would have been preponderantly greater than to all the others. Today, this very minute, the billions in sterling credit which the English built up throughout the war in the sterling area are not convertible into dollars, and won't be, unless the British line of credit is extended by our Government. We will lose the tremendous world market there, and we will see the continuance of the sterling area, which in peacetime is an economic fester stretching round the world. The British have agreed to restore the convertibility of these sterling credits to dollars if we loan them money. When those sterling credits become convertible into dollars, and into other important foreign exchanges such as the Swiss franc and the Swedish kroner and the Dutch guilders, all of which must move freely in a world of international economic cooperation,

they will become customers of American industry. When the sterling area countries are able to convert their sterling balances over a period of years into American dollars they will be able to buy American production for many, many years after the domestic market has been surfeited here in the United States. This continuing demand will be vital to us, and will keep the wheels turning here as well as in India, China, Britain, Russia, France, and everywhere. Without it, our dreams of domestic full employment is impossible of realization. If one wheel stops it is only a matter of time until they all stop. And the next step is war, for the shooting war always follows an economic war. It always has, and it always will. So we must stop the economic war before it starts, and one of the initial steps—by all means not the only one—is to extend this line of credit to the British.

And when we do the British will assume their obligation of membership in the International Monetary Fund and the International Trade Organization, which will serve only the purpose of facilitating the growth of balanced world trade. England will settle her accounts—her blocked sterling balances—by the spinning wheels in her own factories and by her own resources.

Some Americans fear that this loan to England will be but the forerunner of similar loans to all the other countries of the world. I am firmly convinced that these fears are groundless. I am convinced that through mechanisms already established, such as the Bretton Woods Bank and Fund and the Export-Import Bank, the financial difficulties of other nations will be met. I do believe, however, that it is at least as important to spend for peace as it is to spend for wars.

This $3,750,000,000 loan to England is equivalent to just 2 weeks of war. That's exactly what we were spending every 2 weeks toward the end of the war. Secretary of the Treasury Vinson said, on January 9, that "this is not an expenditure, but an investment. It is sound business for America." I agree thoroughly. "This is not an expenditure, but an investment."

It's not an investment in terms of money or profit or interest or capital gain. It is an investment in world security, it is an investment in insurance, world insurance against the relentless borrowing economic virus which in the atom age not only means war, but destruction.

Ladies and gentlemen, this investment will not be made without a struggle. The forces opposed to genuine international cooperation are still active and becoming more active daily. Ignorance and isolationism, prejudice and passion, partisanship and provincialism are attempting to lead us down the same path which they led us in 1919. The Chicago Tribune, the New York News, Mr. Hearst, and the entire wrecking crew are mustering their forces against this proposed loan. Their opposition will be formidable; it will be difficult enough to beat them without encountering the additional opposition of forces which normally would be helping the cause. Let us not be led into irrelevant objections. Let us not fight this loan because we do not approve of Britain's policy in Palestine or India or the Malay Peninsula. I do not approve of these policies either, but I ask you in all frankness, what in heaven's name is the relationship between those policies and a loan which is to be made primarily in our own self-interests and the interests of world peace. As the American Farm Bureau has so well pointed out, these loans are in the long-time interests of our own Nation; it is sheer selfishness, if you please, combined with the contribution which is being made to international economic peace.

For my part, I shall work for this loan with all my heart, both on the Banking and Currency Committee of which I am a member, and on the floor of the House of Representatives. I would not like to think that generations from now future Americans would say, "That man was one who helped cause this atomic war; he claimed to believe in international cooperation, but he failed to work for legislation which would help to prevent it." In the name of all that we hold sacred, in the name of civilization itself, I trust that this time the American Nation, through its Congress, will not muff the ball; I hope we shall all have the farsightedness and the courage and the intelligence to take those steps to implement the ideals about which we are always talking. If so, then our children will rise up and call us blessed; if not, the prospects of an advancing civilization are dim indeed.

The Filipino Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARLOS P. ROMULO

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER OF THE PHILIPPINES TO THE UNITED STATES

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1946

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD a communication received from the Filipino—USAFFE—Disabled Veteran Association, which I wish to bring to the attention of my distinguished colleagues in this House. My speech on the floor today is a plea for these veterans and their comrades who fought so heroically for the American flag. The communication follows:

FILIPINO (USAFFE) DISABLED
VETERAN ASSOCIATION,
Manila, P. I., February 11, 1946.

Brig. Gen. CARLOS P. ROMULO,
Resident Commissioner to the
United States, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GENERAL ROMULO: We who are permanently and totally disabled veterans of Bataan and Corregidor (PA-USAFFE) hereby respectfully request your helping hand in fighting for the cause of your less fortunate countrymen who bore the brunt of war and suffered miserably in defending America's flag in this part of the world.

While the service of the Philippine Army after its formal induction into the services of the United States armed forces in the Far East at the outbreak of the war is not considered service in the United States Army according to the military order of the President of the United States dated July 20, 1941, it cannot be denied that in the fields of Bataan and Corregidor the Filipinos made supreme sacrifices to defend the honor and prestige of America in a war she had declared against Japan.

Furthermore, our induction was never requested by us, for we could have rallied under America's colors to prove our loyalty without such formal process; but, the War Department under whose authority our induction was made had convinced us further of America's sense of fairness in treating us as equal in the fields of battle. Therefore any attempt to exclude us from any benefit, however limited, due other members of the United States forces who fought with us will be unjust and unfair.

While America has made in glowing terms her praises of the heroism of the men who fought and bled for her cause, she has forgotten her promises to us now that everything is over. To shirk from the moral responsibility and obligation to provide help to us now that we are deprived of every opportunity to earn a decent living is indeed against all the very principles for which America involved us in fighting this war.

Pursuant to the provisions of the military order of the President of the United States dated July 20, 1941, exception in the payment of benefits is made only in case of disability or death subject to the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration. Excluded from all other privileges, rights, and benefits conferred upon members of the armed forces of the United States with whom we fought, sacrificed, and died side by side against the enemy in the fields of Bataan and Corregidor, a legislative proviso was made recently to provide 50-percent benefit—the rate of pension proposed being a peso for every dollar any other United States Army veteran gets.

We wish to voice our sentiments against such legislation of the United States Congress through you. Such discriminatory provision certainly violates basic human principles for our disability contracted on the same fields of battle, is now, by virtue of such legislative provision, judged under different standards and criteria from the other members of the United States armed forces while it is evident that we underwent the same hazards, dangers, exposures to death, sacrifices, and sufferings.

Among those who joined and rallied under American colors, the plight of the disabled veterans is the most miserable one. To us, the future lies ahead dark and gloomy. For all that we have had during the years of patient accumulation when we were physically fit, making little fortunes and future for our loved ones, are now gone—our homes, our property, and every little thing dear to us were either confiscated by the enemy, burned, or devastated, not to mention the deprivations, suffering, and torture done to us for remaining loyal to the United States, to whom we owe allegiance. Now that every vestige of our economy is disrupted, making the cost of living very high; now that we find ourselves helpless and deprived of the power and ability to earn a decent living to provide for our children; now that we are total victims of war and destruction, what else is in store for us? What else can we do but to appeal to America's sense of justice and humanity? Undoubtedly, we feel that the 50-percent payment of benefits to the less fortunate crippled veterans of Bataan and Corregidor defeats the very spirit and purpose of America's act of rewarding their sacrifices.

We believe that this is only due to the lack of a more considerate understanding of the situation. We believe further that a more generous act on the part of the American Congress in the matter of payment of benefits to men who bore miserably the brunt of war and who unhesitatingly made heroic sacrifices to uphold the honor of the flag of the United States in this part of the Pacific can be considered the best example of American altruism and generosity to those who were willing to give their lives for the cause of freedom and democracy.

We therefore humbly solicit your helping hand to enable us to enjoy the full measure of America's act of generosity which the people of our country and the people of the world shall acclaim as an expression of America's spirit of justice and equality.

Trusting that you will not fail lending us your helping hand in this matter, and reiterating our confidence and faith in your ability and courage in fighting for our cause before the American people, we remain

Very respectfully yours,
Lt. JUSTO CONDES,
Chairman.
Lt. FLAVIO CERVANTES,
Vice Chairman.
Sgt. ADRIANO S. OLIVAR, Jr.,
Secretary.

Peron Defeat May Get United States Out of Unhappy Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Chicago Sun of February 27, 1946:

PERON DEFEAT MAY GET UNITED STATES OUT OF UNHAPPY SITUATION

(By Sumner Welles, former Under Secretary of State)

These reflections are written before the announcement of the outcome of the Argentine national elections.

If Jose P. Tamborini, the presidential candidate of the Democratic Alliance, is elected, the Argentine people will return to the form of democratic government which they maintained for many decades prior to the first revolt of the Argentine Army in 1930.

Dr. Tamborini's election also would result in the renewal of nominal relations with the United States and Argentina. His election would save the United States from a critical and dangerous embarrassment.

But no matter what the outcome of the elections may be, the State Department's recent action will arouse suspicion and hostility toward the United States throughout Latin America for a long time to come.

In The Time for Decision, I wrote 2 years ago:

"The people in this country who have so vehemently urged this Government to adopt a policy of coercion, or at least of retaliation toward Argentina, are advocating a course which will have completely opposite results from those they seek.

"Not only do the basic principles of existing inter-American agreements and the good-neighbor policy itself preclude an attempt on the part of any American nation to dictate the policy of another, but also any such attempt will provoke a reaction upon the part of the Argentine people which may well create a permanent rupture.

"Such measures could do incalculable damage to the interests of the Western Hemisphere during the uncertain years which lie ahead. If we believe in the efficacy of democratic principles and in the ultimate power of public opinion, then we must permit the Argentine people to determine their own destinies for themselves."

The State Department's blue book was made public 2 weeks before the Argentine national elections. It obviously was intended to influence their outcome. It will be widely interpreted as intervention in the sovereign concerns of the Argentine people.

One can imagine what the reaction here would be should some major power, such as the Soviet Union, publish an official document assailing the highest authorities of the Government of the United States and a Presidential candidate immediately prior to national elections in this country.

The document was published by the Department of State without prior consultation with the governments of the other American republics, as is required by existing inter-American agreements.

The communication of the document to the ambassadors of the other American republics barely 24 hours before its publication does not constitute even the semblance of consultation. The action taken by this Government was purely unilateral.

The State Department persists in its fatuous insistence that the legitimate grievances of all of the peoples of the Americas against the present Argentine dictatorship warrant the prosecution of a bitter and exclusive feud between Argentina and the United States.

It is incapable of understanding that what is required is a joint effort on the part of all of the American governments patiently and constructively to cure the deep-seated political, social, and economic evils which enable such demagogues as Col. Juan D. Peron to gain wide popular support.

There is no statesman of the Americas who is a better democrat, nor a truer friend of the United States, than Dr. Oswaldo Aranha, former foreign minister of Brazil. Dr. Aranha informed the press on February 14:

"I can assure you that the State Department has hurled a bomb with its blue book, without previously informing the Brazilian foreign office, which was taken by surprise."

The charges contained in the blue book have been known to the Government for a considerable period. Had the Department of State desired to strengthen the inter-American system, rather than pursue its unilateral campaign against the present Argentine regime, it would have communicated these charges to the governments of the other American Republics for the purpose of official consultation and of joint action long before the commencement of the electoral campaign in Argentina.

Evidences of the success of interventionist propaganda that the United States should disregard the sovereign rights of weaker peoples whenever it sees fit are accumulating. They even are apparent in a recent report of the Foreign Policy Association, where such statements as these are made:

"The United States must face the fact that as the great American power it has responsibilities to the inter-American system that go beyond those of the other nations. * * * While it has on various occasions spoken out strongly * * * it has not yet been able to follow up its strong language by action."

Such statements mean that the United States should revert to the fatal policy of the first quarter of the present century, when this country continually intervened, and frequently by armed force, in the other independent Republics of the Americas.

That course would destroy the foundations upon which the good-neighbor policy and the inter-American system rest; recognition of the sovereign equality of all the American states; respect for the independence of all of the peoples of the Americas, and full cooperation in all questions which affect the peace, security, and welfare of the New World.

The ideology and the practices of the Perons and of their followers undoubtedly represent a major danger to the well-being of the New World.

But there is scarcely a thinking Latin American outside of the ranks of the interventionist propagandists who will not insist that United States policy has done far more to increase that danger than to dissipate it.

There is no valid distinction which can be drawn between our recent policy and imperialism.

It is the same policy as that recently followed by the Soviet Union in eastern Europe and in the Balkans. It is a policy which asserts the right of a major power, solely because of its strength, to dictate the political determination of its weaker neighbors.

It can end only in the destruction of the sovereign liberties of smaller states. It is tantamount to the proclamation by the United States of a sphere of influence within the New World.

The Case Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL VINSON
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 1946

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, the Nation is fed up on strikes. The people are tired of labor-management disputes. Because of these disputes today the Government has had to operate oil refineries, meat-packing plants, tugboats in the New York Harbor, and various other businesses. The reconversion program has been slowed down by the steel strike and by the unsettled General Motors strike.

These conditions have led to congressional action. In an effort to remedy the labor-management disputes, the House, on February 7, passed what is known as the Case bill by a majority vote of 258 to 155. The underlying principles of that bill are to preserve and protect the right of collective bargaining and at the same time to insure that labor disputes affecting the public interest should be settled fairly and, so far as possible, without interruption or delay in the production and distribution necessary to the public interest.

The most pertinent provisions of the Case bill are:

First. The creation of a permanent Labor-Management Mediation Board, vested with jurisdiction to settle disputes by conciliation, mediation, and voluntary arbitration;

Second. This Board is given the power to outlaw strikes called during a 30-day period for peaceful settlement efforts and to require the maintenance of status quo;

Third. The Board is vested with the right to go into Federal court for injunctions, if necessary, to maintain conditions unchanged through the period;

Fourth. Mutual responsibility is fixed, making collective-bargaining contracts equally binding upon management and labor;

Fifth. Unions and employers alike will be liable to damage suits in the courts if contracts are violated;

Sixth. Violence or threats of violence and intimidations by either party to a dispute will be outlawed—district courts being granted specific authority to enjoin violent picketing and threats of violence, and organized boycotts being specifically outlawed; and

Seventh. Union organization of foremen or supervisory employees will be banned unless such employees performed manual work.

Too often has the public interest been flaunted by both parties—labor and management—for their selfish gain. This must be stopped. That is exactly what the Case bill proposes to do.

The role of the Government under the Case bill is no less the guardian of the general welfare than of individual freedom. Rightfully, legislation has heretofore been enacted to guarantee the

right of collective bargaining, but such right should not be permitted to be exercised to the detriment of the interest and the rights of the general public. Parties to a contract, whether they be labor or management, must be made to respect and comply with such contracts. The use of force, violence, and compulsion violate our sacred principles of freedom and self-government. It was with the deepest conviction of these principles that the House passed the Case bill.

Mr. Speaker, I received the following letter from the president of the Georgia Farm Bureau Federation, which is most pertinent and self-explanatory:

MACON, GA., *February 21, 1946.*

Hon. CARL VINSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN VINSON: I am taking this opportunity to thank you in behalf of the farmers of Georgia for your able support and vote on the Case bill.

We have felt for a long time that labor should have some responsibilities as well as industry and agriculture. The fact that they have been allowed to strike, boycott, and actually destroy property without any responsibility has been very much disturbing to other groups.

I was very much pleased to note that the entire Georgia delegation supported and voted for the bill. It will be a pleasure to pass this information on to the farmers.

Thanking you again for your support in behalf of this legislation, I am,

Sincerely yours,

H. L. WINGATE,
President.

Veterans' Priority in Purchase of Army Surplus Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL STEWART
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1946

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

ARDMORE, OKLA., *February 15, 1946.*

Hon. PAUL STEWART,
United States Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In support of the movement for new legislation to improve the priority standing of veterans in acquiring Army surplus property, I would like to state my experiences in trying to purchase some heavy construction equipment through the Smaller War Plants Corporation and the War Assets Corporation.

Since being released from the Army, as indicated by my letterhead, I have been engaged in the construction business. What little equipment I now have, I have secured from dealers directly, but as you well know, dealers are unable to supply very much in the way of equipment.

I have been certified by the Smaller War Plants Corporation since July 1945, but as yet, have been offered only two units of equipment, that were absolutely worn out. After driving 400 miles to Austin, Tex., to inspect a caterpillar tractor, model D-7, with bulldozer, hydraulic controlled, priced at $7,812, I found that this piece of equipment was completely worn out. The original price of this piece of equipment from a dealer was $8,200, being only $388 more than the Reconstruction Finance Corporation's price. Judging from the small difference in price, I supposed that the machinery was new or practically new. After making an 800-mile round trip, I found that this equipment had been used some 2,800 hours and was very much abused.

The other piece of equipment offered me was a model LS, 8-yard, LeTourneau scraper, which was listed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at $5,200 with tires in fair condition. I did not bother to make the trip to Camp Claiborne, La., to inspect this piece of equipment as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation's list price was $700 more than the original cost of this model scraper.

A few days ago I was at Camp Gruber, Okla., and while there found several new caterpillar tractors, model D-7, equipped with cable-controlled bulldozers, three model D-6 caterpillar tractors equipped with hydraulic-controlled bulldozers and with Hyster winches mounted on rear, also various other makes and models, all new. I was informed that all of this equipment had been declared surplus by the Army and turned over to the War Assets Corporation for disposal. At that time I had with me a Smaller War Plants Corporation form No. 63, which has been certified and is supposed to entitle me to purchase three model D-6 caterpillar tractors equipped with hydraulic bulldozers. I was told by the surplus property officer at Camp Gruber that this equipment would have to be purchased through the Veterans Surplus Property Office of the War Assets Corporation, Fort Worth, Tex. I then made a trip to Fort Worth and was told at the Veterans Surplus Property Office that there was no way for me to purchase any of this equipment as it had not been listed with them and that they didn't know if and when it would be listed with them. I had the serial numbers from seven of these tractors and was also informed that there was no way to trace the listings and prices of these tractors through their serial numbers.

I have been out considerable expense and loss of business by not having sufficient equipment. I have made several trips to Oklahoma City and to Fort Worth and have been unable to accomplish anything. I am beginning to believe that none of the Army surplus equipment that is usable will ever become available to veterans unless there is some change made in the system now used in the disposing of this property.

I would appreciate any assistance you may be able to render on this matter.

Yours very truly,

HOYT E. KIRBY.

Inflation for the Veteran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1946

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following letter from Michael J. Holajter, Jr., of 4904 Grasselli Avenue, East Chicago, Ind., a returned veteran, echoes thoughts that are in the minds of the great majority of the boys who fought in World War II.

In my remarks Tuesday on the pending Patman housing bill, H. R. 4761, I stated that the average veteran could not pay over five or possibly six thousand dollars for a home.

As set out in Mr. Holajter's letter, profiteering is not solely confined to the sale of dwellings, but unless drastic measures are taken, every necessary item will become embroiled in an inflationary tailspin:

EAST CHICAGO, IND.,
February 25, 1946.

Congressman RAY J. MADDEN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MADDEN: With conditions as they are I do not know which is the worst—being in service or being a civilian again.

I have been out of the service since November 1945 and find that the ones who are hard hit are the servicemen.

It is beyond me to see a 1941 four-door Dodge sedan with radio and heater selling today for $1,225. This as you know is within the OPA ceiling price. I, myself, had a car of this very make and only paid $1,129 with radio and heater early in 1941. In early 1942, at which time I was inducted into the service, I was forced to sell my car for $750 and which car was less than a year old. This I do not see even though the cost of living has gone up considerably since 1941.

The same goes for a home. For the past 2 months I have tried to purchase a home for my family and find that I have to pay $9,000 for a house that probably only cost $5,000 to build 5 years ago.

It is my opinion that the cost of such items that are at least 5 years old or better should be based on the cost it actually cost to build, minus wear and tear, and not in accordance with the cost of building today. These were built before the prices went up and should be priced accordingly. Why should we pay such prices when it did not cost that much to build in the first place. Are we supposed to pay for the cost of upkeep and operation that was incurred by the seller for the last 5 years and which he had good use of?

Everybody is out selling their cars and homes today because they know they can get the price for them. Let's stop this racketeering and give us fellows a fair chance to get back on our feet.

It is easy for young couples whose husbands were not in the service and who had the opportunity to buy a home or car when the prices were down to say, "We have only been married 3 years and we already have a home and car of our own." I, too, could have had a home today had I not been inducted into the service. I am not sorry I served my country but would like a fair chance to make ends meet.

I, like many others, am in favor of the OPA continuing on, at least until June 1947, and trust that something will be done soon in regard to these high prices.

Respectfully yours,

MICHAEL J. HOLAJTER, JR.

Mob Law, 1945

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1946

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent of the House, I present for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very thoughtful editorial which appeared in the Washington Post re-

cently entitled "Mob Law, 1945," as follows:

MOB LAW, 1945

It is a commentary upon American "mores" that one is tempted to point with pride to the fact that only one person was lynched in the United States during the year 1945. The record is better than it has been in any recent year, far better than it was a decade ago or throughout the first quarter of this century. Two persons were murdered by mobs in 1944, three in 1943, five in 1942. But in 1935, lynch law took the lives of 20 human beings; the toll in 1920 was 61, while in 1901 it was as high as 130. These grim statistics give some ground, then, for hoping that Americans have come to entertain a higher respect for the laws they themselves fashion and for the system of justice under which they live.

Unhappily, statistics do not tell the whole story. It is sometimes difficult to distinguish between the brutal action of a mob in shooting, hanging, or burning a prisoner taken from the hands of law-enforcement officers and the murder of an accused or suspected individual by three or four men who have chosen to take the law into their own hands. There have been killings in the course of the past year, and in other years as well, which might very well have been cataloged as lynchings. For they represented, if in somewhat less atrocious form than the behavior of an insensate mob, the same sort of disregard for the regular processes of justice which is one of the ugly aspects of lynching as it is narrowly defined.

We have no record, moreover, of how largely the threat of lynching has been used to intimidate and repress Negroes in our Southern States, where this kind of violence has become a tradition. It is impossible to estimate the extent to which even courts of law have yielded to mob sentiment as a means of averting mob action. The best that can be said is that there has been a heartening decline in what Dr. Guy Johnson, executive director of the Southern Regional Council, has called "the old-style mob lynching," and a growing abhorrence for this sort of lawlessness among the officials and the decent citizenry throughout the South.

We shall need to stand vigilantly on guard against any return to lynch law in the transition period from war to peace. With the return of Negro soldiers to their homes, there may be a dangerous tendency to implement prejudice with violence. Economic dislocations exacerbate racial tensions and foment mob hysteria. The comparatively good record of 1945 affords no occasion for complacency. Lynching has not yet been altogether uprooted from our way of life. Its existence even as a threat is a stain upon our society.

Post Office Workers' Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 1946

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the House Post Office and Post Roads Committee opened hearings this morning on H. R. 5059, known as the Mead-Burch bill, providing for a raise for the postal employees of the Nation. I appeared before this committee and urged a $500-per-year increase.

The salary of the postal workers of America has not kept pace with the rising cost of living during the last 25 years. Great numbers of their personnel served in the armed forces of the United States during World War II and the added labors of the increased mail load during the war was carried on by an insufficient postal personnel during the late emergency.

The following editorial in this morning's Times-Herald is timely and contains a valuable message to the Members of Congress that immediate and favorable action should be taken on H. R. 5059:

POST OFFICE WORKERS' PAY

The Post Office employees are among the best and most efficient of our numerous Federal civil service workers, barring an occasional officious little sourpuss behind some Post Office wicket; and they are among the worst paid.

Their salaries never were princely. During the depression they took various fancy pay cuts, the deepest of which was 27½ percent, and it was not until the end of 1934 that their salaries got back to the 1925 levels.

THEY DESERVE A PAY RAISE

Since 1934 wages in most industries have been on the upgrade, and a widespread 15 percent boost was granted by the Little Steel formula in 1941. In the period 1925–43 the postal workers managed to obtain an increase in take-home pay totaling only $1.69 per week. Withholding taxes and retirement deductions are now eating seriously into their salaries, while the cost of living keeps going up.

Bills to raise postal salaries by $300 a year on a temporary basis have been introduced in Congress by Senator JAMES M. MEAD (Democrat, New York) and Representative THOMAS G. BURCH (Democrat, Virginia). The postal workers would like to raise the figure to $500.

Certainly it seems to us that in this period of rising living costs and rising wages in private industry these public employees deserve some increase in pay—and that Congress ought to take early and favorable action on their request for an adequate raise.

The Housing Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 1946

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of February 26, 1946:

CONCENTRATE ON HOUSING

There is not enough being done in this country about the housing scarcity. It is not only a matter for the Federal Government, but for every State and local government where living quarters are woefully short. Like many another problem this one can be licked if we set out to lick it.

Some weeks ago the administration in Washington authorized an announcement that a movement would be launched to provide housing. The plan is in charge of a Mr. Wilson Wyatt. The goal is 2,700,000 homes. But nothing was said as to how this could be done. The contribution is merely one of lip service.

Homes should have priority. Factories, schools, churches, office buildings, and others of that kind can wait. There should be concentration on housing. Take lumber. If we cannot get it from our own mills, let us import it. What are all the cargo ships we built during the war doing? Turn them into lumber ships.

Is labor the bottleneck? Then let us induce young men to get into the building trades. Let us get the unions to cut the apprentice period in two. Let us appeal to their patriotism. Every young serviceman should have a place to live. We owe those boys a tremendous amount of service. They rendered a tremendous amount to us.

There is no sleight-of-hand in making bricks. There is no heavy investment in brick-making plants. It is purely a matter of preparing material, molding, and burning it.

Take plumbing. Let us simplify plumbing. Let us standardize toilets, wash stands, and bath tubs. Let us cut out frills.

There is plenty of glass. There should be plenty of plaster. There is not much to roofing and spouting. Small steam or electric shovels can dig cellars in no time. Tile or cement blocks will furnish good foundations. Sewer and water connections are simple operations.

Let the large industries turn loose all the carpenters, bricklayers, and other builders they can spare so they can go to work on houses.

When we read of spending seven or eight thousand dollars for a six-room frame house it gives us a pain. Under present conditions such prices may be justified, but present conditions are simply atrocious.

During the war we managed to secure mass production of ships, planes, guns, shells, and other material. Why cannot we engage in mass production of homes? Where are our industrial brains? Where is our fighting spirit? Let us smash the log jams and the bottlenecks.

Some of the fellows who are sitting pretty in these days of shortages will kick. Let them kick and be hanged. There is a big job to be done. There are millions of young married couples without homes. They are living with their parents or other relatives. Many of them have babies to care for. Many of them are living under conditions which are positively distressing.

In a country like America this housing matter is a disgrace. We can build automobiles, refrigerators, washing machines, etc., in great quantity. Then why in the name of all that is holy cannot we build homes for the men who fought for us in Europe and the Pacific; who went through hell for us over there?

It is a community, State, and Federal responsibility that will not be discharged by honeyed words from politicians who, as a rule, do not give a hang for anybody except themselves.

A Remedy for Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Henry W. McLaughlin, director of country, church, and Sunday-school extension of the Presbyterian Church in the United States:

Strikes are becoming a national menace. The welfare of the entire consuming public

is being threatened. They are, therefore, a matter of public concern. The conflict between the two contending groups needs to be looked into by eyes that have not been blinded by prejudice either against capital or labor. Strikes are caused mainly because labor feels that it does not get a just share of the wealth it produces. And management is irritated by the fact that labor seems to try to get as much as it can for services as small as possible.

The remedy, we believe, lies in the adoption of measures that will make the best interests of both groups more nearly identical. Each faction should be made to see things from the other's point of view.

INSIDE THE CAR

When automobiles first began to be used, a friend of our family was prejudiced against the owners of cars. She asserted they deliberately tried to frighten horses with these new "inventions of the devil." She had a horse and buggy view of the matter. I had just gotten a new car. I valued her good will and friendship. So I asked my wife to invite the lady to take a ride. She enjoyed it immensely. Whenever we approached a horse that shied at the car, she laughed and said, "Now I see it from the inside of the car." It was not very long until she had one of her own.

In Great Britain labor unions in their beginning were largely recruited from the members of the Christian churches, and have continued to be dominated largely by altruistic motives. There is a better understanding between labor and capital than here in America. The two groups seem to work harmoniously, each sharing a definite responsibility in increasing the efficiency and larger productivity of commodities. That kind of teamwork and cooperation seems to be lacking in America. Only where there is such cooperation and teamwork can bargaining between the two groups settle their difficulties. Bargaining to be successful must be between friends, not enemies. Otherwise, it becomes bickering, and bickering settles nothing. When we read in the newspapers that a strike has been settled, we know it has just been patched up. It is like patching an old, worn-out automobile tire, getting ready for another blow-out. It is not much better if the strike is settled by arbitration, as long as prejudice and hatred survive on the part of both groups. The present antagonistic attitudes are undermining the foundations of both their houses.

A BASIC PRINCIPLE OF ECONOMICS

A basic principle of economics is for each country to produce those commodities which it can at the least cost. The permanent prosperity of a country depends upon the percentage of the agricultural and manufacturing commodities which it can produce more cheaply than other countries. The highest interests of both capital and labor in America are to get and hold foreign markets for our agricultural and manufactured products. Profits too big and wages too high not only work a hardship upon our own buying public, but make it much easier for other countries to underbid us and take away from us our export trade which we now have the golden opportunity to establish.

What America needs is to produce more cheaply, more abundantly, and more efficiently. Strikes are deadly to the welfare not only of the public at large, but also the pressure groups themselves that foment them.

INTERESTS OF BOTH GROUPS THREATENED

Free enterprise and capitalistic economy with all their good features are doomed unless labor can be reconciled. We may think it cannot happen in America, but it has happened in Russia and other countries. Huey Long, with his share-the-wealth proposals, is dead. John L. Lewis can never be President of the United States. But they will have their successors, probably abler and more subtle. As labor discontents grow, prejudice becomes more blinded and hatreds more bitter, agitators will gather to themselves a following that will destroy our present way of American life.

THE BIGGEST GANG

One day I talked with some CCC camp boys. I asked them what they thought of the plan. One of them replied, "My father died and left my mother with a large family of children to support. I was the eldest. I tried to get a job, but failed. I was sent to a CCC camp. I've learned a lot of things, and $30 a month has been mailed to my mother. In order to keep the family from starving, she had been compelled to mortgage our home and little farm. With the $30 a month additional to what she and the children could produce, she has been enabled not only to support the family but to pay off the mortgage." I shall never forget the eagerness in the face of the boy just approaching voting age when he added, "They tell me President Roosevelt has a lot of enemies." I replied, "Yes; a lot of enemies." (It was during the campaign when Franklin D. Roosevelt was a nominee for the third term.) The boy then said, "They tell me they have a lot of money." I replied, "Yes; they have a lot of money." The boy then with much satisfaction remarked, "They may have the most money, but we are the biggest gang."

There is food for thought in the fact that this biggest gang of which this youth was a typical representative is rearing large families of children, and, therefore, producing the majority of the future voters of America. The remedy lies in the direction of making laborers sharers in ownership. Owners of property are not easily converted to communism or even socialism.

MIKE'S PIG

The following story illustrates. Mike was an ardent Communist, and loud in his praises of the system. Pat said, "Do you mean to tell me that people who have things have to share 'em with people who haven't?"

Mike: "That's it."

Pat: "Mike, if you had two farms, would you give me one?"

Mike: "Sure."

Pat: "If you had two houses, would you give me one?"

Mike: "Sure."

Pat: "If you had two cows, would you give me one?"

"Sure," was Mike's answer.

Pat: "If you had two pigs, would you give me one?"

Mike: "No, I got two pigs."

Mike was a Communist until it concerned the property he really possessed.

EXORBITANT WAGES NOT THE REMEDY

Labor should have just and fair wages, sufficient to guarantee a comfortable standard of living, but not an extravagant one. Management should have fair and just profits, but not big enough to encourage extravagant living on the part of the owners. Extravagance is fatal to happiness and the best interests not only of adults, but especially of their children. This is true if the possession of too much money leads to spending for useless or harmful things such as intoxicating liquors and gambling. It is true the possession of too much money encourages idleness. Idlers are a menace to society—whether they be idle poor or the idle rich. The Bible teaches charity to the unfortunate, but the Apostle Paul was wise when he wrote to the Thessalonian Christians, "For even when we were with you, this we commanded you, that if any would not work, neither should he eat."

High wages mean high cost of living, so it is a vicious circle. The farmers justly demand and will get a parity of prices. If labor becomes too arrogant and too grasping, management which has to sell in competition with the rest of the world cannot afford to operate. If labor continues to demand ever-increasing wages, capital will be forced to transfer to other countries where factories can be operated to produce goods more cheaply and efficiently. This will inevitably lead to widespread unemployment in America.

THE PLAN

The remedy which I propose is as follows: Require by law that every corporation set aside 10 percent of the annual net profits with which to purchase stocks in the company to be given to the workers annually. In order to protect the laborers from their own follies in selling and spending the proceeds of the stocks on foolish things, it should be required by law that these stocks cannot be sold until the owner reaches 60 years of age. If he should die in the meantime his wife must have reached the age of 60 before the stocks become negotiable. By that time they should have sense enough to keep the stocks and continue to draw the dividends. If they do sell at 60 they will probably invest the proceeds in a home or some other venture that will guarantee security in old age.

The dividends equal to 10 percent of the net profits should be distributed not upon the basis of wages received by individuals, but upon the basis of other standards. These standards by which every worker should be graded should be worked out jointly by a representative of labor, management, and the Department of Labor of the United States Government, the representative of the Government having the deciding vote in cases of disagreement between the other two. The factors determining these standards should be (1) length of time of service with the company; (2) number of hours devoted to duty during the year; (3) the spirit of cooperation and interest in production; (4) efficiency in the performance of tasks assigned. Other facts may be considered. These would all encourage loyalty, efficiency, and a personal interest in the success and profits of the enterprise. When laborers are interested in the profits of a corporation and become actual sharers in their benefits it will do much to remove the motive for strikes, layoffs, and inefficiency.

In order to prevent the owners of big business from consuming the profits in exorbitant salaries there should be a just and fair regulation of salaries to be paid in accordance with the efficiency and character of services rendered by those employed in management. No deadheads should be tolerated simply because they own a large block of stock. Looking at this plan for what it would do over a period of years, it certainly would be to the advantage of owners and operators. It would also be an advantage to laborers who would share in the increase and the profits. They would receive their dividends annually, and at the age of 60 would have accumulated a competency for the security of old age.

It would create a motive that would stimulate good will and cooperative teamwork between management and labor. It would be a remedy for strikes.

Extension of Price Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1946

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

FIGHT INFLATION NOW—A CALL TO ACTION

We, the undersigned, call upon members of our organizations, other organizations, and all other citizens to unite now for the immediate extension of the Price Control Act.

The present Price Control Act expires June 30.

If the act is not extended, prices will soar, rents will skyrocket, the value of the dollar will tumble—inflation will have us in its grip.

THE PRICE CONTROL ACT MUST BE EXTENDED NOW

Business should know now whether or not there will be ceiling prices after June 30.

If the Congress waits until June to extend the act, there is danger that some businesses will hold up production hoping that ceilings will go and they can boost their prices.

THE ACT MUST BE PASSED WITHOUT WEAKENING AMENDMENTS

Congress must make it possible for OPA to maintain its standards for holding prices.

If Congress should amend the act to require OPA to grant a price increase whenever there is an increase in cost, or place any similar limitation on OPA's established policy, it would invite the spiral of inflation and destroy the act.

SUFFICIENT FUNDS MUST BE PROVIDED

Congress must provide OPA with a large enough appropriation to maintain its present organization in full force.

The job of holding the line against inflation has never been harder. Lack of funds can be as disastrous to price control as a bad law.

OUR TASK IS CLEAR

We must let every Congressman know that we the people, all of us, want:

Price and rent control for another year.

Immediate extension af the Price Control Act.

No weakening amendments.

Adequate appropriations for the big job of holding the line against inflation.

Helen C. White, President, American Association of University Women; Ralph E. Hemstead, General Secretary, American Association of University Professors; Lelia Massey, Executive Secretary, American Home Economics Association; Jack W. Hardy, National Commander, American Veterans of World War II (Amvets); Faye Stephenson, President, Congress of Women's Auxiliaries, CIO; May Gibbons Executive Secretary, Council for Social Action of Congregational Churches; Colston E. Warne, President, Consumers Union of United States; Mae Wright Downs, President, Delta Sigma Theta Sorority; Mrs. LaFell Dickinson, President, General Federation of Women's Clubs; Jo Davidson, Chairman, Independent Citizens' Cammission for Arts, Sciences, Professions; Katharine Armatage, President, League of Women Shoppers; Bishop Lewis O. Hartman, President, Methodist Federation for Social Service; Mrs. Henry A. Ingraham, President, National Board, Young Women's Christian Association; Mrs. William A. Hastings, President, National Congress of Parents and Teachers; Cecie P. Henry, President, National Congress of Colored Parents and Teachers; Alice Hamilton, President, National Consumers' League; Ruth Craven, Executive Secretary, National Council of Catholic Women; Mrs. Joseph M. Welt, President, National Council of Jewish Women; Mary McLeod Bethune, President, National Council of Negro Women; Willard E. Givens, Executive Secretary, National Education Association; James G. Patton, President, National Farmers' Union; Clyde B. Murray, President, National Federation of Settlements; Anna Lord Strauss, President, National League of Women Voters; Lester B. Granger, Executive Secretary, National Urban League; Rose Schneiderman, President, National Women's Trade Union League; George C. Hatch, President, New Council of American Business; Thomasina Johnson, Legislative Representative, Nonpartisan Council, A. K. A. Sorority; Clark Foreman, President, Southern Conference for Human Welfare; Reinhold Niebuhr, Chairman, Union for Democratic Action; Mrs. Herman Lowe, President, Women's Auxiliaries of Labor, A. F. of L.; Thelma Stevens, Executive Secretary, Woman's Division of Methodist Church.

Food Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of February 21, 1946:

STOP SUBSIDIES NOW

Stabilization Director Chester Bowles asks Congress to continue food subsidies for another year. He is no fonder of the subsidies, he says, than are the farmers and other groups now protesting their continuance. He feels, however, that dropping them would be ruinous at this time. "It would be impossible to make a success of the new stabilization program," he says, "with food prices shooting up."

We think Mr. Bowles is wrong in this. The new stabilization program is a program of economic readjustment. Wages and, to a lesser extent, prices are to be moved up to a new level. They are then to be stabilized at that level, so far as possible. Is there any good reason, while a general readjustment is being made, why food prices should not be permitted to rise sufficiently to compensate for the dropping of subsidies?

If subsidies were dropped, the price of bread should rise 1 cent a loaf. The price of canned vegetables should go up 1 cent a can. Meat prices should climb from 3 to 5 cents a pound. Butter should go up 12 cents and cheese 14 cents. The American food bill thus would be increased $1,579,000,000 to the consumer—and reduced $1,579,000,000 to the taxpayer.

It was questionable to allow these subsidies in the first place, for they made food prices unrealistic. It is a mistake to continue them, for the same reason.

Under the present system, with Government paying some of the food bill of every consumer, part of the "drive toward inflation" is being concealed instead of faced. We shall have to face it some day. Isn't it best to face it when we are trying to set a new line against inflation? If we continue the subsidies for another year, it will be still harder to rid ourselves of them. The time to drop them is now.

Will Wyatt's Government Building Plan Wreck an Industry?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1946

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an excellent study on the housing plan of Expeditor Wyatt by Dr. Willford I. King, one of our Nation's leading economists. Dr. King declares Wyatt's Government building plan, as incorporated in the so-called Patman bill, now being considered, will not only wreck the building industry, but it will add tremendous tax burdens.

This, Mr. Speaker, is a study every Member of Congress should read before casting his vote on the Patman bill.

WILL WYATT'S GOVERNMENT BUILDING PLAN WRECK AN INDUSTRY?

(By Dr. Willford I. King)

On February 8, 1946, President Truman requested Congress to enact promptly the legislation necessary to carry out the housing program, recommended by Mr. Wilson W. Wyatt, Housing Expediter.

Mr. Wyatt explains that "private enterprise must assume the leading role in this task, as it did in the task of war production—industry is entitled to a fair return—labor is entitled to a fair return—and that means higher wages, in some contributing industries, where workers have been historically low paid."

TO MEET ANOTHER EMERGENCY

Mr. Wyatt's program is avowedly designed to meet an emergency. Just now, we also have an emergency in sugar, an emergency in wheat, an emergency in automobiles, an emergency in steel, an emergency in transportation. The assumption is, that, as long as these emergencies continue, it is the duty of government to assist and direct private industry, and that, without such assistance and direction, the emergencies will continue indefinitely.

From the economic standpoint, such a system, in which private industry is supervised by government, parallels the one which Mussolini established in Italy, and called fascism. It is practically identical with that installed by Hitler in Germany, and designated as national socialism. One characteristic of all such collectivist systems is the existence of a never-ending series of emergencies. Why is this true?

The answer is that, when government assigns to bureaucrats the direction of industry, the inevitable result is a failure of supply and demanded to balance.

AN IMPOSSIBLE ASSIGNMENT

The reason for this is that the man has not yet been born who has knowledge sufficient to enable him to estimate, even approximately, the magnitudes of the factors making for supply, and of the factors making for demand. When the Government officials sets the price, it will either be so high that part of the product cannot be sold, or so low that a shortage will develop. We can be sure that, as long as government continues to control either prices or production, we shall always be efflicted with surpluses, shortages, and emergencies.

What is the origin of the present housing shortage? Not long before the war we had a great housing surplus, vacancies were numerous. Second-hand houses, in good condition, were selling at fractions of their

reproduction costs. From 1935 on, rising incomes strengthened the demand for houses, and active building continued until the war started. At that time it was rare to find any but new houses selling for more than two-thirds of their reproduction costs, and vacancies were still common. One must, therefore, conclude that in 1942 we had a surplus rather than a shortage of housing.

EMPTY HOMES ARE FEW

Today, by contrast, residential prices have risen sharply, and empty houses are undeniably hard to find. Why? For this situation, there are several reasons:

1. During the war home construction came practically to a standstill. This tended toward a deficiency of home units.

2. At the same time, the Government indulged in an orgy of inflation. This has cheapened the value of the dollar. Wage receipts and the national income have almost doubled. Rents have been held down by ceilings. This is equivalent to depressing rents sharply, in comparison to wages and income—in other words, housing has been made a very cheap commodity. When things are cheap, people buy more of them. Families have spread out, and occupied the previously vacant space.

3. Since, as just mentioned, real rents have fallen, landlords have found the renting of houses unprofitable. Many houses have, therefore, been allowed to deteriorate, until they are uninhabitable.

4. The war added more than a million to the normal number of marriages. Now these new families are seeking independent dwellings.

Mr. Wyatt asserts that "an inflationary spiral would be fatal to the building program." If such is the case, he had as well resign himself to failure.

INFLATION IN CURRENCY

At the end of 1937 the Nation's total currency supply, counting both money and demand deposits, was less than $34,000,000,000. By the end of 1944 it had risen to $115,000,000,000. While official figures are not yet available, the indications are that, at the end of 1945, the total amount of circulating medium was at least $121,000,000,000, or 3½ times the 1937 figure. This means that, in 8 years, our currency supply was inflated by about $87,000,000,000, or more than 250 percent. Had production remained at the 1937–38 level, the result to be expected would have been a 250 percent price increase.

Fortunately, however, production in 1945 was roughly double that of 1937–38. Under such circumstances, the effect normally to be expected is not a multiplication of the price level by 3½, but instead its multiplication by something like half that amount—or 1¾, in other words, a price rise of 75 percent. This probably accords roughly with what has actually occurred. The holding down of certain prices by the OPA has merely accentuated the increases of other prices. Great quantities of goods have been sold in the black market, at high prices. Sellers have surreptitiously advanced the nominal grades on a large variety of other goods. Prices of diamonds have trebled. Stocks have advanced widely. Jewelry has skyrocketed.

Mr. Wyatt's faith that inflation can be prevented by price regulation is akin to that of the man who tries to keep his house cool on a hot day by putting ice on the thermometer bulb. In reality, since the budget is not yet balanced, his program spells more inflation, and more robbery of the thrifty.

SUBSIDY WITHOUT LIMIT

There is no doubt that, now, and indefinitely in the future, veterans and others will stand in dire need of housing. They will be in dire need of food, of clothing, of fuel, of light, of house furnishings, of medical care, and of vacations. If it is the duty of government to furnish them with housing, it is equally the duty of government to furnish them with all these other things.

Experience shows that by far the most effective device yet discovered for providing citizens with the things which they need, is free competition—free enterprise. Neither fascist Germany nor socialistic Russia has been able to hold a candle to American capitalistic industry, as regards output per man-hour. Neither has shown evidence of being able to give to its citizens adequate supplies of those goods, which the citizens have really needed and wanted.

THE COLLECTIVIST PHILOSOPHY

There is an irrepressible conflict between the philosophy of Grover Cleveland, and that of Wilson Wyatt. Cleveland said it was the duty of the citizens to support the Government, and not the duty of the Government to support the citizens. Mr. Wyatt takes exactly the opposite position—that of Fascists, Socialists, Communists, and collectivists in general.

If it be granted that planning by Government is superior to planning by private enterprise, it follows that Mr. Wyatt has probably done as good a job of planning as is feasible. But just where is the evidence that Government can do the job even approximately as efficiently as can private enterprise? After World War I, houses were scarce, just as they are now, but did the scarcity bring national disaster? Everyone knows that it did not. Without governmental aid, private industry soon remedied the shortage.

REMOVE THE CONTROLS

At the present time, if the Government would take off all controls on prices, interest rates, and production, it would not need to engage in a housing program. A million Americans would "take a flyer" on putting up a house or two, and a few would put up dozens or hundreds of houses. The housing shortage would quickly be overcome, and it would not require Government subsidies, Government guarantee of loans, or Government training of workers. With price controls removed, supply and demand would balance, there would be no shortages and emergencies would tend to disappear.

Such would almost certainly be the result if the Government withdrew its support from the tyrannical labor monopolies, which prey upon both workers and the public, by limiting production, raising wage rates so high as to cause mass unemployment, and exacting from buyers unreasonably high prices, not only for houses, but for products of all kinds.

If the Government goes into house building, it will take labor and material away from private builders and wreck the private building industry. Is this desirable? Moreover, on the basis of all past evidence, it is almost certain that any given grade of house will cost the Government far more than it would cost if built by a private builder.

BARRACKS INSTEAD OF HOMES

Furthermore, it is clear that Mr. Wyatt plans to go in heavily for prefabricated houses. These are likely to resemble barracks more than dwellings of the type which Americans generally desire. One of the goals to which the ambitious American aspires is to the privilege of building a house to suit his particular taste. Houses last a long time. Do we want to have the landscape marred for half a century by rows of structures looking more like chicken coops than residences?

It is, of course, undoubtedly true that many veterans and other people as well, will be delighted if Government—that is, the other citizens—will pay part, or all, of the cost of their new houses. However, the fact must not be overlooked that veterans represent most of the families of the Nation. After all, passing the buck to Uncle Sam does not lessen in any way the total cost of the houses. That bill must be paid by someone. What Mr. Wyatt's plan boils down to is that the families of veterans and others who happen to want, and get, the Government-subsidized houses, will be sponging a large part of the cost of their houses off the families of other veterans. Is this a square deal?

POOR REWARD FOR VETERANS

It is well to remember that the veterans do not represent a small and isolated group. Instead, they constitute the majority of the able-bodied male members of a whole generation. There is no feasible way of having one generation supported by others. It seems unreasonable to suppose that the vast majority of veterans are asking for anything of the kind. Everyone is agreed that those who are disabled should be given ample care. But the best present that can be made to the able-bodied young man returning from the war is that he be given an opportunity to climb as high as his talents will allow on the ladder of success, unhampered by artificial restrictions and governmentally-sponsored labor monopolies. Under such conditions, he will not need to lean upon the crutch of Government housing subsidies, as represented by the Wyatt program.

ESSENTIAL FEATURES OF WYATT'S PROGRAM

1. Construction during the next 2 years of 2,700,000 homes, of which all but 250,000, are to be of permanent construction.

2. Preference for veterans and their families, in the rental or purchase of these homes.

3. Appropriate provisions for nonveteran hardship cases.

4. A Government subsidy to builders, amounting to not less than $400,000,000.

5. Absorption by Government of undue risks in developmental work on new-type materials.

6. Guaranteed markets for materials manufacturers.

7. Purchase by the Government of any houses constructed under the program, if the builders cannot sell them in the open market. Any houses, so purchased, will later be sold by Government, at the best prices obtainable.

8. The houses are to be sold for not more than $6,000 each, or are to be rented for not more than $50 per month.

9. The Government will insure mortgages, up to 90 percent of the value of each home.

10. The Government is to control strictly the prices of materials, and the rents of the houses.

11. Ceilings are to be set, or maintained on rents, and prices of old and new houses, and on building lots in urban areas.

12. One and one-half million additional workers in construction are to be recruited and trained (presumably by Government).

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee with reference to the St. Lawrence seaway, February 22, 1946:

Mr. Chairman, there isn't much that I can add to the wealth of testimony offered in

support of the further development of the St. Lawrence route. However, I do wish to take this opportunity to allay the fears of some of the more violent opponents to this important program.

A half century ago when the construction of the Panama Canal was under consideration its principal opponents were the railroads. Then, as now, they were convinced the completion of the project would bring certain ruin. The greatest opposition to the seaway, as was true with the Panama Canal, comes from the eastern railroads. Just how exercised the eastern lines are about the project can be appreciated when one takes into account the fact that as recently as 15 years ago the western railroads were all strong supporters of the St. Lawrence seaway. Apparently their vision has been obscured since that time by the eastern lines.

The railroads really have no cause to fear the competition of the St. Lawrence seaway for at most the commerce carried over this water route will only be a small fraction of the present commerce of our eastern ports, and it is estimated to amount to less than 3 percent of the ton-miles carried by the railroads. The tonnage carried via the St. Lawrence seaway will be largely new tonnage resulting from economic expansion which cannot be realized under the present land-locked conditions of the Middle West. This economic expansion will be stimulated by the seaway and the whole country, as well as the railroads and other opponents of the project will be greatly benefited. The new industries and business that will rise in the Middle West as a result of the seaway will assure expansion of transportation needs which will more than offset any possible diversion of the railroad's traffic.

The power companies and the coal operators, next to the railroads, are the greatest antagonists of the seaway. The power companies are concerned about the possibility of the Government going into the power business. I am opposed to Government entering into competition with private enterprise but have no fear of that possibility in connection with this project. The power in this instance is but a by-product of the seaway. Since the power is available it should be fully utilized. The power development will not compete with existing power but will be merely supplementary for it will greatly industrialize the areas it serves.

As for the coal industry, it apparently fears the competition from foreign fields. If the fears were well-grounded then all of the cities on the east coast would have taken advantage of the available foreign coal. However, we find that even though there is no tariff on coal the imports amount to only sixteen-thousandths of 1 percent of the total volume of American production. Furthermore, we find that Canada prefers our coal to that of the British Isles even though the British coal can now be shipped in ocean vessels to Montreal. Even today more than 80 percent of the coal needs of Canada are supplied by the United States. As to the effect of the domestic sale of coal as a result of the power project, it has been pointed out that in the TVA area alone, since the advent of this project, the coal consumption has increased fivefold. It is but a fulfillment of the old adage that "new business brings new business."

The completion of the St. Lawrence seaway will permit the rise of new industries which will not necessarily compete with those existing elsewhere but merely complement and supplement them. Therefore we find that organized labor in the State of Wisconsin, the A. F. of L. and the CIO is strongly in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway and have asked that its interest be noted.

The completion of the seaway shall open a new frontier in our national development which will open to world trade the important ports on the Great Lakes. The modernization of the St. Lawrence route will benefit not only the people of the Middle West but the entire Nation. In the long run, it will greatly help those interests that today are attempting to block its attainment. The completion of the St. Lawrence is long past due; let us get on with it in order that the full wealth and productive power of the Middle West and the country as a whole can be realized.

Immigration Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 1946

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert an editorial which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal on February 26, 1946, entitled "Halving Immigration Quotas":

HALVING IMMIGRATION QUOTAS

Effort is now being made by some alarmists in Congress to cut immigration quotas to this country in half for a 10-year period. The cut would apply to all countries, except that the minimum quota figure of 100, now applying to 39 countries and isolated areas, would remain the minimum.

There is no possible excuse for this type of guesswork reduction at this or any other time. If our immigration quotas are to be revised at all, the revision should be made on the basis of a thorough study of all the elements involved. A House subcommittee has already suggested that such a study be undertaken by a commission created expressly for the purpose.

Surely there is no emergency at this time. Present quotas total only 153,879. Great Britain and Ireland account for 83,574, so that the total for the rest of the quota world is only 70,305. The British-Irish quota is never fully used, and in recent years actual admissions have not averaged anything like the half to which quotas would now be reduced.

The country can easily assimilate even the full number allowed to enter under present quotas, if that number should presently be reached because of conditions abroad.

Thus there seems to be no reason for a change in policy. There are several reasons for keeping to the figures established in 1929, one of which is the importance of supporting the general nonisolationist policy of the United States. When, in 1921, this country began restricting immigration, it did so only to keep the number of newcomers down to a point where assimilation would not be too difficult. The present law has achieved that objective. No change should be made in it, except after the most careful study and to correct specific faults.

The Gossett bill should be defeated.

George Washington and His Men at Valley Forge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 1946

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address I delivered Sunday, February 24, 1946, in the Washington Memorial Chapel at Valley Forge, Pa.

This was my first trip to historic Valley Forge. On approaching this hallowed spot I felt as if I trod upon holy ground. To be sure, there are many historic places within the confines of our great country, but probably none surpassing Valley Forge.

Years ago, Rev. W. Herbert Burk, D. D., conceived the idea of having each of the several States, through their respective Governors, to officially conduct Sunday services in the Washington Memorial Chapel. February 24 was designated as South Carolina Sunday. The colors of our State were displayed prominently in the beautiful and impressive chapel. I was commissioned by our Governor, the Honorable Ransome J. Williams, to speak for him on this occasion.

Since the passing of Dr. Burk his worthy successor, the Reverend John Robbins Hart, as rector, is carrying the work forward in a very commendable fashion. I am proud to have participated in my State's service at Valley Forge and commend the work most heartily.

The address follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I bring you greetings from Gov. Ransome J. Williams, of South Carolina, who has commissioned me to speak for him at this historic place on this eventful day. I am greatly honored but approach my task with all humility as I seek to discharge the high trust I bear. Coming as I do for the first time to this hallowed spot, I would interpret some of the sentiments of my fellow South Carolinians as I discuss the subject of Washington and His Men at Valley Forge.

The army which Washington led at Valley Forge was greatly inferior in numbers and equipment to the enemy which faced it across the river. It was a body of brave, courageous men worse than ill fed, ill housed, and ill clothed. "The men were literally naked," says a famous historian, "some of them in the fullest extent of the word." "Part of them mud, part of them blood, the rest of them—not at all." The situation here at Valley Forge in that cold, bleak winter of 1777 was dark and desperate. It seemed that our fight for liberty was doomed to perish beneath the heavy snows of these wooded hills you and I look out upon today.

But the fight for liberty did not perish here at Valley Forge; it rose up with a spirit that performed the incredible and accomplished the almost impossible. The place where we are now met is not the graveyard of American independence, but the cradle of it. This is indeed hallowed ground upon which you and I stand, my fellow citizens, ground hallowed by the sacrifices and personal privations which Washington and the men of his army endured to win for us the right to live in a free and independent nation. We are the recipients of a goodly heritage.

The only way that we can be worthy of this heritage is to be willing to guard and defend it with the same degree of unselfishness, patriotism, and individual sacrifice which was required to win it for us. In the war that we have just won, I feel that such a spirit was characteristic of the attitude and conduct of the great majority of our people. We could never have won the war without such spirit. The most disturbing signs of the times in which we are now living, however, are evidences of a growing feeling or belief that such spirit will not be required to win the peace.

My friends, the same degree of devotion, willingness to sacrifice, and patriotic service is required to win the peace and to maintain it as was required to win the war. "Unto whom much is given, much is required," says Holy Writ. Much, indeed, is required to meet the opponents of the American way of life who seem to be organizing in an all-out effort to substitute for the principles of free enterprise, which rewards a man for effort, initiative, and merit, the promises of a deadly concept which holds that the government should give a man his sustenance whether he is willing to work for and earn it or not.

It was not so many years ago that the late Speaker of the United States House of Representatives warned:

"There are evidences of certain sinister influences and minorities now seeking to sap and mine the pillars of this temple of freedom. We may have been too tolerant of some of their recent manifestations of subversive treachery. We have sought with rather grim patience to respect the guaranty of freedom of speech; but it may be only fair to admonish all such groups that they take counsel of their prudence lest by going one step too far, it will be too late to escape the wrath and indignation of all real Americans."

We are still waiting with "grim patience" but our patience is tried almost to the breaking point when we reflect upon the price others have had to pay in order to keep the fires of liberty burning. When one thinks what Washington and his weary and bedraggled Army had to endure at Valley Forge, all justification for tolerating such manifestations of subversive treachery ceases to exist.

May we not on this hallowed ground rededicate our own individual lives to the tasks that are ahead of us. Let us seek to emulate the example set for us by George Washington and his followers. Then in truth it may be said, "America, we do not know beneath what sky nor on what sea shall be thy fate. We only know it shall be high. We only know it shall be great."

The Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 1946

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, the motive behind the bill under consideration in the House, H. R. 4761, is to provide homes and dwellings for the returning veteran and as has been so well said by the Members in the debate on this bill, there can be no controversy over that objective. Veterans who have returned from the wars, having spent a considerable part of their formative life out of the country defending it from its enemies and thereby having been deprived of securing real estate or planning to build homes, should have every encouragement and every facility offered to them to achieve that aim.

But, does this bill do that? Does this bill make it easy for a veteran to build a home and to finance it? Does it enable him to acquire a priority on the material necessary for the construction of a dwelling, and does it in any way expedite the manufacture and the flow into the market of those materials?

Let us inquire a little bit into the history of the effort made in the GI bill of rights to give a veteran an opportunity to borrow money for the organization of a business or the building of a home, and see how it was worked out. Under the original GI bill, title III, a veteran was enabled to borrow $2,000 under a guartee of the Federal Government with the approval of the Veterans' Administration, and after this law was in operation for a short time it was discovered that in making a loan for the purchase of real estate a veteran would have to have two appraisals made, one by the lending agency and one by a representative of the Veterans' Administration, and the veteran had to pay the appraisal fee on each occasion.

During the first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, because of many complaints about the complicated procedure required by the Veterans' Administration, as well as the expense involved, the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation carefully went into this matter and after considerable thought and discussion, amendments to the GI bill were brought to the House for action and subsequently were written into the law. Under the present law a veteran may borrow up to $4,000 with a Federal guarantee and only one appraisal is necessary in the purchase of real estate; the maturity date for loans was extended to 25 to 40 years. Loans are now being made under the authority of the revised law.

Now let us see what this bill, H. R. 4761, provides as far as the veteran is concerned. In section 703 (a) it is provided as follows, and I quote from the bill:

> The Director is authorized to require any person who owns, holds an interest in, deals in, or offers to sell or to buy any housing accommodations to furnish information under oath or affirmation or otherwise, to make and keep records, and to make reports. * * * The Director may require any such person to permit the inspection and copying of records and other documents and the inspection of housing accommodations.

Here we have once more all the red tape of bureaucracy and the effort which the Congress has spent in trying to make things simple, easy, and expeditious for the veteran in building a home is done away with. The provisions of this bill would certainly make it far more difficult for the veteran to build a house than under the present law.

Now, what does the proposed law do in expediting the manufacture of materials that go into the construction of a dwelling? Under section 705 of the bill it is provided that whenever in the judgment of the Director there is a shortage of building materials, he may regulate or allocate such materials in such manner and under such conditions as he deems necessary and proper, and he may give preference in the purchasing or renting of housing accommodations in connection with this subject.

There is not one provision in the bill which would tend to stimulate the manufacture and production of articles necessary to the construction of a house. It is the testimony of everyone who is at all cognizant of the building industry that a great bottleneck exists in the production and manufacture of housing materials and this is attributed to the policies and attitude of the OPA in maintaining strict and rigid price ceilings, thereby discouraging production. Business cannot operate at a loss, no matter what the New Deal philosophy preaches.

It has been suggested in the debate that subsidies could be paid to stimulate the production of these materials, but as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] so ably pointed out in his remarks yesterday on this subject, a 10-percent increase in the price ceiling for building materials would be far cheaper for everybody than a Government subsidy. I would add to the remarks of the distinguished gentleman that such a policy would also tend to strengthen our system of free enterprise and not open up another opportunity for Government deficit financing.

Veterans should have priority on materials; veterans should have priority on rentals; veterans should have priority on construction labor; in short, veterans should have priority on everything which goes to the building of a home, but unless the materials used in home building are produced and made available, all these priorities mean absolutely nothing.

In its present form this bill is a hodgepodge of words which, I think, would be productive of very little construction, and whether or not it can be made workable by amendment remains to be seen.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 1946

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, like most questions involving foreign policies, the arguments on the British loan have developed far more heat than light. Those who argue for the loan insist that the only alternative is the opening of a new and destructive trade war between the British and ourselves. In such an economic war all the weapons of the imperial system would be turned against us. The Empire preferential system which we have been criticizing so strongly in recent years, would be invoked against us. The argument runs that maintaining the British economic structure is vital to our own well being.

On the other side, there are those who assert that our obligations to ourselves as the one great capitalistic government must require our first consideration. They say that Britain has resources in land and colonies which could well be applied against her debts and that before we talk money to the British we should sit down and talk turkey. There are British possessions in the Western Hemisphere which the British have always declared to be economic liabilities. If they are economic liabilities, they are certainly not needed to protect any British interests against us. Before we consent to any outright grant, it would certainly be well for us to discuss frankly the possibility of transferring British

possessions in the Western Hemisphere to our Government.

It would be a good idea to talk over aviation landing rights in the British home islands and the development of a trusteeship policy over colonial and mandated lands that would promise some hope of peace in the Near East and in India. This would not be taking advantage of Britain's present needs. On the contrary, I believe it would be a realistic effort to solve some of our problems in a spirit of frankness and businesslike good will. We have had too much secret diplomacy in other areas. Certainly we do not need it with the English-speaking people of Great Britain.

I should like to make one further observation in connection with the British loan. There are many people who still hunger for the good old days when we could regard ourselves as a separate New World. Europe was the old country and we wanted nothing whatever to do with its affairs. During the year 1945, we loaned 11 nations the sum of $2,458,000,000. The Export-Import Bank has been approached by 6 other countries looking for financial aid. Italy is asking for $1,000,000,000; China wants about $2,000,000,000; Poland needs a minimum of $400,000,000; Finland has requested $100,000,000. Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia have just lined up at the window but their figures are not yet in shape to forecast.

There has not yet been news of the lending needs of Russia and France, but it is safe to guess that they will be large. France received $850,000,000 in 1945, and is now seeking to modernize her industry. Stalin told a Congressman in Moscow last year that his country could use $6,000,000,000 to reconstruct its shattered economy.

Before we cancel these debts or sanction futher loans, let us assure ourselves that our own resources are equal to these drains and that we will not incur an additional burden of taxation which will crush our own industry and commerce. Let us assure ourselves that our debtors will be not only able but willing to repay these loans and that if their purpose be to restore them to prosperity with a view to a lucrative foreign trade with us, that such trade will be worth the investment and that the money will be used for that purpose and not to enrich individuals or to strengthen economic systems hostile and ruinous to our own. We are under no moral or legal obligation to our allies. It was we who saved them from subjugation and it is they who should be grateful to us.

Sign Up and Trust the OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARVE TIBBOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1946

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Johnstown Democrat, Johnstown, Pa.:

SIGN UP AND TRUST THE OPA

"Sign up and trust the OPA."

That now is the watchword in Washington. That is the advice to industry now facing, or about to face, demands for wage increases.

That is the advice, specifically, being handed out with a straight face to hundreds of fabricators of steel products, of which there are three currently affected in this city.

These plants are facing a double squeeze. They are caught between labor demands for 18½ cents an hour more, on the one hand, and an increase of $5 a ton in the price of the semifinished steel they buy, on the other.

Yet they are told, "Sign up and trust to OPA."

Can they trust OPA? What has been the record of OPA in expediting price appeals in the past? What has been the record of OPA, specifically, in expediting price appeals for the steel industry?

Not good.

The basic steel industry had been dickering with OPA for price adjustments long before the January 21 shutdown over the wage dispute. Months of futile investigation, dozens of endless hearings, had gone on.

The OPA, through a spokesman, admitted to the steel industry that it was entitled to price relief on the basis of the rapidly rising costs of production. Yet, despite this admission, no price increases were forthcoming until a month-long strike over a wage increase threatened the Nation's peacetime economy.

Would it be too cynical to wonder whether the steel industry would not be singing for price relief today if the Government had not been forced to act by the throttling of production due to the strike of 750,000 steel workers?

Now the fabricators—many of whom also had been manufacturing and selling some of their products at a loss, even before the double-bladed increase in the cost of steel and their wage bill—are advised to "sign up and trust to OPA."

When the steel mills shut down over the wage dispute, did the Government say to the United Steel Workers of America, "Sign up and trust" to some alphabetical agency or another?

Now that a general wage-price policy has been established and price increases promised, sooner or later, to steel fabricators, does the Government say to steel workers not yet covered by contracts calling for the 18½-cent wage increase, "Sign up and trust to OPA?"

It does not.

How long will the Government of the United States maintain the labor-industry highway as a one-way street? Is it not about time that Government stopped mixing politics and economics, and settled down to a bit of old-fashioned frankness and honesty and justice for all hands?

As things now stand, the pleader before the bench of governmental bureaus stands an excellent chance of leaving the courtroom with what he wants, or part of it, at least, if he has a couple of thousand potential votes sticking out of his pocket—or a couple of hundreds of thousands of potential votes, as the case may be.

But let the man or the company, which would be doing well if it marshalled half a hundred votes, appeal for deserved relief from Government control, and he is told bruskly, "Sign up and trust to OPA."

We still are supposed to be operating under a republican form of government, the learned counsel to the House Un-American Activities Committee to the contrary. But maybe that gentleman is right, in some degree, at least, when he insists that America is no democracy.

In many respects, we are crowding the line of national socialism. Before and during the war we used to call national socialism nazism. If we continue as we have been, we soon will have to find a new name for it.

Housing Wilderness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT K. HENRY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1946

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial which appeared in the Wisconsin State Journal of Madison, Wis., under date of February 22, 1946:

MOSES WITH A RIGGED COMPASS

If there yet be a simple soul trusting the Federal Government to lead this country out of the housing wilderness, let him ponder Madison's experience, which is on a comparatively small but still important scale.

Long ago, Madison officials took the initiative in trying to solve Madison's emergency housing requirements. They requested the Federal Public Housing (FPHA) to assign us 100 demountable housing units. Possible sites were picked, some selected. Madison made itself ready for them.

"Sure," said FPHA finally, "Madison can have them."

They were assigned, but they never arrived.

They were never even found. Lost in the red tape. Buried at the bottom of somebody's "Immediate Action" basket.

Again seeking to care for its own, Madison moved to develop Truax Field as a housing area. Surveys, coats, blueprints were made ready. It would be an expensive proposition, but Madison was willing to bear all that was found necessary. Since the demountable plan to be shared by the FPHA was lost in somebody's shuffle, would the Federals instead kick through with some financial aid out of the specific sum already provided by Congress?

Now comes the Federal answer:

No. No money available.

But in the same breath comes this as well: The Federals may—just may—develop 100 temporary units at Truax itself, as a Federal project.

And just to make the confusion complete: All this, says FPHA, need not prevent the city's proceeding to develop its own 1,000 units out there at its own expense, for which facilities will be made available "as soon as details can be worked out."

Oh, sure, sure! Back in the basket!

Ah, yes, the FPHA moves in mysterious ways, its own miracles to perform.

But is it so mysterious? No money for a municipal project, but plenty for a Federal plan. Now explain that?

There isn't anything puzzling about it.

An agency set up ostensibly to speed public housing and work through, with, and in behalf of localities is doing no such thing. It is part and parcel of the whole new and redeal plan to block private and municipal construction and to keep all the power, material, and programs in the grasp of the Washington political bureaucracy.

That's first.

The cold and homeless, fed with high-sounding pap to keep them warm, are strictly second.

Attention United States Senate—Special Attention, Senate Judiciary Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROSS RIZLEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 1946

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, recently I called attention to the liquidation of two dairies in New Canaan, Conn., by Local 338 of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, and so forth. Further supplementing the statement I made concerning the matter, together with the news article as it appeared in the March issue of the Farm Journal, I include as a part of my remarks under permission heretofore granted for the Appendix of the RECORD, two additional articles, one appearing in the Wall Street Journal under date of January 30, 1946, and the other from the New York Herald Tribune under date of February 2, 1946:

[From the Wall Street Journal of January 30, 1946]

THE MILLER'S MISTAKE: THEY KNEW DAIRYING BUT NOT ABOUT A. F. OF L.—SO NEW CANAAN BROTHERS, WHO LIKED TO SELL GOOD MILK, HAD TO GO OUT OF BUSINESS

(By Sydney B. Self)

NEW CANAAN, CONN.—On Monday, a small dairy, started 4 years ago in this community by the three Miller brothers, closed its doors and went out of business.

The Miller brothers were brought up on a farm. They knew the dairy so well that they put all their savings into it. But they reckoned without Local 338 of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Stablemen and Helpers, A. F. of L.

The dairy's seven or eight drivers had been called out on strike by the union. The demands were a 28-percent increase in basic pay and a 5-day week which, the Millers figured, would boost their pay roll more than 50 percent. The union, according to the brothers, also was asking for a 66⅔ percent increase in commissions.

Furthermore, the proffered union contract barred the Millers from doing manual work around the dairy. They have been putting in a 7-day week and doing more than half the labor as well as driving the trucks in a pinch. Union negotiators said they would let the Millers work, but refused to put this concession in writing.

TWO HUNDRED PICKETS IMPORTED

Last week end was probably the most trying in the lives of the Millers.

Their striking drivers represented only a corporal's guard, but the union sent a small battalion of pickets from out of town—about 200 to 250—to police the dairy. A detachment of 60 Connecticut State troopers came too, to keep order. Women customers who came to get milk for their babies had their auto tires slashed.

The few Miller employes who were not among the pickets decided they had enough. They quit. The Millers, too, decided they were through.

"We would merely be signing a petition of bankruptcy in advance," said William C. Miller, dairy president, in an open letter to Frederick Conrad, union president, explaining the closing of the dairy.

Like other small businesses, the Millers do not keep a staff of cost accountants. But they can add. They figured something like this:

They had a pay roll of $455 a week which would be raised by the proposed union wage scale to $600 or $700 a week, not including the higher commissions which were demanded.

The brothers sold about 2,000 quarts of milk daily at retail for 16 cents, and paid 9.5 cents, higher than the going wholesale rates. That's because they sold only Jersey or Guernsey milk which, they say, is the richest in cream. Plus some small wholesale business that they performed, this brought their net to around $144 a day, or say $1,000 a week.

MILLERS FEEL THEY CAN'T MEET DEMANDS

Subtracting $700 wages from $1,000 would leave $300 for the salaries of the Millers who would not be allowed to work. Then, there would be the additional costs for trucks, gasoline, pasteurizing, bottles, and other operating costs.

So the Millers, even without cost accountants, figured that it simply couldn't be done.

The union had a solution. It proposed, according to William C. Miller, that the brothers sell their business to a larger concern which could meet the union's demands.

"We will not sell our customers," was Mr. Miller's answer to this proposal in his open letter to the union's Mr. Conrad. His letter continued: "If we cannot give them (the customers) our product—the product they have come to know and trust—we will not ask them to blindly go to another, merely because we have turned over to that other our route books and have written glowing praises of our purchaser, obviously put into our mouths."

New Canaan is a small commuting village where people like Jersey milk with plenty of cream. Big dairies sell "standardized milk," with butterfat content brought down to the legal minimum, well below the butterfat content of the whole milk from Jersey and Guernsey cows sold by the Millers. The brothers built up their business by supplying the local demand for richer milk.

In closing his letter to the union, William Miller says, "You have won a brilliant victory. I applaud you but—the golden goose is dead, the eggs are no more."

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 2, 1946]

THE CASE OF THE MILLERS

One of the first rules of sound journalism is that news and editorial comment should be strictly segregated. Nevertheless, every so often a news story bobs up which, without any conscious effort on the part of the writer to make it one, turns out, through its sheer simplicity and factuality, to be as effective an editorial as any that could be purposefully contrived.

Such a story is the half-column account sent in to the Wall Street Journal this week from New Canaan by Staff Correspondent Sydney B. Self on what happened to the Miller brothers of that little community, which borders on Stamford, Conn. The Millers, Mr. Self explains, are three brothers, who were brought up on a farm, knew all about dairying (and put all their savings into it), but who had "reckoned without Local 338 of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Stablemen and Helpers, A. F. of L."

"Last week end," writes Mr. Self, "was probably the most trying in the lives of the Millers." The union had called out their drivers, demanding a new contract which was tantamount to a 50-percent increase in the pay roll, asked for an increase of 66⅔ percent in commissions and barred the Millers from doing any manual work around the dairy. Although the Millers had only seven or eight drivers working for them, the union sent in from 200 to 250 pickets from out of town to police the dairy (which necessitated the use of 60 State troopers to maintain order). When women customers drove up to the dairy to get milk for their families the tires of their cars were slashed.

The employees decided they had had enough and quit. And the Millers followed shortly. The Millers didn't have an accounting staff, but they could add and subtract, and they got out paper and pencil and did just that. Their business (around 2,000 quarts a day) grossed about $1,000 a week, out of which a $455 pay roll had to be met, in addition to the cost of trucks, gasoline, pasteurizing, bottles, and other necessary expenses of doing business. It did not take much figuring to see that with the pay roll jumped to between $600 and $700, themselves barred from working and with other expenses continuing as usual the Miller brothers, as they wrote to Frederick Conrad, union president, in signing the proposed contract would simply be "signing a petition of bankruptcy in advance."

The union had a solution for this problem. Why, they suggested, didn't the brothers sell out to a larger concern, which would be better able to meet the union's wage demands? To this the Millers, who had built up a quality business, with butterfat content of the product well above the legal minimum, answered with a flat refusal. "We don't propose to ask our customers," they declared, "to go blindly to another, merely because we have turned over our route books and have written glowing praises of our successor—obviously put into our mouths."

The battle between the powerful teamsters' union and this little Connecticut enterprise was short, and the defeat was a crushing one. But it was more than a defeat for the Millers; it was one more defeat for the thing that over the years has been this country's greatest source of strength—the right of an American citizen to go into business for himself with a fair chance of making a success of it if he works hard and produces something that the community wants and needs. That is the essence, not only of free enterprise, but of the only kind of equality that is consistent with the dignity of man—equality of opportunity. There are many threats to that system today, but none is greater than that presented by organized labor grown to manhood with respect to power, but with no corresponding increase in responsibility. As Congress prepares to write a new labor law, one could wish that every member had the case of the Millers before him. Because the case of the Millers is neither more nor less than today's labor problem in America presented in simple microcosm.

Southern New England Farm and Home Show

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 1946

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, on February 21 the Southern New England Farm and Home Show was held in the Cranston State Armory, Providence, R. I. Part of the proceedings were broadcast and I offer for printing in the RECORD the radio round-table conference held on that occasion. It sets forth very forcefully Rhode Islands position in agriculture.

Mr. John Johnson, of Newport, R. I., the president of the Rhode Island Agricultural Conference, opened the program

and introduced Dr. Raymond G. Bressler, who led the discussion. It follows:

Mr. JOHNSON. It is a high honor and personal privilege for me as president of Rhode Island Agricultural Conference to introduce our efficient and popular State director of agriculture, Dr. Raymond G. Bressler, who will act as toastmaster and conduct the radio round table.

Mr. BRESSLER. The applause you are hearing is coming from the banquet hall of the Cranston Street Armory in Providence, R. I. The occasion is the revival of the winter farm show which was abandoned during the war years.

In keeping with the spirit of the new era we are coming out in new clothing and with a new name. Henceforth, we will be known as the Southeastern New England Farm and Home Show. This emphasizes the economic boundaries of our State rather than its political boundaries. This is the occasion when we wish to show the agriculture of Rhode Island, eastern Connecticut, and southeastern Massachusetts to the rest of the world. And we also wish to show our own folks what the rest of the world has developed by way of implements, machinery, equipment, insect and pest controls, and food and feed products for the farm and home to make their everyday work less burdensome and more attractive.

We have discovered during the last 4 weeks, however, that we may be a year too early. No one anticipated last summer that we would run into February 1946 with much of the new equipment for the farm and home still in the making stage. It appears now that we are ahead of the manufacturing and that we shall have to wait another year before we can show you all the good things we had planned. Let us hope, in the meantime, that labor and management will adjust their differences and get ahead with the main business of making the things you and I wish to buy.

There is a great gathering here tonight of farm and city folks, ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience. Following the banquet of more than 300 reservations the room rapidly filled up. I understand that there are many standing in front of the amplifiers in the main exhibition hall. John, how many would you say there are in this room at this minute?

Mr. JOHNSON. Six or seven hundred, I should judge.

Mr. BRESSLER. At least 600, Mr. Johnson. By the way, Mr. John Johnson, of Newport, is president of the Rhode Island Agricultural Conference. This is a federated organization, consisting of 25 member societies, all interested in promoting agriculture and rural life in our southeastern New England. They have done a fine job in sponsoring this 1946 show.

Seated with me on the radio stage are: His excellency, the Honorable John O. Pastore, Governor of Rhode Island; Mr. Carl Wilken, of Sioux City, Iowa, economic analyst of the Raw Materials National Council and research consultant of the National Association of Commissioners, Directors, and Secretaries of Agriculture; and Mr. L. L. Rummell, of Cincinnati, Ohio, agricultural counsel of the Kroger Grocery & Baking Co.

In the audience we have the members of the agricultural committee of both houses of the Rhode Island General Assembly, the speaker of the house, the president of the senate, the chairman of the finance committee, the director of our department of labor.

We also have with us the commissioners of agriculture from the Northeastern Association, W. H. Allen and A. K. Gardiner, of New Jersey and Maine; a committee of prominent labor leaders; and a group of leading industrialists. It is in these last two groups that we are especially interested tonight. Pleasantly, we have an ax to grind with them. We don't think they recognize the full importance of agriculture in our State and National economy. Well, you men can get ready, gentlemen, for in just about 30 seconds we'll start telling you how important agriculture is.

By and large, though, listeners on the radio, our gathering is composed of men and women from rural Rhode Island, and a fine group it is. Mr. Governor, what do you think of them? How do they look to you?

Governor PASTORE. Mighty fine. If you hadn't just told us of the visitors from other States I would have thought they were all from Rhode Island.

Mr. BRESSLER. I wonder if you realize, Mr. Pastore, before you became Governor, how great an agricultural State Rhode Island really is?

Governor PASTORE. Not exactly, Dr. Bressler. I knew, of course, that there were many fine farms in Rhode Island and that our agricultural products were as good as any in the country. In fact, I have been told many times that they are better, and that a Rhode Island fresh egg is a premium anywhere. But I hadn't quite appreciated the significance of our agriculture to the State.

Mr. BRESSLER. What do you mean by "significance," Mr. Governor?

Governor PASTORE. Just this: There are 3,800 farms in our little State whose combined capitalization is about three hundred millions and with this capitalization the products that are produced annually are valued at about sixteen millions. This means cash, the most definite measure of success in farming or in any other business for that matter.

Mr. BRESSLER. That would be good production in any field, wouldn't it, Mr. Governor?

Governor PASTORE. It would, indeed. Many a manufacturing concern doesn't even approach that mark.

Mr. BRESSLER. Well, Mr. Wilken, I see a twinkle in your eye. That record is almost as good as Iowa's, isn't it?

Mr. WILKEN. Yes, it is. But an Iowan doesn't like to admit that there are any farms in the United States that produce as well as those in the State where the tall corn grows. I suppose you are aware, Doctor, that farm-for-farm Rhode Island ranks at the top of the Nation.

Mr. BRESSLER. Oh, yes. I have had to defend Rhode Island agriculture too many times with you fellows from the Central West not to look up some statistics. Cow-for-cow, hen-for-hen, and farm-for-farm, we are better than most States, and I am including both Iowa and Ohio in this comparison, Mr. Rummell.

Mr. RUMMELL. That's a good point, Dr. Bressler. I have never thought that mere bigness was the best measure of greatness. What the individual unit accomplishes whether it be a cow, a hen, or an acre, is most important. The total production of any State is merely the sum of all its units. Poor little Rhode Island can't help that it is not as big as Texas.

Mr. WILKEN. "Poor little Rhode Island." By the way, Doctor, why don't you make that your State song?

Mr. BRESSLER. State song! We love the melody, Carl, but we object to the title. There is nothing poor about us. Do you men realize that the cash income per farm in Rhode Island is 75 percent more than the average for New England, that the average value of implements and machinery per acre is three times the country's average and the value of our farm land is almost four times that of the country.

Governor PASTORE. Mr. Rummell was telling me during dinner that we also have one of the best produce market set-ups in the Northeast.

Mr. WILKEN. The Governor needn't confine himself to the Northeast. The Providence wholesale market stacks at the top in the country.

Mr. BRESSLER. We like to hear that, don't we, Mr. Governor? Especially when it is true.

Governor PASTORE. You wouldn't say, Doctor, that we don't always tell the truth about our State, would you?

Mr. BRESSLER. Oh no, never; but we try to make the most of what we have, although seriously, Mr. Governor, it is impossible to overemphasize the importance of the work of the farmers—the food and fiber producers of our country. Agriculture is one of America's basic industries.

Mr. WILKEN. That's right, Doctor. I like to put it this way. Agriculture is the key to our prosperity. Factory pay rolls always approximate farm income whether stable or fluctuating, up or down.

Mr. BRESSLER. In other words, Mr. Wilken, what you are saying is that your total pay rolls for industry in America are always close to the total farm income and that they go up and down together.

Mr. WILKEN. Yes; except there is a time lag of about 6 months. Agriculture normally goes down first and starts up first. When this happens, as sure as there is an economic law of supply and demand, industry will follow in 6 months or thereabouts. Let's look at 2 years which will illustrate this relationship. In 1928 and in 1932 our farms produced substantially the same quantities of grains and livestock but the price received in 1932 was less than half what it was in 1928. The national income dropped to less than half, maintaining an approximate 7 to 1 ratio. Factory pay rolls took an equivalent drop. Automobile production fell from 4,000,000 to 1,186,000. The value of construction dropped even more sharply. The net result was approximately $42,000,000,000 of loss in 1932 as compared to 1928. Farm income reached its low in 1932 and started moving up in 1933. But most of the other elements in our economy, following the natural lag behind agriculture, reached their low in 1933 and did not start up until the turnover of increased farm dollars began to take effect. In 1937 farm income approximated $10,000,000,000. Then, with a larger production on the farms, prices weakened, the farm income in 1939 dropped over a billion dollars, factory pay rolls dropped over a billion, and the Nation fell off over seven billion. In 1939 everything started up toward the present level, but, if we don't try to stabilide our farm income and in turn our national income at a high level our country will be in a deplorable state in a few years.

Mr. BRESSLER. And that means a high price for farm products and a high wage for labor. Would you say that agricultural and labor income are Siamese twins, what affects one affects the other? If one gets sick the other follows.

Mr. WILKEN. Precisely, except that agriculture always seems to be the one to catch it first. You can't prevent a future depression unless agricultural production and prices are maintained.

Mr. BRESSLER. The agricultural dollar then is a very important factor in our national income?

Mr. WILKEN. It is the most important consideration in our whole national economy, for it determines over the years what the Nation's income will be, the number of jobs and the wages that can be paid. It doesn't make any difference whether our national income is high or low. The farmers' dollar multiplied by seven approximates $7 for the Nation. The ratio of 1 to 7 held for the good years in the 1920's, the bad years in the thirties, and the boom years of the war. If our country wishes to meet its obligations for operating expenses, interest payments and amortization of its debt, there must be an annual income of at least one hundred and forty billions.

Mr. BRESSLER. And you say that to get that much money the farmers of our country must receive in the aggregate twenty billions?

Mr. WILKEN. Exactly; you've got the point. We are too heavily in debt ever again to be a low-income nation.

Mr. BRESSLER. Mr. Governor, you seem to have a question.

Governor PASTORE. Well, hardly a question as yet. You know, Doctor, I am beginning to understand what you were driving at in your annual report when you said, "Fat farms make fat factories, fat factories make fat banks, fat banks make fat citizens, and fat citizens make fat farms." I think you also said that, "a nation wishing to be strong must look to the welfare of those who work with the raw materials of nature; the farms, fisheries, forests, and mines." What bothers me is how to bring about the things that Mr. Wilken suggests must be done. How can we bridge the gap between theory and action? What is the machinery for doing all this? How can the farmers be guaranteed the income you say they must have?

Mr. BRESSLER. What about this, Carl?

Mr. WILKEN. The gap is already partly bridged, Mr. Governor. Let's start with the easy items first: mineral and oil resources. Of course the prices should be stabilized and in fact they have been for a great many years. Six big oil companies control the price of crude petroleum at around 95 cents to a dollar a barrel. The Guffey Coal Act and the Wagner labor law, between them, have further stabilized this industry even at considerably higher base prices.

Fisheries and forestry, in the main, are in the hands of commercial interests and become more a question of wages than prices. Unlike farming, most of the employees in these two industries are working for someone else. Price of the product affects them less directly. The price the farmer receives is both his salary and his profit.

Mr. BRESSLER. Why do you assert, Carl, that agriculture is the most important factor in our national economy? Couldn't our national income be maintained just as well by supporting factory pay rolls?

Mr. WILKEN. It could, but why start with some point along the line when the logical place to start is with the source of wealth, our raw materials?

First. Agriculture is a basic raw material industry.

Second. It supplies 65 percent of the raw materials utilized in the United States.

Third. Its products, except fiber, are used quickly and therefore become buying power faster than mineral or forest products.

Fourth. There are twice as many business units in agriculture. Roughly, there are 9,000,000 business units in our whole country, of which 6,000,000 are in agriculture.

Fifth. Two-thirds of the capital invested in productive enterprise is in agriculture. Do you want any more reasons? I can consume the rest of our time, you know.

Mr. BRESSLER. No; I guess that's enough for our radio audience. We may continue this in your discussion off the air later. Your point is that agriculture is not the tail in our national economy but rather the dog himself priming the pump of national prosperity.

Mr. WILKEN. Yes, it is, if you wish to put it that way.

Mr. BRESSLER. You have answered only one of the Governor's questions. What about the machinery to make your program effective?

Mr. WILKEN. Well, here it is:

First, Congress should pass a foundation parity law including only the basic nonperishable or the unprocessed crops—corn, wheat, cotton, oats, barley, rye, rice, flax, hay, potatoes, peanuts, soybeans and the like. You understand of course that the dairy cow and the hen are as much processors of food as the pickle factory or the bakery.

Mr. BRESSLER. Yes; but it is the first time I have ever heard a cow compared to a pickle factory.

Mr. WILKEN. For my purpose they are the same.

Second. That we protect agriculture by import duties on both raw materials and finished goods at our parity levels.

Third. That we sell our surplus raw materials and finished goods at the world price level and absorb the loss from revenues obtained from tariff collections on imports.

Fourth. That we provide a 100-percent dollar and regulate the value of it at 100 for all groups.

Fifth. That we use the Bretton Woods agreements as a yardstick for world prosperity and stabilize gold and silver in line with American parity price level. Silver is the monetary medium of exploited nations. To leave it out simply means continued exploitation and dollar devaluation.

There it is, Doctor. If we use the American price level for a yardstick, we will be worth $600,000,000,000 and can have one hundred and fifty billion income annually with full employment and prosperity. If we use the world level, we will be worth only three hundred billion with seventy-five billion income, resulting in unemployment and chaos.

Mr. BRESSLER. Well, Carl, that certainly sounds impressive, and it looks as though we might be heading to make this grand old country of ours a land of "milk and money." And bringing milk into our discussion enables us to get away from agricultural prices and onto dairying, the second most discussed problem in the field of agriculture. Our guest speaker from Ohio, Mr. L. L. Rummell, was formerly editorial writer of the Ohio Farmer. Mr. Rummell, what about the dairy industry; is there anything in the air other than just more and more milk?

Mr. RUMMELL. That's a big order, Dr. Bressler, because our dairy industry is such a far-flung enterprise in our whole agricultural picture.

Mr. BRESSLER. In Rhode Island, Mr. Rummell, dairying is our leading agricultural business and we take pride in the production records and quality of milk that our fine herds produce. But what are the dairy folks doing in a national way.

Mr. RUMMELL. During the years when I was on the staff of the Ohio Farmer and director of the Ohio Holstein I got very close to the situation. You probably know of the work which is being done by the American Dairy Association—even though Rhode Island dairy producers are not affiliated with the association in their broad, constructive program.

Mr. BRESSLER. Yes; I am familiar with their efforts, and I think a good many of our progressive dairymen in Rhode Island are, too.

Mr. RUMMELL. The American Dairy Association supports a research program which is designed to help the consumer—which means every one of us. We all know that milk is as nearly a perfect food as possible but, unfortunately, not all of us use as much milk as the nutritionists tell us we should.

Mr. BRESSLER. I know one family that uses all the nutritionists tell us to use and then some. About a year ago I started protesting the monthly milk bills——

Mr. RUMMELL. You didn't get far with that.

Mr. BRESSLER. No, I didn't. My wife started giving me the line about a quart of milk having as much food value as a pound of beefsteak, and so forth. But we must get back to the American Dairy Association. How is the association supported? Where does the money come from for all this fine research work?

Mr. RUMMELL. A fund for the work is derived from contributions made by the association members. Every year, during the first 2 weeks in June, each member keeps a record of his production and contributes to the fund 2 cents per hundredweight of the amount of milk he delivers at the plant.

Mr. BRESSLER. That sounds fair enough. It's a cooperative venture then, and each producer gives according to the measure of his business.

Mr. RUMMELL. That's right, Dr. Bressler. This fund then is used to support research studies at various institutions of learning, such as your own Rhode Island Agricultural Experiment Station at Kingston. Dean Campbell tells me that the college dairy herd is one of the finest in this part of the country.

Mr. BRESSLER. It certainly is, and the Rhode Island dairy industry have their experiment station to thank for many improvements in milk production procedures, and for making our Rhode Island dairy herds among the best in the country. Did you know that only New Jersey has a higher cash income per dairy cow than Rhode Island?

Mr. RUMMELL. No, I didn't.

Mr. BRESSLER. Well, I just threw that in to keep the record straight and to please Bill Allen, commissioner of agriculture from New Jersey who is here at the head table. New Jersey is also one of the small States and must do a lot of howling to keep its agricultural head above water. Go ahead, Mr. Rummell, with what you were saying.

Mr. RUMMELL. I'm hoping that your forward-looking Rhode Island dairymen will support the research program of the American Dairy Association, for you have the facilities in Rhode Island to help us with our work.

Mr. BRESSLER. To come to another of your interests, Mr. Rummell. I read in the local paper several days ago a financial statement of the Kroger Grocery & Baking Co. It almost blew my hat off. To be perfectly frank I had never heard of the Kroger Co. until I learned you were to be associated with it as agricultural counsel. Tell us something about the company.

Mr. RUMMELL. I wouldn't want to recite a lot of figures here. That would make me sound like a talking annual report. But I can tell you that through Ohio, the Midwest, and the South we operate nearly 3,000 retail stores, and are in a position to know a good deal of what the consumer wants and needs—folks like you and me and all of us.

Mr. BRESSLER. I should think so. Are you using your present position to study consumer desires, for instance?

Mr. RUMMELL. Very much so. In Columbus, Ohio, for example, we have been cooperating with the Ohio Agricultural Experiment Station in a survey of packaged vegetables. We have been putting up vegetables, keeping them at low temperatures and marketing them so that there is no waste.

Mr. BRESSLER. No waste. Well, that sounds like one of the postwar dreams we've been hearing so much about these last few years.

Mr. RUMMELL. It's no longer a dream, Dr. Bressler. The housewife can go to a store, buy these packaged vegetables and when she gets home, put them right in her oven or in the boiling pan. She knows exactly what she is buying and how much she is buying. They're all prepared and in addition to that she doesn't have to fill her garbage container with wilted leaves or half-spoiled vegetables.

Rhode Island will be seeing such packaged vegetables, I'm sure. That's one of the fine things that results from cooperation and research in a free democracy like ours. New discoveries are quickly disseminated throughout the Nation.

Mr. BRESSLER. Rhode Island already has these packages, Mr. Rummell. For 6 or 7 years our Lungo Brothers have been packaging spinach, lettuce, cut cabbage, and a mix they call the salad bowl all ready for french dressing or whatever you like on it. I understand that you go farther. You have

experimented with about everything from onions to cauliflower.

Mr. RUMMELL. That's right.

Mr. BRESSLER. Which brings me back again to the start of our discussion, when I referred to our land of "milk and money." After all, vegetables are also an important part of good diet, and we can't be a strong Nation unless we eat the right things.

We certainly appreciate your interest in our agricultural problems here in Rhode Island, Mr. Rummell, and are most happy that you could take the time from your busy life to come East from Cincinnati to be with us. The pattern of life in Iowa and in Ohio is not too different from our own. As consumers, we're all in the same market basket, so to speak.

Restoration of Ford's Theater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 1 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Plan To Restore Ford's Would Fill Last Panel in the Lincoln Tragedy," written by Nelson B. Bell, and published in the Washington Post of February 24, 1946.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLAN TO RESTORE FORD'S WOULD FILL LAST PANEL IN THE LINCOLN TRAGEDY

(By Nelson B. Bell)

Thousands of pilgrims annually visit Mount Vernon and come away with a vivid impression of the surroundings and manner in which George Washington lived.

Other thousands visit the old Ford's Theater on Tenth Street and carry away little more than the bare knowledge of the geographical location of the spot on which Abraham Lincoln was assassinated the night of April 14, 1865.

This is a memorial discrepancy which Senator MILTON R. YOUNG, of North Dakota, patriotically and wisely seeks to remedy.

On February 6 Senator YOUNG introduced a joint resolution (S. J. Res. 139) directing the Interior Secretary to estimate the cost of reconstructing Ford's Theater.

In offering his resolution, the Senator observed that "a visit to Washington is to many an American family an experience of a lifetime, long planned for and undertaken with a singleness of purpose and a sincerity of interest. To visit the Lincoln Memorial, the Capitol of the United States, and the White House are great experiences in the lives of many of our people."

A BARREN SHRINE

"To those who love Lincoln, a visit to Ford's Theater is an additional experience long anticipated. But in visiting Ford's Theater they feel a distinct disappointment. They do not see the theater at all.

"Although nearly 81 years have elapsed since that tragic event, it is not too late to bring back to the American people a vision of exactly what occurred. The home in which he died, located at 516 Tenth Street, is a Lincoln shrine and is intact. It is very unfortunate that the theater across the street is not also intact.

"The restoration of the stage, the boxes, and the scenery in Ford's Theater is a duty which should be carried by us all. It is not a question of the cost. Each visitor is now charged by the Department of the Interior an admission fee. These moneys could be applied to the cost of restoration."

DETAILED RESTORATION

"I look to the earliest possible restoration of Ford's Theater. Not just the stage, boxes, and scenery, but the chair in which the immortal Lincoln last sat and the flag that draped his box."

Senator YOUNG is wholly justified both in deploring the present state of Ford's Theater and in his confidence that its restoration lies easily within the realm of possibility.

When apprised that the Senator contemplated bringing the issue to focus on Lincoln's birthday, or as near that date as filibusters and whatnot would permit, we paid a visit to Ford's and found no semblance of a theater.

The low-ceilinged room to which the public is admitted upon payment of the 10-cent fee is thickly studded with supporting pillars and glass showcases which afford meager material for reconstructing the scene on the fatal night of April 14, when Lincoln attended Laura Keane's performance of Our American Cousin, the last play ever presented on the stage at Ford's.

Thin black lines trace the bases of the columns supporting the Presidential box, the stage-line and the footprints of John Wilkes Booth as he made his escape into the opposite wings. That is all.

Except to the liveliest imagination, the structure is far less suggestive of the playhouse than of Government offices, warehousing and the other utilitarian uses to which it has been put.

While all source material is, of course, available to the Government, there has been extensive research looking to the exact reproduction of Ford's Theater as it was that night in 1865. These data, embracing dimensions, decoration, equipment, furnishings, and stage settings, are, or should be, extant.

TWO MOVIE STUDIES

They were gathered first for the Rockett Brothers' production for First National of the motion picture "Abraham Lincoln," released as a silent film January 27, 1924, and again by United Artists for another Lincoln biographical picture released under the same title on August 31, 1930.

The Ford's Theater sequences in the Al and Ray Rockett "Abraham Lincoln" were so painstakingly realistic that they were authenticated and applauded by members of the Lincoln audience still living in 1924, and by the late distinguished character actor, William Ferguson, who was a member of the cast of Our American Cousin.

Neither is Senator YOUNG too optimistic with regard to other features of the proposed restoration.

The chair in which Lincoln sat when Booth shot him from behind is still in existence and, I am given to believe, in a fair state of preservation.

The same is true of the American flag that draped the presidential box. My understanding is that it is in official custody, with the rent caused when Booth caught his foot still unmended.

It is also presumable that in the Oldroyd collection, housed in the shrine at 516 Tenth Street, opposite Ford's, are other relics of the martyred President's last hours that would be appropriate to the rehabilitation of the theater.

With the theater restored, the two buildings might well be jointly conducted by the Interior Department, or under whatever auspices, as the complete picture of the passing of one of the world's immortals.

A NAME REDEEMED

In such circumstances the specious suggestion always is heard that the theatrical profession might tacitly resent so vivid reminder that it was an actor who killed Lincoln.

The black stigma that attaches to the name of John Wilkes Booth should be completely erased from the minds of the profession by the rich contributions made to the stage by his older brothers, Junius Brutus and Edwin Thomas Booth, and their abhorrence of the act of their kinsman.

Senator YOUNG's proposal deserves universal and unflagging support.

Harvest of Stars Radio Program Celebrating Texas Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT THOMAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 1, 1946

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, International Harvester Co.'s Harvest of Stars program is heard Sunday at 2 p. m. eastern standard time, over the entire NBC network, and brings together each week one of radio's greatest assemblages of stars. Raymond Massey, star of screen, stage, and radio, is the narrator of the program and is featured in the dramatic sketches; Howard Barlow conducts the 70-piece Harvest of Stars symphonic orchestra and Lyn Murray directs the 30-voice chorus.

Harvest of Stars is produced by Russ Johnston, vice president in charge of programs for McCann Erickson, Inc., who represent the International Harvester Co. The premiere of the program was October 7, 1945.

The Harvest of Stars program March 3 is devoted to Texas, "the State so big it has to have a program all to itself." The program will honor the one hundred and tenth anniversary of the most famous event in Texas' struggle for independence—the fall of the Alamo. The program also commemorates the hundredth anniversary of Texas' statehood.

Jan Peerce, Metropolitan opera tenor, will be the guest soloist for the Texas celebration and all of the program and the music will honor the State of Texas.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the program as follows:

Mr. MASSEY. This is Raymond Massey. Welcome to another International Harvester program—Harvest of Stars. Our guest today is the brilliant young tenor of the Metropolitan Opera, Jan Peerce—and we're going to pay our respect to Texas, the State so big it has to have a program all to itself. This week is the hundred and tenth anniversary of the most famous event in Texas' struggle for independence—the fall of the Alamo, the shrine of Texas liberty. We're going to do a play about that later * * * but now, let's start the program with Howard Barlow conducting the International Harvester orchestra and chorus in three songs that are part of Texas and the southwest: Chisholm Trail, Carry Me Back to the Lone Prairie, and La Cucaracha.

(Barlow, orchestra and chorus: Western medley.)

Mr. MASSEY. Let's listen to some Texas brags.

Voice No. 1: Texas occupies all of the continent of North America except a small part set aside for three places called the United States, Canada, and Mexico.

Voice No. 2: Why—if you fold Texas north, you're up into Canada; fold it east, and you're out in the Atlantic; fold it west, and you're into the Pacific. But it's healthier to leave Texas alone.

Voice No. 3: If everybody in the United States moved to Texas, they'd still have plenty of elbow room; and they'd probably live a lot longer.

Mr. MASSEY. Yes, Texas is the place. And now here is International Harvester's guest star, Jan Peerce, to sing a Mexican song all Texans love—the beautiful La Paloma.

(Peerce and orchestra: La Paloma.)

Mr. MASSEY. Thank you, Mr. Peerce. You know, the Mexican tradition is so strong in Texas, and so famous, that travelers are usually surprised to find that down in the southeastern part of the State there's a very strong German influence, too. It goes back to the days of the eighteen-forties, when many Germans were fleeing from middle Europe to escape political persecution, and just naturally headed for Texas in their search for freedom. They brought their music with them, and it became a true part of Texas culture. Here is Howard Barlow to conduct a Texas favorite, the lovely Strauss waltz, Southern Roses.

(Barlow and orchestra: Southern Roses, by Strauss.)

Mr. HANCOCK. Howard Barlow has just conducted the International Harvester Orchestra in Southern Roses, by Strauss. And now, here is Raymond Massey to play Col. William B. Travis in a story about the fall of the Alamo, the fortress at San Antonio—the story of the 12-day siege that ended with every Texan dead at his post.

(Music: Builds to a crescendo, and out of it.)

Voice No. 1: Thermopylae had its messenger of defeat; the Alamo had none.

(Music: Builds again. Then, out of it.)

Voice No. 2: Remember the Alamo!

(Music: Builds again. Then, out of it.)

Mr. MASSEY. Commandancy of the Alamo, San Antonio de Bexar, February 24, 1836. To the people of Texas and all Americans in the world: Fellow citizens and compatriots, I am besieged by a thousand or more of the Mexicans under Santa Anna—I have sustained a continued bombardment and cannonade for 24 hours and have not lost a man. The enemy has demanded a surrender at discretion, otherwise the garrison are to be put to the sword if the fort is taken; I have answered the demand with a cannon shot, and our flag still waves proudly from the walls—I shall never surrender or retreat. Then, I call on you in the name of liberty, of patriotism, and everything dear to the American character, to come to our aid with all dispatch. The enemy is receiving reinforcements daily and will no doubt increase to three or four thousand in 4 or 5 days. If this call is neglected, I am determined to sustain myself as long as possible and die like a soldier who never forgets what is due to his own honor and that of his country. Victory or death. William Barret Travis, lieutenant colonel, commandant.

(Music: Builds swiftly with cannonading behind it.)

Voice (over it, softly): Inside the walls, a hundred and eighty-seven men, with a little food and a few guns, led by the four: William Travis, called Buck; Jim Bonham; Jim Bowie; Davy Crockett (pause), March 3d, the tenth day.

(Music and cannonading hit a climax, then fade swiftly to nothing. Out of the silence, softly, lonesomely, a guitar, and a young voice singing.)

Smithers (singing):

"Go tell Aunt Rhody,
Go tell Aunt Rhody,
Go tell Aunt Rhody,
That her old gray goose is dead.
The one that she was savin',
The one that——"

Travis: Smithers!

Smithers: —"she was"—Uh? Oh! Mornin', Colonel Travis!

Travis: What are you doing here? Why aren't you up on the walls?

Smithers: I been relieved; I been up there all night.

Travis: Then why aren't you sleeping?

Smithers: Well, I sort of lost the habit, Colonel Travis. Besides, the Mexicans been so quiet this mornin'. I don't figure I could go to sleep, 'thout a couple of cannon goin' off around my head.

Travis: Is Colonel Bowie awake in there?

Smithers: Yes, sir. And coughin' purty terrible. He's got the consumption bad.

Travis: Better try to get some sleep, Smithers.

Smithers (quick fade): Yes, sir, I'll try. But it's so quiet!

(Coughing fades in.)

Travis: How is it, Jim?

Bowie: Eh? (Coughing stops.) I'm all right, Buck. How is it out there?

Travis: Quiet. (Coughing again. It stops.)

Bowie: Aaahhh! What a way to be! I wish something would happen. Jim Bowie never figured to die in bed.

Travis: Anything I can get you?

Bowie: No. Any of the messengers come back?

Travis: No. I keep waiting for Bonham.

Bowie: He won't come back. Fannin'll talk him into staying there at Goliad.

Travis: But we've got to have Fannin! If he brings his men up, we can hold off Santa Anna until he dies of old age! It's our one chance!

Bowie: Well, don't count on Fannin. He's a careful man. (He starts coughing again.) Aaahhh! (Firing, off.) What's that?

Travis: It's outside the walls!

Campbell (fading in): Colonel Travis! Where is he? Colonel Travis!

Travis: What? Here!

Campbell: There's a rider coming over the hill. Headed for the east gate.

Travis: Is it Bonham?

Campbell: I don't know. He's on a white horse. And the Mexicans are pourin' on everything they got!

Travis: Get on the gate! Smithers!

Smithers (off): Yeah? (Firing is heavier.)

Travis: Get on the east gate! Get ready to throw it open! See you later, Jim!

Bowie (fading): Bring him back here!

Travis (yelling orders): Up on the east wall, men! Crockett! Where's Crockett?

Crockett (off, yelling): I'm ahead of you, Buck! Up there, men! Pour it on! Pour it on!

Travis: Dickerson! Open up with your guns! (Men are yelling.)

Voice: Fire! (A cannon booms. Another.)

Crockett: It's Bonham! Jim Bonham!

Travis: Smithers! You on the gate?

Smithers: Ready!

Travis: Throw it!

Crockett: Pick 'em off, men! Don't just shoot! Save your lead and pick 'em off! (Horse fades in at gallop.)

Smithers: He's in!

Travis: Shut the gate! (Horse comes to stop.) Jim, you all right?

Bonham: Sure I'm all right. Hello, Buck.

Crockett: Got him! There's another for Betsey! (Firing slackens.) Save your lead, men! They know they're licked!

Travis: Come on inside. What's the news from Fannin?

Bonham: Bad. (Takes a deep breath.) Let me get my breath. How's Bowie? (Firing fades out in a scatter.)

Travis: You'll see. He's in here. (Coughing fades in.)

Bonham: Is that him?

Travis: Yeah.

Bonham: Aahh—that's bad. (Coughing stops, on.)

Bowie: Bonham, is that you?

Bonham: Hello, Jim! Well! You're looking fine!

Bowie: Save that for the girls. What about Fannin?

Bonham: He won't come.

Travis: Won't come! Why not?

Bonham: He doesn't think it's any use, Buck. And he figures he's going to be attacked any day, and he'd better sit tight at Goliad.

Travis: Of all the lily-livered—!!

Bonham: Now wait a minute, Buck. He sees it his way. And besides, if you want to know, he hasn't got much of an army. (Bowie starts laughing and coughing.)

Bowie (coming out of it): Well, Buck, there goes your chance.

Travis: Yeah, there goes my chance.

(Music: Transition.)

(Crowd murmurs: "What's up? Where's Travis? What're we all doing down here? What's Travis want us for?")

Bonham: 'Tention!!

Smithers: There he is. There's Travis. (Crowd subsides.)

Travis: Easy, men; everybody here?

Voice: Where's Jim Bowie?

Bowie: Here I am, flat on my back, bed and all! (Laughter.)

Voice: You alone, Jim? (Laughter.)

Travis: All right, men. (Silence.) The time's come for us to do a little talking. The Mexicans are holding their fire; I think we can talk now.

Voice: Wouldn't matter if they kept right on shooting! They haven't hit a one of us yet! (Laughter.)

Travis: That's right; 10 days now, and they haven't hit a one of us. And we've hit quite a few. But I don't know how much longer we can go on that way. The enemy hasn't tried to storm the walls yet, he might try any day; and when he tries, he might get over, and if he gets over—we'll die fighting, but we'll die. You see—it's time we gave up the idea that help's going to come; it's time we understood that we stand here alone. And that's what I came to ask you: How much longer you think you want to stand. I'll make it short. You've seen the red flag that flies over the church in town; you know what it means: No quarter; death to the rebels. And that's what we are: Rebels. Free men, fighting for freedom. We know what it means, we've been doing it all our lives, our fathers did it before us. Fighting for freedom's a lifetime job; you can never let go; you stop for a minute, and you lose it all. Well, I'm not asking you to stop. But you're all free men, and I've got to give you a choice. There are ways of getting out of here, not for many, but for a few, one at a time, to make a run for it in the dark. Those of you who have wives and children—I have no right to ask you to stay here and die. You can get away and fight for freedom tomorrow. That's what I came to tell you.

Voice: You've got two kids of your own, Travis.

Travis: My job's here. Well?

Voice (quietly): Who'll cross the line and stand with Travis? (Pause.)

Voice (quietly): Here I come.

Voice (quietly): Here I come.

Voice (anxious): Hey, Jimmy! Wait for me!

Voices (in an uproar): Yea, Travis! Here we come! Liberty and freedom! God and Texas! Here we come! (A tremendous cheer.)

(Music: Blasts out full, and into it the sound of firing and cannonading. It holds solidly, and then, over the music and noise.)

Travis: God and Texas! Victory or death!

(Music: Continues up full, then quickly subsides into a minor strain.)

Voice (softly, into the music): Thermopylae had its messenger of defeat; the Alamo had none.

(Music: Out.)

Mr. HANCOCK. Now, here is International Harvester's guest star, Jan Peerce, in another bow to Texas, with a favorite song of the southern border, El Rancho Grande.

(Peerse and chorus: El Rancho Grande.)

Mr. MASSEY. This is Raymond Massey again. Let's get back to Texas—it's hard to keep away from it. The State that calls for superlatives. First in petroleum, first in beef cattle, first in cotton, first in spinach, first in roses, longest, tallest, widest, deepest, the State with one ranch bigger than Delaware, with more goats than Missouri has people, with more sheep than the population of Pennsylvania, the only State that came into the Union by treaty as a sovereign nation; the only one that has the right to divide itself into five States if it wants to—but what Texan would want to. Here is Howard Barlow to pay tribute again, as he conducts the International Harvester orchestra and chorus in The Texas Blue Bonnet Song and Tin Pan Alley's contribution, Deep in the Heart of Texas.

(Barlow, orchestra, and chorus: Closing medley.)

Return to Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 1 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Return to Liberty," which I delivered in Kansas City, Mo., on February 12 before the Missouri Republican Club.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Republicans and my good friends, all over the United States today the Republican Party is opening the campaign of 1946. I come from the political arena in Washington, where confusion reigns supreme, the place to which as yet no peace has come; and so far as the Government is concerned we have not even recognized the cessation of hostilities. The Democratic Party is hopelessly divided between those who follow the PAC program on every issue, and those who insist upon constitutional government but don't care very much whether progress is made within that system or not. At first it was doubtful which way Mr. Truman would turn, but he has chosen to follow the PAC course on nearly every measure. He has chosen the course of unlimited public spending and increased power to Federal bureaucracies. Fortunately, half the Democrats and most of the Republicans in Congress disagree with that course. But the result is a national deadlock at a time when we should be moving on sound lines toward increased prosperity. Only by the return of the Republican Party to power can we achieve a unified and constructive program of progress within American principles of freedom and sound government. Today begins the campaign to make that program possible, to elect a Republican Congress in 1946, and a Republican President in 1948.

The foundations of any Republican program must be liberty and justice. In 1837 Abraham Lincoln, whose birthday we today here celebrate, said that our forefathers' task in America was "to uprear upon its hills and its valleys a political edifice of liberty and equal rights." And at Gettysburg he spoke those immortal words, "Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." Liberty and equality; liberty and justice; liberty under law equally administered; those are the bases of the American Republic.

They must be the basis of any Republican program. Whatever progressive purposes we may announce, whatever the measures to carry them out, they must be designed in accord with these principles, and I speak tonight particularly of liberty. We must maintain the liberty of the individual guaranteed by the Bill of Rights so that his daily life is not regulated by some Government bureaucracy. We must maintain his liberty to say what he pleases and to worship as he pleases. We must maintain the liberty of States and localities to rule themselves without orders from Washington, for only thus can we prevent the vast concentration of power in Washington which would bring real national freedom to an end. We must draft our measures without delegating unrestrained authority to Federal bureaucrats so that the liberty which men have may be protected in the courts.

This Government was established in 1776 to secure the blessings of liberty for its people. We have fought two world wars, not to dominate the world or save other peoples, but to be certain that Nation remains free from any foreign domination or threat of foreign domination. At home, liberty is the basis of the success which we have achieved. Our standard of living was brought about by the initiative, the genius, the daring, and the inspired hard work of our people. These qualities could only have come into existence through liberty of thought and liberty of action.

Today that liberty is threatened by the steady spread of totalitarian ideas. We have defeated three great totalitarian states which set out to conquer the world without regard for liberty or justice. But we have half accepted many of the theories of states which we have conquered. These theories are the style today, not only with our left-wing writers, but with many who do not see the results to which they threaten to bring us. Too many who ought to know better seem to believe that more government is the solution of every problem. If anything is wrong, some czar must be set up and be given power to correct it, to find a remedy if he can, in his arbitrary discretion. If any project is attractive, Washington must put up the money to carry it out. These ideas not only destroy local self-reliance, but they play directly into the hands of those who consciously plan a complete concentration of power in the state. The state must manage everything, it is said, if we are to avoid depression and unemployment. It would be a tragic result if a war successful in securing liberty from foreign domination resulted in the destruction of liberty at home by foreign ideologies.

The President has accused Congress and the Republicans of delaying his legislative program. They have delayed it because they have been opposed to its attacks on liberty. They have opposed it because the thinking of the Democratic administration is dominated today by the policies and thinking of the PAC, derived directly from Marx via Moscow. I know of no body of men more representative of the American people than is Congress—Congress has opposed the Truman program because the American people have not yet come to this kind of thinking, because they still believe in liberty.

Nearly every feature of the Truman program calls for more Federal power, which means less liberty for the people. Most features call for more Federal spending, which means more Federal power. It would be hard to point to a project for spending money which the President has not endorsed. More Federal buildings—Federal grants for every kind of local public works, Missouri Valley Authorities, Arkansas Valley Authorities, Central Valley Authorities, St. Lawrence Waterways, billions for Bretton Woods, billions for the Export-Import Bank, billions for UNRRA, billions for the British, billions for compulsory health insurance, billions for compulsory military training. Nowhere in all of these messages do we find any concern whatever about the burden of taxation or the burden of debt which must result from such a policy. The Budget is unbalanced and it fails to include huge sums in the nature of loans to foreign countries which will certainly increase further the public debt. Spending is power—if inflation or depression result from this reckless policy it leads to a demand for more power, more regulation, and less freedom.

The key to the Truman program was the so-called full employment bill. In its original form it contained an absolute Government guarantee of a full-time job to every citizen and an endorsement of the Keynes-Wallace compensatory-spending theory. That is, the President was directed to estimate the number of jobs that might be wanted, the gross national income necessary to create these jobs at some average wage to be fixed by him, and then submit a program of economic measures with Federal spending and investment equal to the difference between this inflationary goal and the probable national income. The theory of the bill was that in the last analysis prosperity could always be produced by sufficient Government spending. The calculations required might easily have called for the additional expenditure by the Government of thirty or forty billion dollars over the normal budget. It was based on the theory that we could spend ourselves into prosperity.

The jobs-guaranty provision came directly from the Soviet Constitution, article 118, where it is said, "Citizens of the USSR have the right to work—the right to receive guaranteed work, with payment of their work in accordance with its quantity and quality. The right to work is insured by the Socialist Organization of National Economy * * *." Only a Socialist state has ever succeeded in guaranteeing employment, and no Socialist state has ever begun to equal the standard of living of the people of this country under a free system.

Congress amended and modified the Truman-PAC bill until the bill agreed on last week contains no mention of full employment, no guaranty by the Government, no compensatory-spending program, no national budget. The bill is even milder than the House bill which the President denounced as wholly unsatisfactory to his philosophy. It only directs the President to submit each year a general plan, covering all features of our economic system to bring about maximum employment and general prosperity. Of course, we all agree that we should plan to avoid the calamity of another depression. But that planning must be based on sound financial principles and the reduction of public debt, not on unlimited Government spending and the power which that spending gives.

The President complains that the Congress has not enacted his recommendations regarding unemployment compensation, but the President's real program was, and is, to federalize unemployment compensation. Congress is opposed to that tremendous centralization of power. As a step toward his goal, the President tried under PAC pressure to get Congress to enact a bill increasing all unemployment compensation to $25 a week for 26 weeks, taking from the States their right to fix their own rates. He vetoed the act to reduce Federal expenses by returning the employment offices to the States. Everyone admits that these offices and the unemployment compensation bureaus should be run by the same government. The President is trying to federalize the whole outfit and,

in effect, give control of employment to left-wing labor. Congress does not propose to abolish the United States Employment Service, but only to return to the States the local offices which President Roosevelt seized without authority the day after Pearl Harbor. The United States Employment Service would continue to exchange information and handle interstate requirements. The State offices, coordinated by the USES, can give just as much and better service to veterans and other applicants for jobs. Congress insists on State control because local and State management means more freedom for our citizens.

The President favors the continued control of prices and rents "for many months to come" and objects to the fact that we only continued the Second War Powers Act until July 1, 1946. Congress and most of the Republicans disagree. We believe in eliminating Federal control over prices and priorities at the earliest possible moment as a necessary step to reconversion and to that increased production which alone can bring an ultimate reduction in prices. I believe it will be necessary to continue controls over rents and a limited number of scarce articles beyond July 1, 1946, but I also believe that the commodities to be controlled should be expressly named and a more definite and fairer rule prescribed for fixing prices and rents. But today the Bowles propaganda machine is working overtime to continue controls indefinitely, over all business transactions. It is choking production. It is imposing injustice on large and small business alike but small business suffers far more because it has less reserves. The policy of price control in time of peace crushes the initiative and freedom essential for progress.

The whole policy of inflation control is hypocritical today, because while the President denounces inflation he is promoting the greatest peacetime inflation this country has ever seen, first, by lavish spending of Government money, and, second, by urging a general increase in all wages and salaries. The increase may be justified in many cases, but since the average increase in hourly wage rates since 1941 is already 42 percent, compared to a 33 percent increase in the cost of living, a further general increase in wages can only result in further increases in prices. We see it now in the absolute necessity of increasing steel prices. Inflation control is sought more because it gives power over business than because it will control inflation.

The President has recommended the continuation of subsidies. He says the removal of subsidies would result in increasing the cost of living by 3 percent, which he considers outrageous although he is recommending a general increase in wages and salaries many times that amount. There is no more inflation in permitting a necessary increase in prices than there is in borrowing the money to pay subsidies and thereby increasing the national debt. We cannot escape either way the result of rising costs and wages brought about by Government policy. Subsidies are a means by which the Government can control the operation and the profits of individual concerns, thus reducing the reward for efficiency, initiative, and hard work. They mean both more spending and more power for the Government. They should be eliminated.

The President insists upon an FEPC Act so drastic and granting such tremendous power to the Government over every individual and corporate employer that even its advocates last week in the Senate admitted that it must be extensively amended. I have presented a bill in accordance with the Republican platform, designed, by study and voluntary appeal, to lessen constantly the disadvantage under which the Negro is placed today in seeking for work. But it does not give the Government the vast power demanded by the PAC, and therefore I am denounced by the left-wingers as a reactionary.

The President has endorsed the plan for compulsory military training by which every boy, more than a million of them a year, shall be taken for a full year of military training. It is impossible to conceive of any more totalitarian measure, one which places the life of every citizen during his formative years for a substantial period under the absolute control of the Federal Government. The Government may upset his plans for education, his plans for an occupation, his plans for a family, at its arbitrary will. It may indoctrinate him with the current philosophy which dominates the thinking of Washington. Such conscription has been a feature of every great totalitarian state. It cannot be justified short of absolute necessity, and no case has been made out to show that a reserve of 10,000,000 men from 18 to 27 will even serve any useful purpose of national defense. Yet, it is supported by many people on the ground that our boys need discipline and a certain kind of education which can only be forced down their throats by an all-powerful Government. Incidentally it also involves Federal spending at the rate of at least $2,000,000,000 a year. More power and less freedom.

The Army should have turned its attention first to establishing a voluntary peacetime Army of a million men, or perhaps a million and a half while Germany and Japan are being occupied. But they have simply retarded the demobilization of a wartime Army without preventing the demoralization of those who remain. Even the advocates of compulsory military training have never claimed that there would be conscription for the Army itself. The War Department should have devoted itself to establishing this new peacetime Army instead of wasting its energy and its propaganda on compulsory military training and the unification of the services under Army control. We must make the Army sufficiently attractive to establish the necessary peacetime force on a voluntary basis. We could well add to that a reasonable reserve through a voluntary system of military training in cooperation with the existing schools and colleges.

The President demands Federal compulsory health insurance. That means that from three to four billion dollars is arbitrarily deducted from all pay rolls and flows into the Social Security Board in Washington. There it is used to pay all the doctors in the United States. The President says this is not socialized medicine because you can choose your own doctor; but, of course, the man who pays the doctor is his employer and that is to be the Federal Government. Not only is medicine socialized, but it is socialized under the control and direction of a Federal bureau in Washington. Of all of President Truman's program, this represents the greatest extension of power and cash—the greatest limitation on the daily freedom of the American citizen to manage his personal life.

Only in the President's labor bill has he antagonized the PAC, and certainly there could be no milder measure than he has proposed. But it is characterized by the same demand for power, because it leaves completely to the President through his personally appointed fact-finding boards the power to indicate the solution which is likely to determine the outcome of many labor controversies. The Congress, surely, should clarify and declare the principles of labor relations on a much more definite and detailed plan, and Congress is inclined to do so without abolishing the freedom of industry and labor to work out their own problems in each business.

In foreign affairs the President has always exercised a greater power to act without consulting Congress or the people, but the measures which have been forced through by the violent propaganda of the State Department have practically eliminated every power over foreign affairs reserved to the Congress or the people. I was much in favor of our joining the United Nations, and I am quite willing to obligate ourselves to submit our disputes to a world court or to arbitration. But through the Bretton Woods Act, through the Reciprocal Trade Act, through the act setting up our delegation to the United Nations, Congress has given the President almost unlimited power, both over our economic relations with other countries and over our political relations with other countries. Through his delegate on the Security Council, he may make war without the approval of Congress and without the approval of the people of the United States. He may reduce tariffs to a point which will destroy American industries and yet be entirely within his legal rights. He may purchase goods abroad and import them into this country, thereby setting the price of such goods. Almost the only restraint upon him today is the power of the purse which requires him to submit to Congress a proposal like the British loan.

I do not say that all of these powers should be refused. In some cases they may be essential, but if all this Truman program were adopted, there would remain little freedom to the people of the United States against the arbitrary determination of an arbitrary President. I believe that in foreign affairs Congress should determine the rules by which tariffs shall be fixed, by which our boys shall be sent into foreign wars, and by which our economic relations with other countries shall be governed. Unlimited delegation of discretion to the President in all foreign affairs can easily lead to a complete absence of freedom at home.

In the domestic field we should definitely write the laws, not leave them to be written by administrative bureaus. We should leave all possible control in the hands of local and State governments. We should avoid plans which require detailed regulation of every farmer and every business. We should reduce Federal power and reduce Federal spending instead of constantly increasing it. Only by such policies can we avoid the present-day trend to the all-powerful state.

I have indicated the position on many current issues which I believe should be taken by any party which believes that this should be a free America. The Republican Party has presented a very definite and affirmative program in the platform of 1944, and in the recent statement of principles adopted by the Republicans in Congress and the national committee. Of course, the minority party is not in a position to bring its program before the Senate or the House because procedure is controlled by the Democrats. We ask for an opportunity in 1947 to present that program for action through a Republican House of Representatives. But it can be easily summarized.

If liberty is the key to peacetime progress, it is time that we declared the end of hostilities and terminated most of the war powers. Price and rent controls should only be continued after July 1 for those articles which are really in scarce supply. A peactime army should be immediately built up by sufficient inducement so that every drafted man can be released and the draft of other men brought to an end. We should constantly reduce expenses until further tax reduction can be brought about without creating a deficit. Particularly, tax reduction should extend to the incomes of the lowest income group, to most of the war excise taxes, and to the duplication of taxation on corporations and the dividends from common stocks.

We must insist upon a balanced budget in order to prevent further inflation, to assure stability of wage level and price level, and to prevent the depression which follows any inflated boom. The control of credit may be expanded, but direct control of industry and

prices must be removed to insure increased production. We want reasonable progress with worth-while public works, and plans to increase that program if there is any falling off in private purchasing.

I have repeatedly outlined the Republican plan for social welfare. We are in favor of extending the coverage of the old-age-pension system and unemployment compensation to many groups such as agricultural labor and domestic service. We should undertake to see that no family or individual willing to work suffers hardship and poverty, by assisting the States to provide a reasonable floor under subsistence, housing, medical care, and education.

We must recognize that the expense of this system must be borne by the more fortunate four-fifths of the population who do not need it. We, therefore, cannot impose upon them so heavy a burden as to discourage their initiative and activity. Nor can the minimum standards, the floor, be so high as to destroy the interest of men in securing something better through their own efforts. The prosperity of the country depends upon the activity of the four-fifths, but a country as productive as the United States should not fail to provide a minimum standard of living for everyone who is willing to work, or who is unable to work by reason of mental or physical handicap.

The initiative and the administration should rest upon the local and State authorities, because local self-government is an absolute essential of real freedom. The standards on which aid is granted should be clearly indicated in the Federal statute so that nothing depends upon the mere discretion of the Federal bureau. Federal aid should be confined to the lower-income groups and not extended to the whole population as President Truman's health program proposes.

We have endorsed the program of Federal aid to enable States to extend their health- and medical-care programs to cover all unable to pay for health and hospital service.

I believe we should adopt a housing program, including a reasonable amount of public low-rent housing, which will constantly improve the housing plant until all are assured of decent shelter in decent surroundings.

I believe that we should extend Federal aid to assist education in those States which, after making at least the average effort, are unable to give every child a basic education.

This social-welfare program can be worked out within our constitutional system and without limiting the freedom of our people. It can be worked out at a total cost of perhaps $750,000,000 a year instead of the fifteen billion of social security proposed in the Murray-Wagner-Dingell plan.

Our labor policy, too, should be based on the principles of liberty and justice: liberty from Government interference and real impartiality between employee and employer. I am opposed to compulsory arbitration of all labor disputes, and a prohibition of those strikes which are concerned with basic questions of wages and hours, because I believe it must lead inevitably to Government fixing of all wages. I don't see how a Government can fix wages without going on to fix prices, and then every man and every transaction is ruled from Washington. We can reduce labor strife by a sound board of mediation, but it must be completely impartial between the parties. We should insist that unions be incorporated and thereby made responsible for the performance of their collective-bargaining contracts. That can only strengthen and build up the principle of collective bargaining effectively prescribed by the National Labor Relations Act. Beyond this there are amendments which may reduce violence on both sides and correct injustices between the parties.

I have read many editorials and speeches, criticizing the Republican Party because this program is not sufficiently liberal. There is seldom any specification in these criticisms, seldom any indication that the writer has read the program or listened to the views of Republican leaders. Most of the criticism comes from those who are clearly New Dealers themselves and merely wish to discredit and reduce the strength of the Republican Party. Whenever any criticism is heard, it is acclaimed by all the claque of commentators and columnists and editors who either take their tone directly from Moscow or the PAC, or those others who have so easily accepted the doctrine that every ill can be cured by more Federal power and more Federal spending and want the Republican Party to propose new plans for such power and spending. It is time that these critics get down to cases, that they let us know clearly whether they are in favor of the specific measures introduced into Congress after being written by the left-wing groups in New York, carefully phrased to write into law their totalitarian philosophy. If not, what is their liberal program? As I understand the word "liberal" it means something which renders the people more free. It means measures which turn away from control by the Government and from the concentration of vast power in Washington. It means a program which is designed to build our progress on those two fundamental principles which have made our people the most progressive, the most powerful, and the most tolerant which the world has ever seen, the principle of justice, and the liberty of freemen.

Embargo on Shipments to Spain

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. SAVAGE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 1, 1946

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, in the past months, I have been deluged with letters, telegrams, phone calls, and personal requests from great numbers of my constituents to halt the flow of American materials of war to the Axis-created Franco regime in Spain.

For this reason, I have spoken before and shall speak again in favor of House Resolution 312, introduced by my distinguished colleague, the Honorable JOHN M. COFFEE, of Washington, which calls for a complete diplomatic and commercial break with the Axis-created regime of Francisco Franco in Spain.

It is my conviction that the United States Government must, in the very near future, make the program of the Coffee resolution the American diplomatic policy vis-à-vis Franco Spain. But until that happy day why must we continue arming an enemy state?

I am today introducing a resolution calling for an embargo on all raw and manufactured war materials to Spain until Spain is once again under a democratic government which will confiscate the German cartel factories in Spain and turn the Nazi war criminals now at liberty in Spain over to the justice of the United Nations.

There has been much talk lately of Franco giving way in favor of the monarchy which was repudiated by the Spanish people at the polls as far back as 1931. There is nothing the cartels would like better than to see the monarchy restored to Spain, because they know that under the Bourbons the cartels would not be touched in any way in Spain. Even Franco in an interview on February 20 with Mr. Cyrus Sulzberger, of the New York Times, declared that he has always been in favor of a monarchy in Spain. This latest declaration of Franco must not be forgotten in the months to come.

Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution for the consideration of the House:

Whereas the United Nations Organization has twice unanimously voted to bar from membership in the United Nations the present Nazi-Falange regime of Spain; and

Whereas in the recent blue book issued by the State Department on Argentine links with the Axis the present regime of Spain was exposed as being guilty of plotting against the military security of the United Nations; and

Whereas the present Nazi-Falange regime of Spain has permitted over 100 German cartel factories to establish themselves in Spain; and

Whereas the Nazi-Falange regime of Spain has repeatedly refused to hand German cartel criminals and their assets over to the United Nations; and

Whereas it has become known that Nazi scientists are now at work on atomic energy projects in German cartel laboratories in Spain; and

Whereas the German cartel masters are planning a third world war against the democracies; and

Whereas under Franco, Spain is the chief industrial, political, and military base of the German cartels; and

Whereas an embargo must be declared before we can stop the sale of planes and bulldozers or any other equipment to Spain that she might use to start a war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the people of the United States, acting through our elected Representatives in the House of Representatives in Washington, urge it upon the President of the United States to protect American lives and security by immediately declaring an embargo on all arms, ammunition, aircraft, motor vehicles, cotton, ores, oil, and all other fabricated and raw materials of modern warfare from the United States to Spain until the Franco regime is replaced by a democratic Spanish government which will confiscate all German cartel assets in Spain and turn over to the United Nations War Criminals Commission all those Nazi war criminals who are now at liberty and in positions of economic power in Spain.

Postal Pay Is Inadequate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following timely editorial from the Detroit Times:

POSTAL PAY IS INADEQUATE

It is an ironical situation that the national administration, which has professed so much concern for improved wage standards in private industry, remains indifferent to

the shockingly inadequate wage standards of Federal postal employees.

The Nation's postal workers are still the most poorly paid group in America, despite the paltry increase given them last July by the Salary Reclassification Act which became effective at that time.

That was the first pay increase they received in 20 years.

Even so, it added only $400 a year to the pay of the individual postal worker which was largely nullified by the increased withholding tax and retirement deductions.

In fact, the only actual increase in "take-home" pay for the postal worker after his increase in wages, was gained from overtime for Saturday work, and he is now deprived of that.

The actual situation with respect to the Nation's thousands of postal workers now—and they constitute one of the most indispensable groups in our national life—is that they are compelled to maintain their homes and families on even less pay proportionately than before the skimpy gesture made by Congress last year.

There has been some recognition of this situation in Congress, Representative BURCH, of Virginia, and Senator MEAD, of New York, having introduced a bill which, if passed, will provide an additional temporary increase of $300 annually.

But why is the proposed new increase temporary?

And why is it such a niggardly sum?

Surely, the postal workers of the Nation, who perform such a vital service for the country, are entitled to adequate pay on a permanent basis.

Indeed, in view of the higher costs of living which now prevail, an annual increase of $500 would be little enough.

It would not put postal workers on a level with even the lowest paid workers in private industry.

But it would enable them to conduct their homes and raise their families a little closer to the American standard of living than has been possible in the last quarter century.

If the American people as a whole have been under the illusion that the increased postal pay voted by Congress last year entirely discharged the national obligation to these vital workers, they should face some facts.

The joint conference of affiliated postal employees provides some of the pertinent facts.

A married mail handler in the senior grade, with 20 years of service, now has a total take-home pay of $33.64 per week.

A newly appointed married man and war veteran in that same post takes home only $29.10 a week, and if he is single he takes home only $27.27.

Do you think that is adequate pay for a type of public service that means so much to every individual citizen and every business institution in America?

Congress should promptly pass an adequate salary readjustment bill in the interest of postal workers, not in the penurious terms of the Burch-Mead bill, but with recognition of the long and continuing injustice to postal workers of which the Congress and the country are jointly guilty.

Return to Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 1 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Return to Justice," which I delivered in Dallas, Tex., on February 14, 1946, to the Republicans of Texas.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Republicans, I was delighted to be invited to come to Dallas to speak on the occasion of your Lincoln Birthday dinner. I eagerly accepted your invitation because it gave me an opportunity to express again my gratitude to the Texas Republicans for the wonderful treatment they gave me in 1940 at Philadelphia when they still stood with Ohio on the last ballot. I hope that I have given them no cause to regret the course which they took at that time. I have been able to keep in touch with your leaders, and I would be ungrateful indeed if I did not express my admiration for the political wisdom and courage of your national committeeman from Texas, Col. R. B. Creager.

This week, all over the United States, Republicans are meeting in honor of the birthday of the real founder of the Republican Party, Abraham Lincoln. During the last 2 days I have participated in great enthusiastic meetings in Missouri and Kansas, and I have heard reverberations of similar meetings in other States. We are opening the campaign of 1946. There is no doubt in my mind that the control of the Congress will return to the Republican Party this year, and the control of the entire Government in 1948.

During recent years we have wandered far from the principles of Abraham Lincoln, but those principles are still strong in the hearts of the American people. They have seen remained strong in the hearts of a good proportion of the Democratic Party. That party today is hopelessly split between those who follow the Political Action Committee program on every issue, and those who believe still in the principles of American constitutional government and free enterprise. Unfortunately, the American wing is so demoralized by the course of the prevailing forces in the party that it is unable to develop any program of progress within those constitutional principles. At first it hoped that Mr. Truman would turn in its direction, but he has chosen to follow the New Deal PAC course on every important measure which he has proposed, except his timid fact-finding labor suggestion. He has chosen the course of unlimited public spending and constantly increasing power to Washington bureaucracy. He complains that Congress delayed the adoption of his measures. Undoubtedly, there has been such delay because Congress—most of the Republicans and half of the Democrats—differ basically with his philosophy. The newspapers are inclined to be critical of legislative bodies, but Congressmen represent the views of the people of the United States far more than any group which can be gathered together anywhere. They do not vote against Truman and the PAC because of any prejudice or any partisanship. They vote against him because they know that if they would stay in Congress, they must vote their own principles, and represent the true feelings and philosophy of the American people in their districts.

The Republican Party is founded on two great principles of government. In the platform of 1944 and the recent statement of principles, by the Republicans in Congress we have proposed a constructive program of progress in every field into which government should enter. But in drafting that program we are concerned that every measure be in accord with those principles. Lincoln stated them eloquently in his Gettysburg address, "Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new Nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." Liberty and equality; liberty and justice; liberty under law impartially administered.

At Kansas City I pointed out that every one of President Truman's measures is based on a restraint of liberty, on more regulation of business, on more regulation of the lives of our citizens, on more centralization of power in Washington and less independence for States and local communities. If we go along that course, we will be accepting the very totalitarian ideas which we have fought two wars to destroy.

Tonight I want to dwell particularly upon the necessity of a return to justice, a return to principles of fairness and impartiality between every citizen, a return to a rule of law and of equal justice under law. There is no principle which more distinguishes the Republican ideals of America from the totalitarian ideal of Hitler and Mussolini to destroy which so many American boys have lost their lives on the field of battle. There is no principle which more distinguishes America and England from Russia, and leads to the differences which we find in all our negotiations with our Allies. Abraham Lincoln once expressed his view of its importance, when he said: "Let reverence for the laws be breathed by every American mother to the lisping babe that prattles on her lap, let it be taught in the schools, in the seminaries, and in colleges; let it be written in primers, spelling books, and in almanacs; let it be preached from the pulpit, proclaimed in legislative halls, and enforced in courts of justice."

The whole ideal of justice is foreign to a totalitarian state. There the law and the courts are instruments of state policy. It is inconceivable to them that a court would concern itself to be fair to those who appear before it when the state has an interest. Nor do they feel any need of being fair between one man and another, nor to present logical argument to justify a position. Nothing is more typical of the American Communist than to assert and reassert an argument which has been completely answered and disproved, in order to secure his point by propaganda to the ignorant. This inclination to disregard justice, impartiality, and logic has spread into the United States, first with the New Deal type of legislation, and then with the war, for war is a great promoter of totalitarian government. "Inter arma leges silent."

In war all of us recognize that justice to the individual, vital as it is, must be subordinate to the tremendous national necessity of preserving the nation itself. Abraham Lincoln suspended the writ of habeas corpus. But now we are faced with a government which, in effect, proposes to continue war powers as long as they can be stretched, and with them the subordination of fairness to some supposed national policy. We hear constantly the fallacious argument. "If you would surrender these rights to win the war, is it not just as necessary to surrender them to win the peace?" "If you will incur a $50,000,000,000 deficit to win the war, why not a $50,000,000,000 deficit to create prosperity at home?" Unless we desire to weaken for all time the ideals of justice and equality, it is absolutely essential that our program of reconversion abandon the philosophy of war, that it be worked out within the principles of justice.

We had already wandered far from justice at home. Expediency was always the key of New Deal legislation. In particular those who have administered the law have felt no necessity to be fair. There are countless examples.

The National Labor Relations Act was based on the sound principle that collective bargaining should not be interfered with by employers. But wide discretion was given to the Board, and the first Board members, instead of trying to administer the act fairly, regarded themselves as crusaders to put a

CIO union into every plant in the United States without consideration of any element of impartiality. I sat for weeks hearing the bitter complaints against the administration of that law, and the most violent complaints came from the heads of the American Federation of Labor. I do not think that any more serious miscarriages of justice have ever occurred in the United States than under that first National Labor Relations Board. Even President Roosevelt was finally forced to replace all the members of that Board. There are still many injustices in the labor field. Industry still feels that questions regarding the calling of elections and the reinstatement of workers are decided without the slightest consideration of principles of justice. Industrialists are being criticized because they do not submit their disputes to arbitration by the President or his appointees. Obviously, they feel from experience that those appointees will be strongly prejudicial against their position, and that the decision will be based not on principles of law but on Government policy. The fact-finding board in the General Motors case clearly stated that its decision was based on a wage-price policy declared by President Truman in a speech without authority of law. If we establish fact-finding boards, we ought to declare by law the principles on which they must act. Furthermore, there is no justice in a situation where the employer is responsible for carrying out his agreements, but the union is not. Unions should be required to be incorporated and furnish financial reports to their members.

Now we have the same kind of enforcement proposal in the Chavez bill to set up a Fair Employment Practice Commission. Even in the endeavor to stop discrimination we cannot afford to go further with the unfair labor-practice technique, because it gives arbitrary power to a board necessarily prejudiced, with practically no appeal to the courts. I introduced an FEPC bill based on the Republican platform, and based on the principle of intelligent study of employment situations, and voluntary plans to improve employment opportunities for Negroes, against whose employment there is serious discrimination in many localities—more, I believe, in Northern States than in the South. I believe that progress can only be made in this field by voluntary means, but certainly it cannot be made with safety by making injustice a part of the procedure.

The practice of creating administrative boards has destroyed justice in many fields. When Government got into the business of regulating the production of every farmer, telling him what he could sow and what he could reap, it had to set up an administrative machinery far beyond the capacity of any court to control. The enforcement of milk prices, production, and distribution by Federal milk boards has been pursued without regard to any legal principle. The attempt to control cattle through the OPA has operated to bring losses to thousands of farmers. Regimentation is inconsistent with justice because the detailed control of millions of individuals has to be left to administrative boards. Such boards are always concerned with policy, but not with justice.

I have followed closely the history of the Office of Price Administration. I felt that price control was necessary in war, and I helped to draft a fair bill. More and more the actions of the OPA have come utterly to disregard the law and disregard justice or fairness to individual producers, manufacturers, and distributors. It is almost impossible to get a prompt hearing, particularly before the man who makes the final decision. Months pass before action is taken on protests. The Government policy to keep all official prices from rising in any degree dominates every decision where businessmen are concerned. As costs rose, one concern after another was squeezed until thousands of small businessmen were forced to quit. During the war, while I protested, I felt that, after all, these concerns were casualties of the war, no more unfortunate than the thousands who battled in the Army. But the same injustice continues today.

Except in the case of rents and very scarce commodities, I believe that our only recourse is to let controls expire on July 1, 1946. As to the controls which remain, we had better abolish OPA and transfer what is left to other agencies. It is the more necessary because those who dominate the OPA and its enforcement division have utterly lost the American philosophy of justice. They have no desire to be fair.

Business has received the same kind of treatment under the reciprocal trade treaty law. Hearings are held before boards which have nothing to do with making the final decisions, decisions which may destroy an American industry. Now it is even proposed to hold a general conference in Europe with a number of foreign nations to make these reciprocal treaties in some secret meeting, with even less opportunity to be heard for those whose business is at stake. In this field, as in many others, we have delegated to the President powers to be exercised in his individual discretion, without the slightest requirement of any conformity to law or principle.

I have seen something of the enforcement of the Wages and Hours Act. The director is prosecutor, judge, jury, and instigator of private suits. The employer is presumed to be guilty until he proves himself innocent.

Since the days of the New Deal's attack on the Supreme Court of the United States, the whole fabric of our constitutional law has been weakened. He is a rash lawyer who, today, will predict that any law passed by Congress will ever be held unconstitutional by the present Supreme Court.

Practically every measure presented by the administration in the field of social welfare is based, not on law laid down by Congress, but on unlimited power given to a Federal bureau to deal with States, local governments, and individuals, according to regulations made in the arbitrary discretion of some bureau chief and changeable at any moment by his arbitrary will. For years the administration has opposed the passage of the bill regulating administrative procedure in Federal agencies. It has opposed it because that bill strikes at the very heart of the New Deal, the action of Government bureaus according to policy and expediency without restraint by law or justice. Progress can be made in these fields of social welfare under law, if Congress will take the trouble to write the law. But the administration of matters in the field of social welfare should be left to the States, where it is usually conducted in strict accordance with the law, and without the detailed regulation by administrative boards which is so serious a denial of justice.

One thing which has turned the people back towards an appreciation of law is their experience with the Army. Justice in the Army is hardly justice at all. Thousands of men feel that they have not had a square deal. Over and over again promises were made, only to be broken because the heads of the War Department believed that national necessity knew no law. Having accepted this principle they make the mistake of confusing their own opinions and policies, changing from day to day, with national necessity. Once you admit an exception to the rule of law, there is no stopping place in your slide toward statism, the arbitrary control of the individual by the State. There is a general feeling that the courts martial conducted by the Army have departed from many principles of justice, that men have not had fair trials, and that grossly excessive penalties have been imposed. In Hawaii the Army took over the administration of the courts, and the history of that administration should be an eye-opener to those who think that Americans have some innate sense of law and justice, which differentiates them from other people. It can happen here. Innocent men were imprisoned without trial, courts were conducted without the slightest regard to the most elementary rules of evidence, there was absolutely no appeal to anyone from the arbitrary arrogance of minor officers. The moment you admit that Government policy is above the law, you soon reach an absolute denial of the principles of justice on which we thought this country was founded.

There is another field in which we seem to have accepted the principle of expediency or necessity, and abandoned the principle of justice. That is in the whole field of foreign policy. We have drifted into a condition where in substance the world is to be ruled by the power of the great nations, and not by international law. I felt we should join the United Nations Organization, and I approve the Charter, but under the Charter in many respects the set-up of the Security Council is a denial of justice.

Article 39 gives the Security Council power to adopt any measure, economic or military, which it considers necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. While the Charter prescribes justice as one of the guides for the assembly, it can in no way be construed to make it a guide or even a consideration for the Security Council.

In perfect accord with the Charter, the Security Council could decree the destruction of a nation, although its cause is just, simply because its location or its misfortunes make it a center of international contest. I offered an amendment on the floor of the Senate, directing our delegate not to vote for the use of force against any nation unless he was satisfied that the result would be in accord with international law and justice as well as peace and security. The fact that this was rejected by the administration shows the extent to which they have accepted the philosophy of force as the controlling factor in international action.

I believe that ultimate peace can only be achieved by a rule of law and justice, accepted by the public opinion of the world. Force, even if applicable to all powers, which it is not while the veto power exists, should only be one of the weapons of justice. I believe that our delegate, by insisting always on justice, can lead the world in that direction. Apparently, only the Republican Party can make justice a policy of the United States Government.

At Tehran, at Yalta, at Moscow, we have forgotten law and justice. Nothing could be further from a rule of law than the making of secret treaties distributing the territory of the earth in accordance with deals and pure expediency. We cannot excuse ourselves by declining territorial acquisition or subjecting ourselves to unreasonable and illogical restrictions on our sovereignty over unpopulated Pacific islands. We are just as much to blame if we acquiesce in unjustified acquisition of territory by others and hand over to them property without trusteeship, as in the case of the Kurile Islands.

There can be nothing further from justice than the proposed territorial settlements of Europe and Asia. Without a word of protest we seem to have agreed to the acquisition of Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia by the U. S. S. R. There is little justice in the action we have taken regarding these Baltic peoples. There is little justice to the people of Poland in the arrangements we have made regarding the government of that unfortunate country. The extending of justice throughout the world may be and is beyond our powers, but certainly we need not join in the process by which force and national policy is permitted to dominate the world. I believe that all Americans view with discomfort the war trials which are going on in Germany and Japan. I do not purport to pass final judgment on the wisdom of that procedure, but they do violate that fundamental principle of American law that a man

cannot be tried under an ex post facto statute. If these men committed military crimes I would almost rather see them executed by court martial than go through the elaborate procedure of the Nuremberg trials. I feel that it may discredit the whole idea of justice for years to come.

In the last analysis, even at the end of a frightful war, we should view the future with more hope if even our enemies believed that we had treated them justly, in trials, in the provision of relief, and in the final disposal of territory.

I have been in the Senate now for 7 years, and at times I have been hopeful that the administration of the Democratic Party would admit liberty and justice again into its councils. Many of its leaders would welcome that result now, but with the acceptance by President Truman of every theory and every philosophy of the New Deal bureaus at home, and of the American imperialists abroad, I believe that hope is vain. If we do not desire the foundations of our Republic to be washed away from under us there is no remedy except the return to power of the party which its great leader, Abraham Lincoln, started on its career of liberty and justice. There is no great difference today between the parties in the ideals of economic world peace, progress, high-level employment and production, and social welfare which the Americans desire to attain. The question is whether they shall be temporarily and superficially attained by huge grants of power and money, by Government policy and no attention to individuals, or whether they shall be permanently reached under the form and substance of an American republic, based on impartiality between man and man, between capital and labor, between the state and the individual, between nation and nation.

What Should We Do About the British Loan?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 1 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by me entitled "What Should We Do About the British Loan?" at a round-table discussion on American Forum of the Air on February 26, 1946.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT SHOULD WE DO ABOUT THE BRITISH LOAN?—STATEMENT AND QUESTIONS BY EDWIN C. JOHNSON, OF COLORADO

STATEMENT

Wild and uncontrolled inflation is sweeping the earth. Tonight a cup of coffee costs $100 in certain cities; and yet we Americans smugly think it cannot happen here. Under Federal Reserve arrangements every dollar of our huge bond issues is printing-press money. Tonight the currency of the United States, which includes a trainload of interest-bearing printing-press money which we call bonds, totals more than three hundred thousand million dollars. Now it is proposed that we add another carload of printing-press money to that trainload of inflated currency which already is threatening the very existence of this Republic. It is proposed that we issue three thousand seven hundred and fifty million additional paper dollars to finance a British loan. During the next 3 years Britain expects to spend twice the amount of this loan on armaments. If Britain gets such a loan from us she will be able to hold her own in the world's current armament race. Henry Wallace says not only must we put up six thousand million dollars to carry out our pledge in the Bretton Woods agreement, plus three and a half thousand million dollars through the Export-Import Bank, plus several thousand million dollars for UNRRA, but in addition to those carloads of paper money this great liberal leader anticipates that during the next 3 years we must put up fifteen thousand million dollars for additional loans to Europe and Asia. I do not charge the American sponsors of these vicious loans with a desire to finance a world armament race, but the net result of their fantastic proposal will do exactly that. What a bankrupt heritage this generation of Americans is leaving to posterity. It can happen here, Ted Granik. If the present trends continue, soon a cup of coffee will cost $100 right here in Washington.

QUESTIONS

1. During the next 3 years Britain is expected to spend twice the amount of their loan from us in an armament race. Should American taxpayers finance such an expenditure?

2. The Secretary of Commerce says the trading deficit of Europe, Asia, and South America for the next 3 years will be $51,000,000,000. Excluding the United States, the rest of the world will expend during the next 3 years $65,000,000,000 for armaments. If it were not for the current armament race, would there be a deficit of $51,000,000,000 abroad?

3. If Secretary Wallace is correct that the United States must dig up an additional $15,000,000,000 to be loaned to Europe and Asia, is not the projected British loan merely the first instalment of a huge avalanche of foreign loans?

4. Is the British loan a loan to end all loans, or is it a loan to open the floodgate of countless colossal loans?

5. The United States Treasury, through its colossal bond-funding program, has imposed a mortgage on every item of private property in the United States for every cent it would bring on a good market. The United States owes more money than all the other nations combined (excluding, of course, Germany, Japan, and Italy). Why does not the State Department disclose these facts to the American people?

6. The United States has indulged in deficit financing for 15 years. A deficit of $20,000,000,000 is anticipated for the year beginning July 1, 1946. How much deeper in the red can our Treasury go without exploding?

7. I have a substitute for Mr. Clayton's irresponsible and wildly inflationary scheme to subsidize American exports. My plan does not add to the already inflated currency of America; it subtracts from it. Instead of being inflationary and therefore ruinous, my proposal is deflationary. I would authorize the Treasury to sell special bonds to American investors; the proceeds to go to Britain and in turn whatever interest and principal is paid by Britain would be paid to these investors. These bonds would bear on their face, "Not backed by the credit or guaranteed by the United States." What is wrong with my substitute, Mr. Clayton?

8. Under the GI bill of rights we guarantee loans to our veterans at 4 percent; while the British loan agreement the interest rate is considerably under 2 percent. Are not American veterans as worthy as the British Empire?

9. Foreign holdings in the United States on January 1, 1946, not including $4,000,000,000 in foreign-owned gold, total more than $14,000,000,000. American assets belonging to the United Kingdom are $3,200,000,000 and Canada $1,750,000,000. How do you like that?

10. Why does not a British financial statement accompany the British loan application?

11. Exports from the United States to the United Kingdom amounted to $513,955,000 in 1938. That was the insignificant sum of two-thirds of 1 percent of our national income for that year. At that rate it would require 8 years for our exports to the United Kingdom to consume the projected loan. Is two-thirds of 1 percent of our national income so vital an export item that we are justified in wrecking our economy in order to obtain it?

12. Lend-lease cost our Treasury $46,000,000,000; but if it saved the lives of American soldiers it fulfilled a noble mission. No one complains that the United Kingdom got the lion's share of this gratuity. However, under the guise of lend-lease we sold British every conceivable article from sewing needles to locomotive engines. The bulk of this merchandise had no direct connection with the war. From us it was a gift; but the British Government sold these gifts to her people at full market value and put the money in her own treasury. That helped her taxpayers finance her war. If we really owed Britain anything for fighting Germany, have we not paid that debt in full?

13. Britain began her conversion to civilian production 1 month after Eisenhower invaded Normandy and long before Germany surrendered. After that we had the task of bringing Japan to her knees, so Britain had almost a year's start on us. Why is official Washington so concerned about British reconversion and so complacent about our own reconversion?

14. An advertisement in the London Daily Times January 16, 1946, reads: "USA orders 250,000 vacuum cleaners from Britain!" Before the war we sold such household equipment to the United Kingdom. Is not this reversal in trading significant?

15. While Britain is applying for a loan here she is negotiating loans to other nations. Greece, for example, gets forty million in British loans and Britain receives in return valuable commercial and political advantages. Why is Britain loaning money if she herself must borrow?

16. Britain owes India and Latin America $15,000,000,000. This debt must be and should be serviced and paid in British goods. Everyone except our State Department understands what a tremendous advantage that gives British factories over our factories. Loans from us cannot change her natural trading advantages. We have no foreign debts which we can liquidate with American production. Does not the nature of the British debt structure give her a tremendous trading advantage over the United States?

17. According to Werner Knop in the Saturday Evening Post, February 9 issue:

"The net income of every Briton after taxes has exactly doubled. His wartime savings equal $35,000,000,000 plus $14,000,000,000 in bank deposits and twenty billion in postwar credits."

That totals $69,000,000,000 of British purchasing power through savings. On a per capita basis British savings equal ours. Why should not the British Government borrow from her own citizens as our Government must?

18. Germany and Japan, Britain's two prewar competitors for world trade—thanks to the Morgenthau scorched-earth policy—have been completely eliminated as industrial nations. What more can Britain ask from us than that?

19. Lending money to foreign nations was not one of the original purposes for which the United States of America was created. Should the pawnbroker's emblem—three balls—now decorate the United States Treasury in Washington? Are the founding

fathers turning in their graves as they view this disturbing spectacle?

20. In the United States politicians and officeholders are here today and gone tomorrow. Is a nation operating under such a political system equipped to make a success of the international banking business?

21. Would not my slogan "Billions for the relief of the starving babies abroad, but not one cent for the relief of empires" be timely and very proper at this time?

22. We are all seeking an easy way out and a short cut to glory, but is not the solution to our problem, Britain's problem, and the world's problem, work and sweat? Is there any other real solution?

A Letter From a Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 1, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a letter I have received from the members of the band of the U. S. S. *Dixie* who give their reasons for their desire to transfer from their present assignment.

U. S. S. "DIXIE" BAND,
U. S. S. "DIXIE," FOURTH DIVISION,
CARE OF FLEET POST OFFICE,
San Francisco, Calif., February 26, 1946.

Representative THOMAS J. LANE,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LANE: The reason for this letter is to appeal to you to do all you can to have the U. S. S. *Dixie* band transferred from its present duty. We have many excellent reasons for this change of duty but so far our requests seem to have fallen upon deaf ears. Nor are we given any sensible information as to the why or wherefore.

We are writing all the Members of Congress who represent the respective members of our organization. We sincerely hope that you can take a just view of our condition and help us all you can as our ship is ready to sail April 1 for at least 6 months of foreign sea duty and very possibly more.

In the following paragraphs you will find the reasons we set forth and upon which we base our claims that we rate, need and deserve a change from sea duty to shore duty.

We are not being used as musicians. There is little likelihood that we will be in the future. We haven't played for 4 months. Several of our key men have been released or transferred which seriously cripples our ability to play even if we are switched back to our music duties. Our present duties include mess cook duty, watches, bus driving, stevedoring, and various working parties. This work is normally done by seamen or non-rated men. We are all rated musicians.

When we left the school we were told that after 18 months we would be given shore duty. Later the bureau changed it to 24 months. There was an Alnav put out in 1945 that stated that after 24 months of sea duty a man is eligible for rehabilitation leave and reassignment! Our ships files seem to be incomplete and we are unable to find the number. We have been on the *Dixie* for 26 straight months of uninterrupted and continuous sea duty!

Our powers as musicians have been waning considerably. The future will not help. In our profession, where 3 to 6 hours a day of practice are almost necessary to keep in good playing condition, this 4-month lay-off with 6 more in the offing will be disastrous. This ship has no facilities for individual practice and very little for band rehearsal. This ship does not need a band.

We are definitely not essential! That is definitely proven by the type of duty which has replaced our specialized duties.

We are all maladjusted and nervous from our continued duty in the Pacific. We didn't see any kind of civilization for almost 2 years. We sincerely doubt if we will be able to mentally survive another ordeal of 6 months or possibly more time at sea.

We haven't spared ourselves in the slightest to do our part during the war which our records will testify. Now that the war is over we feel that we surely rate some consideration.

Out of a group of 1,400 men the band is practically the only senior group to return to sea.

We hope that you can do something for us and that you will be convinced of our plea before April 1.

Sincerely yours,

Paul S. Barth, Musician Second Class; Robert E. Puff, Musician First Class; Gerald W. Bordner, Musician Second Class; Robert F. O'Brien, Musician Second Class; Clyde W. Reynolds, Musician Third Class; David L. Walters, Musician Second Class; Donald L. Dean, Musician Second Class; Turner M. Gaught, Musician Second Class; Leslie E. Walden, Musician First Class; E. Donald Stute, Musician Second Class; Golden A. Smith, Jr., Musician Second Class; Robert G. Appleton, Musician Third Class; Bruce B. Denney, Musician Second Class; J. H. Foley, Musician First Class; J. W. Haas, Musician Second Class; F. J. Hanneman, Musician Third Class; Gordon W. Sperl, Musician Second Class; C. L. Hartmann, Musician First Class.

Radio Address on Congress Speaks Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 1, 1946

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me on the program, Congress Speaks, over CBS, Station WTOP, Washington, D. C., February 12, 1946:

Of all the experiences I had while on the committee's assignment to the Pacific bases, the most vivid impression remaining with me is the vastness of the Pacific Ocean. Here is an area of tremendous distances. It is impossible to describe adequately the magnitude of the task which faced our fighting forces in mounting the various stages of the offensive against Japan. Thousands of miles separate the many groups of islands from which the Japs had to be routed before our men could move forward to their ultimate goal.

Hundreds of thousands of tons of shipping were required to move men and equipment across thousands of miles of ocean on the long road from Guadalcanal to Iwo Jima. If nothing else has been accomplished, this assignment has convinced me that the United States must never again lose sight of its true relationship to the lands which lie across the Pacific Ocean. To maintain and protect that relationship the first essential is an adequate navy—with the correct type of ships and bases.

Millions have been spent in developing island bases, some of which are so situated that they are of vital strategic importance to the future security of our country. After weighing carefully all the considerations involved, it is my sincere opinion that several of these island groups must be retained by the United States as our exclusive possessions.

The Marshalls, the Marianas group and the Carolines are, I believe, of particular importance. These must be developed even further until they are formidable American outposts. I am unable to see how we can intelligently advocate any other plan.

These islands have been of tremendous value in the development of the offensive against the Jap homeland. Their importance to the security of the United States has been clearly demonstrated in the war which has just closed. If further evidence of our right to these bases is required, then I respectfully and humbly call attention to the pretty, well-cared-for cemeteries which dot those islands; where row after row of white crosses bear mute testimony to the terrific price our people paid to win these island outposts. The great sacrifices which were made by the people of the United States convince me that we must continue to be vigilant in order to make certain that the peace these brave men bought with their lives shall not be disturbed. Because of these men who gave the last full measure of devotion our western frontier is now far west of San Francisco.

I had the privilege of talking to many of the enlisted men in the service who are stationed on the islands and in Japan and China. I was particularly fortunate in meeting some from my own State. Most of those I met had but one wish in life—to come home.

My colleagues and I asked a lot of questions about demobilization. I know it is a tremendous job—with many heartaches—but the Navy, by and large, is trying hard to do the job well. There has been some regrettable confusion and, in some instances, delays which were particularly galling. But there is plenty of shipping available now and the men are on the move toward home. I expect even greater progress will be shown as the new recruits become available for replacements at the bases and aboard the ships overseas.

The stations where some of the men are serving are particularly distasteful. Some bases are being rolled up and there is little or no activity outside of caring for surplus equipment and stores and making the stations ready for inactivation. Some of the stations are pretty rugged and at some bases the climate is horrible. All these things, added to the fact that the men want to come home, makes it pretty tough and it's no wonder that the men gripe.

Some of the men are depressed because they don't know just why they are occupying particular areas. I found this to be true, particularly among the marines in China. From my conversations with the men I learned that conditions were deplorable when they first arrived. Housing was far from adequate and there was little or no heating. The Jap quarters which the marines took over were filthy and the weather was bitter cold. They have come a long way since then, but these men need some serious consideration.

The men have heard and read about statements of various authorities attempting to explain why the marines are in China. Their job is supposed to be helping China to repatriate the Japs. They are guarding railroads and communication lines and many of them wonder if they are destined to become a permanent garrison. The letters which they receive from home indicate the same concern is shared by their parents. This frame of mind is not good.

I firmly believe our State Department should make a forthright statement outlining our policy in Asia. I have met many who are convinced that we are definitely committed to intervention in China. I have met just as many who are convinced that we have no clear-cut policy of any kind relative to the Far East. This is an unhealthy situation. Our policy in China and in the Pacific islands is interwoven with our policy toward all Asia. It needs to be honest and clearly set out. The servicemen and the folks waiting for them at home are entitled to know what that policy is, and I believe it is now possible to set a date for the withdrawal of all the marines from China. If such a move is made I know the marines there will feel a new lift. They will then become enthusiastic ambassadors of the United States. As it is now—they certainly aren't selling America to anyone. They are discontented. They are discouraged.

I think our State Department, on many occasions, has been altogether too bashful about setting forth our position. I appreciate and admire the efforts to promote harmony among various nations, but, I don't believe in harmony at any price. I can understand that a lot of give and take is necessary in international relations, but I think we ought to stop concentrating on the give for just a little while and pay some attention to the taking part of the bargain.

China impresses me as a potential market for just about everything that the United States can produce. The struggles which these brave people have borne for so long have brought them to the brink of destitution. They need just about everything. An enlightened American policy toward the people of China will enable both peoples to reap great reward for many years.

One of the biggest problems we found is that involving surplus property. I can't begin to tell you the impression I received when I saw acres and acres covered with equipment and material of all kinds. Naturally, we were concerned primarily with naval property, but the Army has a similar problem with which it is wrestling.

Because our military leaders could not afford to contemplate the capitulation of Japan short of invasion of their homeland, it was necessary to lay up vast stores of material of all kinds. Just about the biggest job the Navy has now is taking care of all these supplies.

Warehouses have been built and requisitioned. Great efforts have been made by the men at the various stations to get as much as possible under cover. However, it is impossible to protect all of it.

The climatic conditions on many of the islands are such that a great deal of this surplus property is deteriorating rapidly.

I have talked the matter over with my colleagues and it is our intention to suggest some definite policy in connection with the disposition of this property. Much of it can be returned to the United States for disposal but to undertake to return all this equipment would be, I am convinced, a very costly operation and one almost certainly destined to be wasteful.

I might add—in anticipation of future construction work at some of the bases which we propose to develop to the maximum degree possible—the Navy is setting aside, under proper protective arrangements, a great deal of equipment and parts which can be used by contractors. This will result in a considerable saving to the Government.

The devastation and destruction of the villages and cities over which the war rolled defies belief. I can't begin to describe to you the conditions which we saw.

Although I had read of the great bombing raids on Tokyo and other Japanese cities—I was not prepared for the sights which met us on our arrival in Japan. General MacArthur and his staff and the men serving under his command have worked wonders, but there is still a great deal to be done.

The plight of Manila is very sad. Once a most beautiful city, it now lies in almost complete ruin. Bravely the people of the city carry on, and on every hand there is the evidence of the struggles of men and women to erect homes and chapels out of the wreckage that lies all about. The Philippines are receiving considerable help from our armed forces, but I fear they will need a great deal more substantial assistance before they will have even started on the road to recovery. All through the islands the situation is the same.

I have learned a great deal on this assignment of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives. I wish it were possible for all Members of Congress to cover the same ground. I wish many of our civic leaders could see this vast area. I am sure it would be good for the country.

It is an area which presents great opportunities—but it also presents grave responsibilities. These we cannot avoid—even if we would.

Care of Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 1, 1946

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

PORTLAND, MAINE, *February 20, 1946.*
Hon. ROBERT HALE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The national commander of the American Legion, Dr. John Stelle, continues to criticize Gen. Omar Bradley, the present head of the Veterans' Administration, for defending the very policy upon which the Veterans' Administration was established, namely, the giving of medical care to the war wounded and disabled.

General Bradley has now been Director of the Veterans' Administration for 6 months, during a very difficult period. He was appointed last August when the Veterans' Administration was in a bad mess. He was put in because the "antiquated and inefficient" methods of the Veterans' Administration needed to be changed. He came into a new job at a time when the returning soldiers were flooding the Veterans' Administration with a stupendous amount of work. Moreover, during the war, the Veterans' Administration had a depleted staff. Most of the doctors in it had left for service in the Army and Navy, as well as civilian help. Many of the demands made upon it were completely unreasonable.

General Bradley has rightly requested that the hospital admission be restricted to service-disabled cases. This restriction was suggested in an effort to relieve much of the present overcrowding. There is a 90,000-patient bed load and two-thirds of these are non-service-connected cases. General Bradley is reported to have questioned the whole policy of hospitalization of veterans who do not have service-connected ailments. So do we, who have watched its operation for twenty-five long years. I am sure that General Bradley is doing a good job. He has given it 6 months of close study, with many good advisers from the Disabled American Veterans of World War I and others interested in the returning soldier. These men who are not in politics and not interested in getting votes are in full agreement with the general's conviction that the Veterans' Administration should be for the war-disabled veterans. It was never the intent of the law to hospitalize ex-servicemen for nonservice disabilities unless these servicemen were indigent—in other words, unable to pay. A pauper's oath is required of all non-service-connected cases, and according to General Bradley, this requirement in practice has become mere fiction. He therefore justly and correctly suggested putting an end to this sabotage of Veterans' Administration facilities.

Apparently the Veterans' Bureau and the public need to be reminded that we have no right to jeopardize the established policy of this Government that America's wartime disabled be given first consideration by the Veterans' Administration. For this purpose it came into existence. To throw into its lap the medical problems of every veteran, regardless of the cause and ability to pay, saddles it with a program so vast that the really needy—the war wounded and disabled—will die before their needs are met.

Every doctor in private practice and every veteran with eyes and ears open knows of financially able veterans of World War I who have no service-connected disability, who went in and crowded out of needed beds disabled soldiers with service-connected disabilities. No one wishes to deny any ex-service man or anyone else the right to hospitalization and medical care if he is unable to pay. But when there are not enough beds, when the Veterans' Administration is flooded with phony claims of men who expect to get something from the Government, when they know full well that they have no service-connected disability, and when men able to pay go to the Veterans' Administration to demand medical attention to which they are not entitled, then we thank God that we have men like Omar Bradley. He is willing to fight for what he believes is right, even when he must fight the commander of the American Legion.

The American Legion is a big organization with millions of votes. Its rules prevent it from entering politics, but its commanders have not always been above trying to get political plums for themselves, or above misinterpreting the ideas of the members in their own way of thinking. Commander Stelle is courting the good will of the "gimme" members. Veterans often spend money liberally for liquor, unneeded automobiles, and other luxuries—but are not willing to pay out a red penny when they need medical care. I am glad to say that it was only a small percentage of the Legion members who tried to sponge on the Veterans' Administration. If a pauper's oath is required, it should not be kept secret, as it has been. The press, social welfare workers, the Red Cross, and the American Legion have led some ex-soldiers into the belief that their military service entitles them to medical service for themselves and family for the rest of their lives.

The disabled veterans' organization has comparatively few members though it has all the talking points. It has too little influence. Many Americans have never heard of its existence. It is a minority group. It is an organization in which the strong must look out for the weak and the discouraged. This is true of both the American Legion and the Disabled American Veterans. I have belonged to both organizations since their inception soon after the 1918 armistice, and I know whereof I speak. Ever since World War I the disabled veterans have had to fight for the principle that the disabled veteran is the reason for the existence of the Veterans' Administration, and they should not be crowded out by financially able, able-bodied men.

The war of killing people is over. After this second terrible World War, there are many more disabled soldiers and they are entitled to the best possible care. Surely the veterans themselves do not want to inter-

fere with the rights accorded by law to the disabled who have service-connected disabilities.

Gen. Omar Bradley has always been known as a soldier's general. He knows how important it is to separate phony claims from the real McCoy. This takes time. He is trying to put first things first, and that means the war-disabled soldiers come first. I am sure they will as long as he is head of the Veterans' Administration.

ADRIAN H. SCOLTEN, M. D.

The Ordnance Victory System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 1 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Ordnance Victory System" written by Lt. Gen. L. H. Campbell, Jr., Chief of Ordnance, and published in the spring, 1946, issue of the magazine Dixie Business. This article deals with the miraculous achievements of production by the Ordnance Corps of the Army under General Campbell's direction during the war.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ORDNANCE VICTORY SYSTEM

(By Lt. Gen. L. H. Campbell, Jr., Chief of Ordnance)

During World War II the industry-ordnance team produced more than $9,000,000,000 worth of ammunition, more than $3,000,000,000 worth of small arms, more than $5,000,000,000 worth of artillery, and more than $19,000,000,000 worth of tank and various types of combat and noncombat military vehicles. The total dollar volume was in excess of $38,000,000,000.

Here are a few typical items. The industry-ordnance team produced nearly 11 tons of artillery ammunition, about 6,000,000 tons of bombs and rockets, more than 15,000,000 rifles, carbines, pistols, revolvers, and Browning automatic rifles, more than 22,000,000 helmets, more than 180,000 pieces af aircraft artillery, more than 270,000 tanks and self-propelled weapons, more than 2,000,000 trucks, and more than 1,000,000 other vehicles.

This gigantic production for our own combat forces and for more than 40 Allied nations was made possible by the application of four simple formulas which I have been asked by the editor to outline briefly for the readers of Dixie Business.

First of all, throughout the war, the emphasis was placed upon industry-ordnance cooperation.

My first official act on becoming Chief of Ordnance on June 1, 1942, was to establish a personal advisory staff consisting of four outstanding business and industrial leaders who were thoroughly familiar with all phases of mass production. The men chosen were Bernard M. Baruch, chairman of the War Industries Board in World War I; Lewis H. Brown, a regimental supply officer in World War I and president of the Johns-Manville Corp.; Benjamin F. Fairless, who completed in just 22 years the transition from a raw young surveyor in the field to the chief executive position in the U. S. Steel Corp.; and K. T. Keller, president of Chrysler Corp., who in less than a year directed the planning, building, and outfitting of a mammoth tank arsenal and completed production on his first tank. The appointment of these men was intended to underscore again and to reaffirm in the most emphatic way the tremendous importance of industry's role in the great, bewildering, onrushing armament program.

These and other advisory groups gave generously of their time, entirely without compensation, to help the Ordnance Department carry on, as quickly and efficiently as possible, its vital part in the most gigantic manufacturing, training and warehousing program in human history. At various intervals, civilian experts and ordnance officers worked over a great variety of problems—engineering and production problems, administration and personal problems, maintenance and supply problems, facility-expansion problems, training problems, and a multitude of miscellaneous questions pertaining to such matters as contract terminations and property disposal.

Industry-Ordnance cooperation was not a new idea. The novelty was in bringing to perfection the teamwork, the ability to work together, of a new civilian-military backfield with a new quarterback calling the signals. The same teamwork which was developed in the executive backfield was also developed in the line—the operating branches.

This wholehearted cooperation between industry and Government, which was demonstrated so forcibly during the war years, created an invaluable precedent which has equal bearing and importance in the peacetime years ahead. Industry and Government should continue to work together in building a better and more prosperous America.

Our second principle of operation was to clear the way for industry at maximum capacity and efficiency. Our six old-line arsenals, together with our headquarters technical staff were the principal repositories of armament knowledge down through the years. Our greatest responsibility was to pass on to industry this priceless know-how in the manufacture of rifles, artillery, ammunition and tank-automotive vehicles. After that industry was encouraged to improve upon our techniques, if at all possible, particularly in the way of mass production methods. While it is true that industry had to meet rigid military specifications, our one desire was to aid industry in every possible way rather than to dictate to industry how the job should be done. This faith in the ability, ingenuity, and resourcefulness of American industry was amply repaid in unprecedented production.

Our arsenals were at all times prepared to supply production techniques to civilian manufacturers who had no previous experience in the production of ordnance equipment. But our arsenals also received many benefits from those industrial firms with which they have been associated. At the beginning of the national emergency the arsenals were able to contribute their pilot line techniques to civilian manufacturers. Later in the war these same manufacturers were able to improve upon initial arsenal techniques, to speed up production, and to lower costs. Volume or mass production replaced laboratory or pilot-line production.

At Watervliet Arsenal, for example, some private firms learned for the first time such cannon-manufacturing processes as the boring of the deep holes, rifling, powder chambering, and step threading. On some jobs it was advisable to have contractor personnel perform the duties of the operator in the arsenal to insure a successful beginning in the civilian plant. Sample cutting tools were made available so that they could be duplicated as to proper material, hardness, clearance angles, sheer, lips, and grinding finishes. Facility and operation drawings were provided. In some cases it was necessary for industry to plan better facilities than those available to produce cannon in larger quantities than had ever before been attempted. These retooling jobs were handled in an excellent manner and often pointed to methods that were adopted at Watervliet to manufacture the same or similar cannon components.

Having obtained basic armament production information, industry then began to improve upon original ordnance methods and suggested a great variety of time-saving and material-saving techniques. In the early phases of the national-defense program ordnance engineers, technicians, and arsenals taught industry; in the latter phases industry instructed ordnance in many new shortcuts in mass production.

The moral is that, given encouragement and relieved of unnecessary restrictions, regulations, and red tape, American industry is capable of production miracles. Had the Ordnance Department insisted that everything should be done the Ordnance way, if Ordnance had interfered at every step of the production process with gratuitous advice, suggestions, and commands the job of arming America and her allies would not have been done half as well as what was actually achieved in production in an incredibly short time.

Our third principle of operation consisted of the development of industry integration committees.

These committees represented the cross weave in the fabric of America's wartime ordnance-production program. The lines of mutual assistance between industry and Ordnance were well developed by the eary part of 1942, but intraindustry ties, such was the force of peacetime rivalry and competition, were relatively undeveloped. Part of my job as a production expediter was to put highly diversified companies, large and small, into harness together. Many companies found themselves far afield from their normal peacetime pursuits. They were awarded Government contracts for the production of unfamiliar items under strange and complicated wartime rules and regulations. Ordnance had to train, guide, and assist them individually during the initial stages of production and then weld them together into intimate groups for the rapid manufacture of specific ordnance items. In both instances the task was sometimes as difficult as teaching a right-handed man how to write with his left hand. Early difficulties were soon overcome, however, and industrial integration, the vital cross weave that knitted together hundreds of companies from coast to coast, became a permanent feature of the wartime Ordnance manufacturing program.

There has been considerable publicity on the integration program and occasional press comment on the good work accomplished by a few committees; but there has been only an imperfect realization of the Nation-wide extent of this unique form of industrial teamwork as applied to ordnance production. On VE-day there were 82 industry integration committees, covering 162 types of ordnance equipment and combining the efforts of 1,527 prime contractors and approximately 10,000 subcontractors. The largest number of committees in operation at any one time was 131. Of the total number of such committees in June 1943, 75 committees were working on tanks and automotive equipment, and 15 on such artillery items as guns, gun carriages, and fire-control instruments.

The fourth and last principle of wartime ordnance operation which yielded rich dividends was the principle of maximum decentralization.

I am well acquainted with all the arguments favoring concentration of power and centralization of authority. Ordnance experience has proved, however, that the Department can best function under a decentralized plan of operation, and it has been my consistent policy to delegate authority whenever and wherever possible. The person

to whom authority is delegated automatically assumes responsibility for results. I measure him by results. We carved up a $38,000,000,000 program into as many parts as good management dictated. Results achieved in the war are indicative of the soundness of the policy.

The ordnance districts may serve as a practical illustration of the scope and range of our decentralization policy. Ordnance procurement was initially decentralized in 13 ordnance districts, roughly corresponding to the major manufacturing areas in the United States. Eight districts, in turn, progressively decentralized their operations until on VJ-day these districts had 39 region suboffices. The Boston ordnance district had one suboffice; the St. Louis ordnance district had seven; two of the five suboffices of the Detroit ordnance district were located in Canada.

Regional offices were established primarily to administer ordnance supply contracts with facilities located at such distances from a district office as to make it just as difficult and uneconomical for that office to work directly with manufacturers as it was for facilities, particularly small facilities, to have their top management away 2 or 3 days on travel to and from the district office. During the war, ordnance production and inspection personnel, working out of nearby suboffices kept in constant touch with manufacturers and rendered immediate assistance in anticipating and overcoming production problems. In the spring of 1942, when each week saw new fronts ablaze, with resultant changes in raw materials and manpower conditions, it became apparent that some adjustments would have to be made in the previously conceived form of departmental organization.

After lengthy conferences with my advisory staff, we decided to extend the traditional ordnance policy of decentralization from the district system to other fields. Four major decisions were taken—to decentralize the administration of artillery ammunition production, to establish a tank-automotive center in Detroit, to form a small arms ammunition office, and to create a field office for safety and security matters.

In keeping with these decisions, I ordered the transfer of the administration of ammunition plants from Washington to a local point geographically central to the various ammunition plants which included, in addition to Government-owned, Government-operated plants, approximately 60 Government-owned, contractor-operated new Ordnance facilities producing ammunition above caliber .50 and allied raw materials under cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts. This new decentralized office was established in St. Louis.

On the same day that the St. Louis office was officially established, the five-fold job of designing, manufacturing, buying, distributing and maintaining all Army automotive land vehicles not carrying guns or armor—trucks, passenger cars, jeeps and ambulances—was transferred from the Quartermaster Corps to Ordnance. Motor transport, in itself a gigantic responsibility, was superimposed on the previous Ordnance responsibility of a similar nature for tanks, combat cars, and all other motorized fighting equipment carrying guns or armor. Here indeed was a new and major challenge to Ordnance. In order to meet the rapidly expanding automotive program successfully, Ordnance needed all the additional help it could possibly secure from Industry. It was therefore a logical step to set up a new tank-automotive office in Detroit—the motor capital of the world. The success of this decentralized plan of operation is indicated by the fact that my office in Detroit accepted 3,050,000 major pieces of automotive equipment during the war, valued at 16 billion dollars.

Our next major decentralization order in the summer of 1942 established an ammunition suboffice of the Small Arms Division in Philadelphia to exercise the functions pertaining to the manufacture, procurement, production, inspection, and acceptance of small-arms ammunition and accessories. This office successfully supervised the manufacture of 47,000,000,000 rounds of small-arms ammunition from June 1940 to VJ-day—a highly creditable achievement in every way.

Our last major decentralization order established a safety and security office in Chicago. It was a certainty that the unprecedented expansion of explosives and ammunition facilities would present hazards of vast and ominous magnitude. The manufacture of explosives and ammunition has always been attended by recurrent disasters in the past, and the new decentralized office was activated to keep loss of lives, property, material, and time to an absolute minimum. So successful was the operation of this office that, according to a recent tabulation, of all disabling injuries at ordnance plants more than 95 percent were in no way due to explosives manufacture but were attributable to the common variety of industrial exposures found in miscellaneous manufacturing industries.

Decentralization, in ordnance terminology, is not synonymous with abandonment. The transfer of many responsibilities out of Washington did not mean that the various centers and suboffices were left without guidance, direction, and supervision. Contact with Ordnance headquarters and these offices was maintained in various ways—by the usual means of communication, by periodic directives and reports, by regional conferences, and by frequent meetings in Washington and in other parts of the country. I believe that it is part of my job to get out of Washington from time to time and to see for myself what is going on. From June 1, 1942, to VJ-day, I traveled almost 200,000 miles, mostly by airplane.

Stop the Appeasement Policy Toward Communism

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 1, 1946

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it was heartening, indeed, to real patriotic Americans to hear the statements by two of our representatives who have just returned from London.

I refer to my distinguished friend, Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG, of Michigan, and my distinguished friend, Hon. James F. Byrnes, Secretary of State.

According to their statements, it seems they have come to realize that appeasement of Communism is getting America nowhere except into trouble.

The American people are behind them in this attitude and are demanding that they stiffen up, go forward with it, and let the world know that we mean what we say, and that we do not propose to have our country undermined and destroyed.

I am going to suggest to Secretary Byrnes that he not only stop appeasement abroad but that he begin to clean out his own department and every other department of government that has these Marxist Communists on the Federal pay roll.

Let us help to maintain peace among the nations of the earth. But at the same time let us see that our country is protected at home and respected abroad.

Mr Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the address of Secretary Byrnes delivered in New York on yesterday.

The matter referred to follows:

TEXT OF SECRETARY OF STATE BYRNES' TALK OUTLINING AMERICA'S POSITION ON DISPUTED WORLD PROBLEMS

We are beginning to realize that the war is over. It is good to have sons, husbands, and fathers home again. It is good to open a newspaper without fear of finding in the casualty lists the name of one near and dear to us.

But this is not wholly a time of celebration and rejoicing. As families in their homes on the farms and in the cities settle back from the dinner table to hear the boys tell of Normandy and Iwo Jima, there is an unspoken question in every mind. The question is what we can do to make certain that there will never be another war.

During the war our goal was clear. Our goal was victory. The problems of industrial and military mobilization, it is true, were problems of the first magnitude. Production bottlenecks often seemed unbreakable, transportation difficulties and manpower shortages insurmountable. On the fighting front, the combined land, sea and air operations were heartbreaking in complexity.

These were hard tasks. Yet we were able to apply a yardstick to each proposal by asking a simple question: "Will it help to win the war?" The common goal of victory served to unite us and to give purpose and direction to our efforts.

Now that we have come into calmer waters, our relief and gratitude are mixed with uncertainty. Our goal now is permanent peace, and surely we seek it even more anxiously than we sought victory.

FINDS PEACE PATH DIFFICULT

The difficulty is that the path to permanent peace is not so easy to see and to follow as was the path to victory.

When an issue is presented, we ask, "Will it help to win the peace?" When the answer is slow to come or does not come at all, we grow uneasy and apprehensive.

While we may be in doubt about many things, there are certain basic propositions on which we are clear.

One is that a just and lasting peace is not the inevitable result of victory. Rather, victory has given us the opportunity to build such a peace. And our lives depend upon whether we make the most of this opportunity.

Another thing of which we are certain is that we Americans alone cannot determine whether the world will live in peace or perish in war. Peace depends quite as much upon others as it does upon us. No nation is the complete master of its fate. We are all bound together for better or for worse.

Because we know this, we have pinned our hopes to the banner of the United Nations. And we are not content simply to take our place in that organization. We realize that although the dreams of the world are lodged in it, the United Nations will fail unless its members give it life by their confidence and by their determination to make it work in concrete cases and in everyday affairs.

DISCUSSES LONDON MEETING

And so I wish to talk to you about the first meetings of the United Nations. What has been said in these meetings had been said as

plainly and bluntly as anything I have heard said by responsible statesmen in any private conference.

These first meetings were intended only to establish the various organs of the United Nations. But so pressing were some of the problems presented to the Security Council that they had to be dealt with before there was a chance for the Council to adopt even provisional rules of procedure.

All was not calm and peaceful at the meetings in London. There was effort to use the United Nations to advance selfish national aims. But the clash of national interests and purposes which were reflected in the debates in London was very much like the clash of local and special interests which are reflected in our National and State Legislatures.

We may deprecate some of these clashes of interest. But when they exist, it is better that they should be publicly revealed. If these conflicts of interests did not appear in the forums of the United Nations, these forums would be detached from reality and in the long run turn out to be purposeless and futile.

ON MIDDLE EAST DEBATE

A most significant precedent was established when the Security Council finished its discussions of the complaint of the Syrian and Lebanese Governments requesting the withdrawal of French and British troops from their territories.

The Council did not take formal action because of a difference among the permanent members as to the form of the resolution. But no one questioned the general proposition that no state has the right to maintain its troops on the territory of another independent state without its consent, nor the application of this proposition to the pending case.

The particular form of resolution to this general effect which was presented by the United States representative, Mr. Edward R. Stettinius, was supported by most of the members of the Council. It failed of acceptance, however, because the Soviet Union vetoed it on the ground that it was not definite enough.

But the British and French Governments immediately announced that, notwithstanding the technical veto of the Soviet Union, they would act in accordance with the American resolution as it clearly represented the views of the Council.

This indicates that the mere legal veto by one of the permanent members of the Council does not in fact relieve any state, large or small, of its moral obligation to act in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter.

TELLS OF GOOD START

The United Nations got off to a good start. However, that does not mean it is an assured success. It simply means that the Charter will work if the peoples of the United Nations are determined to make it work. At times our Congress may make serious errors of omission and commission. Such errors are not the fault of the Congress as an institution. They are the fault of its members or of their constituents who fail to measure up to their responsibilities.

So it is with the United Nations. It will succeed only as we, the peoples of the United Nations, measure up to our responsibilities.

I should be lacking in candor if I said to you that world conditions today are sound or reassuring. All around us there is suspicion and distrust, which in turn breeds suspicion and distrust.

Some suspicions are unfounded and unreasonable. Of some others, that cannot be said. That requires frank discussion between great powers of the things that give rise to suspicion. At the Moscow Conference there was such frank discussion. It was helpful. But the basis of some suspicions persists and prompts me to make some comments as to our position.

We have joined with our allies in the United Nations to put an end to war. We have covenanted not to use force except in the defense of law as embodied in the purposes and principles of the Charter. We intend to live up to that covenant.

But as a great power and as a permanent member of the Security Council we have a responsibility to use our influence to see that other powers live up to their covenant. And that responsibility we also intend to meet.

Unless the great powers are prepared to act in the defense of law, the United Nations cannot prevent war. We must make it clear in advance that we do intend to act to prevent aggression, making it clear at the same time that we will not use force for any other purpose.

The great powers are given special responsibilities because they have the strength to maintain peace, if they have the will to maintain peace. Their strength in relation to one another is such that no one of them can safely break the peace if the others stand united in defense of the Charter.

The present power relationships of the great states preclude the domination of the world by any one of them. Those power relationships cannot be substantially altered by the unilateral action of any one great state without profoundly disturbing the whole structure of the United Nations.

Therefore, if we are going to do our part to maintain peace in the world we must maintain our power to do so, and we must make it clear that we will stand united with other great states in defense of the Charter.

If we are to be a great power we must act as a great power, not only in order to insure our own security but in order to preserve the peace of the world.

FOR MILITARY TRAINING

Much as we desire general disarmament and much as we are prepared to participate in a general reduction of armaments, we cannot be faithful to our obligations to ourselves and to the world if we alone disarm.

While it is not in accord with our traditions to maintain a large professional standing army, we must be able and ready to provide armed contingents that may be required on short notice. We must also have a trained citizenry able and ready to supplement those armed contingents without unnecessarily prolonged training.

That is why in the interest of peace we cannot allow our Military Establishment to be reduced below the point required to maintain a position commensurate with our responsibilities, and that is why we must have some form of universal military training.

Our power thus maintained cannot and will not be used for aggressive purposes. Our tradition as a peace-loving, law-abiding, democratic people should be an assurance that our force will not be used except in the defense of law. Our armed forces except as they may be called into action by the Security Council, cannot be employed in war without the consent of the Congress. We need not fear their misuse unless we distrust the representatives of the people.

SEES NO CAUSE FOR WAR

I am convinced that there is no reason for war between any of the great powers. Their present power relationships and interests are such that none need or should feel insecure in relation to the others as long as each faithfully observes the purposes and principles of the Charter.

It is not enough for nations to declare they do not want to make war. Hitler said that. In a sense he meant it. He wanted the world to accept the domination of a totalitarian government under his direction. He wanted that without war if possible. He was determined to get it with war if necessary.

To banish war, nations must refrain from doing the things that lead to war.

It has never been the policy of the United States in its internal affairs or in its foreign relations to regard the status quo as sacrosanct. The essence of our democracy is our belief in life and growth and in the right of the people to shape and mould their own destiny.

It is not in our tradition to defend the dead hand of reaction or the tyranny of privilege. We did not fight against the Nazis and Fascists who turned back the clock of civilization in order that we might stop the clock of progress.

WANTS POSITIVE DIPLOMACY

Our diplomacy must not be negative and inert. It must be capable of adjustment and development in response to constantly changing circumstances. It must be marked by creative ideas, constructive proposals, practical and forward-looking suggestions.

Though the status quo is not sacred and unchangeable, we cannot overlook a unilateral gnawing away at the status quo. The Charter forbids aggression and we cannot allow aggression to be accomplished by coercion or pressure, or by subterfuges such as political infiltration.

When adjustments between States, large or small, are called for, we will frankly and fairly consider those adjustments on their merits and in the light of the common interests of all States, large and small, to maintain peace and security in a world based on the unity of all great powers and the dominance of none.

There are undoubtedly vitally important adjustments which will require our consideration. Some of these situations are delicate to deal with. I am convinced, however, that satisfactory solutions can be found if there is a stop to this maneuvering for strategic advantage all over the world and to the use of one adjustment as an entering wedge for further and undisclosed penetrations of power.

We must face the fact that to preserve the United Nations we cannot be indifferent—veto or no veto—to serious controversies between any of the great powers, because such controversies could affect the whole power relationship between all of the great powers.

The United States wishes to maintain friendly relations with all nations and exclusive arrangements with no nation. Naturally, there are some problems which concern some nations much more than other nations. That is true in regard to many problems related to inter-American affairs. That is true in regard to the control of Germany and Japan.

AGAINST EXCLUSIVE BLOCS

In our relations with the other great powers there are many problems which concern two or three of us much more than the others of us. I see no objection to conferences between the Big Three or the Big Four or the Big Five.

Even conferences between ourselves and the Soviet Union alone, conferences between ourselves and Britain alone, or conferences between ourselves and France or China alone, can all help to further general accord among the great powers and peace with the smaller powers.

But in such conferences, so far as the United States is concerned, we will gang up against no state. We will do nothing to break the world into exclusive blocs or spheres of influence. In this atomic age we will not seek to divide a world which is one and indivisible.

We have openly, gladly and wholeheartedly welcomed our Soviet ally as a great power, second to none in the family of the United Nations. We have approved many adjustments in her favor, and in the process resolved many serious doubts in her favor.

Only an inexcusable tragedy of errors could cause serious conflict between us in the future. Despite the differences in our way of life, our people admire and respect our allies and wish to continue to be friends and partners in a world of expanding freedom and rising standards of living.

But in the interest of world peace and in the interest of our common and traditional friendship we must make plain that the United States intends to defend the Charter.

Great powers as well as small powers have agreed under the United Nations Charter not to use force or the threat of force except in defense of law and the purposes and principles of the Charter.

We will not and we cannot stand aloof if force or the threat of force is used contrary to the purposes and principles of the Charter.

WOULD SPEED PEACE MAKING

We have no right to hold our troops in the territories of other sovereign states without their approval and consent freely given.

We must not unduly prolong the making of peace and continue to impose our troops upon small and impoverished states.

No power has a right to help itself to alleged enemy properties in liberated or ex-satellite countries before a reparation settlement has been agreed upon by the Allies. We have not and will not agree to any one power deciding for itself what it will take from these countries.

We must not conduct a war of nerves to achieve strategic ends.

We do not want to stumble and stagger into situations where no power intends war, but no power will be able to avert war.

We must not regard the drawing of attention to situations which might endanger the peace, as an affront to the nation or nations responsible to those situations.

It is quite possible that any nation may in good faith embark on a course of conduct without fully appreciating the effects of its conduct. We must all be willing to review our actions to preserve our common interests in the peace, which are so much more important to all of us than the differences which might divide us.

We must get back to conditions of peace. We must liquidate the terrible legacy which the war has left us. We must return our armies to their homelands. We must eliminate the breeding grounds of suspicion and fear. We must not deceive ourselves or mislead our Allies. To avoid trouble we must not allow situations to develop into incidents from which there is no retreat.

CALLS FOR PATIENCE NOW

We must live by the Charter. That is the only road to peace.

To live by the Charter requires good will and understanding on the part of all of us. We who had patience and gave confidence to one another in the most trying days of the war must have patience and give confidence to one another now.

No nation has a monopoly of virtue or of wisdom, and no nation has a right to act as if it had. Friendly nations should act as friendly nations.

Loose talk of the inevitability of war casts doubt on our own loyalty to the Charter and jeopardizes our most cherished freedoms both at home and abroad.

There are ideological differences in the world. There always have been. But in this world there is room for many people with varying views and many governments with varying systems. None of us can foresee the far distant future and the ultimate shape of things to come. But we are bound together as part of a common civilization.

As we view the wreckage of the war, we must realize that the urgent tasks of reconstruction, the challenging tasks of creating higher standards of living for our people, should absorb all our constructive energies.

Great states and small states must work together to build a friendlier and happier world. If we fail to work together there can be no peace, no comfort and little hope for any of us.

Brotherhood or Bombs—Which?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 1 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very timely address delivered on February 28, 1946, at the Church of the Reformation in Washington, D. C., by Frederick Taylor Wilson, author-lecturer, on the subject Brotherhood or Bombs—Which?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Moses, the first and greatest of lawgivers, solemnly said to his people at an anxious hour in their history: "I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing; therefore choose life that thou and thy seed may live."

In our own land, in other years, James Russell Lowell warned that—

"Once to every man and nation
Comes the moment to decide,
In the strife of truth with falsehood
For the good or evil side."

Mankind, now, however, faces its greatest decision.

The year 1945 was an amazing one. Historians, centuries hence, will write in wonder of its world-shaking events. The triple sudden deaths in that year, all within a period of less than 20 days, of President Roosevelt in a quiet Georgia retreat, and the fated endings of Mussolini and Hitler, the one at the hands of outraged fellow Italians and the other, like Samson of old, amid the falling ruins of Germany, were great historic events. The successful closing of the long, drawn-out wars with both Germany and Japan, soon thereafter were occasions for world-wide rejoicing. After long enduring the dark night of war, mankind, like Dante of old, in joy again beheld the stars of peace.

But the most momentous events of 1945 were not the sudden passing of these national leaders, however good or evil they may have been, for other leaders before them had passed. Neither was the ending of global wars, horrible as they were, our most thrilling events, for wars before them had come to a sudden end.

The two events of 1945 which history will record as of most far-reaching significance to the human race were the successful completion at San Francisco by the representatives of 51 different nations, of the plan for the United Nations Organization and the announcement a few weeks later of the release and the application of the deadly effect of the atomic bomb upon two helpless cities in Japan. The work at San Francisco was the real beginning of what can become the parliament of man and the federation of the world, about which poets have sung and prophets have long prophesied. The old League of Nations, however great may have been its work, did not include in its councils representatives of either Russia or the United States, and, therefore, could not be called truly international. The release of the atomic bomb with all its potential power suggested to thinking man the coming of the awful judgment day of his childhood and was a terrible omen of what could prove to be the means for man's ultimate destruction. The hell-fire of other days again entered into the imaginative thinking of a frightened world. As Mathew Arnold expressed it:

"Down came the storm. In ruins fell
The worn-out world we knew."

Mankind suddenly realized that a new age had burst upon it which can prove to be either the end of all or another golden age for man. It is significant that the meeting place at San Francisco was near what the world knows as the Golden Gate.

The work at San Francisco was not of a spectacular nature. There great men and women labored day after day with anxious interest as spokesmen for a majority of the peoples of the world and hewed out in brilliant fashion from the hard oak of realism what, under God, could prove to be the world's greatest structure of idealism. There, the blueprint was made for a universal workshop, in which sane leaders of nations, in the future, may in actuality beat their swords of war into plowshares and their spears of battle into the pruning hooks of peace. In dignity and decorum these representatives of 51 different nations garbed in the dress of their native lands and speaking their own varied languages, came forward and affixed their several signatures to what should prove to be the Magna Charta of mankind and the world's first great declaration of independence. That work has now been approved by a majority of the nations represented at San Francisco and the foundation for universal peace and brotherhood has now been laid.

Contrast this constructive work at San Francisco with the awful destructive scenes which took place a few weeks later in Japan. There, like Prometheus of old, man, poor, weak man, brought down fire from heaven, and scenes far more thrilling than the days of debate and compromise at San Francisco took place. From a murky sky, lonely pilots of the purple twilight let loose upon war-battered Japanese cities, like the dew of death pictured by Tennyson, the most destructive weapon of war ever used before by man. Flames of heat of 4,000,000°, brighter than the light of the midday sun, swept heavenward to a height of more than 8 miles, and at a velocity of more than 500 miles an hour, and in a short while untold thousands of helpless men, women, and children melted away like wax in the deadly flames of this ghastly invention of man. The imaginative inferno of Dante was eclipsed by the real inferno which man's genius had let loose upon the world.

All of this was the work of a weapon of war no larger than a common cocoanut. It had been released at a cost of $2,000,000,000, or one-fifth of the entire wealth of all Manhattan Island, and in it was a pent-up power greater than that of any weapon of war yet devised by man. It would require a contribution of near $1 from every human being on earth to pay this bill.

It is said that one pound of uranium 235, an element used in the construction of the atomic bomb, equals in potential energy 1,500 tons of coal, 250,000 gallons of gasoline, and 80,000,000 cubic feet of gas. And yet only one-tenth of 1 percent of the possible power which could have been released was released upon the bewildered cities of Japan. At last a Frankenstein monster created under the leadership of the wisest among us had been devised and the world learned for the first time of this horrible instrument of war which could quickly destroy it.

Now, as Zoroaster proclaimed long ago, two great forces—the one of light and the other of darkness—contend for world mastery. Which shall prevail?

The United Nations Organization may in truth with its world-wide ramifications become the word forum where voices of the oppressed among the nations, long silent, may be heard and long maturing plans for a just and lasting peace among the nations reach their final perfection. It can be the way, under God, in which a new day of brotherhood and good will can be made to prevail.

"Where the bars of race and creed and speech
which sever
Will be fused into one humanity forever."

There is great satisfaction in the thought that the future control of this awful bomb will be under the direction of the United Nations Organization. There this new-found power may be directed to the work of prolonging human life rather than of destroying it; to lifting burdens from the backs of tired men and women rather than multiplying them; and to performing the divine task of bringing a statelier Eden back to man. If man should have once lost his paradise of plenty, that paradise can be regained. Piety and poverty were never genuine yoke fellows. Riches and righteousness are not natural rivals, but can learn to walk together in heavenly harmony. Despair and disease were never destined to haunt forever the home of man made in the image of God. There is a divine discontent in the human family which can be satisfied. The kingdom of peace, power, and plenty can be realized.

There is great hope for man in knowing that mighty voices in the church of God had a vital part in the promotion of this new world parliament. Its spiritual opportunity is as unlimited as its political future.

The alternative is too terrible for human contemplation. The potential destructive power of the atomic bomb is beyond human comprehension. It is said that three such bombs properly placed could, overnight, destroy the entire industrial structure of America. No city or nation could successfully protect itself against such a day of doom. One scientist declares that 123 such bombs properly placed could wreak more deadly damage than all the recent years of war. Mother earth itself—like exploding stars—could be completely annihilated. A mad race among the nations to excel in the making of this weapon of destruction could only end in their universal bankruptcy.

For such a time as now the church universal has come. For 2,000 years good men and good women have talked and written of human brotherhood. The hour is now upon us when that brotherhood must become a grand reality or we perish. The key to the future peace of the world lies in the successful operation of the United Nations Organization. The success of that organization lies in the support of a church universal, for only the moral and spiritual unity of man will make workable the political unity of the nations. The time has long past when any sincere religious group should spend its time sniping any other group, great or small, which seeks to promote good will among men. Tolerance and truth demand a respect for every apostle of human brotherhood.

What a task for the church? The Master of all men in confidence declared that His Kingdom lay within the hearts of men. Whenever all human souls possess that kingdom the reign of righteousness will be universal. The universal church is greater than any human organization. It is something more than Jewish or Gentile, Catholic or Protestant. It is rooted in the recognition of God as the universal Father and of all the children of men as made of one blood. No particular faith holds a monopoly of religious truths. There is in each religious faith a vital truth which can be used in the building of this ecumenical edifice. Micah's plea for justice, mercy, and humility as the requirements of God was a universal plea. Freedom, knowledge, and human kindness are the common property of every great faith. Let us believe that the Kingdom of God lies just ahead. The arrival of "The one far-off divine event," can, under God, be hastened. It will come, not by observation as a cosmic catastrophe, but like the leaven in the lump, when the spirit of Christ is universal.

It is of supreme importance that every potent pen and every vibrant voice in the world today—whatever their religious beliefs—become enlisted in this mighty effort for the promotion of the universal spirit of tolerance, truth, and good will. These are the God-given arches which will support forever the bridge of brotherhood. It is a momentous task, for millions of the human race, like Laocoon and his sons, are still caught in the awful coils of ignorance, intolerance, and religious superstition.

But there is hope ahead. There is a perpetual plasticity in man's nature and the miracle of a redeemed humanity can become a glorious reality. For such to become true, a light more brilliant than that which rose above the cities of Japan must break upon the world. Such a light will not flash from the blast of bombs, but from the throne of Eternal Love, a love that transcends all love for nations, the love that holds the sun and moon and stars, the love for humanity. Then a new day will dawn upon the world. And with its coming, there will be ushered in the age sublime which will bring to the broken sons and daughters of men—

"A brotherhood that shall grow stronger
Than the narrow bonds which now distract the world;
When cannons roar and trumpets blare no longer,
The ironclads rust and battle flags are furled."

Then we shall have a new heaven and a new earth, for the first heaven and the first earth will have passed away. Brotherhood and not bombs will rule the world!

A Real Farmer Speaks His Mind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 1, 1946

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, in common with all members of the House, I have received a large number of letters respecting many matters and things pending before Congress.

Recently I received a letter from a man who knows whereof he speaks, concerning the plight of the farmer.

Under consent granted, I am extending my remarks and including a letter from Walter Smith, of Plainfield, Vt., which deserves to be read by all who are interested to relieve the situation which obtains. This is it:

PLAINFIELD, VT., *February 25, 1946.*

DEAR SIR: I am writing you in regard to the labor situation on the farm. Are you aware that it is almost impossible to hire any help at any price? It is scarcer than during the war, and farmers are also finding it hard to meet the price demands of the few farm laborers that there are. During the war we had some help, but many left after hostilities ceased. We would be glad to have farm labor receive as good wages as help in other business, but how can the ordinary farmer pay $100 a month and room and board? Room and board elsewhere would cost a person over $50 a month. How can we pay this at the present cost of feed? After feeding our cows and paying the hired man I would have a bare living, to say nothing of supporting my family. It is true that farm work is long hours and hard work, but a farmer can't operate on an 8-hour day.

Just how many more average cows would a farmer have to keep in order to meet these wage demands? How many more hens, etc.? At that it would be a losing battle; we couldn't then operate at a profit. Isn't a farmer entitled to a fair profit on his investment?

We are getting a good milk price but no notice is taken of the fact that all we have to buy has increased in proportion. Why try to keep some prices at a 1937 low with the cost of production at a 1946 high?

In my situation I have decided that it will be impossible to produce any maple products this year because of lack of help. Why not lumber that sugar place as it is of no worth as a maple producer now and quit sugaring for good? Of course, it takes 60 to 80 years to raise a maple tree but the price of lumber is good.

Why is the cost of equipment so high? I bought a milking machine pail to go with my other machines. The pail could be made for not over $10 worth of material I firmly believe. The inflations and other parts might cost $8 and there is a pulsator that is no more complicated than the $5 carburetor on a Ford car. Yet I paid $90 for this pail. Last spring I ordered a tractor to be delivered as soon as possible. I haven't received it yet and today was told that because of strikes it was probable that my tractor wouldn't come through until summer. Unfortunately my hay dosn't understand strikes and will probably mature at the accustomed time; how shall I harvest it? If we can have neither machinery nor help what point is there in attempting to operate a farm? My farm is 300 acres and therefore I feel some help is necessary; it is hardly a one-man farm. I keep a herd of 40 milkers and approximately 70 head of stock, a flock of hens, pigs; I raise 15 ton of squash, 150 gallons of maple products, 500 pounds of beans, 75 to 100 bushel of potatoes above my own needs. I ship approximately 200,000 pounds of milk and produce several hundred dozen eggs. This farm supplies all the needs of the stock outside their grain. Are we to sell the stock and let this farm lie idle for a few years to let people realize it is necessary for the farmer to exist? There is no insurance for a farmer against hard times. Other businesses provide unemployment insurance but if my farm is to go out of production because of reasons beyond my control how about insurance for me?

If I have to sell a beef it is always called grade B or C product, but if I wish to buy a cut of beef for my own use I pay grade A price. The slaughterer gets a subsidy and the farmer takes the loss.

We can't get grain for our hens so we are forced to sell them at the price a dealer offers. From comparison with the price in the market someone must make a profit and again the farmer takes the loss.

Why are we supporting a full staff, or nearly so, of OPA officials when most articles have been removed from the ration list? Are we going to keep them in office until they too retire on a pension?

Most politicians claim on their platform to be farmers. How many operate their farms and pay all expenses of the farm and have a profit? If they are farmers let them come now to the aid of the farmers. We need help unless we are to be forced to sell our stock and only keep what we can handle alone, this labor situation must be clarified, and the importance of it made clear to the people of this country. The farmers did more than their share during the war and

believed we would not again be the forgotten group when we were not so desperately needed. But what has been done to insure us a place so that we can maintain an adequate standard of living?

Other groups depend partly on the power of a strike to enforce their demands but what would happen if the farmers went on strike? You have no fear of this believing that we are not well enough organized. But that is only part of the truth, most farmers more than any other group have a social consciousnes that prevents their using this weapon as farmers alone realize that a farm strike would bring such suffering as our country has never had to endure. Farmers would hesitate to inflict suffering on innocent children that would be the main victims. But what can we do?

If you and other Congressmen have the interests of the farmer at heart now is the time to show it. Do something about the cost of equipment or give us a milk price in proportion to it. See that some way is made to insure farm labor. We have to have machinery and help.

Thank you for your attention, I am

Sincerely yours,

WALTER SMITH.

Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 1, 1946

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave given me to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Ellsworth Huntington, professor of geography at Yale University, protesting the actions of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

I have singled this letter out from a number that I have received criticizing the manner in which this committee has been handling its investigations. Professor Huntington is a member of one of our earliest families. He is outstanding among the scholars of this Nation, and indeed of the world. He has long been famous for his expeditions in geographical research and for his published studies on the interrelationship of geography and economics. During the First World War he was a captain in the Military Intelligence Service of the Army. His background and thinking are thoroughly American.

Mr. Speaker, I think it important that the Members of this House read Professor Huntington's observations on the operations of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Our constituents are not restricted by the rules of this body from expressing themselves regarding our actions as a whole or the actions of any group representing us. They are watching us closely and when we so conduct ourselves as to bring forth their condemnation, it behooves us to pay attention to what they say. As a Member of this House I am jealous of our good reputation and trust that Professor Huntington's remarks will fall on attentive ears and cause the committee to realize that a change in its methods and approach to the problem it has undertaken to resolve is in order, lest the tide swell and public opinion be so roused that the dignity of Congress be seriously injured and the democratic process be subject to disparagement and suspicion.

YALE UNIVERSITY,

New Haven, Conn., February 22, 1946.

Hon. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN,

House Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KOPPLEMANN: My attention has just been called to a curious letter sent out by the Committee on Un-American Activities. This letter was signed by Ernie Adamson. The letter contains a phrase which says that the National Committee to Combat Anti-Semitism is engaged in "solicitation of money for the purpose of controlling the thoughts of American citizens." The use of the word "controlling" is wholly unwarranted. It carries, and is apparently meant to carry, a somewhat sinister suggestion that the Committee to Combat Anti-Semitism is doing something wrong.

That committee undoubtedly wishes to influence people's thoughts. That is exactly what you do when you seek election, and what I do when I write a book. We none of us try to control people's thoughts, but only to influence them.

The letter of the Committee on Un-American Activities is one of many examples of what seems to me a very dangerous attitude on the part of that committee. I strongly protest against such action and against the assumption of the committee that any organization with which it does not happen to be in sympathy is therefore un-American.

My personal belief is that the Committee on Un-American Activities ought to be discharged at once. It does more harm than good.

Very truly yours,

ELLSWORTH HUNTINGTON.

Anglo-American Financial Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 1, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a pamphlet on Questions and Answers on the Anglo-American Financial Agreement.

There seems to be so much confusion about the facts regarding the British loan, it might be helpful to see what the facts really are.

The Treasury Department has tried to describe the agreements clearly and simply so that the people of the United States will understand what they have to gain from helping the people of Great Britain get back on their feet.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON THE ANGLO-AMERICAN FINANCIAL AGREEMENT

(U. S. Treasury Department, Washington, D. C., January 1946)

FOREWORD

When the financial agreement with England was announced, the Treasury received many inquiries about the proposed credit. These questions came from Members of Congress, from business and civic organizations, and from private citizens interested in the urgent problems dealt with in this agreement.

It seemed to me that millions of our citizens must be asking themselves these same questions. They want to know the facts about the financial agreement. They want to know why the proposed credit is necessary. I have, therefore, asked the Treasury staff to present in plain language the questions that we have received and the answers that we have given on the financial agreement.

The American people want a world of peace and prosperity. So do the people of all countries. This will be possible only through international cooperation to establish fair currency and trade practices that will make it possible for world trade to expand and grow. We have made a good deal of progress toward this goal. Unfortunately, England will not be able to commit herself to the prompt application of these principles until she is sure that she will be in a position to secure her essential imports of food and raw materials.

For 6 years, England devoted most of her resources to fighting the war. She converted her export industries to war production. She sold foreign investments and incurred a foreign debt of $13,000,000,000 to pay for her world-wide war expenditures. But now the war is over. England can secure imports only by paying for them with exports. She can meet her huge foreign debt only by finding markets for her products. With some help, it will take a few years for England to restore her export industries and to reestablish her export trade. In the meantime, England must import. Otherwise the health of her people will be impaired and her industries will decline.

If England can secure a credit that will help pay for her essential imports during the next few years, she can immediately accept the principles of fair and nondiscriminatory currency and trade practices. In fact, England will be greatly benefited by an expansion of trade on such a basis. That is the policy England would prefer.

But if England cannot secure such a credit, she will have to take drastic steps to curtail her imports and to force her exports on other countries. Our exports would be excluded, as far as possible, from British Empire countries which would concentrate on trade with each other. Such a policy would inevitably divide the world into conflicting economic blocs. In blunt language, the world would be at war—economic war.

The consequences of such a policy would be tragic for the United States, for England, and for the entire world. That is why the representatives of the United States and England went over this problem in discussions that lasted more than 3 months. They agreed that England would need help in maintaining essential imports and that part of this help should be in the form of a credit of $3,750,000,000 from the United States. And they agreed that with this help England could abandon wartime currency and trade discriminations and join with the United States in a program of international economic cooperation. This is the essence of the financial agreement between the United States and England which is now before Congress for approval.

This financial agreement, and the proposed credit will be a big step in preventing economic warfare. It will also be a big step in building a world in which countries live and work together in peace and prosperity. For England it will mean a chance to feed her people and reconvert her industries in a world of expanding trade. For the United States it will mean opening the markets of our best customer, England and the British Empire, to the products of our factories and farms. For all countries it will mean a chance to reconstruct a war-shattered world, with expanding trade, greater employment, and higher standards of living.

The people of the United States and the United Nations have agreed on a program in which countries cooperate to maintain peace and prosperity. The United Nations Organization, with its Security Council, General Assembly, Economic and Social Council, and International Court of Justice, constitute one side of this program. The International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the proposed International Trade Organization constitute another side of the same program. The financial agreement with the United Kingdom is essential to the realization of this entire program for peace and prosperity. This is what I hope the people and Congress will bear in mind in considering the financial agreement.

FRED M. VINSON,
Secretary of the Treasury.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 1946.*

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

1. What is the Anglo-American financial agreement?

The financial agreement between the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom is an agreement under which—

a. The United States will extend to the United Kingdom a line of credit of $3,750,000,000, which can be drawn upon until December 31, 1951.

b. The United Kingdom will end a series of wartime financial and commercial restrictions and practices which have the effect of discriminating against American trade and reducing the flow of world trade.

The loan will be repaid in 50 equal installments, beginning in 1951. The amount to be paid each year for principal and interest of 2 percent is fixed at $120,000,000 on the $3,750,000,000 credit, plus an additional $20,000,000 on the $650,000,000 settlement for lend-lease and surplus property. This makes a total of $140,000,000 a year. The portions of the payment that will be credited to principal and interest, respectively, will vary from year to year, the portion to be credited to principal increasing and that to interest decreasing.

The financial agreement is associated with a far-reaching agreement on commercial policy and a settlement of the outstanding lend-lease and surplus-property problems of the two countries. The commercial policy statement proposes the establishment of an International Trade Organization which would aim to expand world trade by reducing trade barriers, avoiding trade discriminations, and eliminating cartel practices.

2. Who decides whether the credit should be extended?

Congress has to authorize the Government to extend the line of credit to England. Section 1 of the financial agreement states that it will take effect on the date when the United Kingdom is notified by the United States that Congress has made the necessary funds available.

The authorizing legislation will have to be passed by both Houses of Congress.

3. Does England need this credit?

In the next few years England will not have enough income from abroad—foreign exchange from exports and services—to pay for food and materials which the British people must buy abroad, if they are to live and their industries are to operate. The British estimate that, even if they economize strictly on imports and buy nothing which is not essential, they will have to spend abroad in the next several years from $5,000,000,000 to $6,000,000,000 more than they can sell abroad.

The British cannot pay for these essential imports with their own currency, the pound sterling. Foreign countries already have more than $13,000,000,000 of sterling and will be increasingly reluctant to sell their goods and services for this currency. Therefore, the British need a credit in foreign money to continue to buy imports from the United States and other countries. In a few years their export industries will be restored and they will earn enough foreign exchange to pay for their imports and other expenditures abroad.

After careful study, the American representatives concluded that a credit of $3,750,000,000 from the United States, plus her other resources, will enable England to meet the postwar deficit in her international trade. If England's needs turn out to be smaller than estimated, she will not use the entire amount of the line of credit. England will try to keep her obligations to a minimum, in order to keep down the annual payments of principal and interest which she will have to make.

4. How did England get into this position?

England got into these foreign-exchange difficulties because she devoted most of her resources to the war. In the next few years her earnings from overseas business will be lower than before the war because—

(a) British exports are lower. During the war England's export industries were converted to war production or shut down. In 1944 she exported only 30 percent as much goods as in 1938. It will take several years to reconvert these industries and restore their trade.

(b) British foreign investments were sold. During the war England sold over $4,500,000,000 of her foreign investments, and thereby lost forever the income which they formerly yielded. The proceeds were used to buy war goods from us and other countries. In addition, England incurred foreign debts of $13,000,000,000.

(c) England's income from shipping and other services has fallen off. Part of her merchant fleet was sunk in the war. Many of the other services she sells abroad, such as banking and insurance, are linked with the revival of her trade.

While the war has reduced England's earnings of foreign exchange, some of her foreign expenditures will be increased. The destruction from bombing has to be replaced, and this means increased imports of raw materials. Much of the capital equipment in her factories deteriorated during the war, and this, too, must be replaced, in part by means of increased imports.

5. What will England do with the credit?

Section 3 of the financial agreement states:

"The purpose of the line of credit is to facilitate purchases by the United Kingdom of goods and services in the United States, to assist the United Kingdom to meet transitional postwar deficits in its current balance of payments, to help the United Kingdom to maintain adequate reserves of gold and dollars, and to assist the Government of the United Kingdom to assume the obligations of multilateral trade, as defined in this and other agreements."

Since England needs a large quantity of the kind of goods which the United States can best supply, it is probable that a large part of the credit will be used to finance direct exports from the United States to England. The British will also use the credit to pay other countries for imports, when these countries want dollars to buy imports from the United States. Thus India, for example, will be able to use the proceeds of her exports to England to pay for her purchases in the United States.

6. Will England pay off the blocked sterling with the credit?

Section 6 of the financial agreement provides that "any amounts required to discharge obligations of the United Kingdom to third countries will be found from resources other than this line of credit." This means that England will not use the loan to repay any part of the huge sterling balances which other countries acquired during the war. These and other British obligations will have to be settled from such other foreign exchange resources as may be available to England.

7. Will England use the credit to nationalize her industries?

This credit is to help Britain meet her foreign exchange problem which would be precisely the same under a Labor Government or a Conservative Government. The money will be used only to buy goods and services from abroad. It will be used to help eliminate wartime trade and exchange restrictions which are entirely unrelated to the nationalization of British industries.

This loan of dollars is for England's external needs—her business with foreign nations. As a matter of fact, if England wants to acquire a British industry she does not need foreign credit for this. She can pay the owners by giving them British Government bonds, or by paying sterling secured by taxes and loans in England.

8. Why is the loan referred to as a "line of credit"?

The dollars lent to England will be used ultimately to buy goods and services or settle claims in the United States. The British will use dollar funds only as they need them to meet obligations. The United States will therefore provide the money in a series of transfers extending over a period of years, rather than in a lump sum.

Under the terms of the agreement, the line of credit will be available for use by the British until December 31, 1951. The annual amounts withdrawn from 1946 through 1951 will be added together, and that sum will constitute the principal of the loan. If the entire line of credit is used, the principal will be $3,750,000,000. Repayments of principal and interest at 2 percent will begin in 1951, based on the amount outstanding on the last day of that year.

9. Is the rate of interest reasonable?

The rate of interest is 2 percent on the outstanding amount of the loan, and interest payments begin in 1951. The effective rate of interest will be somewhat lower than 2 percent, if either substantial amounts of the credit are used before 1951, as is probable, or the interest payment in any year is waived, as is possible under the agreement.

The rate of interest is low compared with what American banks would charge a foreign government. It is not low compared with what England can undertake to pay in dollars. Even with the rate of interest at 2 percent, the payments of interest and principal will be about $140,000,000 a year for 50 years on the $3,750,000,000 credit and the approximately $650,000,000 which the British will owe for the settlement of lend-lease and surplus property. This is a large sum of dollar exchange which the British will have to earn each year and transfer. Over the 50 years the total interest to be paid will be $2,600,000,000. This is additional to the principal.

The rate of interest should be considered together with the other provisions of the financial agreement, many of which England would not have agreed to in return for a loan whose carrying charges she would consider beyond her capacity. It should also be remembered that before the negotiations there were many persons who felt that only a grant would make it possible for Britain to abandon the wartime financial and commercial restrictions of the sterling area.

10. What will be the burden to the American taxpayer?

The immediate effect of this transaction will be to transfer funds borrowed from the American public to an account from which the Government of the United Kingdom can draw as needed. The credit is an investment, not an expenditure, by the United States Government. There will be a cost to the taxpayer only if—

(a) Some portion of the loan is not repaid; or

(b) If the interest payments prove to be less than the cost of borrowing by the United States Government.

The average interest rate which the United States Treasury pays on the Government debt is slightly lower than the rate of interest which England will pay on the credit. However, because England is not required to begin interest payments until 1951 and because some interest payments could conceivably be waived, it is possible that over the whole life of the loan the United States Treasury will pay to American bondholders somewhat more in interest than it receives from England as interest payments.

The loan will, of course, bring many direct and indirect benefits. It will promote production and trade. The income of the American people will be higher. And with more trade and income, the United States Government will find its revenues increased.

11. Why will interest payments be waived under certain conditions?

The waiver clause recognizes that temporary adverse conditions can make payment of interest difficult. The British point out that American purchases of British goods might in a depression sink so low that over several years it would be impossible for them to earn the dollars necessary for their interest payments.

It has not been customary to make allowance in foreign loans for the possibility of a depression in world trade. The absence of such a provision is one of the reasons why default was often difficult to avoid. Our representatives thought that a provision which permitted interest to be waived in especially bad years was not only fair but also to our benefit. We certainly would prefer to collect the principal rather than force default, which might be the only alternative.

England may request a waiver of interest and the United States will grant it in any year if (a) the British find a waiver is made necessary by the present and prospective conditions of international exchange and the level of British gold and foreign exchange reserves; and (b) the International Monetary Fund certifies that the income from exports of goods produced in England, plus their net income for services rendered to foreigners, such as insurance and shipping receipts and foreign investment, falls below an agreed minimum, stipulated in the financial agreement, necessary to pay for essential imports.

The agreement provides that the amount of interest due will not be waived in any year unless interest payments are also waived on other obligations of England incurred during the period from December 1945 to the end of 1951 and unless payments on the accumulated sterling balances are correspondingly reduced.

It should be noted that the waiver does not apply to repayment of principal. The whole of the principal of the credit must be repaid without qualification.

12. Can England repay this credit?

As world trade recovers after the war, it is expected that England will have an expanding income from exports and from insurance, shipping, and overseas investments. By 1951, when the first annual payment on the loan is due, England's foreign exchange income from these sources should be large enough to enable her to make payments without unduly curtailing essential imports. England will use a portion of her foreign exchange income to meet the annual installments on the credit instead of increasing her overseas purchases or adding to her monetary reserves.

Of course, no one can predict with certainty what will happen in the next 50 years. It is possible that world trade will sometimes break down. England made payments on her World War I debt to us until 1931 when President Hoover proposed that payments be suspended on all war debts for 1 year. Because during the depression our imports were reduced and our foreign investments stopped, England was unable to obtain sufficient dollars to resume payment on her war debt.

A primary purpose of the loan is to prevent a break-down in world trade. This purpose will be furthered by the establishment of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank, and the proposed International Trade Organization. If we succeed in achieving a high level of world trade, there can be little question as to the ability of England to meet her obligations under this loan.

13. Will we have to increase our imports?

Ultimately, we must import more goods if we intend to export on a large scale and derive the full benefits of increased international trade. During the immediate postwar period, however, we shall probably be a net investor in foreign countries and the amount of this investment will enable us to export without equivalent imports.

At a later stage we shall not only have to import more, but we shall want to import more. Our population will be greater. Our national income will be greater. In addition, we are very likely to need more imports of many raw materials in the future. Some of these raw materials we do not produce at all. Of others, our own resources will be too small for our growing needs.

In the long run, increased imports will have the effect of raising our standard of living so long as we maintain employment at a high level, because increased imports mean more goods available for consumption.

14. Why doesn't England borrow from other countries?

England has borrowed from others. During the war, foreign countries accumulated billions of sterling in exchange for the goods and services they supplied England. Since they could get only limited quantities of goods in return, the effect was that England borrowed from them. These accumulated sterling balances amount to more than $13,000,000,000 and are held mostly for the account of countries in the sterling area.

England is borrowing from others. Sterling is still piling up in London to the account of foreigners, at the rate of roughly $2,000,000,000 a year. Foreign countries are taking this sterling—a loan to England—in exchange for the goods and services they are now supplying.

England will borrow from others. She is now seeking other credits on long term, for example, from Canada.

The United States is not alone in helping England with credits. But it must be remembered that, aside from the United States and Canada, nearly all the capital-lending countries have been physically devastated by war and are themselves in need of aid. Therefore, England must look to the United States for the bulk of the credit she requires.

15. Why couldn't the International Bank extend this loan?

England will handle her own internal reconstruction and development. The line of credit is to meet a large external emergency. We all know that as an island nation, England relies heavily on trade with other countries. The balance between what she ships in and buys and what she ships out and sells was thrown out of kilter by the war. She needs credit in foreign currency to continue buying until she can restore her export trade.

The Bank is not intended to deal with special needs of this sort. The Bank's resources must be used for long-term reconstruction and development purposes. The proposed loan to England is a long-term emergency credit unsuited to the operations and purposes of the bank.

16. Why doesn't England sell her foreign investments?

England has already sold $4,500,000,000 of her foreign investments. She will have to dispose of still more in settling her wartime debts.

A portion of what is left is not salable because of wartime destruction, disruption of trade and other causes. Another large portion would have to be sold mainly in the currencies of the countries in which they are located and therefore would not solve England's need for dollars or currencies convertible into dollars. Finally, any investments would have to be sold gradually to realize anything like their value.

When a country sells any of its foreign investments, it terminates for all time its foreign income from those investments which are sold. To England this would mean a further deterioration in her balance of payments and even greater difficulty in securing essential imports.

17. Why doesn't England cut her foreign expenditures?

At the present time, England is drastically cutting her overseas expenditures. Her war expenditures in foreign countries are of course being greatly reduced. Her dollar expenditures, especially, have been cut and orders have been given to all sterling area countries to purchase for dollars only those essential items which cannot be otherwise obtained.

England's urgent need for $5,000,000,000 to $6,000,000,000 is not based on large foreign expenditures. On the contrary, even with the credits from us and other countries, England will have to maintain her imports at an austere level. It will be hard to feed and clothe her people and rebuild her homes and factories on such a level of imports. England's standard of living will be little different from wartime.

18. What would England have to do if we do not lend the money?

If the credit from the United States is not extended, England would be forced to continue her wartime currency and trade restrictions and drastically curtail all expenditures in the United States. These restrictions would have to be applied not only by England but by nearly all of the British Empire. The dollars earned by these countries would continue to be turned over to the British and allocations would be made by the British permitting the expenditure of these dollars only for the most essential goods that could not be obtained within the British trading area.

Judging by the recent past, England would also extend her system of bilateral agreements to still other countries. These agreements, like the present sterling area arrangements, would discriminate against and perhaps exclude American trade.

Without the loan, these restrictions and arrangements would be continued because England would be compelled—

(a) To cut her dollar deficit by diverting purchases, even at higher prices, to other countries.

(b) To obtain credits from other countries by importing from them and by paying in sterling.

The continuation of these wartime devices would in effect establish a sterling bloc based on the need to reduce purchases from the dollar bloc. The attempt to exclude the United States from these markets would enhance the possibility of economic conflict.

19. Why shouldn't the credit be financed by allowing citizens to invest in British obligations directly?

The people who make this proposal overlook the fact that regardless of the terms of the loan, no foreign bond issue of this size could be floated in our markets. Furthermore this is not a practical proposal because the financial agreement involves many considerations other than the extension of a credit.

As explained elsewhere in this document, the real question is whether the long-range

interest of the United States requires that England be offered this financial assistance at this time. The credit is designed to make it possible for England to remove discriminatory restrictions on international trade and to associate herself fully with the United States in a program designed to encourage the world-wide expansion of trade.

In other words, the credit to England must be viewed as an integral part of the financial agreement with all of its benefits to American business. It cannot be judged as an ordinary commercial credit.

20. What is the sterling area?

Just as the "dollar area" is understood to include a number of countries that have close trade and financial ties with the United States, so the sterling area before the war were the countries closely linked in trade and finance with England. These countries held the larger portion of their monetary reserves in London, and carried out most of their international transactions in sterling, which was convertible into practically any currency in the world.

When the war came England restricted the convertibility of sterling into dollars and limited the use of sterling in purchases from the dollar area. Other countries in the sterling area imposed similar controls. While the currencies of the sterling area countries could be exchanged for each other, none of them could be converted into dollars except to the extent permitted by the monetary authorities in London.

As a war measure, to conserve the exchange resources of England and the sterling area countries, these controls were essential. In peacetime, they can only bring about a serious reduction in trade and the diversion of trade into uneconomic channels. The prewar sterling area, like the dollar area, was a convenience to trade. The wartime restrictions are a menace to trade.

At the present time the sterling area includes all of the countries and territories comprising the British Empire (except Canada and Newfoundland), Egypt, Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, Iraq, Iceland, and the Faroe Island. One purpose of the financial agreement is to restore the convertibility of sterling, particularly with respect to current transactions, such as imports and exports. Thus, the sterling area will in considerable measure return to its prewar form.

21. What is the dollar pool?

The so-called sterling area dollar pool is an arrangement by which the dollars earned by countries of the sterling area are pooled and allocated by London in accordance with essential needs.

It works like this. When an Indian exporter sells goods in the United States, he turns the dollars over to the Reserve Bank of India for rupees. These dollars are then sold to England for sterling. And this happens in all of the sterling-area countries that have net dollar receipts. In this way, all the dollar holdings of the sterling area are pooled. Then, when a country in the sterling area needs dollars, it applies to London. To conserve dollars, funds are not allocated to buy goods in the United States that can be secured in any sterling-area country. The American producers of such goods are virtually shut out of the sterling-area markets.

If the dollar pool is continued into the postwar period, the difficulty of reestablishing multilateral trade would be considerably increased. Moreover, its operation in peacetime would inevitably involve discrimination against American exporters. Trade among the sterling-area countries would be developed in preference to trade with the United States or other non-sterling-area countries.

Under the terms of the agreement, the dollar pool will be abolished within a year, unless this Government agrees that an extension is necessary.

22. Will sterling-area countries now be able to purchase more freely from the United States?

As a result of the credit made available to England, most sterling-area countries will be in a position to make larger purchases from the United States. Within a year, unless the United States agrees to a later date, the current receipts of dollars and sterling of each sterling-area country will be available to make purchases anywhere. Thus, India's sterling income from exports to England could be converted into dollars to make purchases in the United States. Under present restrictions such income can only be used for purchases in the sterling area.

The proposed United States loan will substantially increase the total amount of dollars available to England and all the sterling-area countries with which to buy our exports.

23. What controls will England place on American sterling balances?

In section 8 of the financial agreement, the United States obtains a written commitment that American exporters selling goods to the United Kingdom will be paid in dollars or if paid in sterling, they will be allowed to convert the sterling into dollars.

Until 1951, the imposition of exchange controls by the United Kingdom will be governed by this commitment and specific provisions of the International Fund Agreement. After 1951, all exchange controls will be subject to the International Monetary Fund.

24. What will England do about other bilateral monetary agreements?

These agreements, which have been made with many European and some South American countries, will have to be substantially revised within a year after the financial agreement comes into effect.

The British bilateral agreements provide that the sterling received for exports to England can be used only for purchases or payments in the sterling area.

Under section 8 of the financial agreement, England states that within a year—unless a later date is agreed with us—she will impose no restrictions on payments and transfers for current transactions. British payments for Danish exports, for example, which are now used only inside the sterling area, will soon be convertible into other currencies, including dollars, and be available for use in any country. The existing bilateral agreements will have to be revised to give effect to this principle.

When that is done, a large amount of potential discrimination against American trade will have been removed.

This commitment lasts until 1951, by which time all the provisions of the International Monetary Fund will apply.

25. Will England discriminate against us by means of import restrictions?

In section 9 of the financial agreement, each government undertakes not to discriminate against the other through import quotas, or like devices. Since England's imports are mainly controlled through import permits, this is an important protection to American exporters. It will last until 1951, when it is expected that the rules of the proposed International Trade Organization will govern.

In practice, this should mean that quotas will not be so administered as to refuse permits for American goods while granting permits for similar goods from other countries.

26. What will be the nature of the settlement of sterling balances accumulated during the war?

During the war many countries accumulated sterling balances. These sterling liabilities, which amount now to more than $13,000,000,000, arise as a result of England's large war expenditures overseas. Because of exchange restrictions the balances could not be used for purchases outside the sterling area. Because of wartime shortages and commodity and shipping controls, they could not be used to make purchases in England. Therefore, the sterling balances accumulated.

It is not possible for England to produce in the near future a sufficient volume of exports to pay off these balances. Furthermore, her holdings of foreign exchange are too small to permit the sterling to be exchanged for other currencies which the owners could spend elsewhere.

In section 10 of the financial agreement, England states her intention to make agreements with each of the countries concerned for an early settlement of these balances. With respect to countries belonging to the sterling area, it is expected that the accumulated balances will be divided into three categories. One will consist of a portion to be made available immediately for current transactions, including purchases in the United States. Another will be gradually released for current transactions over a period of years beginning in 1951. This, too, can be used for purchases in any country, including the United States. The remainder is to be adjusted as part of the common costs of winning the war against the Axis powers.

It is likely that many countries outside the sterling area will also agree to gradual liquidation of their sterling balances over a period of years.

27. Does the loan give England an advantage over the United States in world markets?

On the contrary, the proposed loan will put American exporters on an equal competitive basis with the British in selling to the countries of the sterling area. Any country that has funds, say sterling, that can be used to buy in England will be able to use the funds to buy in the United States if their people prefer to buy here. No country will be forced to discriminate in its trade as between the United States and the sterling area.

When the accumulated sterling balances are released, it is agreed by England that the money may be used for current payments anywhere. The money can be used to purchase American, British, or any other goods.

28. Is the British credit a precedent for other loans?

It is not. No other country has the same crucial position in world trade as England. The wide use of the pound sterling in world trade, the large proportion of the world's trade which is carried on by the countries of the British Empire, the extreme dependence of England upon imports—these and other factors mean that the financial and commercial practices of Britain are of the utmost significance in determining what kind of world economy we shall have.

We expect that, as a general rule, the needs of foreign countries for help will be met through UNRRA, the International Fund, the International Bank, and the Export-Import Bank. If any special case could not be handled through these established organizations, the question of a loan would be put to Congress for its authorization.

29. How is the loan related to the objectives of the United Nations Organization?

The proposed credit to England is vital to the objectives of the United Nations Organization. We have learned from long experience that world peace depends on world prosperity. It is not enough to deal with the political problems that threaten world security. We must also deal with the economic problems that can lead to conflict between nations. The charter of United Nations Organization recognizes this fundamental interrelationship between peace and prosperity by establishing an Economic and Social Council to encourage and facilitate international economic cooperation.

By promoting a high level of world trade on a multilateral basis, the financial agreement will make an important contribution to world prosperity. It will help assure closer friendship and greater commerce between England and the United States by eliminating the harmful currency and trade practices. It will prevent the danger of economic warfare. In addition, the agreement provides the basis for a broader understanding on international trade practices to be drawn up at the forthcoming conference on trade and employment. The elimination of currency and trade restrictions and discrimination and other forms of economic warfare is essential to the building of a peaceful and prosperous world. That is a major purpose of the financial agreement.

30. What does the United States gain from the financial agreement?

Broadly speaking, each provision of the financial agreement benefits the United States because each is part of the whole structure of cooperation between the two countries in establishing international commercial and financial policies designed to promote the balanced growth of international trade.

Throughout these questions and answers the specific benefits of the financial agreement to the United States have been discussed in some detail. The following list summarizes briefly the principal benefits which the United States will receive, in addition to payment of principal and interest on the credit:

(a) The credit will enable England to buy goods and services in the United States, and these transactions will increase the employment and income of the American people.

(b) Payments by England to other countries will increase the ability of those countries to buy goods and services in the United States.

(c) The sterling area dollar pool will be dissolved, with the result that sterling area countries which acquire dollars will be able to use those dollars directly to buy goods and services in the United States.

(d) Sterling paid for exports or other current business will be freely convertible. Any country can then use such sterling to buy goods and services from the United States or from any other country in the world.

(e) Exchange controls will not be used to prevent residents of the United States from converting into dollars the sterling they get from exports or other current business with England.

(f) Britain's import controls will be administered in such a manner that no discrimination against American products will result.

(g) England will release a portion of the blocked sterling balances held by British Empire and other countries, and the sums thus released will be freely convertible to make purchases in the United States or any other country of the world.

(h) England will be able to assume the full obligations of membership in the International Monetary Fund and the International Trade Organization and can afford to abandon those restrictions and practices which would otherwise have been retained during the transition period.

(i) England will settle the blocked sterling balances with her own resources and this large problem which hinders the restoration of world trade will be solved.

(j) The elimination of exchange and trade restrictions and the solution of these problems will increase American prosperity by increasing the volume of world trade.

(k) The foregoing specific measures will eliminate many causes of economic friction which might threaten the good relations between the two countries.

(l) Finally, all danger of a division of the world into conflicting British and American economic blocs will be averted.

Reply of Robert R. Wason to Criticism by Chester Bowles of Price-Control Attitude of the National Association of Manufacturers

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 1 (legislative day of Friday, January 18), 1946

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in recent weeks much publicity has been given to criticism made by Mr. Chester Bowles of the attitude of the National Association of Manufacturers on price control. Mr. Robert R. Wason, president of the National Association of Manufacturers, has answered Mr. Bowles in a radio address on February 26. In the interest of fairness I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by Mr. Wason be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Bowles contended last Tuesday that the only way to prevent inflation is by continuing price controls.

The National Association of Manufacturers contends that the only way to prevent inflation is to get rid of price controls.

It is obvious Mr. Bowles and the National Association of Manufacturers have the same objective. Both want to prevent inflation.

The difference between Mr. Bowles and the NAM is solely on the way to accomplish this objective.

Mr. Bowles admits that his plans to hold prices haven't worked. He confesses that OPA has not been able to hold the price line he set some months ago.

Of course, he explains that is a mere bulge in the price line when he now puts into effect the new price rises on clothing, meat, and the other necessities of life.

The important fact is that the prices cause a rise in your costs of living, whatever Mr. Bowles calls it. Actually, it is a plain breakthrough to a higher cost of living.

Let's look at the actual facts in this problem so vital to every housewife.

Under what Mr. Bowles calls his new all-out attack, which is also his confession that the old attack has failed, general wage increases in the neighborhood of 50 percent above the prewar level are possible.

Under his plan any compensating increases in prices will be held to the below-normal level of profits during 1936–39. That was a period, as Mr. Bowles admitted on an earlier occasion, when six out of ten of the Nation's companies were operating at a loss.

Now, Mr. Bowles expects production to climb on red ink and continued losses.

He is denying human nature—the fundamental instinct of self-preservation. It can't be done. It is the same instinct that prompts you to change jobs when you find one that pays more money for the same kind of work.

He is forgetting that, in America, every investor is a voluntary investor. The man who bought automotive shares or invested in steel or oil, could have bought an automobile, or a radio, or a vacation, instead.

Finally, he is defeating the objective of jobs for all, which the administration shares with industry.

He apparently does not realize that the greatest contribution industry can make to the Nation is its ability to keep turning out goods. A busted business provides neither goods nor jobs.

Mr. Bowles also said, you will remember, "There is no question that the stoppage resulting from labor disputes has seriously delayed production at critical points."

Certainly strikes are holding up production. But Mr. Bowles failed to add that the length and number of these strikes are due to the fact that the President of the United States urged management to raise wages 18½ cents while OPA has refused to allow prices that make it possible to meet the President's request.

If the industrial machine is producing, the housewife, vainly searching the stores for food and textiles and household necessities, can tell you that they are either not manufacturing what she wants or else much of their production is finding its way into black markets.

Black markets and bootlegging flourish in many every-day products that are prevented from being manufactured in quantities.

Many manufacturers, in accordance with OPA regulations, make higher-priced articles to stay in business. This deprives the housewife of low-price goods and the manufacturer of volume of sales opportunities. These restrictions cut down production of the articles most people want and need.

One large maker of men's work socks tried for 9 months to get a higher price ceiling from OPA, without results. Now, 80 percent of his machinery is idle.

Have you tried to buy such a commonplace essential as clothespins? If you are lucky enough to find some, they were probably not produced in the United States. Do you know the reason? Many clothespins used to come from Maine, but the Maine company can't make them under OPA ceilings. One chain store gets them now from Denmark and Mexico.

A friend down in New Orleans built up a national business in strawberry preserves. He hasn't been able to produce preserves for over a year now. Why? The sugar shortage?

No, the ceiling prices on strawberries in the patch are higher than he can charge for his preserves in the jar, under OPA.

You have tried to buy shirts. This is an OPA classic of production frustration. You can't buy shirts for love or money.

Can this be one of the causes? The OPA ceiling on one quality of cloth used in low-priced white shirts is 54 cents a yard. But running this cloth through a press to give it colors, the ceiling price under permitted OPA regulations becomes $1.70 a yard.

So your stores may have high-priced fancy shirts. They don't have low-priced white shirts.

Last week Mr. Bowles mentioned the fact that the meat you serve at supper actually costs you less. There are thousands of us that would like the address of Mr. Bowles' butcher.

Mr. Bowles did not mention butter among his OPA blessings. Have you had any lately? And what did you pay for the quarter-pound that came out from under the counter?

Milk production is reaching an all-time high. But the war isn't over as yet when it comes to butter.

According to the American Dairy Association, the trouble is that the OPA ceiling on butter is 46 cents a pound "although the butter makers must pay 60 to 72 cents for the cream they need to produce it. Under this policy, the more butter they make the more money they lose." You don't have butter for your children's bread but you have ice cream.

Both production and employment must be retarded while OPA fiddles with prices.

Prices in a free market are set by the consumer, not by the producer. Any producer can price himself right out of the market if he is short-sighted enough to ignore competition. You simply won't buy if you think that prices are too high.

NAM is contending for the removal of price ceilings so that the industrial machinery of the Nation may turn out the goods that you want, rapidly and in unprecedented volume, and still stay in business.

Yet the American housewife is one of the shrewdest purchasing agents on earth.

Every manufacturer is under constant pressure to give the housewife greater values to induce her purchases of his goods with his competitors. Only by giving constantly lower prices can he obtain her approval to remain in business.

Historically we have never gotten runaway prices on a rising production. Such a runaway of prices cannot be expected unless the Government runs the presses that print the money.

Runaway prices always result from scarcities. It is the scarcities created by OPA to which NAM objects.

Prices should be returned to American housewives.

The ceilings the housewife sets, everyone in industry and agriculture must set.

The price discretion of the housewife is far more to be trusted than the demagogs and crystal gazers, the slide-rule experts and bureaucrats of Washington.

Stripped of all economic prattle, what we are contending for, therefore, is that you, and not the OPA should be putting the ceiling prices on the things you want.

That's the way it has always been in this country, and that's the way we want it to be now.

Feed Famine Will Bring Ruin to Our Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 1, 1946

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, my section of Texas is an area which largely depends on the success of its farmers. They are serious, realistic, patriotic people who realize that all our wealth comes from the soil.

I try to keep in pretty close touch with my people and depend on them for their suggestions and criticisms. Every day I find suggestions on tablet paper, written in pencil, which the Congress would do well to follow.

When I first came to Congress I received about 25 or 30 letters a day. During the years I have been here I have constantly urged my people to assist me by giving me their suggestions. My incoming mail has grown until last week I averaged around 150 letters a day. Although it is a definite strain on my own capacity as well as the limited staff allowed me by law, I read and carefully study these letters and endeavor to fulfill the requests of every kind and type possible. I feel that receiving 1,000 letters a week from a district of approximately 300,000 people is really a democracy at work, and I sincerely hope that everyone of my people who reads the three statements which have recently been issued will write me their suggestions about things that should be done to better our area.

Under permission previously obtained I include the comments referred to:

FEED FAMINE WILL BRING RUIN TO OUR FARMERS

Congressman LYNDON B. JOHNSON today urged Secretary of Agriculture Clinton P. Anderson to take action immediately under War Foods Order 9–19 by delivering substantial quantities of protein feed to the Texas area in order to alleviate the feed famine which is bringing ruin to farmers by the score.

The Congressman said, "This is not merely a problem that needs adjustment and cooperation. It is an immediate crisis that requires emergency measures or a substantial group of our agricultural community will become impoverished as a reward for producing food for a war-ravaged world."

Congressman JOHNSON added, "It simply is not an answer to the present plight of Texas farmers and producers to tell them that the Department of Agriculture statistics show the State receives 93 percent as much feed as was used there during 1945. Frankly, they don't believe it. Millers and feed stores are at the point of closing; poultrymen are desperate and have little hope of salvaging their investment or getting their chickens and turkeys to market; hatcheries are receiving cancellations on egg contracts; cattlemen are constantly in fear of being unable to procure feed; and veterans, who have gone in debt under the GI bill of rights to purchase their small ranches, are being wiped out."

OUR FARMERS NEED HIGHLINES, HIGHWAYS, HIGH SOIL PRODUCTIVITY, STABILIZED FARM PRICES

"Farmers are just as poor as the land they live on," asserted Congressman LYNDON B. JOHNSON in a statement to the House Rules Committee Friday as he urged passage of the Poage bill authorizing use of surplus Government equipment in soil-conservation work by conservation districts and county commissioners courts. This legislation would enable these agencies to obtain surplus material, equipment, and supplies to carry on conservation practices. Graders, tractors, trucks, maintainers, bulldozers, and other soil-moving equipment would be made available immediately.

Stating that the soil-conservation program, which has been necessarily curtailed drastically during the war years, must move full-steam ahead if we are to maintain and rebuild our soil, JOHNSON went on to say: "Good soil practices have materially increased the productivity of farm lands in central Texas. We have prevented waste, increased the yield, and consequently increased the land values, but just a start has been made. My farm program for the tenth district is simple but clear—highlines and highways to our farms, high soil productivity, and high but stabilized farm prices. We cannot achieve our conservation aims unless machinery for carrying on the work is made available. The Army and Navy have this equipment stored in depots and warehouses here at home and all over the world. Much of it is out in the open, subject to rapid deterioration.

"Why waste them longer? We can and should stop the waste of material and in doing so stop the wasting of our soil. Give our local officials and our progressive farmers a chance and they will make the most of it."

LIGHT OUR FARMS NOW

The House of Representatives on Thursday, February 14, passed the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act of 1946. Included in funds authorized by the bill is an appropriation of an additional $100,000,000 for rural electrification construction until July 1, 1946.

Congressman LYNDON B. JOHNSON spoke before the Congress in behalf of the REA appropriation, calling attention to the successful and model rural electrification program in the Tenth Congressional District. Congressman JOHNSON pointed out that more than 10,000 farm homes in his congressional district are already served by rural electric cooperatives and more than 10,000 other farmers in the area are without electricity because the war cut off the supply of materials.

JOHNSON asserted that although these people had paid membership fees in REA cooperatives, lack of materials and appropriated funds would make it impossible to construct new power lines to their homes unless immediate action was taken.

"Today they—the Pedernales and Lower Colorado River Electric Cooperatives—are applying for a loan from the REA, but they cannot get one dollar. There will not be 1 mile built in that large fertile area of central Texas, unless this amendment is adopted," the Texas Congressman said.

The REA amendment was approved and the bill now goes to the Senate for consideration.

Texas Congressmen who spoke and were actively urging the additional funds for farm electricity included W. R. POAGE, of Waco; LUTHER A. JOHNSON, of Corsicana; GEORGE MAHON, of Colorado; J. M. COMBS, of Beaumont; and JOHN C. LYLE, of Corpus Christi.

Address of Hon. Kenneth C. Royall, Under Secretary of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 1, 1946

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable Kenneth C. Royall, Under Secretary of War, before the chamber of commerce, Wilson, N. C., at 8:30 p. m., Friday, February 15, 1946:

It is fine to be back here in eastern North Carolina. The longer I have been away and the more I have seen of other places the more keenly I realize that to a person born and bred in this section there is no other satisfactory place to live. I look forward to the time—which I hope will not be too distant—when I can come back home and stay down here the rest of my life.

But it is not merely the heart warming of homecoming that stirs me about our native State. I am moved—and during the entire war have been moved—by the inherent patriotism of our people and particularly by the spirit and valor of the young men which we sent to our armed forces. I have chosen tonight to talk about these young men as well as the older men who served with them.

I have two simple thoughts which will run through my talk and which, I hope, will merge largely into one single idea. First, the American soldier of World War II, particularly the enlisted man, was the best treated soldier that America or any other nation has ever had and, second, this same soldier produced the greatest fighting force that the world has ever known.

A little more than 6 months ago the fighting phase of the greatest war in the annals of the human race came to a close with the unconditional surrender of Japan. It is still too soon for us to grasp the significance of this war to the future of mankind. It is too soon even to grasp the magnitude of the war itself. Practically everyone of the 2,000,000,000 human beings that inhabit the earth are directly affected by the conflict. And the course of the lives of billions yet unborn will be influenced by the results of this struggle.

During the years that we were participants, more Americans were under arms than in all the wars of our previous history. During the course of the war approximately 15,500,000 men served in the Army and Navy and other armed services. Of this number 10,600,000 served in the Army. Seven million three hundred thousand of these were on duty overseas and a very large percent of them fought in one or more of the major campaigns. They—our American soldiers—fought on every continent and on every sea. They fought in every clime—in the jungles and in the Arctic. Our armed defenders flew in the rarefied substratosphere and navigated the ocean depths. And we won a great victory.

But the magnificence of that victory should not blind us to the enormity of the human cost. A million men were casualties. Our dead lie in scores of cemeteries from Greenland to Australia—from Holland to India. More than one-fourth of a million men were killed in action or died of wounds. That is four times as many as in all of America's wars against a foreign enemy.

It is a source of pride to all of us that in our Army 260,000 North Carolinians served. It is a source of both pride and sadness to know that many North Carolina soldiers died in the service of their country. Hundreds were decorated for bravery and for valiant service.

This army of more than 10,000,000 represented every walk of life. The proud and the humble, the rich and the poor, the farmer, the professional man, the laborer, the merchant, the manufacturer, served together—often in the same squad—and shared alike the pride and hardship of service.

Some served as officers and some served as enlisted men. And our officers were drawn from the same classes as the enlisted men. I think it would be interesting to see where we get our officers.

There were approximately 900,000 officers who served in the Army from the beginning of the war to the end of hostilities. This included 872,000 male officers. In this number were 72,000 chaplains, doctors, dentists, pharmacists, and veterinarians appointed directly from civil life and approximately 24,000 other officers, largely specialists, such as lawyers and scientists also appointed directly from civil life. There were 227,000 officers from the Reserve Corps and the National Guard. Many of these had previously served as enlisted men. There were 18,000 Regular Army officers, of which half were graduates of West Point.

All of the other officers were enlisted men of this war who had completed the course in officer candidate schools or in air training schools or had won battlefield promotions. Selections for officer candidate schools were made on the basis of demonstrated merit from among those who applied for admission. Altogether 531,000 of our officers were commissioned after serving as enlisted men in this war. If we exclude the chaplains, doctors, and other specialists, this is 70 percent of all our officers. More privates became officers of our Army in this war than in all of our previous history. Many other officers served as enlisted men in the last war or at some other time. I am certain it is no exaggeration to say that, exclusive of medical officers and other professional specialists, more than four out of every five officers had served as enlisted men in the Army. There was more opportunity for an enlisted man to become an officer than in any of our previous wars.

There has been some comment on the number of generals in the Army. Fifteen hundred generals seems a large figure but all the figures in this war were large. As a matter of fact there were fewer generals proportionately in this war than in any previous war ever fought by the United States.

In this connection it may be interesting to mention some of our general officers who served as enlisted men in previous wars: General Hodges, commander of our First Army, and General Krueger, commander of our Sixth Army, both rose from privates in the Regular Army. General Kenny, head of General MacArthur's Air Forces, is a former enlisted man, and General Doolittle enlisted as a flying cadet in the First World War. General McLain rose from private in the Oklahoma National Guard to be a corps commander with the rank of lieutenant general, and General Lear, former head of our Ground Forces, was an enlisted man of the Colorado National Guard. And these are only a few of a long list.

Certainly in respect to the selection of its officers the American Army is truly democratic. Just as in our political life and in our business life the humblest citizen has an opportunity to reach the top depending upon his demonstrated ability and qualities of leadership, so it is with the Army.

Of course, there have been mistakes in the selection of officers just as there are mistakes in the selection of officeholders in our civil government and just as there are mistakes in the selection of foremen and managers of businesses. As long as any system is administered by human beings there will be mistakes. But on balance the officers of the United States Army demonstrated that their selection was good. These officers had a magnificent record of achievement. They conceived, planned, executed, and led a series of military campaigns with successes never surpassed in the history of warfare. They could not have done this without the skill and bravery of all ranks. But skill and bravery can win success in war only under leadership.

We hear today criticism of what is called the Army caste system; that is, the distinction between officers and enlisted men and the additional privileges which officers enjoy. We hear this after every war and we hear it to a lesser extent during a war. May we analyze this a little?

America is an independent Nation. American boys grow up with the spirit of independence. They do not like to work under commands. They do not like artificial distinctions of any character. Our Army is made up almost entirely of such young men. That is one side of the picture and an important side. But there is another side. No fighting organization can be successful unless it is trained and disciplined. Our own history and that of other countries is replete with examples of large, well-equipped forces but with little or no training or discipline, succumbing to attacks of units numerically much smaller but thoroughly trained and thoroughly under the control of officers. I read in the press the other day a statement by a retired chief of naval operations and a prominent diplomat giving an outstanding example during the present war of a large army with little or no distinction between officers and enlisted men which was defeated by a much smaller, disciplined army. His story told how this larger army, as a result of that experience, strengthened the authority and position of its officers and thereby built one of the great fighting forces of the war.

Officers are necessary in a military organization and these officers must have authority. A machine shop must have a foreman. A store must have a manager. A large farm must have someone in control of its operations. A ship must have a master. A football team must have a coach and a captain. And leadership and the right to command and control are all the more necessary when men are expected to face new tasks and strange tasks and dangerous tasks. Without the leadership and the right to command, an army becomes an ineffective mob. We must have officers to guide our armies when our country is threatened and our citizens imperiled.

If we ask officers to take the responsibility of leadership in time of national danger, such officers must have some advantages. Without them there would be little incentive for a man to be an officer and we could not expect to have competent leadership. During this war there was developed a considerable feeling on the part of enlisted men that they did not want to become officers. I personally know of many who felt that way. This is partially due to the added financial and other benefits which have been given to enlisted men during this war and in part to the unwillingness to assume the additional responsibility that a commission would entail. When some of the best of our enlisted men have no desire to become officers, we are deprived of leadership which we need, and if this feeling should spread—if there should be a lessened inducement and incentive to become an officer—then surely our military efficiency would be decreased.

There would be another result. The enlisted man is entitled to the best quality of leadership he can get. With a narrower field for the selection of competent officers he would be deprived of this leadership. No one would suffer from the lack of competent officers as much as the enlisted man. There is not a person present who would want his son or brother to go into battle except under the leadership of the best officers that could be found.

There, of course, have been shortcomings and failure on the part of some officers. There have been officers who have abused their authority and privileges. Unfortunately, this is inevitable. It would be impossible to select with speed nearly 1,000,000 officers and not have this occur. These cases are the ones you hear about but they are relatively few and the fact that they are few is a tribute to the character and leadership of young Americans who formed the bulk of our officer personnel.

So here are two conflicting considerations on the question of the so-called caste system in the Army. First, the independence and proper pride of the enlisted man; and, second, the necessity for discipline and for officers to maintain this discipline. These two considerations must be reconciled as far as possible.

The leadership of the Army has tried to reconcile them by permitting as much democracy and equality in the relations of officers and enlisted men as is consistent with efficiency and safety. It is a difficult line to draw and we have witnessed in other nations at various times errors in both directions.

No decision made on this question will be free from criticism—perhaps, from both sides. There have been charges of injustice to enlisted men and, because there are many enlisted men, we hear much of these. There have also been charges of relative injustice to officers. There are fewer officers and we hear less of these charges.

There may well be—and probably is—merit in both contentions. Neither Congress nor the Army nor any group of men can be wise enough to devise for an organization as large as the Army a system that is perfect. We can only strive to make it as nearly perfect as possible.

I am convinced—and I believe practically every officer who served in both wars is convinced—that there is a much more sympathetic association of officers and enlisted men in World War II than there was in World War I. I can't imagine, for example, in World War I the congenial relationship with the Supreme Commander that manifested itself whenever General Eisenhower visited a group of GI's. If you had seen his willingness to give them autographs, to talk with them, you would have gotten a fine view of the attitude of our military leaders—our brass, if you wish—during this war.

It has become fashionable in some quarters to sneer at Army brass hats. I never know exactly what is meant by a "brass hat." The most satisfactory definition seems to be that a brass hat is an officer at least one grade higher than you, whom you don't like or who doesn't like you. Whatever may be

meant by this or similar phrases it seems to me that almost every soldier in this war—be he a private or a brass hat—did a magnificent job and clearly earned the everlasting gratitude of his country.

The value of our officers and men has been recognized—by all of America—by the Congress who passed our laws—and by the Army who administered those laws.

These officers and men were fed better, they were clothed better, and they were cared for better than any army of all time. The food of our soldiers was nourishing and varied and appetizing—much better than the repeated "goldfish" and "slum" and "corn Willie" of World War I. Of course, the soldiers—men and officers—grumbled about the food. That is a constitutional right and applies not only to the Army but to colleges and to restaurants, to the Pentagon Building in Washington and even at home.

Clothing and beds were warm and in ample quantities. Of course, there were times, for example at Ardennes, when our soldiers were cold. There will always be times in any war when there cannot be sufficient covering and clothing at a particular spot at a particular time. But whenever the military situation permitted it, this condition was remedied.

No army in history received such excellent medical care as was given to our wartime force. Epidemics have been really nonexistent. Health was maintained at an exceptionally high standard. Battlefield casualties received immediate care, and the system of evacuation by air and motor to rear hospitals was truly remarkable. The percentage of complete recovery of wounded soldiers is outstandingly high. And the Army has assisted and is assisting the competent Veterans' Administration in caring for the disabled and in providing the best possible artificial limbs and other prosthetic devices for the living casualties of the war.

And we paid our soldiers and their families a record amount. In fact, enlisted men were so liberally paid that numbers of them would not even seek to become officers. There is no income tax to pay on allowance for dependents and none to pay on the food or clothing furnished an enlisted man. I could give you cases where enlisted men with a large number of dependents and with a fairly large outside income received larger net amounts for their services in the Army than did general officers with a like amount of outside income. But the comparison of a general officer and an enlisted man is not typical. A better and more common example is that of a master sergeant with long service and with a wife and two children who is not quartered or rationed at an Army post. His monthly pay and family allowances amounts to $390 plus his clothing, as compared with $392 for a captain with similar service and also having a wife and two children. And this example does not give effect to opportunities for an enlisted man to get more value for his money than an officer, and does not take into account the public expectation that an officer should have a higher scale of living.

Recreation facilities and entertainment were provided for officers and enlisted men during this war on a scale never before attempted—and they were furnished almost up to the front line. And there were rest areas with excellent facilities. Here again the enlisted man had a financial advantage, for his were free and officers paid at least a part of the cost. In southern France practically all the hotels and clubs in the great resort city of Nice on the Riviera were taken over by the Army and used solely for the recreation of enlisted men—all without cost to them. Of course, there was complaint that the soldiers were not permitted to gamble at the Monte Carlo casino, but knowing soldiers as I do I am confident that they probably found a good and well-known substitute.

And our soldiers have had the most rapid rate of orderly demobilization that has ever been experienced by any Nation. By June 30—a little more than 1 year after VE-day and about 10 months after VJ-day—we will have discharged from the Army about 7,750,000 men, leaving in only about 500,000 who were serving on VE-day—and practically none who had seen battle and none at all, other than volunteers, who have served more than 2 years. Here again the enlisted men have been preferred, and officers held a longer period of time.

All this and more you did for your soldiers. The credit belongs to you and all the American people and to their Representatives in Congress. The Army was only the implement of accomplishment.

None of us begrudge what we did for our soldiers. We could have liked to have done more and, particularly in the case of our junior officers, I am convinced that we should have done more. When we contemplate what our men did and what our officers did, we are entitled to feel that every cent we spent and every service we rendered to our soldiers was repaid by them many times. We had a magnificent Army—in my judgment the greatest that ever fought under any flag. Its courage, its skill, and its leadership brought us to victory, and saved our Nation and the present peace of the world.

It has been my privilege recently to attend the presentation of several Congressional Medals of Honor. It is an inspiring experience and one that will keep alive your faith in our country and its citizens. About 3 weeks ago such a medal was awarded to Pfc John R. McKinney, of Woodcliff, Ga., and I would like to read you a part of that citation:

"Just before daybreak approximately 100 Japanese stealthily attacked a light machine-gun position. Having completed a long tour of duty at this gun Private McKinney was resting a few paces away when an enemy soldier dealt him a glancing blow on the head with a saber.

"Although dazed by the stroke, he seized his rifle, bludgeoned his attacker and then shot another assailant who was charging him. Alone, Private McKinney was confronted by 10 infantrymen who had captured the machine gun.

"Leaping into the emplacement, he shot seven of them at point-blank range and killed three more with his rifle butt.

"He warily changed position, secured more ammunition, and reloading repeatedly, cut down waves of the fanatical enemy with devastating fire or clubbed them to death in hand-to-hand combat. When assistance arrived, he had thwarted the assault and was in complete control of the area. Thirty-eight dead Japanese around the machine gun and two more at the side of a mortar 45 yards distant was the amazing toll he had exacted single-handedly."

This wonderful accomplishment by a small-town southern boy is, of course, unusual and outstanding, but the spirit and the courage behind it was typical of thousands and hundreds of thousands of our soldiers. And it was the spirit of officers as well as of enlisted men.

In fact, in World War II the casualties among the officers were proportionately heavier than the casualties among the enlisted men. This could have come from only one cause—the officers shared the dangers with their men and in many instances led them to battle instead of following them into battle.

In the great victory of World War II, North Carolina men and North Carolina officers played an outstanding part. Among the divisions were two whose names mean much to us, the Thirtieth and the Eighty-first Divisions—the Old Hickory and the Wildcat. While they did not contain the same proportion of North Carolina boys that they contained in World War I, they symbolize to many of us, particularly the veterans of 1917–18, our State's contribution to the fighting forces. The Thirtieth fought gloriously in Normandy, in northern France, at Ardennes, and in the Rhineland. And the Wildcat—with which I served during the entire World War I—made a great combat record, this time in the western Pacific, the mandated islands, and the southern Philippines.

I saw none of the fighting in this war except for a short time at the front in Italy; but from my brief glimpse there, and more largely from the first-hand stories of men and officers who were engaged in combat, I know that on the fighting front the enlisted man and the officer worked together as a coordinated team and developed a spirit of mutual confidence and mutual respect and friendliness which made our combat Army great. And while the fighting lasted this same spirit prevailed behind the lines.

It has been easy to lose this friendly and cooperative feeling when the excitement of war is past and the men are anxious to get back home and civilian life. It is hard to create this spirit of mutuality in men who leave home and enter the service now without the inspiration of a great combat task to perform. But under the influence of this peacetime let-down, we must not forget the real part, the joint part, that both men and officers played in winning the war.

The people of any nation are mercuric in their metal attitudes, quickly forgetting past accomplishments in their intense—and sometimes selfish—interests in the problems immediately before them. America is very much that way. There is already a tendency to relegate to history the valor and courage of the men who sacrified and braved danger during this war. These men deserve better than this and the Nation deserves better than this. Their deeds represent an all-time high in American patriotism and in American spirit and we cannot recall those deeds to our minds too often.

Tonight I have spoken principally of the Army because of my connection with it during the war and now. What I have said of the Army, of course, applies equally to the Navy, the Marines, the Coast Guard, the merchant marine, and the other great services of this war. They are entitled to the appreciation of all Americans.

I hope that the comradeship born on the battlefield and in the camps and nurtured by the mutual pleasures, hardships, and dangers, will continue into peacetime. I am certain that this will eventually be true. I am equally certain that a great majority of the officers and men in resuming their places in civilian society will realize that the opportunity for service in peace is only secondary to that in war. The same qualities of courage, skill and leadership which these men have demonstrated will help the Nation solve the manifold problems that confront us now. These officers and men have been willing to die for their country—and many have died. Those who have returned will, I am sure, be willing to live for their country.

These veterans of World War II, together with the veterans of World War I, have demonstrated their right to the confidence of all of America. They are entitled to this confidence from the Nation and if given an opportunity to mold in peace as they have defended in war, they will build in the next generation a greater and stronger America.

Resolutions Urge Removal of Controls on Building Materials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, in discussing H. R. 4665, known as the Patman

housing bill, I should like to bring to the attention of the Congress two resolutions adopted by the Michigan Retail Lumber Dealers Association at its annual convention held in Grand Rapids, Mich., February 5, 6, and 7. The resolutions follow:

Whereas the members of the Michigan Retail Lumber Dealers Association typify the small businessman of the Nation; and

Whereas small business enterprise of every nature is being more and more regulated and controlled by bureaucratic decree; and

Whereas in our belief this is in direct opposition to the ideals of free enterprise as practiced by our forefathers and approved by the rank and file of small businessmen: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress of this United States, our only representative body and as such sworn to uphold the best interests of our country, be advised of our beliefs and requested that such regulation and control be removed now that the emergencies of war are over and allow the small business enterprise to again take its place as a free institution and a vital part of our national life.

Whereas the Michigan Retail Lumber Dealers Association, representative of the lumber industry of this State, is vitally concerned with the building of homes; and

Whereas the Federal Housing Administration, as it functioned before the war, was an important factor in the building of homes by simplifying the financing and insisting on sound construction; and

Whereas at the present time the Federal Housing Administration is under the National Housing Agency, which includes all of the public housing programs now fostered and subsidized by the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Michigan Retail Lumber Dealers Association, in convention assembled, direct its collective voice to the Congress of the United States, and particularly to the Members thereof from Michigan, to exert every influence at their individual and collective command to divorce FHA from NHA as soon as is practical, and return it to its prewar status where it served as a great aid to both private industry, private builders and the home owner; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Michigan Members of the United States Congress.

Broadcast by Hon. Charles M. LaFollette, of Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 1, 1946

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following broadcast by Hon. CHARLES M. LAFOLLETTE, of Indiana, under the auspices of National Conference of Christians and Jews, Willkie House, Tuesday, February 19, Station WEVD:

Perhaps my approach to brotherhood will differ from that which is usually used, and, therefore, I am asking you to think with me as I go along and withhold judgment until I have finished.

Recently the whole idea of the kinship of man, the universal spirituality of man and the universal fallibility of man have been ignored by those who have been working the hardest in good faith to advance a resultant idea of the brotherhood of man. Consequently, our advancement toward the goal of universal brotherhood has been retarded by the means which too many people are using to attain it. Brotherhood is not a milk-and-toast subject, because people are not milk-and-toast individuals. A concentration upon the good side of human nature which ignores man's fallibility, and, therefore, the presence of evil characteristics in his nature fails to present a true picture of the nature of man so that the distortion thereby produced offends the intelligence of man. This hinders our progress toward the goal of understanding and tolerance without which no real feeling of kinship can exist.

Brotherhood is a lusty, hardy thing. It must arise out of our contacts with each other on the sidewalks, in the drug stores, in the tavern, in the subways, on the job, at the prize fight, and the ball park. These are the places where men come in contact with each other most often. And these are the places where human beings are human. Consequently, it is in these daily contacts that the characters of individuals are laid bare. Some of us push and crowd and some of us stand back a little. It is in these circumstances and at these times that we learn and, therefore, should remember that all men inherently want to push a little, elbow a little, take an advantage a little, ask for service out of order a little. These things are inherent in man. It is in these contacts that an "I'm sorry," "I beg your pardon," "Go ahead," "Where is the end of the line?" as they are dropped into the maelstrom of daily activities do more to create good will, mutual understanding, and the liking of individuals for individuals, which is the essence of brotherhood, than all of the speeches made at all the formal brotherhood meetings, where people are consciously on their good behavior, can ever accomplish.

Therefore, let us quit closing our eyes to realities and acknowledge the truth about ourselves, that is, that it is easier to grab than to hold back. But that each act of self-restraint on the part of each of us as an individual is not only a contributing factor but that it is a necessary factor in preparing the soil of human understanding into which we propose to plant the seeds of economic equality of opportunity, of full production, of freedom of speech and restraint in name-calling; seeds which we prepare in the cloistered atmosphere of pure democratic thought. For unless these seeds are planted in a soil of mutual understanding, arising out of decency in everyday contacts, we cannot harvest the crop of democratic realities worthy of our democratic planning.

I have no quarrel with the making of plans for the advancement of the democratic ethic into all of man's relationship with his fellowman. Indeed, in some measure I have been privileged to participate in the making of those plans and to join in the fight for their advancement. But certainly it makes good sense to point out that the capacity of humans to understand large plans, calculated to advance equality of opportunity among people and fairness with each other in debating the advisability of those plans, must depend upon a basic initial respect, understanding of and genuine liking of their fellowman as they find him on the streets in their daily contacts with him. That is the first step. For how can we humans develop the capacity to comprehend plans for the extension of fair play among men, which demand a capacity for vision and speculation, before we have learned to deal fairly with each other in our present everyday contacts?

It is relatively easy to advance abstract theories, designed to lessen the stresses under which men live on this earth and to bring about a greater equality of material well-being and truer degree of equality under law. The difficulty lies in getting people to evidence the personal individual capacity for self-sacrifice, self-restraint, and understanding, without which these plans cannot operate.

Therefore, the democratic way, which is always the hard way, demands of us that we as individuals develop the capacity to live in a manner which is consistent with our thinking and our ethic. We will not spring overnight into individuals capable of so living. It is the nature of things that men must develop this capacity. It is pleasant to close our eyes and ignore this fact, but like many pleasant things, it is also foolish and foolhardy to do so. If we are trying to build a world in which there is brotherhood, then let us face the facts that we must build each day our individual ability for fair play as we live with each other in our daily humdrum activities.

If the bricks are made of mud, the towering structure of democracy lying in the minds of democratic philosophers cannot be built for the bricks will be unable to stand the strain placed upon them by the design of the builders.

I feel it is proper also to make one or two observations about the means being used to create understanding among people. As I have pointed out, basically this problem will be best solved by the actions of individuals in their daily contacts with each other. But this is a field in which the planning of activities and the organization of efforts to promote understanding may, under proper leadership, be handled by people who have the time to devote to this effort as specialists. Nevertheless, when we delegate to professionals the job of promoting understanding among people, we, as individuals, have a tendency to excuse ourselves from further consideration of the problem and from further examination of the means used by professional purveyors of brotherhood to bring about the desired result.

Humans are fallible. Therefore, professional leaders of brotherhood groups are fallible. Out of this fallibility arises a very positive tendency to develop practices which satisfy the emotional longings of the people who have the greatest need for the desirable effect which a condition of mutual understanding in the world would produce. A professional or semiprofessional speaker on the subject of brotherhood therefore always finds a responsive audience and great applause when he approaches the subject of mutual understanding by pointing out to those who are the victims of our present lack of decency in human relations, the errors of those who wittingly or unwittingly create the condition. But I doubt very much whether this does much from a constructive standpoint to advance the cause of mutual understanding. Actually, such a speaker cheats his audience. He takes up their time to regale before them things which they already know. He does this too often consciously for the purpose of being loudly cheered and credited by his audience with having a great understanding of the subject. Of course, he is credited with having a great understanding because he recites the wrongs which the audience already knows. But constructively he has accomplished nothing.

This pattern, too often followed by the professional promoter of brotherhood, is pure unadulterated cheating. It cheats the people who contribute the funds for the purpose of creating brotherhood. It cheats the people who are being harmed by the imperfect condition of brotherhood which now exists. It cheats those who are lacking in a capacity for brotherhood, by failing to bring to their attention the mistakes in the thinking and the errors of their conduct, in order that they may be awakened to the errors of their ways and furnished a pattern to follow in changing them.

And finally, it cheats the professional promoter himself, for he destroys whatever ability he might have had in the beginning to do the job the hard way by pointing out to those who need it the reforms in conduct which they must effect by their actions; he cheats himself by feeding his ego with the easily obtained plaudits of the oppressed.

I do not generalize or make this charge against all of those who work earnestly to advance the cause of mutual understanding among people. Generalization, of course, is one of the basic causes of misunderstanding. But the pattern, which I have pointed out, appears too often to permit me to ignore it, if I want to make some constructive contribution to the cause of brotherhood. We who wish to bring about understanding cannot afford to ignore the existence of means and practices which are negative in their effect and therefore of little value, merely because we fear the criticism of professionals in this field, who often have great power to injure or destroy their critics.

I confess my own fallibility. The soundness of my judgment on this question I submit to the bar of public opinion. But having a conviction, and believing that by expressing that conviction I can aid the cause of brotherhood, I must speak it. Understanding among people must be attained by constructive acts and he who believes in brotherhood and desires it earnestly must not withhold his opinions from fear of being misunderstood or risking his personal popularity. The time is too short. The need is too great. There is no place on this battlefield for the coward.

The Pauley Nomination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 1, 1946

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of February 26, 1946:

WHY FURTHER HEARINGS?

William A. Patterson's testimony before the Senate Naval Affairs Committee yesterday virtually amounted to a charge that Edwin W. Pauley tried to sell him a Government favor for a $35,000 donation to the Democratic Party and took a threatening tone when he declined to buy.

The president of United Airlines said that, at a time when his company had a franchise application pending in Washington, Pauley said to him, after he had refused a request for a $35,000 contribution to the Democratic campaign fund: "You'd better think twice before turning us down."

Mr. Patterson's testimony discredits a nominee whose discrediting has now become supererogation. As President Truman's nominee for Under Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Pauley has been discredited so often and so roundly that if there were such a thing as a referee in a confirmation hearing, he would be compelled to call time in order to stop what has now become a slaughter.

Mr. Pauley was discredited when, after he had denied under oath that he had discussed the tidelands oil issue with President Roosevelt, former Attorney General Biddle, or Secretary of the Interior Ickes, the fact that he had talked with them all about it was proved so conclusively that he was forced to admit under oath that he had talked with all three of them about it, with Mr. Ickes "50 or 100 times."

Mr. Pauley was discredited when former Assistant Attorney General Littell swore, over Pauley's denial, that the nominee had tried to persuade him to withhold the Government's tidelands suit on the ground that it was unwise politically.

Mr. Pauley was discredited when, after having testified under oath that the Mexican Government had formally approved a project of his to establish an oil plant in Mexico, he was compelled to admit under oath that the Mexican Government had not formally approved it.

Mr. Pauley was discredited when Secretary Ickes, over the nominee's denial, testified—and backed it up with diary notes jotted down at the time—that Pauley had told him $300,000 in contributions to the Democratic Party could be obtained from oil men if they could be assured the Government would withhold the tidelands suit.

Senator TOBEY, the chairman of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee, has said that the record will show that Pauley, when pressed, has reversed himself on no fewer than six occasions, all under oath.

What useful purpose, therefore, can be served by the taking of further testimony? How does the Senate Naval Affairs Committee know whether or not to believe what Mr. Pauley is saying now, when it has six glaring proofs that it could not afford to believe what he has already said? Or if the committee expects to believe some of his testimony and disbelieve some, what method does it have at hand—crystal ball, tea leaves, or phrenology—to determine which is which?

Mr. Truman has made it known that he doesn't care how often Mr. Pauley has sworn to both sides of a question—that he still thinks he has made a fine nomination. There ought to be somebody in Washington who cares about such things, and a good place for a start would be in the Senate Naval Affairs Committee. The committee could, by a single simple action, testify that it likes veracity and dislikes being misled. That action would be to end hearings forthwith and throw the nominee out.

Overseas Information About the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 1, 1946

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, the people of foreign countries hunger for information about the United States. All other great Nations are meeting their responsibility in this field by dissemination of information and news. The United States is lagging far behind, and unless machinery is set up by this Congress through which the world may be properly informed of our ideals, advantages, and activities at home, the day of regret will surely come. In this connection, I include guest editorial by Herbert Ager carried in the Saturday Review of February 9, 1946:

THEY WANT TO KNOW

Congress has been asked by the Department of State to authorize an overseas information program as an addition to the foreign service of America. Our present foreign service is chiefly concerned with reporting to Washington about events abroad. It is proposed that in all our embassies and legations we should have men whose sole duty is to help foreigners to understand our life, culture, and institutions so that current events in the United States can be seen in a proper perspective.

Two objections may be raised to this plan: Why should America spend money on advertising herself, and why can't the newspapers, press services, and radio supply all the necessary information by private enterprise, without help from Government?

The answer to the first question is easy: America should not spend money on advertising herself, and is not proposing to do so. The Department of State is merely undertaking to meet a widespread and articulate demand, a demand for help and guidance in knowing and judging America. It was essential during the war that our allies and our neutral friends should have such help. It is just as important to continue the help in peacetime, since the threatened human race is at last trying to close its ranks and to work cooperatively for the salvation of the world.

Those who took part in the overseas information work of OWI learned the encouraging fact that the outside world is eager for more knowledge of America. We don't need press agents or good-will merchants; we do need people who can meet the desire for facts, for documents, background material, and interpretations of our policies and purposes. It is good news that the desire exists. If the nations are to become less quarrelsome, they must become more informed. If the decent people of the world are to trust each other, they must first know about each other. Since the wish to know has been created by the wars and the repeated disasters of our lifetime, it is surely a wise policy to make the wish come true.

If we are proud of our country, we must believe it is to everyone's advantage to have our country understood. If the world were indifferent there might be nothing we could do, in dignity, to break down the indifference. But when the world is asking for help it would be folly to refuse.

In Great Britain, for example, the schools, the armed forces, the press and radio, women's clubs, trade unions, business organizations, churches—all the institutions of society, public and private—ask continually for help. An information officer is not putting pressure on people to accept his wares; he is under constant pressure to provide more wares.

The answer to the second question—why can't this be done entirely by private enterprise?—can be given in terms of one form of enterprise: the newspapers and the great news agencies such as AP, UP, Reuters, etc. English newspapers, even if they someday return to prewar size, are very small by American standards. They have no room to print full texts, or even long excerpts, of important speeches in Congress or by the President; they have no room for more than the briefest summary of government documents.

Since they cannot print full texts, they naturally will not pay cable charges on full texts. They buy from the new agencies, or receive from their own correspondents, about as many words as they expect to use. So a 5,000-word speech may be reduced to 200 words—and they are likely to be the most flamboyant, spectacular, or perhaps even the most quarrelsome words in the speech. This implies no criticism of the press. The most exciting passages are the most newsworthy, though they may fail to give an accurate impression of the whole.

If an editorial is written on the basis of the 200 words, instead of the 5,000, it may be unfair to American policy. If a speech is made, or a question asked in Parliament, on the basis of the 200 words, it may start a chain of misunderstandings and recriminations. This is one of the ways in which

well-meaning people, who would like to know and trust each other, drift into ignorance and hurtful criticism. It is very much in the national interest of America to avoid such mistrust as much as possible.

A Government information service can provide the full text, in the case of really important speeches, at the same time that private enterprise provides the brief excerpt. The editorial writer, or the politician, wants the full text. Repeated experience during the war shows that he wants it, that he will read it if he can get it, and that he will comment fairly and intelligently if he has a chance to do so. Private enterprise cannot always provide him with the chance. Government can, and therefore Government should.

There is no use trying to pick up the pieces after a misunderstanding has been allowed to happen. As in the famous case of Humpty Dumpty, all the king's horses and all the king's men can never fit the pieces together again. Neither can all the President's horses and all the President's men. But a trusted accurate information service can often prevent the breakage.

Such a service will not trespass on the domain of private enterprise. The press, the radio, the films, the books and magazines, tell much of the story of America. The more they tell, the better for all concerned. The more they tell; the easier the task of a Government information service. But it is not their prime purpose to foresee and to ward off misunderstandings, to fill in the gaps, to help the foreigner to know everything about us which he has the will and the ability to learn. In the past, it has been nobody's job to give such help, and the past is dark with unnecessary and undesired ill will. If the future is to be brighter, we must find new ways to allow our neighbors to know us. People can always get along with each other better than governments, if people are given a chance to understand.

HERBERT AGAR.

John Cardinal Glennon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 1, 1946

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the St. Louis Star-Times of Tuesday, February 19, and another from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of the same date, commenting on the great honor that has come to the city of St. Louis and the great territory west of the Mississippi River in the elevation of the universally beloved Archbishop John Joseph Glennon to the College of Cardinals.

[From the St. Louis Star-Times of February 19, 1946]

THE COLLEGE OF CARDINALS

Following a secret consistory in the Vatican, Archbishop John Joseph Glennon, dean of American Catholic bishops, yesterday received formal notification of his elevation to the cardinalate.

When on Thursday he receives his red hat from Pope Pius XII, he will enter an institution that began in the fourth century when the early Roman Christians were emerging from the catacombs. The title cardinal comes from cardo, meaning a hinge, around which things turn. Originally it was applied to all priests permanently attached to churches, but later it came to be reserved for the chief priests of the principal churches of Rome, whence the modern practice that each cardinal take his title from some Roman church.

Developing as the needs of the church imposed new tasks on the Sacred College of Cardinals, it took about eight centuries for the cardinalate to acquire its present status. Starting as writers of the lives of the martyrs and advisers of the Pope, the cardinals did not see their position firmly established until 1059. In that year it was recognized that the election of a new Pope and the interim government of the church rested in their hands when death vacated the pontificate. In 1180 the College of Cardinals was recognized as a corporation under canon law.

In 1247 the election of a new Pope was reserved to the cardinals exclusively, although it was not until 1562 that Pope Pius IV finally confirmed this policy. By 1300 their main duties had become those of counseling the Pope, helping to govern the church by participating in consistories, acting as papal ambassadors abroad and serving as protectors of religious orders.

In 1857 the total number of cardinals was fixed at the present 70—6 cardinal bishops, 50 cardinal priests, and 14 cardinal deacons. Today, though the three orders of cardinals remain, their duties depend on whether they continue as bishops or archbishops of important cities or whether they hold office at the Vatican. In either case, they still have the responsibility of counseling the Pope and electing his successor when he dies. Cardinal Glennon with his princely dignity, his wisdom, and his love for people is worthy of the prestige of the College of Cardinals. As he joins it as a prince of the church, St. Louis is cognizant of the merited honor that comes to him.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of February 19, 1946]

THE CHURCH UNIVERSAL

Amid scenes of glittering splendor and reverent ceremonial that are the highest symbols of the religious faith to which some 330,000,000 of the world's population adhere, Rome this week is witnessing a spectacle unprecedented in the long history of the Roman Catholic Church—the elevation of 32 of its prelates to the high honor of membership in the College of Cardinals.

These new princes of the church have been chosen by the Supreme Pontiff for their "learning, holiness, and honorable life," or, as another authority puts it, their "doctrine, piety, and prudence." St. Louisans of whatever faith feel pride in the fact that one of these, the senior in years among the group, is John Cardinal Glennon, of this city. There is pride in this recognition of the trans-Mississippi region of America for the first time in the highest council of the church, no less than in the personal tribute to the churchman of whom the Commonweal recently said:

"Archbishop Glennon, of St. Louis, might be described as the grand old man of the American hierarchy, continuing the tradition of personal charm, simplicity, and directness so widely associated with such great figures of the past as Archbishops Dowling and Ireland."

There are other regions, several of them, whose ordinaries are for the first time to wear the long-trained red soutane and the engraved ring with its relics of the saints. All the world's continents are now represented, with the appointments from Australia and China. The Sacred College has its largest membership in generations and the long tradition of an Italian majority in its composition has been broken.

So, in the wisdom of Pius XII, an act of statesmanship has been performed that demonstrates with new forcefulness the church's proud claim to universality. "Now," in the words of Cardinal Glennon, "the Holy Father will be surrounded by representatives of all peoples, thus fulfilling the command of our Lord to His Apostles, 'Go forth and teach all the nations.'"

In a day when the revival of intense nationalisms disturbs the advocates of world cooperation for the future peace and security of mankind, the Catholic Church by this historic reorganization has set an example before the temporal statesmen of the nations. Pius XII, himself an Italian, views equably the prospect that his successor may be a "foreign Pope," the first since Adrian VI, the Netherlander who held the papal throne in 1522–23.

The concept of the church universal, signified in Rome this week by the churchmen who have crossed the oceans to participate in the moving ceremonies under the stupendous dome of St. Peters', is of loftiest import to the followers of the faith. The precept they represent is an ancient and revered one, for their office is proclaimed as in spiritual succession to the Twelve Apostles, those first evangelists of the new faith which sprang from the shores of Galilee.

The church universal finds spiritual comfort in its living unity no less than in its credal teachings, and that unity has never been so broadened and strengthened as in the solemn proceedings now progressing in the Holy City. For men of all faiths and of no faith who administer the political realm as the hierarchy administers its sector of the religious, there is a profound lesson in what the spectacle means.

Pay Raises for Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 1, 1946

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, when the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads began its hearings yesterday on H. R. 5059, the Burch-Mead bill, to provide pay raises for postal employees, I sent a statement to Chairman BURCH of that committee, urging that the committee take prompt and favorable action on this important legislation and requesting that the committee amend the bill to replace the present provision for a $300 pay increase with a new provision for a $500 increase.

Today I should like to take this opportunity to call the attention of all of the Members of the House to the need for immediate and favorable consideration of this bill.

Our postal employees have served the Nation faithfully and well for many years, and our postal system has provided a public service in which we can take a great deal of pride. I sincerely regret that we cannot take a similar pride in the compensation which we have provided for these employees. Rather, we must feel ashamed of the inadequate income on which these people are expected to live.

Never generous in the past, the income of postal employees has now become quite inadequate to the needs of an American

family under the present high cost of living. We expect and we receive from these workers a very high degree of efficiency and service, but in return we offer them a very poor recognition of their work.

In these difficult days of reconversion, when the whole country is undergoing industrial upsets and disturbances in the effort to win just compensation for the labor of the workingman, the Federal Government cannot hope to establish a workable policy which will influence and help straighten out the problems of employees and their employers so long as we do not even provide adequate pay for our own Federal employees.

It is the responsibility of the Government to lead the way in this effort to provide decent living standards for our working people. We cannot afford to lag behind.

In view of the tremendous quantities of money which were gladly devoted to the winning of the war, we cannot now hesitate at the prospect of the relatively small amount required to provide a decent income for our own people who are employed by the Postal Department.

Our tremendous expenditures during the war were justified on the grounds that they made possible the destruction of a terrible threat to our potential peace and well-being. Certainly this small expenditure now is more than justified, for it constitutes a real investment in that peace and well-being at home for which we fought.

For these reasons, then, I believe that it is no less than a duty for the Congress to approve the postal pay-raise bill and to amend it to increase the raise to $500 per year, for only in this way can we provide a decent standard of living for our postal employees, who so clearly deserve it.

His Lordship Speaks on the British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 1, 1946

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, Lord Rotherwick, managing director of the Clan Steamship Line, in London this week denounced the proposed United States loan to Britain, saying it should be an outright gift, free of all interest.

In his speech before the chamber of shipping, Lord Rotherwick said:

If this loan, with its one-sided, impossible, and unbelievable conditions, takes place it will mean the elimination of this country as one of the great powers for peace and stability in the world, and I am afraid it will result eventually in this country sinking to a small third-class power—an illegitimate forty-ninth State of America, dragging down with her the other members of the Empire. It is something to be ashamed of. It was nothing more or less than the selling of the British Empire and its independence to America.

Mr. Speaker, those are the words of a British lord. If that is the feeling of the British peerage at this time, do you believe their opinion will change or that they will ever want to pay interest or any part of the principal of any loan made by the United States to Britain?

Washington's Birthday Address of Hon. Kenneth C. Royall, Under Secretary of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 1, 1946

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable Kenneth C. Royall, Under Secretary of War, at an Americanism banquet sponsored by the Winston-Salem (N. C.) Junior Chamber of Commerce, at 8 p. m., Friday, February 22, 1946:

On this anniversary of the birth of the greatest of all Americans, I want to discuss one of the least known of his many "firsts." I refer to our system of military justice which George Washington established for our Army 170 years ago and which with periodic revisions continues as our system today.

In my discussion tonight my theses are three. First, the present system of military justice as administered by the American Army—and I will include the Navy—is a sound system, comparing favorably with other systems of justice, civil or military. Second, this system is not a perfect system and is subject to improvement in the light of experience during this war. And, finally, the system of military justice is one of the most misunderstood and misrepresented of all Army activities.

In this latter connection may I give a composite example of the wild and inaccurate stories about military justice which are floating around and sometimes find their way into reputable papers and emanate from prominent sources.

The War Department receives a pitiful letter from a young wife asking that her husband be released from imprisonment and complaining that he had received a 40-year sentence and is contributing nothing to her support. According to her story—given to her largely by her husband—John Blank had been guilty of only 3 days' absence from a rear overseas post and had returned for duty voluntarily. She said he had previously served honorably on the front and had a good record in the Army and before entering the Army. She claimed he had received an unfair trial and an excessive sentence and that after confinement he was a model prisoner. A man prominent in public life makes a scathing statement about this case and some of the press pick it up and criticize the Army and the whole system of military justice.

The story is slightly incorrect. John was absent 3 months, not 3 days. He did not return voluntarily to his unit; he was apprehended with great difficulty. His offense was desertion from his unit not at the rear but near the front, and he boasted that he would be living when his buddies were dead. As for his previous record he had deserted his wife before he went into the Army and had gone a. w. o. l. three times before the occurrence for which he was tried. He had not been a model prisoner but had sought to escape.

And the story fails to state some other material facts. When he deserted his unit it was moving into the area of fire and he had to be replaced by a patriotic soldier who was willing to do his duty. During the period of Blank's desertion his unit had suffered 10 percent casualties, of which one-third were killed. The loyal soldier who replaced him was among the dead.

There are many such incorrect stories and many resulting criticisms of the Army.

Those of us lawyers who have dealt at times with civil criminals recognize that rarely can you rely upon statements that they make about their own crimes—even to their own counsel. If you would interview the inmates of an average penitentiary a majority of them would protest their entire innocence and most of the others would insist that there were extenuating circumstances—which in fact never existed. And they would criticize the court that tried them. It was an old English saying that "No wretch e'er felt the halter draw with good opinion of the law."

In civil life we do not give credence to the criminal. But put the same man in uniform and his false and uncorroborated story makes the front page.

Let us make a fair analysis and appraisal of our much-criticized system of military justice. It differs from the civil system of justice in several respects. For example, it recognizes not only civil offenses but also an entirely new class of offenses, usually called military offenses, that is, offenses which would not be crimes in civil life.

If a man quits his task in civil life, his punishment is usually at the most a discharge from his job. It is apparent that this system would not work in the Army. The Army must be kept intact and it must have the requisite amount of discipline to perform its work. Hence, the military crimes of absence without leave, desertion, disobedience of orders, misconduct in the face of the enemy, and other similar offenses call for penalties that must often be severe.

And these offenses must be punished not only to preserve the military organization, but also in justice to the conscientious and law-abiding soldier who performs his tasks. If a man deserts on the eve of battle, when every ounce of power is needed to gain and hold an objective, he has done more than betray his country in the abstract sense. He has betrayed his fellow soldiers, increased their labors and their peril, and has perhaps signed the death warrant of an individual or a platoon or a company.

I should now make it clear that the criminal soldiers I am discussing tonight represent a small—a very small—percentage of the men in the Army. Less than 1 percent of our soldiers were ever sentenced to confinement by general court martial. In some theaters of war, for example, the European theater, the figure was as low as one-fourth of 1 percent. If we except those who commit minor infractions not punishable by general court martial, more than 99 percent of our troops were good soldiers and patriotic soldiers and brave soldiers and successful soldiers. But I would not have you think that the Army has forgotten even the 1 percent—these lost sheep—while it is caring for the ninety and nine.

It should be remembered that the court-martial system is a statutory system prescribed by Congress under the express terms of our Constitution. The statutes are called the Articles of War. The Army does not make the system, it merely implements and administers it under the congressional enactments.

Today—as after every war—the court-martial system is under attack. Many criticisms are totally unfair. Some of the others at least have elements which require consideration in the light of the war's experience.

We frequently hear that soldiers charged with crime are kept in jail a long time awaiting trial. And then we hear that soldiers are hurried into trial without adequate time to prepare their defense. On the whole, neither of these inconsistent criticisms is justified. The average time between arrest and trial is about 16 days, the period being longer where a defendant needs it for a proper preparation of his defense. I believe that our civil courts could well follow this example of prompt—reasonably prompt—justice.

It is charged that the court martial provides for no grand jury proceeding and no formal indictment. The United States Constitution expressly exempts courts martial from this requirement. However, there is under the court-martial system a thorough and impartial investigation preceding trial that, in the opinion of most lawyers who are familiar with it, provides a greater protection for the accused than does the grand jury proceeding.

At this preliminary investigation the accused can be represented by counsel and he has the right of cross-examination. The investigating officer may find that there is not sufficient evidence to support the charge. And even if he finds otherwise, that finding is reviewed by higher authority before there is any trial.

It is sometimes said that the right of the accused is not protected in a court-martial case. But he is provided defense counsel of his own selection, without any expense to himself. If civilian counsel are available he may also employ them at his own expense. By regulation it is the duty of counsel to defend the accused by all legitimate means. And you have known of the vigor of such defenses, even in recent cases where enemy defendants were involved.

Another criticism sometimes leveled at courts martial is that they are convicting courts. Let us look at the true picture. In the first place, I wish to emphasize that the percentage of men tried by general court martial has steadily decreased over the course of the years. Even as late as 1931, 28 men out of every 1,000 were tried in 1 year by general court martial. This was in peacetime and, of course, there are normally more court-martial trials in war than in peace. Yet, during the present war, less than 10 men out of every 1,000 were tried over the entire 4-year period. These figures indicate not only a better behaved Army but also a much more careful investigation before trial—which eliminates cases that should not be tried.

And even after this screening there has been during this war a remarkable record of acquittals. For example, in murder cases 32 percent have been acquitted and 37 percent found guilty of lesser offenses, a total of 69 percent. A similar total for manslaughter cases is 70 percent acquittals or reductions, and for rape cases 66 percent. The total finally sentenced in general court-martial cases over the entire 4-year period is around 8 men out of every 1,000. We believe that this war has justified the old Army statement: "If you are innocent, take a court-martial trial. If you are guilty, seek a trial by some other court."

The court-martial system provides a complete procedure for review of every case—an automatic appeal, again without expense to the accused. In fact, there are two reviews, one in the accused's own unit and another in the War Department—or during war by the theater commander. And death cases in peacetime also go automatically to the President for final decision.

These reviews, as well as the trials themselves, are conducted not by a tribe of strangers, but by officers, the vast majority of which have previously served as enlisted men. Four-fifths of our line officers of this war have so served and most of these, 531,000, have come up from the ranks during the war.

But, after all, you may ask: "Aren't many court-martial sentences too severe?" And in frankness I must answer, "Yes"—if you leave out of account the Army plans of restoration and clemency. But the answer is a decided "No," if you take into account these two remedial measures—restoration and clemency. I will discuss these later, but for the moment let us consider certain aspects of original court-martial sentences and some of the reasons behind seemingly excessive punishments.

First, let me make it plain that here again in the matter of punishments we are met with many inaccurate stories and, even if the stories are accurate, we are met with criticism that would almost pass unnoticed in the case of civil courts. Civil punishments, whether they err on the part of severity or leniency, are sometimes criticized locally but anything connected with the Army concerns every part of America and, therefore, one court-martial mistake—or one alleged mistake—resounds throughout the land.

We must remember that the Army is a cross-section of America. We have kept out men with known criminal records, but it was impossible to exclude men with unknown criminal records or with criminal tendencies. The Army has good men and it has bad men, and the uniform alone does not change the bad into good.

There are necessarily some slackers and cowards and those who want to foist on others both their work and their danger. There are gangsters and highway robbers and thieves and murderers, and, strange to say, some of them performed well in battle. This is to their credit, but that credit cannot extend to a general immunity. Those who commit crimes, particularly serious crimes, must be appropriately punished.

I have already talked on strictly military offenses. Without discipline and without the enforcement of discipline an Army would become a mob and the lives and safety of the good and conscientious soldiers would be endangered.

The Army also has to deal with the same type of crimes that are punished in civil life—murder, rape, robbery, fraud. Here we are frequently met with the plea that because of the combat record of some men they should not be punished even for the offenses for which they would be punished in civil life.

But a combat record is not a continuing license to kill or steal or defraud. It would be unfair to our good citizens, our orderly citizens, to establish a principle which would turn loose in our cities and in the country a class of criminals who would feel that they were superior to any law or any punishment.

Of course, in court-martial cases, as in civil cases, the innocent relatives often suffer. The family of a man convicted by court martial is deprived of its family allotment. The family of a man convicted in a civil court is similarly deprived of the earning power of the prisoner while in confinement. Whether these innocents should suffer and whether a system can and should be devised by which this suffering can be alleviated is a question broader than military justice. It is a sociological question that the nation must answer before our lawmakers can apply it to either civil or military courts.

Of course, there have been mistakes and injustices in initial military sentences. Under the stress of war and the necessity for discipline there may have been more such initial mistakes than in civil courts. But in fairly evaluating military sentences we must consider the whole process, including the restoration and clemency systems. The process is not complete and the sentence is not in any real sense final until the prisoner has had his chance under these systems.

The Army considers its 1 percent delinquents one of its most important problems. It feels that every soldier, regardless of his bad record, should have the chance to salvage himself and restore himself to useful life. No one recognized this more than our former Under Secretary, Hon. Robert P. Patterson. In fact, no one recognizes any problem of the GI more clearly or more sympathetically than does my predecessor in office.

Under Judge Patterson's jurisdiction there was established and administered in this country and overseas a system of rehabilitation centers, set up to restore to duty as many general court-martial prisoners as possible. Under this plan prisoners who seemed likely to prove restorable were screened carefully, given special training in a prehonor and then in an honor company, and, if they qualified, were restored to duty. This privilege of restoration was extended to qualified men, no matter what their offenses or sentences might have been. To date, the total of such restorations is in excess of 25,000 men, the practical equivalent of two divisions.

It is a tribute to the system and to the men who qualified under it that less than 1 out of 8 of those who have been restored have failed to make good. These men were saved from a lifelong stigma of being postwar convicts, were saved the crippling disability of a dishonorable discharge, and were given and accepted an opportunity to serve their Nation honorably in its great crisis. You may recall the case of 115 railroad battalion men who had been convicted of pillaging Government supplies in France and had been given long prison sentences. They made restitution and were formed by General Eisenhower at their request into a special company for active combat service.

But restoration to duty was not the only remedial process set up by the War Department under the guidance of Judge Patterson. There was established a clemency procedure by which all cases of general court-martial prisoners could be reviewed as rapidly and as thoroughly as possible—reviewed not once but periodically. A War Department Clemency Board was appointed by Judge Patterson early last year, and special clemency boards operating under the first Board were constituted after VJ-day.

I was fortunate enough last November to get former Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts to act as chairman of the War Department Clemency Board. Under his guidance and that of Mr. Austin MacCormick, a well-known penologist, and with the assistance of Colonel Snow, of my staff, the clemency boards started a few months ago a systematic and intensive review of each of the cases of the 32,000 general court-martial prisoners then in confinement. Between 12,000 and 13,000 of these cases have already been reviewed, and it is confidently expected that the review of all cases will be completed by June of this year. Special and primary attention is being given to those who were sentenced overseas.

We are not engaging in a general pardon procedure and we strongly oppose those who urge a jail delivery for all who committed either civil or military offenses. As to military offenses particularly, we must bear in mind the soldiers who performed their duty and tasks faithfully and stuck to their guns day in and day out. We must be just to these good soldiers.

But we are reviewing each case thoroughly on an individual basis. Full information on the offender's life history is obtained. Weight is given to personality factors which may explain the offense, such as immaturity, mental defects, excessive anxiety over home conditions, etc. It is recognized in the case of military offenders that now there is less necessity for severe exemplary punishments. The sentence mentioned in my composite il-

lustration would probably be reduced from 40 to 7 or 8 years.

There is inevitably some lack of uniformity in sentences from various theaters. The boards seek to provide this uniformity and to reach an ultimate sentence which is consistent with justice and, in the case of civil crimes, is in line with what would have been the sentence in a civil court.

That is our system of military justice. The soldier who finally has to serve a sentence imposed by court martial will know, even if he will not admit it, and any who have the true facts will also know, that the soldier's case, be he officer or enlisted man, has been fully investigated before the charges were preferred, that he has had an opportunity to defend himself, that he has been tried by a group of officers, a majority of whom had probably served as enlisted men. He will know that his sentence has been carefully reviewed under court-martial procedure, not once but twice. He will know that in addition to such review he has had an opportunity for restoration to duty. He will further know that, if he was not restored to duty, his sentence has been individually considered by a fair, efficient, and high-minded group under the leadership and direction of a former Supreme Court Justice of the United States.

That is our system that we present to the Nation.

But we do not offer this system as perfect. Of course, there will be mistakes. We cannot claim perfection for any system of justice or business or government devised by men and administered by men.

It would have been unwise to change our system of military justice during the war. Suppose the standard of punishment for desertion had been fixed the day after Tarawa or during the fighting on the Anzio beachhead or at Ardennes. Any change must come in the calm atmosphere of peace, when we have available to us a complete record of the experience of war. After every conflict the Army evaluates its campaigns, its organization, its discipline, its military justice. The Articles of War and the court-martial procedures have been reviewed after other wars. They are being reviewed now.

The responsibility for the system of military justice is upon Congress, who can properly make such changes as it deems necessary. But this does not relieve the War Department from the duty of recommending to Congress changes that should be made. We expect to make such recommendations as may seem appropriate to us. In addition to a review within the Department we have asked the American Bar Association to appoint a special committee to give thorough and independent study to our system. We also welcome the opinions of interested citizens and we carefully consider all opinions expressed to us.

Our object has been—and will be—to provide for our Army an administration of justice which, while maintaining the necessary military discipline and reasonably protecting the public from crimes and criminals, will also give personal justice to the wayward 1 percent of our troops.

Keep the Navy Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 1, 1946

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following thought-provoking article written for the magazine Ships by the distinguished chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, the Honorable CARL VINSON, of Georgia. No Member of the House is better qualified to discuss the important subject of sea power and its value to the security of our Nation.

KEEP THE NAVY FREE

(By Hon. CARL VINSON, chairman, House Committee on Naval Affairs)

There is a serious and well-supported attempt being made to subordinate the place of navies, and in particular the United States Navy, in the over-all military scheme. This attempt goes under the name here of unification of the armed forces, and proposes the abolition of the Navy Department. Universally, proponents of unification argue that recent developments in air power and explosive energy have minimized the importance of ships and navies, and make separate establishments unnecessary. This argument can only stem from minds, military or otherwise, which do not understand, or choose to disregard, the historical importance of sea power. And in the war just ended, fought over a globe three-fourths of which is water, the absolute value and necessity of sea power was positively demonstrated. The victors had sea power and the vanquished did not.

Shipbuilders, of course, understand sea power and its importance to the defense of a nation, but it is essential that the meaning of sea power be made clear to everyone so that the danger of making the Navy merely a component or supplemental branch of the armed forces will be realized.

Ships are the backbone of sea power, but sea power embraces more than just ships. Sea power includes everything which makes a nation powerful upon the sea. It is the influence which a nation can exert to uphold its interests on the seas both in peace and war, and it implies the ability to contain or blockade, or deny the free use of the sea to an enemy. Sea power takes in the battle fleet, the submarines, the carrier aircraft, the merchant marine, the shipyards and floating drydocks, the advanced bases, and all the personnel and machinery necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the above elements. Sea power is in proportion to the strength of a country's navy. The United States has more sea power than any other nation because it has the strongest navy. If the Navy is to be weakened, as it will if it loses its identity as a separate department of the Government, it follows that our sea power will be weakened, thus impairing the national safety.

Sea power kept open our supply lines in the Atlantic and Pacific; sea power prevented Germany from invading England, the Azores and Bermuda; sea power prevented Argentina and Spain from aiding Germany; sea power made possible our invasions of north Africa, France, and the Pacific islands, and from the Pacific islands land-based aircraft were able to destroy Japanese cities. Sea power has defeated every would-be dictator from Xerxes to Napoleon to Hitler.

After every war the demand is made that the United States reduce its Navy, scrap its ships and shipbulding facilities, and in general make itself impotent in the realm of sea power. Now we have a further demonstration of such short-sightedness in the proposal to do away with a separate Navy Department. To subordinate the Navy will naturally lead to a subordination of our merchant marine and our shipbuilding and shipbuilding facilities. It has been so through history. When our Navy was strong, or growing, our ocean commerce flourished, our shipyards expanded. When the Navy was small or in periods when our people were indifferent to its existence, our merchant ships sailed few seas and our shipyards were idle. World peace is our hope, but no man knows the future. This is the very worst time to be considering anything but a strong and independent Navy.

In addition to its probable debilitating effect upon sea power, the subordination of the Navy will have other national and worldwide repercussions.

Unification of the armed forces under a single cabinet head would reduce civilian control over the military establishments. The Air Force has now grown so large and so strategically important that it should have representation in the Cabinet, which would give the President the assistance of three civilian administrative heads of the armed forces. But if the Air Force is not to be made separate, and is to be merged with the Navy and Army, there will be only one Cabinet member instead of three to advise the President. Under this one head will come a supreme chief of staff for the armed forces, who will be the military leader for Navy, Army, and Air. This military leader would have more power in his hands, military and economic, than has ever before been entrusted to an appointed official in this country. If there had been a supreme chief of staff during the war, he would have had to make decisions affecting 12,000,000 men and the expenditure of a major portion of our gigantic war budget. In a democracy it is better that a council of leaders make decisions when the lives of so many people and so much wealth is involved. The Joint Chiefs of Staff was our wartime answer, and it is still the answer.

And if we did require the services of a supreme chief of staff, where would we obtain him? With all due respect to our present outstanding military and naval leaders, I do not think any one of them would submit that his experience was qualifying. How could it be? Our generals have been trained for ground or air warfare, our admirals for sea fighting. And if we begin training our officers to be Army and Navy and Air officers, they are no longer going to be experts, but rather jacks of all trades and masters of none. What will happen to our infantry and tank and amphibious and carrier specialists? Modern war is specialized war, and while we all hope for permanent world peace, we must continue to train men in the highest specialized arts of war, in order better to help preserve the peace. The only way to be sure of having these specialists is to permit the unhindered growth and development of each branch of the services, with the consequent emergence of Navy, Army, and Air Force leaders. Then we can coordinate, by means of a national security council and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, military policy and decisions on the highest levels.

There should be a greater degree of coordination and integration of the armed forces. But why all the haste on insisting that present unification proposals are the answer? Why is discussion being shut off? Without the proper congressional committees having heard testimony for or against a merger, it is said that "all the evidence is in." That is as wide of the mark as anything could be. Very little of the evidence is in. Our industrialists and business leaders have not been heard from, except one, Mr. Ferdinand Eberstadt, who opposes the merger. Our diplomats have not been heard from, nor our labor leaders, manpower experts, Government leaders, medical men, or farmers. It would be most unfair to consider any legislation affecting the future organization of the armed forces of this country without inquiring into the attitudes of the people whom the armed forces serve.

There have been periods in our development when the people of the United States have forgotten that we are a naval power. But in times of crisis—1812, 1898, 1917, and

1941—it was our reliance on sea power that preserved us and brought us victory. The spearhead of our sea power must be a strong and independent Navy. That Navy has and will continue to exercise coordination with the other arms, but it must never be subordinated to them.

Work of Selective Service Boards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 1, 1946

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, quite recently the Congress very properly recognized the members of the selective-service boards throughout the United States. Appropriate ceremonies were held, and certificates of service and medals were issued in the name of Congress.

I want to say that I am glad to see this recognition accorded these men. Many of them have been on the job for more than 4 years. It has been for them a most unpleasant task, and has required a great deal of time and constant exercise of good judgment. These community leaders have devoted themselves patriotically and unselfishly to this work, and are still doing it. I desire to make a permanent record in this way of the citizens of my congressional district who have been engaged in this task.

Having myself served for 2 years as chairman of the selective-service board, I think I have a personal knowledge of the devoted work they are doing. They have done it without a cent of pay, and they are richly entitled to the gratitude of their country.

Men having served in my congressional district are as follows:

ATLANTIC COUNTY

Local Board No. 1: Reuben L. Babcock, C. Raymond Kears, Theodore E. Stokes, Carl M. Voelker.

Local Board No. 2: Robert Burns, Daniel D. Conway, John C. Cook, Michael L. Ruberton.

Local Board No. 3: Harrison Cook, John W. Kellum, Albert A. F. McGee, Walter L. Molineaux, Hiram Steelman.

Local Board No. 4: Allen B. Endicott, Jr., Harold W. Faunce, Edward M. Hackney, Hugo Krause.

Local Board No. 5: Preston Crook, Harry L. Fairbairn, Jr., L. R. Ressler.

Local Board No. 6: Dean Burton Crawford, Clarence S. Steigerwald, Lee F. Washington, John R. Wilson.

CAPE MAY COUNTY

Local Board No. 1: Leo M. Danerhirsh, Horace W. Gardiner, J. Thornley Hughes, Allan McClain.

Local Board No. 2: Robert Bright, Floyd P. Hoffman, Harry W. Orme, Edward H. Phillips.

CUMBERLAND COUNTY

Local Board No. 1: Russell S. Henderson, Herbert W. Letts, Paul D. Lucas, Henry S. Sharp.

Local Board No. 2: Herbert C. Bartlett, Solve E. D'Ippolito, C. Emerson Nash, Stuart D. Taylor.

Local Board No. 3: Richard N. Chubb, Foster V. Mitchell, Josiah S. Newcomb, Howard M. Sheppard.

Let Us Be Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER PATRICK

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 1, 1946

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I am sure every Member of this House, and all the people of our country, agree with the desire of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], expressed on this floor yesterday, to do honor to the memory and the heroic service of the late Gen. George S. Patton, Jr., by award of a Congressional Medal of Honor. No tribute we can pay that valiant soldier is too great, nor can we ever fully express this Nation's gratitude to him.

Unfortunately, the gentleman from Mississippi coupled his plea with a slur upon the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. B'nai B'rith, more than 100 years old, is a large and highly respected Jewish organization recently cited by both the Army and Navy for its patriotic contribution to the war effort. It has long been engaged in the promotion of understanding and good will among all religious faiths. The gentleman has intimated several times, apparently without presenting supporting evidence, that the league was in some way responsible for newspaper stories of the so-called "slapping incident."

As a matter of fact, relations between General Patton and the Anti-Defamation League were most cordial and friendly. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include correspondence between General Patton and Joseph A. Wilner, the resident commissioner of the league:

OCTOBER 11, 1945.

Gen. GEORGE S. PATTON, Jr.,
A. S. N. O–2605,
Commander Fifteenth Army,
APO No. 408, New York, N. Y.:

As bereaved father of two sons lost in service, one, Capt. John Wilner, of your command, I am deeply distressed at injustice being done your reputation by Columnist O'Donnell of Patterson newspapers. Article attributes to you certain remarks derogatory of Jewish servicemen at time of Sicily hospital incident and falsely asserts soldier involved, Charles Herman Kuhl, was Jewish. Whole implication of article is that you are guilty of sentiments contrary to the fair-mindedness which my son's correspondence described. Would appreciate assurance of misrepresentation your attitude by aforementioned newspapers.

JOSEPH WILNER,
Washington, D. C.

HEADQUARTERS, FIFTEENTH
UNITED STATES ARMY, OFFICE OF
THE COMMANDING GENERAL, A. P. O. 408,
October 15, 1945.

Mr. JOSEPH WILNER,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WILNER: Replying to your Western Union telegram I am glad to have the opportunity of categorically denying that I have ever made any statement contrary to the Jewish or any other religious faith. I am a sincere believer in the Supreme Being and have never interfered with or even examined the religious or racial antecedents of the men I have the honor to command. My sole effort has been to provide victorious soldiers who can serve their country and defeat the enemy with the minimum loss to themselves.

With appreciation of and thanks for your interest, I am

Yours truly,

GEORGE S. PATTON, Jr.

HEADQUARTERS, FIFTEENTH
UNITED STATES ARMY, OFFICE OF
THE COMMANDING GENERAL, APO 408,
November 21, 1945.

Mr. JOS. A. WILNER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILNER: Replying to your letter of November 6, please accept my thanks for the interesting clippings enclosed and also for your kind remarks. I am sure that your interest in the matter has been amply justified by the results obtained.

Truly yours,

G. S. PATTON, Jr., *General.*

DECEMBER 12, 1945.

Gen. GEORGE S. PATTON, Jr.,
Heidelberg Hospital, Germany:

In common with all Americans shocked and grieved by your misfortune. Our congregation Adas Israel is offering prayers for your early recovery.

JOSEPH A. WILNER.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1946

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Arkansas Democrat, Little Rock, Ark., of December 16, 1945:

THAT LOAN TO BRITAIN

You'll be hearing agonized yelps about our $4,400,000,000 loan to Britain. It must be approved by Congress, and all the vote-seeking foes of the administration will have a noble chance to sound off.

You know the tune they'll hit. The administration is squandering our substance. It's flinging the taxpayer's hard-earned money to a foreign nation. We'll never get it back. The unpaid loans of World War I will be reviewed with tremolo vocal effects and oratorical antics. There'll be touching references to the needs of our own people. The flag will be waved and resounding statements made about home and mother and the iniquity of plastering a mortgage on tots in the cradles.

Well, that's politics. Free government everywhere has its circusy aspect, and most healthy people like it. Life must be a dreary business in countries where government is just a dull routine of power doing as it likes, with no political plays and counter-plays, no rousing appeals to the people.

Apparently, the British House of Commons had its grandstand act in the course of approving the loan provisions. There were 2 days of debate, with the Conservative minority heckling the Laborites who are responsible for the terms of the loan. And Commons wasn't deciding on lending money—only on accepting it.

But this is one case where the borrower had much of the trading advantage on his side. The loan is vital to Britain, true enough. Yet it is also important to us that we make it.

For without this credit, Britain would have to embark on a fight for world trade by every device she could invent. Only so could she live. She would have to tighten relations with all parts of her empire and with her neighbor countries in northwest Europe, building up a trade bloc with preferential tariffs and quotas and any other means available.

We would be virtually shut out of that large market. We would have to battle that set-up, with its wealth of raw materials and its manufacturing skills, for trade in South America and every outlying corner of the world.

It would be sheer stupidity to force such a course on Britain. The cost to us in trade would eventually be far greater than the amount of the loan, even if it's never repaid.

More than that, Britain must be strong if there is to be a balanced world, with any prospect for peace. She is our natural ally, and a feeble, impoverished Britain during the years it would take her to recover unaided, would weaken our own position.

This loan isn't an act of charity. It's just good sense.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 1, 1946

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following article by Clifford B. Ward, editor of the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel, concerning the proposed loan to Great Britain:

GOOD EVENING

(By Clifford B. Ward)

FEBRUARY 27, 1946.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: If I were in your position as a Member of the Congress of the United States, I would vote against the so-called loan to Great Britain, for the following reasons:

1. It isn't a loan, but a gift. The English themselves prefer that it be so regarded.

2. Opposition to the loan in England is for the purpose of making those Americans, who are not too bright, believe that we have put over a sharp Yankee deal on the English, which, of course, is not true.

3. If we lend the English the three billion seven hundred million which they are asking, we agree as a part of the deal to cancel the two billion three hundred and thirty-one millions still due to us on England's World War I debt and also reduce the twenty-five billions which England owes us on the World War II lease-lend account to a figure in between fifty millions and seven hundred and fifty millions.

4. There is no provision for amortizing the principal of the new debt and no interest will be payable unless Great Britain has an export trade for more than 5 years which averages above its export trade for the years 1936–38 which is improbable. If this happens England will pay interest at the rate of 2 percent a year, but only if it happens. When the trade drops again, the interest payments stop.

5. If we make this cash-on-the-barrel head loan to England, forgiving all her World War I debt and canceling nearly all of its World War II lease-lend account, we set a precedent which we must follow in dealing with every other nation wishing a loan and owing us money. We must loan Russia the billions it is requesting while also canceling its debt. Then we must do the same for France and any other nation that puts the bee on us, else we will dangerously discriminate between nations.

6. The money which we are being asked to lend can only come from Americans who already hold nearly three hundred billions of dollars worth of I O U's from their own Government. With each loan that we now make, we will lessen the value of every one of our Government securities outstanding. Every investor in United States securities will take a loss as a result of the additional loans.

7. But while we are making these loans so-called to other nations at no interest, we are going to force our taxpayers to pay 2½ percent on them. Yet only a few years ago our Government said that one-third of our people were in need. Granting that this was an exaggeration for political purposes, the fact remains that few average Americans are in a position to give several hundred dollars apiece to the people of other countries.

8. The presumption is that we are a solvent country, but there is no one who knows whether we are solvent or insolvent as a Nation. There has been no balance sheet run off on our national resources and liabilities. Until such a balance sheet is struck off, we should make no more loans.

9. Granting that England and other countries need dollars, let's ask them what they have to sell. These countries all have tremendous assets by way of raw materials, land, military bases, etc. Let them sell us some of these things which we need and for which we are willing to pay.

10. The economic hope of the world is the United States, but that hope cannot be realized unless we keep on an even economic keel. We as a Nation do not exist merely to dissipate our wealth for the benefit of the rest of the world.

11. I am interested in what happens in the rest of the world, but I am primarily interested in what happens to us.

The Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 1, 1946

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be more confusion over the so-called Patman bill than on any legislation coming before the House in a long time. After all is said and done, the great majority seem to place the present lack of building materials right in the lap of OPA. Extension of price control in the housing field, as proposed by this bill, would appear to be unworkable and further prevent the recovery of private enterprise in housing. Price control in the lumber industry is not new. The experience over the past 4 years has brought out the unrealistic policies of OPA and accounts for the present lack of production. The statements from the Office of Price Administration that their policies are not hampering the production of lumber are absurd. Evidence from practical lumber manufacturers all over the country is absolutely contrary and this evidence comes from men who make lumber and not from those philosophizing about it. Mills are closing down because of the inadequacy of ceiling prices.

Let us get down to brass tacks. Low cost houses, costing around $5,000, require about 8,000 feet of lumber. Suppose this lumber averages in cost $90 per 1,000 feet to the consumer, and I believe I am very fair in this figure, the lumber bill would be $720. Now suppose to get adequate production it would require an increase in ceiling prices of 10 percent—and I do not believe this would be necessary—the increase in cost to the consumer would be $72. Now would not that be better than the present black-market proceedings? OPA has announced a few increases in the South, the western mills, and flooring mills. The story is that again the retail dealers are to be asked to absorb these increases. I believe the retail dealers have absorbed all they can afford. I sincerely hope the amendment which Mr. BUFFETT announced he would offer will be adopted. After fixing the amount necessary to get production, that amount will be passed along to the ultimate consumer and distribution would go through the regular channels. This would discourage illegitimate black-market dealers and there would be no discrimination between the retail dealers and the manufacturers.

I also would like to see another amendment adopted and added to the Wolcott bill—an amendment, which I understand will be offered, granting every possible priority for channeling all necessary building materials for the veteran's own home, or for his own business, or his farm buildings. After such requirements are filled, the producer or manufacturer of said building materials shall have the right to dispose of any surpluses through the regular distribution channels, for further building purposes.

This country needs housing for its veterans. First, let us smash the bottleneck and by law so change the present law so as to require some real workable policies, realistic and flexible enough to meet conditions and get production.

Civil-Service Appointments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 1, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and memorandum received by me from the President of the Civil Service Commission:

UNITED STATES CIVIL
SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington D. C., February 27, 1946.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. McCORMACK: The President of the United States, on Monday, February 4, 1946, signed Executive Order No. 9691 "directing the Civil Service Commission to resume operations under the Civil Service rules, and authorizing the adoption of special regulations during the transitional period."

As the signing of this order and the issuance by the Civil Service Commission of regulations to carry out the provisions of the order relate directly to the problems of those seeking employment in the Federal Government, as well as the problems of those who

are now employed in the Departments and agencies under war-service appointments, we thought that it might be helpful to you if we gave you a brief summary of the new program.

The Executive order is, in effect, a directive to the Civil Service Commission to begin operations at once for holding examinations for regular civil-service appointments.

As you know, since March 16, 1942, all appointments in the Departments and agencies, with the exception of the field service of the Post Office Department, and since October 23, 1943, all appointments in the field service of the Post Office Department, have been for a period not to exceed the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter. The primary reason for making provision for these war-service appointments was to make sure that positions in the Federal service would not be filled on a permanent basis while millions of our fellow citizens were serving in the armed forces.

As a result, the Civil Service Commission does not have today any lists for regular civil-service appointments. It must start from the beginning in compiling such lists. Such a start will be made within the next few weeks. As we announce examinations for regular civil-service appointments, we will, as has been the case in the past, inform your office of these announcements.

During the period that we do not have lists for regular civil-service appointments, the departments and agencies under the provisions of the Executive order are authorized to make purely temporary appointments pending the establishment of our new lists. This is in accordance with the practice which has been followed since the civil-service system was first brought into existence in 1883.

In making these temporary appointments, however, the departments and agencies must give preference first to disabled veterans, second to nondisabled veterans, and third to former Federal workers. They must also conform to the qualifications standards for the various jobs in the Federal service as issued by the Civil Service Commission.

Persons interested in securing these temporary appointments may be referred direct to the departments and agencies where persons with their particular qualifications are being hired. If your office is not informed where persons with particular qualifications are being hired, applicants may be referred to the Civil Service Commission, or to one of the regional offices, where they will be given all available information.

The President's Executive order also sets forth the policy to be followed in determining the future status of persons now serving under a war-service appointment. Such persons, if they have any hope of continuing to serve in the Federal Government, must file for the regular civil-service examinations when they are announced for the types of positions now occupied by them. If they fail to pass these examinations when they are announced, they will be replaced by persons from the top of the regular civil-service lists. Many of the persons at the top of these lists will, of course, be veterans, in accordance with the provisions of the Veterans Preference Act of 1944.

War-service appointees who take and pass the regular civil-service examination will, in many instances, be certified for a regular civil-service status provided, of course, that all veterans who have superior rights under the Veterans Preference Act of 1944 are taken care of first. The Civil Service Commission and its regional offices, as well as personnel offices of the various departments and agencies are prepared to explain the conditions under which a status is acquired. Thinking, however, that you might, from time to time, receive inquiries from interested persons concerning this and other questions, we are enclosing with this letter a memorandum which you may desire to use in replying to correspondence.

The Civil Service Commission is fully aware of the heavy work load in all offices of Members of Congress growing out of the human problems which are the direct result of the transition period from war to peace. To the extent that these problems affect civil-service applicants and employees of the Federal Government, we want to assure you that we stand ready to assist you in every possible manner in dealing with these problems.

If you have any questions relative to the matters set forth in this letter, or any other matters over which the Commission has jurisdiction, please feel free to communicate with us.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY B. MITCHELL,
President.

CHANGES UNDER EXECUTIVE ORDER 9691

1. Regular civil-service appointments to be resumed: As directed by Executive Order 9691 of February 4, 1946, the Civil Service Commission has begun operations for holding civil-service examinations for regular appointments. It will not be possible to announce all the examinations at once for the hundreds of types of positions that exist in the Federal service. Some of the examinations will be announced in the near future; others later.

2. Establishment of eligible lists: The eligible lists resulting from these examinations will be set up in the order determined by eligibles' numerical ratings modified by such factors as veteran preference and by the State apportionment in filling positions in Washington, D. C.

3. How war-service employees may acquire a civil-service status: If a war-service appointee takes and passes the examination, he may receive a regular civil-service appointment in one of the following ways:

(a) If he receives a high enough grade so that under the regular certification provisions the Commission reaches his name in the course of filling requisitions for personnel, he will be certified to the agency in which he is employed for a regular civil-service appointment.

(b) If, under the regular certification provisions, the lowest rating reached by the Commission on the list on which his name appears does not exceed his rating by more than five points, he may, upon recommendation of the department or agency in which he is now working, be given a regular civil-service status provided all veterans ahead of him have either been appointed or have received the consideration to which they are entitled under the Veterans Preference Act of 1944. This means, for example, that if, in connection with supplying names to departments, the Commission has reached the grade of 89 on an appropriate civil-service list any nonveteran war-service appointee who has received a grade of 84 or more on such list may be given a regular civil-service status provided that all veterans above him have been appointed or have been given the consideration to which they are entitled under the Veterans Preference Act of 1944.

In order to receive a regular civil-service status under the second plan, as in (b), the person holding a war-service appointment must have served for at least 1 year. In determining whether his service has been for this length of time, military service will be counted if he left the position to enter military service.

4. Temporary appointments authorized until probational appointments can be made: Until the civil-service examinations have been held for probational appointments, and the eligible lists have been established, Federal agencies have been authorized to fill their vacancies through temporary appointment. Agencies will receive applications for temporary appointment, determine the applicants' qualifications (in accordance with the Commission's standards), and will make selections from among those who are qualified. They will be required to consider applicants in the following order: (1) 10-point preference veterans; (2) 5-point preference veterans; (3) former Federal employees who are not veterans; (4) other applicants. The temporary appointment may continue until an eligible list is established and appointment is made to fill the position on a probational basis.

5. How to apply for temporary appointment: Application should be made to the Federal agency or establishment in which employment is desired. If the applicant does not have information indicating where persons with his particular qualifications are being hired, he may communicate with the Commission or with one of its regional offices and he will be given all available information.

6. How to establish eligibility for probational appointment: Persons who wish to establish eligibility for regular appointment must qualify in an examination given for such appointment. When the examinations are announced they will be given appropriate publicity.

We Desire Cordial Relations With Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 1, 1946

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks and following the great address in the Senate by the able and brilliant Senator from Michigan, ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, on February 27, I desire to call attention to the House and to the country of a portion of the program of the Communist International.

Is the United States playing the same role today that Chamberlain did at Munich—appeasement?

Members of Congress and representatives of the press have repeatedly expressed their incomprehension of the aims and motives of the Soviet Government in its present policies throughout the world. There is little cause for bewilderment on this score since the unrepudiated and still valid program of the Communist International has made this unmistakably plain. The present confusion results from the temporary suspension of these aims for the period during which the Soviet Union was under direct attack from Nazi Germany and in dire need of the aid of the democratic capitalist countries. Every act of the Soviet Union and its foreign agents in the Communist Parties in this and other countries demonstrates the resumption of these aims on a higher scale and the present validity of this statement which I quote from the program of the Communist International:

World economy has been split into two fundamentally hostile camps, the camp of the imperialist states and the camp of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the USSR. The difference in class structure and in the class character of the government in the two camps, the fundamental differences in the aims each pursues in internal, foreign, economic, and cultural policy, the fundamentally different courses of their development, bring the capitalist world into sharp

conflict with the state of the victorious proletariat. Within the framework of a formerly uniform world economy, two antagonistic systems are now contesting against each other: the system of capitalism and the system of socialism. The class struggle, which hitherto was conducted in forms determined by the fact that the proletariat was not in possession of state power, is now being conducted on an enormous and really world scale; the working class of the world has now its own state—the one and only fatherland of the international proletariat. The existence of the Soviet Union and the influence it exercises upon the toiling and oppressed masses all over the world is in itself a most striking expression of the profound crisis of the world capitalist system and of the expansion and intensification of the class struggle to a degree hitherto without parallel in history.

The capitalist world, powerless to eliminate its inherent contradictions, strives to establish international associations * * * the main purpose of which is to retard the irresistible growth of the revolutionary crisis and to strangle the union of proletarian republics by war or blockade. * * * Thus, as a result of the first round of imperialist wars a new, fundamental antagonism has arisen of world historical scope and significance—the antagonism between the USSR and the capitalist world.

Those who cherish the illusion that if we grovel sufficiently in our appeasement policy or if we rely upon the good will of the Soviet leaders, cordial relations with the Soviet Union will be assured, are not looking facts in the face and are doomed to bitter disillusionment. I am heartily in favor of cordial relations with the Soviet Union, but the leaders of that country will have to demonstrate by their behavior the sincerity of their desire for such relations, before America can rely upon them. Thus far they have established little ground for confidence.

Wyatt Asks Builders for Full Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 1, 1946

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the February 28, 1946, issue of the Chicago Sun:

HOUSING CHIEF IN APPEAL HERE—WYATT ASKS BUILDERS FOR "FULL EFFORT"

(By Leonard Castle)

Wilson W. Wyatt, National Housing Administrator, told the Nation's home builders last night that his program for the construction of 2,700,000 new homes in the next 2 years offers them the greatest opportunity and the greatest challenge in history.

Speaking at the National Association of Home Builders' convention at the Stevens Hotel, Wyatt said that "the role of the private home building industry is at the core of the entire veterans' emergency housing program."

FULL EFFORT URGED

The Nation needs and must have "full effort, full participation and full cooperation" from home builders and "on that basis we can meet the challenge of the veterans housing emergency and we can lick that emergency," Wyatt said.

His plea for full cooperation was presented as various members of the association were assailing the program as a "conspiracy for socialized housing," and there were indications that the convention today would place itself formally on record in opposition to the Wyatt program.

"PRIVATE ENTERPRISE," HE SAYS

At an earlier press conference, Wyatt answered the charge of "socialized housing" by contending that "this is a private-enterprise program, from soup to nuts."

He explained that 2,500,000 of the homes would be constructed by private builders, while the remaining 200,000, in the form of temporary, emergency housing, would be built by private industry under contract to the Government.

"It is inconceivable that the home builders would oppose the program," he told reporters. "I don't feel that the home builders are against it. If they are it is sheerly through misunderstanding. The program offers them their greatest chance for sustained activity at a minimum of risk."

WYATT ASSAILED IN LOBBY

Wyatt had said in Washington Tuesday that an "integrated lobby" was opposing the program. Frank W. Cortright, executive vice president of the association, said here yesterday that the home builders' group "has made no statement of policy on Wilson Wyatt's housing program."

"We have no lobby either attacking or defending it in Washington," Cortright said, adding that no stand would be taken until after a board meeting with Wyatt today.

BOON TO JOBS SEEN

In his speech, Wyatt told the builders: "If we face up courageously and vigorously, we will have done due service to the urgent needs of our veterans.

"We will have built an industry which will contribute in vast measure to full production, employment, and prosperity in America. And we will be adding to the heritage of America the treasured right of decent homes for all families."

The Government's role in the housing program, he said, will be to get the materials, the labor, the financing aids, and all other needed assistance into the hands of the men who will build houses.

The No. 1 bottleneck, today, he explained, is a shortage of materials and the Government intends to break this bottleneck by premium payments to manufacturers.

SIX HUNDRED MILLION NEEDED

The legislation now before Congress calls for an appropriation of $600,000,000 to make these premium payments to speed up production.

Other steps the Government anticipates taking under the program were listed as:

1. Obtain 1,500,000 additional building trades workers through a vigorous recruitment and liberalized apprentice training program, with special emphasis on attracting veterans to the building trades.

2. Assure adequate financing for moderate and low-priced homes. "The future of the housing industry as a large volume leader in the American industrial system lies in that mass housing market."

3. Cooperate with organizations striving to modernize local building codes to permit "the use of all sound new materials and new construction methods." He said he was sure builders generally would support the removal of all needless and obsolete restrictions in local building codes.

4. Tap the capacity of prefabricators. He denied that this phase of the program involves unfair competition with conventional home builders for "under this emergency program there will be capacity business for all."

When the goal of 2,700,000 homes is achieved, Wyatt said, the industry will not have built itself out of a market, but will have put itself in postion "to start on the sustained long-range job of building decent homes for all American families in enormous, record-breaking numbers, every year."

LONG-RANGE PLANS URGED

"That is why the need for emergency housing measures and basic, long-range measures are inseparable and equally urgent.

"That is why the veterans' emergency housing program includes both essential emergency measures and the general housing bill which would stimulate sustained development of new markets for private housing, help in rebuilding of our cities, and provide for our families of low income," Wyatt said.

Statement of Henry J. Kaiser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRENT SPENCE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 1, 1946

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Henry J. Kaiser before the Banking and Currency Committee, United States House of Representatives:

My response to your invitation to testify today stems from a deep sense of duty as an employer to my employees, as a seller to my customers, and as an industrialist to my colleagues in the business world.

The subject before us is of such momentous importance to America and to the civilized world that it calls for a clear and uncompromising statement of position. In requesting my presence here, it may be assumed that your committee believed we could speak from the experience of operating 25 industries, including steel, aluminum, chemicals, ships, home construction, household appliances, cement, concrete, and many other construction materials. It is not generally known that certain of these industries were in successful operation for many years before the outbreak of the war, and that for 30 years we have been marketing products to the public, direct and through dealers.

These 25 enterprises operate today at least 50 plants, grouped at 5 major regional centers—southern California, northern California, the Northwest, the Midwest, and the East. They produce more than 130 different items, marketed as individual products some of which are listed here: Agriculture, aircraft, aluminum, automobiles, cement, chemical, concrete, contracting, engineering, ferroalloys, gypsum, household appliances, housing, insurance, iron and steel, lime, machinery, magnesium, medical, mining, refractories, sand and gravel, shipbuilding yards, ship repair yards, steamship.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

Kaiser steel plant

Pig iron, coke, steel ingots and blooms, toluol, creosote, slag, pipe stock, steel plate and structural shapes, tar, ammonium sulfate, xylol, flake pitch, steel merchant bars and shapes, sheet piling and specialties, phenol, light and fuel oils, benzol, solvents, sodium carbonate, reinforcing steel, fertilizers.

Long Beach plant

Automobiles.

NORTHERN CALIFORNIA

Richmond shipyards (Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4)

Victory ships, coastal vessels, C4 cargo vessels, repair work.

Permanente industrial center (near Palo Alto)

Portland cement, rock products, lime, magnesium, light metal alloys, sand castings, magn sia, magnesium, hydroxide, oxygen, brick, periclase, volitalized silica, raw dolomite, calcined dolomite, hydrated and processed lime, doubled burned dolomite, ramix, ferroalloys, fluxes, miscellaneous chemical specialties.

Building materials plants

Washed gravel—all sizes, crushed gravel—all sizes, crushed rock screenings, railroad ballast—all types, crusher run base, slurry base, concrete sands, plaster sands, asphalt sands, stock car sand, asphaltic concrete—all types, plant mix, oil mixes, stabilized base, ready mixed concrete.

NORTHWEST

Columbia River shipyards, Portland, Swan Island and Vancouver

Victory ships, coastal vessels, C4 cargo vessels, repair work.

Spokane aluminum plants

Aluminum ingots, aluminum sheet.

MIDWEST

Willow Run plant

Automobiles.

EAST

Fleetwings aircraft plants

Military aircraft, hydraulic valves, aircraft subassemblies, stainless steel specialties, personal aircraft, appliances.

The inflation which we are called upon to fight today is due in major part to the tremendous demand for goods of all kinds throughout the world. The unsatisfied needs of mankind, not only in America, but in every land, exert the greatest pressure on the price structure. Our huge wartime national income has swelled the demand for ample food, new clothing and adequate shelter. The price of these necessities is our first concern. They must not be priced beyond the people's reach. The people of America are hungry, besides, for all of the other manufactured products that industry can produce. Let me give you a dramatic example from our own experience in the automobile market in New York City. Men and women stood for hours in a blinding snowstorm, in a line four-deep and four blocks long, hoping to see and to place orders for the transportation they so sorely needed. Similar demonstrations appear daily on every main street in America where lines form to purchase the limited supplies of certain staple foods and certain luxuries, such as nylon stockings and other products, which are considered essential to a high standard of living.

There is grave danger in the common argument that this tremendous demand could be met by so simple a device as removing price controls. Such an expedient would spell ruin for the great mass of mankind which has only limited purchasing power. The long years of war all but exhausted the basic supplies in the markets of the world. This tragic circumstance has created a scarcity without parallel. The situation calls for the utmost cooperation between all branches of industry, labor, and Government to maintain sound price levels, and thus protect the dollars that will convert wants and needs into purchases until production can satisfy demand.

The enterprises for which I am responsible are business organizations. For more than 30 years we have been engaged in those fields of free enterprise which are the most highly competitive. In the hard school of experience, we have faced the problems of production. We know the problems of selling. We know the importance of costs and the survival value of efficiency. We know the importance of looking ahead and in that foresight we have confirmed our belief in the future of this country. We know that sound business is not out to make a quick killing.

From all this experience, we are today ready to testify that the surest cure for inflation is production—the highest possible level of production at the earliest possible moment. Production, not price control, is the problem that we must solve. The Office of Stabilization can and will help us to increase production, and I am certain that the OPA will handle its pricing power to the end that maximum production will be achieved.

I cannot agree with those who profess to be able to estimate the extent to which the new wage-price policy will increase the cost of production. Thus far generalities about future costs are too vague to be convincing, and no one will deny that we are still a long way from potential peacetime production levels. As a matter of fact we can cite instances from our own experience where increased wages have actually lowered costs through increases in production.

I hear no dissent from the principle that increased production is the true solution to the problem of inflation. If this principle is sound, then the best way to increase production will be to stop bickering and go to work, with all sides ready to give and take in the all-important effort to raise production to the level of demand.

As a people trained in the democratic tradition, we cherish the right to criticize our Government in all its branches, but the best criticism stems from experience. In managing 25 industries we have come to learn how the OPA works. In all of our enterprises, throughout the war and since, we do not know of a single instance in our dealings with the OPA where, after the facts were presented, we were not accorded fair and equitable treatment by this agency. This statement covers our total experience with the OPA as a seller and producer in the market.

As a buyer under the OPA for our various industries, we can again report satisfactory treatment. We, too, are faced with a shortage of essentials. Our experience indicates that the supply of basic materials is equal to about half of the demand. As buyers, we would be greatly concerned if suddenly all restrictions on the seller were removed and we were compelled to bid at auction for vital supplies.

To illustrate the point, this committee may be interested to know that as buyers we recently faced new situations wherein we found ourselves unable to purchase steel. In the first instance, the Kaiser Co. tried for 4 months to place orders for sheet steel for the production of a low-priced dishwasher. Our inability to satisfy this requirement from any supplier forced us to adopt an aluminum tub for this household appliance.

The Kaiser-Frazer Corp. encountered exactly the same experience in regard to steel for automobile bodies. Until this week we were unable to secure a commitment on any specified tonnage of steel for the manufacture of automobiles. Some suppliers said that no tonnage was available. Others promised to advise us later on how much tonnage we can have and when.

The Kaiser interests are taking four steps to remedy this alarming situation:

1. We have expressed our belief that a failure on the part of industry to cooperate in this critical emergency will necessitate action on the part of the Stabilization Director.

2. We have approached Mr. Bowles with the request that he study such allocation of steel as would be fair and equitable for all producers. This would preserve that competitive force which is so indispensable to the life of American industry.

3. We have been obliged to lease from the Government and to operate an aluminum ingot plant and an aluminum rolling mill in order to produce our own raw materials. In the aluminum industry we will welcome regulation from the OPA in our pricing of this light metal which is also in critical shortage. Only recently we were advised that the earliest delivery of aluminum which we could expect was 48 weeks, which comes dangerously close to being a year.

4. Finally, the shortage of steel sheet is so critical that in addition to leasing the aluminum plants we are also studying available DPC steel plants. At South Chicago, for example, there is a Government-owned, war-built $93,000,000 steel plant for which competitive bids are to be received April 1 by the War Assets Corporation. We are investigating this plant, with the thought in mind that there may be ample floor space to increase its facilities and to install a strip mill for the rolling of steel sheets. If our studies show it is economically sound, we will be among the bidders making a proposal to the War Assets Corporation.

In our opinion, the consumer demand for products requiring sheet steel is so great that it will require the operation, for at least 3 years, of all of the steel capacity of the United States, including the additional capacity installed during the war. Again I say, the only way to reduce government controls is to use all of our existing facilities for production, and to build, where necessary, new facilities to give us increased production and meet the demand. Congress has already done its part in providing the Surplus Property Administrator with ample authority to make these plants quickly available to industry, after a check by the Attorney General to insure they are so allocated that competition is encouraged.

I have thus spoken from experience because I do not wish to generalize. In facing the actualities of inadequate supply, we have learned that price control is vital to the health of our country through this emergency, and that inflation will finally be brought into balance by production. It is now altogether clear that the Office of Stabilization is necessary at this critical juncture in order to protect buyers, sellers, and the public both as to pricing and as to allocation; for these two are kindred necessities in a market where demand so far exceeds supply. In this transition period from war to peace, when the barrel holds so much less than the customers want, the customers will either fight for it or overbid for it. When industry produces enough barrels full of the things that people want, then we won't need allocation and price control.

The National Association of Manufacturers has recently taken full-page advertisements in the Nation's press to urge the abandonment of OPA. In this campaign, NAM has given no indication of how this procedure would remedy the present emergency. I cannot believe that this is the unanimous verdict of its members. Outside of NAM there are thousands of manufacturers whose opinions are certainly not represented in NAM's advertisements. I know that the NAM has not approached us for our viewpoint. The vast majority of American businessmen in trade and production, who are not members of NAM, are a force to be reckoned with, and should be heard.

With this knowledge, it appears to me that the NAM—before taking a position in which it presumes to represent American industry—should make a poll and furnish this committee with its results. In preparing a questionnaire for such a poll of American industry, the facts for and against inflation should be presented. If NAM prefers to poll only its own members, we may hope that it will make some attempt to find out what the employees of its members are thinking, because, after all, it is the people who will have to pay the price for inflation.

I notice a tendency today to use the phrase "the little man." I presume this means the plain citizen whose voice is too seldom heard. If this is a proper definition, "the little man" is industry's biggest customer. He is the one who needs protection. The savings of the worker, the widow, and the dependent would suffer most if we permit the United

States to stage a general auction in which the price of everything will be bid up until only the few can satisfy their needs. America's huge financial reserves, born of war and represented by the earnings and savings of our people, must now have that fair and equitable protection which is afforded by agencies such as the OPA and the Office of Stabilization.

One look back into history should be enough to convince us that we must not open the road to uncontrolled inflation. We had the experience—after the abandonment of price control—of the soaring boom of 1919. And we had the experience of a total bust in 1920. Does experience teach us nothing?

There is no more brilliant chapter in the history of American economics than the story of price controls throughout the Second World War. The necessity for those controls will not be past until full production has been achieved. There is, as yet, no convincing argument that full production must await removal of price controls. The answer would be an inflation of disastrous proportions, in the financial markets, the commodity markets, and throughout the whole field of production and distribution, and, as always, laying its heaviest toll on those who are the least able to bear it.

In concluding this statement, the committee should understand that I do not believe that the OPA is perfect—there is no such thing as perfection anywhere. It is easy to criticize, easy to say what should have been done, or what should be done, as one watches from the sideline. It is a real responsibility, however, to initiate a program such as the OPA, to coordinate it, to guide it, and to keep it free from those who may unwittingly hurt it with criticism. This is not a time when we need criticism. We need to work together for the common good, which is increased production. The OPA needs help from everyone—from Congress, from the people—and we must all join in the use of this agency, and make it stronger by giving it our confidence.

Expansion of the Marine Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 1, 1946

Mr. KOPPLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to insert a copy of my radio address which I made February 27 over Station WDRC, Hartford, with regard to H. R. 5331, which I introduced on February 1, to expand the Marine Corps for occupation duty, and replacements:

This evening I would like to discuss a bill which I introduced in the House a few weeks ago regarding the expansion of the Marine Corps. Senator MCMAHON introduced the companion bill in the Senate. Before introducing the bill both of us consulted with Government officials, especially Marine Corps officers of top rank, and with private citizens, among whom was Thomas Beck, of Wilton, Conn. All of us are deeply concerned because GI's and their families are asking why they are not being discharged, now that the fighting is over. Yet, like all responsible American citizens, we recognize the importance of retaining a substantial part of our armed forces for some time to come, and that we have an important job to do in the occupation of countries in Europe and Asia until conditions are more nearly normal.

Our bill is chiefly for the purpose of assigning our occupation responsibilities to the marines. Especially in so-called peacetime, the marines have traditionally been the American occupation force—they are trained for that work—they know when they enlist that their duties will carry them to foreign lands.

The present peacetime strength of the Marine Corps is 100,000. Its top wartime strength was under one-half million. Our bill would expand the corps, through volunteer only, to 700,000. Only for a time, during the war, were draftees permitted to select the Marine Corps. But now all men who enlist in the Marines, do so as volunteers in the regular corps, not as reserves. Bear that distinction in mind. There is a difference between the regulars and the reserves whether you are talking about the Army, Navy, or Marines. The regulars enlist for a definite period, peacetime or wartime, to serve as long as their enlistment lasts. The reservists are the millions of men who enlisted or were drafted for the war, to serve as long as the emergency lasts. For instance, they are eligible for discharge on points. The regulars are not.

I have made this explanation because I want to point out emphatically that our bill calls for volunteers in the regular Marine Corps. If our bill passes, it will enable the speedier discharge of the millions of men still in the reserves of the Army, Navy, and marines, who feel that since the fighting has stopped, they are entitled to return home.

The draft law expires on May 15 unless Congress extends it. In order to stop the draft, a tremendous drive has been made for volunteer recruits in all the services. More attractive inducements are offered, but volunteer recruiting has not been as fruitful as we hoped. Consequently, our bill offers not only more attractive housing, educational, and recreational opportunities but also, and this is most important, more pay.

I believe that our failure to reach our recruiting goals is due largely to the inadequacy of the pay we have been offering. Personally, I doubt that a former GI, are one who now anxiously is counting the weeks until he can get home, will care how much money the fellow gets who elects to go over and finish the job.

There is another angle to this pay item. Except in war, when we glorify everyone who wears a uniform, unfortunately we do not look upon the man who joins the Army or Navy with the respect which is due him. We don't give him the incentives to serve his country in military life that we give him in civilian life. The pay is paltry and, hence, capable young men who would benefit from such service, and from whom the country would benefit, look askance at the idea that they join the Regular Army, Navy, or Marine Corps for a period of, say, 2 to 4 years. Any man with ambition is bound to feel that he can do better financially at any other job.

Consequently, for the most part, our peacetime services have drawn into the ranks the fellows who couldn't do better in civilian jobs. And yet, service in the Army or Navy is fully as important to the Nation as service in any other Government branch.

World conditions are far from stable. We ranked high in the councils of war because we not only had the arsenals, we also had manpower. We had all the wherewithal for victory. There are grave questions to be decided before the peace can be written. There are serious differences of opinion between our member allies which we will be called upon to decide. We cannot do as we did in 1920—build a fence around ourselves. The world can be encompassed in a matter of hours. The world can be destroyed in a matter of hours. The fence age belongs to past history.

Until we know what security and protection our Nation can depend upon from the international police force which is provided for in the United Nations Charter, a force yet to be developed, we cannot willy-nilly withdraw our forces, weaken our protection, curtail our Army and Navy, and say "We will peace, therefore we shall have peace." We thought we could do that once in a less dangerous age. We were wrong.

It may be months, it may be years before we can, with other nations, decide on just what strength our Army and Navy must be, just what share of the world will be ours to police, but until that time, any irresponsible weakening of our strength will spell disaster for ourselves, and surely for our children. We don't know what awaits us, and until we do know, we cannot weaken the foundations of the peace we are attempting to build by destroying our most potent argument—a big stick.

Opinions still differ as to how large our occupation forces must be. Some say 350,000 for the Pacific and 335,000 for Europe, besides those in training.

Our bill does not seek to eliminate the Army and the Navy. Both Senator MCMAHON and I feel that fewer men will be required if the big occupation job can be turned over to the marines.

By June 30, all men in the Army with 2 years in service will be eligible for discharge. Many with 2 years of service will be out before that time. Not all, but some of them will have to be replaced. But the question then arises—how many such replacements can be obtained? Selective Service has stopped drafting the fathers. Surely then, all fathers in service should be released. Selective Service has also stopped taking men over 26. Consequently, all men over 26 should be discharged. That limits us to non-fathers between the ages of 18 and 26. That reservoir has been pretty much depleted. I personally doubt that we can obtain enough draftees from that category to replace the men who are entitled to return, which means we must appeal to volunteers.

Of course, as time goes on, our overseas and domestic needs will be smaller. But for some time to come, we will need forces overseas as well as in this country.

We can streamline that occupation job, so far as manpower is concerned, by training men especially for occupation duty. And that is where the Marine Corps comes in, because by training and tradition our marines have always done our occupation job and done it well. There are over 100 instances wherein our marines have served as occupation troops, not necessarily from the standpoint of military occupation, but oftentimes, as right now in China, by invitation of the country to help them recuperate.

Our occupation troops can do a marvelous job of good will. Their conduct will impress the people of the nations where they are stationed—either for good or for bad. The marines have a splendid record for esprit de corps—or, in other works, great team work.

It's not easy for someone like myself to direct young men to give up their careers and delay their planning for their futures by remaining in service. I can well appreciate their natural desire to come home. I can well appreciate the natural incentive which made them do the job superbly while the job they thought necessary had to be done, but now that fighting is over, and since they are really civilians, they want to get back to civilian life.

An alternative must be found. And I think that the bill Senator MCMAHON has introduced with me is the answer. The marines have had good reason to boast of their corps d'esprit. They have built it up through 170 years of glorious achievement, during peaceful years and bitter years of fighting. I am not making a brief for them. They have made their own. I am asking the Congress to make it possible for the Marine Corps to expand its ranks, to enlist young men from 18 to 25, single young men with no home ties, to make it worth their while to

give, 2, 3, or 4 years to their country during these critical years during which we must have a force in readiness while we build the foundation for the peace we hope will last for all time.

Our fighting men have done a marvelous job. It is now our duty to permit them to write finis to their job as early as possible. I know the marines will be delighted to take over this added responsibility.

The Taxicab "Army"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 1, 1946

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following editorial from the February 23, 1946, issue of the Evening Star of Washington, D. C.:

THE TAXICAB "ARMY"

Granting that citizens have the constitutional right peaceably to petition Congress respecting their grievances, it is not clear what the "invasion" of Washington by a Chicago taxicab "task force" of 150 cabs and their drivers is expected to accomplish. The grievances voiced by leaders of the "army" have to do with alleged injustices done them by the city of Chicago. More specifically, the protesting drivers, most of them war veterans, are complaining about a Chicago ordinance limiting to 3,000 the number of taxicabs licensed to operate there. That would seem to be a strictly local matter which does not concern Congress or the Federal Government, yet the drivers apparently have vague hopes of obtaining Federal intervention through some sort of legislative action or Department of Justice proceedings under the antitrust laws.

Washington, with painful memories of other veterans' marches after the First World War, is gratified that the uninvited delegation has conducted its invasion in orderly fashion. It is disturbing to local officials and residents, however, to learn that the group is making no plans for early departure, despite the fact that its members are running out of funds and have begun to appeal for financial aid. The city already has assisted the "army" in finding a bivouac, although it must be admitted that in turning over Camp Simms to the visitors the Commissioners were not only accommodating the drivers but relieving Washington's already congested streets of added parking burdens.

One danger of this type of demonstration is that it has a tendency to induce other groups of petitioners to adopt similar methods of focusing public attention on their problems. The march on Washington in 1932 by veterans demanding bonus legislation began in a small way in May of that year, when the first small groups of veterans arrived from the Midwest. The early arrivals were orderly and were extended every possible courtesy by the police. The movement grew by leaps and bounds in June and July, however, with radical elements taking an increasing interest in the demonstration. Disorder followed disorder until the climax on July 28, when two resisting veterans were shot fatally by police and troops were called out to evict the "bonus army" from its Anacostia camp.

It is interesting to recall that in his report on the origin of the disorders, Attorney General William D. Mitchell told the President: "This experience demonstrates that it is intolerable that organized bodies of men having a grievance or demand upon the Government should be allowed to encamp in the city and attempt to live off the community like soldiers billeted in an enemy country. Attempts by such groups to intimidate or coerce Congress into granting their demands hurt rather than help their cause." The Chicago taxicab "army" fortunately cannot fairly be said to fall into the category of offenders that the Attorney General had in mind. But there is always the possibility that demonstrations of this kind will lead to other marches by less orderly groups.

Disabled American Veterans' Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES DOMENGEAUX
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 1, 1946

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a joint resolution which would establish a just and lasting tribute to that large number of our fellow Americans who offer the greatest evidence of the horrors and aftermath of war.

I propose that the first Sunday in December of each year be set aside throughout our Nation as Disabled American Veterans' Day, in honor of those who have given their health, their youth, and their future in the cause of America and for the sake of a better world for all mankind. The observance date has been selected because of the fact that it was on a Sunday, December 7, 1941, at Pearl Harbor, T. H., that Americans were first called upon during World War II to sacrifice their lives, their limbs and their blood at the hands of militaristic and ruthless aggressors. The victory over those forces that would destroy freedom has been won, but at the cost of a great human toll.

It is most fitting and proper that we set aside a special day in commemoration of the sacrifices of those who have been wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled while serving actively in the defense of our Nation in time of war. In time of peace we are all too likely to overlook the problems that face these men whose jangled nerves, shattered minds, and wrecked bodies bear testimony to their devotion to their country and their willingness to give their all in order that right and justice prevail. There is need that public attention be called periodically to the duty of extending a helping hand to deserving disabled veterans and their dependents, and the dependents of our war dead, and to the preservation and promotion of the rights and benefits to which they are entitled. It is particularly necessary that the war disabled be assured the opportunity of self-sustaining, gainful, and useful employment, supplemented by adequate compensation, medical treatment, hospitalization, and vocational training, justified on the basis of their service-incurred disabilities. It is a privilege and duty that our entire citizenship support all constructive measures deemed to be desirable on behalf of the disabled veterans, their dependents, and the dependents of our war dead.

The measure I am sponsoring authorizes the President of the United States to issue annually a proclamation calling upon officials of the Government to display the American flag on all Government buildings on the first Sunday of each December, and urging the public to observe the occasion in schools, churches, or other suitable places, with appropriate ceremonies.

I hope that Congress will speedily adopt this measure. It is the least we can do for those who have done so much.

Maj. George Fielding Eliot Doubts Benefits of Unification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED. V. IZAC
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 1, 1946

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article appearing in the February issue of Sea Power by Maj. George Fielding Eliot, a leading commentator on military and naval affairs for many years. Unaffiliated with any specialized group or interest he has expressed his own opinions in the pages of the Nation's newspapers and magazines, in books, and over the air waves. This article on the subject of the merger of the armed forces is based on testimony which Mr. Eliot gave before a congressional committee recently:

The supporters of the program of unification of the services rest their arguments largely upon conjectural benefits. They believe that the system they propose will produce results beneficial to the national security, and to the armed services which must be the pillars of that security. Presenting these beliefs, they ask that a system which has in fact proved itself an adequate instrument of victory be changed for a system which has, in fact, wherever it has been tried by this Nation or any other, been disastrous in its results. Their conjectures are directly opposed to fact.

It is a fact that, whenever a naval service has been subordinated to a land service, or placed in a position where it could be primarily controlled—as to policy, appropriations, organization, and general direction—by land officers or by an administration in which land officers had a controlling voice, it has deteriorated. This is the universal verdict of history. There are no exceptions.

It is a fact that no nation has been able to develop true air power except when, by one means or another, the development of its air forces has been freed from the control of officers of the land and sea services. This, too, is the universal verdict of history, though the experience we have had with aviation is far shorter than with sea power.

Now the primary purpose of the bill before you is unified control of our armed forces. The bill seeks to introduce the element of one-man decision over all our armed forces at a lower echelon of command than that of the President of the United States. It seeks to compel agreement between them by appointing a single Secretary and a single Chief of Staff who can, at some point in a discussion, say: "That is enough; I have made my decision." When you do that, you commit the future security of the United States to the wisdom of that single decision. You

make a mistake against which all experience arises to warn you.

You are gambling the future of this country on the chance that your Secretary of the Armed Forces will always be impartial, uninfluenced, and evenly balanced, and that the Chief of Staff of the Armed Forces, his principal military adviser, will always, as he assumes office, forget all his ties with his own service, and at the same time acquire, by some mysterious heavenly gift, a complete understanding of the needs and nature of the other two services.

It will not happen that way; it has never happened that way.

Let us look at the record of history. From the earliest days of sail, naval warfare has, in essential respects, been different from land warfare, requiring another type of training, different genius, a dissimilar approach to problems of strategy, tactics, logistics. Air warfare is now affected by similar considerations.

A RECORD OF FAILURE

One of the earliest lessons I would mention was the defeat of the Spanish Armada, a great fleet sent out by the greatest power of the time to cover the invasion of the British Isles by a Spanish army. But the fleet was itself commanded by an officer who had never previously served at sea, the Duke of Medina-Sidonia; in it, military officers were supreme, the sailors were in positions of subordination; and it was completely defeated, as you all know, by an English fleet much inferior in force, but commanded by seamen—Drake, Hawkins, Frobisher, and the rest.

France has tried one-man control of her armed forces three times: Under Louis XIV and his great minister, Louvois; under Napoleon; and under the Third Republic, in the days just preceding this war. In all three cases, disaster was the result. Under Louvois, France suffered the great naval defeat of La Hogue. Under Napoleon, she suffered naval defeat at Trafalgar, which brought to naught all the land victories of the great Emperor. Under the unification schemes of the 1930's, she suffered defeat by land largely because of lack of air power. Twice the navy suffered; the third time it was the air force; the result was the same—national disaster.

In Germany, the army has always dominated military thought. The results speak for themselves. In the war of 1914–18, Germany had created a great navy, but the German High Command had no idea how to use it. The German surface fleet served no purpose whatever; for the most part it rusted away at anchor, though there were occasions on which it could have challenged the British dominion of the seas, and had it been successful, Germany would have won the war. In this war, the Germans had a much smaller surface fleet, but they accomplished nothing with it worth its cost. In both wars they did something with submarines, but were unable to make this weapon produce decisive results. As for German air power in this war, the famous Luftwaffe never developed a true strategic air force; it was hampered throughout by subordination to the views of land officers in the high command, and at last was virtually destroyed.

AIR ARM MAY ALSO SUFFER

Russia, like Germany and France, has always suffered from the domination of army officers in the field of over-all military planning and policy. Consequently the Russian Navy has never amounted to much. It was used in 1914–18, in the Baltic Sea, as a mere appendage of the army, under the control of the army commander in chief, to guard the army's right flank. It was similarly used in this war both in the Baltic and Black Seas. Russian air power never developed beyond the tactical, support-of-ground-troops stage. It was the invariable Russian practice to put the air commanders on any front under direct orders of ground commanders, to be used as a sort of long-range artillery.

There is a little American experience along this line. In the earliest days of this Republic, our Navy was under the War Department. It had nobody to fight its battles and present its needs to the Congress. Consequently we came to the very brink of war with France, in 1798, without a single seagoing warship ready for action. Three frigates which had been laid down in 1794, at a time when we expected some trouble with the Barbary pirates, had lain uncompleted ever since. It was not until President Adams asked Congress to create a separate Navy Department, in 1798, that these frigates were completed for sea, and three others authorized; and the foundations of American sea power were laid as we began to develop our naval traditions and our naval experience.

None of these cases, as cited, is identical in every detail with the conditions we now face. But in all these cases, the principle involved is the same. In all, the control of the armed forces was entrusted to one man, who was responsible for the final decision in matters of general policy affecting both land and sea forces, or in matters affecting land, sea, and air forces. The idea of one-man decision was paramount. The idea of compelling agreement, of ending debate by the decision of that one man prevailed. This is what is now proposed to you. If you do it, you will produce the same results as has every other nation which has attempted it.

The other way of getting the services to work together as a team is the method of coordination. In this method, the services have military and civilian heads who must agree on broad policy decisions. The services have equal access to the head of the State and to those who control the public purse strings. Their cooperation is organized within an agency which provides machinery for facilitating agreement, for providing adequate information, and for putting joint decisions into effect. Within it, they are equal. Experience has something to say on this method, too. It is the method by which we won this war, for one thing. It is the method by which the British nation has won both this war and the last one. Its record is therefore one of successful accomplishment, in sharp contrast to the record of unification.

The St. Lawrence Waterway as Viewed by a Representative of the Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 1, 1946

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under consent previously granted, I am extending my remarks and including an address by Hon. Clarence E. Cleveland, executive secretary of the Vermont State Railroads Association, Montpelier, Vt., delivered before the Morrisville Rotary Club, Morrisville, Vt., on the 27th day of February 1946:

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY AND POWER PROJECT

What is the St. Lawrence waterway and power project, sometimes called the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence project?

Please pardon me for being somewhat elementary at the outset, and for assuming that there may be at least some persons who have only a vague idea of what this proposal is all about. The St. Lawrence waterway is not a new discovery, or a new invention, or the young offspring of any current politician as some would wish you to believe.

At the present time there already exists a waterway from Lake Superior and Lake Michigan through Lake Huron, Lake St. Clair, Lake Erie, Lake Ontario, and thence down the St. Lawrence River to the Atlantic Ocean. There is now, and has been for 40 years, a channel and system of canals with a minimum depth of 14 feet in the St. Lawrence between the Lakes and Montreal.

The idea of deepening this water route and building locks and canals for larger vessels was dreamed of and romanced about centuries ago—even ever since the days when Canada was New France and the St. Lawrence River was viewed as the means of access to the interior of a continent which at the time was an undeveloped wilderness. Even the Welland Canal, which connects Lake Erie and Lake Ontario, was undertaken by Canada in 1824, nearly 125 years ago. At that time the Welland Canal was heralded as a first step in a general plan to convert the Great Lakes, to all intents and purposes, to a seacoast.

From time to time since 1909, a variety of interests have been persistently at work developing arguments in favor of the deepening and necessary construction to carry out this proposed scheme.

The movement for the creation of a deep waterway gained major impetus in 1919. In that year an amendment to the rivers and harbors act was passed requesting an investigation and report on the costs of improvement in the St. Lawrence between Montreal and Lake Ontario necessary to make the river navigable for oceangoing vessels. Since that time various other commissions, departments, and committees have made reports on the subject, both from navigation and power standpoints.

In 1931 the State of New York entered the picture by appointing the St. Lawrence Power Development Commission. On January 31, 1931, that commission reported in favor of a public power development at the International Section of the St. Lawrence River. The Power Authority of the State of New York was also created in 1931 by act of legislature, and is one of the leading present-day lobbyists for the proposal.

On July 18, 1932, a treaty between the United States, Canada, and Great Britain was signed to effectuate the project. It was then submitted to the United States Senate for ratification. Hearings and investigations took place from November 1932 to February 1933. From that point until March 1934 there were lengthy discussions in the Senate both for and against the St. Lawrence seaway project.

In the meantime on February 7, 1933, the New York Power Authority and the United States engineers recommended that the costs for which the United States would be responsible in connection with the development of the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River should be divided between the United States and the State of New York. New York's share was set at some $90,000,000. For this payment New York State was to have the right to utilize, for power development, all of the St. Lawrence River flow in the International Rapids section allocated to the United States by treaty, other than that required for navigation. The State of New York was also to receive title to the power works and lands upon which they were located and which might be necessary and convenient for their operation.

Finally on March 14, 1934, the treaty came to a vote in the United States Senate and was rejected. An analysis of the vote shows that all of our New England Senators were present and that only two voted in favor of it—Brown of New Hampshire and Gibson of Vermont. The record also shows that both of New York's Senators voted against the treaty. This treaty was never submitted to the Parliament of Canada for ratification.

Another treaty draft was offered to Canada by this country in 1938, but the Province of Ontario was cool to the proposal at the time. Then, with the coming of the European war, the Canadian attitude purportedly changed, and the whole St. Lawrence matter was revived in Washington.

By now you will see that the St. Lawrence project has resolved itself into a double-barreled implement, one barrel being the seaway and navigation feature, the other hydroelectric power development. Two barrels instead of one to shoot away hundreds of millions of United States dollars to be borrowed and added to the greatest public debt the world has ever known.

The treaty having failed on March 19, 1941, a so-called executive agreement between the United States and Canada was signed providing for the construction of the hydroelectric power facilities at the International Rapids section and for the completion of the essential links in the deep waterway, not later than December 31, 1948. This executive agreement, almost identical in form and substance with the 1932 treaty, was sent to Congress by Mr. Roosevelt on March 21, 1941. This executive agreement was a clever device to bypass the constitutional requirement that a treaty, to be valid, must receive a two-thirds affirmative vote by the Senate. Thereafter a bill was introduced in the House to validate the agreement and authorize the President to enter into an agreement with New York to turn over the United States' share of hydroelectric power to the New York Power Authority. This bill failed. In fact it never came to a vote.

There always has to be a lure connected with every questionable proposal of this type. At that time national defense was the crying need claimed by the proponents. They said we needed a secure haven in the Great Lakes for shipyards to build ships for war.

I recently came across a February 1924 issue of the National Geographic magazine devoted entirely to the Hawaiian Islands. I quote one sentence from it relating to Pearl Harbor. "With a depth of over 60 feet, an area of nearly 10 square miles, reached by a tortuous channel from the sea, and completely hiding all vessels within its haven from view toward the sea, it leaves nothing to be desired as a natural naval base." We haven't forgotten what happened at Pearl Harbor. Something similar could have happened in the Great Lakes. Even one bomb-damaged gate would bottle up every seagoing ship if not already bottled by 5 months of ice.

Another ghost story at the time was a threatened shortage-to-come of electricity for power and light to carry on the war effort. Well, history has disposed of that claim. We were never short of power during the war and never short of light except on occasions of man-made black-outs.

Another national-defense argument for the St. Lawrence project was that it would be needed in case of war because the railroads would not have the capacity to handle the transportation job. The events of the recent war settled that argument. The railroads not only carried the tonnage in summer, but through the winter of 1944–45, the worst winter from a transportation standpoint ever recorded in the Great Lakes region, they continued, month by month, to break all records for the delivery of export freight for war at the North Atlantic ports. This was at a time when the St. Lawrence was frozen hard and tight.

The proponents introduced new and similar authorization bills in the House and Senate in the Seventy-eighth Congress. One such bill was S. 1385, the Aiken bill. Hearings were conducted on this bill with a view to determining whether an agreement between the United States and Canada to undertake the project was of such a nature that it would in fact require a treaty. The weight of the testimony was that a treaty would be necessary and that the Executive agreement to which the Aiken bill sought to give congressional approval was obviously a subterfuge.

In December 1944 in the closing days of the Seventy-eighth Congress, in a final desperate move to obtain congressional consent for the St. Lawrence project, Senator AIKEN offered his bill as an amendment to the omnibus rivers and harbors bill which was then before the Senate. The Senate rejected AIKEN's amendment by a vote of 56 against and 25 for.

But the St. Lawrence seaway and power project proposal refuses to stay dead and buried. So again in the present Congress joint resolutions have been introduced in both Houses and are now pending providing for congressional consent to the Executive agreement of 1941. One more attempt, of course, to side-step a treaty.

When the "for national defense" claim for the seaway passed out, a new bait was needed by the proponents. "Jobs for the unemployed" during the reconversion period after the war seemed to be the next best theme song. We are in that period now and it is quite apparent that jobs are more plentiful than is unemployment. So now the only headliners which are left to the proponents seem to be the two old refrains, "cheap transportation" and "cheap power."

In some instances the savings on transportation claimed by the advocates have even exceeded the rates in effect. For example, it was once contended by proponents that savings on shipping wheat from Duluth to Montreal via the St. Lawrence seaway would amount to 8 cents per bushel. The actual cost of shipping this commodity from Duluth to Montreal, however, had only been 6 cents per bushel. Exaggerated savings figures have been arrived at, in many instances, because of failure to use the cheapest present routes in comparing shipping costs between existing transportation facilities and the proposed St. Lawrence route.

It is not contended, however, that the proposed St. Lawrence seaway would not offer a cheap mode of transportation for certain bulk commodities, but only during the summer months and further provided that speedy delivery of freight is not required. But it is extremely doubtful if these savings would be sufficiently large to justify the original expense of the project, together with upkeep costs and the damage done by the shift of business from established forms of transportation to the suggested new route.

From a navigation standpoint it is an undeniable fact that the St. Lawrence project, if completed, would be a "frozen asset" during many months of the year, owing to ice-bound conditions. A study of an actual record over a 5-year period indicates that the Great Lakes ports could be served by ocean-going ships only 58 percent of the time, or slightly less than 7 months of the year. This could only mean that other forms of transportation would necessarily have to maintain a stand-by capacity to take care of the St. Lawrence seaway traffic during more than 5 months of the year.

It has been claimed by the proponents that the seaway would effect low transportation costs on livestock feed from the West to the New England farmer. In operation at the present time is what is termed a "milling and transit privilege" which allows railroad cars which have originated in the West to be stopped off at manufacturing plants in New England and the grain processed and reforwarded at a normal charge of approximately $6.30 per car. If this type of operation were not possible, it would mean a local freight charge from the processing plants to the retail dealers throughout New England. Take, for example, Brattleboro, Vt., where the lowest possible rate out of a processing plant would be 11 cents per cwt., or $2.20 a ton, which would have to be added to the cost of feed before it reached the farmer.

The great grain breaking point in the East is Buffalo; next West, is Chicago. If grain should move into New England through the St. Lawrence waterway there would be no great breaking point where the railroads could absorb these shipments and there would be no milling and transit privilege. That would mean local freight charges, from some waterway port, throughout the entire New England States. This would add probably in the vicinity of 17 to 19 cents, instead of 11 cents per cwt., on grain products.

The lumber industry also operates on a break-transit rate similar to that which grain companies now use.

And furthermore, can railroads be expected to maintain stand-by facilities to carry grain, feed and other freight in this area during 5 months of the year when during the other 7 months it is carried on the St. Lawrence waterway?

Neither would the American farmer who grows grain profit from the St. Lawrence seaway. Export grain would be the chief American agricultural product to be shipped through the waterway. Even if a possible maximum saving of 3 cents a bushel were realized, this would be absorbed by the foreign buyer and vessel owner. An example of the price drop procedure operating in the European market was seen in 1929, when at the urgent request of President Hoover, rail rates from the Middle West to the Atlantic seaboard were reduced on the shipment of winter grain. At that time, the European market dropped its price offer by an equivalent amount, because Argentina wheat shippers met the competition. It is the European purchaser, not the American farmer, who would benefit from this possible 3-cent differential.

Let us take a brief look at the dazzling promise of cheap power for New England. Will hydroelectric power, if developed on the St. Lawrence River, ever be transmitted beyond the borders of New York to the New England States? New York State has always maintained the legal right to the use of the flow of water in the St. Lawrence along its boundary, subject only to the right of the Federal Government to control such waters for navigation purposes.

In accord with that claim, the Legislature of New York created its power authority, and restricted the sale of such power as might be allocable to the State of New York from that generated by a joint project constructed by the United States and Canada, for limited purposes wholly within the State of New York. That interpretation of the act is conceded by some seaway proponents, while some proponents even admit that the New York Power Authority Act will necessarily need to be amended to allow the transmission of this power beyond the borders of that State. Will the New York Legislature amend that act? Opposition to the project in most sections of New York State, including the large cities, is very determined, and it has been, and still is, being vigorously asserted. If the subject should be opened up in the New York Legislature, there is an excellent prospect that the legislature would not agree to amend the law so as to permit any State other than New York to obtain any portion of the power. And even if the New York law should be amended, can any stretch of imagination picture New York selling power developed from a $90,000,000 investment at cost?

The proponents admit that some sort of an arrangement will have to be worked out with New York on this point before power will be available to outside States. Would it not be good business practice to consummate such an arrangement with New York before the United States enters into an international contract with Canada to start this mammoth project? If it is to be the policy of the Federal Government that States other than New York are to share in this power, the rights of those States should be deter-

mined, fixed, and accepted, before we obligate the United States in the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars of borrowed money to complete this huge undertaking.

Visionary as this whole scheme is, let us for a moment envision that an agreement can be worked out whereby New York will share this power with the six New England States on a population basis, which would seem most fair. The 1940 census shows the total population of New York and New England to be 21,916,432. The population of the New England States alone is given as 8,437,290, or approximately 38.5 percent of the total area being considered. So consequently New England would be entitled to 38.5 percent of the capacity of the power plant to be built on the New York side of the river. The proponents choose to talk of this capacity in terms of 2,200,000 horsepower, which sounds larger than kilowatts, and is the combined development on both sides of the river. The average capacity of the New York plant is conceded to be 1,100,000 horsepower or 710,000 kilowatts. Thus, it would therefore follow that New England would, on a 38.5 percent basis, be allowed 273,350 kilowatts out of that New York capacity of 710,000 kilowatts.

As of November 1, 1945, the capacity of all generating plants located in New England was reported to be 3,195,561 kilowatts. Should the hypothetical 273,350 kilowatts from the St. Lawrence be added to the present New England capacity, we would arrive at a total figure of 3,469,911 kilowatt capacity, and going along another step, we find that the St. Lawrence contribution to New England would represent only approximately 7.87 percent of that total. And we should not overlook the tremendous power loss in attempting the transmission of electricity over such extremely long distances. This relatively small percentage of added capacity, if needed at all, would not be sufficient to affect rates or increase the use of electricity in New England. This would still hold even though it should be possible to generate and transmit electricity from the St. Lawrence to New England at a lower rate than now prevails, which seems to be in considerable doubt.

It has been said that the cost of developing power as proposed would be about $500 per kilowatt of capacity. If only one-half of this amount is to be charged to power, the cost per kilowatt of capacity will amount to about $250. Information indicates that steam-power capacity can be installed in the area proposed to be served by the St. Lawrence development for approximately $100 per kilowatt.

Prewar estimates as to the cost of the entire St. Lawrence project are presently of little value because of the decreased purchasing value of the American dollar. Even were this not so, such estimates are open to question in the light of the great disparity between estimated cost and final actual cost of other similar Government projects. For example, the Panama Canal, estimated to cost only $160,000,000, actually cost $375,000,000; the Welland Canal cost $128,000,000 instead of the estimated $114,000,000; the Chicago Drainage Canal, estimated to cost $16,000,000, finally cost $53,000,000.

A prewar estimate made by the Niagara Frontier Planning Board set the figure for the total cost of the St. Lawrence project at $1,220,588,000; Canada's share to be $597,367,000 and the United States share to be $623,221,000. The proponents here in the United States have cultivated the notion that with respect to cost it is a 50–50 proposition, with Canada footing half the bills. But there is a joker in it. Canada's past expenditures upon the Welland Canal of $131,900,000 are to be credited against her share of the new outlays of money. Thus, of the new outlays, much more than one-half comes from the United States; and, of course, the cost of improvement of United States harbor facilities on the Lakes is borne wholly by the United States.

At today's prices for material and labor, no one knows what the total cost would be. The proponents are now simply taking the attitude of "build it regardless of cost."

Let us now briefly summarize some of the losses likely to ensue if the seaway is completed. In all talk about the benefits from construction of the St. Lawrence channel, there is a disposition to overlook the fact that many individuals and many industries will lose.

The taxpayers will lose, since they would have to pay for a project which does not even contemplate any form of repayment for its use—even though that use for transportation is to be predominantly by foreign shipping.

The transportation industries—rail, waterway, and highway—and their employees, would lose. They would lose because the men and the facilities necessary to handle the tonnage during the 5 months or more when the St. Lawrence is blocked by ice, would have to stand by in unprofitable and jobless idleness during the half of the year when the waterway would be open.

The coal industry and the coal miners of the United States would lose much, if not most, of the present Canadian market for 17,000,000 tons of coal a year, which would be displaced by foreign coal brought across the Atlantic as ballast in ships coming into the St. Lawrence and Great Lakes for cargo.

Other producing industries of the United States would lose through intensified competition from the enlarged movement of foreign shipping, bringing into the United States foreign products manufactured, transported, and marketed under labor and other conditions with which the United States cannot compete. Foreign ships would not come in empty.

Seaports would lose through the diversion to the St. Lawrence route of shipping and traffic for which they have already provided, and are maintaining, ample facilities.

The Nation would lose by spending huge sums to establish a costly form of transportation which could exist only because the burdened taxpayers would provide and support it. It would, in addition, disrupt long-established and satisfactory commercial arrangements, would intensify transportation problems, would add to unemployment, and would cost all of us many times more than it might save some of us.

One of the battle cries of the proponents in respect to this project is "Every President since Woodrow Wilson has endorsed it"—or words to that effect. They have repeated that again and again—and again. Well, one of those same Chief Executives also endorsed the Passamaquoddy fiasco, if I remember correctly.

Here in Vermont it may well be recalled that in 1941 the legislature of the State, by resolution, in no uncertain terms expressed its disapproval of the seaway.

Again in 1944 the house of representatives, in special session, decisively defeated a resolution which was introduced in favor of the project.

The Iwo Jima Statue

REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 1, 1946

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, on November 10, 1945, the one hundred and seventieth anniversary of the founding of the United States Marine Corps, an interesting ceremony for the unveiling of the statue commemorating the raising of the flag on Iwo Jima was held in the city of Washington. The present location on Constitution Avenue is temporary, but efforts are now being made to provide a permanent location for this beautiful memorial.

The statue is the creation of Felix W. de Weldon, who was a member of the naval forces stationed at Patuxent Air Station at the time of the picture. The famous wire photo of Rosenthal's picture of the flag raising on Mount Suribachi reached the United States within 24 hours after the flag was raised, and when Capt. T. B. Clark, executive officer of the naval air station at Patuxent, saw the picture he called it to Mr. De Weldon's attention with this comment: "Here is something for you to do in sculpture. It is the greatest picture of the war."

The brilliant young artist started to work on it immediately and completed a model within another 24 hours. General Vandegrift and Admirals Jacobs and Denfeld viewed the model with enthusiasm. The three survivors of the battle who participated in the flag raising, Pfc Ira H. Hayes, Pfc Rene A. Gagnon, and John H. Bradley, pharmacist's mate second class, sat for their own likenesses. The pilot model was cast and presented to President Truman on June 4, 1945.

It was my privilege during the sculptor's progress on the heroic life-size model of the flag raising to visit him in his studio and to observe his work upon this significant memorial. The three survivors, with three other marines representing those who fell in battle, posed for the sculptor. For the faces of the three who were killed Mr. De Weldon used photographs furnished by the Marine Corps.

The base of the statue is an exact outline of the island of Iwo Jima. The statue is 36 feet high and weighs 20 tons. I am sure the Members will agree that it is an inspiring representation of one of the most important events of the war.

Shortly after the crucial battle of Iwo Jima, I introduced a resolution to change the name of the island to "the Marine's Island," and my action was inspired by the feeling which I know is shared by the membership, that in a certain sense the island had literally become the island of the marines, for they had fought for and secured it at terrific cost. I did not ask for a hearing upon the resolution, however, because it appeared at once that the name Iwo Jima had become deeply embedded in the minds of the people and in their language.

While the proposal to change the island's name was strongly supported at first as a fitting tribute to the marines, it became evident that there were more appropriate means of honoring those who participated in the battle. The organization of a voluntary committee of friends of the United States Marine Corps for the purpose of providing a permanent location for Mr. De Weldon's statue presents such an opportunity to the Nation. I would therefore strongly urge that official recognition be made of these efforts and that encouragement be

given to the raising of funds through voluntary subscription for the acquisition of the statue and its preservation in an attractive location in Washington City.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include the addresses of Gen. Alexander A. Vandegrift and Mr. De Weldon at the unveiling of the statue.

The SPEAKER. Is there any objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The address of General Vandegrift follows:

Mr. Chairman, we in the Marine Corps are proud that the men represented in this statue here to be dedicated are marines. We are proud with the same pride that we take in our entire years of tradition of which this deed has become an immortal part. But we have no illusions. We know that this statue commemorates much in addition to the courage of the marines—much more than the capture of a dominant height on Iwo Jima. We know that its meaning encompasses the whole effort of the people of our Nation.

I believe it to be highly significant that we Americans do not honor the event memorialized here in terms of conquest of territory or the spoils of aggression. To us, it stands as a legacy far more lasting than any material thing taken from the enemy, far more universal than the acquisition of 8 square miles of territory. The five marines and a Navy corpsman who placed the flag atop Suribachi typified the unsurpassed gallantry of all the men of all of the services who caused our total victory. Their courage was from exactly the same cloth as that which smashed the German war machine in Europe and the Japanese in every theater of war in the Pacific. The men who raised the flag symbolized the sacrifice made throughout the ranks of our fighting men. Three of the six died in bitter combat of the next several days. Thousands like them in every theater of war fell in defense of their country, and in the trust that after victory their Nation would dedicate its might to the maintenance of the peace and security to which they dedicated their lives in total.

May this heroic statue serve to remind all who pass that we must keep the faith with the brave and the fallen. A successful Victory Loan will help to complete what those men began. An America strong in heart, in spirit, and in arms is our best assurance of preserving the freedom for which they fought. They have done their full part. The rest is up to us, their countrymen of this generation and other generations to come.

The address of Mr. de Weldon follows:

Mr. Chairman, General Vandergrift, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen:

The publication of the Associated Press photo of the United States marines raising our flag on Iwo Jima gripped the American imagination as no other war picture has done. Twenty-four hours after this picture appeared I had completed the initial sketch of the statue which you see. I was on duty at the Patuxent River Naval Air Station at the time and used my week-end liberty to complete the pilot model of the statue which I later had the honor to present to President Truman.

In this present work it was my privilege to have posing for me the three survivors of the heroic action which this statue symbolizes. Through the cooperation of the Marine Corps, it was possible to obtain pictures of the three men who gave their lives in this bitter fighting. I tried in every way to achieve accuracy and realism in re-creating their epic of American bravery. I have tried to create more than a statue, however—it is my hope that this work will remain at once as a symbol, not only of the bravery of our armed forces but of the relentless determination of our people to defend democracy against those who would deny the fundamental dignity of man.

This flag which we honor and under which we serve is the emblem of our unity, our power, our thought and purpose as a nation. It has no other character than that which we give it from generation to generation. The choices are ours. It floats in majestic silence above the hosts that execute those choices, whether in peace or in war. And yet, though silent, it speaks to us—speaks to us of the past, of the men and women who went before us, and of the records they wrote upon it. It has witnessed a great history, has floated on high—the symbol of great events and a great plan of life worked out by a great people.

The National Debt Gets a Lift

REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, the hearings of the Subcommittee on the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriations, of which I have the honor to be chairman, have produced one notable result.

In the course of the hearings we elicited some testimony on the conscience fund. A conscience-stricken citizen read the testimony and sent me these two $10 bills without a word of explanation as to what was hurting his or her conscience. The conscience fund is a part of the general receipts of the Treasury, and I am sending these two bills to Secretary Vinson to be applied to the national debt.

By a singular coincidence this contribution comes from the State of Pennsylvania, ably represented in part by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], who so often arises and propounds with telling and incisive force the inquiry, "Where are you going to get the money?"

His question is partially answered by his fellow Pennsylvanian. If other Pennsylvanians who may be similarly burdened in mind and other citizens of other States with sensitive consciences, would follow suit the national debt might be whittled down considerably, although the debt has burgeoned forth into such proportions that, optimist as I am, I would hardly venture to predict that it could ever be entirely paid off in that way.

The conscience fund was first established in 1811 when the intake was $250. The American conscience has been working regularly ever since, except in 1848. Either the conduct of our people was perfect in that year or consciences were not in good working order as that was the only year since 1811 when there were no contributions to the fund. The smallest annual intake was $6 in 1827 and 1852. The largest was $118,117.71 in 1945. The $20 I am sending to Secretary Vinson will bring the total conscience contributions up to $910,884.83.

Surplus War Goods

REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, the sale and disposal programs of the Surplus Property Administration and its present successor, the War Assets Corporation, have been and are today a complete and dismal failure so far as the people of the State of Montana are concerned, and I believe this is equally true of surrounding States.

During my recent visit to Montana I listened to complaints on this subject from the Governor of the State and almost all of the veterans, city officials, school officials, labor organizations, ranchers, and businessmen with whom I talked. Since I returned, the complaints have continued to flow in in my correspondence, and I am firmly convinced that they are justified and that the disposal program so far as we are concerned has failed utterly.

In mid-January after many of these protests had been brought to the attention of Surplus Property Administration officials, a disposal depot was established in Helena. We thought that would take care of some of our difficulties, since theretofore it had been necessary for Montanans to travel many hundreds of miles to Utah or Seattle or Denver to view or be present at the sale of surplus goods. Material had been moved from Montana to the coast, and our buyers, when they were fortunate enough to make a purchase, were forced to pay shipping charges back to Montana.

We thought the Montana depot would solve that problem. Instead, I have a telegram from Lieutenant Governor Eaton announcing the creation of a committee to try to secure some surplus goods for Montanans. He asks that we make whatever changes are necessary in the War Assets Corporation system to insure that veterans get the priority to which they are entitled.

I have a letter from a member of that committee, Herbert Kibler, the adjutant of the Montana Department of the American Legion, replying to my request for information concerning the depot at Helena. I read from this letter:

For your information, the only surplus at the depot which will be up for sale shortly is a great deal of oil and greases, some plate steel, enamel, and also about three or four portable electric welders.

Montana needs a lot of things besides greases and three or four electric welders.

As matters now stand—

Mr. Kibler continues—

anyone from Montana who desires to purchase any surplus is required to go to Se-

attle or down to California and take his chances on being able to purchase what he desires. In most instances, on his arrival, he finds that the surplus he might be interested in has all been disposed of, and what might be termed just plain junk is all that is left.

In my last conversation with Governor Ford, of Montana, he told me that the State of Montana had sent a man up and down the west coast to all the disposal centers in the area in an attempt to buy some of the many items which would be useful to, and are urgently needed by, various departments of the State government, including the hospitals and colleges. The State university system itself maintained a purchasing agent at one of the disposal centers. But at that time, and this is still true, so far as I know, the State of Montana has not been able to buy anything because local bidders and buyers of large lots took all available material.

I do not think an individual veteran has much chance of getting what he wants if the State purchasing agent in a tour of several States is unable to buy anything.

I believe that the War Assets Corporation should make it a policy to supply interior States with a fair share of available and useful goods, so that we may benefit from this program. It is apparent at present that coastal States and areas of heavy population are taking the cream of the surplus war goods. Some adjustment must be made in the priority arrangement so that the veteran really will have an opportunity to get some of these materials. An early solution to this problem is required if the people of Montana and other States in a similar position are to get any surplus goods.

Necessity for Further Price Control

REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, over the week end I received a resolution from the Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors which I desire to read into the RECORD.

You will note that the resolution states the county supervisors are convinced that the great majority of the citizens of Milwaukee County want the OPA continued and want it to establish ceiling prices on home and building construction.

Some Members have come into the well of the House and solemnly proclaimed that the people overwhelmingly are opposed to price control and particularly to controls on the price of houses.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the members of a county board are generally pretty close to the people. They know what the people are thinking. I believe that this resolution accurately reflects the mood of the American people respecting price control, and I commend it to those Members who so ardently assure us that the American people want price controls abolished.

Whereas, judging from articles appearing daily in the public press, there seems to be an ever-growing movement, particularly on the part of management and industry, to secure the abandonment of the Federal Office of Price Administration, which agency has during the war been so successful in maintaining price ceilings and preventing the inflation which marked the history of World War I; and

Whereas, in our judgment, continued vigorous enforcement of price ceilings by the Federal Government is the only force that can successfully prevent a postwar runaway inflation period that must ultimately result in great hardship to the working classes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors by these presents record the conviction of the great majority of the citizens of this community that the Federal Office of Price Administration not only be continued but that it increase its vigilance in establishing ceiling prices not only upon the products of industry but upon home and building construction; and be it further

Resolved, That our representatives in Congress be urged to exert every influence to maintain the continued existence of this most essential Federal agency; and be it further

Resolved, That the county clerk be, and is hereby, directed to send a certified copy of this resolution to the Congressmen representing this county and the Senators representing the State of Wisconsin.

OFFICE OF THE COUNTY CLERK,
Milwaukee, Wis., February 28, 1946.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Milwaukee County at an annual meeting of said board held on the 19th day of February 1946.

[SEAL] GEO. F. BREITBACH,
County Clerk.

While the World Goes Hungry

REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, while the world goes hungry and while fresh food crops rot in the fields, a jurisdictional dispute between the A. F. of L. and the CIO Cannery Workers Union in California has effectively tied up 98 food-processing plants in that State.

In a recent decision, the NLRB set aside a disputed election which was held last October for the purpose of selecting an exclusive bargaining agent for the cannery workers. In addition to setting aside the election, the Board stated that "none of the unions is entitled to an exclusive status as the bargaining agent after March 1." I have appealed to the Chairman of the NLRB and to the President to maintain the status quo that existed prior to March 1 until another election is held and an exclusive bargaining agent is selected. This appeal has been rejected.

Now comes a story from California to the effect that the United States Department of Labor Conciliation Service has declined to intervene in the jurisdictional dispute. A statement issued Saturday by the United States Labor Conciliation Commissioners read as follows:

The momentum of the forces involved has become such that the usual mediative procedures are not feasible—at least, until new and imperative factors emerge or are injected into the situation.

Mr. Speaker, immediate action by the President of the United States is imperative. Something must be done to save the farmers' investments and to insure the orderly harvesting and processing of California's fruit and vegetable crops that are so badly needed here in the United States and by the starving countries in Europe. I appeal to the President to invoke his full authority in order to bring peace to this troubled labor front.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following pertinent and timely editorial from the San Francisco Chronicle of March 1:

WHILE THE WORLD GOES HUNGRY

A few weeks back, the National Labor Relations Board penned some words which in the normal course of events are going to have an effect upon the entire world. Because the ramifications of these words are important to the California housewife, the Czechoslovak peasant, the Russian worker, and the French tradesman, they bear quoting.

Discussing last fall's challenged elections among the northern California cannery workers, the Board ruled that the results of the elections should be set aside. But the important words are these:

"While we view the record as requiring this result, we reach it with considerable reluctance, because it means that the employees will have no barganing representative to negotiate an exclusive collective agreement to cover the coming season, until a new election can be held, which may result in one of the rival unions being certified. The current AFL contract will expire on March 1 and, since the legal effect of the foregoing determination is to keep the question of representation pending before the Board, none of the unions is entitled to an exclusive status as the bargaining agent after that date."

BOYCOTT SCHEDULED FOR TODAY

Today is March 1. As of this date, the AFL Teamsters' Union has scheduled a boycott of northern California's canneries, which will close them up tighter than a drum. In the next 4 or 5 months, unless some settlement is reached, one-third of the Nation's annual crop of canned fruits and vegetables—the normal allotment of this prolific region—will rot in the fields. At a time when the United States has shouldered the burden of feeding a good part of the world, as well as its own people, the consternation will not be limited to Americans. Other, hungrier, peoples will turn to us with the same question: "Why?"

It will be the purpose of this editorial to reduce the answer to its simplest terms.

For the past 9 years, the AFL Cannery Workers' Union, an affiliate of the Teamsters' International, has had an exclusive bargaining contract with the canners of northern California. The current contract, of 1 year's duration, expires today.

Last fall the CIO Food, Tobacco, Agricultural and Allied Workers' Union of America, the "FTA," which had undertaken to organize the cannery workers, asked the NLRB to

hold an election to determine whether the majority of workers preferred the AFL or the CIO.

ELECTION RESULT IS VOIDED

On the basis of counted ballots, the CIO won a plurality by some 1,200 votes, but failed to win a majority. The AFL promptly challenged some 1,290 of the ballots, and the Labor Board declared the election null and void, and recommended another election be held at the next period of fullest employment in the industry—next July or August.

But the NLRB did not stop there in its decision. It went on to proclaim, in the words quoted above, that "in accordance with well-established principles" the employers had but two alternatives during the season just ahead—to bargain with all unions on an impartial basis, or to bargain with none.

The AFL, thus seeing its exclusive grip on the industry broken by board ruling without the benefit of a valid election, rebelled. The CIO, on the other hand, quite understandably hailed with joy this opportunity to get its foot in the door without the usual recourse to a formal election.

So the teamsters said in effect: "Extend our 9-year contract until such time as a new election is held, or we won't play."

And the CIO told the employers in effect: "You heard what the NLRB said—now abide by the ruling."

The employers, this time, are by no means alone in their role of innocent bystander caught in the middle. They have with them the farmers, who stand to lose the profits of a year's labor; the American public, which stands to lose a third of its fruit and vegetables for the year, and a few million hungry world citizens, who seem about to learn that the vaunted American food surplus which was to tide them through the next year is in large part a mirage.

DECISION WAS IMPRACTICAL

The neutrals who are charged with unraveling this knot like to dream of going back to the day the NLRB rendered its decision, and conjuring up a ruling which merely voided the election, without any added strings with regard to what the employers could or could not do by way of bargaining. That way, the AFL could have renewed its contract, the CIO could, had it desired, have challenged the legality of it, and the whole thing could have gone into extended litigation. In the middle of the litigation, the regular election could have been held as scheduled next summer, and the result would have rendered the litigation strictly academic anyway. Meanwhile, the produce would have been canned on schedule.

But that's just a pipe dream. What the conciliators have to face now is the problem of which alternative they can persuade the parties to accept—if any.

The teamsters' union could, if it chose, back down from its boycott. This would constitute a piece of labor statesmanship which would gain the union more in public esteem than it stands to lose in leaving the CIO's foot in the door.

CONCILIATORS ARE BAFFLED

The NLRB could, if it chose, modify its decision, even at this date, to leave the way open for litigation to take place while the crop is being canned.

Such action on the part of the Labor Board would involve loss of face, true, but the loss would be rather nominal. Its bureaucratic face is not in very good repair at this point anyway, considering that, through its stubborn administration of book rules, it has jockeyed a vital industry into a cul-de-sac which is currently baffling the best minds of the Conciliation Service. The NLRB muffed a golden opportunity for some bright labor statesmanship of its own when it failed to resist the temptation to write its own interpretation of the Wagner Act into its decision. The face it stands to lose in reversing itself now is trivial as compared with the amount of the same commodity it may relinquish if the pending mass crop rotting becomes a fact.

And, unfortunately, the NLRB's face is not the only factor at stake at this moment. The health of a few million Americans, and the lives of a few million unfortunates elsewhere in the world, demand consideration in this crisis.

The High Price of Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 1, 1946

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith a very well-written article from the March issue of Nation's Business, written by that able and well known Washington correspondent, Lawrence Sullivan:

THE HIGH PRICE OF PRICE CONTROL

(By Lawrence Sullivan)

"Hi diddle, diddle, we're caught in the middle;
The wells of the market run dry—
The ceiling on prices produces a crisis
That leaves us with nothing to buy."

President Truman has referred to 1946 as "a year of decision." The trails we blaze on the reconversion road this year will determine the course of our national economy for perhaps a decade. Does reconversion mark a road toward resumption of competition and free enterprise, or a movement toward a permanent system of managed economy—an American adaptation, perhaps, of Europe's now prostrate systems of national socialism?

The big decision, say many leaders in both Congress and business, will come on price control. The present law expires at midnight June 30. President Truman has urged its extension. Will Congress concur?

Price control is the very essence of managed economy, or economic regimentation. If the Government is to control peacetime prices, it soon will discover—as it did in wartime—that it also must control production specifications, wages, raw materials standards, distribution margins.

"Price control saved America from a disastrous wartime inflation," say the friends of OPA.

"Price control is throttling reconversion, curtailing employment opportunities, demoralizing established business methods and practices," cry the defenders of the American enterprise system.

The debate is on.

Whatever may be said for OPA as a wartime agency, the pressing civilian needs of the reconversion period present a vastly different problem. In wartime, a policy which discouraged civilian production and consumption through inequitable pricing may have been justified in that it tended to divert materials and manpower to war goods. But precisely the opposite is needed in peacetime pricing. The American people today want goods. Any Federal control which stifles or limits production or distribution is subject to challenge.

LOW PRICES, FEW GOODS

Three committees of Congress already have heard segments of the story of the price of price control. The House Banking and Currency Committee took down some 1,300 printed pages of testimony last summer in connection with the extension of the Emergency Stabilization Act; the special Smith Committee Investigating the Executive Agencies has issued two reports on OPA; and the Senate Small Business Committee has documented more than 5,000 specific complaints from the business community on the general theme, How OPA cut my throat.

"The real preventive of inflation is production," the businessmen tell Congress. "Take OPA off our necks and let's get going."

"No," says the newly appointed Economic Stabilizer Bowles, in effect. "Price controls must not be removed until production is adequate."

But OPA tells manufacturers that their postwar prices must be related generally to their 1942 prices—despite the fact that industrial raw materials now are about 28 percent higher, and average straight-time hourly wages are up. Meanwhile, the weighted average of wholesale prices for manufactured products has risen only about 8 percent. This squeeze on operating margins, businessmen contend, has curtailed production, crippled normal distribution in many lines at both the wholesale and retail levels, introduced a new system of merchandizing best described as the "I know a guy" outlet.

Many fear that another year of price control would so disorganize and dislocate the normal pattern of our American economy that prolonged regimentation would appear perhaps irresistible.

Every major nation tried price control in World War II. But in most European countries, wartime price control was but an extension of the peacetime pattern of managed economy. In Germany, Russia, Italy, for instance, the pattern of dictatorship was the peacetime norm. Wartime price controls were merely another step along a familiar path. In America, however, price control was a new and alien thing—tolerated everywhere only as an emergency measure which, by implication at least, would be abandoned at the earliest moment possible.

Price control ran against the grain of America on many counts. Over large areas of business it diverted ingenuity and the skills of management from production to distribution. It introduced an era of trickery and border-line compliance in every avenue of marketing. Price ceilings tended in many lines to drive low-cost merchandise completely from the market; to divert essential allocated materials from staple civilian merchandise to price-free luxury goods; to undermine every natural impulse toward quality merchandise.

SHODDY DEALINGS

Consumer morale was shocked by an ever-spreading system of favoritism, behind-the-hand deals, tips and gratuities for scarce merchandise. The consumer soon lost his vaunted place as monarch of the market and became a pitiable thing, pleading for a chance to buy.

The result was a grevious distortion of the entire economy of the United States evasion, deception, substitution replaced the traditional American business standards of quality, fair dealing, and faithful service.

The American people want to get on the beam once more—the beam of maximum production, full employment, normal distribution, and competitive prices for honest merchandise. To do this, say those who have studied price control at close range since 1941, they must slam the door of history on an experiment which, in peacetime, has neither reason nor experience to recommend it.

Inferior products, through substitutions, dilution, or skimping, have been one notable result of price fixing in the reconversion period. The Smith committee's reports document scores of instances in which high-quality products of the prewar days were driven from the postwar market by ceiling prices lower than postwar production costs—only to be replaced in the course of a few

months by an inferior product officially ceilinged at a higher price.

CHEAP ROBE AT HIGHER PRICE

One long-established firm, the hearings disclose, sold a quality bathrobe recognized in the trade as a superior garment. OPA set the ceiling price at $3. The manufacturer could not make a profit at that price. But a new manufacturer who came in with no prewar cost experience then got a ceiling of $3.25 for his robe, with a poorly finished collar, careless seams, cheap binding, and a sleazy cord. With a higher price for an inferior item, the new producer can supply plenty of robes at a profit, and that is what the trade now gets. Meanwhile, the established and experienced producer of the quality product is ceilinged out of business.

A manufacturer of infants' dresses got a ceiling of $6.50 a dozen—too low to allow a profit. But a newcomer in the field got a ceiling of $10.50 for an inferior product.

In men's shirts, two different producers got ceilings of $3.50 and $3.55 per dozen for standard prewar garments. But a new starter in the field got a ceiling of $7.35 a dozen for a garment "made of white sheeting."

An established toy maker was ceilinged at $1.92 for a sturdy rubber-tired scooter; but a newcomer who used scrap metals exclusively got a ceiling of $3.75.

In women's apparel, the deterioration of quality at higher ticket price has been especially marked. In one case, a manufacturer sold a standard house dress for $1.30 in 1942. On the basis of 1945 costs he petitioned for a price of $2.18 for the same item. This was denied. But a new producer soon got a ceiling of $4.37 for a competing dress, "although better material was used in dresses selling for 79 cents in 1942."

A similar case was cited by Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY, of Nebraska, in a coast-to-coast broadcast. Standing before the microphone in New York, he exhibited to the studio audience two peach-colored slips. The first was designed to sell prewar at $1.95 retail. Now ceilinged below actual production cost, it had been driven from the market.

"So what happened?" the Senator demanded. "Another manufacturer makes a shoddy garment, calls it a new design, and is able to sell it for $3.95—and you can't tell the front from the back. That's the kind of sacks Chester Bowles is hanging on the women of America."

The Senator also exhibited a cotton party dress which he said had been priced at $76—"and it doesn't have 3 pounds of cotton in it."

QUALITY GETS POORER

A returned Army officer told the Senate Small Business Committee a similar story. He owns a chain of 15 variety stores in Georgia and Florida. Released from the service, he went to New York to buy baby dresses. But the company he sought had gone out of business. He placed an order with a new firm. A month later he got samples of the new product. The cloth was "not even suited for baby dresses, and the workmanship was the poorest." Yet the prices were much higher.

Like exhibits were presented in behalf of manufacturers, wholesalers and retailers in kitchen equipment, furniture, toys, handbags, shoes, and many other items. One long-established producer of shoe bags got a ceiling of $7.20 a dozen. As soon as his carry-over inventories of materials were exhausted he stopped production. But a new producer then got a ceiling of $13.50 a dozen.

Summarizing testimony covering hundreds of these cases, the National Retail Dry Goods Association said:

"Too often reliable manufacturers are not allowed reasonable ceilings for their honest merchandise, but newcomers can sell inferior goods for twice as much—with OPA's blessing. That is why the American housewife cannot find good, moderate-priced dresses in the market."

All these dislocations in civilian production and distribution in the past 6 months have, in the words of the October 22 report of the Smith committee:

"* * * retarded reconversion, prevented production, especially in low-priced commodities, restricted opportunity for full employment, and, at least in some instances, actually caused prices of cost-of-living commodities to rise."

BETTER SUPPLIES ANTICIPATED

It was natural for consumers to anticipate last August that the end of the war would bring a gradual and sustained improvement in retail supply straight across the board. No one expected normal supplies in 60 or 90 days; but everyone had a right to, and did, anticipate that the trend of improvement would be observed in practically every line by the year end. That expectation has been disappointed sadly. In many lines, particularly in textiles, wholesale and retail inventories are smaller today than at any time during the war.

Speaking for the National Association of Retail Clothiers, W. O. Swanson, of Omaha, told the Senate Small Business Committee:

"In my store today I have 5 percent of the suits that I normally have at this time of year. Overcoats are only slightly better. Our stock of heavy underwear—none. We get enough overalls to sell them for about 2 hours each month. Work gloves are almost extinct. Regular underwear is sold as soon as it comes in, so there is no inventory. Our situation is typical of men's stores, both large and small. In spite of promised relief, the situation is growing steadily worse."

INVENTORIES ARE EXTRA LOW

Mr. Swanson presented statistics covering a survey of 174 men's stores in Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, and Wisconsin. In June 1945 their stocks of suits were 28 percent below a year earlier, but by December suits on hand were 70 percent below a year ago. The June survey showed shirts 84 percent below a year ago, pajamas 87 percent below, underwear 63 percent below.

A survey of 77 men's stores showed that more than 50 percent of the customers were returning servicemen—and nearly 45 percent are walking into the stores and out again, unable to buy what they need.

Asked how OPA's maximum average price policy had affected retail supplies of clothing, Mr. Swanson said he believed it had diverted many textiles from staple to luxury items.

He estimated that, in 1946, about 7,000,000 men will be discharged from the services. They will require at least two suits each. On top of that 10,000,000 garments must be available for essential civilian demand. Right now the manufacturing industry is producing on the basis of less than 10,000,000 garments a year, and last year only 14,000,000 garments were produced.

"It has been almost a year since OPA announced its low-cost clothing program, which came out with a fanfare that it would cause a large volume of low- and medium-price merchandise to be in the men's stores."

OPA's cost-absorption principle, which requires wholesalers and retailers to absorb a large portion of price increases granted to manufacturers, already is limiting reemployment in the retail trade, the Senate hearings disclose.

RETAILERS ABSORB THE COST

In a detailed field study of the cost-absorption policy, the American Retail Federation listed 127 different price increases approved by OPA at the manufacturing level. But in 96 cases the retailer was required to absorb the entire price increase. This policy has pinched retail margins, until the incentive to a wider distribution of goods, in some lines, has been stifled.

The hold-the-line policy, as applied, attempted to hold the retail level at 1942, while permitting basic production costs to inch upward, through wage increases approved by the War Labor Board, and higher raw material costs generated by the price-support and Government-loan programs for agricultural products. As a general rule, OPA has required wholesalers and retailers to absorb most of all of these approved cost increases out of normal operating margins.

Cotton sheeting well illustrates the problem, which touches every major line found in the department stores, hardware stores, or general variety stores. In September 1941, before price control, the average retail markup on a standard bed sheet was roughly 30 percent. OPA advanced the retail ceiling on this item from $1.19 to $1.29, but in so doing advanced the manufacturer's ceiling from 83 cents to $1.23. As a result, the retailer's gross margin was squeezed from about 36 cents per sheet to 6 cents.

This theory of cost absorption, applied straight across the board, now clogs distribution in many lines. The fact that more than 250,000 retail establishments closed during the war is conclusive evidence, says the American Retail Federation, that the cost-absorption theory has held the line mainly by a process of slow death to normal distribution.

REASONABLE PRICES, MORE GOODS

All the evidence at hand appears to support the conclusion of the organized retailers that "where sound pricing requires upward revision, such adjustment is more economic and socially desirable than damming up recovery through inadequate distribution. * * * To stimulate employment, both in production and distribution, the price structure must be released from the rigid mold into which our wartime policy has frozen it."

Men's shirts virtually have disappeared from the shops in many cities. During the war, production allocations were calculated on the basis of 12,000,000 men in the military services. Half of these men now have been demobilized, but the Government's low-cost production schedules still are geared to the original civilian demand levels of 1943–44.

These basic production allocations in textiles are a joint operation of OPA and the Civilian Production Administration (formerly WPB), but the price ceilings and distribution margins fixed under wartime conditions still control every major segment of the cotton industry.

Instead of stimulating all-out production at profitable prices, this production price structure, by squeezing mill margins, actually puts a premium on restricted production. In many cases mill operators find from cost analysis that the less they produce the nearer they may hope to come to breaking even on the month.

But, although standard garments in shirting are rigidly ceilinged, novelty numbers move on easier margins, either because of new prices fixed on the basis of wartime costs or failure of the price regulations to extend to the so-called luxury items. As a result, all manner of sport shirts, work jackets, and trick blouses are available at $6 to $15 per garment.

BUTTER FAMINE CAUSED BY PRICES

Price dislocation alone has created a Nation-wide butter shortage during the past 3 months. When the butter subsidy of 5 cents a pound (paid to the creamery) was abandoned last fall, the ceiling price was advanced by approximately the same amount. The plan was to let the consumer pay the full cost of the butter. But at the same time, the ceiling was removed from all types of cream normally used in butter production. Result? The cream moved in a free market—to ice cream, whipping cream, fancy cheeses, candy, egg-nog mixes, cakes, pies, and a vastly expanded table use in millions of homes.

As cream prices swept upward in the free market, they soon passed the equivalent of the rigid butter ceiling. Thereafter virtually no cream was available for butter making. Butter simply disappeared from the market.

By early January 1946, the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation expressed the fear that the creameries might be closed down because many people were buying butter in the form of cream at a price that equaled $1.25 to $1.50 a pound in terms of butter. A stampede demand developed for one-family kitchen churns.

The dairy industry took its case to Congress, with a vigorous demand that the butter ceiling be adjusted to alinement with the going price of cream. At that point Secretary of Agriculture Anderson estimated that the butter ceiling probably would need to be set ultimately near 75 or 80 cents a pound. If the butter drought continues 2 months longer, the final price necessary to bring butter back into normal distribution channels may reach $1 a pound. Why? Because the longer price control dislocates supply with faulty pricing, the greater will be the national shortage, and the higher, consequently, the new price level.

This whole operation has been repeated in other products—in meats, cotton textiles, flour, to name a few. In each case, OPA ceilinged the consumer product at wholesale and retail, but left the basic raw material in a practically free market, anchored only to a floating parity which moved steadily upward. In every product the point was reached ultimately at which the processor could not pay the Government support-price for the raw material and yet prepare it for market at a profit under the established OPA ceiling.

As the recent experience in butter demonstrates so forcefully, the pay-off comes when the subsidy is abandoned—as all will be by June 30, 1946. Then we shall see, in dollars and cents, how much the cost of living was stabilized and to what extent it was merely subsidized by the United States Treasury, in the alluring name of parity.

WOOL GROWERS LOSE MONEY

Costs are costs, and if production is to be maintained these new costs must be met in selling prices.

Congressman FRANK A. BARRETT, of Wyoming, our second ranking wool-producing State, charges that OPA has been responsible for "a drastic reduction in domestic wool production during each year of the war," despite the fact that our consumption almost doubled. He cited a report from the United States Tariff Commission in January 1945 estimating that, under OPA ceilings, domestic wool growers lost 10.8 cents a pound on their 1944 clip. The wool ceiling was fixed in 1941. Production costs have skyrocketed, but OPA refused a ceiling adjustment.

"The wool industry is well on the way to becoming one of the casualties of the war," Congressman BARRETT told the Smith committee. "Slowly but surely we have been forced to cut down our herds."

To stretch civilian wool allocations, a combination of OPA price orders and WPB production specifications, forced the manufacturer early in the war of some 700,000 yards of adulterated fabrics.

"Adulteration of wool textiles reached a new high in this country," Barrett told the committee. "But the buying public wouldn't take it. The goods remained on the shelves of the garment makers and the mills from 1942 until the end of 1944. Then UNRRA bought it for export."

Another case cited before the Senate Small Business Committee revolved around paint brushes. A New Jersey manufacturer had been fully occupied producing brushes on war priorities. In February 1944 he asked for a price increase to apply on civilian items, which he anticipated would be resumed by midyear. On August 7, 1944, he finally got a price. It took due account of the increased cost of bristles but made no allowances for higher costs on machine-turned handles. The new price was so unsatisfactory that the entire line was discontinued. As this line represented about 51 percent of the firm's peacetime business, its discontinuance has been a considerable factor in limiting postwar jobs in that area.

FAVOR OPA ELIMINATION

Six weeks after publication of the most recent report from the Smith committee on OPA, Congress still was being bombarded with telegrams from merchants in all parts of the country. Typical was the message from A. L. Killian, of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, as read to the Senate on December 10, 1945:

"We urgently recommend you investigate possibility of eliminating OPA in all phases except sugar, fats, and rent control. We have a strong feeling this would eliminate much shoddy merchandise made by fly-by-night manufacturers at ridiculously high prices approved by OPA. We are getting dribble shipments from old established firms while getting many offers by new firms we never heard of, with prices approximately double reputable firms.

"If legitimate manufacturers are turned loose to produce, competition will soon level prices off and quality will improve rapidly. Retailers and the public will revolt at excessive prices. Reputable stores and manufacturers will not cut their own throats for short-term profits.

"Unless we get immediate action of some kind to encourage production of dependable merchandise, scarcity of goods will become so acute that the situation will not be manageable."

Appeals of this general tenor reach Congress by the hundreds every day. They come chiefly from owners and managers of small businesses—those who simply can't stand the overhead imposed by OPA in compliance forms, inventory reports, and daily applications for merchandise quotas and allocations.

As a gesture of appeasement, OPA announces every month a list of commodities removed from wartime price control. The December list included such urgent civilian needs as domestically grown bamboo poles, advertising streamers made of coated fabrics, manhole covers, pneumatic life rafts, horse-race sulkies, racing motorcycles, and wooden cooperage dowels.

Such lists have been coming along periodically since August. They are the basis of OPA's claim that "wartime controls are being relaxed as fast as the supply situation will permit."

True, several thousand items have been removed from control; but in relative business volume all the freed items combined probably would not made a good trainload of business daily in the entire Nation.

Meanwhile, the techniques of permanent price control are being ever more deeply anchored—and perfected—in every basic line of production and distribution.

Maybe it can happen here.

PEACETIME BUSINESS NEEDED

In the final analysis, the Smith committee is concerned not a whit with the debate over the value of OPA as a wartime measure. Its interest is now centered on the problem of getting America back in stride for maximum production, full employment and normal distribution of goods. Its survey of reconversion price policies, as applied in scores of industries to thousands of items, led the committee to conclude:

"It is manifest that the effect of a continuation of too rigid price and administrative policies can prove seriously detrimental, not only to reconversion itself, but to the economy of the Nation and the utility of its currency."

That, in a word, means that OPA, instead of ameliorating the situation, is accused of actually generating the forces of inflation.

Winston Churchill on Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, when Winston Churchill, the great British statesman, soldier, and scholar, speaks at Fulton, Mo., on world affairs tomorrow, I hope that he tells the world what he really thinks about Russia's world-wide policy since the end of the war. There is no one in my opinion who understands it so well when he described the Russian Government in 1931 and again in 1937 said:

But communism is not only a creed. It is a plan of campaign.

A Communist is not only the holder of certain opinions; he is the pledged adept of a well-thought-out means of endorsing them. The anatomy of a discontent and revolution has been studied in every phase and aspect, and a veritable drill book prepared in a scientific spirit for subverting all existing institutions. The method of enforcement is as much a part of the Communist faith as the doctrine itself. At first the time-honored principles of liberalism and democracy are involved to shelter the infant organism. Free speech, the right of public meeting, every form of lawful political agitation and constitutional right are paraded and asserted. Alliance is sought with every popular movement toward the left.

The creation of a mild liberal or socialist regime in some period of convulsion is the first milestone. But no sooner has this been created than it is to be overthrown. Woes and scarcity resulting from confusion must be exploited. Collisions, if possible attended with bloodshed, are to be arranged between the agents of the new government and the working people. Martyrs are to be manufactured. An apologetic attitude in the rulers should be turned to profit. Pacific propaganda may be made the mask of hatreds never before manifested among men. No faith need be, indeed may be, kept with non-Communists. Every act of good will, of tolerance, of conciliation, of mercy, of magnanimity on the part of governments or statesmen is to be utilized for their ruin. Then when the time is ripe and the moment opportune, every form of lethal violence from mob revolt to private assassination must be used without stint or compunction. The citadel will be stormed under the banners of liberty and democracy; and once the apparatus of power is in the hands of the brotherhood, all opposition, all contrary opinions must be extinguished by death. Democracy is but a tool to be used and afterward broken; liberty but a sentimental folly unworthy of the logician. The absolute rule of a self-chosen priesthood according to the dogmas it has learned by rote is to be imposed upon mankind without mitigation progressively forever. All this, set out in prosy textbooks, written also in blood in the history of several powerful nations, is the Communist's faith and purpose. To be forewarned should be to be forearmed!

Congress Still Listens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LEMKE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, am glad to include in my extension of remarks a recent editorial in the Williston Herald, published at Williston, N. Dak. The article shows that when constituents of Members of Congress appear before congressional committees they generally take home with them the impressions they receive and the action Congress takes in protecting their local interests.

Why should not all Members of Congress be interested in each and every locality in our Nation? We are 48 States but one Nation, and every part of every State is the concern of the Nation. I am glad that the citizens of Williston have formed so favorable an impression of the Congress of the United States.

I am especially glad because there are certain groups with foreign ideologies that have been busy trying to destroy the confidence that our people have in their Congress. I think that disease has about run its course, and the people are again beginning to realize that their protections from overzealous bureaus is in the Congress. Here follows the editorial which speaks for itself:

News coming out of Washington yesterday announcing that the Appropriations Committee in the House had for the second time attached a rider to the Garrison Dam appropriations which, in effect, limited pool operation of the reservoir to 1,830 feet, was most heartening to people of the Williston area.

Local backers of the pool limitation provision had even greater cause for jubilance over this announcement than when the House voted its initial restriction action in December.

It was then that some members of the State water commission charged Williston with deceit and treachery, indicating that a delegation had gone to Washington from here under cover of secrecy and secured support of their proposed action from North Dakota Congressmen, and slipped through the Lemke limitation amendment in some sort of an underhanded method. This in spite of the fact that Gov. Fred Aandahl and other members of the commission had been told by different Williston representatives, both privately and at a hearing in the State capitol, that they would carry their fight to Congress.

Particularly significant was recognition of the views of the Bureau of Reclamation, which from the beginning, was entirely sympathetic in support of the 1,830 pool level.

Heartening, too, was the possibility that the big Buford-Trenton irrigation project might finally be carried through to completion, and that the Williston project also constructed, together with a part of the Nesson unit south of Ray.

In western North Dakota is where irrigation is needed most; where the rainfall is most meager; and where farmers have manifested a desire to see it developed. Because of these factors, it has always seemed the height of folly to even gamble with a chance of destroying either projects already constructed and in operation or those already surveyed and approved for construction, as the 1,850-foot level most assuredly would do.

But above all else the news was heartening because it enlarges faith in our constitutional form of government.

If its cause is just, and it does not seek to deprive any other community or section of the State of its legally constituted rights, a community, though it be comparatively small and stand alone, failing to receive recognition by its own State authorities, can appeal to Congress and its voice will be heard.

There was a time when Williston stood alone in the controversy that has now become a topic of State-wide discussion.

But this was not for long. When it was learned that our people were in no manner registering opposition to a high dam, and only sought, for the security of our people, deferment in fixing the final pool level of Garrison Reservoir until experience was had in its operation, and asked that the ultimate determination of that level be left with the Congress of the United States, other communities over the State, recognizing the reasonableness of our contention, began rallying to our support.

Then when Congressmen LEMKE and ROBERTSON, who had stood solidly with us despite a bombardment of protests which the opposition had hurled at them in Washington, saw Minot and other larger communities and organizations enter the fight with us, they too continued to stand against all opposition, headed by the Governor, the "brass hats," and other dignitaries of the State. The fact that the committee has for the second time carried through with these two Congressmen indicates a feeling of confidence on the part of their colleagues which cannot help but add to their stature as real statesmen.

Heartening, too, is the fact that, in face of all the confident opposition and the big array of witnesses during this secend hearing, one of the largest and most important committee groups in Congress clung to its principle of giving ear to the "little fellow," and seeking to protect the rights of the common man.

Whatever may be the benefits to come from Garrison Dam, and to whatever remote portion of the State those benefits may reach. Williston wants to see every person, every community, get its fullest measure. We believe this can be accomplished without the necessity of surrendering benefits which our own people have already earned by sacrificial toil through the years.

And while political repercussions of one sort or another have been threatened from the present controversy, there should be a common ground somewhere, when tempers are cooled and conclusions based on tolerant thinking, where those who sincerely have the best interests of all the State at heart could meet, so that every section of the State could maintain its own individual era of progress and in turn contribute more bountifully to building a truly greater North Dakota.

Veterans' Housing Survey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, today I received from James S. DeLaurier, publisher of the Hammond (Ind.) Times, the result of a survey pertaining to veterans' housing conducted by that newspaper. These statistics have been carefully compiled through information-seeking coupons published in his daily newspaper, and cooperation was received from the chamber of commerce, real-estate boards, labor leaders, and Purdue University. In this great industrial area of the Calumet region, the following facts were revealed concerning the housing crisis as it affects the returning veteran and industrial workers generally:

First. Seventy percent of the questionnaires were answered by veterans of World War II.

Second. The survey estimates that the Calumet region will need approximately 15,000 homes in the next 2 years.

Third. Forty-seven percent are now renting, while 53 percent are housed with friends or relatives.

Fourth. Seventy-six percent of the veterans answering planned to build homes costing between four and seven thousand dollars, while 24 percent desire to rent.

Fifth. Thirty-eight percent of the veterans disclose they had from three hundred to eight hundred dollars as down payments and 62 percent disclose they had between one thousand and three thousand dollars for down payment.

Sixth. Sixty-eight percent could pay rentals between thirty and forty dollars per month and 32 percent from forty to fifty dollars per month.

Mr. DeLaurier stated that upon checking with the United States Employment Service offices, he found that during February far more veterans returned to the Calumet region than during January. Owing to the fact that the above survey was conducted during January, it is natural to presume that the housing situation will become more critical as the months pass.

On account of the outstanding railroad and water transportation facilities in this Indiana Calumet area, numerous industries will also move into this region which will further congest the housing situation.

The above information is extremely valuable to builders, contractors, and material men, especially in congested industrial areas so they may realize that the great demand during this emergency is for low-priced homes. The building industry will need the aid, assistance, and cooperation of our Government in solving this necessary reconversion problem.

Intervention in Internal Affairs of Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter

sent by me today to the Secretary of State:

MARCH 4, 1946.

Hon. JAMES F. BYRNES,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Along with a great majority of my constituents, I wish to protest the State Department's policy of intervention in the internal affairs of Spain, as I believe it endangers world peace and is contrary to a long-established policy of this Nation. In my opinion, it is definitely in the interests of Russia rather than of the United States and is further Russian appeasement secretly agreed upon at Potsdam.

Would we as a nation tolerate any other power telling us that we were Fascists because the citizens of our Capital City are not allowed to vote, or that a number of our States have poll taxes which prevent Negroes and poor whites from voting, or would we tolerate any nation telling us what person we should elect as President? Of course, we would not; yet that is precisely the policy we are pursuing in both Argentina and Spain. I am firmly convinced that if Colonel Peron is elected in Argentina he can thank Mr. Spruille Braden of our State Department.

Franco is a military dictator and I certainly would not want to see him the head of our Nation. Military dictators, however, have existed in Spain and South America time and time again. He disclaims being a Fascist. The Falangists or Spanish Fascists have always been a small minority in Spain, despite all propaganda to the contrary.

These statements will, I am sure, be corroborated by our wartime Ambassador to Spain, Dr. Carlton J. H. Hayes, and our recent Ambassador, Mr. Armour.

How can we justify recognizing the Balkan nations and Poland and Yugoslavia where communistic stooges of Stalin are in control, and not recognize Spain where the Falangists are in a minority among the people and are a minority in Franco's cabinet. Is communism something different from fascism from the American point of view? If so, I would like to know what the fundamental differences are.

The facts are with respect to Spain that besides lip service, the Spanish Government gave very little to Hitler during the war. It sold raw materials to both sides, which it had a right to do, and finally, at the request of our Ambassador, cut off all supplies to Germany. The sole contribution in the way of troops was one token division and one air squadron which was sent to fight the Russians who lent aid to Franco's enemies during the civil war. The division was subsequently recalled at the request of our Ambassador Carlton Hayes.

Contrast Russia's behavior with that of Spain's during the same period. Stalin not only collaborated with Hitler in starting the war but with large armies invaded and seized half of Poland and a large section of Finland and the Baltic countries. In addition Stalin supplied Hitler's armies with raw materials and goods and cut off supplies to the Allies until the "wolf turned on the jackal" in July 1941.

If Russia's behavior is to be excused on the ground of expediency, so should Spain's which was far less able to cope with Hitler's threat of invasion than the Reds were.

The dominant group in the United front which Franco overthrew consisted chiefly of self-proclaimed Anarchists, Communists, Syndicalists and Socialists who during the Spanish civil war on a large scale destroyed churches, shot down and butchered unarmed priests and nuns by the thousands. That is the group that Stalin and his cohorts all over the world want to see restored to power in Spain. No one is so naive now as to believe that Stalin has any interest in promoting democracy in Spain.

It is my conviction that wittingly or unwittingly our policy of cooperating with Communist-Socialist dominated France, we are playing Stalin's game. If a monarchistic or truly democratic regime were established in Spain the Russia Communists and their agents all over the world would not be satisfied, and would continue their attacks on the new Spanish Government with the same intensity that they are now attacking the present regime.

When the Spanish picture is analyzed in cold light of realism, the only true reason that the communistic and left-wing elements are opposed to Franco is not because of his lack of love for democracy but because he defeated their plot to communize Spain when they thought that unfortunate country was in their grasp. As Winston Churchill, when he described communism and its methods in 1937, said:

"Is it not an exact account of the communistic plot which has plunged Spain into the present hideous welter against the desires of the overwhelming majority of Spaniards on both sides?"

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM B. BARRY,
Member of Congress.

Income-Tax Credit for Charity Practice of Physicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 4, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Current Comment for February 9, 1946:

INCOME-TAX CREDIT FOR CHARITY PRACTICE OF PHYSICIANS

The value of the services rendered annually by physicians of this country in the treatment of the indigent sick for which they receive no compensation has been estimated as in excess of $300,000,000. Recognition of this tremendous contribution made by physicians for the public good is reflected in a bill, H. R. 5296, introduced in the Congress January 30 by Representative CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, of Connecticut. The measure provides that physicians, surgeons, and dentists, commencing with the taxable year 1946, shall be allowed an additional credit as a deduction on their income tax equal in terms of percentages to that portion of their time each year which is devoted to charity, free clinic work, and public research work. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue will prescribe by regulation, it is contemplated, the method of computing such time and the proof which shall be required in substantiation.

At the time the bill was introduced Representative LUCE had inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement embodying the justification for her sponsorship of this legislation. In connection with the many proposals being made for various kinds of governmental control of medicine, she said:

"None of these proposals is a logical development of the American system of recognizing, promoting, and rewarding individual choice and achievement. In our earlier history pioneer medicos were rewarded for their frequently ill-paid devotion by a very special place in the community, high respect from their fellow citizens and patients, and payment in lovingly prepared delicacies where cash was scarce. Those times have largely vanished. To become a doctor, a surgeon, a dentist now requires some 8 or 9 years of unremunerative and expensive schooling. Until he has completed all this, usually by the time he is 29 or 30, the doctor cannot even begin to earn his own bread and salt, much less begin to repay himself for the costs of learning his profession."

After referring to the fact that all reputable physicians give a considerable portion of their time to the treatment of patients who are unable to pay for the services in any way except by gratitude, the statement continues:

"Surveys as to the amount of these unpaid services indicate that the percentages range from around 30 to 45 of all treatments given. This is a direct contribution on the part of the physician, surgeon, or dentist to the public welfare. In addition are the hours spent without pay in public research work, on hospitals' boards, and on boards of charitable organizations. All this must be chalked up to professional devotion, since it results in no return and often requires the practitioner to lengthen his working day to 15 or 16 hours or more in times of epidemic. There are no limits possible on a doctor's working day."

Because of the facts so well set forth in her statement, Representative LUCE believes that the recognition contemplated by her bill is fully justified. This measure is pending before the House Committee on Ways and Means, where, it may be assumed, it will be given consideration by the committee in connection with its program to revise the income-tax law.

The Time Has Come for Plain Talk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT RAINS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Anniston (Ala.) Star of February 24. This is a timely and thought-provoking editorial on a subject of paramount concern:

THE TIME HAS COME FOR US TO TELL RUSSIA TO STOP THROWING HER BULKY WEIGHT AROUND

It may seem impertinent for a newspaper as small as the Anniston Star, published in a city as small as Anniston, Ala., to keep raising its voice with respect to the foreign relations of our Government. But we cannot forget the observation of an eastern sage who once said that "he who will not take heed of things far away will soon find trouble near at hand." And it is in appreciation of the eternal verities of that truism that we feel impelled every now and then to try to bring home to the consciousness of our readers the fact that unless we first settle our affairs in the world at large we cannot enjoy the blessings of peace and prosperity in our domestic economy.

We often have stated in recent years that our world has shrunk from the relative size of a grapefruit to that of an English walnut. And since this is true, we must realize that what we used to refer to as foreign news has now become local news in every city, town, and hamlet in the United States. Indeed, we have twice seen in our own time how a bomb thrown at an Austrian grand duke in the little Bosnian city of Sarajevo, how an Ital-

ian invasion of Ethiopia, a Spanish civil war, a German invasion of the Rhineland, Japanese invasion of Manchuria, and a pitched battle between Japs and Chinese at the Marco Polo bridge near Peking eventually changed the way of life of every individual American.

It should be patent to any thinking person, therefore, that we cannot fail, with impunity, to take heed of things far away. And it is pleasing to note that the brilliant young Congressman from our neighbor city of Gadsden, ALBERT RAINS, who has but recently returned from a tour of observation in Europe, agrees with our point of view. For in an interview with the Washington correspondent of the Birmingham News last Sunday he said:

"We can no longer feel as voters, as American citizens, in the light of our responsibility for world peace, that our main concern is with local affairs or event national domestic affairs, and that foreign affairs are the concern of the President, the State Department, and a few commentators.

"We may be proud that we are an idealistic Nation, a Nation which hates injustice and tyranny, but we must also guard against our greatest national weakness—the tendency to proclaim our ideals and then let other people carry them out.

"Because of our position of leadership, the economy of the world is of the utmost concern to this Nation. Wars are born of depressions. Hungry people are dangerous."

This is eternally true. And hence it becomes the duty of this richest Nation on the face of the earth to give unstinted support to UNRRA and to supplement the work of that great humanitarian agency by sending food and clothing to the starving peoples of the world through the medium of our manifold charitable organizations. It is not right, however, to send more to Italy, an enemy nation, than we send to China, a country which suffered through 14 long years in a war that was of vital concern to us.

Nor can we salve our consciences by merely sending food to the peoples of dispossessed nations. We have got to cease being a Nation of mere headline readers—a people who "cheer the victory parades and evade all responsibility toward the principles for which the war was fought." We have got to become a more studious, a better informed, a more alert people, to the end that we may never again have to waste our substance and sacrifice the lives of our best young men in the fighting of a defensive war for which we were not prepared. Indeed, until the world becomes civilized enough to settle its differences by means of legal process, we must remain able to implement our words with force against an aggressor nation anywhere in the world.

We would not now stigmatize Russia, our recent ally, as an aggressor. We sympathize with her desire for security; we fully understand the terrible price she has had to pay in order to maintain her territorial integrity and her way of life. But today she is throwing her bulky weight around in such a way as to impinge on the security of other friendly peoples, including the United States of America. She says she is being "encircled" by the so-called capitalist countries of the world, but unless we in turn become encircled it is high time that we call on her to halt before it is too late for us to do anything about it.

This paper does not believe that it is in the interest of world peace or of world trade that we should attempt to keep Russia permanently landlocked. Under international agreement she should have access to warm water. But when she not only attempts to dominate the Balkan States, but western Europe, the Scandinavian States, the Middle East, Turkey, and the Dardanelles, Greece and the Dodecanese, which would mean the destruction of Britain's lifeline to the Far East in the Mediterranean, it is enough to give pause to every thinking American.

Heretofore, the British Fleet has been a wall of protection for us in the North Atlantic, but such encirclement as Russia seems to envisage would reduce Britain to a second- or third-rate power, and we must decide now whether we want to trade off Britain and France for Russia. We have got to decide, too, if we are to be deprived of access to middle eastern oil by Russia's "peaceful" penetration and whether we are to be driven from the high seas by the superfleet that Stalin says he plans to build in the next 5 or 10 years.

It may even now be too late to recoup our loss in world prestige; for while Russia has been playing for world stakes, we here at home have been engaged in the precipitate demobilization of our armed forces and in a class war among ourselves, while the Congress has been wasting the people's time and money over more or less futile investigations, plus a filibuster that ought never to have been provoked. And business as usual seems to be our objective in spite of the fact that the war is not officially over.

Walter Lippmann makes the pertinent suggestion that we send our Pacific Fleet into the Atlantic for a visit to strategic places to let the world know that while we have all but destroyed our Army, our Navy is still a potent force. But right at the moment Russia is needling us as well as Britain in the Far East, and that is the part of the world where we have moral commitments going back as far as the time of John Hay.

And in spite of Russian propaganda, we should not retire from China until we know definitely just where Russia proposes to stop in her own program of expansion. Maybe our new military Ambassador to the Kremlin, Lt. Gen. Bedell Smith, can get the answer. At least, it is hoped that he will not pull any punches by way of letting Stalin know that we did not send him lend-lease for the purpose of giving him title in fee simple to all of the big round world.

Organization of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of March 4, 1946:

BRING CONGRESS UP TO DATE

The La Follette-Monroney committee, created last year to study the organization and operation of Congress and to recommend improvements, came out today with an admirable report.

The American people have been increasingly concerned over the evident inability of Congress to play, with maximum effectiveness, its proper role in our form of government. Their concern was reflected in a flood of suggestions to the committee. To all, the committee applied this simple test: "Will they strengthen Congress and enable it to do a better job?"

Congress will gain strength and ability to do an immensely better job if it adopts the La Follette-Monroney proposals. Here are some of the changes that would be made:

The unwieldy committees, with their overlappings and conflicts, would be greatly simplified. The Senate would have only 16 standing committees instead of 33; the House only 18 instead of 48. Each committee's jurisdiction would be clearly defined. Each would have a small, well-qualified staff of research experts, and no longer would have to depend on inevitably biased departments and bureaus of the executive branch for fact-and-figure information.

The Legislative Reference Service would be enlarged and strengthened to give skilled research assistance to individual Congressmen.

Each Senator and Representative would have an able, well-paid administrative assistant to look after the errand running and other nonlegislative work that now absorbs a huge part of the average Member's energy and time.

Congress could no longer approve appropriations without regard for Federal income. It would be required to keep the total of appropriations within anticipated revenue or, by record vote, to express itself in favor of increasing the public debt.

Congressional time would be used more effectively. A heavy burden of petty, detail work would be lifted, for instance, by giving the District of Columbia self-rule instead of requiring Congress to serve as Washington's city council.

Organized groups exerting pressure on Congress would be required to register themselves and their agents and to report lobbying expenditures.

The $10,000 salaries of Senators and Representatives would be raised to $15,000 a year.

Most Members of Congress will be enthusiastic about the proposals for higher pay, pensions, and more help for themselves. But there will be bitter opposition to other suggestions, especially those for reforming the committee systems and reducing their size. That would mean reducing the number of committee chairmen, and Senators and Representatives who have risen to these positions of power by long service do not, naturally, want to give them up. But the La Follette-Monroney report states a compelling reason:

"No adequate improvement in the organization of Congress can be undertaken or effected unless Congress first reorganizes its present obsolete and overlapping committee structure. This is the first and most important test of whether Congress is willing to strengthen itself and its organization to carry the tremendous work load that present-day governmental problems place upon it."

Production Subsidies in the Housing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Baltimore Sun of March 3, 1946:

PRODUCTION SUBSIDIES IN THE HOUSING PROGRAM

President Truman has now hit squarely at one of the sticking points in the House debate on the Patman housing bill and the general emergency-housing program. It is that $600,000,000 worth of what the euphemistic Mr. Wilson W. Wyatt calls premiums, alias subsidies. These subsidies

would be paid to manufacturers of housing materials, including prefabricated elements, to get out the production. Critics of the subsidy plan say, with considerable justification, that subsidies are a form of economic opiate and, in principle, bad.

But there are some impressive things to be said on the other side of the debate at just this moment in history. Mr. Truman has just said some of them in his special letter to the Speaker of the House. They are being said at greater length and in impressive detail by Representative MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, in the House debate. The considerations raised by the Messrs. Truman and MONRONEY have already swung the National Association of Home Builders from vehement opposition to unqualified acceptance of the Wyatt subsidy program. For the home builders' association knows most poignantly what everybody else is aware of—that lack of materials is one of the big obstacles in the way to an all-out housing construction drive. Everybody agrees, too, that price ceilings help account for this production lack. Well, then, are we likely to get away from price ceilings? Probably not for some time. If we are not going to get away from price ceilings, something else must be done.

The only other thing that can be done, say the backers of the Wyatt plan, is to pay subsidies to manufacturers who can prove that their profit margins require this kind of help. Right here Mr. MONRONEY has some especially pertinent comment. For these are not the kind of subsidies which have been offered in the food line, says Mr. MONRONEY. These subsidies are more nearly comparable to the subsidies paid during the war to high-cost producers of certain needed metals, like copper.

The argument for this kind of producers' subsidies is rather different from the argument for the consumer's subsidies. The latter, frankly, are a way by which the Government can keep food prices down and so buy off pressure for higher wages and salaries. But the producers' subsidies are paid to high-cost marginal producers who might not be able to produce at all without them. As Mr. MONRONEY puts the issue, it is a question of paying subsidies to high-cost marginal producers, in order to get an additional volume of production; or rejecting subsidies, and just not getting the needed production. To boost ceilings to the point where these high-cost marginal producers could operate without subsidies would be, Mr. MONRONEY fears, to give the nonmarginal (the efficient) producers unduly large profits. The subsidy program permits both the nonsubsidized and the subsidized producers to make about the same normal rate of profit. Certainly the burden is on critics of the subsidy plan to show how production can be secured without subsidies if ceilings are to be continued. This is just what President Truman is suggesting.

Pay Increase for White-Collar Workers and Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 1, 1946

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the Civil Service Committee and the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads of the House of Representatives:

STATEMENT BEFORE THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Commissioner Flemming, in his testimony Monday morning, pointed out that pay increases in industry range from 50 to 55 percent since January 1941, and that the wage board employees in the Government's navy yards will in all probability receive a total increase of approximately 54 percent.

These figures are sufficient justification, to my mind, for seeking an increase of 25 percent for the white-collar group of Government employees, instead of the 11 percent that would be granted under the terms of the Senate version of the pay bill originally introduced by Senator DOWNEY, or the 20 percent advocated by the Civil Service Commission. It seems to me definitely unfair that there should be discrimination against any group of employees, particularly against any group working for the United States Government.

Some persons contend that the pay scales of white-collar employees and those who work at the manual trades are not susceptible of comparison. With that view I cannot agree. Each man is an individual. Each man has the same elementary needs of food, clothing and shelter for himself and for his family. He has a right to expect to bring up his family in comfortable circumstances, and whether he works in one job or another makes little difference that I can see.

There was some years ago, when white-collar workers enjoyed more favorable conditions in comparison with manual workers than they do today, the attempt to divide these two groups by assurances to the white-collar man that his services were of much greater importance to society, and that he should not make common cause with the tradesman. The white-collar man was told that he had greater opportunities and, in general, a much more favorable position.

Today the white-collar man knows that this is not so; the tradesman's pay has increased considerably more than his own, and it is the white-collar man who now occupies the unfavorable position. It is not very comforting to him to be told now that he shouldn't expect as much as the tradesman.

I cannot see why there should be any distinction. It costs the white-collar man as much to live as the tradesman. Perhaps it costs him a little more, because he must wear good clothes on the job, whereas the tradesman wears working clothes that are less expensive and capable of enduring heavy wear.

Some men are trained to work with the hand and some to work with the brain. Some men can keep accounts, some men can operate a slide rule. There are differences in their equipment, and that is why they choose different types of jobs. But there is no real difference in them as human beings. They want the same sort of deal for their families, and they want that to be a square deal.

Mr. Flemmings' testimony brought out the point that the increase granted by the revised form of Senator DOWNEY's pay-increase bill, S. 1415, as it now stands, if combined with the increase granted by the Pay Act of 1945, just barely covers the increase in the cost of living since 1941.

But, as he also showed, pay in industry and in navy yards has gone considerably beyond that. The increase in living costs is generally accepted as 33 percent. Industry and navy yard pay increases run about 20 percent above that figure.

If S. 1415, with its 11-percent increase, just covers the rise in living costs, surely an additional 14-percent increase is not unreasonable. It would still leave a disparity between the pay of Government employees and the pay of industrial workers, and even of the Government's navy yard workers. The total increase would be about 47 percent, at most, instead of the 50 to 55 percent these groups of employees have received or are about to receive.

I believe that Uncle Sam should be a fair and reasonably generous employer. Certainly, there would be nothing lavish about granting to his white-collar employees a general increase 7 points below what he grants to tradesmen in his navy yards and 8 points below the going pay increase for industry. I think a 25-percent increase is the least this Government can, in good conscience, offer to the faithful men and women who have served it so devotedly during the war years.

Several months ago President Truman said the increase should be at least 20 percent. Chester Bowles, this week, said the same thing in his testimony on the pay bill. Other Government administrators have pointed out the urgent need of early and adequate salary increases and have told of their problems, when so many competent employees are leaving the service because of lack of opportunity.

The Government should at this time not only raise the real wage value of the basic rates under the classification act to a true cost of living level but it should also, as has been the custom in industry, preserve some of the wartime earnings of Government employees, in order that their purchasing power may be maintained on a high enough level so that they will not be placed at a disadvantage in comparison with other groups.

We have, it seems to me, a duty and an obligation to Government employees stronger than what we owe to the employees alone, though that is a very great obligation indeed. We have a duty and a responsibility to see that the Government service is maintained at a high standard, and that, in the long run, will not be possible if the men and women who would normally choose to enter it realize that they are going to be penalized if they do so.

In the interest of honest and efficient government, we must be fair to our Government employees. On the basis of the facts already revealed as to the nature and amount of pay increases in industry, where white-collar pay, as Mr. Bowles has stated, rose 34.7 percent during the war years, we cannot in fairness grant a pay increase of less than 25 percent to Government employees now.

STATEMENT BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

Mr. Chairman and members, I am very happy to have this opportunity to appear before you today to speak in favor of the $500 increase for post-office employees. Some persons contend that the pay scale of the post-office employees and those who work at manual trades are not susceptible of comparison. With that view I cannot agree.

Each man is an individual. Each man has the same elementary needs for food, clothing, and shelter for himself and for his family. He has a right to expect to bring up his family in comfortable circumstances and whether he works in one job or another makes little difference that I can see.

In the interest of honest and efficient Government, we must be fair to our Government employees and again I urge this increase in salary for the postal employees to meet the high cost of living.

Justice for Postal Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my re-

marks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Binghamton (N. Y.) Press:

JUSTICE FOR POSTAL WORKERS

Postal workers are entitled to the liberalization in pay that they currently seek. In fact, if trained workers are to be retained and new workers recruited, a pay increase is mandatory.

Three years ago Congress gave these workers a temporary cost-of-living bonus of $300 a year. This expired last June and was replaced by a grant of $400 a year. But because of withholding taxes, larger deductions for retirement and return to a 40-hour week, the workers netted only an additional $1.69 a week. Two bills before Congress would provide $300 more a year.

What the workers want is $500, a figure that does not seem too high, inasmuch as the permanent increase of last summer was the first in 25 years. The postal workers seek liberalization of an entrance salary of $1,700 a year, an average of $2,500 after 9 years, and $3,000 after 26 years of service.

Although some thousands of postal workers are members of an organization affiliated with the A. F. of L., they cannot strike, nor have they inclination to do so. Channels of redress open to workers in private industry are closed to them. Congress must act.

An honored maxim of postal workers comes from Herodotus. It is: "Neither snow nor rain nor heat nor gloom of night stays these couriers from swift completion of their appointed rounds."

As the most faithful of public servants, and so recognized by the public they serve, they deserve generosity. So far they haven't obtained justice. Congress must heed their reasonable pleas for pay adjustment.

The Housing Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am enclosing a very comprehensive letter from a constituent in which he discusses the present building impasse. I commend this letter to the attention of every Member of the House and the Senate, the Members of which can profit thereby. At this time we have before us in the House of Representatives legislation which proposes to speed up the construction of housing for our people. We can well take a leaf out of the experience of this constituent, a veteran of the First World War and an experienced builder.

The letter follows:

Hon. ROY O. WOODRUFF,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have never written you before, and will try to make this letter brief, but conditions in the country have reached such a stage that I think people should let their Congressmen know how they feel about things, so I want to get in my 2 cents' worth.

I am a veteran of the First World War, and a builder by trade, the past few years have specialized in the designing and building of log cabins. My work was stopped by the war. Then I worked for the Ordnance as a civilian employee until the end of 1945. For years we have been planning on building a tourist resort of log cabins and have put all our savings into the project, but now it seems that new Government restrictions on building will kill our chances.

We all know there is a shortage of homes, but think they are going about it in the wrong manner. The bottlenecks have been shortages of material mostly, and we believe the present condition of the country is due to the antics of the labor unions and the New Deal, which has never solved anything yet. Instead of creating another czar, this time in the building industry, why wouldn't it be better to make materials available to all, and without restrictions on the use of that material?

If we have so much money that we can underwrite the British and Russian Empires why can't we use some of it, if necessary, to encourage increased production of building materials through subsidy for a few months, or until production catches up with demand? Our idea is to put reasonable price ceilings on materials, but lift all restrictions on the use of them. Then you will see some building; every builder will go to bat and we will get those homes we so badly need. But with more Government restrictions, I am afraid it will defeat the very purpose we are trying to achieve, more homes. No builder wants to have some dizzy New Dealer telling him how and when and where he can build, but make materials available to all, and at reasonable costs, and lift restrictions on their use and we will see those badly needed homes going up. Lumber, like a lot of other items, is too high. It could be brought down for the time being, by subsidy, until supply catches up with demand, then a builder will have some idea what his jobs will cost and can go ahead without fear. Everyone would benefit by getting homes at reasonable cost, and our money would be helping Americans first, instead of all the rest of the world. I have talked with a number of builders and men in business closely associated with the building business, and we all feel the same way about it—put reasonable price ceilings on materials to encourage their production, remove all restrictions on the use of building materials, making them available to everyone without priorities or other restrictions—then we will get homes.

As to the present labor situation, we are getting no where, and fast. The present labor policy is leading us straight for the worst kind of inflation and then depression. We must have drastic labor laws to pull the stinger out of the unions; their arrogance and selfishness and political power will ruin this country, and they must be curbed, or do we want to follow the path of France? France patterned its prewar government after our New Deal; we all know what happened to France. Labor unions are all right if kept in their place, but today they are misled (not led) by rotten thugs and gangster politicians, Communists, and other radicals, and we think Congress should do something about it, or we might as well hand the country over to them.

Our only hope now lies in Congress; it will be too long to wait till the 1948 election; too much damage is being done now, and we can be completely lost if we wait much longer.

As to the UNO, we don't think the permanent home of the UNO should be located in this country. Why have a supergovernment within our borders? It would mean a nest of international spies always within our borders, and since the sun never sets on the British Empire, why not use one of the many islands the British own, anywhere they might want, and use it for the home of the UNO, which I think will turn out to be just another dream and a debating society, sponsored by the Democrats. We can't legislate peace into the peoples of the world; it must be in their hearts and minds. Treaties are only scraps of paper when they want to make it so. We have seen how the various nations double-cross each other. Could we trust them because of a signed piece of paper? I don't trust Russia any more than I do the New Deal, and why should we underwrite Russia or England? Do we have to buy their good will? If so, we had better save our money and use it for America and Americans. Keep our defense forces intact, and let us not scrap our weapons as we did before. No treaty will enable us to get sudden production when we might need them again.

As to the OPA—it is getting to be a joke, but not a funny one. They have failed in their purpose; prices have gone up and still going up, and we think they should be eased out of existence very soon. Keep fair-price ceilings on certain things such as building materials, clothing, and perhaps a few other items, but for a short time only, so production will catch up with demand; then remove OPA and give the people of the country a chance to adjust themselves without Government interference. There might be some confusion to start with, but it will soon adjust itself. If certain things go too high, a boycott will take care of that, then later, after production is increased, competition will even up our keel. What we need is production, and more of it, and the removal of restrictions. Let us not socialize the building industry for another gang of bureaucrats. This is the finest country in the world. Let us keep it that way.

Very truly yours,

C. R. MARTIN.

Demobilization of Men Overseas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. GEELAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. GEELAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a letter received under recent date from Mr. Clinton S. Golden, chairman, CIO Veterans Committee, in which he advised me that he was enclosing a copy of an open letter to the Congress of the United States, attention of the Honorable Mr. MAY, chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee, which letter was signed by Sgt. James H. Roof, Jr., and 110 other soldiers presently stationed in Seoul, Korea, which I also include in the RECORD:

OFFICE OF VETERANS COMMITTEE,
CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D. C., February 11, 1946.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Attached is a copy of a letter and petition signed by 111 soldiers of the American occupation forces in Korea and addressed to the Congress of the United States. It was sent to the CIO with the request that we endorse and forward it on to the Congress.

We are much gratified with this expression of confidence in our organization, and we are happy to comply with their wishes insofar as possible. We must point out, however, that the CIO believes replacements for the absolute minimum of our military needs can be met by voluntary enlistment if Army pay schedules are made attractive and if the outworn and undemocratic Army caste system is abolished.

Sincerely yours,

CLINTON S. GOLDEN,
Chairman, CIO Veterans Committee.

SEOUL, KOREA, *January 22, 1946.*

Mr. PHILIP MURRAY,
President, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You will find enclosed a copy of an "open letter to Congress." I am sending this letter to you because we soldiers are of the belief that your organization is the friend of the common man. We believe that your many millions of members can and will do all in your power to assist us in getting a square deal on the matter of serving in the armed forces of the United States. We know that you agree with us that this burden should not be placed on a few hundred thousand of us while all the rest of the men in our country are at home enjoying their homes and children.

We ask you to please endorse this letter and forward it on to Congress with the full weight of your committee behind it. We would also appreciate it very much if you would publish it in your union papers.

As one American citizen to another we will appreciate your every effort in our behalf.

Thanking you in advance, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. ROOF, Jr.,
First Sergeant, 38736500.

SEOUL, KOREA, *January 19, 1946.*

The Honorable Mr. MAY,
Chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee, House of Representatives.

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

DEAR SIR: Undoubtedly you have received many letters of this nature. We American soldiers are often called chronic complainers, but we believe that we have a just cause. We still believe that we are American citizens, and we still believe in the democracy that our buddies fought and died for. But we feel that we are not getting a democratic American square deal on service in the Army from the standpoint of demobilization of men overseas, now that the war is over. The following are our reasons:

1. Why are men in the States being declared surplus and discharged, regardless of points, length of service, age, or dependents, while we who are overseas are told that we cannot be discharged or sent home because there are no replacements available?

2. We are told that there are 400,000 surplus men in the Pacific theater of operations. Why aren't the high-point men, combat men, men with 1 or more children, and over-age men screened out of the Pacific theater force and sent home at once? Are replacements necessary for surplus men?

3. Why are men over 37 years of age being discharged in the States and at the same time men over 37 years of age who are overseas are told that they will have to wait until they have reached their thirty-eighth birthday?

4. Why should the burden of occupation be forced on a few hundred thousand men who happened to be overseas at the end of the war?

5. Why is it necessary for any man to have to serve more than 18 months when our Nation has 140,000,000 people to draw from, and approximately half of that number are men?

6. Why is it necessary to occupy friendly nations such as Korea, China, the Philippines, India, Africa, and the Hawaiian Islands? Are we a world police force? We can understand the occupation of Japan and Germany, but not the rest of the world.

The following is what we want and think should be done. We are submitting this for your consideration and action:

1. Continue the present rate of demobilization until the goal of July 1, 1946, is reached, namely, 1,500,000 men as set by the War Department.

2. Pass necessary legislation to continue selective service in sufficient numbers to assure a sufficient number of replacements on the basis of a maximum length of service of 18 months for all drafted men.

3. Pass necessary legislation to make the Army as a career more attractive from an economic standpoint as compared with similar civilian activities. One hundred dollars a month minimum pay would make possible an Army of 3,000,000 or more by voluntary enlistments and the Army could select the best of manpower from the millions of applicants that would be available.

4. Set up a rotation system for overseas service so that no one drafted man would be forced to serve, against his will, more than 1 year overseas.

5. Set up a discharge system covering the following four categories for men drafted before VJ-day:

(1) Points based on months of service (make the point score accumulative, giving each man his point credits each and every month, based on double credit for each month overseas).

(2) Dependents (all men with more than one dependent drawing dependency benefits should be discharged at once if the man so desires.)

(3) Age (all men who have reached their thirty-fifth birthday should be discharged at once if the man so desires.)

(4) Maximum length of service of 18 months for all drafted men with the continual reduction of number of months of service of men now in the Army until the goal of 18 months is reached.

(5) A comparable system should be set up for all officers who were drafted prior to VJ-day based on the above criteria.

Mr. Congressman, is it the will of our people through the House of Congress that determines the laws and policies of our Government, or is it the will of the War Department through the House of Congress that dictates the laws and policies of our Government and people?

We feel that we are being reasonable—don't you? All that we ask is fair play. Is that asking too much?

What are you going to do about this problem, Mr. Congressman? Don't you think that there has been enough dilly-dallying already? When are you going to act?

We are writing this letter to you as American citizens and we expect to be treated as American citizens. Your cooperation will be appreciated and remembered.

Sincerely yours.

We, the undersigned do hereby endorse and approve the above letter in its entirety as representing our views and opinions and we believe that its contents represents the views of the majority of all American soldiers in Korea.

JAMES H. ROOF, Jr.,
First Sergeant, 38736500.
(Also signed by 110 other GI's.)

Protecting the Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced in the House a bill, H. R. 5146, relating to the performance, by Federal judges, of services for the United States not related to their judicial duties.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excellent editorial which appeared in the Mankato Free Press, Mankato, Minn.:

PROTECTING THE SUPREME COURT

When the history of the troubled era through which we are passing is written by objective historians one of the strong, influential, and stable figures in American public life will probably prove to be Chief Justice Harlan Fiske Stone.

Chief Justice Stone took over as head of the Nation's highest judicial tribunal at a time when public respect and regard for the court had been rudely shaken by President Roosevelt's bitter attack on the "nine old men" and by his unsuccessful efforts to purge the Court and make it over to conform with his personal economic theories. Quietly but effectively through the years, Chief Justice Stone has been laboring to restore the court to that position of high dignity and esteem which it formerly has held, and which it always should hold, in the public mind.

One of his particular efforts has been to urge members of the court to refrain from undertaking other activities, from listening to the lure of active politics, from permitting their names to be used as possible candidates for other offices—even for the Presidency.

It is now known that President Roosevelt asked Chief Justice Stone to conduct the Pearl Harbor investigation. He refused on the ground that other men were available and that a member of the Court should not engage in such activities. Mr. Justice Roberts later accepted the invitation to serve. The action of Mr. Justice Jackson in serving for the United States in the war criminal trials at Nuremberg was disapproved by the Chief Justice and only recently he is known to have strongly opposed the possible resignation of Mr. Justice Douglas, to serve as Secretary of the Interior.

These actions do not merely stem from a high regard for the proprieties by the Chief Justice—they are founded on hard reality as well. Repeatedly recently justices have either been away from the Court, as Justice Jackson is now, or they have felt compelled to disqualify themselves for cases because of activities they had, outside the court, bearing on these cases. As a result, only eight justices consider a case; frequently 4 to 4 decisions result end then the case has to be argued over again; valuable time is lost both to the Court and to the litigants involved.

So serious has this situation become that Representative JOSEPH P. O'HARA of our own second district, has introduced a law to bar all Federal judges, Supreme Court justices included, from performing outside activities. Such legislation will unquestionably meet with the approval of Chief Justice Stone and of the public generally as well.

Outstanding Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, throughout World War II, I have made a very careful study of the service rendered by the newspapers of the First Iowa District to our boys and girls on the fighting fronts and in varied assignments all over

the world. Many of these newspapers have given outstanding service and it has been recognized by the men and women of the First Iowa District serving in the armed forces throughout the war; by the relatives of these service men and women; and by the entire community served by these papers.

One of the most outstanding examples of service of this kind was that given by John O'Donnell, of Davenport, Iowa, who conducted a weekly section in the Davenport (Iowa) Democrat under the title of "Dear Joe." Mr. O'Donnell's service was so outstanding that I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 28, 1945, a very fitting description of his work, written by Mr. Hugh Harrison, managing editor of the Davenport (Iowa) Democrat.

The Lions Club of Davenport, on Thursday night, February 21, extended further highly deserved recognition to Mr. O'Donnell and paid tribute to him as the outstanding citizen of Davenport, Iowa, for the year 1945.

I am including here an editorial from the Davenport Democrat of Friday, February 22, which describes the tribute to Mr. O'Donnell:

OUTSTANDING CITIZEN

A representative gathering of citizens, men and women, some 400 in number, at the Masonic Temple, Thursday night, paid tribute to John O'Donnell as the outstanding citizen of Davenport for the year 1945. The event was sponsored by the Lions Club.

Hardly had the program started but John must have discovered he was among friends. Leading citizens of the community sounded praises of his splendid work in behalf of sports, as a contributor to the morale of the armed forces through his weekly "Dear Joe" letters in the Democrat, and as a newspaperman.

The "Dear Joe" pages started by Mr. O'Donnell in August 1942 contained a total of over 3,000,000 words. Letters were printed from GI's from 24 countries in the European war theaters, 28 islands in the Pacific, and 194 camps in the United States. It required much labor, and not a little patience on the part of Mr. O'Donnell to supervise this gigantic undertaking. Best yet, the idea originated in his fertile brain and was carried out successfully through his own personal endeavor.

John O'Donnell's work will stand out as one of the more notable achievements of the local war effort. It is well that it has been recorded in book form of permanency, and for reference by coming generations.

That Mr. O'Donnell's achievements are recognized and appreciated beyond his home town was made apparent at the testimonal dinner in the presence of Dr. Eddie Anderson, head football coach at the University of Iowa, who in his talk rated John as one of the outstanding sports authorities of the country.

All in all it was a wonderful occasion for Mr. O'Donnell and the pleasure was equally shared by the many guests who came to do him honor. Their high esteeem for the honoree was displayed in the enthusiastic ovation tendered him, and the hearty applause which greeted the speakers.

A good citizens, a worker, a loyal friend of the men and women in the armed forces, and a fine fellow in every way was the unanimous verdict given Mr. O'Donnell by the guests of the evening.

Well may John O'Donnell stand as Davenport's outstanding citizen. The title needs no apologies, for it is well deserved.

Resolutions of Jewish War Veterans, Department of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. GEELAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. GEELAN. Mr. Speaker, Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of two resolutions adopted by the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, Department of Connecticut, at a meeting held in Meriden, Conn., on February 17, 1946:

Whereas the housing accommodations for returning veterans and for those veterans already attempting to adjust themselves to civilian life is progressively becoming more acute; and

Whereas the veteran by reason of lack of housing accommodation are finding it more and more difficult to return to a normal civilian status and consequent adjustments as a civilian; and

Whereas the situation is aggrieved by the housing needs of civilians: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Council of Administration of the Department of Connecticut of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, in meeting assembled at Meriden, Conn., this 17th day of February, 1946, petition, through the Congressmen and Senators representing the State of Connecticut in the Congress of the United States, that every effort be made to place the full responsibility, control, and management of the housing and building of homes for veterans under the supervision of the Government of the United States by law; and be is further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each Representative of the State of Connecticut in the Congress of the United States for their attention and action.

Whereas the Fair Employment Practice Act has suffered defeat in the Senate; and

Whereas the passage of this act is in conformity with the democratic principles of this United States; and

Whereas the Fair Employment Practice Act is still in a House committee, where it will remain unless it is voted out of this committee: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Council of Administration of the Department of Connecticut of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, in meeting assembled at Meriden, Conn., this 17th day of February, do hereby memorialize the Members of Congress that immediate consideration, commensurate with other pressing problems of Congress, be given to the passage of the Fair Employment Practice Act; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each Representative of the State of Connecticut in the Congress of the United States for their attention and action.

The Effect of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in viewing the world situation many of us are wondering just what the people of this country gained in winning the war. It is interesting to read an analysis of the present situation written by Mr. Louis Fischer appearing in the Progressive, from which the following extracts are taken:

The First World War made pacifists of millions. The Second World War has made millions of pacifists who advocate militarism. They are pacifists and cynics and militarists; they say, war is waste; war is inevitable; prepare for war. The war has left one god: power.

Modern democracy is not a movement to achieve something; democracy is a way of life. Democracy is relaxation. The tensions are introduced by personal struggles for a living or for wealth or other successes.

Dictatorships function in a condition of permanent public mobilization. Totalitarian governments are always summoning their subjects to die. But the normal state of a democracy today is collective inaction.

Before democratic society bestirs itself to action it must be goaded by a Pearl Harbor or, as in England in September 1939, by a threat to a national existence, or by an economic depression. Truly national acts by the people of a democracy are rare.

The function of democracy is to protect the majority against a minority, to protect one minority against the other. This conduces to passivity. Democracy means checks and balances. They conduce to passivity.

Groups like trade-unions, cartels, manufacturers' associations, and various lobbies operate to defend or aggrandize themselves. The national community as a whole, the democracy, rarely operates as a unit except through its government, whose indecision, temporizing, and procrastination are the result of the balance between one force which pulls in one direction and another, sometimes almost equal, force which pulls in another direction.

The lag between politics and science merely confirms the dilemma of a free society. Scientists develop the atomic bomb according to the best methods the best brains can devise. But the disposal of the bomb in peacetime is not determined by what the best brains think; the decision is the sum total of innumerable interests, pressures, pulls, fears, lures, hopes. Science would long ago have abolished poverty, empires, and backward regions.

Democracy fears a very active efficient government: It might endanger freedom.

All these factors explain the retreat of the appeasing democracies in the face of aggressive dictatorships. They also explain the failure of democracies to solve internal problems.

The problem facing democracy is to achieve economic security and universal prosperity while retaining political freedom.

Who Is Selling America Short? Wall Street, Not Chester Bowles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, for a long lifetime I have been saying that powerful and avaricious financial interests of Wall Street and the curb and commodity exchanges are a constant threat to economic stability and prosperity in our country.

Over the Columbia Broadcasting System last Tuesday a hardy journalist, Quincy Howe, said the same thing, and he said it so briefly and concisely that, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the full text of Mr. Howe's remarks as furnished to me by CBS.

Mr. Howe tells us why the National Association of Manufacturers is taking full page ads in big papers to advocate inflation. They can make money buying and selling stock; but the people lose, because their money buys less and less. And finally everybody loses. Nobody wants to keep businessmen from making a fair profit; but no one ought to want to let speculators rob us of our buying power through exorbitant profits.

Mr. HOWE. Who is selling America short? Wall Street, not Chester Bowles. Yesterday Mr. Bowles told a congressional committee he believed that the Government's new wage-price policy could hold the line against inflation.

Today the stock market went into a nose dive. Mr. Bowles urged Congress and the American people to continue farm subsidies, to keep the present price ceilings on rent, to stop inflation of real estate. And because Chester Bowles commands such wide popular support that most Americans want to follow his advice, Wall Street fears the worst.

Apparently the American people can stop inflation if they want to. Peace, it's terrible. Remember the stock market in wartime? Every time we lost a battle, every time the war seemed sure to continue indefinitely, the prices of common stocks went up. But when the Germans or the Japanese looked groggy, Wall Street would go through one of those dreadful "peace scares" and the prices of common stocks would go way down.

It's still the same story. A week ago the wave of strikes seemed sure to rise higher and higher. So did prices. The National Association of Manufacturers was taking out full page newspaper advertisements urging Congress to shake off what it called the shackles of price control. More than one of the men around Truman was urging just a "touch" of inflation.

And Mr. Bowles revealed today that young Henry Ford wanted permission to hike up the prices of Ford cars 55 percent. Yes, you heard me right—55 percent. Don't let anyone tell you that we all stand to lose if we get inflation. Not in the early stages anyway.

Of course about 85,000,000 suckers who bought war bonds will find themselves stuck with 75- or 50-cent dollars 10 years from now. Of course, 60,000,000 holders of life insurance policies will leave their families only half or three-quarters as much real money as they expected to leave, depending on how far the inflation goes.

People who depend on pensions, salaries, savings, and fixed incomes will lose out, too. But everybody does not lose. People who own common stock can sell that stock for more and more money as the inflation goes forward. Even though the money itself buys less and less. People who own real estate, people who own property of every kind, find themselves better and better off in terms of money. Inflation brings universal ruin only when the value of money drops to nothing at all. And that happens only if production falls, as it has in so many European countries today. The United States is another story.

Once we get something like full production, we shall not be short of goods. But if we get full production, plus, say, a 50-percent inflation the wealth we produce will not go to the people who have saved their money. It will go to the speculators and to the owners of our biggest industries.

The price of stocks on Wall Street reflects the mass emotions of speculators—large and small. But the price of stocks is the result, not the cause of inflation. The real inflationists are not the Wall Street plungers; the real inflationists are to be found among the men who own or control the biggest American industries.

And if prices go up 25 or 50 percent while the value of the dollar drops to 75 or 50 cents, they not only get a larger cash income, they get a larger share of the national income. While those Americans who put their trust in the dollar will be getting less.

The battle over inflation thus comes down to a battle for a redistribution of national income. And in that battle, those who oppose inflation represent the many, those who want inflation represent the few.

British Views on Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Quincy (Ill.) Herald-Whig entitled "British Views on Loan":

BRITISH VIEWS ON LOAN

Opposition to the American $4,000,000,000 loan came from conservatives in both England and the United States. American opposition is based on doubt of British ability to repay and fear that if the loan is repaid it will be in goods detrimental to American industry. Some Britishers also question their country's solvency, but their principal objection lies in the danger to British industry. By importing American goods, even on American credit, Britain will work hardships on her own industries and labor, they say.

The 90 to 8 vote of approval in the House of Lords failed to show the extent of disapproval, since 60 members abstained from voting in silent opposition. These opponents argue that temporary inconvenience would be more than offset by long-range benefits of going it alone.

The American and British opponents of the loan have one thing in common. Both basically are nationalistic. They are willing to accept a certain degree of collaboration for peace, perhaps on the order of the old League of Nations, but are unwilling to go all out in lifting barriers from trade and pooling armaments for peace in full economic and diplomatic collaboration. They are willing, even eager, to return to the practice of unrestricted economic warfare of the type that has bred two destructive wars in a quarter century.

From the liberal point of view, all such things are experiments. The old system did not prevent wars. Perhaps the British loan won't help to turn the trick, but if it aids in developing world cooperation it will have been worth what it costs. Britain is in a state of economic collapse after years of war. She constitutes a mighty bulwark against invasion of this country by any European power. Trouble with England is vitually impossible. The United States holds hostages against trouble with the Empire.

The British Empire, long America's best customer, can resume that place only through economic strength. America doesn't need an export market immediately but soon our factories will be turning out more goods than the domestic needs will require.

Perhaps the loan advocates' best argument is insurance of peace through a better world. More people must have more advantages if wars are to be prevented. From the past we have learned that no nation can be prosperous if the rest of the world is in depression. The Bretton Woods monetary agreements is tied to the British loan. Its approval is considered one of the keystones of the United Nations Organization.

Four billion dollars is a great deal of money to risk. Yet the war just ended cost us 100 times that much and brought only death and destruction. Perhaps a friendly act costing 1 percent as much will bring more satisfactory results.

Veteran's Wife Pleading for Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith a letter from one of my constituents, who is the wife of a veteran:

CHICAGO, ILL., *February 22, 1946.*

DEAR MR. ROWAN: As the wife of a veteran, I am incensed at the opposition which has developed to the Wyatt housing program. The real-estate interest and home builders are the ones who will gain by the increased production of housing, but in their shortsightedness oppose this plan, as the big interests oppose every plan to better the lot of the human being.

I wish that rather than waiting for a vote on the floor (I'm confident you'll vote for the plan) that you would immediately devote every available minute to fighting for the Wyatt plan in all its aspects and against the pressure groups who oppose the plan.

The veterans—all the millions of them—and their families are watching you and your colleagues closely to see whether all the beautiful promises made during wartime mean anything.

Fight for the Wyatt housing plan!

Sincerely,

SHIRLEY G. GOULD
(Mrs. Joseph E.).

Labor Problems and Reemployment of Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include two editorials from the Telegraph-Forum, Bucyrus, Ohio, which are most timely. Every Member of Congress should read these articles:

[From the Telegraph-Forum of February 23 1946]

WHAT PRICE STRIKES?

If ever America was in a position which demanded reflection of its ways, that time is now. Today's wave of strikes is heading the Nation toward the crossroads of continued democracy, as it was inherited by today's

generation, and economic ruin. Unfortunately for the Nation, those who should do the reflecting are so engrossed in grabbing all that they can grab today that they are not allowing themselves to face the economic facts that face them and the rest of us. Today's willful strikers are closing their eyes to facts they themselves are creating, but they can't recognize them because they are being fed so much radical propaganda and such untruths as those put out recently by one union. Here is what it said: "GE and Westinghouse are engaged in a gigantic plot against you and us." It is not conceivable that the human mind could believe that two of the biggest industrial concerns in America would plot against their workers and their customers. Another from the same union: "Here's part of the plot against you (the public). Both GE and Westinghouse for months have withheld radios, refrigerators, washing machines, electric irons, and other needed electrical appliances from the market." Neither is it conceivable that the human mind could believe that an established industrial concern would withhold sales and deny business to itself.

Strikers out because they want to be out are being woefully misled by smooth tongues that are interested in membership totals and dues, but profess to be interested in the working people. That "interest" is not deep enough for them to make provision from union millions to keep strikers and their families. This alone is proof that they are not interested in the workers' welfare. When strikes continue week after week as they have here and in many other communities, local union leaders, or their representatives, go begging up and down the street and among the workers in working industrial plants to raise funds to feed strikers who are out of work only because they walked away from their jobs, jobs that are there for them to go back to, jobs that they could be working if the union leaders who misled them would abide by the constitutional right of every man to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, which includes work.

What price strikes? A schoolboy knows that when nothing is coming in, nothing can go out. Strikers who refuse to work throw away income and when income is willfully denied one's self, so also is purchasing power. The powers behind strikes talk of "living wages," "more money," "decent pay," but do they explain to those who listen and obey how long it will take to make up what strikers lose during a strike that continues week after week.

The current wave of strikes started out to be a 30-percent pay raise proposition. What is being gotten varies, but it is not 30 percent. Once the current wave settles down, it can be expected that the radicals, whose interest in the worker should not be confused with their hatred for the "bosses," will come back for the rest. That could be about the time the present strikers are beginning to recover from the payless weeks of the present strikes, still no further ahead than if they had not struck and had received their old pay regularly during their weeks of idleness.

Meanwhile, what is going on? The companies have been forced to pay higher wages. Therefore, they have likewise been forced to charge more for their products. Around and around goes the cycle, higher wages, higher prices. In the end the strikers are no better off than they were. The rest of the people are worse off. Volume production keeps costs down. Free competition keeps prices down. Only by full production can the nation prosper and with it her workers. Strikes hit at the heart of these truths. Strikes and unreasonable demands upon industry strike at the heart of America. Who gains? The radicals who live, many lavishly, off of the workers' dues. Who loses? America. What price strikes?

[From the Telegraph-Forum of February 28, 1946]

TRUMAN ON VETS' JOBS

President Truman's appeal Monday to all employers to work with the Government in finding jobs for veterans is one of the biggest farces that has come out of Washington for a long time. In an appeal for veterans to have an opportunity to work out their own destiny, the President asserted that "they deserve that right and we are determined they shall have it."

These are the words of a man who for long has alined himself so solidly with the CIO that he either dares not or at least does not use Government pressure to help veterans work who want to work but who cannot do so because of the CIO's methods of enforcing its policies over and above those of the Constitution.

Truman pleads for jobs for veterans while veterans, some right here in Bucyrus, are willing and ready to go to work but cannot, not because there is no work but because the New Deal-backed CIO prohibits them to do so by closing entrance gates with pickets.

When the Truman administration adopted the policing of requiring an 18½ cents an hour wage increase, the administration tossed to the winds all semblance of collective bargaining. There can be no bargaining so long as the administration and the CIO are unitedly for only one wage increase. There is no flexibility. Both the administration and the union have said 18½ cents an hour or else. There is nothing to bargain. The issue is closed under such terms.

It is the duty of government to protect one person's, or any numbers of persons', right to work. The Truman administration has failed in this duty, here and in other communities. Truman lacks all semblance of judgment in making the request he made yesterday in the face of facts against his administration.

Statement of J. H. Leib

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by J. H. Leib, legislative director, Amvets, before the House District Committee on February 19, 1946:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, my name is J. H. Leib, I am the legislative director of the American Veterans of World War II, Amvets.

I come here to urge the immediate consideration by the Congress of H. R. 5229, and I will be very brief in presenting the position of my organization.

Amvets feels very strongly concerning this proposed legislation.

First, because of the possibility that it will put approximately 432 veterans to work.

Second, because it will correct a great injustice and, equally as important, it will play a significant part not only in building up the morale of the fire department, but it will encourage greater public service.

Mr. Chairman, it is estimated that two-thirds of a fireman's life is actually spent at work.

His home life is certainly not sound, nor is it secure.

Firemen now are obliged to work a 72-hour per week schedule.

Let me emphasize the injustice of their deplorable and amazing hours.

Their week-day shift commences at 8 a. m. and lasts until 6 p. m.—which amounts to 10 hours per day—6 days per week.

Their night shift begins at 6 p. m. straight through until 8 a. m., a total of 14 long and apprehensive hours.

With only two shifts these firemen work 60 hours day work and 84 hours night work.

Now let us take up their long and uncomfortable week ends.

On Friday the night shift goes to work at 6 p. m. until 8 a. m.

Then along comes the day shift.

They carry on from 8 a. m. Saturday morning until 8 a. m. Sunday morning, 24 long and bitter hours.

On top of this these same human beings must return to work at 6 p. m. Sunday—after putting in 24 hours—and carry on until 8 a. m. Monday.

This goes on and on.

We believe that this is man's inhumanity to man.

The organized strength of the Fire Department is now 940 men. There are between 20 to 30 vacancies.

Another shift would add approximately 432 veterans, since none but veterans are eligible for appointment under existing regulation.

At this point I would like to insert a newspaper clipping from the Washington Post, February 19, 1946, which shows the urgency for providing more jobs for veterans:

"More than a million veterans are now drawing idle pay." For the first time since the passage of the GI bill of rights, a year and a half ago, more than a million veterans are drawing $20 a week unemployment compensation.

"Veterans' Administration's latest figures show that as of the week ending February 9 readjustment allowances totaling $25,581,000 were paid to 1,035,995 former servicemen. The week previous 963,035 veterans received $23,786,000 in jobless benefits.

"Washington region figures for the week ended February 9 are as follows: District, 2,819 veterans received $74,000; Virginia, 8,865 veterans received $231,000; Maryland, 17,354 veterans received $369,000."

We respectfully request that this unfortunate predicament be corrected as soon as possible, through the adoption of H. R. 5229, which asks that the Fire Department be composed and operated by a three-platoon system, a system which now exists within the Police Department. They operate on an 8-hour shift, 48 hours per week, such as 8 a. m. to 4 p. m.; 4 p. m. to 12 p. m.; 12 p. m. to 8 a. m.

Finally, it is impossible to reconcile the fact that a fireman works these hardship hours and yet receives the same pay as given to District policemen, who, in turn, work shorter and more reasonable hours. Isn't the risk of a fireman equally as dangerous as that of a policeman?

It is about time that the Congress give these public servants a square deal. Everyone, industry and business and the professions, are urging a 40- to 48-hour week. Here is an opportunity to set an example. Thank you very much.

Congressional Wrecking Crew

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the

following editorial from the March 3, 1946, issue of the Chicago Sunday Times:

CONGRESSIONAL WRECKING CREW

If a group in Congress had refused to give the Government extraordinary powers to speed the construction of ships and tanks and airplanes during the war, public opinion would have cracked down on it.

Such a group, spurred by real estate and other lobbies, is trying to sabotage the Government's new plan to build 2,700,000 new homes in the next 2 years.

Right now the pressure of the lobbies is shown in the House of Representatives, where critical action will be taken in a few days. President Truman has become so alarmed over the strength of the pressure groups that he has sent a special letter to Speaker RAYBURN pleading for legislative assistance for his administration's measure. He asked Members of Congress to consider housing as an American issue—not a narrow party issue. And it is a major American issue, bigger than any party.

The mumbling, grumbling coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats in the lower House say the plan is socialism. They want housing as usual.

If, during the war, we had built airplanes as usual we never would have constructed the huge fleets that finally knocked out Hitler and Tojo.

HOUSING CRISIS IS WAR

Those who now want housing as usual fail to realize that we are locked in a desperate war against time and inertia. We must provide homes for our people and prevent the growing chaos of overcrowded communities. It's a major emergency.

The people of the local communities realize the seriousness of the situation.

Their sons and daughters returning from overseas, newly married and hoping to establish their own families, have no place to live.

The local representatives of the people of the community realize the seriousness of the situation.

Chicago's city council on Thursday took extraordinary action to speed construction of housing. It published an emergency housing code which took Chicago out of the strait-jacket of restrictions which for many years has prevented inexpensive, modern home building in the city limits.

The city council also approved the plan of Federal Housing Expediter Wilson W. Wyatt, even while that plan was under fire from the congressional wrecking crew.

BUILDERS BACK WYATT

The men who build houses realize the seriousness of the situation.

Officials of the building trades unions, long opposed to prefabricated dwellings, said they'd go along, too. The National Association of Home Builders, meeting here 7,000 strong, were at first opposed to Wyatt's plan to use $600,000,000 in Federal funds to spur construction of home-building material. This is one of the main bones of contention in Congress—the socialization feature.

After a heart-to-heart talk with Wyatt, who came here to emphasize the need for his plan, the builders reversed their attitude. They certainly are not Socialists. They are practical builders and contractors. They said the Nation's needs came first and resolved all their doubts in favor of Wyatt. They approved the Presidential order which makes Wyatt a virtual housing czar.

The President of the United States knows the seriousness of the situation.

During the week Mr. Truman emphasized the increasingly acute nature of the housing situation by an appeal to the Nation's people to share any available living facilities with homecoming veterans. He asked all churches and synagogues to form housing committees to find homes for men who are getting out of uniform.

The little group of willful men who oppose the growing tide of public opinion are of the "yes, but" variety. They agree there's a housing shortage. But they say there's no need to stimulate production by direct Government subsidy such as stimulated arms production during the war.

CONGRESSMEN OUT OF TOUCH

Those who are fighting price ceilings, who want controls taken off, who pooh-pooh the warning that inflation is a real and awful danger that could devastate our markets and our pocketbooks, are out of touch with the people.

The people know that Wyatt is right when he says we need to build 950,000 permanent private homes this year. That is more homes than were built in any other year in our history. But we need homes people can buy, homes in the lower brackets, costing about $6,000, and renting for $50 or less, depending on the locality. And we need to build them while keeping inflation under control.

The Home Builders Association found Building Expediter Wyatt a reasonable and convincing man. He puts the public need first, but he also demonstrates convincingly that serving the public is, in the long run, the most profitable and satisfactory course for everyone to take. That is a lesson many Members of Congress have yet to learn.

Mr. Wyatt's Conspiracy in Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, heretofore I have made two speeches from the floor in which I have called attention to the tactics and activities of certain groups opposed to the housing bill, which will be found on page 1652 of the RECORD for February 26 and on page 1784 of the RECORD for February 28.

My attention has been called to an editorial in the Chicago Sun of Tuesday, February 26, entitled "Mr. Wyatt's 'Conspiracy' in Housing," which is timely and pertinent to the bill we have been debating with the inspired help of Western Union and the United States mails under a mass attack of propaganda from every branch of the real-estate, construction, and building-supply industries. Of all the editorial comments I have read, I believe this is the most concise and pointed, and I am inserting it in the RECORD. I hope the strong arguments given here will be heeded, and that the vote on the bill will not be further delayed and will be favorable.

I have observed and been subjected to many of these contemptible campaigns of high-powered pressure groups and lobbies; but the campaign against the housing bill exceeds in arrogance anything I have ever seen. It is deplorable, and should be resented by every fair-minded Member of this House, whether he is for or against the bill. I hope that the special committees of House and Senate on small business will take cognizance of this regimented assault on the integrity of legislative decisions and make a full investigation of the campaign against the housing bill.

I hope, too, that the lobby will take the advice of the Sun to enlist in Mr. Wyatt's "plot" to build more and lower-cost houses, and see that our citizens and ex-servicemen have a roof over their heads, such as the antagonists of the bill enjoy. Let me add that in addition to the inspired telegrams of opposition from self-serving interests, I have many messages, both telegrams and letters, from civic groups, organized labor, and servicemen's organizations urging and pleading for passage of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have just received a long and expensive telegram signed by the National Association of Retail Lumber Dealers, one of those I have received in opposition to the housing bill. They, like all similar groups, oppose the bill for their own benefit and selfish interest. Consumers, who will not share in industry's profits, and who dread every new bubble of inflation, want housing, and believe this bill is the most practicable concrete way of getting homes for hundreds of thousands of veterans, their families, and just plain citizens.

The editorial from the Chicago Sun follows:

MR. WYATT'S "CONSPIRACY" IN HOUSING

Wilson Wyatt, National Housing Administrator, has a missionary job to do in Chicago today. The National Association of Home Builders, whose convention he will address, is kicking against his program to build 2,700,000 homes in the next 2 years. One of its committees has denounced the program as "a conspiracy for socialized housing," and suggested that veterans be enlisted in a campaign against it. Mr. Wyatt must persuade the builders, instead, to build houses.

If it seems odd that the industry should be more interested in killing off the Wyatt program than in building the houses he asks, one must remember that this is an odd industry. Its front men have for years succeeded in putting their worst feet forward. Instead of buckling down to the job of producing more housing for less money, they have preferred to fight Government policies aimed at that goal. Instead of reviving and reorganizing a stagnant industry that has failed the people, they chose to conduct a rearguard action in defense of the status quo.

Do the builders realize what they are doing? Having failed to develop on their own initiative a flexible and progressive industry able to meet such a crisis as that of the present, they can sabotage the Government's efforts only at great risk to themselves. The veteran wants a house. He will not be impressed by hoarse cries of "socialized housing." Unless he gets a house, and fairly soon, he will demand socialization that is socialization.

Mr. Wyatt's program, of course, is far from that. In fact, he proposes to rescue the home-building industry from the dire position it now occupies. By the use of Government stimulants, as these tools were used in wartime, he seeks to obtain the needed production by private enterprise. If the builders know their own interests, they will accept his proposals gladly, and turn to with a will. A nation that is starved for homes is bound to prefer a Wyatt program for 2,700,000 houses to a private-enterprise plan for half that many.

The Wyatt program faces immediate peril in Congress, where the Patman bill to provide for price control and subsidies has been watered down by a House committee. The bill must be strengthened and passed if the real estate inflation is to be stopped and large-scale home production, both by conventional methods and prefabrication, is to be gotten under way.

The alternative is clear. Let real estate inflation continue, and most of the veterans will not be able to afford a home. Let costs mount, and the number of houses built will shrink far below the level of acute need. Let a slow and backward industry pursue its old insufficient ways, and we shall have another boom, another crash, another slump.

No, Mr. Wyatt is not leading a conspiracy of socialization. He is plotting for more and lower cost houses; scheming to remedy the deficiencies of an industry which has failed to remedy them itself; contriving ways to fulfill the national obligation in housing while leaving its production in private hands. In such a "plot" the home builders should enlist as willing conspirators.

Annual Farm Economic Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the February 21, 1946, issue of the Story City Herald, Story City, Iowa:

CANNED GOODS

They had the annual farm economic conference in Des Moines last week. Great farm leaders were there and, as usual, scintillated with words worn threadbare through incessant use during the past quarter century.

Mordecai Ezekiel, of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, solemnly declared, "The United States can't gain by keeping other nations poor." As if anybody ever believed we could. Ezekiel belongs to the bunch who have the notion we can get rich by giving other nations money with which to buy our stuff.

Professor Jesness, of the University of Minnesota, offered this gem of deep thinking: "Demand for farm products will be caused by a high level of employment and resulting consumer power." The professor was on safe ground; the demand for farm products will be there—employment or no employment. He probably meant the price would be higher.

Now hear this one enunciated by John Abbink, of the Foreign Trade Council: "The proposed loan of $4,000,000,000 to Britain would be advantageous to the United States even if never repaid." Advantageous to the importers, exporters, and ship owners, maybe.

Henry Wallace was present at the conference, of course. He played safe, too, by relieving himself of these three pragmatic statements:

"World trade is badly out of kilter after two world wars and a long depression." Henry, by the way, had charge of Uncle Sam's depression for eight solid years and didn't make much of an impression on it until the Second World War came along.

"For a good many things which we don't have we need imports at a reasonable cost." Trouble with Henry, he wants imports of things we do have: lower tariffs on farm products from South America and the junking of our rubber factories so we can import rubber from the East Indies.

"Unless we realize we are a part of the world market we are going to find ourselves again in the condition of the 20's and 30's." Henry's father and grandfather, and all the past generation, knew full well we are a part of the world market and tried earnestly to keep the world from using us as a dumping ground for slave labor. The result is we became the world's richest Nation before Henry was born. And it is noteworthy that the impoverished nations of the world made headway in proportion as we progressed: We bought their goods and they bought ours, on the fair and square basis of value received and value given, without hidden subsidies or bond issues to influence trade.

Foreign Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

WESTERLY, R. I., *February 27, 1946.*

To the Congress of the United States of America, the Senate and House of Representatives, Washington, D. C., greeting:

Honorable fellow Americans, an American citizen, acting under the provision of the American bill of rights, takes this method of voicing his logical objection to any foreign loan such as proposed, being approved by the Congress or consummated by the action of any source other than by direct mandate of the citizens of the United States of America; and not then until the Congress of the United States of America has by official action first placed upon the statutes of the United States of America a suitable old-age pension consistent with the so-called American way of life.

The United States of America—the richest country in the world—must first take proper care of its own people before squandering its resources in foreign lands. Based on history in this regard, use of the word squandering does not seem out of place in my opinion. The Townsend plan, so-called, has not been approved by our Government because, it has been said, to do so would bankrupt the country, or words to this effect. If this be true, then it is inconsistent to consider loaning billions to foreign countries with no ample security other than a promise to pay back sometime within 50 or more years. If the United States of America can find billions for foreign countries, then surely it can find adequate funds for disbursement among our aged in the form of a pension consistent with the dignity of the richest Nation on earth. It is the aged today who in their youth, by toil of mind and body, have brought to the surface the riches of which we are prone to boast. Let us take care of our own first—then if there is any to spare we can consider foreign loans if it is really needed and they can give ample security that will compel repayment within a reasonable time; otherwise, no.

Let us pay more attention to American just rights and less to world political ambition. Uncle Sam needs your friendship now; don't let him down. It is respectfully requested that this communication be read to the Members of your respective Houses and incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Very sincerely yours,

ALFRED ROBERTS,

A Native-Born American Citizen Whose Forebears Were Settlers in the Sturdy State of Maine.

(NOTE.—Sent to Presiding Officer, House and Senate.)

Forty Years of Service in the House

REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I rose with the purpose of answering the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but having learned during my short absence from the floor of the statement of the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], calling attention to the fact that today is the beginning of my fortieth year of service in this House, and of his words of praise, I cannot proceed until I have thanked the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Nor can I proceed without trying to express my gratification and appreciation for the generous applause and the spontaneous standing ovation you gentlemen have just now so graciously given me. It is a tribute and an honor for which I thank you. I hope I continue to merit and deserve your expression of friendship and good will, and the memory of this occasion will serve as an encouragement to me in my service to the Congress, to my district, and to my country.

The Packers and OPA

REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Now, Mr. Speaker, having expressed my deep and sincere gratification for this spontaneous ovation, I continue in my original purpose in rising. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] has called attention to the complaint of a packing house in his district complaining about OPA. I venture to say that that very packing house has made more money since 1941 than it ever did before price control was imposed, notwithstanding the wartime restrictions for the benefit of all of us.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I cannot yield, Mr. Speaker; I am sorry.

In this connection I wish to insert the text of a recent broadcast by Quincy Howe on that subject which speaks more plainly than I can. He points out that in the beginning of inflation property makes money, but in the end, when money becomes valueless, everybody loses. He blames the owners and managers of industry and speaks of the indefensible attitude of the National Association of Manufacturers in their current attacks on OPA.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The American Conscience Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARLOS P. ROMULO
RESIDENT COMMISSIONER OF THE PHILIPPINES TO THE UNITED STATES
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the Members of the House to an eloquent radio address on the future of the Philippines, delivered by the Honorable Paul V. McNutt, United States High Commissioner to the Philippines. Commissioner McNutt has just come back from Manila, where he spent 3 months observing the extent of the devastation wrought on my country by the grim vicissitudes of war. "The Philippines," he says, "are the wounded war veteran of the American community of peoples." He has seen, not only with his eyes, but with his heart, the dreadful wreckage of war in the Philippines.

In discussing the American obligation to the Filipino people, Commissioner McNutt speaks more forthrightly than would be proper for any Filipino spokesman. On the same subject, but with a different approach, I have spoken several times on the floor of the House. As Resident Commissioner of the Philippines, I am truly grateful to Commissioner McNutt for saying what it would have been in bad grace for me, as a Filipino, to say.

His speech could have been made only by an American. It is an expression of Americanism at its best. He bespeaks the American conscience. His timely and thought-provoking address follows:

The Philippines today are islands of confusion in a vast sea of unrest. That confusion is to a large extent made in America. We helped bring it about. So far we have not done much to resolve it.

The sea of unrest is the general unrest of the Orient, with more than a billion people striving and elbowing their way toward nationhood, in the direction of the twentieth century. In that troubled scene the Philippines should not be an area of confusion, but an area of order and certainty. We can make it so.

The confusion in the Philippines is the confusion of despair and frustration, of impatience and uncertainty. The islands have been brutally, criminally ravaged by war, by our war. The enemy blasted them in the first assault and captured them. We returned. In the process of liberation, and as a result of unbelievable Japanese brutality in defeat, the Philippines were damaged beyond description. Cities were laid waste, innocent people were burned out and slaughtered.

These are words, but there are facts to support them. I have just come from 3 months in the Philippines. I have never spent a more exciting 3 months. I have never spent an unhappier period in seeing what I had to see.

The islands are now a devastated land, burned over, blasted, shattered, and plundered. The beautiful city of Manila, Pearl of the Orient, has become an ugly scarecrow of a city, a shanty town, a crowded community of shacks and lean-tos, a graveyard of the skeletons of buildings.

But that is just the physical appearance. Much worse damage has been done to the Philippines as a nation. The national economy has been destroyed and wrecked. More than 95 percent of the total Philippine production before the war was for export—if you exclude rice and fish, both of which are locally consumed. More than 90 percent of the country's exports went to the United States. The big-four exports—sugar, hemp, coconut, and tobacco products, depended to a major extent on the existence of a tariff-free market in this country.

The Japanese shattered that Philippine economy. Sugar lands were ordered turned to cotton. Tobacco lands were left fallow. Coconut and hemp lands were ordered cultivated, but the orders went unheeded. The Filipinos wouldn't work for Japanese masters. Even at gun point the loyal Filipino millions offered quiet but immovable resistance.

Today there are no crops for export. There is almost no economy. The sources of income for local government have been virtually wiped out. The currency tied by law to the American dollar is sound, but values are unbelievably inflated. Communications among the 7,000 islands of the Philippines are still paralyzed.

The Commonwealth Government is helpless to move effectively toward rehabilitation. There is a bitterly divisive collaborationist issue. The nation is involved in a national political campaign. The people of the Philippines are waiting, with decreasing patience, for the United States to redeem its promises, to take the necessary steps to attack the paralysis which has frozen the economy of the country.

We made the Philippines a promise of independence, to be effective on July 4, 1946. We showered them, for 50 years, with brave words about democracy, about Western ideals. Those words were taken seriously. They were taught in the schools. They were practiced.

In the early months of our defense program, before the war, we exhorted the Philippines to produce more and more of the products we needed. We required them to ship it all to us, to stop shipments to other countries. They responded nobly. Then came the war.

The great mass of Filipinos resisted the invader. They fought the Japanese in a hundred different ways. There were 200,000 heroes on every island of the Philippines, who rose up from the fields and villages to fight back. Those men, and women, brought to the Japanese a nightmare of violent resistance which no other colonial people attempted. They made the occupation the most difficult job the Japanese faced in the Orient. They were heroes, every one of them, those guerrilas. They fought for their Philippines, and for their America, the America they had been taught to love, the giver of laws, the giver of freedom, the giver of democracy. Their story has not even been half told.

Because of those millions of resisting Filipinos, and because of those 200,000 heroic guerrillas, we have an obligation to the Philippines that extends beyond legal covenants, beyond promises, beyond independence. We have an obligation to reward the Philippines in full measure for the lives and property they lost, for the lives and property they saved us.

We have interests in the Philippines, too, American interests. I am not referring here to our commercial interests, which are important, and which make for jobs here at home. I am referring to our broader interests in the Orient and in the world, which are based upon our united determination to keep and maintain the peace. For this purpose, the United States has a special obligation in the Far East. In that part of the world, it is the armed might of the United States, actual and potential, which must be depended upon by the United Nations Organization to furnish the police power and the moral hindrance to would-be aggressors. For this purpose, we need bases in the Far East. And bases in the Far East mean bases in the Philippines. Those bases are not intended merely to protect the Philippines, nor the United States, but are primarily intended to give authority to the conscience of the world.

But arms alone are not enough. Atom bombs are not enough. We need the friendship and the confidence of the millions of people of the Orient. Based on that friendship and confidence, our armed strength becomes not menacing, but reassuring; not threatening, but promising.

The 18,000,000 people of the Philippines are our ambassadors in the Orient. The continuing faith of those Filipinos, men of brown skin but of western democratic mind, is a symbol to the entire Far East of our good will and democratic practice. We must not, we dare not, lose that faith. We cannot afford to destroy it by our own inaction.

Today there are pending on Capitol Hill two pieces of legislation, the Bell bill and the Tydings bill, which are designed to assist in the rehabilitation and reconstruction of the Philippines. Those bills have the support of President Truman. They are urgent, life-giving legislation for the Philippines. The Bell bill gives Philippine industry 28 years of preferential tariff; the Tydings bill authorizes appropriation of $450,000,000 for rebuilding public works and paying for war damages. The Philippines have been waiting for 5 months for this legislation. No positive rehabilitation can get under way without these two economic charters of recovery. Congress, I believe, is now ready to act. It will be a belated recognition, but it must be given in a hurry.

The fact of independence for the Philippines on July 4 does not reduce our obligation to these people. The Philippines are the wounded war veterans of the American community of peoples. We will have as much responsibility for them after July 4, 1946, as we, as individuals, would have for a wounded son after he has reached the age of 21.

For many years there will be a special relationship between the two countries and the two peoples. We will be obliged to help the Philippines regain their economic health for years to come. It is to our interest to do so, and to take such measures as are necessary to help the Philippines shake off the shackles of a feudalistic past. Only then can they become a modern, a free, and liberty-loving democracy, in accordance with the principles we have taught them for 50 years—an economic as well as political democracy. That is the job for tomorrow, the challenge to future Philippine-American relations.

Effect of Pending Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial appeared in the Dunkirk Evening Observer, an excellent paper published in my home city, which points out the effect of the pending strikes on all parties concerned. The distinguished editor has made a careful analysis of the local situation resulting from the suspension of pay rolls, which gives a fair picture, I assume, of thousands of similar communities dependent upon industrial pay rolls.

Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial to which I have referred as a part of my remarks:

AN APPEAL

Let's go back to work.

The steel strike has been settled. Hundreds have gone back to work, but they may not remain at work very long. Unless the fabricators begin to use their steel the steel makers will again be out of work.

The strike issues in the main have been settled.

It remains to iron out the details.

But these details are cumbersome and complicated.

They involve decisions by Government departments already cluttered up with a great mass of requests.

To get prices fixed and apply the new formula may take weeks and weeks.

Meanwhile Dunkirk men and Dunkirk families are losing approximately $12,000 a day.

Your pay, whatever it is, has not been appearing for 6 weeks. It may not appear for 6 weeks longer. Can you afford that?

And you, Mr. Employer, what of your operations? Your overhead is running along. You are paying nonproductive office help—and you are getting nothing out of it. If this keeps going on, you are fairly certain to face a decided loss this year—a loss when there might be a handsome profit.

As the worker and the employer lose, the city also loses. Every other worker, every taxpayer, every businessman must take a share of the loss. It is a long, vicious, tiresome, disastrous circle.

Why not get together on a provisional basis, right now? Let whatever settlements or concessions there may be in the final settlement be retroactive to the date of returning to work.

Why wait for slow governmental departments?

Let's cut the loss—everybody's loss.

Let's meet now on this basis so that we can all be at work and happy by March 1.

This is an appeal, without prejudice, for the good of the city and everyone in it. Get together now.

Radio Broadcast by John Hurley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpt from NBC News Broadcast, February 24, 1946, read by John Hurley, NBC staff announcer:

Well, apparently there is nothing on tap in Congress this week that will touch off another filibuster, but it looks as though another one may be coming some time fairly soon. There's a move afoot to bring up the fair employment practices bill again, this time to the House floor. And that, you know, is the bill the southern Congressmen say they won't have any part of. It was killed off in the Senate not long ago, but it has supporters in the House, and they are busy thinking up a way to get it to the floor. The authority for this is HUGH DE LACY, the Washington Democrat, who is serving his first term in the House. This man DE LACY, by the way, has a pretty colorful background.

There is an unwritten law on Capitol Hill, you know, that a freshman Congressman is seen and not heard, sits quietly with hands in lap, being respectful to his elders. That doesn't impress DE LACY. He is not awed by his elders one bit. He speaks up to them whenever they need it, and that is usually when he thinks somebody is stepping on the toes of the little man.

DE LACY is a little man himself—except in size. He is tall and husky; looks as if he might be a day laborer, a ditch-digger, or a shipyard machinist. On the other hand, he looks and talks as if he might be a college professor. Well, at one time or another, during his 35 years, he has been all of those. He still holds his membership card in the machinist union; and he also holds a master's degree in English.

DE LACY's political thinking falls somewhere in that now-familiar zone "slightly left of center." His opponents—and he has picked up a lot since coming to Congress—say his thinking is more, much more, than slightly left of center. Some of them call him a Communist. DE LACY laughs.

He began acting like a freshman Congressman isn't supposed to act last fall when he stood up and said his piece about Patrick Hurley, our former Ambassador to China. Hurley, you remember, kicked off an explosion around town when he resigned and accused the State Department of wrecking our foreign policy in China. While the State Department was busy preparing a reply, DE LACY stepped up and beat them to the punch. He said it was Hurley, not the State Department, who wrecked our Chinese foreign policy. For his pains, he was called an upstart by a lot of people. But that's all right with him. Because, he says, the entire Hurley episode served a useful purpose. In the first place, it helped make the people conscious there is such an animal as United States policy in China. And, more concretely, it resulted in General Marshall going to China and real progress toward ending the Chinese civil war.

About this matter of public opinion, DE LACY has some very definite ideas. He thinks the people should speak up more, to make Congress do what they want. For instance, he says, if the people really want better social-security coverage, really want more unemployment compensation, if they sign enough petitions and write enough letters, they'll get it.

He says he and some other House Members are getting up a petition now to bring the fair-employment-practices bill to the House floor. That's the bill the southern Democrats talked to death in the Senate a couple of weeks ago. DE LACY calls the filibuster disgusting. And he also thinks the Senate played its hand wrong. The southerners, you remember, said they were willing to filibuster all summer if necessary, but he thinks that was a big bluff. He says the Senators who wanted the bill should have let the southerners go ahead and talk. Then, he says, the people would have got mad enough to do something about the spectacle of a Senate conducting no business and drawing a salary.

And speaking of salary, DE LACY never made very much money. Even when he had his white-collar job teaching in college he only made $110 a month. And at one time he and his wife were almost broke. Eighteen bucks, he says, between us. Now he has three daughters and a Congressman's salary. And still, he says, he's not saving as much as he did when he worked in the shipyard. He worked in the shipyard, by the way, all during the war, building destroyers. Even on the day of the primary election in 1944, he worked his 8 hours and kept on working right up until a couple of weeks before the general election in November.

The Totalitarian Trend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an address made by Mr. Carroll B. Huntress, vice president of the Republic Coal & Coke Co., before the forum of free enterprise, at the Statler Hotel, Buffalo, N. Y., on February 28, 1946:

A meeting of agricultural, educational, industrial, and labor interests of New Jersey was held in Trenton last month. Discussion related, in part, to teaching of Americanism in the public schools. The meeting functioned through several panels in the forenoon and through a single gathering in the afternoon, when reports summarizing the morning sessions were received from duly chosen delegates of the panel sessions. At each of the panel meetings a Communist figured prominently in the debate, arguing vociferously for the "rights of the underdog" and frequently employing that much-abused phrase, "the underfed one-third." A friend whom I visited in Trenton a few days ago told of a conversation which he overheard, as the afternoon session was about to commence, at the entrance to the room where that meeting was to be held. A woman member of the trio of Communists said to her two associates, "We might as well leave now. We can't make any trouble in there."

As I look over this audience, I don't believe that woman or any of her ilk could make trouble here. But I cite this instance as a sample of what's going on and as evidence of the "confuse and divide" technique which threatens our very foundations. To such a statement as I have just made there is the conventional challenge of the parlor-pink to the effect that if our foundations are so weak as to be susceptible to such propaganda they are not worth saving. That type of individual would be the champion cry-baby when comes the revolution and we all eat strawberries, like them or not. It's insane, according to some folks, to talk about a revolution here, in the light of the small fraction of Communists. They contend it just couldn't happen here. Well, if most of us, with the courage of sheep, are going to remain unvocal, it certainly will happen here. As in Virgil's day, so now, "it never troubles a wolf how many the sheep be." All of us have likely read that letter Macaulay wrote 100 years ago, in which he made a startling prophecy. He predicted that in the twentieth century—and we're only about half through it—this country would be pillaged by barbarians even as Rome was destroyed. The difference, he said, would be that, whereas the destroyers of Rome were outside barbarians, the destroyers of America would be the people of our own country and the products of our own institutions. Fantastic as it may sound, it is much less fantastic than was the case a decade or so ago. Our present barbarians would reform defects of detail by universal confusion; cure illness by death. Riddance from a present evil is not a cure unless here is an all-around improvement in condition.

It is high time we advert to that ancient admonition, "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." A growing number of so-called good Americans, especially those afflicted with a psychopathic passion for security, actually

sneer at what they dub the antiquated doctrine expressed in that admonition. This indicates that the foundations of the Republic are weakening and unless there is at once a well-directed countermovement a totalitarian economy will follow. EVERETT DIRKSEN, an outstanding leader in the House of Representatives, delivered the annual address at this year's meeting of the New York State Bar Association. Communism on the March was his subject, and he spoke from the record of observations made on a recent round-the-world trip. The inroads that ideology has already made here call, he counseled, for a herculean effort in opposition.

No better illustration of the technique of the enemy could be had than is afforded by the Trenton, N. J., incident. And what is the underlying philosophy of those subversive forces? I was thrilled at a January meeting when the most Reverend J. Francis McIntyre, auxiliary bishop of New York, by a sharp attack on those forces which conspire to divide Americans, brought 400 diners to their feet in a spontaneous ovation. He said, "Integrity, courage in leadership, are the needs of our time." This is the spirit of America, which adheres to what has made our country great. Yet there are those who seek to change from our democratic principles of Washington and Jefferson to the so-called democracy of "confuse and divide." There is a well-organized effort to confuse democracy with communism. For instance, the New York Daily Worker, which George Sokolsky, eminent New York Sun columnist, styles, "The organ of an alien international conspiracy," invariably refers to the Communists and their friends as progressives. According to a New York Times editorial under date of February 6, "actually, affirmation has been made in Soviet practice and in the Soviet Constitution that a real democracy is compatible with a single political party, with only one list of candidates in an election, with a secret police and an unfree press." Let us remember, nevertheless, that western democracy cannot be a successful general practice unless it is based on a true general conviction. Democracy grows at one's own doorstep; that is, as a prerequisite for its effective advocacy there must be the root of democracy in our own lives. In some cases, the worms appear to have been busy at the root. On January 31, at Fort Devens, near Boston, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower called upon veterans to fight as hard for the peace as they had fought against the Axis. Here is what he said: "Attack everything anti-American now with as much vigor as you attacked the Germans and the Japs during the war. It's up to you to forestall any recurrence of any type of foreignism. You have an investment in the United States and the Star-Spangled Banner means a lot more to you now." General "Ike" is well aware of the dangerous trend—that's why he sounded the alarm. His reference to the investment which our soldiers have in the United States leads to the observation that in perhaps a larger sense than that implied in the title of the organization under whose auspices we meet today, every American has a precious investment to safeguard.

What is to be done about all this? you ask. Presumably, you have given serious thought to this general question, and you're attending this meeting in search of an intelligent answer. This statement by Daniel Webster furnishes the answer, "nothing will ruin this country if the people themselves will undertake its safety." In other words, the saving of the country from wrong thinking and wrong philosophies lies in the hands of the people themselves. As it stands today, a handful of collectivists can paralyze our country. Certainly, we are headed into stormy seas; and we cannot ride out the storm by squirting oil on the raging waters. The great middle group of our population must act. There are several organizations around which our forces should rally. An outstanding group, whose set of principles entitles it to loyal support on the part of those who believe that among human rights is the right to property, is the Investors League.

Your attendance reflects an interest in the preservation of the free enterprise system. Such an interest is timely, as Mark Sullivan, the distinguished analyst, pointed out in his January 1 column, where he wrote that "the fate of that system in the United States is a main issue for 1946." "This system is under attack," he said, "an attack in the rest of the world so successful that America is the only large country maintaining the system." The Marxians and their fellow travelers, in Buffalo as elsewhere, insinuate collectivism is better; but they cannot make a case on objective data, for the facts show that private capitalism is the most successful system the world has ever known. Consequently, they resort to the "confuse and divide" technique.

Previous to my Trenton visit, I had planned to confine my remarks to exposition of the uneconomic features of the St. Lawrence project. I now cite the support given to that project, including its espousal by the President, as proof of the trend away from the private-enterprise system. Both in its power aspects and in its transportation aspects the proposed St. Lawrence-Niagara development is thoroughly typical of a trend of governmental usurpation of the rights of citizens and of expropriation of the results of their enterprise. Unless that trend is reversed, destruction of a society of freemen and of the economy that flows from the vigor of free enterprise will follow. A great deal of the expropriation of private enterprise by Government becomes so much an accustomed thing that after a time we take it to be perfectly natural. Then it is easy for people to reason from what is assumed to be natural to making the same kind of process universal.

Most proponents of the St. Lawrence project give at least lip service to the free-enterprise system, while contending that our economy will be strengthened by this billion-dollar-plus scheme. Some advocates attempt to assure us that another TVA won't happen here, and call attention to the Federal-State accord whereby the latter would have the power distribution rights. Some observers, who are acquainted with governmental tactics in the TVA expansion program, believe that, should the project be developed, it wouldn't be many years before Washington ruled the St. Lawrence roost. If the left-wing philosophy which has such a powerful grip on our present economy prevails we know what to expect. As Hitler exposed his hand in Mein Kampf, so the left-wing crowd, speaking through Victor G. Reuther, chairman, postwar policy committee of the United Auto Workers, exposed their hand in the December 1945 issue of a magazine called Common Sense. In that issue Reuther advocated "the substitution of democratic social ownership for private monopoly ownership." Do you investors want democratic social ownership? And what does Mr. Reuther mean by the term "democratic"? He tells us in these words, "the forms of social ownership we propose to institute must, in the fashion of the cooperatives and the TVA, be absolutely democratic in character." That's the type of democracy which the St. Lawrence project would generate. Democratic social ownership, to employ Mr. Reuther's phrase, would soon overtake the railroads. It wouldn't be long before a governmental set-up would take over the electric utilities of the State of New York. Why not? It happened in Tennessee in the face of a stiff fight by a stalwart warrior, Wendell Willkie. The socialistic domination of distribution and customer relations in the Tennessee Valley is now complete. For instance, the United States, through the Electric Home and Farm Authority, has engaged in the sale of refrigerators, not only in the Tennessee Valley but throughout the Nation.

Let's take a look at the St. Lawrence scheme. No transportation medium available for use only 7 months in the year is sound. On the power phase of this project, which Vice President Matthew Woll, of the American Federation of Labor, calls a monstrosity, I would make a few observations. Most of the discussions of the St. Lawrence power development refer to a $93,375,000 expenditure by the State of New York as if that were the whole story. In an Albany dispatch to the New York Times, under date of February 2, we read: "Under the Federal-State accord, the State is to have the power distribution rights in return for payment of $93,375,000 toward the cost of the St. Lawrence development." The following entirely disregards all question of the necessary burdens which it is proposed to lay on the seaway. No question is here raised as to whether ancient cost estimates represent the postwar possibilities. It is believed that general observation answers that. Taking the figures appearing in the eighth annual report of the Power Authority of the State of New York for the year ended December 31, 1938, at their face value, we find that the $93,375,000 is just the opener and that the power authority itself projects an undertaking on its own basis of estimating of $604,030,000, or six and seven-tenths times the conversational cost of the public power project. And this eliminates all consideration of the general experience in such matters, namely, that the subsequent discovery of unexpected trifles runs to a substantial part of the original estimate.

This, however, is beside the point. The discussion of a $93,375,000 expenditure by the State of New York is flagrant deception. The protagonists of the scheme have fully in mind a vastly larger undertaking and have excellently put themselves in the position, if anything is ever said later as to their not having been frank, that whatever the conversations have been their published report has put all and sundry on notice as to the intent and extent of the project. This is chiseling on the grand scale. Now for the climax, depending, of course, on your point of view. Even when all of this is done, the power authority does not promise to effect an economy of more than one-tenth of a cent per kilowatt-hour at wholesale. Serious analysis would show this economy working really in reverse, in much greater degree.

The protagonists of the power development cheerfully assume that the people of New York State and the neighboring States can absorb a bunch of kilowatt-hours and thereby relieve all the ailments of man, from falling hair to fallen arches, taking in gastric ulcers en route. Granted that there are many things which electrical energy can do, given the means of employing it, the fact still remains that the user has to equip himself with the devices of utilization. The alleged economy of the St. Lawrence and the Niagara development is predicated on the assumption that residential consumers in upstate New York will use 3,000 kilowatt-hours a year each, and those in the metropolitan district 2,400 kilowatt-hours each per annum. It has been computed that this use could be accomplished by the installation of 1,600,000 refrigerators, 2,400,000 electric ranges, and 1,200,000 electric water heaters, the ranges and water heaters displacing coal and gas, to say nothing of birch, hickory, and maple from the farmers' woodlots. Maybe this is all very nice, but the residence consumers of the State would have to put up over one billion for these appliances, not to mention the reinforcement of house wiring to take on the heavy load of the electric ranges. This represents something like an investment of $300 per average family throughout the State. Quite apparently, the people

of the State are expected to serve the St. Lawrence development rather than the other way round. The protagonists apparently never heard "the Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath."

Respecting the ability of the average upstate domestic customer to consume electrical energy, estimated by the power authority of the State of New York at 3,000 kilowatt-hours per annum, let's look at the record in the Tennessee Valley. Domestic rates in that area have been made low by dint of phony cost allocations, tax and interest immunity, unpaid collateral services of government. Propaganda in the valley—federally paid for—has reached the heights of evangelistic fervor. The operations in the valley have been going on long enough to show what may be expected in comparable nonmetropolitan areas. TVA reports that for the 12 months ending with November 1945 the average domestic energy consumption through the systems, municipal and rural, served by TVA was 1,713 kilowatt-hours, which figure falls 1,287 kilowatt-hours below the estimate of the New York State Power Authority for upstate residential consumers.

There is considerable ballyhoo about the industrial growth that the proposed power development would generate. But those who prate of the importance to the industrial development of a region through creation of an abundance of power facilities, as if that were all that is involved, are definitely overlooking the major part of what it takes. The production-plant investment necessary for creating a useful job is generally estimated at $6,000 per worker. The investment per worker in power plant and transmission and distribution facilities is reckoned at $900. The production-plant investment is thus seen to be nearly seven times the investment in a first-class steam-power plant, along with facilities, for supplying an industrial job. This is not to say that the power costs are of no consequence. It is simply to underline that if the development of the power is by a process which casts a cloud over private enterprise the major part of the plant for employing the American worker is made more difficult to create, and it is further to say that it is economically easier to create a power plant than it is to create the industires that use its output.

There is no disposition here to quarrel with the taking over of private functions by government when it is really necessary, and certain processes of regulation and control may be justified; but the Government competition with which the railroads are now faced and which may make Government seizure inevitable is not justifiable. The threat of TVA competition forced the sale of electric-utility properties in Tennessee 7 years ago. We now hear demands that the Government take over the aluminum business, the steel business, and, pretty soon, there'll likely be renewed clamor for nationalization of the coal industry. We have seen the extreme in this sort of thing in Mr. Hitler's development of the "peoples' automobile." How can some of our Michigan friends say that can't happen here, in the light of the threat of the St. Lawrence project to private enterprise? Excuses can readily be contrived. They are as easily formed as are picket lines but are not nearly as solid. Public health is now being made an excuse for the governmental practice of medicine, and full employment is being made an excuse for the more extended hiring of its citizens by the superstate. And so on, ad nauseam.

The more we study this St. Lawrence-Niagara regional development idea the clearer we see its resemblance to the concept of the altruistic state, which is now being enlarged by intertwining with the concept of an altruistic industry. It's just another excuse for the extension of the "welfare state' where neither economy nor the public welfare warrants. And no suggestion has been advanced yet that the principal industry with which the St. Lawrence canal would compete, namely, the railroads, would enjoy tax-exemption along with the older type of philanthropic institutions. Definitely, the railroads would qualify as such, for they would be called upon to stand by for 7 months of the year in order to have their facilities available for the transportation of freight which the canal couldn't handle for the 5-month period when it is frozen. The issue of an ability-to-pay wage wouldn't long concern the railroads. Bankrupted, they would be taken over by the Government.

Only a Francis Bacon, with his rare talent for condensed prose, the distilled essence, could treat properly, in a limited period, of the sinister significance of this St. Lawrence scheme, with emphasis on the power phase. Once let the State get its hands on the power-distribution facilities of this country, and socialization of industry is right around the corner. That's the primary goal of the totalitarians. Their propaganda machines are vast, the operation subtle. Governments have traditionally bribed their citizens with bread and circuses into sacrificing their liberties. This movement resolves itself into an attempt to bribe the grain-raising Prairie States, the automobile-manufacturing States, with allegedly low-cost subsidized transportation; an attempt to bribe the States of New York and Vermont with allegedly low-cost subsidized power into sacrificing free enterprise. It was the wily Lenin who said the sure bait of communism to catch capitalism is that of immediate profit. That bait is now being dangled before the eyes of the great automobile corporations.

Our entire problem narrows down to this—how are we to make ourselves heard on these vital issues? The enemies of our type of democracy are throwing their weight around, with the recent result that our internal disorder was not far from chaos. The so-called minority groups bombard the Congress, motivated by knowledge that an extremely popular trait of not a few Members of that body is a consuming desire for longevity in office. Consequently, it is of paramount importance that the great middle group of Americans make known to Washington, and to State legislators as well, how they feel about the momentous questions of the day. We can function through a body such as the Investors League. This over-all observation is in order. We can function effectively over the long range only if we have a clear sense of ethics. An ethical conception must be pushed to the front, with the end result that service, not wealth, will be the standard of honor.

Godchaux Raps United States Rice Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit a copy of a statement on rice by Hon. Frank A. Godchaux, Jr., president of the Louisiana State Rice Milling Co. of Louisiana, which was published in the New Orleans Times-Picayune, of date March 1, 1946:

GODCHAUX RAPS UNITED STATES RICE POLICY—SAYS LARGE PART OF CROP PRACTICALLY DESTROYED

BATON ROUGE, February 28.—Frank A. Godchaux, Jr., president of the Louisiana Rice Milling Co., said today that the Government practically destroyed a large portion of this year's rice crop, as far as domestic use is concerned, by basing the rough rice ceiling price on a moisture content so high that much of it became "stack-burned" in storage.

"The Government's vacillation first one way and then another is ample evidence," he said, "of a lack of clear policy and a lack of understanding of what they are doing to the industry and the country."

Godchaux' statement was made in a letter, released today, to J. H. McLaurin, president of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, on the current rice situation.

Godchaux also challenged the Department of Agriculture figures on rice distribution, and questioned the wisdom of the Government's policy of allocating this year's crop.

"Our only source of information on total rice shipments," Godchaux said, "is the Government's figures, and it is important to us, as well as to the Government, to have the truth. It is probably partly this lack of knowledge of what is going on in the rice industry that gives rise to unreasonable and uneconomical Government orders."

He said that at Government insistence, rice farmers, faced with rising demand and short labor supply, invested heavily in new rice growing and harvesting machinery, while mills adjusted their milling and storing equipment to the new combines.

Cutting down domestic consumption of rice and shifting demand to other foods, Godchaux said, "practically destroys the heavy investment that has been made in the rice industry. It is neither intelligent nor American for our Government to destroy investment that it has insisted on being made."

Godchaux concluded that "the only remedy we see for the mismanagement of this year's rice crop is to allow a reasonable portion of what top-grade rice remains to be shipped to the domestic trade before the Government set-aside."

Terminal Leave for Enlisted Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by J. H. Leib, national legislative director of American Veterans of World War II:

AMVETS URGE TERMINAL LEAVE FOR ENLISTED MEN

(By J. H. Leib, national legislative director, American Veterans of World War II)

On numerous occasions Amvets have emphatically stated their position relative to terminal leave in behalf of enlisted men who are being discharged from the armed forces.

Amvets have never been able to understand why the Congress approved Public Law 226, Seventy-ninth Congress, which provided terminal leave for commissioned personnel but which completely disregarded similar benefits to the GI's who carried the brunt throughout the war.

Amvets have protested this unfortunate and discriminatory legislation until we are blue in the face, yet the Congress steadfastly refuses to call open hearings or take up for immediate consideration pending bills which seek to grant enlisted personnel the same

consideration that was given to the greedy pressure groups located in the Pentagon Building and in the Navy Department.

This so-called vacation pay has already become a heavy burden upon the taxpayers of this Nation. Terminal rewards should never have been started in the first place, but since it is now the law of the land—for officers only—Congress should as a matter of fairness expedite legislation to enable men currently being discharged from the services to readjust and reorient themselves before seeking civilian employment.

The bill to grant terminal leave to officers was signed by the President on November 21, 1945—more than 3 months ago—and still nothing definite has been done for the enlisted men.

It appears that many Members of Congress are not fully informed regarding this situation.

Few seem to know that enlisted men are entitled to 30 days' furlough leave per year, but if they are for some reason unable to use up this time they automatically lose it. Under existing regulations it does not accumulate to their credit.

However, commissioned officers who receive the same 30-day leave are allowed to pile up this furlough time but not to exceed 120 days. In other words an officer who did not use his leave will receive his full pay and allowance for 4 months upon discharge.

Congress has many bills before it to correct this great injustice. If it is good policy to permit terminal leave with full pay for officers then why isn't it equally good policy to allow the same privileges to enlisted men on the same footing. Haven't they earned this consideration by their many sacrifices?

Not Unduly Exacting About Soviet Expansion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 4, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, many Americans have expressed a hope that with the establishment of the United Nations Security Council the era of unilateral and forcible expansion of the Soviet Empire would be replaced by an orderly process in which the desires of the peoples involved would be consulted and conformed to, as promised in the Atlantic Charter, the Moscow agreement, No. 1, and the Charter of the United Nations.

These same Americans have looked forward to a more vigorous policy on the part of their Government than that which was described by Secretary of State Byrnes last October as not being unduly exacting.

How far these hopes still are from fruition is very clearly summed up in the following article by Joseph and Stewart Alsop which appeared in the Washington Post on February 6, 1946:

NEW WORLD CONFLICT

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

The cat is emerging from the bag. Reports from London at last clearly recognize that the basic problem of international relations is a rapidly developing conflict between the tired British imperialism, and the vigorous Russian imperialism or expansionism—you may choose whichever word you please. The future implications of this conflict are almost illimitable. They embrace, in truth, most of Europe and Asia.

An analysis of the conflict, area by area, is the only way to grasp the potential meaning of the over-all picture. After extensive consultation, such an analysis has been prepared, and is presented herewith:

The Middle and Far East are the areas where the conflict is at present most clearly visible, with the storm center, of course, in Iran. Essentially, the Iranian settlement reached by the United Nations is regarded as a Russian victory. The new Iranian Premier, Qavam, is a weak intriguer, on whom the Russians have a considerable hold. It is rumored in Tehran that Qavam will ask the Soviet puppet in Azerbaijan, Peshavari, to enter his government as Minister of Agriculture. The rebels in Azerbaijan have made great progress in consolidating their position, and recent State Department reports indicate the Iranian Government could no longer reestablish sovereignty over Azerbaijan, even if Soviet forces were withdrawn from the area.

Thus the Kremlin and the new regime at Tehran are now expected to reach an agreement, on the basis of the fait accompli, in the discussions authorized by the United Nations Security Council. But the vital point is that the Russians have already won the real prize—actual or potential control of the Iranian Government. This in turn gives them the power, when they so desire, either to cancel the Anglo-Persian oil concession, which provides the life fluid of the British Empire, or to move down to the Persian Gulf, or both.

The British can hardly protect themselves against these potential threats in Iran, except by proclaiming the independence under their control of Arabistan, where the oil concessions and gulf ports are located. And this would both compromise their position, by openly repeating the Russian tactics to which they have objected, and probably fail of its object in the long run. Meanwhile, in India, the situation is degenerating ominously, with a great famine expected to coincide with the climax of the embittered negotiations regarding Indian independence. Strengthened by their new base in Iran, the Russians are expected by the British to fish in the troubled Indian waters.

In the Mediterranean, the seriousness of the Anglo-Russian conflict is just coming into the open. The Russians want Tripolitania, the Dodecanese, concessions from Turkey which, if granted, would impair Turkish independence, and the expulsion of the British troops from Greece. Long ago Bevin accused the Soviets of wishing to "place themselves across the throat" of the British Empire because of their Mediterranean aspirations. Here again, the British position is inherently very weak. To counter full Russian pressure on Turkey, for example, the British would probably be forced to promise the Turks to fight by their side. As for Greece, the elections supervised by the British and ourselves may probably bring in a non-Communist government. Yet even the most optimistic British officials frankly doubt whether such a government can sustain itself after the scheduled withdrawal of British troops. The combined pressure of the EAM, from within, and the pressure from without of the Russian satellite governments in Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia (all of which have loud grievances against Greece) would be too strong.

Finally, in Europe itself, there is the possibility that the hunger and misery of the winter will bring in a Communist government in France, which would both make the talk of a western bloc ridiculous, and greatly simplify the task of the Communist parties in other European nations.

It is no wonder that Bevin talked with such brutal frankness to the United Nations Security Council. Among American policymakers there is no longer much doubt that the Soviets intend to press their advantages everywhere to the utmost. If they do this successfully, Britain will cease to be a major power. The crisis—and it is a major crisis—the outcome of which is likely to determine the pattern of the future—finds this country almost without a policy. At London, Byrnes purposely avoided discussions with the British which might have led to parallel action, in order to avoid rousing Russian suspicions. We are not ready to back the British, which would be a vast undertaking. Yet our policymakers view with intense dismay the changes in the world balance of power which would result from a complete Soviet success in the present contest with Britain. Thus far, those who make our policy have decided only to explain very clearly to the Russians that if their real desire is to upset the world balance of power in their favor, the United States will no longer be able to place its faith in the security machinery of the United Nations. What this may accomplish, still remains to be seen. One must add, of course, that it also remains to be seen whether the Russian intentions are as ambitious as the American State Department and the British Foreign Office now believe.

Terminal Leave

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, my bill to extend terminal leave to enlisted men and women of the armed forces is still in the Military Affairs Committee, and I am hopeful it will be reported out soon. In my opinion it is absolutely necessary that this bill be brought out on the floor of the House at the earliest opportunity so that the inequality inherent in the status of terminal leave can be done away with. If a terminal-leave bill is not recommended by the Military Affairs Committee soon, I shall place a discharge petition on the Clerk's desk and do my utmost to get the necessary 218 signatures to bring it before the Congress for debate and approval. Too much time has already been wasted on this measure. We cannot delay much longer.

The Power Authority of the State of New York Endorses Seaway Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, before World War II the opponents of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project championed delay because of governmental affairs being in bad condition, a depression was on, we had no need for the project under those conditions, and

so forth and so forth. With great eloquence the opponents pointed out the propriety of delay.

DELAY TACTICS OF OPPONENTS

When World War II commenced, the opponents changed the tune of their song and then they said that while World War II was going on, the project must be delayed because it might hinder the war effort. That same sort of excuse was used by everybody who wanted to prevent something being done. It worked. The project was delayed and many of its friends argued for delay alongside the railroads, the utilities, the eastern seaboard ports, John L. Lewis and other agencies and peoples who did not want to see the project undertaken.

When World War II terminated the opponents of the seaway project again came forward with a rather serious look on their faces, and this time they said there must be further delay. The war is over now, they have said, and we have changed conditions. The opponents said: "We must reexamine this matter. Conditions have changed in Canada. They have changed in the United States," and so forth. So the opponents of the project are back here now advocating delay even though the St. Lawrence project is just exactly the same as it was in 1934 and just the same as it was before World War II and after World War II. Not a single factor in relation to the seaway project has changed at all. The only thing new is the atomic bomb.

THE POWER AUTHORITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

One, probably the only one, of our national agencies which has consistently and persistently advocated the building of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is the State agency in New York known as the power authority. This was created by an act of the State legislature and has for its object the development of power on the St. Lawrence. The agency functions through trustees who are appointed by the Governor. The present officers are: Francis B. Wilby, chairman; Fred J. Freestone, vice chairman; George Stephens Reed, Maurice P. Davidson, Gerald V. Cruise, and Ralph Gunn Sucher, executive secretary and counsel.

I can testify, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that the Power Authority of the State of New York has kept alive the St. Lawrence project during the years when other considerations crowded it out of the minds of the American people. We owe this group of high-minded, able, and conscientious men a debt of gratitude for the faithful work they have done in connection with this matter. They have a national viewpoint. The bill in question provides for the development of power and navigation, hand in hand. Gen. Thomas Robins, of the War Department engineers, testified in 1941 that the development of power and navigation should be done concurrently and that the development of one should proceed together with the development of the other. The Power Authority of the State of New York has always stood by this position advocated by General Robins.

MAJ. GEN. FRANCIS B. WILBY URGES ST. LAWRENCE DEVELOPMENT

On February 20, 1946, Maj. Gen. Francis B. Wilby, United States Army, retired, chairman of the Power Authority of the State of New York, appeared before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and testified on behalf of legislation to complete the project. I am sure that many Members of this House know General Wilby and are familiar with his 40 years' record as an officer in the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army. He was at the front as a combat officer in the First World War. While serving as Superintendent of the Military Academy at West Point he undertook an inspection tour of 35,000 miles which carried him to the principal theaters of World War II in 1944.

Between World War I and World War II, General Wilby was engaged as district engineer and divisional engineer on navigation, power, flood control, and irrigation projects, as well as river and harbor improvements. His work took him into many of our great river basins and coastal areas.

When Gov. Thomas E. Dewey appointed General Wilby to the Power Authority early in February 1945, he selected one of the most seasoned engineers in this country for that responsible post. General Wilby became chairman of the group on February 13, 1946, and last week he presented his views on the St. Lawrence project at the hearings now in progress. Because of the outstanding importance of his statements, coming as they do from a thoroughly qualified and experienced engineer, I ask leave to insert excerpts from General Wilby's testimony in the RECORD, which excerpts are as follows:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, last week I was appointed a trustee of the Power Authority of the State of New York and was elected chairman a few days before the opening of the hearings of your committee.

I am sure that you gentlemen are aware of the fact that the Governor of our State, the Honorable Thomas E. Dewey, is on record for the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. Before starting my statement on behalf of the Power Authority, I believe it is fitting that I quote from Governor Dewey's message to the legislature, January 3, 1945, in part as follows:

"After 20 years of discussion, the tremendous power potential of the St. Lawrence River still remains undeveloped. Its estimated 1,620,000 kilowatts would be the second largest project of its kind in this continent. Its beneficiaries would be the residents of this State and nearby areas.

"At the last session of the legislature, upon the recommendation of the State administration, resolutions were unanimously adopted declaring for the prompt development of the St. Lawrence River by measures which would provide low-cost power from these resources under the inalienable ownership of the people. * * *

"I recommend, therefore, that the State continue vigorously to assert its substantial rights and interests in the St. Lawrence development.

"For years I have advocated the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. During the past decade the means have been found and billions in Federal funds have been appropriated, to develop great rivers in other sections of the country, for power, navigation, flood control, irrigation and like purposes. The incomparable resources of the St. Lawrence River should no longer be wasted."

The Power Authority of the State of New York is here today to cooperate in the advancement of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, and in the hearings of your subcommittee.

At the last congressional hearings, in 1941, we recommended approval of the United States-Canadian agreement of March 19, 1941, which is before you, and we support it now. We strongly favor the power development in the International Rapids section under the dual-purpose project covered by the agreement, including the completion of the navigation improvement. We also approve the essential features of the plans submitted by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, to complete the entire development. We consider the cost estimates for the over-all project presented by the Corps as conservative and reliable, knowing that these figures are based upon thorough, on-site investigation. We also support wholeheartedly the maintenance of the Federal-State accord of February 7, 1933, on the power development in New York.

Any proposals we shall have to make to the subcommittee in reference to the legislation, Senate Joint Resolution 104, will be constructive recommendations, designed to strengthen, clarify, and perfect the terms of the resolution. I wish to place on the record now a request that we be permitted to submit such recommendations in the course of the hearings.

* * * * *

1. Low-cost power and low-cost transportation, such as the St. Lawrence development will provide, are essential to an expanding economy, sustained production and employment, and an increased volume of foreign trade for the United States in the postwar world. These are basis elements in any program to enable American industry, labor, and agriculture to prosper in the highly competitive conditions that follow the war.

2. The War Department, the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, Department of Agriculture, the United States Maritime Commission, and other agencies of the Federal Government charged with the duty of continuous studies of the transportation needs of this country recommended the completion of the St. Lawrence navigation improvement in 1941 and in 1944. The Power Authority accepts the findings and conclusions of such agencies that this project, when completed, will furnish exceptionally low-cost transportation. Far from diverting any measurable volume of tonnage from existing ports and railroads, the surveys of these agencies show the project will create new traffic, both domestic and foreign, in which existing port, shipping, and railroad facilities will share.

3. Engineering studies, independently made by the Power Authority from 1931 down to date, show that St. Lawrence power can be generated and transmitted to load centers throughout the State at delivered costs far below those of the most efficient steam plants now operating in New York or elsewhere. In the last year prior to the outbreak of the war in Europe, the Power Authority, on May 16, 1939, submitted to the Governor and the legislature the results of a coordination survey on electric power supply and requirements in New York State, based upon 4 years of technical studies.

4. In its coordination report, the power authority estimated that the St. Lawrence project would provide about 6,600,000,000 kilowatt-hours of energy anually at a cost of about 1 mill per kilowatt-hour. It was estimated in the report that, under the coordination plan recommended by the authority, power from the St. Lawrence, the

Niagara, and from existing and needed new steam plants, could be delivered at 80 percent load factor to large substations near Syracuse, Schenectady, Binghamton, and Poughkeepsie, and to a transmission loop interconnecting with the metropolitan area, at an average annual cost of 2.61 mills per kilowatt-hour. The report estimated annual savings from this plan, which included both St. Lawrence and Niagara power development, of about $27,770,000, as compared with the equivalent power supply from modern steam stations.

5. The coordination survey assumed that a 287,000-volt transmission system would be required to carry the large blocks of power at high tension potentially available from the St. Lawrence and the Niagara. Substantial economics in long-distance high-tension transmission have since been effected by the successful use of 230,000-volt lines in the Boneville-Grand Coulee, TVA, and other areas. Later studies undertaken by the Power Authority and a review of wartime improvements in the art of long-distance transmission indicate that the 1939 transmission estimates of the Authority were well within the range of actual costs.

6. We consider figures on cost of generation and transmission of St. Lawrence power submitted to this committee on February 18, 1946, by the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, based upon studies by the Commission's staff, as equally conservative. These figures show that St. Lawrence energy can be produced at the site in New York at about 1.0 mill per kilowatt-hour, as compared with 1941 production costs ranging from 2.19 mills per kilowatt-hour to 4.24 mills per kilowatt-hour at the most efficient steam plants in New York. The Commission's studies further indicate that St. Lawrence power can be delivered throughout the State of New York and in nearby States at average costs of about 2.22 mills per kilowatt-hour, at 80 percent load factor. It will be noted that these estimates submitted by the Federal Power Commission fully confirm the results of the earlier detailed studies of the Power Authority.

7. The Power Authority concurs in findings of the Federal Power Commission that St. Lawrence power could be transmitted at low cost over a wide area, including all of New York State and parts of New England and the Middle Atlantic States. In 1941 the Power Authority supported the terms of the Mansfield bill (H. R. 5993) providing for "a widespread equitable disposition of the power to public agencies in other States, including counties, municipalities, public power districts, and rural electric cooperatives within economic transmission distances" of the St. Lawrence project. The Mansfield bill and the Pittenger-Aiken bills, H. R. 2280, S. 1385, Seventy-eighth Congress, contained identical provisions, and definitely allocated costs of $93,375,000 to be assumed by the Power Authority as the accredited agency of the State of New York in the ownership and operation of the project. These provisions were recommended by the State Department, the War Department, the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, the Commerce Department, the Federal Power Commission and other agencies in 1941 and 1944.

8. The Power Authority is convinced from its studies of power supply and requirements in New York and neighboring States in the Northeast that mutually beneficial arrangements could readily be made for the interchange of power, without artificial limitations imposed by State lines. Unquestionably, experience has shown that interconnections of power systems, such as exist in the Bonneville-Grand Coulee area, in the TVA area, and among other systems elsewhere, greatly increase the value and enhance the service of such systems and furnish needed security against break-downs.

9. While fully prepared to arrange for interchanges and interconnections with public agencies and rural electric cooperatives in neighboring States, the Power Authority is opposed to any weakening of the public safeguards contained in its own act, governing the sale and resale of St. Lawrence power.

10. All studies heretofore made by the Power Authority, as well as by the Federal Power Commission, have demonstrated that St. Lawrence power can readily be absorbed in the State of New York, even assuming no sales to public bodies in other States or interchanges with power systems in other States. New York State has had no major hydroelectric-power developments in 22 years, since the last units were installed at Niagara Falls in 1924. In the decade following World War I, hydro capacity in New York State generating plants increased by 564,815 kilowatts from the end of 1920 to the end of 1930. Over the same period, steam capacity in the State increased by 2,219,565 kilowatts, a total growth of capacity, including both hydro and steam, of 2,784,380 kilowatts. This growth over the 10 years following World War I was about three times the potential capacity of the St. Lawrence power development in New York.

11. Recent wartime experience in the production of aluminum furnishes a concrete example of the need for low cost hydroelectric power in New York State. The Defense Plant Corporation's aluminum plant, built by the Government at Massena, N. Y., near the site of the proposed power project, operated from June 1942 through January 1944, depending upon steam power transmitted long distances to the plant. Power costs at the Massena plant were the highest among all DPC aluminum plants in the United States, averaging 6.6 cents per pound in 1942, and 6.9 cents per pound in 1943. This compared with an average power cost at the Troutdale, Oreg., DPC plant, served with hydro power from Bonneville, of 2.1 cents per pound in 1942 and 1.9 cents per pound in 1943. In the report on the aluminum industry filed by the Attorney General September 19, 1945, Senate Document No. 4, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, it was stated that the prospects for successful peacetime operation of this plant are excellent if and when the St. Lawrence hydro power project is built and that the completion of the seaway will make it possible to locate an alumina plant close by which will have ocean-port advantages and so be able to use foreign bauxites. Without low cost hydro power, the report stated, the plant cannot produce aluminum cheap enough to meet current prices and still leave a profit for the operator.

12. Today there is no reserve of developed hydro-electric power available in the Northeast. This has unquestionably limited the expansion of industry, while 4,000,000 domestic and small commercial consumers in New York State continue to pay relatively high rates. During the war, New York has been utilizing 220,000 kilowatts imported on short-term contracts from Canada. Under a temporary war permit, 12,500 cubic feet per second of additional water has been diverted and used at the Adams plant of the Niagara Falls Power Co. to provide 90,000 kilowatts. This power has been sold since January 1, 1945, under rates fixed by the New York Public Service Commission, at 1 mill per kilowatt-hour, to a limited group of industries at the site. Any new increments of low-cost power needed to replace these temporary supplies of hydro for New York State can come only from prompt development of the St. Lawrence.

* * * * *

PROGRAM FOR NEW YORK STATE POWER PROJECT PRESENTED AT PREVIOUS HEARINGS AND APPROVED BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE

At the last congressional hearings on the pending United States-Canadian agreement held before the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors in the Seventy-seventh Congress, the Power Authority recommended the approval of the agreement, consistent with the fulfillment of the Federal-State accord on the New York power project.

In the course of the hearings, the Power Authority presented a summary of the program under which it is proposed to conduct the New York State power project, upon the approval of the pending United States-Canadian agreement, as follows:

"Among the broad principles which the Power Authority has advocated as a basis for future operation of the St. Lawrence power project in the public interest are the following:

"In the operation of the project and the disposition of the power generated therefrom—

"(1) No part of the United States' share of the water in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River should be diverted for the benefit of any person or private corporation, nor should the use of any part of said water or the rights pertaining to said water be sold, leased, or otherwise alienated to any person or private corporation for the generation of hydroelectric power, nor should the power generating facilities be sold, leased, pledged, mortgaged, or otherwise alienated to any person or private corporation.

"(2) Full recognition should be given to the interests of national defense.

"(3) There should be made available and delivered without charge to the War Department so much power as shall be necessary in the judgment of said department for use in operation of all reservoirs, canals, locks, and other facilities in aid of navigation in the International Rapids section.

"(4) The project should be considered primarily for the benefit of the people as consumers of electricity, and particularly for the benefit of domestic and rural consumers, to whom it should be made available at the lowest possible rates and in such manner as to encourage increased domestic and rural use of electricity.

"(5) In disposing of the power generated by the project preference should be given to counties, municipalities, and public power districts; and provision should be made so that municipalities and other political subdivisions and public agencies, now or hereafter authorized by law to engage in the distribution of electric current, may secure a reasonable share of the power generated at the project.

"(6) In the event power is sold to any public agency, private company, or individual for resale, the contracts for the sale of such power should include adequate provisions for establishing resale rates, which should be fixed by the generating agency and which not only should provide for passing on to the electric consumer savings in costs of generation but also should be promotional in character, designed, insofar as reasonably possible, to result in periodic rate reductions. Such contracts must be for a period of time not exceeding 20 years, including renewals.

"(7) The power-generating agency should have due legal authority to construct, acquire, maintain, and operate substations and transmission lines for the purpose of serving the principal load centers within economic transmission distance of the project."

* * * * *

NEW YORK STATE POWER PROJECT APPROVED IN CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE REPORT AFTER HEARINGS ON PENDING AGREEMENT

In its report to the House (H. Doc. No. 1431, 77th Cong., 1st sess.) recommending approval of the pending United States-Canadian agreement and construction of the St. Lawrence project, the committee said in reference to the Federal-State accord provisions of the St. Lawrence project bill, section 2 (b), and the program presented by the Power Authority:

"The terms of section 2 (b) are consistent with previous action taken by the House and with the reports and recommendations of the public agencies of the Federal Government

and the State which have participated during the past decade in cooperative plans for the completion and conduct of the project in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River.

"The joint resolution of the Corps of Engineers and the Power Authority, dated February 7, 1933, referred to in section 2 (b) of the bill, provides that in respect to the works to be constructed on the United States side of the boundary in the International Rapids section, the Power Authority shall assume the cost of the power works and one-half of the cost of the works common to navigation and power. This formula of cost allocation was approved by the House on April 26, 1933, in the adoption of House Joint Resolution No. 157, Seventy-third Congress, first session."

* * * * *

Resuming the discussion of the Mansfield bill, H. R. 5993, later reintroduced as the Pittenger-Aiken bill (H. R. 2280, S. 1385, 78th Cong.), the report continued:

"The allocation of costs approved by the House and the Federal-State accord embodied in House Joint Resolution 157, have continued to receive recognition from Federal and State authorities as an equitable basis for completion of the project. Since 1931 the State of New York has maintained the Power Authority as a public agency directed to cooperate with the Federal Government in plans for the improvement of the International Rapids section and, according to testimony before the committee, has expended $1,250,000 on engineering surveys, marketing studies, and other activities contributing to the advancement of the project.

"The Dominion of Canada and the Province of Ontario on March 19, 1941, entered into an agreement under which the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of the Province will undertake the operation and maintenance of the powerhouse on the Canadian side of the boundary and use the Canadian share of the water for the development of power. The Federal-State agreement to be executed subject to the approval of Congress and the State of New York contemplates similar provisions on the United States side."

The report of the committee referred to the "detailed plans for the conduct of the power project in accordance with established public power policies heretofore applied in other areas," adopted and presented by the trustees of the Power Authority at the hearings, and concluded:

"The successful experience of other State public power projects, many of which have been constructed with the use of Federal loans and grants, in extending rural electrification, serving defense needs, and supplying power to public bodies across State lines, is described in statements of Federal officials presented to the committee in the course of our extended consideration of the bill.

"It is the view of the committee that the cooperation of the Federal Government of the United States, the Dominion Government of Canada, the State of New York, and the Province of Ontario in plans and accords developed over the past decade for the improvement of the International Rapids section has been of the utmost value. We recommend that the basis be established for continued cooperation under a Federal-State accord pursuant to the terms of section 2 (b), as the best means of utilizing the resources of this international stream with maximum benefits to the public."

The power authority reaffirms the recommendations contained in the program it presented at the last congressional hearings, in support of the pending United States-Canadian agreement and the Federal-State accord, and concurs in the conclusions stated in the report of the congressional committee.

Consistent with these recommendations and with the statement of Governor Dewey on September 19, 1945, as concurred in by the President in his statements of September 26, 1945, and October 3, 1945, the power authority again urges the prompt enactment of enabling legislation to approve the pending United States-Canadian agreement, to authorize the completion of the St. Lawrence development, and to implement the Federal-State accord.

* * * * *

In connection with our formal statement, I hope I may be permitted to make a personal observation. Last month I completed over 40 years of service as an officer in the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, having divided my time between the military and the civilian work of the corps. It has been my privilege, serving with the corps, to work on multiple-purpose river projects and harbor improvements in many States of the Union. After such an experience, it would be impossible for me to take any other than a national view of the St. Lawrence development or to evaluate it from the angle of any sectional, local, or special interest. With the Army engineers, I have seen the locks and dams built, the powerhouses constructed and machines installed, and the flood-control works erected along our great inland waterways. On the Mississippi and the Ohio, we have seen the barges and towboats serving new commerce and handling tonnage created by such improvements. More recently, at West Point, I have observed with keen interest ocean cargo vessels plying up and down the improved channel of the Hudson that made Albany a seaport.

It is my conviction that any sound project which provides needed facilities for power, navigation, flood control, irrigation, or other beneficial public uses in one locality or region, expands the industry, the commerce, and the wealth of the whole Nation.

The comprehensive programs heretofore authorized by Congress to develop the latent natural resources of our rivers have, in my judgment, helped to make the United States the great country it is today. The improvements envisioned by Congress have paid for themselves many times over. They have contributed immeasurably to the development of our country and to the prosperity and enterprise of our people. In two World Wars, we have seen their tangible results in the productive power and industrial might of this Nation, mobilized behind our fighting men on the battle fronts.

I do not know of any project in this country that combines power benefits and navigation benefits, serving such populous, productive areas, to quite the degree that we find them in the St. Lawrence development. The project is so sound, from an engineering and economic standpoint, and so obviously in the interest of all our people, one marvels that it was not completed long ago. I have accepted my present assignment from the State of New York in the hope that we can help to finish the job and contribute to the prompt completion of this urgently needed public improvement.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD the following editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Milwaukee Journal:

APPROVE LOAN TO BRITAIN

President Truman's request that Congress approve the proposed $3,750,000,000 loan to Britain was sure to run into much opposition.

Opponents charge that the loan is in reality a gift, because, they say, Britain will never pay it back. Or they say Britain doesn't need it. Or they say that it is a bribe to induce Britain to stop discriminating against American trade. Finally, they ask why the United States should help out Britain with American taxpayers' money.

We do not believe that the American taxpayer should help out Britain, just for Britain's sake. But we do believe, as President Truman tries to explain to Congress and the Nation, that the loan should be approved for the sake of America's own welfare. We are speaking of the direct effect that a British economic collapse would have on this country and the effect it would have on our efforts to restore the world to peaceful stability.

The best facts available indicate that Britain is in a state of great financial and industrial distress due to the ruinous cost of our common war against the Axis. So exhausted are her resources that she has to conserve every dollar by holding down imports. She must try desperately to get her export trade going, for, without exports, Britain cannot survive, cannot buy, will not consume American goods—and she has long been our best customer.

We do not know whether Britain will be able to pay back the loan, even on the generous terms which have been agreed upon by the negotiators between our two countries. There are some in Britain who fear she may not be able to repay. But in view of the reasons for this loan, it does not seem that the question of repayment should be the final factor. Just as we had to preserve Britain during the war, not for her sake but for ours, so we now have to prevent a financial failure that would shake to their very foundations the structures, like Bretton Woods, that we have set up to promote stability. It is as simple as that.

Those who express the fear that this loan will only lead to many loans to other countries—a total that might drain us too much financially—have a more cogent argument, one that does need attention.

There is, or could be, that possibility and we shall have to guard against it. The answer lies in applying to others the same yardstick we apply to Britain. Will it benefit us, directly or in furtherance of our objectives? If the answer is "Yes," and if the loan is reasonably within our means, we may want to make it; if not, we most certainly should deny it.

There is no danger if we will keep our hats on straight.

Bar Association to Vote on Race, Creed, Ancestry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, following is the text from the official ballot form of the Los Angeles Bar Association. It is self-explanatory:

BALLOT ON PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE III, SECTION 1 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE LOS ANGELES BAR ASSOCIATION

Article III, section 1 reads as follows:

"ARTICLE III

"*Membership*

"SECTION 1. Membership: Membership of the Association shall consist of active members, honorary members, nonresident members, and affiliated members, as those terms are hereinafter defined."

A petition has been filed with the secretary and presented to the board of trustees which proposes that article III, section 1 of the constitution of the Los Angeles Bar Association be amended by adding thereto the following sentence:

"Neither race, color, creed, nor national ancestry shall be a bar to membership."

The board has ordered that the proposed amendment be submitted to the members by written ballot. Arguments in support of, and in opposition to, the proposed amendment are enclosed herewith.

Shall the foregoing amendment to the constitution be adopted:

(To indicate your vote, mark (X) in the appropriate square. Yes ☐. No ☐.

Important: After voting, enclose your ballot in blank envelope provided and seal same. Enclose sealed envelope in addressed envelope and write your name on outside of addressed envelope in space provided therefor. All ballots must be in the hands of the secretary on or before 12 m., Monday, February 4, 1946.

Ballots of voters who fail to place their names on the envelopes addressed to the secretary will not be counted.

ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT OF AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE III, SECTION 1, OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE LOS ANGELES BAR ASSOCIATION PROHIBITING REFUSAL OF MEMBERSHIP BY REASON OF RACE, COLOR, CREED, OR NATIONAL ANCESTRY

Negro lawyers are barred from membership in the Los Angeles Bar Association solely because of their race.

The proponents of this amendment seek to remove this bar of racial discrimination by an amendment to the constitution of the association.

Section 1 of article III of the constitution of the Los Angeles Bar Association now reads as follows:

"SECTION 1. Membership: Membership of the association shall consist of active members, honorary members, nonresident members, and affiliated members, as those terms are hereinafter defined."

It is proposed to amend the same by adding thereto the following sentence:

"Neither race, color, creed, nor national ancestry shall be a bar to membership."

It is not without embarrassment that the proponents of this amendment ask its adoption. By doing so there is, of course, an open confession that our professional association established to advance the science of jurisprudence; to promote the administration of justice; to encourage a thorough legal education; to maintain the honor and dignity of the profession of the law, and to cultivate social intercourse among its members (constitution, Los Angeles Bar Association, art. II, sec. 1), must needs amend its basic document to express affirmatively an ideal and essential of democracy.

Here, and in no other place, lies the embarrassment of the proponents.

Lest it be thought that the proponents have needlessly exposed the association to shame, the events leading up to this proposal must be stated.

The board of trustees candidly admits that it excludes Negroes from membership, solely because of their race. This policy of discrimination will be maintained, the board states, until a mandate is received from the membership requiring that this racial discrimination cease.

This racial discrimination is bottomed by the board upon the association's unbroken history of refusal of membership to Negro lawyers and upon certain language in article II, section 1, of the constitution of the association, quoted above.

Unhappily, this history of racial discrimination cannot be denied. The proponents wish that it could.

The proponents deny that the constitution of the association contains any language supporting this policy of racial discrimination.

They recognize, however, the reality that the board of trustees controls admissions to membership.

Opposition to this policy of racial discrimination has been expressed to the board and the view of the proponents that this policy is without support has been rejected.

The board has agreed to submit by mail this proposed amendment to the members by written ballot, accompanied by this argument and an argument to be submitted by those opposed.

Under article XI of the constitution the affirmative vote of a majority of the members voting shall be required for the adoption of the amendment.

The proponents respectively suggest that the merit of this amendment must be painfully obvious. No group of citizens should know better than lawyers the ideal of racial equality expressed in the Constitution of the United States, which they are sworn to uphold when they embark upon their professional careers. To deny to a Negro lawyer who is qualified, and the bar of this country has many, admission to membership in this professional group because of his color is to impose upon him an inferior, second-class citizenship. It is not a matter of tolerance or intolerance. It is a matter of justice or injustice. It involves democracy and that which is the enemy of democracy. Racial prejudice is always repugnant; it is doubly so when it is found in a democracy; that it should be found in a professional association of lawyers, as it is here, is nearly unbelievable.

The issue here has been centered on Negro lawyers. The proposed amendment, however, is broad enough to prohibit this racial discrimination directed against other groups entitled to practice law in this State.

If we are to be truly democratic, we cannot preach equality and deny it to millions of our fellow Americans. Much less can we, as lawyers, deny it to other lawyers, solely because of their race.

The proponents are confident that the members of the Los Angeles Bar Association will "Maintain the honor and dignity of the profession of the law" by voting for this amendment. In this, they will be supported by the historical concept of our profession as guardians of democracy.

This amendment is needed more for our dignity as human beings and lawyers than it is by those who are the victims of this unjust discrimination.

We respectfully solicit the vote and support of all members for this proposed amendment.

Daniel G. Marshall, M. B. Silberberg, James C. Sheppard, Ben S. Beery, David Tannenbaum, Charles E. Beardsley, Landon Morris, Martin J. Burke, Vincent C. Hickson.

ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION TO THE PROPOSAL TO AMEND ARTICLE III, SECTION 1 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE LOS ANGELES BAR ASSOCIATION, WHICH AMENDMENT IF ADOPTED, WILL ADD THE FOLLOWING SENTENCE: "NEITHER RACE, COLOR, CREED NOR NATIONAL ANCESTRY SHALL BE A BAR TO MEMBERSHIP"

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 3, 1946.*

The proposed amendment to the constitution of the Los Angeles Bar Association seeks to make lawyers of the colored races eligible to membership.

Since the organization of the association over 50 years ago, lawyers of the colored races have never been admitted to its membership. This consistent policy has been based upon considerations which go to the very existence of the association.

It has always been an important function of the association to bring its members together in frequent social gatherings attended not only by the men and women who compose its membership, but also by their friends and members of their families. As declared by its constitution, one of the association's purposes has been to cultivate social intercourse among its members. Realization of this social objective has contributed in very large measure to the growth and usefulness of the association. It is fair to assume that its membership has been built upon a justifiable expectation that this objective should receive continued recognition.

This social objective of the association is seriously and definitely threatened by the proposal to admit lawyers of the colored races to its membership. In many cases members would decline to attend functions thrown open to the colored races. Social contact between the races cannot be dictated. It is known that this proposal would be regarded by many of the association's present members as an attempt to dictate their social contacts, and would unquestionably lead to many resignations.

All of this involves no question of racial equality, and certainly no disparagement of the professional attainments of colored lawyers. The considerations involved are those reflected elsewhere in the restrictive membership qualifications of many clubs and organizations whose functions are social in character. These qualifications necessarily are based upon the personal preference of the membership.

Defeat of the proposed amendment would not deprive colored lawyers of an opportunity to engage in organization activities connected with their profession. They already have their own local bar organization; they are members of the State bar; and are eligible to membership in certain other bar organizations.

Fairness and any regard whatever for the future of the association demand that the problem presented by the proposed amendment be thoughtfully considered. So considered it will be seen that the problem is practical, not theoretical. If the proposed amendment were adopted we sincerely believe that it would be impossible as a practical matter for the association to function as in the past. The result would be dissension threatening ultimate disintegration of the association.

We urge that the amendment be defeated.

Norman A. Bailie, George Breslin, Joe Crider, Jr., Stanley N. Gleis, John M. Hall, Edward D. Lyman, Hubert T. Morrow, Edna Covert Plummer, Richard A. Turner, Paul Vallee, Ernest S. Williams, Frank B. Belcher.

Critical Housing Shortage Caused Double Killing in Washington and Will Increase Divorces, Sociologists Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, an article recently appeared in the Wash-

ington Post by Adelaide Kerr on the subject Double or Nothing's a Bad Housing Gamble. It is timely in view of the present housing shortage. It is as follows:

DOUBLE OR NOTHING'S A BAD HOUSING GAMBLE

(By Adelaide Kerr)

NEW YORK, February 23.—What is it like, "living double"—two or more families in one home or apartment?

"It's murder," the young lieutenant said.

He was standing in line at the Officers Service Committee headquarters, which helps veterans find living quarters. He represents one of a million American families which have doubled up. (Housing authorities say there may be 3,000,000 families doing it before the end of the year.)

"We've lived double all over this country," went on the lieutenant, glancing at his pretty, blue-eyed wife. "It just won't work. Either you have to give up everything you want or you have to keep battling for it all the time. They want to play the radio; you want it quiet. They want to get up at 6; you want to sleep late. You like your steak rare; they want it well done."

LEATHER LOVERS

"I'll never forget that steak," said his wife. "That's when we were living with in-laws of in-laws out in Illinois. One day she had a big juicy steak and she was going to fry it, of all things. I persuaded her to broil it, and it was fairly rare. Then the teen-age daughter said at table, 'O-o-o-h, I can't bear it. It's all bloody.' So her father scolded her and they had a family row and it was all supposed to be my fault.

"You can't ever seem to get it fixed. If you don't do your part, they don't like it. And if you do your part and do it well, somebody is likely to sniff that apparently you didn't like the way they did the same thing the last time.

"In one place where we were the daughter had a baby and she also had a job. So I tried to help by taking care of the baby. First thing I knew he was calling me 'mummy.' And his mother heard him one night and began to cry and said she guessed she didn't have a baby any more. So then her mother said, 'Shame on you. After all she has done for your child.' And then everybody cried."

IT CAN BE DONE

"Well," said the blonde Wave behind them, thoughtfully, "I certainly would not say living double is any picnic, but it can be made to work. My husband and I are sharing a two-room apartment with a friend and his wife and their baby, and we get along. Mary is a wonderful housekeeper and I am learning a lot from her."

A captain down the line joined in: "My wife and I are living with my mother and father in a four-room apartment. My mother just doesn't understand my wife and I'm in between.

"We're not foot-loose. I'm working to complete my bachelor of science in education and my wife is studying stenography to add to our income while I'm still in school. But my mother is terribly annoyed because we go to school nights and don't stay at home. I don't say my wife is perfect—she is too quick with an answer, maybe. We're not going to let this thing get away from us. We're going to keep it under control—I hope. But we're going to move just as fast as we can."

"I'm going to move too—if it's only to one room," said the frail wife of a naval lieutenant. "We are three families in a four-room apartment and the confusion is out of this world. We try to have community meals, but one of the wives won't do her share of cooking and dishwashing. And one of the men never comes to meals on time.

"The other wife is always washing things out and hanging them in the bathroom. She uses my powder and scatters it all over the place; she uses my curlers and breaks them. We've got to move; I don't care where."

"You'd better be careful where," said a former lieutenant who was suffering from combat fatigue. "That's what we did. My brothers and I and our wives were all living with our parents in a four-room apartment. My wife was going to have a baby, so I moved her. To a little dark room in a rooming house. The baby was born there. And now she's sick and the baby's sick and I can't take care of them or get the right food. My family blames me. I'm going crazy."

His voice broke and tears coursed down his face.

Mrs. Herbert Carlebach, head of the Officers Service Committee, took his arm and led him to her desk.

"It's the in-laws that drive them crazy," she explained as she gave him a cigarette. "They get along better with perfect strangers. They can't yell at them.

"We are going to feel the psychological effect of this housing shortage and doubling up for years to come. A new slum is being created in New York. It's the most dangerous family problem this country has to face."

Also appearing in the Washington Daily News, Saturday, March 2, 1946, was an article disclosing how the housing shortage caused a double killing. It is as follows:

DESPERATE HOUSE SHORTAGE LEADS TO DOUBLE KILLING

This is the story of a lonely, unhappy old man who "thought he was just in the way" and in a desperate fumble at escape left only tragedy behind him by killing his landlady and himself. It is also a sidelight on Washington's housing shortage, so desperate that the prospect of having no place to live could drive a grandfatherly roomer to commit murder.

Today Coroner A. Magruder MacDonald will perform an autopsy on 60-year-old James W. McConchie, roomer at 9 S Street NW., who shot Mrs. Mable Kirby, 40, three times in the back with an antique revolver as she stood by the kitchen sink—then put the gun muzzle in his mouth and fired a final shot. The only possible motive seen for the act was that he feared there would be no room for him when the Kirbys moved to smaller quarters.

FOUND BY DAUGHTER

The two were found dead on the kitchen floor of the row house at 6:15 p. m. yesterday by Mrs. Kirby's daughter, Evelyn, 20, a Wave, who returned from her office at the Navy Department to find the doors locked. She summoned next-door neighbors and together they peered through the kitchen window, where they saw the bodies lying only a few feet apart.

Thinking they were victims of gas, Miss Kirby turned in a fire alarm. Firemen and police found an old .38 caliber hammerless revolver lying between Mr. McConchie's outstretched legs.

An hour later Mrs. Kirby's husband, Horace O. Kirby, 42, stumbled on the tragedy. A plasterer, he had just returned from a 4-week job at Elkton, Va. His wife had been preparing chicken for his homecoming dinner when the old man's shots cut her down at the sink.

NOT MY WIFE, TOO

Struggling to control his emotions, the grief-stricken husband listened to the story.

"If the old man had to do it, why didn't he just kill himself—not my wife, too," he sobbed.

"I've got to be a man and take this," he said. "We've known the old man for years, and for 7 years he's lived with us. We were his only friends. We were just like children to him. Then this is how he repaid us."

He said he first met Mr. McConchie 22 years ago when they both lived in the same boarding house. Seven years ago the Kirbys took him in as a roomer and partially supported him. A former bid clerk for the District's purchasing department, Mr. McConchie drew a small retirement pension.

TOLD NEIGHBORS

"Recently the old man felt he was sort of in the way," Mr. Kirby said. "He went around telling the neighbors about it. We were planning to move to an apartment, but we never said we wouldn't take him with us. He was like a part of our family."

Police said the old man had $140 on his person, a notebook, watch, keys, and a bronze good-luck piece. Property was turned over to his son, Elmer McConchie, of 1845 Calvert Street N. W.

Five shots had been fired from the gun according to police. Apparently three had struck Mrs. Kirby, the fourth had gone wild and the fifth Mr. McConchie saved for himself.

Funeral arrangements for Mrs. Kirby have been postponed pending word from the Kirby's son, Harold Jr., 19, a signal man, second class, now stationed on Okinawa.

Recently appearing in the newspapers of the country was an article by a Harvard sociologist, Carle C. Zimmerman, on the subject of divorces caused by doubling up in homes. It is as follows:

DOUBLING UP WILL INCREASE DIVORCE, SOCIOLOGIST SAYS

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., March 1.—Doubling up of young married couples with their in-laws during the housing shortage will shoot the Nation's divorce rate skyward in the next 5 years, Harvard Sociologist Carle C. Zimmerman predicted today.

It's a case of too many cooks spoiling the family broth, as Professor Zimmerman sees it.

"Getting along in married life is tough enough without having others listen in or butt in on quarrels and disagreements," he said in an interview. "In a world that looks upon divorce as an easy and honorable remedy for marital ills, we may expect a tremendous upsurge of divorces as the immediate result of doubling up.

"The present rate of 275 divorces in every 1,000 marriages is high, but it will go much higher before 1951."

One of the Nation's foremost authorities on family sociology, Professor Zimmerman believes you can't have two "bosses"—either in the kitchen or at the shaving bowl. So he thinks the best advice to give young couples now living with in-laws is to move out as soon as housing is available.

"A couple would be better in a trailer or a Quonset hut by themselves than in a palace with their in-laws," he said, hastening to explain that he nursed no grudges against in-laws in general.

When there are plenty of homes again, the divorce rate will drop slightly, according to Professor Zimmerman.

But the in-laws themselves don't have to worry. Professor Zimmerman thinks it's a safe bet that the doubling-up process won't hurt them a bit.

"When a husband and wife have lived together long enough to become in-laws," he said, "they have a substantial handicap in that death-do-us-part race."

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I wish to include the report of Joint Chiefs of Staff on the St. Lawrence project as presented by Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on February 18, 1946:

FEBRUARY 16, 1946.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF STATE.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In conformity with your request of November 5, 1945, the Joint Chiefs of Staff have examined the matter of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power projects and their effect on the national security.

The principal factors which influence the consideration of these projects in the interest of the national security are that, in the event of a national emergency, they would provide:

(a) Shipbuilding and ship-repair facilities, located in a relatively secure area, capable of expansion and of conversion for handling deep-sea vessels, which could be used to supplement coastal shipyards.

(b) An additional line of communication, navigable by ocean shipping, which could, by diversion of some cargo for overseas destinations, ease the strain during wartime on rail transportation and port facilities of the east and Gulf coasts. This seaway could also serve as a reserve route to be used in the event of interruption of other routes by enemy action.

(c) A large source of cheap, dependable power, which can be generated without the use of coal or other critical combustibles and without use of crowded rail or highway transportation facilities; this power would be available in an area which, during World War II was a power-deficit area.

The foregoing factors prompted the Secretaries of War and the Navy to support the projects in 1941 in the interests of national defense. In the light of the experiences of World War II, in which total mobilization became a near actuality, it is evident that the prospective increase in our war potential that would have been contributed by these projects, had they been completed, would have been of material assistance in prosecuting the war. It is probable that attainment of success in any future world conflict would require utilization of the ultimate production and transportation facilities of the United States and possibly Canada. The Joint Chiefs of Staff consider that it would be in the interests of national security to complete projects, such as these, which would have distinct military advantages and would materially increase the industrial and transportation potential of the United States.

Although the St. Lawrence Valley is a possible route for invasion of eastern North America, the Joint Chiefs of Staff consider that construction of the proposed works would not facilitate invasion by that route since the power plants, locks, and canals would readily be rendered unusuable in the event such action became necessary.

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War.

Standardized Bearing Dimensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, occasionally an observation by spokesmen for various industries is significant because it calls attention both to a problem and to a solution of that problem, and incidentally reflects the possibilities of promoting trade generally by rather simple methods.

It seems to me that a recent statement by S. F. Wollmar, executive vice president of SKF Industries, Inc., was one of those.

He urged the Nation's motor and machine manufacturers to join a movement to standardize sizes of ball and roller bearings just as sizes of electric bulbs, tires, clothing, and shoes are standardized.

Mr. Wollmar said:

This standardization would reduce overall costs, speed delivery of bearings to prime reconversion centers, aid young industries, and broaden American participation in world reconstruction.

Ball- and roller-bearing manufacturers are now required to produce and stock as many as 40,000 sizes and makes of antifriction bearings and some of these products differ from others by the merest hair's breadth. If a uniform system of basic sizes were adopted, it might be possible to concentrate our capacity on turning out about 2,000 sizes of bearings. These would meet almost every industrial need without any sacrifice of quality.

I am inviting reconsideration of standardized bearing dimensions now while memory of war production experience is still fresh. Standards adopted as long as 25 years ago have been allowed to lapse because of the recent spectacular expansion of the machine industry.

The war emphasized the rapidity with which standardized bearings could be produced as well as the production difficulties that constantly plagued the output of nonstandard bearings.

Early standardization would be of particular benefit to such new industries as television and synthetic fabrics. Studies made by SKF engineers indicate that bearing standardization would result in speedier and more economical production and customer servicing for those industries. The engineers declare that an international standards agreement already reached will simplify the problem of rushing bearings for such desperately needed items as machine tools and other mechanical equipment to Britain, France, Belgium, Holland, and other members of the United Nations which use the same bearing standards.

Future foreign business of American manufacturers also would be helped by standardization. Potential customers in foreign nations would be much more likely to buy American equipment now and in the future if they know they can obtain standard-sized bearings and other parts with relative ease instead of having to wait weeks and months for specially fabricated replacement.

UNO Permanent Headquarters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 4, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks on the subject of selection of a site for locating the permanent seat of the United Nations Organization, I call attention of my colleagues and constituents to the following press dispatch giving the official text of the resolution adopted by the General Assembly at its final London session:

TEXT OF UNO RESOLUTION ON PERMANENT HOME PLANS

LONDON, February 16.—Text of the resolution on the temporary and permanent homes of the United Nations Organization, as adopted by the General Assembly of the UNO here this week follows:

"The General Assembly resolves that:

"1. Permanent headquarters:

"(A) The permanent headquarters of the United Nations should be established in Westchester (New York) and/or Fairfield (Conn.) counties, near to New York City.

"(B) A headquarters commission shall proceed as soon as possible to the region mentioned in (A) above with a view to carrying out an exhaustive study thereof and making recommendations to the General Assembly in the second part of its first session (in September) regarding the exact location to be selected within the aforementioned general region.

"(C) The headquarters commission shall draw up plans based on the assumption that the United Nations will acquire approximately: (1) 2 square miles, (2) 5 square miles, (3) 10 square miles, (4) 20 square miles, (5) 40 square miles with details in each case of the approximate cost of acquiring the land and buildings within these areas.

"(D) The headquarters commission shall ascertain what measures the Federal, State, and county authorities in the United States are prepared to take in order to control development in the territory adjacent to the zone.

"ASSEMBLY TO DECIDE

"(E) On the basis of the information thus provided, the General Assembly at the second part of its first session shall make a final decision as to

"(1) The exact area required, and

"(2) The exact location of the permanent headquarters within the aforementioned Westchester-Fairfield region.

"(F) This resolution does not imply any financial commitments of the United States (other than the expenses of the headquarters commission) and does not impose any financial obligations on its members and the Assembly remains free to decide these questions at the second part of its first session according to article XVII, paragraphs 1 and 2, and article XVIII, paragraph 2 of the Charter.

"Interim headquarters: The interim headquarters of the United Nations should be located in New York City.

"(2) Headquarters commission:

"(a) A headquarters commission composed of representatives of Austria, Uruguay, China, France, Iraq, Netherlands, United Kingdom, USSR, and Yugoslavia shall be set up to carry out the tasks entrusted to it under the first part of this resolution regarding the permanent hearquarters.

"EXPERTS PROVIDED

"(b) The headquarters commission may be assisted by experts including planning engineers, lawyers, real-estate experts, financial advisers, and other appropriate experts who, at the request of the secretary general, shall be designated by the Government of the United States of America.

"(c) The secretary general shall consult with the headquarters commission or the experts assisting it, as he may deem necessary or appropriate, on problems which may arise in connection with the temporary installation of the various organs of the United Nations in the United States, the material arrangements for the holding of the second part of the first session of the General Assembly in September 1946, and the housing of the delegates, secretariate and other personnel who may be required to reside for

longer or shorter periods near the temporary headquarters of the organization.

"(d) The secretary general is authorized to pay the expenses of the members of and to compensate the experts attached to the headquarters commission on such basis and in such form as may appear to him most appropriate.

"(e) The headquarters commission shall submit its final report on all matters referred to it to the General Assembly at the second part of its first session.

"(f) The General Assembly during the course of the second part of its first session shall give consideration to the appointment of a planning commission of experts as recommended in chapter X, section 3, in the report of the preparatory commission."

Relief for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor for Saturday, March 2:

UNRRA STEP PUTS POLES IN ROLE OF PAWN

(By Edmund Stevens)

WARSAW, March 2.—The impending cut in the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration to Poland has raised the dire threat of starvation. The country that suffered more from the Nazi invaders in proportion to its size than any other is, thereby, faced with new heartbreaks, perhaps involving further reduction of its already depleted population and disruption of its recovery program.

The official UNRRA justification of the cut is that last summer's world wheat crop, and especially the European crop, was disappointing, whereas the prospects are poor for the current Argentinean crop as a result of drought. The Polish press and Polish public, however, have been quick to read into this wheat "reduction" political motives which top UNRRA officials here do not deny.

They freely and frankly admitted that the critical attitude in influential American and British circles toward the existing Polish regime may have influenced the UNRRA decision. In this connection, they mentioned British resentment that the Polish delegate to the United Nations General Assembly meeting in London, Zygmunt Modzelewski, had sided with Andrei Vishinsky, the chief Russian delegate, in the Security Council arguments.

The same officials also pointed out that certain other food-importing countries competing for a share of the world's wheat supply have more political influence, money, and propaganda machinery at their disposal than war-torn and impoverished Poland.

To the outside observer it would appear as if Poland's martyrized population is about to undergo a new ordeal for reasons that are largely, if not wholly, partisan. This, UNRRA officials in Warsaw openly acknowledge. They confirm that the results of such a cut may be disastrous, but add that they themselves are powerless to alter decisions reached in London and Washington. To give the full picture, it is important to recall that the Poles are bread-eating people, far more than are Americans, for example.

In normal times, the Polish wheat production fully covers its home consumption, leaving a margin for export. In its recovery from wartime devastation, Polish agriculture has been severely hampered by last summer's drought. Furthermore, the scant snowfall this winter renders the prospects for the coming crop not to encouraging.

Agricultural experts with whom I have talked envisage that the famine may further result in a shortage of seed grain for the spring sowing, thereby further delaying the day when Poland again will be able to feed its own population without outside aid.

The Poles complain that they are being left to starve, whereas, at least according to some reports, the Germans will be living in comparative comfort—with Allied help. Italy also will continue to receive its 600,000 tons of wheat monthly.

And so, some Poles here are asking: "Who won this war, anyway?"

Statement of Col. Philip F. La Follette on Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MERLIN HULL
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 22, 1946

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, Col. Philip F. La Follette appeared before the Committee on Military Affairs in opposition to the proposal for universal military training in peacetime.

Colonel La Follette served three terms as Governor of Wisconsin. He is a veteran of the First World War, in which he rose to the rank of captain. Upon the declaration of war with Japan, he promptly proffered his services to his country. He went to Australia with our troops, where he was assigned to the staff of General MacArthur. He was a participant in all the campaigns from Australia to Japan. He was promoted from time to time to the rank of colonel. Recently he retired from the staff of General MacArthur and returned to his home at Madison, Wis.

Colonel La Follette long has been an earnest student in civilian life and in the Army which brings to him exceptional qualifications to speak on peacetime military training. His clear-cut statement before the Committee on Military Affairs is thorough and comprehensive. It is worthy of consideration by every Member of Congress.

The Capital Times, one of the prominent dailies of the Northwest, in its editorial comment upon his statement says:

We urge you to read his suggestions and proposals on conscription for they constitute an outstanding contribution to the discussion of one of the most vital issues before the American people today. They represent the thoughtful consideration and conclusions of a man who was in military counsels of the war and who has been able to relate his knowledge to the impact of technological advance on our military institutions.

Colonel La Follette makes clear that he approaches the conscription issue from the only rational grounds of discussion—national defense. Quite rightly he ignores the poppycock about military training bettering the health, morals, and education of American youth.

National defense in this atomic age, Colonel La Follette says, will best be served if we forget about conscription plans—even the watered-down proposal offered by the American Legion. He believes that a highly trained, well-paid volunteer Army will satisfactorily meet the needs of the Nation both from the standpoint of defense and carrying out our commitments in the rest of the world.

Eliminate the Army's caste system, increase the pay of enlisted men and their opportunities for promotion, and peacetime compulsory military training will not be needed for national defense. A volunteer Army will be sufficient.

The following was Colonel La Follette's statement before the Committee on Military Affairs:

Mr. Chairman, I was delighted to accept the invitation to appear because I am convinced that you are confronted with an issue whose determination is bound to have an enduring impact on the peace of the world, the security of America, and the survival of our cherished democracy.

I should like to make two points clear at the outset. In the first place, my argument, as will soon become clear, is directed against all versions of peacetime conscription, the new proposal by the American Legion no less than the original scheme of the War Department and President Truman. In the second place, I cannot in the time at my disposal deal with what I regard as the synthetic, or artificial type of argument in behalf of peacetime conscription—the arguments, for instance, that universal military service will develop the health of our youth, indoctrinate our young men with a moral discipline, provide them with job training, strengthen their characters, or provide a substitute for full employment. Arguments of this kind, it seems to me, have been adequately dealt with by the educators, clergymen, and others who have already appeared before you.

I approach the subject today exclusively as an issue of national defense—the defense of America from external aggression and the defense of our democracy from the internal assaults of those who are captivated by the short-cut methods of alien ideologies and the total militarism of foreign totalitarianisms.

The invasion of an American's liberty by universal military service is justified only when it is unmistakably clear that the Nation's security demands it. Our national security does not now demand it. On the contrary, universal military service is now almost completely out of date and its adoption would almost certainly lull us into a false sense of security, just as the Maginot line tricked the French into a complacency which proved their undoing 6 years ago.

Most of us can agree that in time of war conscription is the fairest and most equitable way of sharing the risks and hardships of combat. In time of peace, however, the duties of the average soldier are comparable to the recruitment of GI's than to policemen. There is no more reason to apply coercion to the recruitment of GI's than to policemen.

America needs a peacetime Army, both for overseas duty and to provide a powerful, swift, mobile, highly trained, perfectly equipped force to defend us against any threat of aggression.

But we are talking here not of sheer numbers, nor of size for the sake of size, but rather of a compact, highly specialized force of experts. We are talking here of a force of keen technicians thoroughly trained to master and keep abreast with the highly complicated instruments of modern warfare, rather than millions of conscripts rushed through a quickie course of calesthenics, close and extended order drill, and the other routines of a 1-year course under conscriptions.

Modern science is repealing many of the old laws of war which served so usefully in the past. The classical military injunctions have

become obsolete in the age in which a single atomic bomb can pulverize an entire battlefield. Some of those old military concepts become perilous folly in an age in which a rocket plane streaking through the sky with the speed of sound can blast to bits a transport vessel ploughing through the seas with 10,000 conscript foot soldiers.

Anyone who has looked with any imagination into that Pandora's box that military science has opened in recent years knows that the technical complexity of warfare will increase rather than diminish. We are determined, I hope—every one of us—to prevent the outbreak of another war. But since we must plan for any and every eventuality, we must accept the fact that more than anything else, we shall need high quality personnel for any future emergency.

One of the principal liabilities of winning wars is that too often outworn ideas remain in positions of power and the surviving hierarchy of military officers base their program of preparedness for the next war on the prevailing ideas of the last. The obsolescence in military thinking is as great as the obsolescence elsewhere in life. The Army's demand for universal military service is as out-of-date as the Pentagon Building itself, which, though built in the 1940's, is a horrible violation of the military principle of dispersal.

It is generally recognized today that after World War I the Allied High Command presented Germany with the basic necessities which produced the marauding blitz army of Hitler's Reich. By limiting Germany to an army of 100,000 men with 12-year enlistments, we gave the German Wehrmacht the incentive to pioneer new ideas for a highly skilled and trained army of technicians—an army which made ideas take the place of sheer numbers, an army which made fire power and mobility and science an easy conqueror of France's Maginot Line, conscript army, and textbook theories of warfare.

The striking forces in the late war were far more highly trained—with far greater specialization—than in World War I. It is certainly safe to assume that preparedness against another war will require even greater, rather than less specialized training for combat forces. That specialization, technical training, and carefully developed skills we can get only by working with a group of men who have volunteered for that purpose, and who have been attracted to that work by the realization that they are to become part of a regular army of free volunteers in the employ of a free people. They must know that they are to be treated as a valued, essential, and honorable part of our national life, and not as conscripts for a year of poorly paid training.

This, then, must be our goal—to build a democratic army of free men who have signed up to serve because the stakes are high enough, the rewards attractive enough, and the opportunities compelling enough.

And this brings me to the very heart of what I want to say today. Just as science working in the laboratory is revolutionizing the weapons of war, you of Congress must be revolutionary in the field in which you are supreme—the making of national policy.

I urge that Congress make the military service as attractive to volunteers as it has made the Federal civil service.

Concretely, I am proposing that in order to build a democratic defense force, rather than a conscript army, Congress do these things now:

1. Establish a minimum pay scale starting at $100 a month, plus the usual allowances, for privates, with a corresponding increase in scale for noncomissioned officers.

2. Provide a system of promotions from the ranks and a program of education and in-service training to enable GI's to qualify for advancement and to become trained technicians.

3. Strike at the military caste system by narrowing the difference in clothes, quarters, mess, legal rights, and social life between GI's and officers.

4. Improve the officer class by putting appointments to West Point (and Annapolis) on a civil-service basis and by putting peacetime promotions on a basis of competitive examinations.

Once we get over the horse-and-buggy notion that we cannot afford to compensate a regular standing Army adequate for our national needs, we shall find that men will enlist for service in the armed forces exactly as they do in any other department of Government service. The Government does not expect to employ clerks, stenographers, or other Federal employees at half the salaries paid in private business. Yet we offer a soldier today half the going rate of pay for a Wisconsin farmhand. If we compensate and reward the soldier at anything approaching a competitive standard, we shall have more volunteers than we need, and even more important, we shall enlist into our defense forces a type and quality of man that we need so vitally in building a democratic army.

I am well aware of the fact that it is not possible to eliminate all differences between officers and men and still have a disciplined army. I am convinced, however, that we can abolish many of the inflexible restrictions of the old Prussian caste system and still retain the basic discipline required. The American GI, if I am any judge, wants besides fair pay and decent living conditions, a feeling of significance, of belonging, of being appreciated, and an awareness that brains, ability, and industry will win him promotions.

Given this type of democratic program, America can build a powerful volunteer army, an army whose abilities and skills and training would repay us many, many times over the cost of training a vast conscript army of men whose 1 year in service would make them specialists only in griping.

I assume that no one is seriously proposing that we should base our preparedness on the theory that the United States is going to launch an unannounced blitz war on some nation in Europe or Asia. On the contrary, I take it that we all want this country in a position where if such a blitz were made against us, we would be able to repel it, and have ample time to put our country into high gear for war production. If this is our goal, then it is all the more reason why we should have available at all times a trained, skilled, perfectly equipped, quickly maneuverable force that can repel such an attack while we are harnessing our human and physical resources for whatever the duration might be.

Our national security does not require and our national income cannot finance both such a regular army of highly trained volunteers and a conscript army of masses of soldiers. Hence, we must choose. I choose the constantly available force of well-paid, well-trained volunteers who have had an opportunity to study and master what has truly become in our age of diabolical engines of destruction—the science of warfare.

The logic of the present and the lesson of the past seem to me to point decisively to the kind of volunteer army I have discussed as our national defense hope for the future. It is our defense not only against a possible external enemy but our bulwark, too, against the inroads of a militaristic fascism. One by one we seem to be embracing, in what we were pleased to call the arsenal of democracy, many of the very Fascist institutions against which we threw our men, money, and materials in World War II. We fought, among other reason, to wipe out the specter of permanent militarism. Are we now to embrace as our very own the monster we swore to destroy? I trust not.

There is another and far better course for us to pursue.

First, let us build and maintain a volunteer regular army fully adequate to repel any foreign invasion. Second, instead of embracing the major tenet of totalitarianism—military conscription—let us use our best leadership to lead all nations to outlaw universal military service. By so doing we will not only be keeping faith with our solemn declarations of purposes in World War II but we will be heading our own country, and perhaps the world, in the direction of a lasting peace.

Old-Age Pension Legislation Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, recent announcement that the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives would conduct hearings on proposed amendments to and changes in our social-security law is most important and in my way of thinking one of the major issues in our legislative program. This hearing, in my opinion, is long delayed. As we all know, legislation relating to raising money for old-age pensions is a revenue matter and is referred under the House rules to the Ways and Means Committee.

Several bills are pending and many amendments will no doubt be offered relating to this subject. Friends of our aged citizens have tried on many occasions to have proposed national old-age pension legislation considered either in the committee or in the House of Representatives. I am one of those Members who has consistently demanded that the administration and the social-security agency of the Government take steps to correct the present situation. Last week a number of Members signed petition No. 22 which will bring out for debate and amendment and change H. R. 4747 which deals with the question of old-age pension, and other matters. This petition was a discharge petition and, of course, requires 218 signatures. When that number of signatures is secured, the committee handling this legislation is then discharged from any further consideration of it, and then it comes before the House of Representatives.

I referred to the present situation and by that I mean the present method of having the States pay out old-age assistance and having the Federal Government appropriate an amount equal to the payment made by the State. This method has proven wholly inadequate. Our aged folks face a miserable existence under this program. You can hardly refer to the program without apologizing for it.

The second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress is well under way and in the remaining months of this session I hope the Congress will do something to improve the condition of our pension citizens who have been so long neglected.

The plight of our aged folks is perhaps worse today than at any time within the past quarter century. In the main they must live on a fixed income based on prewar levels. They are confronted with a 33-percent increase in living costs. Opportunities for employment are more restricted. Job preferences are given to returned veterans and younger workers. Technical advances, inventions, and modern production methods are fast eliminating the oldster from the field of employment. The number included in this class, 60 years of age and over, is about 10 percent of our population, or some thirteen and one-half million. This is more than we had in the armed forces at the peak of the war effort. It is estimated that at least 10,000,000 of this group are dependent in part or totally upon someone else for their existence. They pose a social and economic problem and this Congress must do something about it.

You say we have old-age assistance under social security, but who could honestly claim that the present old-age pension paid by the Government and States would keep body and soul together? They are so woefully inadequate that even the administrators of these pension funds admit that, at best, they only supplement private assistance and contributions.

Christian principles and American justice are shamefully violated so long as we force millions of our senior citizens to live in want and misery. They built this country and made possible the prosperity which we now enjoy. Certainly from our great bounty and limitless wealth this Congress can find ways and means of providing a decent living for our deserving aged. Is there a Member of Congress who would face his constituency and say that we do not have the funds or substance to meet this old-age emergency.

The kindest thing anyone can do is smile when the argument that we cannot afford this expense is advanced to defeat old age pension legislation. Right now the administration is considering a $4,000,000,000 loan to Great Britain. I am opposed to that loan but regardless of that, I wish someone would tell me why our people who are running the Government want to give away money to foreign countries and then neglect our own people. The example of wanting to do good to others can be multiplied in many different directions.

We can and must afford retirement to our elder citizens and relieve them from economic activity. With the rapid advances in technology it has become increasingly difficult to keep the older workers employed. They are the unwanted men in industry, the first to be discharged, the last to be hired. Rather than see workers pushed from the active labor force, hit or miss, the logical policy to follow is one of selection. A wise nation will specifically mark the older workers for retirement and clear the path for employment for younger men and women. We cannot afford the waste and social hazards of unemployed youth.

Already signs of unemployment appear on the horizon of the future. The wheels of industry are grinding out much needed peacetime products. Within a few short months, these emergency needs will have been supplied and industry will have adjusted itself to normal conditions. Then, we can reasonably expect the old law of supply and demand to assert itself in the labor market. There will be more job seekers than there are jobs and mass unemployment is not improbable. Real statesmanship requires that we anticipate this possible situation and take the proper steps to meet it now. One step in that direction is to retire the aged from gainful employment and thus provide a job for a younger person.

Our senior citizens have made their contribution to society and have earned their retirement. If their retirement is insured the whole process of business activity will be stabilized.

One War Is Enough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. SAVAGE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edgar L. Jones, from the February 1946 issue of the Atlantic Monthly. I think it is a very timely article and important, since Mr. Jones is a veteran. During his 40 months of war duty, Edgar L. Jones served for over a year with the British Eighth Army in north Africa; he served also as a merchant seaman, an Army historian, and for 7 months as the Atlantic correspondent in the far Pacific, where he was present at the assaults on Iwo Jima and Okinawa. Here is his box score of what the men he lived with really thought about military life and the promise, or threat, of peacetime conscription:

ONE WAR IS ENOUGH
(By Edgar L. Jones)

I

Probably I shall be tagged as a psychoneurotic veteran of too much bloodshed when I say that I get alternately fighting mad and cold sick inside whenever I hear people talk about the next war. I cannot understand how they can be resigned to the prospects of another global conflict so casual in their assumption that wars are inevitable, so damnably unaware of the consequences of their current complacency.

Has everyone in this country lost faith in peace? Here we stand at the threshold of what could be a new and better world, and our fainthearted citizenry insists upon locking backward and muttering that what has always been must be. Maybe the United Nations Organization will succeed in preventing further global conflicts, but the men from Missouri and 47 other States have to be shown. World peace, according to our self-acclaimed realists, is at best a heart-warming dream; common sense demands that we put our trust in bombs and battleships. So let us teach our youths, along with the new generations in Germany and Japan, that wars are wrong, but at the same time let us be practical and bring up our children to be good soldiers, just in case.

Cynical as most of us overseas were, I doubt if many of us seriously believed that people at home would start planning for the next war before we could get home and talk without censorship about this one. Although our hopes and fears for the future were varied, our common goal was most assuredly more than the elimination of a few world powers so that the remaining nations could square off for yet another war. Nor did we endure the half-life of a regimented military existence just to have people tell us that it is inevitable that our children will have to suffer similar bitter experiences.

We had a right, I think, to expect that in return for our services the global home front would give peace a fair trial. We made our various sacrifices to give our own and younger generations a chance to improve on the past, not to have the unchanging Old Guard take our victory from us and rebuild the world along their deadly prewar pattern of distrust, secrecy, and intrigue. We wanted peace, not a world divided into armed camps; permanent peace, not a short wait between wars. Many of us had to bomb, burn, and blast into oblivion an untold number of helpless victims of total war. Only a few of us are so unaware of our own war crimes that we can let it be said that we fought only to preserve the old way of life.

Surely the entire home front could not have suffered through 4 years of anguished waiting, dreading each incoming telegram, shuddering at each new invasion headline, and still consider war to be the only dependable solution to international controversies. Instead of viewing the rest of the world with suspicion and singling out the next enemy, there must be some Americans willing to rely upon the fact that millions of global citizens are as peace-loving as ourselves. Certainly we do not all believe that we can successfully talk peace at the point of a gun or bring up our children as conscientious civilians by first exposing them to military indoctrination, the very antithesis of education for democracy.

But if there are some Americans who want peace badly enough to give up their right to wage war, they are being outvoiced by our militant Old Guard, whose idea of a foreign policy is to keep the United States armed to the teeth and ever ready to challenge any country which disputes our world leadership. Regardless of the existence of personal misgivings, we, as a Nation, are placing our reliance not on international cooperation but upon the atomic bomb and the willingness of our boys to back our decisions with their lives. If it takes two to make a war, we are making certain that we are one of them.

I do not pretend to speak for all veterans. In the course of 40 months of war duty and five major battles I was only an ambulance driver, a merchant seaman, an Army historian, and a war correspondent, never a downright GI. Possibly the men who were subjected much more completely than I to the whims of militarism are now satisfied with their hollow victory, but I doubt it. I never met that fabulous character, Typical GI Joe, whose every thought and postwar desire was so well known to politicians and the writers of advertising copy. But I met a lot of other Joes, and my guess is that before long—and the sooner the better—the veteran serviceman is going to wake from his deep dreams of peace, a job, and a home and realize that his country has let him down, and badly.

Being a GI was a point of view, not a military classification, and the more thoroughly one was exposed to the waste, unfairness, senselessness, and horror of war, the more completely one substituted the serviceman's perspective for an anachronistic civilian way of thinking. The man in uniform stood apart from society and judged it, often too harshly, in the light of his own insecurity, the sacrifices which were demanded of him,

and the possibility that he was being played for a sucker. In varying degrees, depending upon a man's length of service, the GI perspective included bitter contempt for the home front's abysmal lack of understanding, its pleasures and comforts, and its nauseating capacity to talk in patriotic platitudes.

The fighting man was not a deep-thinking man, despite all the lofty sentiments attributed to him. He left the peace talk to the civilians who had the time and place for it. Having been maneuvered into a position where he had to kill or be killed, he did not trouble himself with pretenses that he was a crusader. He fought because his people at home expected him to fight, and he let them seek the necessary justification for his own ruthlessness. The most he wanted was to end the war, and all wars, as soon as possible, so that he could live in peace and let others, including his own children, live in peace. He expected the home front to share his aversion for war and to figure out a better way to settle future disputes.

Civilian Joe is too concerned at present with his personal problems of readjustment to get mad at what he habitually blasphemed in his uniformed days as home-front stupidity. He is still too dazed from being home and free again to be bluntly vocal. When the veteran does start talking back, this country is going to have its wartime illusions badly shattered.

Observers not subjected for long periods to the servicemen's barren existence were in no position to interpret accurately a GI's life, because they lacked the necessary perspective. Congressmen on fly-by-night overseas tours did not understand the men doing the fighting, nor did press representatives, with one notable exception. To a greater extent than any other civilian, Ernie Pyle saw the war from the GI point of view, and he hated it with GI thoroughness. But even Ernie found it difficult to sympathize with States-side soldiers and shore-based sailors who complained as bitterly as the dirtiest dogface about their lot in life while enjoying all the physical comforts which the infantrymen lacked.

The plain, unpublicized fact of the matter was that 9 out of 10 servicemen wanted nothing more to do with wars after their first week of basic training. Whether stationed in Washington or on a scrap of coral sand, the average GI considered himself to be the purposeless victim of malignant justice. As he so often remarked, "From where I stand, this whole thing stinks!" He hated everyone conceivably responsible for his misfortune, cursing out the home front as vehemently as the Japanese and the Germans. His special gripes, however, were reserved for the undemocratic, stupefying favor-ridden totalitarian nature of military life itself. He had no use for a system in which one class got the best of everything, and the other class got less than what was left.

II

We Americans have the dangerous tendency in our international thinking to take a holier-than-thou attitude toward other nations. We consider ourselves to be more noble and decent than other peoples, and consequently in a better position to decide what is right and wrong in the world. What kind of war do civilians suppose we fought, anyway? We shot prisoners in cold blood, wiped out hospitals, strafed lifeboats, killed or mistreated enemy civilians, finished off the enemy wounded, tossed the dying into a hole with the dead, and in the Pacific boiled the flesh off enemy skulls to make table ornaments for sweethearts, or carved their bones into letter openers. We topped off our saturation bombing and burning of enemy civilians by dropping atomic bombs on two nearly defenseless cities, thereby setting an all-time record for instantaneous mass slaughter.

As victors we are privileged to try our defeated opponents for their crimes against humanity; but we should be realistic enough to appreciate that if we were on trial for breaking international laws, we should be found guilty on a dozen counts. We fought a dishonorable war, because morality had a low priority in battle. The tougher the fighting, the less room for decency; and in Pacific contests we saw mankind reach the blackest depths of bestiality.

Not every American soldier, or even 1 percent of our troops, deliberately committed unwarranted atrocities, and the same might be said for the Germans and Japanese. The exigencies of war necessitated many so-called crimes, and the bulk of the rest could be blamed on the mental distortion which war produced. But we publicized every inhuman act of our opponents and censored any recognition of our own moral frailty in moments of desperation.

I have asked fighting men, for instance, why they, or actually, why we, regulated flame-throwers in such a way that enemy soldiers were set afire, to die slowly and painfully, rather than killed outright with a full blast of burning oil. Was it because they hated the enemy so thoroughly? The answer was invariably, "No, we don't hate those poor bastards particularly; we just hate the whole ——— mess and have to take it out on somebody." Possibly for the same reason, we mutilated the bodies of enemy dead, cutting off their ears and kicking out their gold teeth for souvenirs, and buried them with their testicles in their mouths, but such flagrant violations of all moral codes reach into still-unexplored realms of battle psychology.

It is not my intention either to excuse our late opponents or to discredit our own fighting men. I do, however, believe that all of us, not just the battle-enlightened GI's, should fully understand the horror and degradation of war before talking so casually of another one. War does horrible things to men, our own sons included. It demands the worst of a person and pays off in brutality and maladjustment. It has become so mechanical, inhuman, and crassly destructive that men lose all sense of personal responsibility for their actions. They fight without compassion, because that is the only way to fight a total war. To give just one illustration, I asked an infantry colonel whether he gave his battalion a prebattle lecture. The colonel replied approximately as follows:

"You can damn well bet I put 'em straight ahead of time, and they were the best damn outfit in the Philippines. I taught 'em ethics, fighting ethics. I taught 'em there were two kinds of ethics, one for us and one for the yellowbellies across the line. I taught 'em that the best way to kill a man was when he was lying down with his back up; the next best way was when he was sitting with his back toward ya; and the third best was when he was standing with his back toward ya. * * * Always shoot 'em in the back if possible; that's what I taught 'em, and there wasn't another battalion could touch 'em."

Among other things about modern warfare, I think the home front should also comprehend the full significance of the fact that a front-line soldier had a good chance of being killed in this war by his own side as well as by his opponents. Battle positions changed so rapidly that American soldiers were shelled by American artillery and warships, bombed and strafed by American planes, and machine-gunned by American tanks—not occasionally, but often. We also sank our own ships and shot down numbers of our own planes—how many no one knows, but the ship I was on in the invasion of Sicily knocked out four German planes and three of our own, which was considered a good average.

Peter Bowman summed up our victory to date in Beach Red, when he wrote, "Battle doesn't determine who is right. Only who is left." We destroyed Fascists, not fascism; men, not ideas. Our triumphs did not serve as evidence that democracy is best for the world, any more than Russian victories proved that communism is an ideal system for all mankind. Only through our peacetime efforts to abolish war and bring a larger measure of freedom and security to all peoples can we reveal to others that we are any better than our defeated opponents.

Today we stand on trial—we are either for peace or for war, and the rest of the world is prepared to move with us or against us. The burden of proof is on us; and our willingness to make peace, not our capacity to wage war, is the true measure of our good-neighborliness.

III

Peacetime conscription, no matter what euphemistic title we use for camouflage, is the mark of a belligerent. If we were to adopt such a course, we should be deliberately turning our backs on the peace for which we sacrificed so much and killed so many. We should be making it clear to all the world that the United States, formerly the champion of international accord, has lost faith in the principles underlying the United Nations Organization and hereafter places its reliance on its own military might. We should be double-crossing every GI who died for more than a mere triumph of arms, and robbing the living of their hard-earned dividends.

The majority of servicemen I met overseas and in camps scattered throughout this country, excluding members of the Regular Army and Navy, had in common four ideas pertaining to the peace: (1) they put up with military life because they had to, but they did not want it for their children; (2) they hoped for a better world, not the "old order of things"; (3) they were not certain what sort of a world peace organization we should have, but it was obvious that we had tried once to keep the peace alone and failed; (4) they were convinced that come hell or high water, the Army and Navy would put their own interests above all else, even the peace.

All the GI wants, in effect, is to have us give peace a chance, rather than to embark upon an out-and-out war program before the UNO has been given a reasonable trial. He is not sure of anything, but he has faith in the possibilities of a better world. He held on to that faith at Tarawa, Normandy, and Iwo Jima, where only death was a sure thing. To give us the chance to find some way other than reliance on men and munitions to keep the peace, he risked everything he held most precious. He now puts to shame all those of us who are so lacking in the courage of our convictions that we agree with President Truman when he says—

"Until we are sure that our peace machinery is functioning adequately, we must relentlessly preserve our superiority on land and sea and in the air. Until that time, we must also make sure that by planning—and by actual production—we have on hand at all times sufficient weapons of the latest nature and design with which to repel any sudden attack, and with which to launch an effective counterattack.

"That is the only way we can be sure—until we are sure that there is another way."

First get all set for another war, then talk peace—that is the policy of distrustful American militarists, and that is what the GI's mean by the old order of things. We already have the greatest military machine on earth, and the only one equipped to be aggressive on an amphibious, interhemispheric scale, but General Eisenhower assures us, on the basis of his familiarity with the leaders of other nations, that there exists no fear of

our motives in keeping ourselves strong. As a low-point friend of mine wrote from Manila, the general should tell that to the Russians, on whom our old guard has already declared war.

If other nations have no fear of our motives, they must have turned a deaf ear when Fleet Admiral Halsey told our Senate: "We want to win wars, and we want to fight them on enemy ground. That makes us all invasion-minded. That calls for an overseas movement as the first step in our air, ground, and sea offensive." But perhaps it is not fair of me to imply that the admiral was advocating conscription when he remarked that we were all invasion-minded, because actually he was arguing at the time against a single department of national defense. When the militarists talk conscription, they speak much more guardedly about national security, permanent peace, and a fine thing for our young men.

The advocates of conscription acknowledge that their bill must be passed soon or it will be defeated. They are trying to shove through Congress an unprecedented piece of militaristic legislation while wartime emotions still run high, because they know that their program cannot be justified by cool reason. The protraining campaigners have to hurry, because a few more congressional post-mortems like the Pearl Harbor investigation will cure the public's blind faith in the superior wisdom of its military leaders. The slogan, "We were unprepared before, we must never be unprepared again," looks sickly in the light of General Marshall's testimony that Hawaii had at least sufficient means so that it could have broken up the attack, so that it would have done only limited harm.

Even more damaging public disillusionment will come when the returning veteran takes time out to talk back to anyone who blithely assures him that military life is a grand experience for young men. The majority of the men in uniform hated the Army with a bitterness that made them want to take their misery out on anyone conceivably responsible for their plight. They wanted others to suffer as they suffered. Whenever universal military training was mentioned, they invariably said, "Good idea. Get the whole home front into this thing. Then maybe someone will appreciate what we have to go through."

This is at least a partial explanation of why supposedly representative polls have shown the GI to be currently in favor of a bill which obviously defeats his long-term campaign to end militarism at home and abroad—this, plus the more obvious fact that men in uniform were never free to talk openly on the subject of "why I hate the Army." If they did, they were quickly section-eighted out of the Army as constitutional psychopaths. When peace organizations requested that persons opposed to conscription be allowed to go abroad and present their side of the argument, the War Department said it could not be arranged. Nevertheless, persons favoring postwar compulsory training, including Edward N. Scheiberling, national commander of the American Legion, have been transported overseas to proselyte the GI's.

For 2 weeks the New York Selective Service headquarters polled the conscription sentiments of men being processed for discharge. The majority were in favor of compulsory teen-age training, as was to be expected, but those opposed (and only those opposed were requested to state their reasons) gave some revealing answers. The principal objections listed by slightly more than 2,000 GI's were, "not needed," "bad environment," "racial discrimination and favoritism," and "a volunteer Army and Navy would be enough." The first and last objections are self-evident, or soon will be. The second and third, however, touch closely upon the heart of GI gripes.

Los Angeles Daily News Talks Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD this very timely editorial from the Los Angeles Daily News of Wednesday, February 27, 1946:

THE SHADOWS ON THE MAP

If Los Angeles is to rise soon to its postwar responsibilities, someone with a bold, clear voice, is going to have to say, "Folks, here are the obstacles, there are the goals. Let us now proceed to fight our way from here to there."

Take housing, for example. In the midst of acute need for 200,000 new homes, in the midst of unprecedented strains on local government, something certainly will have to be done to prevent a great city from becoming further confused in a planless centrifugation impelled by the housing shortage.

Probably what is needed, among other things, is a sweeping program of land assembly.

For to begin with, if 200,000 homes are to be built, the vast majority in the $5,000 to $6,000 price range, someone had better start asking, "Where are they to be built?"

A lot of people in Washington, as well as locally, have been getting hopped up over the prospect of millions of homes blossoming miraculously in the next 2 years from a streamlined building industry and an easy-to-pay mortgage system without bothering to glance at pegged-up land values and to ask themselves what such values imply.

It requires no gift of prophecy to foresee few low-cost homes being built on land which has trebled in price since Pearl Harbor.

In the second place, any dim-wit can guess that if such homes are built in any considerable quantity they'll be built far out on the fringes of the city, thereby increasing living costs for everyone.

Land price, therefore, is the crux of the housing problem. It's a far tougher nut to crack than labor and material shortages, restrictive practices in the building trades, antiquated, uneconomical building codes, or any of the half dozen other interrelated factors of the housing dilemma.

In 22 cities of the United States today—cities ranging in size from 50,000 to 4,000,000, and including Los Angeles—45 percent of total city area is vacant.

Much of this vacant area is in the central part of cities. Also in central metropolitan areas are extensive patches of blighted, squalid property.

Together the vacant areas and the blighted areas, both centrally located, form the shadows on the city's map.

Take a look, for example, at Los Angeles' 13 blighted regions, at its innumerable outcroppings of unused land—all within a radius of a few miles from the civic center.

Take a look at Chavez ravine, 10 minutes from the heart of downtown Los Angeles, a beautiful mountain area largely undeveloped and inaccessible. Take a look at Hazard Park, near the general hospital; take a look at the Mount Washington region or Boyle Heights.

Drive around the midtown section, from Sunset south to Pico, from Figueroa west to Vermont or Western, and count the vacant lots, the gray confusion of rundown houses and practically discarded business establishments.

It isn't a pretty sight, of course. It's all, in fact, a sort of dreary, wasteful, ghostly reminder of how private enterprise, hoping for past gains, has clung barnacle-like to scraps of land and mere sticks of houses while the dynamics of new enterprise have pushed outward to the city's perimeters many new real-estate developments, many new shopping centers.

Backwashes of time and hoarded hopes, the shadows on Los Angeles' broad face are scrofulous symbols of disorganized community growth.

They are shadows, moreover, to which all of us are daily paying tribute. A few yardsticks: A shrinking downtown percentage of retail sales, increased costs of transportation for commuters from outlying areas, increased costs to taxpayers for extending utilities and services to more and more outlying subdivisions.

In 1943 three square miles of Boyle Heights paid $207,825 in property taxes. But every taxpayer in the city helps pay the total bill of $485,511 for Boyle Heights' police protection, for its fire, health, library, parks, and playground services.

Shadows on the map are municipal deficits which have accrued through planlessness, technological change, the passage of time, and just plain greed and speculation.

Removing these blemishes is good economy for every man, woman, and child in Los Angeles. Making use of vacant land in the city's center for new homes is a clear imperative.

Under California's community redevelopment act of 1945, Los Angeles can now establish a land assembly agency. Unfortunately, the legislature, at its recent special session, ignored Gov. Earl Warren's twice-repeated request for a $10,000,000 appropriation to assist local communities in beginning the land assembly job authorized by the act.

As the housing crisis deepens from place to place—as its solution drags—events may well prove this failure to implement urban redevelopment will stand as the legislature's most tragic flop.

But local officials can still do something besides pout and pass sympathetic resolutions. With the sovereign tools at their disposal—condemnation, eminent domain, taxation, and public credit—they can still make a good start.

The key tool, however, is courage. Without it shadows are never dissolved.—R. E. G. H.

America's Position on Disputed World Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, on last Thursday night the distinguished Secretary of State, Hon. James F. Byrnes, at the dinner of the Overseas Press Club of America, held in the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, delivered a timely, thoughtful, and significant address in which he outlined America's position on disputed world problems. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address as published in the New York Times of March 1 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are beginning to realize that the war is over. It is good to have sons, husbands, and

fathers home again. It is good to open a newspaper without fear of finding in the casualty lists the name of one near and dear to us.

But this is not wholly a time of celebration and rejoicing. As families in their homes on the farms and in the cities settle back from the dinner table to hear the boys tell of Normandy and Iwo Jima, there is an unspoken question in every mind. The question is what we can do to make certain that there will never be another war.

During the war our goal was clear. Our goal was victory. The problems of industrial and military mobilization, it is true, were problems of the first magnitude. Production bottlenecks often seemed unbreakable, transportation difficulties and manpower shortages insurmountable. On the fighting front, the combined land, sea, and air operations were heartbreaking in complexity.

These were hard tasks. Yet we were able to apply a yardstick to each proposal by asking a simple question: "Will it help to win the war?" The common goal of victory served to unite us and to give purpose and direction to our efforts.

Now that we have come into calmer waters, our relief and gratitude are mixed with uncertainty. Our goal now is permanent peace, and surely we seek it even more anxiously than we sought victory.

FINDS PEACE PATH DIFFICULT

The difficulty is that the path to permanent peace is not so easy to see and to follow as was the path to victory.

When an issue is presented, we ask, "Will it help to win the peace?" When the answer is slow to come or does not come at all, we grow uneasy and apprehensive.

While we may be in doubt about many things, there are certain basic propositions on which we are clear.

One is that a just and lasting peace is not the inevitable result of victory. Rather, victory has given us the opportunity to build such a peace. And our lives depend upon whether we make the most of this opportunity.

Another thing of which we are certain is that we Americans alone cannot determine whether the world will live in peace or perish in war. Peace depends quite as much upon others as it does upon us. No nation is the complete master of its fate. We are all bound together for better or for worse.

Because we know this, we have pinned our hopes to the banner of the United Nations. And we are not content simply to take our place in that organization. We realize that although the dreams of the world are lodged in it, the United Nations will fail unless its members give it life by their confidence and by their determination to make it work in concrete cases and in everyday affairs.

DISCUSSES LONDON MEETING

And so I wish to talk to you about the first meetings of the United Nations. What has been said in these meetings had been said as plainly and bluntly as anything I have heard said by responsible statesmen in any private conference.

These first meetings were intended only to establish the various organs of the United Nations. But so pressing were some of the problems presented to the Security Council that they had to be dealt with before there was a chance for the Council to adopt even provisional rules of procedure.

All was not calm and peaceful at the meetings in London. There was effort to use the United Nations to advance selfish national aims. But the clash of national interests and purposes which were reflected in the debates in London was very much like the clash of local and special interests which are reflected in our National and State Legislatures.

We may deprecate some of these clashes of interest. But when they exist, it is better that they should be publicly revealed. If these conflicts of interests did not appear in the forums of the United Nations, these forums would be detached from reality and in the long run turn out to be purposeless and futile.

ON MIDDLE EAST DEBATE

A most significant precedent was established when the Secuity Council finished its discussions of the complaint of the Syrian and Lebanese Governments requesting the withdrawal of French and British troops from their territories.

The Council did not take formal action because of a difference among the permanent members as to the form of the resolution. But no one questioned the general proposition that no state has the right to maintain its troops on the territory of another independent state without its consent, nor the application of this proposition to the pending case.

The particular form of resolution to this general effect which was presented by the United States representative, Mr. Edward R. Stettinius, was supported by most of the members of the Council. It failed of acceptance, however, because the Soviet Union vetoed it on the ground that it was not definite enough.

But the British and French Governments immediately announced that, notwithstanding the technical veto of the Soviet Union, they would act in accordance with the American resolution as it clearly represented the views of the Council.

This indicates that the mere legal veto by one of the permanent members of the Council does not in fact relieve any state, large or small, of its moral obligation to act in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter.

TELLS OF GOOD START

The United Nations got off to a good start. However, that does not mean it is an assured success. It simply means that the Charter will work if the peoples of the United Nations are determined to make it work. At times our Congress may make serious errors of omission and commission. Such errors are not the fault of the Congress as an institution. They are the fault of its Members or of their constituents who fail to measure up to their responsibilities.

So it is with the United Nations. It will succeed only as we, the peoples of the United Nations, measure up to our responsibilities.

I should be lacking in candor if I said to you that world conditions today are sound or reassuring. All around us there is suspicion and distrust, which in turn breeds suspicion and distrust.

Some suspicions are unfounded and unreasonable. Of some others, that cannot be said. That requires frank discussion between great powers of the things that give rise to suspicion. At the Moscow Conference there was such frank discussion. It was helpful. But the basis of some suspicions perist and prompts me to make some comments as to our position.

We have joined with our allies in the United Nations to put an end to war. We have covenanted not to use force except in the defense of law as embodied in the purposes and principles of the Charter. We intend to live up to that covenant.

But as a great power and as a permanent member of the Security Council we have a responsibility to use our influence to see that other powers live up to their covenant. And that responsibility we also intend to meet.

Unless the great powers are prepared to act in the defense of law, the United Nations cannot prevent war. We must make it clear in advance that we do intend to act to prevent aggression, making it clear at the same time that we will not use force for any other purpose.

The great powers are given special responsibilities because they have the strength to maintain peace, if they have the will to maintain peace. Their strength in relation to one another is such that no one of them can safely break the peace if the others stand united in defense of the Charter.

The present power relationships of the great states preclude the domination of the world by any one of them. Those power relationships cannot be substantially altered by the unilateral action of any one great state without profoundly disturbing the whole structure of the United Nations.

Therefore, if we are going to do our part to maintain peace in the world we must maintain our power to do so, and we must make it clear that we will stand united with other great states in defense of the Charter.

If we are to be a great power, we must act as a great power, not only in order to insure our own security but in order to preserve the peace of the world.

FOR MILITARY TRAINING

Much as we desire general disarmament and much as we are prepared to participate in a general reduction of armaments, we cannot be faithful to our obligations to ourselves and to the world if we alone disarm.

While it is not in accord with our traditions to maintain a large professional standing army, we must be able and ready to provide armed contingents that may be required on short notice. We must also have a trained citizenry able and ready to supplement those armed contingents without unnecessarily prolonged training.

That is why in the interest of peace we cannot allow our military establishment to be reduced below the point required to maintain a position commensurate with our responsibilities, and that is why we must have some form of universal military training.

Our power thus maintained cannot and will not be used for aggressive purposes. Our tradition as a peace-loving, law-abiding, democratic people should be an assurance that our force will not be used except in the defense of law. Our armed forces, except as they may be called into action by the Security Council, cannot be employed in war without the consent of the Congress. We need not fear their misuse unless we distrust the representatives of the people.

SEES NO CAUSE FOR WAR

I am convinced that there is no reason for war between any of the great powers. Their present power relationships and interests are such that none need or should feel insecure in relation to the others as long as each faithfully observes the purposes and principles of the Charter.

It is not enough for nations to declare they do not want to make war. Hitler said that. In a sense he meant it. He wanted the world to accept the domination of a totalitarian government under his direction. He wanted that without war if possible. He was determined to get it with war if necessary.

To banish war, nations must refrain from doing the things that lead to war.

It has never been the policy of the United States in its internal affairs or in its foreign relations to regard the status quo as sacrosanct. The essence of our democracy is our belief in life and growth and in the right of the people to shape and mold their own destiny.

It is not in our tradition to defend the dead hand of reaction or the tyranny of privilege. We did not fight against the Nazis and Fascists who turned back the clock of civilization in order that we might stop the clock of progress.

WANTS POSITIVE DIPLOMACY

Our diplomacy must not be negative and inert. It must be capable of adjustment and development in response to constantly changing circumstances. It must be marked by

creative ideas, constructive proposals, practical and forward-looking suggestions.

Though the status quo is not sacred and unchangeable, we cannot overlook a unilateral gnawing away at the status quo. The Charter forbids aggression and we cannot allow aggression to be accomplished by coercion or pressure or by subterfuge such as political infiltration.

When adjustments between States, large or small, are called for, we will frankly and fairly consider those adjustments on their merits and in the light of the common interests of all States, large and small, to maintain peace and security in a world based on the unity of all great powers and the dominance of none.

There are undoubtedly vitally important adjustments which will require our consideration. Some of these situations are delicate to deal with. I am convinced, however, that satisfactory solutions can be found if there is a stop to this maneuvering for strategic advantage all over the world and to the use of one adjustment as an entering wedge for further and undisclosed penetrations of power.

We must face the fact that to preserve the United Nations we cannot be indifferent—veto or no veto—to serious controversies between any of the great powers, because such controversies could affect the whole power relationship between all of the great powers.

The United States wish to maintain friendly relations with all nations and exclusive arrangements with no nation. Naturally, there are some problems which concern some nations much more than other nations. That is true in regard to many problems related to inter-American affairs. That is true in regard to the control of Germany and Japan.

AGAINST EXCLUSIVE BLOCS

In our relations with the other great powers there are many problems which concern two or three of us much more than the others of us. I see no objection to conferences between the Big Three or the Big Four or the Big Five.

Even conferences between ourselves and the Soviet Union alone, conferences between ourselves and Britain alone, or conferences between ourselves and France or China alone, can all help to further general accord among the great powers and peace with the smaller powers.

But in such conferences, so far as the United States is concerned, we will gang up against no state. We will do nothing to break the world into exclusive blocs or spheres of influence. In this atomic age we will not seek to divide a world which is one and indivisible.

We have openly, gladly, and wholeheartedly welcomed our Soviet ally as a great power, second to none in the family of the United Nations. We have approved many adjustments in her favor, and in the process resolved many serious doubts in her favor.

Only an inexcusable tragedy of errors could cause serious conflict between us in the future. Despite the differences in our way of life, our people admire and respect our allies and wish to continue to be friends and partners in a world of expanding freedom and rising standards of living.

But in the interest of world peace and in the interest of our common and traditional friendship we must make plain that the United States intends to defend the Charter.

Great powers as well as small powers have agreed under the United Nations Charter not to use force or the threat of force except in defense of law and the purposes and principles of the Charter.

We will not and we cannot stand aloof if force or the threat of force is used contrary to the purposes and principles of the Charter.

WOULD SPEED PEACEMAKING

We have no right to hold our troops in the territories of other sovereign states without their approval and consent freely given.

We must not unduly prolong the making of peace and continue to impose our troops upon small and impoverished states.

No power has a right to help itself to alleged enemy properties in liberated or ex-satellite countries before a reparation settlement has been agreed upon by the Allies. We have not and will not agree to any one power deciding for itself what it will take from these countries.

We must not conduct a war of nerves to achieve strategic ends.

We do not want to stumble and stagger into situations where no power intends war, but no power will be able to avert war.

We must not regard the drawing of attention to situations which might endanger the peace, as an affront to the nation or nations responsible to those situations.

It is quite possible that any nation may in good faith embark on a course of conduct without fully appreciating the effects of its conduct. We must all be willing to review our actions to preserve our common interests in the peace, which are so much more important to all of us than the differences which might divide us.

We must get back to conditions of peace. We must liquidate the terrible legacy which the war has left us We must return our armies to their homelands. We must eliminate the breeding grounds of suspicion and fear. We must not deceive ourselves or mislead our allies. To avoid trouble we must not allow situations to develop into incidents from which there is no retreat.

CALLS FOR PATIENCE NOW

We must live by the Charter. That is the only road to peace.

To live by the Charter requires good will and understanding on the part of all of us. We who had patience and gave confidence to one another in the most trying days of the war must have patience and give confidence to one another now.

No nation has a monopoly of virtue or of wisdom, and no nation has a right to act as if it had. Friendly nations should act as friendly nations.

Loose talk of the inevitability of war casts doubt on our own loyalty to the Charter and jeopardizes our most cherished freedoms both at home and abroad.

There are ideological differences in the world. There always have been. But in this world there is room for many people with varying views and many governments with varying systems. None of us can foresee the far-distant future and the ultimate shape of things to come. But we are bound together as part of a common civilization.

As we view the wreckage of the war, we must realize that the urgent tasks of reconstruction, the challenging tasks of creating higher standards of living for our people, should absorb all our constructive energies.

Great states and small states must work together to build a friendlier and happier world. If we fail to work together there can be no peace, no comfort, and little hope for any of us.

Salute to Jewish War Veterans of the United States Upon Their Golden Jubilee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, representing the fighting men of that faith who have fought in American wars, are celebrating their fiftieth anniversary this year. More than 900,000 Jews fought for America in the armed forces of the Nation in World Wars I and II. It is fitting and proper that their great contribution should be memorialized. The following editorial appeared on Sunday, February 24, in the New York Journal and American, Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph, San Francisco Examiner, Chicago Herald American, Baltimore News-Post American, Boston Record-American Advertiser, Los Angeles Examiner, Detroit Times, Albany Times-Union, Seattle Post-Intelligencer, Milwaukee Sentinel, Los Angeles Herald and Express, San Francisco Call Bulletin, Oakland Post-Inquirer, San Antonio Light.

I recommend that all citizens read it:

FOR GOD AND COUNTRY

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

"May the children of the stock of Abraham, who dwell in this land, continue to merit and enjoy the good will of the other inhabitants, and there shall be none to make them afraid." (George Washington.)

America salutes the Jewish War Veterans of the United States on their golden jubilee.

It will be celebrated at Madison Square Garden, on March 4.

It will be staged in a cavalcade of patriotic splendor.

It will unfold the scroll of the fighting Jews for America.

The Jewish war veterans are dedicated—

To maintain true allegiance to the United States of America.

To foster and perpetuate the principles of Americanism.

To combat bigotry and instill the love of God and country.

To honor the memory of patriotic service of men of Jewish faith.

To inculcate the doctrines of liberty, equal rights, and justice to all.

Who does not know the stirring saga of that ancient race of God,

Whose immemorial feet the grapes of wrath have trod?

When has there ever been,

When will there ever be again,

An epic having equal power to stir the impulses of men?

The Jews are an ancient people whose spiritual riches were deposited in a literature in the form of the old Bible, revered the world over as an ageless repository of divine inspiration, and of the purest philosophy and wisdom.

They have nurtured a Moses and a Christ.

They were born in freedom and weaned on the teachings of the Ten Commandments.

They were comforted and sustained by the psalmists, and disciplined by the seers.

They were the couriers of the ethics of Abraham, the songs of David, and the prophecies of Jeremiah to all mankind.

The Jews have been a stalwart people, and their exhibitions of military valor and individual courage have won for them the world's plaudits.

The songs of Deborah burst forth with martial music.

The battle of Gideon is the battle of heroes.

The dauntlessness of Saul, Jonathan, and David testifies abundantly to the gallantry of the ancient sons of Israel.

They are intertwined with the evolution of civilization.

They have been sturdy champions of liberty in every age and in every clime.

They have enriched the world's literature and sciences.

They have never neglected any standard of principle, any mode of thought, or any concepts of philosophy in their grand march of achievements through the centuries.

Yet theirs has been a lonely river in the ocean of mankind.

All the mighty floods of human suffering have never caused it to overflow.

All the fires of cruelty heated in the furnace of bigotry have never caused it to dry up.

Its waves have rolled crimson for ages with the blood of its martyrs.

It is singularly refreshing to recall that the Jews greatly aided Columbus in the discovery of America.

His caravels were outfitted by Luis de Santangel, and his astronomical maps were drawn by Abraham Zacuta.

His ship's physician and surgeon were Bernal and Marco, and his interpreter was Louis de Torres, who was the first to tread American soil.

The Jews have played a glorious role in the development of American history since the birth of the Nation.

They were identified with our colonial growth and helped finance the Revolution.

They bore a gallant part under the leadership of Gen. George Washington.

They have fought in all the wars of the Republic.

Yes, they have won the highest commendation from every President of our country.

Let us call with pride the roll of those gallant defenders in our Nation's holy cause.

We see the Jews at Valley Forge, when the spirit of the American people hung low and only the stout of heart stood fast and constant by Washington.

Of the 3,000 Jews in all the colonies, four of them were lieutenant colonels, three majors, six captains and many in the ranks.

Be it noted that Lt. Col. Isaac Frank was aide-de-camp to General Washington.

Haym Salomon dedicated his entire fortune of $640,000 to the young Republic and later died impoverished.

We see them in the War of 1812.

It is inspiring to note that Uriah P. Levy, commander of the brig-of-war *Argus*, ran the British blockade and destroyed 21 British merchantmen.

With tongue and pen he succeeded in effecting the abolition of bodily punishment in the United States Navy, and died a commodore, then the Navy's highest rank.

We see them in the Mexican War, the fight for Texas, and in the Seminole wars.

Again the fighting Jews in action!

Again the healing Jew, in the person of Surg. Gen. David Deleon.

We see them rallying under the inspiration of Abraham Lincoln during the Civil War.

Of the 200,000 Jews in the United States, 10,000 saw active military service and seven received the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Frederick Knefler, of Indiana, rose to the rank of major general, and Edward S. Solomon was brigadier general.

It is interesting to observe that Lincoln named Leopold Newman, of New York, brigadier general while he lay dying of battle wounds received at Chancellorsville.

We see them also with William McKinley striking the shackles of bondage from a neighboring people and bringing forth an island republic.

America accepts the challenge of Spanish tyranny.

"Remember the Maine!"—Fifteen Jews were on that ill-fated battleship and Sgt. Maurice Joost, of California, was the first to fall in the attack on Manila.

Five thousand intrepid Jewish volunteers gladly answered the call of their President.

We see these gallant warriors with Woodrow Wilson fighting to make the world safe for democracy.

Two hundred and fifty thousand Jews were in uniform, constituting 5 percent of the fighting forces.

Ten thousand Jews held commissioned rank, and 1,100 Jews were cited for valor in action.

The greatest epic of courage ever to come out of that war—the exploits of the Lost Battalion—was a demonstration of conspicuous bravery.

We see them once more with Franklin Delano Roosevelt fighting to make democracy safe for the world.

First American penetration of German soil was made by the Third Armored Division, commanded by Maj. Gen. Maurice Rose, of Denver, who gave his life for his country.

First American assault boat to hit the shore of France on D-day was commanded by Lt. Abe Condiotti, of Brooklyn.

The first Japanese battleship sunk in the war was the *Haruna*, sent to the bottom by a plane piloted by Capt. Colin Kelly, whose bombardier was Sgt. Meyer Levin.

First American officer killed in the Philippines was Lt. Henry D. Mark, of Los Angeles.

First four-medal winner of the American Army in World War II was Lt. Morris Berenson, of Garfield, N. J.

And there are scores of Americans of Jewish faith whose names will live forever in the archives of our Government.

Travel where you may through American cemeteries on a thousand battlefields,

Travel where the delicate poppies carpet the earth with their rich red blossoms or in the glistening white stones rising above the flower-strewn mounds—

There you will see, side by side, one beneath the cross of Christianity and one beneath the star of David.

Jew and Christian pillowed in eternal glory!

Yes, they have fought, bled, worshipped and died together!

May the spirit of America be quickened and renewed.

May the strength that cometh from the hills descend upon us and guide us forever.

America! America!
God shed His grace on thee,
And crown thy good with brotherhood
From sea to shining sea.

Resolutions of Farmers Union Central Exchange, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the Farmers Union, one of the great farm organizations of the United States, operating particularly in the Northwestern States, is deeply concerned with the development of the United States, and particularly do its members feel that by the building of the St. Lawrence seaway, markets for farm products will be opened up to the internal part of the United States.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith resolutions adopted by the stockholders of Farmers Union Central Exchange, Inc., at its fifteenth annual meeting in February 1946:

The Farmers Union Central Exchange, a regional farm supply cooperative, doing business in the five Northwest States of Montana, North and South Dakota, Minnesota, and Wisconsin, comprised of 400 local cooperative companies with a membership of 150,000 farmers, assembled in annual convention at St. Paul, Minn., this 21st day of February 1946, does hereby adopt the following resolution:

The people of the United States are now faced with a problem of expansion of their economic life which would necessitate the obtaining of modern and economical transportation facilities in order to give the millions of farmers, workers, and businessmen, a wide opportunity to apply their skill and knowledge for the exploration of our vast natural and industrial resources and enhance the prosperity of the country as a whole.

The development of the St. Lawrence seaway project presents one of the ways of enlarging our transportation system to economically utilize our productive capacities by the stimulating of world and domestic trade through lower cost of transportation. It will stimulate the agricultural and industrial activities of the Great Lakes area which is the key region of the agriculture and industry of America.

We, the delegates, representing 150,000 Northwest farmer members of the Farmers Union Central Exchange, Inc., heartily endorse and recommend that every effort be made toward the immediate opening of the St. Lawrence deep waterway transportation which will give our land-locked Midwest an opportunity to expand its economic activities.

I, Madge I. Hughes, assistant secretary of Farmers Union Central Exchange, Inc., do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of a resolution of the stockholders of said Farmers Union Central Exchange, Inc., duly adopted at the annual meeting of stockholders of the corporation the 21st day of February 1946.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of said corporation this 1st day of March 1946.

MADGE I. HUGHES.

We unequivocally endorse the idea of price control and all price ceilings and of the general operation of the OPA during the war. We realize that there might have been mistakes made in the operations of these various programs but the over-all results achieved were of far greater benefit to the common man than the inconveniences caused.

We further recommend that these controls be maintained as long as is necessary to prevent undue inflation or serious maladjustments in our economic system.

We endorse the development of all the resources of the Missouri River and its tributaries through a Missouri Valley Authority patterned after the Tennessee Valley Authority. We urge speedy enactment of pending legislation to attain this end.

I, Madge I. Hughes, assistant secretary of Farmers Union Central Exchange, Inc., do hereby certify that the foregoing are true copies of resolutions adopted by the stockholders of said Farmers Union Central Exchange at their annual meeting on February 21, 1946.

In witness whereof, I hereunto set my hand and affix the seal of said corporation this 1st day of March 1946.

MADGE I. HUGHES.

We condemn monopolies and cartels as instruments of an economy of scarcity. The Antitrust Division of the United States Department of Justice has a case pending before a Federal jury in Chicago on American cheese, and the investigations conducted by the Antitrust Division in connection with this case and the indictment upon which this case is based point to monopolistic practices in the cheese industry.

A bill of particulars filed by the Antitrust Division in connection with this case contains definite evidence that the prices established on cheese on the Wisconsin Cheese Exchange are the result of collusion and previous agreements between dealers, and investigations show that most of the distribu-

tion of cheese is controlled by four large corporations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Farmers Union Central Exchange delegates assembled in the annual convention at St. Paul, Minn., this 21st day of February 1946 does commend and approve the efforts of the Antitrust Division of the United States Department of Justice on behalf of the farmers to stop monopolies in this country and particularly commends the Antitrust Division for its work on the above case and pledges its support and cooperation.

I, Madge I. Hughes, assistant secretary of Farmers Union Central Exchange, Inc., do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of a resolution of the stockholders of said Farmers Union Central Exchange, Inc., duly adopted at the annual meeting of stockholders of the corporation the 21st day of February 1946.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of said corporation this 1st day of March 1946.

MADGE I. HUGHES.

One War Is Enough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES R. SAVAGE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to supplement the remarks I made on yesterday wherein I included chapters 1, 2, and 3 of an article by Edgar L. Jones from the February issue of the Atlantic Monthly. Under unanimous consent, I include chapters 4 and 5 of the same article, as follows:

IV

Army life was a bad environment, not only morally, but mentally and physically. It sapped a man's initiative, because his desire to put his talents to good use was thwarted repeatedly by the military classification and schools system. It discouraged free thinking, because a man was told what to do and when to do it, and was constantly reminded that the only way was the right, or traditional, way. It made him irresponsible, because the Army took care of everything; wasteful, because everything belonged to the Government; excessive, because a soldier always tried to jam as much pleasure as possible into what might be his last fling. It destroyed his personal sense of values, because a GI could not call even his soul his own.

The extreme distinction between officers and men was intolerable to most members of the lower-class bracket and embarrassing to many democratic junior officers. The autocratic, self-indulgent behavior of the boys with the brass irked the men who took the orders. The GI acknowledged that some distinction was necessary, but he could not understand how so little rank could entitle his "superiors" to so much: The best beds, the most appetizing food, the most leisure, the least restriction on pleasure, the only covered seats at outdoor movies, the right to go to the head of the line at the PX, and, above all else, the right to treat fellow Americans as servants and take it for granted that they had to obey.

The majority of officers were frustrated in turn by the small band of Academy-trained Regulars who would never give a Reservist an even break unless assured that their own positions were not threatened. The Reservists were the victims of empire-building Regulars who kept themselves surrounded by great numbers of unnecessary personnel in order to justify their rank or make a promotion for themselves possible. The Reservists were disgusted by the over-abundance of duplicate headquarters, each over-supplied with Regular Army "desk soldiers." They resented the system whereby they had most of the new ideas, but the Regulars got the credit, and those in the Navy were hardly surprised to learn at the end of the war that the Regulars had awarded themselves three and one-half times more decorations than were bestowed upon the Reserves.

The Army and Navy had every opportunity to strike a clean blow for democracy by setting an example in nondiscrimination against Negroes, but, instead, both services insisted upon racial segregation wherever and whenever possible. The Negro in "well run" military installations was not allowed to sleep in the same room with white men, eat at the same table, or attend the same churches. This was especially true in southern camps, where both services supported the local programs to "keep niggers in their place" in restaurants, theaters, busses, and railroad stations. When men like Joe Louis raised an objection, they were immediately transferred overseas or "up north." Except for a few "show units" of all-Negro personnel, our colored soldiers of democracy were restricted to the most menial tasks of stevedoring and cleaning the barracks of their white superiors.

One of the very few paratroop companies ever to go through training without a single man balking when it came his turn to jump was an all-Negro outfit; yet the Army made no effort to correct the rumor that Negroes were cowards. The outfit was not sent overseas, where its performance might have encouraged other Negroes to demand fighting assignments, but was shipped off to the Northwest to fight forest fires. The Navy was even more prejudiced against Negroes than the Army—witness its refusal to allow a small company of colored truck drivers to return home on one of its carriers because there was no segregation facilities on the flight deck.

Neither the Army nor the Navy made an honest effort to curb the dangerous rise of antilabor sentiments among our men in uniform, or anti-Jewish prejudices, or the whole distorted range of hatreds against the home front. Either through indifference or through malice aforethought, the military allowed the gap between GI's and civilians to widen to alarming proportions.

Directives out of Washington urged the Army and Navy to inculcate democratic ideals in our troops, but the orders were either disregarded by Regular officers, who consider a 1-hour-a-week orientation course to be pure fiddle-faddle, or were turned over to inept officers whose sterile lectures were guaranteed not to make a GI reason why. The military naturally could not teach human equality, or freedom of speech, or any other liberal idea which it could not let its disciples practice, and joined readily in Senator TAFT's preelection plan to bar from troop consumption all socio-political reading material.

No matter how the GI looked at it, he could see no foundation for the assertion that military training was "education for democracy." The essence of his training was "do what you're told to do and shut up," and that was a far cry from the civilian, or American, way of life. Nor did the GI, except in rare cases, learn what President Truman and others have called "skills useful in future civilian life." If he had, he would not have been so bitter about his "wasted years" in the service. The chief gripe of the majority of men in the armed forces was the fact that they were stuck in jobs they did not like and could not get out of doing.

For every thousand men, the Army needed 101 chauffeurs and mechanics, 45 cooks, bakers, and butchers, and 34 medical and dental technicians, all of whom were turned out in 6-week courses. If a man did not go into the service with one of these skills, he learned only enough to do a specific job, not to earn a postwar living. Likewise, a radar operator learned to read a radarscope, but not the principles of electronics; an aviation mechanic learned how to take an engine apart according to prescribed military methods, not the principles of internal combustion motors; and a yeoman learned military correspodence procedure, not how to write business letters. Whatever a man learned, thousands of others learned the same thing, so today those "skills" are a glut on the market.

V

Stripped of its window dressing, military training is education in the ways of violence, and little or nothing else. In reference to current plans to compel all our youth to serve time in a camp for conscriptees, I would go even further and say that the proposed training would not be technical preparedness for the next war, but merely a means of indoctrinating young men with militaristic ideas. It stands to reason, I believe, that anything a boy might learn about warfare in 1946, excluding the manual of arms, would be as ancient and unserviceable as the boy himself by 1960, or whenever the next war is supposed to take place. The weapons of the next war are now top secret, and if anyone is trained to use them, it will be members of the Regular Army and Navy.

It seems likely, at the time I am writing, that the War Department will drop its plea for a full year of continuous military training and try to settle for 4 months only, plus additional service in the National Guard or ROTC. This would be an open admission that the military lobby is not so much interested in the training as in the principle of keeping this country in a perpetual state of warmindedness. If the Army and Navy could extend into peacetime their war-won influence and prestige, as conscription would allow them to do, neither service need worry where its next appropriation is coming from. To the tune of "nothing is too good for our boys," the militarists would ride herd over Congressmen and taxpayers alike, justifying each new demand for money by renewing their grim warnings about the war just around the corner.

Considering the battle-tested greatness of some of our generals and admirals, I do not want it supposed that I accuse every man in a bestarred tunic of being the enemy of peace. Our generals fight wars; they do not start them. It is the military system, not always the leaders themselves, that represents democracy in reverse. Nevertheless, it is a general's job to exalt the fighting profession and to work untiringly for more guns, more planes, more bases, and more men in uniform. His first interest is the Army, and to his way of thinking, whatever is best for the Army is best for the country as a whole. While this was often the case in wartime, it does not follow that the professional soldier's plans for peace coincide with the best interests of the Nation. In matters as basic and controversial as conscription or disarmament, the most unselfishly devoted of our military leaders take a prejudiced stand.

Universal military training means more important posts for many of our military leaders, faced otherwise with shrinking commands; it means fat contracts for our manufacturers of food, clothing, shoes, trucks, medical supplies, and all the other equipment needed to outfit nearly 1,000,000 new conscriptees a year; it means Government endowment of military education programs for our universities; it means lucrative research projects for our industrial laboratories; and new members by the thousands for the American Legion. It means the self-perpetuation of the military machine as a new form of boondoggling to win profits and power for the few, while the taxpayer is burdened with

the costs of supporting both conscription and a standing force of between two and three million members of the Regular Army, Navy, Coast Guard, and Marines.

Worst of all, in my opinion, peacetime training provides a patriotic opportunity for the old guard to work on the minds of our youth before they have a chance to go to college or to learn to think for themselves. With teen-age orientation under the control of militant reactionaries, conscription would produce generation upon generation of narrow-minded, intolerant, red-baiting, labor-hating defenders of the status quo—or what the American Legion would term good Americans. The older ones among us in uniform saw what happened to the kids in this war, and we would not willingly have our own children become the mirrors of the military mind, which stands squarely for force, for the inevitability of armed conflicts, and for the principle that might makes right.

Reconversion of our thinking from a war to a peace basis would kill militarism in this country before it had a chance to spread any further. As it is, we are still looking at our military leaders through red-white-and-blue-colored glasses, and allowing them to sell us the most flagrant bill of mislabeled goods since prohibition was passed off as a national cure-all. The conscription barkers and next-war drum beaters are trying to put over military training as an antidote for everything from atomic nerves to unemployment. What Senator JOHNSON of Colorado, a member of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, has termed "the most un-American proposal of our time" is being heralded as an absolute essential for the defense of our country. With Prussian thoroughness, our militarists have even supplied us with an enemy, the Russians.

The greatest single barrier to the furtherance of world peace, regardless of General Eisenhower's statement to the contrary, is America's exclusive preparedness for another war. Were we to place our military might in a world trust fund, renouncing sole control over our atomic bombs and superdreadnoughts, it would obviate the necessity of any other country's building up defensive forces to match our own. Once the United States gives up its sovereign right to wage war in favor of a world peace-enforcement organization the rest of the world has no alternatives except to follow suit or be branded as a prospective belligerent. With our strength committed to an international tribunal, any country attempting to manufacture its own armaments would be instantly exposed as the enemy of peace and would be treated as such by all other nations. No country today is so self-sufficient that it could afford to stand alone.

Secretary of the Navy Forrestal told the Woodrum committee, "We are going to fight any international ruffian who attempts to impose his will on the world by force." Such an eminent authority notwithstanding, we cannot maintain world peace by ourselves. Except by stunting our national growth and sacrificing our youth and resources, we cannot settle the Pacific situation the next time the Asia for the Asiatics movement gets under way. We cannot do guard duty over the Balkan status quo, or protect democratic minorities in Spain, or guarantee Chilean sovereignty.

In order to be free to develop ourselves, we must rely on an international police force to take care of international ruffians. Instead of envisioning curselves in the role of benevolent world cops, we should be turning over our badges to international deputies of peace, who would relieve us of the responsibility of being constantly alerted for trouble. We should be working toward a united world, indivisible, with equal restraints and correspondingly equal liberties for all.

Strikes Don't Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I offer for the RECORD an editorial from the Labor Digest, Indianapolis, Ind., published in behalf of labor:

STRIKES DON'T PAY

When the General Motors strike reached its one-hundredth day, employees had lost so much in wages that a minimum of 500 days of work—at the increase demanded—were required to recoup their losses. That is, according to arithmetic. Actually, in most cases, a much longer period would be required. The pay increase would have to be earned for 5 days to amount to 1 day's income at the old rate. (We have left out of consideration a half of 1 percent for the purpose of clarity.)

You can figure it, yourself. The CIO union is ready to settle for 19½ percent increase. That is about one-fifth of a day's pay. For every day lost then, 5 will have to be worked to catch back.

This writer shared a taxicab recently with a young woman and her 3 children, aged 2, 4, and 6. The 4-year-old prattled:

"We live in the country. On a farm."

His mother explained:

"We bought a little place out northwest of town. It isn't a farm but we have an orchard and garden. We think it's a better place for children than town. I managed to keep it while my husband was in service—with a little help from his folks. Now we can see our way ahead, if there isn't a strike. My husband is a streetcar man."

We had heard no rumbling of a trolley strike and said so. She shrugged.

"You never can tell nowadays. The union is talking of a strike. It makes me mad, and scares me, too. My father was a miner and we were a large family. That is why I hate John L. Lewis. Every April he had to call a strike.

"That meant we didn't have enough to eat all summer and I had to go to school in the fall in wornout clothes and without any of the things I needed. In the winter we could eat and try to catch up. Then in April Mr. Lewis had to have his strike again."

"Didn't you consider that your father was getting better wages on account of the union?" the writer asked.

"All I know is that when he was working we had enough to get along and to plan for the future, but Mr. Lewis always wrecked those plans. Now, if this union calls a strike, we may lose our little place. My husband gets from $50 to $80 a week, depending on overtime. I can plan on that, but I can't figure how long a strike will last."

General Motors strikers want more money. All workers will sympathize with that natural hope. But suppose they learn that the strike was timed not to serve their interests but to serve a political faction in the union's leadership. What will be the feelings of the strikers, their families, and the tens of thousands of other workers, not represented in the strike but displaced on account of it?

That it was badly timed from the workers viewpoint, all observers will agree. The resistance by employers would have been less determined and formidable if the union had waited until the tremendous postwar reconversion job had been accomplished, production begun, and actual proof of the car market's potentialities discovered. Every observer was agreed that a record-breaking sales volume was to be expected and hence record-breaking production and record-breaking employment. But no observer among the experts would venture an estimate in dollars and cents of the business ahead. The future was uncharted. Many factors would have to be seen in operation.

In the General Motors strike and all other current strikes—most of them precipitated by CIO unions which felt obligated to follow the UAW policy—work might have been continued on the old scale set under the War Labor Board, at least until this spring or summer.

There was no galloping horse in the situation. When negotiations were begun in the light of current experience, wage increases could have been sought on a retroactive basis. That would have meant that increases, eventually obtained, would have been dated from the time of union contract expiration or some other date agreed upon.

That would have been something. Workers and their families would have received handsome lump-sum payments even after being profitably employed all the time. They could have had new homes, new cars, new metal kitchens, new radios, and money in the bank.

Instead:

"We're wiped out," said one striker's wife. "We had nice savings before the strike. My husband and I both worked during the war. And we didn't spend our money in taverns or for luxuries. We felt pretty secure. Of course we have had some unexpected bills due to illness, but our main trouble has been more than 3 months of idleness. We're broke. The only way we're any better off than a lot of people I know who threw their money away during the war is that our credit is still good. But bills have to be paid eventually. We just feel what's the use trying to get ahead."

The strike of General Motors was called when it was for reasons that were reasons to UAW leaders but not to UAW members. Walter Reuther wanted a strike because it served his personal interests in a fight for union control. A union vice president in charge of General Motors locals, he was engaged in a feud with George Addis, UAW treasurer. Addis and R. J. Thomas, UAW president, had tried to ditch Reuther in a recent convention.

He needed the publicity of a strike in his own jurisdiction to build him up. He would like to replace Thomas and become the dictator of all automobile workers and eventually of all CIO unionists. His ambitions know no bounds.

And Walter Reuther is a Communist. He was trained in Moscow to carry on communistic propaganda in America. The Labor Digest has a letter, written by Walter Reuther and his brother, Victor, from Russia to relatives in this country in 1934. In it the Reuther boys described the Red paradise in Russia and reaffirmed their determination to make America communistic, too.

We have published this letter, not once, but twice, and Walter Reuther has not challenged its authority.

So, millions of Americans are suffering today because this otherwise unremarkable young man has mad ambitions.

Please remember that it is the Communist "line" to create discontent and turmoil in furtherance of their dream of revolution. Well-paid workers are not discontented, not potential recruits for revolution. Communists do not want workers well paid nor contented.

Strikes do not pay.

They do not pay workers; they do not pay investors; they do not pay the public.

Lincoln Day Address of Hon. Bourke B. Hickenlooper, of Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able Lincoln Day address delivered in Portland, Oreg., by the distinguished junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. I think this is one of the finest of all Lincoln Day addresses which it has been my pleasure to read.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It has been several years since I have had the privilege of visiting Portland and the State of Oregon. In fact, the last time I thrilled to the grandeur of your scenery and the fine hospitality of this beautiful city was in the summer of 1931, and I shall always remember the cordial hospitality of the people of Portland. Among other wonders of this city, I distinctly recall that the water in your reservoirs is so pure that it can be used in storage batteries without being distilled. Since that time I have met many of your citizens. I have had a very cordial friendship with your able Governor, Earl Snell, and during the past year I have enjoyed the friendship of, and have formed the highest regard for, your two very capable Senators, GUY CORDON and WAYNE MORSE. Their vigor and intelligence give unusual representation to Oregon. I can assure you from first-hand knowledge that the reputation and problems of the Oregon soft lamb and of the Klamath and other valleys of your fine State are firmly established and successfully defended not only in Washington, but throughout the Nation. I am certain that whenever Oregon lamb is mentioned, OPA shivers and takes to the storm cellars.

Today we observe the birthday of the founder of the Republican Party and one of history's greatest men. It is a tradition not alone for the United States, but for all mankind. Abraham Lincoln was one of the great men of all history because of his perception of human objectives and because of the fidelity with which he adhered to his convictions of human needs. He preserved, at a time when the great experiment of American self-government was in the balance, the principles of human rights upon which all systems of real freedom have been based.

The unfathomable depths of his soul have made if difficult for historians to agree upon many of his attributes. It is true that disagreement, as a rule, is on superficial characteristics but perhaps no student of Lincoln has ever really plumbed these depths or has ever been able to piece together all of the pattern of his nature. There is little dispute, however, about his capacity for understanding of and sympathy with his fellow man and his unalterable will to preserve the fundamental rights and opportunities of the individual. I think he was closer to the real heartbeat of a struggling young Nation, closer to its dreams and ambitions, more understanding of its problems than any other man who had assumed the office of President. His entire life was part and parcel of the frontiers of freedom and the veneer of sophistication never touched him. His origin was lowly indeed—even on a frontier where social graces were absent, and he was not confused by the rote and rule of academic education. He learned of life and of fundamental justice under the rules of the wilderness and of survival. He grew up as a part of that throbbing outer fringe of free men and women who found their freedom in the hardships which they themselves elected to endure. He saw justice established and enforced more often as a matter of instinctive human rights than as a result of written statutes, he learned at first hand of the tenacity with which free men and women secure and retain their personal rights.

His tremendous capacity for human understanding sustained him throughout all his life. It was the political and the administrative rock upon which he stood and which supported him in public life in spite of the buffetings by those with selfish ambition and in spite of vilification by little men who hate. When the destiny of the Union hung in the balance, he found strength in his clear understanding of the objectives and goals of America.

Perhaps as clear a statement of his concept of duty as he ever made was in his reply to Horace Greeley shortly after he assumed office in the midst of a great Civil War. The internal emotions of our country were in most dangerous confusion and the fundamental issues of American Government were beclouded by passion, prejudice, and emotional zeal. The fate of the Nation at that moment hung more on the leadership of the President than upon the strength of armies. No President has been more bitterly hated and vilified by a vocal minority than Lincoln, for a season, and no period in our history was more fraught with explosive disaster than the period in which he assumed the Presidency.

Slavery was the fuel which fanned the flame of dissension but slavery was not the basic issue, at least it was not the controlling issue in Lincoln's mind and history has verified the soundness of his position.

Horace Greeley, who seemed to have mistaken the limb of slavery for the trunk of our system, had attacked Lincoln repeatedly on the slavery question. Pressing him for a decision on this issue that was, of course, of great importance. Finally Lincoln wrote to Greeley in reply to one of Greeley's demands that Lincoln state what he would do about the question of slavery and with astounding clarity laid down his purpose. In this reply, he said:

"As to the policy I seem to be pursuing, as you say, I have not meant to leave anyone in doubt.

"I would save the Union. I would save it the shortest way under the Constitution. The sooner the national authority can be restored, the nearer the Union will be the Union as it was. If there be those who would not save the Union unless they could at the same time save slavery, I do not agree with them. If there be those who would not save the Union unless they could at the same time destroy slavery, I do not agree with them. My paramount object in this struggle is to save the Union, and is not either to save or to destroy slavery. If I could save the Union without freeing any slave, I would do it; if I could save it by freeing all the slaves, I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing some and leaving others alone, I would also do that. What I do about slavery and the colored race, I do because I believe it helps to save the Union, and what I forbear, I forbear because I do not believe it would help to save the Union. I shall do less whenever I shall believe what I am doing hurts the cause, and I shall do more whenever I shall believe doing more will help the cause."

No statesman ever outlined more clearly the public purposes which he proposed to accomplish nor adhered more faithfully to his public duty as he conceived it. His purpose was to save the Union and he intended to save the Union in spite of all obstacles, emotions, and confusion. He believed the Union should be saved because it was the greatest system of government for the freedom of people ever devised and he let no influence swerve him from this path.

As the pattern of his purpose became clear the love and respect of the American people increased. When he died the world mourned. His principles and the symbol of his life became dedicated to the Nation and his greatness was recognized by Secretary Seward who gently touched the great tired frame in death and reverently and truly said, "Now he belongs to the ages."

Lincoln does belong to the ages. He stands as the symbol of human hopes and individual freedom. He stands as the emblem of fidelity to his fellow man.

The Republican Party was founded by Lincoln and it has marched forward under the principles for which he stood. As a great party, it presided over the expansion of a new nation to new frontiers. It encouraged free enterprise and the development of the individual. It furnished fuel for the lamp of freedom by keeping government free and in the hands of people. It has fought autocracy and statism throughout its history and the great liberalization of social and human rights that have preserved and increased the dignity of the individual have been sponsored in States and in the Nation under Republican leadership and policies.

After the Civil War the great West was opened, transportation systems were built, the vast resources of our continent became available for use and opportunity became unlimited. In no other country was emphasis so placed upon the rights of humanity and the responsibility for one's brother as in our own country and we carried to the rest of the world our conception of progress and self-government. Dignity and responsibility in public office was accentuated and throughout the years of Republican administration emphasis was placed upon more opportunity for the individual and less control by the Federal Government.

Under this system we reached new heights of human comfort. We became the land of opportunity and hope.

We have been put to the test twice in the last 28 years and each time have proved beyond all doubt that free men and women in the free system of human enterprise can overcome systems of regimentation. In 1917 and 1918 and without long preparation the genius of our production both of labor and management astounded the world and produced the power to give victory in that war. Again in 1941 the genius of free enterprise in management and labor produced "impossible" results and tipped the scales in World War II for victory against the most highly orgagnized and well-prepared forces of slavery and destruction that the world has ever seen. These great accomplishments could not have occurred except for the foundations of freedom and of individual liberty that had been laid down in the years before, and most of these years had been Republican years.

The crisis facing us today is not financial alone, but threatens the very roots of our system. Forces are at work in our country, and have been at work for the past 13 years, in powerful places of Government, designing and scheming to change our system into a controlled and dictated economy that would destroy the fundamentals of free enterprise and individual responsibility.

When the New Deal went into power in 1933 it promptly broke all of the pledges it had made to the American people and set out to acquire power, to tax and spend, and thereby break down the accumulations of individuals and, in the words of one of its

mentors, Dr. Tugwell, "to make America over." The detailed prewar failure of the New Deal to reestablish sound economy is too well known for repetition here. The piling up of a peacetime national debt to nearly $50,000,000,000; the hysterical repeated cry of "emergency"; and the constant grasp for power through the creation of hundreds of bureaucratic agencies whereby appointed officials make their own laws, interpret them, and sit in judgment upon their violation; the servitude of the Congress to the President during that period, and the brazen assaults upon the last pillar of constitutional strength, the Supreme Court, were all weapons of confusion and change calculated to "make America over."

The public may not yet realize the ominous significance of bureaucratic government. It is only when the individual gets caught in the meshes of changing regulations, snooping, and arbitrary punishments for alleged infractions of unknown and often unavailable regulations, that the significance of government by men and not by laws is emphasized.

During the eight peacetime years of the New Deal these practices grew by enormous proportions. Except for the threat of war, before which we were solemnly promised by the highest authority that "your sons will not be sent to fight in foreign lands," the Nation would have completely repudiated the policies of the New Deal that were strangling us. The record proves beyond argument that after 8 years of these policies, the economic level had not been returned to that of the twenties; men had not been put back to work and dependency and poverty—in a land of plenty—were on the increase.

We did get into World War II, our armed forces fought with unsurpassed brilliance, families sacrificed their loved ones, and their money, and Republican blood flowed just as red as Democratic blood. In this fight for the principles of freedom, the armed forces of this country became the only place where it was not necessary to prove allegiance to the New Deal in order to get a Government job.

Our Nation fought this Global War to protect the opportunity and enterprise of America and to help establish its principles in other parts of the world. We have endured controls that are dictatorial, but necessary in war. We have suffered enormous casualties and we now have a national debt, a mortgage upon the future of those who fought, and of the generations to came, of nearly $300,000,000,000.

The share of every man, woman, and child in our Nation is $2,000. Every veteran who starts in life begins with that debt against his future earnings, and his wife has the same debt—and the babies born have the same debt. The man who labors and his wife and children have this debt, and it must be paid out of the future production and earnings of the people of the United States. Every American family of four owes $8,000.

Under our system the earnings of the individual create his freedom and independence and provide a means by which he can assume the responsibility for his own destiny. We want security in this country but we want security with freedom. Before the Civil War the Negro in the South had clothing, food, and shelter, but he was not free. He did have a substantial measure of security but he had no control over the fruits of his labor and he could not assume, or meet, any responsibility for his own advancement or progress. He was a slave with shelter, but the master took his earnings.

Today our debt and the demands of government, National and State, through taxation, command at least 40 percent of the earnings of America, and if national income should drop that percentage would increase because the obligation is a fixed charge. We have gone far down the road toward statism—statism of arbitrary rule, statism in which government is becoming the master of the enterprise and the freedom of the individual and is commanding more and more of that which he earns and dictates more and more how he shall earn it. If we should reach that 100 percent, then economic freedom will have been completely destroyed and we will have substituted for it full enslavement of the people to government.

There is only one certain way by which we can stop this headlong rush toward centralization and dominion of government; there is only one way by which we can assure the continued mastery of the people over government and halt the growing mastery of government over the people. That way is by the election of a Republican Congress and a Republican administration.

I say this is the only way because the New Deal and the administration have offered no solution to the existing economic confusion and political corruption other than more spending, more controls, and more concentration of government. Our Budget for next year has been proposed at around $35,000,000,000, and messiahs of the New Deal croak hoarsely that the failure of peacetime recovery in the thirties was because we did not spend enough money in deficit financing. Instead of deficit expenditures of $3,000,000,000 to $5,000,000,000 a year, they now say deficit spending of perhaps $40,000,000,000 per year is needed. They say that we did not have enough controls and that we need more. They say that free enterprise should be further shackled, ruled, and managed; they weakly explain the failure of their plans by saying that they did not plan enough; they brush aside as a bothersome irritant the fact that the American system of individual opportunity and freedom of the past 150 years built the most virile and productive economy the world has ever seen. They fight at every turn the attempts to reestablish these principles for the recovery of America.

We have won a military victory in this war and the organized forces of barbarism have been crushed, but if the sacrifices our people have made are justified we must win the war of reconversion and peace that is now upon us. The world is in terrible chaos—friend and enemy alike are starving, social and political systems are tottering. The opportunity—in fact, the obligation—is ours to lend a guiding hand and influence in the interest of humanity. But we cannot assert our full strength and influence so long as internal confusion of policy and economy continue here at home. Domestically we face the specter of inflation and the administration is doing nothing constructive to stop it; the administration is fumbling with policies that consistently contribute to this danger.

There is only one way to prevent further inflation and restore normal peacetime economy—that is maximum production and maximum use of our resources.

Government agencies, at the people's expense and in direct violation of law, are using millions of public money to flood this country with a vast propaganda, claiming that prices have been held down and that inflation has been prevented. Cost-of-living statistics have been published with abandon, many of which have been compiled on non-existent articles. The price curve of low-cost clothing and other goods may have gone up 33 percent but if there is none available one must buy luxury items as necessities. Subsidies from the Public Treasury, to the extent of billions of dollars, have been poured out under the false premise that these keep down the cost of living. Every dollar of subsidy, however, is added to the tax bill and must eventually be paid by us and by generations that did not incur the debt. There are those in Government who urge permanent controls. If they are established, production in this country will be further stifled—inflation and black markets will flourish as never before—full regimentation will result and both America and the world will be pushed backward.

Controls of prices and of the allocation and distribution of products is desirable during during the emergency period following the war, until production equals demand, but these controls shou'd not be those of strangulation. Policies that fix prices below the actual cost of production prevent production. No farmer, manufacturer or businessman can long stay in business if he is forced to sell either without a profit or below cost and labor suffers from unemployment. There are many businesses that have been able to sell at a profit, and that can produce and sell under present regulations at a modest profit now, but usually these are so-called big businesses having multiple lines of production in which they can absorb the price lost on one article from the profit made on another. Too often however, they stop the production of the unprofitable item and produce only the profitable items. Little business, upon whose products a price has been fixed by Government below the cost of production, cannot absorb these losses however, and therefore must either curtail production or go out of business; and little businesses have closed by the thousands in recent months. The propaganda has it that adjustments are made in these cases, but the fact is that Government policy through delays, incompetence, and some times by deliberate intention, fails to make these adjustments, and the public fails to get the goods. Production is now, and always has been, a matter of price and everyone knows that if labor and material costs are increased they must be reflected in prices. Free enterprise cannot exist when wages and material costs spiral upward, but final price is held rigidly to a prewar level below actual cost. It just simply won't work.

It is not necessary for prices to be permitted to run away. Controls can be exercised and maintained at one level as well as at another, but production cannot be secured when prices on many essentials are held at a level that will not permit the production and distribution of goods at a profit.

Much of this confusion has resulted directly either from the incompetence of public officials who write the policies or from the political ambitions of others who seek these controls as stepping stones for their own ambition and shortage of housing, textiles, machinery and countless other essentials can be traced directly to these stupid or calculated policies.

If we are to have recovery, the fumbling and uncertain policies of the present administration must be stopped—men of competence must be placed in administrative positions with a sympathetic determination to get the wheels of peace and industry going.

We have ample proof that being a political or social pal of the President is not an automatic qualification for high public office; that haling from a certain group in Missouri does not bring efficiency or solution to the problems that must be met and solved.

Our job is to reconvert America at the earliest possible moment to free enterprise and opportunity. We must, and will, meet the social problems. The Republican Party has met these problems in the past and has guided this country during its greatest progress and prosperity. The principles of collective bargaining for labor were established and developed by Republican administrations—State and national. Workmen's compensation, anti-child-labor laws, and a host of others were sponsored and passed in Republican States; the rights of the individuals were protected and free enterprise was developed as Republican policy. This will continue to be our job.

The prospects for the future are beyond belief if our system is unshackled and free

men and women in a free economy are permitted to exercise their genius. On the contrary, if statism becomes dominant and the economy of our country and of the individual is increasingly controlled by bureaucratic edict, this progress will be stifled and tomorrow's generations will suffer.

We need a restatement of the Bill of Rights, and we need an administrative Government in this country as fully committed to, as fully cognizant of, and as unswervingly determined to enforce these principles as was Abraham Lincoln, as were the signers of the Declaration of Independence, and as were the fathers of the Constitution. We need no theorists either from here or from abroad to remake our Nation and our system. We need courageous public officials who will, as a sacred duty and with understanding and competence, retain and strengthen the American system—the greatest system for human progress the world has ever seen.

In addition to domestic confusion, the administration has handled international affairs with timidity and uncertainty. Our Nation took the lead in sponsoring and establishing the United Nations Organization. With vigorous and sincere cooperation by the nations this can be the basis for future peace, but with that exception our foreign policy has been shrouded in mystery and suspicion. We find secret agreements continuing to crop up, even after repeated assurances that there are no secret agreements. We built vast installations throughout the world without receiving in return any assurance that we might use them in peacetime; we find members of the State Department making various and often conflicting declarations of policies that confuse the international picture. We see strange proposals to give up secrets of the atom bomb, possessed exclusively by us, before we have any assurances that the world will commit itself to peace and abandon the destruction of war.

Atomic energy and its awful power should be one of the strongest weapons for peace, but it will become the greatest threat to civilization if, without reliable and adequate assurances of peace, it is made available to those who promote war.

Our policies and obligations should be courageously adopted and vigorously stated, and we should not compromise on fundamental objectives upon which the destiny of tomorrow depends. Our freedoms must be secured, and the trade of the world must be free to flow. The people of the world should have their standards of income and living raised—not by donations, but through production and fair play. But above all we must follow a policy at home and abroad that will safeguard and preserve the standards and profits of a free America and a progressive, prosperous citizenry. Most of these responsibilities rest on administrative leadership; in order to obtain them we must have a change in administrative leadership.

The confusion and internal frustration of the administration in Washington has never been more apparent than now. When have we ever before seen a member of the President's Cabinet go before a committee of the Senate and blast the confirmation of a Presidential appointee to high office? When have we seen such a multitude of objections and criticism to other appointments as have occurred recently? When have we seen party henchmen and personal associates in such numbers, and without adequate qualification, proposed for and put in charge of vital Government agencies and functions? And when has the fate of our system been more at stake?

A great obligation rests upon us, all of us. We owe it to the man who labors and who is now subjected to autocratic control to a degree unequaled heretofore. He works or goes idle at the command of leaders, some of whom are sincere and some of whom are criminal racketeers. Many times their orders do not represent the will of the majority, but it all amounts to the same thing—they are regimentated, their freedom of action is controlled, and they and the public suffer. We owe an obligation to the service men and women of this country to maintain the right to work, free from tribute and free from dictation. We owe to the fathers and mothers of those who fought and those who died, the preservation of the system for which they sacrificed, and we owe an obligation to the men and women of the past whose courage and foresight won a wilderness for freedom on our eastern shores, and who spread that system westward over the prairies and plains and across the majestic mountains of the West until it touched the Pacific. The fruits of their sacrifices must not be lost. But perhaps greater than all responsibilities is our responsibility to the generations of tomorrow. Their heritage is in our keeping; the measure of their freedom, of their comfort, and their progress will be largely fixed by us these years and we must not shirk it. The generations of tomorrow will either condemn or praise us and we have it in our power to say which it will be.

Political government and policies control the destinies of man. They can shackle all freedoms as they have done in countries of the world within our own generation, or through eternal vigilance in protection of the sovereignty of man, they can keep clear the road to higher destinies.

We of the Republican Party have the great responsibility of protecting our system and of preserving it for ourselves and for the groping millions of the world who look to us for inspiration.

Let us again, with Lincoln, "highly resolve that this Nation * * * of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Dr. Edwin Walter Kemmerer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to include as a part of my remarks the very fine tribute paid to Dr. Edwin Walter Kemmerer, one of the outstanding and most distinguished experts on monetary questions. I have had close contact with Dr. Kemmerer for many years and I deplore his sudden passing as a distinct personal loss, as well as a great loss to the Nation.

The tribute follows:

[From Monetary Notes, published by the Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy]

DR. EDWIN WALTER KEMMERER

JUNE 29, 1875-DECEMBER 16, 1945

On December 16, Dr. Edwin Walter Kemmerer, president of this committee, passed away. Although he had experienced a heart attack during the late summer, he appeared to be on the road to recovery and shortly before his death had written this office expressing the hope and expectation of attending the coming annual meeting of our executive committee and officers in late January or early February.

The passing of Dr. Kemmerer deprives the committee and the country of the wise counsel of perhaps the most experienced scholar in the field of money that this Nation has produced in recent years, if not in its entire history. No other man has advised so many countries in monetary matters.

With a thorough knowledge of monetary history, he had a perspective that prevented him from being carried away either by love of novelty or by admiration of antiquity. He had the capacity for great patience; he knew how long it sometimes takes for economic forces to work themselves out to their logical conclusions; and he was remarkably tolerant of people with much less knowledge, perspective, and experience.

But in addition to his distinguished record as a teacher, a scholar, and a man of affairs in the monetary field, Dr. Kemmerer was a gentleman of the highest type. He was always kind, helpful, generous, and a splendid cooperator. He had the mellowness and the modesty of the intelligent and widely experienced man, and he had a delightful sense of humor. To have known and to have been associated with him intimately have been among the rare privileges of life.

The world has been made poorer by his passing, and the loss of his valuable counsel in monetary matters is something that this country could ill afford at any time, much less in times like these.

The following record from Who's Who (1944–45), reveals something of his attainments and public service:

"Born Scranton, Pa., June 29, 1875; s. Lorenzo Dow and Martha H. (Courtright) K.; A.B., Wesleyan U., 1899, LL.D., 1926; fellow in economics and finance, Cornell, 1899–1901, Ph.D., 1903; LL.D., Occidental Coll., 1928; Dr., honoris causa, Central U., Ecuador, also from all univs. of Bolivia, 1927; D.C.S., Oglethorpe Univ., 1933; D. Sc., Rutgers Univ., 1933; LL.D., Columbia Univ., 1935; m. Rachel Dickele, Dec. 24, 1901; children—Donald Lorenzo, Ruth. Instr. economics and history Purdue U., 1901–03; financial adviser to U.S. Philippine Commn., spl. reference to establishment gold standard in P.I., 1903; chief div. of currency, P.I., 1904–1906; asst. prof. polit. economy, 1906–09, prof. economics and finance, 1909–12, Cornell U.; professor economics and finance, Princeton U., 1912–28. Walker professor international finance, and director Internat. Finance Section, 1928–43, professor emeritus since June 1943; financial adviser to Govt. of Mexico, 1917, and to Government of Guatemala, 1919; chmn. Commn. of Am. Financial Advisers to Colombia, 1923. Mem. Kemmerer-Vissering Gold Standard Inquiry Commission for Union of South Africa, 1924–25; expert on currency and banking to Dawes Committee, 1925; chairman American Commn. of Financial Advisers to Chile, 1925; chmn. American Commn. of Financial Advisers to Poland, 1926, to Ecuador, 1926–27, to Bolivia, 1927; pres. Am. Commn. Financial Advisers to Colombia, 1930, to Peru, 1931; president American Commission, Financial Experts to China, 1929; joint chmn. Hines-Kemmerer Commn. to make econ. survey of Turkey, 1934; pres. Economists' Nat. Com. on Monetary Policy since 1937. Mng. editor Economic Bulletin, 1907–10. Contbr. magazines, Fellow Am. Statistical Assn., Am. Acad. of Arts and Sciences; mem. American Economic Association (president 1926), American Philos. Soc., Council on Foreign Relations. Awarded gold medal by Govt. of Colombia, for services to Colombia, 1923; Commander's Star, Order of Polonia Restituta, 1926; Order of Merit, First Class, Ecuador, 1927; Order of the Crown (Belgium), 1937. Trustee Wesleyan Univ. since 1936, Scranton-Keystone Junior College since 1935. Director U.S. and Foreign Securities Corp.; U.S. and Internat. Securities Corp.; Dividend Shares; Carriers and General; Bullock Fund; Am. and Foreign Power Co. Mem. Delta Kappa Epsilon, Phi

Beta Kappa. Mason. Clubs: Century, Bankers, Princeton; Nassau (Princeton); Blooming Grove Hunting and Fishing (Pa.); Bald Peak Colony (N.H.). Author: Report on the Advisability of Establishing a Government Agricultural Bank in the Philippines, 1906; Report on the Agricultural Bank of Egypt, 1906; Money and Credit Instruments in Their Relation to Gen. Prices, 1907, revised, 1909; Seasonal Variations in the Relative Demand for Money and Capital in the United States (in report of Nat. Monetary Commn.), 1910; Modern Currency Reforms, 1916; The United States Postal Savings System, 1917; Monetary System of Mexico, 1917; The A B C of the Federal Reserve System, 1918, 11th rev. edit., 1938; Six Lectures on the Federal Reserve System, 1920; High Prices and Deflation, 1920; Kemmerer on Money, 1934; Money—The Principles of Money and Their Exemplification in Outstanding Chapters of Monetary History, 1935; Inflation and Revolution: Mexico's Experience of 1912–1917, 1940; The ABC of Inflation, 1942. Home: 161 Hodge Road, Princeton, N. J."

WALTER E. SPAHR,
Secretary of the Committee.

The Housing Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials:

[From the Milwaukee Journal of March 1, 1946]

WHAT'S WRONG WITH HOUSING

Lots of things are wrong with housing and are slowing us down in the attempt to meet the present acute shortage. Take coal furnaces manufactured by a prominent firm in Milwaukee, for instance.

The head of the firm has ordered that no more coal furnaces be shipped for the present. More than 400 have piled up already in the warehouse. Production has been ordered slowed down, so as not to tax warehouse facilities.

Why aren't the furnaces being sold? Because, the firm maintains, the OPA price ceiling is so low that the company loses money on the furnaces. The more it sells, the more it loses. That's the explanation offered.

This country operates on a basis of industry that must make a profit to pay wages and taxes. We can't expect manufacturers to sell at a loss for any considerable length of time. We shouldn't try to force them to do so.

But builders want furnaces for houses for veterans, and for others needing their own shelter. What are we going to do? The OPA should immediately go to the bottom of cases like this. If the ceiling is too low, raise it to allow a fair profit. If the ceiling is O. K. and the manufacturer is wrong, let the OPA cry it from the housetops. It is up to the OPA to break such bottlenecks.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of March 2, 1946]

WHAT'S WRONG WITH HOUSING?

Yesterday we talked about one thing wrong with housing, citing the case of a local manufacturer who has ordered no more coal furnaces shipped because he claims the OPA ceiling is too low to allow him to make a profit.

There are lots of things wrong with housing. Take labor costs, for instance. The other day a builder who has had many years of experience in our community checked over labor costs on small houses just completed. He compared these figures with labor costs on identical houses built in 1941. What do you think he found?

The labor cost now is twice what it was 5 years ago. Wage rates haven't gone up anything like that. Some advances have been about 50 percent, but most increases have been much less, percentagewise. Why has the labor cost of the house doubled, then?

Well, there is a lot of inexperienced and incapable help, for one thing. There is a lot of turn-over. There are men, some of them returned veterans, who work a few days, then quit. They simply don't want to stick to a job. And there are a lot of workers who got so used to loafing in war plants that they just can't do a fair day's work for a fair day's pay.

Then there are some who know building-trades workers are in such demand that they don't have to work hard. They reason the boss won't fire them, because he can't afford to. Anyway, these loafers aren't hurting the boss very much. He can sell all the houses he can build right now. But the buyers of these houses will be cheated. They won't get their money's worth. It would be a good thing for the loafers to think this over—think it through. Many veterans are going to be cheated shamefully.

Nobody in the building trades can work himself out of a job the way things are now. Wages are the best ever. Employment is the steadiest in history and should be for a long time. Never was it more important that men building houses give an honest day's work for a good day's pay.

Many workmen are doing this. How about those who aren't joining in?

How Good Is Russia's Word?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Barnet Nover from the Washington Post of March 5, 1945:

HOW GOOD IS RUSSIA'S WORD?

(By Barnet Nover)

Long ago it became clear that when spokesmen of Soviet Russia employ such terms as "democracy" or "free press" or "self-government" or "free and unfettered elections" the meanings they give these words and phrases are frequently quite different from and sometimes the exact opposite of the meanings we give them.

For that reason the charitable view has been that Russia's failure to carry out what seemed to us the clear implications of certain of the agreements reached at Yalta, Potsdam, Moscow and other conferences was due not to bad faith but to uncertain language.

In this connection it was repeatedly said by those who had had dealings with the Russians that whenever they, and particularly their No. 1 man, Generalissimo Stalin, were induced to make a precise commitment that commitment was invariably and punctiliously carried out.

This charitable view of the way Russia carries out agreements needs pretty drastic correction in the face of what has been happening in Iran and Manchuria.

"Democracy," for instance, may be a vague term, vague enough at least by definition to make it possible for Pravda and the Moscow radio and Vgacheslav Molotov to claim that the governments in Rumania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia, not to mention Soviet Russia herself, are truly democratic.

But there cannot be any two-way interpretation of the term: "March 2, 1946." In the years since 1917 the Russians have carried out many revolutionary changes. With admirable restraint they have left the calendar and the multiplication table alone.

One and one are two in Russia as they are here. And in the Russian calendar as in ours March 2, 1946, was the second day of the third month of the year following the year numbered 1945, and no other day.

On January 29, 1942, Great Britain, Russia and Iran signed a treaty of alliance in which it was stipulated (art. 5) that:

"The forces of the Allied powers shall be withdrawn from Iranian territory not later than 6 months after all hostilities between the Allied powers and Germany and her associates have been suspended * * *."

The last of Germany's associates to give up the ghost was Japan. She surrendered unconditionally and formally on September 2, 1945. This meant that the withdrawal of Allied troops from Iran was to be completed by March 2, 1946.

Actually the reason for the presence of Allied troops in Iran disappeared after Germany's surrender in May 1945. That is why first Great Britain and later the United States sought to persuade Russia to clear out of Iran at an earlier date than the time fixed in the 1942 agreement.

The British proposal was made during the meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers at London. Molotov's reply was haughty.

"I would like to tell you once again," he wrote Ernest Bevin, the British Foreign Secretary, "that in the case of the Soviet Government the question of withdrawing troops from Iran did not in general constitute a special problem inasmuch as there is a treaty which makes provision for it. I would ask you to bear in mind that the Soviet Government attaches exceptional importance to strict fulfillment of obligations undertaken."

Later, in reply to Secretary Byrnes' proposal that all foreign troops be removed from Iran by January 1, 1946, Molotov, after declaring that Russia "adheres unwaveringly" to the December 1, 1943, Declaration of Tehran in which Russia, Great Britain, and the United States promised to respect Iran's independence declared that:

"The declaration in question, however, does not affect questions of the number of Soviet armed forces on Iranian territory, just as it does not affect the question of the period of the stationing of Soviet troops in Iran. This latter is determined by * * * the Anglo-Soviet-Iranian tripartite treaty of 1942."

In this Soviet note reference was also made to the Russian-Iranian treaty of 1921 which provides for a temporary Russian occupation of Iranian territory in the event of other powers using Iran as a base for an attack on Russia. In his address to the United Nations Security Council, Andre Vishinsky, the Soviet Vice Foreign Minister, also mentioned this treaty.

It is, then, the Russian contention that Iran is being used as a base for an attack on the Soviet Union? Obviously such a contention is so nonsensical that even the Kremlin has not dared advance it. In fact all American and British troops have been withdrawn from Iran and the only troops still in occupation there are Russian troops.

Nonetheless, the circumstance that Russian spokesmen continue to cite the treaty of 1921 is ominous.

In Iran, as in Manchuria, a concrete, specific, and unequivocal pledge by Russia has proved to be without binding force.

The reason why Russian troops remain in Iran is that as long as these troops remain Russia has available a direct and immediate form of pressure on the Tehran government whose Premier is in Moscow negotiating a settlement.

The reason why Russian troops remain in Manchuria—they were to leave by February 1—is that the Kremlin wants to make Manchuria, China's richest region, the economic satrapy of the Soviet Union. In both cases Russian policy is sinister since it involves treating solemn pledges as scraps of paper.

A Letter From a Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a letter I have received from an Army lieutenant who at present is stationed in Germany and whose legal residence is in my congressional district:

FEBRUARY 8, 1946.

DEAR SIR: I am at present stationed near Frankfurt, Germany, and serving as a lieutenant with Military Intelligence of the United States Army. I have been discussing the reports about "starving Germans" with a rather large number of my friends and I find that they are very much of the same opinion as I am myself. We are deeply concerned about some of the remarks made by several Senators who profess so much concern about the "poor starving Germans." Neither I nor anyone I have talked to has seen any Germans starve in the United States zone of occupation. On the contrary, most of them seem well fed and the kids especially look very healthy. When one compares these kids here with the kids in France, Holland, and England—countries which I have seen—one is really shocked to see these German kids apparently so healthy and well fed. For 5 years the Germans have been systematically plundering other countries of Europe and have carried out Goering's orders, as recently brought out at the Nuernberg trial. "If anyone starves in Europe it will not be a German."

I am shocked that there is a movement on back home to help the people who have been responsible for so much misery. If we have any food to give away, and I guess we have, why not give it to the French, the Dutch, the British, the Greeks, the Italians, the Yugoslavs, etc., the people who suffered at the hands of the Germans? It made us mad to hear that the English people have to further tighten their belts and live on reduced rations while some people in the United States are formulating a plan to send even more food than we are already shipping to Germany.

I would not have written to you, sir, if there were not very many of us who felt the same way. In fact in the "mail call" or "B Bag" column of our newspaper, Stars and Stripes, sentiments similar to these expressed by me have appeared, a proof that many of my buddies over here think the same and feel the same way about it.

Sincerely,

LT. H. M. FLEISCH.

Injustice in Military Courts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio script entitled "Injustice in Military Courts," prepared by Edwin F. Woodle, of Cleveland, Ohio, president of the Cuyahoga County Bar Association.

There being no objection, the script was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RADIO SCRIPT: INJUSTICE IN MILITARY COURTS

Question. Mr. Woodle, has your investigation of military courts indicated that they have been fairly and justly administered?

Answer. No; I am sorry to have to report that in a very large number of instances in both the Army and the Navy military courts have not been fairly and justly administered. Of course, this is not universally true, as there have been in places courts martial conducted in such a fashion that justice to the defendants undoubtedly resulted, but the number of cases in which the defendants were not fairly treated and in which they were not accorded the basic rights given to them under the Articles of War, and in which they were subjected to harsh and excessive punishment have beeen so numerous as to require some basic changes in the entire system.

Question. Do the Army and the Navy have a system of courts as we understand them in civilian life?

Answer. The system of justice in both the Army and the Navy is administered under regulations enacted by the Congress of the United States and embodied in manuals which are basically similar but not alike in all respects.

In the Army the manual is known as the Articles of War, and in the Navy it is known as Naval Courts and Boards. These manuals create what purport to be trial courts, but any resemblance between a court in civilian life and a court martial in military life is thoroughly deceptive. The various court-martial tribunals are appointed by commanding officers in this country and abroad to whom the War and the Navy Departments have assigned powers of appointment in their respective command areas.

In civilian life we recognize the tremendous importance of making certain that both judges and counsel be carefully trained and learned in the law before we entrust them with the authority of passing judgment upon their fellow men, or even with the responsibility of prosecuting or defending anyone accused of violating the law.

In military life, however, no such care or precaution is observed. In the first place, only officers are permitted to sit as members of a court martial or to participate as advocates for the prosecution or the defense.

In the second place, there is no standard or qualification with which a member of the court is required to comply. Here, as in every other phase of military justice, as you shall see, the entire matter is left to the uncontrolled discretion of the commanding officer.

It is true that article No. 4 of the Articles of War provides that "The appointing authority shall detail as members thereof those officers of the command who, in his opinion, are best qualified for the duty by reason of age, training, experience, and judicial temperament."

But the exercise of the commanding officer's opinion from the evidence at hand is, in most instances, governed by purely personal and arbitrary considerations, and apparently influenced more by propinquity and the expectation of results satisfactory to the commanding officer than by the qualifications suggested in the rule.

The prosecuting attorney is known as the trial judge advocate, but neither he, nor the defense counsel, nor even the one member of the court who is termed the "law member," is required to be a lawyer, or to have had any experience in the trial of lawsuits.

It is apparent, therefore, that the absence of a qualified court, and of trained and experienced counsel, cause any similarity between a court-martial and a civilian court to be purely one of form. And needless to say, it is the substance and not the form which is important.

Question. But, Mr. Woodle, these trials that you have been investigating are all over and done with. The war has ended. Most of our boys are coming home, and millions of them will soon be out of service. Can you suggest why this subject of court-martial proceedings should be of interest and importance to our radio audience and to the people of Ohio?

Answer. That question should not be difficult to answer. There are no people in the world in whom there can be found a more innate—a more finely developed sense of justice—than the American people.

Of course, we have no proprietary claim to justice in these United States. Nevertheless, in the comparatively short history of our country, many men have died and much blood has been spilled for the twin principles of liberty and of justice.

Is it not then a monstrous paradox that thousands of men, who fought in World War II that justice might be rendered to all peoples, became themselves the victims of a military system of justice which inflicted upon them needless, cruel and undeserved punishment?

This alone should be sufficient to rouse the interest and to enlist the sympathies of the people of Ohio. But there are other and equally important reasons.

The vast majority of men in the Army and the Navy who were convicted of offenses in trials by general court-martial have received, or will receive, in addition to the punishment of imprisonment, a dishonorable discharge from the service of their country.

Many of these men have proven themselves to be heroes, and have been so recognized by almost every type of award for valor that could be bestowed by their Government. Yet, these men, and all others who have received a dishonorable discharge, must be forced to carry with them this stigma for the balance of their lives.

One dishonorably discharged from the service of his country forfeits almost all rights as a citizen. Under the law as it now stands no clemency board, nor any member of the War or Navy Departments, can alter or in any way affect a dishonorable discharge of a serviceman.

There will be hundreds of such men among us in this State—thousands elsewhere throughout the country—who must rely upon what the people and the Congress of the United States will be willing to do to remove an otherwise lifelong stigma continuing long after they have served their appointed period of punishment.

There is an additional reason why this subject commands the attention of every citizen. The Army and the Navy are seeking, in Congress, the enactment of a law providing for universal military training.

Regardless of whether such a law is approved by any citizen or any Member of Congress, it is clear that there should be

no compulsory military training which would subject any boy or young man to the existing system of military justice.

Question. What have you found to be basically wrong with the present system?

Answer. The inherent faults of the system are so numerous that I can only highlight them here.

The first and the most important fault, and the one which pervades every phase of the proceeding from beginning to end is the unlimited power of the commanding officers. So long as that exists, mere changes in procedure will be of little help. Let me repeat what has been said on this subject by two men who are qualified to speak and are in a position to know what they are talking about.

One, Judge Elijah Adlow, of Boston, a former judge advocate of the Twenty-sixth Infantry Division in World War II, said:

"In substance the fate of GI Joe depends on one man—the commanding officer. He decides whether the soldier should be prosecuted. He appoints the court and the counsel. When the trial is over he approves, disapproves, or modifies the sentence of the court.

"There are pleadings and witnesses and counsel and arguments. But there is generally an amazing resemblance between the court's verdict and what the commanding officer wants done.

"The system is the personal property of the brass hats. Let a court make a decision other than that desired by the appointing authority and see what happens. Officers who have sat on courts and voted to acquit defendants have felt the resentment of the commanding officer in more ways than one. Defense counsel who have secured the acquittal of clients have been found more useful thereafter on other assignments."

Imagine, if you will, the kind of justice you might expect to receive in a criminal court in the State of Ohio if the prosecuting witness, who charged you with an offense, had absolute control over the personal careers of the judge and the jury.

Should you believe the picture is an exaggerated one, I assure you it is not. The situation has been well described in a statement made by Brig. Gen. H. C. Holdridge, recently retired, who was a graduate of West Point and a veteran of more than 30 years' service. He said:

"The primary cause for failure of military justice is that justice cannot be divorced from the commander, and the commander is not interested primarily in abstract justice but in military discipline. He is a law unto himself. Military justice is a function of command. The commander can, and frequently does, order charges preferred.

"The officer drawing the charges, the investigating officer, the members of the court, the staff judge advocate, and finally the prison officer, all are under the domination of the commander. He becomes accuser, judge, jury, court of appeals, and executioner. They live in the shadow of his approval or disapproval. Their own security is dependent upon his will. If he is a sadistic bully, and there are such, the results on the accused may be deplorable."

There are many instances which our investigation has brought to light in which the commanding officer has directed the verdict of the court even before the trial took place, and there are court members who have openly stated that it is their duty to find the defendant guilty whenever charges have been preferred by the commanding officer.

Is it possible to say that justice can be rendered by any court with such an attitude?

A second and cardinal weakness of the system is the failure of the trial record, which is prepared in connection with every court-martial trial, to disclose vital and prejudicial errors such as the influence exerted by the commanding officer upon the court, or the failure of the commanding officer or of the court itself to afford to the accused the safeguards purportedly guaranteed to him by the Articles of War.

If these errors had been committed, as is frequently the case, but the record fails to disclose the errors, then it is obvious that a review of the case by any number of reviewing authorities is of little value so far as the attainment of justice is concerned.

In discussing the administration of these courts, much emphasis has been placed by the War and Navy Departments upon the right of the defendants to select civil counsel, if they so desire, or to be furnished with counsel appointed by the court.

In practice, this rule is frequently a snare and a delusion. The evidence at hand is ample that counsel requested by the accused is seldom appointed; that defense counsel are generally, if not universally, untrained and incapable of properly representing the accused, and that while the prosecution is given all the time it desires to prepare its case, defense counsel, on the other hand, are appointed only shortly, if not immediately, before the trial, and given little, if any, time for preparation.

Examples have been uncovered in which the accused did not even meet his counsel until less than an hour before the trial, and consulted with his counsel all of 15 or 20 minutes in advance of the trial.

Another weakness is in the system of investigations which are required to precede the placing of every charge.

There are no permanent or especially qualified investigating officers. Although the investigation is presumed to be impartial, our inquiry discloses that the accused is seldom given equal treatment in the investigation, which has decidedly the aspect of a grand jury hearing.

Lack of knowledge, lack of experience, a desire to please the commanding officer, or just the desire to hurry through what is merely an extra duty, frequently result in hasty and unfair investigations and reports. Later, these reports play an important part in the disposition of the case.

Confinement of an accused, or even of a mere suspect, frequently lasts for weeks, and sometimes for months. In the meantime, he is provided with no defense counsel with whom he may confer, or from whom he may obtain necessary help, although important evidence in his favor may be destroyed and witnesses necessary to his defense killed, transferred, removed, or discharged. Under such circumstances, justice to the accused is not possible.

Question. Has there been any official recognition of this situation?

Answer. Yes, the earliest official recognition of which I am aware was given by the Cuyahoga County Bar Association, with headquarters in Cleveland. That association issued a report on August 22, 1945, critically reviewing the administration of military courts and urging a thorough congressional investigation as a preliminary to important changes in the laws governing such courts.

As more and more men have been released from service and have felt free to express themselves more instances of injustice have been revealed, so that the full impact and importance of the problem is gradually becoming known to the public.

On November 26, 1945, a resolution was introduced in the United States Senate by Senator WAYNE C. MORSE, of Oregon, providing for just such an investigation as that urged by the Cuyahoga County Bar Association. This resolution is now in the hands of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, and has been applauded by many. However, the full truth will not be revealed without difficulty and not without the objections of our military leaders. On December 31, Senator MORSE charged that the Army and the Navy were trying to sidetrack his resolution. He said: "The Army and Navy don't want an investigation because they know it would show shocking injustices. It would disclose the tyrannical nature of the courts and the arbitrary procedures followed by them."

The problem has been recognized by the Army in the creation of a special Clemency Board charged with the task of reviewing the punishments meted out in some 35,000 general court-martial cases. But the authority of this Board is limited and restricted in many respects by the existing laws, and the Board, in any event, must proceed at the outset with the assumption of a guilt that is frequently contrary to fact.

Question. What can the people of Ohio do that will help to remedy the situation?

Answer. One big way to help is by openly expressing your opinion on the subject. The more opinions that are openly expressed the more public sentiment will be crystallized in support of needed changes in the law. An even more effective way, however, is to write directly to your Senator or Congressman. This method is in fact far more effective than most people would ever imagine, and it will help to make sure that these things do not happen again.

Lithuania and Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Lithuania and Liberty," written by Dr. W. Elmer Ekblaw, of Clark University, and published in the Worcester Daily Telegram of February 18, 1946.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LITHUANIA AND LIBERTY

(By Dr. W. Elmer Ekblaw, Clark University)

The Lithuanians in America's population have recently celebrated the twenty-eighth anniversary of their independent statehood following the First World War. By appropriate ceremonials they have recalled the opportunity for service, the vision of happiness in the promise of liberty, and the universal enthusiasm of their people, that February 16, 28 years ago, opened up for them on their political and cultural horizon. They have not only celebrated the anniversary of that glorious day, but they have reconsecrated themselves to the cause of freedom. They have resolved, more firmly than ever, to crusade courageously, unceasingly and faithfully for the restoration of that liberty, that independence of sovereignty, that bright promise of happiness and opportunity for service among the free nations of the world, which Lithuania deserves and which Russia has so treacherously and so unjustifiably wrested from her.

What of the Lithuanians in Lithuania? They dare not raise their voices in protest against the cruel fate they suffer, much less have they heart to do so, as they realize how wretched is their slavery, how cruel is their bondage, how merciless is the treatment that has become their lot under the Russian tyranny. They see little hope for the future. Betrayed by the Russian Government that deliberately and cynically violated every solemn treaty it made with their country—the Peace Pact of 1920, the Nonagression Act of 1926, and the Mutual Assistance Pact of 1939—the people have now no chance, no

strength, no power to resist the complete and ruthless Russification of their beloved land.

The political history of Lithuania for the last 6 years, albeit a record of patriotism, persistent effort for neutrality, and patient attempt to placate her two mighty enemies, Germany on the one hand, and Russia on the other, has been a sad story of delusion, despair, and final exploitation and subjugation first by one and then the other. Everything that Lithuania could honorably do to preserve her independence and integrity she did, but to no avail. A small land set between two wolfishly imperialist aggressors, she fell victim first to one and then the other, despite her determined and valiant struggle to retain her place among the free, sovereign nations. Since Russia's seizure of the little land, there has been no mercy, no justice, no salvation in sight for the Lithuanians. They are now a people in bondage, as bitter as any that ever befell any people, as savage and terrible as any that Babylon, or Rome, or any conqueror ever imposed upon any people.

The tide will turn. The day of reckoning will come—perhaps not so soon as the more hopeful Lithuanians would like, but surely. "The mills of God grind slowly, but they grind exceeding fine." The leaven of freedom is forever working. Tyranny cannot endure. Injustice cannot prevail. And so the faithful folk of Lithuanian stock in America, celebrating the anniversary of their former liberation and reasserting their right to freedom, restating their indubitable claims to justice, have sound reason for their faith, their hope.

God grant that America and Britain, and all the rest of the freedom-loving nations of the world, stand steadfast for the freedom and autonomy of the Baltic states and peoples, as they have so far done; grant that there may be no wavering in their support of the rights of such small nations to liberty, and sovereignty over their own land and folk.

All honor to the faith, the courage, the patience of the Lithuanians, who dare so heroically to assert their rights; may they regain them all.

A Vital Human Document

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article by Harry H. Schlacht which appeared in the Boston Daily Record, Boston, Mass., under date of March 4, 1946:

A VITAL HUMAN DOCUMENT
(By Harry H. Schlacht)

We have observed the one hundred and fifty-seventh annversary of our Federal Constitution.

It was on March 4, 1789, that the first session of the Federal Congress under the Constitution was held in Federal Hall, Wall and Nassau Streets, New York City.

God bless our Constitution.

It is a charter of our fundamental laws.

It is a living, vital, human document with a soul and a spirit.

It expresses the hopes and yearnings of the great heart of America for the life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness of all her people.

It is the anchor of our safety and the bulwark of our security.

It is the mighty fortress of our liberties and institutions.

Its sublime philosophy was born and lived and practiced by men in past ages.

Its seeds were planted in Athens 25 centuries ago.

It continued its growth through the various governments of Rome.

It survived the persecutions and blighting influence of the Middle Ages.

It started to bloom with the Magna Carta and later with habeas corpus.

It finally came into full fruition in the definite provisions of our Constitution.

It was the inspiration of our early settlers.

It was the beacon light of Washington and the founding fathers.

It is the touchstone that illuminates the paths of future generations.

We have been devoted to our Constitution.

We know that wise men conceived it.

We know that strong men administered it.

We know that brave men fought for it.

We know that heroic men died for it.

There are some who refer sneeringly to our Constitution.

They say it is obsolete and outdated.

They say, "You can't eat the Constitution."

Our answer to this contemptible insult to our great charter of human rights is, "No, and neither can you eat the Ten Commandments nor the Sermon on the Mount."

If the time comes when the American people shall no longer be inspired by the teachings and admonitions of the two great tenets of the lowly Nazarene, the liquidation of our civilization will soon follow.

Let us now and evermore reaffirm our faith in our Constitution.

Let us rededicate ourselves to the task of ever preserving it.

Let us ever cherish our precious heritage.

Let us remember that our fighters for freedom gave life to it and their lives for it on all the flaming battle fronts.

Let there be a national observance of the Constitution's adoption as urged by the Hearst newspapers.

Let us heed the words of William Randolph Hearst to set aside a Constitution Day to give all American citizens an opportunity to make public declaration and demonstration of our reverence for the great document whose provisions protect our liberties and preserve our Republic.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of Saturday, March 2, 1946:

WATERWAY—A RUSSIAN SCHEME!

Now we've heard everything.

Even the St. Lawrence waterway project is a deep, dark Russian plot. Those wily Muscovites want it built so they can pour Russian coal into this country and put our miners and railroad workers out of jobs.

In all seriousness, this is what Thomas Kennedy, secretary-treasurer of the United Mine Workers of America, asserted before the Senate committee studying the seaway proposal.

"The seaway is right down the Russian alley and is made to order to tie into the Russian plan," he proclaimed.

We don't know which Russian plan Mr. Kennedy is speaking of. There have been so many. The last one we noted was Stalin's extended program to build the Soviet industrial economy to unheard of heights, a program that would take all the coal the Russians could mine for a long time.

If there has even been an American project, conceived by Americans for the benefit of Americans, it is the St. Lawrence waterway. The Russians have probably given as much thought to it as we have to the dredging program for the upper Volga River.

But at the moment there are people in this country who get the willies whenever Russia is mentioned. So hanging the Russian tag on the good old St. Lawrence project—which we've been talking about for a quarter century—might help defeat it. It must be admitted there is no trick the seaway enemies will not try.

Sh-h-h, don't tell anyone, but the Russians have other plans for the waterway. They are going to use it to flood us with vodka, and then bury us in caviar.

Grave Emergency Faces Nation—Newspaper Predicts That Selfish Bloc Will Picket Congress on Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cleveland Press:

President Truman's bold and imaginative program to build 2,700,000 new houses in 1946 and 1947 will dump into the lap of Congress a problem that is sure to develop a great deal of opposition on some of its details.

Most likely point of controversy: the proposed ceiling on the selling price of building lots and all houses, new or old. Yet the wild inflation already disastrously developing in this field calls for drastic action of some kind.

The current inflation in real estate represents purely fictitious values, the result of excessive demand operating upon limited supply. In the end everybody suffers, for when the boom attains its peak, as it inevitably must, it becomes a bust in almost the same breath. The peak buyer loses his shirt, the mortgage holders lose theirs, taxing agencies reap empty tills. Only the fellow who sold at the peak has any profit, and 99 times out of a hundred, unless he gages the sale to the split second, he loses his gains by having to pay inflated prices for everything he buys. Real estate is usually the first to inflate and the first to bust.

With millions of ex-service people unable to find decent housing accommodations, or any whatsoever, decent or indecent, and with millions more still to be discharged, the housing situation has become an emergency matter with a capital E.

Many of the "lucky" ones are paying through the nose for what they can find, whether they buy or rent.

"Take care of them," said General MacArthur, speaking of the men who won the war, as Japan surrendered. The Nation has an obligation to discharge, not merely implied but implicit, in the GI bill of rights.

That hopeful measure hasn't been of much help to service people because inflated values and the next-to-impossibility of getting labor and materials have made a mockery of it in the field of housing.

Property owners will resent the fixing of ceilings on lots and houses. Real-estate interests will yammer about governmental interference in private enterprise. Constructors will fight proposed emphasis on prefabricated houses.

But after all is said and done a grave emergency faces the Nation, and Homeric remedies for desperate situations are provided by the public welfare clause of the Constitution. Selfish blocks will picket Congress, but if Congress is keeping its ear to the ground it will pay more attention to the distressed cries of the homeless than to the pressure groups, for once in its recent life.

The Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 4, 1946.*
Hon. BEN F. JENSEN,
United States Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

In the last 24 hours, officials of the Government have issued a series of irresponsible statements. These statements are so general and so broad that it would take several days to answer them. The retail lumber dealers of the United States are at all times willing to discuss fairly the reasons and cures for the housing shortage. The retail dealers have either been deprived of a hearing or have been ignored on the few occasions that their views have been made known to administrative officials. We appeal once again for a chance to be heard on a nonpartisan basis. We do not want inflation, but we do want building materials and the immediate construction of homes for veterans. The retail lumber dealers do not believe that the Patman bill will accomplish these purposes. The Buffett amendment, if attached to the Wolcott substitute bill, will come closer than any legislative proposal that has been made to accomplish these ends. The Wolcott substitute without the Buffett amendment is not acceptable. If subsidies are required for any purpose we want to know how the money is going to be used to increase production of building materials and erection of homes before any endorsement can be given.

No one in the administrative departments or on the floor of Congress has justified the expenditure of $600,000,000 in subsidies and furthermore, no one in the executive departments and on the floor of the Congress has explained just how these subsidies are to be doled out. We honestly believe that the subsidy proposal is a substitute to relieve OPA of its responsibilities to grant on a selective basis reasonable price adjustments to manufacturers of building materials, and that it will create inequities which will further curtail production. The administration now has authority to make subsidy payments through RFC, therefore let the administration explain before the Appropriations Committee how much it needs and for what products. This is not a partisan issue. We represent 23,000 retail lumber dealers in the United States and these retail lumber dealers represent every possible shade of political thinking. This association has not and will not engage in politics. The members of this association are normally responsible for more than 75 percent of the individual homes constructed in the United States, and every one of the members of this association stands ready to appear before the administrative departments of the Government and before the committees of Congress to give the reasons for the housing shortage and to explain what measures are necessary to correct it. We believe that Mr. Patman's proposal will not accomplish its alleged purpose and that the veterans who are the next-door neighbors of the retail lumber dealers will soon find this out if this bill is passed.

NATIONAL RETAIL LUMBER
DEALERS ASSOCIATION,
H. R. NORTHRUP,
Secretary-Manager.

How Much Shall We Lend?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the total gross debt and contingent liabilities of the United States Government now totals $636,898,220,145.98. The total owed to the United States by foreign countries as of July 1, 1945, was $14,791,340,307.53. Great Britain presently owes us from previous war—World War I—a principal amount of $4,368,000,000 together with unpaid interest of $2,047,664,782.58, or a total now due the United States from Great Britain from transactions prior to World War II of $6,415,664,782.58. All of these debts are a crushing load that must eventually be borne by the taxpayers of the United States, if past experience is to be any guide to the future.

A billion dollars is difficult to realize or visualize. A homely illustration may give a faint idea of the magnitude of the present obligation which this generation and future generations must pay by the sweat of the brow. If a $1,000 bill were to be placed on the pavement alongside of the Empire State Building in New York, and then other $1,000 bills placed upon the first bill until the pile of $1,000 bills were as tall as the Empire State Building the pile of $1,000 bills would amount to $1,000,000,000. It may be the idea of the New Dealers, so adept in the repudiation of promises and in the making of promises which cannot be fulfilled, to finance the socialistic government of Great Britain. What an anomaly to ask a capitalist country to finance a socialistic program in an effort to prove that socialism is a success while its capitalistic supporter is a failure.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent to insert an editorial from the Wall Street Journal of March 5, 1946. The title of the editorial is: "How Much Shall We Lend?":

HOW MUCH SHALL WE LEND?

It is possible to construe the first public report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, which President Truman approves, as an effort on the part of this Cabinet group to limit the American Government's foreign loans yet to be made to about $7,000,000,000. The chief questions the report puts before Congress are: (1) If the recommended loans are made, can the Government's lending stop there? (2) Will these "loans" in truth be loans or gifts?

To begin with, limitation as implied in the report applies only to transactions before June 30, 1947. Governmental intentions and policies beyond that date are left open. The Council and President Truman urge that Congress extend the $3,750,000,000 50-year credit to Great Britain but leave all other lending of the public funds to the Export-Import Bank, which would have authority to lend to a total of $4,750,000,000, of which loan resources Congress has already put $3,500,000,000 at its command. An additional lending authority of $1,250,000,000 for the Bank is requested. Its then permitted maximum of loans, together with the British credit, would come to $8,500,000,000.

In addition, the United States is committed to provide $2,570,000,000 of the working capital of the Monetary Fund and $3,175,000,000 of the capital of the International Bank, bringing existing and proposed commitments up to $14,425,000,000. Our subscriptions to Monetary Fund and International Bank are not immediately payable in full. The President's covering letter with the Council report treats $950,000,000 of the Fund contributions as a "noncash item," since it is to take the form of non-interest-bearing Treasury certificates. But the governors of the Fund may demand that these certificates be converted into dollar credits. Only 10 percent of the Bank's capital allotment is expected to be called for before June 30, 1947, but the remainder is a contingent liability.

The program of the Advisory Council and the President thus contemplates further loans, credits, and capital advances of roundly $13,000,000,000—the $14,425,000,000 above mentioned less the Export-Import Bank's commitments already made, which on December 31, 1945, amounted to $1,559,000,000. These loans and contributions would be made step by step during several coming years. In a different category is the Government's further expenditure through UNRRA of perhaps $1,000,000,000, yet this is also a draft upon the United States Treasury.

All these projected transactions mean purchasing power for the borrower nations, the larger part of which will be exercised in this country. The resulting stimulus to our export trade is emphasized; the Advisory Council says: "Only by the reestablishment of high levels of production and trade the world over can the United States be assured in future years of a sustained level of exports appropriate to the maintenance of high levels of domestic production and employment." But the Council does not neglect to stress political aspects of the program. It says, "Economic stability will foster peace" and speaks of "the main objective of the foreign economic policy of the United States, which is to lay the economic foundations of the peace."

Throughout the Advisory Council's report runs the assumption that contemplated loans are to be investments, on which interest shall be paid currently, the principal of which is eventually to be returned. It describes the Export-Import Bank as considering, among other things, "the capacity of the borrower to repay." It speaks of the time "when net repayment begins, whether this be in a few years or many decades from now." It says nothing about willingness or unwillingness of borrowers to repay, though these are to be mainly intergovernment transactions. Since the end of World War I we have seen governments repudiate their obligations to other governments; we now see them coming back to the same lender for new loans.

Loans of this sort are political transactions in more senses than one. When serv-

ice of a foreign loan imposes upon the people of the debtor nations an unwelcome degree of "austerity," a government which would fulfill the contract obligations can be deposed. Intergovernment loans made among belligerents during a war—such as our $41,000,000,000 of lend-lease assistance—are rightly regarded as the lenders' contributions to a common war effort. Postwar government borrowers will assuredly argue hereafter that lend-lease and loans after the fighting were the same in nature—that both were means to equality of sacrifice in the struggle to free mankind from tyranny. We have lately heard many Britons assert that the United States is at least $6,000,000,000 in arrears of its just share in the material sacrifice made by the United Kingdom alone.

So we had better ask ourselves some questions like these:

1. Can we suppose that any major part of the loans our Government may now extend will be repaid, or that such repayment as is made will not engender a sense of wanton injury of the weak by the strong?

2. Are we willing to donate the larger part or the whole of $13,000,000,000, or whatever the total may ultimately become, to assist the outside world in its economic rehabilitation?

3. Would the drain of the world's needs concentrated upon our resources, added to the drafts made upon them by the war, impair our long-term ability to play our needed part in expanded world trade while adequately meeting our domestic requirements?

4. Would the contemplated loans strengthen or weaken the will of other peoples to help themselves?

5. Is it wise and sound national policy to subsidize our export trades, if the contemplated loans will not surely serve the other purposes ascribed to them by their advocates?

We submit that at the root of these grave issues lies the fact that the proposed loans would be intergovernment transactions. We believe that the good and useful purposes which their proponents say they would serve would be better served by speeding up the International Bank, with special attention to its functions as guarantor of loans from private investors to credit-worthy private borrowers.

We think the record is clear that intergovernment loans in peacetimes serve neither peace nor economic progress.

Abuses in Veterans' Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of March 3, 1946:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL ABUSES

Early last year Representative PHILBIN, of Massachusetts, made charges of inefficiency and callous treatment of veterans in veterans' hospitals. At that time the Veterans' Administration was still under the direction of Brigadier General Hines. Some of his defenders in Congress indignantly denied the Philbin charges.

Now a special veterans' subcommittee of the House has announced a series of findings after an investigation, and noteworthy among them is one that it found "some cases of beatings and mistreatment of patients in certain Veterans' Administration hospitals."

This is partly attributed to inefficient personnel and officials who formerly could not be removed except under elaborate processes; assignment of soldiers and other untrained personnel as hospital aides as a war emergency measure and a certain amount of "administrative inflexibility and complacency."

Without doubt there are "many loyal and hardworking staff members," as the committee says, who have done their best to cope with "an increasingly grave emergency and meet the needs of the sick and disabled." This is not a blanket accusation against faithful and conscientious workers, who are touched by the spectacle of brave soldiers who have suffered for their country's cause.

But the most adequate measures must be taken, especially in neuropsychiatric hospitals, to prevent a recurrence of such abuses. General Bradley should be given specific authority to hire and fire Veterans' Administration employees. The committee urges creation of an independent board of review to hear complaints relative to operation of hospitals and treatment accorded veterans. These and all other steps necessary should be taken without delay.

The Cost of Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of Thursday, February 28, 1946:

MORE ON THE COST OF STRIKES

The last 6 months has brought the most dramatic illustration of the cost of strikes that the country has seen in many years.

Figures compiled by the United States News, a privately published weekly on national affairs, show that in the first 6 months of "peace" 63,000,000 man-days of production were lost, $560,000,000 in direct wages were lost in struck industries, and unemployment caused in other industries (because of the strikes) cost many more millions. Unfilled orders run into billions, and loss of sales commissions runs into hundreds of millions.

In the auto strike, the company offered 13.5 cents an hour increase and the union agreed to accept 19.5 cents. The first 13 weeks of the strike cost each worker about $650. At 6 cents an hour—the differential in dispute—it would take the strikers 5 years and 3 months to make this up. In steel, the spread was less. The strike netted 3 cents an hour over what was offered. Even though the strike was brief, each worker will require 2½ years to make up the $195 that was lost.

Since September, electrical workers have lost 53 million dollars; bituminous coal workers, 30 millions; lumber and meat packers, 19 millions each; AFL machinists in the San Francisco bay area, 36 millions; glass industry workers, 9 millions.

The argument is sometimes made that this is unfair computation, because, even though the strikers lose money, there are other gains; also, that the total gains to all labor must be taken into consideration. Whatever may be said for these factors in ordinary times, in the present postwar reconversion period it is a pretty safe guess that the total loss from reconversion delay, in all industry in the country, far surpasses any gains that the strikes have brought or will bring to labor. Our national reconversion program has really been thrown out of gear—set back at least 3 months, says John D. Small, Administrator of Civilian Production, and our industrial production, he adds, has hit a new low since the spring of 1941, because of the strikes.

It is not suggested that employers were all angels, or that they do not bear some responsibility for the strikes. But the preponderance of evidence indicates that labor could have won pretty nearly a 15 percent increase across the board in the struck industries by bargaining to the limit without strikes.

Contrary to charges of some labor leaders, there is no evidence that industry generally took part in any conspiracy to smash the unions and reduce wages. Rather, it may be said that industry proposed, more than it had for some years, to assert what it conceived to be its rights in collective bargaining rather than accept, without bargaining, everything that labor demanded.

Substantial wage increases were expected by the public and were offered by management. It becomes increasingly clear that the union leadership which forced the disputes to a strike stage, with a few exceptions, was unwise, both for memberships involved and for the whole country, in this difficult reconversion period when we should have gone full speed ahead.

Look Who Is Wearing "Sockless Jerry's" Shoes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from a Philadelphia paper of February 20, 1946:

LOOK WHO IS WEARING "SOCKLESS JERRY'S" SHOES

We can't tell for sure whether "Sockless Jerry" Simpson wore socks or not.

His opponents said he didn't.

But we do know where he stood on economics. "Sockless Jerry" was a political product of the post-Civil War period. He was a member of various minor parties—Greenback, Union Labor, People's Party. He was finally elected to Congress from Kansas. He was one of the phenomena William Allen White had in mind when he wrote his famous editorial, What's the Matter With Kansas?

Simpson was for inflation, for practically unlimited amounts of paper money. He wanted prices to go up, but fast.

We also know who has stepped into "Sockless Jerry's" economic shoes—the National Association of Manufacturers.

The NAM says it's against inflation.

But what it advocates is removal of all price controls on manufactured goods.

It wants prices to go up before they go down.

With price controls off, the NAM reasons, production would go up and prices would come down "within a reasonable time."

But the NAM doesn't say what it means by a "reasonable time." It doesn't say what would happen to the wage earner in the meantime.

And it doesn't say what would happen to the NAM members in the meantime. We know. They'd be making money faster than "Sockless Jerry" wanted the Government to run the printing presses—while the wage earner would have a hard time buying shoes.

We are glad that Chester Bowles, newly appointed Director of Economic Stabilization and former head of OPA, didn't miss those NAM ads.

He told the House Banking and Currency Committee on Monday that the NAM was an irresponsible pressure group. He asked the Congressmen to regard its argument against price controls with a cold and fishy eye.

He warned of inflation and the speculative fever and added: "The lobbyists and profiteers are licking their chops."

Bowles admitted that the administration had made mistakes in taking off wartime controls too fast.

He asked Congress to forget the NAM arguments, to extend the Price Control Act and the payment of subsidies beyond the present expiration date of June 30 this year.

If this is done, Bowles said, the Government's new Big Steel formula would merely be a bulge in a relatively narrow sector of the price line. It would affect chiefly metal goods, should have little effect on essential expenditures: rent, food, clothing.

Bowles has given Congress the choice—of following the arguments of the National Association of Manufacturers and thus inviting disastrous inflation, or of backing the OPA to give the wage earner a chance to buy the things he makes at a reasonable price.

If the NAM wins, we may all wind up sockless, because we can't afford to buy 'em.

Address of Hon. Philip J. Philbin, of Massachusetts, at Atlantic Union College, Lancaster, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at Atlantic Union College, Lancaster, Mass., March 3, 1946:

It is with a deep sense of honor and privilege that I join with you tonight in welcoming back the patriotic and heroic service men and women of this community.

Let me compliment and congratulate your able and distinguished leader, President Jones, all the officials of the college, and each and every one of you here present, who have made this soul-stirring occasion so outstanding, and so successful.

Our first thought tonight should be and is to express to almighty God our profound gratitude for our deliverance from the terrible scourge of war and the return of our beloved sons and daughters to their homes, their families, their schools, and civilian pursuits.

Those who have served our country from this community and from the brethren of your group have made superlative contributions to the cause of liberty and democracy which we can never forget. We give them all our humble thanks, though in truth we can never possibly thank them for their valiant service. Their devotion, their loyalty, their courage, their fidelity are absolutely unexcelled. They have recorded a glorious and illustrious chapter in the history of noble deeds and patriotic sacrifice. Time does not permit me on this proud occasion, which we reserve primarily for expressions of gratitude and rejoicing at the safe return of our young friends, to deal fully with this subject, but I would be remiss in my duty as your Congressman, as your steadfast friend, and an ordinary lover of justice and truth, if I were not to make reference this evening to the special achievements of your young men.

These men devoted their abilities, offered their energies, and, in many cases, gave their lives to our cause. Remember, they did not take life, they saved it, and their deeds of heroism and valor were not exceeded by those of any other group.

These men, boys to us, served and worked on land, sea, and in the air, in every theater of war, on every world battle front. Though they moved in places of greatest danger, submitted themselves to the extremest hazards of war, they walked calmly and unafraid. They did not flinch in the face of death. They did not hesitate in the time of crisis. Armed for the most part only with first-aid kits they moved everywhere truly as agents of mercy to bind up the wounds of the suffering, to revive the stricken, to succor the helpless, and to comfort the dying. They relieved those who fell in battle, they rescued those who could not find a haven, and they restored those who were maimed, broken and scarred, cut, crushed and battered by the terrible weapons of modern scientific warfare. How many lives they saved no one will ever know, but thousands, yes, perhaps hundreds of thousands of American boys who were cruelly smitten by our desperate ruthless enemies will ever breathe a prayerful sigh of gratitude and everlasting appreciation for the merciful ministrations of the noble corpsmen of the Adventist group, who challenged death itself in every blazing corner of the earth where the war was waged, to salvage, to rescue, to heal, to relieve, and to restore to health and life the bleeding, pathetic victims of man's own insensate bestiality and hate.

These men did not carry a musket in their hands, they did not kill and slay and maim and wound their fellow man. They did not fire the great battle guns of the fleet or press the levers that dropped the deadly bombs from the air. Theirs was the work of mercy, theirs was one of the greatest contributions to our common war effort, theirs was a self-sacrificing devotion to country that was made without spilling one drop of human blood or the taking of a single life.

From these 12,000 or more Seventh-Day Adventists who rendered these priceless and magnificent services in the Army, the Navy, and Air Corps, some of the most heroic exploits of the war have come. Fearless and dauntless, courageous and unflinching to the very end, even to death itself, is it any wonder that the great Government of the United States, through our esteemed President, should have singled out one of these noble young heroes, Corp. Desmond T. Doss, Seventh-Day Adventist youth of Lynchburg, Va., to receive the Congressional Medal of Honor. Let me read you a part of his citation:

"Pfc Desmond T. Doss was a Company A man with the Three Hundred and Seventh Infantry Medical Detachment when the first battalion of that regiment assaulted a jagged escarpment 400 feet high on one of the Japanese islands on April 29, 1945.

"As our troops gained the summit, a heavy concentration of artillery, mortar, and machine-gun fire crashed into them, inflicting approximately 75 casualties and driving the others back. Private Doss refused to seek cover and remained in the fire-swept area with the many stricken, carrying them one by one to the edge of the escarpment and there lowering them on a rope-supported litter down the face of a cliff.

"On May 2, he again exposed himself to heavy rifle and mortar fire, in rescuing a wounded man 200 yards forward of the lines; and 2 days later he treated four men who had been cut down while assaulting a strongly defended cave, advancing through a shower of grenades to within 8 yards of enemy forces in a cave mouth, where he dressed his comrades' wounds before making four separate trips under fire to evacuate them to safety.

"On May 5, he unhesitatingly braved enemy shelling and small-arms fire to assist an artillery officer. He applied bandages, moved his patient to a spot that offered some protection from fire, and while shells fell close by, painstakingly administered plasma. Later that day, when an American was severely wounded by fire from a cave, Private Doss crawled to him where he had fallen 25 feet from the enemy position, rendered aid, and carried him 100 yards to safety while continually exposed to enemy fire.

"On May 21 in a night attack on high ground he remained in exposed territory while the rest of his company took cover, fearlessly risking the chance that he would be mistaken for an infiltrating Japanese and giving aid to the injured until he was himself seriously wounded in the legs by the explosion of a grenade. Rather than call another aid man from cover, he cared for his own injuries and waited 5 hours before litter bearers reached him and started carrying him to cover.

"The trio was caught in an enemy tank attack and Private Doss, seeing a more critically wounded man nearby, crawled off the litter and directed the bearers to give their first attention to the other man. Waiting the litter bearers' return, he was again struck, this time suffering a compound fracture of the arm. With magnificent fortitude he bound a rifle stock to his shattered arm as a splint and then crawled 300 yards over rough terrain to the aid station.

"Through his outstanding bravery and unflinching determination in the face of desperately dangerous conditions Private Doss saved the lives of many soldiers. His name became a symbol throughout the Seventy-seventh Infantry Division for outstanding gallantry far above and beyond the call of duty."

Think of it, my friends, think of the magnificent spirit of sacrifice, devotion, service and loyalty that moved this gallant young man. No human words can possibly portray his fearless attachment to duty, his high purpose to rescue and help his fellow men, his unceasing zeal in carrying out works of mercy. This is an unusual illustration indeed, but from my own knowledge of the official record of the service of your group, it typifies perhaps as well as anything else could, the unexcelled sacrifices that your boys have made to forward the cause of our country in the time of its greatest trial. I could go on and on to give examples of the exceptional work and service of our medical corpsmen, your medical corpsmen, who were never afraid to die—and many of them did die—and who never hesitated for a moment, no matter how great the hazard, to help their comrades. I may well say that so long as America can develop men imbued with the profound love of God and fellow man that animated these gallant corpsmen, the fountainhead of our liberty and freedom will be secure. Theirs was a triumph of the spiritual over the things of a materialistic world, over the most terrible engines of human destruction, over the most frightening events of war.

We can all learn a precious lesson from their devotion and unstinted sacrifice. But we must do more than that; we must give some practical expression to the great patriotism and idealism which they brought into the service of their country. We must so shape our future conduct and the conduct of the affairs of our Government that the immortal truths for which they made these immutable sacrifices, the immortal truths of justice, freedom, democracy, and faith may be preserved in our way of life and in our religious, political, social, and economic institutions. We must strive to bring into reality the lasting peace for which

they and their other noble comrades suffered to insure. We must work to end this insensate, periodic slaughter of our young men, to banish these hates, these prejudices, these loathings of the spirit and the mind, these greeds for power, these lusts for conquest and possessions—all the gross brutalizing tyrannies—which breed strife between human beings and nations.

We must ourselves be true to the immortal truths that are set forth in our religious teachings, Constitution, the right of our people to be free, to go their own way of life, and to practice and enjoy their conscientious beliefs and convictions and the worship and faith of their own choice. We do not seek to dictate to others free to choose, the kind of government they shall have. We ask that they shall "do unto others as they would have others do unto them." We ask that they join with us to stop this recurring butchery, bloodshed, and suffering which reduces mankind to the level of the jungle beast and which in this atomic age, if pursued to its logical end, will surely bring all civilization down in ruins.

Let us remember that the government is not our master, the state is not our master, but our servant. The government and the state must bring to us the blessings of democracy and not the cursed slavery of dictatorship. Let us keep all our institutions free and democratic, let us insure that the young men and women of this and future generations will not only be spared the horrors of war but will be accorded the blessings of peace, will be given the right to pursue their own chosen careers with the least possible interference by the state and without having pressed down on them the heavy burdens of militarism and regimentation.

We have just finished a great, costly, and bloody war. As yet, we have not brought all our boys back from that war, though we hope that time is close at hand. Let us put a stop to jingoistic, war-monging talk. Let us cease trying to regiment our young men into the very military patterns that they fought to destroy elsewhere. Let us be prepared for any eventuality and maintain an adequate national defense to guard our Nation from attack but let us work and strive for a peaceful democratic world where free nations will settle their disputes without resorting to force, death, and destruction.

We cannot be too vigilant in this work because militaristic movements are active and powerful, led sometimes by sincere patriotic groups.

To all intents and purposes an aroused public opinion springing spontaneously from the homes, churches, educational institutions, labor, and management groups and virtually every other segment of the American people has, for the time being at least, completely overwhelmed the peacetime draft, or universal military service.

The proposal for extension of Selective Service, that is, the wartime draft is equally objectionable to opponents of conscription. Like universal service, it would continue taking our young men into the armed forces by compulsion. It would continue taking them away from their homes, families, schools and jobs, breaking and interrupting their careers and regimenting them into military components in Army camps where they will be subject to all the undesirable conditions and temptations of that atmosphere.

In the main, there are three arguments for this proposal, in fact for both proposals. First, that they are necessary to furnish replacements for demobilized personnel. Secondly, that they are essential to our national defense, and thirdly, that the Army can discipline, train, educate and develop our young men better than their parents, their religious leaders and our American schools and colleges. With full respect to the proponents, to my mind, all these arguments are specious and untenable.

The present strength of the volunteer forces of Regular Army, Navy and Marine Corps is in the neighborhood of 1,000,000 men, and it is growing every day. Such a force is more than enough, if properly deployed—and there has been enough time since VJ-day for that—to perform all essential occupational duties and, together with the millions of highly trained, experienced veterans who have already been, or shortly wil be demobilized, to provide an adequate national defense in peacetime.

Of course, if we anticipate war in the immediate future, or the next few years, this force may not be sufficient. I do not believe that our Nation is presently in danger of war though we should be prepared for every eventuality. More than that, we should work to strengthen the instrumentalities of peace and to make war impossible. The draft moves in precisely the opposite direction. It pours oil on the smouldering fires of international unrest. The adoption of the draft, either by extending selective service, or by adopting universal conscription, will certainly excite the suspicion and distrust of other nations and certainly result in another mad competitive race of armies and armaments that would in every likelihood culminate in another, and probably the final, world war.

After all the pious words about the Atlantic Charter, self-determination for all nations, peace, justice, tolerance and decency which our Government has broadcast by every manner and means throughout the world during the past few years, this Nation ought to be ashamed of itself at this time to be setting the example to other nations, by conscription or otherwise, of starting another race in armies and armaments. In fact, if we still retain any faith whatsoever in our oft-repeated, widely disseminated war aims, it is our solemn duty to future generations of young Americans and to humanity itself to strive for peace, to furnish the strong, militant leadership necessary to secure lasting peace instead of working to set up the conditions and instruments that will inevitably lead to war.

Moreover, it is now evident that armies of the future, if we must have them, will not be trained along conventional military lines as foot soldiers and infantrymen. The atomic bomb has already reshaped and revolutionized future warfare. Basic training as the Army has known it during the recent war is obsolete. The soldier of the future, for the most part, must be a carefully trained and skilled technical specialist, schooled in the scientific laboratory and practiced in factory and industrial techniques. He must be equally at home in the air, on land, and on and under the sea. The real military effective of the future may well never smell the smoke of battle. From locations far removed from his objectives he will press buttons and exercise remote control over electrical and chemical devices and weapons that will spread havoc and destruction thousands of miles away. Such an army, such a national defense embracing coordinated naval and aviation units must be made up of a relatively small but hard striking, regular, professional highly mechanized force that can spring into action over a very broad front on a moment's notice.

Neither selective service nor the peacetime draft could ever furnish such a force because science is moving so fast that reserves trained under these programs would be outdated, and outdated almost as quickly as they could be trained. Few citizens would oppose voluntary training for our young men in National Guard, ROTC, and civilian defense and scientific academic work, but none of these activities should have compulsory features which are offensive to the American tradition and highly objectionable to most of our people.

Our boys fought and died to defeat militarism and not to adopt the basic patterns of military dictatorship in our own country.

Before we launch upon the building of large-scale provocative military establishments, the least we can do in the sacred name of those who have sacrificed so much for a decent future world is to intensify our efforts for peace. It is surely not only most appropriate but most urgent that we should try with all our energy sincerely through utilizing the UNO and all other agencies working for peace through international agreement to end military conscription throughout the world, outlaw the atomic bomb just as we outlawed poison gas, earnestly strive for the reduction of large armaments and use every other means available to us to put an end to the inhuman and periodic killing and maiming of our finest young men and spare the world the misery, suffering and social unrest that war always entails.

The least we can do, I repeat, and want to emphasize, before we set out on a program of militarization of our young men and economy is to make insistent and earnest appeals and efforts for peace. When other nations reject them and it should become evident to us that they are unwilling to act in good faith, that they insist on conscription and armaments to enforce policies of aggression, imperialism and totalitarian infiltration that will lead to war, it will then be time enough for us to consider the stark realities and the necessities of having to live in a world that will be turned into an armed camp.

Private first class Doss and his comrades of the Medical Corps and all their other comrades of the fighting fronts of every race and creed, through heroism and sacrifice have pointed out to us the path to peace. The least we can do as a people and as a nation is to live up to the great ideals, the lofty aspirations for which they fought, suffered and died. If we truly keep their sacrifices and sufferings in mind, if we have the same high purpose and the same warm faith, the same love of God, humanity and country that animated them, if we cling tenaciously to the fundamentals of freedom and democracy for the perpetuation of which unspeakable carnage has afflicted the whole world, we will rapidly move into a brighter day, a day of prosperity and peace for all our American people and for the world.

Philip Rudich

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of all the grave industrial disputes which are having such a deplorable effect on the welfare of our country, it is my pleasure to speak briefly of a labor leader in my congressional district, who is doing an outstanding job.

Mr. Philip Rudich, the manager of south Jersey joint board, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, has brought to his present work a wealth of personal experience, as well as a calm and judicious temperament, which has proven highly beneficial to all of south Jersey. He has been a manual worker and he knows the workers' problems, but he likewise knows and appreciates the problems and difficulties of management.

He has been concerned with the welfare of the worker in the clothing industry since his early youth, when he was employed in Baltimore. He came to

my district in 1932, in the depths of depression, and has made a vast contribution to the welfare of working people and to industrial peace and good relationships.

Mr. Speaker, there has been no district in the United States with a better war record than mine. Industrial enterprise increased and prospered, and production was maintained efficiently and consistently, and still is. To this happy situation, the efforts of Phil Rudich have contributed in substantial measure.

He has become a real part of the community, and has been of help and assistance in many civic endeavors, especially in the wartime bond and material conservation drives.

That he is held in esteem and affection is evidenced by his fiftieth birthday celebration, which occurred on December 23, 1945, which, in most inclement weather, was attended by 800 friends from all walks of life and representing all shades of political opinion.

It is my pleasure to make this brief mention of his work and to hope that it will continue successfully in the future as it has in the past.

Lumber Dealer Asks for Price Control To Prevent Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the past several weeks I have repeatedly expressed the view that the honest and legitimate real-estate men and lumber dealers of the country would refuse to support the efforts of the speculators to profiteer at the expense of the returning veterans. Today I received a letter from a lumber dealer who says that he would profit considerably if my bill were defeated, but he is strongly urging its passage because of his fear of inflation.

GREAT LAKES, ILL., *March 1, 1946.*
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: I have been following closely your efforts to put ceilings upon residential construction, both new and old. Two nights ago I had the privilege of hearing your discussion on the radio from Washington. As manager of a retail lumberyard with a large residential construction volume, as a real-estate operator, and as the owner of a construction company specializing in housing, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you on your understanding of the problems before us. I think it is undoubtedly necessary at this time to put in sensible price controls on an item that has reached a very dangerous point of inflation.

No doubt I would profit considerably if your bill were defeated, but I am strongly urging passage of it in order that what I see as inflation of tremendous proportions may be averted.

I also strongly urge that the program be administered directly by the Federal Housing Administration, with whom I have had considerable dealings. The vast knowledge they have accumulated of actual construction costs and methods will be the greatest contribution to the success of the measure in operation.

If I can be of any service to you at this or any other time, please do not hesitate to call on me. I expect to return to my home in Lufkin, Tex., upon discharge from the Navy within the next month.

Yours very truly,
ARTHUR TEMPLE, JR.,
S1c, Units 3 and 4, Building 1200, Disbursing Section; Duty, United States Navy Personnel Separation Center, Great Lakes, Ill.

Substandard Wages Paid in So-Called High-Wage Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. GEELAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. GEELAN. Mr. Speaker, there is a widespread notion among people in this country, most of whom should be better informed, that substandard wages are paid only to workers in the Southern States or in a few isolated spots in this country. Actually, very low wages are paid to a proportion of workers in all parts of the country including those sections that are commonly supposed to be high-wage areas. You will find pockets as it were, of substandard wages in all parts of this country—North, South, East, and West. Actually, the only differences between certain regions insofar as wages is concerned, is the extent and severity of substandard wages in one place as compared to another. The entire Nation needs the protection of legislation which would amend the Fair Labor Standards Act and thus raise wages everywhere nearer to what may be considered an "American standard." To illustrate this point, I wish to reproduce herewith an editorial appearing in the Connecticut Vanguard in its January 1946 issue. I quote:

COMPANY CASE SHOWS MINIMUM-WAGE LAW NEED

We have a left-handed compliment to pay to a certain company. This firm has been running newspaper advertisements seeking female employees at 55 cents an hour. There are other firms around the State paying wages as low as this, but few have the courage to come right out in public and admit it. Congratulations to this company on its courage.

The vanguard is grateful to this company for helping the CIO to dispel the myth of high wages. The CIO is doing some work in this direction itself, but an employer with the frankness of this company can always do it better.

A contract, which includes the 55-cent rate, was recently negotiated with the company by the union of mine, mill, and smelter workers. No apology is due from the union. Before negotiations the minimum pay rate was 45 cents. What the union accomplished was an increase amounting to more than 22 percent. In addition, the union obtained the inclusion in the contract of a wage reopening clause, so that a further increase can be asked following settlement of the general wage drive in the area. In other words, the union is not through with the company.

But the union should not in the first place have had to fight for a wage raise from a paltry 45 cents an hour to a puny 55 cents. A minimum wage at a standard of decency should be a matter of law. It should be possible for unions to concentrate on raising pay standards above the minimums of decency and not be compelled to devote time to lifting pay levels out of the gutter.

If Congress would pass the Pepper amendment to the minimum-wage law a Federal floor under wages of 65 cents an hour would be established.

The CIO talks a good deal today about the need of a social conscience among industrial employers. This particular company's case seems to us to be a case in point. This firm is hiring women employees at 55 cents an hour, $22 a week, $1,144 a year—less deductions. The president of the company is paid $48,000 a year; the vice president receives $30,000; and the executive vice president, $26,979. Directors and five officers, including the afore-mentioned, receive a total of $140,979.

We can't help wondering how people like these feel about consigning their employees to substandard living when they themselves, out of the profits of the same industry, live so richly.

Letter of Ralph R. Todd, of Greensboro, N. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a letter received from Mr. Ralph R. Todd, a veteran who has seen 3½ years of service, from Greensboro, N. C., outlining, in my opinion, sound suggestions:

GREENSBORO, N. C., *February 8, 1946.*
The Honorable CARL L. DURHAM,
Congressman, Sixth District North Carolina, House of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The writer has just returned from service after 3½ years, with 2 years in the ETO, and it was decided that many of us would write our Congressmen immediately upon our return and express our views in regard to certain matters—for what they are worth:

SECURITY

We feel we must have a strong Army in order to win the peace—troops for the Zone of Interior, occupation forces, and a strong commitment to back up UNO. If necessary to do so to maintain this security force, we should by all means continue the draft. However, a program should be instigated to sell these men going in now on the idea that the job they are doing is just as important as the job the men did during the war—that what we do now and the manner in which we do it is going to determine whether we have a long period of peace, or continue major wars at 10- to 20-year intervals.

FOREIGN POLICY

It is felt we should have a strong foreign policy, with the necessary force to back it up. There is already some talk about the State Department recognizing the forceful acquisition of the Baltics by Russia, which is definitely against point 6 of President

Truman's 12-point foreign policy and represents an appeasement policy which has already proven itself to be the road toward trouble. These European countries are today a seething mass of hatred—and will continue to be so as long as the major powers continue to play politics at the expense of the smaller powers. We have stated our policies in the form of the Atlantic Charter, the "four freedoms," and President Truman's foreign policy—so, let's follow through on our stated policies, whether it be in relation to the Baltics, Turkey, Iran, or any other countries, with the forces to back up our decisions. The powers we deal with today appreciate straight talk, and that's what we should give them.

UNRRA

The writer was ammunition officer throughout the entire war, and also worked as such for several months during the occupation. I have had an opportunity to work and discuss matters with hundreds of displaced persons. I have been in and out of the displaced persons camps. I have talked with numbers of my fellow officers who have been in charge of displaced persons' trains into Poland. I have discussed the matter with fellow officers in the military government. In short, I have studied the matter over a period of several months in the American occupied zone in Germany. It seems that a considerable number of people here have the mistaken idea that UNRRA is strictly a Jewish problem, which conception is quite wrong. These displaced persons are made up of refugees from the Nazis and from Russian-dominated countries; they are, for the most part, political refugees, and cannot be repatriated due to retaliation against them. Even President Roosevelt recognized this and stated that these people would not be forced back to areas where it has been proved that retaliation against them will amount to persecutions just as bad as the Nazis carried on. The plight of all these people is pitiful, and we should continue to help them to the extent of our ability, treating each and everyone on an equal basis—whether he be a Gentile, Jew, Pole, Baltic, Balkan—in all matters, food, housing, immigration privileges, etc., until the problem is settled. To do otherwise is inhumane and breeds for trouble.

FOOD FOR EUROPE

It is felt that everything possible must be done to keep the rest of the world from starving. Some of the people in Europe who were looking for the happy day for the Allies to win the war are already murmuring that "most anything is better than present conditions"—with children dying of malnutrition and others going hungry with bleak possibilities—these things make for restlessness and for trouble which breeds for fanatics like Hitler. We must help during this critical time until economic conditions begin to stabilize—if nothing else, strictly from a selfish standpoint.

INTELLIGENCE

With our world citizenship responsibilities and our security problems facing us as never before, we need in addition to our diplomatic corps and our consuls a corps of men throughout the world to report back to our State Department or some such central agency the trend of thinking of the men in the street—the bakers, local bankers, local merchants, and even local politicians, as well as to keep an eye on any war plants that may be set up in out-of-the-way areas. Experience has taught us that we get only a portion of the picture from exchange of viewpoints from our diplomats, who are told only what the respective governments want us to know. If our Government can keep abreast of the trend of thinking of the masses, utilize this information, and set policies accordingly, it is felt we could go a long way toward eliminating future conflicts.

It is hoped that out of the millions of men overseas who had an opportunity to study conditions and gather conclusions, that many of them will take the opportunity to pass these impressions to those responsible for setting up our policies—not as a member of a pressure group—or not with an ax to grind. If this is done and the impressions are channeled in the right directions, I feel a great deal will have been accomplished.

Thanking you, I remain,

Sincerely,

RALPH R. TODD.

Lithuania and Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article entitled "Lithuania and Liberty," by Dr. W. Elmer Ekblaw, of Clark University, Worcester, Mass., eminent scholar and public figure.

This article concisely sets forth the case of Lithuanian freedom and the urgent need for relieving that afflicted country and noble people of cruel oppression and unwelcome domination.

I urge our State Department to act at once through the use of good offices to liberate Lithuania and the other Baltic and Balkan states who are seeking their sovereignty and independence.

The article follows:

LITHUANIA AND LIBERTY

(By Dr. W. Elmer Ekblaw, Clark University)

The Lithuanians in America's population have recently celebrated the twenty-eighth anniversary of their independent statehood following the First World War. By appropriate ceremonials they have recalled the opportunity for service, the vision of happiness in the promise of liberty, and the universal enthusiasm of their people, that February 16, 28 years ago, opened up for them on their political and cultural horizon. They have not only celebrated the anniversary of that glorious day, but they have reconsecrated themselves to the cause of freedom. They have resolved more firmly than ever, to crusade courageously, unceasingly, and faithfully for the restoration of that liberty, that independence of sovereignty, that bright promise of happiness and opportunity for service among the free nations of the world, which Lithuania deserves and which Russia has so treacherously and so unjustifiably wrested from her.

What of the Lithuanians in Lithuania? They dare not raise their voices in protest against the cruel fate they suffer, much less have they heart to do so, as they realize how wretched is their slavery, how cruel is their bondage, how merciless is the treatment that has become their lot under the Russian tyranny. They see little hope for the future. Betrayed by the Russian Government that deliberately and cynically violated every solemn treaty it made with their country—the Peace Pact of 1920, the Nonaggression Act of 1926, and the Mutual Assistance Pact of 1939—the people have now no chance, no strength, no power to resist the complete and ruthless Russification of their beloved land.

The political history of Lithuania for the last 6 years, albeit a record of patriotism, persistent effort for neutrality, and patient attempt to placate her two mighty enemies, Germany on the one hand, and Russia on the other, has been a sad story of delusion, despair, and final exploitation and subjugation first by one and then the other. Everything that Lithuania could honorably do to preserve her independence and integrity she did, but to no avail. A small land set between two wolfishly imperialist aggressors, she fell victim first to one and then the other, despite her determined and valiant struggle to retain her place among the free, sovereign nations. Since Russia's seizure of the little land, there has been no mercy, no justice, no salvation in sight for the Lithuanians. They are now a people in bondage, as bitter as any that ever befell any people, as savage and terrible as any that Babylon, or Rome, or any conqueror ever imposed upon any people.

The tide will turn. The day of reckoning will come—perhaps not so soon as the more hopeful Lithuanians would like, but surely. "The mills of God grind slowly, but they grind exceeding fine." The leaven of freedom is forever working. Tyranny cannot endure. Injustice cannot prevail. And so the faithful folk of Lithuanian stock in America, celebrating the anniversary of their former liberation and reasserting their right to freedom, restating their indubitable claims to justice, have sound reason for their faith, their hope.

God grant that America and Britain, and all the rest of the freedom-loving nations of the world, stand steadfast for the freedom and autonomy of the Baltic States and peoples, as they have so far done; grant that there may be no wavering in their support of the rights of such small nations to liberty, and sovereignty over their own land and folk.

All honor to the faith, the courage, the patience of the Lithuanians, who dare so heroically to assert their rights; may they regain them all!

Clothing Workers Demand Passage of Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I should like to include the following statement from Jacob S. Potofsky, general secretary-treasurer of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

This organization represents 325,000 Americans, many of them veterans of World War II. I believe the Members would like to see that they have constituents who feel differently on the housing problem from the National Association of Real Estate Boards.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,

Member of Congress,

Washington, D. C.:

Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, representing 325,000 members and families, many of them veterans of this war, wholeheartedly support your housing bill and urge its passage without substitutes or crippling amendments. Veterans' housing shortage so critical that it will forever be a blot upon Congress if it fails to make low-cost materials

and housing available to them after their sacrifice to keep this country safe and free. American people will never understand Congressmen who would place private housing material and real-estate profits above essential needs of American heroes. We congratulate you on your fight and urge you to serve notice on your colleagues American people will never forget any failure to pass your splendid measure.

JACOB S. POTOFSKY,
General Secretary-Treasurer, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

Vandenberg Policy Soundly Based

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, ever since returning from Russia late last fall, I have been urging that the United States adopt and adhere to a realistic policy toward Russia exemplifying both firmness and friendliness in our Russo-American relations. Upon our return, the members of our subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee made such recommendations to President Truman, to the State Department, to the Congress, and to the country.

It is gratifying therefore, Mr. Speaker, to observe at long last that the administration seems to be veering toward a policy of firmness with Russia. Senator VANDENBERG in his historic report to the Senate last week apparently applied the prod which finally moved the State Department and the White House from the dream world in which they have been living. Following the address of the senior Michigan Senator, Secretary of State Byrnes in somewhat less definite and direct language emulated the example of Senator VANDENBERG and spoke up for American interests and American ideals. Still later, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee echoed the same sentiments.

The reaction of the American press has been almost universally favorable to the positions outlined by Senators Vandenberg and Connally and by Secretary of State Byrnes. As an example, I call your attention to the following editorial from the Sioux Falls Daily Argus Leader, published in Sioux Falls, S. Dak.:

VANDENBERG POLICY SOUNDLY BASED

Among the significant speeches of the year in Congress was that by Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG when he reported this week on his observations at London as an American delegate to the UNO meeting in London.

Out of his experience at the UNO session came the profound impression, he told his colleagues, that the time has come to deal firmly with Russia.

The United States and Russia, he believes, can live together in reasonable harmony. But, he insists, we must be ready (1) to speak as plainly as Russia does and (2) to sustain our purposes just as vigorously as Russia does hers.

Clearly, therefore, he does not advocate a policy of appeasement. Instead he is suggesting that we be firm and that we be articulate. He wants the United States to speak out and to insist that our policies command the position they merit.

Obviously he is not in sympathy with those who seem to be of the impression that we must soft-pedal our criticism of Russia and that we must retreat from our objectives to keep the Russian bear in good humor.

Senator VANDENBERG's ideas should command attention because of the experience from which he draws his deductions. He has been in London for the past 2 months attending the UNO deliberations where he has had an opportunity to deal with the Russians and to study with other nations the problems of the world. Because he is a competent and qualified observer, we should heed his recommendations.

Interesting, too, is the fact that his observations duplicate those given to the Sioux Falls Chamber of Commerce last December by Representative KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota, just after he had returned from a tour of Russia. He said then that we can get along with Russia but that we must be willing to speak out and to say "No" to that country when our ideals and circumstances so advise.

Mr. Speaker, Russia is a strong nation and she respects strength rather than vacillation. In her choice of friends among the family of nations she is attracted to those who say what they mean and mean what they say. In developing a pattern of international relations whereby Russia and America can jointly help preserve order, equity, and peace in the world, therefore, it is important that our American statesmen be both definite and firm. A continuation of the appeasement attitudes which have marred our dealings with Russia to date can lead only to disdain on the part of the Russians and disillusionment on the part of the rest of the world.

Housing Facilities for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
TUCSON CHAPTER, NO. 4,
February 26, 1946.

Representative RICHARD HARLESS,
Representative from Arizona,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HARLESS: At a meeting of the Disabled American Veterans, Chapters 2, 4, and 8, representing a membership of 1,440, held on Friday, February 22, 1946, a motion was made that a resolution be sent to our Arizona delegates in Washington setting forth the plight of the World War II veteran in obtaining housing facilities in the city of Tucson.

"Be it resolved, That we, the Disabled American Veterans, request the proper governmental authorities come to Tucson and set up a housing program for World War II veterans similar to that projected for war workers during the years 1942 through 1945."

In explanation of the above resolution, we wish to cite the following facts:

1. That old residences now are selling on the average for about twice their 1940 value.

2. That World War II veterans are not getting a large enough percentage of the available building supplies, evidenced by the erection of many new warehouses, stores, and large homes far too expensive for the average veteran.

3. That many veterans are coming to southern Arizona for health reasons. We feel that it is a governmental obligation to make it possible for these men to be able to stay here in order to rehabilitate themselves in this advantageous climate.

Thanking you for any consideration you may give this matter, we are,

Respectfully yours,
EDWARD F. WEIL,
Commander, Chapter 4.
JOHN BLACKAZ,
Commander, Chapter 2.
R. GODDARD,
Vice Commander, Chapter 8.

Selling America by Short Wave

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a very pertinent and informative article by Richard L. Strout, carried in the Christian Science Monitor, on the subject of selling America by short wave:

SELLING AMERICA BY SHORT WAVE

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—The State Department now broadcasts texts of important speeches and documents, and also news, to foreign countries. Whether this will continue depends on what disposition is made of the great governmental broadcasting plants leased, built, or acquired during the war.

The Associated Press recently decided not to let the State Department use its services as one of the sources of its news broadcasts to foreign nations, and the United Press followed suit. The AP and UP argued that the Government cannot engage in news broadcasting without creating the fear of propaganda.

The International News Service is continuing its service to the Government. At the same time the Associated Press continues to furnish its news to the British Broadcasting Corp., a quasi-governmental institution, and to Tass, the Russian Government news agency.

During the war, the OWI sent out extensive news, as did the Office of Inter-American Affairs. Now the State Department wants to continue the service, on a greatly reduced scale. The world, it says, is eager to hear about the United States. Britain and Russia are actively distributing news. The State Department would like three things: (1) Appointment of information officers at principal embassies and legations; (2) continuation of its present practice of distributing full texts of important statements and speeches, sent abroad by radio telegraph, and (3) some form of news broadcasts.

There are two sides to the argument. Against the service is the dislike of Government competing with private business, the fear of propaganda, the reluctance of the AP and UP to being connected with a Government enterprise which, they apprehend, may not only constitute propaganda itself, but may bring them under foreign suspicion of being Government organs. Carl W. Ackerman, dean of the Columbia School of Journalism,

supports their position, as does Edwin L. James, managing editor of the New York Times, who declares "there may arise a real issue of objectivity in the Government's news coverage, of a Presidential campaign, for instance."

The withdrawal of AP and UP will not, of itself, stop the State Department's broadcasts, though it may weaken its influence somewhat by clouding it with suspicion abroad. Ultimately, Congress will determine whether the State Department activity is continued by voting or withholding funds.

There seems no doubt that the world wants news about the United States. Also that some of the news it is getting, even in the most favorable countries, like Britain, is sketchy. Without official texts, for instance, it would be hard even for British editorial writers to comment satisfactorily on a Truman speech of which they may get 300 words by cable. In three areas, southeast Europe (including the Balkans), in the Middle East, and in southwest Asia, private American news agencies have few, if any, clients. If the State Department short-wave broadcasts end, British and Soviet broadcasts will have the field to themselves. American democracy won't have much voice.

"The greatest single need I found was for widespread dissemination of news and information concerning our country," Maury Maverick, retiring Chairman of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, said recently on returning from a tour of the Pacific.

"The outside world is eager for more knowledge of America," commented Herbert Agar, editor and historian, formerly connected with war news dissemination.

Ralph McGill, editor of the Atlanta Constitution, unpaid consultant to the State Department in setting up its information program, asserts that the State Department's broadcasts "are neither propaganda nor competition in the dissemination of news."

Recent debates in Parliament show no signs of dropping the B. B. C. overseas broadcasts. Among other things, officials say they are good-will factors in selling British goods abroad.

The question is literally still "in the air." The trade journal, Editor and Publisher, has asked the AP and UP to reconsider their action, while unsympathetic Time magazine asserts they are motivated by reasons which it calls obscurely mystical.

Strong arguments, perhaps, can be made on either side, at least as to methods. But over the need of telling the world about American democracy, there seems little disagreement.

The Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two wires I have received, one from Mr. Ferd Kramer, president of the Metropolitan Housing Council of Chicago, and one from Mr. Louis Wirth, chairman of the Committee on the Chicago Housing Crisis, Chicago, Ill.:

CHICAGO, ILL., *March 4, 1946.*
Hon. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

We consider passage of premium payment plan being voted on in Patman bill today key to accomplishment of entire Wyatt program. Veteran housing crisis in Chicago grows more desperate daily. Must have action. Urge you lend full support to passage of premium payment provision today and all other legislation needed to implement Wyatt program.

METROPOLITAN HOUSING
COUNCIL OF CHICAGO.
FRED KRAMER, *President.*

CHICAGO, ILL., *March 4, 1946.*
Hon. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge immediate enactment of entire program suggested by Administrator Wyatt. We vigorously protest against any crippling amendment or vetoing of premium payments since we regard them as essential to prevent inflationary price increases and for full mobilization of capacity to produce.

COMMITTEE ON THE
CHICAGO HOUSING CRISIS.
LOUIS WIRTH, *Chairman.*

The Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish at this point to include the following remarks in opposition to the Patman bill, H. R. 4761, to amend the National Housing Act.

I have been wondering if this plan, the Patman bill, which proposes to give servicemen homes and about which we have been doing so much talking, will do the job.

Of course, we all want to see our servicemen have a place to live, but will this plan succeed? A plan conceived, I fear, mostly by inexperienced theorists, economists, and analysts, quite a few of whom have not even had any real business experience, say nothing about building or property experience—I mean by that statement properties other than their homes that they have rented, sold, or bought on the open market.

If this plan is adopted I think I can visualize what it will do to the small-town lumber and building-material dealers. The fabricators will get what meager supply of building material is available while the small-town markets and farmers—where houses are even scarcer in proportion than in the cities—cannot get materials for their servicemen.

Here are the materials that must be produced which are subject to distribution controls through priorities: lumber, concrete block, clay sewer pipe, structural clay tile, cast-iron soil pipe, cast-iron radiation, common brick, millwork, face brick, gypsum board, gypsum lath, and bathtubs. What has happened that all these essential building materials are lacking? Have we exhausted raw material supply? Or plant production? No.

Here, for example, is an instance of OPA action that has resulted in increased production. After 6 months' delay, OPA granted a 4 to 10 percent price adjustment that allowed 125 of 400 closed brick and tile plants to reopen. This price adjustment allowed these plants and 400 others that had been operating, to hire needed labor. As a result, in the next quarter, production rose 35 percent.

But in hardwood flooring, siding, plywood, millwork, and construction lumber, OPA clings to its wartime formulas. Instead, OPA follows the unrealistic policy of allowing premium prices to mills for producing lumber for such things as export to foreign countries and for items that were needed in wartime industries.

In 1925 a million homes were built by private industry, and homes will not be built now unless private industry builds them.

Will the housing expediter do like the War Production Board did during the war—flounder around until the President had to call in men with extensive business experience, such as Mr. Wilson, to get war materials produced and Mr. Jeffers to get rubber produced in sufficient supply? Is this a carefully camouflaged political scheme to get another huge Federal bureau going so there will be more votes for the fall election? I have been a Member of this body since January 1943 and have heard a lot of speeches by my colleagues on this floor condemning bureaus and bureaucrats. Now we reverse ourselves and endeavor to set up a bureau that will be one of the largest, if not the largest, yet established.

Why not let the Federal Works Agency handle this project if the Government must get deeper into the building business? The Public Buildings and Grounds Committee is in the building business and has had a chance to see and learn about the Federal Works Agency and its operation. It is staffed with men who have building experience; it is already going and could handle this Patman brainstorm, if the Government insists on getting in the building business and competing with private business.

As evidence of its ability to build houses, the Federal Works Agency in one operation, let contracts for 49,000 houses in 5 weeks' time and has actually built 90,000 houses, so if we must have a bureau dabbling in the building field why not call in the Federal Works Agency, which I am satisfied can do the job without increasing its personnel?

I think all that needs to be done to get houses going is to take the OPA off the necks of the manufacturers of building materials and the retail lumber and building-material dealers of the country. Everyone, I am sure, will agree with me that it took production to win the war—now at this stage of reconversion it will take production to win the economic and psychological peace, not only here in America but all over the world.

Comptroller Lindsay Warren says there are 10 agencies in Federal construction, 10 in materials and construction and now we have a plan before us to set up the biggest one yet.

The Patman bill is unsatisfactory and the Wolcott substitute, while it is an improvement, does not insure production and without production priorities will not be worth the paper on which they are written.

This bill should be sent back to committee and more extensive hearings held, then let us do everything possible in the way of removing restrictions in order to really start production of building materials.

Truman O. K.'s Program for 2,700,000 Homes for Vets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from PM for February 7, 1946:

TRUMAN O. K.'S PROGRAM FOR 2,700,000 HOMES FOR VETS—PLAN TO COMPLETE $20,000,000,000 PROJECT IN 22 MONTHS

(By Gordon H. Cole)

WASHINGTON, February 7.—Wilson Wyatt, National Housing Administrator, has received White House approval on a new emergency housing program for construction of 2,700,000 new homes for veterans within the next 22 months, it was learned today.

Wyatt's program, aiming for an estimated $20,000,000,000 in new housing within 2 years, is the most ambitious home construction program ever attempted by the United States of America. The Nation's construction record, set in 1927, was just over 900,000 dwelling units built in a single year.

Announcement of Wyatt's program is expected within the next 24 hours.

TO GET PRIORITY

With the formal announcement, Wyatt is expected to order postponement of virtually all new commercial, industrial, and other deferrable construction until the veterans have been housed.

Instead of 400,000 new homes this year, proposed by Wyatt's predecessor, John B. Blandford, Wyatt is raising the Government's sights to shoot for 1,000,000 new homes by December 31, this year, and 1,700,000 additional homes by the end of 1947.

To fix such a goal, Wyatt has been forced to discard the old "building-as-usual" philosophy which has enfeebled earlier Government attempts to cope with the housing shortage. Conventional materials and conventional construction are expected to produce two-thirds of the new homes.

In addition, Wyatt is proposing substantial Federal subsidies to encourage the production of prefabricated and factory-built houses. Prefabricators are being asked to produce 825,000 new houses by the end of next year—a production record never even imagined by most prefabricators.

WYATT'S PROGRAM

Factory production is to be used, under Wyatt's program, to provide low-cost homes selling for less than $5,000. At present material prices, conventional contractors are virtually frozen out of this lowest price range and little competition is expected with regular builders.

Wyatt's program further provides:

Joint State and municipal operation of the program with city assistance to help the Federal Government keep nonessential building from eating up scarce materials.

Federal subsidies are to be paid material producers to absorb wage increases necessary to attract labor without raising the price to home owners.

Markets are to be guaranteed material producers. Premium payments will be considered for producers who raise output over the established quota.

The Government is to absorb undue risk in experimentation with new materials and new production methods.

Tax incentives are to be offered new firms who take exceptional risks in the use of war plants for the production of materials, parts, or completed homes.

A program has been worked out for recruiting and training 1,500,000 new building materials and building trades workers.

As an essential part of this program, Wyatt is renewing his request for price ceilings on new houses, old houses, and on vacant lots.

All new construction will be for veterans. Nonveteran families will be required to prove hardship to be entitled to new housing during this program.

To take care of the long-range housing needs of the Nation, Wyatt is urging enactment of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill, now pending in the Senate.

Some of the Fruits of Our War—Gleanings From 1 Day's Issue of a Washington Newspaper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following articles:

AMERICAN INVESTMENTS ABROAD TO REMAIN TANGLED FOR YEARS

(By Associated Press)

Under plans laid down at Potsdam, Germany will be stripped of its industrial war potential, and its manufacturing output for export will be limited to what the country must pay for imports essential to its domestic economy.

Industrial machinery beyond this basic core will be dismantled and, in most cases, be used as reparations to replace and rehabilitate industries looted or devastated by the Nazis throughout Europe.

Government officials said some of this machinery will be American owned. They estimated that American investments in Germany before the war totaled approximately $1,300,000,000.

OPPORTUNITY TO BUY

Under present plans, the American owners would be given first opportunity to purchase their own property, for use somewhere outside Germany, while retaining a claim for war damage against the Government. But this procedure has not received, as yet, the wholehearted approval of this Government.

(By Richard Cushing)

DAIREN, MANCHURIA, February 26 (Delayed).—This port city of Manchuria, occupied by Red Army troops, is considered by the Russians as their own personal property for the moment. From all indications, they are in a forceful condition to stay.

Full-dress Red Army maneuvers are being held over extensive areas of the rolling country to the north of Dairen.

The Russians have built tremendous military strength in Dairen, 30 miles from the big naval base at Port Arthur and clearly are seen to be taking a strong hold here.

CLOSE SURVEILLANCE

Official Soviet secret police are keeping foreigners under close surveillance.

Huge quantities of industrial machinery, I have been informed reliably, have been taken from Manchurian factories as booty of the Russians' 10-day war and shipped to Vladivostok. I was told that 80 percent of the equipment of the Anshan steelworks between Dairen and Mukden was put aboard 30 freighters which sailed for Vladivostok in a convoy last year.

(In a broadcast from Tientsin, China, monitored in San Francisco by the American Broadcasting Co., Frederick B. Opper, of ABC, said 20 of the 30 ships were Liberty ships lend-leased to Russia by the United States.)

Staff Sgt. Dick Wilkins, of New York, of the Army newspaper Stars and Stripes, Associated Press photographer Julian Wilson, of Louisville, Ky., and I rode into Dairen on Soviet trains yesterday.

Mile after mile we saw Red forces in military maneuvers. They employed tanks, mortars, and antiaircraft guns. American lease-lend tanks were in evidence.

BIG BATTERIES SEEN

As we neared Dairen we could see, on either side, fully equipped soldiers crawling across fields on their bellies in mock battle rows. Rows of surprisingly big antiaircraft batteries were being placed in strategic spots.

The Soviet commandant at Dairen, stocky Lt. Gen. George Kirilovitch Kostov, obviously was surprised by the arrival of American newsmen in this bristling garrison port.

He declared that we "were not in Manchuria," that our China theater credentials were invalid and that we definitely were out of place.

The general informed us we would be restricted to a hotel, guarded and dispatched to Mukden on the next train. Refusing to grant an interview, he suggested we remain in our rooms so our "security would not be endangered."

Today we were taken under arrest to the railroad station by three armed guards and put aboard a troop train.

Considerable mystery has surrounded the recent disappearance of several Dairen White Russians, one an interpreter for the Reds.

"White Russians aren't treated any too well by the Reds," I was informed.

"We don't like to work for the Soviets. You never know what will happen to you when they don't need you any more."

FIFTY THOUSAND RUSSIANS IN NAZI ARMY TURNED OVER TO SOVIET BY UNITED STATES

(By the Associated Press)

FRANKFURT, March 2.—The United States Army has turned over to Soviet Russia more than 50,000 men caught fighting for Germany who have been classified as Russian nationals.

Prisoner of war camps in the American zone are nearly empty of the Russians. It is explained here that under an agreement at Yalta the United States committed itself to turn over to the Soviet Union all Russian citizens who were captured in German uniforms, who were members of the Red Army and could not show discharges, or who were accused by Russia of voluntarily giving aid and comfort to the enemy.

This was to be done without regard to their personal wishes, and by force if necessary.

What awaits these men in Russian territory is not known here, but frenzied efforts by some of them to escape going there indicates that they do not contemplate the prospect with pleasure. At least 10 have committed suicide. Others wounded themselves and many have forcibly resisted attempts by their American captors to put them on trains headed for Russia.

Many of the suspects try to hide their nationality and the job of finding them among

millions of prisoners is difficult. Russian investigators scan the prisoner of war rosters and point out those they suspect. However, all suspects receive hearings from joint Russian-American screening boards.

Only about 700 of the suspects remain in the American zone.

MUKDEN, February 28 (Delayed).—Maj. Gen. Andrei Kovtounstankevitch, Soviet commandant in Mukden, told American correspondents today that Japanese prisoners of war in this area are being sent to Siberian camps instead of being repatriated.

The general said he did not know precisely where they were sent or for what purpose, only that they were disarmed and dispatched to Siberia by train.

The general had been asked whether the Japanese had been sent north as slave labor crews in the same manner Germans were employed in Russian reconstruction. He said he was surprised such a question could be asked.

(By the Associated Press)

NUERNBERG, March 2.—The International Military Tribunal in a closed session today deliberated the prosecution demand for a criminal judgment against six Nazi organizations—the SA (storm troopers), the SS (Elite Guard), the Leadership Corps, Gestapo, Reich Cabinet, and the high command and General Staff.

If the tribunal holds that the six organizations are criminal, the prosecution estimated that approximately 2,000,000 Germans might be liable to punishment. The defense said 7,000,000, including the turn-over in membership in the organizations, would be liable.

Labor's Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a speech recently made by the Honorable John C. Knox, judge of the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, on the subject of labor unrest, on February 28 before the One Hundred Club in New York City.

Judge Knox speaks with authority and commands the respect of every American citizen. No one, by the wildest stretch of the imagination, could call Judge Knox a labor-baiter. He is a sincere friend of labor and in this address he shows his concern about its irresponsible leadership. He approaches this subject in a calm, judicial manner with a background of definite experience in the settlement of labor disputes.

I endorse his views most heartily as being sound and thoroughly American and as representing the ideas of the true friends of labor, who look for a better understanding between industry and the workingman. There is no reason in the world why it shouldn't be brought about and men like Judge Knox contribute immeasurably to that end.

The speech follows:

My presence here tonight is due, I suppose, to the fact that recently I gave an interview to a newspaper reporter and was bold enough to suggest that disputes between capital and labor should be settled peacefully, rather than by gage of battle. That suggestion met with a response that is little short of amazing, and I am pleased that some of your members thought it worthy of discussion at a meeting of this organization.

You should understand at the outset that I make no pretense of being an expert upon labor's relationship with capital. I have, nevertheless, had some experience in dealing with labor unions. A few years ago, when the fur workers' union was dominated by Louis Lepke and Jacob Gurrah, I became acquainted with the brutalities that characterized their activities. Included among these were bombings, arson, stabbing, acid-throwing, and probably murder. After the conclusion of the trial in which these disorders were revealed, it was my privilege to send both of these ruffians to jail. Lepke, you may remember, was later convicted of homicide, and died in the electric chair.

It may also interest you to know that, over the past 10 years, I have arbitrated numerous disputes between unions and management. These arbitrations have had to do with numerous differences that had arisen between the electrical workers' union and New York newspapers—the typographical union and Newark newspapers—and, most recently, with a dispute between the Mutual Life Insurance Co. and its elevator operators.

In addition to this experience, I have been a Federal judge for almost 28 years. Within that time, and in the trial of a thousand lawsuits, I have come to know the processes by which involved and complicated questions between opposing litigants can be adjudicated peaceably, justly, and to the satisfaction of both of the parties and the public. Similar processes, in my judgment, can be made applicable to the labor troubles that have so long plagued the land in which we live. If there be merit in the thought that I indulge, it is high time that these processes be put into operation.

From the day on which Cain killed Abel, human beings have engaged in strife, controversy, and cavil. They will, I fear, continue to do so until the crack of doom. It, therefore, becomes a task of civilization, not alone to prevent wars among the nations of the world, but to see to it that capital, on one hand, and labor, on the other, shall be required to settle their controversies without breaches of the public peace.

TRIAL BY COMBAT

Once upon a time, in the days of William the Conqueror, subjects might, in resolving their disputes, resort to trial by battle. Each of the disputants could choose his champion, and these two, on a day appointed, would repair to a 60-foot square to engage in physical combat. They would be accompanied by scarlet-robed judges of the court of common pleas, as well as by sergeants of law. This meeting would take place at sunrise, and, upon proclamation that the court was in session, a knight would introduce the champions.

The gladiators would be dressed in armor with red sandals. Their limbs were bare below the knees and the elbows. Arming themselves with 4-foot batons, each of the contestants wearing four-cornered targets, the men would begin their battle. If one did not vanquish the other before sundown, they were required to fight until stars shone in the sky. When this occurred—and if the case were one between a tenant and his landlord—the tenant won his suit. This would follow, too, if the tenant's champion was the victor. However, if the tenant's champion went to his death, or turned craven, the landlord was entitled to judgment.

Thus, in a bygone day, lawsuits were tried. This procedure, without any semblance of right or justice about it, now seems uncivilized and ridiculous. And so it was. At the same time, it possessed one cardinal virtue: The gladiators fought each other and did not disturb the public peace.

But, here in America—when strikes and lock-outs occur—the combatants not only fight each other, but engage in mortal combat with you and with me. Moreover, their acts are condoned by law and excused by public authority. Let me illustrate:

A little more than 2 weeks ago this town was a beleaguered city. Due to a strike of some 3,000 men, 6,000,000 people, in almost zero weather, were cut off from their supply of fuel. Tugboats, it is true, had been taken over by the Government, but this, so far as the strikers were concerned, was an idle gesture. They disdained to work for the United States.

Rather than do so, the workers decided—for all they cared—that the aged, the infirm, the sick, and the young might freeze to death. Upon their refusal to work, what happened? Did the Government operate the boats? It did nothing of the kind.

What would it have done had 3,000 German or Japanese soldiers cut the supply line on which this city depends for comfort, health, and life itself? The Army and Navy of the United States would have come to our rescue, and we would have had our fuel in less time than it takes to tell the tale. But not so in this case. A labor union was involved, and the power and might of government—strong enough to bring Germany and Japan to their knees—suddenly lapsed into a state of impotence.

MERCHANTS PENALIZED

What then took place? A peaceful community was put under a regime that was nothing less than martial law. Business houses, places of amusement, public schools, and places of worship were told to close their doors, and they did. For this dislocation of normal city life the merchants of New York were penalized to the extent of millions upon millions of dollars. Immediately following this period of inconvenience, danger, and loss something happened. It was this:

On the next day the owners of the tugboats, together with their operatives, quickly decided that their dispute was one that might amicably be settled, and the siege of New York was lifted. Three arbitrators are now engaged in adjusting the differences that caused the strike. But when they make their decision who knows for certain that it will be enforced? The country's steelworkers failed to observe the terms of their contract. Other unions may, if they choose, do likewise. If so, we may again be subjected to a state of siege.

You should know, at this point, that I am heartily in favor of labor unions. Were it not for them, the workers in industry, due to the selfishness of management, would face a barren and unhappy future. Unionism has done much to dignify their callings, and to raise their standards of living. I devoutly hope these accomplishments will be both secured and bettered. I don't, however, subscribe to the idea that the rights of labor are superior to those of the public. In my judgment, both capital and labor should be required to subject themselves to the rigors of law and order and to the preservation of the public welfare.

COURTS OF PEACE

Now, in what I am about to say, I wish you to know that I am not opposed to the use of conciliation and arbitration in labor disputes. If these devices, or either of them, can be effectively employed to bring about and maintain harmonious relations between

management and workers, I say, "More power to them." But, when these methods fail to adjust differences, and when such failure threatens to subject the public to inconvenience, loss, and open disorder, some other medium of determining labor disputes should be available to either or both disputants.

Just as courts of law have superseded the gage of battle in the settlement of private quarrels, similar courts, in which labor controversies peacefully can be determined, should be established. If this were done, and if they were manned by upright, intelligent, fair-minded men, I firmly believe that before very long, both capital and labor would look upon them with confidence and respect. If so, we could be relieved of the economic and social losses that are now suffered by both management and labor, and most of all by the public.

Day in and day out, the court in which I sit is constantly deciding controversies quite as intricate and involved as any that were in issue in a labor dispute. Moreover, the litigants understand that each decision means what it says, and that it must be obeyed. The result is that the peace, order, and security of the community are, at all times, maintained. If this country is to thrive and prosper; if it is to be free and happy; if its integrity of government is to continue, we must devise a means by which capital, labor, and the public may live in peace.

In making approach to a solution of our present difficulties, we should constantly bear in mind that the right of a man to work is quite as precious as is the right to strike. Nevertheless, in the absence of union membership, thousands upon thousands of men are denied the privilege of earning a livelihood. I should imagine that, in their judgment, the freedoms about which we constantly prate and boast are little more than sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal.

And as we give thought to the man who wants to work and can't, we should also remember the union members who go on strike not because of their wish to do so but because they must. These men, I have reason to believe, can be counted by the thousands. If any of them dares criticize the leader who calls an unwarranted strike, he is a marked man from that day on. By one pretense or another, suspension or expulsion from the union is likely to be his portion.

PLIGHT OF THE WORKER

When this occurs, the worker will be deprived of his job and prevented from getting another. Indeed, luck will be his if he is not subjected to mayhem and torture. And yet, whatever happens to the worker, he is, from a practical standpoint, without the slightest chance of redress. Repressed in their utterances, dominated in their actions, and victimized frequently by officials who should give them protection, the lot of many of our workers has some of the characteristics that marked the slave laborers in Germany. These conditions should, and ultimately must, end.

For what reason, too, should this country tolerate the warfare that is waged over jurisdictional disputes between rival and competing unions? As the leaders of these unions engage their men in industrial strife; as factories close down, and men chafe in idleness, money ceases to circulate, machines grow rusty, consumer demand goes unsatisfied, women and children become hungry, and humanity is insufficiently clad. And all this in the name of union labor.

If our politicians, and many of our public officials, were forthright and spoke the truth, they would ascribe the blame for this situation to the men who, in their struggle for personal power and aggrandizement, are willing that industry should be prostrate; that people should starve, and that the country should finance the campaigns that some labor leaders fight against us.

Two days ago, this city was threatened with a strike of its transport workers—many of them civil-service employees of the municipality, and entitled to benefits not ordinarily available to the workers in private industry. And who was primarily responsible for that threat to our convenience and safety? That answer is easy. His name is Quill, and, what is more, he is a member of the Council of the city of New York.

Sworn to protect and defend the rights of the populace whose laws he helps to make, his loyalty to his union takes precedence over his allegiance to the public which elected him to office. Unless we are alert and ready to protect ourselves, it is entirely possible that union labor—a distinct minority of the population—will rule the majority. And, if this comes about, it will rule with a hand that is both hard and ruthless.

When labor unions countenance strife and disorder, and when, fearful of the loss of income and numerical strength, they tolerate racketeering upon the part of subordinate locals, it is high time that the public cease to listen to the emotional appeals with which labor dins our ears, and insist that, when labor speaks, it shall do so, not only with reasonableness and realism, but with a sense of its own responsibility to the public welfare.

Let us face the fact that if some of our leaders of labor be not curbed, they may, conceivably, wreck industry, destroy the capitalistic system, and change our form of government. Within my own courtroom, a communistic labor leader has declared that, if the court could not find the money with which to meet his demands, it would be well to permit the company, whose affairs were under administration, to be operated by its employees, who, he said, were the true owners of its property.

As between labor and government, as between capital and government; as between anybody and government, I stand for the authority of government—and the present form of government—over each and all of them!

It were well that all of us should now reach the conclusion that, if men are to be free, and if they are to enjoy the blessings of freedom, they should no longer toy with the thought that the ideology either of fascism or communism will give relief from the tribulation that afflicts us.

Lobbyists Attempting To Control Votes of Congress—Patman Charges Real-Estate Spokesmen With Attempting To Dupe Legitimate Builders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I should like to include the script of a radio debate between myself and the able Congressman from California, Representative CARL HINSHAW, which was broadcast over WINX on Sunday, March 3, at 12:15 p. m., on a program entitled "Is Congress Doing the Job?"

Mr. HART. This is Ed Hart speaking to you from Washington. On January 3 President Truman told the people that we urgently need 5,000,000 additional homes now. It is clear, therefore, that this is an emergency problem which calls for an emergency method of solution. The administration forces in Congress were slow to act. Then one day the President's Housing Expediter, Mr. Wilson Wyatt, stated, in effect, that every day Congress fiddled 3,000 houses were never built. That statement burned white anger in the minds of the people who were looking in vain for a place to live.

Recently Congress began consideration of the housing bill—the Patman housing bill—an administration measure. One of our guests today is Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, author of that bill. He will present his case. Our other guest is Representative CARL HINSHAW, Republican, of California, who states most emphatically that he is not against a housing program, but that he does oppose the particular Patman-Wyatt-administration program.

Gentlemen, in your opinion has Congress been obstructing or aiding administrative efforts to do something about the scandalous housing shortage? Congressman PATMAN.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Hart, last November I offered the Congress a practical housing bill embodying the main features of President Truman's program. It had three objectives: First, to increase production of building materials through incentive price increases and premium payments to producers, in order to obtain the maximum volume of the lumber and brick we need. Second, to channel scarce building materials into homes for veterans. Third, to kill off inflationary speculation in existing homes until production starts.

My bill is simple—it is workable—but what has happened is unpardonable. I have a very high regard for Congressman HINSHAW, of California, my able, sincere opponent in this debate, and what I say is not personal, either as to him or any other individual.

I accuse the lobbyists of the speculative real-estate interests—the paid disciples of those who worship the great god greed—of working incessantly, spending thousands of dollars, to sabotage the efforts of Congress to provide homes for Americans, particularly veterans.

They are militantly on the job here on Capitol Hill in Washington, D. C. The veterans are being lulled to sleep, evidently, because many of these opponents are telling them that they are for the veterans. Yes; they are for them, but they oppose the only plan that is offered, and they do not propose any plan of their own to help the veterans get houses.

Not since the multi-million-dollar Wall Street lobby against the Holding Company Act of the mid thirties has Washington seen such an arrogant attempt to control the votes of Congress.

I accuse these lobbyists and their employers of attempting to profiteer out of the misery of the American people who cannot find a place to live.

I accuse them of organizing a campaign built on deliberate falsehood and innuendo. I already have requested the FBI to investigate one set of forged telegrams sent from Texas to Congressmen.

I accuse them of attempting to dupe legitimate builders with such statements as this: That this program to build more houses will put half the builders of the United States out of business.

I accuse them of urging Congressmen to stoop to personal vilification of public officials on the floor of the House because we wish to provide homes at a reasonable cost.

That is the major reason why the President's housing program is being delayed. However, there is another reason. The late President Roosevelt once said there were some "Yes, but—" men in Congress and elsewhere. Some of them still are with us. They are the men who give lip service to the veteran's cause, then sabotage our sincere efforts to help provide him a home. Congress will be doing a job if it avoids these things and passes this bill.

Mr. HART. Thank you, Mr. PATMAN. Now let's hear from Congressman HINSHAW.

Mr. HINSHAW. Well, Mr. Hart, I'm going to confine my remarks to the bill. Congress

has been working hard to assure the building of more homes, particularly for veterans, and Mr. PATMAN will agree that there is not one single Member of the House of Representatives who is not eager to assist in building as many houses as possibly can be built to meet the shortage. The Patman bill, in my judgment, would retard to slower than the present snail's pace the production of millions of houses. It would freeze the bad conditions that already exist in the housing industry and make them worse. It would create a further multiplication of the present confusion by adding a myriad of new regulations and barrels of red tape. That situation is bad enough now. What we need is to cut away the jungle of red tape so that we can see new houses.

Everyone knows that the one big bottleneck caused by that red tape, the one which is holding up home building, is the shortage of building materials. If Mr. PATMAN and his colleagues would concentrate on the most direct and effective method of producing and delivering more building materials and eliminate the unnecessary controls and red tape which are hampering builders, more homes would be built and the cost of building would be much less than it is now. The Patman bill, in my judgment, would delay building, and that is why I oppose it.

Mr. HART. Thank you, Mr. HINSHAW. You oppose the Patman bill because you see it holding up home building and adding to red tape more restrictions and confusion, while Mr. PATMAN sees passage of his bill as the step necessary for Congress to take to alleviate the tremendous housing shortage. Now I'm going to ask you: Is it really necessary to supplement the President's Executive order, which made Mr. Wilson Wyatt our Housing Expediter, with additional housing legislation? Why not let Mr. Wyatt do what he wants to do without further legislation, Mr. PATMAN?

Mr. PATMAN. One good reason, Mr. Hart, is that the Second War Powers Act expires June 30, and the power that he possesses now would expire June 30. Furthermore, he cannot stop speculative resales, which caused the speculation after World War I that was so ruinous, and he cannot break the bottlenecks in production or cut red tape, because he does not have the power under the Second War Powers Act. Therefore, this legislation is necessary.

Mr. HART. Do you want to comment on that, Mr. HINSHAW?

Mr. HINSHAW. The whole trouble with our economy today, Mr. Hart, is the multiplicity of conflicting controls and the efforts of the administration to play checkers with the complex factors which make up our economy.

Mr. HART. The next question is: Do you think it is advisable, as Mr. PATMAN suggests, in his bill, to put a ceiling price on existing houses, as he proposed in his original bill, Congressman HINSHAW?

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. PATMAN's proposal was to place a ceiling on homes at the first price that the home was sold at after this bill that he proposes is passed. But I think that Mr. PATMAN's proposal is absurd. It would encourage fraudulent and inflationary sales. If any ceiling is established it should be based on an independent appraised value, made at the time of the sale. The true appraised value is the cost of reproducing the structure at the time of sale, less depreciation and obsolescence.

Mr. PATMAN. We are trying to get away from so much bureaucratic control and regimentation. Therefore, we have adopted a simple formula—not necessarily to fix the prices on the 29,000,000 existing homes, because if they are not sold during this emergency there will be no occasion for any price at all. Present owners, under this proposal, could sell their homes at any price they could get, but that price would remain the fixed price throughout the emergency.

The Washington Post has been carrying on a campaign in favor of this proposal, pointing out how fair and reasonable it is. It will just stop speculative resales, and the speculator is the only one, to my mind, who has a right to complain.

Mr. HART. Well, now, do you think you need the $600,000,000 a year in subsidies, which Mr. Wyatt calls premium payments, to make certain that homes are built at a reasonable cost?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; I think so, because that is the only power that he will have to break these bottlenecks and cut the red tape. That method worked well during the war, when for 4 years the war workers and those of us here at home had a right to get these homes in a similar way.

Mr. HART. What do you think, sir?

Mr. HINSHAW. In my judgment, subsidies are not the things that are needed to get volume production of houses. We need first to cut out the strikes in basic industries and get back to work so that materials can be produced and put in motion; and then make judicious price-ceiling increases in the normally low-priced standard grade of building materials.

Mr. HART. Would this bill—the Patman bill—if it passes, be of practical benefit to the veteran? Would it actually help the veteran who is looking for a house?

Mr. HINSHAW. Of course, this bill won't benefit the veteran, or anybody else. Because with the load of red tape this bill would provide, the contractor couldn't possibly estimate in advance the cost of a home, and therefore he would be unwilling to guarantee a price. If he does guarantee a price, it would have to be high enough to cover the cost of all unforeseeable delays and probable idle labor costs. Of course, the Government wouldn't approve that price as a price ceiling, hence your reliable and substantial builder couldn't afford, and won't afford, to build.

Mr. PATMAN. I say that it will help the veteran, and I'll give you one illustration. These critical materials are being used now to build race tracks, saloons, honky-tonks, and everything else—commercial buildings which are not needed. This bill will channel those scarce materials into the building of homes—moderately priced homes—and give the veterans a preference, just like we gave the war workers preference during the war—give them a preference during the life of this bill, the next 18 months.

Mr. HART. All right. Now, here is the final question: There have been charges and counter charges that pressure has been brought to bear on Congress from outside sources in regard to this bill. What about this, gentlemen? Have you been subjected to outside pressure? Lobbying, to speak plainly.

Mr. PATMAN. The Crane Co., one of America's largest and most highly respected manufacturers of plumbing equipment, has been forced to cancel its membership in the Producers' Council because of the untruthful and sordid lobbying activities this council is conducting against this bill. The National Association of Real Estate Boards and its executive secretary, Mr. Herbert Nelson, has been conducting a very sordid and untruthful campaign against housing for veterans. Now that organization is offering a $30,000,000,000 bonus bill as an alternative—not a bonus to the veterans, but a bonus to the speculators and gougers.

Mr. HART. Do you want to comment on that, Mr. HINSHAW?

Mr. HINSHAW. I can only say this: If the prayers of the people who produce materials and build houses not to load this new batch of red tape on their backs is considered to be lobbying, then the answer is, of course, that they have been lobbying. Would you have these men, who are responsible for carrying out a building program, be silent when they know that this red tape will keep houses from being built?

Mr. HART. Gentlemen, in closing this debate I am going to quote once again from Mr. Truman's January 3 speech, when he said: "We must utilize the same imagination, the same determination, that back in 1941 enabled us to raise our sights to overcome the Nazi and Japanese military might."

With that imagination and determination we can mobilize our resources here at home to produce the housing we require. Gentlemen, is Congress going to help or hinder us in doing this job?

Draft Versus Voluntary Enlistment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, many of the servicemen, the returning veterans, and the people back home, including the parents of the boys subject to military draft, are becoming very much interested in the subject of draft versus voluntary enlistment.

The people are beginning to think and ask whether or not the Selective Service Act should be extended beyond the date at which it will soon expire unless the Congress provides for its extension. The public generally thinks the war is over and should be officially declared at an end. They are growing impatient because the President has not issued a proclamation officially terminating the war. They frequently say that if the President will not issue the proclamation, Congress should pass the necessary resolution to bring the war to an end. But the President has urged Congress not to pass any such resolution, and perhaps for that reason the several resolutions introduced along this line have not, as yet, been acted upon.

The people are anxious to know why more young men have not volunteered their services in the various military organizations. They are beginning to seek the reason for this hesitation and delay. Many of their questions are being answered by the men who were in uniform and some of whom are still in uniform. The people generally are convinced that enough boys would volunteer their services if they had confidence in what is told them by the heads of our military organizations. But the men just coming out of the service, and many of those who are still in the service, have told us of repeated instances, almost without number, where the boys were told almost anything to get them into the service, and, after they were once in, they found the promises or statements were unauthorized and would not be carried out, and were not carried out as the boys had been promised. This has shocked the faith of young men not only in military organizations, but to a great extent in our Government and in the administration of governmental affairs. This is a deplorable situation.

Perhaps most of the boys were led to believe that as soon as hostilities ceased, the 6-month period would begin to run, and that they could shed their uniforms and get back to civilian life, to home and loved ones, within 6 months after the

shooting was over. Now they find that they were taken into the armed forces for the duration and 6 months thereafter, but that the end of the duration and the beginning of the 6-month period have not been designated. They say one of the chief reasons for their not voluntarily enlisting now is that they are afraid that there may be another catch, and they are staying clear of such snares and pitfalls as far as they can.

It is the belief of many clear-thinking people, servicemen, veterans, and near relatives of the boys, that if confidence in government, confidence in the heads of our military organizations, could be restored, and if the boys could be assured that there will be no more unauthorized statements and promises made, and if they could rely upon what is told them at the time of their induction, an adequate volunteer army could be raised to take care of the situation which now confronts us. But nobody seems to know how many men we need, and no agreed and determined basis has been established; or, if it has, the public has not been so informed, and they want to know.

I quote from the following letter which I have just received from a man who has recently returned from the service. He has written me voluntarily his own reactions, which I think are indicative of the thinking of untold hundreds of our veterans and the boys still in the service, as well as that of their parents. I quote:

It came to my attention while I was overseas as an enlisted man in the United States Army that there was a bill before the Congress to grant enlisted men the same terminal leave privilege as officers now receive. Since I have not heard anything about the bill being passed I assume that the bill either has not been acted upon or has been defeated.

I do not think it is necessary to point out to you the injustice of the present situation regarding terminal leave. At present it is the lone privilege of the medieval hierarchy.

To take my own case for an example, after 3 years of service—23 months of it overseas—I had received one 9-day furlough. Had I been an officer at the time of my discharge I would have received a total of 81 days for terminal leave for which I would have received full pay and allowances. As it was, since I was not an officer and a gentleman, I received only my mustering-out pay besides my regular pay.

The situation which I have described to you is not only an injustice but is un-American as well, since it grants a privilege to the few and denies it to the many.

I have heard, since my return to the United States last month, that both the Army and the Congress were disappointed because enlistments in the Regular Army had not been as large as they would like; but if you ask any enlisted man or former enlisted man you will get any number of reasons. To put it briefly very few men desire to serve in a medieval hierarchy after being taught democracy since his birth.

I would like for you to inform me as to the bill in question, as to whether it has been acted upon, or if it has been defeated.

The following letter is from an intelligent constitutent of mine, a prominent physician:

Due to the disturbing conditions at home and abroad, I am writing to express my views regarding the way our Army is planning to continue the drafting of our young boys after May 16.

Mr. SCHWABE, in time of war I was in full accord on drafting, but since the war is over I am absolutely against drafting our young boys away from their school and college.

In my opinion, if the Army life was made more attractive there would be plenty of volunteers to guard our surplus property and control our enemy country. Of the number of people I have talked to, I am sure there are hundreds in my locality who feel as I do about this matter.

I am quoting two paragraphs of Cedric Foster's broadcast of January 17:

"First, let the President, as Commander in Chief, investigate demobilization and tell the people exactly what he recommends as a total number for the armed forces. Then let him estimate how long it will be before volunteers can take over the job of guarding surplus property and controlling enemy countries. Then let him impress upon Army leadership that a volunteer Army can only be raised if the leadership of the professional army recognizes that * * * its present actions will be the determining factor * * * the factor in the decision of every citizen to enlist in an army to become a professional. There will be thousands upon thousands who will enlist if the pay is attractive, if the chance for advancement on the basis of merit is accorded, if the opportunity for education is given. There will be many who will enlist if the present unwarranted line of demarcation between officer and enlisted personnel is out—to use a Navy phrase, at 'position one easy' instead of always being at 'call to quarters.'

"This kind of army will keep the people's pledge as it will be a people's volunteer army. They'll keep the pledge to those who died and there were men who died. I saw them—not in Europe, because I wasn't there. But I saw them in the Pacific. I saw them dropped into the sea from the decks of an aircraft carrier. I saw them—infantrymen—buried in the red, steaming sand and in the cold, clammy mud of the Philippines. They were the life and blood of America—life given and blood shed—that all citizens of this land could live in security. Under their crosses and beneath the waves, their spirits are calling today. God forbid that we fail to heed their cries of anguish."

Mr. Speaker, Congress should approach the subject of extending the draft or the Selective Service Act with the idea of requiring our military forces to pursue their business in the American way. There is no more reason why straightforward, forthright, honest, and dependable statement of conditions should not be made to our boys in the service than those who enter into contracts pertaining to private associations and business affairs. Nor is there any excuse for our not paying our boys in uniform amounts commensurate with the service performed, taking into consideration the compensation that is paid in other departments of government and by private industry. The boys should be afforded opportunity for their mental and physical development, educational privileges, while they are in the service—particularly while in the armies of occupation. These matters have been neglected, woefully, and the people resent it. We know that time hangs heavily on the hands of those constituting the armies of occupation and in many other branches of service, when we are not engaged in war. This time can be profitably and advantageously employed, if we have the interest of the boys at heart and if they be not placed under arbitrary, autocratic, un-American, and medieval military disciplinary regulations and routines, as set forth by the authors of the above letters, and as revealed by the expressions of the boys returning from the service.

The Easiest Thing To Sell Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Concord Daily Monitor, Concord, N. H., of February 28, 1946, entitled "The Easiest Thing To Sell Us":

THE EASIEST THING TO SELL US

The proposed loan to Great Britain has had hard going, and now the French want to get in on the gravy. Their bid for something in excess of $2,000,000,000 has been a natural result of consideration of a loan to the British. And there will be other such requests from other nations so long as Uncle Sam loans money which must first be borrowed from the American people.

One of the international agreements was concerned with the creation of an international bank, to which this Nation pledged the largest contribution of working capital. It was to be the business of this bank to keep international credits and the currency of the many nations in as sound a condition as possible. Now it would seem that what Great Britain and France are asking is that the United States compete with this international bank.

In addition to chipping in generously to the capital of the international bank, and being asked to advance billions to Great Britain and France direct, this country is also charged with the business of providing relief for the unclothed and unfed peoples of Europe. The latter task is frankly recognized as one of charity, and is being handled on an international basis by UNRRA, an international agency. But it is the United States which must supply the bulk of the material relief.

The United States can be and is charitable. But there is slight call for it to be soft-hearted in matters of national finance. When it starts making loans to other nations it is soft-hearted, no matter what reasons the administration may give.

Suppose this country decided its own financial condition wasn't too good (and it isn't federally) and that instead of continuing deficit budgets it would borrow the difference between what it can raise in taxes and what it wants to spend from some other nation. What would be the attitude of the American people? They would protest vigorously. They would do either one of two things—demand that Federal expenditures be kept within income or loan the Government the money, instead of letting it go abroad for it.

What manner of pride is it which permits the British and the French to seek to tap Uncle Sam for billions? As a matter of fact the people of those nations do have pride in the matter and have indicated their dissatisfaction with the proposals of their governments. But the governments, like our own, are bent upon spending more money than there is, and more credit than is sound, now. The sounder procedure of concentration upon production and balanced budgets

and lessened inflation no longer appeals to political leaders in the western world.

This Nation may be relatively well off, but it can't raise the status of other nations by merely loaning them money. It can help them most by trading with them and by encouraging their industrialization. If we buy some of their products, they can buy some of our machinery and improve their production capacity, both for home consumption and for world commerce.

Theoretically that is the way in which the other nations propose to pay off any loans we make to them, but experience shows that we'll never collect the loans because we won't buy enough of their products. This fact should be recognized by us. It is recognized by the other nations, though they say nothing about it to us. They realize it is easier to sell us the idea of a loan to them than it is to market their products here, even though they have products which they can produce more economically than we can produce them, and we in turn have other products which they need and can't produce at all or can't produce so reasonably as we can.

If we are strong and the other nations weak, they aren't going to be made stronger by weakening us. That is just the old story of the rotten apple in the barrel causing all the good apples to rot.

Washington's Homeless Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpt of an article from the Washington Star:

WASHINGTON'S HOMELESS CHILDREN

If you don't believe there are homeless children in Washington, try advertising an apartment for rent with a note that you have no objections to them.

Mrs. John W. Hall inserted an advertisement in the Star yesterday offering to share her home at 3619 Eighteenth Street NE., with another couple.

"We have no objections to children," she wrote. "We like them."

Her telephone began to ring at 11 a. m., the minute the first edition hit the street. Mrs. Hall and her husband, an employee of the Government Printing Office, personally interviewed 26 couples. After selecting the winner they turned down 37 additional requests.

One caller had been interned by the Japanese. At least, he said, the Japanese provided sleeping quarters for his child. The Polish Embassy called, seeking accommodations for an attaché. An Army captain identified himself as a Congressional Medal of Honor winner. The Germans didn't scare him, but the housing shortage has made him a nervous wreck, he said.

"We didn't want to turn anyone down," Mrs. Hall said. "They came with pictures of their children. They brought them along. At one point there were 20 persons in our living room. They all were nice people and desperate. We wanted to give everyone a chance before deciding."

Mrs. Hall knew what they were up against because she had gone through a similar experience when her husband went to work at Wright Field, Ohio, during the war. The family finally had to buy a house there. A few months later Mr. Hall was transferred to California. Arriving in Sacramento with two small daughters after 8 days on the road, the Halls couldn't even get into a tourist camp. They managed to buy a house that afternoon.

She had a hard decision to make yesterday, but finally Mrs. Hall selected Mr. and Mrs. Bernice Wood and their 3-year-old daughter, Mary. The father, a discharged serviceman, was the first caller and said he obtained the first copy of the Star that came out.

"Mary sold herself," Mrs. Hall said. "She had blond ringlets all over her head. My little girls are blond, but they don't have any curls."

Mrs. Hall's daughters, Linda, 3½, and Anne Margaret, 4½, took one look at Mary and said:

"Mama, you did get us the baby sister we asked for."

But at 10 p. m. the telephone still was ringing. A distraught father said his family would be sleeping on the street if something wasn't done. Mrs. Hall promised to tell the story in hopes that other families with extra rooms would help out.

Homes for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED A. HARTLEY, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, Representative PETERSON of Florida and I have introduced a bill which deals with one of the Nation's greatest responsibilities to its veterans—the responsibility of tangible encouragement and assistance in securing a home.

Veterans have wearied through years of endurance with barracks and Quonset huts. The Nation cannot discharge its responsibility, or fulfill its promises, to them by providing civilian barracks restyled as veterans' housing. Real homes—the kind the veteran wants, whether in the country or in the cities—and only real homes can meet this need. The veteran can get this kind of home, and he can get it most quickly if our enormous productive capacity is turned loose to supply it.

During past periods of readjustment following years of war it has been a tradition of the Government of the United States to grant some form of homestead assistance to its veterans. The obligation of the Nation to assist its veterans in meeting this basic human requirement was never as great as at present. We are no longer a frontier country with a vast public domain to parcel out, but this fact does not remove the present urgency for homestead assistance. Rather, the need for this traditional evidence of the Nation's gratitude is more pressing than ever before in our history.

The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 is surely a conscientious attempt to provide a wide range of necessary and proper benefits to the veteran. In the field of education, particularly, it provides direct and tangible assistance which, to the veteran who chooses to use it to its full extent, can reach a monetary value to the veteran, and an actual outlay by the Federal Government of approximately $7,000. This is not a loan to be repaid, but takes the form of a direct grant.

Assistance toward home ownership provided by this measure, on the other hand, is confined principally to guarantee of a loan which must be repaid. In the final analysis, this particular benefit simply permits the veteran to delay payment of the normal down payment, or, in other words, to go 100 percent into debt for a home. In my judgment, Mr. President, the divergent character of these two benefits constitutes inequity.

Thus far, 948,000 veterans have applied for educational aid, and 688,000 of them have been declared eligible. In contrast to this only 64,000 veterans have been able to utilize the home-loan provision of the act. This clearly reveals that there is inadequacy in the legislation, and I believe that it is the particular inadequacy which I have pointed out.

The full value of the grant for educational purposes cannot be realized by a large group of veterans who must devote their principal time and energies to the support of their families. The purpose of the bill I am now introducing is to equalize these benefits to some extent, by providing for homestead assistance grants to veterans who cannot take full advantage of the educational benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 and who are willing to waive educational benefits of that act to an extent equivalent to the amount of the homestead grant provided.

This bill seeks to provide homestead assistance grants based on length of the veteran's service in World War II, with a minimum grant of $500 for veterans with 6 months service or less. The amount of the grant would be increased by $50 for each additional month of service, and there is a provision that no grant could exceed $2,500. The veteran would apply for the grant to the nearest office of the Veterans' Administration and would file with his application a legal and general description of the property he wishes to purchase. The Veterans Administration would check the application, and if it found the value of the property reasonably in accord with the purchase price, would issue the grant in the form of a certificate of credit which could be negotiated only to sellers or mortgagees of land and improvements in lieu of cash.

The bill is based on the belief that the veteran himself, rather than someone in Washington brooding over census reports, knows what kind of home is best for him. Consequently, it defines the kind of homestead which can be purchased with the aid of a grant as "property including land and permanent building, that is, a single-family residence, part of a multifamily structure, a residence in a cooperative or mutual housing development, or a building containing a family dwelling to be used as the principal place of residence of the veteran."

In order that there be no temptation to speculate by quick sale for profit after purchase with a grant, the bill provides that upon receipt of the grant the veteran shall issue to the Veterans' Administration a non-interest-bearing personal

note in the amount of the grant. One-fifth of the face value of this note would become due each year for 5 years on the anniversary date of issuance of the grant. Each of these five annual obligations would be canceled on the respective anniversary dates upon presentation by the veteran of an affidavit affirming that he has continued to retain the property as his home during the preceding year.

In the event of sale of the property during the 5-year period required to establish full homestead rights, the uncanceled portion of the full note would be payable to the Veterans' Administration. For example, if a veteran sold his homestead 2 years after purchase he would have received two annual cancellations each amounting to one-fifth of the full amount of the note. Within 30 days after sale, and upon notice of sale to the Veterans' Administration, the remaining three-fifths of the amount of the note would be payable. However, if the veteran purchases another home, in the same or different locality, the remaining uncanceled portion of the original homestead grant could be applied to the purchase of the second homestead, and canceled in three annual cancellations.

The bill contains other safeguards and provisions for such contingencies as death or disappearance of the veteran, destruction of the property, foreclosure, and failure to comply with provisions of the proposed act. In order to make the homestead assistance benefit equally available to all veterans, the bill provides that the grant may be issued and applied toward indebtedness against any homestead of a veteran of World War II, provided that such indebtedness shall have been incurred subsequent to the date of the veteran's entry into the active military or naval service.

Like other homestead assistance measures that the Congress has provided in the past, this proposal recognizes a disparity in economic conditions between the time the war emergency began and the time of the veterans' return to civil life. It recognizes that home costs have increased approximately 10 percent per year during the war period, and that in consequence of this the veteran finds himself at a serious disadvantage in entering the present market to purchase a homestead. He needs help from his Government if he is to compete on equal terms with others for available homes. Priorities in the purchase of new homes will not help him overcome the general rise in price level which has occurred while he was away from home in the service of his country.

Let me point out here that in giving help to the veterans for education, there was no attempt to revamp the costs of education to make it available to veterans. Our assistance was direct to the veteran.

Before us now are proposals which seek to distort the entire economy of the Nation to create an artificial price level to benefit the veteran. It is urged that this be accomplished by the kind of rigid restriction, regulation, and economic tinkering which can only give war-time scarcity a new lease on life by introducing countless delays in the production process for establishment of new ceiling prices, approved costs, operating regulations, and official procedures. We are asked to support a cumbersome scheme of uninvited and unwelcome subsidies to producers—subsidies which can stifle normal competition by paying Government premiums to marginal producers. In the name of the veteran we are asked to take a long step toward the kind of excess in governmental control which the veteran was called upon to fight.

Clearly this perversive emphasis on severity of control and upon intrusive governmental participation in production will put the break on our productive mechanism. We desperately need something that can reach over toward the accelerator. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that this bill, accompanied by discernment and realism in adjusting OPA controls, can give a thumping push to the accelerator for home production, and thereby provide veterans with the kind of homes they really want with a minimum of delay.

Shocked

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, much interest is being manifested today in the thinking of our servicemen and veterans. It is high time we observe what their attitude is with reference to how well we may have kept or may now be keeping the faith at home while they were protecting it abroad.

These boys were not in a position to plan affairs at home. They did not have time to think very seriously about what was going on here while they were so absorbed in the heat of the campaigns overseas. There seems to have been an utter failure on the part of many who stayed at home to assume the responsibility of keeping this Government American—the America that these boys were told it was before they left. No one seems to have planned for housing the boys who were in uniform. A little foresight would have suggested that they would need homes when they were discharged from the service. They need clothing and a lot of other things that they are now wanting and to which they are unquestionably entitled. Apparently we were not prepared for the war, and it is as apparent we are not prepared for peacetime operations. The boys know they have been let down in this respect.

While they were gone certain internal conditions developed which they do not like and which forthright Americans do not like. Ideologies of foreign extraction have become too much in evidence. The boys are shocked to get home and find that conditions at home are not what they were told they were fighting this war for abroad. They are not going to be satisfied with doles and subsidies and a lot of cheap political lip service. They want economic freedom and equality of opportunity, not hampered and not restricted by bureaucracy and bureaucrats. Yes they are shocked and they may shock others before long.

In this connection I am pleased to quote the following editorial from the Tulsa Tribune, of Tulsa, Okla., entitled:

"SHOCKED!"

(By Richard Lloyd Jones)

President Truman lends his autograph to broadcast a public appeal to the youth of America urging them to enlist in the United States Army and as an inducement he cites wages for a soldier service which any leader of organized labor would look upon with scorn. And there are two lessons in this.

First. Mr. Truman, as President of the American people, is not advocating a soldier pay that is commensurate with the soldier's service. The second lesson is that the labor racketeers who dominate this timid government at Washington have a contempt for the country which President Truman asks our youths to serve.

Our Congressmen, through Mr. Truman and without his demurrer, offer $50 a month for a private, $12 a week, less than $2 a day. If the boys who hire out for that are sent into foreign fields in armies of occupation they will learn the worth of the land which they serve.

We sing "Land of the free and home of the brave," but we don't mean it any more. In our national and State capitols we have few defenders of free men now.

Look at the shameful spectacle in the great city of New York. The people elected a leader. Recently this mayor went cringing to a labor racketeer to plead, to beg pretty pleas that this labor racketeer be considerate enough of the people not to freeze all their activities, tie up the town. "Fooey on the mayor," said the racketeer, and he tied up the town. What has happened to this "Land of the free and home of the brave"?

This country was made by men who believed that every man should be a free man, should have the right to work without the consent of some grafting racketeer, without paying fees and extortion to a hijacker who robs men of their freedom. And what does our Government do in the face of this tyranny? Most of our United States Senators are against freedom now. Our President does not defend the constitutional rights of free men. He asks our youths to respond to his call to the colors for a paltry pay while he does not fight for our freedoms here at home.

William S. Power, an American soldier boy from Pittsburgh, Pa., who has just returned from 3½ years of European war, is shocked at what he finds when he returns to this "Land of the free and home of the brave." Through the pages of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat he unburdens his outraged soldier's soul. That brave boy puts to shame every cowardly Congressman and the White House itself. Billy Power, of Pittsburgh, is the free man who fought for the freedoms our government at home has let be lost. Let Billy Power speak:

"This power strike that paralyzed my home town (the Pittsburgh I used to brag so much about during my 3½ years in the Army) was the last straw. Here's a letter I've wanted to write ever since arriving back in the States last month. Can there be such fools in such a paradise? Can there be such discontents amid such plenty? Can there be such self-pitiers among the recipients of so many blessings?

"This is the United States of America. This is the land that each and every European I've ever talked to would give 10 years of his life to live in. This is the land of unlimited opportunity and personal liberty. This is the land that recognizes no barriers of caste and class, race and religion. This is the

land among lands, the Nation among nations, the most blessed of the blest. This is the United States of America.

"America, to the foreigners, is a dream, a legend, the eighth wonder of the civilized world. Yet all of this passes blissfully over the heads of the average American citizen. All of this, even when it is realized, is calmly, smugly, and matter-of-factly accepted. All of this everything means nothing.

"Personal liberty and unrestricted personal opportunity? Some Americans will throw it away by becoming a 'serial number' in a gigantic, strictly regimented union—another pawn, another number, another nobody.

"Democracy? Some Americans will take totalitarianism if there's an extra temporary dime an hour in it for them.

"Money, money, money * * * gripe, gripe, gripe * * * strike, strike, strike. Personal freedom, personal liberty, personal independence, and spiritual and moral values are chucked overboard for that dime. Certainly there's power in a mass; if a man likes to be a hunk of mass rather than John Jones, independent individual who makes his own decisions.

"When are some Americans going to appreciate the blessings they have instead of complaining about the luxuries they lack? When are some Americans going to think in terms of putting something into a business instead of taking something out of it? When are some Americans going to concentrate on working for what they get instead of striking for what they want?

"The psychological catch phrase, 'living wage,' is a mockery and a joke to any soldier who has come back from where they really have it tough. A 'living wage' in almost every other country under the sun means soup and potatoes for the kids and a couple of black-market American Army OD shirts and trousers for the old man.

"A 'living wage' anywhere else but in America means that the father of the family earns enough dough to put some cheap clothes on his children's backs and some bread in their stomachs.

"A living wage in any and every sense of the term signifies an absence of luxuries. And what is a luxury? A luxury is a gas stove as compared to a wood stove; an electric iron as compared to a flat iron; a refrigerator as compared to an ice box. A luxury is a sewing machine, a radio set, a telephone—red meat on the table, an extra suit of clothes in the closet, an automobile. A luxury is that which is over and above the bare necessities of life.

"There have been plenty of luxuries in the past for Americans. There are a lot of luxuries right now. There can be countless more in the future. There can be enough luxuries for everyone who is willing to work for them. This is America, the land of plenty—remember?

"There's plenty of material, plenty of food, plenty of everything for everybody in America. It's ripe to be picked instead of picketed, begging to be developed and blushing with shame at being neglected.

"Americans will never get this abundance by self-pity, belligerence, and indolence. Americans will never obtain their plenty by watching clocks, measuring pay envelopes, and kicking each other in the teeth. They'll get a higher standard of living in the future in the same way that they got it in the past—the only way—by working, toiling, and producing those things they need and want.

"It's a crying shame to see Americans who sabotage the unlimited opportunities for comforts and luxuries that lie before them."

So speaks a soldier who sacrificed to do his duty while we at home failed in our duty to keep the freedoms he fought for.

Best Location in the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted me to extend my remarks I wish to insert in the RECORD an editorial which recently appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

Each of us has pride in the respective communities we represent. We of Cleveland feel we have much to offer to industry and to individuals. We firmly believe we have the "best location in the Nation" as Mr. Frank J. Ryan of the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co. so aptly put it.

BEST LOCATION IN THE NATION

The campaign of the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co. to attract new industries to the territory it serves in northeastern Ohio deserves the commendation and support of all groups who live and work in this area—private citizens, governmental bodies, and business and labor organizations.

The Illuminating Co. is not the sole conductor of the drive to publicize the advantages of the Cleveland area as the site for new industries and the expansion of established ones. But its national advertising campaign under the slogan "Best location in the Nation" has attracted national attention to the factors which make northeastern Ohio a desirable location for the production and distribution of manufactured articles.

Moreover, it offers a location engineering service to companies contemplating expansion. That this service has proved helpful is shown by the fact that many new industries have taken advantage of it before deciding to locate here.

Recently Frank J. Ryan, assistant to the president of the Illuminating Co., told the Cleveland Rotary Club that during 1945 more than 50 companies made commitments for industrial expansion in this area, and that their plans involve expenditures in excess of $100,000,000 and job opportunities for at least twenty-two thousand five hundred. Commitments for expansion that will equal or exceed those obtained in 1945 are now in prospect for 1946.

"Here in the Cleveland area," said Ryan, "it is the pay rolls and profits earned in industry that support our homes and schools, our clubs and hospitals and churches, our stores and theaters, and other commercial enterprises.

"Everything we have in this area in the way of purchasing power, standard of living, comfort and culture derives basically from our industries. As industry develops here and industrial production, pay rolls, and profits increase, everyone shares directly or indirectly in the benefits."

In its advertising campaign the Illuminating Co. stresses Cleveland's geographical location as one of the principal factors which make Cleveland desirable for production and distribution. Within 500 miles of Cleveland there are 75,000,000 people and most of the major markets of North America.

The company also emphasizes the area's transportation facilities, the adequacy and low rates of electric power, the supply of manpower and labor skills, accessibility to raw materials, availability of parts and supplies, financial, business, and industrial services, favorable tax structure, unlimited fresh water supply, desirable plant locations and excellent living and cultural environment.

It is clear that Cleveland has something to sell and that every Clevelander has a personal stake in the promotion of Cleveland's industrial progress and prosperity.

Majority of Newspapers Against Case Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, the newspapers of this country represent a substantial segment of public opinion and are usually well informed on public issues. In addition, the newspapers generally have not been notably favorable to organized labor. A recent survey of newspaper opinion, however, which appeared in the United States News of February 15, 1946, indicates that the so-called Case labor dispute bill has the unqualified endorsement of relatively few of the Nation's editors and that a far greater number warn against hastily considered labor legislation and believe that the bill is too drastic—particularly the provision for court injunction against violence. I wish to include in my remarks the summary of newspaper opinion referred to and also an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of February 26, 1946, entitled "Worse Than Forgotten," and also an editorial from Labor under date of March 2, 1946, quoting a warning against the bill in Business Week:

[From the United States News]

STRIKE CONTROLS IN HOUSE BILL—PRESS REACTION

The Case labor disputes bill, passed last week by the House, has the unqualified endorsement of relatively few of the Nation's editors. A far greater number, who warn against hastily considered labor legislation, believe parts of the bill too drastic, particularly the provision for court injunctions against violence. Intervention in major disputes by a Federal mediation board and equal penalties on both sides for contract violation are more widely approved.

Terming the legislation "long overdue," the Troy (N. Y.) Record (Republican) considers its provisions "mild enough" and says that authorization for injunctions against violence "is but endorsing the most elementary principles of justice."

The Christian Science Monitor (Independent) opposes precipitate action on this "extremely delicate problem." Conceding that "what the Case bill sets out to do will meet little argument," the Monitor observes that, while maintenance of the status quo during negotiations, as provided, "sounds logical and reasonable," nevertheless "veteran mediators and arbiters * * * warn against such restraints." The injunction weapon, it believes, has been abused by industry in the past and "warrants the most cautious approach."

Although foreseeing that application of such a "drastic" law "might bring about the bloodiest area in labor's history in this country," the New London (Conn.) Evening Day (Independent-Republican) argues that

"something, surely, has got to be done to end the present ruinous strike tendency," and it won't be done by "harmless" legislation.

The Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator (Independent-Democrat), however, calls the bill "dishonest" and says "its matter as well as its intent is bad." Among the objections raised is that "it would put the Government in the very middle of all disputes, whereas the aim should be to keep it out of them." This newspaper says that "Congress cannot pass broad legislation in time to do any good in the current strikes" and that it should "pass some such limited measure as the President's fact-finding plan and then settle down to deliberate, careful study of permanent legislation."

The Wall Street Journal (Independent) sees a "serious risk that a half-baked statute, added to the present jumble of law and emergency regulations, would only aggravate existing labor disputes," and believes that "the whole structure of Federal labor law badly needs overhauling." It argues, too, that violence and intimidation "are already illegal under most local police laws. Whether their prohibition by Federal law would be better enforced is a wide-open question."

"The trouble with the Case bill," say the Washington (D. C.) Post (Independent), "is that a number of sound objectives have been tangled up with extreme and unworkable provisions. It needs * * * pruning and revision" by a congressional committee.

But the Washington (D. C.) Star (Independent) believes that passage of the bill serves the purpose of getting some effective legislation * * * started through the mill, even though there is room for doubt as to the wisdom of some of it.

Not denying that some provisions of the Case bill are extreme, the Indianapolis (Ind.) News (Independent-Republican) describes it as "aimed at violence and irresponsibility," not at the right to strike. "Furthermore," it continues, "the bill avoids the pitfall of compulsory arbitration" and so "is preferable, even from labor's standpoint, to President Truman's fact-finding procedure."

But the Chicago (Ill.) Journal of Commerce (Independent) opposes it on the ground that "mediation of the type proposed * * * turns out to be compulsion." Calling for revision of the Wagner Act, this newspaper believes that then "the next step should be for the Government to wtihdraw to the side lines."

The Baltimore (Md.) Sun (independent Democratic) calls the measure "moderate * * * as far as its explicit provisions go." But it considers substitution of "a kind of Federal policing" for local authority to prevent violence "grave in all its implications." The Sun also objects to "Mr. CASE's apparent assumption that a union is a firm and tangible legal entity, as responsible * * * as is a corporation." A deeper objection, it adds, is that the bill attempts "to pile on top of a series of special privileges another series of limitations on those special privileges." It questions "whether the wiser course would not be simply to repeal the special privileges in whole or in part."

The Case bill is "a mixture of good and bad," in the opinion of the New York Times (independent), which disapproves legislating "without careful study on a matter of this importance." But this paper sees "a demand in the country and in Congress * * * for 'action' in the present labor crisis," and it suggests three steps in the immediate situation: Repeal of the Smith-Connally Act, then passage as a stopgap of the Wagner Act amendments passed by the House in 1940 and buried in a Senate committee, and, finally, appointment of "a commission of experts to propose a well-rounded program of permanent Federal labor legislation."

[From the Christian Science Monitor of February 26, 1946]

WORSE THAN "FORGOTTEN"

In contrast to the commendable mediation machinery set up by the Case bill, there are several provisions in the measure which the Senate is likely to scrutinize with a questioning eye. One of them contains the definition of workers classed under management and as such denied the status of "employees" under the Wagner Act.

Among workers whom the bill would bar from unions are those "whose duties include the computation of the pay of other employees"—in other words, timekeepers and pay-roll clerks. Now, by common knowledge, such clerical employees appear to be typical members of that "white collar" group which benefit neither from salaries on any true managerial level nor from the kind of pay rates which vigorous unions have gained for the production worker. To bar such people from the right to organize and to bargain collectively would seem to discriminate against a portion of the "forgotten" public the Case bill purports to protect.

[From Labor]

LET'S SIT DOWN AND REASON TOGETHER—"BUSINESS WEEK" WARNS THAT THE CASE BILL IS LIKELY TO BOOMERANG; BOSSES VIOLATE CONTRACTS TWICE AS OFTEN AS UNIONS!

Business Week, as its name indicates, is printed primarily for businessmen. It endeavors, and with a reasonable amount of success, to give them advice which is worthwhile. Appreciating that "labor relations" are playing an increasingly important role in the lives of employers, the editors of Business Week devote one page of their magazine to The Labor Angle.

In their latest issue, they discussed the Case bill, that extraordinary piece of anti-labor legislation which the erudite gentleman from South Dakota, who proudly proclaims the many institutions of learning he has attended, succeeded in putting through the House, with the aid of certain Southern Democrats, commonly and somewhat irreverently referred to as "the sweatshop brigade" meaning that they are always on the side of the employer who pays the lowest wages.

The gentleman from South Dakota and his sweatshop friends had quite a celebration when they passed the Case bill, but Business Week is not so sure about its alleged virtues. It fears the mountain has labored and brought forth another Smith-Connally Act.

Business Week has its eye on section 10 of the Case bill. This provides penalties for the violation of contracts between unions and employers.

"Management has rather generally assumed that these contract-breaking walkouts are all there is to the responsibility problem and that penalties for contract-breaching will bother only the unions," says Business Week, and it adds, with considerable emphasis: "This is far from the truth."

It points out that when violations of contracts go to arbitration, the decision is against the employer in about two out of three instances.

"Therefore, if any penalties are to be imposed on either party who violates a labor contract or—as is also being suggested—if certain rights are taken away from the party acting contrary to the contract, the employer much more often than the union would be in jeopardy."

Business Week suggests that if management wishes "to avoid the sad experience of the Smith-Connally Act," then "business must leave off the easy way of thinking in slogans and really get down to bedrock facts on the responsibility problem."

This is all very interesting. How often have we been told that unions do not respect their contract obligations? Most of us know that is not true, and now we have a business magazine warning businessmen that if responsibility is enforced impartially against unions and managements, the record, so far made, shows that management will be the victim in two cases out of three.

Republicans Need More Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with permission heretofore granted, I am including as part of these remarks an editorial from the Northwood Anchor of Northwood, Iowa.

The editorial is as follows:

REPUBLICANS NEED MORE SENSE

Some of the national leaders of the Republican party are advising that the rank and file membership, including prospective candidates for office, return to its original principles. It is sound advice. If the New Deal is a good thing, join it. If it isn't, then quit trying to outdeal it by matching or exceeding its extravagant pledges of which many have never been and never will be redeemed.

A new deal, in gamblers' parlance, never guaranteed a square deal, and a square deal, after all, is enough encouragement for any independent, self-reliant man or woman. Those who clamor for more than that want a crooked deal—the cards stacked to favor some more than others. If the Republican Party continues to seek votes on that kind of platform it deserves further defeat.

Smart people do not try to beat the other fellow's game. If they think it has something in it that leads to good results they play it as the rules provide. If the same smart people think the game is not what it pretends to be they show it up by proposing a better one—not by proposing to put more bounce in the action by adding a fifth ace and playing jacks and deuces wild.

Open Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL STEWART
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following open letter from the Spiro (Okla.) Times:

OPEN LETTER TO OUR HIRED MEN IN WASHINGTON

DEAR SIRS: Remember us? We are the farmers. We are the fellows who furnish all your food and pay a very large part of your salaries. We are those ragged fellows whose wives have sewed patches on the patches on the patches on our overalls. We are the chaps who have fixed our old machinery until there is nothing left to fix.

We are even running out of haywire to tie busted tools together.

We are the fellows who are now organizing as rapidly as possible for the purpose of shutting off the grub supply of all strike-bound parts of the country until production of tools, machinery, overalls, and the goods we so badly need again gets under way.

You are down there at Washington because a lot of us voted for you. We expected you to do a little looking after our interests. So far we have noticed no such effort on your part.

If you would stir your stumps and quit filibustering and otherwise behaving like a bunch of clowns, you could get production started without our having to carry out a food stoppage. But you'd better get busy—or we will.

When you find your mail cluttered up with copies of this letter mailed in by our members and friends, better pay a little attention—or you may be wondering what hit you next time you come up for election. And if you want to beat us to the job of getting production started, better move fast. It is later than you think.

The PHEASANT.

Address of Winston Churchill

REMARKS
OF
HON. E. E. COX
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the address that the great Winston Churchill made at Fulton, Mo., on yesterday, in addition to electrifying the entire world, should carry hope to the hearts of peoples of good will everywhere.

That Russia is actually now appropriating to her own use the contribution that we made to the winning of the war just closed must be recognized by everyone. That she intends to spread out her power and, if possible, to communize the entire world, cannot be doubted.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting the address of Mr. Churchill, notwithstanding the fact that it costs $140, according to a statement furnished by the Public Printer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, Winston Churchill rendered a great service to civilization yesterday, and I am glad the gentleman is putting his speech in the RECORD.

We may not agree with everything Mr. Churchill said, but his argument against communism is simply unanswerable.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

I am glad to come to Westminster College this afternoon and am complimented that you should give me a degree. The name "Westminster" is somehow familiar to me. I seem to have heard of it before. Indeed it was at Westminister that I received a very large part of my education in politics, dialectic, rhetoric, and one or two other things.

It is also an honor, perhaps almost unique, for a private visitor to be introduced to an academic audience by the President of the United States. Amid his heavy burdens, duties, and responsibilities—unsought but not recoiled from—the President has traveled a thousand miles to dignify and magnify our meeting here today and give me an opportunity of addressing this kindred Nation, as well as my own countrymen across the ocean and perhaps some other countries too. The President has told you that it is his wish, as I am sure it is yours, that I should have full liberty to give my true and faithful counsel in these anxious and baffling times. I shall certainly avail myself of this freedom and feel the more right to do so because any private ambitions I may have cherished in my younger days have been satisfied beyond my wildest dreams.

Let me, however, make it clear that I have no official mission or status of any kind and that I speak only for myself. I can, therefore, allow my mind, with the experience of a lifetime, to play over the problems which beset us on the morrow of our absolute victory in arms; and try to make sure that what has been gained with so much sacrifice and suffering shall be preserved for the future glory and safety of mankind.

The United States stands at this time at the pinnacle of world power. It is a solemn moment for the American democracy. With primacy in power is also joined an awe-inspiring accountability to the future. As you look around you, you feel not only the sense of duty done but also feel anxiety lest you fall below the level of achievement. Opportunity is here now, clear and shining, for both our countries. To reject it or ignore it or fritter it away will bring upon us all the long reproaches of the after-time. It is necessary that constancy of mind, persistency of purpose, and the grand simplicity of decision shall guide and rule the conduct of the English-speaking peoples in peace as they did in war. We must and I believe we shall prove ourselves equal to this severe requirement.

When American military men approach some serious situation they are wont to write at the head of their directive the words "Over-all strategic concept." There is wisdom in this as it leads to clarity of thought. What, then, is the over-all strategic concept which we should inscribe today? It is nothing less than the safety and welfare, the freedom and progress of all the homes and families of all the men and women in all the lands. And here I speak particularly of the myriad cottages or apartment homes where the wage earner strives amid the accidents and difficulties of life to guard his wife and children from privation and bring the family up in the fear of the Lord or upon ethical conceptions which often play their potent part.

MUST SHIELD HOMES

To give security to these countless homes they must be shielded from the two gaunt marauders—war and tyranny. We all know the frightful disturbance in which the ordinary family is plunged when the curse of war swoops down upon the breadwinner and those for whom he works and contrives. The awful ruin of Europe, with all its vanished glories, and of large parts of Asia, glares in our eyes. When the designs of wicked men or the aggressive urge of mighty states dissolve, over large areas, the frame of civilized society, humble folk are confronted with difficulties with which they cannot cope. For them all is distorted, broken, or even ground to pulp.

When I stand here this quiet afternoon I shudder to visualize what is actually happening to millions now and what is going to happen in this period when famine stalks the earth. None can compute what has been called "the unestimated sum of human pain." Our supreme task and duty is to guard the homes of the common people from the horrors and miseries of another war. We are all agreed on that.

Our American military colleagues, after having proclaimed the "over-all strategic concept" and computed all available resources, always proceed to the next stop, namely, the method. Here again there is widespread agreement. A world organization has already been erected for the prime purpose of preventing war. United Nations, the successor of the League of Nations, with the decisive addition of the United States and all that that means, is already at work. We must make sure that its work is fruitful, that it is a reality and not a sham, that it is a force for action and not merely a frothing of words, that it is a true temple of peace in which the shields of many nations can some day be hung and not merely a cockpit in a tower of Babel. Before we cast away the solid assurances of national armaments for self-preservation, we must be certain that our temple is built, not upon shifting sands or quagmires, but upon the rock. Anyone with his eyes open can see that our path will be difficult and also long, but if we persevere together as we did in the two World Wars—though not, alas, in the interval between them—I cannot doubt that we shall achieve our common purpose in the end.

I have, however, a definite and practical proposal to make for action. Courts and magistrates cannot function without sheriffs and constables. The United Nations Organization must immediately begin to be equipped with an international armed force. In such a matter we can only go step by step; but we must begin now. I propose that each of the powers and states should be invited to dedicate a certain number of air squadrons to the service of the world organization. These squadrons would be trained and prepared in their own countries but would move around in rotation from one country to another. They would wear the uniform of their own countries with different badges. They would not be required to act against their own nation but in other respects they would be directed by the world organization. This might be started on a modest scale and a grow as confidence grew. I wished to see this done after the First World War and trust it may be done forthwith.

It would nevertheless be wrong and imprudent to entrust the secret knowledge or experience of the atomic bomb, which the United States, Great Britain, and Canada now share, to the world organization, while it is still in its infancy. It would be criminal madness to cast it adrift in this still agitated and ununited world. No one in any country has slept less well in their beds because this knowledge and the method and the raw materials to apply it are at present largely retained in American hands. I do not believe we should all have slept so soundly had the positions been reversed and some Communist or neo-Fascist state monopolized, for the time being, these dread agencies. The fear of them alone might easily have been used to enforce totalitarian systems upon the free democratic world, with consequences appalling to human imagination.

God has willed that this shall not be, and we have at least a breathing space before this peril has to be encountered, and even then, if no effort is spared, we should still possess so formidable a superiority as to impose effective deterrents upon its employment or threat of employment by others. Ultimately when the essential brother of man is truly embodied and expressed in a world organization, these powers may be confided to it.

I now come to the second danger which threatens the cottage home and ordinary

people, namely tyranny. We cannot be blind to the fact that the liberties enjoyed by individual citizens throughout the United States and British Empire are not valid in a considerable number of countries, some of which are very powerful. In these states control is enforced upon the common people by various kinds of all-embracing police governments, to a degree which is overwhelming and contrary to every principle of democracy. The power of the state is exercised without restraint, either by dictators or by compact obligarchies operating through a privileged party and a political police. It is not our duty at this time, when difficulties are so numerous, to interfere forcibly in the internal affairs of countries whom we have not conquered in war, but we must never cease to proclaim in fearless tones the great principles of freedom and the rights of man, which are the joint inheritance of the English-speaking world and which, through Magna Carta, the Bill of Rights, the habeas corpus, trial by jury, and the English common law find their famous expression in the Declaration of Independence.

All this means that the people of any country have the right and should have the power, by constitutional action, by free, unfettered elections, with secret ballot, to choose or change the character or form of government under which they dwell, that freedom of speech and thought should reign, that courts of justice, independent of the executive, unbiased by any party, should administer laws which have received the broad assent of large majorities or are consecrated by time and custom. Here are the title deeds of freedom, which should lie in every cottage home. Here is the message of the British and American peoples to mankind. Let us preach what we practice and practice what we preach.

POVERTY IS AHEAD

I have now stated the two great dangers which menace the homes of the people. I have not yet spoken of poverty and privation, which are in many cases the prevailing anxiety, but if the dangers of war and tyranny are removed, there is no doubt that science and cooperation can bring, in the next few years, to the world, newly taught in the hard school of war, an expansion of material well-being beyond anything that has yet occurred in human experience.

Now, at this sad, breathless, moment, we are plunged in the hunger and distress which are the aftermath of our stupendous struggle; but this will pass and may pass quickly, and there is no reason except human folly or subhuman crime which should deny to all the nations, the inauguration and enjoyment of an age of plenty. I have often used words which I learned 50 years ago from a great Irish-American orator, Mr. Bourke Cockran: "There is enough for all. The earth is a generous mother; she will provide in plentiful abundance food for all her children if they will but cultivate her soil in justice and in peace."

So far we are evidently in full agreement. Now, while still pursuing the method of realizing our over-all strategic concept, I come to the crux of what I have traveled here to say. Neither the sure prevention of war, nor the continuous rise of world organization, will be gained without what I have called the fraternal association of the English-speaking peoples. This means a special relationship between the British Commonwealth and Empire and the United States. This is no time for generalities. I will venture to be precise.

Fraternal association requires not only the growing friendship and mutual understanding between our two vast but kindred systems of society but the continuance of the intimate relationships between our military advisers, leading to common study of potential dangers, similarity of weapons and manuals of instruction and interchange of officers and cadets at colleges. It should carry with it the continuance of the present facilities for mutual security by the joint use of all naval and Air Force bases in the possession of either country all over the world. This would perhaps double the mobility of the American Navy and Air Force. It would greatly expand that of the British Empire forces and it might well lead, if and as the world calms down, to important financial savings. Already we use together a large number of islands; more may well be entrusted to our joint care in the near future.

The United States already has a permanent defense agreement with the Dominion of Canada, which is so devotedly attached to the British Commonwealth and Empire. This agreement is more effective than many of those which have often been made under formal alliances. This principle should be extended to all the British Commonwealths with full reciprocity. Thus, whatever happens, and thus only, we shall be secure ourselves and able to work together for the high and simple causes that are dear to us and bode no ill to any. Eventually there may come the principle of common citizenship but that we may be content to leave to destiny, whose outstretched arm so many of us can clearly see.

There is, however, an important question we must ask ourselves. Would a special relationship between the United States and the British Commonwealth be inconsistent with our overriding loyalties to the world organization? I reply that on the contrary, it is probably the only means by which that organization will achieve its full stature and strength. There are already the special United States relations with Canada and between the United States and the South American republics. We also have our 20 years' treaty of collaboration and mutual assistance with Soviet Russia. I agree with Mr. Bevin that it might well be a 50-year treaty. We have an alliance with Portugal unbroken since 1384. None of these clash with the general interest of a world agreement. On the contrary they help it. "In my Father's house are many mansions." Special associations between members of the United Nations which have no aggressive point against any other country, which harbor no design incompatible with the Charter of the United Nations, far from being harmful, are beneficial and, as I believe, indispensable.

MUST BUILD TEMPLES

I spoke earlier of the temple of peace. Workmen from all countries must build that temple. If two of the workmen know each other particularly well and are old friends, if their families are intermingled and if they have faith in each other's purpose, hope in each other's future and charity toward each other's shortcomings, to quote some good words I read here the other day, why cannot they work together at the common task as friends and partners? Why cannot they share their tools and thus increase each others' working powers? Indeed they must do so or else the temple may not be built, or, being built, it may collapse, and we shall all be proved unteachable and have to go and try to learn again for a third time, in a school of war, incomparably more rigorous than that from which we have just been released.

The Dark Ages may return, the Stone Age may return on the gleaming wings of science, and what might now shower immeasurable material blessings upon mankind, may even bring about its total destruction. Beware, I say; time may be short. Do not let us take the course of letting events drift along till it is too late. If there is to be a fraternal asscciation of the kind I have described, with all the extra strength and security which both our countries can derive from it, let us make sure that that great fact is known to the world, and that it plays its part in steadying and stabilizing the foundations of peace. Prevention is better than cure.

A shadow has fallen upon the scenes so lately lighted by the Allied victory. Nobody knows what Soviet Russia and its Communist international organization intends to do in the immediate future, or what are the limits, if any, to their expansive and proselytizing tendencies. I have a strong admiration and regard for the valiant Russian people and for my wartime comrade, Marshal Stalin. There is sympathy and good will in Britain—and I doubt not here also—toward the peoples of all the Russias and a resolve to persevere through many differences and rebuffs in establishing lasting friendships.

We understand the Russian need to be secure on her western frontiers from all renewal of German aggression. We welcome her to her rightful place among the leading nations of the world. Above all, we welcome constant, frequent, and growing contacts between the Russian people and our own people on both sides of the Atlantic. It is my duty, however, to place before you certain facts about the present position in Europe.

From Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic, an iron curtain has descended across the continent. Behind that line lie all the capitals of the ancient states of central and eastern Europe. Warsaw, Berlin, Prague, Vienna, Budapest, Belgrade, Bucharest, and Sofia, all these famous cities and the populations around them lie in the Soviet sphere and all are subject, in one form or another, not only to Soviet influence but to a very high and increasing measure of control from Moscow. Athens alone, with its immortal glories, is free to decide its future at an election under British, American, and French observation.

NO DEMOCRACY EXISTS

The Russian-dominated Polish Government has been encouraged to make enormous and wrongful inroads upon Germany, and mass expulsions of millions of Germans on a scale grievous and undreamed of are now taking place. The Communist parties, which were very small in all these eastern states of Europe, have been raised to preeminence and power far beyond their numbers and are seeking everywhere to obtain totalitarian control. Police governments are prevailing in nearly every case, and so far, except in Czechoslovakia, there is no true democracy.

Turkey and Persia are both profoundly alarmed and disturbed at the claims which are made upon them and at the pressure being exerted by the Moscow government. An attempt is being made by the Russians in Berlin to build up a quasi-Communist party in their zone of occupied Germany by showing special favors to groups of left-wing German leaders. At the end of the fighting last June, the American and British Armies withdrew westward, in accordance with an earlier agreement, to a depth at some points of 150 miles on a front of nearly 400 miles, to allow the Russians to occupy this vast expanse of territory which the western democracies had conquered.

If now the Soviet Government tries, by separate action, to build up a pro-Communist Germany in their areas, this will cause new serious difficulties in the British and American zones, and will give the defeated Germans the power of putting themselves up to auction between the Soviets and the western democracies. Whatever conclusions may be drawn from these facts—and facts they are—this is certainly not the liberated Europe we fought to build up. Nor is it one which contains the essentials of permanent peace.

In front of the iron curtain which lies across Europe are other causes for anxiety. In Italy the Communist Party is seriously hampered by having to support the Com-

munist-trained Marshal Tito's claims to former Italian territory at the head of the Adriatic. Nevertheless, the future of Italy hangs in the balance. Again, one cannot imagine a regenerated Europe without a strong France. All my public life I have worked for a strong France and I never lost faith in her destiny, even in the darkest hours. I will not lose faith now.

GROWING CHALLENGE

However, in a great number of countries, far from the Russian frontiers and throughout the world. Communist fifth columns are established and work in complete unity and absolute obedience to the directions they receive from the Communist center. Except in the British Commonwealth, and in the United States, where communism is in its infancy, the Communist parties or fifth columns constitute a growing challenge and peril to Christian civilization. These are somber facts for anyone to have to recite on the morrow of a victory gained by so much splendid comradeship in arms and in the cause of freedom and democracy, and we should be most unwise not to face them squarely while time remains.

The outlook is also anxious in the Far East and especially in Manchuria. The agreement which was made at Yalta, to which I was a party, was extremely favorable to Soviet Russia, but it was made at a time when no one could say that the German war might not extend all through the summer and autumn of 1945 and when the Japanese war was expected to last for a further 18 months from the end of the German war. In this country you are all so well informed about the Far East and such devoted friends of China that I do not need to expatiate on the situation there.

I have felt bound to portray the shadow which, alike in the West and in the East, falls upon the world. I was a minister at the time of the Versailles Treaty and a close friend of Mr. Lloyd George. I did not myself agree with many things that were done, but I have a very strong impression in my mind of that situation, and I find it painful to contrast it with that which prevails now. In those days there were high hopes and unbounded confidence that the wars were over, and that the League of Nations would become all-powerful. I do not see or feel the same confidence or even the same hopes in the haggard world at this time.

On the other hand, I repulse the idea that a new war is inevitable, still more that it is imminent. It is because I am so sure that our fortunes are in our own hands and that we hold the power to save the future, that I feel the duty to speak out now that I have an occasion to do so. I do not believe that Soviet Russia desires war. What they desire is the fruits of war and the indefinite expansion of their power and doctrines. But what we have to consider here today while time remains, is the permanent prevention of war and the establishment of conditions of freedom and democracy as rapidly as possible in all countries.

Our difficulties and dangers will not be removed by closing our eyes to them; they will not be removed by mere waiting to see what happens; nor will they be relieved by a policy of appeasement. What is needed is a settlement, and the longer this is delayed, the more difficult it will be and the greater our dangers will become. From what I have seen of our Russian friends and allies during the war, I am convinced that there is nothing they admire so much as strength, and there is nothing for which they have less respect than for military weakness. For that reason the old doctrine of a balance of power is unsound. We cannot afford, if we can help it, to work on narrow margins, offering temptations to a trial of strength. If the western democracies stand together in strict adherence to the principles of the United Nations Charter, their influence for furthering these principles will be immense and no one is likely to molest them. If, however, they become divided or falter in their duty, and if these all-important years are allowed to slip away, then indeed catastrophe may overwhelm us all.

Last time I saw it all coming, and cried aloud to my own fellow countrymen and to the world, but no one paid any attention. Up till the year 1933 or even 1935, Germany might have been saved from the awful fate which has overtaken her and we might all have been spared the miseries Hitler let loose upon mankind.

There never was a war in all history easier to prevent by timely action than the one which has just desolated such great areas of the globe. It could have been prevented without the firing of a single shot, and Germany might be powerful, prosperous, and honored today, but no one would listen and one by one we were all sucked into the awful whirlpool.

We surely must not let that happen again. This can only be achieved by reaching now, in 1946, a good understanding on all points with Russia under the general authority of the United Nations and by the maintenance of that good understanding through many peaceful years, by the world instrument, supported by the whole strength of the English-speaking world and all its connections.

Let no man underrate the abiding power of the British Empire and Commonwealth. Because you see the 46,000,000 in our island harassed about their food supply, of which they only grow one-half, even in wartime, or because we have difficulty in restarting our industries and export trade after 6 years of passionate war effort, do not suppose that we shall not come through these dark years of privations as we have come through the glorious years of agony, or that half a century from now, you will not see seventy or eighty millions of Britons spread about the world and united in defense of our traditions, our way of life, and of the world causes we and you espouse. If the population of the English-speaking Commonwealth be added to that of the United States, with all that such cooperation implies in the air, on the sea, and in science and industry, there will be no quivering, precarious balance of power to offer its temptation to ambition or adventure. On the contrary there will be an overwhelming assurance of security. If we adhere faithfully to the Charter of the United Nations and walk forward in sedate and sober strength, seeking no one's land or treasure, or seeking to lay no arbitrary control on the thoughts of men, if all British moral and material forces and convictions are joined with your own in fraternal association, the high roads of the future will be clear, not only for us but for all, not only for our time but for a century to come.

U. S. S. "Arkansas"

REMARKS

OF

HON. W. F. NORRELL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, in news releases from the Navy Department regarding the forthcoming atomic bomb tests to be carried out in the Pacific area, it was some weeks ago learned that the U. S. S. *Arkansas*, the dowager of the fleet, which has come through two world wars undamaged, would be among those vessels to be used in the test.

The U. S. S. *Arkansas*, the third ship to be so named, had her keel laid January 25, 1910, and was built by the New York Shipbuilding Co. at a cost of $4,675,000 for hull and machinery. With an over-all length of 562 feet, a normal displacement of 27,900 tons, and a speed of 21 knots, she has an allowed complement of 1,057 enlisted men. She was launched January 14, 1911, having been christened by Miss Mary Louise Macon, of Helena, Ark., daughter of Representative Robert M. Macon, and commissioned on September 17, 1912, under the command of Capt. Roy C. Smith.

Principal engagements in which she has participated in her illustrious career include the intervention at Vera Cruz in April 1914; service with Division 9 in July of 1918, in which she battled submarines in the North Atlantic and was later present at the internment of the German Fleet in the Firth of Forth on November 21, 1918. She did convoy duty in the North Atlantic in 1941–42, convoy duty in North Africa in 1943, and assisted in the Allied landings off the coast of Normandy in June 1944, and at Iwo Jima in February, 1945. Her service record includes escort duty to the U. S. S. *Washington* bearing President Wilson to Brest, France, December 1918; flagship of Admiral Benson, Chief of Naval Operations, on his return from the Peace Conference; flagship of Commander Scouting Fleet for Vice Adm. Arthur L. Willard; detailed for a number of years to midshipmen of the Naval Academy on their summer cruises.

The present Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel was an ensign on the U. S. S. *Arkansas* at the time of her commissioning. Gen. A. A. Vandegrift, Commandant of the Marine Corps, has also served aboard her.

The people of Arkansas, speaking through their Governor and members of the Arkansas delegation in Congress, desiring that the ship be given into custody of the State as a memorial, requested that the Navy Department give consideration to sparing her from the atomic tests. It was expected to sail her up the Mississippi River to Helena, or into the Arkansas River to the vicinity of Little Rock. In view of the sentiment we attached to the vessel, and speaking as chairman of our delegation in the House, I expressed the hope to the Secretary of Navy that it would be found possible to give custody of the ship to the State of Arkansas.

The Secretary replied that the Navy's choice of vessels for use in the test had been reduced to a matter of military necessity and availability, and that it was regretted that such ships as the U. S. S. *Arkansas*, which had served with distinction in our Navy for so many years, cannot be spared and exhibited as memorials. It was felt that the ship could render one last distinguished service to her Navy and country, as a result of which our armed forces would be supplied vitally needed information to be gained from the tests.

Our people are now reconciled to such use of the ship, with the realization of the necessity for the use of vessels of various sizes and strengths. We consider that the notable part which the U. S. S. *Arkansas* has played in naval annals of

the United States is becomingly highlighted in this final role of a splendid ship.

If she survives this final test it is our hope, as the Navy has indicated, that the U. S. S. *Arkansas* may be transferred to the State for which she is named as a remembrance of a gallant lady.

Un-American Activities

REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, attacks against the Un-American Activities Committee follow the same pattern as did the attacks against the old Dies committee. It is one smear after another. The purpose being to purge out of existence a congressional committee which attempts to preserve the American form of government and the American way of life. There is, however, a ludicrous side, as evidenced recently in a Communist sheet entitled "In Fact," Gebrge Seldes, editor, the March 4, 1946, copy of which I hold in my hand. On the right-hand side of the front page, George Seldes states: "Whereas the Dies committee refused to fight fascism," and yet on the left-hand side of the same page, is an article which states in part, and I quote:

> Last February, Gen. Van Horn Moseley, who has been exposed by the Dies committee as having Fascist leanings.

George Seldes, on the masthead of In Fact, claims that his paper is an antidote for falsehood in the daily press. If this is so, then which of Seldes' statements is antidote and which is false?

In the same connection, it is interesting to learn something about George Seldes, editor of In Fact. His complete record is as follows:

George Seldes is the ace smear artist of the American Communists. Among all the so-called intellectuals or professionals who have attached themselves to the Communist movement, Seldes is unquestionably the most perfidious in his smearing.

Seldes is a journalist of sorts. In the early post-War I years he was expelled from several European countries, including Russia and Italy. From Berlin he wrote some of the most hair-raising dispatches on the Communist world plot. In those days he was as acrimonious in his ravings against the Communists as he is now acrimonious on their behalf. About 1936 George Seldes went over to the Communists—lock, stock, and barrel. In these 9 years he has been affiliated with scores of Communist enterprises. He easily ranks as one of the country's leading Communists, as this rather exhaustive account of his Communist activities and connections will attempt to show.

American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born: Seldes was a sponsor of this auxiliary of the Communist Party in 1941.

American Committee to Save Refugees: Seldes was a sponsor of this Communist enterprise in October 1941.

American Council on Soviet Relations: Seldes signed a manifesto urging an American declaration of war on Finland under the auspices of this Corliss Lamont-headed Communist-front organization.

American Friends of Spanish Democracy: In 1937 this outfit was one of the Communist Party's auxiliaries for Spain. Seldes was among those affiliated with the organization.

American Investor's Union: In 1939, George Seldes was a member of the board of directors of this Communist organization. The organization sprang from the efforts of Bernard J. Reis and Consumers Union to harass business enterprise.

American Peace Mobilization: Seldes was a member of the national council of the American Peace Mobilization, the seditious Communist front organization which expressed the party line in the days of the Stalin-Hitler pact.

Artists' Front To Win the War: In the days of the American Peace Mobilization, the Communists were bitterly isolationist—George Seldes included. Stalin was not then involved in the war. After Hitler's invasion of Russia, many of the same American Communists and Communist fellow travelers expressed their new line in a front which was known as the Artists' Front to Win the War. George Seldes was a sponsor of this latter organization, and was among those Communists who used this set-up to scream for a second front.

Citizens Committee for Harry Bridges: Seldes was a member of this obviously Communist front. Virginia Gardner, now Washington representative of the New Masses and Daily Worker, was its executive secretary.

Committee to Defend America by Keeping Out of War: This was another of the Communist fronts which operated during the days of the Stalin-Hitler pact. Seldes was in this, too.

Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America: This Communist gathering was held in Washington, D. C., June 7–9, 1940, in the middle of the period of the Stalin-Hitler pact. Seldes, the ever-present Communist sponsor, was among its supporters.

Consumers Union: This Communist front, headed by Arthur Kallet, whose party name was "Edward Adams," had Seldes as one of its original sponsors—1936.

Coordinating Committee to Lift the Embargo: This committee was a subsidiary of North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy, and included George Seldes as one of its sponsors.

Emergency Peace Mobilization: Seldes sponsored this parent of the American Peace Mobilization, chief Communist front of the Stalin-Hitler friendship era.

Equality: This was a Communist-line magazine which appeared in 1939–40 and to which George Seldes was a contributor.

Frontier Films: This organization was one of the many Communist excursions into the film field. George Seldes was a member of its advisory board.

Friday: This was another of the Communist-line periodicals which came and went. George Seldes was one of its endorsers.

Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade: The Abraham Lincoln Brigade was composed of at least 60 percent Communist Party members, according to the testimony of Earl Browder. George Seldes was among those who were affiliated with the Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade.

League of American Writers: Attorney General Francis Biddle described this organization as subversive. Seldes was one of the signers of the call to its fourth congress.

National Committee for People's Rights: George Seldes was a member of this Communist-front organization which Attorney General Biddle described as subversive.

National Emergency Conference: Seldes was among the signers of the call to this conference. It was a Communist gathering which met on May 13, 1939.

National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights: This Communist-front organization was the direct successor to the American League for Peace and Democracy (which dissolved in February 1940). George Seldes was a member of its board of sponsors.

National Federation for Constitutional Liberties: One of the most important of all the Communist-front organizations of recent years. Seldes was affiliated with it in the defense of Communist Party leader Sam Darcy—real name Dardeck.

New Masses letter to the President: This was one of the rankest of defenses for the illegal and subversive activities of the Communists during the period of the Stalin-Hitler pact. Seldes was a signer of the letter.

New York Peace Association: Early in 1940 the Communists organized numerous local groups to express the party line of isolationism in keeping with the Stalin-Hitler pact. The New York Peace Association was one such group. Seldes was one of its sponsors.

Open letter for closer cooperation with the Soviet Union: In September 1939 a group of outstanding Communists and Communist fellow travelers issued this open letter. George Seldes was among the signers.

Soviet Russia Today: Among the contributors to this organ of Communist propaganda was George Seldes—November 1938, page 9.

Spanish defense committees: Seldes was one of the supporters of the Campaign to Aid International Volunteers, a Communist front to support the Loyalist cause in Spain.

Statement by American progressives on the Moscow trials: Stooges of the American Communists signed this statement, among them being George Seldes.

United American Spanish Aid Committee: Seldes was on the executive board of this Communist front.

United States Week: A Communist-line magazine of which Seldes was a contributing editor.

American Farmers Vigilante Committee

REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, for too many years high New Deal officials have promoted labor-management strife. This reached an all-time high when the President of the United States stated over the radio that we could raise wages without raising prices. Of course, that statement is incorrect, it never has been done, wages and prices go up and down together. The President's speech was an invitation to strike.

More than 6 months has elapsed since the war ended, but we have had no production of goods because of the strife and confusion emanating from the New Deal. I have before me a letter from the American Farmers Vigilante Committee and the resolutions which they have adopted, reading as follows:

AMERICAN FARMERS
VIGILANTE COMMITTEE,
Edgar, Nebr., March 1, 1946.

Hon. CARL CURTIS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On behalf of our membership and affiliated organizations, representing more than 22,000 farmers, we are sending you the resolutions passed at our last meeting.

We respectfully request that you read these resolutions to the House of Representatives, as we feel that the Congress of the United States can, if it will, make it unnecessary for us to further complicate the business of reconversion.

Sincerely,

V. HUBERT JOHNSON,
President.

Be it resolved, That labor and industry by their present bickering and refusal to settle their differences and get back to the job of producing vitally needed goods, tools, and machinery, are doing the Nation grave damage; be it further

Resolved, That we do not believe the Nation can be restored to normalcy and prosperity by refusing to work—but, if that is the way the rest of the Nation insists upon trying to do the job, we farmers will help.

Therefore, if the present intolerable situation is not soon remedied, and the goods we need provided with all possible speed, we will take the following action:

First. Appeal to all farmers to join our members and affiliates in withholding from the market all farm produce until the wheels of industry again begin to roll.

Second. If such withholding of produce does not bring the desired results, we will appeal to all farmers to seed only enough of their land to take care of themselves. This action, we realize would not only shut off the foundation of foodstuff, but so wreck the reservoir from which that fountain springs, that nothing could be done about it until another seeding time. That would be a catastrophe, and we will advocate such action only as a last resort.

We hope our fellow citizens in other walks of life will not press us that far; but we have held the bag long enough, if the rest can quit producing, so can we. We ask that Congress and all American citizens give this serious thought, as planting time will soon be upon us; be it

Resolved, That the price of farm produce should be increased in the same proportion as the wages of labor, and the cost of industries' finished product—and that this organization will strive in every way possible to bring about such an adjustment; be it

Resolved, That the farmers of the Nation, being vitally concerned, should have a seat at the conference table whenever labor and capital sit down with Government; be it further

Resolved, That this organization will work toward this end and insist that the farmer who occupies their seat represent all the farmers of America, not just one of the many farm groups now apparently engaged in keeping the Nation's farmers divided; be it

Resolved, That we are opposed to payment from taxes of unemployment compensation to men who will not work, or who are prevented from working by strike action; be it

Resolved, That we are opposed on principle to subsidies, which are only a method of financing a person or business by public taxation. If any business cannot endure without a hand-out from the Public Treasury, it is bankrupt, and it either should be liquidated or allowed to adjust its prices; be it

Resolved, That the farmer is facing a new crop year under enough handicaps without being further hampered by the drafting of young farmers. We demand that this evil be stopped, by declaration upon the part of President Truman that the war is officially ended; be it

Resolved, That copies of this and of all other resolutions adopted at this meeting be made and sent to Senators BUTLER and WHERRY, of Nebraska, and also to Nebraska Members of the House of Representatives with the request that they be read upon the floors of both Houses of Congress.

James F. Scanlon

REMARKS
OF
HON. EMMET O'NEAL
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, on December 1, 1915, James F. Scanlon began 30 years of service with the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and on February 16, 1918, he transferred to the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, and has remained there ever since. He came to Washington, as a young man, with the Honorable Swagar Sherley, a former chairman of the Appropriations Committee. Jim Scanlon is still a young man, after these long years of service, and in my opinion he will always have a youthful spirit, abounding in energy and love of life. If there is a job to be done, even now, he can wear down any colaborer in the vineyard; if there is fun to be had, he can outlast the most youthful; if there is a service to be rendered, he will be there when the others have gone.

When I first came to Washington, a verdant inexperienced Congressman, I landed on the Appropriations Committee and Jim Scanlon spread a protecting wing around me. He tendered me his friendship in a true Irish way, with a reservation of the right to give me the devil if I ever needed it. He exercised that right on more than one occasion. I am grateful to him for the beneficent frankness he used to correct the error of my ways. Whenever a friend or constituent from Louisville came to Washington, I would take him in to see my friend, Jim Scanlon, and he would extend himself in according to me great praise for my so-called accomplishments. Of course they were exaggerated by the kindly, genial, and imaginative good will of a true son of Erin. His kindliness, his friendship, his advice, and his ability developed in me a deep affection, which could never be lessened by his frank disapproval of me at other times.

Jim Scanlon made a fine and abiding contribution to his country in his daily devotion to duty. His careful analyses of problems before the Appropriations Committee, his intelligent suggestions as to corrections of the work of the committee, here and there, his common sense, his 100-percent Americanism, his loyalty, his fearlessness, and all that goes to make up the man, have left their imprint on the future of this country, and upon those, particularly, who have served on the Appropriations Committee. Like others, I will hold a lasting respect and devotion for him. His contribution to his country cannot be fully told. May he live long and enjoy the reward of duty well done.

The Appropriations Committee adopted a resolution, born of friendship, admiration, and respect of the individual members of the committee, with which I would like to close this brief and inadequate tribute to my friend, Jim Scanlon:

Resolution in tribute to our retiring administrative clerk, Mr. James F. Scanlon

Whereas the official active-duty connection of Mr. James F. Scanlon with the Committee on Appropriations of the United States House of Representatives voluntarily will terminate on November 30, 1945, after a period of continuous service beginning on February 16, 1918; and

Whereas Mr. Scanlon's entire period of service has been one of unsurpassed loyalty and devotion to duty, and of successive contributions to the efficient, intelligent, and orderly procedures and accomplishments of the Committee on Appropriations, and hence the House of Representatives and the Congress; and

Whereas Mr. Scanlon's fine personal qualities, companionableness, and unselfish devotion to duty, and his everreadiness to aid, counsel, and advise, have won for him the enduring admiration, affection, and esteem of every member of the Committee on Appropriations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Committee on Appropriations, individually and collectively, wholeheartedly share in the preceding expressions and join in a declaration of their everlasting gratitude for the splendid service Mr. Scanlon has rendered, and in extending to him their earnest wish that his life ahead may be long and bountifully strewn with God's richest blessings;

Resolved, further, That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the records of the committee and that the original signed copy thereof be transmitted to Mr. Scanlon.

Adopted by the committee November 26, 1945, and subscribed to by each of the following Members thereof:

CLARENCE CANNON, Missouri, chairman; CLIFTON A. WOODRUM, Virginia; LOUIS LUDLOW, Indiana; MALCOLM C. TARVER, Georgia; JED JOHNSON, Oklahoma; J. BUELL SNYDER, Pennsylvania; EMMET

O'NEAL, Kentucky; LOUIS C. RABAUT, Michigan; JOHN H. KERR, North Carolina; GEORGE H. MAHON, Texas; HARRY R. SHEPPARD, California; BUTLER B. HARE, South Carolina; ALBERT THOMAS, Texas; JOE HENDRICKS, Florida; MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Ohio; JOHN M. COFFEE, Washington; W. F. NORRELL, Arkansas; ALBERT GORE, Tennessee; JAMIE L. WHITTEN, Mississippi; THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, Illinois; JAMES M. CURLEY, Massachusetts; THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR., Maryland; GEORGE W. ANDREWS, Alabama; JOHN J. ROONEY, New York; HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN, Connecticut; JOHN TABER, New York; RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, Massachusetts; CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, Vermont; EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Illinois; ALBERT J. ENGEL, Michigan; KARL STEFAN, Nebraska; FRANCIS H. CASE, South Dakota; FRANK B. KEEFE, Wisconsin; NOBLE J. JOHNSON, Indiana; ROBERT F. JONES, Ohio; BEN F. JENSEN, Iowa; H. CARL ANDERSEN, Minnesota; HENRY C. DWORSHAK, Idaho; WALTER C. PLOESER, Missouri; HARVE TIBBOTT, Pennsylvania; WALT HORAN, Washington; DEAN M. GILLESPIE, Colorado; GORDON CANFIELD, New Jersey.

Reply to James Roosevelt

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, an Associated Press article of February 28, tells us that James Roosevelt, son of the former President, has assumed the position of national director of political organization for the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.

This article quotes him as assuming to speak for the Democratic Party, bidding for all the left-wing liberals and saying that "the other side can have BILBO and RANKIN, of Mississippi." Poor Jimmie, he may not know it, but he is no longer in a position to speak for the Democratic Party. He has now joined the Communists.

This Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions is one of the rankest Communist-front organizations in the whole country.

According to Samuel Sillen of the Communist Daily Worker, the official Communist organ in the United States, this organization changed its name in December of 1944 from the Independent Voters Committee to the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. Investigation reveals that this organization today includes many sincere liberals who have been misled into joining it. Probably that is how Jimmie got hooked.

However, the core of this organization is composed of a group of admitted Communists and a long list of fellow travelers, who have given their support to Communist-front organizations dedicated to one or more of the following purposes:

First. Defense of the Communist Party and its members.

Second. Support of Communist publications.

Third. Support of the Soviet Union and its foreign policy.

Fourth. Support of special campaigns under Communist initiative.

Everyone knows that the Communist Party is dedicated to the overthrow of this Government, as will appear from the following statement made by its present leader, William Z. Foster, in accepting the nomination for President of the Communist Party in the United States. Here is Mr. Foster's exact words which he admitted under oath before the Committee on Un-American Activities:

> No Communist, no matter how many votes he should secure in a national election, could, even if he would, become President of the present Government. When a Communist heads a Government of the United States (and that day will come just as surely as the sun rises), that Government will not be a capitalistic government, but a Soviet government, and behind this government will stand the Red Army to enforce the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Documentary evidence to prove the Communist affiliation of the organizations which I name is available.

The New Masses, a well-known organ of the Communist movement in the United States, had this to say of this group:

> Every lover of a richer life will welcome the new Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions headed by Jo Davidson, prominent sculptor.

Jo Davidson, chairman of this newly formed group, sponsored the Congress of American Soviet Friendship, which was cited as a Communist front on March 29, 1944, by the Special House Committee on Un-American Activities. Mr. Davidson also signed a statement in honor of George Dimitroff, former head of the Communist International and one of the bloodiest revolutionists the world has ever known.

Treasurer of the group is Frederick March, who sponsored the Congress of American Soviet Friendship and seven other Communist front organizations. Mr. March was identified as a member of the Communist Party by a party member who testified under oath before the Tenney Fact Finding Committee of the State of California.

Chairman of the finance committee is Herman Schumlin, who, on April 13, 1940, defended public school teachers in New York charged with Communist activities, signed a statement for release of Sam Darcy, Communist Party organizer, sponsored the committee defending William Schneiderman, a Communist organizer, sponsored tribute to Ferdinant Smith, Communist maritime union leader and one of the leaders in the recently exposed Communist sponsored dock strike in New York City.

During the days of the Hitler-Stalin pact, Mr. Schumlin signed a protest against what he called the war hysteria of the administration.

He was also a member of the executive committee of the so-called American Friends of the Chinese People, a Communist-front organization, together with Philip Jaffee, alias J. W. Phillips, who was recently convicted of securing State Department secrets illegally. Other Communist-front activities include membership in and support of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee and executive board of the American League for Peace and Democracy, another well-known Communist-front organization.

Other Communist-front supporters of the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions include Louis Adamic, who is affiliated with 25 Communist fronts; William Rose Benet, 16 Communist fronts; Ernest P. Boss, 7 Communist fronts; Langston Hughes, 49; Canada Lee, 3; Max Lerner, 26; Martin Popper, 3; Paul Robeson, 34; Edward G. Robinson, 2; Orson Welles, 14; Mary McLeod Bethune (colored), 39; Aaron Copland, 22; Philip Evergood, 13; Henry Pratt Fairchild, 40; Walter Rautenstrauch, 45; Viljalmur Stefanson, 32; Marc Connelly, 6; Norman Corwin, 7; Lillian Hellman, 40; and Harlow Shapley, 11.

The above are merely typical of the group. The following sponsors of this Communist-front committee have from time to time written for the two chief Communist organs in the country, the Communist Daily Worker and the New Masses: Louis Adamic, Howard Fast, Philip Evergood, Langston Hughes, Raphael Soyer, Viljalmur Stefanson, Paul Robeson. Other well-known Communist-front sponsors associated with this committee include John Howard Lawson, leading Communist agitator in the film colony; Louis Calhern, of Actors Equity; John T. McMannus, Alonzo F. Meyers, John P. Peters, Earl Robinson, Dr. Gregory Zilborg, and Johannes Steele, recently sponsored by the Communist Party in New York City to fill a vacancy in this House.

The Washington branch of the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions gave domicile and direction to the youthful Federation of Atomic Scientists, who adopted as their platform a plea to release atomic secrets to Russia, stating: "We—United States—cannot afford the luxury of adopting legislation putting atomic bomb controls on a national basis."

They want us to give it to the Communists of the world so they can use it to destroy our Christian civilization.

I bring these facts to your attention, because many of the sponsors of this so-called Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions have also been in the past, and are today, endorsers, sponsors, and officers of other pro-Communist groups, chiefly in the cultural field.

On August 10, 11, and 12 of 1945, the New York State convention of the Communist Political Association held secret sessions at Manhattan. At this, as at a previous convention, held in July of the same year, Mr. Earl Browder was dethroned at the direction of the master voice from Moscow, and the former IWW

leader of the First World War, William Z. Foster, became the new head of the Communist Party, pledged to return to class hate and industrial warfare as directed by Jacques Duclos, who had recently returned from Moscow to take up the reins of the Communist Party in France.

During this convention June Hoffman, of the cultural section of the Communist Party, addressed the members, saying:

We built the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. It is a great political weapon.

I am sure that Jimmie Roosevelt did not realize when he joined up with this gang that he would be one of the tools of this great political weapon of the Communist Party.

I have before me a letter from one of the former members of this organization in New York City who was misled into joining them.

This letter is addressed to the Committee on Un-American Activities, and is as follows:

You may already have had your attention drawn to the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, headquarters at Hotel Astor in New York City, as a possible front for Soviet anti-American activities. As one who in an art organization has had ample opportunity to observe the methods and psychology of the Communist, I urge you to do what is possible to control them.

You undoubtedly know that the artistic and educated workers in general have been especially hard hit by rising costs of living with only sporadic rises in earning power. You also know the use which was made in Russia of these idealistic and impractical people. The combination makes them rather an obvious group to be made use of by the Soviet in their fifth-column activities. These people need protection.

I, like several of my friends, joined the organization early before the end of the war. The avowed policy was to back the war effort and then to do what was possible to further the arts, sciences, and professions during the difficult employment era that was expected after the war was over. This avowed purpose has been gradually all but eliminated. Several times a week, in spite of the fact that I sent in my resignation last October, I received orders as to my political activities, who to vote for, what to write my Congressman, to join picket lines, etc. The direction has become increasingly obvious. Strong literature was sent out in favor of Davis, the Negro (Communist) who wanted to organize a colored Communist nation in the South. * * * The latest told us to write Congress to back a bill suppressing your committee. It is a tome rather than any one activity that leads me—and some of my most intelligent friends—to believe as we do.

I think America has proved during the war that she believes in democracy. I believe that most of those now working along Communist lines do not realize to what they are exposing themselves. I feel therefore, that your attention should be strongly directed toward this committee.

Therefore Mr. Speaker, instead of Jimmie Roosevelt trying to read decent Democrats out of the party from his point of vantage in a Communist-front organization, I would suggest that he get back on the beam himself, that he return to the Democratic fold himself, and then, as the Saviour once said:

"Go and sin no more."

Government Commitments for Agricultural Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been trying to find a condensed statement showing in intelligible form the various commitments that have been made by this Government with respect to the agriculture of the Nation. To my amazement I discovered that no such summary existed in the Department of Agriculture, and I therefore asked the Secretary of Agriculture to prepare such a statement for me.

The figures in the financial tables require very careful analysis inasmuch as there are recoverable capital obligations and expenditures for the purchase of resaleable commodities which somewhat confuse the picture. Nevertheless, these tables indicate the tremendous size of Government expenditures for the benefit of agriculture, some of which, such as the subsidy payments, must obviously be reduced or eliminated in the near future.

The statement follows:

SUMMARY OF LEGISLATION RELATING TO PROGRAMS FOR THE BENEFIT OF AGRICULTURE

SOIL CONSERVATION AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

Soil Conservation Service: The Secretary of Agriculture was directed by sections 1 to 6 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590a-590f), to create the Soil Conservation Service, and he was authorized to carry out through this Service a broad program for the control and prevention of soil erosion by research, methods of cultivation, furnishing of financial or other aid, and acquisition of lands when necessary to carry out such purposes.

Agricultural Adjustment programs (AAA): The agricultural conservation programs authorized by sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g-590q), direct the Secretary of Agriculture to make payments and grants of other aid to agricultural producers for the purposes of preservation and improvement of soil fertility, promotion of the economic use and conservation of land, diminution of exploitation, and wasteful and unscientific use of national soil resources, the protection of rivers and harbors against the results of soil erosion in aid of maintaining the navigability of waters and water courses and in aid of flood control, and reestablishment at as rapid a rate as the Secretary of Agriculture determines to be practicable and in the general public interest of the ratio between the purchasing power of the net income per person on farms and that of the income per person not on farms that prevailed during the 5-year period August 1909 to July 1914, inclusive, and the maintenance of such ratio. Section 15 of the act (16 U. S. C. 590o) authorizes an appropriation of $500,000,000 a fiscal year to enable the Secretary to make such payments and grants of aid.

Sugar programs and payments: Section 301 of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1131), authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to make payments with respect to sugar or liquid sugar commercially recoverable from the sugar beets or sugarcane grown on a farm for the extraction of sugar or liquid sugar provided growers comply with certain conditions relating to child labor, farm wages, and soil conservation, among others.

Land conservation and utilization (submarginal lands): A program of land conservation and land utilization providing, among other purposes, assistance in controlling soil erosion and preserving natural resources is authorized by title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1010–1013). In connection with such program, the Secretary's powers include that of acquiring and retiring from cultivation, lands that are submarginal or not primarily suitable for cultivation, and he is authorized to protect, improve, develop, and administer such acquired lands.

Water conservation and utilization: Conservation and utilization projects for the purpose of stabilizing water supply are authorized by the act of August 11, 1939, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590y–590z–10) (Case-Wheeler). Construction, operation, and maintenance of water projects by the Government with cost thereof to be reimbursed by the water users under various conditions is provided by such authority.

Flood control: The Flood Control Acts of 1936, 1938, and 1944, as amended and supplemented (33 U. S. C. 701a et seq.) conferred various functions on the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to making surveys and carrying out measures on watersheds for run-off and water-flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention in aid of flood control. The Secretary is authorized to carry out programs for the same purpose on 11 designated river basins or watersheds in accordance with reports submitted by the Department and approved by Congress.

SUBSIDY, PRICE SUPPORT, AND RELATED PROGRAMS

Subsidies, general: Subsidies on agricultural commodities are authorized by the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 968), and section 2 (e) of the Stabilization Act of 1944, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 902 (e)). Section 2 (e) prohibits payment of subsidies after June 30, 1945, unless money has been appropriated by Congress for such purposes. Section 3 of the act of April 12, 1945 (59 Stat. 50 (Public Law 30, 79th Cong.)), makes the foregoing inapplicable to the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and limits the amounts which may be spent in subsidy programs. The act of July 31, 1945 (59 Stat. 506 (Public Law 164, 79th Cong.)), increased the amounts authorized to be expended by the Corporation pursuant to section 3 of the act of April 12, 1945, with respect to livestock and livestock products, wheat and wheat products, and butterfat and butter.

Price support, basic commodities: Price support of basic commodities is provided by section 8 of the Stabilization Act of 1942 (50 U. S. C. App. 968), as amended by section 2(4 of the Stabilization Extension Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 632, 643), as amended by section 37 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 765, 784), and further authority is contained in section 302 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1302), authorized loans on agricultural commodities by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the act of July 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 506 (Public Law 108, 79th Cong.)).

Price support, other commodities: Price support authority for so-called Steagall commodities, those for which an expansion of production for war purposes is necessary, is provided by section 4 of the act of July 1, 1941, as amended (15 U. S. C. 713a-8 (a)).

Price support, other commodities: Price support for agricultural commodities, other than basic and Steagall commodities, is authorized by section 4 (b) of the act of July 1, 1941, as amended (15 U. S. C. 713a-8 (b)),

under which it is declared to be the policy that lending and purchase operations of the Department of Agriculture shall be carried out so as to bring the price and income of the producers of nonbasic agricultural commodities to a fair parity relationship with the basic and the Steagall commodities to the extent that funds are available for such operations with respect to basic and Steagall commodities and the ability of producers to bring supplies into line with demand.

Lend-Lease appropriation: Price support operations are incidentally affected by the provisions of section 201 (d) of the Defense Aid Appropriation Act, 1946, 59 Stat. 412 (Public Law 132, 79th Congress), which earmarked $500,000,000 of lend-lease funds for the procurement of agricultural commodities and foods produced in anticipation of lend-lease needs for expenditure for the postwar price support of agriculture.

Indirect price support (disposal of commodities): Indirect price support is effected by certain laws relating to the disposal of Government owned and controlled stocks of agricultural commodities, the laws which regulate marketing (the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, 7 U. S. C. 671–674 and 608c), and imposition of marketing quotas (Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, 7 U. S. C. 1311–1375), and those encouraging the consumption of agricultural commodities (sec. 32 of the act of August 24, 1935, as amended, 7 U. S. C. 612c). Restrictions on the disposal of Government owned and controlled stocks at less than parity prices have been included in the annual Department of Agriculture appropriation acts for some years. The restrictions applicable to the Commodity Credit Corporation are, by section 21 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 775), made applicable to the disposition of surplus farm commodities by any Federal agency. Such restrictions have been carried over for a period of 2 years after the war by the act of April 12, 1945, 59 Stat. 50 (Public Law 30, 79th Cong.). Section 2 of the act removes, for a period of 2 years after the war, the restrictions regarding prices and quantities imposed by section 381 (c) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1381 (c)), on the sales of pledged cotton by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Parity guaranties and export bounties: Authorizations which involve expenditures with respect to parity guaranties and export bounties, in addition to those previously cited regarding price support operations, are to be found in section 21 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, which provides that commodities may be sold at less than current prevailing market prices, or less than prices applicable to sales of commodities by the Commodity Credit Corporation when such sales are for export only.

Exportation and domestic consumption (sec. 32 programs): Further parity guaranties and export bounties are incident to programs to encourage exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural products authorized by section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935, as amended (7 U. S. C. 612c). The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to use funds made available under such section to encourage exportation of agricultural commodities by the payment of benefits in connection with such exportation or by payments to producers in connection with the production of that part of any agricultural commodity required for domestic consumption, encourage the domestic consumption of agricultural commodities by diverting them by the payment of benefits or indemnities or by other means from the normal channels of trade, or by increasing their utilization through benefits, indemnities, donations, or by other means, among persons in low-income groups, and reestablishing farmers' purchasing power by making payments in connection with the normal production of any agricultural commodity for domestic consumption.

Parity payments: Payments to producers of certain commodities to obtain parity prices are authorized by section 303 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1303). Such act authorizes and directs the Secretary, if and when appropriations are made therefor, to make payments to producers of corn, wheat, cotton, rice, or tobacco, on their normal production of such commodities in amounts which, together with the proceeds thereof, will provide a return to such producers which is as nearly equal to parity prices as the funds so made available will permit. Appropriations were not made for this purpose for either the 1945 or 1946 fiscal years.

LOAN ACTIVITIES

Farm Credit Administration

The Farm Credit Administration resulted from a consolidation of farm-loan agencies by Executive Order No. 6084, March 27, 1933.

Federal land banks, joint stock land banks, and national farm loan associations: The Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended (12 U. S. C. 641–1012) authorized the establishment of Federal land banks, joint stock land banks, and national farm loan associations under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration for the purpose of making agricultural credit available to farmers on long-term mortgage loans.

Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation: The Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act of January 31, 1934, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1020–1020h), authorized the establishment of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation with a capital of $200,000,000, subscribed by the Governor on behalf of the United States. The corporation was authorized, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, to issue bonds in an aggregate amount not exceeding $2,000,000,000, guaranteed by the United States. It is further authorized to purchase consolidated farm loan bonds, to make loans to Federal land banks and joint stock land banks, and to invest in mortgage loans made under the authority of the act of May 12, 1933, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1016–1020).

Federal intermediate credit banks: The Federal intermediate credit banks were authorized to be established by the Agricultural Credit Acts of 1923, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1021–1129). Such institutions act as a bank of discount to supply short-term funds required by production credit associations, private financing institutions which make loans to farmers, and farmer cooperatives.

Regional and Central Bank for Cooperatives: Regional banks for cooperatives were authorized to be established in each of the 12 farm-credit districts, and a central bank for cooperatives was also authorized by the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1134–1138f). Such banks are authorized to make, in addition to loans to banks created under the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, loans to cooperative associations and stabilization corporations established under the Agricultural Marketing Act, as as amended (12 U. S. C. 1141–1141j).

Production credit corporations and production credit associations: Production credit corporations and production credit associations were authorized to be created by the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1131–1131i). The Production Credit Corporation supervises local production credit associations, which make short-term loans to finance all types of farm operations, including loans to farmers for the purpose of enabling them to make home alterations, repairs, and improvements, and loans to oyster planters.

Regional agricultural credit corporations: Regional agricultural credit corporations were authorized to be established by the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1148–1148d). Such corporations are empowered to make loans to farmers and stockmen, the proceeds of which are to be used for an agricultural purpose, including crop production, or for the raising, breeding, fattening or marketing of livestock.

Emergency crop and feed loans: Emergency crop and feed loans are authorized by the act of January 29, 1937, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1020i–1020o). Such loans may be made to farmers for fallowing, planting, cultivation, production or harvesting of crops, supplies incident thereto, feed for livestock or for any of such purposes.

Cooperative associations and stabilization corporations (Agricultural Marketing Revolving Fund): The Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1141–1141j), authorized the establishment of a revolving fund to be used in connection with loans to cooperative associations and stabilization corporations when such loans promote the effective merchandising of agricultural commodities so that the industry of agriculture will be placed on a basis of economic equality with other industries, and to that end to protect, control, and stabilize the currents of interstate and foreign commerce in the marketing of agricultural commodities and their food products. The Farm Credit Administration is authorized to promote education in the principles and practices of cooperative marketing, to encourage the organization, improvement in methods, and development of effective cooperative associations, and to keep advised and make reports as to crop prices, experience, prospects, supply and demand, at home and abroad.

Cooperative Marketing Division: In addition to lending activities, the establishment of a division of cooperative marketing was authorized by the Cooperative Marketing Act of July 2, 1926 (7 U. S. C. 451–457). Such Division is authorized to render service to associations of producers of agricultural products, and federations and subsidiaries thereof, engaged in the cooperative marketing of agricultural products, the cooperative purchasing of farm supplies, credit, financing, insurance, and other cooperative activities.

Farm Security Administration

Farm ownership loans: The Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act of July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006, 1014–1029), authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans so as to enable farm tenants, farm laborers and sharecroppers and other persons to acquire farms constituting efficient farm-management units. Funds appropriated for making tenant purchase loans are distributed between the several States and Territories on the basis of farm population and the prevalence of tenancy. An appropriation of not to exceed $50,000,000 for each fiscal year after 1939, is authorized by the act. The Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1946, Public Law 52, Seventy-ninth Congress, made available $50,000,000 but earmarked $25,000,000 for loans to veterans without regard to the customary allocation between the States.

Rehabilitation loans: Rural rehabilitation loans are made pursuant to the authority of the annual Department of Agriculture appropriation acts. Such loans are made to needy low-income farm families who are unable to secure credit from any other source at comparable rates to purchase feed, seed, livestock, farm equipment, and other farm and home supplies.

Water storage and utilization: Facilities for water storage and utilization in arid and semiarid areas are authorized by the act of August 28, 1937 (16 U. S. C. 590r–590x, 590z–5). The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to formulate a program of projects for the con-

struction and maintenance of water-storage or utilization facilities and to furnish financial or other aid in connection with the development of water facilities. Financial aid has been in the form of loans to groups unable to secure credit elsewhere.

Flood restoration: Flood restoration loans are made and servicing of prior flood loans is done pursuant to the authority contained in Public Law 82, Seventy-ninth Congress. Such loans are made to farmers who have suffered flood damage to their farms in the calendar year 1945.

Rural Electrification Administration

Electric power and equipment: The Rural Electrification Administration is authorized by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901–915), to lend money for the purpose of financing the construction and operation of generating plants, electric transmission and distribution lines and systems for the furnishing of electric energy to persons in rural areas who are not receiving central station service and the wiring of the premises of persons in rural areas and the acquisition and installation of electrical and pumping appliances and equipment.

PAYMENTS TO STATES

Extension service

Agricultural extension activities: Cooperative agricultural extension work for the giving of instruction and practical demonstrations in agriculture and home economics through land-grant colleges, extension agents and farm people in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture and payments to States of grants for such extension activites are authorized by the following statutes:

1. Smith-Lever Act of May 8, 1914 (7 U. S. C. 341–343, 344–348).
2. Capper-Ketcham Act of May 22, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 343a, b).
3. Bankhead-Jones Act of June 29, 1935 (title II, sec. 21, U. S. C. 343).
4. Act of April 24, 1939 (7 U. S. C. 343c–1).

The provisions of these statutes were extended to the Territory of Alaska by the act of February 23, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 386c), and the act of June 20, 1936 (7 U. S. C. 343e); to the Territory of Hawaii by the act of May 16, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 386–386b), and the act of June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 343d); and to Puerto Rico by the act of March 4, 1931, as amended (7 U. S. C. 386d-f), and the act of August 28, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 343f-g).

Experiment stations

State agricultural experiment stations: Research, experiments, and investigations at agricultural experiment stations bearing directly on the agricultural industry of the United States relating to plants and animals, diseases and remedies for same, crop rotation, use of plants, trees, grasses, fertilizers, analysis of soils and waters, production, manufacture, preparation, use, distribution, and marketing of agricultural products and scientific researches for the establishment of a permanent agricultural industry and the development and improvement of rural home and rural life together with payments to the States for carrying out such activities are authorized by the following statutes:

1. Hatch Act of March 2, 1887 (7 U. S. C. 362, 363, 378).
2. Adams Act of March 16, 1906 (7 U. S. C. 369).
3. Purnell Act of February 24, 1925 (7 U. S. C. 370).
4. Bankhead-Jones Act of June 29, 1935, title I, section 2, as amended (7 U. S. C. 427a–427g).

The provisions of these statutes were extended to the Territory of Alaska by the act of February 23, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 386c), and the act of June 20, 1936 (7 U. S. C. 369a), to the Territory of Hawaii by the act of May 16, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 386–386b), and to Puerto Rico by the act of March 4, 1931, as amended (7 U. S. C. 386d–f).

Crop insurance

The Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1501–1519), authorizes and empowers the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, beginning with the 1945 crops, to insure producers of wheat, cotton, and flax, against loss in yields due to unavoidable causes. The corporation is also authorized to insure producers of certain other crops on an experimental basis for a period of 3 years. Experimental programs are applicable only to corn and tobacco for 1945 and 1946.

Summary of obligations by major programs, U. S. Department of Agriculture, fiscal years 1945–47 [1]

[These obligations do not represent the net cost to the Government, since there are offsetting recoveries such as collections of principal and interest on loans, receipts from sale of commodities, and crop-insurance-premium collections]

Program	Obligations, 1945	Estimated obligations, 1946	Estimated obligations, 1947
1. Soil-conservation and related programs:			
Soil-conservation operations and research	$29,378,265	$34,503,500	$38,078,000
Agricultural conservation program (principally payments to farmers)	335,325,830	328,235,216	269,341,098
Conditional payments under the Sugar Act	52,452,391	48,428,532	54,966,715
Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land	1,482,535	1,371,200	1,598,000
Water-conservation and utilization projects (Wheeler-Case program)	866,185	1,138,749	1,131,000
Flood-control program	164,269	1,065,017	5,167,435
Total, soil conservation and related programs	419,669,475	414,742,314	370,282,248
2. Subsidy, price-support, and related programs:			
Commodity Credit Corporation. (See also loans, item 3 (a) below.) [2] Includes such programs as dairy production, feed wheat, and other subsidy programs; soybean, cotton, wool, and other price-support purchases, and wheat, tobacco, sugar, and other supply purchases of basic commodities [3]	2,307,833,483	2,590,000,000	(4)
Programs under sec. 32, act of Aug. 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612c) for purchase of agricultural commodities for distribution through State welfare agencies, diversion of agricultural commodities to byproducts and new uses, encouragement of exportation of agricultural commodities, school-lunch and milk programs, and related expenses	66,124,906	114,960,992	[5] 205,787,241
Total, subsidy, price-support, and related programs	2,373,958,389	2,704,960,992	
3. Loan programs:			
(a) Commodity Credit Corporation (principally price-support loans) [2]	527,294,110	200,000,000	(4)
(b) Farm Credit Administration:			
Loans:			
Federal land banks [2]	80,112,126	109,400,000	[6] 69,563,000
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation [2]	40,243,955	13,723,000	(4)
Federal intermediate-credit banks [2]	873,643,868	878,175,000	(4)
Banks for cooperatives [2]	379,885,224	384,365,000	444,800,000
Production credit associations [2]	500,305,170	525,000,000	525,000,000
Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation [2]	12,608,651	7,800,000	(4)
Subtotal	1,866,798,994	1,918,463,000	
Less Federal intermediate-credit bank loans to and discounts for other FCA institutions [2]	791,147,956	800,000,000	(4)
	1,095,651,038	1,118,463,000	(4)
Emergency crop and feed loans	16,232,897	18,000,000	20,000,000
Agricultural marketing revolving fund	759,000	700,000	500,000
Total, Farm Credit Administration loans	1,112,642,935	1,137,163,000	
Administrative expenses:			
Corporate funds [2]	30,465,645	32,094,200	[7] 21,302,200
Appropriated funds	4,902,270	5,003,009	5,178,300
Total, Farm Credit Administration administrative and operating expenses	35,367,915	37,097,209	
Total, Farm Credit Administration	1,148,010,850	1,174,260,209	
(c) Farm Security Administration:			
Loans:			
Farm tenancy [8]	11,699,346	50,000,000	50,000,000
Rural rehabilitation [8]	66,907,653	67,500,000	67,500,000
Water facilities, arid and semiarid areas	806,669	798,500	1,777,200
Flood and windstorm damage	352,358	1,750,000	
Total, Farm Security Administration loans	79,766,526	120,048,500	119,277,200
Administrative expenses including servicing and collecting outstanding loans, grants, etc.	26,766,282	29,021,371	26,957,495
Total, Farm Security Administration	106,532,808	149,069,871	146,234,695
(d) Rural Electrification Administration:			
Loans [8]	25,731,055	200,885,786	250,000,000
Administrative expenses, including servicing and collecting outstanding loans	2,898,845	4,671,965	5,000,000
Total, Rural Electrification Administration	28,629,900	205,557,751	255,000,000
Total, loan programs	1,810,467,668	1,728,887,831	
4. Payments to States for extension work and agricultural experiment stations:			
Payments:			
For cooperative extension work, including work of county agents	18,903,660	23,313,660	27,233,660
For State agricultural experiment stations	7,001,208	7,205,208	7,552,500
Total payments	25,904,868	30,519,868	34,786,160
Administrative expenses:			
Federal Extension Service and Office of Experiment Stations	920,844	1,046,491	1,143,593
Total, payments to States for extension work and agricultural experiment stations	26,825,712	31,566,359	35,929,753

Footnotes at end of table.

Summary of obligations by major programs, U. S. Department of Agriculture, fiscal years 1945–47 [1]—Continued

[These obligations do not represent the net cost to the Government, since there are offsetting recoveries such as collections of principal and interest on loans, receipts from sale of commodities, and crop-insurance-premium collections]

Program	Obligations, 1945	Estimated obligations, 1946	Estimated obligations, 1947
5. Crop insurance:			
Indemnities paid, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation [2]	$492,551	$13,823,950	[4]
Administrative expenses, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation	2,772,970	8,304,900	[4]
Total, crop insurance	3,265,521	22,128,850	
6. Forestry: National forest protection and management, fighting forest fires, forest research, farm and other private forestry cooperation, forest roads and trails, and related activities	41,322,187	48,966,698	$82,709,193
7. Marketing services and regulatory activities: Meat inspection, crop and livestock estimates, market news service, inspection and grading of farm products, regulatory, and other related activities	18,546,565	19,010,549	21,139,762
8. Crop, livestock, food, and related research: Investigations in animal and plant production, breeding and improvement, in methods of controlling diseases and insect pests, in agricultural chemistry, and in food, textiles, and home economics; soil, fertilizer, and agricultural engineering studies; and agricultural economic investigations	20,107,426	21,525,986	23,739,058
9. Control of insect pests and plant and animal diseases: Eradication of tuberculosis and Bang's disease; control of insect pests and plant diseases, including emergency outbreaks and white-pine blister rust; inspection and quarantine of plants and animals, etc	14,087,413	15,658,886	18,996,548
10. Special war items not classified above:			
Emergency Rubber Project	4,138,875	3,866,500	250,000
Salaries and expenses, War Food Administration	25,335,133	11,000,691	
Farm Labor Supply Program	27,400,042	24,140,962	[10] 8,393,455
Total, special war items not classified above	57,174,050	39,008,153	8,643,455
Grand total, foregoing items	4,785,424,416	5,046,456,618	
BY SOURCES OF FUNDS			
Appropriations	719,349,035	773,689,682	826,640,253
Loan authorizations (RFC funds)	104,338,554	318,385,786	367,500,000
Capital funds (Commodity Credit Corporation, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, and institutions supervised by Farm Credit Administration)	3,961,736,827	3,954,381,150	[4]
Total	4,785,424,416	5,046,456,618	

[1] Excludes obligations against trust funds, reimbursements, and transfers and allocations from other agencies.
[2] Financed with corporation funds.
[3] Exclusive of purchases under the General Commodities Purchase program, principally for Lend-Lease and UNRRA operations, amounting to $1,311,048,900 in 1945, and $210,000,000 (estimated) in 1946. This program includes only non-basic commodities.
[4] Budget estimates of obligations for 1947 for wholly owned Government corporations are now being prepared pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act, approved Dec. 6, 1945, and will be furnished as soon as they are available.
[5] Includes estimated reappropriation of $88,000,000 of unused balances of prior year funds.
[6] Decrease reflects assumptions that (1) Land Bank Commissioner lending authority, which expires June 30, 1946, will not be extended, (2) no change in present lending limit (65 percent of normal agricultural value), and (3) Federal land banks will close only a small proportion of loans presently being closed jointly by Federal land banks and Land Bank Commissioner.
[7] Does not include any amounts or wholly owned Government corporations for the reason stated in footnote 4 above.
[8] Financed with funds borrowed from RFC.
[9] Represents payments relating to 1943 and prior crop year programs. Operation of the Federal Crop Insurance program was reinstated by Public Law 551, approved Dec. 23, 1944.
[10] Represents estimated funds available for first half of fiscal year. Appropriation for this program is made on a calendar year basis.

Prepared by Office of Budget and Finance, Budgetary Reporting and Statistics Section, Feb. 21, 1946.

For the OPA To Be Continued It Should Also Be Improved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who has always voted for the establishment and implementation of the Office of Price Administration. At the same time, I realize that in some instances it has gone to excess and its field representatives have at times engaged in activities smacking strongly of gestapo methods. Now is the time, while we are considering the necessity of extending OPA powers for another 6 months or 1 year, to write in constructive improvements to the basic legislation authorizing the OPA.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I take this means of calling to the attention of the Banking and Currency Committee, which is now considering the OPA extension legislation, the following recommendations which have come to my office from many of the merchants and business people of South Dakota.

I believe these recommendations merit the careful consideration of the committee. I commend them to the study and analysis of the Banking and Currency Committee:

In considering the future status of OPA (if it is to be continued) we merchants of South Dakota respectfully submit the following five-point memorandum for consideration in making this agency function more effectively and more satisfactorily:

1. Prices should be raised on low-run merchandise to compensate for added costs since establishment of the base period price.

2. The additional cost should be paid by the consumer and cannot and should not be partially absorbed by the distributors, whether wholesale or retail.

3. Net profits, under no pretext, should be considered a factor in arriving at price in attempts to gain greater production. (Some OPA representatives contend that since most retailers have made a profit in the past 3 years they can afford to absorb additional costs now.)

4. There should be no publicity for noncompliance allegations until after it has been proven that a violation exists and has been definitely proven fraudulent in intent.

5. The Office of Price Administration and its representatives should be helpful in preventing and correcting misunderstandings and errors that may arise in their multitude of orders to the distributors and retailers rather than seeking means of injuring the retailer by their present methods of investigation (sometimes called "gestapo" methods) which seriously injure the morale and effectiveness of the merchant in the large job he has to do.

We believe that a greatly increased production, facilitated by the above suggestions, would soon tend to decrease prices, the natural law of supply and demand would become effective and competition in the sale of merchandise would end the need for the Office of Price Administration.

Franco Must Go!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. SAVAGE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, getting fascism out of government is like getting thistles out of your field. You have to destroy the roots or it will sprout and grow again.

Franco has stated that he will not step down voluntarily, and why should we expect that he would? He murdered many thousands of Spanish people to get that job, and he is still butchering them to keep it; but the declaration from London, Paris, and Washington is an important step in the right direction.

Therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, I include this fine editorial from the Washington Post of March 6, 1946:

FRANCO MUST GO!

The three-power declaration regarding the Franco regime, issued simultaneously in Paris, Washington, and London, is in several particulars disappointingly vague in language. It also suffers from being not so much a clear-cut program of common action by Great Britain, the United States, and France as a verbal appeal to the Spanish people to rid themselves of their dictator. Given the armed power which Generalissimo Franco commands, this may be a practical impossibility. Nonetheless, the three-power declaration sounds the doom of the Spanish dictatorship. For it is difficult to believe that the three democracies will permit El Caudillo to defy them and perpetuate in a vital corner of Europe a regime which for so long played the enemy's game.

In view of Franco's record, now laid bare by the State Department, the Allies have every reason and every justification for forcing Franco to get out. The charge that any pressure on him would be contrary to the

doctrine of nonintervention is nonsensical in the circumstances of Franco's complicity. It has become dangerous in view of the atomic bomb. The atomic bomb and the presence in the world of dictators create a potentially explosive situation we cannot ignore for a moment. As Dr. Harold C. Urey, Nobel prize winner and one of the men responsible for the development of the bomb, pointed out in New York the other day: "The atom bomb is characteristic of a tyrant's weapon. It is just the weapon that would enable a dictator to sit firmly in his seat and no one could do anything about it."

Actually the three-power declaration on Spain does not contemplate direct intervention—not yet. Indeed, it denies any such intent. It says, and quite rightly, that the "Spanish people themselves must in the long run work out their own destiny." It expresses the hope that "leading patriotic and liberal-minded Spaniards may soon find means to bring about a peaceful withdrawal of Franco, the abolition of the Falange, and the establishment of an interim or caretaker government under which the Spanish people may have an opportunity freely to determine the type of government they wish to have and to choose their leaders." The one positive note struck by the three-power declaration in this connection is that once such an interim government is set up it would be recognized. This recognition would include the taking of practical economic measures by the Allies to assist Spain in her reconstruction.

Franco has now declared flatly that the three-power declaration will not cause him to budge. And as long as he continues to have the support of the Spanish Army, it is hard to see how the Spanish people, no matter how violently they may detest him, can force him out. Accordingly, the three-power declaration cannot be regarded as the final word on the subject, but merely a step in the direction of a goal—the elimination of the Fascist regime in Spain—which it is to the interests of the Spanish people and of the rest of the free world to achieve.

The Rumpus About Tie-in Sales of Liquor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have noticed with amusement the activities of officials of the Alcohol Tax Unit in their campaign to punish liquor dealers for so-called tie-in sales. I yield to none in my high regard for the Chief of the Unit, but, I believe, that his present tactics show a misguided zeal in the public interest. He might as well try to destroy sin or change human nature. He might as well try to milk a ram.

Tie-in sales abound in all business, and are the rule, not the exception. When you go into a haberdashery, either at Independence, Mo., or in Washington, D. C., and try to buy a white shirt, you will find that they are not on display. They are under the counter. You ask for them and you are told finally that you can have one but in addition must buy a patterned or colored shirt. No governmental agency seeks to stop such a tie-in sale nor could any Government agency do so.

If a housewife goes to her grocer for sugar, she expects to be sold, in addition, fresh vegetables or canned fruit. That is perfectly legitimate, although sugar may be rationed. The druggist will try to sell you perfume when you buy Carter's Little Liver Pills or a tooth brush with tooth paste.

No one complains about the dairyman who ties in milk with cheese. In the past, in order to get Ford passenger cars, every Ford dealer was compelled to take a quota of tractors and to subscribe to the Dearborn Independent as well. It has always been the policy of General Motors and all standard motorcar manufacturers to insist that their dealers buy slow-moving models in order to get their fair share of regular up-to-date passenger cars. Over the radio soap is tied-in with all sorts of gadgets. Send 10 box tops of hinky-dink breakfast food and get a toy baby carriage with 50 cents. Or send in 100 wrappers of bubble gum and get a collapsible swimming pool. But let the liquor dealer couple whisky with wine or rum or gin and there is holy war.

What is wrong about it? Frankly the practice of tie-in is as old as the first trading post. Why should the liquor men be deprived of a method of sales promotion which is not frowned upon in any other industry.

Whisky—American and Scotch—is scarce, due to the alcohol holidays, both here and abroad. In order to procure whisky, dealers demand that wine or gin or rum or cordials or other slow sellers be purchased. That makes hard liquor harder to get. Maybe the WCTU favors that.

This tie-in practice does not increase consumption of whisky. The scarcity continues. It may be far better to induce the sale of the lighter and less alcoholic beverages like wine or cordials.

We are told that the public suffers. That is just eye wash. The public may suffer—but only because it cannot get what it wants, whisky in large quantities. That is not due to the tie-in sale. The retailer who has on his shelves the extra wine or brandy, allegedly tied in with whisky, will naturally want to move said wine or brandy. He will reduce the price of the brandy and wine to encourage greater sale and eliminates sales resistance. The regular price of the brandy may be $4 per bottle. It is now reduced to $1.99. The public saves thereby over $2.

Certainly the retailers have not suffered. They were never more prosperous. They dare not complain.

Liquor is or is not a legitimate product. The ATU treats it as illegitimate in its "tied-in" sale elimination campaign—a campaign conducted with more vigor than sense.

Its inspectors might, to better advantage, hunt in other fields.

In cases where a commodity like butter or sugar is scarce, the public is induced to buy or use less. It should be so with whisky. Why should not the ATU come out with slogans to induce the public to do with less or do without whisky during the shortage. It might take a leaf out of the book of the War Food Administration which placards the Nation with lessons on food conservation. Instead of a constructive campaign to discourage any abuses and to encourage moderation, it goes on a rampage making "sinners" out of dealers who follow the practice obtaining in all other lines of legitimate business. It seizes upon an archaic, obscure provision of the statute to base its complaints. That statute was devised in preprohibition days to discourage distributors from owning retailer outlets. It was then a case of "tied houses" with no relation to "tie-in" sales.

Congress never gave the ATU the power it now presumes to exercise. The court will soon determine that. I admire the puritanical spirit of the ATU. But its witch hunting will only get it the labor for its pains.

Housing as Usual

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. SAVAGE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, it is seldom that you ever find an editorial that is more straightforward, and explains the exact issue any more clearly than this editorial from the Washington Post of March 6, 1946, regarding the housing bill that we are now considering on the floor of the House.

Therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the above-mentioned editorial:

HOUSING AS USUAL

The House of Representatives on Friday treated the Nation to a demonstration of capricious irresponsibility. Acting through a fraction of its membership, a coalition of 161 Republicans and southern Democrats, it cut the heart out of the President's program of housing for veterans. A mere 92 Congressmen, with not a single Republican among them, filed down the aisle to support the premium payments for expansion of building material production without which, as Housing Administrator Wilson Wyatt clearly warned, we cannot provide the homes needed for veterans. The rest of the House slunk away—no doubt in shame. And those who had the hardihood to stay lacked the courage to be named and counted.

The intellectual content of the debate on the housing program was no less disheartening than the outcome. In place of homes in which to rear their families, veterans were given enough empty piety to nauseate them for the whole balance of their lives. For example, in response to Representative MONRONEY's sober exposition of the need for subsidies, Representative BREHM delivered himself of the following rhetoric: "I ask the gentleman, did our early pioneers in industry receive subsidies in their effort which resulted in America becoming the greatest Nation on earth? No subsidies were paid to those early pioneers, and yet we have outstripped the world in both new and old industrial production and material."

Of course, the answer Mr. BREHM so promptly gave himself is as erroneous as his

question is irrelevant. Industry in America has had subsidies in the form of a protective tariff ever since its inception. Moreover, as Representative STARKEY put it: "We have given subsidies to all big business in the form of carry-backs and carry-forwards. They holler to high heaven when we talk of subsidies that will go to the common man. * * * We made provisions for ship purchasers buying ships. * * * We have helped the railroads, we have helped insurance companies, we have helped importers and exporters with legislation. That all cost the taxpayers money. But when it comes to taking a few dollars out of the Treasury and spreading it out among all of the people, we holler that it is contrary to our form of government." He might have added that some of Mr. EBERHM'S constituents who happen to be farmers get subsidies for what they grow.

Let us hope that the Senate tackles this urgent issue with less sycophancy and more common sense. We face an emergency. In the next 2 years the country must construct a minimum of 2,700,000 new dwelling units for the men coming out of uniform and their families. It cannot be done by the technique of housing as usual. During the war emergency, extraordinary powers and methods and incentives were employed to speed the production of planes and ships and tanks. We knew that business as usual would not serve. And we did not bow down before the bugbear of socialism or yield to the pressure of importunate lobbies. The same sort of daring and resolution is necessary to meet the housing crisis of today.

A Letter to Pandit Nehru, of India—Demands Made Upon the British Cabinet Ministers to India That Independence Be Granted and That a Constituent Assembly Be Set Up, To Be Followed by a Caretaker Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter:

MARCH 6, 1946.

PANDIT JAWAHARLAL NEHRU,
Anand Bhwan, Allahabad, India.

MY DEAR PANDIT NEHRU: I want you to know that there is a strong, healthy opinion in the United States which deeply sympathizes with India's aspirations for freedom. The sentiment is growing in the United States that there should be a final settlement that will put an end to British rule. We liberals in the United States have followed with interest the elections recently held and we confidently hope that your party, the National Congress Party, will receive an overwhelming popular mandate as the chosen representative to deliver India from British misrule. We are as disturbed as you that the Moslems desire independent Pakistan, which would comprise three provinces in the northwest and two in the northeast. Naturally, the British Raj takes advantage of this division in the ranks of Indians and wishes to use it as a pretense for a postponement of Indian independence. It is the usual dodge of the British—"divide et impera." To us it seems unthinkable to have two free Indias—Hindustan and Pakistan. In the United States we fought a bitter Civil War to prevent the setting up of two independent sovereignties.

We thoroughly agree with you that first and foremost, Britain must recognize India as an independent country and, secondly, agree to the setting up of a constituent assembly, having full authority to frame a constitution for India. Freedom must come first and that will act as a solvent for all internal difficulties. However, the same arguments advanced against Indian independence, on the grounds of divisive factors existing between Hindus and Moslems, were advanced because of the political, religious, and economic differences which existed in our original Thirteen Colonies. But once independence was achieved, the 13 different countries, as it were, united and became the United States of America.

We also sympathize with your views that "the easiest and fairest way to proceed is not to deal with parties as such, or with religious or other groupings, but with the provincial legislatures, after they are elected."

To the 11 provincial assemblies would be referred the convocation of the constituent assembly as well as the formulation of a new central government to function as a caretaker government until the constitution can be adopted. It is well that the newly elected provincial legislatures have the dominant voices in deciding these two momentous questions. As you so cogently state it, the 11 legislatures could select delegates from among its members to set up a preliminary conference. This conference would develop a constitution. Similarly, in America we set up a Constitutional Assembly to hammer out on the anvil of discussion our own Constitution.

It may be that the Moslems will not agree but surely the Hindu and Moslem leaders of India have sufficient wisdom to accept some sort of proposition within the framework of your plan which would be palatable to them. If they do not agree, it seems evident that the Congress Party will prevail in 8 of the 11 Provinces and in the remaining 3 the Congress Party will have a strong voice. If all reasonable efforts fail to bring the Moslem League into line and one or more of the Moslem areas wish to secede, they can do so. I am confident that eventually sober judgment will prevail and they will come back into the new Indian Federation. It is utterly inconceivable that there can be a successful Moslem movement. It would be likened to the tail wagging the dog. The economic and political problems involved would be insurmountable and eventually any enthusiasm for Pakistan would evaporate.

The sooner the British Labor Government realizes the need for the setting up of a constituent assembly, after the declaration of independence, the better. It is hoped that Viceroy Wavell and the Cabinet Ministers now in India, First Lord of the Admiralty A. V. Alexander, Lord Pethick-Lawrence, secretary of state for India, and Sir Stafford Cripps, chairman of the board of trade, will see the light in this regard. Britain cannot repeat the mistake of the first Cripps offer. It dare not again "give a postdated check on a tottering bank." Unless the British Labor Government shows good faith, it will continue to lose caste in America. I state this despite recent criticism of the supposed apathy on the part of many Americans. Thousands and thousands of us are on your side of this issue and want the aims and aspirations of the Indian people realized. Their plight is no wit different than our own in 1776. Instinctively and traditionally, Americans are deeply distrustful of all aspects of colonialism, and such a policy is despised. Many silently sit in critical judgment, although it would be far better if they were articulate and persuaded to express their views fully.

We never doubt for one moment that you will continue in your magnificent struggle for a free India. We recognize with you that the independence of India is indispensable to the peace of the world. Specifically, the settlement of the Indian problem is essential to any semblance of stability in Asia. In such stability the United States has a tremendous stake. Even if we were devoid of more compelling reasons, which we are not, an enlightened self-interest demands that Americans support you and your followers. We shall continue to maintain that Britain must surrender the governmental power to the Indian people, and, specifically, to those representatives which the Indian people will choose themselves. We firmly agree with you, likewise, that once the paramount question of independence is settled, then the internal difficulties, which now seem insurmountable, will melt away as the snow in springtime.

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER,
Representative, Fifteenth Congressional District, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Telegram to the Secretary of State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include therein a copy of a telegram to the Honorable James F. Byrnes, Secretary of State:

MARCH 4, 1946.

Mr. JAMES F. BYRNES,
Secretary of State, Department of State, Washington, D. C.

MR. SECRETARY: According to reliable press reports, Generalissimo Franco has condemned to death for conspiracy against his Government three women, Maria Teresa Toral, Mercedes Gomez, and Isabel Sanz. The last two are trade-union members. Maria Teresa Toral at 33 years of age is, according to information received by us, one of Spain's outstanding scientists. During the last years of the Republic she worked in Spain's Institute of Chemistry and Physics, originally set up by the Rockefeller Foundation. After Franco's entry into Madrid she was divested of her degrees and arrested. In 1941 she was released to continue scientific studies in the Institute Ibis, where she worked with Spain's well-known scientist, Moles. There are those who consider her the Lisa Meitner of Spain. Six months ago she was arrested again and condemned to the firing squad in the immediate future. Mr. Secretary, we urge you to press Generalissimo Franco for a stay of this execution and also to point out to him that the shooting of this brilliant young woman will alienate further the sympathy of many Americans for his regime. We sent a cable this morning to Generalissimo Franco, which we trust he will receive. We quote that cable:

"Generalissimo FRANCISCO FRANCO,
"Madrid:

"As women, as democratic legislators, and as Christians, we speak for many American women who are horrified at the news of the announced execution of Maria Teresa Toral. Whatever her reputed offense against your government, we feel that it would be a far greater crime against womanhood if she were to be executed, and this could not fail further to alienate American public opinion, for there is an increasing revulsion in all Christian and democratic countries against regimes that seek to justify their existence as being bulwarks against totalitarianism and godlessness only to indulge themselves in brutal totalitarian police state acts."

Mr. Secretary, we hope you will inform us as soon as possible of the success of your efforts in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

CLARE BOOTHE LUCE,
Military Affairs Committee.
EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Foreign Affairs Committee.
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
Naval Affairs Committee.
EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS,
Foreign Affairs Committee.
HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS,
Foreign Affairs Committee.
CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE,
Banking and Currency Committee.

Challenge to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call to the attention of the House the following editorial and news story which appeared in the Washington Post on March 5, 1946:

CHALLENGE TO CONGRESS

Hope for continuation of virile democracy in America took a spurt upward yesterday with the release of the report of the La Follette-Monroney committee on the organization of Congress. In our opinion, it is one of the best reports ever brought out by a congressional committee. With broad strokes of statesmanship, it sketches a bold and progressive plan for the restoration of Congress as an efficient and responsible policymaking body for the Nation. Citizens aware of the need for buttressing our democratic system at this vital point will read the document with a mingled sense of surprise and thanksgiving.

The feeling of surprise will spring from the fact that six Members of the Senate and six Members of the House have been able to agree unanimously, with only occasionally personal dissents on minor points, on such a sweeping program of reform. Students of Congress on the outside have recommended most of the improvements contained in the committee's report. But this call upon Congress to set its house in order comes from within. It reflects a new awareness in Congress of its loss of prestige and power because of its own obsolete methods and organization. It is an omen of the happiest sort for the restoration of Congress to the position of authority, respect, and importance that it should always occupy.

The sense of thankfulness will spring from the very large measure of the committee's achievement. It is no mere shuffling of offices or boost in expenses that the La Follette-Monroney committee suggests. Rather it is a comprehensive adjustment of our democratic system to the age in which we are living. "We have been guided," the report accurately says, "by what Justice Holmes called 'the felt necessities of the time.'" The committee properly addressed itself to "a grave constitutional crisis * * * in which the fate of representative government itself is at stake."

The first of the "felt necessities" which it proposes to meet is the demand for a new committee system. Following the suggestions of Senator La Follette, the committee suggests reduction of the heterogeneous conglomeration of 33 Senate committees to 16 streamlined legislative study groups with well-defined jurisdiction. The tangle of 48 House committees would be reduced, in accord with Representative Wadsworth's plan, to 18. Committee assignments for each legislator would thus be reduced; overlapping would be eliminated; expert assistance would be provided; special committees would be eliminated and supervisory and investigative functions would be assigned to each regular committee within its own field. Regular meetings days would be fixed; testimony would be digested to save time, and members of Congress would be given a chance to explain their bills instead of having most of them go directly into the discard.

No less important are the proposed policy committees which are intended to take the place of existing steering committees which "seldom meet and never steer." Majority and minority policy committees would be elected at the beginning of each new Congress by the majority and minority conferences. Their purpose would be to bring cohesion and leadership into the legislative picture. The majority policy committees would constitute a formal council to meet regularly with the President for the formulation of national policies to be enacted into legislation. This is, as we have frequently urged in recent years, a sensible method of making our system of divided powers function more smoothly. It is so eminently desirable in these days of rapidly moving events and momentous national issues that we can scarcely imagine any responsible opposition to it.

Additional plans are concerned with strengthening fiscal controls, registration of lobbyists, increasing congressional salaries to $15,000 a year, opening of the Federal retirement system to Congressmen, and making more efficient use of Congressmen's time. In this latter connection there is a strong recommendation for self-government for the District of Columbia which should warm the hearts of local suffrage advocates. Only a few of the more urgent reforms, such as reorientation of the House Rules Committee, are left out. Even in this instance the proposed policy committee could be expected to put the rules tyrants in their place.

The report as a whole is an inspiring call to Congress to rise to the larger challenge thrust upon it both by our grave world responsibilities and by the new tempo of events. In our opinion, it becomes an essential chart of the pattern that American Government must follow if the best in our way of life is to be preserved.

(By Robert C. Albright)

A comprehensive face-lifting program for Congress yesterday was recommended by the La Follette-Monroney Joint Committee on Congressional Organization.

Complete overhauling of the spreading congressional committee system capped a list of 37 recommendations to meet the felt necessities of the time.

Forty-eight House standing committees would be reorganized down to 18. Similar mergers would cut the Senate total from 33 to 16. The new committees would keep close tab on corresponding Government agencies. No new special investigating groups would be created.

MANY PROPOSALS MADE

Other proposals for bringing Congress up to date ranged all the way from registration of lobbyists to over-all congressional Budget control to check deficit spending in peacetime. Congressional leadership would be formalized in majority and minority policy committees. House and Senate majority policy committees would form a new Legislative-Executive Council, maintaining constant liaison with the executive branch.

Sweetening some of the less popular reforms were improved staffing and research for Members, an increase in Members' salaries from $10,000 to $15,000 a year, inclusion of legislators in the Federal retirement system on a contributory basis, and a 50-percent salary increase for elected Capitol officials.

The report, representing more than a year of study, was filed simultaneously in House and Senate. Some of the findings faced rocky going in a Congress inured to old methods, but the initial reception was good.

MUST DEVISE PLAN

Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr. (Progressive, Wisconsin), and Representative A. S. MIKE MONRONEY (Democrat, Oklahoma), chairman and vice chairman, respectively, of the 12-man joint group, must now find a way to get the plan before Congress in concrete legislation.

Congress, in setting up the joint group more than a year ago, gave it no legislative authority.

One novel fiscal-control feature of the report outlines a system under which Congress will fix its own spending totals at the start of each session, and stay within them under a budget-balancing arrangement of its own.

Within 60 days after each session opens, the revenue and appropriations committees of both Houses would sponsor a concurrent resolution setting over-all Federal income and expenditures for the coming fiscal year.

If the spending total exceeded estimated Federal revenue, Congress would take a roll call vote on authorizing the additional Federal debt. Should appropriations later exceed the approved Budget figure, all appropriations (except those of a permanent nature) would be reduced by a uniform percentage, to keep within the over-all limit. The result would be a sort of compulsory budget-balancing check by Congress each year.

Seniority rules in both Chambers were untouched by the report, the committee disagreeing on (1) a better method of selecting committee chairmen and (2) modifying the broad powers of the House Rules Committee.

The joint group was not empowered to bring in recommendations on two other widely debated reforms—limitation of Senate debate and congressional "question periods" for examining department heads.

The report termed reorganization of the present "obsolete and overlapping" committee structure the No. 1 problem and real test of congressional willingness to strengthen itself.

INCREASED DUTIES URGED

Besides trimming down the number of committees, the report recommended increased responsibilities for each with every Member of Congress having membership on one of the reorganized groups.

Monthly docket days would be set aside so that Members would be assured of hearings on every bill introduced. Records would be kept of committee attendance and a record of the votes would be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Committee chairmen would be required to repoft promptly all bills approved, and seek a rule to bring them to the floor.

Other recommendations:

1. Conference committees would be limited to differences in fact between the two Houses. Items on which both Houses have reached agreement could not be changed in conference.

2. An understandable digest of a bill would have to accompany every committee report, together with reasons for passage, the national interest involved, the cost and the distribution of any benefits.

WANT FOUR EXPERTS

3. Four staff experts, exempt from discharge for "political reasons," would be assigned to each of the regular committees. Present clerical personnel would be retained up to six per committee. Two each would be available for committee-connected work in the offices of the chairman and ranking minority member.

4. The office of legislative counsel would be expanded, with its appropriations increased from $90,000 to $150,000 a year for the next 2 years, and further increases later.

5. The Congressional Library's legislative reference service also would be expanded to supply skilled research for Members and a pool of experts for committees. Appropriations would be increased to $650,000 for the 1948 fiscal year, and to $750,000 thereafter.

6. An $8,000-a-year administrative assistant for every Senator and Congressman to assume nonlegislative duties, freeing Members for more time on national legislation.

7. An Office of Congressional Personnel, under a $10,000-a-year director, to establish and maintain a modern and uniform personnel system for all service employees of the Capitol.

8. A stenographic pool from which Senators and House Members would augment their own staffs during "busy seasons."

NO SECRET HEARINGS

9. Executive or secret hearings on appropriation bills would be abolished. House and Senate Appropriations Committees, after hearings in public, would have to file their reports 3 days in advance of floor consideration. Four qualified staff assistants would be assigned to each Appropriations subcommittee.

10. An annual General Accounting Office audit of each Government agency would be required, together with a report on administrative performance and operations of each agency.

11. Legislative "riders" on appropriation bills would be barred in the future, as would limiting amendments having the effect of legislation. The Comptroller General would survey so-called limitations on appropriations, ferret out those that cost more than they save.

12. To save Members time, Congress would delegate authority to the Federal courts and to the Court of Claims to hear and settle claims against the Government. Set periods of congressional recess would be determined, and Congress would experiment with alternate 3 days each for committee meetings and Chamber sessions. Self-rule for the District, reported elsewhere in this paper, was likewise recommended as a congressional time saver.

13. Organized groups lobbying for or against legislation required to register each session with the House clerk and Senate secretary. They would have to file itemized quarterly statements under oath on all amounts spent to influence legislation.

14. Congressional salary increase to $15,000, effective in the Eightieth Congress (January 3, 1947), and taxable on the same basis and with the same allowable deduction, as business and professional returns.

RETIREMENT PAY OFFERED

15. Optional permission for Members of Congress to join the civil-service retirement and disability system, on a contributory basis of 6 percent of base pay. To be eligible for an annuity a member must have served at least 6 years and have reached the age of 62. Members could purchase credit for prior service at the Government rate provided in the Civil Service Retirement Act.

16. A 50-percent salary raise for elected officers of the Senate and House, and a 50-percent increase in annual appropriations to the office of the Vice President and the office of the Speaker, the proposed director of congressional personnel in addition would recommend equitable readjustments in present salaries paid employees in the offices of the Senate secretary, House clerk, sergeants at arms, doorkeepers, and the Speaker's table.

17. Remodeling of the Chambers of both Houses to provide improved acoustics and seating facilities in House and Senate caucus rooms. Expansion of Senate and House restaurant facilities to reduce crowding. Reassignment of Capitol space to provide ample facilities for joint committees and conference committees. Improved school and housing facilities for House and Senate pages.

18. Improved presentation of the daily program in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The RECORD would report not only the regular legislative sessions but also scheduled committee hearings and a brief résumé of the previous day's congressional activities.

MANY FEAR OUTCOME

The committee reported "a widespread congressional and public belief that a grave constitutional crisis exists in which the fate of representative government itself is at stake."

"Public affairs are now handled by a host of administrative agencies headed by nonelected officials with only casual oversight by Congress," it said. "The course of events has created a breach between Government and the people."

"Behind our inherited constitutional pattern a new political order has arisen which constitutes a basic change in the Federal design. Meanwhile, government by administration is the object of group pressures which weaken its protection of the public interest. Under these conditions, it was believed, the time is ripe for Congress to reconsider its role in the American scheme of government and to modernize its organization and procedures."

SET-UP OF CONGRESS COMMITTEES

Here are the new, consolidated Senate and House committees proposed by the Joint Congressional Reorganization Committee, followed by existing groups whose functions they would absorb:

SENATE

1. Agriculture—Agriculture and forestry.
2. Appropriations—Appropriations.
3. Rules and Administration—Audit and control, enrolled bills, library, printing, privileges and elections, rules.
4. Banking and Currency—Banking and currency.
5. Finance—Finance.
6. Labor and Public Welfare—Education and labor, finance (social-security jurisdiction).
7. Claims*—Claims.
8. Interior, Natural Resources and Public Works—Commerce, Indian affairs, interoceanic canals, irrigation and reclamation, mines and mining, public buildings and grounds, public lands and surveys, territories and insular affairs.
9. Civil Service—Civil service, postoffices and post roads.
10. District of Columbia*—District of Columbia.
11. Expenditures in the Executive Departments—Expenditures in Executive Departments.
12. Armed Services—Military affairs and Naval affairs.
13. Veterans Affairs—Pensions, finance (veterans jurisdiction).
14. Interstate Commerce—Interstate commerce, manufacturers.
15. Foreign Relations—Foreign relations.
16. Judiciary—Patents, immigration, judiciary.

(*) To be abolished if approval is given recommendations for District of Columbia self-government and judicial or

(*) To be abolished if approval is given recommendations for District of Columbia self-government and judicial or administrative settlement of claims.

HOUSE

1. Agriculture—Agriculture.
2. Appropriations—Appropriations.
3. Expenditures in the Executive Departments—Expenditures in executive department.
4. Banking and Currency—Banking and currency; coinage, weights and measures.
5. Civil Service—Civil service, census, postoffices and post roads, District of Columbia.
6. Public Works—Flood control, public buildings and grounds, rivers and harbors.
7. Judiciary—Judiciary, patents, revision of the laws, immigration and naturalization.
8. Interstate and Foreign Commerce.
9. Labor—Labor, education.
10. Merchant Marine and Fisheries—Merchant marine and fisheries.
11. Foreign Affairs—Foreign affairs.
12. Veterans' Affairs—Pensions, invalid pensions, World War veterans' legislation.
13. Armed Services—Military affairs; Naval affairs.
14. Public Lands—Public lands, territories, irrigation and reclamation, mines and mining, insular affairs, Indian affairs.
15. Ways and Means—Ways and means.
16. Rules—Rules.
17. House Administration—Accounts, disposition of executive papers, enrolled bills, library, memorials, printing.
18. Un-American Activities—Un-American activities.

Abolished outright would be the committees on election of President, Vice President and Representatives in Congress, election No. 1, No. 2 and No. 3, and the Claims and War Claims Committees.

World Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER K. GRANGER
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD an open letter by Mr. F. R. Windegger, chairman of the Missouri State Committee for World Federation:

DECEMBER 17, 1945.

Mr. FRANCIS H. RUSSELL,
Chief, Division of Public Liaison,
Department of State, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RUSSELL: This letter is not written from desire nor with pleasure, but from necessity. The necessity arises out of receipt of your form "Ready Letter," with rubber stamp date of December 7, regarding world government proposals which have reached the Department of State. When that Bureau, which is supposed to be the servant of the people, writes letters purporting to tell the people how they should think on matters vital to their very existence, it confirms the timely warning given us by Emery Reeves in his book, The Anatomy of Peace, that our present policies lead logically and inevitably to totalitarianism. Therefore, we think your letter requires an answer in frank and unmistakable language.

The first paragraph of your letter is gratifying in that it states: "Owing to the large volume of letters arriving in the Department on this subject, it is impossible to make a personal reply to each letter." This is concrete evidence that "We, the People" are not only thinking, but acting. While the situation you mention is gratifying, it is by no means surprising to those of us who for years have taken an active part in explaining to the people the price of world peace. Possibly the news has not yet arrived at the "Ivory Towers," that according to a National Opinion Research Center release of December 2, 1945, 54 percent of all American civilians expressed more confidence in the control of the atomic bomb by world government than

by the Security Council of the United Nations as presently constituted. Those starry-eyed dreamers, who think that after 2,000 years of failures we can, in this atomic age, make a gentlemen's agreement keep peace in the world, and refuse to consider a plan which has been successful in our own country for over 150 years, should hesitate to smear the 54 percent as "perfectionists," who can best be described as those people who do not believe in making the same mistake "again and again and again."

We doubt if the Division of Public Liaison is acquainted with the fact that on December 6, 1945, the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri, with only two dissenting votes, passed the resolution favoring world federation which has become internationally known as the Humber resolution from the name of its author, Robert Lee Humber, who originally had it introduced and passed by the legislature of his native State, North Carolina, on March 13, 1941, and which same resolution has been adopted by 12 other States, the last being Florida on May 3 of this year. This apparent lack of knowledge of the thinking and action of the people suggests the possibility that the Division of Public Liaison is a one-way street, in which event it is time its name should be changed to Division of Propaganda. Such a suspicion is heightened by your letter.

The second paragraph of your letter, in diplomatic language, endeavors to condition the recipient for the third and last paragraphs, which contain the meat of the letter.

You say in the third paragraph:

"I hope you will agree that, no matter what any citizen believes about the ultimate form of international organization, his first task is to assist as far as he can in bringing into full and effective operation the organization projected in the Charter of the United Nations. As you know, organization under the Charter is not intended to be immutable, and it is to be hoped that under it the United Nations will move steadily in the direction of the strengthening of the authority of its organs. When the President urged prompt approval of the Charter upon the Senate, he stated that the Charter was not a static treaty and that it could and would be improved just as our own Constitution has been improved."

It is apparently not realized in the State Department that the American people knew instinctively that for political reasons it might be necessary to adopt the Dumbarton Oaks proposals into a charter for the benefit of those who came in late. These late arrivals, of course, included many members of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, as well as the technicians in the State Department, who were still thinking in terms of 1918. We, who took an active part in favor of adoption of the San Francisco Charter, worked on that basis, hoping that the San Francisco Charter could be developed into a world government, even though our founding fathers over 150 years ago found it necessary to scrap the Articles of Confederation and institute a real Government based on law by the adoption of a Constitution. In this connection, we remember very clearly being told that the Charter "* * * would be improved just as our own Constitution has been improved," but we also realized that the Charter is not a Constitution but merely a so-called gentlemen's agreement which can be and always has been broken at will by any of the high contracting parties, when they thought it served their national interest.

But since San Francisco, the atomic bomb has fallen. In the words of Norman Cousins, "The need for world government was clear long before August 6, 1945, but Hiroshima and Nagasaki raised that need to such dimensions that it can no longer be ignored." Or, as Freda Kirchwey has so aptly expressed the effect of the atomic bomb, "In the space of a day the world security organization grew from childhood to senility. Now it must be replaced."

In your last paragraph you say:

"Individuals who continually reexamine the premises upon which international relations are founded will make a contribution to political development in the same way that free and intelligent criticism has always contributed to the development of government everywhere. Your contribution today will be especially valuable to the extent that it points to the need of effective international action now through the processes envisaged by the charter."

It is this "papa knows best" attitude which we resent. It may be necessary to approach world government through the United Nations Organization when it is finally set up. Before San Francisco, a high official of the State Department stated frankly, "The idea of a superstate never entered our heads in connection with Dumbarton Oaks." Nobody wants an all-powerful superstate, but this time we hope the American representatives will have their minds full of world federation when they go to the organization meeting of the UNO. What thinking people want, and what they are trying to tell you in no uncertain terms, is that at the first session of the United Nations Organization, the first utterance should be, "Gentlemen, I propose we unite." This proposal should come from the American representatives, since we are, for the moment, the leading nation of the world and the originators of the only form of government for the world which is appropriate and vitally essential for world peace—federation. Again, in the words of Norman Cousins:

"After the Charter was drafted, even its warmest advocates did not claim that it was equipped to cope with war or the threat of war. But it was felt that time might work to the advantage of the United Nations—time in which to build up the habit of peace; time in which to strengthen and implement the Charter so that it might someday take the form of a real and durable world structure. But the time factor has been reversed. Time no longer works for peace. Time today works against peace."

It is very evident from your letter of December 7 that the technicians in the State Department and highly vocal members of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate fail to realize that time is running out and, therefore, the atomic bomb has made it impossible, impractical, and fatal to give the Charter time and see if it won't work.

Since reading the President's statement of December 15 on China, "The Government of the United States holds that peace and prosperity of the world in this new and unexplored era ahead depend on the ability of the sovereign nations to combine for collective security in the United Nations Organization." We have been wondering what he means by combine. If he means unite, then we could be sure he realizes the nature of the new and unexplored era, which dawned over Hiroshima on August 6. All the people know now is that sovereign nations make wars in which the people suffer and die.

What we need is for the technicians in the State Department to sacrifice their pride of authorship in the Dumbarton Oaks proposal for the good of mankind; and with the other bad advisers around the President to step aside and permit the President to listen to the voice of the people who are waiting for him to implement the inspiration given him at the time of his "Republic of the World" speech at Kansas City on June 28, 1945.

Original copy of this letter is being sent to the President with the earnest hope that the Secretariat will permit him to read it.

Sincerely,

F. R. VON WINDEGGER,
Chairman, Missouri State Committee for World Federation.

Control of the Atomic Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Hanson W. Baldwin from the New York Times of March 6, 1946:

CONTROL OF ATOMIC BOMB IMPERATIVE—DISCLOSURES OF PRACTICES IN CANADIAN ESPIONAGE CASE BRING ISSUE MORE SHARPLY INTO FOCUS HERE

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The Canadian spy case brings to sharp focus the entire problem of atomic energy legislation in this country.

The espionage so far revealed is serious in its nature and particularly in its consequences, and is likely to become much more so with future revelations. However, we should not confuse the issue by talk of ethics or by name-calling or emotionalism. The Russians have done in Canada only what every other nation, in this world of power politics, has done and is doing—and must do—if it is to survive in the atomic age. They did it with a considerable degree of amateurish naïveté, but the important and the somewhat shocking fact is not that the Russians procured secret information, nor the manner in which they procured it, but that Canadian and British nationals in positions of authority and trust chose to violate the responsibilities and the duties of their offices for the benefit of a foreign power.

LOYALTY IS REAL ISSUE

It is this stage of the investigation that merits the greatest consideration and attention. If men or women in public office in this country or Canada find themselves bemused or confused by the doctrines of communism, or torn by a double allegiance, they have no place in public office. And for those who, while professing public allegiance and fidelity to one set of principles and one nation, privately pay obeisance to another, there can be nothing but contempt.

All this does not mean that there should be a "Red probe" or a witch hunt. That, unfortunately, may be one of the more serious consequences of the Canadian case. Already, there is considerable pressure to tighten up the provisions of the Espionage Act—an act which is now, if anything, too broad. We must make haste slowly; otherwise there is grave danger that civil liberties may be disregarded and the principles we stand for in this country brought to naught.

But the Canadian case makes more imperative than ever before the necessity for a rapid consideration by Congress of legislation for the national control of atomic energy—and the establishment as soon as possible, by UNO of international controls.

The first atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima on August 6, 7 months ago. In that interval extensive hearings have been held by Senator BRIEN MCMAHON'S atomic energy committee, and various bills have been framed, but no final congressional action has been taken.

The hearings have shown a major split between military and scientific opinion as to the desirable type of legislation. The McMahon bill, which emphasizes complete civilian control of atomic energy policy making and libertlizes, as far as possible, public information about atomic energy, is greatly favored by the scientists. It is on the whole

a good bill and compensates for the dangerous features of the military-sponsored May-Johnson bills.

But in one respect it is clearly deficient and puts the cart before the horse. Until and unless the world agrees to outlawing the use of atomic energy in war and puts teeth in such an agreement by setting up (if that be possible) an airtight international inspection system, this country must continue to develop atomic energy for military purposes and our military men must be represented on any commission that controls atomic energy.

MILITARY POWER INVOLVED

Today atomic energy is military power and nothing more, and to bar the military from representation on a policy-making-control commission, as the scientists would do, is to set up virtually an entirely new department of war, separate from, and outside of, the War and Navy Departments. It makes no sense. As long as atomic energy is to be used for military purposes in the world our military must have a hand in it or our own national defense will be hopelessly crippled.

Of course, in any atomic-energy-control legislation that is passed the principle of civilian preeminence and civilian control over the military—fundamental to our type of Government—must be upheld, and secrecy restrictions must be liberalized as much as possible. Otherwise we shall defeat our own purposes—the preservation of democracy and the fostering of scientific research.

There must be, in other words, in any acceptable legislation a reconciliation of conflicting ideas and aspirations.

This the scientists on the one hand and the military on the other seem to have lost sight of. Peace, and the ideal, is never gained by an easy road; no simplified approach will do.

Many of the physical scientists—suddenly, since Hiroshima, become social and political scientists—have not indicated any great understanding of this fact. They are out to reform the world overnight, for they have had an understandably guilty conscience since their creation by a Frankenstein monster. But the world will not be made over in their image by losing sight of reality. Yet in their zeal too many of the scientific pronouncements seem to have lost sight of the kind of world we live in.

This attitude, this understandable fear of what tomorrow holds, this attempt to "gild" the present, has undoubtedly helped to lead to the kind of rationalization that perhaps served to justify—in their own minds—the acts of the Canadian and British citizens who gave secrets to the Russians.

It should give all of us—scientists, public, legislators and military—cause to stop and think. We must retain our ideals for international organization and work for them. And we must lend more than lip service.

After the Atomic Energy Commission of UNO has been established and is at work we must be prepared to offer one or more definite concessions:

1. Destruction of the atomic bombs already manufactured.

2. Halting of production of atomic bombs for a certain period while the commission deliberates.

3. Agreement to outlaw atomic energy in war and to turn over to UNO, or to destroy our atomic factories, if a satisfactory control system on an international basis can be set up, and provided UNO can be strengthened to meet these tremendous responsibilities.

But it would serve no point now to give Russia atomic bombs, or to tell her all the details of how to make them, and we are, indeed, blind optimists if we think the Russians would interpret this as anything but a naive gesture.

Our ideals and aspirations will be badly served if we lose sight of the fact that the millennium is not here and that we must still live in the mud and dross of today.

Bill To Permit Steamship Companies To Operate Aviation Routes, Especially To Meet Foreign Competition—Maritime Commission Empowered To Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the Civil Aeronautics Board has set its face against a unified sea-air service in the cases of overseas transport, holding that each form of transportation must be independently managed and controlled. It defends its position by maintaining that such is and was the "congressional intent." Nothing is further from the truth.

The policy of the United States transportation has never been declared to be one of rigid separation in management and control of modes of transportation. A review of the hearings and the subsequent acts of Congress, such as the Interstate Commerce Act, the Motor Vehicle Act, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, and the Civil Aeronautics Act, reveal no such intent on the part of Congress.

Principal railroads are engaged in some form of motor transportation. Where it serves the public interest, carriers by water operate highway carriers and railroads operate steamships. The Merchant Marine Act of 1936, section 212, authorized and directed the Maritime Commission "to study and cooperate with vessel owners in devising means by which there may be constructed by or with the aid of the United States express liner or superliner vessels comparable to those of other nations, especially with a view to their use in national emergency and the use with or in lieu of such vessels of transoceanic aircraft service."

Why a theory of separateness in overseas transportation should now be applied to the detriment of our postwar foreign trade, I fail to see. Other countries are prepared to offer a complete sea-air service. Only recently, the House of Commons approved the British White Paper which discards the "single chosen instrument" practice for the establishment of three main air transport corporations, one of which operating between the United Kingdom and South America will be controlled and operated by steamship lines. If the Civil Aeronautics Board policy prevails, we are obviously at a competitive disadvantage in dealing with foreign trade conditions such as custom regulations, money exchange, immigration, public health quarantine, and sources of traffic. Coordinated sea-air services of other countries will, as a consequence, be able to offer lower fares and shipping rates to travelers and shippers. This becomes more evident when goods are to be shipped to or received from the interiors of the trading countries.

If the United States is to attain and maintain its rightful place in foreign trade and in world transportation, the ruling against unified sea-air service must be reversed. It must be remembered that the Civil Aeronautics Board is an administrative and not a policy-making body.

However, since the Civil Aeronautics Board stubbornly holds to its unjustifiable position, Congress must act. The CAB cannot stand in the way of progress and it must be bypassed. Time is of the essence. Foreign merchant marine companies are supplementing their overseas routes by air transportation and they will soon crowd out our native companies. Therefore, I have this day offered a bill correcting this intolerable situation. It would empower the Maritime Commission with authority to grant franchises, after public hearing, to United States marine transport companies for maintenance and operation of supplemental aviation routes on foreign soil.

The bill follows:

A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, with respect to air transportation by marine transportation and shipping companies

Be it enacted, etc., That Title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subtitle as follows:

"SUBTITLE—AIR TRANSPORTATION

"SEC. 241. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any marine transportation and shipping company may engage in overseas air transportation or foreign air transportation, or both, if there is in force a certificate issued by the Commission authorizing such company to engage in such air transportation.

"(b) Application for a certificate shall be made in writing to the Commission and shall be so verified, shall be in such form and contain such information, and shall be accompanied by such proof of service upon such interested parties, as the Commission shall by regulations require.

"(c) Upon the filing of any such application the Commission shall give public notice thereof by posting a copy of such application in the office of the Secretary of the Commission, and shall give notice thereof by such other means to such persons as the Commission may by regulations prescribe. Any interested person may file with the Commission a protest or memorandum of opposition to or in support of the issuance of the certificate applied for. A public hearing shall be held on such application if the applicant, or any person having a substantial interest in the proceeding, shall so request within such time as the Commission shall by regulations provide, and the Commission shall dispose of such application as speedily as possible.

"(d) The Commission shall issue a certificate authorizing the whole or any part of the air transportation covered by application if it finds that the applicant is fit, willing, and able to perform such transportation properly and that such transportation is required by the public convenience and necessity; otherwise such application shall be denied.

"SEC. 242. (a) Each certificate issued under this subtitle shall specify the terminal points and intermediate points, if any, between which, or if such specification is impracticable, the area or areas within which, the holder thereof is authorized to engage in air transportation and the service to be rendered; and there shall be attached to the exercise of the privileges granted by the certificate such reasonable terms, conditions, and limitations as the public interest may require. No term, condition, or limitation of a certificate shall restrict the right of the holder thereof to add to or change schedules, equipment, accommodations, and facilities for performing the authorized transportation

and service as the development of the business and the demands of the public shall require. The holder of a certificate shall not be deemed to have violated any term, condition, or limitation thereof by landing or taking off during an emergency at a point not named in its certificate or by operating in an emergency, under regulations which may be prescribed by the Commission, between terminal and intermediate points other than those specified in its certificate. The holder of a certificate may make charter trips or perform any special service without regard to the points named in such certificate, under regulations prescribed by the Commission.

"(b) Each certificate shall be effective from the date specified therein and shall continue in effect until suspended or revoked as hereinafter provided, or until the Commission shall certify that operation thereunder has ceased: *Provided*, That if any service authorized by a certificate is not inaugurated within such period, not less than 90 days, after the date of the authorization as shall be fixed by the Commission, or if, for a period of 90 days or such other period as may be designated by the Commission, such service is not operated, the Commission may by order, after notice and opportunity for hearing, direct that such certificate shall thereupon cease to be effective to the extent of such service.

"(c) No certificate issued under this subtitle may be transferred unless such transfer is approved by the Commission and by the Civil Aeronautics Board as being consistent with the public interest.

"(d) No certificate issued under this subtitle shall confer any proprietary, property, or exclusive right in the use of any air space, civil airway, airport, or air navigation facility.

"SEC. 243. The Commission, upon petition or complaint or upon its own initiative, after notice and opportunity for hearing, may by order alter, amend, modify, or suspend any such certificate in whole or in part if the public convenience and necessity so require, or may revoke any such certificate in whole or in part for intentional failure to comply with any term, condition, or limitation of such certificate: *Provided*, That no such certificate shall be revoked unless the holder thereof fails to comply, within a reasonable time to be fixed by the Commission, with an order of the Commission commanding obedience to the term, condition, or limitation found by the Commission to be violated. Any interested person may file with the Commission a protest or memorandum in support of or in opposition to such alteration, amendment, modification, suspension, or revocation of a certificate.

"SEC. 244. No holder of any such certificate shall abandon any route or part thereof for which a certificate has been issued by the Commission, unless, upon the application of such holder, after notice and opportunity for hearing, the Commission shall find such abandonment to be in the public interest. Any interested person may file with the Commission a protest or memorandum of opposition to or in support of any such abandonment. The Commission may, by regulations or otherwise, authorize temporary suspension of service to such extent as may be in the public interest.

"SEC. 245. So far as is consistent with the provisions of this subtitle, the holder of any certificate issued under this subtitle, and the overseas air transportation and foreign air transportation engaged in by such holder shall be subject to all applicable provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended.

"SEC. 246. As used in this subtitle—

"(1) The term 'Commission' means the United States Maritime Commission.

"(2) The term 'marine transportation and shipping company' means any common carrier by water subject to regulation with respect to its rates, fares, and charges under the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended.

"(3) The terms 'overseas air transportation' and 'foreign air transportation' shall have the meaning assigned to such terms in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended."

Let's Have Prices That Tell the Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am including as a part of my remarks today an editorial that appeared in a recent issue of the Country Gentleman, entitled "Let's Have Prices That Tell the Truth." I commend the reading of this editorial. It calls attention to the fact that subsidies, after all, are paid for the benefit of consumers. Such being the case, they ought to know what the subsidies are, and who really benefits by reason of such payments.

The editorial follows:

LET'S HAVE PRICES THAT TELL THE TRUTH

If food subsidies are to be continued beyond June 30, as the administration asks, Country Gentleman makes this suggestion to Congress: Put them on an honest basis. They are primarily subsidies for the benefit of consumers. Let them be paid then at the actual point of benefit and allow farm prices to move freely, at least up to where they will reflect the true market value.

As it is now, we do not have prices that tell the truth. They present a false front to both consumer and producer. A part of the real price is concealed from the consumer because the Government pays it. This was admitted by the President, when he calculated in his message to Congress that a removal of subsidies would cause a rise of 3 to 5 cents a pound in average retail prices of meat, 12 cents a pound for butter, 1 to 2 cents a quart for milk, and 1 cent a loaf for bread.

A tangle of prices and subsidies deprives farmers of any accurate measurement of the value of their products. They are left without the guidance in their operations that the market normally affords them. The unsettled cattle-feeding situation is an example of the results. Meanwhile, farmers are kept under an uncertainty—which ought not to be imposed on the Nation's most willing producers—as to what will happen when subsidies are removed from their price structure. If subsidies were placed where they belong and farm prices allowed to fill up the gap this uncertainty would be lessened. Devising a method of transferring these food subsidies to those who really enjoy them should not be beyond the powers of official Washington.

Also, if consumers need these subsidies to help with their cost of living, we should see that they get the most out of them. Let us pay the subsidies for purchases of the most healthful, body-building foods. They can be made to contribute in this way to the development of a more nutritious national diet and stronger, better-fed people.

But the most important reason for bringing food subsidies out into the open, so that all can see what they are and who is getting them, is that this is the honest policy. All of us want to be proud of the American Government, and to feel that it sets a standard of being aboveboard in all its dealings. Food subsidies, as they are now set up, do not square with such a standard. If Congress renews them, it should make them honest.

Amvets Urge Automobiles for War Amputees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include the following correspondence and a petition signed by 350 amputees at Walter Reed Hospital, also a clipping that appeared in the Washington Daily News:

[From the Washington Daily News of March 6, 1946]

CROWD DANGERS STIR AMPUTEES TO SEEK CARS FROM GOVERNMENT

"A girl brushed by me and I just toppled." That happened to Pfc Ralph Broitman, 21, who lost one leg in the European theater of operations, in the Eighth Avenue subway in New York where he had gone on furlough to see his parents and try out the artificial leg in normal transportation.

Mr. Broitman is a member of the war amputees car committee who will present today to the Veterans' Affairs Committee of Congress a petition signed by 350 leg amputees of Walter Reed Hospital asking that each veteran so handicapped be given a car to offset the tremendous disadvantage he finds in not being able to get around easily.

"We are not asking for charity," says Pfc Frank W. Monico, chairman of the committee, "but we do feel an artificial leg is not enough. We can't get about if it's snowy. We too easily lose our balance in a crowded bus or tram.

"And we just can't climb hills," the amputees with Private first class Monico chorused.

"Financially, most of us can't afford a car," continued Chairman Monico, "but that is the only device that will give us an equal chance with others."

"Yes; if I had a car I could go on with the work I prepared myself to do before the war," Pfc Norman Raines said. "I've studied to be a psychiatric social worker, and I could finish the course if I had a car so that I could do the supervised field work required. Without a car, I couldn't do that kind of work."

The drive for cars for leg amputees is sponsored by Amvets.

FEBRUARY 28, 1946.

Gen. OMAR N. BRADLEY,
Veterans' Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL BRADLEY: Amvets is launching a movement to obtain specially made vehicles for amputees either through Government purchase or through the patriotic cooperation of automobile manufacturers. We would appreciate very much learning the position of the Veterans' Administration in regard to this matter.

We are contacting individual manufacturers to see if we can secure these automobiles at a reduced cost and we wonder whether or not you will cooperate with us in submitting legislation to Congress in order

that the Government may secure these vehicles for those who are now permanently disabled.

Your early attention will be appreciated.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH LEIB,
National Legislative Director.

Letter sent to following automobile companies: Dodge Motor Co., Studebaker Corp., General Motors Corp., Ford Motor Co., Kaiser-Frazer Co.:

MARCH 2, 1946.

GENTLEMEN: Amvets are launching a movement to obtain specially made vehicles for amputees. We have contacted Members of Congress and the Veterans' Administration for support in this endeavor in behalf of those who have lost part of their body in defense of their country. In this endeavor we need the patriotic cooperation of all automobile manufacturers and we trust that your company will take an active interest in this worthy cause.

We are extremely anxious to know how far your company could go in making these cars available to the thousands of disabled veterans. Also advise as to approximate price and whether or not your company has engaged in any research along these lines.

Trusting that we shall hear from you as soon as possible and with many thanks, I am,

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH LEIB,
National Legislative Director.

WAR AMPUTEES CAR COMMITTEE,
ARMY MEDICAL CENTER,
WALTER REED HOSPITAL,
Washington, D. C.

The Army has given us a prosthesis to prepare us for civilian life. We, however, feel that this hasn't proven adequate to place us on an equal basis with the able-bodied, because of:

1. Weather hazards (snow and mud).
2. Public crowds (pushing and shoving).
3. Prosthesis break-down.
4. Terrain (difficulty in climbing hills, etc.).
5. Transportation difficulty (subways, busses, trolleys).

We, the undersigned, are therefore resolved: That every veteran, who because of war-inflicted injuries, is seriously hampered in walking, in order that he may compete on a basis relatively equal to those who are not so handicapped, be supplied an automobile by the Government.

Frank W. Monico, chairman; Thomas N. McKenna, New York; Kenneth L. Colbert, Indiana; Thomas Allison, Pennsylvania; John H. Zundel, Ohio; Echmund C. Anschutz, New York; Harold L. Frank, Pennsylvania; James Mullary, New York; John D. Hull, Maryland; Sidney Schuman, Washington, D. C.; Patrick T. Byrne, Joseph F. Seesman, James J. Burke, New York; Roy F. Russo, Ohio; Howard Bland, Kentucky; Charles H. Rossman, New Jersey; Earl V. Walls, Jr., Pennsylvania; Harry W. Hinebaugh, Jr., Washington, D. C.; Charles C. Bochanis, Connecticut; Joseph E. Kuspul, New Jersey; John J. Kellery, Massachusetts; George Skalski, Warren Huffman, West Virginia; Grant G. Sullivan, Kentucky; Cecil G. Gough, Jr., Maryland; William Kettler, Ohio; Joseph F. Stork, Pennsylvania; Angus W. Rose, Virginia; Odis L. Warren, Oklahoma; Harry W. Wilt, David A. Kent, New Jersey; George E. Hayden, Illinois; Harvey L. Scharf, New York; John Wagner, Pennsylvania; Edward H. Patterson, John A. Milone, New York; Joseph C. Megatis, Pennsylvania; Jacob Davis, Massachusetts; Louis G. Hall, New York; Nicholas J. Larusso, New Jersey; Stanley E. Swizenski, Vito Romeo, New York; Ralph Knauf, Pennsylvania; George Everett, Massachusetts; John Humphreys, New Jersey; Walter E. Dillion, Jr., New York; Wallace P. Oring, Joseph Costorino, New Jersey.

Michael S. Mac Donough, New York; Joseph Garbaccio, Haledon, N. Y.; Charles Burns, Kansas City, Mo.; Hubert Durbin, Louisville, Ky.; Walter C. Fijalkowski, Patchogue, L. I.; Calvin M. Maynard, West Virginia; James P. Rafferty, Cherry Tree, Pa.; Philippe P. Doucet, Nashua, N. H.; Manuel P. Castro, Falls River, Mass.; Chester T. Hudson, Jermyn, Pa.; Clyde M. Bruck, Fairhope, Pa.; Robert J. Boucher, Hamden, Conn.; Hugh D. McCambridge, Akron, Ohio; Wallace J. Newman, Marion, Va.; George Van Guilder, Lynbrook, N. Y.; Edward J. McEvoy, Bronx, N. Y.; Robert T. Lock, Springfield, Ohio; Brent C. Oxley, Louisiana; Paul Bodner, New York; Tadao Ono, Hawaii; John Georgopoulos, New York; John Gilmartin; Lionel Anger; James J. Podany; Emmor E. Gordon; Alfred M. Shubert; James Cannon; Edmund Fannon; Vernon J. Oiici; Alfred Koval; Florentino Casile; Edmund G. Fayert; Joseph R. Mirabella; Joseph Jennings; Ignace Faucheux; Norwood G. Moore; Louis Catizone; Archie Dennis, New York City, N. Y.; Clarence O. Smith, North Carolina; James W. Bishop, Arkansas; Frank F. Siemenski, Edwin F. Anderson, Pennsylvania; Robert R. Nelson, New Jersey; Richard C. Woolson, Pennsylvania; Francis J. Jumper, New Jersey; Walter Wood, Lexington, Ky.; James Jeffers, Ohio; Gerald Wallace, Tennessee; Robert Knabbe, New York; James H. Hudson, Virginia; John F. Hoffman, Philadelphia, Pa.; Kenneth H. Schneider, New York City, N. Y.; Herman H. Wallace, New Mexico; David Hess, Baltimore, Md.; Clifford C. Smith; Robert T. Lock; John D. Stone; William F. Wooten; Charles B. Sandford, Paterson, N. J.; John G. Rooney, Boston, Mass.; Charles B. McAnerney, Midford, Mass.; Robert R. Bell, North Tonawanda, N. Y.; William C. Levy, New York City, N. Y.; William G. Biddulph, Trenton, N. J.; David Pogoloff, Brooklyn, N. Y.; John Meehan, Erie, Pa.; Nathan Early; Larry A. Bauchard, Bangor, Maine; Terumi Kato, Honolulu, Hawaii; Aaron Koslow, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Joseph Marcellino, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Angus N. MacLeod, Boston, Mass.; Alex F. Szymonies, Simpson, Pa.; Arthur Hutchinson, Portsmouth, Ohio; Harry Elliit, Jr., Bloomfield, Ind.; Milton Kornfeld, New York City, N. Y.; Walter Lisczyzynsky; J. B. Henson; M. W. Kitchen; Byron B. Rife; Louis A. Walter; Charles H. Kubach; C. L. Lipish; L. J. Gillespie; William J. Grant; R. St. Jean.

Alex Levi, New York City, N. Y.; Elmer Siple; Raymond O. Goins; James B. Davis, Pennsylvania; Lemuel S. Evans; Norris A. White; Edgar F. Edwards; Charles M. Coe; Anthony R. Cancemi, John Milone, New York; Ralph Broitman, New York City, N. Y.; Matthias Offerman, Newark, N. J.; Frank R. Miseyka, Joseph C. Kopchinski, Pennsylvania; Andrew F. Haas; Charles Leeper; George Maguire, New York; Stanley A. Baryza; John M. Thornton; Richard F. Hinkle; Griffith C. Blair; Bert B. Ross; Hilbert J. Henry; Theodore Zolnierz, Pennsylvania; Andrew Owens, Boston, Mass.; Milton Varney; Donald Price; Ray Sekinger; Frank J. Pandolph, Massachusetts; Nicholas J. Ratkovich, Paul S. Gallo, New York; Edward F. Zarachowicz, Ohio; Robert B. Chapman, Massachusetts; James R. Stout, Fletcher Gainey, Indiana; Joseph E. Mueller, Maryland; Robert Blamd, Jr., Virginia; Clifford C. Smith, Jr., Ohio; Thomas F. Babchalk, Ervie Agatucci, John Jones, Pennsylvania; Daniel Cooper, New York; Everett Bengston, Rhode Island; Tiber Tomshaw, Ralph Forman, 3d, New York; Robert V. Sell; Alfred V. Pennacchia; Ray E. Cambron; Alfred Conklin; Leo J. Marsalek; Hyatt Shackleford; Arthur Hook; Chas. M. Falk; Wilson Makabe; Ralph Holmes; Stanley Gottfried; Charles S. Tobias; Gene D. Hinkle; William L. Haltiwanger; Ezio Martini; Joseph Bianco; Emil Szewczyk; Santo J. Imbesi; Joseph B. Ranept; Thomas E. Burke; Leonard Krupczinski; Robert M. Hugill; Ralph B. Goughnour; Charlie A. Cawley; Victor Fogelquise; Edwin Preese; John W. Breen; Anthony Currei; Julius Wagman; Edward J. Volk; Donald J. Flynn; Michael Romanick; Robert F. Hemmer; John H. Drqubaugh; Ralph W. Pennington; J. J. Kopcsak; Peter U. White; Alfonse J. Swider; Robert W. Smith; William J. Telesco; John J. Testa; John T. Griffin; Horace A. Mauney; Ward B. Smith; John E. Dizeo; Edward S. Lack; Altord Kidd; Forrest W. Honeycutt; Paul F. Zieqelhofer; Edward J. Partu; James T. King; William H. Wagner; Joseph J. Stasrak; Gerald Gillerman; Worth Stancil; Harry V. Loosemore; Clifford E. Weakley; William H. Worgen, West Virginia; Joseph Micken; Paul J. Wiedorfer; William A. Harris; Herbert P. Paumett; Fredrick H. Schultz.

Eugene Bassett; Lewis Gruber, New York; Clarence E. Wallace; Howard R. Scott; Richard G. Corbin; Christy J. Proferis; Robert E. Gross; Charles N. Lapinsky; Ralph A. Brown; Peter J. Freyar; Earl M. Wright; William A. Ricci; Frank W. Morris; Carroll Stubblefield; Robert J. Melton; Virgil L. Lewis; Stanley A. Nelson; John P. Henderson; Felix M. Bedwill; Ernest H. Ratter; Robert Watson; John Ruggiere; Pete DelValle; Leland Wenger; David Snyder, New York; Daniel R. Puma; Harry M. Silver; David Hess, New York; Joseph Lawrence; Louis Agosto; Bernard Seeley; Edward H. Georgens; Albert P. Belvamino, Massachusetts; Alex Harrison, Washington, D. C.; Richard J. Totte, Massachusetts; John Brunda; Michael Moran, New York; Robert Beigarten; Frank J. Sieminski, Pennsylvania; William G. Palmer, New York; David Lensner; Albo Angelo; Charles English, Griffin, Ga.; Paul A. Hiaster; James Curry; Pasquale D. Chiacchia, Massachusetts; Richard L. Palmeri; Edward F. Le Grand; Charles W. Pelachaty; Clifford H. Ferris; Lee Miller; George Murphy; Jack Vanderpol; John P. Grimes; Norman Edwards; Joseph J. Brofman; Robert V. Brodt; Frederick W. Harris; Jerry E. Trotter; James F. Blanton; James W. Christy; Anthony P. Albuchta; Vivian S. Ewell; Eugene Newman; Otis Denny; Charles C. Eill, Jr.; Fred M. Raby; Alden F. Matt; Richard Etzey; Thomas L. Mann; Charles Jackson; Chester M. Burdinski; Rocco Cuteri; James H. Rice; Anthony R. Cancemi; Norman Raines; Jerry J. DeLena, Massachusetts; Leonard McCarthy, New York; Frank C. Kolb; John Gamber; Leroy Baxter; Clair Newman; Charles C. Ricci; Raymond Snyder; Paul Scoggins; Thomas T. Henderson; William M. Cureton; Nicholas Delmont; William E. Johnson; Samuel C. Bailey; William Plumley; Timmy G. Thomas; Lesemico Cerasaro; Gandolph Viviano; James Swatchak; Frank O'Connor; and Robert McVey.

Hayes Would Keep Hands Off Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Sun:

HAYES WOULD KEEP HANDS OFF SPAIN

PEORIA, ILL., March 5.—Carleton J. Hayes, historian and United States Ambassador to Spain from 1942 to 1945 advised last night: "I would leave Spain to the Spaniards and patiently trust them to bring about their own evolution."

His remarks, at a forum meeting sponsored by a Catholic Te Deum group, came after a simultaneous announcement by the

United States, France, and Great Britain that expressed hope for a peaceful withdrawal of Franco and establishment of an interim government.

Hayes said that when President Roosevelt sent him to Spain in 1942 his instructions were in accordance with traditional American foreign policy.

"But now," he said, "we seem to be following a new line which says we must virtually invade a country in order to hold democratic elections."

The former Ambassador said that Spain was "at least indirectly helpful to us in winning the war" and declared:

"Now Spain is being charged with being pro-Axis. Personally I think the charge is unjust, untrue, and contrary to the facts."

Hayes said that Spain during the war permitted 1,200 Americans to pass through the country while German submarine men were being interned. He stated that passage also was allowed to 25,000 Frenchmen on their way to join Free French forces, and to 7,000 refugees of all nations.

"I think it is about time," Hayes said, "we realize that Russia and the United States don't mean the same thing when they say democratic elections."

Toledo's Income Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of March 6, 1946:

TOLEDO'S INCOME TAX

Imposition by Toledo, Ohio, of a city income tax again focuses attention upon the growing evil of multiple taxation. The need for a better coordination of Federal, State, and local taxes has long been felt and plans for eliminating tax conflicts have been constantly studied. During the war such problems were shoved into the background. But now many cities are confronted by the necessity of finding new sources of revenue to take care of enlarged population and to make up for delayed repairs, expansion, and improvements in municipal services that had to be postponed because of the war.

The cost of such undertakings will be high, compared to prewar standards, owing to the interim rise in prices of materials and labor, and these will have to be financed from local sources of revenue.

In turning to the income tax to meet its revenue needs Toledo is not breaking new ground, for Philadelphia already has a personal earned-income tax and New York City seriously considered adopting an income tax when relief needs were pressing. The Toledo tax is unique, however, because it applies to corporate as well as individual incomes and profits—and covers nonresidents to the extent that their incomes originate in the city.

The administrative difficulties of this sort of localized taxation are sufficient to condemn it, even if there were no other reason for objecting to it. But there are other and more serious grounds for opposing municipal encroachments on the income-tax field. The addition of State income tax levies to the heavy burden of Federal income taxation has already given rise to serious problems. If the precedent set by Toledo, located in a State that does not levy personal income taxes, were to be followed generally, many taxpayers would find themselves subject to triple taxation of incomes. The need for some over-all agreement that would prevent excessive reliance upon a single source of revenue is clearly indicated.

The Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, when it has been impossible to comply with the requests of individuals, groups, and organizations that support be given to and appropriations voted to carry out programs in which they were especially interested, charges that I am a reactionary have frequently followed.

The fact that the United States Treasury is not only empty, but shortly will be $300,000,000,000 in the red, that the money would have to be borrowed and eventually repaid, in large part by the returning veterans and their descendants, and that the program tended toward socialism or statism, seemed to make no impression upon those who were disappointed.

That my reasons for opposing New Deal policies which, in my judgment, would eventually destroy our way of life, the independence of our people and our economic security, are sound, receives support from the following editorial, clipped from the March 3, 1946, issue of the Grand Rapids Herald, published at Grand Rapids, Mich., Frank Sparks, editor:

WARNING TO THE FARMER

The other day there came to the desk of this editor an editorial from the Barre (Vt.) Daily Times. It is so sound and so full of meaning and warning that we are printing it herewith.

"HOW SOCIALISM REACHES THE FARMS

"A recent Associated Press dispatch from London occupied a space of 23 lines. Probably not one person in a thousand read it. And yet it conveyed an omnious message.

"The item said Minister of Agriculture Tom Williams told British farmers over the radio that failure to cooperate in the labor government's planned agriculture program might mean confiscation of their land. He said that the Government's policy is intended 'to insure that land is properly farmed, managed, and equipped.' He warned that, as a last resort, land would be taken, at a valuation, from farmers and landowners 'who failed to play their part. * * * We must have the power to control, and we shall seek legislative authority from Parliament to serve compulsory directions.'

"British farmers are warned that if Britain's new Socialist government has its way, farmers will raise what it says, when it says, and where it says, or lose their land.

"It has pointed out that here in the United States, under our program of Federal socialization of electric power, carried on largely under the guise of flood control, irrigation, navigation, etc., the next logical step would be socialization of land. If Government, at the taxpayers' expense, is to furnish electric power, which is virtually the smallest item in the family budget, why should it allow vast areas of land which produce the staff of life, to be farmed for private profit, especially when it spends billions of public funds to reclaim or irrigate it?

"The people of the United States who sanction Government-owned business in our country, are setting the stage for a socialized government to take over the land.

"Once socialism is established, the farmer, with his private ownership of land, is the most vulnerable to attack, for he raises the crops without which life cannot exist."

Please remember, when you ask for and receive appropriations of Federal money, it is only a part, and frequently but a small part, of the dollar you pay to the tax collector, for much of your tax dollar is used for administrative expense.

And do not forget that, when Federal funds are given, either to the individual or the municipality, Federal regulation and supervision follow, and, if we do not watch our step, we will wake up some day to learn that very few of our activities are within our own control.

Farmers will not only be told when and what and how much to plant, but they will be told when and where and for how much to sell; and businessmen and industrialists will have the already burdensome and expensive Federal regulations extended.

The freedom of the individual to carry on his own activities in his own way, heretofore so greatly prized, will have vanished.

Hon. Clare Boothe Luce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to call the attention of Members to an article by Miss Elena Saveloff-Savelkoff, an American citizen of Russian ancestry, giving tribute to our colleague from Connecticut, the Honorable CLARE BOOTHE LUCE.

No Member of this House has done more to maintain the honorable American tradition of providing a haven for the politically oppressed than has Mrs. LUCE in her two terms among us. Right now there are pending in committee two bills introduced by her for this noble purpose: One, the House Concurrent Resolution No. 109, to legitimatize and give a regular status to all stateless persons who are now in any area occupied by any armed forces of a United Nation; and, two, H. R. 4725, a bill to authorize the admission of three Russian nationals, now in the United States, who fear that their return to the Soviet Union will result in death or perpetual imprisonment because of their political beliefs.

This type of action seems to me the best example of giving practical effect to basic American principles.

The article follows:

THOUGHTS OF THE MOMENT

(By L. M. Saveloff-Savelkoff)

I dedicate this verse to the Member of Congress, the Honorable CLARE LUCE, who has

conserved the humane sentiments of pity and compassion towards our neighbor, so rare in these times:

"We do not sing our songs,
Nor do our lips smile any longer.
Our eyes gaze sadly into the distance—
At the vanished past.
The wound of our heart aches rebelliously,
And tears tremble on our lashes
But do not fall."

—*Elena Saveloff.*

The unusual means of conducting contemporary wars, accompanied by untold horrors, have influenced the psychology of mankind in an evil way.

The merciless destruction of cities, under the ruins of which perished tens and hundreds of thousands of peaceful inhabitants composed, in the majority, of old men, women, and innocent children, have choked and exterminated in mankind its spiritual qualities which differentiate it from the animal world. Pity, mercy, and compassion have disappeared and have been replaced by indifference toward one's neighbors and utter heartlessness.

Stricken by the lack of faith, mankind turned away from its Creator and His Son and repudiated the great commandments of Christ which call for love of God and neighbor. It abandoned the path shown by Christ and turned in the direction of materialism and its fellow-travelers—faithlessness and egotism. The result of this change is noticeable at present and humanity has returned to the distant times of the Old Testament and its commandments, "eye for eye and tooth for tooth." Yet even this was not sufficient—now they want two eyes and two teeth for one eye and one tooth. Mankind, having repudiated the great commandment to love one's neighbor, is closing its eyes to the horrors taking place in the world and through this promotes the rule by force and terror. Yet at the same time and at every opportunity it utters lofty pronouncements regarding liberty and the rights of man, which remain but empty words because the actions contradict the words.

We see that humanity was not satisfied with victory and the destruction of the military might of the enemy. It has imposed on the vanquished nations conditions which make existence practically impossible, and death by starvation is awaiting many. We also notice that several countries in the east of western Europe have been turned over to a nation ruled by a godless power, where reign total license and terror. We know what has happened in these countries where so much blood has been shed and the turning over of these countries has been effected without the consent of their inhabitants, which fact contradicts the lofty principles found in various charters of freedom.

There is yet another painful question for us Russian-Americans to answer—it is the problem of the unfortunate Russian people who have fled from their native land where rules the bloody license of the godless and criminal non-Russian power. They fled to the countries where they hoped to find protection and refuge, but, unfortunately, they were mistaken, because, in spite of the lofty principles proclaimed by the said countries, these people were forcibly turned over to the Bolsheviks, in whose kingdom sure torture and death awaited them. Some of them preferred suicide to returning to their native land. Yet even these suicides failed to awaken in humanity the feelings of pity and compassion.

Suddenly in the midst of general silence and indifference a woman's voice was heard calling men to have mercy and compassion. This voice belonged to a Member of Congress, the Honorable CLARE LUCE, Representative from the State of Connecticut, who raised it in defense of several unfortunate Russians who were being forcibly deported to Europe to be handed over to the Bolsheviks. One of these men tried to commit suicide because he knew that mockery, torture, and violent death were their lot, which fact must have been known to those who gave the deportation orders. Will Mrs. LUCE's appeal to mercy and justice find a response at this time? But she did not stop at uttering mere words, she brought up the Russian question before Congress, which fact should always be remembered by us Russians, and we also should treasure the name of this woman who lifted up her voice in the midst of complete indifference and heartlessness in the defense of defenseless Russians who were left to their fate by the cruel world.

All this brings to our mind the words spoken by another woman (Elena Saveloff) pertaining to the present predicament of the people of Russia:

"Being strangers amidst the world's banquet
We pass on—denizens of another world.
Although we are of this earth,
There is no place for us here.
The past illumines our life
And shines before us in the darkness
Like a luminous vision."

American citizens of Russian descent, do not forget the name of the great American citizen, CLARE BOOTHE LUCE.

The Lumber Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DUDLEY G. ROE
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose a letter, published in the Baltimore Sun a few days ago, showing how the OPA is stifling the production of our desperately needed material for housing construction as a result of its absurd, foolish restrictions, and regulations.

The letter follows:

To the EDITOR OF THE SUN:

SIR: The fundamental reason for the shortage of building materials is the OPA. The average price for timbers is approximately $50 f. o. b. mill, yet if the mill remanufactures these timbers into smaller sizes each succeeding operation nets him less and less until he gets to 2-inch plank, which averages approximately $35. To manufacture this 2-inch plank it has been necessary for him to expend considerable money in labor and overhead and depreciation; yet he must take $15 per thousand less. I ask you: Does this make sense?

This same mill can ship these timbers to a milling-in-transit mill and it can remanufacture these timbers and place a charge up to approximately $18 per thousand. Yet the mill which has the equipment and should do this work is unable to do so because of the OPA ceiling.

We must all admit dry lumber is proper to put into a house. There are a number of better mills which have the facilities for kiln-drying their product yet today are unable to do so because OPA will not allow them sufficient margin to cover this cost, with the result these mills are forced to ship their stock green from the saw.

Recently the west coast mills made an advance of about 15 cents per hour to labor, which amounted to approximately 18 percent. They were told by OPA they could not get an increase in their prices until they had operated for 6 months, and 25 percent of the industry showed a loss.

Until OPA is drastically curtailed or eliminated entirely there is not a chance for improvement.

GEORGE A. MEYLS, Jr.

BALTIMORE, *February 21.*

Constructive Labor-Management Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying indeed to me to be able to include with my remarks herewith the text of an article written by the Reverend Benjamin L. Masse, in the March 2 issue of the great Catholic magazine, America.

Father Masse in this article assumes that H. R. 5328, the bill which I offered in the House as a substitute for the Case bill, has been enacted into law and traces the course of a labor dispute as it would be handled under those circumstances.

Needless to say I am still hoping that legislation of this sort can be passed by the Congress and that I believe most earnestly that the results if this were done would be very much as forecast by Father Masse.

The article follows:

THE LAW THAT WASN'T THERE

(By Benjamin L. Masse)

This is pure fantasy about a law that doesn't exist and an industrial dispute that never happened.

The law that doesn't exist (H. R. 5328) was sponsored by Representative JERRY VOORHIS, of California, and was rejected by the House of Representatives during the hectic debate on the Case bill.

The dispute that never happened arose when the nonexistent International Union of Grocery Clerks demanded a wage increase which involved the possibility of a strike. Had it been called, it would have shut down the entire retail and wholesale grocery business in the United States.

The steps that led to the happy ending of this imaginary dispute—an ending that was at least endurable both to the union and to the National Food Association, the employers' bargaining agent—were the following:

1. On November 15 the union notified the association that it was not prepared to renew the existing contract when it expired on January 1 unless straight hourly wage rates were increased a flat 10 percent. Five days later the parties agreed to begin conferences in Washington, D. C., on December 1. This willingness on both sides to enter negotiations revealed a mutual desire to abide by the provisions of the Voorhis Act, which specified that, in industries affecting commerce, both labor and management should exert every reasonable effort to make and maintain agreement without strikes or lockouts.

2. After 4 weeks of negotiations the parties were unable to reach an agreement. The association offered a 5-percent raise, but the union adhered to its original demand. The press began to speculate on the possibility of a strike in the key business of food distribution.

3. On January 2 the union and the association, conscious of their public responsibility and realizing their inability to reach an agreement, invited the Administrator of the "Conciliation and Mediation Division" of the Department of Labor to intervene. (If the parties to the dispute had not acted the Administrator would have intervened on his own initiative, since the controversy threatened an "immediate and substantial interruption to the free flow of commerce.") The effect of this intervention was to freeze existing rates of pay, hours, and conditions of employment until 5 days after the Administrator had notified the parties that his efforts to effect a peaceful settlement had failed. The union was free to strike, but it did not do so, since a strike would have gained absolutely nothing for the membership. Once the "Conciliation and Mediation Division" had taken over, the Voorhis Act stipulated that, except both parties agreed, no changes could be made in the old contract.

4. After six busy days, the Administrator had to confess the failure of efforts to mediate the dispute. Accordingly, after reviewing the danger to the public of a stoppage in their industry, he suggested that the parties agree to "final and conclusive" arbitration. Both the union and the association refused, but, if they had accepted, jurisdiction in the dispute, according to the Voorhis Act, would have shifted to the United States Board of Arbitration. (This is an independent agency, headed by three members, in the executive branch of the Government. Upon the request of both parties to an industrial dispute, it cooperates in selecting an arbitration board from its roster of skilled arbitrators. The award of this board is filed with a Federal district court which, unless a petition to impeach the decision is made by one or both the parties to the dispute, enters final and conclusive judgment.)

5. After the failure of mediation and conciliation and the refusal of the union and the association to agree to arbitration, the Administrator informed the Secretary of Labor of the fact. This was on January 8. The latter, ascertaining that the controversy was of such a nature as seriously to affect the national public interest, certified the matter to the President. Three days after this notification, the President appointed a fact-finding board to investigate the dispute, draw up a report of findings of fact, and make recommendations. Twenty days after the board was set up, on February 1, its report was in the hands of the President. The board recommended a blanket increase of 6 cents an hour, retroactive to January 1. Both parties, fearful of arousing an adverse public reaction, agreed to accept the compromise.

During the deliberations of the fact-finding board, business had continued without interruption. Although the union had been free to strike during this time, it did not do so. There was little point in striking since, during the 20 days the board was sifting the facts, and for 5 days after its report was given the President, the parties were forbidden by law to make any change, except by agreement, "in rates of pay, hours, or conditions of employment in effect prior to the time the controversy arose."

With the signing of the contract, the public felt assured that there would be no stoppage for the rest of the year in the essential business of food distribution. True, the union and the association, unable yet to forget old suspicions and still learning to live together cooperatively and constructively, were unable to agree on an arbitration clause which would have provided for the peaceful settlement of all grievances. But there was widespread confidence that any dispute likely to rise would be referred to one of the adjustment panels established by the United States Board of Arbitration under the Voorhis Act. The panels are quasi-judicial agencies standing between parties to industrial disputes and the regular courts. To them can be referred any unsettled grievance, or even a difference of opinion over the interpretation or application of the collective-bargaining agreement. If the decision of the adjustment panel is subsequently approved by the United States Board of Arbitration, it can be enforced in the Federal courts. Assured of relatively speedy and inexpensive justice, there is no great urge, either on the part of labor or management, to provoke a stoppage over these contractual issues.

In the short time the Voorhis Act has been on the books—in the pleasant world of fantasy, I mean—there have been a few major strikes and a number of small ones. But more frequently than in the past industrial disputes are being settled in an orderly and peaceful way. Anyhow, the act was not intended to outlaw strikes, since only a totalitarian government can do away with strikes completely. The most encouraging aspect of the situation is the great change in the attitude of labor and management. When the bill was before Congress, not a single leader of labor or industry spoke in its favor. Most of them were adamant in their opposition to anything like it, and predicted the most dire consequences if such legislation should be passed. If you were to talk to them now, they would admit, privately at least, that their fears had been somewhat exaggerated. Only a few of them would confess a willingness to return to the "good old days."

The act isn't perfect by any means, and it will probably be amended as time goes on. But there are fewer strikes these days—and the public loves it.

Address of Most Rev. Lawrence J. Sheehan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a recent address made in Baltimore by the Most Reverend Lawrence J. Sheehan, auxiliary bishop of Baltimore and Washington:

In returning to take up residence in Baltimore after more than 25 years, I am conscious mainly of two things. First, there is the comfortable feeling of returning to the home of my childhood and youth. And, secondly, there is the consciousness of walking back into an atmosphere where the traditions of the past have been kept vividly alive.

This evening I should like to speak to you briefly about some of those traditions which are particularly dear to us. For I have a deep conviction that if the American people are to remain a great nation, and particularly if they are to grow in greatness, they must turn increasingly to those traditions in which their true greatness is rooted.

In the first place I believe we should all bear in mind that no nation on earth has nobler civic traditions than these United States. Those traditions have been fixed for all time chiefly by our two great leaders, Washington and Lincoln. Deep reverence for God and His sacred law, belief in God's Providence, and the conviction that on these things depend all that is worth while in our civic life: love of liberty, a sense of justice, and a deep devotion to all our fellow men—these are the traditions we have inherited. Please God, these are the traditions we shall preserve and pass on to generations yet to come.

In all the Union there is no State which has nobler traditions than Maryland. Those traditions had their origin in the high purposes of George and Cecil Calvert. Betrayed for a time in colonial days, they were revived at the birth of our Nation and of our State and passed on to us by men like Charles Carroll of Carrollton, his cousin Daniel, and their worthy compeers. From that day to this no State has been so tenacious of its finest traditions as the free State of Maryland.

And the traditions of Maryland as a State center are, for the most part, in Baltimore. I am well aware, of course, that there are in the State other communities of greater antiquity; and I am also well aware that the love of tradition so deeply rooted in the people of Maryland has kept the capital of the State in Annapolis. But for all of that, since the formation of the Union, the heart of Maryland has been Baltimore. And the people of Baltimore share with the people of the whole State their love and reverence for the good things which have come down from ancient days.

This evening, however, I am thinking particularly of the traditions of the Catholic Church in Baltimore. Those traditions were set by our first bishop and archbishop, John Carroll, the true father of the Catholic Church in the United States. Schooled in the privations and adversity caused by the penal laws of the colony, Carroll was eminently fitted to establish the traditions by which we live. Forced by those laws to seek with his cousin Charles a Catholic education in Europe, he chose the priesthood as his vocation in life and entered the Society of Jesus. Hardly had he been successfully launched on his career of teaching when the tyrannical governments of Europe caused the suppression of the society to which he had given himself. Returning to his native Maryland he found that he was not allowed to have even a public chapel for his priestly work among his 10,000 or more Catholic fellow colonists. Therefore, when the movement for freedom was taking shape it is little wonder that Carroll threw the weight of his not inconsiderable influence on the side of liberty; and, once freedom had been established, the new Government found no more ardent supporter than he.

Two things stand out in the life of John Carroll: First, his great love of the church and his uncompromising loyalty to the Holy See; and, second, his ardent devotion to his country and his equally uncompromising loyalty to the civil government. And he, perhaps, more than anyone else in our history, has shown that not only is fealty to the church compatible with true patriotism and whole-hearted support of our national Government, but also that from true religion sound civil government receives its surest and most effective support.

The traditions established by Carroll have inspired and guided his successors. Neill, Mareschal, Whitfield, Eccleston, Kenrick, Spaulding, and Baily trod faithfully in the path he had marked out. Cardinal Gibbons became in his age the symbol of all that John Carroll had stood for in his. And today our present beloved archbishop stands as a worthy and fearless successor in that noble line.

To none in all that line do these archdioceses owe more than to Archbishop Curley. Since first he came among us he has made his very special care the development of the parochial school system. During the almost 25 years of his archiepiscopate the number of schools has increased from 125 to 189; the number of pupils has risen from 35,865 to 64,637. Two great diocesan high schools for girls have been established, and plans have been made, property secured, and funds gathered for two for boys. Nor have other phases of religious life been slighted. The number of new parishes has everywhere kept

pace with the increasing population. The magnificent new seminary at Roland Park was primarily the result of his zeal and inspiration. The retreat movement for men and women has been brought into being and has continued to flourish. The Catholic charities in both major cities have been developed, systematized, and liberally supported. The steady and rapid progress of the church throughout both archdioceses stands a magnificent monument to a great archbishop of broad vision, high purpose, and unflagging zeal.

That his present visual impairment should deprive him of the satisfaction of actually seeing all his plans brought to full fruition is the source of deep sorrow to all of us. But the great patience with which he bears this cross and the heroic fortitude with which he continues to direct his great work fills us, his subjects, with the determination to see to it that, with God's help, his plans are carried out to completion. The prayer of all of us is that God may spare him for many years to guide and inspire us.

To become associated even in a minor capacity with this noble procession of ecclesiastics is a priceless honor and a holy privilege. In taking up my position in Baltimore as an auxiliary bishop in these archdioceses I pledge myself to the great work and to the sacred traditions we have inherited.

Subsidies Make for Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Robert Bliss, editor of the Janesville (Wis.) Gazette, has written a most interesting editorial entitled "This Is the Way We Buy Prosperity." He very ably analyzes the subsidy situation and concludes that the Government is operating on a false basis when it attempts to maintain high standards artificially by the use of taxpayers' money. We are headed for trouble, and those of us who have been in this House for some time appreciate that situation. It is time to call a halt.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include the editorial in question:

THIS IS THE WAY WE BUY PROSPERITY

Americans are being duped into a coma, resting on the fallacy that purchasing power can be maintained simply by pegging prices on the one hand and raising wages on the other. Supposedly, because we have limited some prices and allowed wages to increase, we are in the midst of a boom era.

The most obvious hole in the argument is that we are not producing, for America's phenomenal high standard of living and miraculous war production grew out of our characteristic use of machines and our historic ability for hard work, for team work.

Something has happened since VE-day. There has been a let-down. Folks don't want to work. Men and women refuse good jobs. Strikes have played a vital role in this stagnation.

Meanwhile we go merrily on our way, insisting upon a higher standard of living, refusing to face realities. We'd rather pay taxes for subsidies than to pay prices for goods that would relieve us of taxes.

We balk at higher prices for butter and other foods, yet we are willing that the Government tax us for money which in turn is paid to the farmer in lieu of higher prices for his produce.

In simple terms it's like this: Suppose butter were raised 14 cents per pound. That would raise the ceiling from 54 cents to 68 cents. We are paying about that much now, but it's all under cover. Our Government is paying the farmer a subsidy (Government aid so that he won't lose money) instead of allowing him a higher price for cream that goes into butter. But the farmer is paying part of these tax dollars too—part of the aid he gets back from the Government.

Now, we pay upward of 54 cents a pound for butter. What the farmer gets for his cream is equal to about 68 cents a pound for retail butter. We and the farmer are paying that 14 cents in taxes.

Government subsidies mean Government aids in the form of payments made by the Government to the farmer—he gets a check periodically.

The farmer wants farm subsidies stopped. He's more of a realist than most of us. Butter and other food prices would rise, of course, and we know what effect that would have on wage demands.

But there are other subsidies, too. We have plenty of ships for a big merchant marine—freighters which carry out exports and imports. But those freighters are manned by sailors who are paid much more than sailors of other nations. Competition from those foreign nations will begin to squeeze before long, after the United States sells 5,000 surplus ships. We must either subsidize our shipowners or give up our sea trade to others. Our standard of living in this country is too high to compete.

Then there are metals subsidies. We don't want the mining companies to lose money or pay less in wages, so we contribute taxes to the Government to pay the mine operators part of their costs—for copper, zinc, and lead.

In other words, we are on a false basis today. With our high taxes we are keeping the high standards up artificially. We are due for a fall, and the bottom will drop out in a catastrophe that will make the 1930 depression look small, unless we get to work and produce.

The only way America became great was by its phenomenal production under the free enterprise system, with capital and labor working for greater efficiency, streamlined manufacture, higher quality, greater quantity at lower cost per unit. Advertising played a vital role in creating more and richer markets for our goods. With new machines we produce more with less work, shorter hours, and at higher pay. But that all comes from research, work, production, and high volume of sales.

We are heading for trouble unless Americans everywhere compromise their differences now and dig in. Production and more production is the sole answer to lower prices, high employment and wages. In addition, we must have a government that will balance the budget, trim expenses, and clear the way for labor and management to work together.

President Urged To Clean Up Mess

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging to know that many Americans today are giving thoughtful consideration to national and international problems. One of my constituents has sent me a letter, with a request that I present it to President Truman and read it before the House. Because of the significance of the views expressed therein, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following letter from Mr. Fred J. Lohmeyer, of Idaho Falls, Idaho:

IDAHO FALLS, IDAHO, *February 20, 1946.*

Mr. HARRY TRUMAN,
President of United States,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have observed quite carefully the effect of your policies upon our country and I am frank to say that there are a number of things of which I disapprove. It is vital to you and to us that some of these policies be changed at once.

One of the most important changes you must make is to quit letting a few supposedly important people lead you around and tell you what to do. Don't forget that you are in office to do the best you can for all the people, not just to cater to a few who have special axes to grind. Sometimes I wonder whether you take orders from us or the generals and the admirals. The generals want to take every boy by the collar and shove him into the Army whether he likes it or not. You want the same. The generals want a big army to frighten the world into submission (you call it cooperation). You want the same. The generals and the international corporations want to divide the world up for profit and are sponsoring a system of power politics and colonial exploitation all over the world. You want the same.

You never got these ideas from the rank and file of the people, Mr. President; you got them from the power politicians, the generals and the admirals, and the international money changers.

To make matters worse, you are even letting England lead you around. England needs money to continue her imperialism and shoot down the Greeks and the Indonesians, and you agree. I say let England pay what she owes us and to quit kicking people around in Greece and Indonesia before we lend her any more money. But perhaps you won't listen to me because Attlee and Lord Beaverbrook are telling you what to do.

I approve of your fact-finding board in principle but you should have representatives of labor on the board, also. How can the rights of labor be preserved if there is no one from labor on the board? We can be certain no one is going to champion labor's case unless labor is represented on the board.

It is imperative that you do something at once to unsnarl the major labor disputes and get men back to work. If something isn't done right away to get these problems solved, we are going into an economic tail spin which may end in panic and eventual revolution. I pray to God that you will have enough backbone to call all these people in and thresh out the labor and capital dispute and get the workers back on the job.

Now, there is another matter which is very important to those of us who believe in God and realize the value of prayer. To the best of my knowledge no session of the United Nations Organization has ever been opened with prayer or even with the slightest reference to a Supreme Being.

I feel there are few things more important than for all delegates present to enter upon their duties with prayerful hearts and in the light of divine guidance. Most of the weaknesses of the UNO arise from the fact that the member nations are not guided by the teachings of Christ. Why then should not at least a few minutes each day be devoted to prayer or some other appropriate religious observance? We know that you are not in sole control of such things but your influ-

ence could go far toward correcting this mistake.

Now in conclusion let me reemphasize the importance of serving the people rather than the few who are grinding special axes at your expense. You will have to decide whether this is a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people, or a Government of the few, by the few, and for the few. Let me warn you, you may deceive the people for a while but in the long run the people will find out what you are doing and throw you out of office.

I say either clean up the mess in Washington or resign and give some one else a chance to clean it up.

Sincerely yours,

FRED J. LOHMEYER.

Where Does the Money Come From?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include with my remarks an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal raising some very pertinent questions about the activities of the so-called National Physicians Committee for the Extension of Medical Service. It is high time that the financial resources of this group were brought into public view. The Milwaukee Journal has rendered a great public service in publishing this editorial:

THE DRUG-STORE HANDOUT

Some Milwaukee drug stores recently have been distributing to their customers little pamphlets attacking "political medicine," or, more specifically, President Truman's plan for extension of social security to cover general distribution of medical care, and the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill of 1945 which would effectuate that plan.

Now a great many Americans entertain serious doubts about the Truman plan and the Wagner-Murray-Dingell plan. Questions can be raised whether the bill's objective of improvement in the medical care for large areas and large segments of the population would offset the more conspicuous dangers. And any citizen has a right to express his opposition to the plan—in the open and with full disclosure as to who is behind his talk.

We think the thousands of customers who are receiving this little yellow pamphlet have a right to know whose money is paying for it. It bears the name of the National Physicians' Committee for the Extension of Medical Service—a committee that is itself up to its neck in a political campaign to sway public opinion on the medical care question. It boasts that in the 1942 congressional campaign it established committees in 390 of a possible 425 congressional districts and contacted 800 candidates. It estimates that out of 435 Congressmen elected it had 300 pledged to be for the program the doctors advocate; or, to say it another way, to be against any program the doctors don't want. Talk about mixing politics and medicine. Thousands upon thousands of dollars must have been spent by this committee.

Where does all the money come from? The charge has been freely made that some of the larger chunks come from the big American drug manufacturers and suppliers who are most anxious to curry favor with the doctors and who have a big financial stake in promoting use of trademarked medicines. We do not say that is true. But we do think the question ought to be answered. Maybe a good place to begin to ask questions would be over the drug-store counter, as the druggist does his chore for the doctors—or for somebody else.

Extension of Price Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRENT SPENCE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by John D. Small, Administrator, Civilian Production Administration, before the House Banking and Currency Committee on the extension of the Emergency Price Control Act, Tuesday, March 5, 1946:

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, today, as we cope with the aftereffects of the war and try to solve the many difficult problems that confront us, I am glad to have the opportunity to tell you my views on the continuance of price control.

I believe that the fight against inflation is one of the most important we are waging today. Right at the outset I want to make it clear that I continue to stand with those who believe it would be disastrous to our economy to let prices run wild during this period of scarcity, as I fear they would if controls were removed at this time. Last December I testified at considerable length before the Senate Small Business Committee on the need for a continuation of price control. I am of the same opinion today.

The situation is explosive. Enormous demands far exceeding supplies have created great pressures which if unchecked would lead to sky-rocketing prices. I believe that most thinking people, including both those in industry and out of industry, are convinced that these pressures must be checked.

I believe it is equally clear that we must not only hold prices within bounds but at the same time, and just as importantly, we must get production up because that is our only chance to stop inflation. Production, all-out, sustained maximum production, is the only real cure for inflation, just as it is for unemployment.

Our country stands today at an extremely critical juncture. The public welfare and the future prosperity of the Nation depends upon (1) prompt settlement of the strikes; (2) prompt resumption and expansion of production; and (3) avoidance of additional major work stoppages.

THE RECORD OF THE PAST

Inflationary conditions today are comparable to, but far more powerful than, those existing at the end of World War I.

Our experiences after World War I were disastrous. As we look back, the causes and effects of the violent inflation and subsequent deflation that followed the last war seem very clear.

To lift price control now would, in my opinion, inevitably recreate the same cycle of inflation and deflation that we had in 1919–20—disaster and ruin for thousands upon thousands of businesses—the majority of them small firms.

I would like to refer you to two charts (attached) taken from a report to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency and dated September 1, 1945.

These charts show quite clearly what happened after the last war and what can easily happen again unless we have learned our lesson and unless we, as a country, are determined not to let it happen again.

THE INFLATIONARY FACTORS WHICH MAKE IT NECESSARY FOR US TO CONTROL PRICES

In my opinion, the most important inflationary factors present in our economy which require that we control prices are the following:

1. The enormous volume of liquid assets currently held by business units and by the consuming public, a part of which is the enormous volume of money in circulation; and the volume is now greater than the total public debt at its peak in 1919.

2. The increasing wage scales, which mean increasing buying power in the public's hands.

3. The large volume of deferred demand for housing, non-Federal public works, consumers' durable goods, clothing, and other items and the related demand for industrial plant and equipment.

4. The heavy foreign demand for American products for relief and rehabilitation and for commerce. The latter would be increased by proposed foreign loans.

5. Industry's requirements for replenishment of inventories to get into civilian production; the urgent need to fill up with goods all distributing channels—the pipe lines from factory to consumers.

6. The continuing budgetary deficit of the Federal Government.

All of these six factors create demands but on the supply side we have:

7. A volume of production now far below demands and even under the best of circumstances unable to catch up with demands for many months.

All of the above factors were present after World War I and help to explain the speculative boom of 1919–20, but owing to the greater length of and more productive effort required in World War II, they are now potentially much more explosive than in 1919–20.

It seems to me that in the face of these inflationary factors, we must for the immediate future continue to control prices in those areas where demand greatly exceeds current supply.

But we must at the same time recognize that price control does not eliminate inflationary pressures, it merely holds them in check. Balancing the Budget would eliminate one important inflationary pressure, but all-out sustained production is the only way that most of the pressure can be removed, and inflationary pressures must be removed if we are to get back to a stable economy.

WHAT ARE OUR PROSPECTS OF GETTING PRODUCTION UP?

I believe that they are excellent!

Obviously we cannot do it overnight, but in a few short months we can make a tremendous lot of progress.

Probably the best indication of our productive possibilities is given by our actual production during the war. That story is too well known to warrant repetition here. I think I should point out that between 1939 and 1944 we expanded manufacturing capacity by over one-third, even after allowance for the fact that some proportion of the additional plant will turn out to be of little peacetime value. And when it is recalled that we were not operating our industrial plant at capacity in 1939, it is evident that we have the plant and equipment to form the basis for a very sizable increase in production. In addition, the war has necessitated the training in industrial methods of millions of previously unskilled workers. It also forced the adoption of many revolutionary technical advances, many of which can be adapted to peacetime production.

Any doubts that have been expressed as to our ability to achieve as high a level of production in peacetime as we achieved during

the war because of the inflationary elements that were inherent in war activity is to my mind more than offset by the fact that during the war almost 13,000,000 of our youngest and most productive workers (almost one-quarter of our labor force) and tens of billions of dollars of plant and equipment were withdrawn from productive activity and devoted to destructive purposes.

The return to productive activity of the men in the services and the conversion to peacetime use of the plant devoted to war production can more than offset the inflationary factors that existed during the war. If we then find that our plant is still inadequate, we can build more. If the labor supply is short, we can increase the efficiency of the labor we have through improved technology and mass production. In short, we have the plant, the raw materials, the labor and the industrial know-how necessary to regain and eventually exceed the record levels of war production.

Production, immediate all-out production, is the principal need at the present time. The more goods we get on the shelves the sooner the dangers of inflation will be overcome. All-out sustained production means that a maximum number of workers will be employed and that the dangers of widespread unemployment and of consequent needless human suffering will be dissipated. But production of this scale can be attained only if we have a substantial measure of industrial peace; if both management and labor have the will to work to produce in volume; and if all of us are guided by common sense, rather than by emotions, in dealing with the industrial problems that confront us individually and from day to day.

RECOMMENDATIONS

I recommend that action be taken by the Congress at an early date extending the price-control legislation for a year beyond June 30, 1946. I believe that the psychological effect of knowing that the act is going to be extended is of utmost importance to our economy.

Undoubtedly the possibilities of the removal of price controls, or of priority and allocation controls, as of some fixed preannounced future date, all contribute to the pressures that encourage producers and manufacturers to accumulate materials and supplies and hold them until that date arrives, rather than to release them at this time for the civilian market where they are greatly needed to facilitate speedy and orderly reconversion. I believe, therefore, that one of the greatest contributions that Congress can make toward the speeding of reconversion and the improvement of supplies available to civilians is to announce well in advance of the expiration date of current laws, the policy that these laws will be continued for the critical months of the transition period.

Housing Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE WORLEY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

PERRYTON, TEX., *March 5, 1945.*

Hon. GENE WORLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Perryton American Legion voted unanimously to back the Patman bill, Government subsidy for GI housing. It is our humble opinion as the GI bill now stands regarding housing that it is like a reaper standing in a field of golden grain without motive power to direct its effort it stands useless. Let's get the motive power. We ask that this be recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Send all available material on above.

WALTER LAMASTER,
Chairman, Housing Committee.

Continuation of Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following testimony before the Banking and Currency Committee, United States House of Representatives, by Ralph E. Flanders, February 28, 1946:

For the record, I am Ralph E. Flanders, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, chairman of Jones & Lamson Machine Co., of Springfield, Vt., and chairman of the research committee of the Committee for Economic Development. In the last-named capacity my associates and I have been working for more than a year studying the problem of how to restore an economy free of direct price and production controls, which will at the same time be safeguarded against both inflation and depression.

Last April the CED research committee published a statement of national policy on the subject of the removal of wartime controls. We were fortunate enough at that time to foresee some of the problems which we are now facing. I should like to read a few short paragraphs from that statement:

"As the CED has stated, the objectives are high consumption, high production, and high employment.

"It is assumed, also, that our objective is to attain these within the framework of a vigorous and expanding economy in which the great volume of jobs will be provided by free private enterprise.

"The committee believes that these objectives will best be served by the ending of all wartime controls as soon as the emergency needs for them have ended.

"At the same time, it must be very clear that no control should be removed at a time when its removal would jeopardize * * * the successful transition to a healthy peacetime economy.

"On some controls—production controls for example—action must not wait beyond the period of need for war production if high civilian production and employment are to be reached at the earliest possible moment. Other controls, notably those affecting prices, may have even an increased importance for a period after production controls are ended. They will be our chief protection against inflationary pressures in the transition period while production is being expanded, inventory pipe lines filled, and excess demand induced by wartime savings is being worked off. Since it will be wise to remove some controls promptly after war production needs are satisfied, there is sure to be a demand for the unwise early removal of others which can perhaps serve their greatest usefulness after actual fighting has stopped."

I shall not discuss the specific recommendations made last spring, as they have already been presented to your committee by another member of the CED research committee. I shall be happy to supply you with copies of the recommendations in full, however, if you wish them.

More recently the research staff of the CED has been preparing a report entitled "Jobs and Markets," addressed to the problem which your committee is now considering—how to restore free markets in the transition while preventing inflation and depression. The recommendations of this report are the independent findings of the economists who make up our staff. They do not necessarily represent the views of the businessmen on the CED research committee or its board of trustees. I do recommend the report, however, as a thoughtful and balanced analysis, worthy of your careful attention. The report will be publicly released tomorrow and copies have been distributed to the members of your committee.

The report urges the need for a comprehensive program to achieve three objectives:

A. To expand rapidly to a high level of production and employment.

B. To prevent a major rise in the general level of prices.

C. To eliminate price control as soon as it ceases to be essential for the achievement of high employment and stable prices.

It is the conclusion of the research staff:

1. That price control authority should be extended to June 30, 1947, and terminated on that date, except in the field of rents.

2. That, for the period of its extension, administrative operations of the price-control authority should be speeded up, price-control standards should be raised moderately, and a vigorous policy should be followed in suspending controls.

3. That a policy which consists merely of the extension of price-control authority is not enough. The staff urges the prompt adoption of fiscal and monetary policies which will bring demand into balance with supply at high levels of employment and which will permit the termination of price control at an early date without inflation.

Specific proposals for carrying out this program are presented in the research report which has been distributed to you. I shall not go into them further but shall turn instead to my personal observations.

In view, two issues about price control are easily disposed of:

First, price-control authority will be needed beyond June 30, 1946.

Second, price control must not be permanently or indefinitely continued. Its definite and early termination must be assured.

We now see on every hand the evidence of extreme inflationary pressure. Incomes are high, the public has an enormous amount of money, and the demands pent up during the war are great. Although supplies for civilians are increasing, the public still wants to buy more of almost everything than is now being produced. Without price ceilings, the prices of many commodities would now be skyrocketing under the pressure of excess demand. We look forward to a further expansion of production, and we must do everything we can to hasten this expansion. But it is not at all clear that foreseeable production increases will eliminate, or even appreciably narrow, the excess of demand. Expanding production will bring higher incomes, increased bank credit and general optimism. It might conceivably increase rather than decrease inflationary pressure, particularly for goods in scant supply and under price control.

I need not elaborate before this committee the evils of inflation. Certainly every group in this Nation—including the business community—would reap irreparable loss from such a price increase as followed the last war, to say nothing of more extreme possibilities. For some months price control will be an indispensable protection against runaway prices. We must not abandon it prematurely.

But the evils of indefinitely continuing price control would be even greater than the

evils of eliminating it too soon. Our economy runs on prices. Prices determine who produces what and how much he earns for producing it. The authority to control prices cannot be centrally administered for any sustained period without inefficiency, inequity, break-down of respect for law, and, most important, serious danger to our personal and political freedoms. I think there is no likelihood that the American people will embrace regimentation willingly. But there is a risk that in default of proper policy we will reluctantly accept more and more controls as the only alternative to real economic ills. We do not want to be confronted a year from now with the choice which faces us today—inflation or price control. It will take positive action to escape that dilemma.

I shall return later in this statement to the question of getting rid of price control rapidly without inflation. First, I wish to make certain recommendations about the kind of price control that should and can be continued for a limited period. Price control at present is unworkable and unfair. We must look for legislative standards and administrative procedures which will operate quickly, without impending production or creating major inequities and at the same time will prevent a serious increase in the general level of prices. Perfection cannot be expected in any of these regards. But I believe that some changes can be made that will greatly improve the transition functioning of price control.

My recommendations are not intended as a reflection on the OPA staff. The members of that staff with whom I have come in contact have been conscientious and hard-working. For 4 years they administered a wartime law under wartime conditions with great success. Since VJ-day numerous steps have been taken to reconvert price control to transition needs. Congress should hasten that reconversion process by restating in new terms the objectives, standards, and general procedures of price control.

The major goal of my recommendations is to speed up and simplify price control. The most common and most serious criticism of OPA is that it acts too slowly to meet the needs of a rapidly changing peacetime economy. The pace of reconversion has been rapid; it would have been even faster if price determinations could have been obtained from OPA more quickly. It seems probable that the stabilization order recently announced by the President will result in a greatly increased number of applications for price adjustment, thus materially increasing delay.

1. AUTOMATIC PRICING

The establishment of ceiling prices would be speeded and simplified if the responsibility for price determination were shifted as far as practicable to the individual businesses concerned. A business would compute its own ceilings, pursuant to legislative standards and OPA regulations, and subject to review and enforcement by the OPA. The prices so computed would automatically become effective unless disapproved by OPA within a specified short time period and OPA would retain the right of revising these prices subsequently. I realize that there are many cases where this procedure will not work—for instance where uniform prices must be set for the product of numerous sellers. But a similar procedure is being used now in certain fields—notably for small and new firms in the reconversion industries. What I propose is the extension of a device already found practicable. Such self-pricing procedures could safely be applied now to firms seeking price relief under the "general rescue" provisions, which authorize price increases to a break-even level. They could also be made available to most, if not all, reconverting firms. I suggest that the use of self-pricing procedures be extended by legislation over as broad an area as now seems practicable and that OPA be directed to apply the system elsewhere as rapidly as it becomes feasible to do so.

There is an instructive precedent for this course in our experience with contract settlement. In order to avoid interminable delays in settling $50,000,000,000 of contracts by the usual method of checks and counterchecks the Congress authorized a streamlined procedure. A large part of the work is done by the contractors themselves under a uniform formula and subject to prompt review and final settlement. The speedy settlement of contracts has been a major aid to reconversion. I am certain that the cases of fraud or evasion are infinitesimal and the great gain has been well worth the slight risk on this score.

2. USE OF ACTUAL COSTS

In one respect the President's recent stabilization order appears to me to represent a backward step. Sec. 2 (b) of Executive Order 9697, setting forth the new policy, provides, in essence, that price adjustments shall be such as in the judgment of the Price Administrator will be sufficient to enable the industry, unless operating at temporary low volume, to earn an average rate of profit during the ensuing 12 months equal to the rate of return on net worth during its base period. In other words the Price Administration is to estimate for a full year ahead, how such rapidly varying factors as changing labor and materials costs, changes in productivity and changes in volume of operations will combine to yield a return on net worth equal to that of the prewar period 1936–39.

I submit that this is an impossible task. As chairman of an established company with good operating records, I have had some personal experience with the problems of estimating future costs. I know from my own experience of the many pitfalls and errors inherent in any such estimating process, particularly when applied to a period as uncertain as the year immediately ahead. The danger is only partly that the OPA estimates may be wrong. Any procedure will involve some errors. But the forecasting procedure is certain to involve a maximum of delay and interminable, unresolvable disputes.

I urge that the legislation now being considered provide that price determination be placed on the basis of actual operating experience at the earliest practicable date. To escape the influence of low-operating volume upon costs—in other words, to eliminate the so-called bulge costs—costs of the highly abnormal early change-over period should be disregarded. Our research staff has suggested that for all industries other than reconversion industries the first quarter of 1946 and all subsequent quarters should be considered to be quarters of normal-operating experience, and that for reconversion industries the second quarter of 1946 and all subsequent quarters should be so considered. This seems to me a reasonable recommendation and I suggest it for consideration by your committee. Exceptions to the use of first-quarter experience might be permitted where costs were distorted by strikes or other impediments to production. It should be remembered that prices so established are subject to review in case they should subsequently be found inappropriate.

3. A VIGOROUS POLICY OF SUSPENSION OF PRICE CEILINGS AND DECONTROL

Price control should be trimmed down progressively to those critical areas that would otherwise threaten price increases of overall significance. This is important as a way of freeing the economy from unnecessary controls as quickly as possible. But I should like particularly to emphasize the importance of sloughing off controls as a means of permitting OPA to concentrate on doing a quicker and better job in the essential areas. To control the prices of every one of the millions of commodities at every stage of production in the American economy was a Herculean task even in wartime. To do this at all successfully during the next year will be an impossible task. And in my view such all-inclusive control is unnecessary, if our objective is to prevent a major increase in the general level of prices and particularly those cost-of-living prices most likely to set off a price-wage spiral. The administrative capacities of the OPA, however great, are not infinite. They should be focused on the crucial problems.

Progress in suspending ceilings has been less than I had hoped. Production delays resulting from labor-management disputes, and the development of a pervasive excess of demand has, of course, limited the opportunities for suspension of ceilings thus far. As we proceed into 1946, however, and if we limit the general excess of demand, there will be a growing number of areas in which supply is in near balance with demand. Price ceilings should be suspended promptly when such a near balance is achieved. Ceilings should also be suspended on commodities which do not materially affect living costs and which do not threaten seriously to divert manpower or materials required for essential production—particularly if these areas present complex administrative problems, as many of them do.

A considerable number of dime-store items and luxury goods have already been decontrolled. I think that with a realistic notion of what is a necessity, the area of luxury goods eligible for decontrol could be significantly widened. Also we need to go further in suspending ceilings on components used in the manufacture of end products still under control. This would do much to remove bottlenecks which are insignificant price-wise but serious from the standpoint of production.

I know that a dozen plausible arguments can be made against any specific proposal for suspending ceilings. The concept of universal, precise and efficient control of prices has much theoretical appeal. But in fact universal control and efficient control cannot be achieved together. There is never a perfectly safe time to remove a ceiling. Every decontrol action involves risks of a crisis of one kind or another. However, those who look at each case as an isolated problem may not appreciate the risks of not decontrolling—the danger that the whole price-control system will collapse of its own weight or that production will be strangled by inflexible controls. We need a policy of "calculated risks"—of balancing the risks of decontrolling too soon in particular cases against the general risks of holding all controls too long.

It is extremely difficult to establish a legislative formula for decontrol, in view of the numerous, varied and rapidly changing situations which we shall face during the coming months. I believe that it is possible and desirable, however, to write into the pending legislation general standards, such as those set forth above, for the guidance and direction of the Price Administrator. I believe it would be helpful also to establish a responsible official within the price-control agency, acting under the general direction of the Administrator, whose primary responsibility it would be to conduct a continuous review to select ceilings for suspension and to plan the simplification and liquidation of price control generally. A similar device apparently worked effectively in the case of the War Production Board.

Basically, the speed and scope of decontrol will depend upon our success in creating conditions which permit the suspension of ceilings. If we allow inflationary demand to continue and if production continues to be retarded, the scope of decontrol will be narrow. But with vigorous measures to control excess demand and price

and other policies to stimulate production we can create a wide area in which ceilings can safely be suspended.

4. LIBERALIZED STANDARDS FOR PRICE RELIEF

The general standards used by OPA in considering applications for price increases, while not inappropriate for wartime, are not appropriate for peace. The present base period, ordinarily the rate of earnings before taxes to net worth during 1936–39, includes at least two definitely depressed years, and even the best years were not good. Moreover, corporation taxes are now much higher than in the base period, so that the present standard implies profits after taxes considerably below the 1936–39 ratio to net worth. Today, with profitable war business gone, with business risks increased, and with wage rates rising, many industries may be forced to profit levels which are unfairly low and which will not provide adequate incentives to enterprise—especially new enterprise.

I suggest that the earnings standard—now, generally speaking, the rate earned on net worth before taxes during 1936–39—be raised by about one-third. Any one of several devices could be used to achieve this purpose. I suggest also that the product standard now employed by OPA—which now permits particular product prices of industries producing more than one product to be raised whenever average ceiling prices fail to cover average manufacturing costs—be changed to cover average total costs (including overhead).

These liberalizations would not guarantee to each firm the profits which it might expect in normal prosperity. They are minimum standards. They will protect firms against being squeezed far below the level of profits which the great bulk of firms might reasonably expect to exceed in normally prosperous times.

Modifications along lines I have suggested should make it possible to live with price control during the period of its continuation. Even with the changes suggested, however, we must still rid ourselves of price control as soon as it is practicable to do so. The question is not whether price control should be abolished, but when.

After careful consideration, I believe that we should extend price-control authority, simplified and streamlined, as earlier suggested, until the spring of 1947. It should then be terminated finally and completely, except for rent controls. Rent control, because of the time required to provide an adequate supply of housing, may need to be continued for a somewhat longer period.

In all candor I would not object to any termination date between March 31 and June 1, 1947. The important thing is that we fix now and with certainty the date of final termination.

I believe that extension of price-control authority until March 31, 1947, is necessary to allow a reasonable time for high employment to be reached and a near balance between supply and demand to be achieved. If we should reach this point earlier price control can and should be terminated by Executive order. I believe, further, that the terminal date should be set some time before June 30, 1947, in order to make clear to all that what has been done is not merely to extend controls for another year but to set once and for all the date for its elimination. The point I make here is mainly psychological, but it is important.

The final termination of price-control authority must not be made contingent on prior achievement of balance between supply and demand at high employment. Such a policy would be an invitation to drift into a position where we are always confronted with a choice between price control and runaway inflation. We must accept responsibility for preventing inflation without price control.

The time to begin to act on this responsibility is now. Price control must first be supplemented and then supplanted by anti-inflation measures which do not restrict the full and free operation of the American productive system. In the traditional governmental functions of taxation, public expenditure, and monetary control we can find the necessary tools. But we must focus policies in these fields on preventing inflation and depression if we are to emerge from the transition with an expanding and unregimented economy.

More specifically, the Congress and the administration should plan to balance the Federal Budget in the fiscal year 1946–47 and if possible run a budget surplus. This is the time to eliminate every Federal expenditure that is not absolutely necessary and to postpone every project that is postponable. Any unnecessary expenditure today is a reckless addition of fuel to the inflationary fire. The Government should be prepared to generate a substantial budget surplus if inflationary pressure continues strong at high employment levels.

We should give up all thought of further tax reductions as long as the present excess of demand continues. Now is no time to lower taxes, much as we should all like to do so. Moreover, we should remember that tax revision is not a one-way street. If present inflationary forces strengthen, taxes may have to be raised.

Finally, we must act promptly to restrain excessive credit expansion. We should be careful, of course, that adequate credit is available to meet the needs of new and expanding businesses. But we are sitting on a powder keg. Existing machinery and policy cannot prevent a great expansion of our already huge cash supply. As matters stand, the limits to monetary expansion are hopelessly remote.

Both the existing large money supply and the possibility of great expansion flow from the sale of Government bonds to the banks during the war. Bank deposits—the public's money—increased step by step with the increase in bank holdings of governments. And under present policy the banks can obtain the reserve basis for further credit expansion by selling their Government securities to the Federal Reserve. The process of money expansion via bank purchase of governments can still go on, although the total Government debt is decreasing. It is imperative that measures be taken to bring this expansion under control. Monetary policy must be enlisted in the battle against inflation.

In brief summary, then, I urge both the temporary extension and the definite termination of price control. These are equally important—the temporary extension to avoid inflation, the prompt and definite termination to restore free markets. Neither is simply a matter of renewing or not renewing the act which is now on the statute books.

I do not think that business can live with price control in its present form for another year. We must modify it so that it can live and be lived with. It should be liberalized and streamlined to reduce delays, inequities and obstacles to production. Four changes are needed:

1. Extend the area of automatic, self-assigned pricing with OPA review.

2. Base prices on actual costs, not forecasts.

3. Vigorously and positively seek out the areas in which ceilings may be suspended.

4. Raise the standards for price relief to prevent profit squeezes which deter production and discriminate against enterprise.

To terminate price control we should start now to remove the conditions which make price control indispensable today. I have recommended that price control should be continued until the spring of 1947 and that there should be no renewal, except for rents. With that as the cut-off period, we should use monetary and fiscal measures to achieve a balance of demand and supply. We cannot simultaneously and consistently be against inflation, against price control and in favor of low taxes, Government deficits, and easy money. When stable prices and free markets are the objective, strict Government economy, steep taxes, and monetary restriction are not too high a price.

Compulsory Peacetime Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by John Deschner, representative of the national conference of the Methodist Youth Fellowship, before the House Military Affairs Committee on February 21, 1946:

The national conference of the Methodist Youth Fellowship, which I represent, is the national representative governing body of the Methodist Youth Fellowship, our national organization for Methodist young people and students which has a constituency of approximately 2,000,000 young people. My appearance before this committee was directed by an official action of the national conference, which has since 1943 been giving consideration to the problems of compulsory peacetime military training. My statement represents officially and unanimously adopted resolutions of the national conference of the Methodist Youth Fellowship, and not my views only.

A word of explanation: We want to speak to you as Christians as well as Americans. We believe that the Christian's response to God cannot be made in a vacuum, but must be made in society. We have tried to see the good represented in both sides of this question, and our testimony before you is a part of our Christian response to God.

Our conclusions on the issue of compulsory peacetime military training are as follows:

1. It is not wise at this time to register so conclusively our lack of faith in the United Nations Organization.

2. We question some of the effects of compulsory peacetime military training upon individuals, and their implications for general peacetime education.

3. We feel that compulsory peacetime military training will have unfortunate effects upon recruitment to the ministry to the profound concern of the Youth Fellowship and the church at large.

Let me expand these:

First. We are under the imperative need for world government, not only as the most effective protection against a war of annihilation, but to prove that the demands of justice in a new age can be met by a mankind politically mature enough to give and receive justice. We would be overly idealistic, it is true, to blindly trust the world government that exists to do this job. But we will be unrealistic if we refuse to give the United Nations Organization a chance to test itself, since it is the only instrument of collective security we possess, and it is now more dangerous than ever to despair of collective security. Christians, perhaps more than others, are sensitive to the nature of trust. To receive trust, trust must be given. Looking at the great amount of suspicion we have aroused in the only nations who could fight us in the next war with our handling of the

secret of atomic bomb manufacture, and seeing this fact against the background of the new and increased great power status of the United States, it is no understatement to say that our decisions concerning collective security are decisive. We have taken great initiative in breeding suspicion. We must take initiative in dispelling it. The logic from here is clear: It is our duty to do everything in our power to aid the success of the United Nations Organization. Embarking on a policy at this time which will be universally understood as our belief that the UNO cannot protect us from another war can only add more ice to already chilly international relations and make more impossible the task of the new world government. The time may possibly come when the UNO will have proved to the world that its difficulties are insurmountable and that the world is doomed to international anarchy and national defense. Then it will be time to consider the problem of conscription and other means of defense. But at this time, when world government is trying to muster every bit of support and strength, the proposals under consideration are out of place because of the inevitable undertones their passage will have in the capitals of the world. Therefore, we, as Christians, demand that cooperation be given a fair trial. Thus we declare our opposition to the proposals under consideration.

Second. If compulsory peacetime military training is not absolutely necessary at this time, it is difficult to justify some of the effects which would accompany it. I can only name a few by way of example. There is the danger of subjecting 18-year-olds to a year's indoctrination before they can enter the liberating tradition of learning which our universities preserve. There is also the danger of forcing young men into a situation where the normal social controls on moral behavior are notoriously more relaxed than upon the university campus. If a system of ROTC training is contemplated, there is the inherent discrimination against the small college (often a church college) which would not have an ROTC system. These threats and dangers must necessarily be sustained in the necessities of war. But in a situation where it is not clear that such sacrifices are imperative, we claim that the costs in human values are too high to justify compulsory peacetime military training.

Third. We would like to say how adoption of these proposals is likely to affect the concrete interests of our youth movement and church. A study quoted by Dr. Mark May, of Yale University, in volume III of his authoritative work, The Education of American Ministers, shows that the best age for decision to enter the ministry is between 17 and 20. Thirty-nine and six-tenths percent of men in seminaries decided for the ministry at this age. This fact is to be expected for the influence of these years on the choice of vocation is well known. The study goes on to point out that the three most important factors in order of their importance are: (1) home and parents, (2) church and minister, (3) denominational young people's organizations, conferences, camps, and summer projects. To take a young man away from the influences which are most likely to impel him to decide to be a minister at the precise time when he is most likely to so decide will have profound effects on our recruitment to the ministry. The situation is made all the more urgent by the peculiar character of the Methodist ministry at this time. A study made for the Methodist General Conference of 1944 by Dr. Murray H. Leiffer, director of social research at Garrett Biblical Institute, shows that the present age distribution of men in the effective ministry of our church is definitely weighted toward the older years and that while the size of our church has almost doubled since 1915, the rate of ministerial recruitment has showed a marked downward trend. For example, in the present 5-year period, 1943–47, it is estimated on the basis of mortality rates and other known factors that 3,275 men will be lost to the effective ministry. But in the last 5-year period, 1938–42, only 2,284 were recruited. This would indicate that we are replacing about two-thirds of the ministers we lose. Thus, with the church facing a crisis already in the recruitment of its ministry, the passage of the proposed bill can only accentuate the crisis. This situation has caused and will be cause for much concern in our church. Millions of Christians are vitally concerned with the state of the church. You may be sure that this effect of the adoption of a system of compulsory peacetime military training will be regretted and deplored by many of our members.

Why am I, a student, speaking of such matters? Because the ministry of our church includes the ministry to students and youth, and because recruitment to the ministry is a major concern of our youth movement. We submit these matters, therefore, to your attention. In being responsible to God, we must oppose compulsory peacetime military training because its high costs in international trust, in individual personality, and in the future of the ministry of the church are at this time unjustified.

A Patriotic Advertisement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, as a measure of public sentiment concerning the proposed British loan there is inserted herewith the copy of an advertisement financed by a Wisconsin company appearing in a great daily newspaper:

ATTENTION, AMERICAN MOTHERS AND FATHERS: DON'T SELL OUR CHILDREN INTO THE SLAVERY OF DEBT

After the First World War England owed every voter in the United States about $500. No interest or principal has ever been repaid. Now England's debt to every voter in the United States amounts to about $3,000. Are we bankrupting ourselves for the benefit of Europe?

England controls over one-half of the world, but she does not even tax her colonies as much as we are taxing ourselves. Why should we loan her money which she can raise herself? When the tax rate in England and in England's colonies gets higher than in the United States we can consider lending money to her. But, even then, should England have priority over any other country?

On February 12, 1946, Canada loaned another $100,000,000 of credit to the Netherlands. Why doesn't she loan money to England?

Unpaid loans have always led to bankruptcy. We certainly owe it to our children to keep this country from going bankrupt. Dictators can only prosper in a bankrupt nation. We must not put ourselves in the same position as the countries of Europe.

WE MUST NOT BANKRUPT OUR CHILDREN FOR ANYONE

It is up to us, who think of our children's prosperity, to do everything in our power to make their lives as secure as possible.

WE AMERICANS MUST DICTATE OUR POLICY, NOT FOREIGNERS

Congress today has a very serious responsibility. We must help guide the thoughts of our Government.

This is your last chance! If our country comes first with you, protest these loans by writing your Congressman now.

Respectfully,

ALUMINUM SPECIALTY CO.,
W. E. SPINDLER, *President.*

Too Much Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 14, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in considering the difficulty many of us are experiencing in getting the things we need when money is so plentiful, I have given expression to my views in a letter to an old friend which is submitted herewith:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON COINAGE,
WEIGHTS, AND MEASURES,
Washington, D. C., March 4, 1946.

Mr. J. H. EBY,
Spokane, Wash.

DEAR EBY: As you know, your letters are always welcome. It is discouraging to learn that prices are climbing so high and working such a hardship on people who have reached the age of retirement and must live on their savings.

If you were here this Saturday afternoon, when the girls are gone, and I am mulling over the accumulated mail—we would go out and get in the car, parked down here by the front door of the House Office Building and go some place, maybe to Hogate's and order a couple of mariner's platters and some good beer and see what we would get on the platter. I'll bet we would get a nice stack of shrimp salad and a pile of fried scallops and a few fried oysters and some deviled something or other baked on a half shell, with a nice backlog of fresh fried filet of sole under a heap of french fried potatoes, with a substantial portion of good cabbage salad, only there would be such a crowd we would have to wait quite a while for our turn to get in and then we could set back and talk about these high prices and the OPA.

Of course, I held out against the plans that got us into all of this but then, when you take 10,000,000 young fellows out of the factories and off the farms and have to dig up the food to feed them, and then send them about the world to smash up the means of production, it is a wonder we have got anything to eat at all—and now, when most of these lads that went to war are back who wants to work? When they have got all this money in their pockets and there is $29,000,000,000 of perfectly good paper money in circulation?

You know that a young man that is in the money cannot be expected to drop things and monkey with anything as common as feeding pigs and milking cows or raising potatoes and garden truck. Most of our boys have progressed beyond that stage in this country. All we have got to do now is to increase Government payments all around and live above this farm work business. It seems some of us never did think much of the hayseeds, anyway.

Of course, I like to farm and put up all our own eats and live on the things that grow on the farm—with plenty of good smoked hams and bacon in the smokehouse, with jars of packed butter, churned right on the place, and crocks of water-glassed eggs setting on the shelves in the cellar for winter, with a good barrel of kraut and bins full of apples,

pears, potatoes, beets and things like that with a pit of cabbage covered over outside and one or two good winter milk cows to keep us in milk and cream until the dairy herd freshens in the spring.

It's kind of comforting when Thanksgiving day rolls around and the table is loaded down with good things to eat to see the plump, roast turkey, with celery, mashed potatoes, mince pies made of good apples, meat and cider, all produced right on the farm. Shucks, what's the use paying all this money on a little old restaurant check for the things you can have on the farm, right at home, for nothing—if you are not too high toned to work. Only the city boys and the fellows out of the Army ain't used to living that way, and besides, how can you expect a man to want to work when his pockets are full of money.

When a man isn't on a farm and willing to take care of things this high price business is kind of hard on a fellow, 'specially when he has worked good and hard all his life for everything he got and now has reached the age where he has to make his savings provide all the things he must have to live.

Ever since coming to Washington, I've been battling to prevent the very thing that is giving us so much trouble now: by trying to get a plan through that would keep things steady, a plan that would give this country a sound, adequate, workable money system and the elimination of artificial monopolies by passing laws that would protect business and foster free enterprise; to give the people engaged in all our industries a square deal. Let's hope that we can work out and adopt plans that will protect business and industry and thereby bring prices into equitable adjustment.

Sincerely,

COMPTON I. WHITE, M. C.

Tennessean Answers Full-Page Advertisement of National Association of Manufacturers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith an editorial from a Tennessean, answering a full-page advertisement run by the National Association of Manufacturers, entitled "Road To Price Chaos." It is as follows:

Those who read the National Association of Manufacturers' advertisement in yesterday's issue of this paper will agree that the association makes economics simple. In fact, a little too simple, like learning to fly in one easy lesson, or reducing without diet, exercise, or drugs.

The NAM explanation is too simple to be misunderstood. Price controls cause inflation. Get rid of Chester Bowles, the OPA, and the stabilization program and, presto, inflation is gone. And why do such controls cause inflation? "Because price controls in controls hindered the production of goods in The reader is not supposed to ask if price controls hindered the production of goods in wartime—when we had more food, steel, tires, gasoline, textiles, and other goods produced than ever before. Least of all is he supposed to wonder if this is really peacetime, with reconversion still incomplete and millions of men still in the armed forces.

The NAM states one incontestable fact, "business cannot live by producing at a loss." And what is the reader to conclude from that? Why price ceilings are causing losses, but the reader recalls that business did not suffer under price ceilings during the war. Indeed, it made more money than ever before. Under the Government's price formula, a reasonable profit is assured each industry. This formula does not underwrite profits for the submarginal or marginal producer, to be sure; but it is to be recalled that in any peacetime year there are many producers who do not make profit. Even in 1929, the peak peace year of production, almost 40 percent of American corporations reported no taxable net earnings.

Mr. Bowles calls up some data not mentioned in the NAM advertisement. American industry, on the whole, is in an extremely favorable profit position, as attested by 1943 corporation tax data. Only 15 percent of it is materially affected by the transition from war to peace and that segment is being taken care of in Government price and tax plans. The other 85 percent was in clover in 1945 and has every reason to be in clover in 1946 as the result of unlimited consumer demands and the diminishing costs of mass production.

The NAM does not bother itself with such factual data as Mr. Bowles deals in. Not when it has such a beautiful theory as the following: "Remove price controls on manufactured goods and production will step up fast. Goods will then pour into the market and, within a reasonable time, prices will adjust themselves naturally—they always have—in line with the real worth of things."

Real Homes or Realty Speculation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the current issue of the Democrat:

REAL HOMES OR REALTY SPECULATION?

Critics of the administration's plan to get 2,700,000 new houses built by the end of 1947 complain that the program is too drastic.

Of course it is drastic. So are the hardships being endured by several million American veterans who can't find a decent place for themselves and their families to live.

You can't face up to a major crisis like the present housing shortage without drastic action.

In 1933, with our economy practically down for the count, drastic action was taken. As a result, the country got back on its feet. But the business-as-usual boys screamed to high heaven.

In 1941 and 1942 we took drastic action to gear the country for war production. By all-out effort we threw such a weight of men and materials at our enemies that we literally blasted them to kingdom come. But again the business-as-usual crowd yelled that they were being hurt.

Now the same calamity chorus is at it again. Lobbyists are swarming over Capitol Hill like termites, chewing away at the props of the plan that the President and Housing Administrator Wyatt have set up to relieve the home shortage. Republicans in Congress are lined up almost solidly against the program. If they cannot kill it outright, they are determined to delay it and cripple it with as many weakening amendments as possible.

The Wyatt plan is an across-the-board program. It strikes realistically at every angle of the problem, which is the only way a quick and effective job can be done.

It involves incentive payments to get production moving swiftly. It stimulates use of new materials and methods in an industry whose techniques are as outmoded as a buggy whip would be on a 1946 Buick. It provides Government aid in financing home mortgages.

It diverts scarce materials from nonessential commercial construction into low-cost homes that the people will be able to afford. And it protects home buyers from runaway increases in already inflated real estate prices.

Every day the program is delayed means 3,000 fewer houses built this year.

The alternative to the Wyatt plan is coddling of special interests—and continued shortage of houses. The choice is between quick, drastic action and prolonged drastic hardship.

Most shameful spectacle of all is the fight of the real estate interests against ceiling prices on houses.

These interests—according to their spokesmen—are not concerned because ceiling prices would cut into the enormous profits they hope to get as a result of the desperate need for shelter. Heaven forbid! It is the poor veteran they are worried about. If a veteran buys a house in 1946 they want to protect his right to sell it at a profit in 1947.

What veterans want is a roof over their heads now—not a chance to speculate. Few veterans can afford the prices that are being asked for houses now, let alone the prices that will be imposed if the real estate business has its way.

What makes the crocodile tears of the housing speculators particularly disgusting is the fact that the price boom they are so eager to set off would inevitably be followed by a collapse in values. Then every veteran who had managed somehow or other to get hold of a piece of property would be left holding the bag.

Allocation of Steel by CPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

DETROIT, MICH., *March 6, 1946.*

JACK SMALL,
Chairman, Civilian
Production Administration,
Social Security Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Steel industry is refusing to supply steel to the Kaiser-Frazer Corp. If steel companies continue taking this attitude then I strongly urge that allocations be made by CPA to automobile companies, including Kaiser-Frazer until there is sufficient for everyone to buy on the open market. What is to prevent CPA from using its war powers and allocating steel which would normally have gone to GM to companies such as Kaiser-Frazer where it can be used immediately? Press release from your office shows evidence of flagrant violation by companies of inventory limitations. What is CPA doing to enforce its rulings?

R. J. THOMAS,
President, UAW-CIO.

Statement of A. Jerd Bayless, of Canton, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by A. Jerd Bayless, director of the Lincoln High School Band, of Canton, Ohio:

CANTON, OHIO, *February 15, 1946.*

To the Canton City Board of Education, Jesse H. Mason, Superintendent of Schools:

There has come to my attention a matter which, in my opinion, has a direct and important bearing upon the public-school system of the city of Canton and which, therefore, should be worthy of consideration by all Cantonians connected with the public schools, including the students and parents. Although the matter concerns itself specifically with policies governing the department of instrumental music, the principle involved would seem to me to be influential in determining the policies of all departments in the system.

Kindly bear in mind that this report, aside from laying down certain pertinent facts, is an expression of purely personal opinion. It has been drawn up for the sole purpose of laying before the school authorities and others who may be interested, a personal point of view which may be considered when formulating final decisions.

As director of instrumental music at Lincoln High School, I have been held responsible for conducting the department as efficiently as possible and at the same time always acting within the bounds of the policies set by the board of education. In the carrying out of my assignment, I therefore consider myself directly responsible only to the proper school officials and the board of education.

The department of instrumental music at Lincoln High School embodies the concert band, marching band, B band, and orchestra. The so-called pit band, pit orchestra, and dance band, are not separate and distinct from these groups, but are merely segments or sections of them. They have been created for the purpose of giving talented and interested students an opportunity for additional supplementary training in instrumental music, exactly as a science teacher might assign a group of worthy and ambitious youngsters supplementary work on a related scientific project.

The so-called dance band is just such a related supplementary project in the instrumental department and, as such, is as truly a part of the department as is the concert band or orchestra. It was created for the simple reason that there happened to be enough talented and interested boys and girls in the department, who expressed a desire for training in playing standard dance music, to make the carrying-through of such a project feasible and practical from an educational point of view. It is therefore a genuine educational program.

In training young people in anything there must be an incentive for study and practice if the training program is to be effective. In music, obviously, this incentive lies in practical application of the art or, in other words, public performance. A marching band could not be created in the absence of opportunities of halftime performances and/or street parading, any more than a football team can be created in the absence of a schedule of games. The concert band cannot exist without concerts at which to play. Indeed, public performance, or practical application, not only is vital to the success of the training program, but is, just as surely, an integral part of it. What enjoyment the audience receives from a halftime show, an athletic contest, or a band concert, is really, from the educator's point of view, incidental. What is of primary importance, educationally speaking, is the fact that these boys and girls are receiving some amount of practical experience in a subject which happens to interest them, and this under the sponsorship of the board of education, and paid for with the taxpayer's dollar. This, I maintain, is as it should be, and as it must be, if we are to continue to boast of a worthy system of public education.

As heretofore implied, the dance band project at Lincoln High School is simply a course of training in this type of music, laid out for those interested and capable. Logically, the dance band without a dance to play for would be like a football team without an opponent. This problem has heretofore at Lincoln been met by means of the various class parties and school-held social functions. Following the logic expressed above, it can truthfully be stated that, from the director's standpoint, what pleasure the dancers get from the performance of the school dance band is purely incidental. As far as the director is concerned, he is merely giving the boys and girls of the organization training relative to the project. Indeed, it may be well considered as part of the regular classroom or laboratory work, and analogous to a 6 weeks' test in history, or a special assignment in English.

This supplementary training in dance-music study and performance has been carried on at Lincoln High School for some time. Similar training is now being inaugurated at McKinley and Lehman High Schools. Timken Vocational High School carries it on to a very limited extent. Whether such a project should be carried through in any given school is up to the judgment of the particular director involved, since only he is qualified to decide whether or not the talent, interest, and available time is such as to warrant such a project. The important point is that, as of this date, and to the best of my knowledge, the carrying on of such a project is within the bounds of school policy as set by the board of education.

In light of the above you will be interested in knowing that on the evening of February 12, 1946, a representative of the local musicians' union called on me at my home for the purpose of discussing certain problems which were arising regarding school-dance activities. During the course of the conference he set forth the following points:

1. The union is perturbed because of the fact that the Lincoln dance band is playing for the school class parties; especially since the idea seems now to be spreading to other schools, notably Lehman and McKinley.

2. The union seeks our cooperation to the extent that our dance band will refrain from playing for these class parties, except by possible occasional special permission of the union. The union will, in return, cooperate with the school by allowing us to play for certain functions.

3. Should we refuse to cooperate in the matter the union would be forced to employ certain clubs as a means of retaliation; notably the suspension of high-school students from union membership, the levying of fines, and the blacklisting of all functions emanating from Lincoln High School, even though said functions might be held outside the school.

4. The musicians' union claimed to be supported in its contention by organized labor of Canton.

This, in short, is the sum and substance of the union case as stated by this representative. A theme of cooperate or expect measures of retaliation permeated the entire interview.

I laid my side of the case before him much as I have done in this report, emphasizing especially the following points:

1. The dance band is not a separate organization set up for the purpose of furnishing music for class dance parties, but, rather, comprises a program of training which is set up as a regular course in the department.

2. The actual playing for a class party is nothing more or less than classroom activity for the students in this group.

3. To the best of my knowledge I am conducting the instrumental music department well within the bounds of the policies set by the board of education. Any change in my program would have to be brought about through a direct order emanating from my employer, namely, the Canton Board of Education.

Therefore the final decision rests with the board. As a teacher in a public school I am directly responsible only to this group, which represents not an individual, nor a labor group, but rather represents the school-supporting public. As a teacher in a public school, furthermore, I shall continue to refuse to heed the dictates of any individual or group, except when such dictates are received by me through the board of education or its officers.

Finally, as a public-school teacher, I am not authorized to make any decisions regarding school policy. The following remarks are, therefore, merely expressions of personal opinion, to be taken for what they are worth, and come from one whose primary interest lies in the training of school boys and girls.

1. If the musicians' union can forbid the dance band from playing for class parties it can, by the same token, forbid the marching band from appearing at football games, or the orchestra from playing at class plays. These are all established courses of training carried on by the department.

2. If individuals or groups, whose primary purpose or intent does not lie in public education, can tell the schools what they can and cannot do, within the classroom, the traditional concept of free public education is indeed in jeopardy.

3. This actual "dance-band problem" is, when considered in comparison with the school system as a whole, rather minute. However, the principle of the issue involved, and the question emanating therefrom, becomes serious. The whole question, it would seem to me, resolves itself to this: Shall we, as parents, as taxpayers, and as people interested in the educational welfare of our youth, tolerate any outside interference in the regular classroom activity carried on within the confines of these tax-supported institutions?

4. My personal answer to this is, of course, "no." My whole argument in the case is based on my contention that, in the specific case of our dance-band activity, the local musicians' union is tampering with and impeding the efficiency of regular classroom work. It is interfering with a program of training which is maintained and supported by a taxpaying public, and not by union assessments.

Respectfully submitted,

A. JERD BAYLESS,
Director, Lincoln High School Band, Canton, Ohio.

We, the undersigned, have read the above report in its entirety. We agree thoroughly with the philosophies and opinions expressed and, unless ordered otherwise by the board of education, intend to operate our respective departments according to identical trends of thought.

ROBERT D. STUMP,
Director, McKinley High School Band, Canton, Ohio.

SAM L. BELL,
Director, Lehman High School Band, Canton, Ohio.

Loan to Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CONRAD'S,
La Crosse, Wis., March 4, 1946.
Hon. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Recently I read one of your news letters which you sent to a friend of mine, and may I congratulate you on your stand toward a loan to Britain.

I'm an ex-GI and naturally very much interested and concerned about the pending housing legislation. The situation is acute, as you know, and I think I speak for the average GI when I say he is understanding and tolerant toward his present plight, as he is accepting the condition as an aftermath of the war. However, the phase he is most concerned and distressed by is the bickering that has resulted from pressure by lobbyists and certain money interests.

At the present, we GI's are looking to our Representatives and hope you won't be taken in and sell us short. We are counting on men like you because we have seen what faulty government and greed have done to other countries. Therefore, today more than ever before, we are politically minded and determined to practice our democratic rights.

Sincerely yours,

S. WEINBERGER.

Speech of Winston Churchill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, after an introduction by our President, Mr. Churchill made a speech which is a mockery of all the great war speeches he made extolling the benefits of Big Three unity. His proposal to set up an Anglo-American bloc blows into oblivion all his fine-sounding phrases during the war.

We have all hoped and prayed that the United Nations Organization could be made to function effectively to insure world peace. We no sooner put the breath of hope and life into this essential ideal for mankind, when the theory of balance of power is brought forth in the heart of America by a war leader who presumably once wanted to end war for all time.

The game of balance of power has always brought war to this earth. The history of the past 2,000 years has proven conclusively that when nation was set up against nation—or one bloc of nations against another bloc of nations—war was always the inevitable result. I am opposed to the formation of any blocs, any spheres of imperialistic power, whether they be in the form of British imperialism, Russian imperialism, or American imperialism. All must be opposed if we are to save the world from another terrible war.

It is incredible to me that the Tory representative from Great Britain used the heart of the United States as a platform for the reactionary proposal to set up one power with another, with only one possible objective: creating a bloc against a third power. History has proven the insanity of this. The destructive potential of atomic power has already demonstrated how disastrous another war can be.

Therefore, we must face the fact now that if the United Nations Organization is going to be subverted into rival and power-hungry blocs instead of nations working together for peace for all time, the future we face will see mankind obliterated by the atomic bombs of hatred, envy, and greed.

Standardization of Bearing Dimensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the latest step in the American march toward standardization of sizes—a trend which has made the manufacture and distribution of virtually everything we use more efficient—is being taken in the field of ball and roller bearings which now are as essential to daily living as automobile tires and radio tubes.

While the matter of standardization of boundary dimensions of bearings may seem unimportant to the average man, S. F. Wollmar, an official of the SKF Industries, Inc., Philadelphia, points out that our whole machine-age economy moves on antifriction bearings.

Some of these bearings are the minute ones in sensitive aircraft instruments, some the modest sizes used in vacuum cleaners and other household appliances, and some the 4-foot, 9,000 pounders used in high-speed rolling mills which squeeze out sheet aluminum and steel for automobiles and airplanes.

Lack of standardization, Wollmar says, requires the bearing industry to produce and stock up to 40,000 different sizes and makes of ball and roller bearings, many of which vary in size by less than a hairsbreadth.

This number could be reduced, Wollmar believes, by nearly 38,000 with resulting benefits in speedier production of urgently needed industrial and consumer goods for use at home and abroad.

While ball and roller bearings look simple, and are usually one of the smallest component parts of every machine, or motor that moves, they are actually one of the most difficult parts to make, since their dimensions must often be held to one ten-thousandth of an inch, equivalent to splitting a hair into 30 equal parts, Wollmar points out. Thus, even the most minute changes in dimensions can mean the changing over of as many as 150 extremely complicated tools and gages used in bearing manufacture.

The benefits of standardization, Wollmar declares, would have even more widespread effect on the everyday lives of Americans than did the standardization of the sizes of such things as electric bulbs and sockets, automobile tires, railroad tracks, hairpins, and a host of other products made by different companies to standard sizes, even though quality may vary according to price.

Not only do most electrical household appliances use antifriction bearings, but all of the tools to make parts for these devices use ball or roller bearings, he points out.

If manufacturers and designers of all types of machines and motors would adopt a more uniform system of boundary dimensions for the bearings used in their products, Wollmar says, the bearing industry would be able to supply the demand, and, through the elimination of frequent and expensive change-overs on bearing-making machinery, be able to deliver even higher quality bearings more efficiently and economically to the consumer.

Even those manufacturers whose machines require hand-tailored bearings would automatically benefit from standardization of ball and roller bearings, Wollmar emphasizes, explaining that in the unusual cases where exceptional speed and tolerance would require special dimensions, the anti-friction-bearing industry's research and development engineers could readily solve these special problems with the least divergence from established standards.

With bearings hidden away in prosaic grease so long, it took a war to remind us of their importance. Indeed, one of the first morale films the Army motion-picture division produced for showing in our war plants told the story of bearings. It dramatized the fact that everywhere a wheel or a shaft turns, bearings are essential. Without them, our industrial civilization could not exist.

Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting for me to hear the Members of this House discuss the building of Houses for the veterans when I know the background and vocations of the Members of this House.

I will enumerate their occupations before and in some cases the present and past means of livelihood. This is a resumé of the membership of the Seventy-seventh Congress: 224 lawyers, 169 businessmen, 4 farmers, 3 dentists, 5 medical doctors, 1 veterinarian, and 1 pharmacist. And I believe that it has

not changed very much in this, the Seventy-ninth Congress, and the only group that I would look for builders would be in the business group, and the word "business" to me can include almost anbody, in any line of endeavor. The 4 farmers could build barns or sheds, if they had a handy hatchet and sawman. While I am a dentist by profession, I am also a pioneer builder and owner of apartment houses in Wilmington, Del.

The building regulations for apartments call for brick, stone, and concrete; wood floors, and iron fire escapes. The discussion so far has been on the prices for finished houses of six or eight rooms, at a price of $6,000 to $8,000. No talk about the cost per cubic foot for various construction of brick, cinder, or concrete block or frame work, covered with asbestos or wood shingle or German siding. Your bath and kitchen fixtures, and heating and plumbing plans can vary in quality and prices. Your outside grading, walks and, of course, a garage for one or two cars is also to be figured. Then when you think you have arrived at an approximate cost, add 10 to 20 percent for extras.

I was the first builder to put oil burners in apartment houses in Delaware, 33 years ago, which were changed to coal by Mr. Ickes' suggestion or orders. In 1 month after changing, I was told it would be better if the oil was used. I am still wondering who is right. Where do all of these specialists come from? I am going to vote for this bill, a substitute may not be as good for the veterans.

Ceiling Prices on Live Cattle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following court decision from the Federal District of Oregon:

BOWLES, ADMINISTRATOR, OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION, V. BEN LEVY, DOING BUSINESS AS CENTRAL MARKET, CIVIL NO. 2756 AND FOUR OTHER CASES: NOS. 2785, CIVIL; 2787, CIVIL; 2788, CIVIL; AND 2824, CIVIL—DISTRICT COURT, DISTRICT OF OREGON, FEBRUARY 20, 1946

OPA actions for injunctions to enforce compliance with Maximum Price Regulation No. 574, which establishes ceiling prices to be paid for live cattle. The regulation, based on 30-day reporting periods, requires estimated live weight and grade to conform to dressed weight and grade, after applying certain formulas.

Injunctions to issue.[1]

William B. Wetherall, regional chief, Food Enforcement Division, of San Francisco, Calif.; F. E. Wagner and James M. Blackford, district enforcement attorneys, Cecelia P. Gallagher, enforcement attorney; Victor E. Harr and J. Robert Patterson, assistant United States attorneys, of Portland, Oreg., for the plaintiff.

Cake, Jaureguy & Tooze (Herbert C. Hardy and Ralph H. Cake, of counsel), all of Portland, Oreg., for the defendants.

McColloch, district judge.

I accept the contention of defendants as proven that the regulation is unworkable in this area. It has been shown that violations are unavoidable. No evidence was offered to the contrary.

But the question remains whether I may deny OPA an injunction in any case where a regulation exists and violation of the regulation is shown. All of my instincts say that should not be enough, that the equities should be open to inquiry in every case.[2]

Hecht Co. v. *Bowles* (321 U. S. 321) ruled that an injunction need not be issued where a defendant was honestly endeavoring to comply and could in time comply. But here the defendants, while honestly endeavoring to comply, cannot at all times and under all conditions be certain that their operations will, at the end of every 30 days reporting period, "be in compliance" under the formula.

The regulation itself cannot be assailed in this proceeding. Section 204 (d) of the Price Control Act prohibits that. It compels the courts to treat a regulation as valid, even though they know it to be invalid.

Assuming, therefore, as Congress has commanded, that the regulation is valid, must an equity court issue an injunction, even though it is clear that future violations are bound to occur, regardless of the good faith and earnest efforts of the defendants to avoid violations?

In other times, I would have thought there could be but one answer to this question, but the decisions in this circuit have so completely shorn the district judges of discretion in OPA cases, I must conclude that equity is compelled to act in this field, even though there be not equity—that an injunction must issue, even though it is known at the time of the issuance that nonwillful violations are bound to occur.[3]

This is a strange situation, previously unknown to our law, and it could not arise except for the vise [4] that section 204 (d) puts on the courts, coupled with the appellate decisions referred to, which take away that discretionary powers normally allowable to trial courts.

Because I have no choice, I will therefore issue the requested injunctions, expressly reserving, however, the question of their enforceability, for I am yet to be persuaded that an equity court can punish conduct that contains no ingredient of evil.

CLAUDE MCCOLLOCH,
Judge.

[1] The regulation has been contested in 26 cases, mostly unreported, before 10 district judges. Judge Hulem makes a good statement of the difficulties arising under the regulation in *Bowles* v. *Albert Glauser, Inc.* (61 F. Supp. 426). There are other local problems that will be stated in the findings in the instant case.

[2] It seems not generally understood among agency attorneys that when the Government enters the courts as a litigant, its standing, with few exceptions, not pertinent here, is the same as a private litigant (28 Am. Jur. p. 342).

[3] It should be plain that the results of this pincer is to destroy the judicial character of the courts. It makes them mere vassals.

[4] *Case* v. *Bowles* and *Hulbert* v. *Twin Falls County, Idaho*, decided in the Supreme Court February 4, 1946, will repay study. The vise may be loosening. *Bowles* v. *Case* (9 Cir., 149 F. 2d 777); *Soundview Pulp Co.* v. *Taylor* (150 P. 2d 839); *Twin Falls County* v. *Hulbert* (156 P. 2d 319).

[5] See the remarks of the Chief Justice at the argument in *Hecht Co.* v. *Bowles* (321 U. S. 321 (1944), reported in the United States Law Week for February 8, 1944 (12 LW sec. 3, 3257).

This is one of twenty or more cases that have been filed throughout the Western States to combat, it is said, the rising price of beef cattle. My recollection of a number of years in the range country is that prices of cattle always rise at this time of the year, before the new grass starts. Be that as it may, this has been selected as a test case, and I should think it would be an excellent case to take to the United States Supreme Court to find out whether the courts have become mere rubber stamps for executive action.

Single Power Unit Supplies Major Utilities for Home—New Invention Cuts Cost of Home Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the high cost of homes in this day and age. One aspect of the building situation that has been almost completely overlooked in these discussions has been the advancement in technology, utilizing mass production, which will reduce many of these original costs, and yet provide the optimum of modern equipment.

Under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I should like to include an article from one of America's most widely recognized authorities on housing design and construction. This magazine is the Architectural Forum. In its February 1946 issue it devoted an unusually large part of the issue to this invention, as follows:

Since the day plumbing moved indoors, the house-building industry has recognized the economy of closely grouped utilities. Back-to-back kitchens and bathrooms have always been the hallmark of penny-wise builders. During the past 15 years many a forward looking designer has gone still further, developed for prefabrication a so-called mechanical core containing all or most of a house's utilities. While some of these ideas reached the mock-up stage, none went into production. Not until this month will the industry preview the first mass-produced mechanical core when the Ingersoll utility unit is unveiled simultaneously at the annual convention of the National Association of Home Builders in Chicago and at the manufacturers' 12-house proving ground at Kalamazoo, Mich.

Produced by Ingersoll Steel & Disc Division of Borg-Warner Corp., the utility unit is comprised of two major parts: (1) a factory fabricated core containing furnace, water heater, plumbing, and electrical circuits and (2) the fixtures which normally appear in any well-equipped kitchen, laundry, and bathroom but which are integral parts of this smartly designed unit.

Introduction of the utility unit is a good thing for the building industry. It holds significance for most every branch:

For the builder it means easier, more rapid construction and lower costs.

For the architect it provides an economical factory-made design for part of the house, yet allows him a free hand in the arrangement of the house's major elements.

For the lender it means the writing of larger mortgages covering several built-in kitchen and laundry fixtures which heretofore, as movable accessories, have ordinarily been financed by the relatively high-cost, short-term loans of commercial banks.

For the prefabricator of houses who is willing to subcontract his utilities, it may be

the solution to one of his knottiest problems. (One leader in the field has already seen it this way, has placed an order with Ingersoll.)

For building labor and particularly its plumbers, the new unit with its factory assembled core offers only the possibility of more construction through lower costs. (However, the manufacturer is using A. F. of L. plumbers in the factory production of the core, offering them the benefits of year-round employment.)

For the dealer alone the new product means nothing—it will be sold direct from manufacturer to builder.

For the industry as a whole, currently beset by soaring costs, Ingersoll's efforts to lower the cost of house utilities are welcome. Original goal was to produce the package of utilities at a price 20 percent below the cost of buying and assembling comparable equipment in the conventional manner. Certainly, some saving was to be expected, reflecting those which Ingersoll will effect through the manufacture of many of the unit's parts, through the purchase in wholesale lots of the other parts, through mass production of the unit's core, through the economies inherent in the compact design of the unit (less piping, shorter wiring circuits, etc.) and, finally, through a streamlined sales policy. Although final pricing will depend on raw material costs and other factors prevailing at the start of production, the standard model of the utility unit shown on these pages has been tentatively tagged at $1,300 f. o. b. Kalamazoo.

How much of the promised savings will be passed on to the house-buying public remains to be seen. However, the house buyer is guaranteed smaller monthly payments, since all of the unit's component fixtures, including clothes washer and refrigerator, are, when assembled, integral parts of the unit and the house, and their cost may therefore be spread out thin over the term of the mortgage.

PRODUCTION WILL HIT STRIDE THIS SUMMER; BIG BUILDERS WILL BENEFIT FIRST

Although eager for such economies, the industry and the public must wait. Like everything else being produced by reconverted industry, Ingersoll's new product cannot be delivered immediately. Eventually, three or four B–W plants may be retooled for its production, but the one being retooled today will not start mass production before spring. However, Ingersoll hopes that this Kalamazoo plant will be turning out 500 units a month by midsummer, has yet his production sights on a target of 6,000 units for 1946.

Chances are that all of this year's output will go to large-scale builders, for the company's policy for the present is to accept only orders for 50 or more units. There are several good reasons for this: (1) Such builders are in a better position to bargain with labor. (2) Concentration of sales in groups of at least 50 will simplify the complicated problem of servicing them. (3) Mass sales and deliveries will facilitate mass production and permit lower costs. Sometime in the future smaller builders may enter the market, order as few as one at a time. Then, through his builder, the individual who is building a house may also order his utility unit.

Most of the credit for the development of the packaged utility equipment goes to Roy C. Ingersoll and a few others. Among these were Industrial Designer Donald Deskey whom Ingersoll retained last May to assist in the design, production, and promotion of the new product. Deskey Associates had already conceived a prefabricated utility package similar in many respects to Ingersoll's. So, the design of the utility unit is the result of the threefold collaboration of Architect Lankton, Ingersoll's engineers, and Deskey's designers headed by Partner Leonard Keller, director of the product-design division.

To field test the design and operation of the utility unit, to demonstrate its flexibility and to create a full scale showroom for the new merchandise, Ingersoll last summer commissioned eight architects to design 12 houses of various styles, sizes, and costs, then built them in Kalamazoo. The project has also proved to be a much headlined introduction to Ingersoll's grand promotional campaign. In these days of slim pickings, the mere completion of 12 new houses would make headlines anywhere; designed, as they are, by some of the country's leading architects, these 12 will command Nation-wide attention. Never before have there been built side by side the houses of such experts as Dow, Harris, Keck, Stone, Stubbins, Wills, and Yost. Less known but most familiar with the utility unit, Architect Lankton designed three more.

All these purposes and promotional advantages were in the minds of publicity-wise Donald Deskey Associates when they suggested such an architectural project to Ingersoll. While Deskey was selecting the big-name architects, Ingersoll purchased 10 acres in a partially developed section of Kalamazoo, appointed a construction superintendent from his staff of engineers and designated local Miller Davis Co. as general contractor. Deskey had no difficulty lining up his architects at a flat fee of $2,000 each. At the same time Landscape Architect Michael Rapuano, of the firm of Clark, Rapuano and Holleran, was commissioned to develop the site plan, locate the houses, and beautify the scrubby lots.

Major requirement given the architects was that they "demonstrate the flexibility of small house design around a utility core" and that they "publicize the utility unit by presenting it in houses designed with broad consumer appeal and sales potential." Each architect was instructed not to exceed a certain sales price based upon an average cost per cubic foot which put the houses within the prewar $4,000 to $8,500 bracket.

When completed this month, the houses will be rented to Ingersoll employees, including President Ingersoll's son Robert, works manager of the company's Kalamazoo plant. Other tenants who are particularly well qualified to study the operation of the houses and their utility units are Ingersoll's chief engineer and his home economics expert.

While these tests are under way, the houses will be used to a limited extent as a show room in which the utility units will be demonstrated to invited builders. However, most builders will have already seen the new product and its application in the Kalamazoo houses, for the manufacturer is devoting 7,200 square feet of floor space to a comprehensive display at this month's convention of the National Association of Home Builders at Chicago. There the Nation's leading house builders will see elaborately detailed models of the Kalamazoo houses, walk around a full-size installation of the utility unit, examine an exploded display of its component parts and take away with them a brochure showing use of the unit in 38 additional house designs.

Builders who miss the Chicago debut may soon see a similar demonstration in their own localities, for Ingersoll now contemplates putting the show on the road. And, before long, they will be able to see the real thing, for builders throughout the country will soon be moving utility units into their new houses. Even prior to the opening of the Chicago and Kalamazoo displays, Ingersoll had a sizable backlog of orders from large-scale builders who have been sold by the utility unit's advance publicity.

The houses shown are among the very first of the postwar crop. This fact alone gives them unusual significance; but they happen also to be good designs, noteworthy for their intelligence, honesty, and realism. They were conceived while the war was still raging and begun as soon as it was finished. They thus necessarily reflect the grim realities of building today. But that they exist at all is a tribute to Ralph Gulley who—as head of Deskey's Architectural Division—had the task of integrating and coordinating the work of the many specialists involved.[1] The houses as finished reflect this process. At every stage of their development they were reviewed by the Deskey office, by Ingersoll's purchasing department and production men. Many of the changes which resulted were aimed at better adapting the houses to their lots and relating them to each other. Other modifications were sometimes involved. Reviewing the original designs, Mr. Ingersoll suggested that "the group as a whole should stick closer to the middle of the road if we are to meet the preferences of a large enough number of people to 'sell' the houses and the unit." At the same time, however, it was wisely suggested that each design include "some unique feature which would attract attention and serve as a talking point for publicity."

Never for a moment losing sight of the fact that it was the small house which offered the largest potential market for his unit, Ingersoll kept the houses small—they range in size from 6,200 to 16,400 cubic feet, and would cost from $4,650 to $12,300 to duplicate based on an average estimated cost of about 75 cents per cubic foot. Since they are designed for national publicity, they wisely cover a wide range of geographic considerations and stylistic preferences. The various installations of the unit were deliberately varied: some burn oil, others gas; heating capacity varies widely;[2] they use various methods of distributing the heated air, including George Fred Keck's radiant floor system; all four variations of the standard unit's plan are demonstrated; one unit is on the second floor and one unit is expanded with auxiliary equipment to form a custom kitchen.

Despite these variations, however, the houses have many qualities in common—not least of which is the ease with which they absorb Mr. Ingersoll's new utility unit. On that count, he can consider his experiment already successful. For all the houses prove that the unit neither limits the designer's imagination nor freezes the floor plan of his houses.

[1] Other personnel of the Deskey Associates who have been responsible for important phases of the development program are: Frank S. Bache, construction and research; Clifford B. Curtis, architect, architectural coordinator; Dwight LaBarre, product design engineering; Harold E. Leeds, architecture and house models; Walter H. Smith, house decorating and furnishings. Deskey's consultants were: A. Lawrence Kocher, architect; Prof. Richard M. Bennett, Yale School of Architecture; Dr. Elaine Knowles, home economist, Teachers College, Columbia University.

[2] Heat loss computations in the 12 houses range from 32,290 B. t. u. to 101,105 B. t. u., with all estimates based on a temperature of 10° Fahrenheit and a 10 mile-per-hour wind.

Letter From Frederick C. Schmidt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, it has rarely been my practice to introduce letters into the CON-

GRESSIONAL RECORD which come to me from constituents. I feel this letter which I ask unanimous consent to introduce into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to be one of the most remarkable documents that has ever come to my desk.

Certainly it is a most fundamental thing and touches the very heart of the national question with which this Congress labors today. I urge that every reader of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and particularly the Members of Congress, read this letter signed by Frederick C. Schmidt, of Kongsberg, N. Dak.:

KONGSBERG, N. DAK., *February 28, 1946.*
The Honorable CHARLES R. ROBERTSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I'm a farmer, or trying to be, after serving 3½ years in Uncle Sam's Navy. I had to sell my machinery and rent my land when the draft took me and now I can't get any replacements so have to stand like a beggar at my dad's door. This is bad enough but to stand here and watch the almost childish goings-on in Washington is too much.

What is the matter? Why doesn't somebody grab the bull by the horns and get rolling? Why are these strikes permitted to go on in a mad rush toward either anarchy or Communism? How many men actually belong to these unions and want these strikes? Not the majority, I'm sure. Since when does a man have to ask somebody or pay for the right to work? But behind all this stands our Government supporting lock-outs and labor trouble with its ridiculous price-fixing schemes and the OPA.

The word was "to hold the line" but who is breaking through in the greatest game of power politics ever heard of? Labor, or more aptly, labor racketeers. Of course, the blame does not all lie there but OPA can certainly claim the lion's share. Yes, OPA and those advocates of price fixing and Government control who are nothing but Communists under the skin and are out to abolish our system of free and competitive enterprise.

I ask you: What's the use of more economical methods or mass production or any other fruits of our competitive system if a man, or business, cannot thereby increase his profits and better his income? We might all just as well go back to the Stone Age if Government is going to stand there and tell a man how to do everything. Government should act as mediator and conciliator but not as owner and operator and as the over-all "big boss."

We need production and we won't get it until the shackles imposed by dictatorial Government are removed. If the line is to be held then hold it or else let it go evenly all around and none of this: here-but-not-there stuff.

As to peacetime conscription, I am unalterably opposed to it. To lessen the period of service or change the age doesn't change the principle a doggone bit. What place has conscription in a democracy among freemen? I thought we just fought a war to get rid of just such things—or was it to free others but enslave ourselves? It's nothing but the effort of power-minded men to hold themselves up by holding somebody else down.

Why isn't the service made attractive and decent enough so a respectable man can join up without apologizing? Why does a man have to assume the status of a salaried convict to be in the service? I know; I was there. Abolish special privileges for officers with its caste system and reconstitute the service on the order of the plan proposed by former Brig. Gen. H. C. Holdridge.

I am opposed to the British gift-loan because who made us Santa Claus for the rest of the world and Britain isn't a democracy anyhow and never gave anybody any freedom until she had to and besides, who comes first: The British or American veterans?

I do not ask for any gift or bonus from our Government; in fact, I believe these gifts and doles are breaking down the moral fiber of our country. All I ask is that we be offered as a loan what is being given to foreigners, namely, money at 1½-percent interest.

This get-something-for-nothing attitude, fostered by the Roosevelt administration, is mainly responsible right now for all these strikes. People got the idea that they can eat without working and OPA and Government certainly do nothing to disprove that theory.

Another thing is this atomic bomb. "Turn it over to a civilian commission," they say. What for? Do we intend to hand over to the rest of the world all our other military secrets? There is just as much sense in the former as the latter or vice versa. Or don't we trust ourselves with so powerful a weapon? I can well believe so when I see all the stirring we are doing in Spain and Argentina. There will be just one result in that—we'll have made some more enemies.

Thanking you for your kind attention, and hoping that for once you have a clear-cut statement of a citizen's views, I am,

Sincerely yours,
FREDERICK C. SCHMIDT.

P. S.—Would like to include here my idea of the solution to the labor-management problem.

I have often wondered why business doesn't organize on a profit-sharing basis with the employees as partners and shareholders in the company. I know this has been done in several instances and I've never heard of labor trouble in these companies. This system simply eliminates the two camps of labor and management, making one of the whole works. Profit for one is gain for the other, making common cause and interest. Labor racketeers have tough sledding in such a set-up.

Can an Isolationist Change His Spots?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent heretofore granted, I am extending my remarks by including an article which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of recent date, entitled "State of the Nation."

I would like to call attention to and emphasize what Mr. Roscoe Drummond, chief of the Washington bureau of the Christian Science Monitor, has to say with respect to the trend toward isolationism. There is a great deal of truth in what Senator WARREN R. AUSTIN, of Vermont, is quoted as having said with respect to the "undertow pulling the United States back to isolationism and extreme nationalism." The truth of that statement is evidenced by the correspondence which crosses my desk and by the position taken by a great many people who ought to know better.

The truth of it is, as somebody has well said:

No man can lift himself up by pulling at his bootstraps. The leopard cannot change his spots nor the Ethiopian his skin. Nor can a man change his own innate nature. Nor can one man change the nature of any other.

The failure to learn this physiological fact is responsible for the failure of many reform measures that have been devised by men and governments. Human nature, whatever it is defined to be, is stamped upon the very fabric and constitution of every man when he is born. He inherits it from his ancestors, as the leopard does his spots and the Ethiopian his skin. The fact that the Ethiopian maiden camouflages her skin with cosmetics does not change the real nature of the skin. A person may change his conduct, and often does, but that does not change his human nature.

As long as human beings retain their human nature they would save themselves and disappoint both God and man.

If professional reform organizations and civil authorities could ever learn that it is impossible for human beings to change human nature they would save themselves much grief and disappointment.

We ought to know by this time that we cannot legislate to change human nature.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am including the article to which I have referred, which reads as follows:

STATE OF THE NATION

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—In the United States Congress today there are politicians who are toying and tampering with the Nation's security.

No one expects or necessarily wants Congress to do everything which the administration recommends, even in the nonpolitical field of national security. But when Congress does virtually nothing which the administration asks in behalf of the armed services—and keeps on doing nothing—it's time to look around for the reason. It's politics, politics, politics; no matter how you spell it, it's politics.

Three vital issues of military policy remain unresolved, and one of the controlling reasons is that Congress has its eye stolidly fixed on the coming elections. It doesn't want to waft the slightest disturbing breath over the electorate; it doesn't want to do anything controversial which might affect a single vote; let other decisions wait, and while they wait America grows weaker as the world grows more troubled. The issues which are thus delayed are these:

1. Extension of the Selective Service Act so that the United States Army will have sufficient men—until they can be obtained by voluntary recruitment—to carry out the Nation's long-term occupation tasks in Germany and Japan and adequately garrison its outlying defense bases.

2. Enactment of a universal military-training program so that the United States will at all times have quickly available an adequate reserve of trained forces to help meet any emergency.

3. A decision on whether the Nation's armed services will be strengthened or weakened by being administratively merged into a single department of national defense, as urged by the President.

Obviously there can be an honest divergence of judgment over these proposed measures, but when nothing positive is being done about any of them, a simple difference of opinion is hardly an adequate explanation. A definite decision one way or the other—and Congress doesn't even want to do this because action either way might offend a voter somewhere—is better than delay and default.

Several questions need to be pondered thoughtfully before any of these three measures of national security are rejected.

Will a weak America or a strong America contribute most to keeping the world at

peace? After World War I, the United States rejected military training, dismantled its Army, sunk a lot of its Navy. Did American military weakness in the thirties discourage or abet World War II?

Are we certain that any future aggression will be a push-button push-over? Or must we, until the carefully calculated possibilities of atomic energy are clear, do whatever is presently necessary, including military training, to be ready for future military needs? Can we safely risk the Nation's security on even the best guesses as to what future aggression might be like? Don't we need to keep one foot on the ground while both eyes are on the horizon of natural scientific development?

Must we not either publicly revise our military commitments—such as the long-term occupation of Germany and Japan—or decisively equip our armed forces with the means to carry out those commitments?

Senator WARREN R. AUSTIN of Vermont, who has reason to know what he is talking about, recently wrote to a friend: "I feel a tremendous undertow pulling the United States back to isolation and extreme nationalism. It seems more difficult now than it was during the war to overcome this undertow. Yet, it must be surmounted."

There is ample evidence to support Senator AUSTIN's appraisal. The Congressmen who were most isolationist before the war are today the most active in opposing measures to give the Nation the military strength to do its share in maintaining the peace.

Few people really believe that America intends or wants to go back on its world commitments, but the undertow of isolation needs to be understood to be met. It is the kind of undertow which, with deep insight into the workings of the human mind, Paul once advised the Romans about:

"For the good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do.

"I find then a law, that when I would do good, evil is present with me." (Romans 7:19, 21.)

Paul's insight and advice is pertinent today because the undertow of isolation in Congress is simply an attempt to reverse the constructive, nonpartisan decisions Congress already has made in behalf of world peace and America's role in maintaining it.

Hon. George F. Rogers, of New York, Offers Bill To Provide for National Health and Productive Power of the People of the United States by Clarifying the Laws Pertaining to Hospital Treatment, Medical Care, 74 Veterans' Hospitals and 6 Diagnostic Research and Proving Centers and a Medical Flying Corps for Disabled Veterans and High-Altitude Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE F. ROGERS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. ROGERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, seldom do I take the time of the House to present matters of grave concern to the Nation, for we have those outstanding Members on both sides of the aisle who are authorities and highly qualified to present the arguments for or against any given issue.

But the events of time have necessitated that any Member of the House who can assist in law making that will prevent total chaos in our Nation step forward and speak his mind, as it now seems that only in this way can we all more or less assist each other in formulating ideas which may be the means of checking inevitable disaster.

America will soon have furnished 20,000,000 men and women in the service of both world wars the means or excuse for dissatisfaction and unrest, not mentioning the ideal psychological environment for human misbehavior. Naturally; we do not purposely engage in wars to cause these conditions, but wars do have the very unfortunate habit of bringing in its wake home-front disasters.

I regret to say that of late I have been plagued with one persistent question which, without a doubt, has been asked every Member of Congress. Letters, telephone calls and wires have continually been hounding me with urgent requests for an answer to this vital question: "When can I get into a veterans' hospital for treatment? Why must I wait until I develop a fatal disease before the veterans' hospitals can accommodate me with a bed?"

It is not for me to say that, in the past, veterans of wars have been treated in hospitals which were unfit even for those who were paying a debt back to society for some crime they had committed. Records show, without a question of doubt, that this Government, regardless of blame, did foster a system of veteran hospitalization which caused great controversy and shock to the people of this Nation.

It is also true that steps and measures were taken to correct the evils of the last Veterans' Administration by this new Administration and that, with proper guidance and help from an intelligent Congress the veterans of this late war will not have to go begging for hospitalization.

This has the earmarks of digging up an old dead, "lame duck." However, it may well serve to prove that opinions of certain well-meaning groups sometimes are the direct cause of chaos. During the crisis of World War I hospitalization, the Federal Board of Hospitalization in the Bureau of the Budget entertained the philosophy that the peak of veterans' hospitalization would be about 1957. Meaning to say that at middle age the veteran would fail in health, and only then should he be treated. This also means that this Government is of the opinion that prevention of health failure is of no importance and that only at death's door should we begin to treat disease. Perhaps it is, then, no wonder that we have such a shortage of medical science and care for our economy. If this philosophy is to be used again, and from the reports I have received it is indicated that it will, then again shall we hear the cries of inadequate hospital care of our national heroes.

Gen. Omar N. Bradley testified in substance to the committees of Congress, quote:

They say the peak of hospitalization will be reached about 1970.

This again means that only when our veteran is stricken with a fatal disease, will he be able to reach a veterans' hospital bed.

It is my sincere hope and wish that every veteran of this war, after having been treated so marvelously by the Army and Navy medical personnel, will never require urgent hospitalization. However, since this is just a wish and there is and will be more so an urgent need for veterans' hospitalization, I am now asking this Congress to face the issue with facts and reality and to pass legislation now, which will once and for all take care of this most vital need—the first charge of the Nation.

These are the facts: In spite of the precautionary measures by the selective-service medical examiners to isolate medically unfit inductees, it is estimated, according to the medical disability discharges, that approximately one million and a half veterans have broken down in health, due to the rigors of war. There is no way of knowing the extent of future break-downs among the millions of other veterans now discharged, serving and going to serve. We must be prepared for any eventuality and this preparedness means that we must build now the system of hospitals and medical corps needed to operate them to take care of at least 300,000 bedridden veterans at one time, all the time.

It is common knowledge that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure, so why should we not admit that it is wiser to prevent total disability by correcting minor ills which, in the past, have not been cause enough for warranting a bed for this so-called minor ailment. The Army and Navy carry out the policy of treating diseases in their early stages in order not only to send a human out into the civil world again in good health but mainly to put back into the Treasury money that would have gone out for total disability. It is strange that no other branch of this same Government has the foresight to visualize this gigantic but simple method of high finance: Save a human today and save the Treasury pay.

I do not want to draw swords with the wonderful medical advisers to our Government officials, or whoever else puts the ideas through that have been the stand-by of the Veterans' Administration's function, but I do want to wake up some of my colleagues to the fact that complication has replaced simplicity and that the result has been chaos, not only in veterans' affairs but also in other national affairs.

In this reference, I mean to say that right after the last war it took Edward Hines, a civilian lumberman and builder from Maywood, Ill., to take his old speedway apart and use the materials to build what is today the outstanding show place of the Veterans' Administration. Why is it necessary that a civilian must set the example for such a wonderful Government as ours to follow?

If I thought that my colleagues were lending a deaf ear, I would call upon another Edward Hines to build a bigger and better veterans' hospital for our well deserving veterans. But since we all know that the public is clamoring for righteousness in behalf of the returning veteran, we will not find it necessary to

ask for charity, or have to pay later for someone else's idea.

The World War Veterans' Act of 1924, as amended, provides for hospitalization of honorably discharged veterans, even though their disability may not be due to service. This means that every veteran has the right to seek a bed in a veterans' hospital, regardless of the nature of his illness, and law demands that this bed be provided, if available. Under such a law, we appear, on the surface, to have taken care of the veteran while, beneath the surface, we are Indian givers.

Since the President himself admitted to Congress that the service men and women were used to adequate medical care in the service and that they would expect the same continuous care in civilian life, then it follows that this adequate care must have its start in the Veterans' Administration. This adequate care must come from the constitutional representatives of the people. I have statistics in my files which prove beyond a doubt that we, the Government, must build at least 200,000 hospital beds throughout this Nation. The appropriation of over $448,000,000 for veterans' hospitals, since passage of the G. I. bill, is a start in the right direction. Without additional substantial appropriations, the proper management of these funds and a law to carry out a definite program, it is possible that billions will be spent without achieving maximum health promotion.

I, therefore, wish now to introduce an all-inclusive bill which will provide for the immediate additional construction of hospitals with bed capacity of 57,000. Also the building of the necessary associated branches of medical service to make the Veterans' Administration a complete medical center within itself. This medical center will have its own research laboratories, medical flying corps for quick transportation of serums, equipment, and patients from one specialty to another. Also, this bill will provide the Veterans' Administration with fact-finding proving centers to determine the merits of healing arts which heretofore have not been considered.

There shall be freedom of medicine in the Veterans' Administration under this bill of rights. No veteran shall be deprived of his medical treatment if he desires his choice of physician.

Since Gen. Omar N. Bradley has asked for an expression of our intentions and disposition of veterans' affairs, it is high time that we lay bare some facts, figures, and start the ball rolling that will provide the necessary law and funds which will expedite these pressing matters.

The greater part of the research necessary to the formulation of this bill has been done by the Victors Adjustment Organization, Inc., a national research group, through its president, Mr. Straude E. Wiseman, of Indiana. Mr. Wiseman has been actively interested in veterans' affairs ever since the close of World War I and was for 6 years with the Veterans' Administration at Hines, Ill., an assistant to the manager of that facility, the finest in the Administration.

The crying need for an over-all inclusive program to meet the health needs of our huge influx of new veterans is only sharpened by the light of Mr. Wiseman's research and his knowledge of the money and health which was wasted beyond recovery by the slowness with which the needs of World War I veterans was met. Something has already been accomplished, of that we are well aware, but we have not made our plans big enough to meet the need and they are not being acted upon with enough dispatch. The Congress must prove to the people of the Nation it is able to completely care for the health of its victors.

In an address at Chicago at the national convention of the American Legion on September 19, 1944, Henry Ford 2d said in speaking of the days following World War II:

> They will be days when we must concentrate all our combined efforts on the rehabilitation of our men returning from service. They will be days when everything must take second place to help these men regain physical health and their mental happiness.

Need I tell you those days are here?

Ten Homeless GI's Look to Congress for Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I received a telegram from 10 war veterans in Fort Dix, N. J. This telegram contains only 16 words—probably because these boys do not have the money to spend for five- and six-hundred-word telegrams to us, such as those we receive from the National Association of Real Estate Boards—but these 16 words, in their stark simplicity, express far better than the thousands of euphoneous phrases the desperate need of our returning youngsters for houses.

For the benefit of the Members I should like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD what 10 homeless GI's have to say:

FORT DIX, N. J.

Congressman PATMAN:

We fought for decent homes. Don't let business as usual lobbyists take them away from us.

TEN HOMELESS GI's.

Farm Crisis in New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, no group of our American people are more patriotic than our New Jersey farmers. They have never failed our Republic in time of peace or war. Their contribution to victory in World War II has been outstanding.

Today New Jersey's farmers are worried and they have cause to be. It is because of the feed shortage for farm animals and the situation is now so serious that poultrymen are disposing of an unwarranted number of laying fowls and the State milk authorities report milk production has been reduced to an alarming degree. The New Jersey Farm Bureau, which called the crisis to the attention of the Secretary of Agriculture several weeks ago, complains no action has been taken looking to relief and he contends quite properly the northeast area should not be called upon to do more than its share in the world food-relief program.

I know Mr. Anderson, who heads the Department of Agriculture and I cannot help but believe he will respond at once to the appeals of our State's farmers, granting them every possible relief. He knows the whole northeast area and, in fact, the entire country, has a tremendous stake in this matter.

I present communications I have received this week. They describe the picture in detail.

TRENTON, N. J., *March 1, 1946.*

Hon. GORDON CANFIELD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Feed situation in New Jersey critical. Unusual heavy liquidation of chickens now taking place. We have presented our case to Secretary Anderson but after 3 weeks of conferring we can't see that any progress is being made in the solution of the problem. We need your help now. Detailed statement follows.

H. W. VOORHEES,
President, New Jersey Farm Bureau.

NEW JERSEY FARM BUREAU,
Trenton, N. J., March 1, 1946.

Hon. GORDON CANFIELD,
House Offie Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CANFIELD: The alarming shortage of feed for farm animals constitutes a serious threat to the northeastern dairy and poultry industries and to future supply of fresh milk and eggs for consumption in this area. At a meeting of the Northeastern Governors' Feed Committee, held on February 11 in New York City, representatives from Maine to Maryland reported that commercial feed supplies in the northeast were inadequate and would be almost exhausted in from 15 to 30 days.

Feed manufacturers and local dealers report that they are unable to purchase more than a small part of essential ingredients now being used because price ceilings make it more profitable for Midwest farmers to feed grain to hogs than to sell it as grain. It is true also that with corn prices at ceiling since October, it has been largely impossible to purchase corn except in a black market. Unless this situation is remedied promptly the northeastern dairy and poultry industries will bear the brunt of a necessary reduction in the numbers of livestock and poultry.

At a recent meeting of New Jersey feed manufacturers and dealers held in Trenton it was pointed out that the situation here in the State is very serious. Dealers reported their inability to fill orders for the poultrymen and stated that in some sections of the State serious liquidation of flocks was already taking place. Recent letters from farmers in different sections of the State indicate this to be true.

Recently, Governor Edge appointed a feed committee to consider this matter. Certain recommendations were made by this committee and also by the New Jersey feed manufacturers and dealers. These recommendations as to how the feed situation might be improved were called to the attention of Under Secretary Hutson on February 14, and were again called to Secretary Anderson's attention on February 19. It was obvious from both of these conferences that the Department of Agriculture appreciates the seriousness of the situation but apparently they are at a loss as to how it might be corrected.

On February 18, Gov. Walter E. Edge wired Secretary of Agriculture Anderson, as follows:

"On February 14 the northeastern governors' feed committee placed before Under Secretary of Agriculture Hutson the critical feed situation in this area and found him in substantial agreement with its appraisal of the existing situation. Accordingly, I urge that early steps be taken to bring about an equitable distribution of feed and thus prevent the inevitable large-scale liquidation of livestock and poultry in the Northeast. If such liquidation should occur, this large segment of our population would be faced with a serious shortage of essential foods for months to come."

To date, no action has been taken by the authorities which would in any way relieve the situation here in New Jersey. We have tried every possible means through regular channels to accomplish this. We feel now that we must call on you for help. It is my understanding that similar action is being taken in all of the Northeastern States. I believe that the congressional delegation from these States is being approached to the end that they are acquainted with the situation and in hopes that they can do something to help relieve it.

I appreciate that this is a very brief statement concerning this very serious problem. There is no question in our minds, however, that unless something is done soon we, here in the Northeast, will have to liquidate our cows and chickens to an extent far in excess of other areas of the country. We are willing, in view of present feed shortages and particularly in view of the situation in Europe, to do our part in the liquidation but we do not feel that we should be asked to do more than other areas.

I want to impress on you the fact that this matter is serious and I am in hopes that you can assist in making available a larger supply of feed for the New Jersey farmers, at once.

Very truly yours,

HERBERT W. VOORHEES,
President.

NEW BRUNSWICK, N. J., *March 4, 1946.*

Hon. GORDON CANFIELD,
Washington, D. C.:

Critical shortage of feed will force New Jersey poultrymen to dispose of an unwarranted number of laying fowls and greatly curtail raising of replacement stock. Governor's feed committee has placed facts before Secretary Anderson without results. We look to you for help. We need it.

C. T. DARBY,
President, New Jersey State Poultry Association.

TRENTON, N. J., *March 4, 1946.*

Hon. GORDON CANFIELD,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Feed situation in New Jersey most critical. Those in authority in Washington apparently unable to do anything about it. Already reducing milk production to an alarming degree. Can you help?

ARTHUR F. FORAN,
Director of Milk Control.

Atlanta Newspaper Charges Selfish Interests Attempting To Scuttle Veterans' Housing Program

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Atlanta Constitution long has been known as one of the most objective journals of the deep South.

For the benefit of those Members who might have been deceived by the propaganda barrage directed against our veterans' housing program by the real-estate speculators, I should like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial published by that newspaper on March 1:

BLOCKING THE HOUSING PROGRAM

The President's housing program had rough going in the House of Representatives yesterday.

All indications are that selfish interests are at work to scuttle the entire effort to provide low-cost homes for veterans.

Despite the fact that each day's delay is costing the Nation 3,000 urgently needed additional housing units, Congress continues to bicker and dawdle.

The housing measure currently under discussion, authored by the able Texan, Representative PATMAN, would merely authorize Federal Housing Administrator Wilson Wyatt to continue the priority system whereby available materials are channeled into low-cost houses for veterans.

Yet it is being indiscriminately attacked as communistic, bureaucratic, and dictatorial and is the target of as vicious an organized pressure campaign as has recently been seen on Capitol Hill.

One can only hope the Nation's homeless veterans are taking careful note of the identity of those who are blocking action on the only positive housing program yet offered. One trusts they will find it convenient, in coming elections, to inquire of those who so vehemently oppose the President's plan why they have not a single alternative proposal to submit.

The Nation has an obligation to the millions of men who laid down their peacetime pursuits to bear arms in defense of our liberties.

They must be provided housing in the quickest, most practical manner. Those who, for their own selfish motives, are delaying the only plausible program to accomplish this should be called to account for their actions.

"Let Us Begin Afresh"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, the war with its tragic and sternly realistic episodes has developed some of the finest poetry in the entire history of literature. In the midst of his exacting duties as a private first class, in Europe, Jack H. Monninger of Indianapolis has written a poem which I think is worthy of being preserved in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is as follows:

LET US BEGIN AFRESH

Let us bow our heads in shame, but keep
within our hearts the flame,
That makes our victories truly great.
As nations fall, as nations rise, let's show the
world that we surmise
The truth, that still shall guide our fate.
And if we falter on our way because of
wounds received in fray,
Let us fear not, for we are men of men.

Let us lift our heads with pride, and in our
fellow men confide,
That they might reach their weakened goals.
And like the blast that shook our world, so
peace could again be unfurled
We now must forge ahead with self control.
And if we are engulfed by fear and shirk
because our fate is near,
Let us begin afresh, and battle to the end.

Let us hear the Voice we seek, Yes we are
strong, but we are weak,
For we are fearing men of gathered mass.
If evils in our hearts still burn, we ask for
aid to help us spurn
This element, that tends to haunt us till the
last.
And if, in seeking for the light we lose our
way on darkest night,
Let us repent, and dawn shall come again.

Let us again regain our waste and send it
forth so all might taste
Our good, though long it has been dead.
And if our fears and wounds and faiths,
still cannot make us contemplate,
Then we are lost, the same as those we have
misled.
And if we know just why we fail, let us again
retrace our trail,
For we are men of men. "Let us begin
afresh."

—*Jack Harris Monniger.*

Our Silly Food Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the good judgment and sound common sense contained in the following editorial taken from the Chicago Tribune of Monday, March 4, 1946, concerning our present silly policy of providing food subsidies, is so applicable and pertinent to subsidies in general, and to the school-lunch subsidy and the proposed housing subsidy in particular, that I commend it to the thoughtful consideration of my colleagues in the House:

BONUS FOR HEAVY EATING

Every month the Government pays $5 of the average family's grocery bill. The remittance isn't made to the housewife or the grocer, but the payment is made just the same. The way it works is that the Treasury sends some money to the flour millers and directs them to credit enough on every barrel of flour to reduce the price of a loaf

of bread by a penny. The sugar people get their checks so that the consumer saves a cent a pound. The dairy people get a contribution of about a cent for each quart of milk. Other payments on behalf of each family are made for meat, cheese, and some other things.

The Government calls these subsidy payments. At the end of a year they amount to about $2,000,000,000. That would average $60 a family or $5 a month. To get one's full share it is necessary to eat just the things the Government helps to pay for. In general, vegetarians are out of luck. Those who are on a breadless reducing diet are out a penny on every loaf they don't eat. Citizens who are so desperately ill that they cannot eat anything receive no consideration. To get the most out of the subsidy system, you must buy only the articles on which the bounty is paid, and at the table let yourself go with this rule as a guide: The more you buy and the more you eat, the more you save.

Playing favorites among the victuals does not become a government. A sick man ought to have as much consideration as a well one. The fair way to pass around this $2,000,000,000 is to divide up the money, and let the consumer who likes spinach eat spinach, without cutting off his benefit payment. Let the ration board hand out a crisp new $5 bill to each housewife every Monday morning. The cost to the Treasury would be exactly the same as at present. The benefit to the average family would be the same.

Of course, if the Government distributed the subsidy to the consumer to enable him to pay full price, instead of to the producer to enable him to sell at a cut price, nobody could pretend any longer that subsidy payments are necessary to prevent inflation. Anyone capable of a moment's sustained concentration would realize that subsidies are about the most inflationary elements in the whole economy. It is no more inflationary to give the consumer the money directly than to give it to somebody else to pass along.

Selling food below cost has had consequences that could have been foreseen. Despite record production in 1945, supplies are so much reduced that the President is organizing a famine emergency committee, whose object is to get people to eat less and waste less. An administration which pays a premium on eating, and then appeals to people to eat less is silly beyond all belief. Mr. Hoover will have rendered the country another great service if he enables Mr. Truman to understand this.

Farmers Union of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable personal gratification that I learn that the California division of the Farmers Union has severed its relationship with the National Farmers Union. It has been apparent to me for many years that the policies of the National Farmers Union, under the leadership of James G. Patton, were not compatible with the policies of the California division of this farm group. The following communications which I have just received from California are self explanatory, and I commend them to the attention of my colleagues:

To Officers, Executive Committee, and Members of the Annual Convention of the National Farmers Union, Meeting at Topeka, Kans., March 4, 5, and 6, 1946:

There sometimes comes a time in the history of all men and organizations when, through lack of understanding of one another's problems, disagreement on policies, and assumption of authority neither warranted nor authorized, it appears best for all parties to dissolve the ties that have bound them, terminating all mutual obligation.

The members of the California division of the Farmers Union are very conscious of and believers in the principle that "all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, and among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

It now appears that the officials of the National Farmers Union, denying these principles, have during the past few years departed so far from the original objectives and precepts of the founding of the National Farmers Union that it would be contrary to all sense of reason, self-respect, and retention of our liberties, for our California union to remain affiliated with the national union.

Particularly do we point out the denial of the right of California by the national union officials to:

1. Decide for itself a position on the American-Mexican treaty.

2. To state its opinion on the 160-acre land ownership limitation in the Central Valley water project.

3. The right of selection of its own members with whom they work and associate.

4. The right to support cooperative enterprises of their own choosing.

5. The right to have their State officials carry out projects and represent principles that have been inaugurated and determined upon in membership meetings, arrived at after free and open debate.

6. Although frequently requested to do so, not once has any of the national officers visited with the California union. However, they have had time to come to California more than once and meet with groups hostile to the California union, even to the extent of interesting paid employees of the Federal Government.

7. Last, the right to state their beliefs whom the national president associates himself in an executive capacity with groups that many of our members believe are working against our American form of government.

Not being able to acknowledge the authority of the national union to dictate to the California union in the above regard:

We, the officers and members of the executive committee, meeting in Newman, Calif., on Washington's birthday, 1946, do hereby present and relinquish to the National Farmers Union convention assembled in session at Topeka, Kans., March 4, 5, and 6, 1946, our charter and do in every way proclaim our independence of and disassociation from what is known as the National Farmers Union.

Furthermore, we request the delegates and members of said gathering, by suitable resolution, to consummate such action.

We part bearing in mind a very pleasant and useful association with the officers and rank and file of the national and of the several State farms unions over a period of almost half a century.

As we have in the past, we intend to continue to be of service to California agriculture. Any time in the future our policies and views should parallel as to the needs of the California farmer, you can count on our wholehearted cooperation and support.

Respectfully submitted to the national convention.

Fred Talbot, Fred Hassler, M. N. Parsons, Joe Aguiar, L. W. Armstrong, Wm. Grothman, Ben Arnhold, Carl Visman, R. V. Garrod, Tony Ferreira, Myrtle Talbot.

On February 14, 1946, James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, suspended the charter of the California Farmers Union. This action was approved by the national board. These charges are not substantiated by facts, consequently, Fred Talbot, chairman of the State executive committee, called this committee in session on February 22. The committee unanimously placed themselves on record as believing agriculture could be better served by the State union withdrawing from the National. This has been done. As a short résumé of the charges against the California union on which action was purportedly based, and the State answer thereto, would be interesting to our members, we present the following statement of national union charges.

1. California accuses the national president of accepting prominent places in the CIO-PAC.

Answer: California got that information from a paper published in another State, and merely discussed it. James G. Patton was vice president of the PAC.

2. Accuses the California union of stating the national union policies were radical and communistic.

Answer: California merely stated what was reported in the national paper.

3. Hostile to family type farming.

Answer: California is and always has been favorable to the American type family farm, but is in opposition to collectivism as applied to farming.

4. Opposing the American-Mexican water treaty.

Answer: Before Boulder Dam was completed, Mexico annually got 750,000 acre-feet of water from the Colorado River. Under the new treaty with a more even distribution over the year, America grants Mexico 1,800,000 acre-feet annually from the Colorado. Mexico, however, gives to Texas 350,000 acre-feet per annum from a tributary of the Rio Grande, which water Mexicans never have and could not use. So, all told, Mexico gets 1,800,000 acre-feet annually, originating in the United States. Texas gets 350,000 acre-feet of water from Mexican territory. The California union did oppose that treaty. Patton favored it.

5. The State union an appendage of the State president.

Answer: False, because the State president always carried out the policies of its members as expressed at their annual meetings.

5A. Accuses California of opposing the 160-acre limitation on land ownership under the Central Valley water project.

Answer: This is an effort to regulate farm acreage by bureaucratic rulings, a very vicious procedure.

6. California had less than 1,000 bona fide members.

Answer: What is a bona fide member? Oklahoma was one time down to 220. As long as the $500 per year was accepted by the national union, that has always, up to now, been sufficient to retain a charter.

7. Refused to take in persons eligible for membership or authorize organization of local unions.

Answer: California differs with the national in regard to eligibility. California never refused any eligibles according to the California union standards.

8. Frustrated all advances for growth in order to operate as the personal appendage of the State president.

Answer: Refer back to No. 5.

9. Abandoned fundamental objectives of the national union.

Answer: If what the national paper prints are the fundamental objectives of the national union most California members cannot subscribe to them. California members believe it is the national union that has abandoned the Farmers' Union principles, not California.

10. Have openly and publicly urged applicants for membership to join other unions and organizations.

Answer: Entirely false, this accusation is based on the statement very properly asked, "Why do you wish to affiliate with the Farmers' Union?" Upon the answer to this question to a large degree depends acceptance of applicant.

11. Abandoned by word and deed paragraph 2 in the charter and in its constitution, article II.

Answer: This applies to membership qualifications. No one yet has been admitted to our California union who did not believe in a Supreme Being and whose major financial interests were that of farming.

R. V. GARROD.

Dangerous Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK FELLOWS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bangor (Maine) Daily News of March 4, 1946:

DANGEROUS MEDICINE

"Hold all prices to the prescribed line and you hold back inflation."

Three times a week, administration broadcasters tell the public that, by radio. Almost every day, administration spokesmen say it in print. Not Mr. Bowles—he limits his appeal to rent, food, and clothes—but a whole host of lesser fry.

What do they mean?

Surely, they are deceived. And so, surely, they are deceiving.

Four factors cause inflation:

(a) An abnormal growth of purchasing power;

(b) Such wage-increases as augment that power and, at the same time, augment both production-costs and consumption-demand;

(c) Abnormal demand, or need, for commodities;

(d) A production that is abnormally below demand.

Just now, the country's ready-money supply, "hand-money," is greater than it was at the start of World War II, almost three times greater than in 1929. "With all that cash to spend," people ask, "why worry?"

Here's why:

Because the increase isn't an increase in real wealth. Because, instead, it is the result of Government bond issues, which raised the Government debt to grotesque proportions. Because, while we face a budget that inflationarily threatens an actual deficit larger than the prewar deficit, the Treasury can hold down interest rates only by inflationary processes.

The Presidential formula for wage raises without price raises—though Mr. Truman compromises somewhat in such matters as steel—is really a formula for inflation. It merely increases a purchasing power which, relative to services and commodities, was already too great.

Necessarily, during the war, production of lasting commodities was nearly zero. Result: The demand for them today is more than just abnormal; it is practically unprecedented. Now price control over the manufacture of new commodities—replacements—is dangerously keeping production far below demand.

Teachers of political economy must be curious as to what inspired idiot started the administration's evidently sincere belief that we cannot have inflation if prices are kept at a given level. For the belief, as formulated by those Government spokesmen, is simply not true.

Explanation of Vote on Housing Bill Will Be Demanded by Homeless Ex-Servicemen and Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the adoption of several amendments to the GI housing bill which has greatly weakened some of its provisions, I shall reluctantly vote for it on final passage. I shall do so in the hope that the body on the other side of the Capitol will restore the provisions of the bill or by further amendment will bring its effect and purpose in line with the original recommendations of that constructive and far-seeing official, Mr. Wilson Wyatt, Housing Expediter, upon whose shoulders the President has thrust the burden of relieving the critical situation facing our homeless ex-servicemen and citizens of our country.

It is to be deplored that these crippling amendments have been adopted by a nearly unanimous vote of the Republicans with the aid of the votes of some reactionary Democrats. It is inconceivable that they should vote against the establishment of price ceilings on building materials and supplies and a limitation on the cost of construction of homes which would insure the building of a home within the financial means of our ex-servicemen and citizens who are practically homeless. They are living today in crowded quarters, in rooms without adequate or proper facilities, in converted apartments, attics, and basements, under double-up arrangements, all of which do not lend to decent or healthy living. Yet in the face of these existing conditions, which are bound to grow worse with the return of additional hundreds of thousands of veterans, we find, as I have stated, the Republicans voting almost en bloc with some reactionary Democrats in denying them the relief which they so imperatively need. It appears to me that they are more interested in the builders, material suppliers, and the real-estate operators than in the ex-servicemen and those of our citizenry who are without a roof over their heads.

One cannot come to any other conclusion than that these groups, supported by one of the worst organized lobbies I have ever observed in my long years of service, have selfishly opposed the limiting provisions of the bill in order to derive a still greater profit at the expense of our ex-servicemen and citizens.

I again express the hope, Mr. Speaker, that the other body will so amend the bill as to prevent gouging by selfish groups and that a real opportunity will be afforded to our homeless ex-servicemen and citizens in this acute emergency to obtain decent homes at a reasonable cost.

What Is the Legion?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the American Legion, I noted with a great deal of interest an article appearing in the American Legion magazine entitled "What Is the Legion?" by Chief Justice Robert G. Simmons, supreme court, State of Nebraska, and former Member of this body.

I feel his remarks are worthy of wide publicity and therefore have asked to have them extended in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WHAT IS THE LEGION?

We of another war sometimes are asked, "What is the American Legion?" The American Legion is not a club, although many of its posts operate clubhouses. It is not a fraternal organization, although it offers the fellowship of comrades in arms. The Legion is a service organization. It is the trustee of a sacred responsibility and power. The beneficiaries of this trust own the Legion. It belongs to those men and women who bear on their bodies and minds the marks of the price they have paid for love of country. It belongs to the father and mother, the widow and the orphans of those for whom there can be no homecoming. It belongs to those sons and daughters of ours who yet serve America in the far-flung spaces of the world. It belongs to every man and woman of America who has honorably served his Nation in the armed forces. While it serves its membership and those who were of the armed forces, it also has a primary concern in the future of America. It has offered and will continue to offer leadership in those causes that promote the well-being of the Nation. It seeks the cooperation and help of every citizen. It belongs to the Nation. Those who own it are the beneficiaries of its service and its strength. Through it we who served America in times of war continue to serve it and each other in time of peace.

Science and Our Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on March 5, 1946, it was my

privilege to be present at a dinner in honor of 40 winners of the fifth annual science talent search competing for the Westinghouse science scholarships.

I was lucky enough to be invited because David Dill Cudaback, 17, of Napa, Calif., and a son of one of my constituents, was one of the winners.

The war gave a great impetus to science and the development and use of the atomic bomb dramatized science and focused attention on the part it can play in destruction and, by way of contrast, what it can do to help us in peace. These young scientists, who were the best out of thousands who competed, typify for us the scientists of the future. They are eager, bright, and ambitious young Americans who are anxious to contribute their talents to the development of a better civilization. We hope their talents will never be used or required for destructive purposes or for that legalized murder we call war. They do not want this to happen. We hope that the statesmen of the world—who this very hour are making decisions and developing policies that may develop a world of law and peace—will make their dream of a world of peace and happiness come true.

Dr. E. U. Condon, Director of the National Bureau of Standards, and a noted scientist, delivered a most inspiring speech at this meeting, which I am including in these remarks:

We are met here tonight to do honor, not only to the 40 boys and girls who are the winners in the fifth annual science talent search but also to the thousands of boys and girls throughout our land and throughout the world, who are our hope for the scientific development of the future. You 40 are bright boys and girls. You are therefore intelligent enough to realize that you are fortunate. You know that there are plenty more of equal promise and enthusiasm back home where you come from. You know that your presence here does not mean that you are already made as scientists. You know that it simply means that you have shown yourselves worthy of the support and encouragement which Westinghouse science scholarships afford.

And you know that with this support you accept a responsibility to work for maximum self-development as creative scientists and good citizens.

The future of science in the world, indeed, need give us no concern if in every land the boys and girls of eager intelligence comparable to yours will be sought out and given the opportunities for growth which await you. I have no fears for the future if we entrust it to free, inquiring, critical minds such as yours.

But, my young friends, there are quite a few of your elders gathered here tonight, and there are some things I want to say to them. The people of my generation and those who are my elders have made quite a sorry mess of the world in which you are going to have to live. I want to talk to them about some things we need to do right away—in the next few years—to make amends as best we can while you are acquiring the background knowledge and technique with which you will make your contributions to science in the future.

Millions are dead, millions more are homeless, hungry, and shivering at the end of the worst war in man's history. In America we have been more fortunate, although even here we have war-born difficulties; there is, for instance, a serious shortage of women's stockings made of a particularly favored synthetic fiber.

The war's destruction far exceeds that of any catastrophe yet known. The war ended with the application of a new weapon that is a thousand times more frightful than the weapons which produced most of the war's frightfulness. And already we have responsible statements from scientists who made this development, that bombs a thousand times more powerful than those already used are capable of being made in the near future. There are men living who know how to make a single bomb whose destructiveness is equal to a million 10-ton block busters. One such bomb, dropped on Washington or any other major city, may be expected to wipe out its population, to destroy its buildings utterly, and to render the site uninhabitable due to poisoning by radioactive materials.

In the face of this situation, people react essentially in one of two ways. The first kind say, "It's just another weapon. Mankind learned to adapt to the longbow, and the crossbow, and the B–29. We have always had wars." An extreme expression of this kind is found in a speech by Prof. Leslie A. White, of the anthropology department of the University of Michigan, delivered in Philadelphia last December. He says, "As for the extermination of the human race as a consequence of hurling atomic thunderbolts, this, too, may be admitted as a possibility, and all we can say is that if it is to come it will come." This is indeed a rather coldly hopeless, fatalistic expression. Professor White further says, "Extravagant expressions of horror will not alter the course of events."

There is a certain rhetorical trick here in that in our language, "extravagant" connotes exaggeratedly inaccurate and thus emotionally detracts from the serious warnings which responsibile physcists are trying to give us. Now, I would agree that expressions of horror alone will not alter the course of events. But I insist that if we look at what civilization has suffered in World War II, even before the atom bomb, and couple it with the picture of a war with plentiful use of the old-fashioned one-hoss shay atom bombs, and further with the picture of a war with both sides equipped with the really potent 1950 models—then, I say, no expression of horror of which our hearts are capable can be exaggerated or extravagant. I say we need not and should not fatalistically await death, reading papers to an academic society meeting in a museum in Philadelphia.

The second kind of people react differently. We say, this is the end. Mankind has brought down suffering and death on its head, spiritual values have been destroyed, hatreds have been nourished and developed into great social cancers by war, and the war fears and the war suspicions and divisions among men.

This has been going on since the beginning of time and will surely destroy us all if we let it continue. This second kind of people say simply that this must stop. We say there is such a thing as progress toward a higher level of development. With all the stumbling and fumbling, we see an upward trend throughout human history. We read the lesson of history to be that men can go forward together, and that men can progress to new freedoms, and new areas of social adjustment.

We see that man's growing mastery over the forces of nature also serves to amplify the magnitude of the social crises which confront him. Centuries ago, wars were local affairs. However terrible, they affected only relatively small sectors of civilization. But the last two major wars were world wars in a true sense. Their damage literally affected everyone. We face a situation in which a future world war, employing atom bombs, in rockets guided by radio, and many other marvels of man's perverted ingenuity, will achieve a destructiveness thousands of times greater than ever achieved before. The magnitude of the crisis is such that we must soberly think of the choice as being between drifting into a war which will lead to the destruction of civilization, leaving a remnant of stunned, confused, poverty-stricken, frightened men and women amid the ruins—or a wholesome healthy development of a united mankind, using its intelligence cooperatively for the good of all.

I beg of you, cast in your lot with the persons of the second kind—the people who believe there is a possibility that men throughout the world can live in freedom and justice, in love and good will, that they can devote their full energies to constructive application of the rational thinking to call science to the arts of peace. In asking you to join with us, I make no promise of certain security. I only promise hope, and tell you that the other way leads to certain doom. If we try to establish the brotherhood of man on earth we may fail, but if we do not even try we shall surely fail, and what an unbearable load of guilt our consciences will then have to carry.

So much for the generalities of the situation in which we find ourselves. Now, if I may, I would like to comment a little more specifically on the immediate choices which lie before us.

We must assert ourselves in every kind of agency of world cooperation toward positive wholesome working together for human welfare. This means the fullest kind of active support to the efforts of peoples everywhere to go forward, in political and economic freedom, to the highest level of educational, scientific and cultural achievement. This means specifically support to UNO, UNRRA, and UNESCO, and whatever other such activities lie ahead.

We must particularly seek to bring about closer working relationships with our friends and allies, the Russians. Russia and the United States are today the most powerful nations in the world so unless we can get along together, there is no hope for peace. We must seek to recapture something of the feeling of joy and pride we had in being on their side, after Stalingrad and during their long, arduous drive to push the Nazi war machine out of their devastated lands. We must welcome their scientists to our laboratories, as they have welcomed ours to theirs, and extend the base of scientific cooperation with this great people. Of course, we must behave this way toward the scientists of all nations—I only mention Russia because she is right now the target of attack by those irresponsible, who think she would be a suitable adversary in the next world war.

We must regain for all scientists that freedom from military domination which is so necessary if science is to be used for peaceful ends. With nazism not wholly exterminated, we must have scientists contributing to the development of our tools of war, since, God forbid, we may, if all else fails, have to use them. But the scientific life of the country must not be subordinated to, nor derive its chief support from, the military.

This is essential in the interests of the military themselves. Because the scientific spirit is so completely opposite to the military spirit, science simply will not go forward under domination. Nowadays men must work together in large organizations. It is characteristic of the military organization that operations are planned and directed from the top, with the details executed by men below, by persons who unquestioningly and obediently respond to the orders given them from above. The flow of original thinking is from the top to the bottom. I conceive just the opposite to be true in a properly administered scientific organization. The function of a scientific director is to set up working conditions where the lowliest novitiate is put in touch with all the problems in his field and encouraged to worry about them and to come out creatively with

new ideas and results. He is the sole judge of what knowledge he needs in order to work effectively on his problem. The flow of original thinking in this case is mainly from the bottom to the top.

Every worker must have access to the whole story because no one can foresee which scientist will have the truly creative idea. And each scientist must be free to discuss his ideas, while in the formative state, with his colleagues anywhere, for it is from the working together of many minds that new science comes.

In contrasting the military and scientific, I do not wish to imply that one is wholly wrong and the other wholly right. Just as I do not recommend the military procedure for the conduct of scientific research, neither would I want our safety to depend on the outcome of a battle in which the scientific method of free discussion, independent thinking and mutual criticism was followed by all the captains and lieutenants on the battlefield. Military operations and scientific research are two quite different kinds of human activity and neither should be subordinated to the other.

Of course my reason for stressing this point is that right now we are confronted in America with a situation in which scientists are being held very strictly under military domination, to the severe detriment of our scientific development and the development of wholesome international relations.

What is going on? Prominent scientists are denied the privilege of traveling abroad. Physicists are not allowed to discuss certain areas of their science with each other, even as between individuals working on closely related phases of the same subject. They can only communicate through official channels, involving censorship of their communications by Army officers without knowledge and so without competence. Information essential to understanding is being denied to students in our universities, so that, if this situation were to continue, the young students we honor here tonight will get from their professors only a watered-down Army-approved version of the laws of nature.

In this connection one is reminded of the Holy Scriptures where, in the eighteenth verse of the eighth chapter of Ecclesiastes, we read:

"Wisdom is better than weapons of war; but one sinner destroyeth much good."

The laws of nature, some seem to think, are ours exclusively, and that we can keep others from learning by locking up what we have learned in the laboratory and not telling it to our allies. Later they will learn what we know and more besides, which, because of our unfriendly behavior, we cannot expect them to tell us. In the course of time, because of such provocations, we are allies no more—we start as friends and end as snarling, suspicious neighbors.

It is sinister indeed how one evil step leads to another. Having created an air of suspicion and mistrust, there will be persons among us who think other nations can know nothing except what is learned by espionage. So, when other countries make atom bombs, perhaps much better than those we have, these persons will cry "treason" at our scientists, for they will find it inconceivable that another country could make a bomb in any other way except by aid from Americans.

Let us cast this isolationist, chauvinist poison from our minds before we corrode our hearts and arouse suspicions of our motives in the minds of the decent peoples of the world. Let us cooperate wholeheartedly with the other nations of the world to agree to use atomic energy only for peaceful purposes and to set up an inspection system to enforce such agreement. The United Nations Assembly has unanimously voted to establish an atomic energy commission to draw up such a plan. In face of the frightfulness of atomic warfare, it is inconceivable to me that any nation will refuse to participate in a program of international cooperation and inspection. Yet, much public discussion, and even more private conversation, is based upon the assumption of such a refusal. We must push forward with all possible speed in order to find out where we stand in the world today so that it is no longer possible for different groups and different nations to base their thinking and their planning upon different hypotheses. I am confident that if we do this the outcome will be world friendship and cooperation, and not atomic war and the destruction of civilization.

In closing I would like again to quote Scripture, this time the New Testament, seventeenth verse of the eighth chapter of Luke:

"For nothing is secret, that shall not be made manifest, neither anything hid, that shall not be made known and come abroad."

Finally, I want to read to you from a poem by Elizabeth Barrett Browning, called, "The Truth Is Whole":

"Use is the aim of Science! give again
A golden sentence to the faithful pen—
Dwell not on parts! For parts contract the mind;
And knowledge still is useless when confined,
The yearning soul, enclosed in narrow bound
May be ingenious, but is ne'er profound:
Spoiled of its strength, the fettered thought grows tame;
And want of air extinguishes the flame!"

My young friends, do not be depressed by my remarks. Go on, work hard, enjoy to the fullest the expanding view and the communion with nature which your study of science will bring—the while, I hope, we others shall join together in healing war's wounds, and making the kind of world in which your talents can have free play to develop wholesome applications to human welfare for all the peoples of the world.

Apathetic and Pathetic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, once during a great crisis, it was said: "When the educated, industrious, temperate, thrifty citizens are as prompt and zealous and unfailing in duty as the ignorant and venal and mischievous, or when it is clear they cannot be roused to their duty, then, but not until then, if ignorance and corruption always carry the day, there can be no honest question that this Government has failed. But, let us not be deceived. While good men sit at home, not knowing that there is anything to be done, nor caring to know, half persuaded that this Republic is the contemptible rule of a mob and secretly longing for some splendid and vigorous despotism, then remember that it is not a government mastered by ignorance; it is a government betrayed by intelligence."

I hope those who believe in liberty and its preservation, and who boast of their education and intelligence, will read and digest the editorial which I am inserting by unanimous consent as a part of my remarks:

APATHETIC AND PATHETIC

Concerning Premier Stalin's Russia and its international conduct, there are a great many puzzling aspects. To us the most puzzling is not rooted in Russia. It grows in America. It can be expressed in the form of a question: Why should anybody expect Stalin to do anything different than he is doing? If any surprise at all is due, it is in the fact that Stalin, being what he is and having the opportunity that he has, should be even as moderate as he has been.

The opportunity is that a ruthless man believing in the law of force has no opposition. And he has none because the only nation in the world around which could rally a decent respect to the opinions of mankind is losing its faith. It is becoming ashamed of its traditions. The light of freedom for the individual which has heartened men for a century and a half flickers and burns low in a fetid atmosphere from which the sustaining oxygen has been drained.

Try this if you will. Go into any group—the more prosperous and fashionable the better the test—and speak of the "self-evident truth" that "all men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Say to this group that "to secure these rights governments are instituted among men."

We venture that you will be startled by the number of people, particularly younger people, who do not know that you are quoting the Declaration of Independence. And of those who know, a large number will not agree with the philosophy expressed. And of those who agree—and this is the most tragic thing—many will not have the courage to say so.

Perhaps the dominant attitude was summed up by a young man who would probably think of himself as an intellectual. He said:

"Only a few people in the Bible Belt believe those things now."

Or listen to the young minister of the gospel who came to his office sneering at those who "operate in a vacuum of idealism."

We gave our Government encouragement—it did not need much—to connive with Stalin. In the criminal decision of Yalta an American President accepted secret agreements which bartered thousands of human beings and which, if carried out, will send thousands more to exile and death.

We did that and a chorus of writers and commentators defaulted their obligation to ask questions and said that Yalta was good. They said Stalin was a man of his word. He would not grab territory. He would not suppress the churches. He would cease to send his agitators into every corner of the world. He would not use his military power to force on other peoples his own social and political system. Each of those things he has done. Some illusionists, who said he would not, now have the decency to acknowledge disillusion. They suggest that we shake an admonitory finger at Stalin.

That is a ludicrous suggestion. Does anyone imagine that Stalin is such a fool that he thinks we can or will oppose his armed might with ours? And if we are not ready to do that, what other means of opposition have we? We have none, for we besmirched our own moral precepts. We have dropped our faith and stand grotesquely naked.

Yet we tell other peoples of the world how they must act. We have abandoned the tradition that peoples have the right to work out their own destiny.

We denounce a Colonel Peron, of Argentina, as a dictator and a bad man suspected of aggression, and, therefore, he must not rule that unhappy Republic. He certainly is those things. But who is the United States to denounce the man that the people of his country apparently have chosen in a free election and to condemn any other government for cooperating with dictators? The fact is that Colonel Peron helped himself to power by borrowing more than one page from the book of the New Deal.

But Colonel Peron and General Franco, another unsavory character, ruling Spain, are, we say, corrupt. Furthermore, they suppress the rights of the people. They poison the wells of free information. They certainly do those things.

Let us see what government it is that hurls these accusations of corruption and extralegal sanctions.

It is a government where the family and the friends of a President could use their prestige to enrich themselves and those who publicly protested are denounced. It is a government against which, for the first time in history, Americans fear to speak. It is a government which is spending the people's money on a bureaucracy with which men abhor contact, because resistance means reprisals. The system has the expected results. Many businesses feel that they must have a friend at court, and so some who have official access are paid as "advisers." There was a time when we called such men lobbyists and investigated them. Now they are appointed to high office.

Looking at our record of connivance with dictators and looking at our domestic scene, is it any wonder that the people of Argentina decided that Colonel Peron might be the lesser of two evils?

And while we condemn the dictators for suppressing and distorting the free flow of information, our own State Department proposes a plan to blanket the world with propaganda.

Why should Stalin take us and our pious protestations seriously? Why should he give us any attention at all? He knows what is happening and he knows that we are treading the path to his philosophy and his orbit. He thinks he has only to wait—and he may be right.

We have told the world about "four freedoms" but the number of men who live under the heel of dictatorship is greater, not less. We have not stood for freedom. We are in the thick of the game of power politics. We are in it in Europe and in Asia, and we have imported it to the American Continent. It is Stalin's game and of course we do it badly.

There are men not afraid to speak out. One is John Foster Dulles who dares speak, and knows whereof he speaks. We quote:

"I am afraid we have got very few friends in the world today. There was a time when we had more friends than any other people of the world. Today we have influence because of our production capacity, because people are trying to get the physical things we produce. I do not detect any real friendship on the part of other peoples. This leaves us in a dangerous and vulnerable position; one which we should do our utmost to correct."

A man's standing in his community is a projection of his own character. A nation's standing in the world is a projection of its domestic life.

What we see at home is a condition where public trust is openly accepted as an avenue to private gain; where a government is so steeped in propaganda lies that it must give the wrong reasons for its policies; where in the name of freedom the citizen is being handcuffed to rules of a troupe of brilliant pygmies who write the prescription for a fuller life on an adding machine; where debt is prosperity and thrift a social crime; where it can be asserted that there exists a "moral right" to steal and bribe; where men shout free enterprise and then seek better and bigger government subsidies; where women leaving black markets stop to sign petitions for continuation of price control; where groups demanding, "When do we get ours?" no longer whisper but shout and where officials no longer consider it necessary to conceal that they are the creatures of these groups.

Is it any wonder that in our international relations we cannot combat the assertion that black is white and that the goal of human freedom is the slave state?

Is it any wonder that Mr. Dulles laments the lack of those policies, "expressive of the righteous faith of the best in America?"

We are apathetic: We are rapidly growing pathetic.

First New Jersey Farm Loan to Staff Sgt. Andrew William Sinclair, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1946

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, in the early part of this year, I had the pleasure to present to Staff Sgt. Andrew William Sinclair, Jr., an FSA check for $6,500 which enabled him to buy a farm. I am advised that this was the first farm loan of its kind made in New Jersey, and I am particularly proud that it was done in Cumberland County in my district.

Sergeant Sinclair waded ashore on the Normandy Beach on D-day, one of the first of our men to invade the continent of Europe. He is a holder of the Bronze Star in addition to many other citations for meritorious service. He is now back with his family as millions of other boys are, and trying to catch up with civilian life.

Mr. Speaker, this loan will enable him to catch up because it was made on a businesslike basis. A committee of local farmers appraised the value of this farm, as well as the ability of Sinclair to operate it. It is no service to veterans to help them get something that they cannot afford, or to do something they will not be able to do, but a businesslike appraisal such as was given in connection with this loan is a method which assures a reasonable chance for the future.

The fact that this loan in my district was the first loan granted in New Jersey is not accidental. Mr. F. Rene Gossiaux, the Farm Security Administration supervisor, has both his brain and his heart in this work. This agency is trying to do a job for our returned soldiers that might well be a model for other agencies of Government.

Polish Cardinals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1946

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Marquis Childs, that appeared in the Chicago Daily Times, on the creation of the 32 new cardinals of recent date. This article deals with the most colorful career of Adam Stephen Cardinal Sapieha, who was Archbishop of Crakow, Poland, when he was elevated to the College of Cardinals:

POLISH CARDINALS

(By Marquis Childs)

WASHINGTON.—With all the columns and columns of news about the creation of the 32 new cardinals, there has been scarcely any mention of one of the most remarkable prelates to receive the scarlet biretta of a prince of the church.

That is Adam Stephen Cardinal Sapieha, who was archbishop of Crakow in Poland when he was selected for elevation to the College of Cardinals. Cardinal Sapieha comes of an old and aristocratic Polish family. For generations the Sapiehas have figured in Poland's troubled and tragic history.

The new cardinal has lived up to family tradition. Remaining in Poland through the German occupation, he became one of the heroic figures in the underground resistance to Nazi barbarism. Through his courage and his persistence in trying to help victims of the Nazis, he won a wide popular following. He never yielded to the threats or the persuasions of the invaders.

In popular esteem, Cardinal Sapieha's position is in marked contrast to that of August Cardinal Hlond, of Poland. Hlond fled from the cardinal's palace in Warsaw as the Germans invaded his country. He took refuge in France and was there when France fell.

For a time, Cardinal Hlond's whereabouts were a mystery. It was not known whether he was a prisoner of the Nazis or had been given his freedom. Just after Allied forces crossed the Rhine last year, he was found in a Westphalian monastery.

With fighting still going on in Poland and eastern Europe, Hlond went to the Vatican, where he remained until he decided to return to Warsaw. His welcome was not exactly warm, if only because his conduct during the war had been in such contrast to that of Sapieha.

Not long after his return, Cardinal Hlond delivered several sharp attacks on the Polish Provisional Government. The government did not respond in any way. A little later, the cardinal preached a sermon against racial hatred and racial persecution which he had been urged to do as part of the effort to check the forays of armed bands which continued to pillage and loot in outlying districts.

While it may have no significance Cardinal Hlond was not present at the history-making consistory when the new cardinals were created. He was not a witness at the ceremony at which Poland's Sapieha, in whose family there have been many temporal princes, became a prince of the church.

Attacking the Vatican and the new cardinals, Soviet propagandists included the name of Sapieha of Poland. This is not likely to do the new cardinal any harm in his native land. He has won a secure position in a country which is overwhelmingly Catholic.

The Poles have always been a highly individualistic people. That helps to explain why their history has been so troubled through the centuries. The Nazi conquest and occupation and the terrible fighting which led up to liberation destroyed most of their cities and took millions of lives. But all of this could not, as events are beginning to make clear, destroy the Polish character.

The contemporary judgment of Poland as a satellite of her great neighbor, Russia, is too hasty. There are still an estimated 200,000 Soviet troops in Poland. Others are constantly in transit to and from Germany.

While the new government has brought some improvement, conditions remain chaotic.

Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1946

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, within the last 3 weeks I have introduced two bills which, in my opinion, are definitely needed by veterans, and which they are entitled to have promptly considered and passed. The first is a bill to grant benefits in lieu of accumulated leave; and the second is a bill to provide service credit for veterans under the Social Security Act.

The accumulated-leave bill—H. R. 5637—is one of a large number of quite similar bills introduced by Members interested in this legislation. I prefer the language of my bill to that of some of the other bills that have been introduced, but I am prepared to support any bill that will properly accomplish this purpose that the Military Affairs Committee will report.

A few days after the introduction of this bill I was greatly encouraged to hear the statement made on the floor that the subcommittee was about ready to report such legislation favorably. I again urge that the full committee report legislation as soon as possible because that has already been greatly delayed. I do not overlook the fact that this measure will be costly, but similar benefits have been granted to officers, and there is no just reason to discriminate against the men. A copy of H. R. 5637 follows:

A bill to grant to enlisted personnel of the armed forces certain benefits in lieu of accumulated leave

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) effective as of December 7, 1941, each enlisted member of the armed forces of the United States shall be considered, for the purposes of this act, as being entitled to leave at the rate of 2½ days for each month during the war-service period. Such leave, less the leave actually received and used prior to discharge or release from active duty in such armed forces, may be accumulated, and each individual entitled thereto under this act shall be entitled upon discharge or release from active duty to receive, in a lump sum, pay and allowance covering such accumulated leave.

(b) The pay and allowances referred to in subsection (a) shall be computed at the rate of the pay and allowances which the individual was receiving immediately prior to discharge or release from active duty.

(c) In the case of enlisted personnel discharged or released from active duty prior to the date of enactment of this act, such lump-sum payment shall be made only if application therefor is made within 90 days after the date of enactment of this act. In the case of an individual discharged or released from active duty in the Army such application shall be made to the Secretary of War, and in the case of an individual discharged or released from active duty in any other branch of the armed forces application shall be made to the Secretary of the Navy.

(d) For purposes of the operation of this act with respect to any particular individual the term "war-service period" means the period beginning with the date of commencement of such individual's active service in the armed forces of the United States, or December 7, 1941, whichever is later, and ending 6 months after the date of the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, or the date of such individual's discharge or release from active duty, whichever is earlier.

(e) This act shall not apply to members of the armed forces who have served less than 90 days, nor to such members who have been dishonorably discharged.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to social-security credits, this is a very important matter which I think has largely been overlooked. I want to illustrate what I hope to accomplish by this bill. H. R. 5487 is a special amendment to title II of the Social Security Act to preserve the status of veterans whose rights or their survivors' rights would otherwise suffer irretrievable damage. It is a bill which can be interpolated into the present law without interfering in the slightest degree with the law as it now stands. Out of close to 12,000,000 men in the armed services it is likely that about 80 percent of them had continuous accumulating credits or interrupted credits of wages paid. Through happenings beyond their control, from the moment they left employment to enter the service these wage credits ceased.

Under the provisions of title II, which takes care of old-age and survivors insurance and is administered by the Federal Government alone, wage credits determine the insurance status, taken together with other determining factors in the eligibility requirements which have been set up.

In the case of the service man or woman three things could happen upon his death. If he had a widow surviving with children under 18 years of age, if her husband's wage records met the requirements, she and the children would be entitled to monthly insurance until the last child attained 18. If she had no children, she would be entitled to a lump-sum settlement and later on if she did not remarry, at age 65 she would be entitled to monthly insurance the rest of her life. The third instance is the provision for dependent parents upon an unmarried son or daughter when the parents are 65. The taking place of the above payments all depend on the status of the wage record. The eligibility depends on quarters of coverage accumulated. A quarter of coverage is defined as a 3-month calendar period in which at least $50 in wages or salary has been paid. It might all be made in 1 day or evenly earned throughout the 3 months. To find out whether or not the person has an insurable status we take one-half of the elapsed quarters since January 1, 1937. Since 9 years have elapsed, that means 108 months. Dividing this by 3-month periods—which constitute a quarter—we obtain 36 quarters. Applying the rule by taking one-half of these elapsed quarters, we obtain 18 which is the number of quarters required at the present moment. One exception to this is in the case of a veteran under 22, who will need only six quarters. The other exception is with men well over 65. Once the eligibility is determined, then the amount depends on the average monthly wage. So it will now be clearly seen how important this proposed amendment is. It not only will have much to do with eligibility but also with the amount received. Going back to 1940 from September 16 on, means 21 quarters of coverage and in some cases 22 quarters and almost $10,000 of wages at the moment. The bill limits these wage credits to 180 days after termination of hostilities as proclaimed by the President, a declaration which has not yet taken place. At the same time that this bill takes care of eligibility, it also takes care of wages. A matter of $10,000 or more, whether it be now or at age 65, will make a very material difference in arriving at the average monthly wage of a workingman, upon which the amount of his monthly insurance, as well as that of his wife, or of his wife and children, depend, if he dies before attaining age 65. Of course, many veterans early gave their lives, in which case this bill would not mean so much; but still it would be considerable. In fact it means that veterans who had an uninterrupted wage record previous to induction and have served continuously would attain a permanently insured status upon discharge, albeit the monthly amount might be small. It, therefore, would be highly desirable to continue work until 65.

As before mentioned, there is no reason in the world to wait for any other changes, as this bill if enacted at once, as it surely should be, having been long overdue, would not in the least disturb any part of the present act as amended August 14, 1939.

The Ways and Means Committee is now considering amendments to title II, and I have asked the committee to carefully consider this bill. A copy of H. R. 5487 follows:

A bill to provide for a service credit for veterans for purposes of title II of the Social Security Act

Be it enacted, etc., That, effective as of September 16, 1940, title II of the Social Security Act (relating to old-age and survivors insurance benefits) is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section reading as follows:

CREDIT FOR SERVICE IN ARMED FORCES

SEC. 210. (a) For the purposes of this title a veteran shall be deemed to have been paid, during the period of his active military or naval service occurring after September 16, 1940, and not after the expiration of 180 days from the date proclaimed by the President as the date of the termination of hostilities in the present war, remuneration for employment at the rate of $160 per month.

(b) In the case of any veteran who died prior to the enactment of this section, and who was not a fully or currently insured individual at the time of such death, the 2-year period within which proof of dependency and support must be filed under subsection (f) (1) (B) of section 202, and the 2-year period within which application must be filed under subsection (g) of that section, shall begin to run from the date of enactment of this section.

(c) For the purposes of this section—

(1) The term "veteran" means any individual who served in the active military or naval service of the United States at any time after September 16, 1940, and who either died in such service or was discharged or released from active duty.

(2) The term "active military or naval service" in the case of any individual means active service in the Army or Navy of the United States, the United States Marine Corps, the United States Coast Guard, or any of their respective components but does

not include (A) service pursuant to enlistment or reenlistment after June 1, 1945, in the Regular Military Establishment or after February 1, 1945, and in the Regular Naval Establishment, or (B) service with respect to which such individual is entitled to a credit, based on military or naval service, under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, or laws relating to the retirement of officers of the United States Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, unless such individual elects, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President, to waive the benefits of such credit.

(d) There is authorized to be appropriated to the trust fund amounts equal to the taxes which would have been payable by employees and employers, under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act, as amended, if the amount deemed for purposes of this section to have been paid as remuneration for employment had been actually paid as remuneration for employment.

The Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM W. LINK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1946

Mr. LINK. Mr. Speaker, today the National Housing Act which provides for a Housing Expediter and which defines his powers was passed by the House.

I voted for this act on the final passage—not because it will do all the things that we tried to have it do—but because of the set-up that now exists in the House, I felt that this was the only measure that could be passed.

In my estimation, removing subsidies which would have controlled prices on building materials seems to be the first step along the road to inflation. Taking off price controls on old buildings is another step in the same direction; however, the present set-up in the House being what it is today—a better bill could not be passed at this time.

I hope that our friends in the Senate will do a better job than was done in the House.

A Veteran Asks the President Some Questions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1946

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter from one of the partners in a small meat market and grocery in my district. I place the following in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The original letter is addressed to the President of the United States.

Here is a letter from one of two brothers, both just returned from service in World War II. They have been given the market by their father, who opened it 23 years ago. It is entirely a family affair—the two brothers, a sister, the father.

Yet, for over a month that little market has been picketed by the A. F. of L. Butchers and Meat Cutters Union, demanding that the brothers sign a contract with them. With whom would they contract? With the members of the family? Who would be forced into the union? The sister? The father?

The brothers have very properly said they cannot sign a contract. So the picketing goes on. One day there were 15 picketeers. That is one picket for each 2 feet of store frontage. I do not need to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that this case has aroused the people of the community in which the market is located. What good will is being created for organized labor by such incidents? If local leaders lack intelligence to handle such local problems, why is not something done about it by the national leaders of the A. F. of L.?

Unfortunately, the case is not unique. A short time ago, those of us who live on the other side of the river, were unable to buy certain specialized bakery products, made by a small family bakery, because another A. F. of L. affiliate, was demanding that this little bakery run only by the baker and his wife, unionize itself. The owner himself drove the truck. The demand carried with it the threat that if the baker did not sign a contract with the union, then no grocery store could sell his product, because no driver, for other bakery products, would deliver to that store. That particular argument was finally settled, not by the baker giving in to the methods indicated, but by an agreement between the grocers and the union that the products, if sold in the stores, would not be displayed with other bakery goods. Those delivered by drivers belonging to the union, are displayed on the baked goods shelves; this baker's goods are to be found in the refrigerator.

So far as I know, the picketing of the little family market, in Fullerton, is still going on. Certainly, the two returned veterans show no signs of any intention to yield to the threats nor to the picketing. They didn't fight for 3 years each in defense of the liberties of the peoples of various nations of the world, to come back home and surrender their own liberties quite so easily.

I commend the thoughtful reading of this letter to every Member of the Congress, and particularly to every Member of the Senate, which now has before it the consideration of a bill to arrange for the settlement of labor disputes by agreement and by arbitration, and for the elimination of such incidents as this one, which do nobody any good, employer, employee, labor union, or consumer.

The letter follows:

ROQUET'S MARKET,
Anaheim, Calif., February 18, 1946.

HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TRUMAN: My brother La Verne and I jointly own and operate a little neighborhood store in Anaheim, Calif. About 2 months ago we both were in the Army. I served for 3 years and 9 months; La Verne was in a little less than 3 years. We both wore sergeant's stripes when we were discharged.

Today, marching up and down in front of our store—it only has a 30-foot frontage—are pickets, members of the A. F. of L. Butchers and Meat Cutters Union, Local 551. They have been there since January 9, and there is no let-up in sight because La Verne and I refuse to sign a contract with them.

First, let me explain that our store is strictly a family affair. La Verne runs the meat market, as he did before entering the service; I run the grocery department. We have working with us our father, Octave Roquet, and our sister Ferne. That constitutes the hired help. The store is not new in Anaheim; my father greeted the first customers 23 years ago, and we have been operating here in this town ever since. It was while La Verne and I were in the Army that my father decided to turn the store over to us upon our discharge.

One day, a week or so ago, there were 15 pickets parading in front of our store. Mr. Truman, that's one picket for every 2 feet of store frontage. They have promised to continue their marching in front of our store until we sign a contract. That means they are going to be there a long time, because there isn't going to be any contract. In the meantime, no union truck driver will deliver us merchandise, and if the pickets are successful in their plan, no meat, milk, bread, or other staples will be brought to us.

Now then, Mr. Truman, in view of the situation I have outlined above, there are certain questions that La Verne and I would like answered. After all, we were in the Army because we thought we were fighting for, among other things, the rights of individuals to do business free from fear and from the necessity of paying tribute to anyone.

First, Mr. Truman, we would like to know whether or not there is any kind of relief to be expected from the economic strangulation exerted upon us by the union?

Is it to be the national policy that small businessmen must become a part and parcel of unionism in order to operate?

Must a family such as ours submit to extortion before we can receive the goods necessary to line our shelves?

Is it necessary that we let some group of men who have no financial or other interest in our enterprise dictate to us as to when we may open and close our doors?

Must we pay tribute to an organization in order to conduct a business?

Is there any difference between this kind of pressure and the tactics of gangsters who once forced many businessmen to pay for "protection" from mob violence?

Is this the sort of thing that the late President Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill had in mind when they adopted the "four freedoms?"

My brother and I had something else in mind when we entered the Army, you can be sure of that. And, so did a few million other young men. We weren't in the Army to protect the gangsters and the racketeers—not by a long shot. We were in the Army because we thought we were helping protect the American way of life—we thought the war was being fought to eliminate dictators and the rule-by-force systems.

For us, apparently, the fight is not over and we don't like it. So far as we can see, there is only one answer—somewhere along the line we've been handed a beautiful double cross.

Mr. Truman, Roquet's Market is just a little pebble in a rather small pool, in fact, we are so small that we have no printed letterheads. But even so, we feel that we have a right to expect protection from our Government.

What do you think, Mr. Truman?

We know you are an extremely busy man, but we do hope you will find time to answer our questions.

Sincerely,

R. O. ROQUET.

Veterans' Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the bill we are now considering, H. R. 4761, introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], seeks to amend the National Housing Act by adding thereto a new title relating to the prevention of speculation and excessive profits in the sale of houses and to insure the availability of real estate for housing purposes at fair and reasonable prices. The objective back of the bill is to make available at the earliest possible moment housing accommodations not only for veterans but for other distressed cases. During the war all of our facilities and manpower were devoted to the prosecution of the war and as a result there was practically no construction for residential purposes. With the war over, our servicemen being mustered out, and with the increased population and need for new homes, this problem of residential housing becomes one of the first magnitude. Many of the older homes are now becoming uninhabitable by reason of age and lack of upkeep—all of which only adds to the seriousness of the problem. Thousands of veterans find it impossible to find housing accommodations of any sort. Mr. Speaker, I, for one, am willing to go the full limit in providing any and all legislation needed to solve this problem and make available as soon as possible homes for purchase or rent by veterans as well as other hardship cases.

One of the fundamental requirements which we must adhere to is to provide homes within the price ranges which would enable veterans to purchase or rent a home. It was hoped that homes could be provided at price ranges, not exceeding $6,000 as a maximum, and at a monthly rental of not more than $50. With the high cost of building materials and labor, it is not certain that homes can be made available within this price range. Before the war five-room cottage-type homes with modern equipment and facilities could have been provided for $3,500 to $4,000. That day seems to have passed. We must not, in seeking to solve this problem, foist upon the veterans synthetic houses of the glorified chicken-coop type, which are not only an eyesore to the neighborhood in which they are erected, but which would be a fraud upon the veteran. These homes of synthetic materials, many of which were constructed during the war, are wholly unsuited for permanent housing for veterans and I, for one, will not support any legislation which seeks to inflict upon the veteran that type of housing.

In mapping a program for veterans' housing, we must insure against speculation and excessive profits which would burden the veterans with costs and mortgage indebtedness far exceeding the real value of homes purchased. The United States is a Nation of home owners. More than any other nation we have, in the past, developed home ownership and by reason thereof, are in a position to successfully solve this problem by making building materials and finances available for all who seek to build or rent a home. In doing so, we should make full utilization of all existing facilities and industries as well as firms and individuals heretofore or now engaged in home building. We should not adopt a program which would make it impossible to utilize the experience, investment and know-how of our builders. Mr. Speaker, this bill with existing amendments, will:

First. Create an Office of Housing Stabilization, to be headed by a director.

Second. Continue for a year beyond June 30 next the authority for wartime priorities and allocation of scarce building materials into homes for veterans.

Third. Establish a preference for veterans in the purchase or rental of new houses.

Fourth. Authorize the director to halt or check the export of lumber as long as scarcities exist in the United States.

Fifth. Increase Government home mortgage loan authority by $1,000,000,000.

Sixth. Grant to the director broad authority to direct other Government agencies in respect to building materials and housing.

Proposing to expedite the construction of sufficient housing at fair and equitable prices, this bill would authorize the President to appoint, either within an existing agency or as an independent officer of the Government, a Housing Expediter who would formulate plans and programs to provide an increasing supply of housing accommodations; issue orders and directives on policy to other agencies; recommend enactment of legislation to the President; and consult and cooperate with Federal, State and local agencies, industries, labor, and other groups. Functions, powers, and duties now vested in the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion which are necessary to enable the Expediter to carry out the provisions of the bill would be transferred to the Expediter and would not expire with the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act. The emergency powers of the Federal agencies would be exercised to alleviate the housing emergency.

The Expediter may allocate materials or provide priorities as such allocation or priority becomes necessary, and particularly he will consider the factors in low-cost and low-rent housing needed for satisfying the requirements of World War II veterans. He may forbid the export of lumber or materials to foreign countries. Provision is made for penalties for infringement and for appropriations as may be necessary. All provisions of the bill and regulations thereunder will terminate on June 30, 1947, unless Congress declares its termination earlier.

The National Housing Act is amended to make the provisions of title VI apply specifically to veterans. The amendments will provide: First, increase in the maximum amount of principal obligations of insured mortgages from $1,800,000,000 to $2,800,000,000, and the President may approve an aggregate amount of $3,800,000,000; second, the maximum allowable principal obligation of each mortgage may be increased by the Administrator within certain prescribed limits; third, the rate of maximum interest on an acceptable mortgage is changed from 6 to 4 percent; and, fourth, veterans are given a preference or priority instead of war workers.

The additional authority granted by this bill, together with existing powers already held by the Expediter, will, it is believed, enable him to inaugurate and bring to a successful conclusion a program that will make homes available for veterans and others within the limits of the building materials and manpower available. The success or failure of the housing program will depend upon the Expediter.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with this problem I want to call to your attention the serious bottlenecks that exist in my district in Oregon and in the Northwest generally with respect to the production of lumber products. My State produces more lumber than any other State in the Union. At the present time, owing to the various restrictions imposed upon the industry, it is impossible for lumber manufacturers to supply the lumber and wood products needed for housing construction. By reason of these restrictions, much of the lumber that would ordinarily go into house construction is being exported. It has just come to my attention that lumber will shortly begin moving from Willamette Valley, Oreg., mills for export to China. This movement will extend over a period of from 4 to 5 months and I am informed there will be 10 carloads per day for 30 days; 15 per day for 45 days; and 20 per day for the rest of the period. The 25,000,000 feet will be in timbers of 6 by 8-inch and 14 by 14-inch size. The reports of the West Coast Lumbermen's Association disclose that during the first 5 weeks of 1946, production amounted to 519,369,000 board feet as against 736,071,000 in the comparable period of last year, or 29 percent less production. The January production was only 71.7 percent of the 1942–45 average. At the end of January the industry had unfillec orders of 702,728,000 board feet and stocks on hand totaled only 391,706,000 board feet. We cannot build houses for veterans or anyone else without lumber and other building material. It is a mistake for Federal officials to believe that by the passage of a bill and without removing the bottlenecks and restrictions on production, they will be able to build houses. The restrictions now blocking and holding back lumber production, and particularly lumber of the sizes and quality needed in home construction, must be removed before we can make any headway in supplying homes for veterans.

As long as Federal officials in charge of this program refuse to make adequate price adjustments to permit lumber manufacturers to produce the kind and type of lumber needed for home construction at a price that would permit them to meet their expenses without loss,

there will be little lumber produced of the kind and quality needed. As long as higher prices can be secured for unfinished or dimension sizes, the supply will go into that type of lumber.

Many lumber mills are shut down throughout the country as a result of this policy of the Federal Government and its failure to make proper regulations which would enable the lumber mills to produce the kind of lumber needed. I am just in receipt of a telegram from the Jones Lumber Co., an old, reliable concern in my district, which states that if the new proposed regulation restricting the amount of lumber a mill can sell to its own yards is put into effect, it will be compelled to shut down completely. The telegram to which I refer is as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., *March 4, 1946.*

Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL,
Washington, D. C.:

We are reliably informed that OPA will through new restrictive regulations limit the amount of lumber a mill can sell to its own yard or yards on the basis of what is sold to its yard in 1941; this new regulation to be effective about March 15. This is not price control; this is bureaucratic regimentation and manipulation. Who benefits from such regulations? It does not lessen prices to consumers; it merely says that a mill-owned-or-operated retail yard cannot expand or do any more business than it did in 1941 while other yards can double and treble their business. If this new regulation becomes effective you may expect us to shut down completely and not manufacture at all. Is this America? Do you want more lumber produced or do you want us to reduce our production to where it was in 1859 when we first started?

JONES LUMBER CO.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that this legislation, giving full authority to the Expediter to carry forward a building program and to channel building materials into home construction for veterans and hardship cases, with full authority to adjust prices and prevent speculation and excessive profits will be enacted into a law without delay, and that the Expediter will go forward with the program.

Address of Barnet Nover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, today many proponents of international comity either overemphasize or underrate the damage done to good relations by the unilateral acts and declarations of the Soviet Union.

It is, therefore, all the more necessary to call attention to such well-balanced and soundly based appraisals of the present world situation as the following address given by Mr. Barnet Nover, of the Washington Post, at the convocation exercises of the University of Buffalo on February 22, 1946:

More than 9 months have now elapsed since Germany's unconditional surrender and more than 6 months have gone by since imperial Japan gave up the ghost. In the world we live in, in the extraordinarily disturbed era that men of my generation grew up in, there has never been any sharp line of demarcation between war and peace. The Second World War began, though so many were tragically blind to the fact, long before a single shot was fired. There is no longer any organized, large-scale fighting going on anywhere in the world. But peace is still a dream awaiting fulfillment. I say this not merely because peace has not yet been formally proclaimed and because, so far, only one minor peace treaty, that with Siam, has been signed by the Allies. Nor do I say it in any spirit of pessimism. The most hopeful fact of our times is that we no longer assume as we did during the years between Armistice and Armaggedon, that peace is merely an absence of fighting. It is no more that than beauty is merely the absence of ugliness or virtue merely the absence of vice. The most hopeful fact of our times is that people—people of every nation and every race and every creed—now realize, as they have never done before, that peace is not and cannot be the automatic consequence of victory.

All that victory can do is to help clear the ground of the most obvious obstructions so that in due course we can begin to build on a sound foundation of mutual trust, a truly durable house of peace. What is obviously required is a long sustained and continuously cooperative effort by all the nations of the world and particularly by the great powers, an effort that involves an endless process of mutual adjustment among the victors and between the victors and the vanquished.

We have begun to discover that, with the best will in the world, this process of adjustment is not easy and can be disappointingly slow. There have been, as there were bound to be, many false starts, innumerable set-backs. The other day, for my own edification, I drew up a list of the problems regarding which two or more great powers have been at loggerheads during the past year and, for that matter, still are. Leaving out incidental issues, I found that there had been no fewer than 20 such problems, each of them the subject of a more or less heated controversy. They have involved such specific issues as the nature of the postwar political systems in Poland, Hungary, Austria, Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and Italy; the manner in which the postwar settlements with Germany's former satellites are to be drawn up and the terms of those settlements; the future of China, Korea, and Iran; the future of the Dardanelles; the degree of authority and power to be vested in the United Nations Organization and the manner of that organization's functioning; the disposition of Italy's colonies; the relationship between colonial powers and dependent peoples; the all-important question of what is to be done with Germany, and the equally important question of what safeguards are to be drawn up regarding the future use of atomic energy.

None of these problems are unsolvable. Some are in process of solution, at least on a tentative and temporary basis. For better or worse, erstwhile differences among the Great Powers, particularly the Big Three, regarding the governments of certain of the succession states and some of the Balkan countries have been adjusted. A compromise was reached at Moscow, and it may prove to be a workable compromise, regarding the method of drawing up the peace settlements with former Axis satellites. The first steps have been taken to investigate the problem of atomic energy as a problem in international relations and there is no more vital problem than that since, it is no exaggeration to say, the future of mankind depends on what is done about it. The greatest achievement of the past year, next to the achievement of victory, of course, was the writing of the Charter of the United Nations and that Charter's ratification by 51 nations and the setting up, a little more than a month ago, of the United Nations Organization.

It is true that at London there was more of the bull ring than the town meeting in the role thrust upon the UNO. A great many problems were fought over in the Security Council and the General Assembly. None of these problems was actually solved as a result of the vehement debates in which, significantly enough, the principal antagonists were almost invariably the representatives of Great Britain and the Soviet Union. In the old days such undiplomatic language as Mr. Vishinsky shouted at Mr. Bevin and as Mr. Bevin shrieked back at Mr. Vishinsky would have caused the guns to go off by themselves. The first meeting of the UNO had no such tragic outcome. The Bevin-Vishinsky altercations did not add anything either to the gaiety or to the peace of mind of nations—and we could all stand a little more gaiety and greater peace of mind. Yet the debates in the Council cannot be said to have made matters worse. While they underlined the fact—it has not been a secret for some time—that Anglo-Russian relations are far from good and are not getting better, those exchanges between Mr. Vishinsky and Mr. Bevin made it clear that Russia, like the rest of us, believes that UNO is an instrumentality which can be used to advance her particular national interests and cannot, therefore, be ignored. There is promise in that attitude and also a danger. The UNO cannot merely be the sounding board for a lot of international caterwauling but must become, if it is to fulfill its primary function, the place where international differences are adjusted and the work of the world advanced. But for the moment the discussions at London and the fact that, violent as they were, they did not break up the United Nations Organization, have tended to ease one of the great fears recurrently felt in Washington.

That fear is that Russia's role after the Second World War would duplicate the role of the United States after the First World War, with the eastern colossus retreating into the same kind of isolation as the western colossus had done a quarter of a century earlier. When Cordell Hull returned from Moscow in November 1943, one of his most applauded accomplishments was that he had secured Russia's signature to a statement of principle in which was embodied the pledge to set up a new world organization to keep the peace. Later Russia took part in the Dumbarton Oaks discussions. Yet on the eve of the San Francisco Conference, last April, the fear that Russia would stay away from that conference or would limit its role to that of observer was so widespread that there was a great sigh of relief when Molotov arrived.

Russia did take part and from beginning to end a very active part in the San Francisco Conference, as I can testify. But again, last November, there was an upsurge of the old fear with the result that one of the prime purposes of Secretary Byrnes' late mission to Moscow was to insure that Russia would not play possum when the UNO met. Of course, Russia didn't play possum. Her role at London was the familiar role of the bear.

My own belief is that the recurrent fear that Russia might withdraw from UNO and retreat into isolation is based both on a misconception of what isolationism really involves in the world of today and a misunderstanding of Russia's diplomatic strategy. We think we know what isolationism is because that is what we practiced, or thought we practiced, in the years between the World Wars and for a century and more before that. But our isolationism was based on the belief that, being flanked, east and west, by two broad oceans and, north and south, by two weak and friendly nations, we were invulnerable to attack and, therefore, that the way to

insure peace for ourselves was through a policy of passivity.

The Russians have never shared that belief. Russia has been invaded five times in the last 130 years. She was invaded by Napoleon who got as far as Moscow. She was invaded by the Kaiser. She was the victim of multiple Allied interventions in 1918. In 1919 a Polish army came close to the gates of Kiev. Most recently and most vividly remembered there was the Nazi invasion, with German troops sweeping across Russia to the Volga.

The Russians are perfectly well aware that their geographical position has not made them invulnerable to attack from without. Yet Russia's rulers are not yet prepared to accept and act upon the thesis that there is no such thing any longer as a strategic frontier. We now live in an age of atomic power, an age of very long-range planes that can fly nonstop from Tokyo to Washington, an age of self-propelled and guided missiles which, in a few years, may have been developed to the point where it will be possible to launch them in one continent against a target located in another. The Russians, I am certain, are perfectly well aware of these grim facts of life. But that has not stopped them from expanding Russia's borders outward and surrounding the Soviet Union with a chain of satellite, buffer states.

But that is only one aspect of Russian policy. There is also the policy, recently enunciated by Generalissimo Stalin, of making Russia in 10 or 15 years the greatest industrial nation on earth. This ambition in itself need constitute no danger to the world. Under certain circumstances it can be a blessing. But if the purpose of Russia's industrial expansion proves to be, as many suspect Stalin intends it to be, not the improvement of the standard of living of the Russian people but the building up of Russia's military might, it can be a very real danger indeed.

Still another and related aspect of Russian policy is to be found in her diplomatic maneuvering. This brings me back to Russia's relations to the UNO and the recurrent fears I have already mentioned that Russia would retreat into aloofness.

The one clear aspect of Russian foreign policy which the events of the last few years have demonstrated is that Russia will not stay out of but is determined to join every combination of powers that might conceivably be employed against her; if possible, to dominate such a combination or at least exercise a veto over its activities; or if she cannot join the combination, do everything possible to prevent it from coming into being; or, if it has come into being, to break it up. That is why Russia has fought vigorously and so far successfully to prevent the establishment of the so-called western European bloc which has so many advocates in Great Britain, France, Belgium and the Netherlands. By the same token, Russia joined the United Nations but insisted that the Charter include a veto provision through which it is possible for Russia to block any action she deems injurious to her interests or destructive of her freedom of action.

All this, it seems to me, adds up to the fact that the policy which Russia has been pursuing is a policy of isolationism, not isolationism in the passive American sense but isolationism of a peculiarly dynamic variety. For the opposite of isolationism is not merely participation in world affairs but participation on the basis of the belief that the world is a community in which the safety and welfare of one is and must be the concern of all, on the basis of rules which govern the relation of men in society.

I have dwelt at this length on Russian foreign policy because Russia happens to be one of the two countries—the other, of course, being the United States—that holds the key to the future. So far as the United States is concerned, I don't believe there can be the slightest doubt that the policy of isolationism as it was preached and practiced in the twenties and thirties has gone the way of the crinoline and the old horse car. There are still a few unreconstructed isolationists left in the Senate and outside, notably in a few newspaper offices. But they have about the same relationship to the great current of feeling that kept this country from playing its part in the past that a cigar-store Indian in an antique shop has to the late Sitting Bull. There are many more who now belong in the category of partially reconstructed isolationists. They have not really changed their minds but only their votes and not always those. They are the ones who having put themselves on record in favor of the United Nations Charter, cast their ballots against the Bretton Woods agreement, voted against extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, held up the appropriations for UNRRA, and have been shouting loudest for absolute American sovereignty over the Pacific islands we had conquered from Japan. The same breed of mavericks will be found, I'm afraid, in dangerously large numbers in the ranks of those shouting to high heaven against the loan to Britain.

I feel pretty confident that, in the final show-down, the British loan proposal will be ratified. But if the backsliders and the die-hard isolationists and the economic nationalists in Congress have their way and the loan is rejected, the consequences of such a development would certainly, in my opinion, be disastrous both to us and to the rest of the world. Unless we do our part, and it must of necessity be an important part, in the task of world reconstruction, and unless we do all we can to widen the area of unhampered and unrestricted world trade—and both of these aims are basic in the British loan—our anticipated industrial boom will have just about the same lasting qualities as did the boom of the 1920's. And that era of illusory prosperity, as you all know, ended in the worst crash this country has ever experienced.

We have become accustomed to the idea that peace is indivisible. Yet it is equally true that prosperity, too, is indivisible. To deal with the political ills that afflict the nations of the world without taking measures to improve the world's economic lot is like trying to walk one-legged on a slippery street in a 50-mile gale. It cannot easily be done if it can be done at all.

Yet, as I've said, I'm not too gloomy about the ultimate fate of the British loan. It represents only one of many aspects of our shift from isolationism to active participation in world affairs. Not only did we play a prominent part in the events leading up to the signing of the United Nations Charter and the setting up of the United Nations Organization, but we played a prominent part, too, at the Bretton Woods monetary conference, in the setting up of UNRRA, in helping draw up, at Chicago and Bermuda, an agreement laying down the basic principles regarding the regulation of international air traffic. We participated in the two food conferences that led to the creation of the world food organization and in the United Nations Educational Conference.

It is conceivable that world government which so many wise and able men feel has become an absolute necessity in this day of atomic energy may come about not through any sudden and dramatic abdication of sovereignty by the nations of the world, great and small, but through the slow and steady multiplication of cooperative international agencies having to do not with high politics but with the more humdrum and day-to-day matters of health and food and education and aviation and finance and labor standards, and so on. Here again Russia casts a dark shadow. Russia has been conspicuously absent from most of those conferences. Her representative was present at the Atlantic City meeting at which UNRRA came into being. But Russia's role in UNRRA is that of beneficiary rather than contributor. She was also represented at Bretton Woods. But so far Russia is the only great power that has not ratified the Bretton Woods agreement.

As I say, world government may grow from the multiplication of those agencies performing so much useful work in the international sphere. But that process is bound to be slow and we cannot depend on it. Nor can we depend alone on the UNO. I believe very strongly in the UNO.

At San Francisco last spring I saw the Charter being hammered out word by word, line by line, paragraph by paragraph. I have no illusions about it. The UNO though primarily intended to be a peace-enforcing agency is least capable of carrying out that great function among the many lesser functions it has. It can only enforce peace if there is among all the great powers the will to keep the peace. And if there is that will the danger of war will be nonexistent.

Whether there is that will can depend to a frightening extent on the United States, on us. We have twice demonstrated in the course of the last 30 years that any nation that arouses our wrath courts disaster. Even if Generalissimo Stalin's latest 5-year plans are carried out on schedule and in accordance with the Kremlin's blueprint we shall remain for some time the Nation with the most powerful industrial machine, the most impressive technology, the greatest latent war potential on earth.

Potential power is not actual power. We were potentially as strong in the years between the wars as we proved to be after Dunkerque and Pearl Harbor. But Germany and Japan for years thumbed their noses at us and added injury to insult because they did not believe we could mobilize our power with sufficient speed to make that power effective against them.

Is history repeating itself? We sought in eastern Europe and the Balkans to see that the pledges of the Atlantic Charter, the promise of the "four freedoms" were made a reality. How many of the "four freedoms" are being respected in Yugoslavia or Bulgaria today?

We made a tremendous effort over a period of many months and with great patience to bring about a stable equilibrium in the Far East where our interests and Russian interests impinge on each other more directly than anywhere else. In the name of amity between two of our great wartime allies we persuaded China to turn back the clock and grant Russia strategic bases and railroad rights in Manchuria, bases and rights which Russia had originally acquired under the czars. Has it profited us anything? Has it profited China? The answer so far, certainly, cannot be given in the affirmative. We fought a war to destroy fascism, and in Argentina, in the hemisphere of the "good neighbor," fascism has taken new root. We sought to play the role of mediator between Russia and Britain in all the arena where those two powers are in latent conflict. Can we point to one question, whether it is Iran or the Dardanelles or Greece or in the Adriatic, where our mediation has up to now resulted in any conclusive results?

There is no nation in the world to which the other nations look more yearningly for leadership than they do the United States. They view us without a sense of fear and in a mood of admiration. We represent to them—they are not as conscious of all our faults and shortcomings as we are—the citadel of human rights and human dignity, the repository of freedom. But many of those nations who look to us for leadership are beginning to wonder whether we have the capacity to lead. That king of France who marched up the hill only to march down again didn't do a more thorough job of rapidly reversing his course than we did after

VJ-day. Our once magnificent and impressive military force has been dissipated. The war for us was over when the fighting ended. But wars are never over until the causes that produced them have really been eradicated. Can we say that the causes that produced the last war—fascism, militarism, unrestricted national sovereignty, international anarchy—have now all disappeared? We are still strong—potentially. And we have the atomic bomb. Oh, yes; we have the atomic bomb. But that atomic bomb by revolutionizing the nature of war has made us more rather than less vulnerable. It is a weapon that, so far as we are concerned, is 5-percent asset and 95-percent liability. The atom bomb has only magnified our responsibility without adding to our influence. That influence can only be regained and maintained if in this disordered world we live in we stand firm, unshaken and unshakable for justice among nations, great and small, powerful and weak, for freedom to know and to speak and to worship, for law and law observance. But the voice we raise in the world on behalf of those principles that are the warp and woof of our traditions will be a thin voice indeed, it will not be heard and it will command no respect unless we are strong.

What I have just said is not new but very old. It was said long ago by an old-fashioned, Eighteenth Century gentleman, a great soldier, a great statesman who, like us, knew what it was to live through a cycle of wars and domestic turmoil and international confusion, a man who loved liberty so much that he was willing to sacrifice everything he had to achieve it.

"There is nothing," wrote George Washington to James McHenry in 1782, "there is nothing which will so soon produce a speedy and honorable peace as a state of preparation for war, and we must either do this, or lay our account for a patched-up inglorious peace, after all the toil, blood, and treasure we have spent. This has been my uniform opinion, a doctrine I have endeavored, amidst the torrent of expectation of an approaching peace, to inculcate; the event, I am sure, will justify me in it."

That phrase, "a state of preparation for war" that Washington used rings harshly and ominously in our ears. It no longer fits in with realities of our times, even if it did with those of Washington. To prepare for war now is to prepare for total destruction, world suicide. You cannot in this day and age even safely employ the word defense. There is not now, there may never be any real defense against the atomic bomb except a state of total peace. But whatever words we use the fact remains that there is as yet no substitute in international affairs for power. It is no longer possible in this day and age, as it was in Washington's and it was not easy then, to employ that power solely to achieve security for one's own Nation. The frontiers of peace are today as wide as the world. The fears that plague us by day, the terrors that beset us by night, are merely a reflection of the sovereign fact that for better, for worse, for richer, for poorer, the world in Wendell Willkie's phrase is really one world.

"The establishment of our new Government," wrote Washington in 1790, "seemed to be the last great experiment for promoting human happiness by reasonable compact in a civil society. It was to be, in the first instance, in a considerable degree a government of accommodation as well as a government of laws."

If we are to have peace in the world, the world, too, must be governed by accommodation but also by laws.

As I said at the beginning I do not despair of the present situation. As we look around the world so many aspects of it remind us of the world as described in Genesis, a world without form, and void; and with darkness upon the face of the deep. Only this time it is up to mankind itself, it is up to all of us, to carry out the divine admonition that was both prayer and promise.

Let there be light.

The Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives yesterday refused to do its part in alleviating the critical housing shortage confronting the veteran, by rejecting the Wyatt proposal as incorporated in the proposed Monroney amendment to the Patman bill. It is difficult to see how the required building materials for a goal of approximately 3,000,000 homes for veterans in the next 2 years can be produced without the incentive or premium payments requested by the President and his able Housing Administrator, Mr. Wyatt. I regret that the majority of House Members did not support this proposal—its passage was vital to the welfare of our returned and still returning soldiers.

One Hundredth Anniversary of Iowa Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 7, 1946

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress will be interested to know that the State of Iowa is this year celebrating the one hundredth anniversary of statehood. Iowa was admitted to the Union of States by an act of Congress on December 28, 1846, and became the twenty-ninth State. The State of Iowa thus became one of the important States carved out of the Louisiana Purchase Territory and was the first State so admitted in which human bondage was prohibited.

Down through the years Iowa has had a glorious history. Her sons have taken part in all the wars prosecuted by this country since statehood and in World War II there were 250,000 Iowa men and women in the armed services. Of course, a great many made the supreme sacrifice for the defense of the Republic.

The Post Office Department assured me some months ago that a memorial postage stamp in the denomination of 3 cents in commemoration of statehood for Iowa will be put out by the Post Office Department some time this year.

The Iowa Centennial Committee, appointed by the Governor of the State, has endorsed unanimously a suggestion of Charles M. Fouts, a high-school student of Albia, Iowa, for a design of the postage stamp. The design suggested by this young man is a reproduction of a large picture in the Iowa State Capitol Building entitled "Westward," which depicts the immigration of citizens into the great Mississippi Valley territory and the hardships and privations that these pioneers suffered in establishing homes and free government in the Middle West.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include a copy of a resolution adopted by the Howard Cessna Post, No. 136, of the American Legion, Department of Iowa, located at Albia, Iowa, as follows:

Whereas it has come to the attention of the Howard Cessna Post, No. 136, American Legion, Department of Iowa, located at Albia, Iowa, that one Charles M. Fouts, a student in our local high school, has been singularly honored by having had accepted a letter and design for a commemorative stamp of the one hundredth anniversary of Iowa as a State; and

Whereas we of the local American Legion feel that we should be in neglect of duty were we to pass the opportunity to sponsor and encourage the proper authorities in Washington, D. C., to use this design for said commemorative stamp: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Howard Cessna Post, No. 136, American Legion, Department of Iowa, go on record by asking our Representatives in Washington, D. C., to put forth every effort at their command to further and obtain for the State of Iowa and especially said Charles M. Fouts the design presented to the proper committee and copies of this resolution be sent to Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER and Representatives KARL M. LECOMPTE and JAMES DOLLIVER, and also copies spread upon the records of Howard Cessna Post, No. 136, Albia, Iowa, American Legion, Department of Iowa.

Passed and adopted this 4th day of March A. D. 1946.

C. ALBERT LEWIS,
Commander.
RUSSELL LANCIAL,
Adjutant.

Wages, Prices, and Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER E. BREHM
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 7, 1946

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the March 9 edition of the Pittsburgh Courier so splendidly states the issue, as I believe it to be, that it seems apropos to insert it in the RECORD in the hope that it might help stabilize and coordinate the thinking of those of us who are really trying to be liberal in our thinking without going off the deep end.

This editorial is truly sound American philosophy:

WAGES, PRICES, AND PRODUCTION

As the country seems to be emerging from the epidemic of strikes designed to gain wage increases, and successful in most instances, it is significant that these increases are being accompanied by a rise in prices of all necessities.

Steel has gone up, meat has gone up and there have been and will be price increases all

along the line, while at the same time workers have lost hundreds of millions of dollars in wages.

In numerous instances striking workers have spent all of their war savings and cashed in all their war bonds to make ends meet during the work stoppages.

This indicates that much of the wage increases won will not prove to be real increases because the cost of life's necessities will keep pace with them.

Real wages can be increased without any increase in wages if prices go down, and this is brought about most speedily by increased production which places more consumer goods on the market.

Another way to increase real wages is to reduce taxation by cutting the expense of Federal, State, and municipal government, and at the same time to curb monopolistic practices.

This can be done by intelligent political action which can be exercised in the coming congressional elections, and by pressure on the legislators in the Federal and State capitals without expensive and wasteful work stoppages which often increase prices by cutting production.

Too many Americans came to believe during the depression and post-depression years that the Federal Government possessed some sort of inexhaustible cornucopia dispensing money and all the good things of life in an endless stream, and that any politician promising this boon could make good his promise.

Slowly the more intelligent citizens are learning that government produces nothing but laws and regulations, and that only increased economic production can increase real wages and so truly contribute to the improved well-being of the Nation.

Not only must there be the right to work, but there must be a realization that only through thrift and industry, and the curbing of monopolistic practices, can the Nation prosper.

School Lunches—A Must

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1946

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an address I delivered over CBS network, Station WTOP here in Washington, Tuesday evening, March 5, 1946:

The school-lunch program is a must program because it conserves our greatest asset, our American children.

The Federal Government spends millions of dollars each year on soil conservation, and it is money well spent, because it guarantees to the future abundant food and fiber. It spends millions each year on the conservation of our natural resources, so they will last down through the years to serve our people, and this also is money well spent. It also spends millions each year conserving the health of our livestock, treating cattle for the hoof-and-mouth disease, blackleg, ticks, cows for Bang's disease, hogs for cholera, and so forth, and more millions developing foods to make cattle and hogs put on more weight, cows give more milk, chickens lay more eggs, and so forth. Now, I am not against these expenditures. I think that they are wise. But as I have voted for them year in and year out, I sometimes wonder if we are not more considerate of the health and diet of our livestock than we are about the health and diet of our children. Is it not about time we gave a little more consideration to the conservation of our children, so they will grow and develop, physically and mentally, into real American men and women, strong in body and mind, and capable of carrying on and preserving our God-given institutions of freedom, liberty, and equality? What do you think you fathers and mothers of America?

While I do not minimize the importance of the school lunch to agriculture, because I know from experience that it has been a great help in disposing of surpluses, as well as increasing the consumption of food, I would hate to think that I am so neglectful of the welfare of our boys and girls that my sole motivating cause for being for the program was consideration for the farmers. Surely the welfare of our children should not depend upon whether the farmer has, or has not, a surplus. The big thing—the controlling thing in the program, is furnishing underprivileged and undernourished American boys and girls a wholesome, nutritious meal, so they will develop mentally and physically into strong American men and women.

That many of our boys and girls are not being given the proper food is beyond cavil. Dr. Parran, the Surgeon General, testified before the committee hearing the school-lunch bill that dietary studies of school children in various parts of the United States, both urban and rural, showed many school children's diets grossly deficient—in some instances as high as 90 percent deficient. General Hershey, head of the Selective Service, stated that studies made by his office showed that 70 percent of the children who had a fair or poor nutritional diet 10 or 12 years ago were rejected. The study also showed that about 40 percent of all of those called under the draft were rejected, and that the great cause of the physical and mental defects upon which rejections were based was lack of proper nutritive diet during childhood.

Such a showing, my friends, presents a national problem, and it is right and proper for the Federal Government to step in and assist in bringing about the needed corrections.

The school-lunch program is not a new idea. Progressive, far-seeing men and women in many sections of our country years ago realized the need of the child for a hot nutritious school lunch, and through local efforts, chiefly through the efforts of the parent-teachers' associations and local civic clubs, put in school lunches in their local schools. Because the program was sound and people soon discovered a marked improvement, physically and mentally, in the children given the hot, nutritious lunch, it grew, and today has been embraced by schools in every State in the Union. The Federal Government stepped in the picture some 12 years ago as a relief measure. Then in 1935 the Agricultural Department, in order to assist in removing farm surpluses, commenced distributing surplus food products to the schools. Then in 1943, WPA having been abolished and war demands consuming all farm surpluses, thus doing away with all Federal aid to the lunch program, the Congress stepped in and authorized, through language in an appropriation act, that $50,000,000 of what is known as section 32 money, be turned over to the War Food Administrator to be used in aiding the school-lunch program through cash indemnities. This arrangement has been carried on since, from year to year, as no basic legislation has ever been enacted. What the present legislation does is to set up a permanent program by basic legislation.

Of our 208,235 public schools in the United States, last year some 48,000 schools operated a lunch program, serving lunches to some 8,200,000 children. In addition there are many public and private schools operating outside the program, serving lunches to some five or six million children. Hence, the over-all picture is this: Some fifty to sixty thousand schools are serving schoo lunches to some ten or twelve million boys and girls. In addition, some 1,000 child-care centers are serving hot lunches to some 75,000 children.

The school-lunch program has been approved by both the House and the Senate and is now in conference. I hope the conferees, within the next few days, will agree upon a program, and that the program as finally agreed upon will give like treatment to the boys and girls in both public and private schools. The need of the child is the controlling consideration, and this need is as great in the private schools as it is in the public schools.

Mr. WORCESTER. Why are Federal funds needed in school-lunch programs?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Primarily because many of the schools, without Federal aid, would be unable to operate a lunch program. There are thousands of schools in America located in poor sections. The children in these sections come from poor homes where the earning capacity of the breadwinner is not sufficient to provide the child with a hot, nutritious, noonday lunch. Without Federal assistance very few, if any, of the schools in such areas would be able to provide the school children with noonday lunches. Take away Federal assistance and you take away the lunch from the child most in need of a nutritious noonday meal.

Mr. WORCESTER. Is there a wide variation in school-lunch activities in different parts of the country?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Yes; and this variation in lunch activities is largely due to lack of proper financing. In some sections where the lunch program has not been inaugurated, the trouble, of course, is lack of interest and appreciation, which, I am happy to state, is rapidly disappearing. As those in these sections begin to realize what the hot lunch means to the child they are demanding the lunch program.

The type of lunch varies in the different schools. Three types of lunch are served—grades A, B, and C. Grade A lunch is a complete nutritious meal, the cost to the child varying from 10 to 25 cents per lunch, the average being around 12 cents. This lunch furnishes the child from one-third to one-half its daily nutritional requirements. Type B lunch, while incomplete, furnishes the child with 20 to 25 percent of its daily nutritive requirements, and costs from 5 to 15 cents, the average cost being around 8 cents. Type C lunch consists of one-half pint of milk, and the cost varies from 1 to 2 cents.

As the program develops and the people become educated to the value of a hot, nutritious lunch to the child, it is hoped that all schools can put in the complete noonday meal.

Mr. WORCESTER. Why consider food needs of only school-age children? Aren't any non-school-age children in need of similar aid?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. While all children, regardless of age, need a hot, nutritious lunch, those too young to go to school have a fair chance of getting a hot noonday meal at home. It is imperative, however, for the school child in order to properly develop physically and mentally to have, at least, one nutritious meal. I agree, however, that many non-school-age children are going without proper diet, and I hope the day will soon come when every American child has at least enough of the right kind of food to eat.

Mr. WORCESTER. What specific advantages are there in Federal aid for school lunches?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Worcester, there are so many advantages that I cannot begin to enumerate them this evening. For instance, under the bill the Federal Government is charged with setting up the standards for a nutritious lunch, and the school, before they can secure Federal funds, must meet the standards. This is all-important in that it sets the standard and assures the child a nutritious lunch. It would be foolishness

simply to provide the child with food without regard to its nutritional value. If the child were left free in the matter, in all probability it would select food that would do it very little, if any, good. Then, too, when the Federal Government comes in and pilots the way it becomes possible for every school in the land to embrace the program. Moreover, Federal aid lends permanency to the program.

Mr. WORCESTER. What are the possible aids to agriculture in the school-lunch program?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Aside from being an outlet for farm products in surplus, aside from the enormous market for food, the program at present supplies (last year agricultural products valued at $89,547,160 went into the program), the greatest value of the program to the farmers is this: It will furnish instruction in the principles of nutrition, which will bring about an increased consumption of farm products. The example that is set in furnishing the children nutritious food and instruction in nutrition will not be forgotten by the children when they go home, nor will it be forgotten by them when they grow up and have families of their own. It is a proven fact that children go home and tell their parents about the kind of food they have in their school lunches and that the information they have carried home has brought about a marked improvement in those homes, as far as quantity and quality of food consumed is concerned.

Mr. WORCESTER. What is done when local requests for Federal funds exceed the appropriation?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Federal funds are apportioned to the States on the basis of school population and need. If any State fails to match its apportioned funds that part not matched is reapportioned, and in that way many of the local requests you speak of are met. Of course, if all the States match Federal funds, in which case there are no funds left to reapportion, the local schools will simply have to do the best they can. In most of the cases, however, you will find the local interest so great that the funds are readily supplied from local sources.

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. CLASON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of the Members of Congress statements broadcast over Station WSPR in Springfield on February 17, 1946.

The first speech dealing with "Justice for Poland" was delivered by Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts. The second speech was delivered by Judge Napoleon J. Vigeant, of Chicopee, Mass.

These broadcasts in behalf of Poland are arranged by the Polish-American Congress, Inc., and they are listened to by an ever-increasing group of the citizens of western Massachusetts:

ADDRESS OF HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Friends of Poland, when Dr. Smolczynski invited me to join you in your Sunday broadcast on this Polish hour I wrote him that I did not expect to be in Springfield in the near future, so he asked me to prepare a little statement and read it so that it could be transcribed to you. I am happy to do so.

I have the greatest admiration for the citizens of Poland and those of Polish descent in other countries throughout the world. Theirs is a great heritage of fredom, and their courage and their will to fight to the bitter end to maintain that heritage have been an inspiration to all of us. The Atlantic Charter and other conferences had raised the hopes of every freedom-loving citizen. The Potsdam agreement lent encouragement for every person who fought or worked for the freedom of peoples everywhere. But neither that agreement nor the conference at Yalta was consummated in a way to encourage the friends of free Poland. I for one cannot put my stamp of approval on much of the treatment accorded Poland. The people of that country still suffer. They have not yet felt that sense of justice and love which they expected and deserved. I would like this morning to point out to you a hope. It may be a faint hope but yet it may become a real one. That hope lies in the United Nations Organization which is about to become a reality. All of us must have faith in its purposes, in its ideals, and its promises. Article 14 of that agreement is the article which I would like to quote to you. It was the article which the United Nations delegation at San Francisco was so insistent to have included. I feel it may give a special encouragement to Polish citizens. It says:

"The General Assembly may recommend measures for the peaceful adjustment of any situation, regardless of origin, which it deems likely to impair the general welfare of friendly relations among nations, including situations resulting from a violation of the provisions of the present charter setting forth the purposes and principles of the United Nations."

Free discussion in the General Assembly of the United Nations gives encouragement that ultimate correction of the present wrongs and the attainment of the desired justice and the spirit of freedom may be obtained. I agree that this hope is no guaranty but I feel that it is toward the end in which we can place some justification. It is at least the goal towards which the lovers of the Polish people who realize what they have stood and fought for can work with firmness and determination. Let us strive as Lincoln said "in the right as we see the right," to bring the full measure of freedom, prosperity and happiness to the gallant Polish people beside whose boys many of our own sons have fought and died in the past 3 years. In the meantime our Government in the United States must do its part never to force the involuntary repatriation of Polish citizens who do not want to go back to their homes. Up to the present time we have not exerted ourselves to the fullest extent. We must do all we can through speedy mail and parcel post to permit citizens of Polish descent in this country to help and keep in touch with their loved ones in Poland. Have we done all that we can to see that this has been carried out? I think not. If we want the world to believe that we are champions of liberty and democracy, fairness, and decency, we must show by our actions that we have the courage of champions and are willing to help, not by words only but by deed—for deeds speak louder than words. With God's help on this Sunday afternoon we may take encouragement for the future of Poland, and I for one join with you in praying that truth, justice, and security of living may in the not too distant future again prevail in a free and glorious Poland.

ADDRESS OF HON. NAPOLEON J. VIGEANT, THE PRESIDING JUSTICE OF THE DISTRICT COURT OF CHICOPEE, MASS.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Atlantic Charter, referred to by my good friend Senator SALTONSTALL, is that set of principles proclaimed by our country to the world, for which we were willing to fight the Second World War, and for which we were willing to make sacrifices, not only of our material wealth, but also of our blood. The other Allied Nations subscribed to those principles, and the Atlantic Charter became the Magna Carta of our combined effort to crush nazistic totalitarianism. Poland, the ever-living symbol of those principles, did not need to subscribe to them, for she had already lived them, and fought and died for them.

Poland's valiant stand against Hitler's conquering hordes inspired our country to the enunciation of those principles, but when the fortunes of war turned against Hitler, we gradually abandoned them, one by one, and, although we still rendered lip service to its pronouncements, we are now turning to power politics of might against right, and we are forsaking one country after another in eastern Europe into the bondage of another aspiring, ambitious nation.

For the best evidence of our changed attitude, let us look at the plight of Poland. Here is the sixth largest country in Europe, with a prewar population of 35,000,000 people, with a recorded history of 1,000 years, firmly attached to Christianity and western culture, now deprived of her freedom, her independence, and her constitutional government.

Poland was the first country that opposed Hitler. Attacked by German armies from the west, and Russian armies from the east, Poland became the victim of two greedy aggressors working in agreement, one with the other. They divided the overpowered country, and entered upon a planned program of plundering the nation, deporting its people, and destroying every vestige of culture and advancement, and causing untold hardship and suffering.

After the falling out between Hitler and Stalin, Poland became the battleground of the strongest armies in Europe, bent on destroying everything that stood in the path of either of them. The Germans moved into Soviet Russia, and when they were finally pushed back, in a large measure due to American assistance, Soviet Russia claimed half of the unfortunate country that she had already been given by Hitler when they had been partners in crime.

When the Polish constitutional government in exile refused to sign an agreement condoning this conduct, Soviet Russia severed diplomatic relations, and imposed on the remaining half of Poland its own puppet communistic regime, which was eager and willing for its maintenance in power, to sign away any part of Poland that was directed by Moscow. To placate the western allies, and to make a show of adherence to the principles of the Atlantic Charter, an insignificant number of Polish democrats were added to the Polish puppet government, gaining for that regime official recognition of it by the United States and Great Britain. The edicts of the communistic majority of that regime will be enforced by the Russian Army, garrisoned in every larger city of Poland, and the Russian secret police will take care of any organized opposition by deportation to Siberia or immediate liquidation.

Are we fulfilling our obligations to the trusting nations of Europe who expected us to be champions of liberty and democracy? What will be the result of our inconsistent foreign policy of continued appeasement of Russia? It is hard to prophesy, as the future is covered with a heavy veil.

Many people are of the opinion that in every country deprived of freedom and independence the democratic elements that confided in us, that had faith in us and in our pronouncements, now hate us bitterly and wait only to act for themselves, to throw off the yoke of Russian bondage. It is inevitable that another world war will ensue.

By placing most of Europe under Soviet domination, we are adding to its power and

building up a military colossus that will outnumber us in available military strength because of the resources of the whole of Europe and most of Asia at its disposal. It follows that such a domination of Europe will result in the still stronger infiltration of communistic ideology into the continents of North and South America, causing many disturbances and strifes on our own soil.

We are creating a commercial giant nurtured in regimented industry and finance that in the not too far distant future will enter upon an undreamed-of competition with us in all of the markets of the world.

It is, therefore, in our own self-interest that we be concerned with the plight of Poland, for there can be no lasting and durable peace for the world without justice for Poland.

Collection of Lincoln Relics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1946

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I submit to my colleagues a most interesting story written by Bethel D. Swint and published in the Point Pleasant Register, Point Pleasant, W. Va.

The article should be of interest principally because it concerns the great Lincoln; and, further, it concerns Col. Kellian V. Whaley, a former Member of this House, who was closely associated with Lincoln. Colonel Whaley was a Member of this body, serving two terms, 1863–65.

The Fourth Congressional District, which I have the honor of representing, was a part of the district represented by Colonel Whaley, and all the persons involved in this story are closely associated with my section of the country.

Mrs. Swint and John G. Aten, Jr., reside in Point Pleasant.

The article follows:

VALUABLE COLLECTION OF LINCOLN RELICS OWNED BY JOHN ATEN, JR.

(By Bethel D. Swint)

John Aten, Jr., deputy to his father, John Aten, county clerk of Mason County, is the proud possessor of the remarkable Whaley-Aten collection of relics directly connected with President Abraham Lincoln. Mr. Aten himself is a recognized authority on matters relating to the great President's life.

Lincoln—the hero, the schoolboy idol who rose as a meteor from dull obscurity to the highest position in the land—may seem to be ceasing as an inspiration in this day when hard work is a doubtful virtue and the path to success is not always the same one trod by the leaders of other days. But he has not ceased to be interesting.

The items in the Whaley-Aten collection give one a clear picture of many of the events which were transpiring when John Aten, Jr.'s grandfather, Col. Kellian V. Whaley, a native of New York, was in the Nation's eye as a Congressman during Lincoln's administration. Colonel Whaley lived in Wayne County before and during the Civil War in 1861, and after West Virginia became a State he served two terms in Congress, 1863 and 1865.

The Lincoln relics owned by the Atens were handed down by Colonel Whaley. He and Lincoln became close friends when the latter was beginning the practice of law in Galesburg, Ill., and Colonel Whaley was a school teacher in that town. That was before they went to Washington. Colonel Whaley, who was the father of Mrs. Waldo E. Allen, of this city, and Mrs. Estella M. Sands, of Maurietta, Calif., had a distinguished military record. His son, the late Carlyle Whaley, died here last year.

Included in the collection is a black crepe-shrouded gold-braided shoulder badge which Colonel Whaley wore as a member of the congressional delegation which followed the remains of Lincoln to the burial place at Springfield, Ill. The transportation ticket which entitled Colonel Whaley to ride on the funeral train, and which was signed by E. D. Townsend, then Assistant Adjutant General, is also in the collection. Included also is a black-bordered card of admission to the East Room of the White House when the martyred President's body lay in state, April 19, 1865.

The President and Mrs. Lincoln invited the Whaleys to the White House March 1, 1864. The Lincolns must have kept rather late hours for the time set for the guests was from 9 to 12 o'clock.

Invitations to inauguration ceremonies were elaborate affairs in those days. The invitation sent to Colonel Whaley and his family for the inauguration of Lincoln March 4, 1865, was signed by more than 50 "managers."

A Brady photograph of the President, which was given to Colonel Whaley by Lincoln himself, is quite distinct and shows the Great Emancipator as a man not quite so homely as he has sometimes been pictured.

Other items in the collection include a picture of Lt. Gen. Ulysses S. Grant and a handwritten invitation to a social affair given by the Grants at the Douglas Rowe, April 6, 1865. The Atens own a picture of the entire Congress taken at the time Colonel Whaley was a Member of that august body. An invitation from Secretary of the Treasury Salmon P. Chase and Miss Chase, presumably his sister and official hostess, is among the momentoes.

Wyatt Smith, of Your Friends and Mine column, recently wrote that "Colonel Whaley was an ardent unionist whose feelings for his one-time enemies never notably abated. He did not look with favor upon the suit of William H. Fry, of Buffalo, W. Va., for the hand of Mollie Whaley, his daughter." Fry had been a Confederate soldier.

After leaving Congress, Colonel Whaley became a United States collector of revenue on the Texas border. While he was gone, ex-Confederate William H. Fry successfully wooed and won Mollie Whaley. The couple were married in Point Pleasant in the house now the home of Mrs. W. R. Gunn and Dr. and Mrs. Neil Gunn on River Street, July 27, 1869. The Reverend Stephen Vaught, a Methodist minister and father of W. H. Vaught, of 908 Main Street, performed the ceremony.

R. P. B. Smith, county clerk of Mason County, wired Colonel Whaley of the marriage. Colonel Whaley and his son-in-law were said to have never been reconciled, but Mrs. Fry visited her father before he died. Their daughter, Nellie, is Mrs. John Aten, Sr. Their other children were Henry K. Fry and Bertha Fry, who was the wife of John E. Armstrong (both deceased); Mrs. Frank Shafer, of Cincinnati, Ohio, and Mrs. Arthur Henry, of Weston.

Great-grandchildren of Colonel Whaley residing here are Charles M. Fry, Mrs. Carl G. Gardner, Mrs. Okey Blagg, Mrs. Lena Carr, and John Aten, Jr.

The Atens have a copy of an issue of the New York Morning Herald of April 15, 1865, which carried well-written accounts of the shooting of Mr. Lincoln the evening of April 14, and the fatal wounding of Frederick Seward, Secretary of State by the assassin who stole into his apartment on the pretext of bringing medicine from the druggist. The Herald worked against a news deadline that was the last word. A bulletin said the President died at 22 minutes past 7 o'clock the morning of the fifteenth, and the paper went to press at 7:30 o'clock.

A newspaper worker couldn't recist further notations about the 4-page copy of the old Herald, which carried the news of Lincoln's death, the beginning of Sherman's march out of Goldsboro, Ga., and a few other items on the front page. The entire inside 2 pages were devoted to advertising Kitchel's Liniment, with the exception of one-half the editorial column which was devoted to Lincoln's death.

Included in the interesting collection, but not connected with Lincoln, is a copy of Volume 1, No. 1, of the New York Herald, published in New York City on May 6, 1835 by James Gordon Bennett & Co. Among the items on its pages is a dispatch showing Great Britain and Russia at sword's point over the Dardanelles.

Items of the collection were displayed at the Jamestown Exhibition in 1907.

The whole world has arrived at more or less settled opinions as regards the high qualities of human nature and responsible leadership in public life and towering above all who have gone before stands the figure of Abraham Lincoln.

Public Welfare Act of 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1946

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I introduced on yesterday H. R. 5686, a bill entitled the Public Welfare Act of 1946. This bill provides for the public welfare through grants to the States for assistance for needy individuals and for welfare services. It proposes to amend the Social Security Act in order to achieve two purposes: First, that the States may be enabled to meet actual need wherever it exists, and second, that the Federal Government may deal with the States on a unified rather than piecemeal basis in the welfare field.

This proposal is based on the principle that while the actual administration of welfare programs is the responsibility of the States and localities, the Federal Government has a clear-cut responsibility to give leadership on a national basis and to extend financial aid to the States in a joint campaign against insecurity, poverty and their resultant social evils. This bill has been prepared after consultation with those who administer such programs. It incorporates the recommendations of the American Public Welfare Association, an organization of State and local public-welfare agencies, welfare officials, board members, and workers. It reflects the results of 10 years' experience in administering the present welfare provisions of the Social Security Act.

The social security program approaches the problem of insecurity in two ways. First, through the social insurance programs, both old-age and survivors' insurance and unemployment compensation, it undertakes to prevent dependency by assuring individuals a cash pay-

ment to compensate them for loss of earning power due to unemployment or old age or, in the case of premature death, to assure their survivors a regular benefit payment. Payments under the insurance program are based on contributions made to an insurance fund by the worker and in his behalf by his employer and are, in effect, a form of savings to which he is entitled because of an equity interest regardless of his personal circumstances. The insurance system represents, to my mind, the ideal way of helping individuals to protect themselves against the predictable hazards of modern economic life. I favor its extension to the entire working population of the country. I favor also the liberalization of benefits so that they will be adequate to provide the basic needs of the average person.

It must be recognized, however, that it will be many years before even an expanded or liberalized social insurance program can provide the maximum protection to the bulk of our population. The Social Security Act, as enacted in 1935 and subsequently amended in 1939, recognized the responsibility of the Federal Government to assist the States in meeting the needs of certain groups, namely, the aged, the blind, and dependent children, on an assistance basis. Moreover, it recognized that there are related needs for health, child welfare, and vocational rehabilitation services in which the Federal Government had a responsibility to assist the States. The second approach of the social security program was, therefore, to underpin the insurances with grants to the States for assistance and for services.

Today we are confronted with a situation in which both phases of the social security program should be strengthened if the needs of the country in this critical postwar period are to be met. The bill which I have introduced deals with the assistance and welfare service phase of the program but in no way represents an alternative to the proposals for insurance liberalization which are covered by other measures.

The Public Welfare Act of 1946 is directed toward meeting the actual needs of millions of people in this country. These people are either already out of the labor market because of age, disability, or widowhood and can therefore never hope to benefit from an insurance program which is based on employment, or they are among the 21,000,000 working people not now covered by the OASI program who, even were the coverage of the program to be extended, cannot hope to receive full benefits for many years to come, or they are those who cannot support themselves fully on the present low level of benefit payments. It is my conviction that even while we work toward a complete and comprehensive insurance system we must simultaneously make it possible for the States to meet the want that is actually on our doorstep today. Obviously, as the insurance program expands, the assistance program and the charge against general revenues which it represents will automatically decline. I want to make it very clear that while I propose a comprehensive assistance program which will place a floor under poverty and want for all people, I do so in the clear expectation that numerically it will be a diminishing program as the insurance program expands.

The basic purpose of the bill is to assist the States and to provide the leadership of a common program to the end that no person in the country need go hungry for want of public aid and that, where needed, welfare services may be made available to alleviate or prevent poverty, to minimize its resultant social evils, and to promote the welfare of those who cannot protect themselves, especially children. The bill proposes to achieve these ends in the following ways:

First. It would make it possible for the Federal Government to assist the States in meeting need whatever its cause. It would leave to the States the option as to whether they wished to continue the present categories of old-age assistance, aid to dependent children and aid to the blind or whether they preferred to provide for these groups as part of a comprehensive assistance program. Provisions would have to be made for these three groups as a condition of receiving Federal funds and no State could exclude any otherwise eligible person because of residence or citizenship requirement. It would make it possible to assist all needy children not in institutions, including those in foster homes.

Second. It would assist the States to provide on a more nearly adequate basis for the actual requirements of needy individuals and families. It would do this in three ways. First, it would extend a higher percentage of Federal financial aid to the poorer States and thus rectify the present situation whereby under an even sharing of costs by the Federal Government and the States, the States that need it most receive the least in Federal aid. Second, it would permit the States to determine the amount of assistance needed in a particular case and authorize the Federal Government to meet its share of the cost without the present maximum limitations of $20 a month each on old-age assistance and aid to the blind and the miserably inadequate present limitation on aid to dependent children of $9 a month for the first child, $6 a month for other children, and nothing for the mother or responsible relative. In the third place, it would require the States to so allocate funds within the States as to meet in full the needs of eligible individuals on the basis of standards determined by the States.

Third. It assists the States to meet more adequately the needs of those who require medical care by authorizing direct payment to doctors, institutions, and other agencies furnishing such care to the needy and by permitting those adults who require medical care voluntarily to reside in public as well as private institutions without loss of their cash assistance. The high incidence of disability and chronic illness among those who require assistance, especially the aged, makes this an important provision. It is intended to meet an actual current need and is not put forward as a substitute for any other measures to meet the health needs of the population as a whole.

Fourth. It extends the area of Federal financial aid to services as well as assistance, recognizing that the needs of children and many of the needs of adults require something more than cash assistance. The war years have demonstrated as never before, and we see the continued need reflected in postwar conditions, that a Nation which neglects the welfare of its children and families pays a heavy price in delinquency, maladjustment, and ultimate dependency. The bill would permit the Federal Government to match State expenditure for social services on the same basis as assistance.

Fifth. The bill would require unified administration of federally aided welfare programs at all levels of government—local, State, and Federal. Under the present hodgepodge situation in many States and localities a needy individual finds himself shunted from office to office in a vain effort to find the answer to his needs. At the same time the State welfare departments, in trying to work out a unified and comprehensive approach to the welfare needs of their own States find themselves increasingly hampered by the necessity, imposed by the present Social Security Act, of dealing with two Federal agencies, namely the Social Security Board in the Federal Security Agency and the Children's Bureau in the Labor Department, on two programs as inseparable as assistance and child welfare services. This bill therefore proposes placing the administrative responsibility in what appears the logical welfare agency of the Federal Government, the Federal Security Agency. Should action be taken under the Reorganization Act or other legislative enactment to transfer the Children's Bureau or its child welfare functions to the Federal Security Agency it would, of course, be up to the Federal Security Administrator to relate its welfare functions to the unified administration of welfare services provided by this bill. It is felt that the proposal of this bill will serve the best interests of children as well as adults by recognizing that the welfare needs of children must be met as a whole, not piecemeal, and by further recognizing that the welfare of children is inextricably tied up with that of the family.

Bring Congress Up to Date

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, we should all be very grateful to the La Follette-Monroney committee for the painstaking study it has made of Congress and of the ways Congress can be brought up to date. Let us hope that the recommendations of the committee will be followed up with bills and resolutions to put them into effect. Typical of the editorial commendation of the work and report of the committee is the editorial

which appeared in the Memphis Press-Scimitar of March 4, 1946, which is as follows:

BRING CONGRESS UP TO DATE

The La Follette-Monroney committee, created last year to study the organization and operation of Congress and to recommend improvements, came out today with an admirable report.

The American people have been increasingly concerned over the evident inability of Congress to play, with maximum effectiveness, its proper role in our form of government. Their concern was reflected in a flood of suggestions to the committee. To all, the committee applied this simple test: "Will they strengthen Congress and enable it to do a better job?"

Congress will gain strength and ability to do an immensely better job if it adopts the La Follette-Monroney proposals. Here are some of the changes that would be made:

The unwieldy committees with their overlappings and conflicts, would be greatly simplified. The Senate would have only 16 standing committees instead of 33; the House only 18 instead of 48. Each committee's jurisdiction would be clearly defined. Each would have a small, well-qualified staff of research experts, and no longer would have to depend on inevitably biased departments and bureaus of the executive branch for fact-and-figure information.

The legislative reference service would be enlarged and strengthened to give skilled research assistance to individual Congressmen.

Each Senator and Representative would have an able, well-paid administrative assistant to look after the errand-running and other nonlegislative work that now absorbs a huge part of the average Member's energy and time.

Congress could no longer approve appropriations without regard for Federal income. It would be required to keep the total of appropriations within anticipated revenue or, by record vote, to express itself in favor of increasing the public debt. Committee hearings on spending bills would have to be public, instead of secret, as they are now. And all Members would have longer opportunity to study appropriations before voting on them.

Congressional time would be used more effectively. A heavy burden of petty, detail work would be lifted—for instance, by giving the District of Columbia self-rule instead of requiring Congress to serve as Washington's city council.

Organized groups exerting pressure on Congress would be required to register themselves and their agents, and to report lobbying expenditures.

The $10,000 salaries of Senators and Representatives would be raised to $15,000 a year. And Members would be permitted to contribute to the Federal retirement system and become eligible to annuity payments from it after serving at least 6 years and reaching age 62.

Most Members of Congress will be enthusiastic about the proposals for higher pay, pensions, and more help for themselves. But there will be bitter opposition to other suggestions—especially those for reforming the committee systems and reducing their size. That would mean reducing the number of committee chairmen, and Senators and Representatives who have risen to these positions of power by long service do not, naturally, want to give them up. But the La Follette-Monroney report states a compelling reason:

"No adequate improvement in the organization of Congress can be undertaken or effected unless Congress first reorganizes its present obsolete and overlapping committee structure. This is the first and most important test of whether Congress is willing to strengthen itself and its organization to carry the tremendous work load that present-day governmental problems place upon it."

Housing Stabilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. VORYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am willing to vote for this so-called Patman bill in its present form, but I believe it would be far better to send it back to the committee to be reconsidered and rewritten, and shall therefore vote to have it recommitted for this purpose.

I want to do anything I can to help produce more housing at fair prices for war veterans, but I am not going to be stampeded by high-pressure propaganda into voting for measures that will produce more Government controls, more bureaucrats, more confusion, but no more houses. There has been a lot of talk about the selfish, short-sighted lobbying against certain features of the original Patman bill, but I have never seen anything to compare with the pressure and power of the lobbying in favor of certain features in the original Patman bill. We have eliminated subsidies for producers of building materials. I believe it is selfish and short-sighted for us to load part of this year's housing bill onto our children by piling it on top of the national debt. We have eliminated price ceilings on existing houses. I believe it is selfish to ask the Government to clamp down on present home owners for the benefit of would-be home owners. This is also short-sighted, for the sheer burden of attempting to fix ceilings on 29,000,000 houses, built at different times and under all sorts of conditions would create a bureaucratic mess that would make it practically impossible to buy or sell an old house.

The Patman bill now provides for a housing expediter, for maximum sale prices on new houses, for allocation, priorities, and pricing of building materials, for veterans' preference in buying and renting, for financing the construction and purchase of low-price houses at 90 percent of the appraisal value. Under efficient administration these provisions should go far in producing houses for veterans at reasonable prices. I am willing to vote for them.

On the other hand, there is nothing left of the original Patman bill except the title and part of the purpose clause; President Truman says that the heart has been taken out of the bill; his housing expert, Mr. Wyatt, says that the House has scuttled his house program. I think this bill should be sent back to the committee which considered it, so that we may find out whether the President and Mr. Wyatt were in earnest in their vicious criticism of the House action or whether they were merely preparing an advance alibi for the failure of a program they knew was unworkable. There may be mistakes and inconsistencies in the present bill, which was put together on the floor of Congress by means of amendments. I believe this bill should be rewritten in committee before it goes to the Senate. That is why I shall vote for its recommittal. On the other hand, I am willing to vote for this bill as it is rather than to make no attempt to aid in the housing situation.

Certain things, however, are clear. You cannot build a single house by passing a law. No Government administrator is going to build a single house, although he may prevent the building of many. Houses are going to be built by American contractors and workmen, and the law must be administered so as to encourage them to build. I hope, for the sake of the homeless, that this administration shows more appreciation of these fundamental truths in the future than it has to date.

I should also like to sound a note of warning to every World War II veteran. There has been so much political talk about the so-called Patman bill and housing legislation that some of it may be used to persuade veterans that they have a great opportunity, in fact, a duty to buy the homes that are offered this year. Every veteran should remember that this year he will buy a house on an inflated postwar market, and should think a long time before he ties himself down to years of payments on a home purchased under such conditions. No one has yet been able to suggest a law that will eliminate this condition. Certainly the proposed Wyatt program would not do it. Therefore, every veteran should beware of Government propaganda and real-estate salesmen's talk, and if he buys a home this year or next do it with his eyes open, remembering that Congress cannot pass a miracle and that he may be paying on his 1946 Wyatt dream house for a long, long time.

The Veteran and Surplus Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 7, 1946

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, all of us are interested in the problem of assisting veterans in procuring surplus Government materials. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a letter from Lt. Comdr. B. A. Crisman, in which he discusses the present situation, and gives several constructive suggestions for its betterment:

JANUARY 28, 1946.

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KEFAUVER: Since Congress has demonstrated a willingness to as-

sist the veterans, I thought that you would be interested in the following facts regarding difficulties of the veterans in procuring surplus Government materials.

Since my duties are involved in closing excess naval bases and facilities in the Eighth Naval District, I am often confronted by a veteran with the question of procedures for procuring surplus Government properties. Many of the ex-servicemen are becoming quite bitter with the red tape and the useless efforts they have exerted in an attempt to obtain materials for their new business. This is distressing, and is believed not to be the intention of Congress to make such materials difficult to procure.

Several reasons seem to be the cause for this as far as I can see. One of the reasons is that the veterans do not fully understand the complicated procedure to follow in order to obtain this material. The separation centers are distributing information which is believed complete and adequate regarding the buying of surplus properties. Enclosed is a copy of the instructions which are given to servicemen as they are separated at the separation center, New Orleans, La., where I am now stationed. Now you can see this is quite an awkward and complicated process.

The second reason for veterans having difficulty is that they are often directed to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which is a selling agent for surplus properties. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is interested in selling large quantities of material and, therefore, are not particularly interested in single or small quantities of items. With this policy the veteran is often ignored or given a disinterested answer to his inquiry. A particular incident of this was witnessed in Oklahoma City when a sergeant was kept waiting for an undue length of time and finally given an inadequate answer to his inquiry for purchase of surplus properties.

Another reason for difficulty in purchasing surplus materials is that information regarding the availability of material is not made public or properly advertised in order that the veteran buyer knows of its availability. Often a veteran is in the market for certain items, such as tires, automobiles, and kitchen equipment which he has not known was available for purchase until an announcement was made in the local paper regarding the sale of 900 trucks or 7 tons of tires by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to some large purchaser.

There are probably other reasons for the veteran to be discouraged in purchasing these materials, but these three seem to be the most outstanding that I witnessed.

It is believed to be of interest to Government and armed services to make these purchases easier for the veterans because the ex-servicemen are very conscious at this time of Federal Government expenditures and procedures. Many men have been in the service several years under wartime conditions when expenditure of materials, equipment, and funds were not necessarily a consideration.

It is suggested that an agency be established or that one which is already established be assigned a mission to facilitate small purchases by qualified veterans and that the procedure for such purchases be somewhat simplified. This agency should have available lists of surplus materials of all types.

A veteran should be able to approach this agency with a request for certain material. The agency would determine if he is qualified to purchase the material; then it should locate the material for him and permit personal inspection by the veteran. The surplus material should be sold at market prices or less. The object of this agency should not be to get the highest price for the materials as it is with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, but to distribute such materials as required by veterans at reasonable prices.

It is realized that the purchase of surplus material is quite a complicated procedure; however, since the veteran has been told that such material would be available to him upon his application and since many have witnessed extravagant uses of materials, particularly overseas, and during the war, they feel that their meager requirements could be satisfied if the administration of the selling agencies was efficient.

Many more urgent problems are now pressing Congress, but any consideration that can be given this situation would be appreciated by all ex-servicemen, I am sure.

It seems that I shall be required to wait until September for my release. I thank you for your prompt action on my personal problem and am assured that everything possible has been done.

Sincerely,

BRYAN A. CRISMAN.

Labor Relations in Sweden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, frequent reference is made, in discussions and books on the subject of labor relations, to the successful handling of labor relations in Sweden. The Swedish plan is often referred to as a model plan.

The American Swedish News Exchange, Inc., located at 630 Fifth Avenue, New York, issued a news letter December 17, 1945, dealing with the subject. It was reproduced, with permission, by the Associated Industries of Minneapolis in its news letter of February 21, 1945.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include it herewith because I believe it will be helpful to all who are seeking better labor relations in our own country:

LABOR RELATIONS IN SWEDEN

SYSTEMATIZED COLLECTIVE BARGAINING APPROVED BY BOTH LABOR AND MANAGEMENT

"A balance of power between employers' and workers' organizations undoubtedly constitutes a strong guaranty against misuse of the weapon of open conflict," writes Arnold Sölven, legal counsel for the Swedish Trades Union Federation. "It forces the leaders on both sides carefully to evaluate and weigh ends and means, aims and possibilities. It is indeed no sure guaranty of labor peace * * *. But through the organizational balance of power, open trials of strength in the Swedish labor market have increasingly assumed the character of ultima ratio, the last way out, only employed after all the possibilities of reaching a peaceful solution by process of negotiation and mediation are exhausted."

An equally favorable employer opinion of this bargaining system with national organizations on both sides has been noted by an American observer[1] who writes: "The great majority of Swedish employers no longer regard unions and collective contracts as necessary evils, but actually prefer them to verbal agreement with individual workers." He says he has the assurance of the leaders of the Swedish Employers' Federation on this point, also of many other persons in a position to judge the consensus of employer opinion.

COMPULSORY ARBITRATION OF LABOR DISPUTES OPPOSED

The aim both of employers and workers throughout the history of collective bargaining in Sweden has been to maintain the contractual basis and avoid compulsory government arbitration. Arnold Sölven points out, in regard to the factors leading to the formulation of the so-called basic agreement (huvudavtalet) between the employer and worker organizations, that "it was clear to the central organizations on both sides that a stiff and obstructive system of compulsory regulation was inevitable unless the contracting parties themselves took measures to render public action to assure labor peace superfluous." That was during the 1930's, when as a result of constantly increasing pressure for compulsory regulation of labor disputes, a joint management-labor committee sat for 2½ years before the basic agreement was finally arrived at. The proposals for compulsory regulation, it should be noted, were mostly of a political nature, not originating from either management or labor. Nor were they supported by parliamentary committees, the attitude generally being taken that the settlement of interest disputes[2] was a matter for negotiation between the parties concerned. Consequently the only provision in the labor relations statutes in Sweden absolutely prohibiting coercive action in the form of strike, lock-out, blockade, etc., refers to the interpretation and application of collective agreements. A special court, known as the labor court, has been set up for settling disputes of this nature, and no employers or workers bound by a collective agreement may take action to settle them on their own behalf, being liable to penalty if they do.

LABOR STATUTES MAINLY A CODIFICATION OF EXISTING PRACTICE

An interesting aspect both of the basic agreement and the legislation governing labor relations is that they represent a codification of existing practice rather than the introduction of any essentially new procedure. The provision in the collective-agreement law of 1928, for instance, prohibiting strikes and lock-outs in interpretational disputes was already included in most national agreements. Similarly, the section of the law providing that one party to an agreement may be held liable to damages by the other for evasion of responsibilities is no more than a statutory confirmation of a previous Supreme Court decision.

The setting up of the labor court, on the other hand, even though it was constituted on similar lines to the already-existing working hours court (Arbetsrädet), was in fact a new step. At first strongly opposed on the workers' side, this court has come to be accepted, albeit with reservations, by the unions, which have in fact initiated by far the largest number of cases handled by it. This seeming paradox is explained by Norgren by the fact that it is generally the employer who decides, in the first instance, how the provisions of an agreement shall be interpreted and applied. The employers, while opposed to compulsory arbitration in interest conflicts, favored mandatory adjudication of interpretational disputes. According to Norgren, they argued that under the previously existing arrangement "it was too difficult for them to get redress when the unions failed to live up to agreement obligations,

[1] Paul H. Norgren, the Swedish Collective Bargaining System. Cambridge, Mass., 1940. Harvard University Press.

[2] i. e. disputes concerning the setting of wages and conditions of work, as opposed to interpretations of contracts arrived at by collective bargaining, which come under the heading of jural disputes and as such are regulated by law.

and that the only way to insure observance was through explicit legislation, properly implemented."

After the collective-agreement law, the next statute concerning labor relations, adopted in 1935, made it obligatory to give warning of a contemplated strike or lock-out. The motivation was to avoid coercive measures that were ill-considered or due to misunderstanding. Seven days' notice have to be served to the opposite party and also the local government mediator, and the reason for the action has to be stated. According to a clause later included in the basic agreement between the employer and labor organizations, an employer has also to give warning of dismissal of a worker to the trade-union representative in the plant. The clause also provides for immediate consultation in the matter if demanded by either the employer or the union. It only applies in the case of workers who have been employed at least a year, however, and excludes workers employed for a definitely limited period.

RIGHT OF EMPLOYER TO RUN BUSINESS HIS OWN WAY RECOGNIZED

In general the right of the employer to engage and dismiss workers at his own discretion is, however, recognized both in the statutes and in worker-management agreements. Thus a provision in the basic agreement, stipulating negotiation regarding cases of dismissal if the union desires it, clearly states that in judging the case the dependence of the business on the workers' efficiency and suitability shall be taken into account, as well as the rightful interest of the workers in security of employment. It may be noted, too, that the majority of dismissal cases brought into the labor court have gone against the workers. This tendency was somewhat curbed, however, by the passing in 1936 of the law establishing the right of workers to form associations and bargain with employers. The employer's freedom to dismiss workers now only applies if it does not infringe on this right.

The law was introduced, not so much to establish this right for the manual workers, for whom it already existed contractually, as to extend it to foremen, office workers, etc., whose attempts to organize had been strongly opposed by management. This law prohibits any setting aside or limiting of the right of association, even by mutual agreement. The one exception concerns foremen: if a collective agreement includes a clause to the effect that foremen may not be members of the same union as the employees under them, the employer has the right to demand that the clause be observed.

STATUTORY PROCEDURES FOR FORCING RECALCITRANT PARTY TO NEGOTIATE

The right to bargain is secured by the provision in the law of 1936 obliging one party to negotiate at the demand of the other. A party refusing to negotiate, however, cannot be directly forced to do so. Either application must be made to the Government mediator, who will place himself at disposition if requested either by the employer or a union organization which includes at least half of the affected workers, or the appointment of a neutral chairman by the Board of Social Affairs (Socialstyrelsen) may be demanded. The latter course involves a process of registration of the union's central organization with the board, by which not only the union but also the employer are bound to observe labor peace during the negotiations. If no solution can be arrived at under a neutral chairman, an arbitration board may be set up, although without either party being obliged to accept its proposals. In case of refusal, the arbitration board's proposals may be made public at the request of one of the parties. Not until the negotiation process has thus been completed may coercive action be taken, and then only with regard to the dispute which has been the subject of the negotiations.

PUBLIC MEDIATOR REQUIRED TO INTERVENE IN BARGAINING DEADLOCKS

Public mediation in labor disputes in Sweden dates back to 1906. The present law, dividing the country into seven mediation districts, was adopted in 1920. This law makes it the duty of the public mediators to follow closely all bargaining developments within their districts and be always ready to assist in settling disputes and generally act so that work stoppages may be avoided. The mediator himself has to judge when to intervene in any dispute in order to persuade the parties to refrain from coercive action until negotiations have taken place.

The parties to the dispute are legally obliged to enter negotiations at the mediator's request, and also to produce documented proposals for solution of the matter in question. If one of the parties ignores the request pressure can be applied by the mediator reporting the case to the labor court, which has the power to force the party to negotiate by imposing fines. It should be noted, however, that the mediator may not take this step at his own initiative, but only on the request of one of the disputing parties. It may be noted further that on account of the fact that collective contracts are in force everywhere the services of the mediators are in practice mainly required toward the end of the period of the contract's validity. Agreements generally run from 1 to 2 years, with 3 months' notice of cancellation. If no such notice is given the old agreement remains in force for an additional year, or such time as may be specifically stated.

The mediation process is not obligatory. If both parties want neutral direction of their negotiations by someone other than the public mediator they can either agree on a neutral chairman or else make a joint application to the board of social affairs for the appointment of such a chairman. If they fail to arrive at an agreement under a mediator the only remaining resort is arbitration, which, however, is not a means of forcing settlement, either, unless both parties have agreed that the outcome shall be binding. Arbitration may also be resorted to in disputes over the interpretation of collective agreements, which would otherwise be brought before the labor court.

INTERPRETATIONAL DISPUTES SETTLED SPEEDILY BY LABOR COURTS

The labor court was set up in 1928 in order to provide a means of settling disputes over the interpretation of collective agreements more speedily than was possible in the ordinary courts. The section of the collective agreement law making agreements legally enforceable provided the basis of this second law, enacted simultaneously. The court may not adjudicate any interest disputes, even if both parties desired it, and further may only handle disputes concerning work contracts insofar as the contracts are regulated by collective agreement. Otherwise such cases are adjudicated by the regular courts. If, as is generally the case, negotiation in any dispute is stipulated in the collective agreement, the matter may not be brought before the labor court until it has taken place, unless it appears that negotiation has been rendered impossible by causes beyond the plaintiff's control.

The labor court consists of a chairman and six members, of whom two are nominated by the Government and two each by the employer and labor organizations. It convenes one day each week, hearing four cases. Both parties to the dispute must present their points of view in writing a week in advance, in order that the judges may acquaint themselves with the facts before the hearings, which are thus kept within the allotted time of 1 hour. Written verdicts are generally produced within 2 weeks after the hearings. A large number of the court's decisions have been unanimous, which Norgren points out may have been a reason for the changed attitude of the workers, knowing as they do in such cases, that their own representatives have concurred in verdicts which have gone against them.

LABOR PEACE DURING AGREEMENT PERIOD PRACTICALLY GUARANTEED

The aim of the law on collective agreements and the labor court is to prevent work stoppages during the period covered by agreements. Consequently the law prohibits coercive action during such period on account of disputes as to the validity or meaning of a contract, or as to whether some action is in conflict with the agreement itself or the collective agreement law. The provisions of the law may further not be nullified by collusion between the parties. The law also includes a direct prohibition against taking coercive action to bring about a change in the agreement or to affect conditions of work after the agreement has expired. Apart from this there is no provision against action to force a settlement of a pure interest dispute even during the life of an agreement; such disputes may sometimes arise if, for instance, owing to the introduction of new machinery or new methods, the basis on which piecework has been calculated is upset, and there is no stipulation in the agreement as to what shall be done in such cases.

Norgren notes in this connection that "limitations on the introduction of labor-saving machinery are almost totally absent in Swedish collective contracts; and in practice there has been little opposition to innovations by the workers." If there is any stipulation regarding such in the agreement, it generally merely states that piece rates may be changed by negotiation.

CURTAILMENT OF BARGAINING FREEDOM A THREAT TO DEMOCRACY ITSELF

Another American observer[3] quotes Sölven to the effect that interest disputes can only be avoided by removing their basic cause, namely, the opposition of economic interests between capital and labor. Sölven makes clear that "under our present economic system, the problem must be limited to the question of smoothing out this opposition as far as possible." This, and no more, is what the Swedish system for regulating labor relations tries to do.[4] The Government investigation committee which produced the famous Mammoth Report in 1935 showed that legislation to curb the unions would inevitably lead to state intervention in the whole field of business.

It was to avoid this very development that the two and a half year joint deliberations of management and labor at Saltsjöbaden, which resulted in the basic agreement, took place. Of this agreement Arnold Solven says: "It may be asserted without exaggeration that the basic agreement is epoch making in Swedish labor peace policy. * * * Events in the world have made it clear that the freedom and right of self-determination enjoyed by the two parties to the labor market in our country * * * are enjoyed exclusively by reason of the democratic form of government. Fully conscious of this, the parties have aimed at eliminating, through the agreement, any possibilities of attack on industrial freedom of action, which at the same time would constitute a threat to the democratic order."

---

[3] James J. Robbins, the Government of Labor Relations in Sweden. Chapel Hill, 1942. University of North Carolina Press.

[4] In the years 1936–38 disputes which were settled by negotiation covered respectively 99, 91, and 94 percent of the workers involved.

Statement of C. Arthur Moore, of Greenwich, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 7, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement made by a prominent citizen of the town of Greenwich, Mr. C. Arthur Moore, on the selection of Greenwich as a part of the proposed site of the permanent United Nations Organization headquarters:

When I heard the fantastic news of the UNO land grab I thought of it, naturally, as an attack on my home and the homes of my neighbors. And I decided that that point of view, while natural, was so personal that I could properly say nothing on the subject which could or would affect others.

But as the days have gone by and my mind was cleared of the mists of personal feelings, other more seriously important aspects of this matter came to me, aspects very, very serious to all Americans—aspects affecting our very form of government and the safety of every American.

The long ago disposal of the Kurile Islands to Russia, kept secret for so long, even months after the end of the Japanese war, started my train of thinking which finally brought this UNO grab into proper focus. The Kuriles were never American territory. But they were our spoils of war, won from the enemy by the lives of our enlisted men of our Army and Navy. And, though this war just ended had demonstrated they were vitally important to our national safety, they were secretly given away to the only power which could best use them against us, and given away long ago and secretly.

It was interesting that this deal on the Kuriles was made public right at the time the UNO deal came up. They are so similar in many ways. The one is a precedent for the other. The second, the UNO deal, will be another precedent for what folly and what further rape of American rights and American citizenship?

It is doubtful if the most powerful dictator in the world would have attempted to do what someone—unauthorized by any legal action of the American people—attempted to do, actually did, in the UNO matter. But it is certain that the most powerful of dictators would have had too much good sense, too much feeling of national dignity to have ever done what was attempted in the case of UNO.

Treason is a serious crime. Yet what is it, but treason, for any unauthorized servant of the American people (elected or appointed) to attempt to alienate American territory, to give American territory out of American hands into the hands of any alien authority?

Someone or some committee of Americans must have told the members of UNO that that organization could have any part of this country, in any part of this country that a committee of UNO might decide upon. Otherwise, it seems impossible that the members of UNO would have been so blatantly and bare-facedly foolish as to do what was made public in selecting the so-called Stamford area for UNO.

What other rights or property of Americans has already been secretly given away to foreign powers? What rights and properties of ours are being given away right now, in secret, or will be given away tomorrow if this UNO deal is allowed to become an accomplished fact? And how many bigger rapes of the American people will be put over with the Kuriles deal and this UNO deal as established precedents?

No equality in the world among nations is fostered by such deals as the UNO excepting the equality among all other nations in the world to move in on the United States to take what we have got. And as we at this moment appear to have far more than anyone else and everyone else wants what we have the result of the UNO grab as a precedent appears to be mighty dangerous to all of us.

There seems to be a hypocritical and sadly successful effort of publicity experts of the UNO to imply that the success of UNO depends greatly on securing the large amount of land in the selected place for the UNO site. Of course, this is completely untrue. And that it is untrue ought to be publicized as widely as the false idea that this site (or any other site) is vital to the success of UNO.

But the underlying American stupidity, if not the traitorous scheming, of Americans with other members of UNO is shown most clearly by the way the whole thing was attempted. American officials acting as Americans and with the welfare and success of UNO in mind would have, it appears to me, studied what was the minimum UNO would need as a start, adequate until the success of UNO had been demonstrated by time. This modest but adequate plan could then be fitted into many spots, free of congestion, climatically good, and not too valuable, not in any place likely to block natural growth and development of anything American.

Guests usually live in the room assigned to them by the host. And the UNO remains a guest in whatever nation they may choose to have as their permanent home. If here, as guests of the American people and not of any American official or group of officials. It is the right of the people as a whole to know what UNO needs to function, not what it demands for a good time. And it is a matter of sober and serious thought for the whole people as well as for the inhabitants of various localities as to what land and where the UNO should be asked to settle itself. Any other nation, if it had been chosen as host by the UNO, would have acted in the manner outlined above.

There is much in this UNO situation of the same stuff which has caused the unrest and dissatisfaction in our armed forces of late. Good Americans don't like to see themselves or any other Americans shoved around, particularly shoved into back seats to make place for others.

To return to the matter of possible treason contained in the UNO situation. It would be well for Americans in office, both elected and appointed, to remember that they are servants of the American people. And when they propose to give away what belongs to Americans there is an orderly, decent, and proper way to approach this delicate and dangerous task. The way the UNO matter has been handled up to date is in all ways contrary to this proper way.

Every American within and without the confines of this country is menaced by the precedent of the Kurile Islands give-away of land conquered by our men and of vital value to us; and by the precedent of the UNO attempted action in our own country. The menace is no remote and theoretical one. It is immediate, personal, real.

The way to end this menace is to return power into its proper channels, to allow the American people knowledge, full knowledge, of what is going on in way of surrendering American rights all over the world. And to do everything though the proper constitutional processes—even the making of promises confined from now on to the elected National, State, and local authorities as constitutionally set up.

The UNO has started badly. The promise of its future is not great if judged by the land-grab attempt. Certainly it shows that the democratic methods we call American and are supposed to have fought for, are not understood or comprehended in any way by UNO as it functions today. It may be a warning against UNO.

There Is No Mystery About Soviet Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 7, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dorothy Thompson:

THERE IS NO MYSTERY ABOUT SOVIET POLICY
(By Dorothy Thompson)

In Senator VANDENBERG's speech he asked, "What is Russia up to?" He asserted, "Russia is a mystery." But what the Soviet Union is up to has been increasingly clear ever since the Yalta Conference. It is up to realizing, as far as possible, its aims since the 1918 revolution: the undermining or overthrow of every other social order and unification of the world under the Red Star.

During the war we had many reasons for believing that Stalin, for the sake of enduring friendly relations between the great powers had either abandoned that aim or was prepared to leave its fulfillment to history without active assistance of the U. S. S. R. After the attack on Russia, Stalin declared his allegiance to the Atlantic Charter. The Third International was formally dissolved and the Communist parties everywhere readjusted their previous line. Mr. Litvinov, in a speech in New York, envisoned a postwar reconciliation between the Communist and capitalist worlds through mutual modifications of program.

Hopes were encouraged that the 1937 constitution would be put into real practice in Russia and the Russian peoples extended, as a reward for their unexampled sacrifices, the civil liberties which were the fruit of the Western eighteenth century revolutions. Most prognosticators anticipated a general postwar turn to the left, with forms and degrees of socialism compatible with the circumstances and majority opinion of the various countries.

Whatever suspicions the Soviets might previously have entertained were removed, we thought, by the demonstrations of utter fidelity with which Britain and the United States observed the coalition.

These, among many other things, included the immediate British rejection of the Hess mission, offering to guarantee the British Empire in return for benevolent neutrality toward a war against Russia—a reversal of the up to then Russian role; they included shipments of lend-lease with absolutely no strings attached, amounting to $9,000,000,000 or a quarter of the Soviet war budget. They included unreciprocated visits of British and American statesmen to Soviet or Soviet-occupied territory, each attended by serious wartime dangers, the last made when the Soviets were unaware of President Roosevelt's precarious state of health. They included yielding on the matter of territorial gains made by Stalin during his pact with Hitler. And they included official silence on a great number of worrisome difficulties in relations.

All questions of prestige were laid aside in an effort to dispel Soviet "distrust." However sinister the Munich pact may have

seemed to Russia, it was certainly more than canceled by the Russo-German pact, which gave the green light to Hitler for the war against the west, made the Soviets for nearly two war years Hitler's silent partners, and turned Communists in all countries fighting Hitler into defeatists and saboteurs.

But by the late winter of 1944, when it was apparent that the German Armies could not long resist, Soviet policy changed, and, after Yalta, obviously. No one not politically deaf, dumb and blind, or utterly ignorant of Soviet and comintern history, could deny the evidence.

Soviet policy, proceeding without effective opposition, was to capture and integrate into its own economic and power complex Eastern Europe from the Baltic to the Adriatic, either by annexation, Quisling governments or popular front governments without effective guaranties for the equal participation of non-Communist parties.

Soviet policy was to enter the far eastern war at the last moment and play for a dominant position in the Far East.

Soviet policy was to disintegrate western Europe, beginning with Germany, in order to lay it open to revolutionary conquest when the German and European standard of living should have fallen to a sub-Balkan level.

Soviet policy was to divide the United States from Britain by reviving the slogan of the Russo-German pact, of the war for imperialism, work for the collapse of the European far eastern empires and fall heir to their disintegrating parts.

Soviet policy was to put Russia in such a position in Iran and Turkey as to bring pressures on the Middle East to which weak governments would yield without any premature Soviet act of open aggression.

Comintern policy was to support such revision of the French constitution as would give France the weakest possible government.

Comintern policy was to agitate for the withdrawal of American and British troops from Europe and Asia.

Comintern policy was to fan every social disorder in non-Communist countries with a view to producing internal chaos.

In short, Soviet and comintern policy is revealed to be the realization of Hitler's power aim, and by all of Hitler's methods short of war; to dominate the Eastern Hemisphere, divide Great Britain, the United States, and France, and undermine their societies from within.

And every British and American agreement contributed to its "peaceful" accomplishment, preeminently the insane "peace" of Potsdam, the visit to Canossa of Secretary Byrnes after the failure of London, and the tongue-tied dismay of American journalists fearful of rocking the boat.

There is no longer any mystery about Soviet policy. The mystery is how, step by step, American and British leadership should have made decisions or interim concessions, the probable results of which should have been obvious to any logical mind.

The Forgotten Man of the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, it appears that the same forces are at work in the world today that thwarted the plans of President Wilson to establish permanent peace and fair dealing among nations. There is inserted herewith an article by L. E. Shuck which appeared in the Progressive:

(By L. E. Shuck, Jr.)

For four long years, amid great fanfare and bally-hoo, millions of Americans have ranged thousands of miles from their homes to risk their lives in a war for freedom and democracy. They entered the world-wide struggle against the ideas and aims of fascism and dictatorship with glorious phrases against imperialism, racialism, and power politics ringing in their ears.

The people who remained at home were loud and eloquent in expressing their gratitude. There was a great deal of patting on the back and much of the "(you) give 'em hell for me" routine. Many a GI was so impressed with this talk that he was leaving for a war that would root out the very causes of war that he began to feel that if he did his bit in fighting the world's ills those who stayed at home could be depended upon to do their bit when their turn would come to fight for a just and democratic peace.

But the grim fact is emerging today that the forgotten man of 1945 is the soldier who was naive enough to believe that he was risking his life on battlefields far from home for something better than the selfish interests of the major powers.

The policy-making leaders of America and the Allied Nations seem to have repudiated the lofty pledges and noble sentiments of a few years ago. Now they appear to be mostly interested in allowing our allies—Britain, Russia, France, Holland, and their satellites—to grab all the distributable assets they can lay their hands on. The accepted definition of these assets is the domination and exploitation, political and economic, of millions of peoples of all colors who lack sufficient power to resist the greedy demands of the victorious Allies.

The great tragedy to the returning serviceman—only just back from helping to break the German and Japanese stranglehold over large areas of the world—is to read almost daily in his newspaper how the arrogant Allies are fastening their grip on these same areas for equally selfish purposes. The news from Europe, from Africa, from the Dutch East Indies, and from French Indochina tells the same depressing story of imperialism.

Truly the international scene makes those of us who survived feel grateful that we did not pay the supreme sacrifice for such lowly aims as are now being carried out by our leaders.

Today our military hospitals and cemeteries are jammed with men who helped beat Germany, Japan, and Italy. But the council tables of the victors are crowded with British, Russian, and French greedily reaching out for control over smaller nations and overseas empires.

It has been especially depressing to us to watch the British and Russians wrangling for control of Europe and the seaways and gateways to empire, without any thought for the aspirations or rights of the peoples concerned. Britain, determined to preserve her empire, and Russia, determined to build one, continue to make a mockery of everything we were assured we were fighting for.

Equally important is the struggle of the nations of southeast Asia for their basic freedom, that freedom which we demanded for all. Our press tends to treat the legitimate struggle of the Annamese for freedom from French domination as if it were an unjustifiable rebellion from justly constituted authority. This revolt is being put down with lend-lease materials and, in the final analysis, with American money as well.

Remember the people of Annam and the other Indochinese states had well-developed cultures and historic governments when the French walked in during the last half of the nineteenth century and took them over at the point of the gun merely because France wanted some stolen territory to compete with the many British grabs. It seems to be accepted as a foregone conclusion by our policy formers that Indians, Burmans, and southeast Asiatics in general must remain under British, French, and Dutch domination indefinitely.

It appears not unlikely that the ideals of fascism have triumphed in the war, after all. Since the close of hostilities little but Fascist methods have been in evidence. It has slipped the minds of most people that fascism is fascism whether it is carried on in the German language or in the Russian, English, or French languages. It its tacit support of many of the most selfish demands of the other great powers, our Government is giving aid and comfort to imperialism and totalitarianism all over the world. Yet we were told, as we were sent out to kill, that we were fighting a war against those very evils.

Many of us experienced a momentary lift by the outcome of the British election. But that hope was quickly battered down. In spite of the number of supposed liberals in the new British Government, it is obvious now that their liberalism and devotion to democratic ideals extend only to the United Kingdom. Others—lesser breeds of men—are regarded by them as undeserving of liberty or of any consideration which might interfere with continued British domination of 700,000,000 colored peoples and varying large numbers of European and Arabic whites.

Although even the official propagandists could never dub despotic Russia a democracy, that nation was referred to, during the war, as a "defender of democracy." Now, in her use of her tremendous new power and prestige, she appears to be inaugurating an imperialist policy which can make the Romanovs, Napoleon II, and Disraeli appear in history as small-time real estate operators.

The energetic movements for freedom and independence of Indians, Burmese, Koreans, Indo-Chinese, and Indonesians, to mention only the better known and better organized, are waiting to be heard in their demands for something fundamental and thoroughly just as their own political and economic freedom. They are being ignored while we entertain deputations of their unwanted overlords who are virtually blackmailing us for more handouts from American taxpayers—handouts to finance a ruthless crackdown of democratic forces.

Misconceptions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to include the following article by Eleanor Roosevelt:

[From the New York World-Telegram of February 25, 1946.]

MISCONCEPTIONS

(By Eleanor Roosevelt)

HYDE PARK, Sunday.—Judging from some of the fantastic misconceptions I am getting in my mail, it seems to me that some of our people are not approaching the aftermath of war with common sense. For one thing, I should like to make it entirely clear that I never said the children of Germany were chubby. No one in Asia or war-torn Europe is chubby. I did say that while there

was hunger in Germany, as yet there was no starvation.

The thing one dreads in war-torn countries is epidemics. These are more apt to occur where the people have been on low and undesirable diets for a long time and, therefore, have had their resistance undermined. That is the case in Europe wherever Germany was the conqueror in the early days of the war and was able to siphon off the available food into Germany, leaving the conquered nations a far lower minimum of calories than Germany herself is being allowed today.

Fifteen hundred calories is not enough, but 1,500 calories a day for a year or two is better than less than 1,000 calories for 4 or 5 years. The record will show that the German occupation in many cases meant less than 1,000 calories a day and that babies did die of starvation in the Allied countries.

It is true that people all over Europe, young and old, are dying perhaps more rapidly than they would have had there been no war, and I hope that a visit to Germany or any other country will make anyone conscious of the absolute necessity of working for the UNO and making it the people's instrument for peace.

Throughout most of Europe, from all I was able to learn, people living in the country are better off than those living in cities. That is true of people living in other nations during the war as it is true today in Germany. Because of the early bombing of Berlin, poor people in that city probably were hungry for 2 years before the final defeat of the Germans.

The people in other German cities fared better. Nevertheless—and I want to repeat what I said—as far as one can see, the children even of Berlin look no worse off than the children of Great Britain, who have been on a reasonably good, but extremely restricted, diet ever since Germany began the war.

Wherever the Japs have passed, starvation is staring people in the face, as it is in India. That is partly because of the narrow margin on which the people lived anyway. Whether we can keep a great number of people from dying of starvation, I do not think is yet known. It can only be done by coordination of all available food supplies in the world, and by careful direction of shipping and distribution.

I think we should be willing to do all we possibly can to prevent famine anywhere. But when people talk about feeding Germany better at the present time, yet do not seem to be concerned about giving our allies in Europe a better diet first, I think they have lost their sense of justice and have become hysterical and therefore unable to act in a common-sense fashion.

The Bomb and the Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include a statement by Henry L. Stimson, former Secretary of War who, with Franklin D. Roosevelt, carried us through those years of greatest national danger. The statement is on atomic energy and the position it holds on the Council of Nations:

THE BOMB AND THE OPPORTUNITY

(By Henry L. Stimson)

The advent of the atomic bomb has created a profound impression in all quarters of the globe. Bidden or unbidden, the atomic bomb sits in on all the councils of nations; in its light all other problems of international relations are dwarfed. This is so not because these other problems are no longer important in themselves, but because the question of the control of the atomic bomb towers above all else. No other problem has been so constantly in my thoughts as this one.

If the atomic bomb were merely another—though more devastating—military weapon, which could be assimilated into the customary pattern of international relations, conceivably we could then follow the old pattern of secrecy and sole reliance upon national military superiority, and depend upon international caution to stay the future use of the weapon. But, to my view, the recent unlocking of atomic energy constitutes a first step—and only a first step—in a new control by man over the primal forces of nature too revolutionary and dangerous to fit into the old patterns. The military application of this discovery underscores most sharply the divergence between man's growing technical power for destructiveness and his psychological power of self-control and group control—his moral power. If this is so, how this problem is approached in the sphere of the relations among the nations is a question of the most vital importance in the evolution of human progress.

The chief lesson I have learned in a long life is that the only way to make a man trustworthy is to trust him; and the surest way to make him untrustworthy is to distrust him and show your distrust. And it is from this lesson that I draw the conviction that only a direct and open dealing with other nations on this, the most pressing problem of our time, can bring us enduring cooperation and an effective community of purpose among the nations of the earth. It is the first step on the path of unreserved cooperation among nations which is the most important. Once the course of national conviction and action is set in this direction by the example of the major powers of the world, petty differences will be recognized for what they are, and the way toward a real fraternity of nations will be open.

We must not delay. The poisons of the past are persistent and cannot be purged by timid treatment. By its sole possession of the bomb, at least for the present, the United States finds itself in a position of world leadership. But this solitary possession is most certainly very transient. It must recognize this and act swiftly. It must take the lead by holding out an open hand to other nations in a spirit of genuine trust and with a real desire for a thorough-going cooperative effort in meeting and solving this problem. Truly this is a time for greatness of heart and of purpose, and unless we demonstrate these qualities now other nations cannot be expected to do so.

The development of atomic energy holds great, but as yet unexploited, promise for the well-being of civilization. Whether this promise will be realized depends on whether the danger of swift and unprecedented destruction can be removed from the earth. Whether it is removed depends on whether we and other nations move firmly, quickly, and with frank transparency of purpose toward the goal of uniting all men of good will against the appalling threat to man's very existence. The focus of the problem does not lie in the atom; it resides in the hearts of men.

Justice for Greece in Peace Treaties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Sumner Welles:

JUSTICE FOR GREECE IN PEACE TREATIES URGED

(By Sumner Welles, former Under Secretary of State)

The deputies of the Foreign Ministers in London continue to debate the peace settlements to be taken up at the Paris Peace Conference scheduled for May. They have made little progress. The peace conference may have to be postponed.

But, so long as these discussions continue, the full influence of the United States should be exerted to make sure that when the final settlements are reached, justice is done to Greece. The peace treaties with Italy and with Bulgaria involve the vital interests of the Greek people. The frontiers to be fixed for Yugoslavia and for Albania will help to decide whether Greece will be protected from future aggressions.

The Greeks underwent 5 years of bitter suffering in their struggle against the Axis. It is tragic that after their liberation Greece should have become an arena for a contest between Soviet and British interests. All of the efforts of the Greeks to begin political and economic reconstruction have been blocked by this contest. It has encouraged civil war.

Whatever the political complexion of the government which is installed as a result of the approaching national elections, it is the obligation of all the major powers to assure the Greek people that when the peace treaties are written their claims to equitable treatment will not be overlooked.

No nation of Europe waged a more gallant fight against the Axis. American public opinion has not forgotten that when the Fascists treacherously attacked Greece in 1940, it was the unfaltering courage of the Greek people which drove the Italian invaders back beyond their frontiers.

Hitler was forced to divert many of the divisions which he had intended to use against the Soviet Union in order to subdue Greece. Greek resistance thus rendered a signal service to the Russian people. But the greatest service of the Greeks was when, in the most critical moment of the war, in the spring of 1941, supported only by a small expeditionary British force, they blocked for a few weeks the German advance to the south so that Hitler's plan rapidly to pass through Syria and Iraq to the Persian Gulf could not be carried out in time.

Had Hitler been able to reach Syria before the Iraq revolt had been put down by the British, the Germans and Japanese could have joined hands in the Persian Gulf; Suez and Egypt would have been cut off. The whole course of the Second World War might well have changed.

As a consequence of her resistance, Greece is economically prostrate. Dependent, if minimum living standards are to be maintained, upon her shipping and her export trade, Greece lost during the war 65 percent of her ocean-going freighters, and all of her coastwise shipping. The task of rehabilitation which the Greeks confront is staggering.

The Near East has become the scene of an increasing conflict of interest between the Soviet Union, bent upon an expansion of her

influence over that area, and the Western powers, which are determined to keep open to all nations the channels of communication through the eastern Mediterranean, the Suez Canal, and the Red Sea.

A peace treaty which gives the people of Greece a maximum assurance of security would constitute a bulwark for a free and stable order in the eastern Mediterranean.

The Greek people desire fair reparations for the damage done them by the Axis Powers.

They seek in addition three territorial adjustments.

The peace treaty with Italy will decide the future sovereignty of the Dodecanese Islands, in the eastern Mediterranean. The 150,000 inhabitants of these islands are in their vast majority, Greek—in origin, in language and customs, and in aspiration. United with Greece by their own demand in 1821 the great powers returned them to Turkish domination a few years later. As an outcome of the Italian-Turkish War in 1912, Italy seized the islands from Turkey. She remained in control of them until recently.

At the close of the First World War the Italian Government agreed to cede the islands to Greece. This agreement was never carried out. The present democratic leaders of Italy, almost without exception, recognize the right of Greece to obtain permanent sovereignty over the Dodecanese.

Recently the Soviet Government has refused to commit itself as to the ultimate disposition of the islands. It is reported determined to demand that an international trusteeship be established over them under Soviet administration. The control of these islands by any major power would be a potential threat to freedom of communications.

For reasons of international security, as well as for reasons of equity, the Greeks of the Dodecanese should be restored to Greek sovereignty.

The other two territorial adjustments demanded by Greece require rectifications of her frontiers with Albania and with Bulgaria.

In the first instance, ethnic considerations as well as reasons of security warrant such a change. In the second instance, where only a very minor rectification is sought, the security of northern Greece is involved. Neither demand can be legitimately denied.

Some of these territorial adjustments were urged in a resolution adopted by the United States Senate in 1920. A similar resolution is pending before the United States Senate today. It should be approved.

The question, as it affects the American people, is not merely one of gratitude to the people of Greece. They fought gallantly. But they were fighting in defense of their liberty and for a world in which they could live in safety and in freedom. They were fighting for the same reasons for which the American people were fighting.

The real reason—a question which directly affects the interests of the United States—is what peace settlements for Greece will be most likely to make for that kind of world order which both Americans and Greeks wish to see established.

Resolution of United Benefit Societies, of Cleveland, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1946

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include a resolution adopted on March 3 by the United Benefit Societies at a meeting held in Cleveland, Ohio:

Whereas we, American citizens of German extraction from Hungary, Rumania, and Yugoslavia, have been and are true and loyal to our country, the United States of America, and during the war have contributed so much to our victory with our work and skill; and

Whereas thousands of the younger ones have served in our armed forces and many of them had to offer the highest sacrifices for our country; and

Whereas we men and women have blood relatives in those countries, Hungary, Rumania, and Yugoslavia; and

Whereas we have read in our American press and many of us have received personal letters informing us that the Russian Government, the Rumanian Government, the Yugoslavian and Hungarian Governments have ordered and already executed the forced evacuations of thousands of our relatives and friends and put in labor camps; and

Whereas it is only human that our hearts go out to those unfortunate men, women, and children: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, American citizens and members (75,000) of the United Benefit Societies and having residence in the Twentieth, Twenty-first, and Twenty-second Congressional Districts of Ohio, in a public meeting held on the 3d day of March 1946 in the Banater Hall in the city of Cleveland, Ohio, do hereby respectfully request the President of the United States and the Secretary of State of the United States to enter an immediate and vigorous protest with the Russian, Rumanian, Yugoslavian, and Hungarian Governments and other concerned governments against the forced evacuation and the placing of any peoples into labor camps or other forced concentrations; and, further, to cause open communications to be established immediately and reopen service for the transmission of private and public aid to such peoples; and, further, to cause the immediate return of said peoples to their former homes and communities with the guaranty of their political freedom as well as reestablishment of their homes and communities by the concerned governments, including financial aid in payment for their destroyed possessions and any damages caused by their displacement.

John Fischer, President; Fred Teschner, Secretary; Karl Schmidt, Pete Sodlon, Stephen Halber, Anton Zellich, Peter Straky, Elizabeth Dietes, Adam Schneer, Executive Committee.

Crucial Importance of Small Investors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address which I delivered before a free-enterprise forum of the Investors League at Buffalo, N. Y., on February 28, 1946. I ask that following my address, there be printed a series of three illuminating articles by Mr. Thomas Furlong which were printed in the Chicago Tribune of February 25, 26, and 27. These articles substantiate the theme of my address, namely, the crucial importance of the small investors to our American system of private enterprise. When we protect the interests of the 15,000,000 small investors of America, when we encourage them and others to invest wisely and soundly, we advance our system of private enterprise.

There being no objection, the address and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE INVESTOR: KEY MAN TO AMERICAN INDUSTRY

It is truly a pleasure and an honor to address this forum, devoted as it is to one of the most vital of all issues on the American scene. That issue is, of course, free enterprise versus shackled enterprise; or, expressed in other terms "private ownership versus public ownership," or "individualism versus collectivisim," or "the American way versus the alien way."

These are not just words or meaningless generalities. This is a real issue, a burning issue, an issue worthy of our mightiest endeavor on behalf of freedom and against our beloved America taking the road to serfdom.

It is particularly appropriate that we here take our stand on behalf of free enterprise in this great industrial city of Buffalo, this city of many races and creeds and colors blended as one into the American pattern, this city which furnished so vast a proportion of the sinews of war and thus enabled us to keep America free.

THE INVESTOR'S LEAGUE AND ITS VITAL WORK

Yes, it is more than appropriate that it is the Investor's League, led by your distinguished president, Dr. B. C. Forbes, which sponsors this forum. I have followed with interest and admiration the series of stimulating forums already held and planned in the future by your league.

Yours is an inspiring challenge: to protect and advance the interests of the American investor and in so doing, to protect and advance the American way—the way of political, economic, and social health and freedom.

Yes, I am certain that you will prove adequate to that challenge. You have met here in order to gain new strength and information for your crucial work. You have entered into this forum to get a healthy "shot in the arm," the kind we all need. It is the kind we need, particularly at times when not our confidence and belief in the American way but the confidence of some may wane a bit. Why does their confidence wane? It wanes because the American mind has been assaulted from every side by synthetic collectivist thinking.

I am certain, however, that your confidence in the American way, the investor's way, the free way is still very high. You may ask me why I am so confident? It is because I am talking to leaders, to men and women in the forefront of the battle for free enterprise in their community, to men and women battling to keep America American. I am talking to men and women who recognize that we of this generation are but the trustees of the great values bequeathed to us, and which we must pass on to future generations vital and unimpaired.

AMERICANS WORK OUT THEIR OWN SALVATION

On uplifting and challenging occasions such as this, I am often reminded of a story about man working out his own salvation.

"There was an old colored man named Mose who, during the depression, had no home to go to. He wandered up and down the highways and byways of the Southland. He had no worldly possessions, only a singing heart. He was a real singing Sam, but he had no place to rest his head. Once there was a white man like that. He was called Jesus of Nazareth, and of Him it was said, 'He was so poor that He had no place to lay his head.'

"This colored man roamed up and down the Southland. One day he was told, 'Mose, you can go up there in that half-acre lot. There is an old shack there that you can live in.' Mose went there, and he found that the shack was in very bad condition.

"The windows were broken, the shutters were about ready to fall off, the doors were falling off their hinges, and the roof was caved in. The half-acre lot was filled with weeds, stones, and poison ivy.

"But Mose went to work. By the next spring, Mose had fixed up the little shack. He had put the doors back on the hinges; he had repaired the windows and the roof, and he had painted the little building. Roses were climbing over it. Out in the half-acre lot the weeds and rocks were gone. Flowers were blooming there. Just about then the old colored parson came by. He said, 'Mose, you and the Lord is sure done a good job here.' Mose replied, 'Parson, you should have seen it when the Lord had it alone.' "

Mose didn't brood over the situation; no more should we. He had work to do; so have we.

Now, my fellow citizens, the meaning of this little story is clear. It is that every one of us must work out our own salvation in our own way, seeking divine guidance, but using our own brains and brawn, our own initiative, our own God-given talents, to handle our own problems, fearlessly. So, too, everyone of us, individually and collectively, must help work out the salvation of America—fearessly.

This means eradicating the weeds of communism, the rocks of loose thinking, the clutching vines of class hatred and intolerance, self-pity, and resentment.

You remember the words of Dante: "Give light and the people will find their own way."

He meant light—truth, not synthetic thinking. That is what we are seeking here today—light, truth. That is what all of mankind is seeking in this complex, atomic age with its startling discoveries and rapid changes.

THE INVESTOR'S KEY ROLE

There are few, if any, more important roles to be played in the continual growth and progress of our dear country than that of the American investor. Why? Because it is the investor who provides the financial means for private enterprise to continue to expand so that our people may have an ever and ever higher standard of living.

But before we go any further, let us see what this system is.

The system of private enterprise is a system of human relations where all men are free to work at tasks of their own choice, to invest their resources at their own discretion, and to enjoy the fruits of their labor and of their investment.

Free labor and free investment are two sides of the same coin. You cannot have one without the other. You cannot destroy freedom of labor without destroying freedom of investment. A system where men would be assigned to work by the Government or by unions, where men could not accumulate savings, where they could not invest those savings, where their investments were not protected but were instead confiscated and without due process of law—this would not be a free system. You and I need but look to Europe today to observe how these conditions exist in countless countries.

THE MEANING OF "INVESTOR"

Now, when we speak of investors we mean both material and spiritual investors.

By material investors we mean those who have invested in homes, in stores, in small and big businesses, in tools of their trade—the dentist's and doctor's equipment, the carpenter's tool kit. These men and women are sustainers, builders, creators of jobs and of wealth.

Of course, the most obvious example of material investors are the 85,000,000 holders of United States war bonds, the 70,000,000 holders of life-insurance policies, the 40,000,000 bank depositors, the fifteen and more million stockholders and bondholders.

We know how crucial these financial investments have been to our country. We know how the purchase of war bonds enabled our Government to finance the war program, how private life insurance policies insure the security of our people, how bank deposits prove so vital in times of personal emergency and, too, when things run smoothly.

We are also aware of the indispensable role of the stockholders and bondholders. It is they who have made our system of small and large businesses possible. It is they who have enabled America to be technologically head and shoulders above all the rest of the world combined.

Statisticians have estimated that it takes an average of $7,000 of capital investment to create a single industrial job today. Without that $7,000, the job cannot be created nor continued. Every year there is an addition of 700,000 new workers to our labor force. That means that there must be an investment of $7,000 times 700,000 workers or about $5,000,000,000 in investment capital simply to provide jobs for new workers.

Where does that capital come from? From the great mass of small investors, the men of industry, of thrift, of vision.

It is these small investors, 425,000 of them, who hold stock in the great General Motors concern; 700,000 of them hold stock in the American Telephone and Telegraph Co.; 270,000 hold stock in the Radio Corp. of America.

When we speak of these corporations, we must think of the investors in them, just as we must think of their labor and their management. The investor, the laborer, the manager, these are the three pillars of our industrial structure. Each must be free of termites, of wreckers. Each must be free to make its greatest contribution to the whole. Each must work as a teammate with the others.

THE INVESTORIC AGE

For too long has the role of one of the vital members of this team—the investor—been ignored and misrepresented. Actually, as I have indicated, the investor, by making his savings available to management, has become a key man to American industry. So true is this that your able forum director, Mr. William Jackman, has called ours an "investoric system."

This is indeed an investoric age, an age when it is absolutely necessary that great masses of men and women be encouraged to invest soundly and wisely so as to expand and develop our complex system.

Since 1870, over 15 million new jobs have been created in 15 major industries brought about by new inventions. Had investment money not been available to stimulate the development of these inventions, the auto industry, the aircraft industry, plastics, electronics, and so on would not have developed to their present advanced stages.

It was the industry, the inventive genius and accumulated savings of our forbears which in the brief span of 150 years have brought us the highest standard of living in the world.

Even before the war, America, with only 7 percent of the world's population and 6 percent of the world's land surface possessed 71 percent of the world's autos, 59 percent of the world's telephones, 52 percent of the radio sets, 31 percent of the railroad mileage.

Our entertainment and recreation facilities, our educational system, our health surpass those of any power on earth.

THE TERRIBLE ALTERNATIVE OF COLLECTIVISM

And yet, there are those in our midst—collectivists in word and deed—who would divide our house, who would tear down our industrial structure, who would make investments insecure and then confiscate those investments, who would replace our way of life with the slavery of bygone days and of today. We call that slavery stateism or collectivism or communism.

The alien way is apparent in Russia today in its economic system, in its political system, in its utter disregard of what we call the democratic way—the way of the Bill of Rights. We know that Russia has experienced centuries of submerged thinking and living—the past of the czars and the revolution. But before any American should be persuaded by the glib tongues of those who think that the Russian way should be exchanged for the American way, we should see what that way is.

Private property there is the exception. Her farmers are as serfs on their collective farms. Labor is regimented like soldiers. She has practically no middle class.

Many of the Russian people may be happy. They did a great job in this war. But they do not know freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of religion, freedom of assembly, trial by a jury of their peers. With our background, we could not be happy without those freedoms.

How could any clear-thinking, fair-minded man or woman be willing to trade our way of life for Russia's, our freedom for her slavery?

THE MENACE OF COLLECTIVISM HERE

And yet there are considerable numbers of vicious-minded or misguided individuals who would lead our beloved land down the road to serfdom.

It is these collectivists in our midst who seek to poison our minds against the investoric system. They picture the investor as a worthless parasite, as a bloated plutocrat. They try to smear the builders, the creators of wealth—men like the Fords and Rockefellers—and make them appear as enemies of Main Street.

They try to create a landless, homeless, rootless so-called proletariat—a mob of wreckers who would tear down our society.

We must antidote this collectivist poison. You ladies and gentlemen, through your national organization, your publications, your forums, your industrious Washington representative, Mr. Nathan J. Paulson, you have a genuine article to sell in this investoric system—this American system. You have a job on your hands to bring light, to bring truth, so as to dispel ignorance and misunderstanding.

You have a righteous cause in upholding the investor—keyman for industry, for prosperity—man of thrift, of initiative, of vision—the farmer, the small and big businessman, the professional.

You have a right to prove that Wall Street and its exchanges, wisely and soundly administered, are the friends of Main Street and are absolutely dependent on Main Street.

You have the right to uphold as an ideal not the so-called rootless proletariat but the homeowner, the small and big businessman, the stockholder, the bondholder—men and women with roots, with stability.

THE SIGNS OF COLLECTIVISM HERE

Your challenge is an inspiring one, and it is not an easy one. Already, there are many signs of collectivism contesting our way of life. One sympton I have already cited—the poisoned propaganda against investors. But there are also deeds and conditions which would undermine the position of investors and thus undermine our system. I will name six of these "wrecking" conditions:

1. The unbalanced budget: With Government deficit financing blowing up the national debt balloon—now almost $300,000,000,000—until it bursts and inflation results. Then the collectivists expect to pay

off the debt with worthless currency, although such payments would ruin our people.

2. An octopus bureaucracy with a stranglehold on agriculture and business, sending out arbitrary orders, nuisance questionnaires and incomprehensible directions. I wish that you could be in my office for one or two days to hear the factual stories of the small and large businessmen who write, wire and call me about bureaucratic maladministration which is holding back production.

3. Government competition with private enterprise: We need only to look around us to see how Government today has invaded innumerable sphere of private enterprise and is apparently seeking to drive private enterprise to the wall—in utilities, in lending functions, and in many others.

4. A throttling tax system which punishes initiative instead of encouraging it, which deprives men of the fruits of their labor and of their investment.

5. A despotic centralization of authority which, through the bait of money, takes away from our States and localities, functions which are rightfully theirs, which discourages them from solving their local problems at their local level, which sends them running to the Federal Treasury for more and more handouts.

6. The rule by a segment of our population: Racketeering labor bosses who dictatorially command what amount to field armies of men. These bosses can order strikes which can paralyze our Nation, which can lay us open helpless to atomic and rocket invasion. These bosses can levy tribute upon the consumer, upon management, upon labor itself.

THE COUNTERATTACK AGAINST COLLECTIVISM

Yes, these are six condition which warn us of worse conditions to come, ending finally in stateism, in a situation where there are no economic, political, or social checks and balances but where power is centralized, unopposed and capable of going to any excess. And let me say, my fellow Amtrcans, that this system of checks and balances, this system of three separate branches of Government, of big and little business, of investor, laborer, and manager is the very woof and warp of our American way of life.

Well, how are we going to preserve this system? How are we going to counterattack collectivism?

Let me suggest six ways. Other ways will ccour to you, I am sure:

1. We must balance the Budget and make the Federal Government live within its means. We must reduce the national debt and demobilize useless agencies and jobholders.

2. We must get rid of those in Goverment who are activated by a master complex, who do not recognize their function as public servants, who do not recognize public office as a public truso, who do not believe in the system of private profit and private enterprise. Get Government out of the "red" and the Reds out of Government.

3. We must get Government out of spheres which rightfully belong in the hands of private enterprise.

4. We must set up a tax system that is simple, clear-cut, and follows plans of justice and equity.

5. We must encourage local initiative and local self-reliance, rather than dependence upon the Federal Government.

6. We must curb the racketeer in labor just as we must curb any racketeers in management. We must provide for the responsibility of unions before the law, for publicized union finances, for democratic union elections. We must prohibit strikes in utilities and nation-wide industries and provide for compulsory arbitration as a last resort to prevent strikes and to insure continuous production.

This country belong to all of us—to the general public. It does not belong to this segment or that segment but to all segments—the working, saving, investing public.

CLEARING UP BASIC TERMS

I know that a collectivist hearing my views and recommendations might falsely denounce them as "reactionary." I do not want to bandy terms about, but I say that it is the collectivists who are the reactionaries. It is they who would turn the clock back. It is they who would return us to the dark ages of slavery, who would force us back to the days before there was a constitution, a bill of rights, a system of checks and balances.

I, for one, seek to conserve the best that is in America, to conserve our investoric system, to conserve our unsurpassed standard of living, our constitutional way of life—protection for all American rights. I want progress in the American way. If that makes me a conservative, then I am one.

There are too many folks about who are mistakingly called liberals who are liberal only with other people's money, who are prodigal with other people's resources and other people's liberties.

Their program is "Tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect"—not the American program—That is an alien program.

Your program, on the other hand, to encourage prudent investment, to safeguard such investment, to get full production is an American program.

SPIRITUAL INVESTMENT

My fellow citizens, we have seen that the investor is a keyman for American prosperity. We have seen the ways in which our investoric system may be developed.

But at an earlier point I referred also to spiritual investors, and to the old colored man, Mose, who worked out his problem.

I feel I would be remiss if I did not emphasize as my concluding theme the importance of spiritual investment.

You and I know that money and material values are but means to an end, not ends in themselves. Man must not make money a fetish. An individual in our great land may accumulate much wordly possessions by dint of ingenuity and industry. But he can't take those possessions with him. There are no pockets in a shroud.

While he is here on earth, his wealth gives him added responsibility to use it wisely—with discretion and judgment. It is his responsibility to help bring light to other men. "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall set you free." It is confusion, ignorance and darkness, which make wreckers of men. Truth antidotes these evils by begetting poise and judgment.

The material investors of America have the responsibility of wise spiritual investment. "Man does not live by bread alone." In this great land, we do not count only our material blessings. Far from it, we reckon our spiritual blessings as the supreme blessings. These are the blessings that give us that inner glow of a job well done, that inner glow of growth and fruition.

But just how may we invest spiritually? May I cite three ways? They are the ways of the great, humble man whose birthday we celebrated earlier this month—Abraham Lincoln. They were the ways, too, of the Father of our Country—George Washington.

Lincoln, in particular, the lowly backwoodsman, the humble rail splitter, invested spiritually in faith in God and the common man, in love of the Republic, in humor.

His faith moved mountains. His faith was the substance—mark you, the substance—of things hoped for, the evidence of things unseen. His was the kind of faith that prompted an old darky to say: "Lord, there ain't nothing that you and me can't handle."

Lincoln's love of the Republic, of its freedom, its opportunities, its checks and balances was another investment that could never fall in value.

So, too, was his humor, his use of mirth—of a wholesome yarn, to refresh men, to release their taut nerves so they could work out their problems.

You and I can invest, too, spiritually—restoring, strengthening, and broadening the spiritual foundations of the Republic. You and I can hold unlimited shares of preferred stock in faith, in humor, in love of the Republic. You and I can help make the home, the school, and the church still stronger foundations of the Republic.

CONCLUSION

My fellow Americans, I have stated that yours is a great challenge—a gallant challenge—to bring light so that our fellow citizens will understand the job of the investors of America.

I conclude with this thought: You, ladies and gentlemen, leaders, trail blazers, will rise to that challenge.

You will be adequate. Of this I am certain. You will be adequate.

[From the Chicago Tribune of February 25, 1946]

BIG UNITED STATES FIRMS ARE OWNED BY SMALL HOLDERS

(By Thomas Furlong)

A majority of shareholders in American corporations are small investors. This is clearly established by examination of the ownership records of individual companies and more extensive surveys by the Securities and Exchange Commission and other agencies.

There are 13,810,000 separate shareholdings in 1,710 widely owned enterprises according to data compiled by the Securities and Exchange Commission. A break-down of these holdings showed that a little more than half of them had a value of $500 or less. Less than a tenth of them represented holdings valued at more than $5,000.

LIST HOLDINGS BY SIZE

The distribution of the holdings by the size of investment is detailed in the following table:

Value of individual holding based on 1937 market prices

	Shareholdings	
	Number	*Percent*
Up to $500	7,505,456	54.4
$501 to $1,000	2,061,244	14.9
$1,001 to $5,000	3,066,092	22.2
$5,001 to $10,000	613,490	4.4
Over $10,000	563,638	4.1
Total	13,809,638	100.0

The study was limited to corporations with securities listed on national exchanges.

There are 26,000,000 shareholders in the 473,000 active corporations doing business in the country. Because investors, on the average, own stock in three different corporations the SEC estimated that the actual number of shareholders is between 8 and 9 million.

DATA ON STOCKS' VALUE

Data were also compiled on the aggregate value of stocks owned by investors in the different brackets. This information for the 1,710 companies follows:

Value of individual holding

[000 omitted]

	Aggregate investment of group	*Percent*
Up to $500	$2,012,185	4.8
$501 to $1,000	1,552,604	3.7
$1,001 to $5,000	7,321,986	17.4
$5,001 to $10,000	4,619,353	10.9
Over $10,000	26,685,404	63.2
Total	42,191,532	100.0

Superficially, the foregoing figures bear out the claim that ownership of American cor-

porations is concentrated in the hands of relatively few individuals. The table shows, for example, that 4.1 percent of the shareholders own more than 63 percent of the stock in the companies studied.

HELD IN NAME OF COMPANIES

The majority of the holdings of common stock of 1,000 or more shares, however, were owned not by wealthy individuals, but were held in the names of charitable and educational institutions, investing companies, life insurance companies, banks and brokers and their nominees. Although registered in a few names the beneficial owners of these large blocks of stock are individual investors, insurance policyholders, estate beneficiaries, and others.

It was found, for example, that the largest single shareholder in 12 large corporations was the New York Life Insurance Co., one of the largest of the mutual companies whose affairs are controlled by policyholders. Prudential Life was the largest holder in 7 corporations, Sun Life of Canada in 7, Metropolitan in 10, and Equitable Life in 3. One large brokerage firm was the biggest single holder in five corporations, another the biggest holder in three. The brokers, of course, although the holders of record, were merely nominees for the actual owners.

[From the Chicago Tribune of February 26, 1946]

SMALL EARNERS GET BULK OF PROFITS IN UNITED STATES

(By Thomas Furlong)

Individuals with net income of less than $5,000 a year received two-thirds of all business profits reported in Federal income-tax returns by individuals.

The same income class received 30 percent of all dividend payments made by corporations to individuals and about one-quarter of all profits accruing to partnerships.

DEPEND ON BUSINESS, FARMS

These facts are drawn from the mass of statistical data compiled by the Treasury Department from information reported in tax returns. A third of all persons paying Federal income taxes depend for income, in whole or in part, on the profits of industrial business or farming enterprises.

The economic interest of this large group, conservatively estimated at 15,000,000 persons, is adversely affected by any Government action that seeks to redivide the country's production pie. If wages are raised without compensating price increases profits are curtailed. If both wages and prices are advanced profits may hold up, but an economic squeeze is applied to those who depend on fixed-income investments such as annuities, proceeds of life insurance, bonds, and rents.

LIST INCOMES OF 1942

Income from dividends and business profits received by individuals in different income brackets for 1942 (latest year available) is shown in the following table:

Net income classes	Business profits	Dividends
Under $5,000	$6,174,049,000	$859,076,000
$5,000 to $10,000	1,306,310,000	378,133,000
$10,000 to $25,000	1,002,347,000	548,913,000
$25,000 to $50,000	372,527,000	387,514,000
$50,000 to $100,000	201,385,000	293,145,000
$100,000 to $150,000	68,273,000	112,132,000
$150,000 to $300,000	64,514,000	106,077,000
$300,000 to $500,000	27,367,000	43,155,000
$500,000 to $1,000,000	20,963,000	47,215,000
$1,000,000 and over	14,560,000	33,233,000
Returns with no net income	23,468,000	23,928,000
Total	9,275,761,000	2,832,521,000

The foregoing tabulations are based on about 20½ million returns made in 1942 on tax form 1040. It is not complete because it omits dividends and business profits reported on form 1040A [optional for use by individuals with incomes up to $3,000]. If the latter returns were included, the aggregate dividend payments and business profits received by those with less than $5,000 net income would be somewhat increased.

TOTAL INCOME EIGHTY-SIX BILLIONS

Total income reported in 1942 by all individuals was $86,000,000,000, of which sixty-five and one-half billions was from salaries and other compensation. Of the other twenty and one-half billions, business profits and dividends accounted for about 62 percent.

Another important source of nonsalary income was partnership profits which aggregated $3,478,000,000. Of this total, eight hundred and ninety-one millions were reported in the returns of persons with net income of less than $5,000. More than two-thirds of the income reported from rents and royalties and from annuities was received by taxpayers reporting less than $5,000 of net income. A similar pattern was shown for income from dividends in Federal savings and loan associations.

[From the Chicago Tribune of February 27, 1946]

BIG BUSINESS: WHO OWNS IT? HERE'S ANSWER

(By Thomas Furlong)

The American Telephone & Telegraph Co. offers one of the best illustrations of the character and distribution of ownership in American corporate enterprise. There are 684,000 owners of American Telephone stock, one of the highest priced issues traded on the New York Stock Exchange. The company is one of the 20 large American corporations with more than 100,000 owners each.

The most recent figures reported by the company disclose that 518,000 of the stockholders own less than 25 shares each. More than 200,000 own less than 5 shares each. Holders of 100 shares or more, who own 47 percent of the total stock, number 39,000. Included in the holdings of more than 100 shares are 825 holdings of more than 1,000 shares, which constitute 15 percent of the total stock. There is a total of 19,750,000 shares.

BIG HOLDINGS BENEFIT MANY

As is true of other large corporations, a majority of the holders of 1,000 or more shares are not individuals but investment trusts, insurance companies, brokers, banks, and other fiduciaries. The company estimates that the beneficial owners of these holdings number considerably more than 3,000,000 persons.

Of particular interest is the fact that more women are registered owners of the stock than men. The company gives the following classification of its stockholders:

Men	184,000
Women	376,000
Joint accounts	82,000
Others	42,000
Total	684,000

Other facts disclosed by the company are:

There are 32,000 trust accounts that hold stock with a par value of $190,000,000.

Among the registered owners are 6,800 institutions, corporations, and private firms. Included in this group are many religious organizations, schools, colleges, hospitals, and other nonprofit institutions.

Of the present stockholders, more than half have owned their shares for more than 10 years; another 120,000 for more than 5 years.

FIFTY-FIVE THOUSAND EMPLOYEES OWN STOCK

Stock is owned by 55,000 employees of the company.

The largest holding by an individual is less than one-half of 1 percent of the total stock.

Stock ownership is widely distributed geographically. In no State are there fewer than 400 shareholders; in 6 States there are 40,000 or more holders; in 17 States there are between 5,000 and 40,000 holders.

The company reports that it has no exact information on the age and economic status of its shareholders. It expresses the opinion that a large number of the holders are elderly persons and that as a group they represent no stratified segment of the population. Like the stockholders in other company, the list "includes all classes of people who have shared the incentive to save and invest," says a company publication.

ASSETS TOTAL SIX AND THREE-QUARTERS BILLIONS

With assets which total $6,750,000,000, American Telephone is the largest nonfinancial corporate enterprise in the country, and its stock is more widely owned than any other concern. The ownership pattern of American Telephone, however, is strikingly similar to that of other large corporations, such as United States Steel, whose 12,500,000 shares are owned by a quarter of a million holders, including many charitable and educational institutions, insurance companies, and similar institutions. Included among the individual holders of Steel stock are 99,000 women who own 3,371,000 shares. The number of men owning stock is smaller, but their aggregate holdings are somewhat larger.

A 4–H Club Member Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 8, 1946

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following remarks of Jane Chilcoat, of Maryland, at the breakfast meeting of the friends of 4–H Clubs, in Washington, D. C., March 6, 1946:

It is indeed a milestone in my life as a 4–H member to come here as a representative of the 4–H girls of America and talk to you about our work and its importance in the changing world of today. As one thinks of the ideals set forth in 4–H, it is fitting that we emphasize those things in our lives which have helped us develop our talents for greater usefulness. The very thought of 4–H immediately brings to mind certain ideas that have been instilled in us since we first joined the club—the working together with other young people, learning to do by doing, helping younger members through experiences of our own, helping to develop leaders, learning to think things through, and to accept responsibility.

We, who are youth, know we are living in a rapidly changing world. Also, we know we will be the leaders of tomorrow. By us its problems will be met and from us must grow a way to their solution. Four-H through its fourfold teaching—head, heart, hands, health—is building the kind of young adults who will be able to assume these responsibilities.

The main objective of club work is greater efficiency in agriculture and home economics, but even more important is the character-building effect which its activities is having on those who come in contact with them. The qualities built in youth through these activities live forever, along with the capabilities we acquire.

There is an exhibit here today of some of the things we learn to do in club work. It is not that we learn just to make a dress,

but we learn to clothe ourselves, prepare meals, manage a home. All of you know how difficult it has been to get dress materials of any sort. But we who live in rural areas, and yes, even some of our city cousins, have found a partial solution to this problem through the cooperation of the feed companies who began putting their feed in cotton print bags. The pretty print dress in the exhibit was once a feedbag. The wool suit in the exhibit was made by a 4–H girl from my county. One of the hostesses and a fellow club member of hers, took as a team demonstration project, the making of stuffed animal toys. Such demonstrations teach us to work together and to gain confidence in ourselves by getting before an audience and talking. Each time the girls gave the demonstration a larger number of toys was added to the group. Since these, too, were among the hard-to-get items during the war, the girls started getting requests from friends and relatives for their toys and soon had a flourishing business. Even though they were limited to the number of toys because of the scarcity of materials, they made around $100 on what started out to be just another team demonstration.

The social contacts made in 4–H are doing much to overcome the natural shyness found in so many young people and is building thoughtful, considerate men and women who will be welcomed into any society. Who knows just which of us will be the leaders of tomorrow and take your places in the public eye? Who knows just how many former 4–H members may be sitting in on a breakfast similar to this 10 or 15 years from now?

Baltimore County, my home county in Maryland, is one of 15 such counties in the State which has a young adult organization known as a senior council. This is an outgrowth of 4–H, composed of members over 16 years of age. It sponsors activities of the younger club members in the county and is helping to develop the leaders who will become members of the adult organization in the community.

Now that the war has been won, as far as the actual fighting is concerned, we are all more aware of the problem confronting us of building the peace so that the generations to come will not have to live through another era of death, destruction, misery, and hunger. The 10 guideposts which are being emphasized in our club work and during this National 4–H Club Week are indeed a challenge to the rural boy or girl who has grown up as a club member. They deal with the problems that face America and the work to be done in this period of reconversion. They present a challenge to each member to make his best better by acquainting himself with the job to be done and working together toward the goal of lasting peace and prosperity. Couldn't a program similar to this be adopted by the youth of the other nations of the world to reach a better understanding of other peoples and their problems? Permanent world peace seems to hinge on this.

Since we were 10-year-olds and started our first "needle and thimble" project, the ideals taught in 4–H have given us a good foundation for creating better homes for better living. As are our homes, so will our Nation be.

As the 4–H girl goes forth into the world as tomorrow's citizen, her 4–H principles and background will have helped her to become physically strong, mentally alert, and morally straight, and thus she will be better equipped to take her place in this changing world. The 4–H ideals learned in our earlier days have a greater meaning today than ever before as we rededicate ourselves to the tasks that lie ahead. This verse by Carl Schurz seems to sum up 4–H work and its effect on our lives better than any words of mine could ever do:

"Ideals are like stars,
You will not succeed in touching them with your hands,
But, like the seafaring man on the desert of waters,
You choose them as your guides,
And, following them, you reach your destiny."

The National 4–H Clubs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 8, 1946

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday morning it was my privilege to attend the national friends of 4–H breakfast. This was a part of the program in observance of National 4–H Club Week, March 2 through the 10th.

Among those on the program were two members of the 4–H Club who spoke on the subject What 4–H Club Work Has Meant to Me and to My Community. The speakers were Jane Chilcoat, of Maryland, and Durwald Lyon, who lives on a farm near Toledo, Iowa, in the district which I have the honor to represent.

The work of the 4–H Clubs is familiar to everyone here. Its character building program is one of the finest things we have in the country for young people. During the war the members did a great patriotic service in the food-production program. The 4–H Clubs are deserving of the support not only of this Congress but of all the American people.

I am enclosing a copy of the speech made by Durwald Lyon, as follows:

Friends of 4–H Clubs, I have been asked to say a few words upon what 4–H Club work has meant to me.

I live in Iowa, as has been said, in Tama County, which is in the central part of the State. I live on a 280-acre farm and the land is rolling. We are quite proud that we were the first farmers in Tama County that started a contour demonstration, where we laid our farm out in contours. Many farmers have since that time copied us and now Tama County is in a soil-conservation district.

We do principally livestock farming. We have a herd of 21 Jersey cattle that I started as a 4–H Club project, with 2 Jersey heifers. We are very proud of the production records that our herd has made. They have an average of 450 pounds of butterfat, for 2 years in a row, which is second high in the State, and we had a cow that was high production in the 4–H division.

I am sure that 4–H Club work has helped us to get this herd to be high producers. The things that I learned in 4–H Club work, such as feeding and management and judging, were invaluable to me when we started figuring out rations for our cattle.

I have had quite a little judging experience for the selection of these animals. At our dairy cattle congress, which is our State dairy show, we had a State judging contest for 4–H Club members. In 1943, I won this judging contest. In 1944, I was very disappointed. I wanted to be the only person ever to win it 2 years in a row, and I received second. They started reading the list of high individuals. They started with the fifth first, and the fourth and the third, and then they read my name for second, and I was very disappointed. But I felt a little better when they read the first-place individual—my younger brother, who defeated me. [Laughter.]

I was very unfortunate this spring, early in the year, when my father became seriously ill and I was called on to take over the management of the farm. I am sure that without the experience of my 4–H Club that I had in judging of livestock, in selection of livestock, in feeding them, and what I learned in crop rotation and soil conservation, I would not have been able to take over successfully our farm and manage it; also, what I learned about keeping farm records and the banking experience that I had, with the money that I had received as prizes and from the sale of my livestock, was very beneficial to me.

Our club is very active, the club of which I am a member, in demonstration work. We demonstrate to the farmers of our community at their fair meetings and sales barns, wherever we can get a place to talk, how to save money, how to save time, in different small things about a farm. Last year we demonstrated grub control. Grub costs the Iowa farmers several thousand dollars each year. We went to farmers' meetings around and demonstrated a very simple way, by using derris powder to sprinkle on the cows, and this gets rid of the grub. The county agent told me that in 1944, they sold only 5 pounds of this to Tama County farmers. After the 4–H Club demonstrated this, they sold over 250 pounds.

I had a friend who lives only 2 miles from our place, whose folks would not let him join the 4–H Club. Finally, I talked them into it when he was about 17 years of age, which was 2 years ago. His father probably raised the worst looking hogs in Tama County. It took him a whole year to get them ready for market, and then they weighed about 200 pounds and looked—well, they did not look very good. The boy went into the purebred Deward hog business, and now he and his father are in partnership. They are selling livestock, breeding livestock, and they get their hogs to market at about 6 months of age and they weigh about 230 pounds. This man is getting three or four times the profit that he ordinarily would get when he did it the old way, through the boy's 4–H experience.

I also think that the 4–H Club program has developed me individually. I can remember when I first started talking—it was at a 4–H Club meeting, and I tried to get up and make a motion, and I had the darndest time. [Laughter.] Finally, I learned to make motions, I learned to conduct meetings, and this year, when I was elected as president of the State boys' club organization, I had to make a few speeches. You probably think I haven't come a very long way in making speeches. [Laughter.] I remember, I used to turn sort of a dark red when I got up, and now it is sort of a bright pink. [Laughter.]

But, seriously, I think that the 4–H Club program has developed me to be a better citizen, and I think by being a better citizen in the United States, that is the best contribution that I can make to the world and to our country. I think by being a better citizen, the United States will be stronger, and if it is stronger, I think the world will be a better place in which to live. I thank you. [Applause.]

The Fertilizer Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 8, 1946

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I submit a statement prepared by the American Plant Food Council, Inc., with regard to the fertilizer situation. The statement contains historical information of value and indicates that the fertilizer industry is making every effort to meet fully the plant-food requirements of American farmers.

While I congratulate the industry upon the splendid effort which has been made, the fact remains that there is still great need for further expansion if we are to safeguard properly our soil resources, provide food for our own people and contribute to the world's food supply.

At no time in history has there been a greater need for good husbandry and intelligent planning. I am sure that the information contained in the statement prepared by the American Plant Food Council will be of great interest to the farmers of America.

The statement follows:

THE FERTILIZER SITUATION

The record demand for fertilizer and plant-food materials this year will likely be somewhat in excess of supply although the Civilian Production Administration estimates that American farmers will have more total plant food during the current fertilizer year than ever before. Higher prices for farm products together with the critical need for full agricultural production and the relative low prices of fertilizer and plant-food materials largely created this unprecedented demand. Government controls of building materials made plant expansion practically impossible during the war while the recent steel strike cut the production of sulfate of ammonia by an estimated 75,000 tons. Substantial requests for plant-food materials have been received from many liberated and Allied countries since the end of hostilities. Production facilities were largely destroyed in some nations during the war so that today the combined food board is allocating most plant-food materials on the basis of world needs. The prewar excess capacity of the fertilizer industry in this country has made possible the record supplies of plant foods used by farmers during the war.

Fertilizers are recognized as one of the most effective means of greatly modifying soil productivity in regions where temperature and rainfall are suitable for crop production. The fertilizer industry hopes that American farmers will use a sufficient amount of the right kinds of fertilizer to safeguard our soil resources and produce an abundant supply of nutritious foods for all needs.

Recognizing that farmers should use larger amounts of commercial plant food and believing that increased consumption will be further stimulated through research and educational activities, the industry is planning to expand their facilities just as rapidly as materials are available and restrictions are removed. Surveys indicate that 30 or more new fertilizer plants were either started during the war or projected for construction by private industry. Most of the new construction is scheduled for the Midwest and west coast areas.

A survey of the facts pertaining to the fertilizer situation shows, first, the increased amounts of high-analysis fertilizers supplied for agriculture without any appreciable plant expansion as follows:

Year	Tonnage used	Average plant food content of all fertilizer
		Percent
1920	7,296,000	15.70
1930	8,425,000	18.08
1940	8,656,000	20.46
1944	12,468,000	20.64

Second, the trend of fertilizer prices compared with other major commodities purchased by farmers as follows:

[1910–14 prices=100]

	1939 index	*1945 index*
Seed	130	281
Feed	92	175
Farm machinery	154	176
Equipment and supplies	110	141
Building materials other than houses	148	208
Fertilizer	100	121
Average of all	122	174

Third, that our potash needs, formerly dependent upon foreign nations, have been recently supplied by domestic industry as follows:

Year:	*Production (tons K O)*
1921	10,171
1925	25,448
1930	61,270
1935	192,793
1940	379,679
1944	817,[illegible]92

Until the outbreak of World War I, all potash salts were imported. The war shut off our supplies and efforts were made to produce potash in this country. After the war, imports were resumed and the United States production practically ceased. One company, however, continued in operation and succeeded in developing a commercially successful process for producing muriate of potash from the brine of Searles Lake, Calif. Its production increased steadily during the twenties and has been further expanded to meet current requirements. In the meantime Government and private industry were exploring for potash salt deposits in the Southwest. Commercial deposits were discovered near Carlsbad, N. Mex., and production of crude salts started in 1931 and refined salts in 1932. Three companies are now producing from the Carlsbad deposits. The rapid increase in production in this country, even with labor and material shortages, gave American farmers more potash than they had previously used, filled military and industrial requirements and supplied part of the needs of our allies in several neutral countries.

Fourth, that the increased demand for nitrogen can now be largely supplied from domestic synthetic production as follows:

Year:	*Synthetic capacity tons N*
1925	15,300
1930	195,500
1935	341,350
1940	380,300
1944	[1] 1,186,100

[1] 755,000 tons represented by Government plants built largely for war purposes.

The consumption of nitrogen for fertilizer purposes has increased during the war period. In 1930 our farmers used 370,600 tons of nitrogen and the average annual consumption of nitrogen during the period 1930 to 1940 was about 325,000 tons each year.

Year:	*Total consumption tons N*
1940	419,093
1941	458,051
1942	398,563
1943	505,632
1944	626,208

Imports provided about one-half of our fertilizer nitrogen in prewar years and have been an important source of nitrogen during the war. For the period 1935 to 1939, imports averaged 191,800 tons of nitrogen. Approximately 55 percent of imports were from Chile, 20 percent from Canada, and 20 percent from Europe.

Fifth, that the production capacity of superphosphate always exceeded the prewar demand. The great expansion of the normal superphosphate industry was in 1900–1920. A comparison of production and total capacity figures indicates that during many relative good years production was about 50 percent of capacity. In 1932 it was only 17 percent of capacity and during the 10-year period 1931–40 production averaged about 37 percent of capacity. Shortages of labor and sulfuric acid as well as the diversion of elemental phosphorous from double superphosphate manufacture to military uses prevented capacity production of superphosphate. Despite this situation 1944 production was almost 50 percent greater than in 1940.

The American Plant Food Council, which represents an important segment of the fertilizer industry, recognizes that a stable and efficient agriculture must be based on soil maintenance and improvement. We know that soil management for efficient crop production depends upon many practices, including crop rotation, the use of lime and manures, the control of erosion, and the proper use of plant food. We advocate the various practices that make for efficient soil management. The council will use its influence to assure the production and use of the right kind and amount of fertilizer to foster a sound system of farming.

Lumber Shortage and Timber Culture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY O. TALLE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 13, 1946

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement made by me before the Agricultural Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations on February 13, 1946, as follows:

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, in order to conserve the time of your committee I have prepared a written statement, which I submit for your consideration. In addition, I may say briefly that Mr. Brown and I, as well as other members of the Banking and Currency Committee, have struggled for months with the problem of getting increased supplies of lumber and other building materials for use in alleviating the serious housing shortage throughout our country. Had a program like the one proposed at this time been put into operation several years ago, we would not

now be so disturbed about our dwindling lumber resources.

Mr. Chairman, my statement this morning deals with three items in the appropriation for the United States Forest Service for the fiscal year 1947, namely, experimental forests and ranges, farm and other private forestry cooperation, and forest products, in the order stated.

EXPERIMENTAL FORESTS AND RANGES

The recent growth of interest in forest research in Iowa is probably a result of the difficulty which farmers experienced in securing lumber for farm use during the war years. When lumber imported from the West or South was no longer available a great many farmers found in their own wood lots a source of material that had been hitherto overlooked. Thousands of small sawmills which had previously received but scant attention suddenly won recognition in many communities. Wood-using industries turned to local wood lots for raw materials. These developments served to heighten interest in wood lots as income producers. But maximum income from timber production requires skillful management, and owners quickly discovered that information on woodlot management was lacking as compared with information on the management of other crops.

The Federal Government, through the Forest Service, has taken the lead in forest research, which is a comparatively new field of applied science. The Forest Service maintains 12 regional forest experiment stations, which serve all timber-growing sections of the Nation. Iowa is in the territory of the Central States Forest Experiment Station, with headquarters at Columbus, Ohio.

An "experimental forest" is a tract of woodland or potential woodland—such as submarginal farm land—representing a typical range of local conditions and set aside for forest research. Usually it exceeds 1,000 acres in area. It is an outdoor laboratory and has its counterpart in the experimental farms used in cropland research. In experimental forests technicians test improved methods of woodland management, logging and marketing of timber products, establishment of forest plantations, and other problems of concern to woodland owners of the local area. The most promising methods that result from this research are made available to farmers and other timber owners through agencies already set up, like the State forest service or the Agriculture Extension Service.

In the past a few experimental forests have been established and have demonstrated their usefulness. However, not until last year, when your committee granted an appropriation for the establishment of 11 experimental forests in the South, was there any effective support for the expansion of the experimental forest idea. The South is now urging establishment of 9 additional areas to complete a chain of 20; but it is equally important, I think, to extend the system to the Middle West, the Pacific Northwest, the Lake States, and the Northeast regions.

Last week the Forest Service outlined to your committee a 5-year plan for establishing experimental forests and ranges on a Nation-wide basis. Although this plan proposes the establishment of experimental forests in many States, including Iowa, the appropriation recommended by the Budget Bureau is not sufficient to provide for an area in Iowa in 1947. I urge that you give serious consideration to increasing the appropriation for this work in an amount sufficient to cover the Middle West region, and particularly Iowa. In this connection, I should like to point out that the purchase of land for an experimental forest in Iowa is not a problem since public land is already available for that purpose.

FARM AND OTHER PRIVATE FORESTRY COOPERATION

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, I should like to discuss briefly farm wood lots and the work of the farm foresters under the item entitled "Farm and Other Private Forestry Cooperation."

Forest trees on the farm add to its value and beauty. They supply timber needed for buildings, fences, fuel, and many other uses. There will often be a surplus which can be sold in the form of standing timber, sawlogs, posts, poles, cross ties, pulpwood, fuel wood, and so forth. Moreover, these trees can often be grown successfully on soils too poor or slopes too steep for the successful production of the ordinary agricultural crops. In addition to the commercial possibilities, a well-cared for home forest serves as a windbreak for buildings, a shelter for livestock, a protection against erosion, and a means for retaining soil moisture.

Under the authority of the Norris-Doxey law, and other acts, Congress annually appropriates money for cooperative work with private timber owners. Much of the work is handled through various State agencies. In my State it is administered by Prof. G. B. MacDonald, State forester, and head of the school of forestry, Iowa State College, at Ames.

The program in Iowa is carried out by technical foresters, each assigned an area comprising several counties. The foresters work in close collaboration with the county agricultural agents, acting as specialists in their line upon call of the agricultural agents. The forester gives the woodland owner assistance in marking timber for cutting, advice as to the best methods of utilization, information as to available markets, and counsel in many other problems. It is an established fact that the majority of our farmers know how to estimate, measure, and appraise ordinary farm crops much better than they do standing trees and logs. The work of the farm foresters is designed not only to improve forest management on the wood lot but also to demonstrate the additional income that can be secured therefrom.

Iowa needs more farm foresters than the recommendation of the Budget Bureau for farm and other private forestry cooperation makes possible, and it is respectfully suggested that this item be carefully reviewed.

FOREST PRODUCTS

Mr. Chairman, the third and final item I shall refer to is the appropriation for forest products. It is this item which provides funds for research in devising new and extended uses of wood and other products of the forest at the Forest Products Laboratory, Madison, Wis., and for the maintenance of forest-utilization services at various locations throughout the United States.

The research work of the Forest Products Laboratory was of incalculable value to the war effort, and there are many phases of the work which should properly be extended and expanded for peacetime application.

There are still large quantities of wood wasted in the forest and at the sawmills. I am informed that roughly one-third of the raw material is used to good purpose; the remaining two-thirds, in the form of unharvested down timber, limbs, slabs, edgings, and sawdust, constitutes an economic waste. Through the research carried on by the laboratory, it is reasonable to assume that this tremendous waste can be greatly reduced.

I understand that the Budget Bureau has recommended no increase over the appropriation for the current fiscal year except to provide for some minor adjustments in change of pay for Federal employees. At its peak capacity during the war, I am told, the laboratory employed about 700 people; this figure has now been reduced to 500; and my information is that, if the present Budget Bureau recommendation is accepted, it will be necessary to reduce personnel further to approximately 250 employees. During the past 2 years the regular appropriation for operating the laboratory has been supplemented liberally by funds from the War and Navy Departments and other war agencies. Those additional funds will unquestionably disappear at the end of the current fiscal year, and it would appear that serious thought should be given to replacing them, in part, by a moderate increase in the regular appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to incorporate the following letters which I have received from constituents as a part of my testimony:

(The letters referred to are as follows:)

DUBUQUE COUNTY FARM BUREAU,
Dubuque, Iowa, December 21, 1945.

Hon. HENRY O. TALLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HENRY: During the past couple years, I have been reading accounts in the papers from time to time concerning the production of wood in the war effort. I sold some walnut timber myself, which was made into gunstocks, and was pretty much at a loss about the value of this timber and the price I should receive.

There is a lot of valuable timber, in northeast Iowa especially. Very little has been done in the past to take care of this resource. I understand there is a possibility of the United States Forest Service extending their research program into Iowa. This seems like a very good idea to me. Can you give me any information concerning these plans?

We are trying to get the farmers in our county to handle their timber as part of the farm crops, and we need all the help and information we can get. I would appreciate hearing from you in the near future.

Yours very truly,
JOHN B. COUSIN, *President.*

WAUKON, IOWA, *January 28, 1946.*

Hon. HENRY O. TALLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TALLE: We have had a forestry committee in Allamakee County for quite a number of years and surveys indicate that there are approximately 130,000 acres of timberland in our county. Logging, lumbering, and production of forest products has for many years been a vital part of our economic farm set-up. We are, therefore, very interested in any appropriation which can be secured to instigate or further any decentralization of forest research work so that our problem here in Iowa can be given due consideration, or which will provide us with assistance on a cooperative forestry basis.

We understand that the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture is in session at present and we request your support in pushing appropriations of this type. We believe Mr. L. I. Barrett of the United States Forest Service there at Washington can give you specific information on these forestry appropriations if you can see fit to help us.

Very truly yours,
JOHN ROUSTER,
Chairman, Allamakee County Forestry Committee.

CURTIS COMPANIES, INC.,
Clinton, Iowa, February 1, 1946.

Hon. HENRY O. TALLE,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HENRY: My attention has been called to the proposed legislation dealing with the appropriation for the Forest Products Laboratory. It is being considered, I understand, at the present time by the House Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, with Judge MALCOLM C. TARVER, of Georgia, as chairman. The only member of the Appro-

priations Committee from Iowa is BEN JENSEN.

This is vitally important legislation to a good many of your constituents who are interested in the work done by the Forest Products Laboratory. We urge support of at least the Budget recommendation which merely provides that the existing facilities will be used at only one-half capacity. Of course, we would like to see the entire effort stepped up rather than curtailed, and actually I believe that the Forest Products Laboratory can stand on its record as being one of the few governmental agencies that has done a real constructive job.

Any influence you can bring to bear on the members of this subcommittee or on the members of the Appropriations Committee will be greatly appreciated.

With best regards,

Yours very truly,

G. M. CURTIS.

FARLEY & LOETSCHER MFG. CO.,
Dubuque, Iowa, February 2, 1946.

Hon. HENRY O. TALLE,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. TALLE: It has come to the writer's attention that the agricultural appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1947 is now being prepared by the House Subcommitee on Agricultural Appropriations and that the Budget Bureau has recommended only sufficient funds to utilize one-half of the facilities at the Forest Products Laboratory in Madison, Wis.

We wish to point out that the Forest Products Laboratory, in our opinion, has done a most remarkable job on forest-product research. Forest Products Laboratory has been very helpful to us in establishing manufacture of impregnated compressed wood which we manufactured for the Army Air Forces to be used for propeller blades during the war. Further, we sold a large quantity of impregnated compressed wood for insulation spacers in naval vessels. This product has remarkable characteristics, and for your information we are enclosing a leaflet describing the product. Please note also at the bottom of page 3 the table of physical properties.

We cite our Farlite Compreg as only one example of a commercial product developed through the research efforts of Forest Products Laboratory. The writer wants to say that if all of the Government funds were expended as wisely as the money used for research at Forest Products Laboratory, taxpayers would not complain about the present heavy scale of taxes.

It will be appreciated if you would give this matter your attention and, if possible, have the appropriation in the agricultural bill increased for Forest Products Laboratory research, so that their good facilities can be used to the fullest extent. Please advise of any action you may take.

Very truly yours,

FRED R. LOETSCHER,
Manager, Plastics Division.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, this concludes my testimony, and I thank you and your committee for your time and attention.

Mr. TARVER. Thank you, Mr. TALLE.

Upton Close

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excerpt from the 6 p. m. newscast of Albert L. Warner, director of the Washington news staff of WOL, delivered on Wednesday, March 6, 1946, which I think under the circumstances exhibits remarkable restraint on the part of Mr. Warner.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There is a kind of unwritten law in most newspaper shops and radio stations that one columnist or commentator does not find basic fault with another in the neighboring column or program. It is a type of professional immunity. You may criticize ignorance and malevolent confusion at a distance, but not in the critic at your elbow.

I propose to break that rule.

Upton Close was here last night and spoke over this and other stations on a sponsored program. This is the same Upton Close who minimized Japanese aggression against us before the war, and, on the afternoon of the Pearl Harbor attack, explained it as possibly a coup engineered by Germany, or a coup of a small portion of the Japanese Navy, or by some other Japanese group. Apparently it just couldn't be the war move, carefully planned, of the Japanese Government and its whole military machine.

On December 10, 3 days after the Jap attack, he suggested that the Japanese samurai code might be keeping them from bombing cities and probably was leading them to good treatment of American troops and civilians captured on the Asiatic coast. American prisoners who were slapped, beaten, starved, tortured and saw their comrades bayoneted know the answer to that.

So now we have Upton Close back. With him here last night was Tyler Kent, the clerk in the American Embassy in London. Kent, you recall, took confidential Government messages to his London apartment. The British say they got to the hand of pro-Germans. Close told the public last night that there was no emergency about the housing shortage, but primarily, he charged that American officials are working up two or three wars.

He attacks not only our own Government, but Great Britain, Russia, and France.

You don't have to guess, you know in advance what he champions—Fascist Franco and the Nazi henchmen who are on top in Argentina.

In his broadcast, Upton Close had a handful of alleged facts. Take a look at them. He says the State Department came out in favor of Vargas in Brazil, but the Brazilians elected Dutra. The fact is, Ambassador Berle spoke up against postponing the election. The effect, if any, was the very opposite of what Mr. Close said. It was against Vargas and for an election in which Dutra was the favorite.

The next thing you can put your finger on is the suggestion that our Government has told the number of airplanes it can furnish Communist-instigated France—those are Close's words—to fight the Spaniards. Here are the facts:

The French Government is allowed to buy American surplus military material. In fact, we equipped a gallant French force which fought with us in the war. France has not been given anything for the purpose, as Close intimates, of fighting the Spaniards.

Next, he says that Spain, under Franco, is so inviting a place that American money is being invested freely there.

The fact is, the State Department doesn't know of any investments going into Spain.

Then Close says that American money is completing some giant airfields in Spain so this may be our toehold when we send another military expedition to Europe.

The fact is, that Spanish money has bought some American surplus military equipment such as bulldozers to build an airport near Madrid for commercial air lines, and that's all.

Close says we intervene in Argentina but give it farm machinery to raise food for Britain.

The fact is, the State Department has spoken out against pro-Nazi activities of Presidential candidate Peron and yet saw to it also that Argentine people have the means to move their food from farm to ships to help feed the starving in Europe and Asia.

Close kisses off Franco as a man who never hurt us, but who had to "talk nice" to a government overrunning Europe. Let me read what Franco actually wrote to Hitler in 1941—"I stand ready at your side, entirely and decidedly at your disposal, united in a common historical destiny, desertion from which would mean my suicide. I shall always be a loyal follower." That's Franco. But enough of this tripe.

Where you find greed, selfishness, and stupidity, there you will find Upton Close. You could see him there last night, with the Dictator Franco at one shoulder and the Argentine Nazi Peron at the other; and behind him, the eager specter of Hitler and the drooling war lords of Japan.

Mediation and Arbitration in Labor Disputes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the labor situation delivered by me at New York, N. Y., February 25, 1946, before the United Labor Committee to Aid the UAW–GM Strikers.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Certain industrial events are in deadly parallel to those which followed the last war. A powerful minority of industrialists who were successful 20 years ago in their open-shop drive are setting the same stage and redecorating the old props. The same die-hard actors and paid stooges are rehearsing new lines to inflame and confuse the public. They seek to foment hysteria and thus secure passage of legislation that will hamstring labor and give them free rein.

Who are they? They are the remnants of the economic tories who led the great anti-union drive in the 1920's. They opposed and defied section 7a of the NIRA. They schemed to defeat the Wagner Act in the Congress and the courts. Since that time they have plotted to circumvent and nullify labor's charter. They have seized upon every occasion to try to discredit labor with falsehoods and half-truths.

These are no casual off-hand opinions. I know the records of many of these men and industries. When I was chairman of the Senate Civil Liberties Committee we took 30,000 pages—70 volumes—of printed testimony and heard more than 1,000 witnesses over a 4-year period, testifying under oath concerning the sordid practices of labor espionage, strike-breaking, private police excesses, the use of industrial munitions, and the like.

In our first report to the Senate in February 1937, we concluded: "This partial report of findings has uncovered a colossal drive to frustrate enunciated labor policy and to neutralize American labor laws." Subsequent records amassed by the committee showed conclusively that much of the labor unrest in this country is due to a poisoned attitude injected into labor relations by a minority of employers who are fighting labor to the last ditch.

During the present struggle, charges and countercharges have come thick and fast. There have been accusations of conspiracy, irresponsibility, and unreasonableness. In my opinion, Congress should sift these charges. To that end, I have joined with Senators KILGORE, MORSE, and MEAD in introducing Senate Resolution 228 which calls for an investigation into the "causes of current labor disputes, including economic and other factors and governmental policies affecting such disputes." I believe that this resolution should be adopted promptly and an investigation undertaken so that the Congress and the country may have all the facts.

There can be no doubt that some employers, who have never accepted collective bargaining in good faith, are seeking to use the present situation to destroy unionism. It is fairly evident also that some employers would like to use the present situation to break price control.

Clever antilabor propagandists are always trying to do two things: First, place the blame of the strike on labor. Second, exaggerate the extent and effect of the strike.

Let's be fair about the responsibility for strikes. Some people seem to think that striking is a pleasant diversion for the laboring man. Well, it isn't. Go into the home of a man who has been on strike for some time. You'll find a wife and family sorely in need of the barest necessities of life. You'll find hungry children. You'll find unattended illness and hardship. No; it isn't fun to go on strike. Then why does he strike? That's an easy one to answer: Because the man has the courage to fight for his rights and because he has a deep conviction that his cause is just. It is the same fighting spirit that won us our liberty years ago and very recently won us a war.

Frequently during the war years the propagandists were smearing labor. They were out to lick labor no matter what adverse effect it might have on war production. They sought to blame labor for the lack of sufficient guns, planes, ships, and tanks. They forgot about their monopolies and cartels that had created the real bottlenecks. They secured passage of the ill-advised Smith-Connally Act, and then whimpered when they found that some of its provisions could boomerang.

The truth is that during the war less than one-sixth of 1 percent of working time was lost due to strikes. That amazing record is almost twice as good as the prewar 1935–39 average. By way of contrast, it can be noted that industrial accidents and illness cost about 10 times as much lost time.

You know the other half of the story: what labor helped to accomplish in national production. American industry produced about 300,000 military aircraft; 64,000 landing vessels; 12,000 other naval and cargo ships, 22,000,000 rifles, pistols, and machine guns; 700,000 artillery, light field, and tank guns; 12,000,000 tons of bombs and ammunition; 2,500,000 trucks and tanks; $11,000,000,000 worth of radio and radar equipment; and 50,000,000 pairs of boots and shoes.

It is true that time lost since VJ-day is substantially greater than the wartime rate—almost three times as great, or about one-half of 1 percent of total working time. But let's look at that figure, too. The time loss is comparatively high because stoppages averaged 16.3 days for each worker instead of 5.3 days of idleness in the war months. This confirms the fact that the strikes we are experiencing now are bitter and prolonged because they cut deeply into new and basic industrial issues that cannot be settled as easily by ordinary conciliation and mediation.

Furthermore, as far as the over-all picture is concerned, it is easy to lose sight of the fact that much of our reconversion has proceeded more swiftly and smoothly than we had a right to expect. The fact that we have had strikes in key industries has dramatized the situation and affected more workers than usual.

Industrialists should recognize that it is good business to give their workers decent standards of living. The prosperity of industry, and that of farmers and service groups as well, depends largely on the prosperity of the worker. Labor is part of the mass market on which mass production depends. Farm prices and farm income are paid largely out of labor's share of industrial income. Historically, American industry has prospered when labor made its gains. Increased purchasing power, often very reluctantly given or wrested from industry, has been the life blood of our economic system.

Far-sighted management realizes that the greatest untapped market in the world is right here in this country among those who now have bare subsistence purchasing power. Give them a chance to increase their standard of living and you automatically shift our economic machine into high gear.

It is frequently argued that those industries which pay more than a bare subsistence have discharged all their responsibilities toward labor and society—that demands for higher wages or lower prices in these industries are not justified. Such an argument might be true in a static economy. It doesn't hold water in an expanding economy. The entire industrial history of our country attests to the fact that industry can raise wages and can lower unit prices and still make good profits. It's no magic. It's simply a practical lesson in mass production, efficiency, and technology.

It should be conceded that this very general analysis is not the complete picture of our present economic situation. There would have been fewer strikes since VJ-day had the President and other administration spokesmen laid down a definite blueprint with respect to wages and prices, instead of trying to mollify both sides with an indefinite and vacillating policy. In addition, several unusual temporary economic factors are highly important. First of all, a tremendous backlog of demand exists for many industrial products. Second, strong inflationary tendencies are lurking in the economy. Third, the necessity for the continuance of many governmental economic controls impairs the operation of certain checks and balances in collective bargaining. Fourth, the economic road ahead, after complete reconversion, is still uncertain.

Several facts stand out clearly in this confused picture. Many industries are assured of a market for everything they can possibly make for the next few years. In many cases it means lowered costs that should be reflected in higher wages and lower prices. Many industries have already benefited substantially by reduced average unit labor cost due to the reduction of overtime costs.

In those industries that cannot actually effect operating economies under these conditions, and where labor is working for wages that do not permit an adequate standard of living, now is the time to raise those wages, even if some price increases are necessary. Never will these industries be in a more favorable position to absorb increases. If this is not done, the effect will be to impose substandard conditions not only for the present, but for a long indeterminate period. All too often in a glutted labor market it is the industry with the marginal wage that sets the industrial standard.

When the initial backlog of demand is satisfied, there must be a continuing high-level demand. That can be assured only with a high level of purchasing power, gradually built up with an increase in real wages.

These and similar problems are the complex issues behind the labor scene. It is clearly apparent that restrictive labor measures are not the answer. Curtailment of labor's rights can only bring bitterness and discontent. The logical conclusion of such repressive measures is to abolish entirely the right to strike and the right to peaceful picketing. These are fundamental rights which stem from the Constitution.

I cannot emphasize this too strongly: this approach is the method of totalitarianism. The destruction of a free and strong labor movement was the first step in the subversion of the rights and liberties of all segments of the population. When total control was achieved, the status of labor, and in fact all culture, reverted to barbarism, including the exist-for-work theory of economics. This method to secure production is irreconcilable with democracy and freedom.

Punitive legislation against labor, or any group in society, inevitably entails the loss of freedom for all. Labor's basic rights are indivisible with other basic rights. Strike down the rights of labor and you have struck a major blow in wrecking the freedom of speech, and all other liberties that we cherish. It is part of the same pattern. It is part of the same freedom.

These self-evident truths should give warning to those who would extend the Federal power to curb alleged abuses of labor. A temporary victory resulting in a curtailment of labor's fundamental rights will pave the way for governmental encroachments on the rights of management. Permanent regulation of salaries, profits, and prices will be a logical outcome of Federal policies that place labor in a strait-jacket.

The serious situation we face today calls for a delicate operation on the ills of our economy—not a haphazard swinging of the meat axe and bludgeon. A labor strike is a symptom of industrial illness. Too many people are concerned only with the symptom.

The constructive approach to this critical problem is in the opposite direction. The only real answer is full and free collective bargaining, in an atmosphere permeated with mutual confidence instead of mistrust. The spotlight of public opinion must be turned on those who refuse to bargain in good faith.

The conciliation and mediation services of the Government must be strengthened. The use of voluntary mediation and arbitration must be encouraged. Such provisions written into a voluntary collective agreement will afford protection against work stoppages. Compulsory methods usually defeat themselves because they do not remove the friction and bitterness that must be resolved before a satisfactory employer-employee relationship can be had. Cooling-off periods are unsatisfactory because they can easily become heating-up periods or merely stalling-off periods.

I am satisfied that Americans can work out this problem. I am convinced that we can do it without surrendering our birthright of freedom. To achieve this end all elements in our country must have patience and forbearance. Above all, we must have faith in the democratic process and a determination to preserve our fundamental liberties.

In the most destructive war in history we proved that free men could outfight and outproduce nations governed by totalitarian states. We now have the opportunity to prove to the world that free men living in a democracy can have economic opportunity for a high standard of living without surrendering their fundamental rights.

The General Motors Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. STANFILL
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. STANFILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Louisville Courier-Journal for March 5, 1946, regarding the dispute between General Motors and the United Automobile Workers. This, in my judgment, is one of the clearest statements about this entire matter I have seen, and I think the whole country would benefit if it should be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A STRUGGLE THAT CAN BUT WEAKEN EVERYBODY

The dispute between General Motors and its workers doubtless will go down in our industrial history as a horrible example of mishandling, confusion, and dubious motives; in short, as one of the most unfortunate of episodes, doomed in the end to serve nobody well, with candor, dignity, responsibility, and professed principles all affronted by both sides.

The union's offer to resume work under arbitration—an offer in which artifice and desperation seem to be equally mingled—and the company's rejection with a counterproposal that cunningly changes the subject by a taunting challenge, serve but to deepen the impression of a perversity that is almost malign.

Issues involved in the dispute were no more complex in the beginning than those which separated negotiators in other industries that long ago have reconciled their differences, if even as much as in some. But there was a kind of immoderation of attitudes on both sides that made this strike difficult. There was a virtual admission on part of the General Motors Division of the United Automobile Workers that its intent was punitive and destructive, that it was bent on a test of power as much as on a vindication of principle. It fairly flaunted its strategy of isolating company by company and bending each to its will. Partly defensive against this threat, partly aggressive against the union as such (the cancellation of contract ought to be evidence on this point), General Motors moved instantly to create a new set of issues, so that the original question was blurred at the start by economic theory and definitions of free enterprise. One may well suspect this to have been as deliberate as the union's plan of divide and conquer.

It was as if the two parties were engaged in a race in which each side darted off in opposite directions, or in a debate waged in different languages, so that the longer they kept at it, the farther apart they got. When one changed its course in pursuit of the other, directions were shifted, so that original issues seem now to have been forgotten (52-for-40, wage-price relationships, validity of fact-finding) and a sort of fluid, disingenuous wrangle to have taken the place of bargaining.

It may not be easy to escape the suspicion that, at this stage, the union's offer to return to work pending arbitration was made partly to get out from under the onus of compromise on a point on which it was furiously declared there could be no compromise, and partly to feint the company into the position, for public view, of wanting to prolong the strike.

Obviously the company does want to prolong the strike, possessing several advantages. Not the least of these is the union leadership's making a do-or-die point of 1 cent an hour, although it is diligently trying to minimize this weakness by talking of differences also on contract and working conditions. But the company's refusal of arbitration is based on grounds that seem pretty thin when it says that arbitration is bound to support its offer of an 18½-cent-an-hour raise, so why arbitrate? A genuine desire to get back to work and restore old relationships would find the proposal attractive.

The plain truth is that a pathological condition of mind has grown up in this controversy, a progressive degeneration of reason and responsibility on both sides, and the early show of bargaining has descended into a mutual vengeful snarling, as if each were determined now only upon destruction of the other. In the most recent tightening of the deadlock, the country must have a dismal feeling that this is where it came in, but an even more forlorn wonder as to where it possibly can go now in this matter.

Control of Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD what I consider to be a very important article on the subject of the control of atomic energy. The article was written by George Fielding Eliot and published in the New York Herald Tribune of a recent date. The article is entitled, in part, "General Groves' Aims on Control of Atomic Energy Questioned." General Groves' aims need, in my opinion, plenty of questioning.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL GROVES' AIMS ON CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY QUESTIONED—HIS COMPLAINT ON 'LEAKAGE' OF SECRETS IS SEEN AS A MOVE TO OBSTRUCT CIVILIAN DIRECTION AND AID MAY-JOHNSON BILL FOR "ATOMIC CZAR"

(By George Fielding Eliot)

The control of atomic energy affects the future safety of every citizen of the United States. American atomic policy must, therefore, be kept under the control of the people of this country through their duly elected public servants.

It is not exclusively a military matter, any more than it is exclusively political, or scientific, or economic. It has all these aspects, and it must be considered from all these viewpoints. But to consider it or to decide it on the basis of one of these aspects to the exclusion of the others can lead only to national disaster.

This basic issue has been sharply drawn by Senator BRIEN MCMAHON, of Connecticut, chairman of the Senate Committee on Atomic Energy, in his speech before the Overseas Press Club in New York on Thursday evening.

The vital importance of Senator MCMAHON's contentions have been vividly, though, one may be sure, unintentionally underlined by Major General Leslie R. Groves, chief of the Army's Manhattan Project, in a press interview on Friday.

A FORCE FOR PEACE

Said Senator MCMAHON: "We should now give notice to the world that we regard atomic energy as a force for peace by handing its control over to a civilian agency."

Said General Groves, referring to the forthcoming atomic bomb tests in the Pacific: "There has been too much discussion already. That's what concerns me. I'd like to see the press locked up on the press ship, taken out to a certain point, write what they can see of the explosion, and then send them back home."

"And then you would see an explosion," a reporter told him.

The general should not have to wait so long to see that explosion.

It is, indeed, high time that the press and the people of this country started asking a few questions of and about Maj. Gen. Leslie R. Groves.

Why, for example, did the general try to frighten the country by complaining about leakage of atomic secrets just at the time of the disclosure of Soviet espionage activities in Canada? These statements have been branded as completely false by the Association of Oak Ridge Scientists, and characterized as an attempt to obstruct passage of the McMahon bill for civilian control of atomic energy in favor of the May-Johnson bill, which would provide for military control. This bill is indeed so worded as to place dictatorial powers over atomic energy in the hands of a single administrator who could not be removed even by the President of the United States. There is good reason to suspect that this job of atomic czar could, in the minds of many proponents of the May-Johnson bill, be most appropriately filled by none other than Maj. Gen. Leslie R. Groves.

But it might be well for the people of this country to stop, look, and listen before they entrust their lives and the lives and futures of their children to one man over whom they will have no control and who could, under the terms of the May-Johnson bill, find ample authority to throw any citizen who protested against his acts into the penitentiary for a long term of years—that is, if the protest were at all specific, and could be construed as violating security.

It might be well to ask why it is that virtually every scientist of any reputation who has worked on the atomic projects regards General Groves with so much suspicion and distrust. It might be well to ask with what bogies General Groves so frightened the members of Senator MCMAHON's committee during his recent testimony in executive session (after the Canadian disclosures) that scientists who are in close touch with what is going on in Washington have now swung from optimism to pessimism over the prospects of a favorable report on the McMahon bill. It might be well to ask why Senator MCMAHON himself found it necessary to make so vigorous an appeal to the public to remember the essential principle of our government, the control of the military by the civil power, and to beg that it be not departed from in a matter of such vital consequence as the control of atomic energy.

INDEPENDENCE MISUSED

It might be well to recall that in every country where the military have gained independence of civilian control, that independence has been misused.

It might be well to ask why, when General Groves so plainly has no confidence in the people of this country, the people of this

country should have such unbounded confidence in General Groves as he seems to demand?

There has been too much discussion already, says the general. That's what concerns him, he tells us. There should be more discussion, a great deal more, and a lot of it should be about General Groves and what makes him tick, and why.

It is our lives you are playing with, general. It is our country's future. And we'd like, if you have no objection, to continue to have these affairs of ours controlled under the arrangements we have found satisfactory for the last century and a half—the arrangements set down in the Constitution of the United States.

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on rural electrification which I delivered at Buffalo, N. Y., on Tuesday, March 5, 1946, before the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am glad to have the opportunity to participate in your annual meeting. An occasion like this does much to arouse enthusiasm to carry forward the fight to extend rural electrification. To give the farmers of America the miracles of an electrical age is a noble, humanitarian and economic objective. I am proud to have been associated with this movement from its inception.

The REA is less than 11 years old. It was created by Executive order on May 11, 1935, with an appropriation of $75,000, under the Federal emergency relief program. It was given continuing status by the congressional act approved May 20, 1936. The act wisely gave preference to cooperatives, public agencies, and limited profit groups.

In the short span of intervening years between then and the present, including the war years when most of the REA expansion activities were suspended, more than one and one-half million customers have been provided service from 500,000 miles of transmission lines and 64 generating systems financed by REA. Insofar as the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association is concerned, I note from the February issue of your official publication that you can now boast of 470 member cooperatives, with 699,996 consumer members. That is a splendid record of growth.

Perhaps the most significant figures that can be mentioned are the census figures on the extent of rural electrification. Only 10.9 percent of all farms had electricity in 1935. Ten years later, in 1945, about 44.7 percent of all farms were electrified. The large part of this progress was due directly to the REA.

To date, Congress has authorized about $725,000,000 for REA loans, exclusive of the $100,000,000 in the pending deficiency bill which will be approved shortly. The ultimate goal of complete electrification of all rural areas, which should be completed within 10 years, is estimated by the Budget Bureau to have a total cost of $1,825,000,000. It should be emphasized that this is not a burden on the taxpayer. This is money for loans, most of which are gilt-edge. The program's solid financial position is shown by the fact that delinquencies on the repayment schedules to date have been considerably less than 1 percent.

There were good economic reasons why the Government 11 years ago undertook the responsibility of promoting rural electrification through cooperatives. First and foremost, private utilities had not done the job. It was not because the utilities disliked the farmer, but merely because they did not choose to dilute their urban profits with less profitable rural operations. The incentive for rapid expansion was lacking.

It was clearly apparent then, as now, that an expansion policy for rural electrification based solely on anticipated profits would be very slow in reaching the farmer. Furthermore, it might actually doom many to indefinite darkness because a profits policy will inevitably skim off the best business and forget about the thin areas. The only way an integrated coverage could be obtained was to establish the REA and make it possible for the farmers to help themselves. That is where the Government came in; that is where the cooperatives came in.

Electricity has become such an important item in a decent standard of living that the Government cannot condone a situation where a large segment of our population must live without it, or pay prohibitive costs for it. It is a tribute to the ideals and efficiency of the rural electric cooperatives that they have been able to overcome the basic economic handicap of serving those whom the utilities would not serve, and yet give comparable service for all. Your rural cooperatives have supplied power to areas and farmers who would not have electricity for many years. Your cooperatives have substantially reduced the costs of rural service, so that more people can enjoy the benefits of electricity.

Electricity is bringing a new era into American agriculture. I venture the assertion that electricity will ultimately revolutionize agriculture more than all the farm inventions of the last century combined. Fortunately, most of the changes will be on the credit side of the national ledger. It is my opinion that the availability of cheap electricity on the farm is the best possible insurance that the farmer of tomorrow will have the social and economic status to which he is entitled as a major producer in our economy.

The family-owned and operated farm is one of the cornerstones upon which our political democracy rests. An adequate supply of electricity at reasonable rates will be an important factor in its preservation, as against corporate agriculture.

Once the farmer gets the power, he quickly learns how to make good use of it. Statistics of power consumption for newly electrified farms show a rapid rise in the rate of consumption over a period of the first few years, especially. Experts in the Department of Agriculture say that electricity has more than 50 different uses in the home, and more than 300 uses on a farm.

For example, a dairy farmer can make use of milking machines, milk refrigeration equipment, bottlewashers, equipment for sterilizing utensils and pasteurizing milk, barn ventilation fans, devices for heating the drinking water of cows, animal groomers, electrocution screens for flies and insects, and ensilage cutters. A poultryman can effectively use lighting to improve egg production, heat to control incubation, and ultra-violet light to improve the hardihood of young chicks. In general farming electricity can be used effectively for corn shelling, husking, and shredding; hay hoisting and baling; feed grinding; wood sawing; threshing; concrete mixing; and power for general machinery.

This is in addition to the usual applications of home, barn, and yard lighting; and the usual home appliances—radio, refrigerators, washing machines, irons, toasters, vacuum cleaners, and so forth.

It should be noted that each extension of rural electrification opens a vast new market for electric appliances. It is estimated, for example, that normal REA expansion in the next 3 years will create a market for more than 1,000,000 radios, 1,000,000 electric irons, 700,000 washing machines, 500,000 refrigerators, 400,000 toasters, 250,000 vacuum cleaners, 200,000 hot-plates, and 100,000 coffee makers.

There may also be a new additional service made possible through rural electrification. Telephone service may become integrated with it. It has been proved feasible to use rural power lines for carrier-currents for telephone service. Only last week it was announced that royalty-free patents were given to equipment manufacturers, and that it is expected that telephone service will be extended to an additional million farm families within the next few years. The REA, the Federal Communications Commission, and private telephone laboratories are all promoting this development which may mean a two-for-one bargain in rural electrification.

All of these facts add up to this: Electricity on the farm makes farming more profitable, reduces the drudgery of farm labor and, most important of all, makes the farm a more comfortable place for the farmer and his family to live.

From these self-evident truths and the great success of the REA program to date, it might be assumed that the REA would encounter no further opposition. But such is not the case. The private utilities are seizing every opportunity in their persistent efforts to cripple this great program. I know, because I have been in the thick of the fight on several fronts within the past few months; yes, even a few days ago in the Senate.

There are so many legislative issues that need careful attention that I was uncertain almost to the last day as to whether or not I could accept the invitation to be here. But I am glad I could come. And I intend to continue the fight on these issues in the Senate as long as I am privileged to have a seat in that great deliberative body.

For many years I sat side by side in that body with the man who led the fight to establish the REA on a permanent basis. Senator Norris never faltered when the going became tough. Now, when the private utilities are marshaling their forces to cripple and hamstring the program, it is up to us not to falter. We must organize and meet their challenge head on. Every friend of the REA, in and out of Congress, must give his best in the battle now being waged.

The opponents of cooperatives and rural electrification are not making a frontal attack. They know that public opinion could not be mustered on their side if a clear-cut issue of for-or-against is presented to the people. Therefore, they are making oblique, slashing attacks by which they hope to accomplish their ends.

You know the tactics: "The rural electrification cooperatives are all right, but—". "We have no quarrel with the cooperative movement, but we think it should be required to—".

Or, they contend that everything that needs to be done has been done by the Government; that the problem, great as it was, has now been solved. Then they add that additional rural electrification can be accomplished without further governmental aid. That argument was used 11 years ago when almost 90 percent of the farms of this country were without electric light and power.

Still another more subtle approach is that which tries to "improve the efficiency of rural electrification"—and I put that in quotation marks—by restricting the operations of cooperatives in the construction of competing generating plants and transmission lines.

As late as Friday in the Senate we had under consideration a deficiency bill which carried, among other things, an authorization of $100,000,000 for REA loans. This item was added to the bill on the House side to meet the situation with which you are familiar, namely, that almost all of the present funds are allocated and that no continuing authorization, such as the Poage bill, has yet been approved by Congress.

After the hearings had been closed, the Senate Appropriations Committee in executive session adopted an amendment which provided that no part of the money should be available for the construction of generating plants, unless it was certified by the Federal Power Commission that current was not available in the area at reasonable rates.

Those of us who realized the implications of this amendment—how it would in effect repeal parts of the REA Act—exposed it on the Senate floor, and stopped it cold, by a vote of 52 to 21.

What would this amendment have done? It would have deprived cooperatives of the bargaining power whereby they may secure reasonable rates from public-utility companies. They cannot ignore reasonable rates that would be set by actual or threatened competitive service. Everyone who is familiar with the history of the activities of the power corporations knows that even with this bargaining power cooperatives in some instances have been refused power at reasonable bulk prices.

It is highly significant that when cooperatives were forced under these circumstances to build competing plants, they were able thereby to secure lower rates. I am familiar with the Dairyland Power Cooperative and other cooperatives in my State. I know that unless that cooperative had had the ability to construct its own plants it would have had to take power from the power companies at 1.8 cents per kilowatt-hour. Instead, it was able to obtain its own power at 1.28 cents per kilowatt-hour. It thereby obtained a savings to the Dairyland Cooperative alone of $330,000 a year.

We had a similar congressional fight last December when utility interests tried to block various power projects and transmission lines that will mean lower rates to REA cooperatives. The issue is essentially the same on all multipurpose dams: the power companies want to obtain control of any power that is generated. A favorite method of trying to do that is to write legislative provisions into the law which will prohibit the Government from constructing transmission lines to the dam. The object is to place the private utilities in a position where they are the only customer for the power and thus to enable them to buy it at dump prices. We fought out that issue in the Senate last June when an effort was made to deprive the Department of the Interior of necessary funds to construct connecting transmission lines to Shasta and Keswick Dams. I discussed the issue at length and pointed out to the Senate at that time that the question before the Senate is, Shall these great power projects be operated for the public good, or turned over, lock, stock, and barrel to a private corporation for gain?

We won that fight, and also the previous one in November 1944 when we defeated the so-called Bailey amendment to a flood-control and power-project bill. The Bailey amendment also would have precluded the Government from building transmission lines when private interests wanted to buy the power at the dam.

I cite all these instances to emphasize the fact that we have strong opposition. And you know as well as I that it does not lack financial backing for propaganda purposes. From the steady stream of literature that comes across my desk—it is beautiful art work and well-written copy—I believe that it must serve at least one useful purpose—it must give employment to a great many people.

In all seriousness, we cannot afford to underestimate the drive that will soon be made in full force against all cooperatives on tax issues. We cannot afford to underestimate the further efforts that will be made to hamper REA expansion on this same issue of generating plants, or the more preposterous claims that the job of rural electrification is done, and that private utilities can handle the rest of the farmers. If I am any judge of the situation, these issues will be before the Congress soon again. Even the Harris bill in the House of Representatives, which has been reported from the subcommittee to the full committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, contains provisions which would restrict and hamper expansion. To obtain the kind of program we want, we need the help not only of you who are directly concerned, but every farmer who has a stake in rural electrification and every co-op member who believes in the cooperative movement. I call on all the friends of this great program to stand shoulder to shoulder in meeting the onslaughts of the utility interests.

Address by Hon. Lister Hill, of Alabama, to Gen. Henry H. Arnold, at Testimonial Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on February 9, 1946, at the Statler Hotel in Washington, the Army Air Forces tendered a testimonial dinner to Gen. Henry H. Arnold on the eve of his retirement as commanding general of the Army Air Forces. I was privileged to make an address on that occasion, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We gather tonight to do honor to an old comrade, a great soldier, a great airman, a great military leader, a great servant of our country, Gen. Hap Arnold.

His is the story of the achievements of an American boy who was to rise step by step until he was to stand within the small and select company of the leaders who were to save our country and the liberties of all peoples. His is the story of the man who did the impossibles.

We see Hap Arnold, a lanky young second lieutenant graduating at West Point in 1907, winning Aviator's Certificate No. 29 in 1911, winning the first of all United States military aviation badges in 1912, and in that same year being the first Army officer to have his name inscribed on the Mackay Trophy.

World War I comes and he does well his part. In 1935 he wins for the second time the Mackay Trophy, and in 1938 brings the Collier Trophy to the Army Air Corps.

And then World War II, the greatest war in all the world's history. Hap Arnold is full-grown now, with his splendid personal leadership, driving spirit, and professional genius. His unerring vision grasped the picture and his sound judgment correctly estimated the situation. In his brain the eagles of battle built their eyries, and beginning almost from scratch without a precedent, without a pattern, he created the mightiest military machine of the air the world has ever known. He smashed precedent, he cut the lines of static thought, he did the needful and built anew. He demanded from his subordinates, from science, from industry and labor, from all America, twice as much as it appeared humanly possible to deliver. He got at least 50 percent more than anyone, except Hap Arnold expected to get. His driving spirit, the driving spirit of the Army Air Forces found translation in their motto, "It can be done."

In 1940, we had to get aircraft to England—not a few but a veritable flood of them. There was not sufficient shipping space to make even a start. Hap Arnold mused, "Airplanes are made to fly. We will fly them to England."

Oh, it could not be done; everybody except Hap Arnold knew that. It was a long way to England. The route lay across the icy wastes of the North Atlantic. There were no intermediate landing fields, no communications, no weather services. The losses would be terrible to contemplate. Maybe a few long-range bombers could make it in a few of the better days during the summer. But it was just impossible.

A few months afterward Hap Arnold was to report to a committee of Congress, "We did fly the planes, pursuits as well as bombers, to England, and during the winter with the same success as we did in the summer, with no greater losses."

American and Allied experts assured Hap Arnold that daylight, high-altitude, precision bombing was impractical and impossible. Our allies had tried and had given up. Theoretically and demonstratedly, it could not be done. We could not possibly break through German defenses without prohibitive losses. Even the Germans were convinced. But Hap Arnold knew that to win the war we had to go through, and we know how well and how often we went through in broad open daylight straight to the targets.

The general had to have fighters to accompany the heavy bombers over Germany. A young staff officer remembers vividly walking to his desk one morning and finding there a directive for a fighter aircraft that would escort heavy bombers from England to Berlin and return. The general wanted it in less than 6 months, and from the assembly lines came pouring the Thunderbolts and the Mustangs. When the first fighters accompanied the heavy bombers over Germany, and Nazi pilots reported them, the Nazi high command laughed and said that the pilots were seeing things. They said it was impossible for a fighter to fly that far, until one day the commanding general of the Nazi fighters went out to take a look at the air war and met four American Mustangs which chased him all the way back to Berlin. Then he knew how far the American long-range fighters could fly.

The European winter came, with its wretched weather, and our air operations were coming almost to a standstill. The general's answer was to find out how to bomb through the overcast. He rallied the world's scientists and forced the solution. Soon, our thousand-plane attacks were as regular in bad weather as in good. With our fancy radar and radio gadgets our planes were able to drop their bombs on the enemy almost as precisely as if they were seeing the targets.

There was often a scarcity of many of the critical materials needed for the building of our planes and their equipment. These materials were in demand by other leaders no less conscientious or patriotic who were carrying grave responsibilities. It was the driving spirit of Hap Arnold that made all appreciate the vast importance of his great bombing offensives, won the approval of the

President, and secured from the Joint Chiefs of Staff the overriding priority to meet his needs.

Great as were the planes that Hap Arnold built, he recognized that their effectiveness against the enemy depended upon who serviced and navigated and piloted and fought them. He realized that 65 percent of the Air Forces' enlisted personnel and practically all of its officers had to be technical specialists. He demanded that the Air Forces have only the best in officers and personnel. He got them. From the flower of American youth came his mechanics, his pilots, and his fighting airmen. They paid tremendous dividends.

When the war broke with such swiftness there was an insistent demand that Hap Arnold send all available trained personnel to stem the engulfing tide of enemy air power. He was too wise for this. He refused to hazard the future to serve the hour. He sent only a portion. With the remainder as a teaching nucleus he welded together the mighty Army Air Forces that whipped its weight in Messerschmitts, Focke-Wulfs and Mitsubishies. It was a tough decision. It was the right decision.

With his planes and his fighting airmen Hap Arnold carried the war to the very heart of Germany long before it was possible to land on the beaches of Normandy. Where Hitler and Goering with all their planes and strategems and all their vaunted Luftwaffe failed, Hap Arnold succeeded. While Hitler and Goering could not understand and appreciate the tremendous significance and import of strategic bombing, Hap Arnold smashed Nazi plants and production lines, paralyzed their transportation systems, blasted their reserves, and made possible the landings on the Normandy beachheads, the terrific and heroic drive of our ground forces across France, through the Siegfried line, over the Rhine and on to the complete disaster of the German Armies.

Few of us will ever know the difficulties encountered in keeping the European bombing offensive coordinated under the command of airmen so as to utilize maximum efficiency of air power. General Arnold well remembered those difficulties when he set up the great B–29 offensive in the Pacific. To insure that its mighty strategic strength would not be weakened by the divided command in the Pacific, he set up the headquarters of this great force here in Washington with himself directly in command. Here he was the Commanding General of the Army Air Forces, a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a member of the Combined Chiefs of Staff, and in addition, brilliantly commanding the largest combat air force of all the world 5,000 miles from its theater of operations. What a general!

There is nothing in recorded history like it.

In early 1944 Hap Arnold took a trip to Europe. On the basis of what he saw there he decided in his own mind that the war in Europe would soon be finished. He forthwith cabled his staff in Washington to stop the enormous flow to Europe of aircraft, crews, bombs, ammunition, fuel, and all that goes with aerial war, and to channel the full weight of our air power potential toward Japan. A momentous decision, indeed. Only courage and military genius could make a decision of such import.

With that decision and all it meant in the bombing and burning and blasting of Japan, within 90 days from VE-day, without a single American ground soldier having to put his foot on the Japanese mainland, Japan surrendered and we celebrated VJ-day.

How sweet must be the thought tonight to Hap Arnold that his courage, his daring, his vision, and his genius contributed so much to the saving of the lives of thousands of American youth and of millions of American casualties.

It was a fateful quirk of chance that made Hap Arnold a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. But once he sat with the President and other service chiefs there was no question about the need for him in that body. At long last the Chief of the Air Service was in his rightful place. At long last air power had won recognition as an equal partner in waging the war. At long last the Army Air Forces had an authoritative voice in the decisions as to how and where they would be employed. Military aviation made its greatest forward step and Billy Mitchell stood vindicated.

Under Hap Arnold so brilliant were the achievements of the Army Air Forces, so magnificent their record, and so superior their contribution to the winning of the war that they cannot today be denied equal status and equal autonomy with land and sea forces. I tell you tonight that it shall be so written into the law of the land. Air power takes its place as America's first line of defense.

In this atomic age we know that our best hope for peace lies in an organized world under law and justice. We also know that until the world can be so organized—and the processes are slow, painfully slow—we must keep America strong if we would play our part in the leadership of the world and in the building of its peace. Men and nations do not follow weak leaders. And we must keep America strong that we may keep America free.

Hap Arnold, ever looking to the future, has already called in the scientists, the experts, and the best brains of our country and started them on mountainous research to find the answers, to look 20 years into the future that we may best plan and shape our defenses. In his historic document, the third report of the Commanding General of the Army Air Forces to the Secretary of War, he has left a rare testament of wisdom and of experience for our guidance.

As we pay tribute tonight to Hap Arnold, we cannot forget her who has been his best lieutenant, his kindest critic, his wisest counselor, and who has done so much to keep the home fires burning, Mrs. Hap Arnold.

Brooking no fear, quick to decide, going through with his purposes whatever obstacles opposed, Hap Arnold leaves an inspiring example of achievement, of devotion, of brilliant leadership that will quicken and strengthen the spirit of the Army Air Forces down the years.

As Hap Arnold departs from us he carries with him our affection for him as a comrade, our appreciation of all that he has done for the Army Air Forces, and our pride in his exalted services to our country and its free institutions. A searching survey of his record shows that there is no great act of his which our country would annul, no great decision by him which military judgment would reverse, no deed done which wisdom would deplore. His fame as a soldier is eternally fixed. He has won his place in the high fellowship of our country's great military leaders headed by George Washington. And we may know that if Washington were with us tonight he would join with us in saying to Hap Arnold, "Well done. Well done."

Statement in Opposition to Compulsory Military Training by Dr. John R. Sampey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. STANFILL

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. STANFILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Dr. John R. Sampey of the Baptist Theological Seminary at Louisville, Ky., setting forth his ideas regarding compulsory military training. Dr. Sampey is recognized not only in Kentucky but throughout the Southland as a great spiritual leader of the people, and his words and advice carry great weight among religious people all over this country.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A WORSHIPER OF LEE RENOUNCES WAR

(By John R. Sampey)

To show that I have not departed in the slightest from my great hero, Robert E. Lee, I wish to quote a brief passage from the authentic life of Robet E. Lee by Douglas Southall Freeman.

On page 497, of the fourth volume, on The Pattern of a Life, Dr. Freeman shows the marked change that came over General Lee after 1865. I quote as follows: "He was changed, also, in that, after 1865, he put out of his heart the military career that long had fascinated him. All the misgivings he had felt before the war regarding the pursuit of arms were confirmed by 5 years at Lexington. He spoke his conviction, as always, when he told young Professor Humphreys that the great mistake of his life had been in pursuing the education of a soldier, and he was not jesting in his encomium to General Ewell on the delights of a civil life. It was not by chance that he failed to keep step with the superintendent of VMI when the two walked together at the head of the column of cadets."

Dr. Freeman records the misgivings General Lee had felt before the war regarding the pursuit of arms. Please observe that he stated explicitly to Professor Humphreys that the great mistake of his life had been in pursuing the education of a soldier. He felt that he had largely thrown away his life in the work of destruction, and he devoted his closing years to the work of building up the young men of the South in order that they might build up Virginia and other States. He rejoiced in this work of reconstruction as opposed to the destructive activity of war.

From the days of West Point until Appomattox General Lee always conducted himself as a soldier, but after 1865 he refused to keep step when he marched with the superintendent of Virginia Military Institute at the head of the column of cadets. What could more strikingly show his renunciation of war?

I have long had some doubt as to General Lee's attitude toward war, and it is now perfectly plain to me that my great hero for the last 5 years of his life absolutely renounced war. He refused even to talk about the battles of the War Between the States lest the review of these terrible battles encourage hate against the North. He spent the closing years of his life in working for peace for his country.

It is well known to my many friends that I encouraged our people to give themselves heart and soul to winning the First World War against the Kaiser, and the Second World War against Hitler and his hordes. I was so earnest in my advocacy that I was deemed by some of my friends as a "war monger."

The question before the American people at the present time is the suggestion by President Truman and the leaders of our armed forces that youths of 18 shall be drafted for 12 months into military service. This would be far inadequate for the training of men in modern warfare.

I have two serious objections to this universal conscription of our American boys of 18. The first objection is that our only possible enemy in war in the future would probably be Russia. The plan to draft boys of 18 for only 12 months' military service

would be a joke in the eyes of Russia. With her population of 190,000,000, which is rapidly increasing through the encouragement of large families among the Russians, she will far outdistance us in building up a great army. She bore the brunt of the struggle against Hitler and his hordes during World War II. The Germans concentrated against Russia from two to three times as many divisions of their Army as they did against England and the United States. The proposed plan is wholly inadequate to provide any protection from an attack by Russia, if war should be brought on between our country and the Reds.

I have a second very serious objection to the conscription of our boys of 18 in our armed forces, as they are at present turned over to the sellers of liquid damnation in the form of whisky and beer. The example is set from the Chief of Staff and some of our top generals all the way down through the noncoms, and many thousands of our American boys who never touched alcoholic liquors in their homes in America have become addicts of liquor drinking. I cannot for a moment get my consent to encourage any lover of youth to vote for conscription of the 18-year-old boys as long as the distillers and the brewers flood our armed forces and all the world with alcoholic beverages.

I am authorizing my colleague, Dr. J. B. Weatherspoon, who is also chairman of the Social Service Commission of the Southern Baptist Convention, to send out to our Baptist papers and any other organs of public opinion, my intense opposition to the conscription of our 18-year-old boys.

The Fight Against Cancer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Doctors Are Out to Conquer Cancer and They Need Your Help," written by Eric A. Johnston and published in the Reader's Digest of March 1946.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DOCTORS ARE OUT TO CONQUER CANCER AND THEY NEED YOUR HELP

(By Eric A. Johnston)

Between Pearl Harbor and VJ-day, cancer killed 607,000 Americans—more than twice the number killed by Germans and Japs.

Cancer is the greatest killer of women between the ages of 35 and 55; the second greatest killer of men. Nearly 2,000 children die of it yearly.

Some 17,000,000 Americans living today are destined to die of cancer unless we do something about it.

Last year we started to do something about it. Responding to an appeal of the American Cancer Society, we subscribed approximately $4,000,000 to launch an all-out attack on the disease.

Of this, nearly $1,000,000 has already been made available for organized research. The National Research Council will serve as research adviser to the American Cancer Society; thus the campaign will be supervised by the same body to which the Government turned for advice on wartime research.

More than $2,500,000 has helped existing cancer clinics and hospitals with their immediate job. The immediate job—as distinct from the long-range effort to discover cause and cure—is far from hopeless. For, even on a basis of what we know now, we can save many cancer cases if the condition is detected and treated early enough. Early detection means periodic examinations by qualified cancer physicians in properly equipped clinics and hospitals. We have such facilities, but they are too few, too distant, too poorly equipped to serve all the 17,000,000 Americans marked for cancer death. At some clinics appointments must be booked 6 or 8 months in advance.

The funds you and I contributed last year have financed special cancer training for county medical examiners; surveys of State facilities for cancer treatment; refresher courses to qualify general practitioners to detect cancer early; radium, new X-ray machines, and other needed equipment for existing cancer clinics and hospitals.

But all this is only a beginning. We've set out to conquer cancer. Let's finish the job.

April is cancer-control month. At that time the American Cancer Society will launch its drive for $12,000,000 to speed up cancer research, extend public education, provide more and better hospitals and clinics, and train more specialists.

There is a high purpose in this campaign; the conquest of cancer must be undertaken. Your contribution to the American Cancer Society, Empire State Building, New York 1, N. Y., or to your own State cancer committee, will help.

The OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, day by day it becomes increasingly apparent that the OPA is one of the biggest stumbling blocks to reconversion, and the production of needed goods in this country. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "We Need OPA, but Let's Delouse It," from the Record-Herald and Indianola Tribune of February 21, 1946. Also I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the same newspaper of the issue of February 28, entitled "OPA in a Glass House."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Record-Herald and Indianola Tribune of February 21, 1946]

WE NEED OPA, BUT LET'S DELOUSE IT

L. S. Riford, agricultural cooperation chairman of the National Association of Manufacturers, said in Des Moines Saturday that price controls are a "road block that is impeding the progress of every industry." He declared they are strangling industry and agriculture.

A few hours later Secretary Wallace said to the same group of listeners that OPA must be backed for another year or there is imminent danger of wild inflation.

In this case the Record-Herald must agree with Mr. Wallace; but Mr. Riford is not altogether wrong. Price controls should be maintained for a limited time as a safeguard against inflation; but the cussedness and inconsistency can and should be taken out of OPA. The worst enemies of OPA are in its own organization.

OPA has discriminated against smaller businesses in spite of all its assurances of interest in them. There are too many crooks somewhere in its councils who talk one way and do another.

On the other hand, the ideas of businessmen that OPA should be completely scrapped are not to be taken with unreserved confidence. We must not forget that NRA in 1933 was the child of the United States Chamber of Commerce, yet was the biggest flop of its time. Businessmen, so-called, indulged in the orgy of stock and bond exploitation and installment buying which preceded the collapse of 1929.

But the mistakes of businessmen 20 years ago are no excuse for the mismanagement of OPA in 1946.

The gestapo tactics of some men in its enforcing division are reprehensible and amount to nothing less than high-handed chicanery. When Mr. Kline, head of OPA for Iowa, spoke to the Rotary and Lions Clubs of Indianola, he convinced most people of his personal sincerity; but he did not convince anybody of the sincerity of some of his superiors and subordinates, who are giving OPA a black eye. If OPA is our last line of defense against inflation, then the greatest threat of inflation lodges among some of the OPA employees, because they are wearing out public patience.

Mr. Kline asserted that violations of the OPA regulations would be enforced without fear or favor, that the violator would be prosecuted the same as if he drove through a stop light. That was the illustration he used.

It was an unhappy illustration from his standpoint. His entire audience was made up of men who try to obey traffic rules, not because they are afraid of being arrested, but because they believe them to be essential to safety.

Yet there was not likely a man among them who had not at some time unintentionally driven through a stop light and had not been arrested for it. And so long as he is a good citizen with due respect to the rights of his fellowmen, not one of them has any fear that in a month, 6 months, or a year after the mistake some 2-by-4 lawyer, who cannot make a living in private practice, will zoom down on him and prosecute him with added penalties for delay.

OPA regulations are so intricate and so constantly changing that no businessman can hope to go through a year without some technical violations of them. It is unfortunate that, no matter how conscientiously a man may try to comply with the spirit of OPA, he is constantly living in fear of prosecution for some violation of which he himself may not even be aware.

It is this, more than the broad, general purpose of the administration, that is driving people to distraction and to demand that the whole thing be wiped off the map.

[From the Record-Herald and Indianola Tribune of February 28, 1946]

OPA IN A GLASS HOUSE

Iowa OPA does not seem to be able to explain why the authorized increase in ceiling price of ear corn on the farm was withheld from Iowa farmers for nearly 11 months. At least the authorized statement by OPA given to the Tuesday edition of the RHT does not explain it. It comes nearer being an admission of the neglect rather than an explanation. The truth is the statement beats around the bush, dodges the issue, and says nothing. It admits the ceiling was raised

last March, but contains not a word of explanation of why Iowa farmers have been kept in the dark on it 11 months.

During that time Iowa farmers, those who are honest and loyal enough to cooperate with OPA, have lost thousands upon thousands of dollars by selling at 2 cents below the ceiling. Maybe it amounted to only ten, twenty, or a hundred dollars to the individual farmer; but altogether it would have been a right sizable sum.

In short, the OPA has gouged the very farmers who were its best friends. Those who sold on the black market have not been hurt.

Perhaps someone in OPA has slipped. It may have been an oversight. If so, OPA would do well to admit it frankly. But the embarassing question immediately arises: What would OPA do to a businessman or a farmer who made such a mistake?

OPA has had a disagreeable but necessary task to perform during the war, and even yet. It is easy enough to criticize, but not so easy for the critic to prove that he could have done any better. Perhaps the best thing to do is to forget this mistake. It may be the only thing to do, for the law provides no petty-fogging lawyers to sock OPA officials between the eyes for their mistakes.

However, if the Iowa farmers and the general public look with mercy on OPA, it may be expected in return that the gestapo agents of OPA will not be permitted to make for themselves records of prosecutions by hounding citizens who cannot keep up with all the meticulous regulations under which they are supposed to operate.

OPA in Iowa now seems to be in a glass house. It may be well to exercise considerable care in throwing rocks around.

Smear Campaign by Jewelry Manufacturers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. P. CARVILLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. CARVILLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an editorial entitled "Smear Campaign by Jewelry Manufacturers," from the Mineral County Independence-News, published at Hawthorne, Nev., and edited by Mr. J. R. McCloskey.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SMEAR CAMPAIGN BY JEWELRY MANUFACTURERS

The law of supply and demand is at work on the side of the mine operators of the West in their battle to prevent a raid by eastern jewelry manufacturers on the United States Treasury and secure silver valued at $1.29 an ounce at a special price of 71 cents an ounce. It was somewhat of a mystery to western men to understand the smear campaign carried on against William Jennings Bryan in his effort to monetize silver on the basis of 16 to 1 ratio with gold, states the Denver Mining Record in an editorial which continues:

The powerful jewelry manufacturing group wanted to continue to get cheap silver and they knew that the plan of Presidential nominee Bryan would end their racket. The same organization that smeared Bryan and constantly ridiculed silver as money is now before the United States Senate asking for special consideration and a bargain price for the white metal. The entire Nation believes in fair play and with the facts now under the limelight of publicity down in Washington, the western silver producers may after all these years get justice.

Western mining men should bombard United States Senators from eastern and western States with requests that they prevent the jewelers from successfully raiding the Treasury and getting $1.29 per ounce silver for 71 cents an ounce. Subscribers and readers of the Mining Record who are opposed to the jewelers' raid should write their Senators at Washington protesting against this plan to break the price of the white metal.

Senators who have believed in silver as a needed money metal have been subjected, in the past, to smear campaigns financed and paid for by the big eastern jewelers' organizations. National publications which many thought could not be bribed, printed scurrilious attacks on Senators presenting a solid front in their work for the white metal. Millions of dollars have no doubt been expended in this effort to break the price of metal, but now the demand exceeds the supply and if the Senate acts justly and wisely, it will prevent the proposed raid on the silver in the Treasury and make the jewelers pay the Treasury price for the metal just as they must pay the Treasury price for gold.

Price Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Let Us End the Controls," published in the Arizona Daily Star of February 28, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET US END THE CONTROLS

When the post-war "planners" in Washington announce that they are seeking by the present system of controls to prevent another 1919–20 boom and collapse, they imply that our country went through a desperate period after the end of that post-war boom. With ominous words they speak about the unemployment and the fall of prices, in a tone that would lead many to believe that the Nation barely survived.

Since there are many millions of people still alive in the United States who can speak from the actual experience of living through that period, perhaps their testimony is worth something. Certainly the black and dismal situation pictured by the "planners" did not develop. Not only did the Nation survive, but a period of great prosperity followed the collapse of 1920, a period in which the workers made enormous gains in their well-being. And it was all done without "planners."

After World War I there was a boom and a skyrocketing in prices of everything. Sugar went to 25 cents a pound; coffee to 60 cents; butter to 75 cents; eggs to $1 a dozen. Clothing went up, with shoes at $15 a pair; ordinary men's suits at $60; shirts at $4 and so on. Rents went through the ceiling, and there was similar scurrying about for houses. The stock market boomed. Wages followed prices and went to levels much ahead of prewar rates. And there were strikes, perhaps as many as there are today, but not involving as many workers.

In 1920 the thing blew up. The stock market crashed. General Motors was in difficulties. Great numbers of businesses failed. Unemployment became acute with a total of something like 4,000,000 unemployed. There was a definite amount of distress, but nobody starved.

The liquidation ran its course during the next year. Prices fell, but slowly and surely productivity revived and then began an era which was called profitless prosperity. Business hummed, but profits were small, until the big speculative period beginning in 1927 got under way.

The contrast between that record and what is being done today is a valuable one. The postwar period did one thing which is not being done now. It unleashed productivity by giving free play to American initiative Instead of being curbed, hamstrung, and punished the way they are today, producers were given a green light. The market was a free one. The high prices functioned as an automatic rationing plan. As production increased prices began to fall.

There was a similar housing shortage, and it was not cured with a year or two. As late at 1924 and 1925 there was still an acute housing shortage in Tucson. Very few houses were for rent, and prices were high.

What did follow from 1919 onward was an economy of abundance made possible largely by the opportunity for initiative. What we are seeing today is an economy of scarcity unwittingly promoted by the Government controls, which in existing circumstances, are fostering a growing black market. Rewards go to those willing to cheat; penalties to those who are honest and cooperative.

That shocking development is much worse than a temporary period of free price adjustment. It not only discourages and paralyzes the productivity that comes with free initiative; it sets a moral standard that will in time destroy civilization itself.

Would it not be better for the country to suffer some temporary inconveniences, rather than to bottle-feed the American people under the guise of economic security and stability, as if they could not withstand the shock of adjustment?

Let those who doubt, and who went through the postwar period of World War I, think back. Conditions were not as bad as the professional planners would have us believe. The progress that followed was real.

With a world crying for reconstruction, with millions of homes and their furnishings to be manufactured, with millions of automobiles to be sold and increasing millions of mouths to be fed, let us have enough faith in the principle of free initiative to bring an early end to these blighting controls. Let us not be frightened by bogeyman tales of the 1919–20 period. Let us have faith that what made this country great will continue to make it great, and that Americans are not weaklings, unwilling to take the risks and hardships that go with the functioning and the free market of a free society.

Let us end the controls.

Washington's Birthday Address by Hon. William Langer, of North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered at Minneapolis, Minn., on Washington's Birthday, before the George Washington Club.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Friends, in this year of decision, 1946, we need more than ever the moral courage and the stamina of the man whose birthday we celebrate today—George Washington.

As a nation and as individuals we must have the vision to see what is right, the moral courage to act accordingly, and the stamina to follow through.

George Washington perceived that winning the war of independence was not enough. The peace must be won also. He had the moral courage to insist that a mere piece of paper, the Articles of Confederation, be thrown where it belonged, in the scrap heap, and a living organism be born which, given sunlight and proper environment, would grow greater with each passing year. And so his vision and courage gave us the foundation of the American way of life, the Constitution of the United States of America. Despite a strong inclination to retire from public life, he had the stamina to stay by the infant until it could stand on its own two feet. George Washington is truly the father of our country.

At the Constitutional Convention, inspired by the spirit of this great man, politicians became statesmen. Partisan politics were submerged as were individual hatreds and prejudices. Although jealous of States' rights and reluctant to relinquish any sovereignty when the convention first convened, gradually a spirit of compromise for the common good pervaded the discussions. Government of the people rather than of the States became the motive force.

Small States were given an equal voice in the Government by the establishment of the Senate of the United States, which consists of two Members from each State, whether the population is approximately 639,000, as it is in North Dakota, or 2,785,000, as it is in Minnesota.

The Constitution, born in blood, was baptized in a spirit of sacrifice for the common good.

Before the Constitution won the approval of the people of the United States, however, one major defect had to be remedied. The rights of the people had to be guaranteed. Having gained their freedom at great sacrifice, our forefathers did not regard it lightly. They prized their personal liberty. And so the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, known as the Bill of Rights, became the law of the land. The Constitution is the servant, not the master, of the people.

Ladies and gentleman, the United States has reneged on its heritage of freedom for all. In accepting the United Nations Charter, we literally crucified freedom in the world. How can we so piously applaud an organization that condemns half the world to remain in bondage? That condones Great Britain's imperial policies? That ignores the riots of the common people who ask only a voice in their own government? That is a mere impotent spectator to the Big Powers' private maneuvers?

When I first read the proposals for a world government outlined at Dumbarton Oaks I detected many weaknesses. The absence of the spirit of George Washington was too apparent. The Bill of Rights was forgotten. The Articles of Confederation lived again.

I voted against the Dumbarton Oaks proposals and advocated a counterplan of regional, self-sufficient governments of comparative size.

I had no occasion to change my mind when I read Charter of the United Nations Organization formulated at San Francisco. It is a government ruled by five men on the basis of power and power alone.

An even cursory study of the Charter reveals this fact. There is a General Assembly made up of all members of the United Nations and a Security Council, dominated by the Big Five Powers, as they are so often called.

Now here is the interesting point: The General Assembly has no authority to initiate any measures. It can merely consider, discuss, initiate studies, receive reports, and make recommendations about any matter in which the Security Council is interested.

The Security Council, the ruling body, consists of 11 men. Five of these men are permanent members. In other words, Russia, England, the United States, France, and China, the five big powers, will always be represented on the Security Council, which has the only authority to act. By what devine right are they given this power over the entire face of the earth? They are not elected by the people. They are merely appointed, as Edward Stettinius was appointed by the President. They are not accountable to the people. They are kings on throne. There is danger in placing so much power in the hands of a few men who are, after all, only human. Our forefathers, realizing this fact, set up a government of checks and balances. But the UNO Security Council has no check. It is certainly not balanced.

Of the six nonpermanent members, two are from countries in the British Commonwealth of Nations, Abdel Badawi Pasha from Egypt and Norman J. Makin from Australia. Another member is Zygmunt Modzelweski, of Poland, a country dominated by its powerful next-door neighbor, Russia. The other three members are from Mexico, Brazil, and the Netherlands.

Your very able and distinguished Senator, Hon. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD, and I were the only two to vote "no" to the United Nations Charter. Neither Senator SHIPSTEAD nor I would deny that we assumed certain responsibilities in Asia and Europe the day our soldiers set foot on foreign soil. But we do deny that the Charter accepts those responsibilities in a spirit of justice.

I would like to quote the words of a man whom I believe to be one of the most honorable men on the floor of the United States Senate, my very good friend HENRIK SHIPSTEAD:

"In liberating Europe we have devastated Europe. By annihilating the German state we have created a vacuum in Europe. The peoples of Europe must be helped to recovery and the vacuum will be filled either by our democratic concepts or by totalitarian ones. * * *

"The question at issue is whether this Charter is real or phony; whether it is in truth an instrument to secure international peace and justice, or a cynical imposture bred by hypocrisy out of power politics.

"Having fought and won this war, we owe it to those who have died to make sure that they shall not have fought for no purpose. Nor should we either by acclamation or by default allow the peace settlement to be dictated either by vengeans or the greed of the victors, thus once again sowing the seeds of a new world conflagration."

But, ladies and gentlemen, isn't that exactly what we are doing? It is apparent that Russia, England, and the United States, by virtue of power, of guns, of tanks, of the atom bomb, are going to have the deciding voice in all action taken.

It might be wise in the interest of peace to apply such a charter if—and here is the most important if in the history of the world—if these three countries acted in the interests of the many instead of the few if they were willing to settle around the conference table in a spirit of compromise and self-sacrifice for the common good, if they were really dedicated to liberty and justice for all.

But what do we find? The UNO refuses to intervene in Indonesia. Iran's protest against Russia shelved by Security Council. Anti-British riots in Egypt and India quelled with gunfire. Russia negotiates with Iran. (You can imagine what bargaining power weak Iran will have when she's up against the bold, brazen Russian bear.) Poland butchered as a present to Stalin. Is there liberty in all this? Is there justice?

I say that the UNO is not a democracy. It is an oligarchy. Five men can regulate the armament of every nation and establish and maintain their own military and naval staff. Small nations and minority groups are mere pawns in the hands of five men. And these five men are dominated by two, Ernest Bevin of Great Britain and Andrei Vishinsky of Russia. Edward Stettinius, our representative, is a school boy who was pushed ahead too many grades. He's lost and befuddled. There is no agreement in our foreign policy.

Our freedom has been bought too dearly to be entrusted to the whims of five men who are in no way accountable to the people for their actions.

Consider what the situation would be if the United States were governed like the UNO. The House of Representatives would be a mere debating society, made up of men appointed by the governors of the States. The Senate would represent only 11 of the 48 States, and those 11 men would be appointed by the governors also. Five of the largest States would always be represented in the Senate and they would control its action in their own interests. There would be no executive responsible to the people. There would be no government responsible to the people. Is this democracy?

The words I spoke when I voted "no" to the United Nations Organization on July 28, 1945, I repeat today:

"Mr. President, during my service in the Senate in behalf of the common people, I have never sold the truth to serve the hour. I have no quarrel with the vote of any honest Senator upon this floor. Each one took the same oath that I took, namely, to defend and uphold the Constitution of the United States of America.

"Practically all Members of this body have indicated that they will vote for the Charter. Under my oath, Mr. President, and under my conscience, I cannot so vote. If I did I would feel that I was betraying the hundreds of thousands who have died in this war for the United States, and the hundreds of thousands who have sacrificed their loved ones and their treasure. I would be willing to vote for the appropriation of the last dollar in the United States Treasury, and the last dollar that we could borrow if, by spending that money, we could eliminate war, which we all abhor and hate. I would unhesitatingly vote for the Charter if I felt that it offered even the tiniest hope of a permanent peace. But, in spite of that, Mr. President, I feel from the bottom of my heart that the adoption of the Charter—and, make sure, we are going to implement it—will mean perpetuating war. I feel that it will mean the enslavement of millions of people from Poland to India, from Korea to Java, as well as people in many other places on this earth.

"Mr. President, I feel that the adoption of the Charter will be one step more toward compulsory and military conscription, and all that which goes with war.

"In my opinion, the Charter is not at all similar to the Constitution of the United States which was adopted by the Original Colonies. I may say at this point that I agree with what the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] said earlier in the day, when he stated:

"Most important of all, the American Constitution went to great length to guarantee genuine equality to States entering into the Union. Neither Ben Franklin nor the other members of the constitutional convention would have tolerated a Constitution by which two or three or five of the States were given a veto power over all of the rest."

"Mr. President, I say to you and to the other Members of the Senate that, in my judgment, if the Charter had been in effect when the American Revolution took place, France and all other countries who came to help us would not have been able to come, and today we would still be a colony under the rule of England.

"Mr. President, in my campaign for the senatorship 5 years ago I pledged to the fathers and mothers of North Dakota that I would never vote to send our boys away to be slaughtered upon the battlefields of Europe. I kept that pledge on this floor. I promised in that campaign to vote in the Senate to expend the last dollar, if necessary, in order to defend the Western Hemisphere. Again I say, Mr. President, that I kept that pledge to the people of North Dakota.

"Having so pledged myself, and having been elected to my senatorship upon such a pledge, and not having been elected to create an organization to which we would give a promise, either express or implied, that it would have authority to send our boys all over the earth, I cannot support the Charter. I believe it is fraught with danger to the American people, and to American institutions. I further believe that when a candidate for office pledges himself by specific promises, these promises should be honored, regardless of the political consequences which may follow to the candidate who made them.

"Furthermore, Mr. President, I reiterate that we ought not to vote on this Charter in the absence of our 11,000,000 fighting men and women. They are now away, and we do not know what their attitude will be upon their return, after having been to the four corners of the earth and after having fought upon the seven seas. We sit here, Mr. President, in our fine offices and upon this senatorial floor, blissfully ignorant of what these 11,000,000 veterans may be thinking. After all, they constitute the backbone of the common people of America. Certainly there is no reason for such a hurry to pass this Charter that some steps could not have been taken to have referred the matter to the people of the country, including the men and women in the armed forces, before the final vote was taken upon it.

"As their representative here in the Senate, I cannot, I will not, God helping me, vote for a measure which I believe to be unlawful under out Constitution, a measure which, in my opinion, betrays the very people who sent us to the Senate as their representatives."

It grieves me to have to repeat these words. I wish with all my heart I had been wrong and the UNO would have functioned in the interest of justice and peace. But such is not the case. My worst fears have been realized.

As long as Russia and Great Britain continue to interfere in the internal affairs of smaller nations, fomenting race and class hatred, there will be cancerous danger spots.

Thus England supports and appeases the Arabs in order to maintain influence in the Middle East at the expense of the refugee Jews who are refused admittance to their national home, Palestine.

Thus Russia encourages Communistic minorities in Poland, in Yugoslavia, in Greece, in Bulgaria, in Rumania, in Iran, perhaps even in Iraq. In Poland this has resulted in the virtual annihilation of the more liberal elements, and Poland kneels cowed under the shadow of the Kremlin.

Thus England supports princes and wealthy landlords in India which is held in a state of "arrested development" in order to furnish markets and raw materials for British industry. This means that English colonies literally feed, clothe, and house the English people in Great Britain, and the people of India subsist on less than 3 cents a day. In India England has always played off the Hindus against the Moslems, preventing unified action on the part of the Indians. The recent three-man commission sent to India to discuss self-government does not in itself give much cause for elation. Such commissions have in the past been but sops to quiet too active resistance.

The crux of the matter, as I see it, is that when large powers deal with smaller and weaker powers their desire is only to exploit, not to develop. The UNO merely legalizes this exploitation.

There has been a great deal of name calling in recent sessions of the Security Council but almost immediately any vital problem has been shelved. The conflict of interest between England and Russia is so fundamental and selfish motives so apparent that no agreements of importance were reached.

If kicking and screaming is a sign of health, the UNO infant will live a long life. But I'm afraid the strong lungs are housed in a weak body. The UNO is doomed to die, deprived of the milk of human kindness.

The recent action of the UNO in regard to Iran is a case in point. Iran asked for redress against Russia whose troops are stationed in northern Iran. Russia retaliated with charges that Great Britain's troops in Greece and Indonesia are a threat to peace. Ernest Bevin shouted "liar" at Andrei Vishinsky. Russia threatened the veto on a proposed vindication of British policy. The problems were left to be solved by power politics.

The provision that any so-called big power can veto action taken by the other big powers makes a farce of the entire proceedings of the Security Council whenever a charge is brought against one of the powers who can invoke the veto power. It is indefensible in principle and means that power politics is the order of the day. And yet might is not right. How can we allow it to be so?

All over the world the common man is awakening. Stirred by the Japanese promise of pseudoindependence, by the Allied promise implicit in the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms," millions of men and women are stirring within the limits of the chains that bind them.

You see it in the riots in Egypt, in India, in Indonesia, in Palestine. Our moral duty is obvious. A country founded by refugees seeking a haven where all races can live in freedom from oppression must not repudiate the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms."

It is time we remembered the words of George Washington who warned us against siding with one nation against another. He would have insisted that as a nation we have the moral courage to stand for what is right, to insist on a world government that makes all people equal. He would warn us of foreign influence that is not in the best interest of the common people. There are his words spoken in his famous Farewell Address after two terms as President of the United States of America. His whole life had been a fight to free this country from the rust of foreign influence which could undermine the whole system of government at home. Of course he was speaking at a time when the wide expanse of ocean was a more formidable barrier than it is today. But his words never needed more consideration than they do now. I am quoting George Washington:

"Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, I conjure you to believe me, fellow-citizens, the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican governments.

"The Nation which indulges toward another an habitual hatred or habitual fondness is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest."

Ladies and gentlemen, George Washington's words should be heeded. The United States cannot afford to continue to place itself in subservience to a third rate power like England with an "habitual fondness" that has no basis in fact. We are a strong nation and should lead, not follow.

When sea power was synonymous with world power, England could tie colonies throughout the world to her apron strings. This condition won't continue long in an air age of the atomic bomb. England will soon lose her slave labor and have to forage for herself. What the United States needs is a new Declaration of Independence. As George Washington said:

"Sympathy for your favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducement or justification. It leads also to concessions to the favorite nation of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate, in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld."

Which only goes to prove a point I have ben insisting on since the question of the $4,400,000,000 loan to England was introduced in the Senate. Why should we favor England with a loan that is in reality a gift? We are in debt to a frightening amount today because of lend-lease as well as our own expenditures and sacrifices on the altar of the god of war. Do you know that in order to pay this so-called loan, the normal income tax of 1939 has to be tripled?

If we have so much money, let's make the loan to the poor American farmer who is trying to bring his business up to date again. Let the farmer and the small home owner have a loan at 1-percent interest and give him 45 years to pay. At least we will get our money back and the entire country will benefit by the use of it.

We cannot support with $4,400,000,000 a third-rate nation that aspires to rule the world. We must become more realistic in our foreign policy and stop deluding ourselves that by adhering to the UNO we have ipso facto prevented a third World War. Such a hope is a long way from the truth.

The UNO is not spreading the gospel of freedom and liberty that is our heritage and our strength. The UNO is merely a club in the hands of five Caesars to maintain the status quo and improve the political strength of the big powers. The UNO does not diminish the enmity of Russia and England but merely legalizes it, placing us square in the middle. Force is the frightening dictator and the UNO merely the armor behind which the dictator parades.

Is that why we made the Declaration of Independence? Is that why George Washington said at the Constitutional Convention, "Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair. The event is in the hands of God." Is that why your sons and husbands and sweethearts and fathers fought and died in the last two World Wars?

George Washington's tired, ragged, hungry forces were the David that beat Goliath in the War of Independence. We need more Davids today, armed with bows of justice and arrows of truth. There is yet time but night draws near. The world has been bathed in the blood of your sons, but is not yet washed clean. We must, we will, dedicate ourselves to that task.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able statement presented to the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, considering the St. Lawrence seaway legislation, by Reginald P. Long, supervisor of Grand Island, Erie County, N. Y. I also ask to have printed a copy of the resolutions adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Erie County, N. Y., bearing on the same subject.

There being no objection, the statement and resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I appear before your honorable body today as the official representative of the Board of Supervisors of Erie County, N. Y. Embraced within our county are the cities of Buffalo, Lackawanna, and Tonawanda, and 25 well-populated towns. We represent, in truth, the heart and soul of the Niagara frontier and, as such, have the deepest and most vital interest in the project before you today—the St. Lawrence seaway.

I represent on that board the town of Grand Island, which is, as its name implies, an island which splits the Niagara River in half and which lies midway between the Canadian and American shores. From a geographical standpoint, let me say parenthetically that we are in a good position to appreciate the claims of both Canada and our country in this matter. However, as a representative of the town, and as a member of the Board of Supervisors of Erie County, I convey here to you today our vigorous and wholehearted opposition to this project. We believe the St. Lawrence proposal to be economically unsound. Our belief in that regard has been substantiated by a survey made by the highly competent and entirely impartial Brookings Institution. The results would not justify the enormous cost. The seaway phase of this project calls for a 27-foot channel for a distance of 1,350 miles from Lake Superior to Montreal, with the widening and deepening of the St. Lawrence for a distance of 183 miles. Despite the prewar estimate of Government engineers that it would cost, including the power plant, slightly less than $600,000,000, competent impartial private engineers state that the cost would not be less than $1,000,000,000.

When we realize that the Panama, Suez, Welland and other canals have all cost from two to three times the original estimate, we may safely assume that the figures of the private engineers are conservative. All this money would be expended on a transportation outlet that for 5 months of each and every year would be useless, because of weather and ice conditions, and as a consequence, the privately owned railroads now operating so efficiently and which carried nobly their burden during the late war, would have to be maintained in operating condition for the entire year in order to function during the 5-month period that the Government-owned canal paid for by the taxpayers was not in operation. That obligation the railroads could not financially meet, and men of vision can see the Government some day subsidizing the railroads to provide for the transportation of necessary merchandise and that, I need not mention here, is financially and economically unsound.

You have heard many times the devastating effect the competition of this project would have on the Niagara frontier and the State of New York. Logical arguments support the contention that Buffalo and the Niagara frontier could tear down its enormous grain elevators and close its harbor, the Nation's greatest inland marine center, if this project was carried to completion. However, looking at the picture from a national standpoint, we ask ourselves is this seaway in the best interests of the United States as a whole. We ask ourselves would American shipping benefit, and the answer is definitely "No." Most vessels of the American merchant marine are too big for the proposed waterway. As a matter of fact, a very small portion of our merchant marine could utilize it. It would be used mainly by small tramp steamers under foreign flags and these tramp steamers operate on low wages. They have lower standards of food and poor accommodations for the crew. Such shipping would be indeed ruinous competition to our own Great Lakes fleet and the International Longshoremen's Association and the American Merchant Marine Institute back up that statement to the hilt.

We ask ourselves would a waterway create lasting jobs and again the answer is a resounding "No." Except for the initial construction the St. Lawrence seaway would destroy jobs rather than create them. Incoming tramp ships carrying coal and ore mined at low foreign wages and carried at ballast rates by underpaid crews would take jobs from American miners and railroaders and attack industry in general. We could go on indefinitely pointing out the danger to America as a whole, but you've heard these arguments and I am sure can recognize the truth in them.

The power project connected with the St. Lawrense seaway is just as economically unsound and as wasteful an expenditure of the people's money as the seaway itself, from the national standpoint, as well as that of the State of New York and the Niagaga Frontier, which I represent. The only portion of the State of New York, and for that matter the United States, which could be economically served by this power development, would have very little demand for the power, for the area comprising the northern portion of New York is not an industrial area and I understand it would not be feasible to channel the power a sufficient distance to strike our industrial area, where the demand might be heavy. I am not here to defend private industry as such, or public utilities as such, but we do feel that the American people are entitled to value for money spent, and we are of the firm belief that the power project itself would be a white elephant from the standpoint of this country, and at best could only be of use to the people of Canada.

We are, therefore, gentlemen, vigorously opposed to the St. Lawrence seaway project in its entirety and the Board of Supervisors of Erie County, N. Y., has gone on record in this opposition. I am filing, herewith, a certified copy of this resolution. We respectfully urge you gentlemen to protect the high standard of living of the United States and to protect those industries of the State of New York and the Niagara frontier which create and foster that high standard of living and which, during the war just ended acquitted themselves so nobly in producing the weapons of victory and to protect those industries which, if given the opportunity, will forge again the instruments of peace. We ask you to protect not only the Niagara frontier and the State of New York, but the Nation itself by preventing this unscrupulous raid on our national treasury which has as its motive the creation of a seaway which, in our opinion, will bring no good, but will be the most harmful blow ever struck against American industry and the American people as a whole.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF ERIE COUNTY,
BUFFALO, N. Y., *February 25, 1946.*

To Whom It May Concern:

I hereby certify that at a session of the Board of Supervisors of Erie County, held in the county hall, in the city of Buffalo, on the 17th day of April A. D. 1945, a resolution was adopted, of which the following is a true copy:

"Whereas on various occasions and over a period of years this board has gone on record in opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway; and

"Whereas said proposed seaway presents a present threat to the economy of New York State and especially to the Niagara frontier as great as at any time since its inception; and

"Whereas no evidence has been presented to show that whatever benefits might accrue to the Nation they would in no way justify the expenditure of a billion dollars at a time when the credit of the Nation has been strained to the limit in prosecution of the war; and

"Whereas the people of the State of New York have contributed millions of dollars to provide water transportation from Lake Erie to the port of New York; and

"Whereas New York State, because of its great percentage of national wealth, would be required to contribute a great part of the total cost of the proposed seaway and at the same time create a transportation system in direct competition with its own system; and

"Whereas the diversion of transportation to cheap foreign shipping and the opening of our inland markets to alien tramp steamers would be detrimental to American labor, the American farmer, and American industry and so lower the whole standard of American living: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That this board renew its opposition to the St. Lawrence seawry, that it petition our representatives in the Congress of the United States to oppose any and all legislation proposing such a project; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That this board join with and urge all organizations, public, semipublic, and private, in the Niagara frontier to create a united force to the end that all opposition possible may be brought against this unsound and undesirable project."

Attest:

JEAN C. MARTIN,
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of Erie County.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF ERIE COUNTY,
BUFFALO, N. Y., *February 19, 1946.*

To Whom It May Concern:

I hereby certify that at a session of the Board of Supervisors of Erie County, held in the county hall, in the city of Buffalo, on the 29th day of January A. D. 1946, a resolution was adopted, of which the following is a true copy:

"*Resolved*, That a committee consisting of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, the chairman of the board, the chairman of the

finance committee, a representative from the clerk's office and the county attorney be authorized to attend, in conjunction with a committee from the city of Buffalo, hearings in opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway at Washington, D. C."

Attest:

JEAN C. MARTIN,
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of Erie County.

The Case of the Millers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY. O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I present for the RECORD an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune. Therein is presented the most flagrant, the most dastardly invasion of American constitutional rights that has come to my attention. It is becoming increasingly clear that unless Federal and State extend to our citizens the protection in their constitutional rights, and do so without further delay, free America will be a thing of the past.

The editorial follows:

THE CASE OF THE MILLERS

One of the first rules of sound journalism is that news and editorial comment should be strictly segregated. Nevertheless, every so often a news story bobs up which, without any conscious effort on the part of the writer to make it one, turns out, through its sheer simplicity and factuality, to be as effective an editorial as any that could be purposefully contrived.

Such a story is the half-column account sent in to the Wall Street Journal this week from New Canaan by Staff Correspondent Sydney B. Self on what happened to the Miller brothers of that little community, which borders on Stamford, Conn. The Millers, Mr. Self explains, are three brothers, who were brought up on a farm, knew all about dairying (and put all their savings into it), but who had reckoned without local 338 of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Stablemen, and Helpers, A. F. of L.

"Last week end," writes Mr. Self, "was probably the most trying in the lives of the Millers." The union had called out their drivers, demanding a new contract which was tantamount to a 50-percent increase in the pay roll, asked for an increase of 66⅔ percent in commissions and barred the Millers from doing any manual work around the dairy. Although the Millers had only 7 or 8 drivers working for them, the union sent in from 200 to 250 pickets from out of town to police the dairy (which necessitated the use of 60 State troopers to maintain order). When women customers drove up to the dairy to get milk for their families the tires of their cars were slashed.

The employees decided they had had enough and quit. And the Millers followed shortly. The Millers didn't have an accounting staff, but they could add and subtract, and they got out paper and pencil and did just that. Their business (around 2,000 quarts a day) grossed about $1,000 a week, out of which a $455 pay roll had to be met, in addition to the cost of trucks, gasoline, pasteurizing, bottles, and other necessary expenses of doing business. It did not take much figuring to see that with the pay roll jumped to between $600 and $700, themselves barred from working, and with other expenses continuing as usual the Miller brothers, as they wrote to Frederick Conrad, union president, in signing the proposed contract would simply be "signing a petition of bankruptcy in advance."

The union had a solution for this problem. Why, they suggested, didn't the brothers sell out to a larger concern, which would be better able to meet the union's wage demands. To this the Millers, who had built up a quality business, with butterfat content of the product well above the legal minimum, answered with a flat refusal. "We don't propose to ask our customers," they declared, "to go blindly to another, merely because we have turned over our route books and have written glowing praises of our successor—obviously put into our mouths."

The battle between the powerful teamsters' union and this little Connecticut enterprise was short, and the defeat was a crushing one. But it was more than a defeat for the Millers; it was one more defeat for the thing that over the years has been this country's greatest source of strength—the right of an American citizen to go into business for himself with a fair chance of making a success of it if he works hard and produces for himself with a fair chance of making a success of it if he works hard and produces something that the community wants and needs. That is the essence, not only of free enterprise, but of the only kind of equality that is consistent with the dignity of man—equality of opportunity. There are many threats to that system today, but none is greater than that presented by organized labor grown to manhood with respect to power, but with no corresponding increase in responsibility. As Congress prepares to write a new labor law, one could wish that every Member had the case of the Millers before him. Because the case of the Millers is neither more nor less than today's labor problem in America presented in simple microcosm.

Continue Price Control—Prevent Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 8, 1946

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker under the permission granted me, I include as part of my remarks the following speech delivered by Hon. Chester Bowles, Director of the Office of Economic Stabilization at the annual convention of the National Farmers Union, Topeka, Kans., March 5. It follows:

I am delighted to be here tonight with my friends in the Farmers Union. There is no group in America among our farmers, our workers, or our businessmen, who had a more enviable record of public service during the war period. There is no group in America which has more enlightened leadership. There is no group in America which has more to contribute in our struggle to achieve a future of peace, prosperity, and plenty.

To say that we have been going through a crisis during the last few months is something of an understatement. There has been widespread dissension among us. There has been bitterness and disillusionment. We have found ourselves pulling in different directions with every group blaming everyone else for the difficulties which inevitably confront us as we reconvert from war to peace.

If we stop to think about it, I believe we will agree that this situation was scarcely unexpected. For more than 4 years we had been concentrating all our efforts on an all-out war in all parts of the world. The problems of our economic reconversion from war to peace has been clear to everyone. The problem of reconverting our thinking, our loyalties, and our prejudices, although just as difficult, has been far less appreciated. It has not been easy overnight to adjust ourselves to the ways of peace. It will take time for all of us to realize fully that only by pulling together and working together can we achieve the kind of future which all of us seek.

Today those among us who are inclined to be pessimistic will find plenty to worry about. There is the problem of our relationships to Russia, a relationship which for the good of all the world must be worked out on a reasonable and friendly basis. There is the problem of industrial strife and the tendency of many of our people to pit group against group for their own selfish interests. There is the grave danger of inflation, a danger which is greater today than at any period since Pearl Harbor.

But the outlook is not all gray. There is also a great deal to give us confidence in our future. During the war we have learned for the first time the real potentialities of American production on our farms and in our factories. Labor and management have learned what the farmers always knew—that only through unlimited production can great wealth be achieved. We have learned that no group among us can profit at the expense of the other.

Finally, during the war period, I believe we have cut loose, once and for all, from the narrow isolationism of the past. Although we still have our American nationalists, our Gerald Smiths, our imperialists, the country as a whole has come to recognize that unless the world is at peace with increasing prosperity everywhere, there can be neither peace nor sustained prosperity here at home.

Eactly what are the greatest hurdles that lie today between our people and this longed-for future of prosperity and plenty? By far the greatest single danger is, I believe, the danger of inflation.

There is no group in America which understands the consequences of inflation better than our farmers. It was our farmers who suffered most in the boom and collapse following World War I. And no group was harder hit than our farmers when the Wall Street stock-market crash set off the depression of the early thirties.

What is the record on price control in this war period in comparison to the war of 25 years ago? What about production, profits, and income. Can inflation really be controlled?

During the First World War we had only moderate controls over prices and rents. As a result while production increased only slightly—on our farms the increase was only 5 percent—prices and rents skyrocketed and eventually we were faced with a terrific collapse.

During this war prices and rents have been held more nearly in line, particularly during the last 3 years. During the war years, the cost of living has risen less than one-third as much as during the World War I inflation that reached its peak in 1920. Since spring of 1943, the increase has been held to less than 4 percent. And today industrial prices stand only about 4 percent above where they were in May 1943. To

those lobbyists who say that full production under price control is impossible, let me emphasize that it was in this same period that the records of production in our factories and on our farms have reached their greatest heights.

We have produced more in the price-control years than ever before in our history. More than that, each group has enjoyed greater prosperity. Our weekly earnings of factory workers have increased 86.2 percent since 1939. Business profits before taxes were nearly 5 times as large in 1945 as before the war, and bankruptcies fell to the all time low of 810—fewer than in any single month of the booming twenties. Our farmers as a whole are also better off than in any period in our history. The actual increase since 1939 in net operating income per farm is slightly over 300 percent.

This, however, is a dangerously misleading figure because it fails to take account of the shockingly low incomes which our farmers had in the prewar years. An increase in income from $400 to $1,200 looks impressive to the statistician. But you and your family are only too well aware that $1,200 is still a long way from actual riches.

Since VJ-day various mistakes have been made in the handling of the economic stabilization program. In the first place, we moved far too rapidly in removing controls over industrial production. It was proper, of course, to scrap the great majority of these controls following the end of the war with Japan. But clearly more of them should have been maintained to assist us in our efforts to increase our supply of clothing and building materials and other essential products.

We were expecting also a considerable drop in city employment. Some experts estimated that there would be at least 5,000,000 workers walking the streets in search of jobs by January 1. As a result of a drop in industrial wages, the experts expected a sharp decline in farm income.

Instead, employment has held up. Reconversion, although delayed by labor-management difficulties, is well ahead of schedule. The take-home pay of our factory worker, while less today than on VJ-day in spite of many increases in the hourly rates, has dropped far less than was expected.

As a result our national purchasing power has been maintained at a high level, and because the supply of goods is necessarily far below our actual needs, the pressure for higher prices and rents has been almost overpowering.

Two weeks ago a new economic stabilization program covering wages as well as prices and rents was developed to meet the new situation that confronted us. I was asked to leave my post at OPA to direct this over-all program and to see that inflation is kept under tight control.

Clearly the task will not be an easy one. The next 90 days will determine our success or failure. Between now and the first of June, one of the most fateful decisions in the peacetime history of our Nation will be reached. In that brief period the forces of greed will finally overcome us and inflation will be a rapidly growing fact, or the strength of the people will be reasserted and the stabilization program will be strengthened and maintained.

The crisis is an immediate one because it is between now and June that Congress must choose between a continuation of the price- and rent-control legislation beyond June 30 until June 30, 1947, or a disastrous inflation. Congress has the choice of eliminating this act completely and letting prices and rents go sky high, or modifying and weakening the act so that it is useless as a means of protecting you against the inflationary pressures; or frankly and firmly granting us the necessary powers to continue to hold the line as we have held it since May 1943.

Between now and June, Congress must also determine whether we are to continue to use subsidies to maintain food prices at roughly their present levels, or whether these subsidies are to be eliminated with a resulting sharp and dangerous rise in the cost of living for tens of millions of our people.

Between now and June, Congress must decide whether the Office of Price Administration, the Office of Civilian Production, and the Wage Stabilization Board are to receive sufficient funds to carry out their enormous responsibilities, or whether reduced appropriations are to be used as a cellar-door method to sabotage our efforts to fight off inflation.

Finally in the immediate future Congress must decide whether we shall move vigorously ahead to build the homes which millions of veterans are looking forward to at reasonable prices, or whether we shall continue to fumble with the housing crisis in the name of reaction and narrow selfish interests.

The next few weeks represent the Guadalcanal, the Okinawa, and the Stalingrad in our fight to maintain a stabilized economy. To lose this fight will mean disaster. To win it will pave the way to a future of sustained prosperity for all of us.

Day after day, the battle lines are being drawn with increasing sharpness. On the one side we have all the millions of inarticulate little people who have made our country great in the past and on whom its future depends. On their side are many leaders among our farmers, among our factory workers, and among our businessmen.

Opposed to them are some of the most irresponsible, reckless, greedy organizations in America. Let there be no question about whom I am talking. I am talking about the lobbyists of the National Association of Manufacturers. I am talking about the heads of the National Retail Dry Goods Association, with all the phony propaganda with which they seek to cash in on the apparel shortage. I am talking about some of the real estate lobbies, and your old friend the packers' lobby, and the textile lobby. I am talking about the dairy lobby.

I am talking about those lobbyists who haunt the Washington hotels and the halls of Congress and the governmental agencies, endlessly scheming and plotting to trade the interests of the great majority of our people for the narrow short-range profit of the groups which they represent. And finally, I am talking about those speculators in the commodity markets and those speculators in Wall Street who time and again have played the American public for suckers in their promise of speculative profits from stocks and securities, and who today are again irresponsibly whooping it up for inflation.

These people do not represent business. They do not represent the majority of our manufacturers, or our retailers, or our landlords, or textile operators, or dairymen, or our investors. They represent only themselves. But let's not underestimate their skill, their perseverance, or their reserves. They are out to eliminate or wreck the only controls which stand between our people and inflation. We are on the eve of a crisis which cannot be exaggerated. Between now and early June, we shall determine whether we are to have stable prices and stable rents; whether our savings and insurance policies are to be protected; whether our bonds are to be worth the money which we paid for them; or whether we are to start down the primrose path toward another inflation which will surely bring disaster to our economy and sweep away the life savings of tens of millions of our people.

During the coming months we shall also go a long way toward deciding the strength of our American democracy, for if the lobbyists and pressure groups can win this fight against the people, then our democracy indeed will have suffered a dangerous defeat.

A great deal depends in the next few weeks on our farmers. Every effort has been made and every effort will be made to embitter our farmers against the working people of our cities. Over and over again our farmers will be told that industrial workers and businessmen have been "getting theirs," and that now its their turn to get even.

This is a demagogic and dangerous appeal.

As you listen to this particular siren song remember that farm income has been maintained since VJ-day only because there has been only a relatively moderate drop—roughly 5 percent—in the total income of our city workers. Part of this has been due to the unexpected continuation of overtime work and part to the increases in wages that have already gone into effect. As the normal workweek becomes the rule, it will, of course, take increases in the hourly wages rate of many more of our factory workers to make up for the loss in take-home pay if we are to maintain demand for farm products and the income of our 6,000,000 farm families.

Most farmers dislike subsidies. Naturally, they would prefer the same amount of income as a result of a higher price. For this reason many farmers have told me, "I am highly in favor of price control. I want to see the price of farm machinery held down—farm fencing—building materials—apparel and housefurnishings. I am solidly behind you on that score. But I simply cannot go along with you on subsidies."

That is a natural viewpoint for farmers to take. But it has one basic fallacy, and that is the fact that without subsidies on food the stabilization of our economy is completely impossible. If subsidies were to be removed on July 1 when our present authorization runs out food prices would promptly move upward 8 percent.

Milk would increase at retail 2 cents a quart. Meat by from 3 to 5 cents a pound. Cheese by 14 cents a pound. Butter by 12 cents. Bread by 1 cent. Most canned fruits and vegetables by 1 cent a can. This would be a severe blow to millions of families living in the cities on narrow incomes. It would bring about widespread demands for wage increases and very probably the collapse of our wage stabilization program. And let's not forget that would not add a single penny to the income of our farmers.

On the contrary, as wages moved higher, manufacturing costs would again move upward, and so would the prices of things you buy in the store. The increase in the cost of the products and services you buy would leave our farmers considerably worse off than they are today. This would lead to further demands all around and an increasing inflationary spiral which could have only one final disastrous result.

Let there be no mistake about it. Whether we like it or not, subsidies and effective price control are indivisible. Without one we cannot have the other. That is why I say that the attitude of our farmers will decide the success or failure of our efforts to control inflation. If our farmers will close their ears to the propaganda of some of their own leaders and to the voice of the National Manufacturers Association and other groups which have subtly tried to drive a wedge between them and the other working groups; if our farmers will lend us their support and backing along with all the tens of millions of people in our cities, then there can be only one result between now and June, and that is a resounding people's victory over the forces of inflation.

Clearly, this victory over inflation is essential if we are to achieve the kind of future toward which every thinking person is hoping and praying. It is essential if we are to maintain the high purchasing power on which the prosperity of all of us depends. Throughout the war and particularly since VJ-day our farmers have learned the extent to which their own incomes are dependent on the purchasing power of our city people. The most effective over-all program for farm prosperity is a program that brings prosperity to all of our people and keeps all our millions of workers employed at good wages.

In the period which lies ahead, however, we must take additional steps designed specifically to help the 6,000,000 families who live on our farms. We must continue to push vigorously ahead with our program of rural electrification. We must move ahead in the field of crop insurance so that the farmers may have the same protection that businessmen and industrial workers have long enjoyed against mishaps beyond their control. We must develop long-range programs on all basic feeds to give us stability of supply and price. We must develop a program for the South which will raise the income of southern farmers as well as southern workers, a program which will take specific notice of the problem of cotton, the need for diversification of farming, and increased farm mechanization. We must move ahead vigorously in providing grants for rural schools, roads, housing, and health projects.

There will be opposition to many of the programs which are developed in the long-range interest of the farmer. But the farmer's fight for a more prosperous future is a fight which belongs to all of our people. The 25,000,000 men, women, and children on our American farms represent our greatest undeveloped market. Intelligent businessmen and city workers realize this. They know that until our farmers receive their just share of our national income that there can be no broad sustained prosperity for the rest of us.

Together—businessmen, farmers, and workers—we can and must move ahead to greater and greater heights of achievement. Working together as we worked together to win this greatest of all wars, we cannot fail.

Today the whole world is looking toward America. What we do or fail to do in providing additional food for Europe, India, China, and other areas faced with malnutrition and starvation will mean life or death to tens of millions of people in the immediate future. What we do or fail to do here at home in our fight against inflation, in our efforts to develop a sustained full-production, full-employment economy will have repercussions for good or for evil in every corner of the globe for generations to come.

Will we move ahead under a vigorous democracy to greater and greater heights of production? Will we move ahead to higher incomes for all of us, toward the elimination of slums, disease, ignorance, and ill health? Or shall we embark on an inflationary joy ride to disaster, with the spectacle of some strange new American fascism arising out of the bitterness and the disillusionment which will surely result? What will our American answer be to this gravest of all questions which ever faced our Nation during peacetime?

Will it be the answer of the NAM which has fought on the wrong side of every public question for the last 30 years? Will it be the answer of the pressure groups, the answer of organized greed?

Or will it be the voice of the everyday people of America, clear, strong, determined, confident—with their heads held high, and their eyes firmly fixed upon a future that for generations to come means the difference between hope and despair not only for 140,000,000 Americans but for all the people everywhere throughout the world?

Caviar at $24 per Pound and Pheasant at $2.25 per Pound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 8, 1946

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following news articles appeared in the January 17, 1946, Times-Herald:

TODAY'S SPECIAL: CAVIAR $24 PER POUND

NEW YORK, January 17.—One Madison Avenue market, its meat supplies exhausted by the meat workers' strike, was displaying this sign for the benefit of its patrons:

"Plenty of pheasant, Scotch grouse, and caviar."

Pheasant was quoted at $2.25 a pound and caviar at $24 a pound. No price was given on grouse.

After reading this article certain situations are brought to mind. If imported foods such as caviar can be sold for $24 per pound and imported fowl for $2.25 per pound without causing inflation, why are domestic fowl subjected to such low ceilings?

On October 22, 1945, I called the attention of the Members of the House to OPA Revised Maximum Price Regulation No. 289, which was an amendment to provide imported Swiss cheese a 12¾-cent-per-pound ceiling above the ceiling of domestically produced Swiss cheese.

The OPA did not have the legal authority to place this ceiling on imported Swiss 12¾ cents per pound above the domestic Swiss. If anyone thinks this power has been delegated to the OPA, let them answer why it was necessary to spend 10 days on the reciprocal trade treaties that gave President Truman the power to reduce duties by 50 percent. If Chester Bowles had the authority to remove the duty of 5 cents per pound altogether, why pass a law giving the President the power to reduce the duty by only 2½ cents per pound?

No administration will ever talk about inflation more than the present one and it is doubtful if any administration will ever be in power that will do more to promote inflation.

The following is an advertisement which is one of several that have appeared in central Wisconsin papers during the past several months:

LIVE POULTRY WANTED

	Cents
Heavy hens	22
Leghorn hens	20
Heavy springers	24
Leghorn springers	20
Roosters	15

We had better have a fact-finding committee to find out what the producer received per hour for producing these 15-cents-per-pound roosters and 22-cents-per-pound heavy hens.

When President Truman provided the steel interests the $5-per-ton increase in the price of steel and the steel worker the 18-plus cents hourly increase in wages above the $1.08 average he was receiving, the Price Control Act was given a sleeping pill from which it may never recover.

Address of Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE J. BATES
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 8, 1946

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address by the Honorable Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., at the Middlesex Club, Boston, February 12, 1946:

We meet tonight on the one hundred and thirty-seventh anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln—who led and inspired the forces which served our Nation in the very moment of its destruction and in so doing set a standard for all of us who come after him to follow.

Edmund Burke says that during the reign of the kings of Spain, whenever they were in doubt, their statesmen would say that they should consult the genius of Philip II. How natural, therefore, it is for us as Americans, when perplexed as we are today to consult the genius and memory of Abraham Lincoln. It is, moreover, imperative for us Republicans to look at his life, so rich in accomplishment, to study his character, so many-sided and yet always so noble, and to gain inspiration from his great soul.

Surely in contemplating the new dangers in the world today, we can agree that we need all the help and all the wisdom and inspiration that Lincoln can give us. The answer to so many of our present problems—from that of peace in a world of atom bombs to that of prosperity in an era of industrial disputes—is found, in the last analysis, in the hearts and souls of men who live their lives in the common life of every day. Lincoln's life inspires us all in its general course. But, beyond that, Lincoln's life is today actually a practical guide.

What a life it was. It contained what Carl Shurz called such a "weird mixture of qualities and forces." We can see the whole span of his growth in some of the things he said. In his maiden speech as a candidate for the Illinois Legislature, at the age of 23, he closed with these words:

"But if the good people in their wisdom shall see fit to keep me in the background I have been too familiar with disappointment to be very much chagrined."

And, after 30 years of public life, Lincoln wrote: "The mystic chords of memory, stretching from every battlefield and patriot grave to every living heart and hearthstone all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union, when again touched, as surely they will be, by the angels of our better nature."

How steadily, how swiftly, and how straight his stream of life flowed through those 30 years. In the words of Ecclesiasticus: "And God brought out a man of mercy, a man loved of God and man, whose memorial is blessed. He sanctified him in his faithfulness and meekness."

His life was nobly lived. At Ford's Theater in Washington that life was suddenly cut short. The chronicle of that day records: "Within the narrow compass of that stage box that night were five human beings, the most illustrious of modern heroes, crowned with the most stupendous victory of modern times; his beloved wife, proud and happy; two betrothed lovers with all the promise of felicity, that youth, social position, and wealth could give them; and a young actor, handsome as Endymion upon Latmus, the idol of his little world. The glitter of fame, happiness, and ease was upon the entire group; but in an instant everything was to

be changed with the blinding swiftness of enchantment. Quick death was to come on the central figure of that company * * * over all the rest the blackest fates hovered menacingly; fates from which a mother might pray that kindly death would save her children in their infancy. One was to wander with the stain of murder on his soul, with the curses of a world upon his name, with a price set upon his head, in frightful physical pain till he died a dog's death in a burning barn. The stricken wife was to pass the rest of her days in melancholy and madness; of those two young lovers, one was to slay the other and then end his life a raving maniac."

So reads the contemporary chronicle. But in the hearts of the generations which have outlived that chronicle Lincoln lived on. Succeeding generations have studied his life as we are doing tonight. What particularly impresses us today?

First on any list would be his human, loving kindness. We see his hatred of cruelty when in his early childhood he reproved some of his boyhood acquaintances for cruelty to a dumb animal. This same hatred of cruelty appears in his fight against slavery. And we again see his greatness of heart in his letter to Mrs. Bixby, who, in losing her five sons in the Civil War, had, as Lincoln said, "laid so costly a sacrifice upon the altar of freedom."

He loved his fellow man. Such love must be the guiding motive of those who govern in a democracy.

A second quality was his honesty. Horace White, a contemporary of Lincoln's and an active Republican, says this:

"The popular conception of Mr. Lincoln as one not seeking public honors, but not avoiding public duties, is a postbellum growth very wide of the mark. He was entirely human in this regard, but his desire for political preferment was hedged about by a sense of obligation to the truth which nothing could shake. This fidelity to truth was ingrained and unchangeable. In all the speeches I ever heard him make—and there were many—he never even insinuated an untruth, nor did he ever fail when stating his opponent's position to state them fully and fairly. He often stated his opponent's position better than his opponent did or could. To say what was false, or even to leave his hearers under a wrong impression, was impossible to him. Within this high enclosure he was as ambitious of earthly honors as any man of his time. Furthermore, he was an adept at logrolling or any political game that did not involve falsity. I was secretary of the Republican State Committee of Illinois during some years when he was in active campaign work. He was often present at meetings of the committee, although not a member, and took part in the committee work. His judgment was very much deferred to in these matters. He was one of the shrewdest politicians in the State. Nobody had had more experience in that way, nobody knew better than he what was passing in the minds of the people. Nobody knew better how to turn things to advantage politically and nobody was readier to take such advantage, provided it did not involve dishonorable means. He could not cheat people out of their votes any more than out of their money."

Such a principle is a charter for the enduring freedom of a people truly and enduringly free. Such a charter should be, and will be, the charter of the Republican Party, not for today or for a single adventure but for all the times that are to come.

Third on my list was his desire to unite the people. It was Lincoln who asked the famous question: "Must a government of necessity be too strong for the liberties of its people or too weak to maintain its own existence?" Lincoln saw with his genius for understanding and solution the horns of this dilemma. He knew, as Shurz said, "that in order to steer this Government by public opinion successfully through all the confusions created by the prejudices and doubts and differences of sentiment distracting the popular mind and so to propitiate, inspire, mould, organize, unite and guide the popular will that it might give forth all the means required for the performance of his great task, he would have to take into account all the influences strongly affecting the current of popular thought and feeling and to direct while appearing to obey. This was the kind of leadership he intuitively conceived to be needed when a free people were to be led forward en masse to overcome a great common danger under circumstances of appalling difficulty—the leadership which does not dash ahead with brilliant daring, no matter who follows, but which is intent upon rallying all the available forces, gathering in the stragglers, closing up the column, so that the front may advance well supported. For this leadership Abraham Lincoln was admirably fitted—better than any other American statesman of his day; for he understood the plain people, with all their loves and hates, their prejudices and their noble impulses, their weaknesses and their strength, as he understood himself, and his sympathetic nature was apt to draw their sympathy to him."

His passion to unify the American people was expressed in his ringing and solemn utterance: "A house divided against itself cannot stand. I believe this Government cannot endure permanently half free and half slave. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved; I do not expect the house to fall; but I do expect it will cause to be divided."

In our contracted modern world where we live shoulder to shoulder with other nations having different views of life, how vital it is for us never to be a house divided.

These then are three pinnacles of Lincoln's life: First, his loving kindness for his fellow men; second, his honesty; and, third, his passion to unify the people. There is, of course, one more. You may call it, as history has, a radical trait. Perhaps "independent" would be a better word. Others have described this trait. Phillips Brooks described it in these words:

"In him goodness and intelligence combined and made their best result of wisdom. For perfect truth consists not merely in the right constituents of character, but in their right and intimate conjunction. This union of the mental and moral into a life of admirable simplicity is what we most admire in children; but in them it is unsettled and unpractical. But when it is preserved into manhood, deepened into reliability and maturity, it is that glorified childlikeness, that high and reverent simplicity, which shames and baffles the most accomplished astuteness, and is chosen by God to fulfill his purposes when he needs a ruler for his people, of faithful and true heart, such as he who was our President.

"Another evident quality of such a character as this will be its freshness and newness, if we may so speak. Its freshness or readiness—call it what you will—its ability to take up new duties and do them in a new way, will result of necessity from its truth and clearness. The simple natures and forces will always be the most pliant ones. Water bends and shapes itself to any channel. Air folds and adapts itself to each new figure. They are the simplest and most infinitely active things in nature. So this nature, in every virtue of its simplicity, must also be free, always fitting to itself each new need. It will always start from the most fundamental and eternal condition and work in the straightest, even although they be the newest, ways to the prescribed purpose. In one word, it must be broad and independent and radical. So that freedom and radicalness in the character of Abraham Lincoln were not separate qualities but the necessary results of his simplicity and childlikeness and truth."

This man "of freedom and radicalness," let us remember in conclusion, reminded his fellow countrymen that "this country with its institutions belongs to the people who inhabit it. Whenever they shall grow weary of the existing Government they can exercise their constitutional right of amending it, or their revolutionary right to dismember or overthrow it." We cannot be timid and be worthy of Lincoln.

One final word from him, one word of thunder that comes breaking out from the past to help us today: "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves."

If we but let our minds be bold, in the spirit of these words, and follow the bright light of Lincoln's genius we need have no fears about the future.

What Really Is Happening?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 8, 1946

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in the December 31, 1945, What's Happening in Washington, I find in the column pertaining to inflation under No. 4, the following:

Prices and cost of living will edge up another 5 to 10 percent.

Under general domestic conditions, No. 29, I find:

Farm income may fall about 10 percent.

I have noted in the press and the publications of the United States Department of Agriculture that the farmers are expected to receive 10 to 15 percent less income in 1946 than in 1945. It is to be regretted that the administration cannot or does not find a formula that will look after the interests of the farmers of the country. The Department of Agriculture constantly spends more time on propaganda and less on agricultural problems. The propaganda is based on half-truths and has reached a point where the farmer takes their utterings with many, many grains of salt. This country is fortunate in still having some of the old civil-service men in the Agriculture Department to give that Department at least some respectability. However, they are gradually being pushed into the background, and their studies painted up by the New Dealers and presented by the politicos who are evidently more interested in the vote crop than in any crop any farmer ever grew at any time.

More of this can be expected as we see the Tammany, Kelly-Nash, and Hague corrupt political machines take over the party once known as the Democratic Party. These machine politicos had better quit harboring the thugs operating under the benign leadership of Dan Tobin. The farmers do not like to have their heads bashed in when they take their produce to market, and would like

to have a small slice of the "four freedoms"—freedom from fear—while they carry on their great work of feeding the people of the Nation and, to a great extent, the starving people of the world.

With the present set-up where the CCC has millions upon millions to carry on its operations, it appears that national farm income can be just about what the politicos and bureaucrats want or wish it to be.

Long Beach Editorial Reminds Loan Is Not All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 18, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank you and the membership of the House for granting me unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of today an editorial which appeared in the Long Beach Press-Telegram-Sun at my home city on December 16, 1945.

It appears as timely now as it did when it first was written, in its statement of some of the factors which must be considered by the American people in their final decision upon this very matter:

LOAN TO BRITAIN IS NOT ALL

Perhaps because it is easier to understand than the other terms, the $4,400,000,000 loan by the United States to Britain nearly monopolizes the discussion on both sides of the Atlantic of the economic agreements negotiated by the American and British governments. It is unfortunate, because the loan is far from being the whole of the agreement, and it may turn out to be not even the most important part of it.

Besides the loan and related provisions for cancellation of the greater part of Britain's lend-lease obligations to the United States, the agreements contain provisions for restoration and development of international trade by removing or reducing barriers to the free movement of commerce among nations.

Britain agrees to modify its policy of trade preference maintained before the war between it and British dominions and colonies, thus opening new markets to American goods. It agrees to modify its policy of promoting British trade in some sections of the world to the disadvantage of American trade by manipulation of international exchange through use of monetary pools.

Coupled with reciprocal tariff concessions and the Bretton Woods provisions for a world bank and an international exchange stabilization fund, the little discussed conditions of the Washington agreement compose a program for expansion of world trade, in which the United States and Britain are the biggest factors.

Britain cannot survive without world trade, and the United States must have world markets for surplus goods if it is to have maximum production and employment, without which there will not be jobs for all the 55,000,000 or 60,000,000 Americans who will want to work, and the American people will not have sufficient income to bear the burden of the Nation's war debt.

All of this seems to be forgotten in the uproar in both countries over interest rate and other terms of the loan.

President Truman's Speech to Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 8, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply impressed by the speech delivered by President Truman to the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America on yesterday. In this speech the President goes to the very heart of the problems of mankind and calls on us all to bring to bear upon them those spiritual forces which alone can bring about their solution.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am therefore inserting this very fine address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

Friends of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ, I like to consider this conference to which you have so kindly invited me, as one which represents no one particular sect or creed, but rather as one which represents the spirit of religion as a whole. We are a people who worship God in different ways. But we are all bound together in a single unity, the unity of individual freedom in a democracy.

We have just come through a decade in which forces of evil in various parts of the world have been lined up in a bitter fight to banish from the face of the earth both these ideals—religion and democracy. For these forces of evil have long realized that both religion and democracy are founded on one basic principle, the worth and dignity of the individual man and woman. Dictatorship, on the other hand, has always rejected that principle. Dictatorship, by whatever name, is founded on the doctrine that the individual amounts to nothing; that the state is the only thing that counts; and that men and women and children were put on earth solely for the purpose of serving the state.

STRUGGLE BETWEEN DOCTRINES

In that long struggle between two doctrines, the cause of decency and righteousness has been victorious. The right of every human being to live in dignity and freedom, the right to worship his God in his own way, the right to fix his own relationship to his fellow men and to his Creator—these have again been saved for mankind.

The fight to preserve these rights was hard-won. The victory took a toll of human life and treasure so large that it should bring home to all of us forever how precious, how invaluable, is our liberty which we had begun to take for granted.

Now that we have preserved our freedom of conscience and religion, our right to live by a decent moral and spiritual code of our own choosing, let us make full use of that freedom. Let us make use of it to save a world which is beset by so many threats of new conflicts, new terror and destruction.

FORCES AGAIN AT WORK

In our relations abroad and in our economy at home, forces of selfishness and greed and intolerance are again at work. They create situations which call for hard decisions, for forthrightness, for courage and determination. But above everything else they call for one thing, without which we are lost. They call for a moral and spiritual awakening in the life of the individual and in the councils of the world.

The last 5 years have produced many awesome discoveries in material things. But it has been truthfully said that the greatest discoveries of the future will be in the realm of the spirit. There is no problem on this earth tough enough to withstand the flame of a genuine renewal of religious faith. And some of the problems of today will yield to nothing less than that kind of revival.

If the world is long to survive, the gigantic power which man has acquired through atomic energy must be matched by spiritual strength of greater magnitude. All mankind now stands in the doorway to destruction—or upon the threshold of the greatest age in history. Only a high moral code can master this new power of the universe, and develop it for the common good.

REASON FOR RULE OF FORCE

When the sages and the scientists, the philosophers and the statesmen, have all exhausted their studies of atomic energy, one solution and only one solution will remain—the substitution of decency and reason and brotherhood for the rule of force in the government of man.

If men and nations would but live by the precepts of the ancient prophets and the teachings of the Sermon on the Mount, problems which now seem so difficult would soon disappear.

That is the great task for you teachers of religious faith. That is a supreme opportunity for the church to continue to fulfill its mission on earth. The Protestant church, the Catholic church, and the Jewish synagogue, bound together in the American unity of brotherhood, must provide the shock forces to accomplish this moral and spiritual awakening. No other agency can do it. Unless it is done, we are headed for the disaster we would deserve. Oh, for an Isaiah or a Saint Paul to reawaken a sick world to its moral responsibilities!

The need for this moral awakening applies to all men and women everywhere, but it applies particularly to the youth of today from whom the leadership of tomorrow will come. The aftermath of a major war always includes an increase of juvenile delinquency. Sometimes it is the fault of the boys and girls. More often it is the result of everything that is abnormal in war—including the absence of fathers and mothers in the armed forces or in business or war industries.

TO WOMEN OF AMERICA

We shall always be grateful to the women of America, who have performed such an outstanding service to our country during the war. In some cases, however, this patriotic devotion to the national interest has resulted in unavoidable neglect of children. Smaller children were taken care of through the help of the Government in child-care centers. But this could not be done in the case of older children. We are now paying the social penalty for failing to provide adequate supervision and guidance for many of our children during their formative years.

Whatever the cause, the need is now pressing and unyielding. The younger generation of today yearns for moral uplift. To the parents of the Nation—and to you of the churches of God—has come the responsibility of helping them on to the right path.

And one of the ways we can all help not only the youth of the Nation but all men and women is by the provision of decent homes. To make up for the lag in home building during the years of the war, this country has embarked on the most ambitious civilian housing program in our history. Every possible resource of Government will be used to reach our goal of 2,700,000 low-cost homes within the next 2 years. Nowhere can the influence of deep religious faith and ethical living be more adequately felt than in the homes of the Nation. The spiritual welfare of our people of tomorrow is going to depend

on the kind of home life which our Nation has today.

"SHARE THE HOME" EFFORT

That is why it is so important that all churches throughout America cooperate in the "national share the home" effort. If each congregation of the 250,000 churches and synagogs in this country would open their spare rooms to only 4 veterans, 1,000,000 veterans and their families could receive temporary shelter until new houses are available.

Nothing could be more helpful in reaching the goal of a decent home for every American—and by that I mean Americans of all races and religions and of all income groups—than the active cooperation and inspiration of the churches of the Nation. By working in your local communities where the primary job and responsibility lie, you can help make this program the success which it must be. For home life reflects the Nation's life. It must conform to an ever-rising standard.

To raise that standard should be, and is, the constant aim of your Government and the underlying basis of its policies. It would make the effort so much easier if people and nations would apply some of the principles of social justice and ethical standards which have come down to us from biblical times. All the questions which now beset us in strikes and wages and working conditions would be so much simpler if men and women were willing to apply the principles of the Golden Rule.

BROTHERHOOD OF MAN

If we really believed in the brotherhood of man, it would not be necessary to pass a Fair Employment Practices Act.

If certain interests were not so greedy for gold there would be less pressure and lobbying to induce the Congress to allow the Price Control Act to expire, or to keep down minimum wages, or to permit further concentration of economic power.

A truly religious fervor among our people would go a long way toward obtaining a national health program, a national housing program, a national education program, and an extended and improved social security program.

As among men, so among nations—nothing will do more to maintain the peace of the world than the rigorous application of principles of our ancient religion.

We have tried to write into the Charter of the United Nations the essence of religion, the end of aggression, the maintenance of peace, the promotion of social justice and individual rights and freedoms, the substitution of reason and justice for tyranny and war, the protection of the small and weak nations—by these principles the United Nations have laid the framework of the charter on the sound rock of religious principles.

UNITED STATES STAND ON CHARTER

The United States expects to support that charter. It expects to defend that charter. It expects to expand and perfect that charter. And we are confident that all the other United Nations expect to do the same.

In the crisis of global war the common peoples of all the world became bound together in a great fraternity. It was dedicated to resistance against aggression and determination to overcome the tyrants and dictators who sought to enslave. The resources of all the United Nations were pooled into one fund of power. Weapons, supplies, ammunition, equipment, ships, food—the wealth and manpower of each were dedicated to the common good of all.

Now that victory has come, that has stopped. But throughout the world there are now millions and millions of men, women, and children who still look to the rich and powerful nations of the world for help. Principally they look to the people of the United States for help. Not help to fight an enemy, nor help for luxuries and extravagances—but just help to keep themselves alive, help in the form of food and clothing, the barest necessities of life. Of course, we cannot feed them all. But we can go a long way.

APPEALS FOR FAITH

As your President, I appeal to you again—and to all Americans everywhere—to prove your faith and your belief in the teachings of God by doing your share to save the starving millions in Europe and Asia and Africa. Share your food by eating less, and prevent millions from dying of starvation. Reduce your abundance so that others may have a crust of bread. In short, prove yourselves worthy of the liberty and dignity which you have preserved on this earth, by helping those less fortunate who have been starved by the dictators for so many long years and who still starve even in liberation.

Ours should be a continuous thanksgiving for the fact of victory and for the blessings which are still with us in this land. The brave men and valiant women who made this possible under God will inspire us to face our new problems with resolution. They are problems which will call for the best in us. As long as we remain true to the spirit of these men and women, to the religious faith which carried them to victory, we shall not fail.

We have this America not because we are of a particular faith, and not because our ancestors sailed from a particular foreign port. We have our America because of our common aspiration to remain free and our determined purpose to achieve for ourselves, and for our children, a more abundant life in keeping with our highest ideals.

Let us determine to carry on in that same spirit—in a spirit of tolerance and understanding for all men and for all nations—in a spirit of religion and religious unity.

What Is a Fair and Acceptable Rural Hourly Take-Home Pay?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 8, 1946

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following news item which appeared in the Manawa (Wis.) Advocate is of interest:

Wisconsin farmers earned nearly four times as much per hour of labor at the wartime peak as they did in 1939—but the catch is that they averaged only 14 cents an hour in 1939.

This news item was probably released by the State agricultural college as they have cooperated for many years with Dr. Wylie D. Goodsell, of the United States Department of Agriculture, on his studies of the returns for farm labor. While the 1939 figures coincide with the reports from Dr. Goodsell, the 14 cents per hour was the average hourly return for labor on the farms studied and beyond question were greater than the State average of all farms.

First. The following paragraph is from the January 5 Surplus Foods Report, an agricultural economic analysis:

Dairy products: A letter has been written from Secretary Anderson to Mr. Bowles, via Judge Collett's office covering the dairy products picture for 1946 and including a recommended increase in the price of butter. This recommendation has been rumored to be from 10 to 13 cents a pound. Whatever the recommendation the OPA will object to it. Instead of an increase in the price of butter, it has been suggested that there be some consideration given to a roll back in the prices of some other manufactured dairy products.

Second. The following paragraph is from the January issue of Nation's Business:

Most business plans for 1946 are based on expectation of a persistent upward trend in raw-material prices, wages, and total production costs. * * * Government commodity experts predict general wholesale price level may advance as much as 8 percent in 1946. Only exceptions of this general trend are farm product prices, rural land values, and food prices.

In November the United States Department of Agriculture predicted a 10- to 15-percent reduction in the 1946 national farm income in comparison to 1945. Inasmuch as the USDA has the funds with which to control markets the national farm income in 1946 can be expected to be just about what the bureaucrats want it.

The program proposed appears to be more for everyone except the farmer. If the above-average farmer did receive 56 cents per hour for his labor in 1945 is he now to be confronted with higher production costs but at the same time receive a cut in the hourly returns for his labor?

There are 12,000,000 workers who are going to be paid less than even the Steagall amendment states, if the USDA does not change its ways. Will 6,000,000 farmers sit idly by and see it happen?

Veterans' Housing—Same Old Runaround

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit a letter which I have received from the dean of the John McNeese Junior College of the Louisiana State University, at Lake Charles, La., in my district in regard to his efforts and my efforts to obtain housing units to take care of veterans enrolling in this college in my district.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good example of the treatment of veterans who have no place to live, as well as the treatment accorded veterans who are trying to go to colleges to take up their education where they left off when they went to the wars to defend their country.

Mr. Speaker, from the letter which I ask be included following these remarks, it will be seen that they are trying to pass us with broken-down trailers, notwithstanding there are ample substantial housing units available for my college in the area where located; however, all the veterans get is the usual runaround to veterans, and a continuation

of bureaucracy existing in practically all of the departments of this Government.

"Oh, Heaven," he cried, "my bleeding country save."

The letter follows:

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY,
JOHN MCNEESE JUNIOR COLLEGE,
Lake Charles, La., March 1, 1946.

Hon. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I appreciate your letter of February 26, and I sincerely know you are using your efforts to assist in this matter to the fullest extent. It seems to me that it is unfortunate that these agencies will, in some instances, not try to do the economical thing. For instance, I spent Tuesday in Orange, Tex., with the head of the housing project there. They have 616 housing units available for colleges. Only 235 have been allocated. Those have been allocated to Texas Christian University, at Fort Worth, and are now being torn down, put on trucks, and hauled to Fort Worth, which is about 400 miles, on a cost-plus basis. Others are being torn down and hauled to Hammond for Southeastern College. In the letter of Amis, which you enclosed with yours, he stated we would get some from Leesville. I sent a man to his office in Fort Worth Monday from the college with plans prepared by Shutts Bros., and my man was told that the ones in Leesville were not available, and now we would get some from Baton Rouge. I am at a loss to understand the situation, and it does not seem like there is much that can be done about it. My understanding is that the more pressure you put on, the more you get.

I have the site selected, have hired the best engineers in southwest Louisiana to make the necessary maps and drawings, and I don't know what else to do.

The trailers are not satisfactory where they are located, and, of course, I imagine Amis and his crowd would like to spend several thousand dollars fixing them up so two or three men would have a job looking after them, and, at the same time, would keep the city from getting them. Amis is misrepresenting facts to you when he says that we were allocated 20 trailers. We were allocated, according to his telegram, 20 housing units, and housing units to other colleges seems to mean the housing units are to be moved from Orange, Tex., to Southeastern, and from other points to other colleges, but, according to Amis, the interpretation at McNeese means trailers.

I appreciate your interest, and will keep you advised. They did tell my man, while he was in Forth Worth, that we would get 10 housing units, and they are now supposed to come from Baton Rouge. Next week I do not know where they will come from.

With kind regards, I am,
Cordially yours,
L. E. FRAZAR, *Dean.*

Political Economists Again Discredited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 7, 1946

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, if things keep going as they are, the people of this Nation will lose faith in the words of supposedly unbiased, nonpolitical Government economists and statisticians as they have lost faith in the printed and spoken words of administration leaders past and present.

Here is a good example. Those persons who have any kind of a memory and like to keep up with current events to see if they jibe with the predictions of leaders in the past will recall that shortly after VJ-day last August administration economists began to predict that we would have 8,000,000 unemployed by the spring of 1946. They allowed themselves to be quoted freely, basing the prediction on a looked-for decline in employment through reconversion and from other natural causes.

Yet, as everyone knows, except that unemployment caused because strikers will not work or because employers will not hire demobilized servicemen at a living wage, there is no real unemployment in this country—and likely will not be any for years, considering the dammed-up purchasing power.

This situation is not unexpected among economists who had no ax to grind last fall. But the political economists in this administration were off base because of one good reason: They wanted to see the administration ram through a lot of bills which since have rested in House and Senate committees.

Remember, these politically minded and now-discredited bureau economists had to say what the administration wanted them to say. And, in that period last year, to frighten us in Congress into action, the economists predicted unemployment which they knew likely would not come to pass this spring. I am glad to be able to say that many Members of Congress were not hoodwinked and browbeaten into action. We have learned that the boys in the executive branch will make up any kind of a story to get what they want.

Reduction and Control of Armaments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 8, 1946

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, "Churches and the World Order" was a title of a report submitted yesterday by John Foster Dulles, noted American diplomat, as chairman of the committee to the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

This organization is representative of 27,000,000,000 members of Protestant churches. In that report was a resolution calling for an international agreement to abolish universal military conscription in peacetime, which is in accord with a resolution I have filed in the House. The resolution was adopted.

The part relating to the subject of an international agreement on abolition of conscription reads as follows:

A. REDUCTION AND CONTROL OF ARMAMENTS

10. The charter of the United Nations contains provisions for the regulation and reduction of national armaments by international agreement. We recognize the psychological and political obstacles which stand in the way of world disarmament. Yet we hold that the certain dangers of world rearmament require every effort to bring about the international reduction and control of weapons for mass destruction.

If the nations are to break the cycle of wars and preparation for war, they must follow a bold and farsighted policy. Nothing less will suffice. The General Assembly, as well as the Security Council, should apply the provisions of the charter for the regulation of armaments. The representatives of the United States in the UNO should immediately seek agreement on a comprehensive plan for the progressive reduction of military establishments throughout the world, for the universal abolition of peacetime conscription, and for the outlawry and effective control of weapons of mass destruction.

11. In the initial use and continued production of atomic bombs, the United States has given and is giving sanction to these weapons of mass annihilation. We believe that this policy must not be continued. Our Nation, having first used the atomic bomb, has a primary duty to seek to reverse the trend which it began. Unless the United States will give moral leadership and accept risks for the sake of a new birth of confidence, we see little hope for escape from the growing crisis.

What Must We Do To Help Feed Europe?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 8, 1946

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement and résumé of my remarks, on the Town Meeting of the Air, given last night in New York, over the American Broadcasting Co., on the subject What Must We Do To Help Feed Europe? The other participants on the program, included the Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable Henry Wallace; Senator Claude Pepper; and H. J. Heinz 2d.

Now, Mr. Denny, Senator PEPPER, recently returned from an extensive trip through Europe, says the job of feeding Europe is terribly easy, but he admits, in the same breath, that, the record shows that it has not been done. It seems to me that he should give specific suggestions on feeding Europe. He talks about a loan to Britain. He should call it a gift, and certainly, the Senator must know that this money will not help feed the starving people of Europe. The Senator scolds the Agricultural Department for not extending credit to UNRRA when it was needed. He wants the OPA extended as a method of helping to feed Europe. This agency fathers the black market and their foolish pricing policy has caused a shortage of everything from butter to milady's girdles. It will take far more than a loan to Great Britain, or the continuation of OPA, to get food, immediately, to those who are starving.

In reviewing Secretary Wallace's remarks, we must remember that he is a member of the President's Cabinet. We can all agree that partisan politics, in the feeding of the starving people of Europe, should not be tolerated, but I would remind the distinguished Secretary that the production, processing, distribution, and pricing of food in the United

States is honeycombed with politics. This administration cannot escape its responsibility in the present break-down of supplying food to Europe.

I think it is true that there are some Americans who are knee deep in calories and are literally digging their graves with their teeth. The housewife scans the food advertisements and there are moments of indecision as to whether she wants sirloin steak, veal, fowl, or fish, together with a large choice of vegetables and fruits.

At the same time, the world looks to America for food. To them we are a land of plenty. We are told that millions are on the verge of starvation. Help must be given before June 1, or many will starve. What can be done? Can the agreements and commitments made, be kept? If not, why not? I doubt if we can keep our commitments. The bureaucrats of Washington have fooled the American people and those of foreign countries. The information they gave out about our food supply was incorrect. This country promised 300,000,000 pounds of meat to Europe in the first 3 months of this year. Senator PEPPER has stated we supplied about 3 percent to February 19. Europe is receiving about 60 percent of the flour we promised. To produce flour, we must move the wheat from elevators, now plugged full. I present a wire of recent date, from western Nebraska, stating that it will take 2 years, at the present rate they are receiving cars, to move the wheat from the elevators and bins of the farmers. Who is to blame for this?

Europe needs canned goods and yet, according to the Department of Commerce, over which you preside, Secretary Wallace, the carry-over of canned vegetables is 51 percent below 1940, and canned fruits about 61 percent below 1940. This is an all-time low.

For 20 years before the war we imported more agricultural products than we exported. In 1944 we imported 260,000,000 bushels of wheat and exported 15,000,000 bushels. We had a billion-bushel crop of wheat, not only in 1945 but also in 1915. In 1915 we had no foolish plowing under of crops or pig killing, regimented agricultural program.

Wasting food should be stopped. The garbage pails of some American families would feed many in Europe. The Army saved 20,000,000 pounds of cooking fat last year. They are now saving 720,000 pounds of bread per month. They are saving 56,000 pounds of sugar per month by not sweetening their prunes.

Volunteer rationing would be a great help.

Make it possible to mail food packages to Europe. Six countries are now denied food through this source. Individuals in Greece may receive one 11-pound package every 2 weeks; Italy a 4-pound package every month, in limited areas. As Mr. Heinz has so well stated, tell the American people the truth through the press, radio, and from the pulpit about the plight of starving millions. Their generosity, decency, pride, and self-sacrifice knows no limits.

Encourage and increase the number of victory gardens. They produced a million tons of food last year.

Place one individual over all food production, pricing, and distribution. At the present time a dozen agencies have their finger in the food pie, and the program is one of rules, directives, confusion, and a merry-go-round of red tape.

For a long-term food-production program, under one Government head, I suggest providing the farmer, not only with help, but machinery, fertilizer, and an adequate price. Selective service stripped the farmer of experienced help. The Tydings amendment, as passed by Congress, provides that no essential farm labor should be drafted without a proper replacement. This has not been followed. The farmer, unable to get new machinery, is struggling with old, outmoded equipment. Due to strikes, little farm machinery is being manufactured. The farmer has been denied fertilizer for the production of crops. One Southern State received 11 percent of all the fertilizer and yet produced only 2 percent of the food crops. There is no food value in tobacco and cotton sandwiches.

To help feed Europe, we should cooperate, fully, with the recently created Famine Emergency Committee. They will have some good suggestions to offer the Government and the American people. The American people should be willing to accept substitutes in their diets.

Government promises to the farmer must be kept. There can be no prosperity in this country, with a sick agriculture. We cannot attain prosperity and happiness through a policy of scarcity. Our farmers are patriotic citizens. During the war, their wives, their children, and the older men worked from daylight to dark. They were producing food for their sons fighting in fox holes all over the world.

Government subsidies, regulations, and red tape discourage the farmer. The subsidy on butter is 17½ cents a pound, but where is the butter? Government controls create emergencies and emergencies create controls. It is a vicious cycle and is moving faster and faster.

The immediate problem of supplying Europe with food centers around one of transportation, voluntary rationing, and cooperation of the public and responsible Government agencies. This Government should cut the red tape in the handling of food, for regulations kill our best impulses, smothers our conscience, and trips up progress in the delivery of food to the starving.

Praise Where Praise Is Due

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 7, 1946

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, it is well known that I have never been much of a hand to praise the New Deal. At the same time I have always felt keenly that Republicans should give praise where praise is due. Therefore, I take this occasion to compliment Gen. Arthur J. Browning, new Director of the Office of Domestic Commerce in the United States Department of Commerce.

It seems that General Browning, at a press conference last Monday, had the fortitude to tell an economic truth in the presence of his boss, Henry A. Wallace, causing the latter's face to become a fiery red.

Here is what General Browning said:

> Our interviews with numerous manufacturers indicate that they lose their best production men because they feel that it is useless to get a salary increase which will be taken away by higher taxes.

In other words, according to General Browning, the 13-year trend of tax laws, as sponsored first by President Roosevelt and Morgenthau and now by President Truman and Secretary Vinson, actually discourages individuals from doing their best work. The tax laws, as Republicans have said time and again, as presently constituted do not provide an incentive for men to work harder, to think and plan and produce more vigorously.

Newsmen, including Dan Kidney and Peter Edson, who were alert enough to see the difference between what Browning said and what Wallace has been preaching all these years, had a field day pointing to the Commerce Secretary's embarrassment.

After all, this is liable to come to anyone who tries to talk out of both sides of his mouth at the same time.

The REA Program in Oklahoma and the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 8, 1946

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, in response to the demands of rural people who do not yet enjoy electric service, REA-financed cooperatives and other borrowers have swamped the Rural Electrification Administration with the greatest wave of loan applications in the agency's history. Line construction is in progress throughout the country and will expand as the materials situation improves.

During the fiscal year ending next June 30 Congress authorized REA to lend $200,000,000—the greatest 1-year loan fund in its history. On January 1, with 6 months of the fiscal year remaining, approximately $145,000,000 from this fund had already been allotted to borrowers, leaving only $55,000,000 available from current REA funds. At the same time pending applications on hand or in process in the field totaled more than $200,000,000, only approximately one-fourth of which could be approved from 1946 funds. By the first of the year, borrowers in 21 States had exhausted the loan funds available to them from the lending fund for fiscal 1946.

This great demand for REA loans is a reflection of the insistence with which the Nation's rural residents are demanding electricity, now that wartime restrictions on line construction have been removed. Slightly more than half of the Nation's 6,000,000 farms still lack central-station electric service. Another 3,000,000 nonfarm rural homes, rural schools, churches, stores, factories, and other rural establishments remain to be served with electric power. These 6,000,000 potential rural electric consumers represent the job ahead in rural electrification.

The REA borrowers are undertaking this job on an area-coverage basis, serving thinly settled sections along with more densely populated areas. By careful advance planning of lines and sound business management, REA believes that its borrowers can attain their goal of electric service for every rural community.

At the time REA was established in 1935, only 743,954 farms, or 10.9 percent of all the farms in the United States, had received central-station electric power. The latest official estimates show that on

June 30, 1945, 2,725,610 farms, or 44.7 percent of the total, were electrified. Approximately half of the farms electrified since 1935 are served by REA-financed systems.

Through November 30, 1945, the latest date for which statistics are available, REA had allotted $654,057,000 in rural electrification loans to 955 borrowers—879 locally owned, member-operated electric cooperatives, 57 public bodies, and 19 private utilities. Eight hundred and forty of the borrowers had lines and other facilities in operation. These borrowers operated 445,000 miles of lines serving 1,359,000 farms and other rural consumers in 46 States, Alaska, and the Virgin Islands. Most of these systems were operating only distribution facilities and buying wholesale power. Seventy-five of them were generating part or all of their own power. During the year ending June 30, 1945, REA-financed systems distributed more than 2,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of power.

As of November 30, REA had advanced $456,096,000 on the loan allotments to its borrowers. The borrowers had made payments of principal and interest of their loans amounting to $99,789,000. Of this amount, $19,684,000 represented advance payments on principal in excess of the amount due. Delinquencies on REA loans, consisting of amounts more than 30 days overdue, totaled only $519,000, slightly more than one-half of 1 percent of the amount due.

Oklahoma REA borrowers, already serving 36,000 rural power users, have completed plans for service to several thousand others as rapidly as line construction materials become available. As of January 1, Oklahoma borrowers had received $5,360,000 in loan allotments from REA loan funds for fiscal 1946. This money will be used to finance power lines to reach more than 10,000 unserved rural consumers.

From its $200,000,000 loan fund for fiscal 1946, REA earmarked $6,126,600 for loan allotments in Oklahoma. Since more than 80 percent of this amount had been allotted by January 1, only $766,600 was still available for lending in Oklahoma during the remaining 6 months of the fiscal year. On the same date, REA had on hand and in process $3,815,000 in loan requests from the State to finance rural electric facilities to reach around 7,500 unserved rural consumers.

Before the REA program began, fewer than 6,000 Oklahoma farms had electric service. This number had increased to 36,000 by July 1, 1945, according to REA estimates. On the same date, estimates show, 143,287 of the State's farms, or 79.7 percent of the total, still were without electricity. In addition, many nonfarm rural dwellings and other rural establishments remained unserved.

Since 1935 REA has allotted a total of nearly $20,000,000 in loan funds to 24 borrowers in Oklahoma. Twenty-three of these borrowers are rural electric cooperatives and one is a private utility. These borrowers operate 15,000 miles of power lines serving 36,000 rural consumers, most of them farms. One cooperative is generating part of its own power; the others are buying at wholesale from public agencies and private power companies.

Oklahoma REA borrowers are more than meeting the required payments on their Government loans. According to REA's financial summary, Oklahoma borrowers have paid $1,728,000 on principal and interest due, including $353,000 repaid on principal in advance of the time it was due. Less than $17,000 was overdue.

Birth of the Federal Reserve—A Money Control System That Has Spread Around the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, today on a small island off the coast of the State of Georgia a small group of people are meeting to launch a new international money and credit control system, commonly known as the Bretton Woods plan. That will, in effect, as stated by the English Lord Keynes, one of the originators of the system, be the economic government of the world. A plan, as he pointed out to the British Parliament, that would provide excellent machinery for enforcing financial blockades. What is being done on this island off the coast of Georgia today brings to mind another momentous meeting of financiers on a small island off the coast of Georgia, as told by one of the conspirators, Frank A. Vanderlip, in an article which I have condensed and taken from the February 9, 1935, issue of the Saturday Evening Post, reprinted here:

As early as 1907 I had found myself in hearty accord with Woodrow Wilson about the matter of the social value of publicity for the affairs of big corporations. He had stated publicly at that time that he thought the aggressive antagonism toward trusts was due to the fact that the people were kept in ignorance of the affairs of the trusts. He had said further, and I still agree with him, that corporation lawyers injured the interests of their clients by counseling secrecy. My views on this subject were considered radical by some of my close associates when I was president of the National City Bank.

A SECRET EXPEDITION TO JEKYL ISLAND

Despite my views about the value to society of greater publicity for the affairs of corporations, there was an occasion, near the close of 1910, when I was as secretive, indeed, as furtive, as any conspirator.

For me the beginning of the adventure, I should think, was a letter that came from Mr. Stillman in Paris. He said he had just had a long conference with Senator Nelson Aldrich, Zivil in our code, who was very keen to get to work on banking and currency revision. Aldrich, Mr. Stillman reported, regretted that Henry Davison, of J. P. Morgan & Co., and I had been unable to join him in Europe during the summer; he felt that over there we might have had plenty of time for our discussions, and been free from interruptions. In a moment of entire candor he would have said, "free from reporters." Mr. Stillman said he had told Mr. Aldrich that freedom from interruptions was essential, but that it could be accomplished by getting Davison and me down to Warwick, his place in Rhode Island, without anyone's knowing of it. That was Mr. Aldrich's plan as he left Paris. Mr. Stillman wrote me that I should make everything else subservient to giving my whole time and thought to a thorough consideration of the subject. He said that Aldrich was persuaded that he could accomplish more by getting out of the Senate, so as to put the work of revision on a nonpartisan basis. Mr. Stillman expressed to me his fear that after revision the banks might not be so well off. He wrote that from that time on Davison and I ought to follow the matter very closely, and keep in touch with Aldrich. Aldrich, I was informed, believed in some sort of centralization, but not in the establishment of a central bank such as France had. Mr. Stillman also reported to me that in his talk with Senator Aldrich he himself had not expressed any views, except as he had impressed on the Senator his belief in the necessity of not being too much influenced by our Wall Street point of view.

But would the electorate have believed that? I question their ability to do so. Just to give you a faint idea: Senator Aldrich was the father-in-law of John D. Rockefeller, Jr., and himself a very rich man. Once I had written to Woodrow Wilson at Princeton, inviting him to speak at a dinner. Wishing to impress him with the importance of the occasion, I had mentioned that Senator Aldrich also had been invited to speak. My friend Dr. Wilson had astonished me by replying that he could not bring himself to speak on the same platform with Senator Aldrich. He did come and make a speech, however, after I had reported that Mr. Aldrich's health would prevent him from appearing. Now then, fancy what sort of headlines might have appeared over a story that Aldrich was conferring about new-money legislation with a Morgan partner and the president of the biggest bank.

On October 22, 1910, I wrote to Mr. Stillman in Paris: "Senator Aldrich met with what came very near being a severe, if not fatal, automobile accident. You probably have seen the report of it in the papers. He was pretty well bruised, having cuts on each side of his face. He is very much better now, but the accident has naturally postponed the conference that was in mind. He will be about in a few days, and Mrs. John D., Jr., tells me that they do not think there will be any serious effect from the accident."

BANKERS IN DISGUISE

As the time for the assembling of Congress drew near, Senator Aldrich became increasingly concerned about the report he must write on behalf of the Joint Monetary Commission; likewise, there ought to be, he knew, a bill to present to the new Congress, and none had been drafted. This was how it happened that a group of us went with him to the Jekyl Island Club on the coast of Georgia.

Since it would be fatal to Senator Aldrich's plan to have it known that he was calling on anybody from Wall Street to help him in preparing his report and bill, precautions were taken that would have delighted the heart of James Stillman. Those who had been asked to go were Henry Davison, Paul Warburg, Ben Strong, and myself. From Washington came A. Piatt Andrew, Jr., who was then an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, and who now is a Member of Congress from Massachusetts. We were told to leave our last names behind us. We were told, further, that we should avoid dining together on the night of our departure. We were instructed to come one at a time and as unobtrusively as possible to the railroad terminal on the New Jersey littoral of the Hud-

son, where Senator Aldrich's private car would be in readiness, attached to the rear end of a train for the South.

When I came to that car, the blinds were down and only slender threads of amber light showed the shape of the windows. Once aboard the private car we began to observe the taboo that had been fixed on last names. We addressed one another as "Ben," "Paul," "Nelson," "Abe"—it is Abraham Piatt Andrew. Davison and I adopted even deeper disguises, abandoning our own first names. On the theory that we were always right, he became Wilbur and I became Orville, after those two aviation pioneers, the Wright brothers. Incidentally, for years afterward Davison and I continued the practice, in communications, and when we were together.

SECRET MEETING ON JEKYL ISLAND

The servants and the train crew may have know the identities of one or two of us, but they did not know all, and it was the names of all printed together that would have made our mysterious journey significant in Washington, in Wall Street, even in London. Discovery, we knew, simply must not happen, or else all our time and effort would be wasted. If it were to be exposed publicly that our particular group had got together and written a banking bill, that bill would have no chance whatever of passage by Congress. Yet who was there in Congress who might have drafted a sound piece of legislation dealing with the technical banking problem with which we were concerned? Indeed, there were surprisingly few bankers, besides those of us who had been called together, who had given the special matters under consideration any thorough study whatever. Most bankers were reluctant to accept any change; George Baker was.

We proceeded, in the rear room of that private car, to get to work as soon as the train was moving. That first discussion of the banking structure and of what ought to be done about it produced scraps of ideas as formless as the contents of a rag bag. Everyone had some little piece of project to throw on the table for discussion, and everyone's pet scheme encountered some other fellow's objection.

We had traveled a good many miles without making much progress, when I told my companions of a piece of advice, as to the proper way to conduct a conference, that had been given to me by Frank Trumbull, a dear friend of mine who was then the chairman of the board of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway.

"What we ought to do first," I said, "is to set down those things about which we are agreed; then, one by one, we can take up those things about which we seem to disagree."

From then on we made swift progress. I was appointed amanuensis and in my paleolithic shorthand recorded those proposals which we all were ready to echo as we heard them; of course, we knew that what we simply had to have was a more elastic currency through a bank that would hold the reserves of all banks.

We were taken by boat from the mainland to Jekyl Island and for a week or 10 days were completely secluded, without any contact by telephone or telegraph with the outside. We had disappeared from the world onto a deserted island. There were plenty of colored servants, but they had no idea who Ben and Paul and Nelson were; even Vanderlip, or Davison, or Andrew, would have meant less than nothing to them. There we worked in a clubhouse built for people with a taste for luxury. The live-oak trees wear fantastic beards of Spanish moss on Jekyl Island; in November brown leaves make its forests utterly charming. Without our ever stopping to hunt, deer, turkey, and quail appeared on the table; there were pans of oysters not an hour old when they were scalloped; there were country hams with that incomparable flavor that is given to them in the South. We were working so hard that we ate enormously. We worked morning, noon, and night.

We put in the most intense period of work that I have ever had. Sometimes Davison and Strong would be up at daybreak to get a horseback ride or a swim before breakfast, but right after breakfast the six of us would gather around the table and resume where our discussion had ended the previous midnight. We stuck to the plan of putting down on paper what we agreed upon; there was no back-tracking, no wrangling. Harry Davison was a splendid person to prevent wrangles in any company. Warburg, the best-equipped man there in an academic sence, was so intense and apparently felt a little antagonism toward Aldrich that some of our moments of strain might have developed into real hindrance had it not been for Davison. Always he could be counted on to crack a joke just at the right moment to ease a strain. No telephones rang, none could bother us to ask for an opinion of the market, there were no directors' meetings, no interruptions whatever. Thanksgiving occurred during that week, and we ate wild turkey with oyster stuffing and went right back to work. We gave, each of us, every bit of our mental energy to the job, and I enjoyed that period as I never have enjoyed anything else. I lived during those days on Jekyl Island at the highest pitch of intellectual awareness that I have ever experienced. It was entirely thrilling.

COLLABORATING WITH ALDRICH

As we dealt with questions I recorded our agreements in that shorthand I had first practiced with chalk on the tail stock of my lathe back in Aurora. If it was to be a central bank, how was it to be owned—by the banks, by the Government, or jointly? When we had fixed upon bank ownership and joint control, we took up the political problem of whether it should be a number of institutions or only one. Should the rate of interest be the same for the whole Nation, or should it be higher in a community that was expanding too fast and lower in another that was lagging? Should it restrict its services to banks? What open-market operations should be engaged in? That was the sort of questions we dealt with, and finally, at the end of our week, we had whipped into shape a bill that we felt, pridefully, should be presented to Congress. As I recall it, Warburg had some objections, but we were in substantial agreement on the measure we had created. We returned to the North as secretly as we had gone South. It was agreed that Senator Aldrich would present the bill we had drafted to the Senate. It became known to the country as the Aldrich plan. Aldrich and Andrew left us at Washington, and Warburg, Davison, Strong, and I returned to New York.

Congress was about to meet, but on a Saturday we got word in New York that Senator Aldrich was ill—too ill to write an appropriate document to accompany his plan. Ben Strong and I went on to Washington and together we prepared that report. If what we had done then had been made known publicly, the effort would have been denounced as a piece of Wall Street chicanery, which it certainly was not. Aldrich never was a man to be a mere servant of the so-called money interests. He was a conscientious, public-spirited man. He had called on the four of us who had Wall Street addresses because he knew that we had for years been studying aspects of the problem with which it was his public duty to deal.

As is now well known, the bill we drafted did not get through Congress. Aldrich retired from the Senate, and then a Democratic majority came down to Washington along with Woodrow Wilson, who had defeated President Taft. The platform on which he was elected contained a statement expressing the opposition of the Democratic Party to the Aldrich plan, or a central bank. There was a good deal of discussion about that. It was contended that originally the platform committee had agreed upon the statement: "We are opposed to the Aldrich plan for a central bank."

Now, although the Aldrich Federal Reserve plan was defeated when it bore the name of Aldrich, nevertheless its essential points were all contained in the plan that finally was adopted. It provided an organization to hold the reserves of all member banks and arranged that they would always be ready to relieve a member bank under pressure by rediscounting loans that it held. The law as enacted provided for 12 banks instead of the one which the Aldrich plan would have created; but the intent of the law was to coordinate the 12 through the Federal Reserve Board in Washington, so that in effect they would operate as a central bank. There can be no question about it: Aldrich undoubtedly laid the essential, fundamental lines which finally took the form of the Federal Reserve Law.

Housing Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 8, 1946

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

HOUSING SUBSIDIES

During the war subsidies were paid on food and other products to hold down prices. Under wartime conditions a strong case could be made for subsidies on a limited scale. Unfortunately, despite the many pledges to discontinue subsidies after hostilities ceased, we find today not only a continuation of the wartime program but recommendations to expand it. Housing Expediter Wyatt followed this plan in his proposed housing program. After the House voted against housing subsidies Mr. Truman described this action as "a blow at the heart of the veterans' emergency housing program." The bill has now been passed by the House—minus its subsidy provisions—and on this issue we believe that the House is on sounder ground than the administration.

Under the proposed housing program the taxpayer was asked to subsidize all home builders to the extent of $600,000,000 or more. To justify this huge expenditure, the program was described as a veterans' housing program. However, there was nothing in the program to prevent nonveterans, including many people who have accumulated large wartime savings, from acquiring building materials for homes they desire to purchase. Certainly these people should not be subsidized when they acquire new homes. If the objective is to hold down the cost of new homes to the veteran, there is no reason why some special financial provision cannot be made which applies to that group alone.

Additional subsidies would further unbalance the Federal Budget and increase the inflationary pressures which Mr. Wyatt proposed to counteract by the payment of subsidies. If the present price level is to be maintained, the inevitable result would be more and more subsidies. This is particularly true since it was proposed that wage

June 30, 1945, 2,725,610 farms, or 44.7 percent of the total, were electrified. Approximately half of the farms electrified since 1935 are served by REA-financed systems.

Through November 30, 1945, the latest date for which statistics are available, REA had allotted $654,057,000 in rural electrification loans to 955 borrowers—879 locally owned, member-operated electric cooperatives, 57 public bodies, and 19 private utilities. Eight hundred and forty of the borrowers had lines and other facilities in operation. These borrowers operated 445,000 miles of lines serving 1,359,000 farms and other rural consumers in 46 States, Alaska, and the Virgin Islands. Most of these systems were operating only distribution facilities and buying wholesale power. Seventy-five of them were generating part or all of their own power. During the year ending June 30, 1945, REA-financed systems distributed more than 2,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of power.

As of November 30, REA had advanced $456,096,000 on the loan allotments to its borrowers. The borrowers had made payments of principal and interest of their loans amounting to $99,789,000. Of this amount, $19,684,000 represented advance payments on principal in excess of the amount due. Delinquencies on REA loans, consisting of amounts more than 30 days overdue, totaled only $519,000, slightly more than one-half of 1 percent of the amount due.

Oklahoma REA borrowers, already serving 36,000 rural power users, have completed plans for service to several thousand others as rapidly as line construction materials become available. As of January 1, Oklahoma borrowers had received $5,360,000 in loan allotments from REA loan funds for fiscal 1946. This money will be used to finance power lines to reach more than 10,000 unserved rural consumers.

From its $200,000,000 loan fund for fiscal 1946, REA earmarked $6,126,600 for loan allotments in Oklahoma. Since more than 80 percent of this amount had been allotted by January 1, only $766,600 was still available for lending in Oklahoma during the remaining 6 months of the fiscal year. On the same date, REA had on hand and in process $3,815,000 in loan requests from the State to finance rural electric facilities to reach around 7,500 unserved rural consumers.

Before the REA program began, fewer than 6,000 Oklahoma farms had electric service. This number had increased to 36,000 by July 1, 1945, according to REA estimates. On the same date, estimates show, 143,287 of the State's farms, or 79.7 percent of the total, still were without electricity. In addition, many nonfarm rural dwellings and other rural establishments remained unserved.

Since 1935 REA has allotted a total of nearly $20,000,000 in loan funds to 24 borrowers in Oklahoma. Twenty-three of these borrowers are rural electric cooperatives and one is a private utility. These borrowers operate 15,000 miles of power lines serving 36,000 rural consumers, most of them farms. One cooperative is generating part of its own power; the others are buying at wholesale from public agencies and private power companies.

Oklahoma REA borrowers are more than meeting the required payments on their Government loans. According to REA's financial summary, Oklahoma borrowers have paid $1,728,000 on principal and interest due, including $353,000 repaid on principal in advance of the time it was due. Less than $17,000 was overdue.

Birth of the Federal Reserve—A Money Control System That Has Spread Around the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, today on a small island off the coast of the State of Georgia a small group of people are meeting to launch a new international money and credit control system, commonly known as the Bretton Woods plan. That will, in effect, as stated by the English Lord Keynes, one of the originators of the system, be the economic government of the world. A plan, as he pointed out to the British Parliament, that would provide excellent machinery for enforcing financial blockades. What is being done on this island off the coast of Georgia today brings to mind another momentous meeting of financiers on a small island off the coast of Georgia, as told by one of the conspirators, Frank A. Vanderlip, in an article which I have condensed and taken from the February 9, 1935, issue of the Saturday Evening Post, reprinted here:

As early as 1907 I had found myself in hearty accord with Woodrow Wilson about the matter of the social value of publicity for the affairs of big corporations. He had stated publicly at that time that he thought the aggressive antagonism toward trusts was due to the fact that the people were kept in ignorance of the affairs of the trusts. He had said further, and I still agree with him, that corporation lawyers injured the interests of their clients by counseling secrecy. My views on this subject were considered radical by some of my close associates when I was president of the National City Bank.

A SECRET EXPEDITION TO JEKYL ISLAND

Despite my views about the value to society of greater publicity for the affairs of corporations, there was an occasion, near the close of 1910, when I was as secretive, indeed, as furtive, as any conspirator.

For me the beginning of the adventure, I should think, was a letter that came from Mr. Stillman in Paris. He said he had just had a long conference with Senator Nelson Aldrich, Zivil in our code, who was very keen to get to work on banking and currency revision. Aldrich, Mr. Stillman reported, regretted that Henry Davison, of J. P. Morgan & Co., and I had been unable to join him in Europe during the summer; he felt that over there we might have had plenty of time for our discussions, and been free from interruptions. In a moment of entire candor he would have said, "free from reporters." Mr. Stillman said he had told Mr. Aldrich that freedom from interruptions was essential, but that it could be accomplished by getting Davison and me down to Warwick, his place in Rhode Island, without anyone's knowing of it. That was Mr. Aldrich's plan as he left Paris. Mr. Stillman wrote me that I should make everything else subservient to giving my whole time and thought to a thorough consideration of the subject. He said that Aldrich was persuaded that he could accomplish more by getting out of the Senate, so as to put the work of revision on a nonpartisan basis. Mr. Stillman expressed to me his fear that after revision the banks might not be so well off. He wrote that from that time on Davison and I ought to follow the matter very closely, and keep in touch with Aldrich. Aldrich, I was informed, believed in some sort of centralization, but not in the establishment of a central bank such as France had. Mr. Stillman also reported to me that in his talk with Senator Aldrich he himself had not expressed any views, except as he had impressed on the Senator his belief in the necessity of not being too much influenced by our Wall Street point of view.

But would the electorate have believed that? I question their ability to do so. Just to give you a faint idea: Senator Aldrich was the father-in-law of John D. Rockefeller, Jr., and himself a very rich man. Once I had written to Woodrow Wilson at Princeton, inviting him to speak at a dinner. Wishing to impress him with the importance of the occasion, I had mentioned that Senator Aldrich also had been invited to speak. My friend Dr. Wilson had astonished me by replying that he could not bring himself to speak on the same platform with Senator Aldrich. He did come and make a speech, however, after I had reported that Mr. Aldrich's health would prevent him from appearing. Now then, fancy what sort of headlines might have appeared over a story that Aldrich was conferring about new-money legislation with a Morgan partner and the president of the biggest bank.

On October 22, 1910, I wrote to Mr. Stillman in Paris: "Senator Aldrich met with what came very near being a severe, if not fatal, automobile accident. You probably have seen the report of it in the papers. He was pretty well bruised, having cuts on each side of his face. He is very much better now, but the accident has naturally postponed the conference that was in mind. He will be about in a few days, and Mrs. John D., Jr., tells me that they do not think there will be any serious effect from the accident."

BANKERS IN DISGUISE

As the time for the assembling of Congress drew near, Senator Aldrich became increasingly concerned about the report he must write on behalf of the Joint Monetary Commission; likewise, there ought to be, he knew, a bill to present to the new Congress, and none had been drafted. This was how it happened that a group of us went with him to the Jekyl Island Club on the coast of Georgia.

Since it would be fatal to Senator Aldrich's plan to have it known that he was calling on anybody from Wall Street to help him in preparing his report and bill, precautions were taken that would have delighted the heart of James Stillman. Those who had been asked to go were Henry Davison, Paul Warburg, Ben Strong, and myself. From Washington came A. Piatt Andrew, Jr., who was then an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, and who now is a Member of Congress from Massachusetts. We were told to leave our last names behind us. We were told, further, that we should avoid dining together on the night of our departure. We were instructed to come one at a time and as unobtrusively as possible to the railroad terminal on the New Jersey littoral of the Hud-

son, where Senator Aldrich's private car would be in readiness, attached to the rear end of a train for the South.

When I came to that car, the blinds were down and only slender threads of amber light showed the shape of the windows. Once aboard the private car we began to observe the taboo that had been fixed on last names. We addressed one another as "Ben," "Paul," "Nelson," "Abe"—it is Abraham Piatt Andrew. Davison and I adopted even deeper disguises, abandoning our own first names. On the theory that we were always right, he became Wilbur and I became Orville, after those two aviation pioneers, the Wright brothers. Incidentally, for years afterward Davison and I continued the practice, in communications, and when we were together.

SECRET MEETING ON JEKYL ISLAND

The servants and the train crew may have know the identities of one or two of us, but they did not know all, and it was the names of all printed together that would have made our mysterious journey significant in Washington, in Wall Street, even in London. Discovery, we knew, simply must not happen, or else all our time and effort would be wasted. If it were to be exposed publicly that our particular group had got together and written a banking bill, that bill would have no chance whatever of passage by Congress. Yet who was there in Congress who might have drafted a sound piece of legislation dealing with the technical banking problem with which we were concerned? Indeed, there were surprisingly few bankers, besides those of us who had been called together, who had given the special matters under consideration any thorough study whatever. Most bankers were reluctant to accept any change; George Baker was.

We proceeded, in the rear room of that private car, to get to work as soon as the train was moving. That first discussion of the banking structure and of what ought to be done about it produced scraps of ideas as formless as the contents of a rag bag. Everyone had some little piece of project to throw on the table for discussion, and everyone's pet scheme encountered some other fellow's objection.

We had traveled a good many miles without making much progress, when I told my companions of a piece of advice, as to the proper way to conduct a conference, that had been given to me by Frank Trumbull, a dear friend of mine who was then the chairman of the board of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway.

"What we ought to do first," I said, "is to set down those things about which we are agreed; then, one by one, we can take up those things about which we seem to disagree."

From then on we made swift progress. I was appointed amanuensis and in my paleolithic shorthand recorded those proposals which we all were ready to echo as we heard them; of course, we knew that what we simply had to have was a more elastic currency through a bank that would hold the reserves of all banks.

We were taken by boat from the mainland to Jekyl Island and for a week or 10 days were completely secluded, without any contact by telephone or telegraph with the outside. We had disappeared from the world onto a deserted island. There were plenty of colored servants, but they had no idea who Ben and Paul and Nelson were; even Vanderlip, or Davison, or Andrew, would have meant less than nothing to them. There we worked in a clubhouse built for people with a taste for luxury. The live-oak trees wear fantastic beards of Spanish moss on Jekyl Island; in November brown leaves make its forests utterly charming. Without our ever stopping to hunt, deer, turkey, and quail appeared on the table; there were pans of oysters not an hour old when they were scalloped; there were country hams with that incomparable flavor that is given to them in the South. We were working so hard that we ate enormously. We worked morning, noon, and night.

We put in the most intense period of work that I have ever had. Sometimes Davison and Strong would be up at daybreak to get a horseback ride or a swim before breakfast, but right after breakfast the six of us would gather around the table and resume where our discussion had ended the previous midnight. We stuck to the plan of putting down on paper what we agreed upon; there was no back-tracking, no wrangling. Harry Davison was a splendid person to prevent wrangles in any company. Warburg, the best-equipped man there in an academic sence, was so intense and apparently felt a little antagonism toward Aldrich that some of our moments of strain might have developed into real hindrance had it not been for Davison. Always he could be counted on to crack a joke just at the right moment to ease a strain. No telephones rang, none could bother us to ask for an opinion of the market, there were no directors' meetings, no interruptions whatever. Thanksgiving occurred during that week, and we ate wild turkey with oyster stuffing and went right back to work. We gave, each of us, every bit of our mental energy to the job, and I enjoyed that period as I never have enjoyed anything else. I lived during those days on Jekyl Island at the highest pitch of intellectual awareness that I have ever experienced. It was entirely thrilling.

COLLABORATING WITH ALDRICH

As we dealt with questions I recorded our agreements in that shorthand I had first practiced with chalk on the tail stock of my lathe back in Aurora. If it was to be a central bank, how was it to be owned—by the banks, by the Government, or jointly? When we had fixed upon bank ownership and joint control, we took up the political problem of whether it should be a number of institutions or only one. Should the rate of interest be the same for the whole Nation, or should it be higher in a community that was expanding too fast and lower in another that was lagging? Should it restrict its services to banks? What open-market operations should be engaged in? That was the sort of questions we dealt with, and finally, at the end of our week, we had whipped into shape a bill that we felt, pridefully, should be presented to Congress. As I recall it, Warburg had some objections, but we were in substantial agreement on the measure we had created. We returned to the North as secretly as we had gone South. It was agreed that Senator Aldrich would present the bill we had drafted to the Senate. It became known to the country as the Aldrich plan. Aldrich and Andrew left us at Washington, and Warburg, Davison, Strong, and I returned to New York.

Congress was about to meet, but on a Saturday we got word in New York that Senator Aldrich was ill—too ill to write an appropriate document to accompany his plan. Ben Strong and I went on to Washington and together we prepared that report. If what we had done then had been made known publicly, the effort would have been denounced as a piece of Wall Street chicanery, which it certainly was not. Aldrich never was a man to be a mere servant of the so-called money interests. He was a conscientious, public-spirited man. He had called on the four of us who had Wall Street addresses because he knew that we had for years been studying aspects of the problem with which it was his public duty to deal.

As is now well known, the bill we drafted did not get through Congress. Aldrich retired from the Senate, and then a Democratic majority came down to Washington along with Woodrow Wilson, who had defeated President Taft. The platform on which he was elected contained a statement expressing the opposition of the Democratic Party to the Aldrich plan, or a central bank. There was a good deal of discussion about that. It was contended that originally the platform committee had agreed upon the statement: "We are opposed to the Aldrich plan for a central bank."

Now, although the Aldrich Federal Reserve plan was defeated when it bore the name of Aldrich, nevertheless its essential points were all contained in the plan that finally was adopted. It provided an organization to hold the reserves of all member banks and arranged that they would always be ready to relieve a member bank under pressure by rediscounting loans that it held. The law as enacted provided for 12 banks instead of the one which the Aldrich plan would have created; but the intent of the law was to coordinate the 12 through the Federal Reserve Board in Washington, so that in effect they would operate as a central bank. There can be no question about it: Aldrich undoubtedly laid the essential, fundamental lines which finally took the form of the Federal Reserve Law.

Housing Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 8, 1946

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

HOUSING SUBSIDIES

During the war subsidies were paid on food and other products to hold down prices. Under wartime conditions a strong case could be made for subsidies on a limited scale. Unfortunately, despite the many pledges to discontinue subsidies after hostilities ceased, we find today not only a continuation of the wartime program but recommendations to expand it. Housing Expediter Wyatt followed this plan in his proposed housing program. After the House voted against housing subsidies Mr. Truman described this action as "a blow at the heart of the veterans' emergency housing program." The bill has now been passed by the House—minus its subsidy provisions—and on this issue we believe that the House is on sounder ground than the administration.

Under the proposed housing program the taxpayer was asked to subsidize all home builders to the extent of $600,000,000 or more. To justify this huge expenditure, the program was described as a veterans' housing program. However, there was nothing in the program to prevent nonveterans, including many people who have accumulated large wartime savings, from acquiring building materials for homes they desire to purchase. Certainly these people should not be subsidized when they acquire new homes. If the objective is to hold down the cost of new homes to the veteran, there is no reason why some special financial provision cannot be made which applies to that group alone.

Additional subsidies would further unbalance the Federal Budget and increase the inflationary pressures which Mr. Wyatt proposed to counteract by the payment of subsidies. If the present price level is to be maintained, the inevitable result would be more and more subsidies. This is particularly true since it was proposed that wage

increases for building workers should be financed in part by subsidy payments. To the extent that a subsidy program succeeded in holding down the prices of homes, it would aggravate the present difficulties in another way. The shortage of housing is measured by the difference between the demand for new homes and the supply that can be made available. At lower prices the magnitude of the shortage would inevitably be greater than at higher prices. The lower prices would encourage a continuation of the large demand for new homes, even by persons who now have adequate housing. At the same time there is no assurance that subsidy payments would stimulate supplies as much as anticipated by Mr. Wyatt. Thus the payment of subsidies would not correct the present shortage.

It would be much more realistic to permit a price increase for building materials. Such an increase would act to stimulate the output of the required materials and would cut off some of the less necessitous demands. It would also permit a return toward a free economy rather than the further extension of Government control which would accompany subsidy payments.

Amendments to GI Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 8, 1946

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, acting on the belief that the important amendments to the GI bill are of great interest to the veterans of my district, and that they are entitled to be fairly acquainted with their rights under the amendments, I am, by unanimous consent, placing in the RECORD a brief analysis of the amendments, and a schedule of the original provisions of the act, which have not been changed:

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Extension of time: The time during which a course may be initiated is extended from 2 to 4 years after discharge or end of the war, whichever is later, and the time limit for completing the course is raised from 7 to 9 years after end of the war.

Age limit removed: Any eligible veteran now may receive 1 year of education or training, plus additional education (up to a maximum of 4 years), for total length of active service. He need not have been under 25 years when he entered service, nor need he show that his education was interrupted by war service.

Short intensive courses: Courses are no longer limited to a cost of $500 for an ordinary school year. Short intensive courses may be undertaken and the additional cost prorated against the period of eligibility to which the veteran is entitled at the rate of $500 per school year. No such short course may cost more than $500.

Correspondence courses: A veteran may apply to take a correspondence course under the new provisions, but he is entitled to no subsistence allowance. One-fourth of the elapsed time used in pursuing such a course is charged against the veteran's period of eligibility. Total amount payable for correspondence courses for any veteran is limited to $500.

Subsistence allowance increased: Monthly subsistence allowances are increased from $50 to $65 for veterans without dependents, and from $75 to $90 for veterans with dependents.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION OF DISABLED VETERANS

Extension of time: Vocational training under Public Law 16, involving more than 4 years of training, may be begun by a disabled veteran, subject to Veterans' Administration approval, and the time for completing such training is extended from 6 to 9 years after the end of the war.

Subsistence allowance increased: Disabled veterans now will receive a minimum of $105 per month without dependents, $115 with a dependent, plus $10 for the first child, $7 for each additional child and $15 for any dependent parent. This represents an increase over previous allowances. If the veteran is receiving a lesser pension he will receive the above amounts while he is in training status. In no event will his pension be reduced by entering training.

GUARANTY OF HOME, FARM, AND BUSINESS LOANS

Guaranty is automatic: These loans may now be made by any lending agency which is subject to examination and supervision by a Government agency, and restrictions of certain Federal laws are removed. A loan becomes automatically guaranteed if the lending agency and the veteran close the deal, the terms being in accord with the provisions of the act. The only other requirement is that the cost does not exceed the appraisal made by a VA-designated appraiser. Loans made by individual lenders (not falling in the class of approved institutions indicated above) must obtain prior approval by VA in order for the loan to be guaranteed.

Amount of real-estate-loan guaranty increased: Any loan on real estate may be guaranteed up to a maximum guaranty of $4,000 of the loan, as compared with a $2,000 limit under previous law. The Government guaranty remains 50 percent of the total loan up to the maximum amount. The business-loan guaranty limit remains at $2,000, or 50 percent.

Amortization limit extended: Real-estate loans may be amortized over a period up to 25 years, and farm-realty loans up to 40 years. Maturity on non-real-estate loans may not exceed 10 years.

Purchase of lots: Proceeds of a loan may be used to purchase a lot in connection with home construction.

Normal value out: Phraseology of the previous law is changed from "reasonable normal value" to "reasonable value" in connection with appraisals of property upon which a guaranteed loan is sought.

Loan purposes broadened: Provisions of the act are liberalized so that loans may be made for all ordinary farming purposes, for any normal business enterprise, and so that existing indebtedness in default may be refinanced in connection with all types of eligible loans.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

No deduction from future bonus: That portion of the law (sec. 1505) which provided that any financial benefits received under the act would be deducted from any future bonus authorized, is repealed.

United States veterans in Allied service now eligible: Anyone who served in the active military or naval service of an Allied Government and was a United States citizen when entering such service is eligible for the benefits of the act and of Public Law 16 (78th Cong.). He must, however, be a United States resident at the time claim is filed, and must not be receiving similar benefits from another nation.

Persons on terminal leave: Educational and loan-guaranty provisions of the act, and vocational rehabilitation under Public Law 16, are extended to persons on terminal leave or who are being hospitalized pending final discharge. No subsistence allowance may be claimed, however, by persons taking education or training under the act or under Public Law 16. This section is made retroactive to June 22, 1944, when the original Servicemen's Readjustment Act became law.

Artificial limbs: Provision is made to insure ample authority for Veterans' Administration to procure prosthetic appliances for veterans and instruct them in the use of such appliances, including payment of any expenses involved in the veteran's traveling to and from the center where the appliance is fitted and training given in its use.

Office space for service organizations: Veterans' Administration is authorized to provide office space, if available, to paid, full-time representatives of recognized veterans' organizations.

Veterans' Administration procurement of space: The act makes permanent Veterans' Administration's authority to procure necessary space for administrative, clinical, medical, and out-patient treatment purposes by lease, purchase, construction, condemnation, or declaration of taking. This authority previously was limited to 6 months after the end of the war.

PROVISIONS NOT CHANGED

Major provisions of the law which remain unchanged are:

Eligibility requirements: A veteran must have served in the active military or naval service on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war. He must have been discharged or released under conditions other than dishonorable after active service of 90 days or more or because of an injury or disability incurred in line of duty.

Hospitalization program: Veterans' Administration is authorized and directed to expedite additional hospital construction, and to establish all necessary administrative offices to make veterans' benefits more readily available.

Review of discharge: Ample provision is made for review by the War and Navy Departments of unsatisfactory discharge from service. A new amendment, of minor importance, is designed to clarify the intent of the law.

Job assistance: All previous regulations relating to Government assistance in helping veterans obtain employment are continued. The United States Employment Service and the Veterans' Placement Service Board are directed to cooperate in seeing that all veterans, able and willing to work, obtain employment.

Readjustment allowance: Unemployed veterans who register with an office of the United States Employment Service are entitled to a readjustment allowance of $20 per week while unemployed. An eligible veteran may receive such payments up to a maximum of 1 year, depending on length of service. Self-employed veterans with net earnings of less than $100 per month may receive an allowance amounting to the difference between net earnings and $100 in any month, up to a maximum of 1 year, also depending on length of service.

WHERE TO APPLY FOR BENEFITS

Prosthetic appliances: Any Veterans' Administration hospital or regional office.

Education and training: Any Veterans' Administration regional office or at the school you wish to attend.

Vocational rehabilitation: Any Veterans' Administration regional office.

Loan guaranty: Any eligible lending institution as outlined above. If negotiating with a private lender, any Veterans' Administration regional office.

Review of discharge: The War Department or the Navy Department, whichever was your branch of service.

Job assistance: Nearest office of United States Employment Service.

Readjustment allowance: Register at nearest office of United States Employment Service.

Farmers Demand Enactment of Hobbs Antiracketeering Measure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 8, 1946

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago the House passed the Hobbs antiracketeering bill which is still pending with the other body. The recent issue of the National Grange Monthly, the official magazine of the National Grange, contained an article on this measure by Mr. Fred Brenckman, well-known Grange leader. His statement so clearly states the farm interest in this legislation that I am urging my colleagues to read it and for that purpose I am submitting it for the RECORD.

It follows:

FARMERS DEMAND ENACTMENT OF THE HOBBS ANTIRACKETEERING MEASURE—FOES OF THE BILL PASSED BY THE HOUSE BOAST THEY WILL SMOTHER IT IN SENATE, AS WAS DONE IN THE LAST CONGRESS

In an effort to correct the evil consequences of the Supreme Court decision in the Teamster's Union case of nearly 4 years ago, the House of Representatives on December 12 passed the Hobbs antiracketeering bill (H. R. 32), which has been referred to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, headed by Senator PAT MCCARRAN, of Nevada.

Foes of the measure, the labor unions, together with their supporters in Congress, have publicly declared their intention to kill the bill in the Senate, just as they succeeded in preventing action on a similar bill that was passed by the House by a big majority in the last Congress.

SUPREME COURT PROTECTED RACKET

Recalling the circumstances that brought about the introduction of the Hobbs bill, on March 2, 1942, Associate Justice James F. Byrnes handed down a decision of the Supreme Court, in which it was held by the Court that Local 807 of the Teamsters' Union, of New York, together with 26 of its individual members, were not guilty of violating the Antiracketeering Act of 1934.

The evidence presented in the case showed that it was a common practice for members of the teamsters' union to hold up motortrucks at the New York end of the Holland Tunnel and demand a day's wages for a union member to drive the truck to its destination, often only a few squares away.

If the driver of the truck said he did not need any help, he was informed that he would have to pay the fee just the same. This amounted to $9.42 for a large truck, or $8.41 for a small one. Threats, intimidation, and often physical violence, were used to compel the owner or driver of the truck to comply with the demands of the members of the Teamsters' Union. In one instance, a farmer and two of his sons were attempting to deliver a load of produce to a ship berthed in the Hudson, were thrown into the river and narrowly escaped drowning. A large proportion of the trucks held up were owned or driven by farmers.

When the perpetrators of these outrages were indicted they were found guilty, after a trial of 6 weeks in a United States district court. However, the circuit court of appeals reversed the lower court, whereupon the case was taken to the United States Supreme Court.

GIST OF THE DECISION

In handing down the decision of the Supreme Court, Justice Byrnes, who is now Secretary of State, declared that the Antiracketeering Act was passed "to close gaps in existing Federal laws and to render more difficult the activities of predatory criminal gangs of the Kelly and Dillinger types," but that the law did not apply to labor unions or their members.

According to the decision, "accepting payments even where services are refused," is a form of union activity beyond the ban of the Antiracketeering Act and, therefore, beyond the reach of present Federal laws. Continuing, the Court in its decision said:

"This does not mean that such activities are beyond the reach of Federal legislative control. Nor does it mean that they need go unpunished. The power of State and local authorities to punish acts of violence is beyond question. It is not diminished or affected by the circumstance that the violence may be the growth of a labor dispute. The use of violence disclosed by this case is plainly subject to the ordinary criminal law."

It is worthy of note that the authorities of New York City, where these outrages were committed, gave no protection whatever to the victims of the racket. Federal action in the case was based on the ground that the racketeers were guilty of obstructing interstate commerce, bringing the matter under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government.

In a vigorous dissenting opinion to the Supreme Court decision, Chief Justice Stone said that there was evidence in the record to show that the defendants in the case conspired to compel trucks drivers or their employers, by force and violence, to pay the sums of money demanded. He further said that the payments were made by the drivers and truck owners to purchase immunity from violence, and that this was the end knowingly sought by members of the union. Justice Stone likewise declared that to sanction such practices would make common-law robbery appear "as an innocent pastime."

HANCOCK SUMMARIZES NEW BILL

In opening the debate on the Hobbs bill in the House on December 12, Congressman CLARENCE HANCOCK, of Syracuse, N. Y., fittingly said:

"Mr. Chairman, this bill is made necessary by the amazing decision of the Supreme Court in the case of the United States against Teamsters' Union, 807, 3 years ago. That decision practically nullified the antiracketeering bill of 1934.

"In effect it legalizes in certain labor disputes the use of robbery and extortion, two crimes that are recognized as serious in every State of the Union and in every civilized country, whether made use of by union men, nonunion men, professional racketeers or plain hoboes. In effect the Supreme Court held that it was the intent of Congress and the meaning of the act that members of Teamsters' Union, 807, in New York City were exempt from the provisios of that law, when attempting by the use of force or the threat of violence to obtain wages for a job, whether they rendered any service or not.

"In my judgment that is a gross misinterpretation of the law and a distortion of the intent of Congress. Of course, it never was the intent of Congress to legitimize crime; nevertheless, the decision of the Supreme Court in the teamsters' case will be the supreme law of the land until the Supreme Court reverses itself, which is not likely, because five of the members of the Court who made that astounding decision are still members of the Court; or until Congress acts to correct and supersede the decision and adopts a new law written in clear and unmistakable language.

"This is all the bill does. We think a mistake was made by the Supreme Court; we are attempting to correct it through enacting a new law which will accurately and definitely reflect the attitude of the Congress, the general public and the honest, law-abiding members of labor unions."

During the course of the debate on the bill, it was claimed by some Members of the House that the abuses which the Hobbs bill aims to correct no longer exists.

MINNESOTA FARMER VICTIMIZED

However, other Members stoutly denied this, Congressman H. CARL ANDERSEN, of Minnesota, submitted an editorial from the Dawson (Minn.) Sentinel, to show the length to which racketeering members of the teamsters' union go in his section of the country. The editorial was as follows:

"Last week a Dawson farmer was sent to Des Moines, Iowa, to pick up some machinery needed to complete the installation of corn driers at the local elevators. The trucker made the trip without mishap or difficulty with Iowa labor groups. He loaded his truck with his shipment and then was told by labor representatives that he not only had to unload the truck and take it back to Dawson 300 miles away, empty, but also that he had to join the local truckers' union and pay dues of $32 before they would permit him to leave with his truck. And this is a free country where free enterprise is encouraged. Any other organization or individual attempting such action would have been promptly jailed and charged with highway robbery, and in addition would probably have to answer charges of threatening, intimidation, and interference with commerce. It is incidents like this which make one wonder just how far some can go with racketeering methods without being made to account for their actions."

SOME EXAMPLES FROM CALIFORNIA

Congressman JACK ANDERSON, of California, who is a farmer, said:

"A lot of our produce is hauled into the city of San Francisco. The man who drives the truck, who hauls our fruit and produce into San Francisco, must belong to the teamsters' organization or he must pick up a member of the teamsters' organization, carry him on the truck to the point of unloading and pay him for all the time that the truck is in the city of San Francisco.

"The farmers of the four counties I represent have been forced on many occasions, while hauling their own produce in their own trucks, to pick up members of labor organizations at the city limits of San Francisco, carry them on the truck to the point of unloading and back again to the city limits and pay them their wage for that period of time. This must be done in spite of the fact that the man who is thus paid does no work as far as driving or unloading the truck is concerned."

Continuing, Mr. ANDERSON said:

"I recall a time, back about 1938, when milk in the San Francisco milkshed was declared 'hot' and the members of the teamsters' union refused to haul the milk for the dairymen. Because the farmers' milkers declined to join the dairy workers' union, a secondary boycott was declared, and the teamsters left the milk to spoil instead of hauling it to the city for processing and bottling. As a result of such high-handed action the public went without milk and the farmers lost money. This ridiculous policy was carried so far in one instance in southern California that a farmer who fed his cows hay that was declared 'hot' because it was hauled by a nonunion truck driver, also had his milk declared 'hot' and the teamsters' union refused to haul the milk."

Not so long ago, the Golden Rule Church, of San Jose, Calif., bought a cooperative creamery which had a contract with the teamsters' union. Several members of the congregation were notified that they could not work in the plant unless they joined the

union, and this decision was upheld by the National War Labor Board.

A FEW TYPICAL CASES

To show that the racketeering complained of is still being practiced, last summer a fruit grower connected with the Berks-Lehigh Cooperative Fruit Growers, Inc., of Pennsylvania, took a load of 225 bushels of peaches to Philadelphia. Before the driver of the truck was permitted to unload the peaches he was compelled to join the Philadelphia local of the teamsters' union, which cost him $29.

Later a driver for the same organization carried a consignment of peaches to Newark, N. J. In this case the driver was obliged to join the Newark local of the teamsters' union before he could unload. The fee charged in this instance was $51. There have been innumerable instances of this kind.

The Walker-Gordon Dairy Farm, of Plainsboro, N. J., was outrageously treated by the Newark local of the teamsters' union last year. The union boycotted the milk of this company during January 1945, and in a period of about 2 weeks the owners of the farm lost about $20,000. In the end the company had to agree to let the union organize the 150 workers at its plant, although the majority of the workers had no desire whatever to join the teamsters' union.

During the negotiations in this connection, spokesmen for the union boasted that they intended to organize all the big farms first and then the rest would have to fall into line. The argument of the union is that any place that uses a milking machine is no longer a farm but an industrial dairy establishment. It is interesting to note that there are more than 46,000 milking machines in use on the farms of New York State alone.

HOBBS MARSHALLS FACTS

In closing the debate on his bill in the House on December 12, Congressman HOBBS, in answer to the claim that racketeering was no longer being practiced, said:

"May I say that I have had more than 1,000 letters and telegrams from organizations of farmers all over the United States saying that the condition is even worse than it was in 1943, when we passed this bill before, for the simple reason that then they were charging only the price of a day's union wage, $8.41 for a light truck and $9.42 for a heavy truck; whereas now they not only charge those fees for chaperoning farmers on city streets to save their lives, but in addition they charge from $30 to $56 as an initiation fee into the union, which the farmers never get the privilege of joining. * * *

"Hon. Joe Eastman, then head of the Office of Defense Transportation, told me that his examiners reported 1,000 trucks a night being held up and robbed in various cities of this Union from Los Angeles to Seattle, across through Milwaukee and Chicago, and through Scranton, Pa., which was another hot spot; Philadelphia, and New York, and over 100 a day at the New York end of the Holland Tunnel. He was begging as a witness in 1943, pleading the cause of defense transportation, and called attention to the numbers and numbers of trucks loaded with shells and guns for our Army and Navy, which were held up and robbed by those goons at the mouth of the Holland Tunnel. These authorities prove that racketeering was bad enough in 1943 to cause our faces to be set like flint against it. It is worse now."

Since more than 2 years have elapsed since the hearings were held on the original Hobbs bill, it is possible tha the Senate Committee on the Judiciary may appoint a subcommittee to hold new hearings. There could be no legitimate objection to such a procedure. However, the supporters of the Hobbs bill want action this time. They do not want the measure to be smothered by inaction in the Senate, the fate that befell the previous bill.

The National Grange and the other farm groups, together with thousands of unorganized farmers throughout the country, want to see agricultural producers freed of the necessity of paying tribute to the teamsters' union. Every decent American joins in voicing the demand that this brigandage must stop.

FRED BRENCKMAN.

Why the Loan to Britain Stands By Itself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1946

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Arkansas Gazette for March 3, 1946:

WHY THE LOAN TO BRITAIN STANDS BY ITSELF

Many people may have figured that if we lend $3,750,000,000 to Great Britain we should lend other billions to other nations. But President Truman, who is going to ask Congress to add $1,250,000,000 to lending funds of the Export-Import Bank, holds that other foreign loans should be limited through the next fiscal year to the amount of the bank's expanded capital, and that the proposed British loan is a unique case which would not be a precedent for a loan to another country.

Why should the British loan be distinguished from all other proposals?

More than 40 percent of the foreign trade of the United States is with the British Empire. Britain is the center of the sterling area, which except for Canada, includes the Empire and some Near East countries. During the war Britain spent $13,000,000,000 in the sterling area. If the countries can now spend $13,000,000,000 only for British goods, large amounts of American goods will be kept out of the sterling area. It is said that for generations the people of India, Egypt, the Near East, and South America would buy goods in Britain because they could spend sterling there. Australia, for example, can use sterling to buy cotton in the United States, but can buy cotton in the sterling area.

The loan agreement provides that at the end of a year anybody may exchange British pounds for dollars or any other money desired. And anybody who sells goods to Britain can get in return money to spend in the United States or any other country.

It is insisted by those who should know that action on the British loan may determine whether this is to be a world trading by groups and blocs or a world with three-fourths of the trading area free; and that Britain's situation will determine whether the world moves in the direction of expanding private enterprise in international markets or reverts to discrimination and hampering blocs.

We are told that if Britain, for lack of dollars with which to buy, is forced to make deals with various countries other than the United States, and to resort to every sort of restriction and discrimination, it might be difficult ever to change these conditions and open the world's markets to our goods.

The people of Great Britain have got to have employment; they have got to be able to import material; they have got to eat and live.

A Congressional Office in Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 8, 1946

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by me recently over the radio:

Today, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to give you a verbal picture of your Congressman's office and the manifold and varied duties which are performed therein. In this connection and in order to more quickly acquaint you with the functions of a congressional office, I quote in part a very interesting speech made 6 years ago, shortly after I came to Washington, by Representative LUTHER PATRICK, of Birmingham, Ala., and naturally a dyed-in-the-wool Democrat. Luther is a very good friend of mine and he is not only quite a wit but before coming to Congress was a radio commentator in his home city. He drew up and submitted to each Member of Congress 10 simple rules of conduct for our use and I give them to you at this time because of their full conception of the manifold duties which we are called upon to perform and which at the same time do somewhat handicap us in our performance of the careful study and prosecution of legislation for you and for the Nation at large. I repeat these rules:

"1. Entertain, with a smile, constituents, their wives, their sons, sons' wives, etc. Go with them to the White House, show good reason why you are unable to personally have them meet the President, take daughters to meet midshipmen at Annapolis.

"2. Explain what bill is up for debate, points for discussion, how it will be passed, how you will vote and why.

"3. Attend to balcony and point out Speaker Bankhead, Leaders Rayburn and Martin, Ham Fish, Dewey Short, that man Martin Dies, and name each lady Member of Congress.

"4. Respond to worthy causes, make after-dinner speeches, before-dinner speeches, learn to eat anything, anywhere, any night—work all day, dictate all night, and be fresh as a rain-washed daisy for next day's duties.

"5. Be a cultured gentleman, a teller of ribald stories, a profound philosopher, preserve a store of "Confucius say" gags, be a ladies' man, a man's man, a he man, a diplomat, a Democrat with a Republican slant, a Republican with a Democrat viewpoint, an admirer of the Roosevelt way, a hater of the New Deal, a New Dealer, an old dealer, and a quick dealer.

"6. Learn how to attend six to eight major functions, rushing home and back during each term on one round-trip travel pay.

"7. Have the dope on hot spots in town, with choice telephone numbers for the gay boys from back home, and help to contact all local moral organizations and uplift societies in Washington.

"8. Learn to be an expert guide. Keep car in tip-top shape.

"9. Know names and dates related to all points of interest, and be able to explain and supply information regarding public buildings, and statuary about Washington.

"10. Be an authority on history, travel, psychology, philosophy, education, economics, civics, finance, export trade, Government printing, international relations, neckties, and fishing tackle."

Frankly, I must agree with much of what is tabulated in the foregoing rules and with Mr. PATRICK'S further comments:

"Understand, I do not claim to come up to it all, especially as to telephone numbers, hot spots, stories, and so forth.

"A Congressman has become an expanded messenger boy, an employment agency, getter-out of the Navy, Army, Marines, ward healer, wound healer, trouble shooter, law explainer, bill finder, issue translator, resolution interpreter, controversy oil pourer, gladhand extender, business promoter, convention goer, civic ills skirmisher, veterans' affairs adjuster, ex-serviceman's champion, watchdog for the under dog, sympathizer with the upper dog, namer and kisser of babies, recoverer of lost baggage, soberer of delegates, adjuster for traffic violators—voters straying into Washington and into the toils of the law—binder up of broken hearts, financial wet nurse, good samaritan, contributor to good causes—there are so many good causes—cornerstone layer, public building and bridge dedicator, ship christener—to be sure he does get in a little flag waving—and a little constitutional hoisting and spread-eagle work, but it is getting harder every day to find time to properly study legislation—the very business we are primarily here to discharge, and that must be done above all things. To go on would not help a lot. We are running our legs off on details, but we must keep the approval of Mr. and Mrs. Voter, so we find here a subject upon which we can all agree; and regardless of these labors involved, I for one, prefer it to any job I have ever had, and do not expect to relinquish it without a powerful fight. I hope I am here to stay many, I trust, useful years."

Now it has not been my practice on these broadcasts to quote at length one of my Democratic colleagues, but we know they, too, are capable or we would not have our traditional two-party system in this country, under which our Nation has grown to its present world-wide leadership, and they are our personal friends down here even though we do not vote alike, and above all they have our wholehearted respect. I am simply calling his timely observations to your attention because I believe they explain—even though rather humorously—the complexities of a congressional office.

As you can appreciate from the foregoing, our tasks down here are indeed tremendous and when I say our tasks I pay whole-souled and wholehearted respect to my office staff. They are the ones who, of necessity, must carry the burden of the many detailed duties attached to this office and which—in the name of your Congressman—they are called upon to perform. I believe I have as fine a staff as any to be found on Capitol Hill. My staff consists of my secretaries, Mrs. Anne Cook, of Rogers City, and Mrs. Madlyn Grabowsky Fall, of Ingallston (in Menominee County), and my veterans' secretary, former Staff Sergeant Alvin Christopherson, of Alpena, who met with an accident over in Tunis. My staff and I frequently call ourselves "Bradley, Incorporated," and we are just that, because we work as a team all the way through. My principal task—and for which you elected me—is to study and prosecute legislation, but that, too, during the past war years has become tremendously complex. In addition, requests to perform individual services are increasing daily, and which requests, naturally, have nothing whatsoever to do with the study of legislation and on which I personally am expected to spend a considerable portion of my own time.

The first thing in the morning, I read the paper and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to keep up with daily events. I try to do this before coming to the office because once I enter my office door the day's work begins—the telephone rings constantly—visitors call and many times I have difficulty in making my committee meeting at 10 a. m. My principal committee is the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee that has jurisdiction over all legislation pertaining to all phases of shipping, shipyards, seamen, etc., operating on the Great Lakes and on the oceans, over all forms of fishing, over the Coast Guard, over the Panama Canal, etc. In committee is where we do a great part of our congressional work, where we hold public and private hearings, listen to the testimony of all kinds of witnesses, and then draft, study, and re-draft legislation. At 12 noon we go to the House floor for the daily session, and, as a rule, do not get back to the office much before 5; then if I have made a speech I have to go over it carefully—possibly revise it with one of my secretaries—and then seriously get into my day's dictation.

Now let me tell you in a little detail what my office is called upon to do by taking you through our pending files as of today:

Here we have numerous requests for civil-service retirement refunds. In some instances the application for refund filed by the individual concerned never reached the Civil Service Commission. In other instances Civil Service does not have the man's pay record and no action can be taken by them until the department concerned sends in the proper form. This necessitates our contacting the civilian personnel records office—which in most instances is a decentralized division no longer located here in Washington and calls for a letter of inquiry to another State and the awaiting of advices that the proper pay record has been sent to the Commission whereupon repeated telephone calls are necessary until we are advised a check has gone forward to our constituent.

Then we have numerous letters from young folks interested in securing Government positions overseas. In cases of this kind we contact departments here to ascertain where positions are open and determine the specific qualifications for same and our constituent is then sent the proper application form and advised to return it either to my office or to the department in question—after which we keep in telephone contact with the agency in the hope of securing an assignment. And, of course, being a Republican, I have no patronage to hand out.

My time on the air does not permit me to elaborate on the work involved in visa cases—where American citizens here wish to have their nephew, uncle, aunt, brother, or friend brought to America and call upon me to assist them in obtaining immigration visas which are necessary. At times it takes weeks to get the desired information from our State Department and calls for correspondence direct to our consular offices or embassies abroad. Then, too, there are American citizens in Europe who want to come back home and it is necessary that they secure passport approval which has to be cleared with our State Department. Then, at times we are called upon to arrange for transportation for English and Australian GI wives, and this frequently takes months to accomplish. Further, we have requests to protect American interests in foreign countries, and this calls for the verification of all documents sent to us by individuals by the State Department, thence by the diplomatic offices abroad, and finally by the foreign government wherein the interests are located. Because of the confusion in Europe today it takes weeks or months to clear all information and then at times after building up a tremendous file of correspondence and making repeated trips to the State Department or foreign embassies—we are set back on our haunches by the verdict that the American interests, in reality, are held by persons who now await trial as Axis sympathizers. These are heart-breaking cases to myself—and certainly so to my constituents—but we must accept the facts as given to us until proven false.

No little of our problems entail our servicemen. Some of them we have to get back to the States on emergency leaves because of sickness at home; others are, frankly, just lost—nobody has heard from them for months, and this entails the headquarters concerned contacting commanding generals abroad in an effort to locate a man's whereabouts and report to us. Then, too, my friends, strange as it may seem, we must play the part of Dr. Anthony in locating husbands who were discharged but never returned home. And then there is the myriad of correspondence which comes to our office on veterans' pensions, claims, discharge certificates, arrears in pay, etc., which reminds me of a case we had the other day that illustrates the carelessness of our discharged veterans in being so anxious to get home that they sign their papers without being sure they are in order. We have repeatedly tried to warn the boys against this. One young man wrote us that he was anxious to get married and when he and his young lady sought to get their marriage license, and they asked for his discharge certificate, lo and behold, he was astounded to find that his marital status thereon was listed as "narried." So we were asked to straighten that matter out. Meanwhile the young man and his bride-to-be learned that "haste makes waste."

We do our best to process rural route extension applications; check on unemployment-compensation cases; the extension of REA lines; answer the voluminous correspondence on protests to the way your Government is being run by this administration; acknowledge views on pending legislation; assist in the securing of Government loans for industries or civic organizations; then a certain city wants a small boat harbor and that has to be taken up either in form of legislation or with the Army engineers; someone wants a postmastership—this, of course, is Democratic patronage, and I, as a Republican, have no say-so. We are called upon to handle patent cases, homestead applications, priorities, etc. We send out all documents made available to Members of Congress to our libraries, our county clerks, our parents, and those who specifically request publications. To keep abreast of happenings back home we daily check our district newspapers.

Naturally, you can see from the foregoing we must have a working knowledge of all departments, and, friends, with the present shifting about of governmental bureaus and agencies that is no small trick. I stress again, we are always glad to be of service to you. However, if at times you do not receive a reply as promptly as you expect, please realize it is because many times we are just plain "snowed under."

Frequently it is long after 8 or even after 9 at night before your Congressman gets home for his dinner, but that is the life of a Congressman in Washington. Am I complaining about it? Definitely not. I hope you reelect me next fall because I like the work. We enjoy giving you the best service possible.

I have devoted this broadcast to the workings of a congressional office. I have attempted to impart to you the workings of a congressional office so that those few who take frequent occasion to jump on us, who feel we are overpaid, may appreciate that we, too, have an arduous job to do down here in Washington, which we consider not only a distinct privilege but a pleasure. We shall continue to serve each and every one of you, regardless of your political connection, to the best of our ability.

Now, in conclusion. I came to Washington in January of 1939 and from then on until the summer of 1944 all of us were on the job

12 months of the year. In the summer of 1944 we had our first vacation of 2 months but, even so, our Washington office had to be kept open, and so my secretary, Mrs. Fall, of Ingallston, Mich., remained behind to take care of those duties. If you don't think those were manifold, then listen to the following poem which she composed early one morning in August of 1944 based on the morning's correspondence, which she sent to me out of the heat of Washington to the cool of northern Michigan. It speaks for itself, and I read it to you now:

Now here I sit amidst the mail
A frettin' and a stewin'
A truck they want—and tires, too.
Then—my boy is sick—what will I do?
My checks don't come, I am in need
See that they get here with undue speed.
The neighbor's cows are in my hay
Please get me wire without delay.
My neighbor's dogs ate up my sheep
Please write at once—attorney fees won't keep.
My health is failing fast and speedy
My farm is overgrown and seedy
My Joe is over there a fightin'
But I ask what for—I expect your writin'!!
Please get our check from CCC
To pay us for canning the lowly pea.

With all of the taxes, why do they mention
"You better watch out" if we don't get our pension.
Total conscription is their aim
If you don't accept it—what be our gain?
Then—write at once upon receipt
Of my lengthy letter—done up so neat.
What be these Social Security rules
They take our money and spend it like fools.
Get up and do your bit
We true Americans must not quit—P. S. I know you're writing!

Then on we go to still some more—
If you will permit, I'm getting sore.
I went into the valley of death for my son
Now get him back to me—on the run.
We can't get our mail up here
So call up Walker and make that clear.
My son writes saying he is a physical wreck
Call the General at once and make a thorough check.
We engineers work hard all day
Call up Headquarters and get us subsistence pay.
Chevrolet cars are selling for a fraction
Button-hole Chester and get some action.

Then news comes—in words so few
And a Joey is killed in Tim-Buck-Too.
And all the rest is put aside
For he was their son in whom they took such pride.
And though numerous thoughts and words we say
None can comfort those people today.

But the world moves fast—and back we go
To the man in the Army with the broken toe.
So it's off we are to check again.
The District produces—a one, two and three
The baby books off the shelves do flee
Publications come in and out they go
Bearing the stamp—a hie-de-ho.

The papers aren't read—the days are too short
The filing sits idly—it brings forth a snort.
The floors are all waxed
The desks are all polished
But to top it all off—our "Schoolcraft" did perish.
And so—I sit upon my cushioned chair
And wonder what I am doing there.
But after all is said and done
It truly is a lot of fun
And even though my brow is corrugated—
I'm proud to be one of "Bradley, Incorporated."
But now I find I scooped Al Weber
Looks like I am based myself—as well as that

Requisition of Surplus Property for the Soil Conservation Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 8, 1946

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, Monroe County, Iowa, has a very active soil-conservation district organization and the commissioners are very much interested in legislation permitting the requisition of surplus property for the soil-conservation service to be used in erosion control. In this connection I ask consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution adopted by the board of commissioners of the Monroe County Conservation District on February 27, 1946:

The matter of securing surplus Government machinery and equipment for earth moving and soil-conservation development was discussed, to request action in Congress on the Poage bill, H. R. 538, and the McKellar bill in the Senate, or proposed legislation to speed action in making such equipment available to soils districts, the following resolution was adopted on motion by Foster, seconded by Martin.

Whereas there is great need in Iowa soil-conservation districts for heavy earth-moving equipment for development of soil-conservation practices on the farms of district cooperators; and

Whereas the above-mentioned bills provide for making surplus war machinery available: Be it

Resolved by the Board of Commissioners of Monroe County Soil Conservation District, That we urge prompt action in Congress passing this legislation, and that letters be written to Congressman KARL M. LECOMPTE, Congressman THOMAS E. MARTIN, Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, and Senator GEORGE WILSON requesting the facilities of their good offices to speed action on the bills mentioned.

E. G. HAWK,
Chairman.
STERLING B. MARTIN,
Secretary.
JAMES W. FOSTER,
Member.

The Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. P. W. GRIFFITHS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 6, 1946

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I have listened through the entire debate on the Patman housing bill and it appears to follow the same pattern; yes, the very same arguments are being made as on all previous bills, viz., here is a chance to do something for the veteran.

Now I would like to see every veteran able to acquire a home of his own, but I am afraid the veteran still will be without a home if this bill passes because where is any guaranty that any homes will result? Certainly they cannot be made without lumber, brick, tile, glass, and so forth. You do not build homes with paper, hot air, or pious declarations. Yes, he will have as much chance of getting a home as he now has of acquiring surplus property.

Let us look at the record as regards just one item of surplus property—tractors. During the war about 80,000 were manufactured, of which approximately 80 percent went overseas and stayed there. Of those remaining in this country about 8,000 have been distributed to purchasers—the number going to the veteran, however, has been an infinitesimal percentage because the veteran comes third in preference.

On February 1, 1946, SWPC had issued approximately 36,000 certificates for crawler type tractors.

On same date, WAC had requests for 37,000 wheel and crawler type tractors from Federal and State agencies. So what good is the veteran's certificate. It is just a hunting license. Why continue to fool the veteran? Why not be honest?

Now I have been informed that there might possibly be another five or six thousand come through. Now just think of this, UNRRA wants 10,000 and according to the law as written can take them all and there will not be a single one for anybody in these United States. Good heavens, why not get these little plots of ground in Europe going with some Missouri mules of the four-legged type, some horses and hand plows, but do not be foolish enough to let them strip this country of tractors which they cannot economically turn between their hedges and above all let us get the veteran machinery to go to work with and amend the Surplus Property Disposal Act, if necessary, so that when the veteran gets a certificate to purchase he has something instead of a meaningless hunting license.

"Dear Congressman"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 8, 1946

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Life magazine of March 8, 1946:

"DEAR CONGRESSMAN"—HERE IS SOMETHING WORTH WRITING TO HIM ABOUT: PUTTING HIS OWN HOUSE IN ORDER

When an editorial exhorts its readers to write their Congressmen, it usually means the writer can't think of anything else to say. Yet here is a matter in which a volume of mail is really called for if we are to have a Congress worth writing to at all. For, after 54 weeks of study, a joint House and Senate committee has proposed a reorganization of Congress. These proposals add up to the best horse sense that Congress has spoken to itself in several decades. If adopted, as they certainly should be, and in toto, Con-

gress can become a more effective body, well on the path to retrieved success.

Many people think of Congressmen as windy old dopes enjoying free haircuts, subsidized lunches, and a lot of joy rides at public expense. Actually most Congressmen are harassed, overworked, underpaid, conscientious men, who, though directors of the greatest enterprise in the word, are handicapped at every turn by methods, machinery, and facilities that belongs to the era of red velvet and brass spittoons.

WORKSHOPS

The joint committee, whose chairman has been Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, a Progressive from Wisconsin, and whose vice chairman has been Representative MIKE MONRONEY, Oklahoma Democrat, proposes as its most vital point a wholesale revamping of the present committee structure. This is wise because no less than 90 percent of the legislative job is done in these committee workshops. Among them are such outmoded committees as the Senate's on Interoceanic Canals. It may have been vital when the Panama Canal was built, but not today. During the Seventy-eighth Congress it paid more than $10,000 to clerks who assisted it in the "task" of passing on but 2 out of the 709 public and general bills of that session. The House has four elections committees. Not one has a contest before it at this time, yet each has a clerk on the pay roll at $2,760 a year and a janitor at $1,260.

The joint report observes, "We recognize the difficulties inherent in simplifying this old system of 81 standing committees." What it means is the difficulty in persuading Congress to give up the oddments of patronage contained in these clerkships, the free junkets hither and yon that are perquisites of membership, the prestige of being chairman of some committee, even if it's only the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

It will require some public clamor to drive through the joint report's plea that committees be condensed and rationalized. For example, it is proposed to lump eight committees—Interoceanic Canals, Commerce, Indian Affairs, Irrigation and Reclamation, Mines and Mining, Public Buildings and Grounds, Public Lands and Surveys, Territories and Insular Affairs—into one new streamlined Committee on Interior, Natural Resources, and Public Works. By such means the Senate's 33 committees would be reduced to 16 and the House's 48 to 18.

Obviously, Congressmen cannot bloom overnight into experts on all the diverse matters laid before them daily. They need facts and assistance. Since 1919 Congress has had a Legislative Reference Service. The joint committee finds the present budget of $198,000 a year inadequate and urges boosting it to $750,000. Its research staff would be augmented by authorizing four experts at from $6,000 to $8,000 apiece for each of the streamlined committees. It is shocking to think that a legislative body for a country apparently destined to spend twenty-five to thirty billion dollars a year has been so backward in research. Congress now gets its information haphazardly and wastefully from the newspapers, from pipe lines, and from questioning department heads. Properly equipping the committees with experts would end the necessity for constantly creating new special investigating committees, the authors of the joint report believe.

PURSE STRINGS

The way that Congress holds the national purse strings is hardly less alarming. The left hand spending money never knows what the right hand that is raising money is doing. There is no firm, set relationship between income and outgo. The joint committee has some good proposals here. The Revenue and Appropriations Committees would be required to report early each session just how much was coming in, and how much was projected for outgo. If the two sums did not balance, Congress would either have to reduce appropriations by a uniform percentage—except for interest, pensions, and other fixed items—or increase the public debt.

Appropriations originate in the House Appropriations Committee, which has a number of subcommittees dealing with specific expenditures, a subcommittee for the Navy, for Interior, Justice, etc. These subcommittees meet in executive, which is to say secret, session. Some no doubt operate very well, others, equally without doubt, operate very poorly. The system of review by the parent committee is, to speak mildly, perfunctory. Frequently, consideration by the Appropriations Committee of a bill involving billions is given less than 1 hour.

Here again the joint report's recommendation for added, qualified personnel will help the committee understand more about what it is doing and the secrecy, as the joint report agrees, must end. These hearings should be open to press and public, unless some matter of national security is under consideration. Another useful recommendation is that the functions of the General Accounting Office be expanded to give "information that will enable Congress to determine whether public funds are being carelessly, extravagantly, or loosely administered and spent."

Although much has been written about the demands made upon Congressmen by folks back home—everything from getting baby books off to new arrivals to sending flowers for lodge funerals—the joint committee found little that could be done to save the time of Congressmen. Quite a bit of this errand running is good for democracy. It is an open channel from the people to their Government.

Another recommendation that is worth at least a trial calls for establishment of minority and majority policy committees. The idea here is to clarify party lines and cause (a) the two major parties to adopt a line on a wider variety of public issues and (b) to encourage individual Congressmen to follow their party line. Slavish devotion to a party line would be, of course, undesirable and is not intended. Yet it is a fact that a citizen cannot vote for a Democratic or Republican Congressman these days with any assurance he will follow the announced platform of his party.

Conservative Republicans are more often to be found voting with southern Democrats than with liberal Republicans and vice versa. Party organizations within Congress are now in poor repair. The coordination between the majority party and the White House is likewise poor. It is planned that the majority committee would consult with the President frequently, harmonizing and adjusting the party policy at both the White House and congressional levels.

PAY

We have saved until last the item that will probably arouse most reaction. The present pay of Congressmen is $10,000. The joint report recommends $15,000. This is still low for the quality of people we want in Congress. It is especially low when it is remembered that two homes must be maintained, sundry political contributions made, dinner checks of visiting firemen picked up, and so on. President Truman and the National Planning Association advised up to $25,000 a year. That is nearer the mark.

In addition to an increase in pay, the report urges that Congressmen be permitted to join the Federal retirement system on the same contributory basis as other Federal employees. This is a vital proposal. When it was advanced a few years ago there was a storm of thoughtless disapproval. The report circulated that a Senator might after only 1 year's service retire for life on $400 a month. Actually, that would have applied to only one Senator, a veteran who had served with distinction for 35 years, and it would have applied to him only if he had made substantial back payments. As it turned out, this Senator failed of reelection and finished his days, not exactly in poverty, but unable to afford amenities for himself or his aging wife. He was George Norris. Few men have deserved more from their country.

Congressional pay and retirement arrangements are now wrong and must be corrected. It is one way to attract better people to serve in Congress. But, when you write your Congressman in support of raising his pay, don't neglect to insist that this is only a part of the package of reform that Congress needs. Let more pay be the just reward for self-reorganization under the plan of the joint committee.

Address of Most Rev. Richard J. Cushing, D. D.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE J. BATES
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1946

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an anniversary address by Most Rev. Richard J. Cushing, D. D., and the introductory remarks by Rev. Ladislaus A. Sikora, of Salem, Mass., at the special Polish services in the Cathedral of the Holy Cross, Boston, Mass., Sunday, February 17, 1946, during the bicentennial celebration of Thaddeus Kosciusko.

No country has suffered more down through the centuries than Poland, and the words contained in this address set forth clearly the trials and tribulations of that great nation and its people.

ADDRESS BY REV. L. A. SIKORA

We are gathered in this beautiful cathedral, the mother church of our diocese, at the generous, thoughtful, and heart-warming invitation of our revered archbishop, to pay tribute to the memory of a distinguished son of Poland, Thaddeus Kosciusko.

He left his beloved native land after resisting the force and might of the ancient enemy of his people and came to our shores to offer his services in the cause of freedom and right. He knew the lot of the oppressed. His magnificent contribution to the achievements of the American ideals is too well known for me to recount here.

But, there is one significant item, not too generally known which shows forth the character of the man, the all-embracing humanity character, that was his by the birthright of his Catholic faith.

In his last will and testament, he asks his friend Thomas Jefferson, to dispose of his earthly possessions, which by the way consisted of a grant of land given by our own grateful Nation in recognition of his outstanding services. The proceeds of the sale of this land were to be used to purchase the freedom of the slaves.

With profound gratitude to God, for having given us so exalted hero, a hero, who belongs not to Poland, not to America, but to all mankind, we plead the cause of Poland.

Our national honor places upon us a clear duty to see that Poland, the land of Kosciusko, and during this last war, a most faithful ally, be treated as a friend, and an ally.

On this Kosciusko Bicentennial Day we pay tribute to the achievements of his genius.

We honor today the defenders of Warsaw, Narvik, Tobruk, and of Monte Cassino. We honor the memory of thousands, hundreds of thousands of Americans who fought for our ideals. These ideals which are being denied to Poland—to Poland, called the inspiration of the world. We plead the cause of heroic Poland, of democratic and tolerant Poland, of Christian Poland.

We greatly appreciate Governor Tobin's timely proclamation, for it aids the cause.

We are exceedingly grateful to his excellency, our beloved archbishop for the generosity of his noble and understanding heart. He has endeared himself to all, but the Polish people especially are grateful for what he has done for them and what he is doing for the cause of Poland.

Through his thoughtful invitation we are here, and join him in pleading prayer to the Almighty God.

ADDRESS BY MOST REV. RICHARD J. CUSHING, D. D.

During the past week Polish people and their friends throughout the world celebrated the bicentennial of the Polish hero of two continents, Thaddeus Kosciusko.

His memory is commemorated by a monument here in the city of Boston; another in our National Capital, and a third at West Point. A foundation perpetuating his name flourishes in New York City. Elsewhere in this country and in France there exist material memorials to the valiant and virtuous personality of this Polish soldier to whom our newly founded Nation was deeply indebted.

Even if these monuments did not exist, the name and the achievements of Thaddeus Kosciusko would still be deathless in the hearts of the proud people of Poland and the grateful hearts of America. Thaddeus Kosciusko was born February 12, 1746; he died October 15, 1817. The people of Poland and their friends need not be told the story of the manner in which, between these two dates, this great and good man served the cause of liberty in two hemispheres. The mere history of his life I shall not repeat here this afternoon.

I do wish, however, to recall what the point and lesson of his life should be for those who are worried about Poland at this present moment of her history. Usually it is unhealthy to live in the past. Our people particularly are tempted to dwell on the past glories and the past griefs of their nations; as a consequence, too often the initiative in the future is left to those who despise the past. It is usually a mistake either for individuals or for nations to look back too much on what is now no more.

But sometimes it is very inspiring to recall the past, especially when we do so in order to meditate on the parallels between the dark chapters of past history and the worries of the present. Sometimes by turning our gaze into the forgotten past we discover grounds for new hope, new courage, and new determination in the future.

That should be the lesson of Thaddeus Kosciusko for the Polish people in our own day. There are so many parallels between the Poland of his day and the Poland of ours that the reasonable man will be inspired by his history to persevere in the hope that Poland is by no means doomed today. Poland will survive unto new glory in the fulfillment of her ancient destiny.

Those who still remember, as all men should, the circumstances which involved Poland in the recent war will be struck with the parallel between them and the circumstances under which the Polish hero, Thaddeus Kosciusko, entered American history. He had scarcely finished his education when he came to these shores, moved by his hatred of oppression, to ally himself with the American patriots who were then struggling against fearful odds for their liberty as a people. His declaration to General Washington is historic; it breathes the abiding spirit of Poland. He said, "I have come to fight for the cause of independence," and in reply to Washington's question as to what he could do, "Try me" was his typical answer. Washington did try him, and as a result he moved from honor to honor until, our national independence having been secured, he was named a brigadier general and cited by our Congress for his "long, faithful, and honorable services" in the cause of political freedom and a people's independence. The parallel is striking between the spirit in which Kosciusko fought for us and the spirit in which Poland bled for the rest of the world during the terrible months of the recent war when she was butchered by Nazi and Communist hordes.

But the story of Thaddeus Kosciusko yields other coincidences. After the War for Independence, Kosciusko returned to his native soil. In 1791 he tried, with thousands of other valiant men in Poland, to do for his own country what he helped us to do for ours. At that time, and so often since, the Polish Nation was obliged to resist the tyrannical interference of Russia. Kosciusko and his patriotic associates tried to free Poland from the despotic and deadening influence with which Russia attempted to subjugate the Polish people and subordinate their natural development to Russian interests.

The technique of imperialist Russia was a familiar one; it is by no means unknown to modern history. It supplemented acts of external aggression and prepared for these with carefully planned production of internal dissension and the promotion of internal debilitating factionalism. Kosciusko collaborated in the defense of a Polish constitution which was designed to secure the just rights of the people, to grant full and entire social liberty to all, and to eliminate the causes of class conflict and partisanship which were the death of Poland and the strength of her enemies. The adoption of this constitution was the pretext of a declaration of war against Poland; it was a brief, bloody war, and the Russians won it easily. They set up a puppet government.

Kosciusko was morally incapable of serving under a government which was Polish only in name. By his refusal to become a collaborationist with the enemy-dictated government set up in Poland, he incurred the necessity of becoming an exile in France. Here is another and a curious parallel: He became a kind of one-man government in exile, anxiously promoting, as best he could, the interests of his nation, and watching every opportunity to serve them. He led one momentarily successful but ultimately doomed effort to deliver Poland from the yoke of her captors. For a time, the patriotic zeal and the soldierly endurance of the Polish people were enough to offset the tremendous advantage in numbers and resources of their enemies, but finally the Polish forces were routed and Kosciusko fell a wounded prisoner. He was confined in a Russian dungeon—and with him were locked away the last hopes of the national salvation of Poland.

Those who read in history of that bloody and bitter chapter of Poland's story may find strange, grim grounds for consolation as they read its modern counterpart.

There is another parallel between the life and the times of Kosciusko and the spirit of those who today love Poland. When Napoleon entered upon his efforts to organize Europe in accordance with his ideas and ambitions, efforts were made to induce Kosciusko, now an old man and weary of war, to identify himself with the Napoleonic campaign against Russia. The efforts were implemented by promises of the part Poland might hope to play in Napoleon's victory. There was vague talk of the rewards that Poland might expect if Kosciusko could induce the Polish people to cooperate in the realization of a new order. Again Kosciusko's answer was historic, and Polish people down to our day can understand and echo it: "On no conditions," said he, "will I engage in your enterprise unless you will guarantee to Poland a free national government and its ancient limits; do this, and whatever of talents or influence I possess shall be at your disposal."

So from the memory of Kosciusko let all Polish peoples and all the friends of Poland take heart forever. The sorrow of Poland is the same now as it was then. The source of the sorrow is the same, the tests of the Polish power to endure are the same. So also, as there be a God, shall the eventual outcome be the same. Please God that outcome will be brought to pass by legal means and peaceful stratagems. When it shall come, no man knows. But this is certain: Poland shall not die.

It must not die. The fate of Christendom, as well as that of Poland, is always involved when Polish destiny is at issue.

We are told that for reasons of politics we should keep silent about Poland. We are told, even by those who believe in democracy, that we must forget about the rights of Poland, which had a democratic constitution since the First World War, in order to protect, at the expense of Poland, stronger nations which are just beginning to talk about democracy. We are told, even by some who believe in religion, that we should temper our concern for the future of the faith in Poland in order that Christianity may not be too annoying to governments which repudiate it. We are told that the new lords and masters of Poland and of eastern Europe do not like to hear priests speak of these matters, and that we should, therefore, leave them to the world's political leaders.

Well, so be it. But perhaps we can remind political leaders who hope to build a peace, of one fundamental religious fact about Poland which has enormous political significance. It has had in the past, it will have in the future. It is a fact which could be productive of unmeasurable good, the good of peace included. A great Englishman of letters expressed it accurately and dramatically when he said, "Poland is the culture thrust like a sword blade between the Byzantine tradition of muscovy and the materialism of Prussia." That is what Poland is; and that is infinitely the most real, practical, determining, and important thing about Poland. "Poland has traditionally been the providential Catholic wall between Asiatic mysticism to her east and Prussian materialism to her west." "For generations Poland spared the world the dread possibility of a fusion between these two titanic forces, forces which even singly bode no good for Christendom and united could lay waste the western world."

History bears witness that there has been one people in eastern Europe upon whom Christendom and the western world could always rely. The other peoples have their virtues, their traditions of valor and of achievement; they have their particular glories and special vocations, these orthodox nations of the east. But in times of crisis for Europe and for Christendom, they went their several ways and closed up within themselves, preferring their national religions, national destinies, and national survival to adherence to Catholicism, to the general destiny of the western world and to the survival of Christendom. Poland has always chosen for Christendom and for Europe, and for that choice she has been willing to pay with the partition of her land, the destruction of her state, and the persecution of her religion.

That is why Christendom and our democratic western world owe Poland so much. And that is why the consciences of Christians and of democrats are so troubled by the silence about Poland today.

The people of Poland, at home or abroad, well know wherein lies the only hope of their survival. It is not in politics nor in diplomacy. It is certainly not in militarism; armed revolution in this age of total mechanical warfare is never the way by which to secure national independence and a chance to live as a nation. The way out lies in the rededication of the Polish people to the faith that taught them the truth which made them free. The Polish people have always associated their faith with their freedom; they have themselves said that their love for freedom was inspired by and subordinate to their love for the faith: "We love liberty more than anything on earth," the Polish people said to Catherine of Russia in the days of Thaddeus Kosciusko, "but we love the faith even more than freedom!"

In that spirit, the spirit of Poland in the most gloricus pages of Polish history, all those who love them pray that the people of Poland may persevere through these dark days of their betrayal.

During the nineteenth century, when suffering under oppression, the Polish people adopted as a national hymn one containing the prayer: "Return to us, Lord, our motherland and freedom."

In 1918, on regaining their independence, they changed the words to: "Preserve for us, Lord, our motherland and freedom."

When the country was overrun by the Germans in 1939, the original words were restored.

Today, in spite of the efforts of the provisional government to change the wording again, the churches still resound to the people's cry: "Return to us, O Lord, out motherland and our freedom."

Please, God, that prayer will one day be answered.

Suggestion for an Autonomous Self-Contained City for the UNO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW L. SOMERS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 8, 1946

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, the vexing problem of how and where best to locate the headquarters of the United Nations Organization is one that is of vital interest to all Americans, as well as to all the member governments.

Discussing the problem with a lifetime friend, Maj. Joseph Caccavajo, former consulting engineer of the city of New York, who served with distinction in the Army Corps of Engineers, he suggested a possible solution which I believe is most interesting, and I feel is worthy of careful study by all concerned.

The idea is to create an autonomous island, which will meet all the requirements of the UNO, and to provide sufficient area for all present and future needs.

A place where a city can be laid out and developed without the restrictions and obstacles such as are present in and about all of the other sites suggested to date.

The plan I here present for consideration in my opinion, and that of others acquainted with it, will be entirely free of most, if not all, of the drawbacks and problems involved in the Connecticut-New York area, now being given primary attention.

It involves no interference with any valuable business or residential areas, public utilities, highways, Federal or State functions.

It removes any possible threat or fear of interference from pressure groups, picketing, demonstrations, or other disturbances mentioned by some of those who spoke in London recently. It will be autonomous to a greater extent than Vatican City in Rome because it can easily be provided with direct and uninterrupted communication by air and sea with the outside world, and have its own railroad connection by land.

One of the several draw-backs to the Connecticut-New York site is the loss of many millions of dollars in annual tax returns to the States and municipalities in the area. Capitalize this loss and it will add hundreds of millions of dollars to the initial cost of the project. In addition, serious consideration must be given to the disturbance and destruction of thousands of expensive homes and a considerable number of valuable properties and business establishments.

The policing of the boundaries also involves an annual expenditure of huge proportions, and there will be added problems such as exist at all international frontiers.

Another factor which must be considered if, as has been stated, the UNO area is extended to embrace 40 or 50 square miles, is that Americans who may be permitted to remain in the UNO area will be deprived of any voice in local government, and as residents on "foreign soil" may be deprived of other rights and privileges enjoyed by American citizens.

The construction of an autonomous island will save many millions of dollars in initial cost, permit of a comprehensive orderly plan for development of a world capital and the construction of official buildings, homes, hotels, utilities, and so forth. Best of all it will allow an independence for all concerned in keeping with the ideals and objects of the UNO and our own Government.

There are a number of places where such an island might be located. The site which Major Caccavajo and I suggest for the UNO city may not be the best but it has, in my opinion, advantages which certainly warrant serious consideration. It is on the New Jersey coast, a few miles north of Atlantic City, within a matter of minutes from New York City, Philadelphia, and Washington. La Guardia Field is about 90 miles away; Philadelphia, 50 miles; Washington, less than 150 miles. It is little more than 100 miles from New York by motor car.

Adequate air-field accommodations and water deep enough for ships can be made available so as to permit direct communication with all parts of the world by air and sea. The construction of a comparatively short spur will permit of direct railroad connection with the American railroad systems.

No buffer state or neutral zone will be necessary and the policing of the UNO area will be self-contained to an extent not otherwise possible.

Electric light and power, gas and water supply, sewage disposal, police and fire protection, and so forth, will be entirely in the hands of the UNO government. Internal management will be entirely free from any interference with or by our own Federal or State Government departments or agencies.

The property to be acquired for the site can be secured at small cost and very few people will be disturbed. Major construction operations can be carried forward with practically no interference with business or people in and near the site.

The whole project can be completed within a few years.

The island as contemplated will lend itself to landscaping comparable to what was accomplished on the filled-in area used so successfully by the New York World's Fair in 1939–40.

It is suggested that it cover no more than 10 square miles, which is sufficient to meet all the needs of the UNO. Ten square miles, 6,400 acres, nearly half the size of Manhattan Island, can accommodate hundreds of thousands of people if need be.

A number of our leading cities cover less than 10 square miles, and though a considerable part of their area is given up to business and industrial plants, which condition will not exist in the UNO city, they have many times as many residents as UNO city will ever have.

For example:

Cambridge, Mass., 7 square miles, population, 1940, 110,879.

Camden, N. J., 9.8 square miles, population, 1940, 117,536.

Paterson, N. J., 8.4 square miles, population, 1940, 139,656.

Reading, Pa., 8.8 square miles, population, 1940, 110,568.

Trenton, N. J., 7.7 square miles, population, 1940, 124,697.

In other words, 10 square miles can take care of all possible governmental requirements, including airfield, and provide adequate living room for 100,000 or more people, without need for encroachment on any surrounding territory.

A rough plan of the proposed UNO city, prepared by Major Caccavajo, shows a system of streets and broad boulevards, radiating from a central plaza, with ideal locations for monumental buildings and sites where each of the United Nations may establish distinctive and individual replicas of their homelands. The artistic and architectural possibilities are almost without limit.

May I suggest that the chief of engineers through the Secretary of War, be asked to give a rough estimate of the cost of constructing such an island in or near the site mentioned, or elsewhere, if the idea meets the approval of the UNO officials.

While the site mentioned has many advantages, the main idea I desire to present is to create an autonomous city, and there may be other sites where it might be located when further study of such a project is made.

The main advantage of the site I have suggested herewith is that it can be constructed with little interference with surrounding areas at a cost which will undoubtedly be considerably less than might be possible elsewhere. There is also the advantage of location and the time element, both of which are most important.

Hold the Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 8, 1946

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following story from a recent issue of the Green Bay Press-Gazette:

HOLD THE LINE, 23-CENT BULGE COSTS $25 FINE

The man had just entered the Press-Gazette editorial room and stood before one of the desks grinning sheepishly.

"I have just been nicked by the OPA," he told the reporter and then after a pause "does that have to be published?"

Assured that he was only one of many and that he had no chance to escape publicity he said:

"That's O. K. if they will just tell why I was fined. It is a small matter and if it's explained I don't care at all. I am George Herlache. I manage the Deprey furniture store at 720 Main Street. I sold a rug for $54 and gave the lady 50 cents discount. The net price was $53.50; now it seems the ceiling price should have been $53.27. I was 23 cents over. I don't know how I did that but on some items we get 4-percent discount for 10 days, and on some we get 2 percent for 30 days. I must have figured the 2-percent discount."

The reporter looked at the man suspiciously and asked, "Is that all? Your only overceiling sale?" When he assured the reporter that it was, he asked, "How did the OPA find out about this?" and he went on with the astonishing story:

"They take our invoices and bills, and they figure the discounts and when they have the cost they add our mark-up and they have the ceiling price. Then they check back against our sales."

The reporter suggested that it must have taken some time to find this little item, and he went on:

"He was there from about 9 in the morning until 3 p. m. When he showed me the error I took the slip and gave the lady 75 cents discount. But he said, 'That doesn't change anything. You made the sale.' Then I showed him that the rug was still in the store, and I asked him, 'What if she doesn't take it and the sale is off' but he would only say, 'You made the sale.' So I paid the $25 today."

At the OPA office it was said that the store had not been previously visited by the price panel of the Brown County price control board nor had the store been checked by OPA prior to the spot check. A member of the enforcement staff said that the $25 penalty had been accepted rather than to go through considerably more work to determine whether other overceiling sales had been made.

OPA Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER H. GROSS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 8, 1946

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

PENNSYLVANIA SAW CORP.,
Newark, N. J., March 1, 1946.

Mr. CHESTER H. GROSS,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GROSS: If ever the OPA should go out the window it is now. It may be all right to hold it for a few things like rent control, etc., but it is tying up the productive ability of practically 100 percent of the manufacturers of this country. As an instance, in 1944 we had quite a large manufacturing loss. It took 1 year for the OPA to decide to give us a 6-percent increase in our selling prices. They figured that this amount was just about enough to let us break even. When asked what we were going to do to recup past losses they said, "It is too bad." When asked about a little profit they merely laughed at us. Now comes along an increase in the price of steel. It will amount to approximately 12 to 14 percent as far as we are concerned. The steel company is now beginning to ship us steel at the old prices and on the invoices they state that they will send the corrected invoices at such time as the OPA determines just what the price of steel should be. In the meantime we don't know what our costs are. We may be running into the red for all we know and there is no way of determining it until we know what the steel is going to cost. If we run into the red we are supposed to apply to the OPA Stabilization Director for price increase. By the time they wake up to doing something about it another year will probably go by. We have taken all the losses we can now take, and if we are going to be further handicapped we are going to merely lock our doors. That is the position that a great many people are taking, including, as we understand it, the big American Chain plant at York. They are closed down tight and it is our understanding that they have no intention of opening up again until they get an actual price increase for their goods.

It is high time that Congress did something about this or America will be seen going to the dogs. I know you do not want that, so as Tennyson advised, "Let your voice rise like a fountain night and day."

Very truly yours,

F. G. ACOMB.

YORK, PA., *March 6, 1946.*

Hon. CHESTER H. GROSS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GROSS: This year our company is celebrating its ninetieth anniversary and in our entire career we have been able to operate successfully under Government regulations. This includes the period of the last 12 years, when we operated under Government regulations to a larger extent than in all the previous years combined.

For the first time in our entire history the road ahead does not seem to be clear, because of the conditions with which we are confronted as a result of the settlement of the steel strike. This settlement came as a distinct shock to us, as we believe it has to all steel fabricators, in that no provisions were made to absorb the increase in the price of steel, and a wage increase, with which we are definitely faced because of the national pattern which was set by the Government in settling the steel strike. It was our hope that in the length of time that was taken to settle that strike, provisions would have been made which would automatically have permitted steel fabricators to pass on the increase, the same as the makers of steel are permitted to pass it on to us.

It has been our practice during the last 12 years to operate our company on the basis of a sales forecast, broken down month by month, against which we budgeted all items of cost, month by month, and predetermined our profit, before and after taxes, at the end of each year. We have 12 years' experience operating under this plan and each year we have come out within 1 percent of our predetermined figure.

In forecasting our sales for 1946 and budgeting all items of cost, including material, labor, and overhead, the figures were based on material prices and labor costs as they existed January 1, 1946, and this enables us to very definitely allocate to our 1946 operations what the increase in the cost of steel, and a comparable increase in labor rates, will mean to our 1946 operations; and instead of coming out with a profit, through which the taxes we would have paid would have been $136,981, we will come out with a loss of approximately $182,000. Our prices on 80 percent of the volume of business for 1946 and under OPA regulations are the same as they were in October 1941.

We believe this situation is not peculiar to our company, but that the same conditions will apply to practically all manufacturers of capital equipment, the nature of which does not lend itself to mass production procedure.

It occurs to us that the Office of Price Administration is losing sight of the serious problem with which manufacturers of our type are confronted. Our figures show that if we are to pay the taxes that are reflected in our predetermined method of operating our business, we will require as a minimum a 7½-percent across-the-board increase in order to absorb the increase in the price of steel and the increase in wages, with which we are definitely faced.

We believe the time has come when the Congress should investigate the power that is vested in a few men in OPA, as undoubtedly the lack of profits and, therefore, the lack of taxes from many companies, will make a greater contribution to an inflationary spiral than is being anticipated.

Our relations with our employees is very satisfactory and the cooperative spirit existing between management and labor in our company is commendable and even with the critical situation facing us, we intend doing our level best to bring the year through as near a break-even point as possible and in this effort we will have the wholehearted assistance of all our employees; but unless price relief is granted, and as we see it today, our company will make no contribution toward the national budget.

We intend making application to OPA on their prescribed forms for price relief, but we are fearful that the processing of our requests will be delayed to such an extent as to have no effect upon this year's operations; therefore, we do not believe the answer to this serious problem will come through the processing of requests by individual companies, and since time is the essence of this situation, it is our thought that OPA should grant an across-the-board price increase to steel fabricators on the basis of somewhere between 5 and 20 percent.

We do not favor the abolishing of OPA entirely, but it seems to us to be practical for OPA to control inflation through granting increases gradually as conditions dictate,

percentagewise across the board, to industries whose production is of a similar nature.

The Congress are the only ones whom we recognize as the direct representatives of the people and, therefore, the only hope we have for immediate relief under present circumstances is for the Congress to take this situation in hand and from the Congress itself dictate the policies of the Office of Price Administration.

Because we believe the present situation is critical from the standpoint of the national budget, I am addressing this appeal to you in the hope that it may be of some assistance to you in dealing with this important problem.

Sincerely yours,

A. B. FARQUHAR CO.,
WM. J. FISHER, *President*.

P. S.—You will be interested to know we have a union contract with three unions of the American Federation of Labor.

The Housing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. MAY
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 8, 1946

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast by Earl Godwin:

Good evening, folks. Building a home in America should be one of the most joyous experiences of all life; and building homes for the generation of veterans who have won the war and brought glory to our land should be a nationally uplifting episode. But, sad to relate, the preparations for this home-building program have been a long-drawn-out caterwauling process between and among various groups and political parties.

The Government's housing program is for 2,700,000 homes in 2 years, and, to make sure there is a clear road to this ambitious goal, the chief governmental policy is to insure priority to building material for such homes. Give the veterans priority on buying and financing such homes. And a genuine effort to keep down the price of these homes!

The first difficulty the builders run into is the lack of material, and that's where the first Kilkenny cat fight started.

The Government at Washington is so used to solving all problems by writing a directive or concocting a regulation or rushing up to the Treasury for a cartload of money to be used in paying part of your grocery bill or something, that the housing program heads—of whom Wilson Wyatt of Louisville is chief—said, "Well, boys, let's pay some of these building manufacturers a little extra money so they will quit sulking and come out in the open with plenty of bricks, shingles, doorknobs, and such other gadgets as a veteran needs for a house."

The building-material boys, who have been bogged down flat as a pancake under price controls, figured that any more dealings with Washington would be disastrous and said, "Nothing doing. The war is over. For the love of Mike let's restore the old law of supply and demand and insure plenty of material, as it always was from the beginning of time under the healthful impetus of American competition."

Well, somehow or other, in the last few years, American competition has been smeared until competition takes on the aspects of Captain Kidd and Lucretia Borgia. Anyone who speaks of Americanism or free competition is called a Fascist. The only way many officials want to deal with American business—which made America fairly strong—is to tie it down, give it a bottleful of dope, and then allow it to take a few minutes' exercise in the prison yard accompanied by at least one strong-armed OPA keeper. The great sin in America today is being successful enough to make a profit of more than 4 cents on the dollar. Anyone who makes a nickel finds it taken away on the ground that the Government knows best and, besides, money is not going to do you much good, anyhow.

Well, when the housing program, which is all that could be desired in its aims, reached the point in Congress where it was about to be implemented with $600,000,000 of Treasury money which was to be spread about among the doorbell and doorknob manufacturers, brick makers, saw mills, and what have you, there arose in the House of Representatives a whirlwind of sentiment against any more artificial help or restraints on business—big, medium-sized, or little.

Practically every Member of the House, at least those who live in the average medium-sized city or rural area, has from one to a thousand merchants and small manufacturers on his neck with bitter complaints about being kept in red ink and loss and lack of help by wartime restrictions which ought to be gone by now. That is their complaint. I am being a realistic reporter, telling you why the housing program is as it is at this moment.

Business wanted to be free to do this huge building job without handcuffs, questionnaires or special trips to Washington.

The administration folks couldn't see it that way.

They said, if you do that, prices will rise and you cannot build these veterans' homes to be sold at anything like $6,000, which is the ideal.

But the House of Representatives boiled over and refused to O. K. that $600,000,000 subsidy.

You know that sum amounts to about $223 per house. And it doesn't seem likely that success or failure in America depends on any such little money as that.

The point of my story is not an argument in favor of one side or the other, but is a report that the House of Representatives represents people and people at home are sore at continued Government controls; and, whether right or wrong, their Congressmen expressed this view. They would rather have some rough going for a few weeks than experience further dealings with boards and commissions down here at the National Capital.

The various veterans' lobbies, labor, and other liberal organizations have been whipped up to a frenzy against the American plan as finally rated by the House, threatening to defeat every Member of Congress who voted for free enterprise. They charge their Congress has succumbed to the real-estate trust, or some other lobby, but here is a point these furious young men overlook: Members of the Houses are experts in public opinion in their own neighborhood, and all 435 come up for renomination and reelection this year. Politics boils in every district. These Congressmen are presumed to know how their folks feel. And from the talks I have had with many of them, the folks feel they can build all these veterans' homes without any difficulty if Washington will get off their necks. That viewpoint may turn out to be disastrous, but that's the ruling sentiment just now.

I think a little common sense may be required. With all this burst of freedom, someone has got to ride herd on some of these house and home builders, or the price will shoot up somewhere and spoil the whole deal. And, of course, this program has yet to pass the Senate.

Violent predictions of failure of the building program have been and are now being made, but may I call your attention to the fact that predictions in Washington are worth about a dime a dozen. I have particular reference to the dire prophecies of doom and destruction made by Government officials on high levels, who warned that Congress must pass a bill guaranteeing everybody a job or we would all be selling apples on the street corners by this time.

Sidney Hillman, in August, last, predicted 10,000,000 unemployed within 6 or 8 weeks.

Secretary Wallace, on October 30, last, approved the idea that unemployment would reach 8,000,000 right now. Arthur J. Altmeyer, Chairman of the Social Security Board, had 5,500,000 unemployed by last Christmas; 8,000,000 unemployed by next summer. One of his estimates—and he was throwing them in the air like a juggler keeping four scintillating balls going at one time—had 8,000,000 unemployed last Christmas.

Secretary Schwellenbach, last November, threw up his hands and said it would be impossible to estimate within one or two million the number of people who would be unemployed, and he had 8,000,000 men out of work just about now.

And John W. Snyder, conservative and well-founded, was bitten by the bally-hoo bug and had 8,000,000 people out of employment at this particular moment.

Now, what are the facts? Instead of 8,000,000 people out of work last Christmas, there were less than 2,000,000. Instead of five, six, seven, or eight million people out of work this spring, the actual official figures are 2,300,000 and the normal corps of unemployed is two and one-half million people, which may or may not include the million or more out of work voluntarily because of strikes.

At any rate, after that terrific blast which was made for the purpose of bally-hooing or driving Congress into guaranteeing a Government job or some other kind of a job for everybody in the country, you must remember that nature has taken its course; the original fantastic full employment bill was not passed, although a better and common-sense maximum employment law is now on the books. So the prophets of doom turn away from the unemployment that didn't happen and are bally-hooing for further control by the Government over the manufacturing industry and individual enterprise.

The real fight is not for or against houses for veterans. The real argument has been on the best method of obtaining 2,700,000 modest homes within 2 years.

Russia makes the headline of the week, but first here is some sound advice as to what we all should do to protect today's higher property values.

At last, American officials are not afraid to speak their minds on Russia. When Senator VANDENBERG came out and said every time Russia moved the rest of us inquired "What's Russia up to now?" it brought a hurry-up speech from Secretary of State Byrnes, which did not mention Russia, but came out flatly against some of the Russian shennanigans.

Diplomats have a way of speaking without mentioning the man they're berating. Like the card-playing miner in the old six-shooter days, who was convinced that the dealer in the game was crooked. The dealer was a one-eyed man. And the suspicious miner finally pulled out his weapon and spoke as follows:

"I ain't mentioning no names. But if a certain guy in this game don't quit dealing 'em off the bottom, I'm going to shoot out his other eye."

That's about the way Jimmy Byrnes talked to Joe Stalin. Of course, words are just words and nothing else.

Then along came Winston Churchill. He said tougher things about Russia than anyone has said since Russia and Hitler were hand-in-glove. Suggests a military alliance between the British Empire and the United States to make us feel good and strong, as the Russian bear arises and shakes his paws. Chances are very much against any such military alliance. Better still, let us put every ounce of strength possible into the United Nations. Call another meeting of the United Nations and ask Russia to lay its intentions right on the line. Then if there's no good answer, then talk about an Anglo-American alliance.

Among the immediate effects of Winston Churchill's speech is a greater realization in Washington that the American people have O. K.'d a far-flung foreign policy which requires that we be strong in every corner of the world. And we have shucked off our Army and Navy strength until we could scarcely quell a riot, much less stand up to a really strong adversary.

And at the end. Did you hear my coworker Walter Winchell say J. Edgar Hoover may be pleasantly surprised this week? Well, the surprise may well be a medal pinned on J. Edgar Hoover for outstanding and even yet secret work during the war. Watch for this event tomorrow.

General Motors Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 8, 1946

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, the General Motors Corp. is blocking production. The United Automobile Workers has made a proposal which the majority of the American people consider fair, but the arrogance of the corporation continues. It is high time the General Motors management recognized it has some social responsibility. A typical comment is that of the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of March 6, 1946, entitled "Waiting on GM and UAW":

The almost complete break-down of all negotiations between the UAW and General Motors presents a most discouraging picture. The Nation waits while the two sides fence.

After weeks of moves and countermoves, GM made what it called its top offer of 18½ cents an hour, and asked, in event of a rejection by strike leaders, that the offer be submitted to the membership by secret ballot.

The strike leaders rejected the offer and refused to submit it, by itself, to a referendum. But the strike leaders did come back with a fair counterproposal containing these two questions:

"1. Do you favor returning to work and ending the current dispute on the basis of the corporation's offer of 18½ cents an hour increase and its latest proposal on basic contract matters? or

"2. Do you favor returning to work on the basis of the corporation's 18½-cent wage increase offer and its latest proposals on basic contract matters, with the understanding that all issues still in dispute shall be submitted to arbitration by an arbitrator appointed by the President of the United States?"

We see nothing wrong with that and we think GM would have been wise to accept it. Somebody has got to budge, somewhere, if this controversy is ever to be settled. While the Nation waits, its needs remain unmet.

Outfitting an Industrial Lifeboat Two-Way Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 8, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I wish to include a column from the Galesburg Labor News of February 14. It is entitled "Outfitting an Industrial Lifeboat Is a Two-Way Job," and was written by Edwin R. Wright, former president of the Illinois State Federation of Labor:

OUTFITTING AN INDUSTRIAL LIFEBOAT IS A TWO-WAY JOB

A lot of people have the idea that if you firmly grab a dollar by its edges and exert enough strength you can stretch it, as least, to two or three times its ordinary dimensions. In fact, although it is not referred to as dollar stretching this procedure has become a favorite pastime of the intelligensia—college professors, radio commentators, editorial writers, and, especially, third- or fourth-string "industrial experts." The really big ones know better. And we can prove it.

For our part, we know that a dollar can be stretched, because we have had some part in this stretching process. We didn't do it alone—no one can—although we have, we often think, wasted reams of good paper and pounds of ink and slapped our brain up to a peak in attempting to row our boat without oarlocks, if you get what we mean.

Sometimes, of course, we trades unionists, have forged a set of crude but workable oarlocks for our own boat, for our own purpose, and then started working out a corresponding set for the other side of the boat—which is the sole property of our bosses.

Where we meet a measure of cooperation—and, sometimes, but rarely, we do—the task is possible and the results encouraging.

We're neither a reformer nor a "sorehead," so let's let it go at that. If we can prove a point without name calling we all feel better about it.

Oh, well, here's another try at reaching a better understanding with our bosses, our own members, and, incidentally, our own ego.

What do we know about business? That means, of course, what do we do with our union's money.

First, we pay dues into the union. In one fund of a particular union we have built up a reserve of $2,467,746.28. Out of and because of this fund we are selling—and have for 40 years—life insurance to our members at a premium rate of less than $6.00 per $1,000 coverage per annum. We think that is "businesslike."

Another fund totals $3,809,543.66. Out of and because of this accumulation this international union is enabled to pay an old age pension benefit of $40.00 per month. Additional sums are paid from local union funds and the larger city organizations pay their elderly incapacitated members about $30.00—a total monthly sum approachng or reaching $70.00—12 times each year.

We think this is "good business" because this feature costs considerably less per member than does the government maintained old age pension—which, of course, our members receive also. Old-age pensions of about $40.00 from the Government ($20 additional if married and age limits permit) and $70 from our own funds, well, do you agree that's "good business"?

We go further. If a member of this union wishes, he may pay $12 per year for sick and accident insurance and receive $10 a week over a long disability period.

Again, a sick or incapacitated or elderly member—this is cared for in another fund but paid into the union as dues—may go to a private national hospital—transportation, meals, and sleeper prepaid, yes, tips, too—and receive every care and comfort, including all professional service, clothing, and even a spending-money allowance.

And, please remember, there isn't even a hint of charity in all this—it's all paid for in union dues, paid by our individual members working as a union.

"Your men and women"—yes, our women receive the same pay, do the same work and receive the same benefits as the men—"have strikes or lock-outs, don't they?" you ask.

Of course, but not too many. We finance these difficulties on the same broad principle as we do all our other activities.

"Sometimes they cost you a lot of money?"

Yes. One such argument with an employer has been running for more than 50 years and another for more than 40. This union is somewhat tenacious, perhaps, in such matters.

These labor difficulties have cost these particular employers, directly or indirectly, we think, sums equal to or exceeding the physical valuations of their businesses. These employers may have a different point of view, but that's their privilege, of course.

The union has paid out a lot of money, too, but nothing comparable with that of our former employers, and we think that is "good business"—not, of course, to have strikes, but to have the courage and ability to meet them, if we must.

Because of this policy, in part at least, we believe, we have very few strikes or lockouts. We sincerely wish that we had none at all.

Labor peace is the best of "good business."

"You pay big salaries to get men to do your business as you want it done?"

Sure! Sure! We regard officership in our union as a high honor and most of our officers—all, we think—have fewer financial resources at the end of their terms than they had when they started them.

Our international officers receive $7,500 per year. Our local officers receive the equivalent of the highest union scale in their cities—with an additional $10 weekly, perhaps, for good measure—but nothing for overtime and the many extra services they perform. The same effort and responsibility and "know how" would, in private business life, pay them much more liberally.

"You're proud of your union, aren't you? What else do you do as an organization?"

We train our members in their craft as well as in their civic and union duties and responsibilites. Every apprentice is required to take a full course in craft education and to pass a stiff examination before he or she is allowed to join the union.

Our union "card" is very near a guaranty of proficiency in one or another of the branches of our calling—and every year we are raising the standard. This is not a simple procedure because of changes and improvements in technique and in equipment, but its "good business" to go as far and as fast as we may.

We have given a bare outline of the International Typographical Union. The benefit features are the same in principle—and sometimes in amount, in New York, Chicago, and Galesburg—except that the smaller cities pay less amounts in purely local activities. (And pay smaller union dues, too.)

Many, many trade-unions do almost as much for their members—some claim more—but let them tell their own story.

Today America is placing heavy emphasis on "efficiency," "production," and "understanding" and this brings up the question: "Is labor doing its part?"

We think so.

We think if you understood us better that you, too, would think so.

We thank you.

The Army and Navy Forever

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 8, 1946

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted me, I wish to include in the RECORD an anonymous poem The Army and Navy Forever—a la Hamlet's soliloquy:

THE ARMY AND NAVY FOREVER

That it should come to this
The war but two months dead! Nay not so much; so excellent a team; that was, to others
Hyperion to a satyr; so loving to each other
That one might not between the winds of Heaven
Visit the other too roughly. Heaven and earth!
Must I remember? Why Army would hang on Navy
As if increase of harmony had grown
By what it fed on. And yet, with a month,
Let me not think of it; Frailty, thy name is woman.
So little time; or ere those shoes were old
With which she leaped ashore from Navy decks
Like Artemis, all haste; why she, even she,
Oh Heaven! a beast, that wants discourse of reason,
Would have pondered longer marriage with the Navy
Her brother in arms; but no more like the Army
Than I to Hercules; within a month
To marry! Oh most wicked speed, to post
With such dexterity to incestuous sheets!
It is not, nor it cannot, come to good,
But break my heart, for I must hold my tongue.

FSA Program as It Applies to Veterans of World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 8, 1946

THE RURAL REHABILITATION PROGRAM

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, applications from veterans of World War II for initial rehabilitation loans are being filed at an accelerating rate, region VIII figures show. The figures:

Applications for initial rural rehabilitation loans

December	745
January	1,594
Cumulative	4,418

Indications are that the peak demand for loans is still many months ahead.

Inquiries made in four Oklahoma counties in January indicated that slightly more than half of the men who went into the armed services were still to be returned to civilian life.

Of those who have returned, many are still in the adjustment period and have not decided their future course definitely enough to come to FSA to apply for financial help. All applications thus far received from veterans have come from those who have been out of service long enough to have reached a decision and to have made arrangements to go back to work.

Army surveys have resulted in a statement that a million veterans are expected to return to the farm. Companion surveys have resulted in an estimate that 75 percent of the veterans returning to farms will require financing of some kind.

If the commonly accepted figures showing that about 10 percent of the Nation's farms lie within region VIII are correct, it would indicate that a total of 100,000 veterans may seek to return to the farm within this region; and that some 75,000 of them will require financing of some kind.

FSA, of course, will not finance all of the veterans requiring help, nor will all of them turn to FSA. However, an insight into the proportion of veterans seeking FSA financing, as compared to other types of agricultural financing is afforded by figures on applications for so-called GI loans in region VIII:

During January, applications for GI guaranteed loans totaled 121. During January, applications for initial rural rehabilitation loans — FSA — totaled 1,594.

Cumulative figures show a total of 4,418 applications for FSA's rural rehabilitation loans; 351 applications for GI loans.

In other words, veterans are applying for rural rehabilitation loans, as against GI loans, at a rate of more than 12 to 1.

This is only a part of the story. The figures on GI loans include applications for both personal property loans and real property loans.

FSA is receiving applications for real-estate loans at an increasing rate. The figures:

Applications for farm ownership loans

December	412
January	825
Cumulative	2,728

Add the applications for rural rehabilitation loans, 4,418, and 2,728 applications for farm ownership loans, and the total number of applications becomes 7,146, about 20 times as many applications for loans under FSA's programs as for GI loans.

As applications come in more and more rapidly, the loan-making rate rises correspondingly. The figures:

Initial loans made to veterans

December	287
January	842
Cumulative	1,764

In December, $479,757 was loaned to World War II veterans in the rural rehabilitation program; in January, $1,287,479. In all, $2,697,666 has been advanced to World War II veterans under the rural rehabilitation program.

Farm ownership loans to veterans

December	24
January	49
Cumulative	111

Rehabilitation loans made between now and the end of the fiscal year will depend on the money available. Indications are that there will always be a backlog of unfilled applications.

Farm-ownership loans to veterans will depend largely upon the availability of land, reasonably priced. Many applications received to date have been for loans upon farms which would not appraise out. This factor is the principal obstacle in the way of an accelerated FO program for veterans.

As to FSA's future ability to meet the demand from World War II veterans for agricultural financing in region VIII:

In his statement before the Agriculture Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, the FSA Administrator said:

> A loan authorization of $67,500,000 has been recommended for the fiscal year 1947. This amount will enable us to provide the supplemental assistance to present borrowers necessary for their continued progress toward rehabilitation and initial rehabilitation assistance to approximately 25,000 additional farm families—or about 8 per county.

In region VIII applications for initial rehabilitation loans received from veterans alone, in 1 month alone—January—averaged more than 4.4 per county.

Applications from veterans alone on hand at the end of January totaled 1,776, or approximately 5 per county.

And the peak demand, as has been indicated, is still ahead.

On the basis of the evidence presented here, region VIII will need, for veterans alone, all of the money the Administrator says will be available for the "25,000 families" over the entire country. Poor civilians! Poor other 10 regions!

Congress should increase the authorization and appropriation immediately.

South Dakota Has Largest Per Capita Hunting Revenue in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 8, 1946

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, South Dakota's famed hunting advantages have become a million-dollar industry. Last year, only Pennsylvania and Michigan exceeded South Dakota in hunting revenue, with the result that by several times over South Dakota has the largest hunting revenue of any State in the Union.

Mr. Speaker, the reasons for South Dakota's unique and interesting record as the hunting paradise of the United States are numerous and obvious.

First, sir, give credit to the State bird of South Dakota and the royal game bird of the whole United States, the sporty,

delectable South Dakota ring-necked pheasant.

Secondly, let credit go to the renowned hospitality of South Dakota folks.

For other reasons, give thought to the healthful, stimulating, exhilarating, zestful climate which South Dakota invariably turns on to greet the visiting hunters during the more than 100-day-long open season on King Pheasant.

Or if you please, sir, consider South Dakota's vast productive soil which raises the corn, grain, fruit, shrubs, and berries which are so coveted by the pheasant and so conducive to general human happiness and prosperity. Add to that, the beautiful lakes and streams of South Dakota—practically all free from pollution—the good highways, the opportunity to fish trout, cast for black bass, hunt wild geese and ducks, and even shoot an elk or deer while visiting South Dakota in quest of pheasants and you will realize why South Dakota's popularity as a hunter's paradise is growing by leaps and bounds.

Mark up your personal calendar, Mr. Speaker, to visit South Dakota next fall along with the many of our colleagues who make the trip each year. Like them, I am sure you will get your daily bag limit of pheasants and you will find no limit on the enjoyment and adventuresome experiences which you will share.

There follows hereafter some arithmetic which indicates how many good Americans are making it a habit to go to South Dakota for their hunting adventures:

STATE STANDS THIRD IN HUNTING REVENUE—JUMPS FROM TENTH PLACE IN TOTAL COLLECTED FROM LICENSES

WASHINGTON, March 5.—The 48 States collected $15,512,252 from the sale of 8,190,901 hunting licenses in the year ended last June 30, compared with $13,547,152 for 7,505,258 licenses in the preceding year.

Reporting this today, the Fish and Wildlife Service said the number of licenses issued last year set a record for the war period.

Despite travel restrictions and the rationing of gasoline and tires, nonresident hunting licenses jumped from 107,685 in 1943–44 to 154,363 in 1944–45.

Pennsylvania led all other States in revenue received with $1,395,841. Others in the big ten in revenue included Michigan, $1,198,437; South Dakota, $1,087,122; California, $913,307; New York, $854,827; Ohio, $669,256; Wisconsin, $617,857; Washington, $511,268; Colorado, $510,888; and Illinois, $473,339.

South Dakota has the sharpest increase, jumping from tenth place in 1943–44 with $465,602 to third.

Economic Gymnastics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 8, 1946

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to include an editorial of Spencer A. Canary, editor of the Daily Sentinel-Tribune of Bowling Green, Ohio, describing the economic gymnastics of the New Deal:

"HOLD THAT LINE"

If the clumsy efforts of President Truman and his New Deal advisers to "hold that line" were not so tragic in their import for America, they would be pathetically humorous.

Their apparent intent is good; but, like Hell, the present economic status of the country is paved with good intentions; and the future paving blocks seem likely to be of the same material.

They are trying to "make two blades of grass grow where but one grew before" with half the fertilizer. They are trying to make 60,000,000 jobs with 30,000,000 opportunities. They are approving greatly increased wages for workers and at the same time trying to "hold that line" of prices by limiting employers to a profit based on the rate of profit on net worth earned before the war sent prices upward.

Here is the New Deal formula for profits: "To earn an average rate of profit equal or as nearly as may be to the rate of the return on net worth earned by the industry in the peacetime basic period applicable to that industry."

For example, suppose the net worth of a business before the war were $100,000, that it did business amounting to $200,000 a year and made a net profit of 6 percent, or $12,000. Suppose that the present net worth were 25 percent greater because of increased cost of replacements, therefore being $125,000. Under the New Deal rule it would be allowed a net profit of 6 percent of $125,000, or $7,500—if it could make it without the ceiling price being raised; and, if it were raised so that consumers had to pay more, would that be "holding the line"?

Let's see. Suppose the business were automobiles and that the cost of labor going into them before the war were 40 percent. The 40-percent cost for labor would take $80,000 of that $200,000 business, which yielded $12,000 profit. But suppose that 40 percent were increased 18 percent, making it 58 percent as the cost of that labor. That 58 percent would take $116,000 out of that $200,000, which would be the selling price of the factory's product, if the selling price were retained, an increase of wages by $36,000; and, of course, the rest of the cost, for materials, etc., would also be higher.

But under the New Deal theory the $200,000 selling price should remain the same or be increased only enough to allow a profit of $7,500. If the selling price were permitted to be increased to care for the increased cost of labor and of materials, the price to consumers would be 18 percent or $236,000 for the factories' products.

So the public would have to pay $36,000 more for the same products, while the capitalists would get only $7,500 return on its net worth, or about 3 percent.

This allows nothing for replacements due to depreciation in the factory or for enlargements which might mean more employees. Fine business theories of the New Deal.

It is in line with the OPA ruling that permits a good price on cotton but keeps the price of textiles so low that they are of inferior quality.

More Truman Snap Judgment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARVE TIBBOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 8, 1946

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Johnstown Tribune, Johnstown, Pa.:

MORE TRUMAN SNAP JUDGMENT

President Truman's announcement excluding the steel fabricators from the benefits of the price increase granted on basic steel products has thrown a good-sized monkey wrench into the machinery set up for the settlement of strikes affecting the smaller industries of the Nation. Just how the President expects the fabricating concerns to survive if they are compelled to grant an 18½-cent-an-hour increase in wages and the $5-a-ton increase in the price of steel is quite beyond our comprehension.

The decision of Mr. Truman, it seems to us, is radically at variance with his professed love for "the little fellows" in industry. In a sense, too, it is a slap in the face for Chester A. Bowles, his new Stabilization Director, who had announced that the fabricators would be permitted to adjust their prices in line with the increase granted basic steel.

Unfortunately, many of the fabricating companies have already signed contracts at the new wage rate on the assumption that they would be granted price relief. Those who have not yet signed up, therefore, are in a more fortunate position.

The Presidential decree will have the effect of prolonging the strikes among all such concerns and thereby keep well over 200,000 workmen idle.

Mr. Truman is rapidly acquiring a reputation for snap judgment on important problems, and this would appear to be another case in which he has spoken without giving the subject the consideration it should have had. He has had to reverse his position a number of times in recent months, and he will have to do it again if he wants to save the smaller industries from collapse.

Major General Willoughby Lauds MacArthur's Rule of Conquered Japanese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER H. GROSS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 8, 1946

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Gettysburg Times of March 3, 1946:

MAJOR GENERAL WILLOUGBY LAUDS MACARTHUR'S RULE OF CONQUERED JAPANESE

More interested in talking about the achievements of his chief than about his own distinguished war record, Maj. Gen. Charles A. Willoughby, crack intelligence officer for General MacArthur from Bataan to Tokyo, declared in an interview here Friday evening that MacArthur's conduct of the Japanese occupation would have won for him an immortal place in history without his previous combat record.

The general came to Gettysburg Friday afternoon as the week-end guest of Mrs. E. S. Lewars and her brother and sister-in-law, Mr. and Mrs. Paul Singmaster, Seminary Ridge. He will return to Washington, D. C., Sunday afternoon, and on Monday will board a plane which will take him back to Tokyo and General MacArthur. He consented to an interview by a reporter for the Gettysburg Times Friday evening at Mrs. Lewars' residence.

HAS MANY DECORATIONS

General Willoughby, who wears all the important Army decorations given by this Nation excepting the Congressional Medal of Honor, is generally credited with being in a

large measure responsible for the low casualty rate of MacArthur's land invasions through the thoroughness of his intelligence work.

With coveted decorations from China, the Dutch and Russia yet to be bestowed, General Willoughby already possesses the Distinguished Service Medal, the Distinguished Service Cross, the Silver Star, the Philippine DSM, the Order of the British Empire, the Philippine Liberation ribbon and the Presidential unit citation with two bronze clasps.

These decorations are in addition to those he accumulated in western front duty under MacArthur in World War I. That list included the French Croix de Guerre and Italian and British awards. South American countries also have added to his collection of medals.

TOOK A FEW CHANCES

The Distinguished Service Cross was given for action in the Palau Islands "where I took a few chances," the general explained in answer to the reporter's questions. The Silver Star was given for Willoughby's emergency action on January 24, 1942, on Bataan when he took command of a Philippine battalion "and kept them going for a day."

The DSM, the general said, covered his war services generally but the citation read to him at General MacArthur's headquarters in February 1944, when the award was made, did not use such modest terms.

The general was cited for "exceptionally meritorious service to the Government in a position of great responsibility." It went on to say that General Willoughby "speedily and with brilliant resourcefulness planned and put into action necessary agencies for providing the command with reliable and comprehensive information concerning the enemy in vast and inaccessible areas."

PRAISES MAC ARTHUR

Returning again to his emphatic praise for General MacArthur's occupation policies in Japan, General Willoughby said: "The situation in Japan today is very similar to that in the Philippines from 1904 to 1908. Our fair treatment then of the Philippine insurrectionists won them over to us, and, when the time came, they fought gallantly at our side."

Comparing General MacArthur's military stature with such great leaders as Lee and Napoleon, the general declared: "I've never known a commander who inspired such loyalty or who had a more intuitive grasp of the science of warfare."

Speaking of the bloodless occupation of Japan's mainland, General Willoughby observed that MacArthur's "superb judgment enabled him to sense just how far he could go to make the Emperor and the nation bow to his rule. Had he not made exactly correct decisions the occupation of Japan would have been a bloody affair."

The atomic bomb was the "last straw" for the Japs and broke their will to resist. Without the use of the bomb, the costly victory would have come from 1 to 4 months after the invasion of Kyushu, the general believes.

AVOIDED CHAOS IN JAPAN

"MacArthur took over Japan with a handful of men, literally surrounded by 51 divisions of Japanese troops and menaced by an air force of several thousand planes with Kamikaze pilots. We used the only man in Japan who could implement our orders—the Emperor. There were "continue the war" hotheads in his council but he cast the deciding vote for surrender. If Hirohito had not been handled as aptly as he was, there would have been chaos in Japan.

"We had only a handful of Japanese speaking officers and 4,000 Nisei, whose intelligence work in the Pacific was of greatest value. If the Emperor had quit or been killed, we would have had the impossible task of running Japan.

"In Japan there has been no trouble, no sabotage, no fighting, no deaths—thanks to MacArthur's discreet handling of a situation that had trouble constantly seething beneath the surface.

"Let's leave this brilliant commander alone. There is nothing that a four-power committee can do in Japan half as well as this great patriot and statesman has done and is doing," he urged.

PRAISES NISEI

General Willoughby has the greatest praise for the services of the Nisei (Jap-Americans). "They were our greatest discoverers of information. They hit the beach with the combat forces—knowing that if they were captured they'd be boiled in oil at least—and rounded up every scrap of paper information they could find—letters, diaries, orders, troop dispositions, and so on.

"The Bismarck Sea victory brought Intelligence its first big break in the Pacific war. It was probably the biggest single 'find' of the Pacific war. The Jap Navy was utterly routed, but a handful of survivors—machine-gunned by Australians as they landed—brought ashore a three-volume copy of the latest Japanese Army register with 2,700 pages of Jap officers and their latest assignments. Our Niseis translated the document, and we supplied copies to all our forces and allies in the Pacific.

"From that day on, by picking up Jap division radio messages, we were able to trace not only the exact location of each division but we knew where most of their officers were at all times.

"We kept casualties at a minimum by gaining complete information on every sector before we attacked. We knew where the tough spots were and avoided them. They were taken from the rear later. I was a company commander in the First World War, and I decided then that if ever I was in a position of authority I would see to it that officers had all the information possible about the territory they were attacking. We supplied detailed maps to every officer, down to platoon leaders, showing the section he was operating in—even down to jungle paths. That helped a great deal.

"MacArthur had the toughest task of any war commander. Through late 1942 and much of 1943, when a vast part of our war plant production was going to north Africa, MacArthur was getting only a drop.

"At the same time he was placed in the position of being unable to lose a single battle. One defeat and the white man would have lost face completely in the Far East and I believe China would have quit."

General Willoughby, a graduate of Gettysburg College in 1914, was in Gettysburg last in 1938. During that visit, he served as interpreter at a luncheon given at the Hotel Gettysburg by General Marshall, then Chief of Staff, for the Brazilian chief of staff who came here to visit the battlefield.

General Willoughby returned to the Philippines with General MacArthur in March of 1939 to head his intelligence staff. He was with MacArthur at Bataan and went with him in March 1942, on that hazardous trip by PT-boat and Flying Fortress to Australia.

The general was interested to learn Friday evening that an Adams County boy, Sgt. Henry Pecher, was a member of the crew of one of the four B-17's that went on that rescue mission. Pecher was in one of two planes that crashed en route to meet MacArthur's party.

It was the tall General Willoughby who met with the first Japanese peace envoys as the Pacific war was ending and he had an official role in the formal surrender ceremonies aboard the battleship *Missouri* when the Japs quit.

General Willoughby has been in the States for the last month—in Washington, D. C., and visiting with friends. He came here from Bronxville, N. Y., where he was the guest of Arthur J. Singmaster, brother of Mrs. Lewars.

Price Control Means Production Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 8, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have received many letter recently from constituents of mine and people from different sections of the United States. It seems that they have about come to the conclusion that fixation of prices, planned economy, and regulation of commodity prices in the name of inflation prevention, have exactly the opposite effect from that they were designed to have. Price controls mean production controls.

But this is in keeping with the New Deal philosophy of scarcity. Scarcity means limited production, and limited production really means higher prices. Higher prices, with inflated currency such as we have, means inflation. The red tape of OPA and other agencies controlling prices and regulating production has resulted in the closing of many businesses and the curtailment of much production. What we need is an abundance of production, rather than limited production. Controlled economy will not result in abundant production. Only abundant production will bring about an equitable price structure. The law of supply and demand, if unhampered and uninterfered with by "new dealocracy," will produce the desired results and avoid inflation.

Some time ago I received a letter from one who seems to know his subject and who perceives where the "new dealirium" is leading us. I quote the letter from an Oklahoma City, Okla., citizen:

HON. GEORGE SCHWABE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SCHWABE: About 150 years ago, according to what I consider reliable authority, France, after one of her many wars, tried to work a system of price controls because there was a shortage of materials and prices were increasing at a tremendous rate and runaway inflation was very evident. They even went so far that people were tried and sent to prison, even put to death. They found after about 2 years that price control was not only not keeping prices down, but it was causing the very thing that the government feared most—that was inflation—because price control did not control prices, it only controlled production, because the goods people wanted could not be produced by the manufacturers so they just quit and left all production to the black markets, who were not controlled and they, in time, produced enough that they supplied the market and the prices came back. Now we have the same thing. Are you controlling prices or are you controlling production? I, for one, and there are many millions like me, am very much convinced that you are only controlling production and that nothing you can do in the way of laws will change the law of supply and demand and nothing but that law will keep prices down.

I do not see how anyone could help but realize that what is causing the strikes is higher cost of living, yet Mr. Bowles would have us believe that it costs no more now than in 1942; that is, when we asked him

for a rent adjustment. But take a $5 bill and go to a grocery store—I do not say that they are not justified in getting the prices they ask and get, but at least we do have groceries. But how in Heaven's name can General Motors be expected to raise wages to meet the strikers' demands if they have the prices controlled on their cars? What is the result? They do not make cars. The officials will be able to pay their grocery bills for several months without making cars, but what about the workers? Maybe they can be paid by the Government, and then what have you? It just does not make sense to me. Maybe I am dumb, but since the law of supply and demand has always worked, why all at once does it not work? I believe it will.

Of course, we have had a big war and the American people produced enough war material in two short years to win that war against nations that had been preparing for it for 10 years while we were being told by our leaders in Washington, and I quote: "No mother's son will ever fight on foreign soil if I am elected." You no doubt remember that very well. If the people could do that in that time, does it seem reasonable that we cannot produce enough to stop inflation from running away? I think we can. But again, only production will stop it; price control which only controls that production will not.

Do you think even a small manufacturer is going to go out and buy a lot of raw material on which the prices, to a great extent, are not controlled, and make up a lot of articles and then take a chance that some bureaucrat who knows nothing about his line will set a price on it that will break him, or he will have to pay off so much that it will break him? If I were he I would lock the door and go fishing. Wouldn't you? And that is what thousands of them are doing now. And we do not like it at all. We want radios, cars, and such things.

Mr. Bowles is boasting that rent control is working. Of course, it should, because the property owner is taking a beating every month. Property is running down and no repairs are being made, or it is being rented on the black market, either of which is bad. But is it working, or is it causing a greater housing shortage? I believe that in Oklahoma City there are about 3,000 vacancies, part of them caused by property being held for sale, of course, but I believe a lot of them are vacant because the owners cannot afford to rent them at the ceiling prices. Here is just one example. In the 600 block of Third Street is a large house in which there are three apartments. The owner pays the bills. The OPA cut the rent to $4.50 per week which is about $54 per month for the whole house and the bills run over $50. That house is locked up now and I see many others like that over the city. There is no question in my mind but that the OPA can cure the house shortage here in 60 days by doing two things. And believe it or not it is not the elimination of rent control, though I think it would be a good idea; but if the regulation which keeps a property owner from getting possession of his property was done away with, and a 20-percent increase in rent was allowed the property owners, the housing shortage would be solved here, because there are enough houses vacant which the owners will not rent because they cannot get possession of them when they want to take care of the situation. Again, does price control really control prices, or does it only control production? Of course, I may be wrong, but I have spent most of my life in this business.

Did it ever occur to you that we could not pay on a national debt of $300,000,000,000 without inflation of some kind? Well, it has to most of us. It will cost more to run the Federal Government this year than all the people made in 1933. Then why not try to cut the cost of the Government, and do away with some of the bureaus and bureaucrats, or are they bigger and stronger than our Congress? If they are, maybe we should get a new Congress. A lot of us are thinking about that, too.

How far have we come along toward national socialism in the last 15 years? I do not need to ask you. You know. But the one thing that most of us cling to is that under our system we can sometimes change the men in office and it will work better than changing the form of government. I think we have the greatest country and the greatest Government in the world and we want to keep it that way. That, I am sure, you will agree with; then why try to change it? I believe the people are smart enough to run their own business, and I believe that you think so too. Why not let them try? It could not be a much worse mess than it is now.

The immediate need, of course, is production and more production. We have the raw materials, we have the manpower, we have the machinery, we have the money to pay for the goods. We seem to have everything except the brains to get it started. You cannot control one thing without throwing something else out of line and then when you try to control that you throw something else out of line, and so on. This system of controls which is the law of supply and demand has been built up over a period of 160 years and it works. Of course, if we want to pattern after England, then we can have Government control; but our forefathers left that country many years ago because they did not like that. Were they all wrong? I do not think so.

At least you can do this. The present price-control law will not expire until June 30. What is the use of renewing it now? It cannot hurt anything to wait and the thing may look entirely different by then. A great many things have happened in a much shorter time. We may not need it then, and it might not hurt the tax burden of the people if about a million of the people now on the pay roll would have to look for a job, and I believe it would help our idea of Congress. It is something to think about, anyway.

Milwaukee Wants More Air Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 8, 1946

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD a resolution of the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee protesting the report of an examiner of the Civil Aeronautics Board which is against the interests of our city and the entire area of which it is the center.

At the present time Milwaukee, the thirteenth city in the country, has direct service from only two air lines, one to the East and one to the East and Northwest. Five other air lines have petitioned the Commission to initiate direct service between Milwaukee and other parts of the country, and their petition has been denied.

Milwaukee needs such service, particularly to the South, Southwest, and California, and can support it. The air lines are eager to give it. The Chicago airport, through which a large part of Milwaukee air travel must be shuttled, is already overcrowded and inconveniently located. Milwaukee is 90 miles away from Chicago and is definitely not a suburb of that city. Milwaukee is the thirteenth largest city in population and tenth in value of manufactured products.

I sincerely hope the Civil Aeronautics Board will overrule the short-sighted report of its examiner.

Whereas the applications of the United Airlines, American, Chicago and Southern, and Eastern Airlines, also the Midwest Airways, Inc., of Milwaukee, as well as other feeder lines, for routes to Milwaukee have been rejected by the Civil Aeronautics Board examiner, much to our regret and surprise; and

Whereas the examiner's recommendations would deny Milwaukee what it is rightfully entitled to, that is, the right to give and have air service throughout the Nation, as well as transcontinental service; and

Whereas the Civil Aeronautics Board will rule upon the findings of the examiner, we believe every effort should be made to give Milwaukee (which is the thirteenth largest city in the Nation) such service as it deserves and that we should petition this board to give us favorable consideration: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee does hereby petition the Civil Aeronautics Board to set aside the recommendations of the examiner, Mr. F. Merritt Ruhlen, and urges the Board to give its approval of the applications of the United Airlines, Chicago and Southern, American, and Eastern Airlines, also the Midwest Airways, Inc., of Milwaukee, to serve Milwaukee as well as other Wisconsin feeder routes; and be it further

Resolved, That the common council offers its wholehearted support to the County of Milwaukee and the Milwaukee Association of Commerce in making this appeal to the Civil Aeronautics Board for favorable action and that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Milwaukee Association of Commerce, the county board, and to our United States Senators and Representatives in Congress.

More New Deal Scarcity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 8, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the philosophy of the New Deal has been a philosophy of scarcity. Under the guise of attempting to hold prices down for the consumer, there has been developed a scarcity of commodities and consumer goods. This has made prices higher. It has promoted inflation. Some argue that we should keep price controls until production approaches the demands of consumption. But the longer we wait, the scarcer the articles become and the more difficult it is to remove the controls. Then, when they are removed—and I

doubt if the New Dealocrats actually want to remove imposed regimentation or planned economy at any time—the prices may skyrocket and inflation may become rampant.

Water will always seek its own level, if unrestrained. The same principle applies to the field of economics. What we need is not more limited production, but more abundant production. Abundance will bring prices down to the level at which the producer cannot expect to, and will not, receive more for his commodities than the cost of production plus a reasonable profit. That is the way the natural law of supply and demand has always worked and always will work successfully. That prevents inflation, and it is the only sure prevention. But the New Deal theories of scarcity will some day develop a serious inflation, a runaway inflation, and we will be caught with high prices and scarcely any production. This will be the result of more New Deal scarcity which we are having forced upon us constantly by OPA and other regulatory and regimenting agencies and bureaus of the National Government.

Mr. Speaker, I am just in receipt of a letter from J. E. McDonald, commissioner of agriculture of the great State of Texas, dated March 4, 1946, in which he encloses a copy of a telegram he said he sent to President Truman on the date he wrote me. Mr. McDonald requested me to take time to read his telegram and give its contents favorable consideration. I was so impressed with the soundness of his thinking and the expressions of his convictions as set forth in his message to the President, that I thought it might be well to pass it on for the benefit of my colleagues and of all who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Mr. McDonald's telegram to the President follows:

AUSTIN, TEX., *March 4, 1946.*

President HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Rather than the suggestion that the American people consume 25 percent less food in order that starving peoples in war-torn nations may eat, why not ask American farmers to produce 25 percent more food and then either remove OPA or increase ceiling prices sufficiently to enable them to do so? Recently, organized labor and the steel industry were granted substantial wage and steel price increases and now comparable farm wage increases and higher prices for farm products must be provided or the Nation will be confronted with a greater scarcity of food and a lopsided economy, unemployment, and Government subsidies. The announced 2 percent to 3-percent raise in ceiling prices for grain is grossly insufficient and taken into comparison with the 15- to 20-percent wage increases recently given industrial workers constitutes an insult to the intelligence of the American farmer. This Government has tried and proven the fallacy of attaining prosperity and happiness through the policy of scarcity. May we never again make the mistake of plowing up cotton and killing little pigs and cattle or otherwise curtailing production while there are hungry and naked at home or abroad. Full production of agricultural and industrial commodities with equitable and full parity prices paid for that portion domestically consumed and world-market prices for that portion exported would give this Nation security and tax-paying power to liquidate the enormous national debt. We need equitable floor prices on agricultural commodities to encourage production and not unfair ceiling prices to discourage and make impossible adequate production. Let this be a government of and for all the people as our forefathers intended it to be.

J. E. MCDONALD,
Texas Commissioner of Agriculture.

Lumber Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 8, 1946

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a communication from the Illinois Lumber and Material Dealers Association, directed to me and other members from Illinois, the contents of which I urge the Members of the House to read and study carefully because you will get a clearer picture and the reasons why lumber is not available for the building of homes for veterans and for other purposes.

The Illinois Lumber and Material Dealers Association makes out the case for your lumber dealers in every State and in every district in the Nation. It is not only a call for greater production, citing the reasons how it can be brought about but it is a desperate plea of the retail lumber dealers throughout the Nation for the preservation of private enterprise.

I urge the Members to study this analysis from the Illinois Lumber and Material Dealers Association because in it you will find information you should have in approaching the question of the extension of the OPA for another year.

You will see why the OPA officials must have some common sense knocked into their heads by definite amendments in order to get better administration of the act, or in the event the act cannot be amended, the best reason why the OPA should be abolished.

The communication follows:

ILLINOIS LUMBER AND MATERIAL DEALERS ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Springfield, Ill., March 7, 1946.

Hon. CHARLES W. VURSELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As the congressional representative of the people of Illinois, I feel sure that you are greatly concerned with the problems which beset its citizens, the small businessmen, their employees and their families. For that reason I am submitting to you the following report of conditions in the retail lumber distribution field which is a true and factual report and not in accord with the fanciful statements you have been receiving from Washington departments.

I am asking you to read carefully this report, beginning with the following telegram:

"FEBRUARY 21, 1946.

"Mr. GEOFFREY BAKER,
"Deputy Administrator in Charge of Price,
"Office of Price Administration,
"Washington, D. C.:

"Very possible that any further attempts to force absorption on retail lumber dealers can result in many yards closing, further hampering distribution of materials to alleviate housing shortage. Many others will disregard regulation reminiscent of eighteenth amendment. Action preventing yards handling self-owned timber discriminatory and will reduce production. Suggest you get practical advice of industry advisory committee. Above consensus of 1,222 Illinois dealers.

"J. D. MCCARTHY,
"Secretary, Illinois Lumber and Material Dealers Association.

"During the entire period of the war the retail lumber dealers contributed wholeheartedly to this program both in delivery of lumber to the war effort, and to the domestic essential economy. War plants which were unable to secure even a promise of lumber shipments from the mills were able to get it on an hour's call from the local dealer. Cargo ships in the ways were rushed to completion because the dealers along the Gulf coast rushed needed lumber to them in a matter of hours, and not months.

"The retail lumber dealers made no effort to take advantage of this emergency situation by highly inflated prices. They adhered strictly to the mill ceiling prices as established by the OPA, and added only the historic percentage mark-up which they had used over many years—and which experience had taught they required to continue in existence.

"On August 11, 1943, the OPA established RMPR 215, which was a pricing formula by which the retail lumber dealer established his selling price. This formula was only established by the OPA after exhaustive examination of the historic percentage mark-ups which Illinois dealers have always used; the cost of doing business and the profit returns as discovered through the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the Labor Department.

"I wish to repeat with emphasis that this formula was established wholly by the OPA as a fair and equitable retail sales price for the seller and the consuming public.

"The war ended and the lumber industry appeared to be in a favorable position with no reconversion problems but with the tremendous task ahead of supplying the materials and building the homes which had been at a practical standstill for over 4 years. But instead of building materials being produced in greater volume, the production rapidly decreased and in some cases seemed almost to disappear.

"Why? The answer to the question and the blame for the conditions can be laid directly on the doorstep of the OPA.

"Why is there no lumber for the building of homes for GI veterans? Because the State Department and the Foreign Economic Administration have taken 225,000,000 board feet of lumber for the first quarter of 1946, 1,000,000 board feet for the full year of 1946, or enough lumber for 85,000 homes, for shipments to foreign countries such as Spain and others in South America to maintain diplomatic and export relations.

"Because the OPA, by the use of fancy clauses, permits the lumber manufacturer to receive as much as $8 a thousand board feet premium for shipping this lumber out of the country as he would receive if sold to lumber dealers for use in a GI house.

"Because the OPA by the use of fancy clauses permits the lumber manufacturer

for a rent adjustment. But take a $5 bill and go to a grocery store—I do not say that they are not justified in getting the prices they ask and get, but at least we do have groceries. But how in Heaven's name can General Motors be expected to raise wages to meet the strikers' demands if they have the prices controlled on their cars? What is the result? They do not make cars. The officials will be able to pay their grocery bills for several months without making cars, but what about the workers? Maybe they can be paid by the Government, and then what have you? It just does not make sense to me. Maybe I am dumb, but since the law of supply and demand has always worked, why all at once does it not work? I believe it will.

Of course, we have had a big war and the American people produced enough war material in two short years to win that war against nations that had been preparing for it for 10 years while we were being told by our leaders in Washington, and I quote: "No mother's son will ever fight on foreign soil if I am elected." You no doubt remember that very well. If the people could do that in that time, does it seem reasonable that we cannot produce enough to stop inflation from running away? I think we can. But again, only production will stop it; price control which only controls that production will not.

Do you think even a small manufacturer is going to go out and buy a lot of raw material on which the prices, to a great extent, are not controlled, and make up a lot of articles and then take a chance that some bureaucrat who knows nothing about his line will set a price on it that will break him, or he will have to pay off so much that it will break him? If I were he I would lock the door and go fishing. Wouldn't you? And that is what thousands of them are doing now. And we do not like it at all. We want radios, cars, and such things.

Mr. Bowles is boasting that rent control is working. Of course, it should, because the property owner is taking a beating every month. Property is running down and no repairs are being made, or it is being rented on the black market, either of which is bad. But is it working, or is it causing a greater housing shortage? I believe that in Oklahoma City there are about 3,000 vacancies, part of them caused by property being held for sale, of course, but I believe a lot of them are vacant because the owners cannot afford to rent them at the ceiling prices. Here is just one example. In the 600 block of Third Street is a large house in which there are three apartments. The owner pays the bills. The OPA cut the rent to $4.50 per week which is about $54 per month for the whole house and the bills run over $50. That house is locked up now and I see many others like that over the city. There is no question in my mind but that the OPA can cure the house shortage here in 60 days by doing two things. And believe it or not it is not the elimination of rent control, though I think it would be a good idea; but if the regulation which keeps a property owner from getting possession of his property was done away with, and a 20-percent increase in rent was allowed the property owners, the housing shortage would be solved here, because there are enough houses vacant which the owners will not rent because they cannot get possession of them when they want to take care of the situation. Again, does price control really control prices, or does it only control production? Of course, I may be wrong, but I have spent most of my life in this business.

Did it ever occur to you that we could not pay on a national debt of $300,000,000,000 without inflation of some kind? Well, it has to most of us. It will cost more to run the Federal Government this year than all the people made in 1933. Then why not try to cut the cost of the Government, and do away with some of the bureaus and bureaucrats, or are they bigger and stronger than our Congress? If they are, maybe we should get a new Congress. A lot of us are thinking about that, too.

How far have we come along toward national socialism in the last 15 years? I do not need to ask you. You know. But the one thing that most of us cling to is that under our system we can sometimes change the men in office and it will work better than changing the form of government. I think we have the greatest country and the greatest Government in the world and we want to keep it that way. That, I am sure, you will agree with; then why try to change it? I believe the people are smart enough to run their own business, and I believe that you think so too. Why not let them try? It could not be a much worse mess than it is now.

The immediate need, of course, is production and more production. We have the raw materials, we have the manpower, we have the machinery, we have the money to pay for the goods. We seem to have everything except the brains to get it started. You cannot control one thing without throwing something else out of line and then when you try to control that you throw something else out of line, and so on. This system of controls which is the law of supply and demand has been built up over a period of 160 years and it works. Of course, if we want to pattern after England, then we can have Government control; but our forefathers left that country many years ago because they did not like that. Were they all wrong? I do not think so.

At least you can do this. The present price-control law will not expire until June 30. What is the use of renewing it now? It cannot hurt anything to wait and the thing may look entirely different by then. A great many things have happened in a much shorter time. We may not need it then, and it might not hurt the tax burden of the people if about a million of the people now on the pay roll would have to look for a job, and I believe it would help our idea of Congress. It is something to think about, anyway.

Milwaukee Wants More Air Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 8, 1946

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD a resolution of the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee protesting the report of an examiner of the Civil Aeronautics Board which is against the interests of our city and the entire area of which it is the center.

At the present time Milwaukee, the thirteenth city in the country, has direct service from only two air lines, one to the East and one to the East and Northwest. Five other air lines have petitioned the Commission to initiate direct service between Milwaukee and other parts of the country, and their petition has been denied.

Milwaukee needs such service, particularly to the South, Southwest, and California, and can support it. The air lines are eager to give it. The Chicago airport, through which a large part of Milwaukee air travel must be shuttled, is already overcrowded and inconveniently located. Milwaukee is 90 miles away from Chicago and is definitely not a suburb of that city. Milwaukee is the thirteenth largest city in population and tenth in value of manufactured products.

I sincerely hope the Civil Aeronautics Board will overrule the short-sighted report of its examiner.

Whereas the applications of the United Airlines, American, Chicago and Southern, and Eastern Airlines, also the Midwest Airways, Inc., of Milwaukee, as well as other feeder lines, for routes to Milwaukee have been rejected by the Civil Aeronautics Board examiner, much to our regret and surprise; and

Whereas the examiner's recommendations would deny Milwaukee what it is rightfully entitled to, that is, the right to give and have air service throughout the Nation, as well as transcontinental service; and

Whereas the Civil Aeronautics Board will rule upon the findings of the examiner, we believe every effort should be made to give Milwaukee (which is the thirteenth largest city in the Nation) such service as it deserves and that we should petition this board to give us favorable consideration: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee does hereby petition the Civil Aeronautics Board to set aside the recommendations of the examiner, Mr. F. Merritt Ruhlen, and urges the Board to give its approval of the applications of the United Airlines, Chicago and Southern, American, and Eastern Airlines, also the Midwest Airways, Inc., of Milwaukee, to serve Milwaukee as well as other Wisconsin feeder routes; and be it further

Resolved, That the common council offers its wholehearted support to the County of Milwaukee and the Milwaukee Association of Commerce in making this appeal to the Civil Aeronautics Board for favorable action and that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Milwaukee Association of Commerce, the county board, and to our United States Senators and Representatives in Congress.

More New Deal Scarcity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 8, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the philosophy of the New Deal has been a philosophy of scarcity. Under the guise of attempting to hold prices down for the consumer, there has been developed a scarcity of commodities and consumer goods. This has made prices higher. It has promoted inflation. Some argue that we should keep price controls until production approaches the demands of consumption. But the longer we wait, the scarcer the articles become and the more difficult it is to remove the controls. Then, when they are removed—and I

doubt if the New Dealocrats actually want to remove imposed regimentation or planned economy at any time—the prices may skyrocket and inflation may become rampant.

Water will always seek its own level, if unrestrained. The same principle applies to the field of economics. What we need is not more limited production, but more abundant production. Abundance will bring prices down to the level at which the producer cannot expect to, and will not, receive more for his commodities than the cost of production plus a reasonable profit. That is the way the natural law of supply and demand has always worked and always will work successfully. That prevents inflation, and it is the only sure prevention. But the New Deal theories of scarcity will some day develop a serious inflation, a runaway inflation, and we will be caught with high prices and scarcely any production. This will be the result of more New Deal scarcity which we are having forced upon us constantly by OPA and other regulatory and regimenting agencies and bureaus of the National Government.

Mr. Speaker, I am just in receipt of a letter from J. E. McDonald, commissioner of agriculture of the great State of Texas, dated March 4, 1946, in which he encloses a copy of a telegram he said he sent to President Truman on the date he wrote me. Mr. McDonald requested me to take time to read his telegram and give its contents favorable consideration. I was so impressed with the soundness of his thinking and the expressions of his convictions as set forth in his message to the President, that I thought it might be well to pass it on for the benefit of my colleagues and of all who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Mr. McDonald's telegram to the President follows:

AUSTIN, TEX., *March 4, 1946.*

President HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Rather than the suggestion that the American people consume 25 percent less food in order that starving peoples in war-torn nations may eat, why not ask American farmers to produce 25 percent more food and then either remove OPA or increase ceiling prices sufficiently to enable them to do so? Recently, organized labor and the steel industry were granted substantial wage and steel price increases and now comparable farm wage increases and higher prices for farm products must be provided or the Nation will be confronted with a greater scarcity of food and a lopsided economy, unemployment, and Government subsidies. The announced 2 percent to 3-percent raise in ceiling prices for grain is grossly insufficient and taken into comparison with the 15- to 20-percent wage increases recently given industrial workers constitutes an insult to the intelligence of the American farmer. This Government has tried and proven the fallacy of attaining prosperity and happiness through the policy of scarcity. May we never again make the mistake of plowing up cotton and killing little pigs and cattle or otherwise curtailing production while there are hungry and naked at home or abroad. Full production of agricultural and industrial commodities with equitable and full parity prices paid for that portion domestically consumed and world-market prices for that portion exported would give this Nation security and tax-paying power to liquidate the enormous national debt. We need equitable floor prices on agricultural commodities to encourage production and not unfair ceiling prices to discourage and make impossible adequate production. Let this be a government of and for all the people as our forefathers intended it to be.

J. E. MCDONALD,
Texas Commissioner of Agriculture.

Lumber Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 8, 1946

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a communication from the Illinois Lumber and Material Dealers Association, directed to me and other members from Illinois, the contents of which I urge the Members of the House to read and study carefully because you will get a clearer picture and the reasons why lumber is not available for the building of homes for veterans and for other purposes.

The Illinois Lumber and Material Dealers Association makes out the case for your lumber dealers in every State and in every district in the Nation. It is not only a call for greater production, citing the reasons how it can be brought about but it is a desperate plea of the retail lumber dealers throughout the Nation for the preservation of private enterprise.

I urge the Members to study this analysis from the Illinois Lumber and Material Dealers Association because in it you will find information you should have in approaching the question of the extension of the OPA for another year.

You will see why the OPA officials must have some common sense knocked into their heads by definite amendments in order to get better administration of the act, or in the event the act cannot be amended, the best reason why the OPA should be abolished.

The communication follows:

ILLINOIS LUMBER AND MATERIAL DEALERS ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Springfield, Ill., March 7, 1946.

Hon. CHARLES W. VURSELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As the congressional representative of the people of Illinois, I feel sure that you are greatly concerned with the problems which beset its citizens, the small businessmen, their employees and their families. For that reason I am submitting to you the following report of conditions in the retail lumber distribution field which is a true and factual report and not in accord with the fanciful statements you have been receiving from Washington departments.

I am asking you to read carefully this report, beginning with the following telegram:

"FEBRUARY 21, 1946.

"Mr. GEOFFREY BAKER,
"Deputy Administrator in Charge of Price,
"Office of Price Administration,
"Washington, D. C.:

"Very possible that any further attempts to force absorption on retail lumber dealers can result in many yards closing, further hampering distribution of materials to alleviate housing shortage. Many others will disregard regulation reminiscent of eighteenth amendment. Action preventing yards handling self-owned timber discriminatory and will reduce production. Suggest you get practical advice of industry advisory committee. Above consensus of 1,222 Illinois dealers.

"J. D. MCCARTHY,
"Secretary, Illinois Lumber and Material Dealers Association.

"During the entire period of the war the retail lumber dealers contributed wholeheartedly to this program both in delivery of lumber to the war effort, and to the domestic essential economy. War plants which were unable to secure even a promise of lumber shipments from the mills were able to get it on an hour's call from the local dealer. Cargo ships in the ways were rushed to completion because the dealers along the Gulf coast rushed needed lumber to them in a matter of hours, and not months.

"The retail lumber dealers made no effort to take advantage of this emergency situation by highly inflated prices. They adhered strictly to the mill ceiling prices as established by the OPA, and added only the historic percentage mark-up which they had used over many years—and which experience had taught they required to continue in existence.

"On August 11, 1943, the OPA established RMPR 215, which was a pricing formula by which the retail lumber dealer established his selling price. This formula was only established by the OPA after exhaustive examination of the historic percentage mark-ups which Illinois dealers have always used; the cost of doing business and the profit returns as discovered through the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the Labor Department.

"I wish to repeat with emphasis that this formula was established wholly by the OPA as a fair and equitable retail sales price for the seller and the consuming public.

"The war ended and the lumber industry appeared to be in a favorable position with no reconversion problems but with the tremendous task ahead of supplying the materials and building the homes which had been at a practical standstill for over 4 years. But instead of building materials being produced in greater volume, the production rapidly decreased and in some cases seemed almost to disappear.

"Why? The answer to the question and the blame for the conditions can be laid directly on the doorstep of the OPA.

"Why is there no lumber for the building of homes for GI veterans? Because the State Department and the Foreign Economic Administration have taken 225,000,000 board feet of lumber for the first quarter of 1946, 1,000,000 board feet for the full year of 1946, or enough lumber for 85,000 homes, for shipments to foreign countries such as Spain and others in South America to maintain diplomatic and export relations.

"Because the OPA, by the use of fancy clauses, permits the lumber manufacturer to receive as much as $5 a thousand board feet premium for shipping this lumber out of the country as he would receive if sold to lumber dealers for use in a GI house.

"Because the OPA by the use of fancy clauses permits the lumber manufacturer

to receive as much as $10 a thousand more for the sale of lumber to railroads than he would receive if he sold the same items to retail lumber dealers to be used in the building of a GI house.

"Because the OPA still clings to pricing formulas which were given the lumber manufacturers as an incentive to produce heavy items for the war effort in the South Pacific whereby the lumber manufacturer receives $6 and $8 a thousand premium for these timbers and heavy dimensions over the amount he can receive for those items necessary to build homes; such as, siding, centermatch, shiplap, flooring, and ceiling.

"As an incentive to stimulate production of southern pine lumber, the OPA granted the southern lumber manufacturers an increase of $2.50 a thousand on November 29, and a second increase of $3.25 a thousand on February 13 They have also granted the manufacturers of hardwood flooring an increase of 10 percent to stimulate production. In all of these price increases to the mills, they have simultaneously issued regulations which force the retail lumber dealer to absorb these price increases. In addition to this absorption, they have also provided that the retail lumber dealer must now discontinue the handling charges which have always been recognized as a cost of doing business and which the OPA themselves recognized and set up in the RMPR 215 formula.

"So that you may more fully understand the penalty which is being imposed on the retail lumber dealer, I give you below two tables, the first of which shows how the dealer arrived at this retail selling price under the original formula, and what is now proposed by OPA regulations:

"Original formula MPR 215 of Aug. 11, 1943

"In-yard cost of item	$50.00
"Handling charge	$5.00
	$55.00
"30-percent mark-up	$16.50
"Retail selling price	$71.50
"Profit in dollars	$21.50
"Percent mark-up on cost	43
"Percent mark-up on sales	30

"New formula of OPA

"In-yard cost of item	$50.00
"2-percent buying commission	$1.00
	$51.00
"30-percent mark-up	$15.25
	$66.25
"Less wholesalers' commission of 5 percent	$2.50
"Retail selling price	$93.75
"Profit in dollars	$13.75
"Percent mark-up on cost	27.5
"Percent mark-up on sales	20.75

"Both the percentage mark-up on cost and the percentage mark-up on sales is now much below the amounts the dealer was accustomed to receive in prewar years, and which we hold is an illegal violation on the part of the OPA which, when created by Congress in the War Powers Act, established they could not impose any regulations which would disturb or disrupt established practices of industry.

"The OPA admits that more than 50 percent of southern pine lumber is now being sold through the black market. This is an understatement—it actually amounts to over 80 percent. Truckers with no identifying names on their vehicles are peddling black-market lumber on the streets of every town and city in the entire southeastern area. The prices they are demanding and receiving from contractors building night clubs, saloons, bowling alleys, theaters, etc., are far in excess of the legitimate retail ceiling price. The mills themselves are in violation of the OPA regulation which stipulates they cannot sell at retail.

"Despite repeated protest by the industry, the men who are in charge of OPA from Chester Bowles down to office clerks have refused to take any action whatever against these black-market violations. Rather, their whole attitude is one of encouragement and assistance to increase the scope of these black-market activities.

"The retail lumber dealers of Illinois have been willing to comply with OPA regulations as long as they permitted a fair and legitimate profit for the operation of their business, and so long as the OPA made honest efforts to prevent price violations by either mills or unscrupulous retailers. But in view of the record of the OPA, and in the light of their discriminatory tactics and un-American policies, the dealers' position and intention is set forth in the wire which was sent to Mr. Geoffrey Baker.

"You owe it to your constituents in Illinois to take vigorous action in their defense and have two apparent courses open. Take this matter up on the floor of Congress and demand that the OPA either completely abolish the absorption policy and impose compliance—or else vigorously take your stand with those Congressmen who demand the complete abolishment of the Office of Price Administration.

"The retail lumber dealers of Illinois would appreciate having from you some acknowledgement of the above statement with some indication of what definite action you propose to take in regard to the conditions which we have above set forth. May we hear from you at an early date?

"Yours very truly,

"J. D. McCARTHY,

"Secretary, Illinois Lumber & Material Dealers Association."

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 8, 1946

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution adopted by the Progressive Mine Workers of America, in convention assembled, February 26, 1946, at Springfield, Ill., in support of extension of the Office of Price Administration:

Whereas America's peacetime prosperity depends upon full production and full employment; and

Whereas this goal can be achieved only by maintaining mass purchasing power so that there will be a steady demand for the products of industry and agriculture; and

Whereas inflation destroys the purchasing power of the masses and thus destroys the market for the plentiful supplies of goods that will become available when peacetime production is fully resumed; and

Whereas price control, during the transition period while goods are scarce and demands are heavy, will prevent inflation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this convention go on record requesting that all Representatives of the Congress of the United States support the Office of Price Administration 100 percent; and be it further

Resolved, That all Representatives of Congress be requested to vote in behalf of said program; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, one to Chester Bowles, director of Economic Stabilization, and one to Paul A. Porter, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration.

Tax Exemptions for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 8, 1946

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including herewith a resolution taken from the American War Dads' publication of February 1946 with reference to tax exemption for veterans of World War II:

TAX-EXEMPTIONS RECOMMENDED

Whereas the American War Dads realize the abrupt transition to civilian life by our boys released from the armed forces, which does not give them an opportunity to adjust themselves to the employment wage deductions pertaining to withholding tax and social security; and

Whereas a situation has arisen and continues to become more serious in that a veteran returning from service discovers that after income tax and other deductions, his take-home pay is not in sufficient degree greater than the allowance granted by the Government, resulting in a decision to accept the Government allowance in order to hopefully seek occupation with greater remuneration: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the American War Dads, herewith petition our representatives and Senators in Congress to amend the income-tax law of the Nation by exempting from income tax the first $2,500 of earned salary per year of a veteran of World War II and that such exemption be extended to a period of 3 years from date of said veteran's discharge from the service, thereby granting to the veteran the opportunity to rehabilitate himself into civilian life by enabling him to be employed at the prevailing rate of wages and not be compelled to accept remuneration offered by the Government for the 52 weeks under the unemployment section of the GI bill of rights.